SÁNDOR MATICSÁK – ANIKÓ NIKOLETT TÓTH

BILINGUAL FINNO-UGRIC DICTIONARIES IN HUNGARY

For many years research on the Finno-Ugric languages in Hungary took place in the context of comparative historical linguistics. These languages played a role in the reconstruction of the protolanguage, in the establishment of etymologies and in the outlining of grammatical systems. Subsequently some of the languages began to be studied for their own sake as, following the publication of texts, chrestomathies describing related languages and descriptive grammars were produced. Languages that had been in many ways ‘dead’, in that they were studied by linguistic historians, gradually ‘came to life’. Thanks to the political changes of the late 20th century, the fall of the Soviet Union and the increased permeability of borders, it turned out that the languages of Hungarian’s linguistic kin in distant lands are used not just by the guests at the quinquennial Finno-Ugric congresses, but it is also possible to communicate in them in real life. Exchanges also supported this fact: Hungarian and Finnish scholars, researchers and students travelled to the Volga area and the Ural region and also more and more people came to Hungarian and Finnish universities from these areas to teach students and colleagues their mother tongues, their own living languages. (This is not the place to deal with the unfortunate economic conditions and prospects of the Finno-Ugric peoples living in Russia, nor to review the extensive literature relating to this topic. See for example PUSZTAY 1993, 2006; SAARINEN–HERRALA 2008; SANUKOV 2000; TAAGEPERA 2000). All of these changes made it essential for lexicography to develop and to turn to living languages.

The most important dictionaries of the Finno-Ugric languages are the etymological dictionaries. This article touches upon these only glancingly. The first such dictionary was the Magyar–ugor összehasonlító szótár by József Budenz (1873–1881) (where Ugric actually meant Finno-Ugric), and the Finn Otto Donner’s Vergleichendes Wörterbuch der finnisch-ugrischen Sprachen (1874–1888) was published at the same time. The next piece of work appeared after a long gap: Björn Collinder’s Fenno-Ugric Vocabulary (1955). This was followed by a major Hungarian synthesis, A magyar szókészlet finnugor elemei (1967–1978), then as the culmination of research into Uralic etymology by the Uralisches etymologisches Wörterbuch (1986–1991). Meanwhile, Finnish and Hungarian linguists were not idle either; the Finnish etymological dictionary appeared from 1955 onwards (Suomen kielen etymologinen sanakirja), followed by the more innovative Suomen sanojen alkuperä (1992–2000). On the Hungarian side, we should mention the Hungarian (A magyar nyelv történeti-etimológiai szótára, 1967–1976) and German (Etymologisches Wörterbuch des Ungarischen, 1991–97) versions of the historical-etymological dictionary. Etymological dictionaries of individual Finno-Ugric languages fall outside the purview of the present article.

In what follows we deal only with bilingual (Hungarian and Finno-Ugric) dictionaries and glossaries written by Hungarian authors and published in Hungary (the only exception being in respect of Estonian, where we deal with the full range of dictionaries). We also survey dictionaries written by Hungarian authors in German as an

1 Passages about the dictionaries of minor Finno-Ugric languages were written by Sándor Maticsák. The chapter introducing Estonian dictionaries is Anikó Nikolett Tóth’s work.
intermediary language, and glossaries published in the chrestomathies of individual Finno-Ugric languages. Earlier dictionaries satisfied only the needs of historical linguistics and contain a treasure trove of knowledge collected on research expeditions at the end of the 19th and the beginning of the 20th century. More recent dictionaries are decidedly more communicative and attempt to record the vocabulary of the living language.

**Vogul (Mansi)**

Although János Sajnovics established as early as 1770 that Hungarian and Lapp are linguistically related (*Demonstratio*), and Sámuel Gyarmati had described the relationship of all the Finno-Ugric languages in a scholarly manner in 1799 (*Affinitas*), the Hungarian public, being in the fever of the reform era, and drawing on the memories of the glorious past, rejected the idea of a “kinship smelling of fish”. Given this social background, many years had to pass before a survey of the languages and lives of the Hungarians’ kin could begin. The first to realize that one of the priorities for linguists was research on the Ob-Ugric languages was Antal Reguly. He reached the Hungarians’ linguistic kin in Siberia in 1843 and spent a year and a half there collecting unique material, but his early death unfortunately prevented him from publishing it. A prominent figure of the second generation of Finno-Ugric linguists was Bernát Munkácsi, who collected a great deal of linguistic and ethnographic material on his journeys to the Voguls and Votyaks (1888–1889), thanks to which he succeeded in interpreting most of Reguly’s texts. He was able to publish several works as a result of his own Vogul fieldwork (*MUNKÁCSI 1892–1921; 1894; MUNKÁCSI–KÁLMÁN 1952, 1963*). The vocabulary of the first three volumes of the *Vogul népköltési gyűjtemény* was compiled by Móric Szilasi (1895), of the fourth volume by Zoltán Trócsányi (1909). Szilasi’s words in 1895 proved prophetic: “It will be a long time, alas, before we can possess a complete Vogul dictionary.” However, even he could not have imagined that we would have to wait nine decades for it. (On Munkácsi’s life, see KÁLMÁN 1981.)

The task of compiling this dictionary devolved on Béla Kálmán, professor of Finno-Ugric studies at Debrecen’s Kossuth Lajos University, who completed this task with the assistance of Magda A. Kövesi, László Keresztes and Antal Kiss (*MUNKÁCSI–KÁLMÁN 1986*). The name of Béla Kálmán is familiar to the educated Hungarian reading public mainly because of his excellent popular work on onomastics, *A nevek világa*, but his fieldwork on Hungarian dialects is also well-known. As a Finno-Ugric scholar he was an expert on Vogul; besides a number of essays, he produced *Chrestomathia Vogulica* (of which the 20-page glossary was for a long time the only aid for Hungarian Finno-Ugrists learning Vogul). Béla Kálmán edited Munkácsi’s material and although it was already accessible to scholars in the 1960s, the dictionary itself was not published until 1986.

Kálmán writes in the preface of his dictionary as follows: “As it appears now, almost a hundred years after the fieldwork, this work should be seen rather as a historical-dialectal dictionary of Vogul in as it was in the late 19th century.” This is true, but as

---

2 In this paper, we use the traditional names of Finno-Ugric peoples, those which are better-known to the Hungarian general public.
Vogul is studied only at universities, primarily by Finno-Ugric and secondly by Hungarian majors, it is not surprising. The dictionary is for scholarly use (the meaning of the words is given in Hungarian and German) and presents difficulties for the outsider even in terms of just reading the data, with all its diacritics and in locating the entries attested from several different dialects; and the vast number of examples and citations from Munkácsi’s collection can also deter users unaccustomed to such material (the Hungarian and German word index is indispensable). For the professional, however, this dictionary is extremely useful: it contains a great deal of information about the vocabulary of the Vogul dialects which are rather distant from one another. Leafing through the pages of the dictionary, the everyday life of Hungarians’ fishing and hunting kinsmen living in difficult circumstances comes to life (már ‘arrow without a metal tip’, pajp-kwoľ ‘handle of a birch-bark butt’), together with their beliefs (uj-kěńšěltaytě ēriŋ ‘bear-waking song’, mårakă ‘wife of the water prince’). The core vocabulary also demonstrates the close kinship of Vogul and Hungarian: Vogul k̂iť ~ Hungarian két ‘two’, χ̄ūn̄m ~ három ‘three’, sâm ~ szem ‘eye’ etc.

Ostyak (Khanty)

The Hungarian lexicography of the other Ob-Ugric language consists mainly of glossaries. Bilingual dictionaries are lacking, perhaps partly because it was PAASONEN (1926) and KARJALAINEN (1948), and then the German STEINITZ (1966–1975), who provided syntheses in their time. The first of the Hungarian glossaries was Bernát MUNKÁCSI’s Ostyak glossary. In this, he published the material collected by Károly Pápai, his colleague who died young. Pápai visited the Ostyaks in 1888, but he did not have the opportunity to publish his material, so this task fell to his mentor. The experienced linguist edited the ethnographer Pápai’s data and complemented it with Castrén’s and Ahlqvist’s relevant material, then added Pápai’s Russian entries giving the meanings of words with their Hungarian equivalents.

This glossary was followed by Ödön Beke’s Northern Ostyak material (BEKE 1907–1908). It was back in 1898–99 that József Pápay visited the Ostyaks on an expedition organized by Count Zichy. It took a long time to publish his materials: the texts were edited by Edit Vértes. (For more information about Pápay, see KISSNÉ RUSVÁI 2010). His Northern Ostyak glossary was edited by Ödön BEKE (1959).

More recent glossaries are associated with the name of the outstanding Ostyakologist László Honti. His Northern (HONTI 1978a) and Surgut (HONTI 1978b) material appeared in the journal Nyelvtudományi Közlemények. The former is an approximately 280-word collection of songs and riddles recorded from four informants from Kazym; the latter is a 16-page wordlist containing the material collected in Tromagan and Pim while the author studied in Leningrad.

It was also Honti who published a Northern Ostyak glossary four years later, edited from three 19th century dictionaries in manuscript: those of Popov, Roslyakov and Bartenev (HONTI 1982). This is an exemplarily thorough piece of scholarship; it contains 1706 items and the meanings of the illustrative sentences and words are given in German. Béla Kálmán estimated that over 10 per cent of the material in these glossaries had not appeared in any earlier source (KÁLMÁN 1983: 465).

Another essential work by László Honti was the gap-filling handbook Chrestomathia Ostiacica published in 1984. Its glossary of nearly two thousand words, representing the
texts in the volume, is given in a simplified, somewhat more “user-friendly” transcription. The other chrestomathy featuring a glossary of the Northern dialect is structured similarly (SZ. KISPÁL–MESZÁROS 1980). The transcription employed in the latter is difficult to read: the extensive use of diacritics is problematic even for university students.

**Zyrian (Komi)**

An outstanding achievement of Zyrian lexicography is Dávid FOKOS-FUCHS’s dictionary (1959). Only two comparable works were available before this: WIEDEMANN’s work from 1880 and a dictionary by WICHMANN and UOTILA from 1942. Like that of many other such works, the publication of this one, too, came decades after the collection of the materials: Fokos had collected texts as early as 1911 and 1913, during his study trips; and later, in the years 1916–17 he also recorded some valuable linguistic information from Zyrian prisoners of war (as did Beke, from Cheremis ones; see below). The dictionary of 7,000 entries (22,000 words altogether) is something of a cross between an essential tool for Finno-Ugrists and a vocabulary of the living language. The former feature is illustrated by the fact that etymologically related words are shown within the same entry; the latter characteristic appears in the rich hoard of example sentences and expressions that aim to clarify the different shades of meaning. Fokos provides multiple inflected forms for nouns and verbs, which helps with the morphological features of the stems. This dictionary is an important source for Zyrian word-formation, thanks to the large number of compounds and derived words in it. A point of interest is the fact that Fokos includes and duly identifies many Russian loans. (For an evaluation of the dictionary, see RÉDEI 1960).

The outstanding scholar of Permic Károly RÉDEI published F. A. Volegov’s vocabulary material from 1833 in 1968. Volegov was the head of the salt mine in Usolye and he gave a copy of his own Permyak material to Reguly as a gift. (Permyak is one of the major dialects of the Zyrian language; Russian researchers consider it to be a language in its own right.) This material had been gathering dust in the manuscript rooms of the Hungarian Academy of Sciences until Rédei published it. The entries of this approximately 4000-word glossary in Cyrillic characters are a valuable source for both linguists and ethnographers. The entries are followed by the Russian meaning, then the transcription of the Permyak word into Latin characters, together with the meaning in German. The volume also has a Russian word index.

Another of Károly Rédei’s publications is his *Chrestomathia Syrjaenica* (RÉDEI 1978). This contains a 31-page glossary, which is an indispensable aid for university students learning Zyrian.

The head of a university department in Szombathely, János Pusztay, has published several dictionaries as part of his many series of publications. Between 1993 and 2003 ten pocket dictionaries, practical and useful, appeared in his Hungarian Centre for Finno-Ugric Lexicography (three of Estonian, two of Mordvinian and one each of Zyrian, Votyak, Cheremis, Nenets and Latvian). The seventh volume of this series is the Zyrian–Hungarian dictionary of Nikolay Kuznetsov, a linguist with excellent Hungarian active knowledge in Estonia (KUZNETSOV 2003). The 171-page dictionary gives the entries in Cyrillic letters. The structure of the dictionary is clear, with meanings and homonyms clearly separated, and many expressions to help learn the living language. It
is a pity that it does not contain more entries. There is an appendix, *Rövid komi nyelvtan* (‘A Brief Grammar of Komi’), by the series editor János Pusztay, giving the essentials of Zyrian grammar, from phonological issues through the long established morphological categories to syntactic notes. This is a very useful addendum, which makes the work of the language learner much easier. (The other volumes in the series also contain such summaries.)

**Votyak (Udmurt)**

We owe the first scholarly glossary of Votyak to WIEDEMANN (1880), in an appendix to his Zyrian–German dictionary, but this 40-page list is of limited value both in terms of phonetic notation and its arrangement of dialects. Hence Bernát Munkácsi, who has already been mentioned in connection with Vogul lexicography, wrote the following about his 1885 field trip to the Kama area (one of the results of which was his extensive *Votják népköltészeti hagyományok*): “My greatest concern besides collecting texts was to re-examine the vocabulary of [Wiedemann’s] Votyak dictionary and to expand its material as much as possible” (MUNKÁCSI 1896a: VI). Munkácsi strove for philological accuracy; he indicated the dialect area, the irregular (and perhaps unreliable) forms and the derivation of each word. His procedure in giving the meanings is exemplary, as besides the Hungarian and German equivalents of the words he also provides explanations in Russian or Tatar: “I considered the most important prerequisite of the critical method to include as accurately as possible those original Russian or Tatar explanations of the words which were provided by my informants as they tried to describe the meanings of expressions for me” (MUNKÁCSI 1896a: XVIII). Another of Munkácsi’s goals was to collect ethnographical material and this is why he tries to define or explain words that fall within the scope of mythology and folklore tradition; see for example the description of the summer and winter solstice (*invożo-dir*, 53) or the detailed definition of the “domestic ghost” (*Voršud*, 683). Thanks to his carefulness, this voluminous work (818 pages including the German index) is still, after more than a century, an indispensable aid for Votyak scholars. The dictionary was reprinted by János Pusztay in 1990.

After the publication of Munkácsi’s dictionary there was little lexicographical activity in Votyak for a long time. The noted Permic scholar Yrjö Wichmann’s comprehensive dictionary, which was the result of his late 19th century field trip, appeared only in 1987 (WICHMANN 1987). Of the series of Finno-Ugric chrestomathies published in Hungary, that devoted to Votyak was the work of Sándor CSÚCS (1990). The 32-page glossary of this work has proved very serviceable in the training of university students.

In the last decade, István Kozmács has made a concerted effort to familiarize Hungarians with the living Votyak language. His course book (KOZMÁCS 1998) was published before the turn of the millennium; this has a short Votyak–Hungarian and Hungarian–Votyak glossary. His Votyak–Hungarian dictionary came out in the Lexica Savariensia series in 2002 (KOZMÁCS 2002). This extensive work (almost 500 pages) contains the corpus of earlier dictionaries on the one hand (in addition to Munkácsi and Wichmann also Finnish and Russian works), and material about today’s living Votyak language (mainly media and imaginative literature) on the other. Kozmács introduces an important innovation which indicates some emphasis on the living nature of the
language: he includes neologisms, marking them with the abbreviation nyúj, e.g. йыгдон ‘greenhouse’, кун ужчи ‘statesman’. However, the dictionary also contains much dialect material. The traditional sphere is also well represented: гербер ‘holiday after spring ploughing and before reaping’, куккем ‘bride kidnapping’, мамаля ‘table service for pagan sacrificial rites’ etc. As these are a people living close to nature it is appropriate that he includes many plant and animal names, such as those for the common hedge hyssop, the common tern, or the red-breasted flycatcher. At the end of the dictionary there is a well-organized 26-page grammatical conspectus of Votyak grammar, with illustrative tables and many useful sentences and expressions.

Cheremis (Mari)

The above-mentioned Antal Reguly, after his expedition to Siberia, also carried out research in the Volga area. At the request of the Hungarian Academy of Sciences he travelled to the land of the Cheremis, the Mordvins and the Chuvash in 1845. His severe illness and early death prevented him from arranging and publishing his material, so this was left to succeeding generations. The Vogul and Ostyak material was edited by Hunfalvly, while József Budenz was entrusted with publishing his Cheremis data. The latter published this rich material (876 sample sentences and two sermons) in 1864, in Nyelvtudományi Közlemények, and then used it as the basis for a Cheremis grammar. His 3,000-word vocabulary list first appeared in Nyelvtudományi Közlemények (BUDENZ 1865a), then also as a separate publication (BUDENZ 1865b). In fact, the dictionary is trilingual, because the Latin equivalent of each word is given as well as the Hungarian. Verbs are listed in the first person singular – due to morphological considerations – and a few derived words are given in the entry of the base word. Budenz also pays special attention to the origin of the vocabulary, and also indicates the Tatar or Russian origin of certain words: “I made a separate list of words of Russian origin, which are not relevant from the point of view of Altaic linguistics; there are many of these, especially in the Bible translation and often without any need for them.” (BUDENZ 1865: 334).

Some decades later, Móric Szilasi also published a Cheremis dictionary. His work of 6,800 entries first appeared in Nyelvtudományi Közlemények in several instalments (1898–1900) and then it was also published in a separate volume (1901). His dictionary is twice the size of that of Budenz, for he also used the material collected by Finnish researchers (Arvid Genetz and Volmari Porkka) and the corpus of Troickii’s Cheremis–Russian dictionary, published in Kazan in 1894.

In the fertile period of the “heroic age”, few could have imagined that it would take decades for the next dictionary of Cheremis to appear. At the time of World War I, Ödön Beke, an outstanding Hungarian scholar of Cheremis, was entrusted by the Hungarian Academy of Sciences with collecting as much valuable material as possible from Cheremis prisoners of war. The songs, proverbs, tales and spells recorded from 29 informants from nine dialect areas remained in manuscript for a long time and only after the cataclysm of World War II were they published, between 1951 and 1961 (for detailed bibliographical data, see VELENYÁK 1963). Furthermore, the second volume had been lying among the unpublished dictionary material and slips for decades, and was only published in 1995, thanks to the good offices of János Pusztay (BEKE 1995).

The publication of Beke’s dictionary material proved even more difficult. Trying to publish this immense quantity of dialectal material had for decades been just a pipe-
dream, until 33 years after Beke’s death – Gábor Bereczki, an outstanding Finno-Ugric scholar and Margarita Kuznetsova, a Cheremis linguist living in Hungary, undertook the editing of this huge corpus. As a result of their labours, the dialect dictionary of some 3,332 pages, in nine volumes, came out in János Pusztay’s Bibliotheca Ceremissica series around the turn of the millennium (BEKE 1997–2001). In his evaluation of this work Gábor Zaicz wrote (ZAICZ 2002: 161): “I think that both the conceptual-methodological framework and the practical solutions of the dictionary are to be commended; the entry-words are easy to locate, and the entries themselves are also clearly structured.” The entries follow the principle of etymological arrangement; they contain the various dialect variations and a substantial number of illustrative sentences also. This work is therefore a priceless resource for Cheremis historical linguistics and dialectology.

Gábor Bereczki also wrote a course book very much appreciated in university training (BERECZKI 1990). The lucidly structured, clearly transcribed and easy-to-use glossary of his chrestomathy (99–123) has been aiding students learning Cheremis for two decades now.

It was also Margarita Kuznetsova who ensured that the everyday variety of Cheremis be made accessible to those who were interested. Her easy-to-use and practical dictionary appeared as the ninth volume in the above-mentioned valuable Szombathely series, the Lexica Savariensia (KUZNETSOVA 2003).

**Mordvinian (Erzya, Moksha)**

Mordvinian is a language with an almost unmatched lexicographical past and present. Antal Reguly visited the land of the Mordvin people between 1843 and 1846 and his collection (tales and songs) together with his glossary – complemented with Ahlqvist’s and Wiedemann’s material – was published by József BUDENZ in 1866 (BUDENZ 1866). The 86-page glossary gives Moksha entry-words followed by the Erzya forms (it is a peculiarity of the glossary that Budenz gives verbs in the first person singular form, due to morphological considerations). He does not include words of Russian origin.

Jenő Juhász began to collect material from the Moksha dialect “from course books, literary texts, newspapers and scientific booklets” in 1926. He continued his fieldwork in the prisoner-of-war camp in Nastola, Finland in 1942, where he worked with four Moksha prisoners of war. Following his death in 1960, the editing of the material was taken over by István Erdélyi, and the book finally came out the following year (JUHÁSZ–ERDÉLYI 1961). The 183-page dictionary contains the vocabulary of four Moksha dialects. To use it, one needs some linguistic background, as the transcription in the dictionary is difficult (it still contains the reduced velar, palatalized k and f etc.) The dictionary-user’s work is eased by a Hungarian index. Owing to its relatively limited vocabulary, its difficulty of use and the minor role of Moksha in Hungarian higher education, this dictionary was not widely used.

The next Mordvinian lexicographical work is an Erzya glossary (ERDŐDI–ZAICZ 1974). This 106-page list of some 1,300 words, originally prepared for ERDŐDI’s chrestomathy (1968), in fact encompasses the core vocabulary of Mordvinian. After each entry the authors provide both derived and compounded forms in an etymological arrangement. As the structure of the dictionary is lucid and the transcription used is
straightforward, it played an important role in university training until the late 1980s, when it was superseded by László KERESZTES’s chrestomathy (1990), the 1,700-word glossary of which contains the vocabulary of all the texts and readings of the book, both Erzya and Moksha (e.g. kud M, kudo E ‘house’; kši E, M ‘bread’ etc.) The chrestomathy – together with the glossary – played an important role in the training of Finno-Ugric majors for a long time.

Mordvin lexicography’s new golden age in Mordovia, Finland and Hungary alike occurred in the 1990s; comprehensive dictionaries, etymological and phraseological dictionaries, course books and conversational pocket guides mushroomed at this time (for details, see MATICSÁK 1996). The most prominent representative figure of Mordvinian lexicography in Hungary is Edit Mészáros. Her Erzya–Mordvinian course book – which is well-structured, containing a 3,000-word Erzya–Hungarian, Hungarian–Erzya word index – is still an important aid for Finno-Ugric majors (MÉSZÁROS 1998). Her Erzya–Hungarian dictionary, co-authored with Raisa Shirmankina, appeared in 1999, with a revised and expanded edition four years later in the above-mentioned Szombathely series (MÉSZÁROS–SHIRMANKINA 1999, 2003). In this work Mordvinian is not a “dead” language, used only in university training as a matter of special interest, but a living one. Their editing principles are highly commendable: “In compiling this dictionary, we aim to provide not only the frequently used vocabulary of the language, but to include also as many rarer words of ancient origin as possible; at the same time, we have given only those words of Russian origin that occur most frequently in core vocabulary, or that were adopted in a modified phonetic form” (p. 5). It is greatly to the credit of the editors that this dictionary consists not just of a mechanical set of entry-words and meanings, but also of many expressions and colloquial terms. The dictionary is also rich in scientific terminology, especially from the fields of botany, zoology and linguistics. A wealth of expressions referring to everyday life and folk customs in the Volga area were also included, e.g. kúrńik ‘wedding pirog (large pie filled with vegetables or meat)’, onava ‘wedding kibitka (covered sledge used to carry the bride)’, pëřim ‘Erzya woman’s tiara’, pulaj ‘Erzya back apron’, suzyma ‘thick, sour milk, strained through a linen cloth, similar to cottage cheese’, tаušia ‘Christmas folk song’.

The dictionary tries to solve the difficult problems of the transcription of Finno-Ugric languages in two ways. The 1998 edition gives the Erzya entry-words in Latin letters, the 2003 edition in Cyrillic. Both solutions are, to a degree, justified (for details of the dictionary, see MATICSÁK 1996; ZAICZ 2007).

With Edit Mészáros at their head, a five-member editorial team recently published the first Hungarian–Erzya–Mordvinian concise dictionary (MÉSZÁROS et al. 2008). The 985-page dictionary contains about 17,000 entries, but altogether it comprises some 38,000 Hungarian words and expressions. The Erzya equivalents are shown in both Cyrillic and Latin transcription, which is very useful to students and scholars (even forms arising out of the uncertain nature of Erzya orthography are included at some points).

The vocabulary of the dictionary is up-to-date, meeting even the requirements of comprehensive dictionaries of world languages. (The headwords include computer, mobile phone, internet, cable, network and e-mail, for example.) There are many phraseological units in the entries and also a satisfying amount of collocations and grammatical arguments. Substantial special terminology is also included, from medical
terms through botany and zoology to sport. It would perhaps have been good to have the conjugation/declension for Hungarian words, or at least to have a guide showing inflection at the end of the dictionary.

A whole series of Erzya equivalents are to be found next to the individual Hungarian words, so that this dictionary is in a way also a dictionary of Erzya synonyms; e.g. *süt* (= bakes) ‘řestams, żařams, pańems, valdomtoms, valdo maksoms, ežďems, kaľams’; or the word *csapdás* (= strike n.) for example has 41 equivalents, the word *csattanás* (= crack, snap) has 14, *cesenget* (= rings) has 31, *csillámlik* (= sparkles, glitters) has 19 Erzya equivalents in the dictionary (it is another matter that in the absence of any other information, we cannot be certain what shade of meaning each synonym has or exactly how it is used). Unfortunately, abbreviations and acronyms are omitted from the dictionary. In spite of all this, however, this comprehensive dictionary is very useful in education, research, and can also be recommended to those who wish to learn everyday Mordvinian. (For more about the dictionary: FÁBIÁN 2008.)

A Moksha–Mordvinian–Hungarian dictionary was also published in the Lexica Savariensia series (MOLNÁR 2003). This very brief pocket dictionary containing only the most essential words of the Moksha dialect is designed along the same principles as the other volumes in the series. It is lucid, with clear, up-to-date vocabulary. It is a pity that its brevity means it cannot be really used in either research or in the teaching of the living language.

**Lapp (Sami)**

Research on the Lapp language was neglected in Hungarian Finno-Ugric linguistics until the 1980s. This was partly because these peoples of the far north were very difficult of access, but also because Finnish, Norwegian and Swedish linguists were so far ahead of the field in such research. This scantiness of research is clearly reflected in Hungarian Lapp lexicography, too: there is virtually nothing other than Ignác Halász’s dictionaries, now more than a century old, and the glossary of György Lakó’s chrestomathy to be mentioned here.

Ignác Halász made three study trips to the land of the Swedish Lapps in the 1880s and 1890s, as a follower of Budenz. The outcome of his fieldwork was four volumes of folk-poetic material and – based on this – a grammar, several essays, dictionaries and word-lists. Unfortunately, his early death in 1901 prevented him from accomplishing his career goals.

Halász’s finest achievement is his Southern Sami dictionary; however, he also prepared glossaries of Pite Sami and Lule Sami (HALÁSZ 1884, 1891, 1896).

The earliest of his works is a 140-page trilingual dictionary (Hungarian and German meanings are given after the Lapp entry-words) based on texts from Lule- and Pite-Lapppmark published in 1884. The data are transcribed in a rather simplified format (for which he was criticized by the distinguished Swedish Lappologist K. B. Wiklund). Halász provides the nominative plural of nouns and sometimes also the genitive singular; with verbs he gives the first and third person singular forms and, in light of morphological considerations, the third person singular forms of the negative declension.

After Halász’s dictionaries 85 years passed before the next glossary appeared. The 40-page glossary in Gyögy Lakó’s chrestomathy (1986) satisfied the needs of Finno-
Ugric scholars temporarily, but today a more up-to-date dictionary is sorely needed (one that also resolves the issue of transcription), even if excellent dictionaries of the living language have mushroomed in Finland in recent years.

**Estonian**

Estonian with its 1.1 million speakers is the smallest official language of the European Union; nevertheless it has a special place among the ranks of languages chosen by Hungarians (to study and to research). The status of the language is, of course, enhanced by the fact that it is linguistically related to Hungarian – this is why it is possible to study Estonian at four universities in Hungary (and at ELTE University of Budapest it is a major in its own right). At the same time, however, students who are interested and who travel to Estonia are no longer motivated by linguistic kinship alone; they study and become fond of Estonian for its own sake.

Intensive Estonian–Hungarian contacts have existed since the beginning of the twentieth century, though these were not always maintained during times of war. Still, intense interest on both sides has been steady; it has been possible to study Hungarian in Tartu since 1922. Nonetheless, the first dictionary did not appear until 1993, and no help was available for language learners apart from course books. All the same, there have always been enthusiasts who have managed to acquire the other language despite all the hardships via a third language (and dictionary). Currently the following selection of dictionaries is available: two Estonian–Hungarian and two Hungarian–Estonian dictionaries, one of each published in Hungary and one of each in Finland; furthermore, a newly issued Hungarian–Estonian concise dictionary. Unfortunately, the range of course books in these two languages is not very diverse either.³ Language learners (both Hungarians and Estonians) often use English or monolingual books, or ones intended for Finns.

Estonians have always taken the more active part in the nursing of cultural relations between the two nations. This is shown by the fact that while Estonian dictionaries, like Finnish–Hungarian ones, are the works of linguists and lectors (the latter both as authors and as contributors), there is no Hungarian lexicographer to be found among them, except for János Pusztay. Recent dictionaries are the result of hard work on the Estonians’ part, and were published in Estonia; native lectors participated in the preparations more as contributors than as authors.

In what follows, only bilingual dictionaries will be mentioned, and not glossaries in course books or phraseological dictionaries.

---

János Pusztay and Anu Nurk are the authors of the first dictionary published (PUSZTAY–NURK 1993). This Estonian–Hungarian dictionary from 1993 contains about 7,000 entries on 324 pages. It is based on Estonian and Estonian–Finnish dictionaries, as well as Estonian-, Finnish- and German-language Estonian course books. As regards its word stock, it includes the important words most frequently used in everyday communication, but idiomatic expressions and collocations can also be found within the brief entries. It gives some kind of starting point for the inflexion of words, in that for nouns besides the nominative and the singular genitive, the singular and plural partitive is also given; with verbs the ma-infinitive, the first person singular present, the first person singular imperfect and the da-infinitive forms are provided. The greatest disadvantage of this work is the fact that even shortly after its publication, it became a rarity; moreover, having been published in Hungary, it has never been available to Estonians, other than in university libraries. (An expanded and updated, 15,000-entry version of the dictionary – prepared with the help of Kristiina Lutsar, the Estonian lector in Szombathely – is currently ready for publication.)

The first Hungarian–Estonian pocket dictionary was published in 1995 edited by János Pusztay and Tiina Rüütmaa, a previous Estonian lector at Szombathely (PUSZTAY–RÜÜTMAA 1995). Considerations of space mean that the approximately 8,600 entries of this 547-page pocket dictionary are limited to core vocabulary, but it is commendable that the editors managed to include some idioms and phrases. The primary source for the dictionary was an Estonian–Hungarian pocket dictionary published two years earlier, and a Hungarian–Estonian dictionary edited by István Papp and László Jakab in 1985 was also used to increase the number of entry-words and expand individual entries. Although the intended audience is not specified in the informative bilingual preface, from the structure of the entries it can be inferred that it is primarily for Estonians learning Hungarian. This is odd, because the dictionary in question is, again, a work published in Hungary and available to Estonians only in a very limited way (apart from copies at the Finno-Ugric Department of the University of Tartu and in some libraries).

The division of some headwords into two parts is clearly designed for learners of Hungarian: the sign || divides the constituents of compound words and also separates verbal prefixes (co-verbs), as in egy||ház ‘church’; egyet||ért ‘to agree’; fal||óra ‘clock’; labda||rigés ‘football’. Pronunciation is indicated after each entry, for example: egészség (egésség) ‘health’. Homonyms are differentiated by Roman numerals. Orientation among the different meanings of a word is aided by guide words in brackets. Information useful for the learner of Hungarian is shown in square brackets, but only with nominals: 1. orgon|a (hangszer) [-át, -ája, -ák] 2. orgon|a (virág) [-át, -ája, -ák] (1. ‘organ’ /instrument/ 2. ‘lilac’ /plant/). The dictionary does not contain any appendices or grammatical tables.

In 1999 the authors of the above-mentioned pocket dictionary published a work entitled Észt–magyar szójegyzék az EU Magyarországról írt véleményéhez, which contains 175 pages of Estonian and 113 pages of Hungarian vocabulary and also 56 pages of selected passages. In this series, the editors’ goal was to make available bilingual reference material for use in teaching language and European studies, taking the documents of the European Union as a starting point. Hence this glossary can be seen as a kind of terminological dictionary. The series furthermore contains English–, Finnish–, French–, German– and Italian–Hungarian glossaries, which are all bilingual.
adaptations of the text of the AGENDA 2000 Avis. The authors of the dictionary wanted this glossary to make a contribution to the entry of both countries into the European Union, and to provide bilingual reference material that can be used in language teaching. However, this glossary contains all the words of the EU document, so it includes words like *forell* ‘trout’, *kivi* ‘stone’, *leib* ‘bread’ or *mees* ‘man’. The greatest merit of this work is that it offers many expressions used in politics, e.g. compounds based on the entry-word *valimised* ‘election’: *õigus hääletada kohalikel valimistel* ‘he has a right to vote in the municipal election’, *üleriigilised* ~ ‘general election’, *kohalikud* ~ ‘municipal election’, *vabad ja õiglased* ~ ‘free and lawful election’, *valimiste tulemused* ‘results of the election’.

After the publication of the first Estonian–Hungarian dictionary, we only had to wait seven years for a new one to appear. An indisputable achievement of the Estonian–Hungarian pocket dictionary edited by Sven-Erik Soosaar (*Eesti–ungari sõnastik*) is the fact that it was published in Estonia, so that a dictionary was at last also available to Estonians (SOOSAAR 2000). The dictionary contains 9,000 entries on 184 pages. Compared with the dictionary published in Szombathely, there are no significant changes in content, only typographical modifications. The entries are usually short, rarely containing phraseology, and lacking illustrative sentences and idioms entirely. This is the first dictionary to include a grammatical summary, even if only of the Hungarian language for Estonians. It is laudable that the various meanings of a given word are differentiated not by numbers, but with the help of Estonian synonyms or words in brackets, which is more useful to the language learner: e.g. *koor* (*puu*) ‘bark’; (*vilja*) ‘skin’; (*piima*) ‘cream’. After Hungarian verbs – which are given in the third person singular, in line with lexicographical tradition – their infinitive forms are also provided, which may also help the Estonian learner.

In 2007, the counterpart of the Hungarian–Estonian pocket dictionary (*Eesti–ungari sõnastik*) appeared, also edited by Sven-Erik Soosaar and published by Ilo sõnastik publishing house (SOOSAAR 2007). This dictionary contains about 8,000 dictionary items on 171 pages. Its advantages and disadvantages are the same as that of the Estonian–Hungarian dictionary of 2000, but the conspectus of grammar is more comprehensive. The two glossaries by Soosaar are intended for those who have just started learning Hungarian and use the language in the course of their work or on holiday. The intended audience is again the Estonian user. Even so, it is most unfortunate that although these are bilingual dictionaries, the prefaces and the instructions for use are given only in Estonian.

The Hungarian–Estonian dictionary (*Magyar–észt szótár*) published in June 2010 is much more comprehensive than its predecessors, and provides up-to-date vocabulary and idioms (SEILENTHAL–NURK 2010). The general editors of the dictionary are Tõnu Seilenthal and Anu Nurk, who edited the section *A–Ny*. Two Estonian lectors, Kirli Ausmees and Anu Kippasto (then working in Debrecen), contributed to the manuscript (Ausmees: *O*; Kippasto: *O–Zs*); the language editors of the dictionary were Paul Kokla and Viktória Tóth. The 42,000 entry-words comprising the dictionary are supplemented by many illustrative sentences in both languages; the Hungarian entries are supplied with grammatical information.

Editors always face a difficult task when they start writing a new dictionary, especially if they are not revising an existing dictionary but trying to compile a completely new one. Earlier Hungarian–Estonian dictionaries would not have been
suitable as a starting point for creating entries in the new one, if only because of their 
moderate size (and Sven-Erik Soosaar’s Hungarian–Estonian dictionary appeared only 
after the compilation of the manuscript); nor was there an up-to-date Hungarian–Finnish 
dictionary available to assist them in their task. Hence the main sources for data 
collection were the 2003 edition of the Magyar értelmező kéziszótár (Concise 
Dictionary of the Hungarian Language), the 2000 edition of the Magyar–angol kéziszótár (Hungarian–English Concise Dictionary) by Tamás Magay and László 
Országh and the 2002 edition of the Magyar–német kéziszótár (Hungarian–German 
Concise Dictionary) by Regina Hessky.

The editors strove to be as user-friendly as possible, as can be seen in the declension 
and conjugation tables, or in the fact that grammatical information is indicated not by 
reference numbers but given in brackets after the entry. It is unfortunate, however, that 
this, the only Hungarian–Estonian concise dictionary, does not have an appendix 
providing a brief grammar summary and inflectional paradigms.

Consistency in providing Hungarian grammatical arguments is an advantage for the 
Estonian user, e.g. kitüntet vkit/vmit vmivel ‘reward sy/sg with sg’. Estonian arguments 
are shown only in unpredictable cases: jätma (kedagi/midagi kuhugi) ‘leave sy/sg 
swhere’.

The editors bore in mind recent changes in Estonian and Hungarian society, and they 
also took into account recent specialist terminology. The diverse terminology promised 
in the preface is evident in the inclusion of words like: European Committee, European 
Bank for Reconstruction and Development, EU-conform, EU membership, European 
Union. Likewise, the changing socio-economic situation is reflected in the compounds 
based on words like stock exchange and law (the dictionary includes 86 compounds 
based on the latter). Also, many words reflecting the development of computer 
technology are included: domain, to e-mail, to print, online, server pack, internet, world 
wide web, hard-drive, and related expressions: attached file, to get/send an e-mail. 
Besides the literary language, the dictionary also contains a reasonable amount of 
colloquial language and other linguistic strata.

Encyclopaedia-like entries are a point of interest in this dictionary. These only occur 
when justified, so the vocabulary material does not become too wordy. These additions 
are usually taken from the Hungarian Értelmező Szótár: dobostorta (= ‘layered 
chocolate cake with hard caramel top’) Dobosi tort (karmellglasuuri kihiline 
biskviitort); guba (= ‘Hungarian peasants’ long sleeveless frieze cap’) <vahelekootud 
villanupsudega paksust kalevist varrukateta mantel>. Furthermore, it is evidence of the 
editors’ care and attention that there are also entries without equivalents in any of the 
dictionaries used: aradi: az ~ vértanúk, az ~ tizenhárom (= ‘the martyrs of Arad, the 
Arad thirteen’) <6.10.1849 Aradis hukatid 13 Ungari kindralit>; fehérterror (= ‘white 
terror’) valge terror (Ungaris 1919–1920).

There are also numerous creative illustrative sentences and contextualized examples, 
e.g. tasak: a Dilmah filteres tédk aromazáró ~ban kerülnek forgalomba (= ‘little bag’: 
Dilmah filter-tea is sold in flavour-seal packaging). The dictionary is rich in 
phraseological material too, e.g. aki másnak vermet ás, maga esik bele (‘harm hatch, 
harm catch’; az nevet, aki utoljára nevet (‘he who laughs last, laughs longest’); (úgy) 
él, mint Marci Hevesen (‘live the life of Riley’).

All things considered, Hungarian lexicography gained a major asset with this fresh 
dictionary containing up-to-date vocabulary prepared according to clear principles.
Samoyedic

Though this paper is limited to dictionaries of Finno-Ugric languages, a brief survey of the Hungarian lexicography of Samoyedic, the other branch of the Uralic language family, will not be without interest. (Samoyedic research began in the 1840s, with the Finnish M. A. Castrén; from the “heroic age” of this research Kai Donner can be mentioned as the most important scholar; his 1910 material was published in 1944 by A. Joki. He was followed by T. V. Lehtisalo, whose Yurak Samoyed dictionary came out in 1956.) The editing of Hungarian Samoyed dictionaries began with József Budenz’s Yurak glossary, which appeared in Nyeltudományi Közlemények (1890). Károly Pápai, who died at the tragically early age of 32, organized an expedition to Siberia with his friend, Bernát Munkácsi in 1888, where Pápai carried out ethnographic and anthropological research among the Ostyaks and the Samoyeds. His Selkup material appeared only six decades later, thanks to Péter Hajdú (Hajdú 1952).

Another name in the brief history of Hungarian Samoyed lexicography is that of László Szabó, who collected Selkup texts in Leningrad in 1964; he also produced a glossary to the published material (Szabó 1966). It was also about this time that István Erdélyi issued a glossary of the Taz dialect of Selkup, based on six course books and three grammatical descriptions (Erdélyi 1969). After a long gap, another work was added to the treasury of Samoyed lexicography: the final volume in the Lexica Savariensia series, János Pusztay’s Nenets–Hungarian dictionary (Pusztay 2003).
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Finnugor/magyar szótárak

A magyarországi finnugrisztika magas színvonalát nem csak az elmúlt százötven év hosszan sorjázó monográfiái és szakcikkei mutatják, hanem a szótárirodalom gazdagsága is jelzi. A történeti-összehasonlító nyelvészeti nélkülözhetetlen etimológiai szótárak jelentős része magyar szerzőkhöz fűződik, s hasonlóan gazdag az egyes finnugor nyelvek szótárainak sora is. A rokon nyelveket sok nemzedéken keresztül elsősorban a nyelvtörténeti kutatások tárgyaként tanították, az utóbbi évtizedek politikai változásai következtében azonban egyre inkább élő nyelvként tanulják a Volga-vidékre vagy Szibériába utazó kutatók, diákok; ezek a változások a szótárszerkesztési gyakorlatban is megfigyelhetők. Szinte minden finnugor nyelv lexicológiai irodalma gazdag. A vogul szótárak közül meghatározó a Munkácsi Bernát hagyatékát szótárrá szerkesztő Kálmán Béla műve, a votják lexicográfiból szintén Munkácsi, a zürjénből Fokos Dávid, a cseremiszből Beke Ödön, a lappból Halász Ignác nevét emelhetjük ki a 19. század végének, 20. század elejének alkotói közül. Igen gazdag a mordvin szótárgyűjtemény is, melynek sorából kiemelkedik Mészáros Edit nemrég kiadott nagyszótára. Külön kell szólnunk Pusztay János szótársorozatáról: a Lexica Savariensia öt kisebb finnugor nyelv szótárai mellett már nyenyec anyagot is tartalmaz. A tanulmányban külön fejezet foglalkozik az örvendetesen gyarapodó észt lexicográfával, melynek eddigi legfontosabb műve a Tõnu Seilenthal és Anu Nurk főszerkesztésében nemrég napvilágot látott nagyszótár.