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0. Introduction

In Spanish, the demonstrative modifier can appear either in prenominal position, as (1a-b) shows, or in postnominal position, as (1c-d) shows:

1. a. este/ese/aquel libro
   ‘this/that/that book’
   b. estos/esos/aquellos libros
   ‘these/those/those books’
   c. el libro este/ese/aquel
   ‘the book this/that/that’
   d. los libros estos/esos/aquellos
   ‘the books these/those/those’

In this paper we study the syntax of the demonstrative in Spanish, and we provide a unified analysis for the two different word orders presented in (1).

In section 1 we present the theoretical hypothesis we will adopt to build our analysis of the phenomenon.

---
1. This work is a revised version of the two previous papers ‘Alcune considerazioni sulla sintassi del dimostrativo in spagnolo’ (1994) and ‘Il movimento del dimostrativo in spagnolo’ (1995). Its content was also presented at the XXII° Incontro di Grammatica Generativa (University of Bergamo, February 1996) and at the Sexto Colloquio de Gramática Generativa (Valencia, March 1996). We are grateful to the audience of these conferences, and we are indebted in particular to Guglielmo Cinque, Giuliana Giusti and Anna Cardinaletti for their helpful and constructive comments. We are also grateful to Paola Benincà, Victoria Escandell, Dalina Kafullhi, Nedžad Leko, Manuel Leonetti, Nuria Martí, Ljiljana Progovac and Ur Shlonsky for their valid suggestions and comments. None of these people should be accountable, however, for any mistakes or misunderstandings herein.

2. The demonstrative form ese has in its standard use the function to identify ‘something near the hearer and far from the speaker’, such as the Italian form codesto. Nevertheless, in the common use of the language ese displays also the semantic properties which are typical of the demonstrative aquel whose use is less frequent, namely it identifies ‘something far from the speaker and far from the hearer’.

3. Notice that in Spanish nominals modified by a postnominal demonstrative are commonly used in colloquial speech. It seems that when the demonstrative appears in this position the entire nominal expression receives a deprecatory meaning. This characteristic, however, does not seem to be true in all cases and for all native speakers. In the present paper we will leave open the question concerning this variation in the connotative meaning assuming that it affects the pragmatic ground of the language.
We propose that in Spanish the demonstrative is always generated in a low position inside the extended nominal projection and that at Phonological Form (PF) it can be realized either in this position, (1c-d), or in the prenominal position, (1a-b). This second option is due to the movement of the demonstrative from its base position to [Spec, DP] before SPELL-OUT.

Observing the position the postnominal demonstrative occupies with respect to the other elements internal to the extended nominal projection, we show, in sections 2, 3 and 4, that the demonstrative is generated in the specifier position of a functional projection lower than all the other functional projections containing the different classes of adjectives and immediately superior either to the functional projection whose specifier is occupied by the postnominal possessive, if any, or to the NP projection.

In section 5 we show that the demonstrative, even when it appears at PF in the low position, behaves, from the syntactic and semantic point of view, in the same way as when it appears in [Spec, DP]: the demonstrative in prenominal or in postnominal position provides a referential interpretation. On the basis of these facts, we propose that, if the movement of the demonstrative from its base position to [Spec, DP] is optional before SPELL-OUT, it is in any case obligatory at Logical Form. Moreover, we propose that this movement is motivated by feature checking: the demonstrative, which is specified for the Referential and Deictic features has to raise to [Spec, DP] in order to check the Referential feature which is in D⁰ by Spec-Head Agreement.

Finally, in section 6, we try to extend this analysis to other languages. We show that also in those languages in which the demonstrative always appears in [Spec, DP] at PF this element is generated in the same position we found for Spanish. We propose, then, that the cross-linguistic variation concerning the obligatoriness, the optionality or the impossibility for the demonstrative to raise to [Spec, DP] before SPELL-OUT can be accounted for by suggesting that the Referential feature on the demonstrative has to be checked already at PF in the first case -see Italian, French, German, Albanian-, either at PF or at Logical Form in the second case -see Spanish, Catalan, Bosnian-Serbian-Croatian, Russian, Rumanian, Modern Greek-, and has to be delayed until Logical Form in the third case -see Hebrew, Irish-.

1. Theoretical assumptions

1.1. Demonstrative as Specifier

With the aim of providing a unified analysis for the cases presented in (1), we set our hypothesis in the idea that in Spanish the prenominal position (1a-b) and the postnominal position (1c-d) in which the demonstrative can appear are deeply related the one with the other. In section 5 we show empirical data in favour of this assumption. We discard, in this way, the possibility that in Spanish, and in other languages in which we have the same phenomenon (cf. section 6.1.1.), there exist two different structural positions available for the demonstrative one totally unrelated to the other.

As for the categorial status of the demonstrative, we assume that this element has to be conceived as a maximal projection. In this way, we assume that the demonstrative occupies the specifier position of a functional projection which belongs to the extended nominal projection. For this assumption, we adopt Giusti’s (1993) proposal.

Giusti shows that in many unrelated languages, (2), the demonstrative co-occurs with the article. She observes that the order of the two categories is not the same (cf. (2a-c)
vs. (2d) vs. (2e)), and that the co-occurrence of the demonstrative with the article does not depend on the enclitic nature of the article itself (cf. (2 a-c,e) vs. (2d)).

2. a. ika n anak
   'this the child'
   Dem Art N  Javanese  (cf.(25) p.59)
   b. ez a fiú
   'this the boy'
   Dem Art N  Hungarian
   c. afito to vivlio
   'this the book'
   Dem Art N  Modern Greek
   d. sa madrinn
   'this man-the'
   Dem N-Art  Old Islandic
   e. pan wig jainan
   'the way this'
   Art N Dem  Gothic

She proposes, then, that the demonstrative and the article do not have the same intrinsic nature and consequently do not correspond to the same structural position.

Observing in detail the syntactic behaviour of the demonstrative in Rumanian, Giusti claims that in this language the demonstrative is generated in the specifier of an AgrP immediately dominated by the DP projection, and that it can be realized either in this position (3a), or, by raising to [Spec, DP], in the prenominal position (3b):

3. a. băiatul acesta (frumos)
   'boy-the this (nice)'
   b. acest (frumos) băiat (frumos)
   'this (nice) boy (nice)'
   c. frumosul (*acesta) băiat
   'nice-the (*this) boy'

In (3a) the noun moves over the demonstrative to Dⁿ where the enclitic article appears. The fact that the demonstrative allows N-to-D movement, shows that it can be conceived neither as a D nor as an intermediate functional head. ⁴ Therefore, the only possible solution is to assume that the demonstrative is in a specifier position. In this way, it could be easily explained why its presence blocks the movement of an adjective to [Spec, DP] as in (3c): a violation of the Minimality Principle would prevent Spec-to-Spec movement of the adjective, otherwise possible in Rumanian. ⁵

---

⁴. In fact, the data in (3) show that there is no violation of the Head Movement Constraint, the principle which forbids a head from raising past another head (see Travis (1984) and Baker (1988)).

⁵. According to Giusti, the following contrasts in Italian gives empirical support to the analysis of the demonstrative in [Spec, DP]:

   i. a. Di chi/ di quale studente hai letto la risposta?
      'of whom/of which student have-you read the answer?'
   b. *Di chi/ di quale studente hai letto questa risposta?
      'of whom/of which student have-you read this answer?'

In Italian, unlike English-type languages, it is not sufficient to claim that definiteness triggers opacity effects given that (i.a) is well-formed. On the other hand, if demonstratives are analysed as specifiers, the ungrammaticality of (i.b) can be easily explained: in this case the genitive PP cannot be wh-moved from within nominals because Spec-to-Spec movement is blocked by the presence of the demonstrative in [Spec, DP]. As in English, the Spanish definite article prevents wh-movement of genitive PPs when they are agents (ii.a), but wh-extraction out of nominals is possible when the genitive PP is a theme (ii.b):
1.2. An antisymmetric approach

In order to capture the Spanish data in (1) in a unique structure, we adopt in our analysis the antisymmetric approach proposed by Kayne (1994). Kayne's antisymmetric hypothesis imposes, through the notion of asymmetric c-command, a rigid specifier > head > complement order across languages. According to this order, a head which appears in the structure to the left of its specifier must have raised to a head position asymmetrically c-commanding its trace and the specifier.

Moreover, we adopt, for the structure of nominals, the analysis proposed by Cinque (1993, 1994). According to this analysis, which is compatible with an antisymmetric approach, only the head noun moves to higher functional heads, while modifiers stay in their base positions unless they need to check some feature in a higher specifier.

\[\text{Putting aside the cases in (ii.a), wh-movement of genitive PPs in cases such as (iiib) always gives rise to ungrammatical constructions if a demonstrative is realized in the DP, as (iii) shows:}\]

\[\begin{array}{ll}
\text{ii. a. } & \text{*De quién/ de qué estudiante has escuchado la respuesta?} \\
& \text{of whom/ of which student have-you heard the answer?}\] 
\[\text{b. De quién/ de qué pintor han publicado la foto?} \\
& \text{of whom/ of which painter have-they published the picture?}\]

\[\begin{array}{ll}
\text{iii. a. } & \text{*De quién/ de qué pintor han publicado esta/esa foto?} \\
& \text{of whom/ of which painter have-they published this/that picture?}\] 
\[\text{b. } & \text{*De quién/ de qué pintor han publicado la foto esta/esa?} \\
& \text{of whom/ of which painter have-they published the picture this/that?}\]

Therefore, according to Giusti's observations for the cases in (i), the Spanish data in (iii) can be considered empirical arguments for the assumption that also in this language the prenominal demonstratives occupy the [Spec, DP] position.

\[\text{The definition of c-command that Kayne formulates refers exclusively to categories, preventing segments from entering into this relation:}\]

\[\text{"X c-commands Y iff X and Y are categories and X excludes Y and every category that dominates X dominates Y"} \]

\[\text{(3), p.16}\]

\[\text{7. By these assumptions, we do not consider available a right-adjunction hypothesis such as the one proposed in (i) for the Spanish data in which the demonstrative follows the noun, (1c-d):}\]

\[\begin{array}{ll}
\text{i. } & \text{* DP} \\
& \text{D'} \\
& \text{D°} \quad \text{XP} \\
& \text{el} \quad \text{X'} \quad \text{Spec.} \\
& \text{este} \quad \text{este} \\
& \text{NP} \quad \text{este} \\
& \text{libro} \quad \text{este}\]

In a previous theoretical framework, a similar symmetric structure has been proposed by Ernst (1992) for Irish demonstratives, which occur postnominally. As we will show in detail later, there exist some theoretical arguments which contribute to reject this alternative. The more consistent one we anticipate here is that, since in Spanish and Irish the postnominal demonstrative always precedes the PP subject of the noun and all the other PPs complements of the noun, we would be obliged to
In this way, the order ‘Noun - Demonstrative’ we observe in cases such as (1c-d) is obtained by the movement of the noun to a higher head position, as the structure in (4) shows: 8

4. 

\[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{DP} \\
\downarrow \\
D' \\
\downarrow \\
D' \\
\downarrow \\
cl \\
\downarrow \\
\cdots \\
\downarrow \\
XP \\
\downarrow \\
X' \\
\downarrow \\
X^o \\
\text{libroj} \\
\downarrow \\
\cdots \\
\downarrow \\
FP \\
\downarrow \\
\text{Spec} \\
este \\
\downarrow \\
F' \\
\downarrow \\
F^o \\
\text{tj} \\
\downarrow \\
\text{NP} \\
\downarrow \\
\text{tj} \\
\end{array}
\]

We assume that the low position the demonstrative occupies in (4) must be taken to be the base position. Moreover, we assume that in Spanish -and in the other languages -the demonstrative is generated in this low position. Therefore, we reject the hypothesis that there exist two different unrelated positions for the demonstrative in the extended projection of the nominals. In those cases in which we have the order ‘Demonstrative - Noun’, (1a-b), we propose that this is obtained by the movement of the demonstrative to [Spec, DP] in order to check some feature which is present in this landing site, as the structure in (5) shows. The nature of the feature that justifies demonstrative movement to [Spec, DP] will be expressed in section 5.

5. \[\text{SpecDP estej } [D^o [... [XP [X^o libroj] [FP t}\text{j } [F^o t}\text{j} [NP [N^o t}\text{j}]]]]]]

1.3. The presence of the definite article

The Spanish data in (1) show that, when the demonstrative appears prenominally, the article does not co-occur with it. In Spanish, as in many other languages, the prenominal demonstrative and the article are in complementary distribution -cf. (1a-b)

adjoin them in a very high position in the structure outside the NP, contrary to what is currently assumed.

8. In an antisymmetric framework, a competing structure for (4) could be a structure in which the entire NP raises past the functional projection containing the demonstrative. But also this hypothesis would have undesirable empirical consequences. In fact, as we noticed in footnote 7, in this case it would be difficult to justify why the constituent NP must exclude, in its movement, the PP subject of the noun and all the other PPs complements of the noun.
and the ungrammaticality of (6a). On the other hand, when the demonstrative occurs postnominally, the DP projection is occupied by the article. In Spanish, as in Rumanian, (3a), the presence of the article in $D^\theta$ is obligatory when the demonstrative follows the noun -cf. (1c-d) and the ungrammaticality of (6b). Furthermore, the only possible form for the article is the definite one, as (1c-d) and the ungrammaticality of (6c) show:

6. a. *este el libro
   ‘this the book’
   b. *libro este
   ‘book this’
   c. *un libro este
      ‘a book this’

The data in (6), compared with those in (1), make us to formulate the two following questions:

a. why is it that the presence of the article is obligatory when the demonstrative appears in postnominal position, (6b), while its absence is necessary when the demonstrative appears in prenominal position, (6a)?

b. why is it that the unique accepted form for the article is the definite one when the demonstrative is postnominal, (6c)?

As far as the first question is concerned, we assume that (6b) is ill formed for the same reasons for which sentences such as: *libro nuevo está en el despacho (lit. ‘book new is in the office’) or *he comprado libro nuevo (lit. ‘I-have bought book new’) are excluded. Sentences of this type are ungrammatical because the DP projection is not filled by some functional element after SPELL-OUT. In fact, Spanish requires that the DP is in general lexically overt. Moreover, in cases like these, $D^\theta$ can neither be interpreted as an empty category receiving existential interpretation (cf. Longobardi, 1994), due to the intrinsic characteristics of the head noun libro ‘book’. 9

9. Longobardi (1994) proposes the following two universal principles:

   i.  [D el = default existential interpretation] (65), p.641
   ii. An empty head must be lexically governed (66), p.641

   (i) establishes that a $D$ which lacks overt lexical content is always interpreted as a ‘pure existential operator’, and it is submitted to the standard proper government condition like every empty category (ii). The interaction of the two principles can explain, among other things, why in Romance languages, where $N$ raises to $D$ in Syntax, argumental singular mass nouns and bare plurals can appear only in direct object position. In fact, only in this position can the empty $D^\theta$ be lexically governed by the verb. On the basis of these considerations, one could expect that singular mass nouns and plural common nouns modified by a postnominal demonstrative would appear with an empty $D^\theta$ at least in direct object position, like in cases such as (iii):

   iii. He comprado libros (interesantes)
        ‘I-have bought books (interesting)’

   Nevertheless, this does not seem to be the case. In fact, the corresponding constructions are always ungrammatical:

   iv. a. He comprado *(el) pan este/ese.
        ‘I-have bought *(the) bread this/that’
   b. He comprado *(los) libros estos/estos.
        ‘I-have bought *(the) books these/those’

   We propose that the sentences in (iv) are ill formed because the presence of the demonstrative
So we propose that the presence of the article in those constructions in which the demonstrative appears postnominally, (1c-d), is necessary to make the DP projection visible after SPELL-OUT, given that the D^o cannot be interpreted as an empty category. 10

A principled way to justify the well formed cases in (1) and the ungrammatical constructions in (6a-b) has been proposed by Giusti (1996b) in studying the complementary distribution of the demonstrative with the article across languages. She assumes that in general a functional projection is instantiated in order to realize some feature φ, and that this feature has to be ‘visible’ in order to be interpreted at Logical Form. She also assumes that the visibility condition imposed on functional features is the Spec-Head relation. Then, she proposes the following two general principles:

7. Avoid Functional Head.

8. A Functional Projection must be licensed (at all levels of representation).

-----

prevents the empty D^o from being interpreted as existential. In this way, the contrast between (iii) and (iv) could be accounted for by suggesting that the demonstrative has to be obligatorily interpreted in [Spec, DP] at LF. Consequently, in cases such as (iv) there would be a clash of features in DP: the existential interpretation selected by the empty category in D^o (cf. (i)) would contrast with the intrinsic features peculiar of the demonstrative. As for the nature of the features the demonstrative is specified for, we refer the reader to section 5.

10. Bosque -p.c.- pointed out to us that constructions such as (i) are ill formed because the definite features of the postnominal demonstrative do not agree with the features of the determiner cuatro ‘four’, which must be lexically realized:

i. *cuatro libros estos/esos
   ‘four books these/those’

In principle, we agree with his intuitive idea -cf. footnote 9-. However, in our analysis we do not refer to the notion of ‘definiteness’ to exclude constructions such as (6b) and (6c). Moreover, as for the case in (i), we assume that cuatro does not occupy D^o, according to Giusti (1993); rather it can be analyzed either as an AP or as an existential quantifier which occupies the head of a QP immediately superior to the DP (cf. also Cardinaletti and Giusti, 1992). An argument in favour of the first analysis is that, if cuatro is in D^o, we expect constructions such as estos/esos cuatro libros ‘these/those four books’ to be ungrammatical as is (6a), contrary to fact. Compare the grammaticality of estos/esos cuatro libros with the grammaticality of estos/esos últimos libros ‘these/those last books’ with a prenominal adjective. Thus, according to this analysis, the ungrammaticality of (i) is due to the same reasons which exclude constructions such as (6b) and (ii) -cfr. footnote 9-:

ii. *última película esta/esa
    ‘last film this/that’

On the other hand, if we consider the second analysis Giusti proposes, (i) is excluded because the QP can select either indefinite partitives -and libros estos/esos cannot undergo this interpretation (cfr. footnote9)-, or ‘definite partitive’ PPs, or both of them -i.e. in cuatro libros de los que lei ayer (lit. ‘four books of those that I read yesterday) -. Therefore, (i) is excluded for the same reasons which exclude (6b) and (ii). Compare, in this respect, the well formed constructions in (iii):

iii. a. cuatro de estos/esos libros
     ‘four of these/those books’

b. cuatro de los libros estos/esos
   ‘four of the books these/those’
(7) establishes that when the specifier is lexically filled in order to realize some relevant feature, the functional head does not need (and by minimalist requirements cannot) be occupied by any lexical element. (7) can account for cases such as (1a-b) and other cases in which, still inside the extended nominal projection, most functional heads are not lexically realized. Its violation is instead responsible for the ungrammaticality of cases such as (6a). As for languages in which the DP is ‘doubly-filled’ at PF - i.e. Javanese (2a), Hungarian (2b), Modern Greek (2c), and others -, Giusti proposes that this redundancy is due to the fact that the article realizes or reinforces some features that are not properly made visible by the demonstrative alone. On the other hand, the obligatory presence of the article in cases such as (1c-d), even if in contrast with principle (7), is justified by principle (8). On the basis of what we anticipated, in (1c-d) the article has to be inserted as a ‘last resort’. In fact, only in this way the relevant features in DP the demonstrative must check by raising to [Spec, DP] at Logical Form can be rendered ‘visible’ either at PF or, crucially, at LF. This requirement also accounts for the ungrammaticality of (6b).

Let us now consider the case of question (b). A tentative proposal to account for the obligatory presence of the definite form of the article in D^0, (1c-d), is to assume that only definite features are compatible with the features the demonstrative is specified for. We will call these features ‘Referential’ features, as we will justify in section 5. In this way, if referential features have to be selected inside the DP projection in order to enable demonstrative movement at Logical Form, the insertion of an indefinite article in D^0 would show that this requirement has not been satisfied; and this would give rise to a clash of features between the head and its specifier. The obligatory movement of the demonstrative to [Spec, DP] at LF would be blocked, and the construction ruled out (see (6c)). On the other hand, if the definite form of the article is inserted in D^0 for the reasons we have just mentioned, there would be no clash of features between the head and its specifier. As it is assumed, in fact, referentiality implies definiteness.

Summarizing, we propose that in Spanish the demonstrative has the status of a maximal projection. When it occurs preceding the noun, (1a-b), it occupies the [Spec, DP] position; on the other hand, when it occurs postnominally, (1c-d), it occupies the specifier of a functional projection inside the extended projection of the noun, (4). We also propose that in this second case the demonstrative appears in the position in which it is generated, and that at LF it moves obligatorily to [Spec, DP] in order to check its referential features.

When the demonstrative follows the noun at PF, the D^0 must be lexically filled (cf. (1c-d) vs. (6b)). We propose that the D^0 must be overt in order to make ‘visible’ the peculiar features selected in this functional position at all levels of representation. This also prevents the D^0 being interpreted as empty. The only possible determiner which can satisfy this requirement is the definite article (cf. (1c-d) vs. (6c)). We propose that it is the unique form compatible with the referential features selected in D, which make the demonstrative movement to [Spec, DP] possible at LF. Some of these proposals will be empirically motivated in the following sections.

2. The position of the postnominal demonstrative

We have seen that also in Rumanian, (3a), the demonstrative can be realized postnominally. Giusti (1993) proposes that in this case the demonstrative occupies the specifier of a functional projection (AgrP) immediately dominated by the DP. This
assumption is justified by the fact that in Rumanian no category (e.g. adjectives) can intervene between the noun raised to D² and the demonstrative itself (cfr. *băiatul frumos aceasta [lit. ‘boy-the nice this’]).

As for the Spanish data we do not adopt Giusti’s analysis. In Spanish, contrary to what happens in Rumanian, the postnominal demonstrative always follows the adjectives at PF:

9. a. La reacción desinteresada esta/esa en realidad era preocupante.
   ‘the reaction desinterested this/that really was worried’
   b. *La reacción esta/esa desinteresada...
   ‘the reaction this/that desinterested…’
   c. El chico alto este/ese vive cerca de casa.
   ‘the boy tall this/that lives near home’
   d. *El chico este/ese alto…
   ‘the boy this/that tall…’

(9a) and (9c) exemplify the unmarked word order. In cases like these a predicative analysis for the demonstrative alone is excluded because no intonational break between the adjective and the demonstrative itself is produced, and because the demonstrative does not have stress mark. 11

On the other hand, the ungrammatical sentences (9b) and (9d) become correct if there is intonational break between the demonstrative and the adjective. Following Cinque (1993, 1994), we assume that in cases like these the structural representation should be different, given that the AP establishes a modification of predicative type, namely a modification with respect to the entire DP projection. 12

---

11. Notice that in Spanish, whenever the demonstrative is used predicatively, as shown by its occurrence in postcopular position, (i.a), it is always graphically marked by a stress:

   i. a. Mi libro es éste/#este.
      ‘my book is this’

   b. Mi libro es este libro/#éste libro.
      ‘my book is this book’

12. An argument in favour of this hypothesis is given by the behaviour of adjectives such as principal ‘main’, which can never be predicative, (i):

   i. *Este hecho es principal.
      ‘this fact is main’

When this adjective co-occurs with a demonstrative, the only possible constructions are: the one in which the demonstrative appears prenominally -(ii.a)-; or the one in which the postnominal demonstrative follows the adjective -(ii.b)-. The alternative construction in which the postnominal demonstrative precedes the adjective principal -(ii.c)- is always excluded even with a sharp intonational break between the two elements, contrary to what happens in (9b,d).

ii. a. Esas dos razones principales son no suficientes para disculparle.
    ‘those two reasons main are not sufficient to excuse him’

   b. Las dos razones principales esas no son suficientes para disculparle.
    ‘the two reasons main those are not sufficient to excuse him’

   c. *Las dos razones esas principales son no suficientes para disculparle.
    ‘the two reasons those main are not sufficient to excuse him’
2.1. The postnominal demonstrative and adjectives

Cinque (1993, 1994) proposes that there exists a specific unmarked serialization of the different classes of APs across languages. He also proposes that each of these different classes of APs are universally generated in the specifier position of functional projections which are located between DP and NP. In Romance languages the realization of the adjectives to the right of the noun is to be attributed to the raising of the noun to an intermediate functional head between N and D. The absence of N movement in Germanic languages is due to a parametric variation: Romance, contrary to Germanic, has strong features in the intermediate functional heads which need to be checked in Syntax (cfr. Chomsky, 1993).

With these considerations in mind, and given the contrastive data in (9), we propose that the position in which the demonstrative is generated is a very low position inside the extended projection of the noun. Therefore, we formulate the following generalization:

10. In Spanish the demonstrative is generated in the specifier position of a functional projection intermediate between the DP and the NP and lower than all the functional projections containing APs.

Let us observe, now, the behaviour of the postnominal demonstrative with respect to the different classes of adjectives which can modify an 'event' noun, according to Cinque's terminology. The general internal structure which Cinque proposes for these nominals, and which we extend to Spanish, is presented in (11):

11. \[\text{DP } D [\text{XP poss.AP } X [\text{YP card.AP } Y [\text{WP ord.AP } W [\text{ZP speaker-orientedAP } Z [\text{HP subject-orientedAP } H [\text{NP Manner/ThematicAP } N ]])]])]^{14}\]

(Cinque, 1993, (30), p. 27)

According to Cinque, we assume that in cases like these the head N can move at most as far as the head H of the functional projection HP.

In Spanish, when the postnominal demonstrative co-occurs with a 'manner' adjective, this adjective always precedes the postnominal demonstrative in the unmarked order, and can never follow it, as the contrasts in (12) show:

12. a. La reacción desinteresada esta/esa en realidad era preocupante.
    'the reaction disinterested this/that really was worrying'
    this disinterested reaction was really worrying

---

13. It is important to notice that in Cinque's terminology 'event' nominals refer to nouns strictly associated with the predication. The nouns which belong to this class project the same theta-roles than their corresponding verbs. These theta-roles must be saturated by arguments (PPs or APs), independent of the result, eventive, stative, etc., readings of the noun itself.

14. In (11), as in the structural representation we present in (14), the prenominal possessive adjective appears in the specifier of a functional projection immediately dominated by DP, according to the syntactic behaviour this element has in languages such as Italian (la sua strana risposta [lit. "the his/her strange answer"] (cfr. also Longobardi (1995)). As for Spanish, on the other hand, we assume, adopting Picallo's (1992) analysis, that this position is not the final landing site to which a genitive raises in Syntax. Picallo suggests that, in Spanish, this category further moves to D', given that it behaves like a clitic -namely an X' category- and is in complementary distribution with the article.
b. La respuesta inmediata esta/esa...
   'the answer immediate this/that...'

c. La conquista rápida esta/esa...
   'the conquest quick this/that...'

d. *La reacción esta/esa desinteresada...

e. *La respuesta esta/esa inmediata...

f. *La conquista esta/esa rápida...

If we observe, then, the relative order between the postnominal demonstrative and 'thematic' adjectives in the case in which both occur modifying an 'event' noun, we have the same results: 'thematic' adjectives always precede the postnominal demonstrative, as (13) show:

13. a. La reacción alemana esta/esa no nos convence.
   'the reaction German this/that does not convince us'

b. La respuesta ministerial esta/esa...
   'the answer ministerial this/that...'

c. La conquista Italiana esta/esa.
   'the conquest Italian this/that...'

d. *La reacción esta/esa alemana...

e. *La respuesta esta/esa ministerial...

f. *La conquista esta/esa italiana...

Coming back to the structure presented in (11), and given the ungrammaticality of the constructions in (12d-f) and (13d-f), we can claim that generalization (10) is correct.

In addition, it is also possible to verify the correctness of generalization (10) observing those nominal environments in which the head N is occupied by 'object-denoting' nouns. We extend to Spanish the general serialization of the different classes of adjectives which Cinque (1993, 1994) proposes for 'object-denoting' nominals. The general internal structure of these nominals is presented in (14):


   [HP sizeAP H [LP shapeAP L [MP colourAP M [OP nationalityAP O [NP

   N ]]]]]]]]]


Cinque shows that in these cases the head N can cyclically move at the most as far as the Z position.

In Spanish, we can observe, again, that the postnominal demonstrative always follows, in the unmarked order, each of the adjectival classes which in (14) can appear postnominally at PF, as shown in (15)-(18): 15

---

15. Sáez points out that, contrary to our expectations (cf. also footnote 12), (16b), (17b) and (18b) are acceptable also without any intonational break between the demonstrative and the adjectives, while in (15b) and (18d) a sharp intonational break is necessary to make them acceptable, as in (12d-f) and (13d-f). We do not consider this fact a counterexample to the hypothesis that in cases like these adjectives have to be analysed as predications. Predicative constructions, in fact, do not imply obligatorily an intonational break. Moreover, there are independent arguments which can support our proposal also for cases like (16b), (17b) and (18b). The first one is that if (16a), (17a) and (18a) receive a depreciatory reading (cf. footnote 3), the same reading is completely excluded in the corresponding cases (b). The second argument, is that if in (16b), (17b) and (18b) we realize the locative reinforcers de aquélla acd 'of/here' together with the demonstrative este, the complex 'demonstrative+locative' can never precede the adjective, (1.b):
15. a. El chico alto este/ese vive cerca de casa.  
   ‘the boy tall this/that lives near my home’
   b. *El chico este/ese alto...

   ‘the painting round this/that is very antique’
   b. *El cuadro este/ese redondo...

17. a. El cenicero azul este/ese me lo regaló María.
   ‘the ashtray blue this/that to-me[clit.] it[clit.] gave Maria’
   Maria gave me this/that blue ashtray
   b. *El cenicero este/ese azul...

18. a. El grabado inglés este/ese está mal hecho.  
   ‘the engraving English this/that is badly made’
   b. *El grabado este/ese inglés...
   c. Las ciudades españolas estas/esas no son muy pintorescas.
   ‘the cities Spanish these/those are not very picturesque’
   d. *Las ciudades estas/esas españolas...
   ‘the cities these/those Spanish’

Moreover, as we expect, the same results can be observed when more than one postnominal adjective appears in the construction, as is shown by the contrasts in (19):

19. a. ¿El jarrón redondo azul este/ese no vale mucho.
   ‘the vase round blue this/that is not worth’
   b. *El jarrón azul inglés este/ese...
   ‘the vase blue English this/that…’

i. a. el cuadro redondo este de aquí/de acá
   ‘the painting round this here’
   b. *el cuadro este de aquí/de acá redondo

The complex sequence ‘demonstrative+locative’ will be examined in detail in section 3.2.
Finally, in cases in which we contrast the spatial position of an object with the spatial position of another one, the postnominal demonstrative can never appear preceding the adjective, (ii) (thanks to Luis Sáez for these data):

ii. a. El cuadro redondo este y el cenicero aquel me encantan.
   ‘the painting round this and the ashtray that to me[clit.] like very much’
   I like very much this round painting and that ashtray
   b. *El cuadro este redondo y el cenicero aquel me encantan.

Cinque does not make any distinction between the different semantic functions that ‘nationality’ adjectives can absorb in relation with a particular head noun (possessive, locative, etc.). If we consider the different cases from this point of view, the term ‘nationality’ could be further specified according to the different theta-roles saturated by the adjectives belonging to this class. Here we will leave the question about this further distinction open.
c.  ¿La chica alta francés esta/esa es muy antipática. 17
   ‘the girl tall French this/that is very disagreeable’

d.  *El jarrón redondo este/ese azul…

e.  *El jarrón azul este/ese inglés…

f.  *La chica alta esta/esa francés…

g.  *El jarrón este/ese redondo azul…

h.  *El jarrón este/ese azul inglés…

i.  *La chica esta/esa alta francés…

The ungrammaticality of the constructions in (15b), (16b), (17b), (18b,d) and (19d-i) show that also in those cases in which the head noun belongs to the class of ‘object-denoting’ nominals, the postnominal demonstrative occupies a structural position lower than those occupied by the APs which can be crossed over by the noun. Therefore we conclude that generalization (10) is correct. 18

17. Notice that the sentences in (19a-c) are not completely acceptable because, in general, Spanish tends to avoid nominal constructions with two or more adjectives preceding a postnominal demonstrative, as Ignacio Bosque pointed out to us. Nevertheless, the contrasts between these cases and cases such as (19 d-i) are clear.

18. Bosque -p.c.- observes that whenever a descriptive adjective is modified by an intensifier, it can never precede a postnominal demonstrative, (i.b); rather it must follow the demonstrative, (i.c):

   i.  a.  este niño tan tonto
       ‘this child so stupid’
   b.  *el niño tan tonto este
   c.  el niño este tan tonto

Sáez -p.c.- suggests that in these cases tan ‘so’ does not seem to have in Spanish the intensifier status. Rather it seems to behave like an anaphoric element strictly related to the presence of the demonstrative which must, in some sense, c-command it. This would explain the word order in (i.c) and (i.a). We are not able to account for constructions of this type, but it seems plausible that a different structural representation is involved in these cases. Observe, also, that we have the same results when the adjective is modified by an intensifier such as muy ‘very’, (ii):

   ii. a.  este niño muy tonto
          ‘this child very stupid’
   b.  *el niño muy tonto este
   c.  el niño este muy tonto

On the other hand, when the adjectival intensifier is represented by a bound morpheme such as -ísimo
‘very’, we have the same word order showed in the text, (iii):

   iii. a.  ¿Te acuerdas del niño tontísimo ese que conocimos ayer noche?
          ‘do you remember the child very stupid we met yestraday night?’
   b.  *¿Te acuerdas del niño ese tontísimo que conocimos ayer noche?

We tentatively propose here that the contrasts in (i.b-c) and (ii.b-c) should be accounted for on a par with contrasts such as (iv.a-b):

   iv. a.  este niño tan tonto/muy tonto
          ‘this child so stupid/very stupid’
   b.  *este tan tonto/muy tonto niño

In (iv.b), este ‘this’ c-commands the modified adjective. Nevertheless, the construction is ill formed. So, it seems clear that, when an adjective is modified by an unbound intensifier, the adjective occupies a structural position different from the canonical one -i.e. the specifier of a functional
All the data we have presented in this section can be considered a robust argument in favour of Giusti's (1993) hypothesis that the demonstrative has the XP status, and for this reason, occupies the specifier of a functional projection. In fact, given that in Spanish the postnominal demonstrative always appears after APs in the unmarked word order, we would expect that the head noun could not be able to move over the postnominal demonstrative if this element occupied a head position. Being the N movement a cyclic head-to-head movement, the presence of the demonstrative in a low functional head would block its raising, and, as a consequence, all the APs would appear prenominally, which is contrary to fact.

A second less strong argument is that if we assume the demonstrative occupies a specifier position, we expect that, also in Spanish, wh-movement of a genitive out of the nominal projection is impossible. In fact, if the demonstrative occupies the [Spec, DP] position, the trace left by the wh-movement of the genitive would not be licensed inside the nominal projection, as Giusti (1993) and other authors (Campbell, 1991) pointed out -cf. also footnote 5-. This hypothesis is confirmed by the ungrammaticality of the following sentences:

20. a. *De quién/ de qué pintor han publicado esta/esa foto?
   ‘of whom/ of which painter have they published this/that picture?’

   b. *De quién/ de qué pintor han publicado la foto esta/esa?
   ‘of whom/ of which painter have they published the picture this/that?’

In order to rule out cases such as (20b) we could propose that wh-movement of the genitive PP is blocked either in Syntax or at Logical Form.

If we choose the first possibility we have to assume that this movement is blocked at structural levels lower than [Spec, DP] (cf. Rizzi, 1990): the genitive could not cross over the functional projection containing the demonstrative because its specifier position is filled by the demonstrative itself, giving rise to a violation of the Minimality Condition. This possibility, however, could be plausible if it is possible to show that the functional projection which contains the demonstrative dominates the projections containing the genitive complements of the noun.

On the other hand, if we choose the second possibility, we have to assume that also in those languages in which the demonstrative can or must appear in the base position it must move to [Spec, DP] at Logical Form in order to check some particular features which are present in DP. So, in (20b) the obligatory movement of the demonstrative to [Spec, DP] at Logical Form would be blocked by the presence, in this position, of the trace of the wh-genitive. In section 5 we present independent data to support this second explanation, even if, as we show in the next section, the demonstrative occupies in Spanish a structural position higher than those positions occupied by the subject and the other complements of the noun.

2.2. The postnominal demonstrative and the subject and the complements of the noun

In the preceding section we showed that in Spanish the postnominal demonstrative occupies a structural position lower than the positions occupied by the APs: in the unmarked word order, it always appears after these modifiers. We showed that this position is the specifier position of a functional projection which belongs to the extended projection of the noun, and we proposed that it is the base position.
Let us now see which position the postnominal demonstrative occupies in relation to the subject and the other complements of the noun.

With 'event' nouns, we observe that the internal complements always follow the demonstrative when this element appears postnominally (21a-c). The realization of the demonstrative after the complements of the noun always gives rise to ungrammatical structures, (21d-f):

21. a. La reacción (alemana) esta/esa a las críticas preocupó a todos.
   'the reaction (German) this/that to the criticisms worried everybody'
   b. La respuesta (ministerial) esta/esa al problema no solucionará nada.
   'the answer (ministerial) this/that to the problem will not solve anything'
   c. La conquista (italiana) esta/esa de Libia resultó un gran fracaso.
   'the conquest (Italian) this/that of Libya was a great defeat'
   d. *La reacción (alemana) a las críticas esta/esa…
   e. *La respuesta (ministerial) al problema esta/esa…
   f. *La conquista (italiana) de Libia esta/esa…

We find the same word order in cases in which the genitive PP saturates the Agent theta-role, namely, it is the subject of the NP:

22. a. La reacción (imprevisible) esta/esa de Alemania…
   'the reaction (unexpected) this/that of Germany…'
   b. La respuesta (descortés) esta/esa del Gobierno…
   'the answer (rude) this/that of the Government…'
   c. El ataque (rápido) este/ese de Italia…
   'the attack (quick) this/that of Italy…'
   d. *La reacción (imprevisible) de Alemania esta/esa…
   e. *La respuesta (descortés) del Gobierno esta/esa…
   f. *El ataque (rápido) de Italia este/ese…

The same also happens in those few cases in which both the Agent PP and the Theme PP can appear simultaneously in the construction:

23. a. ?La descripción esta/esa de Juan del ladrón no fue muy detallada.
   'the description this/that of Juan(Agent) of the thief(Theme) was not very detailed'
   b. *La descripción de Juan esta/esa del ladrón no fue muy detallada.
   c. *La descripción de Juan del ladrón esta/esa no fue muy detallada.

With 'object-denoting' nouns, we encounter, again, the same results, as the contrasts in (24) and (25) show: 19

---

19. Nevertheless, in Spanish there are some cases in which the postnominal demonstrative must obligatorily follow a PP(de NP), as the contrasts in (i) show -Bosque p.c.:-

i. a. La mesa de comedor esta/esa es demasiado grande.
   'the table of kitchen this/that is too large'
   the kitchen table this/that is too large
   b. *La mesa esta/esa de comedor…

Cases of this type do not invalidate our hypothesis. In fact, in the specific case presented in (i) the sequence mesa de comedor can be analysed as a nominal compound (cf. Dardano (1978), a.o.) rather than a noun modified by an internal complement. Arguments in favour of this proposal are given either in (ii), where the presence of the article inside the PP blocks this interpretation, or in (iii), where the simultaneous presence of a genitive PP which expresses the possessor gives rise to the
24. a. La falda (corta) esta/esa de María está toda arrugada.
   'the skirt (short) this/that of María is all creased'
b. El hermano (pequeño) este/ese de Carlos no quiere estudiar.
   'the brother (younger) this/that of Carlos does not want to study’
c. *La falda (corta) de María esa...
d. *El hermano (pequeño) de Juan este...

25. a. El cuadro este/ese de Juan de Picasso no es nada más que una copia mal hecha.
   'the painting this/that of Juan(Poss.) of Picasso(Agent) is nothing more than a badly made copy’
b. *El cuadro de Juan este/ese de Picasso...
c. *El cuadro de Juan de Picasso este/ese...

According to the resulting structural order ‘Demonstrative - PP’ we have presented in the examples from (21) to (25), we propose for Spanish the following generalization:

26. In Spanish the demonstrative is generated in the specifier position of a nominal functional projection which immediately dominates the NP projection. 20

2.3. Slightly modifying Cinque’s internal structure for nominals

Let us come back to the internal structure Cinque (1993, 1994) proposes for ‘event’ nominals, (11), we repeat here in (27):


As (27) shows, Cinque assumes that thematic and manner adjectives compete for the same position: the specifier of NP.

In section 2.1. we showed that manner adjectives and thematic adjectives always expected results:

ii. a. La mesa esta/esa del comedor...
   'the table of the kitchen this/that…'
b. *La mesa del comedor esta/esa...

iii. a. La mesa de comedor esta/esa de María...
   'the kitchen table this/that of María(Poss.)…'
b. *La mesa esta/esa de comedor de María...
c. *La mesa de comedor de María esta/esa…

20. The generalization in (26), as it is formulated, assumes a Larsonian structure for the internal NP projection (cf. Larson, 1988), namely a structure which creates more specifier positions inside the NP-shell in order to host the possessor PP in the higher one and the Agent PP in the lower one (cf. (25)). This hypothesis seems to us more plausible than the one defended by Picallo (1992), who proposes that the possessor PP occupies the specifier of a functional projection external to the NP and immediately superior to it. For further considerations which can support our assumption, we refer the reader to section 5 in the text.
precede the postnominal demonstrative, (12) and (13); while in section 2.2, we showed that the genitive PPs subject of the noun follow the postnominal demonstrative (22), like all other complements of the noun. The different position the thematic adjectives and the genitive PPs occupy in relation to the postnominal demonstrative is quite surprising if we adopt the hypothesis that also genitive PPs subject of the noun are in [Spec, NP].

A possible solution to this problem is to propose that thematic and manner adjectives do not actually occupy the [Spec, NP], contrary to (27), but rather a higher position. If we want to maintain Cinque’s idea, we should have to assume that, in a Larsonian structure with more specifier positions inside the NP-shell, the demonstrative occupies the specifier position lower than the one occupied by thematic and manner adjectives. But this hypothesis would lead to two main theoretical problems difficult to treat.

The first and more consistent of these is that we would have to assume that the demonstrative is generated in an internal NP position. This assumption would be difficult to justify given that the demonstrative does not establish any thematic relationship with the noun.

The second problem is that we would have to assume that the agentive theta-role is assigned to two different positions inside the NP-shell: to a position higher than the demonstrative, when it is saturated by a thematic adjective; and to a position lower than the demonstrative, when it is saturated either by a genitive PP, (22), or by a postnominal possessive adjective. In section 4, we will see that the postnominal possessive adjective always follows the postnominal demonstrative in Spanish.

Taking into account these theoretical problems, we propose that thematic and manner adjectives occupy a position external to the NP projection. This position is the specifier of a functional projection which dominates the functional projection containing the demonstrative. 21

At first glance, this proposal does not seem to cause theoretical consequences; rather it seems to have the advantage of explaining in a natural way the fact that these adjectives agree in phi-features with the head noun, as all other adjectives. Moreover, the fact that thematic adjectives absorb a theta-role in a position external to the NP does not seem to posit any problem. In fact, also the prenominal possessive adjective, which is assumed to occupy a position inside a functional projection higher than NP (see Cinque (1993), (1994), Longobardi (1995), et al.), saturates a theta-role assigned by the head noun. 22

An independent argument which can support the hypothesis we are defending is given by the following cases:

21. The idea that thematic adjectives occupy a position higher than [Spec, NP] seems to be confirmed also in Bulgarian, where the agent and the possessor can be realized by adjectival form:

   i. Penkinjat vuzmoz'en otgovor
      ADJ. ADJ. N
      'of Penka(Agent)-the possible answer'
      the possible answer that Penka can give

      (Dimitra-Vulchanova and Giusti, 1996)

22. In order to give thematic adjectives a derivation similar to the one proposed for possessive adjectives, we could tentatively suggest that they reach the specifier of the functional projection we singled out through XP-movement. Nevertheless, we leave the question about its derivation open here.
28. a. La reacción inmediata de Juan preocupó a todos.
   manner Adj. Agent PP
   'the reaction immediate of Juan worried everybody'
   
   b. Los manuscritos benedictinos del Conde de Olivar fueron robados.
      them.(Agent) Adj. Possessor PP
      'the manuscripts Benedictine of the Earl of Olivar were robbed'

The grammaticality of the two sentences would be surprising if we assume that thematic and manner adjectives, which compete for the same position, occupy the [Spec, NP] position after SPELL-OUT, as Cinque suggests. In fact, (28a) should be excluded because the manner adjective inmediata and the agentive PP de Juan would occupy the same position -i.e. [Spec, NP].

The same consideration is available for (28b). Here, the noun manuscritos, which can assign theta-roles even if it is an 'object-denoting' noun, does not prevent the co-occurrence of the agent -expressed by the adjective benedictinos- and the possessor PP del Conde de Olivar.

Therefore, according to the position the postnominal demonstrative occupies in relation to the thematic adjectives, all other 'low' adjectives and the genitive PPs, and according to the results presented in (28), we conclude, slightly modifying Cinque's proposal, that thematic and manner adjectives occupy a position external to the NP projection. We also propose that this position is the specifier of a functional projection very low in the structure, which dominates the functional projection containing the postnominal demonstrative.

3. The structure

3.1. The base position of the demonstrative

We have seen that in Spanish the demonstrative occupies the specifier of a functional projection higher than the positions occupied by the subject of the noun and by its complements and lower than all the functional projections containing APs, as the generalizations (10) and (26) proposed. The structures we propose are the following:

23. Bosque and Piccallo (1994) provide evidence that in Spanish 'classificatory' adjectives are not compounds, contrary to what Crisma (1990) suggests. With the term 'classificatory' adjectives the authors refer to those adjectives which "introduce a domain in relation to which the object denoted by the head noun is classified" (p.5) and do not saturate a licensed theta-role. Adopting this proposal, it becomes appropriate to introduce, in the structures (29) and (30), another functional projection whose specifier hosts this class of adjectives. Its structural position would be immediately superior to the functional projection containing thematic adjectives, (i.b) and (ii.b). We have also to assume that in cases like these the head noun must raise obligatorily to the head position of HP, in (29) -cf. (i.b)-, and to the head position of MP, in (30) -cf. (ii.b)-, crossing over the functional projection containing the 'classificatory' adjectives. This proposal is justified by the fact that the noun always precedes the 'classificatory' adjective. Moreover, when it co-occurs with a thematic adjective, the thematic adjective always follows the 'classificatory' adjective, (i.a) and (ii.a):

i. a. la reforma agraria mejicana (*agraria)
   'the agrarian Mexican (*agrarian')
   
   b. [DP la [XP ... [HP [H reforma] [IP [AP agraria] [I ti]] [LP [AP mejicana] [L ti]] [NP [N [N ti]]]]]]
29. \[ DP \ D [XP \ldots [HP \text{subject-oriented}AP \ H [LP \text{Manner/Thematic}AP \ L [FP \text{Demonstrative}P F [NP \text{Agent/Exper.PP} [N' N' ThemePP ]]]]]] \]

30. \[ DP \ D [XP \ldots [LP \text{quality}AP \ Z [HP \text{size}AP \ H [LP \text{shape}AP \ L [MP \text{colour}AP \ M [OP \text{nationality}AP \ O [FP \text{Demonstrative}P F [NP \text{Possessor}PP \ N [NP \text{Agent}PP [N' N' Compl.PP ]]]]]]]]] \]

(29) represents the partial structure which corresponds to 'event' nominals. (30), on the other hand, represents the partial structure which corresponds to 'object-denoting' nominals. Recall that we also assume the hypothesis that all genitive PPs occupy an internal NP position (see footnote 20). For this reason, we propose for 'object-denoting' nominals, (30), a Larsonian structure for the internal NP projection. 24 Finally, extending to Spanish Cinque's proposal that the noun moves in Syntax to higher positions, we obtain for the two classes of nominals the following possible orders after SPELL-OUT, already presented in previous sections:

31. a. la respuesta inmediata esta de Juan...
   \[ DP [XP \ldots [HP [H respuesta] [LP [AP inmediata] [L tij [FP [DemP esta [rtij] [NP [pp de Juan] [N' N' tij]]]]]]] \]
   'the answer immediate this of Juan'

ii. a. los residuos atómicos rusos (*atómicos)
   'the residues atomic Russian (*atomic)'
   b. [DP los [XP \ldots [MP [M residuos] [LP [AP atômicos ] [j tij [OP [AP rusos ] I O tij ] [NP [N' N' tij ]]]]]]]

When in these environments a postnominal demonstrative appears, it always follows the 'classificatory' adjective (iii). This fact confirms, again, the generalization (10). When the 'classificatory' adjective co-occurs with a thematic adjective, these two types of adjectives always precede the demonstrative, (iv).

iii. a. la reforma agraria esta/esa (*agraria)
   'the law agrarian this/that (*agrarian')
   b. los residuos atómicos estos/esos (*atómicos)
   'the residues atomic these/those (*atomic)'
   c. la incursión aérea esta/esa (*aérea)
   'the raid aerial this/that (*aerial)'

iv. a. la reforma agraria mejicana esta/esa / ?los residuos atómicos rusos estos/esos
   'the law agrarian Mexican this/that / the residues atomic Russian these/those'
   b. *la reforma esta/esa agraria mejicana / *los residuos estos/esos atômicos rusos
   c. *la reforma agraria esta/esa mejicana / *los residuos atômicos estos/esos rusos

The proposal we have just suggested to accommodate the 'classificatory' adjectives inside the extended nominal projection we propose ((29) and (30)) does not account for the corresponding order in English. In fact, in English, 'classificatory' adjectives seem to occupy a lower position with respect to thematic adjectives. We do not know how to account for this asymmetry. A possibility would be to maintain for English the idea that 'classificatory' adjective plus noun form a compound (cf. Crisma (1990)), contrary to what happens in Spanish. Nevertheless we leave this question open here.

24. For the moment, we assume that nouns such as libro 'book', cuadro 'painting', (25), manuscritos 'manuscripts', (28b), etc., exclusively belong to the class of 'object-denoting' nominals, even though they can assign an agentic theta-role. In this way, the NP-shell in (30) can be justified.
b. la conquista italiana esa de Libia...
[DP la [XP ...[HP [H conquistai] [LP [AP italiana] [L ti] [FP [DemP esa]
[F ti] [NP [N' [N ti] [pp de Libia]]]]]]]]
‘the conquest Italian that of Libya’

c. el cuadro inglés ese de María...
[DP el [XP ...[MP [M cuadrosi] [OP [AP inglés] [O ti] [FP [DemP ese] [F ti]
[NP [pp de María] [N' [N ti]]]]]]]]
‘the painting English that of María(Possessor)’

3.2. The internal structure of the demonstrative

In this section we will show that in Spanish the demonstrative in [Spec, FP], (29) and (30), can also have a complex internal structure.

In constructions in which the demonstrative este ‘this’ appears, the locative form aquí ‘here’ can be simultaneously realized. In Spanish, the locative form has to be obligatorily preceded by the preposition de ‘of’. The resulting sequence is este de aquí ‘this [of] here’. 25

We propose that in these cases the locative has the unique function to reinforce the deictic value of the demonstrative we assume it is specified for (cf. section 5). In fact, the interpretation of the DP does not change if the locative is present or absent: the information expressed by este libro ‘this book’ and by este libro de aquí ‘this book [of] here’ are the same. 26

The sequence este de aquí can be realized either in postnominal position, as in (32a), or the demonstrative can be realized in [Spec, DP] at FP and the locative appear postnominally, as in (32b):

32. a. El libro este de aquí está mal hecho.
‘the book this of here is badly made’

b. Este libro de aquí está mal hecho. 27

---

25. In the text we will use the sequence este de aquí ‘this [of] here’ as exemplificative case. The same combination ‘demonstrative+locative’ is also possible with the other forms of demonstratives and locatives. So, we can have este de acá ‘this [of] here’; ese de acá ‘that [of] there’; ese de allí ‘that [of] there’; ese de allá ‘that [of] there’; aquel de allí ‘that [of] there’; aquel de allá ‘that [of] there’. On the other hand, what is impossible, is to realize in the same sequence a demonstrative form which, for example, expresses proximity to the speaker with a locative which expresses distance from the speaker, or vice versa, as in *este de allí/á allí ‘this [of] there’ or *aquel de aquí ‘that [of] here’. A possible account for the impossibility of such combinations will be suggested later in the text.

26. Notice that the independent deixis compatible with the presence of the demonstrative, and, sometimes, necessary, can be expressed by a gestural way.

27. In Spanish we can have cases in which only the locative can appear, as in (i):

i. El libro de aquí me gusta
‘the book of here to me(clit) likes’
I like the book here

Such constructions can receive the interpretation of este libro (de aquí) me gusta ‘I like this book ([of] here)’ even if the demonstrative does not appear lexically realized. In order to account for cases like these, we propose that here an abstract movement of the demonstrative to [Spec, DP] is involved at Logical Form. An argument that can support this proposal is that, if in the same constructions a
'this book of here is badly made'

As for cases such as (32b), we propose that the position the locative occupies in the structure is the base position, namely the [Spec, FP] position ((29) and (30)). In fact, contrasting (33a) with (33b-d), we can observe that the locative must occur in the same position we found for the postnominal demonstrative. It can never occur in a position higher than the adjectives, (33b), and lower than the postnominal possessive, (33c), and the PPs complements of the noun, (33d):

prenominal possessive is realized, the interpretation of the sentence with a covert demonstrative is impossible, (ii), as some native speakers pointed out to us. For the incompatibility between the prenominal possessive and the prenominal/postnominal demonstrative, we refer the reader to section 5.

(ii) su libro de aquí me gusta.
   'his book of here to-me(clit) likes' = *this his book (here) to-me(clit) likes
   I like his book here

So, in (ii) the locative cannot be interpreted as a deictic reinforcer of the demonstrative. Rather it is interpreted as an adverbial PP complement, in some sense, of the noun, receiving the following reading: 'his book which is here/which was published here...'. This reading can be assigned also to sentences like (i), and it becomes more evident in those cases in which the noun is plural, given that it can receive a generic reading, (iii.a), or is a collective noun, (iii.b):

(iii) a. Las tarjetas de aquí son feas.
   'the postcards of here are ugly' = the postcards of here/ of these places are ugly'
   these postcards (here) are ugly'

   b. La artesanía de aquí es fea.
   'the handicraft of here is ugly' = the handicraft of here/ of these places is ugly'
   this handicraft (here) is ugly'

This ambiguity in the interpretation which we can observe in cases like (i) and (iii) depends on the fact that in Spanish the locative must be preceded by the preposition de 'of' when it appears as reinforcer of the demonstrative. In fact, in languages such as Italian, where the locative reinforcer appears without preposition -questo N qui 'this N here', (cf. section 6.1.2.)- the same ambiguity in interpretation is excluded, as the contrasts in (iv) show:

(iv) a. queste cartoline qui sono brutte.
   'these postcards here are ugly'

   b. *le cartoline qui...

   c. le cartoline di qui...
   'the postcards of here/of these places...'

Notice that in Italian, contrary to Spanish, an abstract movement of the demonstrative to [Spec, DP] at Logical Form is excluded, (iv.b), probably due to the different properties the definite article has in the two languages.
33. a. Este libro viejo de aquí de sintaxis/ sobre la guerra está mal hecho. 28
   'this book old of here of syntax/on the war is badly made'
b. *Este libro de aquí viejo de sintaxis/ sobre la guerra...
c. *Este libro suyo de aquí de sintaxis/ sobre la guerra... 29
d. *Este libro viejo de sintaxis/ sobre la guerra de aquí ...

We assume that the sequence ‘demonstrative+locative’ has to be considered a constituent. Arguments which can support this hypothesis can be found observing the syntactic behaviour of this sequence in other languages in which it can appear.

One of these arguments is that in some languages the sequence ‘demonstrative+locative’ can or must move together to [Spec, DP] in Syntax, as happens in Bosnian and Serbo-Croatian, in non-standard English and in Scandinavian:

34. a. ona tamo (nova) knjiga  
   ‘that there (new) book’  
   Bosnian and Serbo-Croatian
b. this here (nice) book  
   English
c. denne herre (flotte) bilen  
   ‘this here nice car-the’  
   Norwegian

Bosnian and Serbo-Croatian provide another piece of evidence that the sequence we are examining is a constituent, as noticed in Brugè and Giusti (1996). In fact, when the noun phrase modified by the sequence ‘demonstrative+locative’ is fronted, a clitic in Wackernagel position can follow either the whole noun phrase, as in (35a), or the sequence onu tamo ‘that there’, as in (35b):

35. a. [[[onu tamo] knjigu] mi donesi  
   ‘that-Acc there book-Acc me(CL.Dat) give(Impr.)’

28 In Spanish the deictic reinforcer de aquí cannot appear when the noun belongs to the class of ‘event’ nominals, as (i) shows:

   i. *Esta respuesta de aquí preocupó a todos.  
      ‘this answer of here worried everybody’

Sáez -p.c.- points out that in (i) the presence of the locative is impossible because the locative cannot be interpreted without a real spatial content which must be restricted to the communicative context. We have the same results when the noun is an abstract noun, (ii):

   ii. a. *Estos modales de aquí  
       ‘these manners of here’
   b. *Esta vez de aquí  
       ‘this time of here’

As for (ii.a), we have to say that it is acceptable only if the locative is interpreted as an adverbial PP (cf. footnote 27) and not as deictic reinforcer; namely if the construction receives the following interpretation: ‘these manners of these places...’. Therefore we conclude that the ungrammaticality of (i) and (ii) is due to the incompatibility of the characteristics of the head noun with the intrinsic properties of the locative in Spanish. However, these properties can vary cross-linguistically. In fact, in Italian, where the locative can ‘extend’ its spatial value, sentences such as (i) and (ii) are grammatical with the interpretation of the locative as deictic reinforcer, as we will show later.

29 As we will show in section 5, it seems that there is evidence to assume that the postnominal possessive occupies a position external to the NP projection.
b. [[onu] tamo] mi knjigu donesi
   'that-Acc there me(CL.Dat) book-Acc give(Imp.)'
   give me that there book

On the other hand, if in the same construction the head noun is modified by the demonstrative alone and an adjective, the clitic must appear immediately after the demonstrative, as in (36a), and it can never appear after an adjective, as in (36b):

36. a. onu mi novu knjigu donesi
      'that-Acc me(CL.Dat) new book-Acc give(Imp.)'

b. *onu novu mi knjigu donesi
   'that-Acc new me(CL.Dat) book-Acc give(Imp.)'
   give me that new book

The well-formed sentence in (35b), compared with the grammaticality of (35a) and (36a), and contrasted with (36b), the ungrammaticality of which is due to the fact that the demonstrative plus the adjective do not form a constituent, strongly supports the constituent status for the sequence 'demonstrative+locative'.

Let us now examine the internal structure of the constituent built by the demonstrative and the locative. As we have shown earlier, (32)-(33), we assume that the base position it occupies in the structure is the same position we found for the postnominal demonstrative. In order to capture the strict relation which is established between the two elements, we extend to this sequence the analysis that Kayne (1994) proposes for the de-constructions in French. In this way, we assume that the sequence este de aqui 'this [of] here' has a complex internal structure in which the element de 'of' occupies the head position of a maximal projection comparable to the CP projection. 30

Este 'this' and aqui 'here' are considered as maximal projections dominated by the 'preposition' de 'of', which establish a predication relation between them, as in a small clause with an abstract copula. This predication relation can be further motivated by proposing that este and aqui must both agree either for the positive value, or for the negative value of the feature [± speaker]. This fact would also account for the impossibility to combine este 'this' with de alli 'of there', or aquel 'that' with de aqui 'of here'.

Keeping these considerations in mind, and adapting Kayne’s analysis to our case, 31 we suggest that the complex sequence 'demonstrative+locative' has the internal structure presented in (37):

---

30. In this respect, notice that when the sequence 'demonstrative+locative' appears, in some Italian dialects, in a predicative construction, the locative is obligatorily preceded by the complementizer che 'that'. This happens in the dialect of Montale (Florence), in which we have [’kwesto ke ’kj] 'this that here', and in the dialect of Parma, in which we have [kost ke ’k] 'this that here' (cf. Poletto, 1995).

31. The structure we propose in (37) is a reduced and slightly simplified version of the structure which Kayne proposed during his 'Venice lectures' (spring, 1995) to account for constructions such as qualcuno di interessante 'some one of interesting', and which appears also in Kayne (1994) p. 106-110, to account for constructions such as quelqu’un de célèbre 'some one of famous' in French.
In this structure, *este* moves obligatorily to [Spec, XP], assuming, according to Kayne, that *de* in $X^o$ requires for its specifier to be occupied by a lexical element. In this way, we obtain the order *este de aquí*, and the orders *ese de acá, ese de allí, aquel de allí* and *aquel de allá* in the other cases.\(^{32}\)

The position to which the demonstrative raises, namely the [Spec, XP] position, gives, then, the demonstrative the possibility of moving to [Spec, DP] before SPELL-OUT or, at the latest at Logical Form, for the reasons we will express later in the text (see section 5).\(^{33}\)

\(^{32}\) In the structure in (37) we have assigned to the locative *aquí* 'here' the categorial status of a PP. This choice has been made according to Larson (1988), who proposes for Bare Adverbs either the status of NPs, since they can function as subjects - e.g. in copular sentences-, or the status of PPs with an abstract preposition.

\(^{33}\) Notice that one can object that a structure such as (37) violates the Left Branching Principle. Even though in this case this violation indeed takes place, it is necessary to specify that the statements of this Principle should be in any case reconsidered in the light of the Kayne's antisymmetric approach. In fact, constructions such as (i):

\begin{align*}
\text{i. Gianni} & \text{ era ritenuto [ti inadatto] da tutti} \\
& \text{‘Gianni was considered [ti unable] by everybody’}
\end{align*}

where the small clause is followed by another complement -i.e. the PP *da tutti* ‘by everybody’-, also violates the Left Branching Principle. Here we will not say anything about this question, leaving the topic open and maintaining the structure in (37).
4. The Postnominal demonstrative and the postnominal possessive adjective

Let us observe, now, the behaviour of the postnominal demonstrative with the postnominal possessive adjective in order to ascertain whether the generalizations (10) and (26) can be maintained also for this case. In Spanish, there exist two paradigms for possessive forms: the ‘elitic’ series and the ‘strong’ series. The ‘elitic’ series is morphologically poorer, given that its forms only agree in number with the head noun, (38a-b). The two series also differ in syntactic behaviour. In fact, while the ‘elitic’ forms can appear only in prenominal position, in complementary distribution with the article (cf. (38a-b) vs. (38c-d)), the ‘strong’ forms can appear in prenominal position, (38c), and in predicative constructions, (38d). They can never appear in prenominal position.

38. a. (*el) mi libro / (*los) mis libros 34
   (*the) my(Sing) book(Sing/Masc) / (*the) my(Plu) books(Plu/Masc)
   b. (*la) mi mano / (*las) mis manos
   (*the) my(Sing) hand(Sing/Masc) / (*the) my(Plu) hands(Plu/Masc)
   c. el libro mío/mi
      ‘the book my(strong)/my’
   d. el libro es mío/mi.
      ‘the book is my(strong)’

As for the prenominal possessive forms, we called them ‘elitic’ forms because they undergo all syntactic tests which characterize them as elitics. Spanish prenominal possessives cannot be modified by any category, cannot be coordinated (*mi y tu hermano [lit. ‘my and your brother’]), cannot appear in predicative constructions, (38d), and cannot receive stress (focus), as many authors have pointed out. As for the position these elements occupy in the structure, we adopt Piccalo’s (1992) hypothesis (cf. footnote 14), which assumes that in Spanish possessives raise to DP in Syntax. She suggests that possessives move as XPs, namely from Spec to Spec, as far as the functional projection immediately dominated by DP - which we can call AgrGenitivePhrase following Siloni (1994) and Longobardi (1995). While in languages such as Italian and Catalan this position represents the last step for movement, in Spanish the same elements move further as X0 elements until D0. This last step is justified by the clitic nature of possessives in Spanish and their complementary distribution with the definite article.

Let us pass on, now, to the possessive in postnominal position. As shown before, (38c), the only available forms which can appear in this position are the forms belonging to the ‘strong’ series.

Observing the unmarked word order inside the nominal extended projection, we can notice that the postnominal possessive undergoes the same restrictions which

34. Notice that the complementary distribution between definite article and prenominal possessive does not affect some Spanish dialects. In some dialects of Asturias, (i.a), Galicia, (i.b), Aragon (i.c), León and Santander areas, the two categories must cooccur.

   i.  a. la só casa ‘the his/her home’  Asturian
       b. a súa casa  Galician
       c. a suya casa  Aragonese

   The same is true for Medieval Spanish, where definite article and prenominal possessive occurred simultaneously in the structure (see Lapesa (1980) among other historical studies).
characterize the postnominal demonstrative. 35

When it modifies an 'event' noun, the unique position the postnominal possessive can occupy is after a manner adjective, namely the class of adjectives which occupies the lower functional projection, (29). The postnominal possessive can never precede it, as the contrasts in (39) show:

39. a. La reacción desinteresada suya me parece sospechosa.
   'the reaction disinterested his/her to-me(clit.) seems suspicious'
   b. *La reacción suya desinteresada...
   c. La conquista rápida suya preocupó a todos.
   'the conquest quick his/her worried everybody'
   d. *La conquista suya rápida...

On the other hand, with 'object-denoting' nouns the postnominal possessive can appear either following the adjective or preceding it without any change in the intonation. In fact, native speakers do not perceive any difference between the alternative orders in (40a-b) and (40c-d). 36

40. a. El cuadro redondo suyo es muy antiguo.
   'the painting round his/her is very antique'

35. The postnominal position of the possessive does not necessarily imply a contrastive interpretation, neither in Spanish nor, for example, in Italian. This reading depends on the contexts in which the construction is used. However, it is obvious that, with the possessive having the possibility to appear also prenominally, the postnominal position preferably receives this contrastive interpretation. In fact, the same interpretation is impossible to obtain in Spanish in the other available position for reasons we just expressed in the text. It is possible that one associates the contrastive interpretation with an 'emarginated' structural position of the postnominal possessive, namely a position which does not correspond to the base position we assume this element occupies in the cases we are going to present in the text. Nevertheless, we assume that a contrastive interpretation is irrelevant to determine the position the postnominal possessive occupies in the structure. In fact, this interpretation can be obtained also in the base position and not necessarily in an 'emarginated' position, as the word order of the examples in (39)-(43) show and as, in other contexts, the use of a strong form instead of its clitic counterpart displays -i.e. vi a él 'I-saw him' vs. lo vi [lit. 'him(clit.) I-saw']. Finally, we judge this consideration strictly related to what happens in some dialects of central and southern Italy. In these dialects, the possessive in prenominal position appears only in its reduced morphological form (i.e. mi/ta 'my/your' vs. mio/a/tuo/a), and can appear in this position only when the head noun belongs to the kinship nouns, (i.a). In all other cases, the unique possibility for the possessive is to occur postnominally (cf (i.b) vs. (i.c)).

i. a. mi/tu zia     'my/your aunt'      (dialect from Ancona)
   b. *mi/tu libro    'my/your book'
   c. el libro mio/tu  'the book my/your(strong)'
   d. *el mi/tu libro
   e. *el mio/tuo libro

On the basis of (i.c), it does not seem correct to assert that the postnominal possessive occupies an 'emarginated' structural position.

36. This possibility with 'object-denoting' nouns reminds us what happens in the same environments with the postnominal demonstrative (see the discussion in footnote 15). A possible account for these cases could be to assume that there exists another functional projection whose specifier can host the possessive. This functional projection would occupy an intermediate position between the higher position -i.e. D^+ and the lower position -i.e. the position we are trying to identify in this section-. Nevertheless, at first glance it seems to us that this proposal, even if plausible, can hardly be supported for Spanish, given the results of (41b-c), (41e-f) and (43e) below.
b. El cuadro suyo redondo...

c. El nieto americano suyo es moreno y pequeño.
   ‘the nephew American his/her is dark-haired and short’

d. El nieto suyo americano...

Nevertheless, if the same class of nouns is modified by more than one adjective, (41),
then we can observe the same restrictions in the word order we have observed in the
case with ‘event’ nouns:

41. a. El cuadro redondo inglés suyo no vale mucho.
   ‘the painting round English his/her is not worth’

b. *El cuadro suyo redondo inglés...

c. *El cuadro redondo suyo inglés...

d. El nieto pequeño americano suyo es moreno.
   ‘the nephew short American his/her is dark-haired’

e. *El nieto suyo pequeño americano...

f. *El nieto pequeño suyo americano...

Putting aside the alternative constructions in (40), which we are unable to account for
at this point of our investigation, the contrasts in (39) and (41) can be considered
convincing arguments to propose that in Spanish the postnominal possessive occupies
a position lower than all the functional projections containing APs.

Let us now observe the position the postnominal possessive occupies with respect
to the complements of the nouns. As (42) and (43) show, the postnominal possessive
always precedes them:

42. a. La reacción suya a las críticas preocupó a todos.
   ‘the reaction his/her to the criticisms worried everybody’

b. *La reacción a las críticas suya...

c. El descubrimiento suyo de América produjo mucha riqueza.
   ‘the discovery his of America produced great wealth’

d. *El descubrimiento de América suyo...

43. a. El cuadro suyo de Picasso no es nada más que una copia mal hecha.
   ‘the painting his/her of Picasso is nothing more than a badly made copy’

b. *El cuadro de Picasso suyo...

c. El cuadro chico suyo de Picasso...
   ‘the painting little his/her of Picasso...’

d. *El cuadro chico de Picasso suyo...

e. *El cuadro suyo chico de Picasso...

Finally, as for the relative order between the postnominal demonstrative and the
postnominal possessive, we can notice that the postnominal demonstrative always
precedes the postnominal possessive, (44). Therefore, we propose that the
postnominal possessive occupies a position lower than the one occupied by the
postnominal demonstrative.

44. a. El libro (viejo) este suyo de sintaxis no me convence.
   ‘the book (old) this his/her on syntax does not convince me’

b. *El libro (viejo) suyo este de sintaxis...

The data presented so far, makes us wonder which position the postnominal
possessive occupies inside the nominal extended projection.
In the literature specific studies on this topic do not seem to exist, at least to our
knowledge. Recently, Piccallo (1992) says, in a brief footnote, that in Catalan the postnominal possessives “do not behave like arguments, instead, they seem to behave like pseudo-adjunctives in some respects.” (p.49).
Given that the postnominal possessive does not necessarily occupy an ‘emarginated’ position inside the structure, as we commented on in footnote 35 and as the contrasts in (42)-(43) confirm (if it follows the APs, it always precedes the complements of the noun), we could suggest two tentative proposals. However, the validity of both of them cannot be easily checked through empirical data, given ‘Cinque’s Generalization’ (1980, 1981) concerning the phenomenon of possessivization of genitive PPs.
The first proposal is that the postnominal possessive occupies either a unique position inside the NP -namely the higher specifier of this projection-, or different positions inside the NP, according to the theta-role it can saturate in the different cases -namely it occupies the same positions occupied by the corresponding genitive PPs-.
The second proposal is to assume that there exists another functional projection external to the NP which immediately dominates it, and whose specifier hosts the postnominal possessive after SPELL-OUT. This second proposal seems to us more plausible from a theoretical point of view. A piece of evidence that can support it is that the postnominal possessive shares the same properties of the adjectives rather than those of the complements of the noun. In fact, it agrees obligatorily in gender and number with the head noun and it cannot be introduced by the preposition marking genitive Case -de ‘of’ in Spanish-. 37
Therefore, if we assume that the postnominal possessive occupies the specifier of a functional projection which immediately dominates the NP, we should slightly modify the generalization (26) in the following way, according to the resulting order in (44):

45. In Spanish the demonstrative is generated in the specifier position of a nominal functional projection which immediately dominates either the functional projection containing the possessive or the NP projection.

5. The movement of the demonstrative

5.1. The intrinsic features of the demonstrative

Let us now return to the main topic of our investigation, namely the possibility in Spanish of realizing the demonstrative either postnominally, (46a), or prenominally, (46b).

   ‘the book this/that/that was published in 1990’
   ‘this/that/that book was published in 1990’

37. Notice that this proposal is compatible with the ‘Case Checking Principle’ proposed by Longobardi (1995). Its formalization, together with all its possible combinations, is presented at pp.15-16 of his paper. Given that the author does not consider the case of the postnominal possessive, we can extend his hypothesis to our case by suggesting that, besides the AgrGP and the base position inside the NP, there exists an intermediate functional projection inside the extended nominal projection in which genitive Case is assigned.
In the preceding sections we showed that the postnominal demonstrative always appears in a structural position lower than all the functional projections whose specifiers are occupied by the different classes of adjectives, and immediately superior either to the NP or to the functional projection whose specifier is occupied by the postnominal possessive. So, we proposed the insertion of another functional projection (FP) inside the extended nominal projection corresponding to the position where the postnominal demonstrative (cf. (29)-(30)) occurs. Finally, we proposed that in Spanish the demonstrative is generated in the specifier of FP (see (10) and (45)). According to this proposal, in (46a) the demonstrative appears, after SPELL-OUT, in the same position in which it is generated, while the noun raises in Syntax to a higher X° position.

In (46b), on the other hand, we propose that the prenominal position the demonstrative occupies is a derived position, due to the long movement of the demonstrative itself from [Spec, FP] to [Spec, DP] in Syntax. Moreover, given the grammaticality of both (46a) and (46b), we assume that in Spanish the movement of the demonstrative to [Spec, DP] is optional in Syntax.

At this point, it becomes necessary to justify, in accordance with the Minimalist framework (Chomsky, 1993), the reasons which enable the demonstrative to move in Syntax, giving as resulting constructions examples such as (46b).

We assume that a common noun modified by a demonstrative is interpreted as a referential nominal expression. In other words, we assume that a common noun modified by a demonstrative designates directly the entity which it refers to, and, for this property, it can receive neither existential nor generic interpretation, as happens with proper names and pronouns. Consequently, we propose that the demonstrative makes the common noun it modifies behave like a proper name or, more appropriately, like a pronoun.

Therefore, on the basis of these observations, we formulate the following assumption:

47. The demonstrative is an element specified for the features [+Referential] and [+Deictic].

From a syntactic point of view, an argument which can support (47), is given by the fact that, as in the case of proper names and pronouns, a nominal modified by a demonstrative cannot be further modified by a restrictive relative clause, as shown in (48) and (49):

48. a. Este libro, que publicó el año pasado, tuvo poco éxito.
    'this book that he-published the last year had little success'
    b. El libro este, que publicó el año pasado, tuvo poco éxito.
    'the book this that he-published the last year had little success'

49. a. *Sólo comprarán estos libros que hayan sido publicados después del '90.
    'only they-will-buy these books that have(Subj.) been published after the '90s'
    b. *Sólo comprarán los libros estos que hayan sido publicados después del '90.
    'only they-will-buy the books these that have(Subj.) been published after the '90s'

The sentences in (48) can be judged well-formed only if the relative clause is interpreted as appositive. The restrictive interpretation for the relative clause is excluded in both cases. This fact can also explain why the sentences in (49) are ungrammatical. In these cases the relative clause can be interpreted only as a restrictive
relative clause because of the presence of the subjunctive mood in the relative clause itself. 38

Furthermore, we assume that $D^5$ contains the Referentiality feature [+ REF], the positive or negative value of which must be checked by some element in the structure, according to the following assumption made by Longobardi (1994):

50. "All D position are universally generated with an abstract feature $\pm R$ (suggesting "referential"), which must be checked with respect to at least one of its values." (Longobardi, (97), p. 659)

Finally, we propose that in Spanish the [+REF] feature in $D^5$ must obligatorily be checked by the demonstrative on the basis of the proposals just made. We also propose that, in this language, such checking can take place either in Syntax -i.e. before SPELL-OUT-, or at Logical Form. 39

On the basis of these assumptions, we are able to account for the demonstrative movement to [Spec, DP] in the Syntax, and, at the same time, for the optionality of such movement at this level of representation.

If the movement of the demonstrative is carried out in the Syntax, the [+REF] feature in $D^5$ is checked already at this level through the Spec-Head Agreement process. In this way, we will have constructions such as (46b). In these cases the head D cannot be lexically filled for the reasons we expressed in section 1.3. On the other hand, if the demonstrative movement is not carried out in the Syntax, as in (46a), the movement rule on the demonstrative must apply at Logical Form, in order to satisfy the referential interpretation that the nominal must receive, which, also

38. Following Longobardi’s (1994) discussion on the semantic properties of proper names and pronouns (cf. pp.633-640 and the references cited there), we can notice that also a noun modified by a demonstrative shares the same characteristics. In fact, a noun modified by a demonstrative is never ambiguous between a de rel/de dicto reading, contrary to what happens with definite descriptions, but it has always a de re reading, just like proper names and pronouns. Moreover, it has a rigid designation -cf. Kripke’s (1980) terminology-, in the sense that, as Longobardi affirms for proper names, "[it appears] to designate the same object throughout all possible worlds (i.e., also in counterfactual situations)." (p.639).

39. Longobardi (1994), in order to justify N-raising to $D^5$ for proper names and the generation in this position for pronouns, proposes two other assumptions strictly related to that presented in (50). These assumptions are repeated in (i) and (ii).

i. This $\pm R$ feature is strong in Romance and weak in German. (ex.(98), p.659)

ii. $+ R$ is universally checked iff the D is interpreted as being in a chain/CHAIN containing an object-referring expression (... i.e. a pronoun or a proper name). (ex.(99), p.659)

If our proposal can be considered plausible from a theoretical point of view, in (ii) we should have to insert the demonstrative in addition to the elements -pronoun and proper name- mentioned by the author. On the other hand, as for (i), we have to say that, unfortunately, checking [+REF] feature by the demonstrative does not seem to undergo the distinction between Romance and Germanic languages. In fact in Spanish, as in Romanian, the two possibilities -strong and weak- seem to be simultaneously available to account for the optionality in (46) and (3) respectively. Moreover, as for Germanic languages, it seems that the [+REF] feature is always strong; in fact, in this group of languages the demonstrative always raises to [Spec, DP] in Syntax (cf. section 6.1.2.2.). However, given that demonstrative movement is an XP movement, we can assume that (i) only refers to X elements. In section 6.2, we will give a tentative general proposal for the movement of the demonstrative.
in these cases, can be obtained in [Spec, DP] through the Spec-Head Agreement process. In these cases, the head D has to be realized at PF for the reasons presented in section 1.3. (cf. also footnote 9).

Therefore, we propose, for the demonstrative in Spanish, the following assumption:

51. In Spanish the demonstrative can raise to [Spec, DP] optionally in Syntax, but it must raise to [Spec, DP] obligatorily at Logical Form.

This hypothesis can be argued for by the fact that the interpretation of the nominals modified by a demonstrative is always referential, even in case in which the movement has not taken place before SPELL-OUT.

An argument that can support it is provided by (48b) and (49b). The sentence in (48b), where the demonstrative appears postnominally, is well-formed only if the relative clause is interpreted as an appositive relative clause, as happens in (48a). (49b), where the relative clause can only have the restrictive reading, is ungrammatical, as is (49a), even though the demonstrative is postnominal.

Another argument is given by the ungrammaticality of the following two sentences:

52. a. *Algunos estos libros tuvieron poco éxito.
   'some these books had little success'
   b. *Algunos libros estos tuvieron poco éxito.
   'some of books these had little success'

(52a) is excluded because the DP estos libros ‘these books’ can receive neither the existential reading nor the partitive Case which are required and assigned by the existential quantifier algunos ‘some’ to its complement (cf. Cardinaletti and Giusti (1992)). 40 We propose that this fact is due to the presence of the demonstrative which gives the DP itself the referential interpretation. 41 (52b) is ill formed even if the definite article is absent (see bare plurals -algunos libros ‘some books’- and modified bare plurals -algunos libros interesantes ‘some interesting books’-) and the demonstrative appears in postnominal position. This fact lead us to extend the considerations made to account for the ungrammaticality of (52a) to this case: in (52b) the presence of the demonstrative in postnominal position makes the DP incompatible with the existential reading and the partitive Case which are required and assigned by the quantifier algunos ‘some’. Given that the existential interpretation for nominals depends on the content of D (cf. Longobardi, 1994, and footnote 9), we have to conclude that in (52b) this projection is specified for the [+REF] feature, and that at Logical Form the unique element in the structure which can satisfy the checking of this feature is the demonstrative itself. The cases in (52)

40. For the incompatibility of partitive Case with nonexistent nominal expressions, we refer the reader to the argumentations presented in Brugè and Brugger (1996).

41. Notice that if the complement of the existential quantifier is realized as a ‘definite partitive’ PP, according to Cardinaletti and Giusti’s analysis, the presence of the demonstrative is possible either in prenominal or in postnominal position, as (i) shows:

   i. a. Algunos de estos libros tuvieron poco éxito.
      'some of these books had little success'
   b. Algunos de los libros estos tuvieron poco éxito.
      'some of the books these had little success'

For an explanation of cases like these, we refer the reader to the discussion we made in footnote 10.
support the hypothesis that there exists a strict relation between the low position in which we propose the demonstrative is generated and the position inside DP where the referential interpretation takes place. Consequently, the [Spec, DP] position is a derived position for the demonstrative in Spanish, to which it must raise in any case, at the latest at Logical Form.

A third empirical argument which supports the assumptions in (47) and (51) is represented by the following cases:

53. a. *Este mi libro de sintaxis fue publicado hace dos años.  
   ‘this my book on syntax was published two years ago’

   b. *Mi libro este de sintaxis fue publicado hace dos años.  
   ‘my book this on syntax was published two years ago’

(53a) is excluded because in the DP projection both the specifier and the head appear lexically filled, contrary to Giusti’s (1996a-b) hypothesis (cf. section 1.3.).

The fact that also the sentence in (53b) is ungrammatical even if only the head D is filled by the possessive at PF leads us to conclude, once again, that at Logical Form the demonstrative must be in any case interpreted in [Spec, DP]. On the basis of this hypothesis, we can then account for the ungrammaticality of (53b). In these cases the demonstrative, which must raise to [Spec, DP] in order to check its [+REF] feature by Spec-Head Agreement, cannot satisfy this requirement because the same feature has been already checked by the possessive which has moved to D2 in the Syntax. So, the [+REF] feature is no more available for the demonstrative.

5.2. The pronominal possessive as referential element

The hypothesis that in Spanish the pronominal possessive provides referential interpretation for the nominal expression it modifies is justified by the fact that a nominal modified by a pronominal possessive cannot be further modified by a restrictive relative clause, as happens with proper names and pronouns. So, we

---

42. Brucart (1994) observes that in Spanish there are cases in which the demonstrative and the pronominal possessive can cooccur in the structure, such as in Catalan and Italian:

   i. estos mis hijos  
   ‘these my(Plu) sons’  
   (9) p.54

Nevertheless, he suggests that this possibility is very limited and defective in the common use (cfr. the ungrammaticality of *todos estos mis hijos ‘all these my(Plu) sons’ vs. the grammaticality of todos estos hijo míos ‘all these sons my(Plu)[strong’), and proposes that cases like (i) must be considered residues of Medieval Spanish, where this cooccurrence was common. Notice that also in some Spanish dialects demonstratives and pronominal possessives cooccur in the structure, probably the same dialects which require the presence of the article together with the pronominal possessive (see footnote 34). We can tentatively propose here, according to Cardinaletti -p.c.-, that in some of these dialects there exists a weak form for the pronominal possessive, as it seems to be the case in (i), together with the strong form. This weak form would occupy the specifier of a functional projection (AgrGP) immediately dominated by DP after SPELL-OUT. This hypothesis would account for the simultaneous realization both of the article and of the demonstrative with the weak form of the pronominal possessive. Notice that we would have to assume the same proposal for some Italian dialects in which the three forms -clitic, weak and strong- seem to coexist. Nevertheless, we will leave the question about the change from the strong form to the clitic form of the pronominal possessive in the passage from Old Spanish to Modern Spanish open here.
propose that the prenominal possessive checks the [+REF] feature in D₀. In fact, the sentence in (54) is well-formed only if the relative clause is interpreted as an appositive relative clause:

54. Mi libro, que publiqué el año pasado, tuvo mucho éxito.
    ‘My book that I published the last year had a great success’

Coming back to the ill-formed sentences in (53), a demonstrative in [Spec, DP] at PF can occur with a postnominal possessive:

55. Este libro mío de sintaxis fue publicado hace dos años.
    ‘this book my(stong) on syntax was published two years ago’

If the possessive always needs to check the [+REF] feature in D₀, the grammaticality of (55) would be surprising. This sentence would be ruled out for the same reasons we proposed to explain the ungrammaticality of (53b).

Nevertheless, we do not consider (55) a counterexample to the proposal suggested for cases like (53b). What we propose is that in cases like (55) there is no clash in checking the [+REF] feature between the possessive and the demonstrative. Evidence which can support this are given by the fact that the postnominal possessive allows for the presence of the indefinite article in D₀ -un libro mío ‘a book my(stong)’ is the only possible form in Spanish to express the indefiniteness with a possessive-, and by the fact that in Spanish, in cases like (56), the relative clause can be interpreted as a restrictive relative clause, besides the appositive interpretation, contrary to (54):  

56. El libro mío que publiqué el año pasado tuvo mucho éxito.
    ‘the book my(stong) that I published the last year had a great success’

The well-formed sentence in (56) together with constructions such as un libro mío ‘a book my(stong)’, leads us to conclude that the postnominal possessive is not specified only for the [+REF] feature. So, we tentatively propose that the possessive is specified either for the positive or for the negative value of the Referential feature. In this way, contrary to what happens with the demonstrative -(51)-, the postnominal possessive has not to move to DP at Logical Form if this movement has not taken place in Syntax. On the other hand, if the possessive chooses the positive value of the Referential feature, it must raise in Syntax, criticizing to D₀, for checking reasons.

---

43. For the incompatibility between the prenominal possessive and the restrictive relative clause see also the different proposal suggested by Brucat (1994).

44. Notice that if in sentences such as (56) the demonstrative appears in its base position, the relative clause can only have the appositive interpretation, being the restrictive one excluded, (i.a). The same happens if the demonstrative is realized in [Spec, DP], (i.b). Compare these cases with (48) and (49).

i. a. El libro este suyo, que publicó el año pasado, no tuvo mucho éxito.
    ‘the book this his that he published the last year had not a great success’

b. Este libro suyo, que publicó el año pasado, no tuvo mucho éxito.
    ‘this book his that he published the last year had not a great success’

The contrast between (56) and (i.a) with respect to the possibilities of interpretation of the relative clause can be considered another important argument in favour of the hypothesis that the demonstrative must always raise to [Spec, DP] at the latest at Logical Form, as (51) proposes and (47) justifies.
However, we propose that this movement is possible only if the [+REF] feature itself is available, namely if it need not be checked by a demonstrative. 45

The contrasts in (57) provide another empirical argument in favour of the hypothesis that the postnominal possessive does not have to move to DP at Logical Form, and consequently that this element is not specified only for the [+REF] feature:

57. a. *Cuatro/Algunos mis libros de sintaxis fueron publicados hace dos años.
    'four/some my books on syntax were published two years ago'

b. Cuatro/Algunos libros míos de sintaxis fueron publicados hace dos años.
    'four/some books my(strong) on syntax were published two years ago'

(57a) is ungrammatical for the same reasons we have proposed to rule out sentences such as (52): the existential quantifiers cuatro 'four' and algunos 'some' prevent the realization of mis libros 'my books' as their complement because this DP is referential, given its behaviour with relative clauses, (54). On the other hand, (57b) is well-formed, contrary to (52b). In this case the DP libros míos 'books my(strong)' is interpreted as an existential nominal expression. This implies that the possessive does not raise to DP at Logical Form, otherwise this projection would not be compatible with the existential interpretation, and ruled out like (57a). In (57b) the DP libros míos seems to behave like a modified bare plural, namely like a DP with an empty D° (cf. Longobardi (1994) and footnote 9).

Given these considerations, we conclude that when the possessive appears in its low position, it need not move to DP at LF, being its presence compatible either with an indefinite article, as we showed above, or with an empty D°, as in (57b), like any other adjective. 46

Moreover, as the contrasts in (58) show, a nominal modified by a prenominal possessive, (58a), cannot be further modified by a relative clause in subjunctive (cf. (49)); on the other hand, if the possessive is realized in its low position, (58b), the same construction is well-formed:

45. Observing the contrasts between (53b) and (55), one can suggest that the ungrammaticality of (53b) is due to a violation of the Minimality Principle: the possessive movement is blocked by the presence of the demonstrative in a specifier which is placed between its low position, (44a), and the D°, as suggested in Brugé (1994). Nevertheless, we assume here that this proposal cannot be considered theoretically correct. In fact, if the movement of a particular element to a higher position is justified by checking some specific feature, or features, there would be no need for the possessive to pass through the [Spec, FP] which hosts the demonstrative in its movement to D (cf. the discussion at the end of section 2.1.).

46. Notice that in general it is not the possessive in prenominal position which obligatorily checks the [+REF] feature, preventing, in this way, this feature from being available for checking by the demonstrative, but the fact that the possessive is realized in D°. In this respect, compare the ungrammatical cases in Spanish presented in the text with parallel grammatical constructions in Italian, Catalan and German:

i. a. questo mio libro
    'this my book'    Italian

b. aquest meu llibre
    'this my book'    Catalan

c. diese meine Hände
    'this my hands'    German

Moreover, at first glance, it seems that also in English and French the possessive is specified for the [+REF] feature which must check in DP.

ii. a. *this my book
    English

b. *ce mon livre
    French
58. a. *Sólo irán a Barcelona sus estudiantes que hayan superado los parciales.
   'only they-will-go to Barcelona his students who have(Subj.) got
   through the partial exams'
b. Sólo irán a Barcelona los estudiantes suyos que hayan superado los
   parciales.
   'only they-will-go to Barcelona the students his[strong] who have(Subj.)
got through the partial exams'

5.3. Some residual cases

Let us come back to the assumption proposed in (47) which establishes that the
demonstrative is an element specified for the [+Referential] and [+Deictic] features.
Besides the main values the demonstrative can have in the language and that are
described by this assumption, this element can also be used either as a discourse
anaphora, as in (59a), or it can function as a 'deictic ad phantasma', as is the case in
(59b): 47

59. a. Juan es guapo, inteligente y simpático. Sin embargo, estas cualidades no
    hacen de él el hombre perfecto.
    'Juan is handsome, intelligent and likeable. Nevertheless, these qualities
do not make him the perfect man'
b. En Córdoba hay estas casitas de estilo alpino...
    'In Cordoba there are these little houses of Alpine style…'

We propose that what distinguishes the characteristics of the demonstrative in the two
uses presented in (59) with the properties of the same element in the use we have
commented on until now is that when the demonstrative functions as a discourse
anaphora or as a 'deictic ad phantasma' it maintains its specification for the feature
[+Deictic], but loses the [+Referential] value. 48 In this paper, however, we will
disregard the characteristics that the demonstrative can assume in these two cases and
we will limit our field of investigation to those intrinsic properties of the
demonstrative we consider basic, namely those properties expressed in (47).
Nevertheless, it seems important to notice that the demonstrative in its use as
discourse anaphora or as 'deictic ad phantasma' displays the same syntactic behaviour
we observed until now, as the cases in (60), compared with those in (59), show:

---

47. The term 'deictic ad phantasma', used in the sense of Bühler (1934), designates those deictic
    elements referring to persons or objects which belong to the speaker's (imaginary) world.

48. A piece of evidence which supports this hypothesis is that the demonstrative can be modified by
    a relative clause with restrictive interpretation when used in these two functions, as (i) shows:

   i. a. Estas/esas cosas que me dices no me gustan para nada.
       'these/those things that to-me(clit.) you-tell not to-me(clit.) they-like at all'
       I do not like all these/those things you tell me
   b. Quisiera comprar aquellos sombreros que se doblan.
       'I-should like to buy those hats which fold up'

Notice, however, that the demonstrative form aquel 'that' can be used as a discourse anaphora or as a
deictic 'ad phantasma' more easily than the demonstrative form este 'this', which appears to be more
linked to the spatial dimension of the context in which the communicative act takes place.
60. a. Juan es guapo, inteligente y simpático. Sin embargo, las cualidades estas no hacen de él el hombre perfecto.
   ‘Juan is handsome, intelligent and likeable. Nevertheless, the qualities these do not make him the perfect man’

b. En Córdoba hay las casitas estas de estilo alpino…
   ‘In Cordoba there are the little houses these of Alpine style…’

Given the well formed constructions in (60), it seem plausible to extend our analysis to these cases. So, we tentatively propose that the movement of the demonstrative from [Spec, FP] to [Spec, DP] in Syntax, (59), or at the latest at Logical Form, (60), is due to the fact that in [Spec, DP] the demonstrative must check some other particular feature which in one case is peculiar to the anaphoric interpretation and in the other is peculiar to the ‘deictic ad phantasma’ interpretation.

6. The comparative approach

On the basis of what has been presented until now, let us say in Spanish the demonstrative is generated in the specifier position of a functional projection (FP) inside the extended nominal expression. This projection is placed lower than all the functional projections containing the Adjectives, (10), and immediately dominates either the NP projection or the functional projection containing the postnominal possessive, (45). We propose that the movement of the demonstrative from [Spec, FP] to [Spec, DP] is optional in Syntax -i.e. before SPELL-OUT-, and obligatory at Logical Form, (51).

Observing the phenomenon in a wider cross-linguistic perspective, we could suggest, adopting and extending Giusti’s (1993) proposal, that across languages there exists more than one position inside the DP projection in which the demonstrative is generated, parametrizing in this way the different realizations of the demonstrative in the structure with respect to the head noun. Nevertheless, our intention would be to propose that in all languages there exists a unique position in the structure in which the demonstrative is base generated. In order to support this idea, we could suggest that in all languages the unique position in which the demonstrative is generated is the one we have proposed and justified for Spanish. The languages will vary as to their power to allow, oblige or prevent the movement of the demonstrative to [Spec, DP] in Syntax. A way to make this hypothesis theoretically consistent is to find some empirical argument that can show that even in those languages which do not allow the demonstrative to appear in postnominal position at PF, this element starts from the same low position we have proposed for Spanish. An argument, which can be found in many languages, is represented by the position the locative which functions as reinforcer of the demonstrative occupies in the structure (cf. section 3.2.). In those languages in which the demonstrative obligatorily appears in [Spec, DP] and can cooccur with the locative, it can be argued that the demonstrative has moved in Syntax leaving the locative in the base position, on a par with what happens for the sequence ‘demonstrative +locative’ in Spanish, (37). Therefore, in these languages, the position of the locative itself will be taken to indicate the base position of the demonstrative, much in the same way as a floating quantifier marks the base position of the noun phrase it quantifies over in Sportiche's (1988) hypothesis.
6.1. The demonstrative in other languages

In this section we show that what we have proposed for the demonstrative in Spanish can be extended to other languages.

6.1.1. Languages in which the demonstrative can appear in postnominal position

Let us begin our general overview by examining the behaviour of the demonstrative in a language related to Spanish.

In Catalan, the demonstrative modifying a nominal can appear either in prenominal position or in postnominal position, as in (61) show:

61. a. Aquest quadre és molt antic.
    'this painting is very antique'
   b. El quadre aquest és molt antic.
    'the painting this is very antique'

Notice, however, that the alternative construction in (61b) is not accepted in all Catalan areas. The north of Catalonia in general uses the demonstrative only in its prenominal position; while the west, and in particular the south of the region, use both (61a) and (61b). The use of the second construction is limited to colloquial or spoken speech, as happens in Spanish. Putting aside those areas in which the phenomenon does not take place, in Catalan, the postnominal demonstrative appears in a position lower than all the functional projections containing adjectives. This happens both in the case in which the head noun belongs to the 'event' nouns class, as the contrasts in (62b-c) show, and in the case in which the head noun belongs to the 'object-denoting' class, as (63b-c) shows:

62. a. Aquesta reacció desinteressada ens ha preocupat a tots.
    'this reaction disinterested worried everybody'
   b. *?La reacció desinteressada aquesta...
    'the reaction disinterested this…'
   c. *La reacció aquesta desinteressada...
    'the reaction this disinterested…'

63. a. Aquest quadre rodó és molt antic.
    'this painting round is very antique'
   b. *El quadre rodó aquest...
    'the painting round this…'
   c. *El quadre aquest rodó...
    'the painting this round…'

With relation to the subject and the other complements of the noun, the Catalan postnominal demonstrative always appears preceding them in the unmarked order, as the contrasts in (64) with an 'event' noun, and in (65) with an 'object-denoting' noun show:

64. a. La reacció aquesta d'Alemanya/a les crítiques no ha impressionat ningú.
    'the reaction this of Germany/to the criticisms has not shaken anyone'
   b. *La reacció d'Alemanya/a les crítiques aquesta...
    'the reaction of Germany/to the criticisms this…'
65. a. El germà aquest d'en Joan és molt jove.
   ‘the brother this of John is very young’

b. *El germà d'en Joan aquest...
   ‘the brother of John this...’

Finally, since the postnominal demonstrative also precedes the postnominal possessive, as we can observe by the contrasts in (66), we extend to this language the hypothesis proposed for Spanish. In Catalan the demonstrative is generated in the specifier of the nominal functional projection FP placed lower than all the functional projections containing the adjectives, (10), and which immediately dominates either the NP or the functional projection containing the postnominal possessive, (45). The movement of the demonstrative from [Spec, FP] to [Spec, DP] in order to check its [+REF] feature is optional before SPELL-OUT-, but obligatory at Logical Form, (51).

66. a. ??El llibre aquest seu de sintaxi no em convenç.
   ‘the book this his on syntax does not convince me’

b. *El llibre seu aquest de sintaxi no em convenç. 49
   ‘the book his this on syntax does not convince me’

Also in Catalan, the demonstrative aquest ‘this’ can be realized independent of its [+Deictic] feature through the locative reinforcer d’aquí ‘[of] here’. As happens in Spanish, the complex sequence aquest d’aquí ‘this [of] here’ can appear in the same position we propose the demonstrative is generated in, (67a), or the demonstrative alone can move in Syntax and the locative stay ‘in situ’, as in (67b).

67. a. ?El quadre (rodó) aquest d’aquí (de Picasso) està mal penjat.
   ‘the painting (round) this of here (of Picasso) is badly hanged’

b. Aquest quadre (*d’aquí) (rodó) d’aquí (de Picasso) (*d’aquí) està mal penjat.
   ‘this painting (round) of here (of Picasso) is badly hung’

Another language in which the demonstrative shares the same syntactic behaviour we have seen in Spanish and in Catalan is Bosnian-Serbian-Croatian. In this language, the demonstrative can appear, besides the prenominal position, in

---

49 In section 5 we have proposed that the incompatibility between the postnominal demonstrative and the prenominal possessive, (53b), is due to the fact that, realizing the possessive in D⁰, it checks the [+REF] feature already in Syntax, preventing, in this way, that the same feature be checked by the demonstrative at Logical Form. Nevertheless, it seems that the demonstrative must appear in Syntax in [Spec, DP], (i.b), and never in its base position, (i.c), even in those languages in which the prenominal possessive appears in the specifier of AgrGP, as is in Catalan.:

   i. a. el seu llibre
       ‘the his book’

b. aquest seu llibre
   ‘this his book’

c. *el seu llibre aquest
   ‘the his book this’

A tentative proposal to account for these contrasts is to suggest that if in D⁰ the [+REF] feature is chosen, the prenominal possessive, which is compatible with this feature, moves to [Spec, DP] at Logical Form. Therefore, (i.c) would be excluded for the same reasons which blocks constructions such as (53b) in Spanish.
postnominal position, leaving the DP projection empty, as in (68). Bosnian-Serbian-Croatian does not display a definite article at all. The realization of the demonstrative in postnominal position is acceptable only at a highly stylistic level. 50

68. a. ova(onaj lijepe momak
   'this(Masc.Sing.Nom.)/that(Masc.Sing.Nom.) nice boy'

   b. *lijepe momak ova(onaj
   'nice boy this/that'

We extend to these languages the general hypothesis proposed for Spanish and Catalan. Arguments which support this proposal are given by the contrasts in (69)-(72): 51

69. a. *nezainteresovana reakcija ova na kritike
   'disinterested reaction this(Fem.Sing.Nom.) on criticisms'

   b. *nezainteresovana reakcija na kritike ova
   'disinterested reaction on criticisms this'

   *this disinterested reaction to the criticisms

70. a. *suknja ova Marijina
   'skirt this Mary(Genitive)'

   b. *suknja Marijina ova
   'skirt Mary(Gen) this'

   this skirt of Mary

In (69) and (70), the postnominal demonstrative can only precede a complement of the noun and never follow it, as in Spanish and Catalan. At the same time, if a postnominal possessive is realized in the structure, the postnominal demonstrative always precedes it, (71):

71. a. Knjiga ova tvoja o sintaksi
   'book this your of syntax'

   b. *Knjiga tvoja ova o sintaksi 52
   'book your this of syntax'

50. We thank NedŽad Leko for his helpful comments on the Bosnian-Serbian-Croatian data we discuss in this paper.

51. For independent reasons, in Bosnian-Serbian-Croatian adjectives appear in prenominal position, apart from some marked cases.

52. Notice that in Bosnian-Serbian-Croatian, the prenominal possessive, which behaves like an XP, as in Italian and Catalan, (i.a), can be never realized in Syntax in prenominal position if the demonstrative appears in its base position. Observe in this respect the ungrammaticality of (i.c):

   i. a. ova moja rasprava o sintaksi
       'this my discussion about syntax'

   b. *ova rasprava moja o sintaksi
       'this discussion my about syntax'

   c. *moja rasprava ova o sintaksi
       'my discussion this about syntax'

In Bosnian-Serbian-Croatian, the cooccurrence of the demonstrative and the possessive has the same syntactic behaviour as that observed in Catalan (see footnote 49).
Finally, since in this language the deictic feature of the demonstrative can be reinforced by a locative, the complex sequence, on the one hand, and the locative alone, on the other, can appear in the base position, (72):

72. a. knjiga ova ovdie o sintaksi
   'book this here of syntax'
   
   b. ova knjiga ovdie o sintaksi (*ovdie) 53
   'this book here of syntax (*here)'

Therefore, we extend to Bosnian-Serbian-Croatian the hypothesis we have proposed for Spanish. We also extend to the sequence ova ovdie 'this here' the structure proposed in (37). However, we assume that in this language, such as in English, (34b), Norwegian, (34c), Italian, (footnote 27, ex.(iv)), and, as we shall see later, in others, the preposition which heads the XP projection and which selects the small clause is lexically empty. This case is comparable to those cases in which infinitival complement clauses are introduced by an empty complementizer. 54

Let us now observe what happens in Rumanian. As the constructions presented in (3) and repeated here in (73) show, in this language the demonstrative can appear at PF either in prenominal position, (73a), or in postnominal position, (73b). 55

73. a. acest (frumos) băiat (frumos) al Mariiei
   'this (nice) boy (nice) of Mary'
   
   b. băiatul acesta frumos al Mariiei
   'boy-the thisA (nice) of Mary'
   
   c. *băiatul frumos acesta al Mariiei
   'boy-the nice thisA of Mary'
   
   d. *băiatul (frumos) al Mariiei acesta
   'boy-the nice of Mary thisA'

---

53. Recall, moreover, that in Bosnian-Serbian-Croatian the sequence 'demonstrative+locative' can raise jointly to [Spec, DP] before SPELL-OUT. See (34a) and (i):

i. ova ovdie knjiga o sintaksi
   'this here book of syntax'

54. Even if the data are not as clear as in Bosnian-Serbian-Croatian and Catalan, we also tentatively extend our hypothesis to Russian. In fact, also in this language the demonstrative can appear postnominally in the colloquial speech of highly educated people, as Michael Yadroff pointed out to us.

i. a. (eta) italianskaja reakcija (eta) [na amerikanskuju akciju] (**eta)
   'this italian reaction (this) [to the american(ACC) action(ACC)] (**this)'
   
   b. (eta) kniga (eta) moja (**eta)
   'this book (this) my (**this)'

55. In Rumanian the demonstrative in prenominal position belongs to a very high stylistic level. Stylistically high, even if in a lower rank, is also the use of the form acesta 'this' in postnominal position. In the current language, the demonstrative appears in postnominal position and in its reduced forms, as the cases in (i) show:

i. a. băiatul ăsta/ăla
   'boy(Masc.-the(Masc.) this(Masc.)/that(Masc.)'
   
   b. cartea ăsta/ăla
   'book(Fem.-the(Fem.) this(Fem.)/that(Fem.)'
We assume that, when the demonstrative appears postnominally, it occupies the specifier of a maximal projection immediately dominated by the DP, as the contrasts in (73b-c) show (cf. also the discussion in section 1.1.). Therefore, we assume that the position the demonstrative occupies in (73b) is a derived position, and not the basic one in [Spec, FP]. When the demonstrative is realized in this position, the invariable bound morpheme -a obligatorily appears on the demonstrative, giving the resulting form acesta 'this', as (73b), contrasted with (73a), shows. Giusti (1993) proposes that this morpheme should be taken as a Spec-Head agreement marker which signals the presence of the trace of the N³, moved to D³, in the head of the functional projection containing at PF the demonstrative in its specifier. On the other hand, Niculescu (see Tasmowski-De Rick, 1990 , footnote 24, p.98 ) points out that this -a has to be considered as a residual reduced form of a deictic adverb.

If we assume this second hypothesis, we could suggest that the enclitic morpheme -a should be compared to the locative reinforcer, which, having lost its unbound form in the development of the language, appears in Rumanian obligatorily ciliated on the demonstrative. A possible empirical argument in favour of this approach is that, contrary to what happens in the other Romance languages, in Rumanian the locative can never appear as reinforcer of the demonstrative, as (74) shows:

74. a. *băiatul acesta (de) aici
   'boy-the thisA here'
   b. *acest băiat (de) aici
   'this boy here'

Nevertheless, if this could account for cases such as (74a), it cannot explain why in (74b), where the demonstrative is realized in its basic form, namely without the 'locative' bound morpheme, it is any way impossible to realize the locative reinforcer.56 We leave this question open here. The only remark we should like to make is that in Rumanian the impossibility of realizing the locative reinforcer independently, prevents us from showing the base position in which the demonstrative is generated in this language.

Therefore, the null hypothesis is to assume that in Rumanian the demonstrative starts in the [Spec, FP] -see (29), (30) and (37)-, as in the other languages, and raises obligatorily to an intermediate position before SPELL-OUT.

The hypothesis that the postnominal position in which the demonstrative appears at PF is an intermediate position can be supported by observing what happens in other languages in which the demonstrative can be realized at PF in more than two positions. One of these languages is Bosnian-Serbian-Croatian. In fact, in this language, besides the base position -i.e. [Spec, FP]- and the [Spec, DP] position (cf. section 6.1.1.), the demonstrative can appear in what we define an intermediate position, as (75a) compared with the cases in (68) and the contrasts in (75b-c) show:

75. a. 2ljepi ovaj/onaj momak
   'nice this/that boy'
   b. ono američko kontrolisanje banaka
   'that american control banks(Genitive)'

56. Notice that, for some native speakers, constructions such as (74b) are well-formed if the locative de aici 'of here' is interpreted as a real adverb, and not as a locative reinforcer of the demonstrative. Nevertheless, it is interesting and at the same time quite surprising to observe that for the same speakers the locative de aici 'of here' is always impossible, even with this 'adverbial' interpretation, in cases in which the demonstrative appears postnominally in its form acesta, as in (74a).
c. američko ono kontrolisanje banaka  
‘american that control banks (Genitive)’
that american control of the banks

Another language which also displays this intermediate position, besides the basic one and the high position in [Spec, DP], is Modern Greek (cf. Giusti, 1996a), as the constructions in (76) show:

76. a. afro to oreo to vivlio tou Janis  
‘this the nice the book of Janis’
this nice book of Janis’

b. to oreo to vivlio afro tou Janis  
‘the nice the book this of Janis’

c. to oreo afro to vivlio tou Janis  
‘the nice this the book of Janis’

Therefore, on the basis of the data in Bosnian-Serbian-Croatian, (75), and in Modern Greek, (76), we extend our hypothesis to Rumanian. In this language, for reasons we are unable to account for at this point of our investigation, neither the demonstrative alone, nor the sequence ‘demonstrative+locative’, nor the locative alone can be realized in their base position. The only available positions in which the demonstrative can appear at PF is the intermediate position and the high [Spec, DP] position. So, we conclude that in Rumanian the demonstrative must obligatorily move to the intermediate position in Syntax, 57 and can optionally raise to [Spec, DP] in Syntax, but, as happens in all other languages, it must obligatorily move to [Spec, DP] at the latest at Logical Form in order to check its referential feature.

6.1.2. Languages in which the demonstrative must appear in prenominal position

Let us observe, now, what happens in those languages in which the demonstrative has to be obligatorily realized in the [Spec, DP] position at PF. In order to extend our hypothesis to these languages it is necessary to find some empirical evidence that can justify that the demonstrative, even if in [Spec, DP] at PF, starts from the low [Spec, FP] (cf. (29) and (30)).

Let us come back to the locative as deictic reinforcer of the demonstrative and to the complex structure proposed in (37). An empirical argument which can render theoretically plausible our proposal even for these languages is to detect the exact position the locative reinforcer has in the structure, given that, as we showed for Spanish, in the case in which the demonstrative moves in Syntax to [Spec, DP], the locative reinforcer remains in its base position, unless the movement in Syntax affects the entire complex, as in the cases in (34).

Let us start by examining the behaviour of the demonstrative in Italian.

In Italian, the unique possible position the demonstrative can occupy in the

57. We propose that the movement to this intermediate position is optional in Syntax for those languages such as Bosnian-Serbian-Croatian and Modern Greek which, as we have seen, also display this option.
structure is the prenominal one - i.e. the [Spec, DP] - . In this language it is possible to realize the locative element with the value of reificer of the deictic feature peculiar to the demonstrative. The two elements can appear string adjacent only when the demonstrative functions as a pronominal category. The resulting combinatorial sequences, are: questo qui ‘this here’, questo qua ‘this here’, quello li ‘that there’ and quello là ‘that there’.

When the demonstrative modifies a noun, the locative reificer always appears in postnominal position:

77. Questo libro qui non è molto interessante.  
‘this book here is not very interesting’

When the noun is modified by a ‘postnominal’ adjective, the locative qui must follow, in the unmarked word order, the adjective itself. This is true either with ‘event’ nouns, or with ‘object-denoting’ nouns, as the contrasts in (78) and (79) show:

78. a. ?Questa risposta diplomatica qui non convincerà nessuno.  
‘this reply diplomatic here will not convince anybody’

b. *Questa risposta qui diplomatica non convincerà nessuno.  
‘this reply here diplomatic will not convince anybody’

c. ?Questa risposta ministeriale qui è una vera vergogna.  
‘this reply ministerial here is a real disgrace’

d. *Questa risposta qui ministeriale è una vera vergogna.  
‘this reply here ministerial is a real disgrace’

79. a. Questo libro vecchio qui di fisica non deve essere venduto.  
‘this book old here on physics must not be sent’

b. *Questo libro qui vecchio di fisica non deve essere venduto.  
‘this book here old on physics must not be sent’

c. Questo libro inglese qui di sintassi è molto interessante.  
‘this book English here on syntax is very interesting’

d. *Questo libro qui inglese di sintassi è molto interessante.  
‘this book here English on syntax is very interesting’

Finally, as for the position the locative occupies in relation to the PP subject of the noun and the other complements of the noun, we have to confirm that also in Italian, as in Spanish, the locative reificer must always precede them, as the contrasts in (80) show:

80. a. Questa risposta qui del governo/al problema è una vera vergogna.  
‘this reply here of the Government/to the problem is a real disgrace’

b. *Questa risposta del governo/al problema qui è una vera vergogna.  
‘this reply of the Government/to the problem here is a real disgrace’

c. Questo libro qui di sintassi/di Gianni è molto interessante.  
‘this book here on syntax/of Gianni is very interesting’

d. *Questo libro di sintassi/of Gianni qui è molto interessante.  
‘this book on syntax/of Gianni here is very interesting’

58. These constructions have in common with the corresponding constructions in Spanish the two following properties: a) they are commonly used in colloquial speech; and b) the presence of the locative in postnominal position can assign a depreciatory reading to the entire nominal expression in the pragmatic ground (cf. footnote 3).
On the basis of the resulting well-formed constructions we have presented so far, we can observe that in Italian the locative reinforcer appears in the same position in which the postnominal demonstrative, the complex sequence 'demonstrative +locative' or the locative alone are realized in Spanish. Therefore, we conclude that also in Italian the demonstrative is generated in the low [Spec, FP] position, dominated by all the functional projections containing the adjectives, and which dominates either the NP or the functional projection containing the postnominal possessive. Nevertheless, contrary to Spanish, in Italian the demonstrative must obligatorily move to [Spec, DP] already in Syntax in order to check its [+REF] feature.

In French also, where the demonstrative must appear pronominally at PF, it is possible to realize the locative reinforcer. In most areas of the country, its presence in the structure has the function of making the deixis explicit, namely of expressing the different types of deictic relation between the speaker and the identified "object". In French this relation is not morphologically expressed by the demonstrative alone, given that there exists a unique demonstrative form: ce "this".

81. a. ce livre-ci
   'this book here'
   b. ce livre-là
   'that book there'

As for the position the locative reinforcer occupies in the structure, we can observe that in French the locative always follows the adjectives, (82), and always precedes the genitive PPs and the other complements of the noun, (83):

82. a. ce livre rouge-ci
   'this book red here'
   b. *ce livre-ci rouge
   'this book here red'
   c. ce livre italien-ci
   'this book Italian here'

59 In French the locative reinforcer is realized through the clitic form -ci 'here' instead of the unbound adverbial form ici 'here', (81a). Coming back to the complex structure proposed in (37), we tentatively suggest that in French the 'bare adverb' ici undergoes a cliticization process which turns it into a clitic element. For this reason it must cliticize to the lexical element which immediately dominates it in the structure e.g. the noun moved to higher positions in Syntax, or an adjective. Probably, the same proposal could be extended to the other locative form là, even tough in this case there is no morphological difference between the unbound adverbial form and its 'clitic' counterpart.

60 Notice that in French the locative can also be absent: ce livre. In this case, the demonstrative ce, receives the meaning of 'this' by default. The same is not true in some Lombard dialects of Switzerland. In these dialects also there exists a unique demonstrative form: quello. Contrary to what happens in French, the neutralization of the different types of deixis makes the presence of the locatives qui 'here' and là/là 'there' obligatory in these dialects. The locative forms always appear in their base position:

i. a. quel libro *(qui) = questo libro
   'that book here' 'this book'
   b. quel libro *(là/là) = quel libro
   'that book there' 'that book'

Thanks to Cecilia Poletto for these data.
d. *ce livre-ci italien
   'this book here Italian'

83. a. ce livre-ci de Jean
   'this book here of John'
b. *ce livre de Jean ci
   'this book of John here'
c. ce reponses-ci au probleme
   'this answer here to the problem'
d. *ce reponses au probleme ci
   'this answer to the problem here'

Given that in French the locative reinforcer always appears in the same position in which the postnominal demonstrative - (10) and (45)-, the complex sequence 'demonstrative +locative' and the locative alone are realized in Spanish, we extend our hypothesis also to this language.

Moreover, we can observe the same results in German, as the cases in (84) show:

84. a. dieses Buch hier
   'this book here'
b. dieses schöne Buch hier von Hans
   'this nice book here of Hans'
c. *dieses schöne Buch von Hans hier
   'this nice book of Hans here'

and, among other languages, in Albanian, 62 as the contrasts in (85) and (86) show:

85. a. ky libr-i këtu
   'this(Nom.) book-the(Nom.) here'
b. ky libr-i i kuq këtu
   'this book-the I red here'
c. *ky libr-i këtu i kuq
   'this book-the I red here'
d. ky reagim-i i shpëtitë këtu
   'this reaction-the I quick here'
e. *ky reagim-i këtu i shpëtitë
   'this reaction-the here I quick'

86. a. ky libr-i (i kuq) këtu mbi sintakën
   'this book-the (I red) here on syntax-the(Acc.)'
b. *ky libr-i (i kuq) mbi sintakën këtu
   'this book-the (I red) on syntax-the(Acc.) here'

61. For some native speakers the construction in (83b) is well-formed even if the locative reinforcer follows the genitive PP. Nevertheless, in this case, the unique possible reading the construction can receive is with a strong contrastive stress on the entire DP ce livre de Jean 'this book of John', giving as resulting interpretation something like: 'this book of John here, and not the other book(s) of John'. On the other hand, in the construction (82a), excluding the possible intonational break between the locative and the genitive PP, no element which compounds it receives a contrastive stress. Rather the entire projection receives an informative value.

62. Thanks to Dalina Kallulli for her helpful comments on the Albanian data.
c. ky reagim-i (i shpijtë) këtu ndaj problemit
   'this reaction-the I quick here to problem-the(Abl.)'

d. *ky reagim-i (i shpijtë) ndaj problemit këtu
   'this reaction-the I quick to problem-the(Abl.) here'

So, we propose, that also in those languages in which the demonstrative must appear in [Spec, DP] at PF, the demonstrative is generated in the same position we have found for Spanish, and, among others, for Catalan and Bosnian-Serbian-Croatian. The empirical evidence which brings us to generalize in this sense is given by the position the locative reinforcer occupies inside the nominal extended projection in these languages, as we have shown in this section. The difference between Italian, French, German, Albanian, etc., on the one hand, and Spanish, Catalan, Bosnian-Serbian-Croatian, Russian, Rumanian, Modern Greek, etc., on the other, is that in the first group of languages the demonstrative does not have the possibility of remaining in its base position at PF, or, in some cases, of appearing in an intermediate position; rather it must move to [Spec, DP] already in Syntax.

6.1.3. Languages in which the demonstrative must appear in postnominal position

In other languages, the demonstrative must be realized in a postnominal position at PF. It can never raise to [Spec, DP] in Syntax.

As for these languages, we assume that the crucial empirical evidence in favour of our idea to extend to them our hypothesis is represented by the position the demonstrative occupies in the structure in relation to the other categories which belong to the extended nominal projection. We assume that also these languages display the internal nominal structure proposed by Cinque (1993,1994) -see (11) and (14) and the modifications we introduced in (29) and (30)-.

The first language which belongs to this group is Hebrew. 63 In Hebrew, the demonstrative must appear in postnominal position. Its presence at PF in [Spec, DP] is excluded, (87).

87. a. ha-tšuvat ha-zot/ha-hi
   'the-answer(Fem.) this(Fem.)/that(Fem.)'

b. *ha-zot/ha-hi ha-tšuvat
   'this(Fem.)/that(Fem.) the-answer(Fem.)'

c. ha-sefer ha-ze/ha-hu
   'the-book(Masc.) the-nice(Masc.) this(Masc.)/that(Masc.)'

d. *ha-ze/ha-hu ha-sefer
   'this(Masc.)/that(Masc.) the-book(Masc.)'

If, in the same structure, an adjective is realized, the demonstrative always follows this modifier, (88a,c), and can never precede it, (88b,d).

88. a. ha-tšuvat ha-mešanyenet ha-zot/ha-hi
   'the-answer(Fem.) the-interesting this(Fem.)/that(Fem.)'

b. *ha-tšuvat ha-zot/ha-hi ha-mešanyenet
   'the-answer(Fem.) this(Fem.)/that(Fem.) the-interesting’

---

63 We are grateful to Uri Shlonsky for the data in Hebrew and for his helpful suggestions.
c. ha-sefer ha-yafe ha-ze/ha-hu
   'the-book(Masc.) the-nice(Masc.) this(Masc.)/that(Masc.)'

d. *ha-sefer ha-ze/ha-hu ha-yafe
   'the-book(Masc.) this(Masc.)/that(Masc.) the-nice(Masc.)'

The cases in (88) show that the demonstrative in Hebrew appears, with respect to the adjectives, in the same position we found for Spanish.

We have the same results we presented for Spanish when the demonstrative cooccurs with complements of the noun. In these cases, in fact, the demonstrative always precedes the subject and the other complements of the noun:

89. a. ha-tšuva (ha-me anyenet) ha-zot šel Dani/la-še'ela 64
    'the answer (the-interesting) this of Dani/to-the-problem'

   b. *ha-tšuva (ha-me anyenet) šel Dani/la-še'ela ha-zot...
      'the answer (the-interesting) of Dani/to-the-problem this'

c. ha-sefer (ha-yafe) ha-ze Šal taxbīr/šel Dani
    'the-book (the-nice) this on syntax/of Dani'

d. *ha-sefer (ha-yafe) Šal taxbīr/šel Dani ha-ze
    'the-book (the-nice) on syntax/of Dani this'

Furthermore, in Hebrew the demonstrative can be reinforced by a locative element. The resulting complex sequences ha-ze kan ‘this here’ and ha-hu sham ‘that there’ cannot be separated by any category, and appear in the same position in which the demonstrative alone appears inside the nominal projection, as (90) shows:

90. a. ha-sefer ha-yafe ha-ze kan šel Dani (*kan)
    'the-book the-nice this here of Dani (*here)'

   b. ha-sefer ha-yafe ha-hu sham šel Dani (*sham)
    'the-book the-nice that there of Dani (*there)'

Another language, unrelated to Hebrew, in which the demonstrative must appear in a low position at PF is Irish. As (91) shows, in Irish the demonstrative forms seo ‘this’ and sin ‘that’ must be realized in postnominal position: 65

91. a. an fear seo/sin
    'the man this/that'

   b. an leabhar seo/sin
    'the book this'

64. Notice that also in construct state constructions the demonstrative occupies the same position with respect to adjectives and complements of the noun, as (i) shows:

   i. a. beyt ha-more AP ha-ze PP
      'home the teacher AP this PP'

   b. *beyt ha-more AP ha-ze PP

   c. *beyt ha-more AP PP ha-ze

65. The Irish data comes from Ernst (1992) and Ball (ed., 1993), given that we were not able to gather them with native speakers. Thanks also to Paolo Acquaviva. Ernst, studying the syntactic behaviour of the demonstrative in Irish, excludes any movement process and suggests that the demonstrative is located in a right branch adjoined to NP and immediately dominated by the genitive phrase, also right--adjoined to NP. As for the reason why we do not adopt Ernst’s hypothesis, we also refer the reader to footnote 7.
Moreover, as happens in Hebrew, the demonstrative can never precede the adjective, as the ungrammaticality of (92b) shows, and, at the same time, it can never follow a complement of the noun, as the ungrammaticality of (93b) shows. In Irish, the demonstrative appears in a structural position lower than the positions the adjectives occupy, (92a), and immediately superior to the NP projection, (93a).

92.  a.  an leabhar nua seo
    ‘the book new this’

   b.  *an leabhar seo nua
       ‘the book this new’

93.  a.  an leabhar (nua) seo faoi teangaíochtaí
       ‘the book (new) this on linguistics’

   b.  *an leabhar (nua) faoi teangaíochtaí seo
       ‘the book (new) on linguistics this’

The syntactic behaviour of the demonstrative in Hebrew and Irish does not give rise to theoretical problems for the analysis we are proposing in this paper. Rather there is evidence to extend it to these languages, since in these languages the demonstrative occupies the same position that the postnominal demonstrative and the sequence ‘demonstrative+locative’ occupy in Spanish.

Therefore, we conclude that in languages such as Hebrew and Irish the demonstrative is realized in its base position at PF. 66 What distinguishes these two languages from languages such as Spanish and Italian is that in Hebrew and Irish the movement of the demonstrative to [Spec, DP] can be neither optional nor obligatory in Syntax. Rather that it must move to this position only at Logical Form in order to check its [+REF] feature.

66. We extend our analysis also to Welsh. In this language, in fact, the demonstrative always appears in postnominal position, as happens in Irish:

   i.  a.  y dyn hwn/yn
      ‘the man this/that’

   b.  y ferch hon/yn
      ‘the girl this/that’

      (from Ball (ed.), 1993, p.314)

Moreover, even though it seems that the demonstrative and the locative cannot cooccur in the structure, the locative can appear alone with feminine and masculine nouns, and it is interpreted as a demonstrative, (ii).

   ii.  a.  y dyn yma/yna
      ‘the man here/there’ = ‘this/that man’

   b.  y ferch yma/yna
      ‘the girl here/there’ = ‘this/that girl’

      (from Ball (ed.), 1993, p.314)

We tentatively extend to these cases the proposal suggested for the same constructions in Spanish (see footnote 27).

62. **The general hypothesis**

In section 5 we provided strong evidence to assume that in Spanish the demonstrative, even when it appears in postnominal position, is in any case interpreted in [Spec, DP], given that only in this position it can check, through Spec-
Head Agreement, the [+REF] feature we showed it is specified for, (47). This requirement allows us to justify the existence of a strict relationship between the two positions in which the demonstrative can appear -i.e. [Spec, DP] and [Spec, FP]-, and consequently, to propose that in Spanish the demonstrative is generated in [Spec, FP] -cfr. (29) and (30). The demonstrative raises to [Spec, DP] optionally before SPELL-OUT but obligatorily at Logical Form (51).

In section 6.1, we presented the syntactic behaviour of the demonstrative in other languages in order to ascertain whether it is possible to extend to them the analysis we have proposed for the demonstrative in Spanish. We showed that there is evidence to assume that cross-linguistically the demonstrative is generated in a low position inside the extended nominal projection, namely in the [Spec, FP] position. Moreover, given that the interpretation of the demonstrative is the same across languages, we have proposed that even in those languages in which this element can appear only in the base position it must in any case move to [Spec, DP] at Logical Form in order to check its [+REF] feature.

According to Chomsky’s (1993) minimalist program, a type of variation across languages depends on whether a particular feature is strong -i.e. the checking process occurs already at PF- or weak -i.e. the checking process must be carried out only at Logical Form. If it is strong, and the checking process implicates a movement rule, the movement must take place before SPELL-OUT, otherwise if the same feature is weak the movement must take place after SPELL-OUT, namely at Logical Form.

Therefore, we formulate, for the demonstrative, the following parametrized principle:

94. Checking the [+REF] feature in Spec.DP is obligatory by Logical Form.\(^{67}\)
   a. the Demonstrative checks its [+REF] feature in [Spec, DP] before SPELL-OUT when this feature is strong;
   b. the Demonstrative checks its [+REF] feature in [Spec, DP] after SPELL-OUT when this feature is weak.

(94) can account for the syntactic behaviour of the demonstrative in all the languages we have examined until now.

(94a) accounts for the behaviour of the demonstrative we observe in Italian, (77)-(80), French, (81)-(83), German, (84), and Albanian, (85)-(86). In languages such as these, the demonstrative always appears in [Spec, DP] because, with its [+REF] feature being strong, it has to be checked already in Syntax.

On the other hand, (94b) accounts for the behaviour of the demonstrative in Hebrew, (87)-(90), and Irish, (91)-(93). Since the [+REF] feature on the demonstrative is weak in languages such these, the checking via movement must take place only at Logical Form, and, for this reason, at PF the demonstrative must be realized in its base position.

Finally, as for languages such as Spanish, Catalan, (61)-(67), Bosnian-Serbian-Croatian, (68)-(72), Russian (footnote 54), Rumanian, (73)-(74), and Modern Greek, (76), we assume that the [+REF] feature on the demonstrative shares both the strong and weak properties. The fact that these languages choose either of the two options in (94) can account for the optionality for the demonstrative to appear before SPELL-OUT either in its base position or in [Spec, DP].\(^{68}\)

\(^{67}\) Recall that this universal requirement agrees with what is assumed in Longobardi (1994).

\(^{68}\) Notice that, from a theoretical point of view, it would be better to avoid resorting to both (94a) and (94b) in order to derive the optionality that these languages display. Nevertheless, it seems to us the only way of capturing this phenomenon. Moreover, we know that cases of redundancy exist in the languages, and that the Grammar should be able to accommodate them.
7. Conclusions

We have proposed that in Spanish there exists another functional projection, inside the extended nominal projection, in which the demonstrative is generated; and the position the demonstrative occupies is the specifier of this functional projection. Starting from the idea to provide a unified analysis for pairs such as (95) and (96):

95. a. esta reacción al problema
   ‘this reaction to the problem’
   b. la reacción esta al problema
   ‘the reaction this to the problem’

96. a. este libro gordo de sintaxis
   ‘this book big on syntax’
   b. el libro gordo este de sintaxis
   ‘the book big this on syntax’

and adopting the fundamental assumptions of the antisymmetric hypothesis (Kayne, 1994) and the hypothesis proposed by Cinque (1993, 1994) on the internal structure of nominals and the movement of the noun, we have shown that:

a. the postnominal demonstrative is realized in the specifier of a functional projection lower than all the other functional projections containing the different classes of adjectives;

b. the functional projection which contains the postnominal demonstrative immediately dominates either the functional projection containing the postnominal possessive, if any, or the NP projection, given that the postnominal demonstrative has to precede the postnominal possessive, the PP subject of the noun and all other PPs complements of the noun, (95b) and (96b);

c. a locative element can optionally cooccur with the demonstrative. This element has the function to reinforce the deictic value of the demonstrative itself. Demonstrative and locative establish a predication relation which undergoes the constituency tests, and the complex sequence ‘demonstrative+locative’ -e.g. este de aquí ‘this [of] here’- or the locative alone -e.g. de aquí ‘of [of] here’- appear at PF in the same position occupied by the postnominal demonstrative;

d. a noun modified by a demonstrative behaves like a referential nominal expression; and a noun modified by a postnominal demonstrative is subject to the same referential interpretation which characterizes the demonstrative when it appears in [Spec, DP] at PF.

Therefore, we have proposed that the demonstrative is specified for the features [+Referential] and [+Deictic]. Assuming that the referential interpretation takes place inside the DP, following Longobardi (1994), we have also proposed that the demonstrative must check its [+Referential] feature in [Spec, DP] through Spec-Head Agreement. These requirements have led us to claim that the demonstrative is generated in the [Spec, FP] of the functional projection whose position in the structure has been determined in (a) and (b), and that the demonstrative must move from [Spec, FP] to [Spec, DP] for checking reasons. Therefore, the [Spec, DP] position is a derived position for the demonstrative.

Since in Spanish the demonstrative displays the option to appear either in its base position, (95a) and (96a), or in [Spec, DP], (95b) and (96b), at PF, we have proposed that the movement rule on the demonstrative can apply optionally before SPELL-OUT but obligatorily at Logical Form.

If the demonstrative does not move to [Spec, DP] in Syntax, (95b) and (96b), the definite article must be realized in D² in order to signal also at PF that this position
contains some particular feature -i.e. the [+REF] feature- which prevents it from being interpreted as existential (cf. Giusti, 1996a-b).

Finally, we have tried to extend our hypothesis for Spanish to other languages. We have examined the syntactic behaviour of the demonstrative in three different groups of languages not necessarily related one with the other: 1) languages where the demonstrative can be realized in prenominal and in postnominal position -Catalan, Bosnian-Serbian-Croatian, Russian, Rumanian, Modern Greek, etc.-; 2) languages where the demonstrative has to appear in prenominal position at PF -Italian, French, German, Albanian, etc.-; and 3) languages where the demonstrative has to be realized in postnominal position at PF -Hebrew, Irish (Celtic), etc.-. We have shown that in all these three groups either the demonstrative, or the complex sequence ‘demonstrative+locative’, or the locative reineforcer alone, occupy the same position the postnominal demonstrative or the complex sequence este de aquí ‘this [of] here’ or the locative reineforcer de aquí ‘[of] here’ occupy in Spanish. Therefore, since we have assumed that the demonstrative has to check its [+Referential] feature in [Spec, DP] in all languages, we have proposed that cross-linguistically the demonstrative is generated in the same position we found for Spanish -i.e. [Spec, FP]-.

We have thus proposed the existence of a parametrized principle to account for the different positions the demonstrative can or must occupy at PF across languages. This principle is based on the weak/strong properties -in Chomsky’s (1993) terms- of the [+Referential] feature peculiar to the demonstrative itself. In those languages in which the demonstrative obligatorily raises to [Spec, DP] before SPELL-OUT, the [+REF] feature of the demonstrative is strong. In these cases, the base position from which the demonstrative starts can be recovered by the optional realization of the locative reineforcer. On the other hand, in those languages in which the demonstrative does not move before SPELL-OUT, the same [+REF] feature of the demonstrative is weak. In these cases the movement has to take place only at Logical Form. Finally, in those languages in which the demonstrative can optionally raise from its base position -i.e. [Spec, FP]- to [Spec, DP] before SPELL-OUT, as in Spanish, the [+REF] feature of the demonstrative shares both the weak and strong properties.
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