

See discussions, stats, and author profiles for this publication at: <https://www.researchgate.net/publication/336769434>

Language ideologies in Hungarian language counselling interactions

Article · January 2019

CITATIONS

0

READS

3

1 author:



Zsófia Ludányi

Hungarian Academy of Sciences

25 PUBLICATIONS 18 CITATIONS

SEE PROFILE

Some of the authors of this publication are also working on these related projects:



Hungarian medical language management [View project](#)



Student-teacher email communication [View project](#)

Language ideologies in Hungarian language counselling interactions

Zsófia Ludányi

Abstract

Discourses concerning language have ideological aspects in both scholarly and everyday scenes. This study examines the language ideologies in the Hungarian language counselling discourses in relation to the Language Management Theory. This paper analyses the questions and answers received by the linguistic counselling service of the Research Institute for Linguistics of the Hungarian Academy of Sciences, especially regarding ideologies that are concerned with the roles of linguists and linguistic counsellors and also dictionaries and their codification. The analysis shows how the popular approach to language is dominated by the standard language ideology, while replies given by counsellors have sometimes contradicting ideologies (i.e. descriptive vs prescriptive).

Keywords: linguistic consultancy service; Language Management Theory; language ideologies; codification; reference dictionary; normative dictionary

Subject-Affiliation in New CEEOL: Language and Literature – Applied Linguistics – Sociolinguistics

1. Introduction

This study is strongly connected to prior studies about speakers' language values and attitudes, regarding the work of the linguistic counselling service of the Research Institute for Linguistics of the Hungarian Academy of Sciences (RIL HAS) (Heltainé Nagy 2009, 2011, 2012, 2014, 2016). A continuation to this research is concerned with the comprehensive analysis of the Hungarian language counselling interactions amended by three new aspects: (i) The research examines the language problems of the speakers using a Language Management Theory approach. (ii) While language ideologies played a marginal role in prior studies (Heltainé Nagy 2009, 81.), they have become the main focus of the current research, as analysis of language problems inevitably leads to language ideologies. (iii) The research explores the language ideologies not just in the questions received by the counselling service, but also in the answers given by language counsellors, with respect to their neutral or total nature (Blommaert 2006, 510), meaning that thought about language can never be devoid of ideologies. The ideologies in the different

approaches of language – everyday and scholarly – are also part of the research.

This current study presents partial results of this ongoing research by showcasing a number of fundamental language ideologies concerning the relationship between language and linguist and the codification of dictionaries.

1.1 Theory and Practice of Language Counselling at the Research Institute for Linguistics of the Hungarian Academy of Sciences

The linguistic counselling service of the RIL HAS operates continuously since its foundation – occasionally from 1951 and permanently from 1957. It plays a vital role in language education and, in a broader term, language cultivation (Heltainé Nagy 2016). The initially continuous phone service lost from its importance, but it is still available two days a week, while email based counselling is continuous, augmented by the Institute's online spell-checking and counselling portal, *helyesiras.mta.hu*, since 2013 (Váradí–Ludányi–Kovács 2014).

The aim, content and method of the Academy's language cultivation have changed continuously with time. To reflect on the heated arguments of the early 2000s (summarized by Minya 2005), István Kenesei, then director of RIL HAS, published an article that attempted to reconcile theoretical linguistics, socio-linguistics and language cultivation, emphasizing the importance of cooperation between the three fields (Kenesei 2004). Kenesei touches upon the dilemmas linguists face while working out the solutions for the occurring language problems, with regard to what guidelines to follow. Is it enough to just comment on the phenomenon based on linguistic data (grammar, dictionaries, corpuses etc.) or should they also give advice, and if yes, what kind? According to Kenesei, a modern, linguistically appropriate advice should follow the following procedure: “The learned common language has this and that; If you want to follow a certain tradition, you have to do this, but it is up to you what you want to do and how you want to behave (on a linguistic dimension)” (Kenesei 2004, 19). Which means, the linguistic counsellor has to approach a phenomenon from the standard when judging its correctness and style, and give advice when to use it or not. But they have to refrain from categorical value judgements and prohibition.

As a result, the aims of the counselling service are twofold (see Heltainé Nagy 2014): (i) solving the language problems by giving professional answers using results from multiple fields of linguistics (language description, historical linguistics, socio-linguistics, corpus linguistics, lexicography, stylistics), and presenting linguistic variables and diversity; (ii) linguistic education, communication of scientific results to influence views on language (Heltainé Nagy 2014, 2016), and to minimize contradictions between the scholarly and non-scholarly scenes of language reflection (Domonkosi 2007b, 39).

The questions asked are varied: 90% are concerned with the normative spelling of certain linguistic items (Kardos 2007, 114), a sign of proper grammar's high prestige, while the remaining 10% are concerned with proper pronunciation or the difference between different versions of linguistic items. Clients may ask for the interpretation of (technical) texts or a second opinion on texts or phrases heard or read in the media. Clients of the counselling service often reflect on the linguistic

changes, positively or negatively (Heltainé Nagy 2012). The counselling service thus continuously faces the value judgement of everyday speakers.

1.2 Theoretical Background: Language Management Theory

As my primary field of research are language problems, the main theoretical framework of this study, for the exploration, analysis and management of language and communication problems, is Language Management Theory (LTM). Language Management Theory is the work of two experts in the field of language planning, Björn H. Jernudd and Jiří V. Neustupný (Jernudd–Neustupný 1987). Their main goal was to make up for the shortcomings of language planning (Nekvapil 2006). LMT has become more and more prominent in international literature in the past decades. In Hungarian linguistics, it is less well-known; it mostly appears in the works of István Lanstyák and Gizella Szabó Mihály (Szabó Mihály 2005, 2007; Lanstyák 2018; see also Balogh – T. Balla 2009; Bari 2018).

The key term of Language Management Theory is language problem, which originally meant a negative divergence from the norm within the given discourse. According to a newer approach, the speaker may regard the divergence (in broader terms: the given linguistic phenomenon) not just negatively but also positively or neutrally (Nekvapil–Sherman 2013, 86). Language Management Theory includes a wide variety of language problems, theoretically it accounts for all of them.

1.2.1 Process and Types of Language Management

The ‘classic’ process model of language management is as follows (Jernudd–Neustupný 1987, 78–80; Nekvapil 2009, 3–4): 1. language is monitored by speaker and deviations from norms are noted (noting); 2. deviations from norms are evaluated (evaluation); 3. an action plan is designed (adjustment design); 4. the process is completed when correction is implemented (implementation). A 5th step was later added to the classic process model: feedback, which is practically the first step again (Sherman 2007). The cyclical model starts a new language management process if the language problem couldn’t be solved; or was solved but resulted in the emergence of a new problem (Kimura 2014).

Language management can be a simple or an organized activity (Jernudd–Neustupný 1987, 76). Simple language management happens on the level of an individual, oftentimes it is only concerned with discourses “here and now” (i.e. correcting oneself after incorrect language use). Organized language management, on the other hand, is done by a certain organization, and it is not just concerned about a single discourse, but rather the system of language. Language ideologies also play a bigger part in the latter. Linguistic counselling is an important part of organized language management. During which, speakers identify a language problem, regard it negatively, and look for a solution. As part of the adjustment design, they turn to linguistic counselling, which (in an ideal scenario) solves the language problem. In a less than ideal situation, the answer to the question and the feedback from the speakers start a new language management process.

1.2.2 Language Management and Language Cultivation

Considering that *language management* is a coined phrase, and not even the activity itself can be considered widespread in the Hungarian linguistic literature, while it is completely unknown to the layman public, I find it important to clarify a seemingly terminological problem that also has more far-reaching considerations.

In a Hungarian context language cultivation is the most well-known type of organized language management activity with the highest esteem among the general public. The notion of language cultivation is also known in other European language communities, for instance in Czech as *jazyková kultura*, in Slovakian as *jazyková kultúra*, in German as *Sprachkultur* (or *Sprachpflege*, cf. Maitz, 2010) or Swedish as *språkvård* (Nekvapil, 2008, 251). In the English speaking world, where the phenomenon does not have a similar long-standing tradition, the notion of language cultivation is used as an equivalent of the above (Lanstyák, 2014a, 20). It has to be considered, however, that language cultivation has a different meaning for different nations at different points in history. It is worth comparing, for example, Czech and Hungarian language cultivation. (I summarize the former based on Nekvapil 2008, 253–257.)

Modern Czech language cultivation was the work of linguists of the Prague School, namely Bohuslav Havránek, Vilém Mathesius and Roman Jakobson, who revitalized the until then purist language cultivation in the 1930s. They considered intervention in the linguistic processes to be scholarly grounded and socially beneficial. The cultivation activities (corpus planning) of the Prague School focus on contemporary standard language. Its cultivation must be based on an exact description of the state of the present standard language. The aim of cultivation activities is twofold: (1) to support the stability of standard language, and (2) to advance its functional differentiation and stylistic richness (Havránek 1932, in Nekvapil 2008, 253–254). By stability, they meant “flexible stability,” not the outright prevention of changes in the language.

Language cultivation in Hungarian culture and linguistics has a different meaning and connotation. Out of its many different interpretations, I highlight the one from Erzsébet Heltainé Nagy (2007), which considers language cultivation a reflecting and evaluating activity, which has an ongoing intellectual tradition in Hungarian culture since at least the 16th century. It functions according to the traditional value of scale of the Hungarian speaking community in the co-relation of language, value and community. It rests on the ideological system and tradition rooted in Humboldt’s ideas, which claims that the mother tongue is energy owned and operated by the members of the community. Heltainé Nagy (2007, 20–23) differentiates between different levels and scenes of language cultivation: from scholarly (professional) language cultivation to everyday, amateur language cultivation. In this paper, it is not possible (nor is it its aim) to give an overview of contemporary Hungarian language cultivation and the debates surrounding it (as they are presented by Minya 2005). But multiple scenes of language cultivation (especially schools, the press, authors, movements and amateurs) have the idea of language correctness as their main focus.

In a Hungarian context – as Lanstyák (2014, 24) says – the aim of language

cultivation is to put the principles of language correctness to the practice in language use, however, there are numerous cases where the “correct” linguistic form is not the one serving speakers’ purposes the best but the one in compliance with the codified norm of the standard language variant. However, regarding variants, codification (as we will see later) is usually not based on actual language use but on structuralist considerations as well as various language ideologies (e.g. linguistic nationalism, purism, standardism, conservatism, rationalism), myths (Bauer–Trudgill 1998; Lanstyák 2007) and superstitions (cf. Domonkosi, 2007a). Moreover, the codified norm is mostly postulated without taking the requirements of the actual communicative situation into consideration (Lanstyák, 2014, 24).

The difference between language management and language cultivation can be explained in a number of different ways. Language cultivation (meaning the academic language cultivation of recent decades, the contemporary public education, the press, public life and movements) focuses on language correctness, while language management on language problems. During language management, it is for the (layman) speakers to decide what constitutes a language problem, not for linguists or language cultivators. They are also different in the sense that language management encompasses more language related activities than language cultivation. Language management consists of language planning, to create a standard language variant, and language cultivation, to further develop and differentiate this standard (Lanstyák 2014, 30).

1.2.3 Language Management and Language Ideologies

Language problems and language ideologies are very strongly related, so much so that dealing with language problems necessarily leads to language ideologies (see Lanstyák 2018, 59). What the members of a given community perceive as a language problem is highly dependent on the ideologies in the light of which linguistic situations are interpreted (Lanstyák, 2010); this applies especially to organized language management, where speakers’ background knowledge, beliefs, language ideologies and linguistic attitudes are of key importance (Neustupný–Nekvapil, 2003, 185; Hübschmannová–Neustupný, 2004, .90; Lanstyák, 2014b, 327, 332).

Language ideologies are ideas and philosophies that are related to verbal communication and language in the broadest sense possible, and in this sense any form of explicit meta-linguistic discourse can be looked upon as a language ideology (Laihonen 2009, 25–26). During linguistic activities as a type of social action, language users conduct reflective and evaluative actions (Domonkosi 2007b, 38, 2007c, 38–39; Tolcsvai Nagy 2018, 33), that is, speakers have an opinion of their own linguistic actions as well as of those of others. The system of motivations, aims and expectations underlying their evaluation is moulded into language ideologies, in other words, language ideologies constitute the presentation and representation of a given language from a certain point of view with a certain purpose (Tolcsvai Nagy 2018, 33). This approach is consistent with the two metaphors that are commonly used in linguistic discourses about language ideologies: language ideology as glasses, and language ideology as a mask (Seböök 2012). To elaborate on the

prior, there are many different types of glasses. A certain type is used for reading, another for long and short distances, and yet another to protect our eyes from the sun. Due to their different functions, they shape reality in different ways according to their functions. And so do language ideologies represent different approaches, through which language can be perceived. (It is important to note here – as Sándor Szilágyi N. points out [2011] – that the metaphor is not perfect, as glasses can be changed and even taken off completely; language ideologies can be changed, but cannot be “taken off”. Perspectives can be changed, but language cannot be approached without an ideology.)

Regarding language ideologies as perspective, I also use the narrower interpretation of István Lanstyák (2018, 60–61): those language related notions constitute as language ideologies that are demonstrably used to explain or justify facts and processes related to language and language use by professional linguists, trained or layman language cultivators, or everyday speakers not concerned with language cultivation.

In her studies on ascribing values by layman speakers in linguistic counselling, Erzsébet Heltainé Nagy (2009, 80–81, 2011, 168–169) presents the different – often overlapping – ways of ascribing values: classifying here language traditions, attitudes, superstitions and myths, while also mentioning – although briefly – language ideologies (Heltainé Nagy 2009, 81). The concepts these coined phrases cover undoubtedly show similarities with each other, yet it is important to note that – meaning especially language myths and superstitions – language ideologies are not some sort of false consciousness, i.e. some systematically distorted perception of reality. The emphasis should be placed on the totality of language ideologies – which is called the total concept of ideologies (Blommaert 2006, 510).

Regarding the previously cited study of Heltainé Nagy (2011), while the terms of myth, superstition and stereotype mentioned there all carry some sort of negative value judgement or false supposition, language ideologies, however, have no such negative connotations (on this, see also Szabó 2015, 335). Value neutrality comes up not just here, but also in the case of scholarly attitudes: whether it is the job of language ideology studies to rate ideologies based on how well they correspond with linguistic positions and the “proper” view of language, or they should just only explore the ideologies in a way that the researcher’s own language ideologies are pushed to the background (see Woolard–Schieffelin 1994, 57–58). In this study, my position is the latter. I aim to present the language ideologies appearing in linguistic counselling, so they may be reflected upon in further practice of counselling activities.

2. Empirical study

In the following, I will present the pilot study that is based on the questions received in email by the linguistic counselling service. As Tolcsvai Nagy (2018, 33) writes, language ideologies occur in great numbers not just in the world but also in Hungarian culture, so my aim is not to explore, quantify and categorize all language

ideologies occurring in linguistic counselling discourse (it would be impossible anyway). Instead, I chose a single topic: the language ideologies about codification, i.e. the role of the linguist and linguistic counselling, as these appear frequently in linguistic counselling discourse.

2.1 Material and Method

Emails received by the linguistic counselling service are tagged with key words to order and categorize them, while also making them easy to search for. During the study, I examined the correspondence of the linguistic counselling service between 2017–2019, chose examples by searching key words, and then I explored the language ideologies appearing in the questions and answers. All of the counselling answers are my own, so the study was a great opportunity for self-reflection. In tagging explored ideologies, I used the language ideology term guide by István Lanstyák (2017).

2.2 Results

2.2.1 Language Ideologies in Counselling Emails

A common type of inquiry is when the questioners are looking for a second opinion on new and creative phrases coined by themselves, and how to “make them official” and “introduce” them into the Hungarian language and vocabulary, or in other words: make them widespread. In these cases, a (perceived or real) language deficiency causes the language problem. Some examples for these coined phrases: *eminózus* ‘opposite of *ominózus* (ominous), a certain pleasant, positive event’; *médiátor* < *média* (media) + *moderátor* (moderator) ‘supervisor of online forums, newspapers, radio and tv channels’; *szülőke* ‘female genitals’. The typical formulation of these questions is well illustrated by Example (1):

(1) „Érdeklődni szeretnék, hogyan lehetséges egy újonnan keletkezett szó levédése, hivatalos bevezetése a magyar nyelvhasználatba.”

[“I would like to enquire how it is possible to patent new words and how to introduce them to the Hungarian language.”]

This reoccurring question type shows what prominent place the Hungarian Academy of Sciences (HAS) has as the institution that started organized language cultivation. In the mind of everyday speakers it is an institution of such influence that has power over the language. The linguists of the Academy are supposed to decide what items constitute part of the language, which are “correct” and which are “incorrect” (language expertism, Lanstyák 2017, 21).

In conjunction with this notion, in everyday discourses about language, linguists seemingly have the power not only to decide the “correctness” of an item, but also – based on knowledge about the linguistic system – to control linguistic processes, influence language and engender linguistic changes (linguistic potentism, Lanstyák 2017, 34).

In Example (1), there is mention of lexical codification, which, in popular view, is proof that a word “exists”. Layman speakers tend to acknowledge the existence of a lexeme if it can be found in a dictionary – single language or grammatical. Lanstyák (2017, 39) calls this notion the ideology of linguistic vocabularism and defines it that the items found in codifying dictionaries are inherently more correct than the ones not found in these dictionaries, furthermore, they do not even exist, but if they do, they must be incorrect. In Example (2), this ideology appears in a more explicit form:

(2) Egy régi angol film (1942) szövegének fordításakor le mertem írni a *megnevet* igét. Azt a kritikát kaptam, hogy ez a szó nem létezik. Én már biztosan hallottam, talán nagyszüleim használták. [...] A Czuczor–Fogarasi¹ szótárban szerepel ez az ige, de újabb szótárakban valóban nem találtam meg. Most akkor létezik ez az szó?

[While translating an old English movie from 1942, I dared to use the verb *megnevet* (laugh, mock). I got the critique that there is no such word. I am sure I heard it, maybe from my grandparents. [...] The verb is in the Czuczor–Fogarasi dictionary, but it is indeed missing from newer dictionaries. Does this word exist?]

Example (2) becomes a language problem from the perspective of the linguistic vocabularism ideology, when other speakers reacted negatively to the archaic word and deemed it non-existent. The speaker perceives the contradiction between the ideology and their own experience (as they heard the word from grandparents), but accepts the ideology of vocabularism by looking up the word in a 19th century dictionary.

Related to linguistic vocabularism is the similar ideology of linguistic codificationism (Lanstyák 2017, 26): only the grammar in language correctness reference books is correct. Linguistic codificationism can be observed in inquiries that question the “correctness” and/or existence of words or other linguistic items, solely because a spell checker program deems it unknown or incorrect, as can be seen in Example (3).

(3) „Érdekes, a Helyes-e így? szerint olyan szó nincs, hogy *negativitás* (miközben igazából csak azt akartam megnézni, hogy biztosan jól tudom-e, hogy nem hosszú *í*-vel kell írni, ahogy valahol olvastam). Vagy én tudom rosszul, és tényleg nincs ilyen szó, és a honlapoldalak van igazaz?”

[“According to *Helyes-e így?*², there is no such word as *negativitás* (negativity). I only wanted to check if it is spelled with an *í*, because I read it somewhere like this. Or am I wrong and there is no such word and the webpage is right?”]

Questions like this show the dangers of spell checker programs, as users invest them with much too great authority, ignoring the fact that no computerized tool

¹ The dictionary was published between 1862–1874.

² *Helyes-e így?* is the spell checker of the helyesiras.mta.hu webpage.

can be 100% effective. Users might ignore the fact that words marked unknown by spell checkers may not deviate from official grammatical rules, but simply may not be included in the program's database. The questioner in Example (3) simply wanted to make sure of spelling, but, because the program's dictionary did not contain the word *negativitás*, then they questioned the existence of the word instead, however previously they had no such doubts. The spell checker program thus generated a language problem. The strong faith in the ideologies of linguistic vocabularism and codificationism may be the source of language problems, lead to questioner's insecurity and ultimately – in the words of Gyula Szepesy (1986) – to “the deterioration of their linguistic mood”.

The ideologies of linguistic vocabularism and codificationism also appear in Example (4) in relation with *deviszont* (but, however). This meshes together the different functions of the informative single language dictionaries, the norm codifying grammatical dictionaries and the spell checker programs.

(4) „A *deviszont* szó helyesírásáról szeretnék hivatalos forrásból érdeklődni, ezért kerestem fel Önöket. Az origo korábbi cikkében említette, hogy már helyesnek számít, ugyanakkor az Önök adatbázisában nem szerepel ez a szó. Hol a hiba? Hiányos az adatbázis vagy urban legend a *deviszont* legitimizálása?”

[“I contacted You to enquire about the official spelling of *deviszont*. There was an article on *Origo*³ that said it is now correct, but it cannot be found in your database⁴. Where is the mistake? Is the database lacking, or is the legitimization of *deviszont* an urban legend?”]

The question reflects on the fact that *deviszont*, based on frequency data, made it into the 5th edition of The Comprehensive Dictionary of Hungarian as a compound conjunction (Iltzész 2014). *Deviszont* becoming its own article in the dictionary turned the heads of everyday speakers and made headlines in the media, because of the linguistic superstitions and negative value judgements (Domonkosi 2007a; Schirm 2014) attached to it. Historically the aim of the comprehensive dictionary is the description and lexicographical analysis of contemporary vocabulary, so it is informative in function (Iltzész 2012). In the popular linguistic view, however, the two functions of normative (prescriptive) and informative (descriptive) mould together. This causes the codification of *deviszont* – as can be seen in Example (4) – to be interpreted as a form of “legitimization”. The same view is apparent in the mentioned Origo.hu article that was given the following title: *A tudomány meghajolt a deviszont előtt*. [Science bowed before *deviszont*] This title suggests a certain

³ The questioner refers to an interview on Origo.hu with Nóra Iltzész, chief editor of The Comprehensive Dictionary of Hungarian, after the 5th edition of the dictionary was published: Fábrián, Tamás–Sarkadi, Zsolt (2014): *A tudomány meghajolt a deviszont előtt*. Interjú Iltzész Nórával, A magyar nyelv nagyszótárának főszerkesztőjével. [Science bowed before *deviszont*. Interview with Nóra Iltzész, chief editor of The Comprehensive Dictionary of Hungarian] Retrieved from: <http://www.origo.hu/itthon/20140221-interju-iltzes-noraval-a-magyar-nyelv-nagyszotaranak-foszerkesztojevel.html> (05. 07. 2019.)

⁴ The questioner means the grammatical tools of helyesiras.mta.hu under “your database”.

layman speaker ideology that there are inherently “incorrect” items in language, which linguistics (or in layman interpretation probably language cultivation) fights against, yet in some cases accepts them, or “bows” to them.

Example (4) shows how, in the questioner’s interpretation, the different functions of dictionaries and computerized tools mould together. In the first sentence, the questioner clearly states their goal: finding out the spelling of *deviszont* (one word or two words). So they turned to RIL HAS as an “official source”. The second sentence shows that the questioner identified a contradiction between the spell checker and their own experience, which made them unsure about their original goal: since the “official” HAS spell checker does not contain the word, then maybe it does not exist (or is inherently “incorrect”), which makes the original question – how to spell it correctly – pointless. As the last sentence shows, the questioner does not entirely dismisses the possibility of the spell checker being wrong, it still occurs to them that the “legitimization” of *deviszont* may just be an urban legend. The ideology of linguistic codificationism caused a language problem here, too.

The helyesiras.mta.hu webpage is based on normative dictionaries, and since neither the 12th Edition of the Rules of the Hungarian Orthography, nor the Hungarian Orthographical Dictionary contain the word *deviszont*, it is also missing from the webpage’s database. More detail about this in 2.2.2, where I analyse the linguistic counselling responses.

The question in Example (5) shows similarities to the phenomenon in Example (4).

(5) Rákerestem a Helyes-e így? keresőmotorral a következő három szóra: *legoptimálisabb*, *kiexportál*, *beimportál*, és mindháromat helyesnek jelölte. Ezek valóban helyesek ebben a formában? Eddig úgy tudtam, hogy mivel az *optimális* eleve szuperlatívusz alakban van, nem helyes tovább fokozni. A másik két szónál ehhez hasonlóan felesleges az előtag, hiszen az *exportál* eleve azt jelenti, hogy kiszállít.

[I searched three words using the *Helyes-e így?* search engine: *legoptimálisabb* (most optimal), *kiexportál* (export out), *beimportál* (import in), and it shows all three as correct. Are they really correct in this form? I thought *optimális* (optimal) is already a superlative and cannot be put further in superlative form. Similarly, in the case of the other two words, the prepositions are pointless, since *exportál* (export) already means “to transport outward”.]

The questioner actually is looking for advice on language correctness and turned to helyesiras.mta.hu – even though it is a spell checking website, its function is to determine normative spelling. Rating and ranking linguistic items is not its job. Of course, the words *legoptimálisabb*, *kiexportál*, *beimportál* conform with normative spelling, so the program regards them to be correct.

Example (5) shows the ideology of linguistic redundantism (Lanstyák 2017, 35), which deems redundant linguistic items inherently more incorrect than non-redundant ones. As these words redundantly contain a superlative form and directional prepositions, the questioner thinks they are incorrect.

Comparing Examples (4) and (5), in the case of *deviszont*, the questioner seemingly believes in the word's (newfound) "correctness", until the spell checker tool shakes them in their belief. In the case of *legoptimálisabb, kiexportál, beimportál*, the questioner believes in their inherent "incorrectness", and only becomes doubtful – only to a lesser extent – when the program labels them "correct" (as in: conforms with normative spelling rules).

In the following chapter, I present the answers given by counsellors of the linguistic counselling service.

2.2.2 Language Ideologies in Counselling Replies

When questioners ask about an unusual or situational item, whether it exists or how to "make official", like in Example (1), we usually give the following answer:

First, we check the available databases, corpuses, like the Hungarian National Corpus that can be regarded the representative corpus of the Hungarian language (Oravecz-Váradí-Sass 2014). Usually we find little to no matches. Behind this step – searching the corpuses – lies the ideology of linguistic usualism: the thought that "the more widespread (geographically, in social strata, speaking situations, linguistic contexts etc.) or more often used an item is, it is inherently more correct than the less widespread or rarer ones" (Lanstyák 2017, 39). In some cases, where the coined phrases are formally correct (i.e. *fontatlan* 'not important'), we usually note that "these words conform with the rules of language, so in this sense, they are »correct«." Note that punctuation in this case should be interpreted as a metalanguage commentary, as in the use of quotation marks mean that the counsellor distances themselves from the everyday use of the word. Using quotation marks – implicitly – is a traditional language cultivation approach, deconstructing the ideology called linguistic autonomism by Lanstyák (2017, 17–18). The ideology refuses to acknowledge the correctness of certain forms without a context of use. Finally, the ideology of linguistic usualism comes to the forefront again: "In spite of this, we don't use it, as it is **not »sanctioned« by custom.**"

In Example (6), I quote the rest of the answer:

(6) „Új szavak tudatos szóalkotásként is keletkeznek folyamatosan. Ezeknek egy része megmarad egyedinek, más részük elterjed, közhasználatúvá válik. Szótárba, szótárakba ez utóbbiak kerülnek. [...] Hogy »szótárérett« szó lesz-e az Ön javaslata: nehéz megmondani. Az Akadémia akkor tud »hivatalossá tenni«, »bevezetni« (vagyis szótári kodifikációval megerősíteni) egy egyedi szóalkotásként indult szóalakat, ha az már közhasználatúvá vált. A javasolt szóalak sorsa, jövője attól függ tehát, hogy mennyire kedvelik meg széles körben a mai és a majdani nyelvhasználók.”

[“New words are created all the time. Some of them remain unique, some become widespread and a part of everyday speech. Only the latter make it into dictionaries. [...] Whether your word will be included in a dictionary, is hard to tell. The Academy can only »make a word official«, codify it in a dictionary, if the unique coined phrase becomes part of everyday speech. The future of the recommended phrase depends on how

popular it becomes among speakers in the present and the future.”]

The linguistic counsellor uses the ideology of linguistic usualism in the answer, when referring to the language tradition, pointing out the process, in practice, is the other way round: it is not the Academy’s decision that makes a word “official” and widespread in the language but the lexemes sanctified by the language traditions are the ones that make it into dictionaries. The ideology of linguistic descriptivism also appears (Lanstyák 2017, 19): the thought that the job of linguists is to describe (here: codify in a dictionary) certain phrases.

When analysing Example (1), I mentioned the ideology of linguistic potentism that is deconstructed in the counselling answer (6), meaning linguists have no power over the language. The ideology of linguistic expertism however – that linguists use their knowledge in the field to give advice on “correct” forms – is continually upheld, since the ideology is the direct result of the communicative situation, which wouldn’t even exist without it. The ideology of linguistic prescriptivism (Lanstyák 2017, 34) is also part of the exchange.

Moving on to the counselling answers regarding *deviszont*. To the question in Example (4), we answered that the word made it into the Comprehensive Dictionary in 2014 as a compound conjunction, and illustrated its use with examples in the dictionary. We mentioned that the process is reversed, meaning dictionaries codify words based on use (linguistic descriptivism), and so *deviszont* shouldn’t be regarded as a “mistake” (just like previously, quotation marks are metalanguage commentary, an implicit language ideology). We also mentioned that the stigma of incorrectness is further perpetuated in speaking communities, “especially where the learned common dialect is the norm”. The linguistic counsellor’s previously descriptive position (presenting the function of *deviszont* with dictionary examples), here, turns into a cautious, barely noticeable prescriptive one.

Finally, the counsellor explains that the tools of *helyesiras.mta.hu* cannot help with writing, because the grammatical companions do not contain the *deviszont* or *de viszont* forms. Only the Comprehensive Dictionary contains them, which is not a grammatical but a descriptive, interpretative dictionary.

The writing of *deviszont* is further elaborated in more detail in another answer. The questioner stated that *deviszont* became a solid compound in 2014 and regarded the spell-checker not marking *de viszont* incorrect a mistake. In the counselling answer, based on the Comprehensive Dictionary, the counsellor further explained the situation: although the heading is a compound (*deviszont*), the writings in the following dictionary examples also vary.

The counsellor further highlights the descriptive nature of the Comprehensive Dictionary, and that it is not grammatical (normative). They also draw attention to the fact that *de()viszont* also cannot be found in The Rules of the Hungarian Orthography or other dictionaries (7).

(7) „Mi következik mindebből? Az, hogy az Akadémiának nincs hivatalos állásfoglalása a *de()viszont* szó helyesírásáról. A nagyszótárbeli egybeírt formát lehet persze követni mint ajánlást, logikusnak is tűnik, hiszen az összeforrt kötőszókat egybe szoktuk írni

(pl. *ámde*, *ugyebár* stb.). De a nagyszótárbeli megjelenés nem egyenlő a helyesírási kodifikációval, ez utóbbi csak akkor történt meg, ha felvette az illetékes akadémiai munkabizottság a helyesírási szótárba, ez pedig nem történt meg.

Ilyenformán nem mondhatjuk, hogy a *deviszont* szót 2014 óta egybe kell írni. Lehet persze egyfajta ajánlásként felfogni, s azt követve egybeírni, de ha valaki különírja a *deviszontot*, arra nem mondhatjuk, hogy eltért a helyesírási normától, mert jelen esetben ilyen – nincs.

A helyesiras.mta.hu portál eszközei a mindenkori akadémiai szabályozást követik. A *deviszont* esete azonban nem egyértelmű, nem létezik erről akadémiai állásfoglalás, így csupán az egybeírt alakot feltüntetni egyedüli helyes megoldásként nem lenne helyénvaló.”

[“The following can be concluded from this: The Academy has no official position on the writing of *deviszont*. The forms in the Comprehensive Dictionary are recommendations, following them seems logical, since there are conjunctions that are solid compounds, like *ámde* (however), *ugyebár* (question tags) etc. Appearance in the Comprehensive dictionary is not grammatical codification, which can only happen when the responsible academic committee adopts a form in the grammatical dictionary, which hasn't happened yet.

As a result, it cannot be stated that *deviszont* has to be a solid compound since 2014. Following the recommendation, it can be used as a solid compound, but writing *deviszont* separately does not violate the grammatical norms, since currently there is no such norm.

The tools of the helyesiras.mta.hu portal always follow the effective academic guidelines. In the case of *deviszont*, there is no such guideline, so regarding only the solid compound form as correct would be inappropriate.”]

In my interpretation, the standard ideology can be seen in the lack of codification, as dictionaries and the rules of orthography are based on the standard language variant, while other (non-standard) language variants and forms do not belong in their scope. So the lack of codification of *deviszont* can be interpreted as a hidden value judgement, since it is only found in the descriptive Comprehensive Dictionary, and not the normative grammatical dictionary.

The answer to Example (5) – regarding the superfluous superlative and prepositions in the words *legoptimálisabb*, *kiexportál*, *beimportál* – contains only two key notions: (i.) the spell-checker only checks for normative spelling, while disregarding other (practical, pragmatical) aspects; (ii.) it is based on normative language use and tradition, and warns about the difference in style or meaning among the different variants.

The occasional replies to counselling answers, however, show that the purely descriptive approach (describing style and use) is often not efficient enough in counselling, as can be seen in Example (8):

(8) „[...] joggal várhatnám el egy tanácsadó szolgálattól, hogy legalább tanácsoljon valamit. Ha nem is ítélezést, de tanácsot várok: bátran használjam, vagy inkább tartóz-

kodjam tőle. Azzal csak szegényedik nyelvünk, ha széttárt karunkkal ennyit mondunk: »hát igen, ez bizony előfordul«”.

[“[...] it is not entirely unreasonable to expect a counselling service to give advice. I don't necessarily need judgement, only advice: should I use the form, or not. It only makes our language poorer, if we spread our arms and say: »well, yeah, this also happens«”.]

3. Summary

In this study, I analysed the questions and answers received and given by the linguistic counselling service of the Research Institute for Linguistics of the Hungarian Academy of Sciences. Through this correspondence, I studied the language ideologies among the Hungarian speaking communities, focusing on the topic of codification in the context of prior similar studies. The novelty of this paper, in comparison, is the framework of Language Management Theory and language ideologies. The latter includes the notion that linguistics and one of its applied fields, linguistic counselling, is also a language about language, a metalanguage activity, so it was self-evident to include the counselling answers in the study. With the analysis of language ideologies, the aim of the study is to reflect upon the linguistic counselling practice: its re-thinking; what language ideologies should be applied in order for the organized language management to better serve the addressing of language problems.

The popular approach to language includes ideologies concerned with the supremacy of the standard. The public looks to the professional linguists to provide guidelines regarding the correctness of certain language forms; linguists are ascribed to have power over the language. The concept of “correctness” among layman speakers are simplified, often not distinguishing between grammatical and pragmatical “correctness” and grammatical norms. The inquiries unequivocally show the reverence of dictionaries that encompass not just printed dictionaries, but also automatized spell-checker tools.

The counselling answers are more ambiguous regarding their ideologies. In some cases, they include contradicting ideologies, e.g. “balancing” between descriptive and normative ideologies. Sometimes, the anti-standard ideology appears implicitly (see the use of quotation marks), while the counsellor also admits to the unviability of descriptive ideologies, as the counselling exchange is expected by the public to provide evaluation and guidance. The counsellor also accepts the ideology of linguistic expertism, since it is the basis of organized linguistic counselling.

Sources

Digital correspondence of the linguistic counselling service at the Research Institute for Linguistics of the Hungarian Academy of Sciences (tanacs@nytud.mta.hu). Budapest: MTA Nyelvtudományi Intézet. 2017–2019.

References

- Balogh, Erzsébet – T. Balla, Ágnes (2009): *Nyelvi menedzselés multinacionális nagyvállalatoknál: két, Magyarországon működő nagyvállalat kommunikációjának összehasonlítása a nyelvmenedzselés-elmélet segítségével* [Language management of multinational companies: Comparing two companies in Hungary with the help of Language Management Theory]. In Borbély – Vančoné Kremmer – Hattjár (eds.), 531–535. p.
- Bari, Diána Éva (2018): A nyelvmenedzselés-elmélet és a hibajavítás szerepe a nyelvoktatásban [The role of Language Management Theory and Correction of Mistakes in Language Education]. In *Időszerű kérdések. Struktúra, funkció, szemiotika, hálózat tanulmánykötet* [Timely Questions. Structure, function, semiotics, network collection of studies] Eds. Balázs, Géza – Lengyel, Klára. Budapest: ELTE BTK Mai Magyar Nyelvi Tanszék – Inter (IKU) – Magyar Szemiotikai Társaság. 263–270. p.
- Bauer, Laurie – Trudgill, Peter (1998): *Language Myths*. London: Penguin Books.
- Blommaert, Jan (2006): *Language Ideology*. Brown, Keith (ed). Encyclopedia of Language and Linguistics. Second edition, vol. 6. Amsterdam: Elsevier. 510–521. p.
- Borbély, Anna – Vančoné Kremmer, Ildikó – Hattjár, Helga (eds.) (2009): *Nyelvideológiák, attitűdök és sztereotípiák*. [Language ideologies, attitudes, stereotypes]. Budapest–Dunaszerdahely–Nyitra: Tinta Könyvkiadó.
- Domonkosi, Ágnes (2007a): *Nyelvi babonák és sztereotípiák: a helyes és a helytelen a népi nyelvészeti szemléletben*. [Language superstitions and stereotypes: Correctness and incorrectness from perspective of folk linguistics.] In Domonkosi–Lanstyák–Posgay (eds.), 142–153. p.
- Domonkosi, Ágnes (2007b): *Attitűd, értékítélet, minősítés: az értékszempont érvényesülése a nyelvi-nyelvhasználati reflexiókban* [Attitude, value judgement, evaluation: The role of values in reflections on language use.] Acta Academiae Pedaogogicae Agriensis. Nova Series Tom. XXXIV. Sectio Linguistica Hungarica, 38–54. p.
- Domonkosi, Ágnes (2007c): *Az értékelés és a minősítés a nyelvművelésben* [Evaluation and qualification in language cultivation]. In Domonkosi–Lanstyák–Posgay (eds.), 38–51. p.
- Domonkosi, Ágnes – Lanstyák, István – Posgay, Ildikó (eds.) (2007): *Műhelytanulmányok a nyelvművelésről* [Working Papers on Language Cultivation]. Dunaszerdahely–Budapest: Gramma Nyelvi Iroda – Tinta Könyvkiadó.
- Havránek, Bohuslav (1932): *Úkoly spisovného jazyka a jeho kultura* [The task of the standard language and its cultivation]. In *Spisovná Feltina a jazyková kultura* [Standard Czech and the Cultivation of Language]. Eds. Havránek, Bohuslav – Weingart, Miloš. Prague: Melantrich. 32–84. p.
- Heltainé Nagy, Erzsébet (2007): *A nyelvművelés fogalma és terénymai* [The Concept and areas of language cultivation.] In Domonkosi–Lanstyák–Posgay (eds.), 13–26. p.
- Heltainé Nagy, Erzsébet (2009): *Értéktulajdonítások a nyelvi vélekedésekben* [Ascribing values in language beliefs]. In Borbély – Vančoné Kremmer – Hattjár (eds.), 87–94. p.
- Heltainé Nagy, Erzsébet (2011): *Nyelvi mítoszok a tanácsadói gyakorlatban* [Language Myths in the Practice of Consultancy]. In *Nyelvi mítoszok, ideológiák, nyelvpolitika és nyelvi emberi jogok Közép-Európában elméletben és gyakorlatban*. A 16. Élőnyelvi Konferencia előadásai [Language myths, ideologies, language politics and linguistic human rights in Central-Europe in theory and practice. Presentations of the 16th Conference on Sociolinguistics]. Eds. Hires-László, Kornélia – Karmacs, Zoltán – Márku, Anita. Budapest–Be-

regzsász: Tinta Könyvkiadó – II. Rákóczi Ferenc Kárpátaljai Magyar Főiskola Hodinka Antal Intézete. 165–174. p.

Heltainé Nagy, Erzsébet (2012): *Nyelvhasználati minősítések, a helyes-helytelen a tanácsadói gyakorlatban* [Assessment of language use: correct vs. incorrect in language counselling]. *Magyar Nyelvőr* 136/4, 394–406. p.

Heltainé Nagy, Erzsébet (2014): *A nyelvi tanácsadás területei és újabb eszközei az MTA Nyelvtudományi Intézetében* [The areas and latest devices of linguistic counselling at the Research Institute for Linguistics, Hungarian Academy of Sciences]. *Anyanyelv-pedagógia* 7/1, <http://www.anyanyelv-pedagogia.hu/cikkek.php?id=505> (Retrieved: 05. 07. 2019.)

Heltainé Nagy, Erzsébet (2016): A nyelvi tanácsadás mint az anyanyelvi nevelés és közművelődés lehetősége [Linguistic counselling as a form of linguistic upbringing and public education]. In „*Szavad ne feledd!*” *Tanulmányok Bánréti Zoltán tiszteletére*. [“Hold that thought!” Studies honouring Zoltán Bánréti] Eds. Kas, Bence. Budapest: MTA Nyelvtudományi Intézet. 247–256. p.

Hübschmannová, Milena – Neustupný, Jiří Václav (2004): *‘Terminological’ processes in North-Central Romani*. *Current Issues in Language Planning* 5, 83–108. p.

Iltzs, Nóra 2012. *Nyelvhasználat és szótári ábrázolás viszonya a korpuszalapú szótárban* [The relationship between language use and lexical representation in a corpus-based dictionary]. *Magyar Nyelvőr* 136/4, 390–394. p.

Iltzs, Nóra (ed.) (2014): *A magyar nyelv nagyszótára V*. [The Comprehensive Dictionary of Hungarian, Vol. 5.] Budapest: MTA Nyelvtudományi Intézet.

Jernudd, Björn H. – Neustupný, Jiří Václav (1987): Language planning: for whom? In *Proceedings of the International Colloquium on Language Planning*. Ed. Laforge, L. (ed.): Québec: Les Press de L’Université Laval. 69–84. p.

Kardos, Tamás (2007): *A magyar helyesírás problémái a nyelvi közönségszolgálat tükrében*. [The problems of Hungarian orthography from the aspect of the linguistic information service]. In Domonkosi–Lanstyák–Posgay (eds.), 114–129. p.

Kenesei, István (2004): A nyelvmélettől a nyelvművelésig. A nyelvészet egységéről és változatosságáról [From language theory to language cultivation. Of the unity and diversity of linguistics]. In *25 év anyanyelvünk szolgálatában* [25 years in service of language]. Budapest: Akadémiai Kiadó. 7–25. p.

Kimura, Goro Christoph (2014): *Language management as a cyclical process: A case study on prohibiting Sorbian in the workplace*. *Slovo a slovesnost* 75, 255–270. p.

Laihonen, Petteri (2009): *Language Ideologies in the Romanian Banat: Analysis of Interviews and Academic Writings among the Hungarians and Germans*. *Jyväskylä Studies in Humanities* 119. Jyväskylä: University of Jyväskylä.

Lanstyák, István (2007): *Általános nyelvi mítoszok* [General language myths]. In Domonkosi–Lanstyák–Posgay (eds.), 174–212. p.

Lanstyák, István (2010a): *A nyelvi problémák típusai*. [The types of language problems]. *Fórum Társadalomtudományi Szemle* 12/1, 23–48. p.

Lanstyák, István (2010b): *A nyelvi problémák típusai nyelvi jellegük szerint* [The Types of language problems according to their linguistic character]. *Fórum Társadalomtudományi Szemle* 12/2, 23–46. p.

Lanstyák, István (2010c): *A nyelvi problémák kezelése* [The treatment of language problems.] *Fórum Társadalomtudományi Szemle* 12/3, 53–76. p.

Lanstyák, István (2014a): *Nyelvalakítás és nyelvi ideológiák* [Language management and

language ideologies]. Bratislava: University of Comenius.

Lanstyák, István (2014b): *On the process of language problem management*. *Slovo a slovesnost*, 75/4, 325–351. p.

Lanstyák, István (2017): *Nyelvi ideológiák. Általános tudnivalók és fogalomtár* [Language ideologies. Basic assumptions and a glossary]. Retrieved from http://web.unideb.hu/~tkis/li_nyelvideologiai_fogalomtar2.pdf (05. 08. 2019.)

Lanstyák, István (2018): *Nyelvalakítás és nyelvi problémák*. [Language management and language problems] Somorja: Fórum Kisebbségkutató Intézet – Gramma Nyelvi Iroda.

Lanstyák, István – Szabó Mihály, Gizella (2009): Hungarian in Slovakia. Language management in a bilingual minority community. In *Language Management in Contact Situations. Perspectives from Three Continents*. Eds. Nekvapil, Jiří – Sherman, Tamah. Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang. 49–73. p.

Maitz, Peter (2010): *Sprachpflege als Mythenwerkstatt und Diskriminierungspraktik*. *Apertum. Zeitschrift für Sprachkritik und Sprachkultur*. 6/1, 1–19. p. Retrieved from: https://www.philhist.uni-augsburg.de/lehrestuehle/germanistik/sprachwissenschaft/Literatur_maitz/cikk34m_Sprachpflege-als-Mythenwerkstatt_.pdf (03. 07. 2019.)

Minya, Károly (2005): *Rendszerváltás – normaváltás. A magyar nyelvűvelés története, elvei és vitái 1989-től napjainkig* [Regime change – norm change. The history, principles and debates of Hungarian language cultivation from 1989 to the present day]. Budapest: Tinta Könyvkiadó.

Nekvapil, Jiří (2006): *From Language Planning to Language Management*. *Sociolinguistica* 20: 92–104. p.

Nekvapil, Jiří (2008): Language Cultivation in Development Context. In *Educational Linguistics*. Eds. Spolsky, Bernard – Hult, Francis M. 251–265. p.

Nekvapil, Jiří – Sherman, Tamah (2009): *Pre-interaction management in multinational companies in Central Europe*. *Current Issues in Language Planning* 10/2, 181–198. p.

Nekvapil, Jiří – Sherman, Tamah (2013): Language ideologies and linguistic practices: the case of multinational companies in Central Europe. In *Ideological Conceptualizations of Language: Discourses of Linguistic Diversity*. Eds. Barát, Erzsébet – Studer, Patrick – Nekvapil, Jiří. Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang. 85–117. p.

Neustupný, Jiří Václav (2003): *Japanese students in Prague: Problems of communication and interaction*. *International Journal of the Sociology of Language* 162, 125–143. p.

Neustupný, Jiří Václav – Nekvapil, Jiří (2003): *Language management in the Czech Republic*. *Current Issues in Language Planning* 4, 181–366. p.

Oravecz, Csaba – Váradi, Tamás – Sass, Bálint (2014): *The Hungarian Gigaword Corpus. In Proceedings of Ninth International Conference on Language Resources and Evaluation (LREC 2014)*. Eds. Calzolari, Nicoletta – Choukri, Khalid – Declerck, Thierry et al. 1719–1723. p.

Schirm, Anita (2014): *A deviszont viszontagságai* [The trials of deviszont]. *Nyest.hu*, 2014. november 12. Retrieved from: <https://www.nyest.hu/hirek/a-deviszont-viszontagsagai> (05. 07. 2019.)

Sherman, Tamah (2007): Language management on the front lines: A report from Dunajská Streda Language Management Workshop. In *Language Management in Contact Situations 5: Report on the Research Projects 154*. Ed. Muraoka, Hidehiro. Chiba: Chiba University, Graduate School of Humanities and Social Sciences. 67–77. p.

Sebők, Szilárd (2012): *A nyelvi ideológiák működési mechanizmusairól, avagy nyelvi ide-*

ológiák szem előtt tartása és „szembe állítása” [On Operating Mechanisms of Language Ideologies]. Fórum Társadalomtudományi Szemle 14/3, 87–108. p.

Szabó, Gergely (2015): „*Hogy fejezzem ki magam szépen?*” – *Nyelvi ideológiák az obszcenitások mögött.* [‘How to put it nicely?’ – Language ideologies behind obscenities]. Magyar Nyelvőr 139/3, 334–346. p.

Szabó Mihály, Gizella (2005): *Nyelvművelés – nyelvtervezés – nyelvi menedzselés.* [Language cultivation – language planning – language management]. Fórum Társadalomtudományi Szemle 7/4, 67–75. p.

Szabó Mihály, Gizella (2007): *A nyelvi menedzselés lehetséges szerepe a magyar nyelvalkításban.* [The possible role of language management in Hungarian language treatment]. In Domonkosi–Lanstyák–Posgay (eds.), 52–67. p.

Szepesy, Gyula (1986): *Nyelvi babonák* [Language superstitions]. Budapest: Gondolat Kiadó. Retrieved from: <http://mek.oszk.hu/01600/01688/01688.htm> (05. 07. 2019.)

Tolcsvai Nagy, G. (2018): A nyelv kulturális, ideológiai értelmezései [Cultural and ideological interpretations of language]. In *A magyar nyelv jelene és jövője* [The present and future of the Hungarian language]. Ed. Tolcsvai Nagy, Gábor. Budapest: Gondolat Kiadó. 32–45. p.

Váradi, Tamás – Ludányi, Zsófia – Kovács, Réka (2014): *Géppel segített helyesírás. A helyesírás.mta.hu portál készítéséről* [Computer aided spelling advice. Designing the helyesírás.mta.hu site]. Modern Nyelvoktatás 20/1–2, 43–58. p.

Woolard, Kathryn – Schieffelin, Bambi (1994): *Language ideology.* Annual Review of Anthropology 23, 55–82. p.