

AFFIX TYPES IN HUNGARIAN

Descriptions of Hungarian have long recognized that affixes fall in two classes distinguished by their morphophonological behavior. Thus far, this distinction has been treated on a language-particular basis, giving those classes rather ad hoc labels: “*synthetic*” vs. “*analytic*” (Siptár/Törkenczy 2002: 5), “1st” vs. “2nd[ff] set” (Tompa 1968: 93f.), etc. At the same time, the distinction is claimed to be lexically idiosyncratic (in the sense relevant here, such is done even by Stiebels and Wunderlich 1999).

Here, it is shown that

- the relevant distinction is whether or not the affix introduces a *phonological word* (ω) boundary; moreover, it is proposed that
- that distinction is predictable from whether the element (= presumed “affix”) in question is attached in the lexicon (“synthetic affix” = actual affix) or in syntax (“analytic affix” = affixal clitic).

That an analytic affix is attached to the outside of a ω is reflected in O-O correspondence (a.k.a. paradigm effects) on one hand; more relevantly to present interest, the position of the ω constituent is directly reflected prosodically in at least three kinds of effects:

1. A ω licenses at its end an extra position for a consonant (a *catalectic syllable*). Consequently, adding a consonant initial synthetic affix triggers repair (1), an analytic one (2) won’t.

(1) -/tOk/ in: $[\text{.r}\underset{\omega}{\text{v}}\text{j}.\underset{\omega}{\text{z}}]$ “drawing” — $[\text{.r}\underset{\omega}{\text{v}}\text{j}.\underset{\omega}{\text{z}}\square.\text{t}\underset{\omega}{\text{o}}\text{k}.]$ “your (PL) dr.”

(2) =/tO:l/ in: $[\text{.r}\underset{\omega}{\text{v}}\text{j}.\underset{\omega}{\text{z}}].\text{t}\underset{\omega}{\text{o}}:\text{l}.$ “from (the) dr.”

2. The ω is subject to augmentation (by vowel lengthening) to minimal word size. (NB: the base in (3) doesn’t occur unaffixed!)

(3) /tɛ/- “do” in: $[\text{.t}\underset{\omega}{\text{ɛ}}-\text{t}.\underset{\omega}{\text{t}}]$ “did” —

$[\text{.t}\underset{\omega}{\text{ɛ}}-\text{h}\underset{\omega}{\text{ɛ}}\text{t}.]$ “can do” — $[\text{.t}\underset{\omega}{\text{ɛ}}:] = \text{v}\underset{\omega}{\text{ɛ}}$. “(while) doing”

3. Hiatus across the boundary of an analytical suffix is not resolved (5); whereas with synthetic suffixes, it generally is (4).

- (4) a. -/On/ in: [.ʋɒ.lɒ.mi-n.]_ω “on something”
 b. -/Od/ in: [.ku.ca:-d.]_ω “your (SG) dog”
- (5) a. [.le:]_ω=:e:rt. “for juice”
 b. [.ku.ca:]_ω=:ul. “(miserably) as a dog”

It is crucial that alignment can have these effects even when an “analytical” affix is forced to go inside the ω by syllabification (after all, a ω consists of feet and, possibly, unfooted syllables) — cf. lack of phonotactic repair in (7).

- (6) -/t/ in: [.ɲo.m]_ω “(foot)print” — [.ɲo.m[ɒ]t.]_ω (ACC)
 (7) =/d/ in: [.ɲo.m]_ω “pushes” — [.ɲom.d]_ω “push it!”

The places the present analysis predicts ω’s to be in are not exactly the same as with Nespor and Vogel (1986: §4.2.2.1) or with Trommer (2008). In particular, vowel harmony doesn’t necessarily stop at a ω boundary. Rather, it can “leave” a ω, but it cannot “enter” another one.

References

- Nespor, M., & Vogel, I. (1986). *Prosodic Phonology*. Dordrecht: Foris.
- Selkirk, E. O. (1995). The prosodic structure of function words. In J. N. Beckman, L. W. Dickey, & S. Urbanczyk (Hrsg.), *University of Massachusetts Occasional Papers in Linguistics*, 18, S. 439–469. Amherst MA: UMass.
- Siptár, P., & Törkenczy, M. (2002). *The Phonology of Hungarian*. Oxford: Oxford Univ. Press.
- Stiebels, B., & Wunderlich, D. (1999). Second stems in Hungarian. *Linguistic Review*, 16 (3), S. 253–294.
- Tompa, J. (1968). *Ungarische Grammatik*. 's-Gravenhage: Mouton.
- Trommer, J. (2008). ‘Case suffixes’, postpositions, and the phonological word in Hungarian. *Linguistics*, 46 (2), S. 403–437.
- Truckenbrodt, H. (1999). On the relation between syntactic phrases and phonological phrases. *Linguistic Inquiry*, 30 (2), S. 219–255.