Goal:

a. To examine the notion of Path and its presence as a projection in the structure.

b. To give evidence that there is no projection Path.

Main ideas:

→ There is no projection in the fseq that lexicalizes Path over Place

(0) PathP
   \quad Path \quad PlaceP
       \quad Place \quad DP

→ The notion of Path is interpreted by other means, for instance by means of a modifier of Place:

(1) PlaceP
    \quad Mod \quad PlaceP
        \quad Place \quad DP

---
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- This way I explain contrasts like the following:

(2)  
   a. El vaso está a {el borde de la mesa/*la mesa}.  
   b. Juan fue a/*en su casa.  
   c. Juan bailó {hasta/*a} su casa.  
   d. Juan recorrió {la carretera/*hasta su casa/*hacia su casa}.  

- Main tools that I use from and not from Nanosyntax:

- fine-grained syntactico-semantic structure (Svenonius 2010)
- phrasal spell-out and post-syntactic lexicalization (Starke 2011)
- The presence of modifiers that change the properties of the terminals.
- The possibility of lexicalizing modifiers together with terminals.

1. Introduction:

A Path projection in the structure:

- Jackendoff (1983):

(3)  
    \[
    \text{PathP}  
    \begin{array}{c}
    \text{Path} \\
    \text{PlaceP} \\
    \text{Place}  \\
    \text{DP} \\
    \end{array}
    \]

- The Path function returns a Path.

→ This way he explains elements like into

(4)  
    \[
    \text{PathP}  
    \begin{array}{c}
    \text{Path}  \\
    \text{PlaceP}  \\
    \text{Place}  \\
    \text{DP} \\
    \end{array}
    \begin{array}{c}
    \text{to} \\
    \text{in} \\
    \end{array}
    \]
2. What is Path?

A set of points?

Directionality?

Both?

- atemporal sequences of locations (Bierwisch, 1988; Verkuyl and Zwarts, 1992; Nam, 1995)

(5) a bridge out of San Francisco (Fong 1997:2)

(6) La carretera va a la playa

‘The road goes to the beach.’

- Is the preposition the element that gives the interpretation of a set of points?

(7) Juan va a la playa.

‘Juan goes to the beach.’

- Directionality? \rightarrow Directional Ps are related to Path (Gehrke 2008)

\rightarrow They can’t combine with verbs like remain or stay:

(8) a. The box stayed in / on / under / behind the table.

b. *The box stayed to / into / onto / from the table.

Gehrke (2008:8)

- P_{Dir} in Den Dikken (2010)

\rightarrow Recent works:

There is a projection that directly encodes the notion of ‘Path’ in almost all recent works on Ps (Fábregas 2007, Gehrke 2008, Koopman 2010, Svenonius 2010, Pantcheva 2011)
- even in those in which *Path* is decomposed into different projections

**Path as a set of points** → Pantcheva (2011):

(9)  
```
     RouteP
       /   \
Route      SourceP
       \   /  \\
Source     GoalP
       \   /  \\
Goal       PlaceP...
       \   /  \
Place      ...
```

→ Goal paths (following Zwarts 2008):

(10)  
```
------+++++
```

Goal paths represent different points.

**Path as a component of directional elements**

→ Fábregas (2007): *hacia* and *hasta*

→ both lexicalize *Path*, unlike *a*:

(11)  
```
     PathP
       /   \  \
Path    PlaceP  
       \   /  \\
Place    DP
         /  \ 
      la casa
```


• *Path* can also be lexicalized by the verb:

(13) \[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{procP} \\
\text{correr} \\
\text{proc} \\
\text{PathP} \\
\text{Path} \\
\text{PlaceP} \\
\text{Place} \\
\text{DP} \\
\text{a} \\
\text{su casa} \\
\end{array}
\]

Fábregas (2007:189)

• What does it mean that both *hacia* and *hasta* lexicalize *Path*? And a verb like *correr*?

⇒ **What does *Path* represent?**

A set of points?

Directionality?

Both?
Main problems:

- If directional Ps represent a set of points it should be possible to have examples like the following:

(14) *Juan recorrió {hasta su casa/hacia su casa}.
     ‘Juan covered {up to/towards} his house

And also:

(15) *Juan fue la carretera.
     ‘Juan went the road.’

- If Path represents directionality, it is not expected that we find directional elements in locative constructions:

(16) a. La casa está al norte.
     ‘The house is to the North.’
    b. Mi casa está hacia allá.
     ‘My house is towards there.’

A possible solution:

Directional elements as locative elements originally:

→ (Extended) Structural Ambiguity Hypothesis (Gehrke 2008, Real Puigdollers 2010):

(17) For any spatial preposition that can be interpreted as locative, it is only locative. Any ambiguity between a directional and a locative meaning is structural.

(Real Puigdollers 2010:129)

- In those cases, the directional interpretation of them is PP-external.

Set of points? → it doesn’t behave as a real set of points like la carretera
(‘the road’)  

Directionality? → Path elements appear in locative constructions
I agree in the fact that Path elements are locative, but their interpretation is not only PP-external → they lexicalize a modifier.

3. Path in modifiers

Path may be entailed by means of modifiers of Place, but there is no Path projection as such

Modifier: non-terminal element of the structure that changes the properties of the head it combines with.

(18)

```
  XP
 / \  
 Mod X’  
   \ /
    X ...  
```

→ Zwarts and Winter (2000): a modifier is the element that applies to an element (BP or B-bar) and gives the same element (BP or B-bar).

(19) Place → Place

3.1. Displace

→ It gives the interpretation that a point is reached from another

(20) El vaso está al borde de la mesa
     ‘The glass is on the edge of the table.’
- The position of the glass is interpreted as “displaced” from the center of the table.

→ In Spanish *a* and not *en* can lexicalize this modifier:

\[
\text{(21)} \quad \underbrace{\text{PlaceP}}_{\text{Mod}} \quad \underbrace{\text{Place'}}_{[\text{Displace}]} \quad \text{Place} \quad \text{DP} \quad \ldots
\]

→ This modifier gives directionality.

How is it possible to have a directional element in a locative construction?

- To interpret a dislocation in a locative construction it is necessary that two locations are interpreted.

→ *El vaso está al borde de la mesa* doesn’t mean that the glass has moved to the edge, but that its location is established with respect to a point of reference, considered the basic location.

- A “directional” element like *a* is possible in these cases as long as it is possible to understand these two locations

- Elements like *borde* are *AxParts* (cf. Fábregas 2007), i.e. they represent parts of elements → The two needed locations are, first, the part and, second, the element to which the part belongs: *edge* and *table*.

- If it is not possible to interpret a second location, the presence of *Displace* is not possible and, hence, the lexical item chosen is *en*:

\[
\text{(22)} \quad \text{Juan está \{} \text{en}/*a \} \text{ su casa.}
\]

- In directional constructions, it is obligatory to understand two locations.
In those cases, a is obligatory:\footnote{I assume that in the case of verbs like \textit{entrar}, which can combine with \textit{en}, the expression introduced by \textit{en} gives the location of the final state and it is not the complement of the predication.}

\begin{equation}
(23) \quad \text{Juan fue } \{a/*en\} \text{ su casa.} \\
\text{‘Juan went } \{\text{to/in}\} \text{ his house.’}
\end{equation}

a is possible in locative (and, hence, stative) constructions because it doesn’t give a change of location of the Figure, but the interpretation that a location is displaced.

The properties of \textit{Displace} allow to consider a as locative

This solves the debate with respect to the directional or locative condition of a in Spanish:

- it is locative because it represents a location (its higher head is \textit{Place})
- it is directional in the sense that it entails two points (which doesn’t mean that there is change of location of the Figure: \textit{the glass}, for instance)

One interesting advantage is that the same structure is kept for a in locative and directional constructions:

\begin{equation}
(24) \quad a \quad \begin{cases} 
\text{PlaceP} \\
\text{Displace} \quad \text{Place’} \\
\text{Place} \quad \text{DP} 
\end{cases}
\end{equation}

What is external is the interpretation of movement.
3.2. *SetPoint*

→ It gives the interpretation that the element it combines with belongs to a set (or scale)

(25) Juan fue hasta su casa.
    ‘Juan went up to his house.’

- The house is interpreted as the last point of a set:

(26)

(27)

```
  hasta
{        }
  PlaceP          SetPoint
                   Place’
                   Place   DP …
```

*The interpretation of last point comes from a modifier of *SetPoint*

(28)

```
  SetPointP
     [final limit]  SetPoint
```

*It could be a different one: [initial point], like in *desde*

* But it can also give the meaning of interiority, for instance. This explains cases like *into*, without saying that *to* lexicalizes *Path* (in line with Noonan 2010):

(29)

```
  into
{        }
  PlaceP          SetPoint
                   Place’
                   [int]  SetPoint  Place   DP …
```
The presence of *SetPoint* entails a set of points, although it doesn’t represent a set of points by itself.

- This explains:

  ➔ Why *hasta* can’t appear in contexts in which a set of points can:

    (30)  
    a. Juan recorrió la ciudad  
    b. *Juan recorrió hasta su casa.  
       ‘Juan covered {the city/up to his house}.’

    It represents a spatial configuration and not an entity that corresponds to a set of points.

  ➔ But also why it can combine with verbs like *bailar*, unlike *a*:

    (31)  
    Juan bailó {hasta/*a} la pared.  
    ‘Juan danced {up to/to} the wall.’

    - This examples shouldn’t be possible according to Talmy’s typology: verbs like *bailar* can’t combine with directional Ps in Spanish

    - It is possible because a verb like *bailar* needs durativity in the event and the entailment of a set of points gives this durativity.

  ➔ Talmy’s typology can be explained by means of the lexical items available in languages (in line with Son 2007, Fábregas 2007, Real Puigdollers 2010)

  ➔ *Further evidence that there is path*:

    - Counterfactual and scalar interpretation:

      (32)  
      a. Juan no fue a su casa  
       ‘Juan didn’t go to his house.’

       ➔ He didn’t start  
       ➔ *He started but didn’t arrive

      b. Juan no fue hasta su casa  
       ‘Juan didn’t go to his house.’
He didn’t start
He started but didn’t arrive

Path is not present in the structure but can be entailed from the presence of a modifier that hasta lexicalizes, like to in English.

3.3. Two important questions

- Why are Displace and SetPoint modifiers?

- They may appear in different positions: estar, abajo.
- They don’t give a new element.
- They are not necessarily present in all languages.

*But they determine the properties of the element they combine with:

(33) Juan fue {a/*en} su casa – ‘Juan went to his house.’

- Are SetPoint and Displace the same?

- It could be that they are the same element with a different modifier that determines if the element is a single point or if it belongs to a set.

4. Place over Path?

(34) La casa está hacia allá
‘The house is towards there.’

- A location based on a directional element

- Place-Path-Place?

(35) PlaceP
    ├── Place
    │    └── PathP
    │         └── Path
    └── PlaceP
→ It is not necessary to postulate a new function like the *G-function* in Svenonius (2010):

\[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{PlaceP} \\
G \quad \text{PathP} \\
\text{Path} \quad \text{PlaceP} \\
\end{array}
\]

(36)

→ Across a meadow a band is playing excerpts from *H.M.S. Pinafore*.

Cresswell (1978)

→ By means of modifiers like *Displace* or *SetPoint* it is not necessary to postulate a projection related to *Place* higher than *Path*:

\[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{PlaceP} \\
\hbox{hacia} \quad \text{Mod} \\
\text{PlaceP} \\
\text{Place} \quad \ldots
\end{array}
\]

(38)

→ As it represents a configuration established over a single point, it can correspond to a location.

5. Other situations in which a *Path* is entailed

- Extended constructions:

\[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{La carretera va a la playa.} \\
\text{‘The road goes to the beach.’}
\end{array}
\]

(39)
- Routes: Dispersion

Directional verb + Multiple location

(40) Los niños fueron por la carretera.

(41)

\[
\text{por} \quad \begin{cases}
\text{PlaceP} \\
\text{[Mod]} \quad \text{PlaceP} \\
\text{Dispersion} \quad \text{Place} \quad \text{DP}
\end{cases}
\]

In both cases, the interpretation of ‘set of points’ doesn’t come from a Path projection.

→ In the first case, it comes from the intrinsic meaning of the extended entity.
→ In the second case, it comes from the Dispersion modifier.

5. Conclusions:

→ Path is not encoded as a projection in the structure. It can be entailed by means of modifiers:

\[\text{SetPoint} \text{ or Scale: hasta, to}\]

→ Ps are locative in the sense that their higher projection in any case is PlaceP.

→ This explains:

- The use of directional elements in locative constructions.
- The apparent exceptions for Talmy’s typology.
- The nature of elements like a or hasta in Spanish.
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