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In Afrikaans, adpositions encode

**Spatial relations** (rampant morphosyntactic variation):
- prepositional phrases, headed by complex/simplex Ps
- circumpositional phrases
- verbal particles
- postpositional phrases
- intransitive adpositional phrases

**Grammatical relations** (no/little morphosyntactic variation)
- prepositional phrases (headed by simplex Ps)
In Afrikaans, adpositions encode

**Spatial relations** (rampant morphosyntactic variation):
- prepositional phrases, headed by complex/simplex Ps
- circumpositional phrases
- verbal particles
- postpositional phrases
- intransitive adpositional phrases

**Grammatical relations** (no/little morphosyntactic variation)
- prepositional phrases (headed by simplex Ps)
Circumposition = *an adpositional phrase* that surfaces as a *P DP P string*

Afrikaans circumpositions are

spatial
(as opposed to marking semantic roles or Structural Case)

Path-encoding
(as opposed Place-encoding)
(1)  (a)  NON-DOUBLING CIRCUMPOSITION  
Jan gooi die bal $[_{pp} \text{ na sy vriend toe}]$.  
Jan throws the ball to his friend to  
“Jan is throwing the ball to his friend.”

(b)  DOUBLING CIRCUMPOSITIONS  
Hy haal $[_{pp} \text{ in my gesig in}]$ asem.  
he takes in my face in breath  
He is breathing into my face.”
(1) (a) **NON-DOUBLING CIRCUMPOSITION**
Jan gooi die bal [pp na sy vriend toe].
Jan throws the ball to his friend to
“Jan is throwing the ball to his friend.”

(b) **DOUBLING CIRCUMPOSITIONS**
Hy haal [pp in my gesig in] asem.
he takes in my face in breath
He is breathing into my face.”

→ (≡CIRCUM-PP)

→ (≡DOUBLING PP)

**Note!**
Though **circum-PPs** and **doubling PPs** always denote **Paths**, **Path** is not exclusively encoded by **circum-PPs** and **doubling PPs**
The Path PP “landscape”

(1) (a) **CIRCUM-PP**
Jan gooi die bal \([_{\text{PP}} \text{na sy vriend} \text{toe}]\).
Jan throws the ball to his friend to
“Jan is throwing the ball to his friend.”

(b) **DOUBLING PP**
Hy haal \([_{\text{PP}} \text{in my gesig} \text{in}]\) asem.
he takes in my face in breath
He is breathing into my face.”

(2) **PREPOSITIONAL PHRASE (\(=\)PRE-PP)**
Jan draf \([_{\text{PP}} \text{om die wingerd}]\).
Jan jogs around the vineyard
“Jan is jogging around the vineyard.”
Main Problem

Assuming:
- **Strong zero hypothesis:** Spatial paths correspond to a uniform underlying structure
- The structure underlying circum-PPs, doubling PPs and pre-PP Paths should be congruous – barring any strong evidence to the contrary

Question
- Why would a perfect system opt for two solutions to the same problem, where one solution is clearly less economical?
- How can this language-internal variation be modelled?
3 main claims:

1) Spatial path is \textit{not} encoded by a single Path-related feature/node

Specifically,
- there are two such features/nodes: \textsc{Path} and \textsc{Dir}, where \textsc{Path} < \textsc{Dir}
- pre-PPs lexicalise only \textsc{Path} whereas circum- and doubling PPs also lexicalise \textsc{Dir}
3 main claims:

2) PATH and DIR fall on either side of a Spellout Domain boundary

- PATH is in the head-initial “P” domain
- DIR is in the head-final “V” domain

→ conventional categories are expanded into zones of ordered formal features

→ no distinct “cut off” points in the syntactic spine between such zones
Main Claims (Continued…)

→ individual morphemes lexicalise **spans** of features
  (span: head-complement relations)

→ elements that lexicalise features in the broad “V zone” behave as verbs

→ elements that lexicalise features in the broad “P zone” behave as adpositions

→ exponents deriving from the same entry may lexicalise structure in more than one zone

**Architectural assumptions:**
late insertion & overspecification
3 main claims:

3) Variation results from

- Differing featural specifications on lexical entries that are traditionally classified as members of a homogenous category P
- How these P elements therefore map onto structure
- Spatial Paths are encoded by:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pre-PPs incorporate CLASS 1 Adpositions</th>
<th>(Section 1)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Circum-PPs incorporate CLASS 2 Adpositions</td>
<td>(Section 2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doubling-PPs incorporate CLASS 3 Adpositions</td>
<td>(Section 3)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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(3) Jan draf \([_{PP} \text{deur/ om/ oor/ verby} \text{die wingerd}]\). Jan jogs through/ around across/ past the vineyard. “Jan is jogging through/around/across/past the vineyard.”

**CLASS 1 Adpositions:**
- deur “through”
- om “around”
- oor “over/across”
- verby “past”

**Traits:**
- always head **pre-PPs**
- always encode **PATH** (never **PLACE**)
- always encode **ROUTE-paths** (never **GOAL-** or **SOURCE-paths**)
Non-axiomatic Path structure: $[\text{PATHP PATH } [\text{PLACEP PLACE } \text{DP}]]^*$
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This section – 2 main objectives

❖ Why two P elements must show up in circum-PPs
   Post-Ps are featurally deficient Path-encoding element;
   Pre-Ps are **Spellout Auxiliary**

❖ Word order (ultimately met only in Section 3)

→ But first, circum-PPs need to be isolated [particle verb + pre-PP] structures, which are “spurious” *circum-PPs*
Circum-PPs are unproductive – (4) are the only tokens

(4) (a) **Na...toe**
Jan gooi die bal \[pp na sy vriend toe\].
Jan throws the ball to his friend to
“Jan is throwing the ball to his friend.” **GOAL**

(b) **Van...af**
Jan stap \[pp van die plaas af\].
Jan walks of the farm from
“Jan is walking from the farm.” **SOURCE**

(c) **Met...langs**
Jan ry \[pp met die grondpad langs\].
Jan drives with the dirt-road along
“Jan is driving along the dirt road.” **ROUTE**
Circum-PPs cannot be separated:

(4')

(a) *Jan gooi die bal ____ toe [pp na sy vriend].
Jan throws the ball to to his friend

(b) *Jan stap ____ af [pp van die plaas].
Jan walks from of the farm

(c) *Jan ry ____ langs [pp met die grondpad].
Jan drives along with the dirt-road

The PPs in (4) are importantly different from another type of P DP P string, which are spurious circumpositions

Spurious circumpositions = [particle verb + pre-PP] combinations
Spurious circum-PPs can be separated*

(5) (a)  
Jan klim \([_{PP \text{ by die venster}] \text{ in}_{PRT} \_ t_V}\).
Jan climbs at the window in
“Jan is climbing in through the window.”

(a')  
Jan klim \([_{PP \text{ by die venster}] \text{ in}_{PRT}}\).
Jan climbs in at the window
“Jan is climbing in through the window.”

(b)  
Die jakkals kruip \([_{PP \text{ onder die heining}] \text{ deur}_{PRT} \_ t_V}\).
the jackal crawls under the fence through
“The jackal is crawling through underneath the fence.”

(b')  
Die jakkals kruip \([_{PP \text{ onder die heining}] \text{ deur}_{PRT}}\).
The jackal crawls through under the fence
“The jackal is crawling through underneath the fence.”

*cf. Pretorius (2015; 2017); Biberauer (2016)
Ps in **spurious circum-PPs** occur in free combination

(6)  (a) Die jakkals [kruip [pp **onder die heining**] deur/ in/uit/ weg].

the jackal crawls under the fence through in/out/away

“The jackal is crawling through/in/out underneath the fence.”

“The jackal is hiding underneath the fence.”

Ps in **true circum-PPs** occur in rigid combination

(6)  (b) *Jan gooi die bal [pp **na sy vriend af/ langs/heen**].

Jan throws the ball to his friend off/along/PRT
**Spurious circum-PPs** cannot cooccur with V-particles

(7) (a) Die duikertjie \(_{VP}\) spring \(_{PP}\) agter die bosse \(_{PP}\) uit \(_{VP}\) (*in/op).  
the duiker.DIM jumps behind the bushes out in/up  
“The little duiker is jumping out from behind the bushes.”

**True circum-PPs** may cooccur with V-particles

(7) (b) Jan \(_{VP}\) ry \(_{PP}\) van die Kaap af \(_{PP}\) in/deur\(_{PRT}\).  
Jan drives of the Cape from in/through  
“Jan is driving in/through from the Cape.”
Interim Summary:

- \textit{na...toe, van...af, met...langs} are an isolable closed class (= true circum-PPs)
- differ verifiably from the productive $[\text{VP} [\text{PP} \text{P DP}] \text{P}_{\text{PRT}}]$
So why do two P elements show up in circum-PPs?

→ Hypothesis A: CLASS 2 adpositions are formally deficient

❖ Post-P is Path-encoding, but lacks the full range of formal features to do the job
❖ Pre-P is a Spellout Auxiliary inserted by Spellout Repair
❖ Spellout Repair: A last resort mechanism conditioned by Exhaustive Lexcialisation*

CLASS 2 Adpositions:
❖ toe “to”
❖ af “from”
❖ langs “along/via”

Traits:
❖ encode PATH
❖ always postpositional
❖ typically require an auxiliary preposition
❖ encode GOAL, SOURCE, and ROUTE

*cf. Fábregas (2007a, 2007b)
The Zero Hypothesis Analysis

Recall: Strong zero hypothesis - Spatial paths all correspond to a uniform underlying structure.
The Zero Hypothesis Analysis (**Not to be pursued**)

**Recall: Strong zero hypothesis** - Spatial paths all correspond to a uniform underlying structure

→ FOFC (= Final-over-Final Condition; cf. Sheehan et al. (Forthcoming))
FOFC (= Final-over-Final Condition)

(17) **FOFC – restricted version** (Biberauer et al. 2014:171):
A head-final phrase $\alpha P$ cannot dominate a head-initial phrase $\beta P$ where $\alpha$ and $\beta$ are heads in the same Extended Projection.

- Whether FOFC resides in core syntax or at PF, much evidence suggests it is a linguistic universal.

- If **PLACE** and **PATH** are part of the same extended projection, the **Zero Hypothesis Analysis** doesn’t hold water.
FOFC (= Final-over-Final Condition)

\[(17)\] \textit{FOFC – restricted version} (Biberauer et al. 2014:171):

A head-final phrase $\alpha P$ cannot dominate a head-initial phrase $\beta P$ where $\alpha$ and $\beta$ are heads in the same Extended Projection.

- Whether FOFC resides in core syntax or at PF, much evidence suggests it is a linguistic universal.

- If \textsc{place} and \textsc{path} are part of the same extended projection, the \textbf{First Pass Analysis} doesn’t hold water.

We resolve this based on insights from \textbf{doubling PPs}
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(18) (a) Jan spring (binne-)in die swembad in.
Jan jumps inside in the swimming-pool in
“Jan is jumping into the swimming pool.”

(b) Jan klim uit die swembad uit.
Jan climbs out the swimming-pool out
“Jan is climbing out of the swimming pool.”

(c) Die hond spring (bo-)op die bed op.
the dog jumps top on the bed on
“The dog is jumping onto the bed.”

(d) Ons ry (tussen-)deur die bome deur.
we drive between through the trees through
“We are driving through the trees.”

(e) Die man kom om die hek om.
the man comes around the gate around
“The man is coming around the gate.”
(18) (a) Jan spring \textit{(binne-)in} die swembad \textit{in}. Jan jumps inside in the swimming-pool in “Jan is jumping into the swimming pool.”

(b) Jan klim \textit{uit} die swembad \textit{uit}. Jan climbs out the swimming-pool out “Jan is climbing out of the swimming pool.”

(c) Die hond spring \textit{(bo-)op} die bed \textit{op}. The dog jumps top on the bed on “The dog is jumping onto the bed.”

(d) Ons ry \textit{(tussen-)deur} die bome \textit{deur}. we drive between through the trees through “We are driving through the trees.”

(e) Die man kom \textit{om} die hek \textit{om}. the man comes around the gate around “The man is coming around the gate.”

$\rightarrow$ Control for “true” vs. spurious doublings*, i.e.:

$\bullet$ $[\text{PP} \; \text{P} \; \text{DP} \; \text{P}]$

NOT

$\bullet$ $[\text{VP} \; [\text{PP} \; \text{P} \; \text{DP}] \; \text{PRT}]$

*Pretorius (2015; 2017) and Biberauer (2016)
Recall: “true” circum-PPs can co-occur with a V-particle:

(19) (a) ...dan kan mense \([vp \text{ in}_{\text{PRT}} \text{ sien [pp in die huis in]}\].
then can people in see in the house in
“...then people can see (right) into the house.”

(b) ...wanneer daai kat \([vp \text{ op}_{\text{PRT}} \text{ klim [pp (bo-)op die bed op]}\].
when that cat up -climbs top on the bed on
“...when that cat climbs up onto the bed.”

(c) ...dat hy \([vp \text{ asem}_{\text{PRT}} \text{ haal [pp in my gesig in]}\].
that he breath-takes in my face in
“...that he breathes into my face.”

(d) ...toe hy \([vp \text{ in}_{\text{PRT}} \text{ kom [pp uit die reën uit]}\].
when he in -came out the rain out
“...when he came in out of the rain.”
Three cases of “true” doubling are isolable: *in...in* “into”, *op...op* “onto”, *uit...uit* “out of”

**Note:** speakers vary in the degree to which they find *op*-doubling acceptable

---

**CLASS 3 Adpositions:**
- *in* “in/into”
- *uit* “out/out of”
- *op* “on/onto”

**Traits:**
- Locative when *prepositional*
- Directional when *doubled*
- Denote “boundary crossing” when directional
Unlike circum-PPs, doubling PPs must be specified for all the formal features that are requisite in Path structures.

They’re just not lexicalising them in one stretch – Why?
Hypothesis B: Circum-PPs have more structure than Pre-PPs

- An additional feature $\text{DIR}$, which embeds $\text{PATH}$, is present in the structure underlying both circum- and doubling PPs.

- $\text{PATH}$ defines a Spellout Domain (SD) boundary (is a phase head), and lexicalisation cannot apply across phases.

- The SD boundary is immutable and prevents a single morpheme from simultaneously lexicalising nodes on either side of the boundary.

- In Afrikaans (V2 in main clauses, SOV in ECs), the SD described by “P” is fundamentally head-initial, and that described by “V” is head final.
03 | CLASS 3 & Doubling PPs

Analysis of Doubling PPs

😊 FOFC is happy
Revised Analysis of Circum-PPs

一直到 2022，FOFC is happy

CLASS 3 & Doubling PPs

😊 FOFC is happy
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Comparison with Cape Afrikaans

Oosthuizen (2009): “speakers of [Cape Afrikaans] [show] a preference for locative PP structures when expressing directional movement.”

“...the [Cape Afrikaans] group seemed to show a preference for structures such as *Hy loop in die huis* (“he walks in(to) the house”) to express directional meaning, where [Mainstream Afrikaans] speakers would typically use the additional directional particle *in.*”

(Oosthuizen 2009: 42)
(20) **Cape Afrikaans**

(a) Hy loop in die huis.
he walks in the house
Intended: “He is walking into the house.”

(b) Hy ry op die dak.
he drives on the roof
Intended: “He is driving onto the roof.”

Oosthuizen (2009:42; 60-61); my annotations
Proposal: In Cape Afrikaans, PATH does not define a Spellout Domain boundary (is not a phase head)
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Summary

→ The variation we see is an interaction between

❖ *the formal specifications on exponents*  
  (which vary category-internally)

❖ *how these exponents therefore map onto structure*  
  (i.e. relative to Spellout Domain boundaries and the head-initial/-final setting of each  
  relative domain)

→ **NB** is the mismatch between the featural specification on “an element of category P”  
  and whether or not these features actually all fall into the same Spellout Domain or not
**Lexicon**

**CLASS A**

```
</om/;"AROUND"; >
```

**CLASS B**

```
</toe/;"GOAL"; >
```

**CLASS C**

```
</in/;"IN"; >
```

---

**Syntax**

```
"V"
```

```
"P"
```

```
DIRP
```

```
PATHP
```

```
PATH
```

```
PLACE
```

```
DPGROUND
```

```
PLACEP
```

```
PLACE
```

```
DIR
```

```
PATH
```

```
PLACE
```

```
```

---
Language-internal variation boils down to syncretism:

- A single lexical item is specified for a span of formal features
- Depending on how these features are structurally “zoned” (i.e. how they are partitioned by phases), exponents deriving from the same lexical entry might behave very differently at

Dialectal variation:

- Same lexical items vary w.r.t. featural specification (but constrained by the formal hierarchy)
- Phases are zoned differently; same lexical items map differently onto “same” structure
Remaining Questions

❖ Does boundary crossing (all doubling PPs; no pre-PPs or circum-PPs) have anything to do with the encoding structure?

❖ Is it right that – as the analysis suggests – Class 1 adpositions (deur (“through”), oor (“over/across”), om (“around”), and verby (“past”)) are non-directed route-paths whereas the route-path met...langs (“along”) is directed?
References

References


Sheehan, M. et al., The Final-over-Final Condition, Cambridge, Ma.: MIT Press.

