

## Here and There\*

Richard S. Kayne  
New York University

### Part I. Introduction

To what extent can we unify the following two instances of *there*?:

- (1) John lives there.
- (2) John spoke thereof.

I will refer to the *there* of (1) as 'locative' *there*, and to that of (2) as 'non-locative' *there*. (2) is archaic in English, although common in Dutch and German.

Locative *there* forms a natural class with *here* and *where* (similarly for non-locative *there*). Katz and Postal (1964, 133) proposed analyzing *where* as deriving from (*at*) *what place*. My proposal will develop the same kind of idea, although the details will be different.

I will bring into the discussion the nonstandard English construction recently discussed by Bernstein (1997):

- (3)a. this here book, these here books
- b. that there book, them there books

I will refer to the *there* (and *here*) of (3) as 'demonstrative' *there* (and *here*).

I follow Bernstein (p. 97) in taking the examples in (3) not to be (reduced) relatives, i.e. they are not derived from:

- (4)a. this book that/which is here
- b. that book that/which is there

This is supported by a number of considerations.

First, (3) and (4) differ in the following way:

- (5)a. \*that over there book
- b. \*this right here book
- (6)a. that book which/that is over there
- b. this book which/that is right here

Second, the clearest cases of prenominal reduced relatives in English can be preceded by other material:<sup>1</sup>

- (7)a. this other recently arrived letter
- b. these two recently arrived letters
- c. that beautiful recently arrived letter

This contrasts with:

- (8)a. \*this other here book
- b. \*these two here books<sup>2</sup>
- c. \*that beautiful there book

Third, a prenominal reduced relative can be stressed, whereas demonstrative *there* and *here* cannot be:

- (9) ?This RECENTLY ARRIVED letter is more important than that LONG SINCE OUT-OF-DATE one.

- (10) \*This HERE letter is more important than that THERE one.

Fourth, there is the basic fact that demonstrative *there* requires demonstrative *that* (and similarly for demonstrative *here* and *this*):<sup>3</sup>

- (11)a. \*the there book(s)

- b. \*a there book, \*one there book, \*some there books

Relatives are freer:

- (12)a. the book that's (over) there  
b. some books that are (over) there

as are reduced relatives:

- (13)a. the recently arrived letter  
b. some recently arrived letters

Taken together, these four points indicate that demonstrative *here* and *there* are not to be thought of as locatives originating in a reduced relative clause.

In fact, as I will argue in the remainder of this paper, locative and non-locative *there* are both, when looked at from the right perspective, to be considered instances of demonstrative *there*.

## Part II. Locatives

### A. THIS/THAT and PLACE

In the spirit of Katz and Postal (1964, 134), let me begin by noting the close resemblance between locative *here* and *there* and the phrases *this here place* and *that there place*:

- (14)a. It's been here for a long time.  
b. It's been in this here place for a long time.  
(15)a. It's been there for a long time.  
b. It's been in that there place for a long time.

Abstracting away temporarily from the question of the preposition, we have the following:

- (16) Locative *here* and *there* are derived from structures approximating  
*this here place* and *that there place*

More specifically:

(17) Locative *here/there* are parallel to *this here place/that there place*, except that locative *here/there* have an unpronounced counterpart of *place*, and an unpronounced determiner instead of *this/that*.

Put slightly differently, the *here/there* of ordinary locatives is simply demonstrative *here/there* embedded in a larger DP with unpronounced noun and determiner.

Potential indirect support for the postulation of an unpronounced counterpart of *place* comes from sentences like:

- (18) We'll be over at John's tonight.

This feels very much like:

- (19) We'll be over at John's place tonight.

Further indirect support for an unpronounced noun *place* may also be found in:

- (20) John came out from behind the tree.

Postulating an unpronounced *place*, which I will represent as PLACE, might lead to an account of the deviance of:

- (21)a. \*Behind which tree did he just come out from?  
b. \*the tree behind which he just came out from

If (20) is really (abstracting away from the determiner):

- (22) J came out from PLACE behind the tree.

then (21) must correspond to either (23) or (24):

- (23) \*Behind which tree did he just come out from a place?

(24) ??A place behind which tree did he just come out from?  
If abstract PLACE in (22) cannot be pied-piped, then the deviance of (21) reduces to that of (23). Speakers who accept (21)<sup>4</sup> must be able to pied-pipe PLACE in such a way that (21) can have a status more like that of (24).

The *this/that* of *this here place/that there place* can be unpronounced only if *place* is:

(25) here, there

(26) \*here place, \*there place

In addition, the locative interpretation of (25) is not available if the demonstrative is pronounced and *place* unpronounced:

(27) this here, that there

While possible, (27) does not have the interpretation of (25).<sup>5</sup> Furthermore, *this/that* and *place* can be simultaneously unpronounced only if *here/there* is present:

(28) John put the book here/there/\*0.

These considerations lead to the following proposal: Let THIS/THAT be the phonetically unrealized counterpart of *this/that*. Then locative *here* and *there* start out as:

(29) THIS here PLACE; THAT there PLACE

Movement of the phrase containing *here/there* and PLACE yields:

(30) [here PLACE]<sub>i</sub> THIS t<sub>i</sub>; [there PLACE]<sub>i</sub> THAT t<sub>i</sub>

In English this cannot happen with overt *this/that*:

(31) \*here this; \*there that

Afrikaans, on the other hand, does have:<sup>6</sup>

(32) hierdie; daardie

with demonstrative *here/there* followed by the (neutralized) counterpart of *this/that*. (The parameter(s) underlying this English/Afrikaans difference remain(s) to be understood.)

The structure proposed in (30) recalls languages in which demonstratives like *this* and *that* follow the noun (not necessarily immediately) - see Cinque (1996, sect. 4).<sup>7</sup>

Thinking of Koopman and Szabolsci (2000, 23) and related work on (bare) remnant movement, let us assume that the movement shown in (30) yields a well-formed output only if *here/there* is unaccompanied by any other overt material in its phrase; then (33) will, as desired, not be possible (= \*here place THIS, etc.):

(33) \*here place/book; \*there place/book

Alternatively, it may be the case that the movement of 'here/there PLACE' seen in (30) is forced by the presence of unpronounced PLACE. This would exclude a locative interpretation of (27).

The further (plausible) assumption that THIS/THAT require movement of the sort illustrated in (30) will prevent (33) from being generated without movement (\*THIS here place, etc.).

If PLACE must always raise, and if (18) contains PLACE, then (18) is actually:

(34) PLACE<sub>i</sub> John 's t<sub>i</sub>

This raising of PLACE may underlie the impossibility, in certain varieties of English (for example, mine), of:

(35) \*We'll be over at hers/theirs tonight.

(i.e. (35) is impossible for me in the PLACE interpretation available in (18)). It might be that *hers/theirs* (or the pronominal part of it) occupies the (higher) Spec position into which PLACE would have to move.<sup>8</sup>

From this perspective, then, PLACE can either raise by itself, as in (34), or with *here/there*, as in (30).<sup>9</sup> Not possible, on the other hand, is:

(36) [other/beautiful PLACE]<sub>i</sub> THIS t<sub>i</sub>; [other/beautiful PLACE]<sub>i</sub> THAT t<sub>i</sub>  
This suggests that the licensing of THIS/THAT is specifically dependent on *here/there*.  
(Adding *here/there* to (36) would lead to the violation seen in (33).)

B. The adposition requirement.

Locative *here* and *there* are excluded from clearly non-prepositional contexts:

(37) John loves Paris and Bill loves that place, too.

(38) \*John loves Paris and Bill loves there, too.

This pair contrasts with:

(39) John loves it in Paris and Bill loves it in that place, too.

(40) John loves it in Paris and Bill loves it there, too.

Similar to (37)/(38) is:

(41) John considers Paris/that place/\*there wonderful.<sup>10</sup>

Some prepositional contexts are not possible, either:

(42) John is fed up with Paris/that place/\*there.

This suggests:

(43) *here/there*, after raising (with PLACE) past demonstrative  
THIS/THAT, must be licensed by a locative adposition.

(The *with* of (42) is not locative.)

This locative adposition may itself be unpronounced, as in (40).<sup>11</sup> Also:

(44) John went (\*to) there.

That there is an unpronounced adposition in (44) is supported by the presence of an overt one in:

(45) He went to Paris.

(46) ?Where did he go to?

Similarly for:

(47) He stayed (\*at) there.

and:

(48) He stayed (at) home.

(49) ?Where is he staying at?

I have formulated (43) in terms of a requirement on *here/there*, and not as a requirement on PLACE. Relevant is the status of:

(50) We love Bill's.

(51) I don't consider Bill's very comfortable.

(52) We're all fed up with Bill's.

In the PLACE interpretation, these don't seem fully natural, but neither do they seem as bad as (38), (41) and (42) with *there*. Thus, it may be that preposed PLACE is favored by an adposition,<sup>12</sup> but that (43) is nonetheless correct in the form given.

An approach to (38), (41) and (42) in terms of (43) differs somewhat from the one proposed by Larson (1985, 613), whose idea was that *here* and *there* intrinsically have oblique Case and that oblique Case is incompatible with the structural Case that would be assigned in contexts like those of (38), (41) and (42). The problem with this is that Icelandic, as shown by Zaenen, Maling and Thráinsson (1985), does have oblique Case-marked DPs in structural Case positions. I will therefore hold to (43), which takes

the deviance of (38), (41) and (42) to simply reflect the absence of the needed licensing configuration.

### Part III. Non-locative *there*.

Archaic English has sentences like:

(53) He spoke thereof.

These are common in present-day Dutch and German.

If one thinks of *there* as being intrinsically locative, then its appearance in (53) is surprising.

On the other hand, the analysis pursued in Part II took what we call locative *there* to be an instance of demonstrative *there* embedded in a phrase containing the locative noun PLACE. From that perspective, *there* itself need not be taken to be intrinsically locative, in which case its appearance in (53) is less surprising.<sup>13</sup>

The *there* of (53) has in common with the *there* of locatives dependence on an adposition:

(54) \*He mentioned there.

Put another way, (53) corresponds to:

(55) He spoke of it/that.

in a way that (56) cannot correspond to (57):

(56) \*I consider there interesting.

(57) I consider it/that interesting.

This similarity with respect to dependence on an adposition, combined with the identity in form of these two types of *there* (locative and non-locative), leads to:

(58) Non-locative *there* is an instance of demonstrative *there*.<sup>14</sup>

Generalizing from the earlier analysis of locative *there* as 'THAT there PLACE' (plus movement), it is natural to take (53) to contain a non-locative *there* that corresponds to:<sup>15</sup>

(59) THAT there THING

Just as 'there PLACE' raises past the (unpronounced) demonstrative determiner THAT in the locative cases, as in (30), so does (phonetically unrealized) THING raise past THAT in the non-locative cases (and similarly for Dutch and German):

(60) [there THING]<sub>i</sub> THAT t<sub>i</sub>

In other words, *here* and *there* are always demonstrative *here* and *there*, in (53) as well as in the more familiar locatives.

As in the earlier discussion of locative *there*, the movement shown in (60) will yield a well-formed output only if *here/there* is unaccompanied by any other overt material in its phrase:

(61) \*there thing; \*here thing

However, unlike the case of locatives (see (27)), non-movement in (59) (with an overt determiner) may be a possibility, if 'that there THING' underlies:

(62) that there; this here

Similarly, with *there* absent, for 'that THING':

(63) that; this

Recall now (43), repeated here:

(64) *here/there*, after raising (with PLACE) past demonstrative  
THIS/THAT, must be licensed by a locative adposition.

At first glance, it looks as if non-locative *there* and *here* (with THING rather than PLACE) differ in that they do not require that the licensing adposition be locative (given (53) and other examples with non-locative adpositions).

I would like to suggest, however, that even non-locative *here/there* require licensing by a locative adposition. Relevant considerations come to the fore if we ask the question: Why does English have locative *there* (i.e. 'THAT there PLACE'), but no longer have non-locative *there* (i.e. 'THAT there THING'), even with an adposition?

Of importance is the fact that within the Germanic languages the only ones that productively have non-locative *there* are Germanic languages of the OV type, i.e. Scandinavian seems to be like English.<sup>16</sup>

This raises the possibility, taking (53) to be an (obvious) instance of a postpositional PP, that (53) is excluded in present-day English and Scandinavian parallel to the rather general absence of postpositional languages where the normal order of verb and postpositional phrase would be 'V PP' (i.e. 'V DP P').<sup>17</sup>

Since 'V PP' order is of course a perfectly common normal order where PP is prepositional, the next question is why non-locative *there* never occurs in (archaic) English with prepositions (and similarly for Dutch and German, both of which have many prepositions):

(65) \*He spoke of there.

I think the answer to this takes us back to (64).

Before returning to (64), however, let me pursue a brief digression. As far as I know (65) is perfectly representative for non-locative *there*, i.e. the generalization that non-locative *there* (and similarly for non-locative *here* and *where*) is never the object of a preposition is exceptionless in all of Germanic.<sup>18</sup>

On the other hand, locative *there* and *here* (and *where*) are sometimes found following a preposition. The facts are complex, since there is a contrast between (66), which at first glance looks like (65), and (67):

(66)a. \*I'm going to there tomorrow.

b. \*They plan to stay at here for a week.

(67) It's warm under here.

The question is whether (67) is, given the contrast between it and (65), compatible with my general claim that locative and non-locative *here* and *there* are essentially the same (demonstrative) element.

In fact, (67) does not contrast minimally with (65), since *here* in (67) is not really the object of *under*.<sup>19</sup> This is suggested by the fact that (67) feels close to:

(68) It's warm here under the blanket.

Like (67), I suspect, is:

(69) I'm in here.

which seems close to:

(70) I'm here in the kitchen.

suggesting an analysis for (67) and (69) on the order of:

(71) [<sub>under/in</sub> X]<sub>i</sub> AT here t<sub>i</sub>

which in more detail would be:

(72) [ [<sub>under/in</sub> X ]<sub>i</sub> AT [ [ here PLACE ]<sub>j</sub> THIS t<sub>j</sub> ] t<sub>i</sub>

More minimal is the contrast between (65) and:<sup>20</sup>

(73)a. He's from there.

b. Why is he leaving from there?

c. He went from here to there in five seconds.

I think the way to proceed is to take (73) to be more representative than (66) (and to take (66) to involve an orthogonal factor requiring that the preposition be unpronounced, for reasons that need to be looked into further).

Why, then, should there be a sharp difference between locative *here/there*, which is compatible with a preposition, as seen in (73) and non-locative *here/there*, which is not compatible with a preposition, as seen in (65)? Let me propose that the answer lies, paradoxically, in generalizing (64) to cover both locative and non-locative *here/there*. This generalization yields:

(74) *here/there*, after raising (either with PLACE or with THING) past demonstrative THIS/THAT, must be licensed by a locative adposition.

In the locative examples of (73), the licenser is the visible preposition (*from*, *to*). In (67) and (69) it's the abstract AT shown in (71)/(72).

In the non-locative (65), there seems to be no locative adposition, so (65) appears to straightforwardly violate (74). But this cannot be right, given:

(75) He spoke thereof.

and especially its fully acceptable counterparts in Dutch and German. If there were really no locative adposition in (65), then there would presumably not be one in (75), either, in which case (75), too, would violate (74) in all three languages, incorrectly.

The solution I would like to propose (adapting an idea from Hoekstra (1984, 290) and Bennis (1986, 193)) is that (75) (and its counterparts in Dutch and German) does in fact contain a locative adposition. This solution will have two primary advantages. First, it will allow us to retain the unified (74). Second, it will allow an account of the absence of (65) in all of Germanic.

This account will relate the ungrammaticality of (65), repeated here:

(76) \*He spoke of there.  
to that of.<sup>21</sup>

(77) \*He's counting on to win.

In Kayne (2000, 298), (77) is excluded as a violation of preposition stranding, parallel to the 'heavy-NP-shift' example:

(78) \*John has shown his work to this semester most of his fellow students.

In acceptable cases like *He's trying to win*, the prepositional complementizer *to* enters the derivation above VP and attracts the infinitive phrase that has been merged as complement to V. That kind of derivation fails to generalize to (77) because of the presence of *on*.<sup>22</sup>

Returning to non-locative *there*, the idea is first, that it requires a locative adposition, as stated above, and second, that, as with infinitival *to*, this locative adposition enters the derivation above VP.

More specifically, this abstract locative adposition enters the derivation after the visible adposition. Therefore, if (76) were possible, it would have to have the (simplified) derivation:

(79) ...spoke of THAT there THING --> merger of locative adposition  
...P(loc) spoke of THAT there THING --> raising to Spec,P(loc)  
...[ THAT there THING ]<sub>i</sub> P(loc) spoke of t<sub>i</sub> -->  
...P(loc)<sub>j</sub>+W [ THAT there THING ]<sub>i</sub> t<sub>j</sub> spoke of t<sub>i</sub> -->  
...[ spoke of t<sub>i</sub> ]<sub>k</sub> P(loc)<sub>j</sub>+W [ THAT there THING ]<sub>i</sub> t<sub>j</sub> t<sub>k</sub>

In the spirit of Kayne (2000, 238, 291ff.), I take this to be a preposition stranding violation (in the third line) parallel to (77), to (78) and, for many speakers, to:<sup>23</sup>

(80) \*John shows his work to only Mary.

The essential difference between (76) and (73) is now seen to reside in the fact that (73) does not require any abstract locative adposition, since it contains a visible one capable of licensing *there*. Put another way, the deviance of (76), like that of (77), is due to the interaction of the two adpositions, whereas (73) only has one. More precisely, the extra adposition ( $P_{loc}$  in (76) and *to* in (77)) induces an illicit movement (which in (78) is induced by a functional head that is probably not adpositional<sup>24</sup>). In (73), on the other hand, no comparable illicit movement takes place at all.

To allow for the grammatical cases of non-locative *there* followed by a postposition, e.g. in Dutch (from Bennis (1986, 176)):

(81) Ik heb er over gesproken. ('I have there about spoken')

I continue to assume that adpositions can be introduced above VP and get together with their 'objects' via movement. In such derivations, as with  $P_{loc}$  in (79), the relevant DP moves to the Spec of the adposition. In prepositional sentences, there are additional movements of the sort seen in the last two lines of (79). Since (81) is not prepositional, we can take it to involve movement to Spec,P, without it needing to involve those additional movements:

(82) ...over gesproken [THAT er THING]<sub>i</sub> --> movement to Spec,P

...[THAT er THING]<sub>i</sub> over gesproken  $t_i$

The adposition *over* does not raise to any W, nor does the VP, then, raise to Spec,W. The last line of (82) is followed by the introduction of  $P_{loc}$ :

(83) ... $P_{loc}$  [THAT er THING]<sub>i</sub> over gesproken  $t_i$

Raising to Spec, $P_{loc}$  yields, without there being a P-stranding violation of the sort seen in (79), the following:<sup>25</sup>

(84) ...[THAT er THING]<sub>i</sub>  $P_{loc}$   $t_i$  over gesproken  $t_i$

in which *er* (which, strictly speaking, has moved up within DP past THAT, in a way not illustrated in (82)-(84)) is licensed in virtue of its relation to  $P_{loc}$ .

This derivation leaves the overt adposition to the left of VP, which is the desired (normal) order for Dutch and German. Additional factors must intervene to allow for the acceptability in Dutch (more than in German, it seems) of sentences with postverbal *er/daar*+P, and similarly for archaic English.<sup>26</sup>

The derivation of a grammatical sentence with locative *here/there* would look like:

(85) John is from there.

(86) ...is [ THAT there PLACE ] --> merger of locative *from*

...from is [ THAT there PLACE ] --> movement to Spec,P

...[ THAT there PLACE ]<sub>i</sub> from is  $t_i$  --> raising of P

...from<sub>j</sub>+W [ THAT there PLACE ]<sub>i</sub>  $t_i$  is  $t_i$  --> raising of VP

...[ is  $t_i$  ]<sub>k</sub> from<sub>j</sub>+W [ THAT there PLACE ]<sub>i</sub>  $t_i$   $t_k$

(86) has not represented the movement of *there* within DP. Adding that to the third line of (86) would yield:

(87) ...[ [there PLACE]<sub>m</sub> THAT  $t_m$  ]<sub>i</sub> from is  $t_i$

in which *there* is licensed in Spec,*from*, since *from* is locative. Thus (85) is correctly distinguished from (76).



The adposition doubling that I have advocated in (83) recalls the extra adposition seen in Italian in sentences like:<sup>27</sup>

- (88)a. Passerò sopra alla questione. ('I-will-pass over/above to-the question')
- b. Penserò su alla tua proposta. ('I-will-reflect on to-the your proposal')
- c. la legge alla quale ho votato contro ('the law to-the which I-have voted against')

In these examples, the prepositions *sopra*, *su* and *contro* are accompanied by the preposition *a* (which in combination with the definite article *la* gives *alla*).

Italian *a* has both locative and dative uses:

- (89)a. Vivo a Milano. ('I-live in Milan')
- b. Vado a Milano. ('I-go to Milan')
- (90) Do il libro a Gianni. ('I-give the book to G')

These can be distinguished by cliticization, which yields *ci* (or *vi*) with locatives and *gli* or *le* with (third person) datives:

- (91)a. Ci vivo. ('there I-live')
- b. Ci vado. ('there I-go')
- (92) Gli do il libro. ('him<sub>dat</sub> I-give the book')

Cliticization in the examples given in (88a,b) yields a *ci* that is clearly 'non-locative':

- (93)a. Ci passerò sopra. ('there I-will-pass over/above')
- b. Ci penserò su. ('there I-will-reflect on')

In none of (88) does cliticization yield a dative. I conclude that the *a* in (88) is a locative adposition (and not a dative adposition).

More specifically, let me propose that the *a* of (88) is an overt counterpart of the abstract locative adposition that I have taken to play a key role in the licensing of non-locative *here/there* in Germanic, as in (81)-(84).

In Italian, the possibility illustrated in (88) is available only with certain prepositions:

- (94) Gianni esce con (\*a) quella ragazza. ('G goes-out with to that girl')

Despite the fact that *con* ('with') does not allow an overt 'extra' locative *a*, cliticization resulting in *ci* is still possible:<sup>28</sup>

- (95) Gianni ci esce. ('G there goes-out')

This sentence, which could translate into English as 'John goes out with her', contains non-locative *ci*.

Put another way, the *ci* of (93) and (95) are most naturally analyzed as Italian counterparts of Germanic non-locative *there*. For example, (93b) is plausibly a close counterpart of the archaic (in English):

- (96) I will reflect thereupon.

The fact that *ci* and *su* are separated in the Italian example is a fact that I take to be orthogonal to the main discussion. (It recalls the way in which (non-locative) *there* and *upon* can be separated in the Dutch counterpart of (96).)

Although the non-locative *ci* of (95) has no close counterpart in English, it is clearly closely related to the non-locative *ci* of (93). More specifically, let me propose that the two *ci* are the same, and that (95) is essentially identical to (93) but for the missing preposition (*con*) in the former. In other words, (95) is essentially like (96), except that in (95) there is a covert *con* where (96) has an overt *upon*.

Comparing (95) now with both (93) and (88), we see that (95) has two covert adpositions, one *con* and one *a*.<sup>29</sup>

The fact that *con* can be unpronounced in (95) is not specific to the cases under discussion, but is in all likelihood related to the possibility of relative clauses with a missing preposition, e.g. in some French:

(97) *ce que j'ai besoin* ('that that I have need')

In summary of this section, consideration of Italian supports the proposal made earlier that Germanic sentences with *thereof*, as in the English (75), contain an extra unpronounced adposition, a counterpart of the *a* of (88).

Before going on to discuss number, let me note that the assimilation of Italian non-locative *ci* to Germanic non-locative *there* is itself supported by the fact that *ci* requires licensing by an adposition (which may be unpronounced), just as *there* does. I repeat an example (56) given above for English, in which non-locative *there* is prohibited from appearing in a non-adpositional context:

(98) \*I consider there interesting.

Italian non-locative *ci* is equally impossible here:<sup>30</sup>

(99) \*Io ci considero interessante. ('I there consider interesting')

## V. Number

The Italian locative *ci* of (91) and non-locative *ci* of (93)/(95) will, as in the earlier discussion of English and other Germanic, correspond to:

(100) [*ci* PLACE/THING/PERSON]<sub>i</sub> THAT t<sub>i</sub>

Like Germanic *there*, Italian *ci* will require the local presence of a locative adposition. In the case of *ci*, and in relation to its clitic character, that locative adposition will always be an unpronounced counterpart of the *a* seen in (88). Recalling the fact that non-locative *there* in Germanic is productive only in the Germanic OV languages, it is likely that the unpronounced *a* that licenses *ci* is not postverbal at the relevant point in the derivation.

Consider now the question whether the abstract noun in (100) can be plural. The initial observation is that neither *ci* nor *there*, nor any of their counterparts in other Romance or Germanic languages, show a morphological singular/plural distinction, e.g.:

(101) \*He went theres.

None of these forms combine with plural morphology.

Despite this, there are indications that a plural counterpart of (100) is available in the languages under consideration.

Although I have not directly addressed in this article the status of *where*, it is plausible to take *where* to have an analysis parallel to that of *here* and *there* (i.e. to occur in a 'D *where* NP' structure). If it does, then the plurality of *where* in the following indirectly supports the possible plurality of *here* and *there*:

(102)a. Where all did he go?

b. Where did he go all?

As discussed by McCloskey (2000), (102b) is possible in West Ulster English, (102a) more broadly (though not in all varieties of English).

Similarly, in Dutch one can have (example provided by Marcel den Dikken):

(103) *Hij heeft daar/er gisteren allemaal mee gespeeld* ('he has there yesterday all with played')

in which *daar* (or *er*) (which is the 'antecedent' of *allemaal* ('all')) is a counterpart of English *there*.

In addition, in French, one can marginally have:<sup>31</sup>

(104) ??*Elle y répondra à tous*. ('she there will-answer to all')

From the perspective adopted here, it is not, strictly speaking, *where*, *daar*, *er*, *y* that are themselves plural. Rather (102)-(104) indicate that the nouns PLACE and THING/PERSON that go with these can (in certain cases) be plural. (103), for example, will contain:

(105) [*daar* THINGS]<sub>i</sub> THOSE *t<sub>i</sub>*

The universal quantifier will combine with this phrase (and not directly with *daar*). The fact that *where*, *daar*, *er*, *y* (like *there* in (101)) show no plural morphology will now be a fact (yet to be well understood) about how plural marking ‘percolates’ to subparts of DP.

Independently of quantifiers, the French and Italian clitics *y* and *ci* also show plurality insofar as they can be linked with a plural under the form of doubling called Right-Dislocation, e.g.:

(106) Jean *y* pense, à ses problèmes (‘J there thinks, to his problems’)

As in (103)/(105), we will have:

(107) [*y* THINGS]<sub>i</sub> THOSE *t<sub>i</sub>*

French and Italian share another locative clitic *en/ne*, e.g. in French:

(108) Jean *en* revient. (‘J (from)there comes-back’)

I will set aside the question how best to distinguish *en/ne* from *y/ci*,<sup>32</sup> and simply note that *en* and *ne* have non-locative uses, too:

(109)a. Jean *en* parle. (‘J there speaks’ = ‘J speaks of it’)

b. Gianni *ne* parla. (Italian - same)

Like *y* in (106), *en* and *ne* can be associated with a dislocated plural:

(110)a. Jean *en* parle, de ces problèmes. (‘J there speaks, of these problems’)

b. Gianni *ne* parla, di questi problemi. (Ital. - same)

In addition, certain instances of non-locative *ne* in Italian (and similarly for French *en*, for some speakers) can be associated with plural agreement:

(111) Gianni *ne* ha visti tre. (‘G there has seen(m.pl.) three’ = ‘G has seen three of them’)

The *-i* of *visti* indicates plural agreement. This agreement is likely to be mediated by *ne*; in the absence of *ne*, this past participle agreement does not take place:

(112) Gianni ha visto/\*visti tre ragazzi. (‘G has seen(m.sg.)/(m.pl.) three boys’)

Despite the fact that *ne* itself shows no number morphology, the past participle agreement of (111) seems to be determined by the plural number of *ne*, or, more exactly, by that of the phrase given in (113), in the spirit of the analysis I have developed here for both locative and non-locative *there*, *y/ci*, *en/ne*.<sup>33</sup>

(113) [*ne* THINGS/PERSONS]<sub>i</sub> THOSE *t<sub>i</sub>*

## References.

- Allan, R., P. Holmes and T. Lundskaer-Nielsen (1995) *Danish. A Comprehensive Grammar*, Routledge, London.
- Barbiers, S. (1995) *The Syntax of Interpretation*, Doctoral dissertation, Holland Institute of Generative Linguistics.
- Bennis, H. (1986) *Gaps and Dummies*, Doctoral dissertation, Tilburg University.
- Bernstein, J. (1997) “Demonstratives and reinforcers in Romance and Germanic languages,” *Lingua*, 102, 87-113.
- Bresnan, J. and J. Grimshaw (1978) “The Syntax of Free Relatives in English,” *Linguistic Inquiry*, 9, 331-391.

- Calabrese, A. (1988) "I pronomi clitici," in L. Renzi (ed.) *Grande grammatica italiana di consultazione. Volume I. La frase. I sintagmi nominale e preposizionale*, Il Mulino, Bologna, 549-592.
- Cinque, G. (1996) "The Antisymmetric Programme: Theoretical and Typological Implications," *Journal of Linguistics*, 32, 447-464.
- Corver, N. and D. Delfitto (1999) "On the Nature of Pronoun Movement," in H. van Riemsdijk (ed.) *Clitics in the Languages of Europe (Eurotyp 20-5)*, Mouton de Gruyter, Berlin, 799-861.
- Cresti, D. (to appear) "Aspects of the Syntax and Semantics of *ne*," in C. Tortora (ed.) *The Syntax of Italian Dialects*, Oxford University Press, New York.
- Den Dikken, M. (1995a) "Extraposition as intraposition, and the syntax of English tag questions," ms., Vrije Universiteit Amsterdam/HIL.
- Den Dikken, M. (1996) "How external is the external argument?," paper presented at WECOL 1996, Vrije Universiteit Amsterdam/HIL.
- Donaldson, B. (1994) "Afrikaans," in E. König and J. van der Auwera (eds.) *The Germanic Languages*, Routledge, London, 478-504.
- Emonds, J.E. (1976) *A Transformational Approach to English Syntax. Root, Structure-Preserving and Local Transformations*, Academic Press, New York.
- Gross, M. (1968) *Grammaire transformationnelle du français. Syntaxe du verbe*, Larousse, Paris.
- Hoekstra, T. (1984) *Transitivity. Grammatical Relations in Government-Binding Theory*, Foris, Dordrecht.
- Holmes, P. and I. Hinchliffe (1994) *Swedish. A Comprehensive Grammar*, Routledge, London.
- Jayaseelan, K.A. and M. Hariprasad (1999) "Deixis in Pronouns and Noun Phrases," ms., Central Institute of English and Foreign Languages, Hyderabad.
- Katz, J.J. and P.M. Postal (1964) *An Integrated Theory of Linguistic Descriptions*, The MIT Press, Cambridge, Mass.
- Kayne, R.S. (1975) *French Syntax. The Transformational Cycle*, MIT Press, Cambridge, Mass.
- Kayne, R.S. (1985) "Principles of particle constructions," in J. Guéron, H.-G. Obenauer & J.-Y. Pollock (eds.) *Grammatical Representation*, Foris, Dordrecht, 101-140.
- Kayne, R.S. (1994) *The Antisymmetry of Syntax*, The MIT Press, Cambridge, Mass.
- Kayne, R.S. (2000) *Parameters and Universals*, Oxford University Press, New York.
- Kishimoto, H. (2000) "Indefinite Pronouns and Overt N-Raising," *Linguistic Inquiry*, 31, 557-566.
- Koopman, H. and A. Szabolcsi (2000) *Verbal Complexes*, The MIT Press, Cambridge, Mass.
- Larson, R. (1985) "Bare-NP Adverbs," *Linguistic Inquiry*, 16, 595-621.
- Longobardi, G. (1994) "Reference and proper names," *Linguistic Inquiry* 25, 609-665.
- Longobardi, G. (1996) "The Syntax of N-Raising: A Minimalist Theory," *OTS Working Papers*, Utrecht University.
- McCloskey, J. (2000) "Quantifier Float and *Wh*-Movement in an Irish English," *Linguistic Inquiry*, 31, 57-84.
- Rizzi, L. (1988) "Il sintagma preposizionale," in L. Renzi (ed.) *Grande grammatica italiana di consultazione. Volume I. La frase. I sintagmi nominale e preposizionale*, Il Mulino, Bologna, 507-531.

- Starke, M. (1993) "Notes on Prepositions and Clause-Structure," Mini-Mémoire, University of Geneva.
- Trudgill, P. and J. Hannah (1994) *International English. A Guide to Varieties of Standard English*, third edition, Edward Arnold, London.
- Van Riemsdijk, H. (1978) *A case study in syntactic markedness*, The Peter de Ridder Press.
- Zaenen, A., J. Maling and H. Thráinsson (1985) "Case and Grammatical Functions: The Icelandic Passive," *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory*, 3, 441-483.

## Notes.

\* To Maurice, for his support and friendship in those essential irretrievable early years.

<sup>1</sup> On the reduced relative status of *recently arrived*, see Kayne (1994, 99).

<sup>2</sup> John Singler tells me that (8b) may be possible for some speakers.

<sup>3</sup> Swedish has demonstrative *there* with what looks like a counterpart of *such* - v. Holmes and Hinchliffe (1994, 167).

<sup>4</sup> For example, John Singler (p.c.). This might be related to the acceptability in Dutch (see Bennis (1986, 27, 39)) of a counterpart of (21), with *from* a postposition.

<sup>5</sup> It may be that (27) is closer to *this thing here, that thing there* than to *this here thing, that there thing*.

<sup>6</sup> See Donaldson (1994, 491).

<sup>7</sup> There might also be a link with Longobardi's (1994) N-to-D raising with proper names.

<sup>8</sup> Why (35) is possible with a pronoun in some varieties of English (see Trudgill and Hannah (1994, 76)) remains to be understood.

Note that (34) recalls Longobardi's (1996) discussion of the construct state in Romance. Why it is not possible in English with overt *place* remains to be understood.

Raising of the sort seen in (34) differs from that of (30) in not being possible with demonstratives:

- (i) We'll be going to that again tonight.
- (i) is not possible with the PLACE interpretation.

<sup>9</sup> Whether there is a close link to *someplace else* (on which, see Kishimoto (2000)), is left open.

<sup>10</sup> Although (41) with unstressed *there* is sharply out, the judgment is less sharp with stressed *there*. Perhaps stressed *there* allows PLACE to be licensed in a manner akin to (22), which would recall:

- (i) I consider under the bed a good hiding place.
- with an analysis:
- (ii) I consider PLACE under the bed a good hiding place.
  - Appreciably better than (41) with *there* is:
  - (iii) ?John doesn't consider anywhere else as wonderful as Paris.

<sup>11</sup> See Katz and Postal (1964, 135), Emonds (1976, 79), Bresnan and Grimshaw (1978, 347).

<sup>12</sup> Cf. Longobardi (1996, note 15) on the Romance construct state showing a partial but non-systematic dependence on a locative preposition.

<sup>13</sup> From this perspective, the interpretation of *here* and *there* is that of deixis; for interesting recent discussion of deixis, see Jayaseelan and Hariprasad (1999).

If *here* and *there* are analyzed as 'h+ere' and 'th+ere', with '-ere' in English closely matching the (more widespread) *er* of Dutch, a question arises (that I will not pursue) as to how to understand the interpretation compositionally.

<sup>14</sup> As in Gross (1968, 54) on French *y*.

<sup>15</sup> (53) can to some extent also involve reference to humans (cf. Bennis (1986, 191)), so 'THAT there PERSON/BODY' must also be available.

<sup>16</sup> Cf. Holmes and Hinchliffe (1994, 365) on Swedish and Allan, Holmes and Lundskaer-Nielsen (1995, 379) on Danish; similarly for Icelandic, according to Thorhallur Eythorsson and Thorbjörg Hróarsdóttir (p.c.).

<sup>17</sup> See Kayne (2000, 321). One does hear in some spoken English instances of (adjunct) *whereby* in relatives. It may be that these are postverbal at no stage of the derivation, and perhaps similarly for *therefore*.

Left open is the question of how a speaker represents/internalizes archaic constructions; also, the status of French (i):

(i) Tu peux compter là-dessus. ('you can count there of-on')  
which is not archaic.

Relevant, too, may be French:

(ii) Ils ont tiré dessus. ('they have shot of-on')  
with a covert argument that is probably to the left of *dessus*.

<sup>18</sup> And perhaps universally - cf. Kayne (1994, 50) on the absence of (65) in postpositional languages.

<sup>19</sup> Rizzi (1988, 530) has made the same point for what looks like a fairly close Italian counterpart of (67), which, however, has (as in French) the reverse word order, e.g. *qua sotto* ('here under'), with this difference presumably related to English *frogman* vs. French *homme grenouille* ('man frog').

<sup>20</sup> That (73) is substantially different from (67)/(69) is supported by (i) vs. (ii):

- (i)a. Where is he from?
- b. Where did he just arrive from?
- c. Where is he off to?

- (ii)a. \*Where is it warm under?
- b. \*Where are you in?

(vs. *Which blanket is it warm(est) under?*, *What room are you in?*) Similarly:

- (iii)a. He's from somewhere else.
- b. He wouldn't be leaving from anywhere else.
- c. This time we're off to somewhere exotic.

- (iv)a. \*It must be warm under somewhere.
- b. \*He can't be in anywhere else.

It appears that the phrase following AT in (71)/(72) must be definite.

If so, then the empty position in English topicalization and clefts apparently does not count as definite (alternatively, extraction from the position following AT in (71)/(72) is impossible):

- (v) We've been living in this cave/in here for weeks.
- (vi) This cave/\*Here we've been living in for weeks.
- (vii) It's that cave/\*It's there that he's been living in.
- (viii) That box/\*There you should never have put it in.

These contrast with:

- (ix) There I hardly ever go for vacation.
- (x) It was right there that I put it.

<sup>21</sup> And perhaps to that of (cf. Kayne (1985, 123)):

- (i)a. \*He stepped on it flat.
- b. \*They ran around him dizzy.

if the well-formed *He squashed it flat* and *They ran him dizzy* necessarily involve an abstract preposition that attracts either *it/him* or *it flat/him dizzy*. Similarly for:

- (ii)a. \*He stepped on it into a pancake.
- b. \*They ran around him into a tizzy.

The text discussion of (76) assumes that *there* is hierarchically lower than *of*. For why it could not be higher, see Kayne (1994, 50).

<sup>22</sup> Sometimes accepted, in contrast to (77), is:

- (i) ?He's counting on there to be a solution.

See Kayne (2000, 311) on the (better):

- (ii) John is thinking about where to go.
- The passive of (i) is worse:
- (iii) \*There's being counted on to be a solution.

recalling:

- (iv) \*There was prevented/kept from being a solution.

<sup>23</sup> This violation will hold independently of where the verb ends up and so will hold, too, for the (ungrammatical) Dutch and German counterparts of (76) with preposition followed by non-locative *there*.

<sup>24</sup> Cf. den Dikken (1995).

<sup>25</sup> A more careful discussion of preposition stranding is beyond the scope of this paper.

The movement illustrated in (84) recalls those proposed by van Riemsdijk (1978).

<sup>26</sup> A basic question not discussed here is how Dutch allows preverbal prepositions - for relevant discussion, see Barbiers (1995).

Similarly omitted from discussion is the question whether any strongly head-final language of the Japanese/Korean/Turkish sort could allow non-locative *there*, and if not, why not.

<sup>27</sup> Cf. Rizzi (1988), from which example (c) is taken. The other two were provided by



Paola Benincà (p.c.).

<sup>28</sup> Cf. Calabrese (1988, 562), Corver and Delfitto (1999, 822).

As in Dutch (see note 15 above), non-locative *ci* can in some cases go with a human, i.e. with 'THAT there PERSON/BODY'.

That (95) is parallel to (94) is supported by the fact that French generally disallows the former (although *Tu peux y compter* ('you can there count') is possible) and does not allow an extra *à* of the sort found in (88) anywhere near as readily as Italian. (Catalan seems to be fairly similar to Italian, in both respects.)

French non-locative *y* is by and large limited to cases where the corresponding overt (non-locative) preposition would be *à*.

<sup>29</sup> I leave open the question why *con* differs from *sopra*, *su*, *contro* in the way seen in (88) vs. (94). It may be that (88) has three adpositions, thinking of French:

(i) *Ils lui ont tiré dessus, à Jean*. ('they him<sub>dat</sub> have shot of-on, to J' = 'They've shot at him, J')

and that *con*, contrary to *sopra*, *su*, *contro*, cannot be preceded by an unpronounced counterpart of this *de*. (95) might show that this property of *con* holds only if *con* itself is pronounced.

For discussion of this extra *de* ('of'), see Starke (1993).

<sup>30</sup> The non-locative *ci* under discussion will have a structure as in (60), with *ci* in place of *there*. Italian locatives are more complex than English, however, in having a clitic/non-clitic distinction (*ci* vs. *lì/là*).

Non-clitic locative *lì/là* ('there') has no non-locative counterpart. It might be that the unpronounced counterpart of *con* (and other prepositions like it) must itself be licensed by, or more specifically be carried along with, an object clitic (including in (97)).

Irrelevant in the present context is the fact that *ci* in Italian is also the first person plural object clitic, and in some perhaps dialect-influenced Italian also a third person dative clitic; see Cresti (to appear, note 9).

(98) and (99) show that the *a* of (88) (and its unpronounced counterparts in Italian and Germanic) itself depends on the presence of another adposition, perhaps for Case reasons.

<sup>31</sup> Cf. Kayne (1975, sect. 2.7).

<sup>32</sup> It is possible that *en* and *ne* involve two unpronounced adpositions (*de/di* and *à/a*), whereas *y* and *ci* involve only one (*à/a*); cf. den Dikken (1996), as well as Cresti's (to appear) idea that *en/ne* is an oblique form of *y/ci*. Alternatively it might be that *de/di* itself counts as the licensing locative adposition for *en/ne*.

<sup>33</sup> The abstract THING/PERSON must not have intrinsic gender; it must rather agree in gender with its antecedent.

On (111)/(113), note:

(ii) John just saw three tanks. Bill just saw three of the/those things himself.

