Resuming Reflexives*

Kleanthes K. Grohmann and Liliane Haegeman
University of Cologne and University of Lille/CNRS

1. Introduction

In this paper, we offer an analysis for the prenominal possessor doubling construction as it occurs in Germanic, paying particular attention to the differences between Norwegian and West Flemish. Our analysis (i) develops recent theoretical proposals driving locality relations, (ii) uses these to derive the occurrence of a possessive pronoun doubling the possessor, and (iii) discusses further comparisons across the Germanic languages. Our main proposal is that the doubling pronoun is a resumptive element, understood more generally as a spelled out copy of the (moved) possessor DP.

2. Prenominal Possessor Doubling Constructions

The Prenominal Possessor Doubling Construction (henceforth, *PPDC*; *PPDed DP* stands for 'possessor-doubled DP') is instantiated in several Germanic languages (and to some degree beyond), diachronically as well as synchronically. We focus on its properties in modern Norwegian and West Flemish, as illustrated in (1) and (2):[1]

(1) Per sin bil (Norwegian; Fiva 1984:2)
Per REFL *car*
'Per's car'

(2) Marie euren vent (West Flemish; Haegeman 1998:1)
Marie her husband
'Marie's husband'

Descriptively, PPDCs are complex DPs containing a *possessor* POSS (which can itself be complex), a prenominal *possessive* pronoun PRON

*We are grateful to the audience at SCL 19, in particular to Marit Julien and Øystein Vangsnes for stimulating discussion. KKG acknowledges support from a DFG-postdoctoral fellowship (*Graduiertenkolleg Satzarten: Variation und Interpretation*, Frankfurt am Main).

[1]We gloss the doubling possessive pronoun in West Flemish as its corresponding possessive pronominal form in English and we gloss the doubling reflexive possessive in Norwegian simply as REFLexive. For further data and discussion of PPDCs, see e.g. Keenan 1974, Fiva 1984, Ramat 1986, Corver 1990, Delsing 1998, Haegeman 1998, Vezzosi 2000.

Nordlyd 31.3:46-62, © the author 2003
Proceedings of the 19th Scandinavian Conference of Linguistics, vol. 31.1,
Edited by Anne Dahl, Kristine Bentzen, and Peter Svenonius

(which doubles POSS), and the head noun (phrase) aka *possessum* NP. We will refer to these elements as such and explore a more concrete structure for this DP:

(3) $[_{DP}$ POSS PRON NP]

Beyond investigating the finer structure of the DP depicted in (3), we will pinpoint the derivational processes underlying PPDCs in Norwegian and West Flemish, deriving in particular the nature and position of possessor and possessive. Two theoretical proposals will guide our investigation. On the one hand, we adapt Grohmann's (2000, 2003) *Anti-Locality Hypothesis*, a means to partition clausal structure into finer domains within which phrasal movement is banned. On the other, we will consider the *Clausal DP-Hypothesis* that assimilates the structure of the nominal layer to that of the clausal layer (cf. Ritter 1991 and subsequent research; see Bernstein 2001, Haegeman 2001).

The relevance of these two hypotheses is obvious: if we can partition the clause into movement-sensitive domains and if the structure of DP bears similarities to the structure of the clause, we would expect to find the same type of partitioning within DP as well, presumably subject to the same locality restrictions. Evidence from the PPDC suggests that we do indeed find this partitioning, and the framework allows for a straightforward derivational introduction of the possessive pronoun in these constructions.

3. The Anti-Locality Hypothesis

Under the minimalist desideratum that the structure of the grammar be determined by (virtually) conceptual necessity (Chomsky 1993, 1995), much of the GB-machinery should be reconsidered, in particular restrictions on the computation that are not motivated by Bare Output Conditions (see Hornstein 2001, Grohmann 2003:ch. 2). We might thus ask whether the ungrammaticality of (4a-c) could receive an alternative explanation to standard approaches, such as evoking filters of sorts (Theta Criterion, Case Filter, Affect Criteria etc.):

(4) a. *John likes. (cf. *John likes himself.*)
b. *Him kissed her. (cf. *He kissed her.*)
c. *Who, Mary detests? (cf. *Who does Mary detest?*)

Under the Copy Theory of movement (lower copies represented in strikethrough throughout and structural ill-formedness is indicated by '#'), the corresponding derivations of (4) at the relevant points could be the ones in (5):

(5) a. # [$_{vP}$ John v^0 [$_{VP}$ likes ~~John~~]]
b. # [$_{TP}$ him T^0 [$_{AgrOP}$ ~~him~~ $AgrO^0$ [$_{vP}$ softly [$_{vP}$ ~~him~~ v^0 [$_{VP}$ kissed her]]]]]
c. # [$_{TopP}$ who Top^0 [$_{FocP}$ ~~who~~ Foc^0 [$_{TP}$ Mary T^0 detests … (~~who~~)]]]

As it happens, the derivations in (5) are all ill-formed, so we would need to say something else to rule them out, if we follow the path just mentioned, namely that restrictions on the computation that do not follow from Bare Output Conditions are not allowed. A starting point for a purely syntactic explanation for this ungrammaticality would be the following hypothesis:

(6) *Anti-Locality Hypothesis*
Movement must not be too local.

In structural terms, "too local" or *anti-local* describes a dependency between two contextually related positions. The common contextual information (as relevant for Anti-Locality) we take to be encoded in all lexical and functional heads that build up a derivation. In order to capture this intuition in structural terms, we introduce the notion of a *Prolific Domain*:

(7) *Prolific Domain (Grohmann 2000:58)*
A Prolific Domain is a contextually defined part of the computational system, which (i) provides the interfaces with the information relevant to the context and (ii) consists of internal structure, interacting with derivational operations.

Following earlier conceptions of the clause (e.g. Chomsky 1986) and much current research on the finer structure of these projections (see Cinque 1999 for review and references), a presumably natural implementation of contextual information would be a clausal tripartition, a formal split of the clause into three Prolific Domains: a Theta-, an Agreement-, and a Discourse-Domain (cf. also Platzack 2001). Following Grohmann (2000), we refer to these as (i) the *Θ-Domain* (that part of the derivation where thematic relations are created; *v*/VP), (ii) the *Φ-Domain* (where agreement/inflectional properties are licensed; split INFL), and (iii) the *Ω-Domain* (establishing discourse information; split CP).

As laid out in detail elsewhere (Grohmann 2000, 2003), we can adopt a dynamic approach to the computation in terms of multiple Spell Out (cf. Uriagereka 1999). Each Prolific Domain forms a part of the derivation where Spell Out applies and the information gets shipped to the PF- and LF-interface components. One minimalist criterion that all conditions, operations

and principles must abide by is that they follow from Bare Output Conditions (Chomsky 1995). With the abolishment of the GB-levels of D- and S-structure, many of the standard conditions do not follow from Bare Output Conditions (cf. discussion around (4)). Let us then formulate a single condition that does:

(8) *Condition on Domain Exclusivity (Grohmann 2000:61)*
An object O in a phrase marker must have one exclusive Address Identification AI per Prolific Domain ΠΔ, unless duplicity yields a drastic effect on the output.
i. An AI of O in a given ΠΔ is an occurrence of O in that ΠΔ at LF.
ii. A drastic effect on the output is a different realization of O at PF.

Further details aside (see Grohmann 2000, 2003 for discussion), the Condition on Domain Exclusivity (CDE) applies to all and only XP-dependencies within a Prolific Domain (but it allows head movement, as head movement changes the PF-matrix of the two heads involved by definition).

A further prediction of the CDE is that if a dependency between two XPs within one Prolific Domain involves two different PF-matrices, the dependency should be well-formed. An interesting and reasonably clear-cut instance of this is a type of left dislocation, often labelled "contrastive" left dislocation:

(9) a. [*Seinen*$_i$ *Vater*], *den* mag jeder$_i$ Junge.
his.ACC father RP.ACC likes every boy
'His father, every boy likes.'
b. [$_{CP}$ seinen Vater C^0 [$_{TopP}$ *den* mag-Top^0 [$_{TP}$ jeder Junge T^0…]]]

The left-dislocated XP and the resumptive pronoun RP are in the same Prolific Domain (namely the Ω-Domain). Moreover, (9) allows a bound variable reading and aside from such absence of Weak Crossover effects, contrastive left dislocation displays other signs of reconstruction of the left-dislocated phrase (presence of Condition A effects, absence of Condition C effects, idiom chunks).

All this and more (such as embedding or multiple left dislocation) stands in sharp contrast to hanging topic left dislocation, illustrated in (10):

(10) a. [*Sein*$_i$ *Vater*], jeder$_{*i/k}$ Junge mag *den/ihn*.
his.NOM father every boy likes RP/him.ACC
'His father, every boy likes him.'
b. [$_{CP}$ sein Vater [$_{CP}$ C^0 [$_{TP}$ jeder Junge mag-T^0 den/ihn…]]]

The obvious analysis made possible by the Anti-Locality Hypothesis is to derive contrastive left dislocation in terms of a (movement) dependency between the left-dislocated XP and the RP, while hanging topics are generated in their surface position, as in standard analyses. By the CDE, this movement can be understood as the result of Copy Spell Out ('➲'), changing the PF-matrix of the lower of the two copies that are in the same Prolific Domain:

(11) $[_{CP}$ seinen Vater C^0 $[_{TopP}$ ~~seinen Vater~~ ➲ den mag-Top^0 $[_{TP}$ …]]]

If RPs in contrastive left dislocation can be reasonably analysed as a derivational result, rather than fully lexical items part of the numeration/lexical array, two relevant questions arise: (i) Do we find other instances of resumption that could be analysed as Copy Spell Out? (ii) Do we find other occurrences of pronouns that could be understood as resumption?

Given a clausal tripartition into Prolific Domains, the CDE and Copy Spell Out as briefly sketched here, one could indeed envision another set of "resumptive" elements, namely grammatical formatives inserted to legitimize a dependency whose members would otherwise be too close to be licensed. A pronoun-qua-grammatical-formatives view has recently been integrated into a derivational approach for local anaphors by Hornstein (2001). As relevant for the Anti-Locality Hypothesis, we suggest that reflexives may be employed to legitimize a too-close dependency (Grohmann 2000, 2003).

To briefly illustrate with a relevant structure touched on above, take (12), where *v*P and VP form one Prolific Domain (namely, the Θ-Domain):

(12) a. John$_i$ likes himself$_i$.
b. $[_{TP}$ John T^0 $[_{vP}$ ~~John~~ v^0 $[_{VP}$ likes ~~John~~ ➲ himself]]]

If on the right track (see the references just mentioned for further discussion and references), the common characterization of the distribution of RPs — that they get inserted when the distance between two positions in a dependency would otherwise be too far to be licensed legitimately (on standard "upper-bound" accounts of locality) — can be extended. We now have (at least, theoretical) reasons to believe that some resumption may take place derivationally, namely, in an anti-local relationship, when the distance between two positions is too close. In other words, modifying a Last Resort approach to resumption (Shlonsky 1992), one type of RPs is inserted into a structure from which movement cannot take place ("Standard Locality"), another when movement is too close ("Anti-Locality").

4. The Clausal-DP Hypothesis

Our goal is to apply the Anti-Locality Hypothesis to PPDCs and derive PRON analogously to other spelled out grammatical formatives. Such an approach is intricately connected to a partition of the nominal layer akin to the one we have sketched for the clausal layer. Let us thus more look closely at DP-structure. Consider again a typical PPDC, here exemplified with (colloquial) Dutch:

(13) Jan z'n huis
Jan his house
'Jan's house'

Before we explore this construction further, concentrating on its structure and properties in West Flemish and Norwegian, we consider the structure of DP more generally, thereby touching on the Anti-Locality Hypothesis and the role it might play in the nominal layer.

One obvious similarity between nominal and clausal constructions concerns left dislocation (where for our purposes, Dutch works just like German; cf. the discussion around (9) above and the analysis supplied). The boldfaced part shows that left dislocation may also apply within DPs:

(14) a. Over **[minister-president van Agt]$_i$** **die$_i$** **zijn$_i$** **fouten**
about Minister President van Agt that his mistakes
hebben we gepraat.
have we talked
'About MP van Agt's mistakes, we talked.' (Jansen 1977:438)
b. Jan$_i$, die$_i$ vertrekt laat.
Jan that leaves late
'Jan, he leaves late.'
c. **Jan$_i$, die$_i$ z'n$_i$ late vertrek**
Jan that his late departure
'Jan's late departure'

We will turn to the relevance of this type of "nominal left dislocation" for West Flemish and Norwegian below. For now, two observations are in order: (i) if left dislocation involves Copy Spell Out in the clausal layer, it should also do so in the nominal layer; (ii) if Copy Spell Out in the clausal layer is due to satisfying the CDE (viz. Prolific Domains), the nominal layer should also be sensitive to the CDE (i.e. have Prolific Domains).

Ever since the formulation of Abney's (1987) DP-Hypothesis and Ritter's (1991) suggestion of e.g. an agreement-related Num(ber)P within

DP, much evidence has been collected to align the nominal DP-structure to the clausal CP-structure, where D^0 plays the "nominal role" of C^0, so to speak (see e.g. Bernstein 2001, Haegeman 2001 for critical reviews). Replace "NumP" by a more general "AgrP" (and do the same with "TP"), we'll get the following:

(15) a. clausal structure: CP > AgrP > *v*P
b. nominal structure: DP > AgrP > NP

If *v*P denotes the domain of thematic relations, AgrP of agreement properties, and C/DP of discourse information (all as understood throughout), a first approximation would thus be to assign the same Prolific Domains:

(16) a. $CP_{\Omega\Delta}$ > $AgrP_{\Phi\Delta}$ > $vP_{\Theta\Delta}$
b. $DP_{\Omega\Delta}$ > $AgrP_{\Phi\Delta}$ > $NP_{\Theta\Delta}$

The tripartite composition of DP is widely employed, and as such suggests that we would find the same (type of) Prolific Domains here as well, just as with the tripartite composition of CP (the clause). And just as these functional projections have been finer articulated in the clausal layer, so have they in the nominal layer (see references above for discussion and further pointers).

Intuitively, the prenominal possessor has a subject-like function inside the DP. Identifying one or more subject positions inside the DP obviously reinforces the parallelism between clause and DP. Regarding the clause, Cardinaletti (2000:36) postulates at least five pre-verbal subject positions, each with a specialized function. (see also Cardinaletti 1997 for a first proposal).

(17) SpecSubjP > SpecEPP > SpecAgrSP > SpecNomP > SpecVP

SpecNomP is a Case-licensing position, SpecAgrSP licenses agreement. In *pro*-drop languages, *pro* occupies the EPP subject position, and a lexical subject occupies SpecSubjP, the position specialised for the subject of predication.[2]

This obviously opens the possibility that the nominal layer also shows more than two prenominal subject positions. Haegeman (2001, 2003)

[2] SpecSubjP is also argued to host a fronted dative with *psych*-verbs inversion patterns, fronted locatives in locative inversion and a fronted predicate in predicate inversion patterns.

proposes the structure in (18), which instantiates two DP-internal prenominal 'subject positions'. SpecAgrP (her SpecIP) hosts *pro* in non-doubled constructions with a possessive pronoun, our PRON (18a), and it hosts the trace of POSS in doubling constructions (18b).[3] SpecFinP is argued to be contextually related to DP and hosts the doubling POSS. The 'subject positions' postulated for the DP can be seen as parallel to the positions identified by Cardinaletti (2000), with FinP corresponding to Cardinaletti's SubjP and AgrP to her EPP position:

(18) a. $[_{DP}\ [_{FinP}\ \ \ [_{AgrP}$ pro *zen* […]]]]
b. $[_{DP}\ [_{FinP}$ POSS$_i$ $[_{AgrP}$ t$_i$ *zen* […]]]]

This parallelism has an interesting consequence. Cardinaletti (2000) proposes that the higher subject position is the landing site for inverted predicates in predicate inversion construction (see fn. 2). Haegeman's (2001, 2003) analysis thus is in line with current proposals, such as den Dikken's (1997, 1998), in which prenominal possessors are analysed as inverted predicates. We'll explore and expand the structure in (18a) presently.

Now that we can conceptually motivate Prolific Domains in the nominal layer, let us see whether we can empirically support them the same way we've done with the clause, i.e. in terms of the CDE. Our testing case is the PPDC. One goal of this paper is a strengthening of the Anti-Locality Hypothesis by demonstrating a more general application of Prolific Domains/Anti-Locality, and the PPDC is a first look at the nominal domain (also Grohmann 2003:ch.6).

5. An Anti-Locality Approach to PPDCs

One assumption about the possessive pronoun PRON is that it is the spelled out nominal inflectional head (containing the phi-features) sitting between D^0 and N^0. It then moves to D^0 (e.g. Corver 1990, Picallo 1994, Delsing 1998, Zribi-Hertz 1998), deriving the complementary distribution with the determiner, seen in (19) and (20) with our two main languages:

[3] Following Zribi-Hertz (1998), Haegeman (2001) assumes that the doubling pronoun PRON is the Spell Out of Agr^0, a position which we do not endorse here as we assume that PRON is a Copy Spell Out of the possessor, a maximal projection. It could be, though, that the doubling pronoun subsequently cliticises to D^0. This would be compatible with our analysis. The issue is only tangential to our efforts, however, as we are simply concerned with the derivational origin of PRON, not any subsequent operations it might undergo.

(19) *West Flemish*
a. (*den) euren boek
the her book
b. (*den) euren eersten ∅
the her first ∅
c. den euren ∅
a'. Marie (*den) euren boek
Marie the her book
b'. Marie (*den) euren eersten ∅
Marie the her first ∅
c'. Marie den euren ∅

(20) *Norwegian* (Delsing 1998:102, citing Fiva 1987)
a. han Per
he Per
b. bilen hans Per
car-the his Per
c. *han Per sin bil
he/his Per REFL car

The structural relations we can ascertain are arguably as follows: (i) at the bottom of the PPDed DP sits the possessum NP (which itself could have complex structure, but that is irrelevant here); (ii) the doubled possessor POSS is itself a DP, sitting in some specifier position higher than NP; (iii) the lowest possible position for the doubling possessive pronoun PRON would be the head that takes NP as its complement; (iv) POSS and the prenominal possessive pronoun PRON do not form a single constituent.

We assume the following (minimal) structure for DPs:

(21) $[_{\Omega\Delta}$ TopP > DP $[_{\Phi\Delta}$ AgrP > PossP $[_{\Theta\Delta}$ NP]]]

On our quest to pinpoint the relevance of Prolific Domains for PPDCs, we will motivate the structure in (21) based on the following assumptions:

(i) We take the locus of checking/licensing possession to be PossP, obviously part of the Φ-Domain: POSS must at least raise here to check possessive Case/agreement. PossP could be parallel to Cardinaletti's (2000) NomP.
(ii) As a 'nominal subject' POSS needs to move to a (higher) subject position, which we label AgrP. AgrP is the lower nominal subject position, also part of the Φ-Domain. We leave it open here whether in

line with Cardinaletti there should be two positions, AgrP and an EPP position.

(iii) DP (i.e. Haegeman's FinP from (18) above) is the highest nominal subject position and is part of the Ω-Domain, relating to discourse.

(iv) On analogy with proposals concerning the CP-layer (our Ω-Domain), the Ω-Domain is split into more material, providing room for nominal topics.

This allows us to propose the following derivations of PPDed DPs in the two languages under investigation (leaving out TopP for the time being):

(22) *West Flemish*

$[_{DP}$ Spec	D^0	$[_{AgrP}$ Spec	Agr^0	$[_{PossP}$ Spec		$Poss^0$	$[_{NP}$	$N^0]]]]$
Marie		~~*Marie*~~		~~*Marie*~~ ➲ *euren*				*book*

(23) *Norwegian*

$[_{DP}$	D^0	$[_{AgrP}$ Spec	Agr^0	$[_{PossP}$ Spec		$Poss^0$	$[_{NP}$	$N^0]]]]$
		Per		~~*Per*~~ ➲ *sin*				*tante*

As (22) and (23) suggest, our analysis ties in directly with the Anti-Locality Hypothesis: the doubled possessor POSS moves from SpecPossP (checking possessive features) to the subject position AgrP. This triggers Copy Spell Out of the lower copy in PossP — the resulting form is the possessive pronoun PRON, derived just as anaphors and resumptives in left dislocation.

Why is the Norwegian Copy Spell Out a possessive reflexive? Delsing (1998:94) observes that "[l]anguages having a distinct reflexive possessive pronoun use this reflexive form in [the PPDC, which he labels the *prenominal periphrastic construction*]." Admittedly, this is not a complete answer, but one that shall do for now; it throws up obvious related questions, such as why local reflexives get spelled out as reflexives, resumptives in German contrastive left dislocation as so-called *d*-pronouns, and so on.

In the remainder of this section we offer some empirical evidence that POSS occupies different positions at Spell Out in West Flemish vs. Norwegian, in particular that it is situated within the Ω-Domain in the former and within the Φ-Domain in the latter language. At this point we are not able to link the difference in position with the distinct Spell Out of the copy (reflexive or pronoun), but we hope to be able to relate these two points in future work.

A first argument comes from left dislocation, which Norwegian does not make available in the nominal layer ('nominal left dislocation'), although

it exhibits perfectly well-formed left dislocation of the sort witnessed in German ('clausal left dislocation'; see (9) above). Consider:

(24) a. Per, ham liker jeg godt.
Per him like I well
'Per, I really like [him].'
b. *Per, han sin plan liker jeg godt.
Per him REFL plan like I well
'Per, his [= him his] plan I really like.'

As a first stab, Norwegian left dislocation seems to show the same properties noted already for German (also Dutch, West Flemish). For example, the counterpart of (9a) is acceptable. The bound variable reading is available in simple topicalization (25a) as well as left dislocation (25b):

(25) a. Far-en sin liker enhver gutt.
father.DEF REFL likes every boy
'His father, every boy likes.'
b. ?Far-en sin, ham liker enhver gutt.
father.DEF REFL him likes every boy

For the meaning 'every boy likes one particular person's father', *sin* gets replaced by *hans*:

(26) a. Far-en hans liker enhver gutt.
father.DEF his likes every boy
'His father, every boy likes him.'
b. Far-en hans, ham liker enhver gutt.
father.DEF his him likes every boy

Other tests employed in the literature to check for reconstruction effects (see Grohmann 2000 for summary) seem to work also (Marit Julien, p.c.). Interestingly, however, (24b) is out.

Nominal left dislocation is acceptable in West Flemish (compare with the Dutch (14) above):

(27) Verhofstadt den dienen zen fouten
Verhofstadt the that.MASC his mistakes
'Verhofstadt's mistakes'

The different canonical positions of POSS in West Flemish vs. Norwegian PPDed DPs allow us to capture the presence vs. absence of

nominal left dislocation. The West Flemish DP looks presumably like (28), where the highest copy of 'POSS', i.e. the one that gets pronounced, would correspond to *Verhofstadt* in (27), 'RP' to *den dienen*, and 'PRON' to *zen*. (For clarity, the first line shows the projections related to the Ω-, the second to the Φ-Domain.):

(28) $[_{TopP}$ POSS Top^0 $[_{DP}$ ~~POSS~~ ➲ RP D^0
$[_{AgrP}$ ~~POSS~~ Agr^0 $[_{PossP}$ ~~POSS~~ ➲ PRON Poss^0 $[_{NP}$ …]]]]]

The Norwegian PPDed DP, on the other hand, does not require POSS-movement into the Ω-Domain (SpecDP). If the Norwegian possessor needs to be fronted for some reason (topicialization, focussing), it will move directly to the targeted position without an additional touch-down in the nominal Ω-Domain. DP-internal topicalization in Norwegian is derived as follows:

(29) $[_{TopP}$ POSS Top^0 $[_{DP}$ Ø D^0
$[_{AgrP}$ ~~POSS~~ Agr^0 $[_{PossP}$ ~~POSS~~ ➲ PRON Poss^0 $[_{NP}$ …]]]]]

Nominal left dislocation is then interpreted as possessor-topicalization and triggers resumption only if topic-movement would violate the CDE.

Without going into too much detail, one possible instance of Norwegian possessor topicalization (i.e. A'-movement within the nominal Ω-Domain) comes from certain dialects.

(30) (han) Per sin katt
he *Per* *REFL* *cat*
'Peter's cat'

According to Marit Julien (p.c.), "[t]he dialects in the districts around Trondheim share some features with the dialects in the eastern part of Norway and other features with the dialects in the north." One aspect of this dialect is that a proper name in an argument position must be preceded by a pronoun (cf. (20a) above):

(31) a. *Æ* ser *(han) Per
I *see* *him* *Per*
b. *(Han) Per e her.
he *Per* *is here*

In the corresponding PPDC, the pronoun is optional:

(32) (han) Per sin katt
him *Per* *REFL* *cat*

In (32), the possessor is focused, and as such parallels many speakers' use of (33a) vs. (33b), where the pronominal pronoun indicates focalization:

(33) a. min katt (focused: 'MY cat')
REFL *cat*
b. katten min (normal: 'my cat')

We could analyse the construction in (32) as involving Ω-movement of the possessor *han Per*:

(34) [$_{FocP}$ *han Per* Foc^0 [$_{DP}$ *Ø* D^0
[$_{AgrP}$ ~~*han per*~~ Agr^0 [$_{PossP}$ ~~*han per*~~ ➲ *sin* Poss^0 [$_{NP}$ *katt*…]]]]]

A second argument for distinguishing the position of the prenominal possessor in doubling constructions in the two languages we are concerned with here comes from floating quantifiers. West Flemish quantifiers may strand from the possessum NP:

(35) a. K'een al Valère zen boeken gelezen.
I-have *all* *Valère* *his* *books* *read*
b. K'een Valère al zen boeken gelezen.

More interestingly, quantifiers may also strand from the possessor POSS:

(36) a. K'een al djoengers under us gezien.
I-have *all* *the-kids* *their* *house* *seen*
b. K'een djoengers al under us gezien.
c. K'een alle drieje djoengers under us gezien.
I-have *all* *three* *the-kids* *their* *house* *seen*
d. K'een djoengers alle drieje under us gezien.
e. K'een allemoale djoengers under us gezien.
I-have *all* *the-kids* *their* *house* *seen*
f. K'een djoengers allemoale under us gezien.
'I have seen all the (three) kids' [their] house."

The positions of the floating quantifier suggest that POSS (i.e. (Q) *djoengers*) is indeed in a higher projection than PRON (*zen*), and it confirms that POSS and PRON need not be adjacent. Depending on how we analyse floating quantifiers, however (see Bobaljik 1998 for an overview), it might also be taken to indicate rather strongly that there are (at least) two POSS-positions:

(37) [$_{DP}$ *djoengers* D^0
[$_{AgrP}$ [*all* ~~*djoengers*~~] Agr^0 [$_{PossP}$ [~~*all djoengers*~~] ➲ *under* $Poss^0$ [$_{NP}$ *us*]]]]

Norwegian also allows quantifiers inside PPDed DPs referring to the possessum NP (not shown here). A non-floating quantifier can be part of NP, in which case it will precede the possessor, but the quantifier may not be stranded. The more interesting, and for us relevant, case concerns quantifying POSS. Crucially, while POSS-related quantifiers exist, they may not be stranded:

(38) Jeg har sett alle barna sitt hus.
I have seen all kids REFL house
'I have seen all the kids' [their] house."

(39) a. alle barna sitt hus
all kids REFL house
b. *barna alle sitt hus
c. *barna sitt alle hus
d. *barna sitt hus alle

If (23) is indeed the structure of Norwegian PPDed DPs, the equivalent derivation to (37) above cannot even be construed: the possessor does not move on, hence the quantifier cannot be stranded. (40) illustrates:

(40) [$_{DP}$ Ø D^0 [$_{AgrP}$ [*alle barna*] Agr^0 [$_{PossP}$ [~~*alle barna*~~] ➲ *sitt* $Poss^0$ [$_{NP}$ *hus*]]]]

This section has shown, then, that adopting a tripartite structure for both the clausal and nominal layer makes certain predictions that seem to be borne out. In particular, the Anti-Locality Hypothesis allows us to apply a tripartite structure in terms of Prolific Domains to the nominal layer, such as complex DPs. The PPDC, in comparison between Norwegian and West Flemish, further allows a finer articulation of this structure and a well-motivated instantiation of the Condition on Domain Exclusivity. This drives

the different derivations and resulting structures we argued for. Our proposal receives empirical support from cross-linguistic differences in topicalizing material within the PPDC and stranding possessor-related quantifiers.

6. Conclusion

We considered the prenominal possessor doubling construction in Germanic and concentrated on a comparison of the properties, structure, and relevant derivations in West Flemish vs. Norwegian PPDC.

In our analysis we maximize the parallelism between the clausal and nominal layer, assuming three Prolific Domains for both (the Θ-Domain, the Φ-Domain, and the Ω-Domain). We also follow recent research by assuming that just as the clause has a number of distinct preverbal subject positions in the Φ-Domain, similarly DP has at least two prenominal subject positions in the Φ-Domain. The latter subject positions are identified SpecPossP and SpecAgrP.

Our proposal is that possessor doubling is triggered by Anti-Locality effects in DP, in particular that it is the result of Copy Spell Out of possessor-movement inside the Φ-Domain, from PossP to AgrP. We further show that while Norwegian possessors remain in the nominal Φ-Domain, West Flemish possessors move into the DP-periphery, the Ω-Domain.

References:

Abney, Stephen. 1987. *The English Noun Phrase in Its Sentential Aspect*, Doctoral dissertation, Massachusetts Institute of Technology, Cambridge.

Bernstein, Judy B. 2001.'The DP Hypothesis: Identifying Clausal Properties in the Nominal Domain,' in Mark R. Baltin and Chris Collins (eds.), *The Handbook of Contemporary Syntactic Theory*, Blackwell, Oxford, pp. 536-561.

Bobaljik, Jonathan David. 1998. 'Floating Quantifiers: Handling with Care,' *Glot International* 3, 3-10.

Cardinaletti, Anna. 1997. 'Subjects and Clause Structure,' in Liliane Haegeman (ed.), *The New Comparative Syntax*, Addison, Wesley, Longman, London, pp. 33-63.

Cardinaletti, Anna. 2000. 'Towards a cartography of subject positions,' Manuscript, University of Venice and SSLMIT, University of Bologna.

Chomsky, Noam. 1986. *Barriers*, MIT Press, Cambridge, MA

Chomsky, Noam. 1993. 'A Minimalist Program for Linguistic Theory,' in Kenneth Hale and Samuel Jay Keyser (eds.), *The View from Building 20. Essays in Honor of Sylvain Bromberger*. MIT Press, Cambridge, MA, pp. 1-52. [Reprinted in Chomsky 1995, pp. 167-217.]

Chomsky, Noam. 1995. *The Minimalist Program*, MIT Press, Cambridge, MA.

Cinque, Guglielmo. 1999. *Adverbs and the Universal Hierarchy of Functional Projections*, Oxford University Press, Oxford.

Corver, Norbert. 1990. *The Syntax of Left Branch Extractions*, Doctoral dissertation, Katholieke Universiteit Brabant, Tilburg.

Delsing, Lars-Olof. 1993. *The Internal Structure of Noun Phrases in the Scandinavian Languages. A Comparative Study*, Doctoral dissertation, Lunds Universitet.

Delsing, Lars-Olof. 1998. 'Possession in Germanic,' in Artemis Alexiadou and Chris Wilder (eds.), *Possessors, Predicates and Movement in the DP*, John Benjamins, Amsterdam, pp. 87-108.

den Dikken, Marcel. 1997. 'The Syntax of Possession and the Verb *have*,' *Lingua* 101, 129-150.

den Dikken, Marcel. 1998. 'Predicate Inversion in DP,' in Artemis Alexiadou and Chris Wilder (eds.), *Possessors, Predicates and Movement in the DP*, John Benjamins, Amsterdam, pp. 177-214.

Fiva, Toril. 1984. 'NP-Internal Chains in Norwegian,' *Working Papers in Scandinavian Syntax* 14.

Fiva, Toril. 1987. *Possessor Chains in Norwegian*, Novus, Oslo.

Grohmann, Kleanthes K. 2000. *Prolific Peripheries: A Radical View from the Left*, Doctoral dissertation, University of Maryland, College Park.

Grohmann, Kleanthes K. 2003. *Prolific Domains. On the Anti-Locality of Movement Dependencies*, To appear with John Benjamins, Amsterdam.

Haegeman, Liliane. 1998. 'Notes on the Anaphor-Agreement Effect in the DP,' Manuscript, Université de Genève.

Haegeman, Liliane. 2001. 'DP Periphery and Clausal Periphery: Possessor Doubling in West Flemish? Relating Nominal Periphery to Clausal Periphery,' to appear in David Adger, Cécile de Cat & George Tsoulas (eds.), *Peripheries*, Kluwer, Dordrecht.

Haegeman, Liliane. 2003. 'The External Possessor Construction in West Flemish,' in Martine Coene, Yves d'Hulst and Liliane Tasmowski (eds.), *From NP to DP, Vol. II: The Expression of Possession*, John Benjamins, Amsterdam, pp. 221-255.

Hornstein, Norbert. 2001. *Move! A Minimalist Theory of Construal*, Blackwell, Oxford.

Jansen, Arans A. 1977. *Jan z'n boek*, een genitief? *Spektator* 7-8, 436-440.

Keenan, Edward L. 1974. 'The Functional Principle: Generalizing the Notion of 'Subject of',' *Papers from the 10th Regional Meeting of the Chicago Linguistics Society*, 298-309.

Picallo, M. Carme. 1994. 'Catalan Possessive Pronouns: The Avoid Pronoun Principe,' *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory* 12, 259-300.

Platzack, Christer. 2001. 'Multiple Interfaces,' in Urpo Nikanne and Emile van der Zee (eds.), *Cognitive Interfaces. Constraints on Linking Cognitive Information*, Oxford University Press, Oxford , pp. 21-53.

Ramat, Paolo. 1986. 'The Germanic Possessive Type: *dem Vater sein Haus*,' in Dieter Kastovsky and Aleksander Szwedek (eds.), *Linguistics across Historical and Geographical Boundaries*, Mouton de Gruyter, Berlin, pp. 579-590.

Ritter, Elisabeth. 1991. 'Two Functional Categories in Noun Phrases: Evidence from Modern Hebrew,' in Susan Rothstein (ed.), *Perspectives on Phrase Structure. Syntax and Semantics 26*, Academic Press, New York, pp. 37-62.

Shlonsky, Ur. 1992. 'Resumptive Pronouns as a Last Resort,' *Linguistic Inquiry* 23, 443-468.

Uriagereka, Juan. 1999. 'Multiple Spell Out,' in Samuel David Epstein and Norbert Hornstein (eds.), *Working Minimalism*, MIT Press, Cambridge, MA, pp. 251-282.

Vezzosi, Letizia. 2000. '*John his book* vs. *John's book*: Possession Marking in English,' in Nanna Fuhrhop (ed.), *ZAS Papers in Linguistics* 15, 168-198.

Zribi-Hertz, Anne. 1998. 'Les syntagmes nominaux possessifs en français moderne: Syntaxe et morphologie,' in Jacqueline Guéron and Anne Zribi-Hertz (eds.), *La grammaire de la possession*, CNRS, GDR 120, Paris, 129-166.