View metadata, citation and similar papers at core.ac.uk
brought to you by CORE
provided by UCL Discovery

The role of linguistics in language teaching: the case of two, less widely taught languages - Finnish and Hungarian

Eszter Tarsoly and Riitta-Liisa Valijärvi

The School of Slavonic and East European Studies, University College London, London, United Kingdom

The School of Slavonic and East European Studies, University College London, Gower Street, London, WC1E 6BT, United Kingdom; e.tarsoly@ssees.ucl.ac.uk, r.valijarvi@ssees.ucl.ac.uk

(Received xxx; final version received xxx)

This paper discusses the role of various linguistic sub-disciplines in teaching Finnish and Hungarian. We explain the status of Finnish and Hungarian at University College London and in the UK, and present the principle difficulties in learning and teaching these two languages. We also introduce our courses and student profiles. With the support of examples from our own teaching, we argue that a linguistically oriented approach is well suited for less widely used and less taught languages as it enables students to draw comparative and historical parallels, question terminologies and raise their sociolinguistic and pragmatic awareness. A linguistic approach also provides students with skills for further language learning.

Keywords: language teaching; less taught languages; LWUTL; Finnish; Hungarian; linguistic terminology; historical linguistics; phonology; typology; cognitive linguistics; contact linguistics; corpus linguistics; sociolinguistics; pragmatics; language and culture.

Introduction

The purpose of our paper is to explore the role of different sub-disciplines of linguistics in language teaching, in particular, their role in the teaching of less widely used and less taught (LWULT) languages. More specifically, we argue that a linguistic approach to language teaching is well suited for teaching morphologically complex less widely taught languages, such as Hungarian and Finnish, in the UK context. UCL SSEES is, and has been, the only place in the UK where these two languages are studied in a typological, historical, and applied-linguistic perspective. Accordingly, both Hungarian and Finnish can be studied at degree level only at UCL SSEES and there are no A Level exams in either of them in the UK[1]. This particular

[1] In Hungarian O-levels were available in the 1960s, in other words, until the number of heritage speakers from the various waves of twentieth century immigration was sufficient. At present, there is an increasing interest in reintroducing O-levels, which is no doubt a result of the post-2004 (Hungary's

position of Hungarian and Finnish at UCL in the UK invited the delineation of a new approach to the teaching of these languages. This approach, in turn, bears on language-teaching methodology in general, which we explore in the following discussion.

Despite a commonly-held view in the UK, linguistics is not to be confused with the learning and teaching, or simply the knowledge of, a large number of languages. We believe that it is one of the aims of language teaching to raise students' general awareness of how languages work and that through the in-depth study of a particular language the teacher should invite and encourage students to think about language as a subject of investigation in its own right. A language class therefore should involve drawing historical or comparative parallels between languages, questioning terminologies, and drawing attention to sociolinguistic and pragmatic considerations. The benefits of acquiring analytical skills to explore languages, which by its very nature involves thinking in terms of paradigm rather than narrative, are twofold. Firstly, such an approach arms students with skills that can be applied in further language learning, inasmuch as it helps students to discover new strategies to understand and learn grammar and vocabulary that would otherwise seem impenetrable. Secondly, it offers a new insight into learning in general, and the independent application of newly-acquired analytical tools provides learners with the joy of discovery. Despite these clear advantages, to our knowledge, no systematic overview of a linguistic approach to teaching morphologically complex languages has been published so far.

EU accession) migration of workers and families to the UK. If A-levels are reintroduced in Hungarian this would, to a certain extent, alter the nature of teaching Hungarian in an academic context as well. Finnish on the other hand is currently taught at the International School of London for young learners between the ages of 5 and 18.

This article is also a plea against the common misconception that any native speaker can teach their language. We show that a linguistically trained teacher who also knows a number of foreign languages can facilitate and boost language learning, and such an approach is particularly relevant in the case of languages which students do not encounter until at undergraduate level in the UK. Our approach is therefore unique when contrasted with the various monolingual communicative approaches and language immersion on one hand, and the traditional grammar and translation method on the other hand. English as a foreign language is generally taught through the target-language, communicatively. Finnish and Hungarian are also taught with communicative methods in Finland and Hungary, respectively. This is partly a necessity as usually not all learners of Finnish or Hungarian know the same languages. A communicative, monolingual teaching method can be applied in those contexts more easily than in the academic context in Britain as the students are exposed to Finnish/Hungarian in their daily lives. When teaching lesser-taught languages in the British context, these approaches would be impossible to apply, especially on *ab initio* courses. Counter-evidence suggests that using only the target-language is hardly the most efficient method with adult learners who benefit from metalinguistic discussion and explanation when learning a language (e.g. Cummins 2007). The traditional grammar and translation method, on the other hand, can be useful in the teaching of lesser taught languages but lacks the depth of analysis that a linguistic approach can provide.

We therefore argue that the role of linguistics is greater in teaching less widely taught languages and non-community languages than it is in teaching widely taught languages, such as French or German, or community languages, such as Gujarati or Somali. Among the reasons for this are: students lack exposure to the LWULT

language, the LWULT languages in question do not have loan words from English or cognates with English, they lack cultural connections to Britain and they are structurally and typologically very different. In addition, there are fewer suitable materials for teaching LWULT languages, and, apart from a very few evening courses, Finnish and Hungarian in particular are available only on highly specialised BA and MA courses, which require an extremely steep learning curve and quick understanding of language structure. Our experience of teaching Hungarian and Finnish in this context prompted us not only to re-think traditional and communicative methods which were part of our training and teaching practice but also, building on the other aspect of our training as linguists, to elaborate new methods where teaching a particular language is an *ancilla linguisticae* and, in turn, a linguistically informed approach becomes a means to understanding a particular language.

Languages taught in the UK

LWULT is used in the UK context to refer to the languages that are not widely taught in schools, i.e. languages other than the so-called modern foreign languages, which are French, German and Spanish, but also Italian and Russian (LWW-CETL). LWULT languages are in America called less commonly taught languages (e.g. NCOLCTL). Another term used in the European context is lesser-used languages, which refers to minority languages of Europe (EBLUL).

LWULT languages can be further divided into two groups: community languages and non-community languages. Community languages (Horvath & Vaughan, 1991), also called heritage languages (Kondo-Brown & Brown, 2007; Brinton et al., 2008), are languages that are spoken in a certain country by large immigrant groups or large minorities. A heritage learner is someone who has acquired some linguistic and cultural competence in the language through interaction with

foreign-born parents and other family members (Kondo-Brown & Brown, 2007). Non-community languages, on the other hand, are languages that are not taught in schools and that do not have a large number of speakers in the country in question.

Both Finnish and Hungarian are non-community languages in the UK but they are official majority languages in their respective countries. The communities in the UK are small, scattered, and isolated from each other. According to estimates approximately 30,000 Finns live in the UK, most of them in London (FINEMB). The number of Hungarians in the UK has gradually increased since Hungary's EU accession but there are no statistics available. Some of these people are in the UK only temporarily and can be classified as temporary migrant workers or students; others are married to British people.

Students of Finnish and Hungarian at SSEES, however, are not recruited from these communities. Typically, they lack, unlike learners of community languages, extensive exposure to the language in question before their university studies. In other words, Finnish and Hungarian are learnt formally in an educational, language-classroom setting instead of being informally acquired in their natural environment (Ellis, 2008:288-311).

A thorough survey of various monolingual and bilingual grammars, textbooks, and readers for learners of Finnish and Hungarian would deserve a section, if not an article, on its own right. We are currently undertaking a study of existing material for Finnish and Hungarian as a second language, exploring the various course books, course book series, and additional learning aids from the point of view of the discussion that follows in the section *Sub-disciplines of linguistics in language teaching* of this article; i.e. the way in which various sub-disciplines of linguistics

inform the presentation of grammar and lexis in various text books. Such a detailed treatment of the subject, however, remains beyond the scope of the present study.

Let it suffice to say that the fact that Finnish and Hungarian are not taught widely means that there are fewer suitable materials for teaching them than for teaching more widely taught languages. Although there are some good grammar books (e.g. Karlsson, 2008; White, 2006; Kenesei et al., 1998; Rounds, 2001) and some bilingual textbooks in Finnish/Hungarian and English (e.g. Abondolo, 1998a; Leney, 2004; White, 2005; Pontifex, 2003, Rounds and Sólyom, 2002; Sherwood, 1996a) most of the textbooks are only in Finnish (e.g. Heikkilä & Majakangas, 2008; Kenttälä, 2010; Lepäsmaa & Silfverberg, 2007; Nuutinen, 2007; and Silfverberg & White, 2003) and Hungarian (e.g. Durst, 2004/2006; *Hungarolingua*, 1996; Erdős & Prileszky, 2001; Kovácsi, 1999).

Monolingual text books, in which target language material is presented using only the target language in the course book, potentially with notes or a separate grammar volume in a (or sometimes several) source language(s), are more suitable for teaching Finnish in Finland or Hungarian in Hungary, or teaching Finnish as a second language to Swedish-speaking Finns, who already have considerable exposure to the language. Such course books are excellent sources of well-written authentic dialogues and texts, and are often accompanied by a set of audio CDs or tapes, where the language is presented at approximately native speakers' speaking speed from the outset. The CDs and audio tapes can be useful for students' independent study or in the class room as listening comprehension exercises; some of these course books are an invaluable learning aid because of the wealth of skill-based or grammar exercises they offer. The major drawback of monolingual textbooks is that they lack a contrastive viewpoint in the way they approach language, and thus fail to provide

contact linguistic insights; they also avoid questioning and comparing the use of grammatical terminology. The pragmatic information is implicitly in the dialogues or texts but it remains the teacher's task to make the student explicitly aware of the various differences. This also means that the order and speed at which morphology is introduced and discussed by most monolingual course books hardly caters for the needs of such fast-paced courses as the academic reading courses on MA level or the BA first year course at UCL SSEES. Monolingual course books can be used in the British higher education context only if accompanied by grammars written in English, and both the texts and exercises often require English explanations or additions.

Bilingual course books usually offer a much faster-paced introduction to grammar, which renders them, in fact, the best sources for teaching Hungarian in an academic context. These include some contrasting with English, and terminology is elaborated as it is applicable to Finnish or Hungarian. Sociolinguistic and pragmatic notes are included, as are explanations of culturally important concepts. Bilingual textbooks tend to include fewer pictures and are better suited for self-study than monolingual books. They also require, however, the teacher to use his/her linguistic expertise. For instance, *Concise Introduction* for Hungarian requires substantial input on the part of the teacher because of the originality of its notation system and complex, albeit coherent and transparent, way of presenting phonology and morphology, but once a student is guided through such a course book, s/he will have acquired language learning itself as a truly transferable skill. A major drawback of bilingual course books is that they are produced under commercial constraints, and thus lack space for drills, exercises, translation assignments, as well as annotated and graded reading passages. Most bilingual course books, however, can be used as a

background reading material for students on both degree and evening courses in an English-speaking environment.

Finnish and Hungarian

Finnish and Hungarian belong to the Finno-Ugric (Finno-Ugrian) branch of Uralic languages (Hajdú, 1975; Abondolo, 1998b, reprinted 2006). Uralic is a northern Eurasian language family, in which Finnish and Hungarian are two of the westernmost languages, and whose eastern limits spread to the region of the river Yenisei in western Siberia. Within the European Union some 18 million people speak a Uralic language; among these Hungarian (native name: *magyar*) has the highest number of speakers, approximately 13 million in Hungary proper and the Carpathian basin, and roughly another million elsewhere in the world. Finnish (native name: s*uomi*) is spoken by some 5 million people in Finland and by another half million in Sweden, Russia, and Norway. The third Uralic language which is one of the official languages of the European Union is Estonian, with approximately one million native speakers in Estonia and the surrounding countries. Apart from these three, there are various other Uralic languages with smaller numbers of speakers in Europe, such as Saami languages in the north of Norway and Finland, and Livonian in Latvia.

Within the Finno-Ugric branch of the Uralic family, Finnish and Hungarian belong to widely divergent subgroups: to the Fennic (or Baltic-Finnic), and the Ugric, respectively. It is assumed that proto-Uralic, from which the Uralic languages of today originate, was spoken in the region near the southern end of the Ural mountains. From here it spread partly as a result of the migration of speakers, partly as a result of diffusion towards both the East and the West. After the separation of the Samoyedic branch of languages from Uralic, the break-up between the Finno- and the Ugric subdivisions of the Finno-Ugric branch is the oldest. As a result, there is no question

of mutual intelligibility not only between Finnish and Hungarian but also between Hungarian and the other Ugric languages, Mansi and Khanty, unlike in the case of languages belonging to the Fennic branch, which formed a continuum of dialects in Scandinavia, and therefore a certain degree of mutual intelligibility can be achieved even today, between Finnish and Estonian, Finnish and Northern Saami for instance.

Typologically both Finnish and Hungarian bear traces of their Uralic origins. Examples of such features include the highly agglutinating or concatenating nature of both languages, vowel harmony, the lack of a transitive verb *have*, possessive suffixes, local case suffixes and postpositions. Finnish and Hungarian, however, have picked up various features from the people and languages surrounding them during the migration and in their contemporary environment. In the case of Finnish, the major influence came from Baltic languages, Slavonic, Germanic, and finally Swedish, for five centuries the language of administration on the territory that is now Finland. In the case of Hungarian, during the migration, Iranian, Turkic, and Slavonic were the most salient influences, especially on the lexicon, while Hungarian also borrowed a great deal, lexically but also in its grammar, from its neighbours in the Carpathian basin, mainly Germanic and Slavonic languages but also from medieval Latin, the language of religious service and administration for centuries.

As for the implications of such features in the teaching and learning of Finnish and Hungarian, the morphological complexity of these languages has to be pointed out as a key aspect of grammar and word-formation, in which Finnish and Hungarian differ radically from most other languages of Europe. As a result of this complexity, in theory any noun or verb in Finnish and Hungarian can appear in hundred if not thousands of forms. This is a major challenge faced by the language learner who will

often find that a phrase in English corresponds to a single, but structurally complex, word in these languages.

However, the complexity of Finnish and Hungarian, unlike, for instance, that of Slavonic or Romance languages, is relatively transparent. That is to say, a teacher of, for example, Polish or Russian is unable to give a simple answer to the question 'what is the marker of the dative case?' because number, gender, declension-type, and irregularities all have to be taken into account. In Finnish and Hungarian, on the other hand, it is almost always straightforward to separate the root of a word from any grammatical markers, such as case endings, attached to it. That is to say, mechanisms according to which words (even the dictionary form of a word) are built are complex but regular.

Thus students of Finnish and Hungarian initially struggle with the following (Silfverberg, 1993; Hämäläinen, 1996; Branch, 1998; Latomaa, 1998, Martin, 1999; Nissilä et al., 2006, Korhonen, 2001; Giay, 1998; Sherwood, 2002; Szili, 2006):

- length of words and relatively synthetic word structure
- unfamiliar vocabulary
- suffixes and postpositions instead of prepositions
- use of certain suffixes and argument structure: suffixes have their prototypical uses and extended uses, the arguments of verbs appear in certain cases
- marking the definiteness of the third person direct object on the verb or definite conjugation (Hungarian) and accusative vs. partitive object (Finnish)
- possession and ownership
- non-finite verb forms and their role in syntax

Two characteristics of the lexical stock of Finnish and Hungarian lead to particular difficulties in learning vocabulary or even using a dictionary of Finnish and Hungarian. First, these languages are rich in derived forms and also in compounds. In Finnish an additional complication are the stem-internal changes, known as consonant gradation. Second, the core of the lexical stock of these languages, and thousands of derivates built from this, is of Uralic origin, and is thus unfamiliar to the learner.

Thus, elements of the vocabulary connect with each other much more than with elements familiar from Indo-European languages. As a result, learning basic vocabulary in Finnish and Hungarian is time well spent at the beginning of one's studies of these languages, as illustrated by the examples below. Every new word ties into the derivational patterns of the language, just as every piece of new grammatical information is an element that feeds into the patterns that successful students establish rather early in the learning process.

Given the extremely high number of inflected forms in which both verbs and nouns can occur in Finnish and Hungarian, one of the greatest difficulties for language learners is to identify the form s/he encounters in a text in order to be able to understand the syntactic role, and therefore find the best English gloss, for the form in question. This makes the development of aural skills particularly challenging because the grammatical information follows rather than precedes the lexical information. In the case of written texts the technique of recovering grammatical information from the suffixes after the lexical information has been established can be taught and learnt with some practice, but there is no such way of 'going back' in the case of aural perception of texts.

Therefore, students do not normally have difficulties with reading and reading comprehension. These are skills with which one can achieve relatively good and encouraging results even during a short course. Students also find easy the lack of gender distinctions and the simple tense system. After initial difficulties, students rarely have problems with pronunciation, spelling, and reading because of the (modified) Latin alphabet and the phonemic scripts.

Course and student profiles

Finnish and Hungarian at UCL SSEES and beyond

Hungarian has been taught at SSEES since 1937, and Finnish on a regular basis since 1972, although it was first taught in 1938 (Roberts, 1991; Sherwood and Tarsoly, 2008). Both languages are now taught on four-year BA courses on three levels.

During the first year most of the inflexional morphology of Finnish and Hungarian is covered, and students are expected to acquire intermediate reading, writing, oral, and aural skills in as little as five contact hours a week, over twenty weeks. (The equivalent of the level reached by the end of year 1 in the Common European Framework of Reference for Languages [CEFR] is approximately A2). During a second-year language course the main emphasis is on syntax, subtleties of modality, non-finite verb forms and their role in the creation of relative, complement, and adverbial clauses, as well as derivational morphology. The latter has a very important role in assisting students to acquire new vocabulary: the final exams include translations both ways as well as essay-writing in the foreign language and reading comprehension, all of which has to be completed without a dictionary. During the course students are also expected to develop their translation techniques, and acquire upper intermediate reading, writing, oral, and aural skills. (CEFR-equivalent: B1 to B2.) Students spend the third year of their studies in the country of the target language, on a study visit abroad. The language training during the fourth year builds on the results of this study visit: matters of style, register, and dialect are discussed and the course includes an advanced training in translation techniques from the target language into English, where students are expected to show sensitivity to register and language variety. They also have to compile a portfolio as part of their course work, in which they explore questions of translation, translatability, the problem of

equivalence, idiomatic and dialectal use, etc. (CEFR-equivalent: B2 to C2, depending on students' individual skills and abilities, the course-aim is to reach at least C1).

At MA level the languages are taught in the form of two highly specialised reading courses, MA New Language and MA Intermediate, where students are expected to acquire upper intermediate reading skills (with elementary speaking skills) in as few as 80 taught hours during the first year. The second year of this reading course is for students who have a specific research interest that concerns Finland or Hungary. Regardless of discipline and individual interests, the language course at this level supports students' reading of highly specialised texts: primary or secondary literature in the target language, mostly from the journalistic, academic, literary, and political registers. Both courses are examined by a three-hour written paper, where students have to summarise and translate excerpts from journal and newspaper articles from Finnish and Hungarian into English, and complete an information retrieval task. The great advantage of these courses is that they provide postgraduate students and young researchers with the opportunity to develop intermediate to advanced reading skills, which enable them to conduct research on a topic concerning the target language's country and culture (or, indeed, economics). Besides the reading skills, the *ab initio* course also equips the students with basic survival skills and they are able to talk about themselves in simple terms at the end of the first year.

Besides the degree courses offered by UCL SSEES, Finnish and Hungarian are offered on evening courses and short courses in London (UCL SSEES, University of Westminster, Imperial College, Morley College); in a number of community weekend schools; and outside of London at University of Leeds (Hungarian),

University of Glasgow (Hungarian), University of Edinburgh (Finnish) and University of East Anglia (Finnish).

The students

The BA course students are usually between 18-25 years old. They are normally studying the language of their choice combined with East European Studies or another language, often a Scandinavian language, in the case of Finnish, and a Slavonic language, in the case of Hungarian, or another Indo-European language. Recently, they have chosen to study Finnish because they are interested in Finnish culture, often Finnish music. In the case of Hungarian the main selling points are the peculiarity of the language, culture, and recent political developments. Some students however chose Hungarian because they are of Hungarian descent but know very little or no Hungarian at all. Students of both languages have usually studied a foreign language in school, although not necessarily up to A level. They often have difficulties understanding grammar, apart from the few who, because of the kind of schooling they went through, handle grammar terms with ease. Although even in such instances elucidation of what *case* or *genitive* means in Finnish and Hungarian might be necessary.

The MA course students study Finnish and Hungarian because they want to conduct research in or about Finland or Hungary. They have normally studied foreign languages before embarking on the MA reading course. As the overview in Table (1) shows, during 2007/08 and 2008/09 the MA students of Finnish have had a Slavonic language, Estonian (another Finno-Ugric language) or an East Asian language, such as Chinese, as their mother tongue. They have studied at least English and another European language before. As for Hungarian, during the 2007/08 and 2008/09 academic year students have come from a great variety of cultural and linguistic

background, including also a few French and English, German and English, Romanian and Russian, Uzbek and Russian bilingual speakers. Other than that, students' native languages have included English, German, Russian, Romanian, Finnish, and Mandarin Chinese. Even among monolingual learners, most students know at least one language, other than English, to a very high level (including Korean, Japanese, Swedish, Czech, and Polish, French, Spanish).

The evening course students form a heterogeneous group. They are usually professionals who have a Finnish or Hungarian partner or some other connection to Finland and Hungary, such as friends or relatives, and property or business in the country. They may not have successfully studied a foreign language before but some hold degrees in foreign languages. They are, however, very motivated.

Table 1. Overview of student profiles on Finnish and Hungarian courses 2007 – 2009.

Course	**Mother tongue**	**Learnt languages**	**Number of students per level**	**Reasons for studying/interests**
BA Level 1-3				
Finnish	English, French, Swedish	French, German, Italian, Swedish and Scandinavian languages, Latin, ancient Greek	1-4	translation, Finnish music, Nordic countries, linguistics
Hungarian	English, German, Portuguese, Hungarian/English	Spanish, French, Estonian, Russian, German, Latin, ancient Greek	1-4	translation, literature, theatre studies, East European culture, language
MA *ab initio* and intermediate				
Finnish	Estonian, Russian, Serbian, Chinese, Thai, English	English, a Scandinavian language, a Romance language, Chinese	2-5	Economy Business, History, Culture, Anthropology

Hungarian	English, German, Finnish, Romanian, Russian, Mandarin Chinese, French/English, German/English, Russian/Romanian, Russian/Uzbek, Russian/English	English, a Germanic, Romance, or Slavonic language, Korean, Japanese	year 1: 8-9; year 2: 1-3	Literature, Politics
Evening courses				
Finnish	English	French, German, Russian	5-12	Finnish partner, friends, or family; property or business in Finland
Hungarian	English, French, Spanish	French, Spanish, German, or a Slavonic language	5-15	Hungarian partner, friends, or family; property or business in Hungary

Sub-disciplines of linguistics in language teaching

Terminology and description

Our experience is that linguistic terminology needs to be (re-)explained when teaching Finnish and Hungarian because most if not all terminology refers to different phenomena in Finnish and Hungarian than it does in e.g. Russian or Latin (see Siitonen, 2005; Haspelmath, 2007; and cf. Dixon, 2010). Inadequately applied terminology can lead a student astray and cause confusion (Sherwood, 1991). The discussion and introduction of terminology therefore should not be an exercise for its own sake. It is required only in cases where the use of the appropriate term sheds light to the way in which a particular area of language works.

For example, the Finnish simple past is in most Finnish textbooks called *imperfekti*, which make one think of aspect. It is more useful to call it *simple past* or *past tense*. Secondly, the direct object in Finnish can be marked not only by the accusative case (e.g. *luen kirja-n* ‘I will read the/a book’); it can also be in the

partitive case when the object is uncountable (*juon kahvi-a* ‘I drink coffee’), the action is not finished (*luen kirja-a* ‘I am reading a book’) and when the sentence is negated (*en lue kirja-a* ‘I will not read the/a book’). The partitive is not only the case of the object, it often is a predicative complement as well (*kahvi on kylmä-ä* ‘the coffee is cold’) and it appears after numbers and quantifiers from 2 onwards (*kaksi kirja-a* ‘two books’, *monta kirja-a* ‘many books’). After being shown and practising the different uses of the partitive, students tend to ask “yeah, but *what* is the partitive?” or “can you explain in one sentence what the partitive is?”. The difficulty in understanding the form is probably related to the fact that they have never heard the term *partitive*, English does not have such a morpheme or function, and the form has a wide range of uses. It is difficult for students to understand or, indeed, accept that a sentence in Finnish can be ungrammatical because it lacks something that is not needed in English at all. Local case endings, on the other hand, are easier to understand because they can be matched up with English prepositions, e.g. the inessive -*ssA* ‘in’, the elative -*stA* ‘from’ and the illative -*Vn*, -*hVn* and -*seen* ‘into’.

Thirdly, The Finnish genitive -*n* not only has the same use as *‘s* or *of* in English (e.g. *Liisa-n kassi* ‘Liisa’s bag’, *Suome-n pääkaupunki* ‘the capital of Finland’), but it has wider uses expressing belonging (e.g. *ove-n kahva* ‘door handle’, *ikkuna-n lasi* ‘window pane’, lit. ‘window’s glass’). English would use a compound or a prepositional expression in these instances. The students realise that a genitive is more than a suffix used to express possession.

In the case of Hungarian, an example of the use of carefully chosen terminology is the introduction of the term *aggregational* instead of *plural*. The former is not only historically relevant, but it also draws attention to the fact that there is no agreement in number between the noun and its quantifier, that is, if a numeral or

other quantifier specifies the number of a certain item, the marking of number on the noun is unnecessary; e.g. *ablak* NOM.SG ‘window’, *ablak-Ok* NOM.PL ‘windows’, but *két/néhány ablak* NOM.SG ‘two/some windows’ (see Lotz, 1976:121–163; Sherwood, 1996a, 2002.) The introduction of the new term, on the other hand, does not and ought not to save time from describing the grammatical phenomenon in question. On the contrary, one could argue that it should be one of the aims and outcomes of language teaching to raise learners’ awareness of the fact that terms such as *accusative* or *dative*, or, indeed, *plural*, are used for simplicity’s sake but they refer to different phenomena in every language to a certain extent.

As is obvious from the student profiles discussed above, learning a less-widely taught language in an academic context is often the first occasion when students encounter *termini technici* used in language description. Even if they had studied a European language before embarking on learning Finnish or Hungarian, they would have hardly needed to operate with certain terms that are impossible to avoid when talking about Finnish and Hungarian. Examples of such terms are: agglutination, morpheme, stem, suffix, primary and secondary suffixes, and derivation. Our experience is that at times even more widely-known terms, such as verb, noun, adverb, singular, plural, grammatical case and declination, conjugation, person, grammatical subject, and object have to be explained, addressed and revisited, as do the notions of word classes, number, person, governance, and argument structure, to mention but a few. This, in turn, is a good opportunity to draw students’ attention to the fact that no two languages are exactly the same, therefore grammatical labels and *termini technici* have a slightly different meaning when applied to different languages (see Dixon, 2010).

Discussion of the structural features of Finnish and Hungarian often prompts students to revise their ideas of what a *word* is, and, in turn, what constitutes a sentence, given that in Finnish and Hungarian grammatical information, which is usually represented by what is seen as a separate word in English, is given by bound morphemes, mostly suffixes, and appears in writing as part of a single unit between two spaces. Thus, it is imperative to clarify these terms before they can be successfully employed in teaching the new language's structure. In turn, learning languages such as Finnish and Hungarian in the UK context often becomes a gateway for a better understanding of how language works, inasmuch as the acquired terms and methods of structural analysis can then be employed in understanding and learning other languages (Crystal, 1985, passim; Szili, 2006:23).

Historical linguistics and phonology

The historical-comparative method in teaching Finnish and Hungarian has limited use because there is no language, especially among the languages usually known by students, which is close enough to Finnish and Hungarian for such a discussion to be relevant. Even in the case of the approximately hundred cognates that Finnish and Hungarian have in common the relatedness of words is hardly recognisable to the untrained eye (e.g. F. *kolme* 'three', H. *három* 'three'; F. *ydin* 'marrow', H. *velő* 'marrow'). These, however, are extremely popular with Finnish students of Hungarian. The presentation of findings of the historical-comparative method could, and should, be adopted rather as a methodological approach on the part of the teacher, insofar as the presentation of language facts benefits from a historically informed view of language (e.g. Peter Sherwood's *Concise Introduction to Hungarian,* passim). This helps to explain anomalies and variation which could, and by many course books are, otherwise dismissed as 'irregularities' or 'exceptions' (e.g. Uotila, 1993; cf.

Dixon 2010). Such ‘irregularities’ might otherwise be discomforting for learners, who might come to believe that the grammatical information they are expected to learn is randomly grouped and presented, and merely a result of the teacher’s or a course book’s whim.

For example, in Finnish a regular sound change **ti* > *si* took place (Hakulinen, 1979). It is worth referring to this sound change when introducing the stem type that ends in -*si* > *si* in the nominative singular, e.g. *uusi* ‘new (nominative)’: *uude-* ‘new (inflectional stem, weak grade)’ or *uute-* ‘new (inflectional stem, strong grade). The regular sound change explains the otherwise unexpected presence of the *t/d* in the various forms in the paradigm, although the nominative singular ends in *si*. This sound change also explains why the past tense marker -*i*- triggers a change -*t*- > -*s*- in the stems of some verbs, cf. *sano-a* ‘say-INF’ vs. *sano-i-n* ‘say-PAST-1SG’ and *ymmärtä-ä* ‘understand-INF’ vs. *ymmärs-i-n* ‘understand-PAST-1SG’.

Regular sound changes also help the students of Finnish to understand the phenomenon called consonant gradation which affects the plosives *k*, *p* and *t*. For example, a noun will have strong grade in the nominative, *kauppa* ‘shop’. When the inessive -*ssA* ending is attached to such a noun, the -*pp*- becomes -*p*-, i.e. the strong grade becomes the weak grade: *kaupassa* ‘in a shop’. The weak grade of a single -*p*- is -*v*-, e.g. *tupa* ‘hut’ v. *tuvassa* ‘in a hut’. This can be explained to the students with the weakening of the plosives before a closed syllable (i.e. a syllable that ends in a consonant) and the fortis-lenis contrast (Ladefoged & Maddieson, 1996). The randomness of what might be seen as spelling changes becomes more meaningful and thereby more manageable to the students.

Assimilation explains the active past participle forms. The past participle marker is -*NUT*. It is attached to infinitive stems: *syö-dä* ‘to eat’- *syö-nyt* ‘eaten’ vs.

pes-tä ‘to wash’ - *pes-syt* ‘washed’. In the latter case the -*N*- has been assimilated to the stem consonant *s*-. A historical approach also helps to explain the existence of the different noun and verb types in Finnish.

In Hungarian, verbs whose dictionary citation form ends in -*ít* have features shared with those ending in a consonant cluster. It is essential to clarify at the beginning of a course, when students first come across this phenomenon, that in today’s Hungarian there is no cluster in -*ít*-final verb stems, but they act as if there was one. This is when the findings of historical linguistics come in handy, in highlighting that a *Vχ* > *í* sound change took place in old Hungarian, hence there is an underlying consonant cluster at the end of verbs whose dictionary citation form now ends in orthographic -*ít*. However a minor point this may seem, it is imperative to raise awareness of learners that groupings of noun and verb stem types are established for a good reason and that knowing them from the outset will eliminate some of the burden of learning further paradigms during their studies.

Another example of the adequacy of applying an approach informed by the findings of historical linguistics on synchronic language description in the class room is the case of Hungarian primary suffixes. There are similarities in the pattern of attaching the aggregational (-*k*), the accusative (-*t*), and the 1SG, 2SG, 2PL possessive suffixes (-*m*, -*d*, -*tOk*). The linking vowel in the case of all these can be a mid-vowel with back v. front v. front-rounded variants: [o]:[e]:[ö], or a low-vowel with only a front v. back opposition, [*a*]:[ɛ], in orthography, again <a>:<e>, depending on when the stem in question first appeared in Hungarian (Bárczi, 1976). It is impossible for learners of Hungarian to predict which stems require the odd-seeming alternative of a front unrounded vowel despite the roundedness of the stem (e.g., *könyvɛ-t*) or a low back vowel with a back stem (e.g., *háza-t*). Knowing, however, that the class of such

stems is closed, and that the *-At* type of suffix is therefore no longer productive, is an important plus in the learning process (cf. Sherwood, 1996a, 2007). Another way to explore this connection is to encourage students to treat the vowel as *thematic*, separating the two stem-types throughout, not only in the discussion of the suffixes concerned but also in indicating the stem-type in vocabulary lists, glossaries, etc., which should help students to predict declension type (cf. Sherwood, 1996a; see also Abondolo, 1988, passim).

Further areas where insights gained from historical linguistics might be relevant on a Hungarian language course are the following: 'exceptions' from vowel harmony (Sherwood, 2007); the stem-final *a>á*, *e>é* change in nominal stems before certain suffixes; the notion of agglutination and how suffixes come into being (cf. section *Typology and cognitive linguistics* on local case suffixes); similarities between possessive noun suffixes and, mainly, suffixes of the definite conjugation; *-ik*-final verb stems in their citation form v. the usual -Ø ending in 3SG and the *-ik* paradigm in general; the subjunctive, and orthographical matters (cf. Dömötör, 2007).

The advantages of the historically informed presentation of language material are far-reaching. Students can apply what they learn at the beginning of the course almost automatically, without much assistance on the part of the teacher, to other suffixes, which follow similar patterns. Although at first glance this kind of treatment of the grammar points in question in Finnish and Hungarian might seem unnecessarily time-consuming, and also contradictory to the notion of gradual introduction of grammatical information in the order of level of difficulty, this seems the only practicable way on such fast-paced courses as the reading courses for Masters students.

Typology and cognitive linguistics

A typological approach helps explain the use of morphemes and various syntactic constructions (Latomaa, 1993). For example, unlike most West-European languages, neither Finnish nor Hungarian has a transitive verb equivalent to English 'to have' (WALS). Instead an existential construction is used in both languages: *Anna-lla on auto* 'Anna-ADE is car', i.e. 'Anna has a car'. The construction is used more abstracly for expressing various feelings, e.g. *Annalla on kylmä* 'Anna-ADE is cold', i.e. 'Anna is cold'.

The *habeo* construction is slightly more complicated in Hungarian because belonging is marked on the noun that belongs (the possessed item) in possessive noun phrases: *Anna autó-ja* 'Anna car-3SG', Anna's car'. The dative suffix is available to disambiguate the 3SG possessor but it is neither necessary nor sufficient to establish the possessive relation between two nouns: *Anná(-nak az) autó-ja* 'Anna-DAT car-SG3'. In the *habeo* construction on the other hand, it is necessary to mark the 3SG possessor clearly for the sake of disambiguation, given that 3SG is outside the speech situation. Thus, the dative is employed to mark the possessor, while the 3SG possessive suffix marks the noun that belongs, that is 'owned': *Anná-nak van autó-ja* 'Anna-DAT is car-3SG', i.e. 'Anna has a car'.

Although it is unlikely that students will know other languages apart from Russian that lack a verb *have*, it might be interesting to point out that this phenomenon is rather common in Asian languages (e.g. Japanese), in order to avoid such naïve comments and mystical assumptions about language as "is it possible that Hungarian lost its verb *have* because private property did not exist during Communism?" or "is it not natural for a language to have a verb *have*?". In order to further eliminate elements of exoticism in approaches to language, it might be also worth noting that there is a clear connection between the function of the dative (and

the adessive) and possession on the one hand, and existentials and possessives on the other, in other languages too, which are probably more familiar to students: cf. Fr. *cette voiture est à Anne* or R. *u Anni jest mashina* (on possession see also H. Varga, 2007; Sz. Hegedűs, 2005)

Our students have identified argument structure as the most difficult area of grammar in Finnish and Hungarian. What makes this area of grammar challenging is that the form the nouns are in depends largely on the verb, in other words, a grammatical element prescribed by the verb, which therefore forms a semantic unit with the verb, is formally marked on the noun (cf. Kothencz, 2007). As a result of the seeming randomness of argument structure, students often forget the suffixes or wonder why the noun needs to be in a certain case (e.g. F. *pitää* ‘to like’ and *puhua* always takes -*stA* ‘ELA, from’, *pidän kirja-sta* ‘I like the book’, *puhun kirja-sta* ‘I am talking about the book’; H. *szeretem a könyv-et* ‘I like the book-ACC’ and *beszélek a könyv-ről* ‘I talk about the book-DEL’). Even those students who studied foreign languages (who learned English as a second language for instance) struggle with this because the idea of having to learn a noun suffix as part of the meaning of the verb appears alien.

Argument structure, however, can be contrasted with English, in which it is conceived of in terms of phrasal verbs or prepositions required by the verb. If, as in English, prepositions rather than suffixes were used, in Finnish and Hungarian too, this part of the grammar would seem more straightforward, given that in such cases a preposition, that is, a ‘word’ in its own right, would have to be learnt with the verb rather than a noun ending.

Therefore, the introduction of the notion of grammaticalisation helps to understand how independent words came to be reduced to grammatical units and

started to be suffixed to noun stems at the same time. Very transparent examples of this are the Hungarian inessive *-bAn* (< *bElE* [bél] ‘gut’ + primary local case suffix *-n* > **belen* > *-ben* > *-ban/-ben*), and the postposition *mellett* (< *mell* ‘breast’ + primary local case suffix *-tt*; cf. E. *abreast*) and the Finnish postpositions *rinnalla* ‘beside, next to, together with’ (< *rinna-lla* ‘breast-ADE’) and *kanssa* ‘with’ (< *kansa-ssa* ‘people-INE’, i.e. ‘in the company of’; in a form of spoken Finnish the latter postposition has become shortened into a suffix *-kaa* and it may display vowel harmony variation, i.e. *-kaa/-kää*) (Lehtinen & Laitinen, 1997; Ojutkangas, 2001).

The other side of the coin, and students’ difficulties, has to do with the conceptual system underlying the local case suffixes. Students are advised to learn the form in which the arguments of a verb appear together with the verb but a cognitive semantic analysis of argument structure may also prove to be useful. For instance, the six local case suffixes in Finnish, and the nine local case suffixes in Hungarian are first introduced in their primary spatial meaning, then in their metaphorical use as time-parameters, and finally in their most abstract function as entity-parameters (Kothencz, 2007; cf. Szili, 2007) The first two functions are normally straightforward because the suffixes can be matched with English prepositions (or combinations of prepositions) and students normally find the system of two- and three-dimensional, two and three static, and four and six dynamic local case suffixes in Finnish and Hungarian, respectively, “nice, clear, and logical”. The first problems arise when students encounter mismatches between languages in the conceptualisation of concrete or abstract spaces (E. *in winter* v. F. *talve-lla* ‘winter-ADE, in winter’ v. H. *tél-en* ‘winter-SUP, in winter’; E. *on time* v. F. *ajoi-ssa* ‘times-INE, on time’ v. H. *idő-ben* ‘time-INE, on time’).

Hence, a brief discussion of various types of metaphor might be appropriate here during the lesson; in the case of the local case suffixes, the notion of orientational and structural metaphors can be introduced (Lakoff & Johnson 1980, 2003; Lakoff 1987). This will explain how various entities can be conceptualised differently in different languages but it can also point out the similarities. For instance H. *baj-ban van* 'trouble-INE is, s/he is in trouble' v F. *ol-la pula-ssa* 'be-INF trouble-INE, to be in trouble' v. E. *to be in trouble* v. Fr. *mettre qn dans le pétrin* 'put so in the trough, get so in trouble'; H. *kihúz a baj-ból* '**pull** out (of) trouble-ELA' v. F. *pääs-tä pula-sta* 'get-INF trouble-ELA, to get out of trouble' E. *get so out of trouble* v. Fr. *tirer qn/se tirer d'affaire* '**pull** so/oneself from/out of matter', hence trouble = CONTAINER, space with limits and boundaries, in which one can be trapped (as opposed to *segít a baj-on* 'helps the trouble-SUP, solves the problem' or *sín-en van* 'rail track-SUP is, is on track, [the solution] is on the way', where solution = ROAD, accessible, open SURFACE, no boundaries or limits (cf. Kothenc 2007).

In summary, the combined application of findings drawn from language typology and cognitive linguistics contributes greatly to the contrastive analysis of the source and target language's structure (cf. Sherwood, 2004; Weber 2003). This ensures that parallels drawn between the two systems are based on the contrasting of two types of cognitive mechanisms rather than on the mechanical matching up of elements taken from two entirely different systems (Horváth J., 2003). Unlike in the case of heritage or community languages, the teaching of Finnish and Hungarian as LWULT languages in the UK starts when the conceptual system of students' first language is already formed, thus it is possible to explore the cognitive frame provided by students' first language and show how the cognitive system underlying the two languages correlate.

Finally, it should be pointed out that for those learners who know Estonian some Finnish constructions and basic vocabulary are easy, i.e. there is positive transfer, but instances of negative transfer are more salient where the two languages differ from one another (Kaivapalu, 2005; Ellis, 2008:349-403).

Contact linguistics

Contact linguistics is featured in the teaching of Finnish and Hungarian both when it comes to loan words and to structures. Learning vocabulary is made easier by starting with loan words and pointing out loan words to help memorisation. Drawing parallels between similar structures in languages that the students know has the same effect.

Loan words in Finnish can be divided into the following groups (Lehikoinen 1994):

(1) hypothetical Indouralic words, which are old in both Uralic and Indo-European (e.g. *nimi* 'name'; *sata* 'hundred'; *vesi* 'water'),
(2) Baltic loans (e.g. *heinä* 'hay'; *olut* 'beer, ale'; *puuro* 'porridge'),
(3) old Germanic loans (e.g. *kulta* 'gold'; *kuningas* 'king'; *kynttilä* 'candle'; *mato* 'worm', cf. En *maggot* (< M.E. *maðek*); *murha* 'murder'; *rikas* 'rich'; *sairas* 'ill, sick', cf. En *sore*; *viikko* 'week'; *viisas* 'wise'),
(4) Slavic and Russian loans (e.g. *ikkuna* 'window'; *lusikka* 'spoon'; *vapaa* 'free'),
(5) Swedish loans and German loans via Swedish (e.g. *apteekki* 'pharmacy'; *herra* 'mister, sir'; *housut* 'trousers'; *kakku* 'cake'; *lasi* 'glas'; *poliisi* 'police, policeman'), and
(6) recent English loan words (e.g. *buumi* 'boom'; *meilata* 'to send an email'; *sori* 'sorry'; *tsättäillä ~ chättäillä* 'to chat').

Out of these six different groups of loan words the Germanic and Swedish loans are the most useful ones in teaching Finnish to students who know at least English. The students are able to recognise and learn the Germanic and Swedish loans easily because they resemble their English equivalents.

Finnish structures which have been influenced by Standard Average European (Haspelmath, 2001; Heine & Kuteva, 2006) or Swedish/Germanic are: Finnish tenses, periphrastic future (Dahl, 2000) and a type of present continuous (Tommola, 2000).

Finnish tenses broadly correspond to the core tenses of English, excluding the future and the English present continuous: *syön* 'I eat' (present), *söin* 'I ate' (simple past), *olen syönyt* 'I have eaten' (perfect) and *olin syönyt* 'I had eaten' (pluperfect). The latter two tenses are analytic and contain a past participle, as do the English tenses. *Tulen syömään* 'I will eat' (lit. 'I come to eat') and *olen syömässä* 'I am eating' are generally easy to learn for students of Finnish as the constructions resemble similar constructions in English. The fact that the definite pronouns in spoken Finnish can be used as types of definite articles, e.g. *se mies* 'that/the man' (Juvonen 2000) facilitates the learning of spoken Finnish. Finnish has, despite its initial exotic appearance, similar features as European languages, in particular Baltic, Slavonic and Germanic (Dahl, 2008), which once again makes the language more manageable for students.

The teaching of Hungarian benefits from contact linguistics mostly in the area of loan words, loan translations, and calques. In the course of its history Hungarian borrowed mostly from the following languages (Zsilinszky, 2003):

(1) Iranian (e.g. *tehén* 'cow'; *tej* 'milk'; *tíz* 'ten'; *asszony* 'woman'; *híd* 'bridge'),
(2) Turkic (e.g. *kantár* 'reins'; *alma* 'apple'; *bér* 'wage'; *gyöngy* 'pearl'), and later (16th century) Ottoman Turkish (e.g. *dívány* 'sofa'; *szandzsák* 'Turkish administrative unit'),
(3) Slavonic, later Serbian and Croatian, and Slovak (e.g. *barát* 'brother, monk'; *ebéd* 'lunch'; *sapka* 'hat'; *csizma* 'boots'; *család* 'family'; *szabad* 'free'),
(4) German (e.g. *céh* 'guild'; *polgár* 'citizen, bourgeois'; *kalmár* 'merchant'; *lárma* 'alarm > noise'; *bliccel* 'dodge'; *stréber* 'nerd'),
(5) Latin (e.g. *lecke* 'lesson, homework'; *iskola* 'school'; *tinta* 'ink'; *nótárius* 'notary'; *diéta* 'diet, parliamentary session'),
(6) Romani and Yiddish dialects, mostly as slang words (e.g. *csaj* 'girl'; *meló* 'work, job'),
(7) neo-Latin languages: Italian, Romanian, and French, some via German from the latter: (e.g. *tárgy* 'object'; *bástya* 'bastion'; *part* 'shore'; *cimbora* 'friend, accomplice'; *zseni* 'genious'; *rúzs* 'lipstick'), and
(8) more recently, English (e.g. *tréner* 'trainer, coach'; *bridzs* 'bridge, card game'; *sztár* 'star, celebrity'; *büdzsé* 'budget'; *szájt* 'internet site'*;* *csetel* 'is on chat', *emailezik* 'emails')

From these groups the most significant from the viewpoint of teaching Hungarian are those between 4 and 8. These, and some Turkish loans, are those words which

Hungarian has in common with languages and cultures surrounding it; students are often native speakers of, or know, a Slavonic language or German, they obviously all recognise loans from English and some also from French, and in the continuous flow of alien-looking vocabulary it is a delight to come across words that remind them of something vaguely familiar. In the case of Latin and German, however, the greatest advantage would be to explore calques and loan translations and the influence of these languages on not only Hungarian compounds but also on non-finite verb forms, argument structure, and syntax (cf. Horváth L., 2003).

Corpus linguistics

We have identified four ways in which language corpora can be useful in language teaching: 1) identifying frequent vocabulary items and collocations, 2) identifying the frequency of certain inflectional forms or lexical items in particular speech situations, 3) identifying the frequency of derivational and inflectional suffixes in a particular function, and 4) identifying the saliency of a form so that it can be taught at the right stage (cf. Sinclair 2004). The students of Finnish and Hungarian benefit greatly from frequency lists of lexical items, which can assist them in acquiring new vocabulary. This is especially useful on second and final year BA courses, where the final exams include translations both into English and the target language, and the use of dictionaries is not permitted.

In Finnish and Hungarian there is a wealth of material to assist the teacher in preparing glossaries for use in language teaching. The Finnish materials include frequency lists, one based on newspaper texts from the 1970s (Saukkonen et al., 1979) and another one on dialects from 1992 (Jussila et al., 1992), a reverse dictionary (Tuomi, 1980), newspaper, television, fiction, and dialect corpora available online (Kielipankki) and a corpus of old written Finnish (Kotus). The Hungarian resources

include the *Reverse-Alphabetized Dictionary of the Hungarian Language* (Papp, 1969), the *Frequency Dictionary of Hungarian Literary Language 1965 – 1977* (Füredy & Kelemen, 1989), the 2003 edition of the descriptive monolingual dictionary of Hungarian (ÉKsz[2]) with frequency indicators, to mention but a few; and the Hungarian national corpus, which is also available online (Magyar Nemzeti Szövegtár). The latter is based on five different regional dialects of Hungarian to include regional varieties from outside of Hungary (Hungary, Slovakia, Ukraine, Vojvodina in Serbia, Transylvania) and on five different *genres* and registers (literary, journalistic, scientific, official, and informal).

Given that vocabulary acquisition is one of the greatest challenges facing learners of Finnish and Hungarian, it would be a worthwhile undertaking to prepare word lists based on frequency for each level and, in particular, for each course offered in UCL SSEES. Those studying for a BA degree in Hungarian would make best use of frequency lists based on literary language, and there is indeed a pilot project that was initially undertaken by Peter Sherwood at the UCL SSEES Language Unit (between 2005 and 2006, for internal use only), to provide such lists of the most frequently used nouns, verbs, adverbs, and adjectives for second year BA students. Frequency lists based on the journalistic and perhaps the official and scientific registers would be more useful for MA students of both Finnish and Hungarian.

Fortunately, most textbooks also usually build on frequent vocabulary, mostly from colloquial language. When there are several variants for a vocabulary item or a case, it is essential to explain to students which ones are more frequent in a certain context, to minimise their learning load and enable them to use the correct variant in the correct context. Such a suffix is the Finnish genitive plural (Rissanen, 1994), which can be *-iden*, *-itten*, *-ten*, *-ien* or *-in* depending on the noun type and the context

(written vs. colloquial). Finnish also often has two variants for a word, one of which is more official and the other more colloquial (e.g. official *olut* 'beer' v. colloquial *kalja* 'beer', or the even more colloquial *bisse* 'beer').

Another area where corpus linguistics can successfully inform language teaching and the acquisition of vocabulary is derivation. This area is usually explored on second year BA and Intermediate MA courses. The rich derivational morphology of the languages facilitates vocabulary acquisition: by learning a stem and the meaning and function of derivational suffixes one can expand one's vocabulary in a short period of time. The examples of Finnish *kirja* 'book' and Hungarian *ír* 'write' are just illustrations of how the derivational bushes of Finnish and Hungarian can assist learners to acquire new vocabulary much more quickly.

Table 2.1: Derivational morphology in aid of vocabulary acquisition, Hungarian

stem ***ír* (V)** ⇨ ⇨ ⇨ ⇩ ⇩ ⇩	**derivates with suffixes**		**derivates with prefixes (and suffixes)**		**compounds**
past part. > ADJ	*írott* 'written'				
pres. part. > AJD > N	*író* 'writer'				> újságíró 'newspaper+writer = journalist'
nomen actionis > V > N > N	*írás* '(the process of) writing'		*átír* 'transcribe'	> *átírás* 'transcription'	> kézírás 'hand+writing = handwriting'
nomen acti > N > V	*irat* > 'written/official document'		> *felirat* 'inscription, subtitle'	> *feliratoz* 'subtitle'	
N	*irodalom* > 'literature'	> *irodalmár* 'literary critic, man of letters'			
N > V	*írnok* > 'scribe'	> *írnokoskodik* 'works as a N'			
N > V	*irka* > 'exercise book, note book'	> *irkál* 'scrible'			
N	*iromány* 'scrible, written piece/text'				
V > N			*aláír* 'sign'	*aláírás* 'signature'	

Table 2.2: Derivational morphology in aid of vocabulary acquisition, Finnish

stem ***kirja* (N)** ⇨ ⇨ ⇨ ⇩ ⇩ ⇩	**derivatives with suffixes (and prefixes)**		**compounds**
N > V > N	*kirjoittaa* > *kirjoitus* 'to write' > 'writing'	*allekirjoittaa* > *allekirjoitus* 'to sign' 'signature'	*kirjoituskone* 'typewriter'
N > ADJ > N	*kirjallinen* > *kirjallisuus* 'literary' 'literature'		*kirjallisuuskriitikko* 'literature+critic=literary critic'
N > N	*kirjasto* 'library'		*kirjastonhoitaja* 'library's+carer=librarian'
N > N > N	*kirje* > *kirjelmä* 'letter' 'petition, statement'		*kirjekuori* 'letter+skin/peel=envelope'
N > V > N	*kirjailla* > *kirjailija* 'to scribble; to embroider' 'author, writer'		*kirjailijaliitto* 'writer+union=writers' union'
N > N	*kirjain* > *kirjaimellinen* 'letter (in the alphabet)' 'literal'		
N > ADJ	*kirjava* 'multi-coloured, mottled'		
N > V > ADJ	*kirjata* > *kirjattu* 'to enter in the books' 'registered'		

Although there is no one-to-one match between derivational suffixes and their function because of the polysemy and non-paradigmatic nature of these suffixes, it is essential to give guidelines to students about the most important function of each (of the most frequent) suffixes, and, *vice-versa*, it is extremely useful to map word classes and provide a list of derivational suffixes that are the most frequently employed to form words that feed into each of the classes (on deverbal noun-forming derivational suffixes in Hungarian, see H. Varga, 2008; on productivity and analogy in derivational morphology Ladányi, 2007; Brown et al., 2008). The productivity of suffixes in certain functions also has to be taken into account, and reverse-alphabeticized dictionaries are very useful for the teacher.

Finally, it is imperative that the teacher takes into account the frequency of occurrence of a certain grammatical form in a certain function and speech situation. Ideally, the syllabus and course programme of four-skill courses should be based on such considerations, rather than merely on perceived or real difficulty level of a certain part of speech or language element. This, however, exceeds the domain of corpus linguistics, and therefore will be addressed in more detail in the section *Pragmatics*.

Sociolinguistics

The implications of conclusions gleaned from the study of language and society are twofold in the teaching and learning of foreign languages. First, the language used in a classroom situation always conforms to some kind of a (codified or unwritten) 'norm', or the standard variety of the target language. Second, through exploring varieties of the target language students become increasingly aware of attitudes towards, and judgements about, their own language.

Unlike in English, it is highly unlikely that the teacher of Hungarian as a foreign language will use phonetic and lexical varieties which belong to a regional variety of Hungarian, and which are therefore significantly different from the variety known as 'standard'. (On the much debated nature of this standard see e.g. Kontra & Sali, 1998). Hungarian is a highly codified language, and the Hungarian Academy of Sciences has a Language Committee engaged in language cultivation and advisory services on language. Thus, it is a necessary part of the teacher's work to inform students about the governing ideologies that influence beliefs about the target language, given that such beliefs inform speakers' use of language and govern the choice of language elements in particular contexts.

In Hungarian, for instance, the use of the *-Om* v. the *-Ok* personal suffix in the 1SG of the *-ik* verb paradigm requires such a sociolinguistically informed clarification. Students have to be aware of the fact that the former is the prestige variety and the latter, in the case of a large number of verbs belonging to the *-ik* paradigm, the more colloquial. Similarly, native speakers are ‘allowed’ to omit the accusative case marker if the definiteness of the noun is marked by a 1SG or 2SG possessive suffix, but it would most probably lead to calamities if learners, who have to demonstrate their understanding of the use of the accusative, omitted the case suffix in an exam situation. Value judgements might concern various layers of language, from pronunciation and morphology to syntax. Further examples in the case of Hungarian include the correct pronunciation of the trill [r] or the front unrounded mid-vowel [e], and the length of the front unrounded high vowel [í]; vowel harmony in cases where there is variation in native speakers’ use of language (e.g. *matek-ot* v. *matek-nek*, see Sherwood, 2007); the use of the declined infinitive v. the subjunctive after the modal auxiliary *kell* ‘have/has to, must, is needed’, to mention but a few.

Another, perhaps more striking example of how society and social change influence a speaker’s idiolect is the teaching of forms of address. The importance of a sociolinguistically informed approach to teaching language is obvious in this case because the Hungarian address system is currently undergoing rapid changes (cf. Domonkossi, 2002; Dömötör, 2005; Kiss, 1993&2003). If in the native-speaking language and culture there are ambiguities about forms of address, and indeed greeting, this has to be pointed out rather than avoided, or swept under the carpet, in the classroom. When advising students which forms to use, it is important to take into account sociolinguistic variables (age, gender, etc) with regard to students as well and provide a variety of examples and exercises accordingly (Dávid, 2005; Maróti, 2003).

The case of Finnish is somewhat different because there are great differences between colloquial spoken Finnish and standard written Finnish (Tiittula, 1992; Hakulinen, 2002). The differences between spoken and written Finnish apply to phonology, morphosyntax and vocabulary. Spoken Finnish has e.g. the following features: apocope (e.g. *talossa* ‘in the house’ > *talos*), diphthongs and vowel combinations are simplified (e.g. *punainen* ‘red’ > *punane*, *kauhea* ‘terrible’ > *kauhee*), -*ts*- is pronounced as -*tt*- or -*t*- (*katso!* ‘look!’ > *ka(t)to!*), thequestion particle missing in second person singular (*otatko lisää?* ‘Would you like some more?’ > *otatsä lisää?*), textually frequent verbs are shortened (*olen* ‘I am’> *oon*, *menen* ‘I go’ > *meen*, *tulen* ‘I come’ > *tuun*), personal and demonstrative pronouns are shortened (*minä* ‘I’ > *mä*, *minun* ‘my’ > *mun*; *nämä* ‘these’ > *nää*), first person plural verb forms are replaced by the so-called passive (*me menemme* ‘we go’ > *me mennään*), subject-verb number agreement is lacking in the third person plural (*tytöt menevät* ‘the girls go’ > *tytöt menee*) and possessive suffixes are not used (*kirjani* ‘my book’ > *mun kirja*).

Finnish teachers tend to modify their speech in order to conform to standard written Finnish (Richardson, 1993; Storhammar, 1994), which is a form of foreigner talk (Ellis 2008:213-221). Using only standard written Finnish in teaching would make it difficult for students to understand spoken Finnish in Finland and their spoken Finnish would sound odd to Finns. Using only colloquial Finnish, on the other hand, would make it difficult to read texts or to write standard Finnish. The solution at SSEES is to teach standard written Finnish first and gradually introduce colloquial forms via songs and other listening exercises, dialogues in fiction, and chats and text messages. This is because it is easier to go from the written system to the contracted spoken form. Learning two codes from the very start would be too taxing for the

student. Because of the two codes, it is essential to encourage the students to spend time in Finland already between their first and second years.

Given that non-native speakers of a language are not supposed to make the kind of 'mistakes' native speakers make, the language used in a class room situation is bound to be a somewhat purified, 'laboratory' variety of the language, even where the difference between spoken and written varieties is less obvious than in the case of Finnish. Reading literature, texts of songs, and weblogs in the target language might well be the only way for students to gain exposure to such varieties, if the target language, like Finnish and Hungarian, is a LWULT language.

The other side of the coin is that students are often faced with value judgements and stereotypes about their own language while learning a new language. Variation within the source language, and values associated with the varieties, are made explicit in the process of learning a foreign language, through translation exercises into English, for instance. In this case, again, it is essential that the teacher, most probably a non-native speaker of the language of instruction, presents a well-informed view on the social and ideological rather than linguistic nature of beliefs about certain language varieties, without advocating the primacy of one dialect over another. This, however, concerns attitudes toward the language of instruction, in our case English, and therefore remains beyond the scope of this paper.

Pragmatics

We incorporate the pragmatic approach in our teaching as a perspective that informs our methodology, regardless of the particular area of grammar and skill we teach or aim to improve during a class. As is perhaps obvious from the questions we have addressed so far, we believe that language teaching is not limited to the presentation and practice, that is, the mechanical 'drilling' or 'hammering in', of a finite set of

rigid rules, but should rather aim at exploring and explaining a particular language's behaviour: the linguistic behaviour of Finnish and Hungarian native speakers. What is at stake here is a set of historically grounded socio-cultural expectations, which students have to understand and fulfil once in Finland and Hungary (mostly BA students and evening course students because these courses aim at offering competence in all four language skills); identify, recognise, and successfully incorporate in their research on Finland and Hungary (this is the case of postgraduate students who do not necessarily have to acquire productive skills on the course). That is to say, the spine of our courses, especially on *ab-initio* courses, is provided by the most characteristic points of Finnish and Hungarian grammar, but we aim to present, organise, and arrange matters related to form in such a manner that students recognise that linguistic form and socio-cultural content are an inseparable whole, and the discussion of either is impossible without constant reference to the other.

More specifically, we use authentic texts from the beginning to demonstrate language points, even if this means at times that more complicated forms have to be introduced sooner than the relatively simpler (the accusative, the possessive noun phrase, and the two conjugations in Hungarian, for instance, before the local case suffixes; in Finnish, plural forms and several non-finite verb forms are practised actively only during the Level 2 course but the students are taught to recognise them earlier to deal with authentic texts).

Over the recent decade, the pragmatic perspective on teaching Hungarian as a second language has been increasingly explored; the various publications and case studies are of much help for the practitioner (e.g. Tátrai, 2007; Szili, 2004; Erdősi, 2006; Maróti, 2003). When reflecting on the applicability of pragmatics in language learning, the teaching of modality naturally springs to mind (Szili, 2006) to mention

but one of the possible applications. This is a particularly challenging area of Hungarian grammar, inasmuch as the various modal categories do not lend themselves easily to a purely formal analysis; matters of function and context have to be taken into account. Furthermore, the surface form taken by modality in Hungarian is very complex: it includes not only the derivational and inflectional morphological apparatus, but also modal auxiliary verbs and syntactic constructions. Thus, its teaching is more effective if the lessons on modality are designed around communicative function and speech acts rather than around form. Perhaps the most spectacular example is that of the subjunctive-imperative in Hungarian. In terms of form, the two (definite and indefinite) paradigms are the most complex in the imperative-subjunctive among Hungarian moods and tenses, given that the stem types, the varieties of the mood marker, and the personal suffixes display a higher degree of fusion than in the case of other moods or the past tense. Given the frequency of the form in written language (clauses of purpose) its presentation cannot be postponed for long, and students encounter it during the last third of a first-year *ab-initio* course. The active use of the form, however, can be given less attention during a first year course, given that, as is also demonstrated by a recent case study (Szili, 2006), its use in speech is rather limited.

Another area of Hungarian language teaching where the application of the pragmatic perspective is imperative is explaining the adequate use of formal and informal form(s), depending on the addressee and the context. These can differ even between languages which distinguish grammatically formal and informal ways of address, but, when the medium of teaching is English, the lack of such distinction at the grammatical level complicates things even further. Given the almost complete lack of morphological person marking in English, learners at times struggle even with

understanding the point of personal suffixes. It is normally instructive to point out that SG3 and PL3 are the persons referring to someone outside of the speech situation, and that addressing someone as if s/he was not present is a means of social distancing. It might also yield good results if the teacher succeeds in consistently using formal forms of address with students while insisting that they address each other in the informal form (cf. also earlier remarks on address systems).

In Finnish, too, one of the most obvious fields that requires a pragmatic approach is that of the various functions of modals and their combination with other language elements in speech situations. For instance, teaching the conditional mood and the question particle enables students to form polite requests (Muikku-Werner, 1992; 1997). The morphologically simpler imperative mood should in these situations be avoided and there is no equivalent of the English *please*. Role-plays during conversation practice classes may well be the best way of illustrating and practising the use of language points, which students have acquired in a formal setting. We also pose questions such as "what would you say in Finland if you bumped into someone in the street?" in class to elicit the appropriate phrase. Finally, the fact that silence is part of Finnish speech culture and privacy is important (Sajavaara & Lehtonen, 1996) also has to be discussed during lessons.

The fact that Finnish and Hungarian are LWULT languages in the UK context renders the application of the pragmatic perspective even more important, but at the same time even more challenging for teachers. Given the lack of unlimited access to native speakers, films, recordings of real life situations, as well as specially designed audiovisual learning aids are a highly valuable means to provide exposure to authentic language use.

Language and culture

Cultural and anthropological insights are also essential in language teaching, namely, when discussing key-concepts that are specific to Finnish or Hungarian culture. Examples of such key-terms in the case of Finnish include e.g. *kesämökki* 'summer cottage' and the activities related to it, the sauna culture, *sisu* 'guts, perseverance, stamina', tango music and various food items, such as *mämmi* 'rye pudding eaten around Easter', *Karelian pies* 'Karelian pasty', *makkara* 'sausage' and *salmiakki* 'salty liquorice' (Dufva et al., 1993; Vaarala, 1993).

In the case of Hungarian, again, *nyaraló* 'summer house' can be an example of cultural terms related to everyday life, inasmuch as it lacks the class connotations that owning a second home or villa might evoke in Britain. Terms related to the schooling and legal systems, housing, history, cultural life and entertainment, whose glossing is hard, if not impossible, in English, often emerge in Hungarian classes. A few examples: *tanácsi lakás* 'state-owned housing estate pre-1989', *jogász, ügyvéd* both roughly: 'solicitor', *romkocsma* 'pub, bar, café, that has been set up in an empty building, but not a squat, and usually exists for a short period of time'. Similarly, words whose translation is seemingly straightforward such as *édes* 'sweet, dear, one's own', *színház* 'theatre', *hegy* 'mountain', or *tenger* 'sea', may have entirely different implications in Hungarian and English culture (cf. Sherwood 1996b).

Such terms need to be defined not only linguistically and lexicographically but also socio-culturally (cf. Szili, 2008). It would be a very powerful learning aid if these terms were compiled and defined in an encyclopaedic form, leading to a comprehensive guide to key-terms of Finnish and Hungarian culture. Not only scholars and learners of Hungarian but also professionals outside of academia, such as those working for the foreign service, the British Council, and all those who are

interested in Finnish and Hungarian culture would benefit greatly from such a publication.

Conclusions and discussion

This paper addressed those aspects of the various sub-disciplines of linguistics, which, in our view, should inform the teaching of LWULT languages in the UK. It is an investigative work and therefore it is not meant to be all-inclusive. The possible contribution of each disciplinary branch mentioned here could be elaborated in more detail and illustrated with further examples. Discussion of the possible contribution of psycholinguistics, translation studies, and anthropological linguistics, to mention but a few, to language teaching warrants further study, as do learning difficulties. Much could be said, for instance, about how to teach a morphologically complex language to learners with various kinds of dyslexia, and what sort of role, in any, linguistics can play in finding the best solution. The approach that the integration of the few heritage speakers requires in classes where most learners are not heritage speakers is yet another theme to be investigated. Our paper also contains suggestions in several subsections for practical projects that we would find worthwhile to elaborate on and complete.

Thinking about language, and inviting others to do so, is the most essential part of a language teacher's work and linguistic training arms teachers with the necessary skills to fulfil this task competently. Language teaching is greatly enhanced by linguistics when the student is not exposed to the language and the language is structurally and typologically very different from the languages that the student knows. Our own linguistic interests and the features of languages that we have learnt and teach affect the way in which we discuss Finnish and Hungarian not only in this paper but also in our teaching.

This paper may give the idea that the teaching of Finnish and Hungarian at SSEES is very much grammar-based, which is not the case. The general approach is communicative and all four skills – listening, speaking, reading and writing – are practised in class and students are tested on all skills. The reason form-based teaching is required is the morphological complexity of the languages in question. Understanding language structure, on the other hand, is also a potential route to success in communicating in a foreign language. It helps learners to use the newly acquired language creatively rather than just parroting 'useful' phrases and constructions that have been practised in class.

Our experience is that if by *linguistics in language teaching* we do not mean the overburdening of students with inadequately applied *termini technici* of language description, nor take it for granted that linguistically untrained learners are unable to understand how language works, it is possible to present language facts in a linguistically informed manner. Students usually welcome this approach and they are excited about discoveries they make into the structure of their own language and other languages they know, through acquiring Finnish and Hungarian.

Whether the adoption of linguistics as an approach to language teaching is successful depends largely on the experience of the teacher and the dynamics between individuals, teacher and students, in a particular group. It is essential to match the method of analysis with the kind of language point that is discussed, and to introduce sufficient amount of information on grammar and the use of language at the right time. During its history, linguistics has developed ways of talking and thinking about language, and once language teaching occurs under circumstances where it is necessary not only to speak but also speak *about* the language in question, the teacher and students benefit greatly from linguistically informed ways of language learning.

We would like to thank the two anonymous reviewers and Daniel Abondolo for their useful comments.

Abbreviations

1	first person
2	second person
3	third person
ACC	accusative case
ADE	adessive case
ADJ	adjective
DAT	dative case
DEL	delative case
E.	English
ELA	elative case
F.	Finnish
Fr.	French
H.	Hungarian
INE	inessive case
INF	infinitive marker
lit.	literally
M.E.	Middle English
N	noun
NOM	nomative case
PAST	simple past tense
PL	plural
R.	Russian
SG	singular
SUP	superessive case
V	verb

References

Abondolo, D. 1988. *Hungarian Inflectional Morphology*. Budapest: Akadémiai Kiadó.

Abondolo, D. 1998a. *Colloquial Finnish*. London & New York: Routledge.

Abondolo, D. (ed.) 1998b, reprinted 2006. *The Uralic Languages*. London & New York: Routledge.

Ahonen, L. 2005. *Sounds Good - Kuulostaa hyvältä*. Helsinki: SKS.

Bárczi, G. 1976. Hangtörténet. Bárczi, G., L. Benkő, and J. Berrár (eds.) *A magyar nyelv története*. Budapest: Tankönyvkiadó: 95–180.

Bessonoff, S.-M., and E. Hämäläinen (2008) *Tilanteesta toiseen: A Finnish Course*. Helsinki: Suomen kielen ja kotimaisen kirjallisuuden laitos.

Branch, H. 1993. Kielentuntemusta Lontoon yliopistossa opiskeleville. *Virittäjä* 97, no. 3: 470-72.

Branch, H. 1998. Vaikeaa vai tärkeää? Suomen sanaston oppimisesta. Grünthal, R., and J. Laakso (eds.) *Oekeeta Asijoo. Commentationes Fenno-Ugricae in honorem Seppo Suhonen sexagenarii 16.V.1998*. Helsinki: Suomalais-Ugrilainen Seura: 63–71.

Brinton, D., O. Kagan, and S. Bauckus (eds.) 2008. *Heritage Language Education: A New Field Emerging*. London & New York: Routledge.

Brown, A., A.-L. Lepäsmaa, and L. Silfverberg. 2008. *Miten sanoja johdetaan? Suomen kielen johto-oppia*. Helsinki: Finn Lectura.
Crystal, D. 1985. *What is Linguistics*. London: Edward Arnold.
Cummins, J. 2007. Rethinking monolingual instructional strategies in the multilingual classrooms. *RCLA* 10, no. 2: 221-40.
Dahl, Ö. 2000. Verbs of becoming as future copulas. Dahl, Ö. (ed.) *Tense and aspect in the languages of Europe. Empirical Approaches to Language Typology.* EUROTYP 20-6. Berlin & New York: Mouton de Gruyter: 351-361.
Dahl, Ö. 2008. Hur exotiskt är finska? http://www.kotikielenseura.fi/virittaja/hakemistot/jutut/dahl4_2008.pdf (Accessed 6 February 2009.)
Dávid M. 2005. Nemtegezés a nyelvkönyvekben. *THL2.* 2005, no. 1: 54-68.
Dixon, R. M. W. 2010. *Basic Linguistic Theory* 1. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
Domonkosi Á. 2002. *Megszólítások és beszédpartnerre utaló elemek nyelvhasználatunkban*. A Debreceni Egyetem Magyar Nyelvtudományi Intézetének Kiadványai 79. Debrecen.
Dömötör A. 2005 Tegezés/nemtegezés, köszönés, megszólítás a családban. *Nyr.* 129: 299–318.
Dömötör, A. 2007. .Nyelvtörténeti kérdések és válaszok a magyar mint idegen nyelv tanításában. *Teaching Hungarian Language* 2, nos.1-2: 5-15.
Dufva, H., P. Muikku-Werner, and E. Aalto. 1993. *Mämmin ja makkaran maa. Kulttuuritietoa meille ja muille*. Jyväskylä: Jyväskylän yliopisto, Korkeakoulujen kielikeskus.
Durst, P. 2004, 2006. *Lépésenként magyarul*, Vol. I and II, Szeged: SZTE.
EBLUL = European Bureau for Lesser-Used Languages. http://www.eblul.org/ (Accessed 5 February 2009.)
ÉKsz.[2] = Pusztai, F. (ed.) 2003. *Magyar értelmezõ kéziszótár*. Budapest: Akadémiai Kiadó.
Ellis, R. 2008. *The Study of Second Language Acquisition*. Second Edition. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
Erdős, J., and Cs. Prileszky. 2001. *Halló, itt Magyarország!* Vol. I and II, Budapest: Akadémiai Kiadó.
Erdősi, V. 2006. Empirikus beszédaktus-kutatás a Magyar mint idegen nyelv kommunikatív oktatásában – A köszönetnyilvánítás beszédaktusának vizsgálata. Nádor, O., and Szűcs, T (eds.) *Hungarológiai Évkönyv* 7. Pécs: PTE BTK: 69–84.
FINEMB = Embassy of Finland. http://www.finemb.org.uk (Accessed 5 February 2009.)
Füredy, M., and J. Kelemen. 1989. *A mai magyar nyelv szépprózai gyakorisági szótára 1965 – 1977*. Budapest: Akadémiai Kiadó.
Giay, B. 1998. A magyar mint idegen nyelv/hungarológia oktatásának módszertani alapkérdései. Giay, B., and N. Orsolya (eds.) *A magyar mint idegen nyelv. Hungarológia.* Budapest: Osiris: 351–390.
H. Varga, M. 2007. A 'birtoklás' kifejezőeszközei. *Teaching Hungarian Language* 2, nos.1-2: 16 – 24.
H. Varga, M. 2008. A cselekvés, történés eredményének kifejezésére szolgáló deverbális nomenképzők (A nomen acti képzői). *Magyar Nyelv* 1: 65-74.
Hajdú, P. 1975. *Finno-Ugrian Languages and Peoples*. London: Deutsch.
Hakulinen, L. 1979. *Suomen kielen rakenne ja kehitys*. Helsinki: Otava.

Hakulinen, A. 2002. Ovatko puhuttu ja kirjoitettu kieli erkaantuneet toisistaan? http://www.kotus.fi/index.phtml?s=2069 (Accessed 15 February 2009.)

Haspelmath, M. 2007. Pre-established categories don't exist: consequences for language description and typology. *Linguistic Typology* 11, no. 1: 119-132.

Haspelmath, M. 2001. The European linguistic area: Standard Average European. Haspelmath, M., E. König, W. Oesterreicher, and W. Raible (eds.) *Language typology and language universals*. Berlin & New York: Mouton de Gruyter: 1492-1510.

Heikkilä, S., and P. Majakangas. 2008. *Hyvin menee! 1: Suomea aikuisille*. Helsinki: Otava.

Heine, B., and T. Kuteva. 2006. *The Changing Languages of Europe*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Horvath, B. M., and P. Vaughan. (eds.) 1991. *Community Languages: A Handbook.* Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.

Horváth, J. 2003. Dán anyanyelvűek hibázási mintáinak elemzése a magyar nyelv lokatívuszi rendszerének tanulási folyamatában – avagy a kontrasztív elemzés mint hasznos tanítási technika. *Hungarológiai Évkönyv*. Pécs: PTE BTK: 42–51.

Horváth, L. 2003. Szószerkezet-történet. Pusztai, F., and J. Kiss (eds.) *Magyar Nyelvtörténet*. Budapest: Osiris: 479, 495, 516–517 , 631, 764.

Hämäläinen, E. 1996. 'Sitä oli mielenkiintoinen asiaa': Subjektin, objektin ja predikatiivin opettamisesta. Vehkanen, M. (ed.) *Suomi toisena/vieraana kielenä – ajatuksia kielestä, kulttuurista, metodeista*. Helsinki: Edita: 28–35.

Hungarolingua Series (Several reprints since 1996) Vol. I., II., and III, Debrecen: Debreceni Nyári Egyetem.

Ingo, R. 2000. *Suomen kieli vieraan silmin*. Vaasa: Vaasan yliopiston nykysuomen ja kääntämisen laitos.

Juvonen, P. 2000. *Grammaticalizing the Definite Article: A Study of Definite Adnominal Determiners in a Genre of Spoken Finnish*. Stockholm: Stockholm University.

Jussila, R., E. Nikunen, and S. Rautoja. 1992. *Suomen murteiden taajuussanasto. A Frequency Dictionary of Finnish Dialects*. Helsinki: VAPK-kustannus.

Kaivapalu, A. 2005. *Lähdekieli kielenoppimisen apuna*. Jyväskylä: Jyväskylän yliopisto.

Karlsson, F. 2008. *Finnish: An Essential Grammar*. London and New York: Routledge.

Kenesei, I., R. M. Vágó, and A. Fenyvesi. 1998. *Hungarian*. London & New York: Routledge.

Kenttälä, M. 2010. *Kieli käyttöön: suomen kielen alkeisoppikirja.* Helsinki: Gaudeamus.

Kielipankki. http://www.csc.fi/tutkimus/alat/kielitiede (Accessed 17 February 2009.)

Kiss, J. 1993. Köszönés- és megszólításformák a rábaközi Mihályiban. *Nyr.* 117: 208–28.

Kiss, J. 2003. Ezredfordulós köszönés- és megszólításformák a magyar nyelvközösségben. *Magyar Nyelvjárások*, XLI: 315-319.

Kondo-Brown, K., and J. D. Brown (ed.) 2007. *Teaching Chinese, Japanese, and Korean Heritage Language Students: Curriculum Needs, Materials, and Assessment*. New York, London: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Kontra, M., and N. Saly (eds.) 1998. *Nyelvmentés vagy nyelvárulás? Vita a határon túli magyar nyelvhasználatról.* Budapest: Osiris.

Kothencz, G. 2007. A -ban/-ben és az -n ~ -on/-en/-ön jelentésrendszere. *Magyar Nyelv*, no. 4: 432–451.

Korhonen, S. 2001. *Suomen kielen solmukohdat: suomi toisena/vieraana kielenä*. Helsinki: Helsingin yliopisto.

Kotus = Kotimaisten kielten tutkimuslaitos. Kaino – Kotuksen aineistopalvelu. http://kaino.kotus.fi/ (Accessed 17 February 2009.)

Kovácsi, M. 1999. *Itt magyarul beszélnek*, Vol. I., II., III., and IV, Budapest.

Ladányi, M. 2007. *Produktivitás és analógia a szóképzésben: elvek és esetek*. Budapest: Tinta Könyvkiadó.

Ladefoged, P., and I. Maddieson. 1996. *The Sounds of the World's Languages*. Oxford: Blackwell.

Lakoff, G. 1987. *Women, Fire, and Dangerous Things. What Categories Reveal About the Mind?* Chicago and London: University of Chicago Press.

Lakoff, G., and M. Johnson. 1980, 2003. *Metaphors We Live By*. London & Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Latomaa, S. 1993. Mitä hyötyä on oppijoiden kielitaustan tuntemisesta? Aalto, E., and M. Suni (eds.) *Kohdekielenä suomi. Näkökulmia opetukseen*. Jyväskylä: Jyväskylän yliopisto. 9–31.

Latomaa, S. 1998. English in contact with 'the most difficult language in the world': the linguistic situation of Americans living in Finland. *International Journal of the Sociology of Language* 133: 51–71.

Lehtinen, T., and L. Laitinen. (eds.) 1997. *Kieliopillistuminen. Tapaustutkimuksia suomesta*. Helsinki: Department of Finnish, University of Helsinki.

Lehikoinen, L. 1994. *Suomea ennen ja nyt. Suomen kielen rakenne ja kehitys*. Helsinki: Finn Lectura.

Leney, T. 2004. *Teach Yourself Finnish*. London: Teach Yourself.

Lepäsmaa, A.-L., and L. Silfverberg. 2007. *Suomen kielen alkeisoppikirja*. Helsinki: Finn Lectura.

LLAS = Subject Centre for Languages, Linguistics and Area Studies. http://www.llas.ac.uk/ (Accessed 13 February 2009.)

Lotz, J. 1976. *Szonettkoszorú a nyelvről*. Budapest: Gondolat.

Magyar Nemzeti Szövegtár. http://corpus.nytud.hu/mnsz/ (Accessed 15 February 2009.)

Maróti, O. 2003. Szia professzor úr! Pragmatikai hibák idegenajkúak magyar nyelvhasználatában. Nádor, O., and T. Szűcs (eds.) *Hungarológiai Évkönyv* 4. Pécs: PTE BTK.166–172.

Martin, M. 1999. Mikä on keskeisintä suomen kielessä? Pekkola, S. (ed.) *Sadanmiehet: Aarni Penttilän ja Ahti Rytkösen juhlakirja*. Jyväskylä: Jyväskylän yliopisto.155–181.

Muikku-Werner, P. 1992. Anteeks, sainko kynänne hetkeksi' – Suomen kielen oppijan pragmaattisia ongelmia. Nyyssönen, H., and L. Kuure (eds.) *Acquisition of Language – Acquisition of Culture*. *AFinLA:n vuosikirja* 1992. Jyväskylä: AfinLA. 281–296.

Muikku-Werner, P. 1997. *"JÄTTÄ MINUT RAUHAAN, HÄVI HETI". Suomalaisten ja suomenoppijoiden pyynnöt ja anteeksipyynnöt*. Jyväskylä: Soveltavan kielentutkimuksen keskus.

NCOLCT = National Council of the Less Commonly Taught Languages. http://www.councilnet.org/ (Accessed 6 February 2009.)

Nissilä, L., I. Kuukka, M. Martin, and H. Vaarala. 2006. *Saako olla suomea? Opas suomi toisena kielenä opetukseen*. Helsinki: Opetushallitus.

Nuutinen, O. 2007. *Suomea suomeksi.* Helsinki: SKS.
Ojutkangas, K. 2001. *Ruumiinosannimien kieliopillistuminen suomessa ja virossa.* Helsinki: SKS.
Papp, F. (ed.) 1969, reprinted 1994. *A magyar nyelv szóvégmutató szótára.* Budapest: Akadémiai Kiadó.
Pontifex, Zs. 2003. *Teach Yourself Hungarian*. London: Teach Yourself.
ÉKsz.[2] Pusztai, F. (ed.) 2003. *Magyar értelmező kéziszótár.* Budapest: Akadémiai Kiadó.
Puro, T. 1999. Sanasto toisen kielen tutkimuksessa ja pedagogiikassa. Martin, M., and K. Voionmaa (eds.) *Yhdeksän tutkielmaa suomesta toisena ja vieraana kielenä.* Jyväskylä: Jyväskylän yliopisto:143–158.
Richardson, U. 1993. Näkökulmia puhutun suomen oppimiseen ja opettamiseen. Aalto, E., and M. Suni (eds.) *Kohdekielenä suomi: Näkökulmia opetukseen.* Jyväskylä: Jyväskylän yliopisto: 33–50.
Rissanen, T. 1994. Varianttien viidakossa – näkökulmia monikon genetiivin opettamiseen. Suni, M., and E. Aalto (eds.) *Suuntaa suomenopetukseen – tuntumaa tutkimukseen*. Jyväskylä: Jyväskylän yliopisto: 63–80.
Roberts, I. W. 1991. *History of the School of Slavonic and East European Studies 1915-1990*. London: School of Slavonic and East European Studies.
Rounds, C. 2002. *Hungarian. An Essential Grammar*. London & New York: Routledge.
Rounds, C., and E. Sólyom. 2001. *Colloquial Hungarian. A Complete Course for Beginners.* London & New York: Routledge.
Sajavaara, K. and J. Lehtonen. 1996. The silent Finn revisited. Jaworski, A. (ed.) *Functions of Silence.* Berlin & New York: Mouton de Gruyter: 263–283.
Saukkonen, P., M. Haipus, A. Niemikorpi, and H. Sulkala. 1979. *Suomen kielen taajussanasto. A Frequency Dictionary of Finnish*. Porvoo: WSOY.
Sherwood, P. 1991. Nyelvtan, terminológia, nyelvtanítás: nyelvleírás és pedagógia összefüggése két terminus technicus példáján. Egyed, O., B. Giay, and O. Nádor (eds.) *Hagyományok és módszerek. Az I. Nemzetközi Hungarológiai-Oktatási Konferencia előadásai.* Volume II. Budapest:104-120.
Sherwood, P. 1996a. *A Concise Introduction to Hungarian*. London: School of Slavonic and East European Studies, University of London.
Sherwood, P. 1996b. A nation may be said to live in its language: some socio-historical perspectives on attitudes to Hungarian. Pynsent, R. B. (ed.) *The Literature of Nationalism. Essays on East European Identity.* London: SSEES University of London and Macmillan: 27–39.
Sherwood, P. 2002. Hungarian as L2: some problems as seen from abroad. http://epa.oszk.hu/01300/01368/00012/pdf/1999_157-167.pdf (Accessed 17 February 2008.)
Sherwood, P. 2004. On not squaring the Circle: Some Diagrammatic Representations in the Teaching of Hungarian as a Foreign Language. *Hungarológiai Évkönyv.* 5. Pécs: PTE BTK: 145–153.
Sherwood, P. 2007. A magánhangzó-illeszkedés tanítása. *Teaching Hungarian Language* 2, nos. 1-2: 25–31.
Sherwood, P., and E. Tarsoly. 2008. A múlt mint előjáték? A hungarológiai stúdiumok hetven esztendeje Londonban. *Teaching Hungarian Language* 2, nos. 1-2: 5–16.

Siitonen, K. 2003. Kieliopin terminologia tuottamassa ongelmia suomi toisena kielenä -opetuksessa. Muikku-Werner, P., and H. Remes (eds.) *VIRSU Viro ja suomi: kohdekielet kontrastissa.* Joensuu: Joensuun yliopisto: 81–87.
Siitonen, K. 2005. Problems of grammar terminology in second language instruction. Fernandez-Vest, M. M. J. (ed.) *Les langues ouraliennes aujourd´hui. Approche linguistique et cognitive.* Paris: Librairie Honoré Champion: 341–346.
Silfverberg, L. 1993. Suomen äänne- ja muoto-opin opetuksesta vieraskielisille. *Virittäjä* 97: 459–465.
Silfverberg, L., and L. White. 2003. *Supisuomea*. Helsinki: Finn Lectura.
Sinclair, J. (ed.) 2004. *How to Use Corpora in Language Teaching*. Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
Storhammar, M.-T. 1994. *Yleiskielen ja puhekielen suhde ulkomaalaisopettajien opetuspuheessa*. Jyväskylä: Jyväskylän yliopisto.
Sz. Hegedűs, R. 2005. A birtoklás magyar kifejezésmódjai a nyelvtanulóknak készült grammatikák tükrében. *Teaching Hungarian Language* 2, no. 1: 38–43.
Szili, K. 2004. *Tetté vált szavak. A beszédaktusok elmélete és gyakorlata.* Budapest: Tinta Könyvkiadó.
Szili, K. 2006. Grammatika? Pragmatika? *Teaching Hungarian Language* 2, nos. 1-2: 22–28.
Szili, K. 2007. Beleöntsem a bort a pohárba, avagy beöntsem? A bele igekötő jelentésszerkezetéről. *Magyar Nyelv* 2: 163–179.
Szili, K. 2008. Édes hazánktól Magyarországig. A *haza* mint szociokulturális rogalom a nyelvi adatok tükrében. *Magyar Nyelvőr*132, no. 2: 151–170.
Tátrai, Sz. 2006. A nagy esernyő csel. *Teaching Hungarian Language* 2, nos. 1-2: 2–35.
Tiittula, L. 1992. *Puhuva kieli. Suullisen viestinnän erityispiirteitä.* Helsinki: Finn Lectura.
Tommola, H. 2000. Progressive aspect in Baltic Finnic. Dahl, Ö. (ed.) *Tense and aspect in the languages of Europe. Empirical Approaches to Language Typology.* EUROTYP 20-6. Berlin & New York: Mouton de Gruyter: 655–692.
Tuomi, T. 1980. *Suomen kielen käänteissanakirja. Reverse Dictionary of Modern Standard Finnish*. Helsinki: SKS.
Uotila, E. 1993. Historiallinen selitys suomen sanaston ja fraseologian opettamisessa. Kalliokoski, J., and K. Siitonen (eds.) *Suomeksi maailmalla. Kirjoituksia Suomen kielen ja kulttuurin opettamisesta.* Helsinki: Yliopistopaino: 27–34.
Vaarala, H. 1993. Juon kahvia kesämökilläni eli a víkendházamban kávét iszom. Vierauden kokemuksesta kirjallisuuden tulkinnassa. Kalliokoski, J., and K. Siitonen (eds.) *Suomeksi maailmalla. Kirjoituksia Suomen kielen ja kulttuurin opettamisesta*. Helsinki: Yliopistopaino:189–199.
WALS = Haspelmath, M., M. S. Dryer, D. Gil, and B. Comrie. 2005. *The World Atlas of Language Structures*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
Weber, K. 2003. Elemi beszédkészség-fejlesztés a magyar mint idegen nyelv órán – kognitív megközelítésben. *Hungarológiai Évkönyv*. 4. Pécs: PTE BTK: 92–103.
White, L. 2005. *From Start to Finnish*. Helsinki: Finn Lectura.
White, L. 2006. *A Grammar Book of Finnish*. Helsinki: Finn Lectura.
Zsilinszky, É. 2003. Szókészlettörténet. Pusztai, F., and J. Kiss (eds.) *Magyar Nyelvtörténet.* Budapest: Osiris: 173-204, 372-393, 618-631, 725-738, 804-824.