

## Reciprocal anaphors in singular constructions in Hungarian

György Rákosi

Department of English Linguistics, University of Debrecen

<http://ieas.unideb.hu/rakosi>

This paper discusses a striking and yet unnoticed difference in the grammatical coding of reflexive and reciprocal anaphora in Hungarian. Whereas plural reflexives require a plural subject antecedent and a plural verb, the reciprocal anaphor does not need an antecedent that bears a morphosyntactically expressed plural feature, nor does it require the verb to be in the plural. The emerging empirical picture points to a fundamental difference between the licensing of reflexive and reciprocal anaphors, inasmuch as the plurality that reciprocals feed on need not be a feature available internal to the computational system. I will argue that the Hungarian data surveyed here may provide further support for analyses that treat reciprocal anaphors as argument reducers (see Dotlačil 2010 for an overview).

The basic facts concerning subject-verb number agreement in Hungarian are as follows (see É. Kiss 2012). The verb shows plural agreement with the subject in Hungarian if the subject has overt plural morphology. Since quantified noun phrases have a non-plural noun head, they do not trigger plural agreement with the verb. Conjoined singular noun phrases may trigger singular or plural agreement when the &P is the topic and is outside of the IP (É. Kiss assumes that plural agreement is in fact triggered here by a 3PL resumptive pronoun), and they always show singular agreement inside of the IP. The reciprocal anaphor is not sensitive to the NUMBER of its antecedent: it is grammatical both with plural antecedents (1a) and with quantified antecedents, which are morphosyntactically singular (2a). This sort of variation has no effect on the interpretation of the reciprocal, it shows the same context-sensitive interpretative range in both cases that has been described in the pertinent literature (see, a.o., Dalrymple et al. 1998). With plural antecedents, plural reflexives also behave the same way as their English counterparts: (1b) either describes a distributive self-seeing event ('each child saw the self'), or a situation in which both children saw a reflection of the self plus the other. When the antecedent is a quantified singular noun phrase (2b), a 3SG anaphor is used, and the sentence only has the distributive reading ('each child saw the self'). Interestingly, a plural reflexive is also grammatical here with a 3SG verb (2c). This is in fact an instance of what den Dikken et al. (2001) describe as *inclusive anaphora* in Hungarian (see 2d): (2c) can only mean that both of the two children saw a reflection of the self plus the other in the mirror. I will show that this sort of inclusive anaphora has logophoric properties in Hungarian, and thus it should not be treated on a par with true reflexive anaphors (notice that English normally employs a pronoun for this purpose (*I saw us in the mirror*), which is not an option in Hungarian for independent reasons).

Thus true reflexive anaphors must agree with their antecedent in NUMBER, whereas reciprocals do not necessarily require PLURAL antecedents. Conjoined singular noun phrases represent another interesting context in this respect. When topicalized, such a noun phrase can antecede a reciprocal, and the verb is either in the singular or in the plural (3a). I carried out a corpus study, which shows that 3SG agreement with the verb is twice as frequent in this case as 3PL agreement, and there is no strong semantic difference between the two strategies beyond some weak tendency to prefer 3PL agreement for (single-event) collective readings. For reflexives, there are two options. We either employ a singular reflexive anaphor with 3SG agreement with the verb (3b, distributive reading only), or we use a plural reflexive with a plural verb (3c, both distributive and collective readings). Plus the inclusive reading is also available here (3d), on analogy with (2c-d), and showing the same logophoric properties.

Noun phrases with a group denoting head represent yet another context where morphosyntactically singular antecedents are grammatical with reciprocals. Such nouns never trigger plural agreement with the verb in Hungarian, but they may antecede reciprocals both in constructions with lexical reciprocal verbs (4a), and elsewhere across the board (4b includes the transitive, non-symmetric *kiss*). This is interesting because it has been argued that singular group denoting nouns are only compatible with lexical reciprocals but not with reciprocal anaphors in other languages (see Palmieri 2018) - apparently, no such constraint applies to reciprocal anaphors in Hungarian. Plural reflexives are strictly ungrammatical in this construction, singular group nouns may only antecede singular reflexives (not shown).

In sum: plural reflexive anaphors must have morphosyntactically plural antecedents, whereas there is no such general constraint on reciprocal anaphors in Hungarian. These data thus provide further arguments against collapsing the grammar of reflexive and reciprocal anaphora.

- (1) a. A *gyerek-ek látták egymást a tükörben.*  
 the child-PL saw.3PL each\_other.ACC the mirror.in  
 ‘The children saw each other in the mirror.’
- b. A *gyerek-ek látták magukat a tükörben.*  
 the child-PL saw.3PL themselves the mirror.in  
 ‘The children saw themselves in the mirror.’
- (2) a. A *két gyerek látta/\*látták egymást a tükörben.*  
 the two child saw.3SG/saw.3PL each\_other.ACC the mirror.in  
 ‘The two children saw each other in the mirror.’
- b. A *két gyerek látta/\*látták magát a tükörben.*  
 the two child saw.3SG/ saw.3PL himself.ACC the mirror.in  
 ‘The two children each saw the self in the mirror.’
- c. A *két gyerek látta/\*látták magukat a tükörben.*  
 the two child saw.3SG/ saw.3PL themselves the mirror.in  
 ‘The two children each saw both of them in the mirror.’ (them=the two children)
- d. *János látta magukat a tükörben.*  
 John saw.3SG themselves the mirror.in  
 ‘John saw them in the mirror.’ (them= John + associates)
- (3) a. *Kati és Éva látta/látták egymást a tükörben.*  
 Kati and Éva saw.3SG/saw.3PL each\_other.ACC the mirror.in  
 ‘Kati and Éva saw each other in the mirror.’
- b. *Kati és Éva látta/\*látták magát a tükörben.*  
 Kati and Éva saw.3SG/saw.3PL herself.ACC the mirror.in  
 ‘Kati and Éva saw themselves in the mirror.’
- c. *Kati és Éva látták magukat a tükörben.*  
 Kati and Éva saw.3PL themselves.ACC the mirror.in  
 ‘Kati and Éva saw themselves in the mirror.’
- d. *Kati és Éva látta magukat a tükörben.*  
 Kati and Éva saw.3SG themselves.ACC the mirror.in  
 ‘Kati and Éva each saw both of them in the mirror.’ (them=Kati and Éva)
- (4) a. A *pár csókolózott/\*csókolóztak (egymással).*  
 the couple kiss.RECIP.PAST.3SG/kiss.RECIP.PAST.3PL each\_other.with  
 ‘The couple was involved in a mutual kissing activity (with each other).’
- b. A *pár megcsókolta/\*megcsókolták egymást.*  
 the couple PRT.kiss.PAST.3SG/ PRT.kiss.PAST.3PL each\_other.ACC  
 ‘The couple kissed each other.’

## References

- Dalrymple, M., M. Kanazawa, Y. Kim, S. Mchombo, S. Petersen. 1998. Reciprocal expressions and the concept of reciprocity. *Linguistics and Philosophy* 21 (2). 159-210. • den Dikken, M., A. Lipták & Zs. Zvolenszky. 2001. On inclusive reference anaphora: new perspectives from Hungarian. In K. Megerdómián & L. Bar-el eds. *WCCFL 20 Proceedings*. Somerville, MA: Cascadilla Press. 137-149. • Dotlačil, J. 2010. *Anaphora and distributivity. A study of same, different, reciprocals and others*. PhD dissertation. University of Utrecht. • É. Kiss, K. 2012. Patterns of agreement with coordinate noun phrases in Hungarian. *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory* 30 (4). 1027-1060. • Palmieri, G. 2018. *Can we hug in Italian? An investigation on lexical and grammatical reciprocity*. Research master’s thesis. Utrecht University.