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ABSTRACT

This chapter discusses the basic properties of preposition reduplication (P-reduplication) in Icelandic with some comparative data from the other Germanic languages. Under Nunes’ (2001, 2004) theory of the linearization of chain links, it can be argued that P-reduplication involves three steps: (i) movement of a preposition to a functional head position within an extended PP, (ii) reanalysis of the moved preposition, and (iii) the creation of a higher copy of the preposition, either through fronting of the remnant PP (wh-movement or topicalization in Modern Icelandic) or leftward movement of the preposition (Old Icelandic). Whichever option is involved in step (iii), the highest copy of the preposition and the reanalyzed copy are overtly realized. The proposed analysis also accounts for the fact that a grammar allowing P-reduplication (with wh-movement or topicalization) also allows preposition stranding but not vice versa.
1. INTRODUCTION

Like all the other Scandinavian languages, Icelandic allows preposition stranding (P-stranding) under A-bar-movement, e.g., wh-movement and topicalization (Maling and Zaenen 1985). P-stranding in Icelandic is more or less restricted to examples where the PP is a complement of a verb, adjective, or a noun, much as in other languages where P-stranding is possible.

In most cases where P-stranding is possible in Icelandic (1a), Pied Piping of the whole PP is also perfectly acceptable (1b).¹

(1) a. Hvað eruð þið að tala um?
   what are you to talk about

   b. Um hvað eruð þið að tala?
   about what are you to talk
   What are you (pl.) talking about?

In this respect, Icelandic contrasts sharply with English where Pied Piping is rarely a good alternative to P-stranding. Thus, (2a) below with Pied Piping is highly marginal but (2b) with P-stranding is fine:

(2) a. ?? About what are you talking?
   b. What are you talking about?

Another, and probably related, difference between Icelandic and English is that P-stranding under A-bar-movement is less constrained in English than in Icelandic but this need not concern us here.²

Icelandic allows Pied Piping and P-stranding to occur simultaneously so to speak, a phenomenon that I will refer to as preposition reduplication (P-reduplication). An example of P-reduplication is given in (3).

(3) Um hvað eruð þið að tala um?
   about what are you to talk about
   What are you (pl.) talking about?

There is no semantic or pragmatic import associated with P-reduplication. It is simply a formal variant that is possible alongside Pied Piping and P-stranding. Hence, P-reduplication looks like a good example of a purely syntactic phenomenon.

To the best of my knowledge, P-reduplication in Icelandic has never been discussed in the linguistic literature before although Icelandic linguists have known

¹As discussed in Section 2 later, there are cases where P-stranding is strongly preferred to Pied Piping in Icelandic.
²This contrast can be seen in examples like (12) in Section 2 later.
about it for some time. P-reduplication is not restricted to Icelandic, however. It is also found in other languages that have P-stranding, e.g., Norwegian, Swedish, and English. The following example of P-reduplication is from Swedish (Delsing 2003):

(4) Med honom vill jeg inte ha någonting att göra med.  
with him want I not have anything to do with
I don’t want to have anything to do with him.

As discussed by Riley and Parker (1986), P-reduplication is found in relative clauses in English containing the relative pronoun which. This is exemplified in (5) and (6) below:

(5) a. These are special rates for which the working American is paying.
    b. These are special rates which the working American is paying for.
    c. These are special rates for which the working American is paying for.

(6) a. The world in which we live can be a frightening place.
    b. The world which we live in can be a frightening place.
    c. The world in which we live in can be a frightening place.

These examples contrast with the English examples in (2) in that P-stranding and Pied Piping have a roughly equal status here; the main difference is that Pied Piping is slightly more formal than P-stranding.

In this chapter, I will discuss the basic properties of P-reduplication in Modern Icelandic (Section 2) and show how they can be accounted for under Nunes’ (2001, 2004) theory of the linearization of chain links (Section 3), assuming that prepositions can be reanalyzed after movement to a functional head position within the extended PP. Further data from Old Icelandic supporting the proposed analysis are presented in Section 4. The chapter ends with a brief summary.

2. THE BASIC FACTS

First of all, note that P-reduplication is not accepted by all speakers of Icelandic and the same is true for Swedish and Norwegian. Still, it is quite clear that P-reduplication is part of the grammatical competence of many speakers, not a mere performance error. Thus, 54.2% of the participants in a recent

---

3As is well known, P-stranding is largely confined to the Germanic languages. Hence, it is unlikely that P-reduplication is found in a number of languages.

4The examples in (5) are from Riley and Parker (1986) but the examples in (6) are based on examples that I have found on the Internet.
survey of syntactic variation in Icelandic accepted the following example of

P-reduplication:5

(7) Ég man ekki lengur með hvaða félagi hann spilar með.
I remember not anymore with which club he plays with
I can't remember anymore which club he plays for.

This written survey included 703 native speakers across the country and in
four different age groups. The results show a very clear pattern in that younger
speakers are more likely to accept P-reduplication than older speakers. How-
ever, further studies are needed to determine if this reflects a real change in
progress or a difference between age groups in that older speakers are more
likely to reject substandard variants.

Second, P-reduplication is not restricted to examples with wh-movement in
matrix clauses or embedded questions as in (3) or (7) earlier. It is also found
with topicalization (8).

(8) a. Á þessu hefur Jón litinn skilning.
the of this has John little understanding
b. þessu hefur Jón litinn skilning á.
this has John little understanding of

c. Á þessu hefur Jón litinn skilning á.
the of this has John little understanding of
John has little understanding of this.

However, Pied Piping is excluded in relative clauses in Icelandic (Thráinsson
1980) and so is P-reduplication, as shown in (9b) and (9c). The reason is simply
that the relative marker sem in Icelandic is a complementizer and therefore
cannot be the object of a preposition. Thus, the offending preposition in (9c)
is the first one.

(9) a. Þetta er maður sem ég þarf að tala við.
this is man that I must to talk to
b.※ Þetta er maður við sem ég þarf að tala.
this is man to that I must to talk

c.※ Þetta er maður við sem ég þarf að tala við.
this is man to that I must to talk to
This is a man that I must talk to.

※This survey was conducted in the spring of 2007 and it is part of a larger project on syntactic
variation in Icelandic.
Third, it is only prepositions that can be reduplicated. As illustrated in (10) below, movement of a PP in Icelandic licenses neither reduplication of the PP nor the DP complement.

(10) a. * Um hvað eruð þið að tala um hvað?
      about what are you to talk about what

       b. * Um hvað eruð þið að tala hvað?
      about what are you to talk what
      What are you (pl.) talking about?

Fourth, P-reduplication is only possible when P-stranding is also possible. In other words, P-reduplication is ruled out when Pied Piping is obligatory in Icelandic, e.g., when the PP is not a complement:

(11) a. Með hvaða rökum var þessu hafnað?
      with what arguments was this rejected

       b. * Hvada rökum var þessu hafnað með?
      what arguments was this rejected with

       c. * Með hvaða rökum var þessu hafnað með?
      with what arguments was this rejected with
      On what grounds was this rejected?

(12) a. Handa hverjum er þessi bók?
      for whom is this book

       b. * Hverjum er þessi bók handa?
      who is this book for

       c. * Handa hverjum er þessi bók handa?
      for whom is this book for
      Who is this book for?

There are cases where P-stranding is possible in Icelandic but Pied Piping is excluded or at least highly marginal, e.g., when the preposition is part of a bigger idiomatic phrase such as komast upp með ‘get away with’. In examples of this kind, P-reduplication is marginal but still better than Pied Piping:

(13) a. Hvað hefur hann komist upp með?
      what has he gotten away with

       b. * Með hvað hefur hann komist upp?
      with what has he gotten away

---

6 Other phrases of this kind are e.g. hafa þörf fyrir ‘have a need for’, líta niður á ‘despise’, taka við af ‘replace’ and eiga auðvelt með ‘find easy’.
c. ?? Med hvað hefur hann komist upp med?
with what has he gotten away with
What has he gotten away with?

Presumably, the problem with (13b) is that an idiomatic phrase has been broken up by movement of the PP. Thus, it is not surprising that P-reduplication is judged to be somewhat better than Pied Piping in these cases.

Something similar can also be seen in Faroese. This is shown by the results of a recent survey of syntactic variation that included 243 participants in six localities in the Faroes and four age groups. In this survey, the participants were asked to evaluate a number of written examples, including the following sentences with Pied Piping, P-stranding, and P-reduplication (the percentages in brackets show how many speakers accepted each example):7

(14) a. Um tað orki eg slett ikki at hugsa. (22.7%)
about that bother I quite not to think
I have no energy to think about it.

b. Tað dugi eg slett ikki at meta um. (88.4%)
that can I quite not to evaluate about
I cannot possibly be the judge of that.

c. Um tað dugi eg slett ikki at spáa um. (41.1%)
about that can I quite not to think about
I cannot possibly think about it.

There is a very striking contrast here in that P-stranding (14b) is accepted by four times as many speakers as Pied Piping (14a) is. Moreover, the contrast in the acceptability ratings for (14a) vs. (14c) shows that P-reduplication in Faroese is possible for many speakers in cases where Pied Piping is excluded.

As we have already discussed, P-reduplication is dependent on the availability of P-stranding. This is also reflected in the historical development of P-reduplication. Thus, examples of P-reduplication started to appear at about the same time as P-stranding became possible in interrogatives in Middle English (Bergh 1998; Bergh and Seppänen 2000). Interestingly, P-reduplication in Middle or Early Modern English is not restricted to informal texts. It is even found in Shakespeare as shown by the following examples (from Radford 2004, p. 192):

(15) a. In what enormity is Marcus poor in? (Menenius, Coriolanus, II.i)

b. … that fair for which love groan’d for. (Prol. to Act II, Romeo and Juliet)

7The survey was carried out by Victoria Absalonsen and Helena á Løgmansbø. I am grateful to them as well as the other Faroese linguists at Fróðskaparsetur Føroyja for assistance. This survey is part of a research project on Faroese that I have worked on in collaboration with Höskuldur Thráinsson and Þórhallur Eyþórsson.
The historical relation between P-reduplication and P-stranding can also be seen in Swedish. According to Delsing (2003), the earliest examples of P-stranding in constructions involving fronting of a nominal complement in Swedish date from the middle of the 15th century. Examples of P-reduplication in Swedish start to appear at about the same time:

(16) a. til þæn førsta skæl swarom wi swa til
b. þi hwilkom helghe domane liggia þi

to the first argument answer we so to
in which sacred things the lie in

Old Icelandic was like Old Swedish in not having P-stranding in examples with overt A-bar-movement. Hence, P-reduplication of the kind we have been discussing is not attested in Old Icelandic. The oldest example of P-reduplication in Icelandic that I am aware of comes from the first translation of the New Testament in 1540 (see Helgason 1929, p. 160):

(17) … á hverja grein allar mannlegar skynsemdir...
    on which branch all human reasons
    hafa sig á rekið.
    have self on stumbled
    … which branch all human intelligence has been hit by.

(Nýja testamenti, p. 348)

The oldest example of P-stranding that I know of is also from that work and this example involves the complex preposition í móti ‘against’:

(18) … hverjum þér örugglega í móti standið í trúnni.
    whom you surely against stand in religion
    … whom you surely oppose in your religion. (Nýja testamenti, p. 509)

Icelandic seems to be like English and Swedish in that the first examples of P-reduplication and P-stranding with A-bar-movement appear at the same time. Nevertheless, it is clear that the historical development of these phenomena in Icelandic requires further study.

---

8However, as discussed in Section 4, Old Icelandic did have P-reduplication with leftward movement of prepositions.
3. P-REDUPLICATION AND THE COPY THEORY OF MOVEMENT

The most obvious analysis of P-reduplication is to invoke the copy theory of movement and assume that the lower preposition is simply a phonetic realization of a copy created by movement of the whole PP. This is shown in (19).

(19)  \[[PP_i [Pi [DP]] ... [PP_i Pi [DP]]]\]  

The problem with this proposal is that it lacks any independent motivation since there is no principled reason why the lower copy of the preposition can be phonetically realized in this structural configuration but not, e.g., the lower copy of the DP. As I will argue later, the copy theory of movement can indeed explain the basic properties of P-reduplication, provided we assume that the lower preposition is in a derived position as a result of an intermediate movement to a functional head position within the extended PP.


In this section, I will propose an analysis of P-reduplication based on the theory of Nunes (2001, 2004). The main points of this theory are briefly summarized below:

(I)  The phonetic realization of chains is subject to Kayne’s (1994) Linear Correspondence Axiom (LCA).

(II)  In most cases, multiple chain links cannot be phonetically realized due to linearization requirements. Thus, syntactic items intervening between two phonetically realized chain links must both precede and follow the same element (i.e., the two links), resulting in a contradiction. Structures with two phonetically realized chain links also violate the irreflexivity condition on linear order (i.e., if A precedes B, then \(A \neq B\)).

(III)  Lower copies of chains are usually deleted because they have checked fewer features than the highest copy. Hence, it is more economical to delete them. Economy principles also rule out deletion of all copies because that involves too many applications of the operation Chain Reduction (which deletes chain links).

The basic intuition in (III) is that Economy principles ensure that it is generally the highest copy of a chain that is overtly expressed. However, under Nunes’ theory, multiple realization of chain links is possible if a member of the chain is morphologically reanalyzed, thereby becoming invisible to the LCA. As a result, the chain link cannot be deleted as such a deletion would violate Economy principles. As an example of this, Nunes (2004) cites cases of
wh-doubling in various languages:

(20)  a. Wen glaubt Hans wen Jacob gesehen hat?  
     whom thinks Hans whom Jacob seen has  
     Who does Hans think Jacob saw?  (German, McDaniel 1986)

     b. Kas misline kas o Demiri dikhâ?  
     whom you-think whom Demir saw  
     Who do you think Demir saw?  (Romani, McDaniel 1986)

     c. Wêr tinke jo wêr’t Jan wennet?  
     where think you where-that Jan lives  
     Where do you think that Jan lives?  (Frisian, Hiemstra 1986)

In all these examples, an intermediate wh-trace is realized. Phonetic realization of the lowest trace is excluded because only moved elements can be reanalyzed. This is shown by the following example from German:

(21)* Wen glaubt Hans wen Jacob wen gesehen hat?  
     whom thinks Hans whom Jacob whom seen has  
     Who does Hans think Jacob saw?

A further restriction on wh-doubling is that the intermediate trace must be only one wh-word. A full wh-phrase cannot survive Chain Reduction as shown by the ungrammaticality of (22).

(22)* Wessen Buch glaubst du wessen Buch Hans liest?  
     whose book think you whose book Hans reads  
     Whose book do you think Hans is reading?

The intermediate traces in (20) can be phonetically realized because the wh-word moves to the embedded C where it is morphologically reanalyzed as part of one terminal element. Hence, the wh-word becomes invisible to the LCA, which operates only on words. By contrast, reanalysis is ruled out in (22) since full wh-phrases must move to [Spec,CP] and therefore cannot be reanalyzed as parts of C.

3.2. Analyzing P-reduplication

In my view, it is highly desirable to analyze P-reduplication along similar lines as the wh-doubling cases discussed earlier, especially since a single word is reduplicated in both cases.

To bring P-reduplication in line with the wh-doubling examples in (20), the ‘extra’ preposition must undergo reanalysis as a result of movement to some head
position. I will assume that this is a functional head position within an extended PP, which I will simply refer to as F. Possibly, this is an abstract Place head (but see Koopman 2000 and den Dikken 2006 among others for discussion about the functional architecture within PPs). Thus, the derivation of P-reduplication proceeds as follows (where phonetically realized elements are boldfaced):

(23) a. \([\text{FP} \ F \ [\text{PP} \ P \ [\text{DP}]]]\)
   b. \([\text{FP} \ [F \ [P_i+P_i]] \ [\text{PP} \ P_i \ [\text{DP}]]]\) (P is reanalyzed with F)
   c. \([\text{PP} \ P_i \ [\text{DP}]] \ldots \ [\text{FP} \ [F \ [P_i+P_i]] \ [\text{PP} \ P_i \ [\text{DP}]]]\) (the PP is fronted)
   d. \([\text{PP} \ P_i \ [\text{DP}]] \ldots \ [\text{FP} \ [F \ [P_i+P_i]] \ [\text{PP} \ P_i \ [\text{DP}]]]\) (the lower PP is deleted)

Two chains are formed in this derivation. The first one is created by movement of the preposition to F and the second one by subsequent fronting of the remnant PP. The first chain is unaffected by Chain Reduction because the preposition in F is reanalyzed and therefore becomes invisible to the LCA. As a result, there is no visible chain to be reduced and the lower copy of the preposition is spared in this round. In the second chain, the lower copy of the PP is deleted, i.e., the lowest copy of the preposition and the lower copy of the DP object. The net result is that the two highest copies of the preposition are phonetically realized.10

Recall that P-reduplication is not accepted by all speakers in those languages where it is found, e.g., in Icelandic. On the analysis advanced here, this means that reanalysis of the moved preposition is only possible for some speakers. In other words, the locus of variation is in the application of reanalysis.

The main advantage of the proposed analysis is that it immediately explains why reduplication cannot apply to the whole PP or the DP object (as shown in (10)): PPs and DPs are full phrases and thus cannot be reanalyzed as parts of words. Therefore, they cannot be made invisible to the LCA, even if they move to some specifier position within the extended PP.

The fact that the exact landing site of the PP is irrelevant is also accounted for under this analysis because P-reduplication relies on a reanalysis of a copy of the preposition within the extended PP. As a result, P-reduplication can apply in matrix questions as well as embedded questions and examples with topicalization.

Moreover, the observed correlation between P-stranding and P-reduplication follows from the analysis if we assume that P-stranding necessarily involves two

---

9 Note that the reanalysis proposed by Hornstein and Weinberg (1981) to account for P-stranding does not involve any movement of the preposition. However, it seems fairly clear by now that P-stranding is not licensed by reanalysis of the preposition and the lexical head selecting it (see e.g., Takami 1992, Baltin and Postal 1996, and Abels 2003).

10 It makes no difference for the proposed analysis of P-reduplication if there are intermediate steps in the remnant movement of the PP, e.g., as in the case of movement out of embedded clauses. The phonetic realization of the chain links will be unaffected since the intermediate PPs will necessarily be deleted.
steps: (i) movement of P to F without reanalysis, and (ii) subsequent fronting of the remnant PP. This derivation is shown in (24).

(24) a. \[[PF \{[PP \{[DP]\}]\}]\]
   b. \[[FP \{[F \{[P_{1}+F]\}] \{[PP \{P_{1}\} \{[DP]\}]\}]\] (P moves to F without reanalysis)
   c. \[[PP \{P_{1}\} \{[DP]\}] \ldots \{[FP \{F \{[P_{1}+F]\}] \{[PP \{P_{1}\} \{[DP]\}]\}]\] (the PP is fronted)
   d. \[[PP \{P_{1}\} \{[DP]\}] \ldots \{[FP \{F \{[P_{1}+F]\}] \{[PP \{P_{1}\} \{[DP]\}]\}]\] (P_{1} and P_{1} are deleted)
   e. \[[PP \{P_{1}\} \{[DP]\}] \ldots \{[FP \{F \{[P_{1}+F]\}] \{[PP \{P_{1}\} \{[DP]\}]\}]\] (the lower PP is deleted)

The crucial difference between this derivation and the one in (23) is that the highest copy of the preposition is deleted here. Hence, it is only the intermediate copy of the preposition in F that is phonetically realized in (24). This difference stems from the absence of reanalysis in (24). Since there is no reanalysis in (24), the chain created by preposition movement to F is subject to Chain Reduction. When Chain Reduction applies to this chain, it deletes not only the lowest copy of the preposition but also the highest copy (see (24d)). The highest copy is deleted along with the lower copy because both copies are non-distinct as they are part of the same numeration and take the same DP complement (see Nunes 2004, p. 54 for discussion of a very similar case of remnant movement with reanalysis). As a final step in this derivation, the lowest copy of the PP is deleted. Thus, we derive a representation where the highest copy of the DP object and the intermediate copy of the preposition are overtly realized.\footnote{11Since the intermediate copy of the preposition is phonetically realized in both (23) and (24), it should be clear that the effect of reanalysis in (23) is not to protect this copy from deletion. Rather, the reanalysis ensures that the highest copy is overtly expressed as in (23).}

If P-reduplication and P-stranding are derived as shown in (23) and (24), any grammar with P-reduplication will necessarily have P-stranding because the former involves the same two crucial steps as the latter plus reanalysis of the preposition. Thus, P-stranding illustrates that reanalysis of the preposition in F is optional. However, since some speakers of P-stranding languages like Icelandic do not allow reanalysis of the preposition, the availability of P-stranding does not entail that P-reduplication is possible.

In the derivation in (23), reanalysis of the preposition is followed by movement of the remnant PP. However, if the PP does not move, a potential problem arises: The analysis advocated here seems to predict phonetic realization of the two copies of prepositions as the higher copy is invisible to the LCA, thereby saving the lower copy from deletion (since there is no visible chain that the lower copy belongs to):

(25) a. \[[FP \{[PP \{[DP]\}]\}]\]
   b. \[[FP \{[F \{[P_{1}+F]\}] \{[PP \{P_{1}\} \{[DP]\}]\}]\] (P is reanalyzed with F)
It is quite conceivable that reanalysis is ruled out unless further movement of the reanalyzed head or a phrase containing that head takes place. To put it slightly differently, a head cannot hide from the LCA unless it is shielded by a higher copy of that head. However, there is a more straightforward solution at hand, namely that phonetic realization of two adjacent prepositions is ruled out by a principle prohibiting adjacent identical heads, a principle reminiscent of the Obligatory Contour Principle (OCP) in phonology. There are well-documented cases of this principle operating in syntax (see e.g., Golston 1995, Grimshaw 1997, and Ackema 2001 for discussion). To take one example, Bošković (2002) argues that sequences of homophonous wh-words are excluded in Serbo-Croatian and this affects the phonetic realization of wh-chains in that language.

4. P-REDUPLICATION WITH PREPOSITION MOVEMENT IN OLD ICELANDIC

As argued in Section 3 earlier, P-reduplication is conditioned by movement of the preposition to a head position within the functional layer of the PP where the preposition is reanalyzed as part of a word. Further movement of the remnant PP creates a higher copy of the preposition and this makes it possible to phonetically realize two prepositions (the highest one and the reanalyzed preposition). Note that the crucial part in P-reduplication is the creation of a higher copy of the reanalyzed preposition. Thus, movement of the remnant PP is only one way of creating P-reduplication. The other way is further movement of the reanalyzed preposition and this is indeed what we find in Old Icelandic as we will discuss in more detail later.

Prepositions in Old Icelandic immediately preceded their DP objects in most cases, as in (26a) and (27a), but prepositions could also undergo a very short leftward movement (see (26b) and (27b)). Moreover, leftward movement of a preposition could give rise to P-reduplication (see Nygaard 1906, pp. 22, 384), as shown in (26c) and (27c).

(26) a. Álfur þóttist og kenna kulda af Óspaki.
Álfur also felt that he sensed animosity from Óspakur.
(Eyrbyggja saga, p. 611)

b. óvinir hans þóttust heldur kulda af kenna
enemies his thought rather animosity from sense
råðum hans.
advice his
His enemies felt some animosity from his advice.
(Eyrbyggja saga, p. 547)
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c. hann þykist kulda af kenna af
he thinks animosity from sense from
skiptum yðrum.
exchanges your
He feels animosity from his dealings with you.
(Laxdæla saga, p. 1591)

(27) a. Öllum mönnum þótti mikils vert um Hallstein.
all men felt greatly worthy about Hallsteinn
All men thought that Hallsteinn was a great man.
(Flóamanna saga, p. 731)
b. Ólafi þótti mikils um vert drauminn.
Ólafur felt greatly about worthy dream.the
Ólafur thought that the dream was quite important.
(Laxdæla saga, p. 1578)
c. Öllum þótti mikils um vert um þetta verk.
everyone felt greatly about worthy about this deed
Everyone thought that this was a big deed. (Grettis saga, p. 1011)

According to Rögnvaldsson (1995), leftward movement of prepositions away from their DP objects was rather rare in Old Icelandic. This is perhaps not surprising since this movement was limited to cases where the PP was a complement of some lexical head as in (26) and (27) earlier. Movement out of adjunct PPs was excluded since adjuncts are islands.

P-reduplication with preposition movement is expected if P-reduplication involves three steps as I have argued here: (i) movement of a preposition to F, (ii) reanalysis of the preposition, and (iii) the creation of a higher copy of the preposition. Old Icelandic and Modern Icelandic differ in how the highest copy is created as P-reduplication in Old Icelandic involves further movement of the preposition, whereas P-reduplication in Modern Icelandic involves further movement of the remnant PP. Unfortunately, we cannot know whether P-reduplication was accepted by all speakers of Old Icelandic, but we do know that reanalysis was optional in Old Icelandic, just as in Modern Icelandic. This is shown by examples such as (26b) and (27b) where the preposition moves without reduplication.

As we have already mentioned, Old Icelandic did not have P-stranding. Thus, we find various examples like (28) below where a PP complement has been fronted, but no examples where the preposition is left behind by fronting of the DP object.

(28) a. Við þessu bjóst þrállinn eigi.
for this prepared slave.the not
The slave didn’t expect that. (Grettis saga, p. 1010)
b. Til hvers mælir þú?
   to what speak you
   What do you suggest? (Víga-Glúms saga, p. 1927)

c. Um slíkt er illt að ræða.
   about such is bad to talk
   It is bad to discuss such things. (Króka-Refs saga, p. 1521)

This means that Old Icelandic did not have the movement of the remnant PP that is necessary for P-stranding (cf. the discussion on the derivation in (24)), but I will not speculate as to why this movement was ruled out in Old Icelandic. Similarly, I do not know why Modern Icelandic does not have leftward preposition movement as Old Icelandic, and this is something that clearly merits further study.

5. CONCLUSION

In this chapter, the phenomenon of P-reduplication in Icelandic has been discussed with some comparative data from the other Germanic languages. Using Nunes’ (2001, 2004) theory of the linearization of chain links, I have argued that P-reduplication involves three steps: (i) movement of a preposition to a functional head position within the extended PP, (ii) reanalysis of the moved preposition, and (iii) the creation of a higher copy of the preposition, either through fronting of the remnant PP (Modern Icelandic) or leftward movement of the preposition (Old Icelandic). In both cases, the highest copy of the preposition and the reanalyzed copy are phonetically realized. The proposed analysis has also been argued to explain why any grammar allowing P-reduplication must also allow P-stranding but not vice versa.
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