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Introduction

• The starting point for the present talk is the following claim found in the literature for standard German and Austrian Bavarian (for German P+D amalgams in [Hartmann 1980, p.172], and others, for Austro-Bavarian [Wiltschko 2012]; Brugger and Prinzhorn 1996):

(1) Reduced definite determiners are not compatible with restrictive relative clauses.

• Problem 1: Exceptions to the claim Austro-Bavarian reduced definite D can combine with non-appositive RCs (Wiltschko 2012 [to appear]. Standard German P+D contractions in Standard German can appear with restrictive RCs Cabredo Hofherr 2012b[a].

• Problem 2: Variation across Germanic In Fehring Frisian and in Swiss German dialects the combination reduced definite D + restrictive RC can be found.

• Problem 3: (minor) The effect is much weaker than e.g. the ban on contraction with relative pronouns in German.

• Claim: Variability and exceptions are due to two factors (Cabredo Hofherr 2013):

(2) a. Variable definition of restrictive RC

b. Different types of RCs used in the exemples

c. Different effects of the full/ reduced determiner contrast

• Proposal: Classification of different types of restrictive RCs, first results on variation across these types for Standard German, Vorarlberger dialect and Fehring Frisian (based on Ebert 1970 [1971]).
1 Starting point

- P+D amalgams in Standard German: According to Hartmann (1980, p.172) if the noun is modified by a restrictive relative, the P+D amalgam is excluded (see also Raffelsiefen (1987), Nübling (2005, 112), Eisenberg et al. (2006, 624), Puig-Waldmüller (2008, 148) Schwarz (2009, Ch. 2.1, Ch. 6.4.2))

\[(3) \text{Obligatory P+D sequence:}\]
\[
\text{a. } ?^*\text{Im in+}\text{NTR.}\text{DAT/ in DET house which sold will be lives F}\n\]
\[
\text{b. } \text{Sie geht z*um zu dem Zahnarzt, der ihr empfohlen wurde. She goes to+DET/ to DET dentist that to-her recommended was She goes to the dentist that was recommended to her.}\n\]


\[(4) \text{I hob' s Buach, des (was) da Chomsky gschriem hot, nit glesn}\]
\[
\text{I have-DET red book that (which) the Chomsky written has not read (Austro-Bavarian)}\]
\[(\text{non-restrictive reading of the RC only), Brugger and Prinzhorn (1996 p.12-13)}\]

- Bavarian: the following contrast from Weiss (1998) is also consistent with this claim.

\[(5) \text{a. } \text{dea/da Baua, dea wo gesdan s' Hai nimm hoam brood hod, ...}\n\]
\[
\text{b. Weiss (1998 91, ex 100d/e)}\]

- Re: Problem 3: In Standard German this incompatibility is not as strong as e.g. the prohibition to contract P with the relative pronoun (homophonous with the full form of the amalgamating article):

\[(3') \text{a. } \text{Das Haus, }^*\text{im/ in dem Fritz wohnt, wird verkauft.}\]
\[
\text{DET house in+NTR.DAT/ in REL.PRON F lives will be sold (amalgam form for relative pronoun)}\]

An explanation?

- It has been claimed in the literature that this restriction on weak definite head nouns with restrictive relative clauses can be derived from a semantic restriction.

- Unique expressions such as proper names do not allow restrictive RCs.

\[(6) \text{*George that likes no one enjoys Handel. Carlson (1977)}\]
• In the literature it is claimed that therefore the semantically weak determiner is not felici-
tous with restrictive relative clauses since it signals uniqueness of the head noun.
• This is taken to be in contradiction with the restrictive RC that implies a choice out of a
number of possible referents (see e.g. [Brugger and Prinzhorn 1996] [Wilschko 2012]).
• This reasoning can be decomposed as follows

(7) a. Weak D + N signals semantic uniqueness of the referent of the DP.
   b. Unique expressions cannot be modified by restrictive relative clauses.
   c. Therefore Weak D + N cannot be modified by a restrictive relative clause.

• Problem with (7): hidden assumption

(8) Hidden assumption:
Restrictive RCs semantically compose with the head DP (adjunction to DP).

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{DP}_1 & \quad \text{D + N} & \quad \text{RC} \\
\text{DP}_2 & \quad \text{proper name} & \quad \text{RC}
\end{align*}
\]

• Partee (1973) pointed out that semantically, the composition with relative clauses is the
following\(^2\)

(9) \[
\text{DP}_1 \quad \text{D + [N + RC]}
\]

• Given (9), the weak D can be interpreted as saying that there is a semantically unique en-
tity satisfying both the nominal predicate and the RC.

• This is clearly the semantic composition found with an example like (10):

(10) Every house that Ina inherited was renovated.
    Every [house[that Ina inherited]]

• Furthermore, nouns modified by restrictive adjectives are compatible with the reduced

(11) a. is/*des Zentrum vom Universum (Austro-Bavarian)
    the red/the center of-the red universe
b. Da Hans hot’n/ *den stärktsten Mann von Los Feliz gschlogn
    the Hans has-the red/ the strongest man of Los Feliz beaten
    Hans beat the strongest man of Los Feliz
c. da/*dea Biagamasta von Hintertupf
    the red/the major of Hintertupf
    (Brugger and Prinzhorn 1996) ex53, p.11)

• Restrictive modification is compatible with the reduced definite determiner.

\(^2\)In particular, Partee (1973) points out that the meaning of the boy is not part of the relativised DP
the boy that is running over there.
2 Exceptions

- There are examples where weak determiners in Standard German P+D contractions are compatible with relative clauses cannot be classified as non-restrictive (see Cabredo Hofherr (2012b, 2013)).

(12) *Im Institut, in dem ich vorher gearbeitet habe, war das kein Problem.*

In the institute that I worked in before that wasn't a problem. (example due to an anonymous reviewer)

(13) *Es dürfe nicht sein, dass Anwohner, die eine Nachtparkgebühr zahlen, in Wohnquartier, in dem sie leben, keinen freien Parkplatz mehr finden.*

It is not acceptable that inhabitants that pay a parking fee for night parking cannot find a parking space in the quarter they live in anymore.

(14) *Im Betrieb, in dem ich Werkzeugmacher gelernt habe, gab es 1000 Mitarbeiter.*

In the factory where I did my apprenticeship to become a toolmaker, there were 1000 employees.

(15) *Der Besuch des ehemaligen Kellners im Privatclub, in dem sie arbeitete, endete für die Frau in Todesangst.*

The visit of the former waiter to the private club, in which she worked, ended in her fearing for her own life.

- This is not a side-effect of amalgamation as the following examples from the Vorarlberg dialect (with an independent full / reduced contrast on the definite Ds) shows:

(16) a. *s / *des inschtitut wo i frühr gschaaffat ho isch bessr organisiert*

The institute that I used to work in was better organised.

b. *mir hot s / des inschtitut wo i frühr gschaaffat ho bessr mir hat*

The institute that I used to work in was better organised.
I preferred the institute that I used to work in before.

- Notice the interaction between article choice and pre-/post-V2 position of the DP.
- The combination reducedD+N+non-appositive RC is also found for Austro-Bavarian, see Wiltschko (2012, to appear).

(17) Wiltschko (2012, ex 3) Context: the mailman who has been delivering mail in the neighborhood for the last 10 years is retired. Everyone knows this mailman. A and B have been living in this neighborhood. A tells B.

Wasst eh, da Briaftroga (wos bei uns austrogn hot) is jetz in Pension. Know prt DET red Briaftroga (wos bei uns austrogn hot) is jetz in Pension.

‘You know, the mailman (who delivered our mail) is now retired.’

3 Variation in Germanic

- In Fehring Frisian restrictive RCs are compatible with a weak definite D:

(18) a. Det / At iast buk, wat hi skrewen hee, docht niks.

DET full / DET req first book REL written has is worth nothing

(Fehring Frisian)

The first book he wrote is no good. Ebert (1970, 169, ex 33’)

- Studler (2008, 95-108, 310) shows for a range of Swiss German varieties that (i) restrictive RCs appear with the full definite determiner significantly more often, but (ii) it cannot be maintained that the reduced definite determiner is excluded in these contexts.

4 Restrictive and non-restrictive relative clauses

- **Question**: What is meant by restrictive?

Conceptual vs. discourse non-restrictiveness

- Fabricius-Hansen (2009) distinguishes two kinds of non-restrictiveness:

(19) conceptual non-restrictiveness (— lexical semantics)

||modifier|| ∩ ||head|| ⊂ ||modifier||

a. inclusion is semantic:

lediger unmarried

Junggeselle bachelor
b. inclusion is motivated prototypically:
   schwarzer Rabe  
   black raven

c. inclusion is motivated stereotypically:
   unschuldiger Passagier, gemeiner Verräter
   innocent passenger, nasty traitor

(20) discourse non-restrictiveness:

modifiers that are discourse-non-restrictive do not play a role in establishing the referent of the DP

a. semantically restrictive but discourse-non-restrictive:


   A therapy, so feared for example the Norwegian painter E. M. could extinguish his creative force. I want to keep this illness, it is part of me and my art. declared the manic depressive Norwegian, despite his extreme changes in mood.

b. conceptually non-restrictive modifiers are also discourse-non-restrictive

   * Fabricius-Hansen (2009) points out that when we talk of restrictivity with respect to modification, we generally mean restrictive referent identification:

   (21) If the modifier is necessary for the identification of the referent of the DP, the modifier is restrictive, otherwise it is non-restrictive. Fabricius-Hansen (2009)

   * As Umbach (2006) points out, restrictive modifiers do not need to contribute new information (contrary to what Potts (2005) assumes) as the examples of the following type show.

   (22) She tried a black and a blue suit on. But she only bought the blue suit.

Restrictive relatives and contrast

* Many definitions of restrictive RCs include contrastiveness.

(23) Kempson 2003

   a. On the one hand, relative clause sequences may be used to restrict the range of variables over which the determiner is presumed to quantify;

---

3 Notice that stereotypical and prototypical associations can be undone, particularly under narrow focus on the adjective (see Umbach 2006).
b. on the other hand they may, non-restrictively, solely add additional information about the entity picked out by the determiner-noun sequence alone:

c. The linguists who were drunk spoiled the party.

• The restrictive reading is taken to correspond to (24a), the appositive reading to (24b).

(24) a. The linguists that were drunk spoiled the party. The sober linguists were blameless. (restrictive reading of the linguists who were drunk)
b. The linguists spoiled the party. They were drunk. (appositive reading of the linguists who were drunk)

• The paraphrase in (23a) is often taken to be the equivalent of the following general restriction on restrictive RCs:

(25) A restrictive relative clause presupposes the existence of entities of which the description given in the relative clause is not true. [Bach 1974: 271]

• In many studies this characterisation is taken to mean that a definite description with a restrictive relative clause implies three things:

(26) a. the relativised DP denotes a unique salient entity in the domain of discourse that satisfies the description combining the head noun and the restrictive relative clause
b. the relativised DP with a restrictive relative also presupposes the existence of an entity in the domain of discourse that satisfies the predicate contributed by the head-noun but not the predicate contributed by the restrictive relative clause
c. the entity that satisfies head-noun and restrictive relative clause is contrasted with the entities that only satisfy the head-noun but not the relative clause

• These three assumptions yield the reading exemplified in (24a): the restrictive relative clause divides the set of linguists in the domain of discourse into those who were drunk and those who were not, contrasting the two subgroups.

• This contrasting reading is taken to be the characteristic reading of restrictive relative clauses in many studies (e.g. [Brugger and Prinzhorn 1996], [Studler 2008], [Wiltschko 2012]).

• Claim: the understanding of restrictive relatives in (26) is too narrow on two counts, marked bold in (26).

(27) a. It is not clear at what level the entity satisfying head noun + ¬RC has to be available.
b. It is not clear that the entity satisfying head noun + RC is contrasted with the entities satisfying head noun + ¬RC
• **Claims:**

(28) a. There are RCs that are restrictive in the sense discussed above (necessary for referent identification) but not contrastive.

   b. The entity satisfying head noun + ¬RC has to be available at the larger level of the world / general background / encyclopaedic knowledge of the speaker, not in the narrower domain of discourse of entities under discussion.

4.0.1 **Non-contrasting restrictive relative clauses**

• I will show that different types of restrictive RCs correspond to different information structures. The contrasting reading of restrictive RCs presented above is only one of at least two possible readings.

• [Ebert](1971) points out that there are cases for which the classification as a restrictive relative clause is not clear cut:

(29) a. Anna bought the house that Ina had inherited.

   b. the relative clause is necessary to identify the referent of the overall relativised DP, so the restriction of the predicate house is necessary

   c. there is no sense in which the house that Ina inherited is contrasted with other houses

• In languages with articles like German and English these examples have a paraphrase corresponding to restrictive relative clauses, not to appositive relative clauses.

• While the paraphrase of the appositive reading in (24b) relies on a definite NP and a second clause providing additional information, the paraphrases of the example in (29) rely on an indefinite NP introducing the referent and a second clause providing additional information that is necessary for the identification of the referent.\(^4\)

\[^4\]This reasoning follows [Hawkins](1978 131) who points out that the example in (ia) can be paraphrased with an indefinite head noun:

(i) What's wrong with Bill? Oh, the woman he went out with last night was nasty to him. [Hawkins](1978 101, ex 3.16)

   a. [Hawkins](1978 131, ex 3.62) Oh, he went out with a woman last night and she / the woman was nasty to him.

   b. Oh, he went out with a woman last night who was nasty to him. [Hawkins](1978 131, ex 3.63)

Notice that this kind of example is best when the predicate of the head-noun and the relative clause make a functional reading plausible:

(ii) What is wrong with Bill? ?The woman he bumped into last night was nasty to him.
Reduced definite articles and restrictive relative clauses

(30) a. Ina inherited a house. Anna bought it.
    b. Anna bought a house. Ina had inherited it. (Paraphrases for (29))

(30) Compare an appositive with a definite head noun:
    We met the mayor who was wearing a funny hat.
    We met the mayor. He was wearing a funny hat

• But (29) also differs from the restrictive reading exemplified in (24a) in its information structure (IS in what follows).
• For (29) there the house that Ina inherited is not contrasted with other houses that she didn’t inherit (contrasting with the reading in (24a)).

• Examples like (29) have an IS corresponding to question-answer focus as in the following exchange:

(31) A: Anna bought a house.
    B: Which house?
    A: The house that Ina had inherited.

• Summarising: The restrictive RC can either

(32) a. add information that allows the identification of the referent or
    b. contrast entities that satisfy both the head noun and the RC and those that do
       satisfy the head noun but not the RC.

• As pointed out by Umbach (2006, 155), adjectives on a non-restrictive interpretation resist focus, this also seems to be true for relative clauses.
• As Fabricius-Hansen (2012) explicitly points out for prenominal modifiers narrow focus (contrastive focus) implies restrictive modification (but not the inverse).

(33) a. Umbach: non-restrictive interpretation ——> no focus
    b. Fabricius-Hansen (2012): contrastive focus ——> restrictive modification
    c. None of this implies
       restrictive interpretation ——> focus

• Conclusion: Focus is not part of the definition of restrictive.

5Not all non-appositive relative clauses behave the same with respect to this paraphrase:
(i) What day was she born?
    She was born on the day that Trinidad became independent.
(ii) # She was born on a day. Trinidad became independent on it.
4.0.2 The existence presupposition of head noun + ¬RC

- As mentioned in (25), restrictive relative clauses presuppose the existence of entities satisfying head noun + ¬RC.
- **Question:** At what level of the discourse does this presupposition have to be satisfied?
- A very explicit version of the approach generally taken is given in [Fabricius-Hansen (2012)](fabricius-hansen-2012).

(34) [Fabricius-Hansen (2012, slide 27)]

a. **Restrictive** modification

There is more than one x in C such that HEAD(x), exactly one x in C such that MOD(x)

→ there is at least one x in C such that HEAD(x) & ¬MOD(x)

b. The context set C is defined as "those individuals that are under consideration on this utterance occasion" [Fabricius-Hansen (2012, slide 15)]

- **Claim:**

(35) a. the existence presupposition head noun + ¬RC for a restrictive relative clause RC does not have to be satisfied by an entity in the context set.

b. It is sufficient if the negation of the RC is compatible with the head noun (i.e. the existence presupposition is satisfied in the maximal situation / in the world).

- Following [Wiltschko (2012, to appear)](wiltschko-2012), I will assume that for the analysis of reduced and full definites at least two context sets have to be distinguished:

(36) [Wiltschko (2012, to appear)]

a. The notion situationally unique is not quite enough, since there is a sense in which the referent of an anaphoric or deictic DP is also situationally unique.

b. The difference between those contexts in which DET_w is felicitous and those in which it is not has to do with whether or not the uniqueness of the referent must be established in current discourse.

c. DET_w is used if the uniqueness of the discourse referent does not need to be established. It is in this sense that the use of DET_w does not depend on the discourse context.

Fabricius-Hansen (2012) contrasts this with the following characterisation of non-restrictive modification

(i) **Non-restrictive** modification

There is exactly one x in C such that HEAD(x), and nothing in the context excludes that MOD(x)
d. Need to distinguish between the common ground that is independent of the current conversation (we may call it the common background) and the conversational common ground, which is sensitive to and manipulated by the ongoing discourse (see Krifka 2008 for a discussion of this distinction).

**Conclusion:** There is no reason to assume that contrastive focus with an element in the narrow context set is an intrinsic part of the definition of restrictive relative clauses. The existences presupposition can be satisfied at the level of the maximal situation / the world. (Or possibly at an intermediate level.)

## 5 Subtypes of restrictive relative clauses relevant for article choice

- Above I have shown that contrastive focus is not a necessary property of restrictive RCs.
- Among the factors that have been shown to be relevant for article choice with RCs are the following:

(37) a. contrastive restrictive relative clauses
   b. establishing RCs/ first mention definites (functional head noun-RC relationship the woman he went out with) [Hawkins (1978)]
   c. functional head nouns [Ebert (1971), 160], see ex [39] above, [Wespel (2008), 134ff]) (the first book he wrote) [Ebert (1970)]
   d. generic reference & intensionality [Ebert (1971)]
   e. atemporal vs. anchored intensional DPs [Keenan and Ebert (1973), Gunkel (2007)]
   f. Maximalising RCs [Carlson (1977)], [Grosu and Landman (1998)]
   g. Relativised V+N constructions

### 5.1 First mention definites

- First mention definites [Hawkins (1978)]: establishing RCs as in [38a] makes the definite article possible on first mention definites. [38b] is not an establishing RC. I will follow [Wespel (2008)] who interprets establishing RCs as those that have a functional head noun-RC relationship.

(38) a. What’s wrong with Bill? – Oh, the woman he went out with last night was nasty to him. ((3.16) in Hawkins 1978:101)

b. What’s wrong with Bill? – Oh, the woman who was from the south was nasty to him. ((3.18) in Hawkins 1978:102)
5.2 Functional head nouns

- For Fehring Ebert observed that functional head nouns legitimise the weak definite determiner where otherwise the strong definite is preferred:

(39)  a. Det as at / det iast buk wat hi skewen hee.
      this is DET_w / DET_s first book that he wrote.
      This is the first book that he wrote. \[Ebert [1971] 160, ex 80\]

b. Compare:

      Det as *at / det buk wat hi tuiaست skewen hee.
      this is DET_w / DET_s book that he first wrote.
      This is the book that he wrote first. \[Ebert [1971] 160, ex 80’\]

5.3 Generic reference and intensionality

- Generic reference: Differences in intensionality: specific and non-specific reference to the class \[Ebert [1971] p. 147\]

(40)  a. a mensen wat suart hiar haa
      DET_w humans REL black hair have
      all possible people that have black hair

b. dön mensen wat suart hiar haa
      DET_s humans REL black hair have
      exactly those people that have black hair

5.4 Atemporal and anchored intensional DPs

- Gunkel (2007, 232) points out that according to Delsing (1993, 119), Holmberg (1987, 1993) and Julien (2005) in Swedish the enclitic article obligatory with appositive RC but optional with restrictive RC if the overall DP is specific and dispreferred if with a RC if the overall DP is non-specific.

(41)  a. Den dag-en jag måste sluta med mitt pensionat
      DEM day-def I had-to.prs/pst close.INF with my guesthouse
      The day that I had to close my guesthouse (past, temporally anchored day)

b. Den dag jag måste sluta med mitt pensionat
      DEM day I had-to.prs/pst close.INF with my guesthouse
      The day that I have to close my guesthouse (present/future, not temporally anchored day)

(examples from Perridon 1989, 208, cited apud Gunkel 2007)
5.5 Relativising verb+noun expressions

- Studler (2008) 105 points out that examples like the following allow weak definite determiners with restrictive relative clauses significantly more frequently:

(43) Studler (2008) 105

a. d Bedängke, wo si händ
   \text{DET}_w \text{doubts} \text{that} \text{they} \text{have}

b. s Wüsse, wo d muesch haa
   \text{DET}_w \text{knowledge} \text{that} \text{you} \text{have} \text{to} \text{have}

c. i de Phöngkt, wo s druf aa chunt
   \text{in} \text{DET}_w \text{points} \text{on} \text{which} \text{it} \text{matters}
   \text{in} \text{the} \text{points} \text{that} \text{matter}

- A common feature of these examples is that verb and noun form a complex expression.
- The verb can be light as in (43a/b) but need not be (43c).
- In some of these examples the RC can be used to contribute the arguments of the noun (44a/b) or modify the abstract noun (compare (44c) with (43b) above):

(44) a. their doubts (compare (43a))

b. der Eindruck, \text{den er auf mich macht}
   \text{the} \text{impression} \text{that} \text{he} \text{on} \text{me} \text{makes}

c. the important point (compare (43c))

- Caveat:

(45) a. The RC in relativised V+N constructions is not appositive as it is obligatory.

b. BUT: we cannot include all relativised V+N constructions with restrictive RCs.
   i. some examples are restrictive relatives (43a)
   ii. at least in a subset of cases the N is not clearly referential (see e.g. (43c) / (44b)
      \text{---} \text{the} \text{RC} \text{involved} \text{does} \text{not} \text{seem} \text{to} \text{restrict} \text{the} \text{reference} \text{of} \text{N}.

5.6 Maximalising RCs / Amount relatives

- Carlson shows for English that amount-relatives are different from restrictive RCs and from appositives (choice of D on head N).
• The amount reading is not a good indicator of amount-relatives however (see Grosu and Landman 1998). Amount relatives are maximalising RCs.
• As far as I can tell, maximalising means that there is no contrast in the discourse context.
• Amount RCs are restrictive in the sense adopted here: they are necessary to identify the referent of the overall DP but not contrastive.
• I will treat amount-relatives as an example of non-contrastive restrictive RCs.

6 Article choice and types of restrictive relative clauses

• Studler (2008) notes that article choice with restrictive relative clauses is not categorical in Swiss German. She therefore examines different subdivisions of restrictive relative clauses to give a more precise description of the variation in article choice.

6.1 Vorarlberg dialect

In the Vorarlberger dialect the choice between a reduced and a full definite article on the head noun is clearly correlated with a contrastive reading of the RC (the data on the Vorarlberger dialect are due to Gerhard Schaden and taken from Cabredo Hofherr and Schaden 2012a,b):

(46) a. (i) D Trouw mit de DA Hans gescht ufs fäscht ku isch, isch fo (ii) Dia frow mit de DA Hans gescht ufs fäscht ku isch, isch fo DET woman with whom DET H. yesterday to-the party come is is from NZ Neuseeland (DET wk ) Neuseeland DET str

The woman that Hans came to the party with yesterday is from NZ.
The use of (ii) implies a contrast with another woman in the context.

b. (i) Da maa wo üsera bojler gflickt hot, hot gsejt, dass mr d rohr usfürba (ii) Dea maa wo üsera bojler gflickt hot, hot gsejt, dass mr d rohr usfürba DET man REL our boiler repaired has has said that we the flue sweep lo sóllan. (DET wk ) lo sóllan. (DET str )

The man who repaired our boiler said we should have the flue swept out. The use of (ii) implies a contrast with another man in the context.

• With establishing RCs and both definite articles are possible.

7 Wie gezeigt kann eine genauere Relativsatzklassifizierung helfen, die Schwankungen in der Artikelsetzung bei der Relativsatzmodifikation besser beschreiben zu können. Studler 2008 (108).
• However, when the full article is used, the referent described by the DP+RC is contrasted with another potential referent of the DP: in ex (46a/b) there would have to be another woman / man in the context who does not fulfill the description of the RC (contrastive restrictive reading of the RC).

(47) **Establishing** RC

a. schtimmt, abr s  kino i deam mr Shrek gsea hond isch no vil true but detₜ cinema in which we S seen have is still much schleimmr.
worse
True, but the cinema that we saw Shrek in was even worse. (Vorarlberger dialect)
(adapted from the discussion in Studler 2008, 153, ex 43a))

b. s/ ?des inschtitut wo i frühr gschaffat ho isch besser organisiert DET_red/ DET_full institute where I before worked have is better organised gsi.
been
‘The institute where I worked before was better organised.’ (Vorarlberger dialect)

(48) **Functional head** N:

I hob gat s/ des easchte buach vom Musil gleasa.
I have just DET_red/ DET_full first book of+DET_red Musil read

I just read the first book by Musil.

(49) **Amount relatives**

a. Da / Dea tee wo i dr kanne isch isch kolt (Vorarlberg)
DET_red/ DET_full tea REL in DET_red tea-pot is is cold
-> no meaning difference

b. jetzt isch da / dea tee wo i dr kanna isch, kolt now is DET_red/ DET_full tea REL in DET_red pot is cold
-> strong D: contrastive interpretation [there is some tea elsewhere]

• With amount relatives the position of the relativised DP plays a role for the choice of article, with a semantic effect which can be characterised in terms of contrast. (see ex [16]).
• In pre-V2 position both articles are semantically equivalent (49a), while in post-V2 position the full article implies a contrast with other quantities of tea (49b).
• In examples with reference to a class both articles are possible; I have not been able to establish if there is the meaning difference noted for Fehring Frisian by Ebert.

(50) **Reference to a class**

a. d / dia lüt wo rouchat sind mojschtens uzfrida. (Vorarlberg)
DET_wk/ DET_str people who smoke are mostly unhappy
b. da / dia vögl wo im heabscht in süda zinad kummad det wk / det str birds who in+det wk autuum in south go come
im früajor widr.
in-det wk spring back
(adapted from exs in Ebert [1971])

• With intensional DPs both articles are possible for atemporal (51a) and temporally anchored uses (51b):

(51) Intensional relativised DPs

a. da / dea spiler wo am mojschta punkt hot, deaf i dr näkschta runda det wk / det str player rel the most points has may in the next round afanga begin
The player who has the most points can open the game in the next round. (atemporal)

b. da / dea fahrer wo des renna gwinnt, wiat olympiasiegea. det wk / det str driver rel det str race wins becomes olympic.champion
The driver that wins this race will become Olympic champion. (temporally anchored)

• Relativised V+N constructions are compatible with a reduced definite determiner:

(52) a. des isch da punkt, uf dean as akut that is det wk point on that it on-comes
that is the point that matters

b. da easchte idruck won i fo eam hob isch ganz guat the first impression rel of him have is quite good

c. da / dea punkt, uf dean as akut isch doch, dass er a arbat finda det wk / det str point on that it on-comes isprt that he a work find.inf muass must
the point that matters is that he needs to find work.

• The choice of definite article interacts with the position of the DP in pre- or post-V2 position: in pre-V2 position both articles are acceptable (52b) while in post-V2 position the weak article is preferred for the example (52a).

6.2 Standard German

• German P+D amalgams also appear in all five RC contexts considered here:

(53) a. Establishing RC
In the house that borders on our garden lives an older couple.

In the hotel that they are staying in, breakfast is served from 7 o’clock.

Karen is mentioned in the first book that was ever written on British gospel music.

We are thrilled by the coffee that this machine makes.

That hardly changes the impression that the epos makes as a whole.

6.3 Fehring Frisian

In the preceding discussion we have seen that Fehring Frisian allows reduced definite articles with certain types of restrictive RCs (54a/b) (see also Keenan and Ebert 1973). According to Ebert (1970, 169, ex 33’)

(54) a. Functional head nouns: reduced definite article

\[
\text{Det / At last buk, wat hi skrewen hee, docht niks.} \\
\text{DET\textsubscript{full} / DET\textsubscript{req} erste Buch was er geschrieben hat \textit{taugt nichts.} (Ebert 1970, 169, ex 33’)}
\]
b. Intensional atemporal relativised DPs: reduced definite article
   i. a lidj wat för fräiaaid stridj (\text{DET}_{\text{red}})
   ii. dön lidj wat för fräiaaid stridj (\text{DET}_{\text{full}})

\text{DET}_{\text{red}} / \text{DET}_{\text{full}} people.pl who are fighting for freedom
(i) the people who are fighting for freedom (non-specific)
(ii) the people who are fighting for freedom (specific) \cite{Ebert1973} p. 10\footnote{8}

d. Establishing RCs: full definite article

Anne hee det hüs keeft, wat Inna arewt hee.
A has \text{DET}_{\text{str}} house bought \text{REL} I. inherited has.
Anne has bought the house that Inna inherited. \cite{Ebert1971} p. 137, ex 23

\begin{itemize}
\item Example (54c) is not entirely conclusive as in this example the RC is extraposed after the verb.
\item Ebert shows independently that in other contexts extraposition is not compatible with a reduced article. In the following examples the particle \text{"ütj} marks the right boundary of the main clause:
\end{itemize}

\begin{enumerate}
\item a. A köning nategt a / dön mensken, wat aarem wiari, \text{"ütj}.
   \text{DET}_{\text{req}} king took-advantage \text{DET}_{\text{req}} / \text{DET}_{\text{full}} humans \text{REL} poor were PRT
\item b. A köning nategt *a / dön mensken \text{"ütj}, wat aarem wiari.
   \text{DET}_{\text{req}} king took-advantage \text{DET}_{\text{req}} / \text{DET}_{\text{full}} humans PRT \text{REL} poor were
   \cite{Ebert1971} p. 147, ex 40
\end{enumerate}

6.4 Swiss German (p.c Rebekka Studler)

(56) \textbf{Establishing RC: strong D}

\begin{itemize}
\item a. for examples translating the following take the strong definite D (Studler, p.c.):
   Die Frau, mit der Hans gestern zu der Party gekommen ist, kam aus Neuseeland.
   The woman that Hans came to the party yesterday, was from New Zealand.
\end{itemize}

\cite{8} Other examples given by Ebert:

(54) \textbf{Generic DP}

\begin{itemize}
\item a. A / Dön mensken, wat rik, san miastids üntufrees.
   \text{DET}_{w} / \text{DET}_{s} humans rel smoke are often unhappy
   \cite{Ebert1971} p. 143, 36)
\item b. A / Dön föglar, wat an harefstem am a süüd tji, kem di wos wäler.
   \text{DET}_{w} / \text{DET}_{s} birds rel in auutumn in \text{DET}_{w} south go come in spring back
   \cite{Ebert1971} p. 143, 37)
\item c. a weak definite is possible with generic reference, which Ebert characterises as allowing
   a question with \text{"was für ein N"} "what kind of N", while reference to a specific object corre-
   sponds to a question with \text{"welches N"} "which N". \cite{Ebert1971} p. 143-45)
\end{itemize}
b. Der Mann, der unseren Boiler repariert hat, hat gesagt, wir sollten die Rohre ausfegen lassen.
The man that repaired our boiler said, we should have the pipes cleaned.

(57) **Functional head-noun-RC relationship** In examples of the following type weak definite articles disproportionately frequently [Studler (2008) 153, ex 43a]

Stimmt, aber das Kino, in dem wir Shrek gesehen haben, finde ich noch viel schlimmer.
True but the cinema in which we Shrek seen have find I even much worse.

(58) **Amount relatives** weak definite D, if not contrasted with some other tea (Studler p.c)
Translation from German:
Ich hab den Tee, der noch in der Kanne war, weggeschüttet.
I threw away the tea that still in the tea pot was.

(59) **Light head-nouns**: weak definite D [Studler (2008) 105] (see above)

(60) "complement-like" RCs

der erste Eindruck, den ich von ihm habe ist ganz gut.
the (first) impression I have of him is quite good

weak definite D (Studler p.c)

(61) **Generic relativised DP**:
Translation from German:
Die Menschen, die rauchen, sind meistens unzufrieden. Studler: in generic use bare plural Menschen or weak definite D, strong definite D is ok if contrast with die Menschen, die nicht rauchen "the people that don't smoke"

6.5 Bavarian

- All data p.c. Helmut Weiss.

(62) **Establishing RC**: strong D

a. was is'n mit'm Maral los?  Dea man, mit dem's what is with Mary wrong? DET3 man with rel.pronDAT.SG=pron.DEW
gesdan . yesterday ...
The man she went out with last night was mean to her. (Helmut Weiss, p.c.)

b. Here position seems to play a role: post V2 the weak msg article does not seem to be excluded, but fsg and nsg are:
*weil *d’frau, mit der’s gesdan ...
   since DET_w=woman with that=she yesterday

*weil s’kind, mit dem’s gesdan gspeit hod,
   since DET_w=child with that=she yesterday played has

(63) **Functional head-noun-RC** relationship

mia hod des Institut, an dem wo’e friaha goabad hob, bessa me has DET_s institute, at rel.pron. where=pron.1sg before worked have better
   liked

I liked the institute where I used to work better. (pb: ntr.sg + RC!)

(64) **Generic DP**: modified plural DPs force the strong determiner (see Weiss 1998, 92)

(65) **Amount relatives**

wie hosd du den Tee, der noa in da kann war, so schnei tringa kind?
   how have you DET_s tea that still in detw tea-pot was so quickly drink could

How could you drink the tea that was in the tea-pot so quickly?

(66) **Light head-nouns**

a. dea punkt, auf den (wo)’s ankimd ...
   DET_s point on rel.pron where=pron.ntr.nom

b. da wichtigste punkt is dabei, dass’ma
   DET_w most-important point is with this
   schwach (vgl. Weiss 1998 habil S. 73)

(67) **complement-like RC** The weak definite article is only possible for syllabic forms,
   with the fem/ pl need the strong form like with adjectives

a. da eindruck, den (wo)’e von eam hob, is ganz guad
   DET_w impression rel. rel+1sg of him have is quite good

b. de meinung, de (wo)’e von eam hob
   DET_s opinion that rel=1sg of him have

(68) **RC without contrast**: strong article

   d’Maria renoviert grod des Haus, des d’Inna vo ihr ha Oma gerbd hod
   DET=Maria renovates just the house that DET_w=Inna of her granny inherited has

   Maria renoviert gerade das Haus, das Inna von ihrer Oma geerbt hat.
7 Conclusion

Preliminary summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RC type</th>
<th>Vorarl.</th>
<th>St. G</th>
<th>Fehring</th>
<th>Swiss G</th>
<th>Bav</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>contrastive restrictive relative clauses</td>
<td>wk</td>
<td>wk</td>
<td>str</td>
<td>str</td>
<td>str</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>first mention</td>
<td>wk</td>
<td>wk</td>
<td>str</td>
<td>str</td>
<td>str</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(functional head noun-RC relationship)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>functional head nouns</td>
<td>wk</td>
<td>wk</td>
<td>wk/str</td>
<td>wk</td>
<td>str</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>generic reference &amp; intensionality</td>
<td>wk</td>
<td>wk</td>
<td>wk/str</td>
<td>wk/str</td>
<td>str</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>light head nouns</td>
<td>wk</td>
<td>wk</td>
<td>wk</td>
<td>wk/str</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>amount relative clauses</td>
<td>wk</td>
<td>wk</td>
<td>wk</td>
<td>str</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>complement-like</td>
<td>wk</td>
<td>wk</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>reference to a non-specific / specific individual of the overall DP</td>
<td>wk</td>
<td>wk</td>
<td>wk</td>
<td>str</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- The data suggest that the choice of article with restrictive relative clauses is a semantic choice that is sensitive to the type of relative clause.

- In Bavarian modification of the head noun seems to force the strong form in more cases than in the other languages considered (with establishing RCs, functional head-noun-RC relationship, with amount relatives).

- However, Bavarian is also set apart by the fact that there is a choice of different relativisers *der / der wos / uos*, the paradigm considered above is therefore not complete. The effect of the choice of relativiser has to be examined in more detail (see Brandner and Bräuning (2012) for the RCI *u*).

- I remain neutral as to whether the different restrictive relative clauses correspond to different syntactic attachment sites in the DP as proposed in e.g. Studler (2008); Wiltshcko (2012). (See arguments below against the extraction argument in Wiltshcko 2010)

7.1 Appendix: Extraction differences

- Wiltshcko proposes a structural difference between weak and strong determiners:

  (70) a. strong definite determiners select an [nP[NP]] complement (Wiltshcko’s 24a)
  b. weak definite determiners select an [NP] complement (Wiltshcko’s 24b)
• Wilschko gives a contrast with respect to extraction (due to Brugger and Prinzhorn (1996, 6)) as evidence supporting this analysis:

(71) a. Von wem host du [\(s\) Possbild \(t\)] nit gsegn?
of whom have you det\(_{wk}\) passport.foto not seen
‘Whose passport pictured did you not see?’

b. *Von wem host du [des Possbild \(t\)] nit gsegn?
of whom have you det\(_{str}\) passport.foto not seen
(Wiltschko's exs 25a/b)

• This argument does not seem convincing since (i) demonstratives do also block extraction, (ii) the strong definite determiner differs in its binding behaviour from the weak definite determiner.

(72) a. Who did you see the picture of?

b. Who did you see that picture of?

• **Claim**: The ill-formedness of the strong definite D in this example should be attributed to the fact that strong definite Ds do not allow binding / co-varying readings independently of extraction, as shown by the following examples from the Vorarlberger dialect (see Cabredo Hofherr and Schaden (2012b))

(73) jedsmol wänn i a nöje pfanna kouf,
every time when I a new pan buy,

a. lot mr noch ujnär wucha da schtil ab. [\(\forall \exists, \exists \forall\)]
   let me after one week DET\(_{w}\) handle off
   Everyday I buy a new pan, the handle falls off after one week.

b. **strong definite D -> no co-varying reading for NP**
   lot mr noch ujnär wucha dea schtil ab. [\(\forall \exists, \forall \exists\)]
   let me after one week DET\(_{full}\) handle off

• The strong definite determiners are weakly deictic in the sense of Zribi-Hertz and Glaude (2007).

(74) Zribi-Hertz and Glaude (2007) distinguish

\(^9\)Notice that with an explicit emphatic element the emphatic reading of the full determiner is forced and binding becomes possible

(i) **strong definite D with explicit emphatic element -> co-varying reading ok**

   lot mia dea fashissene schtil noch ujnär wucha ab. [\(\forall \exists, \forall \exists\)]
   let me DET\(_{full}\) bloody handle after one week off
   (Everytime I buy a new pan), the bloody handle falls off after one week.
a. strong deixis (ostension)

b. weak deixis (presupposed spatialisation): "an interpretation linking the referent to a specific portion of space"

• The strong definite article in languages with two definite articles is weakly deictic: it is incompatible with inalienable possession and cannot appear on weak definites in the sense of Carlson et al. (2006) (see Cabredo Hofherr and Schaden (2012a) for a discussion of the difference between weak definite determiners and weak definite NPs).

(75) Tests for weak deictic articles (from Zribi-Hertz and Glaude [2007, exs 21-23])

a. referential reading vs variable reading (characteristic of weak definites in the sense of Carlson et al):
   Ring the bell, the doctor will answer you.
   (i) article: the doctor on duty (whoever that is)
   (ii) deictic/demonstrative: this/that doctor will answer you.

b. strict vs sloppy identity with ellipsis (characteristic of weak definites in the sense of Carlson et al)
   Paul turned off the light, and so did I.
   (i) article: sloppy or strict
   (ii) deictic/demonstrative: strict only

c. inalienable interpretation
   Paul a levé la tête. Paul hat den Kopf gehoben.
   (i) article: inalienable (= his head)
   (ii) deictic/demonstrative: alienable (some head or other)

• In now remains to be tested if weakly deictic determiners always block extraction.
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