AKADÉMIAI KIADÓ

The handling of issues related to the use of the Hungarian language in Slovakia since the 1990s

Szilárd Sebők* ⓘD

Comenius University in Bratislava, Slovakia

ORIGINAL RESEARCH PAPER

Check for updates

ABSTRACT

The present paper provides an overview of the ways in which Hungarian language issues in Slovakia have been handled from the 1990s to the present, discussing language cultivation, language planning and language management, and summarizing, on the basis of contemporary articles and studies, how the theoretical principles of these directions of research are implemented in the Slovakia Hungarian practices of handling language issues, and, on the other hand, how practical actions of problem handling contribute to theoretical frameworks of shaping language. These results are viewed in their historical contexts throughout the paper, and, at the end, the continuation of earlier processes is also traced in today's linguistic research.

INTRODUCTION

The linguistic problems of Slovakia's Hungarian-speaking community have occupied linguists for decades. What constitutes a Language issue has changed a lot during this time, as have linguists' views on linguists on how these problems could be addressed or, where possible,

* Corresponding author. E-mail: szilard.sebok@uniba.sk

AKJournals

resolved. We can distinguish three types of trends based on what linguists see as a problem and what ideologies and methodological principles they try to address, we can distinguish three types of trends: language cultivation, language planning, and language management.

In this study, I attempt to review how these three widely known approaches to language formation have had and continue to have an impact on the treatment of language problems in Slovakia's Hungarian-speaking community. Another way of putting it would be to say that I will overview the theoretical arguments supported or questioned by the linguists debating the topic of Hungarian language problems in Slovakia on the basis of contemporary articles and studies. I examine how the monopoly of language cultivation came to an end, and how the new theoretical foundations gained acceptance and became a part of the practice of language formation. How has the treatment of language problems evolved from the "gentleman's passion" of some linguists and enthusiastic semi-professionals to scholarly activity? How did we get from the problems of language cultivators to the language problems of speakers? And what are the current research trends that can be seen as a continuation of the processes that began decades ago? I will try to answer these questions below.

THE LANGUAGE PROBLEMS OF LANGUAGE CULTIVATORS

The activities of language cultivating linguists have the longest tradition in the history of language problem management (cf. Kontra, 2006a, 441, 1995, 147), the roots of which go all the way to the start of the journal *Magyar Nyelvőr* (lit. "Hungarian Language Cultivator") in 1872. Numerous ideological changes can be traced in the history of this trend, as Sándor (2001) comprehensively overviews, but in terms of its main goal, we cannot speak of any considerable diversions from this, perhaps with the exception of Lajos Lőrincze's person-centered language cultivation. The basis of language cultivation remains the concept of protecting the language and ensuring its 'healthy' development (cf. the definition of language cultivation in Bárczi and Országh, 1959–1962).

In terms of Slovakia, this was also supported by my previous research during which I reviewed the language-related and language cultivating articles of the only Hungarian language daily in the (Czecho)Slovak language between 1948 and 1999 by surveying all published issues of every tenth volume. The study showed that language cultivation articles, if such writings were published in a given year, answered the same question in each period, namely, what was right and what was wrong (see Sebők, 2015a, 106–107). Some changes were observed only in 1999 when, in addition to language cultivation articles, the popular scholarship writings on language by István Lanstyák and Gizella Szabómihály were published (the activities of the two authors will be discussed below).

The nature of language cultivation articles in general was not greatly influenced by who the target audience was, namely, the Hungarians of which country. As István Jakab wrote, the work of language cultivators in Slovakia differs from that of Hungarians only in that 'in addition to the fight against errors occurring throughout the Hungarian language area, it is also necessary to defend against the effects of the majority language' (1995, 7). The differences between the different linguistic and sociocultural environments were overridden by the basic principle that there is only one Hungarian language (see, for example, Deme, 1994/1998, 148; Jakab, 1983, 180, quoted by Jakab, 1994/1998, 157). From this point of view, it seemed marginal to deal with

questions as to why Hungarian is spoken in a different way beyond the borders of Hungary than within them (for more on this, see Kontra, 1995, 154). Language cultivators used the same explanation for the non-ideal use of language in the Slovak language environment as in Hungary. They blamed the 'sluggishness' and 'speakers' of the people who speak the language (see Kontra, 2006b, 108–109). The solution to the situation was seen in increasing the number of language cultivation articles (for more on this, see Szabómihály, 2007, 55). As language culti-vation is not a branch of (applied) science or scholarship (cf. e.g. Kálmán, 2004), it is not worth considering scholarly criteria in connection with it. However, it is worth briefly addressing the methodological issues of the attempted interventions of language cultivators aimed at changing the language (cf. Szabómihály, 2002, 144–145; Kontra, 1993/1998, 63–65). This is because developing the language awareness of those who speak it by utilising such methods raises several problems.

First of all, the question arises as to whether more people than usual would really read a greater number of language cultivation articles or only those who are interested in the topic to begin with and are more eager to browse language cultivation advice rather than, say, the sports column.

The target group is the so-called average reader (cf. Szabómihály, 2002, 145), about whom we do not know much, although we can still assume that the term refers to people who are interested in issues of language correctness use of language. Here, however, the problem is that the majority of readers may not be in line with this hypothetical average, that is, not everyone internalizes the advice of language cultivators in the same way, with the same assumptions. The issues raised in language cultivating articles are not equally understood by everyone, moreover, it is not even certain that a given issue is a problem for everyone to an equal degree, or indeed a problem at all. After all, language-cultivating articles rely mostly on occasional observations rather than surveys (cf. Szabómihály, 2002, 144; Kontra, 1993/1998, 65), therefore we cannot be sure whose problem we are talking about: the speaker's or rather the language cultivator's?

In an earlier work, I argued (Sebők, 2017, 42–47) that the language system which linguists tend to refer to as 'the system of our language' does not in fact mean a language system abstracted from the statements of the Hungarian speaking community, but, as indicated by the possessive, the language system considered ideal by language cultivators. Accordingly, phe-nomena that are inconsistent with this system of language are therefore considered to be lan-guage problems. That is, the approach of the language cultivator literally identifies the language problem with the problem of preserving the ideal language and chooses to adapt the linguistic behaviour of the speaker to the ideal version of the language as the method of problem man-agement (cf. Lanstyák, 2002, 130). The problem of language cultivators thus becomes the problem of language (cf. Szabómihály, 2005, 69) and the problem of language becomes, in turn, the problem of the the speaker's behavior. Lanstyák consequently wrote about language culti-vation activity that provokes newer and newer linguistic and social problems rather than solving them (2018, 244; cf. 2008, 52).

RE-EVALUATING LANGUAGE CULTIVATION PROBLEMS

The methodological limitations of language cultivation were brought to the fore by a group of linguists after the change of regime. Knowledge of the international literature on bilingualism,

multiculturalism, and language planning provided context and support for – let's say – linguists with a sociolinguistic perspective, from which the weaknesses of language cultivation became very clear (cf. Kontra, 1995, 148). It became increasingly clear that the idea of preserving a single Hungarian language was untenable (see, for example, Lanstyák, 1993/1998, 83–84), and an alternative problem-solving strategy was required that would address the linguistic consequences of the use of the majority language and respond to the minority Hungarians' real problems. There was a heated debate regarding the renewal of language cultivation, as well as on language cultivation and sociolinguistic perspectives, involving Hungarian linguists from both in and outside Hungary as well as of language cultivatin and sociolinguistic perspectives, including István Lanstyák, István Jakab, Gábor Tolcsvai Nagy, László Deme, and Miklós Kontra. The material of the discussion was published in a separate volume (see Kontra and Saly, 1998), and was also summarized in a separate study (see Sebők, 2016; cf. also Kontra, 1997). I will, therefore, describe the debate briefly, only in terms of its consequences.

One of the significant steps of progress achieved as a result of said debate is that the monopoly of language cultivation has been overthrown. Moreover, although language cultivation is still strongly present in the press, in education, and, in general, in people's thinking about language, criticism of language cultivation has also begun.[1] This has provided a different, scholarly insight into the phenomena of language use criticized by language cultivators and into the varieties of the Hungarian language used outside Hungary. Perhaps most importantly, it became clear during the debate that a new approach was needed which breaks with the previous "there is one Hungarian language" approach which no longer considers as deviations the varieties of the Hungarian language spoken in different countries (this change of approach is perhaps due to Lanstyák's, 1995/1998 article; cf. Clyne, 1992). After the debate subsided, some continued their former activities of language cultivating and, though perhaps a little more cautiously, continued to spread the rules of the language correctness. On the other hand, for linguists with a sociolinguistic outlook moving away from language cultivation opened up a space that tested the practical applicability of the new approach. In Slovakia, research on bilingualism (see Lanstyák and Szabómihály, 1995, 1997, 2005) and local varieties of language (Lanstyák, 2000, 2002) was launched with the aim to provide a starting point for a new kind of language management activity.

The theory of language planning provided a basis for the renewal of deliberate language change, which, although not unknown in Hungary (see Herman and Imre, 1987; Grétsy and Kovalovszky, 1985, 339–348), dates back several decades in the West (see, for example, Haugen, 1966; Fishman, 1974; a good overview of it is provided by the collection edited by Tolcsvai Nagy, 1998). The subsequent step was to replace the tradition of language cultivation and instead of cherry-picking language problems and exaggerating certain phenomena it was necessary to make strategic decisions and lay down guidelines for language planning. This task was essentially performed by István Lanstyák (see primarily 1998/2002) and Gizella Szabómihály (see primarily 1999/2002). The most important results of this process can be found in the 1998/2002 volume edited by the latter two aforementioned linguists. In it, they clearly defined the goals of language planning and what would be necessary to achieve them. They stated that

---

[1]See, for instance, Tamás Kis's webpage titled *A nyelvművelés kártékonyságáról és ármánykodásáról* [On the noxiousness and machinations of language cultivation] which provides a continually updated collection of links to articles on the topic: http://web.unideb.hu/~tkis/index.html.

Hungarian language planning in Slovakia cannot be based on the adoption of Hungarian language terminology, because the different institutional systems of the two countries allow for this only to a limited extent. It was stated that, considering the Hungarian patterns, it was necessary to develop professional registers based on the Slovak institutional system and realities, especially in the field of public administration and law (Lanstyák and Szabómihály, 2000/2002, 118, 120–121; cf. Szabómihály, 2007, 60). Additionally, they also made it clear that deliberate language-changing activities were limited to the standard variety and did not seek to influence everyday language use programmatically.

The implementation of Hungarian language planning in Slovakia was undertaken by the Gramma Language Office (of which the two authors were founding members) within an institutional framework. With regard to deliberate language change, its activities focused primarily on the codification and dissemination of elements belonging to the Slovakia varieties of the Hungarian standard, as well as the development of professional language registers; while also aiming to facilitate this, among other things, by popular dissemination of linguistic knowledge, producing translations, and operating a public language service (for details, see Misad, 2009a, 216–218; cf. Sherman, 2007). This was an enormous shift from language cultivation practices. A research-based strategy was drawn up which on the one hand defined the varieties of the Hungarian language in Slovakia, and on the other hand determined the direction for the development of these varieties.

In general, then, we can say that the deliberate language change in Slovakia underwent an extraordinary transformation and broke with the tradition of language cultivation. The Language change no longer had to be adapted to the rules of some exact language system, but to a much broader interrelated system, which included not only the language system and language historical processes but also the consideration of the language community as well as social and socio-cultural factors (cf. Tolcsvai Nagy, 2005, 234). On the other hand, an important related thread remained in the realm of language cultivation. Namely, that language shaping activities continued to focus on language. An important difference is that in the case of language cultivation, the language cultivator determines what a problem is, while in language planning, the linguist who conducts the research assumes this role. What the two of them have in common is that both treat the issue as a problem of language,[2] and they both have a kind of social legitimacy to decide from 'above' what is to be considered a problem in the first place.

FROM THE PROBLEMS OF THE LANGUAGE TO THE PROBLEMS OF THE SPEAKER

The problem-solving activity of linguists called language planning, quickly underwent an important change of attitude. A few years later the same authors who had previously advocated the traditional approach were writing about language management as a new trend and as a critique of language planning (for more information on the development of this trend, see Neustupný, 2002; Nekvapil, 2011). This was a novelty in that the attention of linguists shifted

---

[2]Lanstyák (2007, 199) defines the difference between language cultivation and language planning also as follows: while the focus of the former is on the interests of an abstract notion of "language", the latter considers the interests of (a similarly abstract notion of) the "nation".

from the language to the speaker in the treatment of language problems. It was no longer the experts who decided what the language problems of the community were, instead, they began to observe the problems that the speakers struggled with in specific life situations (see Neustupný, 2002, 435; cf. Szabómihály, 2005, 68). We could also say that the new approach made it possible for the speakers to "tell" what is causing them problems (Lanstyák, 2007, 199; cf. Lanstyák and Szabómihály, 2009).

Language management provided a kind of bottom-up concept, as opposed to the previous, objectivist approach to language planning that went from top to bottom in solving problems: it sought to accept an idea developed within an institutional framework in everyday life situations that required the use of a local standard. Within the approach of language management, however, it is possible to reach the language problems at higher levels, such as education and language policy, by generalizing everyday problems.[3] The way to solve these problems is not through changing the linguistic behaviour of the speaker, as in the case of language cultivation, nor is changing the language the main task, as in the case of language planning activities. Language management focuses much more on transforming the circumstances of a problem situation, starting with the language problems of the speakers.

In the Slovakia Hungarian environment, perhaps the best example of this is the initiation of what has been called the defragmentation of language (see Lanstyák, 2006b; cf. Lanstyák et al., 2010). The terms borrowed from the Slovak model or created based on it, which according to the position of the language cultivator (cf. e.g. Jakab, 1995, 9–43) had to be replaced by their Hungarian counterparts, began to be treated as part of the 'universal Hungarian language' (see Lanstyák, 2006a, no page number) by language planning and language management.[4] This was manifested in, among other things, the fact that some of the elements characteristic of the use of the Hungarian language in neighbouring countries were included in dictionaries of the Hungarian language, for instance in the new edition of the concise Hungarian dictionary of definitions (Pusztai, 2003; for details, see Lanstyák, 2004, 166–211). In other words, circumstances arose in which Hungarian-speaking communities outside Hungary could see their language on an equal footing with that of other Hungarians, and also problems arising from linguistic differences could be solved quickly with the help of new dictionaries (see Lanstyák et al., 2010: 57).

[3]The details of the Slovakia Hungarian adaptation of the language management theory cannot be presented here due to space limitations. For the sake of completeness, however, it is worth mentioning, at least in points, the critical remarks that Lanstyák has made in several studies on the theory of language management. First, Lanstyák criticized the normative conception of language management theory because of its simplifying nature (see, for instance, 2010, 26). Second, he objected to the theory ignoring linguistic ideologies (see, e.g., 2011). Third, he pointed out the fact that this theory does not separate what is so-called wicked problems, which by their nature cannot be solved and can only be alleviated under the circumstances of the problem situation (see Lanstyák, 2015; cf. Sebők, 2015b; in Hungarian, Lanstyák, 2014a). As a result of the critique, the issue of linguistic ideologies became an integral part of language management theory (see Barát et al., 2013).

[4]From the point of view of the history of science, it is not easy to separate the activities of the language planner and language manager in Slovakia: on the one hand, because the application of both theories was carried out by the same pair of authors over the course of a few years, and on the other hand, because Hungarian language planning in Slovakia has been aimed at solving speakers' language problems since its inception (cf. Szépe, 2002, 10).

TOPICAL PROBLEMS

Looking back at the events described above we can say that these were the starting points of processes that have continued to this day. The changes which began in the 1990s are being honed to this day within the framework of language management theory (cf., for example, Lanstyák, 2014b, c) and, even in a transformed form, they have continued for more than twenty years. I discuss these in detail below.

From the point of view of researching language problems, it is important to mention the Termini Hungarian–Hungarian online dictionary, which has been continuously expanded since 2003 within the Termini Hungarian Language Research Network (Lanstyák et al., 2010, 44), to include words, expressions and their variants, local meanings, and additional shades of meaning typical of the language use of the Hungarian speech communities outside Hungary.[5] To this day the work is actively supported by the Domus Program of the Hungarian Academy of Sciences.

This is important for researching language problems in several ways. On the one hand, the dictionary contains 'established' terms typical of Hungarian-populated regions outside Hungary for which it is often difficult to find Hungary Hungarian equivalents. On the other hand, all of this also has an important symbolic message. The dictionary conveys a 'language policy' that does not treat the state varieties of the Hungarian language as deterioration, but rather as a natural consequence of bilingualism.

In addition to the Termini Hungarian–Hungarian dictionary, other dictionaries involving the Slovak and Hungarian languages should also be mentioned as they play a significant role in language planning and language management in Slovakia. In this country, an institutional system different from the Hungarian one raises a number of problems concerning language use, especially when translating legal and administrative terms and names of institutions from Slovak into Hungarian (see Misad, 2019a). Many translators try to find the right term in one of the general dictionaries or attempt ad hoc translations based on their language skills (see Misad, 2009b, 81). It is often the case that different occurrences of the same terminological unit are translated differently within a text (cf. Misad, 2012a, 103), but even if the translator strives to achieve uniformity, it is not always clear what the official Slovak Hungarian term of a given Slovak term or institution is.[6] Moreover, sometimes bilingual dictionaries which were written, in principle, with the intention to clarify meaning, also provide distorted Hungarianize Slovak terms in a specific way (cf. for instance Tankó, 2000), and even dictionaries that call themselves 'terminology manuals' contain many inconsistencies that can be traced back to translators as well as other influencing factors (cf. Horváth et al., 2015; for an analysis of dictionaries and examples of inconsistencies, see Misad in 2019b; cf. also Misad, 2009f).

In other words, from the point of view of Hungarian language management in Slovakia, this is a twofold problem. We have to face not only the diversity of terminology due to ad hoc translations, but also the inconsistencies of the dictionaries intended for clarification. The Gramma (!) Language Office has previously undertaken to solve these problems and a

---

[5]The dictionary has been available online since 2006 here: http://termini.nytud.hu/htonline/htlista.php?action=firstpage.

[6]For instance, according to personal communication by Lanstyák István, the name of the National Institute of Certified Educational Measurement (NÚCEM – Národný ústav certifikovaných meraní) has about twenty Hungarian equivalents that are in use.

Hungarian language list of the names of Slovak public institutions has been drawn up within the office (see, for example, Misad, 2011, 2012b). Later, this unifying work was taken over by the NGO Pro Civis and, at a higher institutional level, the office of the commissioner for minority government of the Slovak government, led by László Bukovszky.[7] In addition to translations of laws affecting minorities, among others, a Slovak–Hungarian dictionary of terminology was added to the website of the government commissioner (Cúth et al., 2012), which contains translations of the names of several important institutions and translations of many legal and administrative terms.[8] This is an important step in preventing the fragmentation of professional languages (for details on the problem, see Misad, 2009c, 11–12; 14–15; cf. Lanstyák, 2018, 288–296).

The next traditional group of language problems concerns mother tongue education.

Several studies prove (see, for example, Misad, 2009d, 2019c; cf. Vančo and Kozmács, 2014) that the change of attitude outlined above, which took place in the history of deliberate language change, has not yet been integrated into minority Hungarian education in Slovakia.[9] The fact that language cultivating traditions live on undisturbed in Hungarian classes (cf. Bilász, 2017; cf. Szabó, 2012) and the greatest emphasis is placed on teaching the correct use of language and the only 'correct' use of standard language, while the concept of 'correctness' is interpreted as independent of speech situation of the speaker constitutes yet another problem (cf., for instance, Lanstyák, 2018, 298). Varieties that differ from the standard, which most students in fact use as their mother tongue, are usually treated by textbooks as exerting a harmful influence that students should be freed from (Misad, 2009d, 153), and the school thus reinforces the subtractive nature of mother tongue education (for the disadvantages of which, see Kontra, 2003/2010, 57–60, cf. Lanstyák, 1998, 70), and by devaluing the spoken variety it indirectly promotes the language shift of the minority Hungarian speaking community.

The gravity of the situation is further exacerbated by the Hungarian language textbooks in use because they not only convey an outdated and in many respects harmful language approach towards students (see Misad et al., 2009 and Lanstyák, 2018, 253–272 for details), but – with the previously mentioned exception – they were prepared following models from Hungary and completely ignore the special circumstances and needs of the minority speech community. Even apart from the Hungarian textbooks, there are also problems with other textbooks originally written in Slovak, because they contain many inconsistencies of translation as well as terminological errors (for details, see Szabómihály, 2008; Misad, 2019d).

The teaching of the Slovak language also faces several problems a thorough description of which would also lead far beyond the scope of the present paper (although see Lanstyák, 2018, 302). Thus, based on the work of Misad (2007, 2009e), I want to mention only the problem which, in my opinion, underlies all other problems; namely, that education does not consider the needs of students as future users of the Slovak language, especially the fact that they will need

---

[7]Continuation of the work that began became questionable after the 2020 elections, as no Hungarian party was elected to the parliament.

[8]In February 2020 a Slovak–Hungarian terminology list of educational terms was posted on the website of Slovakia's Ministry of Education, Science, Research and Sports: https://www.minedu.sk/data/files/9495_final_svk_mad.pdf?fbclid=IwAR1fmxUQIdSj7lgaHuyNXW_WNq8ah0KNZPddfZrjjT6QpmSE3Maglv87BpQ.

[9]An exception is the 2009 textbook written by Katalin Misad, Szabolcs Simon and Gizella Szabómihály.

excellent proficiency in Slovak after leaving school. Slovak language communication is relegated to the background in the classes, and the curriculum focuses primarily on the development of a passive, written language competence.

In addition to problems with the development of professional languages and education, there are other language problems also. From the topics of linguistic research so far, I would like to highlight just one more; the issue of bilingualism in administrative offices, which consists of at least two components. On the one hand, the fact that the majority of Hungarians do not exercise their existing language rights and use the Slovak language in written petitions even when their right to use Hungarian is guaranteed is a problem for the preservation of the current status of the Hungarian language (on the Slovakian situation of language rights, see Szabómihály, 2002). On the other hand, even if an individual wants to use the minority language, the offices often do not have the appropriate Hungarian language forms (even if the translations are available on the Internet) while also neither municipal employees nor private individuals are familiar with Hungarian administrative terminology (see, for instance, Misad, 2019e; Takács, 2019) which is another problem causing further fragmentation of the professional use of language.

CONCLUSION

In the present paper I have reviewed the history of research into language problems of Hungarian relevance in Slovakia from the 1990s to the present day, and I have also covered the most important language problems at present. I have discussed research into these issues through the description of the main features of three trends of deliberate language change – language cultivation, language planning, and language management – focusing mainly on those articles and studies in which different approaches of the three trends were at odds with each other. By use of this method With this I have attempted to reconstruct the process in which deliberate Hungarian language change in Slovakia has been transformed and has progressed from pillorying the language problems created by language cultivation, through the restoration of the "honor" of the local Hungarian varieties to researching the language problems of speakers.

In the following part of the paper, I have reviewed the linguistic problems that are the focus of attention in the Slovakia Hungarian linguistic literature. I have presented the problems arising from the differences between the Hungary vs. Slovakia Hungarian varieties, the problems of translation from Slovak into Hungarian, and the resulting terminological inconsistencies. Furthermore, I have referred to the normative language approach in the teaching of Hungarian to ethnic Hungarian students in schools and the textbooks used in the process, the translation of textbooks from Slovak into Hungarian, as well as the shortcomings in the teaching of Slovak to ethnic students. I have also discussed the problems of administrative practices separately. Although the individual problem area could have been treated in a more differentiated way and certainly other problems could have been also identified, in line with the aims of the paper, I have remained more concerned with the language issues discussed in the literature and, instead of attempting to present a full and comprehensive list of issues, I have concentrated on the common features of the problem areas. After all, they are seldom placed next to each other in this way (with the possible exception of Lanstyák, 2018, 251–307).

An overview of each problem area sheds light on the common ground from which they all emerge, namely, that a greater part of the issues are about the problem of 'translation' between the Slovak and Hungarian languages and cultures in a broad sense. Failure to find the 'domestic' Hungarian equivalent of a term borrowed from Slovak or formed on the basis of a Slovak pattern is considered a translation issue (which the Termini dictionary helps to solve), but we can also list problems related to inconsistent translations of bilingual dictionaries. After all, in addition to the lexicographer having translation problems, an incorrect interpretation in the dictionary can also cause the user a communication problem translation problems. (which the dictionary on the minority government commissioner's website can help with). We can also include in this problem area the texts of textbooks translated from Slovak into Hungarian, the technical terminology of which often follows the 'inventions' of the translator and this can lead to communication problems in the technical language use of dictionary users.

In a broader sense, we can also interpret as a "translation" problem those cases when in official written administration the private individual does not exercise their right to use the Hungarian language and choose to use the Slovak language. This is a translation problem in the sense that the individual speaks literally 'in translation'. This means that a native speaker of Hungarian opts to use Slovak in order not to have to constantly translate administrative terms into Hungarian in an ad hoc fashion, or in order not to have to use a mixed variety so deeply condemned by language cultivators. Equally, if someone does not learn to 'interpret' their thoughts into Slovak with sufficient efficiency in Slovak classes, it can be considered a 'translation' issue as this prevents them from achieving their communication goals in that language.

The obsolete approach to language conveyed in minority Hungarian classes and textbooks, which could only be called a problem of 'translation' between the standard and other varieties only at a stretch, was left out of the list of problems. After all, the issue here is not switching between the different varieties, but the replacement of terms that have been classified in all circumstances as 'incorrect' with those that are 'correct', specifically the fact that students are educated from a pre-school age to take a narrow view of language, meaning that instead of being presented with the diversity of language, they are given the view of 'linguistic exclusivity' which is a standardist ideology.

The latter problem area is not of the nature of 'translation issues', but rather that of attitude.

Unlike the former, it cannot be solved by creating more consistent translations or dictionaries. In the case of minority Hungarian classes and textbooks, to improve the problematic situation, it is primarily necessary to change the attitude towards language as such. Language management plays a major role in this, which, as we have seen in the above examples, has already made its way into linguistics but has so far remained largely in the shadow of language cultivation in education and in the press.

ACKNOWLEDGMENT

Research Institute. The previous version of the present paper was published in the yearbook of the Department of Hungarian Language and Literature at Comenius University in Bratislava in Hungarian language (Sebők 2019). I want to thank István Lanstyák for his comments on the previous version of the paper, Anna Fenyvesi for her help and Miklós Kontra for the literature he recommended.

REFERENCES

Barát, Erzsébet, Studer, Patrick, and Nekvapil, Jiří (Eds.), (2013). *Ideological conceptualizations of language*. Frankfurt am Main etc., Peter Lang.

Bárczi, Géza and Országh, László (Gen. Ed.) (1959–1962). *A magyar nyelv értelmező szótára I– VII* [A defining dictionary of Hungarian, vols. 1–7]. Akadémiai Kiadó, Budapest.

Bilász, Boglárka (2017). *Nyelv és ideológia. Iskolai metanyelvi diskurzus szlovákiai magyar középiskolákban* [Language and ideology: metalinguistic discourse in Slovakian Hungarian high schools]. Univerzita Komenského v Bratislave, Pozsony, Available at: https://fphil.uniba.sk/fileadmin/fif/katedry_pracoviska/kgn/Nyelv_es_ideologia_TLAC.pdf (Accessed: 15 April 2021).

Clyne, Michael (1992). Introduction & epilogue. In: Clyne, Michael (Ed.), *Pluricentric languages: different norms in different countries*. Moutonde Gruyter, Berlin–New York, pp. 455–465.

Cúth, Csaba, Horony, Ákos, Kamoncza, Márta, and Szabómihály, Gizella (2012). *Slovenskomad'arský terminologický slovník* [Slovak–Hungarian terminological dictionary]. A szlovák kormány kisebbségi kormánybiztosának hivatala, Pozsony, Available at: https://www.narodnostnemensiny.gov.sk/data/files/5956_slovensko-madarsky-odbornyterminologicky-slovnik.pdf (Accessed: 15 April 2021).

Deme, László (1994/1998). Kétség és remény közt [Between doubts and hope]. In: Kontra, Miklós and Saly, Noémi (Eds.), *Nyelvmentés vagy nyelvárulás: Vita a határon túli magyar nyelvhasználatról* [Language rescue or language treason? A debate about minority language use of Hungarian]. Osiris, Budapest, pp. 144–149, Available at: http://adatbank.transindex.ro/html/alcim_pdf11071.pdf (Accessed: 15 April 2021).

Fishman, Joshua A. (1974). Language modernization and planning in comparison with other types of national modernization and planning. In: Fishman, Joshua A. (Ed.), *Advances in language planning*. The Hague, Mouton, pp. 79–102.

Grétsy, László and Kovalovszky, Miklós (Eds.), (1985). *Nyelvművelő kézikönyv II* [A handbook of language cultivation, vol. 2]. Akadémiai Kiadó, Budapest.

Haugen, Einar (1966). Linguistics and language planning. In: *The ecology of language*. Stanford University Press, Stanford, pp. 159–186.

Herman, József and Imre, Samu (1987). Nyelvi változás – nyelvi tervezés Magyarországon [Language change and language planning in Hungary]. *Magyar Tudomány* 32(7–8): 513–531.

Horváth, Kinga, Németh, András, Strédl, Terézia, Szabóová, Edita, and Tóth-Bakos, Anita (2015). *Szlovák-magyar* [sic!] *pedagógiai terminológiai kézikönyv. Slovensko-maďarská pedagogická terminologická príručka* [A Slovak–Hungarian Handbook of Pedagogical Terminology]. Selye János Egyetem Tanárképző Kara, Komárno.

Jakab, István (1983). *Nyelvünk és mi* [We and our language]. Pozsony: Madách.

Jakab, István (1992/1998). A köznyelv fejlesztéséről nem mondhatunk le: a nemzeti nyelvművelés „liberalizmusának" és a kisebbségi nyelvművelés „radikalizmusának" okai, gondjai [We cannot give up

improving the standard: the reasons for and problems of the "liberalism" of national language culti-
vation and the "radicalism" of minority language cultivation]. In: Kontra, Miklós and Saly, Noémi
(Eds.), *Nyelvmentés vagy nyelvárulás. Vita a határon túli magyar nyelvhasználatról* [Rescuring the
language or betraying the language? A debate about the use of the Hungarian language by minority
speakers]. Osiris, Budapest, pp. 34–36, Available at: http://adatbank.transindex.ro/html/alcim_
pdf11059.pdf (Accessed: 15 April 2021).

Jakab, István (1994/1998). Nyelvművelésünk múltja, jelene, jövője [The past, present, and future of lan-
guage cultivation]. In: Kontra, Miklós and Saly, Noémi (Eds.), *Nyelvmentés vagy nyelvárulás. Vita a
határon túli magyar nyelvhasználatról* [Rescuring the language or betraying the language? A debate
about the use of the Hungarian language by minority speakers]. Osiris, Budapest, pp. 150–165,
Available at: http://adatbank.transindex.ro/html/alcim_pdf11072.pdf (Accessed: 15 April 2021).

Jakab, István (1995). *Értsünk szót egymással!* [Let's find a common language]. Kalligram Könyvkiadó,
Pozsony.

Kálmán, László (2004). A nyelvművelés mint áltudomány [Language cultivation as pseudoscience]. In:
Büky, László (Ed.), *A mai magyar nyelv leírásának újabb módszerei VI. Nyelvleírás és nyelvművelés,
nyelvhasználat, stilisztika* [New methods of describing modern Hungarian, vol. 6: language description,
language cultivation, language use, and stylistics]. JATEPress, Szeged, pp. 63–82, Available at: http://
web.unideb.hu/~tkis/altudomany.htm (Accessed: 15 April 2021).

Kontra, Miklós (1995). "No CARE-packages, please – we're Hungarians": the climate before, during, and
after the birth of the Budapest Sociolinguistic Interview. In: Harling, Jeffrey and Pléh, Csaba (Eds.),
When East met West: Sociolinguistics in the former socialist Bloc. Mouton de Gruyter, Berlin–New York,
pp. 143–164.

Kontra, Miklós (1997). Hungarian linguistic traitors champion the cause of contact dialects. In: Wölck,
Wolfgang and Houwer, Annick de (Eds.), *Recent studies in contact linguistics*. Dummler, Bonn, pp.
181–187.

Kontra, Miklós (1993/1998). Hogyan válasszunk le ötmillió magyart a nemzet testéről? [How to separate 5
million Hungarians from the body of the nation?]. In: Kontra, Miklós and Saly, Noémi (Eds.),
Nyelvmentés vagy nyelvárulás. Vita a határon túli magyar nyelvhasználatról [Language rescue or lan-
guage treason? A debate about minority language use of Hungarian]. Osiris, Budapest, pp. 59–68,
Available at: http://adatbank.transindex.ro/html/alcim_pdf11066.pdf (Accessed: 15 April 2021).

Kontra, Miklós (2006). Hungary: language situation. In: Brown, Keith (Ed.), *Encyclopedia of language &
linguistics*. Elsevier, Amsterdam.

Kontra, Miklós (2006). Sustainable linguicism. In: Hinskens, Frans (Ed.), *Language variation – European
perspectives*. John Benjamins Publishing Company, Amsterdam–Philadelphia, pp. 97–126.

Kontra, Miklós (2003/2010). Felcserélő anyanyelvi nevelés vagy hozzáadó? (Papp István igaza) [Subtractive
or additive mother tongue education? István Papp's point]. In: Kontra, Miklós (Ed.), *Hasznos nyelvészet*
[Useful linguistics]. Fórum Kisebbségkutató Intézet, Somorja, pp. 57–60.

Kontra, Miklós and Saly, Noémi (Eds.), (1998). *Nyelvmentés vagy nyelvárulás. Vita a határon túli magyar
nyelvhasználatról* [Language rescue or language treason? A debate about minority language use of
Hungarian]. Osiris, Budapest, Available at: http://adatbank.transindex.ro/html/cim_pdf1324.pdf
(Accessed: 15 April 2021).

Lanstyák, István (1993/1998). Nyelvművelésünk vétségei és kétségei [The sins and doubts of Hungarian
language cultivation]. In: Kontra, Miklós and Saly, Noémi (Eds.), *Nyelvmentés vagy nyelvárulás. Vita a
határon túli magyar nyelvhasználatról* [Language rescue or language treason? A debate about minority

language use of Hungarian]. Osiris, Budapest, pp. 74–101, Available at: http://adatbank.transindex.ro/html/alcim_pdf11068.pdf (Accessed: 15 April 2021).

Lanstyák, István (1995/1998). A magyar nyelv központjai [The centers of the Hungarian language]. In: Kontra, Miklós and Saly, Noémi (Eds.), *Nyelvmentés vagy nyelvárulás. Vita a határon túli magyar nyelvhasználatról* [Language rescue or language treason? A debate about minority language use of Hungarian]. Osiris, Budapest, pp. 326–344, Available at: http://adatbank.transindex.ro/html/alcim_pdf11088.pdf (Accessed: 15 April 2021).

Lanstyák, István (1998). *Nyelvünkben – otthon* [At home in our language]. Nap Kiadó, Dunaszerdahely.

Lanstyák, István (2000). *A magyar nyelv Szlovákiában* [The Hungarian language in Slovakia]. Osiris Kiadó–Kalligram Könyvkiadó–MTA Kisebbségkutató Műhely, Budapest–Pozsony.

Lanstyák, István (1998/2002). Magyar nyelvtervezés a Kárpát-medencében a 21. században [Hungarian language planning in the Carpathian Basin in the 21st century]. In: Lanstyák, István and Szabómihály, Gizella (Eds.), *Magyar nyelvtervezés Szlovákiában. Tanulmányok és dokumentumok* [Hungarian language planning in Slovakia: studies and documents]. Kalligram Könyvkiadó, Pozsony, pp. 127–141.

Lanstyák, István (2002). A magyar nyelv szlovákiai változatainak jellemzői [The features of Varieties of Hungarian in Slovakia]. In: Lanstyák, István and Szabómihály, Gizella (Eds.), *Magyar nyelvtervezés Szlovákiában* [Hungarian language planning in Slovakia]. Kalligram Kiadó, Pozsony, pp. 84–108.

Lanstyák, István (2004). Szlovákiai magyar vonatkozású szócikkek a Magyar értelmező kéziszótár átdolgozott kiadásában [Entries of Slovakia Hungarian relevance in the revised edition of the Concise defining dictionary of Hungarian]. In: Lanstyák, István, and Menyhárt, József (Eds.), Tanulmányok a kétnyelvűségről II [Studies on bilingualism, vol. 2]. Kalligram Könyvkiadó, Pozsony, pp. 166–211.

Lanstyák, István (2006a). Nyelvi változatosság a határon túli magyar szókincsben [Variation in the Vocabulary of Hungarian in the Countries Neighbouring Hungary]. In: *Kisebbségkutatás, 15/1*, Available at: http://epa.oszk.hu/00400/00462/00029/cikk8825.html (Accessed: April 15, 2021).

Lanstyák, István (2006b). Határtalanítás [Defragmentation of the Hungarian language]. In: Mártonfi, Attila, Papp, Kornélia, and Slíz, Mariann (Eds.), *101 írás Pusztai Ferenc tiszteletére* [101 papers in honor of Ferenc Pusztai]. Argumentum, Budapest, pp. 179–186.

Lanstyák, István (2007). A nyelvhelyesség mint nyelvi probléma [Correctness as a language issue]. *Kisebbségkutatás* 16(2): 199–213, Available at: https://epa.oszk.hu/00400/00462/00034/cikk14fc.html (Accessed: April 15, 2021).

Lanstyák, István (2008). Nyelvművelés és nyelvalakítás. (A létező magyar nyelvművelés néhány jellegadó sajátosságáról) [Language cultivation and language shaping: on some characteristic features of existing language cultivation]. In: Fazekas, József (Ed.), *Emlékkönyv Zeman László 80. születésnapjára* [Festschrift for László Zeman's 80th birthday]. Lilium Aurum, Dunaszerdahely, pp. 46–68.

Lanstyák, István (2010). A nyelvi problémák típusai [Types of language problems]. *Fórum Társadalomtudományi Szemle* 12(1): 23–48, Available at: http://epa.oszk.hu/00000/00033/00040/pdf/szemle_2010_1_lanstyak-istvan.pdf (Accessed: 15 April 2021).

Lanstyák, István (2011). Nyelvi problémák és nyelvi ideológiák [Language problems and language ideologies]. In: Hires-László, Kornélia, Karmacsi, Zoltán, and Márku, Anita (Eds.), *Nyelvi mítoszok, ideológiák, nyelvpolitika és nyelvi emberi jogok KözépEurópában elméletben és gyakorlatban* [Language myths, ideologies, language policy, and linguistic human rights in Central Europe in theory and in practice]. Tinta Könyvkiadó–II. Rákóczi Ferenc Kárpátaljai Magyar Főiskola Hodinka Antal Intézete, Budapest – Beregszász, pp. 48–58.

Lanstyák, István (2014a). A kusza problémák néhány kérdéséről [Questions relating to complicated problems]. In: Gróf, Annamária, Ildikó, N. Császi, and Szoták, Szilvia (Eds.), *Sokszínű nyelvészet –*

nyelvi sokszínűség a 21. század elején. Írások Kolláth Anna tiszteletére [Multicolored linguistics and linguistic diversity: papers in honour of Anna Kolláth]. Tinta Könyvkiadó–UMIZ–Imre Samu Nyelvi Intézet, Budapest–Alsóőr, pp. 211–216.

Lanstyák, István (2014b). A nyelvmenedzselés-elmélet két kérdéséről [On two issues of language management theory]. In: Misad, Katalin and Csehy, Zoltán (Eds.), *Speculum Varietetis. Nyelvi és irodalmi menedzselés, multikulturális terek, (pseudo)identitás és szöveg* [Speculum Varietetis: language and literature management, multicultural spaces, (pseudo)identity, and text]. Univerzita Komenského v Bratislave, Pozsony, pp. 7–38.

Lanstyák, István (2014c). On the process of language problem management. *Slovo a slovesnost* 75(4): 325–351.

Lanstyák, István (2015). Záludné jazykové problémy: čo s nimi? In: Ondrejovič, Slavomír, Jana, Wachtarczyková, and Satinská, Lucia (Eds.), *Jazyk v politických, ideologických a interkultúrnych vzťahoch*. Veda, Pozsony, pp. 177–193.

Lanstyák, István (2018). *Nyelvalakítás és nyelvi problémák* [Shaping language and language problems]. Fórum Kisebbségkutató Intézet–Gramma Nyelvi Iroda, Somorja.

Lanstyák, István and Szabómihály, Gizella (1995). Contact varieties of Hungarian in Slovakia: a contribution to their description. *International Journal of the Sociology of Language* 120: 111–130.

Lanstyák, István and Szabómihály, Gizella (1997). In: *Magyar nyelvhasználat – iskola – kétnyelvűség* [Hungarian language use, school, and bilingualism]. Kalligram Könyvkiadó, Pozsony.

Lanstyák, István and Szabómihály, Gizella (Eds.), (1998/2002). *Magyar nyelvtervezés Szlovákiában. Tanulmányok és dokumentumok* [Hungarian language planning in Slovakia: studies and documents]. Kalligram Könyvkiadó, Pozsony.

Lanstyák, István and Szabómihály, Gizella (2000/2002). Nyelvi jogaink érvényesítésének nyelvi feltételei [The linguistic conditions of implementing our language rights]. In: Lanstyák, István and Szabómihály, Gizella (Eds.), *Magyar nyelvtervezés Szlovákiában. Tanulmányok és dokumentumok* [Hungarian language planning in Slovakia: studies and documents]. Kalligram Könyvkiadó, Pozsony, pp. 117–126.

Lanstyák, István and Szabómihály, Gizella (2005). Hungarian in Slovakia. In: Fenyvesi, Anna (Ed.), *Hungarian language contact outside Hungary: studies on Hungarian as a minority language*. John Benjamins Publishing Company, Amsterdam–Philadelphia, pp. 47–88.

Lanstyák, István and Szabómihály, Gizella (2009). Hungarian in Slovakia: language management in a bilingual minority community. In: Nekvapil, Jiří and Sherman, Tamah (Eds.), *Language management in contact situations: perspectives from three continents*. Peter Lang, Frankfurt am Main, pp. 49–73.

Lanstyák, István, Benő, Attila, and Juhász, Tihamér (2010). A Termini magyar–magyar szótár és adatbázis [The Termini Hungarian–Hungarian dictionary and database]. *Regio* 16(3): 37–58, Available at: http://www.epa.uz.ua/00000/00036/00079/pdf/Regio_2010_03_037-058.pdf (Accessed: 15 April 2021).

Misad, Katalin (2007). A szlovák nyelv oktatásának helyzete alap- és középiskoláinkban [The state of the teaching of the Slovak language in our primary and secondary schools]. *Fórum Társadalomtudományi Szemle* 9(2): 115–126, Available at: http://epa.oszk.hu/00000/00033/00029/pdf/forum_EPA00033_2007_02_115-126.pdf (Accessed: 15 April 2021).

Misad, Katalin (2009a). Az MTA határon túli kutatóállomásai nyelvi szolgáltató tevékenységének összefoglaló áttekintése, különös tekintettel a Gramma Nyelvi Irodára (2001–2005) [A summary overview of the language services activities of the research stations of the HAS outside Hungary, with special attention to the Gramma Language Office, 2001–2005]. In: Misad, Katalin (Ed.), *Nyelvi kontaktusok. Szlovákiai magyar vonatkozású alkalmazott nyelvészeti tanulmányok* [Language contacts: Slovakia Hungarian applied linguistic studies]. Lilium Aurum, Dunaszerdahely, pp. 213–247.

Misad, Katalin (2009b). A magyar mint kisebbségi nyelv használatának gyakorlata a hivatalos érintkezésben [The practice of using Hungarian as a minority language in official discourse]. In: Misad, Katalin (Ed.), *Nyelvi kontaktusok. Szlovákiai magyar vonatkozású alkalmazott nyelvészeti tanulmányok* [Language contacts: Slovakia Hungarian applied linguistic studies]. Lilium Aurum, Dunaszerdahely, pp. 71–91.

Misad, Katalin (2009c). A szaknyelvi regiszterek fejlesztésének szemantikai és pragmatikai összefüggései szlovákiai magyar viszonylatban [Semantic and pragmatic aspects of the development of special registers in the Slovakia Hungarian context]. In: Misad, Katalin (Ed.), *Nyelvi kontaktusok. Szlovákiai magyar vonatkozású alkalmazott nyelvészeti tanulmányok* [Language contacts: Slovakia Hungarian applied linguistic studies]. Lilium Aurum, Dunaszerdahely, pp. 11–27.

Misad, Katalin (2009d). Az anyanyelvi nevelés problémái a szlovákiai magyar tannyelvű oktatási intézményekben [Issues of mother tongue education in educational institutions using Hungarian as a language of instruction in Slovakia]. In: Misad, Katalin (Ed.), *Nyelvi kontaktusok. Szlovákiai magyar vonatkozású alkalmazott nyelvészeti tanulmányok* [Language contacts: Slovakia Hungarian applied linguistic studies]. Lilium Aurum, Dunaszerdahely, pp. 139–158.

Misad, Katalin (2009e). A szlovák nyelv oktatásának helyzete a szlovákiai magyar tannyelvű alap- és középiskolákban [The state of the teaching of the Slovak language in primary and secondary schools using Hungarian as a language of instruction in Slovakia]. In: Misad, Katalin (Ed.), *Nyelvi kontaktusok. Szlovákiai magyar vonatkozású alkalmazott nyelvészeti tanulmányok* [Language contacts: Slovakia Hungarian applied linguistic studies]. Lilium Aurum, Dunaszerdahely, pp. 159–175.

Misad, Katalin (2009f). Terminológiai problémák a szlovák–magyar, illetve magyar–szlovák vonatkozású szakszótárakban és szakkifejezés-gyűjteményekben [Problems of terminology in Slovak–Hungarian and Hungarian–Slovak specialized dictionaries and terminology collections]. In: Misad, Katalin (Ed.), *Nyelvi kontaktusok. Szlovákiai magyar vonatkozású alkalmazott nyelvészeti tanulmányok* [Language contacts: Slovakia Hungarian applied linguistic studies]. Lilium Aurum, Dunaszerdahely, pp. 29–70.

Misad, Katalin (2011). Intézménynév-standardizálás kisebbségi helyzetben. A szlovák iskolatípusok magyar nevének megállapítása [Standardizing institution names in the minority context: establishing the Hungarian names of Slovak school types]. In: Misad, Katalin and Csehy, Zoltán (Eds.), *Nova Posoniensia*. Szenczi Molnár Albert Egyesület–Kalligram Kiadó, Pozsony, pp. 58–73, Available at: https://fphil.uniba.sk/fileadmin/fif/katedry_pracoviska/kmjl/Nova_Posoniensia_1.pdf (Accessed: 15 April 2021).

Misad, Katalin (2012a). A magyar szaknyelvek és a magyar nyelvű terminológia tendenciái kisebbségi helyzetben, különös tekintettel Szlovákiára [Hungarian specialized terminologies and their characteristics, with special focus on Slovakia]. In: Misad, Katalin and Csehy, Zoltán (Eds.), *Nova Posoniensia II*. Szenczi Molnár Albert Egyesület–Kalligram Kiadó, Pozsony, pp. 86–111, Available at: https://fphil.uniba.sk/fileadmin/fif/katedry_pracoviska/kmjl/Nova_Posoniensia_2.pdf (Accessed: 15 April 2021).

Misad, Katalin (2012b). A szlovákiai intézmények magyar nevének standardizálásáról [The standardization of the Hungarian names of Slovakia institutions]. *Fórum Társadalomtudományi Szemle* 14(3): 51–67, Available at: https://forumszemle.eu/2012/09/06/a-szlovakiai-intezmenyek-magyar-nevenekstandardizalasarol-1/ (Accessed: 15 April 2021).

Misad, Katalin (2019a). Fordítási és terminológiai problémák szlovákiai magyar jogiközigazgatási szövegekben [Issues of translation and terminology in Hungarian language legal and administrative texts in Slovakia]. In: Misad, Katalin (Ed.), *Nyelvhasználat kétnyelvű környezetben* [Language use in a bilingual context]. Fórum Kisebbségkutató Intézet – Gramma Nyelvi Iroda, Somorja, pp. 107–120.

Misad, Katalin (2019b). Helyzetjelentés a szlovák–magyar/magyar–szlovák szótárakról, különös tekintettel a szlovák–magyar párúakra (2000–) [A status report on Slovak– Hungarian and Hungarian–Slovak

dictionaries, with special focus on the former, since 2000]. In: Misad, Katalin (Ed.), *Nyelvhasználat kétnyelvű környezetben* [Language use in a bilingual context]. Fórum Kisebbségkutató Intézet – Gramma Nyelvi Iroda, Somorja, pp. 87–106.

Misad, Katalin (2019c). A nyelvváltozatok szemléltetése a szlovákiai magyar tannyelvű iskolák any-anyelvtankönyveiben [Illustrations of language varieties in Hungarian as mother tongue textbooks of Slovakia schools using Hungarian as a language of instruction]. In: Misad, Katalin (Ed.), *Nyelvhasználat kétnyelvű környezetben* [Language use in a bilingual context]. Fórum Kisebbségkutató Intézet – Gramma Nyelvi Iroda, Somorja, pp. 177–188.

Misad, Katalin (2019d). Nyelvhasználati sajátosságok szlovákból fordított magyar nyelvű tankönyvekben [Characteristics of Hungarian language use in textbooks translated from Slovak]. In: Misad, Katalin (Ed.), *Nyelvhasználat kétnyelvű környezetben* [Language use in a bilingual context]. Fórum Kisebbségkutató Intézet – Gramma Nyelvi Iroda, Somorja, pp. 201–212.

Misad, Katalin (2019e). Kisebbségi nyelvi jogok érvényesítése a dél-szlovákiai helyi önkormányzati hiva-talokban [The use of minority language rights in local government offices in Southern Slovakia]. In: Misad, Katalin (Ed.), *Nyelvhasználat kétnyelvű környezetben* [Language use in a bilingual context]. Fórum Kisebbségkutató Intézet – Gramma Nyelvi Iroda, Somorja, pp. 23–39.

Misad, Katalin, Simon, Szabolcs, and Szabómihály, Gizella (2009). *Magyar nyelv a gimnáziumok és a szakközépiskolák 1. osztálya számára* [Hungarian language for the first grade of grammar schools and technical high schools]. Slovenské pedagogické nakladateľstvo–Mladé letá, Pozsony.

Nekvapil, Jiří (2011). The history and theory of language planning. In: Hinkel, Eli (Ed.), *Handbook of research in second language teaching and learning*, Vol. II. Routledge, New York–London, pp. 871–887.

Neustupný, Jiří V. (2002). Sociolingvistika a jazykový manažment [Sociolinguistics and language man-agement]. *Sociologický časopis* 38(4): 429–442, https://esreview.soc.cas.cz/pdfs/csr/2002/04/03.pdf (Accessed: 15 April 2021).

Pusztai, Ferenc (gen. ed.) 2003. *Magyar értelmező kéziszótár* [Concise defining dictionary of Hungarian]. 2nd, revised edition. Akadémiai Kiadó, Budapest.

Sándor, Klára (2001). Nyelvművelés és ideológia [Language cultivation and ideology]. In: Sándor, Klára (Ed.), *Nyelv, nyelvi jogok, oktatás* [Language, language rights, and education]. JGyF Kiadó, Szeged, pp. 153–216, http://web.unideb.hu/~tkis/ideolog.htm (Accessed: 15 April 2021).

Sebők, Szilárd (2015a). Nyelvről és nyelvet érintő kérdésekről alkotott elképzelések az Új Szó lapjain 1949 és 1999 között [Ideas about language and language related issues in the newspaper *Új Szó* between 1949 and 1999]. *Fórum Társadalomtudományi Szemle* 17(4): 87–110.

Sebők, Szilárd (2015b). Jazykovo-politické problémy ako „záludné" problémy [Language political problems as "insidious" problems]. In: Ondrejovič, Slavomír, Wachtarczyková, Jana, and Satinská, Lucia (Eds.), *Jazyk v politických, ideologických a interkultúrnych vzťahoch* [Language in political, ideological, and intercultural relations]. Veda, Pozsony, pp. 194–210.

Sebők, Szilárd (2016). Language cultivation vs. pluricentricity: the debate on Hungarian language use outside of Hungary. In: Muhr, Rudolf, Fonyuy, Kelen Ernesta, Ibrahim, Zeinab, and Miller, Corey (Eds.), *Pluricentric languages and non-dominant varieties worldwide: pluricentric languages across continents – features and usage*. Peter Lang Verlag, pp. 359–369, Wien et. al.

Sebők, Szilárd (2017). *Meta és nyelv. Kísérletek a nyelvleírás nyelvének leírására* [Meta and language: at-tempts at describing the language of language descriptions]. Univerzita Komenského v Bratislave, Pozsony, Available at: https://fphil.uniba.sk/fileadmin/fif/katedry_pracoviska/kgn/META_ES_NYELV__TLA C_Sebok_Szilard.pdf (Accessed: 15 April 2021).

Sebők, Szilárd (2019). A magyar vonatkozású nyelvi problémák kutatástörténete Szlovákiában. [An over-view of Hungarian language problems research in Slovakia]. In: Katalin, Misad and Zoltán, Csehy (Eds.), *Nova Posoniensia IX. A pozsonyi magyar tanszék évkönyve*. Szenczi Molnár Albert Egyesület, Pozsony, pp. 59–83, Available at: https://fphil.uniba.sk/fileadmin/fif/katedry_pracoviska/kmjl/NOVA_ POSONIENSIA_n yomda_IX.pdf (Accessed: 15 April 2021).

Sherman, Tamah (2007). Language management on the front lines: a report from Dunajská Streda language management workshop. In: Muraoka, H. (Ed.), *Interdisciplinary studies of language management in contact situations*. Chiba University, Chiba, pp. 67–77.

Szabómihály, Gizella (2002). A szlovákiai kisebbségek nyelvi jogai és a kisebbségi nyelvhasználat színterei, különös tekintettel a magyar közösségre [The language rights of Slovakia's minorities and the domains of minority language use, with special focus on the Hungarian minority]. In: István, Lanstyák and Szabómihály, Gizella (Eds.), *Magyar nyelvtervezés Szlovákiában. Tanulmányok és dokumentumok* [Hungarian language planning in Slovakia: studies and documents]. Kalligram Könyvkiadó, Pozsony, pp. 19–40.

Szabómihály, Gizella (1999/2002). A magyar nyelvtervezés, nyelvművelés és anyanyelvápolás lehetőségei és feladatai Szlovákiában [The possibilities and tasks of Hungarian language planning, language cultiva-tion, and mother tongue nurturing in Slovakia]. In: István, Lanstyák and Szabómihály, Gizella (Eds.), *Magyar nyelvtervezés Szlovákiában. Tanulmányok és dokumentumok* [Hungarian language planning in Slovakia: studies and documents]. Kalligram Könyvkiadó, Pozsony, pp. 142–150.

Szabómihály, Gizella (2005). Nyelvművelés – nyelvtervezés – nyelvi menedzselés [Language cultivation, lan-guage planning, and language management]. *Fórum Társadalomtudományi Szemle*, 7(4): 67–75, Available at: http://www.epa.hu/00000/00033/00023/pdf/szemle_2005_4_szabomihaly.pdf (Accessed: 15 April 2021).

Szabómihály, Gizella (2007). A nyelvi menedzselés és lehetséges szerepe a magyar nyelvalakításban [Lan-guage management and its possible role in shaping the Hungarian language. In: Ágnes, Domonkosi, István, Lanstyák, and Ildikó, Posgay (Eds.), *Műhelytanulmányok a nyelvművelésről* [Studies on language cultivation]. Dunaszerdahely–Budapest. Gramma Nyelvi Iroda–Tinta Könyvkiadó, pp. 52–67.

Szabómihály, Gizella (2008). A tankönyvfordításról és a tankönyvek értékeléséről [On the translation and evaluation of textbooks]. In: József, Fazekas (Ed.), *Emlékkönyv Zeman László 80. születésnapjára* [Festschrift for László Zeman on the occasion of his 80th birthday]. Lilium Aurum, Dunaszerdahely, pp. 84–101.

Szabó, Tamás Péter (2012). „*Kirakunk táblákat, hogy csúnyán beszélni tilos." A javítás mint gyakorlat és mint téma diákok és tanáraik metanyelvében* [„We put up signs that you shouldn't cuss": correction as practice and as a topic in the meta-language of students and teachers]. Gramma, Dunaszerdahely, Available at: http://mek.oszk.hu/10900/10947/10947.pdf (Accessed: 15 April 2021).

Szépe, György (2002). Előszó [Foreword]. In: István, Lanstyák and Szabómihály, Gizella (Eds.), *Magyar nyelvtervezés Szlovákiában. Tanulmányok és dokumentumok* [Hungarian language planning in Slovakia: studies and documents]. Kalligram Könyvkiadó, Pozsony, pp. 9–11.

Takács, Henrietta (2019). A kétnyelvűség gyakorlata a dunaszerdahelyi önkormányzati hivatalban [The practice of bilingualism in the office of the Dunajska Streda/Dunaszerdahely local government]. In: Misad, Katalin and Csehy, Zoltán (Eds.), *Nova Posoniensia IX. A pozsonyi magyar tanszék évkönyve* [Nova Posoniensia 9: the yearbook of the Hungarian Department of Comenius University]. Szenczi Molnár Albert Egyesület, Bratislava, pp. 99–119, Available at: https://fphil.uniba.sk/fileadmin/fif/ katedry_pracoviska/kmjl/NOVA_POSONIENSIA_n yomda_IX.pdf (Accessed: 15 April 2021).

Tankó, László (2000). *Szlovák–magyar/magyar–szlovák pedagógiai kisszótár. Slovenskomaďarský/ maďarsko-slovenský pedagogický slovník* [A Slovak–Hungarian and Hungarian–Slovak pedagogical dictionary]. Bratislava.

Tolcsvai Nagy, Gábor (Ed.), (1998). *Nyelvi tervezés* [Language planning]. Universitas Kiadó, Budapest.

Tolcsvai Nagy, Gábor (2005). Nyelvi tervezés. Problémavázlat [Language planning: an outline of issues]. In: Lanstyák, István and Ildikó, Vančoné Kremmer (Eds.), *Nyelvészetről – változatosan* [On linguistics, in a variety of approaches]. Gramma Nyelvi Iroda, Dunaszerdahely, pp. 233–255.

Vančo, Ildikó and Kozmács, István (Eds.), (2014). *A kisebbségi magyar nyelvtantanítás kihívásai a 21. század elején* [Challenges of teaching Hungarian in minority situations in the early 21st century]. Nyitra: Nyitrai Konstantin Filozófus Egyetem Közép-európai Tanulmányok Kara–Arany A. László Polgári Társulás.