MORPHOLOGICAL ASPECTS OF AUSTRALIAN-HUNGARIAN LANGUAGE CONTACT PHENOMENA

EVA FORINTOS
University of Pannonia, Veszprém, Hungary

ABSTRACT. *This paper is one aspect of a large-scale study that investigates how the written language (Hungarian) of a minority group functions outside its traditional setting in central Europe, in an environment where another language is used (English in Australia). This is an intraregional language contact situation and the two languages involved are genealogically non-related and structural-typologically non-identical languages.*

The aim of the paper is twofold. On the one hand, to give an overview of one of "the most debated and still debatable problems contact linguistics is facing e.g., the dynamism of penetrability of the results of linguistic interference into the morphological level of the receptor-language" (Rot 1991: 49) and to find out if the applicability of the findings of language contact scholarly literature can be justified in the case of the current corpus, e.g., Australian-Hungarian corpus. The other aim is to carry out morphological research on the written data in order to see whether the derivational blends, e.g., English loanwords with Hungarian derivational suffixes are formed according to the derivational rules of the Hungarian or English language. Since the language of the examined newspaper is dominantly Hungarian, the most important hypothesis of my study is that the selection is governed by the Hungarian derivational rules. The conclusion we can arrive at is that in the case of derived adjectives it is mainly the dominant language of the examined newspaper, e.g., Hungarian, that influences the word formation process.

KEYWORDS: *language contact, code-switching, corpus linguistics, morphology*

ABSZTRAKT. *Tanulmányomban azt vizsgálom, hogy az ausztráliai magyar kisebbség egyik írott nyelvváltozata tradicionális előfordulásán --Közép-Európán-- kívül, Ausztráliában hogyan funkcionál; ott, ahol az ausztrál angol nyelv használatos. Jelen tanulmány egy nagyobb terjedelmű munka egyetlen aspektusát jelenti. A morfológiai vizsgálat célja egyrészt az volt, hogy áttekintést adjon a kontaktlingvisztika egyik legvitatottabb és vitatható problémájáról, vagyis arról, hogy a befogadó-nyelv morfológiai szintjére milyen mértékben hat a nyelvi interferencia (Rot 1991), másrészt az, hogy a nemzetközi szakirodalom kutatási eredményi alkalmazhatók-e az ausztráliai magyar korpuszra. Egy további kutatás azt vizsgálta, hogy az ún. „derivációs vegyülékszavak" (esetünkben angol jövevényszavak magyar képzővel), vagyis a főnevekből képzett melléknevek a magyar nyelv vagy az angol nyelv szóképzési szabályai szerint képződtek-e.*

Mivel a kutatás két vonatkoztatási nyelve, a magyar és az angol genetikailag nem áll egymással rokonságban és tipológiailag távol álló, azt feltételezem, hogy kevesebb példa van a ragozási morfémák kölcsönzésére, mint a képzési morfémák kölcsönzésére az ausztráliai magyar korpuszban. A konklúzió: a domináns nyelv határozza meg a szóképzést.

1. INTRODUCTION

This paper is one aspect of a large-scale study that investigates how the written language (Hungarian) of a minority group (L1) functions outside its traditional European setting, in an environment where another language (L2) is used (English in Australia). This is an intraregional language contact situation where Hungarian immigrants live among the English-speaking population of Australia; and the two languages involved are genealogically non-related; structural-typologically non-identical languages.

2. THE RESEARCH

The aim of the paper is twofold. On the one hand, to give an overview of one of "the most debated and still debatable problems contact linguistics is facing e.g., the dynamism of

penetrability of the results of linguistic interference into the morphological level of the receptor-language" (Rot 1991: 49) and to find out whether the applicability of the findings of scholarly literature on language contact can be justified in the case of the current corpus, which is Australian-Hungarian (AuH) corpus. The other aim is to carry out morphological research on the written data in order to see whether the derivational blends (e.g., English loanwords with Hungarian derivational suffixes) including e.g., derived adjectives derived from nouns in the word formation process are formed according to the derivational rules of the Hungarian or the English language. Since the language of the examined newspaper is dominantly Hungarian, the most important hypothesis of my study is that the selection is governed by the Hungarian derivational rules.

In conducting the linguistic analysis of the corpus a concordancing program has been used.

3. THE CORPUS OF THE RESEARCH

For my investigation, I agree with Kurtböke's (1998) criticism, according to which written sources have basically been neglected in language contact ever since this field of linguistics was introduced, and I have decided on studying and carrying out research on a written text. Engwall (1994) suggests with many others (cited by Kurtböke 1998) that newspaper texts provide as adequate a basis for a linguistic study of general language use (focusing on vocabulary or grammar) as do literary or specialised texts. If newspapers in general can offer a solid basis for linguistic studies, then community newspapers of minority groups of different countries are especially suitable for this purpose. Since the language of Hungarian migrants in Australia, unlike that of their counterparts in the United States of America, as well as the language(s) of Hungarian minorities in the Carpathian Basin, has not been the subject of much research, this study employs the machine-readable corpus of written language samples taken from the only weekly published newspaper – titled *Hungarian Life* (*Magyar Élet*) – of the Hungarian community in Australia. The corpus is made up of the advertisements found in the 98 issues of *Hungarian Life* published in 2000 and 2001. The number of words of advertisements found in the 98 issues of the chosen newspaper is 96,351, (100%), only 4 per cent of which is written in English, (3,781 words). Obviously they have been excluded from the corpus. 7 per cent (6845 words) of the advertisements are translations of governmental advertisements, 26 per cent (25,272 words) of them were written in unmixed Hungarian, whereas 63 per cent (60,453 words) of them are instances where the two languages – Hungarian and English – come into direct contact. The corpus of the study is made up of the latter three, altogether 92,570 words. Although the dimension of the corpus is determined according to the types, "the abstract representations of tokens", which "are instances of a linguistic expression" (Sinclair 1991: 19), tokens are not without consideration; they are referred to in the coding scheme.

The coding scheme I created for the research includes the basic information in the following sequence:

2000/1/1/96 (6)
2000 – the year of publication
1 – the issue number
1 – the page on which the advertisement was spotted for the first time
96 – the number of occurrences of the same advertisement (token)
(6) – the number of occurrences of the linguistic manifestation in other advertisements (token)

4. CORPUS LINGUISTICS, A METHODOLOGY FOR LANGUAGE CONTACT RESEARCH

There have not been very many computer-readable corpus-based studies available in the field of language contact research so far, and computer applications are still not commonly used in the field of language contact research although Biber (1994) claimed (cited by Kurtböke 1998) that with "the explosion in the availability of on-line corpora and computational research tools, analyses and applications of corpus-based work should become increasingly common over the coming years". Meyer (2002) does not even consider this field of research separately. Although Kurtböke (1998) enumerates a few examples of computer-readable corpus-based research where several languages are involved, she is of the opinion that they have mainly concentrated on second language acquisition, e.g., Lux and Grabe (1991) used corpus based analysis to compare the compositions of students, written in Ecuadorian Spanish and English.

Kurtböke's PhD dissertation (1998), however, is a new attempt in this respect. She has recognised that generally spoken data have been central in the characterisation of language contact phenomena so she has decided on the written code. The data used by her are mainly in two languages that have come into contact in the context of immigration in Australia: Turkish and English. These facts contributed to the present study, i.e., the corpus-driven study of Hungarian-English language contact in Australia.

Language maintenance situations, like the one in which the Hungarian community exists in Australia, can include more or less stable bilingual speech communities in which bilingual mixture of various types is usual, leading to the phenomena known collectively as code-switching, which is a short-term consequence of language contact. This is the actual performance of bilinguals who exploit the resources of the languages they command in various ways, for different purposes. Bilinguals achieve this by alternating between their two languages, or by mixing them in different ways. Researchers do not always agree on precisely what kinds of alternation should be included under the designation code-switching. Code-switching has been defined as "the alternate use of two or more languages in the same utterance or conversation" (Grosjean 1982: 145). According to Thomason (2001: 132) "code-switching is the use of material from two (or more) languages by a single speaker in the same conversation". McLaughlin (1984) emphasises the distinction between mixing and switching by referring to code switches as language changes occurring across phrase or sentence boundaries, whereas code mixes take place within sentences and usually involve single lexical items. Much of the data presented on code switching involve cases of single-word switches/mixes, (e.g., Oksaar 1974; Grosjean 1982).The linguistic manifestations studied in the present study belong to this group. Other aspects of code-switching are discussed by scholars like Hoffmann (1991), Zentella (1997), Myers-Scotton (2002), Thomason (2001), Clyne (1991), Baker (1976), Winford (2003), Auer (1995), Poplack (1990), Gardner-Chloros (1995), etc.

5. MORPHOLOGICAL ASPECT

Rot (1991) enumerates a wide range of views according to which the level of morphology is considered to be the "fortress" of the language which does not "surrender" and does not allow foreign elements to enter it. As Meillet (1921) states it, (cited in Rot 1991: 50) "the grammatical systems of two languages […] are impenetrable to each other". On the other hand Weinreich (1953), amongst others is of the opinion that "the morphological level of the interacting languages may in some cases of permanent internal language interrelations be penetrable as well" (Rot 1991: 50). Zvegintsey (quoted in Rot 1991: 50) came to the

conclusion that: "Generally, it is necessary to admit that though the grammatical domain of the language is not absolutely impenetrable to foreign language influences it seems to be in comparison to other domains of language the most stable constituent". Rot is of the opinion that "the linguistic interference of intensive language contact may often contribute to the formation in the morphology of the receptor-language of bound morphemes with the help of which innovative constructions are formed" (Rot 1991: 54). Winford states that "situations involving more or less stable bilingualism within a community […] tend to promote varying degrees of lexical borrowing with only marginal diffusion of structural features" (Winford 2003: 65). He also emphasises that "even minority languages that are under heavy cultural pressure from a dominant host language resist importation of structure with the exception of derivational morphology and some function words" (Winford 2003: 65).

It has been claimed that there is a continuum ranging from relatively slight lexical borrowing under casual contact to extreme structural borrowing under very intense contact. An example of this is Thomason and Kaufman's borrowing scale (Thomason and Kaufman 1988: 74-76). Winford (2003: 22-24) gives a short taxonomy of contact situations and the types of cross-linguistic influence they contain to illustrate the major outcomes of language contact situations. A modified version of the borrowing scale can be found in Thomason (2001: 70-71).

According to Winford (2003) there is no real agreement on the extent and type of structural borrowing possible in language contact situations. As for morphology, the consensus seems to be that derivational morphemes are much more likely to be borrowed than inflectional ones. Derivational morphology is believed to be introduced through lexical borrowing. With regard to inflectional morphology e.g., whether it can be borrowed, either directly or indirectly, there is rather less agreement. He is of the opinion that languages can borrow a huge number of foreign lexical items while still retaining their basic grammar and their generic affiliation to earlier forms of the language. With the help of several examples, he proves that significant lexical borrowing can introduce new derivational morphemes and processes as well as new phonemic distinctions to a language. Winford (2003), however, criticizes Thomason and Kaufman (1988), who distinguish between "lexical" and "structural borrowing" as though the two could proceed independently of each other. Winford emphasises that "direct borrowing of inflectional morphology can occur in cases of close typological fit between the languages in contact, such importation of inflections, however, appears to be generally rare in situations of language maintenance, though it occurs if there is sufficient congruence between the inflections involved" (Winford 2003: 63).

To sum up what the findings of empirical research in the scholarly literature have proven so far with regard to morphology, the following can be stated. In cases of language maintenance contact situations the maintained language is subject to quite extensive lexical borrowing from an external language, though rather little structural innovation occurs. This tendency is even more likely if the two languages (AuH and English in this case) involved are genealogically non-related and structural-typologically non-identical languages. Moreover, there seems to be consensus that derivational morphemes are more likely to be borrowed than inflectional ones.

All the above mentioned hypotheses can be justified on the basis of the findings of the AuH corpus. On the one hand, no instances of the borrowing of inflectional morphemes are identified in the corpus. As for derivational morphology, only examples of derived adjectives (e.g., when adjectives are formed from nouns in the word formation process) can be found in the corpus. They are discussed in detail in the following subchapter.

6. Derivational Morphology

Since Hungarian is an agglutinative language, derivation has an important role in word formation processes. There are a large number of derivational suffixes, a fraction of which are completely productive; some are governed by various properties of the base, others are highly idiosyncratic. The derivational blends, with an English stem and a Hungarian derivational suffix, in the corpus are derived adjectives when adjectives are formed from nouns in the word formation process (Kenesei *et al* 1998).

6. 1. *Derived Adjectives*

One of the most frequent simple affixes – *i*, generally meaning 'belonging to/from/in/ …N', is in general applied to derive adjectives from nouns and in particular it is attached to place names, names of institutions or locations, nouns expressing professions, personal relations, time or abstract notions. Although the place name is written with a capital letter, the adjectival form is not (Kenesei *et al* 1998). In the English language, however, a noun can be converted into an adjective by a process, which is called 'zero-derivation'; also known as conversion. When we use a noun as an adjective before another noun the exact relationship between the first word and the second depends on the particular expression. There are a large number of possible meanings that can be expressed. For example, in the following examples the first noun says where the second is found or where it comes from, or what it is a part of.

My working hypothesis is that – because of the Hungarian context – adjectives derived from nouns are formed on the basis of the Hungarian derivational rules.

The influence of the English language can be identified in examples (1) – (5) in so far as the adjectives are derived from the noun forms on the basis of the English derivation:

(1) ***Allambie*** temetőbe *(2001/2/12/1)* 'cemetery-ILL'
(2) ***Doveton*** Public Hall-ban *(2001/4/7/1) (1)* 'hall-INE'
(3) ***Doveton*** Community Centre-ben *(2001/14/19/2)* 'centre-INE'
(4) ***Unley*** Uniting Church-ben *(2001/5/12/2) (52)* 'church-INE'
(5) ***Keilor Downs*** Community Centre termébe *(2001/8/14/1) (1)* 'hall-ILL'

Example (6) is a noun expressing a profession:

(6) ***babysitter*** munkát *(2000/13/20/2) (1)* 'work-ACC'

In examples (7a) – (9b) adjectives are formed of nouns once according to the rules of the Hungarian language then the English language:

(7a) ***Norwoodi*** Magyar Klub *(2000/47/19/10)* 'Hungarian Club'
(7b) ***Norwood*** Town Hall *(2001/43/21/1)*
(8a) ***Homebush-i*** Bicentennial Parkban *(2001/34/9/2)* 'park-INE'
(8b) ***Homebush*** Bicentennial Parkban *(2001/11/17/2)* 'park-INE'
(9a) ***Rose Bay-i*** RSL Club *(2000/32/5/1) (4)*
(9b) ***Rose Bay*** Family Medical Practice *(2000/3/14/1) (6)*

The adjectives in examples (10) – (13) are formed on the basis of the Hungarian grammar and they meet the requirements of the spelling rules:

(10) ***burwoodi*** ravatalozóban *(2001/33/13/1)* 'mortuary-INE'

(11) ***newcastlei*** barátaimnak *(2000/49/14/2)* 'friend-PL-POSS-1SG-DAT'
(12) ***courtlandi*** jezsuita temetőben *(2001/39/13/1)* 'Jesuit cemetery-ILL'
(13) ***goodnai*** Crematorium & Memorial Gardens *(2000/10/13/1)*

Examples (14a) – (16b) are adjectives formed in the Hungarian way with either incorrect or correct spelling rules:

(14a) ***Marsden-i*** Magyar Ház *(2000/47/19/10)* 'Hungarian House'
(14b) ***marsdeni*** Magyar Ház *(2001/40/3/1)* 'Hungarian House'
(15a) ***Geelong-i*** református templomban 233 *(2001/5/12/2)* *(12)* 'reformed church-INE'
(15b) ***geelongi*** St. John templomból *(2000/12/14/1)* 'church-ELA'
(16a) ***Punchbowl-i*** Magyar Központban *(2001/15/4/1 (5)* 'Hungarian Centre-INE'
(16b) ***punchbowli*** Magyar Házban *(2001/7/4/2)* *(17)* 'Hungarian House-INE'

Altogether there are 51 adjectives which are formed of nouns in accordance with the derivational rules of the Hungarian language, but unfortunately they do not meet the requirements of the spelling rules. Here ten examples are given as illustrations:

(17) ***Gardenvale-i*** rendelőjében *(2000/1/20/98)* 'surgery-POSS-3SG-INE'
(18) ***Marrickville-i*** temető *(2001/7/11/1)* 'cemetery'
(19) ***Cremorne-i*** Budapest Journal étterembe *(2000/42/20/4)* 'restaurant-ILL'
(20) ***Vaucluse-i*** házba *(2001/20/20/3) (3)* 'house-ILL'

7. SUMMARY

Altogether 94 derivational blends are identified in the corpus (they are considered 100%) out of which 22 (23%) derive an adjective from a noun with conversion, which is a typical way of the word formation process in English. In 72 cases (77%) adjectives are derived from nouns according to the rules of the Hungarian language; 58 of the examples, however, are not spelt correctly. The conclusion we can arrive at is that in the case of derived adjectives it is mainly the dominant language of the examined newspaper, e.g., Hungarian, that influences the word formation process.

REFERENCES

Auer, P. 1995. The pragmatics of code-switching: A sentential approach. In: L. Milroy and P. Muysken (eds) *One Speaker, Two Languages: Cross-Disciplinary Perspectives on Code-Switching.* Cambridge: CUP. 115-35.
Baker, O. R. 1976. Categories of code-switching in Hispanic communities: untangling the terminology. *Sociolinguistic Working Papers* 76. Austin: South Western Education Department Laboratory.
Clyne, M. G. 1991. *Community Languages – The Australian Experience.* Cambridge: CUP.
Gardner-Chloros, P. 1995. Code-switching in community, regional and national repertoires: the myth of the discreteness of linguistic systems. In: L. Milroy and P. Muysken (eds) *One Speaker, Two Languages: Cross-Disciplinary Perspectives on Code-Switching,* Cambridge: CUP. 68-89.
Grosjean, F. 1982. *Life with Two Languages: An Introduction to Bilingualism.* Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press.

Hoffmann, Ch. 1991. *An Introduction to Bilingualism.* London: Longman.

Kenesei, I., Vago, R. M. and Fenyvesi, A. 1998. *Hungarian.* London and New York: Routledge

Kurtböke, P. 1998. *A Corpus-driven Study of Turkish-English Language Contact in Australia.* (Unpublished PhD dissertation without pagination.)

McLaughlin, B. 1984. *Second Language Acquisition in Childhood, vol 1 Preschool Children.* (2nd edn). London: Hillsdale. (first published by Lawrence Erlbaum associates. NJ. 1978)

Meyer, C. F. (2002) *English Corpus Linguistics: An Introduction.* Cambridge: CUP.

Myers-Scotton, C. 2002. *Contact Linguistics – Bilingual Encounters and Grammatical Outcomes.* Oxford: OUP.

Oksaar, E. 1974. On code-switching: an analysis of bilingual norms. In: Quistgaard, J., H. Schwarz and H. Spang-Hansen (eds) *Applied Linguistics: Problems and Solution, Proceedings of the Third AILA Congress.* Copenhagen, Heidelberg. vol 3. 491-500.

Poplack, S. 1990. Variation theory and language contact: concept, methods and data. In: *Papers for the Workshop on Concepts, Methodology and Data, Basel, January 12-13, 1990.* Strasbourg: European Science Foundation. 33-66.

Rot, S. 1991. *Language Contact* Frankfurt: Peter Lang GmbH.

Sinclair, J. 1991. *Corpus, Concordance, Collocation.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Thomason, S. G. 2001. *Language Contact: An Introduction.* Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.

Thomason, S. G. and T. Kaufman 1988. *Language Contact, Creolization and Genetic Linguistics.* Berkeley: University of California Press.

Winford, D. 2003. *An Introduction to Contact Linguistics.* UK: Blackwell Publishing.

Zentella, A. 1997. *Growing Up Bilingual.* Oxford: Blackwell.

Eva Forintos
University of Pannonia, Veszprém, Hungary
Institute of English and American Studies
10 Egyetem Street, Veszprém, 8200 Hungary
forintos@almos.uni-pannon.hu

APPENDIX

(1) **Knoxfield-Wantirna Sth.** rendelőjét *(2001/1/20/39)* 'surgery-POSS-3SG-ACC'
(2) **BONDI ROAD** BRASSERIE *(2000/22/20/2)*
(3) **Mulgrave** Senior Citizens Centre *(2001/16/11/2) (2)*
(4) **Glen Waverley** Senior Citizens Centre *(2001/12/5/2) (10)*
(5) **Commonwealth** költségvetés *(2001/25/5/1)* 'budget'
(6) **Senate** szavazólapon *(2001/42/9/2)* 'ballot-paper-SUP'
(7) **Warrawong** Newsagency Shop *(2000/18/2/2)*
(8) **Huntingdale** Newsagency *(2000/8/9/4)*
(9) **Oakleigh** Newsagency *(2001/32/16/1) (3)*
(10) **Aston-i** rendkívüli választáson *(2001/25/3/2)(1)* 'by-election-SUP'
(11) **Aston** választókerületben *(2001/25/3/2)* 'constituency-INE'
(12) **North Sydney-i** businesshez *(2001/4/20/1)* 'business-ALL'
(13) **Sydney** Magyar Kaszinó *(2001/6/4/1) (1)* 'Hungarian Casino'
(14) **Rookwood-i** temetőben *(2000/13/15/1) (2)* 'cemetery-INE'

(15) ***rookwoodi*** Magyar Temetőben *(2001/38/16/2) (4)* 'Hungarian cemetery-INE'

(16) ***Springvale-i*** lutheránus templomban *(2001/5/12/2) (23)* 'Lutheran church-INE'

(17) ***springvalei*** temetőbe *(2001/43/11/1)* 'cemetery-ILL'

(18) ***Strathfield-i*** [Swan Ave. *(2001/7/10/2) (41)*

(19) ***strathfieldi*** anglikán templomban *(2001/7/12/2) (6)* 'Anglican church-INE'

(20) ***Carlton-i*** temetőben *(2000/47/19/10) (2)* 'cemetery-INE'

(21) ***carltoni*** temető *(2000/8/9/4)* 'cemetery'

(22) **Armidale-i** telefonáló *(2001/33/20/1)* 'call-Deriv. Adj.'

(23) *Glendale-i* Reformed Church-ben *(2001/6/12/2*) *(10)* 'church-INE'

(24) *Hawthorne-i* Manréza templomban *(2001/43/4/1)* 'church-INE'

(25) *Lilydale-i* Memorial Parkba *(2001/3/13/1)* 'park-ILL'

(26) *Parramatta-i* St. *(2001/4/13/1*)

(27) *Unanderra-i* Presbyterian Church-ben *(2001/7/10/2*) *(10)* 'church-INE'