

Prepositional Projections

Introduction:

This paper deals with Czech and Russian prepositions. Its main objective is to show that prepositional properties are derivable from the following PP structure:

(1) $[_{TpP} TP_{(unval\phi-fs, valT-f)} [_{DirP} Dir [_{LocP} LOC [_{DP} (AP) DP_{(val\phi-fs, unvalT-f)}]]]]$

Data:

As shown in (2) and (4), Ps can merge with different categories: with a preposition (2a), (4), with a noun phrase (2b), an adverbial whP (2c), (2g), a verb (2d), an adjective (2e), and a clause (2f). Prepositions can also assign case to different categories, see (2a), (2b), (2e), and (2g).

Czech:

- | | | | |
|---|--|--|------------------------------|
| (2) a. do-před-u
to-in.front.of-gen.sg
'forward' | b. do Prah-y
to Prag-gen.sg
'to Prag' | c. do-kdy
to-when
'till when' | d. do-jít
to-go
'come' |
| e. do-modr-a
to-blue-gen.sg
'(a little bit) blue' | f. přes-to-že [TP ...]
over-this-that
'although' | g. z-kam-a
out-where-gen.sg
'from where' | |

Certain prepositions can assign different cases, as demonstrated in (3). There are also complex prepositions, as shown in (4). And some prepositions can bring about speaker anchoring, consider (5).

Russian:

- | | |
|--|--|
| (3) a. na /v / o stol-e
on in about table-loc | b. na /v / o stol
on in about table.acc |
|--|--|

- (4) iz-za X.gen
out-behind X.gen
'from behind'

Czech:

- (5) Pavel do-nesl knihy.
Pavel to-carried books
'Pavel brought books.'

Proposal:

Complex PPs such as (2a) and (4) show that PPs can be decomposed into two projections: Dir(ectio)nalP and Loc(ative)P, where the first morpheme spells out Dir and the second one Loc, consider (1). According to Pesetsky & Torrego (2004), structural case is an unval(ued) T-f(eature) on D that enters an Agree relation with T. I extend their proposal and suggest that prepositional cases are also an unvalT-f on D and that Ps, in addition to val(ued)T-f, bear probing unval ϕ -f(eature)s on T_P, as shown in (1). Both types of features participate in the case-assigning process (Agree between T_P and the complement of Loc). As a consequence of Agree, unvalT-f on the complement of Loc is valued by valT-f on T_P (i.e. the complement gets a case, as in (2a), (2b), (2e), (2g)) and ϕ -fs on T_P are valued by the complement (there are languages with overt P agreement, e.g. Irish, Hungarian or Welsh). There is a correlation between the type of the T_P complement and the value of the T-f on T_P (the type of case). Depending on its complement – DirP does not have to be projected, as in (3a) - valT-f on T_P assigns either the locative case (3a) or the directional case (3b). The complement of Loc does not have to be only a bare DP (2b), it can also be a CP (sentential DP), as in (2f), which bears ϕ -fs and unvalT-f. Note that *that*-clauses marked with an oblique case typically occur with a demonstrative in Czech (6):

- (6) a. po-*(tom) [C' co [TP ...]] b. za-*(tím)-[C' co [TP ...]] c. pro-*(to)-[C'že [TP ...]]
 after-this what/that behind-this-what/that for-this-that
 'after' 'while' 'because'

The complement of Loc can also be a covert DP (2a), which is modified by an adjective (2e), or an adverbial whP containing a DP (2g); cf. Caha & Medová (to appear), who argue that Czech manner adverbials like *rychl-e* 'fast' are marked with the locative case and contain a covert noun, or Vangsnes (2008), who shows that Scandinavian manner wh-phrases 'how' contain an abstract nominal morpheme. Thus, for the complex PP *dopředu*, I propose the following syntactic structure, where T_P Agrees with DP:

- (7) [T_{PP} T_P [DirP do [LocP před [DP N-u]]]]

When the complement of Loc is not overt (i.e. it is referentially defective; note that although the case on *dopředu* is a reflection of Agree between T_P and the DP, it cannot vary, it is always genitive of the masculine paradigm *hrad* 'castle'), the interpretation must be provided by some other mechanism. Referentiality of PPs is placed in T_P because T_P bears ϕ -fs (it Agrees with the complement of Loc). Given the T nature of T_P, I propose that T_P can get the appropriate interpretation in other T category, specifically, in the verbal TP. T_VP is the place of speaker anchoring because the speech time is located there and also place of referentiality of the clausal subject because unval ϕ -fs on T_V Agree with val ϕ -fs on the subject. Therefore, in (8) Pavel's motion is localized wrt. the clausal subject (*Pavel*), and in (5) the goal location of books is determined by speaker's spatiotemporal position.

- (8) Pavel šel do-před-u.

Pavel went to-in.front.of-gen.sg

'Pavel went forward.'

Ps (with their argument structure and lexicosemantic features) are merged as Loc and then incorporate into Dir (if projected) and into T_P. If PP occurs in the complement position of a verb, then the complex P-head can also incorporate into the verb, as in (2d), and makes the verb perfective (arguments supporting the view that verbal prefixes are incorporated Ps will not be discussed here). Here I argue that valT-f on T_P is responsible for boundedness (definiteness effects). In (2d), valT-f on the complex P-head incorporated into the verb values unvalT-f on Asp as bounded (for features of Asp see (9)), which brings about perfectivity.

- (9) [C_P C [T_P T (unval ϕ -fs, valT-f) [AspP Asp (unval ϕ -fs, unvalT-f) [V_P V [VP V PP]]]]]]

Definiteness effects induced by valT-f on T_P are also observable in the case of verbal objects with structural accusative because unvalT-f (case) on the direct object is valued by T-f on Asp, which was valued by valT-f on T_P incorporated into the verb. Thus, extraction from an object with the perfective structural accusative is worse than extraction from an object with the imperfective structural accusative, for Russian examples see Romanova (2007). Similarly, in (2c) valT-f on *do* brings about boundedness (the final point) of the time interval, in contrast to the bare *kdy* 'when', which expresses an unbounded interval. It is also known that there is a relation between prepositional cases and definiteness; PPs are islands for extraction. In such cases, valT-f on T_P valuing unvalT-f (case) on the prepositional complement induces islandhood (not shown here), similarly as in the case of direct objects.

References:

- Caha, P. & L. Medová (to appear), Czech Adverbs as Case-marked Adjectives. In: *Proceedings of FDSL-7*. Universität Leipzig.
 Pesetsky, D. & E. Torrego (2004), Tense, Case, and the Nature of Syntactic Categories. In: J. Guéron & J. Lecarme (eds.), *The syntax of Time*. Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press, 495-539.
 Romanova, E. (2007), *Constructing perfectivity in Russian*. Ph.D. dissertation, University of Tromsø.
 Vangsnes, A. Ø. (2008), Decomposing manner how in colloquial Scandinavian. *Studia Linguistica*, 62(1), 119–141.