

Grammaticalization in the syntax of preposition doubling in Flemish dialects

Lobke Aelbrecht (GIST, Ghent University) & Marcel den Dikken (Graduate Center, CUNY)

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 (directional) pre-PP or a post-PP.

Key properties

❶ P doubling is restricted to spatial Ps, hence is illicit with the selected PP in (2)b. Moreover, it typically occurs only with directional PPs, not locative ones. A test to tell the two apart 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.

❷ The entire PP complex [P₁ DP P₂] cannot move as a unit. P₁ and the object can undergo movement together, however, to the exclusion of P₂. P₂ on its own can incorporate into the verb cluster, as (4)c illustrates.

❸ 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.

Analysis, part I: A reduced higher P layer – P doubling resembles (Standard Dutch) circumpositions such as ‘*om* DP *heen*’ (‘around DP’), with non-identical Ps. These, too, are always spatial and typically directional (cf.

❶). Circumpositions and P doubling differ with respect to ❷ and ❸, however. With non-doubling circumpositions, the entire circum-PP can move as a unit whereas for (Standard Dutch) many speakers the pre-PP layer fails to subextract and P₂ cannot incorporate, cf. (6) (contrary to property ❷; cf. (4)). Furthermore, non-doubling circum-PPs allow both *in situ* indefinite pronouns ((7)a) and R-pronouns ((7)b, *contra* ❸).

In the structure in (8) for circumPPs (Den Dikken 2010), P₂ is base-generated in P_{Dir}, and CP^[Place], containing P₁ in P_{Loc} and the DP object, moves around it, to [Spec,PathP]. The presence of CP^[Path] prevents subextraction of CP^[Place] and incorporation of P_{Dir}, which captures the data in (6) for the speakers who find the %-marked options illicit. Speakers allowing them allow P_{Dir} to forgo an extended projection of its own (i.e. no PathP, DegP^[Path] and CP^[Path]).

To capture the differences with P doubling, we argue that P_{Dir} in P doubling systematically fails to project a functional layer, which forces P_{Dir} to incorporate, and makes movement of the lower PP possible and movement of the entire [P₁ DP P₂] impossible. This results in the structure in (9) for P doubling, which captures both the movement and incorporation data (property ❷) and the fact that P doubling is directional (property ❶).

Analysis, part II: A defective lower P layer – The landing site for R-movement in Standard Dutch is [Spec,CP^[Place]] (cf. Koopman 1997, Den Dikken 2010). In P doubling this landing site is unavailable (cf. (5)). We capture this by claiming that C^[Place] is defective (C*) in this case, lacking EPP. Hence, an indefinite pronoun cannot move to [Spec,CP^[Place]] to form an R-pronoun and instead, stays *in situ* (property ❸). 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 P_{Loc}’s extended projection and is specified for P_{Loc}’s features. In order to amalgamate with C*, P_{Dir} must be featurally compatible with it, i.e. P_{Dir} must be specified for the features of P_{Loc}(=*op* in (10)) too. Thus, P_{Dir} can only amalgamate with C* if it spells out identically to P_{Loc}. A defective C* demands identical Ps and thereby derives doubling.

On the distribution of P doubling – In Flemish varieties of Dutch, more prepositions are subject to reanalysis as complementizers than in Northern Dutch. More particularly, while in Northern Dutch only the locative P *om* functions as a complementizer, in Flemish two Ps that have *directional* uses (*van* ‘of/ from’ and *voor* ‘for/in front of’) can serve as complementizers as well, cf. (11). Unambiguous uses of directional Ps as complementizers may serve as a cue to the language user that amalgamation of C* and P_{Dir} can be taken further toward wholesale *grammaticalization* of P_{Dir} as C in P doubling constructions. With P_{Dir} initially holding on to its lexical feature [+dir], the reanalyzed P-C hybrid will at first be possible in directional constructions only (cf. ❶); subsequent loss of [+dir] will lead to a widening of the range of contexts in which the P-C hybrid can be used, with *non-directional* P inserted under C^[Place].

Speakers for whom this grammaticalization process is in an advanced stage allow for P doubling in purely locative contexts such as the one in (12) as well. Even for these speakers, however, grammaticalization of P to C is not fully complete at the present time: for all speakers, (2)a – in principle ambiguous between a locative and a directional reading – only supports a directional interpretation. P₂ continues to be analyzed as a spell-out of P_{Dir} (rather than C) whenever such a parse is possible.

Grammaticalization of P to C – Grammaticalization of P_{Dir} to C is a case of structural simplification oriented toward the functional category, in line with Roberts & Roussou (2003), henceforth R&R: upon completion of the grammaticalization of the P-C hybrid, the structural distinction between PP and CP collapses and only CP remains. The directionality of this process (with a structurally *higher* P reanalyzed as the C-head of its *complement*) runs counter to the ‘upward reanalysis’ dictum of R&R’s approach, however: P_{Dir} taking CP as its complement is reanalyzed ‘downward’ as CP’s head.

We claim that grammaticalization toward C is never a case of ‘upward reanalysis’. Alongside the case of grammaticalization of P_{Dir} to C, the paper reinvestigates the grammaticalization path from Dutch *om*, Flemish *voor* and English *for* to C (cf. Fischer *et al.* 2000) and especially that of *van* ‘of/from’. *Van* qua lexical preposition is a P_{Dir} (cf. (13)a), present in all varieties of Dutch; it never selected a CP complement (unlike P_{Dir} in P doubling or *voor* in purposive constructions), nor did it ever head a PP dependent of the matrix predicate in the input to *C-van* (unlike *for* in (13)b). A complex chain of events starting with the development of *van* in possessed noun phrases ((14)a) and leading to the use of *van* as a relator of subjects and predicates ((14)b) resulted in a purely functional incarnation of

van that made it eligible for use as a complementizer – only in infinitival clauses because finite non-root CPs in West-Germanic always had obligatory fillers of C, making finite C a position that *van* could not be reanalyzed as a filler of.

Examples

- (1) a. dat hij **op** dem berg is **op** geklommen. [Asse Dutch]
that he on the mountain is on climbed
 b. dat hij <**op**> de berg <**op**> is geklommen. [Standard Dutch]
that he on the mountain up is climbed
 ‘that he has climbed up on the mountain.’
- (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]
he is in the water in jumped
 ‘He has jumped into the water.’
 b. Hij **heeft** **in** het water (* **in**) gesprongen. [*hebben*: locative]
he has in the water in jumped
 ‘He has jumped (up and down) in the water.’
- (4) a. **Op** **dienen** **berg** <* **op**> klimt hij niet <**op**>. [topicalization]
on that.MASC mountain on climbs he 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 he on climbed
 ‘Up on which mountain has he climbed?’
 c. dat hij **op** **dienen** **berg** <* **op**> niet <**op**> is <**op**> geklommen. [scrambling]
that he on that.MASC mountain on not on is on climbed
 ‘that he hasn’t climbed up on that mountain.’
- (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’
- (6) a. [**Om** **welk** **huis** <**heen**>] is Jan <%**heen**> gelopen?
about which house towards is Jan towards walked
 ‘Around which house did Jan walk?’
 b. ... dat Jan **om** **het** **huis** <**heen**> is <%**heen**> gelopen.
that Jan about the house towards is towards walked
 ‘... that Jan walked around the house.’
- (7) a. om iets heen b. ergens om heen both: ‘around something’
around something towards somewhere about towards
- (8) [CP C^[Path] [DegP Deg^[Path] [PathP Path [PP P_{Dir} [CP C^[Place] [DegP Deg^[Place] [PlaceP Place [PP P_{Loc} DP]]]]]]]]]
- (9) [PP P_{Dir}=**op** [CP C^[Place] [DegP Deg^[Place] [PlaceP Place [PP P_{Loc}=**op** DP=*den berg*]]]]]]]]]
- (10) [PP P_{Dir}=**op** [CP (Place) C*^[Place] [DegP Deg^[Place] [PlaceP Place [PP P_{Loc}=**op** DP]]]]]
- (11) a. Ik probeer altijd **van** vroeg op te staan. b. We hebben niks meer **voor** te eten.
I try always of early up to stand we have nothing more for to eat
 ‘I always try to get up early.’ ‘We’ve got nothing left to eat.’
- (12) % Hij wil **naast** dat meisje niet **naast** zitten.
he wants next.to that girl not next.to sit
 ‘He does not want to sit next to that girl.’
- (13) a. **van** New York naar Philadelphia. b. It is bad **for** people to smoke.
from New York to Philadelphia
- (14) a. het boek van Jan b. die idioot van een dokter
the book of Jan that idiot of a doctor
 ‘Jan’s book’ ‘that idiot of a doctor’

References – Dikken, M. den. 2010. On the functional structure of locative and directional PPs. In *Mapping Spatial PPs: The Cartography of Syntactic Structures, vol. 6*. OUP. • Fischer, O., A. van Kemenade, W. Koopman & W. van der Wurff. 2000. *The Syntax of Early English*. CUP. • Koopman, H. 2010. Prepositions, postpositions, circumpositions, and particles. In *Mapping Spatial PPs: The Cartography of Syntactic Structures, vol. 6*. OUP. • Roberts, I. & A. Roussou. 2003. *Syntactic Change: A Minimalist Approach to Grammaticalization*. CUP.