

Cataphoric Demonstratives and Relative Clauses

Andreas Blümel, University of Frankfurt (A.Blumel@gmx.de)

I propose an alternative to the complement of D analysis of relative clauses (RCs, (1), [3], [1]), which also captures the observation that the RC relates “closely” to the determiner (2-a)/(2-b):

- (1) $[DP[D [CP[DP\dots]_i C \dots t_i \dots]]]$
- (2) a. ?*I found the two pictures of John’s/his.
b. I found the (two) pictures of John’s/his that you lent me.

My proposal derives the differences in reading (restrictive vs. appositive) differently from standard analyses, which rely on the attachment site of the RC relative to D (3-a)/(3-b):

- (3) a. $[DPD [NP[NP\dots] [RelCP\dots]]]$ b. $[DP[DPD [NP\dots]] [RelCP\dots]]$

I am assuming that there is a syntactic difference between anaphoric and deictic demonstratives. The former have an indexical modifier/adjective component (something like *here/there*) which is overt in some languages (*her*+inflection in colloquial Norwegian, (4-a)) and silent in others (German, following ideas by [4]); the latter may in addition have a reinforcer which obviates anaphoric interpretations (4-b).

- (4) a. den her-re klokka (the here-INFL clock)
'this clock' (locative/deictic or discourse anaphoric)
b. den her-re her klokka (the here-INFL here_{reinforcer}clock)
'this clock' (only locative/deictic)

I show that, at least in Germanic, there is a very strong tendency for restrictive RCs to be preceded by (anaphoric or cataphoric, *CAT*) demonstratives. Particularly, in German the determiner robustly patterns with demonstratives and not with – the homophonous – articles (or the realization of D, as is often tacitly assumed in the literature on RCs, cf. [5]). First, *CAT*s and demonstratives show up independently in the sentence (5-a-i)/(5-b), while articles cannot (5-a-ii):

- (5) a. (i) Gib mir ein Buch. Gib mir zum Beispiel dieses.
Give me a book give me for instance this
(ii) Gib mir ein Buch. *Gib mir zum Beispiel das.
Give me a book give me for instance the_{article}
b. Gib mir ein Buch. Gib mir zum Beispiel das das auf dem Tisch liegt.
Give me a book give me for instance *CAT* which on the table lies

Secondly, NP-split is possible with demonstratives and *CAT*s (6-a-i)/(6-b) but not with articles (6-a-ii):

- (6) a. (i) Bücher hat Jens keine/wenige/diese gelesen.
books has J. none/few/these read
'J. has read no/few/these books.'
(ii) *Bücher hat Jens die gelesen. (books has J. the_{article}read)
b. Bücher hat Jens die die ihn interessieren gelesen.
books has J. *CAT* that him interest read

Thirdly, articles can phonologically contract with prepositions but not with demonstratives (7). Contracting the determiner that precedes RCs leads to a sharp contrast in interpretation: the restrictive reading gets lost. Taking [2]’s test (ch. 3.2.2) as an example, (8-a) has a rhetorical reading by which there *are* no kids to point at, as they all enjoy playing. As the head has no referent, the RC must be restrictive. Upon phonological contraction with the preposition, the obligatory reading is that there *is* a (previously mentioned) kid which doesn’t enjoy playing – the RC is appositive. Again the determiner in question patterns with demonstratives, not with articles:

- (7) a. (i) Petra kostet von dem Wein. (P. tastes of the wine)
(ii) Petra kostet vom Wein. (P. tastes of-the wine)
b. (i) Petra kostet von dém Wein. (P. tastes of that wine)

- (8) a. Zeig' auf das Kind, das (*übrigens) nicht gerne spielt!
 point at CAT child that by the way not gladly plays
 'Point at the child that doesn't enjoy playing (there are none)!'
 b. Zeig' aufs Kind, das (übrigens) nicht gerne spielt!
 Point at-the child that by the way not gladly plays
 'Point at the specific child that happens to not enjoy playing!'

Neither the analysis (1) nor (3) can straightforwardly account for this contrast as a P-D sequence is present in both structures; as the phonological reduction in (8) has interpretive effects, a syntactic account is plausible.

Finally, Swiss German (9) and Bavarian (10) prefer strong definite determiner forms with restrictive RCs:

- (9) a. *d bluämä wo am längschtä blüät ... (the flower that on-the longest blooms)
 b. ?d-i blümä wo am längschtä blüät ... (the-AGR flower that on-the longest blooms)
 c. diä bluämä wo am längschtä blüät ... (that flower that on-the longest blooms)
 'The flower that blooms longest ...'
 (10) a. D'Maria hot des Pferd, was aus Mexiko kummt, fia gfealich. (restrictive)
 the-Mary holds the horse that from Mexico comes for dangerous
 'Mary considers the horse that is from Mexico dangerous.'
 b. *D'Maria hot's Pferd, was aus Mexiko kummt, fia gfealich. (restrictive)

I take these observations to mean that restrictive RCs must be associated with anaphoric demonstratives, i.e. the determiner in question is neither an article nor the realization of D. I take [4]'s analysis of demonstratives, by which they are XPs in SpecDP and comprise a silent anaphoric adjective *HERE*, which in my analysis is co-indexed with the RC-CP (by virtue of *HERE* being intrinsically indexical):

- (11) a. $[_{DP}[_{xAP} \text{ HERE}_i \text{ die } \dots t_{\text{HERE}}] \dots [_{CP} \dots]_i]$ (restrictive)
 b. $[_{DP} \dots \text{ die} = D \dots [_{CP} \dots]]$ (appositive)

The parallelisms between demonstratives and *CAT*s in standard German can be derived: the determiner that precedes RCs is always a demonstrative. The obligatory occurrence of "strong" determiners in southern dialects of German can be derived for the same reason. To derive the impossibility to contract with prepositions (and retain a restrictive interpretation of the RC) I assume with [4] that *HERE* intervenes between the preposition and the definiteness marker, blocking the phonological process:

- (12) $[\text{ P} = \text{ auf } [_{DP}[_{xAP} \text{ HERE}_i \text{ das } t_i] \text{ D } \dots]]$ (13) $[\text{ P} = \text{ auf } [_{DP} \text{ D} = \text{ das } \dots]]$
 $\underbrace{\hspace{10em}}_{*_{\text{contr.}}}$ $\underbrace{\hspace{10em}}_{ok_{\text{contr.}}}$

The differences in readings of the RCs are a result of the complexity of the determiners: only when an anaphoric demonstrative is present (with *HERE* being associated with the CP) will a restrictive reading obtain. If the determiner is less complex (D) an appositive reading obtains. The restrictiveness of the RC can now reduce to the inherent restrictiveness of demonstratives: CPs by themselves are neither restrictive nor appositive. They acquire their restrictiveness (or lack thereof) by the determiner.

The prediction the analysis makes is this: in languages where a seemingly plain article precedes a restrictive RC-structure, the determiner must be part of a (n anaphoric) demonstrative structure, i.e. despite the surface impression of a "simple" determiner there must be more complex determiner structure with an anaphoric element.

[1] **Bianchi, V.** (1999). Consequences of Antisymmetry; Headed Relative Clauses. De Gruyter. [2] **Julien, M.** (2005). Nominal Phrases from a Scandinavian Perspective. John Benjamins. [3] **Kayne, R. S.** (1994). The Antisymmetry of Syntax. M.I.T., Cambridge, Mass. [4] **Leu, T.** (2008). The Internal Syntax of Determiners. Ph. D. thesis, New York University. [5] **Salzmann, M.** (2006). Resumptive Prolepsis. A Study in indirect A-dependencies. Ph. D. thesis, Utrecht: LOT.