1 The data
1.1 Depictives
In Hungarian there are various kinds of constructions which contain secondary predicates. This paper is restricted to just one type, the depictive secondary predication (DSP). Depictives are secondary predicates such as *raw* in *Mary ate the fish raw.* Schultze-Berndt & Himmelmann (2004) and Himmelmann & Schultze-Berndt eds. (2005) increase our understanding of the formal and semantic properties of depictives by describing examples from various languages of the world while comparing them with (different classes of) adverbials, i.e. other types of participant-oriented adjuncts. They characterize depictive in the following fashion:

(1) A depictive proper (or depictive in the narrow sense) is a participant-oriented adjunct which is part of the focus domain of a sentence, i.e. which functions as focus exponents. Such adjuncts encode a state which contributes a significant characteristic to the main event – for example, *leaving drunk* or *leaving outraged* is different from simply *leaving.*

The authors also characterize depictives as a distinct category of secondary predicates on the basis of the following properties.

(2) Depictive secondary predications meet all of the following requirements:
   (i) There are two separate predicative elements.
(ii) The depictive is obligatory controlled. The controller is not expressed separately as an argument of the depictive.

(iii) The depictive does not form a complex or periphrastic predicate with the main predicate.

(iv) The depictive is not an argument of the main verb.

(v) The depictive is not a modifier of the controller.

(vi) The depictive is non-finite.

(vii) The depictive is part of the same prosodic unit as the main predicate.

Examples of Hungarian depictives are for instance idegenvezetőként, berúgva, respectively ketten in 3.²

(3) Depictive secondary predicates in Hungarian

a Pál idegenvezető-ként dolgozik Görögországban.
   "Paul tour operator-ESF³ work in Greece"
   'Paul is working as a tour operator in Greece.'

b Péter berúg-va hazament.
   "Peter get drunk-CONV went home"
   'Peter went home drunk.'

c Kett-en mentünk haza.
   "two-ADV we went home"
   'The two of us went home.'

Example 3a shows a nominal, 3b a converbal, and 3c a numeral depictive. Note that the depictive has the function of focus in all three examples, as indicated by its position immediately preceding the verb. I will return to the requirement for depictives to be in the focus domain later. Also note that the depictives in 3 have the subject as their controller, which is only a requirement for the third type, the numeral depictive. The nominal and converbal depictive may also have the object as its controller. In fact, examples such as 4 are ambiguous in the sense that in 4a either János or Péter may be the teacher, and in 4b either János may be drunk or the guest.⁴
1.2 Transparent adjuncts

Things get much more complicated when we also take oriented adverbs into consideration, which may be ambiguous between manner and depictive adverbs. I will explain this in more detail here, since the data is not as well known as the data in section 1.1. The adverb *stupidly* in 5 is used as a manner adverb. The stupidity is ascribed to the way John answers the question.

(5) John answered the question *stupidly*.

The same set of words in a different order yield a different interpretation. The adverb *stupidly* in 6 is rather a participant-oriented adverb which syntactically still belongs to the sentence-level adverbs.

(6) John *stupidly* answered the question.

Adverbs like *stupidly* in 6 ascribe a certain characteristic to the agent on the basis of the event which it performs. The example can be paraphrased as *It was stupid of John to answer the question*, which clearly indicates that the form *stupidly*, irrespective the fact that it takes the adverbial suffix –*ly*, (also) functions as a secondary predicate. No such interpretation arises when the adverbial is in the final position of the clause, as in 5.

When we consider example 7, we see that the form *angrily* allows both interpretations, that of a manner adverb and of an agentive adverb. Peter may read the review in an angry manner, or Peter may be angry.

(7) Peter *angrily* read the review.

The ambiguity present in example 7 disappapers in an example like 8, where *angry*
as an adjective without the adverbial ending – is used as a secondary predicate or depictive.

(8) Peter read the review angry.

What we see on the basis of the examples from English is that there is a partial overlap between manner and agent-oriented adverbs. This overlap has a semantic, syntactic, morphological, and, as we will see later, also a pragmatic component. Neither the observation that there is an overlap between manner and participant-oriented adverbs is not new, nor the observation that the overlap poses a problem for linguistic theory, in particular for semantic theory, is new.5 Himmelmann & Schultze-Berndt (2005) illustrate the problem within the framework of Davidsonian semantics, where verbs carry an event variable and adverbials are analysed as predicates of events. There is an apparently straightforward way of representing the difference between pure manner 9a and depictive 9b as in 10a and 10b, respectively.

(9) a Arthur read the paper slowly. (p  u  r  e  m  a  n  n  e  r)
   b Arthur left the party angry. (depictive)

(10) a read (e) (x, review) & slow (e) (pure manner)
   b leave (e) (x, party) & angry (x) (depictive)

Geuder (2002) already noted that these distinct representations do not account for examples such as 11a where both analyses apply simultaneously.

(11) a Peter angrily read the letter.
   b [read (e) (x, letter) & angry (e)] & [read (e) (x, letter) & angry (x)]

Geuder (2002) argues that the ambiguity arises when there is a factual link between the primary and secondary predication. This link may be consecutive as in 12a or causal as in 12b:

(12) a John angrily read the review of his book. (John was angry after having read the review)
b John *angrily* wrote a letter to the editor. (writing the letter causes the anger)

Geuder labelled this type of adjunct as ‘transparent’. He suggests the following relation between the three categories:

Is the adjunct event-oriented or participant-oriented?

- **event-oriented:**
  - manner adverb

- **participant-oriented:**
  - Does a factual link exist between the primary and the secondary predication?
    - yes:
      - transparent adverb
    - no:
      - depictive adjective

Figure 1: The typology of oriented adjuncts (Geuder 2002)

Hungarian also distinguishes between these three categories. The formal expression, however, differs from English. In fact there is a variety of marking systems. When we take English and Hungarian and add Dutch and Polish, we see that these four languages present an interesting typology.

Firstly consider Dutch and note that Dutch does not formally mark adjectives which are used as depictives 13a, nor those used as manner adverbials 13b. The bare adjective may also function as a transparent adjunct 13c. The zero marking of the adjectives is indicated by -Ø.

(13) Dutch

a Jack eet de vis *rauw*-Ø. (depictive)
   Jack eats the fish raw
   'Jack eats the fish raw.'
b Mary zingt mooi-Ø. (manner)
Mary sings beautiful
‘Mary sings beautifully.’

c Peter verliet woedend-Ø het feestje. (transparent)
Peter left angry the party
‘Peter left the party angry/angrily.’

According to Renz (2007) Polish has two ways to express depictives and transparent adjuncts. In the first one the adjunct takes the form of the adjective and there is agreement between the adjective and the participant to which it is oriented 14a and 14d. In the second one, the adjunct takes the adverbial form 14b and 14e. Renz claims that the two types of expressions are synonymous. Manner can be expressed by the adverbial form only 14c.

(14) Polish

a PiotrNOM wrócił bosoNOM. (depictive)
b PiotrNOM wrócił bosoADV. (depictive)
‘Peter returned barefoot.’
c Profesor nudnoADV wygłasza swój referat. (manner)
‘The professor holds his lecture boringly.’
d BógNOM rozgniewanyNOM zniszczyl Sodomę i Gomorę. (transparent)
e BógNOM gniewnieADV zniszczyl Sodomę i Gomorę. (transparent)
‘God angrily destroyed Sodom and Gomorrah.’

Finally, consider Hungarian which, in these examples, marks all three types by the adverbial affix –en. Note that even the depictive, which has the object as its controller in 15a, is marked by the affix –en.6

(15) Hungarian

a MaryNOM raw-ADV ette meg a hal-AT. (depictive)
MaryNOM raw-ADV ate-ASP thefish-ACC
‘Mary ate the fish raw.’
b Tamás szép-en énekel. (manner)
Tom beautiful-ADV sings
‘Tom sings beautifully.’
c Péter mérges-en írta a level-et. (transparent)
Peter angry-ADV wrote the letter-ACC
‘Peter angrily read the letter.’

The marking of adjectives as oriented adjuncts in the four languages presents an interesting typology. Dutch and Hungarian do not morphologically differentiate between transparent adjuncts, depictives and manner, while English differentiates between depictive on the one hand and transparent and manner on the other, and Polish differentiates between depictive and transparent versus manner. The transparent seems to take the position in between depictive and manner adjuncts.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>depictive</th>
<th>transparent</th>
<th>manner</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dutch</td>
<td>Ø</td>
<td>Ø</td>
<td>Ø</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td>Ø</td>
<td>adverbial marker</td>
<td>adverbial marker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Polish</td>
<td>agreement, or</td>
<td>agreement, or</td>
<td>adverbial marker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>adverbial marker</td>
<td>adverbial marker</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hungarian</td>
<td>adverbial marker</td>
<td>adverbial marker</td>
<td>adverbial marker</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 2: A typology of the marking of adjectives as oriented adjuncts

Given the fact that transparent adjuncts do two things at the same time, i.e. ascribe a property to the agent and ascribe to the way the action is performed, merits a discussion of this class of adjuncts in this paper. Because transparent adjuncts take the adverbial marker –ly in English, these adjuncts are often not considered to be a special class of depictives, but are simply categorized as adverbs.. However, if Polish were the standard, the claim would be that transparent adjuncts are a class of depictives and not adverbs, because depictives and transparent adjuncts are morphologically marked in the same way. I will therefore
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take the semantics of oriented adjuncts to be a more fundamental criterion in
establishing the class of depictives in Hungarian than the morphological marking.
Consequently, I will take the adjectives adverbially marked as oriented adjuncts in
Hungarian also into consideration.

1.3 Information structure and oriented adjuncts
In De Groot (2008: 73) I note that the requirement for a depictive to be the focus
or to be within the focus domain of a clause, or to put it differently, the constraint
that the information denoted by a depictive must not be presupposed, may be
generally correct, but that it is not unproblematic. Example 16a fulfils the
requirement, whereas 16b and 16c do not. The depictive in 16b, used as a
contrastive topic, is presupposed but may be considered to be focal too because of
the contrast. Negation in Hungarian constitutes the focus in the clause. In
negative clauses in Hungarian there is no room for depictives to also function as
the focus. The depictive in expressions such as 16c may, but need not, be
considered part of the not-presupposed information.

(16) a  Depictive as focus
   János tanář-ként dolgozott Amszterdam-ban.
   János teacher-ESF worked Amsterdam-INES
   ‘János worked in Amsterdam AS A TEACHER.’

b  Depictive as contrastive topic
   Tanář-ként János dolgozott Amszterdam-ban.
   teacher-ESF János worked Amsterdam-INES
   ‘As a teacher JÁNOS worked in Amsterdam.’

c  Depictive as pragmatically neutral with sentence negation
   János tanář-ként nem dolgozott Amszterdam-ban.
   János teacher-ESF NEG worked Amsterdam-INES
   ‘János didn’t work in Amsterdam as a teacher.’

A second observation concerning depictives and information structure is that
Hungarian allows depictive phrases with an internal focus. In example 17 the
depictive phrase takes the focus position in the main clause. Within the depictive
phrase a pálinkától ‘from the brandy’ takes the focus position before the stem of the converb otherwise occupied by the aspectual element be.

(17) János a pálinká-tól rúg-va be hozta haza Mari-t
     János the brandy-ABL drunk-CONVASP brought home Mary-ACC
     ‘János brought Mary home drunk FROM THE BRANDY.’

There is interaction between the pragmatic structure of the secondary predication and the main predication. If the depictive phrase contains a focus, then the main predication will not allow some other element to be the focus on that level. In other words, a clause with a depictive secondary predication can have just one focus, which may be the depictive 16a, some element from the depictive phrase 17 or some other element figuring in the main predication 16b,c.

Finally I would like to mention that I have the impression that manner adverbs, like depictives, also favour the function of focus in the clause.

2 The location of Hungarian depictives in representational frames
In the second part of this paper I wish to further discuss semantic aspects of depictives in Hungarian, for which I will make use of the framework of Functional Discourse Grammar (Hengeveld & Mackenzie 2006, 2008). FDG distinguishes between the following four levels for the analysis of linguistic data:

(i) The Interpersonal level (IL) deals with all the formal aspects of a linguistic unit that reflect its role in the interaction between Speaker and Addressee. The Interpersonal level specifies Acts which consist of an Illocution, the Speech Participants and a Communicated Content. Within the Communicated Content, one or more Subacts of Reference and Ascription are evoked by the Speaker.7

(ii) The Representational level (RL) deals with the semantic aspects of a linguistic unit. The term ‘semantics’ is used in a very restricted way in FDG, in that (a) it is restricted to the ways in which language relates to the real or imagined world it describes, and (b) it is restricted to the meaning of lexical units in isolation from the way in which they are used.
in communication. Where the nature of the units at IL can best be described in terms of evocation, the nature of representational units can be described in terms of designation (Hengeveld and Mackenzie 2008: 130). At RL the utterance is thus filled in with semantic content, i.e., with descriptions of entities as they occur in some non-linguistic world. Since these entities are of different orders, the linguistic units at this level differ with respect to the ontological category they designate.

\[
\langle \pi p_1: [ \\
\quad \langle \pi e_{p_1}: [ \\
\quad \quad \langle \pi e_1: [ \\
\quad \quad \quad \langle \pi f_1: ... (f_1): \sigma (f_1) \rangle_\phi \\
\quad \quad \quad \langle \pi x_1: ... (x_1): \sigma (x_1) \rangle_\phi \\
\quad \quad \quad \langle \pi l_1: ... (l_1): \sigma (l_1) \rangle_\phi \\
\quad \quad \quad \langle \pi t_1: ... (t_1): \sigma (t_1) \rangle_\phi \\
\quad \quad ] (e_1): \sigma (e_1) \rangle_\phi \\
\quad ] (e_{p_1}): \sigma (e_{p_1}) \rangle_\phi \\
\quad ] (p_1): \sigma (p_1) \rangle_\phi
\]

propositional content
episode
state-of-affairs
property/relation
individual
location
time
state-of-affairs
episode
propositional content

Here \( \pi \) stands for one or more operators at each of the layers, while \( \sigma \) symbolises one or more modifiers. Moreover, each unit is represented by a variable indicating the order of entity denoted:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Semantic category</th>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Examples</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Propositional Content</td>
<td>p</td>
<td>idea</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Episode</td>
<td>ep</td>
<td>summary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State-of-affairs</td>
<td>e</td>
<td>meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individual</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>chair</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location</td>
<td>l</td>
<td>garden</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time</td>
<td>t</td>
<td>week</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Property/relation</td>
<td>f</td>
<td>colour</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 3: The hierarchical structure of the representational level
Within the context of this paper it is relevant to mention that state-of-affairs are characterized by one or more Properties ($f_1$), which may contain descriptions of Individuals ($x_1$) and further Properties ($f_2$), as illustrated by the following examples:

(18) a John went to Paris.
\[ (e_i: (f_i: [ (f_j: goV (f_j)) (x_i: JohnProp (x_i))_{Act} (x_j: ParisProp (x_j))_{Dir} ] (f_i)) (e_i) \phi) \]

b John walked slowly.
\[ (e_i: (f_i: [ (f_j: walkV (f_j): [(m: slowA (m_i)) (f_i) \phi]]) (x_i: JohnProp (x_i))_{Act} ]
(f_i)) (e_i) \phi) \]

The formalism shows that state-of-affairs are restricted by a property. The property itself is a combination of semantic units that are not in hierarchical relationship with respect to each other, including Properties ($f$), Individuals ($x$), Manner ($m$), etcetera.

(iii) The Morphosyntactic level accounts for all the linear properties of a linguistic unit, both with respect to the structure of sentences, clauses and phrases and with respect to the internal structure of complex words.8

(iv) The Phonological level accounts for the linguistic expression of the phonological units it contains, such as the Utterance, the Intonational Phrase, the Phonological Phrase, and the Phonological Word.

Aspects of the data relevant to a discussion of depictives and representational frames within the framework of Functional Discourse Grammar may be summarized in the following way.

- The subject may be the only controller of the depictive.
- Either the subject or the object may be the controller of the depictive.
- The subject is the controller of the transparent adjunct, which at the same time functions as a manner modifier of the main verb.
- There is a consecutive or causal link between the main and the secondary predication.
- Depictives are within the focus domain of the clause.
CASPER DE GROOT

The central question concerning Hungarian depictives here is the way they are embedded in representational frames. Is there just one unifying pattern or are there different possibilities? If there are different possibilities, what will then be the range of variation?

There are four observations which tell us something about the domain in which the depictives in Hungarian should be located. (i) The first one concerns the fact that depictive phrases may internally have an element with the pragmatic function of topic or focus. This observation suggests that a depictive secondary predication in Hungarian is a Discourse Act. (ii) The second one is that the depictive in Hungarian is within the scope of sentence negation, which suggests that depictives are restrictors of the same e-variable as the main predication. (iii) The third observation is that several depictives show agreement with its controller. Agreement in Hungarian only arises in predicative relations and constructions which involve some sort of discontinuity within a clause, extraclausal constituents included. This observation suggests that depictives, at least several types of them, do not form one constituent with their controllers. This is in line with what has been suggested in the literature (Schultze-Berndt & Himmelmann 2004: 83), namely that there is in fact no syntactic difference between non-restrictive modifiers and depictive secondary predication. (iv) The fourth observation is that depictives do not form prosodic units on their own. Depictive phrases are part of the intonation contour of utterances. There is no comma intonation nor are there any other intonation markers to indicate the beginning or the end of the depictive secondary predication. The first observation suggest an analysis in which the depictive is not part of the main predication, whereas the latter three suggest the opposite. To sum up:

i Topic, Focus     Topic, Focus
   ACT-1          ACT -2
   Main predication depictive secondary predication

ii [... Main[PRED] ... (x_i) ...] [... Depictive[PRED] ... (x_i) ...]

iii [Neg e_i: [predication] (e_i) (e_i: [depictive secondary predication] (e_i))) (e_i)]
ORIENTED ADJUNCTS AND REPRESENTATIONAL FRAMES

Three out of four observations suggest the view that the depictive secondary predication is part of the main predication. The only contradiction is found in the observation that the depictive secondary predication constitutes an independent Act. However, given the fact that the two Acts together, that of the main predication and the secondary predication form one information unit in the sense that there is just one focus, see section 1.3 above, I conclude that the secondary predication can be considered part of the main predication.

In the following sections I will discuss the major subclasses of Hungarian depictives, the nominal, converbal and numeral depictives, and their representational frames, where the depictives are considered to be non-restrictive modifiers of the controller and part of the main predication.

3 Two nominals as depictives

In Hungarian there are two nominal depictives which at first sight look very similar. They reveal, however, significant semantic and syntactic differences. The two types are

(19)  Predicative nominal with preposition mint ‘as’
A férfi-ak mint idegenvezető-k dolgoznak Görögországban.
The man-PL as tour operator-PL they work in Greece
‘The men work as tour operators in Greece.’

(20)  Predicative nominal with the essive-formal suffix -ként
A férfi-ak idegenvezető-ként dolgoznak Görögországban.
The man-PL tour operator-ESF they work in Greece
‘The men work as tour operators in Greece.’

A semantic difference between the expression with mint and the one with –ként, is that the men in 19 are most likely tour operators by profession, whereas such presupposition does not necessarily hold in the case of 20. In that case, the men may be teachers or bank managers who incidentally act as tour operators.

A syntactic difference is that the controller of the depictive in –ként may be either the Agent or Patient of the main predicate, whereas the depictive with mint ‘as’ is not subject to these syntactic restrictions. Potentially all participants, both
arguments and non-arguments, may be the controller of the depictive (De Groot 2008: 80).

A morphological difference is that the depictive in –ként generally does not agree in number with its controller and never agrees in case or postposition, whereas the depictive with mint obligatory agrees in number, case and postposition.

The representational frame for 19 could be 21. There are two ascriptive acts, the second of which is the depictive. The argument of the depictive (xi) is coreferential with the argument of the main predicate. The argument of the depictive does not take a particular semantic function, since the semantic relation between the depictive and its argument is that of property assignment (Dik 1980: 90f))

\[
(21) \quad T_I \quad R_I \quad R_J
\]

The representational frame for 20 could be 22. Note the semantic function of Simile (SIM) of the argument of the depictive.

\[
(22) \quad T_I \quad R_I \quad R_J
\]

The different semantic relation between the depictive and its argument, property assignment versus simile, may account for the fact that there is number agreement in the first case and no number agreement in the latter. The syntactic differences could be taken to be language specific.

4 The converb as a depictive
Converbs (adverbial participles) function as adverbs of manner or circumstance. They may also function as non-verbal predicates in finite clauses or as depictive
secondary predicates. An example of a converb in a non-verbal periphrastic predication is 23a, which is contrasted with an example of the converb functioning as depictive 23b

(23) a Julika el volt fárad-va.
   Julie PFV was exhaust-CONV
   ‘Julie was exhausted.’

b Julika el-fárad-va ült le a sezlon-ra
   Julie PFV -exhaust-CONV sat down thecouch-SUBL
   ‘Julie sat down on the couch EXHAUSTED.’

In the case of the converbal depictive, only the Agent or the Patient of the main predicate may function as the controller.

In De Groot (2008) I argue that a major distinction between converbs in Hungarian that are used as adverbials and those used predicatively is that the latter class arise through derivation. Predicative converbs in Hungarian may be specified for imperfective or perfective aspect, while at the same time the state – of-affairs designated by the converb is a State and not an Event. The state holds at the same time as the eventuality encoded by the main verb. I therefore conclude that the π₁ aspectual operator applies before the derivation and not afterwards, i.e. there is no need to stipulate that the converbal depictive as a predicate allows the application of the aspectual π₁ operator.

The representational frame corresponding to example 23b could be the following:

(24) \[ T_I \quad R_I \quad R_J \]
    \[ (e_i: (f_i: [ \text{le}_\text{ül}-V (f_j)) (x_i: \text{Julika}_{\text{Prop}} (x_i))_{\text{Act}} (l_i: \text{sezlon} (l_i))_{\text{Dir}} ] (f_i)) \]
    \[ T_J \]
    \[ (f_k: [ \text{elfáradva}_{\text{CONV}} (f_m)) (x_i) o ] (f_k)) (e_i; o) \]

The semantic relation between depictive and argument is that of property assignment. The state-of-affairs is that of State.
5 Numeral as a depictive

A third category of depictive secondary predication in Hungarian is based on the predicative use of numerals. There are two types of depictives based on a numeral. The first one combines a numeral with the adverbial marker –an/-en, as in 25. There is no number agreement between the depictive and its controller. The second type is the universal quantifier mind, also referred to as a floating quantifier, in 26. The form mind does not inflect when used as a depictive.

The sister-PL two-ADV they went home
'The sisters went home the two of them.'

(26) Floating quantifier mind ‘all’
A fiúk mind látjuk a lányok-at.
The boys all they see the girls-ACC
'All the boys see the girls. / The boys see all the girls’

The first type of depictive only allows the Agent of the main verb to be the controller, whereas the universal quantifier may be controlled by the Agent and Patient and several other participant roles similar to depictives with mint in section 2. In all cases with the quantifier mind ‘all’, the controller must be plural.

A frame similar as that for the other types of depictives could be postulated for the numeral depictives. Example 27 corresponds with 25, and 28 with 26.

(27) T_I R_i
(e_i: (f_i: [ (f_j: haza-men-V (f_i)) (m x_i: nővérN (x_i))_act ] (f_i))
T_j
(f_k: [(f_m: kett-NUM (f_m)) (x_i) _o ] (f_k)) (e_i) _o)

(28) T_I R_i R_j
(e_i: (f_i: [ (f_j: lát-V (f_i)) (m x_i: fiúN (x_i))_act (m x_j: lányN (x_j))_pat ] (f_i))
T_j
(f_k: [ (f_m: mind-NUM (f_m)) (x_i/j) _o ] (f_k)) (e_i) _o)

The semantic relation between the numeral predicate and its argument is
accounted for by the status of the predicate. I do not know what kind of semantic function could be applied to the argument. I assume that the function of Zero will be appropriate. Note that the numerals are treated as lexical predicates.

Interestingly, the stem _kett- ‘two’ in 27 is the predicative stem opposed to _két ‘two’, which is used in attributive cases.

6 Interim discussion

In the former sections I proposed to treat all major types of depictives as ascriptive acts which correspond to a predication embedded in a restrictor of an e-variable. The depictive itself is not a restrictor of the e-variable of the main predication. It is not a restrictor of another e-variable either. It loosely attaches to one of the referents within the predication by way of coreferentiality. This accounts for the fact that the depictive is non-restrictive. The use of a comma, as proposed for non-restrictive relative clauses and for non-restrictive appositions, is not appropriate because a comma would incorrectly suggest that the depictive forms a prosodic unit on its own. The representational frame of depictives in Hungarian is then as follows:

\[
T_1 \quad R_I \quad R_N \\
(e_i: (f_i: [ (f_j: \text{PRED-V} \, (f_j)) \, (x_i)_\phi \ldots \, (x_n)_\phi \ldots] \, (f_i)) \\
T_J \\
(f_k: [ (f_m: \text{PRED_{N/CONV/NUM}} \, (f_m)) \, (x_{i-n})_\phi \ldots] \, (f_k)) \, (e_i)_\emptyset)
\]

7 Adjectival adjuncts

In section 1.2 I argued that certain adjectival adjuncts in Hungarian should be regarded as depictives, irrespective of the fact that these forms are marked by an adverbial affix. Semantically genuine depictives, such as _nyersen ‘raw.ADV’ in 15a, here repeated as 30, are comparable with the three types of depictives discussed in the earlier sections.

\[
(30) \quad \text{Mari } \text{nyers-en ette meg a hal-at.} \\
\begin{align*}
\text{Mary} & \quad \text{raw-ADV ate ASP the fish-ACC} \\
& \quad \text{‘Mary ate the fish raw.’}
\end{align*}
\]
The applicability of the representational frame proposed in 29 could be expanded by specifying the subcategorization of the secondary predicate by A in addition to N / CONV / NUM. Coreferentiality between the controller and the argument of the adjunct is limited to the Agent and the Patient of the main predicate. As for the transparent adjuncts, let us first have a look at manner adjuncts.

A language may have a distinct semantic category of manner. Thus, whereas Dutch lacks such category, Hungarian has one. Evidence that Hungarian possesses the category of manner adverbs can be found in the fact that adverbs can be derived from other lexical categories, such as *izgul* [V] ‘tremble’ → *izgulva* [ADV] ‘in a trembling way’, or *szemantika* [N] ‘semantics’ → *szemantikailag* [ADV] ‘semantically’. For those languages which recognize manner as a distinct category, manner is represented by the variable $m$.\(^9\) According to Hengeveld & Mackenzie (2008: 268) manner may be a restrictor of properties with differences in scope. Compare, for instance, the following two expressions in English, where *slowly* in 31a modifies the way of reading, whereas *slowly* in 31b does not modify the way of understanding but the way of understanding the problem.

\[(31)\]  a Mary reads slowly.
  b Peter slowly understood the problem.

The scope differences of the properties correspond to \((f_2)\), narrow scope, and \((f_1)\), wide scope, as represented in 32:

\[(32)\]  \((e_1: (f_1: [(f_2: \text{read } (f_2)) \phi \ldots ] (f_1)) (e_1)\phi)\)

The difference between the manner restrictors in 31a and 31b can be formalized as in 33a and 33b, respectively.

\[(33)\]  a \((e_1: (f_1: [(f_2: \text{read } (f_2)): (m_1: \text{slow } (m_1)) (f_2)) \phi \ldots ] (f_1)) (e_1)\phi)\)
  b \((e_1: (f_1: [(f_2: \text{read } (f_2)) \phi \ldots ] (f_1): (m_1: \text{slow } (m_1)) (f_1)) (e_1)\phi)\)

Manner in 33a is represented as a restrictor of the \((f_2)\) variable, whereas manner in 33b is represented as a restrictor of the \((f_1)\) variable.

The possibility of manner functioning as restrictor on \(f_2\) or on \(f_1\) is helpful for an account of transparent adjuncts. Recall that transparent adjuncts are agent-
oriented adjuncts which at the same time function as manner. The ambiguity arises when there is a factual link between the primary and the secondary predication. This link may be consecutive or causal as illustrated by the examples 12, here repeated as 34.

(34) a John *angrily* read the review of his book. (John was angry after having read the review)
    b John *angrily* wrote a letter to the editor. (writing the letter causes the anger)

I suggest analysing transparent adjuncts, such as *angrily* in 34, as manner restrictors of f1, because such analysis accounts for the fact that there is a link between the predication the reading of the review of his book and the ascriptive act of angry as a manner.

(35) (e 1: (f1: [ (f2: read (f2) (x1: John (x1))Act (x2: the review of his book (x2))Pat] (f1) :
    (m 1: angry (m1) (f1)) (e1)φ)

If the adjunct were a manner restrictor of the f2 variable, no such link could be postulated. Representation 36b with a manner restrictor of the f2 variable corresponds to a pure manner expression 36a and not to an expression with a transparent adjunct 34a.

(36) a John read the review of his book *angrily*.
    b (e 1: (f1: [ (f2: read (f2) : (m1: angry (m1)) (f2))
    (x1: John (x1))Act (x2: the review of his book (x2))Pat] (f1)) (e1)φ)

The analysis of the English data equally applies to Hungarian. The difference between pure manner and transparent adjuncts can be accounted for distinguishing between pure manner adjuncts, being restrictors of the narrow f2 variable, and transparent adjuncts, being restrictors of the wider f1 variable. The format of the representational frame which corresponds to the transparent adjunct in 37 is given in 38.
The final question to be answered here is why representational frames such as 38 license the depictive interpretation, i.e. that the ascriptive act T₁ as the restrictor of m₁ is also taken as an ascriptive act applied to the Agent of the main predicate. The answer to this question may be simple if we allow the argument of the embedded predicate to be coreferential with the Agent argument of the main predicate as in 39.

Note that the configuration (ψ (f₁) : (m₁ : PRED -A (m₁)(x₁)) (f₁)) (e₁) () reflects the fact that there is an adjectival predicate the argument of which is coreferential with some other argument which functions as the head of a manner restrictor of a (wider) f-variable.

8 Discussion and conclusions
In this paper I have argued that depictive secondary predications in Hungarian, at the least the one based on a converb, must be considered a Discourse Act, because the depictive phrase allows an internal topic or focus. If, however, an element within the depictive phrase has the function of focus, it will also be the focus of the entire clause, i.e. the main and secondary predication together. This observation weakens the claim that both main and secondary predication are Discourse Acts, because focus will be assigned only once.

A second matter concerning the assignment of focus is that depictives or elements within the depictive phrase are the focus of the clause, are focal in the sense that they are contrasted, or belong to that part of information that is not presupposed. This observation suggests that there must be a relation between the
Interpersonal Level and the use of Representational Frames in the Functional Discourse Grammar of Hungarian. This issue is beyond the scope of this paper. It poses, however, an interesting question for the theory of FDG of how to relate these levels.

As for agent-oriented manner expressions, the transparent adjuncts, I have argued that this category should be considered a special class of depictives and should be discussed in relation to genuine depictives. Data from Dutch, English, Polish and Hungarian support the view that depictives and transparent adjuncts are related phenomena.

The difference between Manner, Transparent Adjunct, and Depictive in terms of representational Frames is accounted for in the following way:

(40) a  Pure manner is the restrictor of \( f_2 \).

\[
\begin{align*}
(\phi_1: (f_1: (f_2: \text{read}(f_2): (m_1: \text{angry}(m_1))(f_2)) ...) & \quad \text{......}
\end{align*}
\]

b  Transparent adjuncts are manner restrictors of \( f_1 \).

\[
\begin{align*}
(\phi_1: (f_1: (f_2: \text{read}(f_2)(x_1)_{\text{Ag}}(x_2)_{\text{Pat}})(f_1): (m_1: \text{angry}(m_1)(x_1)_{\phi})(f_1)) ...) & \quad \text{......}
\end{align*}
\]

c  Depictives

\[
\begin{align*}
(\phi_1: (f_1: [(f_2: \text{PRED-V}(f_2))(x_1)_{\phi} \ldots (x_n)_{\phi}](f_1)) & \quad (f_3: [(f_4: \text{PRED-A/N/CONV/NUM}(f_4))(x_{1-n})_{\phi}](f_3))(\phi_1)_{\phi}
\end{align*}
\]

In the representation in 40c the depictives are presented as ascriptive acts which correspond to a predication embedded in a restrictor of an e-variable. Different from what Hengeveld & Mackenzie (2008: 209) suggest, the depictive itself is not a restrictor of the e-variable of the main predication. It is not a restrictor of another e-variable either. It loosely attaches to one of the referents within the predication by way of coreferentiality. This accounts for the depictive to be non-restrictive. The use of a comma, as proposed for non-restrictive relative clauses and for non-restrictive appositions, is not appropriate because a comma would incorrectly suggest that the depictive forms a prosodic unit on its own.
## Abbreviations and symbols

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ABL</td>
<td>ablative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACC</td>
<td>accusative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACT</td>
<td>actor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ADV</td>
<td>adverb(ial)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASP</td>
<td>aspect</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CONV</td>
<td>converb</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dir</td>
<td>direction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESF</td>
<td>essive-formal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f1</td>
<td>property</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INES</td>
<td>inessive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loc</td>
<td>location</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>m</td>
<td>plural, more than one</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>m1</td>
<td>manner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>noun</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NUM</td>
<td>numeral</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pat</td>
<td>patient</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PFV</td>
<td>perfective aspect</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PL</td>
<td>plural</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRED</td>
<td>predicate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prop</td>
<td>proper name</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R1</td>
<td>subact of reference</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SIM</td>
<td>simile</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUBL</td>
<td>sublative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T1</td>
<td>subact of ascription</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V</td>
<td>verb</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>x1</td>
<td>individual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>φ</td>
<td>function</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>π</td>
<td>operator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>σ</td>
<td>modifier</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Notes
2. For a detailed description of depictives in Hungarian and a discussion of several properties of depictives, I refer to De Groot (2008).
3. I adopt the terminology for (case) suffixes used in traditional Hungarian grammars, e.g. Tompa (1968).
4. I refer to De Groot (2008) for the description of syntactic restrictions of and syntactic differences between the different depictives in Hungarian.
6. There is another adverbial marker, the affix –l. The two adverbial markers are in complementary distribution.
9. Currently, nine semantic categories are distinguished at the representational level, each characterised by its defining ontological feature: property (f; applicability), time (t; applicability), location (l; applicability), manner (m; applicability), quantity (1; applicability), individual (x; l-locatability), state of affairs (e; relative t-locatability), propositional content (p; evaluability), reason (r; evaluability), episode (ep; absolute t-locatability).
10. Hengeveld & Mackenzie (2008: 209) analyse John left the room angry in the following fashion. Angry clearly only applies to John and is understood as a depictive. They present the depictive as the second restrictor of an e-variable (their example 441): 

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{(e_i : (f_i : (f_j : leaveV (f_j)) (x_i) (l : room (l_i)) u) (f_i) (e_i) (f_0)) : (f_k : (f_j : angryA (f_j)) (x_i) (l) (f_k)) (e_i) (f_0)}
\end{align*}
\]
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