

Voice assimilation in Hungarian

Péter Szigetvári, Eötvös Loránd University, szigetva@isis.elte.hu

(1) The data

monomorphemically

<i>afgán</i>	[vg]	‘Afghan(istani)’	<i>Agfa</i>	[kf]	id.
<i>Macbeth</i>	[gb]	id.	<i>Leeds</i>	[ts]	id.
<i>Stuttgart</i>	[dg]	id.	<i>vodka</i>	[tk]	id.

across a morpheme boundary

<i>háztól</i>	[st]	‘house-abl’	<i>hatból</i>	[db]	‘six-elat’
<i>polgazdként</i>	[stk]	‘as political economy’	<i>lisztből</i>	[zdb]	‘flour-elat’
<i>smaragdféle</i>	[ktf]	‘emerald like’	<i>receptbe</i>	[bdb]	‘recipe-illat’

across a word boundary

<i>kék bélyeg</i>	[gb]	‘blue stamp’	<i>zöld kutya</i>	[tk]	‘green dog’
-------------------	------	--------------	-------------------	------	-------------

(2) The representation of voicing

a. laryngeal elements: L and H.

L=[slack vocal folds], H=“[stiff vocal folds]” (KLV 1990:216), but

(i) these two features cannot cooccur in a segment (Halle & Stevens 1971, Kaye 1995:325), i.e. they are not really unary features, (ii) if H is responsible for aspiration (Harris 1994:133ff), it is not [stiff vocal folds] but [spread glottis]

b. a binary laryngeal contrast is either H vs. \emptyset or \emptyset vs. L (cf. Harris 1994:133ff). Hungarian (probably) has \emptyset vs. Lc. regressive VA is the spreading of L from the trigger ([tb] \rightarrow [db]) or the delinking of L from the target ([zt] \rightarrow [st])

d. The meaning of L

L does not mean that the segment containing it exhibits vocal fold vibration, but that it is markedly voiced: an effort has to be made to produce vocal fold vibration (Chomsky & Halle 1968:300f, Hayes 1984). Thus nonobstuent do not contain L, they exhibit spontaneous voicing, which is phonologically irrelevant.

e. problems:

 α . why does L delink? more on this in (3) β . what stops the spreading of L?

standard assumption: L can only spread if the target has a Laryngeal node, L links to the skeleton by the mediation of this node.

- f. If (2d) is true, all and only obstruents have Lar, i.e. either [–son] or Lar is redundant in the representation of obstruents. Proposal: Lar is equivalent to h, the [noise] element inherent in obstruents (Harris 1990:263). Representations:

voiced obstruent	voiceless obstruent	sonorant
x	x	x
h	h	
L		

- g. L spreads backwards until it finds an h on the superficially adjacent segment. (In Russian h-less nonvowels can be skipped: *o*[d] *mzdy* ‘from the bribe’ (Hayes 1984:320); vowels cannot: *taza* *[daza] ‘of the pelvis’.)
- h. Voiceless sonorants are aspirated (Lombardi 1995b:51), from which it follows that H is not dominated by Lar (h here). Note that regressive spreading of aspiration is not as obvious as that of voicing (Greek spelling has $\phi\theta$ and $\chi\theta$, but $\pi\phi$, $\tau\theta$, $\kappa\chi$).

(3) The site

- a. becoming voiceless = loss of L

- b. lenition site:

L is unlicensed in coda (Lombardi 1995a)

L is unlicensed in coda and pre-empty-nuclear onset (Brockhaus 1995)

ablak ‘window’, *abrak* ‘fodder’ vs. *paplan* ‘quilt’, *apró* ‘tiny’;

hab ‘foam’, *habnak* ‘foam-dat’ vs. *ha*[p]*tól* ‘foam-abl’;

ha[j]*ma* ‘onion’ vs. *fi*[c]*ma* ‘prepuce’;

bab ‘bean’, *bableves* ‘bean soup’ vs. *babszem* [ps] ‘a piece of bean’

⇒ loss of L only occurs before a voiceless obstruent:

*x	x
h	h
L	

- c. problem: the constraint above makes an implicit reference to the **absence** of a feature: the first position cannot license L only if the second has h without L.

- d. conclusions:
- α. the site of VA cannot be captured by making reference to syllabic constituents: neither coda, nor pre-empty-nuclear onset position
 - β. in the formulation of VA the absence of L must be referred to
- e. a temporary solution: of two adjacent h's the first is identified with the second (“identified with its governor” (Brockhaus 1995: 133; though whether it is its governor is doubtful in most cases, cf. Lukács 1997)

(4) Nonobstruents in VA: *v*, *j*, *h*

- a. prevocally *v* [v], *j* and *h* are sonorants
- b. non-prevocally *v* and *h* are obstruents [v] and [x], *j* is an obstruent [j]/[ç] only when not next to a vowel
- c. data

<i>ásvány</i>	[fv]	‘mineral’	<i>elvtárs</i>	[lft]	‘comrade’
<i>kedvtelen</i>	[tft]	‘depressed’	<i>két Wrangler</i>	[tvr]	‘two pairs of W. jeans’
<i>céhbeli</i>	[xb]	‘guildsman’	<i>egyház</i>	[ch]	‘church’
<i>bojt</i>	[jt]	‘tassel’	<i>rakj át</i>	[kj]	‘put-imp over’
<i>dobj</i>	[bj]	‘throw-imp’	<i>rakj</i>	[kç]	‘put-imp’
<i>dobj ki</i>	[pçk]	‘throw out’	<i>rakj be</i>	[gjb]	‘put in’
<i>szomj</i>	[mj]	‘thirst’	<i>férj</i>	[rj]/[rç]	‘husband’
<i>szomjról</i>	[m(j)r]	‘thirst-delat’	<i>férjről</i>	[r(j)r]/*[rçr]	‘husband-delat’

- d. problems:
 - α. how do *v* and *h* become obstruents in non-prevocalic position?
 - β. why does [x] not become voiced (if an obstruent)?
 - γ. why is obstruentized [v] and [j] voiced (where does their L come from)?
- e. attempts at answers and further details:
 - ad α. does h get into the representation? if yes, what is its source and is this a case of coda-fortition? if no, how can [v] become voiceless
 - ad β. assuming that [h] is H (and not h, cf. Szigetvári 1996), it does not get voiced because H and L are incompatible in Hungarian (i.e. there are no voiced aspirates; Szigetvári 1997)
 - ad γ. ??? (cf. Cyran 1997: 198ff; but he describes a historical fortition with reanalysis, while here we have a synchronic alternation)

- (5) Claims made
- a. there is no Lar node, its job is taken over by h
 - b. H is not [stiff vocal folds], but [spread glottis]
 - c. H is not dominated by h (i.e. by Lar)
 - d. [h] is not h, but H (h is [s], especially if there is no R)
 - e. VA (in Hungarian) is not describable with reference to syllabic constituents, a linear formulation is simpler and more precise (cf. Rubach 1996)

REFERENCES

- Brockhaus, Wiebke. 1995. Final devoicing in the phonology of German. *Linguistische Arbeiten* 336. Tübingen: Niemeyer.
- Chomsky, Noam and Morris Halle. 1968. *The sound pattern of English*. New York: Harper & Row.
- Cyran, Eugeniusz. 1997. *Resonance elements in phonology: A study in Muster Irish*. Lublin: Folium.
- Halle, Morris and Kenneth Stevens. 1971. A note on laryngeal features. *Quarterly Progress Report* 101: 198–212. Cambridge, Mass.: Research Laboratory of Electronics, MIT.
- Harris, John. 1990. Segmental complexity and phonological government. *Phonology* 7: 255–300.
- Harris, John. 1994. *English sound structure*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Hayes, Bruce. 1984. The phonetics and phonology of Russian voicing assimilation. In Mark Aronoff and Richard T. Oehrle (eds.) *Language sound structure. Studies in phonology presented to Morris Halle by his teacher and students*. Cambridge, Mass.: The MIT Press. 318–328.
- Kaye, Jonathan. 1995. Derivations and interfaces. In Jacques Durand and Francis Katamba. *Frontiers of phonology: Atoms, structures, derivations*. Harlow: Longman. 289–332.
- Kaye, Jonathan, Jean Lowenstamm and Jean-Roger Vergnaud. 1990. Constituent structure and government in phonology. *Phonology* 7: 193–231.
- Lombardi, Linda. 1995a. Laryngeal neutralization and syllable wellformedness. *NLLT* 13: 39–74.
- Lombardi, Linda. 1995b. Laryngeal features and privativity. *The Linguistic Review* 12: 35–59.
- Lukács, Ágnes. 1997. Interonset government and Hungarian: some theoretical considerations. *The Odd Yearbook* 1997: 137–149.
- Rubach, Jerzy. 1996. Nonsyllabic analysis of voice assimilation in Polish. *Linguistic Inquiry* 27: 69–110.
- Szigetvári, Péter. 1996. Laryngeal contrasts and problematic representations. *The Even Yearbook* 2: 97–110.
- Szigetvári, Péter. 1997. Why [h] does not get voiced. Ms., Eötvös Loránd University.