

Here, there, and (every)where

Guido Vanden Wyngaerd

1 Introduction

The words *here*, *there*, and *(every)where* (henceforth HTW) are traditionally taken to be adverbs. Evidence discussed in Burton-Roberts (1991), however, shows that they behave distributionally like PPs. For reasons of space, I do not recapitulate this evidence here, but summarise it schematically in (1):

(1)	Adv	PP	HTW
complement of V	X	✓	✓
modify Adj/Adv	✓	X	X
postmodify N	X	✓	✓
complement of P	X	✓	✓
take PP complement	X	✓	✓
take <i>right, straight, just</i>	X	✓	✓
locative inversion	X	✓	✓

Burton-Roberts (1991: 171) concludes from these data that HTW are prepositions. In terms of their meaning, however, HTW do not just correspond to simple prepositions, but are richer semantically. This is seen in the analysis of Katz & Postal (1964), who argue that HTW derive from an underlying PP-like structure:¹

- (2) *here* : at this place
 there : at that place
 where : at what place

¹See also Kayne (2005), who argues that *here* and *there* are licensed in a structure with silent nouns (THIS *here* PLACE, THAT *there* PLACE). The list in (2) may be extended with complex expressions like *everywhere* and *somewhere*, as well as other expressions of direction and/or location, like *back, away, home, upstairs, downstairs, abroad, aboard, apart, aside, together*, which behave like HTW. I shall not further discuss those here, however.

Aarts (2013) takes HTW to be PPs, which is more in line with their semantics. The conclusion that HTW are PPs is still too general, however: HTW correspond with a subclass of the PPs, namely those with a locative or directional meaning. The locative meaning in particular appears from the fact that some of the environments in (2) require a locative PP, such as the complement of *go* or *put*, or the phenomenon of locative inversion.

The conclusion that what look like single words in fact correspond to complex structures, viz. PPs of the type in (2), provides an interesting case for the nanosyntactic mechanism of phrasal spellout, by which a syntactically complex constituent can be spelled out by a single lexical item. At the same time, there is also some evidence for decomposing HTW. Again looking at both the forms and the meanings in (2), we see that there is also a deictic (*this/that*) or a *wh*-element (*what*) present. This element is responsible for the semantic differences between *here* (deictic proximate), *there* (deictic distal), and *where* (interrogative, or indefinite in complex forms like *somewhere*, *everywhere*; see Haida 2007). The forms also suggest a decomposition of the type $\{h/th/wh\}$ -*ere*, with on the one hand an exponent *h-/th-/wh-*, which is responsible for the deictic/*wh* part of their meaning, and an exponent *-ere* on the other, which spells out a different set of features relating to location and direction. The spatial triplet *h-ere/th-ere/wh-ere* has a temporal cognate in the triplet *now/th-en/wh-en*, which (except for *now*) is subject to a similar decomposition, with the second part (*-en*) referring to time rather than to location/direction. In this short paper, I focus on the second part of HTW (*-ere*), which for convenience I continue to refer to as HTW. I argue that *-ere* realises the locative/directional part of the meaning of *here*, *there*, and *where*. I defer a further discussion of *h-/th-/wh-* to another place and time.

2 Movement, Direction and Location

Before proceeding with the analysis of HTW, I need to discuss prepositional expressions of location and direction. Certain types of P only have a locative meaning (e.g. *in*), while others are directional (e.g. *to*). The difference shows up most clearly in stative predications, such as postnominally or with *be* (Déchaine et al. 1995):

- (3) a. a train in_{LOC}/to_{DIR} Paris
 b. This train is in_{LOC}/to_{DIR} Paris.

French *à* 'at' only has a locative sense:

- (4) a. un train à_{LOC/*DIR} Paris
 b. Ce train est à_{LOC/*DIR} Paris.

Numerous authors have argued that directions are more complex than locations (Koopman 2000, Van Riemsdijk & Huybregts 2002, Kracht 2002, Zwarts 2005, Den Dikken 2010, Cinque 2010, Svenonius 2010, Caha 2010, Pantcheva 2011). Taking DIR and LOC to stand in a containment relation (with DIR containing LOC), the difference between locative *in* and directional *to* can be conceived of as a difference in size, as shown in (5):

(5)

DIR	LOC	PLACE
	in	Paris
to		Paris

This approach allows an account of the otherwise surprising fact that, combined with certain types of motion verbs, both English *in* and French *à* seem to express direction:

- (6) a. She went/came/fell/jumped/flew in the water.
 b. Ce train va à Paris.
 this train goes at Paris
 'This train goes to Paris.'

This fact can be explained by assuming that the DIR element can be realised by a motion verb (Fábregas 2007, Caha 2010), allowing a locative preposition to spell-out the remainder of the functional sequence. This is shown schematically in (7):

(7)

	DIR	LOC	PLACE
be		in	Paris
go		in	the water
aller	à		Paris

Not all motion verbs are able to spell out DIR: English *walk*, *run* or *dance*, when combined with *in*, only have a locative, and no directional, sense, because neither the verb nor *in* can realise DIR. A directional preposition like *to* is needed, as shown in (8) and (9).

- (8) She walked/ran in_{LOC}/to_{DIR} the park.

(9)

	DIR	LOC	PLACE
run		in	Paris
run	to		Paris

Following Levin et al. (2009), I call verbs like *go/fall/jump* verbs of directed motion (or directional verbs for short), and verbs like *walk/run/dance* manner of motion verbs (see also Talmy 1975, 1985 on path-framed vs satellite-framed languages).

3 Analysis

With this in mind, let us return to HTW. This section aims at demonstrating that English HTW can occur in all the slots where locative and directional PPs can occur. This distributional pattern is accounted for by assuming that HTW are the phrasal spellout of a constituent corresponding to a locative/directional PP.

The locative sense of HTW appears in stative predications like (10a) and (10b), and it also appears in sentences where HTW combine with directional verbs, like (10c). Under the analysis developed in the previous section, DIR is realised by the verb in such a case. As a result, HTW shrink to realising only LOC, in spite of the directional sense expressed by (10c). This is shown schematically in (11).

- (10) a. The pharmacy is there.
 b. They live here.
 c. She came here first and then went there.

(11)

	DIR	LOC	PLACE
be		in	Paris
be			there
go			there

The directional sense of HTW becomes apparent from (12), with manner of motion verbs.

- (12) She walked/ran there_{LOC/DIR}.

This sentence is in fact ambiguous, in a manner which is reminiscent of (8) above: there, with DIR left unexpressed and LOC expressed by *in*, the sense was locative, but with DIR+LOC realised by the preposition *to*, the meaning was directional. In this case, the ambiguity of (12) suggests that there is a syncretism between directional and locative HTW. In line with our earlier assumptions, we assume

that directional HTW spell out a larger constituent than locative HTW, as shown in (13):

(13)

	DIR	LOC	PLACE
walk			there
walk		there	

Standard Superset Principle logic accounts for this syncretism: the lexical entry for HTW contains the features DIR+LOC+PLACE, and given that there is no competing lexical item that just spells out LOC+PLACE, the larger lexical item may spell out the smaller syntactic structure that is contained in its lexical entry. Finally, observe that in addition to the features DIR and LOC, HTW also spell out an abstract noun meaning PLACE. In this respect, HTW differ from *now/then/when*, which realise an abstract noun TIME.

4 Conclusion

I have argued that HTW are not adverbs, nor prepositions, nor PPs, but are decomposable into a deictic/wh part *h-/th-/wh-* and a locative/directional part *-ere*. The *-ere* part is the phrasal spellout of an abstract set of features expressing direction and location, and the abstract noun PLACE. How the two parts of HTW and their corresponding feature sets connect with each other is a matter which I hope to return to in future work.

References

- Aarts, B. 2013. *English syntax and argumentation*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Burton-Roberts, N. 1991. Prepositions, adverbs, and adverbials. In I.T.B. van Ostade & J. Frankis (eds.), *Language: Usage and description*. 159–172. Amsterdam: Rodopi.
- Caha, P. 2010. The German locative-directional alternation: A peeling account. *The Journal of Comparative Germanic Linguistics* 13(3). 179–223.
- Cinque, G. 2010. Mapping spatial PPs: an introduction. In G. Cinque & L. Rizzi (eds.), *Mapping spatial PPs* (The cartography of syntactic structures 6). 3–25. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

- Déchaine, R.M., Hoekstra, T. & Rooryck, J. 1995. Augmented and non-augmented HAVE. In L. Nash & G. Tsoulas (eds.), *Proceedings of langues et grammaire I*. 85–101. Paris: Université de Paris VIII.
- Den Dikken, M. 2010. On the functional structure of directional and locative PPs. In G. Cinque & L. Rizzi (eds.), *Mapping spatial PPs* (The cartography of syntactic structures 6). 74–126. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Fábregas, A. 2007. An exhaustive lexicalisation account of directional complements. In M. Bašić, M. Pantcheva, M. Son & P. Svenonius (eds.), *Nordlyd, special issue on space, motion, and result* (Tromsø Working Papers on Language and Linguistics 34.2). 165–199. Tromsø: CASTL, University of Tromsø.
- Haida, A. 2007. *The indefiniteness and focusing of wh-words*. Berlin: Humboldt-Universität dissertation.
- Katz, J. & Postal, P. 1964. *An integrated theory of linguistic descriptions*. Cambridge, Massachusetts: MIT Press.
- Kayne, R. 2005. Here and there. In *Movement and silence*. 65–84. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Koopman, H. 2000. Prepositions, postpositions, circumpositions, and particles. In *The syntax of specifiers and heads*. 204–260. London: Routledge.
- Kracht, M. 2002. On the semantics of locatives. *Linguistics and Philosophy* 25. 157–232.
- Levin, B., Beavers, J. & Tham, S.W. 2009. Manner of motion roots across languages: Same or different? Paper presented at Roots Workshop, Stuttgart.
- Pantcheva, M. 2011. *Decomposing path: The nanosyntax of directional expressions*. Tromsø: University of Tromsø dissertation.
- Svenonius, P. 2010. Spatial P in English. In G. Cinque & L. Rizzi (eds.), *Mapping spatial PPs* (The cartography of syntactic structures 6). 127–160. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Talmy, L. 1975. Semantics and syntax of motion. In J. Kimball (ed.), *Syntax and semantics*, vol. 4. 181–238. Academic Press.
- Talmy, L. 1985. Lexicalization patterns: Semantic structure in lexical forms. In T. Shopen (ed.), *Grammatical categories and the lexicon*, vol. 3 Language Typology and Syntactic Description. 57–149. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Van Riemsdijk, H. & Huybregts, R. 2002. Location and locality. In M. van Oostendorp & E. Anagnostopoulou (eds.), *Progress in grammar: Articles at the 20th anniversary of the comparison of grammatical models group in Tilburg*. 1–23. Amsterdam: Meertens Instituut.

Zwarts, J. 2005. The case of prepositions: Government and compositionality in German PPs. Paper presented at IATL 21, Haifa.