

Case marking on Hungarian pronouns - the need for morph-based referrals

Andrew Spencer, spena@essex.ac.uk

Department of Language and Linguistics, University of Essex

Hungarian nominals take plural and possessor agreement (Px) suffixes and these forms then take one of at least 17 case suffixes: *Évá-nak* 'Eva-DAT, to Eva', *asztala-i-m-on* 'table-PL-1SGPx-SUPERESS, on my tables'. But case-marked personal pronouns consist of a Px-inflected 'case root': *neke-m* 'to me' (=DAT-1SGPx), whose form may be suppletive: *rajta-m* 'on me' (=SUPERESS-1SGPx). Postpositions similarly take Px inflections: *az asztal mellet* 'the table next.to (next to the table)', but *mellete-m* 'next.to-me' etc.

There are no proposals for treating these pronominal forms in the theoretical literature, yet they pose serious conceptual problems for nearly all theories of morphology. Classical morpheme-based approaches (including Distributed Morphology) are totally inadequate: they would require appeal to the syntactically/semantically nonsensical notion 'possessed form of a case suffix'. In realizational models (e.g. Paradigm Function Morphology, Stump, 2001) case markers are just realizations of a [Case] feature and we could appeal to a rule of referral, viz. "to realize the value [CASE:K] of the PRON lexeme realizing [PERS:α, NUM:β], use the form corresponding to [[CASE:K], Px:[PERS:α, NUM:β]]". However, in PFM there can be no 'case root' which might be inflected for Px features: suffixes are effectively phonological strings added to a stem and not inflectable roots.

We can, however, deploy such a rule of referral in Generalized PFM (see Luís & Spencer, 2005, on Portuguese pronominal clitics). To inflect a lexeme in GPFM we define (i) the host (e.g. root) (ii) the exponents (affixes) and their position class indices, e.g. [Px:1SG] → < *m*, +II > (iii) the linear order of root and affixes (by default, read off position classes). I treat the case suffix as a kind of 'fused postposition', with a (degenerate) lexical entry consisting of (i) lexemic index (unique lexical identifier), (ii) two stems, (iii) a meaning (possibly), but NO syntactic properties (so that cases, unlike postpositions, cannot be syntactic terminals). The Stem1 form is the ordinary suffix (position class index +III), the Stem2 form is labelled as a morphological noun ([Mclass: N]) and hence can trigger Px inflection:

	Index	Stem1	Stem2	Index	Stem1	Stem2
DATIVE	<i>nAk</i> , +III	<i>neke</i> , [Mclass: N]		SUPERESS	<i>on</i> , +III	<i>rajta</i> , [Mclass: N]

Postpositions bear syntactic class feature 'P' but their Stem2 is marked [Mclass: N].

Normal case inflection fuses the Stem1 form of the CASE lexical entry with the (inflected) noun: [TABLE: {PL, Px:1SG, CASE:SUPER}] = [TABLE: {PL, Px:1SG}] ⊗ [SUPER:Stem1] = *asztala-i-m on* 'table-PL-1SG-SUPER 'on my tables'. For pronouns this is overridden by our (more specific) rule of referral: 'on me' = [PRON: {Px:1SG, CASE:SUPER}] → [SUPER: {Px:1SG}] = *rajta-m*. The Px agreement automatically selects the Stem2 form of the superessive case (*rajta-*), just as though the case were a postposition or a true noun. The exceptional accusative pronoun forms *engem(et)* '1sg', *minket* '1pl' etc. can even, at a pinch, be analysed this way (though it's probably better to treat them just as exceptions).

GPFM enjoys all the conceptual advantages of PFM, including a notion of 'morphomic stem' (contra, e.g., DM) but unlike PFM it can treat affixes as morphs with (degenerate) 'lexical entries', over which referrals can be stated. Hungarian 'case-marked' pronouns therefore provide extremely strong empirical support for the GPFM model.