

August 9, 2007

Handout 4

III. *to*

- Locative PPs can receive a directional reading with any type of motion verb: ¹

- (1) a. They danced under the bridge.
 b. John walked behind the shed.
 c. The snake slid in front of the door.

- Order: always $P_{\text{PATH}} > P_{\text{LOC}} > \text{DP}$

- (2) a. They ran up behind the shed. / *behind the shed up
 b. John walked down under the bridge. / *under the bridge down

- (3) a. She ran up/down the hill.
 b. *She ran the hill up/down.²

- Directional reading not always possible:

- (4) a. Paul ran in the forest.
 b. They danced in the room.
 c. It floated in the basin. } → locational

- (5) a. John ran in the kitchen.
 b. Nora jumped/fell in the pool. } → directional reading possible

- Some googled examples

- (6) a. ‘The SUV rolled in the ditch.’
 b. ‘The bus hit a car, rolled in a ditch having a depth of ≈ 0.8 m’
 c. As I rolled in the ditch my own bike ran over me.
 d. ‘He was our child from the moment we walked in that room ...’
 e. ‘I walked in my room and noticed my rat was laying in its cage having trouble breathing.’

- *into*

- (7) **Standard analysis:** $to > in \rightarrow in\ to [t_{in} \dots]$ (Jackendoff, Koopman, and all others)

- (8) a. $[V_{\text{DIR}} [P_{\text{LOC}} [Mod_{\text{PLACE}} \textit{in } t_i] AT t_{Mod_{\text{PLACE}}}] \textit{to} [_{\text{KP}} \textit{the pool}_i t_{P_{\text{LOC}}}]]$
 b. $[V_{\text{DIR}} [P_{\text{LOC}} [Mod_{\text{PLACE}} \textit{in } t_i] AT t_{Mod_{\text{PLACE}}}] \textit{GO} [_{\text{PathP}} \textit{to} [_{\text{KP}} \textit{the pool}_i t_{P_{\text{LOC}}}]]]]$

- if *to* = Path why does *to* not have an intransitive use³, while *in* does?

¹ See den Dikken 2003, Folli 2002, Folli & Ramchand 2001, Higginbotham 2000, Inagaki 2002, Son 2007, Tungseth 2007, amongst others for related work in this area.

² Not to be confounded with variable order particle constructions, such as *throw the ball down/throw down the ball*, where the adpositional element ($Mod_{\text{PATH}}/Path$) is used intransitively (‘the ball’ is not its complement, but its external argument).

³ With the exception of the frozen idiomatic expression *He came to*.

- (9) a. She fell in (the pool).
 b. She looked down/up.
 c. She ran to *(the tree).

- Possible hypothesis: *to* obligatorily selects complement, while *in* does not.
 But ...

- (10) a. *She jumped/ran into.
 b. *It fell into.

- *Observation*: *in* is only compatible with implicit objects when used directionally (not locationally)

- (11) a. He jumped in (the pool).
 b. He is in *(the house/the pool/the kitchen/...)⁴

- *Observation*: *in* is only compatible with implicit objects when used directionally (not locationally)

German

- (12) a. Er lief rein.
 he ran R-in
 b. *Er lief in.

- **Hypothesis**: a) E has two adpositions *in*: in_{PLACE} (corresponding to G *in*)
 in_{PATH} (corresponding to G *ein*)

b) *to* (= *zu*) $\rightarrow P_{LOC}$

- in_{PATH} and in_{PLACE} can co-occur in German, but not in English.

- (13) Sie rannte **in** das Haus **rein**.
 she ran in_{PLACE} the_{ACC} house r- in_{PATH} .

- (14) *She ran in_{PATH} in_{PLACE} house.⁵

Advantages

- complement domain of *put*

- (15) a. She put the boxes at the tree.
 b. *She put the boxes to the tree.

- (16) a. She put them down/up/in.
 b. She put the book into the box the wardrobe.

- *in/on* only Ps that can precede *to*:

⁴ Again, there is an exception as in *The doctor is in*.

⁵ Perhaps for OCP related reasons. See Golston 1995 (cited in Nunes 2004), and Boškovič 2002 on Romanian *ce ce

- (17) a. *under to, *over to, *behind to, ... → *under, behind, ...* cannot lexicalise Path
 b. *atto → both are P_{LOC} → complementary distribution

- ‘up into’ does not mean ‘up to in’

- (18) a. ??The small animal crawled up to under the bed and then it died.
 b. ??You must run up to behind the shed and come back.
 c. ??She hopped up to inside the room on one leg.

→ (19) is impossible under a parallel interpretation:

- (19) a. She ran up into the room.
 b. It crawled up onto the table.

Question: how do *in*_{PLACE} and *on*_{PLACE} differ from *behind, under*?

- (20) a. She danced under the bridge. } → ambiguous
 b. The snail slid behind the box. }

- (21) a. They danced in the room. } → locational only
 c. The snail slid on the table. }

- (22) **Speculation:** E *to/TO* cannot co-occur with Mod_{PLACE} *in* and *on* (i.e. overt Mod_{PLACE} *in/on* only occur in locational PPs, where P_{LOC} is *AT*)

→ pronounced *in* and *on* in directional PPs (where P_{LOC} = *to/TO*) are **always** Path adpositions.

→ V_{DIR} *GO* in (21) is not licensed properly, as there is no pronounced P_{LOC}P moving to its specifier cf. situation in Romance!

ITALIAN VERSUS ENGLISH

- (23) a. *She ran in the forest.
 b. The bottle floated under the bridge.
 c. The child ran behind the shed.

Folli (2002):

- English does not permit telic pair formation (telic creation).
- English derives telic events through telic adjunction of accomplishment PPs
- *in* is unambiguously locative. *under, behind, etc.* are both locative and dynamic

Folli & Ramchand 2001:

- Certain verbs in Italian (*correre* ‘run’, *rotolare* ‘roll’, *saltare* ‘jump’, optionally select R(esult)P (“RP augmentation”), thus enabling directional reading in (++)
- English motion verbs do not participate in R(esult)P augmentation (all verbs are [-R])
- Only dynamic Ps (Ps projecting RP (*to/TO*)) permit directional readings

Problems: examples (5), (6) → overlapping class of verbs in E license dir. reading with *in* and *on*.⁶

- (24) She ran in the room.

Challenge: What makes ‘the room/house/kitchen’ different from e.g. ‘the forest’?

⁶ See also Tungseth 2006.

- (25) a. She ran [_{PDIRP} GO [_{ModPATHP} in [_{PathP} PATH [_{PLOCP} TO the kitchen]]]]
 b. *She ran [_{PDIRP} GO [_{ModPATHP} in [_{PathP} PATH [_{PLOCP} TO the forest]]]]

Conjecture: the impossibility of a directional reading in (43a) correlates to the implied “Location” in particles construction (e.g. room, house, ... , but not e.g. forest, wood, park,)

- (26) a. She ran in.
 b. He jumped in.
 c. It rolled in.

- (27) Sie lief rein.

McIntyre 2001: - ‘double particles’ (i.e. $R_{PATH}.PATH$) are interpreted as implying a referential token location (*Landmark Referentiality Generalisation*).
 - bare particles have a generic, non-specific interpretation.

- (28) a. Sie warf den Brief **ein**.
 she threw the letter in ‘He posted the letter.’
 b. Sie setzte den roten Hut **auf**.
 she put the red hat on
 c. Sie sind **ausgegangen**.
 ‘They went out.’ (social reading)
- (29) a. Sie warf den Brief **rein**.
 she threw the letter R-in
 ‘She threw the letter in’ (in some container, not in the sense of posted)
 b. Sie setzte den roten Hut **rauf**.
 she put the red hat R-on
 ‘She puts the red hat on something’ (not in the sense of wearing it)
 c. Sie sind **raus** gegangen.
 they is R-out gone
 ‘They went outside.’ (non-social reading)

Deriving the generalisation (Noonan 2005): R_{PATH} attracts R_{PLACE} to its specifier (R_{PATH} “inherits” specific spatial interpretation)

- (30) a. Ich bin im Zimmer drin.
 I am in the room DR-in
 b. Sie ist im Wald (??drin).
 she is in the woods (??dr-in)
 ‘*She is inside the woods.’
 b. Sie ist im Park (*?drin).
 c. Sie ist in Paris (*?drin).

- English particles don’t mark the difference overtly (R_{PLACE}/R_{PATH} are abstract), but are also to be analysed as bare or as complex particles.

BARE PARTICLES

- (31) a. The news slowly sank **in**.
 b. I'll tuck you **in**.
 c. She put a red hat **on**.
 d. I want to put a record **on**.
 e. He went **under**.
 f. We went **out** last night.
- } * in/on/under/out from **where**?

R-particles:

- (32) a. She jumped R-**in**. → in where?
 b. He let the cat R-**out**. → out from where?
 c. The insect crawled R-**up**. → up where?
 d. She went R-**out**, banging the door. → out from where?

Folli's example (23a): if 'in_{path}' is analogous to the intransitive 'R-in_{path}', → ground argument (possessor of Place) must refer to a container-like location (i.e not forest/wood/park ...)

Generalisation:

- in TO* possible iff
- i) R_{PLACE} is "[+def]"
 - ii) V_{DIR} (*GO*) is licensed by an appropriate verb (e.g. *run, jump, roll*)

Sketch of an analysis

- silent P_{LOC} (*TO*) head requires to be licensed (normally pronounced Mod_{PLACE} in its spec)
- if this fails, it must be licensed by Mod_{PATH}:
 - R_{PLACE}P pied-pipes P_{LOC}P to SpecR_{PATH}P;
 - condition for this: P_{LOC} contains '[+def]'-R_{PLACE}.
 - Mod_{PATH} cannot be stranded in English, it is also pied-piped to SpecR_{PATH}

- (33) [V_{DIR} *GO* [R_{PLACE}P [Mod_{PATH}P **in** [PathP PATH [P_{LOC}P *TO* [R_{PLACE}P *DR* [PlaceP PLACE DP]]]] R t_{Mod_{PATH}P}]
- } _____ }

Additional observation : P-stranding makes directional reading with *in/on* impossible or very hard :

- (34) a. She was late but she ran in the room at 3pm.
 b. *?What room did she run in at 3pm?
 c. *?That's the room she ran in at 3pm.

References

- Abraham, W. 2003. The Myth Of Doubly Governing Prepositions In German. In: E. Shay & U. Seibert (eds) *Motion, Direction and Location in Languages*. In honour of Zygmunt Frajzyngier. Amsterdam, Philadelphia: John Benjamins. (Typological Studies in Language 56), 19-38.
- Bobaljik, J. 2002. A-chains at the PF-interface: Copies and covert movement. *NLLT* 20,197-267.
- Boškovič, Z. 2002. On Multiple Wh-fronting. *LI* 33: 351–383.
- Boškovič, Z. 2004. Be Careful Where You Float Your Quantifiers. *NLLT* 22.3: 681–742.
- Botwinik-Rotem, I. 2004. *The Category P: Features projections, interpretation*. Ph.D. dissertation, Tel Aviv U.
- Botwinik-Rotem, I., & A. Terzi, 2006. The left and right edges of locative Ps. Talk presented at *Edges in Syntax*, Nicosia, Cyprus.
- Cinque, G. 1999. *Adverbs and Functional Heads*. New York, Oxford University Press.
- Den Dikken, M. 2003. On the syntax of locative and directional adpositional phrases. Ms. CUNY.
- Folli, R. 2002. *Constructing telicity in English and Italian*. Ph.D. dissertation, University of Oxford.
- Folli, R., & G. Ramchand. 2001. Getting results: motion constructions in Italian and Scottish Gaelic. In Megerdumian K. & Bar-el L.A. (eds) *Proceedings of WCCFL 20*. Somerville: Cascadilla Press. 101-114.
- Folli, R., & G. Ramchand. 2001. Prepositions and Results in Italian and English: an analysis from event decomposition. Ms. University of Tromsø/ University of Ulster
- Golston, C. 1995. Syntax outranks Phonology: Evidence from Ancient Greek. *Phonology* 12, 343-368.
- Higginbotham J. 2000. Accomplishments. *Proceedings of Glow in Asia II*. Nagoya: Nanzan University.
- Huybregts, M.A.C. & Riemsdijk, H.C. van. 2001. Location and Locality. In Oostendorp, M. van & Anagnostopoulou, E. (ed), *Progress in Grammar*. pp. 1-23. Amsterdam: Meertens/KNAW.
- Inagaki, S. 2002. Motion Verbs with Locational/Directional PPs in English and Japanese. *CJL* 47(3/4).
- Jackendoff, R. 1990. *Semantic Structures*, MIT Press. Cambridge, Mass.
- Kayne, R. 2000. *Parameters and Universals*. OUP.
- Kayne, R. 2005. Some notes on comparative syntax, with special reference to English and Fench. In G. Cinque & R. Kayne (eds); *The Oxford Handbook of Comparative Syntax*. OUP.
- Koopman, H. 1997. The structure of Dutch PPs. Ms. UCLA.
- McIntyre, A. 2001. *German Double Particles As Preverbs*. Tübingen: Stauffenburg.
- Noonan, M. (in revision). Spotlight on spatial PPs: evidence from German shadows. Ms. McGill U.
- Noonan, M. (to appear). *À to zu*. In G. Cinque & L. Rizzi (eds) *The Cartography of PPs*. OUP.
- Noonan, M. 2005b. R-particles. Paper presented at *GLOW*, Geneva.
- Noonan, M. 2007. Little big *da*. Paper presented at *GURT*.
- Nunes, J. 2004. *Linearization of Chains and Sideward Movement*. Cambridge: MIT Press.
- Riemsdijk, H. van. 1990. Functional Prepositions. In *Unity in Diversity. Papers presented to Simon C. Dik on his 50th birthday*. H. Pinkster & I. Genée (eds) Foris Publications, Dordrecht.
- Svenonius, P. 2004b. Spatial P in English. Ms. University of Tromsø
- Son, M. 2007. Event composition of directed motion in Korean and English. Paper presented at *GURT*.
- Terzi, A. 2006. The misleading lexical status of Locative Prepositions. Ms. Technological Educational Institute of Patras.
- Tungseth, M. E. 2006. *Verbal Prepositions in Norwegian: Paths, Places and Possession*. Ph.D. dissertation, University of Tromsø.
- Wunderlich, D. 1993. On German *um*: semantic and conceptual aspects. *Linguistics* 31:111-133