

### Does *into* mean *in*?

This paper contributes to the understanding of complex directional PPs in English. A number of papers have recently argued that directional PPs contain a Path and a Loc(ation) projection; see amongst others den Dikken 2003, Huybregts & van Riemsdijk 2001, Koopman 1997, Inagaki 2003, Noonan 2005, Svenonius 2004b. A number of these proposals focus on Dutch and German, where the Path element occurs as a postposition; see (1). English also has complex prepositional constructions, but here the Path element precedes the locational P; see (2). It furthermore has two complex prepositions, *into* and *onto*. A wide-spread theory about *into* is that *to* expresses Path, and *in* pronounces Place (e.g. Jackendoff 1990, Koopman 1997, Inagaki 2003). The structurally lower Place adposition *in* incorporates into *to*, deriving the inverted order. Under such analyses *into* DP corresponds to the basic structure  $[_{PP} \text{to}_{\text{PATH}} [_{PP} \text{in}_{\text{PLACE}} \text{DP}]]$ . I will henceforth refer to this analysis as Hypothesis 1, short H1. Here I wish to challenge this analysis of *into/onto* by proposing an alternative one, Hypothesis 2 (H2), according to which *in/on* express Path, while *to* is  $P_{\text{LOC}}$ :  $[_{PP} \text{in}_{\text{PATH}} [_{PP} \text{to}_{\text{LOC}} \text{DP}]]$ . Essentially, I propose to reduce the *in* in *into* to the particle *in* as in *She walked in*. The surface order thus reflects the underlying order. While this analysis at first glance seems less intuitive from an interpretive point of view, it nevertheless solves a number of puzzles about the English preposition *to* and the complex forms *into/onto* which remain mysterious under H1. In what follows, I present five arguments from comparative, morphosyntactic, and interpretive perspectives that converge to support my proposal.

(i) The first argument comes from a comparative perspective: the proposed analysis of English *into* finds a natural counterpart in German examples such as (3). German has the fortunate property of distinguishing morphophonologically between the Place adposition *in* and the Path adposition (particle) *in* – while the former is homophonous to English *in*, the latter is pronounced with a diphthong [ajn]. German *zu*, which we take to correspond directly to English *to*, easily co-occurs with postpositional Path adposition, as in (3). It does not, however, co-occur with Place prepositions; see (4). Nor does German permit more than one Path expression; see (9a), providing one of several arguments against *zu* being a Path adposition. Seeing English *into* through German glasses thus makes H2 much less surprising.

(ii) Under H1, the question arises why *to* can only incorporate *in* and *on*, but no other locational Ps; see (5). Other place prepositions, such as *under*, *behind* only marginally occur with overt *to*, and if they do, *to* necessarily precedes them; see examples (6). Under H1 the facts in (5-6) reduce to the fact that *under*, *behind*, *at*, ... do not (easily) lexicalise Path, whereas *in* and *on* do.

(iii) If we add *up* to examples (6), we receive a possible interpretation whereby *up* emphasises the location as the endpoint of the motion, see (7). Crucially, the examples in (8) are impossible under a parallel interpretation. If *into* was underlyingly *to>in*, we might expect the examples (8) to receive the interpretation *She ran up to in the room* and *It crawled up to on the table*, which they don't; *up* in (8) is restricted to an upward motion interpretation. The marginal cases (7) are thus examples of conjoined PPs, i.e. *up AND in to*, rather than recursively embedded PPs. Again, the comparison with German enlightens – here two postpositional Path expressions are impossible (see (9a)), also forcing a coordination structure, which for reasons internal to the structure of German PPs gives rise to the order in (9b).

(iv) The next argument involves particles, which involve an abstract (silent) LocP (see (10); Noonan 2005, Svenonius 2004a). Path Ps are typical candidates for particles. Neither *to* nor *into/onto* can function as particles in English; see (11). If *to* is  $P_{\text{LOC}}$ , (11) follows straightforwardly under the proposed analysis.

(v) Finally, Folli (2002) points out that example (12a), in contrast to e.g. (12b-c), can only receive a locational interpretation, not one of directed motion. She concludes that *in* is unambiguously locative, while *under*, *behind*, etc. are ambiguous between a locative and a dynamic interpretation. However, conflicting with this conclusion is the observation that many speakers of English freely admit a directional interpretation in cases such as (13). I propose (a) that examples such as (12b-c) and (13) involve a silent *to*, see (14); and (b) that the source of the contrast between (12a) and (13), which differ only in the conceptual properties of the ground argument (e.g. room vs. forest) reduces to the fact that in (15), where *in* is clearly Path *in*, the implied location must be a “container”, such as a room, a house, etc, and cannot be an open space, such as a forest or a park.

## DATA

- (1) a. Sie klettert in die Schachtel rein. (German)  
She climbs in<sub>LOC</sub> the<sub>ACC</sub> box R-in<sub>PATH</sub>  
b. Sie klettert auf das Dach runter. (see Huybregts&van Riemsdijk 2001; Noonan 2005)  
She climbs on<sub>LOC</sub> the<sub>ACC</sub> roof R-down<sub>PATH</sub>
- (2) The insect crawled down under the bed.
- (3) Er geht zum Laden rein.  
he goes to-the<sub>DAT</sub> store R-in [ajn]
- (4) a. \*Er geht in den Laden zu.  
he goes in the<sub>ACC</sub> store to  
b. \*Er geht zu den Laden in.  
c. \*Er geht in zu den/dem Laden.  
d. \*Er geht zu in den Laden.
- (5) \*It ran underto the bed. .... \*over to, \*behind to, ...
- (6) a. The boat drifted (?to) behind the hill.  
b. The boat drifted (?to) inside the cave.  
c. The boat drifted (?to) below the bridge. (Examples from Svenonius 2004b)
- (7) a. ?The animal crawled up to under the bed, where it died.  
b. ?You must run up to behind the shed, but not further.
- (8) a. She ran up into the room.  
b. It crawled up onto the table. → *up* is interpreted as a PATH.
- (9) a. \*Sie läuft ins Zimmer **rein rauf**.  
she runs in-the<sub>ACC</sub> room R-in R-up  
b. Sie läuft **rauf**?(und) ins Zimmer **rein**.  
she runs R-up?(and) in-the<sub>ACC</sub> room R-in
- (10) She jumped in. → She jumped [<sub>PathP</sub> in [<sub>LocP</sub> *pro*].
- (11) a. \*She ran into.  
b. \*She ran to. (exception is the highly idiomatic *She came to*)
- (12) a. \*She ran in the forest.  
b. She ran under the bridge.  
c. The child ran behind the shed.
- (13) a. She ran in the room.  
b. She jumped in the lake.  
c. It rolled in the river.
- (14) She ran [ in TO the room ]
- (15) She ran/walked in.

## REFERENCES

- 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.
- 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):187-234.
- Jackendoff, R. 1990. *Semantic Structures*, MIT Press. Cambridge, Mass.
- Koopman, H. 1997. The structure of Dutch PPs. Ms. UCLA.
- Noonan, M. 2005. R-particles. Paper presented at *GLOW*, Geneva.
- 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. 2004a. Adpositions, Particles and the arguments they introduce. Ms. University of Tromsø.
- Svenonius, P. 2004b. Spatial P in English. Ms. University of Tromsø.