

Tanulmány

Zsolt Pál Deli

The bilingualism of Hungarians in the United Kingdom and Ireland

Possible language contact effects in the language use of immigrant
communities. A work in progress.

Abstract

The objective of the present inquiry is to investigate the language contact situation resulting from the bilingualism of Hungarians living in the United Kingdom and Ireland. The present study conducted in the United Kingdom and Ireland, involving 200 participants divided into two groups as experimental groups, based on the amount of time they spent in the target countries, explores the use of three linguistic variables: the ‘must+Verbimperative’, the allative case, and the adessive and ablative case suffixes related to comparative structures, in the language use of the Hungarian immigrant communities, focusing on the results of grammaticality judgment tasks in comparison to outcomes of groups serving as control groups in earlier studies conducted in Hungary and the Carpathian Basin. A modified and digitized version of the questionnaire of the Sociolinguistics of Hungarian Outside Hungary research project (SHOH) was administered. Even though it has been proven earlier that language contact promotes nonstandard language use, this study does not unquestionably support this view and does not indicate any substantial changes in the language use of the immigrant communities in comparison to the control groups.

Keywords: bilingualism, language contact, language use, linguistic variables, migration.

1 Introduction

The predecessors of the present paper dealt with the possible language contact effects of English on Hungarian among British and Irish Hungarians, examining a number of linguistic variables (Deli 2020, 2021). As a continuation, this paper introduces further analysis of research of the same kind to cover a wider range of linguistic variables, and aims to be another part of a larger language contact research project. A caveat is that more general, final conclusions can only be drawn after a fuller picture is seen considering all the variables of the questionnaire used. Hungarian in contact with other languages has been studied over the last few decades; however, few published studies have systematically explored the language contact of English and Hungarian in the United Kingdom and Ireland. Therefore, the aim of the present paper is to investigate the language contact effects of bilingualism in relation to English and Hungarian in the UK and Ireland, especially focusing on preferences of standard and nonstandard language use.

The current study focuses on a quantitative analysis of three linguistic variables. The tasks under investigation cover the use of the ‘must+Verbimperative’, the allative case, and the adessive and ablative case suffixes related to comparative structures. It should be noted here

that the present paper is a ‘work in progress’, being part of a more comprehensive study involving a systematic analysis of a larger number of variables, and it is not the purpose of the author to draw any complete or finished conclusions at this stage whatsoever regarding the ultimate causes of the findings.

2 Migration and language contact

2.1 The role of migration in the formation of language contact

Migration is one of the chief causes of language contact triggering bilingualism in the world (Grosjean, 1982: 30–33; 2010: 8). Throughout history, Britain has been a host to a great number of immigrants. Many of them arrived as political refugees; but, especially after 2004, more and more people came to pursue a better life. Hundreds of thousands of people choose the United Kingdom as their new home each year, including Hungarians (ONS Migration Statistics 2018).

2.2 Hungarians in the United Kingdom

Starting in the 16th century, and following Second World War, more than 25,000 people received refugee status in the United Kingdom. Based on the 2001 census in the UK, there were about 13,000 Hungarian-born people in the UK (Office for National Statistics 2001), and this number reached 52,000 in 2011 (Office for National Statistics 2011), covering England and Wales. This number rose to 80,000, spread in all countries of the United Kingdom (Office for National Statistics, August 2015). The University of Oxford’s Migration Observatory indicates an even greater figure: 96,000 people for the year of 2015, which caused the number of Hungarian migrants to double in a period of only four years. The exact number of Hungarians living in Ireland is far less clear. The Central Statistics Office (2016) reported the Hungarian immigrants to be somewhere between 1,000 and 10,000.

2.3 Theoretical background

Grosjean (2010) states that migration can be motivated by economic and political reasons, and when people move, then languages get into contact with each other, resulting in bilingualism and multilingualism. Languages in contact create cross-linguistic influences or linguistic interferences that are manifested in the linguistic systems of the languages in question, including lexical, phonological, morphological or syntactic levels. Thomason’s (2001) book *Language contact: an introduction* detailed the results and mechanism of language contact. The linguistic consequences of language contact are also elaborated on by numerous authors (see Haugen 1950; Weinreich 1953; Thomason & Kaufman 1988; Thomason 2001, 2010; Winford 2003; Sankoff 2004; Fenyvesi 2005a, 2005b, 2006; Heine & Kuteva 2005; Matras 2009, 2010; Kontra 1990; Bartha 1993; Fenyvesi 1995a, 1995b; Polgár 2001). Fenyvesi’s (2005a) edited volume *Hungarian language contact outside Hungary* explored varieties of Hungarian from linguistic, sociolinguistic and typological perspectives in Slovakia (Lanstyák & Szabó Mihály 2005), Ukraine (Csernicsekó 2005), Romania (Benő & Szilágyi N. 2005), the Csángós of Romania (Sándor 2005), the former Yugoslavia (Göncz & Vörös 2005), Austria (Bodó 2005), the United States of America (Fenyvesi 2005a), and Australia (Kovács 2005). Forintos (2008) covered the English-Hungarian language contact situation in Australia, and in Canada, and

Zsolt Pál Deli:

The bilingualism of Hungarians in the United Kingdom and Ireland

Argumentum 18 (2022), 306–336

Debreceni Egyetemi Kiadó

DOI: 10.34103/ARGUMENTUM/2022/18

South Africa (Forintos 2011), together with her research conducted on semantic aspects of language contact in Australia and New Zealand (Forintos 2015). Huber (2016) investigated the language use of a Canadian immigrant community, while Benkő (2000) studied British Hungarian in the United Kingdom among immigrants and their descendants living in London.

Benkő's (2000) MA thesis is the most well-known available source of research that deals with English-Hungarian language contact in the United Kingdom focusing on case replacements in the language use of people in London (Benkő 2000: 33–34). Benkő (2000) discusses morphological features of 18 first generation (Gen. 1.) and second generation (Gen. 2.) Hungarians living in London, with a special focus on the mixing of the definitive and indefinite conjugations and case endings in British Hungarian. Regarding the variable on conjugation, the author's research results indicate that it was present in the language use of both generations, and the Gen 2. group used more divergent forms than the Gen.1. group; however, the marking of person and number stayed intact. As far as case endings are concerned, two features were discussed: the phenomena of case omissions and case replacements. They occurred in the language use of both generations; however, case omissions were less frequently demonstrable than the replacements of case suffixes, and Gen 2. participants used fewer divergent forms than it had been previously expected by the author. In fact, the replacement of standard Hungarian case endings occurred twice the number of Gen. 2. than Gen. 1. respondents, and in four times as many cases in the London data in general. In addition, case replacement took place exclusively in the local case systems, showing a tendency of simplification as compared to standard Hungarian usage. Benkő's (2000) conclusion is that the results were caused by multiple factors, and they indicated either an influence of English on Hungarian, or language attrition merely in a small number of cases.

2.4 Major genetic and typological differences between English and Hungarian

With the help of linguistic typology, linguists create the structural classification of languages after collecting a considerable number of data, generating typological groups, and based on similarities, constructing various linguistic patterns, structures and systems. It is important to note that English and Hungarian are unrelated languages, both from a genetic and a typological point of view. According to genetic classification, English belongs to the Indo-European language family, while Hungarian belongs to the Ugric sub-branch within the Finno-Ugric branch of the Uralic language family. From a typological perspective, English is considered to show mainly analytic features as can be seen in its verb tense system, where verb phrases might consist of even up to six words such as in the sentence 'he will have been being taught' in the future perfect progressive verb tense in the passive voice. Similarly, the following Hungarian sentence expressed in only one word shows the highly agglutinative nature of Hungarian: *elvitethetném* 'I could have him taken away', which, again, consists of six words in English (Budai & Radványi 1989: 10). From this example alone, we might get a hint of the fact that languages such as Hungarian employ complex derivational processes, which express syntactic structures semantically equivalent to multi-word analytic structures (Thomason 2005: 17).

Therefore, according to linguistic typological classification, Hungarian is an agglutinative language, and the process of agglutination implies morphological processes with clearly identifiable and separable morphemes, where each affix represents a single grammatical function (Moravcsik 2013). However, English also shows synthetic features with case inflections being limited to pronouns, indicating person, number, gender and three cases: the

Zsolt Pál Deli:

The bilingualism of Hungarians in the United Kingdom and Ireland

Argumentum 18 (2022), 306–336

Debreceni Egyetemi Kiadó

DOI: 10.34103/ARGUMENTUM/2022/18

nominative, the accusative and the genitive, while nouns are not inflected for cases with the exception of the genitive marked by 's. Highly agglutinating elements in English are present as well, chiefly in derivational morphological processes where words contain a series of morphemes with clearly distinguishable meaning and form as in the derived word *unwillingness* (O'Grady et al. 1989: 231). Therefore, English is not easily identifiable as belonging to one single category excluding all others. Hungarian is an agglutinative language employing complex morphological processes. The extended use of case suffixation, historically originating in postpositions that eventually were attached to the end of nouns as suffixes, is present in order to express certain adverbial and a number of other functions, whereas English uses prepositional phrases to fulfil similar functions (O'Grady et al. 1989: 241). Therefore, Hungarian shows a wide variety of case inflections, which is a characteristic feature of agglutinative languages.

Concerning word order typologies, English has a rather strict SVO system, while Hungarian is dominantly uses either SVO or SOV word order and is regarded to possess a fundamentally free word order (Horváth 2010). Nevertheless, a wide range of alternative arrangements of words are also possible, depending on focus or emphasis of the speaker (Megyesi 2001). Based on the above evidence, we can conclude that English has a significantly less inflectional character, with only a small number of inflectional morphological elements, and Hungarian has a highly complex system of morphological processes denoting a large variety of grammatical functions.

According to Thomason (2001: 77), when we talk about language contact effects, typological distance between source and recipient languages are of crucial importance, and even highly marked features can be readily borrowable and incorporated into the recipient language within typologically similar linguistic systems; however, it is still the social factors that play the key role in any such exchanges between the systems of languages. On the other hand, marked features are less likely to be borrowed since those structures are generally harder to learn (Thomason 2001: 76).

3 The definition of bilingualism

Generally speaking, "bilingualism is the regular use of two or more languages" (Grosjean 1982: 1), so bilinguals are individuals who use two or more languages in everyday life (Grosjean 2008: 10; 2010: 4), and within the scientific field of applied linguistics, contact linguistics researches and deals with the phenomenon of language contact situations. Bilingualism is everywhere (Grosjean 1982: 1); actually, fifty percent of the entire world's population is bilingual (Grosjean 2008: 11). From a geographical perspective, the phenomenon is present in all parts of the world, involving all levels of society and all age groups.

Nonetheless, there are a number of misconceptions regarding how bilingualism is defined. For example, it is a generally accepted view that bilinguals are people who have spoken both languages with equal proficiency since childhood, or they are split personalities and bicultural. Yet, becoming bilingual in adolescence or adulthood is equally common, and even though minor behavioral changes might happen adopted to certain situations, these individuals are not two monolinguals in one person at all. Biculturalism is possible, but it does not represent any norm whatsoever. So, many assumptions are absolutely wrong. The truth of the matter, however, is quite the opposite. Grosjean (2008: 10, 2010: 75–76) clarifies the issue by refuting certain misunderstandings related to this fractional view of bilingualism, and takes a wholistic

Zsolt Pál Deli:

The bilingualism of Hungarians in the United Kingdom and Ireland

Argumentum 18 (2022), 306–336

Debreceni Egyetemi Kiadó

DOI: 10.34103/ARGUMENTUM/2022/18

view. Bilinguals seldom have an equal and perfect knowledge of the languages they speak or write, and they often have a foreign accent as well, and they are far from being professional translators or interpreters.

In fact, bilinguals know and use their languages to the level they need them, and to the extent required by the environment around them. Therefore, “the bilingual uses the two languages – separately or together – for different purposes, in different domains of life, with different people” – the very essence of the wholistic view (Grosjean 2008: 14). Many times one language dominates, and bilinguals cannot often read or write in one of their languages or, they only have a passive knowledge of a language, so possessing a perfect knowledge in two or more languages is restricted only to a small minority (Grosjean 2010).

The same author (2008: 21–26) also introduces the framework of complementarity principle, in which he describes that language contact situations do not always require a balanced use of both languages in all areas of life at all times. If that were the case, there would not be in any need to be bilingual at all. Various situations in life usually require the need to use different languages where language contact is present, and the level of fluency may also vary according to the specific need of the speaker-hearer, so it is driven by domain specific factors.

The members of the immigrant community that form the respondents of the present study are bilinguals exactly in this sense. They were born in Hungary, then they left Hungary for various reasons and have lived in the UK and Ireland for some time now; yet, they are considered bilingual. In simple terms, they use their languages in accordance with Grosjean’s (2008: 21–26) complementarity principle.

4 Research questions and hypothesis

4.1 Research questions

Research questions:

(1) To what extent does the English of the immigrant community in the United Kingdom and Ireland prefer nonstandard variants in contrast to Hungarian standard options, and can the possible results be attributed to the language contact effect of English on Hungarian?

(2) Will the outcomes confirm earlier findings of research compared to a group of Hungarian native speakers in Hungary and Hungarian speakers in countries surrounding Hungary?

4.2 Hypothesis

It has been hypothesized in earlier studies conducted among Hungarian speakers in the Carpathian basin and elsewhere that dominant languages, as a result of language contact, may exert a detectable effect on the language use of the Hungarian minority speech community (Göncz 1999, 2005; Fenyvesi 2005b, 2006). Therefore, it might also be assumed that, for the variables discussed, the English-Hungarian language contact situation in the United Kingdom and Ireland might produce similar outcomes.

Bilingualism and multilingualism are widespread phenomena (Grosjean 1982: 1, 2008: 11), and they are the natural result of language contact, so the interaction of languages triggers linguistic changes (Fenyvesi 2018). Therefore, it is assumed that in the contact varieties of Hungarian, nonstandard forms are present to a greater extent than in the standard monolingual

Hungarian speech community's options (Fenyvesi 1995b, 2005b; Benkő 2000; Kovács 2005; Forintos 2011; Kontra 2005).

However, it should be made clear that growing up in surrounding countries where Hungarian is a minority language exerts a different and more profound effect on the Hungarian language than being an immigrant in an English speaking country where English is dominantly used as a second language (L2). For example, Hungarian, being embedded in a Romanian speaking environment, produces apparent language contact effects, especially in lexical, phonological, morphological and syntactic levels because of the strong influence of the Romanian language in the everyday encounters of the Hungarian speaking population living there. This asymmetrical language contact phenomenon promotes the loss of the mother tongue. The social value, the legal status, the number of speakers as well as their attitude to the mother tongue or the language of the majority group are all causes that play a role in the vitality of a minority language, and the gradual assimilation tendency is also helped by certain factors such as mixed marriages, the structure of settlements, demographic peculiarities or the educational system (Benő & Szilágyi N. 2005: 133, 137–145).

Hungarian is not a minority language in this context of English-Hungarian language contact situation, since it is used as a second language (L2) in the UK and Ireland; and, it is an all the more interesting venture to examine the results in order to see what effects English exerts on Hungarian, if any at all.

5 Methodology

5.1 *Participants: the composition of the immigrant communities under investigation*

Two hundred immigrants (N=200) from the United Kingdom and Ireland formed the participants of the study as the experimental groups. They were bilinguals speaking English and Hungarian, with Hungarian being their first language. The participants were equally divided into two groups, a group of immigrants having lived there for a longer period of time, or the older group (GB/IRE-OLD), and another group of immigrants having lived there for a shorter period of time, or the newer group (GB/IRE-NEW); (see Appendix B).

The participants were randomly selected from a data base collected with the help of a questionnaire created in Google Forms and distributed among immigrants in the United Kingdom and Ireland during the summer of 2019. The control groups were represented by Hungarian native speakers living in Hungary (HU), and a group represented by Hungarian minority speakers in countries surrounding Hungary in the Carpathian Basin (CAR). The collection of data for the control groups took place during the late 90s. In earlier papers (Deli 2020, 2021), where data was available for a particular variable, results from the United States of America (USA) and Canada (CAN) were also presented. In the current paper, however, only the above mentioned data (HU and CAR) had to be used for comparison except for one variable (YU and CRO in task 624) since there were no data available for the questions/tasks of the SHOH questionnaire from previous studies in the United Kingdom or other English speaking countries.

Sociolinguistic data reveal that 11 members of the GB/IRE-NEW group came from villages or smaller settlements, 1 from a farm, 18 from capital cities, and 70, the majority of the whole group, from towns. 71 participants were located in England, 1 in Northern Ireland, 16 in Ireland, 11 in Scotland, and 1 in Wales. 80 of them were women, and 20 of them were men. Regarding

Zsolt Pál Deli:

The bilingualism of Hungarians in the United Kingdom and Ireland

Argumentum 18 (2022), 306–336

Debreceni Egyetemi Kiadó

DOI: 10.34103/ARGUMENTUM/2022/18

the GB/IRE-OLD group, the numbers are the following: 15 members came from villages or smaller settlements, 2 from a farm, 17 from capital cities and 66, the majority of the whole group, from towns. 71 participants were located in England, 14 in Ireland, 10 in Scotland and 5 in Wales. 79 of them were women, and 21 of them were men (Appendix B).

The vast majority, that is, 91 subjects were born in Hungary, 6 in Romania in the Transylvania region (without the counties or the names of the settlements specified), 2 in Slovakia, and 1 in Serbia in the GB/IRE-NEW group. Almost all subjects, 98 people were born in Hungary, 1 in a country not given in the questionnaire, and 1 in Serbia in the GB/IRE-OLD group (Appendix B). The arrival time of 65 of the participants in the GB/IRE-NEW group was between 2010 and 2015, and 35 people arrived in the given countries after 2015. The arrival time of 71 of the participants was at the early part of the 2000s, while 4 arrived between the '50s and the '70s, 6 in the '80s, and 18 in the '90s (Appendix B).

Regarding the distribution of the age groups of the respondents, 57% were 18–35, 38% were 36–50, and 5% were 51–65 years old in the GB/IRE-NEW group. 35% of the members of the GB/IRE-OLD group fell into the age group of 26–40, 47% were 41–50, 9% were 50–55, and 9% were 56–75 years old at the time of the data collection (Appendix B).

Appendices C, D, E, F and G summarize the data related to education, and the numbers reveal that 6% of the GB/IRE-NEW group did not attend any schools outside of the UK or Ireland, while this number is 2% for the GB/IRE-OLD group, and 63% of the newer group received a college degree outside the UK or Ireland, and 37% got a college degree in the older group outside the UK or Ireland. The rest in both groups attended various schools, predominantly secondary schools, secondary vocational schools, and vocational schools. The majority of the GB/IRE-NEW group (90%) attended schools in Hungary at least as part of their education, while 6% in Romania, with the remaining 2% in Slovenia, and 1% in Serbia and Canada respectively, and 73% of them finished school within the past 10–20 years. For the GB/IRE-OLD group, the place of education was Hungary for 98% of the participants, with the remaining 2% being unnamed, and 78% finished school within the past 15–30 years.

Among the GB/IRE-NEW group, 8% received college education in the UK or Ireland, and this figure is 31% in the GB/IRE-OLD group. 61% of the respondents in the former group did not get any education in the UK or Ireland, while this number is 31% in the latter group. In the GB/IRE-NEW group, 7% participated in postgraduate education, and this figure is 8% in the GB/IRE-OLD group. The number of respondents having graduated from secondary schools in the UK or Ireland is 2% in both groups respectively, and 20% went on to pursue either vocational education or attended various courses among the newer immigrants, and this figure is 28% among the older immigrants. In both groups, the majority of the people finished the last school within the past 5–10 years (GB/IRE-NEW group – 89,95%; GB/IRE-OLD group – 81,25%).

The occupational status of the respondents shows a rather varied picture indeed. A large number of jobs and professions are named, of which I would like to highlight only some notable points, based on the four categories proposed for analysis by Kontra (2003: 63). (1) Professional people and managers; (2) People with other intellectual careers; (3) Skilled workers and self-employed people; (4) Other unskilled (manual) workers. For the GB/IRE-NEW group the percentages of the four categories are the following: (1) – 8%, (2) – 33%, (3) – 34%, (4) – 25%. The breakdown for the GB/IRE-OLD group is (1) – 16%, (2) – 36%, (3) – 26%, (4) – 22% (Appendix H).

Regarding the nationality of the respondents, 2% of them claimed to be Irish, 96% Hungarian, and 2% reported to belong to other unnamed nationalities in the GB/IRE-NEW group, while 7% British, 84% Hungarian, and 9% claimed to belong to nationalities unnamed by the participants in the GB/IRE-OLD group. 100% of the members of both groups considered their native language to be Hungarian, and the native language of all the participants' mother and father is Hungarian in both groups (Appendices I, J and K).

5.2 Research instruments

5.2.1 The questionnaire

The data collection in the present study took place with the help of a modified version of the SHOH questionnaire (Sociolinguistics of Hungarian Outside Hungary project), which was first used in the second half of the '90s for the investigation of language contact situations in the Carpathian Basin involving a number of countries such as Slovakia, Ukraine, Romania, Austria, the former Yugoslavia (Vojvodina and Prekmurje, the latter now belonging to Slovenia). For the relevant tasks of the present study, data from the monolingual Hungarian group (HU) and data from respondents in the Carpathian Basin (CAR) were the only available data for comparison since earlier studies conducted in English speaking countries did not necessarily use all the questions of the SHOH questionnaire, in this case, the ones related to this study. The monolingual Hungarian group (HU) formed the basis of comparison in Fenyvesi's Toledo study conducted in the United States in 2006. At one place, data from Yugoslavia (YU) and Croatia (CRO) were used where data was missing for the CAR group for the given variable. Even Benkő's (2000) data collection was based on her individually designed questions related particularly to examining specific morphological features as referred to above, which means that those data could not form a basis of comparison either. It only shows that, in spite of English being a very widespread language throughout the world, research on the British Isles is still lacking, and to investigate possible language contact effects is rather needed in the UK and Ireland. Therefore, it is the hope of the author of the present paper that this study might be inspirational, and additional research of similar nature will follow in the future.

Questions selected from the SHOH questionnaire were also used in English speaking countries such as the one conducted by Fenyvesi (2006) in a Hungarian immigrant community in Toledo, USA, where the results were compared to the results of Hungarian native speakers.

The original purpose of the research team was to construct a survey suitable for systematic data collection with the potential to be repeated under various circumstances, and in different countries (Kontra 2005: 34, cited in Fenyvesi 2005a). This is exactly what happened during the phase of data collection in the UK and Ireland in the summer of 2019.

The questionnaire contains two parts. The first part of the questionnaire presents the independent, non-linguistic variables for the sociolinguistic aspects, while the second part of the questionnaire shows the dependent variables for the linguistic outcomes. In order to be consistent and faithful to earlier studies where the SHOH questionnaire was used, the organization and grouping of tasks, the order of presentation as well as the numbering of the tasks precisely follow the tendency of earlier administrations of the SHOH questionnaire. The author of this article thinks it desirable that this survey should be repeated in the immigrant communities in the UK and Ireland, for this may be of assistance and serve comparability in further research.

5.2.2 *The types of tasks administered and the structures examined*

The task types administered to the participants are described below. For most part, the tasks administered were grammaticality judgement tasks that examine structural attributes, providing information to the researcher on which structures are possible and which ones are not. For sentences 521, 522, 523 and 524, the respondents had to judge different variations of a sentence on a scale of four options: *very good*, *acceptable*, *quite bad* and *very bad*. This judgement task variety was repeated for sentences 641, 642, 643 and 644 as well. The respondents were asked to circle what they thought was the most suitable characterization option on the judgment scales. For sentences 624, 610, 621, pairs of sentences were given, and the respondents were asked to circle the letter corresponding to the sentence that they considered to be the more natural sounding of the two options presented, one of which was not specified.

The representations for the texts are given in interlinear morphemic glosses (IMG) based on the conventions of the Leipzig Glossing Rules developed by Comrie et al. (2008) at the Max Planck Institute for Evolutionary Anthropology and the University of Leipzig, and the system was also described by other authors (see Lehmann 1982; Croft 2003). IMG makes it possible that the relationship between the original text and its literal translation may be easily followed, together with representing the grammatical structure of the Hungarian sentences.

The structures investigated are the following:

- (1) The ‘must+Verbimperative’ variable
- (2) The allative case variable
- (3a) The comparative constructions variables - comparative case endings (ADJ-CMP+than vs. adessive case)
- (3b) The comparative constructions variables - comparative case endings (ablative case vs. adessive case)

The data collected in the present study did not take place at the same time of the data collection of earlier SHOH studies. The data used can be found in the cross tables of books published on earlier research conducted in the Carpathian Basin such as Göncz’s 1999 volume *The Hungarian language in Yugoslavia (Vojvodina)*. The necessity of the mentioned data for comparison only confirms the limited number of language contact data, especially in English speaking countries.

The questions administered to the CAR group earlier were not exclusively either-or grammaticality judgment tasks; nevertheless, the author of the present article found it suitable to make modifications in this direction in order to increase the willingness on the respondents’ part to provide answers due to the questionnaire’s online nature, and the length and scope of the questionnaire, which amounted to approximately thirteen pages long. Even this way, there were a number of potential respondents who sent me apologetic letters, stating that they were not ready to spend so much time answering linguistic questions.

Wherever an aggregate average was given as a basis for comparison, it was motivated by the fact that the resources consulted had presented those figures that way, so that was the only possible option for the author to refer to those data.

A note on grammaticality judgement tasks (GJT) should be made here. These types of tasks are rather widespread in the emerging field of language attrition, which is “the loss of language abilities of nondisordered individuals in an L2 environment” (Altenberg & Vago 2004:105),

Zsolt Pál Deli:

The bilingualism of Hungarians in the United Kingdom and Ireland

Argumentum 18 (2022), 306–336

Debreceni Egyetemi Kiadó

DOI: 10.34103/ARGUMENTUM/2022/18

and they reflect implicit knowledge that can be augmented by explicit or prescriptive knowledge and have been developed to test structural characteristics of languages.

Nevertheless, they might raise certain concerns in scientific circles regarding their effectiveness. For example, one of their disadvantages is that it does not open “a direct window into an individual’s competence alone” (Altenberg & Vago 2004:107). Similarly, decision-making factors unrelated to grammaticality judgement tasks such as the strategy of rejecting unfamiliar structures, that is, only selecting the deviant structure, might play a role when they are administered. It is also possible that preference from pragmatic or other considerations dominates choices for structures that are grammatically possible, but less frequent; yet, the aim would be to elicit grammaticality at the expense of preference. GJTs are suitable for measuring general trends, but they can produce individual inconsistencies in various forms. For example, response bias for either grammatical or ungrammatical structures might be at stake, and both inter-subject inconsistency and intra-subject variability might come under attack; however, the consistency of individuals undergoing language attrition may vary depending on the degree of attrition as well, and it is no surprise that no individuals are identical, and even the same person does not judge identical or similar structures the same way at different times. Subject characteristics are not easy to control in the first place, no matter what the task type is. Other, mostly technically related factors can also influence the effectiveness of GJTs; so, when constructing tasks, a number of considerations should be taken into account such as possible influencing attributes of the truth of the sentence, sentence order, sentence complexity, position of error in a sentence, linguistic complexity, the degree of grammaticality and others (Altenberg & Vago 2004).

On the other hand, GJT have their own advantages, too. They are quite easy to use, and they can be done in a short period of time involving a large number of subjects without using any technical devices. Respondents are willing to fill out grammaticality judgment tests more than other types because of their ease of use and practicality. Considering the prevalence and popularity of online questionnaires in our age, their use is especially justified. GJTs administered online are really helpful in reaching otherwise remote speech communities abroad, with the additional support of social networking aids.

Grammaticality judgements are not alien at all in normal life settings of language use either. The practice of self-correction is a natural phenomenon in how we process language utterances in everyday situations. If the respondents are not under the pressure of the limitations of time, which can have an influence on the performance, then GJTs are a reliable means in investigating the linguistic subsystems of phonology, morphology, and syntax in particular.

Consequently, their use is clearly justified in the present paper, and even though, like any higher-order activities, they are complex in nature, they still do us good service (Altenberg & Vago 2004). It is important to note that other task types are equally controversial. Therefore, there is no reason for us to get rid of GJTs; rather, the focus should be on carefully designed GJTs administered to L1 attriters.

As far as the future implications of GJTs for studying language attrition are concerned, the combined application of a variety of tasks should be desirable in order to obtain more valid and reliable results reflecting real knowledge for L1 attriters as much as it is possible (Altenberg & Vago 2004: 124; Rippert & Kuiken 2009: 44).

6 Results

The results of the discussed variables are shown in the tables below, which include the percentages of the standard and nonstandard options for the two groups in the UK, the monolingual Hungarian group (HU), together with the result of the combined group for the Carpathian Basin (CAR).

6.1 *The ‘must+Verbimperative’ variable*

The use of the *’kell+felszólító módú igeszervezet’* (must+Verbimperative) verb phrase construction is considerably spreading, and it can especially be traced back to regional dialects. It is most widespread in Transylvania and in the Eastern part of the Great Hungarian Plain (Lanstyák & Szabó Mihály 1997: 49–51, cited in Göncz 1999: 156). Its status among native speakers in Hungary is somewhat ambivalent by language cultivators; but, in a global sense, they do not regard it as totally acceptable.

It is a peculiar feature of the Hungarian language that it not only possesses an infinitive unmarked for person, but it has conjugated infinitive forms marked for person as well. In regional dialects of Hungarian, the use of the infinitive may occur in several structures, and their use is not a matter of standardness, but mainly a matter of statistical difference in use among the various speech communities.

Making grammatical judgments of certain structures might be influenced by dominant languages in countries surrounding Hungary in the Carpathian Basin; and, even though Hungarian is not a minority language in the UK and Ireland the same way as it is in the regions that used to belong to Hungary until the Treaty of Trianon, it is worth examining whether the unmarked, impersonal form is preferred in English speaking countries over infinitive forms marked for person. Since English does not possess infinitive forms marked for person, it is assumed that, if it exerts a language contact effect on Hungarian, then the preference of the unmarked form would prevail in the language use of the immigrant communities in the UK and Ireland.

Tasks 521, 522, 523, 524 (Tables 1–4) as well as 641, 642, 643 and 644 (Tables 5–8) survey the ‘must+Verbimperative’ variable.

6.1.1 (1) [521] – *must+Verbimperative*

<i>Mari-nak is meg kell old-ani-a</i> Mary-DAT also PVB must solve-INF-3SG	<i>a saját problémá-i-t.</i> the own problem-Px3SG.PL-ACC
---	--

'Mary has to solve her own problems, too.'

Zsolt Pál Deli:
The bilingualism of Hungarians in the United Kingdom and Ireland
Argumentum 18 (2022), 306–336
 Debreceni Egyetemi Kiadó
 DOI: 10.34103/ARGUMENTUM/2022/18

521.	HU	GB/IRE-NEW	GB/IRE-OLD	CAR
very good	61 (58.1%)	65 (65%)	66 (66%)	742 ¹ (90.3%)
acceptable	37 (35.2%)	29 (29%)	30 (30%)	
quite bad	5 (4.8%)	4 (4%)	3 (3%)	77 ² (9.4%)
very bad	2 (1.9%)	2 (2%)	1 (1%)	

Table 1. Responses to task 521, the *must+Verbimperative structure*

From this data in task 521 (Table 1), it is clearly seen that the vast majority of the respondents of the CAR group rated the sentence either *very good* or *acceptable* on the given judgment scale, while this proportion is less manifested in the case of the HU, the GB/IRE-NEW and the GB/IRE-OLD groups; therefore, the acceptance of what is considered to be a standard option is less prevalent in the previous two groups.

In task 521, the use of the DAT case is present in Hungarian where the subject is marked by the DAT case suffix in the word *Marinak* ‘to Mary’ instead of the nominative case, and the word *problémáit* ‘her problems’ is marked for plural number with a possessive suffix in the third person singular in the accusative case, and the infinitive is marked for the third person singular preceded by the aspectual preverbal prefix *meg* denoting perfectivity (Kenesei et al. 1998), and the auxiliary *kell* ‘must’. So the subject, the object and the infinitive form all carry marked features as opposed to its English equivalent.

6.1.2 (2) [522] – *must+Verbimperative*

Mari-nak is meg kell old-ani a saját problémá-i-t.
 Mary-DAT also PVB must solve-INF the own problem-Px3SG.PL-ACC

‘Mary has to solve her own problems, too.’

522.	HU	GB/IRE-NEW	GB/IRE-OLD	CAR
very good	23 (21,9%)	20 (20%)	19 (19%)	594 ³ (73.1%)
acceptable	63 (60%)	50 (50 %)	48 (48%)	
quite bad	16 (15.2%)	21 (21%)	28 (28%)	219 ⁴ (26.9%)
very bad	3 (2.9%)	9 (9%)	5 (5%)	

Table 2. Responses to task 522, the *must+Verbimperative structure*

As illustrated in task 522 (Table 2), the results indicate that there is a notable difference in the acceptance of the *very good* and *acceptable* judgment scale options between the CAR group and the HU, the GB/IRE-NEW and the GB/IRE-OLD groups, in that the CAR group shows a substantial preference for this version of the sentence as opposed to the other groups. It is

¹ The aggregate average of *very good* and *acceptable*

² The aggregate average of *quite bad* and *very bad*

³ The aggregate average of *very good* and *acceptable*

⁴ The aggregate average of *quite bad* and *very bad*

notable that the GB/IRE-OLD group prefers the *quite bad* option on the scale to a higher (28%) than the GB/IRE-NEW group (21%), but it is the opposite for the *very bad* option.

The analysis of task 522 (Table 2) is practically the same as it is for task 521, but the infinitival constituent in the sentence is in its uninflected base form.

6.1.3 (3) [523] – *must+Verbimperative*

Mari is meg kell, hogy oldja a saját problémá-i-t.
 Mary also PVB must that solve-IMP.3SG the own problem-Px3SG.PL-ACC

'Mary has to solve her own problems, too.'

523.	HU	GB/IRE-NEW	GB/IRE-OLD	CAR
very good	22 (21%)	26 (26%)	20 (20%)	531 ⁵ (65.2%)
acceptable	43 (41%)	34 (34 %)	38 (38%)	
quite bad	32 (30.5%)	35 (35%)	34 (34%)	282 ⁶ (34.8%)
very bad	8 (7.6%)	5 (5%)	8 (8%)	

Table 3. Responses to task 523, the *must+Verbimperative* structure

Very similarly, the data being compared to the previous task, it is apparent in the answers for task 523 (Table 3), that the percentages for SH in groups HU, GB/IRE-NEW and GB/IRE-OLD are very similar; however, the *very good* option is favored more (26%) by the GB/IRE-NEW group than the older group (20%), while the figure for the *acceptable* option reveals the opposite. The *very bad* option is rejected by the vast majority of the respondents in the HU, the GB/IRE-NEW, and the GB/IRE-OLD groups, while 34.8% in the CAR group supports it together with the *quite bad* option.

An outstanding preference can be observed in the CAR group in favor of the *very good* (42,9%) and *acceptable* options (27,6%), compared to the average of the other three groups. The judgements for the *quite bad* options are rather similar for the GB/IRE-NEW and the GB/IRE-OLD groups, and the HU group shows a slightly stronger preference for it.

In task 523, the subject *Mari* 'Mary' is in the unmarked nominative case, and the verb *oldja* 'solve' after the conjunction *hogy* 'that' is conjugated for third person singular in the imperative, and the word *problémáit* 'her problems' is marked for plural number with a possessive suffix in the third person singular in the accusative case.

6.1.4 (4) [524] – *must+Verbimperative*

Mari is meg kell oldja a saját problémá-i-t.
 Mary also PVB must solve-IMP.3SG the own problem-Px3SG.PL-ACC

'Mary has to solve her own problems, too.'

⁵ The aggregate average of *very good* and *acceptable*

⁶ The aggregate average of *quite bad* and *very bad*

Zsolt Pál Deli:
The bilingualism of Hungarians in the United Kingdom and Ireland
Argumentum 18 (2022), 306–336
Debreceni Egyetemi Kiadó
 DOI: 10.34103/ARGUMENTUM/2022/18

524.	HU	GB/IRE-NEW	GB/IRE-OLD	CAR
very good	13 (12.3%)	13 (13%)	11 (11%)	353 ⁷ (43.4%)
acceptable	27 (25.5%)	40 (40 %)	28 (28%)	
quite bad	36 (34%)	25 (25%)	32 (32%)	461 ⁸ (56.6%)
very bad	30 (28.3%)	22 (22%)	29 (29%)	

Table 4. Responses to task 524, the must+Verbimperative structure

Table 4 for task 524 above illustrates that the answers in the HU, GB/IRE-NEW and GB/IRE-OLD groups show a rather uniform result. However, the CAR group chose the *very good* and *acceptable* options in a greater number than the other three groups. The *acceptable* option is more supported in the GB/IRE-NEW group (40%) as opposed to the GB/IRE-OLD group (28%), while the older group rather accepts the *quite bad* (32%) and the *very bad* option (29%) than the newer group, where it is only 25% for the former and 22% for the latter option.

The analysis of task 524 is somewhat similar to task 523; the only difference being is that this sentence misses the use of the conjunction *hogy* ‘that’.

The next four sentences (641–644) belong to the same variable as the previous four sentences (521–524), but the total of eight sentences were split into two groups in accordance with the presentation of sentences in the original SHOH questionnaire.

6.1.5 (5) [641] – must+Verbimperative

A menekültügyi főbiztos-nak meg kell oldani-a a
 The refugee.matter high.commissioner-DAT PVB must solve-INF-Px3SG the
 menekült-ek elhelyezés-é-vel kapcsolatos problémá-k-at.
 refugee-PL placement--Px3SG-INS connected problem-PL-ACC

'The high commissioner for refugees has to solve the problems related to the housing of the refugees.'

641.	HU	GB/IRE-NEW	GB/IRE-OLD	CAR
very good	56 (52.8%)	82 (82%)	84 (84%)	724 ⁹ (91.2%)
acceptable	41 (38.7%)	16 (16 %)	15 (15%)	
quite bad	8 (7.5%)	2 (2%)	0 (0%)	70 ¹⁰ (8.8%)
very bad	1 (0.9%)	0 (0%)	1 (1%)	

Table 5. Responses to task 641, the must+Verbimperative structure

Table 5 for task 641 reveals that, while there is a substantial difference between the HU and CAR groups, the outcome for the GB/IRE-NEW and the GB/IRE-OLD groups is practically identical, with the preference for the *very good* option being approximately 30-40% more in the latter two groups than in the HU and CAR groups, indicating a more general acceptance of this

⁷ The aggregate average of very good and acceptable

⁸ The aggregate average of quite bad and very bad

⁹ The aggregate average of very good and acceptable

¹⁰ The aggregate average of quite bad and very bad

sentence among the members of the immigrant community than in the monolingual group of Hungarians.

The subject in tasks 641 is marked by the DAT case suffix in the word *főbiztosnak* ‘to high commissioner’ instead of the nominative case, and the word *problémákat* ‘problems’ is marked for plural number in the accusative case without denoting possession in the third person singular. The infinitive in task 641 is marked for the third person singular preceded by the aspectual preverbal prefix *meg* denoting perfectivity (Kenesei et al. 1998) and the auxiliary *kell* ‘must’.

6.1.6 (6) [642] – *must+Verbimperative*

A menekültügyi főbiztos-nak meg kell old-ani a
 The refugee.matter high.commissioner-DAT PVB must solve-INF the
menekült-ek elhelyezés-é-vel kapcsolatos probléma-k-at.
 refugee-PL placement--Px3SG-INS connected problem-PL-ACC

'The high commissioner for refugees has to solve the problems related to the housing of the refugees.'

642.	HU	GB/IRE-NEW	GB/IRE-OLD	CAR
very good	28 (26.9%)	30 (30%)	22 (22%)	586 ¹¹ (75.7%)
acceptable	55 (52.9%)	58 (58 %)	62 (62%)	
quite bad	16 (15.4%)	12 (12%)	13 (13%)	188 ¹² (24.3%)
very bad	5 (4.8%)	0 (0%)	3 (3%)	

Table 6. Responses to task 642, the *must+Verbimperative* structure

Table 6 for task 642 shows that the *acceptable* option is the most preferred one in all groups, and together with the *very good* option, they form the vast majority of the answers, representing a 75.7% in the CAR group on average, and figures exceeding 80% on average for the two options combined can be seen. Regarding the groups in the UK and Ireland, the *very good* option represents a higher figure in the newer group (30%) than in the older group (22%).

The subject in tasks 642 is marked by the DAT case suffix in the word *főbiztosnak* ‘to high commissioner’ instead of the nominative case, and the word *problémákat* ‘problems’ is marked for plural number in the accusative case without denoting possession in the third person singular, and the infinitival constituent in the sentence is in its uninflected base form.

6.1.7 (7) [643] – *must+Verbimperative*

A menekültügyi főbiztos meg kell hogy old-j-a a
 The refugee.matter high.commissioner PVB must that solve-IMP-3SG the
menekült-ek elhelyezés-é-vel kapcsolatos probléma-k-at.
 refugee-PL placement--Px3SG-INS connected problem-PL-ACC

¹¹ The aggregate average of very good and acceptable

¹² The aggregate average of quite bad and very bad

'The high commissioner for refugees has to solve the problems related to the housing of the refugees.'

643.	HU	GB/IRE-NEW	GB/IRE-OLD	CAR
very good	22 (21.2%)	5 (5%)	7 (7%)	505 ¹³ (64.8%)
acceptable	45 (43.3%)	29 (29%)	19 (19%)	
quite bad	28 (26.9%)	37 (37%)	41 (41%)	274 ¹⁴ (35.2%)
very bad	9 (8.7%)	29 (29%)	33 (33%)	

Table 7. Responses to task 643, the must+Verbimperative structure

Concerning Table 7 for task 643, the respondents favored the *very good* and *acceptable* options on a very similar scale, while the major part of preference fell on the *quite bad* and *very bad* options among both the GB/IRE-NEW and GB/IRE-OLD groups. As little as 5% and 7% selected the *very good* option as opposed to the HU and CAR groups, where the respondents judged them to be either *very good* or *acceptable* to a much higher degree, and the *acceptable* option is more favored by the GB/IRE-NEW (29%) than the GB/IRE-OLD (19%) group.

In task 643, the subject *főbiztos* 'high commissioner' is in the unmarked nominative case, and the verb *oldja* 'solve' after the conjunction *hogy* 'that' is conjugated for third person singular in the imperative, and the word *problémákat* 'problems' is marked for plural number in the accusative case.

6.1.8 (8) [644] – must+Verbimperative

A menekültügyi főbiztos meg kell old-j-a a
 the refugee.matter high.commissioner PVB must solve-IMP-3SG the
menekült-ek elhelyezés-é-vel kapcsolatos probléma-k-at.
 refugee-PL placement--Px3SG-INS connected problem-PL-ACC

'The high commissioner for refugees has to solve the problems related to the housing of the refugees.'

644.	HU	GB/IRE-NEW	GB/IRE-OLD	CAR
very good	8 (7.8%)	8 (8%)	5 (5%)	341 ¹⁵ (43.9)
acceptable	30 (29.1%)	12 (12%)	12 (12%)	
quite bad	33 (32%)	22 (22%)	26 (26%)	436 ¹⁶ (56.1)
very bad	32 (31.1%)	58 (58%)	57 (57%)	

Table 8. Responses to task 644, the must+Verbimperative structure

¹³ The aggregate average of very good and acceptable

¹⁴ The aggregate average of quite bad and very bad

¹⁵ The aggregate average of very good and acceptable

¹⁶ The aggregate average of quite bad and very bad

It appears from Table 8 for task 644 that this sentence is by far the least acceptable of the four sentences by any of the groups; however, it is important to note that roughly 37% of the respondents regards it to be either *very good* or *acceptable* in the HU group, with the most marked rejection of these two options having been recorded in the GB/IRE-NEW and GB/IRE-OLD groups, where the *quite bad* option is preferred 4% more in the latter group.

The analysis of task 644 is identical with task 643; the only difference being is that this sentence does not have the conjunction *hogy* ‘that’. From the analysis of the previous sentences it is clearly seen that marked features are abundant in the Hungarian sentences, whereas in English sentences their use is only limited to pronouns. If we trace language contact between English and Hungarian in the above structures, we will most certainly expect the unmarked variants of English sentences to abound in the Hungarian equivalents since they would be more expected to reflect typical characteristics of English; and, consequently, it might be interpreted as a result of cross-linguistic influence.

6.2 *The allative case variable*

One of the inflectional characteristics of Hungarian nouns is the use of cases. As a result of a regular and creative morphological process, which is a typical feature of agglutinative languages, new elements may be added to existing morphological forms without changing the stem of the word (Kiefer 2006: 58).

The semantic function of the allative case is to denote movement to or toward a place. Since English nouns are not inflected for cases, the idea of it is expressed by the use of certain prepositions, primarily ‘to’ or ‘toward’. Standard Hungarian uses the allative case in sentences such as *a főnökhöz jöttem* ‘I came to the boss’. Its use, however, when Hungarian is in contact with other languages is not so straightforward. For example, Lanstyák and Szabó Mihály (2005: 77) states that the language contact effect of Slovakian case usage can be seen on the language use of Hungarians in Slovakia, and the authors cite some examples for this phenomena e.g. “Hungarian used in Slovakia (HS) *a főnök után jöttem*, ‘I have come after the boss’ cf. Standard Slovak used in Slovakia (SS) *prišiel som za šéfom*, ‘I have come after the boss’ vs. Hungarian used in Hungary (HH) *a főnökhöz jöttem* ‘I have come to see the boss’, or similarly in the sentence *interpellál*, ‘interpellate’ is used in the HS printed media as a transitive verb governing accusative case, e.g. HS *interpellálja a minisztert* ‘he interpellates the minister’ cf. SS *interpelovat’ ministra*, ‘to interpellate the minister’, whereas in HH it is intransitive, governing the allative case, HH *interpellál a miniszterhez* ‘to interpellate to the minister’”. Behind the statistical figures, he sees convergence as a cause as demonstrated in the frequency of the varieties.

Fenyvesi (1995b: 1) conducted research in McKeesport on morphological changes in the United States, and she argues that it is a well-observable phenomenon that languages that come into contact with American English undergo changes in the use of the case system of the given language. For example, Fenyvesi (1995b: 2–3) documents that the nonnominative case forms might be replaced with the nominative case; which, in flexional languages, means the loss of case marking in most circumstances; and, in agglutinating languages, such as Finnish, it means the return to the use of the bare stem, abandoning the complete loss of case marking. Therefore, Fenyvesi’s (2005a: 295) study reveal that American Hungarian speakers use Hungarian cases in their speech differently from native speakers of Hungarian living in Hungary (Fenyvesi 2005a: 295), and the vast majority of the case replacements taking place are changes in locative

cases. For example, the sublative or superessive cases are used instead of the standard Hungarian illative case; however, the frequency of their use also varies within certain geographical regions in the United States such as South Bend.

Task 624 (Table 9) surveys the ‘allative case’ variable.

6.2.1 (1) [624] – allative case variable

(1) *Jónap-ot kíván-ok, a főnök... jö-tt-em, panasz-t*
 Good day-ACC wish-1SG the boss come-PAST-1SG complaint-ACC
szeret-né-k te-nni.
 like-COND-1SG put-INF

(2) *Jónap-ot kíván-ok, a főnök-höz jö-tt-em, panasz-t*
 Good day-ACC wish-1SG the boss-ALL come-PAST-1SG complaint-ACC
szeret-né-k te-nni.
 like-COND-1SG put-INF

'Hi, I came to the boss, I'd like to file a complaint.'

The results are presented in the table below.

624.	HU	GB/IRE-NEW	GB/IRE-OLD	YU	CRO
NSH <i>other</i>	0 (0%)	21 (21%)	22 (22%)	0 (0%)	12 (10.3)
SH <i>főnökhöz</i>	104 (100%)	79 (79%)	78 (78%)	119 (100%)	104 (89.7%)

Table 9. Responses to task 624, the allative case variable

Since there is no available data for CAR for this variable, the results for YU and CRO are presented instead. As shown in table 9, the monolingual Hungarian group (HU) and the Yugoslavian group (YU) unanimously (100%) chose the standard Hungarian option (SH), while the GB/IRE-NEW and the GB/IRE-OLD groups' preference for the standard Hungarian variant is much less, 79% and 78% respectively. Regarding the Croatian (CRO) group, the figures reveal that the selection of the standard Hungarian (SH) option prevails although it is less pronounced than it is in the HU and YU groups, but more than in either of the GB/IRE groups.

Task 624 consist of three clauses, the first one being a greeting, the second one containing the clause *a főnökhöz jöttem* 'I came to the boss' with the noun *főnökhöz* 'to the boss' marked by the ALL case suffix, whereas in the English equivalent of this clause, we can find a prepositional phrase containing the preposition 'to' denoting 'direction to' or 'toward'. The Hungarian suffix *-hoz/-hez/-höz* 'to' has a variety of use, whose semantic representations are quite similar to the English counterpart, in this context, the semantic equivalent of the ALL case. Since this semantic similarity is present, and the Hungarian standard option is in harmony with the English ALL equivalent of the preposition 'to' from a semantic point of view, choosing the NSH option is not really expected. Yet, interestingly, both GB/IRE groups would prefer another alternative in the range of 21-22%.

The third clause is rather irrelevant to us as far as the analysis of the structure in question is concerned since it only gives us a closing frame in the whole context of the three clauses, stating the purpose of why ‘I came to the boss’.

6.3 *The comparative constructions variables*

Regarding comparative constructions involving the adessive and ablative cases, Göncz (1999: 155–156, 2005: 233) states that in codified standard Hungarian usage, including most regional dialects, predominantly the adessive case suffix (ADE) *-nál/-nél* ‘at’ is used for the expression of comparative structures (e.g. Standard Hungarian *Júlia magasabb Márknál* ‘Julia is taller than Mark’); however, in certain cases, especially in Vojvodina and Prekmurje the ablative case ending (ABL) *-tól/-től* ‘from’ is also detectable (e.g. *Júlia magasabb Márktól* ‘Julia is taller than Mark’).

It needs to be noted that, although some Hungarian language cultivators acknowledge its presence in the region of Vojvodina and Prekmurje, they do not seem to accept the use of the latter version without reservations. It is hypothesized that the dominance of the use of the ABL case is due to the potential influence of Serbian as a result of language contact, and its equivalent structure can be found there. The Serbian preposition *od* ‘from’ has the same semantic function as the Hungarian ABL case ending *-tól/-től*. Göncz’s (2005: 233) analysis, however, reveal that the observed, and statistically insignificant, differences are more likely to be the consequence of dialectal influence.

In other regions of pre-Trianon Hungary, such as Subcarpathia and Transylvania, the statistical findings support the hypothesis to a greater extent; yet, there is no conclusive proof that monolingual Hungarians would unquestionably favor the standard ADE case ending variable when compared to the language use of bilingual speech communities in the Carpathian Basin.

Tasks 610 and 621 (Tables 10–11) survey the ‘comparative construction vs. the adessive case ending’ and the ‘ablative vs. adessive case ending’ variables.

6.3.1 (1) [610] – comparative case endings (ADJ-CMP+*than* vs. adessive case)

Az osztály-ban senki sem
 the class-INE nobody not {...}.

(1) *magas-abb, mint ő* (2) *magas-abb nál-a*
 tall-CMP than s/he tall-CMP ADE-Px3SG

‘Nobody in the class is taller than him/her.’

610.	HU	GB/IRE-NEW	GB/IRE-OLD	CAR
NSH <i>magasabb, mint ő</i>	18 (16.8%)	6 (6%)	11 (11%)	190 (22.8%)
SH <i>magasabb nála</i>	89 (83.2%)	94 (94%)	89 (89%)	642 (77.2%)

Table 10. Responses to task 610, the comparative case endings variable

Table 10 above for task 610 illustrates that the GB/IRE-NEW and GB/IRE-OLD groups have chosen the SH variety with a bigger margin than the other two groups, with the GB/IRE-NEW group being on the top, and the CAR group showed the least preference for the SH alternative, followed by the HU group, with its 83.2%.

In task 610, sentence (1) *magasabb, mint ő* ‘taller than s/he’ the adjective *magas* ‘tall’ is marked by the comparative suffix ‘-(a)bb’, followed by the conjunction *mint* ‘than’, and the pronoun *ő* ‘s/he’ in the third person singular (3SG) is unmarked for case. It should be noted here that, apart from using any proper names such as ‘Paul’ in ‘taller than Paul’, in English a number of variations are also possible, even pronouns in the accusative case ‘taller than him/her’, or using the inflected form of the copula ‘to be’ at the end of the structure ‘taller than s/he is’ with the personal pronoun being in the nominative case. This analytic construction is identical with its English counterpart on the structural level, and in standard Hungarian use, it is less natural than the other option presented in sentence (2), *magasabb nála* ‘taller at him/her’, in which sentence, the semantic analysis of the phrase *magasabb, mint ő* ‘taller than him/her’ is the same as in the previous sentence; however, the synthetic structural element *nála* ‘at him/her’ after the conjunction *mint* ‘than’ is marked by the ADE case suffix, together with a possessive suffix in the third person singular (Px3sg). The nouns in the English sentences, however, are unmarked. Consequently, the NSH variant is more English-like than the SH variant.

6.3.2 (2) [621] – comparative case endings (ablative case vs. adessive case)

(1) *Patricia magas-abb Klaudiá-tól, pedig egy év-vel fiatal-abb.*
 Patricia tall-CMP Claudia-ABL although a year-INS young-CMP

‘Patricia is taller than Claudia, even though she is a year younger.’

(2) *Patricia magas-abb Klaudiá-nál, pedig egy év-vel fiatal-abb.*
 Patricia tall-CMP Claudia-ADE although a year-INS young-CMP

‘Patricia is taller than Claudia, even though she is a year younger.’

621.	HU	GB/IRE-NEW	GB/IRE-OLD	CAR
NSH <i>Klaudiától</i>	3 (2.8%)	1 (1%)	1 (1%)	132 (16%)
SH <i>Klaudiánál</i>	104 (97.2%)	99 (99%)	99 (99%)	691 (84%)

Table 11. Responses to task 621, the comparative case endings variable

Table 11 for task 621 provides the results for the use of the sentence examining the adessive-ablative case endings in comparative structures. The GB/IRE-NEW and the GB/IRE-OLD groups have chosen, with a unanimous majority, the SH alternative (99%), with the HU group being only behind with a very small margin (97.2%). The result of the CAR group reported less SH answers (84%) than the other three groups.

In task 621, there were two options presented, the first one is *magasabb Klaudiától* ‘taller from Claudia’, and this synthetic structural element *Klaudiától* ‘from Claudia’ after the conjunction *mint* ‘than’ is marked by the ABL case suffix. In the phrase of the second sentence,

Zsolt Pál Deli:

*The bilingualism of Hungarians in the United Kingdom and Ireland**Argumentum 18 (2022), 306–336**Debreceni Egyetemi Kiadó**DOI: 10.34103/ARGUMENTUM/2022/18*

magasabb Klaudiánál ‘taller at Claudia’, the synthetic structural element *Klaudiánál* ‘at Claudia’ after the conjunction *mint* ‘than’ is marked by the ADE case suffix. The equivalent of both Hungarian sentences in English are structurally analytic since English nouns do not possess case inflections, and the proper noun ‘Claudia’ forming one element of the comparative structure is unmarked for case. The question here for Hungarian speakers is not really whether to use the ABL or the ADE case suffixes in the above presented comparative structures (although it is obvious that the ADE case ending is the standard); rather, the real question is whether to use the analytic structure *magasabb, mint ő* ‘taller than s/he’ in task 610 or its synthetic counterparts. The use of either the ABL instead of the ADE case suffix in the relation to English and Hungarian does not, in fact, indicate language contact effect, but the phrase in the sentence *magasabb, mint ő* ‘taller than s/he’ might do so, being the structural rendition of the analytic English sentence fragment ‘taller than s/he’. The more pronounced preference of the CAR group might be due to languages where the calque of certain prepositions of dominant languages Hungarian is in contact with can explain their acceptance or preference. For example, Göncz and Vörös (2005) mentions that the Serbian preposition *od* ‘from’ in comparative structures can be an influencing factor since its primary meaning is the same as the Hungarian ABL case suffix *tól* ‘from’.

7 Summary of the results

Previous studies (Csernicsekó 1998, 2005; Kontra 1998, 2005; Göncz 1999; Göncz & Vörös 2005; Benő & Szilágyi N. 2005; Bodó 2005; Fenyvesi 2005a, 2005b; Kovács 2005; Lanstyák & Szabómihály 2005; Sándor 2005) have demonstrated that in many cases nonstandard structures are preferred to standard varieties to a greater degree in situations where language contact is present, and earlier research (Kontra 2003: 57–63) states that different types of connections between independent, non-linguistic and dependent, linguistic variables exist. However, it is important to note here that the preference of either standard or nonstandard variants in speech communities inside and outside Hungary might be of a purely statistical nature since even without language contact, nonstandard forms can be used and are accepted in certain regions or dialects. Therefore, many times, it is merely a matter of being more standard or less standard when we talk about a certain variant, which is reflected in the frequency occurrences of the phenomena under investigation. For example, Lanstyák (2000: 206) notes, referring to the syntactic elements in Slovakian Hungarian that

the influence of the Slovakian language on the syntax of the Slovakian varieties of the Hungarian language is mostly a statistical question, that is, it manifests itself in the form of frequency differences. In such instances, it is not a matter of borrowing, but of reinforcement, with the contact variety becoming more frequent as a result of the influence of the second language.

Kontra (2003: 57), referring to Chambers (1995: 7), notes that factors such as social class, gender, age, education and occupation primarily define social roles, and they are noteworthy determinants of social class, too; consequently, Kontra (2003: 58) states that it is a widely accepted view that the level of education and language use are interconnected. Similarly, Borbély (1993: 80–81) examining the language use of Romanians living in Hungary demonstrates that education and the preference of language use are related. However, it is only true if educational systems try to preserve the standard in order to exclude speakers of the

Zsolt Pál Deli:

The bilingualism of Hungarians in the United Kingdom and Ireland

Argumentum 18 (2022), 306–336

Debreceni Egyetemi Kiadó

DOI: 10.34103/ARGUMENTUM/2022/18

nonstandard. The connection between education and social status are especially prevalent in Hungarian society, and they are important indicators of social status (Kontra 2003: 59). The more educated people are, the less nonstandard forms they prefer (Kontra 2003: 87), and women use more prestige variants than men in Western European and English-speaking countries (Kontra 2003: 60). Studies conducted in various speech communities show that conservatism in language use becomes stronger with the advancement of age, too (Kontra 2003: 61).

Possible explanations of the results of the present study connected to sociolinguistic causes may involve multiple factors, two of which are the educational level and the occupational status of the participants.

The data reveal that 6% of the GB/IRE-NEW group did not attend any schools outside of the UK or Ireland, while this number is 2% for the GB/IRE-OLD group, and 63% of the newer group received a college degree outside the UK or Ireland, and 37% received a college degree in the older group outside the UK or Ireland. The rest in both groups attended various schools, predominantly secondary schools, secondary vocational schools, and vocational schools. The majority of the GB/IRE-NEW group (90%) attended schools in Hungary at least as part of their education, while 6% in Romania, with the remaining 2% in Slovenia, and 1% in Serbia and Canada respectively, and 73% of them finished school within the past 10–20 years. For the GB/IRE-OLD group, the place of education was Hungary for 98% of the participants, with the remaining 2% being unnamed, and 78% finished school within the past 15–30 years.

Among the GB/IRE-NEW group, 8% received college education in the UK or Ireland, and this figure is 31% in the GB/IRE-OLD group. 61% of the respondents in the former group did not get any education in the UK or Ireland, while this number is 31% in the latter group. 7% participated in postgraduate education in the GB/IRE-NEW group, and 8% in the GB/IRE-OLD group. The number of respondents having graduated from secondary schools in the UK or Ireland is 2% in both groups respectively, and 20% went on to pursue either vocational education or attended various courses among the newer immigrants, and this figure is 28% among the older immigrants. In both groups, the majority of the people finished the last school within the past 5–10 years (GB/IRE-NEW group – 89.95%; GB/IRE-OLD group – 81.25%).

Although the language contact situation is not of the same nature among the immigrant community in the United Kingdom and Ireland as it is in the countries surrounding Hungary, where majority Hungarian speakers became minority Hungarian speakers overnight after World War I, following the Treaty of Trianon (Kontra 2011: 661), it has been demonstrated that the medium of education has somewhat serious implications in the linguistic results of bilingualism and language contact. Research studies in the Carpathian Basin uncover that if the language of education in primary and secondary schools was Hungarian, and not the dominant language of the given country, then the choice of the standard forms was more prevalent than the preference of the nonstandard contact variables (Kontra 2011: 674–675). Furthermore, higher educational levels tend to indicate the retainment of standard variants to a greater extent; therefore, such speakers are more likely to preserve standardness in their practice of language use more consciously. Considering the educational data presented with the vast majority of the speakers having received their education outside the UK or Ireland, we might assume the importance of the educational factor when interpreting language contact results.

As far as the occupational status of the respondents is concerned, the results show a rather varied picture indeed. A large number of jobs and professions are named, of which only some notable points are highlighted, based on the four categories proposed for analysis by Kontra (2003: 63): (1) professional people and managers; (2) people with other intellectual careers; (3)

Zsolt Pál Deli:

The bilingualism of Hungarians in the United Kingdom and Ireland

Argumentum 18 (2022), 306–336

Debreceni Egyetemi Kiadó

DOI: 10.34103/ARGUMENTUM/2022/18

skilled workers and self-employed people; (4) other unskilled (manual) workers. In both the GB/IRE-NEW and GB/IRE-OLD groups of immigrants, the categories of (1) and (2) are quite revealing, and the category percentage (3) for skilled workers and self-employed people is also substantial. Actually, 74% of all the respondents are considered to be fairly educated and skilled, which implies a stronger consciousness of preserving standard varieties in their language use.

In summary, concerning the outcome of the linguistic variables discussed above, we can conclude that since the majority of the participants of the present study was educated in Hungary in schools where the medium of instruction was Hungarian, it is no surprise that the preference of the standard variants is more observable although its extent varies according to certain variables both in comparison to the HU or the CAR group, and in certain variables it might be even more standard than the monolingual Hungarian group's (HU) choices. The evidence from this study suggests that the hypothesis cannot unequivocally be supported, and it is theorized that educational and occupational factors may be key factors, among others in preserving the mother tongue in the immigrant speech communities in the United Kingdom and Ireland. For instance, concerning the two experimental groups in the UK and Ireland, the length of time spent in the target country might also be expected to influence language contact results, but it seems that the amount of time that either of the two experimental groups of this study has spent in the UK or Ireland has not been long enough to produce notable language contact effects to explain any notable deviations from the Hungarian standard, at least at the stage when the investigation has taken place.

8 Conclusion

The purpose of the current study was to determine the possible influence of English on the language use of immigrant communities in the United Kingdom and Ireland for the given variables, and the results of this investigation indicate that the respondents in the United Kingdom and Ireland generally prefer the standard variants together with the monolingual Hungarian group, and the CAR group shows a greater preference for the nonstandard variants in comparison to the HU and the GB/IRE-NEW or the GB/IRE-OLD groups. The implication is that Hungarian as a minority language in the Carpathian Basin is more affected by the dominant languages than Hungarian is affected by English in the UK and Ireland where Hungarian is used as a second language (L2).

Although earlier findings indicated that nonstandard language use was more prevalent where language contact was present, it seems that the results of this study do not unquestionably support the hypothesis, and notable language contact effects have not been detected among the immigrant groups; rather, the outcome is somewhat inconsistent and contradictory.

Therefore, it is the intention of the author of the present paper to further advance the enquiry into the subject matter and conduct a comprehensive analysis involving numerous linguistic variables in order to arrive at a more conclusive interpretation of the results, of which this study is an integral part. Therefore, further analysis is needed to reveal new insights empowering us to a deeper understanding of the Hungarian-English language contact situation in the United Kingdom and Ireland.

References

- Altenberg, E. P. & Vago, R. M. (2004): The role of grammaticality judgments in investigating first language attrition. In: Schmid, M.S., Köpke, B., Keijzer, M. & Weilemar, L. (eds.): *First Language Attrition: Interdisciplinary perspectives on methodological issues*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 105–129. <https://doi.org/10.1075/sibil.28.07alt>
- Bartha, Cs. (1993): *Egy amerikai magyar közösség nyelvhasználatának szociolingvisztikai megközelítései*. [Sociolinguistic approaches to the language use of a Hungarian-American community]. Budapest: Kandidátusi dissertation.
- Benkő, A. (2000): *An analysis of British Hungarian: Some morphological features of Hungarian as used by Hungarian immigrants and their descendants in London*. Szeged, Hungary: University of Szeged: MA Thesis.
- Benő, A. & Szilágyi N. S. (2005): Hungarian in Romania. In: Fenyvesi A. (ed.): *Hungarian language contact outside Hungary: studies in Hungarian as a minority language*. Amsterdam; New York: John Benjamins Publishing Company, 133–162. <https://doi.org/10.1075/impact.20.12ben>
- Bodó, Cs. (2005): Hungarian in Austria. In: Fenyvesi A. (ed.): *Hungarian language contact outside Hungary: studies in Hungarian as a minority language*. Amsterdam; New York: John Benjamins Publishing Company, 241–267. <https://doi.org/10.1075/impact.20.15bod>
- Borbély, A. (1993): Az életkor, a nem és az iskolázottság hatása a magyarországi románok román és magyar nyelvválasztására [The impact of age, gender and education in the Romanian and Hungarian language choice of Romanians in Hungary]. *Hungarológia* 3, 73–85.
- Budai, L. & Radványi, T. (1989): *Angol nyelvtan a középiskolák számára* [English grammar for secondary schools]. Budapest: Tankönyvkiadó.
- Chambers, J. K. (1995): *Sociolinguistic theory: linguistic variation and its social significance*. Oxford: Blackwell Publishing Ltd.
- Comrie, B., Haspelmath, M. & Bickel, B. (2008): *The Leipzig Glossing Rules. Conventions for interlinear morpheme-by-morpheme glosses*. Leipzig: Max Planck Institute for Evolutionary Anthropology.
- Croft, W. (2003): *Typology and universals*. 2nd ed. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, xix-xxv. <https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511840579>
- Csernicskó, I. (1998): *A magyar nyelv Ukrajnában (Kárpátalján)* [The Hungarian language in Ukraine (Subcarpathia)]. Budapest: Osiris Kiadó és MTA Kisebbségkutató Műhely.
- Csernicskó, I. (2005): Hungarian in Ukraine. In: Fenyvesi A. (ed.): *Hungarian language contact outside Hungary: studies in Hungarian as a minority language*. Amsterdam; New York: John Benjamins Publishing Company, 89–132. <https://doi.org/10.1075/impact.20.11cse>
- Deli, Zs. P. (2020): Analytical structures in the language use of Hungarians in the United Kingdom and Ireland. *Alkalmazott Nyelvtudomány* XX. 2020/2, 1–17. [doi:http://dx.doi.org/10.18460/ANY.2020.2.001](http://dx.doi.org/10.18460/ANY.2020.2.001)
- Deli, Zs. P. (2021): A quantitative analysis of four linguistic variables in the language use of Hungarians in the United Kingdom and Ireland. *Alkalmazott Nyelvtudomány* XXI. évfolyam, 2021/1, 18–40. [doi:http://dx.doi.org/10.18460/ANY.2021.1.002](http://dx.doi.org/10.18460/ANY.2021.1.002)
- Fenyvesi, A. (1995a): Language contact and language death in an immigrant language: The case of Hungarian. *University of Pittsburgh Working papers in Linguistics* 3, 1–117.

Zsolt Pál Deli:

*The bilingualism of Hungarians in the United Kingdom and Ireland**Argumentum 18 (2022), 306–336*

Debreceni Egyetemi Kiadó

DOI: 10.34103/ARGUMENTUM/2022/18

- Fenyvesi, A. (1995b): The case of American Hungarian case: Morphological change in McKeesport, PA. *Acta Linguistica Hungarica* 43. 3–4, 381–404.
- Fenyvesi, A. (ed.) (2005a): *Hungarian language contact outside Hungary*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Company. <https://doi.org/10.1075/impact.20>
- Fenyvesi, A. (2005b): Hungarian in the United States. In: Fenyvesi A. (ed.): *Hungarian language contact outside Hungary: studies in Hungarian as a minority language*. Amsterdam; New York: John Benjamins Publishing Company, 265–318. <https://doi.org/10.1075/impact.20.16fen>
- Fenyvesi, A. (2006): Contact effects in Toledo, Ohio, Hungarian: Quantitative findings. In: Watson, G. & Hirvonen, Pekka H. (eds.): *Finno-Ugric language contacts*. Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang Verlag, 157–177.
- Fenyvesi, A. (2018): Language contact. In: Körtvélyessy L. (ed.): *Language typology: Preliminaries and principles*. Rzeszów, Poland: Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Rzeszowskiego, 145–152.
- Forintos, É. (2008): *Aspects of language ecology. English-Hungarian language contact Phenomena in Australia*. Veszprém: Pannonian University Press.
- Forintos, É. (2011): The Language use of the Hungarian Communities in Canada and South-Africa. Bulletin of the *Transilvania*. University of Brasov. Series IV. *Philology and Cultural Studies* 4/53.1.
- Forintos, É. (2015): Semantic aspects of Australian-Hungarian and New Zealand-Hungarian Language Contact Phenomena. *Topos* 4/1, 107–120.
- Göncz, L. (1999): A magyar nyelv Jugoszláviában (Vajdaságban) [The Hungarian language in Yugoslavia (Vojvodina)]. Budapest ; Újvidék: Osiris – Forum Kiadó.
- Göncz, L. & Vörös O. (2005): Hungarian in the former Yugoslavia (Vojvodina and Prekmurje). In: Fenyvesi, A. (ed.): *Hungarian language contact outside Hungary: studies in Hungarian as a minority language*. Amsterdam; New York: John Benjamins Publishing Company, 187–240. <https://doi.org/10.1075/impact.20.14gon>
- Grosjean, F. (1982): *Life with Two Languages: An Introduction to Bilingualism*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Grosjean, F. (2008): *Studying Bilinguals*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Grosjean, F. (2010): *Bilingual: Life and Reality*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press. <https://doi.org/10.4159/9780674056459>
- Haugen, E. (1950): The analysis of linguistic borrowing. *Language* 26, 210–231. <https://doi.org/10.2307/410058>
- Heine, B. & Kuteva, T. (2005): *Language contact and grammatical change*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511614132>
- Horváth, K. (2010): A magyar szórend néhány kérdése [Some questions on Hungarian word order]. In: Gecső Tamás–Sárdi Csilla (eds.): *Új módszerek az alkalmazott nyelvészeti kutatásban. (Segédkönyvek a nyelvészet tanulmányozásához 114)*. Székesfehérvár–Budapest, Kodolányi János Főiskola: Tinta Könyvkiadó, 146–52.
- Huber, M. I. (2016): Analitikus szerkezetek egy kanadai magyar beszélőközösség nyelvhasználatában. [Analytical structures in the language use of a Canadian speech community]. In: Váradi T. (ed.): *Doktoranduszok tanulmányai az alkalmazott nyelvészet köréből*. Budapest: MTA Nyelvtudományi Intézet, 31–44.
- Kenesei, I., Vago, R. M. & Fenyvesi, A. (1998): *Hungarian (Descriptive grammars series)*. London: Routledge.

- Kiefer, F. (2006): Alaktan. [Morphology]. In: Kiefer F. (ed.): *Magyar nyelv*. Budapest: Akadémiai Kiadó, 54–79.
- Kontra, M. (1990): *Fejezetek a South Bend-i Magyar nyelvhasználatból* [The Hungarian language as spoken in South Bend, Indiana]. Budapest: MTA Nyelvtudományi Intézet.
- Kontra, M. (1998): *The Sociolinguistics of Hungarian Outside Hungary (Final Report to the Research Support Scheme)*. Budapest: Linguistics Institute, Hungarian Academy of Sciences. MS. <http://e-lib.rss.cz/diglib/pdf/22.pdf> (28.08.2022)
- Kontra, M. (ed.) (2003): *Nyelv és társadalom a rendszerváltás kori Magyarországon* [Language and Society in Hungary at the Fall of Communism]. Budapest: Osiris Kiadó.
- Kontra, M. (2005): Contextualizing the Sociolinguistics of Hungarian outside Hungary project. In: Fenyvesi A. (ed.): *Hungarian language contact outside Hungary: studies in Hungarian as a minority language*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Company, 29–46. <https://doi.org/10.1075/impact.20.09kon>
- Kontra, M. (2011): The contact dialects of Hungarian. In: Bárdi N., Fedinec Cs. & Szarka L. (eds.): *Minority Hungarian communities in the twentieth century*. East European Monographs, 774. New York: Columbia University Press, 661–679.
- Kovács, M. (2005): Hungarian in Australia. In: Fenyvesi A. (ed.): *Hungarian language contact outside Hungary: studies in Hungarian as a minority language*. Amsterdam; New York: John Benjamins Publishing Company, 319–350. <https://doi.org/10.1075/impact.20.17kov>
- Lanstyák, I. (2000): *A magyar nyelv Szlovákiában*. [The Hungarian language in Slovakia]. Budapest-Pozsony: Osiris Kiadó.
- Lanstyák, I. & Szabómihály G. (1997): *Magyar nyelvhasználat - iskola – kétnyelvűség. Nyelvi változók a szlovákiai és a magyarországi középiskolások néhány csoportjának nyelvhasználatában* [Hungarian language use - school - bilingualism. Language variables in the language use of some groups of secondary school students in Slovakia and Hungary]. Pozsony: Kalligram Könyvkiadó.
- Lanstyák, I. & Szabómihály G. (2005): Hungarian in Slovakia. In: Fenyvesi A. (ed.): *Hungarian language contact outside Hungary: studies in Hungarian as a minority language*. Amsterdam; New York: John Benjamins Publishing Company, 47–88. <https://doi.org/10.1075/impact.20.10lan>
- Lehmann, C. (1982): Directions for interlinear morphemic translations. *Folia Linguistica* 16, 199–224. <https://doi.org/10.1515/flin.1982.16.1-4.199>
- Matras, Y. (2009): *Language Contact*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511809873>
- Matras, Y. (2010): Contact, convergence and typology. In: Hickey, R. (ed.): *The handbook of language contact*. Malden, MA: Wiley-Blackwell, 66–85. <https://doi.org/10.1002/9781444318159.ch3>
- Megyesi, B. (2001): *The Hungarian Language: A short descriptive grammar*. <https://cl.lingfil.uu.se/~bea/publ/megyesi-hungarian.pdf> (28.08.2022)
- Moravcsik, E. A. (ed.) (2013): *Introducing Language Typology*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511978876>
- O’Grady, W., Dobrovolsky, M. & Aronoff, M. (eds.) (1989): *Contemporary Linguistics. An introduction*. New York: St. Martin’s Press.
- Polgár, E. (2001): *Language maintenance and language shift: A sociolinguistic analysis of a Hungarian-American community*. Szeged, Hungary: University of Szeged MA Thesis.

- Rippert, A. & Kuiken, F. (2009): L2-induced changes in the L1 of Germans living in the Netherlands. *Bilingualism: Language and Cognition* 13.1, 41–48.
<https://doi.org/10.1017/S1366728909990320>
- Sankoff, G. (2004): Linguistic outcomes of language contact. In: Chambers, J. K., Trudgill, P. & Schilling-Estes, N. (eds.): *The handbook of language variation and change*. Oxford: Blackwell Publishing Ltd., 638–668. <https://doi.org/10.1002/9780470756591.ch25>
- Sándor, K. (2005): The Csángós of Romania. In: Fenyvesi, A. (ed.): *Hungarian language contact outside Hungary: studies in Hungarian as a minority language*. Amsterdam; New York: John Benjamins Publishing Company, 163–186.
<https://doi.org/10.1075/impact.20.13san>
- Thomason, S. G. & Kaufman, T. (1988): *Language Contact, Creolization, and Genetic Linguistics*. Berkeley: University of California Press. <https://doi.org/10.1525/9780520912793>
- Thomason, S. G. (2001): *Language Contact: An Introduction*. Washington D.C.: Georgetown University Press.
- Thomason, S. G. (2005): Typological and theoretical aspects of Hungarian in contact with other languages. In: Fenyvesi, A. (ed.): *Hungarian language contact outside Hungary: studies in Hungarian as a minority language*. Amsterdam; New York: John Benjamins Publishing Company, 11–28. <https://doi.org/10.1075/impact.20.08tho>
- Thomason, S. G. (2010): Contact explanations in linguistics. In: Hickey, R. (ed.): *The handbook of language contact*. Malden, MA: Wiley-Blackwell, 31–47.
<https://doi.org/10.1002/9781444318159.ch1>
- Weinreich, U. (1953): *Languages in Contact: Findings and Problems*. The Hague: Mouton.
- Winford, D. (2003): *An Introduction to Contact Linguistics*. Oxford: Blackwell.

Internet sources

Central Statistics Office (Ireland): <https://www.cso.ie/en/index.html>

Office for National Statistics (UK): <https://www.ons.gov.uk/>

ONS Migration Statistics (UK):

<https://www.ons.gov.uk/peoplepopulationandcommunity/populationandmigration/international/migration>

The Leipzig Glossing Rules. Conventions for interlinear morpheme-by-morpheme glosses:

<https://www.eva.mpg.de/lingua/pdf/Glossing-Rules.pdf>

The Migration Observatory (UK) <https://migrationobservatory.ox.ac.uk/>

Zsolt Pál Deli
 University of Szeged
 Doctoral School in Linguistics
 English Applied Linguistics Programme
 H-6722 Szeged
 Egyetem utca 2.
 deli.zsolt.pal@stud.u-szeged.hu
 wildrover67@gmail.com

Appendices

Appendix A: Abbreviations used for the interlinear morphemic glosses

1SG	first person singular
3SG	third person singular
ABL	ablative case
ACC	accusative case
ADE	adessive case
ALL	allative case
CMP	comparative suffix
COND	conditional mood
DAT	dative case
IMP	imperative
INE	inessive case
INF	infinitive
INS	instrumental case
PAST	past tense
PL	plural
PVB	preverbal prefix
PX	possessive suffix

Appendix B: Data for residence, state, gender, age, place of birth and time of arrival

Description	VARIABLE	GB/IRE-NEW	GB/IRE-OLD
Type of residence	Village/small settlement	11	15
	Farm	1	2
	Capital city	18	17
	Town	70	66
State	England	71	71
	Northern Ireland	1	-
	Ireland	16	14
	Scotland	11	10
	Wales	1	5
Gender	Male	20	21
	Female	80	79
Age	18–35	57	-
	26–35	-	9

Zsolt Pál Deli:
The bilingualism of Hungarians in the United Kingdom and Ireland
Argumentum 18 (2022), 306–336
Debreceni Egyetemi Kiadó
DOI: 10.34103/ARGUMENTUM/2022/18

	36–50	38	73
	51–65	5	-
	51–75	-	18
Place of birth	Hungary	91	98
	Romania	6	-
	Slovakia	2	-
	Serbia	1	1
	Other	-	1
Time of arrival	2010–2015	65	
	2015 →	35	
	Early 2000s		71
	1990s		18
	1980s		6
	1950–1970s		4
	Born in the UK		1

Appendix C: Educational level outside the United Kingdom or Ireland

DESCRIPTION	GB/IRE-NEW	GB/IRE-OLD
College degree obtained outside the UK/Ireland	63	37
No college education in the UK or Ireland	6	2
Secondary school	11	23
Vocational school	6	18
Technical school	11	18
Only elementary school	3	2

Appendix D: Education according to country outside the United Kingdom or Ireland

COUNTRY	GB/IRE-NEW	GB/IRE-OLD
Hungary	90	98
Romania	6	-
Slovakia	2	-
Canada	1	-
Serbia	1	-
Other	-	2

Zsolt Pál Deli:
The bilingualism of Hungarians in the United Kingdom and Ireland
Argumentum 18 (2022), 306–336
Debreceni Egyetemi Kiadó
DOI: 10.34103/ARGUMENTUM/2022/18

Appendix E: Finishing the last school outside the United Kingdom or Ireland

within _____ years	GB/IRE-NEW	GB/IRE-OLD
5	18	4
10	31	3
15	28	14
20	14	24
25	6	23
30	2	17
35	1	8
40	-	3
45	-	2
50	-	2

Appendix F: Educational level in the United Kingdom or Ireland

DESCRIPTION	GB/IRE-NEW/%	GB/IRE-OLD/%
College degree obtained in the UK/Ireland	8	31
No college education in the UK or Ireland	61	31
Post graduate education	7	8
Secondary school	2	2
Vocational school	6	12
Various courses	16	16

Appendix G: Finishing the last school in the United Kingdom or Ireland

within _____ years	GB/IRE-NEW/%	GB/IRE-OLD/%
5	80,48	57,81
10	9,76	23,44
15	2,44	7,81
20	-	6,25
30	-	3,13
35	7,32	1,56

Appendix H: Occupation

Description	GB/IRE-NEW/%	GB/IRE-OLD/%
Professional people and managers	8	16
People with other intellectual careers	33	36
Skilled workers and self-employed people	34	26
Other (unskilled) manual workers	25	22

Appendix I: Nationality

	GB/IRE-NEW/%	GB/IRE-OLD/%
Hungarian	96	84
British	-	7
Irish	2	-
Not given	2	9

Appendix J: Native language (mother tongue)

	GB/IRE-NEW/%	GB/IRE-OLD/%
Hungarian	100	100
Other	-	-

Appendix K: Mother's and father's native language (mother tongue)

	GB/IRE-NEW/%	GB/IRE-OLD/%
Hungarian	100	100
Other	-	-

Internet link to the questionnaire:

<https://forms.gle/RU8ByqCgyvYhAtVd8>