On the syntax of anaphoric possessor strategies in Hungarian

György Rákosi
University of Debrecen, Department of English Linguistics

The issue. Hungarian has several strategies to code possessors anaphoric to an antecedent in the embedding clause. These include not only covert (1a) and overt (1b) personal pronouns qua possessors, but also the primary reflexive (1c) and its more complex variants (one of which is shown in 1d), as well as the reciprocal (1e). The definite article shows an interesting distribution across the strategies: it may be optional by *pro*-dropped possessors under certain conditions (1a), it is obligatory with overt pronouns and the primary reflexive (1b-c), and it is dispreferred or unacceptable if the possessor is the complex reflexive or the reciprocal (1d-e).

Previous claims. The paradigm in (1) in general, and the article facts in particular, have received relatively little attention in the literature on Hungarian. É. Kiss (1987: 197-198) argues that the Hungarian possessive noun phrase constitutes an independent binding domain, and, consequently, the reflexive and reciprocal anaphors (1c-e) represent a marked phenomenon. Marácz (1989: 396) observes the lack of the article by reciprocal possessors (1e), and he concludes that while the possessive phrase is apparently an NP in this case, it is a DP with, for example, the reflexive possessor in (1c).

Aims and claims. I will argue in this talk that (i) each of the possessive noun phrases in question are definite DP's with an articulated DP-layer, and that (ii) possessors can only enter a local binding dependency with a clause-mate antecedent if no article is present in D. This is the case of (1d-e), which involve the movement of the anaphor to the DP-layer of the possessive phrase.

That the definite article plays a crucial role in the determination of possessive binding domains has been recently shown in Reuland (2011) and Despić (2011, 2015). In particular, they argue that dedicated possessive reflexives (like the Latin *suus* 'self's' or the Russian *svoj* 'self's) are available only in languages without a prenominal definite article, which creates an impenetrable domain for binding. Despić (2011, 2015) elaborates on an account of this distribution under the assumptions that (i) binding domains are phase-based, (ii) DP's are phases, (iii) DP is not universal, and that (iv) dedicated possessive reflexives are grammatical when there is no DP-layer above them and thus they can enter a local binding dependency with their antecedents.

Hungarian is obviously a DP-language and it lacks dedicated (i.e., *specialized*) possessive reflexives, as predicted by the Reuland-Despić analysis. Nevertheless, each of the argument anaphors can function as anaphoric possessors. What makes Hungarian particularly interesting in this respect is the distribution of the definite article in these constructions, which, I argue here, can be better understood from the vantage point of the Reuland-Despić analysis. In fact, it provides particularly strong evidence for it.

Pronouns. Both *pro*-dropped and overt personal pronouns can be anaphoric to a clause-mate antecedent. Overt pronouns are a marked option here, but I show that this is not the result of syntactic constraints and their spell-out is even obligatory in the expression of certain coreference-based interpretations. It is well-known that the definite article is obligatory if the possessor is an overt personal pronoun, and the article may only be absent under certain conditions (which are non-syntactically governed). I will argue that an unpronounced form of the definite article is present in the latter case. Thus pronominal possessors are always preceded by the definite article, which signals a phase boundary and also the left edge of a local binding domain (1a-b). The article facts obtain whether or not the pronoun possessor has a clause-mate antecedent, but crucially, even if they have one, the two are not in the same local domain and no Principle B violation obtains. Possessor extraction data provide additional evidence for this

view: once the possessor is extracted (with dative case), the pronoun cannot be interpreted anaphorically and the reflexive anaphor must be used to license this interpretation (2a-b).

The primary reflexive. The primary reflexive anaphor functioning as a possessor (1c) also requires the obligatory presence of the definite article. This entails in the current analysis that these reflexives do not enter a local dependency with their antecedents. I show that this is indeed the case since they are frequently logophoric in nature (in which case they need not even require a linguistically expressed antecedent), or else the underlying predicate is inherently or naturally reflexive and thus the reflexive possessor itself does not contribute to the building of this reflexive relation (as in the English expressions *go about one's work* or *live one's life*). These possessive reflexives are exempt anaphors (in line with É. Kiss 1987), quite unlike the dedicated possessive reflexive of Latin, Russian, and other languages that have them.

The reciprocal and the complex reflexive. For these two types of anaphoric possessors, the definite article is typically absent if there is a clause-mate antecedent; and it is present in the absence of such an antecedent. I argue that there is nothing marked about the data in (1d-e), both anaphor types are locally bound within the domain defined by the matrix clause. This is possible because both move to the edge of the possessive DP (see Despić 2015 for English reciprocals): the reciprocal is driven by its φ-deficient nature, whereas the complex reflexive moves because of its referential features (which make it syntactically similar to a proper noun in some of its properties to be discussed). I will present corpus and questionnaire data to argue that whenever the definite article does surface by these two anaphoric possessor types, then they do not enter a local binding dependency with a clause-mate antecedent, as predicted by the current analysis.

(1) a. *A   tanárok$_i$ ismerték*   [$_{DP}$ (*a*) *pro$_{i/j}$ határ-a-i-k-at*].
     the   teachers knew   the *pro*   limit-POSS-PL-3PL-ACC
     'The teachers knew their limits.'

   b. *A   tanárok$_i$ ismerték*   [$_{DP}$ *(az) ő$_{i/j}$*   (*kis*) *határ-a-i-k-at*].
     the   teachers knew   the (s)he (little) limit-POSS-PL-3PL-ACC
     'The teachers knew their (little) limits.'

   c. *A   tanárok$_i$ ismerték*   [$_{DP}$ *(a) maguk$_{i/*j}$ határ-a-i-t*].
     the   teachers knew   the themselves   limit-POSS-PL-ACC
     'The teachers knew their own limits.'

   d. *A   tanárok$_i$ ismerték*   [$_{DP}$ ($^{??}$*az*) *önmaguk$_{i/*j}$ határ-a-i-t*].
     the   teachers knew   the   themselves   limit-POSS-PL-ACC
     'The teachers knew their own limits.'

   e. *A   tanárok$_i$ ismerték*   [$_{DP}$ ($^{*/??}$*az*) *egymás$_{i/*j}$ határ-a-i-t*].
     the   teachers knew   the   each_other limit-POSS-PL-ACC
     'The teachers knew each other's limits.'

(2) a. *A   tanárok$_i$ csak nekik$_{*i/j}$ ismerték*   [$_{DP}$ *a   határ-a-i-k-at*].
     the   teachers only DAT.3PL   knew   the   limit-POSS-PL-3PL-ACC
     'It is only their limits that the teachers knew.'

   b. *A   tanárok$_i$ csak maguk-nak$_{i/*j}$ ismerték*   [$_{DP}$ *a   határ-a-i-t*].
     the   teachers only themselves-DAT   knew   the   limit-POSS-PL-ACC
     'It is only their own limits that the teachers knew.'

References
Despić, Miloje. 2011. *Syntax in the absence of determiner phrase*. PhD Dissertation. University of Connecticut. • Despić, Miloje. 2015. Phases, reflexives, and definiteness. *Syntax* 18 (3). 201-234. • É. Kiss, Katalin. 1987. *Configurationality in Hungarian*. Budapest: Akadémiai Kiadó. • Marácz, László. 1989. *Asymmetries in Hungarian*. PhD dissertation. University of Groeningen • Reuland, Eric. 2011. *Anaphora and Language Design*. *Linguistic Inquiry Monograph 62*. The MIT Press: Cambridge, MA.