



Ákos Blaskovics <akosblaskovics@gmail.com>

ICSH16 notification for paper 6465

ICSH16 <icsh16@easychair.org>

2023. április 3. 14:02

Címzett: Ákos Blaskovics <akosblaskovics@gmail.com>

Dear Ákos,

We are pleased to inform you that your abstract titled

On the role of l-vocalisation in Hungarian vowel harmony (talk or poster)

has been accepted as a talk at ICSH16, to be held on 28-29 June 2023 at the University of Graz.

Below we are forwarding you the reviews provided to us by the anonymous reviewers.

We would like to ask you now to kindly confirm your intention to participate as a speaker at the conference by sending an email to:

icsh16@uni-graz.at

As a reminder, each full conference talk will be 30 minutes followed by 10 minutes of Q&A.

The invited talks of ICSH16 are:

Frank Kügler (University of Frankfurt)

On prosodic prominence and focus in Hungarian: Evidence from a cross-linguistic experiment

<https://user.uni-frankfurt.de/~kuegler/>

Hans-Martin Gaertner (Hungarian Research Centre for Linguistics)

On the grammar and pragmatics of non-finite root structures

<http://www.nytud.hu/depts/tlp/gaertner/>

ICSH16 is followed by a thematic Workshp on Finiteness, Clause Types, and Cartography, to be hosted at the same venue on 30 June.

The invited talk at the workshop is:

Susi Wurmbbrand (University of Vienna / Harvard University)

Finiteness and cartography

<http://susiwurmbbrand.com>

Conference webpage:

<https://structure-of-hungarian-16.uni-graz.at/en/>

Contact:

Maya Cortez

icsh16@uni-graz.at

Best regards,

Balázs Surányi

Edgar Onea

(ICSH16 main organizers)

SUBMISSION: 6465

TITLE: On the role of l-vocalisation in Hungarian vowel harmony (talk or poster)

----- REVIEW 1 -----

SUBMISSION: 6465

TITLE: On the role of l-vocalisation in Hungarian vowel harmony (talk or poster)

AUTHORS: Ákos Blaskovics

----- Overall evaluation -----

It is a fairly commonplace statement – in fact, a platitude – nowadays that Hungarian vowel harmony already has an

extremely copious literature both in Hungary and world-wide. Hence, it is becoming increasingly difficult to find a sufficiently remote corner of the range of phenomena involved about which some really novel insight can be hoped to emerge. This paper appears to be a cross between analyses based on participants' treatment of wug items (nonsense words) in psycholinguistic experiments and those based on the actual (normal) language behaviour of native Hungarian speakers: it involves the way an extremely limited set of vocabulary items (in the present case, a handful of syllabic-l-final brand names like Google or Lidl) are treated in terms of vowel harmony (harmonic suffixation).

This talk appears to be a follow-up study on Blaskovics & Ittész (2023), this time bolstered up by experimental phonetic and statistical analysis, as well as detailed and extended reasoning with respect to the underlying reasons for the results being the way they turn out to be. Although the last paragraph shows some deterioration of phrasing (as opposed to the earlier portions of the abstract), the quality of the investigation to be reported in the talk appears to be sufficiently sound and the explanations to be proposed sound interesting enough to warrant inclusion of the talk in this conference. My recommendation is "accept".

One particular question I wish to raise is why it is, in the authors' opinion, that although both syllabic l and vocalised l (in English) are of the dark (velarised) variety, the marginally occurring Hungarian syllabic l is (and/or behaves harmonically as) a front trigger. Is it the case that the usual Hungarian implementation of syllabic/vocalised l is clear, rather than dark? Or is it the case that these segments are/remain velarised but still trigger front-harmonic suffix alternants? Does this whole issue have anything to do with whether the typical German syllabic l is of a clear or a dark quality? And does it have anything to do with whether the individual Hungarian speaker's foreign-language background is English or German or neither? If it does, how come younger subjects tend to pronounce front suffix alternants whereas older subjects' such tendency is weaker? Should it not be expected to be the other way round? (Assuming that younger speakers tend to have more of an English background than older speakers do?)

[Although the following two minor observations have (almost) nothing to do with the expected quality of the talk, I still mention them here. In the second paragraph of the abstract, there is an annoying misprint (/gu(:)g|:-høz/ ~ /gu(:)g|:-høz/) where obviously either the first or the second form is meant to involve the suffix allomorph /-hoz/. In the penultimate paragraph of the abstract, the numbering as (ii) and (i) should be the other way round.]

----- REVIEW 2 -----

SUBMISSION: 6465

TITLE: On the role of l-vocalisation in Hungarian vowel harmony (talk or poster)

AUTHORS: Ákos Blaskovics

----- Overall evaluation -----

The paper addresses an interesting issue. There are only a couple of formal suggestions to be considered for the final version.

Readers might not be familiar with the abbreviations BL, NL so they should be explained shortly. The sound 'l' is given in italics in the title and in some of the paragraphs. In other cases, it is either given as [l] or as /l/. The motivation for this distinction is not clear, and it obviously does not rely on the traditional /phoneme/ vs. [allophone] distinction. Please find a uniform way you are using throughout the paper.

Page 1

Par. 2: (/gu(:)g|:-høz/ ~ /gu(:)g|:-høz/) - what is the difference between the two forms?

Par. 4: "but regarded as pure [l] segments" - what does this mean?

Page 2

Par. 4: (ii) and (i) should be given in the opposite order.