

Complex possessive reflexives in Hungarian

Complex reflexives fall into two broader typological classes (Faltz 1985). One strategy combines a pronoun with an emphatic marker to form a reflexive anaphor (like the English *himself*), and another creates reflexives out of body part nouns. Reflexives in the second group often have a possessive structure, which can be more or less grammaticalized. Interestingly, such complex body part reflexives sometimes have a morphologically more complex variant, which tends to be less constrained syntactically than the basic reflexive, as has been argued for Turkish *kendisi* (Kornfilt 2001), Chinese *ta-ziji* (Pan 1998) or Hungarian *önmaga* Rákosi (2009).

This talk aims at studying the effects of such morphological variation on the syntax and the interpretation of complex possessive reflexives by focusing on data from Hungarian. I argue that these data provide further arguments to an approach to reflexivization that treats the non-pronominal part of a complex anaphor as an element that forms a complex predicate with the verb and reflexivizes it (see Reinhart & Reuland 1993, Anagnostopoulou & Everaert 1999, Reuland 2001, 2011). It is this kind of complex predicate formation that is blocked in the case of complex possessive reflexives, and that has important consequences on their the syntax and semantics.

The primary Hungarian reflexive, *maga* 'himself', is a highly grammaticalized possessive body part reflexive. Even though its original semantics has been bleached, I show that it has retained certain grammatical reflexives of its possessive structure. This primary possessive reflexive has four, morphologically more complex variants: *ön-maga* 'self-maga', *jó-maga* 'good-maga', *saját maga* 'own maga', and the reduplicating variant *maga-maga* (somewhat archaic and only used in non-nominative contexts). As I show, these reflexives each have their own specialized uses, but share at least the following properties in common: (i) unlike the primary reflexive, they readily allow for coreference readings, and may even disallow binding in certain contexts, (ii) they are preferred for proxy-readings of different sorts (see Reuland 2001, 2011), and (iii) they generally have a broader syntactic distribution than the primary reflexive *maga*. This broader distribution includes cases where the complex reflexive is the subject of the clause or it is the non-verbal part of the predicate, long-distance uses, and even strong logophoric uses with discourse antecedents only. In other words, complex possessive reflexives are less constrained syntactically than the primary reflexive.

I show that these properties follow from the rich morphology of these reflexives. On the one hand, the extra morphology may *shield* the internal structure of the body part reflexive, which allows the complex reflexive to survive in syntactic contexts where the basic anaphor *maga* is ungrammatical (see Reuland 2001, 2011). On the other hand, the extra morphology may also contribute to a *reactivation* and *expansion* of the underlying possessive structure, resulting once again in a syntax that is not expected of anaphors par excellence. Finally, I show how this account can motivate the core semantic properties of Hungarian complex anaphors.

- Anagnostopoulou, Elena & Martin Everaert. 1999. Towards a more complete typology of anaphoric expressions. *Linguistic Inquiry* 30 (1). 97-118.
- Faltz, Leonard. 1985. *Reflexivisation: A study in universal syntax*. New York: Garland.
- Kornfilt, Jaklin. 2001. Local and Long-Distance Reflexives in Turkish. In Cole, Peter; Hermon, Gabriella & Huang, C.-T. James eds. 2001. *Long-Distance Reflexives. Syntax and Semantics* 33. San Diego: Academic Press.197-226.
- Pan, Haihua. 1998. Closeness, prominence, and binding theory. *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory* 16 (4). 771-815.
- Rákosi, György. 2009. Beyond identity: the case of a complex Hungarian reflexive. In Miriam Butt and Tracy Holloway King eds. *The proceedings of the LFG09 Conference*. Stanford: CSLI Publications. 459-479.
- Reinhart, Tanya & Reuland, Eric. 1993. Reflexivity. *Linguistic Inquiry* 24. 657-720.
- Reuland, Eric. 2001. *Primitives of binding*. *Linguistic Inquiry* 32 (3). 439-492.
- Reuland, Eric. 2011. *Anaphora and language design. Linguistic Inquiry Monograph* 62. Cambridge, MA: The MIT Press.