Chukchi is one of the languages of the Chukotko-Kamchatkan family spoken by approximately 6000 people in the Far North-East Russia. The language is sometimes considered polysynthetic (Baker 1996). Some of the prominent typological features of the language are productive incorporation and extensive use of lexical affixation. The system of verbal pronominal prefixes and suffixes indexing both A and P-like participants is organized on a nominative-accusative basis (Bobaljik 1998) but the case marking is ergative-absolutive. Despite the fact that a substantial amount of literature was written about different aspects of Chukchi, including grammars, e.g. (Dunn 1999), various syntactic peculiarities of this language are still not described.

The paper analyzes anaphoric dependencies and reflexivity-licensing strategies in Chukchi based on the data collected during fieldwork in Amguema village (Chukotka AO, Russia) in 2017–2018. I show that there are two main means of expressing reflexivity: detransitivization of the verb and insertion of body-reflexive expression (Reinhart, Reuland 1993; Reuland 2011). The latter type can be subdivided into two categories according to the properties of the specifier in the reflexive construction: pronominal possessor or relational form of the intensifier *sinit* '-self'.

The first strategy involves a change in agreement pattern and case marking (1a-b). It is the intransitive version of the predicate *iłɣətewək* 'to wash' that gets a reflexive interpretation. Following (Reinhart 2002), I assume that detransitivization, in this case, is performed in the lexicon. The Bundling operation reduces two θ–roles of a transitive predicate to just one agent-theme role assigned to the sole argument of an intransitive verb. The view is supported by the fact that this strategy is lexically restricted in Chukchi, i.e. not all verbs allow detransitivization to mark reflexivity (1c), unavailability of a proxy reading, and impossibility to bundle other theta-roles, e.g. agent and recipient.

(1) a. ənan   ətłon   iłɣətew-ni-n
         s/he.ERG s/he.ABS wash-3SG.A.3.O-3SG.O
         'She washed her/*herself.' [transitive]
     b. ətłon   Ø-iłɣətek-wʔ-i
         s/he.ABS 2/3.S/A-wash-TH-2/3SG.S
         'She washed *her/herself.' [intransitive]
     c. *ətłon   Ø-łʔu-ɣʔ-i
         s/he.ABS 2/3.S/A-see-TH-2/3SG.S
         Int. meaning: 'She saw herself.'

Another way to establish reflexivity relation is to use a combination of a pronoun in genitive case and a noun *uwik* 'body' (2). It is crucial that in the case of third person subject reflexive interpretation is not necessarily enforced (2b).

(2) a. ɣəm-nan [ɣəm-nin   uwik   ] tə-łʔu-ɣʔe-n   wiił.ɣitenə-k
         I.ERG   [I.GEN   body.ABS] 1SG.S/A-see-TH-3SG.O mirror-LOC
         'I saw myself/my body in the mirror.'
     b. ənan$_i$ [ənin$_{i/j}$ uwik   ] łʔu-ni-n   wiił.ɣitenə-k
         s/he.ERG [s/he.GEN   body.ABS] see-3SG.A.3.O-3SG.O mirror-LOC
         'She saw herself/her in the mirror.'

The last option differs from the previous one in that the possessive pronominal is substituted with an expression *sinit-kin* (self-REL) 'oneself's', which is derived from an agent-oriented intensifier *sinit* '-self, by oneself' (3a-b). This possessive reflexive can be incorporated into the noun in a form of a bare stem, which is also signaled by the change in the vowel harmony pattern (3b-c).

(3) a.   ɣəm-nan   sinit   tə-re-tejkə-ŋə-n
         I-ERG   self   1SG.S/A-FUT-make-FUT-3SG.O
         'I will do it myself!'
    b.   ənan   sinit-kin   uwik   /   sinit-uwik   iłɣətew-ni-n
         s/he.ERG self-REL   body.ABS /   self-body.ABS   wash-3SG.A.3.O-3SG.O
         'She washed herself / her own body.'
    c.   ətłon   senet-kowł-orwə-qaj-etə   ɣe-łqe-łin
         s/he.ABS self-round-sled-DIM-DAT   PF-go-PF.3SG
         'She went to her motorbike.'

While the possessive reflexive can be attached to any nominal, it forms a prototypical anaphoric expression only with the noun *uwik*. This anaphor must be locally bound (long-distance binding is forbidden) and can form dependencies with quantificational antecedents, contrasting with the possessive pronominal strategy discussed above (4). Although the construction has not been entirely grammaticalized yet, its body-part component shows clear signs of desemanticization (5).

(4) a.   wanewan   mikə-ne$_i$ ʔən-anjʔa-ʔa-n   [sinit-kin   uwik   ]$_{i/*k}$
         NEG.NFUT   who-AN.ERG   LOW.A-praise-TH-3SG.O   [self-REL   body.ABS]
         'No one praises herself / her body'.
    b.   wanewan   mikə-ne$_i$ ʔən-anjʔa-ʔa-n   [ən-in   uwik   ]$_{??i/k}$
         NEG.NFUT   who-AN.ERG   LOW.A-praise-TH-3SG.O   [self-REL   body.ABS]
         'No one praises her / her body'.
(5)   senet-oweke-ɣtə   /   #sinit-łʔu.łqəł-etə   tə-rkurə-ne-t   kenti-t
         self-body-DAT   /   self-face-DAT   1SG.S/A-buy-3SG.O-PL   candy-ABS.PL
         'I bought candies for myself / #my face.'

To conclude, reflexivization in Chukchi may be performed in the lexicon (bundling of θ–roles) or in syntax (insertion of a body-part expression). While it is typologically common to form an anaphor on the basis of pronominal intensifier or by combining a pronominal with a body-part noun (protection strategy, described in Reuland 2011), Chukchi is exceptional in that its primary anaphor consists of both, a possessive reflexive based on intensifier and a noun meaning 'body', but no pronominal is involved. Although there is minor variation among native speakers, the corresponding expression with the pronominal possessor is better analyzed as involving coreference and not binding. Thus, Chukchi has a peculiar system as it uses 'protection strategy' when it has nothing to protect.

Abbreviations
1/2/3 – 1st/2nd/3rd person, A – agent, ABS – absolutive, AN – high animate, DAT – dative, DIM – diminutive, ERG – ergative, FUT – future, GEN – genitive, LOC – locative, LOW – low on person scale, NEG.NFUT – negation (non-future tenses), O – object, PF – perfect, PL – plural, REL – relational, S – subject, SG – singular, TH – thematic suffix.

References
Baker, M. C. (1996). *The polysynthesis parameter*. Oxford University Press.
Bobaljik, J. D. (1998). Pseudo-ergativity in Chukotko-Kamchatkan agreement systems. *Ergativity: Recherches Linguistiques de Vincennes*, *27*, 21-44.
Dunn, M. J. (1999). A grammar of Chukchi. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Australian National University.
Reinhart, T. (2002). The theta system: an overview. *Theoretical Linguistics*, 28. 229–290.
Reinhart, T., & Reuland, E. (1993). Reflexivity. *Linguistic Inquiry*, 24(4), 657-720.
Reuland, E. (2011). *Anaphora and Language Design (Linguistic Inquiry Monographs)*. Massachusetts Institute of Technology.