

## Why [h] is not voiced\*

PÉTER SZIGETVÁRI

The topic of this paper is a relatively minute detail of the phonology of Hungarian, the question of why the segment [h] (or rather its non-prevocalic allophone, [x]) fails to undergo voicing when followed by a voiced obstruent, despite the fact that it triggers regressive voicing assimilation itself, and thus behaves like a typical obstruent. I will show that although the target [x] is an obstruent, it is not affected by voicing because it is not merely voiceless like other obstruents, but is in fact aspirated.

### 1. Data and analyses

There are several types of answers that can be given to the question posed by the title. A phonetician, for example, might say that the question is invalid because its presupposition is not true: [h] *is* voiced in Hungarian, typically in intervocalic position (*noha*<sup>1</sup> 'although') and between a sonorant and a vowel (*ko[p]ha* 'kitchen', *marha* 'cattle', *málha* 'luggage'). A phonologist's response might be that he is not interested in this kind of spontaneous voicing, as the resulting [ɦ] will never be distinctive. Intervocalic voicing, including the voicing of consonants observed between a sonorant and a vowel, is never distinctive and can be detected in all sorts of languages. As an example, we may cite English, where obstruents which are devoiced at the edges of words are (spontaneously) voiced in exactly the same environment: intervocalically.

The other environment where one would expect [h]-voicing is in obstruent clusters. Between two superficially adjacent obstruents regressive voicing assimilation takes place in Hungarian: the voicing of the first member of the cluster is determined by that of the second. It is well known that two segments exhibit peculiar behaviour with respect to this phenomenon: [v],<sup>2</sup> in that it be-

---

\* A version of this paper was presented at the 3rd Conference on New Methods for the Description of Hungarian, 16–17 April 1997, Szeged. I am grateful to the audience there, most notably Gyula Zsigri and László Kálmán, and to Péter Siptár and Miklós Törkenczy for their comments.

<sup>1</sup> I use the standard orthography throughout this paper except for cases where it diverges from the IPA in an unpredictable way and the consonant is relevant for the issue discussed.

<sup>2</sup> The fact that [v] does not assimilate is true of the standard dialect. There are dialects spoken in the western part of the country in which [v] voices a preceding obstruent like any other obstruent, hence *ha[d]van*.

comes assimilated (*tév+tan* → *té[f]tan* 'false doctrine'), but does not assimilate (*hat+van* → *\*ha[d]van* 'sixty'); and [h], which assimilates a preceding obstruent (*ad+hat* → *a[t]hat* 'may give'), but does not itself become assimilated (*potroh+ba* → *\*potro[fi]ba*, *\*potro[ɣ]ba* 'into the abdomen'). Apart from these two sounds, the rule of regressive voicing assimilation neatly separates obstruents from sonorants: only the former participate in this phenomenon providing both the input and environment for its operation. The difficulty arises with [h] and [v]. If we regard them as obstruents then [v] should assimilate the preceding obstruent and [h] should become assimilated to the following one, if we treat them as sonorants then [v] should not become assimilated and [h] should not assimilate.

A number of proposals have been made to explain the odd behaviour of [v]. According to Kornai [v] is an obstruent, but its voicing is not specified on the laryngeal tier as is usually the case, but on the manner tier (1994:25ff.). In one of his analyses, Siptár, following Vago (1980), regards [v] as a sonorant, which is devoiced by an ad hoc rule (1995:45). According to a more recent analysis of his, [v] does not have a laryngeal node which could host a [voice] feature, similarly to sonorants, thus it is unable to cause spreading of this property. In coda position, however, it is linked to a laryngeal node, which makes it similar to obstruents (Siptár 1996). Zsigri (1996:278) shows that Kornai's solution is not only stipulative but also makes false predictions: if [v] is an obstruent but does not voice the preceding obstruent because its [voice] feature is not on the laryngeal tier, then it "counts" as a voiceless obstruent, since Kornai has unary features and it is voiceless obstruents that are specified as [obstruent] on the manner tier and have no specification on the laryngeal tier. As a voiceless obstruent [v] should devoice a preceding obstruent, which of course it does not do. As for Siptár's (and Vago's) sonorant [v], Zsigri objects to its being treated differently from other obstruents, when it causes devoicing just like they do. He also notes that some dialects treat this sound as a normal obstruent but that there is no difference between the [v]'s in the two types of dialects, and that it participates in the voiceless–voiced dichotomy typical of obstruents only (1996:274). His proposal is to introduce a new binary feature, [ $\pm$ transient], which supplants [ $\pm$ nasal] and distinguishes non-nasal sonorants ([+transient]) from nasals ([–transient]) on the one hand, and [v] ([+transient]) from all other obstruents ([–transient]) on the other. The members of the resulting natural class ([v l r j h]) alternate with each other and with zero – hence the name of the feature – in several Hungarian dialects (1996:278).

The resistance of [h] to undergoing voicing is an even more complex issue, as it is actually not [h] that does not become voiced but its preconsonantal, strengthened allophone, [x].<sup>3</sup> The sound [h] itself could be considered nonconsonantal

<sup>3</sup> I do not take into consideration the dialect, which sounds affected to many, in which the allophonic realisation of non-prevocalic [h] is influenced by the preceding vowel: depending on its palatality or velarity we get [ç] or [x], respectively. I also disagree with Abandolo, who claims that the buccal version of this sound is voiced in the relevant context like any other obstruent (1988:67). This is a "very-fast-speech" phenomenon.

(e.g. Siptár 1995:44), and the set of sounds that are voiced could be restricted to true consonants, thus excluding [h]. But the same interpretation would hardly be plausible for the velar version, [x], which is the real input for the rule. Siptár proposes ordering the [h] → [x] rule after voicing assimilation (1995:71), but later admits that this is not an adequate solution, since both rules are postlexical (1996:86). Zsigri's proposal is to regard all words ending in [x] as marginal in the lexicon, thus behaving as phonetic quotations, which regularly escape voicing assimilation (1996:282). He explains that the number of items involved is very little, which apparently means that this solution is more economical than others that try to attribute the behaviour of [h] to its segmental make-up. A third alternative is to ban the appearance of the segment [ɣ] in the grammar by brute force (Siptár 1996:86), which again is unsatisfactory: there are numerous examples of underlyingly non-existent segments evolving of regressive voicing assimilation. (Hungarian [d̥z] is an example, one of the sources of which is [t̥s] when it undergoes voicing; Russian [d̥z] is another, which only surfaces as voiced [t̥z], while Russian also exhibits the process [x] → [ɣ], which is precisely what we want to exclude.)

If we are to attribute the failure of preconsonantal [h] (or, more precisely, [x]) to be voiced in Hungarian to its internal characteristics rather than to something special in the lexical items containing it, we have to adopt some theory of segmental make-up first. This is what we will now try to do.

## 2. The representation of sounds

In contemporary phonological theory there are two competing approaches for modelling sounds, one using binary, the other using unary features. Theories using binary features can make reference both to the presence and to the absence of a property of a sound, while the latter option is not available in unary frameworks. A unary framework is thus more restricted, it can handle fewer types of processes, and therefore *ceteris paribus* is more valuable than one using binary features. It follows that until theories which apply unary features become untenable, there is no reason to accept binary features.

The typical voiceless–voiced opposition in obstruents is represented in a binary system as a feature [–voice] in the make-up of the former and [+voice] in the latter. In contrast, if we adopt a unary framework then we first have to make a decision as to whether the distinctive feature should be [voiced] or [voiceless]. Subsequently the opposition may be expressed by either including [voiced] in the voiced or [voiceless] in the voiceless series. Crucially, the other member of the opposition will not involve any specification for voicing or voicelessness. Whichever of the two options we take, when we have two sounds that only differ in this respect one will contain one more feature than the other. So while in a binary framework each segment has the same number of features (at least superficially) and differences between segments depend only on the values of features, segments in a unary framework may also differ in the number of features

of which they are composed. Although it is true that an underlying representation in a binary underspecification model will typically not contain all feature values, some of them are filled in during the derivation, and by the end of the derivation, all the features (of the given language) will be present and will have been assigned some value.

Dependency and Government Phonology are two contemporary frameworks that explicitly aim at applying only unary features. The latter, for example, posits an element (L), the salient property of which is [slack vocal folds]. This element can be equated with a unary feature [voiced]. There is, however, a crucial difference between standard unary features and GP elements: whereas the former are typically conceived of as abstract properties of sounds that are manipulated by the phonology, GP elements are sounds themselves, they are claimed to be phonetically interpretable in isolation. Unfortunately (L) happens to be one of the elements of which this is not true, at least I do not know of any consonantal interpretation that has been proposed for (L). There appears to be another problem with the laryngeal elements in this theory: the standard assumption, as sketched by Kaye *et al.* (1990:215), is that voiced obstruents contain (L), while voiceless obstruents contain (H), an element whose salient property is [stiff vocal folds]. Since because of their salient properties (L) and (H) are incompatible, they are claimed to be mutually exclusive within a segment (e.g. by Brockhaus 1995:219). If it weren't for the fact that the existence series of obstruents without either (L) or (H) has been proposed, we would still have the binary feature [ $\pm$ voice] in disguise.

### 3. [voiced] or [voiceless]?

In unary feature systems the opposition of two sounds, as we have seen, is expressed by one of them having some property, that is, feature, which the other lacks. It is a characteristic of binary features that one of the values is more marked (more special, rarer) than the other. In a unary framework it will then be the marked value that will be established as the unary feature, since of the two sounds in opposition the one having this feature will be more marked: it will be marked by the feature in question.

There are several criteria on which to base our decision as to whether it should be [voiced] or [voiceless] that expresses the opposition in this dimension. If we examine the distribution of obstruents across languages we find that every language has voiceless obstruents and there are languages which have only this type of obstruent (Maddieson 1984:26). The case of fricatives is not so straightforward (*op.cit.*:47) – I will return to a possible reason for this in footnote 17 – nevertheless there are numerous languages (e.g. Ancient Greek, Latin, Old English) which have only voiceless, and not voiced, fricatives.

Another, perhaps even more decisive criterion for treating voicelessness as the unmarked option is the fact that in environments where laryngeal distinctions

neutralise (for example, word-finally in German and Polish) it is always the voiceless member of the pair that survives.<sup>4</sup>

This means that we have to opt for [voiced] (that is (L)) to represent the opposition, thus indicating that among obstruents voiceless sounds are less marked than voiced ones. There remains the issue, however, of what should happen to sonorants. These are typically voiced, yet if we build the feature [voiced] into their representations we make them more marked than voiceless sonorants, which are much less common: even when they do turn up, they only do so in languages that already possess their voiced counterparts, that is, they are more marked. If, on the other hand, (L) is not part of voiced sonorants then why are they voiced? It has been known for quite some time that sonorants are voiced differently than obstruents. While for the former the vibration of the vocal folds is spontaneous, in the articulation of an obstruent an effort has to be made to get the vocal folds to vibrate (cf. e.g. Chomsky and Halle 1968:300). The significance of the element (L) is thus not that the sound it forms part of is voiced phonetically, that is, that the vocal folds vibrate, but that it is markedly voiced: some effort must be made to produce voicing. This explains why, although vowels and sonorants are all voiced, the element (L) is included in the make-up only of voiced obstruents<sup>5</sup> (Hayes 1984). There is no need for any phonetic implementation module to determine that obstruents without any voicing specification are to be pronounced voiceless, while sonorants and vowels are voiced: the vibration of the vocal folds or its absence follows spontaneously from other properties of the segment and the anatomy of the human articulators, in much the same way as the fact that a glottal stop cannot be nasal(ised).

The embarrassing situation GP has found itself in, namely that a binary contrast, voiced vs. voiceless is expressed by two unary features, can thus be resolved along the lines suggested by Hayes, as in fact is done by Harris (1994:133). He claims that voiced obstruents contain (L), plain voiceless obstruents lack any laryngeal element, while (H) in an obstruent marks it as aspirated. The co-occurrence of both elements does not have to be ruled out stipulatively any more, together they represent the rather marked voiced aspirated series. It must be noted that if we accept this view of (H), [stiff vocal folds] cannot be maintained as the salient property of this element. Instead, since (H) is responsible for aspiration, we must assume that [spread glottis] is its most typical characteristic.

<sup>4</sup> In the regressive voicing assimilation of Hungarian and other languages the voiced-voiceless opposition is neutralised and not necessarily in favour of the voiceless party. The voicing in this case, however, has a well-definable source: the following voiced obstruent. I know of no case (disregarding the intervocalic site mentioned at the beginning of this paper) where this opposition would neutralise in favour of the voiced member in the absence of an explicitly voiced environment.

<sup>5</sup> At this point (L) can be excluded from the representation of nonobstruents only by stipulation. Alternatively, it may be given some other interpretation when not in obstruents. For this purpose nasality may be a candidate: obstruents are typically nonnasal and nasality sometimes causes obstruent voicing. But there are also problems with this proposal: nasals are expected to denasalise where obstruents devoice, which is unlikely.

#### 4. The representation of voicing assimilation

Under this interpretation of the element (L), the trigger for regressive voicing assimilation does not have to be restricted to obstruents, since the spreading element is present only in voiced obstruents anyway. The process is a result of the condition that two successive<sup>6</sup> consonants must share the element (L). This can be seen in (1).

(1) *The (L) condition*



As it stands, this condition has two flaws: on the one hand, (L) spreads to the preceding consonant whether it is an obstruent or not, while on the other hand, this solution seems to support those who prefer binary features, because it is not only voiced obstruents that voice preceding voiceless ones (*va*[f]+*golyó* → *va*[<sub>3</sub>]*golyó* 'iron ball'), but voiceless obstruents also devoice preceding voiced ones (*dob*+*[s]oló* → *do*[ps]*oló* 'solo by the drum'), although there is no equivalent of a [voiceless] feature that could be shared.


##### 4.1. The spreading of (L)

A remedy for the first problem is provided by feature geometry, according to which features are not anchored to timing slots in unorganised bundles but group in a hierarchical structure organised by nodes. Two widely accepted nodes are the place node, which gathers the features responsible for place of articulation, and the laryngeal node, which may have the features of voicing, aspiration, glottalisation etc. linked to it. With this hypothesis all we have to suppose is that only obstruents possess a laryngeal node, which is plausible anyway since it is only these that show such oppositions. Thus the (L) element of the following consonant would spread to a sonorant in vain: not having a laryngeal node it would not be able to anchor and would remain uninterpreted. It must be noted that under standard assumptions, during the process of a feature trying to spread to a missing node, [Lar] in our case, the node is created to host the spreading feature. The analysis proposed below aims at excluding this possibility. Besides the obvious advantages of including feature geometry in the model of sound

<sup>6</sup> The position of these two consonants in the prosodic hierarchy is irrelevant. In traditional terms the first one is in a coda, the second in an onset. In frameworks where word-final consonants are not considered codas, the cluster can either be a coda-onset cluster or a sequence of two successive onsets with an intervening empty nucleus. Lowenstamm's (1996) CV approach would again provide a uniform generalisation for the environment: the two consonants are C's flanking an empty V.

make-up (it specifies the natural classes of features and mutually exclusive features), it has an outstanding disadvantage, in that it increases the generative power of the theory excessively: nodes function as additional features, for example, they make representable a three-way laryngeal opposition in obstruents, as shown in (2).

(2) *Three-way laryngeal opposition in obstruents*




The consonant in (2a) has no laryngeal node at all,<sup>7</sup> the one in (2b) has one without anything linked to it, while that in (2c) has an (L) element in addition.<sup>8</sup> Natural languages do not provide evidence for all three types.

Even if we discard feature geometry as too strong a device, features must have some kind of segment internal organisation in order to exclude the possibility of (L) spreading to sonorants. To solve the problem of doubly encoding the sonority-obstruency opposition in the representation (once by a feature like [sonorant] or [obstruent] or [ $\pm$ sonorant] and also by the presence or absence of the [Lar] node), I propose a structure in which there are no nodes but certain features can only link to the skeleton via others. This solution exploits the idea that nodes are in fact features. Putting aside certain details which need to be elaborated, we may hypothesise that (L) can only be involved in the make-up of a segment via the mediation of the element (h), whose salient property is [noise] and which is present in obstruents, that is, it is more or less the equivalent of the binary feature [-sonorant].<sup>9</sup> This means that it is only noisy segments, i.e. obstruents, that can be distinguished by voicing. The representations in (3) show a partial structure for sonorants (3a), voiceless obstruents (3b), and voiced obstruents (3c).

<sup>7</sup> We have supposed above that only obstruents have a laryngeal node. This is not contradicted here, because i. the claim does not strictly follow from anything, it is just a stipulation that seems to hold of (many) languages and ii. it has not been said that all obstruents necessarily have a laryngeal node.

<sup>8</sup> The fourth logical possibility, an (L) element without a [Lar] node, is impossible if that element can only link to the [Lar] node.


<sup>9</sup> There is some uncertainty here whether obstruents are more or less marked than sonorants, since, as noted earlier, each element (like all unary features) is supposed to represent the marked value of an opposition. I am, nevertheless, going to follow Harris (1990:263) in assuming that obstruents contain this element.

(3) *Representation of manners of articulation*

One might say that we could keep the representations in (2) and interpret them exactly like those in (3). While this is possible, the representations in (3) have definite advantages over those in (2): i. they do not contain any new element other than the usual elements, which are indispensable anyway, whereas in (2) both (h) (or its equivalent, like [-sonorant]) and a [Lar] node is needed, ii. they give a nonarbitrary explanation for why only obstruents exhibit voicing oppositions, and iii. they make the creation of a docking site for the spreading (L) element unfeasible: while a [Lar] node may be created, one cannot insert an element (h) for the same reason.

4.2. *The spreading of voicelessness*


The standard explanation for the apparent spreading of voicelessness (e.g. *do[ps]oló*) in frameworks that only employ a unary [voiced] feature (or (L) element, if you like) is that certain prosodic positions are unable to license certain features or can do so only with external help. The traditional coda position – most types of non-prevocalic consonantal positions, to give a more cautious formulation – typically has weak licensing power, which is not enough in itself to license (L). As a result the configuration in (4a) is deemed ungrammatical.



There are two ways of amending this universally ill-formed structure: either the second consonant licenses the element (L) for the first (this is called progressive voicing assimilation (4b)) or (L) must be delinked from the first as well (this is regressive voicing assimilation (4c)). So what seems to be the spreading of voicelessness in fact stems from a restriction on the appearance of voicing. The careful reader will have noticed that both consonants of the ungrammatical cluster contain the element (h). This is understandable in the case of the first consonant, since it is only through this feature that (L) can link to the skeleton in the first place. If the second consonant does not contain (h), however, there is nothing

wrong with the structure, cf. *ablak* 'window', *abrak* 'fodder'. The problem here is that even if we hypothesise that the head of a branching onset is immune to this process, as Lombardi (1995a,b) does, for independent reasons clusters like [bl] and [br] are not considered branching onsets in Hungarian, but as two successive onsets with an intervening empty nucleus or a coda followed by an onset if, unlike GP, the theory applied allows for that option in the case of such clusters. Whichever interpretation holds, the cluster [bl] is not different in respect of its prosodic structure from clusters like [bs], where the first obstruent must devoice. This can only come about if (h) is included in the ungrammatical configuration, which seems very suspicious: it looks as if it were making an implicit reference to the absence of the feature (L) in the second consonant. Of course, including (L) in the representation of nonobstruents would not be of any help as voiceless obstruents, which should then become voiced, can just as well occur before nonobstruents (cf. *paplan* 'quilt', *apró* 'tiny'). Following Siptár (1997), we could also hypothesise that obstruent devoicing takes place before any obstruent, not just voiceless ones. In the case of voiced–voiced clusters this would feed L-spreading (1), however it also presupposes a redundant and highly unlikely step: dissimilation. A solution may be brought about by some kind of fusion of the two (h)'s together with their contents, but even this is unsatisfactory in the special cases of [v] and [h], discussed here.

An alternative approach, alluded to above, is to formulate the sites where voiced obstruents may possibly appear. This is the positive constraint put forward by Lombardi, which does not state where a consonant cannot be voiced, but where it can (1995a:43). I give the essence of Lombardi's diagram in the present framework (this is not an exact replica) in (5).

(5) *Positive constraint on voicing*

According to this constraint voiced obstruents may only appear at the beginning of a syllable, before a vowel. Optionally there may be a sonorant between the obstruent and the vowel. If we want to condition the appearance of (L) by syllable structure, we have to have a clear picture of what syllables look like. There are three competing views about the status of word-final consonants, the prime site targeted by voice assimilation: i. they are in coda position, ii. they are extra-syllabic, in an appendix or something similar, iii. they are onsets followed by an empty nucleus. The second option complicates the formulation of rules rather unnecessarily as it requires us to define the set of elements that can occur in

appendices as well as in codas and onsets. If we adopt view i. (which is what Lombardi does) the constraint will predict word-final devoicing, which does not occur. Lombardi posits an additional site where laryngeal distinctions may be maintained: Lar]<sub>w</sub> (1995a:66). But that also proves inadequate because the voice contrast of obstruents in non-word-final non-syllable-initial position is maintained, e.g. *ha*[j]*ma* 'onion', *fi*[c]*ma* 'prepuce'. Adopting alternative iii. will again be problematic, since its prediction will be that any word-final obstruent can maintain its voicing value, which again is false: word final obstruents cannot be voiced if they are followed by a voiceless obstruent at the beginning of the next word or in a suffix. This renders the positive constraint untenable.<sup>10</sup>

All in all, despite the problems with the formulation of devoicing in (4) – recall that it apparently makes an implicit reference to the absence of (L) – there seems to be no better solution for the time being, and for this reason I will to adhere to it.

## 5. The representation of [h]

One of the consequences of using unary features in phonological representations is that the markedness of segments can be read off their composition. If a feature stands for the marked value of a given opposition, then the more features a segment consists of, the more marked it is. The opposite is also true: the less marked a segment, the less features it contains. The conclusion is that a very unmarked segment may be made up of a single feature, which means that this feature is equivalent to the segment. Phonological features thus cease to be abstract entities, instead we can say that there exist simplex segments (which were traditionally called features) which we can combine to obtain more complex segments.<sup>11</sup> As we have seen, this is the basic stance of GP (cf. especially Harris and Lindsey 1995), but it is often not adhered to very strictly (for example, in the case of the two laryngeal elements, (L) and (H)).

In order to model [h] phonologically we must first take its phonetic characteristics into account. The version of this segment which turns up prevocally is not an obstruent, as [h] lacks the aperiodic noise that characterises nonsonorants. Still, many authors (Vago, Siptár, Kornai, Zsigri of those cited above) specify Hungarian [h] as [–sonorant]. Chomsky and Halle (1968:303) do say that [h] is a sonorant, but this is somewhat at odds with their definition of sonorants: sounds "in which spontaneous voicing is possible" (*op.cit.*:302). This means that it does not have the (h) element.<sup>12</sup> We have seen in section 3 that sonorants are

<sup>10</sup> See Siptár 1997 for a different and more detailed criticism.

<sup>11</sup> Theoretically, segments can be conceived of as having no marked properties, that is, no features in their make-up. This means we must be able to phonetically interpret positions which contain no explicit phonological information other than their prosodic structure.

<sup>12</sup> Interestingly, the standard assumption of GP is that (h) is [h], i.e. when alone in a segment the noise element is phonetically interpreted as [h]. Hence the symbol.

phonetically voiced in the unmarked case, while [h], on the other hand, is not. At this point there also arises the question of how voiceless sonorants can be represented if they do not have a laryngeal node, or an (h) element, according to my proposal. The representation of voiceless sounds includes (h) without (L) linked to it. The absence of both features (in sonorant consonants and vowels) is phonetically interpreted as (spontaneous) voicing. There are numerous arguments for claiming that voiceless sonorants are in fact aspirated (some of these are presented in Lombardi 1995b:50).<sup>13</sup> Their representation thus contains the feature [aspirated] (GP's (H) element) in addition to those present in their normal, voiced equivalent. This also captures the fact that a voiceless sonorant is more marked than a voiced one, while with obstruents the situation is just the opposite (but see Harris 1994:133). Consequently, (H) can be held responsible for the voicelessness of [h] also. Indeed, [h] probably does not have any other feature, since in respect of its place of articulation it is totally unmarked, being debuccalised (cf. Lass 1984:133ff).<sup>14</sup>

Although it is standard practice, probably because of articulatory considerations, to link both (L) and (H), or their equivalents, to the laryngeal node, the fact that (L) can only characterise obstruents while (H) can be present in sonorants as well argues against this. Translated to the framework elaborated here, this means that (L) links to the skeleton by the mediation of (h), (H) on the other hand does not. Whether it links directly or via some other feature is a subject for further investigation, but this is irrelevant for the purposes of this paper.

## 6. The case of [v]

Returning for a moment to the odd behaviour of [v] mentioned in section 1, that it becomes assimilated but does not assimilate laryngeally, we find that by treating it prevocally as a sonorant and in coda position as an obstruent we can offer an account for its behaviour. This is the essence of Siptár's (1996) solution. The technical details, however, are not very felicitous: a laryngeal node is created out of nothing and added to [v]'s in coda position, thereby making them obstruential and so capable of receiving the spreading laryngeal specification of the following obstruent. The details of the fortition mechanism thus appear to be unclear<sup>15</sup> and even problematic, given that codas are typically held to be weak

<sup>13</sup> Even in obstruents the laryngeal opposition, traditionally considered to be that of voiceless vs. voiced, can in some languages be interpreted as aspirated–unaspirated (cf. e.g. Harris 1994:133, Iverson and Salmons 1995).

<sup>14</sup> Kornai (1994:25) represents [h] as an aspirated obstruent, in Szigetvári 1996 I argue for [h] being the independent realisation of (H).


<sup>15</sup> There have been attempts made at deriving manner of articulation from syllabic position (e.g. Jensen 1994, Rennison 1996). Accordingly we could say that the same melodic material is interpreted as a sonorant in onset and as an obstruent in coda position. On the other hand, if obstruency is a function of syllabic position and not of explicit features, then we cannot distinguish coda segments according to whether they are affected by voicing assimilation or not.

and it is exactly there that strengthening occurs in this case. It is nevertheless intriguing that glides, the sonorant [v] and [h] in Hungarian, and [j], [w], [h] and [r]<sup>16</sup> in English, tend to avoid coda position altogether, while [l] often vocalises here in both languages, that is, all these consonants prefer to turn up exclusively before vowels.

## 7. The proposal

The explanation of the strange behaviour of [v] can be applied to the distribution of [h] and [x] as well: prevocally we find an approximant, while if it is not followed by a pronounced vowel its obstruent allophone surfaces. The analyses proposed so far have failed at this point: it is exactly the allophone which is supposed to be inert in voicing assimilation, the approximant [h], which devoices a preceding obstruent, while [x], which, as an obstruent, is expected to participate in the process, fails to be voiced. In the model sketched here [x] is unique among obstruents in that its voicelessness is not (only) a result of its having (h) without (L) hanging from it, but the (H) feature it "inherits" from [h].<sup>17</sup> This element is what inhibits the voicing of the obstruent: (H) and (L) are incompatible in Hungarian. This is something of a stipulation, but it is needed in the grammar anyway since there are no voiced aspirates in the language. It is also useful at this point to presume that (H) is not joined to the skeleton via (h) (or the laryngeal node), since if it were, the (L) spreading backwards would have a chance to delink it. The situation is depicted in (6).

(6) *[x] + voiced obstruent cluster*



In the diagram above the (h) element of the first consonant is between parentheses because I did not take a stand on whether this feature is explicitly there in

<sup>16</sup> Harris argues for post-vocalic [r]'s being in the nucleus, not in the coda (1994:257ff.), so this is true even for rhotic accents of English.

<sup>17</sup> There are certain phenomena that point towards representing the voiceless-voiced opposition in all fricatives by the feature (H) instead of (L). One is the general lenition process in which stops rarely, while fricatives usually, become [h] (Lass 1984:334). Phonetic facts also support this idea: in the articulation of voiceless fricatives the opening between the vocal folds is significantly wider than in the case of voiceless stops (Iverson and Salmons 1995:372). This undermines the thesis of this paper, but for the moment we will simply have to regard it as a task for further investigation.


[x], or whether the noise in it only comes from it being in coda position. In the latter case the impossibility of L-spreading is obvious: in the absence of (h) there is nothing for it to anchor to, like in any other sonorant. This, however, would ruin the explanation for the devoicing of coda [v]. Therefore it seems better to include (h) in the representation of [x] and argue for the incompatibility of (H) and (L).

A further piece of evidence that supports this analysis comes from Russian. Regressive voicing assimilation in this language works much the same way as in Hungarian (with the additional process of word-final devoicing), it involves obstruents, [v] exceptionally does not voice but is devoiced, but the two languages diverge in the case of [x], which is voiced in Russian. The crucial point is that Russian has underlying [x], which does not alternate with [h] in any environment. Therefore we may assume that it does not "inherit" the (H) element, and although (H) and (L) are incompatible in Russian, too, (L) can spread to the H-less [x] resulting in [ɣ].

## 8. Further problems

I have made an attempt to answer the question posed in the title. This, however, cannot be fully successful until an explanation is found for the odd aspect of [h]'s behaviour as far as voicing assimilation is concerned. In the light of what has been said so far it is not clear why a voiced obstruent is devoiced before [h]. The situation is shown in (7) below.

(7) *Voiced obstruent + [h] cluster*



Like other h-less sonorants, [h] should not influence the laryngeal specification of the preceding voiced obstruent in any way. We may suspect that the incompatibility of (H) and (L) has its role to play in this case as well. In languages that do not ban the cooccurrence of these two features in a segment, (H) spreads backwards, and instead of devoicing the preceding obstruent it creates a voiced aspirate with it (cf. e.g. Sanskrit /tad/+/ha/ → [tad<sup>h</sup>:a]). Unfortunately, Sanskrit does not have a [h] that would surface preconsonantly, therefore the prediction that it would be voiced cannot be confirmed. We may assume that (H) also spreads backwards and since it is incompatible with (L) it delinks it (Péter Siptár p.c.). Strangely enough (H) spreads only onto obstruents, although we have seen that, unlike for (L), the presence of (h) is not a prerequisite for the presence of (H).



Zsigri (1996:279) mentions that in a Northern dialect of Hungarian (spoken around Nitra/Nyitra, Slovakia) [h] fails to devoice the preceding voiced obstruent. The explanation he gives is that this dialect has underlying voiced [ɦ], a result of the influence of Slovakian. Plausible though this may seem, it brings up another very problematic phenomenon for the analysis presented: Czech and Slovak both have a voiced [ɦ], which the machinery introduced here is unable to cope with (also Tobias Scheer p.c.). It is somewhat comforting to know that [h] and [ɦ] contrast exceedingly rarely in languages (Ladefoged and Maddieson 1996:326); nevertheless, if one aims at achieving universality of phonetic interpretation the representations of these two sounds cannot be merged.

## 9. Summary

Using a framework of unary features I have tried to give an explanation for why voiced obstruents do not cause a preceding [h] (or more exactly [x]) to be voiced. In the course of my analysis there emerged phonological evidence against the standard assumption that the two "laryngeal" features, [aspirated] (H) and [voiced] (L), are hosted by the same node in the feature geometry tree. We also had to dismiss the idea of regulating the occurrence of voicing in obstruents by a positive constraint making reference to syllable structure, and it also seemed more useful to use other traditional features instead of the more abstract class nodes of standard feature geometry. I claimed that [x] fails to get voiced in Hungarian when followed by a voiced obstruent because it is aspirated, and aspiration and voicing are incompatible in this language.<sup>18</sup> On the other hand, we did not arrive at a satisfactory explanation for how [h] devoices preceding voiced obstruents, and there are also problems with the representation of underlying voiced [ɦ] of the Czech and Slovak type.

## References

- Abondolo, D. M. (1988) *Hungarian inflectional morphology*. Budapest: Akadémiai Kiadó.
- Brockhaus, W. (1995) Skeletal and suprasegmental structure within government phonology. In J. Durand and F. Katamba, eds., 180–221.
- Chomsky, N. and M. Halle (1968) *The sound pattern of English*. New York: Harper and Row.
- Durand, J. and F. Katamba, eds. (1995) *Frontiers of phonology: atoms, structures, derivations*. London: Longman.
- Harris, J. (1990) Segmental complexity and phonological government. *Phonology* 7:255–300.
- Harris, J. (1994) *English sound structure*. Oxford: Blackwell.

<sup>18</sup> Upon seeing the title of this paper, a non-phonologist colleague of mine said he knew the answer to the question why [h] does not get voiced: because it sounds stupid. He was right.

- Harris, J. and G. Lindsey (1995) The elements of phonological representation. In J. Durand and F. Katamba, eds., 34–79.
- Hayes, B. (1984) The phonetics and phonology of Russian voicing assimilation. In *Language sound structure. Studies in phonology presented to Morris Halle by his teacher and students*. M. Aronoff and R. T. Oerhle, eds., 318–328. Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press.
- Iverson, G. K. and J. C. Salmons (1995) Aspiration and laryngeal representation in Germanic. *Phonology* 12:369–396.
- Jensen, S. (1994) Is ? an element? Towards a non-segmental phonology. *SOAS Working Papers in Linguistics and Phonetics* 4:71–78.
- Kaye, J., J. Lowenstamm, and J.-R. Vergnaud (1990) Constituent structure and government in phonology. *Phonology* 7:193–231.
- Kornai, A. (1994) *On Hungarian morphology*. Budapest: Institutum Linguisticum Academiae Scientiarum Hungaricae.
- Ladefoged, P. and I. Maddieson (1996) *The sounds of the world's languages*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Lass, R. (1984) *Phonology: an introduction to basic concepts*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Lombardi, L. (1995a) Laryngeal neutralization and syllable well-formedness. *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory* 13:39–74.
- Lombardi, L. (1995b) Laryngeal features and privativity. *The Linguistic Review* 12:35–59.
- Lowenstamm, J. (1996) CV as the only syllable type. In *Current trends in phonology: models and methods*. J. Durand and B. Laks, eds., 419–442. Salford, Manchester: European Studies Research Institute.
- Maddieson, I. (1984) *Patterns of sounds*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Rennison, J. R. (1996) Can there be empty elements? On empty heads and empty operators. Paper presented at the Eighth International Phonology Meeting, Vienna.
- Siptár P. (1995) *A magyar mássalhangzók fonológiája [A phonology of Hungarian consonants]*. Budapest: Institutum Linguisticum Academiae Scientiarum Hungaricae.
- Siptár, P. (1996) A Janus-faced Hungarian consonant. *The Even Yearbook* 2:83–96.
- Siptár, P. (1997) 7.3. Voicing assimilation and devoicing processes. Draft chapter from P. Siptár and M. Törkenczy (in prep.) *The phonology of Hungarian*.
- Szigetvári, P. (1996) Laryngeal contrasts and problematic representations. *The Even Yearbook* 2:97–110.
- Vago, R. M. (1980) *The sound pattern of Hungarian*. Washington: Georgetown University Press.
- Zsigri Gy. (1996) A zöngésségi hasonulás és a tünékeny mássalhangzók [Voicing assimilation and transient consonants]. *Néprajz és Nyelvtudomány* XXXVII:271–284.