

SEMANTIC ASPECTS OF AUSTRALIAN- HUNGARIAN AND NEW ZEALAND- HUNGARIAN LANGUAGE CONTACT PHENOMENA

FORINTOS ÉVA

***Abstract:** This paper discusses how the written language (Hungarian) of a minority group (L1) functions outside its traditional setting in Central Europe, in environments where another language (L2) is used (English in Australia and New Zealand). They are intraregional language contact situations where Hungarian immigrants live among the English-speaking population of the relevant country. The two languages involved are genealogically non-related and structural-typologically non-identical languages.*

The aim of the paper is to carry out research to study the lexical contact phenomena in which Standard Hungarian and Australian Hungarian and New Zealand Hungarian differ, e.g., what lexical items are present in Australian Hungarian and New Zealand Hungarian that are not part of Standard Hungarian as the result of the influence of the English language.

***Key words:** language contact, written corpus, ethnic press, lexical borrowing, semantic loans*

Introduction

This paper investigates how the written language (Hungarian – L1) of two minority groups functions outside its traditional setting in Central Europe in an environment where another language is used (English in Australia and New Zealand – L2). The two languages involved are genealogically non-related and possess typologically non-identical language structures. They are intraregional language contact situations where Hungarian immigrants live among the dominant language(s)-speaking population of Australia and New Zealand.

This study of lexical contact phenomena reveals differences between Standard Hungarian (SH) and Australian Hungarian (AuH) as well as New Zealand Hungarian (NZH) as a result of the influence of the English language on the aforementioned Hungarian community languages. This research focuses on the loanshifts found in the corpora with special regard to semantic extensions, where the SH word form is used

with the meaning of an English word. The scope of the present paper is confined to the qualitative survey of the corpora.

Standard Hungarian is represented by the Hungarian National Corpus (HNC) created by the Department of Corpus Linguistics of the Research Institute for Linguistics of the Hungarian Academy of Sciences under the supervision of Váradi (2002; see also Sass, 2009). HNC includes 187.6 million words. It is divided into five subcorpora by regional language variants; and five subcorpora by text genres: press, literature, science, official and personal, which is highly similar to spoken communication in particular cases (http://corpus.nytud.hu/mnsz/index_eng.html).

Data and Method

Scholarly literature provides convincing evidence that in the field of language contact research spoken data have always been considered superior to written data, although examples of both spoken and written language mixing have been identified since the beginning of humankind. Kurtböke (1998) also criticises the tendency of contact linguistic researchers in neglecting to investigate written language since the advent of this field of linguistic research. The lack of interest in studying written language to gain wider knowledge on languages in contact stimulated the author to investigate the subject. Additionally, in contact linguistic research, the study of written discourse is of fundamental importance in the 21st century.

Engwall (cited in Kurtböke, 1998) suggests among others that newspaper texts provide an adequate basis for a linguistic study of general language use – as do literary or specialised texts. If newspapers in general can offer a solid basis for linguistic studies, then community newspapers of minority groups of different countries are especially suitable for this function. Since the language of Hungarian migrants in New Zealand – unlike that of their counterparts in the United States of America, Australia, Canada and the United Kingdom as well as the language(s) of Hungarian minorities in the Carpathian Basin – has not been the subject of comprehensive research (cf. Csernicskó, 1998; Fenyvesi, 1995; Fenyvesi, 2005; Forintos, 2009; 2011; 2012; 2008a; 2008b; 2008c; Forintos & Szentgyörgyi, 2012; 2014; Göncz, 1999; Hatoss, 2004; Kontra, 1990; Kovács, 2005; Lanstyák, 2000), this study employs the corpus of written language samples taken from the Australian-Hungarian community's solitary weekly published newspaper titled *Magyar Élet* (MÉ) (issues of 2000 and 2001). Additional sources include the 2010 and 2011 issues of *Magyar Szó* (MSz), which is the on-line bulletin of the Hungarian community in New Zealand.

Forintos, É. (2015). Semantic aspects of Australian-Hungarian and New Zealand-Hungarian Language Contact Phenomena. *Topos 4*(1), 107-120.

The author's coding scheme creates simplified information for easier comprehension of the research. It can be interpreted in the following sequence: 2000 (year of publication), 1 (issue number).

The Ethnic Press

Based on Clyne's work (1991), it can be stated that the number of community language publications tends to decrease. Circulation is frequently dependent on new immigration waves. The newspapers are the only major privately financed community language institution. They present material in varying proportions on homeland and international events including local news, especially from the multicultural scene and the relevant ethnic communities. Some of the newspapers – including *Hungarian Life (Magyar Élet)* as well as *Hungarian Word (Magyar Szó)* – reprint articles from overseas newspapers. This helps readers maintain and develop vocabulary and structures, often introducing them to neologisms reflecting socioeconomic, political and technological change in the country of origin. Some newspapers are written, consciously or unconsciously, in a variety of the language which represents its state at the time of the group's migration. Clyne (1991) draws attention to the fact that “some editors see themselves as guardians of standards, which they sometimes apply with vigorous purism. Advertisements and letters to the editor better reflect the varieties of the community language employed by most speakers in Australia” (p. 146).

Results and Discussion

The process known as borrowing means a kind of import of form or structure from one language system into another, items effected by the process are called *transfers*, *loans*, or *borrowings* and the languages involved are generally referred to – depending on their roles – as *donor* and *recipient* languages (cf. Haugen, 1950; Weinreich, 1953). According to Matras (2009) it is commonly acknowledged that the origin of borrowing is found in the sporadic use of second-language incorporations in the speech of bilinguals. Matras (2009, p. 146) however, criticises the term *borrowing* stating that

borrowing typically leads to the long-term incorporation of an item into the inventory of the recipient language. [...] Not only is there no intention to return the ‘borrowed’ item to its rightful ‘owner’, but for most speakers its original ‘ownership’ may not always be traceable.

He introduces the term *replication* in order

to capture even more closely the fact that we are dealing not with issues of ownership or even direct imitation or duplication, but rather with the activity of employing an item, in context, in order to achieve a communicative goal. (p. 146)

By *replication* he means “the replication of a linguistic system, of any kind, in a new, extended set of contexts, understood to be negotiated in a different ‘language’” (p. 146). Matras basically denotes the replication of ‘linguistic *matter*,’ which is “concrete, identifiable sound-shapes of words and morphs. Linguistic matter has certain properties that distinguish it from the mode of organising units of speech or *pattern*” (p. 146). Additionally, he mentions that

a matter-unit is a complex unit. It has a phonological form, a meaning (whether lexical or grammatical), and a distinct status as an item in the lexicon, with implications for inflectional potential and positioning within the sentence. The process of replication may affect any one of these dimensions: phonology, meaning or morphology and morpho-syntactic status [...] The phonological adaptation of the word-forms illustrates the potential implications of a process of context-bound *replication*: far from entailing just plain ‘copying,’ it is open to modifications, adaptations and changes. (p. 148)

Consequently, matter units are concrete phonological units and are more easily identifiable as belonging to certain subsets of the repertoire. Speakers seem to be more conscious of their selection of linguistic matter units. Matras, however, adds that he does not abandon the term *borrowing*. He makes mention of the fact that Johanson (2002) favours the term *copying* for borrowing because he is of the opinion that this term “emphasises the creative use of an item within the ‘recipient’ language” (p. 146).

Matras (2009, p. 147) suggests accepting a continuum of *bilingualism* in distinguishing bilingual and monolingual contexts, at the far end of which there is the elementary ability to interact in *foreign* contexts. When language users interact in new contexts and use new word-forms to accommodate predominantly to those contexts, some notion of bilingualism emerges, however basic. Consequently, Matras (2009, p. 147) proposes the modification of Thomason’s definition of borrowing, according to which borrowing is “the kind of interference that occurs when the process does not involve any effects of imperfect learning” (2001, pp. 67-68). He advocates covering, at least at the extreme end of the continuum, superficial communication of the kind. Such situations only present incomplete communicative occasions, still they constitute distinct and definitive interaction contexts. Word-forms that are at the

outset retained for these contexts of interaction with outsiders but are later reproduced in interaction with insiders may be considered as ‘borrowings’.

According to Winford (2003, pp. 29-59) lexical borrowing must be seen as one aspect of a creative process of lexical change under contact, which builds on both native and foreign resources. The results of linguistic interference on the level of lexis of the receptor-language are manifested in the form of lexical borrowings, mainly modelled on the donor language, and native creations. The process of borrowing can be very selective: adopting a foreign form but assigning it a new meaning, or adopting a foreign meaning or concept and assigning it to a native form. Many of the outcomes of lexical borrowing involve innovations or creations that have no counterpart in the donor language. Some of these innovations may be created out of donor materials, others may be created out of native materials, and still other creations are blends of native and foreign words.

According to Matras (2009, p. 153) borrowing can usually be explained on one of the following assumptions:

- (1) The degree of borrowing is related to the extent of exposure to the language contact,
- (2) The outcome of language contact is a product of the structural similarities and differences (congruence) among the languages concerned, and
- (3) Borrowability is conditioned by the inherent semantic-pragmatic or structural properties of the affected categories. Issues such as prestige and domain-specialisation of the languages typically fall under (1), while conjectures about functional ‘gaps’ as motivating factors fall under (2). An important question that has often been raised in discussion of borrowing is whether there are inherent differences in the likelihood of different word classes, categories, or types of morphemes to be affected by borrowing.

As it has been discussed above in the relevant literature, numerous definitions exist for the different types of direct and indirect loan. Linguists are not only incapable of arriving at an agreement about the dividing criteria of each term, but also the terminologies differ from each other to a great extent. Matras is of the opinion that

from the perspective of the speaker, borrowing involves a long-term or permanent licence to lift selection constraints on the use of a word-form or structure. Rather than serve in just a limited set of contexts, that word-form or structure now becomes available in a wider set of interaction contexts, perhaps with no limitation at all. (2009, p. 147)

Winford (2003, p. 42) analyses the different attempts made to establish a coherent framework for dealing with contact-induced changes in the lexicon. He states (2003, p. 42) that the “most comprehensive of the early frameworks may have been that of

Forintos, É. (2015). Semantic aspects of Australian-Hungarian and New Zealand-Hungarian Language Contact Phenomena. *Topos 4*(1), 107-120.

Betz (1949), whose basic distinction between loanword and loan-coinage still forms the basis for current descriptions,” and his very detailed and refined terminology describes word-borrowing in many aspects. According to Winford (2003, p. 43):

Haugen (1950a; 1950b; 1953) added a new dimension to existing classifications because he made distinction between importation and substitution – a dichotomy based on the presence or absence of foreignness markers (1950b). Importation refers to the adoption of a foreign form and/or its meaning, and may involve complete or partial imitation. Substitution refers to the process by which native sounds or morphemes are substituted for those in the donor model. Cases where a meaning or concept is borrowed, but expressed by a native form, are instances of morphemic substitution. Following Haugen (1953), lexical contact phenomena can be classified into two broad categories – *lexical borrowings*, which involve imitation of some aspect of the donor model, and *creations*, which are entirely native and have no counterpart in the donor language.

Winford (2003, p. 43) subdivides lexical borrowings into two categories: loanwords and loanshifts: “There are *loanwords*, in which all or part of the morphemic composition of the loan derives from the external source language.” In other words, ‘loanword’ refers to the total morphemic importation of single or compound words. These elements show no morphological substitutions, but they do show degrees of phonological substitutions. Winford (2003, p. 43) states that “Loanwords may be divided into two categories: ‘pure loanwords,’”; for example, *Drive* (MÉ/2000/1), *ELECTION* (MÉ/2001/42), *Global Summit of Hungarians* (MSz/2011/104), *Hungarian Historians* (MSz/2011/104), *Hungarian Register* (MSz/2011/104), *Honorary Consul-General* (MSz/2011/104), *Consulate of the Republic of Hungary* (MSz/2011/104), *Heaton Intermediate School* (MSz/2012/106), *Papanui High School* (MSz/2012/106), and “loanblends” (Winford, 2003, p. 43). Loanblends are combinations of L1 material with L2 material; e.g., they involve transferring a component of the foreign model and the reproduction of the remainder (importation of a foreign morpheme combined with substitution of a native one). Examples of such ‘hybrids’ include (a) derivational blends: imported stem + native affix; for example, *Armyban* (MÉ/2000/36) (*army-INE*), *Avenue-ről* (MÉ/2000/8) (*avenue-DEL*), *Bay-be* (MÉ/2001/22) (*bay-ILL*), *Conductive Education-ből* (MSz/2011/102) (*conductive education-ELA*), *Guinness Book of Records-ba* (MSz/2010/100) (*GBofR-ILL*), *Charities Commissiontól* (MSz/2010/99) (*CC-ADE*), *intermediate-ből* (MSz/2012/106) (*intermediate-ELA*), *College-ről* (MSz/2012/106) (*college-DEL*); or native stem + imported affix (no example found in the corpus) and (b) compound blends: imported stem + native stem; for example, *csirkerağout*

Forintos, É. (2015). Semantic aspects of Australian-Hungarian and New Zealand-Hungarian Language Contact Phenomena. *Topos 4*(1), 107-120.

(MÉ/2001/4) (*chickenragu*). Loanblends – and many other products – are not strictly speech borrowings, but innovations that have no counterparts in the source language.

Furthermore, “there are *loanshifts*” (also called *loan meanings*)

in which the morphemic composition of the item is entirely native, though its meaning derives at least in part from the donor language. Each of these categories can be further subdivided, according to the types of importation and substitution involved. (Winford, 2003, p. 43)

Loanshifts do not actually include surface-level alien morphemes, but instead influence L1 material. They can be divided into the following subtypes. When a native word undergoes extension of its meaning on the model of a foreign counterpart, these are cases of ‘extensions’ or ‘semantic loans.’ For example, *regisztrált* (építész) (MÉ/2000/1) (registered /builder/) (vs. SH *bejegyzett/engedéllyel rendelkező*). The Hungarian verb *regisztrál* (to register) means ‘to record, to make a record of something.’ Here its meaning is extended and used instead of the Hungarian verb *bejegyez* (to recognize) on the basis of the meaning of the English verb ‘to register’ meaning qualified by formal, official, or legal certification or authentication.

Winford states that “loanshifts may take the form of ‘pure loan translations’ or calques in which the foreign model is replicated exactly by native words” (Winford, 2003, p. 43); for example: *hivatalos órák* (*office hours*) (MÉ/2000/12), (vs. SH *félfogadás, fogadóóra*); *dupla szobák* (*double bedrooms*) (MÉ/2001/6), (vs. SH *kétágyas szobák*); *a csárda kapacitásig megtelt* (*house filled to capacity*) (MSz/2010/100), (vs. SH *teltház*); *komissió nélkül vállalt munkáját* (*done without commission*) (MSz/2010/100), (vs. SH *megbízás/megrendelés nélkül, önként végzett munka*).

Winford (2003, p. 44) asserts that: “creative word formation involving imported items is another by-product of lexical borrowing, which Haugen includes in his category of ‘native creations.’” ‘Pure native creations’ means innovative use of native words to express foreign concepts; for example, *hétfégi magyar iskolákban* (weekend Hungarian schools) (MÉ/2001/20); *vegyeskultúrájú ...* (fesztiválja) (multicultural festival) (MÉ/2000/6) (vs. SH *sokkultúrájú, multikulturális*). ‘Hybrid creations’ are blends of native and foreign morphemes to express foreign concepts, for example, *Microwave sütő* (microwave oven) (MÉ/2000/1), (vs SH *mikrohullámú sütő*); *special áraink* (special price) (MÉ/2001/4), (vs. SH *kedvezményes ár*); *potluck ebéd* (*potluck lunch*), (MSz/2010/101) (vs. SH *batyus bál/ebéd*); *lonely magyarok* (lonely Hungarians), (MSz/2010/100) (vs. SH *magányos, elhagyatott*).

Winford (2003, pp. 42-43), with his abovementioned classification, expanded Haugen’s category of ‘native creations’ to include a third subcategory: “creations using only foreign morphemes,” which was not included in Haugen’s classification.

Haugen's divisions are not often observed today as most discussions refer only interchangeably to either 'borrowings' or 'loanwords' instead; although loan translations or calques are recognised. What Haugen called semantic borrowings are generally subsumed under the rubric of convergence (Myers-Scotton, 2002; 2006). When considering the different lexical borrowings, in this study Winford's (2003, p. 42-43) classification is observed because it supports the research more accurately.

In what follows, the linguistic manifestations called semantic loans or semantic extensions are provided. Their existence proves that the countries' dominant language has an influence on the minority community language. Since the scope of the present paper is confined to the qualitative analysis of the data, the list is not exhaustive.

(1) politikai **hozzáállásánál** (MSz/2011/104) (political attitude) (vs. SH politikai hovatarozás)

Your affiliation can indicate the connection or involvement that you have with a political, religious, etc., organization, which is your *politikai hovatarozás* in Hungarian. Your attitude, however, can express the opinions and feelings that you usually conceal, which is your *politikai hozzáállás, állásfoglalás*. The given context refers to the political affiliation rather than the attitude of a person so the Hungarian equivalent of the word 'affiliation' should have been used.

(2) értékes **hozzájárulásukért** (MSz/2011/104) (vs. SH közreműködé-sükért)

(3) **hozzájárulása** (... a tanácskozási) (MÉ/2001/5) (vs. SH részt vesz a vitában/hozzászól a vitához)

The English word 'contribution' can mean something that you give or do in order to help something be successful; the Hungarian equivalent of this meaning is *közreműködés*. Also, it can denote an amount of money that you give in order to help pay for something with the Hungarian meaning *hozzájárulás*. Examples 2 and 3 designate meetings and discussions; consequently, the Hungarian term *közreműködés* is to be used.

(4) **megoszthatjuk** közös ügyeinket (MSz/2011/104) (vs. SH részt vállal, vesz vmiben)

The English word 'share' has meanings inclusive of 'to have or use something with other people' and 'to divide something between two or more people' as well as 'to have equal responsibility for doing something, paying for something.' The Hungarian word *megoszt*, however, carries only the first two meanings mentioned above; the meaning 'to take part in, to take a hand in something' is not included in the Hungarian

definitions. Example 4, accordingly, comprises the extension of the English verb ‘to share.’

(5) egymás lehetőségeiről és **hiányairól** (MSz/2011/104) (vs. SH hiányosság, gyengeség, nehézség)

In example 5 the Hungarian word *hiány* (lack, deficiency) is used, within this context nonetheless, its synonyms (*hiányosság*, *nehézség*) ‘hardship’ and ‘difficulty’ are more appropriate terms because the context refers to the opportunities and deficiencies of people not the lack of something. Since the term ‘deficiency’ can denote both meaning, the extension of this word can be identified here.

(6) **fedőt** ajánlottak föl bajbajutott [...] családnak (MSz/2011/103) (vs. SH fedél, menedék)

The semantic extension of the word ‘cover’ found in example 6 can be interpreted to mean: protection, i.e., ‘something that is put on top of something else to protect on the one hand (*fedő* in Hungarian), or shelter, i.e., ‘a small building or covered place which is made to protect from bad weather, attack or danger’ (*fedél* in Hungarian). The latter definition of the Hungarian word *fedél* is the most accurate interpretation within this particular context.

(7) egy **hétköznapi** új-zélandi (MSz/2011/103) (vs. SH átlagos)

In standard Hungarian, the word *hétköznapi* (everyday), in addition to its explicit meaning, carries negative connotation, e.g., below average, imperfect, second-rate. The English word ‘everyday’ – among its several definitions – can include the meaning ‘ordinary’ (*átlagos* in Hungarian) referring to ordinary people (e.g., ordinary New Zealanders), who are average people portraying indistinguishable qualities. Since example 7 refers to the latter interpretation, the term *átlagos* should have been used.

(8) akik **hozzáférhetőségét** (MSz/2011/103) (vs. SH elérhetőségét)

The English equivalents of the Hungarian term *hozzáférhetőség* found in example 8 include ‘accessibility,’ ‘availability’ and ‘approachability,’ which basically refers to physical approachability. The word ‘availability’ can also denote the availability of someone who is not busy and is therefore free to talk to you or to do a particular task, the Hungarian equivalent of which can be *elérhetőség*. However, the meaning of the word *elérhetőség* has been added to recently and its definition can now also refer to contact details of a person, e.g., email address and telephone number. The context of the word discussed above clearly refers to the personal details of someone; therefore, the Hungarian word *elérhetőség* would be the suitable term.

(9) a magyar nyelv **különbözőségéről** (MSz/2010/100) (vs. SH változatairól)

In the case of example 9, the English word ‘diversity’ has to be considered. The diversity of something is the fact that it contains different elements, i.e., variety; and diversity is also a range of things which are very different from one another, i.e., difference. The Hungarian word *különbözőség* (difference) is used in example 9; the context, however, refers to the varieties, i.e., *változatai* of the Hungarian language.

(10) elhangzott **tanulmány** (MSz/2010/100) (vs. SH előadás)

The Hungarian noun *tanulmány* means a scientific piece of writing on a particular subject made by someone who has thoroughly investigated the topic. Its English equivalent ‘(research) paper’ can also include a talk, a presentation, i.e., *előadás* in Hungarian, on a certain subject. Accordingly, in example 10 the semantic extension of the English word ‘paper’ can be identified.

(11) kápolna **kibővítést** épített (MSz/2010/100) (vs. SH épület toldalék, hozzáépítés)

It can be surmised that the definition of the English term ‘extension’ was incorrectly chosen as the equivalent translation of the Hungarian term *hozzáépítés*. In English an extension is a new room or building which is added to an existing building or group of buildings the Hungarian equivalent of which is *hozzáépítés*. Also an extension can mean a development of something that includes or affects additional people, things or activities, e.g., extension of a firm, i.e., *bővítés*, *kibővítés* in Hungarian. Since the context includes the extension of a chapel, the Hungarian term *hozzáépítés* is the most precise term.

(12) (Kor,) **méret** (MÉ/2001/17) (vs. SH alak, testalkatú, testmagasság)

The Hungarian word *méret* (size) generally means the size of a shoe, or clothes. As opposed to this, the English word *size* can mean the build, volume, or extent of the body, object or phenomena. In this case, the Hungarian definition of *méret* has been appended to mean ‘appearance’, as derived from the English definition of ‘size.’

(13) **külső** (vagy státus) (MÉ/2001/17) (vs. SH megjelenés, külső)

The Hungarian word *külső* (appearance) is generally used to describe the style of a production (e.g., writing, a book). In the context exemplified above, however, it refers to the appearance of a person, to which its meaning does not extend. The selection of the Hungarian noun must have been triggered by the English noun ‘appearance,’ which can denote both people and objects.

(14) **direkt** (Budapestre) (MÉ/2000/1) (vs. SH közvetlenül Budapestre)

- (15) **Direkt** (telefon) (MÉ/2001/5) (vs. SH közvetlen telefon)
- (16) **direkt** (buszjárat) (MÉ/2000/3) (vs. SH közvetlen (megállás nélküli) buszjárat)
- (17) **egyenesen** (a gyártótól) (MÉ/2001/24) (vs. SH közvetlenül a gyártótól)
- (18) **Egyenesen** (a gyárból) (MÉ/2000/29) (vs. SH közvetlenül a gyárból)
- (19) **egyenesen** (Budapestről) (MÉ/2000/41) (vs. SH közvetlenül Budapestről)
- (20) **egyenesen** (a bankszámlájára) (MÉ/2001/25) (vs. SH közvetlenül a bankszámlájára)

The English word ‘direct(ly)’ gives the semantic background to examples (14) – (20). The Hungarian word *direkt* (direct) generally means ‘on purpose.’ In the contexts given above its meaning is extended on the basis of the English word ‘direct(ly)’ and it is used where the Hungarian word *közvetlen(ül)* (direct [ly]) is preferred. The adverb *egyenesen* (directly) is synonymous with *közvetlenül* (directly) and could be accepted in examples (17) – (20) but the adverb *közvetlenül* is more preferable.

- (21) **speciális** áron (MÉ/2000/1) (vs. SH kedvezményes ár)
- (22) **Speciális** [...] ebéd (MÉ/2000/16) (vs. SH különleges ebéd)
- (23) **speciális** különjárat (MÉ/2000/30) (vs. SH különjárat (pl. különvonat))
- (24) **különleges** árak (MÉ/2000/29) (vs. SH kedvezményes ár)

The semantic extension of the Hungarian adjective *speciális* (special) can be found in examples (21) – (22). The Hungarian word *speciális* means that something is different from the ordinary (e.g., unique), but does not necessarily mean that something is extraordinary. If it is used with the word *price*, it is not associated with reduced (discount) price. Example (23) is an instance of tautology because the word for word equivalent of *speciális különjárat* is *special special train*. In example (23) one of the Hungarian equivalents of the word ‘special’ is given but it is not suitable for the context. Although one possible meaning of the word *special* is the word given in example (24), it does not convey the required meaning.

Conclusion

In conclusion, it can be construed that the newspapers of the Hungarian minority communities within Australia and New Zealand presented and used as corpus in this research paper most definitely constitute semantic extensions. *Magyar Élet*, Australia’s Hungarian community weekly print newspaper, and *Magyar Szó*, the

Forintos, É. (2015). Semantic aspects of Australian-Hungarian and New Zealand-Hungarian Language Contact Phenomena. *Topos 4*(1), 107-120.

online digital bulletin of the Hungarian population in New Zealand are but one form of the respective communities' written language. Semantic extensions are linguistic manifestations occurring when a native word's definition is appended with a new meaning based on the model of a foreign counterpart.

Although linguistic manifestations of this category are the product of English language influences, they can be regarded as a constituent of a minority community's language maintenance efforts as they circumvent utilizing an English word as a pure loanword within their vocabulary. Alternatively, a Hungarian word with an appended definition is utilized and the reader of the text must interpret the correct meaning according to its context. The providence of a word's meaning will thus rely on its continuance, metamorphosis and contextual interpretation.

References:

- Akadémiai MoBiMouse Plus Angol-magyar, Magyar-angol Akadémiai Nagyszótár CD-Rom* (2003). Budapest. Akadémiai Kiadó.
- Clyne, M. G. (1991). *Community languages – The Australian experience*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Csernicskó, I. (1998). *A magyar nyelv Ukrajnában (Kárpátalján)*. Budapest: Osiris/MTA Kisebbségkutató Műhely.
- Csernicskó, I. (2005). Hungarian in Ukraine. In A. Fenyvesi (Ed.), *Hungarian language contact outside Hungary* (pp. 89-131). Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Company.
- Fenyvesi, A. (1995). Language contact and language death in an immigrant language: The case of Hungarian. *University of Pittsburgh Working Papers in Linguistics 3*, 1-117.
- Fenyvesi, A. (2005). *Hungarian language contact outside Hungary*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Company.
- Forintos, É. & Szentgyörgyi, Sz. (2014). Language contact phenomena in the written language of the Hungarian community in the United Kingdom. In P. P. Chruszczewski (editor-in-chief), J. R. Rickford (honorary editor), K. Buczek, A. R. Knapik & J. Mianowski (editors), *Languages in Contact*. Vol. 1. (pp. 61-79). Wyższa Szkoła Filologiczna we Wrocławiu & Polska Akademia Nauk, Oddział we Wrocławiu, Wrocław.
- Forintos, É. & Szentgyörgyi, Sz. (2012). Linguistic manifestations of language contact: A case study. In Navracsics J. & Szabó D. (eds.), *Mental procedures in language processing. Studies in Psycholinguistics 3* (pp. 301-305). Budapest: Tinta Kiadó.

Forintos, É. (2015). Semantic aspects of Australian-Hungarian and New Zealand-Hungarian Language Contact Phenomena. *Topos* 4(1), 107-120.

Forintos, É. (2011). The language use of the Hungarian communities in Canada and South Africa. In Balogné Bérces, et al. (eds.) *HUSSE10-Linx. Proceedings of the HUSSE 10 Conference* (pp. 115–119). Piliscsaba: Institute of English and American Studies, Faculty of Humanities, PPCU.

Forintos, É. (2009). The status of the Hungarian as a community language in Australia: The private sphere vs. the public sphere. In Moldovan R. & Petrar P. (eds.), *Proceedings of the international conference „Constructions of identity V”* (pp. 111-119). Kolozsvár: Editura Napoca-Star.

Forintos, É. (2008a). Can code-switching be triggered by the principle of relevance theory? *Bulletin of the Transylvania University of Brasov* 1(50). Series IV. Socio-Humanistic Sciences (pp.55-60).

Forintos, É. (2008b). On the derivational and inflectional morphology of Australian-Hungarian language contact phenomena. In *Papers from the thirtieth annual meeting of the Atlantic Provinces Linguistic Association Conference (PAMAPLA 30)* (pp. 42-47). Halifax (Kanada).

Forintos, É. (2008c). *Aspects of language ecology: English-Hungarian language contact phenomena in Australia*. Veszprém: University of Pannonia Press.

Göncz, L. (1999). A magyar nyelv Jugoszláviában. Budapest/Újvidék: Osiris/MTA Kisebbségkutató Műhely/Forum Könyvkiadó.

Hatoss, A. (2004). Identity formation, cross-cultural attitudes and language maintenance in the Hungarian Diaspora of Queensland. In L. Kerr (ed.), *Cultural citizenship: Challenges of globalisation* (pp.71-77). Melbourne: Deakin University.

<http://corpus.nytud.hu/mnsz>. (August 4, 2014)

<http://dictionary.reverso.net/english-cobuild/>

<http://www.ldoceonline.com/>

Kontra, M. (1990). Fejezetek a South Bend-i magyar nyelvhasználatból. Budapest: MTA Nyelvtudományi Intézete.

Kontra, M. (ed.). (1991). *Tanulmányok a határainkon túli kétnyelvűségről*. Budapest: Magyarágkutató Intézet.

Kovács, M. (2005). Hungarian in Australia. In A. Fenyvesi (Ed.), *Hungarian language contact outside Hungary* (pp. 319-350). Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Company.

Lanstyák, I. (2000). A magyar nyelv Szlovákiában. Budapest-Pozsony: Osiris Kiadó-Kalligramm Könyvkiadó - MTA Kisebbségkutató Műhely.

Matras, Y. (2009). *Language contact (Cambridge textbooks in linguistics)*. Cambridge University Press.

Myers-Scotton, C. (2002). *Contact linguistics, bilingual encounters and grammatical outcomes*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Forintos, É. (2015). Semantic aspects of Australian-Hungarian and New Zealand-Hungarian Language Contact Phenomena. *Topos* 4(1), 107-120.

Myers-Scotton, C. (2006). *Multiple voices – An introduction to bilingualism*. Malden/Oxford/Carlton: Blackwell Publishing.

Random House Webster's electronic dictionary and thesaurus. College Edition Version 1.0 Copyright (1992). Reference Software International.

Sass, B. (2009). "Mazsola" – eszköz a magyar igék bővítményszerkezetének vizsgálatára. In Váradi, T. (ed.), *Válogatás az I. Alkalmazott Nyelvészeti Doktorandusz Konferencia előadásaiból* (pp.117-129). Budapest: MTA Nyelvtudományi Intézet. Retrieved from: <http://corpus.nytud.hu/mazsola>

Thomason, S. G. (2001). *Language contact: An introduction*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.

Váradi, T. (2002). The Hungarian national corpus. In *Proceedings of the 3rd LREC conference* (pp. 385–389). Las Palmas. Spanyolország.

Weinreich, U. (1953). *Languages in contact: Findings and problems*. New York: Linguistic Circle.

Winford, D. (2003). *An introduction to contact linguistics*. Malden-Oxford-Melbourne-Berlin: Blackwell Publishing.

University of Pannonia, Veszprém