

# The morphosyntax of the Hungarian sociative and dissociative suffixes

Marcel den Dikken & Éva Dékány

Hungarian Research Centre for Linguistics & Eötvös Loránd University, Budapest

This paper examines the morphosyntax of (dis)sociative ‘with(out)’, with particular reference to the facts of Hungarian but with an eye towards universality. The morphological analysis of *-stul/stül* ‘with’ and *-talanul/telenül* ‘without’ unpacks these complex forms, utilizing a variety of morphemes treated as heads of phrases in the syntax; the syntax, in turn, represents (dis)sociatives as depictive secondary predications, with a PRO-subject controlled by either the subject or the object of the containing clause. The morphophonology and semantics of sociative *-stul* and dissociative *-talanul* unfold compositionally from the syntactic structure. The analysis of (dis)sociatives reveals the benefits of composing complex word-level formatives in syntax, shows that snowballing head movement and phrasal movement are two discrete strategies for syntactic word formation, and sheds new light on several grammatical formatives and their interactions.

KEYWORDS: sociative, dissociative, depictive, locative, ablative, essive, negation

## 1 Introduction

Comitative/instrumental and caritive case affixes or pre/postpositions are commonly used to express the meanings of ‘with’ and ‘without’. Their syntactic projections can serve as modifiers of verbal or nominal phrases (*he walks with(out) a cane, a house with(out) a garden*). But they can also build secondary predication structures with a PRO-subject controlled by a matrix argument (*he, swims [PRO, with(out) clothes on]*). The morphosyntax of these sociative and dissociative uses of ‘with(out)’ is the topic of our paper, whose focus is the morphosyntax of the Hungarian sociative suffix *-stul/stül* (henceforth just *-stul*, abstracting away from back/front vowel harmony) and its antonym, dissociative *-talanul/telenül* (henceforth just *-talanul*).

- |     |    |   |  |
|-----|----|---|--|
| (1) | a. | <i>ruhástul</i> ugrott a medencébe<br>clothes.SOC jumped the pool.ILLAT<br>‘(s)he jumped into the pool clothes and all’                 | <i>ruhátlanul</i> ugrott a medencébe<br>clothes.DISSOC jumped the pool.ILLAT<br>‘(s)he jumped into the pool clothesless’   |
|     | b. | <i>ruhástul</i> belökte Pált a medencébe<br>clothes.SOC pushed Pál.ACC the pool.ILLAT<br>‘(s)he pushed Pál into the pool fully clothed’ | <i>ruhátlanul</i> ábrázolta a modellt<br>clothes.DISSOC portrayed the model.ACC<br>‘(s)he portrayed the model clothesless’ |

Fekete (2013:97) characterises the sociative as limited to situations ‘in which two entities are metaphorically tied or “glued” together’. This ‘conceptual information of unity’ (p. 99) distinguishes sociative *-stul* from comitative *-val* (*együtt*) ‘(together) with’: thus, contrast *ruhástul ugrott a medencébe* (1a) with *ruhával ugrott a medencébe*, which describes an event in which the subject had the clothes in his/her hands but was not wearing them. Sociative *-stul* is less frequent than the comitative: it predominantly occurs in set expressions (*szőröstül bőröstül* ‘with hair and skin’). But sociative *-stul* is still productive in present-day Hungarian. Its antonym, dissociative *-talanul*, has a wide range of uses, partially overlapping with *nélkül* ‘without’.<sup>1</sup>

1 Dissociative *-talanul* also occurs without the essive *-ul/ül* suffix; for sociative *-stul*, this is generally not the case in present-day Hungarian (see section 4 for discussion). In older and dialectal Hungarian, the combination of the suffixes *-s* and *-t* is attested without essive *-ul/ül*: Fekete (2013:13) gives *egyenes* ‘expressly, absolutely, perfectly’, *öröme* ‘willingly, gladly, fain’ (to which a reviewer of our paper adds that these cannot in fact occur with *-ül*);

We will present a morphosyntactic analysis of *-stul* and *-talanul* that unpacks these complex forms, utilising the morphemes in (2):

- (2)
- |    |       |                |   |
|----|-------|----------------|---|
| a. | -s    | ADJECTIVALISER | <i>ruhás</i> ‘clothed’  |
| b. | -(t)t | LOCATIVE       | <i>itt/ott</i> ‘here/there’, <i>Pécsett</i> ‘in Pécs’                                     |
| c. | -l    | ABLATIVE       | ‘from’: <i>-ból</i> ‘ELA’, <i>-ról</i> ‘DEL’, <i>-tól</i> ‘ABL’, <i>alól</i> ‘from under’ |
| d. | -u/ü  | ESSIVE         | <i>zsákmányul</i> ‘as prey’, <i>hanyagul</i> ‘negligently, carelessly’                    |
| e. | -n    | NEGATIVE       | <i>ne(m)</i> ‘not’  |

These morphemes are the heads of phrases in the syntax. Our analysis of sociatives and dissociatives represents the structures projected by *-stul* and *-talanul* as depictive secondary predications, systematically involving a small clause structure with a PRO-subject controlled by either the subject (as in the a-examples in (1)) or the object (in (1b)) of the containing clause. The morphophonology and semantics of *-stul* and *-talanul* unfold compositionally from the syntactic structures proposed, which are given in (3) (for sociative *-stul*) and (4) (for dissociative *-talanul*).<sup>2</sup>

- (3)  $[_{RP} \text{ PRO } [_{R'} \text{ RELATOR=U+}l [_{XP} \text{ X=}$ -t  $[_{YP} \text{ Y=}$ -s  $[_{VP} \sqrt{=ruha}]]]]]$
- (4)  $[_{RP} \text{ PRO } [_{R'} \text{ RELATOR=U+}l [_{NegP} \text{ Neg=}$ n  $[_{ZP} \text{ Z=}$ -l  $[_{XP} \text{ X=}$ -t  $[_{VP} \sqrt{=ruha}]]]]]]]$

## 2 The syntax of sociative *-stul*

### 2.1 The underlying structure of sociative *-stul*

The syntax underlying sociative *-stul*, depicted in (3), in large measure follows and translates structurally the insightful diachronic reconstruction of *-stul* in Budenz (1884) and Beke (1910).<sup>3</sup>

The head abstractly identified in (3) as ‘Y’ is expounded by the *-s* that categorises the root as an adjective (or *nomen possessoris*), as in (5):<sup>4</sup>

in Beke (1910:195–6) we find *fenekest* ‘by the bottom’, *tövest* ‘by the roots’ (alongside the Transylvanian form *tóssül*, featuring essive *-ül* but lacking locative *-t*; see section 2.1, below), *vegyest(\*ül)* ‘mixed’, *szorgalmatost(\*ul)* ‘diligently’ and *keménységest(\*ül)* ‘with difficulty’; Budenz (1884) mentions *fiast* ‘with his/her/their son’; and György Rákosi (p.c.) points out *erőst(\*ül)* ‘strongly, with strength’, *hamarost(\*ul)* ‘soon’, *oldalvást(\*ul)* ‘sideways, edgeways’, *rögvest(\*ül)* ‘right away’, and he finds that *ruhást jött* ‘(s)he came fully clothed’ is still used in present-day Hungarian. But *-ul/ül*-less sociatives sound old-fashioned, and Beke (1910:196) states that were never common.

2 The labelling is kept partially abstract here for expository purposes. In the ensuing discussion, we will identify the heads ‘X’, ‘Y’ and ‘Z’, whose labels are not immediately relevant here.

3 According to Beke (1910), in Budenz’s wake some (unnamed) linguists have engaged the idea that *-stul* might contain *tele* ‘full’ (drawing a parallel with the Mansi suffix *-təyl* in *iosan-təyl*, which translates into Hungarian as *hótalpa-stul* ‘with snowshoes on’). But Beke indicates that Budenz himself did not truly seem to believe this. Budenz also considers the idea that the *-st* of *-stul* could be related to the morphology found in Mansi (*jau*)*piinš(i)t*, which is rendered in Hungarian as (*atya*)*fiastul* ‘with his children’. This is entirely reasonable; but the suggestion that the *-inš* and *-t* of this Mansi form are, resp., the reciprocal-dual and plural markers (Beke 1910:195) seems without merit. Beke concludes his brief summary of the composition of *-stul* by saying that ‘most linguists’ (again left unidentified) believe that it is a composite of adjectivalising *-s* and locative *-t* plus essive *-ul/ül* — and we agree.

4 Hungarian has two prominent adjectivalising suffixes: besides the *-s* that we are interested in here, there is also the suffix *-(j)ül/(j)ú*, as in *szépszemű* ‘pretty-eyed’ and *nagylyukú* ‘with big holes’. Schirm (2005) takes the difference in distribution between these two adjectivalising suffixes to be rooted in the alienable/inalienable possession distinction — such that *-s* gives rise to alienable possession and *-(j)ül/(j)ú* to inalienable possession. Whether this is entirely accurate is not clear: thus, both *nagylyukú* ‘with large holes’ (as an attribute of Swiss cheeses, for

- (5) a. *ruha* ‘clothes’ ⇒ *ruhás* ‘clothed’  
 b. *szőr* ‘fur, hair’ *szőrös* ‘furry, hairy’  
 c. *vaj* ‘butter’ *vajas* ‘battered, buttery’

The product of *-s* suffixation is often already comitative — thus, *ruhás* translates as ‘with clothes on’ (*a piros ruhás nő* ‘the woman with the red dress’). The *-s* form is adjectival: it can serve as an attributive modifier of another noun (*a szőrös béka* ‘the hairy frog’, *vajas kenyér* ‘battered bread’), and it can be degree-modified (*nagyon/túl szőrös* ‘very/too hairy’, *(leg)szőrösebb* ‘more/most hairy’), as is typical of (gradable) adjectives.<sup>5</sup> A natural hypothesis is to identify ‘Y’ as the adjectival categoriser *a*.<sup>6</sup> This categoriser probably combines directly with the root; the alternative (recognised by Distributed Morphology), viz., that the root is first categorised as a noun (by *n*) and subsequently recategorised by *a*, is disfavoured by the discussion below (9) in section 2.2.

The next head to consider is ‘X’. This is the locative *-t* (see Dékány 2011, Dékány & Hegedűs 2021) found in *itt/ott* ‘here/there’, *minden-ütt* ‘everywhere’, *Pécs-ett* ‘in Pécs’, and also in *egy-ütt* ‘together’, an expression which has a comitative/sociative function (disambiguating comitative~instrumental *-val/vel* to its comitative incarnation). Locative *-t* is also an integral part of the ablative postposition *-tól/től* (which we will revisit shortly, in connection with *-l*). This *-t* is a semantically bland spatial postposition marking central coincidence (Hale 1986), best rendered in English as *at*, which also has non-spatial uses (*at ease*, *at noon*, *at last*, *at once*). We thus identify the category of ‘X’ as P (making no difference here between roots and categorisers).

The function of locative *-t* in the sociative is the same as that of *-t* in spatial expressions: central coincidence. Thus, *-t* expresses that the combination of  $\surd$  and *-s* denotes a state that an argument in the sentence is in: the argument is in the state of being clothed; thus, *ruhás-t* is semantically compositional. But ‘clothed’ (*ruhás*) by itself already denotes a state attributable to a subject. So the semantic contribution made by the locative *-t* is rather minimal. In light of this, it should not come as a major surprise that in dialects, sociatives can be found that contain all the other ingredients of standard Hungarian *-stul* but not the *-t*. Beke (1910) reports that in the Transylvanian dialect, for *tövestül* ‘by the roots, roots and all’ (from *tő* ‘stem, root’; cf. the more common synonym *gyökerestül*), the forms *tövest* and *tősül* are both found, the former featuring adjectivalising *-s* and locative *-t* but not essive *-ül* (fn. 1; we return to this in section 4) and the latter equipped with *-s* and *-ül* but lacking locative *-t*. As far as we are aware, from dissociative *-talanul* the *-t* is never omitted (*ruhátlanul* ~ *\*ruhálanul*, *szörtelenül* ~ *\*szörülenül*, *tövetlenül* ~ *\*tövelenül*/*\*tőlenül*) — we will return to this in section 3.1.

instance) and *lyukas* ‘with holes in it’ can express permanent, inalienable properties (think, for instance, of a person suffering from *lyukas bél szindróma* ‘leaky gut syndrome’). But if Schirm is essentially right in her assessment of the distribution of *-s* and *-(j)ül*/*(j)ú* across the alienable/inalienable divide, the fact that it is precisely *-s* that figures in sociative *-stul* fits neatly with our characterisation of (dis)sociatives as depictive secondary predicates: depictives always express stage-level properties, which by definition are alienable rather than inalienable.

5 These degree modifiers can also be used in combination with so-called adverbs — but the adverbs in question are always adjective-based, bearing the *-(V)n* suffix (called ‘modal-essive’; see fn. 9, below), comparable to English *-ly*; these are not category-changing (‘derivational’) suffixes. Note that with such adverbs, comparative morphology is attached directly to the adjectival base, inside ‘adverbialising’ *-(V)n*: *gyors-abb-an* ‘fast-CPR-ADV’.

6 The suspended affixation pattern seen in *mind feleséges és gyermekestől* ‘both wife and child-SOC’ (Heltai Chronicle 56, 1575), where  $N_{1-s}$  conjoins with  $N_{2-s}$  below *-t-ül*, confirms that (at least in Middle Hungarian; this pattern is no longer grammatical in the modern language)  $N_{1+s}$  represents a phrase in the syntax of the sociative: ‘YP’=*aP* in (3). (3) logically leads one to expect coordination of  $N_{1-s-t}$  (‘XP’=predicate) with  $N_{2-s-t}$  below *-ül* to be possible, too (*feleségest és gyermekestül*). But we are not aware of any attestations of this pattern at any stage.

The combination of  $\sqrt{+s+t}$  (analysed as  $[_{pp} P=-t [_{ap} a=-s [_{vp} \sqrt{\quad}]]]$ ), marking the ‘conceptual information of unity’ (Fekete 2013) that is the hallmark of sociative *-stul*, forms the predicate of a depictive small clause whose PRO-subject is controlled by either the subject or the object of the containing clause. Small clauses are asymmetrical subject–predicate structures projected by a functional head (the RELATOR; see Den Dikken 2006) which establishes the predication relation between the two terms. Overt realisations of RELATOR-heads are not uncommon. In *(s)he works as a secretary* or *they employ him/her as a secretary*, the *as* is an essive particle — a ‘non-verbal copula’ (‘essive’ < Latin *esse* ‘be’). Hungarian essive *-ul/ül* is the closest counterpart to English *as*, and is found on both subject and object depictives: (6).<sup>7</sup> We identify essive *-ul/ül* as the exponent of the RELATOR of the sociative small clause whose predicate is  $N+ -s + -t$ .

- (6)
- |    |                             |                        |                             |
|----|-----------------------------|------------------------|-----------------------------|
| a. | <i>bizonyítékul szolgál</i> | evidence.ESS serve.3SG | ‘it serves as evidence’     |
| b. | <i>zálogul adta</i>         | pledge.ESS gave.3SG    | ‘(s)he gave it as a pledge’ |
| c. | <i>zsákmányul ejtette</i>   | prey.ESS took.3SG      | ‘(s)he took it as prey’     |

We would like to take a few paragraphs to analyse essive *-ul/ül* a bit more microscopically. What underpins the idea that this marker is a realisation of the copular RELATOR of a predication relation is that its [+high, +round] feature bundle rears its head in the verbal copula across Uralic (Mordvin *ul’ems* (Aasmäe 2018:193), Finnish *olla* (Hynönen 2017:35), Hungarian *van*; Proto-Uralic \**vole*). And the *-l* of essive *-ul/ül* is the Finno-Ugric ablative case, which in present-day Hungarian appears in the directional case particles *-ból/ből* ‘out of’, *-ról/ről* ‘from, off of’ and *-től/től* ‘from’, and in several postpositions (*alól* ‘from under’, *mellől* ‘from beside’, *mögül* ‘from behind’, etc.). That this *-l* is also an integral part of the comitative case suffix *-val/vel* ‘with’ can now be seen to fit in with its occurrence in sociative *-stul*: in both, this *-l* is part of the realisation of the RELATOR-head of an adjunct small clause.

That it is precisely the ablative case that is used to partially spell out the RELATOR of this small clause does not appear to be an accident. There are two indications to this effect. First, the well-known *ablativus absolutus* construction of Latin (see (7)) likewise involves a predication structure in an adjunction position, and features ablative case as the realisation of the RELATOR. And secondly, speakers of Hungarian seem to have a subconscious awareness of the ablativity of the *-l*: sociative *-stul/stül* is frequently pronounced and written (throughout the language’s history) as *-stól/stöl*, with a long mid vowel instead of a short high vowel — the same mid vowel that also appears in the ablative postpositions *-ból/ből*, *-ról/ről* and *-től/től*. This may eventually lead to a reanalysis of the morphosyntax of the sociative suffix, with adjectivalising *-s* retained from *-stul* but with the material to its right being treated integrally as the postposition *-től/től*, the latter serving by itself as the exponent of the RELATOR of the predication relation.<sup>8</sup>

- (7) *Pythagoras, [Tarquinio Superbo regnante], in Italiam venit* (Kühner 1878, II: 580)  
 Pythagoras Tarquinius.ABL Superbus.ABL reigning.ABL in Italy.ACC came  
 ‘Pythagoras came to Italy when/while Tarquinius Superbus reigned/was king’

7 Kiefer & Ladányi (2000) and De Groot (2017) take the *-ul/ül* on adjectives (which we are dealing with in the sociative) and the *-ul/ül* that appears on nouns (as in (6)) to be two different, homonymous suffixes. The null hypothesis should obviously be that they are the same. We treat both as exponents of the RELATOR of an adjunct-SC.

8 A reviewer of the abstract on which this paper is based points out that the *-stól/stöl* version of the sociative appears to be gaining ground in present-day Hungarian, and speculates that it may even become the norm in the future. We will not endeavour to predict the future; but to the extent that the text suggestion amounts to a simplification of the morphosyntax of the sociative (with fewer component parts), it does indeed seem a plausible scenario.

Why the RELATOR of adjunct small clauses with a PRO subject shows a tendency (in languages as genetically unrelated as Latin and Hungarian) to be represented by a case particle, and, more specifically, why it is the ablative case (rather than some other case) that is apparently the case morpheme of choice for representing this functional head are questions that we will not endeavour to shed a profound light on here. Mindful of the Saussurean ‘arbitraire du signe’, suffice it to say that it is doubtless significant that the ablative prepositions of Indo-European (*de* in Romance, *of* in English, *van* in Dutch, *von* in German) show a high rate of non-spatial functional uses (so much so, indeed, that English ablative *of* has largely lost its original spatial sense), and that there can be no doubt that these P-elements are usable as RELATORS of predication relationships of various sorts (as in (8); see Den Dikken 2006).

- (8) a. *idiot of a doctor*      *imbécile de médecin* [French]      *idiot van een dokter* [Dutch]  
 b. *hell of (>hella) cool*

In English *he did it out of hunger/spite* or *my fingers are blue from the cold*, the use of the ablative (*out of, from*) is clearly semantically motivated: the adjunct is the cause or source of the event. In these cases, the ablative can plausibly be syntactically represented as a lexical P. But in the Latin *ablativus absolutus* construction and in the (dis)sociative depictives under discussion in this paper, there is no (necessary) sense of causation (thus, in the Latin example quoted above, it was not (necessarily) *because* Tarquinius was king that Pythagoras came to Italy; the two events merely temporally intersected). Hence for these constructions, analysing the ablative as an exponent of a lexical P merged outside the small clause is not semantically justified.

The two components of the Hungarian essive *-ul/ül* suffix are analysed in this paper as partial spell-outs of the RELATOR of a depictive secondary predication structure. This RELATOR has a double exponence because of its ‘Janus-faced’ nature: its [+high, +round] feature bundle (realised as /u/ or /y/, with vowel harmony responsible for the front or back realisation of the vowel) serves the copular function within the small clause;<sup>9</sup> its ablative portion (*-l*) relates the small clause to its syntactic environment.<sup>10</sup> Though it remains to be determined why it is precisely the ablative that is recruited for this purpose, it is not surprising that this liaison function is entrusted to a P-element: Ps are the quintessential connectors of figures to grounds.<sup>11</sup>

9      Essive *-ul/ül* is observed by Kenesei *et al.* (1998:371) and Kiefer & Ladányi (2000) to be in complementary distribution with the modal-essive suffix *-n/an/en* (*halk-an* ‘quietly’). This complementarity will fall out directly if the latter, like the former, is treated as an exponent of the RELATOR. It is interesting to note that modal-essive *-n/an/en* is transparently similar to superessive *-n/on/en/ön* (*az asztal-on* ‘on the table’), which suggests that the modal-essive suffix, like essive *-ul/ül*, is a composite of a locative element (ablative *-l* for the essive; superessive *-n* for the modal-essive) and a vocalic part. If we treat the vocalic part of the modal-essive suffix as an exponent of the RELATOR rather than as an epenthetic vowel ‘belonging’ to superessive *-n*, the fact that the modal-essive and the superessive have different vocalic melodies is no longer a surprise: the ‘linking vowels’ of the two suffixes have entirely different origins; V is morphemic in the modal-essive (with /ɔ/, /ɛ/ and ∅ as its exponents) and truly epenthetic in the superessive. But *-n* is the same element throughout.

10      Den Dikken (forthc.) treats the syntax of depictives not in terms of adjunction (with the depictive adjoined to some projection of the verb, as in the standard approach) but as a case of specificational asyndetic coordination. In this analysis, ablative *-l* can be the exponent of the head connecting the depictive small clause to what it specifies.

11      Veronika Hegedűs (p.c.) points out that there are known cases of ablative-to-locative grammaticalization. For theories of grammaticalization such as Roberts & Roussou’s (2003), according to which grammaticalization always ‘goes up the tree’, this may seem surprising: the ablative is a Path expression, which is higher in the PP than the PlaceP housing the locative. It is possible that ablative-to-locative grammaticalizations arise from a source in which the ablative is a partial spell-out of an essive, which is itself a static expression, much like locative cases.

With the morphosyntactic analysis of sociative *-stul* now complete, we can update the analysis in (3) as in (3'), with 'X' and 'Y' given concrete labels.<sup>12</sup>

$$(3') \quad \begin{array}{c} [\text{RP PRO } [\text{R RELATOR=U+I } [\text{PP P=-t } [\text{aP a=-s } [\text{VP } \sqrt{=}ruha]]]]] \\ \text{COP ABL} \quad \text{LOC} \quad \text{ADJ} \end{array}$$

## 2.2 The derivation of sociative *-stul*

Starting out from (3'), the surface string of *-stul* comes about via consistently left-adjoining snowballing head-movement: the root  $\sqrt{}$  first moves to *a*,  $[\sqrt{+a}]$  subsequently moves to P, and finally  $[[\sqrt{+a}]+P]$  moves to the RELATOR, spelled out as *-Ul*. The roll-up produces the surface output  $\sqrt{-s-t-Ul}$ .

That the derivation of *-stul* must involve snowballing head movement is ultimately due to a property of locative *-t*: the fact that its specifier position is occupied by an abstract element associated in the phonology with a floating feature  $[+\text{high}]$ . This floating  $[+\text{high}]$  in SpecPP is responsible for the fact that in locative *ott/itt* 'there/here', formed via merger of the demonstratives *az/ez* 'that/this' in SpecPP with  $P=-t$ , the vowel *a/e* is raised to *o/i*. Because SpecPP is occupied (and multiple specifiers are structurally impossible: Kayne 1994), phrasal movement into SpecPP, either of P's complement integrally (potentially ruled out independently by antilocality) or of a subpart of it, is blocked in the derivation of *-stul* constructions.  $\sqrt{P}$  also cannot raise to Spec<sub>aP</sub> prior to movement to P: such movement (even if condoned by antilocality) would 'freeze'  $\sqrt{P}$  and bleed subsequent head movement because head movement out of a phrase occupying a derived specifier position is impossible. Hence, only a derivation consistently availing itself of head movement can serve to raise  $\sqrt{+s}$  to the left of  $P=-t$ .

It is impossible to pluralise the root (see (9a)) or to adorn it with possessive morphology (9b), and it is also not possible to attributively modify the root in such a way that the result has the normal prosody of Hungarian attributive modification, with separate word stresses on both the adjective and the noun, as in (9c).<sup>13</sup>

12 In section 2.3, we elaborate on an ingredient of the analysis in (3') that may strike readers as surprising: the fact that a PP is stacked on top of an *aP*.

13 György Rákosi (p.c.) points out that strings of the type in (9c) are attested, and provides the examples in (i) (taken from the internet). We agree that these are acceptable, but would like to make two observations about them that we believe disqualify them as counterexamples to the proposal in the main text. First, these do not have the prosody typical of phrase-level attributive modification in Hungarian — the strings of adjective and *-stul*-suffixed noun in (i) form a single prosodic unit, with stress only on the adjective; this militates against them being garden-variety cases of phrasal attributive modification. Secondly, the attributive modifiers in (i) express a *defining* property of the noun, rather than an incidental one. Such modifiers can perhaps combine directly with the root. If a direct relationship between AP and  $\sqrt{P}$  can be established under certain circumstances, it will be precisely in such cases that adjectival modification of the root will be able to succeed in sociatives with *-stul*.

- (i) a. *Szíve szerint bemenne s lefeküdne aludni, úgy, koszos ruhástól, ahogy van, mert szó szerint rosszul van a fáradtságtól (...).* '(S)he would like to go in according to her/his heart and lie down to sleep, with dirty clothes and all, just the way (s)he is, because she is literally ill from fatigue.'
- b. *Vasárnap délután így vonult ki Mari új ruhástul, kalapostul, a napernyővel a kezében.* 'On Sunday afternoon Mari went out with her new dress and hat on, with an umbrella in her hand.'
- c. *A vásárló érintéssel választhat ruhát, mire megjelenik a tükörben a képe, ruhástul — mármint új ruhástul —, anélkül, hogy valóban felpróbálta volna.* 'The shopper can choose an outfit with a touch, then his or her image appears in the mirror, with an outfit on — that is, with a new outfit on — without actually trying it on.'

- (9) a. \**ruhákostul* ‘N.PL.SOC, with clothes/dresses’  
 b. \**ruhájástul* ‘N.POSS.SOC, with his/her clothes/dress’  
 c. ?\**'koszos/'új 'ruhástul* ‘dirty/new clothes.SOC’

If they had existed, the forms in (9) would have made perfect semantic sense. But they cannot exist, for syntax rules them out. No nominal functional superstructure for number or possession can be projected outside  $\sqrt{P}$  as such superstructure would license the root as a noun and prevent movement of the noun out of the nominal domain and up to adjectivalising *-s*. This is what rules out (9a,b). The ill-formedness of (9c) (*pace* what is pointed out in fn. 13) falls out in a similar way. Attributive adjectives are modifiers of nominal constituents. But in the syntax of the sociative, the root is not enveloped in a functional shell that categorises it as a nominal. This renders attributive adjectival modification impossible.<sup>14</sup>

While all forms of nominal manipulation in (9) are impossible in the sociative, the simpler form *ruhás* ‘with clothes on’ allows for adjectival modification: *koszos/új ruhás* ‘(lit.) dirty/new clothed’ is fine, with the prosodic contour typical of ‘normal’ attributive modification, contrasting with (9c). The syntax of *ruhás* features no projection of  $P=-t$ , and as a result, no head movement to P is called for in this case. The syntax of *ruhás* allows a nominal superstructure to be built atop the root, facilitating adjectival modification. The phrasal constituent containing the root moves terminally to *SpecP*, crossing  $a=-s$  and being spelled out to its left.

- d. *Ezekkel tehát megvették a kislányokat és anyukáikat kilóra, majd jött a felismerés, hogy nem ártana kifejezetten a női közönséget is célba venni, amihez elkészítették a romantikus vigjátékokat női főszereplőstül, szép ruhástul, koktélostul.* ‘So with these they bought the little girls and their mothers by the kilo, and then came the realisation that it would not hurt to specifically target the female audience, for which they made romantic comedies with female protagonists, with beautiful dresses, with cocktails.’  
 e. *Jó elnézni az indai családot akik, vagy 15-en utaznak nagyszülőstől ordító gyerekestől (...).* ‘It’s good to look at the Indian family who, up to 15, travel with grandparents and screaming children’

14 Note in connection with the no-nominal-superstructure restriction that proper names can combine with the sociative suffix (István Kenesei, p.c.):

- (i) *15 perc alatt a teljes magyar államigazgatást ki tudnák iktatni, TEK-estől, Orbán-ostul, Áder-estül*  
 15 minute under the entire Hungarian public.administration.ACC PRT can.COND.3PL liquidate SWAT-SOC Orbán-SOC Áder-SOC  
 ‘within 15 minutes, they could liquidate the entire Hungarian public administration, complete with SWAT, Orbán and Áder’  
 [https://forum.index.hu/Article/showArticle?na\_order=&na\_start=2013&na\_step=30&t=9218186]

Proper names are widely assumed to project a DP; if so, their occurrence with the sociative seems unexpected. However, in Den Dikken & Dékány (2018) we have argued that while proper names indeed correspond to DPs in the default case, under certain circumstances they can project a small structure, and at the same time retain their referentiality. We suggest that this is exactly what happens in examples like (i). Importantly, demonstratives, which according to Den Dikken & Dékány (2018) cannot be smaller than DPs, are entirely impossible with the sociative: (ii). Personal pronouns also need local licensing by a nominal superstructure, which is why sociatives cannot be built on those either: (iii).

- (ii) \**ez-estül* / \**az-ostul*  
 this-SOC / that-SOC  
 intended: ‘complete with this/that’  
 (iii) \**én-stül* / \**mi-stül*  
 I-SOC / we-SOC  
 intended: ‘complete with me/us’

### 2.3 A note on PP-over-aP

Our analysis of sociative *-stul* in (3') involves a PP-over-aP structure. From the perspective of English, this is an unusual configuration: English prepositions do not normally take adjectival complements (though, to be sure, one does find *they regard him as smart, they take it for certain that S*; but here the status of the underlined elements as lexical Ps is debatable: see, e.g., Den Dikken 2006). We would like to take a moment here to support the plausibility of the PP-over-aP structure for Hungarian, before moving on to the discussion of dissociatives.

Within Hungarian, the PP-over-aP structure is widespread and productive. Firstly, it occurs in resultative constructions, which obligatorily feature the sublative ('onto') case suffix on an adjective:

- (10) *lapos-\*(ra) kalapálja a vasat*  
 flat-SUBL hammer.3SG the metal.ACC  
 '(s)he hammers the metal flat'

Secondly, we find it (highly relevantly, in the context of our proposal for (dis)sociatives) in depictives, which must employ the superessive ('on') case suffix on the adjective:<sup>15</sup>

- (11) *forró-\*(n) issza a kávét*  
 hot-SUP drink.3SG the coffee.ACC  
 '(s)he drinks coffee hot'

Thirdly, in predicate clefting constructions the left-dislocated element has to bear dative case, regardless of whether the fronted predicate is nominal or adjectival:

- (12) a. *ház-\*(nak) ház*  
 house-DAT house  
 'as for being a house, it is a house'  
 b. *szép-\*(nek) szép*  
 beautiful-DAT beautiful  
 'as for being beautiful, it is beautiful'

Fourthly, the predicates of selected small clauses also must be adorned with dative case, again irrespective of whether the predicate is nominal or adjectival:

- (13) a. *a legjobb orvos-\*(nak) tartja Marit*  
 the best doctor-DAT find.3SG Mari.ACC  
 '(s)he finds/considers Mari the best doctor'  
 b. *szép-\*(nek) tartja Marit*  
 beautiful-DAT find.3SG Mari.ACC  
 '(s)he finds/considers Mari beautiful'

15 A reviewer points out that the vowel that precedes *-n* when the suffix is attached to a consonant-final [+back] stem is different in depictives from the one found in the superessive: *langyos-an issza a kávét* '(s)he drinks coffee lukewarm' ~ *a balkon-on öntözi a növényt* '(s)he waters the plant on the balcony'. This does not argue against an assimilation of the suffix in *forró-n/langyos-an* to the superessive, however. For a discussion of the distribution of 'lowering' (from *o* to *a*) that provides a general framework for a syntax-based account of the difference between *langyos-an* and *balkon-on*, we refer the interested reader to Den Dikken (2022).



The case-marking of adjectives in these examples is all the more remarkable because Hungarian adjectives do not exhibit concord, thus adnominally they cannot take case marking. Finally, there are also idiosyncratic expressions which feature a PP-over-*aP* structure, such as the ones in (14) — although these are less telling than the ones in (10)–(13) because (some of) these cases could potentially be analysed as nominal structures containing a silent noun attributively modified by the adjective.

- (14) a. *nagy-ban meghatározza/befolyásolja*  
big-INE determine/influence.3SG  
'(s)he determines/influences it to a great degree'
- b. *éppen nagy-ban takarítottam, amikor csengettek*  
just big-INE cleaning.PST.1SG when rang.PST.3PL  
'I was in the middle of cleaning when they rang the doorbell'
- c. *ha kicsi-ben gondolkodsz, az is maradsz*  
if small-INE think.2SG that too stay.2SG  
'if you think small, you remain that (i.e., small)' [<https://www.citatum.hu/szo/kicsiben?r=6>]
- d. *ez ugyanaz pepitá-ban*  
this selfsame checkered-INE  
'there is no difference (lit., this is the same in checkered)'

The examples in (10)–(14) show that PP-over-*aP* is a well-attested configuration in Hungarian. In fact, secondary predicates can only be PPs; 'bare' adjectival secondary predicates (as found in English *John hammered the metal flat*) are systematically excluded in Hungarian. Thus whenever a secondary adjectival predicate is called for, it must be enveloped in a PP, producing a PP-over-*aP* structure of the type we employed in our analysis of sociative *-stul*.

### 3 The syntax of dissociative *-talanul*

#### 3.1 The underlying structure of dissociative *-talanul*

The syntax underlying dissociative *-talan* was depicted in (4). Given the morphological knowledge that we have acquired in the discussion of sociative *-stul*, we can immediately update this structure by giving concrete labels to the heads 'X' and 'Z'. The head 'X' is expounded in dissociatives by the same *-t* also found in sociative *-stul*, which section 2.1 had identified as a locative postposition — so X=P, as before. And 'Z' is expounded as *-l*, which we had previously identified as the ablative of Hungarian. The ablative, like other spatial cases, is the exponent of a P-head. So Y, too, belongs to the category P. We can now revise (4) as in (4').

- (4')  $[_{RP} \text{ PRO } [_{R'} \text{ RELATOR=U+} \text{-l } [_{NegP} \text{ Neg=} \textit{n} \text{ } [_{PP} \text{ P=} \text{-l } [_{PP} \text{ P=} \text{-t } [_{VP} \sqrt{\textit{ruha}}]]]]]]]]]$   
COP ABL NEG ABL LOC

Whereas in sociative *-stul* the locative postposition *-t* governs the projection of the adjectivaliser *-s*, this latter morpheme is markedly absent from the structure of dissociatives, for reasons that we will clarify shortly. Instead, the phrase projected by the postposition *-t* is dominated, in dissociatives, by a projection of another postposition, ablative *-l* 'of/from', which is correlated with the deprivative interpretation of *-talanul* — compare this to the use of ablative *of* in English *deprive of*, the antonym to *provide with* (which uses comitative/instrumental *with*).

The deprivative reading of *-talanul* is primarily contributed by the merger of negation, which is morphologically represented by the same nasal also found in the Hungarian negation particles *ne* and *nem* ‘not’. The presence of negation in the syntax of dissociative constructions is responsible for the forced absence of the *-s* found on sociatives: *\*-stalanul* is impossible. That negation cannot take an *-s* sociative as its complement has the same cause as the fact that, while *met zonder jas* ‘(lit.) with without coat, i.e., without a coat’ occurs in child-Dutch, *\*zonder met jas* (where negative *zonder* selects sociative *met*) is ungrammatical. Probably related as well is the fact that English negative *un-* is incompatible with the negative antonyms of positive adjectives (Jespersen 1942:466): while *happy*, *wise*, *clean* and *true* can all be negated with *un-*, *sad*, *foolish*, *dirty* and *false* cannot. Hungarian *-s* can occur in negative clauses (e.g., *nem volt sós* ‘it was not salty’); likewise, English negative adjectives are compatible with sentential negation (*I was not sad*). In these cases, the negation appears at the level of the clause. But within the same spell-out domain (the complement of the RELATOR in (4’)), *-s* cannot co-occur with negation.

The fact that *-s* is ruled out in the structure of dissociative *-talanul* has an interesting consequence for locative *-t*.<sup>16</sup> The  $\sqrt{P}$  at the bottom of the structure of sociatives and dissociatives is not itself a state-denoting expression. In sociatives, *-s* is what turns it into one. But from dissociatives, *-s* must be absent. It now comes to locative *-t* to procure the state that is to be predicated of the PRO-subject of the small clause. Whereas *-t* merely marks the fact that the subject of the sociative is *in* the state denoted by the combination of the root and *-s*, in dissociatives *-t* plays an indispensable role. Correspondingly, we find that in dialects, sociatives can dispense with *-t* (recall Transylvanian *tössül*; section 2.1); but dissociative *-talanul* never drops its *-t*, because the obligatory absence of adjective-forming *-s* forces the dissociative to rely on *-t* to deliver the state that is predicated of their subject.<sup>17</sup>

Once topped off by the projections of ablative *-l* and negative *-n*, the state-denoting predicate of the depictive small clause is linked to its PRO subject by a RELATOR-head, again spelled out as essive *-ul/ül*, the combination of copular *U* and ablative *-l*. We already discussed the composition of the RELATOR in section 2.1; nothing that was said there needs to be altered in connection with dissociative *-talanul*.

16 In addition, it may shed explanatory light on the fact that while *-stul* can attach to proper names (recall fn. 14), *-talanul* cannot (something to which Balázs Surányi has drawn our attention): *Áderestül/Orbánostul* ‘complete with Áder/Orbán’ ~ *\*Ádertelenül/\*Orbántalanul* ‘(intended) without Áder/Orbán’. It seems to be precisely the presence of the *-s* suffix that makes combination with proper names possible (some attested cases of *-s* forms based on the name *Orbán*: *orbános pólóban* ‘in an Orbán-themed t-shirt’, *orbános graffiti* ‘graffiti about Orbán’, *orbános fotó* ‘a photo of Orbán’, *orbános viccek* ‘jokes about Orbán’). In the dissociative there is no *-s*, only *-t*, which does not go on proper names. This enhances our argument that *-stul* and *-talanul* are suffix complexes that are compositional.

17 Beke (1910:199) notes two pockets of historical Hungarian morphology in which *-t*-less *-lan* occurred — (i) in combination with an adjective (*ujulan*, *ujolan* ‘anew’, from *új* ‘new’) and (ii) in combination with a noun suffixed with *-ig* ‘until’ (*holtomiglan* ‘until my death’, *pokoliglan* [Munich Codex; 15<sup>th</sup> c.] ‘all the way to hell’). For (i), Beke explicitly suggests that the *-l* is the same as the *-l* found in sociative *-stul*; but he does not relate this instance of *-lan* to *-talan*, and takes *-an* to be the modal-essive suffix (see fnn. 6 and 10, above). This is probably correct, although we do not have any insight to offer here. More interesting, to our minds, is (ii), where *-lan* is dependent on *-ig*. It seems to us that for this instance of *-lan*, it is entirely plausible to take the *-n* to be the negative marker, just as in our analysis of dissociative *-talanul* — more specifically, the negation in *-ig+lan* is plausibly the ‘expletive negation’ seen in Hungarian *amíg/ameddig* ‘until’ clauses (*amíg meg nem ismertelek* ‘until I got to know you (lit., until I didn’t know you)’; see Piñón 1991, Ürögdi 2013, *i.a.*). If indeed the composition of the *-lan* of *-ig+lan* constructions overlaps with that of dissociative *-talan*, the fact that *-t* is absent from *-ig+lan* can be understood in light of the text discussion: the host here already denotes a state (*holtomiglan* ‘until the state of me being dead’), so *-t* merely serves to place the bearer of the state *in* this state. (The absence of *-ul* from *-ig+lan* is also unsurprising: *-ig+lan* forms no depictive secondary predicate, so there is no RELATOR.)

### 3.2 The derivation of dissociative *-talanul/telenül*

As in the case of sociative *-stul*, the derivation of dissociative *-talanul* proceeds via consistently left-adjoining snowballing head movement, first combining  $\checkmark$  with  $P=-t$ , subsequently having  $[\checkmark+P]$  team up with  $P=-l$ , then raising  $[[\checkmark+P]+P]$  up to  $Neg=n$ , and in the final step joining  $[[[\checkmark+P]+P]+Neg]$  with the RELATOR, spelled out as *-U+-l*.<sup>18</sup>

In the discussion of sociative *-stul*, the conclusion that the pieces of the puzzle had to be put together via snowballing head movement was supported by the fact that the noun must be ‘bare’, i.e., cannot be pluralised, possessivised or attributively modified. For dissociative *-talanul*, the restriction to bare, unmodified singulars is in effect as well:<sup>19</sup>

- (15) a. *\*ruháktalanul* ‘N.PL.DISSOC, without clothes/dresses’  
 b. *\*ruhájátlanul* ‘N.POSS.DISSOC, without his/her clothes/dress’  
 c. *\*koszos/új ruhátlanul* ‘dirty/new clothes.DISSOC’

That the bare, unmodified singular restriction is not a quirk of Hungarian is shown by the fact that dissociative *-less* (English), *-los* (German) and *-loos* (Dutch) exhibit it, too: *he jumped into the pool (\*dirty) shirtless*. From our analysis, this falls out as a syntactic restriction.

18 While all of the text examples exhibit *-talanul* dissociatives based on a simple root, there exist a few cases that appear to be based on an entire clause. Thus, for the forms in (i) (some of which were pointed out to us by István Kenesei, p.c.), the stem is identical with the present-tense third person singular indefinite form of the verb; and in (ii) (to which by Gábor Alberti, p.c., has drawn our attention), the host of *-talanul* is unquestionably a finite verb: the form *nincs* ‘isn’t, hasn’t’ otherwise exclusively occurs in finite contexts. Because of its finiteness, the form *nincs* in (ii) must be enveloped in a clausal substructure within which its  $\phi_{[3SG]}$  and  $tense_{[-PAST]}$  features can be checked. This entails that in (ii), the lowest of the heads associated with *-talanul*, viz., locative *-t*, must be taking a clausal (TP) complement. The finite verb raises to the T-head of its clause; T is subsequently raised up to *-t*, and beyond this point the derivation proceeds in the by now familiar fashion. Apart from the unusual PP-over-TP syntax apparently underlying (ii), there is one other respect in which this case is noteworthy: negative *nincs* and negative *-telenül* here combine to deliver a negative output paraphrased as ‘penniless’, ‘without anything’, NOT as ‘without nothing’ (which is equivalent to positive ‘with everything’). Rather than involving negative concord across a finite clause boundary, this is probably an instantiation of what Zeijlstra (2010) calls ‘emphatic multiple negative expressions’ (cf. (iii), from the Dutch translation of Irvin D. Yalom’s novel *Lying on the Couch*).

- (i) a. *olvasatlanul* read.DISSOC ‘unread’ c. *ellátatlanul* supply.DISSOC ‘unavailable’  
 b. *járatlanul* walk/go.DISSOC ‘inexperienced’ d. *eladhatatlanul* sell.POT.DISSOC ‘unsellable’  
 (ii) *nincstelenül* isn’t.DISSOC ‘penniless’  
 (iii) u komt hier zonder één aanwijzing, zonder één spoor, *zonder niks*  
 you come here without one indication without one trace without nothing  
 ‘you come here without any indication, without any trace, without anything at all’

Clause-based (dis)sociatives call for more research, which should also clarify the extent to which (dis)sociatives can be based on other non-nominal roots (here *mindenestül* ‘everything.SOC’ comes to mind as an interesting case where *-stul* takes a quantifier as its host; thanks to Gábor Alberti, p.c., for bringing this to our attention).

19 The modification effect is stronger in (16c) than it is in (9c) (recall fn. 13). Also relevant in connection with (16c) is the fact that place names that oscillate between locative *-t(t)* and inessive *-ban/ben* or superessive *-on/en/ön* resist modification when they bear *-t(t)*: (*\*szép Pécs-ett* ~ (*szép Pécs-en* ‘in (beautiful) Pécs’, (*\*gyönyörű Győr-ött* ~ (*gyönyörű Győr-ben* ‘in beautiful Győr’. See Dékány & Hegedűs (2021) and the references cited therein.

But while the ill-formedness of (15) supports the head movement derivation, there remains the question of what rules out the alternative phrasal movement scenario, wherein the projection of the root proceeds to the specifier of *-t*, the locative PP subsequently moves to the specifier of the ablative PP, and so forth. For sociative *-stul*, phrasal movement to the specifier of locative *-t* was ruled out based on the hypothesis that the specifier position of the locative  $P=-t$  is occupied by an abstract constituent represented in the phonology by a floating [+high] feature. In the phonological analysis of dissociative *-talanul*, there is no case to be made for a floating [+high] feature. But setting up a morphosyntactically abstract specifier for locative *-t* nonetheless makes sense for *-talanul* as well. The dissociative marker produces either of two surface outputs: (i)  $\checkmark_{C\text{-final}}+talanul$  (*gondtalanul* ‘trouble-free’) or (ii)  $\checkmark_{V\text{-final}}+LENGTHENING+tlanul$  (*ruha ~ ruhátlanul* ‘without clothes, clothesless’). This can be taken to indicate that there is a vowel (V-slot) intrinsically associated with *-t*, and that this vowel either gets expounded between *-t* and *-l* or manifests itself in the form of lengthening of the stem-final vowel of the nominal base.<sup>20</sup>

Put succinctly, then, the specifier of *-t* is occupied in both sociative *-stul* and dissociative *-talanul* — by a morphosyntactically abstract element which is phonologically represented by a floating [+high] feature in the case of the sociative, and by an epenthetic vowel or stem-final vowel lengthening in the case of the dissociative. Whatever its surface manifestation, the presence of this abstract element in the specifier of the locative PP headed by *-t* radically rules out deriving *x-stul* and *x-talanul* via (snowballing) phrasal movement; only successive head movement operations can help to put Humpty Dumpty together.<sup>21</sup>

20 We have no details to offer at this time regarding the question of how the morphophonology manages to have the abstract vowel in the specifier of locative *-t* play its part, by either surfacing between *-t* and *-l* or lengthening the vowel of N. Note that we are not proposing here that anytime Hungarian has vowel lengthening, this is tied to an abstract element in a specifier position in syntax (thus, in *ruhás* ‘clothed’, phrasal movement is not blocked by long *á*). But for the alternation between *-talanul* and *-V:tlanul*, we do find this plausible (in conjunction with *-stul*).

21 Szabolcsi (1983) points out (thanks to Éva Kardos for drawing our attention to this) that while Hungarian telic predicates characteristically require a verbal particle to overtly mark their telicity (see (i)), verbs built on roots bearing the dissociative marker are a systematic exception: as (ii) shows, these can have a telic reading without a particle as well (this, in fact, is the norm). If the particle restriction in (ib) indicates that telic predicates need an overt element of category P in their complement, then the fact that (iib) disfavors a particles can be attributed to the fact that the syntax of *-talan* already includes material of category P, hence the services of the particle are no longer required. Thanks to snowballing head movement, the P-material in the syntax of dissociatives is represented at the top of the structure, hence visible to external selectors.

- (i) a. *János egy órán át szélesítette/\*kiszélesítette az utat*  
 János one hour.SUP through widen.PST.3SG/out.widen.PST.3SG the road.ACC  
 ‘János widened the road for an hour’
- b. *János egy óra alatt kiszélesítette/\*szélesítette az utat*  
 János one hour under out.widen.PST.3SG/widen.PST.3SG the road.ACC  
 ‘János widened the road in an hour.’
- (ii) a. *János egy órán át légtelenítette a radiátort*  
 János one hour.SUP through air.DISSOC.CAUS.PST.3SG the radiator.ACC  
 ‘János bled the radiator for an hour’
- b. *János egy óra alatt (<sup>°</sup>le)légtelenítette a radiátort*  
 János one hour under down.air.DISSOC.CAUS.PST.3SG the radiator.ACC  
 ‘János bled the radiator in an hour’

#### 4 On the distribution of essive morphology

There is one question left to be addressed. While dissociative *-talanul* readily occurs without the essive *-ul/ül* suffix, sociative *-stul* does not (at least, not in present-day standard Hungarian; see fn. 1 on essive-less *-st* in older and dialectal varieties, but as noted there, such sociatives were never very common and they are non-existent in the standard vernacular today). The question is why the sociative and dissociative should pattern differently in this respect.

The answer to this question must, given the approach to the morphosyntax of sociative *-stul* and dissociative *-talanul* taken in this paper, lie in the availability of a construal of the core of the structures of sociatives and dissociatives as something other than a predicate of an individual. Consider again the structures in (3') and (4'), repeated here, for ease of reference.

- (3')  $[_{RP} \text{ PRO } [_{R'} \text{ RELATOR}=U+-l \text{ } \boxed{[_{PP} \text{ P}=-t \text{ } [_{aP} \text{ } a=-s \text{ } [_{VP} \text{ } \surd=ruha]]}]]]$   
 (4')  $[_{RP} \text{ PRO } [_{R'} \text{ RELATOR}=U+-l \text{ } \boxed{[_{NegP} \text{ Neg}=-n \text{ } [_{PP} \text{ P}=-l \text{ } [_{PP} \text{ P}=-t \text{ } [_{VP} \text{ } \surd=ruha]]}]]}]]$

In these structures, the constituents enclosed in the box serve as predicates of a PRO-subject that is controlled by an argument of the matrix clause, as is typical for depictives. There is little doubt that these constituents can indeed be predicated of individuals — cf., for instance, English *he is (fully) clothed* and *he is shirtless*, where the sociative and dissociative are the primary predicates of copular clauses. But the question on the table is whether these constituents could alternatively be used adverbially, as modifiers of a verbal or adjectival (extended) projection.

Assuming that NegP does not influence the categorial distribution of its complement, the boxed portion of the dissociative in (4') should distribute like an ablative PP. Such PPs can be used as adverbial modifiers, like other PPs can. So we would expect the boxed part of the dissociative to be able to survive on its own, as an adverbial modifier of a verbal or adjectival projection; it should not be required to be included in a small clause with a PRO subject. Concomitantly, there is no reason to expect *-talanul* to become ungrammatical without *-ul* — and indeed, (18b) and (19b) (Dékány & Hegedűs 2021:120), analysed as in (20b), are grammatical.<sup>22</sup>

- (18) a. *feltétlenül el akarok jönni*  
 b. *feltétlen el akarok jönni*  
 'I want to come under any circumstance'  
 (19) a. *hirtelenül befordult az utcába*  
 b. *hirtelen befordult az utcába*  
 '(s)he suddenly turned into the street'  
 (20) a.  $[_{RP} \text{ PRO } [_{R'} \text{ RELATOR}=-\ddot{u}l \text{ } [felt\acute{e}tlen/hirtelen]]]$   
 b.  $[_{VP} [felt\acute{e}tlen/hirtelen] \text{ } [_{VP} \dots \text{ V } \dots]]]$

The boxed portion of (3') is projected by what is historically a locative P, still preserving a clearly locative use in expressions such as *itt/ott* 'here/there', *mindenütt* 'everywhere' and *Pécssett* 'in Pécs'. But as a P with a spatial semantics, *-t* is obsolete, living on in relics but no

22 In addition, *N-talan* can also be used as a primary predicate (*meztelen volt* '(s)he was naked') and as an attributive modifier of a noun (*a meztelen bohóc* 'the naked clown'). If *N-talan* is a negative PP (as per our analysis), the fact that Hungarian PPs cannot normally be pre-modifiers of N (*\*a Jánostól ajándék* 'the János.from gift') raises a question. Another question is posed by the absence of the copula in the present-tense counterpart of *meztelen volt* '(s)he was naked': copula-drop is not normally mandated by PP predicates. These questions need to be looked into.

longer being productive — thus, while *-t* combines with a handful of names of Hungarian towns, including Pécs (fn. 17), its use as a locative cannot be extended to other place names (*\*Buda-pestett*, *\*Sopronott*, *\*Gödött*). Isolated locative uses of *-t* aside, we take it that *-t* is a semantically bleached representative of the category P. The semantics of the boxed portion of (3') is delivered primarily by the complement of P=*-t*, which is an *aP*. Adjectives are perfect as predicates of individuals, but notoriously bad at serving as adverbial modifiers — they typically need to undergo a formal change (in English, suffixation of *-ly*; in Hungarian, the addition of *-Vn* (recall fnn. 5 and 9): *köszönöm szépen* ‘thank you kindly’, *szépen csináltad* ‘you did it beautifully’) before they are eligible to modify a verbal or adjectival phrase. Let us take this to mean that the boxed part of (3') is not, as such, capable of being construed directly with a(n extended) projection of a verb or adjective: it must instead be predicated of an individual, whence the need for the RELATOR and the PRO in its specifier. With the RELATOR spelled out as essive *-ul/ül*, we then derive that the sociative cannot (in the present-day standard vernacular) be reduced to *-st*.

While we have concentrated in this section on the predictions made by our analysis of sociative *-stul* and dissociative *-talanul* with respect to the omissibility of essive *-ul/ül*, it is not unreasonable to think that a role is played in this by the fact that the range of uses of *-talanul* partially overlaps with the free-standing (and non-harmonising) postposition *nélkül* ‘without’ (as we mentioned already in the introduction). The composition of *nélkül* is itself an interesting topic for investigation: its component parts are adessive *-nél* and *kül*, the latter reconstructable as a reduced form of the noun *ki(v)* ‘outer part’ and the familiar essive *-ül* (cf. *kívül* ‘besides, outside, without’; cf. also the particle *ki* ‘out’ and the adverbial *kint* ‘outside’). Perhaps the fact that *nélkül* cannot drop its essive morpheme at all has given *-talanul* a bit of a compensatory leg up when it comes to dropping *-ul*. We will leave this as a speculation — an extremely vague one as it is, but nonetheless something that we hope will serve to trigger some follow-up research. And on this note, we proceed to our concluding remarks.

## 5 Concluding remarks

This paper has presented a morphosyntactic analysis of the Hungarian sociative and dissociative suffixes *-stul/stül* and *-talanul/telenül*. We have unpacked these complex forms with the aid of the adjectivaliser *-s* (a PPI occurring in the sociative but not in the dissociative), the locative postposition *-(t)t*, the ablative postposition *-l*, the essive suffix *-u/ü* (a predication RELATOR), and the negation marker (an apical nasal, occurring in the dissociative but not in the sociative). All of these morphemes were shown to be heads of phrases in the syntax. The complex structures composed out of them serve as depictive secondary predications, with a PRO-subject controlled by the subject or object of the containing clause. Both the morphophonology and the semantics of *-stul* and *-talanul* are entirely compositional.

The analysis of sociative *-stul* and dissociative *-talanul* advanced in this paper sheds new light on a number of grammatical formatives in Hungarian (in particular, *-s*, *-t*, *-l* and *-u/ü*) and their interactions. It also shows that snowballing head movement and phrasal movement are two discrete strategies for syntactic word formation, the former being the only option in the derivation of sociative *ruhástul* ‘clothes and all’ and dissociative *ruhátlanul* ‘clothesless’ whereas the latter is active in the morphosyntax of the denominal adjective *ruhás* ‘clothed’. At a broader theoretical level, the analysis reveals the benefits of composing complex word-level formatives in syntax.

## Acknowledgements

Dékány's work on this paper was supported by the János Bolyai Research Scholarship of the Hungarian Academy of Sciences and the ÚNKP-21-5, ÚNKP-22-5 New National Excellence Program of the Ministry for Innovation and Technology from the source of the National Research, Development and Innovation Fund. Versions of the paper was presented at ICSH15 in Pécs and SinFonIJA14 in Novi Sad. We warmly thank the audiences there and the reviewers and the editor of *JUL* for their constructive feedback.

## References

- Aasmäe, Niina. 2018. The morphosyntactic manifestations of the copula in Erzya. *Linguistica Uralica* 54. 191–204.
- Beke, Ödön. 1910. Megfejtetlen névragok [Unresolved noun suffixes]. *Magyar Nyelvőr* XXXIX. 194–200.
- Budenz, József. 1884. A *-stúl, -stүүл* comitativus rag [The comitative suffix *-stúl, -stүүл*]. *Nyelvtudományi Közlemények* 18. 158–60.
- Dékány, Éva. 2011. A profile of the Hungarian DP. Ph.D. dissertation, University of Tromsø.
- Dékány, Éva & Veronika Hegedűs. 2021. Postpositions: Formal and semantic classification. In Katalin É. Kiss & Veronika Hegedűs (eds), *The syntax of Hungarian: Postpositions and postpositional phrases*. Amsterdam: Amsterdam University Press. 11–191.
- Dikken, Marcel den. 2006. *Relators and linkers*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Dikken, Marcel den. 2022. A phonosyntactic representation of Hungarian ‘lowering’. In J. van de Weijer (ed.), *Segmental structure and representations*. Berlin: De Gruyter Mouton. 307–26. <https://doi.org/10.1515/9783110730098-016>
- Dikken, Marcel den (forthc.). On the merger and antecedence of depictive secondary predicates. In Marcel den Dikken & Hideki Kishimoto (eds), *Formal perspectives on secondary predication*. Berlin: de Gruyter.
- Dikken, Marcel den & Éva Dékány. 2018. A restriction on recursion. *Syntax* 21. 37–71.
- Emonds, Joseph. 1985. *A unified theory of syntactic categories*. Dordrecht: Foris.
- Fekete, István. 2013. Hungarian *gyerekestül* vs. *gyerekekkel* (‘with [the] kid’). *AHEA: E-Journal of the American Hungarian Educators Association* 6; <http://ahea.net/e-journal/volume-6-2013/12>
- Groot, Casper de. 2017. The essives in Hungarian. In Casper de Groot (ed.), *Uralic essive and the expression of impermanent state*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins. 325–52.
- Hale, Kenneth. 1986. Notes on world view and semantic categories: Some Warlpiri examples. In Pieter Muysken & Henk van Riemsdijk (eds), *Features and projections*. Dordrecht: Foris. 233–54.
- Hynönen, Emmi. 2017. The essive in Finnish. In Casper de Groot (ed.), *Uralic essive and the expression of impermanent state*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins. 29–56.
- Jespersen, Otto. 1942. *A modern English grammar on historical principles, vol. VI: Morphology*. London: George Allen & Unwin.
- Kayne, Richard. 1994. *The antisymmetry of syntax*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Kenesei, István, Robert Vago & Anna Fenyvesi. 1998. *Hungarian*. London: Routledge.
- Kiefer, Ferenc & Mária Ladányi. 2000. Morfoszintaktikailag semleges képzések [Morphosyntactically neutral derivations]. In Ferenc Kiefer (ed.), *Strukturális magyar nyelvtan, Vol. 3, Morfológia*. Budapest: Akadémiai Kiadó. 165–214.

- Kühner, Raphael (1877–1879). *Ausführliche Grammatik der lateinischen Sprache*. Hannover: Hahnsche Buchhandlung.
- Piñón, Christopher. 1991. Presupposition and the syntax of negation in Hungarian. In L. Dobrin & L. Rodriguez (eds), *CLS 27: Papers from the 27th Regional Meeting of the Chicago Linguistic Society 1991. Part Two: The parasession on negation*. Chicago: Chicago Linguistic Society. 242–62.
- Roberts, Ian & Anna Roussou. 2003. *Syntactic change: A minimalist approach to grammaticalization*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Schirm, Anita. 2005. Az elidegeníthető és az elidegeníthetetlen birtoklás kifejezőmódjairól [On the expression of alienable and inalienable possession]. *Acta Universitatis Szegediensis – Sectio Linguistica* 42. 155–69; accessed on-line at: [http://publicatio.bibl.u-szeged.hu/7799/6/schirm\\_elidegenitheto\\_elidegenithetetlen.pdf](http://publicatio.bibl.u-szeged.hu/7799/6/schirm_elidegenitheto_elidegenithetetlen.pdf)
- Szabolcsi, Anna. 1983. A specifikus/nem specifikus megkülönböztetésről [On the specific/non-specific distinction]. *Nyelvtudományi Közlemények* 85. 83–92.
- Ürögdi, Barbara. 2013. Adverbial clauses with *-ig* and the ‘Until-puzzle’. *Acta Linguistica Hungarica*. 60. 303–63.
- Zeijlstra, Hedde. 2010. Emphatic multiple negative expressions in Dutch — A by-product of loss of negative concord. *The Linguistic Review* 27. 37–73.

**final version • 24 October 2022**