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account for more than just the doubling construction resumptive pronoun has major advantages over the current agreement analyses. In short, analyzing the possessive pronoun of the doubling construction as a DP by allowing for a DP can be expanded to include the possessor, and not the be use

The major advantage of this analysis of the doubling construction is that it allows the structure to be used for all DP-internal possessive constructions. Further advantages include that explains why the possessor, and not the pronoun, determines the reference (Weiβ 2008) and that the analysis can be expanded to include “tripled” possessors (dem Vater ihm seine Katze ‘the dad him his cat’) by allowing for a DP-internal topic position.

In short, analyzing the possessive pronoun of the doubling construction as a DP-internal resumptive pronoun has major advantages over the current agreement analyses because it can account for more than just the doubling construction and can be extended.

1) [Dem Vater seine Katze] ist gestern weggelaufen.
   (as in 1). In this example, the subject DP includes both a dative-marked (phrasal) possessor (in bold) as well as a possessive pronoun (underlined) that is identical in reference and phi-features (person, number, gender) to the dative possessor. Both precede the possessor (in italics) and form a constituent with it. Haegeman (2004) and Weiβ (2008) propose analyses to account for the doubling construction. While these analyses differ in their specifics, both link the possessive pronoun to the dative possessor through agreement (of the phi-features). This limits the generalizability of these analyses due to agreement of the pronoun with another phrase. In other words, these analyses are limited to the doubling construction but cannot straightforwardly explain the other types of possessive constructions.

To address this, I argue that the possessive pronoun in the doubling construction is better analyzed as a DP-internal resumptive/last-resort pronoun. To be precise, I propose that the pronoun spells out a trace (or copy) of the possessor. My analysis is schematized in 2.

The possessive relationship is established between a possessor phrase (with all its functional layers) and the possessor (with no or few functional layers). I assume (similarly to Haegeman 2004) that the possessive phrase requires a definite marker. I argue that in German this definiteness needs to be overtly marked. Different marking strategies result in the different DP-internal possessor:

• movement of the possessor to a prenominal position yielding the genitive possessor,
• a referring possessive pronoun generated in Dfin,
• a resumptive possessive pronoun due to movement of the possessor through Dfin to FocP yielding the doubling construction, or
• a determiner when the possessor stays inside PossP, resulting in the post-nominal possessor constructions.

The major advantage of this analysis of the doubling construction is that it allows the structure to be used for all DP-internal possessive constructions. Further advantages include that explains why the possessor, and not the pronoun, determines the reference (Weiβ 2008) and that the analysis can be expanded to include “tripled” possessors (dem Vater ihm seine Katze ‘the dad him his cat’) by allowing for a DP-internal topic position.

In short, analyzing the possessive pronoun of the doubling construction as a DP-internal resumptive pronoun has major advantages over the current agreement analyses because it can account for more than just the doubling construction and can be extended.

1) [Dem Vater seine Katze] ist gestern weggelaufen.
   ‘The father’s cat ran away yesterday.’

2) [FocP Possessor1 [DefP {phi-features as pronoun}:1 [Def Def [PossP Possessum [Poss' Poss t1]]]]]
