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Introduction

The existence of language varieties, their constant change and their mutual influence on each other is a universal feature of every living natural languages. Dynamics of language change, however, can be different regarding its scale and quality, depending on the changes taking place in our everyday life. This means that examinations of linguistic change are of prominent importance in times that involve an intensified change in the status and state of language varieties. Besides languages’ potential to change, it is also well-known that our knowledge of our mother-tongue—or of the variety that we acquired during our primary socialization—affects our operation of it to a great extent. An important unit of this domain of knowledge—beside our knowledge of editing and communication—is our general knowledge of language, ‘the broadly defined linguistic mental domain’ (Kiss 2008: 263), which contains attitudes, myths, superstitions and ideologies about language. This means that by mapping speakers’ subjective relationship to language, we can draw information regarding the background of their linguistic behavior, thus indirectly we can explore the hidden causes of the expansion or the regression of certain varieties or even that of linguistic change. In parallel with the analysis of language change, description of speakers’ attitudes is also useful and timely because besides shedding light on the more and more relevant functions and roles of dialects it also pays attention to the circumstances under which territorial language varieties—in marginal and scattered situation in particular—are in increased danger (see Sándor A. 2009, Kiss 2010: 388).

I got in closer relation with dialectology and sociolinguistics as a student of the College of Nyíregyháza in the beginning of 2000s. The research working group of the department provided an excellent opportunity to study linguistic varieties even as a student. I have studied the language use in the Northeast dialect on the field since 2008. Change of dialects, speakers’ attitudes towards their first language varieties and stigmatization connected to regionalism have always been in the center of my interest, while the idea of interdialectal comparative studies occurred to me first during my years in the doctoral school. I have been working on the analysis of the data of the New Hungarian Atlas of Hungarian Dialects more thoroughly since 2009.

The subject of the dissertation

During my research focusing on the comparison of (marginal) dialect regions, I have been doing a comparative study of change with a socio-dialectical viewpoint and with a focus on linguistic geography on two—geographically distant and linguistically and non-linguistically quite different—margin regions, namely the Northeast and the Western Transdanubia regions and their neighboring indigenous minority communities, based on the computerized data of the Hungarian Dialect Atlas and the New Hungarian Atlas of Hungarian Dialects. (Hereinafter referred as MNyA, and ÚMNyA respectively.) My regional comparative analysis is organized around two main analytical viewpoints: it aims at an apparent and real-time empirical study of morphological phenomena, and tries to grasp the spatially and temporally changing attitudes of regional speakers towards their vernacular variety.

Recent changes in the situation and state of dialects can be primarily attributed to extra-linguistic factors rooted in economic, social, political and cultural events of the 20th century. Their change of function, their decline in certain scenes of language use and the consequent bidialectalism or regional standardism, and also their rapid change after the turn of the millennium are all well-known factors for the scholars in the field. Since the publication of the MNyA, however, for a long time there had been no analysis of the degree, extent, characteristics,
local constraints and underlying causes of linguistic change that would have covered the entire Hungarian linguistic area and would have employed unified methodology (cf. ZELLIGER 2011: 289). After the publication of MNyA., which documented the language use of the 1950s, ÚMNyA. was the first data based corpus of the whole Hungarian linguistic area that gave an account of the effects of the social events having taken place around the end of the millennium besides the already mentioned earlier events (the termination of the traditional small-scale farming, World Wars, the treaty of Trianon, urbanization, democratic transformation, etc.) (see Chapter 5.). It is partly this debt that I would like to make up for by processing parts of the audio-recorded corpus of ÚMNyA., by transcribing more than 120 hours of audio recording, by computerizing a mass of data containing 8746 linguistic items and by charting this data on maps. Apart from papers dealing with separate settlements and smaller areas, my dissertation can be considered the first major synthesis since the data collection for the ÚMNyA. came to an end in 2009.

Method of the research

The study of linguistic change I performed within the frame of the ÚMNyA-project incorporates various traditions, classic and modern methods and blends the viewpoints of dialectology, geolinguistics and sociolinguistics. Dialectology, geolinguistics and sociolinguistics intertwine on the level of theory, methodology, mapping and data-analysis. My analysis is a study of geolinguistics and linguistic change with a sociodialectical perspective. It unites the tradition of geolinguistics and sociolinguistics in dialectology (l. BODÓ–VARGHA 2013: 399). It draws on classic traditions, its novelty lays mainly in the point of view of the analysis (comparative analysis), in the technology of map making and in its methodology (software-generated maps and database).

Considering the temporal axis of the research, my dissertation unifies the different types of linguistic change studies (cf. Chapter 1.1.3.). It is a real-time study, an apparent-time study and a ‘communal’ change study at the same time. It is ‘apparent-time’, because it compares the data gained form informants of different age in the same time. It is ‘real-time’, because it is the repeated survey of an earlier sample. Third, it is ‘communal’, because its point of reference, MNyA. – apart from the data-collection notebooks— ties the date only to research sites and not to informants, both on its paper-based and computer-generated maps.

Thanks to its spatial dimension, ÚMNyA. not only makes it possible to do linguistic ‘deep-drill’ in certain villages, but its expansive network of research points enables the exploration of a given dialectal region or greater area, moreover, because of the distribution of the villages under survey along the national border, it is suitable for researching the indigenous minority speech communities. Thus, my dissertation does not only include the study of two dialectal regions but purports the minority speech communities of the chosen marginal areas along the border. My research points in the Western Transdanubia region: Alsóór (Unterwart), Felsőör (Oberwart), Órisziget (Siget in der Wart), Középpulya (Mitterpullendorf); Acsalag, Szilsárkány, Káld, Egyházasrádóc. My research point in the Northeast region: Kék, Ófehértó, Tiszakerecsény, Hermánszeg; Homok (Holmok), Csongor (Csomonin), Vári (Vari), Salánk (Salanki) (see Chapter 2.2.1.).

The presence of the so-called ‘human’ perspective in my research is ensured by the comparative study of informants’ linguistic mentality (see Chapter 4.).
As for the selection of the regions and the circumstances of data collection, it is necessary to mention that as a field worker in the ÚMNyA. project it was me who collected the corpus of the five research points of the Northwest region – the region of my own vernacular. As somebody who was born in the county and knew her land of birth very well I joined the working group of ÚMNyA. in 2008.

Considering the database of ÚMNyA, the whole collection is recorded on tape, therefore it satisfies the criteria of the modern linguistic data, as presented in Chapter 1.3.1. Meeting modern dialectology’s other methodological requirement, processing of the corpus is done in a computerized way. The technical background of creating the maps presenting my data was provided by Bihalbocs, a data recording and map generating software. Thus, following the principles and methods of the Geolinguistic Research Group at ELTE, my research – which is based on computerized data – can contribute not only to the much talked-of ‘reactivation’ of MNyA., but have in sight modern geolinguistics’ principle of ‘integration and publication’ (see VARGHA 2015, on how informatics can support dialectology see JUHÁSZ 2014, and Chapter 1.3.2.).

Aim of study, research questions

My choice of topic illustrates the diversity and methodological richness of contemporary, interdisciplinary dialectology. This richness is present in the selection of the linguistic variables to study, in the definition of the methodological principles, in the technology and data-collection and processing, and in the exploration of the reasons of linguistic variability. Besides the questions that have at the same time dialectical, sociolinguistic and geolinguistic points of view, it is the modern, computerized mapping of data that is in the center of the study. In the threefold frame of reference of space (see e.g. JUHÁSZ 2002), time and society of my research, aspects of description of language –and therefore explanations of linguistic change– multiply. One of the expectable proceeds of my analysis is therefore the wide-spectrum explorability of linguistic variability.

My research questions relating the regional difference and the separating role of the country border in connection with the morphological change study are the following:

- Because of its follow-up nature, one of the main goals of the analysis is to establish whether the dialectical phenomena put down half a century ago are still alive in today’s use of language and if so, in what form. It also seeks to explore which forms are obsolete or used only by the eldest generation compared to the data of MNyA. collected between 1949 and 1960.
  - What effects does the two regions’ ecological, social, geopolitical, cultural, demographic etc. background have on the dynamics of linguistic change?
  - What further modifications can be induced by the same extra-linguistic conditions in the position, usage and state of dialects?
  - To what extent is it possible to grasp the linguistic projection of the regional social differences? Or, in other words: what social meanings are conveyed by the prevailing realizations of the linguistic variables and by the directions of their change?
  - What diverging consequences can the same linguistic and extra-linguistic changes have in the motherland and in indigenous minority situation – and in the two different marginal situations within the motherland?
How do linguistic projections of different economic and social changes in different communities multiply and reflect in the Hungarian and in the indigenous minority speech communities?

- Does change (expansion/repression) only present itself in the frequency of occurrence of the given phenomenon/variable or also on the level of recordability?
- What do the frequency indicators tell about the dynamics of the emerging processes of change in the individual dialects, speech communities?
- Do contemporary processes of linguistic change show divergence or rather homogenizing tendencies in real-time in the speech communities under inquiry compared to the state of language recorded fifty-sixty years ago in MNyA.?
- What is the nature and direction of the changes? (e.g. standardization, shifting towards dialectal forms, getting more archaic etc.)
- Does data of ÚMNyA. support the directions of change outlining upon the findings of MNyA. or other earlier researches?
- Besides being a real-time comparison of tendencies of change, my dissertation is also an assessment of synchronic dynamism. My research question: what is the correlation between age as an independent variable and the tendencies of change in the regions and in the speech communities that were once territorially uninterrupted but are now divided by national borders?

The second topic my research focuses on the regional exploration of speakers’ attitudes towards their own vernacular variety. With the regionally comparative analysis of linguistic mentality I was seeking to establish whether and how language users’ attitudes and judgements towards their own linguistic variety differ in relation with dialectal regions and – within the given regions – in relation with the national border.

Since the nature of cognitive-emotional relation to one’s vernacular variety can have different consequences in Hungary (losing one’s dialect) and in the indigenous minority communities (losing language), I do not subordinate my analysis solely to the aspect of regionality but complete it – like in the case of the change-study– with an additional spatial dimension, which is the role of the border situation.

Similarly to the morphological change-study, one cannot ignore those linguistic and extra-linguistic – economic, social, political – factors that influence the results gained in Hungary and beyond the country borders, and which can have therefore explanatory potential regarding respondents’ attitudes.
Does the data collected in course of the ÚMNyA. interviews by unified methods justify the results of other studies conducted earlier in the communities in question?

Beyond the exploration of the spatial extension and temporal change of the individual phenomenon, an important aim of my work is to unearth the underlying reasons of dialectical change and the attitudes of the speakers.

Results

Summary of the morphological change-study

I made an attempt to explore the dynamism of real-time change from three main aspects. By measuring the incidence or the retreat of each varieties I tried to grab the fact of the change, by establishing the spatial radius of the variants I attempted to seize the expansion of the change, while by indicating the ratio of incidence I tried to appreciate the direction and the dynamics of the change.

Results of the analysis of change show that there are differences in the degree of change, as well as in the spatial expansion of the borders of the phenomena, and also in the frequency of incidence of the individual varieties not only in respect of regions but also in relation to the national border.

Measuring the incidence of dialect variants

- Based on the results of my follow-up study one can claim that the dialectal morphological phenomena in question retreated in the last fifty-sixty years.
- The synchronic snapshot shows that this retreat manifests itself in the low ratio of the incidents rather than in the total disappearance of varieties.
- The proportion of the unrecordable and retreating varieties is different both in relation with the individual regions and with the national border, yet, the degree of the former does not exceed 15% in any of the speech communities in question.
- The proportion of those varieties that are unrecordable in the ÚMNyA. in formal situations is higher in the Western area: it is 14,72% in the Western Transdanubia region (see: enném (sthg), vissz/vissz, minkek, jova, bőrő), 11,11% in Burgenland (see: gyűjök/gyűlök, csipeje, csipőjő, üögő). It is the lowest in Transcarpathia (2,78% see: hajnalkor) and in the Northeast villages (7,41% see: hajnalkor, okosul).
- The proportion of regionalisms with low(er) degrees of occurrence is above 70% in three communities (but it is 50% in Transcarpathia).
- The proportion of the x≤5 variants with no more than five items is the highest in the villages of Western Transdanubia, half of the dialectal variations recorded in ÚMNyA. falls into this category (22% in Transcarpathia, around 33% in Northeast-Hungary and in Burgenland). This rate – which is at least twice as much as in other communities – also supports the fact of the intensified retreat in the Western areas.

Change in the spatial scope of the dialect variants:

---

1 Naturally, the percentage values referred in the text do not express proportions that are representative in relation to the whole speech community but are supposed the be interpreted in relation to the number of the respondents. On the methodological dilemmas of the usability of sociology’s definitions of representativity in dialectology see Chapter 2.1.2. As a consequence, I did not do tests of significance and chi-squared tests. For the detailed introduction of the language data and proportions see Tables 9 - 13.
The proportion of the phenomena whose spatial extension did not change is highest in Transcarpathia, 58.33%. Towards the Western regions this number gradually decreases with each speech communities: it is 51.9% in the villages of Northeast Hungary, 47.06% in Western Transdanubia and 25% in Burgenland.

From the point of view of spatial extension, the highest number of retreating phenomena can be found in Western Transdanubia (53.3%), the lowest in Transcarpathia (11%). Their proportion in the two other villages is uniformly around 25%.

It is interesting that the proportion of the phenomena that show spatial expansion is highest in the two indigenous minority communities. In Transcarpathia, it is more than 30%, while in Burgenland the proportion is 50%. As for the Hungarian villages, it is around 20% in both regions.

Correlation between spatial extension and frequency of dialect variants

The fact that a dialect phenomenon is in the process of change, yet is strong and living is best indicated by the high synchronous occurrence that goes together with spatial expansion. Though the proportion of variants belonging to this group is not higher than around 15%, surprisingly beside the 14.8% proportion of the data from Northeast Hungary (szoptassa, disznaja, borja (of the owner)), their occurrence is quite high – 16.7% and 13.9% -- in the two indigenous minority communities, Burgenland (e.g. innák, szoptassa, taniecsa, mieinknek) and Transcarpathia (e.g. Sándorkénál, szoptassa, nől, disznaja).

Compared to MNyA., variants that show no spatial change and high occurrence are also of balanced status. 20.3% of the all data can be classified as such. Their proportion is highest in Transcarpathia – 36% – with data like nálam, nálunk, bírónál, Ferencnél, locative Sándorék, mondol, veje, tikteket, jova, csipeje, üvegeje. (Proportions in other areas in decreasing order: 23.5% in Western Transdanubia (alszom, iszom, innák, jósók), 18.5% in Northeast Hungary (Sándoréknál, mondol, csipeje, veje, üvegeje), 11.1% in Burgenland (jászók/jáccuk mihíjei)).

Change that comprises spatial retraction and high frequency of occurrence did not occur in any of the speech communities.

Data with low frequency of occurrence and with spatial retraction are evidently in different stages of the road to becoming unrecordable. With the exception of the Transcarpathia speech community, their proportion is high in every area: it is 38.2% in Western Transdanubia (e.g. -jő possessive affix, stems alu- and men-/meny-, and aludjam, aludjék and ennék), 26% in Northeast Hungary (e.g. bőri, veji, -nől, -nál/-nél) and 25% in Burgenland (e.g. kézje, láhje).

Dialect variables whose spatial expansion did not change and have a constantly low level of occurrence are common in every communities – with the exception of Burgenland – but characterizes speakers in Northeast Hungary in the first place (33,4%) E.g.: madárt, bírónál, okoson, jova, nől, tikteket, éjfélbe.

A pattern that combines low frequency of occurrence with spatial expansion is most typical of variants used by the Burgenland speech community (33,3%). E.g.: alszom, iszom, ennék, jászolok/jácolok, Őrzötte, jója, vőjő, tiktek, bagojok/bagók.

Role of national borders in influencing language usage and changes in this role
Proportion of phenomena showing differences in relation with the country border shows differences according to the data of MNyA.: while in the Western Transdanubia region almost half of isoglosses of the dialect variants (22 out of 45, 48.9%) show deviations in accordance with the country border, in the Northeast region this proportion is only 25.7%.

- Similar deviation of the 22 variants of the Western Transdanubia region was supported by the repeated study in 12 cases (54.5%), but in the ten remaining cases the change pointed towards balancing.
  - The distribution became balanced in the case of variants gyűjök/gyülök, szoptassa, taniccса, borja (owner’s), üögö, ennéм, ennék (he/she), vissz, mieinkek, borgyaja (that of a cow).
  - The distribution still shows differences in relation to the national border in the case of variants of űrzötte, mihijei, Sándoroknál, Sándorokhoz, bagojok, kézje, lábje innám, innék (he/she), szopлаta, borgyaja (owner’s), éjfēлbe.
  - The number of the newly established differences along national borders that came into existence due to repression is 5. Csipőjő and csipeje were not recordable in Burgenland, while minkek, jova and bőrö have been unable to find recently in Western Transdanubia.

- The differences occurring on the level of recordability in connection with those relevant variants of MNyA. that are possible to grasp in relation with the country border have greatly decreased (almost to its half) thanks to the intensified linguistic movements, however, the degree of the change is only 22.7% if we take into consideration the newly formed differences having emerged because of the border in the last fifty years.

- In the Northeast region, ÚMNyA. shows that 8 out of the 9 variants that showed differences in relation to the country border retained their spatial exclusivity – although with different ratios of frequency. Difference according to country borders therefore remained in 88.9%.

  - Distribution of tiktek became balanced by means of expansion, the variant that was possible be find only in Transcarpathia have appeared recently on the Hungarian side of the region.
  - Distribution along the country border still shows differences in cases of adi, szoptatnі, tanittі, Sándorék, diszna, kézvel and lábval.
  - Thanks to the linguistic changes (repression) in the region the number of country border variants increased by one: okosul appeared on the Hungarian side of the region in formal situation despite the fact that in Transcarpathia it is still a known variable.

- The total proportion has basically remained the same: according to ÚMNyA., the difference that occurs in relation to the country border in the recordable (!) data remains almost the same, it is basically the same variations that show differences nowadays.

- Comparing the findings of the two regions, there is difference not only in phenomena that differ in relation to the national border. Linguistic movement is more intensified in the Western area. Although in many cases the differences between the two sides of the country borders have been balanced, they have been replaced by many new ones. In the Northeast, the proportion is almost the same, langue use demonstrated a high level of stability in this sense (too).
I examined the differences produced by the border not only on the level of recordability but also on the level of frequency. I presumed that compared to the differences on the level of recordability, differences between the different sides of the border measured on the basis of frequency will show a higher ration in the villages in question.

- This hypothesis was not justified concerning the Western region: out of the 23 dialect variants that showed spatial continuity on the level of recordability only 3 showed differences on the level of frequency in relation to country borders (compared to the total item number N=45 it is 6.7%), see alszom, iszom, disznaja.

- Compared to this, examining the frequency proportions in the Northeast region can lead to interesting consequences. Here, 7 variables –20% of the total data that is spatially continuous from the point of view of recordability– showed differences in relation to the country borders: birónál, Ferencnél, nálam, nálunk, jova, nöl, tikteket. Proportionally, this is five times more than the change recorded in the other region.

- On the nature of processes of linguistic change

I examined the corpora of MNyA. and ÚMNyA. also in order to determine whether processes of linguistic change point towards upsetting linguistic unity and making it heterogenous, or rather in to the opposite direction.

- In this respect, in nearly 30% of the cases no change took place. In almost half of the cases I registered divergent, while in 11.7% of the cases convergent processes.

- In a few cases an exchange took place between the two varieties in the time between the two surveys. For instance, in Western Transdanubia, java took over the place of jova, in a similar way as bore did to bőrő.

- Extra attention is needed to pay to those divergent processes that favor the expansion of a dialect variety. As for the villages in question, we can include in this group the form taníccsa and szoptassa (showing usage of suk/sük and csuk/csük), and the form innák on both sides of the border in the Northeast region.

Summary of the results of the research into linguistic mentality

- Through the analysis of the interviews, it can be said that the attitudes differ in many cases depending on the regions and speech communities. Beyond the regional differences, the presence of the country border often causes different linguistic attitudes. The role and the relevance of the independent variables is shown in table 1.

- In most cases, my hypotheses were proven only partially. I was given answers that largely supported my assumptions for questions “Would you mind if dialectal speech disappeared in your village?” and “Do people speak more eloquently here than in the neighboring village?” (see Chapters 4.2.4. and 4.2.5.2.).

- Beyond the results that can be measured in percentages, both the justifications for the answers, both the reasons, motivations and deductible attitudes are very heterogenous in the villages in question. Their individual differences multiply the possible motivations behind each attitude.

- Beyond the diverseness of the motifs, it can be concluded that the objective and subjective factors that influence the attitudes are of different importance and roles in the different communities. For example, despite the fact that it occurs at many places
in the interview and surfaces in almost all of the communities, the distance of the dialect from the standard language variety is more relevant in the Hungarian research points. The subjective and/or social-economic value of the speakers’ own vernacular (see SWAAN 2004: 28, 43-49) and Hungarian-Hungarian stigmatization (see SZOTÁK 2010: 86) plays a more important role in the attitudes of people living in minority situations (see CSERNICSKÓ 1998: 214).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Chapter</th>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Regional difference</th>
<th>Difference in respect of the country border</th>
<th>Difference in respect of age distribution</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4.2.1.</td>
<td>Do you speak…?</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+ (Northeast region)</td>
<td>+ (Northeast region)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.2.2.</td>
<td>Do you speak the same way as ...?</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+ (Western Transdanubian region)</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.2.3.</td>
<td>Do you think it will survive …?</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+ (on the Hungarian research points of the regions in question)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.2.4.</td>
<td>Would you mind if it ceased to exist…?</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.2.5.1.</td>
<td>Do you like..?</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.2.5.2.</td>
<td>Do people speak more beautifully here than.?</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1. The role of the independent variables in the examination of linguistic mentality in UMNyA. (+ relevant, - irrelevant)

- Factors behind the attitudes differ beyond their role in a given speech community in the way their importance changes depending on the interview question in the same community. For instance, while interviewees responded – disapproving my hypothesis – in an unanimously positive way for the question inquiring the likeability of their own vernacular both in Western Transdanibia and in Burgenland, when measuring the likeability compared to other villages the attitudes were much more unfavorable.
- This is true not only for questions inquiring similar phenomena. Table 2. shows important differences in dominant attitudes in correlation with the nature of the interview questions broken down onto the level of the communities.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Chapter</th>
<th>Burgenland</th>
<th>Hungary (Western Transdanubia)</th>
<th>Hungary (North-east)</th>
<th>Transcarpathia</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4.2.1.</td>
<td>Do you speak…?</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>- (shame-feeling/self-surrendering)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.2.5.2.</td>
<td>Do people speak more beautifully here than.?</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Among the four speech communities it is the interviewees from Burgenland who undertake the dialectal nature of their community’s and of their own speech (see Chapter 4.2.1.). The proportion of ‘yes’ is 87.5% compared to 23.33% and 60%. This percentage, although presumably the result of more than one factors, bear witness to positive attitudes, despite the well-known situation of the language. Surprisingly, interviewees gave quite positive answers regarding emotional attachment (see Chapter 4.2.4.) and the prognosis about the future of the dialects (see Chapter 4.2.3). Among the answers that express regret over the disappearance of dialects it is Burgenland where we got the highest percentages (96.8%). Attitudes towards the situative roles of dialects (see 4.2.2) cannot be deducted with complete certainty due to reasons presented in Chapter 4.1., but the high percentage of the answer ‘not the same way’ could be possibly best explained by the presence of the shame-feeling/self-surrendering attitude, which is connected to the so called function separation and stigmatization. As for the liking index, knowing the zero results of the Northeast region, the ratio of the denying answers is remarkable (3,4% in the Western Transdanubia region and 8,4% in Burgenland) (see 4.2.5.1). The likening index that compares with the neighboring villages shows a somewhat more unfavorable attitude: 33,4% of the evaluable responses of the interviewees claims that people do not speak in a more beautiful way in their home village than in the neighboring communities (see 4.2.5.2).

Results are not less interesting on the Hungarian side of the Western Transdanubian region. Although the respondents present a more positive attitude towards the undertaking of dialects (see Chapter 4.2.1.), and attitude favoring dialects and taking a stance against standard is typical in public spaces (see Chapter 4.2.2.), regarding the survival of dialects these respondents were the most pessimistic among every researched community, with the exception of the elderly and middle-aged respondents every age-group showed negative attitudes (see Chapter 4.2.3.). In contrast, it shows a favoring attitude that although majority of the respondents is convinced about the disappearance of their own dialect, vast majority of them would feel sorry for this occurrence (see Chapter 4.2.4). Beside the fact that the number of ‘yes’ answers is slightly higher, the number of respondents who do not speak ‘the same way’ in public space is soaring.
high, similarly to the speech community of Burgenland. In connection with the high proportion of stigmatization this means the strong presence of shame-feeling/self-surrendering attitude here, too. As for the liking index –just like in Burgenland– I received more positive results than I had expected (see Chapter 4.2.5.1.), yet compared to the neighboring villages the results are more negative here, too, and thus concordant with earlier research results (see Chapter 4.2.5.2).

It was the respondents from the Northeast dialect region who undertake the dialect nature of their communities in the lowest proportion (23,33%), yet, a great amount of hidden prestige can be extrapolated from the fact that I recorded positive attitudes in relation with all the other questions and experienced similar stance during the interviews. In public spaces, it is general to be holding to the vernacular and having an defensive attitude that is hostile towards the standard variety, most of the respondents would feel regret losing this dialect. It is telling that I did not record any answers that would reveal any kinds of dislike towards the vernacular (see Chapters 4.2.2., 4.2.3., 4.2.4., 4.2.5.1.). Because of the high number of irrelevant answers, liking index compared to the neighboring villages could not be assessed.

It is the respondents from Transcarpathia who show the most stably positive attitudes towards their vernacular – almost every interview questions and other independent variables support this claim. Two-third of the respondents gave the answer ‘yes’ to the question ‘Do people speak dialect in this village?’, which suggests that it is proud dialectal identity and a strong sense of regional identity that plays a central role (see Chapter 4.2.1.). Although the number of ‘yes’ answers is slightly higher, there is a quite big number of ‘no’ answers in this community, too (40% of the total answers). In my view, though, this has completely different motivations than that of the Northeast research points: in this case, negative answers were supposed to express the irreproachableness, the ‘utter cleanness’ of the vernacular, which signifies the Hungarian identity of the speakers. It is also possible that the negative answers of the Transcarpathian respondents root in some kind of reactions to the prescriptive approach (see Chapter 4.2.1.). Another possible explanation –which is in concordance with the research results from Transcarpathia– is that respondents are not aware of the regional peculiarities of their language variety (see for instance BERECSZÁSZI–MÁRKU 2003: 197). In bearing with situative language usage, the typical attitude is one that is protective towards the vernacular and aversive to the standard (see 4.2.2.). As for the liking index and the ideas about the future of the dialects, it is also the remarkably positive attitudes that dominate the answers (see Chapters 4.2.3., 4.2.4., 4.2.5.1., 4.2.5.2.).

- **Data also proves that it is worth devoting attention to the correlation analysis of the individual answers.** Though no relevant relation emerged that covered every communities (my hypotheses were proven true partially, relating to individual speech communities or to certain groups within these communities), my results contributed to the confirmation and modulation of the ideas of Chapter 4.3.
  - In the Hungarian speech communities, there is no relevant relation between disapproving remarks and stigmatization of one’s dialectal speech and their linguistic behavior in public spaces. **My hypothesis was proven true in relation with Burgenland and partly with the Transcarpathian community** (see Chapter 4.3.1.)
  - Disapproving remarks and stigmatization of dialectal speakers’ language variety did not influence unfavorably the estimation of the assumed extinction of dialects. **My hypothesis has been proven true in relation with the most stigmatized group of the Transcarpathian speakers** (more than a third of the respondents) (see Chapter 4.3.2.). The attitude about the disappearance of their own vernacular of the Transcarpathian
respondents – who showed positive attitudes towards their language variety with reference to almost all of the questions – seem to be influenced negatively by the disapproving remarks of their environment.

- **My preliminary hypothesis** – according to which those respondents who would report shaming behavior who have been disparaged for their dialectal speech at least once—was not proven true convincingly in any of the communities in question (see Chapter 4.3.3.)

- The most spectacular result of the correlation analyses is that many of respondents from Northeast Hungary would feel sorry for the disappearance of their vernacular who dissociate themselves from the local group of dialect speakers despite (!) the fact that they themselves speak a dialectal variety. This correlation indicates a great amount of hidden prestige of local variety in the region (see Chapter 4.2.1. and 4.3.4.). Those respondents from Transdanubia who would regret the disappearance of their own dialect in general undertake their dialectal speech. In Burgenland, with the exception of a few irrelevant answers every respondent undertakes it and would feel sorry for the loss of it, yet in Transcarpathia the regretful answers are strongly distributed depending on whether the respondent associate themselves with their own dialectal speech, or that of their immediate surroundings.

- Contrasting the questions *Do people speak in dialects in this village?* and *Do you like the way people speak here?* also exemplified the great extent of hidden positive attitudes of the respondents in the Northeast region (see Chapters 4.3.5.). The proportion of the respondents who undertake their dialect speech and at the same time express approval of their vernacular is 40% in Transcarpathia, 60% in Western Transdanubia and 70% in Burgenland.

- Data collected in the course of the ÚMNyA-interviews usually confirmed the results of earlier studies investigating the attitudes of communities in question, however, I found examples for the opposite case, too. For instance, questions that assess the liking index of the speakers in different ways brought different results (see Chapters 4.2.5.1. and 4.2.5.2.) – which sometimes coincide with previous results, sometimes do not. Knowing the data, it is interesting that while respondents – refuting my hypothesis – gave univocally positive answers to the previous question assessing the liking index of their own vernacular in general, regarding the question that involves comparison with other village it was the negative attitudes that surfaced in the Western region – as one could have expected based on previous literature.

**Summary, outlook**

My research is based on the comparison of the language usage of four – linguistically and otherwise very heterogenous – speech communities belonging to two dialectal regions and containing indigenous minority communities from a (socio)dialectal perspective. It is primarily its unusual approach with which my work enriches the heterogeneous literature of linguistic change and contributes to a more profound understanding of processes of linguistic change. For example, my study can be considered unusual for the diversity of the examined communities and in many cases for the point of view and the methods of its data analysis. My analysis enriches the small body of Hungarian comparative dialectological literature, which so far only comprises of the analysis of two-two villages (see: P. Lakatos–T.
KÁROLY 2001, KISS 2011, SÁNDOR 2014). As a real-time study, it connects ‘past and present’, while thanks to its corpus, which can be tied to respondents and is stratified according to age, it connects ‘present and future’ (see NAHKOLA–SAANILAHTI 2004: 75). It is a ‘far-sighted study’, which opens up roads that lead forward and which has the stressed endorsement of ‘social and human points of view that show through territoriality’ as its task, besides ‘assuring immersion in diachrony’ (BOKOR 2007: 48). The possibility of interregional comparison is also an important outcome of the attitude-survey carried through in the framework of ÜMNyA-research.

According to the results of the morphological change study, the morphological dialectal phenomena of the dialects have been greatly repressed in the last fifty-sixty years, though a majority of them is still recordable. The distribution of the varieties often differs in the extent of the change, in the spatial dimension of the boundaries of the phenomena, in the frequency of occurrence, and even in relation of the regions or country borders. The number of phenomena that are getting obsolete –by having less than five item numbers– and that are shrinking spatially is highest in Western Transdanubia. In general, there are two phenomena –‘nákolás’ and ‘suksükölés’– that showed spatial and/or frequency expansion in almost every speech communities. The number of the phenomena that show distribution along the country borders is different, too. Linguistic movement is more intensive in the Western region: although differences on the two sides of the border have been balanced, there is a relatively high number of new differences that step into their place. In Northeast, the ratio is nearly the same, language usage shows a great extent of stability (also) in this sense. Similarly to the morphological results, attitudes of the speakers is different is several cases: they differ in relation with the regions, the border situation, and even with the nature of the research question. The most securely positive attitude can be found in Transcarpathia – there is a great amount of hidden prestige on the Hungarian side of the region, while from the point of view of the research questions, it is the attitudes of respondents living in the Western are that show diversity.

During the planning phase of my research I intended to analyze the corpus from a functional-cognitive perspective, too, yet in the course of the realization it became evident that the introduction of this point of view would have wedged the –already multidimensional– frame of the this linguistic description. This, therefore, remains the subject of a possible future study. My dissertation also owes the reader the processing of the lexical data of ÜMNyA from a cognitive point of view (see IGŁAI 2012, 2014). Also, a useful contribution to the results would be the processing of ÜMNyA’s questionnaire about grammaticality judgments and a more thorough analysis of attitudes, which goes down to the individual level of choosing language varieties.
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