1. Introduction

Hungarian differs from English in how it encodes subject coreference in locative phrases. Whereas both reflexive pronouns and anaphors license coreferential readings in English PPs, at first sight, only the anaphoric strategy seems to be grammatical in Hungarian. Consider the following pairs:

(1) a. Peter saw a snake near him/himself.
    b. Peter closed the door behind him/himself.

(2) a. Péter látott egy kígyót mellett-e / maga mellett.
    Peter saw.3SG a snake-ACC beside-3SG himself beside
    ‘Peter saw a snake beside himself.’

    b. Péter becsukt-a az ajtó-t mögött-e / maga mögött.
    Peter closed-3SG the door-ACC behind-3SG himself behind
    ‘Peter closed the door behind himself.’

Whereas the English data are well-known and have been much discussed, the fact that Hungarian appears to differ so markedly from English has received little attention in the pertinent literature.

And what has in particular gone unnoticed is that it turns out on closer inspection that once we switch to non-third person, pronominal marking of subject coreference becomes much more acceptable even in Hungarian. In actual fact, every native finds a contrast between (3) and (2) with respect to the grammaticality of the pronominal strategy, and most native speakers find it perfectly acceptable in (3).

---

1 The core set of Hungarian spatial postpositions show overt agreement with their nominal complements, and, in accordance with the pro-drop nature of Hungarian, may even drop their pronominal complements up to recoverability, as happens in both examples in (2). I take this to be an instance of pronoun incorporation and, for ease of exposition, I will be referring to forms like mellette ‘beside him’ above as pronominals.
The difference between Hungarian and English thus becomes non-trivial in the light of (3). What needs to be explained is why the English-like pattern is restricted only to first and second person in Hungarian, and why the pronominal strategy stays still more marked in this domain in Hungarian than in English.

Parametrizing the theory of binding in such a way that Hungarian and English fall out as instantiating different binding systems does not seem to offer a non-stipulative solution, and such a step is generally unwelcome in a restrictive theory of grammar. Instead, one would wish to build an account of this difference in binding patterns between the two languages by pointing out relevant structural differences.

This paper is an attempt at properly setting up the background to such a structural account, which I execute elsewhere (Rákosi, 2009). My particular aims in this paper are twofold. First, I show in Section 2 that the optionality of pronominal marking of coreference in English PPs is only apparent. There are constructions which only license either the pronoun or the anaphor, and the two can be argued to be non-equivalent even in contexts where both are licensed. This pattern, as I show in Section 3, is characteristic of Hungarian, too, but it is restricted to non-third person only. Second, I point out in Section 4 that it is not unprecedented universally that binding phenomena are sensitive to the third person/non-third person divide. The differential behaviour of Hungarian is therefore weakly explained, inasmuch as the Hungarian pattern of coreference marking in locative PPs fits the typological picture.

2. Coreference marking in English locative PPs

2.1. The default setting

There is some consensus in the descriptive literature that the default marking of coreference in English PPs is through pronominals. Quirk et al. (1985:359) describe pronominals as “more usual” in these contexts, and Huddleston & Pullum (2002:1489) point out that “there is variation across speakers and also particular examples, but for many the non-reflexive form [i.e., the pronoun] is preferred.”

The least costly assumption then is to take pronominals and anaphors to be non-equivalent in PP contexts, that is, to avoid treating this variation as an instance of true optionality. To substantiate such an analysis, I first overview the contexts in which the variation is absent.
2.2. When only the anaphor is possible

It is well-known that if the preposition is selected by the predicate, only the anaphor is a grammatical marker of coreference. It is important to emphasise that the divide is not between argument and adjunct PPs, for pronominals are grammatical markers of coreference in argument PPs as long as the preposition is not selected by the predicate (see Reinhart & Reuland 1993:664). Compare the following two examples:

(4) a. He, doesn’t believe in/*inside/*above *him/himself.
    b. He, put the book under/near/above him/himself.

The anaphor is also the only option in cases when the preposition is not necessarily selected by the predicate, but it still forms part of an idiomatic unit:

(5) a. She, was beside *her/herself, with rage. [Quirk et al. 1985: 360]
    b. Max, had done it by*him/himself. [Huddleston & Pullum 2002: 1489]

In sum, the pronominal is not licensed as a marker of subject coreference if the preposition does not have independent predicative content.

2.3. When the pronoun is preferred or it is the only option

Jackendoff (1987:382) notes that certain non-selected PPs require pronominal marking of subject coreference. What these all share is that they appear to be vacuous semantically, inasmuch as they can be dropped from the clause without significantly affecting its meaning. The following are his examples:

(6) a. The box, has books in it/*itself.
    b. Bill, brought some books with him/*himself.
    c. The list, includes my name on it/*itself.

Quirk et al. (1985:360), as well as Smith (2004) note that these sentences do not support disjoint reference, cf.:

(7) a. *Bill has brought his lunch with me. [on the intended reading]
    b. *The box has books in them. [on the intended reading]

They both suggest that the reason for the ungrammaticality of the anaphor in the examples in (6) is that the anaphor is only used felicitously if its referent can possibly be contrasted with other individuals available in the discourse, which is not the case here.

If the PP is a high-level, event external adjunct, then anaphors are generally barely acceptable. (8) is an example including a high-level dative type that expresses opinion:

(8) To me/*myself, I had a great life in London.
And finally, even if a PP is more argument-like and shows a preference for anaphoric marking of coreference, focusing can facilitate the use of pronominals (see Huddleston & Pullum 2002: 1485, as well as Reinhart & Reuland 1993 for a comprehensive discussion of this issue):

(9) a. Accidentally, I only forwarded this letter to ME.
    b. Why don’t you buy something for YOU for a change?

This does not destroy the generalisation that the primary or default means of coreference marking is the anaphoric strategy in the coargument domain. But even there, further syntactic operations, like focusing, can license subject coreferential pronouns.

2.4. The predicate-based view of binding and discourse licensing of anaphors

We have seen that pronominals and anaphors are not always in free variation in PP contexts, and this establishes a vantage point from which the cases of apparent free variation can be properly approached. I now briefly outline a frame of analysis proposed by Reinhart & Reuland (1993), which has the potential to cover successfully the whole range of the data discussed above. For lack of space, I only discuss here those aspects of their approach that are immediately relevant for us, and refer the reader to their paper for further details.

Reinhart & Reuland (1993) restrict the scope of reflexivisation to co-arguments. Roughly, this approach requires every predicate to set up its own binding domain (BD). A preposition selected by the verb, as in the case of believe, is non-predicative. It cannot be contrasted or emphasised, and it does not contribute its regular meaning to the interpretation of the predication. Therefore (10a) below is assumed to include one binding domain, which is anchored to the main verb. As opposed to this, the preposition in (10b) is contentful and sets up its own binding domain as a predicate.

(10) a. \[BD I believe in *me/myself].
    b. \[BD1 I saw a snake]\[BD2 beside me/myself].

This gives an immediate explanation for why the pronominal strategy is ungrammatical in (10a). There is only one binding domain, which includes the antecedent, and therefore only the anaphoric strategy is grammatical. This setup also explains why the pronominal is a grammatical marker of subject coreference in (10b): its antecedent, the subject of the sentence, is in a different binding domain. We noted in the beginning that descriptive grammars treat the pronoun as the default marker of coreference in these contexts, which now follows as a consequence of the analysis. But why is it that the anaphor can also be grammatical in (10b)?

---

2 It is not important for us to decide here whether the preposition in (10a) incorporates into the verb at some level of representation. That is a widespread assumption in generative syntax, but what is directly relevant for us is only that the preposition is non-predicative.

3 Only focusing could save the pronoun in (10a). I refer the reader to Reinhart & Reuland (1993) for the technical details of how the focusing cases can be handled in their approach.
Reinhart & Reuland (1993) argue that in actual fact, *myself* is not a true anaphor in these contexts, but a logophor. A logophor is a pronominal element that expresses point of view and that is in need of discourse licensing. This implies that the observed “free” variation between pronouns and anaphors in PP contexts is only apparent, since the anaphor/logophor is only licensed if it can be construed as expressing the point of view of the referent of the antecedent, whereas the pronominal represents a perspective-free interpretation.

Let me illustrate this perspective-dependent variation now with an example modelled on the discussion in Smith (2004). Compare the following two sentences, both of which describes a photograph in which the speaker stands with his back to the camera.

(11) a. *I can see a girl behind me in this picture.*
   b. *I can see a girl behind myself in this picture.*

The most likely reading of (11a) is that the girl is in the background, with the speaker facing her. (11b), on the other hand, would normally place the girl in the foreground, with the speaker facing away from her. Thus (11a) has an objective construal, but (11b) represents the speaker’s more subjective perspective as a participant of the photographed scene. This follows if only *myself*, but not the pronominal *me* has logophoric properties in this construction, which is exactly what I have aimed to show.

3. Coreference marking in Hungarian PPs

3.1. The split between third and non-third person

As I noted in the introduction, pronominal marking of subject coreference is ungrammatical in Hungarian in 3SG, but it becomes fully acceptable for most speakers in first or second person. I repeat (2a) and (3a) as (12a) and (12b), respectively.

(12) a. Péter *mellett-* mellett.  
   Péter saw a snake beside himself.  
   ‘Peter saw a snake beside himself.’

   b. Látt-am *mellett-* mellett.  
   I saw a snake beside myself.  
   ‘I saw a snake beside me/myself.’

Though some speakers find the pronominal in (12b) somewhat marked, everybody finds a clear contrast between this example and (12a), which is clearly ungrammatical. There is a split then among speakers: the majority fully approves of the pronominal in (12b), and some find it marginal. This contrasts with English, where the pronoun has

* 3PL pronominals fare much better in PPs as markers of subject coreference, but they are not fully acceptable for speakers and are clearly not as good as first or second person pronominals. I present a possible explanation in Rákosi (2009).
been argued to be the default marker of coreference in these contexts.

Nevertheless, it is the case that in non-third person, pronominal marking of subject coreference becomes a possibility. In the next subsection, I show that the variation between the anaphor and the pronoun in PP contexts is conditioned by the same factors in Hungarian as in English. Hungarian, in this respect, repeats the English pattern in a more restrictive setting.

3.2. The English pattern in Hungarian

In Hungarian, just like in English, only the anaphoric strategy is grammatical even in first and second person if the P-element (postposition/suffix) is selected by the verb (13). Similarly, if the construction has an idiomatic reading in which the postposition bears no predicative content, then the idiomatic reading is only available in the presence of the anaphor.

(13) Hisz-ek *benn-em / magam-ban.
    believe-1SG in-1SG myself-in
    ‘I believe in myself.’

(14) a. Vág-om a fá-t alatt-am.
    cut-1SG the tree-ACC under-1SG
    (i) I am cutting the tree under me.
    (ii) *I am cutting my own throat.

    b. Vág-om a fá-t magam alatt.
    cut-1SG the tree-ACC myself under
    (i) I am cutting the tree under me.
    (ii) I am cutting my own throat.

As indicated, only (14b), which contains the anaphor, may have the idiomatic reading.

Furthermore, just like in English, there are syntactic contexts in Hungarian which favour or facilitate the use of the pronominal as a marker of subject coreference. High-level, event external adjuncts cannot normally host anaphors, which sound quite degraded in these positions:

(15) Számonra /? magam számára, én vagyok a legszebb.
    for.me myself for I am the most.beautiful
    ‘For me, I am the most beautiful.’

Focusing saves a coreferential pronominal even in contexts in which it would otherwise be unacceptabe, as in the case of P-elements selected by the verb.

(16) Én csak ³ NEK-EM / MAGAM-NAK adt-am jó jegyek-et.
    I only DAT-1SG myself-DAT gave-1SG good grades-ACC
    ‘I only gave good grades to ME.’
Though the focused pronominal in (16) may not pass for everyone with flying colours, it is in stark contrast with the non-focused counterpart, which is fully ungrammatical. Since thus the restrictions on the choice of the coreference marker seem identical in English and in Hungarian in first and second person, we also expect Hungarian to show the same kind of discourse sensitivity that we observed in English in cases of apparent free variation. Consider now (17), which is the Hungarian version of the previous English example (11).

(17) Lát-ök egy lány-t mögött-em / magam mögött a kép-en.
    see-1SG a girl-ACC behind-1SG myself behind the picture-on
    ‘I can see a girl behind me/myself in the picture.’

Recall that the photo was taken with the speaker facing away from the camera, so that the viewer of the picture sees his back only. With the choice of the pronominal, the only reading that speakers appear to get is when the girl is in the background. In contrast, the choice of the anaphor licenses a reading in which the girl is in the foreground, behind the back of the speaker in the picture. Thus the more subjective, perspective-dependent reading is licensed in Hungarian only by the anaphoric element, as happens in English, too.

4. A typological perspective on the variation

4.1. Interim summary

We have identified two dimensions of variation in the previous inspection of coreference marking patterns in Hungarian and English locatives PPs. First, other things being equal, standard Hungarian prefers to employ anaphoric marking of coreference in locative PPs, whereas English utilizes the pronominal strategy by deafult for the same purpose. Second, in first and second person but not in third person, most Hungarian speakers follow an English-like pattern inasmuch as they tolerate both pronominals and anaphors as coreference markers in PP contexts. In this section, I want to show that both of these dimensions of variation fit known typological universals.

4.2. Standard Hungarian vs English

One obvious difference between the English and the Hungarian anaphors concerns their morphological makeup. The English anaphor himself is a compound of the basic pronominal and an emphatic marker. At first sight, the Hungarian anaphor maga ‘himself’ also appears to be complex, and it clearly is historically. The stem mag has the meaning ‘seed’ in contemporary Hungarian, but it used to mean ‘body’ in the Finno-Ugric ancestor of the Hungarian language with all probability. Formally, maga is a possessive construction with the nominal stem and third person singular possessor morphology. It had the meaning ‘his body’, and thus the Hungarian reflexive shows a typologically well-known pattern of grammaticalization. In contemporary Hungarian, however, this origin is completely obsolete, and native speakers would not have the
intuition that *maga* is a complex form in any sense. Therefore *maga* contrasts with the English *himself*, inasmuch as its original morphological complexity has become opaque. There are good reasons therefore to classify it together with non-complex anaphors, like the German *sich* “himself”, and not with evidently complex anaphors, like the English *himself*.

The reason why this issue is important is that Faltz (1985) has shown that the morphological strategy a language employs in its reflexive elements correlates, among other things, with the possibility of allowing pronominals as markers of coreference in PPs (see also Haspelmath 2004 and Smith 2004 for the same point). In particular, languages which have compound reflexives tend to allow coreferring pronominals in PP contexts. English, French and Tagalog, for example, are such languages. French has the compound reflexive *lui-même*, and the regular strategy of coreference marking in PPs is pronominal. The following French example is from Faltz (1985: 114).

\[(18) \quad \text{Jean, a vu un serpent près de lui.}
\]
\[\text{John saw a snake near him}
\]

‘John saw a snake near him.’

Languages which have non-complex primary reflexive elements do not allow pronominal marking of coreference in PPs. German, Serbo-Croat, Latin or Hindi, among other languages, are in this group. For example, the primary German reflexive is the non-complex *sich*, and it is obligatorily used in PPs, where pronominals are ungrammatical as markers of subject coreference (Faltz 1985: 115):

\[(19) \quad \text{Hans, sah eine Schlange neben sich/*ihn.}
\]
\[\text{Hans saw a snake near himself/him}
\]

‘Hans saw a snake near him.’

As we have seen, Hungarian patterns up with German in this respect, and not with English or French.

If we classify the Hungarian primary reflexive *maga* ‘himself’ as essentially a non-compound form, then the analogy with German is expected on the basis of Faltz’s typology. Since, however, *maga* is a complex form historically, it is also not completely unexpected that the default anaphoric strategy of coreference coding in PPs coexist, at least for most speakers, with a somewhat marked pronominal strategy in first and second person. With this internal variation, Hungarian fits another typological pattern, which I discuss in the next subsection.

### 4.3. The split between third and non-third person

The split between third person and non-third person is known to be cross-linguistically relevant in the coding of binding configurations. In a recent discussion of this issue, Reuland (2008) notes that first and second person pronominals can be locally bound in many languages, like Dutch, German or French, which, however, employ a specific reflexive form and not a pronoun in third person to mark coreference.
The following paradigm is from Dutch, and it serves to illustrate the phenomenon. In Dutch, and unlike in English, inherently reflexive predicates need to be marked. The relevant marker is the pronoun in first and second person, but it must be a non-pronominal reflexive form in third person:

(20) a. *Ik was* me.
   I wash me
   ‘I wash.’

   b. *Jij wast* je.
   you wash you
   ‘You wash.’

   c. *Hij wast* *hem/zich*.
   he washes him/self
   ‘He washes.’

In the languages under discussion, unlike in Hungarian, the split between third and non-third person is not restricted to PP contexts, as the Dutch paradigm in (20) also testifies. Nevertheless, (20) is illustrative of an obvious cross-linguistic tendency, which manifests itself in Hungarian, too, even if its sphere of application is more restricted than in other languages.

One plausible functional motivation for this split is that, as Reuland (2008) notes, the interpretation of non-third person pronominals is kept constant across reportive domains. But third person pronominals may pick up various different referents even in the same reportive domain, provided these are available. Consider the two English sentences below for illustration.

(21) a. I saw a snake near me.
   b. He saw a snake near him.

The pronoun him may be coreferential with the subject, but it need not, therefore many different interpretations are possible in the case of (21b). But me in (21a) must be coreferential with the subject, and it cannot possibly refer to any other individual than the speaker. For this reason, there is no special drive to use specific markers of coreference in first or second person, but economy consideration may favour the use of a special reflexive form in third person. This happens in Hungarian PPs.

Another possible functionalist motivation for the split under discussion may be related to the fact that, as we noted it, variation between pronouns and anaphors in PPs is linked up with the lack or the presence of a point of view reading. Perspective-dependent, logophoric uses of anaphors dominantly occur in first and second person, that is, logophoric uses tend to be associated with speech participants. So one potential motivation for why variation in coreference marking is restricted to first and second person only could then be that discourse-driven variation is only relevant in this domain. Third person coreference tends to be perspective-neutral, and thus there is no
need to employ two competing forms. Hence languages may prefer to mark only third person coreference solely by specific reflexive forms because this helps to avoid referential ambiguities where these could arise and because there is no special drive to code perspective-dependent variation anyway.

5. Summary

In this paper, I investigated the encoding of coreference marking in English and Hungarian PPs. I argued that Hungarian only partially differs from English in the pattern that it employs, for it does show an English-like variation between pronominal and anaphoric markers of coreference in PP contexts, but only in first and second person. When this variation is grammatical, it is conditioned by discourse factors in both languages. I also showed that the fact that the default strategy of coreference marking is pronominal in English but anaphoric in Hungarian complies with the typology of Faltz (1985). The split between third and non-third person in the case of Hungarian also fits in with known cross-linguistic patterns of coreference marking.

Nevertheless, a comprehensive account should give a structural motivation for why this split is restricted only to PP contexts in Hungarian. I make an attempt at developing such an account in Rákosi (2009).
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