

0. Introduction In Kayne (2001) a number of Prepositions (Ps) are set apart, it is proposed that they are probes (in the sense of Chomsky 2000, 2001) and they are not merged with what we think of as their object DP. At the same time, it is recognized that this analysis should not extend to all Ps, and, in particular, to locatives. In agreement with the analysis, and with the position that a distinction along such lines should be drawn between different Ps, this work takes up the issue of the latter type of Ps (of Greek primarily). It focuses on locative Ps, which form *Complex Prepositions (cPs)* in the language, and shows that these are not merged with what seems to be their object either, but for different reasons than Kayne's (2001) Ps. I propose that Greek locative Ps (and probably locative Ps of other languages, as well as other kinds of *cPs* in Greek) are nominal, an idea which, when matched with the movement they undergo, explains their interaction with the associated genitive DPs and corresponding clitics. In doing so, I claim that *cPs* are (nominal) small clauses, and demonstrate that the 'predicate inversion' operation they undergo results in facts we also encounter in the sentential domain.

1. The facts Greek locative Ps (see Theophanopoulou-Kontou 1992) cannot be followed by the DP that appears to be their object, regardless of the Case this bears, (1a), (2a). Instead, only the corresponding clitic pronouns are possible, (1b), (2b), giving rise to unusual structures, since clitics do not follow prepositions in general (see Abels 2000, for an account). The Case of the clitic is genitive (which in Modern Greek has collapsed with dative). Locative Ps are *complex Prepositions* in the sense that they can alternatively be followed by a *light Preposition (lP)*, conceivably more similar to Kayne's Ps, followed by an accusative DP, but not by the corresponding clitic, (3), (4).

2. The background The contrasts in (1a) and (2a) vs. (1b) and (2b) find an interesting counterpart in the domain of (direct object) passivization of ditransitives, (5a)-(7a). In both structures, a clitic but not its corresponding DP may be present and an alternative structure with a *lP*, followed by a DP, but not by a clitic, is also available. These facts have counterparts in very many other languages, including English, (5b), with the exception that the 'rescuing mechanism' provided by clitics, (6a), is unavailable in English, (6b). Notice the alternative *lPP* structures that are also available in both languages (7a, b). Anagnostopoulou (to appear) attributes the ungrammaticality of (5) to locality violations (in terms of Chomsky, 1995), according to which movement of *to vivlio/the book* to Spec(TP) is blocked by the D/EPP features of the intervening indirect object *tou Petrou/Peter*. The effects are voided when the corresponding clitic moves to T, as it carries along the features of the indirect object, in either simple or clitic doubling configurations, (6a). No violations are expected to arise for the *lPP* options, (7), if *lPPs* originate lower than the goal (Larson 1988), and they don't. An alternative interpretation of (5)-(6) could be offered in terms of Richards (1997) Principle of Minimal Compliance (see also Pesetsky and Torrego, 2001), thus, take (head) movement of the clitic (to T) to render additional movements (to T, or its Spec) possible. This way we reach an explanation of the passivization facts comparable to den Dikken's (1998) proposals concerning Predicate Inversion.

3. The core proposal With the above into account, I consider *Locative/Complex Prepositions* to be essentially nominal (hence the genitive Case of the associated clitic in Greek) and attribute them the structure of a DP, with the relation between possessor-possesum captured in terms of a small clause (see Alexiadou and Stavrou 2000). Alternatively put, I consider the *cP* to be the predicate with the genitive DP its subject, as in (8a), and subsequently propose that *cPs* undergo obligatory movement past the genitive subject, patterning that of predicate inversion and resulting in the ungrammatical (8b), (compare to (5a)). No violation should arise when the corresponding clitic moves to F, along with *cP* to its Spec, nevertheless (9a) is still ill-formed. The impossibility of co-occurrence of clitic and DP, (9a), is due to the reasons that ban clitic doubling from other than the sentential domain in the language (considering clitic doubling to involve movement, presumably its trace cannot be phonetically realized in the DP domain). As a result, (9b)=(1b,2b) surfaces. Construal of *cPs* with *lPPs* is readily explained if *lPPs* are lower in the structure, (10). Supporting evidence that this is indeed so is provided by the animacy restrictions that hold for clitics, (11b), but not for the corresponding DPs of *lPPs*, (11a), if Marantz (1993) is right in that animacy restrictions are associated with higher positions in the structure. Finally, nominal 'behavior' associated with locative Ps in French (Zribi-Hertz, p.c.) and Hungarian (Kiss, 1998), (indirectly) support the analysis offered for Greek and make locatives a distinct class of Prepositions, unlike those discussed in Kayne (2001).

- (1) a. \*...πισο tou Petrou/ton Petro  
behind the-Peter-gen/the-Peter-acc
- b. πισο tou/\*ton  
behind him-gen/him-acc
- (2) a. \*...επανο tis tileorasis/tin tileorasi  
on the-TV-gen/the-TV-acc
- b. επανο tis/\*tin  
on her-gen/her-acc
- (3) ...πισο apo ton Petro/\*ton/\*tou  
behind the-Peter-acc/him-acc/him-gen
- (4) ...επανο s' tin tileorasi/\*tin/\*tis  
on s' the-TV-acc/her-acc/her-gen
- (5a) ?\*To vivlio<sub>i</sub> dothike tou Petrou t<sub>i</sub>  
the-book-nom was-given the-Peter-dat
- (5b) \*‘The book was given Peter.’
- (6a) To vivlio<sub>i</sub> tou<sub>j</sub> dothike t<sub>j</sub> (tou Petrou)  
the-book-nom him-gen was-given (the Peter)
- (6b) non applicable
- (7a) To vivlio<sub>i</sub> dothike t<sub>i</sub> s' ton Petro.  
the-book-nom was-given s' the-Peter-acc
- (7b) ‘The book was given to Peter.’
- (8) a. [DP ... [FP [F [XP tou Petrou [πισο ]]]]]  
the-Peter-gen behind
- b. \*[DP ... [FP πισο<sub>i</sub> [F [XP tou Petrou [ t<sub>i</sub> ]]]]]  
behind the-Peter-gen
- (9) a. \*[DP ... [FP πισο<sub>i</sub> [F tou<sub>j</sub> [XP t<sub>j</sub> tou Petrou [ t<sub>i</sub> ]]]]]  
behind him-gen the-Peter-gen
- b. [DP ... [FP πισο<sub>i</sub> [F tou<sub>j</sub> [XP t<sub>j</sub> [ t<sub>i</sub> ]]]]]  
behind him-gen
- (10) [DP ... [FP [F [XP [πισο [light PP apo [DP ton Petro ]]]]]]]  
behind apo the-Peter-acc
- (11) a. I Maria stathike piso apo to pedi/to ktirio.  
the-Mary stood behind apo the-child/the-building  
'Mary stood behind the child/the building.'
- b. I Maria stathike piso tou.  
the-Mary stood behind it-gen  
'Mary stood behind it (the child/\*the building).'

## References

- Abels, K. (2000) Clitics as complements of P. Ms. University of Connecticut. •
- Alexiadou, A. and M. Stavrou (2000) Adjective-clitic combinations in the Greek DP. In B. Gerlach and J. Frijzenhout (eds.), *Clitics in Phonology, Morphology and Syntax*, 63-84. •
- Anagnostopoulou, E. (to appear) *On double object alternations and clitics*. The Hague: Mouton. •
- den Dikken, M. (1998) Predicate Inversion in DP. In A. Alexiadou and C. Wilder (eds.), *Possessors, Predicates and Movement in the Determiner Phrase*. Benjamins, 177-214. •
- Kayne, R. (2001) Prepositions as Probes. Ms., New York University •
- Kiss, E. K. (1998) Verbal Prefixes pr Postpositions? Postpositional Aspectualizers in Hungarian. In C. de Groot and I. Kenesei (eds.), *Papers from the Amsterdam Conference. Approaches to Hungarian, Vol. 6*. JATE, Szeged, 125-148. •
- Marantz, A. (1993) Implications of asymmetries in double object constructions. In S. A. Mchombo (ed.), *Theoretical Aspects of Bantu Grammar*, 113-149. •
- Theophanopoulou-Kontou, D. (1992) The Complex Prepositions of Modern Greek and their Structure. *Proceedings of the 13<sup>th</sup> Linguistics Meeting of the Univ. of Thessaloniki*, 311-330.

## **Locative Prepositions as DPs**

Arhonto Terzi  
Technological Educational Institute of Patras  
Dept. of Speech & Language Therapy  
Meg. Alexandrou 1, Koukouli, 26334  
Patras  
GREECE  
e-mail: [aterzi@teipat.gr](mailto:aterzi@teipat.gr)