

Пилипенко Г. **Языковая и этнокультурная ситуация воеводинских венгров. Взгляд «изнутри» и «извне»**. Санкт-Петербург: «Нестор-История», 2017. 336 с.

Gleb Pilipenko is a renowned Russian scholar of Hungarian and Slavic linguistic and ethnic contacts, employed as a research associate at the Institute for Slavic Studies of the Russian Academy of Sciences. Besides, the author has published extensively in Serbian, Russian, Ukrainian, Hungarian, and English on Slavic–Hungarian language contacts in Serbia, Slovenia, and Ukraine (cf. ПИЛИПЕНКО 2011, based on his doctoral thesis).

The book is an interdisciplinary study with fifteen chapters, based on fieldwork, applying analytical methods of critical sociolinguistics, ethnolinguistics, contact linguistics, and linguistic anthropology; valuable fieldwork photos are added at the end. The book begins with the presentation of ethno-demographic characteristics of Vojvodina (Chapter 1); then follows the theoretical and methodological basis of the research (Chapter 2); and an overview of the previous research on cultural-linguistic situation of the Vojvodina Hungarians (Chapter 3). In the following seven chapters, Pilipenko applies sociolinguistic and anthropological analysis, dedicating, thus, separate chapters to the bilingualism in the region (Chapter 4), the mental map of the bilingual region of Vojvodina (Chapter 5), the informants' views on their varieties of Hungarian and Serbian (Chapter 6), the domains of language use (Chapter 7), the communication in family (Chapter 8), the choice of cultural and religious identity in interethnic families (Chapter 9), and the possibility of acquiring the second language (Chapter 10). In the second part of the book, Pilipenko employs methods of contact linguistics using his dialectological knowledge and excellent command of both languages in contact – Serbian and Hungarian. The author discusses the language contact of Serbian and Hungarian (Chapter 11), the linguistic features of the Hungarian variety in Vojvodina (Chapter 12), the Serbian variety spoken by Vojvodina Hungarians (Chapter 13). The last chapters are devoted to migrations (Chapter 14) and ethnocultural traditions of the Vojvodina Hungarians (Chapter 15).

During the fieldwork from 2012 to 2014 throughout the Serbian northern province of Vojvodina (in Pančevo/Pancsova, Skorenovac/Székelykeve, Novi Sad/Újvidék, Ada, Adorjan/Adorján, Zrenjanin/Nagybecskerek), Pilipenko examined more than 50 informants, using classic sociolinguistic research, quantitative methods, and qualitative semi-structured interviews. Informants were of all age, occupations, professions, both genders, Catholics and Protestants. He also explored Székely Hungarians as “a minority within minority”. Many were in interethnic marriages, especially in Novi Sad and Northern Bačka. Eventually, he recorded 40 hours of audio material, building a corpus of 121,840 words. As a foreign researcher, Pilipenko presented a view from “outside” the Hungarian-speaking world and Vojvodina region. Nevertheless, by giving a voice to informants, the book rendered a view from “inside” – as the title underlines. The questionnaire included a wide thematic spectrum which made this field material a suitable source for many disciplines – dialectology, ethnography, sociology, and oral history.<sup>1</sup> Research was conducted in two languages, i.e. Serbian and Hungarian. Some Hungarians communicated rather in Serbian,

<sup>1</sup> The topics included in the questionnaire were as follows: linguistic biography and repertoire, everyday language use, learning the second language, language use in school, socialization of the informants, childhood (interethnic encounters, games with children of other ethnicities), ethnic and religious composition of the settlement, migrations, institutional forms in the municipality, traditional customs and practices, metalanguage utterances, etc.

in the case of language shift. The interlocutors often switched codes, which additionally made this material useful for analyzing code-switching and the Serbian variety spoken by Hungarian native speakers. In theory, Pilipenko was mostly inspired by the works of semi-oticians Mikhail Bakhtin and Yuri Lotman as well as by the founder of Russian ethnolinguistics Nikita Tolstoy. The Belgrade circle practicing linguistic anthropology and fieldwork research at the Institute for Balkan Studies SASA likewise influenced the author.

Pilipenko's analytic method consists of representing selected and transcribed utterances of informants on a particular topic, given in original language (Hungarian or Serbian) and translated into Russian. Then, he analyses the utterances, adding his participant observations and examples from the literature. The informants' voice is, thus, present throughout the book, which makes it heteroglossic in Bakhtin's sense. According to Pilipenko, the command of standard Serbian occurred to be one of the most emerging problems among the Hungarian diaspora (p. 11). Pilipenko found that Hungarian speakers differ between varieties of Vojvodina regions and apply concepts like "pure language/village/Hungarian/Serb", "speaking clean", when referring to a good command of Hungarian or to the ethnic homogeneity (pp. 104–106). According to the Hungarian speakers, the more intensive contact of Serbian and Hungarian, the less competence in Hungarian is present, and vice versa (pp. 108–109). Hungarians who do not have good command in Serbian avoid speaking it as they want to escape mistakes (p. 109). In the regions close to the border with Hungary and in the settlements where Hungarians form a majority, Pilipenko registered a lack of wish of Hungarian speakers to learn Serbian; instead, foreign languages are popular (pp. 110–116).

The analysis of contact phenomena showed that language use depends on the ethnic composition of the settlement and the personal networks of speakers (p. 125). The author paid special attention to interethnic families, which manage diverse linguistic biographies and cultural backgrounds of family members, accept different confessions, celebrate holidays of both (or several) national groups to which family members belong (pp. 131–147). The main reason listed for language shift is the wish for vertical mobility in the Serbian society. The interlocutors ranked the Serbian-language instructions in school very low, appraising them as archaic and incompatible with everyday language use (pp. 157–168). Instead, Serbian was better acquired in childhood when playing with other children, while serving in the army, via TV, etc. (pp. 154, 172–174).

In the part dedicated to language contact, Pilipenko finds that the influence of Serbian is obvious at all levels (pp. 182, 190–191). The communicative misunderstandings are a usual topic retold in anecdotes as the informants apparently find them funny (pp. 186–189, 194–195). The common borrowings from Serbian are terms for cloths, administration, and food products (pp. 192–193). The Hungarian speakers generally avoid Cyrillic script – the official letter in Serbia beside the Latin script, which is also in use – and use it reluctantly (p. 197). The author describes in detail the features of Hungarian varieties in Vojvodina, among others, changes of palatals into affricates, *ty* [tʃ] and *gy* [dʃ] into [č] and [đ], *ly* [j] into [l], omitting final *l*, *r*, *n*, *t*, forms of instrumental *-val/-vel*, the conjugation of the verbs *mondi/mondja*, *-ik* verbs, *jönni*, *menni*, the use of plural after quantifiers, comparative constructions, etc.; he also analyses the use of Serbian and German loanwords, etc. (pp. 198–220). Special attention is devoted to toponyms and the conversational strategies of repeating, coupling, metalinguistic utterances about toponyms (pp. 220–241). One subchapter is devoted to code-switching (pp. 241–254). The Serbian variety of Vojvodina Hungarians is also analyzed, i.e. its phonetic features, mixing of accusative and locative, omitting gender markers, declination of nouns and congruence, omitting reflexive token *se* and

the auxiliary verb *to be*, the choice of verbs, metalinguistic utterances, and self-corrections (pp. 255–267). Pilipenko concluded that all these linguistic features occur also in other regions where Hungarian is in contact with Slavic varieties: in Prekmurje, Transcarpathia, etc. (p. 255). The author made an impressive effort to apply and combine several linguistic disciplines and he was very successful in it. However, there are some problematic uses of sociolinguistic terms, e.g. the term *mistake* for nonstandard contact forms (p. 255); the conclusion that code-switching usually happens when speaker is not competent enough (p. 241); and the term *narrative*, when referring to an arbitrary utterance, extracted from the conversational flow.

In its final part, the book gives an overview of the recent migrations of Vojvodina Hungarians, in the 1960s and 1970s within the “Guest-workers” program to the countries of Western Europe; and since the 1990s (war, military obligatory service, and severe economic crisis) (pp. 268, 274). There are different patterns of migration habitus: some are leaving and selling everything, some are keeping connection to the homeland, and some live as divided families (pp. 275–278). Pilipenko also analyzes the Serbian colonization to Vojvodina after the Second World War, and ethnocultural stereotypes based on the oppositions like Vojvodina Serbs vs. Serbs from other territories, Serbs vs. Hungarians, old inhabitants vs. newcomers (pp. 282–287). The last chapter is dedicated to the ethnocultural traditions of the Vojvodina Hungarians (Saint Lucy’s Day – *Luca napja*, Christmas – *Karácsony*, Easter – *Húsvét*, pig slaughter – *disznótor*, wedding customs, etc.). In this short and very informative overview, there can be noticed the influence of Slavic traditions, dying out of customs and their transformation after the Second World War.

This book represents a valuable contribution to the Hungarian, Serbian, and language contact studies. It is a pity that scholars who cannot read this book in Russian will have difficulties to use its results. Therefore, a translation into Hungarian or Serbian with an extensive English summary would certainly be a welcome step since it would contribute to a better understanding of the Hungarian–Serbian (Slavic) contacts and would certainly help the book to reach a wider audience.

Marija Mandić

#### Reference

Пилипенко 2011 = Пилипенко Г. *Сербский язык воеводинских венгров (с учетом функционирования словенского языка прекурских венгров и порабских словенцев)*. Saarbrücken: Lambert Academic Publishing, 2011.

Дронов П. С. **Очерки по культурным трансферам во фразеологии**. Москва: Институт языкознания РАН, 2018. 102 с.

The monograph written by Pavel Dronov addresses the question of cultural transfers in phraseology and figurative language. The starting point of the author’s reasoning is the idea that different concepts of transfer, both grammatical and cultural, such as those of Zellig Harris and Michel Espagne, can and should be reconciled when describing figurative language, especially idioms. The author regards transfer in phraseology as both a process of idiom exchange and a set of rules for their interpretation or reinterpretation. The book consists of the introduction, seven chapters, and the conclusion.