DELI ZSOLT PÁL

Szegedi Tudományegyetem
wildrover67@gmail.com

Analytical structures in the language use of Hungarians in the United Kingdom and Ireland

Britain has always been a target of immigration. It has been proven that migration causes language contact. The objective of the present study is to investigate the language contact situation resulting from the bilingualism of Hungarians living in the United Kingdom and Ireland to see how contact with English influences their Hungarian. The present study conducted in the United Kingdom and Ireland, involving 200 participants explores the presence of analytical structures in the language use of the Hungarian immigrant community resulting from bilingualism. In order to see the effects of English on the Hungarian language use of the participants, two groups were formed. Group 1. involved people having lived there for a shorter period of time, and Group 2. involved people having lived there for a longer period of time. A modified and digitized version of a questionnaire was administered, previously used in the project called the Sociolinguistics of Hungarian Outside Hungary. It is hypothesized that English exerts a detectable effect on the Hungarian language use of the immigrant community.

Keywords: analytical, bilingualism, language contact, language use, migration

Nagy-Britannia mindig is a bevándorlás célpontja volt. Bizonyított, hogy a migráció nyelvi érintkezést eredményez. A tanulmány célja az Egyesült Királyságban és Írországban élő magyarok kétnyelvűségéből adódó nyelvi kölcsönhatások vizsgálata: annak megállapítása, hogy ez a jelenség hogyan befolyásolja a kint élő magyar beszélőközösség nyelvét. Az Egyesült Királyságban és Írországban 200 résztvevővel végzett kutatás azokat a magyarok által használt nyelvhasználati preferenciákat tárja fel és mutatja be a vizsgált analitikus szerkezeteket illetően, amelyek a beszélőközösség angol–magyar kétnyelvű környezetéből adódnak. A felmérés során két csoportot alakítottunk ki: az 1. csoport adatközlői rövidebb, a 2. csoport adatközlői hosszabb ideig éltek a vizsgált nyelvterületen. Egy korábbi kérdőív módosított és digitalizált változatát töltötték ki az adatközlők. Feltételezzük, hogy az angol nyelv kontaktushatást gyakorol a magyar beszélőközösség nyelvhasználatára.

Kulcsszavak: analitikus, kétnyelvűség, migráció, nyelvérintkezés, nyelvkontaktus hatás

1. Introduction
The United Kingdom has experienced migration from the early days of her existence, whether European, including Hungarian, or global, since the British Empire have always been an attraction of a target destination to countries that have been in adversaries of war or financial difficulties. According to Grosjean (2010), migration for economic and social reasons is a chief cause of movement, potentially causing language contact. The phenomenon of bilingualism and multilingualism is a

widespread tendency in the world. (Grosjean, 1982, 2008). Where there is bi- and multilingualism, there tends to be language contact, and numerous studies have confirmed and demonstrated that language contact situations cause linguistic effects (see Haugen, 1950; Weinreich, 1953; Thomason and Kaufman, 1988; Benkő, 2000; Thomason, 2001, 2010; Winford, 2003; Sankoff, 2004; Fenyvesi, 2005a, 2005b, 2006; Heine, 2005; Matras, 2009, 2010), influencing lexical, phonological, morphological and syntactic aspects of language use.

Considering English-Hungarian language contact, the earliest inquiry was predominantly conducted in the United States, by Kontra (1990) in Indiana, by Bartha (1993) in Michigan, by Fenyvesi (1995) in Pennsylvania and by Polgár (2001) in the state of Ohio. The only comprehensive overview of contact effects in different varieties of the same language to date, titled *Hungarian language contact outside Hungary* (Fenyvesi, 2005a) investigated varieties of Hungarian. Furthermore, it discussed the sociolinguistic, linguistic and typological aspects of the language contact situations of minority Hungarian speakers living in countries surrounding Hungary, along with contact effects of Hungarian in the United States of America (Fenyvesi, 2005a), in Australia (Kovács, 1997, 2005). Forintos, (2008) discussed the English-Hungarian language contact situation in Australia and subsequently in Canada and South Africa (Forintos, 2011), and Huber (2016) in Canada. Benkő's (2000) analysis of British Hungarian seems to be the only study that was carried out in the United Kingdom among immigrants and their descendants living in London.

Regarding analytical structures, which is the subject of the present study, Huber (2016), wrote an article on the topic, which discussed the findings among Canadian Hungarians. Since that study focused on English-Hungarian language contact, in this paper his quantitative results are used for comparison.

In this paper, a brief overview of the sociolinguistic background together with the quantitative results of the contact effects of the speech communities under investigation in the UK and Ireland are presented.

2. Background
2.1. The role of migration in the formation of language contact

Migration causes language contact to form, and migration is an important aspect of English-Hungarian language contact in the United Kingdom. According to Grosjean (2010), migration for economic and social reasons is a chief cause of movement and language contact. Since joining the European Union in 2004, Hungary has seen the emigration of Hungarians to the British Isles in considerable numbers. The United Kingdom is one of the four EU countries with net inward migration of foreign nationals in the hundreds of thousands (ONS Migration Statistics, 2018). The exact

figures are not well-known, but a substantial number of Hungarians live in the United Kingdom and Ireland today.

2.2. The sociolinguistic background of Hungarians in the UK

The United Kingdom has always been a target of immigration. Throughout the centuries a significant number of immigrants have arrived to the Isles for political or economic reasons. Census data show that the growth of the population was rather slow prior to the Second World War. A small group of Hungarians arrived as far back as the 16th century, attending English and Scottish universities, one of whom was Nicolaus de Ungeria, a graduate of Oxford University.

The revolution of 1956 brought the first significant wave of immigrants, who arrived as political refugees, and took up various jobs, and were given the opportunity to attend British universities. The United Kingdom accepted approximately twenty-five thousand immigrants escaping the difficult days of revolution, but a larger number of the people leaving Hungary in 1956 got refugee status in the United States.

Hungary joined the European Union in 2004, and this opened a new chapter in the migration pattern of the Hungarian population. People could travel freely, and many Hungarian citizens, in the hope of a better living, left the fatherland and moved to various EU countries. Following the 2001 UK census, the estimated number of the Hungarian-born population living in the UK was around 13,000. Based on data from the figures of the Labor Force Survey, the Annual Population Survey and the decennial census figures, the British Office for National Statistics (ONS) reported that the Hungarian-born population was 52 thousand in 2011 residing in England and Wales in 2011, three times as many as ten years earlier. Only four years later, in 2015, the number of Hungarian-born residents reached 80,000, the vast majority of them living in England, and about 9,000 living in Wales, Scotland and Northern Ireland (Office for National Statistics, August 2015).

The University of Oxford's Migration Observatory indicates an even higher figure: 96,000 people for the year of 2015, which means that, only in four years, the number of Hungarian migrants in the United Kingdom doubled. The Irish figures are somewhat vaguer, and the records of the Central Statistics Office reveal that, according to country of origin of non-Irish national residents in Ireland in the year 2016, there were between 1,000 and 10,000 Hungarians living there.

3. The purpose of the study

The purpose of the present study is to investigate the results of the language contact situation of the bilingualism of Hungarians living in the United Kingdom and Ireland to see how contact with English influences their Hungarian. The present study

explores the linguistic outcomes of the English-Hungarian language contact. It compares and contrasts the Hungarian of the immigrants in the United Kingdom to standard Hungarian, and research results from Canada, and in some cases, from the USA, are also presented. The current study focuses on the linguistic feature of analytical constructions in the Hungarian language use of the immigrant population of Hungarians in the UK and Ireland.

4. Research questions and hypothesis
4.1. Research questions
Research question: Is the Hungarian language use of the immigrant community living in the United Kingdom and Ireland influenced by the English they are in contact with?

4.2. Hypothesis
Language contact is everywhere, and it may cause people to become bilingual. and where people interact using different languages, language contact produces linguistic changes. (Fenyvesi, 2018). According to previous studies conducted in a number of countries, it is hypothesized that in the contact varieties of Hungarian it is analytic constructions that are predominantly preferred as opposed to synthetic forms that are more representative of the monolingual language use of the Hungarian speech community in Hungary (Kontra, 2005). Based on this assumption it is hypothesized that this produces a similar result in case of the English-Hungarian language contact situation in the United Kingdom and Ireland as well.

5. Methodology
5.1. Participants
Two hundred immigrants (N=200) from the United Kingdom and Ireland mixed form the participants of the study. They are bilinguals speaking English and Hungarian and grew up in Hungary, speaking Hungarian as their first language. The participants are 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).

The participants have been 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. According to six basic categories as independent non-linguistic variables, 11 members of the GB/IRE-NEW group come 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

are located in England, 1 in Northern Ireland, 16 in Ireland, 11 in Scotland and 1 in Wales. 20 of them are men, and 80 of them are women. According to age, 57 people come from the age group of 18-35, 38 people are 36-50, and 5 people are 51-65 years old. The vast majority, that is, 91 subjects were born in Hungary, 6 in Romania, 2 in Slovakia, and 1 in Serbia. The arrival time for 65 of them is between 2010 and 2015, and the 35 people arrived in the given countries after 2015. Regarding the GB/IRE-OLD group, the numbers are the following: 15 members come 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 are located in England, 14 in Ireland, 10 in Scotland and 5 in Wales. 21 of them are men, and 79 of them are women. According to age, 9 people come from the age group of 26-35, 73 people are 36-50, and 18 people are 51-75 years old. Almost all subjects, 98 people were born in Hungary, 1 in a country not given in the questionnaire, and 1 in Serbia. The arrival time for 71 of them was at the early part of the 2000s, 4 between the '50s and the '70s, 6 in the '80s and 18 in the '90s.

A note on why people who were not born in Hungary, yet answering the questionnaire might be important here. During the era of the Austro-Hungarian Empire, historical Hungary accommodated a population of diverse ethnic background where various languages were spoken; however, the Peace Treaty of Trianon in 1920 resulted in the loss of two-thirds of her land, and millions of people got stuck in their new countries and became citizens overnight (Kontra, 2005: 29). Therefore, the neighboring countries of Hungary have a significant number of Hungarians that form minorities in those countries. During the acculturation process, the Hungarian language of these communities is affected by the dominant language surrounding them (Thomason, 2005: 11). The majority of these people still speak Hungarian as their native language even though they live in a country where Hungarian is not an official language, the only exception being Slovenia where it is declared in the constitution, with the estimated population of less than 10,000 speakers (Thomason, 2005: 11). The questionnaire included these people and gave various places of birth as an available option for the respondents. All the people answering the questionnaire claimed to be speaking Hungarian as their mother tongue.

5.2. Data collection
5.2.1. The questionnaire
The questionnaire used is a modified version of the SHOH questionnaire (Sociolinguistics of Hungarian Outside of Hungary project), which was first used in the second half of the '90s for the investigation of language contact situations in the Carpathian Basin administered in a number of countries such as Slovakia, Ukraine,

Romania, Austria, the former Yugoslavia (Vojvodina and Prekmurje, the latter now belonging to Slovenia). The 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).

The questionnaire has two parts. The linguistic part of the questionnaire contains the dependent variables that attempt to measure the linguistic outcomes in analyzing the effects of the grammaticality judgments of the questions on contact-induced sentences. The linguistic tasks include choosing the more natural sounding sentence, judging the correctness of sentences, together with multiple-choice tasks. (Kontra 2005: 40, cited in Fenyvesi 2005a). The questionnaire is suitable for collecting data on the structural changes of the languages in contact.

In addition, in the second part of the questionnaire that contain the independent, non-linguistic variables, the social background, the language use and attitudes of the subjects are included.

5.2.2. The question/task types

The participants of the study were given two different task types: for sentences 503, 507, 514, 603, 605, 607 and 613, they had to choose the more natural sounding of the two sentences presented to them. On the other hand, for sentences 532 and 536, they were asked to judge a sentence and correct it if need be, after considering whether the given sentences were good (a) or bad (2). If option 'bad' (2) were chosen, then they were asked to write down the version considered the right choice for them (Kontra, 1998). This task type, however, had been changed prior to the digital administration of the task for ease of filling out the questionnaire. The representations for the texts are given in interlinear morphemic glosses (IMG) in order that the grammatical structure of the Hungarian sentences can be easily followed, together with the meaning of the original sentences.

6. Results
6.1. Linguistic typology

Linguistic typology is a field of linguistics that deals with the structural classification of languages, creating typological groups, constructed on similar linguistic patterns, structures and systems. Prominent authors (see Greenberg,1966; Comrie, 1981; Ramat, 1987; Croft, 1990 and Moravcsik, 2013) extensively discuss how typological systems work in the field of linguistics.

6.2. Hungarian as an agglutinative language

Languages such as Hungarian employ complex derivational processes, which express syntactic structures semantically equivalent to analytic ones (Thomason,

2005:17). 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). A transparent example in sentence from Hungarian well illustrates how this system works: *leg-meg-veszteget-het-etlen-ebb-ek-nek*, SUP-PRF-bribe-POSS-PRIV-CMP-PL-DAT 'to those who are least bribable' (Moravcsik, 2013: 111).

6.3. Analytic languages

Analytic processes, on the other hand, use single morphemes, mostly free morphemes as words, and few bound morphemes as affixes. Generally, two or more lexical items form phrases, in order to express one grammatical function (Göncz, 1999). For example, expressing the future in English in all aspects: simple, progressive, perfect and perfect-progressive is fully analytical; however, the English pronominal system can be regarded as synthetic, and considerable agglutination is present in certain words containing prefixes and suffixes (O'Grady, *et al*., 1997: 356). The term *isolating* is also used for *analytic*, indicating a one-to-one concurrence of words and morphemes, such as in Vietnamese (Comrie, 1981: 43).

6.4. Hungarian and Indo-European languages

Indo-European languages belong to the synthetic group. A typical feature of such languages is the use of inflections; yet, Indo-European languages tend to use more analytic constructions than Hungarian. Hungarian, in a way, is like Indo-European languages in that it uses synthetic forms, but; beyond that, it has very complex derivational and compounding processes present in its morphology.

6.5. Hungarian in contact with other languages

In Subcarpathia, there are Hungarian speakers who prefer to use analytic constructions to agglutinative constructions characteristic of standard Hungarian (Thomason, 2005: 23). Hungarians have lived together with speakers in the Carpathian Basin long enough to develop analytic features in their Hungarian as a result of the contact with languages that possessed predominantly analytic features of the dominant group (Csernicskó, 2005: 123). Therefore, in contact varieties of Hungarian, there is a more widespread use of analytic constructions at the disadvantage of synthetic forms than in the language use of the speech community of monolingual Hungarians. (Kontra, 2005: 37).

Yet, Hungarian shows less preference for analytical constructions, at least in its monolingual standard Hungarian variety (Göncz, 2005: 225), and even if it uses analytic structures, is not a matter of choosing right or wrong, rather, it is a question

of whether they serve a more efficient mutual understanding between the speakers (Bencédy, 1994). Therefore, when Hungarian shows analytical features, this trait of analyticization, to a great degree, is a result of its contact with other Indo-European languages (Göncz, 1999). Consequently, a great number of differences between standard Hungarian and Hungarian spoken outside Hungary are due to language contact, where Hungarian "takes over features from adjacent languages, which all happen to be Indo-European", and these changes happen and can be interpreted in accordance with patterns of linguistic universals and implicational hierarchies (de Groot, 2008: 192); however, a typological explanation is still lacking for this change (de Groot, 2005: 365).

At the same time, the phenomenon of making synthetic forms more analytical even among monolingual Hungarians living in Hungary is not nonexistent in the language, and this might be due to influence from neighboring countries where Indo-European languages are spoken (Göncz, 2005: 225). Analytical structures are not considered to be ungrammatical; however, as a general tendency, they are more alien-like and more foreign-sounding.

Linguistic insecurity, in an attempt to avoid errors in language use, can also be the cause of the use of analytic structures. Grammatical rules are generally easier to use and easier to remember than synthetic structures (Lanstyák and Szabómihály, 2005: 62).

As a rule, there are certain interferences found even in nonstandard Hungarian varieties, but certain constructions are virtually nonexistent in standard Hungarian spoken in Hungary (Thomason, 2005: 23); and the appearance of analytic structures can also be an internal development in the language.

7. Findings

The findings present the use of the analytic/synthetic variable in the language use of the immigrant communities. The overall statistical findings regarding the choice of analytical or synthetic options can be seen in *Tables 1-9.*, broken down into the various tasks under investigation. It includes the percentages for each group of people, the new (GB/IRE-NEW) and the old (GB/IRE-OLD) immigrants including Huber's data (2016) for a Canadian group (CAN) from his earlier study as well as the figures for the monolingual Hungarian group (HUN). In some tasks, where it was possible, outcomes from the study in Toledo, in the USA (Fenyvesi, 2006) are also included (questions 507 and 613). I found it necessary to use a group as much as possible, where a similar English-Hungarian language contact situation was present.

Previous studies (Göncz, 1999: 151, 2005: 225; Kontra, 1998, 2005: 37) demonstrated that analytical structures are preferred to synthetic constructions to a greater degree where language contact is present, and the findings of this paper partly

support earlier results in this regard. However, as it can be detected in certain tasks, the difference in favor of analytic choices is not always and clearly established, and is not so convincing in the language use of immigrants living in the United Kingdom and Ireland as it is in the results of other studies, included in this paper.

7.1. (1) [503]
(1) *Be-fizet-t-ed   már   az   idei   tagság-i   díj-at?*
    PVB-pay-PAST-2SG already the   this.year membership-ADER fee-ACC
(2) *Be-fizet-t-ed   már   az   idei   tag-díj-at?*
    PVB-pay-PAST-2SG already the   this.year member-fee-ACC

'Have you paid this year's membership fee yet?'

Table 1. Responses to task 503, analytic vs. synthetic structures.

503.	HU	GB/IRE-NEW	GB/IRE-OLD	CAN
NSH *tagsági díjat*	30 (28,6%)	33 (33%)	35 (35%)	59,3%
SH *tagdíjat*	75 (71,4%)	67 (67%)	65 (65%)	40,7%

In task *503* (Table 1), the participants had to choose one alternative. Most participants preferred the standard monolingual Hungarian version (SH); however, the NSH alternative was chosen by a greater proportion in the GB/IRE-NEW and GB/IRE-OLD groups respectively, which is manifested in an 11 % and 13 % difference of less preference for the SH version. A marked difference can be seen in the group of the CAN respondents, where the preference for the NSH version is significantly higher than in any of the other groups.

7.2. (2) [507]
(1) *Un-om   már   ez-t   a   sok   utazás-t   busz-szal.*
    be.tired-1SG EMPH this-acc the much   traveling-ACC bus-INS
(2) *Un-om   már   ez-t   a   sok   busz-oz-ás-t.*
    be.tired-1SG EMPH this-ACC the much   bus-VDER-NDER-ACC

'I am very tired of all this traveling by bus.'

Table 2. Responses to task 507, analytic vs. synthetic structures.

507.	HU	GB/IRE-NEW	GB/IRE-OLD	CAN	USA
NSH *utazást busszal*	21 (19,6%)	7 (7%)	10 (10%)	51,9%	12 (66,7%)
SH *buszozást*	86 (80,4%)	93 (93%)	90 (90%)	48,1%	6 (33,3%)

In task *507* (Table2), the percentages for SH in groups HU, GB/IRE-NEW and GB/IRE-OLD are quite even, and the only groups of subjects that chose the NSH version in a greater number than the SH version is the CAN and the USA group. It is noteworthy that there is only a slight 3% difference between the results of the GB/IRE-NEW and GB/IRE-OLD groups.

7.3. (3) [514]

(1) *Tanító néni,   fáj   a   fej-em.   Ki-me-het-ek?*
    teacher aunt   ache.3SG   the   head-Px1SG   PVB-go-POT-1SG
(2) *Tanító néni,   fáj   a   fej-em.   Ki   tud-ok   men-ni?*
    teacher aunt   ache.3SG   the   head-Px1SG   PVB   be.able-1SG   go-INF

'Miss, I have a headache. May I go out?'

Table 3. Responses to task 514, analytic vs. synthetic structures.

514.	HU	GB/IRE-NEW	GB/IRE-OLD	CAN
NSH *ki tudok menni*	3 (2,8%)	4 (4%)	2 (2%)	29,6%
SH *kimehetek*	104 (97,2)	96 (96%)	98 (98%)	70,4%

Very similarly to the previous task, in answers of task *514* (Table 3), the percentages for SH in groups HU, GB/IRE-NEW and GB/IRE-OLD are very similar, whereas an outstanding preference can be observed in the CAN group in favor of the NSH variation, which figure represents an almost 27% difference compared to the three groups on average.

10

7.4. (4) [532]
(1) *Nem tud-om,   a   bank-i   számlá-já-n   mennyi   pénz van.*
   not know-1SG the   bank-ADER account-PX3SG-SUP how.much money be.3SG
(2) *Nem tud-om,   a   bankszámlá-já-n   mennyi   pénz van.*
   not know-1SG the   bank-account-PX3SG-SUP   how.much money be.3SG

'I don't know how much money there is in his/her bank account.'

Table 4. Responses to task 532, analytic vs. synthetic structures.

532.	HU	GB/IRE-NEW	GB/IRE-OLD	CAN
NSH *banki számla*	68 (63,6%)	1 (1%)	2 (2%)	77,8%
SH *bankszámla*	39 (36,4%)	99 (99)%)	98 (98%)	22,2%

A somewhat startling result can be seen in task *532* (Table 4) that represents the difference between the GB/IRE-NEW and GB/IRE-OLD groups at one end, and the HU and CAN groups at the other end of the scale. As it has been mentioned earlier, this task type, however, had been changed prior to the digital administration of the task for ease of filling out the questionnaire. In the original SHOH questionnaire, after judging two sentences (1) and (2), if option (2) was chosen, the respondent had to correct the sentence, which created an open-ended question, not limiting the choices only to two options. Therefore, it seems likely that when two options are offered, the participants can choose the standard Hungarian variety with a bigger confidence. It still remains a question whether the respondents really use the standard variety in their everyday life. It is possible that they choose their answers in order to live up to the expectations of using the Hungarian standard. Here the difference between GB/IRE-NEW and GB/IRE-OLD groups is an insignificant 1%, too. The fact that 63,6% of the HU, and 77,8 of the CAN groups chose the NSH variety raises thoughts about how question types may influence answers. It is assumed that when participants are faced with open ended questions, they, at the same time, are challenged to come up with an answer that is not given as a choice, so it might raise some insecurity in them. Similarly, it is also possible that they judge the first NSH version to be correct since it is easier to complete the task that way.

The explanation for task *536* (Table 5) is very similar; however, if we look at the answers, we can see that while the CAN group chose the NSH variety with 66,7%, the GB/IRE-OLD and GB/IRE-NEW groups chose the SH variety with 99% and 98% respectively, which figure exceeds even the 81,3% of the HU group. What is an attention-grabbing result in task *603* (Table 6) is the fact that, even though this task type had not been changed and was administered to the GB/IRE-OLD and GB/IRE-

NEW groups in the original task format, the results are practically the same as the result of the HU group.

7.5. (5) [536]
(1) *Ha szellõztet-ni   akar-ok,   így   kér-ek   engedély-t: Ki   tud-om*
if   air-INF   want-1SG like.this ask-1SG permission-ACC PVB be.able-1SG
nyit-ni az   ablak-ot?
open-INF   the window-ACC

(2) *Ha szellõztet-ni   akar-ok,   így   kér-ek   engedély-t: Kinyithatom*
if   air-INF   want-1SG like.this ask-1SG permission-ACC PVB-open-POT-1SG
az   ablak-ot?
the   window-ACC

'When I want to air the room, I ask for permission like this: May I open the window?

Table 5. Responses to task 536, analytic vs. synthetic structures.

536.	HU	GB/IRE-NEW	GB/IRE-OLD	CAN
NSH *ki tudom nyitni*	20 (18,7%)	2 (2%)	1(1%)	66,7%
SH *kinyithatom*	87 (81,3%)	98 (98%)	99 (99%)	33,3%

7.6. (6) [603]
A   repülõgép-ek   meg-sért-ett-ék   Svájc   ..... .
          the airplane-PL   PVB-violate-PAST-3PL   Switzerland   {…}.

(1)   *lég-i   ter-é-t*   (2) *lég-ter-é-t*
          air-ADERspace-PX3SG-ACC   air-space-PX3SG-ACC

'The airplanes violated Switzerland's air space.'

Table 6. Responses to task 603, analytic vs. synthetic structures.

603.	HU	GB/IRE-NEW	GB/IRE-OLD	CAN
NSH *légi terét*	10 (9,3%)	1 (1%)	1 (1%)	25,9%
SH *légterét*	97 (90,7%)	99 (99%)	99 (99%)	74,1%

7.7. (7) [605]

Fáj   a   fej-em,   mert   a   szomszéd egész délután ….. .
ache.3SG   the   head-Px1SG   because   the neighbor whole afternoon {…}

(1) *hegedű-n   játsz-ott*   (2) *hegedül-t*
     violin-SUP   play-PAST.3SG   play.violin-PAST.3SG

'I have a headache because the neighbor played the violin all afternoon.'

Table 7. Responses to task 605, analytic vs. synthetic structures.

605.	HU	GB/IRE-NEW	GB/IRE-OLD	CAN
NSH *hegedűn játszott*	17 (15,9%)	21 (21%)	17 (17%)	11,1%
SH *hegedült*	90 (84,1%)	79 (79%)	83 (83%)	88,9%

In task *605* (Table 7), the answers in the HU, GB/IRE-NEW and GB/IRE-OLD show a rather uniform result. However, in contrast to the tendency of previous answers, the CAN group chose the SH variety in a greater number than all the three groups. The HU and the GB/IRE-OLD groups basically represent the same result, and the GB/IRE-NEW groups have chosen the NSH variety with a bigger margin than any of the other groups. On average, the SH variety shows an overall preference to the NSH variety.

7.8. (8) [607]

Mindjárt kész   az   ebéd,   ….. .
at.once   ready the   lunch,   {…}

(1) ne légy   türelmetlen!   (2) *ne   türelmetlenked-j!*
    not be.IMP.2SG impatient   not   be.impatientIMP.2SG

'Lunch is almost ready, don't be impatient.'

Table 8. Responses to task 607, analytic vs. synthetic structures.

607.	HU	GB/IRE-NEW	GB/IRE-OLD	CAN
NSH *ne légy türelmetlen*	45 (42,5%)	44 (44%)	45 (45%)	70,4%
SH *ne türelmetlenkedj*	61 (57,5%)	56 (56%)	55 (55%)	29,6%

The distribution: of the answers in task *607* (Table 8) is rather even, the only outstanding being the CAN result, where there is a 25% difference in comparison with the rest of the other three groups in favour of the NSH variety. It is worthwhile to mention that even the HU group chose the NSH variety in 42,5%, which might be an indication of either an internal change in the language or a long term language contact to an extent that it is regarded as the more naturally sounding choice of the two options.

7.9. (9) [613]

A	*tükör*	*elõtt*	*hosszan*	*..... .*
the	mirror	before	for.long	{…}

(1)	*szépít-ett-e*	*magá-t*	(2) *szépítkez-ett*
	beautify-PAST-3SG	self-ACC	beautify.REFL-PAST.3SG

'She beautified herself in front of the mirror for a long time.'

Table 9. Responses to task 613, analytic vs. synthetic structures.

613.	HU	GB/IRE-NEW	GB/IRE-OLD	CAN	USA
NSH *szépítette magát*	21 (20%)	8 (8%)	23 (23%)	55,6%	9 (50%)
SH *szépítkezett*	84 (80,0%)	92 (92%)	77 (77%)	44,4%	9 (50%)

In the brief analysis for task *613* (Table 9), the preference for NSH is significant for the CAN and USA group, and quite close in case of the HU and GB/IRE-OLD groups, and the GB/IRE-NEW group follows the expected result more in selecting the SH option in 92%, which figure is significantly higher than the answers received from Hungarians living in Hungary.

8. Conclusion

In this paper I have made an inquiry into how the language use of immigrant communities in the United Kingdom and the Republic of Ireland is influenced by their English. The linguistic feature under investigation focuses on the potential preference for analytical or synthetic language use. Previous studies demonstrated that analytical structures are preferred to synthetic constructions to a greater degree where language contact is present, and the findings of this paper partly support earlier results. However, as it can be detected in certain tasks, the difference in favor of analytic choices is not always and clearly established, and is not so convincing in the

language use of immigrants living in the United Kingdom and Ireland. This can be seen from the discrepancies of the results for the analytical structures. Evidently, further research is needed to examine other linguistic features previously administered to lay the foundation for a more elaborate overall picture of the linguistic outcomes of language contact. The analyses should involve a more systematic examination of the correlation between linguistic and non-linguistic variables. Furthermore, it is desirable that similar studies should be done elsewhere in Europe, reaching beyond the English-Hungarian language relation, discovering so far unsearched language contact situations.

References

Bartha Cs. (1993) *Egy amerikai magyar közösség nyelvhasználatának szociolingvisztikai megközelítései*. [Sociolinguistic approaches to the language use of a Hungarian-American community]. Budapest: Kandidátusi dissertation.

Bencédy J. (1994) A beszélt nyelv és a norma. [The spoken language and the norm]. In: Kemény G. – Kardos T. (eds.) *A magyar nyelvi norma érvényesülése napjaink nyelvhasználatában.* Budapest: MTA Nyelvtudományi Intézete. 17-21.

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.

Comrie, B. (1981) *Language Universals and Linguistic Typology*. Oxford: Blackwell.

Croft, W. (1990) *Typology and Universals*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Csernicskó I. (1998) *A magyar nyelv Ukrajnában (Kárpátalján)*. [The Hungarian language in Ukraine (Subcarpathia)]. Budapest: Osiris Kiadó és MTA Kisebbségkutató Műhely.

de Groot, C. (2005) The grammars of Hungarian outside Hungary from a linguistic-typological perspective. In: Fenyvesi A. (ed.) *Hungarian Language Contact outside Hungary: Studies in Hungarian as a Minority Language*. Amsterdam; New York: John Benjamins Publishing Company. 351-370.

de Groot, C. (2008) Morphological complexity as a parameter of linguistic typology: Hungarian as a contact language. In: Miestamo, M., Sinnemaki, K. and Karlsson. F. (eds.) *Language complexity. Typology, contact, change*. Amsterdam; Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company.

Fenyvesi A. (1995) Language contact and language death in an immigrant language: The case of Hungarian. *University of Pittsburgh Working papers in Linguistics* 3. pp.1-117.

Fenyvesi A. (ed. 2005a) *Hungarian language contact outside Hungary*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Company.

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.

Fenyvesi A. (2006) Contact effects in Toledo, Ohio, Hungarian: Quantitative findings. In: Watson, G. and 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.

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.

O'Grady, W., Dobrovolsky, M. & Katamba, F. (eds. 1997) *Contemporary Linguistics*. London: Longman.

Greenberg, J. H. (1966) *Universals of Language*. Cambridge, MA.: The MIT Press.

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.

Haugen, E. (1950) The analysis of linguistic borrowing. *Language* 26. pp. 210-231.

Heine, B. (2005) On contact-induced syntactic change. *Sprachtypologie und Universalienforschung* 58. pp. 60–74.

Huber M. I. (2016) Analitikus szerkezetek egy kanadai magyar beszélőközösség nyelvhasználatában. [Analytical structures in the language use of a Canadian speech community]. In: Váradi, Tamás, ed. *Doktoranduszok tanulmányai az alkalmazott nyelvészet köréből*. Budapest: MTA Nyelvtudományi Intézet. 31-44.

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

Kontra M. (2005) Contextualizing the Sociolinguistics of Hungarian Outside of 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.

Kovács M. (1997) Language attrition in Australian Hungarian: A case study. In: Borsányi L. and Szőke E. (eds.) *International Conference of PhD Students: University of Miskolc, Hungary, August 11–17. Section Proceedings. Humanities.* Miskolc: Miskolci Egyetem. 114–121.

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.

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.

Matras, Y. (2009) *Language Contact*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Matras, Y. (2010) Contact, convergence and typology. In: Hickey, R. (ed.) *The handbook of language contact*. Malden, MA: Wiley-Blackwell. 66-85.

Moravcsik, E. A. (ed. 2013) *Introducing Language Typology*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Office for National Statistics. August (2015) Population by Country of Birth Estimates. Frequently Asked Questions.

Polgár E. (2001) *Language maintenance and language shift: A sociolinguistic analysis of a Hungarian-American community*. Szeged, Hungary: University of Szeged MA Thesis.

Ramat, P. (1987) *Linguistic Typology*. Amsterdam: de Gruyter.

Sankoff, G. (2004) Linguistic outcomes of language contact. In: Chambers J. K., Trudgill P. and Schilling-Estes, N. (eds.) *The handbook of language variation and change*. Oxford: Blackwell Publishing Ltd. 638-668.

Thomason, S. G. and Terence, K. (1988) *Language Contact, Creolization, and Genetic Linguistics*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

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.
Thomason, S. G. (2010) Contact explanations in linguistics. In: Hickey, R. (ed.) *The handbook of language contact*. Malden, MA: Wiley-Blackwell. 31-47.
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/
The Migration Observatory (UK) https://migrationobservatory.ox.ac.uk/

Appendix
Abbreviations used for the interlinear morphemic glosses
1SG first person singular
2SG second person singular
3PL third person plural
3SG third person singular
ACC accusative case
ADER suffix deriving an adjective
CMP comparative suffix
DAT dative case
EMPH emphasis marker
IMP imperative-subjunctive mood
INF infinitive
INS instrumental case
NDER suffix deriving a noun
PAST past tense
PL plural
POSS personal possessive
POT potential suffix
PRF perfect
PRIV privative
PVB preverb
PX possessive suffix
REFL reflexive
SUP superessive case
SUPL superlative
VDER suffix deriving a verb

Internet link to the questionnaire:
https://forms.gle/RU8ByqCgyvYhAtVd8