

Some Remarks on a Review

In these remarks I will comment on a number of statements made by Paul Schveiger, concerning major theoretical issues, that either do not adequately represent what is contained in my book or are based on a misinterpretation of it. Typical examples of the latter are instances where the reviewer draws far-reaching conclusions about my semantic views or, indeed, about my attitude to contact linguistics as a whole, on the basis of certain examples taken from the chapter on phonetics or—where tackling a single classification—he ignores all the others. I will also have to make a few methodological points.

Where possible I will attach my remarks to characteristic passages taken from the review.

Anthropolinguistics

a “Bakos . . . seems to show little interest in the anthropolinguistic (including socio-cultural) aspects of the problem” (1.1). The whole of Chapter 10 in my book deals with exactly those aspects under the title “The distribution of our Rumanian loanwords in terms of conceptual classes; consequences for economic and cultural history” (pp. 401–52). In the chapter on semantics, there is a separate section on connections between “Economic history and semantic change” (pp. 104–5). In the same chapter, the following question: “What are the concrete socio-cultural factors influencing the main areas our Rumanian loanwords cover?” (p. 106) is followed by a socio-cultural analysis. I am aware that it is not what Schveiger has in mind, thinking as he is in terms of the American methodological framework. Of course, the latter type of investigation would also be justified in principle—though I doubt if it would be of as much interest with respect to Rumanian *vs.* Hungarian.

b “we speak about cultural bilingualism when it involves the educated strata of (one or more) population(s)” Schveiger remarks (1.2.1) before going on to give a more or less accurate paraphrase of what I, referring to Béla Köpeczi’s personal communication, adduce as motivation for my use of the term ‘cultivated bilingualism’ (pp. 179–80). The term may well occur in other papers, but then the reviewer ought to have pointed this out. It is rather strange that all he has to say about the paraphrased part of my book is “This type of bilingualism is only implied by Bakos” (1.2.1).

The classification of borrowings

a “Bakos, p. 139, classifies the loan words only on the basis of the following trichotomy” (1.3.1). Undoubtedly, there is one particular classification (reborrowing, multiple etymology, reiterated borrowing) on the page the reviewer refers to. Still, it

must have escaped his attention that it is only one of several types of classification; in fact, my book also contains, among others, the following types: direct/popular borrowing *vs.* literary/official adoption (p. 399); conceptual categories (Chapter 10, see above); various stages of territorial diffusion (Chapters 4 and 9B), etc. The reviewer adds (*loc. cit.*), "this classification needs further refinement" [*sic*], and lists other criteria (numbered I to IV) as well. Of these, his criterion IV ("strata of L_2 to which the borrowed words belong") appears *expressis verbis* in my book, cf. the table on page 378 and Chapter 9C "Items having penetrated higher stylistic layers" (pp. 394–400). True, there is no separate list of genuine Rumanian items *vs.* ones that are borrowings in Rumanian as well (Schveiger's I and II)—but the Rumanian etymon of each entry is followed by what Schveiger claims is missing: "the etymological status of the borrowed word" [in Rumanian].

b "he does not classify the loan-words according to their position (standard, dialectal, etc.) in Rumanian and Hungarian" (6.2). In my book, I make special mention of items of literary Hungarian, professional vocabularies, and Transylvanian regional standard (pp. 394, 379); as well as specify the social/geographical range or layer of each entry in the dictionary section. The reviewer is right in saying that I do not systematically discuss the geographical range of Rumanian etymons; yet a number of individual remarks of that sort are to be found in Chapter 10 where I deal with semantic micro-structures (fields), as well as, again, with certain Rumanian etymons (e.g., *pracska* p. 471, *pujica* p. 472, *styeracs* p. 474, *untyes* p. 476, *zimcak* p. 477, *zsentelt* p. 478, etc.).

c "two types of borrowings belong to this category (i) necessary in L_2 and (ii) redundant in L_2 . . . See also Bakos 35, who does not make this distinction" (1.2.2). It is true that I do not make a distinction, on the page referred to, between the necessary, therefore widespread, item *cinemintye* and the occasional, hence very rare, item *páznik*; but that is because they are examples taken from the chapter on phonetics, and illustrate the behaviour of Rumanian *n*: how they were borrowed is simply beside the point here. Incidentally, I point out in several cases, especially with respect to *hapax legomena*, that occasional borrowings are a totally different matter from those motivated by certain social or cultural factors.

Semantic aspects

a "Bakos seems to be little interested in the semantic aspects of word borrowing" (2). This is rather surprising remark from the reader of a book containing a detailed chapter on semantics (pp. 85–109) in which I attempt to provide a typology of semantic changes taking place during lexical borrowing. Again, Schveiger takes his example from phonetics: in particular, from my discussion of Rumanian *c* [t]. He is quite right

that "the Rum. *ciordi, măceș* [are] determined by the different socio-linguistic strata they belong to" but that has no particular relevance as the page he refers to (p. 41) concerns the development of the sound *c*.

b "Bakos distinguishes (pp. 86–87) »modification of meaning« from »autonomous meaning development« but does not explain the difference" (2). I have to contradict the reviewer again: all he should have done is read the bottom of page 86 and the top of page 87 to be able to discover the respective definitions. The differentiation in question, by the way, is not my own 'invention', either, and I duly refer (loc. cit.) to statements made by scholars as renowned as L. Deroy and T. E. Hope. All this and sections III/1–2 of the chapter on semantics will clearly reveal that, contrary to Schweiger's opinion, the differentiation has a fairly important theoretical and practical significance.

Phonetics

a "...the prothesis of (e), (i) before the initial groups (st-), (sc-) ... remains unexplained" (4). As part of the discussion of fricatives, Section 3.7 of my chapter on phonetics deals with exactly the phenomena mentioned here (p. 41). What is more, on pp. 42–3 I provide a detailed tabulation of various types of integration.

b "Bakos also leaves unexplained [sic] the so-called pleniphony, well known from the history of Slavic languages ($C_{(r,l)} + (V) \rightarrow (V + C + V)$ " (4). A separate section of the chapter on phonetics discusses what happened to loanwords containing initial consonant clusters; those "of which the second element is *l* or *r*" are given individual treatment (48: 1.2).

c "One of the main reasons for Bakos' »mistakes« is that he denotes by (\check{V}) both the stress and the length of the vowel; another reason may be that he does not distinguish between the various positions in which a phoneme/sound may appear" (4). These objections call for a somewhat lengthier reply.

(a) It is quite true that the acute accent over vowel letters has two different functions in the two languages. In Rumanian, it denotes stress, whereas in Hungarian length (*i*, *ó*, *ú*) or else difference in openness (*a/á*, *e/é*) accompanied by difference in length. However, any Rumanian grammar (even if it does not include an accurate phonological description) will point out that stressed vowels are significantly longer than unstressed ones. Thus, despite undeniable differences, there are also certain features in common in the two systems; or else the regular substitutions I describe could hardly have taken place. These facts are well known to anybody working in the field; still, I consistently refer to stressed vs. unstressed Rumanian vowels and long vs. short Hungarian ones (e.g. pp. 16, 18). I can only hope my text is unambiguous in this respect.

(b) As to positions: do stressed and unstressed environments not qualify as 'positions'? Still, I think I have to trouble the reader with a couple of quotations at this point: "Absolute word final unstressed *a* sounds are replaced . . ." (p. 16: 1.3; cf. p. 17: 2.6); "Some of our *o*-initial Rumanian loanwords . . ." (p. 19: 4.6); "Word initially . . ."; "In word-final position . . ." (both: p. 26: 2). The section on consonants is wholly based on positional distribution. At the beginning it reads "Except for certain positions to be discussed later on, plosives . . ." (p. 28: 1).

Chronology

a We leave the possibility of arbitrary chronologization wide open if we do not base ourselves on actually attested data. In principle, Schweiger is right that the borrowing of a word can be assumed to precede its first appearance in written documents (1.4). Still, a chronology built on such assumptions or hypotheses cannot be justified. The principle itself is not unknown to me. Summarizing fourteenth-century developments, I write: "it is not impossible that further Rumanian loanwords will be found from that century" (p. 203); in my summary on the sixteenth century: "we cannot be sure if these words got into Hungarian as late as this" (p. 224). To my mind, saying more than that would amount to leaving firm ground and entering a very slippery territory.

According to my data, *balán* can be attested from 1833, and *murga* from 1788. Schweiger claims that "they were borrowed at the same time" since "there is no internal, linguistic cause for these two semantically closely related words to be borrowed at an interval of 45 years" (1.4). A rule that words belonging to a close-knit conceptual unit must be borrowed simultaneously stands in need of justification, to say the least. It would be a rather arduous task, though, as such a rule contradicts all known facts of linguistic history (and not only with respect to Hungarian and Rumanian). It is true that most loanwords making up a particular semantic group are adopted in one characteristic period—but not the whole group; some of its items may be borrowed before or after that 'classical' period. Furthermore: (a) the time span of forty-five years between the attested appearance of the two words is too short to be historically relevant; (b) Schweiger fails to notice that the nominalized form *balána* (1757) can be attested prior to *murga* (1788). Would that mean that it has to be an earlier borrowing? I do not think this is a fruitful way of doing word history.

First data are, no doubt, of relative value. Further research can always bring up new data; since I wrote my book, earlier occurrences have been attested for certain lexemes. It is only data, however, that can prove anything—and not subjectivistic reasoning such as that of Schweiger concerning the earlier borrowing of *árgyellánus*, *batuta*, and *bucsal*. Or if he has factual data about these items—which is, after all, imaginable—why does he not present them?

b "he considers that in Transylvania an important Rumanian population only existed since the 14th century" (1.4). What I actually wrote is this: "In this century Transylvania already had a fairly significant Rumanian population" (p. 203). Obviously, 'already' does not mean the same as 'only'. I have no intention of denying that in Transylvania there was a stable Rumanian population well before the fourteenth century or indeed that Rumanian transhumance had previously been going on. On the other hand, it is easy to see that Rumanians (living in the mountains) and Hungarians (living in the lowlands) did not necessarily establish contact with each other.

Dialectology

a Schweiger seems to agree with me that a considerable number of Rumanian loanwords have made their way into Hungarian by direct popular borrowing and that "Popular bilingualism leads to the borrowing of popular forms by L_2 " (1.2.2). However, he also maintains that "Many of Bakos' observations about Rumanian dialectal pronunciation are purely impressionistic. . . Moreover by discussing almost exclusively the standard Rumanian forms he renders their accurate phonological analysis rather difficult. Finally, Bakos does not take into account the distinction between the dialectal and standard forms in Rumanian" (4). Elsewhere: "Bakos points out quite correctly that Rumanian-Hungarian 'bilingualism' is mainly dialectal" (6.1). These statements seem somewhat self-contradictory; do I or do I not take dialectal forms into consideration after all, whether 'impressionistically' or otherwise?

Readers of my book will soon discover that both the old and new Rumanian linguistic atlases (ALR, ALR. SN*) as well as half a dozen dialect dictionaries are regularly referred to at the appropriate places (e.g. in phonetics, word geography, and in entries of the dictionary section). All my data on Rumanian dialect forms are based on Rumanian dialectological sources. Admittedly, there also occur some Rumanian dialect forms without reference to the source documenting the sound shape in question; and a small number of particular dialect forms are deducted from summary isoglosses of the Rumanian linguistic atlas. In all such cases, however, the phonetic phenomenon concerned has previously been covered in the phonetics section. Is it perhaps this procedure, trivial as it is in dialectology, that the reviewer finds 'impressionistic'?

There are, in fact, numerous instances where the Rumanian etymon is not given in a dialect form; but what am I supposed to do when there is simply no dialect form (i.e.

* *Editorial Note:*

ALR-Atlasul Lingvistic Român. (Cluj-Sibiu, 1938-1942; ALR SN-Atlasul Lingvistic Român. Serie nouă. București. 1956-1969.

regional dialect and standard do not differ in the given case) or when the phonetic shape of the Hungarian lexeme does not make it possible to trace it back to a Rumanian dialectal pronunciation? (A couple of such characteristic sound changes are dealt with in detail in my book.) Would it not be much more impressionistic if I had constructed hypothetical dialect forms simply for the sake of uniformity? Surely, it is a sounder method to try to work out the exact pronunciation of the Rumanian source-forms on the basis of the phonetic structure of the Hungarian lexemes concerned. One of the main conclusions I draw in my book is that this type of investigation cannot be successfully carried out without taking both Hungarian and Rumanian dialectal phenomena into account (pp. 55–56, 454).

b “Bakos (pp. 116–117) recognizes the existence of an important Rumanian stable population on the present territory of Hungary . . . For some reason, however, he does not discuss the Rumanian words in Hungarian that have penetrated into Hungarian from the speech of the Rumanians living on the actual territory of Hungary” (6.1). On the pages referred to [recte: pp. 115–117], the reader will find dictionary entries of Rumanian loanwords whose occurrence is restricted to the eastern part of present-day Hungary—and which, consequently, must have been borrowed in that region. I also mention the possibility that further lexemes may have been borrowed there (pp. 121–123), though, contrary to what Schweiger believes, contact with transhuming Rumanian herdsmen was probably more important in that respect than contact with those already settled down (1.1.1.2). On the other hand, it is also worth pointing out that numerous lexemes were not locally borrowed but arrived at the Trans-Tisza region by internal migration as Hungarian words previously borrowed more to the South or to the East.

Rumanian vocabulary

Here I conclude the debate with Schweiger though I would have a lot more to say on various matters; I think I have been able to draw attention to the reviewer's biased approach, while admitting that some of his critical remarks are well-founded. Anyway, readers who will find my book worthy of their attention can easily decide for themselves. There is one more thing, though, that I cannot leave unmentioned: Schweiger reveals a somewhat superficial knowledge of Rumanian vocabulary. A paper on etymology might be expected not to contain obviously false etymologies. The reviewer provides a totally mistaken explanation for the Hungarian plant name *iszkumpia* ‘sumac; *Cotynus coggyria*’, tracing it back to Rumanian *scump* ‘dear’ (4); its real source is *iscumpie* ‘sumac’. It is also incorrect to claim that the Rumanian source of *platyika* ‘flat fish’ (< *plătică* ‘idem’) is a diminutive form (3); in fact, it is a direct borrowing of Bulgarian *платика*. A cursory glance at Cioranescu's Rumanian

etymological dictionary would have saved him from such errors. I cannot see why he marked *ardeleana* (1.2.2), *a băciui* (2), and *murgă* (5) with asterisks; these words are included in any scholarly dictionary of Rumanian (e.g. the entries **ardelean**, **băciui**, **murg** in *Dicționarul explicativ al limbii române*. București, 1975.). I could point out several similar mistakes but I will content myself with presenting **roibă* (6.1): here the asterisk is justified as the word is Schweiger's invention: the correct feminine form of Rumanian *roib* is *roaibă*.

Magyar Tudományos Akadémia
Nyelvtudományi Intézet,
Budapest

Ferenc Bakos