

## Locative Prepositions as modifiers of an unpronounced noun

1. Introduction. Locative P(reposition)s have posed problems for a uniform analysis of the category P and, in particular, for considering all Ps to be functional (van Riemsdijk 1990, 1998, Grimshaw 1991, Botwinik-Rotem 2004). Recent work takes locative Ps to head the (lexical) projection Place P (den Dikken 2003, Svenonius 2004), while it has also been held that they are nominals of some type (Bresnan 1994, Maracz 1984, Collins 2005). Based initially on evidence from Greek, I propose that locative Ps modify a non-phonologically realized noun, *Place*, which denotes the physical space surrounding the Ground argument, and is the complement of a functional head  $P_{Loc}$ . What appears to be the complement of the locative is the possessor of *Place*. The proposed analysis sheds light on the lexical, i.e., nominal, behavior of locatives, while also capturing their functional status. Moreover, it is able to extend beyond Greek, as my discussion of Spanish and English demonstrates.

2. Greek. The genitive Case of complements of Greek locatives (which are possible only as clitics), (1), is a first indication of nominal properties of locatives, since genitive is found only with complements of nouns. Other properties of Greek locatives are also reminiscent of the DP domain, although not of nouns, but of adjectives: a) in both, locatives, (2a), and in the postadjectival position of nouns modified by adjectives, (2b), a (genitive) clitic complement is possible, but not the corresponding full DP, b) the genitive clitic following adjectives, (2b), is subject to animacy restrictions (Alexiadou & Stavrou 2000), also found with clitics following locatives (Terzi 2005), c) genitive DPs were present in earlier stages of Greek, but ceased to exist in both domains (between 12<sup>th</sup> -15<sup>th</sup> centuries). Note that Greek locatives do not carry nominal features, neither do they derive from nouns historically (Skopeteas 2002).

3. The proposal. Considering the similarities between locative Ps and adjectives, I propose that locatives participate in a (nominal) possession structure, in which the locative modifies an unpronounced noun, *Place*, (3), (Kayne 2005). Contrasts such as in (4) argue that *Place* is not the outcome of *nominal ellipsis*, or of substantivization as a result of *type-shifting* (Giannakidou & Stavrou 1999). There is also empirical support for the functional head  $P_{Loc}$ : (4b), by contrast to mainstream adjectives, can be modified by phrases like *straight* or *right* - a modification that I consider to be possible by virtue of the presence of  $P_{Loc}$ . When locatives are followed by the 'light' Ps *se* or *apo* with an accusative DP complement this time, (5a), I consider them to have the structure in (5b). When *se* alone expresses location, (6a), I attribute to it a structure as in (6b), in which *se* lexicalizes  $P_{Loc}$ . Crucially, *Place* is not modified in this structure, hence I account for the less precise denotation of location in (6).

4. Spanish The above view to Greek locatives extends readily to Spanish and improves older accounts (Plann 1985, Campos 1991). Campos (1991) observes that Spanish Ps such as *cerca*, (7), can be stranded, giving the (false) impression of P-stranding. He, rightly, holds that such extractions do not fall within the P-stranding paradigm of Germanic, but are reminiscent of extraction of/from nominals. He adopts claims of Plann (1985), who considers Spanish locatives to be nouns and adjectives simultaneously, and for this reason to be [+N] *neutralized categories*. I argue that there is no real evidence that elements such as *cerca*, *detrás*, *lejos*, *encima*, etc. are nouns, while their adjectival/modifier status is justified. Hence, I also consider the aforementioned Spanish locatives to modify an (empty) noun *Place*, and associate them with a structure as in (6) (leaving aside the noun-adjective order of Spanish). Further advantages of the proposed analysis is that we dispense with the categorial feature [+N], (Chomsky 2001), and with the obscure notion 'neutralized categories'.

5. English I demonstrate that the behavior of English locatives can also be accounted for via the structure in (3)/(5b)=(8). Moreover, an unpronounced *Place* is independently proposed by Kayne (2004), for the English demonstratives 'here' and 'there'. Finally, by associating English locatives such as 'in' with (6b)=(9a), I can explain the difference in interpretation between pairs such as 'in' and 'inside': *Place* is modified (by 'side') in (9b), but not in (9a).

- (1) a. Piso tis.  
behind she-cl-gen ‘Behind her.’  
b. Brosta tu.  
in front he-cl-gen ‘In front of him.’
- (2) a. Piso tis/\*tis Marias.  
behind she-cl-gen/the Mary-gen  
‘Behind her/Mary.’  
b. To megalo tu/\*tu Petru vivlio (tu/tu Petru).  
the big he-cl-gen/the Peter-gen book (...)  
‘His/Peter’s big book.’
- (3) ... [PPLoc [PLoc  $\emptyset$  [DP  $\emptyset$  [XP piso [NP Place [DP tis ]]]]]]  
behind her
- (4) a. I (\*poli) piso kanun thorivo.  
the very behind make noise ‘The people very back make noise.’  
b. Kathisa (poli) piso tis.  
I-sat very behind her ‘I sat very behind her.’
- (5) a. Brosta apo/se ti Maria.  
in front apo/se the Mary-acc ‘In front of Mary.’  
b. ... [PPLoc [PLoc  $\emptyset$  [DP  $\emptyset$  [XP brosta [NP Place [PP apo/se [DP ti Maria ]]]]]]  
in front apo/se the Mary
- (6) a. S-to grafio.  
se the office ‘At/in the office.’  
b. ... [PPLoc [PLoc se [DP  $\emptyset$  [XP  $\emptyset$  [NP Place [DP to grafio ]]]]]]  
at/in the office
- (7) De qué edificio<sub>i</sub> está cerca t<sub>i</sub> la facultad?  
of what building is near the school ‘What building is the school near (to)?’
- (8) a. ... [PPLoc [PLoc  $\emptyset$  [DP  $\emptyset$  [XP behind [NP Place [DP Mary ]]]]]]  
b. ... [PPLoc [PLoc in [DP  $\emptyset$  [XP front [NP Place [PP of [DP Mary ]]]]]]
- (9) a. ... [PPLoc [PLoc in [DP  $\emptyset$  [XP  $\emptyset$  [NP Place [DP the office ]]]]]]  
b. ... [PPLoc [PLoc in [DP  $\emptyset$  [XP side [NP Place [DP the office ]]]]]]

## REFERENCES

- Alexiadou, A. and M. Stavrou. 2000. “Adjective-Clitic Combinations in the Greek DP”. In B. Gerlach and J. Grijzenhout (eds.), *Clitics in Phonology, Morphology and Syntax*, John Benjamins • Botwinik-Rotem, I. 2004. *The Category P: Features, projections, interpretation*. Ph.D. Dissertation, Tel Aviv University • Campos, H. 1991. “Preposition Stranding in Spanish?” *Linguistic Inquiry* 22, 741-750 • Chomsky, N. 2001. “Derivation by Phase”. In M. Kenstowicz (ed.), *Ken Hale: A Life in Language*, MIT Press • Dikken den, M. 2003. “On the syntax of locative and directional adpositional phrases”. Ms., CUNY Graduate Center • Kayne, R. S. 2004. “Here and There”. In C. Leclère, E. Laporte, M. Piot and M. Silberstein (eds.), *Syntax, Lexis and Lexicon-Grammar. Papers in Honour of Maurice Gross*, John Benjamins • Kayne, R. S. 2005. *Movement and Silence*. OUP. Riemsdijk van, H. C. 1990. “Functional Prepositions”. In H. Pinkster and I. Genee (eds.), *Unity in Diversity: Papers presented to Simon C. Dick, Foris* • Riemsdijk van, H. C. 1998. “Categorical Feature Magnetism: The Endocentricity and Distribution of Projections”. *Journal of Comparative Germanic Linguistics* 2, 1-48 • Svenonius, P. 2004. “Spatial P in English”. Ms., University of Tromsø.