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Part I: Two pronominal possessor constructions in West Flemish

1. Introduction: Two kinds of pronominal possessors in the Lapscheure dialect

(1) a Valèresen hoed DP+ sen + NP ‘genitive construction’
   Valère-sen hat

b (Valère) zenen hoed (DP) + poss.pronoun + NP ‘doubling construction’
   (Valère ) his hat

Synchronically: ‘sen’ in contemporary WF (1a) is not simply the reduced/weak form of the masculine
possessive pronoun zenen in (1b).

(1) c Mariesen hoed DP+ sen + NP ‘genitive construction’
   Marie-sen hat

d (Marie) euren hoed (DP) + poss.pronoun + NP ‘doubling construction’
   (Marie ) her hat

The WF sen construction is reminiscent of the Afrikaans construction. Where relevant I will point at some
differences between the two patterns.

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

(W)Flemish vs. Standard Dutch
For many (though not all) speakers of WF, the sen construction is more productive than the –s genitive
in StD, which, for many speakers, is almost restricted to proper names and kinship terms. See Corver
The doubling construction also exists in informal StD (ANS 1990: 163, 294, 822).

1.1. The sen construction (Haegeman 2004)
-sen invariant: no agreement with possessor or possessum

(3) a Valère sen hund Marie sen hund MSG
   Valère sen dog Marie sen dog

b Valère sen hoage Marie sen hoage FSG
   Valère sen hedge Marie sen hedge

c Valère sen hus Marie sen hus NEUT
   Valère sen house Marie sen house

d Valère sen huzen Marie sen huzen PL
   Valère sen houses Marie sen houses

e *djungers sen hus *die mensen sen hus
   the children sen house those people sen house

possessor^4_{sg} sen_{sg} NP

-se/sen alternation: -sen/se: independent of φ features of POSSESSUM
-roughly: se [___#C], sen [___#V] (Taeldeman 1995)
-sen is not an adjectival inflection (see below)

Table 1: sen vs se

---

1 This research is being funded by FWO through the 2009-Odysseus grant-G091409.
2 See also Haegeman (2003, 2004a,b,c)
3 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).
4 I use the label possessor in a broad sense. The relevant nominal may also have a thematic relation to the
 N. See section 2.
POSSUM begins with—→ V C

POSSUM ↓

MASCULINE SG  
Mariesen hoet  
Marie *sen* hat  
Marise *paraplu*  
Marie *se* umbrella

FEMININE SG  
Mariesen henne  
Marie *sen* hen  
Marise *veste*  
Marie *se* jacket

NEUTER SINGULAR  
Mariesen hoedje  
Marie *sen* little hat  
Marise *kleed*  
Marie *se* dress

Plural  
Mariesen hoeten/hennen/hoedjes  
Marie *sen* hats/hens/little hats  
Marise paraplus/vesten/kleren  
Marie *se* umbrellas/jackets/clothes

1.2. The doubling construction: ⁵

- possessive pronoun  - matches possessor (*zijn* ('his'), *eur* ('her'), *under* ('their'))
- agrees with possesuum for gender and number (*MSG* = *en*)

- possessive pronoun agrees with POSSUM:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>MASC SG</th>
<th>FEM SG</th>
<th>NEUT SG</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a</td>
<td>euren hoed</td>
<td>eur veste</td>
<td>eur kleed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>her—MSG hat</td>
<td>her jacket</td>
<td>her dress</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b</td>
<td>Marie euren hoed</td>
<td>Marie eur veste</td>
<td>Marie eur kleed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Marie her—MSG hat</td>
<td>Marie her jacket</td>
<td>Marie her dress</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The *en*- ending of the third person MASC possessive pronoun is not the same as that of adjectives, but is like that of determiners:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>MASC</th>
<th>FEM</th>
<th>NEUT</th>
<th>PLURAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Hoed</strong></td>
<td>Hoed</td>
<td>veste</td>
<td>kleed</td>
<td>kleren</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Eur</strong> ('her')</td>
<td>Eur(en)</td>
<td>Eur</td>
<td>Eur</td>
<td>eur</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Dieren</strong> ('expensive')</td>
<td>Dieren</td>
<td>Diere</td>
<td>Dier</td>
<td>diere</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The possessive pronoun used in the doubling construction has the same properties as that in the non doubling pattern. Possessive pronoun matches POSSESSOR in person-number-gender:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>MASC</th>
<th>FEM</th>
<th>NEUT</th>
<th>PLURAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Hoed</strong></td>
<td>Hoed</td>
<td>veste</td>
<td>kleed</td>
<td>kleren</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Valère</strong> (MASC)</td>
<td>Zen(en)</td>
<td>Zen</td>
<td>Zen</td>
<td>zen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Marie</strong> (FEM)</td>
<td>Eur(en)</td>
<td>Eur</td>
<td>Eur</td>
<td>eur</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Djoengers</strong> (Pl.)</td>
<td>Under(en)</td>
<td>Under</td>
<td>Under</td>
<td>under</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. Comparing the WF prenominal possessor constructions: similarities

2.1. Constituency

(5) a. [Marie se boek] een-k a gelezen. Marie\textit{sen} book have-I already read
   b. [Marie euren boek] een-k a gelezen. Marie\textit{her-MSG} book have-I already read

(6) a. K'een geklaapt [over [Marie se boek]]. I have talked about Marie\textit{sen} book
   b. K'een geklaapt [over [Marie euren boek]]. I have talked about Marie\textit{her-MSG} book

(7) a. K'een [Marie se blouse] en [Marleen se rok] gewassen. I have Marie\textit{sen} shirt and Marleen\textit{sen} skirt washed
   b. K'een [Marie eur blouse] en [Marleen eure(n) rok] gewassen. I have Marie\textit{her} shirt and Marleen\textit{her} skirt washed
   c. K'een [Marie sen blouse] en [Marleen eure(n) rok] gewassen. I have Marie\textit{sen} shirt and Marleen\textit{her} skirt washed
   d. K'een [Marie eur blouse] en [Marleen sen rok] gewassen. I have Marie\textit{her} shirt and Marleen\textit{sen} skirt washed

2.2. Thematic relations and thematic hierarchy

- \textit{sen}: not exclusively POSSESSOR role;
  - hierarchy: POSSESSOR > AGENT > THEME (Cinque 1980, Kolliakou 1999)

(8) a. Marie se foto stung in de gezette. Marie\textit{sen} picture stood in the newspaper
   (i) POSSESSOR, (ii) AGENT/CREATOR, (iii) THEME
   b. K'een Marie se schilderye van Picasso gekocht. I have Marie\textit{sen} painting of Picasso bought
   c. thematic relations: Marie: POSSESSOR, \textit{Picasso} : AGENT / THEME
      Marie: AGENT \textit{Picasso} : THEME
      *Marie: THEME, \textit{Picasso} POSSESSOR
      *Marie: THEME, \textit{Picasso} AGENT
      *Marie: AGENT, \textit{Picasso} POSSESSOR

- ‘possessive pronoun’: not exclusively POSSESSOR role
  - hierarchy: POSSESSOR > AGENT > THEME (Cinque 1980, Kolliakou 1999)

(9) a. Eure(n) foto stung in de gezette. her-MSG picture stood in the newspaper
   (i) POSSESSOR, (ii) AGENT, (iii) THEME
   b. K'een eur schilderye van Picasso gekocht. I have her picture of Picasso bought
   c. thematic relations = (8c)

- possessor doubling: not exclusively POSSESSOR role
  - hierarchy: POSSESSOR > AGENT > THEME (Cinque 1980, Kolliakou 1999)

(10) a. Marie eure(n) foto stung in de gezette. Marie her-MSG picture stood in the newspaper
    (i) POSSESSOR, (ii) AGENT/CREATOR, (iii) THEME
    b. K'een Marie eur schilderye van Picasso gekocht. I have Marie her painting of Picasso bought
    c. thematic relations = (8c)
2.3. Realisation of the prenominal possessor

2.3.1. Semantic properties

[+ANIMATE, (+HUMAN)] constraint

\[
\begin{array}{llll}
\text{constraint} & \text{prepositional phrase} & \text{subject} & \text{possessor} \\
\text{(11) a} & \text{die katte se steert} & \text{that cat} & \text{tail} \\
& \text{die duve se vlerke} & \text{that pigeon} & \text{wing} \\
& \text{*die musse se vlerke} & \text{that sparrow} & \text{wing} \\
b & \text{?die katte euren steert} & \text{that cat's} & \text{tail} \\
& \text{die duve eur vlerke} & \text{that pigeon's} & \text{wing} \\
& \text{?? die musse eur vlerke} & \text{that sparrow's} & \text{wing} \\
c & \text{*die dooze se deksele} & \text{that box's} & \text{cover} \\
& \text{*die deure se slot} & \text{that door} & \text{lock} \\
& \text{*die veste se senteure} & \text{that jacket} & \text{belt} \\
d & \text{*die dooze eur deksele} & \text{that door her} & \text{lid} \\
& \text{*die deure eur slot} & \text{that door her} & \text{lock} \\
& \text{*die veste eur senteure} & \text{that jacket} & \text{belt} \\
\end{array}
\]

Observe that this constraint does not apply to Afrikaans:

\[
\begin{array}{llll}
\text{(12) a} & \text{die boek se omslag} & \text{That book} & \text{cover} \\
& \text{die stoel se leuning} & \text{that chair} & \text{back} \\
b & \text{die fiets se voorwiel} & \text{that bicycle} & \text{front wheel} \\
& \text{die ketting se skakels} & \text{that chain} & \text{links} \\
c & \text{die haelstorm se skade} & \text{the hailstorm} & \text{damage} \\
& \text{\textcolor{red}{\text{(Ponelis 1979: 126-7)}}} \\
d & \text{gister se vertoning} & \text{yesterday} & \text{show} \\
& \text{hebreus se grammaticka} & \text{hebrew} & \text{grammar} \\
e & \text{die water se grens} & \text{the water} & \text{line} \\
& \text{Europe se bevolking} & \text{Europe} & \text{population} \\
f & \text{potplante se blae} & \text{potplants} & \text{leaves} \\
& \text{twee jaar gelede se begroting} & \text{two years ago} & \text{budget} \\
& \text{\textcolor{red}{\text{(Ponelis 1992: 283)}}} \\
\end{array}
\]

+/- definite (see 2.6.)

Quantificational:

\[
\begin{array}{ll}
\text{(13) a} & \text{Da-s niemandse velo.} \\
& \text{That is no one} \text{-} \text{sen bicycle} \text{.'} \\
& \text{‘That is no one’s bicycle.’} \\
b & \text{Da-s niemand eure(n) velo.} \\
& \text{that is no one her-MSG bicycle} \\
& \text{‘That is no one’s bicycle.’} \\
\end{array}
\]

2.3.2. Syntactic properties

'Group genitive' (Delsing 1998, Jespersen 1934, 1938)

In standard Dutch the 'group genitive' is restricted in use:

\[
\begin{array}{ll}
\text{Een vooropgeplaatste genitief op –s komt in de standaardtaal alleen voor bij eigennamen en bij sommige soortnamen die als aanspreking gebruikt kunnen worden. De soortnamen kunnen eventueel door een bezittelijk voornaamwoord , maar niet door andere woorden, voorafgegaan worden. (ANS: I: 163)} \\
\text{Tr:lh : A preposed genitive in –s occurs in the standard language only with proper names and with some common nouns which can be used as terms of address. The common names may possibly be preceded by a possessive pronoun but not by other words.} \\
\end{array}
\]

WF(14)a. \text{de nieuwe juffrouw se velo} \\
\text{the new miss sen bicycle} \\
\text{b} \text{6 \% [de (nieuwe) juffrouw van Frans] se velo} \text{postnominal PP} \\
\text{the (new) miss of French sen bicycle} \\
\text{b’ *de (nieuwe) juffrouw se [van Frans] velo} \\
\]

\text{6 Some WF speakers seem to restrict the possessor to proper names, like in St.D.}
b’’ ??de (nieuwe) juffrouw se velo [van Frans]  
extrapolated modifier: *

c’ %6 [men vriendinne ut Gent] se velo  
my friend from Ghent sen bicycle

c’’ * Men vriendinne sen [ut Gent] velo  
my friend who in Ghent lives sen bicycle

d’ %6 [men vriendinne die in Gent weunt] se velo  
my friend who in Ghent lives sen bicycle

d’’ * ?men vriendinne se velo [die in Gent weunt]

e de nieuwe juffrouw sen (eersten) eigen velo (cf. Börjars 2003: 148)
the new miss se (first) own bicycle

Ponelis (1979: 126) provides the following for Afrikaans:

\( (15) \) my koei wat dood is se vel
My cow that dead is se skin

\( (16) \)

\( a. \) [de nieuwe juffrouw] eure(n) velo  
the new miss her bycicle

\( b \) [de (nieuwe) juffrouw van Frans] euren velo  
the (new) miss of French her bicycle

\( b’ \) *de (nieuwe) juffrouw euren velo [van Frans]  
the new miss of French her bicycle

\( c \) [men vriendinne ut Gent] eure(n) velo  
my friend from Ghent her bicycle

\( c’ \) ?men vriendinne eure(n) velo [ut Gent]

\( d \) [men vriendinne die in Gent weunt] eure(n) velo  
my friend who in Ghent lives her-MSG bicycle

\( d’ \) * ?men vriendinne eure(n) velo [die in Gent weunt]

\( e \) de nieuwe juffrouw euren (eersten) eigen velo (cf. Börjars 2003: 148)
the new miss her (first) own bicycle

2.4. (Mixed) Recursion

\( (17) \)

\( a. \) [DP1 [DP1 [DP3 Marie] se moeder] se veste]  
Marie se mother sen jacket

\( b \) [DP1 [DP3 Marie] eur moeder] eur veste]  
Marie her mother her jackt

\( c \) [DP1 [DP2 DP3 Marie] eur moeder] se veste]  
Marie her moeder her skirt

\( d \) [DP1 [DP2 DP3 Marie] se moeder] eur veste]  
Marie her moeder her skirt

2.5. Prenominal possessor: unique

\( (18) \)

\( a. \) *Marie eur Jan zenen foto  
Marie her Jan his picture

Cf. Marie eure(n) foto van Jan  
Marie her-MSG picture of Jan

\( b \) *Marie eur Janse foto  
Marie her Jan sen picture

Cf. Mariesen foto van Jan  
Marie’s picture of Jan

2.6. Definiteness of DP determined by definiteness of prenominal possessor

Diagnostic: WF:

(i) \( Er \) insertion is obligatory with (copy/trace of) all indefinite (non-generic) subjects.

\( 7 \) Observe that the group genitive is also possible when the possessor ends in a verb (cf. Börjars, Denison and Scot (2007:5) on English).
(19)  a  k peinzen dan *(der) (drie/vee) studenten diene(n) boek goan lezen.
I think that *(there) (three/many) students that book go read
‘I think that (three/many) students will read that book.’

b  k geloven dan (*der) katten we gas eten. (generic)
I believe that *(there) cats indeed grass eat
‘I believe that cats do eat grass.’

c  k peinzen dan *(der) de studenten diene(n) boek we goan lezen. (definite)
I think that *(there) the students that book well go read
‘I think that the students will read that book.’

d  Wien/Weknen aannemer peinzje-gie dat *(der) dat hus goa kuopen?
Who/which contractor think-you you that *(there) that house goes buy
‘Who /which contractor do you think will buy that house?’

Indefinite (non-generic) subjects need not be adjacent to conjunction+der, definite subjects must be adjacent to conjunction (or to finite V).

(20)  a  k peinzen dan der van d joare (drie/vee) studenten diene(n) boek goan lezen.
I think that there of this year (three/many) students that book go read
‘I think that (three/many) students will read that book this year.’

b  *k geloven dan *neu katten we gas eten. (generic)
I believe that now cats indeed grass eat
‘I believe that cats do eat grass now.’

c  *k peinzen dan van djoare de studenten diene(n) boek we goan lezen. (definite)
I think that this year the students that book well go read
‘I think that this year the students will read that book.’

Prenominal possessor determines definiteness of DP (cf Schoorlemmer 1998: 75)

(21)  a  kpeinzen dat *(der) gisteren [en studentinne sen us] verkocht is.
I think that there yesterday a female-student sen house sold is
[en studentinne sen us]: indefinite

b  kpeinzen dat (*der) (*gisteren) [die studentinne sen hus] verkocht is.
I think that *(there) (*yesterday) that female-student sen house sold is
[die studentinne sen hus]: definite

c  [Wekken studentinne sen hus] is *(ter) verkocht?
which female student sen house is *(there) sold
[wekken studentinne sen hus]: indefinite

d  tschynt dat (*der) [en weewe sen hus] atent goed verkuopt. (Generic)
it seems that *(there) a widow sen house always well sells
[en weewe sen us]: generic/definite

(22)  a  kpeinzen dat *(der) al [en studentinne eur us] verkocht is.
I think that *(there) already a female-student her house sold is
[en studentinne eur us]: indefinite

b  kpeinzen dat (*der) al [die studentinne eur hus] verkocht is.
I think that *(there) already that female-student her house sold is
[die studentinne eur us]: definite

c  [Wekken studentinne eur hus] is *(ter) verkocht?
which female student her house is *(there) sold
[wekken studentinne eur hus]: indefinite

Der would be licit when, for instance, related to a stranded P:
(i)  dan der die studenten a dikkerst over geklaapt een
that there those students already often about talked have
‘that those students have already often talked about it’

Definiteness of containing DP independent of definiteness of postnominal van DP:

(23) a Ze zeggen dat *(der) [een hus van nen/dienen student] verkocht is.
   they say that *(there) a house of a/that student sold is
   [een hus van nen student]: indefinite
   [een hus van diene(n) student]: indefinite

b Ze zeiden dat *(der) [t hus van nen/dienen student] a verkocht is.
   they said that *(there) the house of a/that student already sold is
   [t hus van nen student]: definite
   [t hus van diene(n) student]: definite

2.7. Summary

Table 4: Similarities between the two possessor constructions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Constituent with possessum</th>
<th>Sen possessor</th>
<th>Doubling construction</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Thematic relation (AGENT, THEME etc)</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hierarchy: POSS&gt;AG&gt;TH</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Animacy effect</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quantifier possessor</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+/-Definite possessor</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Possessor: complex DP</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Definiteness of possessor determines definiteness DP</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3. Differences between the sen genitive and the doubling construction

3.1 Agreement:
- se/sen alternation: -sen/se: independent of ϕ features of POSSESSUM
  -roughly: se [____#C], sen [____#V] (Taeldeman 1995)

-sen is not an adjectival inflection (cf. Table 5)

Table 5: inflection of prenominal adjectives in -se in WF

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Articles</th>
<th>Indefinite</th>
<th>Definite</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Masculine sg</td>
<td>Nen gedomsen hund</td>
<td>diene(n) gedomsen hund</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A god-damn- sen dog</td>
<td>that god damn sen dog</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feminine sg</td>
<td>En gedomse henne</td>
<td>Die gedomse henne</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A goddamn se hen</td>
<td>that goddamn-se hen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neuter singular</td>
<td>En gedomse hundje</td>
<td>da gedomse hundje</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A goddams doggie</td>
<td>that goddamn-s doggie</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Masculine plural</td>
<td>Ø gedomse hunden</td>
<td>Die gedomse hunden</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ø goddamn- se dogs</td>
<td>those goddamn-se dogs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feminine plural</td>
<td>Ø gedomse hennen</td>
<td>Die gedomse hennen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ø goddamn- se hens</td>
<td>those goddamn-se hens</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Neuter plural

| ∅ gedomse hundjes | ∅ goddamn-se doggies | Die gedomse hundjes | those goddamn-se doggies |

#### 3.2. Number restriction on *sen* possessor:

-singular restriction: the possessor in the *sen* construction is singular:

<p>| | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>Mariesen hoed</td>
<td>b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Marie <em>sen</em> hat</td>
<td>Marie her <em>MSG</em> hat</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>c</td>
<td>*djoengers sen hoed</td>
<td>d</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>the children <em>sen</em> hat</td>
<td>the people <em>sen</em> money</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>e</td>
<td>djoengers underen hoed</td>
<td>f</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>the children <em>their</em>–<em>MSG</em> hat</td>
<td>the people <em>their</em> money</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

But:

<p>| | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>Valère en Godelieve sen oto</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Valère and Godelieve <em>sen</em> car</td>
<td>Marie her <em>MSG</em> hat</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>b</td>
<td>??Valère en Godelieve underen oto</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Valère and Godelieve their–<em>MSG</em> car</td>
<td>Marie her <em>MSG</em> hat</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>c</td>
<td>Valère en Godelieve <em>zyzen</em>/euren oto</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Valère and Godelieve <em>his/her</em>–<em>MSG</em> car</td>
<td>Marie her <em>MSG</em> hat</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6: Summary: agreement patterns *sen* construction and doubling construction

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Sen</th>
<th>Pronoun</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>With POSSESSUM</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+ (NUMBER, GENDER)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>With POSSSESSOR</td>
<td>+SG (NUMBER)</td>
<td>+ (PERSON, NUMBER, GENDER)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The number restriction in the *sen* construction concerns the features of the (head of the) possessor, the number of the N adjacent to the possessor is not relevant:

(26)  a [men *vriendinne* me al eur *katten*] *sen* us
     my friend with all her cat's house
     SG head noun + *sen*
     PL N *katten* ('cats') in complement adjacent to *sen* not relevant
     b de *dochter* van men *vriendinne* *sen* *exoamen*
     the daughter of my friend *sen* *exam*
     c *de dochters* van men *vriendinne* *sen* *exoamen*
     the daughters of my friend *sen* *exam*
     *dochters* ('daughters'): PL head noun: * sen
     *vriendinne* ('friend'): SG N in complement and adjacent to *sen*: not relevant

#### 3.3. Reciprocal possessors (Haegeman 2003, 2004b,c) (see section 4.3 below)

(27)  a dan *ze* mekoar-*se* teksten gelezen een
     that they each-other *sen* texts read have
     b *dan* *ze* mekoar under/*zen*/eur teksten gelezen een
     that they each-other *their*/*his/her* texts read have

Incompatibility of reciprocal possessor with the doubling construction in StD and German:

(28)  a Dutch *Ze hebben elkaars hun/z'n/d'r gasten gezien.*
     they have each other their/his/her guests seen (ANS 1990: vol II: 822.)
     b Dutch Ze hebben elkaars gasten gezien.
     they have each other's guests seen (ANS 1990: vol II: 822.)
     c German *Sie haben einander ihre Gäste gesehen.*
     they have each other their guests seen (Cornelia Hamann, p.c)
Indirect object reciprocal is not excluded as such:

(29)  
\[ \begin{align*} 
& \text{a} \quad \text{WF dan ze mekoar gisteren under gasten vooren gesteld een} \\
& \quad \text{that they each other yesterday their guests presented have} \\
& \text{b} \quad \text{Du dat ze elkaar gisteren hun gasten voorgesteld hebben} \\
& \quad \text{that they each other yesterday their guests presented have} \\
& \text{c} \quad \text{Ge dass sie einander gestern ihre Gäste vorgestellt haben} \\
& \quad \text{that they each other yesterday their guests presented have} 
\end{align*} \]

3.4. Adjacency POSSESSOR and \textit{sen}

3.4.1. prenominal quantifiers (\textit{al-} \textit{heel})

(30)  
\[ \begin{align*} 
& \text{a} \quad \text{k'een [al [Marie sen boeken]] gezien.} \\
& \quad \text{I have all Marie \textit{sen} books seen} \\
& \text{b} \quad \text{[al [Marie sen boeken]] een-k gezien} \\
& \quad \text{all Marie \textit{sen} books have I seen} \\
& \text{c} \quad \ast \text{k'een [Marie al sen boeken] gezien.} \\
& \text{d} \quad \ast \text{[Marie [Q al [Q al][F t sen boeken]]]} \\
\end{align*} \]

(25)  
\[ \begin{align*} 
& \text{a} \quad \text{k'een [al [Marie eur boeken]] gezien.} \\
& \quad \text{I have all Marie her books seen} \\
& \text{b} \quad \text{[al [Marie eur boeken]] een-k gezien} \\
& \quad \text{All Marie her books have- I seen} \\
& \text{c} \quad \text{k'een [Marie al eur boeken] gezien.} \\
& \quad \text{I have Marie all eur books seen} \\
& \text{d} \quad \text{[Marie al eur boeken] een-k gezien} \\
& \quad \text{constituent: V2} \\
& \text{e} \quad \text{[Marie al eur boeken]} \\
& \quad \text{constituent: V2} \\
\end{align*} \]

(26)  
\[ \begin{align*} 
& \text{a} \quad \text{k'een [heel Marie sen brief] gelezen.} \\
& \quad \text{I have whole Mary \textit{sen} letter read} \\
& \quad \text{‘I have read all of Mary’s letter’} \\
& \text{b} \quad \text{[Heel Marie sen brief] een-k gelezen.} \\
& \quad \text{=constituent (V2)} \\
& \text{c} \quad \ast \text{k'een [Marie heel sen brief ] gelezen.} \\
& \quad \ast \text{Possible Q sen NP} \\
\end{align*} \]

(27)  
\[ \begin{align*} 
& \text{a} \quad \text{k'een [heel [Marie euren brief]]} \text{ gelezen.} \\
& \quad \text{I have whole Mary her MASC SG letter read} \\
& \text{b} \quad \text{[Heel [Marie euren brief] ] een-k gelezen} \\
& \quad \text{constituent: V2} \\
& \text{c} \quad \text{k'een [Marie heel euren brief] gelezen.} \\
& \quad \text{I have Marie whole her-MASC SG letter read} \\
\end{align*} \]

3.4.2. Appositives/ NRR

(28)  
\[ \begin{align*} 
& \text{a} \quad \ast \text{men moeder, die eure(n) pols gebroken eet, sen velo} \\
\end{align*} \]

---

9 \textit{Alle mole} (‘all’) behaves differently:

\[ \begin{align*} 
& \text{(i) a} \quad \text{k'een allemole [Marie eur boeken] gezien.} \\
& \quad \text{I have all Marie her books seen} \\
& \text{b} \quad \ast \text{?? k'een Marie allemole eur boeken gezien.} \\
& \quad \text{I have Marie all eur books seen} \\
& \text{Perhaps \textit{alle mole} occupies a specifier position and blocks XP movement of \textit{Marie}.} \\
\end{align*} \]

10 \textit{Heelegans} (‘all/whole’) behaves differently:

\[ \begin{align*} 
& \text{(i) a} \quad \text{k'een [heelegans [Marie euren brief]] gelezen.} \\
& \quad \text{I have \textit{heelegans} Mary her MASC SG letter read} \\
& \text{b} \quad \text{[Heelegans [Marie euren brief] ] een-k gelezen} \\
& \quad \text{I have Marie whole her-MASC SG letter read} \\
& \text{Perhaps \textit{heelegans} occupies a specifier position and blocks XP movement of \textit{Marie}.} \\
\end{align*} \]
my mother, who her wrist broken has, _sen_ bicycle

b  *Marleen, men beste vriendinne, _sen_ velo
Marleen, my best girlfriend, _sen_ bicycle

(29)  a.  men moeder, die eure(n) pols gebroken eet, eure(n) velo
my mother, who her wrist broken has, her–MSG bicycle

b  Marleen, men beste vriendinne, eure(n) velo
Marleen, my best girlfriend, her–MSG bicycle

3.4.3. ‘Remote’ possessor

(30)  a.  *Dat is die verpleegster dan-ze gisteren [DP sen hus] verkocht een.
that is that nurse that-PL-they yesterday _sen_ house sold have

b.  *Wekken verpleegster zei-je gie dan-ze gisteren [DP sen hus] verkocht een?
which nurse said-you –you that-PL-they yesterday _sen_ house sold have

(31)  a.  Dat is die verpleegster dan-ze gisteren [DP eur hus] verkocht een.
that is that nurse that-PL-they yesterday her house sold have

b.  ?Wekken verpleegster zei-je gie dan-ze gisteren [DP eur hus] verkocht een?
which nurse said you that-PL-they -they yesterday her house sold have

3.4.4. Deictic markers and possessors (see 5.3. for an account)

(32)  a [Marie hier] eet da gedoan.  V2→ constituent
Marie here has that done

b  Dat is van [Marie hier].  Complement of P→ constituent
that is of Marie here

c  [An [Marie hier]] meug-je da niet togen.  V2+Complement of P→ constituent
To Marie here may you that not show

d  [DP+ier]: ‘DP who is sitting here’, deictic, linked to speech situation

(33)  a  [Die studente hier] eet da gedoan.
that student here has that done

b  Dat is van [die studente hier].
that is of that student here

c  [An [die studente hier]] meug-je da niet togen.
to that student here may you that not show

(34)  a  Dat is Marie sen/eur uswerk.
that is Marie sen/her homework

b  *Dat is [Marie hier] sen uswerk.
that is [Marie hier] _sen_ homework

c  dat is [Marie hier] eur uswerk
that is Marie hier her homework

(35)  a  Dat is die studente sen/eur uswerk.
that is that female student _sen/her_ homework

b  *Dat is [die studente hier] sen uswerk.
that is that (female) student here _sen_ homework

c  Dat is [die studente hier] eur uswerk.
that is that (female) student here her homework

cf.  d  ?Dat is [die dochter [van hier] ] sen winkel
that is that daughter of here _sen_ shop

---

11 See Haegeman (2004a) for arguments that this is not possessor movement
3.4.5. Ellipsis of head noun of possessor construction

(36)  a Marie eur boeken  b *Marie eur ∅
       Marie her books
       c Marie d’eure  d *de Marie eure
       Marie de her+e
       e * Marie eure

(37)  a Marie se boeken  b *(de) Marie sen ∅
       Marie se books
       c *Marie de sen ∅

3.5. Summary

Table 7: differences between the two possessor constructions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Sen possessor</th>
<th>Doubling possessor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Agreement</td>
<td>SG possessor</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agreement possessum</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reciprocal possessor</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adjacency possessor in DP</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Possessor= appositive/NRR</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Remote possessor in clause</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deictic marker hier on possessor</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ellipsis of possessum</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+ (with article and –e ending)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Part II: Speculations on possessors and the syntax of the nominal projection


4.1. sen cf. genitive ‘s

- sen is not an adjectival ending (Table 5)
- parallel to ‘Saxon Genitive’, in also allowing ‘group genitive’ cf. (14)
- restriction to singular: similar to the English Saxon Genitive (cf. Börjars 2003)

Coordination

(38)  a Valère en Godelieve sen oto
       Valère and Godelieve sen car
       b John and Mary’s car  (Bernstein & Tortora (2005: 1229): collective reading preferred.

4.2. sen: inflectional head in nominal domain

(39)  a Marie sen nieuwen oto
       Marie sen new car
       b [DP [IP Marie [I,sen] [NP nieuwen oto]]]

The position of the sen possessor in the nominal IP-domain corresponds to the canonical subject position in the verbal IP domain (SpecIP).

---

12 We will see in section 5 that discourse markers are incompatible with the sen possessor and that they are compatible with the doubling possessor.

13 For the status of the English ‘s genitive see also Börjars (2003, 2007).
4.3. Variation in the agreement properties of the sen genitive correlates with variation in the copula

Den Dikken’s (1998): possessive ‘s’ corresponds to the third person singular of the nominal copula (is/was) (cf. Benveniste 1966): have = be + to.

Following Den Dikken (1998): WF possessive sen in the nominal inflectional domain corresponds to a copula in the clausal domain.

West Flemish and French Flemish (Marteel, 1992: 158): only singular possessor in sen construction;

(40) a me vaederse klakke b me moederschort
  my father–se cap         my mother–se pinafore
  c Marietjese veint
  Marie-DIM-se husband
  d me broersen appel e me voadersen erpels
  my brother–sen apple     my father–sen potatoes

Afrikaans: se-: nominal copula: both SG + PL

(41) a. Jan se bevele b. die predikant se motor
  Jan se orders         the curate se engine  (Ponelis 1979, p.126)
  c. die amptenare se verslag
    the official–PL se report   (Ponelis 1979, p.127)
  d. die besoekers se vriendelikheid
    the visitors –PL se kindness (Ponelis 1992 283)

Table 8: Inflectional paradigm of the copula ‘be’:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1sg</td>
<td>Am</td>
<td>zyn</td>
<td>zyn</td>
<td>Is</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2sg</td>
<td>Are</td>
<td>zyt</td>
<td>zyt</td>
<td>Is</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3sg</td>
<td>Is</td>
<td>is</td>
<td>is</td>
<td>Is</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1pl</td>
<td>Are</td>
<td>zyn</td>
<td>Zyn</td>
<td>Is</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2pl</td>
<td>Are</td>
<td>zyt</td>
<td>Zyt</td>
<td>Is</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3pl</td>
<td>Are</td>
<td>zyn</td>
<td>Zyn</td>
<td>Is</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.4. The reciprocal possessors

(42) a dan ze mekoar-se gasten gezien een
    that they each other se guests seen have
  b *dan ze mekoar under gasten gezien een
    that they each other their guests seen have
  c They read each other’s books.

(43) *They think that each other are nice. (cf. Woolford 1999, p. 257)

(44) a. A loro importa solo di se stessi. (Rizzi 1990, his (12b))
    to them matters (SG) only of themselves
    dative binds post-verbal anaphor
  b. *A loro interessano solo se stessi. (Rizzi 1990, his (13))
    to them interest (PL) only themselves
    dative cannot bind post-verbal anaphor

(45) The anaphor agreement effect. (Rizzi 1990: 26)
  Anaphors do not occur in syntactic positions construed with agreement.

Rizzi (1990) : Italian verbal agreement, being composed of person and number, is [+pronominal]/
  ‘referential’. Thus it is also [-anaphoric]. [+pronominal] verbal agreement enters into a CHAIN with the
element it is construed with. CHAIN formation between an anaphor and [+pronominal] agreement will
result in a clash in feature specifications and in binding requirements between the CHAIN links.\textsuperscript{14} [+anaphoric] elements are subject to principle A of the Binding Theory and [+pronominal] elements are subject to Principle B.

(42b): anaphor agreement effect: anaphor mekoar (‘each other’) construed with agreement (\textit{under} = person + number).

(42a): no agreement? But: WF \textit{se(n)} imposes a number ([+SINGULAR]) restriction on the prenominal possessor. So the anaphoric possessor (mekoar in (42a)) does enter into an agreement relation with \textit{se(n)}. Rizzi’s (1990) terms, the restriction to the [NUMBER] feature could be argued to entail that \textit{se(n)}-agreement cannot qualify as [+PRONOMINAL]. Putting it differently, \textit{se(n)} is not referential. The pronominal possessor \textit{under}, having person + number, is [+PRONOMINAL].

Burzio (1995, pp. 19-20) argues that the ban on construal of anaphors with agreement (45) should be related to relative strength of the agreement head. A ‘strong’ agreement head cannot be construed with anaphors, but a weak agreement head can. In the WF \textit{se(n)}-construction, nominal (possessor) agreement only encodes [NUMBER]; \textit{se(n)} lacks [PERSON] / [GENDER]. Hence, realised as \textit{se(n)}, WF nominal AGR is substantively weaker than its counterpart in the doubling constructions, which encodes [PERSON], [NUMBER] (and [GENDER]) features.

5. Possessors, DP internal particles and DP-internal movement

5.1. Clausal and nominal particles

(46) a Zè/né, m’een al een medalie.  
\textit{zè/né}, we have already a medal. ‘Look, we already have a medal. b M’een al een medalie \textit{zè/né}.  
we already have a medal, \textit{zè/nè} ‘We already have a medal, look.’ c \textit{Zè}, dienen boek moe-j lezen.  
\textit{zè} this book must-you read ‘This book you must read.’ d Dienen boek moe-j lezen \textit{zè}.  
this book must-you read \textit{zè}

Hypothesis: \textit{zè}: functional head that selects a clause as its complement and that may attract the clausal complement to its specifier (cf. Munaro and Poletto 2004 etc):

(47) a [[\textit{zè}] clause] \textit{zè} clause b [Clause [\textit{zè}] clause] clause \textit{zè}

(46) e Dienen boek \textit{zè} moe-j lezen  
this book \textit{zè} must-you read

(48) a Dienen boek hier \textit{zè} moe-j lezen!  
this book here \textit{zè} must you read ‘You should read this book here.’ b [\textit{dp} Dienen boek \textit{zè} hier] moe-j lezen! (49) a Dienen boek doa \textit{zè} moe-j lezen!  
this book there \textit{zè} the must you read b [\textit{dp} Dienen boek \textit{zè} doa] moe-j lezen!

(50) a [\textit{dp} Dienen boek gunter \textit{zè}] moe-j lezen!  
this book yonder \textit{zè} must you read b [\textit{dp} Dienen boek \textit{zè} gunter] moe-j lezen!

Proposal: in (48)-(50) particle \textit{zè} is DP internal. DP-internal \textit{zè} drives the movement of the containing DP to the clausal left periphery.

(51) a Ge moet [dienen boek]lezen.

\textsuperscript{14} For reasons of space, I am simplifying Rizzi’s account. See also Woolford’s (1999) discussion and her clarifications on the application of generalisation (2).
You must this book read
b *Ge moet [dienen boek zè hier] lezen.
You must this book zè here read
c [Dienen boek zè here] moe-j lezen

5.2. The possessor doubling construction in WF and the particle zè.

(52) a [Die studente eur werk] een-k gelezen.
that student her work have-I read
b [Al [die studente] eur werk] een-k gelezen.
all that student her work have-I read
d Q  DP  possess  NP  e  DP  Q  possess  NP

that student zè her work must you once read
b *[Al [die studente zè] eur werk] moe-j een kee lezen.
all that student zè her work must you once read.
d *Q  DP  zè  possess  NP  e  DP  zè  Q  possess  NP

(54) a [[Die studente zè hier] eur werk] moe-j een kee lezen.
that student zè here her work must you once read
b *[Al [die studente zè hier] eur werk] moe-j een kee lezen.
all that student zè here her work must you once read.
d *Q  DP  zè  hier  possess  NP  e  DP  zè  hier  Q  possess  NP

Observation.
In the doubling possessor construction, the possessor DP can move to the DP edge. This movement becomes obligatory when a possessor DP contains the particle zè. Why? To reach an edge of the DP (phase), from which zè triggers DP movement to the left periphery. If the DP containing zè did not move to the edge, it would not be accessible for an attractor with a matching feature outside the phase.

(55) a {[CP [DP [AP How important] an issue] will that be for your team?]}
- leftward movement of how important internally to DP
b *{[CP [DP A] [AP how important] issue] will that be for your team?]}
- leftward movement of DP
(55) c *That will be {[DP [AP how important] an issue] for your team?}
d *That will be {[DP a how important issue] for your team?}

(56) a Kmoen [die studente hier eur werk] nog verbeteren.
I must that student here her work still correct
b K moen [al die studente hier eur werk] nog verbeteren.
I must all that student here here work still correct
c Kmoen [die studente hier al eur werk] nog verbeteren.

(57) a [[Die studente hier ] eur werk] moen-k nog verbeteren.
that student here her work must I still correct
b [Al [die studente hier] eur werk] moen-k nog verbeteren.
all that student here her work must I still correct.
c [[Die studente hier] al eur werk] moen-k nog verbeteren.
d Q  DP  hier  possess  NP  e  DP  hier  Q  possess  NP
The presence of *hier* does not trigger movement of the containing DP to the clausal left periphery (56). Nor does it trigger obligatory movement of the possessor to the leftmost position in the DP (56/7c).

Hypothesis: the (deictic?) feature of *hier* can be checked DP internally, the (focal?) feature of *zè* cannot be checked DP internally (contra Giusti etc)

### 5.3. The *sen* genitive and *DP internal zè*

#### (58)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>a</th>
<th>[die studente] sen werk</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>b</td>
<td>[Al [die studente] sen werk] moen-k nog verbeteren.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c</td>
<td>*[Die studente] al sen werk moen-k nog verbeteren.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d</td>
<td>Q DP sen NP e *DP Q sen NP</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### (59)

| a | *[[Die studente *zè*] sen werk] moe-j een kee lezen. |
| b | *[Al [die studente *zè*] sen werk] moe-j een kee lezen. |
| c | *[Die studente *zè* al sen werk] moe-j een kee lezen. |
| d | *Q DP *zè sen NP e *DP *zè Q sen NP |

#### (60)

| b | *[Al [die studente [hier] *zè* sen werk] moe-j een kee lezen. |
| d | *Q DP *hier sen NP e *DP *zè hier Q sen NP |

**Observation.**

For a possessor DP associated with *zè* the *sen* construction is unavailable. Why? In the *sen* construction the possessor containing *sen* cannot move leftward (cf. adjacency condition 3.4.), hence it cannot reach the edge of the DP, from which movement of the containing DP to the clausal left periphery can be triggered.

We correctly predict that there will be no problem if the particle *zè* is associated with a DP containing a *sen* possessor. The containing DP as a whole can move leftward across *zè*, to reach the phase edge and trigger movement.

#### (61)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>a</th>
<th>Die studente sen werk <em>zè</em> moe-j een kee lezen.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>b</td>
<td>Al die studente sen werk <em>zè</em> moe-j een kee lezen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c</td>
<td>*Die studente al sen werk <em>zè</em> moe-j een kee lezen.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d</td>
<td>Q DP *zè sen NP e DP Q sen NP *zè</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### (62)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>a</th>
<th>Die studente sen werk <em>zè</em> hier moe-j een kee lezen</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>b</td>
<td>Al die studente sen werk <em>zè</em> hier moe-j een kee lezen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c</td>
<td>*Die studente al sen werk <em>zè</em> hier moe-j een kee lezen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d</td>
<td>Q DP sen NP *zè hier e *DP Q sen NP *zè hier</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Deictic *hier* and the *sen* possessor (cf. (56-7) for the doubling construction & *hier*)

#### (63)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>a</th>
<th>*[Die studente hier] sen werk] moe-j een kee lezen.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>b</td>
<td>*[Al [die studente hier] sen werk] moe-j een kee lezen.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The presence of hier in the possessor DP is incompatible with the sen possessor, though recall that hier is compatible with the doubling construction (see (56-7)). (see also 3.4.4. above). Why?

From the ellipsis pattern in (64)-(65) we deduce that in the doubling construction, though it may be lower than al/heel, the possessor DP occupies a position to the left of that of the determiner. Assume that this is the position in which deictic hier as associated with a DP possessor can also be checked. If this position is not available to the sen possessor, which by hypothesis is lower (39) in the IP domain of the DP, then we account for the contrast observed. Hier will be available when associated with the complete DP:
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