



Hungarian Dialectology. Research of Hungarian Dialects in Romania

Csaba Attila BOTH

Doctoral School of Hungarology Studies
Babeş-Bolyai University, Faculty of Letters
bothcsabaattila@gmail.com

Abstract. After the Treaty of Trianon, the long history of research on the Hungarian dialects in the neighbouring countries did not cease. A previous article on the history of research on Hungarian dialect islands reviewed the significant achievements of Hungarian dialect research up to 1920 (Both 2020b). In the present article, we summarize the essential periods and results of Hungarian dialect research in Romania from 1920 to the present day. The article will show how in the last one hundred years a Hungarian-language department in a minority environment has redirected its research, resulting in a decreasing share of dialectological research, and how, despite these developments, the Hungarian dialectological community in Romania has enriched the Hungarian dialectology research with significant results.

Keywords: Hungarian dialectology, research history, Transylvanian dialectology

1. Introduction

In my previous paper, *From the Beginnings until the Division of Hungary (1920)*, published in 2020, I presented the main aspects of the Hungarian dialect research between 1645 and 1920. The first period of dialect research (between 1645 and 1872) resulted in the early observations of popular language appeared in some of the essential linguistic works on the Hungarian language. The *Age of the Language Reform (1818–1872)* then gave rise to an intellectual environment in which interest in the language of the people became increasingly vital, and at the same time more and more professional works on dialectology were published.

The birth of the *Magyar Nyelvőr* [Hungarian Language Guardian] periodical provided a significant professional forum for the scientific writing of these works and gradually paved the way for dialectology to become an independent field of research in Hungarian linguistics. A little more than thirty years later, however,

Hungarian dialectological research in general witnessed a decline that lasted for a considerably long time, with fewer and fewer scientifically unimpeachable works published, perhaps the main reason being the lack of a committed new generation.

Between 1914 and 1918, the First World War took place, the consequences of which tore Hungarian scientific life apart until the 1990s. On 4 June 1920, the Trianon Peace Treaty divided former Hungary, a country that had been politically and administratively undivided, and fragmented its nation. Since then, we speak of Hungarians living in Hungary and Hungarians living in Romania, Slovakia, Austria, etc. and of Hungarian linguistics in these countries.

With these developments, Hungarian dialect research has not ceased to exist since, as we shall see, it underwent a revival in the first years of the 20th century.

2. The era of rearrangement (1920–1936)

Although dialectological research declined rapidly in the period between the two World Wars, we must nevertheless highlight two works of the time that were a synthesis of everything that had happened in this field of science up to then. One of them is Antal Horger's work, and the other was written by Gyula Laziczius, both entitled *A magyar nyelvjárások* [The Dialects of Hungarian].

The dominant view of Horger's typology (1934) is linguistic history, but it also applies the geolinguistic aspect. In Laziczius's work (1936), the author, completing his studies at the Prague school, applied the phonological aspect in studying dialectal sound systems and the classification of dialects (Márton 1973: 178). A fundamental principle defined his approach: two local dialects not having the same phoneme system cannot belong to the same type of dialect.¹

According to Samu Imre, Laziczius's great merit was, among other things, his intention to place the phonetic classification of dialects on a modern and realistic basis, thus paving the way for a new era (Imre 1978: 149).

2.1. The Csűry school

During the period between the two world wars, Bálint Csűry had a notable role as the founder of folk language research in Debrecen, as representatives of Hungarian dialectology generally consider. Moreover, it was he who started research on Hungarian dialects in Kolozsvár, as before going to Debrecen he had been a teacher at the Reformed College of Kolozsvár.² The university did

1 „Nem tartozhat egyazon nyelvjárástípusba két olyan helyi nyelvjárás, amelynek fonémarendszere nem azonos” (Imre 1978: 149).

2 Kolozsvári Református Kollégium.

not have a department of Hungarian linguistics at that time. We know from the publications of Attila Szabó T. that study groups of Hungarian students were formed in Kolozsvár when he started his university studies at the initiative of Dr Lajos György, the director of studies at that time.

Bálint Csűry led the linguistic community; between 1929 and 1930, he delivered lectures on Hungarian phonetics and sound history (Szabó T. 1941: 305). There had been preceding events to this, as Csűry started collecting the Szamoshát dialect at the beginning of the century, first for his own personal interest and then, after 1908, on behalf of the *Magyar Nyelvtudományi Társaság* [Society of Hungarian Linguistics] (Márton 1973: 179). Moreover, the result of his data collection, the *Szamosháti Szótár* [Dictionary of the Szamoshát Dialect], had already been tagged and placed in boxes, waiting for processing.

He had not yet finished processing the collections of the dialect of his native region when he headed off to the settlements around Bákó,³ populated by Moldavian Hungarians, with the purpose of studying the southern Csángó dialect. This would complete the dictionary of the Northern Csángó dialect, the material of which was collected by Yrjö Wichmann in 1906 and published in Helsinki in 1936, thanks to Bálint Csűry and Artúr Kannisto's work. In the autumn of 1944, Csűry's collection of the southern Csángó dialect was destroyed in the war. Bálint Csűry moved to Debrecen at the beginning of the 1930s, and in the study group mentioned before he encountered Attila Szabó T., who then, in a manner worthy of Csűry, carried on the dialect research in Kolozsvár. According to Samu Imre, Csűry played a vital role in the revival of Hungarian dialectology by making Debrecen the centre of Hungarian dialect research for a long time. It was Csűry who founded *Népnyelvkutató Intézet* [Institute of Folk Language Research], launching the first genuine journal of Hungarian dialectology, entitled *Magyar Népnyelv* [Hungarian Folk Language], which later changed its name to *Magyar Nyelvjáráslások* [Hungarian Dialects] and has been published under this new name till our days. Following the example of the Finns, he urged that dialect research should be brought back to the level of European standards of the period.

At the same time, Imre was critical of Csűry's unrealistic interest in the research of Hungarian territories crossing the borders (Imre 1971: 10–12). As Samu Imre writes: Thanks to Csűry, at the end of the 1930s, dialect research was revived, and collections became more diverse and systematic than before.⁴ We also owe it to Csűry for having developed the first, relatively unified sound marking system, which was a significant advance at the time and, in fact, led to the further development of the system (Imre 1971: 13–14).

3 Rom. Bacău.

4 „Csűrynek köszönhető, hogy az 1930-as évek végén a nyelvjáráskutató munka újból fellendült, hogy az anyaggyűjtés az addigiaknál sokrétűbbé, tervszerűbbé vált” (Imre 1971: 13).

3. The Kolozsvár school

3.1. Folk language research under the leadership of Attila Szabó T. (1936–1944)

Attila Szabó T's interest in folk language began when in 1930 Csűry took him on his second trip to visit Csángó settlements, more precisely Bogdánfalva and its surroundings. Unfortunately, Csűry's first attempt to establish Transylvanian folk language research failed. In the spring of 1936, Szabó T. changed his workplace to the archives of *Erdélyi Múzeum* [Transylvanian Museum Society], and, at Lajos György's encouragement, he started to look for adepts of folk language research. As Szabó T. recalled later, two students, Mózes Gálffy and Gyula Márton became serious researchers of folk language (Szabó T. 1941: 306–307).

Thus, Szabó T. continued delivering the lectures on phonetics started by Csűry in Kolozsvár, focusing mainly on recording dialectal data. When Szabó T. obtained Csűry's glossary, which comprised the fundamental material of his dialect atlases, the questionnaire came to the fore as a data collection method. In the summer of 1937, Szabó T. and his students started collecting folk language data. József Árvay dealt with the geographical names of Hétfalva in Barcaság, Mózes Gálffy studied the dialect of Szind, and Gyula Márton was engaged in dealing with the dialect of Nagymon in Szilágyság and that of Ördöngösfüzes in Mezőség (Márton 1973: 181). So, the gathering of data had started, and *Erdélyi Múzeum* supported research by providing rewards and publishing opportunities. Setting up the first Transylvanian workshop and village research in Kalotaszeg, Bábony (Szabó T. 1937: 50–65), was regarded as an outstanding event of the research of folk language in Kolozsvár.

When speaking about the epoch, Gyula Márton emphasizes the importance of the Romanian dialect research of that time, the centre of which was *Muzeul limbii române* [Museum of Romanian Language] in Kolozsvár. First and foremost, it was he who established this connection since he had studied Hungarian, Romanian, and aesthetics at the university. He learned a great deal from the eminent Romanian linguists of that time, such as Sever Pop, Romulus Todoran, Emil Petrovici, Sextil Pușcariu, and Teodor Capidan. They helped him gain insight into the work methods used during the preparation of the Romanian language atlas, its interpretation and use, and through Capidan's classes he came into contact with the ideas propagated by the French school of sociology, that is, the relationship between language and society. Later on, these imprints were reflected in the work of the department. On the other hand, with Jenő Nagy's help, who studied in Germany after Debrecen and wrote his PhD thesis on the dialect of Kalotaszeg and moved to Kolozsvár, they learned about the history and methods of German dialect research (Márton 1973: 181–183).

At the beginning of the 1940s, systematic Hungarian dialect research began in Romania with the participation of *Erdélyi Tudományos Intézet* [Institute of Transylvanian Science] and the Department of Hungarian Linguistics at the University of Kolozsvár. The works were directed by Attila Szabó T. As Gyula Márton mentioned, this type of research developed in two areas: one of them was related to collecting place names and the other one to dialect research, which developed in two directions. In the summer of 1941, the department began studying the Borsavölgy dialect with Szabó T., Iván Balassa, Mózes Gálffy, Samu Imre, and several students from the Hungarian specialization. The other direction was editing a regional atlas of Kolozsvár and its surroundings, initiated by Mózes Gálffy and Gyula Márton. Data collection started, but World War II broke out, and the plan could not be carried out. Only a sample was published in *Huszonöt lap „Kolozsvár és vidéke népnyelvi térképéből”* [Twenty-Five Maps from the Atlas of Kolozsvár and its Outskirts] (see Szabó T.–Gálffy–Márton 1944). At this time, researchers from Kolozsvár had good results in researching the dialects of Szamoshát, Borsavölgy, Kalotaszeg, and Moldavia, but little progress was made in the research of the other Hungarian dialects in Romania. At the same time, the period was essential for the development of the methodological basis of the Hungarian geolinguistic research in Romania and the collection of the first dialect atlas.

The period between 1947 and 1952 was a time of sheer confusion. Gyula Márton was enrolled as a soldier in October 1944 and then captured in Izhevsk (Russia). Three years later, in 1947, he returned home (Péntek 2016a: 11). Márton was planning to return to Zilah as a high school teacher in 1947, but he eventually accepted the teaching position offered by the Reformed College in Kolozsvár on 1 October. Meanwhile, Attila Szabó T. invited him to the Hungarian Department of the University in the autumn of 1948, and after the education reform in the same year, he was appointed in December. According to his writings, his relationship with Szabó T. and Mózes Gálffy was not without hardships because of their rigid character; besides, he did not really have the time to carry out scientific research due to the numerous new subjects he was teaching. Finally, in the spring of 1950, he began to work on the research project named *Borsavölgye ikeragozása* [Verb Conjugation of Borsavölgy]. At the beginning of the summer in 1949, the university's management was able to provide the department with a financial basis; thus, Szabó T. decided to start mapping the Moldavian Csángó dialects (Márton 2016: 24–29).

In 1949, dialect research began to operate in a somewhat systematic way, and the *Institute of Linguistics of the Romanian Academy* in Kolozsvár was established, to which two Hungarian dialect researchers, Ferenc Gazda and Jenő Nagy, were appointed. Slowly, time was getting ripe for carrying out the richest and most reliable collection of Hungarian dialects in Romania. At the same time, they were at a crossroads: they had to decide whether to collect and

process the material in a smaller area or to collect as much material as they could as it was most important, leaving it to be processed later. They decided on the latter. Two projects were launched: one was a large atlas of Hungarian dialects in Romania, and the other was a series of smaller, regional atlases of dialects. Initially, both were dealt with by the university department, but later the large atlas was transferred to the *Institute of Linguistics* at the Romanian Academy, and the department was left with the regional atlases of dialects. Their methodology was a modern one. The questionnaire of the large atlas had 3,340 questions, and the answers to them were collected at 140 survey points; the atlas of dialects included 850–1,400 questions and sought a network of survey points with absolute density. The series of regional language atlases was launched by the Moldavian Csángó dialect atlas (Márton 1973: 184–186).

3.2. The department of Gyula Márton (1952–1973)

In the autumn of 1952, Attila Szabó T. was unexpectedly dismissed from the university. We started the new academic year without him. In the autumn of 1952, I was appointed Head of the Department, so it was my responsibility to further organize and manage the research work. Of course, I received significant help from Mózes Gálffy, but also from the whole department and even from the university's management (László Bányai). Being a dean simultaneously, I was able to properly represent the interests of the department in higher forums as well.⁵

This is how Gyula Márton remembered the way his activity as head of the department started. He held this position until 1973 when the Department of Hungarian Linguistics and Literature merged. Gyula Márton played an essential role in directing research at the department and participating in research, but he also played an active part in the development of the department. It was thanks to him that members of the following generation came to the department: Márta Vámszer, Zoltán Szabó, László Murádin, Piroska B. Gergely, Mária J. Nagy, Pál Teiszler, and Dezső Balogh and then in the 1950s Ferenc Kósa, István Vőő, János Zsemlyei, and lastly, in 1964, János Péntek (Péntek 2016a: 12).⁶

5 1952 őszén Szabó T. Attilát váratlanul elbocsátották az egyetemről [Szabó T's removal from the university meant that he was transferred to the Institute of Linguistics of the Romanian Academy (Péntek 2016a: 11)]. Az új tanévet nélküle kezdtük meg, [...] 1952 őszén engem neveztek ki tanszékvezetőnek, így a tud. munka további szervezésének és irányításának feladata rám hárult. Persze jelentős segítséget kaptam Gálffy Mózestől, de a tanszék egészétől, sőt az egyetem vezetőségétől (Bányai László) is. Mivel egyben dékán is voltam, megfelelő módon tudtam képviselni a tanszék érdekeit felsőbb fórumoknál is (Márton 2016: 31).

6 Nothing else shows more significantly the attitude of Romanian socialism towards Hungarian scientific workshops than the fact that János Péntek remained the youngest linguist of the

In his work, Gyula Márton continued the initiatives that were developed under Szabó T's leadership. Between 1949 and 1969, the staff of the department collected the material of nine language atlases: *A moldvai csángó nyelvjárás atlasza* [Atlas of the Dialect of the Moldavian Csángós], *Csík és Gyergyó atlasza* [Dialect Atlas of Csík and Gyergyó], *Háromszéki atlasz* [Dialect Atlas of Háromszék], *Udvarhelyszéki atlasz* [Dialect Atlas of Udvarhelyszék], *Aranyosszéki nyelvjárás atlasza* [Dialect Atlas of Aranyosszék], *Felső-Maros mente tájnyelvi atlasza* [Dialect Atlas of the Upper-Maros Region], *Szamosháti tájnyelvi atlasz* [Dialect Atlas of Szamoshát], and *Bánsági nyelvjárás atlasza* [Dialect Atlas of Bánság]. Of these, two volumes of *Csángó atlasz* and *Szilágysági atlasz* were published (for more details, see Cs. Nagy. 2007: 123). Publishing the material of the atlas of Székelyland had a great importance. As publication of atlases was primarily hampered by publishing houses, the editors opted for publishing the material in the form of a dictionary (similar but not identical to dialect dictionaries). The *Székely nyelvföldrajzi szótár* [Szekler Geolinguistic Dictionary] was finally published in 1987 in Budapest (see Gálffy–Márton 1987).

At the same time, Gyula Márton carried out not only geolinguistic research, but he also actively participated in other research activities such as the processing of Transylvanian dialects based on their features, collecting and analysing geographical and personal names, and processing Hungarian linguistic elements of Romanian origin (Péntek 2016a: 12).

We must pay special attention to 1957, when the launch of a Hungarian-language journal on Hungarian issues became a reality in Romania. This was the *Nyelv- és Irodalomtudományi Közlemények* [Linguistic and Literary Communications] published by the Institute of Linguistics at the Romanian Academy in Kolozsvár. Although this journal was not the only one in which Hungarian dialect researchers from Romania published their studies and smaller publications, the archives reveal the dynamics of Hungarian dialect research in Romania. Since the launch of the journal in 1957, we can see that every issue has had more dialectology-related writings, the number of which was later steadily decreasing. At the same time, an overview of the archives also gave an idea of the areas that Hungarian linguists in Kolozsvár were dealing with in dialect research.

According to *Nyelv- és Irodalomtudományi Közlemények* (NyIRK), in 1957, Attila Szabó T. published the first issue of the *A romániai magyar nyelvjárások atlasza* (see Szabó T. 1957), along with some other works on the same topic written by László Murádin, Attila Szabó T., and István Vöő. Several papers, whose authors were Gyula Márton, Mózes Gálffy, Attila Szabó T., János Zsemlyei, and in the 2000s János Péntek, were dealing with dialect-related issues concerning the Hungarians living in Moldavia. István Vöő and Pál Teiszler studied the

department until 1990. This points out clearly that the system did not support supplementing of departments by granting tenure to young professionals.

characteristics of the Hungarian dialects of the Bánság in many of their writings, while Márta Vámszer, Elemér Lakó, and János Péntek dealt with Kalotaszeg. Occasionally, smaller reports on the work of the linguists of Kolozsvár were written and published by Pál Teiszler, Dezső Balogh, Attila Szabó T., and Gyula Márton. There were several publications concerning the dialects of the Székelys, the most numerous of which belonged to Gyula Márton, Márta Vámszer, Mózes Gálffy, Lőrinc Szász, and Pál Teiszler. László Murádin's interest was mainly in the dialects of Mezőség.

3.3. The second generation (1972–1990)

In the previous section, we have already listed the names of the researchers who, following Gyula Márton's resignation and four years after his death (1976), carried on the matter of Hungarian dialect research in Romania. We can describe this period as a relaxation after a long and intense work. It is only natural that several factors may have contributed to it: on the one hand, in Gyula Márton's absence, the motivation to continue these large-scale projects may not have been strong enough. On the other hand, we should not forget that by this time linguistics in Kolozsvár had lost its own department, and for thirty years work had to be done under the circumstances of the minority status, which was not supported either institutionally or financially or ideologically.

The goal set by the previous great generation (Attila Szabó T., Mózes Gálffy, Gyula Márton), that is, collecting dialect material, had been reached; nevertheless, some circumstances intervened and prevented work from being completed. Atlases whose material had already been collected, structured, and edited could not be published, and, consequently, research was difficult due to severely restricted access; moreover, reviewing materials recorded on tags took far too much effort.

As mentioned earlier in connection with *NyIRK*, several works were completed that dealt with the phonetic or morphological aspects of the material collected despite the inconvenient circumstances. From the 1960s onwards, members of the second generation published such works and articles under Attila Szabó T. and Gyula Márton's direction – Elemér Lakó: *A kalotaszegi nyelvjárás magánhangzói* [Vowels of the Dialect of Kalotaszeg] (Bucharest, 1973), Zoltán Szabó: *A kalotaszegi nyelvjárás igeképző-rendszere* [System of Verbal Derivational Suffixes in the Dialect of Kalotaszeg] (Budapest, 1965), Pál Teiszler: *A Nagykároly környéki magyar nyelvjárás magánhangzórendszere* [Vowel System of the Hungarian Dialect of Nagykároly and Its Region] (Bucharest, 1973), Márta Vámszer: *A kalotaszegi nyelvjárás igeragozási rendszere* [System of Verb Conjugation in the Dialect of Kalotaszeg] (Bucharest, 1972), Isván Vőő: *A bánsági magyar nyelvjárások magánhangzórendszere* [Vowel System of the Hungarian Dialects of Bánság] (Bucharest, 1975). In the meantime, the emphasis shifted to other aspects:

folk vocabulary and its ethnographic background, the examination of bilingualism on the dialectal level, including the influence of the Romanian language, and the examination of names based on dialectal material (Szabó Z. 1993: 1431).

These areas of interest were slowly becoming more prominent than dialect research, and their interest extended beyond post-regime transition.

3.4. Hungarian dialect research in Romania after 1990

The beginning of the 90s marked the beginning of an era, and this is a relevant point not only from the aspect of the division of the dialect research but also of any human area which, after being somewhat oppressed, could liberate itself after the fall of the old socio-political system. From our point of view, the year 1990 brought about many changes in many respects. On the one hand, the borders were no longer closed between the countries inhabited by Hungarians, so that the fragmented Hungarian scientific community could begin to converge again. On the other hand, it also meant a significant change in the life of the Hungarian departments of the University of Kolozsvár, as János Péntek had an institution-building role comparable to that of Gyula Márton.

János Péntek discussed the changes brought about by 1990 and the twelve years that followed (see Péntek 2001). Péntek emphasized that Transylvanian areas were almost entirely excluded from Hungarian dialectological research, while Hungarian dialect atlases and large regional ones were continuously produced. Quite ironically, the publication process of dialect atlases compiled with great sacrifices hit obstacles just after the completion of the editing phase. The publication of half or fully completed atlases seemed hopeless before 1990 (Péntek 2001: 20).

An exciting feature of this era is that the centre of research on the Hungarian dialects spoken in Romania was transferred to Hungary. *Magyar Nyelvtudományi Társaság* published two volumes of *A moldvai csángó nyelvjárás atlasza*; moreover, in 1995, the publishing of *A romániai magyar nyelvjárások atlasza* (RMNyA.) also began.

The desperate situation in which RMNyA. was from the point of view of the publication came to an end thanks to the patronage of *Magyar Nyelvtudományi Társaság* and the financial support of *Országos Tudományos Kutatási Alap* (OTKA) [Institutional Funding for Public Research].

This was the time when a working group of young researchers and university students at the Department of History of Language and Dialectology of Eötvös Loránd University (Budapest) was established, whose tasks were the editing, the technical design, and preparation of the publishing process (Juhász 1995: 13).

By now, all the atlas material has been printed. The last, eleventh volume of the series was published in 2010.⁷

7 On the history of publishing the RMNyA., see Juhász 2016.

László Murádin, the collector of *RMNyA.*, who stood almost alone in Transylvanian Hungarian dialect research after the 1960s, had several papers published, which mainly comprised the results of his analysis of the *RMNyA.* database.⁸

Before his death, Gyula Márton collected the dialect of his homeland on his own, and as a result of his work *Szilágysági nyelvatlasz* was published in 2000. The Hungarian handbook of dialectology edited by Jenő Kiss (2001) comprised the results of the analyses that Transylvanian researchers of the 20th century had performed. Thanks to the completed geolinguistic database, the perception of the Csángós' origins has also changed (Péntek 2001: 20–21).

Although not related to Hungarian dialects in Romania, it is necessary to include József Szabó's monography entitled *Magyarországi és jugoszláviai magyar nyelvjárásszigetek* [Hungarian Dialects Islands in Hungary and Yugoslavia] in this review of the history of research since it is the first monographic volume that deals with Hungarian dialect islands on a regular basis. As we can find in the introduction to his volume, József Szabó's interest in dialect islands arose in the early 1960s, when they were collecting dialectal data in Kiskundorozsma under Professor Antal Nyíri's leadership. He took part in this activity as a student of the Hungarian linguistic study group. After a while, it struck him that the language spoken in Dorozsma, which had been integrated with Szeged, is much different from the dialects of Szeged and its surroundings. Then, he examined other topics as well; however, after about two decades, he started to focus – this time more consciously – on examining Dorozsma's dialect, and then he began researching most of the other Hungarian dialect islands (Szabó J. 1990: 7).

The author states that the backlogs encouraged him to contribute to the development of science by examining and describing Hungarian dialects, and accordingly dealt primarily with the dialect islands in Hungary. We could also learn that this was due to administrative reasons, as it was well known that collecting dialect data in surrounding countries was likely to be prohibited or at least to be made more difficult. Therefore, József Szabó used the completed database of *Magyar Nyelvjáráások Atlasza* [Atlas of the Hungarian Dialects] to achieve his research goals, which he also supported with his own work of collecting linguistic data (Szabó J. 1990: 45–46). However, Yugoslavian settlements appeared among his research points, making it possible to discuss Hungarian dialect islands. In his analysis, he carried out thorough statistical work on the classification of the selected settlements (about 200 pages deal with the topic), which he then summarized at the end of the thesis.

Edit Kádár regards publishing dialect and regional language atlases as the most significant achievement of the period between 2002 and 2013. This activity could be seen as the result of the convergence of the linguists from Hungary

8 For more information about László Murádin's work, see Kádár (ed.) 2016.

(especially Budapest) and Kolozsvár. One of the essential methodological innovations of recent decades was the appearance of computational dialectology, which was first used in the digital editing of language atlases. Later on, *Geolingvisztikai Műhely* [Geolinguistic Lab] mobilized enormous resources to make the achievements of the previous highly productive century accessible and researchable. Thus, thanks to this cooperation, a digital dictionary of the Szamoshát dialect and the audiobooks of István Vőő have been produced recently. The 22 questionnaires in the atlas were processed by Noemi Gál (Fazakas) and Mária Hochbauer. They already belong to the generation of the Kolozsvár School of Hungarian Linguistics after 1990 (Kádár 2015: 36).

It is imperative to highlight the names of Domokos Vékás and Fruzsina Sára Vargha in this regard. They have developed a digital tool that is exceptionally versatile and has also taken Hungarian dialect research to a new level. Around Bihalbocs (www.bihalbocs.hu), a computer-based geolinguistic program, a whole school of young researchers has been organized, who have been doing a computer-based, almost unlimited research from the perspective of a new approach. The informatization and integration of several Hungarian geolinguistic atlases is also their merit.⁹

Thanks to the Bihalbocs software, simultaneous analyses of a tremendous amount of data can be carried out in Hungarian dialectology. This helps researchers achieve results that humans cannot do, and this is dialectometry, a method which Vargha discusses comprehensively from the Hungarian perspective in her volume published in 2017 (see Vargha 2017) and with the application of which I have also dealt with in earlier publications (Both 2020b) and research on the Hungarian dialect islands in Romania.

Since the 1990s, the Department of Hungarian and General Linguistics staff in Kolozsvár has hardly ever dealt with dialectological research, either by collecting new data or by further processing previously collected materials. The works of the atlas were also interrupted; for example, the material on Székelyland has still not been published. In many cases, the linguists' attention was distracted by the existence of a specific minority situation (organization of education, protection of minority language rights, sociolinguistic issues affecting the minority situation). The department would have to cover the full linguistic training of future Hungarian teachers; thus, it has been inevitable for them to put more emphasis on other areas of linguistics. However, from the previous great generation, János Péntek came forward with significant dialectological works concerning the region. In the context of dialect research in Romania, and more specifically in that of the present article (Péntek 2005), János Péntek's speech at the Hungarian Academy of Sciences, in which he gave a comprehensive presentation on the Hungarian

9 About the diversity of usefulness of informational data, see: Vargha–Vékás 2009; Vargha 2015a,b, 2016.

language and dialect islands in Romania, is of utmost importance. Bálint Csűry's plan, namely publishing the dictionary of the Moldavian Csángó dialect, has also been carried out by János Péntek. The result of the editorial work lasting for years is *A moldvai magyar tájnyelv szótára* [The Dictionary of the Hungarian Language in Moldvaia] in three volumes published between 2016 and 2018 (see Péntek 2016b, 2017, 2018).

4. Summary

In this article, we have looked back on over a hundred years of research in a field that has long been one of the main driving lines of Hungarian linguistics.

As could be seen, the position of the school of Hungarian linguistics in Kolozsvár has changed considerably, both administratively and politically. The use of the Hungarian language in Romania has been somewhat reduced for an extended period, and Hungarian-language secondary and higher education itself has been relegated to the background. So were the institutions themselves, which served the educational activities.

In a minority situation, and at the same time in a disadvantaged position, the staff of a Hungarian language department did not have the privilege of specializing in a very specific field, and it became inevitable that each of them should be actively involved in several fields of linguistics, both as teachers and researchers.

The above processes have directly affected the possibilities of dialectological research: dwindling resources and new challenges have gradually diverted attention from the study of Hungarian dialects in Romania, which has been marginalized.

Despite all of this, the school of Hungarian linguistics in Kolozsvár has achieved significant results, especially in dialect data collection, and has succeeded in providing a reliable and qualitative snapshot of the Hungarian dialects in Romania 75–100 years ago. Furthermore, this is perhaps more important than whether these data have been evaluated in detail.

It seems obvious, yet it should be mentioned, that research should only be done on available data. However, the nature of language and the time are such that it is not possible to collect living language material retrospectively.

References

Both, Csaba Attila. 2020a. Hungarian dialectology. From the beginnings until the division of Hungary (1920). *Acta Universitatis Sapientiae, Philologica* 12(3): 138–154.

2020b. Egy romániai magyar nyelvjárássziget: Magyardécse [A Hungarian dialect island in Romania: Magyardécse]. In: Heltai, János–Oszkó, Beatrix (eds.), *Nyelvi repertoárok a Kárpát-medencében és azon kívül*. Válogatás a 20. Élőnyelvi Konferencia (Budapest, 2018. augusztus 30. – szeptember 1.) előadásból. Budapest: Nyelvtudományi Intézet. 123–139.

Cs. Nagy, Lajos. 2007. Szóföldrajzi térképlapok a kolozsvári egyetem archívumában [Lexical maps in the Archives of the University of Cluj]. *Nyelv- és Irodalomtudományi Közlemények* 51(1–2): 121–129.

Gállfy, Mózes–Márton, Gyula (eds.). 1987. *Székely nyelvföldrajzi szótár* [Szekler geolinguistic dictionary]. Budapest: Akadémiai Kiadó.

Imre, Samu. 1971. *A mai magyar nyelvjárási rendszere* [The system of contemporary Hungarian dialects]. Budapest: Akadémiai Kiadó.

1978. Tudománytörténeti kérdések a magyar dialektológiában [Problems of research history in Hungarian dialectology]. *Irodalomtudományi Osztály Közleményei* 30(3): 139–153.

Juhász, Dezső. 1995. A kiadásról [On publishing]. In: Juhász, Dezső (ed.)– Murádin, László (coll.), *A romániai magyar nyelvjárási atlasza*, vol. I. Budapest: Magyar Nyelvtudományi Társaság. 13–14.

2016. A romániai magyar nyelvjárási atlaszának kiadás- és recepciótörténetéhez [To the history of publication and reception of the atlas of the Hungarian dialects of Romania]. *Magyar Nyelv* 112(2): 129–139.

Kádár, Edit. 2015. *A romániai magyar nyelvtudomány (2003–2013)* [Hungarian linguistics in Romania 2003–2013)]. Offprint from Péntek, János–Salat, Levente– Sziksza, Mária (eds.), *Magyar tudományosság Romániában 2002–2014 között*. vol. I. Cluj-Napoca: Kolozsvári Akadémiai Bizottság. 29–93.

(ed.). 2016. *Erdélyi magyar nyelvészeti I. Murádin László*. Oradea: Europrint.

Kiss, Jenő (ed.). 2001. *Magyar dialektológia* [Hungarian dialectology]. Budapest: Osiris Kiadó.

Márton, Gyula. 1973. A romániai magyar nyelvjáráskutatás múltja és mai állása [History and contemporary situation of the research of Hungarian dialects in Romania]. In: Ritoók, János (ed.), *Korunk Évkönyv* 1973. (Tanulmányok a romániai magyar tudományosság műhelyéből). Kolozsvár. 173–193.

2016. Az erdélyi magyar nyelvföldrajz hőskora [The heroic age of Transylvanian Hungarian geolinguistics]. Published by Péntek, János–Czégényi, Dóra. In: Péntek, János–Czégényi, Dóra (eds.), *Emlékkönyv Márton Gyula születésének centenáriumára*. Cluj-Napoca: Erdélyi Múzeum-Egyesület. 19–35.

Péntek, János. 2001. Örökség és kihívás. Az erdélyi magyar nyelvtudomány a század- és ezredfordulón [Heritage and challenge. The Hungarian linguistics of Transylvania at the turn of the century and the millennium]. In: Tánczos, Vilmos–Tőkés, Gyönyvér (eds.) *Tizenkét év. Összefoglaló tanulmányok az erdélyi magyar tudományos kutatások 1990–2001 közötti eredményeiről*. vol. I. Cluj-Napoca: Scientia Publishing House. 15–49.

2005. Magyar nyelv- és nyelvjárásszigetek Romániában [Hungarian language and dialect islands in Romania]. *Magyar Nyelv* 101(4): 406–413.

2016a. Felelős vezető nehéz időkben [Responsible leader in challenging times]. In: Péntek, János–Czégényi, Dóra (eds.), *Emlékkönyv Márton Gyula születésének centenáriumára*. Cluj-Napoca: Erdélyi Múzeum-Egyesület. 9–18.

2016b. *A moldvai magyar tájnyelv szótára* [Dictionary of the Hungarian dialects of Moldova]. vol. I/1. A–K. Cluj-Napoca: Erdélyi Múzeum-Egyesület.

2017. *A moldvai magyar tájnyelv szótára* [Dictionary of the Hungarian Dialects of Moldova]. vol. I/2. L–Zs. Cluj-Napoca: Erdélyi Múzeum-Egyesület.

2018. *A moldvai magyar tájnyelv szótára* [Dictionary of the Hungarian dialects of Moldova]. vol. II. Cluj-Napoca: Erdélyi Múzeum-Egyesület.

Szabó, József. 1990. *Magyarországi és jugoszláviai magyar nyelvjárásszigetek* [Hungarian dialect islands in Hungary and Yugoslavia]. Dél-alföldi évszázadok 3. Békéscsaba–Kecskemét–Szeged.

Szabó T., Attila. 1937. Az első munkatábor [The first workshop]. *Hitel* 2(1): 50–65.

1941. Az újabb népnyelvkutató munka kezdete [Beginnings of the new folk language research]. *Magyar Népnyelv* 3. 305–313.

1957. A Román Népköztársaság magyar nyelvjárási nyelvtérképének előkészítése [Preparation of the geolinguistic maps of the Hungarian dialects in the Socialist Republic of Romania]. *Nyelv- és Irodalomtudományi Közlemények* 1(1–4): 13–26.

Szabó T., Attila–Gálffy, Mózes–Márton, Gyula. 1944. Huszonöt lap „Kolozsvár és vidéke népnyelvi térképé”-ből [Twenty-five maps from the atlas of Kolozsvár and its outskirts]. *Erdélyi Tudományos Füzetek* 181. Kolozsvár: Erdélyi Múzeum-Egyesület.

Szabó, Zoltán. 1993. A kolozsvári magyar dialektológiai iskola [The Hungarian dialectology school of Kolozsvár]. In: Békés, Imre et al. (eds.), *Régi és új peregrináció. Magyarok külföldön, külföldiek Magyarországon*. vol. III. Budapest–Szeged: Nemzetközi Filológiai Társaság – Scriptum Kft. 1430–1432.

Varga, Fruzsina Sára. 2015a. Atlaszintegrálás és kvantitatív adatelemzés [Integration of atlases and quantitative analysis of data]. In: Bárth M., János–Bodó, Csanád–Kocsis, Zsuzsanna (eds.), *A nyelv dimenziói. Tanulmányok Juhász Dezső tiszteletére*. Budapest: ELTE BTK. 242–249.

2015b. Lexikai, fonológiai, fonetikai stabilitás (és relevancia) a magyar nyelvjárásokban [Lexical, phonological, phonetical stability (and relevance)]

in the Hungarian dialects]. In: É. Kiss, Katalin–Hegedűs, Attila–Pintér, Lilla (eds.), *Nyelvelmélet és dialektológia* 3. Budapest–Piliscsaba: PPKE BTK Elméleti Nyelvészeti Tanszék – Magyar Nyelvészeti Tanszék. 243–261.

2016. A romániai magyar nyelvjárások atlasza informatizált térképlapjainak kvantitatív nyelvföldrajzi vizsgálata [Quantitative analysis of geolinguistical data of informatized maps of the atlas of the Hungarian dialects of Romania]. *Magyar Nyelv* 112(2): 152–163.

2017. *A nyelvi hasonlóság földrajzi mintázatai. Magyar nyelvjárások dialektometriai elemzése* [Geographical patterns of linguistic similarity. Dialectometrical analysis of Hungarian dialects]. Budapest: Magyar Nyelvtudományi Társaság.

Web sources

Vargha, Fruzsina Sára–Vékás, Domokos. 2009. Magyar nyelvjárási adattárak vizsgálata interaktív dialektometriai térképekkel. [Analysis of Hungarian dialect databases with interactive dialectometry maps]. Előadás a Magyar Nyelvtudományi Társaság felolvasóülésén, 2009. március 24-én ([http://bihalbocs.hu/eloadas/dialektometria_-\]20090324.pdf](http://bihalbocs.hu/eloadas/dialektometria_-]20090324.pdf) (downloaded on: 7 February 2017).