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ABSTRACT

Bengali/Bangla is unusual among South Asian languages in that it uses numerical classifiers. In this paper, I propose a new analysis of the DP structure in Bangla motivated by data previously unaccounted for and typological concerns. Specifically, I propose that Bangla has DP-internal NP movement to Spec,DP to mark definiteness, that the numeral and classifier form separate heads in the syntax, and that there is noun to classifier movement when there is no overt classifier. I propose a feature for each of these phenomena, and attempt to explain the ungrammatical examples using principled reasons derived from this structure. Also, I give an analysis for the quantificationally approximate construction, in which the classifier appears on the left of the numeral. I claim that the model presented in this paper can account for these constructions, and that the differences found between “classifier-compatible” nouns and “classifier-less” nouns with regard to the quantificationally approximate structures follows naturally from my analysis.

1 Introduction

One goal of linguistic theory is to identify properties present in all languages and to discover how languages may differ and why. Identifying universal properties helps us understand better the underlying architecture of grammar and its constraints. Similarly, identifying how languages vary illustrates the flexibility of the language faculty. The internal structuring of noun phrases is one area in which languages vary widely. However, since many well studied languages have a fairly rigid nominal structure, thus far it has been difficult to make generalizations about the universal and language-specific properties of noun phrases.

Bangla is a language with a fairly flexible nominal structure. It is interesting from a typological standpoint, since it is a classifier language in the Indo-Aryan family, comprised predominantly of languages with no numerical classifiers. Previous analyses of the Bangla DP (representatively, Bhattacharya 1999b) have accounted for DP-internal alternations of the position of the NP and the distinction between nouns that combine with classifiers versus nouns that do not. The model pursued by Bhattacharya (1999a,b, 2001) requires that the numeral and classifier form a fused head to derive the other properties of Bangla DPs. However, this approach does not account for a construction that is used to express quantificational approximateness, a “vague” reading on the quantity of a nominal expression. In these constructions, the numeral and classifier invert positions. This phenomenon is difficult to account for in a theory in which the numeral and classifier morphemes form a composite head. Additionally, an approach that relies on a fused head consisting of the numeral and classifier does not generalize to other classifier languages (Simpson 2005). To make stronger generalizations about the structure of DPs in classifier languages and in languages universally, it is important to try
to reconcile data between disparate languages that show similar phenomena, such as Bangla and the classifier languages of Southeast Asia, in order to construct a stronger theory of universal grammar. Additionally, a theory of UG in which two classifier languages differ in minute and opaque ways presents a potentially unnecessarily complicated learning problem for the child.

This paper introduces a model that accounts for the quantificational approximate constructions and expands structural similarities between Bangla and other classifier languages. I will posit that there is DP-internal NP movement to Spec,DP to mark definiteness. In order to explain the differences between nouns that generally are found with classifiers and those that are not, I will posit that there is $N^0$-to-$Cl^0$ movement for the nouns that do not appear with classifiers. I will formalize this by claiming that some nominal roots do not merge with a nominalizer $n$, and thus move to adjoin to a null $Cl^0$ for interface reasons. I will explain the ungrammaticality of NP movement marking definiteness in cases where no overt classifier appears by suggesting that $n$ is required to license NP movement to Spec,DP. Establishing this, I will propose a feature $[\text{Vague}]$ on $D^0$ that enters into an Agree relation with $Cl^0$, triggering left-adjoining head movement to generate the quantificationally approximate DP structure. I will also show that the resulting word orders provide independent evidence for an analysis in which Num$^0$ and $Cl^0$ are separate heads, as has been claimed to be the case in other classifier languages.

2 Structures

In this section, I briefly describe the forms of the morphemes that constitute the Bangla classifier system. Then, I introduce the syntactic phenomena under discussion that hinge on the distribution of the classifier. Afterwards, I describe the phenomena for the two classes of nouns that exist in Bangla: those that are commonly seen in a DP that contains a classifier (“classifier-compatible”) and those that are frequently seen in a DP that does not contain a classifier (“classifier-less”).

2.1 Classifiers in Bangla

Bangla utilizes a relatively small set of classifiers.\(^1\) The most common classifier is $(go)ta$, which surfaces as the clitic $=ta$ in certain configurations. The cliticized form additionally has the diminutive $=ti$ and allomorphs $=to$ and $=te$ in some dialects. The allomorph $=to$ surfaces when $(go)ta$ is cliticized onto $du$ ‘two’, and $=te$ surfaces after $tin$ ‘three’ and $car$ ‘four’. Additionally, $(go)ta$ has a plural variant $gulo$ and a plural diminutive $guli$. The forms of $(go)ta$ are shown below.\(^2\)

\begin{enumerate}
  \item a. $kOek=ta$ bosta
    \begin{itemize}
      \item $=$Cl sack
    \end{itemize}
    ‘a few sacks’
  
  b. $go=ta=kOek$ bosta
    \begin{itemize}
      \item $=$Cl sack
    \end{itemize}
    ‘a few sacks’\(^3\)
  
  c. $ktot=ta$ bosta
    \begin{itemize}
      \item $=$Cl sack
    \end{itemize}
    ‘some sacks’
  
  d. $du=to$ kolom
    \begin{itemize}
      \item $=$Cl pen
    \end{itemize}
    ‘two pens’
\end{enumerate}

---

1 Much of this description is dependent on Dasgupta (1983).

2 Contrasting with closely-related languages, it seems that the forms of $(go)ta$ need to be cliticized onto something — either a Num or NP on its left, or material on its right for the quantificationally approximate constructions. Thus, forms like $*go=ta$ kham “Cl envelope” are not attested. Sahoo (1999) provides data that, to me, seems to suggest that this constraint does not apply in Oriya, however.

3 In Dasgupta (1983), this is translated as ‘a couple of sacks’.
e. tin=ে kalom
   three=Cl pen
   ‘three pens’

Additionally, Bangla uses khan(a), for flat square objects, and jon(a), for human-denoting nouns. The classifier khana surfaces as khana after a numeral, and as khan before a numeral. Similarly, jon appears as jon after a numeral, and jon before a numeral. These are shown in (2).

(2) a. pāc=jon kormi
    five=Cl employee
    ‘five employees’
  b. jon=pāc=ek kormi
    Cl=five=Ek employee
    ‘five employees or so’
  c. kāk=khana biskut
    several=Cl cookie
    ‘several cookies’
  d. khan=koek biskut
    Cl=several cookie
    ‘several cookies’

2.2 Classifier-Compatible Nouns

In the next two sections, I sketch the syntactic patterns under discussion. First, I introduce the DP structures that contain an overt classifier. These are shown in (3), with partial structures in (4).

(3) a. du=to (lomba) kham
    two=Cl long envelope
    ‘two (long) envelopes’
  b. (lomba) kham du=to
    long envelope two=Cl
    ‘the two (long) envelopes’
  c. goa du=ek (lomba) kham
    Cl two=Ek (long) envelope
    ‘two (long) envelopes or so’

(4) a. du=to lomba kham
       DP
       du=to NP
       Lomba kham
  b. lomba kham du=to
     DP
     NP du=to
     Lomba kham

\footnote{Examples adapted from Dasgupta (1997).}
\footnote{In these structures, the numeral and classifier are represented on one node. I reject this later.}
c. goto du=ek lomba kham

In (3a), the DP not marked for definiteness or quantificational approximateness has the word order NUM-Cl-(Adj)-N, numeral-classifier-adjective-noun. For the moment, we assume that the adjective and noun form some intermediate structure, the NP. For DPs marked for definiteness and not marked for quantificational approximateness, the word order is NP-Num-Cl, shown in (3b). Once more, the potential to place an adjective lomba ‘long’ left of the noun suggests that an entire NP appears to the left of the numeral and classifier. Finally, for DPs marked for quantificationally approximateness and unmarked for definiteness, the order of the elements is Cl-Num-NP with a morpheme ek cliticized to the numeral, shown in (3c). Definite, quantificationally approximate structures are discussed in section 7.6

2.3 Classifier-less Nouns

Now, I direct my attention to nouns that do not normally occur in nominals that contain a classifier. First, it is important to establish what comprises this category. In Dasgupta (1983), the author mentions that “measure words” do not normally take classifiers, except to achieve certain referential or contextual effects.

(5) a. i. John amar sathe du din thaklo
   John my with two day stayed
   ‘John stayed two days with me.’
   ii. tin mas
       three month
       ‘three months’
   b. i. du=to bochor kharap galo — 1966 ar 1976.
       two=Cl year bad went — 1966 and 1976
       ‘Two bad years occurred — 1966 and 1976’
   ii. du=to mas-er nam-er feg-e “ari” — januari ar phebruari.
       two=Cl month-Gen name-Gen end-LOC “ari” — January and February
       ‘Two months have names ending in ari — January and February’

The forms with the unmarked interpretations are are shown in (5a). These refer to spans of time and not entities. Examples of the marked referential usages occur in (5b). Here, the noun phrases do refer to entities. The DPs with the marked interpretation for these sets of nouns will behave as other classifier-compatible nouns.

Additionally, Bhattacharya (1999a) gives the forms of nominals without a span-of-time denoting noun in (6). None of these surface with an overt classifier.

(6) a. du def-er moitri
    two country-Gen friendship
    ‘friendship between two countries’

6Examples (3) and (7) adapted from Bhattacharya (1999a) and Dasgupta (1983). Parentheses mark optionality in the gloss and in the Bangla forms.

7This is slightly reworded from the original paper.
Dasgupta’s examples show that for time span denoting nouns there is a referential distinction associated with the classifier — reference to entities is associated with a classifier, and reference to spans of time is associated with the absence of a classifier. However, the examples in (6) show that for other nouns, classifiers may be absent as well. In other words, these are not all “measure words”, per the description in Dasgupta (1983). It is unclear whether there is a semantic property all the nouns in (6) share that could motivate this behavior or whether it is an arbitrary lexically specified feature. The absence or presence of a classifier in DPs with a time span denoting noun are accounted for in the model put forth in this paper. However, the cases in (6) still remain a problem. Interestingly, Simpson (2005) finds similar classes of bare nouns in other classifier languages. A unified analysis from a cross-linguistic or diachronic perspective could potentially explain this phenomena better than any speculation I could offer in this paper. I leave this for further research.

The word orders given in (3) are not the same for classifier-less nouns. The paradigm for classifier-less nouns is given in (7).

(7) a. tin saptaho
   three week
   ‘three weeks’

b. * saptaho tin
   week three
   intended: ‘the three weeks’

c. saptaho tin(=ek)
   week three(=Ek)
   ‘three weeks or so’

For the indefinite quantificationally unmarked DPs shown in (7a), the obvious difference from the classifier-compatible analogs is the absence of a classifier. Additionally, for definite DPs, there is no analog to (3b) for classifier-less nouns — the example in (7b) is ungrammatical. Finally, for quantificationally approximate indefinite interpretations, the classifier-less DPs surface as N-Num, with the optional morpheme ek after Num, shown in (7c). This is quite different from the order Cl-Num-N seen with the classifier-compatible analogs in (3c).

Interestingly, the semantic asymmetry triggered by the presence or absence of an overt classifier and the word order in the quantificationally approximate structures, exemplified in (5) and (7c) respectively, do not occur as such for nouns like def ‘country’ or caka ‘wheel’. That is, for nouns that are not “measure words” or that denote spans of time, the paradigm diverges. This is demonstrated in (8) for caka ‘wheel’. The question of whether this means we should see the data as crossing across

---

8This construction may be allowed to have a definite reading in addition to the indefinite reading represented by the gloss. This is discussed briefly later.
three paradigms or two are not be considered here. The model pursued in this paper is only able to account for the nouns like *din or mas, that do have a CL-Num-Ek-type of quantificationally approximate structures.\(^9\)

\(8\)

a. *tin caka
   ‘three wheel’
   ‘three wheels’

b. (?)*tin-te caka
   ‘three wheels’

c. *caka tin=ek
   wheel three=Ek
   intended: ‘three wheels or so’

d. gota tin=ek caka
   Cl three=Ek wheel
   ‘three wheels or so’

These patterns are summarized in the table in (9), with +Def representing a specification for definiteness, and +QA representing a specification for quantificational approximateness. In this table, +Cl represents nouns that normally appear with a classifier, and −Cl represents nouns that generally do not.\(^10\)

\[(9)\]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>−Def, −QA</th>
<th>+Def, −QA</th>
<th>−Def, +QA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>+Cl</td>
<td>Num-CL-NP</td>
<td>NP-Num-CL</td>
<td>CL-Num-Ek-N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>−Cl</td>
<td>Num-NP</td>
<td>*NP-Num</td>
<td>N-Num-Ek</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The data in (3) and (7) drives the analysis presented in the next sections.

3 Previous Analyses

The most articulated model of Bangla DPs within the generative tradition has been advanced by Tanmoy Bhattacharya, primarily in Bhattacharya (1999a, 1999b, 2001), though referenced in other work.\(^11\)

3.1 Bhattacharya’s (1999) Analysis

An adapted tree representing the analysis of Bangla DPs in Bhattacharya (1999b) is given in (10).\(^12\)

---

\(^9\)Rajesh Bhatt (p.c.) suggested that this class of nouns may only seem to appear without a classifier on the surface, and that there may be a surface-deletion rule in the context of these kinds of nouns. This is an interesting proposal that I leave to future research. This kind of analysis is wholly consistent with the analysis offered in this paper.

\(^10\)These are not syntactic features that play a role in the model pursued here. For the moment, they are just convenient abbreviations.

\(^11\)For alternative analyses and dissenting views within the generative tradition, see Bhattacharja (2008), Diridal (2004) and Ghosh (2006). In other theoretical models, see Bhattacharja (2007).

\(^12\)It is also worth noting that Bhattacharya posits further structure within the NP, including a nP between the QP and NP shells. He uses these to account for further phenomena not under analysis here. I do not comment on this aspect of his theory; I only discuss the QP and the structures that it is directly involved with in this section. I continue to refer to all items below the QP as NP, and later I offer an analysis in which the NP is constructed out of a nominalizer \(n\) and \(\sqrt{\cdot}\), for different empirical reasons than Bhattacharya’s (1999) nP.
In this model, there is only one additional head between the higher DP layer and the lower NP layer, $Q^0$ for quantifier. The $Q^0$ is a complex head consisting of $\text{Num}^0$, the syntactic position for numerals and quantifiers, and $\text{Cl}^0$, the position for classifiers.

To account for the alternation in (3a) and (3b), repeated in (11), Bhattacharya (1999b) proposes an optionally strong feature [\text{Specific}] on $N^0$. This feature causes the NP to move to Spec,QP.

(11) a. $du=\text{t}o\ (\text{lo}mba)\ kham$
  two=\text{Cl} long envelope

  ‘(the) two (long) envelopes’

b. $(\text{lo}mba)\ kham\ i\ du=\text{t}o\ t_i$
  long envelope two=\text{Cl}

  ‘the two (long) envelopes’

To explain the ungrammaticality of (7b), repeated in (12), Bhattacharya proposes that the classifier is required in $Q^0$ to license the [\text{Specific}] feature. In other words, NP movement for specificity optionally occurs, but only when a classifier has merged in $Q^0$. Since there is no classifier in $Q^0$ in example (12), NP movement is illicit.

(12) * $\text{s}a\text{pt}a\text{ho} \text{tin}$
  week three

  intended: ‘the three weeks’

The presence of the classifier does seem to be the difference between the forms in (3b) and (7b), now in (11b) and (12). However, although the classifier is the catalyst for NP movement, the NP’s target is to the left of the numeral, not to the left of the classifier. A fused $Q^0$ captures the correct word order. Having a separate $\text{Num}^0$ and $\text{Cl}^0$ would require having [\text{Specific}] checked by the $\text{Num}^0$ in order to explain the NP’s position, contrary to the observation that the presence of the classifier is required for NP movement. Otherwise, an analysis with separate $\text{Num}^0$ and $\text{Cl}^0$ heads would require an additional movement to have the NP checking [\text{Specific}] surface to the left of the numeral, assuming Bhattacharya’s mechanisms. The fused head ensures that the classifier element in $Q^0$ motivates NP movement, without positing a separate step to get the correct word order. This is a strong advantage of Bhattacharya’s model. Later, we will try to capture this intuition by tying the licensing of the classifier and of the movement for definiteness to a distinct, third property of the DP, namely, whether a nominalizer $n$ merges.

### 3.2 The Classifier as a Marker of Specificity

Bhattacharya (1999b) hypothesizes that the feature motivating NP movement to Spec,QP is an optionally strong [\text{Specific}] feature. This is consistent with Dasgupta (1983) and Junghare (1983), who refer to the classifier as marking specificity.
Why analyze the presence of the classifier or NP movement as marking specificity? There does not seem to be a clear argument one way or another for a definiteness or a specificity-marking analysis, nor is it clear what syntactic reflexes are contributing to this reading. As the idiomatic translations for the examples with a moved NP in (3b) and (7b) would have the reader believe, NP movement seems to mark definiteness pretheoretically. If we were to analyze the classifier as a marker of “just” specificity, we can explain why we can get a classifier in indefinite configurations, shown earlier in (3), repeated in (13), and (14). Here, the classifier is compatible with an indefinite interpretation if it appears before the noun in (13). Additionally, the classifier can elicitize to ek with both the indefinite ‘one boy’ and ‘a boy’ readings in (14), meaning we can not suggest that the appearance of the classifier itself is what triggers a definiteness reading.

(13) a. du=ɨo (lamba) kham
two=CL long envelope
‘(the) two (long) envelopes’
b. (lamba) kham du=ɨo
long envelope two=CL
‘the two (long) envelopes’
c. gɔta du(=ek) kham
Cl two(=Ek) envelope
‘two envelopes or so’

(14) a. chele
boy
‘(a) boy’
b. ek(=tj) chele
one=(CL) boy
‘one boy’ or ‘a boy’

An analysis in which the classifier marks definiteness alone, separate from NP movement, would be too strong in light of these data.

One potential challenge to the definiteness analysis of NP movement is the appearance of the classifier in forms expressing “anti-definiteness.” An example of the anti-definiteness phenomenon is given in (15), taken from Dasgupta (1997). In this example, there are two DPs: lebu=ɨa ‘lemon=CL’ and lɔŋka=ɨa ‘chili=CL’. These two DPs do not refer to either lemon or chili. Instead, they refer to a superset containing both lemon and chili, glossed as ‘vegetables.’

(15) poʃi fi kache lebu=ɨa lɔŋka=ɨa cee newa
neighbor from lemon=CL chili=CL wanting take
‘Borrowing (some vegetables) from a neighbor.’

In this section, I presented the current perspective on the data. In the next sections, I critically evaluate these standing claims. Using the original arguments as a springboard, I explore a new analysis of these data. I argue that this new analysis accounts for the quantificationally approximate readings, left unaccounted for in previous models. The implications of the definiteness/specificity distinction regarding the structural configurations of Bangla DPs is explored in the next section. I ultimately make explicit an analysis in which NP movement does indeed mark definiteness.

4 NP-Movement as a Marker of Definiteness

In this section, I specifically assess the claim that specificity is the motivation for NP movement in Bangla. I first show that there are separate motivations for the appearance of the classifier and for NP

13Originally in Dasgupta (1997), antid´efinitude.
14The fact that lemon is a fruit notwithstanding.
movement, and that the NP movement facts are incompatible with an analysis relying uniquely on specificity. I then argue that anti-definiteness is not evidence against an analysis in which definiteness motivates NP movement. Finally, I propose that definiteness, formalized as [DEF], motivates NP movement to Spec,DP.

4.1 Definiteness and NP Movement

In section 3.2, I presented arguments that the classifier marks specificity. However, is specificity an appropriate motivation for NP movement? One thing is certain — we cannot have both the NP-movement and the appearance of the classifier triggered by specificity strictly. If specificity were the feature triggering NP movement as well as the feature triggering appearance of a classifier, then there should be no meaning difference between a moved NP and an in-situ NP appearing with a classifier. For any DP with a specific interpretation, a classifier would appear to signal specificity, and the NP would optionally move to the left of the classifier to redundantly check [SPECIFIC], or optionally remain in-situ. If the DP were non-specific, there would be neither a classifier nor motivation for NP movement. In other words, if the appearance of the classifier and NP movement share a motivation, moving the NP would only redundantly mark specificity, and there should be no change in interpretation. This is contrary to the observations presented thus far. Therefore, the two phenomena require distinct triggers. I propose definiteness, formalized as a [DEF] feature on D0, motivates NP movement. If this is correct, we can maintain the observation that NP movement signals the observed semantic effect.

Further evidence against an analysis in which specificity motivates NP movement is shown in (16). If specificity were indeed the relevant property motivating NP movement, and definiteness an irrelevant feature, we should find examples of the string NP-Num-Cl or NP-Cl with a specific indefinite reading. As shown below, however, such a configuration is actually infelicitous with an intended specific indefinite reading. That is, a moved NP must receive a definite interpretation, and specificity does not suffice as a trigger for NP movement.

(16) a. jokhon amar bacca-r boes tin chilo, tokhon amra ek bondhu-r / (#
when my child-GEN age three was then we one friend-GEN
bondhu=(n)-r barî-te chilam, ar se ama=ke bolechê je . . .
friend=Cl-GEN house-LOC were and he 1SG=ACC told that . . .
‘When my child was three years old, we were at a friend’s house, and he told me that . . .’

b. ami ek=ta kukur kinte cai
I one=Cl dog to.buy want
‘I want to buy a dog (any dog will do).’ or ‘I want to buy a dog (and I have one in mind).’

c. # ami kukur=(a kinte cai
I dog=Cl to.buy want
intended: ‘I want to buy a dog (any dog will do).’ or ‘I want to buy a dog (and I have one in mind).’

d. ami kukur=(a kinte cai
I dog=Cl to.buy want
‘I want to buy the dog.’

I do not at this time make any explicit claim about any additional referential effects contributed by the classifier. However, as Rajesh Bhatt (p.c.) suggested, if there is any additional referential

15The order of the genitive -r as following the clitic ta in (16a) is somewhat surprising and points to the need for further investigation into the interplay between case marking and classifiers in Bangla.

16However, for a particularly promising suggestion as to why classifiers appear, see Dasgupta (1985), in which Dasgupta offers an analysis in which classifiers are used to give a value to an otherwise unspecified aggregate feature on the noun.
effects that are contributed by the classifier alone and classifiers are required for counting, we would expect all quantified NPs to have the same referential status, which seems to be wrong.

I assume that if definiteness is indeed the motivation for NP movement, then [_DEF] must be checked at Spec,DP. This move seems plausible, since D⁰ is the generally accepted position for definiteness markers. If the NP moves to Spec,DP, there is no issue with resulting word orders since the NP still appears to the left of the numeral. This is shown in (17), with the assumption that Num⁰ and Cl⁰ form separate heads as argued later. However, this leaves us with a problem. As mentioned earlier, there is a link between the presence of a classifier and overt NP movement, exemplified in (18). How do we account for this apparent relation, if we divorce the two phenomena from each other? I address this in section 5.

(17) *lomba kham du=to

(18) a. du=to kham
two=Cl envelope
‘two envelopes’
b. kham du=to
envelope two=Cl
‘the two envelopes’
c. dui soptaho
two week
‘two weeks’
d. * soptaho dui
week two
intended: ‘the two weeks’

One further note. Definiteness is often associated with bare classifiers in classifier languages, per Cheng and Sybesma (2005), Simpson (2005), and Aikhenvald (2000). An analysis in which definiteness sensitive to the presence of a classifier motivates NP movement dovetails nicely with this observation. In other words, the model presented in this paper may generalize to other classifier languages. This is compatible with our secondary goal of proposing a model that would not require the learner to consider a larger class of grammars than is necessary.

4.2 Anti-Definiteness

Before we accept that the NP movement is a reflex of definiteness, we must address whether anti-definiteness à la Dasgupta (1997) is a fatal phenomenon. I do not believe that it is. I entertain two possible explanations that tease out the definiteness from these anti-definiteness constructions without losing Dasgupta’s intuitions. The relevant constructions are shown in (15), repeated in (19).
Gundel et al. (2001) note cases of definite DPs referring to classes, shown in (20). Here, no particular entity is being referred to. Instead, the speaker refers to entire classes — the class of religious tourists, the class of night life tourists, and so on. One could suggest that these apparently definite examples in (20) are parallel (pragmatically, if not also syntactically) to the forms in (19).

(20) Montreal has something to offer the religious tourist and the night life tourist, the art connoisseur, the sports fan, the intrepid walker, and the avid consumer.

If this is the case, then the syntactic configuration of the DP in (19) does not necessarily preclude an analysis in which NP movement serves to mark definiteness. In fact, since English marks these class references with the definite determiner the, the apparent structural definiteness in (19) and (20) may serve as indirect evidence in our favor.

5 N⁰-to-Cl⁰ Movement

I now turn my attention to classifier-less nouns. In Bhattacharya (1999b), the explanation for the ungrammaticality of forms like *sọptaho tin ‘week three’ “the three weeks” is straightforward — NP movement occurs only when a classifier is present, because the classifier licenses [SPECIFIC]. However, following the proposal outlined thus far, NPs do not move to Spec,QP or any position in the domain of the classifier. Thus, we cannot make a similar move. In this section, I posit that Bangla undergoes a N⁰-to-Cl⁰ movement for classifier-less nouns. This is triggered by the failure to merge a nominalizer element n above the root lexical item, triggering the root to move to Cl⁰ for interface purposes. I then derive the ungrammaticality of NP movement for classifier-less nouns from this approach.

First, I follow Simpson (2005) in claiming that if a classifier language contains a construction with no overt classifier, the apparent lack of a classifier is due to N⁰-to-Cl⁰ movement. One piece of evidence in favor of such a theory is that in some languages the same morpheme may appear in both the N⁰ and Cl⁰ positions. Simpson (2005) suggests that in these cases the lower trace or the lower copy of the N⁰ as well as the higher copy are pronounced. Examples of this are shown below: Thai in (21) and Burmese in (22). Presumably, hoong ‘room’ and cun ‘island’ appear in both the N⁰ and Cl⁰ positions, and hence are pronounced twice.

(21) hoong [N⁰ NumP laam hoong] room three room

(Thai)

(22) cun [N⁰ NumP ta cun] island one island

(Burmese)

Do we have evidence for this movement in Bangla? Note that in tin sọptaho ‘three week’ “three weeks”, N⁰-to-Cl⁰ movement would not change the word order, since the Cl⁰ and N⁰ positions are adjacent. The movement would be string-vacuous with these kinds of constructions. This is shown in (23).

---

17Simpson argues that these cases cannot arise due to a lack of a noun with the apparent noun undergoing a lexical operation that changes it into a Cl⁰. There would be no predicate nominal for the classifier to individuate if such a lexical rule existed. In other words, a structure with a Cl⁰ and no N⁰ has an unsaturated Cl⁰.
I propose that this movement operation does occur, however, and that it is specifically an instance of head movement, as shown above. As we will see shortly, intervening material, including adjectives, block this movement. If this were a phrasal movement, we might not expect intervening heads to block movement.

In (3c) and (7c), repeated in (24) and (25), the classifier-less noun *suptaho* ‘week’ occurs in the same position as the classifier in the nominal headed by the classifier-compatible noun *kham* ‘envelope’. A theory in which N\(^0\)-to-Cl\(^0\) movement occurs before the operations that derive the quantificational approximateness forms, in (3c) and (7c), predicts these forms. Thus, we have some language-internal evidence for this kind of movement.

The structures for (24) and (25) are shown in (26). Here, the head movement of Cl\(^0\) to Num\(^0\), then Num\(^0\) to D\(^0\) represents the head movement used to express quantificational approximateness. This is formulated more specifically later. For now, notice that the appropriate word orders are predicted.

What drives N\(^0\)-to-Cl\(^0\) movement? For nouns that do not denote spans of time, given in (6) and repeated in (27), I can at the moment only claim that it is a lexically specified feature. That is, some nouns may simply be marked in the lexicon as not combining with an overt classifier, but only a null classifier. Thus, we could claim that these nouns move to a phonetically null Cl\(^0\), which then projects as a CIP.

However, an account that relies solely on lexical specification does not capture all the data. Recall the referential distinction that Dasgupta (1983) describes for time-span denoting nouns. Essentially, a DP containing a noun of this category with no classifier refers only to the time span, whereas with a classifier the DP can refer to entities. This distinction is repeated in (28) from the original in (5).

---

\(^{18}\)However, we also might not expect head movement to be blocked by an adjective either, if we take adjectives to be adjuncts. The kind of claim that I make explains why the adjunct adjective also blocks this movement, by suggesting that an adjective is only licensed when an optional \(n\) merges, and that N\(^0\)-to-Cl\(^0\) movement only occurs when the nominalizer is not merged. Alternatively, we could also specify that the head-movement operation under discussion is actually one of Local Dislocation, a subspecies of a head-movement-like PF operation that is sensitive to adjuncts and heads alike (Embick and Noyer 2001).
(26) a. \( \text{go} \text{ta du}=\text{ek kham} \)

\[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{DP} \\
\text{D}^0 \\
\text{ek} \\
\text{du ek} \\
\text{go} \text{ta du}
\end{array}
\]

b. \( \text{soptaho tin}=\text{ek} \)

\[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{DP} \\
\text{D}^0 \\
\text{ek} \\
\text{tin ek} \\
\text{soptaho tin}
\end{array}
\]

(27) a. \( \text{du def-er moitri} \)

\('\text{friendship between two countries}'\)

b. \( \text{tin caka-r gari} \)

\('\text{three-wheeled vehicle}'\)

c. \( \text{car paf} \)

\('\text{four sides}'\)

d. \( \text{tin dik} \)

\('\text{three directions}'\)

e. \( \text{ora car bon tin bhai} \)

\('\text{They are four sisters and three brothers.'}\)

(28) a. i. \( \text{John amar sathe du din thaklo} \)

\('\text{John stayed two days with me.'}\)
iii. * sptaho tin
   week three
   intended: ’the three weeks’

Lexical roots are not inherently definite or indefinite. Only nouns and their projections can be used to refer to entities and have a definite or indefinite value. Thus, the nP — and no structure lower than the nP — must move to Spec,DP, since this is the lowest layer at which it is meaningful to describe a structure as definite or indefinite. Thus, the ungrammaticality of (30) is due to the fact that the NP cannot move to Spec,DP to check [Def], as there is no NP to check the feature by virtue of the fact that the root sptaho has adjoined to the null Cl₀.

Note that this puts two heads in a non-local relation. However, I do not think that there is anything that a priori rules out this kind of relation. That is, if we take the Bare Phrase Structure approach seriously, relations between phrases and individual lexical items are necessarily the same ilk. That is, if relating T₀ and D₀ (and thus DP) to check Case in English is an available option, subject to locality constraints, then the D₀-to-Cl₀ Agree operation that I propose here should also be theoretically viable. However, note that this means we need to state locality constraints on head movement on movement as such and not on possible head-to-head relations, or else we will lose the ability to have T₀ and a subject DP enter in the appropriate relationship in English. Additionally, we will need to say something about why particular operations are instantiated by head movement, and why other operations are instantiated by phrasal movement. At this point, I suggest that is

---

19 In Dasgupta’s paper, the translation was ‘There were two bad years — 1966 and 1976.

20 A more formal way of wording this is that D₀ must utilize the operation Agree to probe its c-command domain for n and check the feature [Def]. Upon checking [Def], D₀ checks the EPP feature [n] by moving nP to Spec,DP. In (30), there is no n to satisfy the [Def] feature.
purely by stipulation, and is encoded in the generalized [EPP] feature that cues movement — that is, just as some AGREE operations are instantiated by overt movement and idiosyncratically others are not, so is the distinction between phrasal and head movement.

There are a few ways around this constraint, all with some level of markedness. For one, some speakers allow a coerced reading in which the bare nominal can be construed as definite. Additionally, we have observed that nouns like din ‘day’ in fact can be used to refer to entities with a definite interpretation as long as they appear with a classifier. This is achieved by merging n with the lexical root, giving rise to a structure in which an overt classifier appears by bleeding the movement to a null Cl. Afterwards, [DEF] on D moves nP to Spec,DP as usual. This is shown in (32). This makes sense, since for a linguistic expression to be definite, the structure must be able to refer to something that can have definite status. Thus, an n is required to form a “real” noun. Alternatively, the grammar may merge a dummy demonstrative in D (or, plausibly, higher in the structure) to check [DEF], shown in (33), presumably as a last resort.21

(31)    fat    din
          seven day
     ‘(the) seven days’

(32) din fat=tìa
     day seven=Cl.
     ‘the seven days’

(33) ? sei    fat    din
     that seven day
     ‘those/the seven days’

The placement of adjectives corroborates this analysis. Let’s turn our attention to the data below.

(34)  a. tin    din
      three day
     ‘three days’

     b. i. * tin    din    [N P kharap \underline{\underline{\text{\tiny bad}}}]
        three day bad
        intended: ‘three bad days’

        ii. tin=tìe    kharap din
            three=Cl. bad day
            ‘three bad days’

     c. i. * din    tin=ek    [N P kharap \underline{\underline{\text{\tiny bad}}}]
        day three(=Ek) bad
        intended: ‘three bad days or so’

        ii. gota    tin=ek    kharap din
            Cl. three(=Ek) bad day
            ‘three bad days or so’

Consider what an analysis in which N0 alone moves out of NP would predict. The null Cl0 selects an NP, whose head N0 moves and adjoins to Cl0. If an adjective were to adjoin to NP, we would expect the adjective to be stranded. This does not occur, as shown above. No N0-to-Cl0 movement occurs when an adjective appears. This is easy to account for in the model at hand. By hypothesis, adjectives are adjuncts to structures headed by nouns. There must be a phrase headed by a noun for the adjective to adjoin to. Thus, forming a nP is a prerequisite for licensing an adjective. If

21 This latter strategy seemed marked for at least one informant, so it is shown with a ?.
there is an adjective, then there is a \( n \) to form structure to support the adjective. As stated earlier, movement to \( Cl^0 \) occurs to give the lexical root phonological support. However, the lexical root is already licensed by \( n \) in these structures. Because the grammar has no need to perform a movement to \( Cl^0 \), the root remains \textit{in-situ} as the complement of \( n \). This makes the prediction that adjectives with nouns like \textit{soptaho} require the appearance of a classifier, shown in (34b-ii).\(^{22}\)

6 \textbf{Num}^0 \textit{and Cl}^0 \textbf{as Separate Heads}

Next, I turn my attention to the headedness of the numeral and the classifier. Are they a complex head like the \( Q^0 \) proposed by Bhattacharya (1999b), or are they represented as separate heads? Before directly addressing the issue in Bangla, I examine evidence for separate heads cross-linguistically. Note that, as shown in Simpson (2005), the numeral and classifier do not necessarily appear adjacent to one another across languages. For example, in Mandarin Chinese, an adjective may appear between the numeral and the classifier, demonstrated in (35).

\begin{align*}
\text{(35) } & \text{\textit{yì xiǎo ben shū}} \\
& \text{\textit{one small Cl book}} \\
& \text{\textit{‘one small book’}} \quad \text{(T’ung and Pollard (1982); Mandarin Chinese)}
\end{align*}

Likewise, in Nung, the numeral and classifier may appear on opposite sides of the head noun, shown in (36).

\begin{align*}
\text{(36) } & \text{\textit{an āhn taking nuhng ma}} \\
& \text{\textit{take Cl chair one come}} \\
& \text{\textit{‘Bring a chair.’}} \quad \text{(Saul and Wilson (1980); Nung)}
\end{align*}

Additionally, as Simpson (2005) argues, the numeral and classifier serve different grammatical purposes. The numeral is used to convey the quantity of the noun, whereas the classifier serves to individuate the noun. In other words, the classifier serves a mechanical function in the grammar, and the numeral contributes to the truth conditions of the DP. Furthermore, if Dasgupta (1983) is correct in hypothesizing that classifiers define a value for an aggregate property, another grammatical function is associated with \( Cl^0 \), distinct from \( Num^0 \). Because of these differences, let’s assume that \( Num^0 \) and \( Cl^0 \) are separate heads, potentially with a (crucially) postsyntactic morphological merger that cliticizes the classifier onto the numeral.

Do these generalizations hold for Bangla? Bhattacharya (1999b) claims that \( Q^0 \) is a complex head by citing the constituency tests below, shown in (37). These tests establish that the numeral and classifier cannot be separated. However, the tests only prove that the numeral and classifier are subsumed under a syntactic constituent — they do not provide evidence for the phrasal level. In fact, the tests are even compatible with a model in which the numeral and classifier are separate heads. Suppose the NumP contains ClP and ClP contains nP. If this is the case, then \textit{tin} and \textit{=}\textit{t} \textit{e} still fall within NumP, and thus form a constituent. We still predict the constituency tests below.

\begin{align*}
\text{(37) a. } & \text{\textit{ei }[\textit{[tin=}\textit{t} \textit{e } [\textit{n} \textit{P } \textit{lal boi}]]]} \\
& \text{\textit{this three=Cl red book}} \\
\text{b. } & \text{\textit{ei }[\textit{[}\textit{n} \textit{P } \textit{lal boi} ] \textit{tin=}\textit{t} \textit{e}]} \\
& \text{\textit{this red book three=}\textit{Cl}} \\
\text{c. } & \text{\textit{?tin=}\textit{t} \textit{e } \textit{ei } [\textit{n} \textit{P } \textit{lal boi}]} \\
& \text{\textit{three=}\textit{Cl this red book}}
\end{align*}

\(^{22}\)These facts may be restricted to a few adjectives that merge low enough in the structure to modify the nominal root alone. For adjectives like \textit{gasto} ‘last’, as in \textit{gasto tin soptaho} ‘(the) last three weeks’ which appear on the left of the numeral, there is no interference.
d. *tin-ei=te \[NP \ lal \ boi\]
   three-this=Cl red book
   ‘these three red books’

In the next section, I offer an analysis for quantificationally approximate DPs. This account is compatible with an analysis in which the numeral and classifier form separate heads.  

7 Quantificationally Approximate Reading
In this section I revisit the quantificationaly approximate DPs from (3c) and (7c), repeated in (38) and (39) respectively.

(38) \[got\ a \ du=ek \ kham\]
   Cl two=(Ek) envelope
   ‘two envelopes or so’

(39) \[sptaho \ tin=ek\]
   week three(=Ek)
   ‘three weeks or so’

To account for these data, I propose that \(D_0\) may take a feature \([\text{Vague}]\) to express a quantificationally approximate (or “vague”) reading. Suppose that \([\text{Vague}]\) requires a \(\text{Cl}_0\) to adjoin to it in order to check the feature. I suggest that this occurs because \(\text{Cl}_0\) is responsible for appropriately dividing the space of referrable entities, à la Borer (2005). That is, I propose that the quantificationally approximate reading is a function of vagueness or approximateness over the individuation and division of the reference of the noun. Thus, \(D_0\) engages in an \textit{Agree} relation with the \(\text{Cl}_0\), and \(\text{Cl}_0\) continuously goes through a left-adjoining head-movement operation towards the probe \(D_0\), as formulated in Chomsky (2000).

This approach runs into an empirical difficulty with data like (40), in which we get left dislocation of the classifier, but no \(ek\). Instead, we get doubling of the numerals.

(40) a. \[got\ a \ du \ tin \ kham\]
   Cl two three envelope
   ‘two envelopes or so’

b. \[sptaho \ du \ tin\]
   week two three
   ‘two weeks or so’

However, if we assume a Late Insertion-type model, in which phonological shape of a morpheme only takes form after Spellout, we may still be safe. Suppose that the \([\text{Vague}]\) \(D_0\) has no phonological information stored in its lexical entry. Instead, it may either occur as the form \(ek\), or may parasitically gain its form in relation to the numeral that head-joins to it. Upon adjoining the Num\(^0\) head, \(D_0\) spells out as the next adjacent numeral. Thus, the pre-insertion form is given in (41), and the two phonological options are in (42). Of course, this then gives the grammar a non-deterministic flavor, which may not be desirable.

(41) \[\text{\textit{D}} \ got\ a \ tin \ [\text{Vague}] \ kham\]
   Cl three Vague envelope

\(^{23}\)In pursuing this approach, if we want to have the numeral-classifier complex form a morphological unit, we will need to rely on post-syntactic rules to cliticize the classifier onto the numeral (or the NP with no distinct numeral). Note that we will most likely need to utilize some post-syntactic tinkering with the functional morphemes under discussion either way, as later I suggest that elements that fall under \(D_0\) in quantificationally approximate constructions are not a morphological word. In other words, I am not requiring that morphological words map onto syntactic heads. This disassociation seems to be needed in some approaches to morphology, such as Embick and Noyer (2001).
Why is $D^0$ the position for checking [VAGUE]? Nothing too crucial relies on this part of the analysis. All that matters is that the probe for $Cl^0$ is higher than $Num^0$ in order to derive the correct word orders for the quantificationally approximate structures, and I continue to assume that it is $D^0$ in the discussion for concreteness. However, there are some tentative arguments that $D^0$ should indeed be this probe, and that we may be able to avoid having to posit an additional head solely to act as the target for $Cl^0$-movement.

First, we find $ek$ appearing with indefinites that are not quantificationally approximate.

It is likely no accident that this morpheme is (largely) homophonous with the numeral $aek/ek$, making the form in (43b) ambiguous between two interpretations: ‘one boy’ and ‘a boy’. For either interpretation, a classifier $=ti$ may appear after $ek$. Because of the two interpretations, I posit there are two morphemes $ek$: one being a numeral ‘one’, the other an indefinite determiner, with structures shown below.

For simplicity, I assume that $ek$ in (3c) and (7c), repeated in (45), merge in $D^0$. Presumably, it does not merge at $Num^0$, since there is already a numeral. This precludes an analysis in which $ek$ merges at $Num^0$ and moves to $D^0$, for these structures at least.

This is obviously a common phenomenon, and can be seen across many languages and language families. Whether all of these languages truly have an ambiguity between ‘one’ and ‘a’ structurally is not relevant here.
There is another strategy for expressing quantificational approximateness that seems to be disjoint from the one under discussion, although it does show some similarity to the structures originally shown in (40). This alternate strategy is shown in (46).

(46) tin car=ti kukur
three four=Cl dog
‘three or four dogs’

In this strategy, two adjacent integers appear together, with a classifier on the last numeral. In other words, for a numeral n, the expression n, n+1=Cl-NP can mean ‘n NPs or so’. One could argue that ek in (47) may be one of the two numerals used this way. In other words, this ek is ek ‘one’.

(47) jon car=ek sromik
Cl four(=Ek) laborer
‘four laborers or so’ (Dasgupta 1983)

However, this seems unlikely. First, ek in (7c) and (47) is a clitic, signalled by the equal sign in the gloss. Secondly, the difference between the two numerals is larger than one, contrary to the pattern in (46). Additionally, the classifier has distinct positions in (46) and (47). Thus, I maintain that ek in (47) remains a distinct morpheme from the numeral, by hypothesis, in D₀.²⁵

Thus, let’s assume that ek appears in D₀. Otherwise, if ek is interpreted as a numeral, then it merges in Num₀. It is possible that the ek in quantificational approximate structures is a separate, third morpheme in a distinct position. However, for parsimony and concreteness, I assume that in quantificationally approximate DPs it is located in D₀.²⁶

A curious fact that may be indirect support for the hypothesis that [Vague] merges at D₀ is that given below in the paradigm in (48). If we assume that [Vague] D₀ and [Def] D₀ are separate lexical items that must be in complementary distribution, we can explain the unacceptability of the form in (48b). In order to get NP movement, we need to have [Def] merging at D₀, precluding the D₀ that checks the [Vague]. The reverse case is also true if the quantificationally approximate D₀ merges.

(48) a. gota du=ek kham
   Cl two=Ek envelope
   ‘two envelopes or so’

b. * kham gota du=ek
   envelope Cl two=Ek
   intended: ‘the two envelopes or so’

²⁵Both Dasgupta (1983) and Bhattacharya (2001) note ek seems to be cliticized on quantifiers, shown in (1). An obvious exception is xo k ‘all’.

(1) a. xo k ‘a lot’
   b. xo k ‘a few’ (c.f. xo k ‘few’)
   c. xo k ‘a bit’
   d. xo k ‘a little’ (c.f. xo l ‘little’)
   e. xo k ‘each one’ (c.f. xo r ‘every’)
   f. xo k ‘a few’ (c.f. xo k ‘some, few’)

Bhattacharya (2001) calls this ek ‘Vague-one’. As I develop the model in this paper, I make no claim about this morpheme ek. Since I am not proposing a position for quantifiers in the DP apart from numerals, I have nothing to say about this morpheme. Though, it is not obvious to me that the -k needs to be analyzed as a morpheme at all. Etymology aside, it may just be that quantifiers generally end in -k — similar to question words in English beginning with wh- for the most part.

²⁶If ek merges as D₀, then we might expect other numerals to merge. This would predict forms like *ek tin=te chele ‘a three boys’, which does not occur. However, we can sidestep this issue by suggesting that the vague ek and the indefinite singular ek are two separate D₀’s.
If Num\(^0\) and Cl\(^0\) are separate heads, as I propose, there is an intervening NumP shell between DP and ClP. If this is the case, then Cl\(^0\) must adjoin to Num\(^0\), which then must adjoin to D\(^0\). The roundaboutness of this movement is due to the Head Movement Constraint (HMC), defined in (49). A more updated version of the HMC that also includes XP-level locality constraints is the notion of Relativized Minimality, defined in (50).

(49) **Head Movement Constraint:** Head movement may not skip intermediate heads (Travis 1984)

(50) **Relativized Minimality:** A movement operation cannot involve X and Y over a Z which is relevantly identical to Y in this configuration . . . X . . . Z . . . Y . . . if Z c-commands Y. (Rizzi 1990, 2001, Hornstein 2006)

Suppose that this cyclical head movement is left-adjoining.\(^{27}\) If this is the case, then the word order Cl-Num-Ek-N would arise, as in (48a). Let’s see how. First, Cl\(^0\) adjoins to Num\(^0\), then Num\(^0\) adjoins to D\(^0\). Additionally, if this movement were to occur after N\(^0\)-to-Cl\(^0\) movement, the null hypothesis, then the N\(^0\) would still arise in the Cl\(^0\) position, correctly producing the word order N-Num-Ek for “classifier-less” nouns in the quantificationally approximate construction. These derivations are schematicized in (26), with the derivation of *s\(\)optahoto tin=ek repeated below in (51).

(51) *s\(\)optahoto tin=ek

8 **Further Work**

One problem still remains with this analysis. I have assumed that *ek can merge in D\(^0\) with structures that contain numerals, since it appears in the quantificationally approximate constructions. However, taking this at face value is incompatible with (52).

(52) (*ek) car-te boi
    EK four=C\(l\) book
    ‘four books’

If *ek can merge freely at D\(^0\), then we would incorrectly predict it to be possible here as well. One could posit that *ek has a conflict in a semantic/syntactic number feature, since the corresponding *a four books in English is presumably ungrammatical for a similar reason. However, if that were so, then we would also predict *ek to be illicit in quantificationally approximate structures, since these also contain numerals, supposing [Vague] merges as D\(^0\). This brings us back to the non-trivial assumption that *ek ‘a’ and =ek in the quantificationally approximate constructions are the same syntactically. One method of dealing with this issue is to suppose that we have two *ek’s that can merge in D\(^0\) — the indefinite singular and the quantificationally approximate.

\(^{27}\)See Bobaljik and Brown (1997) for a discussion of head movement and the Extension Requirement.
There is another set of provocative data. In (53), we see that the morpheme $=ek$ can appear without triggering head-movement of the classifier. Instead, it seems to appear to the right of the numeral. One could suppose that this is the same operation driven by [VAGUE], except probing $\text{Num}^0$ instead of $\text{Cl}^0$, and triggering a more local head movement operation. Thus, the structure would look like (54). If this were the case, then it may not be so critical that $D^0$ probes $\text{Cl}^0$ per se, but requires some quantifying head. Sorting out whether there is a subtle semantic distinction between this form and the quantificational approximateness constructions that were the focus of this paper remains to be seen.

(53) $\overline{p\bar{a}c=ek=\bar{u}a}$

five=$\text{Ek}=$Cl (long) envelope

‘five envelopes or so’

(54) $[D^0 [p \overline{p\bar{a}c\ ek}] [\text{Num}^0 \text{go} \ [a \ [n^0 \ kham]]]]$

This might suggest that we need to factor out the two steps in the $\text{Cl}^0$-to-$D^0$ operation. There could be a separate $\text{Cl}^0$-to-$\text{Num}^0$ movement that occurs, followed by a a $\text{Num}^0$-to-$D^0$ operation. This would then give a potentially more modular answer to why here we are only seeing $\text{Num}^0$-to-$D^0$ movement. However, I am not aware of what kind of evidence could tease out these two analyses.28

There are still many distributional questions left to address, as well. For instance, it is still unclear whether both numerals and quantifiers can fall under the same head. This does not seem to be the case, given forms like that in (55). Thus, quantifiers must have a distinct structural position. How this position would figure into the analysis presented here is unclear.

(55) $\overline{kon\ fat=\bar{u}a\ boi}$

any seven=$\text{Cl}=$book

‘any seven books’

It remains to be seen how possessors and demonstratives figure into the structure. If NP moves to Spec,DP, then in what position do possessors appear? Demonstratives occurring in $D^0$ seem to form separate heads in the syntax. This is consistent with the evidence found in the quantificational approximateness configurations and in other classifier languages.

Ultimately, this presents a model in which both the Bangla data and other Southeast Asian languages can fit comfortably. This provides us with a stronger theory of Universal Grammar that does not require the learner to choose between Bangla-type and, say, Chinese-type classifier languages. Instead, the child is pre-equipped with the structural frame that can accommodate a variety of constructions cross-linguistically, with the features and their methods of instantiation varying. This ultimately should be the goal of comparative syntax — reducing superficially different phenomena across a variety of languages to an appropriately flexible base that does not force the child to choose between two options that would only give rise to minimal differences.
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