

DOI: 10.2478/v10122-010-0010-1

ARTICLES

**DOES THE GENITIVE OPERATE IN THE HUNGARIAN CASE SYSTEM?
I. THE *é*-GENITIVE**

ROBERT BIELECKI

ABSTRACT. Robert Bielecki. *Does the Genitive Operate in the Hungarian Case System? I. The *é*-Genitive*. *Lingua Posnaniensis*, vol. LII (2)/2010. The Poznań Society for the Advancement of the Arts and Sciences. PL ISSN 0079-4740, ISBN 978-83-7654-078-8, pp. 7–25

After three centuries of discussion concerning the genitive case in Hungarian, the authors of the latest academic grammars – in contrast to many of their predecessors – no longer distinguish this casual category. Different cases in Hungarian should, according to them, be distinguished only on the basis of their forms (endings). Such an extreme unilateral approach to this category seems to have simplified at first sight the description of the Hungarian language, erasing from it any case syncretism. From the point of view defended in the present paper, however, talking about linguistic entities without taking into account their meaning is illusory; even in the case of meaningless speech segments such as phonemes it is the meaning of the segments in which they occur that constitutes the ultimate instance allowing them to be distinguished at all. The same applies to case. The moderate approach to the category of case adopted here, taking simultaneously into account its (i) morphological, (ii) semantic and (iii) syntactic properties, leads irrevocably to the restoration of the genitive in the description of the Hungarian language. As a specific feature of this language one should consider the sharp distinction between two subclasses of the genitive case: (i) the non-attributive (*é*-genitive) and (ii) the attributive genitive (*Ø*-/*nak*-/*nek*-genitive). Only the first of these (the *é*-genitive) will be discussed in detail. The second (the *Ø*-/*nak*-/*nek*-genitive) will be the subject of a continuation of the present paper. Recognition of the *é*-genitive seems to have been blocked by those of its properties which seem to be quite incongruous with those of other Hungarian cases. It is claimed, for example, that the marker *-é* – unlike the markers of other cases – seems not to express any syntagmatic function. This function is expressed by the case marker attached after the morpheme *-é* (*A diákét (láttam)* ‘(I saw) The student’s one’). In the view of the author, however, the lack of syntagmatic function in the case of the morpheme *-é* is not so obvious. On the other hand, such “discrediting” properties for a case marker candidate, as the property of not occupying the final morphotactical position (*diákét*), can be viewed as entirely irrelevant for the category of case. The adopted approach seems to make possible a description of this fragment of the Hungarian case system from a more homogenous perspective, showing the interplay of different casual meanings within the boundaries of one word.

Robert Bielecki, Institute of Linguistics, Adam Mickiewicz University, al. Niepodległości 4, PL – 61-874 Poznań

1. INTRODUCTORY REMARKS

The Finno-Ugric languages (naturally including Hungarian) with their rich case inventories have often been regarded as a good starting point for investigation of the category of case in general (for example HJELMSLEV 1935: 64–65). The reasons for this view may have been many; firstly, the relatively large number of cases (or *case effective* (*l'effectif casuel*) adopting Hjelmslev's original terminology) may give an impression that the correspondence between a case and its meanings (functions) is less ambiguous, unlike languages with less numerous case inventories, such as most Indo-European languages. (Hjelmslev described the latter even as intangible in the matter of case.) Secondly, the meanings of the majority of Finno-Ugric cases are regarded as being clearly concrete (compare so called "local" cases). Thirdly, because of the considerably agglutinative character of the Finno-Ugric languages the morphological case markers do not usually cumulate other grammatical meanings. Metaphorically speaking: the monosemy of Finno-Ugric morphemes seems to allow us to investigate, amongst other things, the category of case without any obscuring burden. For this reason this grammatical category is considered to reveal itself more explicitly in those languages. Fourthly, inflection in Finno-Ugric languages is considered to be highly "regular". This statement can be conceived as a consequence of the existence of only one or very few allomorphs for each morpheme, whose distribution, in addition, seems to be describable with relatively few rules, mostly without any need to refer to the lexical meaning of the word stem. Fifthly and finally, the level of case syncretisms seems to be relatively low in the Finno-Ugric languages. This is how Hjelmslev himself described the empirical material that should be found in order to solve the question of case:

Pour trancher le problème des cas, il faudrait des systèmes riches, comportant un nombre considérable de cas et par conséquent des significations relativement concrètes et bien délimitées, et il faudrait des systèmes «réguliers», offrant peu de synchrétismes, peu de systèmes particuliers aberrants, peu d'anomalies et peu de déviations dans l'expression (HJELMSLEV 1935: 83).

Artowicz, in her monumental work about the historical development of the morphosyntactic model of the Hungarian language, shows in detail what fatal consequences resulted from, amongst other things, the very rigorous application of the tight classic pattern inherited from antiquity to the description of the category of case in Hungarian. The first significant breakthrough took place, in her view, with the publication of Versegly's grammar in 1816–1817, when the number of recognized Hungarian cases rose from six (characteristic for Latin) to seventeen (ARTOWICZ 2003: 302–368). Having made the change in their approach to the category of case in Hungarian, Hungarian linguists (and unfortunately many other Finno-Ugric linguists too) seem to have chosen a path which causes certain other fatal consequences for the description of this language (these languages). This "liberation" from the ancient case model seems to have provoked an excessively unilateral attitude to the category of case, namely a strong attachment to form – let us call it metaphorically an extreme morphologism. Antal, for example, quite seriously considers the possibility of excluding, amongst others, the accusative and adessive from the inventory of Hungarian cases, assuming that one case category in this language must be manifested in all nomina types by morphemes whose allomorphs are quite similar to one another. It is; they must have the same consonant structure, for example $-(V)t$ for accusative or $-(V)n$ for adessive, etc. The only permissible variance can take place within the vowel structure of the allomorphs

conditioned by the phenomenon of vowel harmony. The impossibility of distinguishing, in the forms of personal pronouns, the morphological markers such as *-(V)t* or *-(V)n* (compare: *engem* ‘me’ or *rajtam* ‘on me’) gives – according to Antal – quite a solid basis to consider the accusative and adessive cases as nonexistent in Hungarian (ANTAL 2005: 287). It is hard not to notice the general tendency in Hungarian linguistics to deprive, one way or another, the Hungarian case system of any syncretism, defectivity or any kind of aberrations. The extremely unilateral approach to the category of case adopted by the majority of modern Hungarian linguists, however, does not turn out, when Hungarian (and other Finno-Ugric languages too) are studied in more detail, to be so unproblematic as was thought (compare BIELECKI 2009). From the point of the view discussed in the present paper the solutions developed by Indo-European linguists over millennia (starting with the ancient case model, actually restricted only to classical Greek and Latin, and ending with the achievements of modern linguistics) are more likely to have the capacity to grasp more linguistically relevant phenomena than the hurriedly invented solutions from the relatively young Hungarian (Finno-Ugric) linguistics, which for this reason seems ridden with unclear notions and discrepancies. The distinguishing of any linguistic entities without taking into account their meaning, referring only to their form, seems to be illusory; even in the case of meaningless speech segments such a phonemes it is the meaning of the minimal diacritic pairs in which they occur that constitutes the ultimate instance allowing them to be distinguished at all.

Attempting to formulate an initial logical reconstruction of the category of case in the Indo-European tradition, it is easy to notice that case was originally meant to be – more or less univocally – a grammatical category which by means of its substantial form(s) (for quite a long time only the endings were taken into account) expresses certain kind of relations between objects (of the (extra)linguistic reality). Putting it in a slightly different way, case was a category which, having some (relatively) regular substantial manifestations – form(s) (naturally different to a certain degree from the forms of other cases) – expressed some casual meaning(s). Because of the characteristic features of Indo-European languages briefly mentioned above, there could be no equality sign between the case and its formal markers. Thus the category of case was understood as a kind of interface between morphology, semantics and syntax. All these aspects of the essence of the category of case seemed to be important to the same degree; none of them was privileged at the cost of the others. The (relatively unconstant) form of the case was treated only as a kind of tool a language uses to express certain casual meanings. We can say metaphorically that the very nature of the Indo-European languages in this matter forced linguistic thought into such a “compromise”. On the other hand, in the multilateral linguistic discussion (mainly concerning Indo-European languages) there are also known quite opposite approaches to the category of case, which seem to have derived this grammatical category only on the basis of logical speculations, largely ignoring its substantial manifestations in a language. Kempf, who explicitly regards himself as a follower of Hjelmslev’s localistic theory of case (by some linguists recognized as extremely semantic and aprioristic), criticizes for example Noreen’s solutions regarding the category of case in Swedish. According to him many of the casual distinctions proposed by Noreen are not reflected in any way in the structure of the Swedish language. For example, the distinction between the sociative case expressing companionship (*med sin drottning* ‘with his queen’) and the attributive expressing addition (*med darrande händer* ‘with trembling hands’) is not accepted by Kempf, because

both relations are expressed with an identical form (by means of the preposition *med* ‘with’) (KEMPF 2007: 112–113). As will be discussed in detail below, the author of the present paper finds the long-established moderate Indo-European tradition to be the most adequate for the description of the Hungarian (genitive) case. This approach takes into account simultaneously all the relevant aspects of case: (i) morphological, (ii) semantic and (iii) syntactic.

2. THE PROBLEM OF THE GENITIVE CASE

The genitive is one of the cases which seem to have afforded the most difficulties in the general theory of case in the Indo-European languages, probably because of its semantic vagueness, consisting in multilateral functions (meanings) which often overlap with those of many other cases. The majority of researchers, however, seem to be more or less unanimous in the view that there can be distinguished two main superclasses of the functions (meanings) of the genitive case: (i) adnominal and (ii) adverbial. Controversies over which of these two functions should be considered primary from the diachronic point of view, and attempts to establish a common synchronic semantic denominator for them, do not yet seem to have found any satisfactory solution (compare for example: HEINZ 1955 and the criticism in KEMPF 2007: 21–22). Although Heinz declares for the semantic unification between the adnominal and adverbial genitive, he himself recognizes the primacy of the adnominal function in contemporary linguistics, noticing that there are Indo-European languages (Celtic and Armenian) where only the adnominal genitive is to be found (HEINZ 1955: 65).

According to the present author, Hungarian can be considered to belong to the same language type in this regard; it is a language in which only the adnominal genitive operates, or in other words, it does not exhibit the adverbial genitive occurring in many Indo-European languages. Its problematic nature does not however seem to result directly from the restriction to the adnominal function. The majority of Hungarian linguists refrain explicitly from distinguishing the genitive firstly because of its supposed total syncretism with other cases: (i) the nominative and (ii) dative (for example: (i) *a diák könyve*, (ii) *a diáknak a könyve* ‘the student’s book’, where *diák* ‘student’ has no ending, like the nominative, and *diáknak* has the ending *-nak* also characteristic of the dative). In their approach it is enough to state that words like *diák* and *diáknak* belong respectively to the nominative and dative, conveying the meaning of possessor which is characteristic for most of the uses of the genitive case in the Indo-European languages. Paraphrasing their view: the genitive is nonexistent as an independent case in Hungarian because the meanings characteristic for this category are conveyed by other cases: the nominative and dative. Those cases simply assume in some contexts the meanings characteristic for the genitive. Some Hungarian linguists claim that the notion of the genitive has simply been transferred from the Indo-European case model into the Hungarian one on the erroneous assumption that if the majority of semantic meanings (such as possessor) conveyed by the Indo-European genitive are covered in Hungarian by some form (or forms), then that form (or forms) must be the manifestation of the genitive case. They seem to make the critical observation that recognition of the genitive as a relevant case for Hungarian results from a view of case through its semantic content in other languages not taking into account the specifics of Hungarian (ANTAL 2005: 442). Strangely enough, the same authors who are concerned by what they see as unmotivated case labeling

seem to have resorted irrevocably to the same method when distinguishing and then naming the cases they find relevant for Hungarian. How would it be possible otherwise to explain the presence of such terms as nominative, dative, accusative, etc. in Hungarian grammars if such a “semantic” transfer had not taken place in their approach as well? As far as the author is aware, the lexemes nominative, dative, accusative and so on have not been found to be of Hungarian origin. What is more, the meanings conveyed by the Hungarian nominative, dative or accusative and their terminological counterparts in Latin, for example, are far from being identical in every detail. In the continuation of the present paper (with the subtitle *The Ø-/nak-/nek-genitive*) it will be shown in detail that the syncretism between the proposed genitive, on the one hand, and the nominative and dative on the other, can be conceived as partial. The morpheme $-\emptyset$ (as in *diák*) and *-nak* (as in *diáknak*) cannot yet be regarded as the whole morpheme conveying the demanded meaning. In order to achieve this, these morphemes must be complemented by the so-called *birtokos jel* ‘possessor mark’¹ (in the phrases so far presented: *-e*), attached for example to the word *könyv* ‘book’. The genitive marker considered there is therefore a discontinuative morpheme dispersed in two words, for example: $-\emptyset\dots -e$, *-nek\dots -e* etc. This brief introduction is sufficient for us to notice that from this point of the view the Hungarian genitive has its own characteristic meanings and forms different from those of other cases, and this, in the light of the considerations briefly sketched in the introductory section, should be sufficient to confirm its existence.

On the other hand, the status of the genitive case and its formal markers in Hungarian is at the same time highly complicated by the morpheme *-é* (called *birtokjel* ‘property mark’ in the modern Hungarian linguistic literature). On the one hand this morpheme conveys the meanings characteristic of the genitive (mainly possessor), but on the other hand in one of its most characteristic uses it does not serve as a tool for binding the word to which it is attached with any other word in the syntagm where it occurs. Because of this, the majority of Hungarian linguists do not grant the morpheme *-é* the status of case marker, contrasting it with other recognized Hungarian cases whose markers express this kind of syntagmatic function beyond any doubt. What is more, the syntactic distribution of the genitive expressed for example by the morphemes $-\emptyset\dots -e$, *-nek\dots -e* and by the morpheme *-é* seems to be strictly complementary; the first functions only as attribute, while for the second the function of attribute is excluded. Both manifestations of the postulated Hungarian genitive exhibit some other properties which are quite astonishing from the “Indo-European” point of view, and will be the subject of discussion in relevant sections of this paper and its continuation. Because the morpheme *-é* was removed earlier in the historic order from the inventory of Hungarian case markers following the above-mentioned “liberation” from the classical case pattern, it will be discussed first.

3. THE *é*-GENITIVE

The discussion as to whether the genitive should be regarded as a relevant case for the Hungarian language has been ongoing for approximately three centuries (ANTAL 1977: 50–52; ARTOWICZ 2003: 311–318). The latest Hungarian academic grammars, however, do

¹ A brief interpretation of the term “mark” will be given in section 3. *The é-genitive*.

not explicitly distinguish this case category (É. KISS et al. 1999: 198–207, KESZLER 2000: 186, 191–204; KIEFER 2000: 577–587, 589). According to Artowicz the first breakthrough in the comprehension of the Hungarian genitive took place with the already mentioned publication of Verseggy's grammar at the beginning of the 19th century. He was supposedly the first to state – in opposition to all his predecessors – that the morpheme *-é* (*birtokjel* 'property mark'²) should not be conceived as a genitive marker matching the Latin genitive endings because the noun provided with it, expressing mainly possessor analogously to the Latin case model, cannot determine another noun. For example, the phrase below turns out to be incorrect³:

- | | | | |
|-----|------------------------|--|--------------------|
| (1) | * <i>a</i> | <i>diák/é/Ø</i> | <i>könyv/Ø</i> |
| | <i>the</i> (Def Artic) | <i>student/Sg-Gen</i> (praed/ellipt)-Sg ⁴ | <i>book/Sg-Nom</i> |
| | ‘the student’s book’ | | |

Additionally, Hungarian nouns provided with the morpheme *-é* can be subject to further inflection, receiving case endings which clearly express syntagmatic relations by themselves, for example:

- | | | | |
|-----|------------------------------|---------------------------------------|--|
| (2) | <i>A</i> | <i>diák/é/Ø/t</i> | <i>(lát/t/am)</i> . |
| | <i>the</i> (Def Artic) | <i>student/Sg-Gen</i> (ellipt)-Sg-Acc | <i>(see-Praet-I Sg Activ Ind Objectiv)</i> |
| | ‘(I saw) The student’s one.’ | | |

In the above sentence, to the stem *diák-* ‘student-’ have been successively attached two morphemes: (i) *-é-* and (ii) *-t*. The morpheme *-é-* gives to the stem *diák-* ‘student-’ the meaning of ‘possessor (owner) of somebody or something (possessum)’ (of course not only in the literal sense). The ending *-t* of the accusative case, on the other hand, expresses the syntagmatic relation of the word to which it is attached (*diáké*) to the finite form of the transitive verb *látni* ‘to see’: *láttam* ‘I saw’. When the analyzed morpheme in the last example does not bind the word to which it is attached with any other word occurring in the same syntagm, it consequently ought to be, according to Verseggy, regarded as a word-forming element, which seems to be a convincing enough reason not to regard the morpheme *-é* as a marker of the (genitive) case. At the same time, however, he claimed that this construction resembles the Latin elliptic genitive. In place of the removed morpheme *-é* he proposed as genitive case marker the endings *-nak/-nek*, being at the same time manifestations of the dative case (ARTOWICZ 2003: 314–317). As is known, his innovation (which with some modifications is regarded by the present author as adequate) has unfortunately not survived to the present day.

In the traditional Hungarian linguistic literature for more than a century the grammatical suffixes have been classified into three types: (i) *képző* ‘word-forming suffix’, (ii) *jel* ‘mark’

² Hexendorf has found at least 18 different names for the same concept in the Hungarian linguistic literature (HEXENDORF 1954: 308).

³ The attributive use sporadically occurring in some Hungarian dialects can be regarded as insignificant for the contemporary literary Hungarian language (compare: PAPP 1955: 292).

⁴ The morphosyntactical categorization of the words in the present paper and their morphematic division is suited to the approach adopted by the author. Its adequacy, however, will be the subject of discussion in a later section of the paper.

and (iii) *rag* ‘ending’. The first (*képző*) and the last (*rag*) seem to be – at least terminologically – understandable from a general point of view. (The remark “at least terminologically” should not be neglected; it is in no way the aim of the present author to reach an ultimate solution to the highly complex problems concerning inflection and word formation.) The second class (*jel*), however, is worthy of comment. As more or less univocally results from the list of the Hungarian suffixes belonging to this class and descriptions of them given in grammars, the “marks” are certainly not word-forming suffixes; they are not means by which new words (whatever that may mean) can be derived. On the other hand, the “marks” are not endings (inflectional suffixes) either, as can be (and actually is) often understood from the fact that they do not occupy the final morphotactical position. This position is occupied only by the endings (as the name indicates). The “marks” and the endings do not seem to be subject to any limitation in their connectivity with word stems conditioned by lexical meaning, for example the suffix *-ság*-, *-ség*- (expressing a kind of abstract meaning), widely recognized as word-forming, can be attached to the stem *szabad*- ‘free-’: *szabadság* ‘freedom’, but probably not to the stem *bolha*- ‘flea-’: **bolhaság* ‘*fleedom’. However other differences between the endings and “marks” apart from their morphotactical position seem to be unclear; Antal writes for example: *Jelnek nevezzük azokat az elemeket, amelyek a szó paradigmatis értékét nem változtatják meg, csak módosítják, ugyanazon az értéksíkon belül eltolják*. ‘We call “mark” those elements which do not change the word’s paradigmatic value, but only modify, push aside on the same value surface.’ (ANTAL 2005: 356 – The original emphasis has been removed here.). The term “paradigmatic value” is quite ambiguous, but it seems that it can probably be understood here as one of the grammatical meanings which organizes hierarchically the internal structure of word paradigms. If it were case with its subclasses recognized by Hungarian linguists as an upper category – as Antal probably suggests – Hungarian nominal paradigms could be structured in the following way⁵:

Nom	<i>diák</i> ‘student’	<i>diákok</i> ‘students’	<i>diákom</i> ‘my student’	<i>diákjaim</i> ‘my students’	...
Dat	<i>diáknak</i> ‘to student’	<i>diákoknak</i> ‘to students’	<i>diákomnak</i> ‘to my student’	<i>diákjaimnak</i> ‘to my students’	...
Acc	<i>diákot</i> ‘student’	<i>diákokat</i> ‘students’	<i>diákomat</i> ‘my student’	<i>diákjaimat</i> ‘my students’	...
...

Hungarian nominatives, datives, accusatives, etc. can also carry other grammatical meanings: (i) number (*diákok*, *diákjaim*, *diákoknak*, *diákjaimnak*, *diákokat*, *diákjaimat*), (ii) person (and simultaneously number (of the possessor)) (*diákom*, *diákjaim*, *diákomnak*, *diákjaimnak*, *diákomat*, *diákjaimat*), etc. The question of why these meanings and many more should not “change the word’s paradigmatic value, but only modify, push aside on the same value surface” remains unanswered. Namely, one can imagine constructing Hungarian nominal paradigms where the grammatical meanings hierarchically organizing their internal structure would be different, for example the upper category in this hierarchy could be:

⁵ Compare with the notion of “dissemificative dimensions” or “paradigmificators” proposed by BAŃCZE-ROWSKI (1999: 34–35).

(i) number or (ii) person (and number (of the possessor)):

(i)	Sg	<i>diák</i>	<i>diákom</i>	<i>diáknak</i>	<i>diákomnak</i>	<i>diákot</i>	<i>diákomat</i>	...
	Pl	<i>diákok</i>	<i>diákjaim</i>	<i>diákoknak</i>	<i>diákjaimnak</i>	<i>diákokat</i>	<i>diákjaimat</i>	...
(ii)	–	<i>diák</i>	<i>diákok</i>	<i>diáknak</i>	<i>diákoknak</i>	<i>diákot</i>	<i>diákokat</i>	...
	I Sg	<i>diákom</i>	<i>diákjaim</i>	<i>diákomnak</i>	<i>diákjaimnak</i>	<i>diákomat</i>	<i>diákjaimat</i>	...

There seems to be no essential difference between the nominal paradigm type suggested by Antal and those two just described. They all share the same idea; homolexical (and homopartiorational) words are being grouped according the grammatical category to which they belong. It is entirely optional which grammatical meaning is placed in the upper position in the hierarchy of those meanings. It may be (i) case in first place and (ii) number, (iii) person (and simultaneously number (of the possessor)) etc. in second, as is probably proposed by Antal; or the total reverse as has been proposed above. The mere place in the hierarchy of the differentiating (dissemificative) grammatical meanings in the framework of Hungarian nominal paradigms is not yet a convincing linguistic fact that can be referred to in the classification of their formal manifestations: suffixes. Additionally – as will be discussed later – the functional difference of the endings and “marks” does not seem to be as sharp and unambiguous as is suggested. The endings are regarded as exponents of syntagmatic relations, while the “marks” are deprived of this function. From the point of view presented in this paper such a claim is either totally untrue, or else the lack of syntagmatic function in the case of some “marks” is not so obvious. As is implied by the Hungarian term used to denote the morpheme *-é* (*birtokjel* ‘property mark’), it belongs to the category of the mysterious “marks” briefly characterized above. Some investigators, for example Lotz, nonetheless do not agree to classify it univocally as a “mark” because of its function of “expressing syntactic relations”. Lotz proposes to distinguish a fourth category of Hungarian suffixes (apart from word-forming suffixes, “marks” and endings) for the morpheme under discussion (LOTZ 1976). In Kiefer’s approach to the case category in Hungarian, the morpheme *-é* seems to be excluded from the inventory of case markers as well, amongst others, on the basis of the assumption that case morphemes in Hungarian language must morphotactically occupy the very last position. Furthermore, words provided with case morphemes must belong to a grammatical category compulsorily governed by verbs, so it is obvious that any (exclusively) adnominal case seems for Hungarian to be *a priori* excluded (KIEFER 1987, 2000: 578, 584).

Let us now take a closer look at the two functions of the *é*-genitive postulated in the present paper, paying attention not only to its predominant convergences with the Indo-European genitive case, but also its peculiarities in Hungarian.

3.1. THE PREDICATIVE GENITIVE

As has already been signaled in the introductory section, case categories in different languages which are labeled with the same grammatical terms are mostly far from being functionally identical; one does not expect the Latin nominative or accusative, for example, to carry exactly the same meanings as their terminological counterparts in Hungarian. There

is no reason why the genitive case should be any exception in this regard. A merely approximate functional similarity seems to justify the identification (at least tentatively) of certain corresponding grammatical categories within different languages under the same name. The linguistic descriptive tradition seems to corroborate this fact beyond any doubt. Of course one should not avoid evaluating the adequacy of the results of such a procedure after the proposed approach has been applied to the investigated language(s). Consequently, under the described circumstances, it is difficult to accept without objections the total exclusion of the morpheme *-é* from the inventory of Hungarian case markers, especially when the following sentence type (3) is considered from the point of the view of its Indo-European counterparts: Latin (4) or Lithuanian (5):

- (3) *A könyv/Ø a diák/é/Ø.*
the (Def Artic) book/Sg-Nom the (Def Artic) student/Sg-Gen (praed)-Sg
- (4) *Liber/Ø discipul/i est.*
book/Nom Sg student-Gen Sg be/III Sg Praes Activ Ind
- (5) *Knyga/Ø yra student/o.*
book/Nom Sg be/III Sg Praes Activ Ind student-Gen Sg
 ‘The book is the student’s.’

It is easy to see that the function of the morpheme *-é* in the sentence type exemplified here by (3) is clearly syntagmatic; it expresses the relation of the word to which it is attached (*diák* ‘student’) to another word occurring in the same syntagm (*könyv* ‘book’). Moreover, the words provided with the morpheme under discussion in the analyzed sentence type match quite well with the words belonging to the so-called predicative genitive in the presented Indo-European languages, covering its: (i) semantic (mainly possessive) and (ii) syntactic (predicative) functions (compare: TOMPA 1970: 520; WIKARJAK 1992: 107; SAMOLEWICZ 2000: 53–55).⁶ In such a context the morpheme *-é* can be conceived as the compulsory grammatical category required by the verb *lenni* meaning ‘to be, to belong to’; whose regimen could consequently be described with the formula: *valakié, valamié lenni* ‘to be somebody’s, something’s, to belong to somebody, something’, if Kiefer’s postulates about the case category and its formal markers in Hungarian should be at least partially satisfied. However as far as the morphotactical position of the analyzed morpheme as marker of the predicative genitive is concerned, the following sentence set should be investigated:

- (3) *A könyv/Ø a diák/é/Ø.*
the (Def Artic) book/Sg-Nom the (Def Artic) student/Sg-Gen (praed)-Sg
 ‘The book is the student’s.’
- (6) *A könyv/ek/Ø a diák/é/i.*
the (Def Artic) book-PI-Nom the (Def Artic) student/Sg-Gen (praed)-PI
 ‘The books are the student’s.’

⁶ The lack of the auxiliary verb (copula) *lenni* ‘to be’ in the third person singular and plural in the present tense should be seen as a matter of secondary importance. Compare however: *A (the (Def Artic)) könyv/Ø (book/Sg-Nom) a (the (Def Artic)) diák/é/Ø (student/Sg-Gen (praed)-Sg) volt (be/Praet-III Sg Activ Ind Subjectiv)* ‘The book was the student’s’, where the copula *lenni* ‘to be’ is lexicalized in the form of *volt* ‘was’.

- (7) *A* *könyv/Ø* *a* *diák/ok/é/Ø.*
the (Def Artic) *book/Sg-Nom* *the* (Def Artic) *student-Pl-Gen (praed)-Sg*
 ‘The book is the students’.’
- (8) *A* *könyv/ek/Ø* *a* *diák/ok/é/í.*
the (Def Artic) *book-Pl-Nom* *the* (Def Artic) *student-Pl-Gen (praed)-Pl*
 ‘The books are the students’.’

The plural marker in the form of $-(V)k-$ in the analyzed sentence type can be attached both to the subject denoting possessum (*könyv* ‘book’ vs. *könyvek* ‘books’) and to the predicative denoting possessor (*diák* ‘student’ vs. *diákok* ‘students’), marking respectively their plurality. On the other hand, the plural marker in the form of $-i$ must be attached to the predicative when the subject of the phrase occurs in the plural number ((6) *diákéi* ‘(are) student’s’ and (8) *diákokéi* ‘(are) students’). Therefore in Hungarian the words belonging to the predicative genitive compulsorily carry information not only about the number of the possessor, but also the number of the possessum. Thanks to this phenomenon there is a concord in number between the subject and predicative quite independently from the number of the possessor itself ((3): *könyv* (Sg) – *diáké* (Sg – Sg), (6): *könyvek* (Pl) – *diákéi* (Sg – Pl), (7): *könyv* (Sg) – *diákoké* (Pl – Sg), (8): *könyvek* (Pl) – *diákokéi* (Pl – Pl)). The morpheme copying the number of the possessum attached to the word expressing possessor in such sentences occupies, as we can see, the final morphotactical position. Needless to say, for such Indo-European languages as Latin or Lithuanian this kind of concord seems to be unknown. Let us compare:

Hungarian	Latin	Lithuanian
<i>A könyv a diáké.</i>	<i>Liber discipulí est.</i>	<i>Knyga yra studento.</i>
<i>A könyvek a diákéi.</i>	<i>Libri discipulí sunt.</i>	<i>Knygos yra studento.</i>
<i>A könyv a diákoké.</i>	<i>Liber discipulorum est.</i>	<i>Knyga yra studentų.</i>
<i>A könyvek a diákokéi.</i>	<i>Libri discipulorum sunt.</i>	<i>Knygos yra studentų.</i>

In spite of this slight incongruity with the Indo-European case model, the basis for recognition of the predicative genitive in Hungarian remains unaffected: (i) the syntagmatic function of the morpheme $-é$ in the analyzed sentence type seems to be obvious quite independent from its morphotactical position, (ii) the conveyed semantic (mainly possessive) meaning and (iii) fulfilled syntactic function (predicative) cover the main characteristic features of the category known in linguistics as predicative genitive.

3.2. THE ELLIPTIC GENITIVE

The erasure of the genitive case manifested by means of the morpheme $-é$, probably done first by Verseghy and remaining accepted in Hungarian linguistics until the present times, seems to have been motivated, as has already been mentioned, by its quite wide incompatibility with Latin genitive markers: firstly the word provided with it cannot determine another noun in the attributive function (compare the incorrectness of the phrase (1)), secondly the word provided with the morpheme under discussion can adopt another case marker which binds on its own the word it has been attached to with another word occurring

in the same syntagm (the sentence (2)). Linguists have thus been more or less unanimous in the conviction that this kind of syntagmatic function is one of the indispensable features of Hungarian case markers. Some of them, however, remain skeptical as to this limitation; Papp István comments on the function of the morpheme *-é* in the following way: *nem nevez meg pontosan egy birtokot (...), csak várakozást kelt és ösztönöz egy – a helyzethez illő – birtokszóval való kiegészítésre. Hát mi a rag szerepe, ha nem éppen ez?! ‘[the morpheme -é] doesn’t name explicitly a possessed object (...), it arouses only the expectation and inspires to complete with the word denoting the possessed object according to the situation. What is the function of an ending [here case ending], if not just this?!’* (PAPP 1955: 293–294). Let us analyze the other function of the Hungarian *é*-genitive postulated in the present paper (sentences (9a)–(9c)) from the point of the view of the so-called elliptic genitive in such Indo-European languages as Latin (10a)–(10c) or Lithuanian (11a)–(11c):

- (9a) *A diák/Ø könyv/é/t lát/t/am.* ‘I saw the student’s book.’
 b) *Ki/nek a könyv/é/t lát/t/ad?* ‘Whose book did you see?’
 c) *A diák/é/Ø/t (lát/t/am).*
the (Def Artic) student/Sg-Gen (ellipt)-Sg-Acc (see-Praet-I Sg Activ Ind Objectiv)
 ‘(I saw) The student’s one.’
- (10a) *Libru/m discipul/i vid/i.* ‘I saw the student’s book.’
 b) *Cuius libru/m vid/isti?* ‘Whose book did you see?’
 c) *Discipul/i (vid/i).*
student-Gen Sg (see-I Sg Praet Activ Ind)
 ‘(I saw) The student’s one.’
- (11a) *Mač/iau student/o knyq/q.* ‘I saw the student’s book.’
 b) *Kieno knyq/q mat/ei?* ‘Whose book did you see?’
 c) *(Mač/iau) Student/o.*
(see-I Sg Praet Activ Ind) student-Gen Sg
 ‘(I saw) The student’s one.’

Being an elliptic (defective) type is the first common feature of the analyzed sentences (9c), (10c) and (11c). They all seem to have originated by means of the ellipsis (removal) of the word denoting possessum: *könyv*, *liber*, *knyga*⁷ ‘book’. The word denoting possessum in the non-elliptic sentences fulfils the function of the head of the phrase being determined syntactically by the word: (i) occurring in the genitive case, (ii) fulfilling the function of the attribute and (iii) denoting (mainly) possessor (*a diák könyve*, *liber discipuli*, *studento knyga* ‘the student’s book’). Thus we can say that from (9a) *A diák könyvét láttam* has been derived (9c) *A diákét (láttam)* by means of the ellipsis of *könyvét*, from (10a) *Librum discipuli vidi*, (10c) *Discipuli (vidi)* and from (11a) *Mačiau studento knyq* there arose (11c)

⁷ The letters *-q* and *-a* mostly do not depict different sounds from the present synchronic point of view, but are used in Lithuanian orthography nowadays as marks of differentiation between certain grammatical meanings: *knyq* (Acc Sg) vs. *knyga* (Nom Sg). The fact that the forms *knyq* (Acc Sg) and *knyga* (Nom Sg) are distinguished thanks to the accent they carry, and not by means of their endings, can from the point of the view of the present paper be neglected as insignificant (compare however: AMBRAZAS 1997: 14, 130–132).

(*Mačiau*) *Studento* after the removal of *librum* and *knygą* respectively. It is conceivable that all elliptic sentences could function in colloquial speech as answers to the following question type: (9b) *Kinek a könyvét láttad?*, (10b) *Cuius librum vidisti?*, (11b) *Kieno knygą matei?* The genitive marker in the analyzed elliptic sentence type does not seem to bind the word to which it is attached with any other word in the syntagm where it occurs. In Hungarian, however – let this be the first feature presented here exposing its difference from the Indo-European elliptic genitive – to the word provided with the morpheme *-é* there must be attached another case marker expressing its relation to another word in the syntagm where it occurs (in (9c) it is the ending of the accusative case: *diáké/t*). In Latin or Lithuanian on the other hand, the words like *discipul/i* or *student/o* do not contain on their own any separate morpheme which would allow them to bind with any other word in the elliptic sentence type. Reversing the process of the elision of the word denoting possessum, it is easy to observe that in Latin and Lithuanian the sentences can be completed with this lacking semantic category without making any changes in the morphology of the words already present in the elliptic sentence: *Discipuli (vidi) + librum* → *Librum discipuli vidi*, (*Mačiau*) *Studento + knygą* → *Mačiau studento knygą*. In Hungarian, as we know, such an addition would result in an incorrect sentence: *A diákét (láttam) + könyv* → **A diáké könyvet láttam*, because this kind of Hungarian genitive is inadmissible in the attributive function. The transition from the elliptic to non-elliptic sentence type in Hungarian requires the change of the elliptic into the attributive genitive (both manifested by formally different markers). The described unsubstitutability of the elliptic and attributive genitive should be for our purposes interpreted from the point of the view of such morphemes as those carrying, for example, the meaning of passivity: (13) *-tat/-tet-* or (14) *-ható/-hető-*:

- (12) *A* *munkás/ok/Ø* *épít/ik* *a* *ház/at*.
the (Def Artic) *worker-Pl-Nom* *build/Praes-III Pl Activ Ind* *the* (Def Artic) *house/Sg-Acc*
 Objectiv
 ‘The workers are building the house.’
- (13) *A* *ház/Ø* *épít/tet/ik* (*a* *munkás/ok által*).
the (Def Artic) *house/Sg-Nom* *build/Praes-Passiv-* (*the* (Def Artic) *worker-Pl Prolat*)
 -III Sg Ind Subjectiv
 ‘The house is being built (by the workers).’
- (14) *A* *ház/Ø* *épít/hető/Ø*.
the (Def Artic) *house/Sg-Nom* *build-Possibil Passiv-Nom Sg*
 ‘The house can be built.’

As far as the author is aware, these morphemes are predominantly regarded as inflectional in Hungarian linguistics in spite of the fact that they are not responsible directly for binding the word to which they are attached with other words in the syntagms. In sentence (12), for example, this kind of syntagmatic function can be attributed only to the morphemes *-ik* (from *építik*) and *-at* (from *házat*). In (13), it is *-ik* (from *építetik*) and *által* (from *munkások által*); in (14) this function is fulfilled by *-Ø* (from *építhető*). What is more, the passive markers do not occupy the final morphotactical position. The passive markers are quite similar to the morpheme *-é* in the function of the elliptic genitive; they all determine the syntactic contexts in which the words provided with them can appear (just as inflectional

suffixes). For example a word containing the marker *-tat/-tet-* or *-ható/-hető-* cannot be determined syntactically by a word belonging to the accusative case, and the syntactic connectivity of a word containing the marker of the elliptic genitive is limited in an analogous way: it cannot determine any other noun as an attribute. Under the sketched circumstances the discrepancy in the treatment of the markers of passive voice (and many more) and the morpheme *-é* in the function of the elliptic genitive remains totally unclear. On the one hand certain morphemes are recognized as inflectional without any further discussion, while on the other hand some, regardless of their conspicuous similarity with inflectional ones, are described unambiguously as word-forming or “marks”, which practically excludes their recognition as case markers. Maybe this state of affairs can be somehow explained by the quite wide incompatibility of Hungarian case with the tight Latin case model, in whose framework such phenomena were simply unforeseen. Antal, for example, referring to the possibility of attachment of any other case marker after the supposed genitive marker *-é* asserts that the cumulation of two cases in one word is absurd – which (together with other Hungarian specificities) confirms the fact of the nonexistence of the genitive case (ANTAL 1977: 65–66). It is difficult to guess what caused him to express such a strong opinion. However there exist in linguistics quite well-known such approaches allowing the cumulation of different case meanings within one word. Kempf in his attempt at a general theory of cases seems to have taken into account such a possibility even in the (not considered agglutinative) Indo-European languages. As a kind of starting point he gives the example of the partitive in the Finno-Ugric and Caucasian languages, which is manifested by means of special endings different from the endings of other cases (especially the genitive). In the Indo-European languages, however, the partitive case seems to be “coupled”, using his words, with other cases (for example nominative or accusative). The notion of “coupled cases” can thus be understood as a cumulation of different cases in one word form. He states that this cumulation can happen in the Indo-European languages in two formally different ways: (i) two different cases are coupled (cumulated) in one form which is the form of another case (for example the partitive, on the one hand, and the nominative or accusative, on the other, can be coupled in the form of the genitive; compare genitive-partitive), (ii) two different cases are coupled (cumulated) in such a way that formal markers of both cases are retained (KEMPF 2007: 47–55). The coupling of the first type seems to be especially widespread in Lithuanian. Let us consider, in the light of Kempf’s approach, the following two Lithuanian sentence types:

- (15) *Mač/iau* *knyg/ų.*
see-I Sg Praet Activ Ind *book-Gen Pl*
 ‘I saw (some) books.’
- (16) *Mač/iau* *knyg/as.*
see-I Sg Praet Activ Ind *book-Acc Pl*
 ‘I saw (the) books.’

According to Kempf, a word like *knygu* ‘of (the) books’, here: ‘(some) books’ with the ending *-ų* of the genitive plural, seems to acquire secondarily, in some syntactical contexts, features of other cases. Thus in sentence (15) the ending *-ų* cumulates: (i) the meaning of the partitive (partitivity) (compare the English translation of the Lithuanian example), and (ii) the meaning of the accusative (compare (15) with (16)). The partitive and the accusative

are “coupled cases” which resort in the Lithuanian language to the endings of the genitive. In his view this kind of case coupling in the Indo-European languages has the following very characteristic structural feature: the marker of one of the coupled cases is removed, and the case category membership of the word from which it has been removed can be deduced only from the syntactical context. In sentence (15), the case whose marker was the object of elision was the accusative, because the syntactical context in which the word *knygy* ‘of (the) books, (some) books’ appears can only refer to this case category. The other coupled case – the partitive – can be recognized by means of the ending *-y*. Kempf goes on to make quite an innovative remark: that such a morphological simplification (elision) of formal case markers does not take place in the Indo-European languages when the formal case markers are not endings but adpositions (prepositions). In the second structural form of case coupling, French appears among the Indo-European languages to be highly specialized. Let us consider the following two French sentence types:

(17) *Je suis⁸ ven/u avec de/s étudiants.*
I/Nom Sg be/I Sg Praes come-Particip Praet with (Sociat) (Part-Pl) student (stem)
Activ Ind Masc Sg
 ‘I came with (some) students.’

(18) *De/s étudiants/Ø sont ven/us.*
(Part-Pl) student/Nom be/III Pl Praes Activ Ind come-Particip Praet Masc Pl
 ‘(Some) Students came.’

In the phrase *avec des étudiants* ‘with some students’ from (17), which in many linguistic elaborations is treated as one word consisting of the stem *étudiants-* ‘student-’ and auxiliary adpositions *avec* ‘with’ (Sociat) and *des* (Part (Pl)) because of its syntactical indivisibility (compare: KURYŁOWICZ 1987: 181–182), markers of two cases can be distinguished: (i) the sociative and (ii) the partitive. In the word (if such an approach is adopted) *des étudiants* ‘(some) students’, on the other hand, there are cumulated markers of: (i) the partitive (in the form of the auxiliary *des*) and (ii) the nominative (in the form of the zero morpheme attached to the stem *étudiants-*). It is worth mentioning that in the Finno-Ugric languages, for example in Komi-Ziryene, the cumulation of genitive-adessive (*-лӧн*) and other case markers (for example elative *-ысь*) both marked suffixally seems to be acceptable as well:

(19) *Кomi/яс/лӧн керка/яс/ысь ыджыд/джык/ӧсь удмурт/яс/лӧн/ысь.*
Komi-Pl-Gen/Adess house-Pl-Def Nom big-Comp-Pl Nom Udmurt-Pl-Gen/Adess-Elat
 ‘The houses of Komis are bigger than those of Udmurts.’

Bañcerowski, in his paper on the category of the word (lexon) in the typological aspect, proposes distinguishing, among other things, the dimension of so-called “derivational thematization of lexons (words)”. In order to classify words with reference to this dimension, we would have to divide them into two subclasses: (i) words whose derivational stem is equal to their form in *casus rectus*, (ii) words whose derivational stem is equal to their form in some *casus obliquus* (BAÑCZEROWSKI 2008: 252). In the light of the approaches briefly sketched above, Hungarian should not be any exception. Kempf’s case “coupling”

⁸ In this paper we do not adopt the delimitation of French morphemes based only on orthography, which in a very controversial way reflects the diachronic state of the language rather than the synchronic one.

would refer in it to the (elliptic) genitive and other case categories. In accordance with Bańczerowski's approach, on the other hand, the following type of paradigm system could be constructed for Hungarian⁹:

subparadigm containing words whose derivational stem is equal to their form in *casus rectus*

Nom Sg	<i>a diák/Ø</i> 'the student'	→ derivational stem for the following subparadigm
Gen (praed) Sg	<i>a diák/é</i> 'the student's'	
Dat Sg	<i>a diák/nak</i> 'to the student'	
Acc Sg	<i>a diák/ot</i> 'the student'	
Iness Sg	<i>a diák/ban</i> 'in the student'	
...	...	

subparadigm containing words whose derivational stem is equal to their form in *casus obliquus*

Nom Sg (of Gen (ellipt) Sg)	<i>a diáké/Ø</i> 'the student's one'
Gen (praed) Sg (of Gen (ellipt) Sg)	<i>a diáké/é</i> 'the student's one's'
Dat Sg (of Gen (ellipt) Sg)	<i>a diáké/nak</i> 'to the student's one'
Acc Sg (of Gen (ellipt) Sg)	<i>a diáké/t</i> 'the student's one'
Iness Sg (of Gen (ellipt) Sg)	<i>a diáké/ban</i> 'in the student's one'
...	...

Thanks to the nominal paradigms constructed in this way it seems to be possible to reveal the interplay of different case meanings within the boundaries of one word – which in the author's view should be conceived as an existing linguistic fact in Hungarian. The (predicative and elliptic) genitive and other cases are interpreted here from a homogenous perspective; the same does not seem to apply to the predominant attitude amongst Hungarian linguists, who do not seem to accept the cumulation of different inflectional meanings, apparently only in reference to the nominal flexion. As has been discussed above, however, verbal flexion is not subject to this kind of restriction in their approach. For example, passive markers whose syntagmatic function and morphotactical position are actually identical with the morpheme *-é* are classified univocally as inflectional suffixes, while the morpheme *-é*, as we know, has been deprived of this feature. The reluctance to recognize the existence of the genitive case marked by *-é* may result from the attachment to the classical model, where the cumulation of different case meanings was simply unforeseen. In this model, on the other hand, passive markers were widely recognized as inflectional suffixes; the cumulation of different inflectional meanings within one verbal form therefore surprised nobody.

Analogously to the predicative genitive, the category of number reveals further properties, quite astonishing from the "Indo-European" point of view, of the Hungarian elliptic genitive postulated here:

- (9c) *A diák/é/Ø/t (lát/t/am).*
the (Def Artic) student/Sg-Gen (ellipt)-Sg-Acc (see-Praet-I Sg Activ Ind Objectiv)
 '(I saw) The student's one.'

⁹ The derivational stem from every subparadigm has been bolded.

- (20) *A* *diák/ok/é/Ø/t* (*lát/t/am*).
the (Def Artic) *student-Pl-Gen* (ellipt)-Sg-Acc (*see-Praet-I Sg Activ Ind Objectiv*)
 ‘(I saw) The students’ one.’
- (21) *A* *diák/é/i/t* (*lát/t/am*).
the (Def Artic) *student/Sg-Gen* (ellipt)-Pl-Acc (*see-Praet-I Sg Activ Ind Objectiv*)
 ‘(I saw) The student’s ones.’
- (22) *A* *diák/ok/é/i/t* (*lát/t/am*).
the (Def Artic) *student-Pl-Gen* (ellipt)-Pl-Acc (*see-Praet-I Sg Activ Ind Objectiv*)
 ‘(I saw) The students’ ones.’

The (monosemic) morpheme of the plural number in the form of *-V/k-* conveys the meaning that there is more than one possessor (*diák* vs. *diákok*). As is implied by comparison of the sentences (9c), (20)–(22), the forms of the Hungarian elliptic genitive also compulsorily carry information about the number of unlexicalizable possessum; for example, sentence (20) *A diákokét (láttam)* unambiguously implies that many possessors are in possession of exactly one possessum; while sentence (21) *A diákét (láttam)* implies that one possessor is in possession of many possessums etc. Needless to say, in such Indo-European languages as Latin or Lithuanian, after transformation to the appropriate elliptic sentence type the information about the number of the removed possessum is lost:

Hungarian	Latin	Lithuanian
<i>A diákét (láttam).</i>	<i>Discipulī (vidi).</i>	<i>(Mačiau) Studento.</i>
<i>A diákokét (láttam).</i>	<i>Discipulorum (vidi).</i>	<i>(Mačiau) Studentų.</i>
<i>A diákét (láttam).</i>	<i>Discipulī (vidi).</i>	<i>(Mačiau) Studento.</i>
<i>A diákokét (láttam).</i>	<i>Discipulorum (vidi).</i>	<i>(Mačiau) Studentų.</i>

And finally; Hungarian seems to admit not only the cumulation in one word of the elliptic genitive and another case, but also the double cumulation of the elliptic genitive itself (compare LOTZ 1976: 185), for example:

- (23) *A* *diák/é/Ø/é/Ø/t* (*lát/t/am*).
the (Def Artic) *student/Sg-Gen* (ellipt)-Sg-Gen (*see-Praet-I Sg Activ Ind Objectiv*)
 (ellipt)-Sg-Acc
 *‘(I saw) The student’s one’s one.’

In such a case, Hungarian nominal paradigms in the light of Bańczerowski’s approach should be completed by the following subparadigm containing words whose derivational stem is equal to the double *casus obliquus* form:

Nom Sg (of Gen (ellipt) Sg of Gen (ellipt) Sg)	<i>a diákéé/Ø</i> *‘the student’s one’s one’
Gen (praed) Sg (of Gen (ellipt) Sg of Gen (ellipt) Sg)	–
Dat Sg (of Gen (ellipt) Sg of Gen (ellipt) Sg)	<i>a diákéé/nak</i> *‘to the student’s one’s one’
Acc Sg (of Gen (ellipt) Sg of Gen (ellipt) Sg)	<i>a diákéé/t</i> *‘the student’s one’s one’
Iness Sg (of Gen (ellipt) Sg of Gen (ellipt) Sg)	<i>a diákéé/ban</i> *‘in the student’s one’s one’
...	...

It is easy to deduce that forms like (i) *diáké* and (ii) *diákée* are ambiguous. Their homonymy can be disambiguated thanks to the syntactical context in which they appear: (i) *A könyv a diáké* ‘The book is the student’s’ where *diáké* is Gen (praed) Sg and *A diáké érdekes* ‘The student’s one is interesting’ where *diáké* is Nom Sg of Gen (praed) Sg and: (ii) *A könyv a diákée* ‘The book is the student’s one’s’ where *diákée* is Gen (praed) Sg of Gen (ellipt) Sg and: (ii) *A diákée érdekes* *‘The student’s one’s one is interesting’ where *diákée* is Nom Sg of Gen (ellipt) Sg of Gen (ellipt) Sg.

4. SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

To recapitulate what has been said about the genitive case in general and then specifically about the *é*-genitive, defended in the present paper, let us start again with a short overview of the history of the attitude of Hungarian linguists to the category of case. At the beginning of scientific consideration of case in Hungarian, the attachment to the classical model was so strong that it turned out that Hungarian and Latin had the same cases in equal quantity. As linguists became more and more aware that the ancient model could not always provide a reliable method for the description of every human language, the specificity of Hungarian became more evident. There suddenly appeared a place for doubts and suppositions that some solutions may have been erroneous. The observations about the genitive expressed by means of the morpheme *-é*, made by Versegly, seem at first sight quite plausible: words provided with it (i) cannot function as attribute and (ii) can be the object of further inflection. Needless to say, in reference to the Latin genitive, for example, such phenomena are unknown. The new genitive case markers *-nak/-nek* proposed by Versegly in the place of *-é* have attracted so many opponents that the genitive case – either with *-é* or with *-nak/-nek* – has not survived in modern Hungarian grammars. From the point of the view defended in the present paper, however, the total removal of the morpheme *-é* from the inventory of Hungarian case markers seems to have concealed quite important facts: (i) it conveys the meaning of possessor (one of the main meanings of the genitive in Indo-European languages) and (ii) in spite of everything it does not fail to fulfil a syntagmatic function, whether more explicitly as in the case of the predicative genitive, or more implicitly as in the case of the elliptic genitive. Assuming that the correspondence between certain grammatical categories in different languages has always been only of an approximate nature, the author sees no reason why the Hungarian genitive should be treated differently here. The convergences between Indo-European genitive markers in the predicative and elliptic function and the corresponding functions of the morpheme *-é* in the Hungarian language system, comprising its (i) semantic (mainly possessive) meanings and (ii) (more or less explicit) syntagmatic function, provide quite a solid basis for distinguishing for Hungarian analogous categories: (i) the predicative and (ii) elliptic genitive. Hungarian predicative and elliptic genitive also manifest some other specific features. Both manifestations of the genitive case must carry at the same time not only information about the number of the possessor, but also – independently – the number of the possessum (*A könyv a diáké* vs. *A könyvek a diákéi* vs. *A könyv a diákoké* vs. *A könyvek a diákokéi* and *A diákét* vs. *A diákokét* vs. *A diákét* vs. *A diákokét* (*látam*)). Such a phenomenon remains unknown to Indo-European languages. Even more astonishing and instructive, however, seem to be the features characteristic only of the Hungarian

elliptic genitive. Firstly, it blocks irrevocably the lexicalization of the possessum, because this kind of genitive is excluded in the attributive function. In Indo-European languages the markers of the genitive case do not vary according to the syntactic function (attributive vs. non-attributive). Secondly, the forms of the Hungarian elliptic genitive show an obligatory connectivity with other case markers, which makes it in this respect quite incongruous with its Indo-European equivalent. This phenomenon seems to have contributed to the greatest extent to the exclusion of the words containing the morpheme *-é* from the inflectional category of case. Some modern linguists, however, accept the possibility of the appearance of more than one case with its formal markers within one word, for example: (i) Kempf with his “coupled” cases or (ii) Bańcerowski with his “words whose derivational stem is equal to their form in *casus obliquus*” distinguished within the dimension of “derivational thematization of lexons”. Their approach was also adopted in the present paper, which allowed the author to construct an appropriate nominal paradigm system reflecting in a systematic way casual meaning(s) that can be manifested within the boundaries of a Hungarian word. Hungarian therefore turns out to be a language where certain casual meanings can be cumulated within the boundaries of one word. This phenomenon refers especially to the elliptic genitive (which can even be doubled) and other cases.

ABBREVIATIONS AND SYMBOLS

* – incorrect; / – boundary between morphemes; Acc – accusative (case); Activ – active (voice); Adess – adessive (case); Artic – article; Comp – comparative (degree); Dat – dative (case); Def – definite (article); Elat – elative (case); ellipt – elliptic (genitive); Gen – genitive (case); -Gen (ellipt) Sg – abbreviations between hyphens inform about the grammatical meaning(s) conveyed by one appropriate morpheme; I – first (person); III – third (person); Ind – indicative (mood); Masc – masculine; Nom – nominative (case); Ø – morphological zero; Objectiv – objective (conjugation); Part – partitive (case); Particip – participle; Pl – plural; Possibil – possibility; praed – predicative (genitive); Praes – present (tense); Praet – past (tense or participle); Prolat – prolativ (case); Sg – singular; Sociat – sociative (case); *student*/Sg – the meaning of singularity is conveyed by the stem itself (for example *student*); Subjectiv – subjective (conjugation); V – vocal

REFERENCES

- AMBRAZAS Vytautas (red.). 1997. *Lithuanian Grammar*. Vilnius: Institute of the Lithuanian Language.
- ANTAL László. 1977. *Egy új magyar nyelvtan felé*. Budapest: Magvető Kiadó.
- ANTAL László. 2005. *A formális nyelvi elemzés. A magyar esetrendszer*. Budapest: Akadémiai Kiadó.
- ARTOWICZ Elżbieta. 2003. *Morfosyntaktyczny model języka w dawnych gramatykach węgierskich. Od Jánosa Sylvestra do Ferenc Verseghegyo*. Warsaw: Katedra Hungaryistyki Uniwersytetu Warszawskiego.
- BAŃCZEROWSKI Jerzy. 1999. “Towards a Grammar of Flection.” *Investigationes Linguisticae* VI, 5–84.
- BAŃCZEROWSKI Jerzy. 2008. “Wyraz w ujęciu morfologiczno-typologicznym.” In: BEDNARCZUK et al. 2008: 233–260.
- BEDNARCZUK Leszek, SMOCZYŃSKI Wojciech, WOJTYŁA-ŚWIERZOWSKA Maria (eds.). 2008. *Językoznawstwo historyczne i typologiczne. W 100-lecie urodzin Prof. Tadeusza Milewskiego*. Kraków: Polska Akademia Umiejętności, 233–260.
- BIELECKI Robert. 2009. “On the Nature of the Accusative in Finnish.” *Lingua Posnaniensis* LI, 19–38.
- É. KISS Katalin, KIEFER Ferenc, SIPTÁR Péter. 1999. *Új magyar nyelvtan*. Budapest: Osiris Kiadó.
- HEINZ Adam. 1955. *Genetivus w indoeuropejskim systemie przypadkowym*. Warsaw: Państwowe Wydawnictwo Naukowe.
- HEXENDORF Edit. 1954. “Az emberé-féle alakok toldalékának elnevezéseiről.” *Magyar Nyelv* L, 301–318.

- HJELMSLEV Louis. 1935. "La catégorie des cas. Étude de grammaire générale. Première partie." *Acta Jutlandica* VII, 1–184.
- KEMPF Zdzisław. 2007. *Próba teorii przypadków II*. Opole: Uniwersytet Opolski.
- KESZLER Borbála (ed.). 2000. *Magyar grammatika*. Budapest: Nemzeti Tankönyvkiadó.
- KIEFER Ferenc 1987. "A magyar főnév esetei." *Magyar Nyelv* 4, 481–486.
- KIEFER Ferenc (ed.). 2000. *Strukturális magyar nyelvtan. Morfológia*. Budapest: Akadémiai Kiadó.
- KURYŁOWICZ Jerzy. 1987. "Zagadnienie klasyfikacji przypadków." *Studia Językoznawcze*, 181–184.
- LOTZ János. 1976. "A magyar É-morféma." In: SZÉPE 1976: 185–190.
- PAPP István. 1955. "A jelfunkció kérdéséhez." *Magyar Nyelv* 51, 290–297.
- SAMOLEWICZ Zygmunt. 2000. *Składnia łacińska*. Bydgoszcz: Homini.
- SZÉPE György (ed.). 1976. *Szonettkoszorú a nyelvről*. Budapest: Gondolat Kiadó.
- TOMPA József (ed.). 1970. *A mai magyar nyelv rendszere. Leíró nyelvtan I. Bevezetés. Hangtan. Szótan*. Budapest: Akadémiai Kiadó.
- WIKARJAK Jan. 1992. *Gramatyka opisowa języka łacińskiego*. Warsaw: Wydawnictwo Naukowe PWN.

Allatum die 21 mensis Junii anno 2010