arcable que en català antic
o component de manera en
nt exemple, on sembla que
i una manera de moviment

e qualque condició serà no
elladures que seran exides
grana que serà garbillada

que és aquella que apareix
a el següent exemple del

ntiça ab la ortaliça fresca

eneral, és una llengua
mponent de Trajecte en
a generalització de verbs
canvi d'estat i lloc, amb
la pèrdua de la capacitat
, de permetre l'alternant
art, el modern i la resta
den adscriure al sistema
abundància de verbs de
, predicats de moviment
x, que indica el trajecte,
refixats de canvi d'estat
tal com el prefix manté
ar un trajecte abstracte.
avorir la generalització
refix com a codificador
ment en el satèl·lit. Per
d'alternança locativa no
rquè l'alternant possible
le lloc, justament el que

THE LEFT PERIPHERY OF NOMINAL CONSTRUCTIONS AND THE EVOLUTION OF DEFINITE DETERMINERS IN ROMANCE[1]

FRANCESC ROCA
Universitat de Girona

ABSTRACT

In this chapter we analyze the syntactic and semantic properties of demonstratives and the definite article in Old and Modern Spanish, and relate them to the evolution of definite determiners from Latin to the Romance languages. We also provide a formal account of these properties and the diachronic change involved on the basis of a series of functional projections in the syntactic periphery of nominal structures.

17.1. INTRODUCTION

The aim of this chapter is twofold. From a strictly empirical point of view, it analyzes the syntactic and semantic properties of demonstratives and the definite article in Spanish. We take into account the behavior of these determiners in Modern and Old Spanish and we relate it to the role of definite determiners in the grammar of nominal expressions and to their diachronic evolution from Latin to the Romance languages. This description is connected to an analysis, within the generative framework, of nominal expressions as DP-projections with a fully articulated functional structure that, in certain aspects, parallels the clausal structure. In this sense, we argue that a complex functional structure inspired by the Force – Fin and Topic – Focus systems of the split CP-hypothesis (see Rizzi 1997) is able to cover the main syntactic and semantic properties of definite determiners in

Spanish (and, more generally, in Romance) as well as the grammaticalization process they undergo. More precisely, we consider that the interpretation of determiners is linked to the features of the functional projections in the D-domain and that their evolution follows from the way definite determiners, along with other grammatical particles and nominal constituents, are merged to this functional structure.

The next section of this chapter is a short overview of the main theoretical points underlying our proposal that may help the reader not familiarized with recent developments of functional projections within the generative framework. In section 17.3. we analyze some instances of the cooccurrence of two definite determiners, which constitute an important piece of evidence for the view of the D-layer as a complex structure, and we extend the analysis of a complex DP-structure to several determiners in Spanish according to their syntactic position and semantic interpretation. Section 17.4. is a brief review of the main changes the forms and systems of demonstratives have undergone from Latin to Romance. Section 17.5. constitutes the bulk of the empirical data examined. Here we study the syntax and semantics of demonstratives in Old and Modern Spanish. We conclude that some important differences hold between the two periods with regard to the demonstrative system and to the way the use of definite determiners was progressively extending to several syntactic contexts. Finally, in 17.6. we analyze the evolution of those determiners in terms of the complex DP-structure we propose, which proves to be especially adequate for the syntactic and semantic characterization of recent approaches to the grammaticalization process traditionally associated to these grammatical items.

17.2. THE SYNTACTIC STRUCTURE OF NOMINAL EXPRESSIONS AND SENTENCES

17.2.1. Functional projections

Abney (1987) proposed that determiners project their own DP-phrase structure outside the lexical domain of the noun phrase (NP). The representation in (1a) expresses this general idea applied to a simple instance of nominal expression like *the book* in (1b):

(1) a. $[_{DP} [_{D'} D [NP]$

    b. $[_{DP} [_{D'} the [_{NP} book]$

The NP is the complement of a functional D-head occupied by the definite article, as in (1), or by any determiner (demonstratives, indefinites, etc.). This treatment of nominal expressions as determiner phrases (DPs), which has been generally assumed within the generative grammar framework, had, as one of its consequences, the consideration of pronouns as "intransitive" determiners (i.e., as D-heads not having any NP complement whatsoever). Although the core idea

of Abney's propo
D-head, which w
unaltered, during
semantic notion l
Rowlett 2007). A
host for all the ele
between definite
and quantifiers (

Further resea
unable to captur
and that more fu
all elements inc
crosslinguistic d
cooccurrence of
objections which
noticed among
Here we limit c
cooccurrence of
determiners we

In Spanish
or postnomina
construction, (3

(2) *este* libr

(3) el libro

    the boo

    'this bo

In order to e
attempt to sum
but, just in ord
consider that m

(i) A single
Giusti 1997, 20
projections (Fl
article is in D
of those functi
nominal expre
positions (spec
like the one in

ammaticalization process
retation of determiners is
D-domain and that their
g with other grammatical
tional structure.

e main theoretical points
familiarized with recent
ve framework. In section
vo definite determiners,
view of the D-layer as
omplex DP-structure to
c position and semantic
changes the forms and
Romance. Section 17.5.
ve study the syntax and
We conclude that some
rd to the demonstrative
progressively extending
the evolution of those
ppose, which proves to
racterization of recent
ly associated to these

EXPRESSIONS AND

n DP-phrase structure
representation in (1a)
ominal expression like

upied by the definite
ndefinites, etc.). This
Ps), which has been
rk, had, as one of its
" determiners (i.e.,
though the core idea

of Abney's proposal (i.e., that nominal expressions are headed by the functional D-head, which would be empty under certain conditions) has remained practically unaltered, during the last years it has been argued that the label D should stand for a semantic notion like "definiteness", rather than that of "determiner" (see Lyons 1999, Rowlett 2007). According to this, the category D would be no longer an appropriate host for all the elements traditionally considered determiners, and a clear distinction between definite determiners (= D), on the one hand, and indefinite determiners and quantifiers (≠ D), on the other, would arise.

Further research during the 90s revealed that the structure in (1) was actually unable to capture all the phenomena related to determiners in natural languages and that more functional structure was necessary. Facts like the differences among all elements included in the set of definite determiners, the existence of great crosslinguistic differences concerning the syntactic position of determiners or the cooccurrence of two definite determiners in some languages constituted serious objections which had to be added to the syntactic and semantic differences initially noticed among definite determiners, indefinite determiners, and quantifiers. Here we limit ourselves to illustrate only one of these empirical objections: the cooccurrence of the definite article and the demonstrative (which are the two determiners we will focus on in the rest of the chapter).

In Spanish a demonstrative determiner can appear prenominally, (2), or postnominally if the definite article is introducing the whole nominal construction, (3):

(2) *este* libro 'this book'; *aquella* chica 'that girl'; *ese* coche 'this car'

(3) el libro *este*; la chica *aquella*; el coche   *ese*

     the book this the girl that   the car   this

     'this book; that girl; this car'

In order to explain that, several hypotheses have been put forward. Certainly any attempt to summarize (and simplify) them in a few paragraphs is risky and unfair, but, just in order to provide the reader with a very general idea, we will roughly consider that most analyses were built on one of the two following ideas:

(i) A single D-head. According to this (see Cinque 1994, Brugè 1996, 2002, Giusti 1997, 2001, Bernstein 1997), there is a unique D-head, and several functional projections (FP) occur between D and the lexical NP-projection. The definite article is in D and the demonstrative is generated in the specifier position of one of those functional projections, in a way closer to the analysis of adjectives within nominal expressions. From that position, the demonstrative can move to higher positions (specifiers or heads, depending on the author). The structure would be like the one in (4).

$$(4) \quad [_{DP} \ D \ [_{FP'} \ F_1 \ [_{FP} \ F_2 \ \ldots\ldots \ [_{FP} \ Dem \ F_n \ [_{NP} \ \ldots\ldots \ ] \ ] \ ] \ ] \ ]$$

In an example like *el libro este* the definite article is in D, the demonstrative remains in the specifier of a lower functional projection, and the noun raises to the highest functional head F_1. The derivation of a prenominal demonstrative like *este libro* implies the absence of the definite article and the movement of the demonstrative to the highest functional projection of the DP.

(ii) Multiple D-heads. This approach (see Cornilescu 1992, Roca 1997, Zamparelli 2000, Den Dikken 2006) is based on the presence of at least two D-heads. The highest one corresponds to the definite article, whereas the lowest is linked to the demonstrative (other functional heads would be located between D_2 and NP):

$$(5) \quad [_{DP} \ D_1 \ [_{DP} \ D_2 \ \ldots\ldots \ [_{NP} \ \ldots\ldots \ ] \ ] \ ] \qquad D_1 = \text{Def. Art.} \quad D_2 = \text{Dem.}$$

The cooccurrence of the definite article and the demonstrative (*el libro este*) involves the overt realization of the two D-heads and is derived through movement of the NP to a specifier located between the two determiners. In the simplest case, where only two D-heads would be present, as in (5), such position would be the specifier of D_2. In the construction with a prenominal demonstrative (*este libro*), this determiner moves to D_1 and the NP may occupy the same syntactic position.

But the discussion on the properties of the functional categories in nominal expressions is not restricted to the amount of D-heads needed. Several authors have claimed that there are strong parallelisms between C (or CP) and D (or DP) (see, for instance, Valois 1991, Szabolcsi 1994, Kayne 1994, or Bernstein 2001). For example, the fact that both categories "close" the lexical VP- and NP-projections yielding a "complete" sentence or nominal expression or that they are crucial for the semantic interpretation and the syntactic distribution of the whole construction. This can be represented, very schematically, as follows:

$$(6) \quad \text{a. Clausal structure} \qquad [_{CP} \ C \ F_1 \ldots F_2 \ldots F_n \ [_{VP} \ \ldots\ldots \ ] \ ] \qquad C = C/D$$

$$ \quad \text{b. Nominal structure} \qquad [_{DP} \ D \ F_1 \ldots F_2 \ldots F_n \ [_{NP} \ \ldots\ldots \ ] \ ] \qquad D = C/D$$

The functional categories appearing between C/D and the lexical phrase correspond to the syntactic realization of the grammatical features (tense, case, person, number, gender, etc.) carried by verbs and nouns, and usually realized as inflectional morphemes or independent particles. Here we will not discuss the nature of these functional projections and, from this point on, we will refer to all of them as IP (Inflectional Phrase), a generic label that will cover tense, aspect, agreement specifications, etc. usually associated to verbs, in the case of sentences, and gender, number, etc. in the case of nominal constructions.

17.2.2. Multiple interfaces

The preceding analysis of clausal and nominal constructions distinguishes three different structural levels: a lower level, where the lexical item V or N and their arguments are projected; an intermediate level, with functional projections with purely grammatical content linked to the formal features of verbs and nouns; and a higher level, formed by functional categories the properties of which allow us to insert the sentence or the nominal expression in the discourse, as well as to determine the interpretation of the whole construction and the syntactic distribution of some of its internal constituents. Platzack (2001), focusing on the analysis of clausal structure, argues that this tripartition of the structure actually produces three interface levels: (i) the level of the *Thematic Form*, which is related to the lexical VP-projection and where thematic relations hold between V and its complements; (ii) the level of the *Grammatical Form*, where operations driven by inflectional features like verbal agreement or tense occur; and (iii) the level of *Discourse Form*, which corresponds to CP (interrogative elements, focalization, etc.). Platzack's work led several authors (Grohmann and Panagiotidis 2004, 2005, Marinis 2004) to consider that the same syntactic domains can be found in both nominal and clausal structure, going back to the parallelism between clauses and nominal expressions: the Θ-domain for the thematic relations of V or N, the Φ-domain for their inflectional features, and the Ω-domain for semantic relations linked to foci, operators, etc.:

(7) a. Clausal structure   __CP__   __IP__   __(vP) VP__

                     Ω Φ Θ

     b. Nominal structure   __DP__   __IP__   __(nP) NP__

                     Ω Φ Θ

17.2.3. Split domains

We have already hinted that the intermediate level (the Φ-domain) may be integrated by more than one single projection. But, in fact, this remark holds for the three syntactic domains. In the case of the lexical domain, several VP-shells and NP-shells may exist in addition to small v and n, depending on the nature of the lexical head and its arguments (see Larson 1988, Chomsky 1995). Early work on the functional domain immediately above VP soon identified projections such as subject/object agreement, tense or aspect for sentences, and number, case or gender for nominal expressions (see Pollock 1989, Belletti 1990, Ritter 1991, Cinque 1999, 2002). However, leaving aside some analyses that noticed the need to postulate a certain kind of CP-recursion and/or recursive adjunction to CP in order to accommodate all the elements appearing at the beginning (or left periphery) of the sentence, it was not until Rizzi's (1997) seminal work when several functional projections proliferated within the highest domain (see, for instance, Benincà 2001, Poletto 2000, Rizzi 2004a).

Rizzi's proposal, known as the *split-CP hypothesis*, divides the category C into two functional heads: Force and Finiteness (Fin). Force is linked to discursive facts and, in that sense, it is conceived as "more external" than Fin, which, on the contrary, is concerned with properties related to the inflectional functional domain of the sentence. The two syntactic heads form the Force – Fin system, which allows for the optional presence of other functional projections like, in Rizzi's original proposal, Topic and Focus. These projections would account for the interpretation of wh-phrases, left-dislocated constituents, topicalized elements, etc. The resulting structure is the one in (8), which captures the cooccurrence of topicalized constituents with a complementizer, (9a), a relative pronoun, (9b), and a wh-phrase, (9c), in Italian (examples from Rizzi 1997: 288-289):[2]

(8) $[_{ForP}$ Force $[_{TopP}$ Topic $[_{FocP}$ Foc $[_{FinP}$ Fin .... $]]]]$

(9) a. Credo *che il tuo libro* loro lo apprezzerebbero molto.

     'I believe that your book, they would appreciate it a lot.'

    b. un uomo *a cui, il premio Nobel*, lo daranno senz'altro

     'a man to whom, the Nobel Prize, they will give it undoubtedly'

    c. Mi domando, *il premio Nobel, a chi* lo potrebbero dare.

     'I wonder, the Nobel Prize, to whom they will give it undoubtedly.'

The split-CP hypothesis has recently been extended to nominal constructions. Haegeman (2004) proposes a split-DP structure along these lines to account for the parametric variation noticed in possessor extraction between languages like Hungarian and Modern Greek, on the one hand, and Germanic languages, on the other. Haegeman argues that prenominal possessors appear in different specifier positions: Spec, Dfin (Dfin = Fin) and Spec, F. The structures she provides are the following (D = Dfin; F is a higher functional projection closer to Focus):[3]

(10) a.   Germanic: $[_{FP} [_{DP}$ possessor$_i [_{D'}$ pronoun$_i [_{IP}$ ... $[$ NP $]]]]]$

    b.   Hungarian: $[_{FP}$ possessor $[_{DP} [_{D'}$ *az* $[_{IP}$ ... $[$ NP $]]]]]$

---

2   Some authors consider that there are more functional projections in this domain. But the basic status of the Force – Fin system is always preserved. Rizzi himself argues for the convenience of having two Topic positions to analyze Italian examples like (ii):
    (i) [Force [Topic* [Foc [Topic* [Fin ....]]]]]
    (ii) Credo che a Gianni, QUESTO, domani, gli dovremmo dire.
      'I believe that to Gianni, THIS, tomorrow we should say.' (Rizzi 1997: 295)
   For the time being, we will only take into account the structure in (8). The possible presence of other functional projections would not interfere whatsoever with our future remarks on it.

3   There are syntactic differences between the two specifier positions. According to Haegeman, Spec, Dfin is an A-position, whereas Spec, F is an A'-position. Besides, the elements in Spec, F can receive a focal stress (as prenominal possessors in Modern Greek).

Marinis (2004) also considers that the functional structure in (8) can be generally applied to Modern Greek possessive constructions, in which the Possessor precedes the Possessum, (11a), and to Determiner Spreading constructions, (11b):[4]

(11) a. Pira *tu* *Niku* to vivlio.

took the-GEN Niku-GEN the-ACC book-ACC

'I took Niko's book.'

b. Aghorasa *to* meghalo *to* petrino *to* spiti.

bought the big the stone-made the house

'I bought the big house, made of stone.'

In both constructions, the elements in the left periphery of the nominal expression (*tu Niku* and *to meghalo*) must be interpreted either as focalized or as topicalized and, accordingly, they are taken to appear in the specifer position of a functional projection above Fin. Analyses of DPs in Modern Greek as structures containing this kind of complex left periphery did not stop there. Several authors also used it to account for the syntactic distribution of demonstratives (see 17.3.1.).

17.2.4. Some remarks on the nature of Topic – Focus and Force – Fin

Up to this point, we have reviewed how the functional field above the lexical VP- and NP-projections has progressively increased during the last decades. Such an increment has been based on theoretical and empirical grounds and developed in a parallel way for both VPs (clausal structure) and NPs (structure of nominal expressions). The resulting complex structure can be divided into three domains, which enable us to capture the syntactic distribution and the semantic interpretation of several constituents that appear in sentences and in nominal expressions cross-linguistically. The three domains correspond to CP or DP (Ω-domain), to the IP projections (Φ-domain), and to the lexical projections VP/vP and NP/nP (Θ-domain). Consistent with the parallelisms drawn between CP and DP, a general "split Ω-domain hypothesis" can be put forward to account for the properties of the highest functional projections in both verbal and nominal constructions:

(12) Split CP

$[_{ForP}$ For $[_{TopP}$ Top $[_{FocP}$ Foc $[_{FinP}$ Fin $[_{IP}$ ...... $[_{vP}$ ... [VP]]]]]]

Split DP

$[_{ForP}$ For $[_{TopP}$ Top $[_{FocP}$ Foc $[_{FinP}$ Fin $[_{IP}$ ...... $[_{nP}$ ... [NP]]]]]]

---

4   Marinis (2004) provides further evidence from acquisition data that show the relevance of the three syntactic domains and, more specifically, of the left periphery projections in these constructions.

However, we must be very careful about the parallelism drawn between Topic – Focus in sentences and Topic – Focus in nominals. It is hard to believe that the semantic partition between topic and comment, and focus and presupposition that appears in sentences (see Rizzi 1997) makes complete sense inside DPs, because nominal expressions do not entail such a semantic partition at all. Although a DP may be interpreted, according to its own grammatical specifications, as focus or topic when it is included in a sentence, and although some DP-internal constituents may be focalized in certain contexts, the same semantic opposition that shows up in sentences is not present inside the DP. Thus, we propose to "reinterpret" these functional projections in DPs as heads with akin values relevant to the semantic and syntax of nominal constructions like, for instance, anaphoric and deictic features or, as Eguren (in press) claims for the case of nominal ellipsis in Spanish, contrastive focus.

Apart from that, we know that sentences bear their own modality, but nominal expressions lack it. Given that modality is also linked to the higher functional projections in sentences, the above objection may be extended to the whole Force – (Top – Foc –) Fin system. In order to avoid it, we will consider that the Force – Fin heads are responsible for other kind of semantic values, like definiteness or generic interpretations that are relevant to the syntactic distribution of the nominal expression. The extension of the Force – Fin and Topic – Focus systems to nominal expressions we will assume in this chapter is built on this adaptation of the values of the functional heads to the nominal properties.

17.3. LEFT PERIPHERY AND DEFINITE DETERMINERS

In this section we apply the split-DP structure in (12) to the syntactic and semantic properties of determiners in Spanish. We will mainly deal with the definite article and the demonstrative determiner, and we will relate the Force – Fin system to the two determiner system $D_1 - D_2$ given in (5) as one possible explanation for the cooccurrence of the definite article and the demonstrative.

17.3.1. The cooccurrence of definite determiners

The definite article and the demonstrative can cooccur within the same nominal construction in Spanish and Greek, among other languages. A clear difference between these two languages is that in the case of Spanish, (13), the order between the two determiners is strictly fixed (Def Art + N + Dem), whereas in Greek, (14), two different orderings are possible:[5]

(13) a. *el* coche (nuevo) *este* (nuevo)

     the car new this new

---

5   All the Greek examples are from Grohmann and Panagiotidis (2004, 2005) or Panagiotidis (2000).

b. *este el coche nuevo

c. *el este coche nuevo

(14) a. ta nea afta fenomena

the new these phenomena

b. afta ta nea fenomena

Grohmann and Panagiotidis (2004, 2005) provide an analysis of the Greek data in terms of a complex-DP periphery with Topic, Focus and Fin projections. Their analysis can be summarized as follows: (i) demonstratives (which may be overt determiners or covert operators) move to Spec, Focus or to Spec, Topic in order to achieve, respectively, their deictic or their anaphoric interpretation; (ii) the overt demonstrative may remain in situ (in the Φ–domain or IP) or move to Spec, Fin as a previous step to possible further movements; (iii) the definite article is a resumptive element that shows up when an antilocality requirement on movement is not met.[6] The two constructions in (14) are derived as follows (OP is a covert demonstrative operator and the symbol '⇒' indicates the appearance of the definite article as a consequence of the antilocality requirement):

(15) [$_{TopP}$ (topic) Top [$_{FocP}$ **afta** Foc [$_{FinP}$ ~~afta~~ ⇒ **ta** Fin [$_{IP}$ nea ~~afta~~ fenomena]]]]

(16) [$_{TopP}$ **OP** Top [$_{FocP}$ Foc [$_{FinP}$ ~~OP~~ ⇒ **ta** Fin [$_{IP}$ nea **afta** fenomena]]]]

These derivations account for the linear orders 'Dem – Def Art' and 'Def Art – Adjective – Dem' as well as for the fact that the demonstrative is interpreted as deictic in (15) (overt movement to Spec, Focus) but as anaphoric in (16) (movement of a covert operator to Spec, Topic). The presence of an additional nominal constituent interpreted as topic, like the genitive complement in (17), is possible only if it is preceding the demonstrative in Focus:

(17) a. tis   epohis   afta   ta   fenomena

the-GEN age-GEN these the phenomena

'these phenomena of our times'

b. *afta tis epohis ta nea fenomena

This approach works well for the syntax and semantics of demonstratives in Greek and, according to the authors, it may be extended to other languages. However, such extension is far from being free of problems, at least for Spanish.

---

6   The antilocality requirement claims that movement should cross different syntactic domains (Grohmann 2003).

Among the problems noticed we will only mention, first, that in their analysis of the Spanish data[7] it is not clear how demonstratives acquire the deictic value because the demonstrative does not reach the Focus position. And, secondly, that the parallelism with the Greek examples, where the occurrence of the demonstrative in a lower position corresponds to the anaphoric reading, suggests that in Spanish the prenominal demonstrative is (preferably) interpreted as deictic, whereas the postnominal one is anaphoric. This prediction is not correct. On the one hand, the prenominal demonstrative can indistinctly be deictic or anaphoric, and, on the other, the postnominal demonstrative also allows for a deictic reading, as the complete equivalency between both sentences in (18) clearly indicates:[8]

(18) a. Cogeré   el libro *este* (de aquí) y   *la* libreta   *aquella* (de allí).

take-FUT.1S the book this of here   and the notebook that   of there

'I will take this book (here) and that notebook (there).'

b. Cogeré *este* libro (de aquí) y *aquella* libreta (de allí).

'I will take this book (here) and that notebook (there).'

Besides, prenominal, but not postnominal, demonstratives can receive an emphatic stress: *cogeré ESTE libro* 'I will take THIS book'. If this kind of intonation corresponds to a (kind of) focus position in syntax, as it is widely assumed, we are led to consider that in this case the demonstrative is interpreted in the Focus projection and, according to Grohmann and Panagiotidis, it should move from Spec, Fin to Spec, Focus. Such a local movement should leave an overt copy (the definite article) in the Fin-head, contrary to facts: *cogeré ESTE el libro* (the representation of this ungrammatical sequence would be identical to that in (15)).

In spite of the fact that Grohmann and Panagiotidis' analysis cannot be applied to Spanish in the terms they proposed, we consider that some of their claims, like the encoding of the deictic force in Focus and the anaphoric reading in Topic, can

---

7   The derivations suggested by Grohmann and Panagiotidis are the following:
    (i) [$_{TopP}$ **OP** Top [$_{FocP}$ Foc [$_{FinP}$ ~~OP~~ ⇒ **el** Fin [$_{IP}$ coche (nuevo) **ese** (nuevo)]]]]
    (ii) [$_{TopP}$ Top [$_{FocP}$ Foc [$_{FinP}$ **ese** Fin [$_{IP}$ coche (nuevo) ~~ese~~ (nuevo)]]]]

8   There is actually a difference in the use of prenominal and postnominal demonstratives in Spanish. Whereas a DP with a prenominal demonstrative is perfectly fine in a sentence that initiates a discourse, a DP with a postnominal demonstrative sounds odd in the very same context. This suggests that the anaphoric reading is the preferred one for postnominal demonstratives. But it is not the case that the deictic interpretation is completely precluded. Given the appropriate pragmatic context, a postnominal demonstrative may be used deictically even in a discourse-initial sentence like (ia), perfectly equivalent to (ib) (both can be used as requests and can be uttered with a finger pointing at the required element):
    (i) a. Póngame   *el* pastel *este* de chocolate, por favor.
          put-IMP.2S-me the cake this of chocolate by favor
          'Give me this chocolate cake, please.'
        b. Póngame *este* pastel de chocolate, por favor.

be incorporated to an alternate analysis of the cooccurrence of the definite article and the demonstrative in Spanish. If we reanalyze the structure with two levels of determination 'D$_1$ – D$_2$', given above in (5), as Force – Fin (plus optional Topic – Focus), we end up with the following representation:

(19) a. $[_{ForceP}$ Force (= D$_1$) $[_{FinP}$ Fin (= D$_2$) $[_{IP}$ … $[_{NP}$ …]]]]

b. $[_{ForceP}$ Force (=D$_1$) $[_{TopP}$ Top $[_{FocP}$ Foc $[_{FinP}$ Fin (= D$_2$) $[_{IP}$ … $[_{NP}$ …]]]]]]

In the case of the postnominal demonstrative construction (*el coche este*), the demonstrative occupies the Fin (= D$_2$)-head and the definite article the Force (= D$_1$)-head, while prenominal demonstratives (*este coche*) are derived, by contrast, from the movement of the demonstrative from Fin to a higher functional head (Force being empty). The complete structure is used to derive the deictic and anaphoric readings of the demonstrative, which will appear in the Focus or Topic heads specified as [+anaph] and [+deixis], respectively:

(20) $[_{ForceP}$ el $[_{TopP}$ Top $[_{FocP}$ Foc $[_{FinP}$ ese $[_{IP}$ … (AP) … [NP] (PP)]]]]]

 [+anaph] [+deixis]

The definite article merges in the highest head Force, the NP (or the constituent including the NP plus the AP or the PP, if it is the case) moves to the specifier position of one of the functional heads above the demonstrative, which moves from Fin to Focus or Topic, depending on its interpretation. This analysis provides several structural positions to host the NP and its (AP o PP) modifiers that precede the demonstrative in examples like *el coche nuevo ese* 'this new car' or *la mesa de madera esa* 'this wooden table'. The occurrence of the modifier before or after the demonstrative is not semantically neutral. Postdemonstrative modifiers are more suitable candidates for a contrastive continuation than the ones preceding it.

(21) a. Tienes que pintar la mesa esa *de madera*, no la de metal.

   have.2s that paint the table this of wood   not the of metal

   'You must paint the wooden table, not the metallic one.'

 b. ?/*Tienes que pintar la mesa *de madera* esa, no la de metal.

If we consider that this kind of continuations are related to contrastive focus (i.e., the syntactic Focus-projection), we can readily capture the contrast. The postnominal demonstrative would be in the head Topic and it would mark the limit of the "Topic area" of the nominal expression; consequently, the elements preceding it could not feed contrastive focus continuations.

This is the approach we propose for the constructions with a definite article and a demonstrative in the particular case of Modern Spanish. But this does not mean that this is the only way to treat all occurrences of definite articles and

507

demonstratives. Nothing would prevent these determiners from merging to another functional head of the system in other kind of constructions or in other languages. The synchronic analysis of the Modern Spanish data we consider here leaves open the possibility for the demonstrative to externally merge to Fin and then move to Focus or Topic, as suggested, or to directly merge to Focus or Topic. But, as we will see, from a diachronic point of view the analysis as movement or as external merge is relevant to the evolution of each determiner and its syntactic behavior.

Summarizing, the crucial points of our analysis are: (i) DPs have an articulated functional structure the heads of which are responsible for the deictic or anaphoric interpretation of determiners; (ii) demonstratives are externally merged in the highest functional domain of DPs (this is fully consistent with the fact that they are always interpreted with semantic values associated to this domain); and (iii) the demonstrative occupies a head position. [9]

17.3.2. The functional heads of the "DP-left periphery"

According to Rizzi (1997), the properties of Force are used to insert the whole expression in the discourse, whereas those of Fin are related to the interpretation of aspects closer to the characteristics of the Φ-domain. In a parallel way, we will consider that the insertion of nominal expressions in certain positions within sentences or predicative structures follows from the properties of the highest head (Force) in the DP projection, and that the lowest one (Fin) has to do with semantic features of nominal constructions in particular.

17.3.2.1. *Determiners in Fin*

Following Haegeman (2004), we will consider that Finiteness in DPs encodes definiteness and that the Dfin-head contains a [+definite] feature that renders this projection suitable for definite determiners in general. In the case of Modern Spanish, the items expressing this content are the definite article *el*, the three demonstratives *este*, *ese*, *aquel*, and the prenominal possessive *mi* 'my', *tu* 'your', *su* 'his/her/their'. By the same token, indefinite determiners like *un* 'a(n)', *algún* 'a(n), some', etc. would be natural candidates to occupy this position when the nominal expression is indefinite. Given that in this chapter we leave indefinites completely

---

9 The syntactic status of determiners as specifiers or heads is often object of controversy (see, for instance, Lyons 1999). We will not discuss here the problems of the analysis of demonstratives as specifiers of low functional projections (see Roca 1997 for the case of Spanish), which is one of the assumptions of Grohmann and Panagiotidis' approach. They argue that demonstratives are specifiers generated in the Φ–domain because these elements bear Φ–features (like adjectives). Such an argument, however, would lead to treat all Spanish determiners (including the definite article) and nearly all quantifiers as the same kind of specifiers too. Given that the syntactic status as head or specifier is not crucial for the purposes of this contribution and it is enough to consider that demonstratives are generated and interpreted in the highest functional domain, we leave this problem open. Bearing this prevention in mind, we will continue treating them as heads.

aside, all the structures will carry the [+definite] specification in Dfin (from now on, we will use the labels Dfin, Dforce etc. to refer to Fin, Force, etc. in DPs):

(22) $[_{DforceP}$ Dforce $[_{DtopP}$ Dtop $[_{DfocP}$ Dfoc $[_{DfinP}$ Dfin $[_{IP} \dots [_{NP} \dots]$ $]$ $]$ $]$ $]$ $]$
$[+def]$

Other grammatical items closely related to the realization of ϕ—features or to the content of the lexical noun like classifiers or determiners specifically used to introduce proper names are also good candidates to occupy the Dfin-head. In the first case, Dfin would be similar to a classifier projection, like the one proposed by Guéron (2003). According to this author, the definite article of generic NPs in Romance is placed in a functional head (Clf) below DP. In non-generic uses, the definite article would raise to D. The second case is illustrated by examples like *en Pere* in Catalan, where the personal article *en* introduces the proper name.[10]

17.3.2.2. *Determiners in Focus*

The Focus projection is related to many specifications. On the one hand, and according to Grohmann and Panagiotidis, it is the responsible for the deictic interpretation associated to demonstratives. But, on the other, it also fits well with the content of wh- determiners that introduce interrogative NPs like *qué libros* 'which books' or *cuántos coches* 'how many cars'.[11] The connection of deictic demonstratives with Dfocus is strengthened by the fact that they can be pronounced with an emphatic stress reinforcing the deictic interpretation:

(23) a. Me llevaré *este* libro.

   'I will take this book.'

b. Me llevaré *ESTE* libro (no aquel).

   'I will take THIS book (not that one).'

As the bracketed continuation indicates, this particular intonation turns the deictic content of the demonstrative into contrastive focus. Assuming that the contrastive interpretation is, at some extent, related to the syntactic Focus projection,

---

10 This treatment of Fin departs from previous analyses of definite articles as expletives (see 17.3.2.4.) and from Guéron's own analysis of the DP functional projections. For instance, Guéron (2003) considers that the highest syntactic D-head encodes definiteness, but in our approach this semantic notion is associated to Fin, and the role of the higher syntactic head corresponds to Topic or Force.

11 In sentences, wh-phrases like *qué libros* or *cuántos coches* move to the Focus projection. So there is a clear link between the wh- feature of Dfocus in nominals and the wh- property of Focus in interrogative sentences.

we can conclude that (23b) constitutes further evidence for the interpretation of the demonstrative in this projection.[12]

The definite article can also receive a particular emphatic stress:[13]

(24) a. Por fin hemos dado con *LA* solución.

by end have-1PL given with the solution

'At last we hit upon THE solution.'

b. Ésta no es una gramática del español, es *LA* gramática del español.

this not is a grammar of.the Spanish is the grammar of.the Spanish

'This one is not a Spanish grammar, it is THE Spanish grammar.'

The emphatic definite article expresses the idea that the referred entity must be interpreted as the worthy one, the real one or the best one (see Di Tullio 1999 and Kornfeld 2008). That is, there is a quantification on the quality of the properties associated to the NP and such quantification points to the highest degree in the scale. This use of the definite article involves both a particular phonetic realization and a focalization of some semantic properties and, consequently, it should be interpreted in the Dfocus projection along the same lines as the emphatic demonstrative.

In Spanish the definite article also appears in nominal constructions that are interpreted as quantified in spite of the fact that there is not any overt quantifier. Leonetti (1999: 826-827) provides a series of examples like the one in (25a), where the DP *las deudas* is completely equivalent to quantified expressions like *la cantidad de deudas*, *las muchas deudas* (with an overt quantifier) or *cuántas deudas* (with a wh-determiner):

(25) a. Es increíble *las deudas* que tiene.

is unbelievable the debts that has-3s

'It is hard to believe how large the amount of his debts is.'

b. Es increíble *la cantidad de deudas* que tiene.

is unbelievable the amount of debts that has-3s

---

12 The relevance of contrastive focus within nominals is attested independently in examples like (ia) and, according to Eguren (in press), in constructions with deleted nominals in Spanish, as in (ib):
  (i) a. Éste es el libro *DE LINGÜÍSTICA*, no el de matemáticas.
    'This is the book ON LINGUISTICS, and not the one on Mathematics.'
    b. A María le gusta el vestido rojo, pero Ana prefiere *el __ azul*.
    'Mary likes the red dress, but Ana prefers the blue one.'

13 Something similar occurs in English. The determiner *the* can also indicate that the noun it is preceding is the best, most famous, etc. In those contexts, the determiner is usually given strong pronunciation.

   c. Es increíble   *las muchas deudas* que tiene.

      is unbelievable the lot of   debts   that has-3s

   d. Es increíble   *cuántas*   *deudas* (que) tiene.

      is unbelievable how many debts   that has-3s

The internal structure of the nominal expression *las deudas* in (25a) must contain an element interpreted in the Dfocus position and responsible for the semantic equivalence to the rest of examples. Such element could be the definite article itself (but notice that it is pronounced very differently from the determiners in (24) and (23b)) or, better, a covert quantifier semantically parallel to *cuántas*, *muchas*, or *cantidad de* (then, the definite article would occupy a higher position, i.e., Dforce (see 17.3.2.4.)).[14]

If we conceive Focus in nominals as a projection (Dfocus) that can be indistinctly associated to the interpretive values just reviewed (deixis, interrogative value, contrastive focus, and quantification on qualities or quantities), rather than as a semantic partition between focus and presupposition like the one that operates in sentences, we obtain a specific syntactic position which is suitable for wh-determiners as well as for certain uses of definite determiners. Such position will be used to set the pertinent semantic and phonetic interpretation, and it is independent from the definiteness specification encoded in Dfin, as the following representation indicates ([+F] = {[+deixis], [+wh-], [+focus], [+Q]}):[15]

(26) $[_{DforceP}$ Dforce $[_{DtopP}$ D-top $[_{DfocP}$ Dfoc $[_{DfinP}$ Dfin $[_{IP} \dots [_{NP} \dots]]]]]]$

                            [+F]   [+def]

17.3.2.3. Determiners in Topic

With regard to the Topic projection, we consider that it is responsible for the anaphoric reading of definite determiners, which is the most frequent use of demonstratives and the definite article. The role of the determiner in this case is to settle the reference of the noun phrase by linking it to an entity or an event

---

14 Additional evidence for the relevance of Focus in DP-structures and definite determiners may come from the *lo - de* construction in examples like (i), as shown in Villalba and Bartra-Kaufman's (2008) analysis of these constructions:

    (i) a. Le sorprendió *lo caro de la casa.*

       'It struck him/her the (degree of) expensiveness of the house.'

      b. Me asusta *lo peligroso de la empresa.*

       'It frightens me how risky the enterprise is.'

15 Maybe a more fine-grained analysis is needed to distinguish the Dfocus interpretations involving a particular intonation ([+Q], [+focus], [+wh]) from those that do not ([+deixis]). This can be achieved by postulating that there exist two different Dfocus projections or that the deictic demonstrative remains in Dfin, unless an explicit locative reinforcement is added to it (i.e., the deictic specification [±prox] does not force the raising to Dfocus by itself (see 17.6.)).

previously introduced in the discourse. The following examples show this in a very reduced context:

(27) a. Ana se encontró ayer con María, pero *ésta* no la reconoció.

  Ana meet.PAST.3S yesterday with <u>María</u> but this not her recognize. PAST.3S

  'Yesterday Ana met María, but María didn't recognize her.'

 b. <u>Juan y Carlos se han peleado otra vez</u>. Odio *esa* situación.

  Juan and Carlos have.3P fought other time hate.1S this situation

  'Juan and Carlos fought each other again. I hate such a situation.'

 c. Mañana vendrán un chico y <u>una chica</u>. *La* chica es muy alta.

  tomorrow come.FUT.3P a boy and a girl the girl is very tall

  'A boy and a girl will come tomorrow. The girl is very tall.'

The demonstratives and the definite article act as an instruction that allows the hearer to unambiguously identify the person or situation referred to by connecting them to the previously mentioned nominal expressions, (27a, c), or to the whole sentence, (27b). Thus, definite determiners with this anaphoric reading are assumed to be interpreted in the Dtopic projection.

In the preceding section the same definite determiners were linked, with a very different meaning, to the Dfocus projection. We think that the existence of two different syntactic positions corresponding to different semantic and phonetic interpretations and the fact that the same determiner can be interpreted in one or another contribute to explain the syntax of determiners in general and, more specifically, some grammatical aspects noticed in the use and the evolution of demonstratives, as it will be developed below.

In 17.3.1. we pointed out that, in contrast with Greek, Spanish prenominal and postnominal demonstratives do not sistematically correspond to two different interpretations (either deictic or anaphoric) and that the main difference between them is that the postnominal demonstrative sounds odd in a discourse-initial utterance. Accordingly, we suggested that postnominal demonstratives would be preferably, but not exclusively, anaphoric (see fn 8). Under the approach we are developing here, there is a clear syntactic difference between the two readings: a deictic demonstrative is in Dfocus, but an anaphoric demonstrative (or definite article) is interpreted in Dtopic. If postnominal demonstratives tend to be interpreted as anaphoric, they will be likely to appear in Dtopic rather than in Dfocus and, in this sense, they will be different from prenominal demonstratives, which show no preference for any of these projections. As a consequence, we would expect postnominal demonstratives not to display certain properties specifically associated

to Dfocus. That expectation is borne out by the fact that the emphatic stress linked to contrastive focus is odd with postnominal demonstratives (cf. examples (23)):[16]

(28) a. Me llevaré el libro *este*.

    b. ??Me llevaré el libro *ESTE* (no aquel).

In fact, the constraint against the emphatic pronunciation applies to any definite determiner interpreted as anaphoric, independently of its position in the linear order. In the following examples, the reference of the nominal expressions introduced by the demonstrative, (29a), and the definite article, (29b), is obtained through an anaphoric relation with the preceding underlined constituents. No emphatic determiners are possible in such a context.

(29) a. <u>Juan y Carlos se han peleado</u>. *Esa* / *ESA situación se repite día tras día.

    Juan and Carlos have.3P fought this situation repeat.3s day after day

    'Juan and Carlos fought each other. Such a situation is repeated every day.'

    b. Llegaron un chico y <u>una chica</u>. *La* / *LA chica abrió [la puerta.

    arrive.PAST.3P a boy and a girl the girl open.PAST.3S [the door

    'A boy and a girl arrived. The girl opened the door.'

The emphatic character (Focus) of the determiner clashes with the pure anaphoric reading (Topic). If we intend to emphasize the anaphoric relation we have to use a modifier like *propio* or *mismo*:[17]

(30) a. <u>Juan y Carlos se han peleado</u>. *Esa mismo* situación se repite día [tras día.

    Juan and Carlos have.3P fought this same situation repeat.3s day [after day

    'Juan and Carlos fought each other. This very same situation is repeated every day.'

---

16 The example (28b) becomes acceptable only in a situation like the one described in footnote 8, which makes the deictic identification clear. Yet, we think that in such a context the deictic contrast is preferably expressed by adding a PP-complement with a locative adverb:

  (i) Quiero el pastel *este* de aquí, no aquel (de allí).
    want-1S the cake this of here not that of there
    'I want this cake here, not that one (over there).'

17 It seems, then, that the sequence 'Det + *mismo/propio*' holds for 'anaphoric relation + emphasis' in a way similar to the formation of the Latin pronoun IDEM '< IS + DEM', where, according to Bassols de Climent (1956: 203 – 204), IS is anaphoric and DEM is the particle highlighting the identity relation.

b. Llegaron   un chico y   <u>una chica</u>. *La propia* chica abrió

[la puerta.

arrive.PAST.3P a boy   and a girl   the SELF girl open.

[PAST.3S the door

'A boy and a girl arrived. The girl herself opened the door.'

Similarly, the emphatic qualitative reading of the definite article is impossible in a context like the following one, which induces the anaphoric reading linked to *una solución*:

(31) Ana y Marta analizaron el problema y propusieron <u>una solución</u> …

'Ana and Marta analyzed the problem and proposed a solution …'

a. … *La* solución nos   gustó   a todos.

the solution us-DAT like-PAST.3S to all

'… we all liked it / that solution.'

b. … **LA* solución nos gustó a todos.

c. … *Ésa* era *LA* solución (y nos gustó a todos).

this was the solution

'This was THE solution (and we all liked it).'

The emphatic definite article is possible only in (31c), where the demonstrative satisfies the anaphoric relation and provides the suitable context for this use of the definite article.

This indicates that definite determiners can be merged either in Dfocus or in Dtopic, but under no circumstance can they be interpreted in both simultaneously. The grammatical properties (like emphasis or contrastive focus) associated to the Dfocus projection cannot be applied to determiners that are merged in Dtopic, where they are interpreted anaphorically, but they are perfectly compatible with instances of the same determiners when they are merged in Dfocus.

As it is well known, reference and definiteness are two different semantic notions. A nominal expression can be interpreted as [±referential] independently of its [±definite] value. The syntactic analysis we propose allows us to treat the two semantic notions separately. The reference of the nominal expression is achieved through the properties of the higher functional projections Dtopic and Dfocus, while definitenes is encoded in the lower projection Dfin. Both Dtopic and Dfocus are relevant to fix the reference of the nominal expression. A demonstrative can be deictic or anaphoric, but in both cases it introduces a [+referential] nominal

expression. If it is deictic, the reference is due to the [+deixis] specification in Dfocus related to physical situation. If it is anaphoric, the reference is obtained through a specification in Dtopic which points at an element present in the discourse. We, then, can add the anaphoric value to the Dtopic projection:

$$(32) \ [_{DforceP} \ Dforce \ [_{DtopP} \ D\text{-top} \ [_{DfocP} \ Dfoc \ [_{DfinP} \ Dfin \ [_{IP} \ \dots \ [_{NP} \ \dots \ ] \ ] \ ] \ ] \ ] \ ]$$

$$[+anaph] \qquad [+F] \qquad [+def]$$

17.3.2.4. *Determiners in Force*

Force is an "externally oriented" category involved in the insertion of the construction it introduces into a larger grammatical domain: the discourse, in the case of sentences; the main sentence, in the case of subordinate clauses; and the sentence or a predicative structure, in the case of nominal expressions. This suggests that the determiners located here should be more sensitive to the conditions on the syntactic distribution of nominal expressions than to its semantic interpretation. In the preceding sections we have connected most of the semantic properties shown by definite determiners (definiteness, emphatic values, deictic and anaphoric readings, etc.) to the rest of peripheric functional projections. So we expect the determiners that appear in Dforce to be (relatively) contentless. Bearing this in mind, the natural candidates for Dforce in nominal expressions are determiners that do not make any relevant semantic or syntactic contribution, i.e., expletive determiners.

Vergnaud and Zubizarreta (1992) and Longobardi (1994) claim that the definite article that appears in the following examples is expletive (we adapted the original French and Italian examples to Spanish):

(33) a. Les hemos regalado *el mismo ordenador* a Ana y a Luis.

    'We gave the same kind of computer to Ana and Luis.'

  b. Los niños levantaron *la mano.*

    'The boys raised their hands.'

  c. *Las ballenas* son mamíferos.

    'Whales are mammals.'

  d. *La María* siempre llega tarde.   [Colloquial Spanish]

    'María always comes late.'

In all these cases the definite article fails to denote and the interpretation of the nominal expression follows from other constituents. In (33a, b), the nominal expression receives a distributive interpretation under the scope of the plural indirect object, (33a), or the subject, (33b), and, consequently, it is not referring to a particular item (computer or hand), as the presence of the singular determiner would suggest. In the case of generic phrases, (33c), the semantic interpretation depends on the noun,

515

which denotes the entire class of whales, and not on the determiner. Finally, proper names, (33d), are inherently referential and the presence of the definite determiner, which usually serves to fix the reference of nominal expressions, is, in this sense, irrelevant. However, despite being semantically empty, the definite article is necessary. As shown in (34), it can only be deleted in the construction with a proper name:[18]

(34) a. *Les hemos regalado *mismo ordenador* a Ana y a Luis.

b. *Los niños levantaron *mano*.

c. *Ballenas* son mamíferos.

d. *María* siempre llega tarde.

The replacement of the definite article by another definite determiner, like the demonstrative, is, with the notorious exception of the type reading of the first example, impossible or yields a very different reading (the symbol # stands for this change of interpretation):

(35) a. Les hemos regalado *este (mismo) ordenador* a Ana y a Luis.

b. #Los niños levantaron *esta mano*.

c. #*Estas ballenas* son mamíferos.

d. #*Esta María* siempre llega tarde.

In (35b) we understand that the boys raised their left hand or their right one (identified deictically). The nominal expression in (35c) may refer to a particular type of whales, but it presupposes the existence of whales that are not mammals, contrary to the generic meaning of (33c). And, by using the demonstrative in (35d), we discriminate a particular individual among the collective formed by the people called *María*, or, with a different intonation, we obtain an evaluative meaning (see 17.5.2.1.5.).

If we consider that the definite article in the examples of (33) is an expletive, following the analyses of Vergnaud and Zubizarreta (1992) and Longobardi (1994), it would be occupying the Dforce-head and its presence would fulfill the (language particular) syntactic requirements of the argument position, where the nominal expression is inserted. However, the expletive nature of the definite article in these

---

18 This is not surprising since in standard Spanish proper names are not introduced by any determiner. But in the varieties of Catalan where the use of the article with proper names is the rule, the determiner is required (unless the complete name is used, as in (ic)):

    (i) a. Avui he vist *la Maria*.
        'I saw Maria today.'
      b. *Avui he vist *Maria*.
      c. *Joan Manuel Serrat* actua avui a Barcelona.
        'Joan Manuel Serrat plays in Barcelona today.'

constructions is controversial. On the one hand, Guéron (2003) considers that the definite article should be analyzed as a classifier in generic noun phrases. And, on the other, personal articles introducing proper names (like *en* or *na* in Catalan) are sensitive to the properties of the name they adjoin to and, in this sense, they seem more akin to Fin than to Force. These objections undermine the analysis of the definite article as expletive built on the four constructions illustrated in (33). But we think that the idea that this determiner may function as an expletive and that it is only used to introduce nominal expressions in certain contexts (i.e., like a Dforce-head) can be maintained.

Roca (1997) argued that Spanish constructions with postnominal demonstratives display all the semantic properties and the syntactic behavior of a demonstrative and that, consequently, the definite article introducing the whole construction is, in this sense, an expletive. The examples in (36) show that, with respect to the combination with an adjective modified with *tan* 'so', the construction with the postnominal demonstrative follows the pattern of the demonstrative and not the one of the definite article, which does not admit these types of modifiers (see Bosque 1989):

(36) a. No pierdas *los libros esos tan caros*.

     not lose-2s the books these so expensive-PL

     'Do not lose these books so expensive.'

   b. *No pierdas *los libros tan caros*.

   c. No pierdas *esos libros tan caros*.

In a way parallel to (34) and (35), the definite article is needed and it cannot be replaced by another definite determiner, like the demonstrative or the prenominal possesive:

(37) a. *No pierdas *libros esos tan caros*.

   b. *No pierdas *mis/estos/esos libros esos tan caros*.

This shows that the definite article (but not any other definite determiner) is required to insert the construction in the discourse. If we consider that the definite article appears in Dforce because it is the only determiner that can be semantically empty (contrary to demonstratives or prenominal possessives), we come up with an answer for the syntactic and semantic properties (as well as the linear order) of nominal expressions with postnominal demonstratives in Spanish.

Another instance of this use of the definite article not included in the preceding discussion may be found in certain psychological predicates:

(38) a. Me   gustan   *los helados*.

       me.DAT like.3PL the ice cream

       'I like ice cream.'

    b. Odio   *las patatas*.

       hate-1s the potatoes

       'I hate potatoes.'

The nominal expressions in (38) refer to all types of ice cream or potatoes and, again, the definite article is necessary. Its deletion leads to ungrammaticality and replacement by a demonstrative results in type or deictic readings. [19]

(39) a. *Me gustan *helados*.

    b. *Odio *patatas*.

(40) a. #Me gustan *estos helados*.

    b. #Odio *esas patatas*.

Interestingly enough, this property seems to be particular of this kind of psychological predicates. The same kind of generic interpretation is expressed through bare NPs, which appear in other kinds of predicates like, for instance, *No como patatas* 'I do not eat potatoes' (where the syntactic configuration is the same as (38b): the nominal expression is the postverbal direct object). Given that the main difference between the two examples lies in the nature of their predicate (*odiar* 'to hate' vs. *comer* 'to eat'), we conclude that the definite article is an expletive in (38) (i.e., it does not make any semantic contribution) and that its presence obeys to a requirement on the form of the internal argument imposed by these psychological predicates in Spanish.

It seems, then, that the definite article (and no other definite determiner) is crucial in these configurations and that its presence is only motivated syntactically. The realization of this determiner in Dforce is a syntactic device that facilitates the insertion of the nominal expression in the pertinent position within the sentence according to the requirements that hold for this type of position in every particular

---

19 Actually, type-denoting nominals with demonstratives refer to properties that can be recovered anaphorically, (ia), or deictically, (ib):

    (i) a. El año pasado pagué 1.000 € por un portátil que pesa 1 kg. Ahora *ese (mismo) portátil* vale 1.500 €.

       'Last year I paid € 1,000 for a laptop that weights 1 kg. The very same laptop costs € 1,500 now.'

      b. Creo que me compraré *este coche*. El que tú compraste es *aquel de allí*, ¿verdad?

       'I think I will buy a car like this one. The one you bought is like that one over there, isn't it?'

language. The definite determiner that typically occurs in Dforce is the definite article, the determiner that achieved a higher degree of grammaticalization in Romance and that can be used as an expletive. We can complete now the functional structure:

(41) $[_{DforceP}$ Dforce $[_{DtopP}$ Dtop $[_{DfocP}$ Dfoc $[_{DfinP}$ Dfin $[_{IP} \ldots [_{NP} \ldots]]]]]]$

      [expl]   [+anaph]   [+F]   [+def]

17.3.3. Summary

In this section we have extended Rizzi's (1997) left periphery proposal for sentences to the structure of nominal constructions. We have proposed that the analyses that distinguish two levels of determination in the DP-structure may be assimilated to the Force — Fin system and that this system can incorporate the Topic and Focus projections if we reinterpret their semantic/pragmatic content and conveniently adapt them to the interpretation of determiners and noun phrases. We consider that the syntactic configurations where two definite determiners cooccur provide evidence for the need of such a complex structure. In this sense, we argued that, in constructions with a postnominal demonstrative in Spanish, the definite article is an expletive determiner in the highest head Dforce and that the demonstrative occupies the Dtopic-head (or Dfocus if interpreted as deictic). In addition to that, we have reviewed the syntactic and semantic properties of determiners in Spanish and we have related them to the Force, Topic, Focus, and Fin projections. The following table summarizes the relation between the functional heads, the determiners, and their interpretation:

Table 1

HEAD	DETERMINER	INTERPRETATION
Dforce	definite article	expletive
Dtopic	definite article	anaphoric
	demonstrative	anaphoric
Dfocus	definite article	qualitative
	demonstrative	deictic
	wh- determiners	interrogative
Dfiniteness	definite determiners	[+definite]
	indefinite determiners	[−definite]

Definite determiners may appear in any projection of this functional domain according to its meaning and to the requirements on the syntactic distribution of the nominal expression. The fact that the same element (a demonstrative or the definite article, for instance) may be in Dtopic or in Dfocus, depending on its interpretation, is not problematic because these projections are optional and they enter into the derivation only when they are needed. That is, when the nominal expression is interpreted either as anaphorically or deictically/qualitatively. There is no risk, then, that the determiner receives two different interpretations in the same construction.

It will be either in Dfocus or in Dtopic, but not in both. The difference between the two definite determiners we are dealing with is that only the definite article may be found in the Dforce-head (i.e., only the definite article is expletive):

Table 2

	Dforce	Dtopic	Dfocus	Dfin
Definite article	√	√	√	√
Demonstrative	---	√	√	√

Our next goal is to test the analysis of the definite determiners presented so far, that is, in terms of four functional projections, in the syntactic uses and the semantic interpretation of demonstratives in Old and Modern Spanish and, more generally, in the diachronic evolution of definite determiners in Romance. The detailed description of the Modern Spanish data (17.5.2.) will require some slight modifications in the explanation provided up to this point.

17.4. THE EVOLUTION OF DEMONSTRATIVES IN ROMANCE

The grammatical properties of demonstratives (their form and content, the system they constitute, the deictic distinctions they express, etc.) have undergone very significative changes from Latin to the Modern Romance languages. Classical Latin had three different demonstrative deictic pronouns and a set of discursive pronouns that was used to allude to a particular entity by means of anaphoric and identity relations or by adding a contrastive or emphatic reading. The forms were the following ones:

Table 3. Classical Latin

	Deictic pronouns		Discursive pronouns	
Dem 1	HIC, HAEC, HOC	Proximal (speaker)	Anaphora	IS, EA, ID
Dem 2	ISTE, ISTA, ISTUD	Proximal (hearer)	Identity	IDEM, EADEM, IDEM
Dem 3	ILLE, ILLA, ILLUD	Distal	Contr/Emphatic	IPSE, IPSA, IPSUM

In terms of the preceding analysis of definite determiners, IS and IDEM (which is 'IS + DEM', with DEM reinforcing the identity relation) have the semantic content associated to Dtopic, while the rest of the pronouns are closer to Dfocus (deixis or emphasis).

But this pronominal system was not preserved in Vulgar Latin. The anaphoric pronoun IS soon disappeared and it was replaced by the proximal demonstrative HIC and, more generally, by the distal demonstrative ILLE (both HIC and ILLE could also be used anaphorically in Classical Latin). The proximal (hearer) demonstrative ISTE took the place of HIC, forming the two degrees deictic distinction HIC – ISTE vs. ILLE. The form IPSE lost the contrastive specification and it was used to express identity and anaphoric relations, replacing IDEM and competing with ILLE. Finally,

demonstratives were reinforced by the locative particle ECCE/*ACCU. This resulted in the following paradigm:[20]

Table 4. Vulgar Latin

	Deictic pronouns			Discursive pronouns	
	Non-reinforced	Reinforced	Deixis		
Dem 1	ISTE	ECCE/*ACCU + ISTE	Proximal	Anaphora	(HIC)/ILLE/IPSE
Dem 2	--	--		Identity	IPSE
Dem 3	ILLE	ECCE/*ACCU + ILLE	Distal	Contr/Emphatic	(IPSE)

The most remarkable points of the comparison between the Classical Latin and the Vulgar Latin systems concern the change from a three degree to a two degree deictic distinction and the extension of the uses of the forms ILLE and IPSE. The diachronic evolution of these two forms led to the emergence of the definite article and new demonstratives, and to the creation of compound forms that emphasized the identity relation and combined a demonstrative with IPSE (HIC IPSE, ILLE IPSE or ISTE IPSE, which produced Italian *stesso* 'itself').[21] The existence of a doubled series of demonstratives (with and without the locative reinforcement) may be attributed, in its turn, to the fact that in Latin (as in most languages) demonstratives were used both deictically and anaphorically and, then, the locative reinforcement can appear as a grammatical device to distinguish deictic (locative) uses from anaphoric uses, i.e., to distinguish the interpretation in Dfocus from that of Dtopic.

All Romance definite determiners derive from the Vulgar Latin forms. On the one hand, the anaphoric discursive pronouns gave rise to the definite article, which presents the form evolved from ILLE in most Romance languages.[22] On the other, the demonstratives ISTE and ILLE, in both the simple and, especially, the reinforced form, as well as IPSE gave the different demonstrative forms. In this sense, we should make a distinction between languages with the three deictic degrees of Classical

---

20 For easy of exposition and in order to show the prominence of ISTE, in table 4 we have excluded the deictic use of HIC. It may seem, as a result, that this form did not combine with ECCE/*ACCU, but this was not the case. Latin compound forms 'ECCE/*ACCU + HIC, HAEC, HOC' existed and resulted in neuter demonstrative forms like Catalan *açò*, Occitan *aisso* or Italian *ciò* (all of them evolved from ECCE HOC).

21 Notice that the fact that IPSE combined with demonstratives like HIC, ILLE or ISTE indicates that it is not a demonstrative during this period. Combinations of two demonstratives (HIC + ILLE, HIC + ISTE, ISTE + ILLE) are not found, as expected, given that, syntactically, they are the same element (Dfocus or Dtopic) and any combination of two of them would be impossible to interpret. Later, IPSE became a true demonstrative and combined with the locative reinforcement (see 17.5.1.).

22 Descendants of IPSE as a definite article are found in certain varieties of Catalan (*es llibre* 'the book') and in Sardinian (*su babbu* 'the father').

Latin (Spanish, Portuguese, Sardinian, Occitan) and languages with the two deictic degree system of Vulgar Latin (Catalan, Italian, Romanian or French):[23]

Table 5. Romance languages

	Spanish	Portuguese	Occitan	Catalan	Italian	Romanian	French	
Dem 1	*este*	*este*	*aiceste*	*aquest*	*questo*	*acest(a)*	*ce(t) ... ci*	Proximal
Dem 2	*ese*	*esse*	*aqueste*	---	---	---	---	
Dem 3	*aquel*	*aquele*	*aquel*	*aquell*	*quello*	*acel(a)*	*ce(t) là*	Distal

The evolution from Latin to Romance as far as demonstratives are concerned can be summarized as follows: (i) loss of the three degree deictic distinction in most languages; (ii) loss of some demonstrative forms; (iii) reorganization of the forms that express deictic and anaphoric relations; (iv) locative reinforcement of the forms used deictically; and (v) grammaticalization of certain demonstratives as definite articles. The general process just reviewed will be a useful reference to adequately place the properties of the demonstratives in Spanish and the analysis of their evolution we will present in the next sections.

17.5. THE EVOLUTION OF SPANISH DEMONSTRATIVES

In this section we study the use of demonstratives in Spanish. First, we will look at the syntactic contexts and semantic values of the different demonstrative forms attested in several stages of Old Spanish. Then, we will compare them with those found in Modern Peninsular Spanish. For the Old Spanish data, we have taken into account the occurrences of the several forms of demonstratives attested in five texts from the 12th century to 15th century and the examples provided by the *CORDE* and the *Corpus del español*.

17.5.1. Demonstratives in Old Spanish

The Old Spanish paradigm of demonstratives is particularly interesting for the study of these determiners in Romance because it was formed by a complete doubled series of reinforced and non-reinforced forms that, at first glance, distinguished three deictic degrees:[24]

---

23 There is, however, a remarkable degree of variation in the forms of demonstratives and their actual use among the several Romance varieties. Thus, for instance, in Catalan, a language characterized by a two deictic degree distinction, there existed three different forms *aquest, aqueix* and *aquell*, and the three degree distinction is preserved in Valencian Catalan (*este, eixe, aquell*) and certain northwestern dialects. Similarly, it is not the case that in languages with three different forms the actual use clearly distinguishes the three degrees in all varieties.

24 We include the form *el* (< ILLE) that corresponds to the modern definite article, because in the Medieval period this form was also used as a demonstrative. In the example (44b), for instance, the syntactic context is rather that of demonstratives than that of the definite article in Spanish (see Company 1999 and Batllori and Roca 2000).

Table 6. Old Spanish

	Simple form	Reinforced form	Deixis
Dem 1	*este*	*aqueste*	Proximal (speaker)
Dem 2	*ese*	*aquese*	Proximal (hearer)
Dem 3	*el*	*aquel*	Distal

The coexistence of both forms of the demonstrative (the simple and the reinforced one) is confirmed by the fact that both are found in the same period and within the same text, as the following examples from the *Poema de Mio Cid* show:

(42) a. Quedas sed,   mesnadas, aquí en *este* logar.

   quiets   be.IMP.2P troops   here in this place

   'Troop, remain here, in this place!' (*Cid*, v. 702; 12th c.)

   b. En *aqueste* escano quem   diestes   vos en don.

   in   this   seat   that.me give.PAST.2s you in gift

   'In this seat that you give me as a gift.' (*Cid*, v. 3115; 12th c.)

(43) a. Sabor   a   de velar   en*essa* santidad.

   Pleasure have.3s of keep.vigil in.this sanctity

   'He really cares for safeguarding this sanctity.' (*Cid*, v. 3956; 12th c.)

   b. En *aquessa* corrida x. dias ovieron.

   in   this   march   ten days have.PAST.3P

   'They spent 10 days on this march.' (*Cid*, v. 953; 12th c.)

(44) a. Ya doña Ximena, *la* mi mugier tan complida.

   yet lady Ximena that my wife   so perfect

   'Oh my dear lady Ximena, that so perfect a wife of mine.' (*Cid*, v.278; 12th c.)

   b. En ganar *aquelas* villas   myo Çid duro   III años.

   in win   those   villages my Cid long.PAST.3s three years

   'Cid took three years to conquer those villages.' (*Cid*, v. 1169; 12th c.)

The reinforced and the simple forms can even appear in the same sentence expressing the same meaning. In these examples all occurrences are clearly interpreted as deictic:

523

(45) a. A mi dizen Caspar, *est* otro Melchior, ad *achest* Baltasar.

　　　　to me call.3P Caspar this other Melchior to this Baltasar

　　　　'I am Caspar, this is Melchior, and this is Baltasar.' (*Auto Reyes Magos*;
　　　　12th c.)

　　b. *esta* noche legarán;　terné　　vigilia　　　　en *aqueste* sancto
　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　[logar.

　　　　this night arrive.FUT.3P have.FUT.1S wakefulness in this　　holy
　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　[place

　　　　'They'll arrive tonight; I'll keep vigil in this holy place.' (*Cid*, v. 3049; 12th c.)

However, such a coincidence does not seem to be the general rule. Girón Alconchel (1999) analyzes the disappearance of the reinforced forms in Modern Spanish and claims that in Medieval Spanish there existed clear semantic differences between the two realizations of the demonstrative. Whereas the simple forms *este* and *ese* expressed spatial and temporal deixis and anaphoric relations, the reinforced forms *aqueste* and *aquesse* were specialized for deixis *ad oculos* (i.e., locative deixis) and emphatic interpretations. This distinction began to be lost at the end of the Medieval period and during the 16th and 17th centuries when *este* and *ese* extended their uses to deixis *ad oculos* and *aqueste* and *aquesse* were seen as popular forms.

In terms of our analysis of nominal expressions, the differences between the reinforced demonstrative and the simple demonstrative that Girón Alconchel points out may be captured by considering that the morphological reinforcement of demonstratives is linked to the Dfocus projection and that it acts as an explicit mark of deictic and emphatic values when two forms with the same deictic specification are available in the paradigm (see 17.6.2.). This implies that the reinforced forms *aqueste* and *aquesse* were interpreted in Dfocus, whereas the non-reinforced forms *este* and *esse* could be interpreted either in Dfocus (when they are deictic) or in Dtopic (when they are anaphoric).[25]

Another controversial point concerning the above paradigm is the existence of the three deictic degree distinction. Rost (2004) suggests that this might not be the

---

25 The contrast between reinforced and non-reinforced forms must actually be understood as a
　　tendency in their use, as we will show in 17.5.1.2. Besides, we think that the distinction may
　　work well for masculine and feminine forms, but not necessarily for neuter demonstratives. In
　　the following examples the neuter reinforced forms *aquesto* or *aquesso* are anaphoric (they are
　　referring to a preceding statement):
　　(i) a. … vos he　　contado *aquesto* a　fin　que …
　　　　　you have.1s told　this　　to　end　that
　　　　'… I have told this to you in order for …' (*Libro de las maravillas*; 14th c.)
　　b. que *ese* cavallero que *aqueso* vos dize
　　　　that this knight　that this　you say.3s
　　　　'that this knight that says this to you' (*Zifar*; 14th c.)

case and that, in fact, Old Spanish had a two degree distinction (proximal vs. distal) and that most of the uses of *ese – aquesse* were anaphoric. We will explore these issues in the following sections.

17.5.1.1. *The use of demonstratives*

Next, we describe the most significant syntactic and semantic uses of demonstrative determiners in Old Spanish concerning spatial and temporal deixis, the anaphoric use, and their combination with a proper name.[26]

17.5.1.1.1. *Spatial deixis*

The three forms of demonstratives are used to indicate the (proximal or distal) situation of the referent with respect to the participants in the speech act:

(46) a. Vees *aquestas* truchas que son en *aqueste* lugar?

     see.2s these trouts that be.3s in this place

     'Do you see these trouts that are in this place?' (*Cal*; 13th c.)

    b. "E *aquellos* dos moços? E *esta* dueña?

     and those two young gentlemen and this maiden

     'And those two young gentlemen? And this lady?' (*Zifar*; 14th c.)

    c. sobit en *ese* cavallo de *esa* dueña.

     go up.IMP.2P in this horse of this maiden

     'Get on this lady's horse.' (*Zifar*; 14th c.)

The forms *aquestas* and *aqueste* in (46a) and *esta* in (46b) indicate proximity to the speaker, *aquellos* in (46b) is referring to two distant people, and *ese* and *esa* in (46c) designate two referents also perceived as proximal (and maybe closer to the hearer than to the speaker; the full context does not make it completely clear). These examples show that the three demonstratives can be used deictically and suggest that there exists a contrast between *este* and *ese* (both are found in the same text) and that a three deictic degree distinction like that of Latin holds in Old Spanish, against Rost´s (2004) claim. However, such a contrast may be, at a certain extent, questioned because when a distance contrast is explicitly established, as in (46b), the opposition is overtly expressed by means of *aquel* and *este*, at least until the very end of the medieval period (we come back to this in section 17.5.1.2.).

---

26 The whole set of syntactic and semantic uses of demonstratives in both Old and Modern Spanish is much larger, but we will restrict our attention to the most relevant ones for our analysis of definite determiners.

17.5.1.1.2. *Temporal deixis*

The three demonstratives are also found in contexts where they refer to temporal events:

(47) a. Las mis compañas   *esta* noche legaran.

    the my companions this night   arrive.FUT.3P

    'My companions are arriving tonight.' (*Cid*, v.3049; 12th c.)

b. Et trabajóse   de   matarlo *aquella* noche que   ospedaba

                                                      [al religioso

   and work.PAST.3S of   kill.him that   night that host-PAST.3S

                                                      [to.the religious

   'And he plotted to kill him the night that the religious person was lodging with him' (*Cal*; 13th c.)

c. Hy iazen   *essa* noche.

   there lie down.3P this night

   'They stay there this night.' (*Cid*, v. 2870; 12th c.)

But the only demonstrative that clearly presents a temporal deictic value in these examples is *este*, (47a), as usual in Modern Spanish (see 17.5.2.1.2.). In (47b), an anaphoric link with a previously mentioned night is established, though the presence of *aquella* is used to reinforce the temporal distance with respect to the alluded night, and it slightly contrasts with the mere anaphoric reading expressed by the definite article of the DP *al religioso* in the same example. The form *essa* in (47c) is interpreted anaphorically, as it is generally the case in all the occurrences of the expression *esa noche* examined. It is interesting to note that the reinforced forms *aquesta* and *aquessa* are not found in constructions with this temporal meaning. This confirms that these forms are preferred to indicate spatial relations.

17.5.1.1.3. *Anaphoric reading*

Anaphoric relations were expressed by most forms of demonstratives in Old Spanish:

(48) a. Alvar Salvadórez e   Galind Garcíaz el   de Aragón, a *aquestos* dos...

   Alvar Salvadórez and Galind Garcíaz the of Aragón, to these   two

   'Alvar Salvadórez and Galind Garcíaz from Aragon, to these two '

   (*Cid*, v. 2001; 12th c.)

b. Con *aqueste* aver tornan se   *essa* conpaña

with this plunder come back.3P this companion

'This companion comes back with this plunder' (*Cid*, v. 485; 12th c.)

c. en que estava   una ave. Et   *aquella* ave   díxoles

in that be.PAST.3S a   bird and that   bird say.PAST.3S.them

'where there was a bird. And this bird said to them ...' (*Cal*; 13th c.)

d. a *este* cavallero en   *aquella* çibdat

to this knight   on that   city

'to this knight in that city' (*Zifar*; 14th c.)

The examples (48a, b) show that the reinforced form *aqueste* can be used anaphorically. These examples go against Girón Alconchel's claim that reinforced forms were specialized for deixis *ad oculos* or for emphatic readings. In (48a) it is possible to argue that the reinforced demonstrative is not merely anaphoric, because it picks up two referents among a group of people previously mentioned and it adds some emphasis. But this is not at all the case of (48b), where the anaphoric relation is the only possibility.

17.5.1.1.4. *Combination with a proper name*

Demonstratives can also introduce proper names:

(49) a. e   el obispo don Jerónimo, e   Pero Vermúez e *aqueste* Muño Gustioz

and the bishop sir   Jerónimo and Pero Vermúez and this   Muño Gustioz

'and the bishop Jerónimo, and Pero Vermúez, and Muño Gustioz'

(*Cid*, v. 3066; 12th c.)

b. e   fue   mucho cruel omne, e   *este* Herodes fyzo

                                                        [matar todos

and be.PAST3S very   cruel man   and this Herodes make.PAST.3S

                                                      [kill all

'and (he) was a very cruel man, and Herodes ordered to kill all' (*Faz*; 13th c.)

c. Grado   a Dios del   çielo & a   *aquel* Rey don Alfonso

pleased to God of.the heaven to that   king ... Alfonso

'It pleased God in Heaven and king Alfonso' (*Cid*, v. 3453; 12th c.)

In this configuration the demonstrative does not lose its deictic, (49a), or anaphoric, (49b), nature. It does not intend to discriminate between two possible referents of the proper name, as in Modern Spanish (see 17.5.2.1.5.). It simply emphasizes the physical presence of a person or the fact that it has been previously mentioned. The use of *aquel* in (49c) is very different. Although an anaphoric interpretation would be available because the king was already mentioned, it is reminiscent of the emphatic use of the demonstrative ILLE in Latin to refer to famous people (*Medea illa, ille Iuppiter*; Bassols de Climent 1956: 201, 223).

17.5.1.2. *The frequencies of use of the demonstratives*

After examining the syntactic contexts where demonstratives appear, we conclude that their main uses are deictic (spatial or temporal) and anaphoric, and that this value is not lost when they introduce proper nouns, which are intrinsecally referential. Bearing this in mind, we can now look at all the occurrences of each form. Table 7 focuses on the occurrences in the five texts examined (medieval period), and table 8 gives a more general idea from the 12th c. to the 20th c.[27]

Table 7. Demonstratives in Medieval Spanish

	12th c.	13th c.		14th c.	15th c.
este	129	295	177	300	377
aqueste	43	13	5	7	8
ese	19	19	53	23	102
aquese	2	-	1	-	-
aquel	27	217	94	226	232
	Cid	Cal	Faz	Zifar	Cel

Table 8. Demonstratives in Spanish (data from M. Davies *Corpus del español*)

	12th c.	13th c.	14th c.	15th c.	16th c.	18th c.	20th c.
<estos>	5844	1816	4626	12751	8263	10289	10349
<aquestos>	131	150	738	284	386	23	-
<esos>	498	104	312	1266	1559	5300	7528
<aquesos>	2	2	8	38	98	6	-
<aquellos>	7220	2208	4124	7457	3273	7905	2626

According to this, *este* and *aquel* were the most frequent demonstratives in Old Spanish (in any text and any century). The use of the demonstrative *ese* only became comparable to these forms from the 16th c. on and, if we restrict the comparison to the medieval period, it is clearly much less frequent (only in the 15th c. did it acquire a certain relevance). With respect to the reinforced forms *aqueste* and *aquese*, it is clear that they are much rarer than their non-reinforced counterparts in any century and that, focusing on the five texts examined (table 7), their relevance is limited to the 12th and 13th centuries. Finally, the reinforced form *aqueste* has always been

much more common th
during the 12th c. – 14th c

All these facts poin
Spanish was based mai
aquel. This provides an
If, following Girón Alc
or emphasis, the abser
ese within the deictic c
with such a semantic c
occurrences of each de
column contains the pe

	12th c
este	92
aqueste	26
ese	8
aquese	1
aquel	20
	Cid

	12th c.
este	32
aqueste	13
ese	1
aquese	-
aquel	4
	Cid

The first conclusi
one and that the re
Although this use ac
that of the deictic use
demonstratives is cle
noticing that both e
and that, although i
percentage of deictic
suggests that Girón
only deictically or e
correct in absolute t
maintained as a rele

---

27   The search of data in table 8 has been limited to the plural masculine form to avoid homonymous forms.

28   We are not consider
three occurrences) i

much more common than *aquesse*, but the differences between them were larger during the 12th c. – 14th c. period.

All these facts point to the idea that the distinction that actually held in Old Spanish was based mainly on two demonstratives: *este* (and reinforced *aqueste*) vs. *aquel*. This provides an explanation for the few occurrences of reinforced *aquesse*. If, following Girón Alconchel (1999), the reinforced forms expressed spatial deixis or emphasis, the absence (or very few occurrences) of the non-reinforced form *ese* within the deictic distinction would preclude the emergence of a special form with such a semantic content. A closer examination of the anaphoric and deictic occurrences of each demonstrative in the five texts examined confirm this (the left column contains the percentage with respect to the total occurrences of the form):

Table 9. Anaphoric demonstratives

	12th c.	13th c.		14th c.	15th c.	Total %
este	92	186	131	225	262	70.1%
aqueste	26	7	-	2	3	50%
ese	8	11	34	8	82	66.2%
aquese	1	-	-	-	-	33.3%
aquel	20	142	80	151	170	70.7%
	Cid	*Cal*	*Faz*	*Zifar*	*Cel*	

Table 10. Deictic demonstratives

	12th c.	13th c.		14th c.	15th c.	Total %
este	32	92	39	54	83	23.47%
aqueste	13	6	-	5	5	38.15%
ese	1	1	1	5	20	12.96%
aquese	-	-	1	-	-	33.3%
aquel	4	18	9	30	36	12.18%
	Cid	*Cal*	*Faz*	*Zifar*	*Cel*	

The first conclusion to be drawn is that the anaphoric use is the most common one and that the reinforced form *aqueste* is the least used with this function. Although this use achieves the 50% of the occurrences, a percentage higher than that of the deictic uses (38.15%), the inferiority with respect to *este* (70.1%) and other demonstratives is clear.[28] Concerning the deictic use of demonstratives, it is worth noticing that both *este* and *aqueste* are regularly found with this interpretation and that, although in absolute terms *este* clearly wins (300 vs. 29 occurrences), the percentage of deictic uses is higher in *aqueste* (38.15% vs. 23.47%). This analysis suggests that Girón Alconchel's claim that reinforced demonstratives are used only deictically or emphatically (and interpreted in Dfocus, in our analysis) is not correct in absolute terms because most uses of *aqueste* are anaphoric, but it may be maintained as a relevant tendency in Old Spanish.

---

28 We are not considering here the percentages of *aquese* due to its irrelevance in absolute terms (only three occurrences) in comparison with the rest of demonstrative forms.

The tables also show that the raise in the use of *ese* took place during the 14th c. and, especially, the 15th c. and that it was connected to the occurrences of the corresponding reinforced form *aquese*. With respect to the deictic interpretation, the difference between *ese* and the rest of demonstratives is clear in the whole set of texts examined: 28 occurrences of *ese* vs. 300 of *este*, 29 of *aqueste*, and 97 of *aquel*. Besides, the percentages of deictic *ese* and *este* are comparable only if we restrict the comparison to the last two medieval centuries: 21.9% of the occurrences of *este* were deictic vs. 21.7% of *ese* in the five texts examined. The fact that *ese* was not generally used as a deictic demonstrative until the end of the medieval period entails that the current three degree deictic distinction could not have been fully operative in Spanish until the same period (i.e., until the change from Old to Modern Spanish). Consequently, we conclude that, in spite of the existence of three different forms (*este, ese, aquel*), the Old Spanish demonstrative system only distinguished two deictic degrees (proximal and distal) like Vulgar Latin (and most Romance languages). The incorporation of the distinction between proximity to the speaker and proximity to the hearer occurred late in Old Spanish. Only when the deictic uses of the demonstrative *ese*, a basically anaphoric form, generalized and became comparable to those of *este* and *aquel* was such a distinction possible.

This conclusion, which, at a certain extent, corroborates Rost's intuition that *ese* is an anaphoric determiner in Old Spanish, is borne out by some data concerning the way different demonstratives are used to explicitly express a deictic contrast within the same sentence. In the following examples the different spatial location is established by means of the proximal demonstrative *este* and the distal demonstrative *aquel*:

(50) a. dixo   est con est, aquel con aquel

    say.PAST.3S this with this that   with that

    '(he) said this one with this one, that one with that one' (*Faz*; 13th c.)

  b. "E *aquellos* dos moços?   E   *esta* dueña?"

    and those   two young gentlemen and this maiden

    'And those two gentlemen? And this lady? (*Zifar*; 14th c.)

The absence of the forms *ese / aquese* in this use was the rule in this context until the 15th c.:

(51) No por   *essa* calle, sino por   *esto*tra

    not through this street but through this.other

    'Not through this street, but through the other one' (*Cel*; 15th c.)

This example is especially relevant because the proximal demonstrative *esta* is opposed to *essa* in a situation where both referents are perceived as proximal, suggesting, then, that the three deictic degree distinction was starting to take effect in Spanish.

17.5.2. Demonstratives in Modern Spanish

The system of demonstratives in Modern Peninsular Spanish is integrated by three diferent forms that distinguish three deictic degrees: proximity to the hearer, proximity to the speaker, and distance from both the speaker and the hearer. This system eliminated the reinforced forms *aqueste* and *aquesse* and the only reinforced form preserved is *aquel*:

Table 11. Modern Spanish

	Simple form	Deixis
Dem 1	*este*	Proximal (speaker)
Dem 2	*ese*	Proximal (hearer)
Dem 3	*aquel*	Distal

The following example shows that the three demonstratives can actually express the three deictic values:

(54) Primero coge *estos* libros y ponlos en *esa* estantería, después trae *aquellas* carpetas y clasifícalas.

'First, take these books and put them on this shelf, then, bring those folders and file them.'

The semantic interpretation of this sentence presupposes that: (i) the books (*estos libros*) are more proximal to the speaker than the shelf; (ii) the shelf (*esa estantería*) can either be located closer to the hearer than to the speaker or at the same distance from both of them; and (iii) the folders (*aquellas carpetas*) are farther from both the hearer and the speaker.

17.5.2.1. *Syntactic contexts and semantic values*

In general terms, Modern Spanish demonstratives preserve the Old Spanish uses (although some relevant semantic differences between the two stages can be detected) and, as we will see, they are extended to a few new syntactic contexts. The main differences to be noticed concern the contrastive uses, the combination with locative adverbs, the use before a proper name, and the cooccurrence with the definite article.

17.5.2.1.1. *Spatial deixis*

The three degrees of spatial deixis and their connection to the speaker and the hearer have already been illustrated in (52), which corresponds to the standard use of the demonstrative determiners/pronouns. There are, however, examples like (53) where the proximal to speaker demonstrative *este* is referring to something that is clearly closer to the hearer:[29]

(53) *Esta* chaqueta (que llevas) te queda muy bien.

'This jacket (that you are wearing) suits you.'

But this construction is not a counterexample to the idea that *esta* designates entities closer to the speaker. This is so because, in the regular interpretation of sentences like (53), the demonstrative is actually establishing a kind of temporal deictic identification that allows for the comparison with a previous (or posterior) referent, (54a), and for the use of other demonstratives like *aquella*, if we conveniently change the verbal tense, (54b) (see 17.5.2.1.2.):

(54) a. *Esta* chaqueta te queda mejor (que la de antes).

'This jacket suits you better (than the previous one).'

b. *Aquella* chaqueta (que llevabas la semana pasada) te quedaba mejor.

'That jacket (that you wore last week) suited you better.'

And in case that a locative deictic contrast between referents and demonstratives is explicitly intended, the demonstrative *esta* maintains its closest-to-speaker nature (independently of the relation with respect to the hearer). In the following example, *esta chaqueta* must refer to the jacket that is most proximal to the speaker:

(55) *Esta* chaqueta (que llevas ahora) te sienta mejor que *ésa*.

'This jacket (that you are wearing now) suits you better than this other one.'

17.5.2.1.2. *Temporal deixis*

Certain occurrences of demonstratives express a temporal deictic identification:

(56) Lo haremos *esta* noche.

it do.FUT.1P this night

'We will do it tonight.'

The proximal form
interpreted through
interpretation in an ex
of any particular night
obtain a sequence wh
a night previously int
did it that night'. How
in nominal expression
original deictic value
correspondence betw
by the verbal form. T
compatible with verb
or future) that allow
it is not with verbal
The distal demonstra
And the proximal d
but the present conti
proximal future), (57

(57) a. Lo *hemo*

'We hav

b. Lo *habí*

'We hac

c. Lo *habi*

'We hac

(58) a. *Lo *ha*

b. *Lo *he*

c. *Lo *es*

The compariso
distinction in ten
proximal *este*, (57
use of demonstra
between *ese* and *a*
its deictic value o
demonstrative *ese*
(it is only incomp
directly connecte

---

29 I thank X. Lamuela for bringing to my attention this use of the proximal to speaker demonstrative.

The proximal form *este* is the only demonstrative that may be unambiguously interpreted through a temporal deictic relation. That is, its appearance and interpretation in an example like (56) does not rely at all on the previous mention of any particular night. If we replace this demonstrative by either *esa* or *aquella*, we obtain a sequence where the reference of the DP must be linked anaphorically to a night previously introduced in the discourse: *lo hicimos esa / aquella noche* 'We did it that night'. However, it is worth noticing that the demonstratives that appear in nominal expressions that refer to temporal events maintain (at least partly) their original deictic value. As the contrast between (57) and (58) shows, there exists a correspondence between the choice of the demonstrative and the tense expressed by the verbal form. Thus, in Peninsular Spanish, the proximal demonstrative *este* is compatible with verbal tenses (present perfect, present continuous, simple present, or future) that allow for an interpretation proximal to the moment of utterance. But it is not with verbal forms (past perfect) that refer to a remote past, (57a) vs. (58a). The distal demonstrative *aquel* only admits remote past verbal tenses, (57b) vs. (58b). And the proximal demonstrative *ese* fits well with all the mentioned verbal tenses but the present continuous (although the simple present must be interpreted here as proximal future), (57c) vs. (58c).

(57) a. Lo *hemos hecho / estamos haciendo / hacemos / haremos* esta noche.

'We have done / are doing / do / will do it tonight.'

b. Lo *habíamos hecho / hicimos* aquella noche.

'We had done / did it that night.'

c. Lo *habíamos hecho / hicimos / hacemos / haremos* esa noche.

'We had done / did / do / will do it that night.'

(58) a. *Lo *habíamos hecho / hicimos* esta noche.

b. *Lo *hemos hecho / estamos haciendo / hacemos / haremos* aquella noche.

c. *Lo *estamos haciendo* esa noche.

The comparison among the three series of examples in (57) reveals that the actual distinction in temporal deixis (expressed by the verbal tense) is produced between proximal *este*, (57a), and distal *aquel*, (57c). This means that the temporal deictic use of demonstratives only distinguishes two degrees, not three. The difference between *ese* and *aquel* is that, in spite of having an anaphoric reading, *aquel* project its deictic value on the temporal interpretation of the sentence, but *ese* does not. The demonstrative *ese* is neutral in this context and its interpretation is strictly anaphoric (it is only incompatible with the present continuous tense, i.e., the verbal tense more directly connected to the speech act).

17.5.2.1.3. *Anaphoric reading*

In Modern Spanish any demonstrative is able to express an anaphoric relation with a referent previously mentioned in the discourse (see Eguren 1999 for a description of this use of demonstratives and the restrictions they are subject to):

(59) a. Ana se encontró ayer   con María, pero *ésta* no la   reconoció.

      Ana meet.PAST.3S yesterday with Maria but   this not her recognize.

      'Ana met Maria yesterday, but Maria didn't recognize her.'

    b. Juan y   Carlos se han   peleado otra   vez. Detesto *esa* situación.

      Juan and Carlos have.3P fought   another time hate.1S this situation

      'Juan and Carlos fought each other again. I hate such a situation.'

In (59a) the referent of the proximal demonstrative pronoun *ésta* is the person designated by the proper name *María*, and in (59b) the determiner *esa* refers to the whole event previously described. The proximal/distal distinction is used to fix the anaphoric relation. When the discourse provides two possible referents, the proximal demonstrative is linked to the last mentioned entity (the closest one) and the distal demonstrative is linked to the first one.

(60) Marta$_i$ y Ana$_j$ ya no trabajan aquí, *ésta*$_{j/*i}$ se jubiló y *aquélla*$_{i/*j}$ se fue a otro país.

    'Marta and Ana do not work here anymore. Ana retired and Marta moved to another country.'

However, the spatial deictic distinction does not extend completely to the anaphoric use. The ungrammaticality of the following two examples is due to the fact that the anaphoric relations distinguish two degrees, but not three (61a), and that the distinction must be established between proximal *este* (not *ese*) and distal *aquel*, (61b).

(61) a. *Marta$_i$, Luisa$_k$ y   Ana$_j$ ya no trabajan aquí, *ésta*$_j$ se jubiló, *esa*$_k$ fue

      Marta Luisa   and Ana yet not work   here this retired   this was

      despedida y   *aquélla*$_{i/}$ se fue a otro   país.

      fired   and that   went to other   country

    b. *Marta$_i$ y Ana$_j$ ya no trabajan aquí, *esa*$_j$ se jubiló y *aquélla*$_i$ se fue a otro país.

The fact that the demonstrative *ese*, which is interpreted anaphorically in several syntactic contexts, cannot enter into this kind of constrastive distinction indicates

that the grammatical op
limited to two degrees (

17.5.2.1.4. *Combina*

In Modern Spanish
demonstrative coocur
introduced by the prep
deictic content they exp
ese de ahí, or *aquel de*

(62) a. Quiero *aqu*

      want.1S tha

      'I want tha

    b. ¿*Aquel de*

      that   of tl

      'That one

      (*Corpus d*

    c. *Este de aq*

      this of he

      'This dep

      español; 2

The presence of t
whole construction i
value of the demonst
are not attested unt
Modern Spanish.

In the Old Spani
redundant locative s
As can be seen in (6
by the demonstrativ

30 There is, in fact,
presuppose a previ
the temporal distri

31 The demonstrative
combined with a d
not found in the o

that the grammatical opposition regarding demonstratives in anaphoric relations is limited to two degrees (proximal *este* vs. distal *aquel*), as in temporal deixis.[30]

17.5.2.1.4. *Combination with a deictic locative adverb*

In Modern Spanish there are deictically redundant constructions where a demonstrative cooccurs with a deictic locative adverb. The locative adverb is introduced by the preposition *de* and it must agree with the demonstrative in the deictic content they express (that is, we may find combinations such as *este de aquí*, *ese de ahí*, or *aquel de allí*, but not like **este de allí* or **aquel de aquí*):[31]

(62) a. Quiero *aquel* libro de *allí*.

       want.1s that   book of there

       'I want that book over there.'

   b. ¿*Aquel de allí* del   Valejo? — No, éste, éste, el   de la Regañada.

       that   of there of.the Valejo   no   this this   the of the Regañada

       'That one there, in Valejo? — No, this one, this one, the Regañada one.' (*Corpus del español*; 20th c.)

   c. *Este de aquí* es   el diputado que había   sido paracaidista.

       this   of here BE.3s the deputy   that have.PAST.3s been parachutist

       'This deputy here is the one who had been a parachutist.' (*Corpus del español*; 20th c.)

The presence of the locative adverb emphasizes the deictic interpretation of the whole construction in such a way that it seems a locative reinforcement of the deictic value of the demonstrative. Given that in the corpora examined these constructions are not attested until the 20th c., we can consider that they are characteristic of Modern Spanish.

In the Old Spanish texts examined, we found some cases that involve a similar redundant locative specification, but the syntactic configuration is clearly different. As can be seen in (63), the locative adverb is not a modifier of the noun introduced by the demonstrative, but a constituent embedded into a relative clause.

---

30 There is, in fact, a close connection between both uses. Anaphoric (or cataphoric) relations presuppose a previous (or immediately following) mention of the referent. That is, they depend on the temporal distribution of the elements that integrate the discourse.

31 The demonstrative *ese* seems a bit weaker than *este* and *aquel* in this context because it can also be combined with a distal adverb: *esa casa de allí (abajo)* 'that house over there'. Such a variation is not found in the other forms: **esta casa de ahí, */?aquella casa de ahí (al lado)*.

(63) a. "*Esta* moça que *aquí* yo tengo"

    this   girl   that here I have.1s

    'The girl that I have here' (*Zifar*; 14th c.)

   b. "*Ese* cavallero que está   *ay*   çerca

    this   knight   that be.3s there close

    'The knight that is around here' (*Zifar*; 14th c.)

   c. Si *aquella* que *allí*   está en aquella cama

    if that   that there be.3s in that bed

    'If the one that is there, on that bed …' (*Cel*; 15th c.)

Besides, the deictic value of the locative adverb does not necessarily match that of the demonstrative. In (64), the adverbs *acá* and *aquí* express proximity, contrary to the distal demonstrative *aquel*:

(64) a. meti   el cuerpo en *aquel* saco que *acá* troxiste

    put.PAST.1s the body in that bag that here bring.PAST.2s

    'I put the body in the bag that you brought' (*Zifar*; 14th c.)

   b. llega sin   temor acá, que *aquel* cavallero que esta *aquí* í

    arrive without fear here that that gentleman that be.3s here

    'Come here with no fear because the gentleman who is here…' (*Cel*; 15th c.)

This deictic discordance of (64b) is possible because the distal demonstrative is not interpreted deictically, but anaphorically, i.e., as a definite article.

17.5.2.1.5. *Combination with a proper name*

In Modern Spanish we should distinguish two configurations where demonstratives introduce proper names:

(65) a. *Esta* Marta no es la que yo conozco, la que yo conozco es otra Marta.

    this Marta not is the that I met.1s the that I met.1s is other Marta

    'This Marta is not the one I met, the one I met is another Marta.'

   b. *Este* Juan siempre está   de broma.

    this Juan always be.3P of joke

    'Juan is always joking.'

The presence of the demonstrative in (65a) discriminates between several referents that we designate with the proper name *Marta* (as the bracketed continuation confirms) and focus our attention on one particular member of this set. In other words, here the proper name functions, to some extent, like a common noun and the demonstrative allows us to identify the relevant referent through the usual anaphoric or deictic relation. In (65b), on the other hand, there is a reading where no such a discrimination between referents takes place and the referent of *este Juan* is identified independently of the existence of other people called *Juan*. That is, here *Juan* acts as a true proper name.[32]

The example in (65b) differs in several grammatical aspects from a sentence like *Juan siempre está de broma*, where, as usual in standard Spanish, no determiner precedes the proper name. First, from a semantic viewpoint, in (65b) certain particular evaluation about the referent is added to the mere identification. Secondly, the initial DP in (65b) may receive a particular stress and the intonation of the sentence slighty separates it from the rest of the clause. Thirdly, in this construction the preferred demonstrative is *este*, in contrast with the configuration in (65a), which shows no restrictions in that sense. Compare (66), where the demonstrative is interpreted as in (65a), with (67), which can be associated to the use in (65b).

(66) a. *Esta / esa* Marta no es la que yo conozco.

b. *Aquella* Marta no era la que yo conocía.

(67) a. *Este / *ese* Juan siempre está de broma.

b. **Aquel* Juan siempre estaba de broma.

Finally, the DP with the demonstrative tends to appear at the beginning of the sentence (i.e., at the left periphery of the syntactic structure of the sentence). This can be clearly appreciated in examples like (68), where the DP is the direct object:

(68) a. *Este Juan*, ayer   lo   vimos   borracho otra vez.

      this Juan   yesterday   him see.PAST.1P   drunk   another time

      'Juan, yesterday we saw him drunk again.'

b. **Ayer vimos borracho a *este Juan* otra vez.

---

32 Actually, the DP *este Juan* in (65b) is ambiguous between an interpretation parallel to that of (65a) and the one just described. In the discussion that follows in the text all the grammatical properties and judgments attributed to this DP are referred only to the second reading, i.e., to the reading of *Juan* as a proper name.

This indicates that the proper name introduced by *este* is a topicalized element and that, by using it, the speaker makes explicit some particular presuppositions about the characteristics of the designated person. Such interpretation depends exclusively on the presence of the demonstrative, as shown by the fact that it is crucial to distinguish (68a) from sentences with topicalized constituents like *A Juan, ayer lo vimos borracho otra vez* (where the proper name, in contrast with (68a), is preceded by the preposition *a* that introduces [+human] and [+spec] direct objects in Spanish), and that (68a) or (65b) can only be uttered if the referent of the proper name has been previously (and recently) introduced in the discourse.

In addition to that, the difference between the two constructions in (65) is clearer in Catalan, a language where proper names are generally preceded by the "personal article" (spelled out as *en / el* (m.) and *na / la* (f.)). The personal article does not appear if the proper name is functioning as a common noun, (69a), but it is necessary in the other interpretation, (69b).[33]

> (69) a. Aquesta Marta no és la que jo conec, la que jo conec és una altra Marta.
>
> *Aquesta *la* Marta no és la que jo conec, la que jo conec és una altra Marta.
>
> b. Aquest *en* Joan sempre està de broma.
>
> *Aquest Joan sempre està de broma.

The presence / absence of the personal article shows that the demonstrative is combining with a proper name structure in one case and with a common name structure in the other. We conclude, then, that the two instances of demonstratives preceding proper names involve two different syntactic configurations: a common noun-like structure in the case of the discriminative reading (65a, 69a), and a proper name structure in the case of the valorative reading (65b, 69b). Only in the former one is the demonstrative interpreted through the usual deictic or anaphoric values.

---

33 These Catalan examples are the exact translation of the Spanish ones in (65). The ungrammaticality of the example in (69b) refers only to the proper name reading of *Joan*. This sequence is grammatical with the interpretation of *Joan* as a common name, like *Marta* in (69a) or *Juan* in (65a). In general, the behavior of the demonstratives in (65b) and (69b) is parallel in Spanish and Catalan, but we think that there is a slight difference between the two languages regarding the apperance of other demonstratives. In Catalan the distal demonstrative *aquell* does not sound as odd as in Spanish (the correspondence between the demonstrative and the past tense of the verb follows the pattern seen in 17.5.2.1.2.):

   (i) Aquell *en* Joan sempre estava   de broma.
   that ART   Joan always be.PAST.3s of joke
   'Joan was always joking.'

Thus, the anaphoric relation needed in this use of the demonstrative (previous introduction of the referent in the discourse) combines with the proximal/distal temporal interpretation.

In the latter, it would act as a kind of topicalization marker (which precludes the spatial deictic reading, but not the anaphoric one).[34]

Demonstratives can also introduce proper names in Old Spanish. But the grammatical configurations we have just commented are very different from the ones attested in the medieval examples, where the demonstratives were used deictically/anaphorically or emphatically (examples (49) repeated here as (70)):

(70) a. e Pero Vermúez e *aqueste* Muño Gustioz   (*Cid*, v. 3066; 12th c.)

b. e fue mucho cruel omne, e *este* Herodes fyzo matar todos   (*Faz*; 13th c.)

c. Grado a Dios del çielo & a *aquel* Rey don Alfonso   (*Cid*, v. 3453; 12th c.)

In current Spanish the exclusively deictic reading of the demonstrative of (70a) is impossible and the anaphoric use of (70b) sounds a bit odd unless the particle *tal* or *propio* is added reinforcing the identity relation: *el/este tal Herodes* vs. *??este Herodes*. The emphasis referred to celebrities, (70c), is nowadays achieved through the definite article and an adjective that overtly expresses this meaning: *el famoso / mismísimo rey Alfonso*. There is, then, a clear change from Old to Modern Spanish. The use of demonstratives before a proper name is now oriented to discriminative or evaluative interpretations, rather than to anaphoric or deictic identifications.

17.5.2.1.6. *Postnominal demonstratives*

The postnominal position of the demonstrative seems to be characteristic of Modern Spanish. We have not found any example previous to the 19th century:

(71) a. ¿Qué se hizo   de la chica *aquella*?

what do.PAST.3s of the girl   that

'What happened to that girl?' (*Corpus del español*; 19th c.)

b. … en el hombre *aquel* tan miserable

in the man   that so vile

'… in that very vile man' (*Corpus del español*; 19th c.)

c. ¿Qué me ibas   a decir de la chica *esa* de tu   clase?

what me go.PAST.2s to say   of the girl thist of your course

'What were you about to tell me about this girl in your class?' (*Corpus del español*; 20th c.)

---

34 The Catalan data show, in addition, that the position of the demonstrative in the DP structure must be higher than that of the personal article. Thus, the personal article would occupy the Dfin-head (as suggested in 17.3.2.1. and 17.3.2.4.) and the demonstrative would appear in Dfocus or Dtopic.

d. la chica *esta* con la que se casó

the girl this with REL.PRON marry.PAST.3S

'this girl (he) married' (*Corpus del español*; 20th c.)

This construction is related to the syntactic status of both the definite article and the demonstrative. According to our analysis, the demonstrative is in Dtopic or Dfocus and the definite article is in Dforce. So the emergence of this construction depends on the (grammaticalized) use of the definite article as an expletive.

17.5.2.2. *From Old to Modern Spanish: The evolution of demonstratives*

The following table compares the uses of demonstratives in Old and Modern Spanish (√ = attested or grammatical; * = unattested or ungrammatical):

Table 12. Old Spanish vs. Modern Spanish

		Old Spanish	Modern Spanish
Deixis	Spatial	√ (2 degrees)	√ (3 degrees)
	Temporal	√ (2 degrees)	√ (2 degrees)
Anaphoric relation		√ (2 degrees)	√ (2 degrees)
Proper names	Deictic / anaphoric	√	*
	Emphatic (celebrity)	√	*
	Discriminative reading	(*)	√
	Valorative reading	*	√
Deictic locative adverb	in a PP complement	*	√
	in a relative clause	√	√
Postnominal position		*	√

The most striking semantic difference concerns the development of the three degree distinction in the spatial deixis, which is the use where each demonstrative form opposes the rest and, consequently, where the existence of three different demonstratives (*este, ese, aquel*) in the paradigm acquires complete sense. The Modern Spanish deictic distinction reminds the Classical Latin system and is subsidiary of the increment of the deictic use of *ese* detected at the end of the medieval period (see 17.5.1.2.). Given that the first occurrences of *ese* (originally a discursive pronoun with an emphatic meaning) in Spanish were mostly anaphoric, the relevant change consisted of the reanalysis of this item as a deictic determiner in Dfocus (like *aquel* or *este*). This change may be linked to the progressive configuration of the discursive relations typical of *ese* through lexical elements like *propio, mismo, tal,* etc. preceded by a clear anaphoric determiner (the definite article, in most cases).

Along this grammatical change, the use of the demonstrative extended to new syntactic contexts. In general, the Modern Spanish uses of demonstratives are, as expected, built on their original meaning and grammatical behavior. But there are some differences that are worth commenting on. With respect to the combination of the demonstrative with a proper name, the main difference is the valorative use that is related to an emphatic interpretation presumably in the Dfocus projection.

The Old Spanish uses that disappeared are reminiscent of the same uses of demonstratives in Latin and they have been replaced by constructions involving the definite article and certain modifiers. The discriminative or restrictive reading of demonstratives with proper names reproduces the prototypical anaphoric and deictic values of the demonstrative and, although we have not found any clear instance in the texts examined, it is possible it already existed in Old Spanish (since the same use may be found in Latin). The existence of postnominal demonstratives relies more on the particular use of the definite article than that of demonstratives, which in this context present the usual anaphoric and deictic readings. Finally, the cooccurrence of the demonstrative and a locative adverb with the same deictic specification is understood as a kind of reinforcement of the spatial deictic interpretation, in a way similar (from a semantic point of view) to the locative reinforcement ACCU in Latin.

The new interpretive possibilities and syntactic uses of the demonstratives in Spanish are linked to the properties of the highest functional categories and, consequently, they must be analyzed in relation to the development of the complex DP-structure in Romance. That is, in relation to the way definite determiners are progressively acquiring the semantic values associated to the different syntactic projections, and to the way their role is changing within the grammatical system. In the next section, we focus on this process in Romance.

17.6. THE GRAMMATICALIZATION OF DEFINITE DETERMINERS IN ROMANCE

The preceding comparison between Old and Modern Spanish with regard to the use of demonstratives allows us to figure out the evolution of these definite determiners. The uses reported correspond to the interpretation of the determiner in the highest positions of the nominal structure. Consequently, their syntactic evolution from Latin to Romance should be parallel to, first, the development of such a structure in nominal expressions and, secondly, the analysis of determiners as grammatical elements related to that functional field. In this section we show that the complex DP-structure we propose fits especially well with an analysis of the evolution of Romance demonstratives as a case of grammaticalization.

17.6.1. Demonstratives and determiners in nominal expressions in Latin

It is a well-known fact that Classical Latin lacked definite articles or any other functional item systematically used to introduce nominal expressions within the sentence. But this does not entail that Latin also lacked the DP-structure specifically associated to these grammatical elements. The deictic and discursive pronouns (see table 3 in 17.4.) were incorporated to nominal expressions in a way that they clearly contributed to settle the reference and the definite interpretation (examples from Bassols de Climent 1956: §§189-197 and Devine and Stephens 2006: 513):

(72) a. *hic* liber; *iste* liber   (deictic)

'this book'

b. *Ea* res est   Helvetiis (...)   nuntiata   (anaphoric)

this thing is Helvetii.DAT.PL announced.FEM.SG

'This plan was announced to the Helvetti'

c. Medea *illa*   (emphasis; proper name)

'that famous Medea'

d. Gavius *hic* quem dico Consanus   (anaphoric; proper name)

'the aforementioned Gavius of Consa'

The combination of the deictic and anaphoric pronouns with the noun (and its modifiers), which corresponds to what traditional grammarians describe as pronouns used as adjectives, reveals that the nominal structure should provide the syntactic positions relevant to the anaphoric or deictic interpretation (i.e., the projections of the DP-domain). Then, the point is to figure out the behavior of the noun and the rest of the nominal constituents within this functional structure in Latin and in Romance languages.[35]

Latin differs from modern Romance languages in that, in general, it had a (relatively) free order of constituents. In the case of nominal constructions, this is confirmed by the fact that in Classical Latin adjectives and other modifiers or complements could follow or precede the noun. Herman (1997) claims that two of the most prominent features of Vulgar Latin regarding word order within nominal expressions were the gradual consolidation of the contiguity between the adjective and the noun and the generalization of the postnominal position for genitive modifiers.[36] The following examples (from Väänänen 1985: 198 and Herman 1997: 101) show that IPSE and ILLE may be either prenominal or postnominal:

(73) a. ... per med
(*Peregrinati*

'... throug
valley'

b. Memoria sa
memoria ec

'Saint Elyse
church has

c. ..., ut *illa*
aerariis dis

'... [asking
Franks trea

Romance language
restrictive word order
languages can be, ver
complements (genitive
noun.[37] We may capt
(definite) determiners
as a consequence of
determiners. This fit
movement leaves behi
most adjectives, and,
domain (the Ω–dom
projections of the sa
from Latin to Roma
through the nomina
analysis of demonst
domain. This proces
where these element
data seem to bear th
postnominal positio
as a determiner and
becoming frequent i

---

35 According to Devine and Stephens (2006: ch. 4, 5), Latin nominal expressions may be attributed a maximal syntactic structure with focus and topic projections and, additionally, with specific projections for demonstratives, strong quantifiers, and weak quantifiers. The surface order between nominal constituents (demonstratives, quantifiers, genitive modifiers and complements, etc.) as well as their pragmatic interpretation would follow from the position they occupy in the structure after several movement operations involving heads and/or phrases.

36 Adjectives (including "pronouns used as adjectives") could be either prenominal or postnominal, but there were some semantic differences. According to Väänänen (1981:243), prenominal adjectives were interpreted as qualificative, whereas postnominal adjectives received a determinative or a discriminative reading. Along the same lines, Devine and Stephens (2006: 511 — 515) pointed out that prenominal demonstratives were restrictive, whereas postnominal ones were non-restrictive.

37 Some adjectives ca
semantic difference
whereas the postno
1996, Bosque and Pi
of exclusively prenc
that determiners p
examined and the c

(73) a. ... per mediam vallem *ipsam* (...) per *ipsam* vallem ostendebant (*Peregrinatio*)

'... through the middle of the valley (...) they appear through this valley'

b. Memoria sancti Helysei ubi fontem *illum* benedixit ibi est et super *ipsa* memoria ecclesia fabricata est   (*De situ terrae sanctae*)

'Saint Elyseus' grave is in the place where he blessed the spring, and a church has been built on this/the grave

c. ..., ut *illa* duodece milia soledorum, quas annis singulis Francorum aerariis dissoluebant, debuissent cassare   (*Fredegario*)

'... [asking] to stop the 12,000 payment .... they give every year to the Franks treasury'

Romance languages went beyond Vulgar Latin in the consolidation of a more restrictive word order. The unmarked order within nominal expressions in these languages can be, very generally, described as follows: (i) the noun precedes PP-complements (genitives included) and most adjectives; (ii) determiners precede the noun.[37] We may capture this by considering that in Romance both the noun and (definite) determiners are in the functional domains of the nominal structure, as a consequence of overt movement of the noun and of external merge of the determiners. This fits well with the word order just mentioned because noun movement leaves behind (i.e., in postnominal position) all the PP-complements and most adjectives, and, in case the noun reached projections of the highest functional domain (the Ω–domain), it also preceded any determiner remaining in the lower projections of the same field. So the syntactic evolution of nominal expressions from Latin to Romance essentially consisted of the development of noun raising through the nominal functional categories (Φ–domain and Ω—domain) and the analysis of demonstrative/anaphoric pronouns as elements merged in the highest domain. This process connected the noun closely with such pronouns even in stages where these elements were not considered true determiners yet. The Vulgar Latin data seem to bear this out. According to Herman (1997) and Väänänen (1985), the postnominal position of the "adjective" (i.e., the pronoun) was enough to interpret it as a determiner and the use of determinative adjectives in prenominal position was becoming frequent in colloquial speech.

---

37 Some adjectives can be either prenominal or postnominal, but each use corresponds to strong semantic differences. Prenominal adjectives may affect the referential properties of the noun phrase, whereas the postnominal ones restrict the meaning of the noun (for the case of Spanish, see Bosque 1996, Bosque and Picallo 1996 or Demonte 1999, among others). There also exists a very reduced class of exclusively prenominal adjectives labeled as "determinative adjectives". The exceptions to the rule that determiners precede nouns are the instances of postnominal demonstratives we have already examined and the definite article in Romanian, which is enclitic to the noun: *omul* 'the man'.

For the purposes of this chapter, it is enough to consider that the combination of a deictic or anaphoric pronoun with a noun in Latin took place in a syntactic structure that included the projections where the pronoun checks its deictic or anaphoric interpretation. In (74) we represent this by taking the position that the pronoun is a determiner (from now on, the form ILLE stands for any demonstrative or discoursive pronoun):[38]

(74) [$_{DforP}$ Dfor ...... Dfin-ILLE [$_{IP}$ ...... [$_{nP}$ ... [NP] ....]]]

According to this analysis, the presence of a noun preceding the demonstrative/discoursive determiner derives from an overt syntactic movement of the noun to the higher functional projections and the increasing use of "determinative adjectives" follows from syntactic merge of these elements in Dfin (and higher projections). The differences between the several stages of Latin and the several Romance languages will follow from the way how the constituents (mainly demonstratives and nouns) of the nominal expression are realized within the structure, that is, from the position where they are externally or internally merged.

17.6.2. The syntactic position(s) of demonstratives and their formation in Romance

In (74) the demonstrative is in the lowest projection of the highest functional domain, but it will be either deictically or anaphorically interpreted in the Dfocus or Dtopic projections, which are above Dfin and are present only if required. The interpretation of the determiner/pronoun in Dtopic or Dfocus implies syntactic overt or covert movement of this element to these projections. The following representations illustrate it (the italic print indicates that the projection is not syntactically relevant to the intended interpretation and in fact, not present in the derivation):

(75) a. Anaphor

[$_{DforP}$ Dfor [

b. Deictic

[$_{DforP}$ Dfor [

We indicate th
covert by underli
copy will be the h
Dfin.[39] It is diffic
Latin. Probably, i
it progressively w
language. The di
very idealized inc
the nominal stru
active host for mc

We have alrea
evolved from der
In our analysis,
have been origin
with a locative (

(76) [$_{DforP}$ D

Several po
demonstrative:
ECCE/*ACCU is
head configur
A third possi
assuming that
of its locative
In any case, t
the reanalysis
interpreted in

---

38 There exists an alternative analysis along the traditional lines that the pronoun is an adjective:
    (i) [$_{DforP}$ Dfor ...... Dfin [$_{IP}$ ... ILLE ... [$_{nP}$ ... [NP] ....]]]
    This analysis, which may be taken as a previous step to (74) if we postulate syntactic movement of ILLE to Dfin, covers well the fact that the demonstrative/anaphoric adjective can precede or follow the noun. But it introduces a clear asymmetry in the syntactic analysis of demonstrative and anaphoric elements. When they appear alone (i.e., they are pronouns), they would head their own projection with the pertinent referential features (unless they combine with a lot of empty functional and lexical categories). When they combine with a noun (i.e., they are adjectives), they merge to a functional projection of the IP domain. Notice that (74) avoids such asymmetry. If, in minimalist terms, the demonstrative/anaphoric pronoun externally merges to the NP (or to the nominal IP) and projects a (complex or not) DP-structure, we do not need to say that pronouns are also adjectives or behave like adjectives. From this viewpoint, pronouns and determiners belong to the same grammatical class of definite entities that are interpreted through anaphoric and deictic relations (i.e., determiners in the sense of Abney 1987).

39 In these (ar
    better, the

40 Unless a f
    Devine an

41 Notice tha
    between t
    the hearer
    overtly sp

(75) a. Anaphoric reading

$[_{DforP}$ Dfor $[_{DtopP}$ ILLE $[_{DfocP}$ Dfoc $[_{DfinP}$ ILLE $[_{IP}$ ...... $[$ NP $]$ ... $]$ $]$ $]$ $]$

b. Deictic reading

$[_{DforP}$ Dfor $[_{DtopP}$ Dtop $[_{DfocP}$ ILLE $[_{DfinP}$ ILLE $[_{IP}$ ...... $[$ NP $]$ ... $]$ $]$ $]$ $]$ $]$

We indicate that the movement of the demonstrative may be either overt or covert by underlining it. If the movement turns out to be overt, the pronounced copy will be the higher one. If it is covert, the pronounced copy will be the one in Dfin.[39] It is difficult to state definitely that this movement was overt or covert in Latin. Probably, it was originally covert (as well as noun or NP movement)[40] and it progressively was made overt through the successive stages and varieties of the language. The difference between Classical Latin and Vulgar Latin (taken both as very idealized individuations) is that, in the latter, overt syntactic movement within the nominal structure increased and the higher functional domain became a more active host for moved constituents.

We have already seen (tables 4 and 5 in 17.4.) that most Romance demonstratives evolved from demonstrative forms reinforced with the locative particle ECCE/*ACCU. In our analysis, this particle may be placed in the Dfocus projection and it would have been originally used to indicate that the demonstrative had to be interpreted with a locative (i.e., deictic) value:

(76) $[_{DforP}$ Dfor $[_{DtopP}$ Dtop $[_{DfocP}$ ECCE/*ACCU $[_{DinP}$ ILLE $[_{IP}$ ...... $[$ NP $]$ ... $]$ $]$ $]$ $]$

Several possibilities arise to account for the formation of the reinforced demonstrative: (i) ECCE/*ACCU is in the head Dfocus and ILLE moves to it; (ii) ECCE/*ACCU is in Spec, Dfoc, ILLE moves to Dfocus, and the resulting specifier-head configuration is reanalyzed as a single item, as proposed in Giusti 2001. A third possibility, which does not match the representation in (76), consists of assuming that the locative particle incorporates to ILLE in Dfin and that, by virtue of its locative meaning, it forces the overt raising of the complex head to Dfocus. In any case, the origins of Romance reinforced demonstratives are to be found in the reanalysis of the sequence ECCE/*ACCU-ILLE as a single lexical form syntactically interpreted in Dfocus.[41]

---

39 In these (and the following) representation, we leave aside the syntactic movement of the noun (or, better, the NP), which would reach at least the specifier position of Dfin.

40 Unless a focus interpretation of a particular nominal constituent was explicitly intended (see Devine and Stepehens 2006: ch. 5).

41 Notice that (76) also allows for the inclusion of another element expressing a content linked to Dfocus, between the locative particle and the demonstrative. This is the case of Italian *codesto* 'this (close to the hearer)'. The origin of this form is ECCU + TIBI + ISTE, where the second person pronoun TIBI overtly specifies the deictic force (proximity to the hearer) that ISTE lost in Vulgar Latin.

This approach predicts that Romance reinforced demonstratives had their origin in a form primarily used as deictic and that their anaphoric use is, in this sense, secondary. The prediction is indirectly borne out by the fact that in the Old Spanish data examined the percentage of deictic uses is higher in the reinforced forms than in the non-reinforced ones (see 17.5.1.2.). Besides, the few occurrences of the reinforced form *aquesse* (<*ACCU-IPSE) in comparison with *aquel* (<*ACCU-ILLE) and *aqueste* (<*ACCU-ISTE) are also in accordance with this. Given that the deictic system maintained a two degree distinction until Late Old Spanish, the deictic formation of a third demonstrative would make no sense.

Finally, we would like to notice that this does not prevent the reinforced demonstrative from being also used anaphorically in Romance. Once it is perceived as an indissoluble lexical unit, the locative content of the particle weakens and the reinforced form is progressively used to express anaphoric relations (i.e., interpreted in Dtopic). The evolution of demonstratives is cyclic. A deictic demonstrative (ILLE, ISTE) is used both deictically and anaphorically to the extent that it needs the presence of a particle (ECCE/*ACCU) to overtly express the original deictic value. Then, the new deictic form starts to be used again deictically and anaphorically, and it might again require a locative element to be interpreted as deictic (17.6.5.). In fact, this was the history of demonstratives in Latin: (i) the deictic form HIC included a final particle –c(e) (related to ECCE, probably), which had a locative meaning and could also be added to the other demonstratives ISTE and ILLE (see Meillet and Vendryes 1979: 497-498); (ii) any demonstrative form was used both deictically and anaphorically (see Bassols de Climent 1956: 199 – 202); (iii) in Vulgar Latin ISTE and ILLE were reinforced by the locative particle ECCE;[42] and (iv) the resulting reinforced forms ended up being used both deictically and anaphorically.

17.6.3. The feature content of determiners: The formation of the Romance definite article

We assume that the deictic and the anaphoric readings of the definite pronoun/ determiner are syntactically expressed through the interpretable features [±proximity] and [±anaphoric]. The [±proximity] feature, which encodes the deictic content of the demonstrative, fixes the reference of the nominal expression through physical relations and is checked off in Dfocus. The [+anaphoric] feature is a device to connect the nominal expression with a referent previously introduced in the discourse and is interpreted in Dtopic. This captures the two interpretations of the demonstratives: (i) a deictic demonstrative is [+anaphoric] and has the [+proximity] or [-proximity] deictic specification, which is checked off through syntactic movement to Dfocus in (75b); (ii) a demonstrative interpreted anaphorically is

[+anaphoric] (and also [±proximity]) and it checks off this value in Dtopic (syntactic movement to Dtopic in (75a)). The positive specification of the anaphoric feature is, then, crucial to force the demonstrative to be interpreted in the highest projection. Or, in other words, [+anaphoric] precludes the deictic identification in Dfocus and allows for the reinterpretation of the deictic content in terms of anaphoric relations.

Following the same reasoning, an exclusively anaphoric determiner bears the [+anaphoric] feature, lacks the [±proximity] deictic specification, and is, as a result, interpreted in Dtopic without any distance contrast. This is the case of the Latin anaphoric pronoun/determiner IS and of the current uses of Romance definite articles:[43]

(77) a. *Ea* res est Helvetiis per indicium nuntiata est   (= 72b)

'This plan was announced to the Helvetii by informers'

b. $[_{DforP}$ Dfor $[_{DtopP}$ IS $[_{DfocP}$ *Dfoc* $[_{DfinP}$ IS $[_{IP}$ ...... [NP] ...]] *]*]]

[+anaphoric]

The anaphoric use of the demonstrative ILLE in Latin involved the [+anaphoric] and [–proximity] specifications, like any anaphoric use of demonstratives. But when ILLE was fully conceived as the substitute of IS, the [–proximity] value was lost. That is, the anaphoric interpretation in Dtopic induced the reanalysis of ILLE without the deictic feature, and the [+anaphoric] feature prevailed. In (78), we provide an instance of anaphoric ILLE (example from Bassols de Climent 1956: 223), and represent the change in its feature content:[44]

---

43 The interpretation of the definite article in Dfocus in Romance is possible only under emphatic readings (see 17.3.2.2.), but never with deictic readings. Similarly, an emphatic pronoun/determiner like IPSE would be interpreted in Dfocus with this meaning.

44 A similar simplification on the feature specification applied to IPSE, which lost its emphatic or contrastive value (another feature interpreted in Dfocus), replaced IS, and evolved into a definite article in some Romance languages (Catalan, Sardinian). In the case of demonstratives, the element with the [–proximity] value is the one that turns into a mere anaphoric determiner. This is not surprising if we take such specification as the unmarked one (or less marked than [+proximity]) and if we bear in mind that [–proximity] demonstratives, like the definite article and in contrast with [+proximity] demonstratives, can be used non-referentially. The compatiblity with a relative clause in subjunctive is a test for a [–specific] and non-referential reading of the nominal expression in Spanish:
(i) a. [*Aquel / el* que llegue   tarde] será   castigado.
        that   the that arrive-SUBJ.3s late be-FUT-3s punished
        'Whoever comes late will be punished.'
     b. *[*Este / ese* que llegue   tarde] será   castigado.
        this this that arrive-SUBJ.3s late   be-FUT-3s punished
Thus, the non-referential reading of the demonstrative, which implies the absence of any feature interpreted in Dfocus, would contribute to its grammaticalization as a definite article.

(78) a. corvus (...) *ille*   corvus ....

    raven-NOM.S that-NOM.S raven-NOM.S

    'raven (...) the raven'

b. [$_{DforP}$ Dfor [$_{DtopP}$ ILLE [$_{DfocP}$ Dfoc [$_{DfinP}$ ILLE [$_{IP}$ ...... [NP] ...]]]]]

    [+anaphoric]

    ([–proximity])

ILLE [+anaphoric] [–proximity] > ILLE [+anaphoric] (= IS [+anaphoric])

The representation in (78b), i.e., the anaphoric use of the demonstrative, is to be taken, then, as the syntactic source for the emergence of the definite article in Romance. A consequence of this analysis is that it predicts that the definite article cannot evolve from the reinforced version of the demonstrative because reinforced forms crucially rely on the interpretation in the Dfocus projection, as shown in (76), where Dtopic is not syntactically active. Only in case it had no link with the Dfocus projection at all could a reinforced form be a candidate to become a pure anaphoric determiner/pronoun. This was not the case of Latin reinforced demonstratives and, consequently, they could not be the basis for the formation of the definite article in any Romance language.

17.6.4. The grammaticalization process

The process of grammaticalization that turns the demonstrative ILLE into the definite article of Romance languages presupposes, as stated above, the loss of the [–proximity] deictic feature and its resulting interpretation as [+anaphoric] in Dtopic. This means that a determiner/pronoun that can be used both deictically and anaphorically (i.e., interpreted either in Dfocus or in Dtopic) is a determiner/pronoun that is being interpreted in the highest functional projections of the nominal structure (Dtopic and, if it were the case, Dforce). This approach is consistent with the widely assumed view on the grammaticalization of ILLE in Romance (see Batllori and Roca 2000 for the case of the Spanish definite article) and with Diessel's (1999) considerations about the grammaticalization of demonstratives in general. According to this author, only the deictic interpretation of demonstratives expresses a non-grammaticalized use. Under this view, the Romance definite article (i.e., the descendant of ILLE with anaphoric value) is an instance of grammaticalization, but so are the anaphoric interpretation of demonstratives and any other uses like type or emphatic readings, the introduction of proper names, etc. Diessel accounts for this behavior of demonstratives by considering that they follow a grammaticalization path that departs from the deictic use and is undertaking all the rest of uses, interpretations, and forms. [45]

---

45 In the case of Romance languages, the grammaticalization path also includes pronominal clitics. Most of these grammatical elements have their origin in Latin demonstratives (examples from

The complex DP-structure we put forward provides us with a syntactic configuration that fits well with the grammaticalization path of demonstratives. If the different readings of the demonstratives correspond to their interpretation in one of the higher functional projections, the grammaticalized and non-grammaticalized uses follow from the way this determiner syntactically merges to these syntactic positions. The relevant representations are the following ones:

(79) a. Deictic use

$$[_{DforP} \text{Dfor} [_{DtopP} \text{Dtop} [_{DfocP} \underline{\text{ILLE}} [_{DfinP} \underline{\text{ILLE}} [_{IP} \ldots\ldots [\text{NP}] \ldots]]]]]$$

b. Anaphoric use

$$[_{DforP} \text{Dfor} [_{DtopP} \underline{\text{ILLE}} [_{DfocP} \text{Dfoc} [_{DfinP} \underline{\text{ILLE}} [_{IP} \ldots\ldots [\text{NP}] \ldots]]]]]$$

c. Expletive use

$$[_{DforP} \underline{\text{ILLE}} [_{DtopP} \text{Dtop} [_{DfocP} \text{Dfoc} [_{DfinP} \underline{\text{ILLE}} [_{IP} \ldots\ldots [\text{NP}] \ldots]]]]]$$

The grammaticalized uses correspond to the interpretation of the demonstrative in the highest projections Dforce and Dtopic, whereas the non-grammaticalized ones are found in the lower projections, assuming that Dfocus is the place for the deictic interpretation.[46] This means that Diessel's grammaticalization path of demonstratives may be syntactically expressed as a way up to the tree in which the higher the determiner appears, the more grammaticalized it is.

With respect to the evolution from Latin to Romance, the main differences concern the way the definite determiners enter into the syntactic derivation. Keeping the idea that the evolution of Romance nominal expressions is linked to the development of the DP-structure, Latin demonstratives appear in the lowest projection and, probably, they did not overtly move to higher positions. In Vulgar Latin (and in the way to Romance), they progressively show syntactic overt movement to the higher projections (depending on their interpretation), producing a rigid syntactic order with respect to genitive complements, but allowing for a certain degree of variation with respect to the position of the noun. And, in (the several stages and varieties of) Romance, they internally or externally merge in the higher functional projections (according to their interpretation). The kind of definite determiner that will typically merge in the highest projections Dforce and

Catalan): *el* 'him, it (m.)'< ILLE, *ho* 'it (n.)' < HOC, *hi* 'there' < HIC (Latin demonstrative adverb). The locative clitic *hi*, for instance, is a clear case of grammaticalization. It is a weak form (enclitic or proclitic to the verb) and it is usually interpreted anaphorically. The following example shows how this form is referring to a previous mentioned place:

    (i) No fiquis això [al calaix]$_i$, que no m'agrada trobar-*hi*$_i$ aquesta mena de coses.

      'Do not put this in the drawer. I do not like to find this kind of things in it.'

46 The "more grammaticalized" status of the emphatic uses may be captured by considering that the demonstratives with these uses are syntactically analyzed in a projection higher than the deictic ones (see fn 15).

Dtopic is the one completely devoid of deictic content, i.e., the definite article (see tables 1 and 2 in 17.3.3.).

The analysis and the evolution we propose are consistent with Roberts and Roussou's (2003) approach to grammaticalization. These authors claim that the syntactic change that intervenes in certain cases of grammaticalization is a change from a movement configuration to a merge configuration (that is, Move > Merge). This is met in any of the representations in (79) and can be generally expressed as follows (F_1 and F_2 stand for any functional projection of the Force – ... – Fin system):

(80) a. $[_{F2}$ F_2 $[_{F1}$ F_1-ILLE $[_{IP}$ ...... $[$ NP $]$ ... $]$ $]$ $]$

    b. $[_{F2}$ ILLE$_i$ $[_{F1}$ t_i $[_{IP}$ ...... $[$ NP $]$ ... $]$ $]$ $]$ →   Movement (from F_1 to F_2)

    c. $[_{F2}$ ILLE $[_{F1}$ F $[_{IP}$ ...... $[$ NP $]$ ... $]$ $]$ $]$ →   Merge (in F_2)

The representation (80b) allows for the reanalysis of the determiner as an element related to the higher functional projection F_2 and, in a further stage, it will externally merge to (i.e., grammaticalize as) F_2, as expressed in (80c).

17.6.5. Summary and final remarks

To sum up, we have seen that demonstratives display several degrees of grammaticalization, which syntactically correspond to external merge or movement to the higher functional projections of the complex DP-structure (Dforce ... Dfin), where (definite) determiners, according to their interpretation, are found in Romance. In general terms, definite determiners with deictic content appear in the lower projections, whereas definite determiners lacking such a content (anaphoric and expletive determiners) merge to the higher projections. Typically, demonstratives belong to the first kind, whereas the second one is realized as the definite article (which is, in fact, a grammaticalized demonstrative). Yet, certain uses of definite determiners, like emphatic interpretations or, depending on the analysis assumed, the introduction of a proper name, depart from this general picture, and they can be captured by merging the determiner in Dfocus or Dfin (see 17.3.2.).

We should also point out that, under this approach, nothing would prevent any demonstrative form from merging in the highest functional position Dforce once it had completely lost its deictic content. This could be the case of the French demonstrative *ce(t)*. In French the demonstrative *ce(t)* has no deictic content by itself and the [±proximity] specification is expressed by means of a deictic locative adverb that immediately follows the demonstrative or the demonstrative plus the noun and its modifiers:[47]

---

[47] See Jones (1996) and, especially, Rowlett (2007) for a more detailed description of the syntactic behavior of French demonstratives and their connection with the functional architecture of DPs.

(81) a. *ceci / celà* 'this / that'

   *c*elui-*ci / c*elui-*là* 'this one / that one'

   b. *ce* livre *ci / là*

   this book here there

   'this / that book'

Rowlett (2007: 63–70) points out that the form *ce(t)* without the locative reinforcement, which can be used anaphorically, functions like a mere definiteness marker, and he places it in a high projection inside the DP structure. In terms of our analysis, this amounts to saying that this form is closer to the definite article, that it externally merges in a high functional position (Dtopic, in case of the anaphoric reading), and that, in short, it has gone one step further in the grammaticalization path than its counterparts in other Romance languages (like *aquel* (Sp.), *aquest* (Cat.), etc.). So French would differ from other Romance languages in that it has two demonstrative forms in a very advanced degree of grammaticalization: the definite article *le* and the definite determiner/pronoun *ce(t)*. In languages like Spanish or Catalan, in contrast, the demonstrative forms still preserve their deictic content and there is only one definite determiner completely devoid of this kind of content: the definite article *el*.

Jones (1996: 260) observes that, in certain dislocated constructions, the demonstrative *ce* can appear in the subject position referring to a previous nominal expression, but losing the agreement gender and number features:

(82) a. La bière d'Alsace, *c'* est délicieux.

   the beer of Alsace this is   delicious

   'Alsatian beer, it is delicious.'

   b. Les enfants, *c'* est mignon.

   the children this is   lovely

   'The children, they are lovely.'

In (82) *ce* looks like a pronoun with no φ-features that fulfills the need of an explicit subject in French in a way closer to that of an expletive subject. This use (as well as, probably, the one found in presentational sentences like *C'est moi* 'It is me') may support the analysis of this demonstrative form as an expletive, that is, as an element linked to the highest functional Dforce-head. And it bears out our proposal that the French demonstrative can appear in the highest DP-projections and is more grammaticalized than its counterparts in other Romance languages. Besides, the fact that the form *ce(t)* evolved from a reinforced demonstrative with the particle ECCE (see Zink 1989) confirms again the cyclic nature of the formation of demonstratives. The Latin locative particle appeared to reinforce the deictic use of the demonstrative.

The resulting form (ECCE + ISTE > *cisti* > *cest* > *ce(t)* in French) lost this content to the extent that nowadays it may be used as an expletive. A locative reinforcement (*ci* / *là*) is required (again) to interpret the demonstrative deictically.[48]

17. 7. CONCLUSION

In this chapter we have put forward an analysis of definite determiners within a "split-DP hypothesis" that postulates the existence of several functional projections in the highest domain of the DP-structure. These functional projections provide us with a suitable theoretical framework to account for the syntactic distribution of definite determiners (demonstratives and definite articles) in Romance, their semantic interpretation, and their evolution in terms of a grammaticalization process.

The change from Latin to Romance involved, on the one hand, a simplification of the deictic distinctions in the demonstrative system and a readjustment of the system of demonstrative and discoursive pronouns/determiners. On the other, the syntactic development of a complex functional structure in nominal constructions and the extension of the uses of most demonstratives. In this sense, the comparison between Old Spanish and Modern Spanish shows that the progressive extension of the grammatical functions covered by definite determiners is a very active process still present in Romance languages. The differences noticed concerning the use of demonstratives (introduction of a proper name, combination with a locative adverb, postnominal position) are related to the analysis of these determiners in the highest functional projections of the nominal structure. With respect to the forms and the paradigm of demonstratives, we have seen that, according to the data examined (texts from the 12th c. to the 15th c.), Old Spanish maintained a demonstrative system based on a two deictic degree distinction (like most Romance languages and Vulgar Latin) until the end of the medieval period. This is when the anaphoric form *ese* began to be systematically used as deictic, and a third distinction (proximity to the hearer) was introduced (like in the Classical Latin system). We have also pointed out that a slight difference concerning the deictic and the anaphoric readings subsisted between reinforced and non-reinforced forms in Old Spanish and that the syntactic uses and interpretations of demonstratives and the definite article are progressively increasing (i.e., they are grammaticalizing in Diessel's terms) until Modern Spanish.

The evolution of demonstratives from Latin to the several Romance languages,

---

48 A different locative reinforcement was already found in previous stages of French. In Old French the locative particle *i* was added to the regular form to intensify the demonstrative content (see Zink 1989: 73 – 74):

(i) *Icest* conseil te don.
     this advice you give
     'I give you this piece of advice.'

This indicates that the Latin particle ECCE was no longer interpreted as a locative reinforcement. Similarly, the particle *i* progressively lost its meaning and disappeared.

combined with the co
treat the definite deter
or lower degree of gra
a higher or lower func
approach also capture
reinforcement with loc

SOURCES

Old Spanish literary te

Poema de Mio Cid. Fa
    Madrid, Dirección

Almerich, Arcidiano
    Itinéraire Biblique
    Acta Salmanticens

Calila e Dimna, J. M. (
    Castalia.133.

El Libro del Cauallero
    University of Mich

Fernando de Rojas,
    Hispánicas.4.

Old Spanish Compila

González Ollé, F. (19
    S.L. [Fines del sig
    1900, 4, 455-62]

Old and Modern Spa

Davies, M. *Corpus d*

Real Academia Esp

combined with the complex functional structure we have proposed, allows us to treat the definite determiners of these languages as demonstratives with a higher or lower degree of grammaticalization which corresponds to their interpretation in a higher or lower functional projection in the DP-system. In addition to that, this approach also captures the cyclic nature of the formation of demonstratives and its reinforcement with locative deictic particles.

SOURCES

Old Spanish literary texts

Poema de Mio Cid. Facsímil de la edición paleográfica, R. Menéndez Pidal (ed.), 1961, Madrid, Dirección General de Archivos y Bibliotecas.

Almerich, Arcidiano de Antiochia, *La Fazienda de Ultra Mar. Biblia Romanceada et Itinéraire Biblique en prose castillane du XIIe siècle*, M. Lazar (ed.), 1965, Salamanca, Acta Salmanticensia, Filosofía y Letras, Tomo XVIII, Núm. 2.

Calila e Dimna, J. M. Cacho Blecua y M. J. Lacarra (eds.), 1987, Madrid, Castalia, Clásicos Castalia.133.

El Libro del Cauallero Zifar (El Libro del Cauallero de Dios), Ch. Ph. Wagner (ed.), 1929, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor/Kraus Reprint.

Fernando de Rojas, *La Celestina*, D. S. Severin (ed.), 1989, Madrid, Cátedra, Letras Hispánicas.4.

Old Spanish Compilation (literary and non-literary)

González Ollé, F. (1993), *Lengua y Literatura Españolas Medievales*, Madrid, Arco/Libros S.L. [Fines del siglo XII. Auto de los Reyes Magos, ed. de R. Menéndez Pidal, RABM, 1900, 4, 455-62]

Old and Modern Spanish data base

Davies, M. *Corpus del español* <www.corpusdelespanol.org>

Real Academia Española: Banco de datos (CORDE). *Corpus diacrónico del español.* <www.rae.es>