HUNGARIAN STUDIES YEARBOOK
2022 (IV)

sciendo

DOI: 10.2478/HSY-2022-0007

"Transylvanian Hunglish" Phonological Properties of Hungarian Accented English in Transylvania

Bálint HUSZTHY
Eötvös Loránd University, Department of Italianistics, Budapest
huszthy.balint@btk.elte.hu

ABSTRACT

Hunglish is a term for Hungarian native speakers' English pronunciation. It is a well recognisable and quite homogeneous accent, which is thoroughly described in the literature of second language acquisition. However, this paper proposes that Hungarian speakers living in Romania use a phonologically different Hunglish compared to those living in Hungary. The study is built on direct speech recordings made with 30 Hungarian speakers descending from various parts of Transylvania. Their accent is confronted with the pronunciation of 15 speakers from Hungary, who participated in the same reading experiment. Results indicate that the English pronunciation of the two groups mostly share the same phonetic and phonological features. Only a few persistent phonological differences can be identified; for instance, English open back vowels [ʌ, ɒ, ɑ] are replaced with Hungarian [ɒ] by the Transylvanian informants, and with [a] by the speakers from Hungary; Transylvanian informants preserve more English schwas and diphthongs due to their L2 Romanian, etc. The differences basically originate in the fact that Transylvanian speakers' interlanguage is much more heterogeneous than that of Hungarians', i.e. Transylvanians speak a substandard version of Hungarian as L1, they speak a Transylvanian dialect, they speak Romanian at high level as L2, and they usually speak further foreign languages as well beyond English; these varieties all affect their foreign accent. The paper takes account of the most important characteristics of Transylvanian Hunglish, with a synchronic phonological analysis, and a contrastive analysis with the general phonological properties of Hunglish found in the literature.

Keywords: sociolinguistics, second language acquisition, phonetics and phonology, foreign accent, Hunglish

© 2022 Bálint Huszthy. This is an open access article licensed under the Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial-NoDerivs License (creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/3.0/)

1. Introduction

1.1. Preface

In the last decades the literature on second language acquisition has shown growing interests towards the phonetic and phonological aspects of acquisition phenomena. Foreign accents acquired a central role in recent studies, and were analysed from multiple aspects. Apart from general descriptions about the phonetic and phonological composition of foreign accents (cf. Scovel 1969; Flege 1981, 1987; Major 1987, 2008; Gut 2007, 2009; Moyer 2013), an applied approach was widely adopted so as to overcome pronunciation mistakes during second language acquisition (cf. Flege 1995; Nádasdy–Szigetvári 1996; Nádasdy 2000, 2006; Szpyra-Kozłowska 2015; Balogné Bérces–Piukovics 2019b; Huszthy 2022). Various works were published using perceptive and pshycholinguistic approaches, too, with the aim of identifying factors which contribute to the perception of foreign accentedness and to determine the limits of accent intelligibility (cf. Flege–Munro–MacKay 1995; Piske–MacKay–Flege 2001; Munro 2008; Munro–Derwing 2011). And finally, the point of view of theoretical phonology appeared to be important as well to gain information about the implications that foreign accents may have towards the synchronic phonology of the speakers' mother tongue (cf. Altenberg–Vago 1983; Eckman 2008; Huszthy 2016a, 2019, 2020).

Foreign accent is the product of phonetic and phonological interference between the mother tongue (L1) of the speakers and the foreign languages (L2) they speak.[1] Actually, it is part of the so called *interlanguage*, the idiolectal variety which is created by the combination of all of these languages (cf. Selinker 1972; Ioup–Weinberger 1987; Keys 2001). Among the various components of interlanguage, L1 plays a key role, since speakers unconsciously transfer their L1's phonetic and phonological elements to L2 (cf. Major 2008). Some of these elements are developed in a "transition zone" between L1 and L2 (e.g., some interlanguage sounds show an intermediate acoustic realisation between authentic L2 and native L1 sounds), but even so interlanguage elements reveal active components of L1 phonology.

Foreign accents can be sorted into groups according to L1 influence, since they are recognisable on the basis of L1 elements which dominate the speakers' interlanguage. Some foreign accents also have a name and literature, e.g. *Spanglish*, *Franglais*, *Itangliano*, *Swenglist*, *Denglish*, *Slogleščina*, *Konglish* etc.[2] (cf. Ahamad–Anand–Bhargava 2020); and one

1 The literature on second language acquisition often uses the abbreviation L2 for any foreign language, independently on the number of L2s spoken by the speakers. There is also another use of the term, for the second (L2), third (L3), fourth (L4), etc. strongest foreign language spoken by the speakers. In this paper the first use is applied, but in some required cases we will also use the term L3.

2 Meaning Spanish, French, Italian, Swedish, Danish, Slovenian and Korean accented English.

of them is *Hunglish*: the Hungarian accented version of English (cf. Doughty–Thompson 1983).[3]

1.2. General characteristics of Hunglish

Hunglish, as foreign accents in general, is characterised by transfer phenomena from the speakers' L1 (that is, Hungarian) onto L2 (that is, English) at every level of phonetics and phonology; including minor articulatory differences between the same phonemes, recurrent segmental substitutions, interference between L1 and L2 in phonological processes and phonotactics (the latter depending on syllable structure), laryngeal features (voice vs. spread glottis) and prosody (word stress, intonation patterns, etc.). We do not give a detailed description here, only outline the most relevant factors which are necessary to compare the Hunglish varieties spoken in Hungary and in Transylvania. Examples derive from the literature about Hunglish (Doughty–Thompson 1983; Nádasdy–Szigetvári 1996; Nádasdy 2000, 2006; Balogné Bérces–Szentgyörgyi 2006; Balogné Bérces–Piukovics 2019b; Piukovics 2021).

In order to discover L1 transfer phenomena onto L2, we also need a preliminary contrastive analysis between Hungarian and English. If we confront the articulatory bases of standard English varieties (Wells 1982; Jenkins 2000; Cruttenden 2014)[4] and standard Hungarian (Siptár–Törkenczy 2000), we find several segmental differences that must be faced by any Hungarian learner of English. According to Flege (1987)'s terminology, the "new" and "similar" phones found in L2 are regularly substituted in the foreign accent by L1 segments (or, on an advanced L2 level, are developed into interlanguage sounds, but still on the basis of L1 articulatory phonetics).

In consonant inventories, five segments are present in English which are absent from Hungarian: the interdental fricatives [θ, ð], the bilabial-velar approximant [w], the rhotic postalveolar approximant [ɹ], and the so called "dark l", a postalveolar-velar lateral approximant [ɬ]. Moreover, the velar nasal [ŋ] is phonemic in English, but it is not in Hungarian, so although it is also present in the Hungarian segmental inventory as an allophone of /n/, it causes difficulties for L2 English learners. Further phonetic differencies concern the voicless stops [p, t, k], which are aspirated in English, but unaspirated in Hungarian.

3 The first mention of *Hunglish* goes back to Doughty and Thompson (1983)'s textbook (they were visiting professors at ELTE, Budapest), which collects the most typical Hungarian pronunciation mistakes of English. They introduce the term Hunglish with these words: "Each country makes its own mistakes in a foreign language. Teachers of foreign languages know that there are certain mistakes that are particularly typical of the country in which they are working. The most frequent – though not the only – cause of these mistakes is interference from the learner's own language. In the case of Hungarian learners of English, we have called the language that arises Hunglish."

4 The two English L1 target accents of the study are *Received Pronunciation* (RP; i.e., Standard Southern British English) and *General American* (GA).

The "new" consonants of the English inventory are commonly replaced by homorganic L1 consonants in Hunglish: [θ, ð] are substituted by [t, s, f; d, z, v; dz] (most likely by the stops [t, d]), as in *thick* [θɪk] > H. [tik(:)], *this* [ðɪs] > H. [dis];[5] [w] is replaced by [v], as in *what* > H. [vat]; [ɹ] is usually pronounced as a trill [r] or a tap [ɾ], as in *red* > H. [ɾɛd]; dark [ɬ] in syllable coda is not applied, it remains a clear [l], as in *feel* > H. [fi:l]; while [ŋ] is generally produced as an [ŋg] sequence by spelling pronunciation, as in *sing* > H. [siŋg]. Aspirated stops are substituted by unaspirated ones, e.g. [pʰ, tʰ, kʰ] > [p, t, k], as in *pit*, *tip*, *key*. Moreover, we often find needless intersonorant s-voicing in Hunglish, such as in *basic* [b̥eɪsɪk] > H. [be:zik] and *Chelsea* [tʃɛɬsi] > H. [tʃɛlzi], etc.; while the postconsonantal *s* suffix is voiceless in Hunglish, e.g. *films* [fiɬmz] > H. [films], *dogs* [d̥ɒgz] > H. [doks], *gloves* [g̊lʌvz] > H. [glo:fs], etc.

In the vowel system even more substitutions appear compared to the consonants. Although there are 14 vowel phonemes in the standard Hungarian inventory [ɒ, a:, ɛ, e:, i, i:, o, o:, ø, ø:, u, u:, y, y:], only a few of them is present in English varieties, and even those have a slightly different acoustic configuration and a completely different phonemic distribution. Besides, there are at least 17 English vowel phonemes (9 monophthongs and 8 diphthongs in RP) which are missing from the standard Hungarian vowel system, and are usually replaced in Hunglish by similar L1 vowels (or intermediate realisations from the individual speakers' interlanguage).

Lax vowels [ɪ, ʊ, ʌ] are regularly substituted by tense vowels [i, u, a], as in *bit*, *put*, *but*. Back long vowels [ɑ:, ɔ:] are usually replaced by [a:, o:], as in *bar*, *bought*. Even [ɒ], which is present in both vowel systems, is often changed in Hunglish for [o] by spelling pronunciation, as in *Bob*. Schwa-like vowels [ə, ɜ:] are replaced by the rounded mid-front [ø] or the unrounded [ɛ], as in *ago*. The *ash* vowel [æ] is one of the hardest to acquire for L2 learners, it is replaced by [ɛ] for a long time, as in *bat*. Finally, a general monophthongisation can be observed in Hunglish, since standard Hungarian does not have diphthongs; e.g. [eɪ] > [e:] as in *face*, [əʊ/oʊ] > [o:] as in *boat*, [ɪə(ɹ)] > [i:(r)] as in *beer*, [ɛə(ɹ)] > [e:(r)] as in *bear*, [ʊə(ɹ)] > [u:(r)] as in *cure*.

Phonotactic differences between L1 and L2 may result in three types of phonological processes: insertion, deletion and assimilation (cf. Cser 2015). Such processes usually happen when two or more vowels or consonants appear next to each other. Both the hiatus resolution strategies and the methods for handling consonant clusters are different in Hungarian and in English, which leads to various foreign accent elements. Many of these are linked to spelling pronunciation, that is, L2 learners often pronounce consonantal combinations according to the orthographical form of the words, which are produced differently by L1 speakers for phonotactic and diachronic reasons, e.g. in initial [pn, ps, kn, gn] clusters, final [mb, mn, gn] clusters, [h] in medial unstressed

5 In the examples Hunglish is abbreviated to H.

syllables, etc. (for more details and examples see Piukovics 2021). The same statement is valid for geminates as well; in fact, English does not have intramorphemic geminates (unlike Hungarian), but since spelling suggests otherwise, long consonants often appear in Hunglish, e.g. *suggest* [səˈdʒɛst] > H. [sadˈːʒɛst], *appear* [əˈpʰɪə(ɹ)] > H. [ɛpˈːiːr], etc.[6] On the other hand, certain English consonant combinations are not allowed for Hungarian phonotactics, so they can be simplified in Hunglish, e.g. *texts* [tʰɛksts] > H. [tɛk(t)s], *sixths* [sɪksθs] > H. [sik(t)s], etc.

English syllabic sonorants [n̩, m̩, l̩, (ɹ̩)] contribute to another feature of Hunglish, since sonorant consonants in Hungarian cannot be parsed into syllable nuclei (cf. Siptár–Törkenczy 2000). Accordingly, Hungarians usually extend English words containing syllabic sonorants with a short unmarked vowel (generally [ə], [ø] or [y]), e.g. *prism* [ˈpʰɹɪzm̩] > H. [ˈprizmᵊ]/[ˈprizᵊm], *rhythm* [ˈɹɪðm̩] > H. [ˈridmᵊ]/[ˈridᵊm], *Wimbledon* [ˈwɪmbl̩dən] > H. [vimblᵊdon], etc. Further segmental quantity phenomena also appear in Hunglish, e.g. English long vowels (or diphthongs) often undergo shortening, mostly when spelling does not allude to lengthening, e.g. *details* > H. [ˈditeːls], *Suzy* > H. [ˈsuzi], *model* > H. [ˈmodɛl], *locate* > H. [ˈlokeːt], etc.[7]

English laryngeal phonology causes additional problems for Hungarians (cf. Balogné Bérces–Szentgyörgyi 2006; Balogné Bérces 2017b; Piukovics 2021). In English, most utterance initial and final obstruents (e.g. [b, d, g]) are voiceless, e.g. *good* [g̊ʊd̥],[8] but since spelling suggests otherwise, Hungarians pronounce them voiced, e.g. *good* > H. [gud]. On the contrary, syllable initial voiceless stops are aspirated in English (pronounced with spread glottis, i.e., with the insertion of a small [h]), e.g. *pet* [pʰɛt]; but aspiration is generally not applied by Hungarians, e.g. *pet* > H. [pɛt].

In terms of laryngeal phonology, Hungarian is a *voice language*, while English is an *aspiration language* (Balogné Bérces 2017b). As a consequence, in English there is no regressive voice assimilation, unlike in Hungarian and in Hunglish; that is, Hungarians use regressive voicing where English speakers do not, e.g. *baseball* [ˈb̥eɪsb̥ɔːɬ] > H. [ˈbeːzbol], *cookbook* [ˈkʰʊkb̥ʊk] > H. [ˈkugbuk], *shoot back* [ˈʃuːtˈb̥æk] > H. [ʃudˈbɛk(ː)], etc.

6 There is another gemination process that also appears in the Hungarian foreign accent, and sometimes gets lexicalised in loanwords: intervocalic obstruents may undergo "unmotivated" gemination in words of foreign origin, e.g. *doping* > Hun. [ˈdopːiŋg], *sweater* > Hun. [ˈsvɛtːɛr], *weekend* > Hun. [ˈvikːɛnd], *Gripen* > Hun. [ˈgripːɛn], etc. Similarly, final obstruents also tend to undergo gemination in Hunglish (and in Hungarian in loanwords), e.g. *shock* > Hun. [ʃokː], *flash* > Hun. [flɛʃː], *tip* > Hun. [tipː], etc. (cf. Huszthy 2016b).

7 Similar phonotactically based features may occur in the Hungarian foreign accent in the case of other L2s as well, like in Ungheriano, i.e., Hungarian accented Italian (see Huszthy 2022).

8 Voicelessness is indicated in IPA by small combining rings above or below the consonants.

Eventually, numerous features of Hunglish are due to prosodic differences between English and Hungarian. First of all, word stress is often misplaced by Hungarians in L2 English, since words (or intonational phrases) are always stressed on the first syllable in Hungarian, while English has mobile stress patterns. Stress misplacement may have multiple consequences for phonetics and segmental phonology as well (for details see Piukovics–Üstöki 2019; Piukovics 2021).[9] Secondly, Hungarians typically use L1 intonation patterns when speaking in English, and speech melody is one of the most evident (and less evitable) features of foreign accents (cf. Balogné Bérces–Piukovics 2019b; Piukovics 2021).[10]

2. Preliminaries to Transylvanian Hunglish

2.1. Hypotheses

The starting point of this study was an informal, impressionistic observation of mine, made after hearing Hungarians of Transylvania speaking English. My first, observationally based hypothesis was that Hungarians born (and raised) in Transylvania use a phonologically different (and less marked) Hunglish compared to Hungarians born in Hungary. The literature on second language acquisition treats Hunglish as a homogeneous accent: Hungarian accented English (see Section 1.2). However, the English pronunciation of Hungarians living in the situation of *social bilingualism*[11] has not been approached from the point of view of second language acquisition; therefore, the first attempt is made in this study.

The most evident sociolinguistic reason for differences between the two target Hunglish varieties is that the interlanguage of Hungarians living in Romania is more heterogeneous compared to those living in Hungary. Most Transylvanians are *dialectophones*[12] (while most speakers in Hungary are not); that is, their L1 is a local dialect of Hungarian, and they also speak the Hungarian substandard; or vice versa, their L1 is the Hungarian substandard, and they also speak the local dialect depending on situation (cf. Péntek–Benő 2020). Because of the above mentioned

9 Hungarians often place the stress to closed syllables (following the Stress-to-Weight principle), even if it is not the stressed one in English, e.g. *energy* [ˈɛnə(ɹ) dʒi] > H. [ɛˈnɛrdʒi]. This is a common feature of the Hungarian foreign accent, which is present in the pronunciation of other languages as well, e.g. in Ungheriano, i.e. Hungarian accented Italian (see Huszthy 2022).

10 Further, more specific theoretical studies on Hunglish propose that advanced learners' accent is a semi-rhotic variety of English (see Balogné Bérces 2017a, Balogné Bérces–Piukovics 2019a, Piukovics–Balogné Bérces 2019).

11 Hungarians of Romania live in social bilingualism, since their L1 is Hungarian, but the official language of the state is Romanian, which they acquire as L2 from childhood and use in public life situations during interactions with non Hungarians (for details see Péntek–Benő 2020).

12 The French loanword *dialectophone* will be used here as a sociolinguistic technical term for dialect speakers; both for those whose L1 is a local dialect and for those who speak a regional dialect or a dialectally based substandard.

sociolinguistic reasons, for the most part they also speak Romanian as L2;[13] moreover, they (especially the younger generations) often speak English and further foreign languages, too (cf. the informants' data in Section 2).

The hypotheses of this study are not specific, since we chose an inductive research method following the lead of the speech recordings. However, two general hypotheses have been formulated at the beginning: first, from a phonetic point of view, we expect more variation in vowel quality from the Transylvanian speakers (induced by the wide dialectal fragmentation of the territory); second, from a phonological point of view we expect less segmental substitutions and less phonotactically based accent features compared to the Hunglish variety described in Section 1.2., given that Transylvanian speakers are presumed to have a more heterogeneous interlanguage, so, a wider articulatory base and fewer phonotactic restrictions.

2.2. Informants and data collection

The empirical part of the study is built on speech recordings made with 30 volunteer informants interviewed at the Babeș–Bolyai University (Faculty of Letters) in Cluj-Napoca, in May 2022. Three of them are professors (one man and two women), the others are students (four men and 23 women),[14] the students' age average is 21. All of them are native speakers of Hungarian (none of them is Hungarian–Romanian native bilingual), and they are all dialectophones, too (that is, they all speak a regional variety of Hungarian).[15]

They derive from different parts of Transylvania, from various localities of the following counties: nine informants come from Harghita (HR) county, six from Covasna (CV), six from Mureș (MS), two from Brașov (BV), one from Cluj (CJ), one from Bistrița-Năsăud (BN), one from Sibiu (SB), and four of them beyond Transylvania, two from Sălaj (SJ) and two from Satu Mare (SM).[16]

13 Their L2 level of Romanian varies from fluent to intermediate, depending on geographical, individual and other sociolinguistic factors; but they are not native bilinguals, except when born in a mixed family.

14 Four informants have been interviewed by two of my students (Ibolya Szikszai and Mónika Szabó), as part of a task for the course of *Applied Sociolinguistics*, they were the ones to choose the sample text, too; I thank them for the excellent enterprise!

15 At the beginning of the recordings they had to introduce themselves: their Hungarian dialects are well definable in this part.

16 The list of the informants' localities of origin (in alphabetic order, with Hungarian spelling): Barót (Baraolt, CV), Beszterce (Bistrița, BN), Bősháza (Biușa, SJ), Brassó (Brașov, BV), Csíkszereda (Miercurea Ciuc, HR), Gyergyószentmiklós (Gheorgheni, HR), Kolozsvár (Cluj-Napoca, CJ), Kovászna (Covasna, CV), Marosvásárhely (Târgu Mureș, MS), Nagykároly (Carei, SM), Nagyszeben (Sibiu, SB), Nyárádszereda (Miercurea Nirajului, MS), Sepsiszentgyörgy (Sfântu Gheorghe, CV), Szabéd (Săbed, MS), Szatmárnémeti (Satu Mare, SM), Székelykeresztúr (Cristuru Secuiesc, HR), Székelyszáldobos (Dobocșeni, CV), Székelyudvarhely (Odorheiu Secuiesc, HR), Szilágysámson (Șamșud, SJ), Szováta (Sovata, MS), Zabola (Zăbala, CV).

All of them speak Romanian as L2 at least at intermediate level, and 16 of them at upper levels, C1 or C2. As far as their English level is concerned, they were sorted into two groups: 16 of them belong to the intermediate group (B1/B2), and 14 of them belong to the advanced group (C1/C2). Many of them speak further foreign languages as well: 16 of them speak one further language beyond Hungarian, Romanian and English, at least at intermediate level (mostly German or French), and 8 of them speak two or three more languages (e.g. German, French, Italian, Chinese, Finnish, Russian, Norwegian).

The data collection had three steps: after a brief self introduction (containing basic sociolinguistic information) in their mother tongue (Hungarian substandard or dialect), the informants had to read out loud an English sample text at first sight, then they had to repeat the reading immediately. The sample text was selected from authentic English materials, it is a small journal article (two paragraphs with title and subtitle) used for B2 level English teaching; a description about Elvis Presley's city of birth. (The sample text can be read in the Appendix of this paper, with phonetic transcriptions.)

A control group of informants from Hungary also participated in the survey: 15 students of Pázmány Péter Catholic University (Faculty of Letters) in Budapest (1 man and 14 women, with the age average of 21), who had the same reading tasks as the Transylvanians. Their L1 is standard Hungarian, and none of them is dialectophone (six of them are from Budapest, the others are from Debrecen, Szeged, Szolnok, Győr, Székesfehérvár, Gödöllő, Piliscsaba, Széphalom and Pétfürdő). Ten of them speak English at intermediate level (B1/B2), five at advanced level (C1/C2). Six of them speak only English as L2, other six speak one more foreign language (mostly German or French), and three of them have acquaintance with a fourth and a fifth language as well (e.g. Italian, Spanish, Classical Latin, Afghan).

One of the hypotheses of the study has already been confirmed after the data collection: the interlanguage of the Transylvanian informants must be more heterogeneous compared to those of Hungary, since they are dialectophones and speak more foreign languages. From another perspective, the main prelimilary difference between the informants from Hungary and those from Transylvania is that the informants of the former group speak English as L2, while those of the latter group speak it as L3, and they also speak additional languages. That is, the foreign accent of the Transylvanian informants must be affected by more sources of interference: their L1 Hungarian, their L1 dialect, their L2 Romanian and their other spoken foreign languages. The phonetic and phonological differences between the accents of the two informant groups are developed in Section 3.

2.3. Additional notes to the Transylvanian informants' interlanguage

Before turning to the results, we must spare a few additional words for the Transylvanian informants' interlanguage, since their dialects and the language contact with Romanian may supply them with extra sounds and phonological features compared to the speakers from Hungary.

From the 20th century, the standard version of Hungarian acquired a high prestige in Hungary, which led to the recession of the dialects; on the other hand, Hugarian varieties in Romania suffered an isolation from the standard, which led to the conservation of the dialects (cf. Péntek–Benő 2020). Dialectal fragmentation in Transylvania is so huge that can be paragoned to the situation of Italian dialects in Italy. Another similar analogy can also be established for the typical foreign accents of Italians and Hungarians from Transylvania. In fact, Italian speakers tend to pronounce foreign languages with a phonologically very similar foreign accent, undependently on their dialectal differencies (Huszthy 2016a, 2019, 2020).[17] Apparently, the same statement can be valid for Transylvanians, too (see Section 3).

Most dialectal differences among Transylvanian varieties and standard Hungarian concern the vowel systems. A few additional segments may appear in these dialects compared to the 14 Hungarian vowel phonemes (see Section 1.2.). First of all, Transylvanian dialects usually have more unrounded mid-front [e]-type vowels, and often have diphthongs (cf. Kiss 2001), which may affect their foreign accent (cf. Sections 2.1. and 4). The most interesting fact about vowel production regards the pronunciation of certain Secler informants (especially from the county of Covasna); in fact, they have the open-front [æ] vowel in their articulatory base (which phonetically coincides with English *ash*), but they do not use it in L2 English (cf. Section 3.2.).[18] Instead, they usually apply the typical Hunglish vowel substitution, and replace English [æ] with [ɛ] of standard Hungarian (cf. Section 1.2.).

Beyond the informants' dialects, we also need to briefly account for a few details of the sound system of their L2 Romanian, since it also contributes to the structure of their foreign accent (for details about Romanian phonology see Chitoran 2002 and Renwick 2022). There is a vowel which lacks from Hungarian (and its dialects), but it is phonemic in Romanian, and therefore it is also present in the Transylvanian informants' vowel system: the mid-central lax [ə], namely schwa. The substitution of English schwas is a typical feature of Hunglish (cf. Section 1.2.), but as we will see, the phenomenon is practically absent from Transylvanian

17 The main reason of this is that the productive phonological properties of L1 dialects, which interfere with L2, basically coindice, and the minor pronunciation differences between the accents are rather phonetic than phonological (see Huszthy 2016a).

18 The Secler informants of the experiment clearly use the [æ] vowel during their self introduction in Hungarian, but they stop to use it during the reading of the English text.

Hunglish. The glide [w] is also present in Romanian (while absent from Hungarian), and its presence may influence the Transylvanian speakers' English pronunciation, since we find less [w]-substitutions in their accent than in that of the informants from Hungary (cf. Section 3.3.).

There are further extralinguistic factors too, which contribute to the impression that Transylvanian Hunglish is a more authentic foreign accent of English compared to Hunglish spoken in Hungary. Most importantly, dubbing is very popular in Hungary, but it is not in Romania (foreign movies and TV-shows are normally transmitted in Romania in original language); accordingly, Romanians (and Hungarians living in Romania) hear authentic English pronunciations from early childhood.[19] Authentic material is also widely used in L2-education system in Romania, while Transylvanians of Hungarian mother tongue often learn English from teachers of Romanian mother tongue. These and other factors can all be responsible for the formation of the Transylvanian speakers' interlanguage, which manifests in their accent when they speak foreign languages.

3. The results of the reading experiment

The speech recordings were processed manually, with an auditory method, i.e., I counted every single pronunciation word by word in an Excel table and made statistics. Certainly there must be some miscalculations, but given the great number of informants, the averages are representative. Most phonological accent features could be identified by perception (e.g. phonemic differences, consonant gemination, vowel lengthening or shortening, obstruent voicing, etc.), others which could not (mostly phonetic features, like precise vowel quality, degree of aspiration, etc.) are not included in the results. The goal was to point out the most important characteristics of Transylvanian Hunglish, and outline the main differences compared to Hunglish from Hungary.[20]

The individual informants usually produced the same pronunciation mistakes and foreign accent features during the first and the second reading, but the second reading was always more confident and faster. As we will see, many phonological components are correspondent in the Hunglish varieties of the speakers, but some show consistent differences. Various target words will be shown and statistically analysed in this section, which were selected from the sample text readings in order to illustrate the most important phonological phenomena which constitute the Hunglish varieties. Many target words had 10-12 phonologically different pronunciations, too, but statistics reveal the most relevant forms used in the Hunglish of Transylvania and in that of Hungary.

19 The accent they predominantly hear is General American (GA), so it is often their target accent during L2 English learning.

20 Results can be still confirmed and specified in the future by more precise, controlled experiments made in a soundproof studio (cf. Section 4).

3.1. Loanwords in L2 reading

L2 words which are also present in L1 as loanwords are often pronounced by the speakers with the loanword form in L1 (i.e., the way how the words have been adapted to L1 phonology in diachrony). Accordingly, the name *Elvis Presley* was pronounced almost by every informant with its Hungarian form [ˈɛlvis ˈprɛsli], only a very few of them (and only advanced L2 speakers) applied English features, like dark [ɬ] and lax [ɪ] in [ˈɛɬvɪs], and s-voicing and approximant [ɹ] in [ˈpɹɛzli]. Other similar loanwords were *Mississippi* > H. [ˈmisisipi] and *Memphis* > H. [ˈmɛɱfis], which were all pronounced by the informants in the same forms. However, in four loanwords a systematic difference was revealed between the two informant groups: *Tennessee*, *rock 'n' roll*, *rocker*, *America*, see Table 1.

The subsequent tables of the paper are set up as follows: in the first column we can see the selected target words, in the second one English L1 forms are transcribed in *Received Pronunciation* (RP) and *General American* (GA),[21] while in the last two columns percentage values can be seen about the results of the Transylvanian (T) informants and those from Hungary (H). Percentages are calculated in relation to the overall pronunciation occurrences in the two groups, respectively (that is, each pronunciation form was calculated for each target word in both groups, and the most common varieties are shown in the table below).

target word	RP, GA	T	H
Tennessee	[ˌtʰɛnəˈsi]	[ˈtɛnɛsiː] 55%	[ˈtɛnɛsːi] 69%
rock 'n' roll	[ˈɹɒkənˈɹəʊɬ], [ˈɹɑkənˈɹoʊɬ]	[ˈɹɒkɛndrowl] 41%	[ˈrakɛndrolː] 54%
rocker	[ˈɹɒkə], [ˈɹɑkɚ]	[ˈɹɒkər] 33%	[ˈrokːɛr] 36%
America's	[əˈmɛɹɪkəz]	[əˈmɛɹikəz] 35%	[ˈamɛɹikaz] 31%

Table 1: Loanword substitutions

Apparently, for *Tennessee*, the form with long final [iː] and short [s] was better for Transylvanians, while Hungarians rather used a short [i] and a long [sː]. For *rock 'n' roll* we had various realisations in both groups (12 in total); the winning output was the loanword form [ˈrakɛndrolː] for Hungarians, and although it was also chosen by several Transylvanians, they rather preferred an interlanguage realisation mixing L1 and L2 elements. The same statement is valid for *rocker* as well, where Hungarians chose the loanword form [ˈrokːɛr], while Transylvanians preferred an interlanguage realisation. Finally, in the case of *America's* the Transylvanian informants mainly used an English-like pronunciation, while Hungarians applied an interlanguage realisation closer to the L1 form of the loanword.

21 When there is no difference between RP and GA, only one L1 transcription is shown.

3.2. Vowels

Among vowel substitutions, English closed lax vowels [ɪ, ʊ] are regularly substituted in both Hunglish varieties by L1 vowels [i, u], e.g. *st̲ill* > H. [stil:], *reg̲ularly* > H. [ˈrɛg(j)ulərli], etc. (only a few exceptions can be found in both groups among advanced L2 speakers). English open back vowels [ʌ, ɒ, ɔ, ɑ] are replaced by three L1 segments in Hunglish: [a, ɒ, o], but substitution proportions differ according to the two groups, as is shown in Table 2.

target word	RP, GA	T	H
h̲ot	[hɒt], [hɑt]	[ɒ] 52% [o] 26% [a] 22%	[ɒ] 13% [o] 30% [a] 57%
st̲op	[stɒp], [stɑp]	[ɒ] 53% [a] 32% [o] 15%	 [a] 84% [o] 16%
forg̲otten	[fəˈgɒtn̩], [fɚˈgɑɾən]	[a] 65% [ɒ] 26% [o] 9%	[a] 55% [ɒ] 7% [o] 38%
r̲ocker	[ˈɹɒkə], [ˈɹɑkɚ]	[ɒ] 64% [a] 29% [o] 7%	[ɒ] 18% [a] 14% [o] 68%
h̲alf	[hɑːf], [hæf]	[ɒ] 82% [a] 28%	[ɒ] 53% [a] 47%
s̲on	[sʌn]	[ɒ] 76% [o] 15% [a] 9%	[ɒ] 40% [o] 7% [a] 53%
s̲ummer	[ˈsʌmə], [ˈsʌmɚ]	[ɒ] 65% [a] 35%	[ɒ] 19% [a] 81%
h̲undreds	[ˈhʌndɹədz]	[ɒ] 61% [a] 39%	[ɒ] 29% [a] 71%
d̲oesn't	[dʌzn̩t]	[ɒ] 56% [a] 44%	[ɒ] 8% [a] 92%
c̲oming	[ˈkʰʌmɪŋ]	[ɒ] 94% [a] 6%	[ɒ] 26% [a] 74%
̲others	[ˈʌðəz], [ˈʌðɚz]	[ɒ] 73% [a] 27%	[ɒ] 29% [a] 71%
s̲ome c̲ome j̲ust o̲nce	[ˈsʌm ˈkʰʌm ʤʌst ˈwʌns]	all [ɒ] 88% all [a] 0%	all [ɒ] 26% all [a] 53%
a̲lmost	[ˈɔːɬməʊst], [ˈɔɬˌmoʊst]	[oː] 60% [o] 30% [ɒ] 10%	[oː] 73% [o] 15% [ɒ] 12%
a̲lthough	[ɔːɬˈðəʊ], [ˌɔɬˈðoʊ]	[o] 82% [ɒ] 13% [oː] 5%	[o] 77% [oː] 23%
m̲ore	[mɔː(ɹ)]	[oː] 100%	[oː] 100%
imp̲ortant	[ɪmˈpʰɔːtənt], [ɪmˈpʰɔɹtənt]	[o] 96% [oː] 4%	[o] 89% [oː] 11%

Table 2: Hunglish substitutions for English open back vowels

As the data show, the usual Hunglish substitution of English mid-open [ɔ] happens with Hungarian mid-closed [o] in both groups, such as in *m<u>o</u>re* [mɔː(ɹ)] > H. [moːr]. But for the other English open back vowels [ʌ, ɒ, ɑ] a general difference is detected between the two informant groups: Transylvanians mostly use L1 [ɒ],[22] while Hungarians primarily use L1 [a]. The phrase "some come just once" (in English all vowels are [ʌ]) is a significant example from the corpus illustrating the two Hunglish substitution phenomena: 88% of the Transylvanian informants pronounced it as [ˈsɒm kɒm dʒɒst ˈwɒns], while 53% of the Hungarians used the form [ˈsam ˈkam dʒast ˈvans] (and 23% of them used [ɒ] only in the last word: [ˈsam ˈkam dʒast ˈvɒns]).

As far as other vowel substitutions are concerned, the *ash* vowel [æ] bearly appears in the corpus, and only in the case of advanced speakers. The usual substitution in Hunglish is with [ɛ] in both groups, e.g. the *and* conjunction sounded always as H. [ɛnd] on the recordings; while the target word *stamps* [stæmps] was almost always realised as H. [stɛmps].[23]

The most special vowel for Transylvanian Hunglish is schwa [ə]. Since it is a phonemic sound in Romanian (which is all Transylvanian informants' L2), it is present in the Transylvanian Hungarian speakers' articulatory base. However, it is absent from that of the speakers from Hungary, who usually replace it with [ɛ] or [ø] (cf. Section 1.2.), or realise it as an interlanguage sound between schwa and [ø],[24] or as other vowels by spelling pronunciation. In Table 3 various target words appear with typical Hunglish realisations of English schwas found in the corpus.

target word	RP, GA	T	H
ov<u>e</u>r	[ˈəʊvə], [ˈoʊvɚ]	[ə] 91% [ɛ] 9%	[ə~ø] 28% [ɛ] 36% [ø] 36%
summ<u>e</u>r	[ˈsʌmə], [ˈsʌmɚ]	[ə] 93% [ɛ] 7%	[ə~ø] 35% [ɛ] 9% [ø] 56%
riv<u>e</u>r	[ˈɹɪvə], [ˈɹɪvɚ]	[ə] 94% [ɛ] 6%	[ə~ø] 43% [ɛ] 10% [ø] 47%
famo<u>u</u>s	[ˈfeɪməs]	[ə] 96% [o] 4%	[ə~ø] 43% [ø] 57%
rock<u>e</u>r	[ˈɹɒkə], [ˈɹɑkɚ]	[ə] 100%	[ə~ø] 50% [ɛ] 50%

22 Or an interlanguage sound which is heavily based on Hungarian [ɒ].

23 Except in the case of two Transylvanian and one Hungarian advanced English speakers, who sporadically used the [æ] vowel in *stamps*.

24 This Hunglish interlanguage sound is generally a fronting-labialised version of schwa, which is not a plain rounded front vowel like Hungarian [ø], rather an intermediate realisation between [ə] and [ø], indicated in Table 3 as [ə~ø].

target word	RP, GA	T	H
import̲ant	[ɪmˈpʰɔːtənt], [ɪmˈpʰɔɹtənt]	[ə] 80% [ɛ] 20%	[ə~ø] 29% [ɛ] 71%
millio̲ns	[ˈmɪljənz]	[ə] 80% [o] 20%	[ə~ø] 56% [o] 44%
regula̲rly	[ˈɹɛgjʊləli], [ˈɹɛgjələ-li]	[ə] 93% [a] 7%	[ə~ø] 64% [a] 7% [ø] 22% [ɛ] 7%
wo̲rld	[wɜːɬd], [wɜ-ɬd]	[ə] 100%	[ə~ø] 29% [ø] 71%
a̲go	[əˈgəʊ], [əˈgoʊ]	[ə] 76% [ɛ] 24%	[ə~ø] 77% [ɛ] 23%
a̲ttraction	[əˈtɹækʃn̩]	1. [ə] 87% [ɛ] 13% 2. [ə] 93% syllabic [n̩] 7%	1. [ə~ø] 40% [ɛ] 60% 2. [ə~ø] 71% [ø] 29%
a̲way	[əˈweɪ]	[ə] 80% [o] 20%	[ə~ø] 63% [ø] 32%
profession̲a̲l	[pɹəˈfɛʃənəɬ], [pɹəˈfɛʃn̩ɬ]	1. [ə] 20% [o] 80% 2. [ə] 100% 3. [ə] 80% [ɛ] 20%	1. [ə~ø] 4% [o] 96% 2. [ə~ø] 100% 3. [ə~ø] 32% [ɛ] 35% [ø] 33%
sev̲enty sev̲en	[ˌsɛvn̩ti ˈsɛvn̩]	both [ə] 72% both [ɛ] 10%	both [ə~ø] 29% both [ɛ] 54%
fo̲rgott̲en	[fəˈgɒtn̩], [fɚˈgɑɾən]	1. [o] 74% [ə] 26% 2. [ə] 50% [ɛ] 28% syllabic [n̩] 22%	1. [o] 90% [ə~ø] 10% 2. [ə~ø] 7% [ɛ] 86% syllabic [n̩] 7%
A̲merica̲'s	[əˈmɛɹɪkəz]	1. [ə] 65% [a] 28% [ɛ] 6% 2. [a] 69% [ə] 31%	1. [ə~ø] 24% [a] 76% 2. [a] 81% [ə~ø] 19%

Table 3: English schwa realisations in Hunglish

English schwas are usually substituted in Hunglish by other vowels ([ɛ], [ø], [ə~ø] or others by spelling pronunciation), but in the Transylvanians' pronunciation they principally remain schwas. This is one of the most significant differences between the two Hunglish varieties. Advanced speakers in the Hungarian group mostly use the interlanguage sound indicated as [ə~ø], while intermediate speakers more often apply the front rounded [ø]. Among Transylvanians, however, this substitution did not occur at all in the corpus, not even in those informants whose Romanian is at lower-intermediate level. On the other hand, [ɛ] is used

in both groups, but to a lesser extent; especially in words with *-er* or *-en* ending (like *summer*, *over*, *forgotten*, *seven*, etc.), and when spelling does not allude to schwa, like in *importa̲nt* > H. [imˈportɛnt], *a̲go* > H. [ɛˈgoː] *a̲ttraction* > H. [ɛˈtrɛkʃən], etc.

English diphthongs often appear in Hunglish as monophthongs (cf. Section 1.2.). Among English diphthongs [aɪ], [aʊ] and [ɔɪ] are usually preserved (and reproduced as [aj], [aw], [oj], like in *miles* > H. [majls], *out* > H. [awt], *voice* > H. [vojs]); but others tend to undergo monophthongisation, which may also lead to vowel shortening. However, Transylvanian informants apparently preserve more diphthongs in their pronunciation compared to the speakers from Hungary. Table 4 shows examples found in the corpus.

target word	RP, GA	T	H
alth̲o̲u̲gh̲	[ɔːɬˈðəʊ], [ˌɔɬˈðoʊ]	[oː] 64% diphthong 36%	[oː] 88% diphthong 12%
ag̲o̲	[əˈgəʊ], [əˈgoʊ]	diphthong 62% [oː] 38%	diphthong 27% [oː] 73%
o̲ver	[ˈəʊvə], [ˈoʊvɚ]	[oː] 77% diphthong 23%	[oː] 92% diphthong 8%
h̲o̲me	[həʊm], [hoʊm]	diphthong 63% [oː] 37%	diphthong 15% [oː] 85%
th̲o̲se	[ðəʊz], [ðoʊz]	[oː] 60% diphthong 40%	[oː] 64% diphthong 36%
m̲o̲st	[məʊst], [moʊst]	long [oː] 48% short [o] 31% diphthong 21%	long [oː] 50% short [o] 32% diphthong 18%
o̲nly	[ˈəʊnli], [ˈoʊnli]	short [o] 70% diphthong 20% long [oː] 10%	short [o] 69% diphthong 12% long [oː] 19%
p̲o̲stage	[ˈpʰəʊstɪdʒ], [ˈpʰoʊstɪdʒ]	short [o] 71% diphthong 18% long [oː] 11%	short [o] 79% diphthong 6% long [oː] 15%
m̲a̲ke	[meɪk]	[eː] 78% diphthong 22%	[eː] 94% diphthong 6%
f̲a̲mous	[ˈfeɪməs]	[eː] 70% diphthong 30%	[eː] 79% diphthong 21%
m̲a̲jor	[ˈmeɪʤə], [ˈmeɪʤɚ]	[eː] 73% diphthong 16% [ɛ] 11%	[eː] 73% diphthong 12% [ɛ] 7% [a] 5% [ɒ] 3%
Gr̲a̲celand	[ˈgɹeɪslænd]	[eː] 92% diphthong 8%	[eː] 91% diphthong 9%
t̲o̲u̲rist	[ˈtʰʊəɹɪst], [ˈtʰɔːɹɪst], [ˈtʰʊɹəst]	long [uː] 44% short [u] 30% diphthong 26%	long [uː] 25% short [u] 59% diphthong 16%
r̲e̲a̲l	[ɹɪəɬ]	[iː] 55% diphthong 45%	[iː] 86% diphthong 14%

target word	RP, GA	T	H
hero	[ˈhɪəɹəʊ], [ˈhɪəɹoʊ], [ˈhiːɹoʊ], [ˈhɪɹoʊ]	1. short [i] 61% long [iː] 39% 2. diphthong 59% [oː] 41%	1. short [i] 23% long [iː] 77% 2. diphthong 17% [oː] 83%
years	[jɪəz], [jɪɚz], [jɜːz], [jɝːz]	short [e] 50% short [i] 32% long [iː] 12% long [eː] 3% diphthong 3%	short [e] 41% long [iː] 52% long [eː] 7%

Table 4: English diphthongs in Hunglish

As Table 4 shows, a general tendency of monophthongisation can be observed in both Hunglish varieties; however, Transylvanian informants pronounce considerably more diphthongs compared to those from Hungary. Diphthongs of Transylvanian Hunglish are mostly backing [ow] in place of English [əʊ]/[oʊ], and sometimes they are even in majority compared to monophthongised realisations, as in *home* and *ago*.[25] Fronting diphthongs are rarer, but still slightly more realisations appear in the Transylvanians' pronunciation than in that of Hungarians, like [ej] in place of English [eɪ] in *make* and *famous*.

The reason for the general monophthongisation in Hunglish is that standard Hungarian does not have diphthongs (cf. Siptár–Törkenczy 2000). However, Romanian does (Renwick 2022), and that may affect the Transylvanian speakers' accent; moreover, certain Hungarian dialects of Transylvania have diphthongs as well, which may be a further reason for the fact that the Transylvanian informants of the study use more diphthongs in English than those from Hungary.

The last aspect of Hunglish vocalism concerns the phenomenon of vowel shortening. We have already seen many examples among the cases of monophthongisation which lead to the abbreviation of the vowel, e.g. in *most* H. [ow] > [oː] > [o]. Vowel shortening deriving from monophthongisation almost equally characterises both Hunglish varieties (see the proportions in Table 4). Shortening primarily arises in closed syllables (as in *only*, *most*, *postage*, *years* etc.), since superheavy syllables are very marked in Hungarian phonotactics (cf. Siptár–Törkenczy 2000).[26] But we can also find the phenomenon in open syllables, like in *tourist* and *hero*; moreover, the ratio of shortening is different in these words in the two target accents: Transylvanians prefer to pronounce *tourist* with a long [uː], and *hero* with a short [i], as opposed to the informants from Hungary, who generally use a short [u] in *tourist* and a long [iː] in *hero*.

25 This diphthong is sometimes realised by Transylvanian speakers as [oʊ], [ou] or [əʊ].

26 A further example of shortening non as the result of monophthongisation can be observed in the target word *seems* H. [sims]. The reason of the shortening is probably the markedness of superheavy syllables again. 60% of the informants from Transylvania pronounced the word with a short [i], as opposed to the 29% of the informants from Hungary (71% of them pronounced it with a long [iː]).

3.3. Consonants

As far as consonants are concerned, the most usual segmental substitutions regard the dental fricatives [θ, ð], which are regularly replaced in both Hunglish varieties by homorganic L1 segments, principally by the stops [t, d]; similarly, aspirated voiceless stops [pʰ, tʰ, kʰ] are also substituted by unaspirated ones, and dark [ɬ] is barely used on the recordings.[27] The velar nasal [ŋ] is almost always produced as an [ŋg] sequence in both informant groups, except in the case of some advanced speakers of English.[28]

The distribution of the bilabial velar approximant [w] is different in the two target accents, though. The informants from Hungary regularly replace it by the homorganic obstruent [v], but Transylvanian informants rather preserve it. Considering three target words from the sample text, in *world* Transylvanians used [w] in 62% of the overall occurrences of the word, compared to the 37% of [w] realisations from Hungary; in *where* the ratio of [w] is 81% vs 35% for the Transylvanians; while in *away* Hungarian informants pronounced [w] in 39% of the occurrences compared to the 58% found in the Transylvanians' pronunciation. Some sporadic hypercorrect [w] pronunciations also occurred on the recordings in place of etymological [v]; especially in the phrase "only one voice", where *voice* was pronounced in a couple of cases as [wojs] in both informant groups.

The rhotic postalveolar approximant [ɹ] shows a similar distribution to [w] in the corpus; that is, Transylvanians often preserve it, while the informants from Hungary mostly replace it by the trill [r] or the tap [ɾ] (the latter especially in intervocalic position). [ɹ] is primarily used at the beginning of words: in the target word *real* 57% of the Transylvanian informants pronounced the approximant [ɹ], compared to the 28% of the speakers from Hungary; in *river* the ratio of initial [ɹ]s is 58% vs 26% for the Transylvanians; while in *regularly* it is 45% vs 25% for the Transylvanians.

Further consonantal phenomena of Hunglish are phonological, primarily linked to phonotactics, syllable structure and laryngeal phonology. A common feature of both target varieties of Hunglish is consonantal gemination inside a single morpheme (cf. Section 1.2). When English spelling suggests long consonants, speakers with a Hungarian mother tongue often pronounce them as long ones, too, as opposed to any L1 English pronunciation. Four target words are in the corpus which are possible inputs for Hunglish gemination. The first one is *still*, whose /l/ occurs before a vowel ("*still a hero*"), and in this position all 45 informants

27 Only some of the advanced L2 speakers used the dental fricatives [θ, ð] (or close interlanguage sounds), aspirated voiceless stops and dark [ɬ]; therefore, I did not make any statistics in this regard.

28 For instance, in the target word *king* 9% of realisations with [ŋ] (and without [g]) were found among Transylvanian speakers, and 5% among the informants from Hungary.

of the study pronounced the word as [stilː].[29] Proportions of gemination are less consistent in the other three target words: *summer* GA [ˈsʌmɚ], *professional* GA [pɹəˈfɛʃənəɬ], *forgotten* GA [fɚˈgɑɾən]. In *summer* 9% of the Transylvanians and 10% of the Hungarians used a long [mː] (but only the intermediate speakers in both groups); in *professional* 63% of the Transylvanians and 87% of the Hungarians pronounced a long [ʃː] (equally in both language level groups); while in *forgotten* 28% of the Transylvanians[30] and 52% of the Hungarians used a long [tː] (mostly from the intermediate group).

The pronunciation of English /u/ with a Yod: [ju] apparently happens by a /j/-insertion process for L2/L3 English learners,[31] as in three target words of the corpus: *U.S.* GA [ˌjuːˈɛs], *regularly* GA [ˈɹɛgjələɹli], *century* GA [ˈsɛntʃəɹi]. The word *U.S.* was pronounced as [ˈjuːɛs] by all of the informants.[32] In *regularly* we found 70% of pronunciations with [j] in the case of advanced Transylvanian speakers, and 33% in intermediate speakers; while 50% of [j] occurred in advanced speakers from Hungary, and 20% in intermediate speakers. In *century* the pronunciation with a Yod leads to /t/ > [tʃ] lexical palatalisation in English: the word was pronounced with [tʃ] by 100% of the advanced and 25% of the intermediate Transylvanian speakers (others pronounced it with a [t]); while among the informants from Hungary 100% of the advanced speakers and 57% of the intermediate speakers used the form with a [tʃ]. Accordingly, the pronunciation of a Yod before /u/ highly depends on the level of L2 English.[33]

Syllabic sonorants were generally avoided by the informants, only [n̩] was occasionally used by advanced speakers; for instance, 22% of the Transylvanians used a syllabic [n̩] in *forgotten*, as opposed to the 7% found in the group from Hungary; in the target word *doesn't* the ratio of syllabic [n̩]s was 20% in both groups, while the year *1977* was pronounced with two syllabic [n̩]s by 13% of the Transylvanian and 10% of the Hungarian informants.

29 Final consonant gemination in monosyllables is not only spelling pronunciation for Hungarians, the phenomenon is also triggered by the *minimal word requirement* of Hungarian phonology (cf. Huszthy 2016b, 2019). This proposal is also supported by the sporadic gemination found in the corpus in the case of the phrase "*hot and sticky*", where the final /t/ of *hot* was geminated in 6% of the realisations from Hungary.

30 A few among the Transylvanian informants used American-like flapping in the word *forgotten*, and pronounced it with [ɾ].

31 As opposed to the L1 English realisations, where [ju] is the underlying form, and historically arose certain forms with *Yod-dropping*, e.g. *sure*, *blue*, *rule*, etc.

32 Some speakers pronounced "*United States*" H. [ˈjunajtitˈsteːts], but still with a [j].

33 Similar results have been found in the case of English /tr/-affrication, too (indicated in IPA as [tr̊]); for instance, in the target word *trip* [tr̊ɪp] 71% of the advanced and 43% of the intermediate Transylvanian speakers applied affrication, while among the speakers from Hungary only the advanced speakers used it, in 82%.

3.4. Laryngeal phonology

Another common Hunglish characteristic found in both groups concerns laryngeal phonology. First, all of the informants pronounce voiced obstruents on the recordings where English spelling suggests voice, even if in L1 English there is no underlying voice in utterance initial and final position (cf. Balogné Bérces 2017b); e.g. *Graceland* GA [ˈg̊ɹeɪslænd̥] > H. [gre:slɛnd]. The absence of aspiration in Hunglish has already been mentioned during segmental substitutions; the main reason for that is the fact that Hungarian is a voice language, while English is an aspiration language (see Balogné Bérces 2017b). Accordingly, Hungarian speakers (both from Transylvania and from Hungary) regularly apply regressive voice assimilation on the recordings. The most apparent cases of this process regard regressive voicing at word boundary, like in the following examples, where all of the informants pronounced voiced consonants (which would be all voiceless in an L1 English pronunciation): *make the* GA [kð̥] > H. [gd], *stop the* GA [pð̥] > H. [bd], *voice that* GA [sð̥] > H. [zd], *yet that* GA [tð̥] > H. [d:].

The frequent voiceless appearance of word final /s/ as a suffix seems to be another common feature in the two Hunglish varieties. Five target words of the corpus are compared in Table 5. RP and GA pronunciations are not transcribed now (in L1 varieties we always find a voiced [z] at the end of these target words), but we separate advanced and intermediate L2 speakers.

target word	T – advanced	T – intermediate	H – advanced	H – intermediate
millions	[z] 53% [s] 47%	[z] 31% [s] 69%	[z] 50% [s] 50%	[z] 21% [s] 79%
miles	[z] 62% [s] 38%	[z] 71% [s] 29%	[z] 30% [s] 70%	[z] 38% [s] 62%
fans	[z] 41% [s] 59%	[z] 50% [s] 50%	[z] 40% [s] 59%	 [s] 100%
others	[z] 88% [s] 12%	[z] 71% [s] 29%	[z] 15% [s] 85%	[z] 22% [s] 78%
hundreds	[dz] 71% [ts] 29%	[dz] 47% [ts] 53%	[dz] 57% [ts] 43%	[dz] 63% [ts] 37%

Table 5: Voicing in the /s/ suffix

As Table 5 shows, the voiced resolution of the suffix /s/ is the most common among the advanced L2 speakers of English, while intermediate speakers more often choose the voiceless [s]. We cannot determine any significant difference between the informants from Transylvania and from Hungary, the choice between voiced and voiceless forms often seems to be accidental; however, statistics reveal that the input form of the suffix /s/ for L2 English speakers with Hungarian mother tongue is voiceless, unlike for L1 English speakers (cf. Section 1.2).

3.5. Word stress

The last foreign accent features which can be determined on the basis of the corpus of this study are prosodic. For now, we only examine the place of the word stress (the intonational patterns found on the recordings can be analysed in a future paper). As a general prosodic outcome of the corpus, we can affirm that the informants assigned stress to considerably more words compared to an L1 English production: almost every word was stressed in the Hunglish pronunciations (see the transcriptions in the Appendix).

In general, speakers with a Hungarian mother tongue often misplace the stress in languages with mobile word stress patterns; a usual replacement strategy is to shift the stress to the beginning of polysyllabic words by the influence of the Hungarian word initial stress (cf. Siptár–Törkenczy 2000). In this regard we also find differences between the informant groups from Transylvania and from Hungary, as it is shown in Table 6.

target word	RP, GA	T	H
although	2nd syll.	1st syll. 44% 2nd syll. 56%	1st syll. 81% 2nd syll. 19%
America's	2nd syll.	1st syll. 30% 2nd syll. 70%	1st syll. 62% 2nd syll. 38%
professional	2nd syll.	2nd syll. 100%	1st syll. 39% 2nd syll. 61%
attraction	2nd syll.	2nd syll. 100%	1st syll. 16% 2nd syll. 84%
important	2nd syll.	2nd syll. 100%	1st syll. 11% 2nd syll. 89%

Table 6: Hunglish word stress assignment

Stress shift to the first syllable mostly appears in the pronunciation of the intermediate speakers in both groups. However, if we compare the productions of Transylvanians and the Hungarians, we see a significant difference. Indeed, the informants from Hungary apply first syllable stress shift much more: in *although* and *America's* in the majority of the occurrences; while in *professional*, *attraction* and *important* to a lesser extent, but in these last three words Transylvanians do not use first stress at all.

The low amount of missed stress assignments in the Transylvanian group may be due to the speakers' L2 Romanian knowledge, since Romanian has mobile word stress, so the informants are able to handle word stress patterns that are different from their L1. The only example where the two informant groups equally misplaced the stress is the case of the phrase *most famous* GA [moʊst ˈfeɪməs]; in fact, in this intonational phrase only the second word is stressed in English, while in Hunglish all of the informants placed the stress to the first word, as it would happen in a similar intonational phrase in Hungarian, e.g. H. [ˈmoːst feːməs].

4. Conclusions

On the basis of the reading experiment presented in the previous section, this paper sorted out the most important phonetic and phonological components which characterise Transylvanian Hungarians' English pronunciation. Several Hunglish features (as described in the literature, see Section 1.2) are common in the L2/L3 English of speakers whose L1 is Hungarian, both from Hungary and Transylvania (see the various subsections of Section 3). In certain aspects, however, Transylvanian Hunglish seems to be a more authentic (i.e., more native-like) non-native accent of English compared to the variety spoken in Hungary. The main reason is that Transylvanians speak English as L3, and they are also dialectal speakers, so their articulatory base is wider, their phonotactic restrictions are less severe, etc.

Among differing vowel substitutions, Transylvanians typically replace English open back vowels [ʌ, ɒ, ɑ] with Hungarian [ɒ] (or an interlanguage resolution based on L1 [ɒ]), as opposed to the usual Hunglish substitution, which happens with Hungarian [a] (see Section 1.2. and the results of the Hungarian control group in Section 3); like in this phrase from the sample text: *some come just once* GA [sʌm kʰʌm ʤʌst wʌns] > Transylvanian H. [sɒm kɒm ʤɒst wɒns] ~ Hungarian H. [sam kam ʤast vans].

There is a general difference in the realisation of English schwas, too. Schwas are often replaced by [ø] in Hunglish, or an interlanguage sound between schwa and L1 [ø] (cf. Sections 1.2. and 3.2.). However, Transylvanians mostly preserve schwas in English, since they have schwa as a phoneme in their L2 Romanian. Nevertheless, the other (less frequent) Hunglish schwa-substitution with L1 [ɛ] occasionally arises in Transylvanian varieties as well, e.g. *import̲ant* H. [imˈportɛnt], *a̲go* H. [ɛˈgoː], etc.[34]

Furthermore, Transylvanians generally use more diphthongs in English than speakers from Hungary. The reason is their L2 Romanian again, which has diphthongs, unlike standard Hungarian (moreover, several Transylvanian dialects have diphthongs, too). Accordingly, the usual Hunglish monophthongisation is less salient in the case of Transylvanian speakers (but it is still present).

Unlike vowels, L1 transfer phenomena regarding consonants are very similar in the two Hunglish target accents. The most important differences concern two segmental substitutions: the use of [v] instead of [w] is less common in Transylvanians' pronunciation, as well as the use of [r] instead of [ɹ]. They also produce more syllabic [n̩]s compared to the speakers from Hungary. Other Hunglish features, like intramorphemic consonant gemination, voiceless input for the /s/ suffix, regressive voice assimilation, etc., equally characterise both varieties.

34 Actually, in these examples the substitution is based on spelling pronunciation, since the "a" letter (which is used to be an English [æ] vowel) is substituted by the H. [ɛ] vowel.

The last aspect which shows differences in the two Hunglish types is word stress assignment. Apparently, Transylvanians apply fewer unjustified stress replacements for L1 influence. The reason is probably their L2 Romanian again, which has mobile stress patterns, unlike Hungarian. But if we concentrate on intonational phrases and not on single words, we find the same stress replacement patterns in both Hunglish varieties; like in the case of the phrase *most famous*, where in L1 English varieties the second word is the stressed one, but Hungarian speakers typically place the stress on the first word of the composition both in Transylvania and in Hungary.

As a general conclusion of the comparison, we may affirm that – apart from the differences seen above – Transylvanian speakers mostly use the same Hunglish features as speakers from Hungary, but to a lesser extent, so their foreign accent seems to be less marked. Accordingly, the initial informal hypothesis of the study has been confirmed only in part: although Transylvanian Hunglish seems to be a less marked foreign accent than Hungarian Hunglish, the two varieties more or less share the same phonetic and phonological components. The second hypothesis of the study about phonetic differences in vowel quality could not be confirmed, apparently Transylvanians use similar vowels to speakers from Hungary, but for accurate vowel formant values we will need more precise speech recordings (made in a soundproof studio, with a headmicrophone).[35] Finally, the third hypothesis has been confirmed: we found fewer segmental substitutions in Transylvanian informants' pronunciation compared to the speakers from Hungary, since they do not substitute English schwas, and they use fewer substitutions in the case of English diphthongs, [w] and [ɹ] as well.

As far as further minor differences are concerned into the informant groups, we can establish some consistencies. Certain pronunciation mistakes typically arise only among the intermediate speakers of English in both groups, e.g. needless diphthongisation in *river* > [ˈrajvɛr] and *lived* > [lajvd], or its opposite in *miles* > [miːls] and *died* > [diːd]. Moreover, considerably more spelling pronunciation mistakes occur among the intermediate speakers (B1, B2) compared to the advanced speakers (C1, C2); some examples from the intermediate groups: *major* [ˈmɒjor], *once* > [ons], *though* > [thoug], *postage* > [ˈposteːdʒ]. All of these features are considered mispronunciations by lower L2/L3 level, and not foreign accent elements by L1 influence. On the other hand, C2 English speakers from both groups occasionally use authentic English pronunciation features, like aspiration in voiceless stops, lax vowels and [æ]. They use fewer elements by Hungarian L1 influence, but they still cannot avoid them, at least some of the time.

35 Only one dialectal difference has been noticed: the target word *where* was pronounced with a mid-closed [e] by four informants from Mureș county: [wer]; while all of the other informants (both from Transylvania and from Hungary) used a mid-open [ɛ] in this word.

An interesting observation is that most Hungarian C2 English speakers' accent is a semi-rhotic variety of English, which confirms previous studies about semi-rhoticity in advanced Hunglish (Balogné Bérces 2017a, Balogné Bérces–Piukovics 2019a, Piukovics–Balogné Bérces 2019; also cf. footnote 10). Many C2 speakers (both among the Transylvanians and the Hungarians) tend to use a non-rhotic English pronunciation, which is obtained by r-deletion in coda position, but sometimes they miss to delete coda-r. They usually manage to delete it when it is not word-final, and before prosodic boundaries, e.g. *wo*r̲*ld* > [wəld], *othe*r̲*s* > [ˈɒðəz], *regula*r̲*ly* > [ˈɹɛgjuləːli], "*rive*r̲*, yet…*" > [ˈɹivə | ˈjɛt], "*rocke*r̲ *(the only…*" > [ˈɹɒkə | ðiˈownli], etc. But they often pronounce coda-r in monosyllables, and in word-final position in connected speech, e.g. *majo*r̲ *tourist…* > [ˈmejdʒəɹˈtuːɹist], *a*r̲*e the…* > [pːɹdə], *fo*r̲ *most…* > [foɹˈmowst], *fo*r̲ *millions ove*r̲ *the world* > [foɹˈmilijənzˈowvəɹdəˈwəld], etc.

Other significant differences could not be find among the informants of the same group; for instance, intermediate and advanced Romanian L2 speakers' Hunglish apparently does not show differences; we could not found any significant differences among professors and students, and males and females, either. However, the four informants of the Transylvanian group who do not geographically belong to Transylvania in a narrower sense (two from Satu Mare and two from Sălaj), show an interesting intermediate accent between the two groups' typical resolutions. In certain aspects their Hunglish is similar to the Transylvanian average, in others to that of the informants from Hungary; e.g., they use schwas and diphthongs, but not as many as the Transylvanians, they rather use [a] than [ɒ] for replacing English back vowels, similarly to the informants from Hungary, etc. It would be worth exploring the differences and the similarities among Transylvanian Hunglish and other Hungarian accents from Romania in subsequent studies.

This paper was a preliminary work for describing the general phonological peculiarities of Hungarian accented English in Transylvania, as compared to the "classical Hunglish" spoken by Hungarians in Hungary. The differences may depend on various factors beyond the heterogeneity of the speakers' interlanguage; for instance, the teachers' accent also affects the students' pronunciation, and Transylvanians often learn English from Romanian teachers. But the influence of their L1 Hungarian is still detectable on their foreign accent. On the basis of the data presented in this paper we can establish additional hypotheses as well, which may lead to further studies about Hunglish and Transylvanian Hunglish in the future.

Acknowledgements

I recommend this study to my colleagues and students at Babeș–Bolyai University out of gratitude for the memorable three years spent together! I especially thank my volunteer informants from Babeș–Bolyai

University and Pázmány Péter Catholic University, without whom I would not have been able to carry out this research. I am particularly grateful to Katalin Balogné Bérces and Sándor Szilágyi N., who provided me with vital comments and suggestions! The project has been realised with the aid of the Hungarian Ministry for Innovation and Technology, as it was partly sponsored by grants TKP2020-NKA-11 and #142498.

Bibliography

Ahamad, Afroz – Anand, Ankit – Bhargava, Pranesh. AccentDB: A Database of Non-Native English Accents to Assist Neural Speech Recognition. In Calzolari, Nicoletta et al. eds. *Proceedings of the 12th Conference on Language Resources and Evaluation*. Marseille: European Language Resources Association, 2020, pp. 5351–5358.

Altenberg, Evelyn – Vago, Robert M. Theoretical implications of error analysis of second language phonology production. *Language Learning* 33/4, 1983, pp. 427–447.

Balogné Bérces, Katalin. Is there a semi-rhotic variety of Hunglish? In Szigetvári, Péter (ed.) *70 snippets to mark Ádám Nádasdy's 70th birthday*. Budapest: ELTE, 2017a, pp. 1–7.

Balogné Bérces, Katalin. A *News Feed*em a *Facebook*on: Fonológiaalapú laringális nyelvtipológia. [My News Feed on Facebook: phonologically based laryngeal typology] *Nyelvtudományi Közlemények* 113, 2017b, pp. 147–166.

Balogné Bérces, Katalin – Piukovics, Ágnes. Semi-rhoticity in language contact: English-based creoles and interlanguages. In Antal, Éva – Czeglédi, Csaba – Krakkó, Eszter (eds.) *Contemporary Perspectives on Language, Culture and Identity in Anglo-American Contexts*. Newcastle upon Tyne: Cambridge Scholars Publishing, 2019a, pp. 326–343.

Balogné Bérces, Katalin – Piukovics, Ágnes. *The accent of Hungarian learners of English*. Manuscript. Budapest: PPCU Institute of English and American Studies, 2019b.

Balogné Bérces, Katalin – Szentgyörgyi, Szilárd. *The pronunciation of English*. Budapest: Bölcsész Konzorcium, 2006.

Chitoran, Ioana. *The Phonology of Romanian: A Constraint-based Approach*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter, 2002.

Cser, András. Basic types of phonological change. In Honeybone, Patrick – Salmons, Joseph eds. *The Oxford Handbook of Historical Phonology*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2015, pp. 193–204.

Cruttenden, Alan. *Gimson's pronunciation of English*. London – New York: Routledge, 2014.

Doughty, Susan – Thompson, Geoff. *Problem English: A Practical Guide for Hungarian Learners of English*. Budapest: Tankönyvkiadó, 1983.

Eckman, Fred. Typological markedness and second language phonology. In Hansen Edwards, Jette G. – Zampini, Mary L. eds. *Phonology*

and Second Language Acquisition. Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 2008, pp. 95–115.
Flege, James E. The phonological basis of foreign accent: A hypothesis. *TESOL Quarterly* 15, 1981, pp. 443–455.
Flege, James E. The production of "new" and "similar" phones in a foreign language: Evidence for the effect of equivalence classification. *Journal of Phonetics* 15, 1987, pp. 47–65.
Flege, James E. Second language speech learning: Theory, findings, and problems. In Strange, Winifred ed. *Speech perception and linguistic experience: Issues in cross-language research*. Baltimore: York Press, 1995, pp. 233–272.
Flege, James E. – Munro, Murray J. – MacKay, Inn R. A. Factors affecting strength of perceived foreign accent in a second language. *Journal of the Acoustical Society of America* 5, 1995, pp. 3125–3134.
Gut, Ulrike. Foreign accent. In Müller, Christian ed. *Speaker classification: Fundamentals, features, and methods*. Heidelberg: Springer, 2007, pp. 75–87.
Gut, Ulrike. *Non-native speech: A corpus-based analysis of phonological and phonetic properties of L2 English and German*. Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang, 2009.
Huszthy, Bálint. Újraelemezhető-e az olasz nyelv fonológiája az olaszok idegen akcentusán keresztül? [A reanalysis of the phonology of Italian through the Italian foreign accent] In Gécseg, Zsuzsanna ed. *LINGDOK 15. Nyelvészdoktoranduszok dolgozatai*. Szeged: SZTE NYDI, 2016a, pp. 95–115.
Huszthy, Bálint. Cappuccinóba completát? A mássalhangzóhossz magyar aszimmetriái idegen szavakban. [Cappucinóba completát? About the asymmetries of consonant length in the loanwords of Hungarian] In Szilágyi, Csaba et al. eds. *Studia Varia*. Budapest: PPCU, 2016b, pp. 121–141.
Huszthy, Bálint. Az idegen akcentus elméleti előnyei. [The theoretical benefits of foreign accent] *Általános Nyelvészeti Tanulmányok* 31, 2019, pp. 137–166.
Huszthy, Bálint. L'accento straniero come contatto linguistico in sincronia. In Arcangeli, Massimo – Klimová, Katarína – Mesárová, Eva – Reichwalderová, Eva – Veselá, Dagmar eds. *Lingue, letterature, identità in contatto*. Rome: Aracne, 2020, pp. 203–218.
Huszthy, Bálint. Ungheriano: A magyar akcentus olaszul beszélve. [Ungheriano: Hungarian accented Italian] *Alkalmazott Nyelvtudomány* 22/1, 2022, pp. 40–63.
Ioup, Georgette – Weinberger, Steven H. *Interlanguage phonology: The acquisition of a second language sound system*. Cambridge, MA: Newbury House, 1987.
Jenkins, Jennifer. *The phonology of English as an international language: New models, new norms, new goals*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000.

Keys, Kevin J. State of the art: Interlanguage phonology. Factors and processes in the development of a second language phonology. *Revista Brasileira de Lingüística Aplicada* 1, 2001, pp. 155–190.

Major, Roy C. Foreign accent: Recent research and theory. *International Review of Applied Linguistics* 25, 1987, pp. 185–202.

Major, Roy C. *Foreign accent: The ontogeny and phylogeny of second language phonology*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum, 2001.

Major, Roy C. Transfer in second language phonology: A review. In Hansen Edwards, Jette G. – Zampini, Mary L. eds. *Phonology and Second Language Acquisition*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 2008, pp. 63–94.

Moyer, Alene. *Foreign Accent: The Phenomenon of Non-native Speech*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2013.

Munro, Murray J. Foreign accent and speech intelligibility. In Hansen Edwards, Jette G. – Zampini, Mary L. eds. *Phonology and Second Language Acquisition*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 2008, pp. 193–218.

Munro, Murray J. – Derwing, Tracey M. The foundations of accent and intelligibility in pronunciation research. *Language Teaching* 44, 2011, pp. 316–327.

Nádasdy, Ádám. *Huron's angol kiejtési kézikönyv magyarajkúak számára: Angol szavak és nevek kiejtése magyarbetűs és nemzetközi átírással.* [Huron's English pronouncing dictionary for speakers of Hungarian]. Budapest: Biográf Kiadó, 2000.

Nádasdy, Ádám. *Background to English pronunciation*. Budapest: Nemzeti Tankönyvkiadó, 2006.

Nádasdy, Ádám – Szigetvári, Péter. Principles of a "foreign-accent" English pronunciation dictionary for Hungarians (HAKSZ). In Terts, István ed. *Nyelv, nyelvész, társadalom: Emlékkönyv Szépe György 65. születésnapjára barátaitól, kollégáitól, tanítványaitól.* [Language, Linguist, Society. Book for György Szépe's 65th Birthday written by his Friends, Colleagues, Students] Pécs: JPTE, 1996, pp. 159–178.

Péntek, János – Benő, Attila. *A magyar nyelv Romániában (Erdélyben).* [Hungarian Language in Roumania (Transylvania)] Kolozsvár, Budapest: Erdélyi Múzeum Egyesület, Gondolat Kiadó, 2020.

Piske, Thorsten – MacKay, Ian R. A. – Flege, James E. Factors affecting degree of foreign accent in an L2: A review. *Journal of Phonetics* 29/2, 2001, pp. 191–215.

Piukovics, Ágnes. *Phonological and non-phonological factors in non-native pronunciation acquisition*. PhD dissertation. Budapest: Pázmány Péter Catholic University, 2021.

Piukovics, Ágnes – Balogné Bérces, Katalin. Factors influencing interlanguage rhoticity: The case of Hungarian-accented English. In Szpyra-Kozłowska, Jolanta – Radomski, Marek eds. *Phonetics and Phonology in Action*. Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang, 2019, pp. 129–147.

Piukovics, Ágnes – Üstöki, Klaudia. Az angol szóhangsúlymintázatok észlelésének és produkciójának tényezői magyar nyelvtanulók esetében: egy próbakísérlet tanulságai. [Factors affecting Hungarian

learners' perception and production of English stress patterns: A pilot study] In É. Kiss, Katalin – Hegedűs, Attila – Pintér, Lilla eds. *Nyelvelmélet és kontaktológia 4.* [Linguistic Theory and Contactology 4] Budapest, Piliscsaba: PPCU, 2019, pp. 237–256.
Renwick, Margaret E. L. Romanian. In Gabriel, Christoph – Gess, Randall – Meisenburg, Trudel eds. *Manual of Romance Phonetics and Phonology*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter, 2022, pp. 531–558.
Scovel, Tom. Foreign accents, language acquisition, and cerebral dominance. *Language Learning* 20, 1969, pp. 245–253.
Selinker, Larry. Interlanguage. *International Review of Applied Linguistics* 10, 1972, 209–231.
Siptár, Péter – Törkenczy, Miklós. *The phonology of Hungarian*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000.
Szpyra-Kozłowska, Jolanta. *Pronunciation in EFL instruction: A research-based approach*. Bristol – Buffalo – Toronto: Multilingual Matters, 2015.
Wells, John C. *Accents of English*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1982.

Appendix: Sample text and transcriptions

The original sample text:[36]

Elvis Presley still "the King"

Although he died almost half a century ago, Elvis Presley, the "King of Rock 'n' Roll", is still a hero for millions all over the world, and Graceland, his home in Memphis, is a major tourist attraction.

It's hot and sticky in the summer in Memphis, Tennessee. The sea is hundreds of miles away from this city on the Mississippi river, yet that doesn't stop the tourists from coming. Some come just once, others make the trip regularly. These are the real fans, those for whom rock 'n' roll has only one voice, that of "the King" himself: Elvis Presley.

Memphis is the city where Elvis lived for most of his professional life; and though he died in 1977, Memphis has not forgotten him. On the contrary, America's most famous rocker (the only one to have had his picture on a set of U.S. postage stamps!) has become the city's most famous son – and seems to get more and more important as the years go by.

Theoretical GA transcription:

ˈɛɬvɪs ˈpɹɛzli stɪɬ ðə ˈkʰɪŋ ||
ɔːɬˈðoʊ hɪ daɪd ˈɔːɬmoʊst hæːf ə ˈsɛntʃəɾi əˈgoʊ | ˈɛɬvɪs ˈprɛzli | ðə kʰɪŋ əv ɹɑkənɹoʊl ɪž stɪl ə ˈhɪəɹoʊ fɚ ˈmɪljənz ɔːl ˈoʊvɚ ðə wɚɬd | ənd̥ ˈg̊ɹeɪslænd̥ | hɪž hoʊm ɪm ˈmɛɱfɪs ɪz ə ˈmeɪʤɚ ˈtʰʊəɹɪst əˈtɬækʃn̥ ||

36 Online resource: https://linguapress.com/intermediate/elvis-memphis.htm (last visit: 07/01/2022)

ɪts hɑɾ ənd̥ ˈstɪki ɪn ðə ˈsʌmɚ ɪm ˈmɛŋfɪs | ˌtʰɛnəˈsi || ðə siː ɪz̊ ˈhʌndɹədz əv maɪłz əˈweɪ frəm ðɪs ˈsɪti ɑn ðə ˌmɪsəˈsɪpi ˈɹɪvɚ | jɛt ð̥æt d̥ʌzn̩t stɑp ð̥ə ˈtʰʊərɪsts frəm ˈkʰʌmɪŋ || sʌm kʰʌm ʤʌst wʌns | ˈʌðɚz meɪk ð̥ə tɫ̊ɪp ˈɹɛgjələ˞li || ðiːz ɑɹ ðə ɹɪəł fænz | ðoʊz̊ fɚ huːm ɹɑkənɹoʊł hæz ˈoʊnli wʌŋ vɔɪs | ð̥æt əv ðə kʰɪŋ hɪmˈsɛłf ˈɛłvɪs ˈprɛzli ||

ˈmɛŋfɪs ɪz ðə ˈsɪti wɛɹ ˈɛłvɪs lɪv̊ d̥ fɚ moʊst əɣ̊ hɪz̊ pɹəˈfɛʃənl̩ laɪf | ənd ðoʊ hɪ daɪd ɪn ˈnaɪntʰiːn ˈsɛvn̩ti ˈsɛvn̩ | ˈmɛŋfɪs həz nɑt fɚˈgɑɾn̩ hɪm || ɑn ðə ˈkʰɑntɫ̊əɹi | əˈmɛɹɪkəz moʊst ˈfeɪməs ˈɹɑkɚ || ði ˈoʊnli wʌn tə hæɣ̊ hæd̥ hɪz̊ ˈpʰɪktʃəɹ ɑn ə sɛt əv ˌjuːˈɛs ˈpʰoʊstɪd̥ʒ̊ stæmps || həz bɪˈkʰʌm ðə ˈsɪtiz moʊst ˈfeɪməs sʌn | ənd̥ siːmz̊ tə gɛt mɔːɹ ənd mɔːɹ ɪmˈpʰɔɪtənt æz ðə jɪɚz goʊ baɪ

Most characteristic pronunciation from Transylvania	Most characteristic pronunciation from Hungary
ˈɛlvis ˈprɛsli | ˈstil də ˈkiŋg ‖ olˈdoː hi ˈdajd ˈoːlmost ˈhɒlf ə ˈsɛntʃəɾi əˈgow | ˈɛlvis ˈprɛsli | də ˈkiŋg of ˈɹɒkɛndrowl | is ˈstilː ə ˈhirow for ˈmilijəns | ˈɒːl ˈoːvər də ˈwərld ‖ ɛnd ˈgreːslɛnt | his howm im ˈmɛŋfis | iz ə ˈmeːdʒər ˈtuːɾist əˈtrɛkʃən ‖ its ˈhɒt ɛn ˈstiki in də ˈsɒmər im ˈmɛŋfis | ˈtɛnɛsiː ‖ də si: jis ˈhɒndridz of majlz əˈveːj from dis ˈsiti | on də ˈmisisipi ˈɹivər ‖ jɛd dɛd ˈdɒzən ˈstɒb də ˈtuːrists from ˈkɒmiŋg ‖ ˈsɒm ˈkɒm dʒɒst ˈwɒns | ˈɒdərs ˈmeːg də ˈtrip ˈrɛgulərli ‖ ˈdiːz ɒːr də ˈɹiːl ˈfɛns ‖ ˈdoːz for huːm ˈɹɒkɛndroul ˈhɛz ˈonli ˈwɒn ˈvojz | ˈdɛt ov də ˈkiŋk himˈsɛlf | ˈɛlvis ˈprɛsli ‖ ˈmɛŋfis iz də ˈsiti wɛr ˈɛlvis ˈlift for ˈmost of his proˈfɛʃːənəl ˈlajf ‖ ɛn ˈdoː hi ˈdajd in | najnˈtiːn ˈsɛvənti ˈsɛvən | ˈmɛŋfis hɛz ˈnɒt forˈgatən him ‖ on də ˈkɒntrəri | əˈmɛɹikəz ˈmoːst feːməs ˈɹɒkər ‖ də ˈonli wɒn tu ˈhɛf hɛt his ˈpiktʃər on ə ˈsɛt of ˈjues ˈpostitʃ ˈstɛmps ‖ ˈhɛz biˈkɒm də ˈsitiz ˈmoːst feːməs ˈsɒn | ɛnt ˈsims to ˈgɛt ˈmoːr ɛnd ˈmoːr imˈportənt | ɛz də ˈjerz ˈgoː ˈbaːj	ˈɛlvis ˈprɛsli | ˈstil də ˈkiŋg ‖ ˈoldoː hiː ˈdaːjd ˈoːlmost ˈhalf ə ˈsɛntʃyɾi ɛˈgoː | ˈɛlvis ˈprɛsli | də ˈkiŋg of ˈrakɛndrolː | is ˈstilː ə ˈhiːroː for ˈmilijons | olː oːˈvɛr də ˈvørd ‖ ɛnd ˈgreːslɛnt | his ˈhoːm im ˈmɛŋfis | iz ə ˈmeːdʒør ˈtuɾist ɛˈtrɛkʃən ‖ its ˈhat ɛn ˈstiki in də ˈsamør im ˈmɛŋfis | ˈtɛnɛsːi ‖ də ˈsiː jis ˈhandridz of ˈmajls əˈveːj from dis ˈsiti | on də ˈmisisipi ˈrivør ‖ jɛd dɛd ˈdazən ˈstab də ˈturis from ˈkamiŋg ‖ ˈsam ˈkam dʒast ˈvans | ˈadərs ˈmeːg də ˈtrip ˈrɛgulərli ‖ ˈdiːz ar də ˈɹiːl ˈfɛns ‖ ˈdoːz for ˈhuːm ˈrakɛndrol ˈhɛz ˈonli ˈvan ˈvojz | ˈdɛt ov də ˈkiŋk himˈsɛlf | ˈɛlvis ˈprɛsli ‖ ˈmɛŋfis iz də ˈsiti vɛr ˈɛlvis ˈlif for ˈmoːst of his proˈfɛʃːənɛl ˈlajf ‖ ɛn ˈdoː hi ˈdajd in | ˈnajntiːn ˈsɛvɛnti ˈsɛvɛn | ˈmɛŋfis hɛz ˈnat forˈgatːɛn him ‖ on də ˈkontraɾi | ˈamɛɹikaz ˈmoːst feːməs ˈrokːɛr ‖ di ˈonli vɒn tu ˈhɛf hɛt his ˈpiktʃør on ə ˈsɛt of ˈjuːes ˈposteːtʃ ˈstɛmps ‖ ˈhɛz biˈkam də ˈsitiːz ˈmoːst feːməs ˈsan | ɛnt ˈsiːms to ˈgɛt ˈmoːr ɛnd ˈmoːr imˈportɛnt | ɛz də ˈjiːrz ˈgoː ˈbaːj

Author's profile

Bálint Huszthy was a visiting professor at the Department of Hungarian and General Linguistics of Babeș–Bolyai University for three years (2019–2022). He is now assistant professor at the Department of Italianistics of the Eötvös Loránd University of Budapest. His research interests include sociolinguistics, Italian and Hungarian dialectology, phonetics, phonology, morphology and second language acquisition.