CHAPTER 2

The DP Structure of Bangla

2.0 Outline of the chapter:

In this chapter, I will address the issues related to individuation, the main theme of the present work (and some surrounding pragmatic issues), particularly in the field of pre-nominal categories in Bangla DP. A considerable literature already exists on Bangla DP. Most of these writings are studies of classifiers in the generative framework. The most recent additions to this corpus are the dissertations by Rajat Ghosh (2001) and Tanmoy Bhattacharya (1999). My detailed survey of their relevant works will be placed in a context set by other generative studies of Bangla nominals, mostly by Probal Dasgupta. It is important to bear in mind that my approach to the observation of these phenomena is altogether different from this whole stream of writings, as they never raised the question of pragmatics in this domain. This chapter will concentrate on both theory and data not presented before. The chapter will start with the two competing functions of the classifiers — quantification and individuation. In the course of discussion of the data, this chapter works out the characteristics of some of the important Bangla quantifiers as well as some adjectives behaving like quantifiers, which will be referred to as Quantifying Adjectives (QAs), and analyzes their occurrence and non-occurrence with the most individualized classifier /Tal/. Some of the notorious vague words, whose formal analysis has never been made part of the standard accounts of the Bangla nominal, will be discussed in this chapter. Their overall place and relevance in the individuation program will be discussed using a hierarchical partitioning of the set of DPs, following the Silverstein hierarchy. A special note on a peculiar classifier /Tuku/ ends the discussion. Finally, in the concluding remarks of the chapter, I propose that in a language like Bangla with no overt determiner, the
function of the D is largely taken over by the classifier /Ta/. With this introduction, I shall directly go to the review of the earlier literature in the next section.

2.1 Survey of literature: -

2.1.0 Studies of Bangia classifiers:
Classifiers have been of interest to the linguists and language thinkers from very old days. Observations about them started right from Rabindranath Tagore, esp. about the default classifier /Ta/ and after that all authors, be it Prof. S. K. Chatterji of comparative philology tradition or Probal Dasgupta, Tanmoy Bhattacharya and most recently Rajat Ghosh of generative tradition: everyone had said something on classifiers. I will do a very quick survey of some highlights in these classifier studies.

2.1.1 Rabindranath Tagore: -
Tagore was the first Bengali whose linguistic observations and descriptions were to stand the test of time. He identified the classifiers as /nirdeSok cinho/ 'a sign that marks, indicates, points, specifies' as early as the 1890s. His point was that adding such a sign makes a noun specific as in /kagoj/ 'paper' vs. /kagojTa/ 'the paper'. According to him, it is equivalent of the English definite article the, though later linguists rejected this assumption and described /Ta/ as a classifier. But the classifier in a language like Bangia where there is no overt D, does take over some of the discourse-linking pointing functions of a D also, as I shall argue in the latter section. If that argument is valid, then Tagore's idea about its character was not actually off the mark. One more observation of Tagore is also significant for my purpose: his point that proper nouns do not take the classifier /Ta/. If it is applied to a proper noun, then the noun is understood as conveying a degraded sense. /Ta/ is never attached to the name of a respectable person. This particular behaviour of /Ta/ also helps me to think of it as a D-linked phenomenon, details of which will emerge in the following sections.
Rabindranath, an insightful observer, also discovered that /Tuku/ (on which I have a separate section) is an exceptional classifier in two senses, one being its ability to denote only a small amount and the second its occurrence with a demonstrative. He also made useful linguistic observations about the behaviour of /khana/, /gacha/ and /gachi/.

2.1.2 Suniti Kumar Chatterji: -
In 1926, in his monumental work 'Origin and Development of Bengali Language', Chatterji observed the behaviours of the classifiers, which were defined by him as 'postpositional affixes or words which are added to nouns or numerals to define the nature of the object or article referred to.' He first pointed out that these classifiers (enclitic words in his language) have similarity with Chinese and Japanese 'numeration' type of words but they lack the range and variety of them as found in those languages.

2.1.3 Probal Dasgupta: --
Published generative work on Bangia classifiers began with the writings of Dasgupta (1981,1983). He was the first to establish the grammatical status of /Ta/ as a classifier and not a definiteness or specificity marker, and thus different from the definite articles. He also observed that some numeral-noun constructions are classifierless. In the other directions he stressed that not only numerals but even certain quantifiers such as /kOek/, /kichu/, /Onek/, /SOb/ occur with /Ta/. Dasgupta also showed how classifiers attached to numerals mark specificity when this numeral-classifier complex occurs as a clitic after a noun. He added /gulo/ in the earlier list of classifiers. Dasgupta (1985) made a distinction between number and aggregation. Unlike a noun system such as that of English or Hindi where a noun must respond to the tacit question of cardinality (one or more than one), the Bangia noun system is built around a different tacit question, that is whether the noun approaches its designatum collectively (as a collection) or individually (one segment of reality at a time). Classifiers do the job of
expressing the aggregation value, the classifier /Ta/ marks individual aggregation whereas the classifier /gulo/ marks collective aggregation. /ra/ in Bangia, which had long been called a plural marker in the traditional grammar, is also an indicator of grouping like Japanese /tati/ as in /marikotati/, which means 'Mariko and other people' and not 'a number of people named Mariko'. Therefore, /ra/ is also an aggregation marker. He mentioned in this article how the language uses the classifiers /jon/, /khana/, /khani/ and /gulo/ with respect to human, animate, mass or count nouns. But the fact that classifiers themselves bear these features was not pointed out in that article. This point has been taken up first by Ghosh (2001) and will be developed in this work also.

2.1.4 Pabitra Sarkar:
Sarkar (1992) commenting on Bangia classifier /Ta/ showed that this item is used for performing different functions in the language such as referential, highlighting, emphasis and exclamation. He also discussed the occurrence of /Ta/ with the adjectives as in /choToTa/ 'the small one', /lalTa/ 'the red one', as a device for the selection and identification of the thing as distinct from others. Except the referential function mentioned above by him, all others are of direct relevance the individuation program proposed in my work.

2.1.5 Tanmoy Bhattacharya (1999):
In a detailed analysis of Bangia DP structure, Bhattacharya kept the classifiers in the QP structure and thus making Q-Cl a merged node. His assumption of this structure is followed in the present work and the quantificational CTI feature of the classifiers helps to reinforce this merged head hypothesis. One more important point in his analysis is the position of Dem in the spec of a new FocP just after DP. Thus, he postulated a four-layered DP structure, containing DP, FocP, QP and NP. This structure is also kept in the present study. For the section on /Tuku/, a problem case
unsolved in the previous studies, this particular structure is maintained. Bhattacharya's other area of investigation related to quantifiers and the possible and impossible combinations of Q with Cl is given a special status in this work. In his work, there was a distinction between 'all' and 'non-all' quantifiers. A similar kind of distinction has come out from a study conducted independently without consulting the previous work. This study also distinguishes between Quantifying Adjectives and real Quantifiers of Bangla.

2.1.6 Rajat Ghosh (1995 & 2001): -

Ghosh (1995) is a work covering the overall DP structure of Bangla, where he discussed first the specificity effect of the N-Num-Cl construction. Mentioning the Bangla classifierless constructions of Dasgupta (1983), he suggested that they are fixed expressions and the definiteness value of the NPs in such constructions comes from the context. Rajat Ghosh (2001) is a comparative study of Bangla and Asamiya classifier system. It is an extensive study where the classifiers of Bangla have been categorized according to their feature system. He argued that classifiers are semi-lexical items having both semantic and phonological content, where he disagreed with the Chomskyian Minimalism (1995), which talks only of two types of categories, lexical and functional. Semi-lexical categories have their semantic, syntactic and phonetic properties specified in the lexicon. The features of the classifier should match with the features of the nouns or the quantifiers, which they attach to. He stated this feature matching in terms of a principle called 'Feature Compatibility Principle' (FCP), which says 'the intrinsic features of a noun, the quantificational features of a quantifier and the boundary definition features of a classifier must be compatible.' I agree with the statement of Ghosh and as a consequence of this conclude that classifiers play an important role in quantification. I propose a feature for the classifiers named CTI or Countability Type Information, which carries the information about its quantificational value. In the next section, I will show how different classifiers take different nouns and quantifiers based on this
feature. They can be graded also in Bangla depending on the CTI feature they carry.

With this short introduction to the previous literature on classifiers, I will go to the next section where the role of classifiers in quantification will be discussed.

2.2. Role of classifiers in quantification

2.2.0. Classifiers in Bangla:

Classifiers are considered to be functional elements that get cliticized to the nouns and are present on a large scale in many East Asian languages like Chinese, Japanese etc. Among the Indian languages Asamiya, Oriya and Bangla have a rich classifier system. Bangla has a default classifier /Ta/, which can be attached not only to the nouns but also to other categories like adjectives, quantifiers and even verbs. The behaviour of this classifier is distinctive. It carries some special feature that generally makes the linguistic element hosting it prominent in the discourse context.

Apart from this default classifier, we have some other regular classifiers like /khana/ used with [+count] nouns, /gulo/ with [+count], [+plural] nouns, /jon/ with [+count], [+human] noun with quantifier and numeral attached, /khani/ used with [-count] mass noun, again with a quantifier attached.

There is one more classifier /Tuku/, a classifier which denotes a small amount. This diminutive classifier behaves rather unusually in relation to its linear sequence inside a DP. This is the only classifier which can occur after a Demonstrative in an otherwise impossible *D-CI-N sequence in Bangla. In other words, this classifier takes a position normally available only to a quantifier in a DP. But DP does not allow any other classifier between D and N, and, since /Tuku/ is not a word, we cannot give /Tuku/ the simple status of a quantifier. This initial observation about the diminutive classifier /Tuku/ led us towards the hypothesis that even classifiers play a role in
quantification. This conjecture is contrary to the standard assumption that since classifiers do not exist in many languages, they are not interpretable at the level of LF, a linguistic level where all languages are presumed to use the same representations. In the next section, we will see some other examples of classifiers with adverbs and quantifiers, which provide additional support to our hypothesis.

2.2.1. Quantificational use of classifiers in Bangia:
We will start this section with the general uses of the classifiers in Bangia.

1. Onekgulo chele
   many-coll boys 'many boys'

2. OnekTa dudh
   much-Ta milk 'a lot of milk'

3. SObgulo apel
   all-coll apples 'all the apples'

4. SObTa tOrkari
   all-Ta curry 'all the curry'

The examples given above of the occurrence of prenominal quantifier-carried classifiers show how the collective classifier /gulo/ is used with [+count] nouns only whereas /Ta/, a default classifier, is used with a mass noun. The human classifier /jon/ is used also with [+count] nouns but only if carried by a numeral or a count quantifier like /kOek/ 'a few'. Numerals and other quantifiers select appropriate classifiers to match the noun's count/mass or human/non-human feature. If instead of /paMcjon lok/ 'five-jon persons' we say /paMckhana lok/ 'five-khana persons', this makes the
listener conclude that those five persons are not being given the respect due to actual human beings but they are being viewed as inanimate objects, some meaningless physical collection of humans strung together. In view of the additional fact that some nouns require markers of respect as a matter of lexical features, it now follows that */paMckhana SikhOk/ 'five-khana teachers' is never used; the form is always /paMcjon SikhOk/ 'five-jon teachers'.

The distribution of the other classifier /khana/ is also restricted to only [+count] nouns.

5. dukhana kOlom
   two-khana pens 'two pens'

6. kOlomkhana
   pen-khana 'the pen'

7. *jOlkhana
   water-khana

8. jOITa
   water-Ta 'the water'

This restriction of using classifiers on the basis of feature matching with the mass/count feature of noun becomes very evident in cases where one particular noun has different uses, some of them count, some of them mass. The examples below will make this point clear.

9. tOrkariTa (*tOrkarikhana) kharap hoe gEche.
   curry-Ta bad has become
The curry has become rotten.

10. phulkopir tOrkarikhana Opurbo reMdheche.
   Cauliflower-gen curry-Ta superb has cooked
   The cauliflower curry has been cooked excellently.'

In (10), /tOrkari/ selects /khana/ because here the curry as a dish is countable, but in (9), it is used as a mass noun and refers to some amount, and therefore the use of /khana/ with it is ungrammatical.

2.2.2. Introduction of CTI feature:

The data presented in the preceding paragraphs certainly shows that there is something more to a classifier than the status of a mere, meaningless functional element that many linguists seem to attribute to it. Each classifier carries (to speak in informal terms) some information that pertains to the compatibility of a particular classifier with the count or mass features of any noun that one proposes to use the classifier with. At this minimal level, I shall speak of ‘Countability Type Information’ (or CTI features) to characterize the information that a classifier carries in its feature structure. This is not all, however. There is evidence for supposing that the classifier interacts not only with the noun, but plays a relatively active role in quantification. Consider the classifier /Tuku/, whose classifier status becomes clear in examples like /kOtoTuku dudh/ ‘what a small amount of milk, where the quantifier /kOto/ ‘how much’ hosts it. Now, this classifier occurs also in the environment of a deictic determiner:

11. eTuku dudh
   this-Tuku milk ‘this bit of milk’

12. ei dudhTuku
   this milk-Tuku ‘this bit of milk’ [+specific]
Generally in Bangla, while the sequence D-N-Cl exemplified in (12) is standard (cf. /ei dudhTa/ 'this milk-Ta', 'this milk'), in contrast a *D-Cl-N sequence is not allowed (e.g. */eiTa dudh/ 'this-Ta milk'). But we find at (11) that the classifier /Tuku/ can occur in the position between D and N in addition to other positions where classifiers normally occur. Notice that Q is available in the slot between D and N, as in /ei paMcTa boi/ 'these five books', but that /Tuku/ cannot simply be a Quantifier, as it is not an independent word and it never takes a Classifier after it. We tentatively associate /Tuku/’s ability to occur between D and N with the independently evident fact that /Tuku/ is not a mere classifier, but also carries quantifier information: /Tuku/ consistently indicates a small quantity.

I have claimed that a classifier carries CTI features that determine the way it can deal with noun neighbours as well as with quantifier neighbours. The CTI features of /Tuku/ leave it free, then, to select either a mass noun like /dudh/ 'milk' or a count noun like /chele/ 'boy': /eiTuku chele/ 'this-Tuku boy', 'such a little boy'. But a count noun does not permit the D-N-Cl format, which means that */ei cheleTuku/ 'this boy-Tuku' is ill-formed. More needs to be said about /Tuku/, and the equipment that will enable us to say it efficiently has yet to be invented. We merely mention the existence of the expression /eiTukuTuku chele/ 'such little children', where the iteration of /Tuku/ marks plurality of the children. It seems comparable to the way a measure word can be iterated in an example like /ei bOsta bOsta cal/ 'this sack sack rice' for 'these sackfuls of rice', or to the iteration of the adjective in /bhalo bhalo boi/ 'good good book' for 'good books'. But we cannot draw any firm conclusion as no other classifier ever iterates.

To turn to another example of a classifier whose quantificational properties are prominent, /khani/ 'the extensive classifier' intensifies the quantificational force of a Quantifier that hosts it. I have purposely chosen a noun of variable countability:
13. /Onekkhani rasta/
   a lot-Khani way 'a long long way, a lot of distance'

14. /OnekTa rasta/
   a lot-Ta way 'a long way'

15. /Onekgulo rasta/
   many-Gulo roads 'many roads'

Where /rasta/ means a count noun 'road', a classifier is selected whose CTI feature bundle is compatible with count nouns, whereas in (13) where the same noun is a [-count] noun and means 'distance', the classifier /khani/ carrying a CTI package compatible with mass nouns is attached instead.

So far I have been considering classifiers with special properties that deserve investigation. Turning to the other end of the spectrum, /Ta/, as a default classifier, can be attached to any quantifier whatever, and as a bare (enclitic) classifier to any noun, any adjective, and even any finite verb. Its minimal Countability Type Information feature matrix, which enables its use with nouns of all types, also ensures that /Ta/ is interpreted without any inherent quantification. This fact brings about a non-collective, non-plural interpretation when no quantifier is present to override this default. The result is that, when /Ta/ is used alone with a noun or adjective, the interpretation is singular, as in (16) or (18). This use of /Ta/ creates, through mechanisms that are not yet understood, a prominence effect, so that the (non-quantificational) element that hosts it receives discourse prominence, as in all three cases given below.

16. amake bhaloTa dao.
   Me-dat, good-Ta give
   'Give me the good one.' (in a context where the reference set is known)
17. aha! korchoTa ki?
   Aha do-2p-pr-Ta what
   'Aha! What are you doing?' (assuming hearer's familiarity with the action)

18. maNSoTa khubjhal.
   Chicken-Ta very hot
   The chicken curry is very hot.'

I leave open the issue of whether such prominence is a result of the fact that/Ta/ is the minimally CTI-specified default classifier or an independent fact about this element that requires special statement.

2.2.3. Conclusion:
To summarize, one proposal that helps address the facts of Bangla surveyed above is that classifiers always bear Countability Type Information (CTI). Quantifiers and nouns select appropriate classifiers to match the noun's mass or count feature. One type of CTI bundle is associated with/khana/, /gulo/ and /jon/ which always work with [+count] nouns. In sharp contrast to these, /khani/ co-occurs only with nouns that bear the [-count] feature and, in addition, denote a divisible mass (I am not committed to the claim that divisibility is a feature). Only non-count quantifiers co-occur with this classifier, as in /Onekkani pOth/ 'a lot of way', /ekTukhani doi/ 'a little bit of yogurt'.

/Ta/ as a default classifier can occur with any of these nouns, and with other elements, and connotes an extra component of referential specificity, a range of phenomena possibly related to the fact that the default classifier has less CTI information than the typical classifiers.
/Tuku/ behaves like a cross between a classifier and a quantifier and its CTI features, which emphasize its diminutive character, leave it free to select
both [+count] and [-count] nouns. It has other properties that seem to pertain to its having more CTI information than usual.

In general the CTI feature bundle of the classifier seems to be a place where a noun and a quantifier can arrange the way they will deal with each other. In other words, the CTI features of the classifier serve as an interface between the noun's phi-features and the quantifier's Q-features. I conjecture that countability is the basis for negotiation between quantification and plurality, and that classifiers are characteristic of languages which separate the site of this negotiation from the N site of plurality and the Q site of quantification.

If non-classifier languages organize this negotiation differently, perhaps within the phi feature bundle of N, then it follows that LF provides parallel, but feature-geometrically slightly different, treatments of the negotiations at the noun-quantifier interface. It also follows that Classifiers are not meaningless pieces of mere morphological baggage.

2.3. Role of classifiers in individuation: --
2.3.0. Introduction to the section: -
In the previous section, I have shown that /Ta/ needs some special attention as it can be used as a default classifier with almost anything in the language and it gives a special effect to the linguistic element which it is attached to. I will develop a new account of /Ta/ in this section. Individuation, as a concept important to the pragmatic theory, emerged in my M.Phil. work and as I said in the beginning it will still have major role to play in the present dissertation. In the following paragraphs, I will reveal the role of the classifiers as tools of individuation.

2.3.1 What is individuation:--
Individuation is a programmatic tool for investigating certain ways of
highlighting one linguistic element in a discourse. Thus individuation studies should be seen as a syntax-pragmatics interface research programme, and at its present stage we still speak of various degrees of a nominal's individuation, thus treating the term 'individuation' as a concept that remains operative. As we keep unpacking it, this term may be replaced at some later phase of the programme by one or more terms that are more precise. But the research programme will still be concerned with the discursive highlighting of an element, esp. a nominal. This focusing or highlighting effect can be brought about by means of different ancillary devices either directly attached with that linguistic element or from the surrounding elements. For instance, addition of the successive linguistic elements in the following examples enhances the specificity/prominence of the noun 'book'.

1. amar boi cai.
   l-gen. book want 'I want books.'

2. amar boiTa cai.
   l-gen. book-cl. want 'I want the book.'

3. amar oi boiTa cai.
   l-gen. that book-cl. want 'I want that book.'

4. amar oi boiTai cai.
   l-gen. that book-cl. emph. want 'I want that book only.'

The default classifier /Ta/, demonstrative /oi/ and emphazier /i/, each of them contributes to the individuation of the noun.

2.3.2 Specificity effect related to the classifiers: -
Although upto this point, I talked only about /Ta/ both in the previous
subsection and section 2.2.2 in relation of it with an extra specificity or pointing effect, it is not the case that /Ta/ is the only classifier in Bangla which has this property. Though it is the most frequently used classifier which can be used with any other item to give specificity or prominence/discourse reference effect, there are other classifiers also which work in a similar fashion giving the above said effect to a less extent.

5. tomader iSkule kOto chatro ache?
   you.pl.-gen. school-loc. how many students have
   'How many students are there in your school?'

No one expects a specific numerical figure in answer to this, so /kOto/ 'how many' without a classifier is sufficient in the question. But where an exact figure /number is expected, a classifier is introduced to give a specificity effect, e.g. in the example below /jon/ 'a human collective classifier' is added to the quantifier.

6. tumi kOtojon chatroke pORao?
   you how many-jon student-obj. teach
   'How many students do you teach?'

The classifiers /gulo/, /jon/, /khana/ and /khani/ are always attached to the quantifiers which are "D-linked" in Pesetsky's sense. Therefore, /ki/ 'what' and /ke/ 'who' never take classifiers; but the discourse-linked items /kon/ 'which' and /kOto/ 'how many' take classifiers in order to focus on the quantified nominal.

/Tuku/, the classifier which has the maximal quantifying role, does not take part in individuation. This shows that if the CTI feature of a classifier provides plenty of quantifying information, it cannot produce the individuation effect. In other words, whenever the [+Q] feature of a classifier is especially
salient, the result is that the factor which is responsible for individuation becomes dormant. In this connection, I am adopting the term "ostensive" from Dasgupta (2002) who offered this feature as a device for formalizing the phenomenon Pesetsky had characterized as "D-linking". My proposal is that the ostensivity feature should be used to describe a classifier's prominence marking property or degree of individuation.

The classifiers in Bangia can be graded according to their CTI feature into three groups and the group associated with maximal CTI is responsible for minimum individuation effect and vice versa. The table provided in the following section (2.3.3) illustrates this. Though /Ta/ is the most frequently used classifier which can be used with any other item to produce specificity or prominence/discourse reference effects, there are other classifiers also which work in a similar fashion giving rise to these effects to a lesser extent. To see this, consider the contrast between (7), where the quantifier carries no classifier, and (8), where it has the classifier /jon/ attached to it.

7. tomader iSkule kOto chatro ache?
   you.pl.-gen. school-loc. how many students have
   'How many students are there in your school?'

8. tumi kOtojon chatroke pORao?
   you how many-jon student-obj. teach
   'How many students do you teach?'

No one expects a precise numerical figure in answer to (7), so /kOto/ 'how many' without a classifier is sufficient for the purposes of (7). But where an exact figure /number is expected, a classifier is introduced to give specificity effect. E.g. in the example (8) /jon/ 'a human collective classifier' is added to the quantifier to show that a fairly exact answer is expected.
2.3.3. Grading of classifiers according to their features:
Quantification and Individuation-- two competing properties of a classifier:
The classifiers in Bangia can be graded according to their CTI feature into three groups and the group which exhibits the greatest degree of quantificational CTI is responsible for the least salient individuation effect and vice versa. The following table illustrates this:

| grading features /Tuku,khani/ /gulo,jon,khana/ /Ta/ |
|------------------|------------------|------------------|
| CTI maximum medium minimum/nil |
| individuation minimum/nil medium maximum |

This table spells out the claim that quantification and individuation are two competing properties of a classifier and that the quantificational role of a classifier diminishes as the individuation property becomes important. Assuming tentatively this characterization of classifiers, I will shift my interest towards the other elements of a DP structure, viz., demonstratives, quantifiers and quantifier-like adjectives. Some vague words, whose categorical status is yet to be confirmed, will also be my concern in the next section.

2.4 On some Bangia Quantifiers and Quantifying Adjectives: -
2.4.0 Introduction to the category quantifier:
Quantifier, as a category, is not very distinctly defined in Bangia studies. It is not enough to consider translation equivalents of traditional typical quantifiers, such as [every] or [some]. In addition to them, there are some words from other categories which function as quantifiers in some contexts. Therefore, the role of the quantifiers is distributed among categories like demonstratives, adjectives and even classifiers. Obviously, the first question that comes to our mind after this is how to delimit the set of quantifiers in
Bangla. This task cannot be attempted on an off-hand basis. The prototypical examples are no doubt the numerals, but there are many more baffling words whose status is yet to be clarified.

One more question also comes up in relation to this. Are quantifiers a specific category or do the categories to which quantifiers belong overlap? Some of these problems will be discussed in the following subsections.

2.4.1. Demonstratives and Quantifiers: their relation and interaction in Bangla:

We will start with the demonstratives, which again typically include the deictic words like [this], [that] etc. which correspond to /ei/ and to /Sei, oi/ respectively in Bangla. These words can occur in the D-N-CI order as in /ei bOITa/ 'this ball-Cl' but the *D-CI-N order is ruled out. On the other hand, in the initial slot before ()-CI-N, the usual occupant found is a numeral or some other quantifier, as in the following cases: -- /tinTe goru/ 'three-cl. cows' or /kOekjon chele/ 'a few-cl boys'. Certainly, then, Quantifiers and Demonstratives are in complementary distribution, as they cannot occupy the same slot.

There are some words which apparently seem to belong to both the classes like /ki/ 'what', /kon/ 'which', /kono/ 'a/some'. /ki/,/kon/ and /kono/ are syntactically demonstratives because they cannot occur in the *D-CI-N order. But these are quantifiers also as interrogatives and indefinites are the most common quantifiers. /kon/ can be followed by any numeral as in /kon carTe/ 'which four' (-animate) or /kon dOSjon/ 'which ten'(+animate). But /ki/ and /kono/ cannot be. What is happening here? If all of them have the feature of the Dem., they should be followed by the numerals. /ki/ and /kono/ cannot be followed by the numerals possibly because they have the feature of the quantifier also while /kon/ has lost it and can be followed by a numeral. /kon/ 'which' has one more intrinsic property which /ki/ 'what' lacks.
It can pinpoint a thing which /ki/ cannot. This is related to D-linking in Pesetsky's term. Which is D-linked, i.e., linked to the context, whereas what is not. Therefore, the power of focusing some element is also greater in /kon/ 'which'. That is why, we can say /ki SOb/ 'what all' in some vague sense, not specifying that 'all'. But we can never say */kon SOb/.

**2.4.2 Vague words: previous work:**

In this section, I shall discuss about some vague words in Bangla. By vague words, I mean words, which denote vagueness in meaning. I will deal with a typical /jO-kO/ construction, but before that let me quickly report what already been done in this area particularly with the vague 'one'.

Dasgupta (1993) analyzed the characteristics of some Bangia vague words ending with /o/ as in /kOkhono/ 'sometime', /kothao/ 'somewhere' and /kono/ 'something or someone'. /EkTa/ 'one' occurring with these words makes them much vaguer. He suggested, reiterating a proposal from Dasgupta (1979), that this /o/ is an augment turning an interrogative into an indefinite word. It has an allomorph /u/ as in /keu/ 'somebody' and /kichu/ 'something'. He classified /ki, kichu/ in the determiner category and /ke,keu/ in the noun category. This hypothesis explains why Case suffixes directly attach to /ke/ and /keu/ whereas /ki/ and /kichu/ precede a noun (overt or zero) to which case suffixes are attached.

Dasgupta also made concrete proposals (difficult to transfer across theories) as to what licenses a clitic such as vagueness-indicating /EkTa/. What any analysis must express is the fact that in /kichu EkTa (-r)/, the D /kichu/ licenses the vague word and the case affix /xl/ occurs after what Dasgupta took to be the zero noun. For /karur EkTa/, /keu/ itself is the noun and it takes the suffix with it as /karur/. So instead of /keu EkTar/, we get /karur EkTa/. With this background about the vague words, let me introduce my observations in this field.
Some vague words or Free Choice Items:

What is the status of Bangla Free Choice Items (FCI), i.e., /jO-kO/ words like /jekeu/ 'anybody', /jekono/ 'anything', /jakichu/ 'anything'? These words like the Demonstratives and unlike the Quantifiers cannot be followed by Cl-N. Moreover, they can be followed by Num-Cl like /jekeu Ekjon/ anybody one-Cl 'anyone (from a group)', /jakichu EkTa/ anything one-Cl 'anything (from a set)', /jekono carjon/ any four-Cl 'any four persons (from a set)'. If numerals are prototypical examples of Quantifiers, then the above structures exemplify D-Q(Num)-Cl order. How is that possible? Does the /jO/ element of these /jO-kO/ sequences retain its characteristics of a Demonstrative? Certainly, the kO-parts are ordinary quantifiers. (However, the /kono/ of /jekono/ seems to behave like a demonstrative also).

Initial inspection suggests that /jekono/ is different in behaviour from /jakichu/ and /jekeu/; /jekono/ can be followed by other numerals also, apart from /Ek/ 'one', but /jakichu/ and /jekeu/ can only be followed by the numeral /Ek/ 'one'. These expressions (/jekeu Ekjon/ and /jakichu EkTa/) are fixed in the sense that the second element of the expression cannot be changed. They are inherently vague expressions compared to /jekono/, which, without specifying one or more exact elements of a set, certainly points more clearly to the number denoted by the numeral attached to it in an example like /jekono carjon chele/ 'any four boys'.

Even in a case such as /jekono Ekjon chele/ 'any one boy' where the numeral /Ek/ 'one' occurs, there is no sense of vagueness about the quantity (here the number one), in contrast to /jekeu EkTa/ 'anybody at all' where the numeral /Ek/ does not convey the meaning 'one' but only underscores the vagueness. We draw the conclusion from the above-mentioned behaviour of the FCIs that /jekono/ retains the feature of the Dem only and lacks the feature of the quantifier, and therefore can be followed by a numeral that retains its full semantic function of denoting a cardinality value, whereas /jakichu/ and /jekeu/ are charged with both quantifier and Dem features.
Syntactically, they behave like the Demonstratives as mentioned in the previous paragraph and semantically they belong to the quantifier class.

2.4.3. Quantifiers and Quantifying Adjectives: A distinction between 'part' and 'whole' quantifiers:

Something curious also happens with some quantifiers and quantifier-like Adjectives that are hereinafter called quantifying adjectives. These elements, Qs and QAs can be broadly categorized into two groups on a preliminary quasi-semantic basis. The members of group A roughly denote a 'whole' and the members of group B indicate a 'part' of something larger. Elaborate discussion and detailed study of these elements are required in order to determine their categorical status; some of them seem to retain both quantifier and adjective features.

The existence of Quantifying Adjectives in this sense is empirically demonstrable even in English. In this language, if a quantified nominal is made to undergo topicalization, the sentence becomes ungrammatical. To see this, compare (a) with (b) in: (a) John, I like. Vs. (b) *Somebody, I like. Now, if the relevant nominal contains the item [whole], the same restriction applies, e.g.: *The whole proposal, we have rejected. This confirms the status of [whole] as a Quantifying Adjective retaining the characteristics of both a quantifier and an adjective. Let's come back to the case of Bangla. Consider the following taxonomy:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group A</th>
<th>Group B</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>/SOb/ 'all'</td>
<td>/khanik/ 'some'(mass)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>/Somosto/ 'whole, all'</td>
<td>/kichu/ 'some (mass)', 'a few'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(count)'</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>/goTa/ 'whole, entire'</td>
<td>/kOek/ 'a few (of a set)'</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Group B words, when they occur as the Q in a DP consisting of Q-CI-NP, mostly behave like 'real' quantifiers, while the words of group A do not. However, the pattern is not simple enough to be amenable to such brief description. We will discuss the distribution of these and some other quantifiers in the next sub-section.

2.4.4. Distribution of the 'whole'-'part' quantifiers: 

For instance, take the word /Sara/ 'whole', which typically collocates with the words denoting parts of the day like /bEla/ 'time of the day', /SOkal/ 'morning', /dupur/ 'noon', /bikel/ 'afternoon', /Sondhe/ 'evening', /rat/ 'night' and /din/ 'day'; with some other words only when those denote either duration (like /SaraTa rasta amra khub anondo korechi/ 'we enjoyed ourselves a lot all the way') or vastness, width etc. as in /Sarata akaS meghe bhore ache/ 'the whole sky is covered with clouds' and /SaraTa mejhe noNra hoe ache/ 'the whole floor has become dirty'. Even in the case of words denoting a part of the day, /Sara/ is never used with the words /godhuli/ 'twilight' and /bhor/ 'dawn' because these words do not express a duration of time; rather, they denote a point of time. /Sara/ when attached with /Ta/, followed by a noun (e.g. /SaraTa bEla/ 'the entire daylight period', /SaraTa pOth/ 'all the way'), specifically denotes the duration of time or width of the space, as opposed to a point in time or space. Then it behaves like a quantifier. E.g.

1. SaraTa ghOr mocha hOy ni, kichuTa hoeche.
   'Not the whole room had been mopped, some portion is left.'
2. SaraTa rasta brisTi hOyni, kichuTa Suknoo chilo.

'It was not raining all the way, some part was dry also.'

The point to note is that /Sara-Ta-N/ in (1) and (2) exemplifies Q-CI-N. In (3) below, on the other hand, /Sara/ occurs as an adjective in the sequence /Sara-N-Ta/, Adj-N-Cl, which is possible for any regular adjective. This is why I place /Sara/ in group A rather than B:

3. /Sara ghOrTa Ogochalo hoe ache/.

'the whole room has become unordered.'

4. /o Sara SOkalTa khele kaTie dilo/.

'he/she has spent the whole morning playing.'

The point that this use of /Sara/ is more adjectival is reinforced by other parallels with regular adjectives. For example, the adjectives can be piled up one after another before a noun; this is true for /Sara/ of (3) with other adjectives, e.g. /briSTibheja Sara rastaTa phule bhore ache/ 'the whole road, wet in rain, is covered with flowers.' We can also replace the /Sara/ of (3) with other regular adjectives like /bORo/'big' or /choTo/ 'small', which we cannot do for (1) or (2). The /Sara/ of sentences (1) and (2) behaves more like a quantifier and that of sentences (3) and (4) is like an adjective. The parallelism between /SaraTa/ and /kichuTa/ in (1) and (2) strengthens the character of that /Sara/ as a quantifier, for /kichuTa/ uncontroversially is a quantifier. We can conclude that /Sara/ can be entered in the lexicon as a word with characteristic features of both categories, quantifier and adjective. Its adjective feature is prominent and in the default case it alone is active.

But if /Sara/ is followed by a classifier, the quantifier feature becomes activated (a matter not formalized here). It is the following classifier which activates the quantifier feature of the item to which it is attached. We will
return to that detail later. Coming to /puro/, /asto/ and /goTa/, the group A items that also mean 'the whole', can all be followed by the default classifier /Ta/. Most often, the noun that would normally follow is dropped and these words are topicalized for the sake of emphasis. E.g.

5. na, na, puroTa khete parbo na.
   no no whole-cl eat-inf can-fut not
   'No, all of it I cannot take.'

6. astoTa amake dile kEno?
   whole-cl me give-past-2p why
   'why did you give me all of it?'

7. goTaTa khabar proSnoi nei.
   whole-cl of eating question-emp no
   There is no question of taking the whole.'

In all the above sentences, the words for 'the whole' are uttered with a topic intonation. These words+/Ta+/noun is an unacceptable sequence: e.g. /goTaTa murgi/ 'the whole hen' or VastoTa murgi/ 'the whole hen' are crashingly bad. However, /puroTa/ followed by a noun, as a topicalized NP is okay. E.g.

8. puroTa ruTi khete parbo na.
   the whole roti to eat can-fut. not
   'I cannot eat the whole roti.'

The contrast between ill-formed /astoTa, goTaTa/ and well-formed /puroTa/ must be interpreted with the general unacceptability of the A-CI-N sequence in mind (In general, nominals such as VbhaloTa chele/ 'good-Cl boy' are excluded). I conclude that /goTa/ and /asto/ are surely adjectives as
contrasted to /puro/, which cannot be so as it occurs in the ( )-Cl-N slot otherwise unavailable for an adjective. Therefore, this /puro/ 'whole' is a quantifier which can enter into a parallelism construction with other quantifiers as in sentence (9). E.g.

9. /puroTa ruTi khabar Saddho amar nei, tumi bOroN khanikTa khee nao./ whole-cl roti of eating ability my not, you rather part-cl eat-pr-2p 'I don't have the ability to eat the whole roti, rather you take a part of it.'

In conclusion, I decide to regard only /puro/ 'whole' as a quantifier and other two /asto/ and /goTa/ as just adjectives.

To continue down the 'A' list of 2.4.3, /SOb/ 'all' can occur in ( )-Cl-N slot unavailable to Adjective, e.g. /SobTa dudh/ 'all-cl milk'. Therefore, surely /SOb/ cannot be an adjective, but must be a 'real' quantifier.

/Somosto/ 'whole' has a restricted use as it is used only with nouns associated with a vast space like /akaS/ 'sky', /paRa/ 'locality', /gram/ 'village', /SOhor/ 'city' etc. This has a specialized use in the written domains only. This seems to be a 'real' adjective, to judge from the following example:

10. /Somosto akaS/ vs.* /SomostoTa akaS/ all/whole sky all/whole-cl sky

Adjective followed by /Ta/ (if there is no N) is a possible combination in Bangla, which makes (11) admissible:

11. /SomostoTa kharap hoe gElo?/ whole-cl spoiled had gone 'So, the whole thing has got spoiled?'
Surely this use reminds us of the behaviour of quantifiers. Probably we can say now that /SObl/, /Somostol/ and /Sara/ were really adjectives and from that use these had been extended in the use of quantifiers later.

Out of the items listed under group B, /baki/ and /addhek/ are also like /Sara/ etc. standing halfway between an adjective and a quantifier. Their adjectival characteristics are observed in the following construction, where /baki/ 'the rest' and /addhek/ 'half can be piled up one after another an option otherwise available only to adjectives. e.g.

12. /ei baki addhek sundor jholme kaporTa die ki korbo?/
   this rest half beautiful gorgeous cloth-cl with what do-fut-1p
   'What shall I/we do with this half of beautiful gorgeous cloth?'

Their occurrence in the slot ( )-Ta-N indicates that they have non-adjectival and quantifier-like properties, e.g. /bakiTa dudh/ rest-cl milk 'the rest of the milk' and /addhekTa dudh/ half-cl milk 'half of the milk'. These two are best treated as quantifying adjectives.

Apart from these two, /khanik/, /kichu/, /kOek/ and /kOtok/ 'some' are only 'real' quantifiers in the sense that the classifiers are always attached to them. They are generally associated with a partitive meaning. Furthermore, they presuppose an already existing set of nouns from which some are taken into consideration in the discourse, e.g.

13. khanikTa dudh rakha ache.
   some-cl milk has been kept
   'Some of the milk has been kept.'

14. kichuTa tOrkari nOSTo hoe gEche.
3.3 Some of the curry has got spoiled.

15. kOekjon lok aSe ni.
   A few of the people did not come.

16. kOtokguli bakSe guli chilo na.
   There was no marble in some of the boxes.

From the picture given above, the main points can be summarized as follows:

(X) From the words of group A, only /goTa/ and /asto/ are adjectives whereas /puro/ is a real quantifier. From group B, /khanik/, /kichu/, /kOek/ and /kOtok/ are 'real' quantifiers and /baki/ and /addhek/ are quantifying adjectives.

(Y) The meaning of 'whole' and 'part of a whole' is closely associated with the 'real' quantifiers. True Adjectives consistently have meanings distinctly different from these.

2.4.5 Some other common quantifiers/quantifying adjectives of Bangia:
Apart from these two lists given above, we can also find some more very common quantifying adjective and quantifiers. One among them is /Onek/ 'many' which functions as a quantifier, an adjective and even as a modifier of an adjective. e.g.
17. mElay Onek lok hoechilo.
   fair-loc many people became
   'Many people came in the fair.'

18. gache gache Onek rONer phul phuTeche.
   trees-loc many colour-gen flower have bloomed
   'Flowers of many colours have bloomed in the trees.'

19. aj OnekTa bhalo achi.
   today much-cl good am
   'I am much better today.'

In 17, /Onek/ is a quantifier, while in 18, the same word is arguably an adjective, (it is interchangeable there with /nana/ Various') and in 19, it acts the way many quantifiers often do as a modifier of an adjective.

But there are also some clear cases of true adjectives, which act also as a quantifying modifier of another adjective. Consider the following instances :

20a. meyeti dekhte beS.
   girl-cl looks nice
   'The girl is pretty.'

b. meyeTi beS kalo.
   girl-cl quite dark
   The girl is quite dark.'

21a. meyeTi dekhte bhalo.
   girl-cl looks good
   The girl is good-looking.'
b. meyeTi bhalo phOrSa.
girl-cl good fair
The girl is really fair.'

22a. meyeTi dekhte darun.
girl-cl looks beautiful
The girl is very beautiful.'

b. jaygaTa darun Sundor.
place-cl very nice
The place is very nice.'

The last words of all the (a) examples above are adjectives but in all the (b) sentences the same words play the role of a quantifier. These words can be used in the answers when the question contains a 'how much', itself a quantifying question word that demands a quantifying answer. The Sanskritic adjective /durdanto/ 'terrific' also acts as a quantifying adjective.

There are two more widely used quantifiers in Bangla, /proti/ 'each' and /prottek/ 'every', the first of which generally takes /Ta/ with it before a noun except for some cases where the word following it is treated as a measure word, e.g. /proti bOchor/ 'every year', /proti maS/ 'every month' etc. Otherwise, the normal sequence is /proti/+/Ta/ followed by a noun, e.g.

20. protiTa ghOre alo o pakha ache.
each-cl room-loc light and fan has
There are lights and fans in each room.'

/proti/ is also used in a special sense after a measure word as a suffix esp. when counting, e.g. /jonproti/ 'per person', /kiloproti/ 'per kilo'. /protyek/
'every', on the other hand, need not always take a classifier with it. An occurrence of /protyek/ that carries no classifier can be followed by a noun as in (21):-

21. protyek baRitei bagan ache.
   every house-loc-emp garden has
   There is a garden in every house.'

But /protyekTa/ is also not ruled out, it seems to be used more often when the utterance is emphasized. In that case, this /Ta/ does some other work of focusing the noun as pointed out in Sanjukta Ghosh(1998). /protyek/ followed by a noun with the classifier /Ta/ is totally out of the question as in */protyek baRiTa/.

These two items are also quantifiers; the claim that they do not belong to the adjective class is also justified by the same test of occurrence in the slot ()-Ta-N which is unacceptable for an Adjective and okay for a quantifier. e.g. /protiTa baRi/ or /protyekTa baRi/ is not ruled out. If they belonged to the adjective class, the above constructions would immediately be ruled out.

This is as much as I can establish here about the characteristics of the Qs and/or Quantifying Adjectives, I now move to the next section where the relative importance of these categories in relation to individuation will be discussed in a hierarchical structure.

2.5. Referential feature hierarchy and individuation:

2.5.0 Concept of Silverstein hierarchy :

In this section, I will try to develop a system of hierarchy of nominal phrases which is based on their referential features and correlates with the occurrence of classifiers with them and other sources of high individuation. The inherent lexical content of noun phrases has been used by Silverstein
(1976) to formulate a hierarchical system which is relatable to the case marking strategies of the language. The noun phrases which are higher in the Silverstein hierarchy follow nom-acc case marking whereas which are lower in the structure go in for the ergative pattern. Those which are midway may exhibit a mixed pattern, described by Heath (1976) as 'doubly-marked' or by Silverstein in terms of an O-A-S system. Silverstein keeps personal pronouns at the highest level of the structure followed by proper nouns, higher and lower animate nouns and inanimate nouns. Heath, in his addendum to Silverstein, includes Demonstratives also in the hierarchy just after the higher ranked nominals.

2.5.1 Similar hierarchical system for the pre-nominal categories:

Given the Silverstein hierarchy as a widely accepted conceptual basis, I propose an extension to accommodate what I shall call pre-nominal categories within this hierarchy based on their referential features. I am using the term prenominal categories as a convenient designation for grammatical or semi-lexical items that precede a noun in a nominal phrase such as clear Quantifiers, clear Demonstratives and other elements such as Relative or Interrogative Determiners whose values for deictic and quantificational features have never become clear. The question of where such categories should appear in revisions of the Silverstein hierarchy can be tackled independently of the position one takes on the formal phrase structure of the nominal constructions in Bangla where prenominal categories appear. Silverstein's placement of pronouns and Heath's placement of demonstratives in the hierarchy invites extensions that will locate the full range of prenominal elements relative to each other. For it has always been obvious that the degree of deixis, referentiality, quantificationality or other properties of a nominal expression arises from the interplay of the features carried by the noun plus its associated lexical sisters (such as adjectives) with the features of what I am calling the prenominal categories. In terms of the individuation research programme that the
present study pursues, the relevance of the Silverstein hierarchy is obvious; hence my attempt to extend it. Items occupying higher and lower niches in this hierarchy exhibit greater and lesser degrees, respectively, of inherent deixis and individuation. Correspondingly, I find that the lower an item is in the Silverstein hierarchy, the greater the chances of that element being able to attach classifier and thereby convey definiteness or some other aspect of individuation. With this point in mind, my presentation of the extended hierarchy, below, focuses not on the potential for case-marking, as in Silverstein's and Heath's work, but on the admissability of a classifier attached to the items in question:

1. personal pronouns
   ami, tumi, Se, apni
   *1p/2p/3p Ta/jon

2. proper nouns
   ram, rohim
   *proper noun-Ta/jon

3. Demonstratives
   ei, oi, Sei 'this, that'
   *Dem.-CI-N, but o.k. Dem-Tuku-N

4. Left relatives
   jara, je je 'who'

5. D-linked wh-Qs
   kOto, kon 'which, how many'
   kOto/kon-jon/Ta

6. non D-linked wh-quantifiers
ke, ki 'who, what'
Q(non D-linked)-Num-Ta/jon/gulo

7. D-Q vague words
   jekeu, jakichu, jekono 'anybody, anything¹
   jO-kO word-num.-cl
   (only small numbers)

8. numerals, other Quantifiers
   Ek..., SOb, puro, proti, kichu 'all, whole each, some'  
   Num-cl, Q-cl
   *keu-Ta/jon 'any'

9. common nouns
   bagh, kapoR 'tiger, cloth'
   N-cl

Personal pronouns (1) and proper nouns (2) have a high degree of referentiality. Generally they do not take any classifier to produce the effect of salience or prominence. The relevant principle is perhaps that one cannot point to the same thing with two different pointing tools. Longobardi (1994) proposed, in a period of DP research when the view that a pronoun is a D was taken for granted, that proper nouns head-move to D to discharge a referential feature. If the classifier /Ta/, when it is endowed with the individuation feature, also originates at or goes to the same D position for similar reasons, then it becomes clear why the first two categories of the above structure cannot occur with such a /Ta/.

The claim that personal pronouns and proper nouns take no classifier, straightforward as it may sound, faces some apparent empirical difficulties, as one sees at (11a, b):
11a. ami SeTa jantam na.
   I that-cl know-past-1p not
   'I did not kow that.'

11b. rahulTa kintu bhiSon boka.
   Rahul-Ta but very foolish 'But Rahul is very foolish.'

The form /SeTa/ in (11a) can be seen by some as the third person human pronoun /Se/ plus /Ta/. But surely this is a misreading of the facts. The third person inanimate pronouns simply have the forms /eTa, oTa, SeTa/ in the proximal, distal and sequent series, respectively. That the pre-/Ta/ portions of these words look like the human personal pronouns /e o Se/ is diachronically significant (and explainable), but surely does not damage the observation that no classifier can be attached to a human /Se/ 'he, she' or /tini/ 'he-hon, she-hon'.

To consider (11b) next, my move here is to propose that the /Ta/ there belongs to a functional category bearing name features, and is similar to the honourific members /babu, mOSai/ 'mister' of that as yet formally undescribed syntactic class. One may tentatively call it the class of Name Status Designators. Unlike / babu/, the items /Ta/ is anti-honourific. I leave open such issues as the lexical and functional feature composition of the class of Name Status Designators. Perhaps the class, on serious investigation, will turn out to include /da/ 'elder brother', /di/ 'elder sister', /boudi/ 'wife of elder brother', which by extension cover non-kin acquaintances also in the relation-maximizing Bangia speech community (in effect /di/ serves as the feminine for /babu/ 'mister'). The use of these post-name elements in any case needs, and awaits, a formal grammatical account. Thus, (11b) does not undermine the generalization that classifiers as such are unavailable for attachment to a proper noun.
Demonstratives in general do not support classifier attachment; I presume that this reflects the double pointing device prohibition. I discount such example as /eiTa/ 'this one' which I analyze as Dem-N-/Ta/ with a zero noun. But there is one exception among the classifiers: /Tuku/ with maximum CTI feature and nil individuation effect. Because of this characteristic feature of /Tuku/, it can be attached with a demonstrative directly, a matter examined at length in section 2.6.

Left relatives unlike right relatives, as explained in Dasgupta (1987) share with personal pronouns the ability to carry first or second person features, trigger agreement with them on the verb, and even have these features carried over into the sequent clause whose sequent subject as in (12) is in the third person. The following examples will make this clear (data adopted from P. Dasgupta 1987):

12. jara bairejete cao, tara jete paro.
   Who out to go want-2p, those to go can-2p
   Those who want to go out, can go.'

In contrast, the right relative constructions exhibit the standard inability of a sequent pronoun to initiate anything but third person reference:

13. tara baire jete pare/*paro, jara jete cay/*cao.
     those . . . can-3p/*can-2p, who... want-3p/want-2p
     Those who want to go out, can go.'

Therefore, left relative pronouns occupy a relatively high position in the Silverstein hierarchy. I leave the details of this for further study by others.
2.5.2 Some empirical tests for judging the categorical hierarchy :

Some tests can empirically distinguish the higher categories from the lower ones in this table. One such test is pointing: a deictic reading can be obtained only from the first three niches of this system. After /Emonki/ 'even', we consistently find a nominal expression that can point to or refer to a presupposed entity known to the speaker. Personal pronouns, proper nouns and Demonstratives do have a deictic reading and wh-pronouns both D-linked and non D-linked have that presupposed reading.

Generally, non D-linked Wh-pronouns do not refer to anybody even in the mind of a speaker but in this particular case probably /Emonki/ adds some extra meaning to the sentence. Without going into that matter also, we can say that there is a demarcation line between the first five niches and the others. In contrast, /Emon/ 'such' always requires a non-deictic expression after it and all niches after the first three satisfy this requirement.

2.6 A problem case: /Tuku/--

In section 2.2.2, while discussing the Bangla classifiers in general, I noted that it is exceptional in behaviour, being the only classifier that can be attached to a demonstrative, and furthermore it bears maximum countability type information. There are some questions and problems related to this exceptional classifier. To address those, this separate section on /Tuku/ is introduced.

2.6.0 Some data related to /Tuku/'s quantifying property: Its differences with /Ta/: -

For the readers' convenience, I will repeat some of the data and facts related to the diminutive classifier /Tuku/ in this section. According to the table showing the gradation of the classifiers based on two features (see section 2.3.1), /Tuku/ stands on the top bearing maximum CTI feature and hence
minimum individuation feature.

1. EtoTuku dudh  
   this much-Tuku milk 'this small amount of milk'

2. eiTuku meye  
   this-Tuku girl 'this little girl'

In both the cases, /Tuku/ denotes only the small quantity. One more point to observe here is its CTI feature leaves it open to select both [+count] noun such as /meya/ 'girl' and [-count] noun such as /dudh/ 'milk'.

The second criterion based on which the distinction is done for the Bangla classifiers is individuation. It is taken as a feature or property of the linguistic elements, which roughly denotes pointing, reference, specificity like features and adds some extra information to the element with which it is attached to. This feature has been created to understand some characteristics of a word in relation to the information it contains as part of my investigation where the concept was launched as a programme to deal with some syntax-pragmatics interface issues (see section 2.3.1).

On the basis of this individuation feature, classifiers can be graded into three categories. As it has been shown in the table in section 2.3.3, the rating is exactly opposite for this criterion compared to the first criterion of Countability Type Information (CTI) feature. Therefore, a conclusion can be made that a classifier's quantification role diminishes as individuation becomes important. /Tuku/ cannot produce or only minimally produces an individuation effect as its CTI feature value is very high.

Comparison of the use of /Tuku/ with other classifiers will make this fact clear.
3. kagojTa porjonto pORar SomOy paini.
   newspaper-Ta even read-gen. time got not
   'I didn't even get the time to read the newspaper.'

4. kagojkhana porjonto pORar SomOy paini.
   newspaper-khana (otherwise same translation)

5. kagojTuku porjonto pORar SomOy paini.
   newspaper-Tuku
   'I didn't even get the time to read this small newspaper.'

For /Ta/, pointing to the newspaper to increase its salience is the main function. /khana/ bears some countability type information as it co-occurs only with [+count] nouns. Moreover, it also induces a definite reading. /Tuku/ adds to the newspaper only the information that the or a newspaper is a trivial thing to read and that even for this triviality the speaker could not find time. When I utter the above sentence, obviously I do not rule out a specific or definite reading by using /Tuku/. But this element emphasizes the quantitative insignificance and not the speaker and/or hearer's prior familiarity with some particular paper. This point lies at the heart of the difference between /Tuku/ and other classifiers.

2.6.1 The empirical asymmetry: a problem:

Now notice the following asymmetry in the data pattern surrounding /Tuku/: -

6a. eiTuku dudh
    this-Tuku milk     'this little amount of milk'

   b. ei dudhTuku
      this milk-Tuku    'this little amount of milk'
7a. ei Tuku baccha/chagol
   this-Tuku child/goat 'this little child/goat'

b. ei baccha/chagol Tuku
   this child/goat-Tuku

For some speakers, (6b) yields a clear specific reading but for me (6a and b) can be interchangeably used for same reading. However, there is an important asymmetry between well-formed (7a) and ill-formed (7b).

In other words, Dem-/Tuku/-N is allowed whatever the noun is but Dem-N-Tuku is allowed just in case the noun is a [-count] noun. Interestingly the behaviour of /Tuku/ and other classifiers in relation to the Dem. is in complementary distribution in Bangla. Where /Tuku/ can occur, other classifiers cannot and where others can (compare /ei bacchaTa/chagolkhana/ 'this child-Ta/goat-khana'), /Tuku cannot.

2.6.2 Previous literature on /Tuku/ :-
Rajat Ghosh (2001) responds to the question as to why Bangia allows only /Tuku/ after Dem when Asamiya allows all classifiers to occur between Dem and a Noun. Ghosh (2001) proposed a new parameter to distinguish between Bangia and Asamiya. His Excapsulation parameter is based on the idea that 'a non-substantive demonstrative can be substantivized by the lexical features of the classifier shared with the classified noun to make its reference more appropriate.' He empirically establishes that in Asamiya all the classifiers can be attached to prenominal demonstratives whereas in Bangia it is marginal as only /Tuku/ can be attached to a prenominal Dem. He shows also that the Dem-CI combination retains the category specification of the Dem, i.e., [+N, +V]. Excapsulation is consistently available in Asamiya and consistently unavailable in Bangia because on Ghosh's analysis Asamiya classifiers are semi-lexical but in Bangia they have become functionalized. Ghosh states that the Dem-CI combination is
generated in the spec of NP, i.e., the standard AP position. This Dem-CI moves upto spec of QP to check its referential feature as that is the site of referentiality in a classifier language. A Dem-CI which moves upto the spec of QP is indexical and the type which does not move is adjectival.

This portion of Ghosh's work becomes important for the following section where I discuss Dem-CI sequence of Bangla going into the details of the exceptional word /Tuku/, which, in my view, belongs to two different categories. But about the asymmetry mentioned above, Ghosh's analysis has nothing to offer. What can be the possible explanation for that phenomenon?

2.6.3 A Possible solution: --Two /Tuku/s--Massifier and QA: --

In this section, I propose that two different words of the form /Tuku/ exist in the lexicon. One /Tuku/ is a massifier, in the sense of Cheng and Sybesma (1999), which is a classifier that has all the features of a measure word and can collocate only with a [+continuous, -count] noun. The other /Tuku/ is a Quantifying Adjective that does not have an independent existence but always occurs attached to a degree word. If this is a degree word homonomous to the demonstrative /ei/ 'this', then the phrase /ei-Tuku/ is generated as an AP at the spec of NP and moves up to the DemP position at the spec of FocP to check the inherent [+Referential] feature coming from its first element /ei/. Bhattacharya (1999) proposes a FocP inside the DP structure. Following him, Bangla DP consists of four levels [DP[FocP[QP[NP]]]]. If there is a referential reading of the DP, AP /eiTuku/ goes to the spec of FocP position by spec to spec movement. For instance, compare /eiTuku dudh/ 'this-Tuku milk' vs. /oiTuku dudh/ 'that-Tuku milk'. In the first case, along with the small quantity of the milk, the proximity of the milk to the speaker is also indicated. But for the second sentence, the milk is certainly not proximate to the speaker. If /Tuku/ occurs attached to an
adjective-modifying pure degree word like /Eto/ 'this much' or /kOto/ 'how much', then Deg-/Tuku/ does not move out of the HP. In the next few paragraphs, I shall give the details of this solution.

I begin by proposing that the extensive /khani/ and the diminutive /Tuku/ are not regular classifiers. Rather, they bear the feature of a measure word, even though this feature does not usually co-occur with the possibility of attachment to a noun (a typical classifier property in Bangla). Cheng and Sybesma (1999) used the term massifier to denote this type of element in Chinese.

My next move is to draw upon the work of Muromatsu (1998), who classified nouns into three categories based on their internal complexity, both syntactic and conceptual, as follows: —

1D: - +degree, -measure, -form: predicate use of noun
2D: - +degree, +measure, -form: concrete mass nouns
3D: - +degree, +measure, +form: count nouns

1D nouns are bare nouns and they are type-lifted to 2D nouns by the use of a measure word or a quantified expression; so that they can be referential. Technically this type-lifting predicate is called a warp. 3D nouns are not only referential but also bound and individuated. They allow numerals and determiners. The warp that type-lifts a 2D noun to a 3D noun instantiates as a classifier in a classifier language. In the absence of classifiers, a language uses grammatical number to serve the same purpose (Castillo 2001).

Coming back to our discussion, example (6a) where /Tuku/ is attached to /ei/, refers to a very small amount of milk. Here /ei/ is a degree word homonymous to the proximal demonstrative this. That it is a degree word is confirmed by the similar construction /Eto/ia bORo baRi/ so/yay big house
'this much big house'. /Tuku/ is a 2D noun here with the features +degree, +measure (a measure word in our terms) but not a classifier.

Similarly, /baccha/ 'child' or /chagol/ 'goat' of (7a), though used as a count noun in general, is not so used in that particular case. To confirm this, consider some further examples: -

8. ora baccha dhOre.
   they children catch 'they catch children.'

9. eiTuku baccha kOtha bolte pare na.
   this-Tuku child talk-infinitive can not
   'A baby this little is not able to talk.'

10. oder eiTuku duTo baccha ache.
    their this-Tuku two-cl children have
    They have two children this small.'

In example (9), /baccha/ is a mass noun without the [+form] feature. We cannot individuate the item /baccha/. From its status as a bare noun in (8), it is lifted to the next higher rank of the hierarchy. In (10), when /To/ (an allomorph of the classifier /Ta/) is added, the noun is lifted to the highest rank where it can be counted. This particular construction is referential as the word /eiTuku/ here is generated in the DemP position since the /ei/ in this case is a referential Dem. There is yet another reordered variant of the construction given as (11): -

11. oder duTo eiTuku baccha ache.
The nominal here is non-referential in nature; /duTo/ 'two' is a QP with Q and Cl and /eiTuku/ is generated in AP position as in (9).

The description given for /Tuku/ holds good of /khani/ also as it too is a massifier (or in our usual parlance a measure word) and involves type-lifting a bare noun to a quantified expression, but never to a count noun in the way exemplified in the following data-set:

12. baRir Samne rasta.
   house-gen. in front of road
   The road is in front of the house.' (bare noun use)

13. amader Onekkhani rasta jete hObe.
   we-gen. much-khani way to go
   'We have to go a long long way.'
   (/khani/ used with a quantifier measures the bare noun /rasta/ 'road')

14. Onekgulo rasta ekhan theke berieche.
   many-gulo(cl) roads here from started
   'From here a number of roads have started'

In (14), /gulo/, a collective classifier, type-lifts a mass noun to a count noun.

Coming to the impossibility of (7b), /Tuku/, when attached to a noun, acts as a classifier bearing a [+continuous] feature, which allows only [+continuous] nouns with a divisible cumulative structure. Therefore, /dudh/ 'milk' is allowed because a very small quantity of milk is milk only and /baccha/ 'child' is not allowed, as */bacchaTuku/, if could be generated would mean a small piece of baby with all its features!

2.6.4 A reduplicated construction with /Tuku/: --
In a reduplicated construction, repeated use of adjective/measure word before a count Noun denotes marked (collective if in principle count or extensive if in principle mass) aggregation.

15. choTo choTo chele
   small small boy 'small boys'

16. gada gada boi
    lots lots books 'lots of books'

The nouns of these cases are not perceived as [+count] nouns, but as a collection or mass of many books/boys. That means, when we say /gada gada boi/ 'lots of books' and /gada gada bhat/ 'lots of rice', we don't really distinguish between those two constructions even though books are count and rice is mass. Nobody expects that someone has counted the books or measured the rice; hence the irrelevance of the distinction between counting and measuring here. Similarly, if /Tuku/ 'a very small amount' is repeated as a measure word in a construction such as /ei Tuku Tuku baccha/ 'these small children', one refers to a proximal group of children who are very small. Extralinguistically, we can perceive such a group and even ascertain its cardinality. But what the language presents here is an aggregation of very small number of some formless things that are not supposed to be counted. This logic may not directly carry over to the denotation of a mass noun. But we can always perceive a number of small amounts of a substance distributed over a number of containers. Bangla uses a particle /kore/, which conveys a sense of distributional measurement and operates on an expression that serves as a unit of measurement. Therefore, /ei Tuku kore bhat/ 'this little amount of rice (per unit)' is the natural choice instead of */ei Tuku Tuku bhat/. /kore/ always occurs after a measure word and is followed by a mass noun as expected with a measure word.
2.6.5 /Tuku/-khani asymmetry: 

There is still one more asymmetry between the two measure words cum classifiers of Bangla, viz., /Tuku/ and /khani/. Like /Tuku/, /khani/ cannot be attached to a Demonstrative. E.g.

16. *eikhani rasta
    this-khani road

Corresponding to this, Vrastakhani/ 'road-khani' is also out. What is the reason for this asymmetry? Demonstrative is a node where the referential feature of a DP is located. Therefore, only those classifiers and measure words can attach to Dem, which bear a referential feature. Certainly, /Tuku/ bears such a feature and /khani/ does not. In Asamiya, as evident from the data by Ghosh (2001), all the classifiers bear such a feature. The referential feature of the Q/Ci node is uninterpretable, therefore it is moved to the Dem to check that feature, as Dem has an interpretable referential feature. /Tuku/ as an adjective does not have that feature as seen at (11).

Now the feature matrix of the classifiers (and/or measure words), with which I started the discussion, will be given.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tuku(Massifier)</th>
<th>khani(MW)</th>
<th>gulo/khana/jon(CI)</th>
<th>Ta(CI)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>[+Q]</td>
<td>[+Q]</td>
<td>[+Q]</td>
<td>[-Q]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[+R]</td>
<td>[-R]</td>
<td>[-R]</td>
<td>[-R]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[-Individuated]</td>
<td>[-individuated]</td>
<td>[+Individuated]</td>
<td>[+Individuated]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

[+continuous] if added with a noun as a classifier

Adjectival /Tuku/ is different from this, a point that has been made in detail.

2.7 Conclusion: -
In this chapter, I have discussed the pre-nominal categories and their relative importance in the study of individuation. Special attention has been paid to the classifiers as they are the category of interest to the present day syntacticians concerned with Bangla. The Individuation function of a classifier, as mentioned in the feature matrix, may turn out to some extent to resemble the function of D in a language like English where there is overt D. The function of D, which is basically a discourse function, is pointing towards an entity in the real world. The English definite determiner <the> does such pointing. What the highly individuated classifier /Ta/ of Bangla does is similar to this, though not identical.

In addition it makes the linguistic item prominent also in the discourse apart from anchoring it referentially. In a classifier language, on the one hand, the classifiers do the job of counting in the absence of the number feature (Muromatsu and Castillo) and on the other hand, they take over for a classifier language some of the job of an overt D in a language where number serves as a phi feature.