

A Short Note on *where* vs. *place*

Richard S. Kayne  
New York University

November, 2005

1. Introduction.

In the spirit of Katz and Postal (1964, 133-134), Kayne (2004) proposed that sentences like:

(1) John went there.

contain an unpronounced noun corresponding to overt *place*. (I will represent the unpronounced version as PLACE, with capital letters, and similarly for other unpronounced elements.) Thus (1) should be thought of as:<sup>1</sup>

(2) ...there PLACE

At the same time, I proposed that this same *there* can be accompanied in other cases by an unpronounced noun distinct from PLACE, as in the now archaic:

(3) He spoke thereof.

for which I took there to be an unpronounced THING present in the derivation:

(4) ...there THING of

Similarly, in (5) it is more plausible to postulate REASON than PLACE as the unpronounced noun accompanying *there*:

(5) Therefore, we should say that.

with the representation:

(6) there REASON fore...

This establishes a link (that abstracts away from the orthographic difference between *fore* and *for*) to:

(7) What did you say that for?

which also plausibly contains REASON, as well as to:

(8) For what reason did you say that?

with overt *reason*. (The unpronounced noun present with *thereby* may be WAY.)

In archaic English (and in contemporary Dutch and German), one also has sentences like:

(9) Whereof have they spoken?

These must have a parallel analysis, with unpronounced THING (cf. (3)/(4)):

(10) where THING of...

(and similarly for *whereby*, again perhaps with WAY).

The claim that *there* and *where* together form a natural class (along with *here*) is immediately plausible. Let me informally refer to them using van Riemsdijk's (1978) term 'r-pronoun'. The 'r-' part of this term is based on the fact that the final consonant of *there*, *where* and *here* is /r/ (and similarly in Dutch). The 'pronoun' part of the term has an obvious naturalness in the case of *there* and *here*; for *where*, one can think of 'indefinite pronoun', a term that has sometimes been used.

More satisfactorily, though, we should think of this terminology in light of Postal's (1966) proposal that pronouns are essentially the same as determiners (and are not nouns). Postal is clearly right in at least some cases, e.g. in French the accusative third person clitic pronouns *le*, *la* and *les* (m.sg.; f.sg.; pl.) have exactly the same form as the definite article. Of course, if Postal is right, the term 'pronoun' itself is misleading. Pronouns don't 'stand for' nouns, rather they are determiners that allow the non-pronunciation of nouns.

In this sense, to (informally) call *there* and *where* (and *here*) 'r-pronouns' is natural, given analyses such as those indicated in (10), (6), (4) and (2), which specifically attribute to *there*, *where* and *here* the property of allowing the non-pronunciation of the associated noun, in a way partially akin to more familiar pronouns. (Similarly, we can call the *there* and *here* of non-standard *that there book* and *this here book* 'r-determiners'.)

Postal's proposal needs to be fleshed out in various ways. For example, French subject clitics don't match the definite articles in the way that accusative clitics do. In Italian, the accusative clitics match the definite article to a large extent but not as regularly as in French. In English, there is no pronoun exactly matching the definite article *the* at all. Furthermore, the pronouns that in Romance do match well with the definite article are quite distinct in

<sup>1</sup> Alternatively, (2) might rather be '...PLACE...there', especially if Kayne (to appear) is correct in its proposal that unpronounced elements necessarily occupy the Spec of some phase.

various ways from the first and second person pronouns,<sup>2</sup> the analysis of which as determiners is less certain (see Bartos (2001) for relevant discussion of Hungarian). Nonetheless, Postal's core claim that what are traditionally called pronouns are not nouns seems plausible.<sup>3</sup>

## 2. *where* vs. *place*.

Let us assume, then, that *there* and *where* (and *here*) are close to pronouns (and determiners), and are not nouns. This is perfectly compatible with the (almost certain) fact that r-pronouns are not single morphemes, since what we call ordinary pronouns are often not single morphemes, either. Ordinary pronouns can have Case morphology (even in English, thinking of the *-m* of *him*, *them* and *whom*), plural morphology (e.g. French *le* vs. *les*), gender morphology (Italian *lo* vs. *la*) and other morphology of a less clear sort (French *moi*, *toi*, *soi* as *m-/t-/s-* + *-oi* - see Kayne (2003)).

Similarly, *there* and *where* and *here* share an *-r* that is arguably a morpheme, as Noonan (2005) has in fact suggested for partially similar cases in German. The *th-* of *there* is arguably a morpheme that *there* has in common with *they* and *that* and *then* - cf. Bernstein (2004). The initial *wh-* of *where* is plausibly a morpheme that *where* has in common with other *wh*-words. If both *-r* and *th-* are separate morphemes in *there*, and *-r* and *wh-* in *where*, then so might be the vowel *-e-* between them.

The possible morphemic status of that vowel is made more interesting by the observation that, despite the orthography, the vowel of *here* is not the same as that of *there* and *where*. This recalls Italian (and Spanish) pronominal possessives, which have second singular *tu-* and (third singular)/reflexive *su-* vs. first singular *mi-*. The fact that *here* and *mi-* share the status of being 'the odd man out' in turn recalls the fact that *here* has, interpretively speaking, something in common with first person, and suggests a possible link between the indefinite *wh-* and the *s-* morpheme of Romance, which might then be seen as the indefinite person counterpart of first person *m-* and second person *t-*.

Taking *where* to have much in common with pronouns/determiners (and taking *where* not to be a noun) leads to a clear differentiation between *where* and *place*, which seems clearly to be a noun rather than a pronoun. This difference is reflected in:

(11) the part of Italy where they spent the summer

(12) \*the part of Italy place they spent the summer

*Where*, but not *place*, can have the behavior of a relative pronoun.<sup>4</sup> A similar distinction can be seen in interrogatives:<sup>5</sup>

(13) Where did they spend the summer?

(14) \*Place did they spend the summer?

((13) contains PLACE in addition to *where*, parallel to (1)/(2).)

Conversely, *place* behaves like an ordinary noun in ways not open to *where*:<sup>6</sup>

(15) The place they took us to was beautiful.

(16) \*The where they took us was beautiful.

as well as:

(17) They took us to a really beautiful place.

(18) \*They took us to a really beautiful where.

<sup>2</sup> And from reflexives of the Romance *s-* type - cf. Kayne (2003).

<sup>3</sup> Unless it were to turn out that all categories are either nouns or verbs, with nouns (and similarly for verbs) then subdividing into lexical nouns and (multiple subclasses of) functional nouns, with functional nouns including classifiers and also nouns like English *number*, *amount*, *pound*, etc. and perhaps also what we call determiners - cf. Corver and van Riemsdijk (2001).

<sup>4</sup> I leave open the question whether (11) contains PLACE in addition to *where*. Relevant is the exact form of the head-raising analysis of relatives - for recent discussion, see Cheng (2005).

<sup>5</sup> A partial counterpart of (14) with *cosa* ('thing') is possible in (certain varieties of) Italian:

i) Cosa vuoi fare? ('thing want-you to-do')  
presumably with an unpronounced CHE ('what').

<sup>6</sup> In what is for me archaic English, one can have:

i) ?Let's go just any old where.

I would guess that *where* here is still not a noun, despite being preceded by (this very particular) *old*, which seems to be a reinforcer of *any*.

Despite these clear differences, there is a context in which *where* and *place* appear to be equivalent:

(19) They went somewhere else.

(20) They went someplace else.

These appear to be synonymous and seem equally acceptable.<sup>7</sup>

At the same time, even *somewhere* and *someplace* act very differently from each other in:

(21) She's written somewhere/\*someplace between 10 and 15 papers this year.

(22) She's written somewhere/\*someplace around 15 papers this year.

A plausible interpretation of these facts is as follows. In line with (2), (19) contains unpronounced PLACE (as does (13) - v. note (1)):

(23) ...somewhere PLACE else

In contrast, (21) and (22) with *somewhere* do not contain PLACE. They are, rather, like (3) and (9) and contain THING, instead:<sup>8</sup>

(24) ...somewhere THING between/around...

in a way that recalls:

(25) She's written something like 15 papers this year.

with overt *thing*.<sup>9</sup> (Put another way, (21) and (22) are the closest productive counterparts in English to sentences like (9), which are productive in Dutch and German.<sup>10</sup>)

<sup>7</sup> Payne and Huddleston (2002, 423) give *-place* as an informal variant of *-where* in American English. Cf. Curme (1977a, 18).

<sup>8</sup> It is worth noting that the presence of THING (and not PLACE) in (21) and (22), as given in (24) (in a way parallel to (3) and (4)), suggests that *between* in (21) is not intrinsically a locative preposition. Cf. the fact that French *entre* ('between') occurs as a reciprocal:

i) s'entretuer ('refl. *entre* to-kill' = 'to kill one another')

The text analysis takes *where* not to be intrinsically locative, either. As Thomas Leu (p.c.) has pointed out, that *where* is not intrinsically locative is also supported by those varieties of German that have *wo* ('where') as a relative clause marker even with non-locative heads - v. Bayer (1983) and van Riemsdijk (1989); cf. also the use of *où* ('where') in French in temporal relatives, as discussed by Starke (2001)

<sup>9</sup> In some colloquial English, one finds:

i) She's written like 15 papers this year.

arguably with an unpronounced SOMETHING. Similarly for:

ii) She was like he's gotta be kidding.

with an unpronounced verb in addition (probably GO - cf. van Riemsdijk (2002)); cf. in part Singler (2005). In other words, (ii) is really:

iii) She was GOING SOMETHING like he's gotta be kidding.

Note that the proposal in (24) is supported by the fact that (21), (22) and (25) share the property of being unamenable to *else*:

iv) \*She's written somewhere else between 10 and 15 papers this year.

v) \*She's written somewhere else around 15 papers this year.

vi) \*She's written something else like 15 papers this year.

Perhaps closely related to (i) is:

vii) She's written some 30 articles this year.

viii) She hasn't written any 30 articles.

ix) She ain't written no 30 articles.

with unpronounced THING and LIKE:

ix) ...some/any/no THING LIKE thirty articles

This is supported by:

x) \*She's written just some 30 articles.

parallel to:

xi) \*She's written just something like 30 articles.

vs.:

xii) She's written just about 30 articles.

<sup>10</sup> Even closer to (21) and (22) is the Dutch phenomenon that has *ergens* ('somewhere') replacing *iets* ('something') when *iets* is the object of a preposition - v. van Riemsdijk (1978,

Despite the apparent synonymy of (19) and (20), and similarly for:

(26) Let's go somewhere/someplace tonight, instead of staying home.

there is reason to think that *somewhere* and *someplace* are actually never quite identical in interpretation, even when both are purely locative, as in (26). This is reflected, I think, in the fact that the following are (to me) less natural with *someplace* than with *somewhere* (it may be that *else* would obscure the difference here):

(27) They must have hidden it somewhere/?someplace.

(28) You've got to take your vacation somewhere/?someplace, after all

As an initial approximation, let us say that *somewhere* is less specific than *someplace*.

Given (23) and the corresponding structure without *else*:

(29) ...somewhere PLACE

which I take to be appropriate for the *somewhere* subcase of (26)-(28) (as opposed to (21)/(22)/(24)), a natural proposal, in light of the difference in interpretation felt in (27) and (28), is that *someplace* does not contain WHERE:

(30) ...some (\*WHERE) place

since, if it did, it would be hard to see where the (slight) difference in interpretation between locative *somewhere* and locative *someplace* comes from. Instead, if (23) and (29) differ from (30) as indicated, we can say that the less specific interpretation associated with *somewhere* is to be attributed to the presence of *where* (i.e. *where* adds an element of indefiniteness, informally speaking, to (29) and to (23)).<sup>11</sup> As for the question why WHERE would be impossible in (30), it might be that *where* in such cases could not reach (or originate in) a position in which its non-pronunciation would be possible (see note 1).

A related question arises concerning (24) as (part of) the analysis of (21) and (22). If 'somewhere THING' is available, why can the 'where' not be omitted entirely and THING be pronounced, yielding?:

(31) ??She's written something between 10 and 15 papers this year.

(32) \*?She's written something around 15 papers this year.

These are clearly less good with *something* than with *somewhere*. A possible answer is that *something* by itself (i.e. without WHERE) would be too specific (not indefinite enough) in the relevant sense, for this context.

Conversely, (25) is considerably degraded if *something* is replaced by *somewhere*:

(33) \*She's written somewhere like 15 papers this year.

The question is why this is not possible with '...somewhere THING...'. Recalling that unpronounced THING may have to move (see note 1), it might be that there is a violation (if *like*, but not *between* or *around*, introduces a kind of relative clause) akin to those produced by moving a clitic heading a relative - v. Kayne (1975, sect. 2.8).

### 3. R-pronouns and licensing.

The presence vs. absence of a determiner before *where* (as in *somewhere* vs. interrogative *where*) does not seem to matter to the presence of unpronounced THING, to judge by the fact that THING is present in both (24) (with *somewhere*) and (10) (with *where*). Similarly, unpronounced PLACE is present in both (29) and:

(34) where PLACE...

which corresponds to simple locative sentences like:

(35) Where are you going?

in a way entirely parallel to (1) and (2).

Yet the presence of a determiner before *where* does make a difference for a phenomenon found in non-standard English (noted by Curme (1977b, 142)):

(36) Let's go somewheres (else).

(37) If you go anywheres (else), go to Paris.

in which *somewhere* and *anywhere* (and *nowhere*) can (non-standardly) be followed by an -s. There is a sharp contrast with bare *where*:<sup>12</sup>

(38) \*Wheres (else) are you going?

This contrast within non-standard English recalls a more familiar one concerning adjectives in standard English:

36ff.).

<sup>11</sup> Cf. perhaps the *which* of *every which way*.

<sup>12</sup> Similarly for relative *where*:

i) the closet where(\*s) they keep their shoes  
and, I think, for:

ii) \*Wheresoever they go, they run into trouble.

(39) You've written too long a book.

(40) You've written how long a book?

which are opposed to:

(41) \*You've written long (of) a book.

An adjective can precede the indefinite article (and in at least some colloquial English an *of*, too - *too/how long of a book*) only if the adjective is modified by a degree word.

Hendrick (1990) proposed an analysis involving movement. The adjective in (39) and (40) is moved past *a* (and, by extension, *of*, in the relevant English) as the result of an A-bar movement within the DP that has something in common with ordinary wh-movement. The contrast with (41) is to be understood in terms of pied-piping. The degree word *too* or *how* in (39)/(40) pied-pipes the adjective, which could not move on its own, as shown by (41).

Let me propose a parallel way of understanding (36)-(38). The non-standard English in question has an *-s* morpheme merged higher than *where*. *Where* can be moved past this *-s* if pied-piped by *some* or *any*, as seen in (36) and (37).<sup>13</sup> Just as in (41), though, if there is no determiner,<sup>14</sup> there can be no pied-piping, as shown by the impossibility of (38).

It should be noted that having this *-s* present and leaving *where* in situ does not yield an acceptable output, either:

(42) \*S where (else) are you going?

as opposed to the adjective case, where non-movement in the absence of a pied-piper yields the well-formed:

(43) You've written a long book.

Possibly, the *-s* in question, as opposed to *a*, requires that its Spec be filled.

<sup>13</sup> Or by *no*:

i) You ain't going nowheres (else).

The result, however, seems less good with *every*:

ii) They went everywhere(?s).

though improved with *else* (as Judy Bernstein (p.c.) points out):

iii) (?)They went everywhere else.

Just as *else* can be stranded in (36) and (37), so may be PLACE:

iv) [ some/any where ]<sub>i</sub> s [ t<sub>i</sub> (else) PLACE ]

though this question is complex - see note 1.

The lesser status of *every* in (ii) with *-s*, as compared with *some/any/no*, may be related to:

v) \*everyhow

vs.

vi) somehow, anyhow, nohow

as well as to the contrast between (21) and:

vii) \*Everywhere between 10 and 15 people will come to the parties.

though (vii) is not good with *nowhere*, either, much as:

viii) Somewhere/\*nowhere/\*everywhere around 15 people showed up.

Different is:

ix) Nowhere (\*else)/\*everywhere near that many people came to the party.

which like (ix) contains THING rather than PLACE - cf. the discussion of (25) and:

x) Nothing like that many people came to the party.

On the impossibility of *else* in (ix), cf. note 9. For me, (vi) is also impossible with *else* - \**somewhat else*, etc. - though some speakers accept it.

Why English doesn't generalize (vi) and the *-where* cases to \**somewho*, \**anywhat*, \**nowhen*, etc. remains to be understood.

<sup>14</sup> If there is an unpronounced determiner (cf. Watanabe (1992) and Kayne (1998)), it must not be capable of acting as a pied-piper, at least not within DP.

I leave open the question whether the *-s* of interrogative *whereabouts* should receive similar treatment, and similarly for the *-s* of *a (long) ways* and for that of *otherwise*.

I think that (i) is more like (36) than like (38):

i) ?We should go elsewhere.

If so, *else* must be a pied-piper, unless there's an unpronounced SOME present.

There is a restriction concerning determiners with *where* that may further support the (partial) parallelism between (36)-(38) and (39)-(41). It is that *somewheres* and *anywheres* have no counterpart (at least to my non-standard ear) with the indefinite article *a*:

(44) \*Let's go awheres (else).

The landing site of *too long* and *how long* in (39) and (40) is clearly to the left of the position of *a*. If *somewhere* and *anywhere* in (36) and (37) have a parallel landing site, it will arguably be to the left of *a*, too, in which case (44) would not be expected at all (i.e., *a* is not part of the same class of determiners as *some*, *any* and *no*).<sup>15</sup>

Assume, now, that standard English has a null counterpart within DP of the non-standard *-s* of (36) and (37) (call it *-S*). By extension from the preceding discussion, *somewhere* and *anywhere* will reach Spec,*-S* as the result of the pied-piping of *where* by *some* and *any*. Since the indefinite article is not a potential pied-piper of that sort, we again have, parallel to (44).<sup>16</sup>

(45) \*Let's go awhere (else).

There is a contrast between (36)/(37) and:

(46) \*Let's go someplaces (else).

(47) \*If you go anyplaces (else), go to Paris.

Unlike *where*, *place* in non-standard English seems incompatible with this non-plural *-s*. This contrast will provide additional support for the idea of a categorial difference between *where* and *place* if it can be shown that it is the nominal character of *place* (vs. the pronominal/determiner character of *where*) that is responsible for the difference in behavior.<sup>17</sup>

Note, finally, that the interpretation of (36)/(37) is not that of plural *-s* and that *somewhere* in fact is incompatible with plural *-s*:

(48) Let's go somewhere that's interesting, for a change.

(49) \*Let's go somewheres that are interesting, for a change.

#### 4. *place* vs. *place*

With *place*, the question of plurality is more complex, in that one does have, especially with overt *to*:

(50) Let's go ??(to) some places that are interesting.

Here the *-s* is the plural one. It is not compatible with *else*:

(51) \*Let's go (to) some places else (that are interesting).

and in that regard shows a sharp contrast with the *-s* of (36)/(37). In addition (50) has higher stress on *places* than on *some*, which is the reverse of *somewhere(s)* and also of *someplace* written as a single word.<sup>18</sup>

<sup>15</sup> One might, instead, wonder about:

(i) \*Let's go somewheres a (else).

which plausibly falls together with:

(ii) \*You've written too long (of) a.

though the following contrast will need further elucidation:

(iii) \*Let's go somewheres a (else) one.

(iv) You've written too long (of) a one.

<sup>16</sup> Bare *where* must have access to another licensing strategy, in all likelihood in the sentential domain. I leave this question open (but see note 19).

<sup>17</sup> Alternatively, (36)/(37) vs. (46)/(47) might indicate that pied-piping to Spec,*-s* depends in part on the presence of unpronounced PLACE itself, as opposed to overt *place* - cf note 1.

*Something (else)* is also incompatible with the non-standard non-plural *-s* of *somewheres (else)*, just as *someplace (else)* is in (46). This groups *something* and *someplace* with *somebody* and *someone*, insofar as they, too, are not compatible with the non-standard *-s* in question:

i) Let's invite somebody/\*somebodies (else) over for dinner.

ii) Let's invite someone/\*someones (else) over for dinner.

If the generalization is that non-standard *-s* is incompatible with an overt noun (which *where* is not), then *one* in (ii) must be a noun. (Scandinavian may be different here - v. note 21.)

<sup>18</sup> English often writes *sometime* as one word, though it (for me) does not share the behavior of *someplace*, given *someplace else* vs. \**sometime else*.

Note also:

i) They're always going places (\*else).

where the impossibility of *else* indicates the presence of the ordinary noun *place*.

Put another way, the *place* seen in (50)/(51) is a noun comparable to the *book* of a sentence like:

(52) Let's buy some books (\*else) that are interesting.

in which *else* is likewise impossible and in which *books* has higher stress than *some*. On the other hand, the *place* of:

(53) Let's go someplace(\*s) else.

is compatible with *else* as shown and has low stress. Although, as argued earlier, this *place* differs sharply from *where* (cf. especially the discussion of (21)-(30)), it clearly also differs sharply from the *place* of (50)/(51), in a way that recalls the double-sided behavior of *thing* in:

(54) Let's do some other things.

(55) Let's do something(\*s) else.

The parallelism between *place* and *thing* is emphasized by:

(56) Let's go someplace else beautiful this time.

(57) \*Let's go (to) some other place beautiful this time.

taken together with:

(58) Let's buy something else beautiful this time.

(59) \*Let's buy some other thing beautiful this time.

The impossibility of plural *-s* in (53) and (55) recalls the fact that in the French counterpart of *something beautiful* the normal feminine gender of French *chose* ('thing') cannot be expressed:

(60) quelque chose de beau/\*belle ('some thing of beautiful<sub>masc.</sub>/beautiful<sub>fem.</sub>')

as well as the fact that French can't have plural here, either:<sup>19</sup>

(61) \*quelques choses d'anormaux ('some things of abnormal')

A possible interpretation of these facts is that *something* (and *quelque chose*) and *someplace* are nominal counterparts of small clauses, i.e. they contain nouns associated with a reduced set of functional projections (that in particular does not include number and feminine gender).<sup>20</sup>

<sup>19</sup> French differs from English with respect to interrogative words. Although (i) and (ii) are both fine:

i) Who else have you invited?

ii) Qui d'autre as-tu invité? ('who of other have-you invited')

there is a difference between:

iii) ??Who famous have you invited?

iv) Qui de célèbre as-tu invité? ('who of famous have-you invited')

The greater deviance of (iii) might be relatable to (v) vs. (vi):

v) ??Who have you invited famous?

vi) Qui as-tu invité de célèbre? ('who have-you invited of famous')

if *who famous* can never be a derivation-final constituent - v. Kayne (2000, p.317 (18)) and Kayne (2004, Appendix) - though it remains to be understood exactly why (iii) is worse than:

vii) Somebody famous has already been invited.

The answer may lie in the extra licensing requirement (if generalized to all bare wh-words) mentioned in note 16, on the assumption that French *de* is playing a relevant licensing role in (iv) and (vi), and that *who else* in (i) is not a constituent (thinking in part of Leu (2005b)), as made plausible by:

viii) Who ever the hell else are you planning to invite?

<sup>20</sup> On the difference in syntactic status between feminine and masculine gender, see Ferrari (2005).

The text suggestion is orthogonal to Leu's (2005a) proposal to the effect that *something (beautiful)* contains an additional unpronounced noun (or perhaps two). On the question of adjectives here, see also Kishimoto (2000) and Larson and Marusic (2004). The text suggestion concerning the plural restriction differs from Kishimoto's.

It may be that *else* is limited to appearing in such 'small nominals', to judge by its restriction to singular:

i) We didn't see much else/\*many else.

ii) We saw little else/\*few else.

iii) If all else fails/\*fail,...

Possibly the exclusion of number with small nominals might underlie:

If this is correct, then all instances of *place* are instances of nouns, i.e. *place* turns out to be consistently different from pronominal/determiner-like *where*.<sup>21</sup>

References:

- Bartos, H. (2001) "Object Agreement in Hungarian - A Case for Minimalism," *The Minimalist Parameter*, John Benjamins.
- Bayer, J. (1983) "COMP in Bavarian Syntax," *The Linguistic Review*, 3, 209-274.
- Bernstein, J.B. (2004) "English *th*- Forms," handout of paper presented at the Copenhagen Symposium on Determination, 26-28 August.
- Cheng, L.L.-S. (2005) "Decomposing Bantu Relatives," handout of paper presented at NELS (U.Mass, Amherst).
- Corver, N. and H. van Riemsdijk, eds. (2001) *Semi-lexical Categories*, Mouton de Gruyter, Berlin.
- Curme, G. O. (1977a (1935)) *A Grammar of the English Language. Volume I: Parts of Speech*, Verbatim, Essex, Connecticut.
- Curme, G. O. (1977b (1931)) *A Grammar of the English Language. Volume II: Syntax*, Verbatim, Essex, Connecticut.
- Ferrari, F. (2005) *A Syntactic Analysis of the Nominal Systems of Italian and Luganda. How Nouns Can Be Formed in the Syntax*, Ph.D dissertation, New York University.
- Hendrick, R. (1990) "Operator Binding in NP," in A. Halperin (ed.) *Proceedings of the Ninth West Coast Conference on Formal Linguistics*, University of Chicago Press, Chicago.
- 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. (1998) "Overt vs. Covert Movement," *Syntax*, 1, 128-191 (reprinted in Kayne (2000)).
- Kayne, R.S. (2000) *Parameters and Universals*, Oxford University Press, New York.
- Kayne, R.S. (2003) "Person Morphemes and Reflexives in Italian, French and Related Languages", in C. Tortora (ed.) *The Syntax of Italian Dialects*, Oxford University Press, New York, 102-136 (also in Kayne (2000)).
- Kayne, R.S. (2004) "Prepositions as Probes", in A. Belletti (ed.), *Structures and Beyond*, Oxford University Press, New York, 192-212 (reprinted in Kayne (2005)).
- Kayne, R.S. (2005) *Movement and Silence*, Oxford University Press, New York.
- Kayne, R.S. (to appear) "On Parameters and on Principles of Pronunciation", in a festschrift.
- Kishimoto, H. (2000) "Indefinite Pronouns and Overt N-Raising," *Linguistic Inquiry*, 31, 557-566.
- Larson, R.K. and F. Marusic (2004) "On Indefinite Pronoun Structures with APs: Reply to Kishimoto," *Linguistic Inquiry* 35, 268-287.
- Leu, T. (2005a) "Something invisible in English," *UPenn Working Papers in Linguistics* 11.1 (Proceedings of PLC 28), p.143-155
- Leu, T. (2005b) "'what for' internally", <http://ling.auf.net/lingBuzz/000207>
- Noonan, M. (2005) "R-Particles," *GLOW Newsletter* 54.
- Payne, J. and R. Huddleston (2002) "Nouns and Noun Phrases," in R. Huddleston and G.K. Pullum (eds.) *The Cambridge Grammar of the English Language*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, United Kingdom, 323-523.

iv) everywhere vs. \*allwhere  
and similarly for \*allbody, \*allone, \*allthing and \*allplace. Relevant, ultimately, will be \*eachwhere, \*eachplace else, etc.

<sup>21</sup> A further difference is *elsewhere* vs. \*elseplace, though it is unclear whether it can be made to follow simply from the non-N vs. N difference. Also yet to be understood is \*elsehow, as well as \*some elsewhere, ??elsewhere interesting and \*aplace else. If this last were to turn out to reflect the necessary absence of *a* from small nominals, the exclusion of (45) and (44) might be looked at in the same way.

Left open, too, is the contrast (in non-standard English):

- i) that there place/city
- ii) \*some where place/city

and the question whether there are languages in which a counterpart of (ii) can be found. Of potential importance in this regard is Leu's (2005b) Swedish example with *var...nånstans*, in which it seems that *where* and a counterpart of *place* do cooccur, though separated (v. note 1).

- Postal, P.M. (1966) "On So-Called 'Pronouns' in English," in F.P. Dineen, edl, *Report of the Seventeenth Annual Roundtable Meeting on Linguistics and Language Studies*, Georgetown University Press, Washington, D.C., 177-206 (reprinted in Reibel, D.A. and S.A. Schane, eds., *Modern Studies in English* (1969), Prentice-Hall, Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey).
- Riemsdijk, H. van (1978) *A case study in syntactic markedness*, The Peter de Ridder Press, Lisse, Netherlands.
- Riemsdijk, H. van (1989) "Swiss Relatives", in *Sentential Complementation and the Lexicon. Studies in Honor of Wim De Geest*, D. Jaspers, W. Klooster, Y. Putseys and P. Seuren (eds.), Foris, Dordrecht, 343-354.
- Riemsdijk, H. van (2002) "The Unbearable Lightness of Going. The Projection Parameter as a Pure Parameter Governing the Distribution of Elliptic Motion Verbs in Germanic", *Journal of Comparative Germanic Linguistics* 5, 143-196.
- Singler, J. (2005) "Like Quotative - a Part of English Grammar Now?",  
<http://www.pbs.org/speak/words/sezwho/like/>
- Starke, M. (2001) *Move Dissolves into Merge: a Theory of Locality*, Doctoral dissertation, University of Geneva.
- Watanabe, A. (1992) "Subjacency and S-structure movement of *wh*-in-situ," *Journal of East Asian Linguistics*, 1, 255-291.