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ABSTRACT

The argument of this paper centres on the various interpretations of definiteness derived from the merge or the moved position of the NP and the presence or the absence of the demonstrative in the Bangla DP. As noted in the Bangla DP literature, in a Dem-less DP the NP in its merge position expresses indefiniteness, and the NP raised above the numeral-classifier expresses definiteness. I suggest that the raising of the NP is an instance of topicalisation which in turn realizes its definite reading. I propose the existence of a topic position below the D in the Bangla DP where the definite reading is achieved. Drawing upon Schwarz’ (2009, 2013) proposal that definiteness can be of two types: unique and anaphoric, I show that Bangla seems to fall into this paradigm of definiteness. I further show that unique definiteness and anaphoric definiteness are separately morphologically represented (respectively) by two demonstratives in the Bangla DP. This in turn leads to the proposal that these two definites are expressed in two separate syntactic positions.

1. Introduction

In Bangla, the Dem(onstrative) may or may not occur in the DP. When the Dem occurs both the non-raised and the raised NP orders ((1) and (2) respectively) express definiteness (Dayal 2012, Syed 2016).

1. oi du-To (lal) jama
   that two-Cla (red) dress
   ‘those two (red) dresses’

2. oi (lal) jama du-To
   that (red) dress two-Cla
   ‘those two (red) dresses’

In the absence of the Dem, the NP in its merge position, cf. (3) gives an indefinite reading (Bhattacharya 1999; Dasgupta and Ghosh 2007; Chacón 2011; Dayal 2012; Biswas 2012; Syed 2016). But the raised NP above Num-Cla in (4) gives a specific reading (Bhattacharya 1999), or
a definite reading (Dasgupta and Ghosh 2007; Chacón 2011; Dayal 2012; Biswas 2012; Syed 2016).

3. du-To (lal) jama
two-Cla red dress
‘two red dresses’

4. (lal) jama du-To
red dress two-Cla
‘the two red dresses’

In this paper I will propose a new approach to the existing arguments regarding definiteness in the Bangla DP. I will show that the DPs in (1), (2), and (4) are ambiguous between two types of definite readings: unique definiteness and anaphoric definiteness. I will also claim that the two types of definites are morphologically realized by two demonstratives in Bangla and those two Dems are merged in separate syntactic heads. This further leads to the argument that the unique and anaphoric definiteness are licensed in two separate syntactic positions in the Bangla nominal domain.

This paper is divided into five sections. The second section reviews the specific/definite in the Bangla DP, as discussed in the Bangla DP literature. In the third section I show that the definiteness in the Bangla DP can be interpreted in two ways: unique definiteness and anaphoric definiteness. I assume that the anaphoric definiteness can be tied to the concept of topicalisation and this leads to the proposal for the existence of a topic projection below the D in the Bangla DP. In the same section, I also claim that the two types of definites are morphologically realized by the two demonstratives in Bangla and those two Dems are merged in separate syntactic heads. This further leads to the argument that the unique definiteness and the anaphoric definiteness are licensed in two separate syntactic positions in the Bangla DP. In the fourth section I show that the topic position where the NP moves to is below D and not above it. The fifth section summarizes the main arguments of the chapter.

2. Specificity vs. Definiteness driven NP movement in the Bangla DP

Bhattacharya (1999) assumes that the Q(uantifier) in the Bangla DP to be a complex head consisting of the Q/Num(eral) and Cla(ssifier). To account for the order in (4), which is repeated below in (5), Bhattacharya proposes that there is a specificity feature in the Q head which gets realized in the morphologically present Cla, as shown in (6). He suggests that the specificity feature in the Cla attracts the NP to the Spec QP in order to give a specific reading, cf. (6).

5. (lal) jama du-To
red dress two-Cla
‘the two red dresses’
Bhattacharya shows that the morphological absence of classifier and the absence of the raising of the NP are correlated, cf. (7) and (8). The data in (7) is from Bhattacharya (1999; p. 95, 96; exs 68c, 70c) and the data in (8) is from Bhattacharya (1999; p. 95, 96; exs 68d, 70d).

7a. tin bOchor
   three year
   ‘three years’

b. *bOchor tin year three
   Lit. ‘years three’

8a. car paS
   four side
   ‘four sides’

b. *paS car side four
   Lit. ‘sides four’

It should be obvious from (3) which is repeated below in (9) where the NP is left in its merge position, that the morphological presence of the classifier does not necessarily drag the NP to the left of Num-Cla.

9. du-To (lal) jama
two-Cla red dress
   ‘two red dresses’

Bhattacharya (1999) therefore assumes that “the option of assigning the strong specificity feature to the Cla may or may not be exercised. But once such feature assignment has taken place, there is no further choice. The complement NP must prepose overtly to check this strong feature” (p. 97).
Later, Chacón (2011) points out that the occurrence of the classifier in the indefinite DP, as in (9), where the NP is left in its merge position, argues that the classifier cannot be the attractor of the NP in the derived order NP>Num-Cla. He, therefore, proposes that the NP moves above Num-Cla to check a definiteness feature and not specificity. He suggests that the D⁰ hosts the feature [definite] which triggers the NP to move to Spec, DP, and not to the Spec, QP as Bhattacharya (1999) proposes. As for the ungrammaticality of (7b) and (8b) Chacón offers an alternative analysis. He claims that a nominalizer n merges with the lexical nominal root to form nP and it is the nP (and not the nominal root) which moves to Spec, DP to check definiteness. Chacón claims that the nominalizer n does not merge with certain nominal roots (like measure words), as in (7) and (8), and thus there is no nP which can move to check definiteness. This explains the ungrammaticality of the orders in (7b) and (8b).²

Dayal (2012) also argues that the raised NP order above numeral-classifier, as shown in (5), gives a definite reading and not a specific reading. In fact, Dayal shows that the non-raised NP order (Num-Cla>NP) is ambiguous between regular indefinite and specific indefinite readings, cf. (10a), and the raised NP order (NP>Num-Cla) has a definite reading (10b). The examples in (10) are from Dayal (2012; p. 12; exs 16a, 16b).

10a. jodi du to təatro aʃे, ami parabo
    if two CL student come I will teach
    ‘If two students come, I will teach.’

b. jodi təatro du to aʃे, ami parabo
    if student two CL come I will teach
    ‘If the two students come, I will teach.’

Dayal mentions that (10a) can mean that the speaker will teach if there is more than one student, whosoever the students are. This gives the regular indefinite reading. It can also mean that the speaker will teach if two particular students come, and the hearer does not necessarily know about them. This gives the specific indefinite reading. But, (10b) can only be uttered in a situation where the referent of the raised NP is known to both speaker and hearer. Similar to Chacón’s analysis, Dayal also suggests that the D⁰ to be +/- definite and the NP raises to Spec, DP to value the + definite feature of the D⁰, as can be seen in (11).

1 Referring to Dasgupta (1997), Chacón (2011: 10; (15)) also shows that the occurrence of classifier in ‘anti-definiteness’ (the term was originally used in Dasgupta (1997) as antidéfinitude) context. The NP>Clai order in (i) does not give definiteness reading. In (i), lebu-Ta ‘lemon-Cla’ and lanka-Ta ‘chilli-Ta’ do not refer to lemon and chilli respectively. They refer to vegetables in general.

i. poSir kache lebu-Ta lanka-Ta cee newa
    neighbour from lemon-Cla chilli-Cla wanting take
    ‘borrowing (some vegetables) from a neighbour’

2 Chacon, also, argues that in classifier less DPs (like (7a) and (8a)) there is N to Cla movement. He states that this N to Cla movement happens due to interface reason. Since the nominalizer n does not merge with the nominal root (denoting measure words and time span), the nominal root merges with the phonetically null Cla⁰ in order to be interpreted at PF.
Maximality/Inclusiveness driven NP movement in the Bangla DP

Dayal (2012) and Syed (2016) points out that both the non-raised and the raised NP orders in the presence of the Dem give definite interpretations (as shown in (1) and (2), repeated below in (12) and (13) respectively).

12. oi du -To (lal) jama that two -Cla red dress ‘those two red dresses’

13. oi (lal) jama du -To that red dress two -Cla ‘those two red dresses’

Bhattacharya (1999) differentiates the non-raised NP order in (12) and the raised NP order in (13) in the presence of the Dem in terms of deixis (in (12)) and specificity (in (13)). Dayal suggests that the difference between both the orders in (12) and (13) is that the raised NP in the presence of the Dem (13) gives a maximality interpretation which is not available in the non-raised NP order (12). Dayal (2012; p. 14) points out “(t)he raised version is only possible when the NP refers to the full set of entities that the description applies to. In contrast, the base structure can be used to pick out a subset of a larger group of entities to which the description applies.” She illustrates her argument with the support of a context (in (14)), which is from Dayal (2012; p. 14; ex. 20). She points out that in (14b) where the NP has raised signifies “there are only two types of red flowers, the roses and carnations.” Whereas, (14c) where the NP remains in its merge position shows that “(t)he speaker may be picking out the roses and the carnations from a set of red flowers that include several others.”

14a. kon phul -Ta Sundor which flower -Cla beautiful ‘Which of the flowers are beautiful?’

b. oi lal phul du -To that red flower two -Cla
Dayal (2012; p. 23) therefore notes in conclusion that there are three possibilities through which definiteness in the Bangla DP is achieved: “One, through the lexical meaning of the demonstrative taking the predicative cardinality/classifier phrase as its argument, or through NP raising to spec of DP to value the +def feature on D and undergoing iota type shift, or through a combination of the two.”

Syed (2016; 2017) suggests that it is the inclusiveness that attracts NP above Num-Cla in the presence of demonstrative (Syed (2016; p. 391; fn. 2) relates inclusiveness to maximality). Syed (2016) explains inclusiveness in reference to Hawkins (1978): “the referent of definite noun phrase must be a part of a shared set, where shared set means entities known by speaker and hearer to constitute either the previous discourse, the immediate or the larger situation, or an association set” (p. 391). Syed (2017) further states that “(f)or definites, the reference is to the only entity or all the entities in the shared set. Otherwise, it will be an indefinite expression. That is inclusiveness is necessary for getting a definite interpretation” (p. 129). Renaat Declerck (1986; p. 12) while discussing “familiarity theory” (by Christophersen (1939)) and ‘location theory’ (by Hawkins (1978)) in definiteness, mentions that the NPs with definite article should always have inclusive reference. To define inclusiveness, he quotes Hawkins (1978): “inclusive refer to the totality of the objects or mass in the relevant shared set.”

Syed illustrates the contrast between the raised and the non-raised NP orders in the presence of the Dem by putting forth a context in (15), where he shows that the raised NP order is felicitous, cf. (15a), and the non-raised NP order is infelicitous (15b). The NP raised order in (15a) suggests that only four shoes were brought and the non-raised order in (15b) suggests that there may be many more shoes bought. The context and the data in (15) is from Syed (2016; p. 391; ex 6).

15. Context: the speaker bought four shoes yesterday and the hearer knows about it.

a. oi juto char -te pherot diye diy.ech.i
those shoes four -Cla return give give.perf.1st per
‘I have returned those four shoes.’

b. # oi char -te juto pherot diye diy.ech.i
those four -Cla shoes return give give.perf.1st per

Based on his analysis of (15), Syed postulates an Inc(lusive) P(hrase) right above the numeral-classifier in the Bangla DP where the NP raises to in order to give an inclusive/maximality interpretation, as shown in (16) which is from Syed (2016; p. 395).
So far we have noticed that there are three DP-internal word orders in Bangla that give definite readings. The first one is the raised NP order in the absence of the Dem, i.e., the (A)>N>Num-Cla order, cf. (4) which is repeated below in (17).

17. (lal) jama du -To
   red dress two -Cla
   ‘the two red dresses’

The second one is the non-raised NP order in the presence of the Dem, i.e., the Dem>Num-Cla>(A)>N order, cf. (1) which is repeated below in (18).

18. oi du -To (lal) jama
   that two -Cla red dress
   ‘those two red dresses’

The third one is the raised NP order in the presence of the Dem, i.e., the Dem>(A)>N>Num-Cla order, cf. (2) which is repeated below in (19).

19. oi (lal) jama du -To
   that red dress two -Cla
   ‘those two red dresses’

There happen to be cross-linguistic evidence which show that definiteness can be interpreted in two ways: unique definiteness and anaphoric definiteness, as noted in Schwarz (2009, 2013). The unique definite noun phrase refers to the entity that is uniquely identifiable by the speaker/hearer in the current discourse or larger discourse, and prior mention of the entity is not required to identify it. Whereas, the anaphoric definite noun phrase requires the referred entity to be mentioned in the previous discourse and should be familiar to the speaker and hearer. Schwarz notices that in languages like German, Fering, Akan, Mauritian Creole, Lakhota, Hausa, and Haitian Creole there are two types of definite articles that are licensed in separate
environments. He shows that the weak definite article is licensed in the uniqueness definite context, and the strong article is licensed in the anaphoric definite context.

Jenks (2015) notices that even the numeral-classifier languages (like Thai, Mandarin Chinese, Korean, Japanese) show difference between the definite noun phrases licensed by uniqueness and the ones licensed by anaphoricity. He shows that in the numeral-classifier languages, unique definites are expressed by bare nouns, cf. (20), and anaphoric definites are expressed by demonstrative or pronoun, cf. (21b). In fact, bare nouns are not allowed in the anaphoric context, as can be seen in (21c). The example in (20) is from Jenks (2015; p. 108; ex 10) and the examples in (21) are from Jenks (2015; p. 113; ex 17).

20. m’aa kamlən hàw
dog PROG bark
‘The dog is barking.’

21a. Miawaan phom ċəə kap nakrian khon niŋ
Yesterday 1ST meet with student CLA INDEF
‘Yesterday I met a student.’

b. (nakrian) khon nan/ (khaw) chalaat maak
student CLA that/ 3P clever very
‘That student/(s)he was very clever.’

c. #nakrian chalaat maak
student clever very
‘Students are clever.’

In this section I will argue that in Bangla definiteness is interpreted as unique and anaphoric. I assume that the raised NP order in the absence of the Dem ((A)>N>Num-Cla), cf. (17), is ambiguous between unique definiteness and anaphoric definiteness. I will also claim that in Bangla the unique and the anaphoric definiteness is lexically instantiated in the form of two demonstratives. Following this claim I will suggest that in the context of certain Dem which is the morphological representation of unique definiteness, both the non-raised and the raised NP orders, i.e., Dem>Num-Cla>(A)>N and Dem>(A)>N>Num-Cla respectively, will express unique definiteness. Again, in the context of some other Dem which is the morphological representation of anaphoric definiteness, both the non-raised and the raised NP orders will express anaphoric definiteness.

Here, I will make a novel claim that in the Bangla DP the anaphoric definiteness is an instance of topicalisation. This will further lead to the proposal that there exists a post-demonstrative topic projection in the Bangla DP. This section is divided into four sub-sections. In the first sub-section I will discuss the properties of topics and anaphoric definites, and I will suggest that the raising of the NP in order to express anaphoric definiteness is an instance of topicalized movement in the Bangla DP. In the second sub-section I will argue that the raised NP order in the absence of the Dem, i.e., the (A)>N>Num-Cla order, expresses both anaphoric
definiteness and unique definiteness. In the third sub-section I will illustrate the claim for the lexical instantiation of the two types of definiteness in Bangla. In the fourth sub-section, we will discuss the licensing position of the two types of definites.

3.1 Anaphoric definites are Topics in the Bangla DP

Anaphoric definiteness and topicalization: both of these concepts pick out the reference of the NP from a shared set that is available in the discourse participants’ mind. I draw my argument for tying anaphoric definite to topic from some well known Topic/Focus literature (Kiss (2007); Gundel and Fretheim (2008); and Jayaseelan (2001)), where it is discussed that definites and topics share the same property, and thus be understood as the same notion. I should mention here that in the aforementioned referred works, definiteness has been treated as anaphoric definiteness and not unique definiteness. Thus, in this sub-section when we come across the term definite it should be understood as anaphoric definite.

It has been claimed in Kiss (2007; p. 70, 71) that “names, definite noun phrases, and specific indefinites noun phrases (or PP subsuming such a noun phrase) are all possible topics, irrespective of their subject, object, or prepositional object status.” Gundel and Fretheim (2008) draw a connection between topic and definiteness, as they mention “it has often been noted (references omitted) that the phrase marked by a topic marker in Japanese and Korean, necessarily has a ‘definite’ (including generic) interpretation.” They show that when the subject is followed by the NOM marker $ga$, both the subject and the object can be interpreted a definite and indefinite, cf. (22). But when the subject is followed by the topic marker $wa$, the subject can only be interpreted as definite, cf. (23). The example in (22) is from Gundel and Fretheim (2008; p. 4; ex 6) and the example in (23) is from Gundel and Fretheim (2008; p. 5; ex 7).

22. Neko $ga$ kingyo $o$ ijit -te
cat NOM goldfish OBJ play with -and
‘The/A cat is playing with the/a goldfish, and …….’

23. Neko $wa$ kingyo $o$ ijit -te
cat TOP goldfish OBJ play with -and
‘The/*A cat is playing with the/a goldfish, and …….’

Also, notice the following set of English data in (24)-(27), which are from Gundel and Fretheim (2008; p. 5; exs 8, 9, 10, 11), where the topicalized phrase adjoined to the left of the clause is definite.

24. My sister, she’s a High School teacher.
25. That book you borrowed, are you finished reading it yet?
26. My work, I’m going crazy. (Bland 1981)
27. The Red Sox, did they play the Yankees?

The syntactic position that corresponds to topicalized interpretation is never occupied by an indefinite noun phrase, cf. (28b). Gundel and Fretheim (2008; p. 5) states that the “(i)ndefinites are generally excluded from topic position unless they can be interpreted generically”. This is evident in (28) which is from Gundel and Fretheim (2008; p. 5; ex 12) and originally from Gundel (1988).
28a. The window, it’s still open.

b. *A window, it’s still open.

Jayaseelan (2001), also, mentions the same about the indefinites not occupying the topic position. He refers to Tirumalesh (1996) who first pointed out that in Dravidian, the elements to the right of V are Topics; and indefinite noun phrases are unacceptable in that position. The noun phrase occupying a topic position refers to the entity that is familiar and identifiable to the discourse participants. A topic is old information available in the discourse and present in the speaker/hearer’s mind, and thus should be definite. As Jayaseelan (2001; p. 46) points out “(i)n fact, we shall be arguing that the leftward movements showing a definiteness/specificity effect in Scandinavian, Dutch, or Yiddish are instances of topicalization – specifically, of movement into TopPs above FP.”

Notice the following Malayalam data in (29), which is from Jayaseelan (2001; p. 49; ex 23), where the canonical position (immediately pre-verbal position) of weilam ‘water’ in (102a) gives an indefinite interpretation. Whereas, in (29b) the non-canonical position of weilam (preposed above the indirect object) gives an obligatory definite interpretation. Jayaseelan (2001) mentions that “(t)his definiteness constraint on weilam in the (b) sentence is explained if it is a Topic” (p. 49).

29a. naan oru maratt -ina weilam ozhiccu
I a tree -dat. water poured
‘I poured water to a tree.’

b. naan weilam oru maratt -ina ozhiccu
I water a tree -dat. poured
‘I poured the water to a tree.’

In Bangla also we have noticed that the NP in its merge position inside the DP gives an indefinite reading, as shown in (3) which is repeated below in (30a). Whereas, the raised NP above the Num-Cla gives an anaphoric definite reading, cf. (4) which is repeated below in (30b).

30a. du -To (lal) jama
two -Cla red dress
‘two red dresses’

b. (lal) jama du -To
red dress two -Cla
‘the two red dresses’

I suggest that the NP movement above Num-Cla in (30b) is an instance of DP-internal topicalized movement and thus in turn gives an anaphoric definite interpretation. I propose that in the order (A)>N>Num-Cla, cf. (30b), the NP moves to the Spec of a Topic Phrase inside the Bangla DP, and not to the Spec, QP (as suggested by Bhattacharya (1999)) or to the Spec, DP (as
suggested by Chacón (2011), Dayal (2012), Biswas (2012)). I assume the topic position where the NP moves to in the (A)>N>Num-Cla order is below the Dem and not above it. This assumption will be supported with empirical evidence in the fourth section of the paper.

3.2 Unique and Anaphoric Definiteness in the Bangla DP

In Bangla, like the languages mentioned in Schwarz (2009, 2013) and Jenks (2015), definiteness can be expressed in two ways, either as unique or as anaphoric. Biswas (2012) shows that in Bangla, bare nouns are used to express unique definiteness, cf. (31), and the raised NP order around the bare classifier is used to express anaphoric definiteness, cf. (32b). The example in (31) is from Biswas (2012; ex 6b) and the examples in (32) are from Biswas (2012; ex 4).

31. rasTropoti -(Ta) Santisthapon -er barta dilen
   president -(Cla) make peace -GEN message gave
   ‘The President sent a message of peace.’

32a. gOtokal {ekTa chele-r / #chele-Ta-r} Sathe alap holo
   yesterday {one-cla boy-gen boy-cla-gen} with meet was
   ‘I met a boy yesterday.’

   b. {chele-Ta / #Ek-Ta chele} triathlon champion
      {boy-cla / one-cla boy} triathlon champion

   In (32b) the raised NP order is felicitous and not the non-raised one. Since the referent of the NP chele ‘boy’ has already been mentioned in the discourse in (32a), thus the non-raised NP order in (32b) is infelicitous as it gives indefinite reading and the NP obligatorily moves to the left of the bare classifier –Ta to give an anaphoric definite reading. The claim that the raised NP order expresses anaphoric definiteness in the Bangla DP is evident from (32a) where the raising of the NP around the bare classifier –Ta is infelicitous as (32a) begins the discourse. In (31) the bare

\[3\] Notice that in (108b), when the NP raises to the left of Num-Cla the numeral ‘one’ does not surface. Bhattacharya (1999: p. 92; fn. 55) shows that the occurrence of NP to the left of ek-Ta ‘one-Cla’ forces the numeral ‘one’ not to surface, as can be seen in (ic).

   i.   a. Ek-Ta boi   b. boi-Ta   c. *boi Ek-Ta
       One-Cla book     book-Cla     book one-Cla

   Bhattacharya suggests that in (ib) the numeral ‘one’ is silent and in indefinite description (as in (ia)) the numeral ‘one’ must surface for PF reasons since the Cla requires something to be cliticized to its left. Thus, bare classifier cannot occur in Bangla DP, as can be seen in (ii), which is noted in Dayal (2012) and Biswas (2012).

   ii.  a. -*Ta boi   b. boi -Ta
       -Cla book     book –Cla
       ‘the book’

   Dayal (2012) also argues that in the order in (iib) there is a null numeral ‘one’ as evident from the singularity interpretation in (iib).
nominal refers to some unique entity which is identifiable to the speaker and hearer in larger situation. Thus the bare nominal in (31) expresses unique definiteness. Here, I suggest that the bare noun in (31) which is a common noun but it functions as a proper noun which is unique in all real world contexts. Notice that in (31), the classifier –Ta is not allowed. In fact, if –Ta is used in (31) it will bring some pejorative connotation (as mentioned by Biswas (2012)). Later, Simpson and Biswas (2016) suggests that the human referents with [+honorific] feature do not occur with the classifier.

So far we have noticed that the raised NP order gives an anaphoric definite reading. Here, I will suggest that the raised NP order in the Bangla DP is not strictly used to express anaphoric definiteness. I assume that the raised NP order is ambiguous between unique and anaphoric definite readings. Consider the DP in (33) where the NP has raised to the left of Num-Cla pied-piping the AP. The raised NP order in (33) can be used in a situation where the referent of the NP has not been mentioned in prior and it is identifiable to the speaker and the hearer in the immediate discourse. Imagine a situation where X and her friend bought a few dresses, and they show them to Y. Y asks X ‘which dresses did you buy?’ To which X replies lal jama du-To kinlam ‘I bought the two red dresses.’ There lal jama du-To refers to a unique entity in the current situation that matches the description of the definite noun phrase. The DP with the raised NP in (33) can also be used in anaphoric contexts, as shown in (34).

33. [lal jama du -To] kinlam
   red dress two -Cla bought
   ‘I bought the two red dresses.’

34. Gatokal [du -To lal jama] pachondo hoyechilo.
    yesterday two -Cla red dress like happened
    [lal jama du -To] kinlam
    red dress two -Cla bought
    ‘Yesterday I liked two red dresses. I bought those two red dresses.’

Simpson and Biswas (2016; p. 174; ex 16) also seem to have recognized the point that the raised NP order around the bare classifier can express unique definiteness, cf. (35). They mention that the raised NP order in (35) refers to an individual/entity that is “clearly visible to the speaker and the hearer, and the speaker draws attention to the presence of the referent, for example by pointing or, directing the hearer to look at the referent.”

35. Ramu and his son are repairing a bicycle. Ramu points to a hammer and says:

4 In Bangla, the NP cannot move leaving the AP stranded (i), or the AP cannot move leaving the NP stranded (ii). In the presence of the AP the NP has to move pied-piping the AP (iii). For details see Guha (2017).

i. *[jama du-To lal] kinlam  
dress two-Cla red bought
ii. *[lal du-To jama] kinlam  
red two-Cla dress bought
iii. [lal jama du-To] kinlam  
red dress two-Cla bought
Simpson and Biswas have shown that the two types of definiteness in Bangla are differentiated by the contexts (for a detail understanding see Simpson and Biswas (2016)). Here, I assume that the unique and the anaphoric definiteness are licensed in two separate syntactic positions inside the Bangla nominal domain. In fact, I will claim that the unique definite and the anaphoric definite are morphologically represented by two demonstratives in Bangla. This will further lead to the proposal for the existence of two separate syntactic heads in the Bangla DP, one of which will carry unique definite feature and the other will carry anaphoric definite feature.

3.3 Deictic and Anaphoric Demonstratives in the Bangla DP

It is well known that in Bangla there are three demonstratives: *ei* ‘this’, *oi* (distal ‘that’), and *Sei* (anaphoric ‘that’). It can be shown that the proximal Dem *ei* has [+Deictic] and [-Anaphoric] features. The sequent Dem *Sei* has [+Anaphoric] and [-Deictic] features. The distal Dem *oi* can either have [+Deictic] or [+Anaphoric] feature.

In Bangla the demonstratives are derived from the pronouns (Bhattacharya (1999), and Dasgupta (1992)), as can be seen in (36) which is from Bhattacharya (1999; p.117, ex 30).

36a.  
36b.  

Here, I shall claim that the proximal Dem *ei* is the lexical instantiation of the unique definiteness and the sequent Dem *Sei* is the lexical instantiation of the anaphoric definiteness. And the distal Dem *oi* can either give unique definite reading or anaphoric definite reading. I, mainly, identify the unique definiteness with the deictic feature of the Dems *ei* and *oi*. It is instructive to note that the three Dems in Bangla have not received equal mention in the Bangla DP literature. The Dem *oi* or the Dem *Sei* has been used to demonstrate the definiteness of the DP. The contexts in which these two Dems have been used in the literature are anaphoric and thus the Dem *ei* (based on its feature composition) cannot be used in such contexts. Recall that the Dem *ei* has [+deictic] and [-anaphoric] features. I suggest that the Dem *ei*, like the Dems *oi* and *Sei*, can express definiteness, but it expresses only unique definite reading and not anaphoric definite reading (based on its features). Thus it can be used in out of the blue contexts, cf. (37), and it cannot be used when preceded by a context, cf. (38).

37a.  
37b.  

5 It was Dagupta (1992) who termed the Dem *Sei* as sequent and pointed out that it is a non-deictic demonstrative
this red dress two -Cla very expensive
‘These two red dresses (here) are very expensive.’

In (37a) and (37b) the usage of the Dem *ei* brings definiteness. I suggest that the definiteness in (37) arises from uniqueness, and not anaphoricity. The deictic Dem in (37) picks out the referent of the NP from the set that is available in the current discourse and is identifiable to the speaker and the hearer either by visibility or pointing. Thus the deictic Dem *ei* in (37) expresses the unique definite reading both for the non-raised NP order in (37a) and the raised NP order in (37b).

Now consider (38b) and (38c) where the usage of the deictic Dem *ei* is infelicitous since (38b) which is the non-raised NP order and (38c) which is the raised NP order, follow the discourse given in (38a).

38.a. Gatokal [du -To lal jama] kinlam yesterday two -Cla red dress bought
‘Yesterday, I bought two red dresses.’

b. [#[ei du -To lal jama] khub dami this two -Cla red dress very expensive
‘These two red dresses are very expensive.’

c. [#[ei lal jama du -To] khub dami this red dress two -Cla very expensive
‘These two red dresses are very expensive.’

On the other hand, the Dem *Sei* due to its [+Anaphoric, -Deictic] features can only be used in anaphoric contexts, like the one in (39a), and in hand it expresses anaphoric definiteness. Thus both the orders in (39b) where the NP has not raised and in (39c) where the NP has raised, express anaphoric definiteness due to the presence of the Dem ‘*Sei*’.

39.a. Gatokal [du -To lal jama] kinlam yesterday two -Cla red dress bought
‘Yesterday, I bought two red dresses.’

b. [sei du -To lal jama] khub dami that two -Cla red dress very expensive

c. [sei lal jama du -To] khub dami that red dress two -Cla very expensive
‘Those two red dresses are very expensive.’

The Dem *Sei* cannot be used in the contexts where unique definiteness is intended, as can be seen in (40).

40. a. X and Y went for shopping. X points at two dresses and says to Y:

b. [#[sei du -To lal jama] khub dami
that two -Cla red dress very expensive

c. #[sei lal jama du -To] khub dami
    that red dress two -Cla very expensive
    ‘Those two red dresses are very expensive.’

The Dem oí can be used either to express unique definiteness or anaphoric definiteness since the Dem oí hosts [+Deictic/+Anaphoric] feature. Thus the Dem oí can be used in anaphoric context, like (41a), and in turn expresses anaphoric definiteness, as can be seen in (41b) where the NP has not raised and in (41c) where the NP has raised. The Dem oí can also be used in an out of the blue context. But without a context, the Dem oí expresses unique definiteness. In (41b) and (41c) the referent of the NP can be picked from the immediate discourse and it can be identifiable to the speaker and the hearer either by pointing or visibility.

41. a. Gatokal [du -To lal jama] kinlam
    yesterday two -Cla red dress bought
    ‘Yesterday, I bought two red dresses.’

    b. [oi du -To lal jama] khub dami
    that two -Cla red dress very expensive

    c. [oi lal jama du -To] khub dami
    that red dress two -Cla very expensive
    ‘Those two red dresses are very expensive.’

The fact that we have noticed that the proximal Dem eí in Bangla cannot be used in anaphoric contexts, Jayaseelan and Hariprasad (2001) have also noticed that the proximal pronouns in Malayalam cannot be used in anaphoric context. The pronominals in Dravidian languages occur in proximal/distal pairs, cf. (42) which is from Jayaseelan and Hariprasad (2001; ex 1).

42. awan (‘that-he’) iwan (‘this-he’)
    awaL (‘that-she’) iwaL (‘this-she’)
    atə (‘that-it’) itə (‘this-it’)
    awar (‘those-they’) iwar (‘these-they’)

Based on their feature composition, the distal pronoun can refer to the antecedent that is distal in nature but the proximal pronoun cannot refer to the antecedent that is distal in nature, as shown in (43a) and (43b) respectively which are from Jayaseelan and Hariprasad (2001; exs 3d, 4d). Jayaseelan and Hariprasad claim that universally R-expressions are distal by default and thus the distal pronoun and the R-expression in (43a) can be co-referential, and the proximal pronoun and the R-expression in (43b) cannot be co-referential.

43.a. Johni wannu. awan, waatil tuRannu
    John came he door opened
I will now show that the deictic and the anaphoric demonstratives in Bangla are merged in two separate syntactic heads inside the Bangla nominal domain. This will further lead us to argue that the unique and anaphoric definiteness are licensed in two separate syntactic positions in the Bangla DP.

3.4 Licensing positions of the unique and the anaphoric definites in the Bangla DP

I postulate two functional projections, DeixisP and TopP, above the QP and below the D inside the Bangla nominal domains. I suggest that the deictic Dem ei is merged in the Deixis0, as shown in (44), and the anaphoric Dem Sei is merged in the Top0, as shown in (45). The Dem Sei cannot be base generated in the Deixis0 as it lacks deictic feature, instead it can be argued that the Dem Sei behaves as a Topic marker as its morphological presence forces the anaphoric definite interpretation of the DP and thus it originates in the Topic0 inside the DP (45). Since the Dem oi has [+Deictic/+Anaphoric] feature, I suggest that the Dem oi can merge either in the Deixis0 or in the Topic0 (depending on the context), as shown in (46).

44. [DP [DeixisP [Deixis ei] [QP [NP]]]]
45. [DP [TopP [Top Sei] [QP [NP]]]]
46. i. [DP [DeixisP [Deixis oi] [QP [NP]]]]
   ii. [DP [TopP [Top oi] [QP [NP]]]]

I will claim that the unique definiteness is expressed in the Deixis position and the anaphoric definiteness is expressed in the topic position in the Bangla DP. Before I start discussing the licensing positions of the unique and the anaphoric definites, I should mention that the demonstrative is always present in the Bangla DP, either as a null Dem (in case of Dem-less DPs), or as an overt Dem (in case of DPs with Dems). I suggest that the Dem (null or overt) with the [+Def] feature unifies with the null D which also has a [+Def] feature, and the Dem (null or overt) moves to the D. I assume this argument from Dasguta and Ghosh (2007, ex 10) where they show that the Dem and the null D are merged in separate syntactic projections in the Bangla/Assamese DP, and they assume that “Dem feature-unifies with D and in effect become a single hybrid head” (p. 3).

Let us first consider the raised NP order in the Dem-less DP. We will start with the NP>Num-Cla order in (47) which is ambiguous between unique and anaphoric definite readings.

47. jama du -To
dress two -Cla
‘the two dresses’
As I have already stated that the anaphoric definiteness is expressed in the topic position below the D, so I will assume that the NP *jama* ‘dress’ in (47) has moved to the Spec of the TopP below the D, as shown in (48). I have also claimed that the anaphoric definiteness is morphologically represented by the sequent Dem *Sei* and the merge position of the Dem *Sei* is in the Topic$^0$ below the D, thus I suppose that the post-D Topic$^0$, at the Spec of which the NP in (48) moves to, is filled with the null anaphoric Dem. In (48) the null anaphoric Dem with the [+Def] feature in the Topic$^0$ unifies with the null D$^0$ with the [+Def] feature, and then the null anaphoric Dem moves to the D$^0$. I assume that the Topic$^0$ in (48) has [+anaphoric] feature which is unvalued and it gets valued with the movement of the NP to its Spec.

48.

\[
\text{DP} \\
\text{TopP} \\
\text{Top} \\
\text{null Dem} \\
\text{NP} \quad \text{du-To} \\
\text{Top'} \\
\text{D} \\
\text{jama} \\
\text{DP}
\]

I have also suggested that the raised NP order in (47) can express unique definiteness. As I have already claimed that the unique definiteness is morphologically represented by the deictic Dem, thus I assume that there is a null deictic Dem in the Deixis$^0$ and the NP in (47) moves to the Spec of the DeixisP in order to give unique definiteness reading, as shown in (49).

49.

\[
\text{DP} \\
\text{DeixisP} \\
\text{null Dem} \\
\text{Deixis'} \\
\text{NP} \quad \text{du-To} \\
\text{D} \\
\text{jama} \\
\text{NP}
\]

In (49) the null deictic Dem with the [+Def] feature in the Deixis$^0$ unifies with the null D$^0$ which also carries a [+Def] feature, and then the null deictic Dem moves to the D$^0$. I assume that the Deixis$^0$ in (49) has [+deictic] feature which is unvalued and it gets valued with the movement of the NP to its Spec. This is how we get the unique definite reading of the DP in (47).

Let us now consider the raised NP orders in the presence of the overt Dem, i.e., the Dem$>$NP$>$Num-Cla order. I will begin with the deictic Dem *ei* in (50) which expresses only unique definite reading.

50. *ei* jama du -To 
    *this dress two* -Cla 
    ‘these two dresses’

The derivation of (50) is presented in (51). In (51) the [+deictic] feature of the Deixis$^0$ gets valued by the merging of the overt deictic Dem *ei* in the Deixis$^0$, which in turn gives the unique
definite reading of the DP in (50). The NP in (50) raises from its merge position to give a maximality interpretation. Here, I suggest that since definiteness is the property of maximality (as mentioned by Dayal (2012) and Syed (2016)) both can be interpreted in the same position. Thus I assume that the NP receives maximality interpretation in the DeixisP and in the TopicP below the D. In (50) the NP moves to the Spec of the DeixisP, as shown in (51), in order to be maximally interpreted. Further the overt deictic Dem ei with the [+Def] feature unifies with the the null D with the [+Def] feature, and the overt deictic Dem moves to the D, as shown in (51).

Now consider the Dem>NP>Num-Cla order in the presence of the overt anaphoric Dem ‘Sei’ in (52) which expresses only anaphoric definite reading.

52. Sei jama du -To
dress two -Cla
‘those two dresses’

The derivation of (52) is presented in (53). In (53) the [+anaphoric] feature of the Top^0 gets valued by the merging of the anaphoric Dem Sei in the Top^0, which in turn gives the anaphoric definite reading of the DP in (52). The NP in (52) moves from its merge position to the Spec of the TopP, as shown in (53), where it is interpreted maximally. Further the overt anaphoric Dem Sei with its [+Def] feature unifies with the null D with the [+Def] feature, and the overt anaphoric Dem moves to the D in (53) and that is how we get the order in (52).

Now consider the Dem>NP>Num-Cla order in the presence of the overt anaphoric Dem oi in (54) which can express either unique definiteness, or anaphoric definiteness.

54. oi jama du -To
dress two -Cla
‘those two dresses’
The unique definite reading of (54) is presented in (55). In (54) the Dem o'i merges in the 
Diexis\textsuperscript{0}, as shown in (55), which in turn values the [+deictic] feature of the Deixis\textsuperscript{0} and also 
expresses the unique definite reading of the DP in (54). The NP moves from its merge position to 
the Spec of the DeixisP where it is interpreted maximally. Further the overt Dem o'i with the 
[+Def] feature unifies with the null D with the [+Def] feature, and the Dem moves to the D, as 
shown in (55).

55.

\begin{center}
\begin{tikzpicture}
\node (dp) {DP};
\node (d) [below of=dp] {D};
\node (o'i) [below of=d] {o'i};
\node (jama) [below of=o'i] {jama};
\node (deixis') [left of=jama] {Deixis'};
\node (QP) [below of=deixis'] {QP};
\node (du-To) [below of=QP] {du-To};
\node (np) [below of=du-To] {NP};
\draw (dp) -- (d);
\draw (d) -- (o'i);
\draw (o'i) -- (jama);
\draw (jama) -- (deixis');
\draw (deixis') -- (QP);
\draw (QP) -- (du-To);
\draw (du-To) -- (np);
\end{tikzpicture}
\end{center}

The distal Dem o'i merges in the Topic\textsuperscript{0} above the DeixisP when it requires to be interpreted 
anaphorically, as shown in (56).

56.

\begin{center}
\begin{tikzpicture}
\node (dp) {DP};
\node (tp) [below of=dp] {TopP};
\node (o'i) [below of=tp] {o'i};
\node (jama) [below of=o'i] {jama};
\node (top') [below of=jama] {Top'};
\node (QP) [below of=top'] {QP};
\node (du-To) [below of=QP] {du-To};
\node (np) [below of=du-To] {NP};
\draw (dp) -- (tp);
\draw (tp) -- (o'i);
\draw (o'i) -- (jama);
\draw (jama) -- (top');
\draw (top') -- (QP);
\draw (QP) -- (du-To);
\draw (du-To) -- (np);
\end{tikzpicture}
\end{center}

The merging of the distal Dem o'i to the Topic\textsuperscript{0} below the D in (56) gives the anaphoric definite 
interpretation of the DP in (54). The NP moves from its merge position to the Spec of TopP 
where it is interpreted maximally. Further the overt Dem o'i with the [+Def] feature in the topic 
position unifies with the null D with the [+Def] feature, and then the Dem o'i moves to the D, as 
shown in (56).

We have noticed in (50) that the overt proximal Dem ei expresses unique definiteness, the 
 overt anaphoric Dem Sei in (52) expresses anaphoric definiteness, and the overt distal Dem o'i in 
(54) can express either unique definiteness or anaphoric definiteness. We have also argued that 
these three Dems give definiteness reading by merging in their respective heads. I have further 
claimed that the Dem with its [+Def] feature unifies with the D which also carries the [+Def] 
feature and then the Dem moves to the D. I assume that the non-raised NP orders in the presence 
of the overt Dem ei in (57), Sei in (58), and o'i in (59) receive definite interpretation in the same 
way the raised NP orders have received in (50), (52), and (54). The only difference between the 
non-raised and the raised NP orders will be that the NP in the non-raised orders in (57)-(59) do 
not receive maximality interpretation.

The DP in (57) expresses unique definiteness due to the presence of the proximal Dem ei. 
The DP in (58) expresses anaphoric definiteness due to the presence of the anaphoric Dem Sei. 
And the DP in (59) can express either unique definiteness or anaphoric definiteness due to the 
presence of the distal Dem o'i.
4 NP movement to the post-Dem Topic position in the Bangla DP

Syed (2012) postulated pre-Dem Focus and Topic positions in the Bangla nominal domain, cf. (60). In this paper, I have proposed for a second Topic projection, i.e., below the Dem, cf. (61).

Here, I will argue that in the NP>Num-Cla order the NP in order to give the anaphoric definite reading moves to the post-Dem Topic position and not to the pre-Dem Topic position. This becomes evident in the presence of the overt demonstrative in (62) where the movement of the NP above the Dem is not allowed, as shown in (62ii).

In Guha (2017), I have also argued for a post-Dem Focus position in the Bangla DP, cf. (63). Here, I suggest that the post-Dem Topic position in the Bangla DP is below the post-Dem Focus position, cf. (64). Our claim that the post-Dem TopP is below the post-Dem FocP (64), is supported by the data in (65i) and its structure in (65ii). In (65i) the NP pied-piping the AP moves to the Spec of the TopP below the D, as shown in (65ii). The anaphoric Dem *Sei in (65i) merges in the Top0 below the D and then it moves to the null D, as shown in (65ii). Further, the AP moves from the Spec of the TopP to the FocP below the D, leaving the NP in the topic position, as can be seen in (65ii).

57. ei du -To jama
   this two -Cla dress
   ‘these two dresses’

58. Sei du -To jama
   that two -Cla dress
   ‘those two dresses’

59. oi du -To jama
   that two -Cla dress
   ‘those two dresses’

60. [TopP [FocP [Dem .....]
61. [TopP [FocP [Dem [TopP .....]

62. i. Sei jama du -to
    that dress two -Cla
    ‘those two dresses’
   ii. *jama Sei du -To
       dress that two -Cla

63. [Dem [FocP ....
64. [Dem [FocP [TopP .....]

65 i. Sei LAL jama du -To
    that red dress two -Cla
‘those RED two dresses’

ii. \[\text{DP} [D \text{ Sei}_k] [\text{FocP} \text{ LAL}_j [\text{TopP} [t_j \text{ jama}_i [\text{Top} t_k] [\text{QP} \text{ du-To} [t_i] ]]]]]

5 Conclusion

Following Schawrz (2009, 2013) and Jenks (2015), I have showed that definiteness in Bangla can be interpreted in two ways: unique definiteness and anaphoric definiteness. I have also claimed that the unique definite and the anaphoric definite are lexically instantiated by the proximal deictic Dem \(ei\) and the anaphoric sequent Dem \(Sei\) respectively. We have noticed that there are three possibilities through which definiteness is expressed in Bangla. One is the raised the NP above the Num-Cla in the Dem-less DP. The raised NP in the NP>Num-Cla order is ambiguous between unique definiteness and anaphoric definiteness. The second and the third ones are the non-raised and the raised NP orders in the presence of the Dem. The Dem>Num-Cla>NP order and the Dem>NP>Num-Cla order express unique definiteness in the presence of the proximal Dem \(ei\), they express anaphoric definiteness in the presence of the anaphoric Dem \(Sei\), and they are ambiguously interpreted as unique definite or anaphoric definite in the presence of the distal Dem \(oi\).

I have postulated a DexisP and a TopicP right above the DeixisP below the D in the Bangla DP. Based on the feature compositionality of the three demonstratives in Bangla, I have suggested that the proximal deictic Dem \(ei\) is merged in the Deixis and the anaphoric sequent Dem \(Sei\) is merged in the Topic above the DeixisP and below the D. I have also assumed that the distal deictic Dem \(oi\) merges either in the Deixis when it is interpreted deictically, or in the Topic above the DeixisP when it is interpreted anaphorically. I have further claimed that the unique definiteness is licensed in the DeixisP and the anaphoric definiteness is licensed in the TopicP below the D.

We have noticed that there exist two topic and two focus projections in the Bangla DP, cf. (66). Syed (2012) have suggested that the occurrence of the topic and focus projections above the D in the Bangla DP is parallel to Rizzi’s (1997) focus and topic projections in the C-system, and I suggest that the occurrence of the topic and focus projections below the D is parallel to Jayaseelan’s (2001) focus and topic projections in the I-system. Thus the nominal left peripheral structure of the Bangla DP corresponds to the left peripheral structure of the clause as shown in (66) and (67).

66. Nominal left peripheral structure in the Bangla DP

\[\text{TopicP} [\text{FocusP} [\text{Dem} [\text{FocusP} [\text{TopicP} ....

67. Clausal left peripheral structure

\[\text{TopicP} [\text{FocusP} [\text{IP} [\text{FocusP} [\text{TopicP} ....
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