

### Locative PPs inside and outside DPs. The view from Romanian.

Ion Giurgea (The Institute of Linguistics of the Romanian Academy, Bucharest)

The data concerning the use of *de* with adnominal locatives in Romanian are interesting for the general theory of the syntactic mapping of argument structure, insofar as they support event decomposition in syntax and they provide evidence for the existence of verbal structure embedded in complex event nominalizations.

**1. The data.** Romanian adnominal locative PP modifiers (including here both spatial and temporal location) must be preceded by *de* 'of, from' (ex.1), except in complex event nominalizations (in the sense of Grimshaw (1990), see Cornilescu 2001) (ex.2):

- (1) Cartea \*(de) pe masă e veche.  
book-the of on table is old 'The book on the table is old'
- (2) interpretarea operei Aida la Covent Garden  
performance-the opera-the.GEN Aida at Covent Garden

Assuming that complex event nominalizations involve verbal projections (v, maybe Asp) embedded under a nominalizer head (Borer 1994, Fu, Roeper & Borer 2001, Alexiadou 2001, Cornilescu 2001, Alexiadou et al. 2007, a.o.), the absence of *de* in (2) can be explained by the fact that the locative modifies a *verbal*, rather than a nominal projection. Further cases where *de* is absent (ex.3a vs. b) can be explained by the fact that the locative specifies an argument implied by the lexical-conceptual structure of the noun, therefore combining with the NP as an argument rather than as a modifier.

- (3) a. podurile peste Dunăre // b. norii \*(de) peste vale  
bridges-the above Danube clouds-the of above valley

The data presented so far support the following generalization:

(4) A locative *modifier* inside a *nominal* projection must be marked by *de*.

Recent studies (Giurgea & Mardale 2013, Mardale 2013) have pointed out some data which appear to be exceptions to (4): (i) *de* does not appear with non-specific objects of intensional verbs (ex.5 vs. 6) and verbs related to possession (ex.7):

- (5) Ion dorește o casă la munte 'Ion wants a house (which should be)  
Ion desires a house at mountain in the mountains'
- (6) Ion dorește o casă de la munte 'Ion wants a certain house,  
Ion desires a house of at mountain which is in the mountains'
- (7) a. Ion a cumpărat o casă la București. b. Ion are o casă la București.  
Ion has bought a house at Bucharest Ion has a house at Bucharest  
'Ion bought a house in Bucharest' 'Ion has a house in Bucharest'

(ii) *de* can be absent with generic DPs:

- (8) Casele la București sunt scumpe.  
houses-the at Bucharest are expensive

**2. Analysis.** I argue that the absence of *de* in (5), (7) and (8) does not constitute evidence against (4), because the PPs in these examples are external to the DP.

**2.1 Locatives in possessive predications.** Extraction facts show that the PPs in (5) and (7) are not DP-internal: they can be moved in the periphery of the clause (by wh-movement, topicalization or focalization) or into a position between the verb and the direct object (by scrambling, ex.9a); none of these movements is possible with DP-internal PPs (ex.9b):

- (9) a. Am cumpărat la București o casă.  
have.1 bought at Bucharest a house  
Possible interpretation: 'I bought a house situated in Bucharest'
- b. \* Am cumpărat { [de la București]<sub>i</sub> / [cu turn]<sub>i</sub> } [o casă t<sub>i</sub>].  
have.1 bought of at Bucharest a house

The syntactic analysis builds on the following observations: (i) locatives in examples such as (7a) are ambiguous between an event interpretation, in which they localize the event

introduced by the verb (in (7a), the buying event), and a theme-oriented interpretation, in which they localize the direct object; (ii) the verbs that allow this theme-oriented reading of locatives are verbs related to possession – besides *buy, get, have* etc., which involve actual possession, we find verbs which involve modalized possession – *offer*, and the desiderative verbs in (5); object-taking *want* is interpreted as *want to HAVE*.

I propose that all these verbs project the possession component in syntax, as a possessive small clause, and the ambiguity in (7a) is due to the ambiguity of attachment of the locative – to the possessive small clause or to the process-denoting part of the clause. For achievement verbs such as *buy*, the possessive small clause is the result state, to be identified with Ramchand’s (2008) ResP. For object-taking desiderative verbs, I assume a PP complement headed by an abstract P translated as HAVE. Following Ramchand (2008), I assume that the coindexation between the possessor position and another argument position (the agent for *buy*, the experiencer for *want*, the goal for *offer*) is indicated in the lexical entry of the verb:

(10) [Ion<sub>i</sub> wants/buys [ResP/PP X<sub>i</sub> HAVE a house]]

Under this analysis, (5) and (7) follow from a single syntactic property: *have*-predications that take weak indefinite objects allow a PP which localizes the object. Note, indeed, that with the stative possession verb *have*, locative PPs only locate the object (ex.7b). A further observation is that the ambiguity in (7a) only arises with *indefinite* objects. Building on the widespread treatment of *have* as a copula that incorporates a P (Freeze 1992, Kayne 1993, Den Dikken 1995, a.o.), I propose that i-level *have* is the possessive counterpart of existential *be* (cf. the restriction of strong DP objects to s-level *have*, ex.11) and therefore, like existential *be*, it allows a further predicative layer which localizes the theme (see (12)). This proposal is supported by the availability of a further predicative layer with s-level *have* (ex.13):

(11) Am casa asta ??(din 1989). ‘?? I have this house /  
have.1SG house-the this since 1989 I’ve had this house since 1989.’

(12) a. There is a house on the hill b. I have a house on the hill.

(13) a. Am cartea la tine.  
have.1SG book-the at you ‘My book is with you / at your place’  
b. Le am pregătite de la ora cinci.  
them(FPL) have.1SG prepared.FPL since hour-the five  
‘I’ve had them prepared since 5 o’clock’

The general structure proposed for Theme-related locatives with possession verbs is

(14) [.. Arg<sub>i</sub> V [ResP/PP X<sub>i</sub> P<sub>HAVE</sub> [PredP Theme [Pred Location]]]]

I will provide a compositional semantics of this structure, building on Pylkkänen (2008).

P<sub>HAVE</sub> is incorporated into the V, except with light verbs, where it can surface as *cu* ‘with’ (for *with* as the possessive P, cf. Kayne (1993), Harley (2002), Levinson (2011)):

(15) Am făcut-o pe Maria cu o casă la mare.  
have.1 made-her.CL.ACC OBJ Maria with a house at sea  
‘I made Maria have a house at the seaside.’

**2.2 Generic sentences.** For examples such as (8), I argue that the locative is the predicate of a small-clause whose subject is controlled by the subject of the sentence. This small clause occupies a position which is interpreted as (part of) the restriction of the GEN operator:

(16) [ [DP<sub>casele</sub>]<sub>i</sub> [ [PRO<sub>i</sub> la București] [GEN [sunt [PredP t<sub>i</sub> scumpe]]]]]

Evidence for this type of construction is provided by examples in which the DP is a proper name, in which case the locative cannot be interpreted as a restrictive modifier:

(17) Maria la mare este mult mai relaxată. ‘When at the seaside, Maria is much  
Maria at sea is much more relaxed more relaxed’

**3. De in adnominal PPs.** Finally, I will suggest an account for the specificity effect in (6), based on the idea *de* is a relativizer which binds the world variable of the locative predication.