

Multiple Determiners in Magahi: DP Structure and the Complex N

Chandan Kumar

Department of English and Cultural Studies, Christ University, India

Received May 26, 2021; Revised July 12, 2021; Accepted March 28, 2022

Cite This Paper in the following Citation Styles

(a): [1] Chandan Kumar , "Multiple Determiners in Magahi: DP Structure and the Complex N," *Linguistics and Literature Studies*, Vol. 10, No. 2, pp. 11 - 24, 2022. DOI: 10.13189/lls.2022.100201.

(b): Chandan Kumar (2022). *Multiple Determiners in Magahi: DP Structure and the Complex N*. *Linguistics and Literature Studies*, 10(2), 11 - 24. DOI: 10.13189/lls.2022.100201.

Copyright©2022 by authors, all rights reserved. Authors agree that this article remains permanently open access under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution License 4.0 International License

Abstract The paper, describing the fact that definiteness cannot be treated on par with the phi-features, suggests a pragmatic-oriented approach towards the phenomenon of multiple determiners in Magahi. It is a linguistic strategy to make the reference deictically (spatially and temporally) available in the context. The paper, providing the pragmatic justification for the phenomenon, argues in favour of a mixed structural account whereby the predicate raising, and split-DP are taken into account. The paper provides both structural and semantics justification for the predicate rising analysis, as the additional determiner on the adjective has the function of both relativizer and nominalizer. Following Julien [29] and Compos & Stavrou [14], FP projection is assumed to host the head /-ka/ which agrees with the lower N in nominal features like gender and number. To take account of the complexity of the initial derivation of N in Magahi, a classifier language, an *nP* in Julien's [29] spirit is adopted with modification. A DP is also projected to host the nominal tense feature and strong referentiality. The proposed analysis captures the existing possible conflation within the NP and introduces a new kind of discussion in the literature through the novel data.

Keywords Multiple Determiners, Specificity, Predicate Raising, Noun Phrase, Indo-Aryan, Magahi

multiple determiners. The explanation of such linguistic behaviour requires a proper syntactic and semantic investigation of the phenomena like (in)/definiteness, specificity, modification (nominal and verbal), movement, agreement, etc. The straightforwardness of the semantic notion of definiteness is challenged by the degree of definiteness of a definite determiner in a nominal phrase. The primary function of a definite determiner is to presume the semantics of presupposition, familiarity/identifiability and referentiality [41]. Theoretically, with this line of enquiry, a noun phrase (NP) requires one determiner per projection to satisfy the structural (as per DP requirement) and conceptual requirements. However, the literature is undetermined on the possible motivation for the occurrence of more than one determiner in the single NP [3]. The presence of more than one definite determiner in the single NP presents problems on the level of syntax, semantics and pragmatics. The phenomenon can be defined as the presence of more than one determiner or determiner like elements in the single NP. In most of the cases, it is found that the phenomenon is seen in the syntax of adjectival modification whereby both adjective and the noun are marked by the definite determiner [47, 5, 45, 33, 13, 29, 3 among other].

A.	həmmər	ləl-ka	kiṭəb-wa
	my	red-DD	book-DD
	My red book.		

1. Introduction

Literature has been indistinct in providing the watertight syntactic and semantic explanation for the phenomenon of

Literature deals with the issue in different ways considering structural and semantic correlations like the word order and the occurrence of the definite determiner, the interpretational import of the definite articles at

different places, the nature of the noun in the lexicon in terms of argument and predicate, the overall interpretational effect of the additional determiner, the syntactic and semantic orientation of the adjective, etc. It is difficult for any single explanation to map the structural variation and motivation for the phenomenon across languages [3].

As noticed in the literature there are a few structural correlations that can be skimmed to better understand the phenomenon. Alexiadou [3] mentions that languages with overt DP don't allow the phenomenon of multiple determiners, case in point is English. Classifier languages present many complex issues in the overall syntactic and semantic configuration of the nominal cartography to account for the phenomenon [29], e.g., non-rigidity of the semantic fixation of the bare classifier [15 and 52]. Semantically, there are prominently two issues, namely the interpretation of the additional determiner within the perspective of restrictive reading, vacuous status, multiple referentiality, etc., and the arrangement of nouns in the lexicon and the process of argumentation. Syntactically, these two issues are surfaced as NP/DP having two projections like DP1 and DP2 [28], and the presence of the predicative nature of phrases in the spirit of Kayne's [31], Bernstein [8], Compos & Stavrou [13] among others. Though these are two prominent syntactic accounts, there are also a few language-specific accounts (Alexiadou [3] for a cross-linguistic perspective, Julien [30] for Icelandic).

The syntactic treatment of the phenomenon also depends on the forms of the determiners occurring on the noun and the adjective, the interpretational difference/similarity between the two structures, the optionality of the phenomenon, etc. If the two determiners are homophonous or same determiner at both places, there can be two possible explanations: first, it can be a case of agreement whereby NP through the feature matching phenomenon show the tendency of concord; second, following Longobardi [40], the determiner could be vacuous or semantically empty. Another structural account proposed by Alexiadou & Wilder [5] following Kayne's [31] basic proposal of determiner complementation, can be employed. In another case, usually in languages where there are different forms of determiners, there is a possibility of interpretational difference. With this line of thinking, there can be a few syntactic possibilities: the determiner on the adjective provides the semantics of specificity and the determiner on the noun exudes the semantics of definiteness (anaphoric). Also, there is a clear distinction between the two, as Ihsane & Puskas [28] and Kumar (in press [36]) have suggested. In such a case, the case of the agreement will be ruled out. The interpretational difference, however, syntactically can be accommodated in two ways: following Ihsane & Puskas's [28] account of having more than one DP or following Julien [29] and Cinque [20, 21] idea of projecting adjective in the specifier position of a functional head which would be in harmony with the analyses suggested in Androutsopoulou [6] and Kariaeva

[30]. A middle or mixed approach is suggested in Campos & Stavrou [13] in that they assumed a functional predicative projection in the extended schema of DP in the spirit of Larson [38] and Eide & Afarli [22]. Bernstein [8] approach can also be useful, considering the status of the marked attributive adjective as the head of the projection. In literature, the position of the adjective as head or in the specifier position of some functional heads have been argued by Bernstein [8], Lamarche [37], Abney [2], Cinque [19], Zamparelli [55], among others.

To see the viability of any structural/theoretical account of any linguistic phenomenon one must provide enough structural and semantic motivation. In this paper, I have followed the basic understanding of universalist theorists regarding the base generated position of the marked attributive adjective, i.e., its predicative source. The idea has been syntactically realized in two ways; incorporating the AP in the DP as CP complement [31 and 5] and considering a functional projection that is not CP in the extended N [13 and 7]. Based on the proposal of Author (fc.) that phenomenon in Magahi is not a case of agreement in definiteness, I propose a mixed account of the syntactic explanation of the phenomenon whereby I argue that the interpretational difference must be accounted following Ihsane & Puskas [28], and the linearity of the derived attributive adjective must be accounted with sophisticated nominal cartography similar to what is proposed by Julien [29] with the help of Cinque [20, 21] and Compos & Stavrou [13]. To keep intact the value of the determiners at both places and also to account for complexities on the level of classifier languages, the proposed account provides a satisfactory result in accounting conflation within NP and deliberating the syntactic-semantic motivation for the phenomenon. The paper follows a mixed approach where the AP in the extended NP is not base generated but is the result of the leftward movement. In the spirit of Julien [29], *n*P is proposed. This is a phase that accounts for complexities internal to the noun, i.e., classifier and plurality. Following Cinque [20, 21], an FP is proposed below the NumeralP projection and above the *n*P. The FP is similar to the PredP in the spirit of Compos & Stavrou [13], and α P, in the spirit of Julien [29]. A DP is also proposed that hosts the strong referentiality and nominal tense that is required in the case of the nominalized verbal adjective [7].

Section 2 present the structural requirement of the phenomenon in Magahi. In most cases, the additional determiner doesn't occur in the absence of the determiner on the noun. The section deliberates on the structural constraint and possibilities. In section 3, an attempt is made to see the semantic contribution of determiners individually, and in the overall interpretation of the NP. An account of agreement in definiteness is denied following Author (fc.). A possible syntactic or structural motivation has been sought in section 4 which describes the semantic motivation of the occurrence and correlated structural existence like the mandatory occurrence of the prenominal perfective participials. Following Nagasaki [43], the

additional determiner performs two functions: relativization and nominalization. A proposal is suggested following Julien [29], Cinque [20, 21] and Compos & Stavrou [13] in section 5. The marked adjective in the prenominal position is not a base generated entity, and a projection in DP is needed to account for the predication that involves capturing the explication of aspect, mood and tense in the extended DP. The proposed analysis not only handles the complex conflation within NP/DP but also renders satisfactory semantic motivations for the phenomenon.

2. Multiple Determiners' Structural Requirement and Magahi

Magahi is one of the less worked languages of the modern Indo-Aryan language family. The basic constituent order of the language is SOV with relatively free ordering. Magahi is a classifier language, adhering to some of the typological characteristics of the classifier languages like non-concurrence of the numeral with the noun without the aid of a classifier, the presence of a bare classifier that has also been treated as the definite particle [53, 36]. The noun in the language accompanies the particle /-wa/ which has been defined and described differently in the literature. Kumar [34, 35, 36] treated the particle as a bare classifier in the similar line of Cheng & Sybesma [15] and described the multiple semantics that it exudes in the process of argumentation and categorization.

There is a basic sense of definiteness associated with the use of the bound morpheme /-wa/ in the language. The particle has been treated as a bare classifier that has the semantics of definiteness, disparagement and a few other properties like categorization and classification along with referentiality. For the task at hand, we shall stick with its definiteness properties. In (1), the particle establishes the identity of the object (table) in the cognition of the interlocutors, therefore, making it referential.

As we have mentioned earlier, in most languages, the phenomenon of multiple determiners is found in the syntax of modification. Yadav [54] described the semantics of the bound morpheme /-ka/ as a definite determiner in the case of Maithili, a sister language of Magahi. He claims that there are two types of adjectives in Maithili, definite (marked) and indefinite (unmarked). The definite adjective in Maithili surfaces as /Adj.+ka/. However, in Maithili, we don't have the regular (at least not mentioned in Yadav (1996)) system of multiple determiners as the noun lacks the overt definite marking. The structural requirement of the suffix /-ka/ is the presence of the definite determiner /-wa/. In a discourse, whenever a marked noun is modified by an attributive adjective, the adjective appears in the marked form- [Adj.- ka + N -wa].¹

Considering the various levels available in the literature for the phenomenon, we shall treat the phenomenon as multiple marking or definiteness spreading, going by the difference described in Alexiadou [3]. As far as the structural requirement is concerned, in the majority of cases, the determiner on the adjective is mandatory in the case of the definite-marked noun. In a few cases, however, we might notice the presence of a marked adjective without the marked noun which hints towards a null nominal licensing in the context of a definite determiner.

Structural possibilities and constraints are illustrated through the examples (3-6).

The syntactic requirement for the phenomenon cannot be rigidly fixed in the language. Sentence (4) is acceptable for many speakers. The post-nominal position for the marked adjective is not grammatical, as it is in the case of Greek. The marked adjective cannot stand alone in the nominal domain without a properly informed discourse such as a conversation; it can be taken as a pragmatic constraint.

Apart from a few structural and pragmatic restrictions, literature notices the irregularity in the occurrence of the adjective in the prenominal position due to the semantic nature of the adjective as well. Adjectives are also divided based on their base-generated positions like prenominal and postnominal, e.g., non-intersective adjectives like former, alleged, merely, etc., and different readings associated with different syntactic positions of the adjective [9]. The marked adjective in the prenominal position is considered an indirect modifier [32]. Notice that with such an account, one cannot stick with the idea that all adjectives in the prenominal position are base generated in the post-nominal position. Bernstein [8] notices that adjectives are syntactically ambiguous in a way that they may appear as adjuncts to the NP or as functional heads. The syntactic relationship between the adjective, noun and determiner has been attributed to the interpretational difference between the pre- and post-nominal adjectives.

3. The Interpretation of Multiple Determiners

The syntactic and the functional account of the phenomenon is based on the interpretational possibilities of the multiple determiners. Many scholars described the difference between the monadic and dyadic/polydefinite reading like Tsakli [51], Ihsane & Puskas [28], Giannakidou & Stavrou [23], Kolliakou [33], Campos & Stavrou [13], Chen [14], Heim [25], Alexiadou [3] among others. The account that single and double determiners bring the change in the resultant semantics of the proposition challenged the account where the phenomenon has been considered as a case of agreement. Borer [10], in the case of Hebrew, observes that NP-internal constructions should agree in definiteness, and thus the presence of an extra determiner is a case of agreement. This

1 Evidence for viewing the particle /-wa/ and /-ka/ as bound morphemes come from the fact that nothing can intervene between the markers and the heads, i.e., noun and adjective, respectively.

seems rather a uniform account with regard to the other semantic features like gender and number. In an NP, the adjective agrees in number and gender with the noun in Magahi, as is illustrated in case of (7-8).

(1)

sonu	tebuləwə-pə	kiṭṭab	rəkʰəl	həi	leṭe	əihe
Sonu	table.DEF-PP	book	keep.PST	be.PRS	bring.IMPF	come

Sonu, bring the book which is kept on the table.

(2)

papa-ke	kələki	kuṛṭəwə	dekʰləhī	he
father-PP	black.DD	shirt.DD	seen.PRF	be.2NH

Have you seen father's black shirt?

(3)

ləlka	juṭa	kekər	həi
red.DD	shoe	whose.NH	be.PRS.3

The red shoe belongs to whom?

(4)

?lal	juṭəwə	kekər
red	show.DD	whose

The red shows belong to whom?

(5)

soniya-ke	juṭwə	ləl (*ki)	həi
soni.CL-PP	shoe.DD	red (DD)	be.PRS.3

Soni's show is the red.

(6)

*soniya-ke	lələki	həi
Soni.CLA-PP	red.DD	be.PRS.3

Soni has the red.

(7a)

motəka	ləikwə	ke	ḡekʰə-le	he
fat-DD.M.S	boy.DD.M.S	PP	see.PST.3NH	be.PRS.3NH

Have you seen the fat boy?

(7b)

motəkən	ləikwən	ke	dekhʰə-le	he
fat-DD.PL	boy.DD.PL	PP	see.PST.3NH	be.PRS.3NH

(8)

motəki	ləikiya-ke	ḡekʰə-le	he
fat.DD.F.S	girl.DD.F.S-PP	see.PST.3NH	be.3NH

Have you seen the fat girl?

There are supposedly two problems in considering the straightforward case of agreement. First, can the definiteness feature be equated with semantic features like gender and number? And second, does agreement subsume the semantics of the markers on different categories and only expresses it on the noun? Alternatively, the same semantics might originate from two or more places; however, pragmatics only accounts for one or together accounts for a similar meaning. Nevertheless, +male and +male (on the adjective and the noun) will give +male, and no accentuation or different interpretation would be resultant in the case of gender agreement.

Further explanation of the second problem requires the answer of the first, i.e., can definiteness be treated strictly on par with the number and gender. Gender and number are semantic features that originate from characteristics of the noun, also termed as intrinsic semantic features of the noun. It would not be straightforward to consider definiteness as an intrinsic feature of the noun. Determiners or definiteness for that matter undermines two important procedures for successful communication: at the level of argumentation and the level of discourse.

The process of argumentation is both a theoretical and an empirical question. Theoretically, one school believes that when a noun participates in a discourse in the argument position, it must be associated with an overt/covert determiner or quantifier. This particular line of thinking came from the languages like English, Latin, etc., where the bare noun doesn't surface on the argument position [40]. There is an underlying reason for this assumption besides the structural manifestation which is rightly explained by Higginbotham [27]. He opines that a noun as part of its lexical entry keeps an open position that is responsible for the kind reading. The determiner is like a type shifter that converts a predicate ($\langle e, t \rangle$) into an argument ($\langle e \rangle$).

Chierchia [16] who worked on Chinese languages argues that the above information is modelled into the binary distinction based on the languages where bare nouns can or cannot appear in the argument position. Universalists propose that there is a universal DP projection such that in the case of the absence of an overt determiner, a language might have a null D projection. The possible proposal for this school of thought is [_{DP} [_D NP]].

(9)

e-go	bərəka	bæt	leṭe	əibə	ka	pəpa
one-CLA	big.DD	bat	bring.IMPF	come.2H	QN	father

Will you bring me a big bat?

(10)

bərəka	bætwa	leṭe	əibə	ka	pəpa	a:ɔʒ
big.DD	bat.DD	bring.IMPF	come.2H	QN	father	today

Will you bring the big bat today?

The multiple accounts of the presence/absence of the determiner on the noun at least confirm the fact that it is not an intrinsic property of the noun. The determiner it seems is an abstract category that cannot be treated as an intrinsic semantic feature of the noun. Also, when we have more than one definiteness determiner, will they work similarly to that of other intrinsic semantic features like gender, e.g., Def. + Def. = Def., or something else.

For the reasons that are discussed above, it doesn't seem plausible to assume definiteness in the same line of gender and number. However, this knowledge nowhere suggests that this cannot be accounted for under the idea of agreement. Following Halle & Marantz [24], the agreement is copying of feature; for this to work in the case of multiple determiners, both the determiners on both places must have a similar semantic feature so that the process of copying of feature takes place. However, as suggested in the above discussion, this might not be the possibility in many languages because of the nature of the definiteness/determiner. Many scholars have observed the difference in the semantic features of the determiners on adjectives in comparison to that of nouns. Tsakli [51] observes that double definiteness brings the prominence reading of the expression; Kolliakou [33], Heim [25], Ihsane & Puskas [28], Campos & Stavrou [13] are in the opinion that double definiteness brings the restrictive reading to the noun. At some point, these scholars among others noticed that a single determiner somewhere has novel reading in a discourse, or ambiguous between the novel and restrictive reading [25]. Kumar [36] argues that the semantic weakness of the definiteness on N is noticeable in the case of double definiteness. He claims that the phenomenon of multiple determiners though provides restrictive reading, presents two types of semantics; following Ihsane & Puskas [28], Kumar [36] claims that the determiners on the adjective and the noun exude the semantics of specificity and presupposition, respectively (notice that in the case of Magahi, the forms of the determiner are different).

One of the prerequisites of definiteness is that an object cannot be definite and indefinite in the same phrase or clause in the sense of anaphoric reference.

In the case of (9), the object is not identifiable, following Lyons (1999). In this particular case, the son is asking his father if he can buy him a big bat. The emphasis is on the physical attributes of the noun, and through the structure nowhere it is deducible that the object is previously identified by the interlocutors. However, if we examine the context of (10), both interlocutors must have seen the bat previously. Kumar [36] illustrated through various examples and concluded that the phenomenon cannot be accounted for through the agreement, fairly. The proposal that puts forwards the interpretational difference [36] takes a path where this is in synchronous with the idea that in the case of multiple determiners the referential index is one.

Ihsane & Puskas [28] proposed a split DP account to explain the idea of specificity and definiteness. DP₁ which is higher in the hierarchy is a projection that hosts specificity and DP₂ definiteness $[-_{DP_1} \text{dexis } [_{DP_2} \text{determiner}]]$. The idea of having more than one projection in the NP is common in the literature [11 and 26]. This proposal, however, doesn't account for a lot of factors of the phenomenon like what is the motivation for the occurrence of the specificity marker, the overall semantic effect of the NP, the status of /-kA/ as a homophonous or similar marker for the reduced relative clause or participial RC in the concerned languages; it also fails to explain the motivation for the presence of more than one determiner in the NP. However, one can argue the pragmatic motivation and establish it as a speech act marker to locate the object deictically.

The overall interpretational difference between the resultant reading is noticed by scholars like Campos & Stavrou [13], Alexiadou [3], Kolliakou [33] among others where they agreed on one fact that doubly marked nominal provides restrictive reading. Campos & Stavrou [13] claims monadic and polydefinite are semantically and syntactically behave differently, therefore, they need to be treated differently. Semantically, as per their analyses, the distinction between the monadic and polydefinite is organized around the presupposition and focus distinction. Notwithstanding, the notion of familiarity or the subset relation is not a sufficient condition for the NP to be interpreted specific, as noted by Abbott [1]. There are NPs that can be interpreted specific even if the referent is not identified, see example (9). This makes Magahi very different from the languages that have been worked upon in the literature.

In the next section, keeping account of the overall interpretation of the nominal structure and the possible motivation for the occurrence of the specificity marker on the adjective, a few possibilities are pitched, and one is taken into consideration for the language-specific explanation.

4. Structural Motivation and Theoretical Account

As far as the derivation of the adjective is concerned, reductionists like Chomsky [17], Cinque [20, 21], Alexiadou & Wilder [5] and most importantly Kayne [31] believe that the instances of the pre-nominal adjective are the result of the leftward movement, i.e., predicate-raising. This particular line of thinking tries to look for the motivation of the presence of the additional determiner in the NP on the adjective; in Kayne's word, this is the process of determiner complementation.

a $[_{DP} D [_{CP} AP_i [_{IP} DP t_i]]]$ – an instance of predicate raising (Kayne 1994)

It fails to accommodate the pragmatic motivation for the presence of the additional determiner. Non-reductionists or separatists [9, 47 and 48] believe that pre-nominal adjectives are base generated in the position. Bolinger [9] and Bouchard [12] talk about the interpretational difference between the prenominal and postnominal adjective.² The interpretational difference is also subject to structural reasons as suggested by Larson [38] and Compos & Stavrou [13].

In Alexiadou & Wilder's [5] account, the interpretational difference between the monadic and polydefinite is not visible. The difference between the two determiners immediately seeks two independent functional projections likely to be categorized on the focus/specificity and presupposition features distinction, following the language-specific observation heretofore. At the outset, Sproat & Shih [47] argues that there are two distinct layers in the DP; one introducing deixis and another determiner $[_{DP_1} \text{dexis } [_{DP_2} \text{determiner}]]$. Ihsane & Puskas [28] argues that specificity and definiteness should be regarded as two distinct phenomena and should be realized as two distinct functional projections.³ We can think of specificity or deictic hosted by DP₁ and definiteness by DP₂.

b $[_{DP_1} D [_{FP} AP [_{DP_2} NP]]]$ - Split-DP analysis

It either involves N-to-D raising or D-to-N lowering in Magahi. The raising can be motivated by the respective characteristics of the enclitic on the adjective and the noun. If the noun or the adjective lacks the suffixes, they will not move and remain in *situ*. The movement is to fulfil their basic semantics of specificity and definiteness. This description, however, overlooks some aspects of structural and semantic correlations, as discussed in the section.

The structural or syntactic motivation for the occurrence of the additional determiner has been discussed by Kayne [31], and subsequently taken and developed by Alexiadou

² It is proposed that the prenominal adjective seems to provide more of a permanent, enduring property of the object compared to the post nominal adjective which has fleeting existence or transient property [9]. Larson [38] suggests a structural account and argues that the difference arises because of the adjective modifying the determiner and the noun.

³ Karieva [30] while treating the phenomenon took split-DP framework and proposed DeicticP and a DP; an additional Focus projection is kept for the APs.

& Wilder [5] and Compos & Stavrou [13] among others in the case of Greek. They present the thesis that every instance of the adjective is the surface form of the relative clause. In Kayne's [31] language, APs modifying the nominal are the predicates heading a clausal complement of the head D of the DP. In this prospect, Kayne says that the relative clause is a CP complement of an external determiner, and the determiner is associated with the nominal by the movement of it up in the schema from the relative clause. Such an explanation could serve the explanatory purpose of the pragmatic account, that the adjective-determiner sequence foregrounds the information and determiner on the noun backgrounds the information. If this pragmatic explanation keeps merit, cognitively, we first access the background information and then only we can foreground it. It requires the determiner + noun sequence to 'ground' the object in the discourse [50], and then enable interlocutors to further use strategies to locate the object deictically, also known as foregrounding the information.

5. Additional Determiner and the RC

Kayne's [31] proposal requires some preliminary requirements on structural correlations that suggest the post-nominal origination of the marked attributive adjective. Interestingly, as is mentioned earlier, the particle /-ka/ is also a relative clause marked (participial relative clause), supporting the claim that indirect modification can be seen as RRC. Below are some examples of the sentential and reduced RC to comprehend the structural and semantic correlations.

Two kinds of observation follow from the below examples; first, a clause consisting of an adjective as a predicate when brought in the attributive position requires the determiner /-ka-, and second, in the perfective participial case, when an RC moves to the prenominal position, the predicate requires to be marked by the determiner /-ka-/ to appear in the nominal phrase (this could also be viewed as nominalizer). In both cases, the marker will inflect for gender and number.

(11)

u	jiṭ	geləi	[dʒo	əḡmiya	bəriyar	hələi]
DEM	win	go.PRF.3NH	REL	man.DD	trong	be.PRF.3NH

The man who was strong has won.

(12)

[bəriyərka	əḡmiya]	dʒiṭ	geləi
strong.D	man.DD	win	go.PRF.3NH

The stronger man won.

(13a)

u	boṭəl	həmmər	hələk	dʒe	tut	geləi
DEM	bottle	my	be.PRF	REL	break	be.PRF.3NH

That bottle was mine which got broken.

(13b)

tutlə-ka	boṭəlwa	həmmər	hələk
break.D.PRF	bottle-DD	mine	be.PRF.3NH

Broken bottle was mine.

(13c)

tutəlki	kətəriya
break.DD.F.S	bowl.DD.F.S

Broken bowl.

Participial reduced relative clauses are obligatorily prenominal in the language. The perfective participial, as in the case of (13), also indicates definiteness to some extent due to the completion of the act; so, when it moves, it probably lands in the specifier/head position of some functional projection that heads relatively some sort of deictic properties like spatial, temporal, etc. In the participial case, the additional determiner carries the semantics of specificity along with the perfective aspect.⁴ The verbal aspect of the marker further hints that the origination of the particle has to do with the predicative origination of the adjective. The particle /-kə-/ seems to have two functions, in the spirit of Nagasaki [43], it works as ‘nominalizer’ in the case of prenominal adjective and relativizer in the cases of the verbal adjective or participial RC. Further, Nagasaki’s observation seems valid in our case, like the non-occurrence of the nominal-attributive suffix /-kə-/ with the action verb, e.g.,

(14)

u	laika	je	əskul	ge-ləi
DEM	boy	REL.	school	go-PRF.3NH
S/he went to school.				

(15)

*əskul	geləlka	ləikwa
School	go.PRF	boy.DD

The two functions must be understood in light of the inclusion of the feature of tense in the DP. The marker /-kə-/ which has both the functions of nominalizer and relativizer, is a perfective participial marker, as explained in example (13) [35]. Now, there are a few questions like, in the spirit of Nagasaki (2016), what is the direction of the relationship between the two functions, does the perfective participial marker bring the tense and other verbal aspects in the extended N, and how does this be accommodated in the assumed projection?

As far as the question of direction is concerned, it seems the direction flows from the nominalizer to the relativizer. The ability to relativize via the marker /-kə-/ in the language is secondary, and it seems the relativization is for the sake of nominalizing the structure. Participial relatives seek less cognitive load when it comes to managing communication. The second question is more important because it will also decide the further required projection in the extended N. The syntax of participial RCs normally subsumed a VP-like structure embedded under the nominalizing node [46 and 7]. Participial relativizing strategies have been defined very different in comparison to the sentential or full-fledged RCs. Unlike full-fledged RCs or main verbs, participials lack independent temporal

reference. It is believed to be non-tensed, or either perfective or in accordance with that of the matrix, i.e., it is not internal in opposed to the full-fledged RCs.

Coming back to the phenomenon of dismantling nominal features (number and gender) of the marker /-kə-/ even in the case of a verbal adjective like (13c), seems to take us to assume that a more natural candidate for the participial is the category similar to D^0 than C^0 (also see the parallelism between Abney [2] and Szabolcsi [49]). Belikova [7] argues that participial RCs lacks CP projection, however, it doesn’t lack the complexities when it comes to the projection of the number of layers in the DP. Krause (2001) argues that the lack of the evidence of CP suggests a participial construction in languages, and to further take account of participial, we need some functional categories in the extended N. Siloni [46] strongly suggests that participials are DP, cross-linguistically, and are non-tensed. She argues that the possibility of the complement of D^0 is [-tense]. Now, the broader question is, does the DP and tense are in complementary distribution? Nordlinger & Sadler [44] in their empirical research observe that NPs in some languages do inflect for the traditional verbal aspects like tense, mood and aspect. In their work, it has been reported that in some languages the tense is encoded in the definite determiner, e.g., Chamicuro, Arabic and its varieties, and Somali [39]. As per the Lecarme [39] observation of Somali, [+/- past] or tense morphology affixes to definite determiner with other phi-features. The case of Magahi resembles that of Somali to a great extent. Earlier in the discussion, it is pointed out that how the function of the marker can be interpreted deictically.

Lecarme [39: 5-6] argues that [+past] nominal can be used deictically, referentially/specifically (the speaker has a specific individual or time interval in mind) or anaphorically. The reference to time or temporality is also correlated with the distinction between the weak (cardinal) and the strong (presupposition) noun phrase [42]. It is further said that cardinal or weak definite receives the temporally dependent reading in opposition to the strong definite. The marked adjective with an unmarked noun is usually the case of an attributive adjective like the one in (9); in those cases, the temporal aspect of the determiner is non-visible, and its deictic or specific semantic becomes more robust. Tense on the adjective depends on the presence of tense on the D, therefore, it only appears when the nominal is definite, i.e., both types of tense morphology must appear simultaneously. In the case of Magahi, we have hardly seen any example where the verbal adjective ‘*tutəl-ka*’ (broken) in the marked form is present in the unmarked nominal. In (9), as we can see there is no way to find the tense on the marker, moreover, it has an indefinite reference.

4 The occurrence of the determiner in the case of the perfective participial hints to the idea that it also carries the verbal aspect of the clause in the case of the movement of RC in the prenominal position.

(16)

tutləka	čəpələwa	pəhen-ke	kəha	dʒəiɕe	hə
break.DD	sleeper.DD	wear-PP	where	go.IMPF	be.PRS.2H

Wearing that broken sleeper, where are you going (lit.).

Now, if we decode the semantics of the nominal in (16), the speaker is nowhere intending to temporally locate the referent, but to denote the specific information that is pertinent for the discourse; it can be described as a subset of an intended set. It chooses the broken shoes out of the shoes already identified. It provides a restrictive reading. However, the specificity or deicticity is deriving its semantic from the completed or passed event, which now has become the characteristic property of the N, e.g., a. ‘*tutə-l-ka giləswa*’ (the broken glass), and b. ‘*giri-it tara*’ (falling star). In the case of perfective aspect like (a), there is an aspectual marker (-l-) which precedes the determiner /-ka-/ and is found in the prenominal positions with the verbal adjective. Now, the question that we seek to answer is what sort of syntactic representation will resolve the problems or take into account the aspects that have been described above.

When it comes to the syntactic representation of the information, I would take a more generic approach, following Lecarme [39] that nominal T-chains are grammatically costless. And the chain is independently created by N-to-d movement in the syntax either overtly or covertly. T-chains will include mood, aspect and other aspects considering both nominal and temporal aspects. It doesn’t necessarily require to have a separate functional projection.

Among a few available syntactic accounts, the effort is made to see the viability of the structural load that a particular account provides. The split-DP hypothesis though besets some problems when it comes to capturing the overall structural and semantic implication of the phenomenon, it allows to correspond with the interpretational difference between specific and definite. The main idea behind keeping the split-DP account (in the spirit that more than one definite-like functional projection can be hosted in the extended NP projection) is to keep definiteness apart from specificity. On the other hand, Kayne’s [31] idea of predicate raising makes sense in order to account for the predicative origin of the marked adjective or verbal adjective. However, in the spirit of Bernstein [8], Belikova [7], and Compos & Stavrou [13], the idea of projecting a functional predicative projection is more suitable for the data, also to account for both relativizer and nominalizer function of the determiner /-ka/. Considering the complexity of the given data, as the language in question is a classifier language, the /-wa/ marker cannot directly and explicitly be termed as a definite article in the strict sense of the terminology [35]. To keep the behaviour of /-wa/ to some extent ambiguous

(particularly with regard to its usage which is subject to speaker and context variation) and apply the basic proposal of the predicative origin of the adjective, we are following a mixed approach.

6. Towards the Mixed Approach

As far as the structure of the NP is concerned, from the functional point of view, we could partly adopt the analysis of Icelandic *nP* of the type proposed in Julien [29]. The proposed *nP* as a phase is a complex projection. For the case in hand, *nP* has been conceptualized with some modification that allows the linear order within the *nP* as Noun-Def.-Number (PL). NumberP projects higher to the DefP in order to satisfy the linear as well as conceptual linguistic processing. However, this projection would not go beyond the *nP* shell. The NP in the language must combine with definiteness and number as part of its derivation. The Number head will host [noun + definiteness] complex. For the projection of the moved adjective under the predicative raising phenomenon, in the spirit of Compos & Stavrou (2004), a functional predicative projection with a determiner head seems to be a plausible account. Leaving out the details of the movement (consult Compos & Stavrou [13]), a PredP is a projection that heads a definite determiner, and due to the enclitic nature of the determiner, adjective lands in the head position of the PredP, appearing with the determiner.

Julien [29] posits an *nP* that has the referential property and can host the definite determiner in the case of the unmarked adjective and the unavailability of the numeral in the NP. It also houses the nominal features and further disseminates the features to the preceding projections. We are not delving further into the specificity of the cartography of *nP* (readers are suggested to consult Julien [29]).

c $[_{nP} [_n \text{ NumP}_i \ n^o [\ t_i \ \text{NP}]]]$ (NumP indicates plurality for Julien)

To take account of the marked adjective in the nominal, we can follow Compos & Stavrou [13] by projecting a PredP, which must be preceded by an FP, an agreement type projection in the DP in the spirit of Alexiadou & Stavrou [4]. In such case, in the spirit of Cinque [21], to take into account the fact of the unmarked adjective, we need to project another FP immediately preceding the NP or to assume that unmarked or direct modifying adjectives generate in the spec, NP/*nP* position (also see the

justification for the same in Bernstein [8] on ambiguous characters of the adjective and its respective structural positions).

Alternatively, in the spirit of Cinque [20, 21] and Julien [29], we can make FP a projection that hosts both the capability of agreement and allow the predication of the adjective on the additional determiner. The merit of complicating the FP also comes from Cinque's idea that FP can be a projection that hosts both direct and indirect modification.⁵ FP that hosts indirect modification (RRC) precedes the FP which hosts direct modification.⁶ Present data (Magahi) don't allow both the modifications at the same time; thus, the derivation alternatively decides/chooses. Cinque [21] also posits an indefinite dP that can be merged below the moved RC that has weak referentiality (intersection of the set contributed by dP and RC). This has to do with the notion that a derivation can only forward the information when it is already backgrounded by some other linguistic material. The reduced RC or marked adjective generally modifies the noun which has some referential status. Since we are positing *nP* (Julien account), we are not positing dP of the Cinque [21] rather we are making FP, the one which hosts RC, more complicated by also giving it the property of dP (specificity, which is not anaphorically referential). The head of the FP would be the additional determiner, i.e., /-kə-/. The determiner in the language is a clitic element, thus the adjective will move to the Spec FP to support the determiner. And, by virtue of *nP* disseminating nominal features [29], APs get agreement like number and gender.

[FP AdjP [F Det. [*nP* *n*]]]

The FP can also behave like AgrP (in the spirit of Cinque 2005), and contains the specificity feature or deicticity, and hosts - anaphoric, +specificity determiner. The head gets its nominal feature from the lower node given that *nP* disseminates nominal features to the preceding projection. FP must also be an immediate projection as per the fact that nothing can intervene between the two projections.⁷

Cinque [21] proposes that adjectives enter in the nominal phrase either as adverbial modifiers or as a predicate of the reduced relative clause. It is important to remind that the adjective is not marked with the nominal features in its predicative position. It is only when it comes to function as an attributive adjective, it gets nominal features. The marker on the adjective /-kə-/ inflects for number and gender. This agreement is in harmony with the noun or *n* in

Julien's spirit. The specificity can also be due to the fronted or focused information in terms of bringing the post-nominal adjective to the prenominal position. This movement must be located in a projection that not only satisfies the linear ordering in the language but also explains the new inflectional features that it gets. Cognitively, front-focus or pre-posing a piece of information in a discourse requires deicticity (spatial and/or temporal), morphologically and/or syntactically that can be broadly understood as a grammatical encoding of pragmatic strategies. As discussed above, in the words of Lecarme [39], [+past] can be used deictically. The projection FP therefore must also be viewed as a structural or modelled realization of the pragmatic requirement.

It is important to assert that the specificity on FP is not due to the presence of the *n*, instead due to the F⁰ and the pragmatics. This account gives us a simple hierarchical projection whereby the adjective is in the FP, headed by the /-kə-/ that precedes the marked noun. the definiteness is limited to the *nP*. This analysis provides us with the correct linear ordering.

d [FP AdjP [_FF⁰ [_{nP} [_n NumP_i *n*] t_{iNP}]]]

(NumP projects Num and NP, i.e., [_{NumP} Num NP])

Magahi is a numeral classifier language whereby numeral precedes the adjective. The presence of the numeral blocks the occurrence of the determiner on the noun but not on the adjective (see example 9). As it seems from the data, the numeral interacts with the definiteness. For convenience, I have provided the NP constituent from the example (9) below.

e-go	bər-ka	bæt
one-CL	big-D.SM	bat.SM

The structure suggests that the *nP* must move higher in the hierarchy, maybe to a Spec of DP for the definiteness in the absence of the numeral; however, the marked adjective blocks this movement. The reason for not assuming a dedicated projection for the bound morpheme /-wa/ has also to do with the associated semantics of the classifier [35, 36]. There are also cases where an unmarked adjective precedes the marked noun (cases of direct modification). And, in that case, the unmarked adjective blocks the movement of the noun up in the schema. For example,

(17)

okər	lal	kiṭəbwa	kenne	rəkʰələhī
His/her	red	book.DD	where	keep.PST.2NH

Where have you kept his red book?

This also justifies the conceptualization of *nP* architect of Julien's in the case of the concerned language. In this case, we need to project a DP. The projection as per the structural requirement must be located below the adjective and above the QP (cardinal numeral projection) to account

⁵ The distinction between the direct and indirect modification is important for the sake of the considered explanation. Researchers locate the distinction between them as bare and marked for the adjective in the prenominal position [47]. The adjective occurring as direct modifiers are free from any structural restriction and only subject to the semantic ordering restriction. Sproat & Shih [47] argues that direct modifiers are simple APs, directly adjoined to the extended projection of N.

⁶ In the literature, the adjective has been both treated as a head and a phrasal projection. The marked adjective, however, has structural and semantic property of a phrase [29 and 19].

⁷ Agree relation can be considered to take place [18]. In the present case, we would assume that only a subset of the relevant features is spelled on adjectival phrase, particularly the feature of definiteness.

for the definiteness of N (17). Alternatively, we can think of the DP as the top node projection, and [AdjP + NP (*nP*)] sequence would move together as a constituent in the specifier of DP. There is a problem with the first possibility that it gives the wrong ordering like [Adj. + DP + Numeral], besides it has many theoretical challenges as well. On the other hand, no theory or proposal has argued that [AdjP + NP] cannot move together [29]. In the universalist spirit, a DP can host referential features along with the tense and aspect [7]. Following Longobardi [40] and subsequently Julien [29], we can assume that DP is a phonologically empty projection where the reference picked by the DP equals the set picked by the lower projection, FP.

In the absence of numeral, FP, which is the immediate-preceding projection of *nP*, moves to the Spec of DP. Julien [29], in the case of Icelandic languages, has argued that the FP moves to the Spec of DP. This movement is motivated to identify a definite-like projection. It is not the case that the referentiality is dependent on D (DP) in the concerned language, rather the referentiality of a definite DP depends on D being made visible.

e [DP FP_i [QP Ø [t_i.....]]] (In the absence of unmarked numeral)⁸

FP raising to the Spec of DP helps to realize the overt definiteness feature in the DP projection even if D itself is not spelt out. The immediate concern though is why do we need to move FP if DP is a projection looking for a referentially strong feature. Its plausible candidate must be *nP*. Notwithstanding, the claim that in definite NPs, the *n* spells out the moment it goes into the enumeration, promising a referential and anaphoric reference further problematizes the raising of either FP or *nP*. The movement of FP to the Spec DP is motivated by the fact that DP requires nominal features along with definiteness. So, the target of D is the complex *nP* and not the adjective projection (FP). In the concerned language, FP fails to provide either of the feature, i.e., nominal as well as definiteness. Therefore, it is argued that the movement of FP is an instance of pied piping [29]. This can also be substantiated by the fact that a marked adjective can follow the numeral in the case of the unmarked noun, case in point is (14). DP fails to attract the FP for the reasons discussed above.

(18)

du-go	bərəka	boṭəl
two-CL	big.DD	bottle

‘The two big bottles’

An independent reason can also be argued in the favour of FP raising to the Spec DP as pied piping. In the case of participial RC, the marked prenominal verbal-adjective

cannot concur with the numeral like (18) in the absence of definiteness of the noun. In the process of pied-piping, DP also provides the aspectual feature to the FP when requires like in (19). Therefore, it is a structural requirement to move the marked verbal-adjective in the Spec DP.

(19)

*du-go	tutə-l-ka	boṭəl
two-CL	break-PRF-DD	bottle

In the case of the overt numeral, the structure looks like

f [DP...[QP Q [FP AdjP F⁰ [*nP*.....]]]] (It explains interpretations like 14)

FP can be marked (/kə/) in the presence of the numeral; however, *nP* cannot be marked in the case of the unmarked overt numeral in the construction.

Structural and semantic justifications for the projection of both an *nP* and a DP must be located in our previous discussion of the weakening of the semantics of referentiality associated with the noun particle /-wa/ in the presence of the additional determiner on the adjective. On many occasions, also noticed by Lyons [41] and Chen [14], the definite determiner referentially locates the object for the speakers only, and the hearer fails to accommodate the identity of the object. For example, notice the example given below.

(20)

P.	kiṭəbwa	leṭe	əihe	lili	upər-se
	book.DD	bring.IMPF	come.2NH	lily	roof.PP

Q. kon wala?
Which one?

P. ləlka
red.Det.

(21)

ləlki	kiṭəbwa	leṭe	əihe	lili
Red.Def.	book.DD	bring.IMPF	come.2NH	lily

Bring the red book while coming.

To put the above examples in context, a person P is asking the person Q to bring a particular book that is kept in a room on the roof of the house. In (20), despite the use of the definite determiner /-wa/, the hearer Q is unable to exactly identify or locate the book in her cognition, and, therefore, demands more information. However, in the case of (21), no new or additional information is needed. From this perspective, the projection of a DP is an important requirement in a way that it hosts a strong referential feature that is satisfied by the pied-piping movement. Now, the *nP* because of its complex orientation sometimes fails to be identifiable for the hearer; however, DP as an operation establishes the fact that the object in the

⁸ The unmarked numeral is the occurrence of cardinal numeral without any kind of modifiers.

discourse is identifiable for both the speaker and the hearer.⁹

The benefit of following Julien [29] account is to leave the question of the markedness of nouns to the *nP*. Accordingly, in the cases of direct modification like (4), the noun gets an anaphoric reading in the *nP* only, and no movement takes place. There are two important questions arise at this moment; first, what stops *nP* to move to the DP and how in such cases DP is satisfied; second, if FP is not the target of DP, why cannot QP moves to the Spec of DP in the process of pied piping. Julien [29] argues that it seems the D cares for the visible morphology, preferably having the semantics of identifiability, deicticity, specificity, etc., and since numeral offers no such overt morphological marking as such, it leaves the numeral/QP and attracts the FP.

This argumentation (D looking for visible morphology) helps to explain two problems in the concerned language. First, the language offers the possibility of having a marked Adjective-N sequence preceding the overt unmarked numeral as in the case of (22). It is pertinent to notice that it is *nP* which is the actual candidate for the DP, and in the absence of an overt D on the noun, the movement doesn't take place, and we get the utterance like (18).

(22)

lələka kiṭəbwa, ʃin-go ɖe ɖihə
red.DD book.DD three-CLA give be.IMPF.2H
Give me the three red books.

Since the numeral doesn't provide the likely features for the DP that led it to the pied-piping process, it is not selected, hence (22). The second problem it solves is the definiteness in the partitive and the marked numeral preceding adjective-N sequence. Partitive numerals allow the marked adjective and noun to follow the numeral.

(23)

ʃuro bəriyərəkən ləikwən həməɾ ɖoʃtɕ həi
four.all strong.PL boy.DD.PL i.GEN friend be
All the four boys are my friends.

In the case of (23), the numeral is marked, and as we have assumed the D targets the overt morphology, and when numeral provides the overt morphology as in (23), it is ready to be processed in the pied piping.

g [DP QP_i [t_i...]]

⁹ Every time I refer to the *nP* as complex structure or orientation, I hint towards the status of the particle /-wa/ as a classifier which has other functions in addition to the definiteness (consult Kumar [35]). Plank [45] while discussing the issue of multiple determiners explained different structural and semantic reasons for the phenomenon in different languages; one of the reasons Plank mentioned is the lack of dedicated marker for definiteness in the language. At this stage of the paper, I would like to appeal to this reasoning as well.

The present approach solves structural confluences that exist within the nominal constituent. It explains the structural and semantic motivation for the presence of the additional determiner in the nominal.

The non-rigidity of the structural requirement can also be explained using this approach. In a few structural occurrences, we have noticed the presence of the marked adjective in the case of the unmarked noun; however, the unmarked adjective in the case of the marked noun is a rare occurrence. One prerequisite of this explanation is that all adjectives which can be marked with /-ka/ must be predicated. This seems true to the concerned language.¹⁰ Certain adjectives can be predicated but cannot appear in the marked nominal construct. There are few adjectives like 'sāṭ' (calm), 'b'hola' (innocent), 'ṭəiyar' (ready) which are infelicitous in the marked prenominal position (these words also seem to be borrowed from Hindi and fail to participate in the language-specific system). These can also be labelled as direct modification adjectives in the words of Sproat & Shih [47]. For this to account, following Cinque (2010), another FP can be projected immediately preceding the *nP*, which usually hosts direct modifiers. The idea that adjectives that cannot appear in the marked prenominal position should also be non-predicative to make sense of Kayne's [31] proposal is way too rigid and probably short-sighted to see the overall implication and motivation of the proposal. It is better to see predicative raising analysis as the explanation for those adjectives which are marked or indirect modifiers.

A comprehensive treatment of the encoding of NumberP and definiteness of /-wa/ in *nP* in Magahi awaits future research. Careful and dedicated research is needed to clearly understand the amalgamation of nominal and verbal features in the DP structure. The paper assumed certain argumentation without detailing the procedures, considering the time and scope of the paper.

7. Conclusions

The phenomenon of multiple determiners in the concerned languages is found in the syntax of modification whereby the prenominal adjective and the noun are marked with determiners. It has been observed that there is an interpretational difference between the two determiners, and an account of agreement cannot be justified. Despite the fact that adjective and the noun markers inflect for gender and number, it lacks a similar semantic value for definiteness. The distinction is focused around presupposition and deixis or specificity on noun and adjective, respectively. From the pragmatic and structural motivation for the phenomenon, a mixed approach is

¹⁰ Following Kolliakou [33] the denotation of the non-intersective adjectives fails to interact with noun denotation, e.g., a former president is not a president. Therefore, non-intersective adjectives are not in principle illicit in polydefinite construction.

suggested which justifies the structural correlations and the interpretational differences. By positing a lower phase, we account for the inherent semantic value in the derivation of N, i.e., the enclitic characteristics of plurality and definiteness, and the ambiguity in the definiteness of /-wa/. The overall functional aspect of the additional determiner is taken care of by the FP projection with the help of *nP* and DP. We kept the FP as a complex projection that hosts a bundle of features and is used as per the requirements. The proposed analysis explains a few structural constraints in the extended N. The FP and DP projection in the extended N account for the pragmatic requirement of the additional determiner. More specifically, it models the phenomenon of the weakening of the semantics of /-wa/ in the presence of the marker /-ka/, and the restrictive reading of multiple determiners, deictically. The marker on adjective in that way can broadly be termed as speech act marker. The paper further seeks a more articulated DP structure that can account for all the articulated and non-articled determiners' conflation configuration.

Appendixes

AP- Adjective phrase
 AgrP- Agreement phrase
 CLA- Classifier
 DEF- Definite
 DD- Definite determiner
 DefP- Definite phrase
 DP- Determiner phrase
 FP- Functional phrase
 F- Feminine
 H- Honorific
 IMPF- Imperfective
 M- Masculine
 N- Noun
 NP- Noun Phrase
 NP- Noun phrase
 NH- Non-honorificity
 PP- Post position
 PRS- Present
 PST- Past
 PRF- Perfective
 PRS- Present
 PL.- Plural
 QP- Quantifier phrase
 QN- Question
 RC- Relative clause
 REL – Relative pronoun
 RRC- Reduced relative clause
 S- Singular
 1, 2, 3 – first, second and third person

REFERENCES

- [1] Abbott, B. 1995. Some remarks on specificity. *Linguistic inquiry*, 26(2), pp.341-347.
- [2] Abney, S.P. 1987. *The English noun phrase in its sentential aspect* (Doctoral dissertation, Massachusetts Institute of Technology).
- [3] Alexiadou, A. 2014. *Multiple determiners and the structure of DPs* (Vol. 211). John Benjamins Publishing Company
- [4] Alexiadou, A. and Stavrou, M. 1998. On derived nominals in Greek. *AMSTERDAM STUDIES IN THE THEORY AND HISTORY OF LINGUISTIC SCIENCE SERIES 4*, pp.101-130.
- [5] Alexiadou, A. and Wilder, C. 1998. Adjectival modification and multiple determiners. *Possessors, Predicates and Movement in the DP*, pp.303-332.
- [6] Androutsopoulou, A. 1995. The licensing of adjectival modification. In *Proceedings of WCCFL* (Vol. 14, pp. 17-31). Stanford: CSLI.
- [7] Belikova, A. 2008. Syntactically challenged rather than reduced: Participial relatives revisited. In *Proceedings of the 2008 annual conference of the Canadian Linguistic Association* (pp. 1-15).
- [8] Bernstein, J.B. 1993. *Topics in the syntax of nominal structure across Romance* (Doctoral dissertation, City University of New York).
- [9] Bolinger, David. 1967. "Adjectives in English: Attribution and Predication". *Lingua* 18: 1-34.
- [10] Borer, H. 1999. Deconstructing the construct. In *Beyond principles and parameters* (pp. 43-89). Springer, Dordrecht.
- [11] Borer, H. 2005. *In name only* (Vol. 1). Oxford University Press on Demand
- [12] Bouchard, D. 2002. *Adjectives, number and interfaces: Why languages vary*. BRILL.
- [13] Campos, H. and Stavrou, M. 2004. Polydefinite constructions in Modern Greek and Aromanian. *Balkan syntax and semantics*, 67, p.137.
- [14] Chen, P. 2009. Aspects of referentiality. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 41(8), pp.1657-1674.
- [15] Cheng, Lisa and Rint Sybesma. 1999. Bare and not-so-bare nouns and the structure of NP. *Linguistic Inquiry* 30:509–542.
- [16] Chierchia, Gennaro. 1998. Reference to kinds across languages. *Natural Language Semantics* 6:339–405.
- [17] Chomsky, Noam. 1965. *Aspects of the theory of syntax*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press
- [18] Chomsky, N. and Collins, C. 2001. *Beyond explanatory adequacy* (Vol. 20, pp. 1-28). MITWPL.
- [19] Cinque, G. 1994. On the evidence for partial N-movement in the Romance DP. In *Paths towards universal grammar. Studies in honor of Richard S. Kayne*. Georgetown University Press.
- [20] Cinque, G. 2005. Deriving Greenberg's Universal 20 and its

- exceptions. *Linguistic inquiry*, 36(3), pp.315-332.
- [21] Cinque, G. 2010. Five notes on correlatives. *Working Papers in Linguistics*, 19, 2009, pp. 35-60
- [22] Eide, K.M. and Áfarli, T.A. 1999. The syntactic disguises of the predication operator. *Studia Linguistica*, 53(2), pp.155-181.
- [23] Giannakidou, A. and Stavrou, M. 1999. Nominalization and ellipsis in the Greek DP. *The Linguistic Review*, 16(4), pp.295-332.
- [24] Halle, M., Marantz, A., Hale, K. and Keyser, S.J. 1993. Distributed morphology and the pieces of inflection. 1993, pp.111-176.
- [25] Heim, Irene. 1982. The Semantics of Definite and Indefinite Noun Phrases. Ph.D. dissertation, University of Massachusetts, Amherst.
- [26] Heycock, Caroline, and Roberto Zamparelli. 2005. Friends and colleagues: Plurality, coordination, and the structure of DP. *Natural Language Semantics* 13:201–270
- [27] Higginbotham, J. 1985. On semantics. *Linguistic inquiry*, pp.547-593
- [28] Ihsane, T. and Puskás, G. 2001. Specific is not definite. *GG@ G*, 2, pp.39-54.
- [29] Julien, Marit. 2005. Nominal phrases from a Scandinavian perspective. John Benjamins.
- [30] Kariaeva, N. 2004. Agreement and locality. *Ms. Rutgers University*.
- [31] Kayne, Richard. 1994. *The Antisymmetry of Syntax*. Cambridge, Mass. MIT Press.
- [32] Kolliakou, D. 1999. Non-monotone anaphora and the syntax of definiteness. *Corblin, F. et al*, pp.121-143.
- [33] Kolliakou, D. 2004. Monadic definites and polydefinites: their form, meaning and use. *Journal of linguistics*, 40(2), pp.263-323
- [34] Kumar, C. 2020. 'Typology of Nominal Modifiers in major languages of Bihar: Magahi, Bhojpuri, Maithili, Angika and Bajjika' [Unpublished manuscript], PhD thesis. Jawaharlal Nehru University, India.
- [35] Kumar, C. 2020. NP/DP Parameter and Classifier Languages: A Case of Magahi. *The Journal of Indian and Asian Studies*, 1(01), p.2050005.
- [36] Kumar, C. 2022 (in press). Multiple determiners in Magahi: A case beyond agreement. *Indian Journal of Language and Linguistics*.
- [37] Lamarche, Jacques. 1991. Problems for N0 -Movement to NumP. *Probus* 3,2: 215-236
- [38] Larson, R. 2000. Temporal modification in nominals. *International Roundtable on the Syntax of Tense, University of Paris VII, France*, 3.
- [39] Lecarme, J. 1999. Nominal tense and tense theory. *Corblin F., Dobrovie-Sorin C., Marandin J.(eds), Empirical Issues in Formal Syntax and Semantics 2*.
- [40] Longobardi, Giuseppe. 1994. Reference and proper names: a theory of N-movement in syntax and logical form. *Linguistic Inquiry* 25:609–665.
- [41] Lyons, C. 1999. *Definiteness*. Cambridge University Press.
- [42] Musan, R.I. 1995. *On the temporal interpretation of noun phrases* (Doctoral dissertation, Massachusetts Institute of Technology).
- [43] Nagasaki, I. 2016. Relative Clauses and Nominalizations in Kolyma Yukaghir. *Studia Orientalia Electronica*, 117, pp.137-151.
- [44] Nordlinger, R., Sadler, L., Butt, M. and King, T.H. 2000 (July). Tense as a nominal category. In *Proceedings of LFG* (pp. 197-214).
- [45] Plank, F. ed. 2003. *Noun phrase structure in the languages of Europe* (Vol. 7). Walter de Gruyter.
- [46] Siloni, T. 1995. On participial relatives and complementizer D 0: A case study in Hebrew and French. *Natural Language & Linguistic Theory*, 13(3), pp.445-487.
- [47] Sproat, R. and Shih, C. 1988. Prenominal adjectival ordering in English and Mandarin. In *Proceedings of NELS* (Vol. 18, No. 2, pp. 465-489).
- [48] Sproat, R. and Shih, C. 1991. The cross-linguistic distribution of adjective ordering restrictions. In *Interdisciplinary approaches to language* (pp. 565-593). Springer, Dordrecht.
- [49] Szabolcsi, A. 1994. The noun phrase. *The syntactic structure of Hungarian*, pp.179-274.
- [50] Taylor, John R. 2002. *Cognitive Grammar*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- [51] Tsakali, V. 2008. Similarities in the interpretation of doubling constructions. In *Meeting of the Department of Linguistics of the University of Thessaloniki*.
- [52] Wu, Y. and Bodomo, A. 2009. Classifiers≠ determiners. *Linguistic Inquiry*, 40(3), pp.487-503.
- [53] Verma, S. 2003. Magahi. *The Indo-Aryan Languages*, pp.498-514.
- [54] Yadav, R. 1996. *A reference grammar of Maithili*. Walter de Gruyter.
- [55] Zamparelli, R. 1993. Pre-nominal modifiers, degree phrases and the structure of AP. *Working Papers in Linguistics*, 3.1, 1993, pp. 138-163.