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Chapter 14
The essives in Hungarian
Casper de Groot

Summary

This chapter presents an empirical study of the distribution of the three essive markers in Hungarian on the basis of a linguistic questionnaire that captures the contexts in which essive and transitive markers may occur in the Uralic languages. The study specifically investigates the opposition between permanent and impermanent state in non-verbal predications. The linguistic domains involved are non-verbal main predication, secondary predication, complementation, and manner, temporal, and circumstantial adverbial phrases. The use of the essives (associated with state) is contrasted with the use of the transitive (associated with change). Finally, the syntactic position of elements marked by an essive is discussed in relation to the position of focus constituents.
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0. Preliminary

The central theme of this volume is the distribution of a form usually referred to as essive, or essive case, where essive is defined as the expression of impermanent state. This chapter explores the relatively terra incognita of the essive in Hungarian. There are in Hungarian several forms traditionally labelled as essive, and, additionally, there are other forms which also have properties of the essive. This chapter discusses or presents all these forms, following the linguistic questionnaire “Uralic essive” (see chapter 1 of this volume).

1. Introduction

1.1. Hungarian and the Hungarians

Hungarian is spoken by about 14 million people around the world today (10.2 million of these inside Hungary and 12.7 million in the Carpathian Basin, cf. Gyurgyik and Sebők 2003). Hungarian was spoken almost exclusively inside Hungary’s borders until the end of the 19th century. Today, Hungarian is found as a minority language throughout most of Western and East Central Europe, as well in North America, South America, Australia, South Africa and Israel. I refer to Fenyvesi ed. (2005) for further details on numbers of speakers and differences which hold between Hungarian inside and Hungarian outside Hungary.

The source of most of the examples in this chapter is the Hungarian Gigaword Corpus (HGC), which currently contains over 1.5 billion words. The corpus contains language variants form Hungary, Slovakia, Subcarpathia, Transylvania and Vojvodina. Texts from the news media make up almost half of the corpus. It further contains all material of the Digital Literary Academy, regulations, laws, by-laws and parliamentary debates, discussions of internet forums very similar to spoken language, and scientific texts of the Hungarian Electronic Library (cf. Oravecz et al. 2014). I will sometimes refer to word or suffix frequencies based on the HGC merely to strengthen the argumentation, or to give

---

1 I am indebted to Anna Fenyvesi for helping me to interpret samples of the Hungarian Corporuses and to improve the overall presentation of the data. I also thank Csaba Oravecz and his colleagues for formulating complex queries to retrieve the appropriate samples from the Hungarian Gigaword Corpus.
further insight into the matter discussed. It is never meant as an exercise in or a contribution to corpus-based statistical linguistics. Other examples are taken from linguistic literature or are, if needed, construed with the help of native speakers.

Disclaimer. The linguistic domain of Hungarian essive is not a well defined domain with clear borderlines separated from other areas of Hungarian morphosyntax. Even within the field of Hungarian essive there is quite some variation. The examples and their interpretations used in this chapter can be considered grammatical or well acceptable even though not for each example for all native readers.

1.2. The case inventory of Hungarian
Tompa (1968: 192-210) distinguishes 27 case forms as in Table 1. Kiefer ed. (2000: 577-587), however, argues for only the first 18 to be cases. Forms 19 to 26 do not meet all or even most of the criteria for elements to count as cases, such as (i) the suffix must be applicable to all types of nominals including proper names, adjectives, pronouns, and numerals, (ii) the element marked by a case must be able to be modified by an attribute, or (iii) the element marked by a case must be an argument of a verb. Interestingly, the essive forms 17 and 18 do not meet all the requirements either, but apparently enough for Kiefer to consider them cases. I will argue for the opposite view, even stronger, I will argue that these essives, but also form 25, are predicative markers, i.e. markers of non-verbal (secondary) predicates, and no case markers at all as will be argued for in section 10.

Table 1 - Case distinctions in Hungarian

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Case Type</th>
<th>Symbol</th>
<th>Example</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nominative</td>
<td>Ø</td>
<td>hajó ‘ship’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accusative</td>
<td>t</td>
<td>hajó-t</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dative</td>
<td>nak</td>
<td>hajó-nak  ‘to/on behalf of/of</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inessive</td>
<td>ban</td>
<td>hajó-ban  ‘in(side)’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elative</td>
<td>ból</td>
<td>hajó-ból  ‘out of’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Illative</td>
<td>ba</td>
<td>hajó-ba   ‘into’ (direction)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Superessive</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>hajó-n    ‘on’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delative</td>
<td>ról</td>
<td>hajó-ról  ‘from’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sublative</td>
<td>ra</td>
<td>hajó-ra   ‘onto/at’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adessive</td>
<td>nál</td>
<td>hajó-nál  ‘near’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ablative</td>
<td>tól</td>
<td>hajó-tól  ‘from near’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allative</td>
<td>hoz</td>
<td>hajó-hoz  ‘to near’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Terminative</td>
<td>ig</td>
<td>hajó-ig   ‘till’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Translative</td>
<td>vá</td>
<td>hajó-vá   ‘into’ (change)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instrument/Comitative</td>
<td>val</td>
<td>hajó-val  ‘with’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Causal/Final</td>
<td>ért</td>
<td>hajó-ért  ‘for’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Essive-formal</td>
<td>ként</td>
<td>hajó-ként ‘as’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Essive-modal</td>
<td>ul</td>
<td>hajó-ul   ‘as’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Temporal</td>
<td>kor</td>
<td>ünnep-kor ‘at (holiday)’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Formal</td>
<td>képp</td>
<td>hajó-képp(en) ‘as’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distributive</td>
<td>nként</td>
<td>hajó-nként ‘per’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distributive/temporal</td>
<td>nta</td>
<td>nap-onta  ‘each’ (day)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sociative</td>
<td>stul</td>
<td>hajó-stul ‘together with’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multiplicative</td>
<td>szor</td>
<td>hat-szor  ‘(six)times’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Modal-essive-1</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>piros-an  ‘being (red)’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Modal-essive-2</td>
<td>lag</td>
<td>bántó-lag ‘being (aggressive)’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Genitive</td>
<td>(Dative in possessive constructions)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Within the context of the present volume a number of the case distinctions listed in Table 1 are relevant. Several of them have an essival use, such as the forms under 17 (essive-formal), 18 (essive-modal), 20 (Formal), 25 (modal-essive-1), and 26 (modal-essive-2). Number 3 (iative) also occurs as a marker of secondary predicates with essive properties. Also note number 14, the translative case, which will be discussed in contrast to the essive(s) in section 8.

1.3. Hungarian productive essive forms
As mentioned above, Hungarian distinguishes between six suffixes with an essive component. In addition to these bound morphemes, there are two free forms which occur in essive-like constructions, namely, the preposition/conjunction mint ‘as’ and the postposition gyanánt ‘as’, ‘by way of’. The distribution of all these bound and free forms differs considerably from each other. It is, however, beyond the scope of this chapter to discuss all forms and the differences which hold between them. Instead, I will concentrate on those forms which count as productive essive markers, the suffixes –ként, –ul/-ül, and –n/-an/-en as in the following examples:

(1) a. Pali orvos-ként dolgoz-ott Debrecen-ben.
   Paul doctor-ESSF work-PST.3SG Debrecen-INE
   ‘Paul worked as a doctor in Debrecen.’

(1) b. Minket akar-t-atok főmunkatárs-ak-ul?
    1PL.ACC want-PST-2PL leading contributor-PL-ESSM
    ‘Did you want (to have) us as leading contributors?’

(1) c. Kati nyers-en et-te meg a hal-at.
    Kate raw-ADV eat-PST.3SG.2f ASP the fish-ACC
    ‘Kate ate the fish raw.’

The free form mint ‘as’ will also receive a lot of attention, because it forms a minimal pair with the essive-formal -ként in expressing permanent – impermanent state (section 3). A summary of the main properties of the other non-productive bound forms will be given in section 1.4 below.

Hungarian essive -ként primarily combines with nouns, including proper names, ordinals and various types of pronouns. The corpus shows only a few examples of –ként in combination with an adjective, but not with verbs or adverbs. The forms énként ‘as I’ and kiként ‘as who’ are rare. Table 2 presents an overview of the combinations.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parts of speech combining with –ként</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Noun</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proper name</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adjective</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>orvos-ként ‘as a doctor’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mari-ként ‘as Mary’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>üres-ként ‘as empty’</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2 Note that –ként belongs to one of the classes of invariable suffixes, i.e. the ones containing é (e.g. causal -ért in ez-ért ‘for this’, or az-ért ‘for that’) (Kenesei et al. 1998: 422), whereas the other suffixes are variable, the choice between them triggered by rules of vowel harmony. Also note that unlike any other suffix, final vowels of the stem will not be lengthened when attaching the suffix –ként (e.g. katona ‘soldier’, katona-ként ‘as a soldier’ opposed to katoná-nak ‘to a soldier’). The suffix –ként will be glossed as ESSF (essive-formal), –ul/-ül as ESSM (essive-modal), and –n/-an/-en as ADV (adverbial marker, as will be explained later in this section).

3 Zf indicates ‘second form’ traditionally called ‘definite or objective conjugation’ which applies when the object counts as definite (see de Groot 2009). The ‘first form’ or ‘indefinite or subjective conjugation’ is like present tense as default not specified in the glosses.
Pronoun
demonstrative \textit{ak-ként} ‘as that’, \textit{ek-ként} ‘as this’, \textit{azok-é-ként} ‘as the ones belonging to those’
indefinite \textit{ilyen-ként} ‘such as this’, \textit{olyan-ként} ‘such as that’, \textit{ennyi-ként} ‘so much as’
interrogative \textit{ki-ként} ‘as who’ or \textit{mi-ként} ‘as what’
personal \textit{én-ként} ‘as I’
Numeral \textit{milliárd-ként} ‘as milliard’, \textit{első-ként} ‘as first’

One utterance in the corpus shows –ként in combination with a conjunction, which is rather rare.
Consider:

(2) Hajl-ok ar-ra, hogy nem szabad úgy szétválaszt-ani a
    incline-1SG that-SUB that NEG free so separate-INF the
    kétt pozício-t hogy vagy-vagy-ként tessz-ük föl a kérdés-t.
    two position-ACC that or-or-ESSF put-1PL.2f up the
    ‘I’m inclined to think that it is not a good idea to separate the two positions by raising the
    question (as) either-or.’

The essive-modal expressed by the suffix –ul/-ül can only be used on nouns. Nouns carrying
the suffix count as depictive or as complement of a verb. The suffix is very often used in an adverbial
way, and it also applies in another non-essive sense, marking a language which one speaks, writes or
learns.\textsuperscript{4} For instance:

(3) Észt-ül beszél és magyar-ul tanul.
    Estonian-ESSM speak.3SG and Hungarian-ESSM learn.3SG
    ‘(S)he speaks Estonian and is learning Hungarian.’

The suffix –\textit{n/-an/-en} can only be used on adjectives. Adjectives carrying the suffix in the
essive sense count as depictives, as in example (1c). Note, however, that the suffix is also
productively used to mark manner adverbials as in the following example:

(4) Anna szép-en énekel.
    Anna beautiful-ADV sing.3SG
    ‘Anna sings beautifully.’

It seems that the suffixes applied in (1c) and in (4) formally count as the same suffix. Tompa
(1968: 205) claims that this suffix (in his overview the model-essive-1 suffix (25) in Table 1) is
etymologically identical with the superessive (case ending number (7) in Table 1). Interestingly, the
superessive and consequently the model-essive-1, which are not identical in present-day Hungarian\textsuperscript{5},
originate from the Old Hungarian locative –\textit{n} (Kiss and Pusztai 2005: 368), which goes back to Proto-
Uralic locative *-\textit{na}, the source of the essive in Finnic and Saami. Given this history, Kenesei et al.
(1998) label the suffix –\textit{en} in example (4) as modal-essive. I will not follow this tradition, for three

\textsuperscript{4} One should not take the expression literally, in the sense of [he speaks as an Estonian], because such analysis
is not applicable to ‘learn’ [he learns as a Hungarian].

\textsuperscript{5} The superessive takes the forms –\textit{n/-on/-en/ön}, whereas the modal-essive takes the forms –\textit{n/-an/-en}. 
reasons: (i) if the form in –en were a kind of essive case, why would its application be limited to the class of adjectives?, (ii) the ending –en on szép ‘beautiful’ in (4) cannot be taken to be the expression of a case, because a governor of such a case cannot be identified in that example, and (iii) the historical name of the form does not add to the function of the form, namely, to mark that the adjective is used adverbially. As a counter-argument one could posit that the gloss of ADV in cases such as example (1c), the marker of a predicative adjunct, is not appropriate, but rather the label model-essential. Since the instances of the adverbial use of the suffix outnumber the essival use, I opt for the label ADV (adverbial marker). Finally, note that examples (1c) and (4) clearly show the different uses of the suffix, depictive versus adverbial. The following example, however, shows that ambiguity between the two interpretations may arise, which pleads for one label to mark both functions. One interpretation of (5) is that Mary is angry (depictive), whereas the other interpretation is that she wrote the letter in an angry way (manner).

(5) Mari mérjes-en ír-ta a level-et.
Mary angry-ADV write-PST.3SG.2f the letter-ACC
‘Mary wrote the letter angry/angrily.’

To sum up, there are three forms which can be considered an essive in Hungarian, (i) -ként, which combines with many, but predominantly with nominal, parts of speech, (ii) -ul/-ül which applies to nouns only and which also has a non-essival use, and (iii) -n/an/-en which applies to adjectives only and which also has a bigger task, namely, to mark adjectives in the function of manner adverbs.

1.4. Less productive and non-productive forms
The postposition gyanánt has essive-like properties, but it basically expresses ‘by way of’ or purpose. The form is often found as a depictive marker which makes the form resemble the –ként suffix. The postposition is found 3,687 times in the HGC, less often than –ként, which occurs 711,486 times.⁶

The suffix -képp(en) ‘as’ very much resembles the suffix –ként. It is, however, not as productive and is found in a relatively small set of expressions. Out of the 19,390 hits with –képp in the HGC, 12,253 of them are just two forms: végképp ‘utterly and semmiképp ‘by no means’. A similar result holds for the use of the long form of the suffix –képpen, in particular in combination with –féle ‘type’, ‘kind of’, as mindenféleképpen ‘in all sorts of ways’, semmiféleképpen ‘not in any way; in no way’. Baayens (1992) convincingly argued that the productivity of an affix can be measured by the number of occurrences with one and the same stem in a large text or corpus. A hapax legomenon, i.e. one occurrence, is a strong indicator that the suffix is productive, whereas many occurrences often indicates non-productivity or fossilisation.

The form –lag/-leg is only found in a limited set of expressions, it is non-productive. The suffix is not tagged in the HGC, hence not retrievable from the corpus.

2. Non-verbal predication
Different from Finnish and Saami, Hungarian non-verbal main predicates do not combine with the essival suffixes –ként, –ul/-ül, and –n/-an/-en. As a depictive marker they may occur in non-verbal predications, as for instance in (6):

(6) Orvos-ként volt tag-ja 1898-1899-ben
Doctor-ESSF COP.PST.3SG member-POSS.3SG 1898-1899-INE
a Gerlachvezette antarktisz-i expedíció-nak.
the Gerlachhead.PST.PTCP.2f antartic-ADJ expedition-DAT

⁶See de Groot (2008) for a systematic comparison between the use of –ként ‘as’, gyanánt ‘by way of’, and mint ‘as’.
‘He was a member of the Antarctic expedition headed by Gerlach in 1898-1899 as a doctor.’

Depictives marked by –ként often occur in non-verbal locational predications, as for instance in (7).

(7) 1944-ben szabadság-os katona-ként volt otthon.
1944-INES free-ADJ soldier-ESSF COP.PST.3SG at home
‘In 1944 he was at home as a returnee.’ (not: ‘He was a returnee in 1944 at home.’)

Differential marking of non-verbal main predicates, which corresponds to the opposition permanent vs. impermanent state, is attested only with the application of the adverbial marker –l on adjectives.7 Consider:

(8) a. Az a férfi rossz. (permanent)
that man bad
‘That man is bad.’

b. Az a férfi rossz-ul van (impermanent)
that man bad-ADV COP.3SG
‘That man is unwell.’

Note that the bare predicate does not require the copula as a supportive element if the subject is specified for third person and tense for present. The predicate marked by –l, however, requires a copula in all instances. The class of elements which can be used in minimal pairs such as (6) is limited to a small subclass of adjectives.

3. Secondary predication
3.1 Depictive
3.1.1. General properties of depictives with an essive in Hungarian

Hungarian essive markers are productively used to encode optional nominal secondary predicates as depictives, expressing property, function or similarity. Schultze-Berndt and Himmelmann (2004) state that depictives designate states of affairs which hold at the same time as the eventuality encoded by the main predicate. This criterion is equally applicable to depictives in Hungarian. The application of the essival suffixes on depictives is not sensitive to tense, aspect, person or animateness. The HGC does not give many examples of definite essival depictives, i.e. essival depictives specified by the definite article (as e.g. example 19 below). The following subsections present an overview of the distributional facts of the three suffixes distinguished. In later sections, it will become clear that the three affixes are not exclusively used to mark depictives. They may also mark depictives in a wider sense, for instance, functioning as temporal or circumstantial adjuncts (see section 6 for examples and section 9 for a syntactic analysis).8 Apart from the three suffixes, there are at least five more

---
7 The adverbial marker –l is supplied with a back or front linking vowel u/ü if the stem ends in a consonant. Different from the essive-modal –ul / –ül, where the vowel is part of the marker, the adverbial marker consists of just the consonant l.
8 Schematically, the following four types of constructions marked by the essive can be distinguished:
   1. Depictive    Paul is working as a tour operator in Greece.
   2. Manner       You think as a child.
   3. Temporal     As a child I lived in London.
   4. Circumstantial As prime minister, he did not intervene.

Himmelmann and Schultze-Berndt (2005) refer to 1 as depictive proper, or in a narrow sense, and to 3 and 4 as depictives is a wider sense.
forms which can serve as a depictive marker or as depictive, notably the converb (deverbal adverbial participle) in –va/-ve, as for instance in (9). More information about these five forms will be given in section 3.1.5 below.

(9) Laci berűg-va ment haza.
PN drunk-CVB go-PST.3SG home
‘Laci went home drunk.’

3.1.2. –ként
The essive-formal as a marker of optional secondary predicates is used with both intransitive and transitive verbs, as can be seen in the following examples:

(10) a. Pál (idegenvezető-ként) dolgoz-ik Görögország-ban. (Intransitive)
PN tour operator-ESS work-3SG Greece-INE
‘Paul is working (as a tour operator) in Greece.’
b. A férfi-ak-at (könyvelő-ként) alkalmaz-t-a. (Transitive)
the man-PL-ACC bookkeeper.SG-ESSF employ-PAST-3SG
‘S/he employed the men (as bookkeepers).’

Elements marked by essive-formal –ként are coreferential with either subject or object. Ambiguity arises if the element marked by the essive-formal may be coreferential with both the subject and object of transitive verbs, as in (9b) above or in the following example:

(11) Péter, János-t tanár-ként, szeret-i.
Peter János-ACC teacher-ESS love.3SG.2f
‘Peter likes János as a teacher.’ (either Peter or János is the teacher)

One of the examples in the corpus suggests that also other objects than those marked by the accusative may be the target of the depictive in -ként (see example (12a). From the context in which the utterance is used, it is clear that the depictive relates to the object and not to the subject, which in fact refers to the father of the speaker. However, I am not sure to what extent it is the grammatical function (and morphosyntactic form) that makes this example all right. It could be the semantics of the verb itself [regard someone as something]. If instead the verb néz ‘see’ is used in the physical sense, the sentence becomes weird, even though the argument remains the same (rám), as in (12b).

(12) a. Ez volt az első eset, hogy férfi-ként
cetaz COP.PST.3SG the first case that man-ESSF
look-PST.3SG at-1SG
‘It was the first time that he looked at me as a man.’
b. ?? .... férfi-ként néz-t ett rá-m.
Man-ESSF look- PST.3SG at-1SG

The ungrammaticality of the following examples illustrate that other participants than subject and object cannot be coreferential with the element marked by the essive-formal:

(13) a. * A gyerek-ek level-et küld-t-ek János-nak, tanár-ként,
the child-PL letter-ACC send-PST.3PL PN-DAT teacher-ESSF
‘The children sent a letter to János as a teacher.’ (János = teacher)
   PN PN-COM speak-PST.3SG teacher-ESSF
   ‘Peter spoke with János as a teacher.’ (János = teacher)

Elements marked by the essive-formal partially overlap with the class of depictives. The elements with –ként may function as depictives, but also in a circumstantial or temporal sense (see sections 5 and 6). Also note that there are many other types of depictives than the one in –ként (cf. de Groot 2008).

As an alternative to the essive-formal, the free form mint ‘as’ can be used.9 The distribution of the free form is similar to that of –ként, as indicated in Table 2 above. As an alternative to example (10a) consider example (14):

(14) Pál (mint idegenvezető) dolgoz-ik Görögország-ban.
   PN as tour operator work-3SG Greece-INE
   ‘Paul is working (as a tour operator) in Greece.’

The use of the essive-formal or the form mint ‘as’, however, yields an interesting semantic difference. It seems that it constitutes a differential marking of the depictive which corresponds to the opposition between permanent vs. impermanent state. The essive-formal entails impermanent state whereas the preposition or complementizer mint entails permanent state. By way of minimal pair consider the following two examples (de Groot 2008: 74):

(15) a. Madonna férfi-ként jelen-t meg a színpad-on.
    PN man-ESSF appear-PST.3SG ASP the stage-SUPES
    ‘Madonna appeared on stage as a man.’

b. ? Madonna mint férfi jelent meg a színpad-on.
    PN as man appear-PST.3SG ASP the stage-SUPES
    ‘Madonna appeared on stage as a man.’

It seems that –ként has a stage level and mint an individual level interpretation. That is why (15b) mint is considered highly questionable or even ungrammatical by native speakers of Hungarian, because due to the form mint it has the interpretation that Madonna is a man. The semantic distinction between impermanent and permanent state with –ként and mint is, however, not robust in the sense that native speakers of Hungarian easily recognize the difference. Still, some examples from the HGC support the view defended here. The context of example (12) above provides interesting information. The speaker is a young man who notices that his father looks at him as a man for the first time, but he does not consider himself a man yet. The use of –ként is then more appropriate than mint in this utterance. As a second example consider the following fragment from a longer phrase, where mint cannot serve as an alternative to –ként, i.e. native speakers of Hungarian do not accept the use of the form mint in this example:

(16) .... mégis a férfi-ként szület-ett, de nő-i
    even though the man-ESSF born-PST.3SG but woman-ADJ
    identity-ACC self-3POSS-DAT declarers-PL-ACC

9 Following Himmelmann and Schultze-Berndt (2005: 24), the form mint ‘as’ could be referred to as a predicative marker. The form is, however, not found as a predicative marker in main (non-verbal) predications. It occurs in comparative and simile constructions. Interestingly, mint ‘as’ behaves as a preposition, while Hungarian has just postpositions.
‘[Even though, as the topics of the presentations indicate, the conference included lesbians of various age groups, ethnicities and political persuasions, as well as handicapped lesbians, however, some of the organizers and participants did not embrace/accept].... those who were born (as) male but professed to have female identity.’

The forms –ként and mint combine with the same set of parts of speech as given in Table 2. However, their syntactic behaviour widely differs. One of the main differences is that in phrases with the form mint there is obligatory number and case agreement (17b). The essive-formal marginally allows number agreement, but case agreement is definitely ruled out. The last constraint could of course be considered a morphological constraint, i.e. the suffix –ként blocks the application of a case.\(^{10}\)

(17) a. A férfi-ak-at könyvelő-ként alkalmaz-ta.
the man-PL-ACC bookkeeper.SG-ESSF s/he.employ-PST.3SG.2f
‘S/he employed the men as bookkeepers.’

b. A férfi-ak-at mint könyvelő-ket alkalmaz-ta.
the man-PL-ACC as bookkeeper-PL-ACC s/he.employ-PST.3SG.2f
‘S/he employed the men as bookkeepers.’

A second difference between the application of the essive-formal and the free form mint ‘as’ is that mint can also be used when coreferential with other participants than subject and object. The use of the essive-formal in the following examples is ruled out (see examples 13).

(18) a. A gyerek-ek level-et küld-t-ek
the child-PL letter-ACC send-PST.3PL
János-nak, mint tanár-nak.
PN-DAT as teacher-DAT
‘The children sent a letter to János as a teacher.’ (János = teacher)

b. Péter János-sal, beszél-t mint tanár-ral,
PN PN-COM speak-PST.3SG as teacher-COM
‘Peter spoke with János as a teacher.’ (János = teacher)

3.1.3. -ul/-ül
Like the depictives with –ként, the depictives with –ul/-ül may function as the predicative adjunct of subjects (19) and objects (20), not necessarily marked by the accusative (21). Ambiguity arises if both subject and object have the same denotations as in (19). However, the context in which clause (19) is used, the depictive clearly relates to the subject.

(19) Jákó-t az alakuló közgyűlés 1887 július 6-án
PN-ACC the inaugural meeting 1887 July 6-3SG.POS.SUPES
titkár-ul választ-otta.
secretary-ESSManswer-PST.3SG.2f
‘Jako was elected the secretary of the inaugural meeting on the 6th of July 1887.’

(20) Feladat-ul kap-ta több-ek közt a bányászat-ot
task-ESSM get-PST.3SG.2f more-PL between the mining-ACC
‘As a task he got mining among others things.’

\(^{10}\) It would constitute a case of Suffixaufnahme, which in itself is not a very rare phenomenon.
Forrás-ul hivatkozik a Szlovák Bibliográfiai Szótár-ra
Source-ESSM refer.3SG the Slovak Bibliographic Dictionary-SUB
‘He refers to the Slovak Bibliographic Dictionary as source.’

The HGC produces 208,493 hits on the basis of the query nominal, noun, + ESS (which is the essive-modal). The HGC does not distinguish between the adverbial marker –l as in (8b) and the essive-modal. Note, however, that about forty percent of the examples are made up by just three forms, namely, rádádsul ‘moreover’ (48,193), tudomádsul ‘notice’ (as in ‘to take notice of’, 22,337), and feleségül ‘as a wife’ (13,052). The first form cannot be considered a depictive, but rather a fixed form as an adverb. The second and third forms could be considered arguments of the verb vesz ‘take’ and not as depictives, as will be shown in section 4 below. Going through the list of examples with –ül/–ül from the HGC, it seems that the variety of lexemes to which the suffix is attached is rather limited. Interestingly, the form hajó-ul ‘ship-ESSM’, used by Tompa (1968) to illustrate case 18 (see Table 1), occurs just once. Again, this is a nice example of a hapax legomenon, which supports the view that the suffix is productive indeed.

The hapax occurs in the following context, which accidentally expresses a semelfactive event (sic):

(22) A friss házas-ok a Titanic-ot választ-ott-ák hajó-ul.
The just married-PL the Titanic-ACC choose-PST-3PL2f ship-ESSM
‘The newlyweds chose the Titanic as their ship.’

The essive-modal does not differentiate between permanent and impermanent states.

3.1.4. -n/-an/-en
Depictives with -n/-an/-en are mostly coreferential with subjects (23), but may also relate to objects (24), as in the following examples. Note that different from standard model-essive 1, the suffix is labelled ADV (adverbial marker), as argued for in section 1.3 above.

(23) a. Arc-a piros-an ég-ett.
Face-3SG.POS red-ADV burn-PST.3SG
‘Her/his face was glowing red.’
b. Az öregasszony fáradt-an sétál-t mellett-e
the old woman weary-ADV walk-PST.3SG next_to-3SG
‘The old woman walked wearily next to him/her.’
slightly cool-ADV start-PST.3SG the week
‘The week started slightly cool.’
(24) a. A szem-ei-t érez-t-e meleg-en.
the eye-3SG.POS.PL-ACC feel-PST-3SG.2f warm-ADV
‘(S)he felt his/her eyes as warm.’

The depictives in –n/-an/-en may denote both impermanent (23-24) and permanent state, as in (25).

(25) ... vagy ha már halott-an feküsz-nek, ...
... or if already dead-ADV lie-3PL
‘... or if they lie dead already, ...’

3.1.5. Other (markers of) depictives
Other alternative forms to express depictives in Hungarian are as follows (de Groot 2008):
(26) Predicative nominal with the postposition gyánánt
Paul idegenvezető gyánánt dolgozik Görögország-ban
‘Paul works as a tour operator in Greece.’

(27) Predicative nominal with the dative case –nak/–nek
Az a pulóver-párna-nak használ-t-am.
‘I used that sweater as a pillow.’

(28) Predicative nominal with the inessive case –ban/–ben
Láttam Ők négy-esben
‘I saw four of them (together).’

(29) Predicative nominal with the instrumental/comitative case –val/–vel
Ezr-es-é-vel számol-t-a meg a pénz-t.
‘He counted the money thousand by thousand.’

Converbs form another major category of depictives (cf. 9). From a syntactical point of view, converbal phrases widely differ from essival phrases. Converbs, which are derived, deverbal adverbs, have verbal properties such as arguments and may even have aspectual specifications. Converbs in Hungarian do not allow the suffix –ként. Due to their different categorical states co-ordination of converbal (deverbal adverb) and essive-formal (nominal) depictives is not allowed in Hungarian. Consider:

(30) * Péter berúg-va és puhány-ként haza-ment.
PN drunk-CVB and spineless chap-ESSF home-go-PST.3SG
‘Peter went home drunk and as a spineless chap.’

3.2. Resultative
The essives as discussed in sections 3.1 are not found as markers of resultatives in Hungarian. The only marker found here is the ablative case, as for instance, in the following examples.

(31) a. A zöld-re fest-ett ládá-t is befed-t-ék
the green-SUB paint-PST.PTCP crate-ACC too cover-PST-3PL.2f
a gyom-ok.
the seed-PL
‘The seeds covered the green painted crate also.’

b. ...fertőzött volt a kút, ki-mer-tük
... infected COP.PST.3SG the well out-bale-PST.1PL.2f
száraz-ra...
dry-SUB
“...the well was infected, we baled it out dry...“

c. János rongyos-ra táncol-ta a cipő-jé-t.
PN ragged-SUB dance-PST.3SG.2f the shoe-3SG.POS-ACC
‘John danced his shoes to pieces.’

4. Predicative complements
Hungarian essive-modal –ként cannot be used to mark a predicative complement, whereas the essive-modal –ul/-ül can, as for instance in the following examples:
a. Zsigmondy Vilmos jellem-e mintakép-ül szolgál-hat-ott
   PN character-3SG.POS pattern-ESSM serve-MOD-PST.3SG
   ‘Vilmos Zsigmondy’s character could serve as a model.’

b. Szomorú-an vesz-em ez-t tudomás-ul.
   sad-ADV take-1SG this-ACC notice-ESSM
   ‘I take notice of this sadly.’

c. Kálmán feleség-ül ve-tte Margittá-t.
   PN brides-ESSM take-PST.3SG.2f PN-ACC
   ‘Kálmán married Margitta.’ (literally: “Kálmán took Margitta as a bride.”)

There are apparent counterexamples against the claim that the essive-formal –ként cannot be used to mark a predicative complement. Consider for instance the following example:

(33) Péntek László a vallomás-ai-ban konzekvens-en Kati-ként
    PN the statement-3SG.Poss.PL-INE consequent-ADV PN-ESSF
    említ-ette Bándy Katá-t.
    mention-PST.3SG.2f PN-ACC
    ‘László Péntek referred to Kata Bándy consistently as Kati in his statements.’

If the essival phrase were a complement of the verb it could not be omitted. It is, however, an optional phrase in the utterance. Moreover, the verb does not designate a three-place relation X, Y, and Z, but a two-place relation X, Y. The essival phrase is a depictive here. The same holds for examples such as (17a) above, and (35b) below. Note, however, that example (32c) behaves differently. The essival phrase ‘bride-ESSM’ cannot be omitted without changing the meaning of the verb. Moreover, the essival phrase cannot be understood as a depictive in the sense “Kálmán took Margitta (being a bride)”.

Hungarian generally employs the dative case to mark the predicative complement in stative relations (34) and the sublative case in resultatives, as shown in section 3.2.

(34) Okos-nak tart-om a fiú-t.
    clever-DAT hold-1SG the boy-ACC
    ‘I consider the boy clever.’

The form –ként sometimes occurs as an alternative of the dative with verbs such as álczáz ‘disguise’. Note, however, that the constituents marked by the dative and essive are depictive secondary predicates and not arguments of the verb in the following examples:

(35) a. Don Giovanni szolgá-nak álczáz-t-a magá-t.
    Don Giovanni servant-DAT disguise-PAST.3SG himself-ACC
    ‘Don Giovanni disguised himself as a servant.’

b. Don Giovanni szolga-ként álczáz-t-a magá-t.
    Don Giovanni servant-ESSF disguise-PAST.3SG himself-ACC
    ‘Don Giovanni disguised himself as (if he were) a servant.’

In Hungarian there is number agreement between the object and the predicative complement marked by the Dative as illustrated by (36):

(36) a. Okos-nak tart-om a fiú-t.
    clever-DAT hold-1SG.2f the boy-ACC
'I consider the boy clever.'

b. Okos-ak-nak tart-om a fiú-k-at.
Clever-PL-DAT hold-1SG.2f the boy-PL-ACC
'I consider the boys clever.'

5. Manner adverbials

Himmelmann and Schultze-Berndt (2005) point out that there may be an overlap between depictives and manner adverbials, or that one form or marker may be ambiguous between a depictive or manner interpretation in the languages of the world. This section investigates whether the Hungarian essive markers, which are depictive markers per excellence as shown in section 3.1 above, may also serve to mark manner adverbials or may have a manner interpretation.

First of all, Hungarian essive-formal cannot be used to encode adverbials. An essival phrase may, however, marginally allow for a manner interpretation partially triggered by the semantics of the verb, as for instance in the following example:

(37) Te politikus vagy, miért gondolkoz-ol gyerek-ként?
you politician COP.2SG why think-PRES.2SG child-ESSF
‘You are a politician, why do you think like a child?’

As for the essive-modal, the situation is different. The HGC does not offer examples of a phrase marked by the essive-modal used in a manner sense. The essive-modal is, however, found in a limited set of informal intensity markers such as marhá-ul (cow-ESSM, lit. ‘as a cow’), or kutyá-ul (dog-ESSM, lit. ‘as a dog’). The literal meaning of ‘cow’ and ‘dog’ is not present in these intensifiers. Consider the following example, where, like in (37) the depictive reading is excluded:

(38) Marhá-ul belever-te az orr-á-t a téglába
cow-ESSM knock-PST.3SG.2f the nose-3SG.POS-ACC the brick-ILL
‘He knocked his nose into the brick very badly.’

Where the manner interpretation of the essive-formal in (37) based on a simile metaphor, the Hungarian adverbial marker –n/-an/-en behaves differently. The form may be used to mark both manner and depictive. Compare:

(39) Manner
a. Fort Worth hol Sam bácsi tök szuper-en horkol-t.
PN where PN uncle AUG super-ADV snore-PST.3SG
‘Fort Worth, where Uncle Sam snored enormously.’

Depictive
b. Péter meleg-en issza a teá-t.
PN warm-ADV drink.3SG.2f the tea-ACC
‘Peter drinks tea warm.’

Also note that the adverbial suffix is also used in combination with numerals functioning as depictives, as in (39):

(40) Kett-en men-t-ünk haza.
two-ADV go-PAST.1PL home
‘The two of us went home.’
In a similar way as in English (Himmelmann and Schultze-Berndt 2005:6), expressions with the adverbial marker may be ambiguous between depictive and manner as in (41).

(41) János mérges-en ment el.  
John angry-ADV go.PAST.3SG away  
‘John went away angry / angrily.’

To sum up, the essive-formal and essive-modal do not serve as a marker of manner adverbials. The essival phrase may, however, be used in a non-depictive fashion indicating a similarity: “think like a child”, or an informal intensifier “very”. The suffix –n/-an/-en clearly serves two purposes: to mark manner adverbials and adjectival depictives.

6. Temporality, Circumstance, and Location
6.1. Temporal expressions
Hungarian essive-formal –ként is very productive in marking temporal phrases, particularly with nouns denoting a life stage, such as ‘child’, ‘young woman’, ‘young man’ etc. Consider the following examples:

(42) Gyerek-ként és ifjúkor-om-ban a természettudomány-ok
child-ESSF and youth-POSS.1SG-INE the natural science-PL
érdékel-t-ek.
Interest-PST-3PL
‘As a child and in my youth I was interested in natural sciences.’

(43) Diák-ként, fiatalember-ként is versel-get-ett.
student-ESSF young man-ESSF also write poetry-FREQ-PST.3SG
‘As a student and also as a young man he wrote poetry regularly.’

(44) (Ők már nem igénylik, hogy az anyu mindennap otthon legyen, mint valamikor
They do not require that mum be at home every day, like before.)
Régebben er-re nagyon vigyáz-t-am, fiatalasszony-ként és
earlier this-SUB very watch-PAST.1SG young woman-ESSF and
orvos-ként nem is válal-t-am ennyi-t, hogy a
doctor-ESSF NEG also undertake-PAST.1SG so_much-ACC that the
gyermek-eim-et rendes-en ki tud-j-am vezet-ni az élet-be.
child-POSS1SG.PL-ACC proper-ADV out be.able-SUBJ-1SG lead-INF the life-ILL
‘Earlier I was very careful about this, as a young [married] woman and a doctor I did not take up so much, so that I could lead my children into life properly.’

Note that orvosként ‘as a doctor’ in (44) is temporal too in this example, i.e. orvos ‘doctor’ can be used as a life stage predicate.

However, the nouns mentioned above may also be used in a momentary, i.e. non life stage, sense. In that case they are clear depictives. By way of contrast consider the following:

11 Temporal and circumstantial phrases with an essive can be set apart from depictives on the basis of a test with negation. Depictives are within the scope of negation whereas the others are not. Compare:
(i) Mary didn’t [eat the fish raw].
(ii) As prime minister, he didn’t [intervene].
A "Virágzó" termelőszövetkezet elnök-e 1906-ban született a Csallóköz-ben, tizedik gyerek-ként.

The chairman of the agricultural cooperative 'Virágzó' was born in 1906 in the Csallóköz region, as the tenth child [of the family].

Egyik húga zsenge korában, a másik fiatalasszony-ként halt meg.

One of his younger sisters died a very young age, and the other as a young [married] woman.

Fiatalember-ként aztán elment Amerikába, és orvos lett.

Then as a young man he went to America and became a doctor.

Clauses with temporal essival phrases may contain locational phrases as well. They do not affect the temporal use of the essival phrases.

6.2. Circumstantial expressions
Hungarian essives are also found in circumstantial expressions, as for instance in (48).

Miniszterelnök-ként O. V. bele-avatkozott.

Prime minister-ESSF PN into-intervene-PST.3SG.

‘As prime minister, V.O. intervened.’

The essival phrase in (48) cannot be analysed as a depictive but rather as a circumstantial phrase, which pragmatically functions as a scene setting element, as indicated by the comma in the gloss.

6.3. Locational expressions
Unlike in various other Uralic languages, essives in Hungarian cannot be used to encode location. The suffix in expressions of the type kedd-en 'on Tuesday' or nyár-on 'in summer' is the superessive case (-n/-on/-en-ón) and not the adverbial marker (-n/-an/-en)

7. Comparative and simile expressions
The standard expression of comparatives in Hungarian is as follows:

Péter János-nál nagy-obb.

‘Peter is bigger than János.’

Neither the essive-formal –ként nor the essive-modal –ul/-ül occur in comparatives. As an alternative of (49) the form mint can be used (50).

Péter nagy-obb mint János.

‘Peter is bigger than János.’
Recall that *mint* and –ként form a minimal pair as markers of depictives (see section 3.1.2), but not in the case of comparison, where *mint* ‘as’ can be used, but –ként cannot.

A simile is a figure of speech that directly compares two different things, usually by employing the words "like" or "as". In Hungarian it is not possible to use the essives in simile expressions. Instead, the preposition *mint* is used, as in:

(51) a. szabad mint a madár
    ‘free as the bird’

b. A lobogó sörény-ek mint a láng-ok
    ‘the flowing mane-PL like the flame-PL’

On the other hand, essival phrases functioning as manner, as (37) in section 5, may be based on a simile metaphor. Another example of the essive-formal which very much resembles a simile expression is (52).

(52) s a hír futótűz-ként terjed-t el a város-ban.
    ‘and the news spread like wildfire in the city.’

8. **Essive versus Translative**

In this section I aim to show whether there is an overlap between the essive and translative in Hungarian, or even a (terminological) switch, as for instance in Skolt Saami, where the form traditionally referred to as the essive also marks complements of verbs of change, or in Erzya, where the form traditionally referred to as translative also encodes stative depictives or predicative complements.

Hungarian has a distinct translative case which takes the form –vá/-vé as in (53):

(53) a. Vér nem válík víz-zé.
    (lit: ‘blood does not change into water.’)
    ‘Blood is thicker than water.’

b. Zöld Péter majdnem sóbálván-nyá változ-ott
    PN almost salt pilar-TRA change-PST.3SG
    ‘Peter Zöld almost turned into a pillar of salt.’

The distribution of the translative in Hungarian is limited to a rather small class of verbs, the class of verbs of change. Most of the 272,587 occurrences of the translative in the HGC are in the context of the verbs válík ‘become, change’ and változik ‘change’.12

Different from its counterpart in several other Uralic languages, the Hungarian translative is not used in non-verbal predications based on a (semi-)copula ‘become’. First of all, Hungarian does not have a dynamic counterpart of stative copula *van* ‘be’. Instead, the future form of the static

---

12 Unfortunately, it is not possible to give a clear statistical statement about the percentage of the co-occurrence of the two verbs and the Translative, because the verbs do not require the overt expression of a phrase marked by the Translative. Moreover, the verbs are also used in the opposite meaning, namely ‘change from’, which require a directional case form.
copula *lenni ‘be’* is used, as in (54).\(^{13}\) Note that the nominal predicate takes the nominative and not the transitive:

\[\text{(54)}\]
\[
\begin{array}{ccc}
\text{PN} & \text{doctor} & \text{COP.FUT} \\
\text{Zoli} & \text{orvos lesz.} & \end{array}
\]

In Hungarian the essives and the translatives never blur. The distribution of the forms is strictly divided: essives occur in stative expressions, and the translatives in dynamic expressions.

9. **Word order**

Hungarian essives are found in four syntactically different types of phrase, namely, in manner, depictive, temporal, and circumstantial phrases:

\[\text{(55)}\]
\[
\begin{array}{ccc}
\text{Manner} & \text{You think as a child.} \\
\text{Depictive} & \text{Paul is working as a guide in Greece. / Mary ate the fish raw.} \\
\text{Temporal} & \text{As a child I lived in London.} \\
\text{Circumstantial} & \text{As prime minister, he did not intervene.} \\
\end{array}
\]

Clauses can be analysed as hierarchical structures, consisting of different layers, each having their own set of operators and restrictors (Hengeveld and Mackenzie 2008). Manner can be considered a restrictor of a verb, where depictive is associated with a verb and its arguments. Temporal and circumstantial phrases have a much wider scope. An example of an operator is Negation which has scope over a verb and its arguments. Example (56) summarizes the (partial) hierarchical structure of the clause relevant to the essives in Hungarian:

\[\text{(56)}\]
\[
\begin{array}{ccc}
\text{a.} & \text{Manner is a modifier of the verb} \\
\text{b.} & \text{Depictive is specified on the level of the verb and its arguments} \\
\text{c.} & \text{Negation has scope over Manner, Verb, Arguments, and Depictive} \\
\text{d.} & \text{Circumstantial and Temporal modifiers are on a higher level, i.e. outside the scope of negation} \\
\end{array}
\]

Hungarian is usually characterized as a free word order language. It is correct that all 24 possible permutations of an utterance of the type “John gave a book to Mary” yield grammatical correct clauses in Hungarian. There are, however, various restrictions which have *inter alia* to do with scope distinctions and pragmatics. Manner expressions are likely to be found in the neighbourhood of the verb, because it is a restrictor of the verb, where circumstantial phrases are more likely to be found in the periphery of a clause, because of their wide scope. As for the temporal and circumstantial phrases marked by an essive, it is indeed the case that these phrases tend to occur at the beginning or end of clauses. As scene setting expressions, they prefer the beginning (cf. example 48). As for manner phrases and depictives, they have a preference for a place close to the verb.

A strong pragmatically motivated restriction says that the focus of the clause immediately precedes the finite verb. For that reason, this position is usually referred to as a focus position, i.e. if

\(^{13}\) Kenesei et al. (1998: 201) consider *lesz ‘will be, will become’* together with *lett ‘would be, would become’* as a copular verb other than *van ‘be’*. They gloss the forms as the present and past tense forms of ‘become’, which is rather unusual. They also consider *válik ‘become, change’* a copular verb, although the verb is clearly a two-place (lexical) verb.
there is a focus in the clause, it will be placed there. 14 Example (57a) illustrates that ‘book’ functions as the focus, and (57b) that ‘Mary’ functions as the focus.

    PN book-ACC give.PRS.3SG PN-DAT
    ‘John gives a BOOK to Mary.’

    PN PN-DAT give.PRS.3SG book-ACC
    ‘John gives a book to MARY.’

Essival phrases follow the syntactic rules where focus is involved. If the essival phrase functions as the focus, it will be placed directly before the verb. If some other element functions as the focus, the essival phrase will not occupy that position. Compare the following:

(58) a. Ildikó nyers-en et-te meg a hal-at.
    PN raw-ADV eat-PST.3SG.2f ASP the fish-ACC
    ‘Ildikó ate the fish RAW.’

b. Ildikó a hal-at et-te meg nyers-en.
    PN the fish-ACC eat-PST.3SG.2f ASP raw-ADV
    ‘Ildikó ate the FISH raw.’

In all new information utterances or thetic statements, i.e. clauses without a focus constituent, there are also restrictions on the order of constituents. 15 The indefinite object, for instance, will precede the finite verb, whereas the definite object will be placed after the finite verb:

    PN book-ACC give.PRS.3SG PN-DAT
    ‘John gives a book to Mary.’

    PN give.PRS.3SG.2f the book-ACC PN-DAT
    ‘John gives a book to Mary.’

Note that a constituent right before the verb is not necessarily the focus of the clause. When we have a look at depictives in thetic statements, we see that they significantly prefer the position immediately preceding the finite verb. Examples of essival depictives are the following:

(60) a. Imre idegevezető-ként dolgozott Olaszoszág-ban.
    PN tour operator-ESSF work-PST.3SGs Italy-INE
    ‘Imre worked as a tour operator in Italy.’

b. Jenő titkár-ul választ-otta ő-t.
    PN secretary-ESSM choose-PST.3SG.2f 3SG-ACC
    ‘Jenő chose him/her to be secretary.’

14 Another crucial issue in relation to focus in Hungarian is stress. I will not take stress and specific focus constructions such as contrastive-focus into consideration here, because the data does not offer this type of information. It is basically from written language. Further empirical and experimental research on the relation between focus, stress, and essive would be most welcome.

15 There is extensive literature on Focus, the focus position and elements which may or must take the position preceding the finite verb in Hungarian. See É. Kiss (2002) for a comprehensive overview of the data.
c. Sándor meleg-en it-ta meg a kávé-t.
PN warm-ADV drink-PST.3SG.2f ASP the coffee-ACC
‘Sándor drank the coffee warm.’

The observations made on the syntactic position of the various phrases marked by an essive are based on a random sample of examples from the HGC. One explicit query was formulated to measure the number of depictives in –ként in preverbal position. It turned out that 32.2% of the depictives with the essive-formal take the position immediately preceding the finite verb. This is an interesting observation, even more in contrast to the percentage of indefinite objects in preverbal position, which is 14.9%. The bare indefinite object has always been considered to be the prime candidate to occur in the position preceding the finite verb in utterances without a special focus. It now seems that the depictive in –ként is ranking much higher than the indefinite object!

(61)  a. Laci könyv-et olvas.
PN book-ACC read.3SG
‘Laci is reading a book.’

b. Anikó orvos-ként dolgoz-ik.
PN doctor-ESSF work-3SG
‘Anikó works as a doctor.’

In its current form, it was not possible to extract the percentage of depictives and manner phrases with the adverbial marker –n/-an/-en in focus position from the HGC. However, in thetic expressions the depictive and the manner phrases also seem to prefer that position. Consider the following:

(62)  a. Pista nyers-en et-te meg a kagyló-t.
PN raw-ADV eat-PST.3SG.2f ASP the mussel-ACC
‘Pista ate the mussel raw.’

b. András szép-en énekel.
PN beautiful-ADV sing.3SG
‘András sings beautifully.’

Examples (61) and (62) suggest that depictives and manner phrases pattern along in their preference to take the focus position in thetic expressions.16 de Groot (2012) makes an attempt to account for the syntactic resemblance between depictives and manner phrases, which is based on their hierarchical location in the structure of the clause. Mackenzie (2013), however, assumes that there is differential focus assignment: (i) to the verb and its arguments, or (ii) to the depictive. If that is correct, it would explain the location of the depictive, namely, in the focus position.

10. Conclusions and final remarks
The following conclusions can be drawn from the expose on essives in Hungarian:
(i) There are three forms which can be considered an essive in Hungarian, (a) -ként, which combines with many, but predominantly with nominal, parts of speech, (b) -ul/-ül which applies to nouns only and which also has a non-essival use, and (c) –n/an/-en which applies to adjectives only and which also has a bigger task, namely, to mark adjectives in the function of manner adverbs.

16 See Nose (2003) for a statistical approach to the essive and word order positions in Finnish and Hungarian on a much smaller sample and a slightly different result.
(ii) The dominant use of suffixes (a) and (b) is to mark depictives, which are optional predicative adjuncts. The third suffix is basically a marker of manner but is also employed to mark a sub-class of depictives. In these functions, the three markers cannot be considered cases but rather (secondary) predicative markers. Consequently, they should not be included in the inventory of cases of Hungarian, as in Table 1. Note, however, that the essive-modal occurs in a small set of fixed expressions, where it marks an argument of a verb. This is not enough to justify the essive-modal being a case.

(iii) Differential marking of main non-verbal predicates (nominative versus essive) yielding the semantic opposition permanent vs. impermanent state is not found in Hungarian. Instead, the opposition is found within the domain of secondary predication. Differential marking of depictives based on the application of preposition mint ‘as’ and essive-formal –ként offers the opposition permanent vs. impermanent state. No such opposition is found with the others essives in Hungarian.

(iv) Almost all essival phrases in the Hungarian Gigaword Corpus are indefinite, i.e. essival elements marked by the definite article are rare. This reinforces the argument that essival phrases are predominantly predicative adjuncts.

(v) The distribution of essive on depictives is not sensitive to tense, aspect, person, or animateness.

(vi) The essive markers are found on other elements than depictives, such as manner, temporal and circumstantial phrases. Depictives (proper, or in a narrow sense) are within the scope of sentence negation, whereas the temporal and circumstantial phrases (depictives in a wide sense) are not.

(vii) The distribution of the essives in Hungarian show no one-to-one relation between form and function, i.e. none of the essives has just one unique application. Although depictives are the prime candidates for essives, there are at least five other forms than essive which can do the same.

(viii) Essival depictives and manner phrases prefer the focus position in thetic utterances. Different factors may be responsible for this tendency: they are focal elements (because they are predicates), they are (mostly) indefinite, they are closely related to the verb and its arguments. Note they are within the scope of negation.

(ix) Temporal and circumstantial phrases marked by an essive are found in the periphery of clauses. As scene setting elements, they occur in the beginning of clauses.

(x) Although Hungarian essives spread out over depictive, manner, temporal and circumstantial phrases, they can be strictly set apart from the subjunctive as the marker of resultatives and the transitive as the marker of the result of change.
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