Ruhástul vagy ruhátlanul — az a kérdés
The morphosyntax of sociative *-stul/stül* and dissociative *-talanul/telenül*

The focus of this paper is the morphosyntax of the Hungarian sociative suffix *-stul/stül* (as in (1a)) and its antonym, *-talanul/telenül* (illustrated in (1b)), dubbed the dissociative suffix. Fekete (2013) aptly characterizes the sociative as limited to situations 'in which two entities are metaphorically tied or "glued" together'; this 'conceptual information of unity tied to the sociative' distinguishes it from comitative *-val/vel (együtt)* '(together) with'. While less frequent than the latter for this reason, and predominantly occurring in set expressions (such as *szőrö-stül bőrö-stül* 'with hair and skin'), sociative *-stul/stül* is productive in present-day Hungarian. Its antonym (which, unlike *-stul/stül*, also occurs without the essive *-ul/ül* suffix) has a wide range of uses, partially overlapping with *nélkül* 'without'.

(1a) *ruhá-<u>stul</u> ugrott a medencébe*   *ruhá-<u>stul</u> belökte Pált a medencébe*
      clothes-SOC jumped the pool.ILLAT   clothes-SOC pushed Pál.ACC the pool.ILLAT
      '(s)he jumped into the pool clothes and all'   '(s)he pushed Pál into the pool fully clothed'
(1b) *ruhá-<u>tlanul</u> ugrott a medencébe*   *ruhá-<u>tlanul</u> ábrázolta a modellt*
      clothes-DISSOC jumped the pool.ILLAT   clothes-DISSOC portrayed the model.ACC
      '(s)he jumped into the pool clothesless'   '(s)he portrayed the model clothesless'

The morphological analysis of *-stul/stül* and *-talanul/telenül* (henceforth only the back-vowel versions will be mentioned, to save space) presented here unpacks these complex forms, utilizing the morphemes *-s* (as in *ruhás* 'clothed'), *-(t)t* (as in *itt/ott* 'here/there' and *Pécsett* 'in Pécs'), ablative *-l* (as in *-ból/ből* 'out of', *-ról/ről*, *-tól/től* 'from'), essive *-u/ü*, and negative *n* (as in *ne(m)* 'not'). These morphemes are the heads of phrases in the syntax, which represents *-stul* and *-talanul* as depictive secondary predications, with a PRO-subject controlled by either the subject (as in the left-hand examples in (1)) or the object (in the right-hand cases) of the containing clause. The morphophonology and semantics of *-stul* and *-talanul* unfold compositionally from the syntactic structure proposed.

§1.1 The syntax underlying sociative *-stul/stül*
The syntax underlying sociative *-stul* is depicted in (2) (where the labelling is kept partially abstract for expository purposes; the full paper will identify the heads 'X' and 'Y', whose labels are not immediately relevant here). This syntax in large measure follows and translates structurally the insightful diachronic reconstruction of *-stul* in Budenz (1884). Y is the *-s* that turns *ruha* 'clothes' into *ruhás* 'clothed', a *nomen possessoris* which is often already comitative: 'with clothes on'. X is the locative *-t* found in *itt/ott* 'here/there', *minden-ütt* 'everywhere', *Pécs-ett* 'in Pécs', and also in *egy-ütt* 'together', which has a comitative/sociative function (disambiguating comitative~instrumental *-val/vel* to its comitative meaning), similarly to German *samt* in *samt allem* 'with all his/her belongings' (cf. Hungarian *cókmókustul*). The combination of N+*-s*+*-t*, which marks the 'conceptual information of unity' that Fekete (2013) identifies as the hallmark of sociative *-stul*, forms the depictive predicate of an adjunct small clause, with a PRO-subject controlled by an argument (either subject or object) of the containing clause. The RELATOR-head of the small clause is spelled out as *-ul/ül*, whose [+high, +round] feature bundle arguably also produces the *v* of copular *van* (a RELATOR *par excellence*; cf. Mordvin *ule* and Finnish *ole* 'be') and whose *-l* is the Finno-Ugric ablative case (which in present-day Hungarian appears in the case particles *-ból/ből*, *-ról/ről*, *-tól/től*, among others). The presence of ablative *-l* under the RELATOR-head of the adjunct small clause assimilates sociative *-stul* constructions to the well-known *ablativus absolutus* construction of Latin (e.g., [*Tarquinio regnante*]*, Pythagoras in Italiam venit* 'Tarquinius.ABS reigning.ABS Pythagoras into Italy came, i.e., with Tarquinius reigning, Pythagoras came to Italy'), which likewise involves a predication structure in an adjunction position.

(2)   [$_{RP}$ PRO [$_{R'}$ RELATOR=V$_{[+high,+round]}$+*-l* [$_{Predicate=XP}$ X=*-t* [$_{YP}$ Y=*-s* [$_{NP}$ N=*ruha*]]]]]

§1.2 The derivation of sociative *-stul/stül*

The surface string of *-stul* comes about via consistently left-adjoining snowballing head-movement: N moves to Y, [N+Y] moves to X, and [[N+Y]+X] moves to the RELATOR; the roll-up produces the surface output N-*s*-*t*-*Vl*. The involvement of head movement throughout the derivation of *-stul* explains the BARE SINGULAR restriction imposed on N (²*[*koszos/új ruhá*]-*stul* 'dirty/new clothes.SOC', *ruhákostul* 'N.PL.SOC', *ruhájástul* 'N.POSS.SOC'): no nominal functional superstructure can be projected outside NP, as such superstructure would prevent N-movement out of the nominal domain. That the derivation of *-stul* must involve snowballing head movement is due to a property of X=*-t*: its specifier position is occupied by an abstract element associated in the phonology with a floating feature [+high]. (In locative *ott/itt* 'there/here', formed via merger of the demonstratives *az/ez* 'that/this' in SpecXP with X=*-t*, this floating [+high] is responsible for the raising of the vowel *a/e* to *o/i*.) Because SpecXP is occupied, phrasal movement out of X's complement into SpecXP is blocked in the derivation of *-stul* constructions: only head movement can serve to raise N to the left of X=*-t*. And because head movement out of a phrase occupying a specifier position is impossible, NP cannot raise to SpecYP prior to N-movement to X: phrasal movement would 'freeze' NP and bleed subsequent head movement. The derivation of *-stul* must hence consistently involve head movement, ruling out all forms of modication of N. By contrast, in the derivation of the simpler form *ruhá-s* 'with clothes on', whose syntax features YP but not XP, a phrasal constituent containing N can move terminally to SpecYP crossing Y=*-s*; so here nothing prevents adjectival modification of N (cf. ✓[*koszos/új ruhá*]-*s* 'dirty/new clothe-d' and ²*[*koszos/új ruhá*]-*stul* 'dirty/new clothes.SOC').

§2.1 The syntax underlying dissociative *-talanul/telenül*

The syntax underlying dissociative *-talan* is depicted in (3). X is exponed by the same *-t* also found in *-stul*. XP in (3) is immediately dominated by a projection of Z, realized by ablative *-l* 'of/from', which gives rise to the deprivative interpretation of *-talanul* — cf. *provide* <u>with</u> ~ *deprive* <u>of</u>. This deprivative reading is further reinforced by merging a projection of Neg=*n* (the same *n* as the one found in *ne* and *nem* 'not'). The postulation of a NegP in the syntax of dissociative constructions is supported by NPI-licensing facts (Hu: *erőtlen volt (arra), hogy* {*a kis ujját is megmozdítsa*/<u>*valamit is tegyen*</u>} '(s)he was powerless to {lift a finger/do anything}'; En: *he is powerless to do* <u>anything</u> *about it, he is clueless about* <u>anything you ask him</u>). The presence of NegP in the structure of dissociative *-talanul* also accounts for the fact the YP of (2) is necessarily absent from (3) (*-talanul*, not *-<u>s</u>talanul*): *-s* is ruled out in the local scope of Neg — i.e., *-s* is a positive polarity item. (The fact that *-s* can occur in negative clauses containing *nem* shows that the polarity sensitivity of *-s* is domain-restricted: *within* the same phase (RP in (3)), *-s* cannot co-occur with negation; but if the negation appears *outside* the local domain for *-s*, there is no problem.) The NegP in (3) forms the negated predicate of the depictive adjunct small clause. The RELATOR-head of the small clause is once again spelled out as *-ul/ül* (on which see §1.1).

(3)   [$_{RP}$ PRO [$_{R'}$ RELATOR=V$_{[+high,+round]}$+*-l* [$_{NegP}$ Neg=*n* [$_{ZP}$ Z=*-l* [$_{XP}$ X=*-t* [$_{NP}$ N=*ruha*]]]]]]

§2.2 The derivation of dissociative *-talanul/telenül*

As in the case of sociative *-stul*, and for the same reason (viz., occupancy of SpecXP), the derivation of dissociative *-talanul* proceeds via consistently left-adjoining snowballing head movement, combining N with X=*-t*, [N+X] with Z=*-l*, [[N+X]+Y] with Neg=*n*, and [[[N+X]+Y]+Neg] with the RELATOR. For depictive *-talanul*, the bare singular restriction seen in sociative *-stul* is in effect as well, as predicted. That the bare 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*. We are dealing here with a *syntactic* restriction; no appeal to lexical word formation is due.

The analysis of sociative *-stul* and dissociative *-talanul* 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 (*ruhástul~ruhás*), and sheds new light on a number of grammatical formatives in Hungarian (in particular, *-s*, *-t*, and *-l*) and their interactions.