

The architecture of spatial PPs through German eyes

Máire Noonan

This talk will present some novel evidence in favour of extended projections of adpositions, elaborating on and revising previous work in this area.

German is known for having both prepositions and postpositions, as well as various types of circumpositional constructions. Colloquial German exhibits some peculiar instantiations of these constellations: it is not uncommon that a preposition is doubled by one or even two copies. These copies are prefixed by either one of the directional morphemes ((*he*)*r*-) or by a reduced pronominal element (*dr*-). The examples in (1) illustrate these constructions for both locational and directional PPs.

- (1) a. Sie sitzt schon seit einer Stunde **unter** dem Tisch **drunter**.
she sits already since an hour under the table PRT
b. Emma ist **auf** das Bett **rauf** gesprungen.
Emma aux on the bed PRT jumped. 'Emma jumped on the bed.'
c. Wickel das Seil **um** den Stab **drum rum**.
wrap the rope around the pole PRT PRT

It will be proposed that the prepositions and its “shadow-Ps” (as I will refer to the post-positional doubles) are pronunciations of various lexical/functional categories that represent the extended projection of PPs, and that Colloquial German thus provides explicit insight into the architecture of adpositional phrases which remains hidden in other languages.

Specifically, I will propose that PPs can contain the following lexical and functional categories, which each are lexicalised individually in the data given above: [Direction>Ref_{Path}>Path>Location>Ref_{Place}>Place]. While the shadow prepositions pronounce combinations of Dir, Path, Location and Place, *r*- (reduced from *her*-) and *dr*- pronounce functional categories Ref_{Path} and Ref_{Place}, respectively. The source of the shadows is argued to result from the morpho-phonologically motivated failure of trace (copy) deletion.

It will be argued that a satisfactory analysis of these constructions requires taking recourse to movement operations such as pied-piping, remnant movement and certain “stacking operations”, and furthermore that apparent head movement should be analysed as remnant phrasal movement. The data thus provide support for an approach to syntax as advocated in recent work such as Hinterhölzl 1997, Kayne 2000, and in particular Koopman & Szabolcsi 2000.

Some interesting restrictions on the shadow construction will be presented, namely that shadow-Ps are not possible with all types of PPs, illustrated by the contrasts below. The proposed analysis will capitalise on these restrictions.

- (2) a. Sie ist auf dem Schrank drauf.
she is on the wardrobe PRT 'She is on top of the wardrobe.'
b. Er ist auf der Lauer (*drauf)
he is on the watch *PRT 'He is on the watch.'
- (3) a. Die Heuschrecke ist im Glas (drin). 'The cricket is in the glass.'
b. Emma ist in Berlin (*drin). 'Emma is in Berlin.'
- (4) Weil Emma **in der Hängematte** hat **drin** sitzen wollen.
because Emma in the hammock aux PRT sit want

Although the shadow-Ps are argued to be generated as part of an extended PP, examples such as (4) reveal their particle-like behaviour, which the analysis must accommodate. I will argue that the functional projections (remnant) and R_{Path}P R_{Place}P optionally split out of the larger PP and move to the position typically occupied by particles, with the surprising conclusion that particles are not restricted to directional Ps in German.