The focus of the present study will be the description of the means by which Hungarian codifies non-anchoring relations. Anchoring relations are constructions that include not only the most prototypical instances of possession, but also some extended uses (Heine 1997; Koptjevskaja-Tamm 2005). Anchoring relations encode the possessum (the head) as the starting point for the identification of the possessor (the dependent) (Langacker 1993; Koptjevskaja-Tamm 2005). On the other hand, in non-anchoring relations the dependent does not help the interpreter to uniquely identify the head, but it specifies the head stating some of the properties associated with it (Koptjevskaja-Tamm 2005). The domain of use of non-anchoring relations spans from the uses shared with anchoring relations to completely different ones, such as MATERIAL relations, AGE, QUALITY or PURPOSE.

The languages of the world may either encode anchoring relations in the same way as non anchoring relations, or they may rely on different constructions (Koptjevskaja-Tamm 2005). In the latter case, anchoring relations are expressed by longer and more complex structures than those employed in the expression of non-anchoring relations. In addition, non-anchoring relations lack any mark of definiteness, specificity and referentiality like possessives or demonstratives. Moreover, in non-anchoring relations the nominals are placed closer to the head than the nominals employed in anchoring relations.

The same distinction drawn for anchoring and non-anchoring relations can also be applied to some part-whole relations, namely partitives and pseudo-partitives. As for partitives, they encode a relation in which a part is conceived as separate or separable from the whole, thus it is considered in parallel with anchoring relations. On the other hand, pseudo-partitives express a part-whole relation in which the part describes a quantity over the head (Selkirk 1977; Koptjevskaja-Tamm 2001). Partitives and pseudo-partitives share clusters of properties, which underlines the similarity that partitives and pseudo-partitives show with the contraposition of anchoring and non-anchoring relations respectively.

The present study was made searching the Hungarian National Corpus in order to elicit data for all the relations under investigation. The corpus search provided instances for every relation, even though remarkable differences in the frequency of occurrence can be found. More precisely, there are two relations that are not much represented: KINSHIP and QUALITY relations.

The results showed that a locative construction (locative case + present participle) can be used to express ORIGIN and PURPOSE relations. As for ORIGIN relations, the locative cases involved express the idea of a movement away from a place; on the other hand, PURPOSE relations are conceived as a target to reach, thus the locative case involved (the allative) expresses a movement towards (the nearby of) a place.

Moreover, the main constructions involved in the expression of non-anchoring relations are almost three: compounds, juxtaposition and the adjectivisation of the dependent. These three constructions express almost every non-anchoring relation, even though each relation is predominantly expressed by only one structure.

The relations that have compounds as their dominant strategy are MATERIAL, KINSHIP and part-whole relations. In these relations, the head and the dependent are bound together and cannot be disjoint either sintactically or semantically.

The case of relations predominantly expressed by juxtaposition are pseudo-partitives and MEASURE relations. In these relations, the dependent modifies the head less than in the other construction types, thus the relation born between the two can be quite easily broken.

Finally, the transformation of the dependent into an attributive adjective is the most frequent structure for expressing Hungarian non-anchoring relations. Relations expressed in this way link strongly, but not indissolubly, together the two components, therefore it is possible to modify the relation between head and dependent.

Eventually, in Hungarian the codification of non-anchoring relations obeys to an iconic principle: the closer the expression of head and dependent is, the strongest its semantic connection.

References

Bernd Heine. *Possession. Cognitive Sources, Forces and Grammaticalization.* Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1997.

Maria Koptjevskaja-Tamm. *A piece of cake* and *a cup of tea*: partitive and pseudo-partitive nominal constructions in Circum-Baltic languages. In editor, *Circum-Baltic Languages. Volume 2. Grammar and Typology.* John Benjamins Publishing Company, 2001.

Maria Koptjevskaja-Tamm. Maria's ring of gold: adnominal possession and non-anchoring relations in European languages. In Ji-Yung Kim, Yu Lander, and B.H. Partee, editors, *Possessives and Beyond. Semantic and Syntax*, pages 155–181. MA: GLSA Publications, Amherst, 2005.

Ronald W. Langacker. Reference-point constructions. *Cognitive Linguistics*, 4(1):1–38, 1993.

Elizabeth Selkirk. Some remarks on noun phrase stucture. In Peter W. Culicover, Thomas Wasow, and Adrian Akmajian, editors, *Formal Syntax*, pages 285–316. Academic Press, New York San Francisco and London, 1977.