DEM-CASE-(h)-CASE
• Demonstratives in colloquial Slovenian, Czech, and Slovak exhibit a paradigm which includes doubling of case around the invariable deictic element -(h)le.

### Slovak

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Slovenian</th>
<th>Czech</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>this-GEN/ACC-le</td>
<td>tohohle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>this-GEN/ACC-hle</td>
<td>tohohle</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Demotives

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Demonstrative</th>
<th>Distribution:</th>
<th>Meaning:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>telje (this.le.)</td>
<td>tohohle (this.kind.le.)</td>
<td>demonstrative &gt; strict spatio-temporal deixis (preventing discourse-deixis)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Historical Change

• The complexes in (1) are not two words pronounced together
  • -(h)le cannot be used nominally by itself
  • can never be split from the demonstrative
• forms a single prosodic word with it.

  • The doubly-inflected examples coexist with those in (4),
  • the variation reflects a diachronic change with (1) as an intermediate stage from (4a) to (4b),
  • following Haspelmath (1993) on Georgian (also Harris & Faarlund 2006, etc.)

Haspelmath (1993):
• change occurs because a clitic that grammaticalizes as a bound derivational morpheme traps case inflection inside the word,
  → a violation of the universally preferred morpheme order: ROOT > DERIVATION > INFLUXION
  (Greenberg 1963, Bybee 1985, Dressler et al. 1987 etc.).
• Case inflection shifts to the edge via a stage which realizes both copies of the morpheme.

Georgian:

- Logar (1967): (4b) forms are innovations
- Oldest (4a) forms in Slovenian – 1846
- Oldest (4b) forms in Slovenian – 1905
- (4) is parallel to (3)
  → a diachronic change from (4a) to (4b) (over (1))

- At this point in time, the three forms coexist:
  • we have three separate (but historically related) grammars

- (4a) and (4b) are unproblematic
  • (4a) - an inflected demonstrative followed by an invariant clitic (h)le;
  • (4b), -(h)le is a derivational suffix on the demonstrative stem -le, inflection is added externally

Why do we get the intermediate stage with the doubled morphological case?

• if the clitic from (4a) gets reanalyzed as a derivational affix, it should merge directly with the stem
  → we should get (4b) directly from (4a),
• if at the doubling stage, the deictic is still an independent word with its own case inflection, we cannot explain why it does not behave like a word

The doubled agreement is a sort of repair strategy to fix the problem with agreement not being at the phase edge. While such an approach does not invalidate a morphological account, it does capture the situation syntactically, thus removing the patterns in (1) from the set of putatively decisive data in the separate morphology/syntax-only debate.