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Abstract
The problem: 3sg possessed suffix with non-possessive deictic function, confined to strongly negative evaluations: a hülyéje! the stupid-poss.3sg ‘that total idiot’.

Claims:
- ‘POSS.3SG’ above is an affective (or recognition) demonstrative suffix (Lakoff 1974, Liberman 2008)
- grammaticalized from a full possessive construction a világ hülyéje the world-stupid-poss.3sg, lit. ‘the stupid one of the world’, meaning: ‘the biggest idiot in the world’
- driven by feature economy (von Gelderen 2011) and the semanticization of originally pragmatically inferred information (Eckardt 2006)
- this POSS.3SG->DEM pathway may partially explain why POSS.3SG suffixes are extensively used in other Uralic languages as demonstratives or definiteness markers (Nikolaeva 2003)

The Problem
(1) a hülyé-je
the stupid-poss.3sg
i. ‘his/her/its stupid one’ (with silent pro possessor)
s. ‘that total idiot’
(2) A hülyé-je
robotpolító tánkolt a Volkswagen-je be.
the stupid-poss.3sg autopolitot fabb. constructed the Volkswagen-poss.3sg-ILL. ‘That total idiot built an autopolit into his Volkswagen.’
Description:
- denotes an individual that is salient in the discourse along the property denoted by the adjective which carries the possessive suffix
- completely productive, but limited to animates and to emphatic and negative (or ironic) evaluations: *az okos-a the clever-poss.3sg ‘that genius’
- discourse function: deictic anchoring to physical context (‘that idiot over there’) or discourse (‘that idiot we’ve been talking about’); immediate situation use and direct anaphoric use of demonstratives (Hawkins 1978)
- obligatorily definite (obligatory cocurrence with definite article, note that Hungarian is a double definite language, cf. Egedi 2013)
- patterns with demonstratives on syntactic tests

Previous research
- noted descriptively but no formal or informal analysis
- partitive POSS.3SG construction analyzed by E. Kiss (to appear) as grammaticalization
- most authors claim that the non-possessive use of possessive morphology in Uralic is not the result of grammaticalization but an inherent feature of these languages (Fraurud 2001, Nikolaeva 2003, Gerland 2014, Janda 2015).

Proposal
1. Description of grammaticalization

1.1 Starting point: bona fide possessive construction (attested in 13th C)
(3) a fala hülyé-je
the village stupid-poss.3sg
‘the stupidest person in the village’

maximal[village] = α. Y(y:3sg:poss) → Y(3sg:poss)
(Cf. English: ‘the pretty one of/in the family’)