

NOT SO LOW DEMONSTRATIVES IN ROMANCE

Pietro Baggio, Queen Mary University of London

Especially after the publication of Brugè's (2002) analysis of Spanish postnominal demonstratives and Italian demonstrative reinforcers, the existence of *low demonstratives* in the noun phrase has very much become part of the "received view" of the syntax of the DP. Some examples include Alexiadou et al. (2007) (and many references cited therein), and Guardiano's extensive work on demonstratives (e.g. Guardiano 2010), as well as Roberts (2017) for a recent approach.

According to this popular approach, demonstratives (henceforth, Dems) that appear in postnominal position (1) surface in their low Merge position, across which N^0 raises by head-movement. Prenominal Dems, on the other hand, undergo movement from that low position to Spec,DP. (Argument) PPs occurring to the right of a postnominal Dem are structurally lower, while adjectives occurring to its left are higher. Similarly, Dem reinforcers (2) are taken to surface in that same low position, while their associated Dem, with which they initially form a constituent, raises to Spec,DP. A simplified structure for Dem reinforcers is shown in (3).

- (1) *el libro gordo este* (2) *questo libro rosso qui*
thebook big this (Spanish) this book red here (Italian)

- (3) [DP Dem D⁰ [N⁰ [(AP*) [<Dem> *qui* [(PP*) [NP <N⁰>]]]]]]

The purpose of my presentation will be to argue against this commonly held view, with data from Spanish (postnominal Dems) and Italian (Dem reinforcers). In particular, I will argue that the claim that *este* in (1) and *qui* in (2) are low in the DP is empirically untenable, and that *at least* their *surface* position must be significantly higher than usually believed.

I will present evidence of five types, exemplified here only with Italian Dem reinforcers for simplicity's sake. First, I will look at coordination structures, which indicate that prenominal Dems form a constituent with the noun that *excludes* the Dem reinforcer. This is shown in (4) with DP-level coordination. Consider also (5), with NP-level coordination (interpreted with a single referent, an individual who is both a singer and an actor): the NPs and their adjectives obligatorily form a constituent that excludes the Dem reinforcer, contra (3).

- (4) [*questa matita e questa penna*] *qui* vs. **questa [matita qui e penna qui]*
this pencil and this pen here
- (5) *questo [mediocre cantante ma abile attore] qui*
this mediocre singer but skilled actor here

Secondly, I will show that NP-ellipsis targets a low constituent that, importantly, excludes Dem reinforcers yet includes syntactic objects (e.g. APs) that would be supposedly higher than Dem reinforcers under Brugè's (2002) approach in (3):

- (6) *quei due gatti grigi lì e questi tre ~~gatti~~ ~~grigi~~ qui*
those two cats grey there and these three (cats grey) here

Thirdly, I will show that the APs occurring to the left of Dem reinforcers are in the mirror image of their base-generated order, requiring a derivation with roll-up movement of the NP (as in Cinque 2010), rather than head-movement of N^0 across unmoved APs (7). Similarly, *pace* Brugè's (2002) claims, the argument PPs to the right of Dem reinforcers also occur in the mirror image of their Merge positions, with hierarchically higher PPs (as evidenced by e.g. anaphor binding tests) further right than hierarchically lower PPs (8). The roll-up derivation required to account for these facts renders a constituency structure with Dem reinforcers lower than the adjectives but higher than the PPs simply impossible. The alternative structure is indicated in (9) (with details, such as traces, omitted).

- (7) *questo vaso cinese(origin) antico(age) qui*
 this vase Chinese ancient here
- (8) *questa statua qui di Napoleone(theme) di Canova(agent)*
 this statue here of Napoleon of Canova

(9) [[[[DP **Dem** D^0 [[[NP N^0] AP_{low}] AP_{high}]] *qui*] PP_{low}] PP_{high}]

Fourthly, the interpretation of DPs with scope-taking modifiers shows, again, that Dem reinforcers are high. In (10) below, *altri* 'other' is obligatorily interpreted as taking scope under the Dem reinforcer and over *miei amici* 'my friends' only.

- (10) *questi [altri miei amici] qui*
 these other my friends here ('these other friends of mine, here')

Fifthly, if the low Dem approach was correct, in cases of DPs with a measure noun (e.g. *litro* 'litre' below), we would expect the Dem reinforcer to occur between the measure N and its partitive PP complement. In fact, as predicted by the structure in (9) under the assumption that partitive PPs, unlike argument PPs, are truly low complements, the Dem reinforcer appears to the right of the [$N_{measure}$ [$PP_{partitive}$]] constituent.

- (11) *questo [litro (*?qui) di vino] (qui)*
 this litre (*?here) of wine (here)

In conclusion, my aim is to provide evidence from Spanish and Italian showing that an extremely popular approach to the derivation of postnominal Dem(reinforcer)s in Romance is empirically untenable. I will conclude my discussion by delineating the high surface position for postnominal Dem(reinforcer)s that emerges from the data discussed. I will adopt a complex structure for the D-layer (e.g. $D^0 > Top^0 > Foc^0 > Def^0$), much inspired by Aboh (2004) and Haegeman (2004). I will suggest that Italian postnominal Dem reinforcers are base-generated in a middle projection of this D-layer. Its complement, containing the demonstrative, the noun head, and any adjectives, will then move to a higher specifier, as shown in (13), based on (2). Argument PPs, if present, may be taken to surface structurally higher than the DP layer, as in Kayne (2005) and Cinque (2010).

(13) [DP [DefP *questo libro rosso*] [XP *qui* <[DefP ...]>] (PP*)

