



Jenks, Peter & Konate, Rassidatou. 2022. Indexed definiteness. *Glossa: a journal of general linguistics* 7(1). pp. 1–44. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.16995/glossa.5717>



Open Library of Humanities

Indexed definiteness

Peter Jenks, UC Berkeley, US, jenks@berkeley.edu

Rassidatou Konate, LafiaCare, US, rassidatou.konate@berkeley.edu

This paper posits a distinction between plain definite DPs and indexed definite DPs: only the latter have a syntactically represented referential index, an *idxP*, in [Spec, DP]. After sketching a theory of *idx* as a cross-categorial feature of pro-forms, the paper argues that anaphoric definites, complex demonstratives (e.g. *that linguist*), and pronominal definites (e.g. *we linguists*) have *idxP* specifiers in [Spec, DP]. The second part of the paper presents a case study from anaphoric definite DPs in Marka-Dafing (Mande) which provides evidence for this proposal. We examine a co-occurrence restriction between exophoric and anaphoric demonstratives in Marka-Dafing, concluding that this restriction provides additional support for a syntactically represented *idxP* in [Spec, DP], as well as motivating the *Single Index Constraint*, the idea that indexed definites can only make use of a single index to achieve reference.

Glossa: a journal of general linguistics is a peer-reviewed open access journal published by the Open Library of Humanities. © 2022 The Author(s). This is an open-access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License (CC-BY 4.0), which permits unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original author and source are credited. See <http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>.

OPEN ACCESS



1 Introduction

The status of referential indices in syntactic theory is unclear. On one hand, theories of coreference and binding have been devised which avoid referential indices altogether (e.g. Safir 2004; Reuland 2011; Rooryck & Vanden Wyngaerd 2011). The development of these theories was motivated by the Inclusiveness Condition of Chomsky 1995 (p. 228), which posited that symbols such as indices could not be added to syntactic representations during the computational procedure.

On the other hand, several streams of research in syntax and semantics continue to assume that indices are part of grammatical representations. For example, the rigidly referential properties of demonstrative noun phrases suggests that they include a referential index, as in (Nunberg 1993; Elbourne 2008; Simonenko 2014; Šimík 2016). The semantic effect of this index is to anchor certain noun phrases to particular referents in the discourse or context. Similarly, Schwarz (2009) and Jenks (2018) argue that anaphoric definites have an overt index while unique definites do not.

Indices have also proven indispensable in research on the grammar of focus. The widely adopted formalism of Kratzer (1991) relies on a binding relationship between a focus operator which evaluates alternatives and a distinguished focus index on the focused constituent which generates those alternatives, necessitated by the island-insensitivity of this relationship (see also Wold 1996; Beck 2016; Bassi & Longenbaugh 2020). In addition to providing an account of island-insensitivity, index-based theories of focus account for intervention effects with multiple foci (Beck 2006). Overt syntactic correlates of focus indices have been proposed in Basaá focus constructions (Leffel et al. 2014) and Sinhala *wh*-particles *de* (Romero & Meertens 2022).

Outside of focus and reference, indices have been essential in the analysis of switch-reference morphology, which has been recently been analyzed as index-sensitive agreement in Washo (Arregi & Hanink 2018) and Amahuaca (Clem 2019a; b; To appear). Leading analyses of sentence-external *same* and *different* also make crucial use of indices Brasoveanu (2011); Hardt & Mikkelsen (2015); Hanink (2018). Finally, reference to indices are needed to account for the distribution of null versus overt pronouns in Mayan languages such as Popti' (Aissen 2000) and Chuj (Royer 2021): if two overt third person pronouns occur in the same clause and neither binds the other, they must have disjoint reference. If one of these pronouns is null, it must be coindexed with the other. Royer (2021) argues that this effect arises at PF, requiring the second of two coindexed DPs to be elided, hence necessarily represented in the syntax. Summing up, then, there is strong evidence from a variety of sources pointing to the fact that indices are a part of the syntax and semantics of natural languages.

It seems that there is strong support for the idea that referential indices may be present in syntax. The only way to include indices in the syntactic representation without violating inclusiveness is to provide them with a featural counterpart from the start. As is the case with

any feature, a featural counterpart of indices would be expected to be part of some but not all syntactic expressions. Building on the above work, this paper argues that incorporating indices into syntactic theory illuminates the differences between unique definite descriptions and a class of expressions which are labeled indexed definites. Indexed definites, or D^xP s, are proposed as a natural class of rigidly referential noun phrases which include demonstratives, anaphoric definites, and pronominal definites (such as *we linguists*). The main idea is that pronouns, anaphoric indices, and demonstratives share a syntactic feature *idx*, interpreted as a variable. In the general theory of *idx* sketched in Section 3, *idx* is category-neutral and combines with different syntactic categories to create anaphoric or indexical counterparts for those categories. The class of indices which refer to individuals are of category $D/idxP$ s; when they occur in indexed definites they occupy [Spec, D^xP]. Plain unique definite DPs, on the other hand, lack an index in their specifier. This contrast is illustrated in **Figure 1**, where *the president* is a unique definite DP while *that president* is D^xP . In this example, the demonstrative determiner *that* is the realization of *idx* in [Spec, D^xP].




Figure 1: Plain versus indexed definiteness.

Semantically, plain or unique definites DPs are headed by a definite determiner interpreted as an ι operator. Once composed with the NP complement of D, plain definite DPs denote the unique individual or maximal plurality with property P in situation s , e.g., *the unique president in s* where s = ‘somewhere in France in the year 2022’. Indexed definite DPs, on the other hand, are headed by a D^x head. D^xP s denote the unique individual or maximal plurality with property P in situation s who is identical to the denotation of the $D/idxP$, namely, the individual located at the index on idx_x , namely the discourse referent $g(x)$, e.g., ‘the unique president who is $g(1)$,’ where $g(1)$ = Emmanuel Macron in some context.

The idea that demonstratives, pronouns, and anaphoric indices occur in the specifier of some DPs has been assumed in some form in much work on DP syntax (Giusti 2002; 2015), anaphoric definiteness (Schwarz 2009; Jenks 2015; 2018), demonstratives (Šimík 2016; 2021b; Ahn 2019), and strong or demonstrative pronouns (Patel-Grosz & Grosz 2017; Clem 2017; Bi & Jenks 2019). An alternative perspective on syntactic indices is pursued by Simonenko (2014) and Hanink (2018; 2021), in which an equivalent of *idxP* lives below DP; this paper will build on this work in pursuing a general theory of syntactic *idxPs*, but will argue that the syntax in Figure 1 is correct, that is, that indices generally surface as a specifier or perhaps adjunct of the DP projection.

The first part of this paper motivates and sets out the distinction between unique vs. indexed definites. Section 2 reviews arguments that plain definites are characterized only by uniqueness, and shows how this conclusion accounts for the ability of plain definites to function predicationally and to covary based on situations. Section 3 sketches a theory of syntactic indices, in particular the idea that there is a general-purpose syntactic *idx* feature, realized as what linguists usually call pronouns and demonstratives, which is interpreted as a variable which picks out a discourse referent. Section 4 argues for the existence of a dedicated syntax and semantics for indexed definites. The arguments for the proposed syntax focus on the phrasal status of demonstratives and pronouns and their ability to co-occur with definite articles in many languages. The argument for the proposed semantics come from the rigidly referential properties of indexed definites and the observation that a trio of interpretations characterize pronouns, demonstratives, and indexed definites: direct reference, anaphoric reference, and covariation via dynamic binding.

The second part of the paper (Section 5) builds further support for the proposal with a case-study of Marka-Dafing, a Mande language spoken in Burkina Faso. Like many Mande languages, Marka-Dafing has an enclitic definite article, shown in (1a). We show that this enclitic is a plain or unique definite marker. However, Marka-Dafing has a dedicated construction for anaphoric definites which includes an additional syntactic marker, the prenominal element *wó*, glossed *idx* in (1b).

- (1) a. *músó'* = *ó*
 woman DEF
 'the woman'
- b. *wó'* *músó'* = *ó*
 idx woman DEF
 'the woman (that we were talking about)'

The distribution and interpretation of *wó* in (1b) and elsewhere provides direct support for the conclusion that it introduces a discourse-anaphoric index, as in the analysis of German strong definites of Schwarz (2009). The anaphoric index *wó* is shown to be in complementary distribution with possessors, both of which are in [Spec, DP].

Finally, section 6 centers around the observation that *wó* is incompatible with the exophoric demonstrative in Marka-Dafing, despite the fact that they occupy syntactically distinct positions. The proposed explanation is the following general constraint:

- (2) THE SINGLE INDEX CONSTRAINT: Indexed definites and deictic pronouns can only rely on a single referential index to refer.

This constraint follows if the proposed structure for indexed definiteness is a general property of human language, i.e., if indexed DPs more generally only rely on a single referential index to refer.

2 Plain definiteness is unique definiteness

Many languages make use of a morphosyntactic feature [\pm DEFINITE], typically associated with a functional element within DPs (Lyons 1999: p. 16). In this section I review existing arguments which show that uniqueness/maximality is both necessary and sufficient to account for the distribution of [+DEFINITE], and hence to characterize the distribution of plain definite DPs. One consequence of this claim is that semantic functions such as referentiality which have often been associated with definite articles are not necessarily associated with definiteness as a notional category per se (cf. Coppock & Beaver 2012).

One compelling argument that definiteness can be reduced to uniqueness/maximality is made by Coppock & Beaver (2012; 2015), who point out that in some predicative uses of the definite article, particularly under negation, the existence presuppositions which are textbook properties of definite articles fail to surface (Coppock & Beaver 2015: p. 380). Such contexts are illustrated below:

- (3) a. Scott is the (only) author of *Waverly*.
b. Scott is not the only author of *Waverly*.

In the positive example in (3a), the definite article contributes the inference that there is just a single author of *Waverly*. This same uniqueness inference holds in (3b) as well, but the sentence explicitly negates the existence of such an author, so the existence of a unique author of *Waverly* cannot be presupposed.

More generally, definite articles are freely available in predicative contexts where uniqueness holds but there is no reference, for example with superlatives like *Fido is the biggest dog in the pound*, including cases without a real-world denotation such as *the largest real number*. Such uses are unique, but they are not referential and in the latter case cannot be said to presuppose existence.

Coppock and Beaver propose that in predicative contexts, *the* is interpreted as an identity function which checks for uniqueness.

$$(4) \quad \lambda P : |P| \leq 1.P$$

Coppock & Beaver (2015) propose that the existence presuppositions characteristic of argumental uses of definites arise due to an additional ι type-shift (Partee 1987; Chierchia 1998; Dayal 2004). However, the only consistent semantic notion associated with [+DEFINITE] in predicative and argumental contexts is uniqueness.

Another central argument for purely uniqueness-based accounts of definiteness come from cases of situation-based covariation, i.e., contexts where a definite is not referential but covaries due to quantification over situations:

(5) Every Thanksgiving in the United States, the president pardons a turkey.

What is important about this sentence is that different presidents pardon turkeys on different Thanksgivings, so the definite description *the president* fails to denote a single individual, though here it functions as an argument.

Elbourne (2005; 2013) and Schwarz (2009) shows how cases like (5) follow from a theory where the uniqueness presupposition characteristic of definiteness is relativized to a *situation* s , part of the semantic metalanguage. Given a predicate P and a situation s , predicative uses of the definite article simply returns the set of individuals for whom P is true in the situation s :

$$(6) \quad \llbracket \text{the}/\iota \rrbracket = \lambda s. \lambda P_{\langle e, \langle s, t \rangle \rangle} : |P(s)| = 1. \alpha. P(x, s)$$

In (5), the situation variable of the definite is bound by the quantifier *every Thanksgiving*, deriving covarying readings of presidents with Thanksgivings (cf. Berman 1987; Kadmon 1987; Heim 1990). Informally, the situation-dependent denotation of *the president* can be paraphrased as ‘the unique president in s' , where s' is a situation variable bound by the quantificational topic, which can be paraphrased ‘Every s' which is a Thanksgiving in the United States.’

The main alternative to uniqueness-based views of definiteness comes from discourse-oriented approaches to meaning, where definite NPs are associated with familiar discourse referents (Heim 1982; Kamp & Reyle 1993; Kamp et al. 2011; Roberts 2002). However, some of the most striking evidence that definiteness should be characterized primarily by uniqueness rather than discourse familiarity comes from languages with a morphosyntactic contrast between unique and anaphoric definiteness (Schwarz 2013). Such contrasts have been described in some detail in at least German and Fering (Schwarz 2009), Icelandic (Ingason 2016), Swedish (Simonenko 2014), Akan (Arkoh & Matthewson 2013),¹ Thai (Jenks 2015), Korean (Ahn 2017), Mandarin (Jenks 2018), Lithuanian (Šereikaitė 2019), Cuevas Mixtec (Cisneros 2019), ASL (Irani 2019),

¹ Though see Bombi (2018) for a reassessment.

and Chuj (Royer 2019; To appear).² If anaphoric definites are distinct from plain definites in these languages, then plain definites must introduce a requirement distinct from anaphoricity; uniqueness is the only plausible option. As predicted, the simpler plain definites in such languages are always those which mark uniqueness and occur in situation-dependent covarying readings (e.g. Schwarz 2009; Jenks 2018), while the more complex expressions are directly referential and anaphoric (Schwarz 2009; Simonenko 2014; Jenks 2018).

3 The syntactic representation of indices

If plain definites only presuppose uniqueness, we can then ask why expressions such as demonstratives and pronouns can be used in non-unique contexts to refer, either to contextually salient individuals in the immediate context or to a discourse referent, and moreover, why they must refer. It has been proposed in recent work that there is a syntactic feature for a class of syntactic heads that introduce a referential index (cf. Simonenko 2014; Hanink 2018; 2021; Ahn 2019); we will adopt the label *idx*, from Hanink 2021. The *idx* is the core of demonstrative and pronoun projections, expressions whose commonalities have long been recognized in the semantics literature (Kaplan 1977; Nunberg 1993). Hanink (2018; 2021) provides striking evidence for this conclusion from Washo (Isolate; Lake Tahoe, California), where third person pronouns and demonstratives share a common morpheme *gi*:

- (7) a. [_{DP} gí:] pélew ?-í?iw-i
 GI jackrabbit 3/3-eat-IND
 ‘He’s eating the jackrabbit.’
- b. [_{DP} hádi-gi pélew] M-ú:bi?-i
 DIST-GI jackrabbit 3.run-IND
 ‘That jackrabbit ran.’
- (Hanink 2021: p. 506)

Hanink builds an analysis of noun phrases in Washo based on the idea that *gi* realizes an *idx* feature, which is proposed to realize either variable binders or variables themselves.

For Hanink, however, *idx* occurs in the extended projection of nouns above NP and below DP. The ability of demonstratives to occur with adjectives (*that tall*) and adverbs (*that slowly*) suggest their distribution is not tied to a particular syntactic category. Usually functional projections such as number or aspect only associate with a particular lexical category.

Suppose instead that *idx* is not part of the extended projection of DP, but instead a feature which freely combines with any lexical or functional category, resulting in an indexed counterpart of

² See also Ahn (2019); Maroney (2021) for recent refinements of this typology, as well as discussion of bare noun languages which do not make such a distinction.

that category. The resulting complex head, $[idx, F]$ —F a category feature—is a phrasal projection with the distribution of F. This immediately accounts for the fact that *pro*-forms are generally distributed across various categories in natural languages. For example, the *idx* counterparts of various categories are suggested below for English:

- (8)
- a. $[idx, D] = \textit{this, that}$, other pronouns
 - b. $[idx, N] = \textit{one}$
 - c. $[idx, V] = \textit{so, that}$ (as in *do so* or *do that*)
 - d. $[idx, P] = \textit{here, there}$
 - e. $[idx, Deg] = \textit{so, that}$ (as in *so tall* or *that tall*)
 - f. $[idx, Adv] = \textit{so, thus}$
 - g. $[idx, C] = \textit{so, that}$ (as in *say so* or *say that*)

English demonstratives *this*, *that* are underspecified for category, explaining their ability to occur as anaphora for a wide range of categories, including for predicates Partee (1986; 1987).³

- (9)
- a. $[idx] \leftrightarrow \textit{that}$
 - b. $[idx, + \textit{PROX}] \leftrightarrow \textit{this}$


The observation that *this* and *that* have a largely category neutral distribution provides an independent argument for the existence of a category-neutral feature like *idx*. More specifically, if lexical items are the realization of abstract bundles of syntactic features, then there must be some feature like *idx* which serves as a shared feature in the category neutral realization of functional morphemes like English *so*, *this*, or *that*.⁴ When *idx*P are associated with a particular category F we will label the resulting phrase $F/idxP$; this paper will focus on $D/idxP$.

$D/idxP$ are internally complex. This complexity includes ϕ -features and features indicating spatial deixis. These features serve as part of the articulated superstructure of *idx*, and are restricted to occur with *idx* features at least in part by their semantics, as specified below.


³ To simplify some of the discussion below we will assume that English *that* is unmarked for $[\pm \textit{prox}]$, and achieves its distal effect pragmatically, by competition with *this*.

⁴ A connection can be made between the category-neutral distribution of *idx* features and the the category neutral distribution of A' -features such as $[\textit{Topic}]$, $[\textit{Focus}]$, and $[\textit{Wh}]$. However, *idx* and A' features should not be conflated; instead, A' -features seem to ‘live’ on *idx* projections. See Leffel et al. (2014) for an index-based analysis of Basaá focus and contrastive topic, Romero & Meertens (2022) for a focus index-based analysis of Sinhala Q-particles, and Šimík (2021a) for a more general framework. Another connection between A' features and *idx* is that pronouns include *wh*-phrases, topic-oriented null pronouns (Huang 1982; Sigurðson 2011), and focused bound pronouns (Sauerland 2000; Mayr 2012), all of which could be seen as A' sub-features on an *idx* head.

(10) a. Structure of *this*₂:



b. Structure of *we*₇:



The idea that pronouns are featurally different from other noun phrases has been pursued extensively elsewhere (Bejar 2003; Harley & Ritter 2002; Harbour 2016; Sichel & Wiltschko 2021; Sichel & Toosarvandani To appear), including the idea that they bear an index feature which restricts their binding behavior (Rezac 2004; Adger & Ramchand 2005). The contribution of the D feature specifically is to restrict the variables which *idx* allows to be included in the domain of individuals. I follow Ahn (2019) in introducing the particular index as type *n* (numeral) argument of *idx*.

Now suppose that the features associated with an index—e.g. gender, number, or place—are partial identity functions on the variable (of type $\langle e, e \rangle$) which ‘add in’ presuppositional content, restricting the referential potential of the index (Cooper 1979; Heim & Kratzer 1998; Sauerland 2009). First and second person features, for example, would require that the variable be restricted to individuals which have as a subpart the contextually supplied speaker or hearer. Inherently spatial demonstratives, on the other hand, might restrict the potential denotation of the variable to individuals at a contextually defined location.⁵

- (11) a. $\llbracket D, idx \rrbracket^{g,c} = \lambda n: g(n) \in D_e, g(n)$, else undefined.
 b. $\llbracket D, idx_2 \rrbracket^{g,c} = g(2)$, if $g(2) \in D_e$, else undefined.
 c. $\llbracket SG \rrbracket^{g,c} = \lambda x. x$, if $|x| = 1$, else undefined.

⁵ This system is similar in many ways to Ahn (2019), especially in treating the variable as an argument of *idx*, and in treating *idxP* as a specifier of DP. There are several differences as well: Ahn does not analyze pronouns as *idxPs*, and ϕ -features for her are located between DP and NP. In addition, Ahn proposes that *idxP* is of type $\langle e, e \rangle$, and is hence able to combine with any referential noun phrase, as discussed below.

- d. $\llbracket \text{PL} \rrbracket^{g,c} = \lambda x.x$, if $|x| \neq 1$, else undefined.
- e. $\llbracket +\text{SPKR} \rrbracket^{g,c} = \lambda x.x$, if $\text{speaker}_c \leq x$, else undefined.
- f. $\llbracket -\text{PROX} \rrbracket^{g,c} = \lambda x.x$, if x is at δ (a demonstration) not near speaker_c , else undefined.
- g. $\llbracket +\text{PROX} \rrbracket^{g,c} = \lambda x.x$, if x is at δ (a demonstration) near speaker_c , else undefined.
- h. $\llbracket +\text{ANAPH} \rrbracket^{g,c} = \lambda x.x$, if x is an established discourse referent, else undefined.
- i. $\llbracket \text{this}_2 \rrbracket^{g,c} = g(2)$, if $g(2) \in D_e$, if $|g(7)| = 1$, if $g(2)$ is at δ near the speaker in c , else undefined.
- j. $\llbracket \text{we}_7 \rrbracket^{g,c} = g(7)$, if $g(7) \in D_e$, if $|g(7)| \neq 1$, if $\text{speaker}_c \leq g(7)$, else undefined.⁶

The variable introduced by D/idx is what Groenendijk & Stokhof (1990) call a *discourse marker*, an element of D_e , formally distinct from the regular metalanguage variables used by the compositional procedure. The idea that discourse markers constitute a distinct set of variables from regular metalanguage variables has been used to account for a variety of phenomena including donkey anaphora (Groenendijk & Stokhof 1990; Chierchia 1995), the distinction between null and overt pronouns (Kurafuji 1998), and the semantic behavior of anaphoric definites (Schwarz 2009), and recently, weak crossover (Chierchia 2020).

A well-known problem for the idea that pronouns are (always) interpreted as variables is the availability of descriptive uses of pronouns, also called E-type pronouns, pronouns of laziness, paycheck pronouns, or neontological pronouns.⁷ The following example based on Cooper (1979) illustrates the problem:

(12) This year the president is a Republican. Next year, he will be a Democrat.

In the most natural reading of this sentence, *the president* in the first sentence and *he* in the second are two different people, the latter perhaps the president-elect who we know identifies as a man. Such data pose problems for the idea that pronouns are variables over discourse referents, because the pronoun *he* should pick up its discourse antecedent, which would be the current president. This reading is available if we imagine a context where a president changes parties, but the president could also be a different person.

One widely adopted solution to this problem is to view *he* in (12) as a unique definite description whose referent can covary by situation. As such, a plausible analysis of descriptive pronouns is as plain definite descriptions with a deleted NP (Karttunen 1969; Partee 1970; Heim

⁶ These lexical entries are simplified, and ignore for example the extent to which these features should be seen as binary or privative (Bobaljik 2008; Harbour 2016), whether the referent of the index has a contextually supplied relation to the DP referent (Elbourne 2008; Šimík 2016), and whether all of the relevant presuppositions, for example of person and gender, are of the same kind (Sudo 2012).

⁷ Some citations include Geach 1962; Karttunen 1969; Partee 1970; 1975; Evans 1977; Chierchia 1995; Elbourne 2001; 2005 and Recanati 2005. The term “descriptive pronoun” is used by (at least) Recanati.

1990; Elbourne 2001; 2005). If this proposal is correct, the pronoun itself could not bear a *D/idx* feature, as the index is introduced by the deleted NP.⁸

However, there is a way of reconciling an ellipsis-based analyses of descriptive pronouns with the idea that pronouns always are the morphological realization of *D/idx*. Suppose that ellipsis is licensed by an ‘E’ feature, as proposed by Merchant (2001: 61), who defines E as an identity function which introduces a presupposition that the elided constituent is e-GIVEN, which, as defined by Merchant, entails the presence of a “salient antecedent” (p. 26), a plausible *idx*. So E seems to entail the presence of [*idx*], perhaps in addition to a feature such as +ANAPH, which introduces the requirement for an explicit discourse antecedent (Hankamer & Sag 1976), not unlike the Marka-Dafing anaphoric definite pronoun discussed below. Descriptive pronouns then such as *it* in (12) would then be cases of a plain definite D (*l*) which occur with complements containing [N, *IDX*, +ANAPH]:

$$(13) \quad [{}_{DP} D [{}_{N/idxP} N, idx_2, +ANAPH]]$$

The [+ANAPH] feature requires that the property anaphor of *N/idxP* be an established discourse referent. Interpretively, the *N/idxP* is interpreted as the property of being the president in a particular situation.

$$(14) \quad g(2) = \lambda x.\lambda s.President(x,s)$$

Combined with the definite determiner and a situation variable introduced at D, we achieve the descriptive reading.

On the morphological side, suppose that third person pronouns in English have lexical entries like the following one:

$$(15) \quad [D, idx, \phi] \leftrightarrow he, she, they, etc.$$

These lexical entries could either realize a *D/idxP* with ϕ -feature restrictions, which could function as DP arguments on their own, or as plain definite DPs with an *N/idxP* complement.

⁸ An alternative analysis of descriptive pronouns is as hidden functions or relations, pragmatically supplied, that derive descriptive behaviors Cooper (1979); Engdahl (1986); Chierchia (1995); Jacobson (2000; 2012). Under such a view, *he* in (12) might be analyzed as a variable with a concealed ‘president’ function from situations to unique presidents, of type $\langle s,e \rangle$; Recanati (2005) argues that in cases similar to (12), deixis is to a particular contextually salient ‘role’. an example of such an analysis is given below:

$$(i) \quad \llbracket he_4 \rrbracket^{s,c} = \lambda s.R_4(s), \text{ where } g(R_4) = \lambda s'.\iota x.President(x,s')$$

If this approach were adopted, the idea that pronouns are always individual variables could be maintained. The difference between the two theories, the one based on NP-ellipsis and the relational variable view, become very similar in particular if an LF-copying theory of ellipsis is adopted, as advocated in some recent work on NP-deletion approaches to weak pronouns (Saito 2007; Bošković 2018; Sakamoto 2017).

Such an approach could explain why third person pronouns do not allow overt NP complements in standardized English: it is precisely the ellipsis of N which corresponds to the availability of the *idx*. Another way of putting this is that English third person pronouns are ambiguous between something like ‘the one’, where ‘one’ is N/*idx*, and referential pronouns, D/*idx*Ps. A twist on this proposal would be to adopt the view that gender features always originate on N (Kramer 2015; 2016; Conrod 2019), composing with either D or D^x to derive descriptive vs. referential readings of pronouns.

This ambiguity seems to be realized overtly in languages which have phonologically strong pronouns, which are referential, and phonologically weak or null pronouns. Typically if one set of pronouns allow descriptive or sloppy readings it will be with weak or null pronouns (e.g. Kurafuji 1998; 1999; Oku 1998; Saito et al. 2008; Runic 2014; Sakamoto 2017; Patel-Grosz & Grosz 2017; Bošković 2018; Barbosa 2019; Bi & Jenks 2019).⁹ This finding is consistent with the idea that weak and null pronouns realize NP anaphora of some kind rather than DP anaphora (see e.g. Tomioka 2003; Runic 2014); null pronouns can be analyzed as N/*idx*, at least in cases of certain sloppy readings, while strong pronouns are always referential D/*idx*P.

4 Indexed definites


An indexed definite DP is a DP with an D/*idx*P in its specifier position. In support of this theory, this section presents evidence that adnominal pronouns and demonstratives occupy [Spec, DP] in many languages. We will then examine the semantic effects of the D/*idx*P specifier in indexed definites, namely the unavailability of situation-based covariation and three semantic functions which are shared with strong pronouns: exophoric uses, anaphoric uses, and dynamically bound uses. This section focuses primarily on complex demonstratives and pronominal definites of the *we linguists* variety; the following section shows that the theory here extends naturally to account for the overt anaphoric D/*idx*P in Marka-Dafing.

4.1 The syntax of indexed definites

This section reviews several arguments that adnominal pronouns and demonstratives are phrasal and occupy [Spec, DP]. It then argues that in several languages where demonstratives are arguably D heads they are indexed definite D heads (D^x).

⁹ In many languages with null pronouns, additional non-pronominal readings are available which seem to necessitate NP-ellipsis in addition to the need for null pronouns which allow sloppy readings (Saito et al. 2008; Li 2014). We set such cases aside.

Schwarz (2009) demonstrated that there are two morphologically distinct definite articles in German, ‘weak’ definite articles, plain definite D heads, and ‘strong’ definite articles, which are used as anaphoric definites in German. It seems natural to think of anaphoric definites as just one realization of a more general category of indexed definite heads, D^x . In English, adnominal pronouns and demonstratives are both overt realizations of $D/idxP$, with the same structure as German strong or anaphoric definites.



The idea that adnominal pronouns and demonstratives have phrasal syntax and occur in [Spec, DP] has been argued for extensively by Giusti (2002; 2015) and is supported by work on the typology of these elements (e.g. Choi 2014; Roberts 2017). In contrast, many analyses of adnominal pronouns and demonstratives in the semantics literature treat them as heads (Elbourne 2001; 2005; 2008; Wolter 2006). This section will review some of the evidence that these categories are phrasal in many cases in support of the view that they occupy a specifier position.

The most basic argument that demonstratives and pronouns are phrasal is that they also function as pronouns, that is, as stand-ins for entire DPs. If demonstratives and pronouns were heads, it would be somewhat surprising for them to license ellipsis of their complement as proposed by Elbourne (2001), as ellipsis in English is typically licensed by a head with a filled specifier (Lobeck 1995). As phrases, demonstratives and pronouns necessarily occupy a specifier position rather than a head position.

Another convincing arguments that demonstratives and adnominal pronouns can be phrasal comes from locative reinforcers, such as in Southern US English *these here books*, where the demonstrative and reinforcer form a phrasal constituent (Bernstein 1997; Leu 2006; Giusti 2015; Leu 2015). In Southern US English, locative reinforcers can also intervene between adnominal pronouns and the noun:

- (17) a. *Them there fellows* come through here, stealing horses and things.¹⁰
 b. ... since *we here men* are pretty gosh-darn different, we would be mighty proud to go ‘bout introducin’ ourselves.¹¹

To the extent that the demonstrative/pronoun and reinforcer form a constituent, they cannot be D heads, so they must be adjuncts or specifiers. As English and other Germanic languages are generally sensitive to a Doubly-Filled D filter, banning both both D and its specifier being pronounced, the absence of an overt definite article in such examples falls into place if demonstratives and adnominal pronouns are in [Spec, DP] (Giusti 2002; 2015; Alexiadou et al. 2007).¹²

More evidence that demonstratives and pronouns are specifiers comes from the fact that they must co-occur with overt definite articles in many languages (Alexiadou et al. 2007; Giusti 2002; 2015; Roberts 2017; Rudin 2021). For example, in Greek (18) and Akan (19):

- (18) a. Emis *(i) glossologi imaste exypni.
 We the linguists be.1PL.PRES smart
 ‘We linguists are smart.’ (Choi 2014: 14)
- b. afto to vivlio
 this the book
 ‘this the book’ (Alexiadou et al. 2007: p. 122)
- (19) Mè-pè sàá àtààdèè nó
 1SG-like DEM dress DEF
 ‘I like that dress [pointing at Amma’s dress].’ (Bombi 2018: p. 151)

Royer (2019; To appear) analyzes a similar case in Chuj, where demonstratives, which mark anaphoric definiteness, occur with noun classifiers, which mark unique definiteness. The Marka-Dafing case study below provides another example with a dedicated anaphoric demonstrative which co-occurs with a definite article. The position of demonstratives in both languages are consistent with their being in [Spec, DP].

Additionally, in Romance and Greek, demonstratives alternate between a few different positions in the DP, typically analyzed as phrasal movement of the demonstrative from a lower

¹⁰ From <http://artsandsciences.sc.edu/appalachianenglish/node/796>, accessed February 14, 2021.

¹¹ From <https://social.shorthand.com/SCSYXL/nyS4prnNJ3/texas-secession-2020>, accessed February 14, 2021.

¹² A reviewer points out that the availability of expressions like *this man here* or *we children here*—possible in many varieties of English—is problematic for the idea that the reinforcer and demonstrative form a constituent. Such cases must involve extraposition of the locative PP reinforcer away from the demonstrative pronoun. This idea is appealing as extraposition of phrasal modifiers is obligatory in many varieties of English (e.g. Sheehan 2017). Supporting evidence for the extraposition analysis comes from the independent availability of *this here* (‘This here is cool!’) and ‘we here’ (‘We here are hungry!’) with no intervening noun.


position in DP to [Spec, DP] (Bernstein 1997; Alexiadou et al. 2007; Giusti 2002; 2015; Roberts 2017). The same phrasal movement analysis for adnominal pronouns is proposed by Choi (2014). Given that both pronouns and demonstratives both move internal to DP, they are phrasal projections, and the landing position for phrasal projections are typically specifier positions.

Finally, reinforced demonstratives can co-occur with the definite article, as would be expected if they were phrasal elements in [Spec, D^xP]; note that *afto* ‘this’ is in fact a distance-neutral demonstrative, hence can occur with both *edho* ‘here’ or *eci* ‘there’ as reinforcers (Alexiadou et al. 2007: p. 103):

- (20) a. *afto-edho* to *pragma*
DEM-here the thing
b. *afto-eci* to *pragma*
DEM-there the thing

Furthermore, when demonstratives co-occur with definite articles, demonstratives typically occur outside of definite articles (Choi 2014; Höhn 2017; Hsu & Syed 2020).¹³ This observation is a challenge for the proposal that *idxP* is generally located below DP (Hanink 2018; Simonenko 2014), though they may move from such a low position, as discussed above. Another analysis compatible with the proposal here is that there is an additional functional projection above D which hosts D/*idxP* in its specifier (e.g. Patel-Grosz & Grosz 2017; Šimík 2016; Hsu & Syed 2020).

While there is good evidence that overt demonstratives and pronouns are often in [Spec, DP], there do seem to be languages where indexed definiteness can be realized with a morphologically distinct D^x head, which can also be a demonstrative. For example, German and Lakhota make a distinction between strong (anaphoric) and weak (unique) definite articles (discussed in Schwarz 2009; 2013), and in Thai and Mandarin, demonstratives mark anaphoric definites and have been analyzed as D^x heads (Jenks 2015; 2018). In such languages, the D/*idxP* in specifier position can be null.



¹³ Roberts (2017) discusses several languages where demonstratives do not raise to [Spec, DP]. Whether such languages are compatible with the ideas presented here is unclear.

German strong or anaphoric definite articles are characterized by the inability of definite articles to contract with preceding prepositions. Schwarz (2009) proposes that it is the presence of the index between D and P which blocks contraction.¹⁴

- (22) a. Plain definite: *von dem Studenten* → *vom Studenten*
 b. Anaphoric definite: *von D/idxP dem Studenten* → contraction impossible, blocked by *idxP*

If P-D contraction occurs at PF, as an instance of Lowering, restricted to directly adjacent heads (Embick & Noyer 2001), the German facts provide a direct argument that *idxP* must be present in the syntax to block adjacency.¹⁵

The observation that demonstratives function as D heads in some languages can help make sense of the fact that in Kayardild (23) and Mandarin (24), adnominal pronouns co-occur with demonstratives:

- (23) PRONOUN + DEMONSTRATIVE IN KAYARDILD (Evans 1995: 251, (6-37)] (as cited in Höhn 2017)

niya dathin-a dank-a kamarri-ja thalardin-d
 3SG.NOM that-NOM man-NOM ask-IMP old.man-NOM
 ‘Ask him, that man, the old man!’

- (24) PRONOUN + DEMONSTRATIVE IN MANDARIN (Huang et al. 2009: 298)

- a. wo xihuan [**nimen** zhe-xie guai haizi].
 I like you.PL these good children
 ‘I like you good kids.’
 b. wo dui [**tamen** naxie liulanghan] meiyou yinxiang.
 I to they those vagrant not-have impression
 ‘I do not have impressions of them/those vagrants.’

In both languages, the pronoun occurs before the demonstrative; this is the general cross-linguistic pattern (Höhn 2017; Hsu & Syed 2020). In Jenks (2018); Bi & Jenks (2019), it was proposed that Mandarin *na* ‘that’ was a D^x head, and the overt pronoun before the demonstrative is a D/*idxP*. A similar analysis could be extended to Kayardild, which shares several similarities with Mandarin: it lacks a definite article, bare nouns can be used for unique definite contexts

¹⁴ See Hanink 2018 for a detailed analysis of contraction blocking which is consistent with the proposal that the index is below DP.

¹⁵ The availability of a null D/*idxP* might also provide an account of the apparent ambiguity of English definite articles between plain and anaphoric uses. Another perspective would be to simply claim that English lacks an anaphoric definite altogether, and that uniqueness suffices in some anaphoric contexts because of the lack of any pragmatic motivation for using a demonstrative. See Ahn (2019) for a theory of competition between anaphoric forms with this general shape.

or in indefinite contexts (Evans 1995: p. 239), and distal demonstratives are used for anaphoric reference (Evans 1995: p. 209).

In summary, there seems to be good syntactic evidence for a phrasal category consistent with $D/idxP$ which occurs in [Spec, D^xP] in many languages. We also saw that demonstratives realize D^x heads in Mandarin and Kayardild. From a historical perspective, the claim that demonstratives occur in both positions is unsurprising: the most common historical source of definite articles across languages is as demonstratives (Greenberg 1978; Heine & Kuteva 2002), and specifier-to-head reanalysis is an established grammaticalization pathway (e.g. van Gelderen 2004).

4.2 The semantics of indexed definiteness

This section begins by laying out a semantics for indexed definiteness. It then illustrates how this semantics derives the requirement that demonstratives must be referential, blocking predicative or situation-based covarying uses. Pronominal definites are then shown to display similar restrictions on their interpretation.

Definite articles are typically analyzed as functions from predicates to individuals of type $\langle\langle e,t\rangle, e\rangle$. Indexed definite articles (D^x) are of type $\langle\langle e,t\rangle, \langle e,e\rangle\rangle$.

- (25) a. PLAIN DEFINITE ARTICLE:
 $[[\text{the}]] = \lambda P_{\langle e,t\rangle} . |P| \leq 1 . \iota x . P(x)$
- b. INDEXED DEFINITE ARTICLE:
 $[[D^x]] = \lambda P_{\langle e,t\rangle} . \lambda y_e . \iota x . [P(x) \wedge R_c(x,y)]$.

The first argument of D^x is its NP complement, of type $\langle e,t\rangle$. The second argument of D^x is a type e variable, the interpretation of $D/idxP$. This basic semantics was proposed for anaphoric/strong definite articles in German Schwarz (2009) and has been extended to anaphoric definites in Thai (Jenks 2015) and Mandarin (Jenks 2018), demonstrative pronouns in German Patel-Grosz & Grosz (2017), strong pronouns in Tswefap (Grassfields Bantu; Cameroon) (Clem 2017), and overt pronouns in Mandarin (Bi & Jenks 2019).

The lexical entry in (25b) is underspecified compared to earlier analyses because the denotation of $idxP$ is related to the unique definite by a contextually supplied relation R_c . It seems that the default interpretation of R_c is identity, i.e., $R_c(x,y)$ in (25b) would be $x=y$, which is the lexical entry assumed in most of the work above. However, other contextually supplied relations are necessary and available, such as a ‘depiction’ relation when referring to someone by pointing at their picture, or cases of deferred ostention, such as pointing at someone’s office door to refer to them (see Nunberg 1993; Elbourne 2008; Šimík 2016 for discussion). We will stick to the case of identity for simplicity.

An different semantics for anaphoric definites is adopted by Ahn (2019: p. 55) and Royer (To appear), where equivalents of *D/idxPs* are identity functions of type $\langle n, \langle e, e \rangle \rangle$, which check that definite descriptions are identical to some discourse referent $g(n)$. In this view, unrestricted *idx* features would have the following denotation:

$$(26) \quad \lambda n. \lambda x : x = g(n).x$$

When this denotation combines first with an index and then with a definite description (here $\iota(x). \text{President}(x)$), it derives an indexed definite reading (assuming $n=3$):

$$(27) \quad \begin{array}{l} \text{a. } [\lambda n. \lambda x : x = g(n).x](3)(\iota(x). \text{President}(x)) \\ \text{b. } = [\lambda x : x = g(3).x](\iota(x). \text{President}(x)) \\ \text{c. } = \iota(x). \text{President}(x) = g(3). \iota(x). \text{President}(x) \end{array}$$

This proposal has the advantage of not treating definite articles as systematically ambiguous, a desirable result languages like Chuj, Greek, or Marka-Dafing where the same definite article occurs in plain and indexed definites; (26) may well be the right semantics for *idxPs* in such languages. Nevertheless, there are languages such as German or Lakhota where the plain vs. indexed definite distinction is marked on *D*, indicating that different lexical entries for *D* vs. *D^x* is sometimes desirable. It is also unclear how pronoun-demonstrative combinations in Mandarin or Kayardild could be analyzed, where demonstratives seem to the realization of *D^x*. Additionally, the analysis in (26) would require demonstratives and pronouns to always compose with a referential expression, even in their putatively pronominal uses, unless they are assumed to be ambiguous with individual-denoting denotations.

A third path for interpreting indices, originally proposed by Elbourne (2005) and adopted by Hanink (2018; 2021), is that *idx* is an identificational property of type $\langle n, \langle e, t \rangle \rangle$:

$$(28) \quad \lambda n. \lambda x. x = g(n)$$

Elbourne (2005), analyzing pronouns as *D* heads with a deleted NP complement, proposes this semantics for the deleted *N*, deriving their standard referential use:

$$(29) \quad \begin{array}{l} \text{a. } [_{\text{DP}} \text{ it } [_{\text{NP}} x_3]] \\ \text{b. } \alpha x. x = (g3) \end{array}$$

Hanink uses the denotation in (28) to derive the semantics of indexed definites without a separate *D^x* head. In her analysis, the property denotation of *idx* in (28) is intersected with the type $\langle e, t \rangle$ denotation of the noun, which then composes with a unique definite article:

$$\begin{array}{l} \text{a. } [_{\text{DP}} \text{ the } [_{\text{NP1}} \text{ IdxP}_3 [_{\text{NP2}} \text{ president }]]] \\ \text{b. } \llbracket \text{NP1} \rrbracket = \lambda x. \text{President}(x) \wedge x = g(3) \\ \text{c. } \llbracket \text{DP} \rrbracket = \alpha x. \text{President}(x) \wedge x = g(3) \end{array}$$

So the indexed definite meaning is derived from the identificational property analysis of indices. While both ideas work, one question for this proposal is how to account for pronominal uses of demonstratives and pronouns; a definite article would always be expected to combine with demonstratives and pronouns to derive their referential uses. Furthermore, in languages like Greek, these articles might be expected to be overt. Instead, it seems to be a nearly universal property of pronouns and demonstratives that they allow argumental, type e uses, an observation consistent with the idea that these categories are of type e , as in (11).

Adopting the semantics in (25b), we get meanings like the following (here again assuming that $R_c(x,y)$ is identity, $x = y$):

- (30) a. $\llbracket we_7 D_x \text{ students} \rrbracket^{g,c} = \sigma x[\text{Student}(x) \wedge x = g(7)]$, if $g(7) \in D_e$, if $|g(7)| \neq 1$, if $\text{speaker}_c \leq g(7)$, else undefined.
 b. $\llbracket \text{this}_2 D_x \text{ student} \rrbracket^{g,c} = \alpha x[\text{Student}(x) \wedge x = g(2)]$, if $g(2) \in D_e$, if $|g(7)| = 1$, if $g(2)$ is at δ near the speaker in c , else undefined.

So in (30a), we_7 students picks out the maximal plurality of students (using the σ operator from Link 1983), who are known to be identical to the individual $g(7)$, one subpart of which must be speaker. The demonstrative description this_2 student picks out the unique student identical to the individual $g(2)$ and near the speaker.

As indexed definites have a pronominal component, they should share functions with pronouns, and indeed they do: pronouns and complex demonstratives are alike in occurring in exophoric, anaphoric, and donkey anaphoric contexts (cf. Nunberg 1993: p. 3).¹⁶ These similarities are most clearly illustrated with demonstratives, where we see parallel behavior in English and Mandarin (the Mandarin data are from Bi & Jenks 2019).

(31) *Exophoric reading*

- a. That lady/she is pretty smart. (pointing)
 b. {Na₁-ge ren / ta₁} hen congming. (pointing)
 that-CLF person / 3SG very smart.
 ‘That₁ person/ she₁ is pretty smart’

(32) *Narrative sequence*

- a. [One student]₁ likes Mary. But Mary doesn’t like that₁ student/her₁.
 b. [Yi-ge xuesheng]₁ xihuan Lisi. Dan Lisi taoyan {na₁-ge xuesheng / ta₁}.
 One-CLF student like Lisi. But Lisi dislikes that-CLF student / 3SG.
 ‘One student likes Lisi. But Lisi dislikes that student/her.’

¹⁶ Not all pronouns have all three uses. English *it*, for example, cannot be used exophorically. ‘It’, then, must be a weak pronoun in English, licensed by ellipsis, as in the discussion in Section 3, consistent with its felicity as a descriptive pronoun.

(33) *Covarying reading (Donkey anaphoric)*

- a. Every farmer who owns a donkey beats that donkey/it.
- b. Mei-ge [you [yi-ge lüzi]₁ de] nongfu dou hui da {na₁-zhi
Every-CLF have one-CLF donkey MOD farmer all will beat that-CLF
lüzi / ta₁}.
donkey / 3SG
'Every farmer who owns a donkey will beat that donkey/it.'

In each of these expressions, the complex demonstrative is interpreted as 'the unique x such that $P(x)$ and identical to $g(1)$ '. Because demonstratives might be the most underspecified realizations of idx (Section 3), the contextual restriction is relatively free. When the speaker is pointing, as in (31), the context will include a pointing demonstration and this demonstration suffices to help the listener identify the value of $g(1)$ (Nunberg 1993; Elbourne 2008; Šimík 2016). In (32), the variable picks out a salient discourse referent, and in (33) the variable is dynamically bound by the existential quantifier in the preceding relative clause. Further evidence for the parallel of exophoric uses of pronouns and demonstratives in particular is provided by Ahn & Davidson (2018), who show that speakers treat demonstratives and pronouns alike in both exophoric and anaphoric contexts.

More evidence for the semantics in (25b) comes from the observation that demonstratives are infelicitous in non-referential definite contexts. In particular, they are impossible in the intensional contexts which generally depend on situation-based covariation for plain definites. This is illustrated for English below.

- (34) a. #Scott is **that** (only) author of *Waverly*.
b. #Scott is not **that** only author of *Waverly*.
c. #Every Thanksgiving in the United States, **that** president pardons a turkey.

The complex demonstratives in these examples must pick out a particular individual and do not allow predicative readings or situation-based covariation, in contrast with the plain definite descriptions discussed in Section 2. The rigidity of these expressions follows if the demonstrative is always identifying the individual who satisfies the definite description with a discourse referent.

Jenks (2018) provided evidence for the same effect in Mandarin: while the bare noun allows situation-based covariation as in (35b), the presence of a demonstrative, also used to mark anaphoric definiteness, blocks this reading (35c):

- (35) a. jīn nián zǒngtǒng lái zì PFP
this year president come from PFP
'This year [the president]_i comes from the PFP.'

- b. míng nián zǒngtǒng jiāng shì DPP de dǎng yuán
 next year president will be DPP REL party member
 ‘But next year [the president]_{??i/j} will be from the DPP.’
- c. míng nián zhè wèi zǒngtǒng jiāng shì DPP de dǎng yuán
 next year this CLF president will be DPP REL party member
 ‘But next year [the president]_i will be from the DPP.’ (Odd, only allows a ‘changing party’ reading).

While (35b) allows the president this year and last to be two different people as they are from different political parties, this reading is not available for the demonstrative phrase in (35c), which can only mean that this year’s president will change parties to the DPP next year. This restriction is explained by the index introduced by *zhè wèi zǒngtǒng* ‘this president’ in (35c), whose index must pick out a discourse referent, most plausibly the president from (35a).

Pronominal definites such as *you linguists* are often taken to provide evidence that pronouns are D heads (e.g. Postal 1969; Elbourne 2005). However, Giusti (2002; 2015) has argued that pronouns in such cases occurs in [Spec, DP] where they introduce a referential index. The idea that pronouns might be *idxPs* in a *D^xP* is supported by similarities between pronominal definites and indexed definites. For example, pronominal definites, like complex demonstratives, readily support exophoric uses, which are marginal with plain definites in English:

(36) You linguists are pretty smart. (pointing)

This sentence is compatible with any context where the speaker is talking to more than one linguist. In such contexts, *you linguists* pick out the maximal set of linguists. This follows from the semantics provided for indexed definites above:

(37) $[[\text{you}_2 \text{ }^x \text{ linguists}]^{\text{sc}} = \sigma x[\text{linguists}(x) \wedge x = g(2)], \text{ if } |g(2)| \neq 1, \text{ if hearer}_c \leq g(2), \text{ else undefined.}$

This is an inclusive *you*; the hearer need only be a subpart of the plurality which is coextensive with the contextually maximal set of linguists. *You linguists* cannot be used to pick out a subset of the linguists present, and this follows from the fact that the structure includes a definite article separate from the indexical pronoun in its specifier position.

In addition, like demonstratives, for example, pronominal definites are impossible in non-referential definite contexts; for example they are impossible as the predicate of a predicative copular clause, which can be plain definites, as we saw in §2.

(38) Gladys and I are #us/ #these/the authors of this article.

The problem with (38) is specifically that the pronominal definite is in a predicate position. For example, inverse or specificational copular clauses, where the subject is a predicate and

the object a referential argument (Mikkelsen 2005), allow a pronominal description to follow a copula:¹⁷

(39) The problem is us linguists.

So it seems that pronominal definites must be directly referential like indexed definites.

There is one additional argument that pronominal definites are indexed definiteness, based on Simonenko (2014), who observes that complex demonstratives are always DP islands for *wh*-subextraction (compare (40a-b)). (40c) shows that pronominal definites pattern with complex demonstratives in this regard, as we would expect if pronominal definites were indexed definites.

- (40) a. Which classes did Mary criticize the instructors of?
 b. *Which classes did Mary criticize those instructors of?
 c. *Which classes did Mary criticize you instructors of?

Simonenko (2014; 2015) shows that this contrast is also found in weak vs. strong articles in Austro-Bavarian German, the latter of which are anaphoric, hence indexed, definites (Schwarz 2009). Simonenko's explanation for why indexed definites are DP islands is that questions are only felicitous in a context where their answer is unknown. Because indexed definites already identify their referent with a particular contextually supplied individual, any *wh*-question originating from within an indexed definite will necessarily be used in a context in which its answer is already entailed. So the pronominal definite must entail that the identity of the pronominal definite is known.

In conclusion, the fact that local pronouns seem to function as an overt *D/id*xP provides an argument for indexed definiteness independent of demonstratives and anaphoric definites. While pronouns can have type *e* meaning on their own, they must have some way of combining with the meaning of the NP, particularly in languages like Greek, where we saw the definite article and pronoun co-occur (18). Treating pronominal definites as indexed definites resolves this puzzle.

5 Anaphoric definites in Dafing as indexed definites

This section turns to a case-study on the distinction between plain and anaphoric definiteness in Marka-Dafing, which provides empirical support for the conception of indexed definites described above. In Marka-Dafing, anaphoric definites are shown to require an overt anaphoric index, which also functions as a pronoun, this anaphoric index can be clearly shown to occupy [Spec, DP] a position distinct from the definite article. Furthermore, the expected semantic contrasts between plain and indexed definiteness arise when this element is present.

¹⁷ Thanks to an anonymous reviewer for pointing this out.

5.1 Background on Marka-Dafing

Marka-Dafing ([Glottocode: mark1256]), called either Marka or Dafing,¹⁸ is a Mande language spoken by approximately 200,000 people in northwestern Burkina Faso (Harrison & Harrison 2002). Marka-Dafing is closely related to Bambara, the national language of Mali, as well as to Dyula (or Jula, [Glottocode: dyu1238]), a major trade language spoken widely to the south. Prior descriptions of Marka-Dafing exist, and their descriptions are consistent with the data described below, although they focus on different dialects (Prost 1977; Diallo 1988; Traore 1998). The data in this paper represents the Safané dialect of Marka-Dafing, the southernmost variety.¹⁹

Mande languages are typologically notable for their S-Aux-O-V word order at the clausal level (Koopman 1984; 1992; Creissels 2005; Nikitina 2011; Sande et al. 2019). The Aux position consists of a complex head marking tense, aspect, negation, and finiteness; it is preceded by the subject. All other VP adjuncts and arguments, including PPs and CPs, follow the verb. A simple clause is given below.

- (41) è ní wúrú = 'ú jè
 2SG PAST dog = DEF see
 'You saw the dog.'

Basic clause structure in Mande has been analyzed elsewhere (Koopman 1992; Nikitina 2011; Sande et al. 2019). Three general observations about the syntax of Mande languages will be relevant below. First, subjects, and, hence, specifiers, occur to the left of their head. Second, with the notable exception of TP, headed by the past auxiliary in (41), heads typically go on the right in Mande. Third, Mande languages are not *pro*-drop languages; pronouns are obligatory in all contexts.

5.2 The definite article in Marka-Dafing

Dafing has a definite article =ú, which occurs as an DP enclitic. The surface realization of the article depends on the final vowel of the word to which it attaches, as illustrated in **Table 1**. Words that end in /a/ have their final vowel changed to [ɔ] (e–f). In low-tone roots, the definite article lengthens the final vowel of its host and inserts H tone, which spreads back to the adjacent

¹⁸ The names Marka and Dafing reflect distinct ethnic identities within the Marka-Dafing speaking community.

¹⁹ The data in this paper represent the speech and intuitions of the second author, working collaboratively with the first author for a five-year period from 2016–2021. Marka-Dafing is the second author's primary language, and is spoken at home with her family, along with Dyula. Marka-Dafing is also the language of her ancestral village which she visits regularly. The second author was actively using this language in Burkina Faso during various stages of the collaboration. Nevertheless, it is an acknowledged limitation of these data that they are primarily based on the judgments of a single native speaker.

root vowel (a-b). On the other hand, the H on the article is realized as a downstep if the word already ends in a H (c-d).

	N		N = DEF	
a.	jè	‘fish’	jè = è	‘the fish’
b.	lù	‘house’	lú = ú	‘the house’
c.	ljé	‘pig’	ljé = 'é	‘the pig’
d.	só	‘horse’	só = 'ó	‘the horse’
e.	sámá	‘elephant’	sámó = 'ó	‘the elephant’
f.	sá	‘sheep/goat’	só = 'ó	‘the sheep/goat’

Table 1: Phonological realization of the Marka-Dafing definite article.


The definite article below appears at the right edge of the DP, after adjectives (42) and numerals (43).

- (42) a. sàmà dʒè:nì
elephant small
‘a small elephant’
- b. sàmà dʒè:ní =í
elephant small =DEF
‘the small elephant’
- (43) a. músó m̀ sá bá
woman CLF 3
‘three women’
- b. músó m̀ sá bɔ ='ɔ
woman CLF 3 =DEF
‘the three women’

The definite article is in complementary distribution with a small class of determiners, including the exophoric demonstrative *mín* ‘this, that’—which will be important below—, an indefinite determiner *d̀* ‘some’, and *vjè* ‘every.’ All but the last of these determiners can take a plural suffix as well, a point we set aside as it is orthogonal to the realization of definiteness.

The left-branching structure below accounts for the major properties of Marka-Dafing DPs. As adjectives precede numerals and classifiers, they can be analyzed as rightward adjuncts on NP.

(44)



This structure captures the distribution observed above for the definite article; D will follow whatever elements are in the DP.

Definite articles in Marka-Dafing are obligatory in all contexts licensed just by uniqueness. First, in the terminology of Hawkins (1978), definite articles must occur in ‘larger situation’ definites such as ‘the sun’ or ‘the chief.’

(45) té =#(‘é), káŋ fàrì
sun =DEF BE intense
‘The sun is intense.’

(46) víí, zúf’í #(=í) zúsó káŋ ji
today chief =DEF heart BE good
‘Today the chief is happy.’

Second, the Marka-Dafing definite article is required in ‘immediate situation’ definites, where only context licenses uniqueness in the absence of prior mention:

(47) à:ká: dé =#(‘é) kùnùn wà
NEG.IMP child =DEF wake.up NEG
‘Don’t wake up the baby!’

Similarly, in a procedural narrative about making pottery, the definite article could be used to introduce contextually unique discourse referents such as ‘the clay’ at their first mention:

(48) S1 nì è=é bé è ká dá: b̀ò ...
if 2SG=PRES want 2SG INF pot throw
‘If you want to make a pot...’

S2 è jì =à dǎmná ní bǒ='ɔ̄ jè
 2SG HAB 3SG start with clay =DEF DAT
 ‘you start with the clay.’

Bridging contexts, discussed extensively in Schwarz (2009; 2013), were not systematically tested, but the examples above suffice to establish that prior mention is not a necessary criterion to use the definite article in Marka-Dafing, hence it is a plain definite.

5.3 Anaphoric definites in Marka-Dafing as indexed definites

Definite DPs can occur with an element *wó*, which must occur at the left edge of the DP.

(49) *wó'* mǔsǒ' =ó
 IDX:ANA woman DEF
 ‘the woman (that we were talking about)’

There is a salient intuition for native speakers of Marka-Dafing that *wó* must refer to an individual mentioned earlier in the conversation. In other words, the presence of *wó* turns a plain definite into an anaphoric definite. Historically, *wò* was a distal demonstrative (Valentin Vydrin, p.c., cf. Zribi-Hertz & Hanne 1995 for Bambara), and in other closely related Mande languages this demonstrative allows exophoric uses. However, in Marka-Dafing, *wó* cannot be accompanied by a pointing gesture, but can only be anaphoric.²⁰

This section presents evidence that *wó* is the *D/idxP* argument for an indexed definite in Marka-Dafing. Rather than carrying ϕ -features or spatial restrictions, however, *wó* restricts variables to ‘established discourse referents’, making it a ‘pure’ anaphoric definite. We will adopt the idea below that *wó* is the realization of the features [D, *idx*, + ANAPH], with the following interpretation:

(50) $[[w\acute{o}_1]]^{g,c} = g(1)$, if $g(1)$ is an established discourse referent, else undefined.

Beyond intuitions about prior mention, the semantic distribution of *wó* clearly shows that it is an anaphorically indexed definite, requiring prior mention and denoting a particular individual when free.

First, *wó* cannot occur in unique definite contexts, like (45) and (46), whose context precluded prior mention.²¹

²⁰ Diallo (1988: p. 151–153) notes that there is a demonstrative *ó* in the Zaba dialect of Marka-Daing, with the same distribution as Safané *wó*, and which contrasts with an exophoric *ní*, equivalent to Safané *mín*. Diallo focuses on the syntactic distribution and phonological behaviour of *ó*, rather than its semantics.

²¹ Bombi (2018) reports very similar observations for the demonstrative + article combination in Akan from example (19), showing that the article previously claimed by Arkoh & Matthewson (2013) to be an anaphoric definite article may in fact be a plain definite (in the terms of this paper). Interestingly, Akan is a language where there is an additional alternation between a plain definite article and the possibility of a bare noun, which is impossible in Marka-Dafing.

Second, *wó* is preferred in narrative sequences, although plain definites are possible in such contexts:

- (51) a. kúnúnj músó d̀ò d̀ó-ná m̀m̀ lú k̀òj
 yesterday woman some enter-PST my house IN
 ‘Yesterday, some woman walked into my house.’
 b. ñ tí má [?](wó) músó =ó ye a-ye wa
 1SG PFV NEG IDX:ANA woman =DEF see before NEG
 ‘I’d never seen that woman before.’

The availability of *wó* in narrative sequences is consistent with the idea that *wó* refers to an established discourse referent.

Finally, *wó* is incompatible with situation-based covariation, which we have seen requires a unique definite:

- (52) *Context:* It is well known that chiefs are mean and grumpy people.
 a. zúù vjè s̀ò zújí =’í k̀ò-m̀àj-ǝ́ m̀ò =’ù yè wà
 village-PL every in chief =DEF not.like people =DEF.PL with NEG
 ‘In all the villages, the people don’t like the chief.’
 b. In every *s’,x*, *s’* a situation in some village *x*, the people in *s’* don’t like the chief in *s’*.

Because it forces reference to a particular individual, *wó* is impossible in these contexts. When *wó* is present, it forces reference to a particular chief who has been mentioned previously, as expected:

- (53) *Context:* There is a chief, Musaa, who is mean to everybody; nobody anywhere likes him.
 a. zú=ù vjè s̀ò wó₂ zújí =’í k̀ò-m̀àj-ǝ́ m̀ò =’ù yè wà
 village=PL every in IDX:ANA chief =DEF not.like people =DEF.PL with NEG
 ‘In all the villages, the people don’t like that particular chief.’
 b. In every *s’,x*, *s’* a situation in some village *x*, the people in *s’* don’t like the chief in *s’* identical to the established discourse referent *g*(2).

Additionally, *wó* can be used as a donkey anaphor, though the plain definite can be used in this context as well:

- (54) [ní tǝ́ ‘ní péỳ d̀ò s̀àj] éε (wó) pé=’í s̀èj
 If man PAST donkey some buy 3SG.PRES IDX:ANA donkey=DEF hit
 ‘If a man buys some donkey, he hits that donkey.’

While *wó* allows covarying readings, its presence also brings to mind readings where *wó pé=’í* refers to some specific donkey, say Bob, who gets hit any time any farmer buys any other donkey. In such a case, Bob would be an established discourse referent.


However, covarying readings with *wó* are clause-bound, whereas situation-dependent covariation is possible even across clause boundaries:²²

- (55) *Context:* Suppose chiefs are selected each year in an election, but that chiefs quickly become unpopular after they are elected.
- a. zú=ù vjè sò, mó-'ú zúji bó.
village=PL every in people-DEF.PL chief.INDEF pick
'In every village, the people pick a chief.'
- b. #kárú tʃén kóbé, wó₂ zújí ='í kùò-màŋ-zí mó tʃèn yè wà
month one after IDX:ANA chief =DEF not.like person one with NEG
'After one month, nobody likes the/that chief.'
- c. *Comment:* If you use *wó* in the second sentence it doesn't make sense, as the first sentence doesn't specify a chief. People would probably reply, "What chief are you referring to?"

The contrast above shows clearly that *wó* picks out a particular individual unless it is clause-internally bound as as donkey anaphor.²³

The meanings above are expected if *wó* realizes the D/*idxP* of a D^xP:

- (56) a. Structure of (49)



- b. $\llbracket(56a)\rrbracket = \lambda x[\text{woman}(x) \wedge x = g(2)]$, if $g(2)$ is an established discourse referent, else undefined.

So Marka-Dafing definite articles must be ambiguous between a plain definite D and D^x. In other words, the definite enclitic is just an exponent of the features [D, +DEFINITE]; the distinction between plain and indexed definiteness on D is not expressed morphologically in Marka-Dafing.

²² Thanks to an anonymous reviewer for suggesting this additional test.

²³ This is essentially an attempt to use *wó* in a context similar to what was labeled *telescoping* by Roberts (1987). See Neale (1990) for an analysis of such cases as unique definites; unsurprisingly such cases are incompatible with anaphoric definiteness.

There is good evidence supporting the claim first that *wó* is in [Spec, D^xP] and second that *wó* is essentially a pronoun. First, the structure in (56) accounts for the word order facts: =*u* is a phrase-final head while *wó* occurs on the left edge of the DP, the position that specifiers (such as subjects) typically occupy in Mande languages; adjuncts and heads occur to the right.

Second, *wó* cannot occur on indefinite DPs; this follows if it is an argument of the definite article:

- (57) a. **wó* *músó*
 IDX:ANA woman
 b. **wó* *músó* *dò*
 IDX:ANA woman some

Third, *wó* is in complementary distribution with other phrasal specifiers in the noun phrase, namely possessors. In (58) we see instances of a pronominal possessor and a phrasal possessor, both of which are possessive. This illustrates that the leftmost position is phrasal.

- (58) a. *m̀m̀* *bó* = 's
 1SG.POSS sheep = DEF
 ‘my sheep’
 b. *Mùsá ká'á* *bó* = 's
 Musa POSS sheep = DEF
 ‘Musa’s sheep’

However, *wó* cannot co-occur with such possessors, suggesting it is a phrase.

- (59) a. **wó* *m̀m̀* *bó* = 's
 IDX:ANA 1SG.POSS sheep = DEF
 b. **wó* *Mùsá ká'á* *bó* = 's
 IDX:ANA Musa POSS sheep = DEF

There is no obvious semantic explanation for the ungrammaticality of (59). It is simple to write a semantics which both encodes possession and includes identity to a discourse referent:

- (60) $\alpha[\text{sheep}(x) \wedge \text{Poss}(m, x) \wedge \alpha x = g(1)]$ (hypothesized meaning for (59b))

This could be the interpretation of an English noun phrase like *that sheep of Musa's*. So the ungrammaticality of (59) must be syntactic. We can account for its ungrammaticality if both possessives and *wó* are competing for [Spec, DP], the position assumed by standard DP analyses of possessives (Abney 1987; Szabolcsi 1994).

As D/*idx* is essentially a pronoun, it is important to note that *wó* also has a pronominal function, where it retains its anaphoric properties.

(61) *Context:* In Ghana, nobody likes the president(s) who died.

- a. \grave{n} $n\acute{o} = \acute{o}$ (/ní wó/) kùŋbè
 1SG PAST=IDX:ANA meet
 ‘I met him.’
- b. \grave{n} $n\acute{o} = \acute{or}\acute{u}$ (/ní wórú/) kùŋbè
 1SG PAST=IDX:ANA.PL meet
 ‘I met them.’

Additionally, *wó* can occur as an anaphoric possessive pronoun:

- (62) $w\acute{o}$ $k\acute{a}'\acute{a}$ $m\acute{u}s\acute{o} = '\acute{o}$ $k\acute{o}-k\acute{a}\eta-z\acute{i}$ $vy\grave{e}$ $y\grave{e}$ 1
 IDX:ANA POSS wife=DEF pleases everybody be
 ‘Everybody likes his (= that president’s) wife.’

Finally, *wó* has similar binding behavior to demonstrative pronouns in German (Wiltschko 1998) and strong pronouns in Tswefap (Clem 2017),²⁴ in that it resists bound variable readings under c-command:

- (63) a. $m\acute{o}$ $t\grave{f}\grave{e}n$ $m\grave{a}-f\grave{b}$ $k-\acute{a}$ $k\acute{a}\eta z\grave{a}\eta w\grave{a}$
 person one NEG-say COMP-3SG full NEG
 ‘Nobody₁ said they_{1/2} are full’
- b. $m\acute{o}$ $t\grave{f}\grave{e}n$ $m\grave{a}-f\grave{b}$ $k-\acute{o}$ $k\acute{a}\eta z\grave{a}\eta w\grave{a}$
 person one NEG-say COMP-IDX:ANA.SG full NEG
 ‘Nobody₁ said they_{*1/2} are full’

Whereas the weak pronoun *á* in (63a) allows a bound variable reading, a bound reading is not available for *wó* in (63b). The inability of *wó* to be bound might arise because of the contextual restriction on *wó*: because it is restricted to established discourse referents, it presumably prefers extra-sentential reference. This restriction does not apply to the third person personal pronoun *á*, an unrestricted variable, which can be bound.

In summary, then, there is evidence that *wó* is a pronoun in [Spec, DP] which restricts the denotation of the DP to a particular contextually salient individual. This makes anaphoric DPs in Marka-Dafing indexed DPs in support of the general proposal advanced above.

6 The Single Index Constraint

We will zoom back out now to try and understand the kinds of referential indices in indexed definites in a more general sense. We have seen evidence for the following three kinds of restrictions provided by *idxPs*:

²⁴ This kind of contrast holds for null versus overt pronouns in many Romance languages as well Montalbetti (1984), where only null subjects can function as bound variables.

- (64) a. Local personal pronouns identify individuals with speaker or hearer as parts
 b. Demonstrative pronouns identify individuals in space
 c. Anaphoric pronouns locate individuals in the discourse

All three restrictions point to some element of the context. Local personal pronouns point directly to the speaker or hearer in a particular context (Sudo 2012), demonstrative pronouns point to different parts of the context: location, in the case of spatial demonstratives, and reference in time in the case of anaphoric demonstratives.²⁵

When we try to combine these restrictions, we find that it is impossible. Instead, languages must select only one kind of deictic restriction per indexed definite, even when there is good reason to think that multiple kinds of deixis should be possible. More generally, this section suggests that there evidence for the following generalization:

- (65) THE SINGLE INDEX CONSTRAINT: Indexed definites and deictic pronouns can only rely on a single referential index to refer.

This principle can be derived from the requirement that indexed definite DPs have only a single *D/idxP* specifier, and each *D/idxP* is always restricted along a single deictic dimension, whether by referring directly to the conversational participants, to the location of an individual in space, or in time. This constraint accounts for the generalization by Hsu & Syed (2020) that markers of identifiability (roughly, anaphoric definiteness) and deixis (roughly, exophoric demonstratives) never seem to co-occur in the same DP. We will review several cases below where this constraint is in effect.²⁶

First, regarding the co-occurrence of local pronominal *D/idxPs* and demonstrative *D/idxPs*, there simply do not seem to be any such cases, which would look like the following:

- (66) a. *we these students
 b. *you those students

Apparent counterexamples come from cases of demonstrative-pronoun co-occurrence in (23) and (24). But if the demonstratives in these languages are *D^x* heads, then the pronoun can be analyzed as the *D/idxP*.

The evidence for the incompatibility of exophoric and anaphoric reference is clearer, particularly when we look at Marka-Dafing. In exophoric contexts, Marka-Dafing makes use of a

²⁵ The possible semantic content of demonstratives across languages is quite rich. For example, Malagasy demonstratives encode a visibility distinction (Paul 2009). Such demonstrative content could be encoded as additional presuppositions on the denotation of the index as proposed above.

²⁶ This constraint does not apply to cases where both DP and NP contain separate indices, for example in expressions such as *that₂ one₃*, where *one₃* is discourse anaphoric to an NP antecedent.

distinct demonstrative determiner *míi* which occurs in the DP-final head position and is restricted to pointing, or exophoric, reference:

- (67) wúrú 'míi
 dog D:EXO
 'this/that dog' (pointing)

There is good evidence that *míi* is a D head, as not only is it DP-final but it is in complementary distribution with definite =ú:

- (68) *wúrú = 'ú 'míi
 dog = THE ART:EXO

The puzzle is just that, despite occurring in different syntactic positions, deictic *míi* and anaphoric *wó* cannot co-occur:

- (69) *wó wúrú 'míi
 IDX:ANA dog ART:EXO

Simple syntactic and semantic explanations for the ungrammaticality of (69) fail. Syntactically, *wó* and *míi* occupy different positions: *wó* is in [Spec, DP], while *míi* is a D head. In both a general pragmatic as well as in purely logical terms, the meanings of the two demonstrative elements are compatible: there is no reason that a speaker could not be pointing at some dog, satisfying the exophoric requirement of *míi*, and that the same dog could also be an established discourse referent, satisfying the anaphoric requirement of *wó*.

The simple theory of indexed definiteness described above, however, provides a natural account for this restriction. Suppose exophoric indexed definite *míi* always contains a phonologically null *idxP* in its specifier position, restricted to the individual being pointed at by the speaker. Call this specifier *idx:EXO*. Because indexed definites only have a single specifier, *wó* is blocked by *idx:EXO*, which is required in the context of *míi*.

Other languages in the literature where exophoric and anaphoric demonstratives both exist show the same restriction. For example, in Limbum (Grassfields Bantu, Becker 2018, which has an anaphoric article and an exophoric demonstrative pronoun (the opposite of Dafing), the two elements also cannot co-occur:

- (70) wè rīŋ [ndíjwě cà / *f̄̄ ā
 2SG know woman DEM:DIST ART:ANA] Q
 'Do you know that woman over there? (pointing)' Becker (2018: p. 49)

Another illustration of the Single Index Constraint comes from Korean. Korean has three demonstrative determiners, two of which are strictly exophoric and one of which is strictly

anaphoric Ahn (2017). Unlike in Marka-Dafing and Limbum, such demonstratives are in paradigmatic opposition as D heads (Chang 2009), and again are blocked from co-occurring.²⁷

It is possible to demonstrate the effect of the Single Index Constraint in English, lending support to the idea that it is a universal constraint. However, its effect is apparent not in terms of the incompatibility of distinct demonstratives, but rather in restricting *that*, which generally is capable of both anaphoric and exophoric reference, to pick just one of these deictic restrictions. To see that this restriction holds, one needs to set up an context where anaphoric reference is felicitous, and then to point at an referent with an exophoric demonstrative. Assuming a bias towards the immediate context, i.e., pointing, it should be impossible for the individual being pointed at and the one being referred to anaphorically to be the same individual. This kind of setup is illustrated in the following example, adapted from Wolter (2007: ex. 11, p. 612):

- (71) [You are telling me about Mary.] “Mary has been telling me that she thinks that there has been a dog digging up her flower beds.” [Then Barky the dog wanders in.] “In fact, she thinks that *that dog* [pointing at Barky] ruined her garden.”

In this discourse the two dogs—Barky and the one Mary believes to have ruined her garden—cannot be the same, although context would seem to strongly prefer such an interpretation. Somehow the final sentence still feels like a *non sequitur*; to get the intended interpretation, the presupposition cleft *that is the dog that ruined her garden* would be necessary. The restriction observed above follows from the Single Index Constraint, exactly as in Marka-Dafing: the exophoric use of the demonstrative in the final sentence blocks an anaphoric interpretation.²⁸

In the following example the effect of the Single Index Constraint is perhaps even clearer:

- (72) *Context:* A couple minutes ago, a creepy guy walks into the room and hides behind a large potted plant. You walk in, and I tell you in confidence:
- a. Watch out! [A creepy dude]₁ walked into the room a couple minutes ago.
 - b. [That man/he]₁ is [that man]₂ (pointing).
 - c. *[That man]_{1,2} (pointing) is really creepy.

(72a) can felicitously be followed by (72b), where the subject is an anaphoric definite and the object is exophoric, each making use of separate (restrictions on) indices. The demonstrative

²⁷ These could also be D/*idx*Ps; Chang’s main argument comes from the compatibility of these demonstrative determiners with possessives, which are taken to occupy [Spec, DP]. But possessives co-occur with demonstratives in many languages, and there is no clear relationship between possession and definiteness across languages (Haspelmath 1999; Alexiadou 2005).

²⁸ Wolter’s paper is a response to King (2001), who argues for a quantificational analysis of demonstratives. Wolter’s account of this distinction relies on the situation variable which restricts the domain of the demonstrative: Wolter claims situation variables introduced by demonstratives must take sentence-level scope. In the theory outlined in this paper, following Nunberg (1993); Elbourne (2008), sentence-level scope follows from the index itself.

subject of (72c) attempts to utilize simultaneous anaphoric and exophoric reference, but as long as the speaker is pointing to the man behind the pot, the sentence again feels *non sequitur* in the context of (72a): there must be two creepy men in the room. This effect follows in English if simultaneous anaphoric and exophoric features indices are not allowed. This restriction likely follows because exophoric indices serve to establish reference, hence are new, whereas anaphoric indices must be part of the context. But crucially, only one index is allowed per DP.

7 Conclusion

This paper has argued that indexed definites are definite noun phrases which contain a specifier which is a projection of an *idx* head, interpreted as a variable. This category defines the class of pronominal elements in language, including demonstratives, which can occur in [Spec, DP], or more generally occur as anaphoric elements. Plain definiteness in contrast only conveys uniqueness, and need not be referential, allowing covariation by situation as well as predicative readings.

It seems likely that correlates of indexed definiteness should occur in every language, particularly as demonstratives have been claimed to be a universal of human language (Diessel 1999; Diessel & Coventry 2020). On the other hand, it seems unlikely that plain definiteness is a universal of human language. That is, not all languages have ways of marking uniqueness. This is particularly clear for languages where putative definiteness correspond to bare nouns, such as Russian or Mandarin. Recently, Šimík & Demian (2020) have shown that uniqueness and maximality effects are not detectable in Russian. In addition, indices might also be extended to referential uses of demonstratives in some indefinite contexts (Ionin 2006; Šimík 2016). So the class of referential expressions this paper has attempted to characterize as indexed definiteness might actually just be a slightly more general category of indexed referentiality, which would stand in opposition to a larger class of non-indexed, not-necessarily-referential noun phrases, which include plain definites and bare nouns.

Finally, returning to the theme of the introduction, referential indices do seem to play a central role in the structure and meaning of certain noun phrases contrary to the expectations of Chomsky (1995). However, the fact that indices occur only some of the time, and in particular that they seem to be absent on plain definites, indicates that the standard generative approach to indexing all potentially referential noun phrases is likely not the right model of grammar. Yet it remains to be seen what role, if any, indices may play in the traditional domain of (co-)indexation and binding.

Abbreviations

1 = first person, 2 = second person, 3 = third person, ANA = anaphoric, ART = article, CLF = numeral classifier, DEF = definite, DEM = demonstrative, EXO = exophoric, DIST = distal, *idx* = index, IMP = imperative, INF = infinitive, MOD = modification marker, NEG = negation, NOM = nominative case, PL = plural, PFV = perfective, POSS = possessive, PRES = present tense, Q = question SG = singular

Acknowledgements

The first author (Peter Jenks) contributed the theoretical proposal, the analysis of the data, and wrote the paper. The second author (Rassidatou Konate) contributed the Marka-Dafing data and the complex semantic judgments related to it. Thanks to Carla Bombi, Elizabeth Coppock, Justin Royer, and Radek Šimík for discussion, as well as audiences at UC Berkeley, Cornell, McGill, and the workshop on “Sorting out the Concepts Behind Definiteness” at the Deutsche Gesellschaft für Sprachwissenschaft 2019, organized by Carla Bombi and Radek Šimík. All errors of judgment, math, theory, transcription, are the sole responsibility of the first author.

Competing interests

The authors have no competing interests to declare.

References

- Abney, Steven. 1987. *The noun phrase in its sentential aspect*. MIT dissertation.
- Adger, David & Ramchand, Gillian. 2005. Merge and move: *Wh*-dependencies revisited. *Linguistic Inquiry* 36. 161–193. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1162/0024389053710729>
- Ahn, Dorothy. 2017. Definite and demonstrative descriptions: a micro-typology. *Proceedings of GLOW in Asia xi*.
- Ahn, Dorothy. 2019. *THAT thesis: A competition mechanism for anaphoric expressions*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University dissertation.
- Ahn, Dorothy & Davidson, Kathryn. 2018. Where pointing matters: English and Korean demonstratives. In Hucklebridge, Sherry & Nelson, Max (eds.), *NELS 48: Proceedings of the Forty-Eighth Annual Meeting of the North East Linguistic Society*, vol. 1, 15–24. Amherst, MA: GLSA.
- Aissen, Judith. 2000. Prosodic conditions on anaphora and clitics in jakalteq. In Carnie, Andrew & Guilfoyle, Eithne (eds.), *The syntax of verb initial languages*, 185–200. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Alexiadou, Artemis. 2005. Possessors and (in)definiteness. *Lingua* 115. 787–819. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.lingua.2004.01.005>

- Alexiadou, Artemis & Haegeman, Liliane & Stavrou, Melita. 2007. *Noun phrase in the generative perspective*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1515/9783110207491>
- Arkoh, Ruby & Matthewson, Lisa. 2013. A familiar definite article in Akan. *Lingua* 123. 1–30. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.lingua.2012.09.012>
- Arregi, Karlos & Hanink, Emily. 2018. Switch reference in Washo as multiple subject agreement. In Hucklebridge, Sherry & Nelson, Max (eds.), *NELS 48: Proceedings of the Forty-Eighth Annual Meeting of the North East Linguistic Society*, vol. 1, 39–48. Amherst, MA: GLSA.
- Barbosa, Pilar. 2019. ‘pro’ as a minimal NP: toward a unified theory of ‘pro’-drop. *Linguistic Inquiry* 50. 487–526. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1162/ling_a_00312
- Bassi, Itai & Longenbaugh, Nicholas. 2020. Against *Tanglewood* by focus movement: A reply to Erlewine and Kotek 2018. *Linguistic Inquiry* 51(3). 579–596. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1162/ling_a_00348
- Beck, Sigrid. 2006. Intervention effects follow from focus interpretation. *Natural Language Semantics* 14. 1–56. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11050-005-4532-y>
- Beck, Sigrid. 2016. Focus sensitive operators. In Féry, Caroline & Ishihara, Shinichiro (eds.), *The Oxford handbook of information structure*. Oxford University Press. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1093/oxfordhb/9780199642670.013.007>
- Becker, Laura. 2018. *Articles in the world’s languages*: Universität Leipzig dissertation.
- Bejar, Susanne. 2003. *Phi-syntax: A theory of agreement*: University of Toronto dissertation.
- Berman, Stephen. 1987. *Situation-based semantics for adverbs of quantification*, vol. 12, 47–68. Amherst: University of Massachusetts.
- Bernstein, Judy. 1997. Demonstratives and reinforcers in Romance and Germanic languages. *Lingua* 87–113. DOI: [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0024-3841\(96\)00046-0](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0024-3841(96)00046-0)
- Bi, Ruyue Agnes & Jenks, Peter. 2019. Pronouns, null arguments, and ellipsis in Mandarin Chinese. In Espinal, M. Teresa & Castroviejo, Elena & Leonetti, Manuel & McNally, Louise & Real-Puigdollers, Cristina (eds.), *Proceedings of Sinn und Bedeutung 23*, vol. 1, 127–142. Universitat Autònoma de Barcelona, Bellaterra (Cerdanyola del Vallès).
- Bobaljik, Jonathan. 2008. Missing persons: A case study in morphological universals. *The Linguistic Review* 25(1–2). 203–230. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1515/TLIR.2008.005>
- Bombi, Carla. 2018. Definiteness in Akan: Familiarity and uniqueness revisited. *Proceedings of SALT 28* 141–160. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.3765/salt.v28i0.4406>
- Bošković, Željko. 2018. On pronouns, clitic doubling, and argument ellipsis: Argument ellipsis as predicate ellipsis. *English Linguistics* 35. 1–37. DOI: https://doi.org/10.9793/elsj.35.1_1
- Brasoveanu, Adrian. 2011. Sentence-internal different as quantifier-internal anaphora. *Linguistics and Philosophy* 34(2). 93–168. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10988-011-9096-3>
- Chang, Soo Jung. 2009. *Nominal structure and interpretation: On the syntax of the Korean determiner phrase*: University of Georgia dissertation.
- Chierchia, Gennaro. 1995. *Dynamics of Meaning*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

- Chierchia, Gennaro. 1998. Reference to kinds across languages. *Natural Language Semantics* 6. 339–405. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1023/A:1008324218506>
- Chierchia, Gennaro. 2020. Origins of weak crossover: when dynamic semantics meets event semantics. *Natural Language Semantics* 28. 23–76. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11050-019-09158-3>
- Choi, Jaehoon. 2014. *Pronoun-noun constructions and the syntax of DP*: University of Arizona dissertation.
- Chomsky, N. 1995. *The minimalist program*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Cisneros, Carlos. 2019. Definiteness in Cuevas Mixtec. In Aguilar-Guevara, Ana & Loyo, Julia Pozas & Maldonado, Violeta Vázquez-Rojas (eds.), *Definiteness across languages*, 39–81. Berlin: Language Science Press.
- Clem, Emily. 2017. Two types of binding: Evidence from Tswefap pronominals. In Lamont, Andrew & Tetzloff, Katerina (eds.), *NELS 47: Proceedings of the Forth-Seventh Annual Meeting of the North East Linguistic Society*, vol. 1, 173–184. Amherst, MA: GLSA.
- Clem, Emily. 2019a. *Agreement, case, and switch-reference in Amahuaca*, UC Berkeley dissertation.
- Clem, Emily. 2019b. Object-sensitive switch-reference and insatiable probes. In Baird, Maggie & Pesetsky, Jonathan (eds.), *NELS 49: Proceedings of the Forty-Ninth Annual Meeting of the North East Linguistic Society*, vol. 1, 173–186. Amherst, MA: GLSA.
- Clem, Emily. To appear. Cyclic expansion in agree: Maximal projections as probes. *Linguistic Inquiry* 1–41. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1162/ling_a_00432
- Conrod, Kirby. 2019. *Pronouns raising and emerging*: University of Washington dissertation.
- Cooper, Robin. 1979. The interpretation of pronouns. In Heny, Frank & Schnelle, Helmut S. (eds.), *Syntax and semantics*, vol. 10. San Diego: Academic Press.
- Coppock, Elizabeth & Beaver, David. 2012. Weak uniqueness: The only difference between definites and indefinites. In *Semantics and linguistic theory*, vol. 22, 527–544. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.3765/salt.v22i0.2651>
- Coppock, Elizabeth & Beaver, David. 2015. Definiteness and determinacy. *Linguistics and Philosophy* 38(5). 377–435. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10988-015-9178-8>
- Creissels, Denis. 2005. S-O-V-X constituent order and constituent order alternations in West African languages. In *Berkeley Linguistics Society*, vol. 31, 37–51. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.3765/bls.v31i2.3189>
- Dayal, V. 2004. Number marking and (in)definiteness in kind terms. *Linguistics and Philosophy* 27. 393–450. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1023/B:LING.0000024420.80324.67>
- Diallo, Mohamadou. 1988. *Elements de systematique et de dialectologie du marka-kan (burkina-faso)*. Lille: Université Stendhal (Grenoble 3) dissertation.
- Diessel, Holger. 1999. *Demonstratives. form, function, and grammaticalization*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1075/tsl.42>

- Diessel, Holger & Coventry, Kenny R. 2020. Demonstratives in spatial language and social interaction: An interdisciplinary review. *Front Psychol.* 11. 555265. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2020.555265>
- Elbourne, Paul. 2001. E-type anaphora as NP-deletion. *Natural Language Semantics* 9. 241–288. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1023/A:1014290323028>
- Elbourne, Paul. 2005. *Situations and individuals*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Elbourne, Paul. 2008. Demonstratives as individual concepts. *Linguistics and Philosophy* 31. 409–466. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10988-008-9043-0>
- Elbourne, Paul. 2013. *Definite Descriptions*. Oxford: Oxford University Press. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1093/acprof:oso/9780199660193.001.0001>
- Embick, David & Noyer, Rolf. 2001. Movement operations after syntax. *Linguistic Inquiry* 35. 555–595. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1162/002438901753373005>
- Engdahl, Elisabet. 1986. *Constituent questions: The syntax and semantics of questions with special reference to Swedish*. Dordrecht: Springer.
- Evans, Gareth. 1977. Pronouns, quantifiers, and relative clauses (I). *Canadian Journal of Philosophy* 7. 476–536. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1080/00455091.1977.10717030>
- Evans, Nicholas D. 1995. *A grammar of Kayardild*. Mouton De Gruyter. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1515/9783110873733>
- Geach, Peter. 1962. *Reference and Generality*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press.
- Giusti, Giuliana. 2002. The functional structure of noun phrases: A bare phrase structure approach. In Cinque, Guglielmo (ed.), *Functional structure in DP and IP* (The Cartography of Syntactic Structures, Volume 1), 54–90. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Giusti, Giuliana. 2015. *Nominal syntax at the interfaces: A comparative analysis of languages with articles*. Cambridge Scholars Publishing.
- Greenberg, Joseph. 1978. How does a language acquire gender markers? In Greenberg, Joseph (ed.), *Universals of human language volume 3: Word structure*, 47–82. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.
- Groenendijk, Jeroen & Stokhof, Martin. 1990. Dynamic Montague grammar. In Kálmán, László & Pólos, László (eds.), *Proceedings of the second symposium on logic and language*, 3–48. Eotvos Lorand University Press.
- Hanink, Emily. 2018. *Structural sources of anaphora and sameness*: University of Chicago dissertation.
- Hanink, Emily. 2021. DP structure and internally-headed relatives in Washo. *Natural Language & Linguistic Theory* 39. 505–554. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11049-020-09482-y>
- Hankamer, Jorge & Sag, Ivan. 1976. Deep and surface anaphora. *Linguistic Inquiry* 7. 391–428.
- Harbour, Daniel. 2016. *Impossible persons*, vol. 74. MIT Press. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.7551/mitpress/9780262034739.001.0001>
- Hardt, Daniel & Mikkelsen, Line. 2015. Same but different. *Linguistics and Philosophy* 38. 289–314. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10988-015-9176-x>

- Harley, Heidi & Ritter, Elizabeth. 2002. Person and number in pronouns: A featuregeometric analysis. *Language* 78(3). 482–526. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1353/lan.2002.0158>
- Harrison, Annette & Harrison, Byron. 2002. Sociolinguistic survey report for the Marka-Dafin language. SIL Electronic Survey Reports 2002-021.
- Haspelmath, Martin. 1999. External possession in a european areal perspective. *Typological Studies in Language* 39. 109–136. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1075/tsl.39.09has>
- Hawkins, John A. 1978. *Definiteness and Indefiniteness: A Study in Reference and Grammaticality Prediction*. London: Croon Helm.
- Heim, Irene. 1982. *The Semantics of Definite and Indefinite Noun Phrases*: University of Massachusetts, Amherst, PhD dissertation.
- Heim, Irene. 1990. E-type pronouns and donkey anaphora. *Linguistics and Philosophy* 13. 137–177. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1007/BF00630732>
- Heim, Irene & Kratzer, Angelika. 1998. *Semantics in generative grammar*. Malden, MA: Blackwell.
- Heine, Bernd & Kuteva, Tania. 2002. *World lexicon of grammaticalization*. Cambridge University Press. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511613463>
- Höhn, Georg F. K. 2017. *Non-possessive person in the nominal domain*. Cambridge, UK: University of Cambridge dissertation.
- Hsu, Brian & Syed, Saurov. 2020. Cooccurrence of nonarticle determiners as evidence for split DPs and bundled projections. *Language* 96(3). e114–e134. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1353/lan.2020.0051>
- Huang, C.-T. James. 1982. *Logical relations in Chinese and the theory of grammar*: MIT dissertation.
- Huang, C.-T. James & Li, Y.-H. Audrey & Li, Yafei. 2009. *The syntax of Chinese*. Cambridge, U.K.: Cambridge University Press.
- Ingason, Anton Karl. 2016. *Realizing morphemes in the Icelandic noun phrase*: University of Pennsylvania dissertation.
- Ionin, Tania. 2006. This is definitely specific: Specificity and definiteness in article systems. *Natural Language Semantics* 14. 175–234. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11050-005-5255-9>
- Irani, Ava. 2019. On (in)definite expressions in American Sign Language. In Aguilar-Guevara, Ana & Loyo, Julia Pozas & Maldonado, Violeta Vázquez-Rojas (eds.), *Definiteness across languages*, 113–151. Berlin: Language Science Press.
- Jacobson, Pauline. 2000. Paycheck pronouns, bach-peters sentences, and variable-free semantics. *Natural Language Semantics* 8(2). 77–155. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1023/A:1026517717879>
- Jacobson, Pauline. 2012. Direct compositionality and ‘uninterpretability’: The case of (sometimes) ‘uninterpretable’ features on pronouns. *Journal of Semantics* 29. 305–343. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1093/jos/ffs005>
- Jenks, Peter. 2015. Two kinds of definites in numeral classifier languages. In *Proceedings of SALT* 25. 103–124. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.3765/salt.v25i0.3057>
- Jenks, Peter. 2018. Articulated definiteness without articles. *Linguistic Inquiry* 49(3). 501–536. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1162/ling_a_00280

- Kadmon, Nirit. 1987. *On unique and non-unique reference and asymmetric quantification*: University of Massachusetts dissertation.
- Kamp, Hans & Reyle, Uwe. 1993. *From discourse to logic*. Dordrecht: Kluwer. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1007/978-94-017-1616-1>
- Kamp, Hans & Van Genabith, Josef & Reyle, Uwe. 2011. Discourse representation theory. In Gabbay, Dov M. & Guenther, Franz (eds.), *Handbook of philosophical logic*, vol. 15, 125–394. Dordrecht: Springer. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1007/978-94-007-0485-5_3
- Kaplan, David. 1977. Demonstratives. In Almog, J. & Perry, J. & Wettstein, H. (eds.), *Themes from kaplan*, 481–563. Oxford University Press.
- Karttunen, Lauri. 1969. Pronouns and variables. In Binnick, Robert I. & Davison, Alice & Green, Georgia M. & Morgan, Jerry L. (eds.), *Chicago Linguistics Society (CLS) 6*, 108–115. Chicago: Department of Linguistics, University of Chicago.
- King, Jeffrey C. 2001. *Complex demonstratives: A quantificational account*. MIT Press. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.7551/mitpress/1990.001.0001>
- Koopman, Hilda. 1984. *The syntax of verbs*. Dordrecht: Foris Publications.
- Koopman, Hilda. 1992. On the absence of case chains in Bambara. *Natural Language & Linguistic Theory* 10(4). 555–594. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1007/BF00133330>
- Kramer, Ruth. 2015. *The morphosyntax of gender*. Oxford University Press. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1093/acprof:oso/9780199679935.001.0001>
- Kramer, Ruth. 2016. The location of gender features in the syntax. *Language and Linguistics Compass* 10. 661–677. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1111/lnc3.12226>
- Kratzer, Angelika. 1991. The representation of focus. In von Stechow, Arnim & Wunderlich, Dieter (eds.), *Semantik: Ein internationales Handbuch der zeit-genössischen Forschung*, 825–834. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1515/9783110126969.10.825>
- Kurafuji, Takeo. 1998. Dynamic binding and the E-type strategy: Evidence from Japanese. In Strolovitch, Devon & Lawson, Aaron (eds.), *Semantics and Linguistic Theory (SALT) 8*. 129–144. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.3765/salt.v8i0.2802>
- Kurafuji, Takeo. 1999. *Japanese Pronouns in Dynamic Semantics: The Null/Overt Contrast*. Rutgers University, PhD dissertation.
- Leffel, Timothy & Šimik, Radek & Wierzba, Marta. 2014. Pronominal f-markers in basaá. In Huang, Hsin-Lun & Poole, Ethan & Rysling, Amanda (eds.), *NELS 43: Proceedings of the 43rd Annual Meeting of the North East Linguistic Society*, vol. 1, 265–276. Amherst, MA: GLSA.
- Leu, Thomas. 2006. These HERE demonstratives. In *U. Penn working papers in linguistics*, University of Pennsylvania.
- Leu, Thomas. 2015. *The architecture of determiners*. Oxford: Oxford University Press. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1093/acprof:oso/9780199945238.001.0001>
- Li, Audrey. 2014. Born empty. *Lingua* 151. 43–68. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.lingua.2013.10.013>

- Link, Godehard. 1983. The logical analysis of plural and mass nouns: A lattice theoretic approach. In Bäuerle, R. & Schwarze, C. & von Stechow, A. (eds.), *Meaning, use, and interpretation of language*, Berlin: de Gruyter.
- Lobeck, Anne. 1995. *Ellipsis: Functional heads, licensing, and identification*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Lyons, Christopher. 1999. *Definiteness*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Maroney, Mary. 2021. Updating the typology of definiteness: Evidence from bare nouns in Shan. *Glossa* 6(56). DOI: <https://doi.org/10.5334/gjgl.1221>
- Mayr, Clemens. 2012. Focusing bound pronouns. *Natural Language Semantics* 20. 299–348. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11050-012-9083-4>
- Merchant, Jason. 2001. *The syntax of silence*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Mikkelsen, Line. 2005. *Copula clauses: Specification, predication, and equation*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1075/la.85>
- Montalbetti, Mario. 1984. *After binding: on the interpretation of pronouns*: MIT dissertation.
- Neale, Stephen. 1990. *Descriptions*. MIT Press.
- Nikitina, Tatiana. 2011. Categorical reanalysis and the origin of the S-O-V-X word order in Mande. *Journal of African Languages and Linguistics* 32. 251–273. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1515/jall.2011.009>
- Nunberg, Geoffrey. 1993. Indexicality and deixis. *Linguistics and Philosophy* 3. 143–184. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1007/BF00126509>
- Oku, Satoshi. 1998. *A theory of selection and reconstruction in the minimalist perspective*: University of Connecticut dissertation.
- Partee, Barbara. 1970. Opacity, coreference, and pronouns. *Synthese* 21. 359–385. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1007/BF00484805>
- Partee, Barbara. 1975. Deletion and variable binding. In Klima, Edward (ed.), *Formal semantics of natural language*, Cambridge University Press. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511897696.004>
- Partee, Barbara. 1986. Ambiguous pseudoclefts with unambiguous *Be*. In Berman, Stephen & Choe, Jae-Woong & McDonough, Joyce (eds.), *NELS 16: Proceedings of the 16th Annual Meeting of the North East Linguistic Society*, vol. 1, 354–366. Amherst, MA: GLSA.
- Partee, Barbara. 1987. Noun phrase interpretation and type-shifting principles. In Groenendijk, Jeroen A. G. & de Jongh, Dick & Stokhof, Martin J. B. (eds.), *Studies in discourse representation theory and the theory of generalized quantifiers*. Dordrecht: Foris. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1515/9783112420027-006>
- Patel-Grosz, Pritty & Grosz, Patrick G. 2017. Revisiting pronominal typology. *Linguistic Inquiry* 48(2). 259–297. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1162/LING_a_00243
- Paul, Ileana. 2009. On the presence versus absence of determiners in Malagasy. In Ghomeshi, J. & Paul, I. & Wiltschko, M. (eds.), *Determiners: Universals and variation*, 215–245. John Benjamins. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1075/la.147.07pau>

- Postal, Paul. 1969. On so-called pronouns in English. In Reibel, David A. & Schane, Sanford A. (eds.), *Modern studies in English*, 201–24. Eaglewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.
- Prost, André. 1977. *Petite grammaire marka (région de zaba)*. Haute Volta: Diocde Nouna Dadougou.
- Recanati, François. 2005. Deixis and anaphora. In Szabó, Zoltán Gendler (ed.), *Semantics versus pragmatics*, Oxford University Press. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1093/acprof:oso/9780199251520.003.0007>
- Reuland, Eric. 2011. *Anaphora and language design*. MIT Press. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1093/obo/9780199772810-0050>
- Rezac, Milan. 2004. *Elements of cyclic syntax: Agree and Merge*: University of Toronto dissertation.
- Roberts, Craige. 1987. *Modal subordination, anaphora, and distributivity*: UMass, Amherst dissertation.
- Roberts, Craige. 2002. Demonstratives as definites. In van Deemter, Kees & Kibble, Rodger (eds.), *Information Sharing: Reference and Presupposition in Language Generation and Interpretation*, 89–136. Stanford, CA: CSLI.
- Roberts, Ian. 2017. The Final-over-Final condition in DP: Universal 20 and the nature of demonstratives. In Sheehan, Michelle & Biberauer, Theresa & Roberts, Ian & Holmberg, Anders (eds.), *The final-over-final condition: A syntactic universal*, 151–186. MIT Press.
- Romero, Maribel & Meertens, Erlinde. 2022. Q-particles and islands in Sinhala *wh*- and polar questions. *Acta Linguistica Academica* 69(1). 104–123. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1556/2062.2022.00470>
- Rooryck, Johann & Vanden Wyngaerd, Guido. 2011. *Dissolving binding theory*. Oxford University Press. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1093/acprof:oso/9780199691326.001.0001>
- Royer, Justin. 2019. Domain restriction and noun classifiers in Chuj (Mayan). In Baird, Maggie & Pesetsky, Jonathan (eds.), *NELS 49: Proceedings of the Forty-Ninth Annual Meeting of the North East Linguistic Society*, vol. 3, 87–97. Amherst, MA: GLSA.
- Royer, Justin. 2021. Object raising, binding, and coreference in Chuj. In Farinella, Alessa & Hill, Angelica (eds.), *NELS 51: Proceedings of the Fifty-First Annual Meeting of the North East Linguistic Society*. 191–204. Amherst, MA: GLSA.
- Royer, Justin. To appear. Decomposing definiteness: Evidence from Chuj. *Canadian Journal of Linguistics*.
- Rudin, Catherine. 2021. Demonstratives and definiteness: Multiple determination in Balkan Slavic. In *Advances in formal Slavic linguistics 2018*. 305–338. Berlin: Language Science Press. <https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.5483114>.
- Runic, Jelena. 2014. *A new look at clitics, clitic doubling, and argument ellipsis: Evidence from Slavic*: University of Connecticut dissertation.
- Safir, Kenneth. 2004. *The syntax of anaphora*. Oxford University Press. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1093/acprof:oso/9780195166132.001.0001>
- Saito, Mamoru. 2007. Notes on East Asian argument ellipsis. *Mamoru Saito* 43. 203–227.

- Saito, Mamoru & Lin, T.-H. Jonah & Murasugi, Keiko. 2008. N'-ellipsis and the structure of noun phrases in Chinese and Japanese. *Journal of East Asian Linguistics* 17. 247–271. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10831-008-9026-8>
- Sakamoto, Yuta. 2017. *Escape from silent syntax*: University of Connecticut dissertation.
- Sande, Hannah & Baier, Nico & Jenks, Peter. 2019. The syntactic diversity of sauxov in the macro-sudan belt. In *Theory and description in african linguistics: Selected papers from the th annual conference on african linguistics*. 667–701. Language Science Press: Berlin.
- Sauerland, Uli. 2000. The content of pronouns: Evidence from focus. In Jackson, Brendan & Matthews, Tanya (eds.), *Proceedings of SALT 10*. 167–184. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.3765/salt.v10i0.3109>
- Sauerland, Uli. 2009. The presuppositional approach to ϕ -features. <https://ling.auf.net/lingbuzz/003877>.
- Schwarz, Florian. 2009. *Two Types of Definites in Natural Language*: University of Massachusetts, Amherst, PhD dissertation.
- Schwarz, Florian. 2013. Two kinds of definites cross-linguistically. *Language and Linguistics Compass* 7(10). 534–559. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1111/lnc3.12048>
- Šerekaitė, Milena. 2019. Strong vs. weak definites: Evidence from Lithuanian adjectives. In Aguilar-Guevara, Ana & Loyo, Julia Pozas & Maldonado, Violeta Vázquez-Rojas (eds.), *Definiteness across languages*, 83–111. Berlin: Language Science Press.
- Sheehan, Michelle. 2017. The final-over-final condition and the head-final filter. In Sheehan, Michelle & Biberauer, Theresa & Roberts, Ian & Holmberg, Anders (eds.), *The Final-Over-Final Condition: A syntactic universal*, 121–150. MIT Press. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.7551/mitpress/8687.001.0001>
- Sichel, Ivy & Toosarvandani, Maziar. To appear. Nominal intervention and the extended PERSON domain. In *Proceedings of WCCFL 39*.
- Sichel, Ivy & Wiltschko, Martina. 2021. The logic of Person markedness: Evidence from pronominal competition. *Language* 97. 42–71. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1353/lan.2021.0001>
- Sigurðson, Halldór Ármann. 2011. Conditions on argument drop. *Linguistic Inquiry* 42(2). 267–304. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1162/LING_a_00042
- Šimík, Radek. 2016. On pragmatic uses of demonstratives: The case of pragmatic discourse anaphora in Czech. In Bade, Nadine & Berezovskaya, Polina & Schöller, Anthea (eds.), *Proceedings of Sinn und Bedeutung 20*. 640–657.
- Šimík, Radek. 2021a. Information structure and its relation to syntax, semantics, and reference. Ms., Charles University, Prague. <https://ling.auf.net/lingbuzz/005822>.
- Šimík, Radek. 2021b. Inherent vs. accidental uniqueness in bare and demonstrative nominals. In *Advances in formal slavic linguistics 2018*, 365–391. Berlin: Language Science Press.
- Šimík, Radek & Demian, Christoph. 2020. Definiteness, uniqueness, and maximality in languages with and without articles. *Journal of Semantics* 37(3). 311–366. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1093/jos/ffaa002>

- Simonenko, Alexandra P. 2014. *Grammatical ingredients of definiteness*: McGill University dissertation.
- Simonenko, Alexandra. 2015. Semantics of dp islands: the case of questions. *Journal of Semantics* 33(4). 661–702. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1093/jos/ffv011>
- Sudo, Yasutada. 2012. *On the semantics of phi features on pronouns*: Massachusetts Institute of Technology dissertation.
- Szabolcsi, Anna. 1994. The noun phrase. In Kiefer, Ferenc & Kiss, Katalin É. (eds.), *Syntax and semantics, vol 27: The structure of Hungarian*. London: Academic Press.
- Tomioka, Satoshi. 2003. The semantics of Japanese null pronouns and its cross-linguistic implications. In Schwabe, K. & Winkler, S. (eds.), *The interfaces: Deriving and interpreting omitted structures*, 321–340. John Benjamins. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1075/la.61.16tom>
- Traore, Karim. 1998. *Dafing: Beiträge zu phonologie und wortbildung einer mande-sprache*. Saarbrücken: Universität des Saarlandes dissertation.
- van Gelderen, Ellie. 2004. Economy, innovation, and prescriptivism: From spec to head and head to head. *The Journal of Comparative Germanic Linguistics* 7. 59–78. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1023/B:JCOM.0000003601.53603.b2>
- Wiltschko, Martina. 1998. On the syntax and semantics of (relative) pronouns and determiners. *Journal of Comparative Germanic Linguistics* 2. 143–181. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1023/A:1009719229992>
- Wold, Dag E. 1996. Long distance selective binding: The case of focus. In Galloway, Teresa & Spence, Justin (eds.), *Proceedings of SALT 6*. 311–328. Ithaca, NY: Cornell. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.3765/salt.v6i0.2766>
- Wolter, Lindsay. 2006. *That's that: The semantics and pragmatics of demonstrative noun phrases*: UC Santa Cruz dissertation.
- Wolter, Lynsey. 2007. Situation variables and licensing by modification in opaque demonstratives. In McNally, Louise & Puig-Waldmüller, Estela (eds.), *Proceedings of Sinn und Bedeutung 11*. 612–625. Barcelona: Universitat Pompeu Fabra.
- Zribi-Hertz, Anne & Hanne, Jean-Fran. 1995. Pronoms, déterminants et relatives en bambara de bamako. *Linguistique africaine* 15. 91–136.

