Preposition doubling in Flemish dialects

Basic data – Certain (Belgian) Dutch dialects display circumpositions with an identical preposition and postposition, cf. (1)a. The interpretation of (1)a is parallel to Standard Dutch (1)b with either a (directionally interpreted) pre-PP or a post-PP (which is obligatorily directional).

(1) a. dat hij op dem berg is op geklommen. [Asse Dutch]
   that be on the mountain is on climbed
   ‘that he has climbed up on the mountain.’

b. dat hij <op> de berg < op> is geklommen. [Standard Dutch]
   ‘he has climbed up on the mountain.’

Properties – + Not all Ps allow for P doubling: doubling is restricted to spatial Ps, hence is illicit with the selected PP in (2)b. More specifically, it typically occurs only with directional PPs, not locative ones. A test to distinguish between the two is auxiliary choice (Den Dikken 2010): directional PPs cooccur with zijn ‘be’, locative PPs with hebben ‘have’; as (3) shows, doubling only occurs with the former.

(2) a. Will zou nooit in het water in springen. [spatial PP]
   ‘Will would never in the water in jump
   ‘Will would never jump into the water.’

b. Will zou nooit in die sprookjes (* in) geloven. [selected PP]
   ‘Will would never in those fairytales in believe
   ‘Will would never believe in those fairytales.’

(3) a. Hij is in het water (in) gesprongen. [zijn: directional]
   be is in the water in jumped
   ‘He has jumped into the water.’

b. Hij heeft in het water (*in) gesprongen. [hebben: locative]
   be has in the water in jumped
   ‘He has jumped (up and down) in the water.’

A second property of P doubling is that the entire PP complex [P₁ DP P₂] cannot move as a unit. The preposition and the object can undergo movement together, however, to the exclusion of the postposition. The postposition on its own can incorporate into the verb cluster, as (4)c illustrates.

(4) a. Op dienen berg <*> op klimt hij niet <*> op. [topicalization]
   on that.MASC mountain on climbs be not on
   ‘He’s not climbing up on that mountain.’

b. Op welken berg <*> op is hij <*> op geklommen? [wh extraction]
   on which mountain on is be on climbed
   ‘Up on which mountain has he climbed?’

c. dat hij op dienen berg <*> op niet <*> op is <*> op geklommen. [scrambling]
   that be on that.MASC mountain on not on is on climbed
   ‘that he hasn’t climbed up on that mountain.’

Thirdly, in P doubling constructions, the indefinite pronoun must surface in situ, to the right of P₁, cf. (5)a. The example in (5)b, with so-called R-movement of the indefinite pronoun (spelled out as ergens) to the left of P₁, is bad, in striking contrast with the (Standard Dutch) single-P construction in (5)c.

(5) a. op iets op klimmen b. * ergens op op klimmen c. ergens op klimmen on something on climb somewhere on on climb somewhere on climb all: ‘to climb onto something’

Analysis, part I: A reduced higher P layer – P doubling resembles (Standard Dutch) circumpositions such as ‘om DP been’ (‘around DP’), with non-identical adpositions. These, too, are always spatial and typically directional (cf. 1). Circumpositions and P doubling differ, however, with respect to properties + and 0. With non-doubling circumpositions, the entire circum-PP can move as a unit whereas for many speakers the pre-PP layer fails to subextract and the postposition cannot incorporate, cf. (6) (contrary to property 0 in (4)). With respect to property +, non-doubling circumpositions allow both in situ indefinite pronouns ((7)a) and R-pronouns to the left of P₁+P₂ ((7)b).

(6) a. [Om welk huis <heen>] is Jan <*> heen> gelopen? [om DP been]
   about which house towards is Jan towards jumped
   ‘Around which house did Jan walk?’

b. … dat Jan om het huis < heen > is <*> heen> gelopen.
   that Jan about the house towards is towards jumped
   ‘…that Jan walked around the house.’
In the structure in (7) for circumpositions (see Den Dikken 2010), the postposition is base-generated in P\textsubscript{Dir}, and CP\textsuperscript{[Place]}, containing the preposition in P\textsubscript{Loc} and the DP object, moves around it, to [Spec,PathP]. The presence of CP\textsuperscript{[Path]} prevents subextraction of CP\textsuperscript{[Place]} and incorporation of P\textsubscript{Dir}, which explains the data in (6) for the speakers for whom the %-marked options are impossible. Speakers allowing these options allow P\textsubscript{Dir} to forgo an extended projection of its own (leaving out PathP, DegP\textsuperscript{[Path]} and CP\textsuperscript{[Path]}).

(8) \[\text{[PP P}\textsubscript{Dir}=\text{op} CP \textsuperscript{[Path]} [DegP \textsuperscript{[Path]} [PathP \textsubscript{Dir} CP \textsuperscript{[Place]} [DegP \textsuperscript{[Place]}] \text{Place}[PP P\textsubscript{Loc} DP]]]]\]

To capture the differences with P doubling, we argue that P\textsubscript{Dir} in P doubling systematically fails to project a functional layer, which forces P\textsubscript{Dir} to incorporate, and makes movement of the lower PP possible and movement of the entire [P DP P] impossible. This results in the structure in (9) for P doubling, which captures both the movement facts (property 2) and the fact that P doubling is directional (property 1).

(9) \[\text{[PP P}\textsubscript{Dir}=\text{op} CP \textsuperscript{[Place]} [DegP \textsuperscript{[Place]}] \text{Place}[PP P\textsubscript{Loc}=\text{op} DP=\text{den berg}]]\]

**Analysis, part II: A defective lower P layer** – The landing site for R-movement in Standard Dutch is [Spec,CP\textsuperscript{[Place]}] (cf. Koopman 2010, Den Dikken 2010). In P doubling this landing site is unavailable (cf. (5)). We capture this by claiming that CP\textsuperscript{[Place]} is defective (C*) in this case. As a consequence, this C* lacks an EPP feature to attract elements to its specifier. Hence, an indefinite pronoun cannot move there to form an R-pronoun and instead, stays in situ (property 3). C*’s defectivity requires it to amalgamate with a lexical host which is featurally compatible with it, in order to be licensed. C* is itself a member of the extended projection of P\textsubscript{Loc} and is specified for P\textsubscript{Loc}’s features: in the case of P\textsubscript{Loc} op ‘on’, it is specified for op’s features. In order to amalgamate with C*, P\textsubscript{Dir} must be featurally compatible with it, i.e. P\textsubscript{Dir} must be specified for P\textsubscript{Loc} (=op)’s features as well. This means that P\textsubscript{Dir} can only amalgamate with C* if it spells out identically to P\textsubscript{Loc}. Selection of a defective C* demands identical Ps and thereby derives doubling, cf. (10).

(10) \[\text{[PP P}\textsubscript{Dir}=\text{op} CP \textsuperscript{[Place]} C* \textsuperscript{[Place]} [DegP \textsuperscript{[Place]}] \text{Place}[PP P\textsubscript{Loc}=\text{op} DP]]\]

**Doubling versus non-doubling circumpositions** – The previous section established a correlation between defectivity of CP\textsuperscript{[Place]}, identity of the P elements, and absence of R-movement. Based on the fact that movement of the entire [P\textsubscript{Loc} DP P\textsubscript{Dir}] string is impossible (cf. (4)b,c), we have argued that P doubling always involves a directional PP that lacks a functional layer of its own. This lack of functional structure causes P\textsubscript{Dir} to incorporate into V\textsubscript{and}, and as a result, P\textsubscript{Dir}’s complement becomes the complex verb’s derived complement. Neither a DegP\textsuperscript{[Place]} nor a locative PP is allowed as the complement of a directional verb, however. Hence, P\textsubscript{Dir} must select a full CP\textsuperscript{[Place]} whenever it forgoes functional structure of its own.

On the other hand, in non-doubling circumpositional PPs, movement of the entire [P\textsubscript{Loc} DP P\textsubscript{Dir}] string is grammatical (cf. (6)a), implying that P\textsubscript{Dir} has its own extended projection. As a result, P\textsubscript{Dir} in principle allows for the full gamut of complement types: a full CP\textsuperscript{[Place]} (necessarily non-defective, as the P-elements are non-identical), or alternatively something smaller, like a locative DegP. Whenever P\textsubscript{Dir} selects a full CP\textsuperscript{[Place]}, an indefinite pronoun object moves to [Spec,CP] and forms an R-word. When P\textsubscript{Dir} selects a DegP complement, [Spec,CP] is absent and the pronoun stays in situ, not forming an R-pronoun.

In other words, an indefinite pronoun in non-doubling circum-PPs can only surface as a non-R-pronoun if P\textsubscript{Dir} selects a DegP\textsuperscript{[Place]} complement. Since DegP\textsuperscript{[Place]} cannot be subextracted out of an extended PP projection, and is illicit as the complement of a directional verb (which forces P\textsubscript{Dir} to have an extended projection whenever it selects DegP), a further prediction is that [P\textsubscript{Loc} iets/wat ‘something/what’ P\textsubscript{Dir}] with non-identical Ps (cf. (7)a) cannot be split by incorporation of the post-P or fronting of the pre-PP. So [P\textsubscript{Loc} iets/wat P\textsubscript{Dir}] with doubling and without should be diametrically opposed in their syntactic behavior. Evidence will be discussed in the talk.

**No reduplication chain** – A logical alternative to our analysis of the doubling facts is one where doubling is due to multiple spell-outs of elements in a chain (cf. Barbiers et al. 2009 for wb doubling). Under such an account, P\textsubscript{Loc} would move to P\textsubscript{Dir} and be realized in both positions. Such an analysis is untenable, however: head movement is impossible across functional projections (cf. Koopman 2010), and since we have argued that a full CP\textsuperscript{[Place]} layer is necessary to capture the movement data in doubling, doubling PPs cannot be the result of multiple spell-out in a chain.