The celebration of the 1,100th anniversary of the conquest of the Carpathian Basin by Arpad and his Hungarian tribes has been going on for a year\(^1\), and the Hungarian government has already begun planning for the 1,000 anniversary of the foundation of Hungarian statehood with the crowning of Saint Stephen, in 1,000. By now, the hundreds of bombastic speeches by politicians have mercifully faded from public memory and the commemorative exhibits are being dismantled; yet more enduring staples of the festivities will prevail. Cyberspace has expanded with thousands of pages of typed-in digital reports and libraries have added new shelves to their stacks to provide space for the freshly printed books and monographs compiled for the occasion. Not only politicians, but also historians, archeologists, ethnographers, and linguists have hastened to put their latest findings and hypotheses about the conquest to paper. Even the Ugric-Turkic war that preceded the millennial celebrations one hundred years ago has been revived by some would-be revisionists.

GYULA KRISTÓ alone authored or edited five works\(^2\) concerning this pivotal period for the forming of Hungarian national identity. The “Lexicon” is the most notable among them. The handsomely produced volume is impressive both in conception and in implementation. The innovative idea of devoting a historical lexicon solely to the Age of Arpad is realized by utilizing 170 contributors with more than 2,000 entries. Most entries go beyond dictionary definitions, and they also cite the standard sources and studies on the individual themes. In the monumental task of providing coherence to the comprehensive handling of several centuries, Gyula Kristó, the editor general, was assisted by Ferenc Makk and Pál Engel. The Hungarian Academy of Sciences funded the project, but the real laurels must be accorded to the University of Szeged. In the last thirty years it has generously nurtured to maturity an Institute of Medieval Studies (Szegedi Középkorász Múhely) and a Department of Altaic Studies (Altajisztikai Tanszék). By the 1990s, Szeged was able to compete with Eötvös Loránd University of Budapest and the Institute of History of the Academy of Sciences as being the most prolific institution on Medieval Studies in Hungary. The list of contributors in the “Lexicon” attests to this claim. Even so, it is curious that among so many specialists there was no place for known authorities like János Bak, Antal Bartha, György Gyorffy, István Fodor, György Hazai, Tamás Hofer, György Kara, or István Vásáry, to name a few, all from Budapest.

---


Whatever regional rivalry might have played a role in the selection of the contributors, the actual entries do not reflect provincialism of any kind. The general characteristic of the “Lexicon” is that of moderation, a careful presentation of traditional Hungarian learning amended by up-to-date research. Readers who look for revisionist hypotheses on the ethnic origin of Hungarians, the conquest, or on the first kings of the Hungarian Kingdom will be disappointed. For example, Gyula László’s speculation of a dual conquest is politely but firmly refuted for lack of historical or linguistic evidence. This predilection for the traditional view is, as a rule, an attractive feature of the work but occasionally it may hinder scholarly detachment. For example, nationalist historians of the nineteenth century used the expression “adventures” (in Hungarian kalandozások) for the brutal nomadic Hungarian raids against Christian Europe that took place in the first half of the tenth century and the “Lexicon” perpetuates this convention. Historians today should not feel obliged to obfuscate events of the forefathers of a different age with disparate moral standards by using euphemistic terms of this type. Similarly the terms “slave” and “slavery” are conspicuous by their omission. True, careful readers can find references to slavery under the headings, “servus”, “szolga”, or “ín” but this oblique handling is less than satisfactory for such an important institution. On the other hand Western “adventures” received more cavalier treatment. An example for this is the complex phenomenon of the medieval Christian crusades that are reduced to “military campaigns of conquest with religious slogans.”

Fortunately these examples are the exceptions rather than the norm. In all, the individual entries of the “Lexicon” are presented factually and equitably. It is destined to become the standard reference work of its type and indispensable to anyone seriously interested in Hungarian history.

Indiana University, Bloomington, Indiana

G. BAYERLE


The folk etymology “kecegárda”—which the English translation totally misses—is just the right word for the title of this book: it both captures the tone and flavor of the language variety recorded here and evokes the background, the memories of the informants whose conversations made this dictionary possible. I well remember ANDREW VÁZSONYI relating to me, during one of our earlier conversations about his field research over 25 years ago, his profound puzzlement at hearing the nonsensical word “kecegárda” again and again from old-timer Hungarian settlers in the Calumet region (southeast of Chicago), whose language and culture he and LINDA DÉGH extensively studied in the 1960s—until he finally discovered the connection to the memorable (pre-Ellis Island) checkpoint for early immigrants into the United States. Both Castle Garden, a circular mansion-like structure at the tip of Manhattan Island (shown in an old photo on the cover of this book), and much of the “Hunglish” language variety that the rendition kecegárda epitomizes, are now things of the past. But the recorded lives, destinies and especially the language of this early wave of immigrants from Hungary
are valuable relics of both Hungarian (emigrant) and American (immigrant) history. The editing and publication of *Túl a Kecegárdán* by MIKLÓS KONTRA is a fitting tribute to the work of the late Andrew Vázsonyi. Without Vázsonyi’s dedication and scholarly persistence in recording and interpreting surviving vestiges of Calumet-region Hungarian, this fragment of ethnolinguistic history would certainly have remained forever uncaptured.

Happily, this annotated dictionary, together with the accompanying explanatory and background materials, not only records in useful detail characteristic lexical, semantic and syntactic features of Calumet-region Hungarian (although for the most part without reference to such terminology), but also goes far in allowing a glimpse into both the linguistic processes that played a part in their creation and the social, cultural and psychological contexts that shaped its speakers’ communicative needs. The backbone of the book—some 100 pages long—is the annotated dictionary itself, but *Túl a Kecegárdán* is far more than a vocabulary list. In an introductory chapter (with an approximate English version provided), the editor reconstructs the origins, circumstances and methodology of VÁZSONYI’s work and points out some unique features of the resulting collection. Following the dictionary is an extensive background essay prepared specifically for this volume by Vázsonyi’s close collaborator in the Calumet project (and his spouse) Linda Dégh, leading the reader through the ups and downs of their pioneering field work among aging members of the Calumet Hungarian community and sharing the insights of a seasoned folklorist and ethnographer into the history and inner dynamics of this vanishing ethnic/linguistic group. Then, following a list (and brief biographies) of the informants, coded for cross-reference, the editor wisely chose to reprint here an earlier (1980) published essay by Vázsonyi on the so-called *főburdos* ‘head boarder’—a focal character in the boarding house system that appears to have thrived during the heyday of this community and been a formative youthful experience for many of Vázsonyi’s informants. Finally, the appendices include excerpts from Vázsonyi’s research notes, an index of the English words serving as models of borrowing into this corpus of American-Hungarian, and a collection of photos and illustrations from the life of the Calumet Hungarian community up to the 1960s.

The language variety recorded in *Túl a Kecegárdán*—as also other versions of the heavily Americanized Hungarian usage that evolved in similar communities—reflects a special social, cultural and economic experience at a specific point in American history. The Calumet region was one of many new industrial areas along the U.S. East Coast and in the Midwest that attracted cheap immigrant labor around and following the turn of the century. Hungarians—in this case mostly villagers with limited education and speaking various regional dialects—joined numerous other nationalities in migrating to and settling around the large heavy industries in these areas. For various reasons unable and/or unwilling to assimilate into the larger American society, the Hungarians, like members of many of the other ethnic groups in this region, depended on one another for social, cultural and linguistic support and survival—moving into the same neighborhoods (and sharing the same boarding houses), founding and maintaining their own churches and social clubs, and continuing to use their own language. But as life and work in industrial urban America meant a radically different socio-cultural experience than life and work in an isolated rural Hungarian village, and insofar as the vocabulary of this imported indigenous language was distinctly unsuitable for reference and communication in this new environment, the door was open, by necessity, to large-
scale linguistic borrowing and adaptation. The result, in this case, was an eventually short-lived and socio-culturally confined neighborhood language variety heavily influenced by the dominant language and culture, but in ways that are quite consistent with common outcomes of similar language contact situations. It is precisely the fact that Calumet Hungarian reflects—and yields interesting outcomes of—natural language processes that makes VÁZSONYI’s data valuable to a linguist and its study linguistically as well as ethnographically worthwhile.

This, then, is the language—the Calumet-region variety of American-Hungarian—that ANDREW VÁZSONYI and LINDA DÉGH extensively recorded and whose special vocabulary and word usage this dictionary presents. A man of broad humanistic interests with a background in law, philosophy, psychology, literature and aesthetics, Vázsonyi was nevertheless not a linguist, and the collection of the vast conversational corpus on which the dictionary is based and the interactions with the informants always had as much of an ethnographic as a linguistic interest to him. Thus Túl a Kecegárda is as much a record of the (recollected) lives and personal histories of the speakers as it is of characteristic linguistic features extracted from the recorded corpus. In fact, the most telling—and most fascinating—material in this work is the set of illustrative sentences provided for each entry of the dictionary (in addition to the pronunciation as captured through spelling, part of speech, meaning and the English model form). These illustrative examples, extracted from an extensive corpus of conversational material recorded on 120 tapes from 140 informants, not only give the immediate linguistic context for each usage but also tell us what the informants talked about, what they remembered, how they described their lives and experiences. In that way these illustrations provide marvelous cultural information. But the primary focus is on the language, and those sample sentences in each entry surely betray the profoundly permeating effects of English on everyday speech in this community: typical sentences such as a grács dórom open volt ‘my garage door was open’ and ekszpektoltuk a geszteket ‘we expected the guests’ and it nem diferensz, ki hu ‘it [makes] no difference here who’s who’ reflect almost total relexicalizations of the indigenous Hungarian morphological and syntactic patterns.

It is easy to see why speakers in this immigrant community succumbed to the temptations of convenience in referring to the new world around them by (their rendering of) American words and expressions. Every day they rode a káré “car” or strittkáré ‘streetcar’ to their dzsob ‘job’ which may have been a fektri ‘factory’ or fandri ‘foundry’, took out the gárbcis ‘garbage’, sapollak ‘shopped’ from the comer grósze-ros ‘grocer’. Never mind that they had perfectly good Hungarian words to refer to these things. Those words were associated in their minds with identical or similar objects in another place, at another time; what existed here was different, if for no other reason than it was here, in this milieu. Thus the objectively identical zsír ‘(pork) lard’ that they used for cooking in the village in the old country now, in Indiana Harbor, became griz; the same kerités ‘fence’ they had around their yard back home was now referred to as fenc; and wine was now in a dzsog ‘jug’ instead of a korsó. But far more importantly, the large-scale borrowing of English words into neighborhood Hungarian was often a direct function of the speakers’ gradual “borrowing” of the surrounding culture itself—the adoption of habits and artifacts of American life into their daily lives: Hungarian templom just didn’t quite do for csőrős ‘church’, where the folks might have a social gathering or a meal in the hálé ‘hall’ (something you never do in a house of prayer in Hungary); nor would főnök ‘boss’ do for formány ‘fore-
man’, the immediate supervisor in the plánt; nor hőrsz ‘hearse’ or puskár ‘push cart’ or dán tán ‘downtown’ or szalón ‘tavern’ for their respective Hungarian equivalents. Not surprisingly, in the ever-intrusive English language environment daily conversations among Hungarians would increasingly include innocent approximations of handy short responses: rádavé ‘right away’ seemed more relevant, more immediately accessible than old-country Hungarian mindjárt or rögtön of the same meaning, and terms like honesztégád ‘honest-a-God’, haliduszé ‘how do you say’, decccit ‘that’s it’ or szanomagán ‘son-of-a-gun’ became convenient conversational fillers within Hungarian sentences. The English model is of course often missed by a long shot, with, say, “interpreter” rendered as torpender and giving rise to amusing folk etymologies (similar to kecegárda) such as ifilujza for ‘influenza’ and szarokräd for ‘sauerkraut’.

This is not the place to go into details of the linguistic character of Calumet Hungarian, but a few more examples should be of interest to the reader. Unlike in the case of borrowing from English into standard Hungarian (as shown, for example, in LÁSZLÓ ORSZÁGH’s seminal monograph “Angol eredetű elemek a magyar szókészletben” [Elements of English Origin in the Hungarian Vocabulary]), the borrowed words in Calumet Hungarian often underwent not only extensive phonological refitting but also profound morphological adaptation. So, by and large, Calumet Hungarian retained (an often dialectal version of) the Hungarian syntactic model but almost indiscriminately borrowed English base morphemes, which it then recast into the Hungarian phonemic mold and freely subjected to affixation according to Hungarian rules. For example, hájvé ‘highway’ or lóbör ‘labor’ or vejöldket ‘wildcat [strike]’ reflects simple phonemic substitutions, and the dropping of the first (unstressed) syllable in lektrik ‘electric’ or peseli [pecseli, pesli] ‘especially’ or resztol ‘arrest’ accommodates the strong word-initial stress rule in the language. But the addition of -ol in rentol ‘rent’ produces a new verb stem, which is then available for further derivational and inflectional processes, e.g. kirentolták (morphemically segmented as ki-rent-ol-t-ák) ‘they rented it out’. The derivation of verbs by adding the suffix -ol is in particular an extremely productive process in this language variety (e.g. ónol ‘own’, sévol ‘shave’, mufol ‘move’, szpendol ‘spend’, filol ‘feel’, and with further affixes, e.g. kibekkol ‘back out’, felpikkol ‘pick up’, kibeletiék ‘they bailed her out’). The sentence áskold meg a néberemet follows standard Hungarian morpheme combination rules, modeled after kérdez meg a szomszédomat ‘ask my neighbor’, but it substitutes the derived verb áskol for standard kérdez ‘ask’ and the recast base néber for standard szomszéd. While any of this output is typically incomprehensible to a monolingual speaker of standard Hungarian, and whatever one may think of the aesthetics of such conglomerated language, it is important to emphasize that the linguistic processes that produce it are completely natural to a language contact situation. This is equally true of more complex examples. In cases of shifts, for example, a phrase or compound may become the source of the Hungarian verb stem, as in gudtájmoz ‘has a good time’, hanimúnoz ‘is on honeymoon’, óvertájmoz ‘works overtime’ (with the verb-forming suffix -oz added). In other cases the base itself is a blend, as grédiskola ‘grade school’, postaofic ‘post office’, félbász ‘chief boss, head supervisor’, gártskanna ‘garbage can’, ókontriban ‘in the old country’; and blended loan translations such as hőriben vagyok ‘I’m in a hurry’ or lukit jásszk ‘s/he’s playing hooky’ or the even more complex phrase le voltak lédapolva ‘they were laid off’, which would all be expressed by different idioms in standard Hungarian, suggest an even higher degree of structural and semantic interference symptomatic of the magnitude of adaptation in
Calumet Hungarian. While *rannolta a bizniszt* ‘ran the business’ (as opposed to *vezette az űzlelet*, of the same meaning), or *az abstézra muffoltam* ‘I moved upstairs’ (as opposed to *az emeletre költöztem*, of the same meaning) might be viewed as simple lexical substitutions, *rajta hagytam a lájtot* ‘I left the light on [it]’ or *rátettem a lájtot* ‘I put the light on [it]’ borrows the concept of the light being turned or left “on”—a concept not used in standard Hungarian (where the light is turned “up”). Nor do people in Budapest read the daily *papír*. They use *papír* to write on.

Which leads to questions about the conceptual code of Calumet Hungarian, and about the genre itself. Is this a dialect of Hungarian? Yes, if dialects are viewed as variations of the same underlying grammar; yet no, if dialects are to be defined by mutual intelligibility. Does it bear a resemblance to pidgin languages? Yes, if pidgins are assumed to typically derive their grammar and lexicon from different languages—and if one accepts the author’s references to this “pidgin Hungarian” [e.g. 197]); yet no, insofar as structurally Calumet Hungarian is almost fully derivable from the standard language. Is this a result of pervasive interference brought about by bilingualism? Yes, to the extent that Calumet Hungarian resulted from extensive language contact; yet no, given that many of the speakers never learned English and remained monolingual or ‘monovarietar’ (more precisely, as one of VÁZSONYI’s elderly informants remarked, often she couldn’t think of either the English or the Hungarian word: “well, with me, English I don’t speak and Hungarian I forget” [203]). And finally, a question that particularly intrigued Andrew Vázsonyi: to what extent is the (lexical) code shared among the speakers—is there a standard within this speech community? Vázsonyi believed so, noting that “even if it’s true that in principle any English word can be the source of a loan word, there has to be a standard word stock... Hungarians use this mixed language among themselves—even those whose knowledge of English is very limited” [198-99]. He assumed—correctly—that for each word the borrowing and adaptation probably occurred once, with perhaps some subsequent re-borrowing of variants, and that the established “tainted” usages were handed down to individual speakers through contact with the speech community that used them [198]. Indeed, although it must have evolved and changed, a shared lexical code—a kind of “standard” for this community—not only existed but was necessary for communication. Vázsonyi’s data once again raises the interesting question—asked before but never studied comprehensively—how the different regional varieties of American Hungarian that developed more or less independently in Hungarian neighborhoods of American cities compare: do they have a common base? are the variations predictable? are the parameters of “American Hungarian” definable?

*Túl a Kecegárdán* contributes to the study of Hungarian language variation in significant and—as Kontra notes in his editorial commentary—unique ways. Above all, it salvages and helps preserve a detailed record of a fleeting episode in global Hungarian language history. Then, it is unusual in being based entirely on a corpus derived from recorded spontaneous everyday speech; most dictionaries and word lists still rely heavily on constructed examples or ones taken from written sources or elicited in isolation from informants. VÁZSONYI’s examples reflect the pragmatics of real speech events. Further, this dictionary portrays the phenomenon of *direct* borrowing through language contact within a linguistically dominant culture, a process that is likely to yield different results than *indirect* borrowing such as from (geographically distant) English into standard Hungarian (cf. Országh’s monograph): a comparative study of these two processes is now made more readily possible. Perhaps most
importantly, *Túl a Kecegárdán* is a pioneering study of a specific stage of language loss—an issue largely neglected in the Hungarian linguistic literature, although the phenomenon itself is rampant within Hungarian ethnic communities in countries neighboring Hungary. Vazsonyi’s documentation may shed some new light on the stages and processes through which the indigenous language of a community disappears.

It is a pity that *Túl a Kecegárdán* is available only in Hungarian; the brief English summaries provided give little compensation to readers who do not read Hungarian. These unfortunate readers miss out on a rich account of a by-gone language from a by-gone era in a by-gone neighborhood.

The American University in Cairo/Egypt

A. KEREK


The author of this bibliography, Dr. Elemer Bako, held the position of Finno-Ugrian Area Specialist at the Library of Congress until his retirement at the end of 1985, after more than thirty years of service. As young scholar, he had been a postgraduate student at the University of Helsinki in Finland in the 1930s, later worked as a lecturer of Finnish language and literature at the Universities of Debrecen, Hungary, and Munich, Germany. His tenure in the Library of Congress coincided with the Library’s increasing commitment in procuring Finnish publications in all formats for this largest book collection of the Western World.

The United States and Finland concluded government-level library acquisition agreements as early as the late 1930s. But it was not until after World War II that a comprehensive survey of the Finnish holdings in the collections was undertaken. The survey also made several key recommendations which subsequently resulted in placing the acquisition program of Finnish publications among the Library’s ongoing priorities. The growth of the collection was enhanced by: official exchange, Dr. Bako’s acquisition visits to Finland, and generous donations by key Finnish organizations as well as individuals.

The first attempt to compile a selective bibliography of the Library’s Finnish holdings resulted in a list by 1975. As the collection grew in size and importance over the years, so was the need to systematically expand and update the bibliography of 1975. Thus by the time of Bako’s retirement from active service in 1985, the work on the bibliographic listing had grown into a major scholarly undertaking. Due to fiscal constraints, the new manuscript of the extended list could not be published for several years. Fortunately, the bibliography was brought to the attention of the newly appointed Librarian of Congress, DR. JAMES H. BILLINGTON, in 1988. He conducted research in Finland, learned the language and was enthusiastic about updating and publishing the present work. In his preface and dedicatory remarks, Dr. Billington notes that: "In this year of 1992 when the Finnish nation and her friends elsewhere in the world proudly celebrate the 75th anniversary of the independence of the state of Finland, the Library of Congress is pleased to present this work, *Finland and the*
**RevIEWS/BESPRECHUNGEN**

*Finns*, as one of its contributions to the commemoration of this important historical event. It has to be noted also that the manuscript had to be updated several years after the retirement of Dr. Bakó. In this, Professor Dr. ESKO HÁKLI, Director of the Helsinki University Library and his staff cooperated with the author. The Helsinki University Library (which also functions as Finland’s National Library) is the preeminent exchange partner of the Library of Congress. These well-established connections furthered the cooperation of Dr. Bakó (who resides in Washington, D.C.) with Dr. Hákli and his staff in Finland.

The volume is based entirely upon the Finnish collections of the Library of Congress which by 1992 contained about 130,000 volumes. This select bibliography includes a total of 2,108 publications, of which 1,716 are monographs, and 392 are serials. The 1,716 monographs were published in the following periods:

- **pre-1945:** 135
- **1945-1959:** 79
- **1960-1969:** 193
- **1970-1979:** 495
- **1980-1991:** 814

As the author notes in the introduction: “The publications listed in this work are not limited to those issued by Finns or in Finland. Included is a considerable number of publications by American, Scandinavian, or other authors.”

This bibliography as a major reference tool has been designed primarily for American, and English-speaking users. The entries are mostly annotated and are organized in twenty-four subject chapters. The entire bibliography is methodically arranged and contains 1005 numerical entries. However, additional titles have been added within many of the rubrics. These are carefully noted by references such as “also,” “see also”, or “to be studied with”. Thus titles related to the same subject are grouped together in an easy-to-use sequential arrangement. The full bibliographic entry is enhanced by giving the title in English translation, when required. Additional notes within the title or at the end of the cited title will assist the user, and add to the practical and easy handling of the work considerably. The call number is clearly noted for every title. Titles in each entry are arranged in a consistent hierarchy which is particularly important for serial publications issued by government agencies. Reference is made to change in the title, and when a publication was reissued at a later date. Changes in editors are also noted for periodicals along with the current editor’s full address.

**BAKO’s system contains titles on every conceivable subject. It will benefit the government official, the scholar, the graduate student, the businessman, the tourist, the explorer, the beginner as well as the seasoned individual who wants to start on or continue study of any aspect of Finnish history and culture. From cover to cover, this bibliography will be a most wonderful tool in academic and special libraries,— also in archives, where there is interest in Finnish, Finno-Ugrian, and Scandinavian studies on both sides of the Atlantic, and indeed anywhere in the English-speaking world. It should serve as a model of painstaking bibliographic scholarship which should be emulated by library schools, graduate programs and learned societies. The title is supplemented by an “Index of Personal Names.” The index of names include all persons who appear in monographs as sole authors, authors of chapters, editors, translators, or had a hand in the publication in other ways. Also, the “Topical Index to Chapter Contents” leads the reader to works that are cited in any chapter of the book. And finally, the “List of Abbreviations and Acronyms” provides a standardized**
explanation of internationally accepted terms that are used in the bibliography throughout.

This bibliography is masterfully conceived and meticulously constructed. I am fully cognizant of the scholarly preparation and high level bibliographic expertise which is required for the execution of this work. The scholarly community in general, and the Finno-Ugric specialists in particular, are indebted to Dr. Bakó for maintaining the highest standards of painstaking bibliographic accuracy throughout the preparation and publication of this volume. And last but not least, twenty-five full-page illustrations (one frontispiece in color, the other 24 in black-white facing the entries of the particular subject-division) are enhancing the artistic quality and the instructional value of the publication. This is an unusual feature in bibliographies of this type; nevertheless, they are a welcome plus for the users of the book.

This work is the result of devoted scholarship, a highly appreciated tribute to Finland and the Finns on both sides of the Atlantic. Representatives of Finnish studies for many generations will use it as an indispensable reference work in their research in America and the entire English-speaking world.

Valparaiso, Indiana

L. KOVÁCS


This work is a welcome addition to the teaching materials available for instruction of the Estonian language for foreigners. Thanks to A. HAAS’ competent translation (from Swedish and Estonian), students pursuing Estonian language studies in America and around the world received a tool set up and edited in a fine American English. The book is also of extraordinary importance for native Estonian instructors who teach their vernacular to foreigners in and outside Estonia (in countries such as the U.S., Great Britain). Until recently, these teachers were relying primarily on grammars written in Estonian which—designed for native speakers in schools and too exhaustive—gave them a daunting task of translating and adapting them to the needs of foreign students. With the increase of English and American student audiences as well as of participants from non-English speaking countries—in which English is generally used as an international means of communication (Common Foreign Language)—in Estonian courses over the last couple of years, the instructors may be overjoyed with this handy new textbook. It offers them—beside reliable Estonian material—terminological help both with regard to the traditional grammar and modern approaches to it.

The material of the textbook is carefully organized along the following lines:

- pedagogically consistent organic build-up throughout the whole volume,
- proceeding from theory to the practice in text application,
- contextualized illustration of the linguistic phenomena,
- rich high frequency vocabulary (translating words from the texts into English),
- explaining complicated grammatical phenomena,
- exercises designed to reinforce the application of the grammatical phenomena previously discussed,
- idiomatic expressions,
phrases and expressions presented either according to a particular topic (e.g.,Weather, Telephone Conversation) or grammatical embeddings.

the lessons conclude with a key to the exercises (to this, see below).

The textbook follows a grammar-based approach to the language—even if the author’s obvious aim is to enhance the students’ conversational abilities. From the beginning on (cf. p. 10), he offers conversational phrases in each lesson. Nevertheless, it is the grammar in which the particular strength of the textbook lies.

TULDAVA conveys an astounding amount of grammatical information, covering all major parts of the morphology of the Estonian language. He offers a detailed description of the rules of the gradation, of the case-system (including the inflectional classes), of the conjugation paradigms (tense system, moods), of the peculiarities of adverbs and adjectives. The rules on the extremely important Estonian word-formation (derivation) are also considered. Proportionally less attention is paid to syntax; but in any case, phenomena such as word order (2), direct object (28) and verb and adjective government (40) in a sentence are appropriately discussed.

Theories in connection with grammar are not elevated to principal questions; they appear in a simple language, without terminological complexities. Each particular explanation will be understandable also for those students who are not pretrained in linguistics. The grammatical rules are amply illustrated with examples. The English translations of the examples, as well as the parallels drawn in the text with the English language are skillful and help to clarify the points made. The carefully planned visual arrangement of the text further enhances the clarity of presentation. The organization of the text into numbered sections within each lesson—a plus compared to the Swedish version of the textbook—facilitates cross-referencing, which in its turn makes the volume apt as a reference book for the Estonian grammar not only for students but also for linguists generally.

The illustrative Estonian texts (the basic Estonian material) was written in the great majority of cases by the author himself (cf. 10). This has the advantage that they contain more examples of the grammatical phenomena discussed in the particular lesson than cited sources from the literature would. They skillfully present verb collocations, adjectival government, word order, special use of cases, etc. Italicized word-forms in the text allow the reader to focus on the relevant grammatical problem immediately. The author claims in the foreword that he makes an attempt to “cover a wide range of topics and situations ... for ordinary conversation” (10); that means that according to Tuldava the texts could also be used for functional language training (debate or dialogue practice). However, in my view, the Estonian texts are not always suitable for content-oriented class discussion (other than grammatical, cf. texts on pp. 17, 26, 30, 34, 38, 43, 48, 82). Although the topics covered in the texts are of considerable variety, they often change within the text, thus depriving them of cohesion and making it hard for the teacher to use them for discussion in class. The same can be said about Expressions sections. They illustrate the grammar point of the lesson in many different ways but do little to promote conversational skills (cf. lessons 91, 98, 104, 116, 133). The reason is that they are presented out of context without any stylistic reference. So the learner is left at a loss as to the appropriate usage of the expressions as well as the response he/she might encounter employing them.

The exercises at the end of the lessons generally fall into three types: they ask the student either to answer the questions, provide the relevant grammatical form, or translate the words or word-combinations, sentences into Estonian or English. These
exercises are carefully constructed to focus on high frequency vocabulary. But here, too, we can see the author's preoccupation with grammatical accuracy rather than communicational fluency. Communicative exercises are entirely missing in the textbook.

Each lesson ends with the key to the exercises, which allows the learner immediate feedback with regard to his/her progress. From the instructional point of view, one is tempted to question the rationale of moving the key to the exercises (in the Swedish edition, they were placed at the end of the volume). It seems that having the answers so close at hand (sometimes on the same page, e.g. p. 18, 45, 50) would tempt the learner to go straight to the answers rather than look for the solution of the problems on his/her own.

No doubt that Estonian textbook under discussion offers a systematic course of Estonian grammar for the English-speaking learner and as such should be an integral part of any Estonian teaching program designed for that audience. Due to the skillful organization of the material, the book can be used with success both by immediate beginners as well as intermediate and advanced students.

Bloomington, Indiana

E. ALAS


This work is likely to appeal to a far wider audience than originally intended by its authors. Although in the Preface (3) they state that their publication is the first phonetic account of the Udmurt language—in itself a challenging enough undertaking—the book offers far more than a survey in the traditional sense of the word. By employing instrumental analysis, it also enables the reader to obtain a precise and detailed account of the inventory of speech sounds in the language. This work will no doubt be of interest to phoneticians in general; as for most of them the work is not easily accessible—a familiar problem with publications in languages not widely known—it is appropriate that this review provides a detailed summary. Besides a thorough phonetic analysis, the Udmurt writing system is also examined in depth, thus affording insights into the all too familiar difficulties encountered when relating the principles of an ideal writing system to the reality of language specific facts.

As stated in the Preface (4), the authors target “students of post-secondary institutions and philology departments with a Finno-Ugric focus. It is also recommended for teachers of Udmurt and Russian languages working at Udmurt schools.” To accommodate this intended audience, certain rather lengthy introductory sections accompanying the actual discussion of the material are justified. Some researchers may find the treatment of these introductory topics unnecessary or somewhat overlong; but bearing in mind their intended audience, one can understand the authors’ objectives in this respect. Besides, the manner in which all technical terms are clearly defined and exemplified, prior to the actual presentation of the data and the subsequent discussions, makes the relevant research material easy to interpret in the way the authors intended.

The book consists of three chapters, the first (and longest) deals with phonetics, providing an informative analysis of the sound inventory and suprasegmentals of Udmurt (5-88). The remaining two chapters examine the current state of affairs and
also related problems—both theoretical and practical—in connection with Udmurt orthography and literary pronunciation (88-143).

The chapter on the phonetics of Udmurt commences with an explanation of the basic concepts necessary to appreciate the discussion that follows. After introducing the essentials of phonetics in a concise and clear fashion, a brief survey of the history of research in Udmurt phonetics is given. This section is particularly valuable for those not having access to such information. The reader learns, for example, that already at the beginning of the century in addition to research employing historical-comparative methodology, some experimental phonetic work was being done (such as the Hungarian phonetician J. BALASSA’s 1915-1916 paper on Udmurt sounds). More recent studies include several dissertations: A. M. AKMAROV’s on the formant structure of Udmurt vowels (Manuscript, 1965), V. N. Denisov’s on the phonetic features of Udmurt stress (Manuscript, 1980), and I. P. POZDEJEV’s on oscillographic analysis of Udmurt consonants (Manuscript, 1986). While acknowledging the achievements of past research resulting from employing the methods of experimental phonetics, the survey also stresses the necessity of instrumental analysis in research on Udmurt phonetics (19-20).

Classification of speech sounds (20-51). The presentation of the sound system in Udmurt is preceded by a general introduction (again, designed for introductory linguistic courses). By referring to phenomena specific to Udmurt, even these basics of linguistic theory are most informative. The authors point out, among other things, that although nasalization is non-phonemic in Udmurt, it is a characteristic property of Udmurt vowels which, depending on their position, may differ in the degree of nasality (24).

The discussion proper on the Udmurt vowel system is likewise informative, and it is this part that is especially insightful for researchers of varying interests, such as Finno-Ugrists and general phoneticians. The table summarizing the formant structures of Udmurt vowels, by comparing them with the corresponding Russian ones1 (Table 1, p. 25), helps to obtain a clear picture of the special quality of Udmurt vowels. This comparison assists the specialists of phonetics to interpret the Udmurt vowel chart appropriately. It becomes clear that Udmurt mid-vowels are articulated somewhat further to the back than the corresponding Russian ones. The section where the seven Udmurt vowels are listed and briefly defined with regard to their articulation (26-27) gives a clear account of the qualities of vowels in that language. This may be read together with the chart where indications of their acoustic characteristics (i.e. the distance plotted between the first and second formants) make it easier to interpret the system of Udmurt vowels (27). Two comments here are in order. First, even though the book is intended for those familiar with Russian phonetic transcription, it would have been useful to relate these vowels also to the approximate IPA equivalent (bearing in mind the rarity of such descriptive analysis available to scholars unfamiliar with Russian phonetic traditions). Second, it would have been appropriate to mention how the authors obtained these $F_1$ and $F_2$ values (number of speakers, their background, number of data, the instruments used etc.).

The section on vowels concludes with a discussion of the phenomenon of vowel reduction. It is pointed out that in Udmurt only quantitative reduction occurs, vowels

---

1The Russian data are cited from the book of V. I. MATUSHEVICH’s Sovremennyj russkij jazyk: Fonetika. Nauka 1976, p. 91-2).
thus not changing their quality (as, for example, is common in Standard Russian) in weak (unstressed) positions. The only exception to this, according to the authors, is the drop of the vowel /y/ in certain positions in words such as kottrak < kotyrak ‘round’ (28). However, it may be pointed out that this phenomenon does not really qualify as vowel reduction; it is simply a vowel deletion (syncope); indeed this is how it is treated later on (54).

The subsequent section (28-51) is devoted to the consonant system in Udmurt. Among the general introductory statements, two important points are clarified. The first is the distinction made between palatal and palatalized consonants, with some discussion of the problems relating to their transcription. The second concerns the Russian influence evident with regard to the palatalization in Udmurt. Both points are adequately clarified (29-30) enabling us to interpret the discussion that follows as intended. After defining the criteria for classifying consonants, the authors conclude that there are twenty-nine consonants in Udmurt: of these, twenty-six are inherently Udmurt, the additional three consonants being more recent acquisitions from Russian (34). Readers not familiar with the classificatory traditions followed here may find the consonant chart presented in Table 3 (35) strange, even cumbersome. But by studying the principles made explicit by the authors in the introduction to this section, it is not difficult to relate this type of consonant classification to the consonant chart commonly encountered (based on the principles of the International Phonetic Association). One might question the practicability of such distinctions as articulations with one vs. two focus, or the employing of the position of the active articulators instead of the more commonly used “place of articulation” criterion (alveolar, palatal, etc.); but the chart nevertheless is clear, and the articulatory characteristics of the consonants are easy to interpret for both specialists and general readers.

The section that follows discusses briefly the theory of the syllable, and thereafter provides useful insights into the syllable structure of Udmurt, elaborating also on the boundary principles relevant in connection with syllabification in that language (46).

The chapter that concludes the discussion of the sound system of Udmurt raises some important issues with regard to both phonetic and phonemic transcriptions. These stem from recognizing language-specific properties that transcription has to accommodate. The authors emphasize also that the transcriptions should be employable not only by specialists of one particular research area (in this case Finno-Ugric linguistics), but also by linguists working in other areas (48). The two tables that illustrate the transcription of Udmurt vowels and consonants (48 and 49) contain useful comparisons with the transcription practices found in the 1962 grammar2 and with those of the 1977 reference book by Kel’makov & Nasibullin.3 A reference to minor changes in the transcription advocated by the authors of the book under review concerns the vowel [y] and the three palatalized consonants [zh] [zj] and [chj] rendered by two dots on the top of the particular Cyrillic letters (х, ѳ, and ɭ, respectively). It would have been helpful to provide the reasons for and some more explicit discussion of the nature of these suggested minor changes. Concluding the survey of the sound inventory of Udmurt, there is a sample given to illustrate the phonetic transcription accompanied by the orthographic version of the passage together with a Russian translation (50-51).

Characteristics of the sound system of the Udmurt language (51-62). The first section under this heading provides a discussion with ample examples of the numerous accommodation and assimilation phenomena typical of connected speech. The list of these phenomena as they occur in Udmurt is fascinating. In addition to the two major types of accommodation phenomena—the first relating to the influence of adjacent sounds, the second to the position of the sound in question within the word or its relationship to stress—the occurrences of consonant epenthesis and vowel deletion (syncope) are also enumerated. In connection with the latter the deletion of [y] as the most frequent occurrence of syncope is listed, although no connection with the earlier classification of this phenomenon as an occurrence of “qualitative vowel reduction” (see p. 28.) is noted. One may also wonder why these latter two processes are treated separately: the examples provided would seem to justify their being classified under the second point, i.e. relating to their position within the word and/or their relationship to stress.

The analysis of Udmurt sounds continues with a discussion of their durational characteristics. First, the intrinsic duration of vowels is given as calculated on the basis of the mean average obtained from two speakers. The vowels are pronounced in isolation and in combination with following voiced and voiceless consonants in both stressed and unstressed positions. It was concluded that the duration is longer in both stressed and unstressed positions before voiced consonants—not an entirely unexpected result (Table 7, p. 56). The duration of vowels was also examined by comparing their measurements in different positions (word-internally and word-finally) again in stressed and unstressed positions. The result confirms predictions concerning longer duration in word-final positions (Table 8, p. 57). The last variable examined in connection with vowel duration were the measurements obtained of vowels in stressed vs. unstressed positions. The result again conforms to the obvious prediction, word-final stressed vowels having longer duration (Table 9, pp. 57-58).

In the same way that their durational characteristics were examined, the intensity of Udmurt vowels was also analyzed by obtaining measurements from two speakers. First, the intrinsic intensity associated with the vowels was calculated on the basis of the mean values in four different positions, varying stressed and unstressed and voiced vs. voiceless environments. The results are summarized in Table 10 (p. 58). Further, the quality of neighbouring sounds, in particular the preceding consonant(s) was considered as a factor relevant to the intensity of vowels (59). It appears that intensity increases when the vowel in question is between voiced segments (this point, however, is not made explicit and measurement values are not provided). The closed vs. open status of the syllable also proved worthy of consideration, but the results obtained here do not show a consistent trend in relation to the degree of intensity, and so the authors do not consider this factor significant. As the measurement values show, intensity distributions on the basis of only 35 examples by two speakers (60) are insufficient for any conclusions to be drawn.

The next section deals with the intonational characteristics of Udmurt. The authors here did not consider it important to define the intrinsic \( F_0 \) values of the vowels as they had done in connection with the durational and intensity intrinsic properties referred to above. It appears that \( F_0 \) is descending in disyllabics regardless of the status of stress. Again, their statements were made on the basis of data obtained from two speakers. Similar \( F_0 \) patterns were discerned in three-syllabic words, i.e. the unstressed second syllable is associated with higher \( F_0 \) values. In concluding this section it is stated that