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1 INTRODUCTION

• Dutch exhibits three kinds of adpositions: prepositions, postpositions, and circumpositions.

(1) a. Het boek ligt op de tafel. [preposition]
the book lies on the table
b. De kat springt de tafel op. [postposition]
the cat jumps the table on
‘The cat jumps on(to) the table.’
c. Hij loopt op mij af. [circumposition]
he walks on me from
‘He’s walking towards me.’

→ Postpositions are derived from prepositions by movement of the DP object

→ Circumpositions are derived through PP movement:

• Topic of this talk: Certain (Belgian) Dutch dialects (Aalst, Asse, dialects from Pajottenland and Waasland) display circumpositions with an identical preposition and postposition.

(4) dat hij op de berg is geklommen. [Asse Dutch]
that he on the hill is climbed
‘that he has climbed up on the hill.’

The interpretation is parallel to the Standard Dutch counterpart with either a (directionally interpreted) preposition or a postposition (obligatorily directional).

(5) a. dat hij op de berg is geklommen. [Standard Dutch]
that he on the hill is climbed
b. dat hij de berg op is geklommen.
that he the hill up is climbed
‘that he has climbed up on the hill.’
2 PROPERTIES OF DOUBLING PPS

Properties:

1. Distribution
2. Movement
3. R-pronouns

PP doubling is only allowed with spatial PPs

- Helmantel (2002) distinguishes core spatial PPs from PPs selected by a verb.

(6) a. De boeken zitten in de kast. [spatial]
   the books sit in the cupboard
   ‘The books are in the cupboard.’

 b. Hij gelooft nog in sprookjes. [selected]
    he believes still in fairytales
    ‘He still believes in fairytales.’

→ The P in selected PPs does not retain its core, lexical meaning: It is a fixed P that means something in combination with the verb selecting it.

- Doubling PPs are only allowed with spatial PPs, not with selected PPs:

(7) a. Lili is op de kast op gekropen. [spatial]
    Lili is on the cupboard on crawled
    ‘Lili crawled onto the cupboard.’

 b. Hij had op Lili (*op) gerekend. [selected]
    he had on Lili on counted
    ‘He had counted on Lili.’

PP doubling is only allowed with directional PPs


(8) a. Lola zit op de stoel. [locative]
    Lola sits on the chair
    ‘Lola is sitting on the chair.’

 b. De kat springt de kast op. [directional]
    the cat jumps the cupboard on
    ‘The cat jumps onto the cupboard.’

→ Postpositional PPs are always directional.

→ Prepositional PPs are usually locative, but can be directional when selected by verbs of motion (Koopman 1997):

(9) a. Lola springt in het water.
    Lola jumps in the water
    locative: Lola is in the water, jumping up and down.
    directional: Lola jumps into the water.

- Doubling PPs are obligatorily directional, not locative.

(10) Lili springt in het water in.
    Lili jumps in the water in
    ‘Lili jumps into the water.’
    # ‘Lili jumps up and down in the water.’ [locative]

→ Movement

- In doubling PPs, the preposition and the DP object can undergo movement together, to the exclusion of the postposition:

1 A few speakers allow doubling PPs with (predicative) locative PPs as well. In section 6 ‘Conclusion and further issues’ below we discuss these cases and provide a potential analysis.
(11) a. **Topicalization**  
\[ \text{Op dienen berg} \text{ is Lili t op geklommen.} \]  
\[ \text{on that.MASC hill is Lili on climbed} \]  
‘That hill Lili has climbed up on.’

b. **Wh-movement**  
\[ \text{Op welken berg} \text{ is Lili t op geklommen?} \]  
\[ \text{on which.MASC hill is Lili on climbed} \]  
‘Which hill has Lili climbed up on?’

c. **Scrambling across negation**  
\[ \text{Lili is op dienen berg niet t op geklommen.} \]  
\[ \text{Lili is on that.MASC hill not on climbed} \]  
‘Lili didn’t climb up on that hill.’

• The doubling PP as a whole – including the postposition – cannot move:

(12) a. **Topicalization**  
\[ * \text{Op dienen berg op} \text{ is Lili t geklommen.} \]  
\[ \text{on that.MASC hill on Lili climbed} \]  
\[ * \text{Op dienen berg op is Lili t geklommen.} \]  
\[ \text{on that.MASC hill on Lili climbed} \]  
\[ * \text{Lili is op dienen berg op niet t geklommen.} \]  
\[ \text{Lili is on that.MASC hill on not climbed} \]  

→ The postposition needs to be adjacent to the verbal cluster and can be incorporated into it (as is typical of postpositions, not prepositions in (Standard) Dutch):

(13) Lili zal op dienen berg <op> moeten <op> klommen.  
\[ \text{Lili will on that.MASC hill on must on climb} \]  
‘Lili will have to climb up on that hill.’
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(14) a. op + iets → ergens op b. over + dat → daarover  
\[ \text{on something somewhere on over that thereover} \]  
\[ \text{on something} \]  
\[ \text{over that/it} \]

(15) a. Ze heeft het boek\{ergens op /*op iets\} gelegd.  
\[ \text{she has the book somewhere on} \]  
\[ \text{on something} \]  
\[ \text{laid} \]  
\[ \text{She put the book on that} \]  
\[ \text{'She put the book on that.'} \]

b. De kat is \{daarop /*dat op\} gesprongen.  
\[ \text{the cat is there.on that on jumped} \]  
\[ \text{'The cat jumped up on that.'} \]

c. Hij is \{erop af /*op het af\} gelopen.  
\[ \text{he is there.on from it from walked} \]  
\[ \text{'He walked towards it.'} \]

• Dialects that display doubling PPs, allow the pronoun to stay in situ and not change form:

(16) Lili is \{op iets op\} geklommen.  
\[ \text{Lili is on something on climbed} \]  
\[ \text{Lili climbed up on something.'} \]  
In fact, R-pronoun formation of the indefinite pronoun is even ungrammatical with doubling:

(17) Lili is \{ergens op /*op het\} geklommen.  
\[ \text{Lili is somewhere on on climbed} \]  
\[ \text{Lili climbed up on something.'} \]

Summary: Doubling PP properties

1. P doubling is typically only allowed with directional (spatial) PPs
2. The entire PP cannot move as a unit, but the Prepositional Phrase on its own can undergo movement.
3. Indefinite neuter pronoun objects stay in situ and do not undergo R-pronoun formation.

R-pronouns

• In Standard Dutch a neuter pronoun in the complement of a PreP obligatorily transforms into an R-pronoun and precedes the P: ‘P + pronoun’ → ‘R-pronoun P’
3 THE INTERNAL STRUCTURE OF DUTCH PPS

• van Riemsdijk (1978, 1990): PPs contain functional structure as well, parallel to the verbal/clausal and nominal domain


→ potential functional structure in PPs:

(18) Locative PPs

(19) Directional PPs: PathP


(20) a. Locative PPs

(21) Locative PP

→ 6 possible PP structures in the complement of V (for argumentation, see den Dikken 2006, 2010)
4 Analysis, Part I: A Reduced Higher P Layer

4.1 The P_Dir layer

Den Dikken (2006, 2010): Two options for P_Dir

P_Dir can either have a full functional structure or none at all.

(22) a. CP[Path] b. PP_Dir

\[ \text{C[Path]} \]
\[ \text{DegP[Path]} \]
\[ \text{PathP} \]
\[ \text{P_Dir} \]
\[ \text{CP[Path]/PP_PLoc} \]
\[ \text{CP[Path]/DegP[Place]/PP_PLoc} \]

• Some consequences of full structure:
  - no incorporation into V: P_Dir moves to Path, but no higher.
  - entire PP can undergo movement as a unit, but lower PP cannot be
    subextracted from it (no CP layer or C-over-C violation).

• Some consequences of no functional structure:
  - obligatory incorporation of P_Dir into V
  - no movement of the entire PP as a unit, only of the complement of P_Dir

4.2 Circumpositions

• Doubling PPs resemble Standard Dutch circumpositions (with non-identical Ps):

  (23) a. Ik loop om het huis heen. [Standard Dutch]
     I run about the house towards
     ‘I am running around the house.’
  b. Hij loopt op mij af.
     he runs on me from
     ‘He’s running towards me.’

• Differences between doubling PPs and circumpositions:

  Contra property Θ:

  There are (Standard Dutch) speakers who do not allow the prepositional PP in
  circumpositions to undergo movement on its own, but the entire [P DP P] string
  can undergo movement as a unit (den Dikken 2006).

  (24) a. % Om welk huis is Lola heen gelopen?
     about which house is Lola towards run
     ‘Around which house has Lola run?’
  b. Om welk huis heen is Lola gelopen?
     about which house towards is Lola run
     ‘…that Lola ran around the house.’

  These same (Standard Dutch) speakers do not allow the postposition to
  incorporate into the verb (den Dikken 2006):

  (25) dat Lola om het huis <heen> is <%heen> gelopen.
     that Lola about the house towards is towards run
     ‘…that Lola ran around the house.’

  Contra property Θ:

  Circumpositions allow indefinite pronouns to stay in situ, but also allow R-word
  formation:
(26) a. Lola is om iets heen gelopen.
   b. Lola is ergens om heen gelopen.

   ‘Lola ran around something.’

• Analysis: Den Dikken (2006) proposes the following base structure for (non-doubling) circumpositions:

   (27) $\left[ \left[ \left[ C_{\text{Path}} \right] \left[ C_{\text{Deg}} \left[ P_{\text{Path}} \left[ PP_{\text{Dir}} C_{\text{Deg}} \left[ C_{\text{Place}} \left[ PP_{\text{Loc}} DP \right] \right] \right] \right] \right] \right] \right]$
   (= full extended projection for both $P_{\text{Dir}}$ and $P_{\text{Loc}}$)

(28) 

$\rightarrow$ The preposition is basegenerated in $P_{\text{Loc}}$ and moves to Place to be licensed.

$\rightarrow$ The postposition is basegenerated in $P_{\text{Dir}}$ and moves to Path to be licensed.

$\rightarrow$ This explains the movement/incorporation property (② above): a full $C_{\text{Path}}$ blocks movement of the lower $C_{\text{Place}}$ and prevents incorporation into the verb.

• ! However: Some speakers do allow for incorporation and prepositional movement (den Dikken 2006).

Solution: These are the speakers who allow for a reduced $P_{\text{Dir}}$ (den Dikken 2006).

(29) $\rightarrow$

$\rightarrow$ The preposition in $P_{\text{Loc}}$ moves to Place to be licensed. The postposition in $P_{\text{Dir}}$ incorporates into the verb to be licensed.

$\rightarrow$ $C_{\text{Place}}$ becomes the derived complement of the verb and comes to precede the postposition.

4.3 Doubling PPs

• Recall property ②: Our structure should allow for movement of the lower PP and incorporation of the postposition.

= parallel to the restricted structure for circumpositions

Analysis: Doubling PPs have a reduced higher layer: $P_{\text{Dir}}$ does not project any functional phrases.
5.1 The P\textsubscript{Loc} layer

Den Dikken (2006, 2010): 3 options for P\textsubscript{Loc}
P\textsubscript{Loc} can either have a full structure, a Deg\textsubscript{[Place]}P structure or no functional structure

- Full structure (CP\textsubscript{[Place]})

Some consequences of a full structure:
- R-pronouns allowed: Spec,CP (Koopman 2000, 2010)
- no incorporation into P\textsubscript{Dir} or V; P\textsubscript{Loc} moves to Place but no higher
- locative PP can undergo movement, unless selected by full P\textsubscript{Dir}-structure
• **DegP**

(32)

```
CP[Path]  
   
...  
PPDir  
PDir DegCP[Place]  
     
PlaceP  
PLoc  
PPLoc  
PLoc DP
```

Some consequences of a **DegP structure**:
- no incorporation into PDir or V: PLoc moves to Place but no higher
- locative PP cannot be subextracted from the PP

• **No functional structure: PLoc**

(33)

```
CP[Path]  
   
...  
PPDir  
PDir PPLoc  
PLoc DP
```

Some consequences of **no functional structure**:
- obligatory incorporation into PDir or V: PLoc needs to be licensed
- DP object behaves like the object of a V: scrambling, topicalization...
- locative PP cannot undergo movement

---

### 5.2 A defective lower layer

• Recall property ①: the in situ indefinite pronouns

(34) Lili is **op iets op** geklommen. [Asse Dutch]
Lili is on something on climbed
‘Lili climbed up on something.’

The lading site for R-pronouns is [Spec,CP[Place]] in Standard Dutch.

→ In doubling PPs this landing site seems to be unavailable.

• **Claim:**

C[Place] is sometimes defective (C*[Place])

Consequences:

① It lacks an EPP feature, i.e. it cannot attract elements to its Spec.
→ No landing site for pronouns → No R-word formation

② It needs to amalgamate with a local host in order to be licensed.
This host needs to be feature compatible with the defective C*.

C* is itself a member of the extended projection of PLoc and is specified for PLoc’s features: in the case of PLoc op ‘on’, it is specified for op’s features.

In order to amalgamate with C*, PDir must be feature compatible with it.
→ PDir must be specified for PLoc(=op)’s features. ²
→ PDir can only amalgamate with C* if it spells out identically to PLoc.

→ PDir’s selection of a defective C* demands identical Ps and hence, derives doubling.

---

² We conceive of the locative/directional opposition as a privative one, with [dir] as the marked feature. PLoc=op is hence specified for all of PLoc=op’s features: there is no feature conflict between [loc] and [dir]; PDir is more richly specified than PLoc and C*, but shares all of PLoc’s and C*’s features, and can license C*. 
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Analysis, Part II:
Dialects that display doubling allow P\textsubscript{Dir} to act as a host for the defective C:

(35) \[ [PP P\textsubscript{Dir} \{ C\textsubscript{Place} \} C\textsubscript{Deg} \{ Deg\textsubscript{Place} \} \{ [Place] \} \{ Deg\textsubscript{Place} \} \{ Place \} \{ PP P\textsubscript{Loc} \} ] ] \]

\[ \rightarrow \text{Doubling allows for in situ pronouns (property } \circledast \text{).} \]

- Analysis of (34): Lilli is \textit{op iets op geklommen}.

\textbf{Step 1:} P\textsubscript{Loc} moves to Place to be licensed (see Koopman 2010; den Dikken 2010)

(36) \[ [PP P\textsubscript{Dir} \{ C\textsubscript{Place} \} C\textsubscript{Deg} \{ Deg\textsubscript{Place} \} \{ [Place] \} \{ Deg\textsubscript{Place} \} \{ Place \} \{ PP P\textsubscript{Loc} \} \{ op \} \{ iets \} ] ] \text{ klimmen} \]

\textbf{Step 2:} Because C is defective, [Spec, C\textsubscript{Place}]P is not available \( \rightarrow \) iets stays in situ:

(37) \[ [PP P\textsubscript{Dir} \{ C\textsubscript{Place} \} C\textsubscript{Deg} \{ Deg\textsubscript{Place} \} \{ [Place] \} \{ Deg\textsubscript{Place} \} \{ Place \} \{ PP P\textsubscript{Loc} \} \{ op \} \{ iets \} ] ] \text{ klimmen} \]

\textbf{Step 3:} Recall that P\textsubscript{Dir} does not project any functional structure in doubling PPs (see Analysis, part I)

\[ \rightarrow P\textsubscript{Dir}+C* \text{ can incorporate into the verb and C\textsubscript{Place}P becomes a derived complement of the verb.} \]

(38) \[ [PP P\textsubscript{Dir} \{ C\textsubscript{Place} \} C\textsubscript{Deg} \{ Deg\textsubscript{Place} \} \{ [Place] \} \{ Deg\textsubscript{Place} \} \{ Place \} \{ PP P\textsubscript{Loc} \} \{ op \} \{ iets \} ] ] \text{ op+klimmen} \]

\[ \text{= op iets op klimmen} \]

5.3 Extension: Circumpositions and R-pronouns

- Recall that circumpositions allow both in situ pronouns and R-pronouns:

(39) a. Hij lijkt \textbf{ergens om heen} te draaien.
    He seems somewhere about to turn

b. Hij lijkt \textbf{om iets} heen te draaien.
    He seems about something towards to turn

‘He seems to be rotating around something.’

- Analysis: When P\textsubscript{Dir} projects functional structure of its own, the size of its complement can vary (see above, cf. den Dikken 2010).

P\textsubscript{Dir} can select:

\( \circledast \) A full functional structure CP\textsubscript{Place} (see above, cf. den Dikken 2006): \[ \rightarrow \text{necessarily non-defective, because the Ps are not identical.} \]

\( \circledast \) A Deg\textsubscript{Place}P (see above, cf. den Dikken 2006):

- Consequences for R-pronouns:

\( \circledast \) Full CP\textsubscript{Place}: R-pronouns

(41) A full functional structure CP\textsubscript{Place} (see above, cf. den Dikken 2006):

\[ \rightarrow \text{necessarily non-defective, because the Ps are not identical.} \]

(42) A Deg\textsubscript{Place}P (see above, cf. den Dikken 2006):

- Consequences for R-pronouns:

\( \circledast \) Full CP\textsubscript{Place}: R-pronouns

(43) A full functional structure CP\textsubscript{Place} (see above, cf. den Dikken 2006):

\[ \rightarrow \text{probably non-defective, because the Ps are not identical.} \]

\( \circledast \) A Deg\textsubscript{Place}P (see above, cf. den Dikken 2006):

\[ \rightarrow \text{necessarily non-defective, because the Ps are not identical.} \]

5.3.1 Consequences for R-pronouns:

- It can also select a bare PP\textsubscript{Loc}, but for reasons of space, we do not discuss this option here.
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Step 2: *iets* can move to [Spec, C[Place]P], forming an R-pronoun (Koopman 1997, 2000; den Dikken 2006, 2010)

\[(41) \:\ldots [\text{PP(Dir)} \text{heen} [\text{CP(Place)} \text{ergens} C[\text{DegP} \text{[Place]} \text{om} [\text{PP(LOC)} \text{om} \text{iets}]])]]\]

Step 3: CP[Place] moves around the P[Dir] to form a circumposition (den Dikken 2006)

\[(42) \:\ldots [\text{CP(Place)} \text{ergens} \ldots [\text{PP(Loc)} \text{om} \text{iets}]][\text{PP(Dir)} \text{heen} t_{\text{CP(Place)}}] = \text{ergens om heen} \]

10/12

Further implication: In situ pronouns and movement

When P[Dir] does not project functional structure, the PreP can move on its own (i.e. the PP can be split) \(\rightarrow\) doubling, and, for some speakers, circumpositions

+ When P[Dir] does not project functional structure, it can only select CP, not DegP.

Only when P[Dir] selects DegP, in situ pronouns occur in (non-doubling) circumpositions.

\(\rightarrow\) Prediction: When the PP is split, the pronoun cannot stay in situ, i.e. has to form an R-word.

Speakers who allow for (46)a, should reject (46)b, in contrast to (46)c.\(^4\)

\[(46)\]

\[\begin{align*}
\text{a.} & & \text{dat hij ergens om leek heen te lopen.} & & \text{'that he somewhere about seemed to run'} \\
\text{b.} & & \text{dat hij om iets leek heen te lopen.} & & \text{'that he about something seemed to run'} \\
\text{c.} & & \text{dat hij om iets heen leek te lopen.} & & \text{'that he about something seemed to run'}
\end{align*}\]

'\(\text{that he seemed to be running around something.'}\)

\(^4\) Speakers who reject (46)a do not allow a P[Dir] without functional structure in the complement of a directional verb, see above (cf. den Dikken 2006, 2010).
6 CONCLUSION AND FURTHER ISSUES

Main claims:
1. Doubling PPs in Flemish Dutch dialects are the result of identical spell-outs of a PLoc and a PDir.
2. The properties of doubling PPs are:
   i. It only occurs with spatial directional PPs
   ii. The entire [P DP P] string cannot undergo movement, but the prepositional part can subextract.
   iii. Indefinite pronouns stay in situ and do not form R-words.
3. To capture these properties we argue for the following structure:
   $$[\text{PP } \text{PDir} \{\text{CP (Place)} \text{C*} \{\text{Place} \text{PPlace } \text{PP PLoc DP}\}]\]$$
   i. Both PLoc and PDir are present → explains distribution.
   ii. PDir does not project any functional structure, capturing the movement properties.
   iii. PLoc optionally projects a defective CP, which forces neuter pronouns to stay in situ and not form R-pronomina.

Further issues:
1. Alternative approach: Doubling as multiple spell-out in a movement chain?
   Doubling is sometimes argued to be the result of spell-out of several links in a movement chain (see among others Barbiers et al 2009 for wh doubling).
   $$\rightarrow$$ PLoc moves to PDir and is realized in both positions.
   Not tenable here:
The movement data require functional structure for PLoc (+ also R-pronouns, Degree Phrases)
   $$\rightarrow$$ The functional structure blocks movement from PLoc to PDir (Koopman 2000)
   $$\rightarrow$$ No movement chain, no multiple spell-out

2. Why do some dialects allow for doubling (i.e. spell-out of PDir)? What is the motivation/trigger for doubling?
   To solve this question it is important to look into language evolution and see how the different dialects of Dutch/Flemish developed.
   $$\rightarrow$$ Link between doubling PP dialects and variants of Dutch allowing for bare PDir with circumpositions (as these have the same structure)?
   $$\rightarrow$$ Disambiguation of directional prepositional phrases?
   Standard Dutch can disambiguate Ps that can be used both directionally and locatively (such as in, cf. Lola springt in het water) by using them as postpositions or prepositions respectively.
   Maybe certain dialects developed doubling as a disambiguation strategy.
   ! Difficult to see if these dialects actually display postpositions.
   $$\rightarrow$$ Flemish dialects also allow P elements van ‘of’ and voor ‘for’ to be used as complementizers. Although the distribution of this use is wider than doubling PPs, we suspect there to be a link: dialects allowing for P complementizers are more likely to allow for the PDir+C* hybrid created in doubling.

3. Gradient grammaticalization of PDir+C* hybrid
   Some speakers allow for doubling with (predicative) locative PPs:
   $$\begin{array}{c}
   (47) \ a., \ % \ H\text{ij wil naast dat meisj}e \ n\text{iet naast zitten.} \\
   \text{he wants next that girl not next sit} \\
   \text{‘He doesn’t want to sit next to that girl.’} \\
   \\
   b., \ % \ De kleren hangen al een hele dag aan de wasdraad aan. \\
   \text{the clothes hang already a whole day on the washing line} \\
   \text{‘The clothes have been hanging on the washing line all day.’}
   \end{array}$$
→ Possible analysis:
For some speakers the amalgamation or hybrid P/C has grammaticalized even further: $P_{\text{Dir}}$ is reanalyzed as $C$ and can lose its directional meaning. As a consequence of this grammaticalization, $C$ itself can also be spelled out identically to $P_{\text{Loc}}$, in the absence of a $P_{\text{Dir}}$.

→ For these speakers, doubling can also occur in locative contexts.

REFERENCES

DIKKEN, Marcel den. 2003. On the syntax of locative and directional adpositional phrases. Ms, CUNY.
DIKKEN, Marcel den. 2006. On the functional structure of locative and directional PPs. Ms, CUNY.

Research funded by FWO

Lobke Aelbrecht (GIST / Ghent University)
Muinkkaai 42, 9000 Ghent (Belgium)
lobke.aelbrecht@ugent.be
http://www.gist.ugent.be/members/lobkeaelbrecht

Marcel den Dikken (CUNY)
Linguistics Program CUNY Graduate Center
365 Fifth Avenue New York, NY 10016-4309 (USA)
MDen-Dikken@gc.cuny.edu
http://web.gc.cuny.edu/dept/lingu/dendikken/