

***Everywhere* on the Solent quantifies over individuals: a new locative impersonal subject**

THE PHENOMENON: The variety of British English spoken along the Solent coastline in South Hampshire (Southampton and Portsmouth) exhibits the ongoing development of an as-yet undocumented impersonal subject. Speakers of Solent English have innovated the use of *everywhere* as an impersonal subject: (1) means that *everyone* on the coast eats fish and chips. This construction is ungrammatical in all other varieties of English we know of, and contrasts with an “institutional” use of *everywhere* in British English, as in (2).

- (1) Everywhere [= everyone] on the coast eats fish and chips. [Solent English]
(2) Everywhere [= every shop] takes credit cards these days. [British English]

A large-scale grammaticality survey addressing the synchronic and diachronic nature of impersonal *everywhere* yielded a difference between older and younger speakers. Older speakers require an overt locative restrictor (“on the coast”) (1), while younger speakers (18-29) can omit this restrictor, as in (3), indicating further innovation of a new impersonal subject.

- (3) Everywhere [=everyone everywhere] talks this way. [Solent English, young]

CLAIM: The older innovative grammar actuated impersonal *everywhere*, while the younger grammar has innovated a null-restrictor.

METHODS: We tested the behaviour of impersonal *everywhere*, investigating whether it behaves like a simple DP (i.e. synonymous with *everyone*), a Strong Implicit Argument/*pro* (Landau 2010), a Weak Implicit Argument [ϕ iP] (Legate 2014), or some hybrid thereof.

Design. A range of diagnostics from the literature on impersonal and implicit arguments were employed (E. Williams 1987, Koenig & Mauner 2010, Kastner & Zu 2015, A. Williams 2015, Bhatt & Pancheva 2017). These were: compatibility with agent-oriented adverbs, modals, passive verbs, and unaccusative verbs (both motion and change-of-state); and the ability to antecede a pronoun, and bind possessive, reflexive or reciprocal pronouns. We also tested whether *anywhere*, *somewhere* and *nowhere* were possible impersonal subjects, with readings akin to ‘anyone’, ‘someone’ and ‘no one’. We further examined whether *everywhere* needs overt quantification via a locative “restrictor”, e.g. *on the coast*. A simple design formed two lists, each with 44 items, such that every participant saw each item either with or without an overt restrictor. Our other manipulation was the diagnostics in the list above, which were coded as different levels of a Condition factor. The levels were compared to each other and to gold-standard grammatical and ungrammatical examples.

Participants. N=107 participants (99 after exclusions) were recruited from the greater Solent area via social networks. We collected demographic information for Age, Level of Education, and Gender, which were included as covariates in post-hoc analyses.

RESULTS: Responses were z-transformed and fit to a maximal mixed effects linear regression model. We mention results significant at the $p < 0.05$ level. The findings are divided into three parts: with a Restrictor, without a Restrictor, and across the youngest age group (exploratory analysis of ages 18-29). Restrictor was a significant predictor throughout.

With an overt restrictor, *everywhere* patterns almost like a full DP/pronoun: it is compatible with agent-oriented adverbs, can bind, can control, is fine as *anywhere/somewhere/nowhere*, and can combine with modals and simple transitive verbs. Preliminary findings indicate that it may antecede a pronoun in a following clause, although additional testing is needed to rule out potential confounds; but strikingly, it **cannot** be the argument of passive or unaccusative verbs. Without the overt restrictor *everywhere* is much less acceptable. It is compatible with agent-oriented adverbs, can bind (perhaps surprisingly), and may combine with modals.

Adding Age as a covariate leads to further interactions, indicating a change in progress. This variable was Helmert coded so that each age group was compared to the average of all older ones. The 18-29 group (N=12) shows the following two-way interactions for Condition*Age

(all facilitatory): Adverb, Antecedent, Anywhere, Binding, Modal and *Nowhere*. This group also shows three-way interactions (Condition*Restrictor*Age) for the following conditions (all facilitatory): Adverb, Control, Simple Transitive. These findings indicate that younger speakers are more accepting of Antecedent, *Anywhere*, Binding, Modal, *Nowhere* and some adverbs even without a restrictor. The older age groups did not show this pattern. Young speakers are significantly more accepting of impersonal *everywhere* across the board, indicating a change in progress in terms of both actuation and diffusion. Notably, Education and Gender had no effect.

PROPOSAL – FORMAL ANALYSIS AND CHANGE: We propose a two-part change: First, Solent English reanalysed *everywhere* as an impersonal subject quantifying over individuals. Second, young speakers extended this but no longer need obligatory overt restrictors.

We suggest that both reanalyses hinge on the institutional *everywhere* construction in (2). This *everywhere* extends the metonymic coercion of location DPs as agentive institutions, e.g. *Washington [= the American government] passed changed the law*. We posit the structure in (4) for (2), whereby *where* is assigned the D and ϕ -features of the intended DP subject, becoming a specific subject (with the effect that overt restrictors are optional), as well as the Agent role assigned by Voice (and typical of metonymy). Consequently, the formal composition of *where* becomes ambiguous for acquirers, making fertile ground for reanalysis.

(4) [VoiceP [QP *Every* [DP *where* {iLoc, N} {iD, i ϕ , +AGENT}]]([PP *in England*)]... (Br. Eng)
 In the older Solent English grammar, *everywhere* is reanalysed as an impersonal. We suggest that impersonal *everywhere*'s QP projects in Spec, VoiceP (cf. Legate 2014), placing on *where* the syntactic features [iLoc, (underspecified) ϕ :_] and the semantic features [+HUMAN, +AGENT] (5). Q, inherently a form of specialized D, values D on Voice, while the combination of [+HUMAN] and [ϕ :_] suffices to satisfy semantic agentive subjecthood requirements.

(5) [VoiceP [QP *Every* [NP *where* {iLoc, N, ϕ :_, +AGENT, +HUMAN} [PP *in England*]]] (Old)
 The Agent role rules out a promoted subject scenario, deriving the ban on unaccusatives and passives. The D and ϕ -features straightforwardly permit control and binding. We suggest that the mandatory overt locative restrictor requirement (*in England*) results from the interaction between *where* no longer being a specific referent and Q requiring domain restriction only possible via D (institution) or a locative PP (older Solent speakers). If correct, this change demonstrates feature-economy-mediated reduction (Roberts & Roussou 2003) of syntactic features, i.e underspecification of ϕ -features and deletion of D, but innovation of [+AGENT, +HUMAN] semantic features on *where* (the former perhaps from the metonymic source).

In the younger grammar, restrictor-less *everywhere* is particularly striking. We suggest that this is made possible by the innovation of a null-restrictor on P, as shown in (6), which may contextually restrict the domain, perhaps relating to a covert domain variable at LF. This appears an innovative use of null preposition P_{LOC} which yields a region when applied to a DP (Kracht 2008), or in this case, is included in QP.

(6) [VoiceP [QP *Every* [NP *where* {iLoc, N, ϕ :_, +AGENT, +HUMAN} [PP NULL RESTRICTOR]]] (Young)

IN SUM, in older Solent English, *everywhere* cannot receive an impersonal interpretation alone due to Q's need for (semantic) domain restriction; yet the younger grammar has innovated a null-restrictor, giving the impression of a stand-alone impersonal. As the construction is quite unstable, we cannot know if *everywhere* will develop into a D-impersonal akin to Germanic *man*. Lastly, *everywhere*'s reanalysis as an impersonal subject highlights the special interaction between locatives and subjecthood in syntax. This interaction appears able to facilitate reanalysis of locatives to not only satisfy subject requirements in TP, e.g. Locative Inversion, but also to act as agentive external arguments in Spec, VoiceP, given the right circumstances.

SELECTED REFERENCES: Landau, I. 2010. The Explicit Syntax of Implicit Arguments. *LI* 41(3): 357-88 • Legate, J. A. 2014. *Voice and v: Lessons from Acehnese*. MIT Press • Roberts, I & A. Roussou. 2003. *Syntactic Change: A Minimalist Approach to Grammaticalization*. CUP.