There, there: strong and weak path-linked proforms

Háj Ross
University of North Texas
haj@unt.edu   **or:** fj44@jove.acs.unt.edu

1.   The nature of the beast.

This paper concerns the structure of paths, those macroconstituents like from Texarkana to Bogotá, which describe the motion of a Gruberian Theme, in spatial sentences. But note that there are also paths through time, as in the meeting ran from dawn to dusk, in which there is a temporal Theme, an event like a meeting, which is conceived of "moving" from one time to another.

One way to explore the grammar of paths is to look at the proforms which are associated with them.   There are two varieties of path-linked proforms – strong ones and weak ones.   These proforms may show up inside explicit paths (e. g., from here to there, from then to now), or they may be spatial or temporal adverbs, either free ones, not selected by the predicates of the clauses in which they are found (as in I worked there then) or as the arguments of certain verbs which require locatives or directionals – verbs such as dwell, depart and reach, or, in the tem-poral realm, as in last till now.   So there are definite deictic path-linked proforms like here, there, now, and then, but there are also indefinite path-linked proforms (such as some[where/place]   (or   other),   every[where/place],   no[where/place],   any [where/place] [all of these may be followed by else]; and, in the temporal realm, sometime (or other), every time, no time, any time).   I will demonstrate below that the definite path-linked proforms come in strong and weak variants, but as far as I can tell, the indefinite ones do not have two flavors. It is only possible to find these indefinite proforms in those environments where strong path-linked proforms occur.

2.   Strong and weak environments

In strong environments, we find strong definite path-linked proforms, and also indefinite path-linked proforms.   In weak environments, we find only weak definite path-linked proforms.   In (1), I have characterized these two types of environments.

(1)   Strong environments   Weak environments

    a.   After prepositions: from, to, for   all other
                                                    prepositions

    b.   With no preceding   locative contexts directional contexts
         preposition

The three prepositions from, to, and for I will refer to as "end-prepositions," because they can mark the ends of paths.   Sources are marked by from, and Goals can be marked either by to or by for (as in I'm heading for El Paso).   Paths start with an optional Source phrase, and end with an optional Goal phrase, and may contain in addition any number of intermediate Trajectory phrases, marked by such medial prepositions as through, along, past, by, behind, etc.

3.   Strong and weak behaviors

When we compare the path-linked proforms that we find in these two sets of environments, we see that weak path-linked proforms are defective, with respect to strong path-linked proforms – the possible behaviors of the weak forms are subsets of the possible behaviors of the strong forms.   For a first indication of such differences, let us note that while strong path-linked proforms can be questioned with <u>where</u>, weak path-linked proforms cannot:

(2)	Questionability
   a Where did you jump from?	a'. *Where did you jump past?
   b. Who retreated to where?	b'. *Who retreated through where?

Strong forms are modifiable, both on the left (by the adverbs <u>right</u> and <u>around</u>) and on the right, restrictively (cf. (3b)) or appositively (cf. (3c)) – weak forms are not – (cf. (3a', b'. c')).   Strong forms are stressable, weak ones are not (cf. (4) – I owe this observation to Knud Lambrecht).   Strong forms, but not weak ones, are topicalizable and left-dislocatable – cf. (5) and (6).

       <u>Strong forms</u>   <u>Weak forms</u>

(3)	<u>Modifiability on the left and right, restrictive and appositive</u>
   a. From right here I leapt.	a'. *Past right here I leapt.
   b. From here on the box I leapt.	b'. *Past here on the box I leapt.[1]
   c. From here – on it – I leapt.	c'.*Past here – on it – I leapt.
(4)	<u>Stressability</u>
   a. I leapt from THERE.	a'. *I leapt behind THERE.
   b. YOU departed from HERE,	b'. *YOU departed HERE,
      & <u>I</u> departed from THERE.	 and <u>I</u> departed THERE.
(5)	<u>Preposability</u>
   a. There you can jump from.	a' *There you can jump through.
   b. There we will stay tonight.	b'. *There we will reach tonight.
(6)	<u>Left-Dislocatability</u>
   a. Rio, I'll leave from there	a'. *Rio, I'll leave there
      tomorrow.	 tomorrow.
   b. Rio, they retreated to there.	b'. *Rio, they retreated past there.

As Paul Postal has pointed out to me, while strong path-linked proforms can con- and disjoin well, weak ones are poor con- and disjoinees, especially in last position – cf. (7):

(7)	<u>Con- and disjoinability</u>
   a. Enid is beautiful, but IBM	a'. Enid is beautiful, but IBM
      is leaving [from there and	 is leaving [*there and Waco /
      Waco / from Waco and there]	**Waco and there] next month.
      next month.
   b. LA is kinky – I don't want	b. LA is kinky – I don't want to
      to drive [to there or Ojai /	 drive [*by there or Ojai / **by
       ??to Ojai or there] yet.	 Ojai or there] yet.

In examples (2) – (7), I have used only one of the criteria in (1) which separate strong and weak environments – the contrast between the objects of end-prepositions and the objects of all other prepositions. Below, I will use the second criterion – the contrast between "bare" strong path-linked proforms – those which are found in locative contexts – and the bare weak path-linked proforms which are found in directional contexts. In the examples above, I have tried to construct syntactic minimal pairs, by contrasting objects of from with the objects of other prepositions like through, past, and behind. In the examples which will follow, I will use two similar minimal pairs. The first is based on the fact that spatial path-linked proforms are ambiguous after most verbs of motion – they can be under-stood to be locatives, with the meaning of "at this/that place," or directional, with the meaning of "to this/that place." Sentence (8a) is a clear example of this ambiguity. What happens to this ambiguity in one of the environments which allows only weak path-linked proforms, namely questions (cf. (1) above), is shown in (8b).

(8)   Questionability
       a. Anaîs bicycled here.   [Loc / Dir]
       b. Where did Anaïs bicycle?   [Loc /*Dir]

Sentences exactly paralleling (8) emerge when other motional verbs like walk, swim, travel, hike, etc. are substituted for bicycle – the phenomenon is a robust one. Note that I am not claiming that there is no possibility of forming a question for the directional sense of (8). Sentence (9), which is that question, we will return to later.

(9)   Where did Anaîs bicycle to?

Now let us construct another near minimal pair to show the locative /directional contrast. This one will depend on the fact that residential verbs, like live, dwell, and reside, select for a locative expression, while journey verbs, like depart (the version without the from) and reach, select directionals – Sources and Goals, respectively. Thus we find contrasts like those between the strong path-linked proforms of (10), on the one hand, and the weak path-linked proforms of (11) or (12), on the other.

(10) a. Dweezil resided there.
      b. Dweezil resided right (over) there.
      c. Where did Dweezil reside?
(11)a.   Moon Unit departed there at midnight.
      b. *Moon Unit departed right (over) there at midnight.
      c. *Where did Moon Unit depart?
(12)a.   The Trapp Family Singers reached there at dawn.
      b. *The Trapp Family Singers reached right (over) there at dawn.
      c. *Where did the Trapp Family Singers reach?

In the following examples, I will demonstrate the strong / weak contrast for bare path-linked proforms in the same sequence of contexts used in examples (3) –(7).

        Strong forms   Weak forms

(13)   Modifiability on the left and right, restrictive and appositive
    a.   Right here I hiked. [Loc}   a'. *I hiked right here. [Dir]
    b.   Here by the sea I hiked.[Loc] b'. *I hiked here by the sea. [Dir]
    c.   Here by the sea I dwelled.   c'. *I reached here by the sea.
(14)   Stressability
    a.   He hiked THERE   a'. ?He hiked THERE
          for three weeks. [Loc]   in three days. [Dir]
    b. YOU lived HERE,   b'. *YOU reached HERE,
          and I lived THERE.   and I reached THERE.
(15)   Preposability
    a. Here we hiked. [Loc]   a'. *Here we hiked. [Dir]
    b. There we will stay tonight.   b'. *There we will reach tonight.
(16)   Left-Dislocatability
          Rio, I'll bicycle there   ?To Rio, I'll bicycle there
          tomorrow. [Loc]   tomorrow. [Dir]
(17)   Con- and disjoinability
    a. Enid is beautiful – I want   a'. *Enid is beautiful – I want to
          to bicycle [there and in Waco /   bicycle [there and to Waco /
          ?in Waco and there]. [Loc]   **to Waco and there] [Dir]
    b. LA is kinky – I don't want   b. *LA is kinky – I don't want
          to bicycle [there or in Ojai /   bicycle [there or to Ojai /
          ??in Ojai or there]   [Loc]   **to Ojai or there]. [Dir]

        In the interests of brevity, I will not mount a full-scale demonstration of the parallels between spatial and temporal paths.   Below, I will give a few examples which are intended to suggest that the same asymmetry between strong and weak temporal proforms exists.   As we might suspect, since the spatial terms are the metaphorical basis for the temporal terms, we find things that occur in the ecology of spatial terms that have no correspondents among their temporal cognates.   One such fact is that while there are verbs which select for bare spatial terms, both locatives and directionals, such as the verbs of residing and of journeying that we have seen above, and while there is one verb in the temporal domain which requires the temporal correspondent of a locative (namely, the passive verb to be dated), I have been able to find no verb which selects for a temporal Goal.   Thus though we have (18), which corresponds to the locative sense of (8a),

        (18)   The painting was dated 1435, and the etching was dated then too.

there is no temporal equivalent of any verb like reach.   Furthermore, sentences like (19) are unambiguous – in them, then means only "at that time," not "until that time."

        (19)   Hong Kong will be part of the People's Republic next July, and I
                 will work then.

        Since we cannot find temporal ambiguities like the spatial ambiguity of (8), and since there can apparently be no temporal equivalent of the reside / reach contrast, we will have to make do with the contrast between the temporal end-prepositions since (which is a Source marker like from) and until, till, and to (which are Goal markers), on the one hand, and medial prepositions like past and through, on the other,   Some results of this comparison appear in (20) – (26).

(20)   Questionability
    a. Since when have you been working? [since = end-preposition]
    b.   *Past when did you work?   [past = medial preposition]
(21)   Modifiability on the left and right, restrictive and appositive
    a. They worked until right then.   [until = end-preposition]
    b. They worked until then in May.   [until = end-preposition]
    c. *They worked past right then.   [past = medial preposition]
    d. *They worked past then in May.   [past = medial preposition]
(22)   Stressability
    a. They worked until THEN.   [until = end-preposition]
    b.   *They worked past THEN.   [past = medial preposition]
(23)   Preposability
    [Here, we see where the shoe begins to chafe.   These temporal
    path-linked proforms are more restricted than their spatial big
    brothers.   The little temporal tykes can't strand even end-
prepositions (cf. (23a)), and they can't even prepose from the one
    verb which selects for them – compare (18) with (23c).]
    a. *Then you can work till, and no one cares.   [till =end-preposition]
    b. *Then you can work past, and no one cares. [past=medial P]
    c. *The painting was dated 1435, and then the etching was dated too.
(24)   Left-Dislocatability [Inexplicably, this seems to work unimpeded
    with both strong and weak then.]
    a. Noon, I can work till then.
    b. Noon, I can work past then.
(25)   Disjoinability
    a. I am usually tired by noon, but I can work [till then or 1PM / ?till
    1PM or then], if that would help.
    b.   ?I am usually tired by noon, but I can work [past then or 1PM /
    *past 11 AM or then], if that would help.

Now that we have seen the contrast between strongies and weakies at work, let me very briefly show that the indefinite path-linked proforms can show up only where we find strong proforms.   The following cases are meant to adumbrate the whole range of possible contrasts, which interested readers can work out for themselves.   First I will cite some spatial cases, and then some temporal ones.

(26) a.. People are jumping [from / *past] everywhere.
    b. Maria wants to bicycle everywhere. [Loc /?*Dir]
    c. If you want to work [until / ??past] sometime or other tomorrow,
    that will require special permission.
    d. If I keep thinking [until / *past] every time that I go to bed, I fear
    that my mind will blow a fuse.

4.   **Into and out of**
If the correct generalization is that strong path-linked proforms show up after end-prepositions, what about the two prepositions into and out of – aren't they end-prepositions?   At first sight, they would appear to be, but when we run them through the tests for strength, this is what emerges.

(27)   Questionability

a. *Where did you jump into?
b. *Where did you jump out of?
(28)   Modifiability on the left and right, restrictive and appositive
a. *Into right here I leapt.
b. *Out of right here I leapt.
c. *Into here in the pool I leapt.
d. *Out of here in the pool I leapt.
(29)   Stressability
a. ?I leapt into THERE.
b. ?I leapt out of THERE.
(30)   Preposability
a. *There I leapt into.
b. *There I leapt out of.
(31)   Left-Dislocatability
The pool, I'll leap [into / out of] there tomorrow.
(32)   Con- and disjoinability
a. ?The pool looks inviting, and I'll leap [into / out of] [there and the
hot tub / ??the hot tub and there] as soon as I can.
b. ? The pool is full of chlorine, which I am allergic to, so I don't
want to leap [into / out of] [there or the hot tub / ?the hot tub or
there] unless I have to.

While there are some discrepancies, on the whole, the weight of this evidence
suggests that into and out of pattern with medial prepositions, rather than with end-
prepositions.   How can this be?
The answer lies in Gruber's insight that into is to be analyzed as a complex
directional – as a locative inside a directional, rather than as a simple end-prepo-
sition.   Gruber suggests the two rules in (33) – cf. Gruber (1967, 1976).

(33) a.   [to   [in NP]] -> into NP
b.   [from   [in NP]] -> out of NP

Support for this analysis can be derived from an analysis of the types of
nouns which can be referred to by there when this proform follows in.   (34)
presents some examples which show that in there likes to refer back to a three-
dimensional solid object, preferably an artifact, prototypically a building or room:

(34) a.   Dylan is in the World Trade Center, and Markus is in there too.
b. ??Dylan is in the pool, and Markus is in there too.
c. *Dylan is in the lake, and Markus is in there too.
d. *Dylan is in a patch of fog, and Markus is in there too.
e. *Dylan is in the garden, and Markus is in there too.
f. **L is in the Roman alphabet, and D is in there too.

In (35), we see that when we try to refer to this same set of nouns with a
phrase like into there or out of there, we run across the same pattern of gramma-
ticalities.

(35) a.   Dylan is in the World Trade Center and Markus just ran into
there.
b. ??Dylan is in the pool and Markus just dove into there.

c. *Dylan is in the lake, but Markus just dashed out of there.
d. *Dylan is in a patch of fog, but Markus just came out of there.
e. *Dylan is in the garden but Markus just walked out of there too.
f.**L is in the Roman alphabet, but even Genghis Khan couldn't put
  K into there.

I take it, then, that this case, at least, can be closed.

5.   Zapping to
Let us return, now, to sentence (9), which, it will be recalled, is the ques-tion which corresponds to the directional sense of (8).   Where could (9), which I repeat here for convenience, have come from?

(9)   Where did Anaîs bicycle to?

It would seem most obviously to derive from *(34), which is ungram-matical because of the presence of the preposition to.

(34) (*)Anaîs bicycled to where

Accordingly, we need to postulate a rule of **To Zap**, a rule, however, which will be needed independently of the problems posed by such ungrammaticalities as *(34), as we can see from (35) and (36).

(35) a.   Vicky flew from Corpus Christi to Palm Springs.
      b.   Vicky flew to Palm Springs from Corpus Christi.
(36) a.   Vicky flew from here ?*(to) there.
      b.   Vicky flew (?to) there from here.

The fact that (36b) prefers to surface without its underlying to is proof enough that there is a need for some rule to get rid of to under some circumstances. However, as might be surmised, there is a recalcitrant unsolved problem as to what those circumstances might be. (36) already provides evidence that adjacency to the verb will figure as a condition on the eventual rule, and the contrast between (36b) and (37) suggests that the centrality of the verb that triggers **To Zap** will play an important role as well.

(37) a.   Vicky went (*to) there from here.
      b.   Vicky Learjetted ?(to) there from here.

That is, the less marked the triggering verb is, the more obligatory **To Zap** must be. However, there seems to be more than simple markedness playing a role here, for both retreat and stride seem to be of low frequency, yet while the former prefers to retain its to, the latter insists on deleting it – cf. (38).

(38) a. There was a cache of ammo in the grove, and the soldiers retreated
          ??(to) there in a hurry.
      b. There was bottle of Slivovitz in the cupboard, and the CEO strode
          (?*to) there with alacrity.

Furthermore, I believe that verbs such as <u>go</u> and <u>run</u>, which permit nouns of spatial extent as their subjects, such as <u>route 66</u>, <u>my property</u>, etc., as we see in (39),

(39) a. Route 66 goes [to LA / (?to) there] from Chicago.
     b. My property runs ?(to) there from Turkey Mountain Brook.

allow <u>to</u> to follow them in such metaphorical usages more than is the case when these verbs occur with normal garden-variety moving subjects.   The problem of the interplay of metaphoricality and prepositionlessness is not limited to the case of <u>to</u>, as we see from examples like (40):

(40) a. Bugsy entered (*into) the house stealthily.
     b. Microsoft entered *(into) negotiations reluctantly.

There are obviously several cans of worms here, if not indeed metacans, and my plan is to fearlessly refuse to shake a stick at them.

6.   Return to bare directionals

There is a serious problem in my previous discussion of bare directional proforms, one related to the rule of **To** Zap.   For as I noted, while (8b), repeated for convenience, is unambiguously a locative question,

(8) b. Where did Anaïs bicycle?   [Loc /*Dir]

a <u>where</u>-question with <u>go</u>, the least-marked verb of motion is unambiguously a directional, and worse yet, if we leave behind a stranded <u>to</u>, as was necessary in (9), the only grammatical way of questioning (8a) directionally, the result with <u>go</u> is at least odd, if not out:

(41) a. Where did Anaîs go?   [*Loc / OK Dir]
     b. ??Where did Anaîs go to?

The directional grammaticality of the <u>where</u>-question with <u>go</u> in (41a) is systematic.   That is, we cannot merely claim that <u>go</u> is exceptional in the type of path-linked question that it allows.   Rather, it is a true exception to the generalization in (1), which states that bare path-linked proforms are weak in directional contexts.   The object of <u>go</u> is such a context, yet the path-linked proforms that replace it are clearly strong, as we can see in (42):

(42) a. Shelley went right there.   [Left-modifiability]
     b. Shelley went there to it.   [Right-modifiability – restrictive]
     c. Shelley went there – to it.   [Right-modifiability – appositive]
     d. Shelley went THERE.   [Stressability]
     e. There Shelley never went.   [Preposability]
     f. Rio, Shelley went there.   [Left-dislocatability]
     g. Shelley went [there and to Curitiba / ?to Curitiba and there].
     [Conjoinability]
     h. Shelley didn't go [there or to Curitiba / ?to Curitiba or there].
       [Disjoinability]

Note that we cannot account for this systematic strongness of the path-linked proforms with go by saying that when the from which depart and leave select for is not there (whether by some kind of lexical process, as seems most likely, or by a syntactic one, which I doubt can be made to work), then depart and leave are followed by weak path-linked proforms, while when **To Zap** applies, it leaves behind a strong proform. This avenue of analysis is not open to us, because of the large class of verbs like bicycle, walk, run, etc., which we have seen to be fol-lowed by weak path-linked proforms, in the absence of their to, as (1) stipulates. I take the risk of emphasizing the obvious here, just to point out how baffled I am by the case of go.

What makes me the most uneasy is the contrast between (b) and (41b), which is repeat for convenience as (43):

(43) a.　　Where did Anaïs bicycle to?　[= (9b)]
　　　b.　??Where did Anaïs go to?　　　[= (41b)]

We can neatly describe the behavior of the normal verbs, like bicycle, by saying that **To Zap** is obligatory – that whenever a to is followed by any kind of path-linked proform, the to immolates itself. This will explain why there can be no to in questions like (44), in which the to has pied-piped with the fronted where.

(44)　　(*To) where did Anaïs bicycle?

But what is not explained, was mich wurmt, is the utter to-lessness that go manifests. With go, to is deleted even if there is nothing to its right which would force it to delete. And what is worse, of all verbs, go is the only one, for me, which can even show up to-lessly before one noun, place, which though it is used to form indefinite path-linked proforms, can also appear quasilexically, modified by an adjective, as in (45):

(45)　　I have gone many fascinating places with Jerry.

What we need, I believe, is some way to say that go is radically, virulently to-less, and to link this fact with the strongness of the proforms which follow it.

And why do we need some such concept as "radical to-lessness," and why must we learn how to link it to strong proforms? Because it is bare locatives that are the strongest path-linked proforms of all. These locative proforms are accom-panied by a preposition that is so evanescent as to almost only be inferrable from the existence of dialects which contain sentences like (46).

(46)　　Where is Ted at?

These dialects distinguish their treatment of where and there. For while this at can surface stranded after where, with certain verbs, it cannot be stranded by a preposed there – cf. *(47)

(47) *There we were never at.

This neutrino-like at can, I believe, also be argued to be deeply present before the objects of end-prepositions in paths. I think that the remote structure of (48a) is that shown in (48b), because of the at's in (48c), at's which are protected

from being deleted by another rule of <u>At</u>-Deletion, one which deletes them after end-prepositions, by the presence of the intervening adverbs <u>right</u> and <u>down</u>.[3]

(48) a. Sal ran from the barn to the dock.
    b. (*)Sal ran from [at the barn] to [at the dock].
    c. Sal ran from [right at the barn] to [down at the dock].

The generalization which I intuit the presence of is one something like that stated in (49):

(49)   **The centrality of locatives**
      The more locative a path-linked expression, the greater its tendency to surface as a bare adverb. Thus since Source and Goal directionals contain locatives, as argued by Gruber, directionals will tend to surface more prepositionally than will locatives. And since universally, bare NP's are more accessible than are NP's which are the objects of prepositions, cross-linguistically, it is to be expected that locative path-linked proforms will exhibit stronger behaviors than will directionals. Thus we will expect to find locatives being more questionable, more modifiable, more stressable, more movable (including to clitic positions), and more con- and disjoinable than are directionals. While we will expect all path-linked proforms to be defective, with respect to non-adverbial NP's, we will expect directionals to be defective with respect to locatives.

The special properties of <u>go</u> represent the tip of an ugly iceberg; for speakers differ as to how many verbs are for them unmarked enough for the verbs to permit directional <u>where</u>-questions. One speaker reports that for him, both <u>run</u> and <u>drive</u> can, another that for her even <u>bicycle</u> can. In the best of all possible worlds, which is rarely the world which English visits, there would be an implicationally ordered list of verbs, such as the one in (50),

(50)   <u>go</u> ≥ <u>run</u> ≥ <u>walk</u> ≥ <u>drive</u> ≥ <u>bicycle</u>. . .

with the happy property that anyone who could use a directional <u>where</u> with some verb at position x on this scale would be able to do the same thing with all verbs to its left. I have looked for such simple scales in the past, with rare success. Things are usually a lot messier than that. How messy they will turn out to be in the present case is a question that will have to wait for future research.

Observe that the problem raised by <u>go</u>, an intransitive verb, which selects a path as its object, will be duplicated by transitive verbs like <u>take</u>, which select for a direct object that is a Theme, with a following path. Thus by (1), we would pre-dict that the <u>there</u> that follows <u>take</u> should be weak – but it is strong:

(51) a. I took Shelley right there.   [Left-modifiability]
    b. I took Shelley there to it.   [Right-modifiability – restrictive]
    c. I took Shelley there – to it.   [Right-modifiability – appositive]
    d. I took Shelley THERE.   [Stressability]
    e. There I never took Shelley.   [Preposability]
    f. Rio, I took Shelley there.   [Left-dislocatability]

g. I took Shelley [there and to Curitiba / ?to Curitiba and there].
[Conjoinability]
h. I didn't take Shelley [there or to Curitiba / ?to Curitiba or there].
[Disjoinability]

In general, we find the same kind of facts with transitive verbs as we find with intransitive ones.   That is, the more central the verb, the stronger the path-linked proforms that occur with it.   Thus for instance, I would expect such unmarked verbs as <u>take</u>, <u>put</u> and <u>bring</u> to occur with the strongest proforms, and slightly rarer verbs, like <u>drive</u>, <u>push</u>, and <u>shove</u>, to occur with weaker ones, and marked verbs, such as <u>elbow</u>, <u>impel</u>, and <u>maneuver</u>, to occur with the weakest ones of all. While I will not attempt a full demonstration of these asymmetries here, the facts of (52)–(54) seem to be going in the right direction (sorry).

(52) a. Where will they put him?
b. They will put him right there.
c. There they should not put him.
d. ?Where will they bring him?
e. ?They will bring him right there.
f. ?There they should not bring him.

(53) a. ?Where will they drive the car?   [Dir]
b. ?They will drive the car right there.   [Dir]
c. *There they should not drive the car.   [Dir]
d. ??Where will they [push/*shove] the car?   [Dir]
e. ?*They will push the car right there.   [Dir]
f. *There they should not push the car.   [Dir]

(54) a. *Where will they elbow the car?   [Dir]
b. *They will impel the car right there.   [Dir]
c. *There they shouldn't maneuver the car.   [Dir]

7.   Conclusion
I have argued that we must distinguish between two types of path-linked proforms – strong and weak ones.   While most of the paper has been spent in demonstrating the differences between these two types of proforms, perhaps paradoxically, I feel that the central contribution of the paper lies in however much of (49) may prove to be true, after it has been subjected to crosslinguistic checking. I have begun this work (cf. Ross (1995b)), and some of the conclusions that I reach there, namely, that Brasilian Portuguese and German both seem to distin-guish systematically between end-prepositions and medial ones, is suggestive.   The evidence suggests that as in English, the objects of medial prepositions are defective, with respect to the behaviors that the objects of end-prepositions can manifest.   I would like to end this paper by discussing one final contrast one between locative and directional adverbials in German, so indicate the kind of research which I hope to carry out in the future.
As is well known, German uses the dative case to express locatives, and the accusative case to express directionals. Thus (55a), with the dative <u>dem</u>, expresses a locative, while (55b), with the accusative <u>den</u>, expresses a directional.

(55) a.   Joachim hüpfte in dem Garten. "Joachim hopped in the garden"

b.   Joachim hüpfte in den Garten. "Joachim hopped into the garden"

If (49) is true, we might expect the former to be able to do things that the former cannot.   One such contrast is found in the adverbial relative clauses which can be introduced with the path-linked morpheme wo- [which corresponds roughly to "where"].   While both sentences in (55) can form relative clauses with the non path-linked relativization strategy shown in (56), only (55a) can form a wo-based relative clause.

(56) a.   Der Garten, in dem Joachim hüpfte, war hübsch.
         "The garden in which Joachim hopped (around) was pretty.
     b.   Der Garten, in den Joachim hüpfte, war hübsch.
         "The garden into which Joachim hopped was pretty.

(57)   Der Garten, worin Joachim hüpfte, war hübsch.
         "The garden in(*to) which Joachim hopped was pretty.

I thus very cautiously conclude that the kind of effects that we might expect to find turning up in languages around the world, if locatives are indeed more central, and therefore less defective, than are directionals, are making their presence felt in German.   I would like, however, to reemphasize the "cautiously" that figured prominently in the last sentence.   It is my experience that languages differ strikingly in their expression of spatial concepts, and it appears to me that the same depth of research that I have struggled to attain for English will be required in each language to be compared before we will have any certainty that a language provides evidence for such a general claim as that in (49).

Acknowledgements

Footnotes

1.   As far as I know, the only types of modifiers which can modify path-linked pro-forms on the right are PP's and where-clauses: there by the watercooler, here where I live.   In general, these right-modified proforms seem bad, after most prepositions except end-prepositions. However, there are some which seem better than others, for reasons that will doubtless continue to elude me for many years.   Here are some:

Past here on this corner vehicles rush at a dizzying rate.
By there where we work, they will be driving all the used Jeeps.

2.   I have not looked into the question as to whether <u>at</u> is stranded or zapped with verbs which select for Locatives after transitives, like <u>lay</u> and <u>place</u>.   At issue is which of the following sentences would be grammatical, ones like (i), or ones like (ii).

(i)   Where did they [lay/place] the flowers at?
(ii) Where did they [lay/place] the flowers?

This question must be left for future research.

3.   I have sketched this analysis in work thus far unpublished (Ross (1995a)).

References

Gruber, Jeffrey.   1967.   Look and See. Language 43.4
_____ 1976.   Lexical Structures in Syntax and Semantics.   Amsterdam: North-Holland Publishing Company.
Ross, Háj. 1995a.   The grammar of space.   Unpublished paper, English Depart-ment, University of North Texas, Denton, Texas.
_____   1995b.   A first crosslinguistic look at paths – the difference between end-legs and medial ones. In Lynn Eubank, Larry Selinker and Michael Sharwood Smith (eds.). The Current State of Interlanguage Studies in Honor of William E. Rutherford.   Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 273-285.