

[Published in Studies in Relational Grammar 3, Brian D. Joseph & Paul M. Postal, eds. (1990),

University of Chicago Press, pp 261-276]

**IS RAISING TO PREPOSITIONAL OBJECT A NATURAL
LANGUAGE GRAMMATICAL CONSTRUCTION?***

Brian D. Joseph

The Ohio State University

1. Introduction

McCloskey (1984) argues for the existence of a construction type involving the raising of a nominal out of a subordinate clause to become the object of a preposition in a higher clause. Specifically, he argues that the Modern Irish sentences in (1) show a nominal, C(h)iarán, which is semantically associated with the lower clause, here as a subject (hereafter 1), but which is superficially the object of the prepositions le 'with' or do 'to, for':

(1) a. Thiocfadh le Ciarán teach a cheannach

 come/CONDIT with house buy/NONFINITE

 'Ciaran could buy a house'

 b. Thiocfadh do Chiarán teach a cheannach

 come/CONDIT to house buy/NONFINITE

 'Ciaran could buy a

house'.

McCloskey posits a rule of Raising to Prepositional Object to account for this pattern. This raising rule occurs only with these two prepositions, although other intransitive main clause predicates besides thiocfadh are found in this construction.

McCloskey claims that this rule is a previously unrecognized type of raising,¹ and thus extends the range of raising rules which must be tolerated in Universal Grammar. Such a construction type would present some potential problems for Relational Grammar (RG) and Arc Pair Grammar (APG).² Specifically, if McCloskey's account is correct, this Irish Raising construction provides a counterexample to one of the laws governing raisings (ascensions in RG/APG terms) in these theories,³ the Relational Succession Law (Perlmutter and Postal 1983a), given quite informally in (2):

(2) An ascende (= raised nominal) takes on the grammatical relation of its host (= the element out of which it is raised).

The Relational Succession Law is violated because the clausal host out of which the raising occurs is a nonoblique subordinate clause;⁴ yet, the raised nominal takes on an oblique status as object of le or do.

Postal (1986) has, however, formulated an RG/APG response to this problem, arguing that the Irish raising is not anomalous but rather is a quite well-behaved type of ascension. Following the suggestion in Perlmutter and Postal (1983a: 68-70), he assumes that the matrix predicates in this Irish sentence-type (as for all intransitive raising predicates universally) determine an unaccusative initial stratum, i.e. with the clausal complement to these predicates being an initial direct object (2). The raising sentences are then taken to involve Raising to 2 combined with demotion of the resulting 2 to Indirect Object (3) status, with le and do being (regular) prepositional markings for this 3. This analysis avoids the problem for the Relational Succession Law noted above and finds some support in the fact that le and do mark uncontroversial 3's elsewhere in Irish. Thus, in Postal's account, this Irish construction involves "raising to prepositional object" only in terms of the superficial form taken by the construction, but, crucially, not in terms of the "target" of the raising; the actual raising in this case is a familiar type, namely, out of a clausal 2 host to 2 status.

But even if it does not require an addition to the typology of possible raising rules, the existence of this construction-type does seem to extend the range of superficial structures that Raising constructions can yield. This is true whether it is a newly discovered type of raising, as McCloskey suggests, or, as in Postal's analysis, merely a hitherto undocumented combination of Raising and Demotion.

Given this conclusion, further facts need to be considered with respect to the possible existence of Raising to Prepositional Object constructions. Although largely overlooked up to now (but see Postal 1986), another instance of a language apparently attesting such a construction, namely Modern Greek, was reported prior to McCloskey's article in Joseph 1979. The Greek construction in question involves a circumstantial adjunct introduced by an element me, ostensibly the preposition meaning 'with'. The particulars of the circumstantial

construction and its analysis are discussed in sections 3 and 4, respectively. In order for the relevance of this construction to the issue of Raising to Prepositional Object constructions to be evident, some facts about Modern Greek prepositions are first presented.

2. Modern Greek Prepositions

Modern Greek has four uninflected prepositional elements that mark a variety of nonnuclear term grammatical relations.⁵ With their usual English glosses, these are: s(e) 'to; in; at; on', ja 'for', apó 'from; by', and me 'with'.⁶

These prepositions mark such grammatical relations as locative, benefactive, 1-chômeur, indirect object (3), comitative, and others, as shown by (3) and (4):

- (3) a. *íme s tin kríti* (LOCATIVE)
am/1SG in the-Crete/ACC
'I am in Crete'
- b. *páme s tin kríti* (DIRECTIONAL)
go/1PL to the-Crete/ACC
'We are going to Crete'
- c. *to éstila s ti rúla* (INDIRECT OBJECT)
it/OBJ.MRKR sent/1SG to the-Roula/ACC
'I sent it to Roula'
- d. *íme após tin kríti* (ABLATIVE)
am/1SG from the-Crete/ACC
'I am from Crete'
- e. *líθike após ti rúla* (1-CHOMEUR)
solved/3SG.PASS by the-Roula/ACC
'It was solved by Roula'
- f. *to épsisa ja ti rúla* (BENEFACTIVE)

it/OBJ.MRKR roasted/1SG for the-Roula/ACC

'I roasted it for Roula'.

Of particular importance here is the range of relations marked by me; these include comitative, measure, instrumental, and circumstantial:

(4) a. páme me ti rúla (COMITATIVE)

go/1PL with the-Roula/ACC

'We are going with Roula'

b. puló portokália me to kiló (MEASURE)

sell/1SG oranges/ACC with the-kilo/ACC

'I sell oranges by the kilo'

c. ékopsa to psomí me to maxéri (INSTRUMENT)

cut/1SG the-bread/ACC with the-knife/ACC

'I cut the bread with the knife'

d. me tóso θórivo, ðen borúsa na ðulépso

(CIRCUMSTANTIAL)

with such-noise/ACC NEG could/1SG SUBJUNC work/1SG

'With so much noise, I could not work'

e. me ton jáni ekí, anisíxisa (CIRCUMSTANTIAL)

with the-John/ACC there was-uneasy/1SG

'With John there, I was uneasy'.

The case-marking associated with the nominal complements to these four prepositions--with a few well-defined exceptions for s(e), ja, and apó, but none for me--is uniformly accusative, regardless of the grammatical relation that the preposition marks.⁷ Thus, any case other than accusative on the prepositional complement in any of the sentences in (3) and (4) yields an ungrammatical structure:⁸

(5) a. *íme s tis krítis / i kríti

- the-Crete/GEN the-Crete/NOM
- b. *páme s tis krítis / i kríti
the-Crete/GEN the-Crete/NOM
- c. *to éstila s tis rúlas / i rúla
the-Roula/GEN the-Roula/NOM
- d. *íme após tis krítis / i kríti
the-Crete/GEN the-Crete/NOM
- e. *líθike após tis rúlas / i rúla
the-Roula/GEN the-Roula/NOM
- f. *to épsisa ja tis rúlas / i rúla
the-Roula/GEN the-Roula/NOM
- g. *páme me tis rúlas / i rúla
the-Roula/GEN the-Roula/NOM
- h. *puló portokália me tu kilú
the-kilo/GEN
- i. *ékopsa to psomí me tu maxerjú
the-knife/GEN
- j. *me tósu θorívu / tosos θórivos, ðen borúsa na ðulépso
such-noise/GEN such-noise/NOM
- k. *me tu jáni / o jánis ekí, anisíxisa
the-John/GEN the-John/NOM.

The preposition plus nominal complement combination forms a constituent which does not allow elements such as adverbs to intervene between its main components; thus, all examples like (6) are ungrammatical:

- (6) a. *páme me pánda ton jáni
go/1PL with always the-John/ACC
'We always go with John'

b. *to éstila se γrýora ti rúla

it/ACC sent/1SG to quickly the-Roula/ACC

'I sent it quickly to Roula'.

One final relevant fact about these prepositions is that their nominal complements can be full clauses with fully inflected subjunctive mood verbs⁹ nominalized with the neuter definite article:

(7) a. o jánis ítan polí γnostós ja to na borési

the-John/NOM was/3SG very known/NOM for the/NTR SUBJUNC

can/3SG

na milái ta vaskiká

SUBJUNC speak/3SG the-Basque/ACC

'John was well-known for his being able to speak Basque'

(literally: "...for the (fact that) he can that he speak the Basque")

b. ðen íðele típote álo apó to na pái

NEG wanted/3SG nothing other/NTR than the/NTR SUBJUNC goes/3SG

'He wanted nothing other than going / than to go'

(literally: "...other than the (fact that) he goes").

This possibility of having a clausal complement to these prepositions, coupled with the fact that me can mark circumstantials, allows clausal circumstantials such as (8) to occur:

(8) me to na kalípti i máska to prósopo,

with the/NTR.SG SUBJUNC cover/3SG the-mask/NOM the-face/ACC

anasénete fisiká

breathe/IMPV.PL naturally

'With the mask covering your face, breathe naturally'

(literally "With the (fact) that the mask is covering your face, breathe naturally").

3. The Greek Circumstantial Raising Construction

The Greek construction relevant to the status of raising to prepositional object appears to be a variant of circumstantial cases such as (8), in which there is a clausal complement to me. This variant is illustrated in (9):

(9) me ti máscara na kalípti to prósopo, anasénete
fisiká
with the-mask/ACC SUBJUNC cover/3SG the-face/ACC breathe/IMPV.PL
naturally

'With the mask covering your face, breathe naturally'.

The subordinate structure in (9) consists of me, followed by an accusative case-marked nominal, hereafter the "pivot (nominal)", and a clausal complement with a fully inflected verb, introduced by the subjunctive marker na.

There is every reason to believe that me in (9) is the preposition me. First, as (4d) and (4e) above indicate, prepositional me, i.e. me serving only as a marker of the grammatical relation borne by a nominal, can have a circumstantial function. Second, as shown by (8), circumstantial me can take a clausal object nominalized with the neuter definite article to. Third, as indicated in (4) and (5) above, accusative case-marking on the pivot nominal in (9) is the expected case for the object of prepositional me; neither nominative nor genitive can occur on the pivot in (9), parallel to the nonoccurrence of these cases with prepositional me:

(10) me ti máscara / *me i máscara / *me tis máskas na
kalípti to ...

with the-mask/ACC with the-mask/NOM with the-mask/GEN

'With the mask covering'

Finally, as shown in (11), nothing may intervene between me and the pivot nominal, again a known feature of Greek prepositions and their nominal complements (cf. (6)):

(11) *me olótela ti máscara na kalípti ...

entirely/ADVB

'With the mask entirely covering'

The conclusion to be drawn, therefore, is that sentence (9) contains the preposition me.

Examination of the status of the pivot nominal reveals, however, that it best taken to be an initial 1 of the complement clause in this construction, and thus to have ascended out of the complement clause to take on complement status with respect to me. Several facts support this analysis.

First, the construction in (9), hereafter the "raising pattern", is systematically related to a synonymous one, seen in (8) above, in which there is a full clausal object of circumstantial me, nominalized by the occurrence of the neuter accusative definite article to. The syntactic alternation between the patterns of (8) and (9) constitutes part of the evidence for an analysis of (9) as involving the raising of the 1 of the clausal complement of me to be itself the complement of me. For with no raising rule, an otherwise unmotivated additional subcategorization for me becomes necessary.

Moreover, there is other support for a Raising analysis of the Greek construction. First, the pivot is always interpreted as coreferent with the clausal complement 1, and examples such as (12), with a complement 1 different from the pivot, are ungrammatical:

- (12) *me ti maría na ton filún ta peðjá
with the-Mary/ACC SUBJUNC him/OBJ.MRKR kiss/3PL the-children/NOM
ton jáni,
the-John/ACC
'*With Mary the children kissing John ...'.

Such facts are expected under a Raising analysis, in fact are a consequence of it, since ex hypothesi, only a complement clause 1 can occur as the pivot.

Also, as expected in Raising constructions, there is no logico-semantic connection between the pivot and the raising trigger me. This fact is manifest in two ways.

First, a nonreferential nominal such as the 1 of a sentential idiom can occur as the pivot. One such Modern Greek idiom is given in (13):

- (13) o kómbos ftáni s to xténi
the-knot/NOM reaches/3SG to the-comb/ACC

'Things reach a head' (literally: "The knot reaches the comb").

This expression occurs in the Raising pattern under consideration here, with kómbo- as the pivot and the idiomatic sense preserved:

- (14) me ton kómbo na ftáni s to xténi étsi,
with the-knot/ACC SUBJUNC reach/3SG to the-comb thus
i lísi faneronótan
the-solution/NOM manifested/3SG

'With things coming to a head in this way, the solution was becoming evident'.

(Literally: "With the knot thus reaching to the comb, ...").

Second, Raising pattern sentences with different pivot nominals but having corresponding active and passive embedded clauses are synonymous, as expected under a Raising analysis, in which there is no thematic link between the pivot nominal and the raising trigger me. For example, (15a) and (15b) each describe the same event:

- (15) a. me tin maría na filái ton jáni, telíose to éryo
with the-Mary/ACC SUBJUNC kiss/3SG the-John/ACC ended/3SG the-play/NOM

'With Mary kissing John, the play ended'

- = b. me ton jáni na filjéte após tin maría,
with the-John/ACC SUBJUNC is-kissed/3SG.PASS by the-Mary/ACC
telíose to éryo
ended/3SG the-play/NOM

'With John being kissed by Mary, the play ended'.

Given then that a raising analysis for the pivot in construction (9) is indicated by these facts and given, further, that me in (9) is the prepositional element me seen in section 2, one may conclude that this Greek construction is an apparent case of raising to prepositional object.¹⁰

Thus, whatever the status of McCloskey's account of apparent Raising to Prepositional Object in Irish, the Greek construction must be taken into consideration in any determination of the status of Raising to Prepositional Object in universal grammar. Even if, as seems to be the case, the Irish construction can be accommodated in an APG framework, the question arises as to whether the Greek facts are as easily dealt with. Postal (1986: 333fn. 1, 354fn. 15) recognizes the potential problem, and in effect challenges someone to provide an adequate APG account of the apparent Greek Raising to Prepositional Object (p. 354fn. 15):

A good deal of the force of the argument [for Irish Raising not being anomalous/BDJ] depends, however, on providing a similar analysis of the Modern Greek case [Joseph 1979/BDJ] mentioned in footnote 1. Unless some way can be found to reduce the apparent raising of 1s to object of a preposition in Greek to more widely documented phenomena, there is little reason to reject the idea that Irish might manifest such raising.

A reexamination of the Greek construction thus seems to be in order; accordingly, in section 4, an APG account of the Greek facts is presented.

4. Greek Circumstantial Raising in Arc-Pair Grammar

There seem to be two main contenders for an APG analysis of the sentence-type illustrated in (9) above. Ultimately, a decision can be made between the two, though each has some consequences for the theory.

Under standard assumptions about how prepositional "flags" marking grammatical relations are to be represented (see Johnson and Postal (1980: Chapter 13)), the preposition

me marking the circumstantial relation borne by the complement clause would not appear in initial syntactic structure. The raising in question could then be out of a circumstantial clause, and the raised nominal could be said to take on the circumstantial relation, and hence ultimately be marked with me. A representation of the raising involved in (9) would thus be (16):

(16)			80
			CIRC
		CIRC	
			90
	1	2	P
	máska	prósopo	kalípt-
	'mask'	'face'	'cover'.

This view of the construction presents no problems with regard to the Relational Succession Law of the sort presented by the Irish case, for the raising is out of a circumstantial host and the raised nominal has circumstantial status in the higher constituent. The principle for circumstantial marking would then be informally:

(17) Circumstantials are marked with me + ACC

where ACC is the morphological feature [+accusative case] that is realized on the nominal to which me attaches.

Without raising, rule (17) would yield a structure such as that in (8), with me as the circumstantial "flag", and the clause-nominalizer to--the neuter definite article--serving as the bearer of accusative case, since the clause as a whole bears the circumstantial relation within the matrix. With raising, (17) would yield (9), with the pivot in the accusative case and marked by the preposition me. All that needs to be assumed here is that raising is possible out of hosts bearing an oblique relation, such as circumstantial. This assumption, as pointed

out in Joseph (1979),¹¹ constitutes a violation of the Host Limitation Law of Perlmutter and Postal (1983a: 53), given informally in (18):

(18) An ascension host only bears term relations (1, 2, or 3).¹²

However, little seems to depend crucially on the Host Limitation Law, for it seems basically to be a generalization over a limited number of attested ascension types.¹³ With no Host Limitation Law, raisings to obliques such as circumstantial would be an expected construction type, for any universal restrictions on ascension hosts would not discriminate among grammatical relations. The raising-to-prepositional-object effect would result from the flagging of certain obliques--in this Greek case, circumstantial--by prepositions.

This analysis, then, gives a coherent, if not very insightful, account of the facts in an APG framework. Thus it perhaps does not provide what Postal calls for (see above), in that it does not fully reduce the Greek facts "to more widely documented phenomena".

But, another APG account can be constructed, which happens also to allow the Host Limitation Law to be maintained in its present form. Instead of treating me solely as a marker of the circumstantial relation, one can note that cross-linguistically there are prepositions and preposition-like elements that clearly originate--certainly diachronically but arguably synchronically as well--from verbs: consider English given, concerning, regarding, or the Chinese element ba, variously called "preposition", "object marker", or "coverb", and deriving from a verb meaning 'grasp; hold'. If further one then notes that there is a mismatch between the wide range of prepositional meanings in natural language and the relatively small number of grammatical relations, then it can be hypothesized that at least some prepositions ought to be taken to be predicates or at least predicate-like in initial structure. Such a proposal has already been made in effect by Becker and Arms (1969), who suggest that "verbs and prepositions may be surface realizations of the same abstract semantic categories" (p. 1). Circumstantial uses of Modern Greek me, therefore, can be analyzed as a predicate, especially natural when one considers that me always triggers accusative case on its nominal complement, the same case determined by verbs--indisputable predicates--on their nominal

2s.¹⁴ This hypothesis, though different from the flagging structures given in Johnson and Postal (1980), would lead, as far as Greek me is concerned, to (19) as the initial structure of the circumstantial raising construction:

(19)

CIRC

80

P 2

me 90

1 2 P

máska prósopo kalípt-.

The grammatical relation of the clausal complement in (19) is given as 2. Since the complement of me is always accusative, the case of final 2s of verbs, it would seem reasonable to assume that it is an object, specifically a 2. The prepositional predicate then could be said to govern an unaccusative initial structure, just as all intransitive Raising predicates in general do, under Postal's analysis.

One might entertain another analysis in which the matrix 1 is the 1 of me (ultimately suppressed by some EQUI-like rule). Then, the initial structure of the Greek Raising constructions would not have me as an unaccusative predicate but rather as an ordinary transitive one. The semantics of the modification provided by these circumstantial clauses, however, argues against such a hypothesis; the me-clause does not modify the matrix 1 per se, as might be expected under this "EQUI analysis", but rather provides modification for the entire proposition expressed by the matrix. For instance, in (20):

(20) me ton jáni na stékete ekí ðen borí

with the-John/ACC SUBJUNC stands/3SG there NEG can/3SG

na ðulévi i maría

SUBJUNC work/3SG the-Mary/NOM

'With John standing there, Mary can't work'

the me-clause says something about the circumstances of the whole proposition of Mary's working, not just about maría alone. Moreover, the circumstantial me-clause can occur as an adjunct to sentences with inanimate and nonagentive 1s that are difficult to construe realistically as a possible 1 of me; one such example is (21):

(21) me ton íljo na xromatízi ólo ton uranó, árxise i méra

with the-sun/ACC SUBJUNC color/3SG all-the-sky/ACC began/3SG the-day/NOM

'With the sun coloring the sky, the day began'.

Thus it seems that me is an intransitive, and more specifically an unaccusative, predicate.

The raising to prepositional object exhibited by Greek would then essentially be ordinary raising out of an unaccusative 2 as host; the raised nominal becomes a 2 of the predicate triggering the raising, in accordance with the Relational Succession Law, as in the previous version of an APG account and as in Postal's account of Irish raising. Such a raising structure would be represented as in (23), where coordinates for stratal levels are indicated only where necessary.

(23)

CIRC

80

CHO c₂

P 2 c₁

2 c₂

me

90

1 c₁ 2 P

máska prósopo kalípt-.

This analysis has the benefit of generalizing the Greek "raising to prepositional object" to other types of ascensions recognized in APG. In particular, all intransitive ascensions can now be said to occur out of unaccusative structures, not only the ascensions discussed in Postal (1986) but the otherwise anomalous Greek ascension as well.¹⁵ The first APG analysis given above permitted no such generalization over attested raising patterns. In addition, the Host Limitation Law can be maintained, for the raising host here is a 2.

Needed in this account, however, is a mechanism by which the predicate me ends up as a preposition, in order to account for the similarities noted above between the me involved in the circumstantial raising construction and the me marking instrumental, comitative, etc. This is admittedly a difficult step for which there is at present no obvious non-ad hoc treatment. Postal (1985) has proposed that some predicates undergo a demotion to one of several sub-predicate relations, and it may be that one of these relations can be used in motivating the prepositional behavior of predicates such as me; however, such a suggestion remains to be worked out, for me¹⁶ and for any natural language preposition that is to be treated as an initial predicate.¹⁷ The present treatment thus necessarily leaves open the question of whether the pivot nominal is marked accusative by virtue of being a 2 of the predicate me or as a result of being associated with me as a preposition.

5. Conclusion

In APG terms, assuming either that a predicate-to-preposition conversion analysis can be developed or that the Host Limitation Law is given up, the Greek construction has a relatively straightforward account as a nonanomalous type of raising that conforms to the Relational Succession Law. Similar to the Irish case, it would then involve "raising to prepositional object" only insofar as the superficial form taken by the construction is concerned. If such an APG treatment is viable, the Greek facts discussed here are no more troublesome to APG than the Irish raising facts that Postal (1986) discussed, and in APG

terms, a construction raising nominals to prepositional object status per se apparently need not be sanctioned in Universal Grammar.

NOTES

_____ *Earlier versions of this paper were presented at the Second Biennial Conference on Relational Grammar and Grammatical Relations (Columbus, Ohio, May 1986) and the annual meeting of the Linguistic Society of America, (New York, December 1986). I would like to thank the audiences at those presentations, and especially David Perlmutter, for helpful remarks. This paper has further benefitted considerably from discussions with Paul Postal and comments from Guy Carden.

1. McCloskey's Irish example is actually not the first suggestion of a rule of Raising to Prepositional Object. Besides the facts in Joseph (1979) to be taken up again below, Paul Postal reminds me that Emonds (1976: 77) posits a similar rule to relate sentence pairs such as:

- (i) We can depend on it that their paper will expose the crooks.
- (ii) We can depend on their paper to expose the crooks.

Emonds' theoretical framework is, to be sure, significantly different from those discussed by McCloskey, or that assumed in Joseph (1979) for the Greek facts. But Emonds' account clearly involves raising of a complement clause 1 to object of a preposition, at least in superficial structure. In APG terms, on in these sentences can be taken to be determined by the verb depend and not to be present in initial structure. Similarly, in other current theoretical frameworks, one might posit a restructuring rule to make depend-on into a complex verbal unit, so that the raising target would not be a prepositional object.

2. McCloskey points out that this rule forces some revisions in accepted analyses in several current theoretical frameworks. He discusses, for instance, "Montagovian" theories of syntax (including categorial grammar and Generalized Phrase Structure Grammar), Lexical-Functional Grammar, and Government and Binding Theory, and concludes that although some problems are raised by this construction, the necessary revisions to the theories are not so drastic that they cannot accomodate Irish Raising.

3. This construction also seemingly runs counter to the Oblique Law (Perlmutter and Postal 1983b), stated informally in (i):

(i) A nominal that bears an oblique relation in a clause bears that relation in the initial stratum.

However, Postal's reanalysis of Irish Raising as not involving raising to oblique status may render the matter moot. Similar considerations hold for the Greek case examined and reanalyzed below. See Joseph 1982 for some discussion of the Oblique Law, now partly irrelevant given the ultimate conclusion reached here, and see note 11 below.

4. The exact grammatical relation of the host is a matter of some controversy. It could be either a clausal 1, under most treatments of intransitive complement-taking predicates, or a clausal 2, under the hypothesis of Perlmutter and Postal (1983a: 68-70), which is developed in Postal (1986) and is discussed immediately below; note that part of the argumentation of Gonzalez (this volume) concerning inversion in Chilean Spanish depends on this hypothesis.

5. See Perlmutter and Postal (1983b: 86) for a relevant typology of grammatical relations.

6. These prepositions are the so-called "primary simple" prepositions of Householder, Kazazis, and Koutsoudas (1964: 146ff.); Greek has other prepositional elements with different properties, e.g. in terms of the case of nouns they combine with, but these are irrelevant here.

7. Specifically, the exceptions are the apparently elliptical uses of apó and s(e) meaning 'from / at someone's house' (e.g. s tu jáni 'at John's (sc. house)', literally "at the-John's/GEN), the use of apó and ja with expressions of age referring to a nominative case-marked nominal (e.g. apó mikrós 'from (when he was) little', literally "from little/NOM"), and some fixed expressions that are borrowings from the learned archaizing variety of Greek (e.g. apó fisikú tu 'by his nature', literally "by nature/GEN his").

8. The genitive in (c) is possible, but only in the reading 'I sent it to Roula's (house)'; note that in (h) and (i) only the genitive is shown since the relevant nouns are neuter and thus show no difference between accusative and nominative.

9. All Modern Greek complement verbs are inflected for person and number, and can, moreover, be overtly tensed; see Joseph (1978), (1983) for general discussion of this situation.

10. One fact about this construction might be taken in some theoretical frameworks to counterindicate a Raising analysis. Although the verb in the complement clause in this construction (e.g. kalípti in (9)) usually occurs without an overt subject, this situation is the result of the regular Greek suppression of unstressed pronominal 1s; the verb, however, is inflected (see note 9) and so in principle always, but especially under conditions of emphasis or contrast (as with móno 'only'), can occur with an overt 1. Thus one can find instances of the Raising pattern under consideration here with an overt pronominal 1 in the clausal complement, as in (i):

- (i) me ton jáni na stékete móno aftós ekí,
with the-John/ACC SUBJUNC stands/3SG only he/NOM there
ðen boró na ðulévo
NEG can/1SG SUBJUNC work/1SG

'With only John standing there, I can't work' (literally: "With John that only he stands there ...").

Nothing within RG or APG that would rule out a "copying" Raising construction, and the existence of English sentences such as (ii), with an apparent Raising construction and the dummy nominal there (see Rogers (1971: 307-8)):

(ii) There looks like there is going to be a riot
makes it difficult for any theory to rule out categorically the possibility of Copy-Raising. Thus, it would seem best to take (12) through (15) as pointing to a Raising analysis. It is necessary to point out, however, that the copying evident in (i) may only be indirectly linked

with the Raising pattern, and not be part of the Raising per se. For Greek simplex sentences occur--albeit rarely--in which pronominal copying of subject nominals is found clause-internally (e.g. *i maría milúse ki aftí* 'Mary, even she, was speaking', literally: "the-Mary/NOM spoke/3SG even she/NOM"). This fact, by the way, weakens the argument for a Raising analysis provisionally put forth in Joseph (1979: 117) based on the availability of such a pronominal copy of the pivot nominal in the embedded clause in the Raising pattern but not generally in the non-Raising pattern, for now the copying could be taken as being independent of Raising.

11. Like the Irish Raising case if not reanalyzed along the lines of Postal (1986), this analysis also yields a violation of the Oblique Law (see note 3). The revision suggested in Joseph (1982) is appropriate here (i.e., an oblique cannot be the target for a "reevaluation", i.e. of advancement or demotion, but can be for ascension). The second analysis for Greek Raising presented below obviates the need for such a complication.

12. Perlmutter and Postal (1983a: 74fn.20) suggest that the range of potential hosts may be further limited to only nuclear terms, i.e., 1s and 2s.

13. In contrast, the Final 1 Law interacts crucially with the Unaccusative hypothesis and Inversion structures to make predictions about the superficial form of sentences in various languages.

14. I leave it open at this point whether any other Greek prepositions should be included in such a class of predicates.

15. The other type of "raising to oblique" discussed in Joseph (1979: 118) can be treated in much the same way as the raising with me. This pattern is illustrated by (i):

- (i) *i tási tu lastíxu na epanérθi s tin*
the-tension/NOM the-rubber/GEN SUBJUNC return/3SG to the-
arxikí thési tu káni to mikró aeropláno na
ksekinái

original-position/ACC its makes/3SG the-little-airplane/ACC SUBJUNC
moves/3SG

'The tension of the rubber band returning to its original position makes the little
airplane move'

and is the raising counterpart to the nonraising sentence in (ii):

(ii) *i tási tu na epanérθi to lástixo s*
the-tension/NOM the/GEN SUBJUNC return/3SG the-rubber/NOM to
tin arxikí θési tu káni to mikró aeropláno na
ksekinái

the-original-position/ACC its makes/3SG the-little-airplane/ACC SUBJUNC
moves/3SG 'The tension of the rubber band returning to its original position makes
the little airplane
move'.

In (i), the 1 of a clausal complement to the nominal *i tási*--marked with the genitive case
(indicated by the genitive definite article *tu* functioning as a clause nominalizer)--is raised to
be the genitive complement of the head noun *i tási*. Since the regular marking for objects of
nominals is genitive, as

in *i θéa tu jáni* 'the-sight-of-John/GEN' (i.e. 'someone's seeing of John'), it can be assumed
that the

clausal complement in (ii) is a 2. So, here too, there is raising out of a clausal 2 to 2-hood
relative to the head noun, exactly analogous to the proposal for raising to prepositional object
with *me*. In Joseph 1979, these two types were generalized as "Raising to Oblique". This
designation, although descriptively accurate, disguises the similarity between the two in terms
of the initial grammatical relation borne by their ascension host.

16. Moreover, such a step would obviate a potential problem for the treatment of *me*
as a predicate. If a predicate, *me* might be expected to adhere to the Final 1 Law of

Perlmutter and Postal (1983b: 100-101) which requires all basic clauses to have a 1 in the final stratum; this problem would not arise, however, if me underwent demotion to a subpredicate and thus did not determine a final basic clause.

17. One is reminded of the comment in Jackendoff (1973: 345) that "people seem never to have taken prepositions seriously"; there are several important questions about the source of prepositions (e.g. are they flags only or can they be something else), the proper formalization of the notion "prepositional object" (which would have an impact on case-marking rules), etc., which still need to be addressed in APG and other theoretical frameworks.

REFERENCES

- Becker, A. L. and D. G. Arms. 1969. "Prepositions as Predicates", Papers from the Fifth Regional Meeting, Chicago Linguistic Society, April 18-19, 1969. Chicago: Chicago Linguistic Society, pp. 1-11.
- Emonds, Joseph E. 1976. A Transformational Approach to English Syntax. Root, Structure-Preserving, and Local Transformations. New York: Academic Press.
- Gonzalez, Nora. (This volume). "Unusual Inversion in Chilean Spanish".
- Householder, Fred W., Kostas Kazazis, and Andreas Koutsoudas. 1964. Reference Grammar of Literary Dhimotiki. Bloomington: Indiana University / The Hague: Mouton (Publication 31 of the Indiana University Research Center in Anthropology, Folklore, and Linguistics / Part II of International Journal of American Linguistics 30.2).
- Jackendoff, Ray. 1973. "The Base Rules for Prepositional Phrases", in S. Anderson and P. Kiparsky, eds., A Festschrift for Morris Halle. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, Inc., pp. 345-356.
- Johnson, David and Paul M. Postal. 1980. Arc Pair Grammar. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Joseph, Brian D. 1978. Morphology and Universals in Syntactic Change: Evidence from Medieval and Modern Greek. (Harvard University Ph. D. Dissertation.) Bloomington: Indiana University Linguistics Club.
- Joseph, Brian D. 1979. "Raising to Oblique in Modern Greek", Proceedings of the Fifth Meeting of the Berkeley Linguistics Society (BLS 5), pp. 114-128.
- Joseph, Brian D. 1982. "A Note on the Oblique Law" In Grammatical Relations and Relational Grammar, B. Joseph, ed. (Ohio State University Working Papers in Linguistics Vol. 26). Columbus, OH: Department of Linguistics, The Ohio State University, pp. 93-101.

- Joseph, Brian D. 1983. The Synchrony and Diachrony of the Balkan Infinitive. A Study in Areal, General, and Historical Linguistics. (Cambridge Studies in Linguistics, Supplementary Volume 1). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- McCloskey, James. 1984. "Raising, Subcategorization and Selection in Modern Irish", Natural Language and Linguistic Theory 1.441-487.
- Perlmutter, David M. and Paul M. Postal. 1983a. "The Relational Succession Law", in D. Perlmutter, ed., Studies in Relational Grammar 1. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, pp. 30-80.
- Perlmutter, David M. and Paul M. Postal. 1983b. "Some Proposed Laws of Basic Clause Structure", in Perlmutter (1983), pp. 81-128.
- Postal, Paul. 1985. "La dégradation de prédicat et un genre négligé de montée", Recherches Linguistiques (Université Paris VIII - Vincennes) 13.33-68.
- Postal, Paul. 1986. "Why Irish Raising is not Anomalous", Natural Language and Linguistic Theory 4.333-356.
- Rogers, Andrew. 1972. "Another Look at Flip Perception Verbs", Papers from the 8th Regional Meeting, Chicago Linguistic Society, April 14-16, 1972. Chicago: Chicago Linguistic Society, pp. 303-315.