## Turning Objects into Locations in English and Mainland Scandinavian

The cross-linguistic variation that will be described and analysed in this talk is the one shown below in (1). In English and Norwegian, it is possible to use the particles *out* and *ut* respectively in a prepositional fashion selecting a Ground directly (cf. Svenonius 2010). In Danish and Swedish the equivalent particles require an extra overt preposition to mediate between them and the Ground DP. The same difference is seen for the particle *in* (though English show a different pattern here).

(1)	a.	I chased him out the door.	English
	b.	Jeg jaget ham ut/inn døren.	Norwegian
	c.	Jeg jagede ham ud/ind <b>ad</b> døren.	Danish
	d.	Jag jagade ut/in honom <b>genom</b> dörren.	Swedish

In (2), we show the same pattern with the particles down/ned/ned/ner and up/opp/op/upp.

(2)	a.	They carried him down/up the stairs.	English
	b.	De bar ham ned/opp trappen.	Norwegian
	c.	De bar ham ned/op <b>ad</b> trappen.	Danish
	d.	De bar ner/upp honom <b>för</b> trappan.	Swedish

To our knowledge, this locus of systematic variation between English and Norwegian on the one hand and Danish and Swedish on the other has not been noted previously in the literature (though Hulthén 1944 noticed the variation between the Scandinavian languages).

'Particles' used as prepositions have a number of peculiar semantic and selectional properties. Firstly, they are highly constrained and require a very specific kind of DP Ground element to be felicitous. In the English examples in (3) below, we see that up/down require a DP like the hill, and are ungrammatical with a DP like the table ("She carried the box down/up the hill/\*the table."). Intuitively, with up/down, a DP complement is only felicitous if it can name a whole PATH structure, to which the particle is only contributing a directionality. We think the case of out in English is similar. The constructions are only felicitous if the DP complement is interpreted as a portal of some sort, not as the Source location ("He threw the ball out the window/\*the stadium."). We think that once again the DP complement here must determine the PATH structure itself, with the particle providing Direction. The difference between the up/down particles and the out particle is that the PATH structure required by the former is extended, while for the latter it is a punctual transition. We show that the same constraints apply to the construction in Norwegian.

The main question that will be addressed is whether the English/Norwegian sentences in 1-2 have the same underlying structure as the Danish/Swedish sentences in 1-2. The answer will be Yes (with some exceptions). The second issue to be addressed is how to best analyze the surface variation shown in 1-2. Two proposals will be discussed: (i) English has a phonologically null preposition that is used in 1-2, and (ii) English and Norwegian has a couple of elements that simultaneously can be act as particles and prepositions. If (i) is correct, we expect to find a more systematic variation between the languages (i.e., we expect that the null preposition should be available in other contexts as well, see Lundquist and Ramchand 2011 for possible candidates), but if (ii) is correct, we expect no systematic (or 'parametric') variation. The talk will end with a discussion about advantages and disadvantages in locating cross-linguistic variation in phonologically null lexical/functional elements, as opposed to in the feature set-up of individual (or groups of) lexical/functional elements.

**Selected references:** Lundquist, Björn and Gillian Ramchand. 2011. Verbs of contact in English, Swedish and German. In *Proceedings from CGSW 23 and 24*, edited by Rhona Alcorn, Peter Ackema, and Caroline Heycock. John Benjamins, Amsterdam. Svenonius, Peter. 2010. Spatial P in English. In *The Cartography of Syntactic Structures. Vol 6*, edited by Guglielmo Cinque and Luigi Rizzi. Oxford University Press, Oxford.