

DEFECTIVITY CAUSED BY TEMPLATICITY

constraints of Hungarian

- ▶ **integrity (concatenativeness):** in a word the stem appears in its integrity (modulo loss of a single vowel)
- ▶ **harmony:** suffix Vs alternate as a function of stem Vs (modulo neutral Vs)
- ▶ **completeness:** the (extended) paradigm of a stem is complete (no defectivity)

harmony & neutral vowels

- ▶ **harmony:** [ha:z-uk] ‘house-3PL.POSS’ vs. [fej-yk] ‘head-3PL.POSS’; [bor-nak] ‘wine-DAT’ vs. [šor-nek] ‘beer-DAT’
- ▶ suffixes containing a neutral vowel ([i], [i:], [e:]) may be invariant, as a result they may be disharmonic: [ha:z-ig] ‘house-TERM’, [bor-e:rt] ‘wine-CAUS’

complete paradigms

In paradigms all morphologically predicted forms occur (modulo some phonotactically banned forms for paradigmatic reasons). Problems with derivational suffixes:

- ▶ extended derivational paradigms are less systematic than inflectional paradigms defined by morphosyntactic values (cf *black-en* vs *pink-en*)
- ▶ the meaning/function of derivationally suffixed forms can be less consistent (cf *woman-ize* vs *idol-ize* vs *burglar-ize*)
- ▶ often alternative lexical (= phonologically independent) affix variants (cf *brev-ity* vs *short-ness*)

templatic diminutives (TDIMs)

truncation in diminutive/hypocoristic/informal/slangy/humorous (= DIM) forms:
(C)i [simp<atikuš>] ‘appealing’ ~ [simp-i] ‘-DIM’; [un<almaš>] ‘boring’ ~ [un-č*i*] ‘-DIM’ / **(C)a** [cer<uza>] ‘pencil’ ~ [cer-ka] ‘-DIM’; [boň<olult>] ‘complicated’ ~ [boň-a] ‘-DIM’ / **(C)o**: [tet<ova:la:š>] ‘tattoo’ ~ [tet-ko:] ‘-DIM’; [tel<efon>] ‘phone’ ~ [tel-o:] ‘-DIM’ / **u(C)** [fiz<ete:š>] ‘salary’ ~ [fiz-u] ‘-DIM’; [pel<enka>] ‘diaper’ ~ [pel-uš] ‘-DIM’ / **e(C)** [kol<le:gijum>] ‘dorm’ ~ [kol-es] ‘-DIM’; [job:<oldali>] ‘rightist’ ~ [job-er] ‘-DIM’

TDIM vs concatenative DIM (CDIM)

TDIMs are **bisyllabic** and potentially **disharmonic**: [ter-ka] vs [tere:z-ke], [tere:zija:-čka]; [miš-ka] vs [miš-i-ke]; [fer-ko:], [fe-co:] vs [ferenc-ke], [fer-i-ke]

bisyllabic template (BST) in verbal frequentatives (TFREQ)

- ▶ **-ka:l** [ja:r-ka:l] ‘walk’, [bu:j-ka:l] ‘hide’, [u:s-ka:l] ‘swim’, [va:j-ka:l] ‘pick’, etc
- ▶ **-doš/deš/døš** [sa:l-doš] ‘fly’, [te:p-deš] ‘tear’, [løk-døš] ‘push’, etc
- ▶ **-kod/ked/kød** [lop-kod] ‘steal’, [le:p-ked] ‘step’, [tøm-kød] ‘pad’, etc
- ▶ **-dal/del** [rug-dal] ‘kick’, [le:p-del] ‘step’, [tør-del] ‘break’, [ty:z-del] ‘pin’, etc

FREQs without the BST

- ▶ **-ga:l/ge:l** (bi- or trisyllabic): [hu:z-ga:l] ‘pull’, [salad-ga:l] ‘run’, [kereš-ge:l] ‘search’, [nevet-ge:l] ‘laugh’, etc
- ▶ **-doga:l/dege:l/døge:l** (trisyllabic): [a:l-doga:l] ‘stand’, [e:l-dege:l] ‘live’, [nø:-døge:l] ‘grow’, [yl-døge:l] ‘sit’, etc
- ▶ **-gat/get** (minimally trisyllabic; totally productive): [moš-o-gat] ‘wash’, [tala:l-gat] ‘find’, [ønt-ø-get] ‘pour’, [yzen-get] ‘message’

three types of FREQ suffixation

1. templatic, invariant, defective (due to template and harmony)
BST: $\sigma+ka:l, \sigma+a:l, \sigma+ga:l_1$
2. templatic, harmonic, defective (due to template)
 - bisyllabic template: $\sigma+doš/deš/døš, \sigma+kod/ked/kød, \sigma+dal/del$
 - trisyllabic template: $\sigma\sigma+ga:l/ge:l_2, \sigma+doga:l/dege:l/døge:l$
3. concatenative, harmonic, complete: only systematic repair strategy (linking vowel): -gat/get

two types of DIM suffixation

1. templatic, invariant, complete:
 - bisyllabic template: $\sigma+DIM$, complete due to **truncation**
 - invariant suffixes: complete due to toleration of **disharmony**
2. concatenative, harmonic, complete
 - no template: [fonolo:guš-(oč)ka] ‘phonologist-DIM’
 - harmonic suffixes: [ñelve:s-(eč)ke] ‘linguist-DIM’

constraint violability

constraint	concatenative	TDIM	TFREQ
concatenativeness (no truncation)	yes	no	yes
harmony (no invariance)	yes	no	no/yes
completeness (no defectivity)	yes	yes	no

conflict resolution: nominal strategy

- ▶ template: repair by **truncation**
- ▶ harmony: **disharmony** tolerated

result: **no defectivity** and **disharmony**

conflict resolution: verbal strategy

no phonological repair strategy:

- ▶ template: repair by selecting alternative suffix
- ▶ harmony: repair by selecting alternative suffix

result: **defectivity** at the level of morphs (though completeness of exponents of FREQ) and **no disharmony**

summary

Two subsystems of morphophonology:

1. **Concatenative (agglutinative):** most nominal and verbal suffixes (including some DIM and FREQ)
 - Integrity (only systematic morpho-phonological processes, e.g. minor truncation, linking vowel)
 - Harmony (invariant suffixes mostly with neutral vowels)
 - Completeness
2. **Templatic:** only exponents of DIM and FREQ, different strategies for nominals and verbs
 - Integrity violable only for nouns/adjectives (truncative DIM suffixes)
 - Harmony violable only for nouns/adjectives (invariable DIM suffixes)
 - Completeness characterizes nouns/adjectives (templatic DIM is productive)
 - Defectivity characterizes verbs (templatic FREQ is not productive)

thank you

and OTKA #119863