Two Flemish Possessive Structures: Affected Possession
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1. FLEMISH EXTERNAL POSSESSION

1.1. EXPRESSION OF NOMINAL POSSESSION IN DUTCH AND FLEMISH

NP-internal possession can be expressed in three distinct ways in Dutch and Flemish: a prepositional ‘van’ possessor (1), a genitive postnominal ‘s possessor (2) and a doubling pattern in which a possessive pronoun links the possessor to the possessee (3).

PREPOSITIONAL VAN POSSESSOR:
- possessee precedes possessor
- preposition van links possessor and possessee
- possessee requires an article
- most frequent and unrestricted variety (ANS 1997)

(1) a. [de fiets van Emma] was kapot
    the bike of Emma was broken
    ‘Emma’s bike was broken’

This project is funded by BOF-01J13911. Thanks to Liliane Haegeman and Lieven Danckaert for their data and feedback. Thanks go also to the GIST-team and the audiences of previous versions of this talk. Part of this presentation is based on work together with Tijs D’Hulster.
b. [de velo\textit{van} Emma] was kapot \quad \text{Flemish}
\begin{quote}
the bike of \quad \text{Emma was broken}
\end{quote}
\begin{quote}
‘Emma’s bike was broken’
\end{quote}

\textbf{Genitive postnominal ‘s possessor:}
\begin{itemize}
\item $\text{o} = \text{fronted genitive (ANS 1997)}$
\item $\text{o} \quad \text{only with proper nouns and some generic nouns that can be used as proper nouns (ANS 1997)}$
\item $\text{o} \quad \text{more in written language than in spoken language (ANS 1997)}$
\end{itemize}

(2) a. [Emma\textquotesingle s fiets] was kapot \quad \text{Standard Dutch}
\begin{quote}
Emma\textquotesingle s bike was broken
\end{quote}
\begin{quote}
‘Emma’s bike’
\end{quote}

b. [Emma\textquotesingle s velo] was kapot \quad \text{Flemish}
\begin{quote}
Emma\textquotesingle s bike was broken
\end{quote}
\begin{quote}
‘Emma’s bike’
\end{quote}

\textbf{Doubling pattern (Hendriks, 2010)}
\begin{itemize}
\item $\text{o} \quad \text{Possessor and possessee form a single constituent.}$
\item $\text{o} \quad \text{DP possessor}$
\item $\text{o} \quad \text{Possessive pronoun with matching \ensuremath{\varphi}-features:}$
\end{itemize}

(3) a. Het moest lukken dat [\textit{Emma haar fiets}] dan net kapot was \quad \text{Standard Dutch}
\begin{quote}
it had-to happen that \quad \text{Emma her bike then just broken was}
\end{quote}
\begin{quote}
‘It so happened that Emma's bicycle was broken just then.’
\end{quote}

b. ’t Moest lukken dat [\textit{Emma eur velo}] toen just kapot was \quad \text{Flemish}
\begin{quote}
it had-to happen that \quad \text{Emma her bike then just broken was}
\end{quote}
\begin{quote}
‘It so happened that Emma's bicycle was broken just then.’
\end{quote}

\begin{itemize}
\item $\text{o} \quad \text{in West-Flemish only with animates (Haegeman, 2013)}$
\end{itemize}

\textbf{West-Flemish se/sen possessor (Haegeman, 2013)}
West –Flemish also has an invariant singular form of the possessive pronoun which cannot be separated from the possessor: se/sen.

(4) Emma \textit{se} velo
\begin{quote}
Emma se bike
\end{quote}
\begin{quote}
‘Emma’s bike’
\end{quote}
\begin{itemize}
\item $\text{o} \quad \text{not a reduced form of the possessive pronoun;}$
\item $\text{o} \quad \text{invariant singular form;}$
\item $\text{o} \quad \text{cannot be separated from the possessor (e.g. by appositive):}$
\end{itemize}
(5) a. *Marleen, men beste vriendin, sen velo
   Marleen my best friend sen bike
b. Marleen, men beste vriendin, euren velo
   Marleen my best friend her.f.sg. bike
   ‘Marleen, my best friend, her bike.’

   o similar pattern in Afrikaans:

(6) Jan se bevele
   John se orders
   ‘John’s orders’

1.2. THE POSSESSIVE DP (HAEGEMAN, 2013)

From the data discussed above, following Haegeman (2013), I assume the following structure for
the Flemish possessive DP (doubling pattern and se-possessor). The possessor in the doubling
pattern is located in [Spec,DP]; the possessor in the se-possessor is in [Spec,PossP].

\[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{DP} \\
\text{Spec} \\
\text{D'} \\
\text{D} \\
\text{PossP} \\
\text{Spec} \\
\text{Poss'} \\
\text{Poss} \\
\text{NumP} \\
\text{Spec} \\
\text{Num'} \\
\text{Num} \\
\text{NP}
\end{array}
\]

- eur:
  - ellipsis: DP/pro den euren Ø
  - non-ellipsis: DP/pro euren euren boek
- sen:
  DP sen boek

1.3. THE FLEMISH EXTERNAL POSSESSOR (FEP)\(^2\)

---

\(^2\) Cf. Haegeman (2011), Haegeman & Van Koppen (2012) and Haegeman & Danckaert (2013) for an
extended description of the FEP.
Restricted to non-standard varieties of Flemish, is the external possession pattern (Haegeman, 2011; Haegeman & Van Koppen, 2012; Haegeman & Danckaert, 2013).

External possession as defined by Payne & Barshi (1999) denotes a group of structures where “a semantic possessor-possessum relation is expressed by coding the possessor as a core grammatical relation of the verb and in a constituent separate from that which contains the possessum.” (Payne & Barshi 1999:3).

For some speakers of Flemish, such a pattern is available resembling the internal doubling pattern. Recall, (3b) repeated here as (7), has a possessor DP linked to the possessee DP by a possessive pronoun which agrees in phi-features with the possessor.

• In the external possessor structure (8) the possessor is separated from the possessee, seen by the intervening adjunct with clausal scope ‘toen just’.

(7) ʼt Moest lukken dat [Emma eur velo] toen just kapot was. 
Flemish
it had-to happen that Emma her bike then just broken was
'It so happened that Emma's bicycle was broken just then.'

(8) ʼt Moest lukken dat [Emma] toen just [eur velo] kapot was. 
Flemish
it had-to happen that Emma then just her bike SUBJ broken was
'It so happened that Emma's bicycle was broken just then.'

• The external possessor DP is found with possessees that function as subjects (8), objects (9), and predicates (10)

(9) Peter ga [Jan] e ki [zen handjes] wassen. 
Peter goes Jan once his hands OBJ wash
'Peter will wash John's hands now.'

(10) ... omdat het [Karel] gisteren [zen verjaardag] was. 
because it Karel yesterday his birthday PRED was
'... because it was Carl's birthday yesterday.'

• Surface elements are similar to the doubling pattern:
  o DP possessor
  o Possessive pronoun with matching φ-features

---

3 On average, the FEP is an accepted, but degraded pattern. Buelens & D’Hulster (to appear) show that there is large idiolectal variation, but that there is an overall tendency for the pattern to be more accepted in West-Flemish (32%) than in Antwerp (12%).
Possessor precedes possessee

**THE FEP IS EXTERNAL POSSESSION**

(see also Landau 1999; Hole 2004, 2006; Lee-Schoenfeld 2006; Deal 2011, 2013, forthc.)

- Possessor DP is external to the pronoun-possessee complex
  - Intervening adjunct has clausal scope (cf. above)
- Possessor DP has "argument" status:
  - Possessor is obligatorily affected by the event expressed by the verb; test: ban on dead possessor (Hole, 2006). FEP cannot occur with dead possessors, internal doubling pattern can.

(11) 't Moest lukken da...⁴

*it had-to happen that*

'It so happened that ...'

context 1: grandmother = alive at time of utterance

- FEP: ✓
  a. ... [mijn grootmoeder] toen just [haren auto] kapot was.
     *my grandmother then just her car broken was*
     '... my grandmother's car was broken just then.'

  - Doubling pattern: ✓
  b. ... [mijn grootmoeder haren auto] toen just kapot was
     *my grandmother her car then just broken was*
     '... my grandmother's car was broken just then.'

context 2: grandmother = dead at time of utterance

- FEP: ✗
  c. * ... [mijn grootmoeder] toen just [haren auto] kapot was.
     *my grandmother then just her car broken was*
     '... my grandmother's car was broken just then.'

  - Doubling pattern: ✓
  d. ... [mijn grootmoeder haren auto] toen just kapot was.
     *my grandmother her car then just broken was*

⁴ Note that the FEP has strong anti-MCP effects (Haegeman, 2011).
'... my grandmother's car was broken just then.'

- Subject-related external possessor shares subject-properties with the subject possessee (e.g. agreement patterns):
  - possessor triggers Complementizer Agreement ((12) and (13)),
  - while possessee triggers V-agreement (see Haegeman & Koppen (2012)).

(12) ... omda-n/*omdat [André en Valère] gebeld *oat/oan because.pl/because [André and Valère] phoned had.*SG/PL
    '... because André and Valère had called.'

(13) ... omda-n/*omdat [André en Valère] toen just [underen computer]kapot
    because.pl/because [André and Valère] then just their computer.SUBJ broken was/*waren
    was.SG/*were.PL
    '...because André and Valère's computer broke down just then.'  (Haegeman, 2011 (33))

1.4. **ANALYSIS: APPLICATIVES**

One approach to an analysis, which I will take at this point, is to assume that the obligatorily affected arguments (Affectees) are introduced into the structure in a specialized functional projection ApplicativeP (ApplP) (cf. Baker, 1988).

- Note: not all applied arguments are necessarily affected by an entire event. As such, an analysis with a light verb instead of an Applicative phrase could also be possible. At this point, I remain agnostic about which is preferred.

Crucially, I will assume that applicatives can be added onto the structure at different points of the clausal spine which relate them to different constituents.

- Pylkkänen (2000, 2002, 2008) identifies two applicative positions:
  - a low ApplP between VP and DO, attaching an individual onto a direct object (e.g. English) (14b):

(14)  a. I baked a cake.
    b. I baked him a cake.  (Pylkkänen 2000:197 (1a-b))

---

a high AppIP between VoiceP and VP, attaching an individual onto a verbal event (e.g. Chaga) (15):

(15) n-“a”-1-ły-1-à m-rà k-élyá
FOC-1s-PR-eat-APPL-FV 1-wife 7-food
‘He is eating food for his wife.’ (Bresnan and Moshi 1993 in Pylkkänen 2000: 197(2a))

(16) a. High Applicative (Chaga)       b. Low Applicative (English)

Rivero (2009) proposes an even higher AppIP:
- above TP
- semantically relates the applied argument to the whole clause (18).
- e.g.: Bulgarian involuntary state constructions (17)

(17) Na Ivan mu se "etjasa knigi.
P Ivan 3Sg.Dat Refl read.Imp.3Pl book.Pl
‘John[sic] {was in the mood/wanted} to read books.’ (Rivero 2009: 147, (1b))

This very high applicative position is the one most likely compatible with the subject-related FEP’s matrix subject’s positions. It predicts that the affected argument scopes over the entire TP (Haegeman 2011; Haegeman & Danckaert 2013). The lower positions suggested by

\[ \text{ImpOP} = \text{imperfect(ive) operator (needed for the involuntary state construction)} \] (Rivero 2009: 148).
Pylkkänen (2000, 2002) may be more suited to the object-related and predicate-related FEP.

• Analysis of a subject-related FEP (cf. Lee-Schoenfeld 2006)⁷:

![Diagram of CP (Complement Phrase)]

… dat Peter toen juste zijn velo kapot was.

that Peter then just his bike broken was

‘… that Peter’s bike was broken just then.’

2. FLEMISH EVENT POSSESSION

2.1. FEvP: SOME PROPERTIES

Flemish can express 'the possession of an event' ('something has happened to me'), with have and be (= Flemish Event Possession (FEvP)).

- Matrix introduces the argument that 'possesses' the event expressed in the embedded clause⁸.
- Two 'alternating' varieties in Flemish⁹ (20a-b):
  - hebben ('have'; (20a))
  - zijn ('be'; (20b)).

---

⁷ tDP should be taken to express syntactic dependency without explicitly implying movement.
⁸ The Possessor in the FevPs could arguably also be called an Experiencer. I use the term Possessor to emphasize the link it has with other clausal possessive structures.
⁹ Note on the geographical spread of FevPs: the have-FEvP is accepted throughout the Netherlands and Flanders (mostly the variety with resumptive pronoun 'het' is common); the be-FEvP is accepted only by some speakers of Flemish in their tusserental (lit. 'in-between language'), regiolectal and/or dialectal registers. Some speakers accept both patterns and alternate between them without attaching a difference in meaning between the two.
• Note that the meaning of the have-FEvP and that of the be-FEvP is the same.

(20) a. We hebben (het) nog gehad dat onze valiezen plots openscheurden.
   we.NOM have it PRT had that our suitcases suddenly open-ripped
b. We zijn (*het) nog geweest dat onze valiezen plots openscheurden.
   we.NOM are it PRT been that our suitcases suddenly open-ripped
   'We've had it happen to us that our suitcases suddenly ripped open.'

• Main points of argumentation:
  o Properties of the FEVP show affectedness of the matrix subjects
  o The syntax of the FEVP can be related to that of the Flemish External Possessor (FEP); especially with regards to sensitivity towards aspect/argument structure.
  o This shared Affectee-property and its sensitivity to the structure to which it is assigned is syntactically encoded. This syntactic encoding results in nominative case assignment.

2.2. THE NOMINATIVE-DATIVE ALTERNATION IN POSSESSIVE HAVE AND BE LATIN
• The nominative-dative alternation in possessive have and be has long been observed: Belvin & Den Dikken (1997), in the line of Benveniste (1966) and others (e.g. Freeze 1992), observe that for a.o. Latin:
  o have has a nominative Possessor subject (21a) with an accusative Possessee;
  o be has a dative Possessor subject (22a) with a nominative Possessee.

(21) a. Marcus librum habet.
   Marcus.NOM book.ACC has
   'Marcus has a book.'
(22) a. Liber est Marco.
   book.NOM is Marcus.DAT
   Lit. 'A book is to Marcus.'

---

10 Abbreviations: NOM = nominative, PRT = particle, DAT = dative, IO = indirect object, S = subject, SC = small clause, ACC = accusative, COP = copula and PASS = passive.
• Analysis proposed by Belvin & Den Dikken (1997):
  o underlingly, the structure is a small clause headed by Agr
  o Possessee in [Spec,AgrP]
  o Possessor is dominated by a PP which is the complement of AgrP

  o *have* is spelled out when the preposition dominating the Possessor incorporates into Agr and this incorporated constituent, Agr and P, moves to F (21b).
  o a preposition which regularly assigns dative case to its complement can no longer do so when it is incorporated (cf. Řezáč (2008) and Alexiadou et al. (2014)), so when it incorporates into Agr, its complement has to receive case elsewhere, namely in SpecFP (where nominative is assigned).

  o *be* is spelled out if the preposition remains adjacent to its complement and does not incorporate into Agr and the functional head F (22b).

  ![Diagram](image)

*Possessive have and be structures in Netherlandic (Heerlen) Dutch*

• Similar *have* – *be* alternation involving possession exists in Heerlen Dutch (Broekhuis & Cornips, 1994):

(23) a. **Hem** is de fietsband lek.
   *him.DAT is the bike tire punctured*

   b. **Hij** heeft de fietsband lek.
   *he.NOM has the bike tire punctured*

   'He has a punctured bike tire.' (B&C: 180, (22c) and (21c); my paraphrase)

   o the Possessor in the *be*-structure is a dative (23a) (*hem*).
   o the Possessor in the *have*-structure is a nominative (23b) (*hij*).
   o clausal possession arises between a dative indirect object (IO) and the direct object...
(DO) of the same predicate (~Agr).
  o the possessed state (de fietsband lek) can be analysed as a small clause.
  o Possessor in both the have- and the be-structure is interpreted as an underlying IO.

- Broekhuis & Cornips’ (1994) analysis of these sentences is in line with the common analysis of have as the spell-out of be+preposition/case (a.o. Benveniste 1966, Kayne 1993, Den Dikken 1997):

(24) a. [TP hem.DATj [T isi [v2P ti [v1P ti [SC de fietsband lek]])]]
  b. [TP hij.NOMj [T heefti [v2P ti [v1P ti [SC de fietsband lek]])]]

  o Be can assign dative case:
    ▪ the Possessor (underlying IO), a structural dative, can retain its case even in the inverted possessive datives (23a-24a).\textsuperscript{11}
    ▪ be is incapable of accusative case assignment.
  o Have is an undative verb and as such cannot assign dative case.
    ▪ have as an undative verb is able to assign accusative case to its direct object (DO).
    ▪ the have-Possessor has to raise to the subject position to receive (nominative) case (23b-24b).

- Note: Broekhuis & Cornips only discuss structural case assignment
  o dative case is associated with the IO position
  o accusative case is associated with the DO position.
  o consequently, when stated that only have is capable of accusative case assignment, what is meant, is that it can license a DO.

**Puzzle:** why is there no regular nominative-dative alternation in the Flemish event possessives (both the have-and the be-matrix subject are nominative)\textsuperscript{11}?

**Hypothesis:** the matrix subject in the Flemish event possessive does not only possess the event but is also affected by it. This interpretation forces it into a higher clausal position where it surfaces as a nominative in both the have- and the be-variety.

2.3. FE\textsuperscript{PV}Ps AND THE POSSESSIVE HAVE AND BE ALTERNATIONS

- Difference between the Heerlen Dutch sentences and the Flemish FE\textsuperscript{PV}Ps:

\textsuperscript{11} In (17a) hem is analysed as dative even if ‘hem’ is syncretic for dative and accusative. For FE\textsuperscript{PV}Ps this is not problematic since the be-FE\textsuperscript{PV}P does not allow hem as matrix subject (whether accusative or dative):
  i. *Hem is nog geweest dat zijn laptop gestolen was.
  he.ACC/DAT is PRT been that his laptop stolen was
o The Heerlen Dutch sentences involve a small clause Possessee, not a full clause Possessee.
  o The Heerlen Dutch sentences express the possession of a state, not the possession of an event.

- Possessive dative of Heerlen Dutch is not available in Flanders (van Bree 1981): one could argue that even though cross-linguistically possessive *have* and *be* are associated with nominative-dative alternations, this does not extend to Flemish.

- However, the availability of the DO pronoun *het* only with the *have*-FEvP (25a) can be explained by Broekhuis & Cornips' (1994) proposal:
  o *have* can assign accusative (25a).
  o *be* cannot assign accusative (25b).
  o *het*: analysed as an accusative DO pronoun coreferential with the extraposed embedded *that*-clause (26).

(25)  a. We hebben *(het)* nog gehad dat onze valiezen plots openscheurden.
    we.NOM have it PRT had that our suitcases suddenly open-ripped

b. We zijn (*het*) nog geweest dat onze valiezen plots openscheurden.
    we.NOM are it PRT been that our suitcases suddenly open-ripped

  'We’ve had it happen to us that our suitcases suddenly ripped open.'

(26)  [we.NOM [hebben [(het.ACC)]][nog gehad [dat [onze valiezen] plots openscheurden]]]}

- Flemish has a dative
  o It is not the absence of the dative case in the Flemish nominal case paradigm that results in the matrix subject of the *be*-sentences being nominative (deflection).
  o Flemish has a fragile class of verbs and adjectives that show a contrast between the 3rd.sgf. pronouns *eur* and *ze* (*she/her*):
    ▪ *Eur* and *ze* can both be used for the accusative.
    ▪ In some dative contexts *eur* seems to at least have a strong preference over *ze* (27).
    ▪ So, *eur* can be both accusative and dative, whilst *ze* cannot express dative.

(27)  't Staat **eur/ze**.
     it stands her.DAT/her.ACC
  'It suits her.'

- The matrix subject of the *be*-FEvP could be a dative.
- This dative pronoun is ungrammatical as matrix subject of the FEvPs:
    she.DAT has PRT had that her suitcases suddenly open-ripped  
b. *Eur is nog geweest dat eur valiezen plots openscheurden.  
    she.DAT is PRT been that her suitcases suddenly open-ripped  
'She has had it happen to her that her suitcases suddenly ripped open.'

2.4. INTERIM CONCLUSION

- Flemish FEvPs show a deviation from the regular be-have alternation in possessive sentences.
- The analysis presented by Broekhuis and Cornips (1994) does not suffice to explain the nominative in the matrix subject of the be-FEvPs (and presumably the have-FEvPs where the same syntactic operation could be present without it overtly showing).
- B&C's analysis does help explain the unavailability of a DO pronoun in the be-FEvP.

2.5. AN ANALYSIS OF AFFECTED POSSESSION

AFFECTEES

- = semantic role assigned to the argument affected by the semantic content of the constituent it is associated with.
- a diagnostic for Affectees is the ban on dead arguments (Hole 2006:387-388).\(^\text{12}\) When applying the 'ban on dead Possessor' test to the have- and be-FEvP we can see that the Possessor has an Affectee role. (29) is only possible if the grandfather is still alive.

(29) Mijn pé heeft /is nog gehad /geweest da Jada me zijnen fiets rondreed.  
    my grandfather has /is PRT had /been that Jada with his bike around.rode  
    'My grandfather has had it happen to him that Jada rode around on his bike.'

ANALYSIS: AFFECTED POSSESSION IN THE CLAUSE\(^\text{13}\)

- Recap: Belvin & Den Dikken (1997:154 (7b-a)):
(30) a. have: [FP [PP [tj DP_{poss}]] [F F [F [Agr AGR+[PP [P]]]]])  
b. be: [FP Spec [F F [Agr DP_{subj} [Agr [PP P_{dat} DP_{poss}]]]]])
(31) a. We hebben (het) nog gehad dat onze valiezen plots openscheurden.

\(^\text{12}\) Affectee diagnostics include the felicity of sentences where affection of the argument is semantically illogical, sentences with inanimate arguments, and the matching pronoun test (which, as pointed out by an anonymous reviewer, also shows that the possessive pronoun in the embedded clause is derivationally linked to the matrix subject).

\(^\text{13}\) These are a tentative analyses; I do not have anything to say about what exactly the relationship is between the subject position and the applicative position (movement? binding?).
we.NOM have it PRT had that our suitcases suddenly open-ripped

b. We zijn (*het) nog geweest dat onze valiezen plots openscheurden.

'Ve've had it happen to us that our suitcases suddenly ripped open.'

Following B&DD's analysis, I assume that the difference between the *be*-FEvP and the *have*-FEvP lies in whether the prepositional element moves to the functional head F or not:

- If P moves to the functional head, the incorporation of Agr, F and P spell out *have* (31a)
- If P does not move, *be* is spelled out (31b).

I further assume that FEvPs are underlyingly AgrPs with full clause propositional Possessors and that there is some feature related to the Affectee semantics of the FevPs which projects an ApplP/vP between CP and FP. This feature attracts the Possessor to its Spec and assigns it nom. case.

\[\text{have-FEvP}^{14}\]

(32)

\[\begin{array}{c}
\text{CP} \\
\text{SpecCP} \quad \text{C'} \\
\quad \text{C} \\
\quad \text{ApplP/vP} \\
\quad \text{PP}_i \\
\quad \text{DP}_{pos} \quad \text{t}_j \\
\quad \text{ik} \\
\quad \text{t}_i \\
\quad \text{Appl'}/\text{v'} \\
\quad \text{FP} \\
\quad \text{Appl/v} \\
\quad [+\text{NOM}, [+\text{AFF}]] \\
\quad \text{F'} \\
\quad \text{AgrP} \\
\quad \text{F+[Agr+P]_k} \\
\quad \text{heb gehad} \\
\quad \text{CP}_{SUBJ} \\
\quad \text{Agr'} \\
\quad \text{dat...} \\
\quad \text{t}_i \\
\quad \text{t}_k \\
\end{array}\]

14 Flemish, like Standard Dutch, has OV word order, except when the object is a CP (Sybesma 2002: 151)
Possessor in SpecFP receives nominative case (cannot receive dat. from P+Agr+F)

- *have* assigns accusative case to its complement in SpecAgrP → accusative DO pronoun (*het*).

**(be-FEvP)**

(33)  

\[ \begin{array}{c}
\text{CP} \\
\text{SpecCP} \\
\text{C'} \\
\text{C} \\
\text{AppP/vP} \\
\text{P} \\
\text{DP_{pos}} \\
\text{ik} \\
\text{F} \\
\text{AgrP} \\
\text{F} \\
\text{CP_{resu}} \\
\text{Agr'} \\
\end{array} \]

- P moves to SpecFP with Possessor Agr and F spell out as *be*.
- *Be* cannot assign acc. case to its direct object (SpecAgrP) (the CP can survive without case (cf. Stowell 1981)) insertion of DO pronoun *het* is impossible.
- P is expected to assign dative case to the matrix subject; but Appl/v requires its Affectee feature to be checked and attracts the Possessor to its Spec. As a result, the Possessor receives nominative case and an Affectee reading.

**3. FEP AND FEVP: PIVOT-PROPERTY**

3.1. **FEP AND FEVP**

- Similarities between (subject-related) FEP and FEVP:
  - Affected possession
  - Possessor is nominative
  - Possessor takes on a pivotal function within the clause
  - Similarities with subjects (cf. subject-related FEP and FEVP have a large number of subject properties): evidence for different subject positions within the clause

- Note: while this section focuses on the commonalities between the FEvP and the FEP,
there are also a number of differences that still need to be accounted for (for properties specific to the FEP cf. Haegeman 2011; Haegeman & Danckaert 2013; Buelens & D'Hulster to appear).

4. INTERPLAY WITH TENSE, ASPECT AND ARGUMENT STRUCTURE

• Sensitivities to the structure which the Possessor is involved in both for FEP and FEvP
• Suggestion: the nature of the Possessee, which is a state in the FEP and an event in the FEvP, may be the source of the different kinds of tense and (viewpoint) aspectual restrictions.

4.1. FEP: THEMATIC RESTRICTIONS ON THE VERBAL STRUCTURE

• The FEP-pattern is sensitive to certain verbal argument structures:
  o It is degraded in transitive sentences (34)
  o It is even more degraded in agentive structures than in less agentive transitives (34a, b and c are on a scale of acceptability)

(34) a. *?? ... dat [Karel] toen just [zijn moeder] een appel gegeten had.
    that Karel then just his mother an apple eaten had
    '... that Karel's mother had just then eaten an apple.'
    transitive; agent subject

    b. ?... dat [Karel] toen just [zijn moeder] een taart gekregen had.
    that Karel then just his mother a pie received had
    '... that Karel's mother had just then received a pie.'
    transitive; recipient subject

    c. ?... dat [Karel] toen just [zijn moeder] de griep had.
    that Karel then just his mother the flu had
    '... that Karel's mother had the flu just then.'
    transitive; patient subject

4.2. FEvP: APECTUAL SENSITIVITIES

• Both the have- and the be-variety are accepted with perfective aspects:

(35) a. Ik heb ‘t nog gehad dat ik naar huis moest omdat de school dicht was.
    I have it PRT had that I to home must because the school closed was
    'I've had it happen to me that Ihad to go home because the school was closed.'
b. Ik heb nog geweest dat ik naar huis moest omdat de school dicht was.
   *Ik heb nu wel meer dat ik naar huis moet omdat de school dicht is.
   I have PRT been that I to home must because the school closed was
   It's happened to me that I had to go home because the school was closed.

• The imperfective iterative and habitual aspect are only allowed with have-EvPs:

(36) a. Ik heb 't nu wel meer dat ik naar huis moet omdat de school dicht is.
   I have it now PRT more that I to home must because the school closed is
   'It happens to me more often now, that I have to go home because the school is closed.'
   b. *Ik ben nu wel meer dat ik naar huis moet omdat de school dicht is.
   I am now PRT more that I to home must because the school closed is

• Other imperfective aspects are not grammatical in any of the EvP structures:

(37) a. *Ik had 't gisteren dat ik naar huis moest omdat de school dicht was.
   I had it yesterday that I to home must because the school closed was
   b. *Ik was gisteren dat ik naar huis moest omdat de school dicht was.
   I was yesterday that I to home must because the school closed was

5. CROSS-LINGUISTIC PERSPECTIVE: EXTERNAL POSSESSION IN GERMAN
   (Lee-Schoenfeld, 2006).
   • German has two patterns which are similar to FEP
     o The possessor and possessee are separate constituents.
     o The possessor is an affected argument.
   • The two patterns:
     o A dative external possessor (38), which behaves similarly to FEP, but has a
t   definite article instead of a possessive pronoun in the possessee. Syntactic
dependency between possessor and possessee (39).
     o A non-possessor dative (40), which does have the possessive pronoun (like FEP),
   but has a different syntactic behaviour (fewer restrictions on e.g. locality). No
   syntactic dependency between possessor and possessee (41)


15 The verb be often has as preferred auxiliary have in the dialects that accept the be-FEvP. The auxiliary be is
also possible, though.
my brother has the mom.DAT unfortunately the car to scrap gefahren

'Unfortunately, my brother totaled mom's car.' (Lee-Schoenfeld 2006:104(2a))

(39)

(40) Mein Bruder hat [der Mami] leider [ihr Auto] zu Schrott driven
my brother has themom.DAT unfortunately her car to scrap gefahren

'Unfortunately, my brother totaled mom's car.'

(Lee-Schoenfeld 2006:105(6a))
6. CONCLUSIONS

- The Flemish Possessive patterns (FEP and FEvP) show that possessors, which are syntactically dependent on a possessive structure, can occur in a different, higher position in the clause.
- That higher clausal position encodes an affectedness and relates a possessor argument to a larger structure.
- Such positions can occur at different levels of the clause.
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