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1 Introduction

Collins & Postal (2008) argue that in sentences like (1a), where the present authors is understood to be the speaker, the present authors contains a null pronoun WE, as in (1b).

(1) a. The present authors attempt to defend ourselves.
   b. [XP [DP WE ] [DP the present authors ] ]

The Icelandic sentence in (2a) is only acceptable if the speaker is not understood to be one of the reporters. If the speaker is understood as one of the reporters, a personal pronoun við ‘we’ must be used.

(2) a. Fréttamennir tala stundum vitlaust.
   ‘The reporters sometimes speak incorrectly.’
   b. Við fréttamennir tölum stundum vitlaust.
   ‘We reporters sometimes speak incorrectly.’

However, if the plural DP is a coordinate phrase, the pronoun is optional. Both (3a-b) are acceptable when pabbi ‘Daddy’ is the speaker.

(3) a. Mamma og pabbi ætla að fara saman í vinnu í dag
   Mommy and Daddy intend to go together to work today
   b. Við Mamma og pabbi ætlum að fara saman í vinnu í dag
   ‘Mommy and Daddy are going to work together today.’

Finally, if a third-person pronoun is used with the above DPs, the sentence can never refer to the speaker.

(4) a. Þau Mamma og Pabbi ætla að gefa þér sælgæti.
   ‘Mommy and Daddy are going to give you candy.’
   b. Þeir bræðurnir eru búnir að fela sig í kjallarunum.
   ‘The brothers have hidden themselves in the cellar.’

*Huge thank you to Hallvarður Áseirsson and Júlíia Hermannsdóttir for all their help! Unless otherwise cited, all the Icelandic sentences come from working with them, but they should get none of the blame for any mistakes. Pakka ykkur kærliga fyrir! Also thanks to Chris Collins, Jeroen van Craenenbroeck, Marcel den Dikken, Inna Livitz, Arhonto Terzi, along with the folks at the CUNY Syntax Supper and the two reviewers for comments on various versions of this work. Finally, thanks to Gunnar Hrafn Hrafnbjargarson for discussing certain parts of the data with me.
In this paper, I discuss the interaction between this pronoun, known as the ‘Proprial Article’ (PA; Sigurðsson 2006), and the ability of a noun phrase to refer to the speaker or addressee. This will be embedded in terms of work in Collins & Postal (2008) on ‘imposters’, cases of mismatch in grammatical person and notional person.

My working hypothesis is that the PA in (2b-3b) is the overt realization of the null pronoun in (1a-b). This is supported by the fact that the sentences in (4) cannot refer to the speaker. If við ‘we’ in these sentences is the overt counterpart of silent WE in English, then þau/peir ‘they’ should be the overt counterpart of a silent THEY. This would be trivial in English, as it would be silent and add nothing to interpretation. When overt in Icelandic, though, it would have the effect of preventing a first-person reading of the DP.

Specifically, I will propose a derivation like (5), where the XP containing við ‘we’ and fréttumennir ‘the reporters’ moves as a whole to SpecDP.

The nature of XP and the motivation for movement will be discussed throughout. Generally, XP movement will be analogized to adjective-noun movement.¹

The paper is organized as follows. In section 2, I provide an overview of the analysis in Collins & Postal (2008), commenting only briefly on its motivation. I then give an overview of some aspects of the Icelandic DP. In section 3, I present data and analysis of plural DPs, such as those discussed in this introduction. Presentation of data on demonstratives will allow a discussion of what conditions the pronunciation/non-pronunciation of the pronoun. In section 4, I turn to singular DPs, which pattern opposite of what we would expect given the plural cases. In section 5, I bring up some other predictions of and problems for the present approach, and suggest that adopting a decompositional view of the extended adjective phrase as in Leu (2008) provides a possible solution. I conclude in section 6. And finally, I provide an appendix with some further data, since this is a relatively unexplored area, and I do not think all data should have to wait for a fully worked out analysis.

¹Here I adopt the assumption in Julien (2005) where the definite suffix is attached in nP. Nothing in particular hinges on this.
2 Background

2.1 Imposters

Collins & Postal (2008) is a detailed study of notional versus grammatical person. Sentences like (3a), when *pabbi* ‘Daddy’ is understood to refer to the speaker, fall under their definition of **imposters**.

(6) An **imposter** is a notionally *n* person DP which is grammatically *m* person, *n ≠ m*.

This is so because the DP *mamma og pabbi* ‘Mommy and Daddy’ is grammatically third-person plural and notionally first-person plural.

Some DPs, like *Daddy* or *this reporter* can optionally have an imposter reading, where the speaker refers to himself. This is popularly known as ‘referring to yourself in the third-person’.

(7) a. At the time, CBS News and **this reporter** fully believed the documents were genuine.

b. *(Your) Daddy* is going to get you an ice cream cone.

c. **Mommy and Daddy** want a few hours on weekends to enjoy ourselves.

Other DPs, like *yours truly* or *number 1* seem to have only imposter readings; their grammatical person and notional person never match.

(8) a. Though **yours truly** has tried to present his readers with a diverse variety of viewpoints, some very different from his.

b. I (only) look out for **number 1** and so does Eddie.

c. A bunch of Seattle Amazonians, including my boss Colin Bodell and **yours truly**, found ourselves in the Asiana Hotel in Chennai this weekend.

d. It was here that The Tyke and **Yours Truly** used to amuse ourselves with a cute little mouse that lived under the fireplace...

Collins & Postal (2008) argue that the notional person, termed the **notional core**, is syntactically represented as a null pronoun. Specifically, they argue that a null pronoun and the overt DP form an appositive constituent, which they call XP<sub>app</sub>. The overt DP is called the **secondary DP**. The secondary DP then undergoes predicate inversion within a shell DP. The shell DP inherits phi-features from the secondary DP.

---

2Several of the examples presented here show coordinate phrase imposters controlling first-person PRO or binding a first-person reflexive, an aspect of imposter syntax which I do not analyze in this paper. See Collins & Postal (2008). See also the examples in (62) and some discussion in section 3.3.

3http://transcripts.cnn.com/TRANSCRIPTS/0709/20/lkl.01.html (Collins & Postal (2008)).

4Full example: “Easiest Sitter Job You Have Ever Had Our daughter (5 months) goes to sleep about 9 p.m. and asleep till morning. Mommy and Daddy want a few hours on weekends to enjoy ourselves.” http://www.simplyhired.com/job-id/rimiec7z4/occassional-weekend-jobs/.

5http://inezha.com/p/7210350/item274.

(9) $\text{DP}_{\text{shell}}$

$\text{DP}_{\text{secondary}}$

$\text{D}$

$\text{XP}_{\text{app}}$

$\text{ME}_{\text{core}}$

$\text{t}_{\text{DP}}$

$\text{Daddy}$

Throughout this paper, I will assume that phi-features are valued under spec-head agreement. In the tree above, the secondary DP is third-person singular, and via spec-head agreement makes the entire shell DP third-person singular. This assumption provides one possible means of diagnosing movement around a null head, which cannot usually be seen directly in word order, as Marcel den Dikken (p.c.) points out to me. There are some cases in this paper, however, where word order can diagnose movement; see the tree in (18) and the discussion of (51).

This analysis raises some questions. First, why is the core silent? Second, why does the secondary DP and not the core or $\text{XP}_{\text{app}}$ move to the specifier of the shell? One could imagine the core moving to the specifier of the shell and valuing its phi-features, whether it is pronounced or not. One could further imagine the whole $\text{XP}_{\text{app}}$ moving to the specifier of the shell and valuing its phi-features – again, whether the core is pronounced or not.

(10)  

Possibility A

Possibility B

Recalling the data in (2 - 4), the immediate question that arises is why it is not possible for a DP with a third-person (plural) proprial article to be a secondary DP in the structure above. That is, what rules out a derivation like (11)?

(11)  

Illicit Derivation of (4a)

I will propose to address the above questions in the following way. First, if something like the derivations in (1b, 5, 12) can be fruitfully analyzed as underlying Icelandic PA constructions, we can make sense of a number of otherwise unexpected facts about both the PA and imitators in
general. Second, I will suggest that the PA is the pronounced core. If so, this would support the idea in Collins & Postal (2008) that the notional core in imposters is syntactically represented as a separate constituent, since elements hypothesized to be silently active in one language often turn out to be overt in another.\footnote{Two well-known examples are (1) hypothesized successive-cyclic wh-movement, later found to mark intermediate complementizers in Irish (see McCloskey 2001, 2002), and (2) hypothesized null Topic and Focus heads in the left periphery (Rizzi 1997), later found to have overt counterparts in languages such as Gungbe (Aboh 2004). Of course, while the existence of overt material can support hypothesized silent material, the lack of overt material in no way provides evidence against silent material.}

However, I will propose that the secondary DP must be a constituent smaller than a DP, namely, nP in the framework of Julien (2005).\footnote{This will be discussed further below.} I will further propose that the constituent the core forms with this nP is more akin to ‘integrated appositives’ (rather than ordinary appositives) and that the core occupies an adjective-like specifier position (αP in Julien (2005), see also Scott (2002)). Thus, the analysis in Collins &Postal (2008) translates here into something like (12).

\begin{equation}
\text{(12) Modified Analysis}
\end{equation}

\begin{equation*}
\text{Modified Analysis}
\end{equation*}

\begin{equation*}
\text{\begin{tikzpicture}
    \node (alphaP) at (0,0) {$\alpha$P};
    \node (DPcore) at (-1.5,-1) {$\alpha$P core};
    \node (tNP) at (0,-1) {$t_{nP}$};
    \node (DPshell) at (0,-2) {DP$_{shell}$};
    \node (nPsecondary) at (-3,-2) {nP$_{secondary}$};
    \node (D) at (-4,-3) {D};
    \node (ME) at (0,-3) {ME};
    \node (3SG) at (-2.5,-3) {3SG};
    \node (Daddy) at (-5,-4) {Daddy};
    \draw (alphaP) -- (DPshell);
    \draw (alphaP) -- (DPcore);
    \draw (DPcore) -- (tNP);
    \draw (nPsecondary) -- (D);
    \draw (D) -- (3SG);
    \draw (Daddy) -- (3SG);
    \draw (3SG) -- (ME);
\end{tikzpicture}}
\end{equation*}

Whether this can account for the wealth of data in Collins & Postal (2008) remains to be seen. One immediate problem seems to be the data which led Longobardi (1994) to propose that movement of proper names to D in English must be LF movement (assuming that kinship names like \textit{Daddy} behave like proper names). Namely, adjectives precede names in English. Since the goal of this paper is not to investigate the interaction between imposters and adjective modification, the latter itself being a thorny issue, I must leave this to future research.\footnote{See Leu (2008), ch. 4, for an overview of the issues involved in adjective modification.}

\subsection{Pronominal Imposters}

Collins & Postal (2008) also observe that pronouns themselves sometimes have a mismatch in grammatical and notional person. The third-person pronouns \textit{he/she} can refer to the speaker if anteceded by an imposter. In the following sentences, \textit{he and Ruth} can bind the reflexive \textit{ourselves} when \textit{he} is anteceded by an imposter such as \textit{this reporter/the present author}. In addition, \textit{he and Ruth} can bind an ordinary third-person plural reflexive.

\begin{equation}
\text{(13) a. This reporter$_1$ believes that he$_1$ and Ruth can successfully defend ourselves against these charges.}
\end{equation}

\begin{equation}
\text{b. The present author$_1$ believes that he$_1$ and Ruth can successfully defend ourselves against these charges.}
\end{equation}
c. This reporter1 believes that he1 and Ruth can successfully defend themselves against these charges.

d. The present author1 believes that he1 and Ruth can successfully defend themselves against these charges.

They argue that there is a null pronoun in he in these examples as well, offering the structure in (14).\(^{10}\)

\[
\text{DP}_{\text{shell}} \ \\
\text{D} \quad \text{DP}_{\text{core}} \ \\
\text{He} \quad \text{ME}
\]

Coordinate DPs can acquire phi-features of the core in (13a-b) because the maximal projection of a CoP generally must have access to the phi-features of all its sub-constituents. In a CoP such as me and my friend, for example, the phi-features of me force the whole CoP to be first-person.\(^{11}\)

Ordinarily, of course, third-person pronouns cannot just refer to the speaker arbitrarily. One could not walk into a room and felicitously utter, “He’s hungry,” where he is supposed to refer to the speaker. Because of this, Collins & Postal (2008) argue that pronominal imposters, by and large, acquire their phi-features by antecedence. That is, they start out as an empty D head with no valued phi-features, and derivationally acquire phi-features under antecedence, which is a primitive grammatical operation in their system. The antecedent must itself be an imposter. I will not explicate the mechanics of this here, but the antecedence of pronominal imposters will become relevant in section 5.

Other cases of pronominal imposters are ‘nurse-we’ and ‘royal-we’.

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{a. Are we}_1 \ &\text{taking good care of ourself}_1/\text{ourselves}_1/yourself_1 \text{today?} \\
\text{b. We}_1 &\text{ seem a bit displeased with ourself}_1/\text{ourselves}_1 \text{ don’t we}_1? \\
\text{c. We}_1 &\text{ (= the monarch) have decided to absent ourselves}_1/\text{ourself}_1 \text{ from the meeting.} \\
\text{d. We}_1 &\text{ (= a single author) find ourselves}_1/\text{ourself}_1 \text{ in disagreement with Dr. Herrenheim.}
\end{align*}
\]

2.3 Icelandic DP

Julien (2005) argues for the decomposition of the DP in (16). Here \(\alpha\)P is a functional head that mediates between \(n\)P and adjectives. She suggests that this may in fact involve a series of such heads, perhaps ordered as in Scott (2002). She argues convincingly that when the \(n\)P has a definite

\(^{10}\)Peeking ahead, Icelandic seems to have an overt counterpart of this structure. See example (21).

\(^{11}\)Collins & Postal (2008) have an explicit formalization (pages 43-50) of how CoPs like me and my friend and you and Daddy get their phi-features. Note that it cannot be spec-head agreement, since you and me and me and you are both first-person singular (for example). One problem with adopting their formalization directly is that their formalization requires an imposter core to be a ‘conjunct’ of the CoP. Another is how to differentiate imposter core ‘conjuncts’ from ordinary conjuncts, which they do using a movement analysis which has not be discussed here. Marcel den Dikken (p.c.) suggests that one might exploit the idea that third-person is ‘non-person’, so that any first-person or second-person features in a CoP might make the CoP first-person or second-person. While I think this might be the right way to go, I must leave formalization of this for future work.
suffix, $\alpha P$ moves to SpecDP in Icelandic, quite generally, stranding Card(inal)P. For Julien (2005), the definite suffix is an instantiation of $n$, and is thus present in $nP$.

\[(16)\]
\[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{DP} \\
\text{D} \\
\text{THREE} \\
\text{Card} \\
\alpha P \\
\text{AP} \\
\text{RED} \\
\text{CARS} \\
\end{array}
\]

For many speakers, adjectives and nouns must follow modifying numerals when a demonstrative is present. When there is no demonstrative, and a suffixed article is used, adjectives and nouns must precede modifying numerals.

\[(17)\]
\[
\begin{array}{l}
a. \text{ðessi þrjú gulu borð} \\
\text{these three yellow tables} \\
b. \text{gulu borð-in þrjú} \\
\text{new.wk tables-the three} \\
c. *\text{þrjú gulu borð-in} \\
\text{three yellow.wk tables-the}
\end{array}
\]

Julien (2005) takes this to show that $\alpha P$ moves to SpecDP unless a demonstrative prevents it from doing so. Similar analyses are proposed elsewhere.

\[(18)\]
\[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{DP} \\
\alpha P \\
\text{yellow} \\
\text{nP} \\
\text{three} \\
\text{Card} \\
\text{t}_{\alpha P} \\
\text{tables.the}
\end{array}
\]

---

12 However, $\alpha P$ is not always present; when it is not, $nP$ moves alone. Julien (2005) implements this in terms of agreement between $\alpha$ and the $n$ head.

13 Some speakers do accept examples like (17c); see Julien (2005).

14 Sigurðsson (2006) has a constituent containing both the adjective and noun moving to SpecDP, stranding the numeral. Svenionius (2008) and Vangsnes (1999) also adopt similar movements.
2.4 The Proprial Article

The Icelandic DP, as already seen, may sometimes have a Proprial Article (PA). The PA a determiner-like personal pronoun which is often used with names and kinship terms. The following definition is from Sigurðsson (2006:30).

\[(19) \text{“The Icelandic Proprial Article is a personal pronoun that stands next to the left of a name or a relational noun, without there being any intonation break between the two.”} \]

There are two reasons to think that the PA is not simply an appositive. First, as noted above, there is no intonational break between the two constituents. Icelandic has appositives as well, and most speakers and linguists agree that there is a difference, in meaning and structure, between the PA and ordinary apposition. Second, the PA has a special stylistic value. Namely, it presupposes that the speaker and the addressee are both familiar with the person named. An example of the PA is given in (20). Note that it agrees gender and case with the head noun.

\[(20) \text{(Hún) Anna sendi (hann) Jón til (hennar) Maríu} \]
\[(\text{She.NOM) Anna.NOM sent (he.ACC) Jón.ACC to (she.GEN) Maríu.GEN} \]
\[\text{‘Anna sent John to Mary’ (Sigurðsson 2006)} \]

Interestingly, it can even occur with a first-person pronoun.

\[(21) \text{Það er bara hann ég.} \]
\[\text{It is only he I} \]
\[\text{‘It is just me (myself).’ (Sigurðsson 2006)} \]

2.5 The Gapped Proprial Article

An important variant of the Icelandic PA is the ‘Gapped Proprial Article Construction’ (GPA). This is where null constituents are apparently licensed. Consider (22a-b). In (22a), the neuter PA þau ‘they’ occurs with the conjunction phrase Jón og María ‘John and Mary’. In (22b), the discourse-salient Anna can be understood to be included. Following Sigurðsson, the DP in (22b) could thus be analyzed as in (23).

\[(22) a. \text{þau Jón og María eru vinir.} \]
\[\text{They.NEUT John and Mary are friends} \]
\[\text{‘John and Mary are friends.’} \]

---

15Note that this is a descriptive definition and does not entail that all PA constructions have the same syntax. Actually, Sigurðsson (2006) suggests in passing that some plural PAs might have a derivation different from third-person singular PAs.

16Neither of these reasons seem to apply to ‘integrated appositives’, and I will suggest that proprial articles are something like integrated appositives.

17This is apparently in direct contrast to similar expressions in Swedish. Julien (2005:124) cites Lars-Olof Delsing, who states that in some Swedish dialects hon Lisa ‘she Lisa’ is used when “the speaker is uncertain whether the listener knows who the referent is.” Thráinsson (2007:91, fn. 4) also observes that the stylistic value of the PA varies across Mainland Scandinavian dialects.
b. Anna kemur líka. Þau Jón og María eru vinir.
Anna comes too. They. NEUT John and Mary are friends.
‘Anna is coming too. She, John and Mary are friends.’ (Sigurðsson 2006)


The GPA can also occur with first- and second-person plural pronouns. Although the ordinary conjunction ég og Jón ‘I and John’ is allowed, the GPA, as in (24) is actually more common.

(24) Við Jón erum ekki eins gamlir og þið Pétur.
We Jón are.1PL not as old as you.PL Pétur
‘John and I are not as old as you and Peter.’ (Sigurðsson 2006)

Sigurðsson notes that the deletion approach can describe examples like (24), as in (25-26).


In this paper, I will assume that this is at some level correct. Namely, I will continue to analyze the GPA as involving coordination and deletion, despite the fact that this is non-constituent deletion.

2.6 Summary

In this section, I have given an overview of the analysis of imposters in Collins & Postal (2008). I then suggested a revision that will allow me to analyze the Icelandic PA as the overt pronunciation of the core. I went on to describe the analysis of pronominal imposters. In the remainder of this section, I gave a very brief overview of the Icelandic DP and the proprial article. I refer the reader to Thráinsson (2007), Sigurðsson (1993, 2006), and Julien (2005) for more detail.

3 Plurals

Here I consider the alternation with plurals. First I consider ordinary DPs with the definite suffix. I then discuss the optional alternation with CoPs. Finally, I present data on demonstratives, which do not occur with the overt PA. This will motivate a discussion of the (non-)pronunciation of the imposter core.

For the rest of the paper, unless otherwise specified, the DPs pabbi ‘daddy’, bræðurnir ‘the brothers’, and fréttamenn(írni) ‘(the) reporters’ refer to the speaker. Thus, all grammaticality judgments reported should be understood in this sense – many ‘ungrammatical’ sentences here are acceptable on non-imposter readings.

18Chris Collins (p.c.) points out that this could be constituent deletion under the opposite constituency, namely [ John [ and ] ].
3.1 Suffixed Article

As mentioned in the introduction, if a plural definite-suffixed DP is to denote the speaker, the first-person plural proprial article víð ‘we’ must be used. The same goes for non-definite plural DPs. The sentence in (27d) looks similar to English we reporters, and I do not discuss it further.¹⁹

(27) a. * Fréttamennír tala stundum vitlaust.
   Reporters.the speak.3PL sometimes incorrectly.

b. * Fréttamenn tala stundum vitlaust.
   Reporters speak.3PL sometimes incorrectly.

c. *(Við) fréttamennír töulum stundum vitlaust.
   *(We) reporters.the speak.1PL sometimes incorrectly.
   ‘We the reporters sometimes speak incorrectly.

d. *(Við) fréttamenn töulum stundum vitlaust.
   *(We) reporters speak.1PL sometimes incorrectly.
   ‘We reporters sometimes speak incorrectly.’

If a third-person proprial article is used, the DP cannot refer to the speaker.

(28) a. * Deir fréttamennír hlakka alltaf til að sjá ykkur á miðvikudógum.
   They reporters.the look forward always to to see you.PL on wednesdays

b. * Deir bræðurnir eru búnir að fela sig í kjallarunum.
   They.MASC brothers.the are.3PL finished to hide REFL in cellar.the
   ‘The brothers have hidden themselves in the cellar.’

In the present analysis, these facts have the following explanation. In order for a DP to denote the speaker, a first-person pronoun must be in SpecXP. In section 3.3, I will argue that XP is αP. In Icelandic, unless something prevents it, the entire αP moves to SpecDP, where the pronoun will be pronounced. The pronunciation of this pronoun is the source of the proprial article. When the proprial article is third-person, this is because the pronoun in SpecαP is third-person, and the same movements apply. However, since the third-person pronoun occupies the position that would be occupied by the first-person pronoun, the DP must have third-person reference.

3.2 Coordinate Phrases

Coordinate DPs (CoPs) behave a bit differently from suffixed DPs. While a first-person plural proprial article is generally allowed when pabbi ‘daddy’ is the speaker, it is not obligatory. Thus, both (3a-b), repeated here, are acceptable when pabbi ‘daddy’ is the speaker.

(29) a. Mamma og pabbi ætla að fara saman í vinnu í dag
   Mommy and Daddy intend.3PL to go together to work today

b. Við Mamma og pabbi ætlum að fara saman í vinnu í dag
   We Mommy and Daddy intend.1PL to go together to work today
   ‘Mommy and Daddy are going to work together today.’

¹⁹See Postal (1969), Roehrs (2005a,b), and Taylor (2008).
Again, though, *pabbi ‘daddy’ may not be the speaker if a third-person proprial article is used.

(30) *They.NEUT Mamma og pabbi ætað gefa þér sælgæti.
    ‘Mommy and Daddy intend.3PL to give you candy.’

The data in (30) is expected, for the same reasons as outlined in the previous section. The data in (29) might at first seem surprising – why should the proprial article suddenly be optional? In fact, though, the possibility of sentences like (29a) as imposters is exactly what we would expect once we look at singular imposters. As I will discuss below, some speakers allow *pabbi ‘daddy’, without a proprial article, as an imposter. Thus, (29a) involves coordination of two DPs, one of which is an imposter, whereas (29b) involves coordination of two *Ps, with *við ‘we’ as a core. In the latter case, overt pronunciation of *við ‘we’ is obligatory.

3.3 Demonstratives

Demonstratives do not behave the way we would expect so far. Unlike with definite-suffixed DPs (27c), demonstratives do not allow a PA.

(31) a. *Við þessir fréttamenn eru(m) búnir að fela okkur/sig í kjallarunum.
   We these reporters are.3(1)PL finished to hide us/REFL in cellar.the

b. *Pessir við fréttamenn eru(m) búnir að fela okkur/sig í kjallarunum.
   These we reporters are.3(1)PL finished to hide us/REFL in cellar.the

c. Þessir fréttamenn eru búnir að fela sig í kjallarunum.
   These reporters are.3PL finished to hide REFL in cellar.the
   ‘These reporters have hidden themselves in the cellar’

This contrast forces a closer examination of the nature of the pronunciation of the core, demonstratives, and the architecture of the DP.

Leu (2008) argues for an adjectival analysis of demonstratives, where they are composed of a determiner-like element along with a silent *HERE. In this view, *these reporters is the spellout of *these *HERE reporters, where *HERE is not pronounced.

Suppose that the imposter reading of *these reporters stems not from *these *HERE reporters, but rather *these *WE reporters. This would explain the unacceptability of non-standard *here in imposters.

(32) *These here reporters fully believed that the documents were genuine.

\[\text{It is worth noting that if } \textit{þessir ‘these’ were dropped in (31a-b), only the first-person reflexive okkur would be grammatical. Similarly, (31c) is only acceptable with third-person reflexive sig, not with okkur. This seems to clearly relate to the phi-features of the binding DP. Through spec-head agreement, *við fréttamennirnir ‘we reporters.the’ is first-person plural, and the bound reflexive okkur must be first-person plural as well. For reasons of space, I do not discuss anaphors external to the DP in this paper, though see the data in (60) and (62).} \]

\[\text{The demonstrative facts in this section extend generally to non-suffixed, prenominal determiners, including preposed possessors and the ‘free’ article. Such determiners arguably have derivations similar to demonstratives (see Leu 2008). See, for example, the data in (64)-(65).} \]

\[\text{Thanks to Chris Collins (p.c.) for pointing out this prediction.} \]
Leu (2008:17) does present the possibility of silent deictics other than locatives being involved in building some demonstratives: “This opens the door for the possibility of having ‘imitation demonstratives,’ …whose modifier stem is not a counterpart of HERE/THERE, but some other semi-functional lexical element whose contribution to the overall meaning comes close to a demonstrative of the HERE/THERE sort.” In fact, pronouns themselves have a deictic function (Levinson 2004), and in some languages participate transparently in demonstrative composition. This is the case, for example, in Älvdalsmålet, which has demonstratives like an-dar ‘he-there (= that)’ (Åkerberg 2000).

Adopting such an approach within the clausal architecture proposed by Julien (2005), this would require WE to be in the the specifier of αP. But how can this be, if αP mediates adjectival phrases and nPs, and WE is clearly not adjectival? Are there any cases where DPs do similar things as adjectives?

In fact, there are such cases, called ‘integrated appositives’ in Huddleston & Pullum (2002:447). Integrated appositives even alternate with sentences where one of the constituents seems to be silent. Huddleston & Pullum give the following examples, noting that in each pair, (a) entails (b).

(33) a. She sang in [the opera ‘Carmen’].
   b. She sang in ‘Carmen’.
(34) a. It was founded in [the year ‘1850’].
   b. It was founded in ‘1850’.
(35) a. The verb ‘use’ is transitive.
   b. ‘Use’ is transitive.

A possible analysis is that in the (a) versions, the DPs the opera, the year, and the verb, are in the specifier of a functional head similar to αP. In the (b) versions, predicate inversion renders these DPs silent (see below). That is, they are a kind of imposter core.

The idea that integrated appositives involve DPs in an adjectival position is similar to the approach XP-like adjectives in Scott (2002). Pursuing a cartographic analysis of adjective ordering, Scott proposes that in cases where nouns or PPs are acting as adjectives, they are in the specifier of an adjectival projection, αP here. He gives examples such as an off-the-cuff remark, night bus, summer desserts, and a ready-to-eat meal.

Integrated appositives might be another class to fit into this category. In the examples above, the modifying DPs the opera, the year, and the verb have an anaphoric quality to them. Formally, they are similar to epithets. They consist of a determiner and a general noun which refers to a specific entity. In this case, the referent is not previous to, but in apposition with the DP. Admittedly, DPs like the year do not make very good epithets, but I imagine this is for pragmatic reasons.23

This seems to make the right kind of cut for the Icelandic data so far. If we assume that predicate inversion cannot apply in the Icelandic cases we have seen so far, along with the DP syntax argued for in Julien (2005), two options present themselves once αP is formed and D has merged: either move αP to SpecDP, or merge a demonstrative there.24

---

23One can almost imagine using the verb as an epithet, as in I just don’t like the (dumb) verb. The opera is harder since it has a generic reading meaning something like ‘going to operas’. Still, I think that the oddness of using these DPs as epithets stems from their typical pragmatic use — they do not seem syntactically bad.

24In section 5, I will propose a different analysis. Julien (2005), for comparative reasons, analyzes demonstratives as occupying a distinct functional head dominating D, Dem(P). I gloss over these details to simplify the exposition.
For now, assume that if $\alpha P$ does not move, the pronoun will be silent, but if it moves, the pronoun will be pronounced. Below, I will suggest instead that whenever (i) Spec$\alpha P$ is c-commanded by $nP$, (ii) Spec$\alpha P$ and $nP$ are co-indexed, and (iii) Spec$\alpha P$ and $nP$ are contained in the same DP, Spec$\alpha P$ will not be pronounced. This is similar to deletion of links in an A-chain. In many models of minimalism (e.g. Nunes 2001), A-chains are formed between co-indexed DPs after copies have been made, in an operation called ‘Form Chain’. In the present case, I treat co-indexed non-copies the same way, but crucially only when they are both contained within the same DP. In the present structures, $nP$ does not come to c-command $\alpha P$, but in section 5, it will. For now, I simply stipulate that if $\alpha P$ is left alone, a pronoun in its specifier will be silent.

$\alpha P$ will be first-person plural when its specifier is $we$. When a first-person plural $\alpha P$ is in SpecDP, that DP will also be first-person plural via the same mechanism. Thus, the DP in (37) is a first-person plural DP. When the first-person plural $\alpha P$ does not move to SpecDP, as in (36), $\alpha P$ will not make the DP first-person plural. There is still a question as to how the DP in (36) becomes third-person plural, which is discussed in section 5.3.
4 Singul ars

A challenge to the idea that the pr o p r i a l a r t i c l e o r i g i n a t es as the core arises when we t urn to s i n g u l ar imposters. We would expect (38c) to be grammatical, but it is not. Moreover, all speakers I have consulted accept (38b) when hann pabbi ‘he Daddy’ is understood to be the speaker. While my consultants also accepted (38a), Gunnar Hrafn Hrafnbjargarson (p.c.) accepts only (38b). For him, a third-person pr o p r i a l a r t i c l e i s o b l i g a t o r y w i t h i m p o s t e r pabbi ‘Daddy’.

(38) a. % En pabbi er löngu búinn að segja þér það.
   ‘But Daddy already told you that a long time ago.’

b. En hann pabbi er löngu búinn að segja þér það.
   ‘But he Daddy already told you that a long time ago.’

c. * En ég pabbi er löngu búinn að segja þér það.
   ‘But I Daddy already told you that a long time ago.’

I will first discuss the alternation between (38b-c) and return to (38a) below.

Recall that Collins & Postal (2008) discuss several cases of pronominal imposters – pronouns where grammatical and notional person mismatch. They argue for a structure like (39) when he refers to the speaker.

(39) \[
\text{DP}_{\text{shell}} \\
\text{D} \quad \text{DP} \\
\text{He} \quad \text{ME}
\]

This was motivated in part by examples like the following, where he and Ruth can bind the reflexive ourselves. Notice, however, that coordinates like they and Ruth seem much worse. Not all speakers readily accept (40a, c), though many do. All speakers I have consulted, however, agree that the examples with they are much worse.

(40) a. This reporter1 believes that he1 and Ruth can successfully defend ourselves against these charges.

b. * These reporters1 belief that they1 and Ruth can successfully defend ourselves against these charges.

c. The present author1 believes that he1 and Ruth can successfully defend ourselves against these charges.

d. * The present authors1 believe that they1 and Ruth can successfully defend ourselves against these charges.

---

25The verb vera ‘be’ is syncretic between first- and third-person in the singular.
This would suggest that the structure [they WE] is not possible, even if [he ME] is. If so, an interesting correlation emerges.

(I) \[
\begin{array}{c|c|c}
\text{English} & \text{Icelandic} & \text{Icelandic} \\
\hline
\checkmark \text{He ME} & \checkmark \text{Hann ég} & \checkmark \text{Hann pabbi} \\
\text{He I} & \text{he Daddy} & \\
\hline
\ast \text{They WE} & \ast \text{Pau við} & \ast \text{Pau mamma og pabbi} \\
\text{they we} & \text{they mommy and daddy} & \\
\end{array}
\]

I propose that the impossibility of \textit{pau} ‘they’ in first-person imposter DPs relates to the impossibility of \textit{pau} ‘they’ with overt \textit{við} ‘we’. One way to instantiate that here would be to say that \textit{hann} ‘he’ in (38b) embeds a silent \textit{ég} ‘I’. That is, something like (39) is in Spec\(\alpha\)P.

(42) \[
\begin{array}{c}
\alpha P \\
\underline{\text{DP}} \\
\underline{\text{Hann éG}} \\
\underline{\text{nP}} \\
\underline{\text{pabbi}}
\end{array}
\]

This would allow us to maintain the generalization that the proprial article matches, and in the present analysis, \textit{is}, the notional core. For some reason, \textit{éG} ‘I’ cannot occupy this position alone in Icelandic, but must be embedded in a third-person proprial article.\(^{27}\) Even a weaker descriptive generalization would have to be that the PA and the core mismatch only when the PA can independently embed a pronoun with the same phi-features as that core.

What about speakers for whom the PA is not obligatory with imposters? In the context of the framework here, we would say that speakers who allow (38a) allow nP to move straight to SpecDP, leaving \(\alpha\)P behind, like English.

Actually, this seems to be the default strategy for names with adjectives. Thráinsson (2005:50) discusses the fact that proper names precede adjectives in the general case. Adjectives preceding names get a contrastive reading.

(43) Neutral

a. Jón gamli fór á sjúkrahús í gær.
John old went to hospital yesterday.
‘Old John went to the hospital yesterday.’

Contrastive

b. Gamli Jón fór á sjúkrahús í gær.
old John went to hospital yesterday.
‘OLD John went to the hospital yesterday.’

\(^{26}\)The impossibility of the former could have to do with its possible bi-morphemic structure. Bernstein (2008) argues that \textit{they} is made up of at least \textit{th-} + \textit{ey}. Possibly, these means that pronouns like \textit{they} cannot be as small as nP, unlike \textit{éG} ‘I’. See also Déchaîne and Wiltschko (2002).

\(^{27}\)Another potentially related situation when the proprial article is obligatory is in possessors, as in \textit{bækur *(hans) pabba} ‘books *(he.GEN) Daddy.GEN’. Note that possession, like (integrated) apposition, is a direct relation between two DPs.
Neutral
c. Sigga lítla byrjar í skóla í haust.
   Sigga little begins in school in autumn.
   ‘Little Sigga starts school in autumn.’

Contrastive
d. Lítla Sigga byrjar í skóla í haust.
   Sigga little begins in school in autumn.
   ‘LITTLE Sigga starts school in autumn.’

Thus, when $nP$ is a proper name, it generally moves to SpecDP, despite the presence of $\alpha P$. So we have a conflict. Imposters and definite $nP$s generally pied-pipe $\alpha P$ to SpecDP, but proper names generally do not. However, proper names are also typical imposters. Some speakers allow the typical proper name movement with imposters, with the result that the core is not pronounced, as in English. All speakers (that I have consulted), however, allow the typical movement for imposters and definite adjectives, $\alpha P$ to SpecDP.

(44) All Speakers – Imposters

All Speakers – Ordinary Adjectives

All Speakers – Names and Adjectives
5 Predictions

5.1 Double Proprial Articles

The hypothesis that the proprial article is the notional core, and that the secondary DP is actually an nP, predicts that it should not be possible to have a first-person plural proprial article with a CoP if the DPs in CoP themselves have Proprial Articles. This is borne out. While it is possible to coordinate two DPs each with a proprial article, such a CoP cannot occur with a first-person plural proprial article.

(45) a. ?Hún mamma og hann pabbi ætla að fara saman í vinnu í dag
   She Mommy and he Daddy intend.3PL to go together to work today
   ‘Mommy and Daddy are going to work together today.’
   b. *Við hún mamma og hann pabbi ætlum að fara saman í vinnu í dag
      We she Mommy and he Daddy intend.1PL to go together to work today
      ‘Mommy and Daddy are going to work together today.’

This is because in the form PA + CoP, the CoP must coordinate nPs, not DPs. The structure in (47) could not be embedded within (46).

(46) \[
\begin{array}{c}
\alpha P \\
\downarrow \text{DP}_{core} \\
\alpha \text{We} \\
\downarrow \text{CoP=nP} \\
\downarrow \text{nP and} \\
\downarrow \text{Mommy} \\
\downarrow \text{nP} \\
\downarrow \text{Daddy}
\end{array}
\]

(47) \[
\begin{array}{c}
\alpha P \\
\downarrow \text{DP}_{core} \\
\alpha \text{He} \\
\downarrow nP \\
\downarrow \text{Daddy}
\end{array}
\]

It would not be possible, on this analysis, to have hann pabbi ‘he Daddy’ be CoP of we + CoP.

In fact, this analysis predicts that even the non-imposter constituent could not have a proprial article, which seems to be true. (48a) is completely ungrammatical, and (48b) is only grammatical on a reading where pabbi og hún mamma ‘daddy and she mommy’ do not form a constituent. (It is possible, irrelevantly, as DP level conjunction, where við pabbi ‘we daddy’ is understood as a Gapped Proprial Article construction, conjoined with the DP hún mamma ‘she mommy’.)

(48) a. *Við hún mamma og pabbi ætlum að fara saman í vinnu í dag
   We she Mommy and Daddy intend.1PL to go together to work today
   ‘Mommy and Daddy are going to work together today.’
b. * Við pabbi og hún mamma ætlum að fara saman í vinnu í dag
   We Daddy and she Mommy intend.1PL to go together to work today
   ‘Mommy and Daddy are going to work together today.’

Recall that the present analysis accounts for the optionality of the proprial article with CoPs in the following way. When the core is við ‘we’ and the secondary DP/nP is a coordinated nP, við ‘we’ will always surface. When it does not, we are dealing with two coordinated DPs, one of which is an imposter, rather than a CoP with an imposter core.

(49) [ WE [ Mommy and Daddy ] ]
(50) [ Mommy and [ ME Daddy ] ]

This predicts that pabbi ‘daddy’ should behave like an ordinary imposter. Gunnar Hrafn Hrafnbjargarson (p.c.) observes that for him, pabbi ‘daddy’, with imposter interpretation, is more natural with the proprial article hann ‘he’, as in mamma og hann pabbi ‘Mommy and he Daddy’. This is expected, since for him, an imposter interpretation of pabbi ‘daddy’ normally requires the proprial article. Nevertheless, the examples (48) and (45b) are ungrammatical for all speakers I have consulted.

Another prediction involves numerals. When αP with ordinary adjectives moves to SpecDP, the adjective and nP precede numerals (17b). Thus, if the imposter core slash proprial article originates in SpecαP, and αP moves to SpecDP, we predict that both the proprial article and the secondary nP precede numerals. This is borne out, as the following examples from a Google search show.

(51) a. Nú vorum við bræðurnir þrír í leikjum.
   Now were.1PL we brothers.the three in games
   ‘We the three brothers were now playing.’

b. Við bræðurnir þrír ...ólutust upp með börnum þeirra Óskars,
   We brothers.the three ...raised up with children.the.DAT they.GEN Óskar.GEN,
   ömmu og afa og öðru frændfóliki.
   Grandma.DAT and Grandpa.DAT and other.DAT relatives.DAT
   ‘We the three brothers grew up with Óskar’s children, Grandma, Grandpa, and other relatives.’

c. Ég man að fyrir um nóttina höfðum við bræðurnir þrír farið í
   I remember that earlier that night had.1PL we brothers.the three gone to
   körfubolta
   basketball
   ‘I remember that earlier that night, we the three brothers had gone to basketball.’

5.2 The Gapped Proprial Article

Although it is not the purpose of this paper to examine verbal agreement in any detail, an interesting pattern is worth noting in certain GPA and coordinate constructions. Note first that, as might be expected, a GPA is possible with a first-person proprial article við ‘we’, where the gapped constituent is understood to refer to the addressee (e.g. þú ‘you.SG’).
(52) Við pabbi ætlum að fara saman í vinnu í dag
    We Daddy intend.1PL to go together to work today
    ‘You and Daddy are going to work together today.’

As expected, agreement in (52) is first-person plural. However, when there is no (G)PA, pabbi ‘daddy’ cannot refer to the speaker if verbal agreement is second-person plural (53a). Here my consultants varied in their judgments. One accepted (53b) but not (53c), while the other accepted (53c) but not (53b).28

(53) a. *Þú og pabbi ætlið að fara saman í vinnu í dag
    You and Daddy intend.2PL to go together to work today
   b. %Þú og pabbi ætla að fara saman í vinnu í dag
    You and Daddy intend.3PL to go together to work today
   c. %Þú og pabbi ætllum að fara saman í vinnu í dag
    You and Daddy intend.1PL to go together to work today

    ‘You and Daddy are going to work together today.’

This relates directly to the proprial article discussion, because a second-person plural proprial article pið ‘you.PL.’ is possible in a GPA construction where pabbi ‘daddy’ is understood to be the speaker. And then agreement must be second-person plural.

(54) a. Þið pabbi eruð að fara saman í vinnu í dag
    You.PL Daddy are.2PL to go together to work today.
   b. *Þið pabbi eru að fara saman í vinnu í dag
    You.PL Daddy are.3PL to go together to work today.
   c. *Þið pabbi erum að fara saman í vinnu í dag
    You.PL Daddy are.1PL to go together to work today.

    ‘You and Daddy are going to work together today.’

Note that while both (53a) and (54a) would be acceptable on a reading where pabbi ‘daddy’ is not the speaker, only (54a) is possible when pabbi ‘daddy’ is the speaker.

The only way to account for this in the present framework is to stipulate that pið ‘you.2PL.’ is a pronominal imposter with WE as a notional core. This is the converse of nurse-we discussed in section 2, where we contains YOU as a notional core (see example 15). Note that in this case, as in all cases so far, we have no real way to make the phi-features of the pronominal imposter head find an antecedent. In the system adopted in the next section, though, there is a way of doing this.

5.3 Person Marking

One problem with the analysis as it stands involves person marking. If a demonstrative merges in SpecDP, the core is silent and the overall DP is third-person. How does this come to be, if neither the secondary nP nor the core move to SpecDP? One option would be to stipulate that demonstratives are inherently third-person. However, since other phi-features on demonstratives, such as number and gender, are usually acquired by concord, this explanation would make ‘person’, among phi-features, the odd one out.29 Further, the demonstrative must have some way of formally

28Gunnar Hrafn Hrafnbjargarson (p.c.) patterns with the former speaker, accepting (53b) but not (53c).
29Although Chris Collins (p.c.) points out that modifiers often do not agree in person.
agreeing with the secondary \( nP \) in gender and number. A straightforward probe-goal approach would not work because the core intervenes between the presumed probe (the demonstrative) and the goal (the secondary \( nP \)).

In this section, I implement the earlier analysis in the system of Leu (2008). In this system, demonstratives are built in an extended adjectival projection and acquire phi-features derivationally. It will allow demonstratives to acquire the phi-features of the secondary \( nP \). Further, it will turn out to provide a mechanism for valuing the phi-features of pronominal imposters under antecedence.

Leu (2008) has taken very seriously the correspondence between agreement on adjectives and determiners, as well as ‘weak inflection’ (the inflection on adjectives in definite contexts). The latter is glossed below as ‘agr’.

Swiss German

(55) a. \( \text{d-i rot } \text{rosä} \)
    \text{the-\textit{agr} red rose}
    \text{‘The red rose’}

b. \( \text{ä rot-i rosä} \)
    a \text{red-\textit{agr} rose}
    \text{‘A red rose’}

c. \( \text{d-i rosä} \)
    \text{the-\textit{agr} rose}
    \text{‘This rose’}

Leu proposes that the Agr that ends up on the determiner (55a) is the same morpheme that ends up on the adjective (55b). The syntax lines up the morphemes: either a definite \( d- \) merges or the adjective moves. If the former, the DP will be definite. If the latter, indefinite.

The specific proposal as to how this works involves a kind of ‘promotion’ analysis of adjectives. That is, the noun originates in a constituent within the extended adjectival projection, which Leu calls xAP. The noun \( (nP) \) raises out of this projection, as in a head-internal relative clause analysis, and then the xAP moves to SpecDP. Crucially, the definite article is merged in xAP, whence the alternation with moved adjectives. A definite xAP in SpecDP licenses a null D. The overall structure is shown in (56).

(56)
Now notice that in (55c), there is no adjective and d-i is consequently interpreted as a demonstrative. Leu proposes that there is in fact a silent adjective in this example, and that silent adjective is HERE. His analysis, then, is that the + agr + HERE will be spelled out or interpreted as this. He extends this analysis to a number of languages.

Pursuing an adaptation to Leu’s system, we would say that AgrA merges with αP and attracts nP to its specifier. AgrA and nP agree under spec-head agreement. This is the source of the third-person phi-features of the demonstrative. Continuing, an article-like element merges with AgrAP, forming the left periphery of the extended adjective phrase. The nP extracts from the xAP, D is merged, and the entire remnant xAP moves to SpecDP. In Leu’s analysis of demonstratives, the sequence the + HERE spells out as this; here, the same would happen for the + WE.\(^{30}\)

(57)  

\[
\text{DP} \\
\text{xAP} \\
\quad \text{x} \\
\quad \quad \text{AgrAP} \\
\quad \quad \quad \text{tₙP} \\
\quad \quad \quad \quad \text{AgrA} \\
\quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \text{-ir} \\
\quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \text{αP} \\
\quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \text{DP} \\
\quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \text{WE} \\
\]

Thus, taking an approach like that in Leu (2008) allows the demonstrative to acquire third-person phi-features despite the intervening we. Further, it offers some hope of an analysis for the GPA construction discussed earlier. Namely, if Collins & Postal (2008) are correct that pronominal imposters normally value their phi-features by antecedence, the derivation here provides a configuration where þú og pabbi ‘you.SG and Daddy’ can antecede the empty D head in SpecαP– as soon as nP moves to SpecAgrAP. Next, the remnant αP moves to SpecxAP and the derivation proceeds as normal from there.

(58)  

\[
\text{þið þú og pabbi eruð að fara saman í vinnu í dag} \\
\text{You.PL you.SG and Daddy are.2PL to go together to work today.} \\
\text{‘You and Daddy are going to work together today.’}
\]

\(^{30}\)Leu (2008) proposes that HERE might undergo further movement, a detail which I gloss over here.
Sigurðsson (2006), in passing, suggested something like this. He observed the possibility that the proprial article of CoPs might originate lower than the CoP, and then move to the higher position. In the present approach, this is an intermediate stage.

This may be extended to the pronominal imposter in hann pabbi ‘he daddy’. When the secondary \( nP \) pabbi ‘daddy’ moves to SpecAgrAP, it is in a configuration to antecede the hann ‘he’. Subsequent movement of \( \alpha P \) to Spec\( xAP \) restores the original word order.

Note that extraction of \( nP \) out of \( xAP \) is only visible/necessary when there is a demonstrative. It may well be the case that it does not extract in other cases but remains in \( xAP \). This would make the Leu-style analysis more similar to the earlier one, where the core and \( nP \) remained a constituent in \( \alpha P \). However, since I do not have time to address the issue of where, exactly, \( nP \) extracts to, I will not be able to distinguish between these two.

### 6 Conclusion

In this paper, I have looked at the interaction between ‘referring to yourself in the third-person’ in Icelandic and the PA. Some interesting facts have come to light, and there are still many open questions. First, when the proprial article is present, it must match the notional person exactly if it is plural. A third-person plural proprial article cannot be used to refer to the speaker. In plural, definite-suffixed DPs, a first-person proprial article is obligatory if the DP refers to the speaker. In coordinate phrases, it is optional.

The exact opposite picture is seen in singulars, where not only can a third-person proprial article refer to the speaker, but for some speakers, third-person proprial article is obligatory if the DP refers to the speaker. In addition, a first-person proprial article is not possible. This difference between singulars and plurals has been the main focus of this paper. However, this is a very simplified picture – in fact, these generalizations only hold true in certain specific cases.

Some of the exceptions have been discussed already, and others are presented in the Appendix. The main exception discussed already involves demonstratives. Demonstratives systematically disallow proprial articles. I have suggested that this has to do with how demonstratives are built, but this is far from a forgone conclusion. In fact, the generalization seems to be that whenever there
is a ‘free’ determiner, such as a demonstrative, a preposed possessive pronoun, or a non-suffixed article, the proprial article cannot appear. For reasons of space, I have not presented the latter two facts.

It is still unclear exactly how non-pronunciation is licensed. This is a ubiquitous problem in work on silent elements, from PRO/pro, ellipsis, and A-copies, to the kinds of ‘non-antecedent based’ silent elements studied in recent work by Kayne (2005, 2006), and Leu (2008). I have tried to suggest that if a pronoun and an nP are contained in the same DP, and the latter c-commands the former, the former will be silent as an A-copy. This is different from the proposal in Kayne (2006), where anything stranded in the specifier of a phase head ends up silent. I have yet to investigate the consequences of this, or whether relevant cases in other domains can be found.31

31Kayne (2005, ch. 6) has argued that when a DP antecedes a pronoun, it first forms a constituent with it, as in [John he] before moving out. Possibly, names and the like always form a constituent with a pronoun, but the latter will be silent unless the name moves out of the DP. This is what the present suggestion would expect, anyway.
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Appendix

In this appendix, I present some data which I did not have space or time discuss or analyze in the main body of the paper. First, I did not address the issue of verbal agreement. One of my consultants systematically allowed CoPs containing an imposter and no proprial article to control first-person plural agreement. I will refer to this speaker as ‘Speaker A’ and my other consultant as ‘Speaker B’. This speaker also allowed third-person agreement. However, no speaker allowed third-person agreement when a first-person proprial article was present.

(60)  
a. Mamma og Pabbi %erum/eru að fara saman í vinnu í dag  
   Mammy and Daddy are.%1PL/3PL to go together to work today.  
   ‘Mommy and Daddy are going to work together today.’

  b. Við Mamma og Pabbi *ætla/ætlum að gefa þér sælgæti.  
     We Mammy and Daddy intend.*3PL/1PL to give you candy.  
     ‘Mommy and Daddy are gonna give you candy.’

Actually, I have found no examples where the proprial article does not agree with the verb.

In the text (section 5) I discussed the fact that speakers reject second-person plural agreement with þú og pabbi ‘you and Daddy’. The same speaker that accepts first-person agreement in (60a) is the one who accepts first-person agreement in these cases (see 53). This speaker also allowed first-person agreement when an imposter was conjoined with a second-person imposter, for example when uppáhalds sonur hans ‘his favorite son’ refers to the addressee.

(61) Pabbi og uppáhalds sonur hans %ætlum/ætla að fara saman í vinnu í dag.  
    Daddy and favorite son his are.%1PL/3PL to go together to work today.  
    ‘Daddy and his favorite son are going to work together today.’

Further, Speaker A allows þér og Pabba ‘you and Daddy.DAT’ to antecede first-person reflexives (homophonous with first-person pronouns), and disallowed the third-person reflexive sig. Speaker B showed the opposite pattern, rejecting the first-person reflexive and allowing only sig. Neither speaker allowed ykkur ‘you.2PL’.

(62)  
a. Hún sagði þér og Pabba að fela okkur í kjallarunum.  
    *Speaker A/*Speaker B  
    She told you and Daddy to hide us in cellar.  
    ‘She told you and Daddy to hide ourselves in the cellar.’

  b. Hún sagði þér og Pabba að fela sig í kjallarunum.  
     *Speaker A/Speaker B  
     She told you and Daddy to hide REFL in cellar.  
     ‘She told you and Daddy to hide ourselves in the cellar.’

This leads to the conclusion that Speaker A quite generally allows, or even requires, the notional core of an imposter to affect the phi-feature computation of the coordinate phrase. Speaker A never allowed a plural imposter such as þessir fréttamenn ‘these reporters’ to control first-person agreement.

Taylor (2008) shows that Brazilian Portuguese has similar variation. A gente, literally ‘the people’, has come to be used as a first-person plural pronoun. However, while some speakers do not allow a gente to control first-person agreement, others do. This looks similar to the variation between Icelandic speakers that I have encountered.
(63) a. A gente vai à praia.
   we go.3SG to.the beach
   ‘We’re going to the beach.’
   
b. A gente vamos à praia.
   we go.1PL to.the beach
   ‘We’re going to the beach.’

Another point of variation involves overt possessors. Both of my consultants tended to find imposters with names slightly more natural with an overt possessor, as in (hann) pabbi þinn ‘(he) Daddy your’. However, Gunnar Hrafn Hrafnbjargarson (p.c.) rejects such examples. Recall that for him, but not my consultants, the third-person proprial article is obligatory. In the future, it will be interesting to see whether or not these two properties correlate in an interesting way.

Another interesting result so far has been the fact that while possessors typically only precede the noun when they have contrastive focus (Thráinsson 2007), I have been unable to find any imposter DPs, other than names and kinship terms (cf. above), where the possessor is in the ordinary post-nominal position. Judgments for the following sentences reflect reference to either the speaker or the addressee.

(64) a. þinn einlægi * einlægi þinn
   Yours truly truly yours

b. þinn auðmújkí þjónn * auðmújkí þjónninn þinn
   Your humble servant humble servant.the your

c. Hans hágöfgi * hágöfgi(nn) hans
   His majesty majesty his

d. Mín kæra eiginkona ?? kæra eiginkona(n) mín
   my lovely wife lovely wife my

e. þinn rass * Rassinn þinn / * Rassinn á þér
   your ass ass.the your / ass.the on you

An example of this contrast is the following.

(65) a. þinn auðmújkí þjónn bíður tilskipan þinnar.
   Your humble servant awaits command your
   ‘Your humble servant awaits your command.

b. * Auðmújkí þjónninn þinn bíður tilskipan þinnar.
   Humble servant your waits command your
   ‘Your humble servant awaits your command.

Given the interesting relationship between the proprial article, demonstratives, definite marking, and post-nominal possessors with pabbi ‘Daddy’, future research should consider the syntax of possessors and how they interact with imposters.

Note that þinn rass ‘your ass’ is very similar to the African-American English (AAE) Camouflage Construction which was the subject matter of Collins, Moody & Postal (2008). It is not quite as grammaticalized as in AAE. For example, it cannot anteced ex reflexives or, as far as I have been able to tell, be used as a subject. Both of my consultants accepted the following examples.
a. Þú sérð rätturulega bara um þinn rass.
   You see naturally only about your ass.
   ‘You only watch out for yourself.’

b. Mættu klukkan 9, ef þú getur dregið þinn lata rass fram úr rúminu.
   Meet clock 9, if you can drag your lazy ass out of bed.
   ‘Meet at 9 o’clock, if you can drag your lazy ass out of bed.’

The interesting point is that these examples could not refer to the speaker with the otherwise acceptable order rassinn þinn ‘ass.the your’ or rassinn á þér ‘ass.the on you’. These orders can only refer to the body part.

Another potentially revealing example was provided by Speaker B, who reports hearing sentences like the following spoken from a father to his young daughter. Demonstratives seem ubiquitous among imposters, so it is interesting that in this case, the demonstrative seems to be the imposter.

(67) Kannski að þessi geti hjálpð þér.
   ‘Maybe that this can.SUBJ help you
   ‘Maybe this one (=I) can help you.’

Another area for future research would involve various kinds of antecedence relations need to be examined to determine the limits of parametric variation with imposters. Cattaneo (2007) showed some interesting ways in which Bellinzonese (a Northern Italian Dialect) differs from English with respect to pronoun antecedence, a topic which I have not looked at in this paper. He showed, for example, that only al sotuscrit ‘the undersigned’ could antecedent first-person pronouns. In contrast, imposters like al papi ‘the Daddy’ could not.

(68) Bellinzonese
a. Al sotuscrit 1 ha decidù che a scpuserò mia chescta dòna
   the undersigned SCL.3.SG has decided that SCL.1.SG will.marry.1SG not this woman
   ‘The undersigned has decided that I will not marry this woman.’

b. * Al papi 1 ha decidù che a scpuserò mia chescta dòna
   the daddy SCL.3.SG has decided that SCL.1.SG will.marry.1SG not this woman
   ‘Daddy has decided that I will not marry this woman.’

Interestingly, the undersigned seems to behave differently in Icelandic as well. The following examples were found on a Google search. It can take a first-person pronoun, in contrast to imposters like pabbi ‘Daddy’, or be bare. An interesting question is how these two differ. It is formally a participial adjective, and it does not have any definite article at all. It seems that first-person agreement is only allowed when a first-person pronoun is there. I have yet to investigate this fully, though.

(69) a. Ég undirritaður hef kynnt mér reglur um notkuná tölvubúnaði.
   I undersigned.STR have.1SG familiarized me rules of use on computer-equipment.
   ‘I undersigned have familiarized myself with the rules of computer equipment use.’
b. Undirritaður hefur kappkostð að fylgjast vel með því sem er að gerast
Undersigned.STR has.3SG striven to follow well with that which is happening
erlendist...
‘The undersigned has striven to keep up with what is going on abroad…’

However, Speaker B has informed me that in coordination structures, the overtness of a pronoun
is necessary for first-person agreement. No agreement pattern other than the one shown would be
acceptable for Speaker B.

(70) a. María og undirritaðir lofa...
Mary and undersigned.STR.PL promise.3PL
‘Mary and the undersigned promise…’

b. María og við undirritaðir lofum...
Mary and we undersigned.STR.PL promise.1PL
‘Mary and we the undersigned promise…’

In these examples, the adjectival participle undirritaðir ‘undersigned’ is in the strong form, i.e.
the form adjectives take in indefinite contexts. In the presence of a demonstrative, however, it
takes the weak form. The interaction of the pronoun with weak/strong inflection versus that of the
demonstrative with weak/strong inflection.32

(71) a. María og sá undirritaði lofa
Mary and that undersigned.WK.SG promise.3PL

b. María og þeir undirritaðu lofa
Mary and those undersigned.WK.PL promise.3PL

Note that the corresponding plural for sá ‘this’ is homophonous with the third-person masculine
plural pronoun þeir ‘they’.

32It is commonly thought that pronouns can act as a definite determiner (Postal 1969; Roehrs 2005a,b, Taylor
2008). Clearly, it does not have the same ‘definiteness’ effects on the adjectives here, so exactly what conditions this
morphology is unclear.