An unexamined assumption in the literature on the historical development of the Norse reinforced demonstrative (ON F/M.NOM.SG sjá, þessi, N.NOM/ACC.SG þetta) is that Runic Norse forms like M.ACC.SG þinsa and N.NOM/ACC.SG þitsa represent intermediate forms between earlier þansi / þatsi and later þina (penna) / þita (petta). According to this view (e.g. Haugen 1982, Lander 2016), there is basically a gradual evolution from ‘Stage I’ forms with the reinforcer -si (common to both North and West Germanic), to ‘Stage II’ forms with both -s(i) and the (specifically Norse) reinforcer -a, to the ‘Stage III’ forms with -a only, seen in the classical stages. In this talk I will make the case that this view is too simplistic and that the dialectal situation was more complicated. I take a quantitative approach to the runic data. Although the runic material can be a fickle guide for various reasons, if it is handled with care it helps us build a nuanced and coherent view of the historical development of the reinforced demonstrative in Scandinavia.