

Demonstrative Reinforcers

Introduction: The deictic properties of demonstratives can be intensified by optional “reinforcers”, elements that frequently look like spatial adverbs. Factoring in (partial) N-raising in the Romance languages and Hebrew (e.g., Cinque 1994, Ritter 1991), there are four basic types of distribution:

- (1) a. **Dem Reinf Adj** *mit seller datt grosse mann* (Penn. Germ., [Eng., Swed., Norw.])
 with that there tall man
- b. **Dem Adj Reinf** *das schöne Bild da von Maria* (German, [French, Italian])
 that nice picture there of Mary
- c. **Reinf Dem Adj** *ot(-o) der guter man* (Yiddish, [Afrikaans])
 REINF this good man
- d. ...Adj **Dem Reinf** *el libro viejo este_{FOCUS} de aquí* (Spanish, [Catalan, Hebrew])
 the book old this of here

Bernstein (1997) discusses languages of types (1a), (1b), and (1d). She proposes that, unless focused as in (1d), *demonstratives move* into the DP. Leu (2007) discusses languages of patterns (1a) and (1c) arguing that *demonstratives and reinforcers move*, as an FP, into the DP. Without further assumptions, the first author cannot explain the high position of the reinforcer in (1c) and the second author cannot account for the low position of the reinforcer in (1b) and (1d). Building on these works, we provide a hybrid proposal.

New Observations: Considering the possibility that the reinforcer may, at least in principle, precede the demonstrative (cf. (1c)) and that the demonstrative may, at least in principle, follow the adjective (cf. (1d)), there are two more logical possibilities. These are schematically represented in (2):

- (2) a. * **Reinf Adj Dem**
 b. * ...Adj **Reinf Dem**

To the extent we are aware, these two latter options are not possible. If true, this is an important finding and any theory of grammar has to explain the systematic absence of these possibilities. The generalization seems to be that a reinforcer cannot appear to the left of the demonstrative if the demonstrative itself appears to the right of the adjective. In contrast, if the demonstrative appears to the left of the adjective, the reinforcer can precede or follow it. Besides these interesting restrictions, there is a lot of cross-linguistic variation: for instance, both following and preceding reinforcers may be bipartite (note that *-o* in Yiddish is optional and indicates that there are two independent reinforcing elements; cf. also (4a)):

- (3) a. *den herre her populæe boka* (Eastern Norwegian)
 the here here popular book-the
- b. *ot(-o) der guter man* (Yiddish, = (1c))

We suggest below that there are two types of reinforcers; the type in (3a-b) projects a Reinforcer Phrase, where one element is in the head position and the other is in the Specifier; e.g., [_{ReinfP} [*-o*] *ot*].

Proposal: Note first that both reinforcers and demonstratives may appear in different positions in one and the same language; compare Yiddish (1c) to (4a) and Spanish (1d) to (4b) (% = dialectal variation):

- (4) a. % *der-o guter man* (Yiddish)
 this.REINF good man
- b. *este_{UNMARKED} libro viejo de aquí* (Spanish, [Catalan])
 this book old of here

Importantly, Bernstein (2001) points out that, depending on the position, the Spanish demonstratives exhibit differences in interpretation with regard to focus. We interpret these facts to indicate that there is movement of the demonstrative with regard to the adjective and that there is movement of the reinforcer with regard to the demonstrative. Following Brugè (1996), we propose that these elements are base-generated in positions below adjectives in a phrase we call ArtP (cf. Julien 2005). Furthermore, suppose that the demonstrative projects a DemP, on top of which is a functional phrase (FP), (5a). Moreover, languages vary as to where they base-generate their reinforcers: as mentioned above, one type projects a ReinfP, which is merged in Spec, DemP. The other type is merged in Art_{Reinf}, (5b). Assuming that FP is separately assembled, it is merged in Spec, ArtP upon completion:

- (5) a. [FP F [DemP (ReinfP) Dem]]
 b. [DP D [adjective [ArtP FP Art_{Reinf} [NP N]]]]

The data follow from the following assumptions: (i) the demonstrative may move to F and ReinfP may move to Spec,FP, (5a); (ii) FP may move to Spec,DP, (5b). Assumption (ii) is a consequence of (i).

Adopting the general framework of Chomsky (2001), we propose that FP is a phase (cf. Leu 2007: 147) and that the feature [+Ref] in D (Longobardi 1994) probes for the demonstrative. In particular, if the demonstrative moves from Dem to F, it is in the edge of the phase FP and can be probed by the feature [+Ref] in D. Being a head, the demonstrative cannot move out of the phase, pied-piping FP and thus moving to Spec,DP. This holds for types (1a), (1b), and (1c). As to (1d), if the demonstrative is focused in Spanish, we propose that it does not move to F. As a consequence, it is not in the edge of the phase and cannot be probed by D (*Phase Impenetrability Condition*). Hence, FP stays in Spec,ArtP. In order to value the features in D, another element (i.e., *el*) has to be merged in D under *Last Resort*.

As to the distribution of the two types of reinforcers, if they were merged in ReinfP and remained in Spec,DemP during the derivation of FP, we derive type (1a). If ReinfP moved to Spec,FP, we derive type (1c). In contrast, if the reinforcer is merged in Art_{Reinf}, then, independent of the movement of FP, the reinforcer stays in situ and follows the adjective and demonstrative. This explains the low reinforcers in types (1b) and (1d). Crucially, the displacement of the reinforcer is parasitic on the movement of FP: reinforcers in Art do not move but reinforcers, as part of FP, do get displaced if the demonstrative moves to F. Assuming that focused demonstratives and ReinfP are incompatible, this rules out the cases in (2).

Four predictions: Assuming that there are two types of reinforcers, we expect that some languages avail themselves of both of them. This holds in Bosnian, which has types (1a) and (1b)/(1d) (Brugè 1996: 45):

- (6) a. *ova ovdie knjiga* b. *ova knjiga ovdie* c. *knjiga ova ovdie* (Bosnian)
 this here book this book here book this here

Second, if a reinforcer cannot move by itself (but only as part of FP), then we predict that it cannot be stranded in an intermediate position. In other words, the schematic data below should be ungrammatical:

- (7) a. * **Dem Adj Reinf Adj**
 b. * ...Adj **Reinf Adj Dem**

As far as we know, these distributions are not possible. Third, returning to Yiddish (4a), assume that, with the absence of *ot*, ReinfP stays in Spec,DemP and *-o* encliticizes to the demonstrative. If so, then base-generating bipartite reinforcers in ReinfP and moving them as a constituent predicts the absence of the following general pattern, which is indeed ungrammatical in Yiddish:

- (8) * **Reinf Dem Reinf** **ot der-o guter man* (Yiddish)

Fourth, if FP moves to Spec,DP, then we expect to find languages where this Specifier can co-occur with a determiner. Although rare, this is borne out in colloquial Swedish (cf. Julien 2005: 117):

- (9) *den där den finaste båten* (colloquial Swedish)
 that there the finest boat-the

Selected References:

- Bernstein, J. 1997. Demonstratives and reinforcers in Romance and Germanic languages. *Lingua*: 87-113.
 Bernstein, J. 2001. Focusing the “right” way in Romance determiner phrases. *Probus* 13:1-29.
 Brugè, L. 1996. Demonstrative movement in Spanish: A comparative approach. *University of Venice Working Papers in Linguistics* 6: 1-61.
 Chomsky, N. 2001. Derivation by Phase. In M. Kenstowicz (ed.) *Ken Hale. A Life in Language*, pp. 1-52. MIT Press.
 Cinque, G. 1994. On the Evidence for Partial N-Movement in the Romance DP. In G. Cinque et al (eds.) *Paths Towards Universal Grammar. Studies in Honor of Richard S. Kayne*, pp. 85-110. GUP.
 Julien, M. 2005. *Nominal Phrases from a Scandinavian Perspective*. Amsterdam: Benjamins.
 Leu, T. 2007. These HERE demonstratives. *U. Penn Working Papers in Linguistics* 13 (1): 141-154.
 Longobardi, G. 1994. Reference and Proper Names: A Theory of N-Movement in Syntax and Logical Form. *Linguistic Inquiry* 25 (4): 609-665.
 Ritter, E. 1991. Two functional categories in noun phrases: evidence from Modern Hebrew. In S. Rothstein (ed.) *Perspectives on Phrase Structure: Heads and Licensing*, pp. 37-62. Acad. Press.