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1 Introduction


In my discussion of Germanic demonstratives below, I agree with all of this (while disagreeing with some details of the individual proposals). In fact, I propose that demonstratives are morphosyntactically complex in that they involve an adjectival modification structure (FP), containing a demonstrative modifier, an agreement head (AgrA), and a definite marker.\(^3\) It is this entire FP that moves to Spec,DP. What distinguishes a demonstrative DP from an ordinary modified definite DP is the lexical choice of the (possibly silent) modifier *HERE/\*THERE* instead of another modifier like e.g. *blue*. The syntactic behavior of *HERE/\*THERE* is different from that of *blue* in ways that obscure, in some languages, its presence and/or its being introduced in an adjectival modification structure.

\*I am grateful for discussion and comments to a number of people including the audiences at PLC30, CGSW21, GLOW29, and at a practice talk at NYU. Many thanks for helpful comments on earlier versions of this paper to Lena Baunaz, Mark Baltin, Oana Ciucivara, Chris Collins, Marcel Den Dikken, Richard Kayne, Lisa Levinson, Henk Van Riemsdijk, Laura Rimell, Anna Szabolcsi and Eytan Zweig. I am especially indebted to Øystein Vangsnes for comments on an earlier version and invaluable discussion of Scandinavian. All errors are mine.

\(^1\)I refer here and throughout to definite adnominal demonstratives. For a typological overview of different kinds of demonstratives see (Diessel 1999).

\(^2\)Elbourne proposes a semantics for *this* in which the denotation of *this* differs from that of *the* only in having an additional index and a proximal feature (see also Vangsnes 1999:part 1). In the spirit of the present paper, these additional components are suggested to be contributed by a demonstrative modifier counterpart of *here/\*there*.

\(^3\)I refer to the Germanic *d/-th-* morpheme as definite marker. See (Bernstein to appear) for an alternative view.

---

The structure I argue for is given in (1). A definite adjectival modification structure, FP in (1), sits in Spec,DP where it licenses the non-pronunciation of the head of DP, D0, host of the overt definite marker in unmodified definite DPs in e.g. Swiss German. The demonstrative modifier HERE moves (across the inflected definite marker d-i) to Spec,FP where it is licensed to be unpronounced.

(1) a. d-i rosa
    the-AgrA rose ("this rose")
    DP
    FP
    HERE d-i HERE tNP
    D0 NP tFP
    ~
    rosa

2 A Silent Demonstrative Modifier

2.1 Scandinavian

Vangsnes (1999:part 2) and Julien (2005:chapter 4) note that prenominal determiners in Scandinavian are formally identical to demonstratives. In plain definites, Swedish and Norwegian (and Danish) do not have a DP-initial definite marker, but only a nominal suffix which is usually glossed DEF (2a). In the presence of an adjectival modifier, on the other hand, these languages exhibit a DP-initial definite marker (followed by inflection), as in (2b). Note that the example is not (necessarily) demonstrative. In (2c) a prenominal definite marker (followed by inflection) is present, just as in (2b), but without an overt adjective. The example is acceptable, but its interpretation is obligatorily demonstrative (examples from Vangsnes (1999:120)).

(2) a. hus-et
    house-DEF
    NOR
    b. de-t svarte huset
    that/the black house-DEF

---

4But see Vangsnes (1999:part 1, 6.2.) for discussion of intensifying noun phrases.

5In present day Swedish and Norwegian, the inflection -t on the definite marker is only orthographic.
There are different ways to account for this set of data. One possibility is to say that Norwegian has two homophonous lexical items de-(t): one a plain definite marker (restricted to occurring in modified DPs) and the other a demonstrative (Julien 2005).

Another way of thinking about (2), which I will pursue, is to assimilate (2c) to (2b). Considering that (2b) is not (necessarily) demonstrative, and further that DP-initial det is legitimate only in the presence of an adjectival modifier, I propose that in (2c), there is an unpronounced adjectival modifier present which contributes demonstrativity.

Vangsnes notes that the example with an (overt) adjective is (segmentally) ambiguous between a demonstrative reading and a plain definite reading. I propose that the demonstrative reading of (2b) is the result of the presence of two adjectival modifiers, one of which is silent and contributes demonstrativity.

The fact that a pre-adjectival definite marker surfaces with the adjective but is not present in the absence of an adjective suggests that it is part of the structure necessary for adjectival modification (FP in (1)). I propose that each adjective is accompanied by its own definite marker (an adjectival determiner, cf. Androutsopoulou (2001)), hence assimilating Germanic adjectival modification to the case known from Greek polydefiniteness (Androutsopoulou 1996, 2001, Alexiadou and Wilder 1998). In demonstrative (2b) the definite marker that goes with svarte is licensed to remain silent (by the definite FP in its Spec), see also section 3.4.

2.2 Swiss German

The argument from Norwegian (2) can be developed in a parallel fashion on the basis of Swiss German, for which I argue that the same phenomenon obtains, with a somewhat different surface manifestation. Swiss German has a pronominal definite marker, independently of whether or not an adjectival modifier is present (3a).

(3) a. d rosä
    the rose

---

6. They are phonetically distinct in that the demonstrative is stressed.
7. This departs radically from the standard view (cf. Holmberg and Platzack 2005). However, see (Simpson 2000) for an analogous claim regarding Chinese de.
b. d-i rot rosă
   the red rose
c. d-i roșă
   "this rose"

What is relevant to note is that in the plain definite DP in (3a) the definite marker is not followed by overt inflection. In the presence of an adjective however, the definite marker is obligatorily followed by overt inflection (3b).

The inflection -i on the definite marker in the modified DP (3b)=(4a) is homophonous with the inflection on the adjective in the indefinite counterpart in (4b), suggesting that it is an exponent of the Germanic strong adjectival inflection (cf. Milner and Milner 1972, Leu 2006), glossed AgrA.

(4) a. d-i rot rosă
    the-AgrA red rose
b. a rot-i roșă
    a red-AgrA rose

I conclude that this inflectional morpheme is part of the adjectival modification structure. The appearance, in adjectival contexts, of this inflection on the definite marker in Swiss German is to be related to the appearance, in adjectival contexts, of a prenominal definite marker (with strong adjectival inflection) in Norwegian. I propose that, as in Norwegian, in Swiss German as well, the definite marker (plus AgrA) is part of the adjectival modification structure, FP in (1), sitting in Spec,DP. Definite FP in Spec,DP licenses the non-pronunciation of D0.

If the definite marker is followed by AgrA in the absence of an overt adjectival modifier, as in (3c), the DP receives a demonstrative interpretation, parallel to Scandinavian.

In sum, morphologically, the DPs in (2c) and (3c) look as if there were an adjective present. Yet there is no overt adjective there. Semantically, these DPs

9The morpheme -i in (3b,c) is the realization of AgrA0 (mnemonic for "adjectival agreement") for feminine (and also plural) structurally Case-marked DPs. In masculine and neuter singular DPs, the definite marker is followed by an inflectional suffix whether or not an adjective is present. I assume that the inflection that is present in the absence of a modifier is not the realization of AgrA0, but corresponds to a different agreement head, for which the feminine and the plural variants are null.

10In Leu (2001) I call the alternation between d and di observed in (3a,b) the "d/di-alternation."

11(3c) is compatible with both a proximal and a distal interpretation.
differ from plain definites in being demonstrative. I conclude that (2c) and (3c) feature a silent adjectival modifier which has a demonstrative interpretation.  

3 Silent HERE/THERE

In this section I will address two questions that seem a priori unanswerable: What does the silent demonstrative modifier look like? (section 3.1), and: Where is it? (section 3.2).

3.1 The Looks of Silent HERE

Swedish (and colloquial Norwegian) has demonstratives that are overtly built on the definite article and the Swedish counterpart of here/there (Holmes and Hinchliffe 1994).

(5) a. det här
the here “this one”

b. det där
the there “that one”

In colloquial Norwegian (6) (and Swedish) this demonstrative here/there carries adjective-like inflection (Bernstein (1997:90), Vangsnes (2004) and p.c., Julien (2005)):

(6) a. den her-re klokka
the here-INFL watch-DEF

b. det der-re huset
the there-INFL house-DEF

Afrikaans has demonstratives composed of counterparts of the same elements, but in a different order (Donaldson 1993, Levi Namaseb p.c.).

(7) a. Ek het hier-die huis gebou.
I have here-the house built “I built this house.”

b. Ek het daar-die man gesien.
I have there-the man seen “I saw that man.”

12 Concretely, in terms of Elbourne (2005), the demonstrative modifier contributes an index and a deictic feature.

13 A counterpart of here/there as building block of demonstratives is crosslinguistically well attested and exists apart from Germanic also in non-indoeuropean languages such as e.g. Australian languages (Julie Legate p.c.), and the native American language Kiowa (Harbour 2006) etc.
In (5) through (7) demonstrativity is contributed by the counterparts of \textit{here/there}, (cf. Kayne 2004). The argument for this is simple. If you have a definite article and something else, and the whole of them has a meaning component that the definite article alone does not have, it follows that this meaning component is contributed by the something else.

Recall the contrast between plain definites and demonstrative DPs in Swiss German and Norwegian repeated in (8) and (9) respectively.

(8)  
\begin{tabular}{lll}
  a. & di rosä & \textquotedblleft this rose\textquotedblright \\
  b. & d rosä & the rose \\
  c. & di rot rosä & the red rose \\
\end{tabular}

(9)  
\begin{tabular}{lll}
  a. & det huset & \textquotedblleft that house\textquotedblright \\
  b. & huset & house-DEF \\
  c. & det svarte huset & the black house-DEF \\
\end{tabular}

The definite marker in the demonstrative (a) examples is identical to the one in the (c) examples (modulo stress), which contain an overt adjectival modifier, and distinct from the ones in the (b) examples, which lack an adjectival modifier.

While in (5) through (7) demonstrativity is contributed by an overt counterpart of \textit{here/there}, I propose that in (8a) and (9a) demonstrativity is contributed by a silent counterpart of \textit{here/there}, \textsc{Here}/\textsc{Here} (where capital letters indicate non-pronunciation).

3.2 The Position of Silent \textsc{Here}

In this section I will tackle the second a priori unanswerable question: Where is silent \textsc{Here}? When \textsc{Here} is silent, we do not have direct access to its position relative to other elements. One possibility is to assume that it is in the same position as its overt counterpart in (5), (6), i.e. to the right of the definite article. Alternatively it may be that its being unpronounced is related to its position at spell-out, in the spirit of Kayne (2006) who suggests that non-pronunciation is an "automatic consequence of the architecture of derivations."

If this is on the right track, then the position of overt elements tells us where their silent counterpart is not, in a given language (perhaps universally).

From this conjecture and from (5), (6), let me conclude that the silent \textsc{There} in Norwegian (9a) is not between the definite article and the noun, since in that position modifiers are overt.\footnote{Strictly speaking, the logic here would allow it to be in a different syntactic position to the right of the article.}

We know from Afrikaans (7), (10) that demonstrative \textit{here/there} can move to the left of the definite marker in (some) Germanic languages.
(10) a. hier-die ("this/these")
   b. daar-die ("that/those")

Let me propose that Swiss German (8a) and Norwegian (9a) are like Afrikaans in that HERE and THERE respectively moves to the left of the definite marker, differing from Afrikaans with regard to pronunciation (or landing site, see section 4). Thus (8a) and (9a) receive the analysis in (11).

(11) a. HERE di tHERE rosä ("this rose")
    b. THERE det tHERE huset ("that house")

I conclude that HERE/THERE in (8a) and (9a) moves to Spec.FP.

Taking it a step further, let me tentatively adopt Kayne’s (2006) concrete proposal that phrases escape pronunciation if they occur in the Spec of a phase at spell-out. This suggests that FP is a phase in the relevant sense. How exactly this notion of phase relates to the one in (Chomsky 2001) is not entirely clear. Assuming a close relation would lead us to identify FP as propositional. This in turn recalls the traditional idea that adjectival modifiers have a clause-like syntax (Smith 1964, Kayne 1994).

3.3 Demonstrative HERE and Article Clipping

Further evidence for the presence of silent HERE to the left of the definite marker morpheme in (11a) comes from article clipping. In Swiss German (and in German) the definite marker morpheme d- remains silent in a range of contexts involving P-DP complementation, as in (12a,b).\(^{16,17}\)

(12) a. [P uf] (#d)ä tisch
   onto the table
   SG

b. [P uf] (#d)ä blau tisch
   onto the blue table

c. [P uf] HERE *(d)-e tisch
   onto this table

\(^{15}\)For present purposes, I am departing from Kayne’s suggestion that this is the only way to escape pronunciation that UG permits. I assume that e.g. silent definite markers are licensed in a way reminiscent of the doubly filled comp filter. A reformulation of this along the lines of Starke (2004) might however be fruitful and ultimately allow the adoption of Kayne’s stronger position.

\(^{16}\)The process is sensitive to Case, the choice of P, and the phi-features of N.

\(^{17}\)The diacritic # indicates stylistic markedness.
However, with a demonstrative interpretation such clipping is impossible and the definite marker morpheme $d$- is obligatorily pronounced. This suggests that there is a licensing configuration for non-pronunciation of the definite marker morpheme $d$- in P-DP complementation, which obtains in (12a,b), but is disrupted in (12c). My proposal is that it is demonstrative *HERE* which, having moved of to the left of the definite marker, intervenes between P and $d$- and thereby disrupts the licensing configuration for non-pronunciation of $d$-.

### 3.4 Demonstratives and Polydefiniteness

Evidence for the presence of a definite marker in addition to the one within the demonstrative FP comes from languages that allow more than one definite marker to be overt, as e.g. Scandinavian, exemplified by Danish (13, in part from Julien (2005:114)). Like Norwegian and Swedish, Danish does not have a pre-N definite marker independently of adjectival modifiers (13a,b), but only in their presence (13c). It does not allow an overt definite marker preceded by an ordinary adjective (!3d). However, Danish allows an adjectival determiner to be overt after a demonstrative (13d).18

(13) a. hus-et  
house-DEF

b. dette (*det) hus  
this (the) house

c. *(det) høje hus-(*et)  
(the) tall hus

d. dette (det) høje (*det) flotte hus  
this (the) tall (the) stylish house

This, I propose, is the result of movement of the demonstrative FP out of a Spec of $\{FP \ (det) høje\}$, and into the left periphery above DP. This disrupts the licensing configuration for non-pronunciation of the adjectival determiner that goes with høje. In Scandinavian, such movement to the left periphery above DP is not available to ordinary adjectival FPs (13d).

---

18The availability of the additional definite marker in (13d) is subject to pragmatic restrictions relating to discourse topicality. Also, it is particularly good with superlative adjectives. Many thanks to Line Mikkelsen for discussion on this point. Julien (2005:109) notes that it is also possible and particularly felicitous with superlatives in Norwegian and Swedish. See also (Delsing 1993:138) for Swedish.
Movement of a demonstrative FP out of Spec,DP and into the left periphery above DP is obligatory in other languages, e.g. Greek (Giusti 1997):

(14) αφιδι τον βιβλίον
this the book

Removing the definite FP from Spec,DP disrupts the licensing configuration for silent D⁰. The definite marker in D⁰ will hence be overt.

4 English these and Silent HERE

The English demonstratives these and those are unique (internally to English) in that they are the only determiners with an overt plural form. The appearance of a regular plural morpheme -s(e) in these needs an explanation.

Let us first note that these transparently contains a definite marker th-. Recall that the overt components of the demonstrative in Swiss German (8a) and Norwegian (9a) are a definite marker followed by adjectival agreement (15c,d). By analogy, I propose that English (15a) is really (15b), where -s(e) is an instance of adjectival agreement. The overt appearance of the plural agreement in these (which English ordinary adjectives lack) can be correlated with another peculiarity of demonstratives, namely the movement of a modifier to the left of the definite marker into a position where it is unpronounced.²⁰

(15) a. these books
    b. HERE the-s(e) tHERE books
    c. HERE d-i tHERE rosā
    d. THERE de-t tHERE huset
    e. hier die thier huis

If the non-pronunciation of HERE/THERE is indeed a consequence of its position at spell-out (Kayne 2006), then on a strong universalist position, the landing site of HERE/THERE to the left of d-/th- must be different from that of hier/daar in Afrikaans. From the limited set of data considered here, there seems to be a possible correlation between movement of HERE/THERE to a silent position and the presence of an agreement head c-commanding the

---

²⁰This mechanism is presumably what underlies Greek “polydefiniteness,” of which (14) hence is a subcase (cf. Leu 2006).

²⁰In the singular this/that the inflection is null, which is different from the absence of inflection, which obtains in Afrikaans.
While in languages with silent HERE/HERE (Swiss Ger-
man, German, Norwegian, Dutch, and most interestingly English) demonstra-
tives do have an overt morphological reflex sensitive to phi-features, Afrikaans
demonstratives don't, but instead have overt left-peripheral hier/daar.\footnote{The picture of Afrikaans is more complicated, with demonstrative uses of dit and
die (Donaldson 1993:142ff.) bearing challenges to the text suggestion.}

In light of this, a possible conjecture is that, in order to license its trace, move-
ment to a silent position may necessitate a head of a kind which inflection
qualifies for (reminiscent of Kester 1996), but d-/th- does not.

5 Adjectival here/there and Reinforcers

Non-standard English allows overt here/there to follow a demonstrative deter-
minder. Bernstein (1997) calls the element here in the non-standard American
English example (16) a reinforcer.

(16) this here book

I have been claiming that a demonstrative like this contains a silent HERE. It
is important to realize that the overt here in (16) cannot be the very mor-
pheme that is incorporated into this. In other words there are two distinct
instantiations of here/HERE in (16). The two have a distinct status. They
differ morphosyntactically and semantically, as I will discuss instantly.

5.1 Licensing of Reinforcer and Demonstrative here/there

A reinforcer like here in (16) is only licensed in combination with a demon-
strative (Bernstein 1997:91). But the demonstrative adjective HERE cannot
be subject to such a constraint, since this would lead to a chicken and egg
paradox. I propose the informal structure in (17).

(17) [\{Dem, HERE the \} here N ] => “this here book”

5.2 Morphosyntax of Reinforcer and Demonstrative here/there

Colloquial Norwegian (and Swedish) presents morphological evidence that
the demonstrative here/there and the reinforcer are indeed distinct, in that only
demonstrative here/there is introduced in an adjectival structure, as I have been
arguing, whereas the reinforcer is not.

\footnote{A possibility pointed out to me by Andrew Nevins, p.c.}
As noted in section 3.1 example (6), overt demonstrative herre/derre features adjectival agreement in colloquial Norwegian. It is also possible in Norwegian (and Swedish) to have an additional counterpart of here/there, a reinforcer. Vangsnes (2004:13) reports that in Eastern Norwegian, up to three counterparts of here can surface within one noun phrase. In this case one of them must carry adjectival inflection. And only the first one can be so inflected.

(18) a. den herre her populære boka mi (her) E-NOR
    the hereADJ here popular book-DEF my here
b. den (*her) her populære boka mi (her)
    the here here popular book-DEF my here
c. * den her herre populære boka mi her
    the here hereADJ popular book-DEF my here

On the present proposal it is a counterpart of the inflected herre in (18a) which, in some languages, moves into a silent position to the left of d-/th-.

5.3 Interpretation of Reinforcer and Demonstrative here/there

The difference in the morphosyntax of demonstrative here/there and reinforcer has a semantic correlate. Among the readings available to demonstratives are a locative deictic reading (19a) and a discourse anaphoric reading (19b).

(19) a. This tree [POINTING GESTURE AT TREE A] is taller than that one [POINTING GESTURE AT TREE B].
    Remember I told you about a position as a ballet dancer? Well, John said he was too old for the job. But I think that’s absurd.

If I am right that demonstratives like this/that contain a counterpart of here/there, it follows from (19b) that this latter element is not obligatorily associated with locativeness. In Kayne’s (2004) and (2005) terms, the here/there in question may but does not have to involve a silent PLACE.

The same obtains with the overt (inflected) demonstrative here/there in colloquial Norwegian, which can be discourse anaphoric (20). Interestingly, this is different for reinforcer here/there, which is obligatorily locative (21).

---

23 Øystein Vangsnes informs me that in some dialects the inflection on the demonstrative here/there differs from ordinary weak adjectival inflection in making fewer gender distinctions.

24 Examples from Vangsnes (2004). See also Julien (2005:section 4.2.4)).
Hence the adjectival here/there which combines with the definite marker to render a demonstrative determiner is distinct from the reinforcer both morpho-syntactically and semantically (though perhaps not lexically).

6 Conclusion

I conclude that (some) demonstratives in Germanic are built out of a definite marker d-/th- and a counterpart of here/there introduced in an adjectival structure. Here/there has the property of (A) being unpronounced (HERE/THERE) in some cases, and (B) moving to the left of the definite marker in some cases, with property (A) parasitic on (B). The movement of HERE/THERE to a silent position to the left of th- correlates with the pronunciation of an otherwise silent plural agreement morpheme in English.

The adjectival modification structure containing a definite marker and the demonstrative here/there/HERE/THERE is argued to sit in Spec.DP where it licenses the non-pronunciation of the definite marker in D0.

This proposal assimilates to a greater degree than previous proposals (A) demonstrative determiners to ordinary adjectival modification within the DP, and (B) Germanic demonstratives to languages like e.g. Greek, in which a definite article overtly co-occurs with a demonstrative determiner.
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