

P-D-drop and pseudo-incorporation in London English

David Hall, Queen Mary University of London

1. Introduction For some varieties of English spoken in London (and to a certain extent, surrounding areas) the preposition *to*, and the definite article on the goal can be dropped with *go* and *come*, with a certain set of nouns (I henceforth refer to the phenomenon as P-D-drop).

- (1) a. I went (to the) chicken shop every day last week.
b. John didn't come (to the) pub yesterday.

There are a number of restrictions on the availability of P-D-drop: the definite article is obligatorily absent, unlike similar phenomena in Northwestern English varieties (2; see Myler 2013, Biggs 2015); it is possible with "institutional" nouns, but also place names (3); it is ill-formed when the noun is modified, except for kind modification (4); it is only possible with *go* and *come*, not manner of motion verbs (5); it is only possible with directional goal interpretation (6).

- (2) We went (*the) pub last night
- (3) a. "Institutional" locations: *shop, pub, school, cinema, post office, church, chicken shop*.
b. Proper nouns: *New York, Central London, Stratford station*.
- (4) a. *Can we go park with the big swings? (5) a. *I swam France
b. *I'm going pub we met at last year. b. *I cartwheeled shop
c. *We went new cinema last weekend.
d. ✓ I went secondary school in Leytonstone. (6) John came *(from the) / ✓ (to the) shop

2. Absence of P-D-structure There are two broad approaches that can be taken here: i) a null P and D; b) radical absence of PP structure. Along the lines proposed for Greek P-D-drop in Gehrke and Lekakou (2013), I suggest that the goal in London P-D-drop is pseudo-incorporated, and that there is no PP structure. First, modification with *straight* (a PP-hood diagnostic, see Myler 2013) is judged as unacceptable (7). Second, it is difficult to see what would prevent P and D being deleted with other instances of *go/went to*, where the interpretation of the goal is not a location or an event at a location (8).

- (7) a. *I'm going straight pub after work. (8) He came *(to the) teacher for help.
b. *She said she's coming straight cinema after school.

Finally, if there were silent P and D heads, we might expect P-D-drop goals to support the same range of interpretations that an overt P and D do, but this is not the case: the goal gets an interpretation which has the properties of a weak definite, or pseudo-incorporated noun.

3. P-D-drop goals are pseudo-incorporated Goals of P-D-drop constructions share some common properties of PI objects: as discussed above they are truncated (no article), can't be modified (4), and can only be "well-established"/"institutional"/"common activity" (3). Furthermore, they are number neutral:

- (9) a. *Everyone went pub yesterday*.
b. Possible continuation:
Sam went to the Granta, and Katie went to the Anchor.

However, unlike typical PNI objects they do seem to support pronominal anaphora.

- (10) Zein and Mark went pub yesterday. It had a good selection of beers.

According to Dayal (2003), this property of PNI is not cross-linguistically stable. Furthermore, bare singulars in English have also been shown to be able to support pronominal anaphora in certain contexts even though

they also can be argued to involve PNI (Stvan 2009). Another hallmark property of PNI is obligatory narrow scope: it is difficult to show that there is a difference between full PP goals and P-D-drop goals in this respect, because a narrow scope interpretation is always preferred (since full PP goals behave somewhat like weak definites). However, given the context in (11), the P-D-drop case is markedly less acceptable, suggesting that narrow scope with respect to negation is indeed obligatory.

(11) Context: you and your friends are planning on meeting at the King's Arms.

- a. ??Sam didn't go to the pub yesterday, he went to another one in Shoreditch with a girl he's been seeing.
 b. *Sam didn't go pub yesterday, he went to another one in Shoreditch with a girl he's been seeing.

I follow Gehrke and Lekakou (2013) in assuming that the incorporating form of the verb *go/come* lexicalizes the path structure that is usually introduced by the preposition, and that the bare goal incorporates as a property P:

(12) $go_{inc} = \lambda P \lambda y \lambda e [P-go(e) \ \& \ \text{THEME}(e) = y]$,
 where $\exists e [P-go(e)] = 1$ iff $\exists e_0 [go(e_0) \ \& \ \exists x [P(x) \ \& \ \text{TRACE}(e_0)(i) \text{ is at } x]]$

A remaining problem with a PNI analysis is that P-D-drop can occur with proper names referring to locations. Proper names are typically taken to be referential, and full referential DPs are precisely not what we would expect under PNI. I suggest that in such cases these are not full referential DPs, but instead that the proper nouns name a property (or set of properties or characteristic activities) associated with the location. An indication that this might be on the right track is that proper names can also sometimes be coerced into a weak definite (and number neutral) interpretation. In (13), taken from Aguilar Guevara (2014), it is not the case that both Lola and Alice must work at the same location: they can work at two different branches.

(13) *Lola works at McDonald's and Alice does too*

4. Pseudo-incorporation is for case licensing I suggest that PI is required to license case in these constructions, following Levin (2015). This is supported by an adjacency requirement between the verb and the goal: no intervening PPs or adverbs are allowed (14), and bare Ns are not available in subject position with a weak definite interpretation: they must be adjacent to the verb to be case licensed (15).

- (14) a. *Come with me shop
 b. *I went quickly shop
 (15) a. The pub is a great place to make friends.
 b. *Pub is a great place to make friends.

Normal weak definites are allowed as subjects of generic sentence (15a; Aguilar Guevara 2014), but must appear with the definite article. The truncated weak definites in P-D-drop constructions however do not project up to D and beyond, and so require licensing under adjacency with the verb.

References

- Aguilar Guevara, Ana. 2014. *Weak definites: Semantics, lexicon and pragmatics*. LOT Dissertation Series, Utrecht.
 Biggs, Alison. 2015. A new case for A-movement in Northwest British English. In Ulrike Steindl et al., ed., *Proceedings of the 32nd West Coast Conference on Formal Linguistics*, 218–227.
 Dayal, Veneeta. 2003. A semantics for pseudoincorporation, Ms. Rutgers University.
 Gehrke, Berit and Lekakou, Marika. 2013. How to miss your preposition. *Studies in Greek Linguistics* 3:92–106.
 Levin, Ted. 2015. Licensing without Case. Ph.D. thesis, Massachusetts Institute of Technology.
 Myler, Neil. 2013. On *coming the pub* in the North West of England: accusative unaccusatives, dependent case, and preposition incorporation. *Journal of Comparative German Linguistics* 16:189–207.
 Stvan, Laurel Smith. 2009. Semantic incorporation as an account for some bare singular count noun uses in English. *Lingua* 119:314–333.