A puzzle about PPs in Danish definite DPs

Definiteness in Danish (and other Scandinavian languages) is expressed either by a prenominal article or a postnominal suffix. When the definite DP contains no modifiers, as in (1) and (2), only postnominal definiteness marking is possible, ignoring a possible demonstrative reading of (2), where *den* is stressed. If the DP contains a restrictive relative clause, as in (3), prenominal definiteness marking is possible.

(1) gris-en
pig-DEF

(2) *den gris
DEF pig

(3) den gris som vi fik af naboen
DEF pig that we got from neighbor-DEF

Accounts based on head-movement of N to D (such as Delsing (1993) and Embick & Noyer (2002)) provide no ready explanation for (3). Hankamer and Mikkelsen (2002) propose an analysis involving lexical blocking of phrasal expressions (Poser 1992), according to which (2) is blocked by (1), because (2) is a phrase with the same featural content as the lexical item in (1). (3) is grammatical because restrictive relative clauses adjoin low (to NP) making *den gris* in (3) not a phrase; hence (3) is not blocked.

A relevant but previously unnoticed fact is that PP modifiers never license the prenominal article:

(4) *den gris med blå prikker
DEF pig with blue dots

Within H&M's analysis this means that PPs must adjoin to DP, not to NP. Then (4) would be ruled out by the general blocking principle that rules out (2). This, however, predicts that a restrictive relative clause outside a PP modifier could not license the prenominal article. This prediction is false:

(5) den gris med blå prikker som vi fik af naboen
DEF pig with blue dots that we got from neighbor-DEF

We explore a solution to this puzzle involving two assumptions: that PP is always adjoined to DP, never to NP, and that restrictive relative clauses are derived by DP raising (similar to "head-raising" analyses (Schachter 1973, Vergnaud 1974, Kayne 1994), but with the crucial specification that the category raised is DP, not NP or anything smaller). This leads to a structure for (5) like (6):

(6) [$_{DP}$ den [$_{CP}$ [$_{DP}$ [$_{DP}$ Ø [$_{NP}$ gris]] [$_{PP}$ med blå prikker]] som vi fik af naboen]]

Given (6), on the H&M analysis, the Poser-blocking effect would not come into play, and on the analyses of Delsing and Embick & Noyer, head-movement of N to the highest D would be prevented because N is inside a specifier.

A remaining puzzle is that complement PPs, which are normally assumed to be sisters of N, behave just like adjunct PPs with respect to definiteness marking. To follow this line of thought to its logical conclusion, one would have to propose that PP complements of N are not sisters of N under N', but occupy some position higher up, just like the adjunct PPs.