

Grammar in the Bilingual Dictionary, with Special Reference to English and Hungarian

Peter Sherwood

On the 40th anniversary of the publication of the first postwar Hungarian-English dictionary in 1948, I dedicate this paper to the memory of its compiler László Országh (1907—1984).

Introduction

I take it as axiomatic that to be truly bilingual, a dictionary needs to be geared equally to the needs of both sets of users; to be truly useful, a bilingual dictionary needs to include information about the grammar of both languages in a systematic fashion.

The outstanding bilingual dictionaries of László Országh are aimed primarily at the Hungarian learner of English. This is made clear in the front matter of the dictionaries: explicitly in the Introduction¹ and implicitly in the fact that three out of the four volumes do not have an Introduction in English (see Table 1). This orientation is also implicit in their selection of vocabulary, in that they make it possible to read (say) English literature but not, really, Hungarian, and in the fact that all guide-words apart from style markers are given in Hungarian only, irrespective of the direction of the dictionary. The grammatical information provided is likewise geared primarily to the needs of the Hungarian learner of English, as the summary in Table 1 shows. Before expanding on this last point, the theme of this paper, I should like to say something more general.

This bias is wholly understandable. There are far more Hungarian learners of English than English learners of Hungarian and there always will be. The dictionaries compiled by and, in later years, under the general direction of, László Országh have been the only serious bilingual Anglo-Hungarian dictionaries produced since the war and the only ones widely available to the Hungarian learner of English. The bias is not only understandable; it has been essential.

However, it is time to make out the case for the needs of the English learner of Hungarian. Hungarian is the first language of over 14 million people², nationals of at least four countries in addition to Hungary itself. This figure places Hungarian well within the international top thirty languages in terms of speakers, and this distribution of Hungarian speakers in Central/Eastern Europe³ places them within the sphere of interest of anyone concerned with this area in any serious way. Overseas interest shows a steady increase; anyone with a serious interest will want to learn the language.

The number of those with one of the Englishes as first or best language must be over 600 million. Moreover, the dominant position of English as a, if not the, world language means that, increasingly, even those with English as a second or subsequent language will tend to assume that the most widely spoken Western language will have the best range of teaching/learning materials for Hungarian. For

example, a speaker of Hindi or Portuguese interested in Hungarian is likely to know enough English to benefit from such materials and will assume (whether or not the assumption is justified) that Hindi- or Portuguese-language materials on Hungarian will be limited or non-existent.

It is therefore a major national interest for Hungary to concern itself with the production of high-quality English-language materials of every kind, but especially material related to Hungarian language learning and Anglo-Hungarian lexicography. To this end a permanent team of lexicographers, linguists, programmers and others is needed to engage in all the various tasks needed to maintain and regularly update all Anglo-Hungarian dictionaries, from the tourist dictionary to the unabridged *Országhs* and the technical dictionaries, cooperating in this work with such overseas centres as seem most appropriate and willing. Failure to do so not only impairs an increasingly accessible Hungary's ability to communicate with a rapidly changing world—and a world whose major international language is changing just as rapidly. It also hinders the efforts of that world to gain a better understanding of Hungary and of all Hungarian-speaking peoples. What has been achieved in recent years by one senior lexicographer, working with a tiny number of helpers that can hardly be called a team, is almost miraculous. But one senior Anglo-Hungarian lexicographer is not enough.

This, then, is the essence of the practical case for making Anglo-Hungarian dictionaries that are equally directed at both sets of users. The complex issues of vocabulary selection and guide-word provision deserve more time than is available here; rather, I shall try to show how the inclusion of grammatical information about Hungarian that would greatly aid the English learner of Hungarian could be achieved.

It should be said at once, and it is clear from Figure 1, that HE(U) does explicitly offer help to the English learner of Hungarian (even if the Introduction which states this is only in Hungarian⁴). And both the concise dictionaries' Introductions show an awareness that the English learner of Hungarian has grammar needs, even if they do not provide for them. HE(C) appeals to fact that the majority of users are Hungarian learner of English and to shortage of space, and refers the English learner of Hungarian to 'the larger dictionaries of the Hungarian language' for information on the word-class and suffixed forms of headwords⁵. EH(C) states that the dictionary is for the post-beginner (!) Hungarian learner of English, and therefore information needed only by the English learner of Hungarian, such as Hungarian pronunciation and suffixed forms, is not provided⁶. Thus, although only EH(U) is quite unconcerned with the English learner of Hungarian, only HE(U) really offers any help.

In these three Introductions there are assumptions not only about the English learner of Hungarian, but about the kind of grammatical information he might need. I discuss these issues under headings suggested by Table 1: Phonetics/Phonology, Word Class and Inflectional Morphology, and Lexical Morphology, with a brief note on Syntax, attempting to 'cost' my proposals along the way. First, a consideration of the notion of 'costing' the suggestions is in order. The notion of 'cost' may be looked at from two perspectives, which ultimately merge. The first kind of cost is the objective cost in terms of space: the number of letters and spaces taken up by the presentation of pre-theoretical grammatical information in the body of the text. The second kind is a more subjective amalgam,

which might be called presentational cost for short. It is to do with the overall look of the grammatical information provided at each entry, but obviously subsumes assumptions about the grammar knowledge and general linguistic sophistication of the user— these may well be at odds with his needs—, and also with the balance of lexis/grammar, not least aesthetically, within the headword.

Writing about English, John Sinclair says 'Dictionaries are sparing in citations of the inflected forms of words (. . .) On the other hand, the inflected forms of the central vocabulary are important and fairly frequent words that should be cited, however regular many of them might be' (Sinclair 1987: 104—105). One need not be a historical linguist to appreciate how true this is of all inflecting languages, and it should certainly be borne in mind by all lexicographers. However, in the case of a fundamentally agglutinating language like Hungarian, the spatial cost of providing all inflected forms is prohibitively high: most nouns have several hundred and most finite verbs at least several dozen.

As might be expected on typological grounds, these complex arrays fortunately show a high degree of regularity. Fairly minor adjustments occur mainly at morpheme boundaries (for example, there is no suppletion, and no more than a score of stems, all monosyllabic, undergo truly radical change), and linguists have been much exercised to reduce or if possible to eliminate those finite 'irregular' sets of nouns and verbs that exhibit change(s) in the form of the headword on suffixation.

HE(U) sensibly opts to give the key forms, from which it is possible to produce all the other forms of a headword (see *Inflectional Morphology*, below), though a little more explanation of why the particular forms have been selected would be welcome.

Spatial cost could be reduced by the use of alphanumeric codes, keyed to tables in an appendix, since changes in the form of the headword on suffixation are limited to three or four kinds. Such scheme, by László Elekfi, was offered to Országgh, but ultimately rejected⁷. Sinclair's strictures on such codes (Sinclair 1987: 110, 113) are largely justified, of course, but this approach in an agglutinating language still offers much to the dedicated user in a very small space. It should not, however, be adopted purely on the grounds that it will save space compared with the pre-theoretical approach in HE(U), as it is unlikely to do so substantially.

More abstract analyses can offer further savings on spatial cost, but the overall presentational cost (symbols, key and explanation of analysis) is almost bound to be too high for an all-purpose dictionary⁸.

Phonetics/Phonology

PRONUNCIATION

Hungarian spelling is almost phonemic, and highly regular, but it is clear that an indication of pronunciation would be useful in the case of discrepancies between sound and letter. These would include 'H and CH' words (**méh**, **méhes** 'bee(-)'; **pech**, **technika**, **krach**, **ihlet** 'inspiration'); some non-primary forms, such as **kisebb** 'smaller'; and, possibly, regular but visually awkward derivational assimilations, such as **egészség** 'health', **igazság** 'truth/justice'.

Surnames and street names (the two are very much connected in Hungary) are met with early and frequently, and contain many archaisms of spelling. The most frequent could be listed in an appendix, with pronunciations (**Kodály (kőrönd)**, **Thököly (út)**). Some given names are in this category (**Attila**) and should be given for this reason. A selection of given names should also be listed, not primarily with a view to translation (although the names of rulers are always translated into Hungarian: **II. János Pál pápa** 'Pope John Paul II', **János Károly király** 'King Juan Carlos' (note the discrepancy), it seems unwise as well as inconsistent to 'translate' given names)⁹, but to indicate the sex (a Hungarian **Boris** is female). Appendices should be resisted, on the whole; here, where only the capitalized words of a language are involved, it is a sensible answer.

STRESS

It is not generally conceded that there is anything interesting about Hungarian stress. Full (non-grammatical) words spoken in isolation are stressed on the first syllable. However, recent work on Hungarian word-order has shown (inter alia) that some adverbial elements may be focused and thus receive sentence stress; in this case their meaning differs from their meaning in non-focus position:

| | |
|---------------------------|---|
| 'egyszerűen tűnt el | '(s)he disappeared in a straightforward manner' |
| egyszerűen 'eltűnt | '(s)he simply disappeared' |
| 'egyszerre ültek le | 'they sat down at the same time' |
| egyszerre (csak) 'leültek | 'all of a sudden they sat down'. |

This is well worth indicating, perhaps with the superscript mark shown. Some homographs are not true homophones:

| | | |
|---------------------------|---------------|--|
| hogy | conj | 'that' (may never take stress) |
| ' hogy (= 'hogyan) | adv | 'how' (always takes focal stress) |
| ki | co-verb | 'out' (never non-contrastively stressed) |
| ' ki | interrog pron | 'who' (always takes focal stress, unless = aki relative pron) |

A pair similar to the last example is **mi** 'we' and '**mi** 'what?'. Many of these are extremely frequent; this additional way of distinguishing 'form' ('grammatical') headwords would be invaluable to the student. It involves little cost.

VOWEL HARMONY CLASS

This is something that has never occurred to Hungarian lexicographers to give separately from suffixed forms (in which this information is normally implicit). Most suffixes have two, sometimes three forms, the choice being dependent on the vowel harmony class of the headword. There are two classes, front and back: front vowel words take front forms of alternating suffixes, back vowel words take back forms. It is possible to tell the vowel harmony class of a word by inspection and the application of a simple rule about 90% of the time. The rule, based on F. Papp's (Papp 1975), is about 25 lines long; every learner of Hungarian must master it

almost immediately and the amount of abstraction involved is minimal. It could be given in the front matter of the dictionary (Sherwood 1981). Only the exceptions to the rule need be marked. These are of two kinds:

(1) Words containing only phonetically front vowels, which are nevertheless back vowel words (**híd** 'bridge', **sír** 'weep; grave', **ír** 'writes'): these words could be marked with a 'BV' symbol in the dictionary or similar. Probably less than 100 words are involved. The cost would depend on the symbol used, but even a wholly explicit **BACK** would cost only 500 spaces (space plus four letters) in all¹⁰.

(2) Compound words: here the final element determines vowel harmony class. The Országh dictionaries never contain grammatical information about compounds, assuming that users can tell compounds by inspection. This is an unjustified assumption. To the English learner of Hungarian **írógép** 'typewriter' (front vowel word) looks little different, vocally, from **irtóznék** 'I'd be repelled' (back vowel word). Compounds could be marked with an internal plus-sign + : **író + gép**, to divide the component elements and enable the vowel harmony inspection rule to apply to the final element alone: **írógép** > ***írógépnek**; **író + gép** > **író + gépek**. The cost would be higher in unabridged and especially technical dictionaries, as these contain more compounds. Random counts suggest up to 100 spaces per page of the HE(U), which has a maximum of 7,200 letters and spaces per page.

Word-class/Inflectional Morphology

WORD-CLASS

Of the valuable aids for the English learner of Hungarian in the Országh dictionaries, one could perhaps criticise on theoretical as well as practical grounds only one: English word-class categories applied to the Hungarian word-stock in HE(U). The categories in the two languages do not always match; indeed, word-class categories and labels are a matter of some controversy in both languages. For example:

pref(ix) is applied to both the permanently initial element in a compound noun (**al** *pref* 'vice-, under-, sub-', e.g. **alelnök** 'vice-president') and to the co-verb (or 'verb prefix') (**alá**² *pref* 'under(neath)', e.g. **alá** 'undermine', **nem ásta alá** '(s)he did not undermine it').

Even when a fairly uncontroversial English term is available, it is not always consistently used (**kell** is given the label *v. imp/vi*, but *imp* is 'imperative' in the list of abbreviations; presumably here it is meant to abbreviate 'impersonal'). That may be a slip, but the usefulness as well as the accuracy of a label such as *vt/vi* after, say, **remél** may be seriously queried: the Hungarian intransitive **remél** hardly ever corresponds to the English intransitive 'hope' as generally understood, which often construes with 'for', whereas the transitive **remél** always needs a sentential object, as the example sentences make clear, making the plain *vt* label into (at best) a space-consuming formality. Word-labelling policy needs more thought.

INFLECTIONAL MORPHOLOGY: KEY INFLECTED FORMS

As mentioned earlier, HE(U) provides in square brackets immediately after the headword an uncontroversial and unconfusing abbreviated form of it, followed by

its key suffixed forms, from which it is normally possible to work out all its other forms. The key forms given are:

for NOUNS

- ending **-a/-e**, the accusative, even though it is always predictable
- ending in a consonant, the accusative or plural (or both, if the vowel is different), to show the important and not always predictable root-final vowel, and also any final-syllable vowel changes/alternations, again only partly predictable
- third person singular (possessive) suffixed form, partly quite unpredictable;

for ADJECTIVES

- as for nouns, though sometimes without the fairly unusual, third person singular (possessive) suffixed form;
- adverb-forming suffix, even though this is largely predictable (**-an/en**, **-ul/-ül**, or **-lag/-leg**);

for VERBS

- third person singular of 'indefinite' conjugation in past tense and the subjunctive;
- also, the first person singular of past when different from the third, and the alternative, very literary, third person singular subjunctive with **-IK** verbs, though it is always predictable;
- the infinitive (in Hungarian this is a suffix on the citation-form), when it requires an extra vowel. It must be said, however, that **HE(U)** contains no explanatory information of the kind just given about these forms, except that they are the base-words' 'most important suffixed forms' (**HE(U)** p. VII).

This practice could be most helpful if extended, with appropriate explanation, from 'its parent work' (**HE(C)**, p. IX) to the **HE(C)**. However, in both sizes, compounds should also be provided with this information. The tacit assumption that a compound always behaves inflectionally like its final element is not always borne out: **tár** 'store' does not inflect exactly as **szótár** 'dictionary (lit. 'word-store/hoard')' (pl **tárak** 'stores', **szótárok** 'dictionaries'; cf also **tárol** 'store vb' but **szótároz** 'record in a dictionary'); but **EH(U)** gives only the forms of **tár**. I return to derived forms below.

Random counts suggest that the cost of showing the key inflected forms of the Hungarian in headwords in **HE(U)** is up to 800 letters and spaces per page of 7,200 letters and spaces. In **HE(C)** the percentage cost would probably be higher, as there headwords represent a greater proportion of the total space on the page, but the information is more valuable, as this is the usual dictionary bought by the beginner. When, in the Introduction to this work, Országh says that 'To save space the declension [i.e. or conjugation — P.S.] of the Hungarian entry-words is not given' and for this information refers the 'foreign user' to 'the larger dictionaries of the Hungarian language' (p. [V]), one wonders if he was seriously thinking of the seven-volume **ÉrtSz**, or of the only other all-Hungarian dictionary, **ÉKsz**, which contains no grammatical information at the headwords, only very concise tables of suffixes in small print in the front matter. It seems odd to suggest looking for grammatical information in the Introduction of *another* dictionary. Be that as it may, there are no other all-Hungarian dictionaries in print.

Lexical Morphology

In this area HE(U) provides in the front matter a list of frequent derivational suffixes, primarily with a view to stating their key suffixed forms once and for all. In other words, this is a device to save spatial cost in inflectional morphology.

The well-known difficulties in the area of word-formation are slightly less, perhaps, in the case of Hungarian than, say, of English. That lexical morphology can be made to offer some saving in spatial costs is clear, in an approximate way, from the fact that the seven-volume *ÉrtSz* contains 58,000 headwords, while the two-volume HE(U) has some 122,000: at least some of the difference between the figures is due to the latter's need to give many regularly derived headwords which have far less transparent English equivalents.

One such regularly derived form, on the border of inflectional and lexical morphology, is the suffix =*ás*/=*és*, traditionally regarded as a deverbal noun formative, but admitted even by historical linguists to be 'capable of creating to this day substantives meaning "the act/action of x-ing" from all verbs' (Bartha 1958: 81 and Berrár: 1974: 99—124). One structuralist linguist simply calls it the 'nominal participle', without discussing its derivational side (Antal 1977: 123). The difficulty is that, in addition to the *nomen actionis* sense, such forms may (but need not) go on to develop further senses, such as *nomen acti* (the result of the action): *toj* = *ás* 'egg (lit. '(a) laying')', *mond* = *ás* '(a) saying', *kér* = *és* 'request (lit. 'asking')', but also *nomen agentis* (the performer of the action): *forr* = *ás* 'spring, source' < *forr* 'bubble up > boil', *nomen loci* (the place of the action): *lak* = *ás* 'lodging, dwelling, flat', *áll* = *ás* 'job, position' < *áll* 'stand', *száll* = *ás* 'accommodation, shelter' < *száll* 'stay (the night)', and others. Moreover, a *nomen actionis* sense may suddenly be required to understand the Hungarian form, even if it is frequent as (say) *nomen loci*: the flat advertisements' *ottlakás szükséges* means something like 'it is essential that one actually live there, in the flat' (the word *ottlakás* is not in any dictionary).

Up to 10% of the headwords in *ÉrtSz* end in this suffix; this figure includes, of course, many compounds which are not included in this study.

High as this figure is, Table 2a shows that many potential forms (all verbs in =*ít* have a *nomen actionis*, at least, in =*ás*/=*és*) are not headwords.

One could hypothesize that only those forms are given as headwords which have gone on to develop further senses. I tested this on a smaller sample summarised in Table 2b (note how the 70,000 headword dictionary has fewer headwords in =*ít* = *ás*/=*és* than the 58, 000 one¹¹). The hypothesis is largely borne out: *ÉKsz* does not feel it can dispense with the *nomen actionis* sense, and gives it, as first sense, even when the main reason for including the form as a headword is a further sense or further senses. ('Further' is not a happy word here, but it is meant as a reminder that sense-discrimination in the analysis of this suffix is no easy matter¹²).

The lessons for our dictionaries are made more complex by the fact that Hungarian favours nominalizations rather more than English. To take an example from HE(C):

megoldás: 1. (csomóé)[. . .] 2. (*problémáé, egyenleté*) solving, solution, settling; followed by five frequently occurring phrases/collocations. However, the *nomen actionis* and the *nomen acti* senses are here collapsed and the basic issue is not tackled: 'solving' can be *actionis* but not *acti*, 'solution' could be *actionis* but is

normally *acti*, 'settling' could be *actionis* but rarely *acti*. Moreover, neither the equivalents nor the phrases given will generate a frequent equivalent, the infinitive, the most noun-like verbal form: '(It was difficult) to solve (the problem), (It was a difficult problem) to solve.' As can be seen, even the Hungarian learner of English would benefit from a more nuanced approach here; let us not forget the large area of vocabulary involved.

Another topic in this field is whether the marking of morpheme boundaries is desirable, and if so, whether it is feasible. The agglutinative nature of Hungarian, the orthographic conventions arising from this (notably the rarity of hyphens in compounding), and the high proportion of native and thus unfamiliar stems and suffixes make it imperative for the English learner of Hungarian to carry out at least informal morphological analysis from the earliest period of study. This means he would benefit greatly from the marking, perhaps with an equals sign =, of word-internal morpheme boundaries. It has already been suggested that compounds should be marked with a +. Apart from the earlier points (vowel-harmony, the possibility of different inflectional forms) this would aid calque recognition (*szem + üveg* 'eye-glass(es)', *kulcs + lyuk* 'keyhole'; *szó + kincs* 'Wortschatz') and fight long-word-phobia (*nép + köz + társaság* 'people's republic', which have similar numbers of syllables and morphemes). The equals sign would be an extension of this practice, which would greatly aid recognition of recurrent suffixes (3% of the headwords in ÉrtSz end in = **ÍT**, for example) and other bound morphemes.

There are, of course, many problems in contrastive morphological analysis, some of the type encountered in the suffix above (Csapó 1981: 69—84 and Berrár 1974). But conventions could be evolved; two suggestions for dealing with bound stem-forms are included in the summary chart of my proposals. Many dictionaries of English mark with word-internal decimal points or in other ways the syllable boundaries of headwords purely with a view to suggesting correct hyphenation points. Good textbooks of Turkish and Hungarian always mark morpheme boundaries with hyphens; I am asking only for a more nuanced and useful approach.

The cost in terms of space of including morpheme-boundary symbols in Hungarian headwords would not, on the basis of random checks, be more than 150 letters and spaces per 7,200 letters and spaces making up a page of HE(U). Again, the cost would be higher in HE(C).

More problematical is the cumulative spatial and presentational cost, as shown in the summary chart. Experience suggests that the English learner of Hungarian usually enjoys this kind of segmentation and gets used to it quickly, as there are often straightforward English parallels in English word-formation. The realization that 'organization' and *szervezet* are morphologically parallel can often be revelatory; its pedagogical value is hard to overestimate.

Syntax

Here the provision of information on the government of verbs is particularly good for both languages. It is almost unfair to pass over this fundamental and excellent aspect of the Ország dictionary in a single sentence. Obviously, examples of sentential objects and other complements should be systematically sought. Much

improved example sentences and phrases, from actual texts and other corpora, with qualities of typicality, naturalness, and of being interesting in their own right, will often provide a great deal of syntactic information. The illustrative phrases and sentences in ÉrtSz are overwhelmingly literary; in any case, it is now a generation old. In ÉKsz the illustrative examples and fragments are often only collocationally useful. In the Országgh dictionaries, although the search for the idiomatic equivalent is often very successful, sometimes typical patterns have not been satisfactorily treated, as in the case exemplified by *megoldás* above.

TABLE I
GRAMMAR IN THE ORSZÁGH DICTIONARIES

| | English—Hungarian | | Hungarian—English | |
|---|-------------------|---------|-------------------|----------------|
| | Unabridged | Concise | Unabridged | Concise |
| <i>Bilingual front matter?:</i> (+: yes/-: Hungarian only) | | | | |
| Introduction | - | - | - | + |
| Abbreviations explained | + | + | + | + |
| Signs and symbols explained | - | - | + | + |
| <i>Phonetics/phonology</i> | | | | |
| English headwords in IPA or near-IPA | ✓ | ✓ | ∅ | ∅ ¹ |
| English stress (+: bi'lou /-: below) | + | + | ∅ | - |
| <i>Word-class and inflectional morphology</i> | | | | |
| Headwords' word-class in English | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ (<!) | ∅ |
| +: foot [feet]/-: foot ^o and appendix | + | + | ∅ | - |
| +: come [came]/-: come* and appendix | + ² | + | ∅ | - |
| +: drop [(dro)pp(ed)]/-: drop and note | + | + | ∅ | - |
| <i>pl</i> Postposed if Hungarian singular translated by English plural | ∅ | ∅ | ✓ | ✓ |
| <i>ut</i> Postposed if English adj/adjectival phrase follows noun | ∅ | ∅ | ✓ | ✓ |
| Hungarian: key inflected forms of non-compound and non-derived headwords | ∅ | ∅ | ✓ | ∅ |
| Hungarian: main noun-system suffixes +: as entries in text/-: only in appendix | ∅ | ∅ | + | - |
| <i>Lexical morphology</i> | | | | |
| English: list of frequent derivational suffixes | ∅ | ✓ | ∅ | ∅ |
| Hungarian: list of frequent derivational suffixes | ∅ | ∅ | ✓ | ∅ |

Notes

(1) In the current edition 'in a few instances the pronunciation of an English word (or part of a word) [i.e. translation, NOT headword — PS] which may present difficulties for the Hungarian beginner is given' (p. VII). In the new edition it will not be, even in these instances.

(2) plus appendix of English auxiliary verb forms

THE INFLECTIONAL/LEXICAL MORPHOLOGY BOUNDARY

TABLE 2a

= *ÍT* and = *ÍT* = *ÁS* / = *ÍT* = *ÉS* in *ÉrtSz* (via *VégSz*)

| | Absolute | As percentage |
|---|----------|---------------|
| No. of headwords ending in = <i>ÍT</i> | 1196 | 100% |
| No. of headwords in = <i>ÍT</i> = <i>ÁS</i> / = <i>ÍT</i> = <i>ÉS</i> | 172 | 14% |

TABLE 2b

= *ÍT* = *ÁS* / = *ÍT* = *ÉS* in *ÉKSz*

| | Absolute | As percentage |
|---|----------|------------------|
| No. of headwords in = <i>ÍT</i> = <i>ÁS</i> / = <i>ÍT</i> = <i>ÉS</i> (cf 2a) | 125 | 100% |
| No. with first or only sense 'act &c of -ing' | 105 | 84% = 100% |
| Of these, no. with further sense(s) | 86 | 69% 81% = 100% |
| No. with illustration(s) of first sense | 31 | 30% |
| No. with illustration(s) of further sense(s) | 42 | 49% |

The problem of illustrative examples brings me to current issues in Hungarian lexicography. The collection of data for the new/old Grand Dictionary of Hungarian and its conversion into computer usable form is now under way. Is it too much to hope that the Hungarian powers-that-be might employ an Anglo-Hungarian lexicographer to produce English translations of the meanings (rather than German ones, as in the three-volume etymological dictionary) and to utilize the lessons learnt in its compilation in Anglo-Hungarian lexicography?

NOTES

- ¹ HE(U) was compiled 'chiefly to satisfy the needs of translators into English' (p. VI.)
- ² Claims that the total number of Hungarians is up to 16 million hinge on the definition of 'a Hungarian'; eg 'a világ tizenhatmilliónyi magyarsága': Tibor Fényi's interview with László Hámos in *Élet és Irodalom* (Budapest) 22 July 1988, p. 7.
- ³ Hungarian speakers are found as far east as northern Moldavia in Rumania (the Csángó Hungarians)
- ⁴ 'The present dictionary does not ignore the needs of non-Hungarian-speaking users either.' HE(U), p. VII.
- ⁵ HE(C), p. V.
- ⁶ EH(C), p. 6.
- ⁷ Personal communication from Ország, 1981.
- ⁸ Alas, much of contemporary linguistic theory comes into this bracket.
- ⁹ It is not clear why Hungarian first names are given in the body of the dictionary, often with 'translations', sometimes marked <approx>, as in **Dezső** <masculine name> (*kb*) Desider. It is surely not good to encourage this. As Andor, András and Endre are all 'Andrew', will this not confuse, rather than help (one thinks of the names of the kings of Hungary)?

¹⁰ Even a fairly concrete analysis can, however, be difficult to adopt in some respects. For example, D.M. Abondolo writes (Abondolo 1988: 33): 'Among univocalic verb roots whose sole vowel is I, those with back prosody outnumber those with front by a proportion of more than two to one. In the interest of economy, it is therefore the *front*-prosodic roots of this class which are marked in the code.'

This perceptive observation, however, makes syllable numbers relevant to vowel harmony, a complication, and also means a loss of productivity, as this rule applies to native stems only.

¹¹ It is worth mentioning that the formula 'the act of -ing' is frequently used in the language of ÉKsz definitions, so it is not unusual to find in the definition of *újítás* (for example) two such forms, which are not to be found in the dictionary itself ('*új dolog kigondolása, létrehozása*').

¹² When the word 'result' was included in a further meaning, for example, the following possibilities were found:

(1) incorporated into the first definition: e.g. *taszítás* 'The act(ion) or the result of throwing'

(2) treated as a 'shade of meaning' (in ÉKsz separated from the first definition by a vertical line, without being given a number): e.g. *könnyítés* 'The fact of making sg easier/lighter. The result of this'

(3) treated as a separate, numbered sense: e.g. *alapítás* 1. 'The act(ion) of founding sg' 2. 'The result of this'

References

Cited Dictionaries

- EH(U) ENGLISH-HUNGARIAN DICTIONARY/ANGOL—MAGYAR SZÓTÁR. 1960. L. Országh (ed.) Budapest: Akadémiai Kiadó. [110,000 headwords]
- EH(C) A CONCISE ENGLISH-HUNGARIAN DICTIONARY/ANGOL—MAGYAR KÉZISZÓTÁR. 1981. L. Országh (ed.). Budapest: Akadémiai Kiadó. [37,000 headwords]
- HE(U) HUNGARIAN-ENGLISH DICTIONARY/MAGYAR—ANGOL SZÓTÁR. 1963. L. Országh (ed.). Budapest: Akadémiai Kiadó. [122,000 headwords]
- HE(C) A CONCISE HUNGARIAN-ENGLISH DICTIONARY/MAGYAR—ANGOL KÉZISZÓTÁR. 1959/71. L. Országh (ed.). Budapest: Akadémiai Kiadó. [51,000 headwords] [NB New edition appeared in 1990 ed. by T. Magay and L. Országh].
- ÉrtSz A MAGYAR NYELV ÉRTELMEZŐ SZÓTÁRA [A Dictionary of the Hungarian Language, in seven volumes]. 1959—1962. G. Bárczi, L. Országh et al. (eds.). Budapest: Akadémiai Kiadó. [58,000 headwords]
- ÉKsz MAGYAR ÉRTELMEZŐ KÉZISZÓTÁR [A Concise Hungarian Dictionary]. 1972. J. Juhász, I. Szőke et al. (eds.). Budapest: Akadémiai Kiadó. [70,000 headwords]
- VégSz REVERSE-ALPHABETIZED DICTIONARY OF THE HUNGARIAN LANGUAGE/A MAGYAR NYELV SZÓVÉGMUTATÓ SZÓTÁRA. 1969. F. Papp (ed.). Budapest: Akadémiai Kiadó. [ÉrtSz a tergo]

Other Literature

- Abondolo, D.M. 1988. *Hungarian Inflectional Morphology*. Budapest: Akadémiai Kiadó.
- Antal, László. 1977. *Egy új magyar nyelvtan felé* [Towards a New Hungarian Grammar]. Budapest: Magvető. 123 ('főnévi igenév: futás').
- Bartha, D. Katalin. 1958. *A magyar szóképzés története*. Budapest: Tankönyvkiadó. 81.

- Berrár, Jolán. 1974. 'Új szempontok és módszerek a szóképzés vizsgálatában' [New views and approaches in the study of word-formation] in Endre Rácz and István Szathmári (eds.). *Tanulmányok a mai magyar nyelv szófajtana és alaktana köréből* [Studies in the word classes and morphology of contemporary Hungarian]. Budapest: Tankönyvkiadó. 99—124 (especially 109—110 and 120).
- Csapó, József. 1981. 'Possibilities and limitations of a contrastive study of lexical derivation' in *Angol Filológiai Tanulmányok/Hungarian Studies in English* 14: 69—84.
- Papp, Ferenc. 1975. *A magyar főnév paradigmatis rendszer. Leírás és automatikus szintézis.* [The paradigmatic system of the Hungarian noun. Description and automatic synthesis.] Budapest: Akadémiai Kiadó. (Chapter IV)
- Sherwood, P. A. 1981. 'Bilingual Dictionaries and Bilingual Grammars: Some Reflections on English and Hungarian Materials' in *Angol Filológiai Tanulmányok/Hungarian Studies in English* 14: 93—108.
- Sinclair, John. 1987. 'Grammar in the Dictionary' in J. M. Sinclair (ed.). *Looking up. An account of the COBUILD Project in lexical computing and the development of the Collins COBUILD English Language Dictionary.* London and Glasgow: Collins ELT. 104—105.