

Postalveolar assimilation and its exceptions from the point of view of Hungarian
language history

TAMÁS FORGÁCS

[Translated from German by Stephen Grimes]

Abstract

The author examines the different types of postalveolar assimilation in the different imperative forms of Hungarian verbs ending in -t (eg. *szeret* -> *szeress*, *tanít* -> *taníts*, pronounced [tanícss]). Generative phonology has presented several proposed solutions for these phenomena in the last decade. It has become understood that a long vowel before a final -t becomes a short vowel when the consonant is followed by a -j. In CV phonology and X-level phonology, these consonants became represented – somewhat abstractly – as C or X units.

The author tries to prove in his article that these results actually are in complete agreement with explanations from earlier language history, and an etymology of these words (and hence their actual morphological structure) explains these results. Therefore it is unfortunate that the modern direction of the field in large part hardly considers the results of language history: it would be desirable for both sides to exhibit more affinity for the results of the other, and thus enriching their research.

1. The question of postalveolar assimilation in the imperative form of the verb with word final -t has long occupied many Hungarian linguists. It is well known that the two types of variations that occur here can be distinguished: in one version the final -t and the imperative -j become /s:/, while in the other -t + -j yields /cs:/. Both types include two groups of verbs.

(1) Verbs with s-assimilation

(a) All verbs with word-final -t, in which the final -t is preceded by a short vowel. For example, *szeret* + j -> *szeress* 'love!'; *köss* 'tie!'

(b) The verbs *lát* 'see', *bocsát* 'forgive', and *lót(-fut)* 'run about': *lát* + j -> *láss*; *bocsáss*; *löss(-fuss)*

(2) Verbs with cs-assimilation

(a) All verbs with word-final -t in which a consonant appears before the -t (the consonant can only be a sonorant: l, r, j, m, n). For example *bont* + j -> *bonts* 'break!'; *márts* 'dip!'; *tölts* 'fill!'; *onts* 'shed!'

(b) All verbs with the derivational suffix -ít, as well as the verbs *fűt* 'heat', *hűt* 'cool', (*dűt*) 'topple', *műt* 'operate', *szít* 'instigate', *tát* 'open (mouth)', and *vét* 'fault'. For example *tanít* + j -> *taníts*; *fűts*, *véts*.

The different assimilation processes of the groups of the type in (1) are easily explained on the basis of the different phonological makeup of the two groups, and if anything problems illustrate the different assimilation features of the group in (2). Based on their differing behaviors during assimilation, they constitute two explanatory attempts. According to Lotz (1960; 1976, 173 in Hungarian), Deme (1961, 103), and Papp (1966, 143), as well as Abondolo (1988, 146), cs-assimilation is a rule-governed process and s-assimilation is not rule-governed. According to this view, stems with a final syllable of two mora in the coda (i.e. a short vowel stands before the -t) participate in this assimilation, while stems with more than two mora in the final syllable (i.e. a long vowel or consonant stands before the -t) take part in cs-assimilation.

Lately, generative phonology has suggested several solutions to clarify the phenomenon, cf. Szépe (1969), Vago (1980; 1987; 1991), Siptár (1990; 1994; 1995), Olsson (1992) and Zsigri (1997). In this research what is critical is whether the segment before the -t is a vowel or a consonant, and as such for them the forms like *láss* are classified as regular forms together with the verbs ending with a short vowel. I quote here a part of the argumentation from Vago: "A hagyományos felfogás rövid és hosszú magánhangzó közötti megkülönböztetése nem egészen kielégítő: A tényeket ugyan leírja, de magyarázatot nem tud hozni arra, hogy (pár kivétel) a mássalhangzók és a hosszú magánhangzók egyformán viselkednek a t-végű igék felszólító módjában. Ezzel szemben nyilvánvaló, hogy ha a hosszú magánhangzókat legalább is részben mássalhangzónak elemezzük egy mélyebb fonológiai szinten, akkor a márt és a fűt féle igék egységes viselkedése a fut felékhöz viszonyítva rögtön kiugrik. De ez csak akkor lehetséges, ha a fonológiai elmélet több leíró szintet ismer el. Pontosan ezzel az érvel, többek között természetesen, járult hozzá a hatvanas és hetvenes évek generatív teóriája a fonológiai tudomány előrehaladásához. [The traditional approach's distinction between short and long vowels is not entirely satisfactory: the facts are described in such a way without an explanation being provided, that (with a few exceptions) consonants and long vowels behave identically in imperative verbs ending in -t. On the other hand it is clear that if we analyze long vowels at least in part as consonants on a deeper phonological level, then the uniform behavior of the *márt* and *fut* type of verbs in relation to the *fűt* type of verbs jumps out relatively immediately. However that is only possible if the theory of the phonology admits additional levels of description. It is exactly for this reason, amongst others naturally, that in the 60's and 70's generative theory made its ascent to the forefront in the discipline of phonology.]" (Vago 1991, 683).

Vago also presents different solution attempts, which generative phonology believes solve the question of the postalveolar assimilation. He presents three different solutions, which chronologically follow one another.

1.1. Generative phonology

Generative phonology mistakes the long vowel before -t as a short vowel-consonant sequence. Thus the same rule applies in the imperative of the verbs *márt* and *fut*: if a consonant precedes -t, then the -t and the imperative symbol -j become written -ts, spoken -cs, and in the end the consonant before the t disappears and the preceding vowel lengthens [Konsonanten in text is an error]. Schematically:

(3) fűCt + j (C = consonant)

fűCts

fűts (cf. Vago 1991, 683; also Szépe 1969, 458-9)

Vago (as cited) next examines which consonant is behind this "phantom consonant", which disappears in the above-mentioned case and exerts an effect on the preceding vowel. Since this consonant cannot break any phonotactic rule, he examines material the Reverse-Alphabetized Dictionary of Hungarian (Papp 1969) and states that (with exception of s and sp) at the end of the stem or derivational suffixes and before the -t only j, l, m, n and r can appear. One can not accept the l, n, r, and m (see e.g. the imperative forms of the *tilt*, *int*, *irt*, *teremt*, in which the consonant before the -t remains), hence only the -j remains.

That is, verbs such as *szít* and *fűt* can be described in generative phonology as *szijt* and *fűjt*, from which it follows that the changes in the imperative of these verbs can be described uniformly, depending on whether a short or long vowel or a consonant is postulated before the -t (see Vago 1991, 684).

1.2. CV phonology

In Vago's later work he always concedes the concreteness of this -j, as *fűjt* suits the pronounced *fűt* only from a phonological point of view and indeed -j does not occur in these words. Thus the question is whether it is at all important to know **what** consonant appears before the -t, or whether it is necessary for the explanation of the facts to postulate **any** consonants, since for correct operation of the phonological rule used in the imperative, the consonant -j is not necessary; it is only important that no vowel appears before the consonant.

In the context of the CV phonology (see also Vago 1987) therefore the different behavior of the verbs such as *lát* 'to see' and/or *fűt* 'heat' is ascribed to the fact that in *lát* the root node belongs to two V-elements, while in verbs such as *fűt* it belongs to a V and to a C:

(4) C V V C	C V C C
l á t	f ű t

Thus in verbs like *fűt*, a C stands before the -t on the CV tier, the -t becomes -cs and not -s, and thus it is explained that *fűt* and its group behaves in such a way as if there were a consonant before the -t.

(5) C V V C	C	C V C C	C
l á t	j	f ű t	j
l á s	j	f ű cs	j
l á s	s	f ű cs	cs (= fűts)

1.3. X-level-Phonology

The CV tier was later replaced by Vago by an X-slot. Among other things it is necessary because as we saw CV Phonology distinguishes two different kinds of vowels: the one is represented by a V- and a C-slot on the CV-level, while the others are represented by two V-units. By comparison one could raise the objection of how a (phonetic) vowel can have such a characteristic which is normally a distinctive characteristic for consonants. In order to remedy this contradiction, one of the newest theories of the phonology suggests that it is not worthwhile to discriminate between C and V on the central level, but rather instead postulate empty, abstract positions on this level. These units become designated with "X" (from which the name of the theory originates: X-level-phonology). The structural difference between *lát* and *fűt* varies according to the following (see Vago 1991, 686-8):

(6) (diagram omitted)

(N = nucleus (syllable core), consonants in the onset branch off from an N", consonants in the coda branch from a N'-slot, vowels on the other hand branch from an N-slot. The difference of the two examples therefore touches on that in the case of *fűt* one postulates a short vowel and likewise thereafter a silent X-slot which is actually only aimed at not allowing the word-final *üt* to follow the nucleus.)

The rules of palatalization for imperative verbs ending in -t in this representation are arranged as follows (Vago 1991, 687):

(7) (diagram omitted)

The rule (7a) permits the final -t to become -s if the X-slot standing before it contains a nucleus, while rule (7b) permits a -cs when the -t and the preceding X-slot belong to the same syllable structure unit, i.e. both come after a nucleus. Thus the palatalization of the -t depends on a structural difference.¹

2. Those were the most important attempts at explaining of the phenomenon of postalveolar assimilation. Vago makes the following comment at the end of his essay, in which he also presents the solutions I have outlined: "Összefoglalásként vegyük figyelembe azt, hogy az egyes elméleti keretek hogyan indokolják a t-végű igék azon tulajdonságát, hogy pár kivételtől eltekintve a t-t megelőző hosszú magánhangzók a rövidekkel szemben szisztematikusan mássalhangzókkal együtt csoportosulnak. A hagyományos nyelvészet a tényeket expliciten fejezi ki, s így eleve véletlen eseménynek számítja. Egy másik felfogás szerint a hosszú magánhangzó két egységre osztódik, ahol a második egység mássalhangzónak felel meg. Ez utóbbi a generatív fonológiában j-nek van feltéve, CV-szintes fonológiában C-nek, míg az x-szintes fonológiában egy teljesen üres, semmi hanggal össze nem kötött időtartamjelnek. Mind magyarázatot ad a tényekre. Hogy melyik megközelítés a legelfogadhatóbb, az utóvégre metaelméleti megfontolás kérdése. Jelenleg az x-szintes fonológia tűnik a legreményteljesebbnek. [As summary we should consider how the individual theoretical frameworks characterize the property of the word-final -t verbs, that with a few exceptions the long vowel preceding the -t is divided into two

¹ Solution attempts for the phenomenon analyzed by us thus come for example in the rules of Siptár (1994, 10) that /s:/ and /ts:/ are brought about through autosegmental spreading and uncoupling, the illustration of Zsigri (1997, 183) – modifying the rules of Siptár somewhat – an analysis due to syllable weight, which I will later return to briefly.

units, where the second unit corresponds to a consonant. Traditional linguistics explicitly expresses the facts, and counts previously exceptional cases. According to another view the long vowels divide into two units, whereby the second unit corresponds to a consonant. The latter is postulated as -j in generative phonology, as C in CV-level phonology, while in X-level phonology it is postulated as a completely empty time-duration symbol with no associated sound. All give an explanation to the facts. However which solution is most acceptable is, after all, a question of metatheoretical considerations. At the moment X-level phonology seems to be the most promising].” (Vago 1991, 690).

If one merely equates traditional linguistics with the structural account, one can classify the criticism of Vago as fair, as this type of linguistics actually registered only the exceptions and made virtually no further attempt at explanation. In this regard the efforts of modern phonology to explain exceptions is clearly commendable (however, unlike Vago, I don’t consider the solution of X-level phonology successful in introducing an element into a dependency model which in fact is connected from above, yet is not associated in any way from below).

However, the question is whether one can find another explanation for the exceptional imperative forms of the verbs ending in -t. If one understands language in the context of the generative theory, one can actually accept all three of the above solution attempts. If, however, one interprets language as historical product and as set of rules which can be acquired, one should also undertake the attempt to find an explanation for the aforementioned exceptions. Although even the above solutions seem to be coherent as rule systems, one must nevertheless ask the question why the long vowels in *fűt* and *hűt* function as short vowel + consonant sequences (or X quantity symbols), while with *lát* and *bocsát* it is not the case. Isn’t it possible that a reason is rooted in the history of the language?² In my opinion such an explanation is possible. My argumentation is based primarily on the etymology of these verbs (and on the corresponding historically accurate development).

Jakab (1967) has incidentally already attempted a historical explanation. I am in agreement with the majority of his statements, and I will include some new, mostly etymological arguments in the explanation.

As has been shown, the exceptions to palatoalveolar assimilation in imperative verbs ending in -t can be arranged into two groups:

(8a) There is no consonant before the -t, but rather a (long) vowel, the -t however does not become an -s, but -cs. Here all verbs with the derivational suffix -ít are included, and the verbs *fűt*, *hűt* (*dűt*), *szít*, *műt*, as well as *vét* and *tát* (which belonged earlier to group 8b).

(8b) A long vowel standing before -t becomes -s: *lát*, *bocsát*, *lót*(-fut), as well as (colloquial) *ött* 'to found' (*össetek*) and *keát* 'cry' (*keássátuk*).

Modern phonology explains the irregular behavior of the words in group (8a) by using the fact that a long vowel is split into two units, whereby the second unit corresponds

² (footnote translation omitted)

to a consonant (and/or an X-slot symbol). For me in this respect the most interesting idea of generative phonology was that by process of elimination we came to learn that the phantom consonants only can be -j. However through historical evidence we can also prove that at a previous time a -j actually appeared before the -t in the verbs in group (8a). To be precise, the majority of the verbs involved here are a reflection of the derivational -s suffix, and as Jakab (1967, 194) already pointed out, one can find such verbs in the Reverse Alphabetized Dictionary of Hungarian (Papp 1969, 490), additionally considering their coined variants. As is well-known, however, the causative-forming suffix -ít derives historically from *kt through a progression -xt > -xt > -jt > -ít whereby the long vowel in -ít (-ét) originates from the fusion of the stem vowel with -j. Thus what generative phonology postulates by omission, language history can establish through historical evidence (cf. extensive evidence such as *tanejt*, *fordejt*, *feszejt* 'to teach, turn, bend' etc. in the language evidence of middle Hungarian) and through etymological reasoning. In the case of the group of verbs containing *hűt*, *fűt*, *dűt*, and *szít*, Jakab (1967, 195) comments that that according earlier historical evidence, -j occurs in the stems of these verbs (also Szepe 1969, 459 refers to it). I would supplement that by adding that in my opinion this -j is not here coincidentally, but presumably part of an opaque causative derivational suffix, one where the middle and causative pairs would be *fűl(ik)* (commonly *fűjt*) ~ *fűt*; *hűl* (commonly *hűjt*) ~ *hűt*; *dűl* (commonly *dűjt*, *döjt*) ~ dial. *dűt*, see the appropriate references in the Dictionary of Language History (Szarvas-Simonyi 1890-1893) or in the Hungarian Dialect Dictionary (Szinyei 1893-1901). Thus in these verbs the middle-forming suffix -l and respectively the causative-forming suffix -ít (<jt) probably followed a vowel-final passive (fictitious) stem, and the long vowel actually originates in the causative forms from the fusion of a short vowel and the -j, while in the middle forms one can form the tone syllable and the following -l based on analogy with the causative pairs.

As far as the verb *szít* is concerned, the situation is no longer so clear, as we have possible evidence that *szijt* 'tease' (see Szarvas Simonyi 1890-1893, III, 200) is a middle variant *szil(ik)*, however it has not been proven. But that does not mean that they could not have existed, especially because *szít* is strongly felt to have causative character ('he caused that the fire begins to blaze', see *gyúl(ik)* ~ *gyul(lad)* vs. *gyújt* 'to ignite vs. to light something').³

Of the three remaining verbs, *műt* is the artificial creation of Pál Bugát and hence irrelevant from a historical perspective, given that its imperative form was apparently based on the verbs which had developed similarly phonologically, such as *fűt* and *hűt*⁴. Therefore the imperative forms are *vét* 'sin, violate something' and *tát* 'make the mouth, eyes large' are problematic, as according to their phonological shape they are not included here, but rather in the group in which the -t becomes -s. Their origin is not completely clear, however from an etymological point of view they probably do not belong here, as the -t would not be a causative suffix. We know however (see above) that we have evidence from earlier centuries that these verbs appear with s-imperative, and hence they are not always included in the group of the verbs with -cs in the imperative. However in the case of *vét*, the group change is an attempt to explain its disturbing homonymity with the imperative form of *vés* 'chisel'.

³ In the Hungarian Dialect Dictionary (Szinyei 1893-1901) a verb *szíl* appears (II, 358), that is not the middle counterpart of *szít*, but a variant form *szí*, *szív* 'sucks' (c.f. *nő:növök*, but *nől* 'wash').

⁴ (footnote translation omitted)

In the case of *tát* there have been greater difficulties at explanatory attempts. Here one can only assume the effect of analogy behind the change, or possibly do as Zsigri suggests, that is, assume that the vocal-consonant distinction in the competence of the speaker was replaced by a distinction due to syllable weight (1997, 183).

(While the etymology of *tát* is uncertain, it cannot be ruled out that this verb possessed an earlier form *tájt*: this verb is explained based on the fictitious stem of the adjective *tág* 'far, vast' and the verb *tár* 'open', and one understands word-final -t as a factitives or causative derivative suffix, as is introduced in the Etymological Dictionary (Benkő 1967-1976, III, 864) – at least this solution should not be excluded. In this case the form from the Apor Kodex (*tássa*) would be regarded as an exception, a special dialectal form.) Nevertheless it is more probable that the original form is with -s (*tássa*), and for me the argumentation of Zsigri seems to be acceptable, which asserts that this because of the preference of the distinction to be based on syllable weight in the group with -cs.

(The verbs *keát* ~ *kiát* 'cry' and *öt(t)* 'pour' also probably originated from the s-group and changed to the group with -cs in the imperative, but in doing so a phoneme -l or -n was interspersed – an un-etymological substitute sound based on analogy with the verbs like *bont*, *ront*. However, it is very difficult to say whether the preference to make a distinction in syllable weight came first and these phonemes were inserted only afterwards, or if the concerned phonemes had already been inserted in earlier times and the group change happened so that they could acquire a consonant before the -t).⁵

Thus we have thus seen that in the majority of the verbs in which a long vowel appears before the -t, in earlier times there was actually a consonant – and not only by the process of elimination. A -j came before the -t, and this is the reason why these verbs behave in exactly the same way as verbs where there is a consonant before the -t concerning postalveolar assimilation. According to evidence from earlier times, the verbs which today belong to the group with -cs in the imperative but contain a vowel before the -t such as in *vét*, *tát*, *keát* and *ött*, did not belong in this group, but rather in a separate group containing *lát*, *bocsát*, and *lót(-fut)*. In other words, they belonged to the group of verbs with -s in the imperative and they joined only in order to remove the disturbing homonymy that was created through the insertion of additional consonants into the group with -cs in the imperative. The verb *tát*, if it actually never possessed an earlier form such as **tájt*, acquired its distinctive preference in the other group on the basis of syllable weight.

In my opinion the fact of whether the vowel before the -t is short or long was not important in the consideration of postalveolar assimilation. The rule could have been formulated such that the word final -t (together with it the imperative symbol -j) become -s if preceding the -t there is either a short or long vowel, however in the case where a consonant precedes the -t (including the -j element of the causative-forming suffixes -jt), then the -t and the imperative marker become -cs.⁶ Therefore today's imperative forms of verbs like *fűt* are remnants of an earlier time when the j-element of

⁵ (footnote translation omitted)

⁶ E. Abaffy (1992, 143) is of such opinion: "[...] a mássalhangzó + t-ből cs lett [...], a rövid vagy hosszú magánhangzó + t-ből pedig ss jött létre [a consonant + -t becomes -cs [...], a short or long vowel before -t becomes ss.]".

the suffix was not voiced⁷, as *lát*, *bocsát*, and *lót(-fut)* are the only apparent exceptions; I have already mentioned the causes of group shift of the verbs *vét*, *tát*, *keát*, *ött*, which earlier belonged to the s-group. The many verbs with the suffix -ít could have served as the basis for group changing based on analogy: their imperative forms are included in the group with -cs imperatives, because in these verbs a consonant (j) actually stood before the -t. Through the voicing of -j and through the monophthongization of what was originally a diphthong, the group acquired a vowel before the -t, however their imperative forms remained unaffected by the change, as the form with -cs remains intact. (As is known, the imperative forms of these verbs showed great fluctuation in the late part of the Old Hungarian period. In many language artifacts one also finds the solutions in the forms with -cs, developed which from the earlier form of the derivational suffix -xt and the imperative symbol -x through the omission of the -t (xt + x > xx) (cf. for example Hebrew *zoboducha*, CzechK. 34 *batoroh*, 51: *keferohed*, etc), however the forms with -cs are gradually (step by step) gaining ground, and also E. Abaffy (1992, 143) sees the source of the change of the rule system as being the creation of the imperative forms of the verbs ending in -t (see also the footnote 6): "az új szabály értelmében, ha a hosszú magánhangzó az -ít képző eleme, a felszólító mód jelével való kapcsolat nem ss-et, hanem ccs-t eredményez [in the spirit of the new rule, if the long vowel is part of the -ít suffix, the connection with the imperative symbol -j does not create -ss, but rather -ccs]. We can still supplement this (by saying) that some of the other verbs like *fűt*, in which the earlier -j was also voiced, probably underwent the same development. This all points to a pattern having developed in which through the combination of the long vowel + t in the imperative, the forms with -s were possible also for forms with -cs. Because the forms of *vét* created according to the old rule with -s were homonyms with the imperative form of *vés*, the language took advantage used the new possibility and eliminated the disturbing homonymy. Also in the case of *keát* and *ött* the new forms with -cs stepped into the forefront, although – as was earlier mentioned – here the consonants acquired before -t can be the cause of the group change. However, the case of *tát* can be considered to be based on analogy with the countless verbs with the suffix -ít. The question still remains as to why the imperative forms of *tát* changed (here for the change in the cs-group one can probably explain that the distinction became stronger due to the syllable weight). However one can find an answer quite easily, as a commonly held truth in language change theory is that the so-called strong elements can resist change better than weak elements. It is probably also known that rarer words are considered more weak than high frequency words. Concerning the frequency value of the word *lát* (contrary to *tát*), the situation is completely clear, because in the Frequency Dictionary of the most aesthetic Hungarian Prose (Füredi Kelemen, 1969) on page 38 it states that while *tát* does not occur at all in the dictionary, in addition, *bocsát* should be substantially more frequent than *tát*. (These data originate from the today's linguistic usage, and it could be pointed out that it is improbable that the frequency of these verbs in middle Hungarian could have been substantially different from today's usage). The verb *lót* is likewise very rare, and it actually could have been in the other group, since because it actually occurs as the first member of *lót(-fut)*, it is easy to say why the imperative form *lóss* could not be **lóccs*, since the second member performed a protecting effect against such a tendency from the front.

⁷ (footnote translation omitted)

Even if one removes from consideration historical evidence such as the etymology of the verbs that are considered exceptions of postalveolar assimilation, from a completely different basic position one can also give an answer to the question of the exceptions, even perhaps why generative phonology also postulates a historically-accounted-for j-element, which in verbs like *lát* and *bocsát* does not occur: it is probably because these did not have a consonant before the -t, (although the latter *bocsát* – probably by analogy – also has a variant *bocsájt*, but Turkish Etymon (**bocsát*) shows it completely clearly that historically there was a vowel before the -t).⁸

I hope that with my argumentation I could prove that one should not lose sight of historical evidence and the results already reached by historical research despite the fertilizing effect of the modern theories.⁹ It is also very interesting to observe how such a dynamically developing discipline as modern phonology always attempts new arguments and solutions in order to be able to explain the exceptions of postalveolar assimilation. One must also admit that for many languages whose history is not known, one does not have other methods of explanation (besides internal reconstruction and the research in universals). However with languages whose earlier development tendencies can be investigated using evidence and whose relatives one also knows, if due to the results of comparative linguistics one has written evidence of certain information from an earlier period, one should not linger by the search for descriptive explanation. In language change research it is particularly commonly-held view that a language's synchrony also contains its diachrony, that is, today's state is the endpoint of a historical development (and the starting point for the further development)¹⁰. Zoltán Gombocz already wrote in 1922 in his work *Nyelvtörténeti módszertan* [The Methodology of the Language History Research]:
nyelvtudománynak nincsenek ahistorikus disciplínái: minden olyan értelmezés, amely a nyelvtörténet adatait figyelmen kívül hagyja, csak hézagos és értéktelen, vagy éppen helytelen eredményekre vezet [linguistics has no ahistoric disciplines: any such interpretation, which ignores the data of language history is incomplete and worthless, or they lead straight to wrong results]" (8). In its current form surely exaggerated, this directly demonstrates the history and the development of linguistics in the 20th century, which besides certain languages has created almost no written evidence. However, in the case of a language for which the history is on the whole known, one should not abandon this knowledge. With this I do not want to say that one may not give purely deductive theoretical explanations, since the attempts to directly explain to us the development of the modern phonology show that in this way one can also find certain explanations of the facts. Therefore, I consider it very important that apart from these deductive methods one also should use historical evidence and the results from historical research to search for explanation, since the examples directly

⁸ Tamás Szende, the editor of my essay, supposes that in a productive rule system one can also supplement the irregular forms through historical and/or semantic figures, whereby a unit of descriptive and historical aspects materialize. He means that anomalies arise where lexical interpretation is connected with either bodily functions (*tát*) or contains a sacred component (*vét*), while e.g. in Turkish *bosat* 'deplete, release' this is not the case.

⁹ (footnote omitted)

¹⁰ Exactly how living organisms got to today's state from their earlier development stages can be solved: one must only think of only those different breadths of the rings of vegetation on the trees, which show how rich the precipitation was in the individual years.

above show that they can sometimes supplement the truth value of another theory and can consequently support it (one should think only of the mutually intensifying arguments, which on the basis of considering the long vowel before the -t a short vowel, we have seen historical evidence, that is, etymological considerations of the historical linguistics).¹¹

Therefore it would surely be profitable if representatives of the so-called traditional and modern theories would also occasionally cooperate. Additionally, a methodological modernization of so-called traditional linguistics would surely be very advantageous, but also in view of that fact that, for the representatives of the modern theory, historical evidence and the results of historical linguistics are becoming important in being able to give new impulses to their own research. In other words – in a slight reinterpretation of Kazinczy's famous saying – *jól és szépen az ír, aki tüzes orthologus, és tüzes neologus egyszer'smind*, '*s egységességben és ellenkezésben van önmagával* [well and beautifully writes the one who is both a fiery orthographer, fiery word creator, and is all the time true to himself in sensory and equally dissimilar minds?].

[Literature omitted]

Address of the author:

Tamás Forgács
University of Szeged
Lehrstuhl für ungarische Sprachwissenschaft
Egyetem u. 2.
H-13722 Szeged
Hungary
forgacs@hung.u-szeged.hu

¹¹ Naturally one may not insist that the two methods always be able to combine with one another, since the rules of the modern phonology – at least according to its ambitions – are predictive, while the historical descriptions and classifications for the actual proto-language causes look for, and hence the two methods cannot be mixed automatically. Hence one should seek to find predictive rules that also correspond to the historical facts.