

9. Terminological analysis of Hungarian colour terms

9.1. Introduction

Colour terms frequently occur in everyday language use, and several branches of science have dedicated decades to their study. Most of these scientific fields consider the question to be well-researched and have drawn their conclusions.

Before we start exploring the topic, the concept of ‘*colour*’ needs to be specified. Although colours are an essential part of everyday life, it is very difficult to define ‘colour’. According to an on-line Oxford Dictionary colour is “the property possessed by an object of producing different sensations on the eye as a result of the way it reflects or emits light”³⁴. This definition is not very clear for the average language user, all we understand from it is that it has to do with vision and it depends on the light coming from the object. The Encyclopaedia Britannica defines it as: “the aspect of any object that may be described in terms of hue, lightness, and saturation. In physics, colour is associated specifically with electromagnetic radiation of a certain range of wavelengths visible to the human eye.”³⁵ But the problem with such a definition is that common people are not familiar with electromagnetic radiation or the parameters of hue, lightness, and saturation.

If we leave the general concept of ‘colour’ and attempt to define individual colour terms, the situation does not become easier. Paterson (2003: 1) is very sceptical about defining colours: “Any attempt to define any particular colour merely by means of words is doomed to failure. We can illustrate the general nature of any particular colour by reference to an object having the same quality (which begs the question) or by reference to its wavelength (which is of interest only as a matter of physics) or by reference to another colour (which becomes circular).” We have seen in chapter 5.1. that reference to wavelengths is not only no use for everyday language speakers, but also ambiguous in physics. Braisby and Franks (1997: 181) also claim that that colour terms do not have clearly identifiable semantic attributes.

³⁴ <http://oxforddictionaries.com/definition/colour>

³⁵ <http://www.britannica.com/EBchecked/topic/126658/colour>

9.2. Aims, methods, sources

The general aim of the dissertation is to study Hungarian basic colour terms from various aspects. The dissertation provides an overview of the most important lines of research published in the international literature, and joins the study of Hungarian colour terms into this huge field of study. The work aims to answer certain research questions that have been raised in the past decades both in the international literature and in the domestic one, but have not been fully answered.

Unfortunately, the Hungarian literature on linguistics only includes some of the various lines of research into colour terms, and as a consequence many of the interesting issues elaborated on in the international literature cannot be accessed in the Hungarian language. The publications on colour terms can fill an entire library, and this paper does not aim to summarise or even touch upon the full body of literature. This would be an impossible task, so instead – after surveying the basics of the field – I decided to provide an overview of certain topics that have been neglected in Hungarian publications.

As opposed to the abundance of international literature on the colour terms of various languages, the issue of Hungarian colour terms (whether basic or non-basic) has not been discussed in detail; I am not aware of a comprehensive monograph that would show new scientific achievements written by a Hungarian author.

Specific aims

My goal is first to provide a comparative summary of the results published in the international literature and then apply certain internationally established findings and methods to the basic colour terms of Hungarian. This general goal has been embodied in smaller and more specific aims. The studies presented in the dissertation have the following aims:

- to summarise the main trains of thought in the relevant international literature, with a special focus on research topics that have not been treated in sufficient detail in the Hungarian literature,
- to provide a thorough, comparative presentation of the literature available on Hungarian basic colour terms (the most recent of which have not been published

by Hungarian authors, and for some reason their results do not seem to have reached the Hungarian scientific community), and to evaluate their findings,

- to study the basic colour term candidates of Hungarian from various aspects (lexicography, terminology, corpus linguistics, lexicology),
- to place special emphasis on the two colour terms for red: *piros* and *vörös*
- to study those colour terms whose basicness is often questioned because they are compounds: *narancssárga* ‘orange’ and *rózsaszín* ‘pink’,
- to study the two possible equivalents for purple: *lila* and *bíbor*,
- to study the criteria of basicness,
- to establish the basic colour terms of Hungarian.

Methods and sources

These intertwined research aims lead to specific research methods. I relied on Fóris (2008a) in identifying the most suitable method. During the research, depending on the research topic, I used several methods that completed each other. My studies are predominantly descriptive in nature, partly theoretical and partly empirical.

I have surveyed a large amount of publications on colour terms in general. I have followed the lines of thought and the development of theoretical frameworks of linguistic relativism, colour universals, perceptual categorisation and prototype theory and the psycholinguistic study of colour term acquisition. I have approached the field of Hungarian basic colour terms starting with Finno-Ugric languages, and narrowed my focus to the basic colour terms of Hungarian, surveying over a century of literature.

During my readings I have encountered several linguistic articles that relied on the sensitivity of certain receptors of the human eye in their explanation of the meaning of colour terms, and underpinned their view with information on wavelengths belonging to certain colours. As I lacked the necessary background knowledge in human physiology and physics to follow such reasoning, I have

decided to start off with the mechanism of human colour vision, and turned to university course books on optics for help. I hoped to be able to decipher the precise characteristics of colours and understand the hierarchy among colours based on scientific texts.

Instead, I had to face the fact that the sensitivity of the cone photoreceptors in the eye does not explain primary basic colours. Moreover, I understood that the basic colours of optics are not the same as the basic colour terms of linguistics, and the various text books on physics use different terminology. This led me to carry out a terminological analysis of specialised texts (on optics, printing press and desktop publishing) with the aim of extracting the defining features of concepts. However, this study has not brought unambiguous results, so I turned to other research methods.

The sources of lexicographic studies were monolingual Hungarian explanatory dictionaries. I have collected the definitions of colour terms in the available dictionaries – *A magyar nyelv értelmező szótára* (ÉrtSz. 1959–1962), *Magyar értelmező kéziszótár* (ÉKSz.² 2003), *Értelmező szótár+* (ÉrtSz.+ 2007) – and I analysed their content. I have also used an online dictionary of Hungarian colour terms as a source.

For the quantitative study I used a huge international database called the World Color Survey (www.icsi.berkeley.edu/wcs_data.html), and for the corpus linguistic analysis I relied on the *Hungarian National Corpus* as my source.

Beyond the basic colour terms, I have also studied other Hungarian colour terms. I have collected my research material from wedding magazines, which proved to be a very abundant source. I have analysed the collected colour terms with functional-semantic and morphologic methods.

The bibliographical data of the scientific works I referred to are found in chapter 10, while the data of dictionaries and other lexicographic works can be found in chapter 11.

9.3. The structure of the dissertation

The dissertation comprises of eight chapters, which are preceded by the *Table of Contents*, and the *Acknowledgement*, and followed by the *Bibliography*, *Sources* and the *Appendix*.

In chapter one (introduction) I outline the research area, the reasons for selecting this topic, and I describe the structure of the dissertation.

In chapter two I summarise and evaluate the relevant literature: I introduce the history of colour term studies, the theoretical background and selected lines of research. I am not aiming at a comprehensive summary of the entire body of literature on colour terms, as that is far beyond the scope of this paper. After overviewing the fundamental publications, I focus of subtopics that have been neglected in the Hungarian literature so far.

The first part of this chapter introduces the physiology of human colour vision, and the various colour scales and systems in use. I have drawn the conclusion that the sensitivity of the three types of cones in the human eye does not explain the so called universal order of colour term lexicalisation. The three cones are sensitive to 570, 535 and 445 nm wavelengths of light, which fall into the yellow, green and blue categories, respectively. Therefore, they do not explain either the privileged position of red, or that in many higher stage languages there are no separate basic color terms for green and blue. Colour vision is not decided by the stimulus formed in the eye. Beyond the cones in the eye, the processing of the stimulus by the brain plays an equally important role in colour vision: the stimulus passes through the hierarchical visual structures of the brain and finally reaches the visual cortex, which has six levels. Each level has its role in vision, colour vision is centred in level 4, but the precise operation of each level is just being explored by modern technology (see Sacks 2004). What is more, the brain areas responsible for processing language have been shown to take an active role in visual perception, which means that the brain does not merely carry out an automatic processing of the stimuli arriving from the eye (Tan et al. 2008).

I have briefly presented the studies that support the theory of linguistic relativism to a smaller or larger extent (e.g.: Lenneberg 1971; Kay and Kempton 1984; Davies and Corbett 1997; Gilbert et al. 2006; Drivonikou et al. 2007; Tan et al.

2008; Kay et al. 2009) and as opposed them, those studies that support the universalist theory to any extent (Berlin and Kay 1969; Collier et al. 1976; Kay and McDaniel 1978; Rosch 2004; Kay and Regier 2003; Regier et al. 2005; Lindsey and Brown 2006). The picture is further refined by studies that claim colour terms are culturally basic (McNeill 1972; Davies et al. 1992; Levinson 2001). Although the scientific study of colour terms has decades of history, the conflicting and contradictory theoretical frameworks of the field have not been resolved yet, as they are very well founded and supported by a wealth of evidence. The issue is far from being settled; new discoveries inspire researchers over and over again.

According to the universalist view, every language has a maximum of 11 (or 12) basic colour terms, and they are lexicalised in languages in a fixed order. Berlin and Kay (1969) established four criteria of basicness: a basic colour term is monolexemic, its meaning is not part of the meaning of another colour term, its use is not restricted, it is psychologically salient. It is claimed that regardless of the fact whether a language has colour terms for them, certain hues (mostly red, yellow, green and blue) have a privileged status in human colour vision because of neurophysiological reasons. These constitute the focal points of primary basic colour categories, and serve as reference points when we have to decide whether a hue belongs to a given category or not. The more similar the target colour is to the focal colour, the easier and quicker the decision. However, the boundaries of colour categories are hazy, hues at the ‘edge’ of a category are hard to decide upon.

The problem with this line of thought is that – as we have seen earlier – the sensitivity of the cone photoreceptors in the human eye does not explain the existence of primary basic colour categories. If colour vision depended heavily on the operation of cones i) *yellow* (and not *red*) would be the privileged colour term after black and white, and ii) every language that has at least five colour terms would have a separate word for *blue* and *green* (which is not the case as many higher stage languages have *grue* – see Davies et al. 1994; and the results of the World Color Survey presented in chapter 6.1.). Kay and Berlin (1997: 196) acknowledge that „since 1969 modest progress has been made in relating cross-language universals of color naming to properties of the visual system”; and although this line of research has been using the most modern technological inventions, this has not changed in the past decade either (c.f.: Kövecses and Benczes 2010).

Next I briefly discuss perceptual categorisation (Saunders–van Brakel 1997a; Roberson et al. 2000; Davidoff 2001; Özgen and Davies 2002; Davidoff et al. 2007; Roberson and Hanley 2010) and prototype theory (Rosch 1978 and 2004; Heit and Barsalou 1996; Barsalou 1989; Wierzbicka 1990). Prototype theory offers an effective framework for understanding colour categories. The theory posits that every category is organised around a prototype, members of the category are compared to this prototype, and occupy their position in the category based on their distance from it. However, Rosch (1978) warns us not to consider one specific entity as the prototype of a natural category. Wierzbicka (1996) also claimed that the prototype of a colour category is the mental representation of the most typical object or entity, and not the object or entity itself.

Finally, I provide an insight into the psycholinguistic studies into colour term acquisition: the age and sex related differences in colour term acquisition (for a Hungarian study see Gósy 1998), and the Stroop effect. Research findings are contradictory here too (see chapter 2.5. for details): some studies find evidence for innate colour categories, some do not; some claim that learning colours takes place more slowly than learning other abstract categories, while other studies disagree; some claim that children can only perform tasks with colours once they have acquired the names of those colours, others claim that these are independent processes. What the authors seem to agree on is that children acquire colour terms very slowly, they make a lot of mistakes, and they learn the names first but use them correctly only after substantial amount of practice. In general, girls seem to have an advantage in learning colour terms, and formal instruction seems to have a positive effect on the process.

In chapter three I define the general and specific aims of the dissertation and discuss the methods and sources used in the studies. The general aim of the paper is to study Hungarian basic colour terms from various aspects: lexicography, terminology, corpus linguistics, and lexicology. The specific aims have been outlined in chapter 9.2. above.

In chapter four I introduce studies into basic colour terms of Finno-Ugric languages (Udmurt, Estonian, Finnish, Mordvin, Cheremis) and then move on to a thorough study of publications on the Hungarian basic colour terms. I start off with pointing out the incorrect information contained in Berlin and Kay's work (1969) on

the Hungarian language and Hungarian colour terms. Then I survey the literature available on Hungarian basic colour terms, placing special emphasis on the two colour terms for red: *piros* and *vörös* (see e.g.: Csapodi 1899; Gárdonyi 1920; Kenedy 1921; Selényi 1948, MacLaury et al. 1997; Kiss–Forbes 2001).

If the criteria defined by Berlin–Kay (1969) is applied to the Hungarian language, many authors (see e.g.: Kiefer 2005: 132; Kicsi 1990: 1144; Kicsi 1988: 460–461; Kiss 2004: 161; Kövecses–Benczes 2010: 34) claim that *rózsaszín* ‘pink’ and *narancssárga* ‘orange’ are not basic, because they are not monolexemic. It is probably for this reason, that certain Hungarian authors (pl.: Kicsi 1988; Balázs and Takács 2009: 54; www.szintan.hu) use the term *narancs* ‘orange’ instead of *narancssárga* ‘orange yellow’; they wish to work with a monolexemic colour term. However, neither the studies having a cognitive approach (e.g.: Uusküla–Sutrop 2007: 118), nor my corpus linguistic studies (see chapter 6.2.2.) support this: in Hungarian *narancs* means the fruit, and *narancssárga* is the colour term.

A further problem with these two colour terms is that they contain the name of the object that characteristically has that colour in one of their constituents (*narancs* ‘orange’ and *rózsa* ‘rose’), and consequently they violate the criteria of basicness. Moreover, both colour terms have several variants in the language: *narancs* ‘orange’, *narancsszín* ‘orange colour’, *narancsszínű* ‘orange coloured’, *narancssárga* ‘orange yellow’, and *rózsaszín* ‘rose colour’ and *rózsaszínű* ‘rose coloured’. However, having analysed the data published in Gósy (1998), Barratt–Kontra (1996) and Uusküla–Sutrop (2007), I have not found evidence of native speakers using the variants.

However, some authors (e.g.: Koski 1983; Crawford 1982; Uusküla 2007 and 2008) put forward that the monolexemic criterion should be abandoned, because the basic colour term is not a linguistic concept but a psychological one, and therefore it is not justified to exclude certain colour terms from the possible candidates for basicness. The findings presented in the dissertation underpin this latter view.

Nevertheless, when analysing the data published in certain studies (e.g.: Gósy 1998; Barratt–Kontra 1996; Uusküla–Sutrop 2007) I have noticed that some participants i) name the orange card with the term *sárga* ‘yellow’ (and in other cases they have not named a card belonging to ne basic colour category with the term for

another); ii) often use other compounds containing –sárga (i.e.: *citromsárga* ‘lemon yellow’, *okkersárga* ‘ochre yellow’) too instead of the plain term for yellow, as if they felt the need to differentiate between the various yellows. This implies that in Hungarian *narancssárga* is a subcategory of yellow, which is consistent with the findings of Bálizs (2008).

However, a carefully planned, methodologically sound field method (Uusküla and Sutrop 2007) provided evidence that *narancssárga* is a basic colour term of Hungarian. The authors developed a method that measures Hungarian colour terms against five thresholds, and *narancssárga* surpassed four of these, leaving no doubt about its basicness.

The evidence on *rózsaszín* ‘pink’ is the following. The colour term has undergone a change in its meaning, it no longer refers to the colour of the rose (which is typically red) (see Csűri 1922). So although the two constituents are transparent in the compound, the meaning of the lexeme does not equal the meaning of its parts. Uusküla (2007) claims that in this case, the colour term can be considered basic, especially if it readily forms further compounds with modifiers or other colour terms (see my findings below). Bálizs (2008) has found *rózsaszín* to be a basic colour category among her participants. Barratt and Kontra (1996) also found that *rózsaszín* was one of the most easily and unanimously named colours in their study. The field method of Uusküla and Sutrop (2007) established that *rózsaszín* surpassed two out of the five thresholds for basicness.

Another unsettled issue is related to the Hungarian equivalent for purple. In optics two colour terms (*lila* and *bíbor*) are used synonymously for this hue, and at times a third one (*ibolya*) also occurs in specialised texts. However, I have concluded in chapter 5 that the scientific use of colour terms does not equal their everyday language use. Certain authors consider *lila* to be the equivalent of *purple* (e.g.: Kicsi 1988: 458; Sipőcz 1992: 409; Kiss 2004: 160; Kövecses–Benczes 2010: 35), others think it is *bíbor* (e.g.: Gósy 1998: 56; Simigné 2004: 33; Balázs–Takács 2009: 54). The on-line colour dictionary (www.szinszotar.hu) claims they are different hues (which is consistent with the findings of my terminological analysis presented in chapter 5.1.) and that both are basic. The field method applied by Uusküla and Sutrop (2007) showed that *bíbor* did not surpass any of the five thresholds for basicness.

The biggest riddle of Hungarian colour terms however is related to the red category. Many international sources (e.g.: Berlin–Kay 1991: 95; Palmer 1981: 74–75; Taylor 1995: 14; Wierzbicka 1996: 317) claim that the Hungarian language is the only one in the world that lexicalised two basic colour terms for red. As I point out based on Uusküla (2011), on the one hand this is not specific to Hungarian (but also to Czech), and only one of them can be considered basic.

After surveying the relevant literature, it seems that the differences in use and the precise meaning of *piros* and *vörös* have not been established after a century of research. Gósy (1998) found that contemporary kindergarten children do not use (are not familiar with) the colour term *vörös*, and university students use it inconsistently. *Vörös* is not among the data of Barratt and Kontra's study (1996), it seems it was not elicited. Uusküla and Sutrop (2007) found that only a quarter of their participants used *vörös* in the list task, and in the naming task they used it very inconsistently; no card was named by at least 25% of participants with this colour term. Out of the five thresholds for basicness, *vörös* surpassed none.

The vantage theory (see MacLaury 2002) was also used to study the difference between the two colour terms for red. MacLaury et al. (1997) conclude that *piros* is the dominant term, and *vörös* is a recessive one. The mapping of the category of *vörös* brought different results among the participants. The colour categories of the two seem to overlap, and the focal point of *vörös* was often included in the category of *piros*. These findings clearly show that *vörös* is not a basic term, but recessive category that is related to *piros*, and their precise relation is not clear.

In chapter five I study Hungarian colour terms from terminological and lexicographic aspects. I attempt to carry out a terminological analysis of basic colour terms based on Fóris (2005). To this aim I use specialised textbooks on optics, the printing press and desktop publishing. I compare results with a monolingual Hungarian dictionary. This work has not brought the expected results, because i) the everyday meaning and use of colour terms is not the same as their scientific use and meaning; ii) the different branches of science may use different terms to designate the same hue; iii) differences in terminology were detected even across the text books of one scientific field, optics. Therefore, I concluded that the role of colour terms in everyday language use is not based on the physical characteristics of colours.

The fact that the defining features of colour concepts could not be determined indicates that the scientific study of light does not treat colours in such an exact and precise way that certain linguistic publications (e.g.: Kay–McDaniel 1978) claim.

In what follows I discuss the role of qualitative measurement and etalon in the dictionary definitions of Hungarian basic colour terms. I studied the definitions collected from three Hungarian monolingual explanatory dictionaries. I point out that the definitions of colour terms are based on qualitative measurement. The etalons are provided either in comparison with the spectral characteristics of sunlight, or with the help of a simile or metaphor.

At the end of the chapter I analyse an on-line database on colours, www.szinszotar.hu. I examine the supplementary materials on the webpage, the monolingual Hungarian dictionary and the bilingual word lists as well. The *Színszótár-ABC* is a monolingual Hungarian database that contains a lot of encyclopaedic information and picture illustrations on 950 colour terms and 80 shade names. Among the bilingual dictionaries we find two English–Hungarian wordlists, an Italian–Hungarian, a French–Hungarian and a German–Hungarian word list as well.

Chapter six contains the quantitative and corpus based study of colour terms. I introduce the methods and findings of huge international venture, the World Color Survey. The enormous amount of information collected over the decades create the opportunity for various statistical calculations; I have selected a few of these (Kay and Regier 2003; Regier et al. 2005; Lindsey and Brown 2006). The calculations provide evidence for the existence of some universal privileged colour categories, their focal points and the general salience of primary basic colour terms.

Then I present my corpus based study of Hungarian basic colour terms, carried out in the Hungarian National Corpus (HNC). I analyse the obtainable frequency data, placing special emphasis on the two colour terms for red: I study their collocations and check their frequency in the five genre-based subcorpora.

The data obtained from the HNC on the above problematic colour terms prove i) that *narancssárga* and *rózsaszín* are the established lexemes, and the other variants only have a fraction of their frequency in the corpus; ii) *narancs* is the name of the fruit and not a colour term; iii) the frequency of *bíbor* is less than a fifth of that

of *lila*; iv) *vörös* is less frequent in the overall corpus, v) the frequency differences in the subcorpora show that in genres where people have a free choice of words (personal and literary texts) *piros* is much more frequently used, while in genres that rely on more set phrases (official, scientific and press texts) *vörös* occurs more frequently; vi) *vörös* tends to form collocations with a small set of nouns, and in some these collocations it does not necessarily refer to a colour (e.g.: *csillag* ‘star’ and *zászló* ‘flag’ both meaning ‘soviet’; *bolygó* ‘planet’ meaning Mars; *bor* ‘wine’; *haj* ‘hair’ and *szem* ‘eye’; *ördög* ‘devil’; etc.); vii) it seems that *vörös* is used more in metaphorical meanings, while *piros* is used literally to designate a colour.

In chapter seven I discuss the mini corpus I collected from wedding magazines. I collected over 200 colour terms and carried out a functional-semantic and a morphological analysis on them. The former allowed for the creation of four large functional-semantic categories, some containing many subcategories; and the latter resulted in eight morphological categories. The largest amount of colour terms was found to belong to the category of blue, so it presented that in detail. Above, I mentioned the claim found in Uusküla (2007) that a compound colour term can be considered basic, especially if it readily forms further compounds with modifiers or other colour terms. My collection of colour terms from wedding magazines proves that this is true for the colour term for pink: i) *rózsaszín* can take the modifiers *halvány* ‘light’; *hideg* ‘cold’; *jeges* ‘icy’; *pasztel* ‘pastel’ and *üde* ‘fresh’ – common modifiers of colour terms; and ii) it can form further compounds with *barack* ‘peach’; *lazac* ‘salmon’ and *lilás* ‘purplish’.

In chapter eight I summarise the most important lines of thought presented in the dissertation and draw the conclusions. To answer the question: ‘How many basic colour terms are there in Hungarian?’ we need to reach an agreement on what a basic colour term is. The wealth of studies overviewed in the dissertation can be grouped in two on this aspect: the early studies following Berlin and Kay’s theory consider the basic colour term to be a linguistic concept, and the newer lines of research consider it to be a cognitive, psychological one. If the first of B&K’s criteria (monolexemic) is observed, so basic colours are distinguished on a linguistic basis, Hungarian has nine basic colour terms: *fekete* ‘black’, *fehér* ‘white’, *piros* ‘red’, *zöld* ‘green’, *sárga* ‘yellow’, *kék* ‘blue’, *barna* ‘brown’, *szürke* ‘grey’ and *lila* ‘purple’. However, if we accept that the concept of basic colour term is a

psychological one (see also Moss 1989), there are 11 basic colour terms in Hungarian: *fekete* 'black', *fehér* 'white', *piros* 'red', *zöld* 'green', *sárga* 'yellow', *kék* 'blue', *barna* 'brown', *szürke* 'grey', *lila* 'purple', *narancssárga* 'orange' and *rózsaszín* 'pink'.

The dissertation concludes with the *Bibliography*, *Sources* and the *Appendix*.

9.4. New scientific results of the studies contained in the dissertation

1. I have proved that the meaning of colour terms cannot be derived from the physiology of human vision.
2. I have carried out a terminological analysis of the defining features of colour concepts based on specialised texts of optics, the printing industry and desktop publishing.
3. I have proved that the role of colour terms in everyday language use cannot be explained by the physical characteristics of light, as the defining features of colour concepts could not be unambiguously determined from specialised texts.
4. I have shown that the definitions of colour terms in monolingual Hungarian explanatory dictionaries rely on qualitative measurement: the etalon is either compared to the spectral characteristics of sunlight, or it given through metaphors or similes.
5. I have analysed a large number of publications on colour term research and established that their conclusions systematically contradict each other, and the opposing theoretical frameworks are equally well-founded.
6. I have pointed out that as opposed to the abundance of literature on basic colour terms of various languages, the amount of studies into Hungarian basic colour terms is relatively small.
7. I have analysed the Hungarian and English language publications on Hungarian basic colour terms.
8. I have pointed out the mistakes on the Hungarian language and basic colour terms found in Berlin and Kay's work (1969).

9. I have studied the frequency of Hungarian basic colour terms in the Hungarian National Corpus.
10. In the corpus linguistic study I placed special emphasis on the frequency of the two colour terms of red in the various subcorpora and the nouns that form the most frequent collocations with *piros* and *vörös*.
11. I have concluded that the monolexemic criterion of basic colour terms should be abandoned as the basic colour term is not a linguistic concept but a psychological one, and this criterion excludes certain colour terms (whose basicness is otherwise well supported) from the basic ones in many languages.
12. I have collected and evaluated the reasons for and against the basicness of *narancssárga* 'orange' and *rózsaszín* 'pink'.
13. I have collected and evaluated the reasons for and against the basicness of the two terms for purple: *bíbor* and *lila*.
14. I have collected and evaluated the reasons for and against the basicness of the two terms for red: *piros* and *vörös*.
15. I have collected the colour terms from wedding magazines and I have carried out a functional-semantic and morphological study.
16. I have concluded that in Berlin and Kay's terms there are 9 linguistic basic colour terms in Hungarian: *fekete* 'black', *fehér* 'white', *piros* 'red', *zöld* 'green', *sárga* 'yellow', *kék* 'blue', *barna* 'brown', *szürke* 'grey' and *lila* 'purple'.
17. , I have concluded that if the concept of basic colour terms is approached from a more justified philological aspects, there are 11 basic colour terms in Hungarian: *fekete* 'black', *fehér* 'white', *piros* 'red', *zöld* 'green', *sárga* 'yellow', *kék* 'blue', *barna* 'brown', *szürke* 'grey', *lila* 'purple', *narancssárga* 'orange' and *rózsaszín* 'pink'.