

**Two prenominal possessors in West Flemish**  
**Liliane Haegeman, Department of English, Ghent University<sup>1</sup>**

## 1. Introduction: Two prenominal possessors in the Lapscheure dialect

### 1.1. Scope of the paper

The focus of this paper is the prenominal possessor constructions in the West Flemish (WF) dialect of Dutch. This dialect has two prenominal possessors, illustrated in (1). I will refer to the pattern in (1a) as the doubling construction<sup>2</sup> and to that in (1b) as the *sen* construction. Since, apart for pronouns, this dialect does not have morphological case, it is not obvious to label *sen* as a genitive. Throughout I will gloss *sen* simply as *sen*. For the variation *sen* vs *se* see section 1.4.

- |     |   |               |                |      |                          |
|-----|---|---------------|----------------|------|--------------------------|
| (1) | a | (Valère)      | zen-en         | hoed | (DP) + poss.pronoun + NP |
|     |   | (Valère )     | his-MSG        | hat  |                          |
|     | b | Valère        | sen            | hoed | DP+ <i>sen</i> + NP      |
|     |   | Valère        | <i>sen</i> hat |      |                          |
|     |   | ‘Valère’s hat |                |      |                          |

(1a) illustrates the doubling construction, in which a DP possessor *Valère* is doubled by a possessive pronoun *zenen* (‘his’). As suggested by the parentheses in (1a), the possessive pronoun may also occur independently (1c). To the best of my knowledge, the properties of the possessive pronoun in (1c) are identical to those of the doubling pronoun in (1a), and the doubling construction in (1a) has the same external distribution as the nominal group in (1c).

- |     |   |           |      |
|-----|---|-----------|------|
| (1) | c | zen-en    | hoed |
|     |   | his-MSG   | hat  |
|     |   | ‘his hat’ |      |

In (1b) the prenominal possessor DP *Valère* is followed by *sen*, which might look like a reduced/weak version of the possessive pronoun *zenen*. However, synchronically<sup>3</sup> the WF morpheme *sen* in (1b) is not to be analysed as the phonologically reduced form of the masculine possessive pronoun *zenen* in (1a). This is seen in (1e). Whereas the possessive pronoun for the third person feminine is *eur(en)* as in (1d), the analogue for (1b) with a feminine possessor is as in (1e), again displaying the *sen* morpheme. The latter cannot plausibly be said to be the reduced form of *euren*.

- |     |   |                      |      |
|-----|---|----------------------|------|
| (1) | d | (Marie) eur-en       | hoed |
|     |   | (Marie ) her-MSG     | hat  |
|     | e | Marie sen            | hoed |
|     |   | Marie <i>sen</i> hat |      |
|     |   | ‘Marie’s hat’        |      |

WF departs from Standard Dutch, which does not have the *sen* construction as such. Its closest analogue is the *-s* genitive. However, for many (though not all) speakers of WF, the *sen* construction is more productive than the corresponding *-s* genitive in Standard Dutch, which, for most speakers, is almost restricted to proper names and kinship terms. See also

Verhaar (1997), Corver (1990: 175-7) and ANS (Haeseryn et al 1997, vol I: 163, II: 821) for discussion. Standard Dutch also has the doubling construction (ANS 1990: 163, 294, 822, Corver 1990).

Afrikaans, a West Germanic language that has descended from 18<sup>th</sup> century Dutch (see Ponelis 1979), has a possessive construction that is interestingly similar to the WF pattern examined here. While I do not intend to analyse the Afrikaans data in any detail, where relevant I will point at some differences between the two patterns.

- (2) a. Jan se bevele  
 Jan *se* orders  
 b. die predikant se motor  
 the curate *se* engine (Ponelis 1979, p.126) (Afrikaans)

In this paper my main goal is descriptive: I will discuss and compare the major properties of the two WF constructions illustrated in (1a) and (1b). In the remainder of this section I offer a first survey of the agreement characteristics of the two constructions. In section 2 I present the commonalities between the two constructions and in section 3 I discuss the differences. It will be shown that while the possessor in the *sen* construction must be adjacent to the *possessum* N, the doubling possessor may, in well defined contexts, be separated from the *possessum* N. This suggests that the two constructions cannot have an identical syntax (*pace* De Vries 2006, Weis 2008). Section 4 is a brief summary.

### 1.2. The dialect of Lapscheure

Lapscheure is a village situated to the North East of Bruges, in West Flanders. There are currently around 500 inhabitants. The dialect spoken in Lapscheure shares most of its salient properties with the surrounding dialects spoken in West Flanders, the province whose administrative center is Bruges. This area has about 1.100.000 speakers, most of whom still speak a dialect or a WF regiolect. West Flanders is one of the five (northern) Flemish provinces of Belgium, where the standard language is Dutch: the others are East Flanders, Antwerp, Limburg and (Flemish) Brabant. The linguistic situation in the Flemish part of Belgium is complex: the standard language is Dutch, while many areas display dialects or regiolects. In addition a more encompassing Flemish colloquial language is emerging which, while not being identifiable as a specific dialect, retains salient dialect-related properties. This regiolect is often referred to as the *tussentaal* and, though frowned upon by purists, it is currently the preferred choice in informal conversations between Flemish speakers.

The dialect of Lapscheure is quite representative of the rural dialects in the North of West Flanders and the properties described for the possessive construction will be found in most surrounding dialects. For some examples of possessor constructions in Flemish dialects see also the material collected through the SAND project and available at DynaSand. (<http://www.meertens.knaw.nl/sand/>)

In Haegeman (1992) I have presented a survey of some of the more salient properties of WF and offered a discussion cast in the generative framework. In many respects WF differs quite dramatically from Standard Dutch both in terms of its lexicon and in terms of its syntax. Salient properties are complementizer agreement, verb projection raising, subject doubling, possessor raising etc. For reasons of space I cannot illustrate these here and I refer the interested reader to Haegeman (1992) and to my later work. One property of the dialect that is going to be relevant for the current discussion is its gender system. WF (and, to some extent,

the Flemish regiolects and the *tussentaal*) differs from Standard Dutch in that it retains a rather robust gender system (Alexiadou, Haegeman and Stavrou 2001, Haegeman 2001). On the one hand, feminine nouns tend to end in *-e*, and nouns ending in *-e* tend to be feminine. Furthermore, the masculine singular is overtly marked by means of the ending *-en* both on determiners, demonstratives, possessive pronouns and on attributive adjectives.<sup>4</sup>

There is no written tradition for this dialect; this also means that there is no formal spelling tradition. There is some recorded and transcribed corpus material available from the 1960s, but while it does offer attested occurrences of some of the patterns illustrated in section 1.1., the material does not offer the detail needed for the current investigation. In particular, of course, judgements about ungrammatical patterns cannot be made on the basis of the attested material.

As is the standard practice in the generative tradition I have based the discussion in this paper on my own intuitions for my idiolect, supplemented with some information obtained from other speakers of the dialect. Where relevant, divergent judgements will be signalled.

### 1.3. The doubling construction

The WF possessive pronoun displays double agreement. On the one hand, like the English possessive pronoun, it matches the possessor in terms of person, gender (for the singular) and number, with *zijn* ('his') for masculine singular, *eur* ('her') for feminine singular, and *under* ('their') for plural. On the other hand, it also agrees with the *possessum* in terms of gender and number features, with *-en* typically signalling masculine singular. As shown in Table 1a, which displays the different forms for the pronoun *eur*, the agreement ending displayed by the possessive pronoun is like that displayed by determiners, and unlike that displayed by adjectives.

Table 1a: inflections of adjectives, determiners

	MASC <i>hoed</i> (‘hat’)	FEM <i>veste</i> (‘jacket’)	NEUT <i>kleed</i> (‘dress’)	PLURAL <i>kleren</i> (‘clothes’)
<i>Eur</i> (‘her’)	eur-en	eur	eur	eur
Determiner (DEM) (‘that’)	dien-en	die	dat	die
<i>Geen</i> (‘no’)	geen-en	geen	geen	geen
Adjective <i>Dier</i> (‘expensive’)	dier-en	dier-e	dier	dier-e

The Standard Dutch versions of the examples in table 1a would be as in 1b. Note that the gender marking ending is absent. For reasons of space I cannot go into more details.

Table 1b: Standard Dutch inflections of adjectives, determiners

	MASC <i>Hoed</i> (‘hat’)	FEM <i>jas</i> (‘jacket’)	NEUT <i>kleed</i> (‘dress’)	PLURAL <i>kleren</i> (‘clothes’)
<i>haar</i> (‘her’)	haar	haar	haar	haar
Determiner (DEM) (‘that’)	die	die	dat	die
<i>Geen</i> (‘no’)	geen	geen	geen	geen
Adjective <i>duur</i>	dur-e	dur-e	duur/dur-e	dur-e

('expensive')				
---------------	--	--	--	--

The possessive pronoun used in the WF doubling construction has exactly the same properties as that in the non-doubling pattern. The possessive pronoun matches POSSESSOR in person-number-gender. This is shown schematically in Table 2:

Table 2: possessor doubling and third person possessive pronouns

POSSESSUM→	MASC <i>hoed</i>	FEM <i>veste</i>	NEUT <i>kleed</i>	PLURAL <i>kleren</i>
(POSSESSOR) ↓				
MASC ( <i>Valère</i> )	zen-en	zen	zen	Zen
FEM ( <i>Marie</i> )	eur-en	eur	eur	Eur
PL (D' <i>jongers</i> ) the-children	under-en	under	under	under

#### 1.4. The *sen* construction (Haegeman 2004)

In the *sen* construction, there is no gender agreement between *sen* and either the possessor or the *possessum*. As seen in (3), regardless of whether the possessor is masculine singular (*Valère*) or feminine singular (*Marie*), and regardless of whether the *possessum* is masculine singular (*hund*, 'dog'), feminine singular (*hoage*, 'hedge'), neuter singular (*hus*, 'house') or plural, the morpheme linking possessor and *possessum* is *sen*. There is also no number agreement between *sen* and the *possessum*. However, *sen* imposes a restriction on the possessor in that the latter must be singular; a plural possessor is ungrammatical (3e).

- (3)
- |    |   |         |                  |         |      |
|----|---|---------|------------------|---------|------|
| a. | Valère <i>sen</i>   | hund    | Marie <i>sen</i> | hund    | MSG  |
|    | Valère <i>sen</i>   | dog     | Marie <i>sen</i> | dog     |      |
| b. | Valère <i>sen</i>   | hoage   | Marie <i>sen</i> | hoage   | FSG  |
|    | Valère <i>sen</i>   | hedge   | Marie <i>sen</i> | hedge   |      |
| c. | Valère <i>sen</i>   | hus     | Marie <i>sen</i> | hus     | NEUT |
|    | Valère <i>sen</i>   | house   | Marie <i>sen</i> | house   |      |
| d. | Valère <i>sen</i>   | huz-en  | Marie <i>sen</i> | huz-en  | PL   |
|    | Valère <i>sen</i>   | hous-PL | Marie <i>sen</i> | hous-PL |      |
| e. | *d' <i>jongers sen</i> hus<br>the-children <i>sen</i> house |         |                  |         |      |

A coordinated possessor is compatible with the *sen* construction, but in this case the coordinated possessor has a collective rather than a distributive reading<sup>5</sup>: (3f) refers to a house jointly owned by Valère and Marie.

- (3) f. Valère en Godelieve *sen* oto  
Valère and Godelieve *sen* car

The number restriction in the *sen* construction only concerns the features of the nominal head of the possessor; thus in (3g) the fact that a plural N *katten* ('cats') is adjacent to *sen* is irrelevant because the head N *vriendinne* ('girlfriend') is singular. Conversely, (3g) is ungrammatical even though *sen* is adjacent to a singular N *vriendinne*.

- (3) g. [men *vriendinne* me al eur katt-en] *sen* hus

- my friend with all her cats-PL *sen* house  
 ‘the house of my friend with all her cats’  
 h. \*[de dochter-s van men vriendinne] *sen* exoamen  
 the daughter-PL of my friend *sen* exam

The restriction to singular possessors does not extend to the doubling construction: a plural possessor will co-occur with the pronoun *under*:

- (3) i. [de dochter-s van men vriendinne ] *under* exoamen  
 the daughter-PL of my friend their exam  
 ‘my friend’s daughters exam of’

As mentioned, the WF *sen* construction is similar to the Afrikaans *se* possessive, illustrated in (2) and repeated here as (4a)-(4b). Like the WF pattern, Afrikaans allows a phrasal possessor (4c). However, the WF restriction to a singular possessor does not apply to the Afrikaans *se* construction, as shown by (4d) and (4e):

- (4) a. Jan *se* bevele  
 Jan *se* orders  
 ‘John’s orders’ (Ponelis 1979, p.126) (Afrikaans)  
 b. die predikant *se* motor  
 the curate *se* car  
 ‘the curate’s car’ (Ponelis 1979, p.126) (Afrikaans)  
 c. my koei wat dood is *se* vel  
 my cow that dead is *se* skin  
 ‘the skin of my old dead cow’ (Ponelis 1979: 126) (Afrikaans)  
 d. die amptenar-e *se* verslag  
 the official-PL *se* report  
 ‘the report of the officials’ (Ponelis 1979 : 127) (Afrikaans)  
 e. die besoeker-s *se* vriendelikheid  
 the visitors –PL *se* kindness  
 ‘the kindness of the visitors’ (Ponelis 1992: 283) (Afrikaans)

As discussed in Taeldeman (1995) the WF alternation *sen/se* is conditioned by phonological constraints: roughly *sen* precedes a vowel and *se* precedes a consonant. The alternation is illustrated in Table 3. Note that in WF (differently from Standard Dutch) initial [h] is systematically dropped.

Table 3: *sen* vs. *se*

<i>POSSESSUM</i> begins with→	V	C
<i>POSSESSUM</i> ↓		
MASCULINE SG	Marie <i>sen</i> hoed Marie <i>sen</i> hat	Marie <i>se</i> paraplu Marie <i>se</i> umbrella
FEMININE SG	Marie <i>sen</i> henne Marie <i>sen</i> hen	Marie <i>se</i> veste Marie <i>se</i> jacket
NEUTER SINGULAR	Marie <i>sen</i> hoed-je Marie <i>sen</i> little-DIM	Marie <i>se</i> kleed Marie <i>se</i> dress
PLURAL	Marie <i>sen</i> hoed-en/henn-en/hoed-je-s	Marie <i>se</i> paraplu-s/

	Marie <i>sen</i> hat-PL /hen-PL /hat-DIM-PL	vest-en/kler-en Marie <i>se</i> umbrella-PL / jacket-PL/clothes
--	---	---

For completeness' sake, Table 4 shows the agreement pattern of an adjective ending in *-s*, exemplified by the adjective *gedomse* ('damned'). Here the form *gedomsen* is restricted to masculine singular. It is thus clear that the *sen/se* alternation is not the effect of some form of inflectional agreement like that found on adjectives.

Table 4: inflection of prenominal adjectives in *-s* in WF

Articles	Indefinite	Definite
Masculine singular	nen gedoms-en hund a-MSG goddamn-MSG dog	diene(n) gedoms-en hund that-MSG goddamn-MSG dog
Feminine singular	en gedoms-e henne a goddamn-FSG hen	die gedoms-e henne that goddamn-FSG hen
Neuter singular	en gedoms hundje A goddamn doggie	da gedoms hund-je that goddamn dog-DIM
Masculine plural	∅ gedoms-e hunden ∅ goddamn-PL dog-PL	die gedoms-e hund-en those goddamn-PL dog-PL
Feminine plural	∅ gedoms-e hennen ∅ goddamn-PL hen-PL	die gedoms-e hen-nen those goddamn-PL hen-PL
Neuter plural	∅ gedoms-e hund-jes ∅ goddamn-PL dog-DIM-PL	die gedoms-e hund-jes those goddamn-PL dog-DIM-PL

## 2. Comparing the WF prenominal possessor constructions: similarities

In this section I go over the properties shared by the two prenominal possessor constructions. Occasionally, I will informally refer to *sen* and to the doubling pronoun as 'linking elements' or 'linker'. The terms have no theoretical significance at this stage, though it may well be that these elements function in the sense of Den Dikken's (2006) relators or linkers or as nominal auxiliaries or copulas (see also Roehrs 2009, Hudson 2009).

### 2.1. Constituency

In both constructions, the sequence possessor-linker-*possessum* forms a constituent. This is shown in (5), in which this sequence precedes the finite verb and is thus the first constituent of a V2 pattern, in (6), in which the sequence is the complement of a preposition, and in (7), in which two such sequences are coordinated. As can be seen in (7), coordination may affect two possessor sequences of distinct types.

- (5) a. [Marie se boek] ee-n-k al gelezen.  
Marie *sen* book have-1SG-I already read-PTCP  
'I have already read Mary's book.'
- b. [Marie eur-en boek] ee-n-k al gelezen.  
Marie her-MSG book have-1SG -I already read-PTCP  
'I have already read Mary's book.'

- (6) a. K'ee-n geklaapt [over [Marie se boek]].  
I have-1SG talk-PTCP about Marie *sen* book  
'I have talked about Mary's book.'
- b. K'ee-n geklaapt [over [Marie eur-en boek]].  
I have-1SG talk-PTCP about Marie her-MSG book  
'I have talked about Mary's book.'
- (7) a. K'ee-n [Marie se blouse] en [Marleen se rok] gewassen.  
I have-1SG Marie *sen* shirt and Marleen *sen* skirt wash-PTCP  
'I have washed Mary's shirt and Marleen's skirt'
- b. K'ee-n [Marie eur blouse] en [Marleen eur-en rok] gewassen.  
I have-1SG Marie her shirt and Marleen her-MSG skirt wash-PTCP  
'I have washed Maries's shirt and Marleen's skirt.'
- c. K'ee-n [Marie sen blouse] en [Marleen eur-en rok] gewassen.  
I have-1SG Marie *sen* shirt and Marleen her-MSG skirt wash-PTCP  
'I have washed Marie's shirt and Marleen's skirt.'
- d. K'ee-n [Marie eur blouse] en [Marleen sen rok] gewassen.  
I have-1SG Marie her shirt and Marleen *sen* skirt wash-PTCP  
'I have washed Marie's shirt and Marleen's skirt.'

## 2.2. Thematic relations and thematic hierarchy

Though I use the term 'possessor' to characterise the relationship between the prenominal DP and the head noun in the nominal projection. It should be pointed out that this term is to be taken in a broad sense. It is not the case that the prenominal possessive pronoun or the prenominal DP - which I refer to as the 'possessor' - must have a POSSESSOR relation in the strict sense to what I refer to as *possessum*. Various thematic relations are possible, including AGENT, EXPERIENCER and THEME: thus in (8a) the possessive pronoun *eur-en* ('her') may refer to the POSSESSOR, the CREATOR or the THEME of the picture. The same interpretive possibilities exist in the doubling construction in (8b) and for the *sen* construction in (8c), in which *Marie* can be the POSSESSOR of the picture, its CREATOR and its THEME.

- (8) a. Eur-en foto stung in de gezette.  
her-MSG picture stand-PST in the newspaper  
'Her picture was in the paper.'
- b. Marie eur-en foto stung in de gezette.  
Marie her-MSG picture stand-PST in the newspaper  
'Marie's picture was in the newspaper.'
- c. Marie se foto stung in de gezette.  
Marie *sen* picture stand-PST in the newspaper  
'Marie's picture was in the newspaper.'

The range of interpretations available for the prenominal possessor construction is also available for the postnominal *van* PP: in (8d) *Marie* can also be the POSSESSOR of the picture, its CREATOR and its THEME.

- (8) d. De-n foto van Marie stung in de gazette.  
the-MSG picture of Mary stand-PST in the newspaper  
'Mary's picture was in the paper.'

When the possessive pronoun or the prenominal possessor DP co-occurs with a postnominal *van* PP, the thematic hierarchy in (9) is observed: the highest ranking role is associated with the prenominal possessor, i.e. the highest ranking nominal in the DP. The application of the thematic hierarchy is illustrated in (10a) for the doubling construction and for the construction with the possessive pronoun, and in (10b) for the *sen* construction. The possible and impossible readings are listed in (10c).

- (9) POSSESSOR > AGENT > THEME (cf. Kolliakou 1999, Roehrs 2009:20, n20)
- (10) a. K'ee-n (Marie) eur schilderye van Picasso gekocht.  
I have-1SG (Marie) her picture of Picasso buy-PTCP  
'I bought Marie's painting of Picasso.'
- b. K'ee-n Marie se schilderye van Picasso gekocht.  
I have-1SG Marie *sen* painting of Picasso buy-PTCP  
'I bought Marie's painting of Picasso.'
- c. (i) *Marie*: POSSESSOR, *Picasso* : AGENT / THEME  
(ii) *Marie*: AGENT *Picasso* : THEME  
(iii) \**Marie*: THEME, *Picasso* POSSESSOR  
(iv) \**Marie*: THEME, *Picasso* AGENT  
(v) \**Marie*: AGENT, *Picasso* POSSESSOR

The relevance of the thematic hierarchy for the argument structure of the nominal domain is not specific to WF, of course. See for instance Kolliakou (1999) on French and Alexiadou, Haegeman and Stavrou 2007: chapter 4, for a review of the literature).

### 2.3. Properties of the prenominal possessor

#### 2.3.1. Semantic properties

For all prenominal possessors as well as for the possessive pronoun there is a [+ANIMATE, (+HUMAN)] constraint: typically the possessor must be human, it can marginally be 'personified' animal name.

- (11) a. die katte se steert                      die duve se vlerke                      \*?die musse se vlerke  
that cat *se* tail                      that pigeon *se* wing                      that sparrow *se* wing
- b. die katte eur-en steert                      ?die duve eur vlerke                      ?? die musse eur vlerke  
that cat her-MSG tail                      that dove her wing                      that sparrow her wing
- c. \*die dooze se deksel                      \*die deure se slot                      \*die veste se senteure  
that *box sen* cover                      that door *sen* lock                      that jacket *sen* belt
- d. \*die dooze eur deksel                      \*die deure eur slot                      \*die veste eur senteure  
that door her lid                      that door her lock                      that jacket her belt

However, the anymacy restriction is not absolute. There is, for instance, variation in the colloquial varieties of Flemish spoken in Belgium. (12a) was an announcement made at Ghent station, I would accept (12b), but find (12c) degraded. The variation in terms of which inanimates allow the possessor doubling construction is subject to further research. See also Hendriks (2002:8).

- (12) a. De trein naar Zottegem zal van                      zijn gewone spoor vertrekken.  
the train to Zottegem will from                      his usual platform leave

- ‘The train for Zottegem will depart from its usual platform.’
- b. Mijn auto zijn licht-en zijn nog aan.  
my car his headlight-PL be-3PL still on  
‘The lights of my car are still on.’
- c. ??\*Die kasse eur deure stoa-t open.  
that cupboard her door stand-3SG open  
‘The door of that cupboard is still open.’

The animacy constraint does not apply to the Afrikaans *se* construction: (13a-e) are from Ponelis (1979: 126-7) and (13f-j) are from Ponelis (1992:283)

- (13) a. die boek se omslag  
the book *se* cover  
‘the cover of that book’
- b. die stoel se leuning  
the chair *se* back  
‘the back of the chair’
- c. die fiets se voorwiel  
the bicycle *se* front wheel  
‘the front wheel of that bicycle’
- d. die ketting se skakel-s  
the chain *se* link-PL  
‘the links of the chain’
- e. die haelstorm se skade  
the hailstorm *se* damage  
‘the damage done by the hailstorm’
- f. gister se vertoning  
yesterday *se* show  
‘yesterday’s show’
- g. hebreus se grammatika  
hebrew *se* grammar  
‘the grammar of hebrew’
- h. Europa se bevolking  
Europe *se* population
- i. potplante se blae  
potplants *se* leaves  
‘the leaves of that plant’
- j. twee jaar gelede se begroting  
two years ago *se* budget  
‘the budget of two years ago’
- (Afrikaans)

In WF, the possessor may be either definite or indefinite, this will also be illustrated in section 2.5 below, and the possessor may also be a quantifier:

- (14) a. Da-s niemand se velo.  
that-be-3SG no one *se* bicycle  
‘That is no one’s bicycle.’
- b. Da-s niemand eur-en velo.  
that-be-3SG no one her-MSG bicycle  
‘That is no one’s bicycle.’

(14b) challenges analyses according to which the DP in the doubling construction is necessarily a topic (de Vries 2006, Giusti 1996, Leu 2008).

### 2.3.2. Syntactic properties

In Standard Dutch the *-s* genitive is restricted in use as the following extract from the modern grammar of Dutch (ANS) shows. (See also Corver 1990: 175-7 and ANS 1997, vol I: 163, II: 821 ).

Een vooropgeplaatste genitief op *-s* komt in de standaardtaal alleen voor bij eigennamen en bij sommige soortnamen die als aanspreking gebruikt kunnen worden. De soortnamen kunnen eventueel door een bezittelijk voornaamwoord , maar niet door andere woorden, voorafgegaan worden. (ANS: I: 163)

Tr:lh : A preposed genitive in *-s* occurs in the standard language only with proper names and with some common nouns which can be used as terms of address. The common names may possibly be preceded by a possessive pronoun but not by other words.

The doubling pattern allows phrasal possessors.

In WF both patterns allow prenominal possessors that are fully expanded phrases<sup>6</sup>. Put differently, if the *sen* possessor is analysed as a genitive then WF could be said to display the so called 'group genitive' (Delsing 1998, Jespersen 1934, 1938, Anderson 2009). As shown by (15) and (16) the internal constituency of the prenominal possessors is potentially the same in the *sen* construction and in the doubling pattern. In both cases there is no requirement for the final element in the possessor to be an N. This means that *sen* does not qualify as a bound morpheme that must invariably attach to a N. In both patterns the prenominal 'phrasal possessor may end in a verb (cf. Börjars, Denison and Scot (2007:5) on English). The head noun of the possessor may be modified by postnominal modifiers, such as prepositional phrases and restrictive relative clauses, (15/16b, 15/16c, 15/16d), neither of which can be extraposed (15/16b', 15/16c', 15/16d). Thus WF does not allow for 'split genitives'.

- (15) a. [de nieuw-e juffrouw] eur-en velo  
 the new-FSG teacher her-MASC-SG bicycle  
 'the new teacher's bicycle'
- b. [de (nieuw-e) juffrouw van Frans] eur-en velo  
 the (new-FSG) teacher of French her-MASC-SG bicycle  
 'the (new) French teacher's bicycle'
- b'. \*de (nieuw-e) juffrouw eur-en velo [van Frans]
- c. [men vriendinne ut Gent] eur-en velo  
 my friend from Ghent her-MASC-SG bicycle  
 'my friend from Ghent's bicycle'
- c'. ??men vriendinne eur-en velo [ut Gent]<sup>7</sup>
- d. [men vriendinne die in Gent weunt] eur-en velo  
 my friend who in Ghent live-3SG her-MASC-SG bicycle  
 'the bicycle of my friend who lives in Ghent'
- d'. \*?men vriendinne eur-en velo [die in Gent weun-t]<sup>8</sup>
- (16) a. de nieuw-e juffrouw se velo

- the new-FSG teacher *sen* bicycle  
 ‘the new teacher’s bicycle’
- b. %<sup>9</sup> [de (nieuw-e) juffrouw van Frans] se velo  
 the (new-FSG) teacher of French *sen* bicycle  
 ‘the (new) French teacher’s bicycle’
- b’. \*de (nieuw-e) juffrouw se [van Frans] velo
- b’’. \*?de (nieuw-e) juffrouw se velo [van Frans]
- c. %<sup>9</sup> [men vriendinne ut Gent] se velo  
 my friend from Ghent *sen* bicycle  
 ‘my friend from Ghent’s bicycle’
- c’. \* Men vriendinne *sen* [ut Gent] velo
- c’’. \*? men vriendinne se velo [ut Gent]
- d. %<sup>9</sup> [ men vriendinne die in Gent weun-t] se velo  
 my friend who in Ghent live-3SG *sen* bicycle  
 ‘the bicycle of my friend who lives in Ghent’
- d’. \* ?men vriendinne se velo [die in Gent weun-t]

In (15e) and (16e) *eigen*, though associated with the possessor, follows the linking element. Since *eigen* follows the ordinal numeral *eersten* I assume that it is not included in the pronominal possessor and that it is an independent premodifier of the *possessum* N. (pace Börjars 2003: 148).

- (15) e. de nieuw-e juffrouw eur-en (eerst-en) eigen velo  
 the new-FSG teacher her-MASC-SG (first-MSG) own bicycle  
 ‘the new teacher’s first own bicycle’
- (16) e. de nieuw-e juffrouw *sen* (eerst-en) eigen velo  
 the new-FSG teacher *se* (first-MSG) own bicycle  
 ‘the new teacher’s first own bicycle’

To the best of my knowledge both types of pronominal possessors are equally allowed in all the functions that are available to DPs in general. (17) illustrates the following functions: (17a) subject, (17b) direct object, (17c) indirect object, (17d) predicate, (17e) modifier of N.

- (17) a. Marie eur/*sen* moeder is ziek.  
 Marie her/*sen* mother be-3SG ill  
 ‘Marie’s mother is ill.’
- b. K’ee-n Marie eur/*sen* moeder al gezien.  
 I have-1SG Marie eur/*sen* mother already see-PTCP  
 ‘I have already seen Marie’s mother.’
- c. k’ee-n dat nie an Marie eur/*sen* moeder gezeid.  
 I have-1SG that not to Marie her /*sen* mother say-PTCP  
 ‘I did not tell Marie’s mother that.’
- d. José is Marie eur/*sen* moeder.  
 José be-3SG Marie her/*sen* mother  
 ‘Jose is Mary’s mother.’
- e. K’ee-n de broere van Marie eur/*sen* moeder gezien.  
 I have-1SG the brother of Marie her/*sen* mother see-PTCP  
 ‘I have seen Marie’s mother’s brother.’

#### 2.4. (Mixed) Recursion

For completeness' sake I add that both doubling construction and *sen* construction are recursive (18a,b), that a doubling construction may appear inside a *sen* construction (18c) and that, conversely, a *sen* possessor may appear inside a doubling construction (18d) :

- (18) a. [DP<sub>1</sub> [DP<sub>3</sub> [DP<sub>3</sub>Marie] se moeder] se veste]  
           Marie           *sen* mother   *sen* jacket  
 b. [DP<sub>1</sub> [DP<sub>3</sub> [DP<sub>3</sub>Marie] eur moeder] eur veste]  
           Marie           her mother   her jackt  
 c. [DP<sub>1</sub> [DP<sub>2</sub> [DP<sub>3</sub>Marie] eur moeder] se veste]  
 d. [DP<sub>1</sub> [DP<sub>2</sub> [DP<sub>3</sub>Marie] se moeder] eur veste]

However, while a prenominal possessor of either type may co-occur with a postnominal PP (18e,f), there may only be one prenominal possessor with respect to the same *possessum* head: any combination of two prenominal possessors, one a *sen* possessor and the other a doubling possessor, is ungrammatical (18g,h),

- (18) e. Marie eur-en           foto           van eur dochter  
           Marie her-MSG       picture       of her daughter  
 f. Marie *sen* foto           van eur dochter  
           Marie *sen* picture   of her daughter  
 g. \*Marie eur-en           eur dochter   se   foto  
           Marie her-MSG       her daughter *sen*   picture  
 h. \*Marie *sen*           eur dochter   eur-en   foto  
           Marie *sen*           her daughter her-MSG   picture

#### 2.5. Definiteness of DP determined by definiteness of prenominal possessor

In WF, the prenominal possessor determines the definiteness of the containing possessor DP (cf. Schoorlemmer 1998: 75, Alexiadou 2005a: 792). One diagnostic for definiteness is the distribution of a DP as a subject. Two properties set apart indefinite subjects from definite subjects (Haegeman 2004a). *Er* insertion is obligatory with (a copy/trace of) all indefinite (non-generic) subjects. Thus in (19a) the subject of the embedded clause is *drie studenten/vee studenten* ('three students', 'many students') and *der* insertion is obligatory. *Der* insertion is ungrammatical in (19b) because the bare plural *katten* ('cats') has the generic reading. In (19c) the definite embedded subject *de studenten* ('the students') is incompatible with *der* insertion. Observe that (19d) suggests that *wh*-nominals are 'indefinite', regardless of whether they are composed of a bare *wh*-word or have a premodifying *which*.

- (19) a. k peinz-en   da-n   \*(der) (drie/vee)   student-en   dien-en boek  
           I think-1SG   that-PL \*(there) (three/many) student-PL   that-MSG book  
           goa-n lezen.  
           go-3PL read  
           'I think that (three/many) students will read that book.'  
 b. k gelov-en   da-n   (\*der)           katt-en we   gas   et-en.  
           I believe-1SG   that-PL (\*there)       cat-PL   indeed grass eat-3PL  
           'I believe that cats do eat grass.'

- c. k peinz-en da-n (\*der) de student-en dien-en boek  
 I think-1SG that-PL (\*there) the student-PL that-MSG book  
 we goa-n lezen.<sup>9</sup>  
 indeed go-3PL read  
 ‘I think that the students will read that book.’
- d. Weknen aannemer peinz-je dat \*(der) dat hus goa-t kuopen?  
 which contractor think-you that \*(there) that house go-3SG buy  
 ‘Which contractor do you think will buy that house?’

The WF embedding conjunction *dat* (‘that’) is inflected for person and number. For reasons of space I cannot develop this here. See Haegeman (1992). Suffice it to say that in (19) and in (20) below *dan* is the third person plural form of *dat*. Indefinite (non-generic) subjects need not be adjacent to the sequence of the embedding inflected conjunction *dat* (‘that’) +existential *der*, definite subjects must be adjacent to the embedding (inflected) conjunction *dat*. Thus in (20a) the subject *drie/vee studenten* (‘three/many students’) may be separated from *der* by the intervening temporal PP *van djoare* (‘this year’), while this is not possible for the generic bare plural *katten* (‘cats’) in (20b) and for the definite *de studenten* (‘the students’) in (20c).

- (20) a. K peinz-en da-n der van d-joare (drie/vee) student-en  
 I think-1SG that-PL there of the year (three/many) student-PL  
 dien-en boek goa-n lezen.  
 that-MSG book go-PL read  
 ‘I think that (three/many) students will read that book this year.’
- b. \*K- gelov-en da-n neu katt-en we gas et-en.  
 I believe-1SG that-PL now cat-PL indeed grass eat-PL  
 ‘I believe that cats do eat grass now.’
- c. \*K- peinz-en da-n van d-joare de studenten dien-en boek we  
 I think-1SG that-PL of the- year the student-PL that-MSG book indeed  
 goa-n lezen.  
 go-PL read  
 ‘I think that this year the students will read that book.’

(21) shows that the pronominal possessor determines the definiteness of the containing DP. In the doubling construction in (21a) the DP *een studentinne eur hus* (‘a student’s house’) requires the presence of *der* and the DP can be separated from the expletive by the adverb *al* (‘already’). With the definite possessor in (21b), no *der* insertion is possible, and the containing DP must be adjacent to *dat*. Again a DP containing a pronominal *wh*-possessor patterns with indefinites. If the possessor has a generic reading, then the containing DP patterns with definite DPs (21d). The same patterns obtain with the *sen* possessor, as shown in (22).

- (21) a. Kpeinz-en dat \*(der) al [en studentinne eur hus]  
 I think-1SG that \*(there) already a female-student her house  
 verkocht is.  
 sell-PTCP be-3SG  
 ‘I think that already one female student’s house has been sold.’
- b. Kpeinz-en dat (\*der) (\*al) [die studentinne eur hus]  
 I think-1SG that (\*there) (\*already) that female-student her house  
 verkocht is.  
 sell-PTCP be-3SG

- ‘I think that that female student’s house has been sold.’
- c. [Wekken studentinne eur hus] is \*(der) al verkocht?  
which female student her house be-3SG \*(there) already sell-PTCP  
‘Which female student’s house has already been sold?’
- d. T-tschyn-t dat (\*der) en weewe eur hus  
it-seem-3SG that- (\*there) a widow eur house  
atent goed verkuop-t.  
always well sell-3SG  
‘It appears that a widow’s house always sells well.’
- (22) a. Kpeinz-en dat \*(der) al [en studentinne sen hus]  
I think-1SG that \*(there) already a female-student *sen* house  
verkocht is.  
sell-PTCP be-3SG  
‘I think that already one female student’s house has been sold.’
- b. Kpeinz-en dat (\*der) (\*al) [die studentinne sen hus]  
I think-1SG that (\*there) (\*already) that female-student *sen* house  
verkocht is.  
sell-PTCP be-3SG  
‘I think that that female student’s house has been sold.’
- c. [Wekken studentinne sen hus] is \*(der) al verkocht?  
which female student *sen* house be-3SG \*(there) already sell-PTCP  
‘Which female student’s house has already been sold?’
- d. Tschyn-t da-n (\*der) een weewe sen hus atent goed verkuopt.  
it seem-3SG that-PL (\*there) a widow *sen* house always well sell-3SG  
‘It appears that a widow’s house always sells well.’

For completeness’ sake note that the definiteness of containing DP is independent of definiteness of postnominal *van* DP. This is shown by (23):

- (23) a. Ze zegg-en dat-\*(der) [een hus van ne-n/dien-en student]  
they say-3PL that \*(there) a house of a-MSG/that- MSG student  
verkocht is.  
sell-PTCP be-3SG  
‘They say that a house of a/that student has been sold.’
- b. Ze zei-d-en dat (\*der) [t-hus van ne-n/dien-en student ]  
they say-PST-3PL that (\*there) the-house of a-MSG/that- MSG student  
al verkocht is.  
already sell-PTCP be-3SG  
‘They say that the house of a/that student has been sold.’

## 2.6. Summary

Table 5 is a survey of the similarities found between the two prenominal possessor constructions.

Table 5: Similarities between the two possessor constructions

	Doubling construction	<i>sen</i>
--	-----------------------	------------

Constituent with <i>possessum</i>	+	+
Thematic relation (AGENT, THEME etc)	+	+
Hierarchy: POSS>AG>TH	+	+
Animacy effect	+	+
Quantifier possessor	+	+
+/-Definite possessor	+	+
Possessor: complex DP	+	+
Definiteness of possessor determines definiteness DP	+	+

### 3. Differences between the *sen* construction and the doubling construction

#### 3.1 Agreement

The doubling construction displays agreement between possessor and the possessive pronoun as well as between *possessum* and the possessive pronoun. As pointed out in section 1, the *sen* construction displays no overt agreement with either possessor or *possessum*, although there is a number restriction on the possessor.

#### 3.2. Reciprocal possessors

In Haegeman (2003, 2004b,c) I have discussed the fact that when the possessor is a reciprocal *mekaar* ('each other'), only the *sen* construction is available:

- (24) a. da-n            ze    mekoar        se    tekst-en gelezen    ee-n  
           that-PL        they   each-other    *sen*    text-PL read-PTCP    have-3PL  
           'that they have read each other's texts'
- b. \*da-n            ze    mekoar        under/zen/eur tekst-en gelezen    ee-n  
           that-PL        they   each-other    their/his/her    text-PL read-PTCP have-3PL

The reciprocal possessor is also incompatible with the doubling pattern in Dutch and in German:

- (25) a. Dutch            \*Ze hebb-en elkaar            hun/z'n/d'r    gast-en gezien.  
           they have-3PL each other    their/his/her guest-PL see-PTCP  
           (ANS 1990: vol II: 822.)
- b. German            \*Sie hab-en einander            ihre Gäst-e            gesehen.  
           they have-3PL each other    their guest-PL see-PTCP  
           (Cornelia Hamann, p.c)

As shown in (26), the linear sequence of a reciprocal followed by a nominal expression containing a possessive pronoun coreferential with the reciprocal is as such available in the languages at issue. For each example in (26), a temporal adjunct (*gisteren, gisteren, gestern* 'yesterday') can be inserted between the reciprocal and the nominal containing the possessive pronoun, showing that the reciprocal and the nominal expression are separate constituents:

- (26) a. WF da-n    ze mekoar    (gisteren)    under gast-en    voengesteld ee-n  
           that-PL they each other (yesterday)    their guest-PL present-PTCP    have-3PL

- ‘that they introduced their guests to each other (yesterday)’
- |       |                      |             |                 |              |          |
|-------|----------------------|-------------|-----------------|--------------|----------|
| b. Du | dat ze elkaar        | (gisteren)  | hun gast-en     | voorgesteld  | hebb-en  |
|       | that they each other | (yesterday) | their guest-PL  | present-PTCP | have-3PL |
| c. Ge | dass sie einander    | (gestern)   | ihre Gäst-e     | vorgestellt  | hab-en   |
|       | that they each other | (yesterday) | their-PL guests | present-PTCP | have-3PL |

The Standard Dutch reciprocal possessor is compatible with the genitive. For independent reasons, this is not the case in German, in which the possessor is by and large restricted to proper names (Josef Bayer and Martina Penke, p.c.).

- |      |    |        |  |                 |          |          |
|------|----|--------|--|-----------------|----------|----------|
| (27) | a. | Dutch  | Ze hebb-en   | elkaar-s        | gast-en  | gezien.  |
|      |    |        | they have-3PL  | each other -s   | guest-PL | see-PTCP |
|      |    |        | ‘They have seen each other’s guests.’ (ANS 1990: vol II: 822.) |                 |          |          |
|      | b. | German | *Sie hab-en  | einander-s      | Gäst-e   | gesehen. |
|      |    |        | they have3PL   | each-other -GEN | guest-PL | see-PTCP |

I have analysed the incompatibility of the doubling construction with the reciprocal possessor in terms of a manifestation of the so-called anaphor agreement effect (Rizzi 1990, Burzio 1995, Woolford 1999). For reasons of space I cannot discuss this here and refer to my earlier papers (Haegeman 2003, 2004b, 2004c).

### 3.3. Adjacency effects

In all the examples discussed so far, the possessor is adjacent to the linking element, be it the morpheme *sen* or the doubling pronoun. This might suggest that the prenominal possessor occupies the same position in the doubling construction and in the *sen* construction, a hypothesis adopted, among others by de Vries (2006) for Dutch and German and by Weiss (2008) for German. However, an important difference between the two WF constructions is that there is an adjacency condition on the *sen* construction, while this is not so for the doubling construction. In the latter construction we observe that the possessor DP may occupy at least two different prenominal positions in the containing DP. In this section I provide evidence for this difference.<sup>10</sup>

#### 3.3.1. Prenominal quantifiers (*al-heel*)

Consider the data in (28): in (28a) the possessor construction is the complement of the universal quantifier *al* (‘all’). As shown in (28b) the string of the quantifier and the doubling construction is a constituent, given that it is the first constituent of a V2 pattern. In (28c) the possessor *Marie* precedes the quantifier, and once again the string possessor-Q-*possessum* is a constituent, as shown in (28d). These data show that the possessor need not be adjacent to the doubling pronoun. One might propose that the possessor can move away from the position to the right of the quantifier to a position to its left, perhaps for reasons of information structure.

- |      |    |                                  |                          |          |
|------|----|----------------------------------|--------------------------|----------|
| (28) | a. | K’ee-n                           | [al [Marie eur boek-en]] | gezien.  |
|      |    | I have-1SG                       | all Marie her book-PL    | see-PTCP |
|      |    | ‘I have seen all Marie’s books.’ |                          |          |
|      | b. | [Al [Marie eur boek-en]]         | ee-n-k                   | gezien   |
|      |    | All Marie her book-PL            | have-1SG - I             | see-PTCP |
|      |    | ‘All Marie’s books I have seen.’ |                          |          |
|      | c. | K’ee-n                           | [Marie al eur boek-en]   | gezien.  |

- I have-1SG Marie all eur book-PL see-PTCP  
 ‘I have seen all Marie’s books.’  
 d. [Marie al eur boek-en] ee-n-k gezien  
 ‘All Marie’s books, I have seen.’  
 e. [ Marie [QP [Q al] [FP t eur boek-en]]]

Observe that *allemole* (‘all’) and *alle viere* (‘all four’) behave differently:

- (28) f. K'ee-n allemole/alle viere [Marie eur boek-en] gezien.  
 I have-1SG all /all four Marie her book-PL see-PTCP  
 ‘I have seen all /all for of Marie’s books.’  
 g. \*?? k'ee-n Marie allemole/alle viere eur boek-en gezien.  
 I have-1SG Marie all /all four eur book-PL see-PTCP

This can be accounted for if it is proposed that while *al* occupies a head position and will not intervene in phrasal movement, *allemole* and *alle viere* are phrasal and block phrasal movement of *Marie*. See Corver (2009) and Kranendonk (2010) for an analysis of *alle* + numeral compatible with this idea.

- (28) h. \*[<sub>TOPP</sub> Marie [<sub>FP</sub> allemole/alle viere [<sub>DP</sub> t eur boek-en]]]

In (29) we see that in the *sen* construction the possessor cannot move away from *sen*.<sup>11</sup>

- (29) a. K'ee-n [al [Marie sen boek-en]] gezien.  
 I have-1SG all Mary *sen* book-SG see-PTCP  
 ‘I have seen all Marie’s books.’  
 b. [Al [Marie sen boek-en]] ee-n-k gezien.  
 all Marie *sen* book-PL have-1SG I see-PTCP  
 ‘All Marie’s books, I have seen.’  
 c. \*K'ee-n [Marie al sen boek-en] gezien.  
 d. \*[ Marie [QP [Q al] [FP t sen boek-en]]]

The same patterns are observed with *heel* (‘whole’).

- (30) a. K'ee-n [heel Marie sen brief] gelezen.  
 I have-1SG whole Marie *sen* letter read-PTCP  
 ‘I have read all of Marie’s letter’  
 b. [Heel Marie sen brief] ee-n-k gelezen.  
 All Marie *sen* letter have-1SG-I read-PTCP  
 ‘All of Marie’s letter, I have read.’  
 c. \*K'ee-n [Marie heel sen brief ] gelezen.  
 (31) a. K'ee-n [heel [Marie eur-en brief]] gelezen.  
 I have-1SG whole Mary her-MSG letter read-PTCP  
 ‘I have read all of Marie’s letter’  
 b. [Heel [Marie eur-en brief] ] ee-n-k gelezen.  
 All Marie her-MSG letter have-1SG-I read-PTCP  
 ‘All of Marie’s letter, I have read.’  
 c. K' ee-n [Marie heel eur-en brief] gelezen.  
 I have-1SG Marie whole her-MSG letter read-PTCP

Again, the expanded form *heelemole* ('all/whole') behaves differently:

- (32) a. K'ee-n [heelemole [Marie eur-en brief]] gelezen.  
I have-1SG *heelemole* Marie her-MSG letter read-PTCP  
'I have read Marie's letter entirely.'
- b. [Heelemole [Marie eur-en brief] ] ee-n-k gelezen.  
*Heelemole* Marie her-MSG letter have-1SG-I read-PTCP  
'I have read Marie's letter entirely.'
- c. \*K'ee-n Marie heelemole eur-en brief gelezen.  
I have-1SG Marie whole her-MSG letter read-PTCP

The contrast can be accounted for if, in line with the analysis of the contrast between *al* and *allemoale* and *alle viere* in (28) above, we propose that *heel* occupies a head position and does not interfere with phrasal movement, while *heelemole* occupies a specifier position and blocks phrasal movement of *Marie*.

- (32) d. \*[<sub>TOPP</sub> Marie [QP heelemole [Q ] [DP t eur-en brief]

Recall that the DP possessor and the possessive pronoun agree in terms of person, number and (in the singular) gender features. Though I won't develop this point in full here, one can speculate that it is precisely the rich agreement relation between the possessor and the pronoun in the doubling construction that allows the possessor and the doubling pronoun to be non-adjacent because the agreement features can establish a binding relation between the possessor and the linking possessive pronoun.

### 3.3.2. Appositives/NRR

I have pointed out (section 2.3.2) that both the doubling construction and the *sen* construction allow for a 'group genitive and that neither requires adjacency between the head N of the possessor and the linking element, i.e. the possessive pronoun or the morpheme *sen*. However, the two constructions pattern differently with respect to the postmodifiers of the head noun that are allowed. While appositive relatives and appositive DPs can separate the possessor from the possessive pronoun in the doubling construction, this is not so for the *sen* construction. If the comma intonation is symptomatic of a constituent break with appositives, then again the examples in (34) can be interpreted in terms of a violation of the adjacency requirement on the *sen* possessor.

- (33) a. men moeder, die eur-en pols gebroken ee-t, eur-en velo  
my mother, who her-MSG wrist break-PTCP have-3SG, her-MSG bicycle  
'the bicycle of my mother, who has broken her wrist'
- b. Marleen, men best-e vriendinne, eur-en velo  
Marleen, my best-FSG girlfriend, her-MSG bicycle  
'the bicycle of Marleen, my best friend'
- (34) a. \*men moeder, die eur-en pols gebroken ee-t, sen velo  
my mother, who her-MSG wrist break-PTCP have-3SG, *sen* bicycle
- b. \*Marleen, men beste vriendinne, sen velo  
Marleen, my best girlfriend, *sen* bicycle

### 3.3.3. 'Remote' possessor<sup>12</sup>

As I have discussed in detail in earlier work (Haegeman 2003, 2004a, c), a WF possessor may appear in a long distance relation with the doubling pronoun. This is illustrated in (35). I have

referred to this pattern as the ‘remote possessor’. I have argued that these are not cases of possessor extraction, but rather of a resumptive pronoun strategy. I refer to my earlier work for arguments.

- (35) a. Dat is die verpleegster da-n-ze gisteren [DP eur hus]  
 that be-3SG that nurse that-PL-they yesterday her house  
 verkocht ee-n.  
 sell-PTCP have-3PL  
 ‘That’s the nurse whose house they sold yesterday.’
- b. ?Wekken verpleegster zei-je  
 which nurse say-PAST-2SG-you  
 da-n-ze gisteren [DP eur hus] verkocht ee-n?  
 that-PL-they yesterday her house sell-PTCP have-3PL  
 ‘Of which nurse did you say that they had sold her house yesterday?’

One argument against a movement account is that the remote possessor is compatible with a pronominal numeral such as *alle viere*. We have seen in the discussion in section 3.3.1 that such numerals do not allow movement of the possessor to the left edge of the containing DP. This means that for the possessor to be extracted it would have to be able to move from the DP-internal position and cross these numerals.

- (35) c. \*Toen zyn Marie alle viere eur huz-en verkocht.  
 then be-3PL Marie all four her house-PL sell-PTCP  
 ‘Then all of Mary’s four houses were sold.’
- d. Dat is die verpleegster  
 That be-3SG that nurse  
 da-n – ze zegg-en da-n alle viere eur huz-en verkocht zyn.  
 that-PL-they say-3PL that-PL all four her house-PL sell-PTCP be-PL  
 ‘That is the nurse about whom they say that all of her four houses are sold.’

The remote possessor construction is not available with the *sen* construction.

- (36) a. \*Dat is die verpleegster  
 that be-3SG that nurse  
 da-n- ze gisteren [DP sen hus] verkocht ee-n.  
 that-PL-they yesterday *sen* house sell-PTCP have-3PL
- b. \*Wekken verpleegster zei-je  
 which nurse say-PST-2SG-you  
 da-n- ze gisteren [DP sen hus] verkocht ee-n?  
 that-PL-they yesterday *sen* house sell-PTCP have-3PL

It is tempting again to relate the fact that the DP in the possessor doubling pattern can be separated from the possessive DP to the agreement relation between the possessor and the doubling pronoun (cf. 3.3.1). In the *sen* construction no such agreement is available and hence the possessor has to be adjacent to the linking element.

#### 3.3.4. Ellipsis of head noun of possessor construction

The strict adjacency requirement on the possessor and the *sen* morpheme also shows up when we consider ellipsis of the *possessum*. In WF only the doubling construction allows *possessum* ellipsis, in which case the definite article is spelt out to the left of the possessive

pronoun, which shows up in a special form. While the pronoun that selects a plural NP in (37a) is *eur*, the pronoun found in ellipsis patterns is *eure*. Both definite article and special ending on the pronoun are obligatory. I assume that the ending serves to license the ellipsis site (see Corver and Van Koppen 2009 and references cited there).

- (37) a. Da zyn Marie eur boek-en.  
 that be-3PL Marie her book-PL  
 ‘Those are Marie’s books.’  
 b. Da zyn Marie \*(d)’eur \*(e).  
 those be-3PL Marie de her+e  
 ‘Those are Marie’s.’

Unlike what happens in English (*John’s are ready*) ellipsis of *possessum* is not available with the Flemish *sen* construction, regardless of whether there is a determiner to the right or to the left of the possessor, suggesting that *sen* is not a licenser of the ellipsis site.

- (38) a. Da zyn Marie se boek-en.  
 that be-3PL Marie se book-PL  
 ‘Those are Marie’s.’  
 b. \*Da zyn (de) Marie sen Ø.  
 c. \*Da zyn Marie (de) sen Ø.

### 3.3.5. Deictic markers, discourse particles and possessors

#### 3.3.5.1. Deictic adverbs.

(39) illustrates the distribution of the DP-internal adverb *hier* (‘here’), which serves to anchor the referent of the DP to the discourse situation. Thus in (35a) *Marie hier* refers to a person named Mary in the speaker’s immediate context. The sequence *Marie hier* is a constituent, witness the fact that it is used as the first constituent in a V2 sequence. The string *Marie hier* alternates with *hier Marie* (see also Rigterink 2005 for Standard Dutch). This use of *hier* seems to be restricted to DPs with a proper name (39) or containing a demonstrative (40). *Hier* alternates with *doar* (‘there’), and *gunter* (‘yonder’) (41).

- (39) a. [Marie hier] ee-t da gedoan.  
 Marie here have-3SG that do-PTCP  
 ‘It’s Marie here who did that.’  
 b. [Hier Marie] ee-t da gedoan.
- (40) a. [Die studentinne hier] ee-t da gedoan.  
 that student here have-3SG that do-PTCP  
 ‘It’s that student her who did that.’  
 b. [Hier die studentinne] ee-t da gedoan.
- (41) a. [Marie doar/gunter] ee-t da gedoan.  
 Marie there/yonder have-3SG that do-PTCP  
 ‘It’s Marie over there who did that.’  
 b. [Doa/gunter Marie] ee-t da gedoan.

When a possessor DP contains the anchoring adverbs *hier*, *doar*, *gunter*, only the doubling pattern is available, the *sen* construction is ungrammatical. This pattern, which – to the best of my knowledge- has not been observed in the literature before, is illustrated in (42) and (43):

- (42) a. Dat is [die studentinne hier] eur huswerk.  
that be-3SG [that student here] her homework  
'That is the homework of this student here.'  
b. \*Dat is [die studentinne hier] sen huswerk.  
that be-3SG [that student here] *sen* homework
- (43) a. Dat is [hier die studentinne] eur huswerk.  
that be-3sg [here that student] her homework  
'That is the homework of this student here.'  
b. \*Dat is [hier die studentinne] sen huswerk.  
that be-3SG [here that student] *sen* homework

For a syntactic account I refer to Haegeman (2009).

### 3.3.5.2. Discourse particles and possessors

#### 3.3.5.2.1. Clausal particles in WF

This section introduces some additional data which have, as far as I am aware, not yet been discussed in the literature.

WF has a number of discourse particles which are to be found on the very left or right fringe of the sentence. (44) illustrates the particles *zè* and *né*. These particles serve to indicate the speaker's attitude towards the content of the utterance and to draw the hearer's attention to the content of the utterance. Both *zè* and *né* are derived from imperative forms of verbs, i.e. *zie* ('see') and *neem* ('take'), respectively (De Bo 1982, De Brabandere 1999, Desnerck 1972). Cf. Haegeman (2008).

- (44) a. Zè/né, m'ee-n al een medalie.  
*zè/né*, we have already a medal.  
'Look, we already have a medal.'  
b. M'ee-n al een medalie zè/né.  
we have-1PL already a medal, *zè/né*  
'We already have a medal, look.'  
c. Zè, dien-en boek moe-j lezen.  
*zè* that-MSG book must-you read  
'That book you must read.'  
d. Dien-en boek moe-j lezen zè.  
That-MSG book must-you read *zè*  
'That book you must read.'

Observe that both *zè* and *né* combine with full clauses; when initial they are outside the strict V2 domain and neither could serve as a first constituent in a V2 structure:

- (44) e. \*Zè/né ee-n me al een medalie.  
*zè/né* have-1PL we already a medal.

Following Munaro and Polletto (2003, 2009) and Munaro (2006), among others, I have tentatively developed the hypothesis that *zè* spells out a functional head that selects a clause as its complement and which may attract the clausal complement to its specifier.<sup>13</sup> This is schematically summarized for *zè* in (45):

- (45) a. [[*zè*] clause] *zè* clause  
 b. [Clause [*zè*] clause] clause *zè*

### 3.3.5.2.2. DP-internal *zè*

A second use of *zè* is illustrated in (46): here it follows a DP. The relevant DP usually contains a demonstrative element, typically the demonstrative determiner *die*, possibly accompanied by *hier* ('here') or *doar* ('there'). From the fact that *zè* may intervene between the head noun *boek* ('book') and post modifying elements such as *hier* ('here') (46c) and the PP *van Valère* ('of Valère') (46d) I deduce tentatively that *zè* is actually DP-internal. (47) and (48) illustrate the same patterns with *doar* ('there') and *gunter* ('yonder') respectively.

- (46) a. Dien-en boek *zè* moe-j lezen!  
 that-MSG book *zè* must-2SG -you read  
 'That book, you must read!'  
 b. Dien-en boek hier *zè* moe-j lezen!  
 that-MSG boek here *zè* must-2SG- you read  
 'That book here, you must read!'  
 c. [Dien-en boek *zè* hier moe-j lezen!  
 d. Dien-en boek *zè* van Valère moe-j lezen!  
 That-MSG boek *zè* of Valère must-2SG -you read  
 'That book here of Valère, you must read!'
- (47) a. Dien-en boek doar *zè* moe-j lezen!  
 that-MSG boek there *zè* must-2SG- you read  
 'That book there, you must read!'  
 b. [<sub>DP</sub> Dien-en boek *zè* doar] moe-j lezen!
- (48) a. [<sub>DP</sub> Dien-en boek gunter *zè*] moe-j lezen!  
 that-MSG boek yonder *zè* must-2SG you read  
 'That book there, you must read!'  
 b. [<sub>DP</sub> Dien-en boek *zè* gunter] moe-j lezen!

DPs containing *zè* must be clause-initial:

- (49) a. Ge moet [<sub>DP</sub> dien-en boek] lezen.  
 You must-2SG that-MSG book read  
 'You must read that book.'  
 b. \*Ge moet [<sub>DP</sub> dien-en boek *zè* hier] lezen.  
 You must-2SG that-MSG book *zè* here read  
 c. [Dien-en boek *zè* here] moe-j lezen

Though I will not develop this point here, observe that this DP-related use of *zè* in WF may shed light on the grammaticalisation of demonstratives. According to the online etymological dictionary of Dutch (Philippa, De Brabandere, Quack, Schoonheim and van der Sijs 2007) the sibilant component in the proximal demonstrative *-s* as in Dutch *deze* ('this') – as well as English *this* – is derived from the verb *see*. Though WF *zè* is not restricted to co occurring

with proximal demonstratives, it is tempting to see the WF data as a first step in a new grammaticalisation cycle.

- (50) a. Dien-en boek doa zè moe-j lezen.  
 that-MSG book there zè must-2SG-you read  
 b. Dien-en boek gunter zè moe-j lezen.  
 that-MSG book yonder zè must-2SG-you read

### 3.3.5.2.3. The possessor doubling construction in WF and the particle zè.

I have shown that the particle *zè* may combine with a DP. In this section I examine the co-occurrence of *zè* with a possessor DP.

In the doubling construction the particle *zè* can be associated with the possessor DP (51a). I will refer to this pattern as the *zè* possessor. When the possessor co-occurs with a quantifier, the *zè* possessor must appear to the left of the quantifier (51b). The position to the right of the quantifier – which is available for the doubling possessor (28a,b) and (32a,b) in section 3.3.1- is no longer available (51c).

- (51) a. [[Die studente zè (hier)] eur werk] moe-j een keer lezen.  
 that student zè (here) her work must-2SG -you once read  
 ‘You should have a look at the work of that student here.’  
 b. [[Die studente zè (hier)] al eur werk] moe-j een keer lezen.  
 that student zè (here) all her work must-2SG-you once read  
 ‘You should have a look at all the work of that student here.’  
 c. \*[Al [die studente zè (hier)] eur werk] moe-j een keer lezen.

These data suggest that associated with *zè* the possessor is forced to occupy a position on the edge of the DP (see Cardinaletti, Giusti and Haegeman (in preparation)).

I have already shown that the edge position in the DP is not available for the *sen* construction (28c). We correctly predict that *zè* is not available with the *sen* possessor.

- (51) d. \*[[Die studente zè ] sen werk] moe-j een keer lezen.  
 that student zè sen work must-2SG -you once read

Observe that an alternative analysis of the data in (51a) and (51b) could be to propose that the possessor DP occurs in a dislocated position, as a kind of sentential topic, and is followed by a regular V2 clause:<sup>14</sup>

- (51) e. [Die studente zè (hier)] [eur werk] moe-j een keer lezen].  
 that student zè (here) her work must-2SG-you once read  
 ‘You should have a look at the work of that student here.’  
 f. [Die studente zè (hier)] [al eur werk] moe-2SG -j een keer lezen.  
 that student zè (here) all her work must you once read.  
 ‘You should have a look at all the work of that student here.’

However, such an analysis is not plausible for (51g), for which the analysis proposed above, i.e. that *zè* is DP-internal is more plausible:

- (51) g. Dien-en boek zè hier van Valère moe-j een keer lezen.  
 That-MSG book zè here of Valère must-2SG -you once read

‘You should read that book here by Valère.’

### 3.4. Summary

Table 6 summarizes the differences between the two prenominal possessor constructions:

Table 6: differences between the two possessor constructions

	<i>Sen</i> possessor	Doubling possessor
Agreement possessor	SG possessor	+
Agreement <i>possessum</i>	-	+
Reciprocal possessor	+	-
Adjacency possessor in DP	+	-
Possessor= appositive/NRR	-	+
Remote possessor in clause	-	+
Ellipsis of <i>possessum</i>	-	+(with article and <i>-e</i> ending)
Deictic marker <i>hier</i> on possessor	-	+
Particle <i>zè</i>	-	+

In Haegeman (2009) I have taken the data in section 3 as evidence against a unitary account of the doubling possessor and the *sen* possessor as proposed, for instance, in De Vries (2006) and Weiss (2008). These authors present analyses according to which the possessor occupies the specifier of DP and the linking element, be it the possessive pronoun or the genitive marker (*s*) is in D. (52a) is based on Weiss (2008).

(52) a. [ DP Possessor [D pronoun/*sen*] [IP ... NP]]

I propose that there are three prenominal positions for possessors in WF: the *sen* possessor occupies the specifier position of an inflectional projection (IP) in the nominal domain, while the doubling possessor occupies the specifier of DP or may occupy a higher specifier position. This is schematically represented in (48b), where ‘Poss1’ etc. represent the position of the prenominal possessor.

(52) b. [QP Poss1(-*zè*) Q [ DP Poss2(-*hier*) D [IP Poss3 *sen/eur* NP]]]

When the possessor is associated with *zè* it must be on a left edge position in the DP. I speculate that this is due to a licensing requirement of *zè*: DPs associated with *zè* cannot occupy the middlefield of the clause but must be in the left periphery:

(53) a. \*K’ee-n      dien-en      boek *zè*      al      gelezen.  
 I have-1SG      that-MSG      book *zè*      already read-PTCP

b.      Dien-en      boek *zè*      ee-n’k      al      gelezen.  
           that-MSG      book *zè*      have-1SG -I      already read-PTCP  
           ‘That book, I have already read.’

A possessor associated with *hier* is not subject to the left-edge condition, but it is subject to some restrictions in that it has to occupy a position in the DP periphery, plausibly the specifier of D. The restrictions on the distribution of possessors with *hier* remain puzzling because

unlike a DP associated with *zè* (51a), a DP associated with *hier* can occur in the middlefield of the WF clause. I intend to look into this issue in future research.<sup>15</sup>

- (54) a. K'ee-n        dien-en        boek hier        al        gelezen.  
 I have-1SG    that-MSG    book *hier*    already read-PTCP  
 'I have already read that book here.'
- b.    Dien-en boek hier    ee-n'k        al        gelezen.  
 that-MSG book *hier*    have-1SG -I    already read-PTCP  
 'That book here I have already read.'

#### 4. Summary

This paper offers a description of two pronominal possessors in the WF dialect of Dutch, namely the construction with a linking element *sen*, and the doubling construction in which a pronominal possessor DP is doubled by a possessive pronoun.

I have provided an inventory of the principal similarities and difference between the constructions. One distinction that sets apart the two constructions is that there is a rigid adjacency requirement with respect to the WF *sen* construction, while the doubling construction allows for a remote possessor. The different agreement properties of the pronominal possessors correlate with a number of additional distributional differences in relation to the position of pronominal quantifiers and nominal discourse particles.

#### References

- Alexiadou, A. 2005. Possessors and (in) definiteness. *Lingua: special issue: The Structure of (In)definiteness: Issues in the Form and Interpretation of Noun Phrases*. R. Zamparelli, ed.: 787-820.
- Alexiadou, A. and C. Wilder, eds. 1998. *Possessors, Predicates and Movement in the DP*. Amsterdam: Benjamins.
- Alexiadou, A., Haegeman, L. and Stavrou, M. 2001. Functional projections in the DP: (noun) morphology, movement and ellipsis. *Studies in Greek Linguistics* 21 : 21-32.
- Alexiadou, A., Haegeman, L. and Stavrou, M. 2007. *Noun Phrase in the Generative Perspective (Studies in Generative Grammar 71)*. Berlin & New York: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Anderson, S. 2009. The English 'group genitive' is a special clitic, not an inflection. Paper presented at the Workshop on Morpho-syntactic categories and the expression of possession. 3-4 April 2009. <http://www.humanities.manchester.ac.uk/medialibrary/llc/files/possessives/Anderson.pdf>
- Bernstein, J. 1997. Demonstratives and reinforcers in Romance and Germanic languages. *Lingua* 102: 87-113.
- Bernstein, J. and Tortora, C. 2005. Two types of possessive forms in English. *Lingua* 115: 1221-1242.
- Börjars, K. 2003. Morphological status and (de) grammaticalisation: the Swedish possessive. *Nordic Journal of Linguistics* 26: 133-136.
- Börjars, K., Denison, D. and Scott, A. 2007. Dimensions of clitics. Paper presented at the LAGB, King's college. London.

- Burzio, L. 1995. The role of the antecedent in anaphoric relations. In *Current Issues in Comparative Grammar*, R. Freidin (ed.), 1-45. Dordrecht: Kluwer.
- Cardinaletti, A. Giusti, G. & Haegeman, L. (in progress) DP-internal particles and the structure of DP.
- Cinque, C. 2005. Deriving Greenberg's Universal 20. *Linguistic Inquiry* 36: 315-332.
- Corver, N. 2007. Uniformity and diversity in the syntax of evaluative vocatives. Ms. U. Utrecht.
- Corver, N. 2009. A micro-comparative perspective on (floating) universal numeric quantifiers. Paper presented at the workshop on the occasion of Robert Cirillo's thesis defense. Amsterdam: 19 May 2009.
- Corver, N and Van Koppen, M. 2009. Ellipsis in Dutch possessor noun phrases: a comparative approach. Ms. University of Utrecht.
- De Bo, L.L. 1892. *Westvlaamsch Idioticon*. Ed. Joseph Samyn. Gent 1892.
- Debrabandere, F. 1999. *Kortrijks Woordenboek*. Kortrijk/Brugge.
- Delsing, L.-O. 1998. Possession in Germanic. In: A. Alexiadou and C. Wilder (eds), 87-108.
- Den Dikken, M. 2006. *Relators and Linkers: The Syntax of Predication, Predicate Inversion and Copulas*. Boston: MIT press.
- Desnerck, R. 1972. *Oostends Woordenboek*. Handzame
- Fiva, T. 1984. NP-internal chains in Norwegian. *Working Papers in Scandinavian Syntax*. 14
- Giusti, G. 1996. Is there a FocusP and a TopicP in the noun phrase structure? *University of Venice Working Papers in Linguistics* 6: 105-128.
- Haegeman, L. 1992. *Theory and Description in Generative Grammar: a Case Study of West Flemish*. Cambridge University Press.
- Haegeman, L. 2000. The external possessor construction in West Flemish. [GG@G](#), *Generative Grammar in Geneva* 1: 1-20.
- Haegeman, L. 2001. Word classes in Germanic: the case of West Flemish. In *Sprachkontakt, Sprachvergleich, Sprachvariation. Festschrift für Professor Gottfried Kolde*, K. Adamzik and H. Christen (eds.), 201-255. Tübingen: Max Niemeyer.
- Haegeman, L. 2003. West Flemish possessor doubling and the anaphor agreement effect. *Germania et alia. A linguistic webschrift presented to Hans den Besten.* H. van Riemsdijk and J. Koster (eds). ISBN: 90-9017951-8
- Haegeman, L. 2004a. DP periphery and clausal periphery: possessor doubling in West Flemish. In *Peripheries. Syntactic Edges and their Effects*, D. Adger, C. de Cat, and G. Tsoulas (eds.), 211-240. Dordrecht: Kluwer.
- Haegeman, L. 2004b. A DP-internal anaphor agreement effect. *Linguistic Inquiry* 35: 704-712.
- Haegeman, L. 2004c. Reciprocals as prenominal possessors in West Flemish. In *Structure et discours. Mélanges offerts à Eddy Roulet*, A Auchlin., M. Burger, L. Filliettaz, A. Grobet, J. Moeschler, L. Perrin, C. Rossari and L. de Saussure (eds), 211-245. Québec : Editions Nota Bene.
- Haegeman, L. 2008. The cartography of discourse markers in West Flemish. To appear in *COPIL*. Ms. University of Ghent.
- Haegeman, L. 2009. Three positions for prenominal possessors in West Flemish. Paper presented at the University of Utrecht, OTS. *Atoms and Laws of the NP*. 2-3 July 2009.
- Haeseryn, W., K. Romijn, G. Geerts, J. de Rooij, M.C. van den Toorn ((1997) *Algemene Nederlandse Spraakkunst*. Groningen: Martinus Nijhoff.
- Hendriks, J. 2002. Agreement and animacy in 'auxiliary pronoun possessives' in Middle and Early Modern Dutch. *Proceedings of the 2002 conference of the Australian Linguistics Society*.

- Hudson, R. 2009. A cognitive analysis of the word 'S. Paper presented at the Workshop on Morpho-syntactic categories and the expression of possession. 3-4 April 2009. <http://www.humanities.Manchester.ac.uk/medialibrary /llc/files/ possessives/ Hudson.pdf>
- Kolliakou, D. 1999. De-phrase extractability and individual/property denotation. *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory* 17: 713-781.
- Koptjevskaja-Tamm, M. 2003. Possessive noun phrases in the languages of Europe. In *Noun Phrase Structure in the Languages of Europe*, F. Plank (ed.), 621-722. Berlin, New York: Mouton de Gruyter,.
- Kranendonk, H. 2010. *Quantificational constructions in the nominal domain. Facets of Dutch microvariation*. Ph.Diss. OTS, Utrecht
- Leu, T. 2008. *The internal syntax of determiners*. PhD. Diss, New York University.
- Munaro, N. 2006. Looking for the atoms of the left periphery: on the interface legibility of interjections and particles. *Interface Legibility at the Edge*. Bucharest, 25-27 June 2006. <http://www.er.uqam.ca/nobel/asymet/conferences/2006/Munaro.pdf>
- Munaro, N. and C. Poletto 2003. Ways of clause typing. *Rivista di Grammatica Generativa* 27: 87-105.
- Munaro, N. and Poletto, C. 2009. Sentential particles and clausal typing in the Veneto dialects. In *Dislocated Elements in Discourse: Syntactic, Semantic, and Pragmatic Perspectives*, P. Cook, W. Frey, and C. Maienborn (eds). New York: Routledge.
- Philippa, M., De Brabandere F., Quack A., Schoonheim, T. and van der Sijs, N. 2007. *EWN A-R*. Amsterdam University Press. [www.etymologie.nl](http://www.etymologie.nl)
- Ponelis, F. A. 1979. *Afrikaanse Sintaksis*. J.L. Hatfield, Pretoria: Van Schalk.
- Ponelis, F. A. 1992. Die ontwikkeling van die possessief in Afrikaans. In *De Binnenbouw van het Nederlands*, H. Bennis and J.W. de Vries (eds.), 273-290. ICG publications: Dordrecht.
- Rigterink, M. 2005. Demonstrative constructions involving deictic adverbs. Handout TABU-dag, 03.06.05.
- Rizzi, L. 1990. On the anaphor agreement effect. *Rivista di Linguistica* 2: 27-42.
- Roehrs, B. 2009. *Demonstratives and Definite Articles as Nominal Auxiliaries*. Amsterdam and Philadelphia: Benjamins.
- Salzmann, M. 2008. Silent resumptives in Zurich German possessor relativization. Paper presented at the workshop Perspektiven Minimalistischer Syntax Leipzig, October 2008.
- Schoorlemmer, M. 1998. Possessors, articles and definiteness. In *Possessors, Predicates and Movement in the Determiner Phrase*, A. Alexiadou and C. Wilder (eds.), Amsterdam: Benjamins.
- Taeldeman, J. 1995. *Jan Z'N + nomen*. Over een bezitsconstructie in de Vlaamse dialecten. *Taal en Tongval* 47: 220-228.
- Vries, M. de 2006. Possessive relatives and (Heavy) pied-piping. *Journal of Comparative Germanic Linguistics* 9: 1-52.
- Weiss, H. 2008. The possessor that appears twice. Variation, structure and function of possessive doubling in German. In *Syntax and Semantics 36: Microvariation in Syntactic Doubling*, J. Barbiers, Koenenman, O., M. Lekakou and M. van der Ham (eds). 381-401. Bingley UK: Emerald Publishing.
- Woolford, E. 1999. More on the anaphor-agreement effect. *Linguistic Inquiry* 10: 257-87.

<sup>1</sup> This research is being funded by FWO through the 2009-Odysseus grant-G091409. Thanks to Alan Scott and Maria Koptjevskaja for their helpful comments on an earlier version of this paper. Needless to say all remaining shortcomings are my own.

- 2 See also Haegeman (2003, 2004a,b,c). For more examples of languages with possessor doubling see,  
among others, Delsing (1993, 1998), Fiva (1984), Koptjevskaja-Tamm (2003), De Vries (2006),  
Salzmann (2008), Weiss (2008). For English dialects in West Somerset (*Mary Jones her book*) see  
3 Wright (1905) (Bernstein and Tortora 2005: 1233)
- 4 Taeldeman (1995) suggests that one option for the development of *sen* could be the weakening and  
generalisation of the masculine singular *zyn* to all genders (1995: 227).
- 5 Moreover while in WF the pronominal system is still gender based with masculine nominal constituents  
picked up by means of the pronoun *hij* ('he') and feminine constituents by means of *zij* ('she'),  
including for inanimate expressions, in Standard Dutch the demonstrative gender neutral form *die* is  
often used.
- 6 For similar effects in English see Bernstein & Tortora (2005: 1229).
- 7 Some speakers do not accept group genitives, hence the diacritic %.
- 8 This example improves with *ut Gent* as an afterthought.
- 9 With the relative clause as an afterthought, the example improves.  
*Der* would be licit when, for instance, related to a stranded P:
- (i) da-n der die student-en a dikkerst over geklaapt ee-n  
That-PL there those student-PL already often about talk-PTCP have-3PL  
'that those students have already often talked about it'
- 10 Thanks to Gertjan Postma for discussing these data with me. See also Haegeman (2004a,b) for  
discussion of the agreement relations.
- 11 See Salzmann (2008) for similar data in Zurich German.
- 12 See Haegeman (2004a) for arguments that this is not possessor movement. See Fiva (1984) for  
extraction in Norwegian.
- 13 The optionalilty of the movement is problematic and suggests that the syntax of initial and final *zè* must  
be differentiated. I will return to this in future work. See also Cardinaletti, Giusti and Haegeman (in  
progress).
- 14 Thanks to Maaïke Schoorlemmer p.c. for bringing up this option.
- 15 See also Haegeman (2009) and Cardinaletti, Giusti and Haegeman (in preparation) for discussion of the  
DP internal structure.