Morphophonological Aspects of Australian-Hungarian Language Contact Phenomena: A Corpus-Driven Contactlinguistic Study

Eva Forintos

This paper discusses one aspect of a large-scale study that investigates how the written language (Hungarian) of a minority group (L1) functions outside its traditional setting in central Europe, 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 and structural-typologically non-identical languages.

1. The Research

The aim of the study is to carry out morphophonological research on written data in order to see how the derivational blends,[1] e.g., English loanwords with Hungarian inflectional suffixes e. g.,: (a) Hungarian accusative case suffixes; (b) Hungarian instrumental case suffixes; (c) Hungarian plural markers, are integrated into the Hungarian text. In other words, the research is undertaken in order to find out if (a) the instrumental case suffix alternant; (b) the linking vowel (if it is required) before the accusative case suffix; and (c) the linking vowel (if it is required) before the plural marker are selected on the basis of the Hungarian letter-to-sound pronunciation rules or the English orthographical pronunciation rules to meet the requirements of the Hungarian vowel harmony rules (Kenesei *et al* 1998: 425).[2]

In conducting the linguistic analysis of the corpus, a general purpose software application – a concordance program, has been used.

2. The Corpus of the Research

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 written texts. Engwall (1994 – cited from Kurtböke 1998) suggests, among other things, that newspaper texts provide an adequate basis, as do literary or specialised texts, for a linguistic study of general language use, focusing on vocabulary or grammar. 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. 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 the advertisements found in the 98 issues of the chosen newspaper is 96.351, (100%), only 4 percent of which is written in English, (3781 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 very same advertisement (token)
(6) – the number of occurrences of the linguistic manifestation in other advertisements (token)

3. Integration of Loanwords
Lexical borrowing must be seen as one aspect of a creative process of lexical change under contact, which builds on both native and foreign resources. The results of the linguistic interference of language contact on the level of lexis of the receptor-language are manifested in the form of lexical borrowing of different kinds but mainly borrowings modelled on the donor language and native creations. The process of borrowing can be very selective, adopting a foreign form but assigning it a new meaning, or adopting a foreign meaning or concept and assigning it to a native form. Many of the outcomes of lexical borrowing involve innovations or creations that have no counterpart in the donor language. Some of these innovations may be created out of donor materials; others may be created out of native materials, still others creations are blends of native and foreign items (Winford 2003).
In the relevant literature, a lot of definitions exist for the different types of direct and indirect loans. Linguists are not only incapable of arriving at an agreement about the dividing criteria of each term but also the terminologies differ from each other to a great extent.
The classification that Wade (1980) provides is quite clear and well-established. According to his classification direct loans can be sub-divided into "aliens" and "assimilated loans". An alien is a borrowed foreign word in its original form, whereas assimilated loans are already firmly established in the vocabulary of the particular language. Loan translations are 'item-by-item renderings of a word or phrase in the source language' (Wade 1980: 43), 'loan transfers (…) give freer renderings of the form in the source language' (ibid. 43). Loan creations comprise formally independent items. In case of 'loan meanings a secondary connotation of an item in the source language is acquired by its counterpart in the borrowing language' (ibid. 43). The components of hybrid loans derive from two different languages.
There are some various aspects from which researchers have attempted to study indirect discrete lexical borrowing: (a) language contact and linguistic interference (b) word-formation and ways of enriching the lexis (lexico-semantics) of the receptor-language (c) translation techniques and problems of adequacy (d) the logico-psychological process of lexical nomination Rot (1991).
Winford (2003) analyses the different attempts which were made to establish a coherent framework for dealing with contact-induced changes in the lexicon. He states that "the most comprehensive of the early frameworks may have been that of Betz (1949), whose basic distinction between loanword and loan-coinage still forms the basis for current descriptions" (Winford 2003: 42), and his very detailed and refined terminology describes word-borrowing in many aspects. According to him "Haugen (1950a, 1950b, 1953) added a new dimension to existing classifications because he made distinction between importation and substitution – a dichotomy based on the presence or absence of foreignness markers (1950b). Importation refers to the adoption of a foreign form and/or its meaning, and may involve complete or partial imitation. Substitution refers to the process by which native sounds or morphemes are substituted for those in the donor model. Cases where a meaning or concept is borrowed, but

expressed by a native form, are instances of morphemic substitution. Following Haugen (1953), lexical contact phenomena can be classified into two broad categories – *lexical borrowing*s, which involve imitation of some aspect of the donor model, and *creation*s, which are entirely native and have no counterpart in the donor language" (Winford 2003: 43). Winford (2003) subdivides lexical borrowings into two categories, e.g., "there are *loanword*s, in which all or part of the morphemic composition of the loan derives from the external source language" (Winford 2003: 43). In other words, the most general term "loanword" refers to the total morphemic importation of single or compound words. These elements show no morphological substitutions, but they do show degrees of phonological substitutions. "Loanwords may be divided into two categories: 'pure loanwords'", (Winford 2003: 43) e.g., *MONEY ORDER (2000/1/2/97) (2)* and "'loanblends'" (Winford 2003: 43). Some cases that appear to belong in this category involve phonological adjustment of a native word on the model of a foreign one, without change in the content. It is difficult to say, however, whether these are really cases of phonological adjustment of the native word as distinct from importation (imitation) of the foreign counterpart, (e.g., *Regisztrált agent* (registered agent) *(2000/33/20/2) (2)*).

Loanblends are combinations of L1 material with L2 material, e.g., they involve the transfer of part of the foreign model and the reproduction of the rest (importation of a foreign morpheme combined with substitution of a native one). Examples of such "hybrids" include (a) derivational blends i.e., imported stem + native affix, e.g., *Church-ben* (church-INE) *(2001/5/12/2*) *(72*) or native stem + imported affix (no example found in the corpus) and (b) compound blends i.e., imported stem + native stem e.g., *csirkeragout* (chickenragout) *(2001/4/3/10)*. Loanblends – and many other products are not strictly speech borrowings, but innovations that have no counterparts in the source language.

And, "there are *loanshift*s", (also called *loan meaning*s) "in which the morphemic composition of the item is entirely native, though its meaning derives at least in part from the donor language. Each of these categories can be further subdivided, according to the types of importation and substitution involved" (Winford 2003: 43). Loanshifts do not actually include surface-level alien morphemes but instead influence L1 material. They can be divided into the following subtypes. Sometimes a native word may undergo extension of its meaning on the model of a foreign counterpart. These are cases of "extensions" or "semantic loans". For example, Hungarian *direkt* originally *directly, straight; on purpose, wilfully, intentionally, deliberately* was extended to mean *direct/through bus, non-stop bus*, on the model of English *direct (2000/1/13/98)*. Winfords states that "loanshifts may take the form of "pure loan translations" or calques in which the foreign model is replicated exactly by native words" (Winford 2003: 43), for example *dupla szobák* (double bedrooms) *(2001/6/3/1)*.

In Winford's words, "creative word formation involving imported items is another by-product of lexical borrowing, which Haugen includes in his category of 'native creations'" (Winford 2003: 44). "Pure native creations" means innovative use of native words to express foreign concepts, e.g., *hétvégi magyar iskolákban* (weekend Hungarian schools-PL-INE) *(2001/20/7/2)*.[3] "Hybrid creations" are blends of native and foreign morphemes to express foreign concepts e.g., *special áraink* (special price-POSS-PL-1PL) *(2001/4/3/17) (3)*. Winford (2003: 42-43) with his classification above expanded Haugen's category of "native creations" to include a third subcategory ("creations using only foreign morphemes") which was not included in Haugen's classification.

4. The Hungarian and the English Vowel Systems

4.1 *The Vowel Harmony Rules of Hungarian Phonology*

"A central aspect of Hungarian phonology is the process of vowel harmony, which places restrictions on the vowels of successive syllables" (Kenesei *et al* 1998: 419). "The term

"vowel harmony" refers to a widespread, word level prohibition on the co-occurrence of back vowels and front vowels, affecting root vowels, affix vowels, and epenthetic vowels. Within the domain of a simplex word, the generalities of backness harmony dictate that back vowels and rounded front vowels do not mix. Unrounded front vowels are neutral in the sense that they may freely co-occur with either back vowels or rounded front vowels. Accordingly, the vowel system of Hungarian may be classified in the following three vowel harmony sets:
1. back harmonic vowels *u* /u/ *ú* /u:/ *o* /o/ *ó* /o:/ *a* /ɔ/ *á* /a:/" (Kenesei *et al* 1998: 420)
/u/ short high back rounded; /u:/ long high back rounded; /o/ short mid back rounded; /o:/ long mid back rounded; /ɔ/ short low back (slightly) rounded; /a:/ long low central unrounded.
2. "front harmonic vowels *ü* /y/ *ű* /y:/ *ö* /ø/ *ő* /ø:/" (Kenesei *et al* 1998: 420)
/y/ short high front rounded; /y:/ long high front rounded; /ø/ short mid front rounded; /ø:/ long mid-front rounded.
3. "neutral vowels *i* /i/ *í* /i:/ *e* /ɛ/ *é* /e:/" (Kenesei *et al* 1998: 420)
/i/ short high front unrounded; /i:/ long high front unrounded; /ɛ/ short low front unrounded; /e:/ long mid-front unrounded.
"The co-occurrence restrictions of vowel harmony are evident in lexical (root) morphemes and are reinforced for suffixes in the form of active vowel alternations: suffixes containing harmonic vowels have both front vowel and back vowel variants. The choice is governed by the harmonic constitution of the root. The basic phonotactic restrictions of vowel harmony are systematically violated by complex words, i.e., compounds and words containing preverbal elements: the constituents of these constructions define their own individual harmonic domains. Therefore the fact that back vowels and front-rounded vowels co-occur in cases like *könyvtár* 'library' (*könyv* 'book' + *tár* 'storage'), *átüt* 'hit over' (*át* 'over' + *üt* 'hit') is perfectly expected. So is the fact that suffixes harmonize to the last morphological component: cf. *könyvtár-ban* 'library-INE', *átüt-ök* 'hit over-INDEF.1SG'" (Kenesei *et al* 1998: 420).

4.2 *The Vowel System of Standard English*
1. front: i:, I, e, æ
2. central: ə, ə:, ʌ
3. back: u:, u, ɔ, ɔ:, ɑ:,
English diphthongs: ei, ai, ɔi, əu, au, iə, eə, uə.

4.3 *Hungarian and English in Contact*
Hungarian is a language in which orthography is dominantly based on pronunciation, so the spelling rules of morphemes are determined by the pronunciation used by speakers of standard/everyday Hungarian. Whereas in the case of English, there is a certain lack of correspondence between graphemes and phonemes, in other words morphemes sometimes have several phonetic forms, depending on the context in which they occur. The contrastive study of derivational blends of this language-contact (when Hungarian and English come into direct contact) has to consider this difference between the two languages. The derivational blends studied here are blends that have an imported stem (English) and a native (Hungarian) affix in Hungarian context. Logically, they are basically approached and studied according to the rules of the Hungarian language. They are examined on the basis of the Hungarian letter-to-sound pronunciation rules and the English pronunciation rules.

5. The Case System of Hungarian
The Hungarian language is a heavily agglutinative language and it has an extensive case system. Cases are used to mark the grammatical function of words in sentences. Cases are attached to the ends of words. Although one or more suffixes may precede them, cases are

always the final suffix of a word. The derivational blends studied here are blends that have an imported stem (English) and a native (Hungarian) suffix in the Hungarian context.

5.1 *The Accusative Case*

Noun stems may undergo some morphophonemic alternations when the accusative case suffix *-t* is attached to them. Regular nouns ending in the consonants *j, l, ly, n, ny,* ***r****,* ***s****, sz, z, zs* require no linking vowel when suffixing the accusative case.[4]

The Hungarian accusative case suffix is attached to the following English lexical item of the corpus in accordance with the Hungarian grammatical rules.

(1) *Money Orders*[5] *(2001/6/3/1*) *(8)* money order-ACC

Regular nouns ending in any other consonant require the linking vowel (LV) *o* (short mid back rounded vowel); *e* (short low front unrounded vowel); *ö* (short mid front rounded vowel) before they take the accusative case suffix. The choice of the linking vowel is determined by the vowel harmony rules of the Hungarian language. The three-way alternation of *o/ö/e* shows the effects of both backness harmony (*o* vs. *ö/e*) and roundness harmony (*ö* vs. *e*). The choice between *o* and *ö/e* is determined under backness harmony; the difference between *ö* and *e* is due to roundness harmony. The latter, in effect, prohibits the vowel *ö* from immediately following an unrounded front vowel (Kenesei *et al* 1998).

a) *Back vowel roots*

"Back vowel roots contain back vowels exclusively and select back harmonic suffixes: e.g., *szamár-nak* 'donkey-DAT'" (Kenesei *et al* 1998: 420).

(2) *granny flat-et (2001/39/20/1)* flat-LV *e*-ACC

According to the Hungarian letter-to-sound pronunciation rule there is the back vowel *a* in the word *flat*; so if this fact was considered, it would take the back vowel *o*. When pronounced in English, it includes the front vowel *æ*, which is why it takes the front vowel *e* as a linking vowel.

b) *Front vowel roots*

"Front vowel roots contain either front harmonic vowels only, or front harmonic vowels together with neutral vowels, in any order. Such roots govern front harmony in suffixes: e.g., *tükör-nek* 'mirror-DAT', *fenyő-nek*' fir tree-DAT'" (Kenesei *et al* 1998: 420). (Hungarian vowels belonging to this group do not exist in the English vowel system, so there are no examples found in the corpus relevant to this group.)

c) *Mixed vowel roots*

"Mixed vowel roots contain back vowels and neutral vowels, in any order. If the last syllable contains a back vowel, then the root determines back harmony for suffixes: e.g., *csinos-nak* 'pretty-DAT'" (Kenesei *et al* 1998: 420).

(3) *Personal Care Attendant-ot (2001/6/20/3*) attendant-LV o-ACC

(4) *Personal Care Attendant (PCA) (2000/21/20/2)* attendant-no ACC

The word *attendant* has a mixed vowel root with a back vowel in the final syllable, consequently the back vowel *o* is chosen as a linking vowel. If it is pronounced in English, it

has a mixed vowel root, too, the final syllable of which is the central *ə* sound, which also requires a back linking vowel. But in this case the Hungarian letter-to-sound pronunciation rule is more likely to be the trigger. Strangely enough, the very same word can be found in the corpus in the accusative case but without the accusative case suffix.[6]

If the last syllable contains a neutral vowel, then three different harmonizing patterns can be identified: back harmonic, front harmonic, and vacillating. Back harmonic mixed vowel roots take back vowel suffixes: e.g., *forint-nak* 'forint-DAT (Hungarian currency).

(5) *Director of Nursing-et (2001/19/20/1)* nursing-LV *e*-ACC

Example (5) has a mixed vowel root with regard to both the Hungarian letter-to-sound pronunciation and English pronunciation with a front (neutral) vowel in the final syllable, so either rule may be the trigger of the choice.

(6) *NANNY-t (2001/11/20/2*) nanny-ACC

Noun stems ending in vowels other than *a* or *e* take the case suffix without a linking vowel. The letter *y* is always pronounced *i* according to the Hungarian letter-to-sound rules. In English it can be pronounced in different ways but in the example above its pronunciation is the same as in Hungarian, that is why it takes the suffix that way.

(7) *Postal Note-ot (2001/6/3/1*) note-LV *o*-ACC

The back linking vowel is attached to the word *note* because if it is pronounced in English it contains a back English diphthong. If the Hungarian vowel system was considered it would take no linking vowels but the final *e* would lengthen to *é* before the accusative case suffix because in nouns ending in *a* or *e* the final vowel is *á* or *é* respectively when the accusative case suffix is attached.

"Front harmonic mixed vowel roots take front vowel suffixes. They either contain an *e* in the final syllable, or else they contain any neutral vowel in the penultimate syllable and *e* or *é* in the final syllable: e.g., *operett-nek* 'operetta-DAT'" (Kenesei *et al* 1998: 421).

(8) *Business Activity Statement-et (2001/1/21/1) (1)* statement-LV *e*-ACC

The word *statement* takes the front linking vowel because the Hungarian vowel system has a neutral vowel in the final syllable. If the English pronunciation were the trigger, the back linking vowel would be attached to the root because the final syllable contains the central *ə* sound, which is regarded as back.

"Vacillating mixed vowel roots allow both back harmonic and front harmonic suffixes, which are in free variation. Most roots with a back vowel in the penultimate syllable and *e* in the final syllable exhibit this behaviour: e.g., *Ágnes-nek/Ágnes-nak* 'Agnes-DAT'" (Kenesei *et al* 1998: 421). (No examples were found in the corpus belonging to this group.)

d) *Neutral vowel roots*

"Neutral vowel roots contain only neutral vowels. In the great majority of cases, suffixes are front harmonic, as expected (neutral vowels are front): e.g., *kicsi-nek* 'small-DAT'. Exceptionally, some neutral vowel roots are back harmonic: e.g., *híd-nak* 'bridge-DAT'" (Kenesei *et al* 1998: 421). They are known as antiharmonic words.

(9) *CAFÉ DELI-jét (2000/41/10/16)* deli-POSS-3SG-ACC

The word *deli* contains neutral Hungarian vowels or if pronounced in English, there are front vowels in it; therefore it takes the front vowel *e*.

Cases may be attached to nouns already marked for possession. All the words ending in *e* lengthen the vowel to *é* (long mid front unrounded vowel). This phenomenon is called Low Vowel Lengthening.

(10) *Website-unkat (2001/40/9/1)* website-POSS-1PL-ACC

The word *website* has a neutral vowel root, so if the linking vowel was selected on the basis of the Hungarian letter-to-sound pronunciation rules, the final *e* of the root would lengthen to *é* on the basis of the Low Vowel Lengthening rule before the accusative case suffix *-t.* If it is pronounced in English it has a mixed vowel root with a back diphthong in the final syllable. As such it takes the back linking vowel. Here the case is attached to a noun already marked for possession.

e) *Disharmonic roots*

"In exceptional cases, mostly in unassimilated loanwords, back vowels and front rounded vowels are found tautomorphenically. Although these words do not follow the general patterns of root harmony, they are always regular with respect to suffix harmony in that it is the last harmonic vowel that determines the harmony of suffixes" (Kenesei *et al* 1998: 422). No examples are considered in this group.

5.2 *The Instrumental Case*

"The instrumental semantic function in Hungarian is most commonly expressed by the instrumental case" (Kenesei *et al* 1998: 210). "The instrumental case suffix *-val/-vel* (general English equivalent: with) begins with the consonant /v/ if a vowel precedes" (Kenesei *et al* 1998: 437): e.g., *ajtó-val* 'door-INS'. Derivational blend (11) is taken from the corpus:

(11) GST-vel *(2000/1/2/98) (2)* GST-INS

"The initial consonant of these suffixes, however, fully assimilates to a preceding consonant" (Kenesei *et al* 1998: 437), as the following example demonstrates it: *család* 'family' *család-dal*. This morphophonological phenomenon is called assimilation.

a) *Back vowel roots*

(12) VAN-nel *(2000/29/20/1)* van-INS

Although example (12) has a back vowel root containing a back Hungarian vowel exclusively, yet it does not select a back harmonic suffix. Instead, it takes the front vowel suffix because of the English pronunciation since the æ sound articulated in it is a front vowel.

(13) credit carddal *(2000/27/20/3*) credit card-INS

In example (13) the back vowel suffix *-val* is used. The choice meets the requirements of the Hungarian vowel harmony rules from both the Hungarian and the English perspectives: on the one hand it contains only back Hungarian vowels (pronounced according to the

Hungarian letter-to-sound rules), and on the other hand when pronouncing it there is contained within a central English vowel and a back diphthong in it.

b) *Mixed vowel roots*

(14) Money Orderrel *(2000/10/16/1*) money order-INS

The word *order* contains a back and a neutral Hungarian vowel so it has a mixed vowel root. Since the neutral vowel is in the last syllable three different harmonising patterns can be identified: back harmonic, front harmonic, and vacillating. According to the Hungarian letter-to-sound pronunciation rules, the example above could follow any of the patterns. In other words, it could either take the front or the back vowel suffix. The reason why it takes the front vowel suffix is that it has the Hungarian *e* (short low front unrounded) vowel sound in the last syllable in it. If the suffix was chosen on the basis of the English pronunciation it would take the back vowel suffix because the last syllable is the central *ə* sound, which is considered to be a back vowel, and as such it takes the back vowel suffix.

c) *Neutral vowel roots*

(15) sheddel *(2001/21/24/2)* shed-INS

As indicated above, the instrumental case suffix has both front vowel and back vowel variants, and the choice is determined by the vowel harmony rule. Example (15) takes the front vowel suffix because it contains only a neutral vowel (neutral vowels are front) both according to the Hungarian letter-to-sound pronunciation rules and the English pronunciation.

5.3 *Plural of Nouns*

The plural marker in the Hungarian language is *–k.* Depending on the stem of the noun, the plural *–k* may or may not need a linking vowel preceding it. If a noun ends in a vowel, no linking vowel is needed before the plural suffix; if the final vowel is *e* or *a*, they must be lengthened to *é* or *á* respectively before the plural *–k.*

a) *Mixed vowel root*

(16) *website-ok (2001/1/24/1)* website-LV *o*-PL

If a linking vowel is needed before the plural marker, its selection is determined by the Hungarian vowel harmony rule, as it is with the accusative case. The Hungarian letter-to-sound pronunciation is definitely ignored in example (16). If it was not, the final *e* would lengthen to *é* and there would be no linking vowel. Obviously, the Hungarian plural suffix was taken on the basis of the English pronunciation rule. When pronounced in English, the word has a mixed vowel root with a back diphthong in the final syllable, therefore the back linking vowel is chosen.

(17) *Beachek-re (2001/5/2/1)* beach-LV *e*-PL-SUB

As for the Hungarian vowel system, the word *beach* belongs to the mixed vowel root group, having a neutral and a back vowel in it, with the back vowel in the final ‘syllable’, so the root determines back harmony for suffixes. Regarding the English vowel system, it

contains a front English vowel, so the choice of the front linking vowel is based on the English pronunciation. The plural declension of a noun in Hungarian is formed by simply adding the case suffix to the plural form of the noun. The choice of the case suffix is also determined by the Hungarian vowel harmony rule. The example below has a sublative case suffix attached to it. The selection of the front vowel suffix is governed by the front linking vowel before the plural suffix.

b) *Neutral vowel root*

(18) *Medicare After Hours Centre-k (2001/43/11/1)* center-PL

Although the Hungarian plural suffix *–k* is attached to the word *centre*, which belongs to the neutral vowel root group, the rule mentioned above is not applied. If it is pronounced in English, however, it has a mixed vowel root, the final syllable of which is the central *ə* sound, which requires a back vowel.

6. Summary

Altogether 27 different derivational blends were examined in this study, out of which 3 take the inflectional suffix without a linking vowel, so 24 examples are considered to be 100%, 11 of which (46%) take the suffix according to both the Hungarian letter-to-sound pronunciation rules and the English pronunciation rules. This is due to the two languages "sharing" some of the vowels, so either one can be the trigger. In 8 cases (33%) the choice of the suffix is governed by the English pronunciation, and only 5 (21%) derivational blends take the suffix on the basis of the Hungarian letter-to-sound pronunciation rules.

In conclusion the following can be stated: the selection of the suffix alternant is basically determined by the English pronunciation rules rather than the Hungarian letter-to-sound pronunciation rules. The majority of the words, however, in the case of which the Hungarian letter-to-sound pronunciation rules govern the selection of the suffix alternant have either of the sounds *ə, ə:* in them in the final syllable. This phenomenon deserves further investigation.

Eva Forintos
University of Veszprém
Department of English and American Studies
10 Egyetem Street
Veszprém
8200
Hungary

forintos@almos.vein.hu

Notes

[1] The reason why only these derivational blends are discussed here is that the corpus provides instances of these grammatical phenomena.

[2] Throughout this study Hungarian language is described on the basis of the following book: Kenesei, I., Vago, R. M. and Fenyvesi, A. 1998. *Hungarian.* London and New York: Routledge

[3] It refers to Sunday schools.

[4] Letters *r* and *s* are italicized because they are the only examples available in the corpus.

[5] Further examples can be found in the appendix.

[6] Myers-Scotton (2002: 226) makes mention of Bolonyai's dissertation of 1999, in which she hypothesizes that there are more instances of accusative loss when word order matches English SVO order than when it is SOV or OSV. She also suggests that the accusative will be omitted in one-word responses. She finds that of the contexts where the accusative suffix is omitted, these two hypotheses explain most omissions. Since this is the only example of that kind, it is impossible to compare the findings of the two studies.

Appendix

(1) ***Model Rules-t*** *(2000/9/2/1)* model rules-ACC

(2) ***BABYSITTER-t*** *(2001/11/20/2*) babysitter-ACC

(3) ***Financial Institution Duty-t*** *(2001/43/9/1)* duty-ACC

(4) ***Hungarian Historical Society-t*** *(2000/7/15/1)* society-ACC

(5) ***Australian Legal Will Kit-et*** *(2001/21/22/1)* kit-LV *e*-ACC

(6) ***Sydney's Sound Big Band-del*** *(2000/32/5/1)* Sydney's Sound Big Band-INS

(7) ***Senior Citizen Card-al*** *(2000/7/14/3*) senior citizen card-INS

(8) ***Rd.-dal*** *(2001/6/11/1) (1)* Rd.-INS

(9) ***Hostel Managerrel*** *(2001/42/14/2) (1)* hostel manager-INS

(10) ***Victorian Multicultural Commission-nal*** *(2001/40/9/1)* Victorian Multicultural Commission-INS

(11) ***Bulk Billing-gel*** *(2000/9/24/4)* bulk billing-INS

References

Haugen, Einar. 1950a. “Problems of bilingualism.” *Lingua* 2, 271-290.

Haugen, Einar. 1950b. “The analysis of linguistic borrowing.” *Language* 26, 210-23.

Haugen, Einar. 1953. *The Norwegian Language in America: A Study in Bilingual Behavior. Vol. I: The Bilingual Community; Vol II: The American Dialects of Norwegian.* Bloomington: Indiana University Press. (Reprinted 1969.)

Kenesei, István., Vago, Robert M. and Fenyvesi, Anna. 1998. *Hungarian.* London/New York: Routledge.

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

Myers-Scotton, Carol. 2002. *Contact Linguistics: Bilingual Encounters and Grammatical Outcomes.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

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

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

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

Wade, Terence L. B. 1980. “Indirect Loans in German and Russian.” *The Incorporated Linguist* 19, 43-48.

Winford, Donald. 2003. *An Introduction to Contact Linguistics.* Malden/Oxford/Melbourne/Berlin: Blackwell Publishing.