

György Rákosi

Myself, the armchair linguist^{*}

Two complex anaphors in Hungarian

Abstract

The paper reports the results of a corpus study of the two Hungarian complex reflexive elements *önmaga* ‘himself’ and *jómaga* ‘himself’. As even the primary corpus data testify, the two reflexives diverge in their grammar in important ways. The paper argues that these data provide considerable support for an analysis in which *jómaga* ‘himself’ is treated as a special, discourse sensitive logophoric element.

Keywords: anaphor, complex reflexive, corpus study, Hungarian, logophor, reflexivity

1 Prologue

In a much-quoted paper, Fillmore argues that the anecdotal lack of mutual understanding and appreciation between *corpus linguists* and *armchair linguists* should be abandoned for good and principled reasons, since “the two kinds of linguists need each other. Or better, ... the two kinds of linguists, wherever possible, should exist in the same body” (Fillmore 1992: 35). Fillmore’s paper is more than twenty years old now, but its agenda has not lost its relevance and it is as pressing on the contemporary scene as it was at the time of its writing. This study of two complex Hungarian reflexives is aimed to be a modest contribution to the kind of linguistics that Fillmore envisages.¹

The primary Hungarian reflexive anaphor, *maga* ‘himself’, is a complex reflexive that has a possessive origin (with the etymology ‘his body’), which it has mostly lost and shows only remnants of its possessive character in the synchronic grammar.² This primary reflexive anaphor has several more complex varieties, and two of these constitute the empirical focus of this paper: *önmaga* (lit.: ‘self-himself’) and *jómaga* (lit.: ‘good-himself’). In a series of papers, I have tried to describe the exact share of labour between these reflexive forms and to provide an account of the unique grammatical behaviour that the two complex reflexives

^{*} The publication is supported by the TÁMOP 4.2.4.A/2-11-1-2012-0001 project (*Nemzeti Kiválóság Program – Hazai hallgatói, illetve kutatói személyi támogatást biztosító rendszer kidolgozása és működtetése konvergencia program*). The project is co-financed by the European Union and the European Social Fund.

I acknowledge furthermore that this research has also been supported by the OTKA (*Hungarian Scientific Research Fund*), grant number K 72983, and by the Research Group for Theoretical of the Hungarian Academy of Sciences at the University of Debrecen.

¹ At the same time, this study is also a tribute to Béla Hollósy, who not only first acquainted me with Fillmore’s paper, but also introduced me to the world of corpus linguistics.

² I discuss the synchronically active possessive features of *maga* ‘himself’ in detail in Rákosi (2011).

manifest (Rákosi 2009a, 2009b, 2011). *Jómaga* is particularly interesting, inasmuch as it seems to function as a special, discourse sensitive *logophoric* element. My fundamental aim in the current paper is to provide further, corpus-based evidence for the logophoric analysis of *jómaga* within the framework of a contrastive corpus study of the two complex reflexives.

The structure of the paper is as follows. In Section 2, I give a brief descriptive overview of the grammar of *önmaga* and *jómaga*. In Section 3, I outline the framework of the corpus study and discuss its most important results and the immediate consequences of these results for the proper analysis of *jómaga*. In Section 4, I conclude by a brief commentary on some of the more general implications of this corpus study.

2 The grammar of the two reflexives

2.1 *The traditional descriptive literature and its critique*

The traditional descriptivist approach to complex reflexives is succinctly summarised in the standard reference grammar *Magyar Grammatika* (Keszler 2000: 160-163). This description rests on two basic claims concerning the grammar of *önmaga* and *jómaga*. First, both are claimed to be emphatic varieties of either the corresponding personal pronoun or the corresponding simple reflexive anaphor. Second, neither is assumed to be grammatically special beyond the emphatic meaning surplus that they are said to carry. *Jómaga* is listed as a personal pronoun, whereas *önmaga* is essentially taken to be bicategorical inasmuch as it is described as the emphatic variety of both the personal pronoun and the reflexive.

Neither claim is completely adequate, nor are they especially enlightening in and of themselves. Concerning the second claim, notice, for example, that whereas both reflexives – as well as, obviously, the primary reflexive *maga* – are licensed in local contexts, bound personal pronouns are not:³

- (1) *János_i a tükör-ben meg-látta magá-t_i / önmagát_i / jómagát_i / *ő-t_i.*
 John the mirror-in PART-saw himself-ACC himself-ACC himself-ACC him-ACC
 ‘John_i caught a glimpse of himself_i / *him_i in the mirror.’

So the distribution of personal pronouns and complex reflexives is not identical, and we cannot therefore take the latter an instance of the former. Furthermore, the distribution of complex reflexives only partially overlaps with that of the primary reflexive *maga*. For example, only complex reflexives can function as nominative subjects. Consider the data in (2):

- (2) *Nekem a legjobban *magam / önmagam / jómagam tetszik.*
 to.me the best myself myself myself appeals
 ‘I like myself the best.’ (lit.: Myself appeals to me the best)

Therefore, neither *önmaga* nor *jómaga* can be simply taken to be either a personal pronoun or a regular reflexive anaphor. Both are freer in their syntax than reflexive anaphors par excellence, but they are not as free as regular pronouns.

³ The following abbreviations are used in this article: ACC: accusative case, IMP: imperative, PART: verbal particle, POSS: possessive, 1SG: first person singular, 3SG: third person singular.

As far as the first descriptivist claim is concerned, it is true that both complex anaphors can be said to be emphatic in some sense. But, as long as we do not specify the exact semantic content of this claim, this description itself does not contribute much to a better understanding of the behaviour of the two reflexives. Note that all kinds of reflexives and personal pronouns can be focussed in Hungarian, and thereby be used emphatically in this sense:

- (3) *János MAGÁ-T / ÖNMAGÁT / JÓMAGÁT / Ő-T látta meg a tükör-ben.*
 John himself-ACC himself-ACC himself-ACC him-ACC saw PART the mirror-in
 ‘It is HIMSELF / HIM that John caught a glimpse of in the mirror.’

Therefore an adequate account must also include clues with respect to why native speakers feel these two complex reflexives are emphatic and what exactly this intuition derives from. In my previous work (Rákosi 2009a, 2009b, 2011) I have tried to set up the outlines of such an account. In the next subsection, I briefly summarise the major empirical findings that these papers report.

2.2 *The peculiar behaviour of önmaga and jómaga*

The crucial difference between the primary reflexive *maga* and its complex variant *önmaga* is that whereas the former can only license run-of-the-mill bound variable readings, *önmaga* also licenses coreference-based interpretations. Coreference, unlike bound variable readings, is a referential dependency that is not coded directly in syntax but is a result of other factors, which are often non-syntactic in nature (see Reinhart & Reuland 1993 and Reuland 2001 for more on this view of binding). Consider example (4) for illustration:

- (4) *Engem meg-ijeszt *(ön)magam, de téged nem.*
 me.ACC PART-scars myself but you.ACC not
 (i) *^{??}‘My own self scares me, but your own self does not scare you.’
 (ii) ‘My own self scares me, but my own self does not scare you.’

On the coreference reading of (4), the nominative reflexive subject *önmaga* refers to the same real world individual that the object pronoun does (i.e., the speaker). In other words, the reflexive has its own independent reference, and it preserves it in the elliptical second clause. The result is reading (ii). Reading (i) requires the bound variable interpretation of the reflexive, in which its reference necessarily co-varies with that of the antecedent. Since the antecedent of the second clause is the second person pronoun, reading (i) should obtain. The bound variable reading is, however, not licensed in this particular construction.⁴

The relative referential freedom of *önmaga* manifests itself in the possibility for this reflexive to be used in grammatical contexts where proper reflexive anaphors are normally banned. For example, it can be a nominative subject, as in (4) above. It can also be the predicate of the clause, as in the corpus example below:⁵

⁴ A possible explanation for the lack of the bound variable reading in this construction is given in Rákosi (2009b, 2011).

⁵ I adopt the convention of using boldfaced reference numbers for corpus examples.

- (5) *Hogyan tanul-ok meg önmagam lenni?*
 how learn-1SG PART myself be.INF
 ‘How do I learn to be myself?’

Given the referential strength that distinguishes *önmaga* from regular anaphors, we expect it to have a relatively unconstrained syntax and to occur in an array of construction types. This is an expectation that a corpus study can either reinforce or disprove.

I argue in Rákosi (2011) that *jómaga* is even less constrained syntactically than *önmaga*. In some sense, we may even treat it as a pronoun – albeit a special, *logophoric* pronominal element. A logophor requires an antecedent whose perspective or point of view is described in the domain that includes the logophor itself (see Reinhart & Reuland (1993) for more on this understanding of logophors). The antecedent may or may not be linguistically expressed. In first and second persons it need not be, since the speaker and the addressee are prominent discourse participants, whose point of view is easily accessible even without explicit linguistic exponence.

The following minimal pair illustrates the perspective-dependent nature of *jómaga*.

- (6) *Péter azt mondta nekem, hogy jómaga is itt dolgozik.*
 Peter that-ACC told to.me that himself too here works
 ‘Peter told me that himself works here, too.’
- (7) **Én azt mondtam Péternek, hogy jómaga is itt dolgozik.*
 I that-ACC told.1SG to.Peter that himself too here works
 ‘I told Peter that himself works here, too.’

The reflexive subject is licensed in the subordinate clause because it represents the content of what Peter said and Peter is construed as the perspective holder of the whole sentence. In contrast, the perspective holder in (7) is the speaker and the third person reflexive is therefore unlicensed in the subordinate clause in the absence of a potential logophoric antecedent.

Jómaga is less constrained syntactically than *önmaga* in the sense that its licensing mechanism is essentially discourse-governed, and syntax only plays a role as long as it can code discourse prominent participants in certain designated ways. But this may actually result in a distribution that is *less* rich for *jómaga* than for *önmaga*, if *jómaga* is expected to be sensitive to discourse-related aspects of syntax. The corpus study has been designed to shed some empirical light on this armchair-generated expectation.

3 The corpus study and its results

3.1 The corpus

The corpus I have used is a roughly 30 million word subset of the fully filtered version of the Hungarian Webcorpus (see Halácsy et al. 2004, Kornai et al. 2006).⁶ The Hungarian Webcorpus was created in 2003, when its developers downloaded 18 million pages from the .hu domain. The fully filtered version only includes documents that could automatically be detected to contain good Hungarian without exceeding a strict threshold of mistakes.

⁶ The exact size of this subcorpus is 29.190.384 words.

Therefore this corpus is a reliable representation of near-contemporary standard and colloquial Hungarian.

3.2 *Önmaga in the corpus*

Table 1. below is a numerical summary of the results of the corpus search targeting the lemma *önmaga* ‘himself’ for the whole of its paradigm, with a breakdown of the attested case forms (rows) and the six different spellouts of the possible NUMBER and PERSON combinations (columns).

<i>ÖNMAGA</i>	1SG	2SG	3SG	1PL	2PL	3PL	TOTAL	
<i>nominative</i>	72	68	621	164	5	213	1143	17.21
<i>accusative</i>	33	38	1013	144	9	232	1469	22.12
<i>dative ‘to’</i>	6	8	146	38	1	37	236	3.55
<i>instrumental ‘with’</i>	25	26	212	65	3	54	385	5.80
<i>illative ‘into’</i>	1	6	73	13	-	13	106	1.60
<i>inessive ‘in’</i>	13	10	1778	46	3	281	2131	32.09
<i>elative ‘from’</i>	10	1	57	10	-	6	84	1.27
<i>sublative ‘onto’</i>	8	7	121	20	-	34	190	2.86
<i>superessive ‘on’</i>	3	2	73	16	1	29	124	1.87
<i>delative ‘from’</i>	8	6	117	31	-	32	194	2.92
<i>allative to’</i>	7	5	86	28	1	27	154	2.32
<i>adessive ‘at’</i>	6	1	13	1	-	5	26	0.39
<i>ablative ‘from’</i>	7	13	110	18	2	34	184	2.77
<i>causal ‘for’</i>	4	2	135	12	-	52	205	3.09
<i>translative ‘into’</i>	2	-	2	1	-	4	9	0.13
TOTAL	205	193	4557	607	25	1053	6640	
	3.09	2.91	68.63	9.14	0.38	15.86		100 %

Table 1: *Önmaga* ‘himself’ in the corpus

The corpus contains 6640 occurrences of the lemma *önmaga* altogether, which marks a relatively high frequency and indicates that *önmaga* is not a peripheral element in contemporary Hungarian.⁷ Here I discuss three aspects of the data in Table 1, which will serve as useful comparison grounds in the analysis of the corpus data concerning *jómaga*.

⁷ Roughly every 4400th word in the corpus is an instance of the lemma *önmaga*.

First, third person forms constitute a definitive majority, with the 3SG and 3PL forms altogether accounting for almost 85 per cent of the data. This is not an unexpected result, given that the Webcorpus contains written texts wherein dialogues in particular and first and second person forms in general are underrepresented in comparison to the spoken vernacular.

Second, *önmaga* can essentially take any semantically compatible case morphology. This fact is a strong indication that *önmaga* occurs in a wide variety of syntactic constructions. This is what we expect from a reflexive that is, as I argued above in 2.2, freer syntactically than the primary reflexive anaphor *maga* ‘himself’.⁸

Third, the ratio of nominative uses is relatively high, which is somewhat surprising in light of the fact that true reflexive anaphors tend to be ungrammatical in (nominative) subject positions. Nominative is the unmarked case in Hungarian, and for expository purposes, I refer to any occurrence of the reflexive that has no visible case-marking as a nominative form. Nominative forms of the complex reflexive occur in six different constructions in the corpus, which I briefly summarise here because this variation is yet another crucial factor that we need to study in order to be able to evaluate the corpus data concerning *jómaga*.

A subset of postpositions in Hungarian take nominative complements, which can be the reflexive that we are discussing, see (8):

- (8) *Ha szeretettel fordul-ok önmagam felé, ...*
 if love.with turn-1SG myself towards
 ‘If I turn towards myself with love, ...’

Önmaga can also function as a predicate, see our earlier example (5). Occasionally, it can function as an intensifier, in which case it either co-occurs with an overt or a *pro*-dropped subject. (9) is an example from the corpus. I add the pronominal subject in brackets for expository purposes:

- (9) ... *ne (én) önmagam legyek életem középpontja, ...*
 not I myself be.IMP.1SG life.POSS.1SG centre.POSS.3SG
 ‘... so that I myself should not be the centre of my own life, ...’

A fourth use is when *önmaga* is the nominative possessor in possessive constructions:

- (10) *önmagam választása*
 myself choice.POSS.3SG
 ‘the choice of myself’

Finally, the unmarked “nominative” form can function either as a subject or an object. Except for the case of 3SG possessors, possessive-marked nouns are grammatical as objects with or without accusative marking. Accusative case is obligatory on nominal heads that bear no possessive morphology or on 3SG possessive nouns in object uses (11-12).

⁸ The third person forms have an exceptionally high frequency in the inessive case (1778 tokens in 3SG (*önmagában* ‘in itself’), and 281 tokens in 3PL (*önmagukban* ‘in themselves’)). This is so because these forms serve as (idiomatic) intensifiers of a sort, similarly to the English *in itself* in examples like *Close work is not in itself detrimental to sight*. I did not separate these data from the rest included in Table 1 because the essential purpose of this table is to show certain tendencies in the use of *önmaga*, and it serves this purpose well without further fine-tuning.

- (11) *Lát-om a halam(-at).*
 see-1SG the fish.POSS.1SG-ACC
 ‘I see my fish.’
- (12) *Látom a halá-*(t).*
 see-1SG the fish.POSS.3SG-ACC
 ‘I see his fish.’

As I mentioned in Section 1, the primary reflexive *maga* has a possessive origin, and this diachrony is still active to some extent. One synchronic reflex of this is the grammaticality of the absence of the accusative marker when the reflexive is a syntactic object. (13) is an example from the corpus, and it is analogous with (11).

- (13) *Meg-talált-am önmagam(-at).*
 PART-found-1SG myself-ACC
 ‘I have found myself.’

The optional accusative case is my addition to the corpus example, and the upshot of this discussion is that the nominative form of the reflexive can also function as a syntactic object.

I have chosen the 1SG form *önmagam* ‘myself’ to perform a pilot study of the distribution of the six nominative functions in the corpus. The results are summarised in Table 2. below.

FUNCTION	TOKENS	RATE
subject	2	2.78
object	31	43.06
complement of postposition	17	23.61
possessor	12	16.67
predicate	9	12.5
intensifier	1	1.39
TOTAL	72	100%

Table 2: Nominative uses of *önmagam* ‘myself’ in the corpus

It is evident that the subject uses of the nominative form constitute a minority with only two examples in this sample. In fact, the nominative of *önmagam* ‘myself’ is most likely to function as a syntactic object in the corpus.

3.3 *Jómaga in the corpus*

The complex reflexive *jómaga* is much less frequent in the corpus than *önmaga*. Whereas the corpus contains 6640 tokens of the lemma *önmaga* (see Table 1.), it contains only 267 tokens of the lemma *jómaga*. *Jómaga* is somewhat marked stylistically as it tends to be restricted to colloquial, spoken varieties of Hungarian (and many may feel it to be of a somewhat mannered style), and it is therefore probably more frequent in speech than it is in the Webcorpus. Nevertheless, even this limited amount of data can offer us important insights into the grammar of this complex reflexive. Table 3. gives an overview of the results of the corpus search.

<i>JÓMAGA</i>	1SG	2SG	3SG	1PL	2PL	3PL	TOTAL	
<i>nominative</i>	252	-	8	2	-	1	263	98.5
<i>accusative</i>	3	-	-	-	-	-	3	1.12
<i>dative 'to'</i>	1	-	-	-	-	-	1	0.37
TOTAL	256	-	8	2	-	1	267	
	95.88	-	3.00	0.75	-	0.37		100%

Table 3: *Jómaga* 'himself' in a cc. 30 million word section of the Webcorpus

As in the previous case, I focus on three aspects of these data. These observations can be directly compared to the ones made above on the corpus search results concerning *önmaga*.

First, here the 1SG form constitutes a definitive majority, accounting for roughly 96 per cent of the total number of occurrences. In the case of *önmaga*, the different case forms of the 1SG paradigm make up altogether only 3 per cent of the data. This is a very clear difference between the two complex reflexives, and I also wish to emphasize the fact that the high frequency of *jómagam* 'myself' is a feature of a corpus of written texts.

Second, Table 3. shows signs of little morphological variation. 98.5 per cent of all the occurrences of *jómaga* are in the nominative, and there are only 3 accusative forms and a single dative example in the corpus. This is in sharp contrast with the rich morphological variation that we have seen attested in the case of *önmaga*.

Third, the nominative forms function dominantly as syntactic subjects. Table 4. provides an overview of the different syntactic uses of the nominative form of the 1SG *jómagam* 'myself'.

FUNCTION	TOKENS	RATE
subject	247	98.06
object	1	0.4
complement of postposition	1	0.4
possessor	2	0.79
predicate	-	
intensifier	1	0.4
TOTAL	252	100%

Table 4: Nominative uses of *jómagam* 'myself' in the corpus

Each function that we have identified above in 3.2 is attested in the corpus, except for the predicative use. But the subject uses (98 per cent) clearly dominate the scene, unlike in the case of *önmaga* (see Table 3.), where the subject use seems to be a marked option.

To conclude, a typical instance of the complex reflexive *jómaga* is a 1SG nominative subject, whereas such uses are rare in the case of *önmaga*. This does not just appear to be some noise in the data, but a fact that requires some deeper explanation.

3.4 *Jómaga as a logophor*

I have claimed in 2.2 above that *jómaga* is a special logophoric element, which can be licensed in a piece of discourse that is presented within the perspective of its antecedent. My aim in this section is to show that this analysis has the potential to provide an explanation for the corpus facts that we have observed in 3.3, and, in turn, the corpus data themselves give further support to the logophoric analysis.

Notice, first of all, that this analysis immediately explains why 1SG forms dominate the data in the corpus. Consider the following two examples:

- (14) *Jómagam sem pszichológus, sem biológus nem vagyok, ...*
 myself neither psychologist nor biologist not am
 ‘As for myself, I am neither a psychologist, nor a biologist, ...’
- (15) *Azok-at a magyarok-at ... el-tiltot-ták. Jómagam-at az írástól, ...*
 those-ACC the Hungarians-ACC PART-ban-3PL myself-ACC the writing.from
 ‘Those Hungarians ... were banned. Myself from writing, ...’

What is common to both examples is that neither contains a linguistically expressed local antecedent for the reflexive. A true reflexive anaphor would be ungrammatical in these constructions, and the primary Hungarian reflexive *maga* ‘himself’ is ungrammatical here in both sentences. The linguistically unexpressed antecedent of *jómagam* is the speaker him- or herself, whose point of view determines the interpretation of both sentences. Since the speaker as a default perspective holder is available in narrative genres, it comes as no surprise that the 1SG form *önmagam* is so frequent in the corpus. This frequency reflects the fact that, other things being equal, the speaker is the default discourse antecedent.

Obviously, this does not render non-first person uses ungrammatical. Quite to the contrary, they are expected to be felicitous when conditions for logophoric licensing are satisfied. Consider the corpus example (16) for illustration:

- (16) *Csáky ... emlékeztetett arra, hogy jómaga ...*
 Csáky reminded that.onto that himself
a meghívó ... kívánságára került be a ... küldöttségbe.
 the inviting.host request.onto got into the delegation.into
 ‘Csáky reminded (us) of the fact that himself got into the delegation at the request of the inviting host.’

The subordinate subject reflexive is licensed here because the subordinate clause expresses the content of the second argument of the psych-verb ‘*emlékeztet*’ *remind*, and as such, it is in the scope of the perspective that is anchored to the matrix subject experiencer *Csáky*. The matrix subject acts therefore as the discourse antecedent of the subordinate reflexive.

It is also non-surprising that this complex reflexive typically functions as a nominative subject, and other morphological forms are either rare or they do not appear in the corpus for principled reasons. The logophoric analysis predicts, for example, that *jómaga* will have no translative uses. Translative case is a morphological marker of secondary predicates, but *jómaga*, as a logophor in need of a discourse antecedent, cannot function as a predicate. (17) is a corpus example including the translative form of *önmagam* ‘myself’. *Jómagam* is unacceptable in the selfsame construction:

- (17) ... *ez tesz engem is önmagam-má / *jómagam-má...*
 this makes me too myself-into myself-into
 ‘This makes me myself.’

Therefore the lack of translative examples in the corpus is no accident, since such forms are predicted not to be grammatical by the logophoric analysis.⁹

In general, it seems safe to conclude on the basis of the corpus data that *jómaga* is preferred to be used over other reflexive forms if there is no linguistically expressed local antecedent present in the clause. If there is one, then speakers tend to prefer the primary reflexive *maga* or the complex reflexive *önmaga*. And if there is none, then *jómaga* will typically be the subject because, other things being equal, it is the subject argument that denotes the default perspective holder.¹⁰ So, *jómaga* either functions as a main clause subject with the speaker as its logophoric antecedent, or as a subordinate subject with a logophoric antecedent in the main clause. *Jómaga* is less frequent or dispreferred in other syntactic functions, because (i) the non-reflexive subject typically introduces a perspective holder, and (ii) *jómaga* is dispreferred over other reflexive elements if there is a local antecedent. This is a tendency, or a weak fact of Hungarian grammar, and it is not an absolute rule since *jómaga* is compatible with local antecedents (see (1) above). However, this tendency is an important aspect of the behaviour of this complex reflexive element.

A final remark on the subject uses of *jómaga* is in order. I have noted in 3.3 that *önmaga* can act as an intensifier associated with either an overt or a covert pronominal subject. I repeat (9) as (18) to illustrate.

- (18) ... *ne (én) önmagam legyenek életem középpontja, ...*
 not I myself be.IMP.1SG life.POSS.1SG centre.POSS.3SG
 ‘... so that I myself should not be the centre of my own life, ...’

It would be natural to assume a parallel analysis for *jómaga*, but I do not find an overt pronominal subject grammatical in this case. I repeat (14) as (19), also indicating the position that the pronominal subject would occupy – only that it cannot do so in this construction by my own judgement.

- (19) (*Én) *Jómagam sem pszichológus, sem biológus nem vagyok, ...*
 I myself neither psychologist nor biologist not am
 ‘As for myself, I am neither a psychologist, nor a biologist, ...’

In the corpus, there is one single example of nominative *jómagam* co-occurring with a pronominal subject. This is the single case I list as an instance of the intensifier use in Table 4., which I quote as (20):

- (20) *Én jómagam ... az ... utcá sorban kapt-am szállás-t.*
 I myself the street.row.in received-1SG accommodation-ACC
 ‘I myself got accommodated in the row of streets.’

⁹ A Google search at the time of the writing of this article found no instances of *jómaga* in translative case. This reinforces the fact that these forms are not just absent, but are truly ungrammatical.

¹⁰ This default can be overridden by other factors, as happens, for example, in the case of certain classes of psychological predicates whose experiencer is a non-subject argument.

I myself do not find this sentence acceptable. Whether it is an accidental performance error, or it is systematically acceptable for certain native speakers, is an issue that requires further investigation which I cannot perform here. In Rákosi (2011), I list some arguments supporting the subject analysis of *jómaga* in the absence of an overt pronominal subject, and I specifically argue against the intensifier analysis of these examples (which would include a covert pronominal subject). Thus, to some extent, I agree with the descriptive tradition, which takes *jómaga* to be some sort of a pronominal element. But that description, as I have tried to show here, is misleading in itself, because it fails to capture the fact that *jómaga* as a reflexive requires logophorically construed antecedents. It is neither a true pronoun nor a reflexive anaphor, but of a third category that shows a mixture of pronominal and anaphoric properties.

4 Conclusions

In this paper, I have conducted a corpus study of two complex Hungarian reflexives. I have tried to find corpus evidence for the claim that I made in earlier writings that treats one of these two complex forms, *jómaga*, as a special, discourse-licensed logophoric element. I performed a parallel corpus search of the two complex reflexives *önmaga* and *jómaga*, both of which translate into English as ‘himself’, to create a framework of comparison.

It has turned out that *önmaga* has a wide morphosyntactic distribution, including all the semantically possible case morphology. In sharp contrast, *jómaga* is dominantly used in first person singular only, and non-subject uses are rare. Thus even at the level of raw data, the difference between the two reflexives is obvious. I have tried to argue here that this difference between the two reflexives is not a matter of accidental variation in frequencies, but it follows from substantial differences in their grammar and specifically from the logophoric properties of *jómaga*. And in fact, the research situation is more complex than what this description may suggest at first, as the relation between the armchair and the corpus side of this case study is clearly not unidirectional. The corpus data provide further motivation for the linguistic analysis, and the linguistic analysis makes certain predictions about what we eventually find in the corpus. Furthermore, this study has also testified that not finding certain types of data in the corpus can be just as useful for the linguist in the sort of comparative frame that I have applied than finding some other types of data in large amounts.

References

- Fillmore, C. (1992): “Corpus linguistics” or “computer-aided armchair linguistics”. In: Svartvik, J. (ed.): *Directions in corpus linguistics. Proceedings of Nobel Symposium 82. Trends in Linguistics Studies and Monographs 65*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter, 35-60.
- Halácsy, P., Kornai, A., Németh, L., Rung, A., Szakadát, I. & Trón, V. (2004): Creating open language resources for Hungarian. In: *Proceedings of the 4th international conference on Language Resources and Evaluation (LREC2004)*.
- Keszler, B. (eds.)(2000): *Magyar Grammatika [Hungarian Grammar]*. Budapest: Nemzeti Tankönyvkiadó.

- Kornai, A., Halácsy, P., Nagy, V., Oravecz, Cs., Trón, V. & Varga, D. (2006): Web-based frequency dictionaries for medium density languages. In: Kilgarriff, A. & Baroni, M. (eds.): *Proceedings of the 2nd International Workshop on Web as Corpus*. ACL-06, 1-9.
- Rákosi, Gy. (2009a): 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. (2009b): Én, magam, önmagam [I, myself, my own self]. In: Maleczki, M. & Németh T., E. (eds.): *A mai magyar nyelv leírásának újabb módszerei VII. Modellek, elméletek és elvek érvényessége nyelvi adatok tükrében*. Szeged: SZTE Általános Nyelvészet Tanszék, 179-196.
- Rákosi, Gy. (2011): Összetett visszaható névmások a magyarban [Complex reflexive anaphors in Hungarian]. In: Bartos, H. (szerk.): *Általános Nyelvészeti Tanulmányok XXIII*. Budapest: Akadémiai Kiadó, 351-376.
- Reinhart, T. & Reuland, E. (1993): Reflexivity. *Linguistic Inquiry* 24.4, 657-720.
- Reuland, E. (2001): Primitives of Binding. *Linguistic Inquiry* 32.3, 439-492.

György Rákosi
University of Debrecen
Institute of English and American Studies
H-4010 Debrecen
Pf. 73
rakosi.gyorgy@arts.unideb.hu
rakosigy@hotmail.com