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1 INTRODUCTION

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

  (1) a. Het boek ligt \textit{op} de tafel. \[\text{preposition}\]
  \[\text{the book lies on the table}\]
  \[\text{the cat jumps the table on}\]
  \[\text{‘The cat jumps on(to) the table.’}\]
  c. Hij loopt \textit{op} mij \textit{af}. \[\text{circumposition}\]
  \[\text{he walks on me from}\]
  \[\text{‘He’s walking towards me.’}\]

  \rightarrow Postpositions are derived from prepositions by movement of the DP object, and circumpositions through PP movement.

  (2) a. \[\begin{array}{c}
  \text{DP} \\
  \text{de tafel}
  \end{array} \rightarrow \begin{array}{c}
  \text{PP} \\
  \text{P’}
  \end{array} \rightarrow \begin{array}{c}
  \text{P’}
  \end{array}\]
  b. \[\begin{array}{c}
  \text{PP_2} \\
  \text{P_2’}
  \end{array} \rightarrow \begin{array}{c}
  \text{P_2’}
  \end{array} \rightarrow \begin{array}{c}
  \text{P_1’}
  \end{array} \rightarrow \begin{array}{c}
  \text{P_1’}
  \end{array} \rightarrow \begin{array}{c}
  \text{P_1’}
  \end{array} \rightarrow \begin{array}{c}
  \text{I_D_P}
  \end{array}\]

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

  (3) dat hij \textit{op} de berg \textit{op} is geklommen. \[\text{Asse Dutch}\]
  \[\text{that he on the hill on is climbed}\]
  \[\text{that he has climbed up on the hill.’}\]

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

  (4) a. dat hij \textit{op} de berg is geklommen. \[\text{Standard Dutch}\]
  \[\text{that he on the hill is climbed}\]
  b. dat hij de berg \textit{op} is geklommen.
  \[\text{that he the hill up is climbed}\]
  \[‘that he has climbed up on the hill.’\]

2 PROPERTIES OF DOUBLING PPS

2.1 The postpositional element is not a particle or verbal prefix

• The interpretation of the P is always the lexical spatial meaning of the P, not (as is often the case in verb-particle constructions) some idiosyncratic meaning contributed jointly by the P-element and the verb: the particle verb \textit{op geraken} only has an idiosyncratic interpretation (‘to run out’, as in \textit{de suiker geraakt op} ‘the sugar is running out’), but in (5) \textit{op geraken} has a compositional semantics derived from the lexical meanings of \textit{op} and \textit{geraken} (‘manage to get up something’).

  (5) Hij is \textit{op} dienen berg \textit{not} \textit{op} geraakt.
  \[\text{he is on that.MASC hill not on reached}\]
  \[‘He didn’t manage to get up on that hill.’\]

• That the second P in doubling PPs is not a particle is confirmed by the fact that P-doubling can occur in the complement of a noun, when there is no verb present at all, as in (6):

  (6) dat wegske over de brug over
  \[\text{that path.DIM over the bridge over}\]
  \[‘that little path over the bridge’\]

  \rightarrow Dutch simple particles cannot occur independently with nominals, in contradistinction to postpositional PPs:

  (7) a. de weg omhoog /*uit
  \[\text{the way up.high/out}\]
  \[‘the way up/out’\]
  b. de weg de stad uit
  \[\text{the way the city out}\]
  \[‘the way out of the city’\]
• Perhaps the clearest indication that the second P-element in P-doubling constructions is not a particle is the fact that doubling PPs themselves co-occur with particles, as shown in (8); in doubling PPs with *naar, this additional particle is in fact obligatorily present (see (8)b).

(8) a. "ik durfde door dat bos niet doorheen lopen"
   I dared through that wood not through.PRT walk
b. ge moet naar diene grote rots naar*(toe) springen
   you must to that big rock to.PRT jump

→ Given that the elements in boldface in the examples in (8) are particles, the P-elements immediately to their left cannot also be analysed as particles.

→ As a general rule, particles are unique per verb; neither are there combinations of free-standing particles and any of the prefixal particles of Dutch, *be-, *ver- and *ont- (see Hoekstra, Lansu & Westerduin 1987): thus, there is *afdekken ‘off-cover, i.e., cover up’ and *bedekken ‘BE-cover’ but not *afbedekken; and there is *invooeren ‘import’ and *vervoeren ‘trans-port’ but not *invervoeren; the pattern is systematic (on apparent exceptions, irrelevant for our purposes here, see Koopman 1995, Booij 2002, and esp. Den Dikken 2003:sect. 2).

→ The co-occurrence of doubling PPs with particles thus precludes an analysis of the second P-token of P-doubling constructions as a verbal particle.

2.2 The distribution of doubling PPs

P doubling is only allowed with spatial PPs

(9) 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.’

P doubling is only allowed with directional PPs

• Spatial PPs come in two flavours: locative and directional.

(10) a. Lola zit op de stoel.     [locative]
   Lola sits 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 usually locative, but can be directional when selected by certain verbs of motion (Koopman 2000; see also Gehrke 2007):

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

• For cases in which a spatial PP is in principle interpretable either locatively or directionally, P-doubling is a disambiguator: it allows only for a directional reading:

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

→ This is further confirmed by the fact that in constructions featuring a manner of motion verb, the use of a doubling PP forces the selection of the auxiliary *zijn ‘be’ rather than *hebben ‘have’ (cf. (13)). This is typical of directional resultatives in general (Koopman 2000, Den Dikken 2010), as (14) illustrates: *hebben triggers a locative reading and *zijn a directional one.

(13) a. Lili is op de kast op gesprongen.
   Lili is on the cupboard on jumped
   ‘Lili has jumped onto the cupboard.’

b. Lili heeft op de kast (*op) gesprongen.
   Lili has on the cupboard on jumped
   ‘Lili has jumped (up and down) on the cupboard.’

(14) a. Lola heeft in het water gesprongen.  [locative/*directional]
   Lola has in the water jumped
   ‘Lola has jumped (up and down) in the water.’

b. Lola is in het water gesprongen.     [*locative/directional]
   Lola is in the water jumped
   ‘Lola has jumped into the water.’

2.3 Doubling PPs and extraction

• In doubling PPs, the preposition and the DP object can undergo movement together, to the exclusion of the postposition: (15)

• But the doubling PP as a whole – including the postposition – cannot move: (16)
(15) a. **Topicalization**

\[
\text{On dienen berg is Lili op geklommen.}
\]

on that.MASC.hill is Lili on climbers

‘That hill Lili has climbed up on.’

b. **Wh-movement**

\[
\text{Op welken berg is Lili op geklommen?}
\]

on which.MASC.hill is Lili on climbers?

‘Which hill has Lili climbed up on?’

c. **Scrambling across negation**

\[
\text{Lili is op dienen berg niet op geklommen.}
\]

Lili is on that.MASC.hill not on climbers

‘Lili didn’t climb up on that hill.’

→ 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):

(16) a. **Topicalization**

\[
\text{* On dienen berg op is Lili t geklommen.}
\]

on that.MASC.hill on is Lili climbed

b. **Wh-movement**

\[
\text{* Op welken berg op is Lili t geklommen?}
\]

on which.MASC.hill on is Lili climbers?

‘Which hill has Lili climbed up on?’

c. **Scrambling across negation**

\[
\text{* Lili is op dienen berg op niet t geklommen.}
\]

Lili is on that.MASC.hill on not climbers

‘Lili didn’t climb up on that hill.’

2.4 Doubling PPs and R-pronouns

- In Standard Dutch a neuter pronoun in the complement of a preposition moves to a specifier in the extended projection of P and surfaces as an R-pronoun:

  \[
  \text{P + pronoun} \rightarrow \text{‘R-pronoun P’}
  \]

(18) a. op + iets \(
  \text{ergens op}
  \)
  \[
  \text{somewhere on}
  \]
  \[
  \text{on something}
  \]

b. over + dat \(
  \text{daarover}
  \)
  \[
  \text{over that/it}
  \]

- But in doubling PPs, R-pronoun formation of the indefinite pronoun is ungrammatical, no matter where the doubling P is placed:

(19) a. dat Lili op iets \(<op>\) is \(<op>\) geklommen.

that Lili on something on is on climbers

‘that Lili climbed up on something.’

b. dat Lili ergens op \(\text{<op>}\) is \(\text{<op>}\) geklommen.

that Lili somewhere on on is on climbers

- R-words are not categorically forbidden in doubling PPs: the wh-pronoun can surface as the R-word waar, as in (20)b; and the demonstrative pronoun undergoes R-word formation obligatorily: in situ placement of dat is illicit (see (21)).

(20) a. Op wat is Lili op geklommen?

on what is Lili on climbers

b. Waarop is Lili op geklommen?

whereon is Lili on climbers

‘What did Lili climb up on?’

(21) a. {Daarop /* op dat} is Lili op geklommen.

{thereon on that} is Lili on climbers

‘that Lili climbed onto that.’

→ (22)b shows that non-identical circumPPs allow R-word formation with indefinites, in contradistinction to doubling PPs (recall (19)b).

(22) a. Lola is om iets heen gelopen.

Lola is about something towards run

b. Lola is ergens omheen gelopen.

Lola is somewhere about.towards run
With non-identical circumPPs, the availability of movement of the entire complex PP versus ‘splitting’ depends on the nature of the nominal complement:
- with [+wh,+R] waar, as in (23), splitting waar+P off from Pp is impossible (in contrast to doubling PPs, where splitting with waar is fine: (20)b);
- with [+wh,–R] wat full pied-piping is impossible ((24)a; cf. (20)a), with the grammaticality of splitting being subject to speaker variation (as is generally the case for the prePP of Dutch non-identical circumPPs; Den Dikken 2010).

(23) a. Waar om heen is hij gelopen?
   where about towards is he run
   ‘What did he run around?’

b. * Waar om is hij heen gelopen?
   where about is he towards run

(24) a. * Om wat heen is hij gelopen?
   about what towards is he run

b. % Om wat is hij heen gelopen?
   about what is he towards run
   ‘What did he run around?’

- These comparative notes on doubling PPs versus non-identical circumPPs should bring home the fact that doubling PPs are not simply circumPPs that happen to have identical P elements on either side of the nominal constituent — their syntactic properties need to be addressed in their own right.

- We will not be able to discuss the syntax of non-identical circumpositional phrases here (see Koopman 2000, 2010, Den Dikken 2010, and references cited there); but we will take the result of Den Dikken’s exploration of Dutch spatial and directional PPs as our starting point in the development of an analysis of doubling PPs.

3 THE INTERNAL STRUCTURE OF DUTCH PPs

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


- potential functional structure in PPs:
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• Not all directional PPs flesh out this maximal structure: there is variation with respect to the size of the complement of P\textsubscript{Dir} as well as the size of P\textsubscript{Dir}’s own extended projection.

→ Den Dikken (2010) argues that there are six possible extended PPs, depending on whether or not the lexical Ps project functional structure.

4 ANALYSIS, PART I: A REDUCED HIGHER P LAYER

4.1 The P\textsubscript{Dir} layer
• Den Dikken (2006b, 2010): P\textsubscript{Dir} can either have a full functional structure or none.

(28) a. CP\textsubscript{[Path]} b. PP\textsubscript{Dir}
\hspace{1cm} C\textsubscript{[Path]}\hspace{1cm} Deg\textsubscript{[Path]}\hspace{1cm} PathP
\hspace{1cm} P\textsubscript{Dir}\hspace{1cm} Deg\textsubscript{[Place]}\hspace{1cm} Deg\textsubscript{[Place]}\hspace{1cm} C\textsubscript{[Place]}\hspace{1cm} P\textsubscript{Loc}
\hspace{1cm} Path\hspace{1cm} PP\textsubscript{Dir}\hspace{1cm} Deg\textsubscript{[Place]}\hspace{1cm} Deg\textsubscript{[Place]}\hspace{1cm} C\textsubscript{[Place]}\hspace{1cm} P\textsubscript{Loc}
\hspace{1cm} Deg\textsubscript{[Path]}
\hspace{1cm} C\textsubscript{[Path]}\hspace{1cm} Deg\textsubscript{[Path]}\hspace{1cm} PathP

• consequences of full structure (28a):
  - no incorporation into V; P\textsubscript{Dir} can move to Path, but no higher.
  - entire extended PP can undergo movement as a unit, but locative subpart cannot be subextracted from it (no CP layer, or A-over-A violation).

• consequences of no functional structure (28b):
  - obligatory incorporation of P\textsubscript{Dir} into V
  - no movement of entire extended PP, only of the complement of P\textsubscript{Dir}

4.2 Doubling PPS
• Recall section 2.3: Our structure should allow for movement of the lower PP and incorporation of the postposition, and disallow movement of the entire dbl-PP.

Analysis:
Doubling PPs have a reduced higher layer: the extended projection of P\textsubscript{Dir} never reaches up to CP\textsubscript{[Path]} in doubling PPs.

• Derivation (I): ‘bare’ PP\textsubscript{Dir}; CP\textsubscript{[Place]} is scrambled into the domain of the verb

(29) a. Lili is in het water in gesprongen.
Lili is in the water in jumped
‘Lili has jumped into the water.’

b. The preposition is base-generated in P\textsubscript{Loc}
The postposition is base-generated in P\textsubscript{Dir} (and incorporated into V).
CP\textsubscript{[Place]} becomes the derived object of the verb and precedes the postposition.

• Derivation (II): PP\textsubscript{Dir} + PathP; CP\textsubscript{[Place]} is raised to SpecPathP

(29) c. Path\textsuperscript{a} can be lexicalised as a particle: (8)
This captures the distributional and extraction properties of doubling PPs.

- The structure contains both a PLoc and a PDir.
  - Doubling PPs are obligatorily interpreted directionally.
- The preposition (PLoc) forms a constituent with the object to the exclusion of the postposition (PDir), which does not project up to CP.
  - CP\[Place\] (with the preposition and the object) can undergo movement on its own, without the postposition; the postposition cannot be taken along;
  - The postposition (PDir) can incorporate into the verb.

5 ANALYSIS, PART II: A DEFECTIVE LOWER P LAYER

- In the previous section we explained the movement properties of doubling PPs by claiming that PDir never has an extended projection reaching all the way up to CP\[Path\] in such constructions.
- The obligatory absence of CP\[Path\] will be shown in this section to follow from a key property distinguishing doubling PPs from run-of-the-mill circumpositions: the fact that the C\[Place\] of doubling PPs is defective.
- The defectivity of C\[Place\] also brings forth an account of the R-pronoun facts of doubling PPs.
- In section 6, we will present a third corollary of the defectivity of C\[Place\] in doubling PPs: its cross-dialectal distribution.

5.1 CP\[Place\] as a defective goal, and the emergence of P-doubling

- Our central hypothesis about what makes doubling PPs different from ordinary circumpositional phrases is that the CP\[Place\] in the complement of PDir in P-doubling constructions is defective.
  - We understand defectivity here in the sense of Roberts (2010): the feature content of CP\[Place\] in doubling PPs is a proper subset of the feature content of the Path–PDir probe upstairs: PLoc has a feature [directional], which PLoc does not have (directionality versus non-directionality is a privative opposition).
  - PDir is thus a proper featural superset of its complement: it subsumes the features that its complement has, and adds directionality to it.
  - The defectivity of CP\[Place\] explains all of the core properties of doubling PPs, including the emergence of doubling itself.
- For Roberts (2010), defective probe–goal relations result either in silence or in displacement; they do not result in doubling.

Why does the defective probe–goal relation between Path–PDir and C\[Place\] deliver P-doubling?

→ PLoc does not raise to C\[Place\]; C\[Place\] does not probe PLoc so the latter is spelled out independently.
→ C\[Place\], qua head of the extended projection of PLoc, shares with PLoc all its lexical features — as an automatic consequence of extended projection in the sense of Grimshaw (1993).
→ When defective C\[Place\] is probed by the upstairs Path–PDir probe, this causes C’s features to be spelled out at PDir.
→ This results in double spell-out of PLoc’s lexical features: once in PLoc (in situ) and once in PDir.

- In this approach to P-doubling, there is multiple spell-out of the same feature-set: the features of PLoc are spelled out both in its base position and in PDir in the latter case as a result of the defective probe–goal relation between Path–PDir and CP.
  - But it is not the case that multiple members of a single head-movement chain are spelled out: the chain-formation operation in question cannot be performed.
  - The grammaticality of subextraction of the prepositional part (see (30)) demonstrates that there must be a CP\[Place\] in the complement of PDir.
  - We know that head movement cannot proceed through C heads: CPs always break head-movement chains; head movement via C into a higher lexical head is never legitimate (see Li 1990).
  - So the fact that (30) demonstrates that the complement of PDir is as large as CP\[Place\], in conjunction with the fact that head movement out of CP is impossible, precludes an analysis of P-doubling in terms of the spell-out of multiple members of a head-movement chain.

(30)  Op welken berg <* op> is Lili <op> geklommen?  
‘Up on which hill has Lili climbed?’

- From the logic of Roberts’ (2010) theory of defective goals it follows that if Path–PDir established a probe–goal relation with defective PLoc, the result would be a simple postposition, not a P-doubling construction: whenever PLoc itself serves as the defective goal for the Path–PDir probe, the result is always displacement (i.e., spell-out of PLoc’s features at PDir).
  - So in simple postpositional PPs (de berg op ‘the hill on’), Path–PDir takes a smaller complement (just PP\[Loc\]), and probes its head (PLoc).
  - This PLoc is a defective goal for the probe, and must consequently remain silent, with the features of P being spelled out at PDir.
• In ‘ordinary’, non-identical circumpositional PPs, the CP\[Place\] in the complement of the Path–PDir probe is not defective.

→ Since CP\[Place\] in non-identical circumPPs is not the extended projection of a proper subset of the P-features under PDir, we do not get doubling of PLoc (as in doubling PPs) or silence under PLoc (as in postpositional PPs).

→ P-doubling results only in a situation in which PDir takes a CP complement that is a proper featural subset of the upstairs Path-P Dir probe — in other words, when CP\[Place\] is defective.

5.2 Defectivity and the forced absence of CP\[Path\] in doubling PPs

• A second consequence of the defective C\[Place\] in doubling PPs is the fact that PDir cannot have an extended projection including CP\[Path\].

→ Recall from (30) that movement of the locative prepositional PP stranding the postposition is grammatical, but movement of the entire doubling PP is not.

→ We have blamed this ungrammaticality on the apparent fact that no CP\[Path\] can be built on top of the projection of PLoc in P-doubling constructions; but we have not yet provided a rationale for this.

→ CP\[Place\]’s defectivity in doubling PPs can once again be held responsible for this.

• The defectivity of the C\[Place\] in the complement of PDir in doubling PPs rests on PLoc being a proper featural subset of the Path–PDir complex upstairs establishing a defective probe–goal relation with CP\[Place\].

→ This proper subset relation effectively establishes a single extended projection running from PLoc all the way up to the Path–PDir complex; CP\[Place\] is a member of this extended projection.

→ No single extended projection is ever allowed to contain multiple projections of C: there is no ‘CP recursion’ in the strict sense of the term; there is a unique C for any extended projection.

→ Since the extended projection of PLoc already includes an instance of C, it is impossible for PDir to be associated with another projection of C.

5.3 Defectivity and R-movement

• An indefinite neuter pronoun cannot undergo R-word formation in doubling PPs; (31)a, with iets in situ, is grammatical, but the R-movement in (31)b is impossible.

(31) a. dat Lili op iets (op) geklommen is. that Lili on something on climbed is ‘that Lili climbed up on something.’

b. dat Lili ergens op (*op) geklommen is. that Lili somewhere on on climbed is ‘that Lili climbed up somewhere.’

• The ungrammaticality of (31)b notwithstanding, R-words are not categorically forbidden in doubling PPs; (32) shows that both daar and waar are grammatical.

(32) a. dat Lili daar op (op) geklommen is. that Lili there on climbed is ‘that Lili climbed onto that.’

b. Ik vraag me af waarop Lili (op) geklommen is. I ask me off where Lili on climbed is

c. Ik vraag me af waar Lili op (op) geklommen is. I ask me off where Lili on on climbed is ‘I wonder what Lili climbed up on.’

5.3.1 Two positions for R-pronouns

• Koopman (2010): there are, in principle, two positions that can accommodate R-words: SpecCP and SpecPlaceP.

→ We argue that there is a difference between SpecPlaceP and SpecCP with respect to the kinds of R-pronouns they can house, drawing a parallel between SpecPlaceP in the extended projection of P and SpecP in the extended projection of V, and taking SpecPlaceP to be a scrambling position – a position with information-structural import.

→ What is raised to SpecPlaceP gets a ‘strong’ interpretation.

→ By contrast, movement to SpecCP does not have any information-structural consequences.

• Definite R-pronouns are freely licensed in either SpecPlaceP or SpecCP, whereas indefinite R-pronouns are not licensed in SpecPlaceP unless they receive a ‘strong’, [+specific] interpretation.

(33) (C[Place]P __ (C[Place]P __ [Deg(Place)P __ [PlaceP __ [PP]])]))

→ The occupant of SpecCP necessarily precedes degree modifiers like vlak ‘right’, while the occupant of SpecPlaceP must follow them.

→ Definite R-words should in principle be able to appear on either side of such modifiers (because they can surface in either SpecPlaceP or SpecCP), but indefinite R-words should show a more restricted behaviour.

→ This prediction is borne out:

(34) a. < daar> vlak < daar> onder/ boven/ naast/… ‘right under/above/next to to that’
b. <ergens> vlak <\textsuperscript{\text{?}}ergens> onder/boven/ naast/…
   somewhere right somewhere under above next.to
   ‘right next to/above/under something’

c. nooit <ook maar ergens> vlak <\* ook maar ergens>
   never also but anywhere right also but anywhere
   onder/ boven/ naast
   under above next.to
   ‘never right under/above/next to anything (at all)’

5.3.2 The ban on indefinite R-words in doubling PPs

• The problem with (35b) is that there is no suitable position for the indefinite R-
word ergens to surface in.

(35)

\begin{itemize}
\item a. dat Lili \textbf{op iets (op)} geklommen is.
   \hspace{1cm}that Lili on something on climbed is
   ‘that Lili climbed up on something.’

\item b. dat Lili \textbf{ergens op} (* \textbf{op}) geklommen is.
   \hspace{1cm}that Lili somewhere on on climbed is
\end{itemize}

• Recall: the CP[\text{Place}] in the complement of P\text{Dir} in doubling PPs is defective.

→ One salient consequence of its defectivity is that its C head cannot be specified for
the EPP property.

→ EPP is the trigger for terminal movement; so the fact that C[\text{Place}] cannot be EPP-
specified entails that it is impossible for something to move into the SpecCP[\text{Place}]
in the complement of P\text{Dir} in doubling PPs and for the derivation to end there.

5.3.3 The difference between terminal and intermediate movement

\begin{itemize}
\item Why is [+wh] indefinite \textit{waar} different from \textit{ergens}?
\end{itemize}

(36)

\begin{itemize}
\item a. \textbf{Waarop} is Lili \textbf{op} geklommen?
   \hspace{1cm}where on is Lili on climbed
   ‘What did Lili climbed up on?’

\item b. Ik vraag me af \textbf{waarop} Lili \textbf{op} geklommen is.
   \hspace{1cm}I ask me off where on is

\item c. Ik vraag me af \textbf{waar} Lili \textbf{op} geklommen is.
   \hspace{1cm}I ask me off where is
\end{itemize}

• The essential difference between \textit{ergens} and \textit{waar} is that movement of \textit{ergens} to
SpecCP \textit{terminates} the derivation whereas in the case of movement of [+wh] \textit{waar}
to SpecCP, onward movement must always ensue — either onward movement of
\textit{waar} by itself or onward pied-piping movement.

• The creation of \textit{intermediate} members of the movement chain is not in any
obvious sense a function of the checking of features, but instead a matter of
ensuring that the movement operation satisfies the locality restrictions imposed on
the formation of such chains.

• To the extent that \textit{intermediate} movement steps exist at all, we believe (with
Bošković 2007) that these require no featural trigger.

→ Movement of \textit{waar} into SpecCP \text{[Place]} in doubling PPs is not the terminal link in
the movement dependency that \textit{waar} is involved in: it is an intermediate step,
necessarily followed by movement into the matrix SpecCP.

→ Intermediate movement steps are not EPP-triggered, hence can target defective
SpecCP \text{[Place]} in doubling PPs.

5.4 Summary

• In our account of the ungrammaticality of *\textit{ergens} \textit{op op}, a central role is played
by the hypothesis that the C head of the CP-complement of P\text{Dir} in P-doubling
constructions is defective.

→ In section 5.1, we had already demonstrated that this hypothesis also provides an
account for the very fact that makes P-doubling special: the occurrence of two
\textit{identical} P elements in a single complex PP.

→ And in section 5.2, we showed that C[\text{Place}]’s defectivity in doubling PPs has the
further benefit of explaining the fact that no functional structure can be built on
the projection of P\text{Dir} in these PPs, something that is responsible for the fact
that the entire doubling PP fails to undergo movement as a constituent.

• These things combined reveal the strength of the single hypothesis that underlies
our analysis of P-doubling in Flemish.

• In the final section, we complete our case for defectivity by arguing that it also
provides us with a window on the distribution of doubling PPs in the Dutch-
speaking world.

6 On the Distribution of Doubling PPs

6.1 Directional prepositions to introduce infinitival clauses in Flemish

• Doubling PPs are restricted to Flemish Brabant and the areas bordering it.
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Question: Why is the distribution of defective \(C^{[\text{Place}]}\) across the Dutch-speaking world restricted, and what does this distribution correlate with?

Answer: The use of directional preposition \(\text{van}\) to introduce raising infinitives

- **Standard Dutch:** locative P \(\text{om}\) introduces control infinitives:
  
  (37) a. Ik zal proberen \([\text{CP (om)}]_{TP} \text{ de klus te klaren}].\)  
  \(I\) \(\underline{\text{will try}}\) \(\text{COMP the job to accomplish}\)  
  ‘I will try to accomplish the job.’
  
  b. Je zal meer moeten studeren \([\text{CP om}][\text{TP te slagen}]].\)  
  \(you\) \(\underline{\text{will more must study}}\) \(\text{COMP to pass}\)  
  ‘You’ll have to study more to pass.’

**Flemish varieties:** directional Ps \(\text{van ‘of/from’ and voor ‘for/in front of’ (cf. (38))}\) can be used as clause introducers as well (cf. (39)).

(38) a. Ik kom net \(\text{van m’n werk}.\)  
  \(I\) \(\underline{\text{come just from my work}}\)  
  ‘I’ve just come from work.’

  b. Ik rijd / zet de auto wel even \(\text{voor de deur}.\)  
  \(I\) \(\underline{\text{drive put the car DRT quickly in.front.of the door}}\)  
  ‘I’ll just quickly drive/put the car in front of the door.’

(39) a. Ik probeer altijd \(\text{van vroeg op te staan}.\)  
  \(I\) \(\underline{\text{try always COMP early up to stand}}\)  
  ‘I always try to get up early.’

  b. We hebben niks meer \(\text{voor te eten}.\)  
  \(we\) \(\underline{\text{have nothing more for to eat}}\)  
  ‘We’ve got nothing left to eat.’

- **Problem:** directional Ps as clause introducers stretch across Flanders, whereas doubling PPs are more restricted.

\(\rightarrow\) This problem is only apparent:  
Clue = the use of \(\text{van}\) as an introducer of raising infinitives

6.2 The different properties of \(\text{van}\) as a clause introducer

- van Craenenbroeck (2000): There are two groups of Flemish speakers who allow \(\text{van}\) as a clause introducer.

\(\oplus\) **Non-central language area** (West and East Flanders, Limburg,…)

\(\rightarrow\) \(\text{van}\) is the Flemish lexical counterpart of \(\text{om}\) in these dialects: both \(\text{om}\) and \(\text{van}\) introduce control infinitives, but no raising infinitives.

(40) Hij lijkt/schijnt \(\{(^{\text{om}}/^{\text{van}})\} \text{de beste kandidaat te zijn.}\)  
he seems appears \(\underline{\text{COMP the best candidate to be}}\)  
‘He seems/appears to be the best candidate.’

\(\rightarrow\) \(\text{om}\) and \(\text{van}\) lexicalise C, and CP blocks NP-raising.

\(\rightarrow\) \(\text{van} = \text{infinitival complementiser}\)

\(\oplus\) The central area (in and around Flemish Brabant, possibly extending all the way to Antwerp), which has doubling PPs

\(\rightarrow\) \(\text{van}\) has a wider distribution than \(\text{om}:\) it can be used with epistemic verbs and raising verbs, unlike \(\text{om}\) (cf. the % in (40)).

\(\rightarrow\) The presence of \(\text{van}\) also makes a semantic contribution that is not found when \(\text{van}\) is absent:

(41) a. Ik zal proberen van de afwasmachine te repareren.  
  \(I\) \(\underline{\text{will try VAN the dishwasher to repair}}\)  
  ‘I will try to repair the dishwasher.’

  \(\rightarrow\) merely an attempt to repair it (successful completion dubious)

  b. Ge schijnt van Marie graag te zien.  
  \(you\) \(\underline{\text{seem VAN Marie gladly to see}}\)  
  ‘You seem to love/really like Marie.’

  \(\rightarrow\) merely indirect evidence

- **Hypothesis:** \(\text{van}\) is **not** being used as a filler of the C head in the second group.

\(\rightarrow\) \(\text{Van is a P that occupies a position immediately outside the infinitival clause.}\)

\(\rightarrow\) It projects a lexical category making an autonomous semantic contribution.

\(\rightarrow\) It can form an amalgam with the null C-head, rendering the clause transparent to NP-raising: amalgamation of \(\text{van}\) and C makes Spec.CP an L-related position, allowing onward movement of the occupant of SpecCP to an L-related position (i.e., SpecTP) higher up the tree.

P-doubling dialects: \(\text{van}\) in NP-raising constructions provides direct evidence for the use of \(P^{\text{Dir}}\)’s as selectors of CPs with whose null heads they featurally amalgamate.

This allows these speakers to build prepositional structures in which a \(P^{\text{Dir}}\) selects a defective \(C^{[\text{Place}]}\) in P-doubling constructions.
7 CONCLUSION

1 P-doubling in Flemish dialects is the result of identical spell-outs of \( P_{loc} \) and \( P_{dir} \).

2 The key properties of P-doubling 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; definite pronouns obligatorily form R-words, and \( wh \)-pronouns optionally do.

3 To capture these properties we argue for the following structure:
\[
[PP \, P_{dir} \, [CP_{place} \, C_{[place]} \, C_{[place]} \, [P_{loc} \, P_{loc} \, DP]()]]
\]
   (i) Both \( P_{loc} \) and \( P_{dir} \) are present \( \rightarrow \) explains distribution.
   (ii) \( P_{dir} \) does not have an extended projection reaching up to \( CP_{[path]} \), capturing the movement properties.
   (iii) \( P_{loc} \) projects a defective \( CP_{[place]} \) without EPP, which forces indefinite neuter pronouns to stay in situ and not form R-words. Definite pronouns move to \( Spec,PlaceP \), and \( wh \)-pronouns can access \( SpecCP_{[place]} \) as an intermediate step in their \( wh \)-movement chain.

4 The defectivity of \( C_{[place]} \) in the complement of \( P_{dir} \) also:
   (i) derives doubling: \( CP_{[place]} \) is a defective goal for \( Path-P_{dir} \), ultimately causing \( P_{dir} \) to spell out identically to \( P_{loc} \), and
   (ii) prevents \( P_{dir} \) from projecting a full extended projection up to \( CP_{[path]} \), causing the entire doubling PP to be immobile as a unit; only the \( CP_{[place]} \) portion of doubling PPs can undergo syntactic movement.

5 The defectivity of \( C_{[place]} \) in P-doubling also captures the empirical correlation between P-doubling and the use of directional \( van \) in raising ininitivals in certain Flemish dialects.
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