

Norbert Corver & Marjo van Koppen  
**Pronominalization and Variation in Dutch**

Demonstrative and Possessive Expressions

**Abstract:** 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 the possessive and demonstrative constructions we discuss feature a DP-internal predication relationship. 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.

**Keywords:** demonstratives, possessives, Dutch and Dutch dialects, Ellipsis, pronominalization, predication.

韓韓

**Norbert Corver:** Utrecht University, UiL-OTS, Trans 10, 3512 JK Utrecht,  
n.f.m.corver@uu.nl

**Marjo van Koppen** Utrecht University, UiL-OTS, Trans 10, 3512 JK Utrecht,  
j.m.vankoppen@uu.nl

## 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.

- (1) J'ai acheté une voiture blanche et Marie a acheté  
 I.have bought a car white and Marie has bought  
 une verte.  
 a green (French)
- (2) I have bought a white car and Mary bought a green \*(one).

Both phenomena have received a fair amount of attention in the literature (see among others Lobeck 1995, Kester 1996, Sleeman 1996, Ntelitheos 2004, Chisholm 2003 for analyses of NPE and Schütze 2001, Panagiotidis 2003a,b, Barbiers 2005, Corver & Van Koppen 2011 among many others for analyses of 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 mijne is groen.  
 your car is white and the mine 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.<sup>1</sup> We will refer to this construction as the DefP pattern (the Definite Pronominalization Pattern).<sup>2</sup>

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) | a. | den        | menne    |        |  |                   |
|     |    | the        | mine     | 'mine' |  | (Wambeek Dutch)   |
|     | b. | mien-'n-de |          |        |  |                   |
|     |    | mine-n-the |          | 'mine' |  | (Hooghalen Dutch) |
|     | c. | de         | miende   |        |  |                   |
|     |    | the        | mine-the | 'mine' |  | (Giethoorn Dutch) |

Dialects furthermore differ in which DP-internal pronominal elements can combine with a definite article. Some dialects can have a definite article with *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 Zeeland) in (6).

- |     |    |      |     |     |             |             |
|-----|----|------|-----|-----|-------------|-------------|
| (6) | a. | Piet | ei  | een | vervelend-e | opa         |
|     |    | Piet | has | an  | annoying-e  | grandfather |

□□

<sup>1</sup> 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.

<sup>2</sup> A similar pattern is found in French, as is exemplified in (i). We hypothesize that *le* in *le mien* is a pro-form pronominalizing the noun (i.e. NP), just like *de* in *de mijne*. For reasons of space, we will not be able to give a detailed analysis of this construction in French.

- |     |    |     |        |             |    |     |        |
|-----|----|-----|--------|-------------|----|-----|--------|
| (i) | a. | mon | père   |             | b. | le  | mien   |
|     |    | my  | father | 'my father' |    | the | my     |
|     |    |     |        |             |    |     | 'mine' |

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** dieje 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 *e*-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 North-western part of the Netherlands. The definite article precedes the pronominal remnant and is obligatory with possessive pronominal remnants.<sup>3</sup> However, it cannot occur with demonstrative pronominal remnants:

- |     |    |      |        |     |       |       |            |
|-----|----|------|--------|-----|-------|-------|------------|
| (8) | a. | mijn | vader  | a.' | *(de) | mijne |            |
|     |    | 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) | mijne |                             |
|     |    | 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 demon-

□□

<sup>3</sup> 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, however, 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.<sup>4</sup>

- |      |    |      |        |     |       |             |  |                      |
|------|----|------|--------|-----|-------|-------------|--|----------------------|
| (10) | a. | mijn | vader  | a.' | (de)  | mijnde      |  |                      |
|      |    | 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 questions, 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 grammatical role the pronominalizing definite article plays within the containing DP. That is, under which conditions does this element appear?

□□<sup>4</sup> Some dialects which display this pattern do not have a pronoun final *-de* but a pronoun final *-t*. We take this to be the same element. Corver & Van Oostendorp (2005) analyze 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 focus), 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  $D^\circ$ -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.' (French)

Abney (1987) argues on the basis of these data that pronouns and determiners occupy the same structural position, namely  $D^\circ$  (cf. also Corver & Delfitto 1999). The difference between the two  $D^\circ$ -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. [<sub>DP</sub> [<sub>D<sup>°</sup></sub> we] [<sub>NP</sub> linguists]]  
       b. [<sub>DP</sub> [<sub>D<sup>°</sup></sub> the] [<sub>NP</sub> 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<sub>neut</sub> chair-DIM '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)



- (15) a. de /\*die /\*een mijne  
 the /that /a mine 'mine'  
 b. de /die /een lieve man  
 the /that /a sweet man 'the/that/a sweet man'  
 (standard Dutch)

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'



	my	aunt	'my aunt'
c. neuter singular:	min	keind	
	my	child	'my child'

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) a. masculine singular:	de	minnen	
	the-masc/fem	my-masc	
b. feminine singular:	de	min	
	the-masc/fem	my-fem/neut	
c. neuter singular:	<b>t</b>	min	
	the-neut	my-fem/neut	'mine'

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) a. masculine singular:	mien-en	hood	
	my-masc	hat	'my hat'
b. feminine singular:	mien-e	muts	
	my-fem	bonnet	'my bonnet'
c. neuter singular:	mien	hoes	
	my	house	'my house'

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.<sup>6</sup>

(24) a. masculine singular:	(d'n)	mienen	
	the-masc	my-masc	

□□

<sup>6</sup> 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** kind  
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.

(26)	Distal	Proximal
<b>Masc. sg</b>	(d'n) dieje the-masc that-masc	(d'n) dizzen the-masc this-masc
<b>Fem. sg</b>	(de) die the-fem that-fem	(de) dees the-fem this-fem
<b>Neut. sg</b>	da that-neut	di this-neut

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).

(27)

	<b>distal</b>	<b>proximate</b>
<b>Masc. sg</b>	(den) daune the that	(den) dezen the this
<b>Fem. sg</b>	(de) dei the that	(de) dees the this
<b>Neut. sg</b>	(t) dat the that	* <b>(t) dees</b> the this

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  
I went more\_often with this aunt stay than with  
\***(de) die**.  
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.<sup>7</sup>

### 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-

□□ <sup>7</sup> 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(emonstrative)-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 [<sub>NP</sub> die<sub>i</sub>] gisteren [<sub>DP</sub> t<sub>i</sub> [<sub>NumP</sub> twee [<sub>Num'</sub> t<sub>i</sub>]]] gezien.  
 I have *die* yesterday two 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.  $[_{DP} \text{Spec } [_{D'} D [_{FP} \text{Spec } [_{F'} F [_{XP} \text{book } [_{X'} X [_{PP} P_{\text{DAT}} \text{John}]]]]]]]]]$   
 b.  $[_{DP} \text{Spec } [_{D'} D [_{FP} [_{PP} t_k \text{John}]_i [_{F'} F+X_j+P_k (=s) [_{XP} \text{book } [_{X'} t_j t_i ]]]]]]]]$

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)),<sup>8</sup> (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 posses-

□□

<sup>8</sup> 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'.<sup>9</sup> The base structure and the derived structure are given in (31)a en (31)b, respectively<sup>10</sup>:

- (31) a. [DP Spec [D' D [FP Spec [F' F [XP boek [X' [X 'n] [PP P<sub>DAT</sub> mij ]]]]]]]  
 b. [DP Spec [D' D [FP [PP t<sub>k</sub> mij] ] [F' F+X<sub>j</sub>(= 'n)+P<sub>k</sub> [XP boek [X' t<sub>j</sub> t<sub>i</sub> ]]]]]

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<sup>o</sup> to F<sup>o</sup>, 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-

□□

<sup>9</sup> 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.

<sup>10</sup> 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 dijn* (the eyes your, 'your eyes'). As noted by Stoett, the Middle Dutch possessive pronoun remains uninflected 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 uninflected 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 prenominal 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 [<sub>F</sub> 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.<sup>11</sup> 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.<sup>12</sup>

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.	<i>ene</i>	stal	a.'	<i>mene</i>	stal	(Oerle Dutch)
		a <sub>Masc</sub>	barn		my <sub>Masc</sub>	barn	
	b.	<i>en</i>	schuuiër	b.'	<i>men</i>	schuuiër	
		a <sub>Fem</sub>	barn		my <sub>Fem</sub>	barn	
	c.	<i>e</i>	schaop	c.'	<i>me</i>	schaop	
		a <sub>Neut</sub>	sheep		my <sub>Neut</sub>	sheep	

□□

<sup>11</sup> 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.

<sup>12</sup> 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: him 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*).<sup>13</sup>

- (33) a. *Mijn* bloem<sub>sing</sub> staat in de vaas. (mij + 'n bloem)  
 my flower stands in the vase  
 ‘My flower stands in a the vase.’  
 b. *Mijn* bloemen<sub>plural</sub> staan in de vaas. (mij + 'n bloemen)  
 my flowers stand in the vase  
 ‘Mijn bloemen staan in de vaas.’  
 c. *Mijn* spinazie<sub>mass</sub> groeit in de tuin. (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) a. \* Ik geloof dat er [*mijn* vriend]  
 I believe that there my friend  
 voor de deur staat.  
 in-front-of the door stands  
 b. Ik geloof dat er [*een* vriend van mij]  
 I believe that there a friend of mine  
 voor de deur staat.

□□

<sup>13</sup> According to Bennis, Corver & Den Dikken (1998), the spurious indefinite article appears in a variety of nominal constructions, including the N of N-construction (ia), the *wat voor N*-construction (1b), and the nominal wh-exclamative construction (ic).

- (i) a. die idioot van **een** Jan<sub>proper name</sub> (N-of-N construction)  
 that idiot of a Jan  
 ‘that stupid John’  
 b. wat voor **een** jongens<sub>plural?</sub> (wat voor-construction)  
 what for a boys  
 ‘What kind of boys?’  
 c. Wat **een** spinazie<sub>mass!</sub> (exclamative)  
 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' (standard Dutch)

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. [<sub>XP</sub> *de* [<sub>X'</sub> [<sub>PP</sub> 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).<sup>14</sup>

(37)  $[_{DP} \text{Spec } [_D \text{ } de_q + D [_{FP} [_{PP} t_k \text{ mij}]_i [_F \text{ } F + X_j + P_k [_{XP} t_q [_X' t_j t_i]]]]]]]$

We assume that the complex head  $F + X_j + P_k$  undergoes fusion at PF with the pronoun. Additionally, we assume that the lower copy of the moved  $D^\circ$  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

□□

<sup>14</sup> 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) a. Imogen thinks  $[_{CP} \text{ that } [_{TP} [\textit{the best candidate}]_i \text{ is John } t_i]]]$  (Predicate inversion)  
 b. \**Which guy*<sub>j</sub> does Imogen think  $[_{CP} t'_j \text{ that } [_{TP} [\textit{the best candidate}]_i \text{ is } t_j t_i]]?$   
 (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) a.  $[_{TP} [\textit{The cause of the riot}]_i \text{ was } [_{a picture of the wall}] t_i]$   
 b. *Was*<sub>j</sub>  $[_{TP} [\textit{the cause of the riot}]_i t_j \text{ } [_{a picture of the wall}] t_j]$ ?

Under the assumption that movement of *de* in *de mijne* involves head movement rather than 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.

(38) a. **Copying**

[<sub>CP</sub> wen<sub>i</sub> [<sub>C</sub> glaubt Hans [<sub>CP</sub> [<sub>C</sub> wen<sub>i</sub> [<sub>C</sub>] [Jakob wen<sub>i</sub> gesehen hat]]]]  
 who believes Hans who Jakob who seen has

b. **Fusion**

[<sub>CP</sub> wen<sub>i</sub> [<sub>C</sub> glaubt Hans [<sub>CP</sub> #wen<sub>i</sub>+C# [Jakob wen<sub>i</sub> gesehen hat]]]]

c. **Chain reduction**

[<sub>CP</sub> wen<sub>i</sub> [<sub>C</sub> glaubt Hans [<sub>CP</sub> #wen<sub>i</sub>+C# [Jakob ~~wen<sub>i</sub>~~ gesehen hat]]]]  
 'Who does Hans believe that Jakob has seen?'

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  $F+X_j(=n)+P_k$ , yielding  $n+e$ , and once between this complex and the possessive pronoun (*mij*), yielding  $mij+ne$  (= *mijne*).

(39) a. **Displacement**

[<sub>DP</sub> [<sub>D</sub> D<sub>1</sub> (=de) [<sub>FP</sub> [<sub>PP</sub> t<sub>k</sub> mij]<sub>i</sub> [<sub>F</sub> F+X<sub>j</sub>+P<sub>k</sub> (=n) [<sub>XP</sub> t<sub>i</sub> (=e) [<sub>X'</sub> t<sub>j</sub> t<sub>i</sub> ]]]]]]]

b. **Fusion**

[<sub>DP</sub> [<sub>D</sub> D<sub>1</sub> (=de) [<sub>FP</sub> [<sub>PP</sub> t<sub>k</sub> mij]<sub>i</sub> [<sub>F</sub> F+X<sub>j</sub>+P<sub>k</sub> (=n)]+ [t<sub>i</sub> (=e)] [<sub>X'</sub> t<sub>j</sub> t<sub>i</sub> ]]]]]

c. **Vocabulary Insertion/linearization**

[ de ] \* [ mij-n-e ]

As indicated in (39), the lower D-copy gets spelled out as *-e* (i.e., /ə/) phonologically.<sup>15</sup> 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*.<sup>16</sup> Schematically:

- (41) a. **Displacement**  
            $[_{DP} [_{D'} D_i (= de) [_{FP} [_{PP} t_k mij]_i [_{F'} F+X_j+P_k (= n) [_{XP} t_i (= de) [_{X'} t_j t_i ]]]]]]$   
       b. **Fusion**  
            $[_{DP} [_{D'} D_i (= de) [_{FP} [_{PP} t_k mij]_i [_{F+X_j+P_k (= n)}]+[t_i (= de)] [_{X'} t_j t_i ]]]]$   
       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;

□□

<sup>15</sup> 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 lampe* 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:  $[_{DP} [_{lamp_i}+D(=-e)] [_{NP} t_j]]$ .

- |     |   |  |
|-----|---|--|
| (i) | a. Lampe wil nait bran'n.<br>lamp-e will not light<br>'The lamp won't light.' | a'. <b>De</b> lamp wil niet branden<br>the lamp will not fire<br>'The lamp won't light.' |
|     | b. noar kerke<br>to church-e<br>'to (the) church'                             | b'. naar <b>de</b> kerk<br>to the church<br>'to (the) church'                            |

<sup>16</sup> *-t* is also found instead of *de*, as in *mient* (my-n-t, 'mine').



#### 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 (S. 4,5 years)  
 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? (S. 4,5 years)  
 and-if it grandpa's-te is  
 'And if it is grandpa's (= grandpa's glasses)?'

Barbiers 1992 for similar analyses).<sup>19</sup> 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:  $[_{DP} O_i \text{ the } [_{SC} [e]_i \text{ thief}]]$ . 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."<sup>20</sup> 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:  $[_{DP} \text{ that}_i D [_{SC} [e]_i \text{ thief}]]$ .

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.  $[_{DP} [_{D'} D [_{XP} \text{ DEMONSTRATIVE } [_{X'} X \text{ PREDICATE } ]]]]$   
       c.  $[_{DP} \text{ DEMONSTRATIVE}_i [_{D'} D [_{XP} t_i [_{X'} X \text{ PREDICATE } ]]]]$   
       d.  $[_{DP} \text{ die/that}_i [_{D'} D [_{XP} t_i [_{X'} X \text{ man}]]]]]$

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

□□

<sup>19</sup> 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'.

<sup>20</sup> 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.

- (45) a. Je moet [die Clinton] niet geloven.  
 you should that Clinton not believe  
 'You shouldn't believe a man like Clinton.'
- b. Ik vind [die Brian van jullie] een vervelend 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' D [XP Clinton [X' X die ]]]]  
 b. [DP die<sub>i</sub> [D' D [XP Clinton [X' X t<sub>i</sub> ]]]]

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 aft<sub>i</sub> [D' i [NumP [AP nei] NUM [NP t<sub>i</sub> [N' katiki [DP tis  
 these 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                    standard Dutch  
       the    that  
       'that one'
- b. (de) die                    Southern Dutch  
       the    that
- c. (\*de) dien-de            Northeastern Dutch  
       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.<sup>21</sup> 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  $X^0$ . 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

□□  
<sup>21</sup> 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.





inheritance: the former variant has it, the latter two do not.<sup>24</sup> 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 dä ...  
       there the that that said that ...  
       a.' [ Den dieën **door**] die zee dä ...  
           the that there that said that ...  
           'That one over there, he said that ...'  
       b. [ **Hieër** den dieën] die zee dä ...  
           here the that that said that ...  
       b.' [ Den dieën **hieër**] die zee dä ...  
           the that here that said that ...  
           'This one over here, he said that ...'

□□

<sup>24</sup> 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 mijne*) 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-eastern 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)  $de + pos < de + dem < de + wh$

(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.

(55) Oerle Dutch	standard Dutch
a. <b>de</b> mene(n) <sub>masc.sg</sub> the my-a; 'mine'	a'. <b>de</b> mijne the my; 'mine'
b. <b>den</b> deize(n) <sub>masc.sg</sub> the this; 'this one'	b'. (* <b>de</b> ) deze the this; 'this one'
c. <b>de</b> welke(n) the which <sub>masc.sg</sub> ; 'which one'	c'. (* <b>de</b> ) welke the which; 'which one'
d. <b>de</b> wieze(n) <sub>masc.sg</sub> the whose; 'whose'	d'. (* <b>de</b> ) wiens the whose 'whose'
e. <b>de</b> wafferen <sub>masc.sg</sub> the what-for; 'what kind of one'	e. (* <b>de</b> ) wat voor één <sub>sg</sub> the what for one; 'what kind of one'

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.

(56) a. <b>de</b> miende the my-the; 'mine'
b. (* <b>de</b> ) diznde the this-the; 'this one'
c. (* <b>de</b> ) welknde the which-the; 'which one'
d. (* <b>de</b> ) wafnde the what+for-the; 'what kind of one'

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) a. *de welke*  
       the    which        'which one'  
 b. "base structure"  
     $[_{DP} \text{Spec } [_{D'} D [_{FP} \text{Spec } [_{F'} F [_{XP} \text{de } [_{X'} [_{X} -lk] \text{wa}+wh ]]]]]]]]$   
 c. predicate inversion  
     $[_{DP} \text{Spec } [_{D'} D_{<Q>} [_{FP} \text{wa}+wh_m [_{F'} F_{<Q>}+lk_j [_{XP} \text{de } [_{X'} t_j t_m ]]]]]]]]$   
 d. movement of *de*  
     $[_{DP} \text{Spec } [_{D'} \text{de}_k+D [_{FP} \text{wa}+wh [_{F'} F_{<Q>}+lk_j [_{XP} t_k [_{X'} t_j t_m ]]]]]]]]$   
 e. fusion  
     $[_{DP} \text{Spec } [_{D'} \text{de}_k+D [_{FP} \text{wa}+wh [_{F'} F_{<Q>}+lk_j [_{XP} t_k [_{X'} t_j t_m ]]]]]]]]$   
 f. vocabulary insertion/linearization  
    [de] \* [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  $[[F+X +Ik]+D (= de)]$  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)  $[_{DP} wa+wh_m [_{D'} [[F+Ik]_s+[de_k+D_{+Q}] [_F t_s [_{XP} t_k [X' t_j t_m ]]]]]]$   
 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.

## References

- Abney, S. (1987). The English noun phrase in its sentential aspect. Doctoral dissertation, MIT.
- Aboh, E. O. (2004). Topic and Focus within D. In: L. Cornips & J. Doetjes (eds.) *Linguistics in the Netherlands* 21, 1-12.
- Barbiers, S. (1992). Adjectives as auxiliaries of the noun phrase. In: R. Bok-Bennema & R. van Hout (eds.) *Linguistics in the Netherlands* 1992, 13-24.
- Barbiers, S. (2005). Variation in the morphosyntax of ONE. *The Journal of Comparative Germanic Linguistics* 8, 159-183.
- Bennis, H. (1987). *Gaps and dummies*. Dordrecht, Foris.

- Bennis, H., N. Corver & M. den Dikken (1998). Predication in nominal phrases. In: *The journal of comparative Germanic linguistics* 1, pp. 85-117.
- Bernstein, Judy (1997). Demonstratives and reinforcers in Romance and Germanic languages. *Lingua* 102, 87-113.
- Bont, A.P. de (1958). *Dialekt van Kempenland*. Van Gorcum & Comp.N.V., Assen.
- Brugè, L. 1996. Demonstrative Movement in Spanish: A Comparative Approach. *University of Venice Working Papers in Linguistics* 6:1-53.
- Brugè, L. (2002). The positions of demonstratives in the extended nominal projection. In: G. Cinque. *Functional structure in DP and IP: the cartography of syntactic structures*, volume 1, 15-53. Oxford University Press, Oxford.
- Campbell, Richard (1996). Specificity operators in Spec,DP. *Studia Linguistica* 161-188.
- Chisholm, M. (2003). Ellipsis in DP. MA-thesis, UCSC.
- Chomsky, Noam (1995). Bare Phrase Structure. In G. Webelhuth, ed., *Government and Binding Theory and the Minimalist Program*, 385-439. Oxford: Blackwell Publishers.
- Chomsky, N. (2000). Minimalist inquiries: the framework. In R. Martin, D. Michaels, and J. Uriagereka, eds., *Step by Step — Essays in minimalist syntax in honor of Howard Lasnik*. Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press.
- Chomsky, N. (2008). On Phases. In R. Freidin, C. Otero & M.-L. Zubizarreta (eds.), *Foundational Issues in Linguistic Theory: Essays in honour of Jean-Roger Vergnaud*, 133-166. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Corver, N. (2003). A note on micro-dimensions of possession in Dutch and related languages. In Jan Koster & Henk van Riemsdijk, eds., *Germania et alia. A linguistic Webschrift for Hans den Besten*.
- Corver, N. (2008). Uniformity and Diversity in the Syntax of Evaluative Vocatives. *The Journal of Comparative Germanic Linguistics* 11.1: 43-93.
- Corver, N., and D. Delfitto (1999). On the nature of pronoun movement. In H. van Riemsdijk, ed., *Clitics in the languages of Europe (Eurotyp 20-25)*, 599-661. Berlin-New York: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Corver, N. & M. van Koppen (2010). Ellipsis in possessive NPs: a micro-comparative approach. *Journal of Comparative Germanic Linguistics* 13: 99-140.
- Corver, N. & M. van Koppen (2011). NP-ellipsis with adjectival remnants: a micro-comparative perspective. *Natural Language & Linguistic Theory*, 29: 371-421.
- Corver, N., M. van Koppen & H. Kranendonk (2013). De nominale woordgroep vanuit dialectver-gelijkend perspectief. *Nederlandse taalkunde*, 18(2), (pp. 107-138).

- Corver, N., M. van Koppen, H. Kranendonk & M. Rigterink (2007). The noun phrase: Diversity in Dutch DP Design. *Nordlyd* 34:1.73-85.
- Corver, N. & M. van Oostendorp (2005). Low Saxon possessive pronominals: Syntax and phonology. In J. Doetjes & J. van de Weijer, eds., *Linguistics in the Netherlands 2005*. 73-86. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Den Dikken, M. (1998). Predicate Inversion in DP. In A. Alexiadou & C. Wilder (eds.), *Possessors, Predicates and Movement in the Determiner Phrase*. 177-214. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Dikken, M. den (2006). *Relators and linkers. The syntax of predication, predicate inversion, and copulas*. Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press.
- Duinhoven, A. M. (1988). *Middel nederlandse syntaxis synchroon en diachroon. Deel 1: De naamwoordgroep*. Leiden: Martinus Nijhoff.
- Embick, D., & R. Noyer. (2001). Movement operations after syntax. *Linguistic Inquiry*, 32(4), 555-595.
- Freeze, R. (1992). Existentials and Other Locatives. *Language* 68, 553-595.
- Giusti, G. (1997). The categorial status of determiners. In: L. Haegeman, ed., *The new comparative syntax*, 95-123. Longman, London.
- Giusti, G. (2002). The functional structure of Noun Phrases: A bare phrase structure approach. In G. Cinque, ed., *Functional Structure in DP and IP*. 54-90, Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Gunnink, J. (1908). *Het dialect van Kampen en omstreken*. Dissertation UvA. Kok, Kampen.
- Hachem, M. (2015). *Multifunctionality: The internal and external syntax of D- and W-items in German and Dutch*. LOT-dissertation 404, Utrecht University.
- Harley & Noyer (1999). State-of-the-Article: Distributed Morphology, *GLOT International* 4: 3-9
- Higginbotham, J. (1985). On Semantics. *Linguistic Inquiry* 16, 547-593.
- Hoekstra, T. & R. Mulder (1990). Unergatives as copular verbs; locational and existential predication. *The Linguistic Review* 7:1-79.
- Hoof, H. van (2005). Split topicalization (Chapter 62). In M. Everaert & H. van Riemsdijk, eds., *The Blackwell Companion to Syntax*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Horst, J. van der (2008). *Geschiedenis van de Nederlandse Syntaxis*. Leuven, Leuven University Press.
- Kampen, J. van & N. Corver (2006). Diversity of possessor marking in Dutch child language and Dutch dialects. In M. Vliegen (Ed.), *Variation in Sprachtheorie und Spracherwerb. Proceedings of the 39th Linguistic Colloquium 2004*. 385-398. Berlin: Lang.
- Kayne, R. (1994). *The Antisymmetry of Syntax*. Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press.

- Kayne, Richard (2005). *Some notes on comparative syntax with special reference to English and French*. In R. Kayne and G. Cinque, eds., Oxford Handbook of Comparative Syntax. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Kester, E.-P. (1996). The nature of adjectival inflection. Doctoral dissertation. Utrecht University.
- Laan, K. ter (1953). *Proeve van een Groninger spraakkunst*. Winschoten: Van der Veen.
- Lobeck, A. (1995). *Ellipsis: functional heads, licensing and ellipsis*. Oxford: OUP.
- Longobardi, G. (1994). Proper names and the theory of N-movement in syntax and logical form. *Linguistic Inquiry* 25.
- Moro, A. (1997). *The raising of predicates. Predicative noun phrases and the theory of clause structure*. Cambridge: CUP.
- Ntelitheos, D. (2004). The syntax of elliptical and discontinuous nominals. MA-thesis, UCLA.
- Nunes, J. (2004). *Linearization of chains and sideward movement*. Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press.
- Overdiep, G. (1937). *Stilistische grammatica van het moderne Nederlandsch*. Tjeenk Willink, Zwolle.
- Panagiotidis, P. (2000). Demonstrative Determiners and Operators: The Case of Greek. *Lingua* 110:717-742.
- Panagiotidis, P. (2003a). Empty Nouns. *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory* 21.2: 381-432.
- Panagiotidis, P. (2003b). One, Empty Nouns and Theta Assignment. *Linguistic Inquiry* 34: 281-292.
- Panneman, M. (2007). *DP Acquisition as structure unravelling*. LOT-dissertation 167, University of Amsterdam.
- Postal, P. (1966). On so-called 'pronouns' in English. In: D. Reibel & S. Schane eds., *Modern studies in English*, 201-244. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall.
- Schönfeld, M. (1959). *Historische grammatica van het Nederlands: klankleer, vormleer, woordvorming*.
- Schoorlemmer, M. (1998). 'Possessors, articles and definiteness'. In: A. Alexiadou and C. Wilder, eds., *Possessors, predicates and movement in the Determiner Phrase*. 55-86. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Schoorlemmer, E. (2009). *Agreement, Dominance and Doubling: the morpho-syntax of DP*. LOT-dissertation 225, Leiden University.
- Schuringa, F.G. (1923). *Het dialect van de Veenkoloniën in verband met de overige tongvallen in de provincie Groningen*. Den Haag: Wolters.

- Schütze, C. (2001). Semantically Empty Lexical Heads as Last Resorts. In: N. Corver & H. van Riemsdijk, eds., *Semi-lexical categories*. 127-187. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Sleeman, P. (1996). Licensing Empty Nouns in French. Doctoral dissertation, University of Amsterdam.
- Stoett, F. (1923). *Middelnederlandsche Spraakkunst*, Martinus Nijhoff, 's-Gravenhage.