

**Tanulmányok a budapesti beszédről
a Budapesti Szociolingvisztikai Interjú alapján
[Studies on Budapest speech based on
the Budapest Sociolinguistic Interview].**

Edited by Miklós Kontra and Anna Borbély.
Gondolat, Budapest, 2021. 355 l.

As its title suggests, this book is a collection of studies based on the Budapest Sociolinguistic Interview (Budapesti Szociolingvisztikai Interjú, henceforward – as it is usually referred to – BUSZI). Before reviewing the book, two preliminary remarks have to be made. On the one hand, the language of the review is English. Although the studies in the book, with one exception, are written in Hungarian, the reviewer is convinced that international readers should also be aware of the existence of the studies presented. On the other hand, although the most appropriate reviewer for this book would be a sociolinguist, the invited reviewer is not one. As a consequence, this review will not evaluate the collection in terms of its contribution to general (cross-linguistic) sociolinguistics, but from the standpoint of a linguist interested in spoken Hungarian.¹

1. The structure of the book

The volume is headed by a table of contents and a list of figures, tables, and maps; and it ends with an annotated bibliography of BUSZI, a name index and a subject index. Between these, three blocks of papers can be distinguished (the individual papers are outlined below). The first block of papers is untitled: it contains three articles written by Miklós Kontra and all of them deal with general questions of BUSZI. The next block is entitled *Bevezető tanulmányok* [Introductory studies] and consists of five papers (two of them by Kontra). It is not easy to define what gives grounds for separating these two blocks. Although the papers in the untitled block were written in 2020–2021 and never published before, while most of the papers in the second block had been published earlier (and two of them were written at the beginning of the BUSZI project, in

¹ The review was written within the project NKFI 139271 *The role of paradigm structure in Hungarian morphology and phonology with typological comparisons* led by Péter Rebrus. I am grateful to Nóra Wenszky for her assistance and advice.

1989–1990), the last of them was written in 2021 and had not been published elsewhere. The third block is entitled *Elemzések* [Analyses] and contains eleven studies on various research problems based on the BUSZI data.²

The book is not really suitable for reading at one go. As it consists of research papers published in various journals, volumes of conference proceedings, Festschrifts, etc., in addition to the introductory studies, almost every single study presents the basic data on the history, aims, data, consultants, methodology, etc. of the BUSZI project. It depends on the researcher what data they consider relevant, and this sometimes leads to strange results in the collection of papers. E.g., in BUSZI-2, five groups of the language consultants represent various professions. The most detailed data on the age of the members of the different groups cannot be found in an introductory study but in a research study on page 237.³ So, if the reader is interested in the age of the members of the different professional groups, they can find the most exact data in the middle of the book, practically, at a random place. There are also some minor contradictions between the data published in the introduction (page 25) and on page 237. Additionally, while according to these data only the ten teachers were over 50, on page 322 in another study, it is stated that twelve consultants were older than 50 years. Although such inconveniences are inevitable in collections of papers, this case indicates the limits and the drawbacks of the genre compared to monographs and compilations of studies.

The editors do not explain why exactly these papers were chosen to be included in the collection. The annotated bibliography at the end of the book suggests that a high number of other studies based on BUSZI have been published, which are not included in this volume. Nothing suggests that the articles were chosen because of their quality or importance among similar studies (although, undoubtedly, these factors had

² The book comes with a DVD, which is not the subject of this review due to limitations of space.

³ The peer-reviewer called my attention to the fact that while all the other sources label a group of consultants as *teachers*, only this paper calls them *high-school teachers*. Indeed, I could not find any other paper that refers to this group as *high-school teachers*. It remains a puzzle whether they all were in fact high-school teachers, and if so, why this fact does not come to light from other sources.

to play a role in the choice). The most correct answer seems to be that the volume contains papers which are not easy to access, as they were published in less conspicuous publications. In all probability, the editors preferred to see them together in one volume, and complemented them with some papers dealing with general questions related to the BUSZI project. The fact that most of the papers were not published in leading journals and many of them appeared in collections with miscellaneous contents (conference proceedings or Festschrifts) supports this idea. However, many papers, published in similar publications, were left out.

2. The papers included

This section gives descriptions of the individual papers included in the book. The three blocks of papers are presented in separate subsections. Subsection 2.1 concentrates on the content, that is, instead of any evaluation, it describes the history, the structure and the methods of the BUSZI project based on the papers in the untitled block. Subsection 2.2 focuses on what kind of information the individual papers in the *Introductory studies* block give. Section 2.3 describes some main research questions and results of the individual papers and makes remarks on the research methods and the structures of the papers as well.

2.1. The history of the BUSZI project

As was mentioned above, all the three papers in the first block were written recently by Miklós Kontra, the leader of the BUSZI project from 1985 (the beginning) to 2010. The first one is essentially a preface, the second one is a detailed description of the history of the BUSZI project, while the third one adds details of the discussion on problems of research ethics which emerged during the history of the project.

The first paper, entitled *Bevezetés* [Introduction], is rather a foreword and can hardly be regarded as a paper. It highlights some points of the history of the BUSZI project and some sociolinguistic projects done in parallel with it; it also mentions the lack of some kinds of sociolinguistic projects done “West of Vienna” (somewhat surprisingly, with an example from Australia); it draws attention to the fact that the data of the project are outdated, and the current social situation cannot be assessed based on that; Kontra self-critically mentions some less successful components of BUSZI as well. Finally, he describes the contents of the book (devoting a few words to each paper) and of the DVD, and also makes some technical remarks.

The second paper is entitled *A Budapesti Szociolingvisztikai Interjú története* [The history of the Budapest Sociolinguistic Interview] and, in a nutshell, contains the following.

Before the eighties, the linguistic research of spoken Hungarian was restricted to 10–12-word-long sentences. The arrival of the tape recorder⁴ has changed this completely: the researchers could record long texts and dialogues and could listen to them several times. Additionally, although linguistic questionnaires were used by dialectologists, urban dialectology practically did not exist. The BUSZI project, which mostly followed the methods elaborated by William Labov, was a breakthrough in these respects.

The project was initiated in 1985 at the Research Institute for Linguistics of the Hungarian Academy of Sciences (henceforth RIL).⁵ A preliminary research was the prosodic transcription of a 20-minute-long program of a local cable TV and its analysis (by the most acknowledged Hungarian prosodist, László Varga). During the following two years, preliminary studies were written on the problems to be researched. In 1987, pilot interviews were made (BUSZI-1), and based on the experiences gained, a second cycle of interviews (BUSZI-2) was conducted in the same year. The consultants of BUSZI-2 represented certain social classes by profession (teachers and university students represented the intellectual elite, factory workers and apprentices represented the working class, while shop assistants represented a class between these two extremes). The consultants of BUSZI-3 and BUSZI-4, the interviews of which were made in the following two years, were representative of the (adult) inhabitants of Budapest. The main purposes of the research were:

- creating a spoken corpus of Budapest Hungarian supplemented with elicitation tasks;
- researching the linguistic variability of sociolinguistically well-defined social classes;

⁴ Evidently, tape recorders were known and used for linguistic research from the fifties, but researchers recorded narratives and folklore, and not spontaneous speech.

⁵ The research institutes of the Academy were taken away from the Academy by the illiberal government in 2019. Nowadays, the institute works as a member of the Eötvös Loránd Research Network (not to be confused with the university named after the same physicist), and it is called Hungarian Research Centre for Linguistics (henceforth HRCL).

- providing a stylistic description, i.e., a description of the linguistic variability in the speech of individuals depending on the measure of control maintained over their own speech;
- recording data which assure the possibility of longitudinal studies with a comparison to data recorded after 10–20–30 years.

The interviews were standardized interviews periodically interrupted by tasks as oral sentence complementation, reading of paragraph-long texts (slowly and rapidly), reading out of minimal pairs and word lists, word elicitation, etc., including questions like “Are these words the same or different ones?”, “Which is the correct form?” or “How do you pronounce it?”. The standardized interview consisted of 26 modules like biography, family, school, childhood, free time, friends, courting, abortion, marriage, dreams, threat to life, etc.

A unique feature of the BUSZI among similar projects all over the world is that the interviews were not made by linguists. The reason was that, according to the regulations of those times, the employees of RIL were not allowed to be paid for the grueling work of interviewing. As a consequence, most of the interviews of BUSZI-2 and all of the interviews of BUSZI-3 and BUSZI-4 were made by sociologists (and a teacher), who went through a special training at RIL. The quality of the interviews was checked by linguists.

The 50 interviews of BUSZI are 80 hours long altogether, and they contain more than 170 thousand running words (tokens) uttered by the consultants and almost 100 thousand words uttered by the fieldworkers. The average length of the interviews is 3,470 tokens, but the standard deviation is large: the shortest interview contains 1,900 tokens while the longest 15,000 tokens.

The annotations of the texts were made by linguists. Besides the transcription, several linguistic features (e.g., elisions, hesitations) are encoded as well. The answers given in the tasks were also separately encoded.

After the ambitious start, the work advanced very slowly due to the lack of financial support. The annotation had not been finished before 2002, and the answers given in the test tasks had not been completely encoded and checked before 2005. However, during this time, many important steps were made: the first anonymized interview text together with the sound file was published⁶ on CD-ROM (1997); the original

⁶ The CD-ROMs were handed over to twenty-odd university departments and research bases in Hungary, and became also available via the Internet.

sound recordings of BUSZI-2 were digitized and archived on CDs (1998–), and several studies based on the already processed data were published. The final version of the searchable spoken language corpus was completed in 2009: it also has a machine-readable XML version. The codification of the test data from BUSZI-3 and BUSZI-4 began in the same year.

The following section of the history of BUSZI deals with issues related to research ethics. As the third paper of the book discusses these issues in a more detailed way, data from both papers will be included in the next paragraphs.

In 2009,⁷ the materials of the BUSZI project came to the attention of a group of researchers dealing with speech recognition. They wanted to use the closed materials, and they were supported by István Kenesei, the director of RIL at that time. In his letter to Kontra, Kenesei claims that BUSZI is a project financed by public money, thus, all its results must be available at least for researchers. The results mentioned also included the recordings of the 50 interviews, which were expected to be available for listening via the Internet. Kontra opposed these plans based on research ethical reasons. From the beginning of the project, guaranteeing anonymity of the consultants was a basic principle, and it included the rule that only a small group of researchers can listen to the recordings (as the consultants were informed before the recording). The published parts were always anonymized, personal names and street names were substituted with pseudonyms. Moreover, the BUSZI research group obtained the ex-post permission of some consultants to share the anonymized recordings with a wider range of linguists, and from 2003, ten interviews were available for linguists outside the research group.

Kontra applied to the data protection ombudsman, who made a statement that for publication, the recordings must be completely anonymized: all the published recordings must be distorted from beginning to end, and any information based on which the consultant can be identified must be made unrecognizable. Kenesei wanted to have the interview anonymized by Kontra, but Kontra refused this referring to his professional beliefs. However, he offered his data handler rights and responsibilities for the person who executes the plans of the directorate. As a

⁷ On page 35, Kontra states that the research group claimed its right to use the BUSZI data in May 2009. However, as can be judged from what is written on pages 46–47, the conflict began in 2008.

consequence, at the end of 2010 Kontra was dismissed. Before that, he was able to publish the two-dimensional data of the test data (that is, the proportions of the answers to the tasks but without reference to the profession, age or gender of the consultants) together with Anna Borbély.

The researchable BUSZI-2 was published in 2012. It is available via the Internet, and it can be used by registered researchers. As Kontra mentions, not a single question has been addressed in its forums (it is also true in the middle of May 2022). The sound files could be listened to only personally in RIL (and now at HRCL), and only in distorted form, which makes them unsuitable for linguistic analysis.⁸ Although distortion was a condition expected by the ombudsman for publishing them via the Internet, paradoxically, even the recordings that could be shared in an undistorted form (thanks to the *ex-post* permissions obtained), are available only in the distorted form.

In the second paper, after dealing with the research ethical issues, Kontra mentions some results of the project. As the studies presented below give a much wider and more detailed picture on the topic, this part will be skipped here. Finally, Kontra gives a list of those who contributed to the BUSZI project, indicating which researchers participated in the various subtasks. The third paper also ends with a section about the project participants: while in a document from 2003 it was explicitly stated that the interviews are the intellectual property of the researchers working on the project, and the RIL did not protest, in 2009 István Kenesei, as the director, stated that the owner of the copyright of BUSZI is the RIL, because the project was financed by public money (from project support or from the budget of the RIL).

Undoubtedly, the story of BUSZI is one of the most interesting parts of the book. Although it has to be stressed that the facts above are presented by Kontra, and the situation cannot be completely judged without hearing the other side, some points seem to be clear. In Hungary,⁹ even if

⁸ Kontra knows about one researcher, Cecília Sarolta Molnár, who used the sound recordings for research purposes – after getting a special permission to use the undistorted sound files. According to Molnár (p.c.), she had to specify short sections (sentences) which she was interested in, and got back short sound files containing these sections. After the analysis, she had to destroy these sound files.

⁹ Evidently, not only in Hungary, but the important point is that as for Hungary, it is possible.

a world-class state-of-art research project is initiated by top researchers, and even if it is financed at the beginning, it can be easily bled out by cutting the financial support. Project leaders can be dismissed if they are unwilling to use the project materials for purposes completely incompatible with the original objectives and ethical grounds of the project, and the project team may simply be disbanded.¹⁰ Although the final attack against the community reportedly was to make the data available, the situation has not improved in this respect in the last twelve years, and in some respects, we can even speak about a step back (e.g. the original sound files became more difficult to access even for completely justified research purposes).

It must be admitted that if a project is financed by public money, it is reasonable to expect that all the results of it, including the collected data, should be made available for the public. However, it is not always an option (think of some industrial or strategic developments). The only possibility to get the most spontaneous speech sample from the consultants is when they speak about sensitive issues; obviously, consultants are not keen to speak about sensitive issues when they know that anyone can listen to the recording. As a consequence, it is practically impossible to build an open corpus of spontaneous speech. Moreover, once the consultants were promised that the recordings will be available just to a limited group of researchers, publishing them is not just unethical against the consultants, but also against the whole research community – and not just linguists. One scandal due to the fact that a supposedly secret recording was published can make the job of any researchers making interviews extremely difficult. This kind of work is based on trust, which can be lost not just between a particular researcher and their consultant(s), but collectively.

As Kontra remarks (p. 42), research ethical questions are not usually addressed in Hungarian linguistics. The reviewer must generalize this claim further: *ethical* questions are not usually addressed in Hungarian linguistics. The exsanguination of the BUSZI project, the destruction of

¹⁰ According to Kontra (p. 37), at the end of 2011, there were only two researchers in the team: the leader Tamás Váradi, who earlier participated in the project mainly as a software developer (cf. pp. 40–41), and Kinga Mátyus, who joined the project in 2009. Csilla Bartha and Anna Borbély, who transcribed and annotated most of the interviews and, together with Kontra, played the most important roles in the BUSZI project, were not participants of the project any more.

the BUSZI team did not lead to any scandals, it is considered to be an ordinary incident that severely damaged the work and career of researchers.

2.2 Introductory studies

Although the second block of papers is entitled *Bevezető tanulmányok* [Introductory studies], the papers included do not really belong to the genre of (research) studies. They do not formulate and answer research questions; rather, they present issues related to the BUSZI project.

The first paper, again by Kontra, is entitled *Budapesti élőnyelvi kutatások* [Research on the Budapest vernacular] and was first published in 1990. Basically, it is a popularizing article that describes the beginning and the objectives of the BUSZI project. It contains some details which were not, but could have been, mentioned in the previous three studies. As it was published in *Magyar Tudomány*, a monthly science magazine of the Hungarian Academy of Sciences, it was written for non-linguist scholars, but it is understandable for any educated reader. The emphasis, on the one hand, is on the technical-methodological details (random sampling, data handling and processing, observer's paradox, elicitation tasks). On the other hand, Kontra usually refers to normative expectations familiar for a native Hungarian reader, and also explains the phenomena related to them (as stigmatization and hypercorrection).

The second paper is entitled *A Budapesti Szociolingvisztikai Interjú kódolási rendszeréről* [On the coding system of the Budapest Sociolinguistic Interview], it was written by Andrea Ágnes Reményi in 1989, and published in *Hungarológiai Közlemények* (the journal of the Hungarian Department of the University of Novi Sad, Serbia – Yugoslavia at that time). The paper resembles an introductory chapter of a fictitious manual for the would-be annotators of BUSZI (or for those who want to do research based on the annotated texts). It concentrates on technical details but also presents the theoretical background. It lists the annotated linguistic variables and the annotating techniques in a more detailed way than the previous papers, and it also presents the user interface of the program for test data input. It is a must-read for those who are planning to use the BUSZI data.

The third paper is simply entitled *A Budapesti Szociolingvisztikai Interjú* [The Budapest Sociolinguistic Interview]. The reason for this is that it was published as a chapter of a popularizing book *A magyar nyelv kézikönyve* [A handbook of the Hungarian language], Kiefer – Siptár (2003); however, it was written in 1999. The author is Tamás Váradi, and it is a

general description of the BUSZI project for the educated public. Compared to the previous chapters, it contains many details on the research questions (test tasks) and the modules of the standardized interviews (including the introductory question),¹¹ and some technical details and preliminary results as well. If someone wants to read just one paper on the BUSZI project in general, from this book, this paper must be recommended.

The fourth paper is the shortest of all the papers in the book, it takes up just two pages together with the list of references. It is entitled *Átlagos mondathossz a BUSZI-2-ben?* [Average sentence length in BUSZI-2?], and it was written in 2013 by Miklós Kontra as a reaction to another article (Váradi et al. 2012, not included in the book reviewed here) which reported that the average length of the sentences uttered by BUSZI-2 consultants is 8.5 words, while the average length of the sentences by the interviewers is 4.6 words. Kontra emphasizes that, in spontaneous speech, the assignment of sentence boundaries is often impossible, and in the case of the BUSZI-2 annotation, it was totally arbitrary: as a consequence, it is not appropriate to measure average sentence length. (The reviewer must wonder, because one of the authors of the criticized paper was Tamás Váradi, who had been a key researcher of the BUSZI project from the beginning.)

The last paper of the block, written by Anna Borbély and Csilla Bartha, is the longest one in the book: it is 28 pages long, plus five pages of references. As its title, *Interjúzás, lejegyzés és kódolás a BUSZI-2-ben* [Interviewing, annotation and encoding in BUSZI-2] reveals, the paper deals with technical details of the project. The authors are those who transcribed and annotated most of the interviews: consequently, and undoubtedly, they are the most familiar with the material. The paper concentrates more on the interviewing techniques (how to involve the partner into the interaction etc.); therefore, it is recommended for those who plan to make similar interviews. Although the authors write less about annotation, they provide a lot of annotated texts; therefore, it can also be useful for those who show interest in annotation.

2.3 Analyses

This block of eleven papers is divided into seven unnumbered sections, each of which contains one or two papers. Six sections are entitled ac-

¹¹ Only 22 of the 26 modules are listed. It turns out just here that only six of the 22 modules were obligatory in the interview.

ording to various disciplines of linguistics: *Hangtan* [Phonetics/Phonology], *Alaktan* [Morphology], *Mondattan* [Syntax], *Szókincs* [Lexicon], *Stílus* [Style], and *Diskurzus* [Discourse]. The seventh subsection is entitled *Varia* [Other topics]. Almost all the papers included in this block were published between 2009 and 2012. Some papers were revised for this book. Below, each paper will be summarized.

Helga Hattyár – Miklós Kontra – Fruzsina Sára Vargha: *Van-e Budapesten zárt ě?* [Does the closed *ě* exist in Budapest?] Traditionally, most of the Hungarian dialects distinguished two front unrounded non-high short vowel phonemes, mid /e/ and (mid-)open /ɛ/. However, the two were merged into /ɛ/ in the northeastern dialect, which became the basis of Standard Hungarian. As a consequence, Hungarian orthography does not distinguish these two phonemes (dialectologists use *ě* for /e/), and, in addition, with the spreading of the standard, merging became more and more typical also for other dialect areas, especially for Budapest Hungarian.

BUSZI had a task to test whether Budapest speakers really do not distinguish these two phonemes. The consultants had to listen to word pairs via headphones, and tell the fieldworkers whether the two words mean something different (and what) or not. There were two word pairs to test the given phenomenon: *hëgyës* /hejɛʃ/ ‘pointed, spiked’ and *hëgyes* /hejɛʃ/ ‘mountainous, hilly’ on the one hand, and *értëm* /e:rtɛm/ ‘understand-PRS.1SG.DO’ and *értem* /e:rtɛm/ ‘for-1SG’, on the other hand. Unfortunately, as later turned out, the difference in the F1 of the second vowel in the second case was so inappreciable (28 Hz) that the results had to be ignored. In the case of *hëgyës* – *hëgyes*, 14 of the 50 BUSZI-2 consultants claimed that they mean different things. (Additionally, BUSZI-3 and BUSZI-4 consultants also seemed to hear the difference in a very similar proportion: every fourth consultant claimed that the words mean something different.) However, the authors argue that the results are not reliable, as even those who do not hear the difference are aware of the fact that the word can mean different things, and answer that the two words have different meanings. Despite that, they examined whether age, gender and birthplace had a significant effect on distinguishing the two phonemes. As was expected, birthplace did: while only one sixth of those who grew up in Budapest distinguished the two phonemes, the number of immigrants making the distinction almost equaled the number of immigrants who did not. When an immigrant does not distinguish the two phonemes, it can usually be explained by their dialectal background.

However, in the case of the native Budapest speakers, the authors could not find data explaining the distinction. They suppose that at least part of them simply considered the words having different meanings because of their polysemy. Surprisingly, gender also had a significant effect, even slightly bigger: while almost every second woman distinguished the two forms, just about every seventh-eighth man. The authors admit that they cannot explain this fact. Age had no significant effect.

The authors also examined whether the consultants produce the difference between the two phonemes. Based on a task when *hëgyës* and *hëgyes* were elicited, they found that only two of the 14 consultants claiming that the words are different in the listening task produced the two words differently: a woman and a man (both were immigrants, but their age is not mentioned). The authors also examined the use of *lëhet* ‘may be, can be’ in different tasks, but the results were not easy to interpret. Surprisingly, they found two consultants who did not distinguish the two vowels in perception tasks but produced the difference in other tasks. At the end of the paper, they give expression to their hope that research made on the material of BUSZI-3 and BUSZI-4 (with a representative sample) will give a more exact picture on the sociolinguistic factors affecting the use of *ë*.

Anna Borbély – András Vargha: *Az l variabilitása öt foglalkozási csoportban* [The variability of *l* in five profession groups]. Hungarian *l* is often dropped or vocalized¹² in coda position. This phenomenon is already observable in Old Hungarian (that is, in the first half of the second millennium), but there are considerable differences between the dialects in this respect. Standard Hungarian forms usually preserve the coda *l*, and its omission is considered as rustic. It is even stigmatized as the sign of uneducated speech. The authors examined all of the BUSZI-2 interviews, and concluded that in the speech of apprentices, the proportion of the dropped coda *ls* was 20%, both in the speech of factory workers and shop assistants approximately 15%, and both in the speech of university students and teachers about 8–9%. Nonetheless, standard deviation is relatively high in all groups (but especially in the group of workers and shop assistants). The proportion of *l*-dropping with only two teachers was lower than with the worker with the lowest proportion (3.95%). Among the 18 consultants with the proportion of *l*-dropping lower than

¹² I.e., it causes the lengthening of the preceding vowel or, especially in dialects with diphthongs, it transforms into a second element of a diphthong.

10% we find 7 teachers, 7 students, 2 shop assistants, 2 workers but no apprentice. On the contrary, among the 16 consultants with the highest proportion of *l*-dropping (> 17%) there are 8 apprentices, 4 workers and 4 shop assistants, but no students or teachers. While 85% of teachers and students, only about 10% of the apprentices produced less *l*-dropping than the average (13.5%). Both the shop assistants and the workers produced under and over the average in a similar proportion. It can be concluded that although unusually frequent or rare *l*-dropping can exclude that the speaker belongs to a high or low social class with high probability, speakers with an average frequency of *l*-dropping come from all the classes.

Kinga Mátyus – Julianna Bokor – Szabolcs Takács: „*Abban a farmerba nem mehetsz színházba*” [“In those jeans, you cannot go to the theater”]. The first article of the subsection of morphology actually discusses phonetic/phonological phenomena related to one particular morpheme, the inessive suffix. The inessive suffix shows two kinds of variations. In Standard Hungarian, it occurs in the forms *-ban* [bɒn] and *-ben* [ben], the choice of the allomorphs is regulated by vowel harmony. However, some word forms, such as *farmer* ‘jeans’ show vacillation and they occur with both allomorphs.¹³ Additionally, spoken Hungarian has also the forms *-ba* [bɒ] and *-be* [be], that is, the same forms but with an *n*-drop (which is otherwise not typical for Hungarian). These forms are also stigmatized: they are condemned mainly because these forms coincide with the allomorphs of the illative suffix. BUSZI had several tasks to test the use of the *n*-drop forms. Additionally, it had some tasks to test whether the choice between the allomorphs with a front or back vowel can be influenced by priming. The following test was carried out. A demonstrative pronoun, agreeing with the modified noun in case, preceded the vacillating nominal form. It was tested whether these two words contain the case suffixes in the same phonetic form. Explicitly: *ebben a farmerben* ‘in these jeans’ and *abban a farmerban* ‘in those

¹³ The reason for this is that front unrounded vowels behave sometimes like neutral vowels, but sometimes like front-harmonic vowels. In this case, the form *farmerben* can be explained by *e* as the last harmonic vowel, so the suffix allomorph with the front vowel must be used. However, the form *farmerban* can be explained by *e* being neutral and transparent, so the last harmonic vowel is the *a* in the initial syllable; therefore, a back suffix allomorph must be used. For a detailed discussion, see Rebrus – Törkenczy (2016).

jeans' more frequent than *ebben a farmerban* 'in these jeans' and *abban a farmerben* 'in those jeans', respectively?

The authors found that in the BUSZI-2 tests teachers, students and shop assistants used the standard forms in the same proportion (~ 97%), apprentices a bit less rarely (~ 94.5%) and factory workers even a bit more rarely (91%). When the task was reading out word lists and minimal pairs, all the five groups used the standard forms in 100%. The lowest proportion was attested in the fast text reading tasks: 80% with factory workers (while in this task shop assistants had the highest proportion, 90%). However, significant differences could be revealed only when they contrasted teachers and university students with the other three groups.¹⁴ Additionally, the proportion of standard forms is significantly lower in text reading tasks (in both slow and fast reading) than in word reading tasks and in sentence completion tasks. From each group, one consultant was chosen and all the inessive suffixes in the standardized interviews were examined. It turned out that even the teacher used the standard form in less than 40% of the cases; the proportion of the standard form was 7% in the speech of the worker, who used the standard form in 70–100% of the cases in the different tasks. As for the priming effect, the authors find that BUSZI-2 consultants used the front variant in almost 60% of the cases when there was no (potentially) priming element (pronoun). When the noun was preceded by a front pronoun, the proportion of the front variant was slightly, but not significantly higher (a bit over 60%). However, when the noun was preceded by a back pronoun, the proportion of the back allomorph grew over 60%.

The authors also examined the tasks of 65 BUSZI-3 and BUSZI-4 interviews. They found no significant difference in choosing the standard form between men (93%) and women (90%), but they found a significant difference between older (> 44 years, 89%) and younger (95%) speakers and consultants without (87%) and with (96%) high school graduation.

¹⁴ They formulate it as contrasting consultants with and without college education – however, students do not have a degree. Moreover, since shop assistants have approximately the same indicators as teachers and students, the results suggest that although social status plays a considerable role, it is not college education that makes the difference.

Anna Borbély: *Két morfológiai változó variabilitásának statisztikai és szociokognitív elemzése a Budapesti Szociolingvisztikai Interjú beszélt nyelvi korpuszában* [Statistical and sociocognitive analysis of the variability of two morphological variables in the spoken corpus of Budapest Sociolinguistic Interview]. The current paper was written in 2020, but it is based on two other articles published in 2007 and 2009. The title fails to reveal what morphological phenomena the paper discusses, and strangely enough, it does not come to light until the fifth and sixth pages of the study, respectively, the first quarter of which is an overview of research history and the theoretical background.

One of the phenomena researched is the phonological behavior of a specific suffix, the ending of the indefinite first person singular conditional, *-nék* [ne:k]. In Hungarian, *é* undergoes harmony in about half of the suffixes in which it occurs.¹⁵ In Standard Hungarian, the indefinite first person singular conditional *-nék* does not undergo harmony, but the definite third person plural conditional *-nék* does alternate with *-nák* due to vowel harmony (so the two forms are identical with front stems but differ with back stems). However, in some dialects and sociolects, both suffixes undergo vowel harmony. However, the harmonizing indefinite first person singular conditional suffix is strongly stigmatized.

The other phenomenon researched is the (indefinite) second person present indicative form of the verb ‘come’, which has several different stem forms (*jön-*, *jöv-*, *jö-*). The reviewer would claim that even this segmentation can be disputed, as – untypically for Hungarian – consonants are lengthened after the *jö-* form: *jö-ssz* [jøs:] ‘come-PRS.IND.2SG’ (similar forms end in short [s]), *jö-ttök* [jöt:øk] ‘come-PRS.IND.2PL’ (usually the ending is [tøk] (: [tok] : [tek])), *jön-nek* or *jö-nnek* [jøn:ek] ‘come-PRS.IND.3PL’ (cf. *jön* [jøn] ‘come.PRS.IND.3SG’, *-nak/-nek* is the general form of ‘PRS.IND.3PL’). Eastern dialects use the form *jösztök* instead of the form *jöttök* ‘come-PRS.IND.2PL’ (probably because of the analogy of *jössz* ‘come-PRS.IND.2SG’), which also shows the same doubts about segmentation: the existence of this form suggests that the stem is *jösz-* both in *jösztök* and in *jössz*. Borbély stresses that there were attempts for the standardization of the *jösztök* form; additionally, at the end of the paper (221), she explicitly states that the *jösztök* form has no negative connotations (although it seems rather that there are not enough data to detect these connotations). However, the reviewer has met sever-

¹⁵ See Rebrus – Törkenczy 2016: 244–245.

al speakers who were complaining about being stigmatized because of using this form.

Borbély demonstrates that the number of consultants using the first person singular *-nák* form at least once in production tests is highly dependent on their profession: 6 workers, 4 apprentices, 2 shop assistants and one student, and no one among the teachers used forms like *adnák* ‘I would give’ or *kapnák* ‘I would get’. (Nobody used the non-standard form consistently: from eight items, maximally four was non-standard: this was the case with two consultants.) Due to the low number of the items, there were no significant differences between the different tasks. The *jösztok* form was used by two teachers and one factory worker in production tests. However, one student, one shop assistant and two workers stated that the *jösztok* form is the “correct” one, and one teacher, one student and two workers claimed that they use this form. Additionally, there was only one teacher who claimed that both *jöttök* and *jösztok* are correct, and they use both forms.

Ilona Kassai: *Az -e kérdőszó és a budapesti nyelvhasználat* [The interrogative particle *-e* and the Budapest language use]. The first paper on syntax is the shortest study in this block, it is just five pages without the references. In Standard Hungarian, the interrogative particle (enclitic) *-e* (typically used in embedded questions) is always attached to the predicate (typically a finite verb). However, in nonstandard varieties of Hungarian, it may also be attached to some other elements, e.g., a negative particle or a verbal particle (*igekötő*). Hungarian verbal particles behave similarly to the German Verbzusatz, that is, in some constructions they behave as a verbal prefix; but in some other constructions, they behave as independent words, and they can stand quite far from the verb they belong to. Three BUSZI-2 tasks were aimed at examining the position of the interrogative particle, all were sentence complementation tasks, e.g., *Nem tudom, hogy ... már a vendég* ‘I do not know (whether) the guest has (arrived) yet’. The answer can be *megjött-e* or *meg-e jött* (*meg* is a verbal particle, in this case, it is just a perfectivity marker; *jött* ‘come.PST.3SG’), although *megjött* without an interrogative suffix can also be used.¹⁶ According to the results, the nonstandard forms (with

¹⁶ The reviewer and the peer-reviewer agreed that while *Nem tudom, hogy megjött-e már a vendég* means ‘I do not know whether the guest has arrived’, *Nem tudom, hogy megjött már a vendég* means ‘I do not know that the guest has arrived’, so omitting the question particle changes the semantics of the

meg-e) occur sporadically, and it is attested with factory workers only. Interestingly, teachers and students tend to use the interrogative particle, while shop assistants, factory workers and apprentices show a tendency to omit it – however, in most cases they use it, and they use it in the standard way (*megjött-e*). BUSZI researchers were also interested in the question that if another interrogative particle, *vajon* ‘whether’ is also present, it affects the use of the interrogative particle *-e* or it does not. Therefore, there was a task in which the sentence to be completed was almost the same, just *vajon* was also added: *Nem tudom, hogy vajon ... már a vendég.* Against the preliminary expectations, *-e* was not less used when *vajon* was present: on the contrary, it was used in slightly more cases.

Daniel Szeredi: *Loss of agreement between Hungarian relative pronouns and their antecedents.* This is the only paper in the book which is in English.¹⁷ In Standard Hungarian, four nominal relative pronouns are distinguished: *aki* for animate antecedents, *amelyik* for inanimate antecedents in selective relative clauses,¹⁸ *amely* for specific inanimate antecedents in non-selective relative clauses, and *ami* for non-specific inanimate antecedents in non-selective relative clauses. As for the difference between *amelyik* and *amely*, the sentence *Láttam a házat, amelyik magas* ‘I saw the house which was tall’ means that there is only one house distinguished with its height, and its height identifies the house, while *Láttam a házat, amely magas* ‘I saw the house, which was tall’ is used when the house can be identified in another way and the information on its relative highness is only supplementary. As for the difference between *amely* and *ami*, the latter could be used when the antecedent is

sentence. They both consider that sentences with *vajon* but without *-e* (*Nem tudom, hogy vajon megjött/megjön már a vendég* with the suggested meaning ‘I do not know whether the guest has arrived’, in the first case with a past, in the second with a present form of the verb) are ungrammatical, and it is difficult to believe 8 of the 46 consultants gave such an answer. However, a similar structure without *hogy* ‘that’ can be grammatical, if the two clauses are not connected syntactically, just semantically (*Nem tudom. Vajon megjött már a vendég?* ‘I do not know. Has the guest arrived?’, understood as ‘I do not know whether the guest has arrived’).

¹⁷ The paper is available online: <https://repository.upenn.edu/pwpl/vol18/iss2/17/>

¹⁸ Nóra Wenzky has drawn my attention to the fact that *amelyik* can also be used for animate antecedents as well: *a tanárt, amelyik (~ aki) megpofozott, elbocsátották* ‘the teacher which slapped [me/you in the face] was dismissed’.

non-specific, e.g., *Láttam azt, ami magas* ‘I saw that which was tall’. Additionally, *ami* is used when it refers to the whole relative clause: *Láttam egy házat, ami megnyugtatót* ‘I saw the house, which calmed me (not the house but seeing it)’.

According to former studies and normative works, three tendencies are observable in the use of these relative pronouns: *ami* is spreading after specific antecedents; hypercorrectly, *amely* also occurs with non-specific antecedents; *amelyik* appears in non-selective clauses. Additionally, Szeredi states that there is another phenomenon, formerly not discussed in the literature, the lack of agreement in number: while a plural relative pronoun should be used after a (semantically or formally) plural antecedent, exceptions are frequent. However, these statements are inaccurate. On the one hand, the fundamental handbook for Hungarian prescriptive linguistics Grétsy – Kovalovszky (1985: 1258–1259) declares that the relative pronoun is usually singular if its antecedent is formally singular, although semantically plural. (In Hungarian, nouns modified by a quantifier, e.g., a numeral, are singular. Additionally, a list of formally singular nouns also counts as semantically plural.) However, even this strongly prescriptive work takes a stand that in these cases the plural form is also acceptable. Moreover, the authors draw attention to the fact that in spoken language, agreement is sometimes omitted: *falakat, amit* ‘the walls (PL.ACC) which (SG.ACC)’ or *a küzdelemben, amiket* ‘in the fight (SG.INF), which (PL.ACC)’. Such patterns are highly condemned by the prescriptivists.

Szeredi worked through all the nominal relational pronouns in the 50 BUSZI-2 interviews. He concludes that *amely* is practically falling into disuse, and it is attested only in the speech of teachers and university students (and also the interviewers) sporadically. Teachers and interviewers, that is, older speakers, used *amely* more frequently than students. Hypercorrect use of *amely* (that is, after a non-specific antecedent) was not attested in the whole corpus. The use of *amelyik* after non-selective antecedents was also rare (3.6% of the cases on average), and there were no considerable differences between the groups. However, when the proportion of the non-selective use of *amelyik* was examined among all tokens of the pronoun, it turned out that teachers and students use this pronoun non-selectively more frequently than the other three groups. As for agreement in number, *amelyik* never occurs in plural. As Szeredi remarks, it is no wonder, because it is not used in a plural form (**amelyikek*) even in Standard Hungarian. (Strangely enough, it is not

mentioned that for selective plural antecedents *amelyek*, the plural form of *amely* is used in the standard. The picture is even more complicated than sketched by Szeredi.) Somewhat surprisingly, *ami* is also rare in plural (*amik*), and it is more avoided by teachers and students than by the members of the other three groups. On the contrary, *amely* and *aki* prefer agreement, actually, *amely* occurs in plural in almost one third of all cases. At the end of the paper, Szeredi demonstrates that the relative frequency of plural forms of *amely* and *aki* is much higher than the relative frequency of plural forms of *ami* and *amelyik* in the Szószablya corpus (Halácsy et al. 2004) and according to Google search.

Miklós Kontra: Szócsinálás (A motiváció szerepe egy ismeretlen tárgy megnevezésében) [Word-making (The role of motivation in the naming of an unknown object)]. The paper is based on a specific module of the BUSZI interview. At the beginning of the module, the fieldworker showed a staple remover, a tool practically unknown in Hungary at that time, and asked the consultant whether they knew what that was. (Usually they did not, or they had a wrong guess.) After that, the fieldworker demonstrated how the tool was used: using a stapler, they stapled two sheets of papers together, and then they removed the staple with the staple remover. In the next step, they showed the staple remover again, and asked the name of it again. At last, the fieldworker asked to name the stapler, the staple and, finally, again the staple remover. The research questions were: 1. How do the consultants name an unknown object? 2. How do they name it after they learnt its use? 3. How do they name it after recalling the names expected to be used during the coining process? 4. Is the coinage affected by profession, age and gender? 5. What factors could have played a role in the formation of the contemporary name? For the first time, the most frequent guess was *sörnyitó* ‘bottle (lit. beer) opener’, and in most of the cases the guess was some kind of (specified or unspecified) ‘opener’, but *csipesz* (most probably as ‘tweezers’, but the word can also mean ‘forceps’, ‘clothes peg’ or some kind of ‘clip’) occurred several times as well. For the second and third times, the most frequent answer was *kapocskiszedő* (lit. ‘staple remover’), and usually all the answers were semantically similar, although the actual lexemes used and the exact grammatical structure varied. The difference between the answers given for the second and the third time was that at the third time, the proportion of the relevant answers was higher. It turned out that profession, age or gender do not affect the naming strategies. In the last part of the paper, Kontra discusses how the name *kapocskiszedő* became

practically exclusive for the tool. This part is a mix of anecdotal reports and summaries of some similar tests made among Hungarian speakers in the neighboring countries. The exclusivity of the name *kapocskiszedő* is based on a Google search. Finally, the answer for the question why this form became the exclusive one is kind of banal: because the manufacturers and dealers used this form.

This study raises several issues. First, it is questionable whether the history of one lexeme can be enough to make any generalization about similar processes. Additionally, it is evident that speakers name a tool based on its function more when they are aware of how it is used than when they are not. Even more, after they were asked about the name of the stapler and the staple, they evidently must have felt that their task is to use these lexemes, so no wonder that they did it. Considering these, it is not clear what the research proved. Going a bit anecdotal: the reviewer became familiar with the staple remover approximately at the time when BUSZI interviews were made. As a student, he worked in an office in Budapest: the staple remover was called *farkasfog* (lit. ‘wolf tooth’) there. Instead of function, this name was clearly motivated by the form of the tool equipped with blatant spikes. This is also a standard way of coining, e.g., the word for scissors, *olló* comes from the word meaning ‘(goat) kid’, because the two shears cross each other similarly to the legs of the young goat. Obviously, *farkasfog* could not occur in the BUSZI interviews, in which functionally motivated forms were forced out of the consultants.

Additionally, the answers also raise potential research questions. On the one hand, most of the names are coined from a noun and a verb (provided with a nominalizer), and in some cases a verbal particle is also attached to the verb: both *kapocskiszedő* (lit. ‘staple-out-picker’) and *kapocsszedő* (lit. ‘staple-picker’) occur. It would be interesting to discuss the function of the verbal modifiers in this position, and even to examine how their occurrence is related to other characteristic features of the structure, or whether their use is affected by profession, age or gender.

On the other hand, consultants sometimes use *gémkapocs* for staple. However, the standard form of the word is *gemkapocs* (nonetheless, the form *gémkapocs* is quite widespread and used by web shops as well),¹⁹

¹⁹ The variation in pronunciation is also mentioned in Grétsy – Kovalovszky (1980: 710). They explain the form *gémkapocs* as a folk etymological change by the analogy of *gém* ‘heron, spoonbill’. However, they do not mention any semantic variation.

and it means ‘paper clip’. The hypothesis that this nonstandard use of the word is typical for those professions which are less related to paperwork (factory workers and apprentices) is reasonable, and its verification would be typical sociolinguistic research (if the quantity of the data is satisfactory). However, these issues are not addressed in the article (or, seemingly, anywhere else).

Csilla Bartha – Ágnes Hámory: *Stílus a szociolingvisztikában, stílus az interakcióban. Nyelvi variabilitás és társas jelentések a szociolingvisztika társas-konstruktivista vizsgálataiban* [Style in sociolinguistics, style in interaction. Linguistic variability and social meanings in social-constructivist research of sociolinguistics]. The first third of the paper (pp. 260–271) is an extensive overview of the literature. Maybe, this can demonstrate that the authors are familiar with the history and the current state of the field. Nonetheless, as it offers just a very brief characterization of the different schools and just an enumeration of terms without any deeper explanation, it is not particularly informative for readers who are not specialists in the field. Moreover, it does not fit organically into the research part of the paper. It does not just contain an overabundance of information not needed to understand the research questions and results, but also lacks information that would be necessary. It becomes clear that the notion of *style* can mean very different things for different researchers; as a consequence, the reader would expect to learn how the authors define and use this term – in vain. Similarly, in the analysis, the authors deploy the term *face-saving* without any prior introduction or mention of the term. Although the analysis seems to be correct and generally convincing, the argumentation is rather impressionistic than principled, and quantified data are rare. The objectives of the study are defined only in the summary, and even there, they remain obscure: to highlight possibilities that make the approaches, attitudes and basic results of the empirical field inevitable for Hungarian stylistic research.

Csilla Bartha – Ágnes Hámory: *A beszédmódok dinamikája az interakcióban: a beszédalkalmazkodás-elmélet lehetőségei a társas nyelvhasználat vizsgálatában* [The dynamics of registers in interactions: the possibilities of speech adaptation theory in the research of social linguistic usage]. While the previous paper is the only paper in the section entitled *Stílus* (Style), this is the only paper in the section entitled *Diskurzus* (Discourse). However, the two papers are thematically very similar, and the interaction of style and discourse are analyzed in both of them.

This paper also has a relatively long introductory part (four pages, while the whole paper is hardly longer than 11 pages without the references). The part on the BUSZI data is only three pages long, and from these, one page is just a general introduction of the BUSZI project, and the rest contains little quantified data. The last three pages discuss some judicial discourse, but the source of the material remains unrevealed. It is unclear while this paper was chosen into the collection, as it contains just a minimal analysis of BUSZI data.

Miklós Kontra: *Megjegyzések a BUSZI-2-beli nyelvi bizonytalanságról* [Remarks on linguistic insecurity in the BUSZI-2 interviews]. Based on Labov (2006: 319), the term *nyelvi bizonytalanság* ‘linguistic insecurity’ indicates the situation when the consultants consider a form as correct, while they state that they use another form. The reviewer finds this term a bit confusing (at least in Hungarian: *bizonytalanság* also means ‘uncertainty, vagueness, incertitude, hesitation, confusion, etc.’). Contrary to what the term could suggest, the fact that the consultants are aware that their language use deviates from the standard (or any other norm) reveals their linguistic consciousness. This can also mean that the deviation is their conscious choice, maybe to demonstrate their background, identity or protest. Additionally, it is doubtful whether all the consultants mean correctness in the same way: some may think that there is really a proper way to speak in some abstract sense, others may think that the correct form is simply what they are expected to use in formal communication (at school, in government offices, in the “serious” media, etc.).²⁰ Kontra uses the term in another sense as well: he also speaks about linguistic insecurity when the consultants accept both of the two competing forms as correct: he also labels this kind of behavior as *inconsistency*. However, such answers may reflect the fact that the consultant is uncertain about which form is correct (in any sense), but also that they are certain about the answer that both are correct.

In any case, Kontra examined six words with variable pronunciation (like *bölcsöde* [bøltʃødɛ] ~ *bølcsöde* [bøltʃø:dɛ] ‘nursery’ or *szopiáne* [sopia:ne] ~ *szofiáne* [sofia:ne] ‘cigarette brand Sopianae’). (Kontra does not give an explanation, but the brand name comes from the Roman age

²⁰ On page 319, Kontra also remarks (referring to an e-mail by Tamás Péter Szabó) that people are socialized to what to answer about how they say things. However, this implies that they are socialized to what to say about what is correct.

name of the city of Pécs, Hungary. In colloquial Hungarian, it was influenced by the much better-known name of the capital of Bulgaria and the female name *Szófia* [so:fia]). Two words with variable morphological form (*eszem* ~ *eszek* 'I eat') were also included. The distribution of the answers is different for each pair. For example, the name of the cigarette brand is one of the extremes, as none of the consultants testified uncertainty: interestingly, 36 of the 50 consultants (almost all the shop assistants, workers and apprentices, but also 6 students and 3 teachers) considered the nonstandard *f*-form to be correct. In the case of *eszem* ~ *eszek*, 35 consultants considered the standard *eszem* form, while 9 of them thought the nonstandard *eszek* form to be correct. One consultant stated that both are correct, the others did not give relevant answers. Interestingly, all the female consultants, but only about the two-thirds of the male consultants considered the standard form to be correct. Kontra also remarks that all the twelve consultants over fifty considered the standard form to be correct, while 11 of the 34 consultants chose the nonstandard form. However, it has to be remembered that at least 10 of the 12 consultants over 50 were teachers,²¹ so it is seriously debatable that age is a critical factor in this case. In the case of *bölcsöde* ~ *bölcsőde*, 15 of the consultants considered that they used an incorrect form. Most of them, 12, said that the standard *bölcsőde* is correct, but they use the nonstandard *bölcsöde* (half of the workers and some apprentices, shop assistants and students made these statements). It is important to stress (and Kontra does not) that the correct form is relatively easy to guess as the word is derived from *bölcső* 'cradle', in which the length of the final vowel is not questionable, as word-final mid vowels are always long in Hungarian. Nonetheless, two workers and an apprentice judge that *bölcsöde* is the correct form, but they use *bölcsőde*. Additionally, 24 of the consultants (among them also 3 teachers and 5 students) thought that *bölcsöde* is the correct form and they use that, while only 10 consultants (7 of them were teachers) stated that *bölcsőde* is the correct form, and they use that. The situation is strange but understandable: despite the etymology, the pronunciation with a short second-syllable vowel is so widespread, that most of the speakers do not doubt its correctness. Those who have been faced with the fact that the normative form contains a long vowel, are likely to follow presumed expectations: edu-

²¹ It is worth remembering that according to the data by Szeredi on page 237, only the ten teachers were over 50.

cated consultants maintain the picture that they speak the standard form, while workers are free to admit that they do not.

Finally, Kontra concludes that consultants with a lower social status show a higher degree of linguistic insecurity. However, the figures presented by him do not support this claim unambiguously. On page 322, he states that teachers gave different answers 6 times altogether, while students 15, shop assistants 19, workers 22 and apprentices 14 times. These numbers show that just teachers show radically lower linguistic insecurity than others. On page 323, he shows that 5 of the teachers and of the shop assistants, 7 students, 8 apprentices and all of the workers gave different answers at least once (and maximally three, in the case of workers, four times). Both cases show that apprentices and students are closer to each other than students to teachers and apprentices to teachers. A more convincing interpretation of the data could be that teachers are expected to speak correctly; therefore, they are less likely to admit that they use an incorrect form. Students and apprentices also feel some pressure, but to a lesser degree. The difference between the answers of shop assistants and workers might be explained by the fact that communication with foreigners is an integral part of the job of the shop assistants, so they also can feel some pressure to speak correctly. In any case, this hypothesis needs further support from the data.

Miklós Kontra: *Mustra a BUSZI-2 kétdimenziós adataiból* [Excerpts from the two-dimensional test data of BUSZI-2]. While the one-dimensional data of BUSZI-2 tests (that is, the proportions of the different answers given to the questions) were published in 2010, the two-dimensional data (that is, those which show the effects of gender, age, social class and immigration to the answers) are still unpublished. In this paper, Kontra demonstrates some two-dimensional data. According to him, profession has the strongest effect, although he differentiates just two classes: the educated class (teachers and students) and all the others. One of his examples is the test presented above in the review on Mátyus et al. In the case of *farmerben/farmerban* without a preceding pronoun, 55% of the educated and 36.7% of the non-educated chose the front form (the difference is not significant). In the case of *ebben a farmerben/farmerban*, 85% of the educated and 43.3% of the non-educated chose the front form, and the difference is significant. In the case of *abban a farmerben/farmerban*, 50% of the educated and 30% of the non-educated chose the front form, and the difference is insignificant. The cases when the suffix on the pronoun and the suffix on the noun are the same are

interpreted by Kontra as “priming prevails”. However, for consultants who gave the same answer in all the cases (and the data suggest that approximately half of them did that) priming is not attested at all. (It would be interesting to know whether there were consultants who preferred disagreement between the two suffixes, i.e., who said *abban a farmerben* but *ebben a farmerban*). Kontra stresses that only the educated are prone to priming and only with a front pronoun.

He also demonstrates some other cases when educated people show a different linguistic behavior, e.g., the stigmatized *inekció* [inɛkʦio:] ‘injection’ instead of the standard *injekció* ([in.jɛkʦio:] or [ɲj.ɛkʦio:]) is used by just one educated consultant but by half of the others. A similar distinction was attested in the case of the test sentence *Ezek az én gyerekeim, azok viszont...* ‘These are my children, but those are’, which was ended with *Pistáéi* ‘those of Pista’ (with a plural marking of the possessed) by half of the educated consultants, but just every tenth non-educated ones (the others used *Pistáé* ‘that of Pista’, in which the plurality of the possessed is unmarked, and the standard interpretation of which is that the possessed is in singular).

Similarly, in some cases, age groups showed different preferences. Two groups were distinguished: 26 consultants were under 24, and 22 over 24 (the age of two consultants is unknown). As an example, the accusative form of *pettyes* ‘spotty, dotted’ was *pettyeset* /pɛc:ɛʃɛt/ for 80% of the youngsters, but only for 45.5% of those who were over 24 (the others answered *pettyest* /pɛc:ɛʃt/). With the same example, gender has a strikingly similar effect: *pettyeset* was used by 81% of women but only by 53.6% of men. 21 of the 50 consultants were labeled as immigrant: these consultants tended more to distinguish /e/ and /ɛ/ (see above in the review of Hattyár et al.). None of them used the form *iszok* ‘I drink’ instead of *iszom*, while 11 of the 29 Budapest-born consultants did (at least in a given task).

Kontra concludes that out of those tasks in which the effect of social factors was proven, the ones influenced by profession outnumber those that are influenced by age, while gender and immigrant status had an effect just in isolated cases. Nonetheless, as he stresses, the analysis was done just on the results of the sentence complementation tasks, so they cannot serve as a basis for any wider generalizations.

3. General evaluation

The book is a multifarious collection of papers. The untitled block of papers is interesting mainly from the point of view of research history. The introductory studies can be fascinating primarily to those who are planning using the BUSZI data or who are about to initiate a similar project. Analyses can be divided into two groups. Papers on phonetics/phonology, morphology and syntax are dominantly decent studies and rely on thorough data processing. However, studies based on test data often struggle to find significant differences between different groups due to the low number of data, especially when BUSZI-3 and BUSZI-4 data are not available. Other papers rather just offer some insights or preliminary data and lack any exhaustive analysis – but many times even these include interesting results.

References

- Grétsy, László – Kovalovszky, Miklós (eds) (1980), *Nyelvművelő kézikönyv. Első kötet. A–K* [A handbook of language cultivation. Vol. 1]. Akadémiai Kiadó, Budapest.
- Grétsy, László – Kovalovszky, Miklós (eds) (1985), *Nyelvművelő kézikönyv. Második kötet. L–Zs* [A handbook of language cultivation. Vol. 2]. Akadémiai Kiadó, Budapest.
- Halácsy, Péter – Kornai, András – Németh, László – Rung, András – Szakadát, István – Trón, Viktor (2004), *Creating open language resources for Hungarian*. In: *Proceedings of Language Resources and Evaluation Conference (LREC04)*. European Language Resources Association, Lisbon.
- Kiefer, Ferenc – Siptár, Péter (eds) (2003), *A magyar nyelv kézikönyve* [A handbook of the Hungarian language]. Akadémiai Kiadó, Budapest.
- Labov, William (2006), *The social stratification of English in New York City*. Cambridge University Press, New York.
- Rebrus, Péter – Törkenczy, Miklós (2016), *Types and degrees of vowel neutrality*. *Linguistica* 56: 239–252.
- Váradi, Tamás – Oravecz, Csaba – Peredy, Márta (2012), *A Budapesti Szociolingvisztikai Interjú lexikai és szintaktikai jellemzői* [Lexical and syntactic properties of the Budapest Sociolinguistic Interview]. In: Váradi, Tamás – Prószéky, Gábor (eds), *Általános Nyelvészeti Tanulmányok XXIV. Nyelvtudományi kutatások* [Studies in General Linguistics, vol. 24. Research in language technology]. Akadémiai Kiadó, Budapest. 199–222.

FEJES LÁSZLÓ
Nyelvtudományi Kutatóközpont