

Within and across languages, it is well documented that elements which are typically considered members of the same category P often exhibit divergent morphosyntactic properties that ought to diagnose distinct category status (cf. e.g. work in volumes like Asbury et al. 2008 and Cinque & Rizzi 2010). Often, a *single element* exhibits such divergent properties (1). Not only does this support the idea that P is not a homogenous category (Svenonius 2008 *et seq.*), but “P elements” are highly *syncretic* – subject to constant, systematic (micro-)categorical shifts:

- (1) (a) Jan sit die suiker **binne₁/in/op** die yskas.
 Jan puts the sugar inside in on the fridge
 “Jan is putting the sugar in/on the fridge.”
- (b) Jan hou die suiker **binne₂-in/*in**-binne die yskas.
 Jan holds the sugar inside in in inside the fridge
 “Jan keeps the sugar in the fridge.”
- (c) Jan gaan **binne₃ / huis/ Stellenbosch/*in toe**.
 Jan goes inside home Stellenbosch in to [AFRIKAANS;
 “Jan is going inside/ home / to Stellenbosch.” P ELEMENTS ARE BOLDED]

The P element *binne* (“inside”) in (1) aligns with three distinct “micro-categories”. In (1a), *binne₁* patterns with P elements like *in* and *op*, preceding its DP complement. In (1b) *binne₂* occurs in a position from which elements like *in* and *op* are barred: as the morphologically initial component of a complex locative adposition. In (1c), *binne₃* occurs in a position from which elements like *in* and *op* are barred, but it takes no (overt) complement. Note that *binne* in (1c) is not simply an instance of *binne₁* with its DP complement omitted because the complements of *in* and *op* in (1a) – with which *binne₁* patterns – are not omissible.

Syncretism poses a challenge for the ontologically primitive syntactic category, because lexical items need to be encoded with category information (or there is no mechanism linking them to correct structural positions). But on a primitive-category approach, each (micro-)categorical function of a syncretic element demands its own lexical entry since there are formal mechanisms linking the various functions of such syncretic elements. So the primitive-category approach necessitates an uneconomical lexicon.

This paper presents evidence for five “micro-categories” in the Afrikaans spatial P domain (Locative Noun, Axial Part, Locative and Directional Adposition, and V-particle), partly illustrated in (2), and divides the language’s “P inventory” into six classes based on the *Formal Range Potential* (FRaP; = the range of functions a given element has the capacity to express) of each element. Following from the observation that the Afrikaans spatial domain exhibits robust adherence to the *ABA generalisation (i.a. Bobaljik 2012 *et seq.*) with respect to these (micro-) categories (3-4), it is argued on a hierarchical model of syncretism (as in Caha 2009) that the functions of this domain correspond to ordered formal features in a fixed functional spine. Syncretic elements are specified – according to their FRaP – for the full range of features corresponding to the functions they are able to express.

- (2) ...dat die man buite_{AXPART} om_{PDIR} die huis verby_{V-PART} ry.
 that the man outside round the house past drives
 “...that the man is driving round past the outside of the house.”

(3) *ABA Constraint on Afrikaans Spatial P

- (a) If a suppletive form functions as an AxPart and V-particle, then it also functions as a locative and directional Adposition.
- (b) If a suppletive form functions as a locative Adposition and a V-particle, then it also functions as a directional Adposition.
- (c) If a suppletive form functions as a locative Adposition but not as a directional Adposition, then neither does it function as a V-particle.
- (d) If a suppletive form functions as a directional Adposition but not as a locative Adposition, then neither does it function as an AxPart.

(4) *Space Contiguity Hypothesis for Afrikaans*

Syncretism targets contiguous regions in the sequence AxPart-P_{LOC}-P_{DIR}-V-particle.

Due to relaxed matching as conditioned by the *Superset Principle* (Caha 2007), exponents need not lexicalise all features for which they are specified. Accordingly, *category effects* arise as an epiphenomenon of the particular set of features an element lexicalises at a particular insertion site, and the differing morphosyntactic properties of (micro-)categories come down to how exponents of each category “partition” the functional spine. This paper presents a unified account of Afrikaans simplex and complex prepositional phrases, intransitive adpositional phrases, circumpositional phrases, doubling adpositional phrases, and particle verbs with P-based particles (5), where variation in the morphosyntactic properties of the P element(s) in a given expression follows from the (span of) features in the functional spine expressed by the P element(s) at that the relevant insertion site. The basic claim is schematically illustrated in (6), where RES(ult) is the lowest verbal node of Ramchand (2008).

- (5) (a) Jan draf **in / deur** die wingerd.
 Jan jogs in / through the vineyard
 “Jan is jogging in/through the vineyard.” PRE-PP (SIMPLEX ADPOSITION)
- (b) Die jakkals kruip **onderdeur** die heining.
 the jackal crawls under-through the fence
 “Jan is crawling through underneath the fence.” PRE-PP (COMPLEX ADPOSITION)
- (c) Al die mense is reeds **bo**.
 all the people are already above
 “All the people are already upstairs.” INTRANSITIVE PP
- (d) Jan gooi die bal **na sy vriend toe**.
 Jan throws the ball to his friend to
 “Jan is throwing the ball to his friend.” CIRCUM-PP
- (e) Hy haal **in** my gesig **in** asem.
 he takes in my face in breath
 He is breathing into my face.” DOUBLING PP
- (f) Jan stof die meubels **af**.
 Jan dusts the furniture off
 “Jan is dusting the furniture.” PARTICLE VERB

(6)

