The case of American Hungarian case:
Morphological change in McKeesport, PA[*]

Anna Fenyvesi
University of Pittsburgh

1. Introduction

Change in the case system of a language is a development that immigrant languages in contact with American English (AmE) are widely observed to undergo. Both flexional and agglutinative languages have been reported to undergo two kinds of change in their case marking systems: (i) replacement of case affixes that would be required in the standard varieties of those languages and (ii) complete loss of case marking (and use of nominative forms in the case of flexional languages, and use of uninflected stems in agglutinative languages).

In the present paper I will discuss changes in the case system of American Hungarian (AH) in McKeesport, Pennsylvania. I will argue that, in addition to a replacement and loss of case marking, this variety of Hungarian is characterized by two other tendencies as well: a simplification of the system of local case marking and a development of a new distinction, not found in Standard Hungarian (SH), in the local case marking of place-names.

2. American Hungarian in McKeesport, PA

The data used for the present study comprises approximately six hours of recordings (242 typed pages of transcripts) of interviews with 20 speakers of Hungarian. The interviews were designed to prompt conversations between the subjects and the interviewer about the subjects' life histories and patterns of Hungarian language use. This method of data collection, while allowing more spontaneous language use which would reflect features of real-life speech, did not permit a more focused elicitation of the same forms and an equal amount of data on all points across the subjects. A comprehensive account of the findings on the phonology, morphology, syntax, lexicon and address system of McKeesport Hungarian-American speakers is given in Fenyvesi (1995).

Four of the speakers interviewed are immigrants (two of them being immigrants of the 1956 Hungarian revolution, and the other two more recent), while the remaining sixteen are second-generation Hungarian-Americans. Fifteen of these are children of early-20th-century immigrants, mostly in their sixties and seventies, and one is the college-age son of a 1956 immigrant. All but two of the subjects belong to the community of the Free Hungarian Reformed Church of McKeesport, while the remaining two subjects live outside the community, in nearby Pittsburgh, but regularly attend social gatherings with the McKeesport Hungarians.

McKeesport, with approximately 26,000 inhabitants, is a former steel-mill town about half an hour's driver outside of Pittsburgh. It had its heyday economically in the earlier part of the 20th century when its booming heavy industry attracted large numbers of working class East European immigrants. The post-WW II decline of the steel industry changed the life of the East European ethnic neighborhoods as well – today the younger generations have all moved elsewhere, and what remains is a small number of ever-decreasing ethnic islands whose mostly older members remain connected only through their Polish, Slovak, Serbian and Hungarian churches. Due to these socio-historical factors, the McKeesport Hungarians are both socio-economically homogeneous and form a real speech community the majority of whose members have known each other for decades.

3. Case features in McKeesport Hungarian

Standard Hungarian is a heavily agglutinative language with 24 cases. The various cases vary greatly in frequency of occurrence – some are extremely common (e.g. the accusative -t, dative -nak, and the local cases, such as inessive -ban or superessive -n, but many are very rare (e.g. the temporal iterative -onta, the distributive -nként, and the modal -lag). The same variability in frequency is also true for the McKeesport data, where some of the cases (e.g. the temporal iterative -onta, the comitative -stul, and the distributive -nként, among others) do not occur at all, and it is by no means the case that all of the others show any changes. Thus, I am not able to present a fully detailed picture of the entire case system of McKeesport Hungarian in this paper, but will, instead, delineate the most prominent tendencies observable in the corpus. In the following sections I will first discuss the replacement and loss of cases (section 3.1) and then concentrate on two tendencies emerging as part of this overall phenomenon, namely the simplification observable in the system of local cases in their primary, directional meaning (section 3.2), and a new distinction which occurs in the use of local cases in connection with place-names in American Hungarian (section 3.3).

3.1. Replacement and loss of cases

The replacement of cases with other cases and the loss of case inflections in immigrant languages is a phenomenon which has been recognized and described for many such varieties. It has been documented among immigrant groups in the United States e.g. for Polish by Lyra (1966) and Preston (1986), for Slovak by Meyerstein (1969), for Czech by Henzl (1982) and Kuãera (1990), for Croatian by Gasiƒski (1986), for Serbo-Croatian by Albin & Alexander (1972) and Jutroniç-Tihomiroviç (1985), for Russian by Olmsted (1986) and Polinsky (to appear), for Yiddish by Levine (1995), for Greek by Seaman (1974), and for Finnish by Lehtinen (1966) and Larmouth (1974). Although the exact configurations vary from language to language, the changes in the case systems of the immigrant varieties of these languages show one main tendency: nominals appear bearing cases other than what would be employed in the standard variety of the language in question, with the most widely occurring form replacing other cases being the nominative, although sometimes other forms take over other nonnominative positions as well. The former process, the replacement of nonnominative forms with the nominative, means, for the flexional type of languages (all of those mentioned above except for Finnish), the complete loss of case marking in some instances, and the

replacement of nonnominative inflections with nominative ones in other occurrences, where the nominative form itself is inflection-bearing (e.g. Russian *-a* class feminine nouns). In agglutinative languages like Finnish, the replacement of nonnominative forms with the nominative means a complete loss of case marking and use of the bare stem.

Even though there are comprehensive studies describing American Hungarian, they do not discuss case features in detail. Kontra (1990) provides a thorough description of the structural features of Hungarian spoken in South Bend, Indiana, but he does not analyze the case system in a detailed way. The only case feature Kontra (1990, 73-74) discusses for South Bend is the affectedness of local cases in place-names (see below), although some of the other case phenomena treated in the present paper do occur in examples throughout his book. Solovyova (1994) surveys morphological changes in Kontra's computerized corpus of South Bend data, pointing out several characteristics of case marking changes, but not in enough detail to be provide a basis for thorough comparison with the McKeesport data. Two overall details provide some insight at the global comparison of the two corpuses: Solovyova (1994, Table 4) found 282 instances of case marking different from SH (counting the total of omitted and replaced case suffixes) in what amounts to approximately 80 hours of South Bend recordings, or, roughly, 3.5 occurrences per hour; in the 6 hours' worth of McKeesport data there are 179 occurrences (again, of replacement and loss together), or about 30 occurrences per hour – almost nine times as much, in relative terms, than in South Bend. More details of Solovyova's findings will be referred to in relevant sections throughout this paper.

Bartha (1993, 135) very briefly mentions that accusative case marking is sometimes missing in her American Hungarian data from Detroit, but she does not discuss any details about its occurrence or whether other cases are affected in her subjects' speech.

Case marking in McKeesport Hungarian undergoes similar changes as in the other immigrant language studies referred to above. Of the 179 instances where case is used differently than it would be in Standard Hungarian, 94 – i.e. slightly more than half – are examples where no case suffix is used at all, while in the remaining 85 instances a different case is used than what would occur in Standard Hungarian.

3.1.1. Loss of case

There are 94 examples in the McKeesport data where case endings are omitted. The omissions are syntactically of two different kinds: 42, or somewhat fewer than half of all the omissions, constitute loss of case marking in argument positions, while the remaining examples are those of case loss in adjuncts. The figures are given in Table 1 in order of frequency of omission; the last row refers to examples where it is not clear what case was omitted.

Interestingly, Solovyova's (1994) findings about the numbers of case omissions in the South Bend American Hungarian data are very similar to those in the McKeesport data. Comparative percentages of the individual case omissions for South Bend/McKeesport are 39.7%/47.8% for the local cases[1], 29.4%/28.8% for the accusative, 14.7%/7.4% for the instrumental, 10.3%/5.3% for the dative, and 5.9%/11.6% for the other cases (Solovyova 1994, Table 7 for South Bend figures). In both corpuses the local

---

[1] The sum of percentages for inessive, superessive, allative, inessive, delative, sublative, and elative for the McKeesport figures from Table 1 above.

cases are affected the most, followed by the accusative, the dative, and finally the instrumental.

Loss of case marking occurs in the speech of most of the McKeesport subjects: fourteen of the sixteen second-generation speakers and three of the four immigrants have instances of it in their speech samples.

Case	Total # of omissions	# of omissions in argument positions
accusative *-t*	27	23
inessive *-ban*	13	0
superessive *-n*	11	0
essive *-ul*	9	9
instrumental *-val*	7	5
dative *-nak*	5	3
allative *-hoz*	5	2
illative *-ba*	3	0
delative *-ról*	3	0
sublative *-ra*	2	0
elative *-ból*	3	0
terminative *-ig*	2	0
[case unclear; local]	4	0
Total:	94	42

Table 1. Omission of case marking in the McKeesport data.

Loss of case marking in argument positions is most prevalent in the accusative, i.e. direct object case marking, but there are a few examples each of dative, instrumental, and allative argument ommissions. The overwhelming majority of them are arguments of verbs, while a few are those of postpositions. All are listed in (1) below, where case-bearing arguments and their English equivalents appear in boldface and *somebody* and *something* are abbreviated as "sby" and "sth", respectively.

(1)　　　　　　Standard Hungarian　　　English meaning
　　　accusative:　*felad **vmit***　　　'give up **sg**'
　　　　　　　　　*felejt **vmit***　　　'forget **sg**'
　　　　　　　　　*fizet **vmit***　　　'pay **sg**'
　　　　　　　　　*hoz **vmit***　　　'bring **sg**'
　　　　　　　　　*ismer **vkit***　　　'know **sy**'
　　　　　　　　　*kap **vmit***　　　'get/receive **sy**'
　　　　　　　　　*kér **vmit***　　　'ask for **sg**'
　　　　　　　　　*készít **vmit***　　　'prepare **sg**'
　　　　　　　　　*küld **vmit***　　　'send **sg**'
　　　　　　　　　*mond **vmit***　　　'say **sg**'
　　　　　　　　　*olvas **vmit***　　　'read **sg**'
　　　　　　　　　*szeret **vmit***　　　'like **sg**'

	*tart **vmit***	'hold **sy**'
	*tesz **vmit***	'put **sg** (somewhere)'
	*tud **vmit***	'know **sg**'
	*vár **vmit***	'wait **for sg**'
dative:	*hív vkit/vmit **vminek***	'call sy/sg **sg**'
instrumental:	*találkozik **vkivel***	'meet **sy**'
	***x-vel** ezelŒtt*	'**x (time)** ago'
allative:	***vmihez** közel*	'close **to sg**'

Some of the examples of sentences with case loss in arguments are given in (2a-g) below.[2]

(2)(a) huszonegy **dolár** egy hounapra kapot   (vs. SH dollárt)
twenty-one dollar a month-subl get-past-3sg-indef
'he got 21 dollars a month'

(b) thugya   Goldi **Szarka**?   (vs. SH Szarkát)
know-3sg-def Goldie Szarka
'do you (formal) know Goldie Szarka?'

(c) szeretem   a muzsikát a **csárdás**   (vs. SH csárdást)
like-1sg-def the music-acc the csárdás
'I like music and *csárdás*'

(d) mektartoták   mindig a március **tizenötödik**   (vs. SH tizenötödikét)
hold-past-3pl-def always the March fifteenth
'they always celebrated March 15th'

(e) asz hítuk   a magyar **negyed**   (vs. SH negyednek)
that call-past-1pl-def the Hungarian neighborhood
'that's what we called the Hungarian neighborhood'

(f) ako tanákosztam   a **férjem**   (vs. SH férjemmel)
then meet-past-1sg-indef the husband-Px1sg
'that's when I met my husband'

(g) mekhalt   khéit **éiv** ezelöüt   (vs. SH évvel)
die-past-3sg-indef two year ago
'she died two years ago'

Adjunct phrases affected by loss of case marking include place, time and other adverbial phrases, examples of which are given in (3a-g) below.

(3) (a) [*Árpi bácsi mikor született*? 'When were you born, Uncle Árpi?']
Janyuár tizenharmadikon, tizenkilenc **huszonketöü**.   (vs. SH 1922-ben)
January thirteenth-super nineteen twenty-two

---

[2] Throughout this paper, American Hungarian examples are given in a broad phonetic transcription based on Hungarian orthography. The capital letters *L* and *R* in AH forms stand for velarized *l*'s and retroflex *r*'s, respectively. American Hungarian forms illustrating the case loss or replacement in question appear in boldface in the examples, with the corresponding Standard Hungarian form given in brackets to the right of each example, or at the right end of the line containing the English meaning. Standard Hungarian forms are given in Standard Hungarian orthography.

     Abbreviations used in the glosses are the following. Cases: abl=ablative, acc=accusative, ade=adessive, all=allative, caus=causal, dat=dative, delat=delative, elat=elative, ess=essive, ill=illative, iness=inessive, instr=instrumental, sublat=sublative, super=superessive, term=terminative. Other abbreviations: adjder=suffix deriving an adjective, def=definite conjugation, indef=indefinite conjugation, inf=infinitive, pl=plural, Px=possessive, sg=singular.

'On January 13, 1922.'
 (b) anyám   ment   a **kiropektor** (vs. SH csontkovácshoz)
    mother-Px1sg go-past-1sg the chiropractor
    'my mother went to the chiropractor'
 (c) apám születet   Szatmár **megy** (vs. SH megyében)
    father be-born-past-3sg Szatmár county
    'my father was born in Szatmár county'
 (d) (:**Monroeville**:) laknak.[3]   (vs. SH Monroeville-ben)[4]
    Monroeville live-3pl-INDEF
    'They live in Monroeville.'
 (e) [*Hol születtek a szüleid?* Where were your parents born?]
    Az édesapám **Fábiánház**, (:and:) édesanyám **Berekszász**.
    the father-1sgPx Fábiánháza and mother-1sgPx Beregszász
    'My father in Fábiánháza, and my mother in Beregszász.'
             (vs. SH Fábiánházán; Beregszászon)
 (f) [*Tud olvasni magyarul?* Can you read in Hungarian?]
    valamenyi thúdom, **kicsi**   (vs. SH kicsit)
    some   know-1sg-def little
    'I can to some extent, a little'

 (g) az éinekeket joban thudom   madzsarul mint **angol** (vs. SH angolul)
    the hymns-acc better know-1sg-def Hungarian-ess than English
    'I know the hymns better in Hungarian than in English'

As I have shown elsewhere (Fenyvesi 1995, 76-77), and as some of the examples above in (2) and (3) also illustrate, loss of case (especially loss of case in arguments) often occurs together with SVO word order and without focus-movement (replacing the usual Standard Hungarian SOV order accompanied by focus).[5] Table 2 below shows the co-occurrence of case loss and focus-movement loss by speaker. The first row shows whether or not loss of case marking in adjuncts occurs in the speech of a given speaker, the second indicates case loss in arguments, the third marks whether either of the previous kind of case loss occurs with a speaker, while the fourth shows whether SVO word order occurs with no focus-movement in sentences uttered by the speaker where SH would have SOV order together with focus-movement. (In designations of speakers "f" and "s" refer to first-generation speaker and second-generation speaker, respectively.)

Speaker:	f1	f2	f3	f4	s1	s2	s3	s4	s5	s6	s7	s8	s9	s10	s11	s12	s13	s14	s15	s16
Case loss in adj.:	+	+	+	-	-	+	+	-	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	-

[3] Words and phrases pronounced by the subjects in their usual American English pronunciation are given enclosed in parentheses and colons throughout this paper.

[4] Declined forms of Monroeville, as well as of Pittsburgh and Duquesne below, contain a hyphen before the case ending since, according to the rules of SH orthography, one is required when the stem ends with a silent letter.

[5] This development of SVO word order and loss of focus-movement is a prominent tendency in AH spoken in McKeesport (for details on the syntax see Fenyvesi (1995)): two of the four first-generation speakers and all second-generation speakers except one have examples of it in their speech.

Case loss in arg.:	-	+	-	-	+	+	+	-	+	+	+	-	+	+	+	+	-	-	-	-
Case loss total:	+	+	+	-	+	+	+	-	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	-
SVO + F loss:	+	+	-	-	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	-

Table 2. Co-occurrence of case loss features with loss of focus-movement and SVO.

It is reasonable to suppose that these two features – loss of case marking and the development of SVO word order – occur as integral components of the same process, with the latter compensating for the former in a change from a synthetic Hungarian grammatical and syntactic structure towards a more analytical English-like one. The source of the change is most likely the joint effect of borrowing (in Thomason & Kaufman's (1988, 21) sense of "incorporation of foreign elements into the speakers' native language") from AmE and a tendency towards simplification and reduction in language attrition.

3.1.2. The replacement of cases

There are 84 examples in the McKeesport data where a different case is used from the one which would be required in SH. All but one of the second-generation speakers and two of the first-generation speakers have one to twelve occurrences of case replacement. A total of 45 examples concern local cases used in locatives, and the remaining 39 examples involve various local and nonlocal cases serving purposes other than locative. The distribution of the kinds of case replacements by speakers is summarized in Table 3.

Speaker:	f1	f2	f3	f4	s1	s2	s3	s4	s5	s6	s7	s8	s9	s10	s11	s12	s13	s14	s15	s16
Locatives:	-	+	-	+	+	+	+	-	-	+	-	+	+	+	-	+	-	-	-	+
Non-locatives:	-	+	-	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	-	+	+	+	+	+	+
Total:	-	+	-	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+

Table 3. Occurrence of case replacement features by speaker.

The distribution of the various case replacements by case is given in Table 4, where the number next to each AH case is the number of occurrences of that particular substitution. The replacements of various cases with AH illative and inessive are not given separately, since, due to a deletion of suffix-final *n*'s, the realization of inessive -*ban* becomes identical with illative -*ba* in AH, just as it does in all Hungarian dialects in Hungary (Imre 1971, 316) as well as in the informal register of spoken SH (Váradi 1990).

Solovyova's findings about the percentages of case replacements as part of the total number in the South Bend corpus are again similar to the percentages in the McKeesport data. Comparative percentages for South Bend/McKeesport are 79.8%/89.4% for local

Instead of SH:	**AH, in nonlocatives:**	**AH, in locatives:**
ablative -*tól*	elative 1	elative 1

allative -*hoz*	dative 1 instrumental 1	adessive 5 illative 2 superessive 1
causal -*ért*	terminative 1	-
delative -*ról*	ablative 1	ablative 1 elative 5
elative -*ból*	illative/inessive 2	ablative 1 delative 1
essive -*ul*	superessive 5 illative/inessive 1	-
illative -*ba*	-	inessive 1 sublative 2
inessive -*ban*	superessive 8 terminative 1 elative 1	superessive 10
instrumental -*val*	superessive 1	-
sublative -*ra*	delative 1 superessive 2	allative 2 illative 2 superessive 10
superessive -*n*	illative/inessive 10 sublative 1	illative/inessive 2
terminative -*ig*	sublative 1	-

Table 4. Number of replacements by case.

cases, 3.4%/0% for the accusative, 3.4%/0% for the dative, 0%/1.2% for the instrumental, and 13.4%/9.4% for the other cases (Solovyova 1994, Table 8 for South Bend figures). Thus, in both corpora of data local cases are the targets of the overwhelming majority of replacements. Unfortunately, Solovyova does not say what the replaced cases are replaced with, thus making such comparison between the two corpora impossible.

The overall picture of case replacement in McKeesport Hungarian is rather striking as far as the number of occurring case replacement combinations is concerned. All other immigrant language studies with which I am familiar that discuss case features note tendencies whereby a larger number of cases is replaced by a smaller number. For instance, the six cases of Standard Russian are decreased to two – nominative and accusative – in American Russian (Polinsky to appear), five of the Standard Polish cases are replaced by three – nominative, accusative and genitive – in American Polish (Lyra 1966), and for Finnish, a language with 16 cases which is related and grammatically similar to Hungarian, both Lehtinen (1966) and Larmouth (1974) mention only case loss, but not replacement of cases with other cases. In the McKeesport data, by contrast, a total of twelve cases are replaced by forms of eleven cases[6] – hardly a notable decrease. And even if the instances of local case replacements in locative meanings are analyzed separately to demonstrate an overall simplification in the system of local case marking

---

[6] These numbers do not include replacement by nominative forms, which I categorized as instances of case loss.

(see below for discussion), the replacement of eleven cases by nine others in nonlocative phrases still does not show a significant reduction in numbers.

I will first discuss the replacement of local and nonlocal cases in nonlocative phrases, and will then consider the locative phrases separately, in section 3.2 below.

All in all, there are 21 examples of nonlocal case replacement where borrowing from AmE can be traced. These include all 10 of the examples where the superessive is replaced by the illative/inessive, in two different constructions. The first is *nyárba* 'in the summer', which occurs 8 times instead of SH *nyáron* in the speech of five second-generation speakers. The second construction occurs twice in the same phrase from the same speaker, where 'both' refers to 'both languages' (i.e. English and Hungarian), as an answer to the questions 'what language do you pray in?' and 'what language do you curse in?' (4). In all of these 10 cases the English prepositional counterpart of the Hungarian case ending is *in*, which is the closest equivalent of the AH case.

(4)   mind a   **khetöRbe**   (vs. SH mind a két **nyelven**)
      all   the   two-iness
      'in both'

Three examples (all from the same speaker) of the replacement of the inessive by the superessive, involving the same phrase, a radio program *being on*, can be attributed to borrowing:

(5) (a) minden phéinteken **rajta**   van.   (vs. SH rádióban)
         every   Friday-super super-3sg be-3sg
         'It is on every Friday.'

     (b) Oszt van   themplom a   **rádión**   is.   (vs. SH rádióban)
         and   be-3sg church   the radio-super also
         'And there is a church (service) on the radio, also.'

     (c) amikor az **rajta**   van   (vs. SH rádióban)
         when   that super-3sg be-3sg
         'when it is on'

All 6 replacements of the essive case are affected by AmE: in 5 the essive is replaced by the superessive in phrases meaning 'in language X'. Although the superessive is not the closest Hungarian equivalent of the English preposition *in*, it expresses the same dimension of static location (as opposed to direction towards or from) in the three-fold grouping of Hungarian local cases. The superessive is also interchanged frequently with the inessive in locative phrases in AH (see discussion below). This replacement occurs in the speech of three second-generation speakers and is illustrated in (6) below:

(6) (a) jou   tuta   a   **szlovákon**   (vs. SH szlovákul)
         well know-past.3sg-def   the Slovak-super
         'she spoke Slovak well'

     (b) (:always:) **angoLon**   beszéLnek   ök   is   (vs. SH angolul)
         always   English-super speak-3pl-indef they also
         'they, too, always speak English'

The only replacement of the essive with the illative/inessive also reflects borrowing from AmE:

(7) minden   khönyeb az **angoLba**   (vs. SH angolul)
     everything easier   the English-ill/iness
     'everything is easier in English'

One case replacement of elative with illative/inessive (8a), and the only replacement of allative with dative (8b), also reflect borrowing: the former replaces the SH 'direction-from' case with what is probably intended as the inessive 'location' case where AmE has the preposition *at*, while the latter has dative instead of a 'direction-to' case where the AmE preposition is used for both functions.

(8) (a) De **magyarba**   is   nagyon jou.   (vs. SH magyarból)
              but Hungarian-ill/iness also   very   good
              'But she is also very good at Hungarian.'

        (b) jötem   **anyukának**   (vs. SH anyukához)
              come-past-1sg-indef mom-dat
              'I came to mom'

        The only replacement of causal with terminative shows both the influence of AmE and simplification characteristic of language attrition: the preposition *for* is the English equivalent of both in some situations (e.g. marking the goal in *elmegy a boltba kenyérért* [terminative] 'to go to the store **for** bread', and marking a time adverbial in *egy hétig volt New Yorkban* [causal] 's/he was in New York **for** a week'); but, since the two cannot be used interchangeably in SH, doing so in AH reflects a reduction.

(9)   egy **dolárig**   dougozot   az ember egész héten   (vs. SH dollárért)
         one dollar-term work-past-3sg-indef the person whole week-super
         'you worked a whole week for a dollar'

        In the remaining 17 examples of case replacement no direct influence from AmE can be established. Eight of these are substitutions of two local cases of the same direction dimension, some examples of which are given in (10):

(10) (a) nem mesze (:**New York**:)-**ból**   (vs. SH New Yorktól)
              not   far   New York-elat
              'not far from New York'

        (b) **mindenféilektü**   tanutunk   (vs. SH mindenfélékrŒl)
              every-kind-thing-pl-abl learn-past-1pl-indef
              'we learned about all sorts of things'

        (c) nagyon vágyot   a   szıleihez   meg **Magyarországhoz**
              very   long-past-3sg-indef the parents-3sgPx and Hungary-all
              'she longed for her parents and for Hungary very much'
                                   (vs. SH Magyarországra)

        The last examples do not show such simplification, but rather a partial breakdown of the SH rules. Among these are the ones given in (11):

(11) (a) thanitota   az osztájt   az elsŒ **hétre**   (vs. SH héten)
              teach-past-3sg-def the class-acc the first   week-sublat
              'she taught the class the first week'

        (b) nem volt semmi mondanivalónk   a   **felnŒttekkel** (vs. SH felnŒttekhez)
              not   was   nothing subject-matter-1plPx the adults-instr
              'we had nothing to say to the adults'

        (c) **vicbe**   mondok   valamit   magyarul   (vs. SH viccbŒl)
              joke-ill/iness say-1sg-indef something-acc Hungarian-ess
              'I say something in Hungarian as a joke'

        A curious detail in connection with the replacement of cases in nonlocative phrases is that, of the total of 39 replaced case endings, 29 receive one of two cases, the illative/inessive (13 times) or the superessive (16 times). This also points to the fact that there is some overall simplification involved in the AH case assignment changes.

3.2. The simplification of the locative system

The nine local cases of SH make up an elaborate system expressing, on the one hand, the dimension of location *in*, *on*, or *at*, and, on the other hand, the dimension of *static location* or *movement from* and *movement towards*. The cases and the dimensions they represent are shown in Table 5.

	Movement from	**Static location**	**Movement towards**
in	elative (-*ból*)	inessive (-*ban*)	illative (-*ba*)
on	delative (-*ról*)	superessive (-*n*)	sublative (-*ra*)
at	ablative (-*tól*)	adessive (-*nál*)	allative (-*hoz*)

Table 5. Local cases in SH.

Although in their most basic meanings all local cases can be used with a noun – e.g. SH *a dobozból* 'from inside the box', *a dobozban* 'inside the box', *a dobozba* '[to] inside the box', *a dobozról* 'from on top of the box', *a dobozon* 'on top of the box', *a dobozra* '[to] on top of the box', *a doboztól* 'from near/outside the box', *a doboznál* 'at the box', and *a dobozhoz* '[to] near/outside the box' – only one set of cases (a horizontal set of three cases in Table 5) can co-occur with names of institutions or places, as in *az iskolából jön* 'come from school', *az iskolában van* 'be at school', and *az iskolába megy* 'go to school', but *az állomásról jön* 'come from the station', *az állomáson van* 'be at the station', and *az állomásra megy* 'go to the station'.

As I mentioned briefly in section 3.1.2, in AH, just as in all Hungarian dialects and in informal spoken SH, the inessive -*ban* suffix undergoes deletion of the suffix-final *n* and is pronounced identically to the illative -*ba*. Since without specific study of this question it is impossible to tell which McKeesport subjects are aware of the distinction between the two cases and which suffix they mean when they say [-**bO**] and [-**bE**], I will not try to analyze the AH examples pertaining to this issue, but will regard each of them as the case that would be assigned in SH.

Replacements of local cases in the McKeesport data are of three kinds. The majority (29 out of the 45) are violations of co-occurrence of a particular place with the set of cases that would co-occur with it in SH (that is, in terms of the arrangement in Table 5, selecting the column correctly but choosing the wrong row). A smaller number (9 examples) are violations of the grammatical position – or column, in the table – while staying in the right row. One example each concerns the postposition *alatta* 'under it (static loc.)' and the partitive place pronoun *valahova* 'somewhere (movement towards)', and two examples are of the adverbial *ott* 'there (static loc.)' – these four express the dimensions of static location or movement from or towards. (Because they do not carry case, these examples are not included in Figure 1 below.) The remaining 3 examples involve both horizontal and vertical violations. The replacement of cases in the McKeesport data is summarized in Figure 1: arrows point from the SH case to the case it was replaced with in AH, while the numbers at the head of each arrow show the number of occurrences of that particular replacement.

Figure 1. Local case replacements in the McKeesport data.

Violations of the first kind, those of row selection, can be illustrated with the following examples:

(12) (a) delative instead of elative:

elhoszták a **LigetröL** a misz madzsart
perf-bring-past-3Pl-indef the park-del the miss magyar-acc
'they brought *Miss Magyar* over from the park' (vs. SH ligetbŒl)

(b) ablative instead of delative:

onat jöt **Magyarországtu** (vs. SH Magyarországról)
from-there come-past-3sg-indef Hungary-abl
'she came from there, from Hungary'

(c) ablative instead of elative and sublative instead of illative:

mentek egy **themplomtul** a **másikra** ezek a népek
go-past-3pl-indef one church-abl the other-subl this-pl the people
'these people went from one church to the other' (vs. SH templomból, másikba)

(d) elative instead of delative:

mi **MagyarországboL** jötünk (vs. SH Magyarországról)
we Hungary-elat come-past-3pl-indef
'we came from Hungary'

(e) superessive instead of inessive:

öü a **Ligeten** dougozot sokig (vs. SH ligetben)
she the park-super work-past-3sg-indef much-term
'she worked in the park for a long time'

(f) inessive instead of superessive:
Œ **Gyálba**   lakik   (vs. SH Gyálon)
she Gyál-iness live-3sg-indef
'she lives in Gyál'

(g) illative instead of allative:
mindenki a **thükörbe** akart   egyszere   meni
everyone the mirror-ill   want-past-3sg-indef at-same-time go-inf
'everyone wanted to go to the mirror at the same time'   (vs. SH tükörhöz)

(h) illative instead of sublative:
A   khéit idöRsebik fiju mentek   a **Phitbe** thanuLni.
the two   older   boy go-past-3pl the Pitt-ill   study-inf
'The two older boys went to Pitt to study.' (vs. SH Pittre)

Because of the scarcity of examples of case replacement involving the same noun, it is not possible to make generalizations about whether there might be any nouns for which case selection in AH differs systematically from that of SH. Only one noun, *utca* 'street', stands out as a possible candidate for systematic differentiation: it occurs six times in the speech of three second-generation speakers with superessive instead of SH inessive:

(13)   a   themplom ot   áL   harmadik **ucán**   (vs. SH utcában)
the church   there stand-3sg-indef third   street-super
'the church is there on 3rd Street'

This is definitely the result of AmE influence, since in AmE the required preposition is *on*, the closest equivalent of the superessive case.

These examples of case replacement – where the static location vs. direction distinction is preserved while the rules concerning the in/on/at dimension are violated – can be attributed both to the influence of AmE, which does not have a complex equivalent system for directional endings, and to the effect of simplification of the rules of local case assignment through the loss of the in/on/at distinction. With the loss of this distinction the rules of local case assignment are simplified – the three rows are merged into one. At the same time, however, the cases belonging to the same column (but formerly belonging to different rows) occur in free variation.

The examples of the second kind of case replacement, in which the location vs. direction distinction is violated, are of three types. One example is hypercorrection of a type very common in Hungary as well – due to the phonetic merger of the two suffixes – in which illative *-ba* is replaced by inessive *-ban* when illative would be required:

(14)   mind a   kheten angoL **themplomban** járnak. (vs. templomba)
all   the two   English church-iness   attend-3pl-indef
'they both attend an English church.'

Five examples show the influence of the dialect area of the speakers' parents – the area north of the imaginary line that can be drawn between the Sajó River and the town of Szatmár, in the northeast of Hungary – where replacement of SH allative with adessive is common (Imre 1971, 318):

(15) (a) ELvitte   apám   anyámat   a **kiropektorná**
perf-take-past-3sg-def father-1sgPx mother-1sgPx-acc the chiropractor-ades
'My father took my mother to the chiropractor.' (vs. SH csontkovácshoz)

(b) **minálunk**   gyütek   (vs. SH hozzánk)

           we-ades-1pl   come-past-3pl
           'they came to our house'

Interestingly, though, according to Imre (1971), such replacement occurs in this dialect only in noun phrases referring to occupations and in family names (as in (15a)). Example (15b) and three other examples like it in the McKeesport data do not contain noun phrases referring to occupations or family names, but are pronominal.

      In three examples, given in (16), sublative is replaced by superessive, which cannot be attributed to either Hungarian dialectal features or the influence of English.

(16) (a) a   madzsar   **istentiszteLeten**   járok   (vs. SH istentiszteletre)
           the   Hungarian service-super   attend-1sg-indef
           'I attend the Hungarian service'

      (b) a   kisjány   kiszaLat   az **uton**   (vs. SH útra)
           the little-girl out-run-past-3sg-indef the road-super
           'the little girl ran out in the road'

      (c) ha **egyetemen**   jársz   akor sokat   keL óvasni
           if   university-super attend-2sg-indef then much-acc must read-inf
           'if you go to university you have to read a lot'   (vs. SH egyetemre)

      The remaining three examples of replacement of local cases come from two second-generation speakers. Two examples by one of them concern one kind of structure, in which sublative *-ra*/*-re* is replaced by adessive (17a-b). One example by the other replaces allative by superessive (17c). Both AmE and Hungarian dialects can be discounted as the source for these cases of substitution, so I attribute it to a breakdown of the rule assigning the SH case in this example, i.e. to language attrition.

(17) (a) egy évet   jártam   a   (:**University of Pittsburgh**:)-**nél**
           one year-acc attend-past-1sg-indef the U. of Pgh-ades
           'I attended the University of Pittsburgh for a year'

      (b) jártam   két   évet   (:**Cleveland State University**:)-**nél**
           attend-past-1sg-indef two   year-acc CSU-ades
           'I attended Cleveland State University for two years.'

      (c) tartoztunk   a   független   **egyházon**   (vs. SH egyházhoz)
           belong-past-1pl-indef the independent church-super
           'we belonged to the independent church'

      The examples concerning the postposition, the partitive pronoun of place and the adverbial all violate the dimension of static location vs. movement towards: three of them express static location where SH would have movement towards (18a-c), and one does the exact opposite (18d). They are all from one speaker.

(18) (a) **alatta**   tették.   (vs. SH alá)
           under.3sgPx   put-past-3pl-def
           'they put it under it.'

      (b) és **ott**   is   mentünk.   (vs. SH oda)
           and there   also go-past-1pl-indef
           'and we went there, also.'

      (c) **ott**   mentünk   magyar   iskolába   (vs. SH oda)
           there go-past-1pl-indef Hungarian   school-ill
           'we went to Hungarian school there'

      (d) ha kint   vagyunk **valahova**   (vs. SH valahol)

if   outside be-1pl   somewhere-towards
'if we are outside somewhere'

These four examples show both the influence of AmE, since in AmE the equivalent forms would be identical for static location and direction towards, and attrition in language death, since they involve simplification of the directional system with these two column merging into one.

To summarize findings in connection with the replacement of cases in locative phrases: although many of the examples discussed in this section show borrowing from parallel AmE structures as well, a general simplification of the system, mostly along the direction dimension is clearly evident.

3.3. The replacement of cases in place-names

The last feature related to the use of cases in AH concerns locative case usage with names of cities and towns. Examples referred to in this section structurally belong and have been discussed in section 3.2.2 above, together with all other cases of locative case replacements, but, as I will show below, they merit further discussion as a separate sub-system.

In SH names of cities, towns and villages (referred to simply as 'place-names' from here on for brevity's sake) receive either the '*in*-cases' (inessive for location, elative for direction from, and illative for direction towards) or the '*on*-cases' (superessive for location, delative for direction from, and sublative for direction towards): 80% of Hungarian place-names receive *on*-cases (e.g. *Budapesten*, *Siófokon*, and *Celldömölkön* for 'in X') and about 20% receive *in*-cases (e.g. *Badacsonyban* and *Veszprémben* for 'in X'),[7] while all foreign city and town names receive *in*-cases (e.g. *Párizsban* and *Helsinkiben*). The use of one or the other case with Hungarian place-names is not predictable morphophonemically.

In AH the usage of cases with U.S. place-names is different from that of SH: it displays an interesting new distinction that does not exist in Standard Hungarian, namely the use of both the *in*-cases and the *on*-cases.

In a brief preliminary paper Kálmán (1970, 42-5) proposes that in AH some U.S. place-names receive *in*-cases, others *on*-cases. He also suggests that because the U.S. is the homeland for Hungarian-Americans, the SH usage of inter-item variability is 'translated' into the terms of the U.S.

In his much more detailed investigation, Kontra (1990, 73-4) demonstrates that the situation is not so clearcut in the case of Hungarian speakers in South Bend, IN, however: in his data, first-generation speakers conform to the model as proposed by Kálmán, while second-generation speakers use only *in*-cases for U.S. towns and cities. (Neither author discusses case endings for non-American city and town names in their respective corpora.) Kontra also notes that big cities like *New York*, *Cleveland,* and *Pittsburgh* never receive *on*-cases even in the speech of first-generation speakers, though smaller cities like *Mishawaka* and *Elkhart* do.

---

[7] These are my own calculations based on the 113 towns and cities listed in the Hungarian guidebook Kulcsár 1989. Because, as Miklós Kontra pointed out to me (personal communication, 1995), there can be differences in the choice of the case-sets between speakers (see also Beregszászi, this issue), these figures should serve as approximations only.

The McKeesport data differ from the situations described by both Kálmán and Kontra in three respects: first, both first- and second-generation speakers use *on*-cases with names of U.S. towns and cities; second, several of them use *in*-cases interchangeably with *on*-cases with the same place-name; and third, even names of big cities can get *on*-cases in the speech of some speakers.

All U.S. place-names that occur in the McKeesport data receive both *in*-cases and *on*-cases (*Pittsburgh-ban* and *Pittsburgh-on*, *Clevelandban* and *Clevelandon*, *McKeesportban* and *McKeesporton*, *Ligonierban* and *Ligonieron,* etc.),[8] with the exception of *Duquesne*, a small town between Pittsburgh and McKeesport, which receives only *in*-cases (*Duquesne-ban*, *Duquesne-ból*, and *Duquesne-ba*) in data from all speakers. The only difference among speakers is that all first-generation speakers and one second-generation speaker use one set of cases (either the *in*-cases or the *on*-cases) with each place-name, while 25% of the second-generation subjects use different sets with the same place-name at different points in their interviews (e.g. *Verszaleszen* vs. *Verszaleszbe* 'in Versailles (PA)'; *(:West Mifflin:)-en* vs. *(:West Mifflin:)-ba* 'in West Mifflin'; *Mikiszporton* vs. *Mikiszportba* 'in McKeesport'; *Klivlandon* vs. *Klivlandba* 'in Cleveland'). Because U.S. place-names occur only sporadically in the data of several second-generation subjects, and the same place-name would often occur just once, I cannot make any generalizations about second-generation usage, except to note that both intra-item and inter-speaker variability occurs among them. Such variability, however, is an important structural characteristic of situations where language attrition is involved (Campbell & Muntzel 1989).

The source of the differences in Kálmán's (1970) and Kontra's (1990) findings and my own are difficult to pin down. Kálmán does not supply any information on the speakers who provided his data, so it is impossible even to speculate about the source of the differences there. The degree of variability in the use of the *in-* and *on*-cases is less in Kontra's South Bend corpus than in the McKeesport data, which is probably due to the fact that, as far as it is possible to tell from Kontra's description of the extent of Hungarian language use in South Bend (1990, 26-27), Hungarian is more widely and more often used in South Bend than in McKeesport and is, therefore, probably affected by attrition to a lesser extent than in McKeesport. The relative number of occurrences of case loss and replacement, which is almost nine times as high in the McKeesport data than it is in the South Bend data, can also be an indication of this.

4. Conclusion

In this paper I have described the differences in case marking betweenAmerican Hungarian data from McKeesport, PA, and in Standard Hungarian. The main tendencies, case loss and case replacement, were found to be similar to changes in case systems of other immigrant languages which have complex inflectional noun morphology and are in contact with American English. The case changes in McKeesport Hungarian, especially those involving case replacement, are, however, more diverse than in other documented immigrant language studies. Nevertheless, the McKeesport findings can only serve as pointers to be used in more focused investigations of American Hungarian targeting the use of cases and eliciting data in order to provide more detailed results.

---

[8] Examples from individual speakers are cited in broad phonetic transcription, while all others are cited in SH orthography in this section.

References:

Albin, Alexander - Alexander, Ronelle. 1972. The speech of Yugoslav immigrants in San Pedro, California. Nijhoff, The Hague.

Bartha, Csilla. 1993. Egy amerikai magyar közösség nyelvhasználatának szociolingvisztikai megközelítései [A sociolinguistic approaches to the language use of a Hungarian American community]. Kandidátusi dissertation. Budapest.

Beregszászi, Anikó. Language planning issues of Hungarian place-names in Subcarpathia. This issue.

Campbell, Lyle - Muntzel, Martha. 1989. The structural consequences of language death. In: Dorian, Nancy C. (ed): Investigating obsolescence: Studies in language contraction and death, 181-96. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.

Fenyvesi, Anna. 1995. Language contact and language death in an immigrant language: The case of Hungarian. In: Pitt Working Papers in Linguistics 3: 1-117.

Gasiƒski, T. Z. 1986. English elements in the speech of the Croatian immigrant community of Santa Clara Valley, California. In: Zbornik matice srpske za filologiju i lingvistiku 29(2): 31-45.

Henzl, Vera. 1982. American Czech: A comparative study of linguistic modifications in immigrant and young children speech. In: Sussex, Rolland (ed): Slavic languages in emigre communities, 33-47. Linguistic Research Inc., Edmonton.

Imre, Samu. 1971. A mai magyar nyelvjárások rendszere [The system of the dialects of modern Hungarian]. Akadémiai Kiadó, Budapest.

Jutroniç-Tihomiroviç, Dunja. 1985. Hrvatski jezik v SAD [The Croatian language in the USA]. Logos, Split.

Kálmán, Béla. 1970. Amerikai magyar helynevek [Hungarian-American place-names]. In: Kázmér, Miklós - Végh, József (eds): Névtudományi elŒadások, 42-5. Akadémiai Kiadó, Budapest.

Karttunen, Francis. 1977. Finnish in America: A case study in monogenerational language change. In: Blount, Ben G. - Sanches, Mary (eds): Sociocultural dimensions of language change, 173-84. Academic Press, New York.

Kontra, Miklós. 1990. Fejezetek a South Bend-i magyar nyelvhasználatból [The Hungarian language as spoken in South Bend, Indiana]. MTA Nyelvtudományi Intézete, Budapest.

Kuãera, Karel. 1990. âesky jazyk v USA [The Czech language in the USA]. Univerzita Karlova, Prague.

Kulcsár, Ödön. 1989. Országjárók könyve [Hungarians' guidebook to Hungary]. ÉTK, Budapest.

Larmouth, Donald. 1974. Differential interference in American Finnish cases. In: Language 50: 356-66.

Lehtinen, Meri. 1966. An analysis of a Finnish-American bilingual corpus. Ph.D. dissertation. Indiana University, Bloomington, IN.

Levine, Glenn. 1995. Elderly second-generation speakers of Yiddish: Toward a model of L1 loss, incomplete L1 acquisition, competence and control. Paper presented at the Symposium on Language Loss and Public Policy, Albuquerque, New Mexico, June 30-July 2, 1995.

Lyra, Franciszek. 1962. English and Polish in contact. Ph. D. dissertation. Indiana University, Bloomington, IN.

Meyerstein, Goldie P. 1959. Selected problems of bilingualism among immigrant Slovaks. Ph.D. dissertation. University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, MI.

Olmsted, Hugh M. 1986. American interference in the Russian language of the third-wave emigration: Preliminary notes. In: Folia Slavica 8(1): 91-127.

Polinsky, Maria. To appear. Russian in the US: An endangered language. In: Golovko, Evgeny. (ed): Russian in contact with other languages. Oxford University Press, Oxford.

Preston, Dennis. 1986. The case of American Polish. In: Kastovsky, D. - Szwedek, A. (eds.): Linguistics across historical and geographical boundaries: In honour of Jacek Fisiak on the occasion of his fiftieth birthday, Volume 2: Descriptive, contrastive and applied linguistics, 1015-1023. Mouton de Gruyter, Amsterdam.

Seaman, David P. 1972. Modern Greek and American English in contact. Mouton, The Hague.

Solovyova, Ariadna. 1994. Morphological peculiarities in a corpus of American Hungarian speech. Indiana University ms., Bloomington, IN.

Thomason, Sarah G. - Kaufman, Terrence. 1988. Language contact, creolization, and genetic linguistics. University of California Press, Berkeley.

Váradi, Tamás. 1990. -Ba vagy -ban? Problémavázlat. [-ba or -ban? A sketch of the issue]. In: II. Dialektológiai Szimpózion 143-155. VEAB, Veszprém.