



The paradigm in Hungarian vowel harmony

Péter Rebrus, Péter Szigetvári, Miklós Törkenczy
Eötvös Loránd University / Research Centre for Linguistics, Budapest
rebrus@nytud.hu, szigetvari@elte.hu, torok@nytud.hu



1 Morphologised vowel harmony (VH) systems

- Morphologisation is the degree of morphological conditioning (it is gradient)
 - “Baseline” = domain of harmony: all VH systems circumscribe VH domains (partially or completely) morphologically: root, stem, phonological word, etc. — sometimes (also) syntactically: phrase, e.g. Kinande, Akan (Downing 2018)
- Morphologisation above the baseline
 - lower end of the scale: in “simple” dominant-recessive systems VH trigger is purely phonologically identified, e.g. Karajá, Kalenjin
 - intermediate: various kinds and mixtures of morphological conditioning, stem/root control (e.g. Finnish, Chichewa) but also some dominant-recessive systems (e.g. Kinande, Maasai)
 - higher end of the scale: harmonic classes are paradigm classes (~inflectional classes) e.g. Hungarian (this talk), Uyghur (Mayer 2021)

2 What makes VH morphologised?

- the inconsistency of VH within the domain: morphologically simplex and complex forms behave differently harmonically
 - root-stem asymmetries (*kanyl* ‘canula’ vs. **bask-yl* ‘in Basque’)
 - other effects overriding VH (*martini-nak/nek* ‘martini-DAT’ vs. *martin-i-nak/*nek* ‘Martin-ADJZ-DAT’)
- lexical conditioning
 - roots: *kej-rø:l* ‘lust-DEL’ vs. *hej-ro:l* ‘peel-DEL’
 - affixes: TRA *tøbb-e* ‘more’, *jobb-a* ‘better’ vs. POSR *ø:s-e* ‘autumn-POSR’, *ja:r-e* ‘summer-POSR’
 - whole word-forms (root+affix): *haver-ok/*ek* ‘pal-PL’ vs. *haver-nak/nek* ‘pal-DAT’
- paradigm-based restrictions
 - paradigmatic uniformity effects (overriding front/back harmony)
 - paradigmatic contrast effects (overriding front/back harmony) – not discussed in this talk
 - paradigm classes (overriding rounding harmony)

3 Hungarian vowel harmony (HVH)

3.1 The traditional myths

- Front/back: *int-ynk* ‘wave-1PL’, *ønt-ynk* ‘pour-1PL’, *ønt-unk* ‘shed-1PL’
- Rounding (parasitic on front): *int-ek* ‘wave-1SG’, *ønt-øk* ‘pour-1SG’, *ønt-ok* ‘shed-1SG’
- Categorical neutrality: neutral vowels are always transparent
papir-ok ‘paper-PL’, *ta:ne:r-ok* ‘plate-PL’ (*haver-ok* ‘pal-PL’ vs. *kompju:ter-ek* ‘computer-PL’?)
- No harmony–morphology interaction: morphologically simplex and complex forms behave in the same way harmonically within the domain of harmony: *papir-ok*, *vak-it-ok* ‘blind-VRBZ-1SG’

3.2 “Exceptions”

- Antiharmonic roots (lexical variation)
 - *irt-unk* ‘eradicate-1PL’, *tse:l-unk* ‘goal-1PL.POSS’, *špejz-unk* ‘pantry-1PL.POSS’
 - sirt-ynk* ‘cliff-1PL.POSS’, *e:l-ynk* ‘live-1PL’, *špejz-ynk* ‘pantry-1PL.POSS’
- Vacillation and lexical variation in transparency/opaqueness
 - [Be:] vacillating: both F and B (*norve:g-ynk/unk* ‘Norwegian-1PL.POSS’) transparent: only B (*ta:ne:r-*yнк/unk* ‘plate-1PL.POSS’)
 - [Bε] vacillating: both F and B (*fo:der-yнк/unk* ‘gravel-1PL.POSS’) transparent: only B (*haver-*yнк/unk* ‘pal-1PL.POSS’) opaque: only F (*kompju:ter-yнк/*unk* ‘computer-1PL.POSS’)
- “Lowering” wrt rounding harmony
 - *fyl-ek* ‘ear-PL’, *øt-ød-εt* ‘five-2SG.POSS-ACC’ vs.
 - *fyl-øk* ‘porcupine-PL’, *øt-ød-øt* ‘five-FRAC-ACC’

3.3 Traditional analyses of “exceptions”

- Antiharmony/lowering can be encoded in the representation (phonologised)
 - abstract vowels + absolute neutralisation,
 - floating features + licensing conventions, etc.
- For vacillating roots several different “underlying” vowels/representations would be needed, e.g. three(!) for /ε/ ⚡
 - transparent (in *haver*)
 - vacillating (in *fo:der*)
 - opaque (in *kompju:ter*)
- Domain-internal morphological complexity cannot be phonologised ⚡⚡
 - monomorphemic *martini-nak/nek*
 - polymorphemic *martin-i-nak/*nek*

4 What determines harmonic classes?

	B-class	F-class	B/F-class
no variation	[...B]	[...F], [...FN]	
only lexical variation	[N]	[N], [NN]	
lex. var. & vacillation	[...Bi(·)], [...Be:] _{FAM} , [...Be] _{FAM} , [BNN'] _{FAM}	[BNe], [...Be] _{CULT}	[...Be:] _{PL} , [...Be] _{PL} , [BNN'] _{PL}

legend: B={u(·), o(·), a(·)}, F={y(·), ø(·)}, N={i(·), e, ε}, N'={i(·), e}; FAM=familiar loan, CULT=cultural loan, PL=plain loan

- no variation: phonology determines harmonicity;
- only lexical variation (= antiharmony): underdetermined but no vacillation;
- lexical variation & vacillation (transparency/opaqueness): highly underdetermined.

Harmonic classes are co-determined by

1. phonological shape (vocalic pattern) of the stem
2. word class of the stem (*hy:f-ek* ‘cool(adj)-PL’ vs. *hø:f-øk* ‘hero(noun)-PL’)
3. meaning of the stem (“familiar”: *haver-*yнк/unk*, “plain”: *fo:der-yнк/unk*, “cultural”: *kompju:ter-yнк/*unk*)
4. degree of nativization of the stem (“native”: *ta:ne:r-ok/*ek*, recent loan: *norve:g-ok/ek*)
5. token frequency of the stem (native but rare: *gat:fje:r-nak/?nek* ‘drake-DAT’, not familiar loan but frequent: *konkret-ak/?ek* ‘specific-PL’)

5 The paradigmatic view of HVH

Class membership co-determined by properties like those in §4 is characteristic of paradigm classes → paradigmatic view of HVH. Advantages:

- phonologically underdetermined classes (§4)
- harmonic uniformity of paradigmatically related forms (Harmonic Uniformity, §5.1)
- other paradigmatic effects
 - Paradigm Uniformity within POSS (§5.2)
 - (paradigmatic contrast: not discussed in this talk)
- thematic vowels (“lowering”, §6)

5.1 Harmonic Uniformity (HarUni)

(Rebrus & Szigetvári 2016, Rebrus & Törkenczy 2017; 2019, 2021, Rebrus et al. 2017)

- HarUni: All the harmonic suffixes have identical harmonic values (F, B or B/F) within the extended paradigm of a root.
- Inhibition of phonologically conditioned variation by HarUni
 - Phonological conditioning of variation due to the limitation of transparency (Hayes & Czirák Londe 2006)
 - * Height Effect (i(·) > e: > ε): *martin-nak/*nek* vs. *norve:g-nak/nek*, *fo:der-nak/nek*
 - * Count Effect (BN > BNN): *martin-nak/*nek* vs. *martinik-nak/nek*, *prote:zif-nak/nek*
 - HarUni: *martinik-i-nak/nek* (≠ *martinik-nak/nek* ...) vs. *martin-i-nak/*nek* (≠ *martin-nak/*nek* ...)
- Maintenance of lexical variation by HarUni despite phonological inhibition
 - Phonological constraint on lexical variation (antiharmony): *ind-ul* ‘start-VRBZ’, *tse:l-unk* ‘goal-1PL.POSS’; but Polysyllabic Split (PSS): *[NN⁺]B
 - HarUni: *ind-it-hat* ‘start-VRBZ-POT’ (~*ind-ul* ...), *tse:l-e:ra* ‘goal-POSR-SUBL’ (~*tse:l-unk* ...), contra PSS

5.2 Paradigm Uniformity within POSS of loan roots (PUPOSS)

(Rebrus et al. 2017)

1. The yodless alternant of 3SG/PL.POSS is available only if its vowel appears as a linking vowel in the paradigm:
 - a. ‘star/geyser-1/2SG’ vs. ‘-3SG’ *star-om/od* / *star-r-(j)a* *gejzi:r-em/ed* ~ *gejzi:r-(j)ε*
 - b. ‘star/geyser-1PL’ vs. ‘-3PL’ *star-unk* ~ *star-(j)uk* *gejzi:r-yнк* ~ *gejzi:r-(j)yk*
 - c. vacillating roots *fo:der-om/od* / *fo:der-(j)a* *fo:der-em/ed* ~ *fo:der-(j)ε* 3/4
 - d. vacillating roots *fo:der-unk* ~ *fo:der-(j)uk* *fo:der-yнк* ~ *fo:der-(j)yk* 4/4
2. Familiar roots: only back linking vowels:
 - a. 1/2SG vs. 3SG *haver-om/od* / *haver-(j)a* *haver-em/ed* *haver-(j)ε* 2/4
 - b. 1PL vs. 3PL *haver-unk* ~ *haver-(j)uk* *haver-yнк* *haver-(j)yk* 3/4
3. PUPOSS is dominated by the phonological constraint *Sib+j but Harmonic Uniformity operates actively
 - a. stable roots (‘fax’) *faks-om/od* / *faks-a*
 - b. vacillating roots (‘notebook’) *notes-om/-od* / *notes-a* *notes-em/-ed* ~ *notes-ε* 2/4

5.3 Asymmetrical vacillation

	plain loan roots	familiar roots	sibilant-final roots
3PL.POSS	<i>fo:der-uk</i> <i>fo:der-yk</i> <i>fo:der-juk</i> <i>fo:der-jyk</i>	<i>haver-uk</i> * <i>haver-yk</i> <i>haver-juk</i> <i>haver-jyk</i>	* <i>notes-uk</i> * <i>notes-yk</i> * <i>notes-juk</i> * <i>notes-jyk</i>
3SG.POSS	* <i>fo:der-a</i> <i>fo:der-ε</i> <i>fo:der-ja</i> <i>fo:der-je</i>	* <i>haver-a</i> * <i>haver-ε</i> <i>haver-ja</i> <i>haver-je</i>	* <i>notes-a</i> * <i>notes-ε</i> * <i>notes-ja</i> * <i>notes-je</i>

HarUni enforces vacillation (overriding PUPOSS) in *notes-a/-ε*.

6 Harmonic class and thematic vowel (“lowering”)

The mapping between harmonic class (back: B, front rounded: F_R, front unrounded: F_U, vacillating: B/F_U) and the quality of the thematic vowel (-o-, -ø-, -ε-, -o/ε-) is not bi-unique.

- The harmonic class does not uniquely determine the thematic vowel:
 - B & -o-: *dal-ok* vs. B & -a-: *fal-ak*
 - F_R & -ø-: *fyl-høz*, *fyl-øk* vs. F_R & -ε-: *fyl-høz*, *fyl-ek*
 - B/F_U & -o/ε-: *fo:der-hoz/-hez*, *fo:der-ok/-ek* vs. B/F_U & -o-: *haver-hoz/hez* vs. *haver-ok/*-ek*
- The thematic vowel does not uniquely determine the harmonic class:
 - -o- & B: *dal-ok*, *dal-hoz* vs. -o- & B/F_U: *haver-ok*, *haver-hoz/hez*
 - -ε- & F_U: *jel-ek*, *jel-hez* vs. -ε- & F_R: *fyl-ek*, *fyl-høz*

Paradigmatic classes of stems by the thematic vowel

paradigmatic class	-o- class	-a- class	-ε- class	-ø- class	-o/ε- class
thematic vowel	mid	low	low	mid	mid/low
harmonic class	B or B/F _U	B	F _U or F _R	F _R	B/F _U
root vowels	[B], [N'], [BN], [BNN']	[B], [N']	[FN], [N], [F], [Bε], [BNe]	[F]	[BN], [BNN']
examples (-PL)	<i>dal-ok</i> , <i>fi:r-ok</i> , <i>tse:l-ok</i> , <i>haver-ok</i>	<i>fal-ak</i> , <i>nil-ak</i> , <i>hej-ak</i>	<i>fyl-ek</i> , <i>jel-ek</i> , <i>hi:r-ek</i> , <i>ber-ek</i>	<i>fyl-øk</i> , <i>kør-øk</i>	<i>kare:l-ok/ek</i> , <i>hotel-ok/ek</i> , <i>aspirin-ok/ek</i>

7 Summary

Because of the high degree of phonological underdeterminedness of the harmony patterns an account of

- HVH including variation (lexical vacillation)
 - its interaction with other morphophonological phenomena
 - the distribution of thematic vowels
- must make reference to **paradigms**.

References

- Downing, Laura. 2018. Is Vowel Harmony canonically (P)Word bound? An Africanist perspective on vowel harmony domains. Phonology Workshop on Long Distance Segmental Phenomena, GLOW41, Budapest, 10 April 2018.
- Hayes, Bruce and Zsuzsa Czirák Londe. 2006. Stochastic phonological knowledge: The case of Hungarian vowel harmony. *Phonology* 23: 59–104.
- Mayer, Connor. 2021. Issues in Uyghur backness harmony: Corpus, experimental, and computational studies. PhD diss, UCLA.
- Rebrus, Péter and Péter Szigetvári. 2016. Diminutives: Exceptions to Harmonic Uniformity. *Catalan Journal of Linguistics* 15: 101–119. DOI: 10.5565/rev/catjl.186.
- Rebrus, Péter, Péter Szigetvári and Miklós Törkenczy. 2017. Asymmetric variation. In Jeff Lindsey and Andrew Nevins (eds.) *Sonic signatures*. John Benjamins. 163–187. DOI: 10.1075/lfab.14.c10.
- Rebrus, Péter and Miklós Törkenczy. 2017. Co-patterns, subpatterns and conflicting generalizations in Hungarian vowel harmony. In Harry van der Hulst and Anikó Lipták (eds.), *Approaches to Hungarian*. Volume 15: Papers from the 2015 Leiden Conference. Amsterdam/Philadelphia, PA: John Benjamins. 135–156.
- Rebrus, Péter and Miklós Törkenczy. 2019. Magyar harmónia: a dolgok állása. *Általános Nyelvészeti Tanulmányok XXXI*: 233–333.
- Rebrus, Péter and Miklós Törkenczy. 2021. Harmonic Uniformity and Hungarian front/back harmony. *Acta Linguistica Academica* 68: 175–206. DOI: 10.1556/2062.2021.00475.