1 Introduction

Danish has two definiteness markers (-en and den) that are in complementary and fixed distribution:\(^1\)

- -en is found when D[DEF] is sister of a minimal NP (i.e. NP consisting solely of N)

(1) Unmodified DPs (the film):

```
DP
| D   |
|     |
| -en |
| film|
```

- den is found elsewhere (Hankamer and Mikkelsen 2005, 2008)

(2) DP containing AP (and DPs with a restrictive relative clause, and direct pseudopartitives):

```
DP
| D   |
|     |
| den |
|     |
| AP  |
| NP  |
|     |
| belgiske |
| film  |
```

Realization of clausal complements (the idea [that ginger aids digestion]) interact with definiteness marking:

(3) Bare CP ⇒ prenominal den

a. den ide [CP at ingefær gavner forðøjelsen] DEF idea that ginger aids digestion the idea that ginger aids digestion

b. *ide-en [CP at ingefær gavner forðøjelsen] idea-DEF that ginger aids digestion. DEF

(4) Preposition + CP ⇒ postnominal -en

a. *den ide om [CP at ingefær gavner forðøjelsen] DEF idea about that ginger aids digestion

b. ide-en om [CP at ingefær gavner forðøjelsen] idea-DEF about that ginger aids digestion. DEF the idea that ginger aids digestion

Today’s goal is to understand and analyse this interaction.

\(^1\)Danish also has distinction between neuter and common gender. -en and den are the common gender forms of the definiteness marker. The neuter gender forms are -et and det.
2 A simple, but wrong, analysis

In Hankamer and Mikkelsen (2009) we proposed the following analyses:

**Bare CP structure**  CP is sister to $N \rightarrow$ sister of $D[\text{def}]$ is not a minimal NP $\rightarrow$ definite article

\[(5)\]

\[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{DP} \\
\text{D} \\
\text{den} \\
\text{ide} \\
\text{at } \ldots \text{fordøjelsen}
\end{array}
\]

**Preposition + CP structure**  PP is adjoined to DP $\rightarrow$ sister of $D[\text{def}]$ is a minimal NP $\rightarrow$ definite suffix:

\[(6)\]

\[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{DP} \\
\text{DP} \\
\text{PP} \\
\text{D} \\
\text{N} \\
\text{-en} \\
\text{ide} \\
\text{at } \ldots \text{fordøjelsen}
\end{array}
\]

While (5) directly represents the intuition that the CP is a complement to $N$, it is challenged by the fact that indefinite, demonstrative and possessive DPs do not allow bare CP complement; they all require a preposition:

\[(7)\]

\[
\begin{array}{c}
en/hans/denne ide *(om) at ingefær gavner fordøjelsen \\
\end{array}
\]

\[
\begin{array}{c}
p/a/his/this idea about that ginger aids digestion \text{DEF} \\
\end{array}
\]

\[
\begin{array}{c}
an/a/his/this idea that ginger aids digestion \\
\end{array}
\]

Under the structure in (5), this is mysterious: $D$ does not subcategorize for the complement of $N$, so how could it determine its syntactic category?

**Our proposal today**  (6) is the right structure for the prepositional realization (section 3), but bare CP complements require the structure in (8):

\[(8)\]

\[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{DP} \\
\text{D} \\
\text{den} \\
\text{ide} \\
\text{at } \ldots \text{fordøjelsen}
\end{array}
\]

- CP and NP are both complements of the definite $D$
- CP is Merged as first complement of $D$; NP is Merged as second complement of $D$
- we get the definite article because $D$ is not the sister to a minimal NP.
- indefinite, possessive and demonstrative Ds do not subcategorize for CP, but PPs can adjoin to any DP $\rightarrow$ (7)
3 PPs attach to DP

PPs uniformly trigger the definite suffix:

(9) Modifier PPs
   a. mad-en fra igår
      food-DEF from yesterday
      the food from yesterday
   b. *den mad fra igår
      DEF food from yesterday

(10) Complement PPs
   a. søster-en til Per
      sister-DEF to Per
      the sister of Per
   b. *den søster til Per
      DEF sister to Per

(11) Indirect pseudopartitives
   a. grupp-en af turister
      group-DEF of tourists
      the group of tourists
   b. *den gruppe af turister
      DEF group of tourists


(12) DP
    /\                  \
   DP  PP
   /\                  \   
  D  NP

Ps generally allow CP complements:

(13) Jeg tror på at mine sange opbygger modet i folk.
     I believe on that my songs up-build courage-DEF in people
     I believe that my songs build courage in people.

(14) VP
    /\                  \\   
   V  PP
   /\                  \
  P  CP

These two patterns intersect to produce prepositional realization:

(15) DP
    /\                  \\   
   DP  PP
   /\                  \   
  D  NP  P  CP

Not all all nouns can head NP in (15); how is that accounted for under this structure? (PP actually Merges with N, then PP extraposes to adjoin to PP, then tree pruning applies, yielding minimal NP complement to D)
4 CP complements to D

(16)\[
\text{DP} \quad \text{NP} \\
\text{D} \quad \text{CP} \quad \text{ide} \\
den \quad at \ldots fordøjelsen
\]

What is radical about (16):

1. One head taking two complements
2. CP being complement of D, rather than N
3. Obligatory extraposition of CP
4. Completely different structure from prepositional realization (compare (16) with (15))

Comments on 1. Since the bare CP realization is unique to the definite article, D[DEF] must have a say in selecting for the CP. Alternatives to (16):

- A ternary branching structure (where D, NP and CP are sisters) is also possible, if we amend the insertion context for the definite suffix to exclude D[DEF] with more than one complement.
- NP and CP form XP which can be selected for by D[DEF], but not any other D.

Support for 2. Definite article takes CP complements elsewhere:

- Clausal subjects are optionally “nominalized” with definite article:

(17) Men [det at vi ikke ved alt] betyder ikke at vi ikke ved noget.

But that we don’t know everything doesn’t mean that we don’t know anything.

- If a CP is coordinated with a DP, the CP is “nominalized” with the definite article

(18) ... hvilket nok skyldes de charmerende krøller og det at han fremkalder moderinstinktet i ethvert skørt.

... which is probably cause by the charming curls and the fact that he brings out the motherly instincts in every skirt.

Such “nominalizations” always use neuter definite article; in (16), gender on D is determined by gender of N.

Support for 3. CP extraposes to DP-final position elsewhere:

- across post-nominal PPs:

(19) Han havde nemlig den aftale [PP med lægen] [CP at han skulle undersøges igen til maj.

In fact he had the agreement with his doctor that he would be examined again in May.
• CP can extrapose out of entire DP:

\[(20)\]

\[a. \text{ De } \text{lavede} [\text{den aftale at ingen m\aa\ g\aa\ derind efter lukketid}] \text{ sidste for\aar}. \]

\[\text{they made the agreement that noone may enter there after close.time last spring} \]

\[\text{They made the agreement that noone may enter after hours last spring.}\]

\[b. \text{ De } \text{lavede den aftale sidste for\aar} [\text{at ingen m\aa\ g\aa\ derind efter lukketid}]. \]

\[\text{they made the agreement last spring that noone may enter there after close.time} \]

\[\text{They made the agreement last spring that noone may enter after hours.}\]

Support for 4. The bare and prepositional realizations are quite different in terms of meaning and use, possibly motivating two quite different structures.

5 Meaning and usage

5.1 Presupposing vs. asserting

Like most other definite DPs, a definite DP with a prepositional realization of the CP presupposes existence of a referent:

\[(21) \text{ De har overholdt aftalen om at bibliotekerne skal finansieres via brugerbetaling.} \]

\[\text{they have kept agreement about that libraries shall finance via user.payment} \]

\[\text{They have kept the agreement that libraries must be financed by the users.}\]

To evaluate the truth of (21) an agreement that library users pay to use the library must have been made. If (21) is negated (they didn't keep the agreement . . .), this is still the case.

A definite DP with a bare CP does not presuppose existence of a referent. It asserts it:

\[(22) \text{ De har lavet den aftale at bibliotekerne skal finansieres via brugerbetaling.} \]

\[\text{they have made agreement that libraries shall finance via user.payment} \]

\[\text{They have made the agreement that libraries must be financed via user payment.}\]

If there is no agreement about library user payment, (22) is false, not truth-valueless or uninterpretable. The negation of (22) does not presuppose any such agreement either, in fact it denies it (though a more felicitous way of expressing this would have an indefinite object NP).

Environmental support

• Prepositional realization of definite DP, with N=aftale (agreement), occurs as

– object of predicates like overholde (keep), \\text{være uenig i} (disagree with), \\text{opsige} (cancel), \\text{undertegne} (sign), \\text{være med i} (be part of)

– subject of predicates like \\text{være kommet i stand} (be established), \\text{holde} (last), \\text{få tilshutning} (get support), \\text{blive effectueret} (be implemented), \\text{blive aflyst} (be cancelled), \\text{blive betegnet som} (be characterized as), \\text{være præget af} (be characterized by), \\text{være uantagelig} (be unacceptable).

• Bare CP realization of definite DP, with N=aftale (agreement), occurs as

– object of predicates like \\text{have} (have), \\text{lave} (make), \\text{få} (get), \\text{indgå} (enter into), \\text{fungere med} (function with), \\text{skilles med} (separate with), \\text{give håndslag p\aa} (shake hands on)

– only one attested subject use, with the verb \\text{indgå} (be included in)
**Interpretation** This pattern appears to instantiate Hawkins’ (1978: 130–149) distinction between anaphoric and referent-establishing definites:

- the prepositional structure is anaphoric
- the bare CP structure is referent establishing.
- Hawkins (1978:130–149): all English definite noun phrases have anaphoric uses; certain types also have non-anaphoric, referent-establishing uses, including ones with clausal complements.
- In Danish
  - anaphoric interpretation is associated with standard DP syntax: D takes NP complement.
  - referent-establishing interpretation is associated with special DP syntax: D takes CP complement

### 5.2 Restrictions on N

Possible Ns in **prepositional** structure:

1. **afstørel** ‘agreement’  
2. **ambition**  
3. **antagelse** ‘assumption’  
4. **bekræftelse** ‘confirmation’  
5. **debat** ‘debate’  
6. **erklæring** ‘declaration’  
7. **forhåbning** ‘hope’  
8. **garanti** ‘guarantee’  
9. **historie** ‘story’  
10. **indrømmelse** ‘confession’  
11. **klage** ‘complaint’  
12. **lov** ‘law’  
13. **lyst** ‘desire’  
14. **mareridt** ‘nightmare’  
15. **opfattelse** ‘perception’  
16. **påbud** ‘order’  
17. **påstand** ‘claim’  
18. **risiko** ‘risk’  
19. **spørgsmål** ‘question’  
20. **tilknytning** ‘impulse’  
21. **undskyldning** ‘excuse’  
22. **ønske** ‘wish’

Bare structure additionally allows:

23. **afvisning** ‘rejection’  
24. **evne** ‘ability’  
25. **forbløffelse** ‘amazement’  
26. **gåde** ‘riddle’  
27. **indrømmelse** ‘confession’  
28. **interesse** ‘hobby’  
29. **nederlag** ‘defeat’  
30. **sag** ‘case/fact’  
31. **skandale** ‘scandal’  
32. **ulempe** ‘disadvantage’  
33. **virkning** ‘effect’
• The Ns in 1-24 have a different semantic relationship with the CP, than the Ns in 25-35.

• The latter relationship cannot be expressed through adjunction of (preposition-encased) CP to DP, only through simultaneous selection by D

6 Conclusion

• If we maintain the standard syntactic characterization of the distribution of the two Danish definiteness markers we are driven to the conclusion that a definite D may take a CP complement and an NP complement

• as radical as this might seem, there is some support for it from

  – the use of the definite article with CPs elsewhere
  – the fact that DPs with such doubly-complemented D have a special meaning (they are referent-establishing rather than anaphoric)
  – the distribution of lexical items in the N⁰ slot in the Bare and Prepositional structures.
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