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1 Introduction

The literature on noun phrases in the Germanic and Romance languages describes two strategies to leave the lexical noun in a noun phrase unpronounced. The first one is to elide it, resulting in what is normally called NPE (Noun Phrase Ellipsis) in languages like French; see the underlined noun phrase in (1). The second one, which we dub the pronominalization strategy, is to replace (in a purely descriptive, pre-theoretical sense) the lexical noun by an indefinite dummy noun, like the insertion of one in English; see the underlined noun phrase in (2). We refer to this pattern as IndefP.

We argue in this article that the dialects of Dutch provide a different implementation of this pronominalization pattern. Consider the Dutch examples in (3) in which a definite article appears when the lexical noun is not realized in possessive and demonstrative constructions.

(3) a. Jouw auto is wit en de **mijn** is groen.  
   your car is white and the **my** is green  
   ‘Your car is white and mine is green.’  
   (standard Dutch)

   b. Die auto is wit en de **deze** is groen.  
   that car is white and the **this** is green  
   ‘That car is white and this one is green.’  
   (dialectal Dutch)

Importantly, definite articles cannot co-occur with demonstrative and possessive pronouns in non-elliptical contexts in Dutch and its dialects, see the example in (4).

(4) a. (*de) **mijn** auto  
   (the) my car  
   ‘my car’  
   (standard Dutch)

   b. (*de) **die** auto  
   (the) that car  
   ‘that car’  
   (dialectal Dutch)

We will argue that the definite article preceding the possessive and demonstrative pronouns in (3) has the same role as *one* in English. They are pro-nouns, i.e., dummy nouns replacing nouns in what we think of as NPE
contexts.\textsuperscript{1} We will refer to this construction as the DefP pattern (the Definite Pronominalization Pattern).\textsuperscript{2}

The Dutch dialects show quite a substantive amount of variation within this construction. One dimension of variation concerns the distribution of the definite article within the DP. There are for instance dialects that have the definite article preceding the DP-internal pronoun (see (5)a), but there are also dialects in which it follows the pronoun, as in (5)b, or even both precedes and follows the pronoun, as in (5)c:

\[(5)\]
\begin{align*}
\text{a.} & \quad \text{den menne} \\
& \quad \text{the mine} \quad '\text{mine}' \\
& \quad \text{(Wambeek Dutch)} \\
\text{b.} & \quad \text{mien-'n-de} \\
& \quad \text{mine-n-the} \quad '\text{mine}' \\
& \quad \text{(Hooghalen Dutch)} \\
\text{c.} & \quad \text{de miende} \\
& \quad \text{the mine-the} \quad '\text{mine}' \\
& \quad \text{(Giethoorn Dutch)}
\end{align*}

Dialects furthermore differ in which DP-internal pronominal elements can combine with a definite article. Some dialects can have a definite article with \textit{wh}-pronouns, demonstratives and possessives, others just with demonstratives and possessive and yet others, like standard Dutch, just with possessives. Interestingly, no dialect allows the DefP-strategy with adjectival remnants.

Another dimension of variation concerns the morphosyntactic makeup of the pronominal element. First of all, dialects/languages can select slightly different feature specifications for the definite article (for instance reflecting masculine gender or not). Secondly, dialects/languages can make use of both the DefP-strategy and the IndefP-strategy, or just one of these strategies. A dialect which makes use of both pronominalization strategies is, for example, the dialect of Zierikzee (spoken in the Dutch province of Sealand) in (6).

\[(6)\]
\begin{align*}
\text{a.} & \quad \text{Piet ei een vervalend-e opa} \\
& \quad \text{Piet has an annoying-e grandfather}
\end{align*}

\textsuperscript{1} These types of examples have sporadically been discussed in the literature (see Corver & Van Oostendorp 2005, Corver & Van Koppen 2010, Schoorlemmer 1996), but they have not been identified as pronominalization strategies so far.

\textsuperscript{2} A similar pattern is found in French, as is exemplified in (i). We hypothesize that \textit{le} in \textit{le mien} is a pro-form pronominalizing the noun (i.e. NP), just like \textit{de in de mine}. For reasons of space, we will not be able to give a detailed analysis of this construction in French.

\[(i)\]
\begin{align*}
\text{a.} & \quad \text{mon père} \\
& \quad \text{my father} \quad '\text{my father}' \\
\text{b.} & \quad \text{le mien} \\
& \quad \text{the my} \quad '\text{mine}'
\end{align*}
en Jan ei een leuk-en
and Jan has a nice-en
Piet has an annoying grandfather and Jan has a nice one.’

b. Deze opa is al oud, maar den die je nie.
this grandfather is already old but the that not
‘This grandfather is already old, but that one isn’t.’ (Zierikzee Dutch)

The attributive adjective in Zierikzee Dutch inflects in the same way as the attributive adjective in standard Dutch: there is always an -en ending, except when the noun is indefinite, neuter and singular. In the latter case, there is no overt adjectival ending. However, when the noun is elided, the ending on the adjective is always –en (irrespective of the feature specification of the elided noun); see (6). Corver & Van Koppen (2011) show that this -en ending is actually not an adjectival ending, but a pro-noun comparable to English one. This example shows that in one and the same dialect we find the pro-noun -en with adjectival remnants and the pro-noun den with pronominal remnants. When we look at the English translation we see that both with adjectival remnants and with the demonstrative remnant the pro-noun one is used.

The goal of this article is to provide a detailed analysis of DP-internal pronominalization patterns in standard Dutch and Dutch dialects. A core ingredient of our analysis will be the idea that these possessive and demonstrative constructions feature a DP-internal predication relationship, an idea which has been explored in most detail for possessive constructions (see among others Den Dikken 1998). Furthermore, we aim to explain the (dimensions of) variation between dialects. Part of the attested micro-variation will be shown to be reducible to the PF-interface and the lexicon, i.e., the loci where we expect cross-linguistic/dialectal variation to be given the assumptions of the minimalist program (Chomsky 2000, Kayne 2005). We will further argue that some cross-dialectal differences relate to displacement. Specifically, in some dialects (viz. those that display feature inheritance in the DP) the demonstrative pronoun can remain in situ in nominal expressions featuring DefP, while in others (those that do not display DP-internal feature inheritance) the demonstrative must move to Spec,DP.

This article is organized as follows. Section 2 describes in detail the properties of the definite pronominalization strategy in Dutch dialects. This microvariation perspective provides us with fine-grained information about the dimensions of variation displayed by this construction. Section 3 first discusses the predicate displacement analysis of possessive nominal expressions and subsequently provides an analysis of the definite pronominalization strategy as attested in varieties of Dutch. In section 4, we give an analysis of Dutch demonstrative constructions, making use of DP-internal predication.
We further provide an analysis of the cross-dialectal variation attested in demonstrative constructions featuring definite pronominalization. Section 5 discusses an implicational hierarchy for the definite pronominalization strategy. Section 6 concludes the article.

2. Data: the definite pronominalization strategy in Dutch (dialects).

In this section we discuss the definite pronominalization strategy in Dutch and its dialects, and in particular to cases of NPE with demonstrative or possessive pronominal remnants.

2.1 Three patterns of definite pronominalization

We can distinguish three different patterns of definite pronominalization in Dutch and its dialects. The different dialectal systems and their distribution are depicted on the map in (7).

(7) Three microsystems for the definite pronominalization pattern
This map depicts the three systems: just the black triangles indicate the standard Dutch system, the white squares with the black triangles show the Southern Dutch system and the black squares with the white triangles represent the Northeastern system.

Let us first consider the system found in standard Dutch (the black triangles on the map in (7)) and several other dialects scattered around the Northwestern part of the Netherlands. The definite article precedes the pronominal remnant and is obligatory with possessive pronominal remnants. However, it cannot occur with demonstrative pronominal remnants:

(8) a. mijn vader a.' *(de) mijn
   my father the my-e ‘mine’
   b. die vader b.' *(de) die
      that father the that ‘that one’

(standard Dutch)

The second pattern (the black triangles within the squares on the map in (7)) is attested in the southern part of the Netherlands (roughly the Dutch provinces of Brabant and Limburg) and in Flanders (the Dutch speaking area of Belgium). The definite article again precedes the pronominal remnant and is obligatory with possessive pronominal remnants and optional with demonstrative remnants:

(9) a. mijn vader a.' *(de) mijn
   my father the my-e ‘mine’
   b. die vader b.' (de) die
      that father the that ‘that one’ (Southern Dutch)

The third and final system is found in the Northeastern part of the Netherlands (provinces of Overijssel, Groningen and Drenthe). This pattern is similar to the pattern we find in standard Dutch in that the remnant-initial definite article can occur with possessive pronominal remnants but not with demonstrative remnants:

---

1 An anonymous reviewer notes that in his/her Dutch the definite article can actually be absent in (8)a’ and that similar patterns are found on the internet. This is an interesting observation that warrants in depth research. What we can already say here, however, is that we have observed this phenomenon for a group of dialect spoken in the Northeast of the Netherlands as well. These dialects seem to have a different strategy to handle NP-omission. We refer the reader to Corver & Van Koppen (2009) for elaborate discussion about this different strategy.
strative pronominal remnants. In contrast to the standard Dutch pattern, how-
ever, this remnant-initial definite article is optional in the Northeastern pattern.
Furthermore, the Northeastern pattern deviates in yet another way from the
standard Dutch pattern, namely the realization of an extra definite article. This
additional definite article follows the pronominal remnant.⁴

(10) a. mijn vader a’. (de) mijn de
     my father the my-n-the ‘mine’

b. die vader b’. (*de) die(nde)
    that father the that-n-that ‘that one’

(Northeastern Dutch)

These data raise the following questions: (i) Why does the definite article
occur in these pronominal patterns? (ii) What determines the noun phrase
internal position of the definite article, i.e., noun phrase initially, noun phrase
finally, or in both positions? And (iii) How can we account for the variation
between these closely related dialects?

Before we provide an analysis of the data that answers these que-
tions, we will first investigate the properties of the definite article in a bit more
detail. We start by looking at the pronominal nature of the definite article in the
DefP-pattern. We will show that the pro-nominal status of this element is not
as farfetched as it might seem at first sight. Secondly we discuss the gram-
matical role the pronominalizing definite article plays within the containing DP.
That is, under which conditions does this element appear?

⁴ Some dialects which display this pattern do not have a pronoun final –de but a pro-
noun final –t. We take this to be the same element. Corver & Van Oostendorp (2005) ana-
lyze this final de/t-element in these dialects as an element that is present for purely phonological reasons, and not as a definite article with a syntactic origin. We will show in the
section 2.3 below that this element induces a certain meaning aspect (viz., contrastive fо-
cus), which makes the analysis of a purely phonological addition less likely. Given that the
meaning that is related to this de/t-element is the same as the meaning of the pronoun initial
definite article that we find in the Flemish pattern, we take it to be the same element in both
types of dialects.
2.2 The pronominal nature of the definite article in the DefP pattern.

The idea that the definite article is actually a pro-noun might seem a bit strange at first, since definite articles are traditionally thought to occupy a functional head position, i.e. the D°-position, in the extended nominal domain. However, the idea that pronouns and definite articles are closely related has been formalized in several different analyses (cf. for instance Postal 1966, Abney 1987 among many others). Within generative syntax, Postal (1966) is the first to observe that the paradigms for pronouns and definite articles show an overlap. Consider, for instance, the example in (11) from French.

(11) a. Je vois le professeur.
    I see the professor
    'I see the professor.'

b. Je le vois.
    I him see
    'I see him.'

Abney (1987) argues on the basis of these data that pronouns and determiners occupy the same structural position, namely D° (cf. also Corver & Delfitto 1999). The difference between the two D°-fillers is that determiners select for a lexical NP complement whereas pronouns usually do not have this option. One argument in favor of the analysis put forth by Abney (1987) is that pronouns can also co-occur with a lexical NP complement in languages like English. Consider the examples in (12).

(12) a. [DP [D° we] [NP linguists]]
    b. [DP [D° the] [NP linguists]]

In Dutch we also find a partial overlap between the pronominal paradigm and the paradigm of definite articles. Consider the examples in (13):

(13) a. 't stoeltje
    the little chair
    'the little chair'

b. 't staat in de weg.
    it stands in the way
    'It stands in the way.'

c. Ik heb 't verplaatst.
    I have it moved
    'I have moved it.'

    (standard Dutch)
The overlap is not complete since the non-neuter definite article *de* cannot be used as a free-standing pronoun, as is evidenced by (14).

(14) a. **de** man
   the\textsubscript{non-neut} man
   'the man'
b. Hij / "**De** staat in de weg.
   he / the\textsubscript{non-neut} stands in the way
   'He is in the way.'
c. Ik heb 'm / "**de** gezien.
   I have him / the\textsubscript{non-neut} seen
   'I have seen him.'

(standard Dutch)

There is yet another indication that there is a direct link between the definite article and pronouns. Diachronically, the current definite articles *de* (used in non-neuter singular and plural contexts) and *het* (used in neuter singular contexts) are the result of a phonological reduction (weakening) of the Middle Dutch definite articles *die* ‘that (non-neuter)’ and *dat* ‘that (neuter)’, respectively. These elements were used both as demonstrative pronouns and as definite articles (cf. Schönfeld 1959:120, Stoett 1923:55).\(^5\)

The definite article in the DefP behaves differently from the ‘regular’ definite article, suggesting that it has a different syntactic status than the regular definite article. In particular, we will argue that it is a pro-noun replacing the noun (more specifically NP) in demonstrative and possessive constructions, whereas the regular definite article is merged in the head position of the higher DP. There are three differences between the regular definite article and the definite article in the DefP. First of all, the definite article in the DefP cannot be replaced by other definite or indefinite determiner elements. The definite article is the only element which can appear in this context; see (15)a. In regular contexts the definite article can be replaced by demonstrative pronouns or indefinite articles, see (15)b.

\(^5\) The phonological reduction of the demonstrative pronoun (*die*) to the definite article (*de*) (see Van Der Horst 2008: 388) resembles the reduction of strong pronouns to weak pronouns: (i) *jij* (you.NOM, 'you') versus *je*, (ii) *mij* (me.ACC, 'me') versus *me*, (iii) *zij* (she.NOM 'she', or they.NOM 'they') versus *ze*. The reduction of *dat* to *het* is a bit less transparent, as an anonymous reviewer notes, but here the reduction was originally from *dat* to *t* (which is actually the form of the definite article that is often used). This weakened *t* was reinterpreted as the pronominal form *het* (see Schönfeld 1964).
Secondly, the definite article cannot appear in combination with possessive or demonstrative remnants when the lexical noun is present; cf. the examples in (16). Reversely, a definite article cannot be added to an adjectival remnant of NPE, if the definite article is not also present in the attributive context (cf. (17))

(16) a. (*de) dien opa  a’ de dien
the that grandpa the that
‘that grandpa’ ‘that one’ (Asten Dutch)

b. (*de) mijn moeder  b’ de mijne
the my mother the mine
‘my mother’ ‘mine’ (standard Dutch)

(17) a. de lieve opa  a’ de lieve
the sweet grandpa the sweet
‘the sweet grandpa’ ‘the sweet one’

b. een lieve moeder  b’ (*de) een lieve
a sweet mother the a sweet
‘a sweet mother’ ‘a sweet one’ (standard Dutch)

Finally, the definite article in DefP is incompatible with attributive adjectives; see example (18). As shown by (19), the regular definite article, or other determiner-like elements, can co-occur with an attributive adjective.

(18) a. de mijne  a’ *de mijn(e) grote
the my the my(-e) big
‘mine’ ‘my big one’

b. de die  b’ *de die grote
the that the that big
‘that one’ ‘that big one’

(19) a. de/die/mijn grote hond  b. de/die/mijn grote
the/that/my big dog the/that/my big
the/that/my big dog’ ‘the/that/my big one’
The assumption that definite articles are pro-nouns (more specifically pro-NPs) in the DefP can easily account for two out of three of the properties of the definite article in this construction. First of all, it is in complementary distribution with the lexical noun, because the definite article pronominalizes the lower part of the DP-projection (i.e., NP), including the lexical noun. Secondly, it cannot co-occur with adjectives modifying the head noun, because they too are part of the structure which is pronominalized by the definite article. Specifically, we assume that attributive adjectives are modifiers adjoined to NP (i.e. [\[AP [\[N]]]) and that the DefP replaces the highest NP. In section 3.2 (note 13) we will briefly address the question as to why the DefP-pattern is only possible with de (e.g. de mijne) and not with die (*die mijne).

2.3 The grammatical role of the pronominalizing definite article.

The question arises whether the occurrence of the definite article in the DefP can be related to some external factors. Corver & Van Koppen (2010) show that the definite article in the DefP with a possessive pronoun functions as an agreement marker to recover the gender specifications of the elided noun. We will give one example here to illustrate this from the Dutch-Brabantish dialect of Asten. Asten Dutch (like most southern dialects) shows gender distinctions for masculine, feminine and neuter. The distinction between masculine vs. neuter/feminine is expressed on the indefinite article. We will dub this ‘indefinite gender’. The distinction between neuter vs. masculine/feminine is expressed on the definite article. We will call this ‘definite gender’. This is illustrated in the examples in (20).

(20) a. masculine singular: nen opa/de oom ‘a grandfather/the uncle’
   b. feminine singular: een oma/de dame ‘a grandmother/the lady’
   c. neuter singular: een keind’/t kenijn ‘a child/the rabbit’

The possessive pronoun in this dialect agrees in gender with the possessed noun and follows the indefinite gender pattern (i.e., it makes a distinction between masculine and non-masculine). This is exemplified in (21).

(21) a. masculine singular: minnen opa
   my-masc grandfather ‘my grandfather’
   b. feminine singular: min tante
Corver & Van Koppen (2010) argue that the definite article needs to be present when the lexical noun is absent in order to recover the gender features of this lexical noun. The possessive pronoun does not make all the relevant distinctions, since it expresses just indefinite gender. According to Corver & Van Koppen, the definite article is added to the remnant of ellipsis in order to express definite gender. Consider the example in (22).

\[(22) \quad \begin{array}{ll}
\text{a. masculine singular:} & \text{de mien} \\
& \text{the-masc/fem my-masc} \\
\text{b. feminine singular:} & \text{de min} \\
& \text{the-masc/fem my-fem/neut} \\
\text{c. neuter singular:} & \text{t min} \\
& \text{the-neut my-fem/neut 'mine'}
\end{array}\]

The definite article is optional in dialects where the possessive pronoun makes the complete set of gender distinctions. Winterswijk Dutch is one such dialect. Consider the example in (23), which shows that Winterswijk Dutch makes a distinction between masculine, feminine and neuter on the possessive pronoun.

\[(23) \quad \begin{array}{ll}
\text{a. masculine singular:} & \text{mien-en hood} \\
& \text{my-masc hat 'my hat'} \\
\text{b. feminine singular:} & \text{mien-e muts} \\
& \text{my-fem bonnet 'my bonnet'} \\
\text{c. neuter singular:} & \text{mien hoes} \\
& \text{my house 'my house'}
\end{array}\]

Given the reasoning provided above, this means that the definite article should be absent (or at least optional) in the dialect of Winterswijk. This is the case, as shown in (24) below.\(^6\)

\[(24) \quad \begin{array}{ll}
\text{a. masculine singular:} & \text{(d'n) mien} \\
& \text{the-masc my-masc}
\end{array}\]

\(^6\) Note that that definite article is obligatory in the neuter singular. We refer the reader to the original paper for an explanation of this.
b. feminine singular: (de) miene
   the-fem my-fem

c. neuter singular: t miene
   the-neut my-e

In short, the definite article is used in the DefP with possessive pronouns that are unable to identify the gender features of the absent lexical noun. Corver & Van Koppen (2010) restricted themselves to possessive pronouns. The demonstrative pattern appears to work more or less the same, however. Consider the examples in (25), which again are taken from the Dutch-Brabantish dialect of Asten.

(25)  a. masculine singular: dizzen / dien opa
       this-masc that-masc grandfather
       ‘this/that grandfather’

       b. feminine singular: dees / die tante
           this-fem that-fem aunt
           ‘this/that aunt’

       c. neuter singular: di / da keind
           this-neut that-neut child
           ‘this/that child’

This example shows that the demonstrative pronoun (in contrast to the possessive pronoun) expresses the full set of gender features. We therefore expect the definite article to be either completely absent or optional. This expectation is once again confirmed by the data. Consider the table in 0.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Distal</th>
<th>Proximal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Masc. sg</td>
<td>(d’n) dieje</td>
<td>(d’n) dizzen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>the-masc that-masc</td>
<td>the-masc this-masc</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fem. sg</td>
<td>(de) die</td>
<td>(de) dees</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>the-fem that-fem</td>
<td>the-fem this-fem</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neut. sg</td>
<td>da</td>
<td>di</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>that-neut</td>
<td>this-neut</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

That this analysis of the definite article in the DefP is on the right track is confirmed by data from the Flemish dialect of Wambeek. This dialect also makes a distinction between masculine, feminine and neuter and this is encoded on the distal demonstrative. The proximate demonstrative, however, does not make the distinction between feminine and neuter. As a conse-
quence, the definite article is obligatory in the neuter singular in this dialect. This is illustrated in the table in (27).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>distal</th>
<th>proximate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Masc. sg</td>
<td>(den) daune</td>
<td>(den) dozen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>the that</td>
<td>the this</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fem. sg</td>
<td>(de) dei</td>
<td>(de) dees</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>the that</td>
<td>the this</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neut. sg</td>
<td>(t) dat</td>
<td>*(t) dees</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>the that</td>
<td>the this</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In short, the definite article seems to be fully optional in the DefP with demonstrative pronouns in most of the Dutch dialects that display this pattern (with the exception of dialects like Wambeek Dutch, where the definite article appears to fill a gap in the gender paradigm). However, closer investigation shows that the definite article cannot be left out freely. The DefP with demonstrative remnants seems to be restricted to contexts which encode contrastive focus. Consider the examples in (28).

(28)  a. Ik ging vaker bij deze tante logeren dan bij *(de) die.
      I went more often with this aunt stay than with the that
      'I used to stay more often with this aunt than with that one.'

b. Laat me je iets over die tante vertellen.
   Let me you something about that aunt tell.
   (*De) die is altijd heel aardig.
   the that is always very nice
   'Let me tell you something about that aunt. She is always very nice.'
   (Southern Dutch)

These examples show that the informants have a strong preference for the presence of the definite article in a contrastive context, as in (28)a. If, on the other hand, the demonstrative pronoun is used as a topic, as in (28)b, the definite article is very strongly dispreferred. The presence of the definite article hence seems to result in a contrastive interpretation of the demonstrative construction. It turns out that a similar contrast is found in the Northeastern dialects, where the definite article of DefP follows the demonstrative pronoun. The DefP diende (that-the ‘that one’) is preferred in a sentence like (28)a, involving contrastive focus, but dispreferred in (28)b, where the pronoun has a
topical use. For the ‘bare’ demonstrative *dien* (‘that’), we see the reverse pattern: it does not occur in a context like (28)a but is fully permitted in (28)b.  

3 Towards an analysis: Definite pronominalization in possessive constructions

Having provided a description of the patterns of definite pronominalization (DefP) as attested in Dutch dialects, we will develop an analysis of these patterns and try to account for the attested cross-dialectal variation in sections 3 and 4. Section 3 discusses the DefP pattern in possessive constructions, and section 4 the DefP pattern in demonstrative constructions. For our analysis, we will base ourselves on the idea that possessive and demonstrative structu-

7 At the end of this section, the question can be raised to what extent DP-internal pronominalization is a more widespread phenomenon in Dutch. Dutch has at least one comparable case of pronominalization, namely with *er* (there, ‘of it/them’) (Bennis 1987). As shown in (i) a, *er*-pronominalization replaces part of an (indefinite) noun phrase by the pro-form *er*, leaving behind a numeral (or quantifier) as a remnant. Just like the definite pronominalization strategy, *er*-pronominalization cannot co-occur with an overt lexical noun or an adjective, see (i). This complementary distribution suggests that *er* originates in a noun phrase-internal position, just like the definite article in the constructions discussed above.

(i) Ik heb *er* toen [twee (*konijntjes*)/*(lieve) ] gezien.
I have *er* then two rabbits/sweet] seen
‘I saw two (*rabbits/sweet) of them then.’

Interestingly, in certain Southern dialects of Dutch, the R-pronoun can be replaced by a D(demonstrative)-pronoun *die* ‘that, those’ (cf. Van Hoof 2005). Notice that at the surface this pattern is quite similar to Def-pronominalization in the sense that the pro-form *die* is a ‘D-pronoun’, just like *de*.

(ii) Ik heb [DP die] gisteren [DP t] [twee [num t]] gezien.
I have *die* yesterday two [count t] seen
‘I saw two of them yesterday’

An important difference between *er*-pronominalization and Def*-pronominalization regards the placement of the pro-form: *er* occurs in a DP-external position; *de*, on the other hand, cannot leave the DP; it must remain inside the DP. The question of the exact relation between *er*-pronominalization and *def*-pronominalization is left for further research.
res involve a predication relationship, which is configurationally defined in terms of a DP-internal small clause structure. By adopting this approach, we follow Den Dikken (1998, 2006) and Campbell (1996)—see also Hoekstra & Mulder (1990), Freeze (1992), Kayne (1994), and Moro (1997), Den Dikken (2006) for predication in the clausal domain—rather than approaches that analyze possessive and demonstrative pronominals in terms of attributive structures (cf. for instance Brugè 1996, Giusti 1997, Schoorlemmer 1998).

3.1 DP-internal Predicate Inversion in possessive constructions

Consider the possessive construction in 30), also known as the Saxon genitive construction.

(29) John’s book (Dutch: Jans boek)

Den Dikken (1998) proposes that the derivation of this possessive nominal expression involves DP-internal Predicate Inversion. The derivation is represented in (30), where (30)a represents the ‘base structure’ and (30)b the derived structure.

(30) a. [DP Spec [D Spec [F [XP book [X P John]]]]]
   b. [DP Spec [D Spec [FP P John] [F +XP (=’s) [XP book [X t]]]]]

Example (30)a represents the source structure in which the possessor (John) is contained in a prepositional predicate (i.e., PP), which is headed by a dative assigning null preposition (i.e., P) and which takes the possessee (book) as its subject. Thus, the ‘underlying’ possessive meaning roughly corresponds to: ‘book (is) to John’. Example (30)b represents the structure that is derived by: (i) the application of X-to-F-movement (for reasons of domain extension (equidistance)), (ii) incorporation of P into the F-complex (yielding the possessive ‘have’-relation at the nominal level), (iii) predicate inversion of the “beheaded” dative PP across the possessee to [Spec,FP].

Following Corver (2003, 2008), we adopt the Predicate Inversion analysis for Dutch possessive constructions containing a pronominal possess-

---

*Domain extension is needed for reasons of locality: the displaced predicate (PP) should be as close (i.e. equidistant) to its extraction site as the “intervening” small clause subject in Spec,XP. See Den Dikken (1998) for details."
sor, as in *mijn boek* ‘my book’. The base structure and the derived structure are given in (31)a en (31)b, respectively:

\[(31)\]
\[
a. \ [DP\ Spec [\theta D [FP\ Spec [\theta F [XP\ boek [x [X n] [PP\ dat mij ]]]]]]]
\[
b. \ [DP\ Spec [\theta D [FP [PP t k mij] [\theta F+X (= ‘n)+P k [XP\ boek [x t j t ]]]]]]
\]

Just like in the English example (30) the possessor moves from the predicate position (i.e., complement of X) to Spec,FP. For reasons of equidistance this movement is accompanied by head movement of the small clause head \(X^o\) to \(F^o\), and incorporation of P into the F-complex. At PF, this resulting complex head is spelled out as the nominal copula \(-n\) which we argue, following Corver (2003, 2008), is an instance of the so-called spurious indefinite article *een* (cf. Bennis, Corver & Den Dikken 1998); see below for discussion. We assume that at PF, this complex head is ‘glued together’ with the oblique pro-

---

9 As an anonymous reviewer notes that there have been several other proposals about the internal structure of the DP that have the potential to explain the data at hand. One could for instance make use of the ideas about the DP put forward in, for instance, Schoorlemmer (2009), in which it is argued that there are two D-positions within the noun phrase, or an analysis as has been provided by, among others, Panneman (2007), in which it is argued that the possessive pronoun pronominalizes part of the DP. As far as we know there are no alternative analyses of the constructions discussed in this paper, however. We do not explore potential alternative analyses here, because our main objective is to describe and analyze the patterns found with demonstrative and possessive NP-omission rather than to compare analyses of possessive and demonstrative patterns.

10 A reviewer raises the question as to whether there is any evidence in Dutch that the possessor starts in a low predicative position. For a theoretical motivation of the idea that a possessor starts out in a low structural position —i.e., the predicate position— within the noun phrase (nominal possessive patterns) or the clause (clausal possessive patterns)— we refer the reader to Den Dikken (1998, 2006). Unfortunately, it is not so easy to find direct empirical support for this low predicative position in present-day Dutch, like e.g. the existence of an in situ variant or stranding of material left behind by the displaced possessor (say, comparable to Q-float phenomena in the clausal domain). It should be noted, however, that in older variants of Dutch (e.g. Middle Dutch) postnominal placement of a possessive pronoun was possible next to prenominal placement (see Stoett (1923:48,87)), as in *die oghen diijn* (the eyes your, ‘your eyes’). As noted by Stoett, the Middle Dutch possessive pronoun remains uninflfected in postnominal position. Possibly, this hints at the predicative nature of this postnominal position. Note, for example, that in present-day Dutch adjectives are typically uninflfected in clause-internal predicative positions (e.g., in copular constructions). Notice furthermore that also with certain noun phrase-internal adjectives inflection can be absent if the adjective follows the noun, as in the fixed exclamatory expression *God almachtig* (God almighty, ‘Heavens!’) versus the vocative expression *almachtige God!* (almighty-e God, ‘almighty God’). Arguably, the postnominal (uninflected) position corresponds to the predicative position, while the pronominal one corresponds to the attributive (i.e. inflected) position.
noun *mij*, which occupies Spec,FP in the syntactic representation. This ‘gluing together’ at PF results in the possessive pronoun *mijn*.

We propose that this PF-process is the operation of Fusion (Harley & Noyer 1999:6; Embick & Noyer 2001), which affixes the complex head [*F°*+*X°*+*P°*] onto the pronominal head inside the inverted PP. The phonological realization of the complex *F°*-head depends on the element that has moved into Spec,FP. If a proper name were to move into this position the complex head spells out as –s (the so-called Saxon Genitive); if a pronoun like *mij* occupies Spec,FP, it is the spurious indefinite article *'n* which surfaces. 11 It is possible that the constituent formed after fusion is no longer transparently reflecting the pronominal and the spurious indefinite article, as is the case with zijn ‘his’ for instance. The third person oblique pronoun is *hem* ‘him’. So, the transparent form of the possessive pronoun should be *hem+n*, which is actually found in several Dutch dialects (see Corver 2003), but instead the opaque form zijn is used to spell out the terminal resulting from fusion. 12

As pointed out above, we analyze *n* in *mijn* as a spurious indefinite article. Evidence in support of its status as an indefinite article comes from its formal similarity with “real” indefinite articles. This similarity is clearly shown by the examples in (32) from Oerle Dutch (De Bont 1958), which displays gender distinctions on the indefinite article.

(32)   a. *ene*      *stal*             a. *me*     *me*    *stal*     (Oerle Dutch)  
     a\textsubscript{Masc} barn   my\textsubscript{Masc} barn  
     b. *en*      *schuuier*         b. *men*   *schuuier*  
     a\textsubscript{Fem} barn   my\textsubscript{Fem} barn  
     c. *e*       *schaap*           c. *me*    *schaap*  
     a\textsubscript{Neut} sheep  my\textsubscript{Neut} sheep

11 Note that there are restrictions on the Saxon genitive (the s-construction) in Dutch. The possessor has to be a proper name or proper-name-like. So, for instance, *oma’s auto* (‘grandmother’s car’), in which the possessor *oma* ‘grandmother’ acts as a proper name, is permitted, but *[die oma’s] auto* ‘that grandmother’s car’ is not. Dutch differs from English in this respect.

12 Note that there are also dialects in which possessor doubling of *hem* ‘him’ and zijn ‘his’ resulting in phrases like *hem z’n boek* ‘let: his his book, meaning his book’. For an analysis of possessor doubling see Corver & Van Koppen (2010).
The ‘spurious’ status of –n in mijn (= mij + een) is suggested by the fact it can be followed by plural and mass nouns, which is impossible with the "normal" indefinite article een (i.e., een bloem, *een bloemen, *een spinazie).\(^{13}\)

(33)  
\[ \text{a. Mijn bloem} \_\text{sing} \ \text{staat in de vaas.} \rightleftharpoons \text{mij + 'n bloem} \]  
my flower stands in the vase

'My flower stands in the vase.'

\[ \text{b. Mijn bloemen} \_\text{plural} \ \text{staan in de vaas.} \rightleftharpoons \text{mij + 'n bloemen} \]  
my flowers stand in the vase

'Mijn bloemen staan in de vaas.'

\[ \text{c. Mijn spinazie} \_\text{mass} \ \text{groeit in de tuin.} \rightleftharpoons \text{mij + 'n spinazie} \]  
my spinach grows in the garden

'My spinach grows in the garden.'

Notice further that spurious een, as part of a possessive pronoun, does not legitimize the occurrence of a possessive noun phrase in the lower "subject" position of an existential construction. It is the (definite) pronominal element mij that attributes definiteness to the entire possessive nominal expression. In this respect, mijn vriend behaves differently from the possessive noun phrase een vriend van mij (a friend of me, ‘a friend of mine’), which is introduced by a real indefinite article.

(34)  
\[ \text{a. Ik geloof dat er [mijn vriend]} \]  
I believe that there my friend

voor de deur staat.  
in-front-of the door stands

\[ \text{b. Ik geloof dat er [een vriend van mij]} \]  
I believe that there a friend of mine

voor de deur staat.

\(^{13}\) According to Bennis, Corver & Den Dikken (1998), the spurious indefinite article appears in a variety of nominal constructions, including the N of N-construction a), the wat voor N-construction 1b), and the nominal wh-exclamative construction ic).

(i)  
\[ \text{a. die idioot van een Jan} \text{proper name} \]  
that idiot of a Jan

‘that stupid John’

\[ \text{b. wat voor een jongensplural?} \]  
what for a boys

‘What kind of boys?’

\[ \text{c. Wat een spinaziemass!} \]  
what a spinach

‘What an amount of spinach!’
for the door stands
'I believe that there stands a friend of mine at the door.'

3.2 Def-pronominalization in possessor-possessee constructions

Having provided some background of the predicate inversion analysis of possessive constructions, let us now turn to the analysis of the “elided” possessive construction in i), i.e., the pattern that we characterized as DefP.

(35) de mijne
the mine ‘mine’

Recall that we have argued that the definite article de ‘the’ in this construction is actually a pronoun substituting for part of the DP. Now that we have established the analysis of non-elided possessive constructions in section 3.1, we can also see which part de substitutes for, namely the subject of the small clause. This means that a DP like de mijne begins as the following small clause:

(36) a. [XP POSSESSEE [ X' [PP P POSSESSOR]]]
   b. [XP [de [ X' [PP P mij]]]]

The pronominally used definite article substitutes for the possessee part of the possessive construction. Or to put it differently, de pronominalizes the small clause subject.

The next step in the derivation is predicate inversion of mij ‘my’ (i.e., P+mij) to Spec,FP and concomitant domain extending head movement of the small clause head X to F (plus P-incorporation). We assume that the pronominal definite article de moves from Spec,XP to D°, as depicted in (37).

Under a bare phrase structure analysis of constituents (Chomsky 1995), the pronominal article de can be both an X° (i.e., behave like a head) and an XP (i.e., behave like a phrase). In its base position in SpecXP, ‘de’ is a head and a maximal projection at the same time (head because it does not dominate a segment of the same type, max. projection because it is immediately dominated by a projection of a different type). In its landing site, ‘de’ is a head (attached to another head). We assume that, analogously to DP-internal displacement of demonstrative pronouns (see section 4.1), displacement of de takes place in order to check some discourse-related feature (like specificity).
on D. The pronominalized small clause subject *de* represents given (i.e., discourse-linked) information, which needs to be checked off in D(P).\(^{14}\)

\[(37)\]  
\[\text{We assume that the complex head } F+X_P+P_k \text{ undergoes fusion at PF with the pronoun. Additionally, we assume that the lower copy of the moved } D^o \text{ also undergoes Fusion with this pronominal element in FP. Fusion takes place before vocabulary insertion and local dislocation (see Harley \& Noyer 1999). We assume following Nunes (2004) that fusion of lower copies has consequences for vocabulary insertion and linearization. More in particular, Nunes proposes that lower copies of a chain do not get pronounced because they lead to contradictory instructions for linearization and hence have to be deleted. For example, in English interrogative constructions involving long distance wh-movement (e.g., *Who do you think that John saw?*), it is only the}

\(^{14}\) In section 2.2 we observed that the definite article *de* in *de mijne* cannot be replaced by another determiner-like element, e.g., the demonstrative pronoun *die*: *die mijne*. We tentatively propose that this contrast is due to the fact that *die* can only (A-bar)-move to Spec,DP, whereas *de*, being a clitic-like element, moves and adjoins to D. In other words, movement of the pronominalizing definite article can be characterized as head movement. With *die* being an XP (phrase) that undergoes DP-internal A-bar movement to Spec,DP, the ill-formedness of *die mijne* can be related to the ill-formedness of example (ib); see Moro (1997) and Den Dikken (2006) for extensive discussion:

\[(i)\]  
\[\text{a. Imogen thinks } \text{[CP that } [\text{the best candidate} \text{ is } ] \text{John} ] \text{ (Predicate inversion)}\]
\[\text{b. *Which guy does Imogen think } \text{[CP that } [\text{the best candidate} \text{ is } ] \text{?} \text{ (wh-movement)}\]

What (ib) shows is that a phrase (in casu: which guy) cannot be A-bar-moved across an inverted predicate in Spec,TP (see Moro and Den Dikken for accounts of this restriction on A-bar movement). We propose that *die mijne* is ill-formed for the same reason: the XP *die* undergoes A-bar-movement to Spec,DP and crosses on its way to Spec,DP the inverted possessor in Spec,FP. That is, we have the structure in (30), with the difference that displaced *die* occupies Spec,DP.

Although A-bar movement across an inverted predicate is not possible, head movement is, as shown in (iib); see Den Dikken (2006:155-156):

\[(ii)\]  
\[\text{a. } \text{[TP [The cause of the riot] was [a picture of the wall] ]} \text{ (XP-movement to Spec,DP, we expect to find the same grammatical outcome as in the clausal domain.}\]
highest *wh*-copy that surfaces at PF ([*Who do you think [who that John saw] who*]?). Nunes argues, however, that if a lower copy of a chain is fused, these contradictory instructions disappear and more than one copy of a chain can be spelled out. One illustration of this multiple realization of *wh*-copies comes from varieties of German that besides having an overt *wh*-word in the left periphery of the matrix clause also feature an overt *wh*-word in the left periphery of the embedded clause (see (38)a). According to Nunes, the phonetic appearance of this intermediate *wh*-copy is permitted as a result of morphological fusion of the intermediate *wen* and the complementizer C. In a way, after fusion with C, the intermediate *wh*-word becomes invisible for linearization processes that apply to the syntactic structure.

![Image](https://i.imgur.com/3.png)

In the line of Nunes (2004), we argue that fusion of the lower copies of a head movement chain can (but do not necessarily have to) result in pronunciation of these lower copies. We assume fusion takes place twice in the example in (35). Once between the (lower copy of the) subject head of the small clause and the complex head F+Xj=nP, yielding *n+e*, and once between this complex and the possessive pronoun (*mij*), yielding *mijn+ne* (= *mijne*).

![Image](https://i.imgur.com/4.png)
As indicated in (39), the lower D-copy gets spelled out as –e (i.e., /ə/) phonologically. Let us now turn to the possessive DefP-pattern attested in the Eastern varieties of Dutch:

(40) (de) mijnde
    the my-n-the ‘mine’ (Eastern dialects)

The derivation of this possessive pattern is basically identical to the one above for standard Dutch *de mijne*. The definite article moves from Spec,XP to D, leaving behind a lower copy in Spec,XP. Just as in standard Dutch both copies get spelled out. The only difference with standard Dutch is that in the Eastern dialects the spell out is *de* rather than *e*. Schematically:

(41) a. Displacement
    [DP[Dl D (= de)]{DP{t t mij}}{F+X+P (= n)}{t (= de)}{X t X}]  

b. Fusion
    [DP[Dl D (= de)]{PP{t mij}}{F+X+P (= n)}{t (= de)}{X t X}]  

c. Vocabulary insertion/linearization
    [de] *[mij-n-de]

It should further be noted that there are Eastern dialects in which the first instance of the definite article is optional (e.g. Giethoorn Dutch *(de) miende*) and others where it is even impossible (e.g. Hooghalen Dutch; *(de) mien’nde*). For these patterns in which ‘initial’ *de* is absent, two possible analyses come to mind. First of all, one could propose that movement of the pronominalizing definite article from Spec,XP to D simply does not take place;

15 Interestingly, this phonological realization of D as e (schwa) as a result of Fusion is also attested in other DP-internal environments in certain dialects of Dutch. For example, the equivalents of standard Dutch *de lamp* and *de kerk* in i) are *lampe* and *kerke* in Oldambt Dutch (see Schuringa 1923:101). In the spirit of Longobardi’s (1994) theory of N-to-D movement, it does not seem implausible to analyze *lampe* and *kerke* as being derived via N-to-D movement, where the D-element in the derived complex head [N+D] spells out as an affix – e. Thus: [lampe,D(=e)] [kerke].

(i) a. Lamp-e wil nait bran’n.
    lamp-e will not light‘The lamp won’t light.’
    a’. De lamp wil niet branden
    the lamp will not fire‘The lamp won’t light.’

b. naar kerke
    to church-e
    b’. naar *de* kerk
to the church‘to (the) church’

16 -t is also found instead of *de*, as in *mient* (my-n-t, ‘mine’).
in other words *de* remains in situ. This derivation is depicted in (42). Secondly, one could propose that it is not just the pronominalizing definite article *de* (i.e. the small clause subject) that undergoes displacement but rather the entire FP. More specifically, displacement of *de* triggers pied piping of FP, where FP lands in Spec,DP, as in (43).\(^{17}\)

\[(42)\]

\begin{align*}
\text{a. mijnde} & \quad \text{‘mine’} \quad \text{(Northeastern dialects)} \\
[DP \text{Spec}[D \text{ [FP [PP t, mij]]}, [F X_{X+K} (= n) [XP = (de) [X \cdot t, t]]]]] & \quad \text{b. [DP [DP [PP t, mij]], [F X_{X+K} (= n) [XP = (de) [X \cdot t, t]]]]] Fusion} \\
[DP [DP [PP t, mij]], [F X_{X+K} (= n) [XP = (de) [X \cdot t, t]]]] & \quad \text{c. [DP [DP [PP t, mij]], [F X_{X+K} (= n) [XP = (de) [X \cdot t, t]]]]]} \\
[DP [DP [PP t, mij]], [F X_{X+K} (= n) [XP = (de) [X \cdot t, t]]]] & \quad \text{d. [mijn-n-de]} \quad \text{Vocabulary insertion/linearization} \\
[DP [DP [PP t, mij]], [F X_{X+K} (= n) [XP = (de) [X \cdot t, t]]]] & \quad \text{e. [mijn-n-de]} \quad \text{Vocabulary insertion/linearization}
\end{align*}

\[(43)\]

Unfortunately, at this moment we do not have strong arguments that favor one analysis over the other. We will therefore leave this issue for future research.\(^{18}\)

\(^{17}\) Note that in these derivations we abstract away from the additional \(\text{–n}\) we see in the Hooghalen Dutch example *mien\text{–nde}*. As we will discuss below in footnote 22, we also find a similar additional \(\text{–n}\) in demonstrative constructions. We do not know exactly how to analyze this \(\text{–n}\), but we assume that it is also a nominalizing element, comparable to one in English. This is in accordance with Corver & Van Koppen (2011) where it is shown that these dialects display a nominalizing suffix \(\text{–n}\) in other contexts as well. Further research is necessary in order to fully understand the properties and distribution of this morpheme.

\(^{18}\) In certain varieties of Dutch (especially Southern varieties), we find the surface pattern ‘de + possessor’, as in *de mine*, also with possessors bearing the Saxon genitive. Two illustrations given in (i):
4. Definite pronominalization in demonstrative constructions

In section 4.2 we will discuss Def-pronominalization in nominal constructions featuring a demonstrative pronoun, as, for example, in *de die* (the that ‘that one’) and *diznde* (this-n-the ‘this one’). In section 4.1 we will first discuss, however, the internal structure of nominal expressions that consist of a demonstrative pronoun and a lexical noun, as in *die man* ‘that man’. We pursue the idea that demonstrative pronouns, just like possessive pronouns, are base generated as part of a DP-internal small clause. In the spirit of Campbell (1996) we propose that the demonstrative pronoun is the subject of the small clause. In this respect, the demonstrative pronoun differs from the possessive pronoun, which we took to be part of the small clause predicate (see section 3.1).

4.1 The internal syntax of demonstrative constructions

Campbell (1996) argues that the common noun of a DP acts as the predicate of the referent of that DP (see also Higginbotham 1985, Abney 1987 and

We assume that these DefP-patterns with a Saxon genitival remnant have the derivation depicted in (39). That is, the possessor undergoes Predicate Inversion and the pronominalizing definite article moves from the small clause subject position to D. It should be noted that in Standard Dutch, DefP-patterns like those in (i) are not possible. In other words, even though DefP is permitted with a possessive pronominal remnant (*de mijne*), it is not possible with a Saxon genitival remnant (*de Jans*; the Jan’s, ‘Jan’s’). We leave the account of this contrast for future research.

Something which we would like to add to this discussion about "de + Saxon genitive" is the observation that in Dutch child language we find patterns like (ii), where the pronominalizing definite article (DefP) seems to stand in its 'base position' (i.e. the specifier position of the small clause XP). Only the possessor (*Laura/opa*) has undergone displacement (viz. Predicate Inversion) in those nominal expressions. Consequently, the definite article (pronounced as *te*) follows the inverted possessor (data drawn from Van Kampen & Corver (2006)).

(ii)

a. En achterop staat Laura-s-te
   and at-the-back stands Laura-s-te
   'And at the back stands Laura’s (= Laura’s drawing).'

b. En als het opa-s-te is?
   and if it grandpa-s-te is
   'And if it is grandpa’s (= grandpa’s glasses)’
Norbert Corver & Marjo van Koppen
Barbiers 1992 for similar analyses). He assumes the referent is a (base-generated) empty element which is the subject of the DP-internal small clause. This empty small clause subject is bound by an operator (possibly null) in Spec,DP. To make things concrete, the DP the thief has the following structure: \( [\text{DP} \ O_i \ \text{the \ [\text{SC} \ [e] \ \text{thief}]}]. \) The operator \( O_i \) in Spec,DP is a specificity operator. According to Campbell (1996:162), this operator "is a kind of DP-internal topic, which links the internal small clause subject position (and hence DP itself) to a referent identified previously in the discourse." Campbell further proposes that the demonstrative that in a nominal expressions like that thief is not a determiner but rather an overt specificity operator in Spec,DP, which binds the empty small clause subject: \( [\text{DP that \ D \ [\text{SC} \ [e] \ \text{thief}]}]. \)

We will follow the spirit of Campbell’s predication approach to nominal expressions featuring a demonstrative pronoun but slightly modify it by assuming that the demonstrative pronoun is not base-generated in Spec,DP but rather moves from the small clause subject position to Spec,DP forming an operator variable chain. This A-bar movement operation, a sort of DP-internal topicalization, is illustrated for example (44)a in the derivation in (44)b-d.

(44)

a. die man  
   that man  

b. \( [\text{DP} \ D \ [\text{XP DEMONSTRATIVE} \ [\text{X X PREDICATE}]]]] \)

c. \( [\text{DP DEMONSTRATIVE} \ D \ [\text{XP t} \ [\text{X X PREDICATE}]]]] \)

d. \( [\text{DP die/that \ D \ [\text{XP t} \ [\text{X X man}]]}] \)

One might raise the question as to why the predication relationship is not the other way around: the noun being the subject of the small clause and the demonstrative element being the predicative element, quite analogously to the base structure of the possessive construction. We propose that such a structural analysis is possible in principle but only if the demonstrative has a predicative meaning, i.e. if the demonstrative designates a property/characteristic of an entity. If the demonstrative designates an entity/individual whose contents is specified by a predicative noun, we have the structure in (44).

We propose that this property reading of the demonstrative pronoun is found in the nominal expressions in (45), where the demonstrative pronoun precedes a proper name. Clearly, a proper name like Clinton does not need

---

19 See also Duinhoven (1988) for Middle Dutch. According to Duinhoven, the Middle Dutch nominal expression die coninc 'that king' had the interpretation: 'that one, a person being a king'.

20 Aboh (2004) shows that in Gungbe (and the Gbe languages in general) specificity is marked overtly within the noun phrase by means of a specificity marker (located in D).
the presence of a demonstrative pronoun for the purpose of referential interpretation. It has been argued in the literature (see e.g. Overdiep 1937) that *die* has a more evaluative reading on the side of the speaker. More specifically, the demonstrative refers to some characteristic property of the referent designated by the noun.

    you should that Clinton not believe
    'You shouldn't believe a man like Clinton.'
b. Ik vind [die Brian van jullie] een vervalend joch.
    I find [that Brian of you] an annoying boy
    'I find that boy Brian (of yours) quite annoying.'
c. Ha [die Jan]! Hoe gaat het?
    Ha that Jan! how goes it
    'Hi John! How are you doing?'

An in-depth analysis of this evaluative demonstrative is beyond the scope of this paper. We tentatively propose that an expression like *die Clinton* in (45) receives the analysis given in (46): *die* starts out as a predicate referring to some property of the subject and is moved to Spec,DP.

(46) a. [DP [D [XP Clinton [x X die]]]]  
    [DP die, [D [XP Clinton [x X t]]]]

As indicated in (44), we assume that the demonstrative element undergoes A-bar movement to the left periphery of the extended nominal projection (i.e., Spec,DP). Such a DP-internal movement operation is familiar from the literature on demonstratives. Panagiotidis (2000:732-733), for example, proposes that Greek nominal constructions featuring a demonstrative in a position preceding the definite article result from movement of the demonstrative to Spec,DP, where movement is triggered by [deictic] feature checking; see (47). See also Bernstein (1997), Brugè (1996, 2002) and Giusti (1997, 2002) for the idea that demonstratives in Romance and Germanic languages are merged in a position (typically a specifier position of a functional head) low in the nominal domain and raise to the left periphery of DP (i.e., Spec,DP) to check the deictic feature.

(47) [DP afi, [D i [NumP NUM nei] NP t [N katiki [DP tis the new inhabitants the-GEN polis]]]]]
    city-GEN
'these new inhabitants of the city' (Panagiotidis 2000:732-733)

4.2 Def-pronominalization in demonstrative constructions

Having argued that nominal expressions like *die man* 'that man' have a DP-internal small clause structure as part of their representation, we will now analyze those patterns in which part of the nominal expressions has been "elided". As was shown in section 2.1, three patterns were attested from a cross-dialectal perspective:

(48)  a. (*de) die the that 'that one'
     Southern Dutch
     b. (de) die the that
     c. (*de) dien-de the that-the

     In standard Dutch, the demonstrative can only occur on its own, in Southern Dutch the definite article *de* can optionally co-occur with the demonstrative, and in Northeastern Dutch *de* can also co-occur with the demonstrative, but, as opposed to Southern Dutch, it must follow the demonstrative. As indicated, it is impossible to have a doubling pattern in which an instance of *die* precedes and follows the demonstrative pronoun. The question, obviously, arises how to account for these patterns of microvariation.

     Let us start our analysis with the Northeastern Dutch pattern. Adopting the DP-internal small clause analysis for demonstrative constructions, we start out with the "base structure" in (49)b. The pronoun *die* raises to Spec,DP to check some Force-feature (say, a [deictic]-feature). The definite article *de* pronominalizes the DP-internal predicate nominal and adjoins to D, see (49)c.\(^\text{21}\) Recall that under a bare phrase structure analysis of constituents (Chomsky 1995), the pronominal article *de* can be both an X\(^0\) (i.e., behave like a head) and an XP (i.e., behave like a phrase). In its small clause predicate position *de* is an XP, whereas in its derived position (cliticized onto D) *de* is an X\(^2\). In the morphological (i.e. post-syntactic) component, the demonstrative *die* and the DefP *de*, which are adjacent in their derived positions, undergo Fusion, possibly to avoid a doubly-filled DP-effect. After fusion, we have the

\(^\text{21}\) Note that *de* in *de die* fulfills the same grammatical role as *one* in English *that one*. Both *de* and *one* pronominalize part of the noun phrase.
morphologically complex unit diende (see (49)c,d). Notice, finally, that a doubling pattern like de diende, in which one instance of de precedes die, cannot be derived since the demonstrative must raise to Spec,DP. That is, it must raise to a position preceding D.22

(49) a. (*de) diende
   the that-the ‘that one’
   b. [DP Spec [L' D [XP die [X de ]]]] "Base structure"
   c. [DP die [de [de+D [XP t [X X t ]] ]]] Displacements
   d. [DP die [de+D [XP t [X X t ]] ] ] Fusion
   e. [dien-de] Vocabulary insertion/linearization

The derivation of the standard Dutch pattern die is largely similar to the one given above for Northeastern Dutch. Starting from the base structure in (50)b, we get the derived syntactic structure in (50)c, after movement of die to Spec,DP and movement (and adjunction) of de to D. The way in which standard Dutch differs from Northeastern Dutch regards the operation of Fusion. Specifically, in standard Dutch die and de do not undergo fusion. In order to avoid a doubly-filled-DP effect, we assume that de is not pronounced. In other words, we have a silent DE in D, as in (50)d.

(50) a. (*de) die
   the that ‘that one’
   b. [DP Spec [L' D [FP [F [XP die [X de ]]]]]] "base structure"
   c. [DP die [de [de+D [XP t [X X t ]] ]]] Displacements
   d. [die] * [DE] no Fusion & silent D (i.e. DE)
   e. [die] Vocabulary insertion / linearization

Let us now turn to the Southern Dutch pattern: de die, in which de and die can co-occur and de precedes die. This last observation suggests that die does not move to Spec,DP in the Southern Dutch pattern, which obviously raises the question why this is so. We propose that the answer to this ques-

22 Within the form diende there is a -n present. This is unexpected, since we have argued above that the –n in possessive pronouns is the result of predicate inversion followed by spell-out and there is no predicate inversion in demonstrative constructions. We do not think this –n is the spell-out of predicate inversion, however, but rather that it is the same ‘additional’ –n we find in possessive constructions in some dialects (see (18)). As already said there, we assume this –n is actually a nominalizing morpheme, comparable to English one (see also Corver & Van Koppen 2011). However, more research is necessary to fully establish the properties of this element.
tion comes from the phenomenon of Feature inheritance. Suppose that analogously to feature inheritance in C-T relationships (Chomsky 2008), there is feature inheritance in D-X relationships. That is, the head of the complement of D (in casu the head of the small clause XP) can inherit features from D (see (51)c)). After inheritance, die can enter into a checking relation with the Force feature in situ. The pronominalizing definite article de, which substitutes for the small clause predicate, raises to D (see (51)d)). Since there is no constituent in Spec,DP, the raised D (de) can be spelled-out. That is, no Doubly-filled-DP effect will be obtained.23

(51) a. de die
   the that 'that one'

b. [DP Spec [D Force] [XP die [X X de]]] "Base structure"

c. [DP Spec [D Force] [XP die [X X Force] de]]
   Feature inheritance & in situ checking

d. [DP [D de[D Force] [XP die [X X Force] de]]] Displacement of de

e. [de] * [die] Vocabulary insertion/linearization

Summarizing, Southern Dutch parametrically differs from Standard Dutch and the Northeastern varieties in terms of the phenomenon of Feature

23 A reviewer correctly raises the question whether a demonstrative pronominalization pattern (e.g. de die, where de is the inverted pronominal predicate) features a property reading (compare with (46)). The following examples from De Bont (1958:380) suggest that such an (evaluative) property meaning is indeed possible:

(i) a. Den dieë zie'k nie gaer.
   the that see-I not preferably
   'I don't trust that guy.'

b. De die', die vertel ik niks.
   the that that tell I nothing
   'That woman, I won't tell her anything! (I don't trust her)'

These examples have a pejorative flavor (i.e. negative evaluation by the speaker). It does not seem implausible to assume that this negative evaluative meaning is somehow associated with the pronominalized predicate de. Arguably, in examples like (6) and (28), this evaluative reading of the inverted predicate is less clearly present (or even suppressed) because the information-structural notion of contrastive focus figures more prominently at the level of interpretation. Importantly, we assume the same structure for both interpretations. We leave this issue for future research.
inheritance: the former variant has it, the latter two do not. The two variants that do not display Feature inheritance differ from each other as regards the phenomenon of Fusion: Northeastern varieties have it, Standard Dutch does not. In order to circumvent a doubly-filled-DP-effect, Standard Dutch does not spell-out the pronominalizing definite article. In other words, we have a silent D.

If our conclusion that Southern Dutch varieties leave the demonstrative pronoun in situ is correct, then this implies that Spec,DP is available for other material (possibly via External Merge). Although we haven't investigated this systematically, it is interesting to observe that in Oerle Dutch (De Bont 1958:414), which is spoken in the south of the Netherlands (Northern-Brabantish), we find patterns in which a locative adverb precedes the definite article in the de die-pattern. Arguably, the locative adverb occupies Spec,DP. Observe that it is also possible to have the locative adverb at the end of the entire nominal expression (possibly in some DP-internal adjunct position). Importantly, in standard Dutch we have the pattern die daar but not daar die. This is expected if die occupies Spec,DP; in that case, Spec,DP is not available as a landing site for daar. Also for the North-eastern dialects, we haven't come across examples in which a locative adverb precedes diende (that the 'that one').

(52) a. [Door den dieën] die zee dā ... there the that that said that ...
   a.' [Den dieën door] die zee dā ... the that there that said that ...
   'That one over there, he said that ...'

b. [Hieër den dieën] die zee dā ... here the that that said that ...
   b.' [Den dieën hieër] die zee dā ... the that here that said that ...
   'This one over here, he said that ...'

24 The idea that feature inheritance is parametrized differs from the standard view that it automatically happens upon merger of the phase head. However, this idea is not unprecedented. Jiménez-Fernández & Miyagawa (2014) in analyzing variation in topic constructions argue that languages differ in whether or not certain discourse features are inherited.
5. An implicational hierarchy

In section 2.1 we saw that some Dutch dialects differ in which element can combine with the pronominal definite article (DefP). In standard Dutch, the possessive pronoun can co-occur with the pronominal definite article (de mijke) but the demonstrative pronoun cannot (*de die). In Southern Dutch varieties, the definite article is found with both possessive pronouns and demonstrative pronouns (de die). The same holds for North-easter dialects, where the pronominal definite article typically follows the possessive or demonstrative pronoun (mijnde, diende). As is clear from this description, the dialects that permit DefP (i.e., the pronominalizing definite article) with demonstrative pronouns is a subset of the dialects that permit DefP with possessive pronouns. In implicational terms: if a dialect X has the def+dem pattern, it also has the def+poss pattern. Interestingly, this implicational hierarchy can be extended. A subset of the dialects displaying the Southern Dutch pattern have an additional option: they can combine the pronominal definite article with a wh-pronoun (de + wh), as for example in de welke (the which ‘which one’). The implicational hierarchy is given in (53) and its (geographical) distribution is given in (54):

(53) \( \text{de + pos < de + dem < de + wh} \)

(54) The distribution and implicational hierarchy of de+poss; de+dem; de+wh
This map clearly shows an implicational hierarchy: dialects that can combine a definite article with a demonstrative pronoun (yellow dots on the map) can also combine the definite article with a possessive pronoun (blue squares) and dialects that can combine the definite article with an interrogative pronoun (black dots) can also combine it with a demonstrative pronoun.

In (55)a-e, the implicational hierarchy is exemplified for the dialect of Oerle (data from De Bont 1958). Comparison with the data in (55)a'-e' from standard Dutch clearly shows that the latter variant of Dutch is much more restricted in the realization of the DefP-pattern; it is only permitted with possessive pronouns.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(55)</th>
<th>Oerle Dutch</th>
<th>standard Dutch</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a.</td>
<td>de mene(n)\textsubscript{masc.sg}</td>
<td>a'. de mijn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>the my-a;</td>
<td>the my;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>'mine'</td>
<td>'mine'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b.</td>
<td>den deize(n)\textsubscript{masc.sg}</td>
<td>b'. (‘de) deze</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>the this;</td>
<td>the this;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>'this one'</td>
<td>'this one'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c.</td>
<td>de welke(n)</td>
<td>c'. (‘de) welke</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>the which\textsubscript{masc.sg};</td>
<td>the which;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>'which one'</td>
<td>'which one'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d.</td>
<td>de wieze(n)\textsubscript{masc.sg}</td>
<td>d'. (‘de) wiens</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>the whose;</td>
<td>the whose;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>'whose'</td>
<td>'whose'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e.</td>
<td>de waffer\textsubscript{masc.sg}en</td>
<td>e. (‘de) wat voor één\textsubscript{sg}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>the what-for;</td>
<td>the what for one;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>'what kind of one'</td>
<td>'what kind of one'</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As shown in (56) also Northeastern varieties of Dutch display a more widespread distribution of DefP (data from Gunnink 1908:74-76). Observe that the doubling pattern is only permitted with the (non-interrogative) possessive pronoun (see (56)a). All other pronouns only permit the simplex pattern with DefP following the pronominal element.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(56)</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a.</td>
<td>de mien de</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>the my-the;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b.</td>
<td>(‘de) diznde</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>the this-the;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c.</td>
<td>(‘de) welknde</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>the which-the;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d.</td>
<td>(‘de) wafnde</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>the what+for-the;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
One could try to relate the more widespread occurrence of DefP in Oerle Dutch to a freer application of feature inheritance within the DP. Recall from the derivation of *de die* in (63) that we took *die* to be licensed in situ after the Force feature associated with D (a phase head) had been inherited by the small clause head X. We tentatively assume that this feature inheritance also applies to other Force features associated with D, such as the interrogative Q-feature. To make things concrete, consider, for example, the derivation of a pattern like *de welke* (see (55)c). Without going into too many details, we assume that *de welke* has the derivation in (57).

(57)  
\[ \text{a. } \text{de welke} \]  
\[ \text{the which ‘which one’} \]

\[ \text{b. "base structure"} \]
\[ [\text{DP Spec} [\text{D} [\text{FP Spec} [\text{F} [\text{XP de [x [\text{-lk} wa+wh}]}}]]]) \]
\[ \text{c. predicate inversion} \]
\[ [\text{DP Spec} [\text{D} [\text{FP wa+wh_m [F [\text{-lk} \text{XP de [x t_m}]}}]]]) \]
\[ \text{d. movement of de} \]
\[ [\text{DP Spec} [\text{D} [\text{FP wa_m [F [\text{-lk} \text{XP t_i f_m}]}}]]]) \]
\[ \text{e. fusion} \]
\[ [\text{DP Spec} [\text{D} [\text{FP wa_m [F [\text{-lk} \text{XP t_i f_m}]}}]]]) \]
\[ \text{f. vocabulary insertion/linearization} \]
\[ [\text{de} * \text{[welke]}] \]

Example (57)b represents the base structure. As indicated we assume that *de welke* can be decomposed into three parts: the small clause subject *de* (i.e., DefP), a small clause head -lk (compare English *like*) and the wh-element *wa* (see Hachem 2015). The meaning corresponding to this small clause structure can informally be defined as: "Def is like what". As indicated in (57)c, predicative inversion moves the wh-pronoun to Spec,FP and X-to-F-movement applies to the small clause head -lk (for reasons of domain extension). As shown by (57)c, we take the Q-feature (interrogativity) associated with D to be inherited by F (i.e. the head of the complement of D). This way, *wa* can be licensed in Spec,FP. In other words, it does not have to (and therefore doesn’t) raise to Spec,DP in order to check off the Q-feature. (57)d shows that DefP moves and adjoins to D. Fusion of -lk and *de* to -lke and fusion of *wa* and -lke yield the form *welke*.

Northeastern Dutch and Standard Dutch do not have the option of feature inheritance. Therefore, the wh-element always has to move to Spec,DP to check off the Q-feature on D. A pattern like *welknde* in (56)d involves the movement steps depicted in (58). Besides movement of *wa* to Spec,DP the complex head [F + X (= lk)] moves and adjoins to D, which also hosts the
displaced pronominalizing definite article (Def). The wh-element (wa) and the complex head \([F+X+lk]+D(=de)\) spell out as welknde after morphological fusion has taken place. Standard Dutch differs from Northeastern Dutch in the realization of the D; it spells out as -e in Standard Dutch, but as -de in North-eastern Dutch.

\[(58) \quad [\text{DP} \ wa+\text{wh}_m [D' [[F+lk]_s+[de]+D_{\cdot 0}] [F'_{t_s} [\text{XP}_{t_k} [X_{t_l} t_m]]]]]]
\]

North-eastern Dutch: welknde
Standard Dutch: welke

6. Conclusion

In this article we have argued that the definite article de in the Standard Dutch possessive construction de mijne 'mine' is a pronoun, i.e. a dummy noun replacing a noun in what we think of as an NP ellipsis pattern. Thus, de mijne is a pattern which does not involve DP-internal elision (i.e., deletion of material) but DP-internal pronominalization. Although in Standard Dutch, the DefP-pattern is not attested in demonstrative constructions, we have shown that in other varieties of Dutch such patterns do exist (e.g. Southern-Dutch de die 'that one' and North-Eastern Dutch diende). We further pointed out an implicational hierarchy for the DefP-strategy: if a dialect permits DefP with wh-pronouns, it also permits DefP with demonstrative pronouns, and if it permits DefP with demonstrative pronouns, it also permits DefP with possessive pronouns. The microvariation attested in this domain of Dutch grammar was associated with the following dimensions of grammar: (i) DP-internal feature inheritance ('yes' for Southern dialects, 'no' for Standard Dutch and North-eastern dialects); (ii) fusion and spell out operations.
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