

**Eötvös Loránd University Faculty of Humanities**

**DOCTORAL DISSERTATION**

**Judit Gasparics**

**The language usage and dialects of the Hungarians of Muravidék**

**Linguistic Doctoral School**

Dr. Vilmos Bárdosi Csc. leader

**Hungarian Linguistic Doctoral Program**

**Sociolinguistic and Dialectologic Sub Program**

Dr. Gábor Tolcsvai-Nagy CMHAS. academic teacher, program leader

Chairman of the committee: Dr. Dezső Juhász Csc. academic teacher

Official judges: Dr. Erzsébet Zelliger Csc. ret. academic docent

Dr. Ottó Vörös Csc. ret. academic teacher

Further members of the committee:

Dr. N. Fodor János PhD. academic lecturer, secretary of the committee

Dr. Katalin Fodor PhD. ret. academic docent

Dr. Annamária Gróf (substitute member)

Dr. Csanád Bodó (substitute member)

**Subject leaders:**

Dr. Jenő Kiss MHAS. professor emeritus

Red. prof. dr. Anna Kolláth academic teacher

**Budapest, 2014**

## **1. The subject and aim of the thesis**

The subject of my thesis is a research on the usage and variants of Hungarian language by the Hungarians living at the Slovenian Muravidék. The framework of my research is provided by the situation of this bi- and multilingual Hungarian minority: living at the border of two countries, sharing multiple cultures, their linguistic habits and dialects. If we examine the past and present of our south-western neighbour, Slovenia, we will find that this is a multicultural area where the peaceful existence of different ethnicities living side by side is provided, and this in itself brought several changes related to lingual connections, culture and identity. For this reason it is a real challenge for a linguist to describe the lingual habits, dialects and the follow-up of switching between these languages in the multilingual Muravidék from a sociolinguistic aspect. It is vital from the aspect of the community to enhance the lingual awareness of the decreasing Hungarian minority, their connection with the Hungarian language and culture, furthermore to raise the prestige of the mother tongue, which is also the key for survival.

The aim of my research was to map the language preferences of the Hungarian community in Muravidék, to describe the languages and dialects and to survey the scenarios of language usage, with special attention to the degree of local dialects and the situation of bilingualism. With my questionnaire I tried to involve as many villages from among the settlements of the Lendva-region and Goricskó as possible – proportionately – into my research. I attempted to distribute the genders and age groups equally with stratified sampling.

## **2. The material and method of the thesis**

I performed the questionnaire-based survey in the bilingual region back in 2011 and 2012. During the period of the field work I also wrote a log with my daily subjective impressions, the opinion of various people, and specific phrases they used but that were unknown to me (passive observation).

My original plan was to do a general research on the Hungarian community of Muravidék by asking two male and two female subjects, separating them based on four separate age groups (16–24, 25–39, 40–64 and above 65). Based on this I would have worked with 16 people at each settlement. But some of the subjects declined me when being asked. There are multiple reasons for the rejection: the people living in Muravidék have been the subjects of various dialectologic, sociolinguistic and ethnographic researches throughout the

decades, to the extent of adapting linguistically (Bokor 2009: 57): they usually reply in a common dialect instead of their local dialect. Especially when they encounter a Hungarian market researcher. Some of their Hungarian registers are not sufficient enough to fill out long questionnaires, so they prefer the short test papers.

During the research 131 people participated altogether in nine locations – Domonkosfa/Domanjševci, Hodos/Hodoš, Szentlászló/Motvarjevci, Kapca/Kapca, Kót/Kot, Szerdahely/Središče, Göntérháza/Genterovci, Pártosafalva/Prosenjakovci and Dobronak/Dobrovnik.

The main increment of the gained corpus is the high voting rate in the villages of the Goricskó region. The previous researches exploring the living language were mainly focussed on the vicinity of Lendva, so we have relatively less data from the Slovenian Őrvidék. As far as I know, until now Penavin (1961; 1966), Bokor (2009), Guttmann (1994: 422–429) and the student Šanca (2013) did lexicological research in the areas of Goricskó, so this region has a lot to offer for any additional linguistic research, applying the views of diachrony and synchrony.

There were certain dialectologic and sociolinguistic preludes of my language questionnaire. Back in 2009 I did some field work for the *Új magyar nyelvjárási atlasz* (later on: ÚMNYA) at the only Slovenian research location, Kót, which is located in the Lendva region. I gained a new perspective from joining in to the ELDIA (*European Language Diversity for All*) FP7 project at the Hungarian Grammar and Literature Department, at the University of Maribor. During the first two years of the project (2010–2012) I took part in the preparation and recording of personal and focussed group interviews. While choosing perspectives I took the researches of Bokor (2009), Guttmann (1984: 59–69) and Kolláth (2005) into consideration. Furthermore, I used the aid of Lendva region's *Tájszójegyzék* (2006) and referred back to some of the works of Lanstyák (2000), Lanstyák and Szabómihály (1997), Kiss (2002: 47–57) and Bartha (2007: 79–114).

My questionnaire consists of ten parts, and contains complete and incomplete questions regarding the usage and function-based dispersion of the Hungarian and other languages, identity, attitudes, the frequency of locally used and borrowed words, lingual varieties and variations.

In the **First Part** I asked the sociological and sociolinguistic details like gender, mother tongue, nationality, religion, age, birth place, present address, highest degree and work place from the survey subjects.

The **Second Part** already went into the details of the language usage within the family, the choice of language between the grandparents, the code changes within and outside the family, the language used at social interaction and reading. The results can be altered by certain social factors like the generations living together, the residence of the grandparents, to which belonged separate questions.

The **Third Part** focussed on the language usage at school: the language(s) of education from nursery school until the university (being mono- and bilingual), completed with the level of spoken languages and providing the length of actually learning the language.

I asked the questions related to religion in the **Fourth Part**, and in the **Fifth Part** I did a research on the role of the languages while listening to the television, radio and reading the newspaper.

The **Sixth Part** discusses the complex relation between language, attitudes and identity, how the Hungarians identify themselves, as someone from Muravidék or from Slovenia; what they think of the native language and its speakers, and what the Slovenians might think of them. By understanding the stereotypes and attitudes towards the other ethnicity we can get closer to get a better understanding of each multilingual area and to demolish prejudice.

The **Seventh Part** reviews the usage of the language variations, starting at the private space to public space, so it asks the subjects about their choice of language – Hungarian common, vernacular, Slovenian or prekmurščina language, the latter being a local dialect of Slovenian in Muravidék – in various situations. At this part I was expecting a subjective judgement from the subjects about the local version of Hungarian in Muravidék, if they have preferred Hungarian, Slovenian or any other phrases; their thoughts about where Hungarian is spoken the nicest and what they think about the future of the Hungarian language.

In the **Eighth Part** I emphasised the research on lingual variants, which type of variations (f.e. *hosszúfalui: hosszúfalusi*) do the subjects prefer.

In the **Ninth Part**, based on questions selected from the *Új magyar nyelvjárási atlasz*, I explored the facts about the knowledge of local words turning active or passive, with special attention to the lexical similarities and differences between the various settlements.

The **Tenth Part** tried to obtain linguistic data from researching the frequency of lingual borrowing about the dynamics of bilingualism. The existence of borrowed words is due to the languages connecting with each other, the practical manifestation of this is actually the number of borrowed words and phrases in the vocabulary of the speakers. I tried to point out the level of contacting by highlighting which lexical units get replaced with another word.

Most of the data gathered in this way is consciously shared, objective lingual data (Kiss 2002: 30), but in some parts of the survey there are some consciously shared, subjective details (Kiss 2002: 30), too. From various methods of data collection (Kiss 2002: 41–42) I mainly used the active, direct method, but when reviewing the lingual variants I also expected the subjects to finish sentences, and at the research of borrowed words I expected them to accept the contact dialect word, or to replace it with another word.

For organizing the data that's been gathered with the survey, I used Microsoft Office Excel 2007; for the analysis of the relationship between sociolinguistic variaties and the language usage and data, furthermore for the preparation of cross reference tables I used version 2.2 of SPSS (Statistical Package for the Social Sciences).

### **3. Building up the thesis**

The thesis itself consists of five main chapters. Chapter one is about the motivation behind the subject of the thesis, list of hypotheses, achieved goals and method of research.

In chapter two I introduce the Hungarian community of Muravidék, I address the changes of identity, the legal background of language, and the status of the Hungarian language within bilingualism.

In chapter three I analyse the corpus itself: first I review the sociological and sociolinguistic varietis, then the general role of the mother tongue, the official and other languages within the family, education, reading, media and religion. There is a separate chapter that unfolds the connections between the language and identity, and gives a picture of the majority of the nation and their language.

The topic of chapter four is the research of dialects in private, official, public and mental areas, but I also analyse the local phrases, expressions along with the lingual variants and borrowed words in this chapter.

The fifth chapter of the thesis summarizes the results of the research, the final chapter discusses the possibilities and chances of the survival of the Hungarian language.

### **4. Introducing the queried community**

The Hungarian and Slovenian population native to Muravidék lives in north-eastern Slovenia, in the so called bilingual area, at 31 mixed settlements, along the region of Gócsej, Hetés and Őrség that belongs to the western group of dialects. This landscape, with its base area of 195 km<sup>2</sup> belonged once to the counties of Vas and Zala.

Based on the division of Varga, the region of Gócsej consists of 13 settlements: Alsólakos/Dolnji Lakoš, Csente/Čentiba, Felsőlakos/Gornji Lakoš, Gyertyános/Gaberje, Hármasmalom/Trimlini, Hosszúfaluhegy/Dolgovaške gorice, Kapca/Kapca, Kót/Kot, Lendva/Lendava, Lendvahegy/Lendavske gorice, Petesháza/Petišovci, Pince/Pince and Völgyifalu/Dolina. Eight villages belong to Hetés: Bánuta/Banuta, Dobronak/Dobrovnik, Göntérháza/Genterovci, Hídvég/Mostje, Hosszúfalu/Dolga vas, Kámaháza/Kamovci, Radamos/Radmožanci and Zsitkóc/Žitkovci. There are ten more settlements in Őrség: Berkeháza/Berkovci, Csekefa/Čikečka vas, Domonkosfa/Domanjševci, Gerőháza/Lončarovci, Hodos/Hodoš, Kapornak/Krplivnik, Kisfalu/Pordašinci, Pártosfalva/Prosenjakovci, Szentlászló/Motvarjevci and Szerdahely/Središče (Varga 1999:7).

When reviewing the historical eras, the identity of the Hungarians living in Muravidék is Hungarian, shaped by the South-Slavic, Yugoslavian and Slovenian ideologies, and today they can consider themselves as citizens of the European Union. But it can easily happen even today, as part of an old habit, that the Hungarians that live here are called Yugoslavians or Slovenians (Zágorec 2006: 108).

Nowadays, the Hungarians of Muravidék have twofold national bonds, the latter manifesting in the form of their regional bond. Because of the shared historic past, they are linked to the west-Hungarian settlements culturally, but at the same time they have the tendency to align themselves socially and economically with the better-suited Slovenian value system (Göncz 2008: 84–85).

The exemplary legal system and legislation in Slovenia could suggest that the Hungarian minority has all necessary rights to use their language publicly. Reality shows however, that their language loses its vitality, the areas of language usage dwindle and it is more and more often used „only” at home as a method of communication (Göncz 2012: 103–121).

The sociolinguistic summary of the Slovenian Hungarian speakers originates from Anna Kolláth: „The bilingualism at Muravidék, according to the reasons of language learning (emphasis: A.K.), is firstly the natural bilingualism for the majority of Hungarians, where even the second language gets learnt mostly in a natural way, in the bilingual areas, mainly within the family. However, this is ordered (controlled) bilingualism at the same time, in case of the children being born mainly from the marriages in villages with Hungarian majority, and also in the case of native Slovenian speakers, if despite living in a bilingual area, the individual obtains the second language mandatorily at an institute, f.e. in a school [...] Based on the sociocultural attitudes, today bilingualism is already subtractive for the Hungarians.

This means that the mother tongue can lose its value in the mind of the majority of speakers (on a personal level), because the minor language and culture of the heterogenic area is ‘only’ equal by the letter of the law, in practise the spaces of using the minor language are decreasing (on a social level). The result of this is the withdrawal of the Hungarian mother tongue (the vernacular version), and ends up in the exchange of the first (the Hungarian mother tongue) and the second (the Slovenian official) language on a wider scale (Kolláth 2009: 39).

We need to take the sad facts into consideration that the majority of the younger and middle-aged Hungarian population of Muravidék is already second language-dominant bilingual, so it is necessary to work out an efficient language strategy to stop the language-suppression, the process of loss and exchange (Kolláth 2009: 51).

## 5. The results of the research

**5.1.** From the analysis of sociological and sociolinguistic factors it turns out that 50,4% of the subjects were men, 49,6% were women. 69,5% identify themselves as Hungarian native speakers, 14,5% regard themselves as Slovenian, 16% consider themselves to have a dual nationality, so the majority of subjects are Hungarian. Aside of the 51, 1% of Hungarians and 45,8% of Slovenians, 2,3% of the subject consider themselves to be of both Hungarian and Slovenian nationality. Based on religious affiliation, most of the subjects are Roman Catholic (52,7% of the entire corpus), then follow the Evangelical (29%) and Reformists (17,6%). The number of subjects in the four reviewed age groups was almost identical. 89,3% of the participants were born in Slovenia, 17 people (13%) lived outside Slovenia for a longer or shorter time. Based on education, most of the research subjects graduated in a secondary school (42,7%), followed by the ones with a primary school degree (34,4%) and with a university diploma (21,4%). 40,5% of the subjects travels to work.

**5.2.** The partners in communication within and outside the family (relatives, neighbours, and friends) use mainly Hungarian, but the Slovenian language gains an increasing foothold. Compared to the other generations, the usage of Hungarian between parents and children is low (34,4%), which we have to consider as a warning sign.

**5.3.** Bilingual education faces multiple challenges, f.e. the necessity of renewing the model, the lack of developing comprehensive guidelines, the decreasing tendency of using Hungarian in the education of science subjects, and the importance of supporting teachers.

The latter faces a great change in the form of the recent development of the methodology of bilingual schools, which helps the 21<sup>st</sup> century reform of education with interactive curriculum multimedia, online glossaries and guides ([www.e-kompetencia.si](http://www.e-kompetencia.si)).

The joint presence of the official and minority languages are determining in the nurseries and primary schools. Most of the subjects (50,4%) finished high school in a monolingual Slovenian environment. The national language is emphasised in the case of courses and universities. All data reflects that the importance of the Hungarian language decreases after the primary school to the extent of ending completely, especially if the students go for a high school outside their bilingual area. The rate of subjects actually continuing their higher education within a primarily Hungarian environment (3,1%).

**5.4** According to the subjects of the research, they speak the local minor language, Hungarian and the major language, Slovenian on the highest level; their Hungarian knowledge represents immense value. Their (native) language skills are enriched by the knowledge of other languages, mainly spoken in the neighbouring countries: the Croatian is one of the determining languages of the multilingual region, and the knowledge of Serbian goes back to the Yugoslavian militant lifestyle. The strong presence of German is related to the historical past, unlike the first language of the modern world, English. So generally we can speak of multilingual individuals who consider the knowledge of multiple languages and their presence alongside each other to be natural.

**5.5.** The survey examined the role of the languages in reading. Well over the other genres, 39,7% of the subjects read religious texts only in Hungarian. When it gets to professional literature, Slovenian has the upper hand (26,7%). The two languages are used together mostly in classical literature (48,1%), and this rate is the lowest in professional literature (19,8%). The combination of Hungarian–Slovenian–Croatian is dominant in journalism (8,4%) and plays no role in the case of religious texts (0,8%).

**5.6.** The most important newspaper in the everyday life of the community is the weekly paper *Népujság* this was the only one among the list that has an online version. This is followed by *Naptár* in popularity, the almanac of the Slovenian Hungarians. The low popularity *Muratáj* – a journal of literature, education, social studies and criticism – indicates that the people's daily life is not majorly influences by scientific or literature texts. The low rates of the elegant *Lindua* – a journal of science, social sciences, literature and art – is more surprising as

it is the only bilingual product: the writers can freely choose the language of their articles, writings, travelogues, etc.

**5.7.** 17,6% of the subjects watches television and listens to the radio only in Hungarian, 4,6% does so only in Slovenian and 26,7 % in both. The Hungarian–Slovenian bilingualism has the greatest impact on these tendencies. 9,9% uses Hungarian–Slovenian–German, 5,3-5,3% uses either Hungarian–Slovenian–Croatian or Hungarian–Slovenian–Croatian–German. Most of the research subjects (77,1%) listens to the local radio station, the Hungarian Radio of Muravidék.

**5.8.** 46,6% of the subjects visits masses and worship services in Hungarian and Slovenian, 31,3% sees services only in Hungarian. Only 17,6% goes to masses that are only in Slovenian. 55% of the subjects prays mainly in Hungarian, the major and minor languages are present together in the case of 26%, and the rate of subjects only praying in Slovenian is 11,5%.

**5.9.** The subjects considered themselves to be monolingual in 14,5%, bilingual in 51,9%, and multilingual in 26,7% of the corpus. A few quotes from the answers I received: „*I consider myself to be monolingual despite speaking more languages*” (22\_Kót\_25–39\_female); motivation for bilingualism: „*because I use Hungarian and Slovenian frequently, I only use the others occasionally*” (104\_Hodos\_25–39\_male); and the fruition of multilingualism: „*because I speak more languages without giving a second thought*” (131\_Dobronak\_16–24\_male).

40,4% of the subjects considered themselves to be a Hungarian living in Muravidék, 39,7% said they are Slovenian Hungarians, so both specified grades got a fairly close result. The ones considering themselves as Hungarians living in Muravidék are tied to the bilingual area, to the closer vicinity of the region, where both Hungarian and Slovenian is widely used; so I believe their sense of regional identity is strong. The naming convention of Slovenian Hungarian refers to a national identity, and that their identity is related more to the country than their living place, the latter identified in our case as the bilingual area.

There was no major research done in the past reviewing the lingual attitudes of the Hungarians of Muravidék, but we can find smaller surveys and analysis in this subject (Hegedűs – Horvat 2003: 412–420; Gašpar 2002; Bokor 2009: 77–108).

56,4 % of the subjects feels natural with Hungarian because they consider this as their mother tongue and the language of thinking, finding it's vocabulary richer than the Slovenian.

For 21,4 % of the subjects Slovenian is the native language and the one they mostly use. Both languages are crucial for 12,2%. According to 55% of the subjects, Hungarian is spoken most beautifully in Hungary, followed by Lendva, Transsylvania, Goricsko and Vajdaság.

The relationship and lingual attitude of the local Hungarians towards the official language and it's native speakers is positive in general, multiple answers were provided claiming that it is not possible to get by without the Slovenian language. The replies provided by my subjects also reveal that the majority of the population is still unable to handle the minority in the right way, they find the minority suspicious because of its exotic and complicated language. Fear of the others dwells deeply within the answers.

## **6. The connections between language usage and independent variables**

**6.1.** The subjects of the survey could choose their preferred language of communication related to 31 different partners and institutions on a private, public, official and mental level. I used the exact Fisher-test to compare the gathered data with seven independent variables: gender, mother tongue, nationality, age, level of education, the language of primary school and the place of living. I found that the least relationship is with the gender, 2 altogether (6,5% of all possible cases), the most connection exists in the case of the language of primary school, 26 (83,8% of all possible cases). The number of links I discovered were the following in the other cases: 10 related to age (32,3%), 14 related to the mother tongue (45,2%), 19 related to the nationality (61,3%), and finally 22-22 for both the level of education and the place of living (70,1%).

Looking at the statisti relationship between the independent variables and the choice of language usage, the most correlation can be seen in the case of public space, 50; the least number of correlations exists on a mental level, 11 altogether. The number of connections in private life are 39, and 15 in official life.

The gained results reflect that the Hungarian varieties lost ground due to the change in preferred language. The minor language is restricted mainly to private and internal (mental) levels, whereas the state language is used more and more often in public and social areas.

**6.2.** I performed a statistic analysis between the above mentioned seven independent variables (see chapter **6.1.**) and the 13 language variables chosen from the questionnaire.

I enlisted the following type variables as universal variables (EV): *tudnék: tudnák, szoktam: szokok, iszom: iszok, kertben: kertbe* and *hosszúfalui: hosszúfalusi*. The following type variables were considered as universal and contact variables (EKV): *fodrász: fodrásznő,*

*orvos: orvosnő, fáj a lába: fájnak a lábai* and *Klaudiánál: Klaudiától*. The third group consists of the analog contact variables: *gimnáziumban: gimnáziumon, kisiskolában: kisiskolán* and *Muraszombaton: Muraszombatban*.

There is no connection between the gender and the lingual variables. There is a single link between the mother tongue and the lingual variables: in the case of *Klaudiánál: Klaudiától* ( $p = 0,001$ ; item number: 117). There is also one link between the degree of education and the lingual variables: *hosszúfalui: hosszúfalusi* ( $p = 0,002$ ; item no.: 115). There is an additional link between the language of the primary school and the lingual variables: in the case of *szoktam: szokok* ( $p = 0,032$ ; item no.: 115).

There are two significant links between the nationality and the lingual variables: *szoktam: szokok* ( $p = 0,011$ ; item no.: 118) and *iszom: iszok* ( $p = 0,037$ ; item no.: 116).

There are two additional links between the living place and the lingual variables: *tudnék: tudnák* ( $p = 0,006$ ; item no.: 97) and *hosszúfalui: hosszúfalusi* ( $p = 0,027$ ; item no.: 117).

According to the statistic analysis the most links connect age and the lingual variables, three altogether. These are: *tudnék: tudnák* ( $p = 0,009$ ; item no.: 97); *kertben: kertbe* ( $p = 0,022$ ; item no.: 124), and *lába: lábai* ( $p = 0,043$ ; item no.: 97).

**6.3.** Two separate chapters reviewed the local phrases within the questionnaire. In the first chapter I chose 9 different questions, based on the handout of 'Új magyar nyelvjárási atlasz' and the data gathering experiences (see Gasparics 2010: 66–76), and then I inserted them in the body of the survey. All questions had it in common, that they were referring to nouns, especially to animal names. Analysing the connection between the nine local phras, words and the seven independent variables the number of possible correlations is 63, which we get if we multiply the number of local words with the number of the seven independent variables. From among the 63 links I found, 7 cases proved to be significant, so 11,1% of all the possible correlations existed. The case of the vernacular *menyét* and the local phrase *menyetasszony~menyedasszony~mönyedasszony* is related to three independent variables (the mother tongue, the age and the living place).

In the second chapter I was looking for an answer to the question, if the subjects know the 21 local phrases I chose from Muravidék, if they do they use them, or if they don't, do they use a different word instead. Based on the analysis of the connections between the local phrases and the seven independent variables we can see that the number of possible correlations is 147, from which 42 are significant links, thus the 28,6% of all possible correlations exists.

The highest number of connetions (12) is between the age and the knowledge of the local phrases. This is proved by the following data:

- *dávirikul*, vernacular meaning: *kiabál*, *énekel*: p = 0,001; i.no.: 127
- *fumu/ünnepi kalács*: p = 0,004; i.no.: 126
- *ginyállo/metszi a fát*: p = 0,001; i.no.: 127
- *irubiru/sárgarigó*: p = 0,008; i.no.: 123
- *istenbogara/katicabogár*: p = 0,004; i.no.: 122
- *kisztek/szereztek, ajánlottak*: p = 0,012; i.no.: 124
- *köcölle/vászondarab*: p = 0,009; i.no.: 128
- *párokli/esernyő*: p = 0,004; i.no.: 128
- *szakajtu/kosár*: p = 0; i.no.: 127
- *böllér/hentes*: p = 0, i.no.: 129
- *gömbös/disznósajt*: p = 0; i.no.: 121 and
- *hóttagat a bagu/huhog a bagoly*: p = 0; i.no.: 127.

7. The last part of the questionnaire reviews the words borrowed from the Slovenian language, matching the process of de-bordering, which is mainly a lexicological-lexicographical and corpuslinguistic process. Under the lingual de-bordering done by the Termini Hungarian Lingual Research Network we understand linguistic works, which aim to include all versions of Hungarian across the borders into recently prepared or already finished Hungarian linguistic publications (Lanstyák 2006: 57), thus merging all linguistic research done within the Carpathian Basin into an 'all-Hungarian' research. The researchers don't just collect foreign lexemes incorporated into various Hungarian dialects but they also organize them, and they also analyse the usage frequency of the lingual units stored in the ht-database. In the chapter I reviewed the possible substitution of 12 direct borrowed words, checking if the subjects replaced the borrowed words in the sentences with other, f.e. Hungarian vernacular phrases.

Based on the number of the substitutions we got the following order (going from the highest number of substitution to the lowest): *kulica/toll* 53,4%; *bágerlik/kavicsbánya* 36,6%; *bolnisku/betegszabadság* 32,8%; *profeszorca/tanárno* 32,8%; *obcsina/község* 30,5%; *májca/pólóing* 24,4%; *batri/szárazelem* 23,7%; *guzsva/tömeg* 23,7%; *tuséroz/zuhanyzik* 19,1%; *zavodon van/segélyből él* 19,1%; *smarnica /szőlő* 16% and *gibanica/százréteű béles* 10,7%.

## **8. The future of the Hungarian language in Muravidék**

Even though the Hungarian language is in a good position from a lingual political aspect, it is still threatened with disappearance by the bilingual practise. It slowly vanishes from education, professional training, religion, administration and justice. Three changes need to happen in order to regain its position: the increasing in its viability, prestige and the enrichment of its functions. More emphasis is needed in the standardization and codification (Bokor 2009:139–145).

Maybe it is possible to preserve the vitality of the Hungarian language with upkeeping the vernacular version, with additive educational politics, with the avoidance of stigmatization, with the perpetuation of bi- or multilingualism in bi- and multilingualism itself, furthermore with paying attention to the European lingual diversity. But fundamentally the fate of a language depends on its speakers: „*It depends mostly on us, Hungarians of Muravidék, on safeguarding our sense of national identity. It is up to the nation if it takes it on, and also on the possibilities provided by the Slovenian state, that does not restrict our existence*” (9\_Kapca\_40–64\_female).

**9.** This thesis was written with two aims: based on the results that have been provided by the research, it would like to help with widely describing and introducing the dialects of the Hungarian language in Muravidék, furthermore to strengthen the survival of the language itself.

## Bibliography

- Bartha Csilla 2007. Kétnyelvűség a Muravidéken. *Muratáj* (Lendva), 2006/ 1-2. 79–113.
- Bokor József 2009. *Nyelviség és magyarság a Muravidéken*. Lendva: Magyar Nemzetiségi Művelődési Intézet.
- Dr. Varga János 1999. *Nyelvhasználat, névdivat. Az anyanyelv (magyar, szlovén, horvát) használata és a névdivat a vegyes házasságokban élők körében a Muravidéken*. Lendva: Magyar Nemzetiségi Művelődési Intézet.
- Dr. Zágorec-Csuka Judit 2006. Mitől függ a muravidéki magyarok identitása? Naptár 2007. A szlovéniai magyarok évkönyve. Lendva: Magyar Nemzetiségi Művelődési Intézet – Magyar Nemzetiségi Tájékoztatási Intézet. 95–117.
- Gašpar, Anita 2002. *A nyelv, a nyelvhasználat és a nyelvhez való viszony Lendván és környékén*. Maribor: Diplomamunka. Kézirat.
- Gasparics Judit 2010. Egy kónyi terepmunka tapasztalatai. Kolláth Anna – Gróf Annamária szerk. *Szépbe szőtt hit... Köszöntő könyv Varga János tiszteletére*. Maribor – Lendva: Magyar Nyelv és Irodalom Tanszék – Magyar Nemzetiségi Művelődési Intézet.
- Muratáj* 1-2 (Lendva). 66–76.
- Göncz László 2008. Muravidéki helyzetkép a múlt és a jelen tükrében. Fedinec Csilla szerk. *Értékek, dimenziók a magyarságkutatásban*. Budapest: MTA Magyar Tudományosság Különösen Elnöki Bizottság. 84–102.
- Göncz László 2012. A magyar nemzeti közösség nyelvi jogai és nyelvhasználata Szlovéniában. Eplényi Kata – Kántor Zoltán szerk. *Térvesztés és határtalanítás. A magyar nyelvpolitika 21. századi kihívásai*. Budapest: Lucidus Kiadó. 103–121.
- Guttmann Miklós 1984. A tájszókészlet aktivitása Lendva környékén. Naptár 1984.
- A szlovéniai magyarok szemléje. Murska Sobota: Pomurska založba. 59–69.
- Guttmann Miklós 1994. A szókészlet táji rétegének változása a szlovéniai Szentlászlón. *Magyar Nyelvőr*, 422–429.
- Hegedűs Andrea – Horvat Susanne 2003. A Lendvai Kétnyelvű Középiskolában végzett felmérés eredményeiből. Hajdú Mihály – Keszler Borbála szerk. *Köszöntő könyv Kiss Jenő 60. születésnapjára*. Budapest: ELTE Magyar Nyelvtudományi és Finnugor Intézete – Magyar Nyelvtudományi Társaság. 412–420.
- <http://www.e-kompetencia.si>
- Kiss Jenő 2002. *Társadalom és nyelvhasználat*. Budapest: Nemzeti Tankönyvkiadó.
- Kolláth Anna 2005. *Magyarul a Muravidéken*. Maribor: Slavistično društvo (Zora 39).

- Kolláth Anna 2009. Két nyelv és oktatás. Kolláth Anna szerk. *A muravidéki kétnyelvű oktatás fél évszázada*. Bielsko – Biała –Budapest – Kansas – Maribor – Praha: Mednarodna založba Oddelka za slovanske jezike in književnosti, Filozofska fakulteta (Zora 68). 36–59.
- Lanstyák István 2006. *Nyelvből nyelvbe*. Pozsony: Kalligram Könyvkiadó.
- Lanstyák István 2000. *A magyar nyelv Szlovákiában*. Budapest – Pozsony: Osiris Kiadó – Kalligram Könyvkiadó – MTA Kisebbségkutató Műhely.
- Lanstyák István – Szabómihály Gizella 1997. *Magyar nyelvhasználat – Iskola – Kétnyelvűség*. Pozsony: Kalligram Könyvkiadó.
- Penavin Olga 1961. Szécsiszentlászlai szójegyzék. *Magyar Nyelvőr*, 4. 460–463.
- Penavin Olga 1966. *A jugoszláviai Muravidék magyar tájnyelvi atlasza*. Budapest: Magyar Nyelvtudományi Társaság.
- Šanca, Leonida 2013. Tájszók egy család magyar nyelvhasználatában. (Záró szeminárium dolgozat). Kézirat.
- Szabó Mária 2006. *Tájszójegyzék*. Lendva vidéki tájszavak szótárszerű gyűjteménye. Lendva: Magyar Nemzetiségi Művelődési Intézet.