PARAMETERS OF NOMINAL DEFICIENCY IN COMPLEX PREPOSITIONS  
Toulouse, September 30-October 1, 2021

1. ROADMAP

“Complex prepositions”: roughly, polymorphemic sequences with “prepositional meaning” or the same distribution as monomorphemic prepositions; described for many languages (e.g., Quirk and Mulholland 1964, Huddleston and Pullum 2002, Melis 2003, Villada Moirón 2005, Fagard and De Mulder 2007, Hüning 2014, Fagard et al. 2020, a.o.)

Scope (see, e.g., Stosic and Fagard 2019 for more possibilities):

(1) **denominal**

a. à l’ intérieur de at/to **DEF** interior of/from **inside**  
   French

b. v tečenie + **GEN** in flow **during**  
   Russian

c. in de richting van in **DEF** direction of **towards**  
   Dutch

(2) **deverbal**

a. concernant **concerning**  
   French

b. ne.smot’r’a na NEG.**look**.**GER** on despite  
   Russian

c. blijkens **appear**.**INF**.**GEN** as appears from  
   Dutch

(3) **adverbial**

a. contrairement à **contrary**.**ADV** to **contrary to**  
   French

b. otnosit’el’no+ **GEN** relatively **in relation to**  
   Russian

c. strijdig met conflicting with **contrary to**  
   Dutch

The only truly productive class is preposition-noun-preposition sequences (PNPs), as in (1) Proposal (cf. Matushansky and Zwarts 2019): PNPs form *non-constituent parts of* regular PPs (cf. Seppänen et al. 1994) formed on the basis of a **weak relational nominal**:
Several issues to discuss:

- evidence for this view
- (accounting for the) variation
- relation to other “complex prepositions”
- cross-linguistic coverage

Elevator pitch:

(a) there are no “complex prepositions”
(b) PNPs are not a uniform category
(c) variation is determined by a cluster of properties (the presence/lack of an article, of P₁ and P₂, modification and possessivization restrictions)

Caveat: not all PNPs have the structure in (4), see Philippova [to appear] for the evidence that dative PNPs like (5) involve a possessive PP complex (Matushansky et al. 2020):

(5) a. Ona posmotrela v-sled emu.  
She stared after him (watched him go).

b. Maša bežala na-vstreču im.  
Masha was running to meet them halfway.


(6) PP

The lexical NP *im* ‘them.DAT’ here is not a dependent inside the PP

### 2. DECOMPOSING PNPs

It seems obvious that PNPs consist of several different parts. Two points of contention:

- internal constituency (§2.2) and variation (§2.3)

#### 2.1. On the nominal core of PNPs

Main evidence: the fact that N₁ is so very often a lexical noun: direction/richting/napravlenie ‘direction’, dessus/verx ‘top’, etc.
It combines with a preposition (P₁)

It has nominal syntax, like the article (or a possessive):

\[
\text{(7) a. The chamber pot can be found at the foot of the bed. M&Z}
\]
\[\text{b. The grandfather clock is to the left of the wardrobe.}
\]

The determiner shows gender and number agreement with N₁ and undergoes the *en/au* alternation (see Cornulier 1972, Zwicky 1987, Miller et al. 1997, Matushansky 2015, a.o.) characteristic of the interaction of the P+D complex with gender in French:

\[
\text{(8) a. en tête du train in head.F of the train}
\]
\[
\text{in the front section of the train French, Roy 2006b}
\]
\[\text{b. au pied de l’arbre to.the.M foot.M of the+tree}
\]
\[\text{at the foot of the tree Dutch}
\]
\[\text{c. in ons midden in our.N middle.N in our midst}
\]

In languages with case-marking the noun shows case morphology (which can be irregular, as in (9b), see also section 5.1):

\[
\text{(9) a. po povodu} + GEN Russian}
\]
\[\text{along occasion.DAT on the occasion of}
\]
\[\text{b. v- pered- i} + GEN in front LOC in front of (locative)
\]
\[\text{c. v- pered- 0 in front ACC to the front of (directional)}
\]

It can even be modified (e.g., *in the general direction of*), on which more below

While the distribution of the noun may be limited to the PNP in question…:

\[
\text{(10) a. à l’ insu de at/to DEF unbeknownst of/from unbeknownst to French}
\]
\[\text{b. by dint of}
\]
\[\text{c. onder het mom van under DEF guise of under the pretext of Dutch}
\]

…this is unproblematic in view of the existence of *fossil words* (Aronoff 1974, aka cranberry words, Richter and Sailer 2003): freestanding morphemes appearing only in one particular environment or a few:

\[
\text{(11) a. kith and kin}
\]
\[\text{b. mettle (in high mettle, test/prove/show (one’s) mettle, on (one’s) mettle)}
\]

Historically the nominal core of PNPs is clearly a noun. What is its synchronic status?

➢ Svenonius 2006, 2010: AxPart (a functional head)
➢ Matushansky and Zwarts 2019: weak nouns
➢ the PNP view: ?
Any theory not treating N as a noun has to account for its nominal syntax. We do not deny that PNPs can evolve into prepositions (cf. Noailly 2006, but also Fagard and De Mulder 2007, Le Draoulec and Rebeyrolle 2021):

(12) a. une mise en scène style Bob Wilson
   a staging style Bob Wilson
   staging in the Bob Wilson style

b. histoire de se faire une idée
   history of REFL make.REFL an idea
   the matter of getting an idea

But they are not prepositions (cf. Place République) unlike the real preposition chez.

2.2. Constituency

PNP sequences can’t be treated as constituents to the exclusion of the lexical NP.

The inner preposition (P₂) can be repeated across conjunction (for some PNPs, like (13), from Fagard and De Mulder 2007):

(13) Je travaille à l’aide de jeux de rôles et de Gestalt-thérapie.
I work at/to DEF+help of/from game of roles and of Gestalt-therapy
   \[ PP_{2} \]

This means that P₂ forms a constituent with the lexical NP to the exclusion of P₁ and N₁:

(14) à l’aide [\{P₂ de jeux de rôles et de Gestalt-thérapie]\]

The combination of P₂ and the following NP also pass other constituency tests:

(15) possessivization (only if P₂ is de or its equivalent)

a. a son insu
   at/to 3SG.POSS unbeknown
   unbeknown to him/her

b. in Jans richting
   in Jan’s direction
   in Jan’s direction

c. in moem napravlenii
   in my direction
   in my direction

(16) R-pronominalization

a. im Hinblick wor.auf/dar.auf
   in+the view WO+on/DA+on
   in terms of what/of it

b. in lijn er.mee
   in line R+with
   in accordance with it

Dislocation (Seppänen et al. 1994) seems to work in English and Dutch:

(17) a. Of which proposal do they seem to be in favor?

b. Met welk voorstel zijn ze in tegenspraak?
   with which proposal are they in conflict
   With which proposal are they in conflict?
Coordinating PNPs with the same \( P_1 \) can in principle be possible only for a small subset of PNPs (for semantic reasons).

For cardinal points, potential cases of such coordination is structurally ambiguous in English:

(18) the area [to the east of the river and (*the) north of the railway]
   a. to the [east of the river and north of the railway] mostly likely not this structure
   b. [to the east of the river] and [north of the railway] probably this structure

Dutch provides unambiguous cases:

(19) De buurtschap ligt ten [noorden van Z en zuiden van W.] Dutch
    The hamlet lies to.DEF [north of Z and south of W.
    The hamlet is situated north of Z and south of W.

Possessivization (15), which breaks the linear sequence \( P_1 - N \), can also be taken as evidence.

### 2.3. Variation

The syntax of PNP sequences is not uniform.

Major points of variation (Quirk and Mulholland 1964, Melis 2003, Stosic and Fagard 2019, etc.):

- the presence of the article
- compatibility with a demonstrative
- possibility of modification
- possibility of possessivization
- variation in the outer preposition
- n-forms in Russian
- lexical restriction on \( N_1 \)

We will only tackle some of these points.

**Main proposal:** the lexical core of PNP sequences is a **weak noun**

### 3. Weak nouns and their properties

Barker 2005, Carlson and Sussman 2005, Aguilar-Guevara and Zwarts 2010, 2013, Klein 2011, Aguilar-Guevara 2014, etc.) weak nouns are characterized by:

- non-referential interpretation (§3.1)
- resistance to modification and pluralization (§3.2)
- alternation with a bare NP (§3.3)
- enriched interpretation (§3.4)
- distributional restrictions (§3.5)

Most of these properties also characterize PNP nominal cores.

#### 3.1. Non-referentiality

Non-referentiality can be diagnosed by sloppy identity under ellipsis (impossible to check for relational nouns) and by resistance to anaphora.

Original examples mostly from references, PNP examples are ours

(20) sloppy identity Carlson and Sussman 2005
   a. Mary heard about the riot on the radio, and Bob did, too. same riot
   b. Mary heard about the riot on the radio, and Bob did, too. different radios

For PNPs, if the lexical NP is different, so is the referent, and if it is the same, the difference in reference may be due to a different process (for nouns like *side*). And yet:
(21) Dominique a complété son projet à l’aide de l’ordinateur, et
Frédérique aussi.
Dominique has completed their projet to the+help of the+computer, and
Frédérique also.

(22) Elke aannemer werkte in opdracht van de overheid.
Each contractor worked in order of the government.

Wide scope is impossible, suggesting that this is not an indefinite
Anaphora removes the weak interpretation:

(23) resistance to pronominalization

a. Alice di d a solo on the saxophone. ?She did not realize it was out of tune.

b. The government acted in the light of his suggestions. ?It was very clear.

With PNPs pronominalization of just the nominal core is simply impossible

3.2. Invariability

Weak nouns resist modification and retain their number (usually, singular):

(24) resistance to modification

a. He went to the 5-story hospital.

b. Each man listened to the red radio on the picnic table.

(25) a. ?in the bright light of his suggestions

b. ?to the cold north of the city

Most PNPs, like most weak nouns, are singular, yet plural ones are also possible. The change in number removes the “weak” interpretation:

(26) a. If you get lost in the mountains, walk down.

b. If you get lost on the mountain, walk down.

no weak reading

(27) a. sous les auspices de, aux alentours

b. sous l’aupice de, *à l’alentour

(28) resistance to pluralization

a. Bob and Mary went to the hotels/#the hospitals.

b. ?in the lights of these suggestions, at the risks of minor inflections

c. op het gebied van A en B ‘in the area of A and B’

d. ?op de gebieden van A en B ‘in the areas of A and B’

Dutch

Number-neutrality characterizes most shifted interpretations

3.3. Alternation with a bare NP

Only a few weak nouns or PNP nouns can alternate, and the choice is often conditioned by dialect or register:

(29) a. Mary went to (the) hospital.

b. Ziggy played (the) guitar.
(30)  a. in (the) light of, for (the) sake of, at (the) risk of  
    b. sous (le) prétexte de, à (la) hauteur de  

For weak nouns, it is easy to see item-specific variation within the same semantic field:

(31)  bare/definite variation  
      a. Sue went to college/to prison.  
      b. Sue went to the university/to the store/to the beach.  

For PNPs within-class variation is more limited:

(32)  a. on top of, in front of  
      b. at the back of, to the left of

So, within the class as a whole we find overt definites and bare cases and only sometimes do we find both possibilities for the same noun

In French classical weak nouns are never bare (see Longobardi 2001), so it is more difficult to argue for a parallel treatment:

Some systematic exceptions to this claim (Beyssade 2011) are bare nouns in the predicate position (Roy 2001, Roy 2006a, de Swart et al. 2005, de Swart et al. 2007, also Lauwers 2014b), in coordination (Roodenburg 2004), and in copular clauses (Lauwers 2012)

(33)  Nous sommes allés au resto.  
      we are gone to+the restaurant  

We went to dinner.

Bare nouns are possible in PPs, for some P-N combinations, e.g.:

(34)  a. sous antibiotique-s  
      under antibiotic-PL  
      on antibiotics  
      Lauwers 2014a  
      b. sous surveillance  
      under surveillance  
      under surveillance

(35)  à pied, à vent, à rebours, à genoux…

Baldwin et al. 2003: article drop is very frequent in PPs with shifted interpretation. These are also likely to involve weak nouns

3.4.  Meaning shifts

Weak nouns undergo enrichment: they are taken in their stereotypical use: if someone goes to the hospital, the weak reading is only possible if they are there to receive treatment

This is why weak readings are incompatible with unusual goals:

(36)  a. They went to bed [#to play cards].  
      b. Mary went to the hospital [#to pee].

With PNPs the N is usually metaphorically or metonymically shifted, rather than enriched:

(37)  a. at the back of  
      b. at the foot of

The enriched interpretation is one of the reasons why modification of weak nouns is severely limited (more on this below)
The change in meaning is not a special property of PNPs or PPs, as it is also found in idioms, including those with weak nominals (38).

(38) a. adding insult to injury
    b. think/*act out of the box

The change can be predictable (see Lauwers 2014a on *sous*)

3.5. Distributional restrictions

A noun is weak only with certain governors (prepositions or verbs):

(39) a. in bed vs. *on bed
    b. play the piano vs. kick the piano

(40) à/*de côté de, sous/#sur la botte de

The question remains how the combination of a preposition and a weak nominal is licensed (as both are needed), but is this so different from the question of how idioms are licensed?

4. Syntactic correlates of semantic weakness

Main point: semantic irregularity does not entail irregular nominal syntax (it’s unidirectional)

4.1. The presence of the article

The existence of near-minimal pairs shows that the choice between the presence and the absence of an article in PNPs is a low-level property of the weak noun in the context of the appropriate licenser:

(41) a. à côté de
    at/to side of
    next to

    b. à l’intérieur de
        at/to the+inside of
        inside

(42) a. on top of
    b. at the bottom of

(43) a. in de naam van
    in the name of

    b. uit naam van
    out name of

    Dutch

    on behalf of

From the NP/DP standpoint PNPs do not form a uniform group and it is not clear that a single denomination leads to theoretical insights

Our proposal: the ability of a given weak noun to appear without a definite article is a lexical property of that noun

Possible formal implementation: m-merger (Matushansky 2006)

4.2. Modification

PNPs differ with respect to their ability to have a modified nominal core

For some PNPs, like for some weak nouns and semi-idiomatic PPs, modification is possible (though restricted):

The presence of an overt article makes modification more likely, but this may be because the class of PNPs is not defined and what is a PNP with an article for one would be a regular PP for another
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(44) a. en prise (directe) avec
     in grip (direct) with
     in (close) contact with

b. at (great/considerable/tedious/epic) length

c. go to (public) school

Some require an adjective:

(45) a. on *(good) terms with
     at *(great/public/considerable) expense

In general, only adjectives yielding degree interpretation or kind-level adjectives are possible:

(46) a. at great/*unforeseen expense
     b. by (*late/*sheer/*big) car
     c. in (sore/desperate) need of

We don’t know what makes modification possible for some PNP s and semi-idiomatic PPs, but the constraints seem similar

5. Conclusion and further questions

Main claim: PNP s are syntactically regular except for the missing article. This property they share with weak nouns, which most frequently appear in semi-idiomatic PPs

There is no insight in treating PNP s as a syntactic class

The hypothesis that the nominal core of PNP s is a weak noun is consistent with the lack of an article (in some PNP s), resistance to modification and number change, non-referentiality and special interpretation

Additional insights might come from PPs without an article (cf. Baldwin et al. 2006)

The special meaning and special syntactic properties need to be encoded in the noun but take into consideration the surrounding context. Similar issues have been tackled in the treatment of idioms by the Distributed Morphology framework (starting with Marantz 1996, who notes that idiomaticity does not change composition)

5.1. Archaic and unpredictable case-marking

Dutch lacks (except on pronouns) both case-marking and the feminine-masculine distinction (the two genders are neuter and common). However, some remnants of both are retained in PNP s and fossilized PPs:

(47) bare NPs

a. te paard
   to horse
   on horseback

b. te raad-e (gaan)
   to advice-E (go.INF)
   to consult

(48) definite NPs

a. te-r aarde
   to-FSG earth
   feminine, no fossilized case marking

on earth
b. te-n hemel
    to-MSG heaven
    masculine, no fossilized case marking
to heaven
(49) a. te-r kerk-e
    to-FSG church-E
    feminine, fossilized case marking
to church
b. te-n kwaad-e
    to-MSG evil-E
    masculine, fossilized case marking
to evil

What is crucial in (48) and (49) is that the special form of the preposition is historically a P-D amalgam (like the French *du* or the German *am*)
The form of the noun is also case, but these could also be fossil words
This non-cliticized article takes these forms also with other prepositions (and the inflection is also found on demonstratives and adjectives in some fixed expressions):

(50) a. aan de-n lijf-e
    on the-MSG body-E
    personally
b. in de-r minn-e (schikken)
    in the-FSG love-E reach an agreement
    to reach an amicable agreement

Given the existence of the mechanism ensuring a special allomorph in some PDN sequences, can the zero article be a special case of its application?

5.2. Against the nominal nature of the lexical core

Russian: n-augmentation of 3rd-person pronouns only happens after prepositions (Yadroff and Franks 2002, Philippova 2018):

(51) a. datʲ ej/*nej
    give.INF her.DAT
to her
b. po nej/*ej
    along her.DAT
(52) a. znatʲ ego/*nego
    know.INF him.DAT
    to know him
b. bez nego/*ego
    without him.DAT

And it also happens with PNPs without an overt P2 (i.e., those where the lexical NP surfaces in the genitive):

(53) a. v ramkax nego/ego
    in framework.PL.LOC it.GEN
    in its framework
Philippova 2018:55
b. vozbuždenie v otношении nego/ego уголовного дела
    initiation in relation he.GEN criminal.GEN case.GEN
    initiation of a criminal case with respect to him

Philippova 2018: in (53) a possessive pronoun is possible as well, but it is not the case that all PN[P]s have all three options
There are no PN[P]s that allow only n-forms
Philippova 2018: n-forms reflect the categorial feature [Prep], variation is due to whether the PNP is analyzed as a morphologically complex P-head or as a syntactic combination of an active P- and N-heads (p. 58).

If PNPs involve a noun, why are n-forms possible? Possible answers:

(i) the genitive-marked lexical NP is actually a PP with a genitive-assigning null P (which may also be subcategorized for by comparatives, also taking n-forms)

(ii) the feature [Prep] is assigned by the outer preposition (P1), and N is not a barrier for this case-assignment (unlike a regular N, but like noun-like cardinals)

In both approaches the weak noun has special syntax, but the specialness is very different.

6. **Appendix: non-diagnostics for constituency**

**Apparent PN coordination:**

(54) a. se mettre du côté et au niveau du genou blessé
   to place at the side and on the level of the wounded knee
   Stosic and Fagard 2019
   
   b. on top and in front of the recycling bin

Alternative analysis: **right-node raising** (Abbott 1976, Bachrach and Katzir 2009, a.o.)

(55)

RNR can be combined with a shared P1:

(56) obéir sous la botte et la fèrule des pauvres
   to obey under the heel and the rod of the poor
   Lauwers 2014a

This also explains cases of coordination of a PNP and a P (Stosic and Fagard 2019):

(57) intervenir [à cause de et malgré] la complexité de la situation
    to intervene because of and despite the complexity of the situation

Coordination of nominal cores does not seem to be possible

The **outer preposition** (P1) **can vary** in function of direction, mode, or polarity:

(58) a. \{en/pa\} dessus de
    \{in/le\} top of/from
    \{in/out\} on top of/over
    
    b. \{in/out\} step with
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This suggests that P₁ is a preposition with its regular properties

NB: The general invariability of outer prepositions is not a counterargument: it is a property of expressions with fixed meaning independently to PNs (cf. in/out of love vs.in/#out of stitches)
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