

REGIO

A review of studies on minorities, communities and society 1998

- Theses on Minority Issues by Ferenc Glatz,
President of the Hungarian Academy of Sciences 5

ARTICLES

- IVÁN GYURCSÍK
Basic Treaties, Minority Issues and the Enlargement of the
European Union (Case-Studies: Hungary, Romania, Slovakia) 9
- GIZELLA FÖGLEIN
National Minorities: Rights and Legal Regulations in Hungary
between 1945–1993 69
- ÁRPÁD MÉSZÁROS-JÁNOS FÓTI
Nationalities and Ethnic Minorities in 20th Century Hungary 95
- KLÁRA SÁNDOR
Secular Linguistics and Education: Questions of Minority
Bilingualism 141
- ANNA BORBÉLY
The Language Use of Romanians Living in Hungary in Light
of Recent Changes 175
- ZOLTÁN TÓTH
What is Melting in the Melting Pot? 187

EDITORS
László Csejdy
Zoltán Fejős

Published by the Teleki László Foundation
with the support of the Commission of the European Union

EDITORIAL OFFICE
Teleki László Foundation
Institute for Central European Studies
H-1125 Budapest
Szilágyi Erzsébet fasor 22/c
Hungary

Tel.: (36)1 275 2505
Fax: (36)1 275 2495
E-mail: regio@tla.hu

Printed by Osiris Publisher

ISSN 0865 557 X

REVIEWS

- SÁNDOR VOGEL
A New Attempt to Define National Minorities (Nicola Girasoli,
National minorities. Who Are They?) 219
- ENDRE BOJTÁR
This Land is a Map (*In-Between Europe 1763-1993* [Map
collection] Compiled by Lajos Pándi) 222
- DÉNES SOKCSEVITS
Disappearing (*Fejezetek a horvátországi magyarok történetéből –
Tanulmányok* [Chapters from the History of the Hungarians
of Croatia – Essays], ed. Lajos Arday) 228

The editors of REGIO are grateful to the Commission of the European Union for making the publication of a new English-language version of the review possible after a three year period of silence. This issue consists of studies which were previously published in 1995–1998 as well as some written for this specific issue. Thus, in the meantime the editors of REGIO have attempted to broaden the publication's perspective through the inclusion of comparative studies in the relevant fields with the addition of a major topic of interest: integration of this region into Europe. This new perspective is also reflected in the publication's new subtitle: *Minorities, Communities, Society*. It is our hope that all studies included will significantly contribute to our understanding of these particular fields of research.

Native language								
Less than 6 years of primary school	1.9	1.5	6.7	1.2	1.7	2.5	1.0	34.2
Years 6 and 7 of primary school	3.3	4.9	4.7	4.3	3.3	7.1	4.8	15.7
8 years of primary school	33.4	38.9	38.4	39.9	30.6	46.2	34.8	42.2
Completed middle level vocational school	24.4	20.5	20.5	24.9	17.2	26.6	24.7	6.5
High school	24.8	21.2	18.1	18.6	27.1	11.5	21.1	1.1
Higher education	12.2	13.0	11.6	11.1	20.1	6.1	13.6	0.3
Total percentage of active wage earners	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
Total number of active wage earners	4 527 157	4 721	3 614	7 342	1 202	1 212	12 472	13 293

KLÁRA SÁNDOR

Secular Linguistics and Education: questions of Minority Bilingualism*

Although sociolinguistic studies in relation to Hungarian minority language use¹ have barely begun they have already occasioned serious debates.² Participants of the debates agree that the Hungarian language spoken in a minority situation differs from that of Hungary – the debate centers around whether it is necessary and possible to intervene in such a situation, of the differences should be accepted because they are the result of natural phenomena and rather ways of solution should be elaborated, so that the language varieties spoken in Hungary and outside of Hungary should not diverge from each other to such an extent that the differences would decrease mutual intelligibility. Everyone also agrees that we should achieve that the language of Hungarians outside the borders of Hungary should continue to remain Hungarian – however, opinions vary enormously as to how this could be best achieved.

The Hungarian teachers of areas inhabited by Hungarians outside of Hungary are rather closely affected by the central questions of this debate – is it necessary or possible to curb the diversity of minority Hungarian language, or whether it is possible to forestall language shift in those Hungarian language areas, where Hungarian is spoken as a minority language. This is so because much of the work falls upon them, they are

* This paper originally was prepared for *NYIT-Lapok* of Csíkszereda (the journal of the Language and Literature Teaching Association of Csíkszereda-Miercurea Ciuc, Romania) I am grateful to Miklós Kontra and István Lanstyák for their comments.

the ones who can significantly influence the use, and ultimately, the maintenance, of the native language.

It seems that the traditional principles, methods, procedures of language cultivation are in crisis³ – to put it more strongly, they have failed. In the following, I would like to outline an alternative proposal which is based on the findings of sociolinguistic studies.

Studies of Secular Linguistics

The basic principle of the secular linguistic studies most often referred to in Hungary as “spoken language studies” is that we can only make valid statements about language as such, and about a particular language, if we base our statements on real language use and not on the intuition of linguists. In order to be able to do this we need *real linguistic data* gathered from normal users of the language (not from linguists), collected from speech situations in which the language is used in the *most natural* way. In order to obtain such data questionnaire surveys and recorded interviews are made in the course of the study of a given linguistic phenomenon, and informants are chosen in such a way as to render the data statistically analyzable. It is important that the data evaluated in these studies be *recorded*, and thus be *verifiable*, and the circumstances of the study should be so described that the study should be replicable at any time. To research the use of language varieties in natural speech situations various methodologies are applied (questionnaires and interview questions are formulated accordingly), in order to overcome those influences which spring from the so called *observer’s paradox*. The American linguist William Labov, who formulated the basic principles and methodologies of spoken language studies put it this way: “we should observe how people speak when they are not observed.”

One goal of secular linguistic studies is the description of the linguistic characteristics *and* language use of a speech community, that is to say to discover what language varieties are used in a given community, what norms direct their usage and what are the linguistic characteristics of a particular language variety. The findings of such studies can be used among

others in the course of language planning, thus in writing grammars, dictionaries or textbooks.

According to the findings of secular linguistic studies, it is immaterial whether linguists judge a given linguistic form to be correct or incorrect, as language use is not determined by linguists but by the norms in force in the language community. These norms vary, in different situations different norms will prevail (for example the same person will choose a different language variety or style if (s)he is speaking with a neighbor, or if (s)he is taking care of official business, and yet another if (s)he is chatting only with his/her family, or if strangers are also present, etc.) and only a fraction of these norms will coincide with what a linguist – arbitrarily, based on his/her personal taste – will deem to be correct.

Differences Between Traditional Language Cultivation and Language Planning Based on Secular Linguistic Studies⁴

Another notion follows from the above mentioned one (that is that real language use has to be studied). Secular linguistics accepts the possibility that both grammatical and agrammatical sentences can be created in a language, that is to say that it acknowledges that a sentence may be good or bad, but it does not accept that a sentence may be correct or incorrect. Thus it acknowledges that there are agrammatical sentences from the point of view of linguistic construction, thus for example the sentence “*Én látok a fiút játszva labda*” (I seeing boy a ball play) is an agrammatical sentence – but adds that native speakers will only create such sentences as a result of aphasia or, possibly as little children, during language acquisition. It denies, however, that a native speaker would create an “incorrect” sentence, or would use an “incorrect” structure. A sentence such as *Menj egy kicsit odébb, mert nem lássuk téled a tévét* is no worse grammatically than *Menj egy kicsit odébb, mert nem látjuk téled a tévét* (Move over a bit we can't see the TV). The difference between the two lies not in that one fulfills the same function better than the other, but in their *social acceptance*: the use of the -suk -sük suffix is a rather strongly stigmatized linguistic form, its users may be

considered uneducated. However, in areas where this is the commonly used form, the natives may consider someone to be pretentious and showing off if upon returning home (s)he uses the "correct" form. Linguists doing secular linguistic work think that all language varieties are equally able to express the intentions and thoughts of their speakers; all of them have their own inner norms, and that speakers in general find it more important to behave by these *covert norms* (otherwise they would be censured by their own group), than the *overt norms* of the larger society (these are the ones also taught at school).

Thus the idea that *variation* is an intrinsic characteristic of language is one of the theoretical principles of secular linguistics. It means that language exists in varieties corresponding to geographical areas and social stratification in such a way, that these varieties are not separated sharply from each other. Rather, they are "*mixed*" in nature, that is to say they do not constitute discrete units, but a continuum. Change is also considered to be a similarly intrinsic characteristic of language: it is also taken for granted that the use of certain linguistic forms decreases, then ceases altogether, and their tasks are fulfilled by other linguistic forms. Traditional language cultivation also recognizes the existence of these characteristics, but for the most part it only considers them to be a necessary evil, and in practice it treats them as features to be mostly eradicated. In general, language cultivation is still interpreted to have as its goal that everyone should speak a sophisticated, idealized version of Hungarian (this is often misleadingly referred to as *literary language*), that is to say the same variety, which is so perfect that any change would only diminish it. However, variation and change are not only intrinsic characteristics of language, but they are also functional. Let us imagine the consequences of having to speak with everyone in the same language variety and style: we would be speaking with the same "care" to our friends on a trip, at a soccer match, to our grandparents eating lamb stew on the harvest party, at a wedding party, or to our partner discussing family problems, as the linguist or announcer on the language cultivation programs of radio or television. With our friends and colleagues of similar interests and professions to ours we would only use technical terms which are known to everyone, which would thus not be "*technical*" at all; our sentences would always be "com-

plete" sentences, our speech would be unambiguous, and our articulation clear. (Let us try to put this into practice for a while and note how our interlocutors react – but let us not forget to tell them afterwards that this had been an experiment only, lest they take it seriously.) If language only existed in one variety we would be unable to express our belonging to a given group by our choice of variants, or the contrary, our separateness from that group. The role of choice as an indicator of identity does not only manifest itself in the expression of national or ethnic identity, when we choose between languages, but also in relation to a speech community of any size, when we choose among the varieties of the same language. In addition to linguistic competence, the native speaker also possesses *communicative competence*: the former enables him/her not to create agrammatical sentences, the latter ensures that in every speech situation (s)he will choose the appropriate language variety and style. As borrowing between language varieties, and the geographical-social spread of certain linguistic forms is also a natural (and thus inevitable) process, after having become widely used linguistic forms become unsuited to denoting group identity, therefore speakers of a given language variety will allocate this role to other linguistic forms, thus change is functional. (Naturally, change, just as much as variability, may have several other functions in addition to fulfilling this one).

Thus, in light of the findings of secular linguistics, the activities of traditional language cultivation become nonsensical: Partly because they are based on the principle that there is "exacting" and "indolent" language use (the latter term meaning both an insufficiently nuanced and monotonous style and the occurrence of "incorrect" forms), and although carelessness may be "tolerated" in certain cases, the cultivated speaker nonetheless will try to avoid it. On the other hand language cultivators value linguistic changes according to whether they "enrich" or "destroy" the language – the criteria of the categorization naturally are always dependent on the extent to which the new form fits the taste (habits) of the person making the judgment. However, secular linguistic studies have proved that the traditional view according to which there is, or it is possible to create, a language variety which is better, more expressive and more valuable than the others is no longer tenable. The evaluation of a given language variety

does not depend on its actual linguistic characteristics, since from a linguistic point of view all languages and language varieties are equally viable, but on the social distribution of political, cultural and economic power.⁵

Therefore it would be useful if traditional language cultivation would be replaced by language planning, which when making decisions would take into consideration the real language use of real language users. These decisions may concern the status of a given language variety, for example which language variety should be the one used in education, in the written and electronic media, and in the teaching of the language to foreigners, etc. (this is what is referred to as the *standard variety* of a given language); and may also concern the kind of elements, or characteristics a language variety should have, that is to say, they may concern the *corpus* of a given language variety (for example when writing monolingual or specialized dictionaries, or grammars).

The fundamental differences between traditional language cultivation and language planning may be summarized as follows:

Language cultivation Language planning

Basic principle	language is homogeneous	language is heterogeneous
Approach	based on monolingualism; there is an ideal variety	considers multilingualism to be natural; all varieties are of equal value
Evaluation	language is either improving or deteriorating	non-judgmental: language simply changes
Method	intuitive	descriptive
Attitude	prescriptive	makes recommendations
Goal	to create "cultivated speakers"	to create competent speakers (who are quite happy with their language)
Ideal	the ideal speaker	the workings of language
EFFECT	NONE or NEGATIVE	NONE or POSITIVE

The differences spring in part from the fact that language cultivators believe that linguists are able to change the language, and in part from their belief that linguists *know* when language is "good" or "bad," and they also know how language can be changed. It follows from the first of these views that language cultivation's goal is the development of an ideal language variety, which will be spoken by speakers who use their mother tongue in a "cultivated," "expecting" manner, to whom it *can be prescribed* what linguistic forms they should treat preferentially, and which ones to avoid. It follows from the second of these views that the proponents of language cultivation bring their decisions intuitively, based on their own linguistic sense, without reference to surveys carried out in the language speech, and that they also evaluate linguistic changes, branding them meritorious or reprehensible.

Language planning believes neither that the linguist can direct the language use of speakers, nor that the linguist knows what is good or bad in a given language⁶ – more precisely it does not believe that there *is* such a thing as good or bad in language. In no matter what part of the world have interviews been collected from a great many informants, the results unequivocally show that language use (including changes) is directed by the language users themselves and not by linguists – all the more so, as there are language communities where there are no linguists, just as it is difficult to imagine that there was even one among the conquering Hungarians of the 9th century or even in the population of Hungary under the rule of the Árpád house (of the 10th -13th century). Language use is determined by a complex system of relationships of diverse factors: among these are for example the factor of what part of the language territory the speaker is from, and what kind of social background and social status (s)he has, influencing factors may be the speaker's educational level, age, possibly gender, profession, the number and nature of his/her social relationships, etc. (S)He will choose the norms by which (s)he speaks according to these factors and the given speech situation (who speaks to whom, where, when, on what topic, in whose presence). Furthermore, linguistic changes are not determined by the principle of "least effort" or by logic, or by aesthetic considerations – which in any case are very subjective, – but by the economic, cultural and political prestige relationships of the speech

community: these may reinforce each other, and in this case there is a good chance that a given change will spread to wider strata of the speech community, but they may also contradict each other, in which case there will be greater differentiation according to who, and under what circumstances, uses the new form.⁷ Taking all of this into consideration language planning primarily attempts to unravel the norms and the characteristic features of the language varieties used in the speech community, thus, it *describes*, that is to say it is *descriptive*. It is aware that language use is not directed by language planners, therefore it does not prescribe, but rather makes recommendations. As it considers all language varieties to be of equal value grammatically, but is aware that socially they are not equivalent, it sees its task to aid language users in identifying which language variety is the most beneficial to them.

The ultimate cause of the differences between language cultivation and language planning lies in the difference of approaches already mentioned that language planning accepts that a given language exists in a great many varieties, language cultivation, however, thinks in terms of such categories as "the" Hungarian, "the" German, "the" French language, etc. If we understand language cultivation to be applied linguistics (as it is suggested by language cultivators), then its theoretical background corresponds to structuralist and generative linguistic theories, all of which take language to be homogeneous, contrary to the approach of secular linguistics which stresses the heterogeneous nature of language. It follows from this perspective that both language cultivation and the structural and generative schools consider the language use of speakers living in a bilingual situation to be "unnatural," "abnormal," even though there are more people in the world who live in a bilingual situation than in a monolingual context.

Language cultivation and language planning are similar in that both may be ineffective.⁸ However, they differ from each other in their effects, if they have one, as it may be positive or negative. The effect of language planning may be positive, because it is based on concrete data, and most importantly because it is not prescriptive in nature, and thus it does not consider it to be a sin if speakers do not accept its recommendations. In the traditional language cultivation literature, however, we often find

statements such as “linguistic education is also the education to be human”; and recently the (Hungarian) Association of the Cultivators of the Mother Tongue announced a competition for the creation of a “Mother tongue advertising campaign” (sic) (published in *Édes anyanyelvünk*, February 1995, journal dedicated to language cultivation), in which the Association called upon readers to create “humorous catchy *slogans* and *ditties* which exhort us to the correct, nuanced use of our language, and *ridicule* and *pillory* errors of language use;” “the advertising slogan [sic] can equally *criticize* unnecessary foreign words, or *ridicule* tortuous, bureaucratic clichés, but *praise* correct forms devoid of incorrectness, jabbering, mumbling, errors of stress or *popularize* respectful, polite forms of address” [my emphases]. The task then is that the participants should create “jocularly critical ditties,” the goal is to *pillory* and *ridicule* those who speak not the ideal language variety. As nobody speaks the ideal language variety, this would also mean that not a single Hungarian native speaker can speak Hungarian properly. Those who nonetheless manage, and even manage very well, in their own “corrupted” Hungarian language, do not take language cultivation seriously. The sentimentally-ethically based charges may become very dangerous if the person confronted with these admonitions and judgments feels that indeed his/her Hungarian does not function, and that (s)he can reach his goals much more successfully by means of another language: that is to say in cases of minority bilingualism. In this case, traditional language cultivation which is based on monolingualism despite its best intentions may encourage, rather than prevent, the acceleration of the language shift of those living in a minority situation.

The Natural Consequences of Minority Bilingualism

What are the most common charges against the language use of minority Hungarians – that is to say what are the greatest fears of those who hope to be able to prevent language shift in traditional language cultivation? That the “Hungarian language” (actually, of course, language varieties) of Hungarian minorities living outside the borders of Hungary, is full of foreign elements resulting from influence of the state language,

and that at the same time it is also very provincial. The one time Current Hungarian Language Department (today: Language Cultivation Department) of the Linguistic Institute of the Hungarian Academy of Sciences created a Language Cultivation Handbook, in which minority speakers of Hungarian face a horrifying picture, namely that due to bilingualism even their ability to think may be endangered. The relevant section contains so many superstitions that it is worth quoting verbatim: "Even this sketchy and incomplete overview of the peculiarities of the language use of Hungarians living abroad in bilingual situations demonstrates that in the course of continuous contact the two linguistic systems get easily intertwined, mixed in the consciousness of the individual, his sense of the language often becomes uncertain, the categories of one language adapt to those of the other, characteristics [sic] become less frequent, and there is a danger of the disintegration of the linguistic system. This does not so much endanger comprehension, but rather the formation of abstract ideas, the ability to think logically and creatively. This is so because with the disintegration of the linguistic system it is the thought process itself which becomes disorganized, muddled" (NyKk I: 1291). Thinking through the meaning of these words we discover not only that the authors of the article consider the basic side effect of bilingualism (the interference, mental connection of the two linguistic systems) so dangerous, that it threatens the mental capacities of bilingual speakers, but also that according to them, it is only possible to "think logically," and to form "abstract ideas," if the mother tongue is not "contaminated" by the categories of other languages, which -according to the above- are unsuitable for logical or abstract thinking. The authors of the article inadvertently make certain statements which may even seem to be linguisticist: linguisticism is the linguistic equivalent of racism. Actually, psycholinguistic studies carried out among bilingual children demonstrate that bilingualism – probably exactly because it diminishes the effects of linguistic relativism¹⁰ – actually speeds up the development of abstract thinking.

It is peculiar that some distinguished Hungarian linguists refer to those of their colleagues who call attention to these linguistic rules and regularities as "nation destroyers," "snakes," "unhinged in their minds;" it is unfortunate that this rather heated language only expresses passions

instead of arguments.¹¹ Yet, the attitude reflected in the Language Cultivation Handbook cannot be based on anything but a great degree of ignorance, on leaving completely out of account the linguistic research of the last fifty years: bilingualism is one of the central themes of 20th century linguistics, and writings on it could fill a library. According to this voluminous body of literature, the "sins" of minority Hungarian speakers are none other than the most natural consequences of bilingualism.

Close contact of two languages, increase in the number of people who know (on some level) both languages has numerous natural, and thus inevitable, consequences both for individual members of the speech community, and for the community itself. The psychological basis of these consequences is that the speakers cannot always mentally isolate the languages known to them (whether we are talking about two or more languages), therefore these are in continuous interaction. It may happen that the results of this interaction are manifested only occasionally, this is what we refer to as *interference*, but these occasional interactions may also become permanent, this is what we refer to as *borrowing*. Both of these may appear on any level of the language: it may affect the sound system, lexicon, syntax, meaning, less frequently it also may appear on the level of bound morphemes (suffixes, case-endings, etc.). The languages in contact affect each other not only directly, but indirectly as well: if both fulfill the same linguistic function by similar means and methods, this may help conserve the given linguistic form; the other language may also influence the frequency, social acceptance, etc. of the occurrence of certain linguistic forms. There can be no valid linguistic argument in favor of those superstitions according to which, there are "necessary" and "unnecessary" loan words, or that grammatical borrowings (for example word order, regimen, etc.) would be more "harmful" from the point of view of the borrowing language, because it ruins its "world" more. These evaluations are based on the delusions mentioned above, namely that linguistic changes are not merely changes, but that they either "enrich," or – as we may hear it much more often – "ruin" the language.

If speakers of a language borrow words or structures from another language there always is some kind of a reason for this, in fact there are several complex reasons, thus every borrowing fulfills some need. It is

often said in connection with minority language varieties of Hungarian that they borrow "unnecessarily" from the language with which they are in contact. Examples quoted ad nauseam include that the Hungarians of România "navétáznak" instead of "ingáznak" (they commute), that the Hungarian child of Szabadka (Subotica, Yugoslavia) drinks "szok" instead of "üdítő" (soda), not even "szuk" or "hűsítő," as does the child of Kolozsvár (Cluj, Romania) or Székelyudvarhely (Secuiesc Odorei, Romania), that at Dunaszerdahely (Dunajská Streda, Slovakia) they put on a "tyepláki," whereas at Újvidék (Novi Sad, Yugoslavia) it is "trénerka," and at Kecskemét (Hungary) they wear "szabadidőruha" or "melegítő" (sweat suit). Language cultivators are rather critical of the use of these words, even though they belong to the most classic and most evident category of lexical borrowing: in the Hungarian native tongue of minority Hungarian-speakers there simply had *not been a signifier* for these things, and it is natural that they have not borrowed their names from the Hungarian of Hungary because they have not *become acquainted with them through the mediation of the Hungarian culture of Hungary*. But it is not only this kind of borrowing which is natural, but also the kind when an old, well-established word is replaced by a newer word, which originates in another language: it is difficult to imagine that pre-7th century Hungarians would not have had arms, knees, ankles, stomachs or even brains (*kar, térd, boka, gyomor, ész*), and yet these words are Turkic loan words in Hungarian. It is clear that the more loan words which differ from the customary denotation of the same object or concept in the Hungarian language varieties of Hungary the contact varieties have, the more these language varieties will differ from each other, and the more mutual intelligibility will decrease. (This is also true for grammatical borrowings.) But it is also clear, that any kind of intervention by language cultivators will be ineffectual against these borrowings. It would be difficult to explain to a child who is ridiculed at a Kolozsvár playground when he is heard to ask his mother for *üdítő* instead of *szuk*, that *üdítő* nonetheless is the "correct" form: his experience is that the opposite is the case, that is to say, the correct form is what the others accept too.

It is not worth -nor is it necessary- to fear for the "Hungarian worldview," as the above quoted excerpt of the Language Cultivation

Handbook puts it somewhat vaguely, for the "characteristics" of the Hungarian language. For the past century there have been well-established criteria for unraveling relationships between languages: on the basis of these (basic vocabulary, grammatical characteristics, and the argument of systematic sound changes) the Hungarian language unequivocally belongs to the Finno-Ugric branch of the Uralian language family. But just as it cannot be seriously claimed that there is an exclusive continuity between today's Hungarians and speakers of the one-time Finno-Ugric language, neither can it be stated that the "worldview" and characteristics of the Hungarian language are exclusively of Finno-Ugric origin. According to the ancient system subordinating conjunctions could never have appeared in Hungarian, since this is a relatively recent feature: it became more widely used after the conquest of Hungary, most likely, at this particular time because the conservatism influence of left-recursive subordination of Turkic languages has diminished, and the influence of Indo-European languages with a preference for subordinating conjunctions has increased. According to the reconstructed rules of the Finno-Ugric basic language, it is alien to the Hungarian language to tolerate initial consonant clusters, and not to dissolve it by means of an intervening or initial vowel, as it still happened in Old Hungarian (for example in such words of Latin origin as *iskola* 'school', *isptály* 'hospital', or *istálló* 'stable', which is of German origin), nevertheless such words as *skót* 'scottish', *sport* 'sport', or *staféta* 'relay' sound Hungarian to us. Earlier, Hungarian did not tolerate the occurrence of front and back vowels in the same word either, to refer to some oft' quoted examples: this is how *magyer* became *magyar* 'Hungarian' and *megyer* (name of a Hungarian tribe), the *cseljad* form became *család* 'family' and *cseléd* 'servant', but who would say that *Ágnes* is not a Hungarian name, or that *fotel* 'armchair' is not a Hungarian word? Furthermore, the "blame" for these changes mostly falls on the Hungarian language itself, namely those sound changes which had caused the disappearance of the velar *ɪ* phoneme from the Hungarian sound system.¹² Qualques, and loan translations can also be blamed for reflecting an "alien worldview," but then we would also have to consider the most prominent representatives of the Hungarian language modernization of the first half of the 19th century to have consciously corrupted the Hungarian "worldview," as very

many words initiated by them were coined along the lines of Latin or German examples (for example *anyag* as a *qualque* of the Latin word *materia*.) "Worldview" and "characteristics" are just as changeable then as the lexicon, we have no reason to deem grammatical changes more harmful than changes in vocabulary.

Thus minority Hungarian language varieties are indeed different from the language varieties of Hungarian in Hungary, but they are merely different, not more corrupt, worse, distorted, impure, etc. Neither do we have to fear that their speakers cannot express themselves just as precisely as the speakers of Hungarian in Hungary, or that their ability to think will be compromised. Minority Hungarian language varieties show exactly the same characteristics as contact varieties the world over. One of the basic tenets of studies dealing with bilingualism is that bilinguals, whether they use one or the other of their languages, never use exactly the same language as monolingual speakers of the given language: the two languages are continually affecting each other, thus the usual accompanying features (interference and borrowing) are also continually present. In minority areas numerous language varieties coexist side-by-side and the consequences of bilingualism can be observed -although to varying extents-, in each this is why they can be referred to as the contact varieties of Hungarian irrespective of the contact language. (Naturally, certain characteristics (may) differ from one variant to the next.)

It is also often said of minority Hungarian language use that it is *provincial*. First, this statement reflects the same monolithic-monolingual attitude which had "helped" to disappear the traditional dialects of Hungary and according to which, everything that is "provincial", i. e. dialectal is to be avoided in "expecting" Hungarian speech, often mentioned but spoken by nobody. Second, representatives of this point of view do not acknowledge the existence of that linguistic-dialectological tendency, that the dialects spoken on the periphery of a given language territory will differ to a greater extent from both each other and from the central dialects, than the dialects spoken in the center of the territory. Third, they do not acknowledge that already in the last century the so called North Eastern and Transdanubian dialects were the only ones to have played an outstanding role in defining the standard, but for the past approximately eighty years

there was not even a chance for the characteristics of the language varieties of the areas lying beyond the borders becoming part of the standard. Fourth, this attitude also reflects ignorance of the fact that in significant portions of the Hungarian language territory lying beyond the borders, until recently it was impossible to receive the broadcasts of the Hungarian radio and television, thus these could not exert a unifying influence. Fifth, those who employ these derogatory terms also neglect to take into account that speakers living in Hungarian language territories outside of Hungary, do not have an opportunity for using the "official," standard Hungarian language: in the linguistic domains where in Hungary the standard is used (press, higher education, political life, official bureaucracy, etc.) minority Hungarians, for the most part, are obliged to use the state language.

It follows from the above that once again it is *natural*, that minority Hungarian language varieties should seem more "dialectal" to the ears of Hungarians from Hungary. *Folk linguistics*¹³ indicate that people usually consider their own language variety to be precise, to be "the" language, since both they and their surroundings speak this since childhood, whoever speaks differently from this, "does not speak the language properly," – but linguists ought to know that those others also speak properly, only *differently*, and that this difference should be acceptable everywhere, not only at home and in the family, or as it is often termed in the literature on language cultivation in "indolent" language use. It would be the task of linguists, and of all those who participate in *linguistic education* to advocate – similarly to religious tolerance – the ideal of *linguistic tolerance*, instead of promoting the ideal of a "uniform language." The former is not even unattainable: it has for example been possible to establish it in Norway, and so far it has proved to be successful. (Finland is often mentioned as an example of linguistic tolerance with respect to the rights of language use accorded to the Swedish minority, but in the case of Finland this is a question of ensuring the equal rights of a minority language – of course this would also be very important from the point of view of minority Hungarian language varieties, – however, in Norway they accord equal rights to different varieties of the *self-same language*.)

Of course bilingualism, and within this, minority bilingualism, does not only have consequences in the system of the language, but also social

ones. For example, those who, as minority Hungarians, do not speak the state language, or are not proficient enough in it to the extent that they could be labeled bilingual, even according to the loosest interpretation¹⁴ of the term, will still use a bilingual, and not a monolingual, variety of their mother tongue. There is nothing surprising about this, since they have learnt and are using the mother tongue in a bilingual context, constantly communicating with bilingual speakers, adapting to the bilingual norms of the latter.

The other consequence is that bilingual speakers in any given situation can choose not only from various varieties of their mother tongue, but also between their mother tongue and another language. Thus, their communicative competence does not extend only to what variety of their mother tongue they should use in a given speech situation, but also to which of their languages is it necessary, possible or worthwhile to choose. Just as the choice of one variety of the mother tongue is determined by the interrelationship of very many factors, the choice between languages will also be influenced by which language will help the speaker achieve his goals the best.

Factors Influencing Language Choice

Language choice may be influenced by external coercion (the use of which language is possible or allowed), norms (in certain situations one, in others the other language is used) and the attitudes of the individual to the two languages.

Research on language choice shows that in the language choice of bilinguals economic factors play a rather significant role. (It is worth noting, that one of the most often quoted studies in connection with this question has been carried out by Susan Gal at Felsoor, on the language shift of Hungarians, cf. Gal 1979)¹⁵. Speakers will evaluate as more valuable the language by means of which they will be more successful; and they consider the other language, even if it is their mother tongue, to be "useless," at most enabling them to communicate with the elderly, but incapable of helping them to get a job, work or money. Thus, because the

“market value” of the other language is greater, they prefer their children to master it better. This evaluation of course may change: the youths of Felsoor for a long time only knew Hungarian as a means of communication within the family, and they used German in every other situation. However, when (around 1990) economic relations between the two countries became more active (thus for example it became possible to form Hungarian-Austrian joint ventures) respect for the Hungarian language increased: it transpired that one could make a living with the help of proficiency in Hungarian.

Political prestige is also a significant factor in language choice: knowledge of the language embodying power (that is to say of the official language) is an indispensable condition of advancement. It is even essential to being well informed, especially if the state does not sufficiently support the language of minorities. Thus, for example by not making information available in minority language newspapers, news programs, or in advertising, or in leaflets, and signs, not to mention in official forms – how can someone be a full-fledged citizen if (s)he does not know how to fill in an official form, simply because (s)he does not understand it. The policies consciously directed at the liquidation of minority languages may be referred to as *linguicide*. This may be not only done to convince users of the minority language that the use of the state language is more advantageous, but also to intimidate them¹⁶. The political dominance of the state language, which in any case is a fact, can only be counterbalanced, and thus minority language use supported, if the given state considers the right to use the mother tongue to be part of fundamental human rights.¹⁷

The *linguistic attitudes* of speakers are not only influenced by economic and political factors, but also by cultural factors. The extent to which speakers are attached to the culture associated with their mother tongue may be an important factor (this may also depend on how well they know it), to what extent they consider the other national symbols their own (besides the common language), to what extent they regard themselves to be part of the nation, and last but not least to what extent *they* are considered to be part of the nation. How these factors relate to the other language may also play a role in the shaping of the speakers' sense of national (ethnic) identity.

In addition to factors affecting the entire community, individual factors may also influence language choice: thus, for example, which language is used with greater facility (which one has the individual learnt in the family, at school, in which one can (s)he read and write), and which one does (s)he consider to be more “beautiful,” quite simply which one does (s)he like better. This is influenced in part by the already mentioned factors exerting their influence on the level of the entire community, and in part by individual factors: for example in connection with which language had the given speaker had more positive, and fewer negative experiences.

It is important to stress once again that these factors determine (exerting their influence in the same direction and thus amplifying, or working in opposing directions and thus weakening or even neutralizing, each other) the attitude of speakers to their own mother tongue, that is to say, how they relate to it: whether they consider it valuable, beautiful, useful or the opposite. The combination of the attitudes and possibilities of the speakers determine in which domains of language use (for example, in the family or in the immediate community, newspapers, literature, scientific and official life, school, religion) and to what extent, will the mother tongue be used. The more limited the number of domains for the use of a language variety the more likely language loss and language shift become.

How can Language Maintenance be Encouraged

Based on the findings of research on bilingualism, language maintenance can be best encouraged by creating a *positive attitude* in the speakers towards their own language variety, that is to say they have to be made aware that the *language variety spoken by them is equally good, only different* from those spoken in other areas of the language territory (even in the capital of the “mother country”). The linguist working on language planning, and the *exemplary speaker* who follows his/her advice and who may have a direct role in the shaping of language use (teachers, priests, journalists, other high prestige members of the speech community), unfortunately do not have

it in their power to direct all the factors of language use. With the exception of a few extremely rare and fortunate cases, the “exemplary speaker” for example has no chance of influencing political factors, and of achieving that the use of the mother tongue should be possible in the greatest possible number of domains. Thus, that it should become possible to use it as official language, that there should be publications, broadcasts in the mother tongue; that there should be education in the mother tongue (including middle and higher level schooling), etc. It would be better if the preparation of the drafts of language laws was left primarily to linguists and not to politicians.¹⁸ Language planners and those who carry out these plans have even less of a say in the shaping of economic factors.

Cultural factors, however, can be influenced: language, which is one of the expressions of a sense of identity, can only be maintained if members of the language community also identify with the culture associated with the language, to be able to do this, however, they first have to become acquainted with the given culture. This should not only include teaching them about the widely interpreted culture associated with the mother tongue, but also reinforcing the local culture associated with their own language variety, as well as identifying and promoting its unique elements. If our premise is that the norms of smaller communities are more binding in language use, just as in other realms of culture, the latter is even more important than emphasizing the values of “universal” Hungarian culture.

For the above outlined reasons minority native speakers of Hungarian often have negative experiences in connection with their mother tongue in a political and economic sense – and there is very little linguists and “exemplary speakers” can do about this. They could, however, do quite a lot to achieve that even if minority language users find their mother tongue less useful *vis à vis* the state language, they should not be burdened with an inferiority complex in relation to the Hungarian language of Hungary. In a questionnaire survey carried out during the summer of 1995, among other things, I sought answers from teachers of Hungarian, teaching Hungarian in minority areas, to the question whether they have ever had unpleasant experiences in connection with their own language variety. Although most of them answered this question in the negative, in the course of conversations many of them told me that they had had such

experiences, and they mentioned the same instances as most of those who had answered the question with "yes": that when their conversational partners in Hungary discovered that they came from the other side of the border they remarked how "nicely" they spoke, how well they knew Hungarian. This unfortunately common remark (well known from innumerable accounts by Hungarians living beyond the borders) demonstrates the "effectiveness" of history instruction in Hungary over the past few decades. (The Hungarian Hungarians did not know that there were Hungarian speaking people outside Hungary, that is why they "praised" the informants' Hungarian.)

One of the major errors of traditional Hungarian language cultivation is revealed by responses given to another question. I asked the informants to indicate on a five grade scale to what extent they consider valid the following statements for the language variety of their locality:

- 1) it is suitable for fulfilling all the functions of everyday language use
- 2) it is also suitable as literary, journalistic, scientific and official language
- 3) it has many dialectal features [it has negative connotations in Hungarian]
- 4) it is a "mixed language:" there are very many phenomena in it which are the result of foreign influence
- 5) a person who speaks it as his/her mother tongue will have difficulty understanding the Hungarian of Hungary
- 6) its condition is continually deteriorating

The answers of 50 Transylvanian informants were the following (adding up and then dividing the number of points by fifty):

	1	2	3	4	5	6
total	235	173	160	122	90	137
average	4.70	3.46	3.20	2.44	1.80	2.74

Analyzing these figures we find that although the informants consider the language variety of their locality to be adequate to fulfill the functions of everyday language use with very high marks (4.7), they consider it to be only moderately suitable for the fulfilling of “careful” functions (3.46 points). And, as it transpires from the answers given to questions 3 and 4, unlike what we may expect, they do not think so because of the foreign elements in it (2.44 points) but much more because of the “dialectal” nature of the local language variety (3.2 points). The encouragement, the valorization of “dialectal flavors” had been one of the goals of “humanistic language cultivation” called for by Lajos Lőrincze, the prominent language cultivator. In practice, however, this hardly ever happens. One could cite numerous examples of the strong stigmatization of dialectal variants of *linguistic variables* (coexisting linguistic forms which fulfill the identical grammatical function in the language) (for example the use of the *-suk -sük* form, or the pronunciation of the *Palóc* region, etc.), or that the only thing “wrong” with a currently rapidly spreading linguistic form is that it is dialectal, “it is good enough for [traditional] dialects, but it has no place in common Hungarian.” In the June 1995 issue of *Édes anyanyelvünk*, one of the best known language cultivators, who works at the Linguistics Institute of the Hungarian Academy of Sciences, found fault with the use of certain “folk” turns of phrases by a Member of Parliament on the radio, a sportscaster in the course of broadcasting, and in a manuscript by a linguist colleague. Gábor Kemény, the author of the article, sarcastically refers these rather slight differences back to the domain of dialects. How does he judge the much more “dialectal” features of the speech of prominent representatives – e.g. poets, politicians – coming from outside Hungary? Are they allowed to speak as they normally speak also in the Hungarian mass media? Or should they adjust themselves to the Hungarian Hungarian rules (maybe not even knowing what they are)?¹⁹

A genuine, and not only seeming, acceptance of non-standard language varieties (not only of traditional dialects, but of other, for example urban dialects) would also be very important from the point of view of education. Children who learn and later use a vernacular (the language variety which the speaker uses the most automatically, in the most common speech situations) which is relatively distant from the standard, not

only have to learn the curriculum at school, but also the standard variety of the language, and this added burden may put them in a significantly disadvantageous position. Therefore linguists are often pushing for an education policy which would not only tolerate but encourage the use of the vernacular in school, only introducing the standard variety gradually, and limiting its use. (Thus for example the teacher would require the use of the standard in written assignments and tests, but not in oral examinations, or only from older children; whereas outside the classroom – during breaks, in the course school excursions, club activities – they may use the language variety of their locality.) Acceptance, reinforcement, and encouragement of the use of the local language variety would be even more important in the areas inhabited by minority Hungarians where there are fewer situations requiring the use of the standard variety of the mother tongue. If these children experience that in many respects their mother tongue is “less good” than the state language, and in the meanwhile also hear that their Hungarian language is not “good” in Hungary either, because it is “dialectal” and “corrupt,” because it is teeming with foreign elements, in the end they would rather speak the state language, especially as in any case they learn its “best,” standard version at school. If, however, they learn standard Hungarian at school then they will not be able to use it in their most natural linguistic context, at home, as the norm prevailing there is different.

Hungarian Diglossia?

One solution to these problems would be if children could use the language variety spoken at their locality at school – at least in lower grades – without having to feel that it is of diminished value. The standard variety of the language would only be introduced gradually during a second phase of the education process, and what’s more the standard variety would differ somewhat according to geographical location, and thus to some extent also differ from the standard Hungarian of Hungary.

This should be so because the Hungarian language is only monolithic according to dictionaries and grammars, but not according to real language

use. With respect to the Hungarian language István Pete (1988) refers to the "literary languages" used in the areas beyond the borders, which differ from each other to some degree, as the "state varieties" of Hungarian, and many have agreed with this distinction. Those languages which have several standard varieties of equal standing (such are for example English, French, German, Spanish) are referred to as *pluricentric* languages. According to István Lanstyák (1995a, 1995b), Hungarian is also a pluricentric language: Transylvania with the Partium, Voivodina, the Slovakian and the Sub-Carpathian Hungarian language territory may be regarded as independent centers, because Hungarian is also used to some extent alongside with the state language in such areas as public administration, education, scientific research, mass communication, publishing (that is to say, in functions where the use of the standard is general). These standard varieties differ from the standard dialect of Hungary, in that while Hungary is the so called *full-fledged and primary* center of the Hungarian language, the above mentioned areas are *partial and secondary* centers. (Whether an area may be called full-fledged or partial center depends on the kind of status and function the variety spoken there has, while the primary and secondary terms are based on historical distinctions). To some extent these varieties differ from each other linguistically (with respect to lexicon, grammatical structures, pronunciation, the frequency of certain elements, etc.) but so far, these differences have hardly been studied²⁰, much less codified. Many are even afraid that if these differences were to be endorsed and no longer treated as deviance, this would hasten the divergence of the Hungarian language varieties spoken in the various countries. At the same time, as Lanstyák (1995b) also points out, there is practically no chance of the disappearance of Hungarian pluricentrism in such a way that the end result would be once again a single, universal standard. The other way pluricentrism could disappear would be for the standards of the independent centers to become separate languages. This, however, can only be the result of social, and not of linguistic, processes, if the speakers of various standards also begin to regard themselves to be separate nations. The Chinese for example consider themselves to belong the same nation, and to be speakers of the same language, despite the fact that there are such enormous differences between certain Chinese dialects that their speakers do

not even understand each other; while Czechs and Slovaks who speak mutually intelligible languages consider themselves to be members of separate nations and the Czech and Slovakian languages to be separate languages.

According to Lanstyák (1995b), if the consciousness of national belonging is strong enough there should be no fear that the language varieties spoken in various areas will be distanced from each other, because through conscious language planning it is possible to bring about a linguistic situation which has proved to be functional in many parts of the world: the condition of *diglossia*.

The term diglossia has first been employed by Charles Ferguson (1975) in 1959 to describe languages which exist in two varieties in the daily use of the same speech community and which can be clearly differentiated from each other both from the point of view of linguistic system and from the point of view of function. One variety, this is what is referred to as high (H) variety, is used in political, religious, and scientific life, in country-wide mass communication, and this is also the language of literature; the other variety, this is what is referred to as the low (L) variety, used in private life, in local newspapers and local mass communication, entertainment, and this is the language of folk literature too. The L-variety is learnt at home, and is spoken as mother tongue, the H-variety is learnt at school, this is not the mother tongue of anyone, thus according to level of schooling there may be great differences between individual speakers regarding the extent to which they can use it. An example of the diglossic situation is the Arab world: local varieties of Arabic are L-variants and classical Arabic is the H-variety, knowledge of which in effect connects to each other speakers of the various local varieties of Arabic.

Joshua Fishman (1967) later expanded the concept of diglossia to such linguistic situations too, where the H and L-functions are similarly separated from each other, but the H and L-varieties are not two varieties of the same language but are two different languages (for example Mexicans living in the United States use English in the H-functions, and Spanish in the L-functions.) We should not forget that the diglossic situation proposed by Lanstyák is not based on this, but on the original Fergusonian diglossia definition, thus under no circumstances does this imply that the

proponents of the proposal would wish to see Hungarian relegated to L-functions, and the state language to function as the H-variety. (There is no need for this as the Hungarian-speakers from areas beyond the borders already live in a diglossic situation in this sense). On the contrary, representatives of this view realize that a basic condition for the creation of a diglossic situation in the Fergusonian sense is that it should be possible to use Hungarian in H-functions as well.

Bidialectalism and Education

The chances for the creation and functioning of a Hungarian-Hungarian diglossia once again do not exclusively depend on linguistic factors, may be primarily not. Regardless of whether a diglossic situation "legalize" the use of non-standard varieties in L-functions, these varieties exist, and naturally they have every right to exist. Diglossia in fact is a more pronounced, clearer and more accepted, therefore special, case of a state of affairs which is characteristic of all standardized languages that in everyday functions speakers use non-standard language varieties learnt as vernacular, while in certain functions they use the standard, and they are capable of choosing between them depending on the speech situation. Most probably this is why the Hungarian literature on the question has for a long time referred to the phenomenon of the ability of a speaker to speak the standard in addition to his/her own dialect as *diglossia* – but this blurring of categories is rather unfortunate, precisely because this condition is basically valid for all speakers, whereas diglossia has particular criteria. (The basic differences between the two may be best explained by the fact that in the case of diglossia there are no in-between varieties, while the generally prevailing situation is that standard and non-standard varieties constitute a continuum.) Most recently, may be under the impact of criticisms, the Hungarian literature has started using the expression *dual code use* for this phenomenon. The authors using this term, due to their recognition of the phenomenon, are much more tolerant than those who propagate the ideal of "a single Hungarian language." However, the term is still narrower than what would be desirable, because it only accepts

traditional dialects (dialects hardly influenced by the standard at all)²¹, but not other non-standard language varieties (for example the one spoken in the working class districts of Budapest). The term which includes the knowledge of any non-standard and standard language variety and the ability to switch between the two is bidialectalism.

Education policy which takes into consideration and is based on the fact of bidialectalism, has been successful in some countries for a long time, in Norway this is the only legal option – most likely the above mentioned rather unique linguistic tolerance is due to this. In countries where language cultivation is held to be important, and has a long tradition – like Hungary – it will most likely take a lot of debate to have the idea accepted that the nation will not be lost if we strip linguistic stereotypes, which exist anyway, of their Academic-Ministerial institutionalization. This would not mean that the school would not require at all the mastering of the standard, however, attempts to teach an idealized Hungarian language would have to be abandoned, and in accordance with this, it would become impossible to require the mastering of the standard through force or based on some kind of a moral imperative. Instead of such slogans as “we don’t say it like that,” “a Hungarian does not speak like this,” “this is how the uneducated speak,” “speak properly,” “say it in proper Hungarian” we need to provide the student with linguistic knowledge of the standard and non-standard varieties, as well as to demonstrate differences between their statuses and functions. In addition, instead of today’s grammar-centered approach, mother tongue education should give much more emphasis to the social aspects of language. By pointing to the main differences between the varieties of the language, and by acquainting the student with the typical domains of use (which one is spoken *customarily* where, under what circumstances, with whom) we could ensure that the continually growing linguistic competence of the students should not become distorted, and become devoid of communicative competence.

To achieve this we should abandon the approach according to which grammar classes should serve to “cultivate” or to “nurture” our mother tongue. Our mother tongue neither is waste land nor is it ill. Neither should grammar classes serve, following the tradition of medieval grammar classes, to force our students to commit such unnatural acts as to learn

categories by heart, and that they should burden their minds with meaningless cramming (such as for example: "In Hungarian the adverb may be expressed by a suffixed denominative, a denominative with an adnominal, a suffixed denominative with an adnominal, an adverb, a pronoun standing for and adverb, etc.") Grammar classes should serve to call attention to the great many interesting things we are unaware of when using our mother tongue in the most natural manner, to demonstrate that these interesting features also characterize other languages, the differences are only those of detail; grammar classes are to help our students to *perfect themselves*, to reach their goals, and to learn how they can best represent their own interests. Grammar classes could afford an opportunity for our students to free themselves of the fear of speaking (or that such inhibitions should not even develop in the first place), that they should not be ashamed of what is unique to them, and that they should be able to accept otherness without value judgment and prejudice.

At the beginning of the century it was impossible to imagine a foreign language class without it primarily involving the cramming of words and grammatical rules and the translation of sentences. Foreign language teaching has undergone such a methodological revolution in this century, that students are not only enabled to translate written texts, but also to orally communicate in the language. The most successful of these methods (for example the use of interactive role playing, cf. Di Pietro, 1994) are not aiming to teach a given language to the students in the fastest possible way, but rather they wish to enable the students to communicate in it as successfully as possible: they are based on the realization that someone who knows a significant part of the vocabulary and the grammatical rules of a language does not yet know how to *use* the language, because effective language use cannot exist without communicative competence. That is to say, an increase in the effectiveness of foreign language teaching cannot be measured by its ability to teach a foreign language without effort and serious investment of energy, but by its ability to teach how to successfully use the given language. In other words these findings do not only relate to foreign languages, but to language as such, the new methods are not based on the characteristics of a foreign language, but of *language*. If we were to take as our starting point that the mother tongue is also a language, and not

some kind of an ideal hovering in unreachable heights, then the adaptation of these successful methods would seem reasonable. Always keeping in mind, however, that those whom we are teaching are already highly competent speakers of their mother tongue.

Translated by Bea Vidacs

NOTES

¹ Although several papers, and even independent volumes have appeared about Hungarian minority language use (for example Ágoston 1990, Jakab 1976, 1983), these -following tradition – have mostly been motivated by the concerns of language cultivation. Their primary goal is not the *description* of Hungarian minority language use, but the enumeration of its “faults” and the *prescription* of “correct” language usage. Research on Hungarian minority language use from a descriptive standpoint began in the second half of the eighties, the volume entitled *Tanulmányok a határainkon túli kétnyelvűségről* [Essays on bilingualism beyond our borders] (Kontra 1991) contains some of the results of this research. Unfortunately, this is incomplete in the sense that it only contains papers relating to the Hungarians of Slovakia and Austria, but currently there is a research project underway which analyses the language use of the Hungarians of the entire Carpathian Basin region. Jenő Kiss’s book (1994) deals with the status of the Hungarian language within and beyond the borders of Hungary. The forums for presenting studies examining Hungarian minority language use are the yearly conferences of secular linguistics: these have been organized with varying partners (institutions of research and higher education) every year since 1988 by the Spoken language Department of the Linguistic Institute of the Hungarian Academy of Sciences. Most of the conference materials (these have been held in Budapest, Újvidék [Novi Sad], Kolozsvár [Cluj], Nyitra [Nitra], Nagymegyec [Calovo] and Ungvár [Uzghorod]) have been also published in a volume; elsewhere István Lanstyák and Gizella Szabó Mihály have published numerous studies from the perspective of secular linguistic studies on the Hungarian language use in Slovakia (for instance Lanstyák 1991, 1993c, 1995d; Szabó Mihály 1991, 1993, etc.); Lajos Göncz’s monograph (1985) deals with the psychological effects of bilingualism and with the language use of bilingual children.

² The debate is mostly carried out on the pages of the *Irodalmi Szemle* [Literary Review] of Pozsony (Bratislava) (see for example Lanstyák 1993a, 1993b; Deme 1994; Jakab 1994; Kontra 1994a).

³ Cf. Tolcsvai Nagy 1991, 1994.

- ⁴ In this study I use the term “language planning” to refer to a case when doing this work would use linguistic data in order to resolve social conflicts and abandon social inadequacies connected to language use. This would be, in my consideration, the ideal case.
- ⁵ The idea of “exacting” and “indolent” language use blurs together different phenomena, this blurring may be due to an error in interpreting Bernstein whereby, the elaborated and restricted code described by Bernstein (1975) are understood to correspond to *standard* and *non-standard* language use. Elaborated and restricted code, however, do not refer to language *varieties*, but to strategies of language use: we use elaborated codes when we suppose that we have little previous common experience with our conversational partner, *therefore* we have to make our statements as verbally explicit as possible; however, we use a restricted code if we have so much previous common experience with our speech partner that it is not necessary to express our thoughts explicitly. That is to say, it is possible to talk in the elaborated code in a non-standard language variety, and it is also possible to use the restricted code in the standard language variant. Thus “exacting” and “indolent” (and similar) denotations are meaningless from a linguistic point of view because they may equally refer to speech which may or may not contain “incorrect forms” or which is explicit, elaborated or less elaborated.
- ⁶ In African American Vernacular English members belonging to the same group refer to those who do not belong or are marginal to the group as “lame.” Labov has made this word into a linguistic term, referring to those who with respect to a network of relationships are outsiders or marginals. They use the language variety characteristic of the given group less systematically than the insider members of the group. According to Labov, linguists become lames in their own one-time communities, thus their intuitions about their own dialects are not reliable enough.
- ⁷ The principle of “least effort,” “analogy,” and “systematicity” and other phenomena often cited in the literature on language history as reasons for linguistic change do not determine a particular linguistic change, at most they can only contribute to whether a certain change takes place or not. One of the greatest mysteries of language as such is language change, and this belongs to the unanswerable questions of linguistics: so far there has been no satisfactory answer to why a given change occurs at a certain point in time, and in a certain particular language, and why not at another time, or why it does not take place in another language. Studies of secular linguistics the have come nearer to solving this problem, (called actuation problem) exactly because when studying linguistic change in addition to taking into consideration system internal factors (the above mentioned principle of “least effort,” analogy, and systematicity belong here) they also take into consideration factors lying outside of the linguistic system. According to this view, these factors are not “extra-linguistic” in nature, rather they are very much part of the language: the social *embeddedness* of language cannot be left out of consideration because if it were, the subject of our

analysis would no longer be natural language but an artificially produced system of signs whose elements and rules are reminiscent of the elements and rules of the language from which it has been “distilled,” but the “artificial language” itself differs fundamentally (functionally) from the natural language.

- ⁸ A survey carried out in Hungary in which the informants were selected to correspond to the ratios of the adult Hungarian population with respect to size of settlement, age, educational level and gender (that is to say the sample was representative of the adult population of the country) recently proved, that there were no significant differences in language use between those who consumed the products of language cultivation (read articles on language cultivation, listened to or watched programs dealing with language cultivation) and those who did not (Kontra 1994b).
- ⁹ This definition in the dictionary appears under satirical rhyme therefore it would have been better to announce a satirical ditty writing contest rather than *advertising campaign*, since advertisements try to sell something and not to ridicule it. For the latter one can be fined.
- ¹⁰ The two founders of linguistic relativism are Edward Sapir and Benjamin Lee Whorf, therefore it is often also referred to as the Sapir-Whorf hypothesis. According to this hypothesis, people’s worldview depends to some extent on what kind of conceptual and grammatical categories and distinctions exist in their mother tongue. Accordingly, the worldview of the speakers of two different languages may differ, depending on the extent to which their languages differ from each other in terms of semantic and grammatical categories.
- ¹¹ These passions have mostly been provoked by the writings of Miklós Kontra (1992, 1993) and István Lanstyák (1993a, 1993b, 1994). The adjectives cited come from László Deme (1993) and István Jakab (1994). It is noteworthy that the latter authors do not counter linguistic arguments with linguistic arguments, but trade in personal attacks instead. In this respect Gábor Kemény’s reply (1993) also falls into this category, but its tone is somewhat more restrained, he “only” blames Kontra for being disloyal to the “community” of Hungarian linguists (who are supposed to be also language cultivators according to Kemény).
- ¹² It was in the wake of this sound change that those words appeared in Hungarian which although they contained *i* sounds, which by then became frontally articulated, but receive suffixes which contain back vowels, for example *zsíros* ‘greasy’, *íjat* ‘bow+acc. suffix’, etc.
- ¹³ Studies on folk linguistics examine how non-linguist members of the speech community (who are referred to as real speakers) evaluate certain language varieties: what kind of conceptions they have about the linguistic system itself, what kind of stereotypes they hold about their own language use and that of others.
- ¹⁴ The term bilingual is understood in a variety of ways. According to the strictest definition, a person who speaks two languages on a native level is bilingual, according

to the less strict definitions (these are the ones most often employed), however, a person who speaks a second language "rather well" is also to be considered bilingual.

¹⁵ Based in part on this, and in part on an other research, also dealing with the language shift of minority language speakers, she has published two articles in Hungarian, see also Gal 1991 and 1992.

¹⁶ On intimidated language use in greater detail see Kontra and Baugh 1990 and Fülci-Szántó 1992.

¹⁷ On linguistic human rights see Skutnabb-Kangas 1992; on the relationship of education and linguistic human rights see Lanstyák 1995c.

¹⁸ See for example the draft law by Sándor Szilágyi N. (1994).

¹⁹ It is worthwhile to quote from the article verbatim, because these quotes clearly exemplify the attitude which indicates linguistic intolerance, still characteristic of today's literature on language cultivation (the emphases are mine): the sportscaster is "in error" because "in the heat of speech at the end of longer words the dialectal element penetrates;" "the folk form" had to be "weeded out" from the manuscript of the linguist colleague because it was "jarringly *vulgar, dialectal*." And the conclusion of the article: "I cannot determine at this point whether the above examples are individual occurrences or indicate a trend (that is to say whether the currently established *more or less unified* standard is once again *being penetrated by spoken, folk language variants from [socially] below*. Naturally, the folk forms cited above are not incorrect – linguistically. But they are incorrect stylistically, because they do not fit into the stylistic context in which I have found them. At least as long as we continue to keep things where they belong."

²⁰ With the exceptions of the Hungarian language variants of Slovakia, see István Lanstyák's and Gizella Szabó Mihály's articles cited in the first note.

²¹ In the course of data collection dialectologists sought out older, rural, if possible male informants who had spent all their lives in a given settlement and had spent their working lives as peasants, because it was supposed that they spoke the "purest" form of traditional dialects. (That is to say, the farthest removed from the standard.) Such informants are referred to as NORM informants, based on the English acronym non-mobile older rural male.

LITERATURE

Ágoston, Mihály (1990) *Rendszerbontás? (Nyelvháználattunk zavarai)*. [System Break-down?(Difficulties in Language Communication)] Újvidék, Forum Kiadó.

Bernstein, Basil (1975) *Nyelvi szocializáció és oktathatóság* [Socio-linguistic approach to socialisation with some references to educability]. In: *Társadalom és nyelv*

- [Society and Language]. Szépc, György and Pap, Mária (eds.), Budapest, Gondolat Kiadó, 393-431.
- Deme, László (1993) Bomlott gondolkodású nyelvészek? [Disoriented Linguists ?] *Új Szó*, February 12, 1993, 7.
- Di Pietro, Robert J. (1994) *Szerepjátékok a nyelvőrán. Stratégiai interakció* [Strategic interaction]. Budapest, Nemzeti Tankönyvkiadó.
- Ferguson, Charles A. (1975) Diglossia. In: *Társadalom és nyelv* [Society and Language]. Szépc, György and Pap, Mária (eds.), Budapest, Gondolat Kiadó, 291-317.
- Fishman, Joshua (1967) Bilingualism with and without diglossia; diglossia with and without bilingualism. *Journal of Social Issues* 23/2, 29-38.
- Fülei-Szántó, Endre (1992) Bomló kétnyelvűség. [Bilingualism on the ropes]. In: *Társadalmi és területi változatok a magyar nyelvben*. [Social and regional variations in the Hungarian language]. Kontra, Miklós (ed.), Budapest, Magyar Tudományos Akadémia Nyelvtudományi Intézete, 35-45.
- Gal, Susan (1979) *Language Shift: Social Determinants of Linguistic Change in Bilingual Austria*. New York, Academic Press.
- (1991) Kódváltás és öntudat az európai periférián [Code shift and Consciousness at the European Periphery]. In: *Tauulmányok a határainkon túli kétnyelvűségről* [Studies on Bilingualism among Hungarians Across the Border]. Kontra, Miklós (ed.) Budapest, Magyarságkutató Intézet, 123-157.
- (1992) Mi a nyelvcsere és hogyan történik? [Changing Language and How it Works]. In: *Társadalmi és területi változatok a magyar nyelvben* [Social and Territorial Shifts in the Hungarian Language]. Kontra, Miklós (ed.), Budapest, Magyar Tudományos Akadémia Nyelvtudományi Intézete, 47-59.
- Göncz, Lajos (1985) *A kétnyelvűség pszichológiája: a magyar-szerbhorvát kétnyelvűség lélektani vizsgálata* [The Psychology of Bilingualism: Study of Speakers of Serbo-Croatian and Hungarian]. Újvidék, Forum Kiadó.
- Jakab, István (1976) *Hogyan is mondjuk? Nemzetiségi nyelvhasználatuk – nemzetiségi nyelvművelésünk* [How do You Say ... ? Language use among Minority Population, – The Cultivation of Native Language]. Bratislava, Madách Kiadó.
- (1983) *Nyelvünk és mi* [Our Native Language and Us]. Pozsony, Madách Kiadó.
- (1994) Nyelvművelésünk múltja, jelene, jövője [Language Cultivation – Past, Present, Future]. *Irodalmi Szemle* 37/4, 46-57.
- Kemény, Gábor (1993) Mi sem akarjuk "leválasztani" azt az ötmillió magyart! Válasz(ok) Kontra Miklósnak [We do not Want to "Cut Off" those Five Million Hungarians Either! Response(s) to Miklós Kontra]. *Szociológia* 14/41, 155-158.
- (1995) Csak népiesen? [Following Folk Traditions ?] *Édes Anyanyelvünk* 17/3, 5.
- Kontra, Miklós (ed.) (1991) *Tauulmányok a határainkon túli kétnyelvűségről* [Studies of Bilingualism Among Hungarians Living Beyond National Borders]. Budapest, Magyarságkutató Intézet.

- (1992) Bomlott gondolkodású magyarok? [Crazy Hungarian Thinking?] *Új Szó* December 23, 1992.
- (1993) Hogyan válasszunk le ötmillió magyart a nemzet testéről? [How to Cut Off Five Million Hungarians from the Nation?] *Szivárvány* 14/40, 123-130.
- (1994a) Szubjektív megjegyzések a magyar nyelvi tervezésről [Private Thoughts on Hungarian Linguistic Proposals]. *Irodalmi Szemle* 37/12, 72-81.
- (1994b) Milyen hatása van a mai magyar nyelv művelésnek? [The Effects of Present Hungarian Language Use]. *Magyar nyelv* 90, 333-345.

Kontra, Miklós and John Baugh (1990) Önként s dalolva adja fel nyelvét s kultúráját? [More than Willing to Give Up Native Language and Culture?] *Regio* 1990/2, 27-44.

Lanstyák, István (1991) A szlovák nyelv árnyékában [In the Shadow of Slovakian]. In: *Tanulmányok a határainkon túli kétnyelvűségről* [Studies on Bilingualism Across the Border]. Kontra, Miklós (ed.) Budapest, Magyarságkutató Intézet, 11-72.

- (1993a) Nyelv művelésünk vétségei és kétségei [Misgivings and Misdemeanors over Language Use]. *Irodalmi Szemle* 36/3, 58-69 and 36/4, 64-74.
- (1993b) Álom és valóság között [Somewhere Between Reveries and Reality]. *Irodalmi Szemle* 36/6, 69-78 and 36/7-8, 96-105.
- (1993c) A magyar-szlovák kétnyelvű diákok magyar szókincsének néhány sajátosságáról [Some Characteristics of Hungarian Vocabulary Among Bilingual Slovak-Hungarian Students]. *Hungarológia* 3, 115-127.
- (1995a) Többközpontú nyelv-e a magyar? [Is Hungarian Multi-Centered?] *Irodalmi Szemle* 38/1, 72-83.
- (1995b) A magyar nyelv központjai [The Centres of Hungarian Language]. *Magyar Tudomány*, 1995 pp. 1170-1195
- (1995c) Nekünk miért nem jó? [Why Isn't It Good For Us?] *Új Szó* June 21, 1995, 7.
- (1995d) A szlovákiai magyar argó néhány kérdéséről. [Issues of Hungarian Argo in Slovakia]. In: *Kétnyelvűség és magyar nyelvhasználat* [Bilingualism and the Use of Hungarian]. Kassai, Ilona (ed.) Budapest, Hungarian Academy of Sciences Nyelvtudományi Intézetének Élőnyelvi Osztálya, 189-201.

Pete, István (1988) A magyar nyelv állami változatai [Official Versions of Hungarian]. In: *A magyar nyelv rétegződése* [The Stratification of Hungarian]. Kiss, Jenő and László Szűts (eds.) Budapest, Akadémiai Kiadó, 779-789.

Skutnabb-Kangas, Tove (1992) Nyelvi emberi jogok [Human Rights and Language]. *Korunk*, 3/5, 82-86.

Szabónihály, Gizella (1991) A szlovákiai regionális sajtó kétnyelvűsége [Bilingualism in Slovakian Regional Press]. In: *Kétnyelvűség a kárpát-medencében I.* [Bilingualism in the Carpathian Basin]. Györi-Nagy, Sándor and Janka Kelemen (eds.), Budapest, Széchenyi Társaság, 30-34.

- (1993) Nyelvhasználat és szociális háttér [Language Use and Social Background]. *Hungarológia* 3, 59-72.
- Szilágyi, N. Sándor (1994) Tervezet. Törvény a nemzeti identitással kapcsolatos jogokról és a nemzet közösségek méltányos és harmonikus együttéléséről [Proposal. Act on Rights to National Identity and the Coexistence of Nations in Peace and Dignity]. *Korunk* 5/3, 121-150.
- Tolcsvai Nagy, Gábor (1991) A nyelvi közösség és a nyelvi egység, kisebbségben [Linguistic Community and Linguistic Unity among Minorities]. *Regio* 1991/3, 166-173.
- (1994) Nyelvárulás és nyelvmentés: kánon vagy diskurzus [Betrayal or Rescue of Language : Canon or Dialogue]. *Irodalmi Szemle* 37/9, 73-85.