

Decomposing prepositions: Case, function and PP-structure in Ancient Greek
Vassilios Spyropoulos
National and Kapodistrian University of Athens
vspyrop@phil.uoa.gr

In this talk I will examine case assignment in prepositional phrases in Ancient Greek and I will argue that it is not a lexical property of the preposition but a matter of the syntactic structure the preposition participates in (see also Abraham 2010). Based on distributional and morphological evidence regarding the lexical item of the preposition (cross-categorial distribution ranging from preposition and adverb to prefix; morphological decomposition into a root element and formatives relevant to categorial and spatial exponence; see Schwyzer & Debrunner 1950) and in line with the syntactic decomposition approach to categorization (Marantz 1997 et seq., Harley 2005 et seq., Borer 2005, Ramchand 2008 among others), I will argue for a decomposition analysis of prepositions (see also Svenonius 2003, 2007, Koopman 2010, Terzi 2010 among others) according to which the category of preposition is decomposed into a Root element $\sqrt{\quad}$, void of grammatical/syntactic information, and a functional layer, which includes a categorizing p head and is responsible for the syntactic properties of the preposition, namely argument structure, function and case assignment:

(1) [FP F ... [_{PP} p [_{NP} $\sqrt{\quad}$]]...]

Such an analysis implies that case assignment in PPs is not a property of the lexical item of the preposition. Evidence for such an approach comes from the fact that in AG the case of the DP in a PP depends on the function of the PP (Luraghi 2003, Bortone 2010 among others), in a way that the correlations between function and case cuts across all prepositions and they are also attested in adverbial bare DPs with a spatial meaning. Based on these facts, I will put forward the hypothesis that case assignment is a property of a p_{CASE} functional head in the functional layer of an extended PP structure and I will argue that the constructions in which the correlation between function and case is attested derive from the same structure, depending on its lexicalization by means of a root vocabulary item.

(7) [FP F ... [_{PCASEP} p_{CASE} [_{PP} p [_{NP} $\sqrt{\quad}$ DP]]]]...]

Thus, concrete spatial PPs involve the whole structure lexicalized by a root vocabulary item, which surfaces as the lexical category of preposition, whereas concrete spatial adverbial bare DPs involve the same structure without the insertion of a root vocabulary item. This proposal accounts for the similarities between PPs and the so-called semantic cases (Fillmore 1968, McFadden 2004), by assuming that adverbial bare DPs are in fact prepositional structure fragments, i.e. functional skeletons including the p_{CASE} head, not lexicalized by a root. Finally, building on the dissociation approach to v and Voice (Harley 2014 among others), and based on evidence from *prepositional prefixation* constructions (i.e. constructions in which the preposition appears prefixed onto another lexical item, e.g. a verb; Humbert 1960, cf. Acedo-Matellán 2016), in which prepositional categorization is independent of case assignment, I will argue that p_{CASE} and p are distinct functional projections: p is simply a categorizing head that turns a root into a preposition, whereas p_{CASE} is responsible for case assignment (and perhaps for introducing the Figure argument; Svenonius 2010) and it may come in different flavors (like ‘flavored’ v heads; Folli & Harley 2005 et seq.), namely p_{ACC} , p_{GEN} , and p_{DAT} .

Selected References: Acedo-Matellán, V. 2016. *The Morphosyntax of Transitions*. Oxford: OUP * Bortone, P. 2010. *Greek Prepositions: From Antiquity to Present*. Oxford: OUP * Folli, R. & H. Harley. 2005. Flavours of v : Consuming results in Italian and English. In P. Kempchinsky & R. Slabakova (eds.), *Aspectual Inquiries*, 1-25. Dordrecht: Springer * Luraghi, S. 2003. *On the Meaning of Prepositions and Cases*. Amsterdam: J. Benjamins * Svenonius, P. 2007. Adpositions, particles and the arguments they introduce. In E. Reuland, T. Bhattacharya & G. Spathas (eds.), *Argument Structure*, 64-103. Amsterdam: J. Benjamins.