

György Rákosi

**Something inside *myself* does not agree:
 On the Anaphor Agreement Effect in Hungarian***

Abstract

The paper offers an overview of Hungarian data pertaining to the *Anaphor Agreement Effect* (Rizzi 1990, and subsequent work), which bans φ -covarying agreement between anaphors and agreement targets. Hungarian is especially interesting in this respect since it has both rich agreement morphology and a variety of reflexive anaphors. The paper argues that the primary reflexive anaphor and the reciprocal anaphor do not occur in syntactic positions construed with agreement, but complex reflexives trigger trivial 3SG agreement. This is surprising because even the primary reflexive has a possessive structure. It is argued that the primary reflexive has a φ -defective stem and is smaller than a DP, whereas the complex reflexives surveyed here are not defective in this respect and they have a DP shell. This accounts for the observed differences in their distribution.

Keywords: anaphor, Anaphor Agreement Effect, Hungarian, possessive, reflexive, reciprocal

1 Introduction

The reflexive and the reciprocal anaphor do not survive as finite subjects in Hungarian even if a c-commanding antecedent is present in the clause.¹

- (1) *A fiúkat nagyon aggasztott- $\{a/ák\}$ maguk / egymás.
 the boy.PL.ACC very.much worried- $\{3SG/3PL\}$ themselves each_other
 ‘*Themselves/Each other worried the boys very much.’

The sentence is ungrammatical irrespective of whether the fully agreeing 3PL form of the verb is picked, or if the verb bears what looks like (default) 3SG agreement. This is not particularly interesting in and of itself: (1) falls within the scope of what came to be known as the *Anaphor Agreement Effect* (AAE, see Rizzi 1990 and subsequent work). The AAE bans anaphors from occurring in syntactic positions construed with agreement. Finite subjects show full agreement

* Tibor Laczkó was the supervisor of my undergraduate essay that I submitted to the National Scientific Students' Associations Conference in Hungary. I presented this work at the conference in the spring of 1999, exactly 20 years ago. I dedicate this paper to him on his 60th birthday, looking ahead to the next 20 years of joint research activities.

¹ Stative object and dative experiencer verbs are two-place unaccusatives in Hungarian with two internal arguments that can be merged in either hierarchical order (see Rákosi 2015 for details). The experiencer object is thus in a configuration to bind the subject anaphor in (1), so the problem is not the lack of a proper local antecedent.

with the verb in terms of NUMBER and PERSON in Hungarian, so it is not especially surprising that the standard reflexive and reciprocal anaphor are not licensed as finite subjects.

There are two factors nevertheless that complicate the picture. The first of these stems from variation across different reflexive types. The default argument reflexive, *maga* ‘himself’ has morphologically more complex forms: *önmaga* and *saját maga*. *Maga* is historically a body-part reflexive with a possessive structure, and though its etymology is not transparent for native speakers, its possessive origin is still manifest in its grammar.² *Önmaga* is derived through adding the prefix *ön-* ‘self-’ to this reflexive core, whereas *saját maga* contains the possessive adjective *saját* ‘own’.³ Both of these two complex reflexives may function as finite subjects, showing “default” 3SG agreement with the verb. Compare (2) to (1):

- (2) A fiúkat nagyon aggasztott- $\{a/*ák\}$ önmaguk / saját maguk.
 the boy.PL.ACC very.much worried- $\{3SG/3PL\}$ themselves themselves
 ‘Their own selves worried the boys very much.’

Possessive constructions represent another complicating factor relevant in the context of the AAE. Possessor pronouns show agreement with the possessum in Hungarian, and this morphology licenses the *pro*-drop of the pronominal possessor (just like subject pronouns can be *pro*-dropped, not shown here):

- (3) a. az (én) ágy-am b. a(z) (te) ágy-ad c. az (ő) ágy-a
 the I bed-POSS.1SG the you bed-POSS.2SG the he bed-POSS.3SG
 ‘my bed’ ‘your bed’ ‘his bed’

Interestingly, each of the anaphors are grammatical *qua* possessors, and they all show what again appears to be *prima facie* 3SG agreement with the possessum:⁴

- (4) a(z) magunk/önmagunk/saját magunk/ egymás baj-a
 the ourselves each_other problem-POSS
 ‘our own / each other’s problem’

² See Bartos (1999: 104), den Dikken et al. (2001: 148), den Dikken (2006: 14), Rákosi (2011), Coppock & Wechsler (2012: 704), and Bányai (2015: 210) for arguments that *maga* ‘himself’ has a grammatically active possessive structure. This is the reason why *maga* patterns up with lexical noun phrases (true possessives included) in the contexts we discuss below.

Maga shows the full possessive paradigm, and the agreement morphology on the stem *mag-* (meaning ‘core’ in current Hungarian, possibly a derivative of a former ‘body’ interpretation) spells out the φ -features of the anaphor:

- (i) *magam* ‘myself’ *magunk* ‘ourselves’
magad ‘yourself’ *magatok* ‘yourselves’
maga ‘oneself’ *maguk* ‘themselves’

The phonological shape of the possessive morphology does not entirely follow the productive synchronic pattern, but this, as well as the finer details of the segmentation of these forms are not directly relevant for our current concerns. Hungarian has no grammatical gender, so agreement phenomena do not target gender features.

³ See Rákosi (2009, 2011) for a description of the grammar of these two complex reflexives. The Hungarian reflexive has other complex variants, too. We mention another one in *passim* footnote 14 in Section 5.

⁴ We do not gloss this possessive morphology in (4) as 3SG for reasons which will become evident in section 5. The definite article has two allomorphs in Hungarian, *a* ‘the’ is used when it precedes a word starting with a consonant, and *az* ‘the’ precedes words starting with a vowel.

So while only complex reflexives can function as finite subjects, any of the Hungarian anaphors can occupy the unmarked possessor position of the Hungarian noun phrase.

This distribution raises at least two fundamental questions. First, what is the grammatically relevant difference between complex reflexives and the rest of the anaphors such that only the former can be finite subjects? Second, what is the relevant difference between the syntax of finite subjects and possessors, given that the unmarked possessive position can host any of the anaphors?

The pertinent literature on Hungarian contains partial answers to these questions. Haegeman (2014: fn. 8.) notes that the reciprocal anaphor cannot be a finite subject in Hungarian, but it can be a possessor. She adds without further comment that the reciprocal possessor does not trigger agreement on the possessum. The coverage of this assumption should presumably also include at least the primary reflexive *maga* ‘himself’ in (4), given that we know that this form shows the same AAE-distribution that the reciprocal does. It need not be immediately obvious in this respect whether the complex reflexives trigger agreement in (4) or not. Laczkó (2013) develops an LFG-based analysis to account for the reflexive facts. He proposes two distinct lexical entries for *maga* ‘himself’, one constrained not to be a subject or a possessor (this is the one that fails in (1)), and another one constrained to be a non-finite subject or a possessor showing third person agreement with the head (4). Further details of this analysis will be discussed in Section 4 below. What is immediately relevant for our concerns is that Laczkó (2013) solves the AAE-related problems by postulating the existence of two distinct uses of the primary reflexive anaphor. Since the reciprocal anaphor needs an analogous treatment, such duplication would be necessary for the reciprocal, too, while AAE concerns do not necessitate this move for the complex reflexives.

My aim in this paper is to carry out a thorough survey of the Hungarian descriptive background in search of an answer to the two questions posed above. I argue that the AAE indeed amounts to the lack of agreement as far as the reciprocal and primary reflexive are concerned. What makes the primary Hungarian reflexive different from other possessive reflexives cited in the literature, is that it has a highly grammaticalized possessive structure with a deficient head. The extra morphology on complex reflexives is needed to overcome this deficiency and to help complex reflexives survive in positions construed with agreement.

The structure of the paper is as follows. In Section 2, I briefly survey the literature on the AAE, focusing on apparent exceptions that Tucker (2010) refers to as *evasion strategies*. In Section 3, I present Laczkó’s (2013) account in more detail, and I argue against the idea that the postulation of distinct lexical entries for anaphors solves all the problems that the AAE triggers. In Section 4, I show that it is unlikely that case deficiency plays a role in the distribution of the Hungarian data. In Section 5, I scrutinize pertinent agreement phenomena to argue that anaphors either manifest true 3SG agreement in Hungarian or they do not agree. I round up and conclude in Section 6.

2 The Anaphor Agreement Effect

The Anaphor Agreement Effect of Rizzi (1990) has attracted considerable attention in the literature, see, a.o., Woolford (1999), Sundaresan (2014), Tucker (2010) and Preminger (2019) for particularly insightful overviews. The emerging consensus on its empirical scope is that variation in feature content within the paradigm of an anaphor does not correlate with

pertinent variation on agreement targets.⁵ The following formulation is from Sundaresan (2014: 22):⁶

- (5) **Anaphor Agreement Effect** (Sundaresan 2014: 22)
Anaphors typically do not occur in syntactic positions construed with covarying \varnothing -morphology.

The AAE thus rules out the agreeing variant of the Hungarian anaphors in (1) above. (6) is another pertinent example from Italian:

- (6) **Italian** (Rizzi 1990:33)
**A loro interessano solo se stessi.*
 to them.DAT interest.3PL only themselves.NOM
 ‘They are interested only in themselves.’

There are two ways in which the reflexive can be saved in this context in Italian, each representing a distinct *evasion strategy* in the sense of, a.o., Tucker (2010). The reflexive can be buried inside an extra structural layer (a PP in (7a)), or it may show non-covarying, *default* \varnothing -agreement (7b).

- (7) **Italian**
- a. A loro importa solo di se stessi. (Rizzi 1990:33)
 to them.DAT matter.3SG only of themselves.NOM
 ‘All that matters to them is themselves.’
- b. ^(?)A loro interessa solo se stessi. (Tucker 2010: 4)
 to them.DAT interest.3SG only themselves.NOM
 ‘They are interested only in themselves.’

While it is the PP layer that saves the anaphor in (7a), a possessive structure may play the same role elsewhere. Consider the following Greek example.

- (8) **Greek** (Anagnostopoulou & Everaert 1999: 108)
 O eaftos tu tu aresi tu Petru.
 [the self his].NOM CL.DAT like.3SG the Petros.DAT
 ‘His own self appeals to Petros.’

The Greek *o eaftos tu* ‘himself’ is a complex reflexive in Greek with a transparent possessive structure, and it is grammatical in the subject position of finite unaccusative verbs. Discussing

⁵ For arguments against the theoretical relevance of the AAE, see Everaert (2001) and Reuland (2011).

⁶ Sundaresan (2014) also adds the following corollary to this:

- (i) *If an anaphor does occur in this position, there must be some other element in the local domain that can instead serve as the source of agreement, both for the verb and the anaphor.*

This is required to account for a special strategy in Tamil that appears to escape the AAE. Sundaresan argues that it in fact does not, but since no similar construction is present in the Hungarian data surveyed here, the formulation in (5) is sufficient for our purposes.

similar examples, like the Basque reflexive anaphor *bere buru* (lit. ‘his/her head’), Preminger (2019) argues that the possessive construction explicitly spells out a cross-linguistically available *encapsulation* structure for the anaphor. The φ -features that participate in binding are located inside this structure (associated, effectively, with the possessive pronominal variable), and the external DP layer carries invariant 3SG agreement features.⁷ In this sense, the agreement pattern attested in (8) is trivial 3SG agreement with a possessive DP.

Below I argue that the Hungarian anaphors we survey here either also show 3SG agreement or they do not agree at all because they occupy a non-agreeing position. Thus the notion of default agreement need not be evoked in the explanation of the Hungarian data. The contrast between the primary Hungarian anaphors and the Greek reflexive does require an explanation, however, since only the latter can be a finite subject. Remember that the complex reflexives of Hungarian *are* grammatical as finite subjects (1). This is again less surprising than the ungrammaticality of the primary reflexive in the self-same context, given that the Hungarian primary reflexive is a body-part reflexive of a possessive origin.

3 Two reflexive entries solve the problem?

As mentioned in the introduction (Section 1), Laczkó (2013) postulates the existence of two types of lexical variants of *maga* ‘himself’, regarding each a distinct type of reflexive anaphor. The examples in (9) illustrate his analysis, which is represented in (10) by the two LFG-style lexical entries.

- (9) a. *Nekem nagyon tetszem / tetszik magam.
 DAT.1SG very.much appeal.1SG appeal.3SG myself
 intended: ‘I like myself very much.’
- b. Megvan nekem a magam *baj-om / baj-a.
 PRT.is DAT.1SG the myself trouble-POSS.1SG trouble-POSS
 ‘I have my own problem.’

- (10) a. *magam*₁, PRON (↑ PRED) = ‘PRO’ (i)
 (↑ PRON-TYPE) = REFL (ii)
 { ~(SUBJ ↑) | ~(POSS ↑) } (iii)
 (↑ PERS) = 1 (iv)
 (↑ NUM) = SG (v)
- b. *magam*₂, PRON (↑ PRED) = ‘PRO’ (vi)
 (↑ PRON-TYPE) = REFL (vii)
 { (SUBJ ↑) | (POSS ↑) } (viii)
 ~(TENSE ↑) (ix)
 (↑ PERS) = 3 (x)
 (↑ σ PERS) = 1 (xi)
 (↑ σ NUM) = SG (xii)

⁷ See Tucker (2010) for a detailed account of the agreement relations that possessive reflexives of the Greek type (8) trigger.

(9a) contains the standard argument reflexive, and the relevant, LFG-style lexical entry is in (10a). This reflexive is ungrammatical as a subject or as a possessor (iii), and it has 1SG agreement features (iv-v).

(10b) illustrates another lexical variant of the reflexive. This item has to be either a subject or a possessor (viii) in non-finite contexts (ix). The possessive construction in (9b) is one such context. It has a third person feature for syntactic agreement purposes (x), but it also has a pair of 1SG features, which are projected to the semantic structure of the LFG architecture (xi-xii). Thus the two reflexives differ also in terms of having syntactically active 1SG agreement features (10a) or only semantically relevant 1SG binding features.⁸

One may indeed find independent arguments to treat reflexive possessors as a special case in Hungarian. Rákosi (2014, to appear) shows that reflexive possessors are exempt anaphors in Hungarian that depend on prominent discourse antecedents for their licensing. As such, they can occur without a clause-mate antecedent, as happens in (11).

- (11) Aztán csak [_{DP} a magam lépt-e-i] koppantak a csendben.
 then only the myself step-POSS-PL slapped.3PL the silence.in
 ‘Then it was only my steps that slapped in the silence.’

In other words, these reflexive possessors have a logophoric character. Be that as it may, this logophoric character may provide motivation for the postulation of a specific reflexive entry, as in (10b), but this step itself achieves little in accounting for the questions we investigate here. It provides no explanation, for example, for why these purported logophoric pronouns are capable of entertaining 3SG agreement (as in (10b)), unlike argument reflexives; or why logophoric uses of the primary reflexive are ungrammatical in finite subject positions (1).

We may add to this that most reciprocal possessors have no logophoric character in Hungarian, and they normally require a proper c-commanding antecedent within the clause:⁹

- (12) A fiúk_i meglátogatták [_{DP} egymás_i szüle-i-t].
 the boys visited.3PL each_other parent-POSS.PL-ACC
 ‘The boys visited each other’s parents.’

In other respects, the reciprocal anaphor patterns up with the reflexive anaphor as far as the AAE is concerned. So, *mutatis mutandis*, we may either reduplicate reciprocal entries along the lines in (10), or we assume that both the primary reciprocal anaphor and the reflexive have a single representation for *all syntactic contexts*. The latter assumption is simpler on the one hand, and, as I argue below, it leads on the other hand to a better understanding of the observed distribution of anaphoric elements in Hungarian.¹⁰

⁸ Preminger (2019) argues that φ -feature matching between binders and anaphors cannot be reduced to syntactic φ -feature agreement, and thus binding into anaphors with what he refers to as encapsulation structures is not an instance of a syntactic agreement process. In essence, Laczkó’s (2013) proposal for (10b) is the restriction of a Preminger-type analysis to a subset of the occurrences of *maga* ‘himself’ in Hungarian.

⁹ See Szűcs (2019) for a discussion of Hungarian reciprocal possessors that have a discourse antecedent.

¹⁰ The reader may note that the D-head is occupied by the definite article if the possessor is the reflexive, but there is no definite article by reciprocal possessors. In Rákosi (2017, to appear) I argue that this is no accident. The definite article spells out the left edge of the DP-phase and thus makes the dependency between the reflexive possessor and a clause-mate antecedent non-local (which, in turn, explains why these reflexives are discourse sensitive). Reciprocal possessors, on the other hand, occupy a position on the edge of the DP-phase, and thus are directly accessible from the matrix clause for the purposes of binding. See Despić (2011,

4 Could it be case deficiency?

One potential reason behind the ungrammaticality of the primary anaphors in finite subject positions could be their purported case deficiency: if their paradigm includes no nominative form, and finite subjects bear nominative case, then primary anaphors may fail to function as finite subjects for the lack of a nominative form. Nominative is the unmarked case in Hungarian, but it has been shown for unmarked possessors that they are genuinely caseless.

The argument goes as follows (see Bartos 2011: 36–37, É. Kiss 2012: 170, and Dékány 2015: 1140–1141). Adnominal demonstratives occur in the presence of the definite article in Hungarian, and they show case concord with the head noun they modify. Thus the dative experiencer has a dative proximal demonstrative in (13), and, under the assumption that finite subjects bear nominative case, the demonstrative within the subject DP also bears nominative case.

- (13) Ez a fiú tetszik ennek a lánynak.
 this.NOM the boy.NOM appeal.3SG this.DAT the girl.DAT
 ‘This boy appeals to this girl.’ (‘This girl likes this boy.’)

Unmarked possessors cannot be modified by this demonstrative (14a), the possessor needs to receive dative marking for the demonstrative to be licensed (14b).

- (14) a. *ez a lány barát-ja
 this the girl friend-POSS
 intended: ‘this girl’s friend’
 b. ennek a lánynak a barát-ja
 this.DAT the girl.DAT the friend-POSS
 ‘this girl’s friend’

The reason why (14a) fails is that the demonstrative requires case marking, but unmarked possessors are genuinely caseless so there is nothing to copy.

If we then assume that the primary reflexive and the reciprocal anaphor have no nominative forms, then that assumption itself may explain why they make good possessors but fail as finite subjects. Nevertheless, we have independent reasons to think that even the primary anaphors may not obviously be case deficient. Here I discuss one such argument that concerns the reflexive.

The primary reflexive *maga* ‘himself’ also functions as a reflexive intensifier in Hungarian, with all the usual intensifier functions (see König & Gast 2006). In this use, the reflexive copies the case of its associate, nominative in (15a) and (15c), and accusative in (15b). The subject pronoun in (15a) and the object pronoun in (15b) may be spelled out or *pro*-dropped.

- (15) a. Holnap (én) magam megyek oda.
 tomorrow I.NOM myself.NOM go.1SG there
 ‘Tomorrow I go there myself.’

2015) and Reuland (2011) for two accounts that elaborate on the cross-linguistic correlation between definiteness marking and binding into possessives.

- b. Miért nem (ő-t) magá-t kérdezted meg?
 why not he-ACC himself-ACC asked.2SG PRT
 ‘Why didn’t you ask he himself?’
- c. János maga írta ezt.
 John himself wrote.3SG this.ACC
 ‘John wrote this himself.’

Interestingly, this intensifier is ungrammatical if it is to co-occur with an unmarked pronominal possessor. The intended reading below should be akin to that of *one’s own* possessors in English, but this particular construction is ungrammatical in Hungarian:

- (16) a. a János (*maga) barát-ja
 the John himself friend-POSS
 ‘John’s friend’
- b. az én (*magam) barát-om
 the I myself friend-POSS.1SG
 ‘my friend’

If intensifier *maga* manifests case concord with its associate, then it copies nominative case in (15a) and (15c); and it fails in (16) because unmarked possessors are caseless. So the ungrammaticality of (16) possibly stems from the same source that leads to the ungrammaticality of (14a).

The intensifier use of the reflexive is arguably different from other uses of the primary reflexive that we have covered so far. But it is still the case that the reflexive intensifier can be shown to have a nominative variant. The most straightforward assumption is that *maga* ‘himself’ is not case deficient in any of its uses, and in the absence of obvious evidence to the contrary, I will assume here that this is so. Thus what lies behind the observed syntactic distribution of the Hungarian anaphors is not case-driven constraints, but issues in φ -feature agreement, as is expected if the AAE is an operative principle of grammar.

5 Anaphors and agreement

Inflecting postpositions show φ -feature agreement with their pronominal complements in Hungarian, and this licenses the *pro*-drop of pronouns in this context, too (17).¹¹ If the complement of the postposition is non-pronominal, no agreement morphology is present (18).

- (17) a. (én-)mellett-em b. (te-)mellett-ed c. (ő-)mellett-e
 I-beside-1SG you-beside-2SG he-beside-3SG
 ‘beside me’ ‘beside you’ ‘beside him’
- (18) a. János mellett b. a fiú(k) mellett c. a ház-unk mellett
 John beside the boy.(PL) beside the house-POSS.1PL beside
 ‘beside John’ ‘beside the boy(s)’ ‘beside our house’

¹¹ Case markers are analogous in this respect, but I focus on inflecting postpositions for expository purposes. See Dékány (2011) and Hegedűs (2013) for recent overviews of the grammar of Hungarian PPs.

- (21) a. ^{??}Ez itt a Péter és az én ház-am.
 This here the Peter and the I house-POSS.1SG
 ‘This is here is the house of me and Peter.’
- b. *Ez itt az ő és az én ház-am.
 This here the he and the I house-POSS.1SG
 ‘This here is the house of him and Peter.’

Bartos argues that the ungrammaticality of (21b) is caused ultimately by a clash between the PERSON feature of the 3SG and the 1SG possessors (which results in an incompatibility between the two respective possessed heads that spell out these φ -features in agreement with the possessors). No such incompatibility arises in the case of (21a), which is a marked example, but there is still an observable difference in acceptability in comparison to (21b). Bartos interprets this as a sign of the lack of agreement between non-pronominal possessors and the possessum. No clash arises in (21a) simply because the lexical possessor does not participate in φ -agreement with the head of the possessive phrase.¹³

We may add to this that anaphoric possessors are fully grammatical in such coordinate constructions. Consider the difference between (22a) and (22b):

- (22) a. a(z) (ön)magam/egymás és a kisgazdapárt nev-é-ben
 the myself/each_other and the smallholders.party name-POSS-in
 ‘on behalf of myself/each other and the smallholders’ party’
- b. *az én és a kisgazdapárt nev-é-ben
 the I and the smallholders.party name-POSS-in
 ‘on behalf of me and the smallholders’ party’

(22b) is absolutely ungrammatical, the φ -feature clash between the possessor conjuncts cannot be resolved. (22a), however, involving the coordination of an anaphor and a lexical noun phrase, is fully grammatical. An obvious interpretation of these facts is that anaphoric possessors, similar to lexical possessors, do not agree with the possessum. This means that anaphoric possessors abide by the AAE, and possessive constructions are thus similar to PP structures in this respect.

For the reflexive anaphor and for the reciprocal, this can be interpreted as the lack of any external φ -feature specification. They survive in contexts where agreement is not required (the complement of Ps and the possessor position), but they cannot be finite subjects, because the finite subject position is construed with agreement. We expect then the primary reflexive anaphor (and the reciprocal) not to be grammatical in coordinate structures that occupy a finite subject position. This is exactly the case: *önmagam* ‘myself’ is grammatical in (23), while *magam* ‘myself’ is not.

- (23) Csak a feladat-om és *(ön)magam volt fontos.
 only the task-POSS.1SG and myself was.3SG important
 ‘Only my task and myself was important.’

¹³ Csirmaz (2006) discusses this agreement pattern in detail, and Laczkó (2002: 64–65) reports on the results of a small-scale survey with native speakers whose judgements also support Bartos’s claim concerning the acceptability difference between (21a) and (21b).

The primary reflexive is therefore unlike the English reflexive, which is licensed in coordinate structures, as is the case in the English translation of (23). In Hungarian, only complex reflexives are grammatical in these positions, because they are externally specified for 3SG, and thus they can participate in agreement in positions where this is required.¹⁴

6 Conclusions

I have argued above that the Anaphor Agreement Effect, as a guiding principle on anaphor licensing, makes good predictions for Hungarian, despite some initial concerns for the contrary. In particular, we have established the following:

(i) The primary reflexive and the reciprocal anaphor only occur in positions that are not construed with agreement. This concerns the complement position of postpositions and the unmarked possessor position: true pronouns do show agreement in both cases, but the anaphors do not. In these positions, anaphors pattern up with lexical noun phrases, which likewise do not agree with the respective heads.

(ii) Complex reflexives show constant 3SG agreement externally, and they are grammatical in finite subject positions. This position is always construed with agreement, therefore the primary reflexive and the reciprocal are ungrammatical as finite subjects, even if they are buried in a coordinate structure.

(iii) Reflexive possessors are discourse sensitive and they may lack a clause-mate antecedent altogether. Nevertheless, both the well-behaving and the discourse sensitive uses can be accounted for assuming essentially the same syntax for the reflexive: it carries no external φ -features in either case.

(iv) It is unlikely that case deficiency might play a role in the distribution of the data. In fact, the primary reflexive has a nominative form at least in its intensifier uses, and in absence of clear evidence to the contrary, we may generalize this to the whole reflexive paradigm.

It is especially fact (ii) that is surprising, given that *maga* ‘himself’ is a body-part reflexive with synchronic reflexes of its possessive origin. We expect it to pattern up with the Greek *o eaftos tu* ‘himself’ (8 repeated as (24a)), but we have seen that it does not. Only the complex reflexives can be finite subjects (24b) in Hungarian.

- (24) a. O eaftos tu tu aresi tu Petru.
 [the self his].NOM CL.DAT like.3SG the Petros.DAT
 ‘His own self appeals to Petros.’
- b. Önmaga / *Maga tetszik Péternek.
 himself appeal.3SG Peter.DAT
 ‘His own self appears to Péter.’

It is crucial to recognize that *maga* ‘himself’ is a very highly grammaticalized possessive structure. It shows no signs of referentiality, which is most obvious in the modification construction in (25):¹⁵

¹⁴ I note here that a frequent translational equivalent of the English coordinate reflexive (*myself and the queen*) in Hungarian is another complex reflexive, *jómaga*. We do not discuss this reflexive here (see Rákosi 2011), but it is noteworthy that only complex reflexives are grammatical in Hungarian in these cases.

¹⁵ See Rákosi (2009, 2011) for other arguments towards the same conclusion.

- (25) a korábbi önmagam / *magam
 the former myself
 ‘my former self’

Each form in the paradigm of *önmaga* ‘himself’ can be restrictively modified, and when they are, they are also compatible with the definite article. The primary reflexive *maga* ‘himself’ is ungrammatical in this construction. We may capture the difference between the two types of reflexives by assuming the following. First, *önmaga* or *saját maga* carry a 3SG (external) agreement feature, while *maga* does not. Second, this follows from the fact that the stem *mag-* is φ -defective in the case of *maga*, but not in the case of *önmaga* or *saját maga*.¹⁶ Intuitively, the extra morphological structure on complex reflexives contributes to structure building and it eliminates the deficiency of the stem, resulting in a *less grammaticalized* possessive structure. Third, this results in the possibility of referential uses in the case of complex reflexives, which we may therefore assume to be DPs, while *maga* is possibly smaller in size.¹⁷ Assuming that possessors are licensed in some functional projection FP, the two types of reflexives can be assigned distinct structural representations as follows:

- (26) a. [_{FP} *pro* [mag-am]] *magam* ‘myself’
 pro STEM-1SG
- b. [_{DP} Ø_{DEF} [_{FP} *pro* [ön/saját [mag-am]<sub>[3SG]]]] *önmagam/saját maga* ‘my own self’
 pro SELF-/OWN STEM-1SG</sub>

In sum, the primary reflexive is deficient in the sense of (26), and that is the reason why it cannot occupy a position where agreement is required. The complex reflexives, on the other hand, show constant 3SG external agreement, which is trivial agreement in the sense of Preminger (2019). Thus the AAE is maintained across the board since no reflexives occur in positions construed with φ -covarying morphology.

The primary reflexive and the reciprocal behave alike in this respect, but the reciprocal anaphor obviously needs a differential treatment. By the force of the above reasoning, the reciprocal is expected not to carry external agreement features in Hungarian, either. This is perhaps less surprising in the reciprocal case, given that it is the reflexive that has a possessive origin. There are obviously many other factors to consider here, since not every anaphor with a complex structure is grammatical in finite subject positions cross-linguistically. In fact, most obey the AAE, see Preminger (2019) for pertinent discussion. I hope to have shown in this

¹⁶ See Tucker (2010) for arguments that the head of the Greek reflexive in (24a) carries (valued) agreement features.

¹⁷ In earlier work (Rákosi 2009, 2011), I have assumed that *maga* also projects a (defective) DP layer. Each anaphor discussed here triggers the so-called definite object conjugation on the verb, and this requires the object to be a DP in Bartos’ (1999) model. More recent work, however, has shown that it is not always warranted to postulate such a strong structural correlate for definite object conjugation, and consequently, it is not necessarily the case that every noun phrase object is a DP in this context. See Coppock & Wechsler (2012) and Wechsler (2013) for details.

I argue in Rákosi (2011) that there are important similarities between the syntax of *önmaga* ‘himself’ and the syntax of names. Restrictive modification, for example, is an option in both cases and it is concomitant with the spellout of the article, as in (25). I also argue in op. cit. that a DP-shell is projected even in the absence of such modification, which is the usual case for both *önmaga* (26b) and names. I assume here for expository purposes that the D-head is occupied by a phonologically zero form of the definite article in (26b), but nothing crucial hinges on that. See Dékány (2011: 93–95) for a detailed discussion and a nanosyntactic account of variation in article use with proper names in Hungarian.

paper that one factor that is relevant in this variation is the makeup of the possessive structure that body-part reflexives assume: very highly grammaticalized possessive reflexives, like the Hungarian *maga* ‘himself’ may be unable to circumvent the AAE because they have a φ -defective nominal stem.

Acknowledgements

The Project no. 111918 (New approaches in the description of the grammar of Hungarian pronominals) has been implemented with the support provided from the National Research, Development and Innovation Fund of Hungary, financed under the K funding scheme.

I thank Péter Szűcs for his comments on the manuscript.

References

- Anagnostopoulou, E. & Everaert, M. (1999): Toward a more complete typology of anaphoric expressions. *Linguistic Inquiry* 30 (1), 97–119.
- Bárány, A. (2015): Inverse agreement and Hungarian verb paradigms. In: É. Kiss, K., Surányi, B. & Dékány, É. (eds.): *Approaches to Hungarian 14. Papers from the 2013 Piliscsaba Conference*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins, 37–65.
- Bartos, H. (1999): *Morfoszintaxis és interpretáció: A magyar inflexiók jelenségek szintaktikai háttere [Morphosyntax and interpretation: The syntactic background of inflectional phenomena in Hungarian]*. Doctoral dissertation. Budapest: ELTE Elméleti Nyelvészet Doktori Program.
- Bartos, H. (2001): Mutató névmási módosítók a magyarban: egyezés vagy osztozás? [Demonstrative modifiers in Hungarian: agreement or feature sharing?]. In: Bakró-Nagy, M., Bánréti, Z. & É. Kiss, K. (eds.): *Újabb tanulmányok a strukturális magyar nyelvtan és a nyelvtörténet köréből. Kiefer Ferenc tiszteletére barátai és tanítványai [Recent studies in Hungarian structural grammar and diachronic linguistics. In honour of Ferenc Kiefer, from his friends and students]*, Budapest: Osiris.19–41.
- Coppock, E. (2013): A semantic solution to the problem of Hungarian object agreement. *Natural Language Semantics* 21 (4), 345–371.
- Coppock, E. & Wechsler, S. (2012): The objective conjugation in Hungarian: agreement without phi-features. *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory* 30, 699–740.
- Csirmaz, A. (2006): Anti-agreement: Features and locality. In: Costa, J. & Silva, M. C. F. (eds.): *Studies on agreement*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 75–98.
- Dékány, É. (2011): *A profile of the Hungarian DP. The interaction of lexicalization, agreement and linearization with the functional sequence*. Doctoral dissertation. University of Tromsø.
- Dékány, É. (2015): The syntax of anaphoric possessives in Hungarian. *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory* 33 (4), 1121–1168.
- Despić, M. (2011): *Syntax in the absence of determiner phrase*. Doctoral dissertation. University of Connecticut.
- Despić, M. (2015): Phases, reflexives, and definiteness. *Syntax* 18 (3), 201–234.
- den Dikken, M. (1999): On the structural representation of possession and agreement. The case of (anti-)agreement in Hungarian possessed Nominal Phrases. In: Kenesei, I. (ed.):

- Crossing boundaries: Theoretical Advances in Central and Eastern European Languages*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 137–178.
- den Dikken, M. (2006): When Hungarians Agree (to Disagree) — The Fine Art of ‘Phi’ and ‘Art’. Ms. New York: CUNY Graduate Center.
- den Dikken, M., Lipták, A. & Zvolenszky, Zs. (2001): On inclusive reference anaphora: new perspectives from Hungarian. In: Megerdooian, K. & Bar-el, L. A. (eds.): *WCCFL 20 Proceedings*. Somerville, MA: Cascadilla Press, 137–149.
- É. Kiss, K. (2002): *The Syntax of Hungarian*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Everaert, M. (2001): Paradigmatic restrictions on anaphors. In: Megerdooian, K., & Bar-el L.A. (eds.): *WCCFL 20 Proceedings*. Somerville, MA: Cascadilla Press, 178–191.
- Haegeman, L. (2004): A DP-internal Anaphor Agreement Effect. *Linguistic Inquiry* 35 (4), 704–712.
- Hegedűs, V. (2013): *Non-verbal predicates and predicate movement in Hungarian*. Doctoral Dissertation. University of Tilburg.
- König, E. & Gast, V. (2006): Focused assertion of identity: A typology of intensifiers. *Linguistic Typology* 10, 223–276.
- Laczkó, T. (2002): On the treatment of informants’ grammaticality judgements. In: Hollósy, B. & Kiss-Gulyás, J. (eds.): *Studies in Linguistics. Volume VI, Part I*. Debrecen: Institute of English and American Studies of the University of Debrecen, 55–68.
- Laczkó, T. (2013): On a much-debated Hungarian predicate: Verb or participle? Syntactic or lexical treatment? *Argumentum* 9, 239–267.
- Preminger, O. (2019 February): The Anaphor Agreement Effect: further evidence against binding-as-agreement. Ms. Accessed at <https://ling.auf.net/lingbuzz/004401>.
- Rákosi, Gy. (2009): Beyond identity: the case of a complex Hungarian reflexive. In: Butt, M. King, T. H. (eds.): *The proceedings of the LFG09 Conference*. Stanford: CSLI Publications, 459–479.
- Rákosi, Gy. (2011): Összetett visszaható névmások a magyarban [Complex reflexive anaphors in Hungarian]. In: Bartos, H. (ed.): *Általános Nyelvészeti Tanulmányok XXIII*. Budapest: Akadémiai Kiadó, 351–376.
- Rákosi, Gy. (2014): Possessed by something out there: On anaphoric possessors in Hungarian. *Argumentum* 10, 548–559.
- Rákosi, Gy. (2015): Psych verbs, anaphors, and the configurationality issue in Hungarian. In: É. Kiss, K., Surányi, B. & Dékány, É. (eds.): *Approaches to Hungarian 14. Papers from the 2013 Piliscsaba Conference*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins, 245–266.
- Rákosi, Gy. (2017): The definite article and anaphoric possessors in Hungarian. *Linguistica Brunensia* 65 (2), 21–33.
- Rákosi, Gy. (To appear): With or without the definite article: On the syntax of anaphoric possessor strategies in Hungarian. In: Hegedűs, V. & Vogel, I. (eds.): *Approaches to Hungarian 16. Papers from the Budapest Conference*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Reuland, E. (2001): The primitives of binding. *Linguistic Inquiry* 32 (3), 439–492.
- Reuland, E. (2011): *Anaphora and language design. Linguistic Inquiry Monographs* 62. Cambridge, Mass.: The MIT Press.
- Rizzi, L. (1990): On the Anaphor-Agreement Effect. *Rivista di Linguistica* 2, 27–42.
- Sundaresan, S. (2014): Revisiting the Anaphor Agreement Effect: a new pattern from Tamil. In: Assmann, A., Bank, S., Georgi, D., Klein, T., Weisser, P. & Eva Zimmermann (eds.): *Linguistische Arbeitsberichte* 92. Institut für Linguistik der Universität Leipzig, 499–526.

- Szűcs, P. (2019): Remarks on binding an control data in Hungarian Complex Event Nominals. *Argumentum 15*, 650-664.
- Tucker, M. (2010, March 21.): *On the implications of The Anaphor Agreement Effect for Binding as Agree*. Ms. UC-Santa Cruz.
- Woolford, E. (1999): More on the Anaphor Agreement Effect. *Linguistic Inquiry* 39 (2), 257–287.

György Rákosi
University of Debrecen
Institute of English and American Studies
H-4032 Debrecen
Egyetem tér 1.
rakosigy@hotmail.com or rakosi.gyorgy@arts.unideb.hu