

Locative Prepositions and Place

1. Introduction

The purpose of this chapter is to investigate the behavior of locative P (preposition)s and offer an account of their not yet fully understood syntactic properties. Locatives are those prepositions that pose various problems for treating all Ps alike along the functional vs. lexical dimension and, in particular, for considering all Ps to be functional elements (Grimshaw 1991; Baker 2003; Botwinik-Roiten 2004). It comes as no surprise, therefore, that Van Riemsdijk (1990, 1998) considers locative Ps to be semifunctional. On the other hand, for Den Dikken (2003) and Svenonius (2004), locative (and directional) Ps—in English, Dutch, and German at least—are lexical heads associated with a number of functional projections on a par with verbs and nouns. Finally, some proposals hinge on the lexical nature of locative Ps in a different manner, namely, by considering them to be nominals of some type; see Bresnan (1994) for English, Marácz (1984) for Hungarian, Collins (2004) for Niua, and Abboh (this volume) for Gbe. What seems to follow from the above, therefore, is that, although it is difficult to pin down the exact status of locatives, general trends emerge nonetheless: First, while there is a tendency to consider locatives lexical elements, it has been difficult to deny their functional component. Furthermore, when it comes to their lexical status, various similarities between locatives and nouns have been pointed out not only within what we tend to think of as exotic languages but also within languages of Europe. The account I propose here sheds light on these issues and offers a new analysis of the behavior and the syntactic structure of locative Ps.

Based initially on empirical evidence from Greek, I argue that locatives indeed have a lexical component, stemming from the fact that they are the modifiers of a lexical element, in particular, of a nonphonologically realized noun that I call Place

and whose presence in the syntactic structure gives locatives a nominal flavor. Although it is beyond the scope of this chapter to investigate the semantic content of Place, it appears to denote the physical space surrounding the reference landmark (i.e., what is considered the ground argument of the locative). This physical space becomes narrower when Place is modified by the locative, while it remains less precise when a locative modifier of Place is missing. I further claim that the DP containing Place is the complement of a functional head, P_{loc} , and that the latter is what contributes the functional makeup of locatives and hence their overall oscillating status along the functional/lexical dimension.

My intention, of course, is to demonstrate that the structures I propose and justify for Greek hold for other languages as well, and for this reason I investigate Spanish and English locative Ps. I demonstrate that Spanish is a language whose locatives behave very similarly to those of Greek. When English enters the picture, it complicates things, while at the same time it poses interesting questions with respect to the relationship locatives have with their complements. Naturally, this is the issue I subsequently address. It follows from the claims outlined earlier that what appears to be the object of locative Ps is the possessor of the unpronounced noun Place, an outcome that I elaborate in this work. English presents a more complicated picture than Greek and Spanish in this respect and raises questions as to whether the object of the locative participates in a possession or in a partitive relation with Place. I explore this question and conclude that there is no sufficient and convincing evidence to support the latter idea.

In the second section of the chapter I present the empirical evidence from Greek on which my claims are based. I demonstrate that locatives share the distribution of adjectives and propose a nominal structure that contains them (in which structure locatives modify the unpronounced noun Place) and is the complement of a P functional head. In the same section I present instances in which Place is not modified by a locative element (with the consequence that location is conveyed in a less precise manner). The third section discusses locatives in Spanish and demonstrates how the current proposal is preferable to previous accounts at both the empirical and the conceptual levels. Section 4 discusses English and dedicates a subsection to the relation of locatives with their complements. The fifth section presents my conclusions.

2. Greek locative Ps

Greek locative Ps are encountered in two syntactic frames, which constitute the empirical bulk of this study. In the first frame, locatives are followed by a smaller P, which is referred to here as "light P" and introduces the object of locatives with accusative case. There are two such light Ps, *se* and *apo*, and they are both encountered in a number of other environments on their own as well.¹ This frame is often referred to as a *complex preposition* in the Greek literature (Theophanopoulou-Kontou 1992), a term that I also employ here.

(1) a. *Stathika piso apo ti Maria*
stood-1s behind *apo* the Mary-acc
'I stood behind Mary.'

- b. Kathomun epano ston Petru.
 was-sitting-1s on se-the Peter-acc
 'I was sitting on John.'

In the other syntactic frame, locatives are followed directly by their complement, which now carries genitive case, however, and can appear only as a clitic. In other words, a full DP as the immediate complement of locatives is not allowed, as is illustrated in (2).

- (2) a. Stathika piso tis/*tis Marias.
 stood-1s behind she-cl-gen/the Mary-gen
 'I stood behind her/Mary.'
 b. Kathomun epano tu/*tu Petru.
 was-sitting-1s on he-cl-gen/the Peter-gen
 'I was sitting on him/Peter.'

For a third frame, one can potentially consider the one in which locatives are not followed by a complement; see (3). Because of the existence of this frame, locatives are also referred to as intransitive prepositions and/or as adverbs in the traditional Greek literature (Tzatzanos 1945/1996).²

- (3) a. Stathika piso.
 stood 1s behind.
 'I stood behind.'
 b. Kathomun epano.
 was-sitting-1s on
 'I was sitting on.'

In what follows I start with the second frame in which locatives are encountered, as it reveals more about their structure.

2.1. (Genitive) clitic complements: Locatives and the nominal domain

The fact that the clitic complement of locatives carries genitive case (2) and that genitive is the case associated exclusively with complements of nominals in Modern Greek constitutes the first indication that Greek locatives may be part of some nominal structure.³ The construal of locatives with genitive complements does not mean that the locative *per se* is some type of noun, however, and it is precisely this point in which the present account differs from previous accounts that attribute nominal properties to locative PPs. To anticipate the central claim of this section, I argue that locatives are the modifiers of nouns (of some special type, as we will see) by virtue of the fact that their distribution is similar to that of adjectives in the nominal domain (see also Terzi 2007).

The similarities in distribution between locatives and adjectives emerge once we compare the distribution of complements of locatives (either clitics or full DPs) with the complements of nouns (possessor clitics or full DPs) in the presence of an adjective. In Greek, possessors can be found in two positions in the nominal domain in the presence of an adjective: The possessor can either follow the noun, in the form of a clitic or as a full DP, (4a), or it can follow the adjective, but only in the form of a clitic (4b):

- (4) a. To oreo spiti tu/tu Petru.
 the nice house he-cl-gen/the-gen Peter-gen
 b. To oreo tu/*tu Petru spiti.
 the nice he-cl-gen/the-gen Peter-gen house
 'His/Peter's nice house.'

The ungrammatical second part of (4b) was grammatical in earlier stages of Greek; see (5). Furthermore, during the same (earlier) stages of the language, locatives could be followed by a genitive DP as well, (6), whereas only a genitive clitic can immediately follow them in contemporary Greek, as is illustrated in (2a–b), repeated here:

- (5) To prion tis tragodias meros.
 the first the-gen tragedy-gen part 'The first part of the tragedy.'
 (Aristophanes, *Frogs* 1120)
- (6) estratopedetsanso ekso tis poleos . . .
 camped-3p outside the-gen city-gen 'They camped outside the city.'
 (Xenophon, *Hellenica* 5.2.25)
- (2) a. Stathika piso tis/*tis Marias.
 stood-1s behind she-cl-gen/the Mary-gen
 'I stood behind her/*Mary.'
 b. Kathomun epano tu/tu Petru.
 was-sitting-1s on he-cl-gen/the Peter-gen
 'I was sitting on him/Peter.'

The similarity between the two domains continues in the sense that the genitive DP complements of locatives ceased to exist during the same period in which DP possessors ceased to occur after an adjective in the nominal domain, namely, from around the twelfth to the sixteenth centuries (see Alexiadou 2005 and Theophanopoulou-Konou 2000 respectively).

I propose that we can make sense of the synchronic and diachronic distributional similarities between locatives and the extended nominal domain if we consider locatives to be part of a structure similar to that of nominals. Rather than considering locatives to be nouns, however, I am claiming that they are modifiers of nouns and, in particular, of a very specific type of noun. Their status as modifiers follows from the fact that they share the distribution of (attributive) adjectives, that is, of elements that are typical modifiers of nouns.⁴ I propose therefore that locatives modify a noun

that is not phonologically realized, one that I call Place. This noun is the head noun of a DP with an empty determiner, as seen in (7). The small clause we also see in (7) is the structure I tentatively adopt for nominal possession; see Den Dikken (1998, 1999) since I hold that what surfaces as the complement of the locative is the possessor of Place:⁵

(7) ... [sc [DP \emptyset [DP epano [X [DP Place]]]] [PP \emptyset [DP tu]]]



Remember from (4) that the possessive clitic may surface in two positions in the nominal domain, namely, following either the adjective or the noun. Ideally, one would expect the same to hold for locatives if we adopt (7) as their structure. It is not necessarily the case that the situation should be identical in the domain of locatives, however, since, when following the noun (i.e., Place), clitics would have to cliticize on a nonphonologically realized element, but the latter is not a legitimate host for clitics.⁶ I propose therefore that the genitive clitic in (7) obligatorily moves from the position after Place to the position after the locative. Once we hold that the position at which clitics surface when they follow locatives is the one after the locative rather than the one after Place, we can account for additional similarities between the clitic complements of locatives and the possessors of mainland DPs in further support of the proposed structure in (7). We have no reason to assume movement of the possessive clitic from the postnominal to the postadjectival position in the DP domain since clitics can appear either after the noun, as in (4a), or after the adjective, as in (4b). Moreover, each of these positions in the DP is associated with different properties with respect to animacy restrictions imposed on clitics, as we will see shortly.

One of the advantages of considering clitics that follow locatives to surface at the position after the locative rather than after Place, namely, at a position counterpart to the postadjectival position in the DP, is that a full DP complement of locatives is not expected to be possible, as in (2) (just as a possessor full DP cannot replace a possessive clitic after the adjective in the nominal domain, (4b)).

Moreover, if we consider clitics that follow locatives to be the counterparts of clitics that follow adjectives, we can account for one more property exhibited by clitics in this position. Alexiadou and Stavrou (1999) have observed that, when possessive clitics follow the adjective, they can refer only to an animate entity, in contrast to the possessive clitics that follow the noun, (8a) vs. (8b). The authors associate animacy with higher positions for clitics in the DP structure:

- (8) a. O trelas tu odigos
the crazy his driver
'his crazy driver'

- b. O trelas odigos tu
the crazy driver his
'his/his crazy driver'

As (9) demonstrates, clitics that follow locatives are also subject to animacy restrictions. Hence, the clitic in (9a) cannot refer to 'the church,' although the context is entirely appropriate. On the other hand, the full pronoun, associated with the complex preposition frame, is perfectly acceptable when referring to 'the church,' (9b). This finding indicates that clitics following locatives are also placed in a higher position in the structure, in line with my claim that they occupy the position after the locative rather than the position after Place.

- (9) a. *I Eleni perimene brosia apo tin eklisia, ke i Maria mesa tis.
the Eleni was-waiting in-front of the church and the Mary inside she-cl-gen

- b. I Eleni perimene brosia apo tin eklisia, ke i Maria mesa se afti.
the Eleni was-waiting in-front of the church and the M. inside se she-pron-acc
'Eleni was waiting in front of the church, and Mary inside it.'

A word of clarification is in order at this point: A number of Greek speakers, although agreeing with the judgments in (9), can accept clitics construed with prepositions even when they refer to an inanimate entity, especially in contexts such as in (10b):

- (10) a. Ides tin eimerida?
saw-2s the newspaper 'Did you see the newspaper?'
b. Ne, kathome epano tis.
yes, sit-1s on it-cl-gen 'Yes, I am sitting on it.'

I believe that the mixed judgments with respect to the animacy of the clitics reflect precisely the steps of the analysis I am advocating. If we assume that there are two positions for possessive clitics in the nominal domain, a higher one that is associated with animacy restrictions and a lower one that is not (Alexiadou and Stavrou 1999), it is plausible that, when a clitic moves from the lower to the higher position, it demonstrates behavior which reflects the different properties of each of the two positions with respect to animacy. Since no comparable mixed behavior is demonstrated in the nominal domain with respect to animacy, it is possible that both positions for clitics are base generated in nominals. On the other hand, the obligatory movement of the clitic from the lower to the higher position in the domain of locatives follows from the fact that clitics cannot be hosted by a nonphonologically realized element such as Place⁷.

To summarize, in this section I have accumulated empirical evidence in favor of the claim that the syntactic structure of Greek locatives involves some type of nominal, in particular, that it parallels in several ways the structure of a DP in the presence of an adjective that modifies its head noun. I have proposed that this parallelism suggests that locatives resemble adjectives in that they also modify a noun, the noun Place. The latter is a nonphonologically realized lexical element, and the DP in which

it is contained has a nonphonologically realized determiner as well. Moreover, what appears to be the complement of the locative is the possessor of Place. I do not address the semantics of Place in this chapter. I believe, however, that it follows naturally from the syntactic structure I have proposed, that Place denotes the physical space surrounding the ground (i.e., the landmark for location or else what appears to be the object of the locative). It also follows, I believe, that what locatives achieve by modifying the noun Place is to restrict the range of its reference and hence to restrict the physical space denoted by it to, let us say, the front, the back, and so on (of the ground argument). We will see the consequences of this modification in subsequent sections, when we investigate structures in which Place is not modified.

The similarities between locatives and adjectives are striking, especially in view of the fact that Greek locatives do not carry nominal/adjectival (or any other) inflectional morphology and do not derive from nouns historically (see Skopeteas 2002, 2006, for ancient Greek locatives). It is nevertheless a behavior consistent with the general cross-linguistic observation that locatives have some type of nominal flavor, an observation that is not always precisely articulated or correctly argued for, however.⁷

2.1.1. The P_{Loc} functional head

There are reasons to believe that considering (7) to be the full structure of Greek locatives is not sufficient. This is so because, if the structure of locatives were just that of an adjectival element modifying an (unpronounced) noun, locatives would not be modified by adverbs and degree phrases such as *akrivos* 'right/precisely' since these do not modify adjectives.

- (11) *To vivlio ixe akrivos kokino/megalo
the book is right red/big.

Nevertheless, *akrivos* can modify locatives, as the following example demonstrates:

- (12) O Petros katise akrivos diplo/proti/afiso mu.
the Peter sat right beside/in front/behind me

This modification possibility, which is available to locatives, leads me to propose that the nominal structure of which locatives are a part is in turn the complement of a (nonphonologically realized in this case) functional head, P_{Loc} :

- (13) ... [P_{Place} [P_{Loc} \emptyset [L_{Loc} L_{NP} \emptyset [L_{XP} P_{Place}]]]] [L_{NP} \emptyset [L_{OP} t_{NP}]]]]
behind she-cl-gen

Hence, modifiers such as *akrivos* modify P_{Loc} , rather than the locative, conceivably occupying the specifier position of PP_{Loc} .

There is one more piece of empirical evidence in favor of taking the DP that contains Place to be the complement of P_{Loc} .⁸ Let us consider an adverb such as *diametrica* 'diametrically', which can modify adjectives:

- (14) Exi diametrica aridhrei aposti.
have-3s diametrically opposed view
'She/he has a diametrically opposite view.'

If we modify the locative with *diametrica*, it has to follow rather than precede *akrivos*:

- (15) a. Kathotan akrivos diametrica piso mu.
was-sitting right diametrically behind me
b. *Kathotan diametrica akrivos piso mu.
was-sitting diametrically right behind me

The order of these adverbial modifiers and the fact that only *diametrica* can modify adjectives (hence locatives as well, according to my claims) is consistent with the structure in (13). In (13), a DP whose head noun is Place is the complement of the functional head P_{Loc} . Therefore, it is lower in the structure than P_{Loc} . As a result, the modifier of (the modifier of) Place appears lower in the structure than the modifier of P_{Loc} , and we get *akrivos* 'right' > *diametrica* 'diametrically' but not the reverse order.

In conclusion, what I have argued for so far and is subsumed under (13) is that there is both a lexical and a functional component to the structure of Greek locatives. The functional component is contributed by the head P_{Loc} that I proposed in this section, and the lexical component is contributed by the (unpronounced) noun Place. I believe that, if I am on the right track, the current proposal is in the spirit of Van Riemsdijk (1990, 1998), who considers locatives to be semilexical. One of the advantages of the proposed analysis is that it demystifies the noun "semilexical," suggesting that it reflects the simultaneous presence of both a lexical and a functional element. Greek instantiates both components via the morphosyntactic distributional evidence I have presented. An additional advantage of the proposed analysis, also made readily available via the empirical evidence from Greek, is that locatives are part of a nominal structure in a very specific way (i.e., not by being nouns but by modifying a noun). As a result, the current analysis also sheds light on the nominal flavor often associated with locatives.

Before closing this section let me also note that by considering the unpronounced noun Place as one of the core ingredients of my analysis, my proposal shares a number of similarities with recent views of Noonan (2005 and this volume) on the structure of locative and directional prepositions and particles, and considers the complement of the locative preposition to be the possessor of PLACE in various instances. Although a valid comparison of the two views deserves more space than this chapter allows, let me direct to a couple of points with respect to which the two proposals differ. Although I do not assume any special structure between P_{Loc} and Place, Noonan takes PLACE to be associated with a special PlaceP projection, embedded in one more projection, $R_{Place}P$. The latter is what hosts *di*-shadow Ps in German, one of whose properties is to contribute a specific spatial interpretation of the locative. As I demonstrate in subsequent sections, I consider specific spatial interpretation to result

directly from the locative's modification of Place. At the same time, I have not found evidence for the rich structure that surrounds PLACE in Noonan's proposal. It would be interesting to see, therefore, whether the simpler structure that I advocate is in a position to accommodate Noonan's facts in a satisfactory manner. This is a task undoubtedly worth considering in the future.

With this in mind, let us now turn to the other frame in which Greek locatives are encountered, the complex preposition structure.

2.2. The complex preposition structures

I mentioned in the introduction that, in the complex preposition frame, Greek locatives are followed by the prepositions *se* or *apo*, which are followed by the DP complement of the locative, now with accusative case.⁹ Note that I use the term *complement of the locative* in a broad sense since, according to the proposed analysis, what is standardly taken to be the syntactic complement or the ground argument of the locative is considered the complement (or argument) of Place.

- (1) a. *Stathika piso apo ti Maria*
stood-1s behind *apo* the Mary-acc
'I stood behind Mary.'
b. *Kathomoun epano ston Petro.*
was-sitting-1s on *se*-the Peter-acc
'I was sitting on John.'

Some locatives are construed with either *se* or *apo* with no obvious difference in meaning, while others are construed only with *apo*.¹⁰ Alternatively put, while all locatives are followed by *apo*, not all of them can be followed by *se*.

- (16) a. *(e)jhano selapo 'on' i' above,* b. *mesa selapo 'inside' i' from within,* c. *brostia selapo*
'in front of,' d. *konda sel'?'apo 'near,' e. dipla selapo 'beside'*
(17) a. *kato apo/se 'under,' b. ekso apo/se 'outside,' c. piso apo/se 'behind,'*
d. *makria apo/se 'away,' e. arisiera apo/se 'left,' f. dekstra apo/se 'right'*

I propose that the structure of complex prepositions is not much different from that of the genitive clitic frame, (13) (see also Terzi 2007). In fact, it is essentially the same, with the difference that the empty P that heads the small clause is now lexicalized by one of the two light Ps:

- (18) ... [_{TP} [_{NP} *t*]_{sc} 0 [_{sc} [_{NP} *t*]_{NP} *piso Place*]] [_{PP} *apo/se* [_{NP} *ti Maria*]]]_{TP}
behind *apo/se* the Mary-acc

It is not clear how (13) and (18) are related and whether they are indeed related transformationally. The idea that the complex preposition in (18) derives from the clitic structure in (13) via the process of predicate inversion (which would attribute *apo*

and *se* the status of linkers, a familiar concept in other languages; see Den Dikken and Singhapreeccha 2004 for a recent thorough study) is not on the right track, as I have demonstrated in Terzi (2007).¹¹

Botwinik-Rotem and Terzi (2008) propose that the light Ps (following Greek (and Hebrew) locatives are responsible for checking the case feature of the DP complement of the locative. In Greek, this is a consequence of the fact that the locative, by virtue of being an XP modifier, is not able to check the genitive case of the DP (nor can the morphologically realized Place or its determiner).¹²

Consistent with this proposal is the observation that the light Ps do not have semantic content. Terzi (2007) demonstrates that *se* never has semantic content when following locatives, while *apo* carries semantic content only in two instances: when it follows *epano* (16a) and when it follows *mesa* (16b) (see also note 15). Interestingly, in precisely these two contexts *apo* cannot be omitted, as a result of which the genitive clitic frame is not available.

2.3. The Preposition *se* and the realization of P_{loc}

At this point it is worth considering another syntactic frame in which the light P *se* occurs. In the following example *se* can be employed on its own to convey location:

- (19) *To vivlio ine sto grafo.*
the book is *se*-the desk
'The book is on the desk.'

Thus, (19) is similar in meaning to (20):

- (20) *To vivlio ine epano sto grafo.*
the book is on *se*-the desk
'The book is on the desk.'

Examples (19) and (20) are not identical in meaning, however. There is a literal interpretation of location in (20) that is missing in (19). In other words, while (19) can be true even if the book is in one of the drawers of the table, this cannot be the case in (20). Likewise, (21) is true even if Peter had been at the balcony of the house when the earthquake took place, while this is not the case in (22):

- (21) *O Petros itan sto spiti otan egine o sismos.*
the Peter was *se*-the house when happened the earthquake
'Peter was in the house when the earthquake occurred' or
'Peter was at home when the earthquake occurred.'

- (22) *O Petros itan mesa sto spiti otan egine o sismos.*
the Peter was in *se*-the house when happened the earthquake
'Peter was in the house when the earthquake occurred.'

I claim that the different interpretations of location in (19), (21), (20), and (22) reflect, first, a different syntactic status of *se*. While in the latter two sentences *se* simply checks the case of the complement DP, in the first two sentences *se* lexicalizes P_{loc} .

In earlier stages of this work I held that the structure of (19) (and (21)) was as in (23), namely, that the P_{loc} head, phonologically realized by *se*, was immediately followed by its DP complement:

- (23) [_{PP} [_{NP} [_{NP} *se* [_{NP} to trapezi]]]]
 se the table

A crucial difference between (23) and (13), therefore, is that the DP with Place as its head noun is not part of (23). By attributing the locative *se* of (19) and (21) the structure in (23) I aimed to capture two facts: first, the literal interpretation of location in (20) and (22), which I took to be related to the fact that its structure is as shown in (13) (namely, it includes Place). That is, I took the literal interpretation to be related to the presence of the unpronounced noun Place and its referential properties, and since no such noun was present in (23), the literal interpretation of location was missing from both (19) and (21). I also meant to account for the fact that those locatives whose structure contains Place do not have to have an overt complement (just as nouns do not have to be followed by their overt complements). Remember that the locatives in (20) and (22) are also able to occur without a complement, as is illustrated in (3) and (25), a possibility that is not available for *se*, (24):

- (24) *O Petros ian se olan engine o sismos.
 the Peter was *se* when happened the earthquake
 'Peter was in when the earthquake occurred.'
 (25) O Petros ian mesa olan engine o sismos.
 the Peter was inside when happened the earthquake
 'Peter was inside when the earthquake occurred.'

I now believe that this was not the right direction, however, for two reasons. First, it is not clear how the presence of Place (or else the presence of a noun and its associated referential properties alone) is able to explain the literal interpretation of location in (20) and (22) (in contrast to the more general interpretation in (19) and (21)). Moreover, it is not satisfactory to ascribe two different syntactic structures to locatives, one with Place and the other without, especially after having argued explicitly for the existence of such a (nonphonologically realized) noun and having claimed that the behavior of locative Ps derives to a large extent from the combination of this lexical element with a functional one.

What I propose instead is that, when the preposition *se* is used alone to convey location, it also takes a DP complement whose determiner is nonphonologically realized and whose head noun is Place. Hence, the structure of the locative PP in (19) and (21) is as in (26):

- (26) ... [_{NP} [_{NP} *se* [_{sc} [_{NP} \emptyset [_{NP} Place]] [_{NP} \emptyset [_{NP} to trapezi]]]]]]
 on/at the table

We find a number of welcome results if we replace (23) with (26). First, we obtain a uniform account of the structure of locatives, namely, that all locatives consist of a head P_{loc} that takes as its complement a DP containing the nonphonologically realized noun Place. Moreover, associating (19) and (21) with the structure in (26), we end up in a better position to explain the literal interpretation of location in sentences such as those in (20) and (22). Location, as expressed in (20) and (22), is actually *narrower* or more *precise* (rather than more literal) than in (19) and (21) not because of the presence or absence of Place but because Place is modified in the first part of sentences but not in the second. Following ideas of Chierchia and Turner (1988), as adopted by Baker (2003) in his discussion of adjectives, I consider (attributive) modification to be the conjunction of the predicate that corresponds to the noun (Place) and the predicate that corresponds to the adjective (locative). As a consequence, *mesa* (Place) 'inside,' for instance, is something that is both *mesa* 'inside' and Place. In other words, the reference of Place becomes more precise when modified by a locative by virtue of the fact that it is narrowed down since it is now the result of its intersection with the locative. In contrast, when location is expressed by *se* alone, as in (19) and (21), Place is not modified; hence, its interpretation (or else the physical space surrounding the ground) is not the result of intersection with some locative element and it is less narrow. It is conceivable that the interpretation of location in such cases is left to pragmatics or language use. Notice that *se* has a somewhat different interpretation in (19) than in (21), presumably related to the fact that the ground is a desk in (19) but a house in (21).

The second issue, namely, that only the modifier-type locatives can stand without a complement, is more difficult to answer under the current proposal, and I leave it aside for the time being. A fact that is worth pointing out, however, is that not all modifier-type locatives are able to stand without a complement to the same extent and under identical conditions. Moreover, even locatives of the P_{loc} type can occur without a complement: If we consider the English locative *in*, for instance, to be comparable to *se* in (24) in the sense of being a P_{loc} head as well, as will emerge from the discussion of English in section 4, we see that it can be employed without an overt complement, (27), in contrast to Greek, (24):

- (27) Peter was in when the earthquake occurred.

Moreover, there can also be morphophonological reasons that do not allow a locative to occur without a complement. Such is the case with the majority of Hebrew locatives, which are construct states, as Bolwink-Rotem and Terzi (2008) argue.

3. Spanish locative Ps

With the above in mind, let us now turn to Spanish, a language with locatives that share a number of properties with those of Greek. At the descriptive level at least, Spanish locatives have also been called intransitive Ps and even adverbials.¹³

Camppos (1991) notices that Spanish locatives, to which he refers as *substantive prepositions*, can be stranded and wonders whether this is a manifestation of the P-stranding phenomenon of the Germanic languages:

- (28) a. *De qué edificio, está cerca t_i la facultad?*
 'What building is the school near (to)?'
 b. *La pastelería de la casa, vivo detrás t_i es buenisísima*
 'The pastry shop behind which I live is excellent.'

He concludes that this is not so and also that, although structures like the preceding involve movement, it is comparable to movement of/from nominals, as in (29):

- (29) a. *De qué libro, no sabes por qué censuraron la reseña t_i*
 of which book, don't you know why they censored the review t_i
 b. *De cuál hija, no sabes por qué está orgullosa t_i?*
 of which daughter, you don't know why she is proud t_i

In order to support his arguments, Campos utilizes the claims of Plann (1985), who considers Spanish locatives +N *neutralized categories*. Plann notices similarities that locatives share with both nouns and adjectives, and since the common property of these two lexical categories is the binary distinctive feature +N (Chomsky 1970), she concludes that they are specified for +N *but only* for +N—hence, the term +N *neutralized categories*.

While I agree with Campos in that extractions such as those in (29), which are also possible in Greek, are not instances of P-stranding, I do not agree with the details of his analysis, nor do I find the term *neutralized categories* appealing. Apart from the fact that the latter term does not make much sense theoretically, it also follows from the wrong considerations, namely, from considering that Spanish locatives share similarities with nouns (in addition to adjectives). Such beliefs are based on misleading evidence, however, which may be justified if it predated the work on the full structure of DPs initiated by Abney (1987) and Szabolsci (1983). Examples such as the following ones, for instance, were considered by Plann (1985) as evidence that locatives share similarities with nouns. More precisely, the fact that the substantive *detrás* follows a preposition, such as *detrás* in (30), on a par with nouns was considered as evidence that *detrás* shares the distribution of nouns. Likewise, the fact that *detrás* in (31) is followed by a possessive adjective, just like nouns are, was also taken as evidence that locatives behave like nouns:

- (30) *El gato me espiaba [p_i desde] [t_i debajo de la mesa]*
 'The cat was spying on me from under the table.'
 (31) *Venia un hombre detrás mío*
 was-coming a man behind mine
 'A man was coming behind me.'

Within subsequent developments of syntactic theory on the structure of DP, however, unless one is able to argue convincingly that the complement of a preposition such as *detrás* in (30) is a bare noun, we can safely assume that it is a full DP. If so, then *detrás* does not have to be the noun of this DP but can occupy any of a number of positions in the DP structure. Such a position is the position of the modifier of the empty noun Place that I have proposed on the basis of Greek locatives. Furthermore, it seems plausible to consider the locatives of examples such as (31) comparable to the Greek frame in (2), in which the locative is also followed directly by a possessive (although by a clitic rather than by a possessive adjective).

Therefore, I propose to extend the account developed on the basis of Greek locatives to Spanish and hence to consider the Spanish locatives under investigation to also be the modifiers of an unpronounced Place:

- (32) ... [_{PP} [_{Place} cerca]_i [_{DP} de [_{NP} la pastelería [_{DP} t_i]]]]]]
 near de the pastry shop

In (32) I also consider the DP complement of the locative to be the possessor of Place, adopting and slightly simplifying the structure Bernstein (2005) proposes for possession in Spanish nominals. Bernstein believes that the possessum moves to SpecDP in Spanish and triggers the presence of *de* in D, most probably for case reasons, as she notes. Remember that the preposition *de*, which follows Spanish locatives, as in (28) and (33a), is also the preposition associated with the genitive of possession in the Spanish DP (33b). It is interesting to also note that Chomsky (1988, 112), in a brief discussion of Spanish locatives, considers the *de* that follows them to be a genitive case marker on a par with the *de* in (33b):

- (33) a. *detrás de la casa*
 behind *de* the house
 'behind the house'
 b. *el libro de Juan*
 the book *de* John
 'John's book'

I also consider (32) to be the structure of Spanish locatives followed by a possessive adjective, as seen in (34), which is a modification of the proposal in Bernstein (2005), who attributes to this particular type of Spanish possessive the structure of a reduced relative clause (contrary to their counterparts in English or French, for instance; Bernstein and Tortora (2005)), explaining in this manner the nonappearance of the preposition *de* with possessive adjectives:

- (34) ... [_{PP} [_{Place} detrás]_i [_{DP} [_{NP} suyo [_{DP} t_i]]]]]]
 behind his

There are several advantages in extending to Spanish locatives the proposals I have made on the basis of their Greek counterparts. First, as I have already pointed out, it

- (42) a. to poli kato meros
the very under place
b. to poli brosia meros
the very in front place

The counterparts of (40) are ungrammatical in English; see (43). Therefore, it seems at first glance that the parallelism I had hoped to establish between English locative prepositions and locative elements such as 'here' and 'there' breaks down at this point.

- (43) a. *this/the under place
b. *this/the in front place

However, it is not clear that the presence of a null Place in the structure depends on the availability of its overt manifestation, although the issue deserves further investigation. Here I assume that the ungrammaticality of (43) is neutral with respect to whether 'under' or 'in front' are able to modify a phonetically null Place in English. On the other hand, I consider the presence of an overt 'place' in (38), (39), and (40) to strengthen the independently motivated claims for the presence of an unpronounced counterpart of it in both Greek and English.¹⁶ Furthermore, although (43b) is ungrammatical, (44) is not:

- (44) the (very) front part/side

It seems, therefore, that 'front' is more like *brosia* 'front' of (40b) than what is revealed by (43b) in the sense that it can also be part of a nominal construction, modifying the nouns 'part' or 'side'.

This leads me to propose that 'in front' has a structure similar to that of Greek and Spanish, modifying the noun Place in a DP that is the complement of P_{Loc} and what surfaces as the complement of 'in front' is the possessor of Place, (45). As for the structure of possession in English nominals, I adopt the proposals of Bernstein and Tortora (2005):

- (45) ... [_{PP} [_{Place} [_{Loc} in [_{DP} front Place] [_{DP} of [_{NP} the house [_{DP} I]]]]]]]

What (45) also tells us is that the P_{Loc} functional head is now phonologically realized by the preposition 'in'. I believe it is absolutely safe to assume that 'in back of' and other locatives of this type have the same syntactic structure.

A further similarity between 'in front (of)' and its counterparts in Greek and Spanish is that it can also be used intransitively, as in the following example from Svenonius (2004):

- (46) I saw a line of soldiers. The one in front (of it) was talking on the phone.

A number of other locatives can also be used intransitively in English, as in the following examples, also from Svenonius (2004). See Huddleston and Pullum (2002) for a complete list.

- (47) a. As the group approached the final summit, Espen stayed behind (them).
b. There was a box on the table. Inside (it) was fine Swiss chocolate.
c. We stood on a bridge. Below (it) we could see barges laden with port wine.
d. Nils looked over the snowdrift. The frozen fjord beyond (it) was dotted with seals.

As I mentioned when discussing Greek locatives in section 2, it is not entirely clear how the omission of the ground argument of locatives is to be evaluated. The purpose of the preceding examples, therefore, was to simply identify one more similarity between the two languages even in this domain (also shared by Spanish, as discussed by Campos 1991).¹⁷ Let us now turn to another characteristic of locatives that also holds for all three languages, one for which I have already provided an explanation and wish to extend to English.

Just like in Greek and Spanish, along with complex prepositions denoting location, there is a parallel structure with a small P in English as well, which also conveys a less precise denotation of location than complex prepositions. In the following pair, for instance, (48a) is true even if the box is not large enough to contain Mary, but this is not the case in (48b). The Greek counterparts in (49) display the same properties:

- (48) a. Mary is in the box.
b. Mary is inside the box.

- (49) a. I Maria ine sto kati.
the Mary is se-the box
'The Mary is in the box.'
b. I Maria ine mesa sto kati.
the Mary is mesa se-the box
'Mary is inside the box.'

Svenonius (2004) attributes the precise interpretation of (48b) to the contribution of the containing *side*. I believe it is more accurate to say that the precise interpretation of the (b) sentences is due to the fact that Place is modified by 'inside'. Recall that the literal interpretation of the complex P is also present in the Greek locative *epano* 'on', in (20) earlier, although no containing *side* is involved. Therefore, taking into account the similarities between Greek and English locatives discussed in this section, I propose that the structure of (48a) is as in (50a) and that the structure of (48b) is as in (50b). Notice that, as in the Spanish counterpart pair in (37), we do not consider Place to move to SpecDP in (50a), as we have neither evidence nor the necessity for such a movement. Furthermore, we consider that the P_{Loc} 'in' is responsible for the case of 'the house' in (50a):

- (50) a. ... [_{PP} [_{Place} [_{Loc} in [_{DP} I] [_{NP} the house [_{DP} I]]]]]
b. ... [_{PP} [_{Place} [_{Loc} in [_{DP} I] [_{NP} the house [_{DP} I]]]]]

One can imagine a number of objections to the preceding claims concerning English locatives, at least when it comes to locatives such as 'inside' or 'behind'. First, in contrast to 'in front' earlier, the preposition 'in' (which I believe occupies P_{Loc} in (50)) forms a compound with the modifiers of Place, that is, with the 'side' or

'hand' parts of 'inside' or 'behind' (50b). Therefore, one may wonder how it is possible that each part of the compound occupies a different syntactic position. I maintain that this compounding is the consequence of some morphophonological process that does not bear on my claims and the proposed structure in (50b) in any crucial manner.

Moreover, it is even plausible that this morphological compounding, at least as evidenced by English spelling, is able to make interesting predictions with respect to the case of the DP complement of locatives. At first inspection we notice that the locatives that keep the P head and the modifier locative apart require that 'of' precede their complement. (51a). Those that do not hold P_{Loc} and the modifier of Place apart (e.g., 'inside', 'behind', 'below', 'beyond') not only do not require the presence of 'of' (51b) but may even disallow it (51c):

- (51) a. in front/in back *(of) the house
 b. inside (of) the house
 c. below/beyond/behind (*of) the house

It is tempting to think that the pattern is surprisingly clean in the sense that the locatives in (51a) require 'of' because the modifier locative is not able to check the case features of its complement since it is a phrasal modifier. For the same reason, Botwinik-Rothen and Terzi (2008) claim that the modifier locatives in Greek cannot check the case of their DP complements, a role that is performed by the light *Ps se* or *apo*. On the other hand, it is plausible that the compounding process that forms 'below', 'beyond', and 'behind' in (51c) results in a new syntactic object that occupies P_{Loc} hence is able to check the case of a DP complement (therefore, 'of' is disallowed). As for the locative in (51b), it is reasonable to assume that it is at an intermediate or a transitional stage: If 'side' is phrasal, just like 'front' or 'back', the presence of 'of' is required for the case of the DP complement. If, on the other hand, it forms with 'in' a compound that occupies P_{Loc} , it is able to check the case features of the DP complement and 'of' is disallowed.

Another conceivable objection for analyzing locatives such as 'inside' or 'behind' as the modifiers of Place is the fact that the second part of 'inside' and 'behind', that is, 'side' and 'hide' is a noun rather than an adjective. Therefore, one can perhaps argue that the locative is not the modifier but the phonological realization of Place in these instances (at least). An answer against this line of reasoning is twofold: First, certain conceptual reasons render it unlikely. These require further research on the nature of unpronounced elements in the sense of Kayne (2005a) in order to be complete, but here is the direction to take: Kayne (2005b, 15) proposes the following principle of compositionality:

- (52) UG imposes a maximum of one interpretable syntactic feature per lexical or functional item.

If (52) is right, and if we maintain that Place denotes the physical space surrounding the ground argument of the locative, the locative modifying Place should carry the interpretable feature that corresponds to the position or interval in

this physical space (see Kayne's discussion of 'red COLOR car' in this respect). If, however, one considers the locative to be the phonological realization of Place, this lexical item would now carry both features, namely, one corresponding to the physical space surrounding the ground argument and the other corresponding to the position in this physical space. Therefore, it is not only inconsistent to assert that locatives sometimes modify and sometimes realize Place, but it is also against the principle in (52).

There are also empirical reasons that render this idea not an ideal alternative. Although there are indeed a number of English locatives whose second part is a noun rather than an adjective, there are also a number of locatives whose second part is clearly an adjective (either synchronically or diachronically) (i.e., 'below', 'beneath', 'underneath', etc.). Hence, if we decide to pursue a uniform approach to the syntactic structure of English locatives, as I think we should, I cannot see any convincing reason to choose the noun rather than the adjective (i.e., modifier), on the basis of the morphological makeup of locatives, as the relevant evidence for their relation with Place. Furthermore, even if we want to take seriously the resemblance of some of these locatives to nouns, nouns can also modify nouns in English (e.g., 'a man of honor'). Finally, even a noun such as 'side', present in the locative 'inside', can modify other nouns, as in 'side dish'.

To conclude, this discussion suggests that considering (even some) English locatives to be the phonological realization of Place is not unproblematic. Therefore, given the account of locatives that I have developed on the basis of the much more transparent facts of Greek, also supported by their Spanish counterparts, the less clear facts of English can be accounted for by the same analysis. The available empirical evidence from English does not seem able to support a solid alternative proposal (at least along the lines that English locatives, rather than modifying Place, are the phonological realization of it), nor can it pose serious counterarguments.

4.1. The relation of locatives to their complements

I have assumed all along that the ground arguments of locatives enter into a possession relationship with the unpronounced noun Place present in their structure in the sense that they are the possessors of Place (which may or may not be modified by some locative). Maintaining that the complements of English locatives, along with those of Greek and Spanish, are the possessors of Place raises at least one question.

If we consider the preposition *of*, which follows a number of English locatives, as the counterpart of the genitive *of* encountered with possessed nominals (see Bernstein and Tortora (2005) for the latter), we notice that the two differ in that, when followed by a pronoun, the morphological case of the pronoun is accusative with locatives, (53a), in contrast to the familiar genitive of nominals, (53b):

- (53) a. in front of him/*his
 b. a book of his/*him

This contrast makes one wonder therefore whether it is correct to propose that the locative and its complement are part of a possession structure in (50). Needless to

say, this disturbing evidence dictates a more careful investigation of the Greek and Spanish counterpart structures as well.

A plausible alternative candidate structure that can conceivably emerge for (53a) is that of a partitive construction, and this is so for a number of reasons: First, English partitives also involve the preposition *of*, which, unlike the possessive *of* is followed by a pronoun/DP with morphological accusative case:

- (54) I have met two of them.

Moreover, the preposition of Greek partitives is *apo* (Alexiadou and Stavrou 1999), namely, the same light P that follows locatives in complex prepositions (along with *se*):

- (55) Ego simandis dio apo alous.
have-1.s first two apo they-acc
'I have met two of them.'

Similarly, Spanish partitives also employ the preposition *de*, which is encountered with locatives:

- (56) Me gustan muchos de los cuadros que hay en el Prado.
me please-3p many de the paintings that are in the Prado
'I like many of the paintings in the Prado.' (from Vos 1999)

Most importantly, however, one may be able to detect a *part-whole* relation in locatives in the sense of a higher DP, which is a subset of a set denoted by the noun phrase in the second part of the construction. In other words, within the analysis I have proposed for locatives, it is conceivable to interpret *in front of John*, for instance, as one of the places, in particular, the *front Place*, of (all of) *John's Places*.¹⁸ Unfortunately, the problem raised by (53a) remains because, even under this analysis, we expect the complement of the locative to also have genitive case, as it is now simply considered the possessor of Places (instead of the possessor of Place).¹⁹

Moreover, locatives fail a syntactic test that distinguishes partitives from possessives: Zanoparelli (1998) points out that partitives differ from possessives in that the former can be split at the *of* PP (57a), whereas the latter cannot, (57b):

- (57) a. Of those people, I have just met two.
b. *Of John's, I often encounter a good friend.

When applying this test to locatives with *of* PP, they pattern the behavior of possessives:

- (58) *Of Mary, I usually sit in front.

I take the preceding to indicate that there is no convincing evidence that locatives (with Place) participate in a partitive relation with their complements. Therefore, I do not pursue any further the idea that the unpronounced Place present in the syntactic structure of locatives participates in a part-whole relation with its complements. Instead, I follow the view I held from the beginning, according to which what appears to be the object of the locative is the possessor of Place. For the same reasons, I also do not proceed with reexamining the structure of the Greek complex prepositions.²⁰ This is also rendered unnecessary if we take into account the several analyses that essentially consider the same structure to underlie both possessives and partitives; see Zanoparelli (1998) for English and Alexiadou and Stavrou (1999) for Greek. Admittedly, the lack of the genitive morphological case on the pronoun that follows *of* in English examples such as that in (53a) remains a mystery.²¹

5. Conclusions

This chapter has two objectives: to provide a detailed account of the behavior of Greek locative prepositions and to use the evidence and insights they provide to better understand the properties and behavior of locatives cross-linguistically. My contribution to the latter objective is made possible via the study of Spanish and English locatives.

I propose that locative prepositions implicate a lexical and a functional component in their structure in a very specific manner. Namely, I argue that most locatives are the modifiers of a nonphonologically realized noun, Place, which is the head noun of a DP with a nonphonologically realized determiner. In turn, this DP is the complement of a functional head, P_{loc} , which can also be phonologically realized, as in the case of *se* in Greek, *en* in Spanish, and *in* in English. When Place is not modified but is present, as indicated by the presence of a phonologically realized P_{loc} , a less precise interpretation of location is conveyed (compared to when Place is modified by a locative).

I also investigate the relation of locatives with their complements and hold that what we see as complements of locatives are the possessors of the noun Place, hence the genitive case they often have. Greek and Spanish offer straightforward evidence to this effect, but English raises the question of whether there is a partitive relation that holds between Place and the complement of locatives instead. I explore this idea to a certain extent but do not find convincing evidence to support it; therefore, I abandon it for the time being.

Notes

¹⁸ Various versions of this work have been presented at the University of Utrecht (February 2005), at the CUNY Graduate Center (March 2005), at the University of Thessaloniki (April 2005), at the USA Workshop on Greek Morphosyntax (Harvard University, July 2005), and at the Workshop on Prepositional Phrases (University of Venice, November 2005). I would like to thank the audiences of these events for their comments and suggestions. For written comments on various earlier versions I thank Irena Botwinik-Roeter, Guglielmo Cinque, Marcel den Dikken, Richard Kayne, Tom Leu, Phoivos Panagiotidis, and Stavros Skopeteas.

Shortcomings are my own responsibility; of course. Research on this topic has been supported by an Archimedes I grant 2.2.(3), cofunded by the European Social Fund and National Resources.

1. *Se* is always contracted on the definite determiner, but it can be found uncontracted in other environments; see (1a). It can also be used alone to indicate location, (1a) as I discuss in detail in section 2.3., or direction, (1b):

- (1) a. *Zo se nia megali poli.* live-1s *se* one big city
'I live in a big city.'
b. *Pigeno stin Athina* go-1s *se* the Athens
'I go to Athens.'

Apo is used in a number of other contexts as well. It is the *by-*phrase of passives, the preposition of partitives, and a directional/source P, (ii):

- (ii) *Egēstrepsa apo to grafio noīs.* returned-1s *apo* the office early
'I returned early from the office.'

Finally, *se* and *apo* are the prepositions of ditransitives (respectively, 'to' and 'from'; see Anagnostopoulou 2003, 2005).

2. In Terzi (2006) I demonstrate that locatives that are not followed by an overt complement should not be considered adverbs (in the sense of elements that lack a syntactic object). Looking at examples of ellipsis, (i), we see that the second conjunct can have a sloppy reading, an indication that there is a copy (with an internal structure) present after the second locative:

- (i) I *María stathike brosia apo tin karekla tis ke o Petros piso.* the *Mary* stood in-front *apo* the chair her and the Peter behind
'Mary stood in front of her chair, and Peter behind his/her chair.'

3. See Terzi (2005) for evidence as to why the case of the clitic that follows locatives is genitive rather than its homophonous dative in Modern Greek.

4. The direction of the argumentation should be kept in mind: I am not claiming that locatives are similar to adjectives because they are modifiers of a noun. Such a reasoning would not be tight because adjectives are not the only modifiers of nouns, neither is the modification of nouns the characteristic property of adjectives (see Baker 2003, 4.2 for a thorough discussion of these issues). Instead, considering the empirical evidence according to which locatives share the distribution of (attributive) adjectives, I am claiming that they also modify nouns.

5. I say "tentatively adopt" because a small clause structure is not compatible with the idea that clitics that follow locatives move from the lower position indicated in (7) to the higher one unless one resorts to some version of sideward movement in the spirit of Nunes (2004). As I discuss shortly, one has to assume obligatory movement of clitics from the post-Place to the postlocative position because (a) clitics cannot be hosted by nonphonologically realized elements and (b) in order to explain the inconsistent judgments native speakers make with respect to the animacy restrictions on clitics following locatives. Here I have used a small clause structure to represent possession simply because it is the structure also adopted by Alexiadou and Stavrou (1999) for possession in Greek nominals

(but see Terzi 2008—which the present chapter predated—for a modification of this particular point).

An alternative, suggested to me by Tom Lenz, is to consider a (phrasal) larger lower *place* of the structure to move higher, taking the clitic along, as in Noonan (2005 and this volume). This is certainly a possibility to investigate, although it is not clear that it would be consistent with the behavior of clitics with respect to animacy. In the present account clitics are considered to cliticize between the locative and Place, a position known to be associated with animacy restrictions in the nominal domain.

6. Since Place is not phonologically realized, it is not controversial to assume that its interaction with clitics is subject to principles similar to those that hold for clitics and other, well-established, nonphonologically realized elements such as traces and empty categories. These are not visible by phonology; hence, they cannot constitute hosts for phonologically weak elements such as clitics (see Selkirk 1986; Nespor and Vogel 1986).

7. Hence, the reactions to those accounts that consider locatives similar to nouns, Szabolcsi (1994), for instance, criticizes Marácz (1984), who considers Hungarian locatives to be nominals, on the grounds that, although they may derive from nouns and are similar to noun phrases, they also have differences that need to be understood.

On the other hand, Bresnan (1994), who considers English locatives in subject and object position to be nominals, proposes that they are the complements of nominals:

- (i) [_{NP} (A PLACE) [_{NP} under the bed]] is a good hiding place.

Matsubara (2001) points out that such an account is problematic because it considers semantic, contextual, and pragmatic (rather than morphological) requirements to be accessible to syntax.

The analysis developed in this chapter does not suffer from the defects of these proposals. Furthermore, not only does it recognize the resemblance of locatives to nominals, but also sheds light on the source of this resemblance.

8. This argument resulted from a response to a comment by Marcel den Dikken, for which I would like to thank him.

9. There is also one more light *P_{me}*, which is construed only with the substantive *mazi* 'together'. It is not clear whether *mazi* is a locative, and hence, whether it should be accounted for by the analysis provided in this work. One may be able to adhere directly to the nominal properties of *mazi* in order to understand its genitive (clitic) complement by drawing on its historical origin from the noun *maza* 'mass' (see Babiniaous 1998). Pertinent at this point is the discussion of Longobardi (2001) for French *chez*:

- (i) a. *Piga (mazi) me ton Petro* 'I went with Peter.'
went-1s together me the Peter
b. *Piga mazi (w/ *tu Petro).* 'I went with him.'
went-1s with he-cl-gen/the Peter-gen

10. *Epano se* means 'on', while *epano apo* means 'above'. *Mesa se* means 'inside', while *mesa apo* means 'from inside', and there are no genitive clitic forms for *epina apo* or *mesa apo*:

- (i) a. **Pouse ikosi metra epano tu* was-flying twenty meters on he-cl-gen
'(11) was flying twenty meters above him.'

- b. *Den evyene fonu mesa tis.
neg coming voice inside she-cl-gen
'No voice was coming out of her.'

Interestingly, there is a strategy for the clitic frame to be construed with these two locatives, one that utilizes the option that the light P *apo* has to (also) precede the locative (see Terzi 2007 for details). As I note there, the presence of *apo* before the locative is optional with all other locatives in the clitic frame, except for the following two:

- (ii) a. Petuse ikosi metra *(apo) epano tu.
was-flying twenty meters apo on he-cl-gen
'(I) was flying twenty meters above him.'
b. Den evyene fonu *(apo) mesa tis.
neg coming voice apo inside she-cl-gen
'No voice was coming out of her.'
c. Stathike pendu metra (apo) pizo tis.
stood five meters apo behind she-cl-gen
'He stood five meters behind her.'

This strategy is also in line with my idea that *apo* carries semantic content in these two instances, as a result of which, presumably, it cannot be omitted.

The optionality of the prelocative *apo* in all other contexts except those in example (ii), is also manifested in the complex preposition frame in (iii) (Terzi 2007). Note that the obligatory presence of the second *apo* in (iii) is due to different reasons, namely to the case-checking needs of the DP complement of the locative (Botwinik-Roem and Terzi 2008):

- (iii) a. Petuse ikosi metra (apo) epano *(apo) ton Petro.
was-flying twenty meters apo on apo the Peter
'(I) was flying twenty meters above Peter.'
b. Den evyene fonu (apo) mesa *(apo) ti Maria.
neg coming voice apo inside apo the Mary
'No voice was coming out of Mary.'
c. tathike pendu metra (apo) pizo *(apo) ti Maria.
stood five meters apo behind apo the Mary
'He stood five meters behind Mary.'

11. If the complex preposition structure, that is, (18), were the result of predicate inversion from (13), the subsequent extraction of the light PP should be ungrammatical since the light PP that is the result of this process is not a constituent. Extraction of the light PP is fully grammatical, however, as (i) demonstrates:

- (i) Se ti to evalueo epano?
se what it put-2s on
'What did you put it on?'

12. In Botwinik-Roem and Terzi (2008) we further propose that the corresponding possessive clitics can check their case in the PF by virtue of fact that they are part of the same prosodic word with the locative.

13. Campos (1991: 741) reports that 'traditional grammarians have not agreed on the status of these prepositions. Thus, although Bello (1847) classifies them as adverbs, Ramsey (1956) considers them complex prepositions when they are used transitively and adverbs when used intransitively.' Chomsky (1988: 1110) refers to Spanish substantives as intransitive prepositions but notices the difference between Spanish *alrededor* 'around' and English 'around' in terms of their ability to assign case to their DP complement.

14. Notice the difference with respect to the position of Place in the two structures. In (37b) we suppose that Place moves to SpecDP just as in the standard nominal domain. An indication of this movement is the appearance of the preposition *de* in D, as argued by Bernstein (2005) for Spanish nominals. We have no reason to believe that a similar type of movement occurs in (37a), however, first of all because *de* is not present and also because it is reasonable to assume that the case requirements of the possessor DP (i.e., the complement of the locative) can now be satisfied by the P_{Loc} head *en*.

15. The exception is Bresnan (1994), who, however, looks at English locatives (and counterparts) in subject and object position but does not investigate their internal structure. As already mentioned, she argues that locatives are the complements of a nominal, as in the following:

- (i) [_{NP} (A PLACE) [_{PP} under the bed]] is a good hiding place.

Similar in spirit is the proposal of Davies and Dubinsky (2001), who postulate a DP shell in English in order to capture the presence of locatives in subject position, (iii), along with all other types of non-DP subjects, (ii)-(iic):

- (ii) a. [_{DP} [_{NP} \emptyset] [_{PP} under the bed]] is a good hiding place.
b. [_{DP} [_{NP} \emptyset] [_{CP} that Shelby lost it]] is true.
c. [_{DP} [_{NP} \emptyset] [_{AP} very tall]] is just how he likes his bodyguards.

16. Kayne's recent work on unpronounced elements shares this line of reasoning. It is demonstrated in Kayne (2005b), for instance, that an overt *-aire* is present in French, (i), while only the unpronounced counterpart of it is encountered in English, (ii):

- (i) une vingtaine d'articles
20 twenty -aire of articles
(ii) hundred + -AINE + -s of articles

On the other hand, both an overt and an unpronounced PLACE may occur with English 'here' and 'there'. The examples in (41), repeated as (iii), constitute the overt option, while the (simplified) structure of 'here' and 'there', argued to be as in (iv) in Kayne (2004), instantiates the unpronounced counterpart:

- (iii) a. Thus here place
b. That there place
(iv) a. \emptyset here PLACE
b. \emptyset there PLACE

17. Svenonius (2004) also observes that the English locatives that are able to occur without an overt complement coincide with those that are able to take *there* as their ground argument:

- (i) a. Go behind/inside/below/beyond/in front of/above there.
 b. *Get among/up/on/between/beside/next to there.

18. This idea does not present problems for the much discussed partitivity constraint, according to which the embedded DP/NP must be definite (Jaekendoff 1977; see Hoop 1998 for an overview) since, even if one considers the lower DP to be essentially interpreted as "all Places," the universal quantifier *all* is one of those elements allowed in partitive constructions.

19. That is, locatives would presumably fall under the second type of standard partitives in the terminology adopted by Baker (1998), for example, "I saw two of John's friends."

20. I am referring to Greek complex Ps in particular because they are the ones that involve the light P *apo*, also present in partitives.

21. A first attempt would be to attribute this ungrammaticality to the presence of the unpronounced element, Place. For instance, one can say (ia) but not (ib) in English (considering (ia) and (ib) to also involve an empty Place, as in Kayne (2004)).

- (i) a. I'm going to John's.
 b. *I'm going to his.

Nevertheless, one would then have to answer why (ii), by contrast to (ia), is also ungrammatical under the intended reading:

- (ii) *... in front of John's

References

Ahney, S. 1987. The English Noun Phrase in Its Sentential Aspect. PhD diss., MIT.

Aboh, E. This volume. The P Route.

_____. 2000. Adjective-clitic Combinations in the Greek DP. In B. Gerlach and J. Grjenzhou, eds., *Citics in Phonology, Morphology, and Syntax*, 63–84. Amsterdam: Benjamins.

Alexiadou, A. 2005. A Possessive Adjective in the Greek DP. In M. Stavrou and A. Terzi, eds., *Advances in Greek Generative Syntax*, 127–51. Amsterdam: Benjamins.

_____, and M. Stavrou. 1999. Revisiting Partitives and Pseudopartitives in Greek. In S. L. Tsoxatzidis, M. Kourila, and A. Haralambopoulos, eds., *Studies in Greek Linguistics: Proceedings of the 19th Annual Meeting of the Department of Linguistics, Faculty of Philosophy*, 1–13. Thessaloniki: Aristotle University of Thessaloniki.

_____, and M. Stavrou. 2003. On Double Object Alternations and Clitics. Berlin: de Gruyter.

_____. 2005. Cross-linguistic and Cross-categorical Variation of Datives. In M. Stavrou and A. Terzi, eds., *Advances in Greek Generative Syntax*, 61–126. Amsterdam: Benjamins.

Babinotis, Georgios. 1998. *Leksiko tis Neas Ellinikis Glossas* (Dictionary of the Modern Greek Language). Athens: Kendro Lexikografias.

Baker, M. 2003. *Lexical Categories: Verbs, Nouns, and Adjectives*. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Barker, C. 1998. Partitives, Double Genitives, and Anti-uniqueness. *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory* 16: 679–717.

Bello, A. 1847. *Gramática de la lengua castellana*, 8th ed. Buenos Aires: Editorial Sopena, 1970.

Berenteii, J. 2005. On the Morphosyntax of Possessive Constructions. *Recherches Linguistiques de Vincennes* 34: 57–78.

_____, and C. Tortora. 2005. Two Types of Possessive Forms in English. *Lingua* 115: 1221–42.

Botwinik-Rotem, I. 2004. The Category P: Features, Projections, Interpretation. PhD diss., University of Tel-Aviv.

_____, and A. Terzi. 2008. Greek and Hebrew Locative Prepositional Phrases: A Unified, Case-Driven Account. *Lingua* 118: 399–424.

Bresnan, J. 1994. Locative Inversion and the Architecture of Universal Grammar. *Language* 70: 72–131.

Campos, H. 1991. Preposition Stranding in Spanish? *Linguistic Inquiry* 22: 741–50.

Chierchia, G., and R. Turner. 1988. Semantics and Property Theory. *Linguistics and Philosophy* 11: 261–302.

Chomsky, N. 1970. Remarks on Nominalization. In R. Jacobs and P. Rosenbaum, eds., *Readings in English Transformational Grammar*, 184–221. Waltham, Mass.: Ginn.

_____. 1988. *Language and Problems of Knowledge*. Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press.

_____. 2001. Derivation by Phase. In M. Kenstowicz, ed., *Ken Hale: A Life in Language*, 1–52. Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press.

Collins, C. 2004. The Absence of a Linker in Double Object Constructions in Noun. *Studies in African Linguistics* 33: 163–98.

Davies, W. D., and S. Dubinsky. 2001. Functional Architecture and the Distribution of Subject Properties. In W. D. Davies and S. Dubinsky, eds., *Objects and Other Subjects*, 247–79. Dordrecht: Kluwer.

Dikken, M. den. 1998. Predicate Inversion in DP. In A. Alexiadou and C. Wilder, eds., *Possessors, Predicates, and Movement in the Determiner Phrase*, 177–214. Amsterdam: Benjamins.

_____. 1999. On the Structural Representation of Possession and Agreement: The Case of (Anti-)Agreement in Hungarian Possessed Nominal Phrases. In L. Kenesei, ed., *Crossing Boundaries: Theoretical Advances in Central and Eastern European Languages*, 137–78. Amsterdam: Benjamins.

_____. 2003. On the Syntax of Locative and Directional Adpositional Phrases. Ms., CUNY Graduate Center (also this volume).

_____, and P. Singhapapetcha. 2004. Complex Noun Phrases and Linkers. *Syntax* 7: 1–54.

Giamakidou, A., and M. Stavrou. 1999. Nominalization and Ellipsis in the Greek DP. *Linguistic Review* 16: 295–331.

Grimshaw, J. 1991. Extended Projections. Ms., Brandeis University.

Hoop, H. de. 1998. Partitivity. *Gloss International* 3: 3–10.

Huddleston, R., and G. K. Pullum. 2002. *The Cambridge Grammar of the English Language*. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Jaekendoff, R. 1977. *X'-syntax: A Study of Phrase Structure*. Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press.

Kayne, R. S. 2002. On Some Prepositions That Look DP-internal. *English of and French de Catalan Journal of Linguistics* 1: 71–115. Also in Kayne 2005a.

_____. 2004. Here and There. In C. Lecière, E. Laporte, M. Plok, and M. Silberstein, eds., *Syntax, Lexis, and Lexicon-grammar: Papers in Honour of Maurice Gross*, 253–75. Amsterdam: Benjamins. Also in Kayne 2005a.

_____. 2005a. *Movement and Silence*. New York: Oxford University Press.

_____. 2005b. Some Notes on Comparative Syntax with Special Reference to English and French. In G. Cinque and R. Kayne, eds., *The Oxford Handbook of Comparative Syntax*, 3–69. New York: Oxford University Press.

- Longobardi, G. 2001. Formal Syntax, Diachronic Minimalism, and Etymology: The History of French *Chez*. *Linguistic Inquiry* 32: 275–302.
- Marcz, L. 1984. The Grammar of PP. MA thesis, Groningen.
- Matsubara, E. 2001. p-P Phases. *Linguistic Analysis* 30: 127–61.
- Nespor, M., and I. Vogel. 1986. *Prosodic Phonology*. Dordrecht: Foris.
- Noonan, M. 2005. R-Particles. GLOW (Generative Linguistics in the Old World) Newsletter 54. This volume: A to Z.
- Nunes, J. 2004. *Linearization of Chains and Sideward Movement*. Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press.
- Plam, S. 1985. Substantive: A Neutralized Syntactic Category in Spanish. In I. Borelouis, H. Contreras, and K. Zagona, eds., *Generative Studies in Spanish Syntax*, 121–42. Dordrecht: Foris.
- Ramsey, M. 1956. *A Textbook of Modern Spanish*, rev. R. K. Spaulding. New York: Holt, Rinehart, and Winston.
- Riemsdijk, H. van. 1990. Functional Prepositions. In H. Pinkster and I. Genee, eds., *Unity in Diversity*, 229–241. Dordrecht: Foris.
- . 1998. Categorical Feature Magnetism: The Endocentricity and Distribution of Prepositions. *Journal of Comparative Germanic Linguistics* 2: 1–48.
- Selkirk, E. 1986. On Derived Domains in Sentence Phonology. *Phonology* 3: 371–405.
- Skopeteas, S. 2002. Lokale Konstruktionen im Griechischen. PhD diss., University of Erfurt.
- . 2006. Prepositions and Adverbs in Classical Greek. In E. Crespo, J. de la Villa, and A. R. Revuelta, eds., *Word Classes and Related Topics in Ancient Greek*, 471–485. Leuven: Peeters.
- Svenonius, P. 2004. Spatial P in English. Ms., University of Tromsø. (also this volume)
- Szabolcsi, A. 1983. The Possessor That Ran Away from Home. *Linguistic Review* 3: 89–102.
- . 1994. The Noun Phrase. In F. Kiefer and K. Kiss, eds., *The Syntactic Structure of Hungarian*, 179–274. San Diego: Academic Press.
- Terzi, A. 2005. Locative Prepositions as Possessives. In M. Maitheouidakis and A. Psaltou-Joycey, eds., *Selected Papers from the 16th International Symposium on Theoretical and Applied Linguistics*, 133–44. University of Thessaloniki.
- . 2006. Locative Prepositions as Modifiers of an Empty Noun. GLOW (Generative Linguistics in the Old World) Newsletter 56.
- . 2007. Locative Prepositions, Predicate Inversion, and Full Interpretation. In E. Agathopoulou, M. Dimitrakopoulou, and D. Papadopoulou, eds., *Selected Papers from the 17th International Symposium on Theoretical and Applied Linguistics*, 210–19. University of Thessaloniki.
- . 2008. Locative Prepositions as Modifiers of an Unpronounced Noun. In C.B. Chang and H.J. Haynie, eds., *Proceedings of the 26th West Coast Conference on Formal Linguistics*, 471–479. Somerville, MA: Cascadia Proceedings Project.
- Theophanopoulou-Kontou, D. 1992. I simbetes prothetikes frasis tis NE ke i domi tous (The Complex Prepositional Phrases of McG and Their Structure). In *Proceedings of the 13th Annual Meeting of the Department of Linguistics*, 311–30. University of Thessaloniki.
- . 2000. Topika epimainata ke "piosi" sin Elinik: Diachroniki prosegisi (Locative Adverbs and Case in Greek: A Diachronic Approach). *Glossologia* 11/12: 1–40.
- Tzartanos, A. 1945. *NeseAphusi Zivrafis tis Koufis Aghiorafis* (Modern Greek Syntax of Dheanouc). Thessaloniki: Kyriakidis, 1996.
- Vos, R. 1999. A Grammar of Partitive Constructions. PhD diss., University of Tilburg.
- Zamparelli, R. 1998. A Theory of Kinds, Partitives, and OF/Z Possessives. In A. Alexiadou and C. Wilder, eds., *Possessors, Predicates, and Movement in the Determiner Phrase*, 259–305. Amsterdam: Benjamins.

Mapping Spatial PPs

The Cartography of Syntactic Structures,

Volume 6

Edited by
Guglielmo Cinque
Luigi Rizzi

OXFORD
UNIVERSITY PRESS
2010