ABSTRACT

This paper presents a unified outlook on the syntax of constructions featuring the reflexive clitic SE in a variety of languages, with particular emphasis on the uniform morphosyntax of the Hungarian element -ik, treated here as an exponent of SE both in the verbal domain and in the nominal domain (esp. in ordinal numeral constructions). The syntactic analysis is couched in the syntax of predication proposed in Den Dikken (2006), with SE systematically represented as the subject of a reverse predication. This syntax delivers a compositional semantics for the range of verbal and nominal construction featuring SE, and provides precise explanations for the distribution of overt exponents of SE and its silent allomorph.

1 Introduction

When the Hungarian suffix -ik attaches to verbs, the result is very often an output which in many of the Indo-European languages would be rendered as a reflexive-marked anticausative or medio-passive construction. Thus, compare the Hungarian examples in (1)–(3) with the French sentences on the right-hand side.

### Hungarian

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(1)</th>
<th>a. János darabokra tör egy ablakot</th>
<th>French</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>János into.pieces breaks a window.ACC</td>
<td>Jean casse une fenêtre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>‘János is breaking a window into pieces’</td>
<td>Jean is breaking a window</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b.</td>
<td>egy ablak darabokra tör-ik</td>
<td>une fenêtre se casse</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>a window into.pieces break-ik</td>
<td>a window SE breaks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>‘a window is breaking/getting broken into pieces’</td>
<td>‘a window is breaking’</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(2)</th>
<th>a. János be-csuk egy ablakot</th>
<th>French</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>János VM-close a window.ACC</td>
<td>Jean ferme une fenêtre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>‘János is closing a window’</td>
<td>Jean closes a window</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b.</td>
<td>egy ablak be-csuk-ód-ik</td>
<td>une fenêtre se ferme</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>a window VM-close-ÓD-IK</td>
<td>a window SE closes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>‘a window is closing/getting closed’</td>
<td>‘a window is closing’</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(3)</th>
<th>a. János messziről lát egy tornyot</th>
<th>French</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>János from.afar sees a tower.ACC</td>
<td>Jean voit une tour de loin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>‘János sees a tower from afar’</td>
<td>Jean sees a tower from afar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b.</td>
<td>egy torony messziről lát-sz-ik</td>
<td>une tour se voit de loin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>a tower from.afar see-SZ-IK</td>
<td>a tower SE sees from afar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>‘a tower can be seen from afar’</td>
<td>‘a tower can be seen from afar’</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The Hungarian examples in (2b) and (3b) differ from their French counterparts in featuring not just the suffix -ik but also another suffix, surfacing between the verb stem and -ik. I will have little to say in this paper about this additional suffix — see Márkus (2015) and Halm (2018) for detailed discussion of the suffixes -Ód (surfacing as -őd or -őd) and -sz, which are plausibly treated as middle voice markers (see section 3.4, below, for some relevant discussion). The focus in this paper is on -ik, which I will assimilate directly to the French reflexive clitic se seen in the right-hand examples.

Hungarian -ik leads what appears to be a double life. In the nominal domain, -ik attaches to cardinal numerals in combination with -Öd (whose vowel has its quality determined by vowel harmony) to form ordinals (see (4)), and to certain quantifiers to form other quantifiers (as in (5)).

(4) a. negy-ed-ik
   four-OD-ik
   ‘fourth’

b. öt-őd-ik
   five-OD-ik
   ‘fifth’

c. hat-od-ik
   six-OD-ik
   ‘sixth’

(5) a. (mind)egy-ik
   every.one-ik
   ‘(each) one’

b. mely-ik
   which-ik
   ‘which’

c. {vala/né}mely-ik
   Q-which-ik
   ‘some’

One of my central claims in this paper is that the -ik seen in (4) and (5) is not a homophone morphosyntactically unrelated to the -ik seen in the b–examples in (1)–(3) but in fact the very same morpheme. A unified analysis of -ik has never been attempted, as far as I am aware. Drawing upon hitherto unidentified connections between Hungarian -ik forms and the morphosyntax of ordinals and reflexivisation in Indo-European, this paper presents a unified approach arguing that -ik is systematically a reflexive clitic (SE) serving as a subject of predication — more particularly, a reverse predication in the sense of Den Dikken (2006).

2 Ordinals

The idea that Hungarian -ik is a reflexive morpheme not just in its verbal guise but in the morphosyntax of ordinal numerals and certain quantifiers as well to my knowledge finds no authoritative endorsement in the literature on Hungarian or Uralic. For Indo-European, what I am about to discuss is also by no means part of the standard canon of morphological analysis. Readers are invited to put their initial skepticism on hold, and to judge the conclusions reached at the end of this section after taking in the entire spectrum of facts, which, taken together (though probably not on an individual basis) make what I think is a solid plausibility argument for the idea that ordinal numerals in all of the languages reviewed in this section involve reflexive morphology, and that the presence of reflexive morphology in ordinals gives rise to a morphosyntax that delivers a sensible perspective on the semantics of ordinal numerals.

2.1 Dutch

For the morphosyntax of ordinal numerals, the facts of Dutch are especially illuminating.
2.1.1 Preamble: ‘Same’

Before analysing the morphosyntax of Dutch ordinals, however, it will be very helpful to set the stage by investigating the Dutch semantic equivalent of English *same*, which has a constitution that turns out to be both very similar to and exemplary for the structure of ordinals in the language.

In standard Dutch, English *same* is rendered by *zelf* ‘self’ plus the invariant suffix -de, this combination being preceded in turn an overt article (usually the definite article, but the indefinite article is possible as well, in which case the string is best translated into English with *similar*):

(6) a. de/een zelf-de man
   the\textsubscript{CG}/a self-SFX man\textsubscript{CG}
   ‘the same/a similar man’

   b. het/een zelf-de kind
   the\textsubscript{NT}/a self-SFX child\textsubscript{NT}
   ‘the same/a similar child’

Note the resemblance between the suffix -de attached to *zelf* and the common-gender (‘CG’) definite article *de*. This will be important in what follows. But it will also be essential to realise that this suffix does not covary in form with the gender features of the head noun: while neuter *kind* ‘child’ takes the article *het* ‘the\textsubscript{NT}’ (where ‘NT’ stands for neuter), the suffix attached to *zelf* is always -de.

The composition of the standard Dutch rendition of English *same* is already quite interesting. But in historical and regional varieties of the language the expression corresponding to *same* can be quite a bit more complex still. (7) presents the richest form attested:

(7) a. de/een zelf -d -s -te man
   the\textsubscript{CG}/a SELF man
   ‘the same/a similar man’

   b. het/een zelf -d -s -te kind
   the\textsubscript{NT}/a SELF child
   ‘the same/a similar child’

In (7), *zelf* is followed by three elements for which it is plausible to treat them as spell-outs of heads of syntactic phrase-markers: -d, -s and -te. I will argue in the following paragraphs that -d and -te are instantiations of the same element, with the same function in each of its occurrences (viz., a RELATOR of a predication relationship in syntax), and that -s is a reflexive clitic.

---

1 Below are some historical and regional citations for *zelfdste*:

(i) mijn Heer B. D. R. gelooft met reden, dat het zelfdste zoude zijn te Cayenne (1781)
   ‘Mr B. D. R. believes with reason that it would be the same in Cayenne’

(ii) het is alleenlyk een zuiverer mate van die allerzelfdste aandoeninge, welke wy dikwils in onze zielen koesteren voor de waardigste voorwerpen van ons eigen soort (1784)
   ‘but it is only a pure degree of that same affliction which we often cherish in our souls for the worthiest specimens of our own sort’

(iii) bij den directeur ‘t zelfdste lolleke: uuk weer een souflett’ op diene kleine zijn koake en hij vliegt naar huis (2014, Ghent dialect)
   ‘the same joke at the director’s place: again a slap on that little one’s jaws and he dashes off home’

(iv) da zijn die zelfdste gasten die een WK of een EK naar België/Holland willen brenge (2019, unknown location in Belgium)
   ‘it is the same fellas who want to bring a World or European Championship to Belgium/Holland’

One also finds *zelveste*. The underlined schwa here could either be a case inflection of *zelf* or a reduction of -de to schwa.
An analysis of the s of (7) as a reflexive clitic (SE) serving as the subject of predication for *zelf* suggests itself straightforwardly (cf. *zich-zelf* ‘SE-SELF’ and Spanish *sí mismo* ‘SE SELF’). In (7), an attributive relation is established between *SELF* and SE, comparable to English *self-same* (with the *s* in *same* perhaps being reflexive, too; cf. Dutch *samen* ‘together’). This attributive relation is a case of predication — more particularly, reverse predication in the sense of Den Dikken (2006), in which the subject of predication appears in the complement position of the RELATOR of the predication relationship, and the predicate is in the specifier position of the RELATOR phrase: see (8b), the reverse counterpart to the canonical subject–predicate relationship in (8a).

(8)  
\[ \begin{align*}  
\text{a. } & [\text{RP SUBJECT } [R \text{ RELATOR } [\text{PREDICATE}]])] \\
\text{b. } & [\text{RP PREDICATE } [R \text{ RELATOR } [\text{SUBJECT}]])] 
\end{align*} \]

The RELATOR of the attributive/reverse predication relationship between *SELF* and SE has an overt exponent in the Dutch examples in (7): *d*, the onset of the Dutch definite article (see Den Dikken 2006:Chapter 5 on articles as spell-outs of RELATORs). The reverse predication structure \( [\text{RP self-d-s}] \) is in turn construed as an attribute to the projection of the head noun (*man/\textit{kind} ‘man/child’), in a second reverse predication structure whose subject is the projection of the head noun, with the predication relation once again mediated by a token of the definite article spelling out the RELATOR: \( te=de. \) (9) sums this up.

(9)  
\[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{DP} \\
\text{D de/het een} \\
\text{DE HET GEEN} \\
\text{PREDICATE} \\
\text{SELF zelf} \\
\text{R} \\
\text{R'} \\
\text{R} \\
\text{NP} \\
\text{man/\textit{kind}}
\end{array}
\]

Just as in the familiar alternation between the simple reflexive *zich* and the complex reflexive *zichzelf*, seen in pairs such as *Jan bezeerde zich* ‘Jan hurt himself (accidentally)’ and *Jan bezeerde zichzelf* ‘Jan hurt himself (not someone else)’, attributive *zelf* in (9) strengthens the reflexive clitic that it modifies, focusing on the reflexivity. In (9) this yields an interpretation equivalent to that of English *self-same*. Because of the fact that the predication relation between *SELF* and SE is unsaturated within RP\(_1\) (due to the fact that SE does not get its reference determined inside RP\(_1\)), this predication structure subsequently serves as the predicate of a projection of the head noun, *man/\textit{kind} ‘man/child’, yielding an interpretation which can be paraphrased clumsily as ‘\textit{man/child i who is the self-same one}’. The semantics of (9) is entirely compositional.

2 The voicelessness of the alveolar stop is phonologically conditioned by the preceding clitic *s* (see also fn. 6, below). In standard Dutch (6), the surface exponent of R\(_2\) is *-de*, as in the underlying syntactic representation in (9). The fact that *-de* is not devoiced to *-te* (as it is in (7)) is due to the fact that the phonological form for *SELF* underlyingly ends in a voiced fricative (cf. archaic *zelve*, and *doe-het-zelven* ‘to engage in DIY activities’). There is no trigger for devoicing of *-de* to *-te* in (6), therefore — unlike in (7), where the host of *-de* is the underlyingly voiceless reflexive clitic *s*. 

---

Marcel den Dikken — Ordinals, reflexives and medio-passives: Unification by predication

4
The morphophonology of (9) raises a few questions regarding the exponents of the two RELATOR heads in the structure. R₂ in (9) is invariably spelled out as -de (> -te), even when the subject of predication is a neuter noun (here kind ‘child’; see (i) and (iii) in fn. 1 for attested examples of the relevant sort). Dutch is standardly assumed to have two definite articles: common-gender de and neuter-singular het. The choice between them is, again standardly, taken to be determined by a feature-matching relationship between the article and the head noun. Configurationally, there ought to be nothing wrong with a feature-matching relationship between R₂ and the subject of predication. But R₂ is invariant in its exponence. The puzzle readily unravels if we deny that Dutch has two definite articles — common-gender de is the language’s only article; het is not an article but a pronoun, restricted to occur in D (Postal 1964) when and only when the head noun is specified as [NEUTER], in which case de (a competitor for the D-slot) cannot be used. We know independently that het is usable as a pronoun (ik heb het genoteerd ‘I have jotted it down’) whereas de cannot be so used. The idea that, of the two complementary forms de and het, only the former is an article at the same time cleans up the landscape of Dutch definite articles and (in conjunction with the hypothesis that articles but not pronouns can serve as RELATORS) helps us account for the fact that R₂ is invariant.

The fact that R₂ is invariant entails that the schwa that follows the onset consonant of the element -te in R₂ cannot be analysed as ϕ-feature inflection. This is also apparent from the fact that this schwa shows up in the indefinite version of (7b): in indefinite singulars with a neuter head noun, the ϕ-inflectional schwa never shows up on attributive modifiers (een stout(*e) kind ‘a naughty child’), but it does show up on zelfdste in indefinite (7b). But although the schwa following the onset consonant in the spell-out of R₂ is not an agreement morpheme, it probably does have morphemic status, not just here but in its use as part of the definite article de as well: the schwa is a member of a melodic cluster representing spatial and temporal deixis, with /å–a/ (in dat ‘that’, dan ‘then’, daar ‘(over) there’) for distality, /t–i/ (in dit ‘this’, hier ‘here’) for proximality, and /ø/ (in de ‘the’, er ‘there’) for ‘neutrality’. Assuming morphemic status for the schwa of de leads us to ask how this deixis morpheme is structurally related to the other element of which de is composed, the d. In light of the fact that the distribution of the marker de indicates that de does not always signal definiteness (as shown already by the occurrence of de as a RELATOR in outwardly indefinite een zelfde N ‘a similar N’ and een vierde N ‘a fourth N’; cf. also een euro de man ‘a euro the (i.e., per) man’, een euro de meter ‘a euro the (i.e., per) metre’, één op de vier ‘one in four’), I take d not to be the head of the form de — rather, d is an adjunct to the schwa, which serves as the head: [Dx [d] [Dx e]].

The conclusion that de is a constituent with the label ‘Dx’ (‘deixis’) is helpful not only in understanding the fact that de can function as a RELATOR of predication relations (‘placing’ the predication in space and time) but also in finding an explanation for the fact that R₁, the RELATOR of the reverse predication relation between zelf and SE=s, can be spelled out only by the onset of the Dutch definite article, d. Why is the schwa that occurs in the definite article de ‘the’ and also in the spell-out of R₂ necessarily absent from the exponent of R₁? I would like to argue that this is a direct consequence of the fact that R₁ in (9) licenses the clitic SE=s by serving as its host. The clitic s is a syntactic enclitic: it right-adjoins to its syntactic host. Kayne’s (1994) Linear Correspondence Axiom explicitly proscribes the right-adjunction of material to an overt host, based on considerations concerning the linearisation of the outputs of syntactic derivations:

(10) syntactic right-adjunction of overt material to an overt host is illicit
So whenever the host of the enclitic s is overt, the output [HOST–CL] is underivable. A straightforward solution presents itself, however: the linearisation problem with right-adjunction of s to its host arises only when the host is itself overt; in the absence of a phonological matrix for the host, the adjunction structure [HOST–CL] is readily linearised. It follows that in the structure in (9), where R₁ is the syntactic host for the enclitic s, the head of the exponent of R₁ must be silent. This is what is responsible for the fact that no schwa occurs between d and s in the forms in (7). Non-exponence of the head of [DX [d] [DX e]] is resorted to only when exponence would result in a violation of (10) or some other ingredient of the grammar. So R₂ and the definite article in D are spelled out as de.

The morphology of standard Dutch (6) differs from that of historical and regional (7) in two respects: it lacks the exponents of R₁ and SE in (9). Syntactically, this could indicate either that the structure of ‘same’ is simpler in the standard language than in the varieties that have (7), with self predicated directly of the projection of the head noun, or that the syntaxes of (6) and (7) are identical but the standard variety both leaves R₁ and the reflexive clitic unpronounced. My perspective on this is that the latter option is likely correct (so that the semantics of ‘same’ remains unaffected), and that the two morphological differences between (6) and (7) are intimately related: with R₁ left entirely silent, there is no host for an overt clitic serving as the exponent of SE, so SE must remain silent whenever R₁ is left completely unpronounced. The hypothesis that the syntax of ‘same’ is invariably the one shown in (9) has the advantage of connecting the surface absence of -d and that of s in (6).

2.1.2 Ordinals

The morphological patterns found for Dutch ordinals very closely resemble the ones attested for the equivalent of English same — in fact, the resemblance is so close that it is eminently plausible to assume that the two have the same morphological constitution. In the standard language, ordinals are generally derived from the corresponding cardinals via the suffixation of invariant -de (see (11)), the same suffix we found in (6).

(11) a. de/een vier-de man
    theCG/a four-SFX manCG
    ‘the/a fourth man’

b. het/een vier-de kind
    theNT/a four-SFX childNT
    ‘the/a fourth child’

And as in the case of the rendition of English same, Dutch ordinals can be extraordinarily complex in historical and regional varieties, as seen in (12).

3 Elision of the schwa of the definite article happens in Flemish varieties in front of an onsetless word, as in family names such as D’Haen ‘the rooster’ or D’Hondt ‘the dog’ (orthographic h is unpronounced in Flemish). I take this to be a low-level phonological process. In the (historic) name of the Amsterdam restaurant D’Vijff Vlieghen ‘the five flies’, the apostrophe suggests schwa elision before a following consonant, but the (synchronic) pronunciation delivers a schwa.

4 For discussion of the morphosyntax of Dutch ordinals, see esp. Sleeman (20xx); she does not mention the forms in (12), however. There are three main exceptions to the general rule for standard Dutch that ordinals are formed via suffixation of invariant -de to the cardinal numeral: the equivalents of English first, eighth, and ordinals for tens (≥20), hundreds, thousands and beyond. All the ordinals in (i)–(iii) feature the string -ste suffixed to the cardinal — the same string that also forms the superlative of adjectives. While eerste ‘first’ is plausibly analysed as a superlative (cf. comparative eerder; see Barbiers xxxx), the forms in (ii) and (iii) are not. Though I cannot pursue this here, I would support any attempt to carry the text discussion of the s of (12) over to the morphosyntax of the superlative in -ste, with s=SE.
The *Woordenboek der Nederlandse Taal* (the official dictionary of Dutch), *s.l.* -ste, explicitly mentions *vierdste* (alongside *tweedste* ‘second’), calling it a mix of -ste and -de, the latter the marker of ordinals in the standard language. Indeed, *vierdste* combines all three elements for which I argued in section 2.1.1, for *zelfdste* ‘same’, that they are exponents of heads of syntactic phrase markers: -d, -s and -te. And as in the case of (7), the forms -de/-te in (11) and (12) are insensitive to the gender specification of the head noun (*een vierd*(e) stout(*e) kind ‘a fourth naughty child’), hence the schwa cannot be treated as ø-inflection.

With an analysis of -d, -s and -te in (7) already on the table, a morphosyntax for the ordinals in (12) readily suggests itself, running entirely parallel to the one in (9): *vier* ‘four’ substitutes for *zelf* ‘SELF’ and likewise serves as the predicate of the reflexive clitic *s* coindexed with the head noun. The semantics for the syntax in (13) is once again compositional. The cardinal numeral is predicated of a reflexive pronoun coreferent with the head noun, delivering ‘the one that is #4’ as the interpretation of RP₁. Because, as in (9), the predication relation established inside RP₁ is not fully saturated, RP₁ is construed as the predicate of a projection of the head noun, man/child. The resulting interpretation can be paraphrased in a way entirely parallel to the one for (9), as ‘man/child (who is) the one, that is #4’. For standard Dutch (11), I again postulate the same structure, with R₁ and (concomitantly) SE unpronounced: simplifying the syntax of (11) to a direct predication relation between the numeral and the head-NP would not deliver the semantics of an ordinal numeral.

---

5 About -de, the WNT only says that it goes back to Indo-Germanic *-tjo*, which is uninformative from a present-day syntactic point of view.

6 The /s/ of *zes* ‘six’ does not trigger devoicing of -de in standard Dutch *zes-de* ‘sixth’ because too much structure intervenes between this /s/ and R₂. The fact that SE=s does consistently devoice the onset of the exponent of R₂ may, in this light, provide evidence that SE=s in (13) (and in (9), too) is phonologically a proclitic (on R₂) rather than an enclitic.
The complex forms in (12) are strictly a feature of historical and dialectal Dutch when the ordinal occurs in attributive position. But when used predicatively in copular sentences, ordinals bear s in present-day Dutch in a wider geographical range than the one in which attributive (12) can be found. Especially in child-Dutch, expressions of the type in (14a,b) are not confined to specific regions.

(14)  a. ik was twee-d-s
      I was two-DE-SE

   b. ik was twee-d-s-t
      I was two-DE-SE-DE
      both: ‘I was second/in second place’

(14a) is straightforwardly analysed, in light of (13), as the construal of RP₁ as the predicate of a canonical predication structure whose subject is the pronoun ik ‘I’. For (14b), which features the additional coronal stop that in (13) was treated as part of the RELATOR of RP₂, we need a more complex syntactic representation — one in which we are probably dealing with a construal of the ordinal RP₁ as an attributive modifier of a silent NP (possibly contained in turn in an empty-headed PP; cf. *in second place).

Note that (14c) is not attested (as far as I am aware).

(14)  c. *ik was twee-d-s-te
      I was two-DE-SE-DE

This suggests, in light of the discussion in the previous paragraph, that when construed with a silent noun (phrase), the schwa that is otherwise an integral part of R₂ in (13) cannot surface. This is probably related to the reason why no schwa surfaces under R₁. Recall from section 2.1.1 that R₁ licenses the enclitic SE, and in order to be able to do so (in keeping with (10)), the head of the exponent of R₂ must be silent, which prevents a schwa from surfacing. Now consider the situation we find ourselves in when the NP in the complement of R₂ is silent. A silent NP requires licensing — we know this from the literature on ellipsis in noun phrases: (15).

(15)  a. John likes his car, but Mary doesn’t like hers ___

   b. *John likes his car, but Mary doesn’t like her ___

   c. *John likes his car, but Mary doesn’t like the ___

It would take me too far afield to go through the licensing conditions on silent NPs in detail. I will focus here on the fact that the definite article (in English as well as in Dutch) is incapable of licensing the silence of its complement (*the/de __). What I take this to mean (in light of the discussion of the composition of the definite article in section 2.1.1) is that the head Dx⁰ sanctions a silent complement provided that it itself has no overt exponent. Phrased in terms of Saito & Murasugi’s (19xx) and Lobeck’s (19xx) proposals, according to which a head needs to be in a Spec–Head agreement relation with something in order to be able to license ellipsis of its complement (see also Den Dikken & Griffiths, to appear), the fact that Dx=/a/ does not sanction a silent NP has the same cause as the fact that the complementiser that does not license a silent TP: these overt non-agreeing
heads are incapable of engaging in a Spec–Head agreement relation. By contrast, a null C-head in Spec–Head agreement with a wh-constituent in SpecCP does make TP ellipsis grammatical (‘sluicing’). And by the same token, while Dx=/ə/ does not, silent Dx does allow a silent noun phrase in its complement — hence the contrast between (14b) and (14c).7

The idea that d and te in ordinals are definite articles exponing RELATOR heads may receive support from the ancestry of the Greek and Latin ordinals, discussed in the next subsection.

2.2 Proto-Indo-European, Greek, Latin and its modern descendants

By consensus (see Sihler 1995, Nishimura xxxx and references cited there), the reconstructed Proto-Indo-European form of the ordinal ‘10th’ is (16a). It is widely assumed that the segmentation of this form was reanalysed as (16b) at a later stage, with Greek (16c) analysed as indicated, the tau serving as the exponent of a morpheme of its own (-ö, the vowel subject to elision) between the cardinal numeral and the adjectival gender suffix.

(16) a. *dekm-ó
b. *dekm-tó
c. δέκα-τ-οζ_Μ
   δέκα-τ-η_Ρ
   δέκα-τ-ον_ΝΤ
   ‘tenth’

7 The absence of schwa in (14c) cannot be attributed to the hypothesis that the ordinal serves as the predicate of a canonical predication structure. Though it is true that adjectival predicates of canonical predication structures in Dutch always lack the inflectional schwa that shows up on attributive adjectives, I already pointed out in section 2.1.1 and again just (12), above, that the schwa of Dutch ‘same’ and attributively used ordinals cannot be analysed as an inflectional schwa because it surfaces even in indefinite singulars with a neuter head noun, where attributive modifiers do not schwa-inflect.

Note that the schwa of ordinals is optional in expressions of the type in (i), the closest Dutch renditions of English the second/third/fourth largest N. In German, the schwa is obligatorily absent here: der zweit/dritt/viertgrößte N. The ordinal in these German expressions forms a compound with the superlative adjective. It is possible that in the schwa-less versions of Dutch (i) we are also dealing with a compound — but this would only account for the absence of schwa if this schwa were an inflectional morpheme, which is not how the text has treated the schwa in question. A tentative suggestion that I would like to advance regarding schwa-less (i) is that the ordinal here, as in (14b), combines with a silent noun (‘(in) second/third/fourth PLACE largest’), and that the licensing of this silence requires absence of schwa (as in the text account of (14b,c)). (Though I marginally accept both versions of (i), I find them to have the rather clumsy status of direct transpositions of the English and German equivalents. In my Dutch, the natural way to render the second/third/fourth largest N is as follows: de op één/twee/drie na grootste N ‘the largest-but-one/two/three N’.)

(i) de tweed(e)/derd(e)/vierd(e) grootste N
the second/third/fourth largest

Also relevant in connection with schwa distribution in ordinals is the fact that in Dutch superlatives (which otherwise must feature a schwa in the string A-ste), the schwa must be absent in (ii). Though this paper is not about superlatives, I suggest that an approach to schwa absence in terms of the licensing of a silent N is again plausible here: ‘to the greatest EXTENT possible’.

(ii) de grootst(*e) mogelijke N
the largest possible
In light of the discussion of the Dutch facts in section 2.1, it is sensible to take the τ(ό) of Greek δέκατος to represent an article (τό is the neuter singular definite article of Greek) whose function it is to serve as a RELATOR of a predication relation — particularly, the predication relation between the cardinal numeral and a silent form of the reflexive clitic, R₁ in (13). Since the reflexive clitic does not have a gender specification, the article in R₁ has neuter gender by default. The RELATOR of the higher predication relation, R₂, is presumably exponed by the gender-inflected material following τ(ό) in (16c).

While in Greek the reflexive clitic that serves as the subject of the numeral does not appear to be overtly realised, in Latin and some of its modern descendants (incl. Italian), the ordinal numerals from 20 contain a string identical with the reflexive clitic: the italicised si in (17).

Latin & Italian  
(17) | a. viginti ~ vice(n)simus/vigesimus | venti ~ ventesimo  
20   | twenty                          | twenty                  
     | tricentum ~ tricentesimus       | cento ~ centesimo       
30   | trenta                           | thirty                  
     | quadriginta ~ quadragessimus     | quaranta ~ quantentesimo 
40   | quaranta                         | fortieth                
     | quadragesimus                    | fortieth                
     | centum ~ centesimus              | cento ~ centesimo       
100  | centum                           | hundred                 
     | mille ~ mille(n)simus            | mille ~ mille           
1000 | mille                            | thousand                 

The string si in (17) is not usually given morphemic status — let alone linked to the reflexive. The Latin forms vice(n)simus and tricentum are usually thought to be ‘remodelings of earlier *vīcēnsos and *trīkēnsos’ (Sihler 1995:433, New comparative grammar of Greek and Latin, OUP). These forms in turn have a complex ancestry, along the lines of (18).

(18) | a. vice(n)simus < *vīcēnsos < *wīkm't-tó < *wīkm't-tó < *wīkm-tó < *wīkm-tó | venti < *ventesimo  
     | b. tricentum < *trīkēnsos < *trīkēnt-tó < *trīkēnt-tó < *trīkēnt-tó < *trīkēnt-tó | venti < *ventesimo 

The earliest reconstructed forms of these ordinals, *wīkm't-ó/*trīkēnt-ó, was prone, via resegmentation, to a reanalysis as *wīkm'-tó/*trīkēnt-Ó, which is supposed to have led to the identification of -tó as a suffix (recall the discussion of Greek δέκατος ‘tenth’ at the beginning of this section). This suffix was itself attachable to the older forms ending in t, yielding *wīkm'-tó/*trīkēnt-ó, which by Proto Indo-European sound laws governing clusters of apical stops underwent s-epenthesis between the two t’s to deliver *wīkm't-tó and *trīkēnt-tó (Sihler 1995:433). The -m in the Latin and Italian forms in (17) is assumed to be a descendant of reconstructed *-mo, usually taken to be the sign of the ordinal,⁸ perhaps having its roots in the ordinal for 7, *septm.

⁸ And also of the superlative. I already mentioned in fn. 4 and 6 that the Dutch superlative likewise has a surface complexity that mimics to a certain extent that of the forms in (7) and (12): klein-s-te ‘small-se-de’. What the role of the reflexive clitic se in the semantics of the superlative might be, and how the morphosyntax of superlatives comes about are questions I cannot delve into here. See Bobaljik (200x) for important work on comparative and superlative formation.
By this account, the s of the forms in (17) is not a ‘deep’ ingredient of their constitution. However, once si firmly established itself as an integral part of all the ordinals from 20 onwards, a natural development (diachronic reanalysis) is for it to gain morphemic status, and to be treated on a par with other morphemic occurrences of si — in particular, the reflexive morpheme. There is no claim being made in this paper that the si of the ordinal numerals in (17) was already functioning as a reflexive morpheme in the earliest Latin records. Rather, the claim is that si WAS so analysed at a certain point in the historical development of the language, leading to a particular syntactic structure for ordinals which the modern Romance languages have inherited.

With si thus identified as a morphemic subpart of Latin and Italian ordinals, we have the three key ingredients in place for an analysis of these ordinals along the lines of (13), arrived at for Dutch: the cardinal numeral serves as the reverse predicate for reflexive si, and the predication structure thus created is the reverse predicate for the projection of the head noun. What remains to be determined is where to fit in the element -m(o), another integral part of the ordinals of Latin and Italian. My proposal for -m(o) is that it is the spell-out of a RELATOR head — more particularly, the exponent of R₂, the mediator of the predication relation established between RP₁ and the projection of the head noun: only by treating -m(o) as the surface realisation of this RELATOR can we account for the linear string of markers found in (14), with the cardinal preceding R₁, the reflexive clitic si procliticising (at PF) to R₂=−m (which gender inflects for the φ-features of the head noun under Agree), and -m+φ in turn being followed by the projection of the head noun. The structure in (19) sums up the structure of the ordinal numerals of Latin and Italian (for the particular case of ‘100th’).

(19)

2.3 Hungarian

According to É. Kiss (2018:97), the first occurrences of ordinals marked with -ik in the historical record date back to around 1500. (20a) is an example from the Festetics Codex of 1494; (20b) is a present-day Hungarian example. I would like to argue that this -ik is the exponent of the reflexive clitic SE in the structure of ordinal numerals presented in the foregoing.

9. I am not prepared at this point to argue for morphemic status for the n in vice(n)simus, trice(n)simus. If it should turn out to be a morpheme in its own right, there is a natural home for it in (19): R₁. Since R₁ is otherwise silent in the structure of Latin/Italian ordinals, si cannot use R₁ as its phonological host. But for the Romance reflexive clitic, this is not a problem: si is a phonological proclitic on finite verbs.

10. Before this, Hungarian ordinals were non-distinct from fractions (on which, see below in the main text).
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(20) a. harm-ad-yk psalmus
    three-OD-ik psalm
    ‘the third psalm’

b. a negy-ed-ik ember
    the four-OD-ik person
    ‘the fourth person’

This -ik is enclitic on -Od, which immediately follows the cardinal numeral. Outside ordinals, the combination of -Od (whose vowel has its quality conditioned by vowel harmony) and -ik occurs in what appears to be a completely unrelated context, in forms such as világosodik ‘lighten up, brighten’, sötétedik ‘darken’, vörösödik ‘redden’. We will see in section 3 that there is in fact a genuine relationship between these forms. But it would be a distraction to jump straight into this at the deep end at this time. For now, what will be more informative is the fact that the suffix -Od by itself (i.e., without -ik), when attaching to cardinal numerals, forms fractions:

(21) a. az út egynegy-ed-e
    the way onefour-OD-POSS
    ‘one fourth of the way’

b. három negy-ed
    three four-OD
    ‘three fourths/quarters’

In Dutch, fractions feature a by now familiar piece of morphology: the element *de, seen in all three examples in (22). With numerals below 20 (with the exception of acht ‘eight’, mentioned previously in fn. 4 as an exception to the regular pattern for ordinal formation up to 20), the suffix *de to my knowledge never combines with -s to form fractions of the morphologically complex type seen in ordinals such as those in (12).

(22) a. één vier-de van de weg *vier-d-s-te
    one four-DE of the way
    ‘one fourth of the way’

b. drie vier-de(-n) van alle Nederlanders *vier-d-s-te(-n)
    three four-DE-PL of all Dutchmen
    ‘three fourths/quarters of all Dutchmen’

c. drie op/van de vier Nederlanders
    three on/of the four Dutchmen
    ‘three in/out of four Dutchmen’

In light of the foregoing discussion this means that the *de seen in fractions is the lexicalisation of the RELATOR of a predication relationship not involving a reflexive clitic as the subject of predication.\(^\text{11}\)

11 The syntactic relationship between (22b) and (22c) is an interesting topic for future investigation. It seems to me highly plausible to treat the *de found in both patterns on a par, as a RELATOR of a predication relation. In (22c), this predication appears to be of the canonical type, with the numeral appearing to the right of *de. Fitting the preposition op
If we treat Hungarian -Od, which distributes like Dutch -de, the same way, this entails for the morphosyntax of Hungarian ordinals that the -Od we see in (20) is the exponent of R2, taking the projection of the head noun ember ‘man’ as its complement. Alternatively, -Od could be treated as an integral part of the structure occupying the specifier position of RP1, with R2 remaining silent. These two alternative outlooks on -Od are juxtaposed in the structures in (23a,b).

(23) a.

With -Od under R2, the structure in (23a) is rather difficult to reconcile with the linear string of morphemes seen in (20): -ik and -Od would have to metathesise via some independently accepted mechanism. Perhaps a local dislocation rule from the toolbox of Distributed Morphology could come to the rescue here. The alternative in (23b), which treats -Od as an integral part of the specifier of RP1, eschews this complication. I am not prepared at this time to force a decision on one of these versions of the analysis of (20). For our purposes here, what we have in place will do. In both approaches encapsulated in (23), R1 is empty, which is good news for -ik, allowing it to cliticise to R1 without flouting (10).

Though the precise status of -Od remains to be investigated further, the most important thing to take away from the discussion in this section so far is that the exponent of the reflexive clitic in the syntax of ordinals in Hungarian is -ik. É. Kiss (2018) argues that the -ik of ordinals and attributive comparatives is the product of a historical reanalysis of an allomorph of third person ‘on’ into the structure for (22c) and accounting for its absence in (22b) is not a straightforward matter. The fact that van ‘of’ can be used in alternation with op ‘on’ in (22c) suggests a link with possessive structures, which introduces further complications. I have no perspective on these matters at present, and will not pursue the syntax of fractions further here.
plural possessive marking into a partitive suffix. In my syntactic structures in (23), the relationship within RP₂ between the predicate (RP₁) and the subject (NP) can readily be understood partitively: not only is partitivity a natural interpretation for the set-intersection relationship that is predication, but the meanings of ‘the person who is the #4’ (my earlier paraphrase of the syntax of ordinal numeral constructions) and ‘the #4 of/among the people’ are equivalent as well.

From the 17th century, -ik is also found on certain quantifiers (incl. (mind)egy-ik ‘(each) one’, mely-ik ‘which’, valamely-ik ‘some’, minden-ik ‘each’). For the quantifiers on which -ik occurs, it seems to me that a syntax entirely parallel to (23) can be upheld, with -ik once again as a reflexive subject of reverse predication. The semantics emerging from the structure in (23b) with minden ‘every’ in the position of negy-Od is paraphrasable as ‘every one, (= SE) of the people,’ (with the relationship between RP₁ and NP understood partitively). É. Kiss’s (2018:92–93) observation that a tanszékünkön minden-ik férfi szakállas ‘in our department every-ik man (is) bearded’ is fine while in generic statements such as minden(“-ik) ember halandó ‘every-ik person (is) mortal’ the use of -ik is very awkward fits in with this: ‘every one, (= SE) of the men,’ makes sense in the former, not in the latter.

The outlook on -ik as a reflexive clitic thus offers us good mileage on the Hungarian facts in the nominal domain, for ordinals and quantifiers alike.

3 Unaccusatives, anticausatives and medio-passives

The -ik of Hungarian unaccusative, anticausative and medio-passive ikes igék ‘ik-verbs’ such as érkez-ik ‘arrive’, tör-ik ‘break’, csuk-ód-ik ‘close’ and lát-sz-ik ‘be visible’ is (descended from) a 3SG reflexive element (Balázs 2001, Sárosi 2003), similar to SE in Indo-European. This facilitates an assimilation of the -ik found in the morphology of Hungarian ordinal numerals (and quantifiers) and the -ik found on verbs. Both spell out SE and serve as subjects of a reverse predication. In present-day Hungarian, -ik can still serve a reflexive function, as in (24a), analysed as in (24b),13 with SE (the subject of predication) coindexed with the raised internal argument, delivering a reflexive predication structure.

(24) a. János borotválkoz-ik
    János shave-IK
    ‘János is shaving himself’

12 É. Kiss (2018) also observes that around the same time at which this -ik emerges in ordinals (c. 1500), -ik also starts showing up on attributive comparatives (az kisseb-ic fia ‘the smaller-ik son’ [Guary Codex, 1495]; a szebb-ik-et megtartom ‘the nicer-ik-ACC I keep’). A partitive interpretation for this use of -ik is again plausible: ‘the son who is the smaller one’ = ‘the smaller one of the sons’. From the perspective of the earlier discussion of Dutch and Latin/Italian about the parallels between ordinals and superlatives, it is interesting to see that in Hungarian the distribution of -ik in ordinals and attributive comparatives historically runs along very similar lines.

13 The suffix -koz/kez/köz seen in borotválkoz is customarily glossed as a reflexivising morpheme. I treat it here as an integral part of the VP predicate, marking it as reflexive, in the sense of Reinhart & Reuland’s (1993) work (to which I subscribe; see Den Dikken 2019 for my reasons for endorsing a predicate-based theory of reflexivity).

This may be a good moment to raise an issue arising for Reinhart & Reuland’s theory of reflexivisation from all analyses of reflexive SE-constructions dating back to Kayne (1989), treating the reflexive clitic as the subject of predication: by being the subject, the clitic cannot reflexive-mark the reflexive predicate, in apparent violation of the requirement that a reflexive predicate be reflexive-marked. My hypothesis is that the predicate in reflexive SE-constructions is always reflexive-marked by an element in VP — in the case of Hungarian borotválkoz-ik, overtly so, by the suffix -koz.
In the syntax of unaccusatives, anticausatives and medio-passives, this SE is semantically coindexed with the event denoted by the VP, which is thus said to come about all by itself. SE φ-agrees with the surface subject, the closest c-commanding element bearing φ-features. The tree in (25b) illustrates.\(^{14}\)

(25) a. a vonat érkez-ik
   the train arrive-ik
   ‘the train is arriving’

b.\[\[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{DP} \\
\text{T} \\
\text{RP} \\
\text{VP} \\
\text{SUBJECT}
\end{array}
\]

\[
\begin{array}{c}
a \text{vonat} \\
\text{T} \\
\text{PREDICATE} \\
\text{érkez} \\
\text{SE}_{i} \\
\text{-ik}
\end{array}
\]

The structures in (24b) and (25b) globally match the syntax of periphrastic passives as proposed in Den Dikken (2019) — see (26b), for the English passive in (26a).

(26) a. the train is built by Bombardier

b.\[\[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{DP} \\
\text{T} \\
\text{RP} \\
\text{VP} \\
\text{SUBJECT}
\end{array}
\]

\[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{the \ train} \\
\text{T} \\
\text{is} \\
\text{PREDICATE} \\
\text{built \ by} \\
\text{Bombardier}
\end{array}
\]

\(^{14}\) In the syntax of both (24b) and (25b), -ik encliticises to T first (see the discussion in the last paragraph of this section); subsequently, V raises to T, left-adjoining to it.
In all these structures, the main verb’s VP is engaged in a reverse predication relationship, and its internal argument is promoted to structural subject. There is an important difference, however, between the derivations based on (24b) and (25b), on the one hand, and (21b), on the other: while the passive in (26) calls for auxiliation, the main verb in (24) and (25) amalgamates with finite verbal morphology itself. What is the root of this difference between (24)/(25) and (26)?

In Den Dikken (2019), the fact that the verb in the reverse predication structure in (26b) is a participial form and cannot be tense/ø-inflected is related to the fact that its projection occupies a specifier position: head movement out of specifier positions is generally very difficult (see, e.g., Baker 1988, Hale & Keyser 1993). In (24b) and (25b), too, the VP originates on a left branch. Yet here, amalgamation of the verb with finite inflection is successful. This is because in (24b) and (25b) the right branch of the RP substructure, the clitic -ik, moves, via R, into the inflectional domain of the clause. Movement of the right branch of a small clause (RP) via its head (R) lifts the islandhood of its left branch. ‘Left branch-hood’ is a configurational property: a left branch is only a left branch in the presence of material to its right; removal of all of this material under movement robs the specifier of RP of its ‘left branch-hood’, and renders its head eligible for an Agree relationship with a head outside RP.15

3.1 -ik and person

The Hungarian reflexive clitic -ik is restricted to third person, like Indo-European SE. In conservative and prescriptive Hungarian, ik-verbs also trigger an unusual form for 1SG[-PAST]: though in [-PAST] -m is otherwise restricted to the objective (aka definite) conjugation, -m shows up on 1SG [-PAST] ik-verbs instead of the -k suffix from the subjective (aka indefinite) conjugation:

(27) a. †érkez-em [‘†’ = conservative/prescriptive]
   arrive-1SG.OBJ/DEF
b. †érkez-ek [‘!’ = prescriptively incorrect but widespread]
   arrive-1SG.SUBJ/INDEF
   ‘I am arriving’

This is perhaps particularly striking in the case of the (few) -ik verbs that are surface transitive: in conservative and prescriptive Hungarian, the verbs of ingestion esz-ik ‘eat’ and isz-ik ‘drink’ take the -m (‘DEF’) suffix for first person singular even in the presence of an INdefinite accusative object.16

15 The fact that movement leaves traces/copies of the moved material behind in syntax suggests that the effect of removal of ‘left branch-hood’ under movement of non-left-branch material is best handled at PF.

The text account of (25) can probably be carried over to so-called s-passives in the Scandinavian languages, which like Hungarian medio-passives eschew auxiliation and have the main verb inflecting for finiteness. It seems highly plausible to approach the -s of Scandinavian s-passives on a par with the -ik of Hungarian ‘ikes igék’ — the morphological form of the -s suffix of s-passives is readily compatible with a treatment of it as a reflexive clitic.

16 I will return in section 3.5 to the question of how surface transitive verbs can participate in the reverse predication syntax in (25b).
Historically, *ik*-verbs also took a specialised form of 2SG agreement: -l rather than -sz or -d. [illustrate this] Synchronically, however, -l is a phonologically conditioned allomorph of regular 2SG.INDEF -sz, no longer specialised for *ik* verbs.

The distribution of -m and -l with *ik*-verbs is expected if (as argued above) -ik is a clitic and (as argued in Den Dikken 2018) -m and -l are likewise clitics (while -k and -sz are inflections): the -m and -l forms found on *ik* verbs with 1SG and 2SG subjects, resp., are the first/second-person singular forms of the reflexive clitic, which is realised as -ik only in the third person singular. Recall from the discussion above (25) that SE φ-agrees with the surface subject, which is the closest c-commanding element bearing φ-features. The clitichood of -m and -l facilitates their participation in the -ik paradigm. More recently, Hungarian language learners have assimilated the -ik verbs to ‘ordinary’, non-*ik* verbs in the first and second person, giving them the regular subject-agreement forms and no longer postulating an overt φ-agreeing clitic in their syntax. The overt clitic is currently confined entirely to the third person singular (i.e., to -ik).

### 3.2 -ik and tense, mood

A vexing question about the distribution of -ik with verbs is why it is not combinable with tense morphology, whether to its left of to its right (30a), whereas (at least in archaic/conservative varieties) it does combine with subjunctive and conditional mood morphology (see (30b,c)).

#### (30)

<p>| | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a.</td>
<td>egy</td>
<td>vonat</td>
<td>érkez(<em>-ik)-ett(</em>-ik)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>a</td>
<td>train</td>
<td>arrive-IC-PAST-IC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>‘a train arrived’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b.</td>
<td>egy</td>
<td>vonat</td>
<td>érkez-zé-k</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>a</td>
<td>train</td>
<td>arrive-SUBJUNCT-IC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>‘may a train arrive’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c.</td>
<td>ha</td>
<td>egy</td>
<td>vonat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>if</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>train</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

17 In the presence of a plural surface subject, the reflexive clitic is systematically silent in present-day Hungarian — that is, the form of the verb in such cases is no different from the one found in non-reflexive constructions.
To explain this, I resort to three independently plausible hypotheses: (a) -ik must encliticise to an F-head that locally c-commands it and can host it; (b) the Linear Correspondence Axiom (Kayne 1994) prohibits right-adjunction of overt material to overt material (recall (10), above) but is silent on cases of right-adjunction in which one of the terms is non-overt; and (c) mood (MoodP) is introduced outside TP, as depicted in (31). 18

(31) \[ CP C [ \text{MoodP} \text{Mood} [ \text{TP} [ \text{VP} \ldots V \ldots] [ \text{R} \text{RELATOR} \text{SE} = -ik] ] ] ]\]

Encliticisation of -ik is illegal with overt morphology in T (-t(t)), by the LCA. But [–PAST] T is silent, and no linear ordering problem can arise when -ik encliticises onto a silent head. Hence -ik legally encliticises onto [–PAST] T. In the subjunctive and the conditional, which are both located above TP in the tree, no interference is posed to encliticisation of -ik to T (which is once again silent in (30b,c)) either.

Since encliticisation of overt -ik to overt T gives rise to a violation of the LCA, and since suppressing overt tense morphology would make [+PAST] irrecoverable from the signal, the last resort solution to the problem posed by (31) in the presence of overt material in T is to use the silent allomorph of the clitic -ik. This silent allomorph occurs elsewhere in the paradigm of -ik verbs as well: the plural paradigm of these verbs (for the verb used in (30): érkezünk ‘1PL’, érkezték ‘2PL’, érkeznék ‘3PL’) is entirely devoid of any overt material in the morphophonological string that corresponds to the clitic SE in the structure in (25). Though the third person singular gives rise to overt -ik whenever -ik is licensed to surface, it reverts to a silent SE in the presence of overt tense morphology in T, which by the LCA cannot serve as a host to the enclitic -ik.

3.3 -ik and -gAt, -hAt

Whereas -ik is otherwise obligatory wherever it is licensed to occur, the frequentative aspectual marker -gat/get and the modal -hat/het ‘can’ make it legitimate for -ik not to be used. For frequentative -gAt, absence of -ik is essentially obligatory; for potential -hAt, combinations with -ik are attested in the historical record and, for some speakers apparently, synchronically as well. 19

18 In Cinque (xxxx), Mood\_REALIS is below T\_ [+PAST]. That Mood projects outside (i.e., higher than) T in Hungarian is clear from the way past tense -(V)t(t) combines with conditional -na: ír-ott vol-na ‘would have written’. See É. Kiss (1998) and Bartos (yyyy) for relevant discussion of the relative positioning of Mood and T in Hungarian syntax.

19 An anonymous reviewer of an abstract based on this paper was so kind as to delve into the Hungarian National Corpus (MTSZ) and to unearth all 1,212 examples recorded there for the string -hAt-ik, from 1773 all the way to 2010. The three most recent attestations of -hAt-ik (all from 2010) are reproduced in (i)–(iii). All three examples are roundly rejected by my own trusted informant for Hungarian. So it is fair to say that -hAt-ik combinations give rise to variation.

(i) ön egyszerre úsz-hat-ik bennük
you\_POLITE at.the.same.time swim-MOD-IK in.them
‘you can swim in them at the same time’

(ii) nem buk-hat-ik el irodalomtörténeti és filológiai igazságok elől
not fail-MOD-IK VM literature.history and philological truths before
‘you cannot fail in the face of literary-historical and philological truths’

(iii) a kivülállólél itt megadat-hat-ik
the outsider.being here VM.give-MOD-IK
‘outsider-hood can be given here’
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(32) a. egy vonat érkez-get(*-ik)
   a train arrive-ik-FREQ-ik
   ‘a train keeps arriving’

b. egy vonat érkez-het(+-ik)
   a train arrive-ik-POT-ik
   ‘a train can/may arrive’

Modality (ModalP) and aspect (AspP) occur between T and the RP that contains the lexical verb (V) and the clitic SE:

Recall from the discussion in section 3.2 that encliticisation of overt -ik is illegal with overt morphology in the functional head immediately outside RP. So when Asp is realised as frequentative -gAt, encliticisation of -ik to Asp gives rise to a violation of the LCA, and the clitic SE is forced to remain silent. This accounts for (32a).

The modal -hAt in (32b) requires a little more discussion because of the fact that overt -ik is not categorically excluded in its presence. Though I have no independent evidence at this time to back up this claim, what I would like to suggest is that there is variation in the Hungarian-speaking community with respect to the treatment of -hAt as the head or the specifier of ModalP. Speakers who treat -hAt as the exponent of Modal0 will perforce reject all combinations of -hAt and -ik, requiring the use of the silent allomorph of SE in the presence of -hAt. But speakers who treat -hAt as a modal adverbial and locate it in SpecModalP do not assign any phonological content to Modal0, allowing it to serve as a legitimate host for the overt enclitic -ik, in keeping with the LCA.

3.4 -ik and -Ód, -ul

In what Márkus (2015) calls the ‘half passive’ (a term intended to be distinct from the familiar terms ‘medio-passive’ and ‘anticausative’), -ik co-occurs with the suffix -Ód (harmonising as -ód/őd): recall (2b), repeated here as (34b) (to be compared to its antonym in (34a), not featuring this suffix — perhaps because nyíl is itself bimorphemic (cf. transitive nyit), with l as one of the morphemes).

Recall from the discussion in section 3.2 that encliticisation of overt -ik is illegal with overt morphology in the functional head immediately outside RP. So when Asp is realised as frequentative -gAt, encliticisation of -ik to Asp gives rise to a violation of the LCA, and the clitic SE is forced to remain silent. This accounts for (32a).

The modal -hAt in (32b) requires a little more discussion because of the fact that overt -ik is not categorically excluded in its presence. Though I have no independent evidence at this time to back up this claim, what I would like to suggest is that there is variation in the Hungarian-speaking community with respect to the treatment of -hAt as the head or the specifier of ModalP. Speakers who treat -hAt as the exponent of Modal0 will perforce reject all combinations of -hAt and -ik, requiring the use of the silent allomorph of SE in the presence of -hAt. But speakers who treat -hAt as a modal adverbial and locate it in SpecModalP do not assign any phonological content to Modal0, allowing it to serve as a legitimate host for the overt enclitic -ik, in keeping with the LCA.

3.4 -ik and -Ód, -ul

In what Márkus (2015) calls the ‘half passive’ (a term intended to be distinct from the familiar terms ‘medio-passive’ and ‘anticausative’), -ik co-occurs with the suffix -Ód (harmonising as -ód/őd): recall (2b), repeated here as (34b) (to be compared to its antonym in (34a), not featuring this suffix — perhaps because nyíl is itself bimorphemic (cf. transitive nyit), with l as one of the morphemes).

3.4 -ik and -Ód, -ul

In what Márkus (2015) calls the ‘half passive’ (a term intended to be distinct from the familiar terms ‘medio-passive’ and ‘anticausative’), -ik co-occurs with the suffix -Ód (harmonising as -ód/őd): recall (2b), repeated here as (34b) (to be compared to its antonym in (34a), not featuring this suffix — perhaps because nyíl is itself bimorphemic (cf. transitive nyit), with l as one of the morphemes).
If -Ód found itself immediately outside this RP, it would be the first available host for the enclitic -ik, and by being overt it would incur a violation of the LCA. The fact that -Ód is compatible with -ik can be accounted for if -Ód combines with the verb inside the substructure that finds itself in the specifier of RP (i.e., inside the predicate of SE=ik). And if it is correct to treat -Ód as Voice, this implies that Voice, in ‘half passives’ at least, is an integral subpart of the predicate, not a functional head merged outside the predication structure.

In striking contrast to -Ód, the suffix -ul, which occurs on the inchoative counterparts to transitive verbs in -ít (see (36) for some examples of -ít/-ul pairs), is systematically incompatible with -ik: verbs suffixed with -ul never take -ik.

(36) a. alak-ít ‘formCAUS, give shape’ alak-ul(*-ik) ‘formNCH, take shape’
    b. bor-ít ‘cloudCAUS’ bor-ul(*-ik) ‘cloudNCH’
    c. ford-ít ‘turnCAUS’ ford-ul(*-ik) ‘turnNCH’
    d. pir-ít ‘reddenCAUS’ pir-ul(*-ik) ‘reddenNCH’
    e. tan-ít ‘teach’ tan-ul(*-ik) ‘learn’

It seems to me plausible to treat -ul as a ‘light verb’, the inchoative pendant to the causative ‘light verb’ -ít.20 If the incompatibility of -ul and -ik is to have a structure-based explanation, along the lines of the foregoing discussion, then this ‘light verb’ must be structurally located outside the reverse predication structure of which SE is the subject: only then can the presence of overt -ul, right outside RP, force SE to be represented by its null exponent.

3.5 -ik and verbs of ingestion

A prima facie incongruous fact about the distribution of -ik in Hungarian is that it occurs on the ingestive verbs esz-ik ‘eat’ and isz-ik ‘drink’: whenever the subject of these verbs is third person singular and there is no definite accusative object, -ik shows up in the present tense.21

(37) a. János esz-ik egy sütit
    János eat-ik a pastry.ACC
    ‘János is eating a pastry’

    b. János isz-ik egy sört
    János drink-ik a beer.ACC
    ‘János is drinking a beer’

---

20 If the above suggestion that nyíl ‘open’ in (34a) is bimorphemic is correct, and if the l in nyíl-ik is the same as the l in -ul, then the ‘light verb’ incompatible with -ik is exponed just as u. Whether the ‘light verbs’ -u(l) and -it are exponents of ‘little v’ or semantically light ‘big Vs’ is, as far as I can tell, not a question that I need to take a stand on.

21 Recall also the fact, illustrated in (28) and (29), that with a first person singular subject and an indefinite object, these verbs give rise (in conservative and prescriptive Hungarian) to a form of the verb that is otherwise found only in the presence of a definite accusative object. This fits into the treatment of esz-ik and isz-ik as reflexive verbs, in light of the discussion in section 3.1, which treats the -m form of the verbal paradigm as the 1sg incarnation of the clitic -ik.
How can ingestive verbs (which would not strike the casual observer as reflexive) that take an accusative object feature -ik, treated as a reflexive clitic, in their morphosyntax?

Before answering this question, let me mention first of all that Hungarian is not an abstruse outlier in the linguistic universe in treating ingestive verbs on a par with reflexive and medio-passive verbs. Basing herself on a survey of thirty-two of the world’s languages, Krejci (2012) finds that such behaviour of ingestives is not at all unusual cross-linguistically (see also Jerro 2019, and, for eating/drinking cross-linguistically, Newman 2009). Krejci presents an extended argument to the effect that ingestive verbs, like medio-passives, are reflexive in their predicate–argument structure. In this light, the occurrence of -ik on ‘eat’ and ‘drink’ in Hungarian is by no means exceptional.

Probably one’s most immediate intuitive response to the observation that ingestive verbs are reflexive would be to think of eat x as feed x to oneself or feed oneself on/with x. Krejci (2012) argues at length, however, that (38a) is not semantically equivalent to (38b), based on significant lexical entailment differences between the two.

\[(38)\]
\[
a. \text{John ate pasta} \\
b. \text{John fed pasta to himself} \\
   \quad \text{John fed himself pasta} \\
c. \text{John fed himself on/with pasta}
\]

While she does not talk explicitly about (38c), which seems a rather better interpretive match for (38a) than (38b), it seems equally unlikely that (38c) could be the source for Hungarian esz-ik. Hungarian has a morphological causative equivalent to English feed, derived by attaching the causative suffix -(t)At to the root of the verb, yielding et-et ‘eat-CAUS, feed’. Though et-et itself accepts -ik, forming the passive et-et-ik ‘eat-CAUS-SE, be fed’ (see (39); on the morphosyntax of -(t)At-ik passives, see Den Dikken & Dékány 2019), it is clearly morphologically and semantically different from esz-ik.

\[(39)\]
\[
a. \text{macska et-et-ik} \\
   \quad \text{the cat eat-CAUS-IK} \\
   \quad \text{‘the cat is being fed’}
\]

Krejci (2012) proposes a bieventive causative representation for digestive verbs wherein two arguments are co-identified. Krejci’s analysis is reproduced in (40).

\[(40)\]
\[
[[\text{ACT}_{\text{manipulate food}}(x)] \text{ CAUS } [\text{BECOME } \langle \text{potentially digest} \rangle (x, y)]]
\]

A paraphrase for (40) would be something like ‘x’s manipulation of food causes x to potentially digest y’. This is not semantically implausible — but it does not deliver a reflexive structure: though the two instances of x in (40) are co-identified, they are not co-arguments of the same predicate. If reflexivity were generally the product of co-identification of the subject of an event that causes another event with an argument of the caused event, then there ought to be no restriction of such reflexivity to digestive verbs: John’s clumsy serving of the food caused him to soil the tablecloth is just as sensible as John’s manipulation of the food caused him to digest it; yet the former is plainly not a reflexive construction. So it seems to me that (40) will not do.
A more promising avenue towards an explanation for the reflexivity of digestive verbs springs from experiential constructions of the type in (41):

(41)  a. John had/got everything stolen on him  
      b. John had/got himself robbed of everything  
      c. John had someone rob him of everything  

These are not causative constructions (although both have and get can independently be used causatively). Nor are they bieventive: it makes no sense to say that the examples in (41) involve an event of theft and an event of experiencing the theft; rather, there is a single event of theft that leaves John, the experiencer, without his earthly possessions. This seems to be the right starting point for an analysis of reflexive verbs of digestion. And what is particularly helpful is that (41b) is explicitly reflexive.

This reflexive and the subject are not obviously co-arguments of a single predicate: himself is an argument of passive robbed, while John is an argument of the matrix predicate. But this should not deter us: in my analysis of constructions with -ik verbs, -ik is syntactically represented autonomously vis-à-vis the verb, so co-argumenthood of -ik and the surface subject is not a requirement imposed on these constructions. As a matter of fact, -ik occurs on the raising verbs tûnik ‘seem’ and lâtszik ‘appear, seem’, which take a small-clause complement whose subject is raised to the matrix subject position on standard assumptions:

(42)  az jónak tûn-ik/lát-sz-ik  
      it good seem-SE/see-SZ-IK  
      ‘it seems/appears (to be) good’

Likewise, so-called s-passives in the Scandinavian languages (which are morphological reflexives, like -ik verbs in Hungarian) can be formed based on epistemic constructions which in the active involve a small clause in the verb’s complement, as in the Norwegian example in (43):

(43)  han finne-s skyldig  
      he find-SE guilty  
      ‘he is found guilty’

But as Williams (1983) famously said, we do not eat propositions. So in the syntax of digestive verb constructions, it is unlikely that we are dealing with anything directly resembling the raising/passive constructions in (42) and (43). And consuming something is not an experiential event: it is necessarily an agentive one. While being fed by someone can be an experience in which the feedee is not agentively involved, an event of eating something requires a wilful agent. So though (41) is on the right track, it is not quite the right analogue to reflexive digestive verbs yet.

Closer to the goal are constructions such as those in (44) and (45), called ‘personal dative’ (PD) constructions in Horn (2008): 22

22 Horn only calls the pronouns in the a–examples ‘personal datives’; he treats the b–examples differently. Huddleston & Pullum (2002:1488) write: ‘While I caught myself some fish implies that the fish were specifically for me, “I caught me some fish does not.’ To the examples in (44) and (45), this difference does not apply.
As in the constructions in (41), the pronominal element coindexed with the subject is an experiencer — but this time around, the subject itself is clearly an agent: the referent of the subject is wilfully executing an event of having a bath or eating a pizza, and at the same time is experiencing this event as a pleasant one. It is striking that experiential have/get-constructions in English are usually adversative, with the experiencer as the maleficiary, whereas ‘ethical dative’ constructions usually involve positive, beneficial experiences. This difference between (41) and (44)–(45) is not syntactically relevant, however. The relevant thing from a syntactic point of view is that (41) and (44)–(45) are all experiential constructions featuring coidentification of the subject and another element in the structure. This coidentification of the subject and the postverbal pronominal — which, in English ‘personal dative’ constructions, is usually a weak pronoun — is what provides the perfect foundation for an explanation of the reflexive behaviour of digestive verbs.

Horn (2008:180) argues that ‘the PD contributes a conventional implicature of typically benefactive subject affect, relating to the satisfaction of the actual or perceived intention, goal, or preference of the subject’. With reference to the particular examples in (44) and (45), I will translate this as follows:

(46) I’m gonna [have a bath/eat a hamburger], & [doing so], will satisfy my current intentions

The event of having a bath or eating a hamburger is executed by the subject, and at the same time the event in question benefits the subject by satisfying the subject’s intentions. The referent of the subject is thus doubly linked to the event — once as the agent (familiarly), and once as the experiencer/beneficiary. The structure in (47) expresses this double linking directly:

(47)

The event (denoted by the VP in SpecRP) is predicated of a reflexive clitic. Because the predication structure formed by predicating VP of SE is not fully saturated (due to the fact that SE is a variable unbound in RP), it is predicated in turn of the subject in SpecTP, with which SE is coindexed.23

23 For Horn (2008), it is precisely the absence in English of a weak reflexive clitic (our SE) that allows English to use a weak pronoun as the ‘personal dative’. I agree with Horn that me here functions like SE — it is the exponent of SE.
The structure in (47), for ‘personal dative’ constructions of the type in (44) and (45), should look very familiar to the reader: it is very much like the structures encountered for SE-constructions earlier in section 3. With (47) in place, the analysis of Hungarian esz-ik ‘eat-ic’ constructions is just a matter of changing the lexical items to arrive at (48b), for the particular example in (37a), repeated here as (48a). The structure in (48b) is syntactically identical with (47).

(48) a. János esz-ik egy sütit
    János eat-ic a pastry
    ‘János is eating a pastry’

b. 

As in the case of (47), the event denoted by the VP is related to the referent of the subject twice: János is both experiencing the event, his appetite being satisfied by it, and wilfully executing it. János is having him some pastry, in other words. Mutatis mutandis, the same is true for the beer-drinking event in (37b). Thus, Hungarian represents eating and drinking events with an ‘institutionalised’ PD.

The syntax of (48a) is transitive, just as in (44) and (45): no argument is raised out of VP and promoted to subject in the structures in (47) and (48b). It is not surprising in light of (48b) that the -ik-marked ingestive verb is capable of assigning accusative case to its internal argument. Nor is it surprising that when the object is definite, no exponent of the reflexive clitic SE can surface (whether to the left or to the right of the marker of the objective/definiteness conjugation; see (49)): Hungarian, quite in general, imposes a very strict clitic co-occurrence restriction on its morphosyntax, so strict that no two clitics can co-occur on the surface in a simple clause; so-called ‘definite agreement’ involves an object clitic (see Den Dikken 2018), and the presence of this object clitic causes the SE-clitic not to be overtly expressed (being represented instead by its zero allomorph).

(49) János esz(*-ik)-i(*-ik) a sütit
    János eat-IC-DEF-IC
    ‘János is eating the pastry’

Before we leave the topic of transitive -ik verbs of ingestion, let me say a few words about the distribution of -ik in (50) and (51). In the examples in (50a,b), -ik must occur (just as before), while -ik can or even must be absent in (51a,b) (the latter an idiom that is always -ik-less in this form, the former a freely formed utterance whose version with -ik was taken from the internet):
(50) a. meg-esz-*\(_{ik}\) engem a tigris / a kannibál
   VM-eat-IK me(ACC) the tiger the cannibal
   ‘the tiger/cannibal is eating me’

   b. a macska ki-esz-*\(_{ik}\) engem a vagyon-om-ból
   the cat VM-eat-IK me(ACC) the fortune-1SG-out.of
   ‘the cat is eating me out of house and home’

(51) a. meg-esz(-\(_{ik}\)) engem a sárga irigység
   VM-eat-IK me(ACC) the yellow envy
   ‘yellow envy is eating me’

   b. esz engem a méreg
   eat me(ACC) the poison
   ‘poison is eating me, i.e., I am extremely angry’

In (50a) we are dealing with a by now entirely familiar case: the tiger or cannibal is eating me to satisfy a basic need, and -\(_{ik}\) is there to express the personal dative. In (50b), the cat is not eating me (\(\text{engem} \) serves as the subject of a small clause whose predicate is \(\text{a vagyonomból}\) — but it IS eating nonetheless, and is doing so out of a desire to satisfy its insatiable appetite. So here again, the use of -\(_{ik}\) fits in with what we have seen before.

Equally sensible in light of our previous findings is the absence of -\(_{ik}\) in (51). The events denoted by these examples do NOT involve the satisfaction of an intention or need on the part of the subject: the subject of these sentences has a referent that can have no intentions or needs because it is inanimate. It might now come as a surprise that a facetious interlocutor quibbling with (52A)= (51b) can respond by uttering (52B), where -\(_{ik}\) is obligatory:

(52) A: esz engem a méreg
    eat me(ACC) the poison
    ‘poison is eating me, i.e., I am extremely angry’

   B: nincs igaz-ad: a méreg nem esz-*\(_{ik}\) senkit!
    not.is true-2SG the poison not eat-IK nobody
    ‘you’re wrong: poison doesn’t eat anyone’

But this actually fits: speaker B’s facetiousness lies precisely in the fact that (s)he is taking speaker A’s utterance (overly) literally, construing the eating as physical consumption by an animate agent. It is exactly his/her knowledge that poison is inanimate and hence cannot physically consume speaker A that leads speaker B to utter (52B). So (52B) is an utterance about literal consumption by an animate agent for the satisfaction of a need — and it is precisely for that reason that -\(_{ik}\) is present in (52B). With this in mind, we may also understand the fact that (51a) is found on the internet with -\(_{ik}\) attached to the verb: the producer of this sentence presumably was feeling like (s)he was literally being eaten up by yellow envy.\(^{24}\)

\(^{24}\) These remarks about Hungarian -\(_{ik}\) with ingestive verbs have a rather tantalising connection to what De la Mora (2011) observes about Spanish ingestive verbs adorned with the reflexive clitic \(\text{se}\) (\(\text{comer-se} \) ‘eat-se’, \(\text{beber-se} \) ‘drink-se’, \(\text{tomar-se} \) ‘drink-st’), which are a perfect morphological match for \(\text{esz-ik} \) ‘eat-IK’ and \(\text{isz-ik} \) ‘drink-ik’, if the analysis I proposed for the latter is correct. Three highly noteworthy features of the Spanish use of \(\text{se}\) with ingestive verbs which
Closing this rather bulky section on the use of -ik with transitive verbs of ingestion, let me emphasise that this use is directly in line with all the other uses of -ik that we have surveyed earlier in this paper: -ik is once again the exponent of a reflexive clitic, this time serving as the beneficiary or experiencer of the event denoted by the VP, just as in (colloquial) English ‘personal dative’ constructions of the type in (44) and (45). With the reflexive clitic coindexed with the subject, the event is doubly linked to the subject, which is both the agent and the experiencer/beneficiary of the event. The semantics is once again entirely compositional — and the connection with ‘personal dative’ constructions (not previously noted in the literature, to my knowledge) is striking.

### 3.6 -ik and unergative activity verbs

From the discussion of transitive -ik verbs of ingestion, it is but a very small step to unergative activity verbs featuring -ik such as the ones in (53a,b). The examples in (53a,b) are part and parcel of a productive strategy for forming denominal activity verbs involving the addition of the verbaliser (VBR) -(V)z to the noun. Some other products of this strategy are given in (53c–f). It would be pointless to try and give an exhaustive list of such verbs: new instances of this pattern can freely be formed based on newly coined nouns.

(53)  
\[ \begin{align*}
  & \text{a.} & \text{bor-oz-ik} & \text{‘drink wine’} \\
   & & \text{wine-VBR-ik} & \\
  & \text{b.} & \text{sör-öz-ik} & \text{‘drink beer’} \\
   & & \text{beer-VBR-ik} & \\
  & \text{c.} & \text{bicikli-z-ik} & \text{‘bike’} \\
   & & \text{bicycle-VBR-ik} & \\
  & \text{d.} & \text{internet-ez-ik} & \text{‘use the internet’} \\
   & & \text{internet-VBR-ik} & \\
  & \text{e.} & \text{szörf-öz-ik} & \text{‘surf’} \\
   & & \text{surf-VBR-ik} & \\
  & \text{f.} & \text{tenisz-ez-ik} & \text{‘play tennis’} \\
   & & \text{tennis-VBR-ik} & \\
\end{align*} \]

do not appear to find a match in Hungarian are (a) the fact that se is generally optional with ingestive verbs in Spanish (whereas it is by and large obligatory with Hungarian esz and isz, special cases like (51) aside) and, concomitantly, that the appearance of se correlates with special interpretive properties — in particular, (b) an aspectual effect (telicisation) and (c) a pragmatic effect (‘a marker of counter-expectations’; De la Mora 2011). There is no obvious sense in which a structure of the type in (48b) should lead to telicisation of the event denoted by the VP — and indeed, in Hungarian the use of -ik with digestive verbs has no such effect. Because of its aspectual role, the se of Spanish ingestive verb constructions is often treated as the exponent of an Asp-head (see MacDonald 2016 and references cited there). But Aktionsart alone cannot account for the interpretive contributions of se with Spanish ingestive verbs, as De la Mora (2011) is right to stress. The fact that se favours non-canonical eating and drinking events, with an inanimate (non-human) subject or with an inedible/undrinkable object, or both (two of De la Mora’s 2011 most salient findings), is something that pits se rather strikingly against -ik, esp. in light of the text discussion of (50) and (51). The ‘special effects’ associated with the use of se on digestive verbs in Spanish remain to be fully understood. It is worth pointing out in closing that De la Mora (2011:165) notes for Mexican Spanish ‘a marked tendency on [sic] speakers to prefer se-marked constructions over non-se-marked constructions, especially with verbs of consumption’ — so se may be becoming (largely) obligatory with these verbs in (Mexican) Spanish, which may result in a shift of the ‘special effects’ currently associated with se use, towards a situation in which the non-use of se will become the special case, as in Hungarian.
The denominal activity verbs formed with the aid of the verbaliser -(V)z overwhelmingly take -ik, despite being unergative rather than reflexive, unaccusative, anticausative or medio-passive. A connection with the occurrence of -ik on ingestive verbs is eminently plausible — especially, of course, in the case of (53a,b), for which an analysis of -ik as a reflexive clitic expressing Horn’s (2018) ‘personal dative’ recognises the fact that drinking beer or wine is typically done for the satisfaction of the drinker’s needs. English can render these cases by using have and a ‘personal dative’, as shown in (54a,b). Biking, surfing the web or the waves, and playing tennis are ways of satisfying basic needs as well. (54f) is a direct ‘personal dative’ counterpart to (53f) in English (Fodor 2017 in fact cites this exact example); and in combination with the light verb do, English can also produce ‘personal dative’ constructions with the predicates in (53c–e), as in (54c–e).

(54)  a. I’m gonna have me a beer  
b. I’m gonna have me a glass of wine  
c. I’m gonna do me some biking  
d. I’m gonna do me some websurfing  
e. I’m gonna do me some surfing  
f. I’m gonna play me some tennis

Once we have this outlook on (53) in place, it need no longer come as much of a surprise that there are non-denominal unergative activity verbs with ‘personal -ik’ as well, including those in (55):

(55)  a. fürd-ik  
      bathe-IK  
  b. al-sz-ik  
      sleep-SZ-IK  
  c. úsz-ik  
      swim-IK

For all of the cases reviewed in this this section, I propose an analysis along the same lines as the one in (48b) for transitive esz-ik: again, the event denoted by the VP is doubly linked to the subject, first via reverse predication (with -ik representing the beneficiary/experiencer) and subsequently via canonical predication (of the nominative subject in SpecTP).

If this is right, Hungarian represents quite a wide range of events with an ‘institutionalised’ PD. The PD construction is inherently limited to expressions of events compatible with what Horn (2008:180) calls the ‘conventional implicature of typically benefactive subject affect, relating to the satisfaction of the actual or perceived intention, goal, or preference of the subject’. The primeval satisfaction of needs is through ingestion of food or liquids, hence eating and drinking events are quintessential loci for PDs. But humans have other needs and intentions as well, like having a bath, taking a nap, or having a swim — and the expression of such needs also gives rise to the use of -ik in Hungarian. There are bound to be accidental gaps in this picture: natural language is full of those. But overall, it seems clear that the distribution of -ik with transitive and unergative verbal events follows the same rules and exploits the same syntax as the ‘personal dative’ construction of English. In both (and in the case of Spanish variable se-marking as well: see fn. 24), we find that, as Newman (2009:24) puts it, ‘experiential, extra-linguistic realities ... motivate aspects of linguistic behavior’.
4 Concluding remarks

In this paper I have presented a unified outlook on the syntax of SE-constructions in a variety of languages, with particular emphasis on the uniformity of the Hungarian element -ik, treated here as an exponent of the reflexive clitic SE in all of its occurrences.25 The syntactic analysis is couched in terms of the syntax of predication proposed in Den Dikken (2006), with -ik and its relatives systematically represented as the subject of a reverse predication. This syntax applies both in the nominal and in the verbal domain, and besides a compositional semantics provides precise explanations for the distribution of overt exponents of SE and its null allomorph.

The uniform treatment of Hungarian -ik as a reflexive clitic emerging from this paper can be extended to the archaic -(t)At-ik ‘-CAUS-IK’ passive (a levél megír-at-ik ‘the letter is being written’), for which the reflexive clitic hypothesis again affords insightful parallels with Indo-European. For -(t)At-ik constructions the analysis incorporates key aspects of the syntax of English get-passives (he got beaten) and German/Dutch lassen/laten ‘let’ medio-passives (es lässt sich essen ‘it lets itself (be) eat(en)’), which thus can also be brought under the unifying umbrella of reverse verbal predication. These matters are taken up in detail in Den Dikken & Dékány (2019).
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25 Lest I be misunderstood, let me make it clear that my unified analysis of Hungarian -ik is meant to cover only those occurrences of the suffixal string /ik/ for which it is plausible to treat it as a single morpheme. The /ik/ found in szeret-ik ‘they love it’ (the marker of third person plural definite/objective agreement for verbs with front-vowel stems) is a combination of two separate morphemes: -i for definiteness (reduced to -j in the suffix -ják occurring on back-vowel stems such as lát-ják ‘they see it’) plus -k for plural. See Den Dikken (2018) for discussion of the -ij of definiteness.