



1-1-2011

# Derjenige Determiner that Wants a Relative Clause

Andreas Blümel

*Johann Wolfgang Goethe-Universität*, [a.bluemel@gmx.de](mailto:a.bluemel@gmx.de)

---

# Derjenige Determiner that Wants a Relative Clause

## **Abstract**

In this article I discuss three existing complement-of-D analyses as possible solutions to the behaviour of the German determiner *derjenige*, which requires the presence of a restrictive relative clause. As it turns out, none of them is without problems. As an alternative I propose a structure without the DP-hypothesis which meets some of the very problems. In the end I provide a number of observations pertaining to its morphology and its discourse behaviour, which may lead to conclude that the determiner in question has a complex internal structure.

# *Derjenige* Determiner that Wants a Relative Clause

Andreas Blümel\*

## 1 Introduction

Since noun-modifying restrictive relative clauses (RCs) usually appear to be optional elements in syntax, they have traditionally been treated as adjuncts to nouns. The following sentence from German exemplifies the optionality of RCs, and (1b) gives the corresponding adjunction structure:

- (1) a. Das Buch (das auf dem Tisch liegt) ist blau.  
(the book) which on the table lies is blue  
'The book that is on the table is blue.'  
b. [DP D [NP [NP ...][CP/RC ...]]]

By contrast, in (2) the RC is obligatory:

- (2) Dasjenige Buch \*(das auf dem Tisch liegt) ist blau.  
(the one) book which on the table lies is blue

If it is taken into consideration at all in the literature, it is suggested that the RC is a complement of D in such constructions<sup>1</sup>. The RC's obligatoriness then follows straightforwardly. Things might not be so simple, though, as I will try to show in this paper. It appears reasonable to ask: what is the structural contribution that *jenig* makes in the complex determiner?

This article is structured as follows: first, I describe and discuss existing analyses of obligatory RCs. Aligning myself with other authors, I take RCs to be complements of the determiner. The innovation in this paper is that I take the determiner structure (DP) to occupy the specifier of the category-determining light noun *n*. In section 3 I describe morphological and some discourse properties of the determiner *d-jenig*, including its Dutch counterpart. I conclude with possibilities to interpret the data, before I conclude the article.

As a final introductory remark, notice that appositive RCs do not take antecedents with the complex determiner *d-jenig* (3a), but only with the simplex one (3b), suggesting that appositives should certainly not fall under the rubric of complements of D:

- (3) a. \*Dasjenige Buch, das übrigens auf dem Tisch liegt, ist blau.  
b. Das Buch, das übrigens auf dem Tisch liegt, ist blau.  
(the one) book which by the way on the table lies is blue

The construction (2) is abundant and not marked in any way, nor is it marginal. Among the sources that mention the determiner are Artemis et al. (2000), Roehrs (2006:213–215), Sternefeld (2008), and it is described in Gunkel (2007).

## 2 Relative Clauses as Arguments of the Determiner

The idea that RCs are complements of the determiner or that they entertain a “close” relationship to determiners has a long history, going back to work by Carlota Smith in the 1960s (cf. Smith 1964). For the purposes of the present paper I will subdivide the analyses that have been proposed into two<sup>2</sup> classes: in one strand of research the nominal head is represented inside of the RC (4), an

---

\*I am grateful to the audiences at the 34<sup>th</sup> PLC, the CGSW 25 in Tromsø and the workshop “Adjectives and Relative Clauses: Syntax and Semantics” in Venice in June 2010 for questions and comments. All remaining errors are mine.

<sup>1</sup>I use ‘the one’ as a gloss here, since it appears to be the closest English counterpart of the determiner.

<sup>2</sup>Recent work by Cinque (2003) represents a third variety: there are two copies of the head, one of which is external and the other one of which is internal to the RC. One point of criticism that I address here for the

approach that dates back at least to the work of Vergnaud (1974) and that has been cherished by many (cf. among others, de Vries 2002), but also been subject to critique (Borsley 1997, Borsley 2001), namely the raising analysis of relative clauses (cf. Kayne 1994, Bianchi 1999, etc.). A second branch of research shares with Kayne's specific implementation the claim that the RC is a complement, and thus essentially "an argument" of the D-head. However, Larson and Yamakido (2008) and Sternefeld (2008: 378-379), who are representatives of this branch, treat the head as external to the RC. Their respective proposal is given in (5):

- (4)  $[_{DP} [_{D} [_{CP/RC} DP_i C \dots t_i ]]]$   
 (5) a.  $[_{\delta P} \delta [_{DP} NP [_{D} CP/RC ]]]$   
       b.  $[_{DP} [_{D} CP/RC ] NP]$

I will now discuss each of these proposals in more detail, and address shortcomings, before I make a suggestion on how to amend these.

### 2.1 The Raising Analysis

The specific raising analysis put forth by Kayne (1994) conflates two properties (for a survey of this development cf. Artemis et al. 2000:4). The D-head selects the relative clause CP; in other words, the RC is not an adjunct but an argument of the determiner. Secondly, the full noun is generated inside the relative clause and is subsequently A'-moved to Spec-CP.

These two properties can—and should—be kept apart. There are independent reasons that militate against treating the external determiner and the nominal head as a non-constituent in languages like German and Polish (cf. Borsley 1997, Heck 2005): specifically, the head matches the determiner in terms of case, which is unexpected if they are not part of the same constituent. Devices to solve this problem have remained stipulative (cf. Bianchi 1999, de Vries 2002). What has not been addressed in the literature, to my knowledge, are cases that exhibit simultaneously the complement of D property and missing Condition C/reconstruction effects (cf. Sauerland 1998):

- (6) Derjenige Bericht von Peter<sub>i</sub> \*(den er<sub>i</sub> abgegeben hat ...)  
 (the one) report by P. which he submitted has  
 'The report by Peter that he submitted ...'

If the full head including the R-expression were reconstructed inside the RC, this sentence should be bad, contrary to fact. Therefore, the full head cannot be represented in the RC, but a structure such as (7) could be assumed:

- (7)  $[_{DP} D [_{NP} [_{NP} \text{Bericht von Peter} ] [_{CP} [_{DP} \text{den Bericht} ]_i \text{er } t_i \text{ abgegeben hat}]]]$

However, in (7) the obligatoriness of the RC remains unexplained, because technically adjunction is a free and thus optional process. The raising structure correctly predicts the obligatoriness of the RC, but incorrectly predicts reconstruction effects: the possibility of (6) appears paradoxical in the light of the raising analysis (we might call this the *raising paradox*). I will now turn to an analysis that can cope with this state of affairs.

### 2.2 Sternefeld's Analysis

In Sternefeld's analysis the (transitive) determiner directly selects for the RC, and the head noun is the right specifier of the DP (8a). In a footnote he gives the option (8b) (fn. 52) to capture the fact that the determiner is a complex head with an adjectival component—a morphological feature on which I will say more below:

- (8) a.  $[_{DP} [_{D'} D CP] [_{NP} \dots ]]$

---

raising analysis (and that Borsley 1997 has addressed already) equally applies to his more articulate structure insofar as the external determiner and the head inside the RC do not form a constituent.

- b. [DP [D' [D D A] CP] [NP ... ]]

The RC thus forms a constituent to the exclusion of the noun<sup>3</sup>. The sentence (6) can be captured with this analysis: the CP is selected by the D-head, and the NP remains external to the RC, correctly deriving the obviation of Condition-C effects. Sternefeld's reasoning proceeds as follows ((9a) is his ex. 57/p. 380): if RCs belong to the determiner system and if adjectives must be interpreted as modifiers of NPs, adjectives are expected to have a narrower scope than RCs. The reasoning is confirmed. In (9b) a set of persons is alleged to be thieves. Crucially, what is not alleged is that they wear brown hats:

- (9) a. die meisten angeblichen Diebe, die sich auf Landhäuser spezialisiert haben ...  
 the most putative thieves who themselves on farm houses specialized have  
 'most thieves who have specialized on farm houses ...'  
 b. die meisten angeblichen Diebe, die braune Hüte tragen ...  
 the most putative thieves who brown hats wear  
 RC >> A >> N  
 \*A >> {N, RC}

His analysis raises number of questions: Most obvious is the question of why this construction is exceptional in having a (right) NP-specifier. If no independent reason is given in support of the analysis, it is *ad hoc*. Another point concerns the linear order: How and why do the determiner's arguments—the CP and the NP—invert (to obtain the attested linearization)? Addressing Sternefeld's own reasoning with regard to scope, we can ask: How is the wide-scope reading of the RC obtained? If the noun is modified by an adjective, a possible structure is below:

- (10) [DP [D' D CP] [AP [NP ... ]]]

It must be assumed, then, that the respective scope is determined after the AP and the CP have swapped their position, since it is then that the RC c-commands the AP (and the NP). As none of this is made explicit, we can only speculate on the details.

### 2.3 DP-Shells (Larson and Yamakido 2008)

Larson and Yamakido have a semantic motivation for their treatment of DPs: quantifiers (and also definite determiners) express relations between sets. Thus quantifiers and determiners are not functional elements in the usual sense: they have thematic structure. Just as the thematic hierarchy for verbs can be captured by a corresponding familiar syntactic configuration, so can the thematic hierarchy of the determiner system be represented within a DP-shell system as depicted below:

- (11) Thematic hierarchy for VPs:  
 V: <sup>0</sup>AGENT > <sup>0</sup>THEME > <sup>0</sup>GOAL > <sup>0</sup>OBLIQUE  
 [VP John [ put V] [VP [NP salt] t<sub>put</sub> [PP on the fish]]]  
 Thematic hierarchy for DPs:  
 D: <sup>0</sup>SCOPE > <sup>0</sup>RESTRICT > <sup>0</sup>NOBLIQUE ('Nominal Oblique')  
 [DP Pro [ every D] [DP [NP boy] t<sub>every</sub> [PP except John]]]

In their system the different arguments to the determiner each occupy a fixed position relative to the other argument, determined by their thematic quality. For instance, the restriction of the universal quantifier (in the example: *boy*) ranks higher than nominal obliques (such as *except*-phrases), and thus the former c-commands the latter in the syntax. *Pro* is a pro-predicate argument that corresponds to the scope and whose content is given by the phrase the DP is a sister of at LF,

<sup>3</sup>There is an interesting parallelism between Sternefeld's idea and the analysis of German attributive adjectives by Leu (2008): in the latter adjectives and definite determiners form a constituent to the exclusion of the noun. This constituent, in turn, occupies Spec-D where it causes D to remain unpronounced.

namely the clause (cf. Larson and Yamakido 2008:52). In this respect DPs are parallel to the thematic domain of the clause, namely the VP, and not, as often assumed, to the TP or the CP: the lowest layer is thematic, and cascades of DPs can be stacked on top (just as the  $\nu$ P is taken to dominate the lexical/thematic core of the verb in many approaches). The D-head of the lower DP then undergoes head-raising to a phonetically null “light determiner”  $\delta$ :

- (12)  $[_{DP2} \text{Pro}_{TP} [_D \text{the } \delta] [_{DP1} [_{NP} \text{book}] t_{\text{the}} [_{CP} \text{that lies on the table}]]]$

At first sight, their analysis is most suitable for the case under discussion:

- (13)  $[_{DP2} \text{pro}_{TP} [_D \text{dasjenige } \delta] [_{DP1} [_{NP} \text{Buch}] t_{\text{dasjenige}} [_{CP} \text{das auf dem Tisch liegt}]]]$

Thus we could assume that *d-jenig* selects the RC in the base and then undergoes head-movement over the head noun to end up incorporated in the light determiner.

Larson and Yamakido’s analysis appears far less stipulated than, say, Sternefeld’s, considering the fact that they successfully apply it to languages that exhibit the Ezafe construction, such as present-day Persian. In this sense, their research provides independent evidence for the analysis that can derive our *d-jenig* case. However, despite such merits, there remains a curious feature in their account, namely an absence of parallelism of the DP to the VP: while the former is the projection of a functional category, the latter is projected from a lexical head.

Another potentially problematic point is the role of the light determiner: I know of no independent evidence for its existence in languages such as German.

## 2.4 A New Proposal

I would like to make a proposal that takes up certain features of the analyses described here. The idea significantly departs from them (and the majority of recent analyses of noun phrases) in one crucial respect: it rejects the DP-hypothesis, at least insofar as the DP is taken to dominate the noun phrase.

The crucial ingredients of my proposal are these: first, I take “nouns” to be category-neutral roots (cf., among others, Harley and Noyer 2000), acquiring their specific syntactic properties by virtue of a selecting head, namely the light noun *n*:

- (14)  $[_{nP} n [_{\sqrt{\text{root}}} \dots]]$

Thus syntactic category information is not part of the lexical item in question but derived from the syntactic environment. For instance, if the root *kauf* is selected by *n*, i.e. if the syntactic structure surrounding it is nominal, we derive the noun ‘the purchase’ (*der Kauf*). If, by contrast, the root is selected by *v*, it becomes a verb (‘buy’, *kaufen*), including its canonical argument structure:

- (15) a.  $[_{nP} n [_{\sqrt{\text{root}}} \text{kauf}]]$   
 b.  $[_{nP} v [_{\sqrt{\text{root}}} \text{kauf}]]$

Secondly, and maybe more controversially, I take determiner phrases to be those functional projections that occupy Spec-*n* (I refer the reader to a host of problems associated with the DP-hypothesis, cf. Bruening 2008):

- (16)  $[_{nP} [_{DP \dots}] n [_{\sqrt{\text{root}}} \dots]]$

Finally, I follow the aforementioned authors in assuming that RCs are complements of D:

- (17)  $[_{nP} [_{DP} D RC] n [_{\sqrt{\text{root}}} \dots]]$

This structure is essentially parallel to the one Sternefeld has proposed, but differs from it in that the position of the noun is not stipulated (and, of course, in that it does not assume the DP-

hypothesis). The resulting picture is that neither the determiners move, nor the head nouns. What does move is the RC, and I assume that it moves postsyntactically, i.e. in the phonological component of the grammar (PF). Just as other finite CPs (finite sentential complements of predicates) obligatorily undergo extraposition in German – contrary to their non-finite counterparts (19 vs. 20) – so are finite attributes extraposed within the nominal domain (18/22):

- (18) [<sub>NP</sub> [<sub>DP</sub> D e<sub>i</sub>] [<sub>n</sub> [<sub>√root</sub> ...] RC<sub>i</sub> ]]
- (18) a. <sup>?</sup>\*Peter hat [dass es regnet] gesagt.  
P. has that it rains said
- b. Peter hat gesagt, [dass es regnet].
- (19) a. Peter hat [schlafen zu können] gehofft.  
P. has sleep to can hoped
- b. Peter hat gehofft [schlafen zu können].

The process of extraposition is not well understood (for a detailed description, cf. Inaba 2007), but as there appears to be a general tendency for finite CPs to undergo extraposition is appears not unreasonable to me to assume the same for the nominal domain. Note that non-finite attributes such as participial constructions – which have been convincingly argued to be CPs (cf. Struckmeier 2007) – remain prenominal (21), unlike what I assume for finite RCs (22):

- (21) [<sub>NP</sub> [<sub>DP</sub> D=der [<sub>CP</sub> sich im Spiegel betrachtende]] [<sub>n</sub> [<sub>√root</sub> Mann]]]  
the himself (in the) mirror watching man
- (22) [<sub>NP</sub> [<sub>DP</sub> D=derjenige [<sub>CP</sub> der sich im Spiegel betrachtet]] [<sub>n</sub> [<sub>√root</sub> Mann]]]  
(the one) who himself (in the) mirror wachtes man

For the data set in (9) I will have to assume that the adjective occupies the DP-structure, including an additional copy of the noun. The scope facts follow. In this respect, my proposal is similar to the one recently proposed by Cinque (2003) for RCs:

- (23) [<sub>NP</sub> [<sub>DP</sub> die [<sub>RC</sub> ...] [angeblichen Diebe]] [<sub>n</sub> [<sub>√root</sub> Diebe]]]

### 3 More Descriptive Properties Pending an Account

Complement-of-D-analyses might have some appeal (say, their simplicity). Yet it is not obvious how they can do justice to the morphosyntactic and functional complexity of the determiner *d-jenig*. In the following I describe some of its properties. I then describe other properties that characterize RCs introduced by *d-jenig* including their similarity to free relatives when the noun is elided, and the discourse linking character the determiner seems to exhibit.

#### 3.1 Morphosyntactic Properties of the *d-jenig* Determiner

The determiner *d-jenig* features five distinct morphemes<sup>4</sup>, listed here:

- (24) *d-er-jen-ig-e* / Def-Agr-Dem-Adj-AdjAgr
- a. a definiteness marker
  - b. definiteness / strong agreement
  - c. the stem of the distal demonstrative *jen*<sup>5</sup> ('that')
  - d. an adjectival ending *-ig* (as in *lust-ig* 'funny', etc.)
  - e. adjectival agreement ending

Internally the determiner is thus similar to combinations of definite articles and adjectives. Specifically:

<sup>4</sup>In archaic German the form *jenig* exists independently of the definiteness marker.

<sup>5</sup>According to Tom Leu (p.c.), it is historically related to the element *yon* in *yonder* and *beyond*.

- like in lexical adjectives in German, the definite marker ( $d\{-er,-ie,-as\}$ ) requires that the suffix on the adjectival ending be weak:
  - $das\text{-}jen\text{-}ig\text{-}e_{\text{weak}}$
  - $*dasjen\text{-}ig\text{-}es_{\text{strong}}$
- the suffix agrees with the definite marker in terms of number:
  - $die_{\text{pl}}\text{-}jenig\text{-}en_{\text{pl}}$
  - $*die_{\text{pl}}\text{-}jenig\text{-}e_{\text{sg}}\text{ Bauern}_{\text{pl}}$  ('those farmers')
- the suffix must case-match with the definite agreement:
  - $den_{\text{acc}}jenigen_{\text{acc}}$ <sup>6</sup>
  - $*den_{\text{acc}}jenige_{\text{nom}}$ <sup>6</sup>

Recall the structure (8b), repeated here:

(25)  $[_{\text{DP}} [_{\text{D}'} [_{\text{D}} \text{D A}] \text{CP}] [_{\text{NP}} \dots ]]$

Given the data above, this structure appears to imply that the processes mentioned (triggering of weak agreement on the adjectival component, number agreement between the definiteness marker and the adjectival suffix and case matching) take place within the complex head  $[_{\text{D}} \text{D A}]$ , namely between the two sub-heads. The fact that, say, weak agreement in German is the reflex on members of a phrase rather than a head (*das [ziemlich dicke(\*s)] Buch* ('the fairly thick book')), means that we would have to postulate two different processes for agreement, a head-internal one, seemingly specialized for *d-jenig*, and one for the regular cases.

All of these morphological properties could be taken to mean that *d-jenig* is not a simple D-head, but rather that we have (at least) an XP. If the determiner in question is an XP, however, a complement of D-analysis of RCs does not seem to be an option. An alternative interpretation is that the complex-looking determiner is a simple head as the result of a grammaticalization process, such that the definiteness marker and the distal demonstrative fused into one head – finally the development from demonstratives to article-like determiners is well attested independently. In that case, questions pertaining to its internal complexity might not arise in the first place. I now turn to discourse-linking properties of the determiner that could be taken to corroborate the idea that the determiner has a complex internal structure, setting it apart from examples with the simplex counterpart.

### 3.2 Discourse Linking and Free Relatives

In the following sentence *d-jenig* is used pronominally. An ambiguity can be observed:

(26) *Derjenige, der ein T-Shirt trägt, trinkt das erste Bier.*  
(the one) who a t-shirt wears drinks the first beer

One interpretation is that of a free relative: whoever wears a t-shirt has to drink the first beer. The other reading is contingent on a nominal antecedent:

(27) *Drei Typen sitzen in der Kneipe. Derjenige, der ein T-Shirt trägt, trinkt das erste Bier.*  
three guys sit in the bar (the one) who a t-shirt wears drinks the first beer

Here, one interpretation is this: out of the three-membered set of guys sitting in the bar, the particular guy that wears a t-shirt drinks the first beer. One possible way to analyze this is to say that there is a phonetically null NP associated with the determiner, whose meaning may either be determined by the linguistic context (in the discourse anaphoric reading), or be generic (in the free relative reading).

Apart from the free-RC readings, it seems as though the determiner has a preference to be discourse anaphoric, indicating that we are dealing with an (maybe exclusively) anaphoric demon-

---

<sup>6</sup>*e* is one possible exponent of nominative; *en* is possible as an exponent of nominative plural, in which case the definite marker must be *die*.



strative<sup>7</sup>, i.e. it might be exclusively anaphoric in those cases when a noun is realized (obviously not when used in a pronominal fashion). Thus *d-jenig*+N preferably occurs discourse-anaphorically rather than out-of-the-blue (26a), while the simplex determiner can occur either way (28b):

- (28) a. ?\*( Im Kanzleramt wurden ein paar Bücher weggeschmissen.) Die  
           in the chancellor office were a couple books dumped the  
           Kanzlerin hat diejenigen Bücher, die sie behalten wollte, gerettet.  
           chancellor has (the one) boo which she keep wanted saved  
 b. (Im Kanzleramt wurden ein paar Bücher weggeschmissen.) Die Kanzlerin hat die Bü-  
     cher, die sie behalten wollte, gerettet.

Related might be the fact that amount readings of RCs are dissolved if anteceded by *d-jenig*:

- (29) a. Das Geld, das die Manager verdienen, möchte Peter verdienen.  
           the money which the managers ear wants P. earn  
           ‘Peter wants to earn the amount of money that managers earn.’  
 b. Dasjenige Geld, das die Manager verdienen, möchte Peter verdienen.  
           (the one) money which the managers earn wants P. earn  
           ‘Peter wants to earn the very money that managers earn (say, the currency Euro, or he  
           wants to re-earn the token-identical money the managers have earned before).’

The observation supports the intuition that *d-jenig* as a determiner is inherently discourse anaphoric: it is preferably used in discourse contexts where the restriction (the noun) is known or presupposed information. However, known or presupposed information and an amount reading do not seem to be compatible.

### 3.3 More on Demonstrative Pronominal Uses of *d-jenig*

The determiner/demonstrative can co-occur with a PP-modifier (30b) and a postnominal genitive-modifier (30c) – in these cases the noun cannot be realized, i.e. we are dealing with an exclusive demonstrative pronoun once the nominal structure is modified by a PP. As we have seen before, this stands in contrast to the cases with a full RC:

- (30) a. Q: Welchen Jungen/Ehemann hast Du getroffen?  
           Which boy/husband have you met  
 b. A: Denjenigen (\*Jungen) aus Berlin.  
           (the one) boy from Berlin  
 c. A: Denjenigen (\*Ehemann) meiner Schwester.  
           (the one) husband my sister

Thinking of Kayne's (1994) treatment of PP-modifiers and attributive adjectives as reduced relatives, I suggest the following generalization on the basis of these properties:

- (31) *d-jenig* co-occurs with a RC, where “RC” includes reduced relatives

However, *d-jenig* with attributive adjectives is not possible (32a). Neither are they possible with PP-modifiers (30b/c), fairly deviant with a full RC (32d), and acceptable if the definite marker on the determiner bears contrastive stress (32e):

- (32) a. \*Derjenige kleine ist mit dem Rad gefahren.  
           (the one) little is with the bike driven

---

<sup>7</sup>Leu (2008:33) observes that colloquial Norwegian makes a transparent distinction between deictic and anaphoric demonstratives.

- b. \*Derjenige kleine aus Berlin ...  
 (the one) little from Berlin
- c. \*Derjenige kleine meiner Schwester ...  
 (the one) little my sister
- d. ?\*Derjenige kleine Junge der ...  
 (the one) little boy who
- e. Dérjenige kleine Junge der ...  
 (the+stress one) little boy who  
 ‘the particular little boy (out of a previously mentioned set of little boys) who ...’

With regard to the preference to be used as a pronominal element, *d-jenig* resembles the Dutch<sup>8</sup> *het-/datgene*:

- (33) a. hetgene dat ik gelezen heb ...  
 (the one) which I read have  
 ‘the one I have read’
- b. ?hetgene van mij ...  
 (the one) of mine
- c. datgene dat ik gelezen heb ...
- d. datgene van mij ...

In contrast to German, however, it is obligatory to elide the noun in the Dutch counterpart:

- (34) a. \*hetgene boek dat ik gelezen heb ...  
 (the one) book which I read have
- b. \*hetgene boek van mij ...  
 (the one) book of mine
- c. \*datgene boek dat ik gelezen heb ...
- d. \*datgene boek van mij ...

Considering the fact that the pronominal variant is more prevalent in this construction than the option of overt nouns, we should ask: Which properties of *dat-/hetgene* make it obligatory to elide the noun phonologically? What is it about German *d-jenig* that, in addition, allows it to be used as a determiner?

The following tables summarize the findings:

	Determiner	Pronominal
RC	yes	yes
PP-modifier	no	yes

Table 1: German

	Determiner	Pronominal
RC	no	yes
PP-modifier	no	yes

Table 2: Dutch

I have to leave an answer to these questions above for future work.

## 4 Conclusion

<sup>8</sup>Thanks to Joost Kremers (p.c.) for the data and the judgments.

In this article I have discussed three complement of D analyses of RCs with respect to their ability to derive the behavior of *d-jenig*. As it turned out, none of the analysis is without problems, and thus I have added a fourth variant in an effort to meet them. I concluded the article with a number of descriptive observations, some of which are new as far as I can tell. The properties described still need to be accounted for.

## References

- Alexiadou, Artemis, Paul Law, André Meinunger, and Chris Wilder. 2000. *The Syntax of Relative Clauses*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Bianchi, Valentina. 1999. *Consequences of Antisymmetry; Headed Relative Clauses*. De Gruyter.
- Borsley, Robert D. 1997. Relative Clauses and the Theory of Phrase Structure. *Linguistic Inquiry* 28:629–647.
- Borsley, Robert D. 2001. More on the Raising Analysis of Relative Clauses. Manuscript, Essex: University of Essex.
- Bruening, Benjamin. 2009. Selectional Asymmetries between CP and DP Suggest that the DP Hypothesis is Wrong. In *U. Penn Working Papers in Linguistics 15.1: Proceedings of the 32nd Annual Penn Linguistics Colloquium*, ed. L. MacKenzie, 26–35.
- Cinque, Guglielmo. 2003. The Prenominal Origin of Relative Clauses. Workshop on Antisymmetry and Remnant Movement, New York University.
- De Vries, Mark 2002. The Syntax of Relativization. LOT.
- Gunkel, Lutz. 2007. Demonstrativa als Antezedentien von Relativsätzen. *Deutsche Sprache* 3:213–238.
- Harley, Heidi, Rolf Noyer. 2000. Formal versus encyclopedic properties of vocabulary: Evidence from Nominalisations. In *The Lexicon/Encyclopaedia Interface*, ed. Bert Peeters, 349–374. Amsterdam: Elsevier Press.
- Heck, Fabian. 2005. Gegen Kopfanhebung in deutschen Relativsätzen. GGS-Handout, Tübingen.
- Inaba, Jiro. 2007. *Die Syntax der Satzkomplementierung: Zur Struktur des Nachfeldes im Deutschen*. *Studia Grammatica* 66. Berlin: Druck und Bindung.
- Kayne, Richard. S. 1994. *The Antisymmetry of Syntax*. M.I.T., Cambridge, Mass.
- Larson, Richard. and Hiroko Yamakido. 2008. Ezafe and the deep position of nominal modifiers. In *Adjectives and Adverbs. Syntax, Semantics, and Discourse*, ed. L. McNally and C. Kennedy, 43–70. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Leu, Thomas. 2008. The Internal Syntax of Determiners. Ph. D. thesis, New York University.
- Roehrs, Dorian. 2006. The Morpho-Syntax of the Germanic Noun Phrase: Determiners move into the Determiner Phrase. Ph. D. thesis, Indiana University.
- Sauerland, Uli. 1998. The Meaning of Chains. Doctoral dissertation, M.I.T., Cambridge, MA.
- Smith, Carlota. S. 1964. Determiners and Relative Clauses in a Generative Grammar of English. *Language* 40:37–52.
- Sternefeld, Wolfgang. 2008. *Syntax, Eine morphologisch motivierte generative Beschreibung des Deutschen*. Stauffenburg.
- Struckmeier, Volker. 2007. *Attribute im Deutschen. Zu ihren Eigenschaften und ihrer Position im grammatischen System*. Akademie Verlag, Berlin.
- Vergnaud, Jean-Roger. 1974. French Relative Clauses. Doctoral Dissertation, MIT.

Graduiertenkolleg “Satzarten: Variation und Interpretation”  
 Johann Wolfgang Goethe-Universität  
 Varrentrappstr.40-42  
 60486 Frankfurt am Main  
 Germany  
 a.bluemel@gmx.de