Thus it seems clear that Hindi bare NPs are definite, which in Heim's theory means that their index must already be present in the file.

The data so far provide evidence that the Hindi bare singular is analogous to the English definite NP. But there are two kinds of possible counterexamples. Bare NPs seem to be universally bound in the antecedent of conditionals, and they seem to be in variation with the indefinite in object position. In what follows we would like to show that these instances can be systematically linked to genericity. We claim that the Hindi bare singular NP has a second meaning which refers to 'kind'. This is illustrated in (4):

(4) admi: Orat-se takatwar he
    man woman-than strong is

"The man is stronger than the woman."
"Man is stronger than woman."

(4) has two readings, one is the definite referential reading, which presupposes the existence of a uniquely salient man and woman; the other is the generic, which relates men and women as a class rather than as specific individuals. It seems clear, then, that the bare NP is also generic. But what kind of a generic is it and what is its connection with definiteness?

A distinction that we think is relevant was made in recent work by Manfred Krifka. Building on the work of Heim and Carlson, Krifka distinguishes between indefinite generics (I-generics) and definite generics (D-generics). I-generics are the generic counterparts of indefinites, as illustrated in (5):

(5) (a) A dog barks (if it is hungry).
    (b) I like a good cup of coffee.

Krifka analyses these as unselectively bound variables. Prototypical D-generics are generic uses of the definite article, as illustrated in (6):

(6) (a) The dodo is extinct.
    (b) In Alaska Bill photographed the grizzly.

Krifka suggests that these are names of kinds. He proposes further, that English bare plurals have both an I-generic and a D-generic reading. While we do not know whether this is the right analysis, we will use Krifka's distinction as descriptive labels and note that the Hindi bare NP appears to behave like a D-generic.

Our first diagnostic shows the behavior of generics in the antecedent of a conditional. The English definite generic in (7) gets a universal reading only when the tense is generic.

(7) (a) If the child has a toy, (s)he is happy. (universal)
    (b) Yesterday, whenever the child had a toy, (s)he was happy.
    (not universal)

This contrasts with the way English bare plurals behave, as illustrated in (8). Here the sentences get a universal interpretation despite the tense.

(8) (a) If dogs are hungry they bark. (universal)
    (b) Yesterday, whenever dogs felt hungry, they barked.
    (universal)

The Hindi bare NP in (9) is like the English definite generic in that it can be universally bound only when the tense is generic; when the tense is episodic, it behaves like a referential definite.

(9) (a) agar bace-ke pas chilona hao, to wo khush rahta hai
    if child-with boy have, then he happy remains

    "If a child has a toy, he is happy" (universal)

    (b) kal ek-se do le-bich-me jabbhi: chor ghar-me ghusa;
    yesterday one two between whenever thief house-in entered
    pulis-me us-ko parkar liya:
    police him caught

    "Yesterday, between one and two, whenever the thief entered
    the house, the police caught him." (not universal)

The only possible reading of (9a) is an anomalous one where a particular thief entered a particular house several times and was caught by the police (presumably, each time the thief was caught, he was released). While we do not at present have an explanation for this phenomenon, it is clear that the universal reading of the bare NPs in (9a) does not require us to posit a definite feature specification. Rather, it calls for a closer examination of the relations between definite and indefinite generics.

A second property that the Hindi generic shares with the English definite generic has to do with the notion of natural kinds. Carlson notes that English bare plurals tolerate reference to any kind whatsoever while the generics are more restricted. Consider (10):

(10) (a) John photographed the grizzly.
    (b) John photographed fat ugly grizzlies.
    (c) 77 John photographed the fat ugly grizzly.

While the definite in (a) and the bare plural in (b) can receive kind readings, it is difficult to give such an interpretation to the definite generic in (c).

The generic use of the Hindi bare NP is similarly constrained, as we see in (11):

(11)
(11) (a) wo ḍak/Tar / ek dok/Tar se shahi: kar rahi: hE she doctor / a doctor with marriage is doing

uska: nam ravi: hE his name ravi is

"She is marrying a doctor. His name is Ravi."

This is explained under our assumption that only individual-level NPs (referential indefinites) introduce discourse referents; for a kind-level NP a semantic operation is required to produce an individual-level realization, which can then be represented on a file card and be accessible for anaphora. Thus to the extent that anaphora to a kind-denoting NP is at all possible, it is the result of accommodation and therefore less natural than anaphora to a referential indefinite.

In a sentence like (16), accommodation is complicated by the fact that the set of people reading has many members and we are likely to infer that there are many books. And anaphora is, indeed, impossible:

(16) *ravi: vani: Or shila: kita: b pRB rahe hE we acchi: hE Ravi, Vani and Shila are reading. They good are

"Ravi, Vani, and Shila are reading books. They are good."

The present analysis predicts the marginal status of (11a) and the ungrammaticality of (16), since we are claiming that anaphora to bare NP is possible only by resorting to some kind of accommodation that introduces discourse referents by an inferential process of some sort.

To sum up the Hindi facts, we can be sure that the Hindi bare NP is a referential definite as shown by (1) through (3). We have also shown, in (4) through (16), that it is a kind-denoting term that does not presuppose a discourse referent. In object position, it is possible to interpret it as an indefinite but facts about quantification and anaphora show that it does not introduce an individual-level discourse referent. We see no way in which a theory that assumes a bare NP to be ambiguous between and - definite could account for the array of facts presented above.

Now let us consider the Indonesian data. Indonesian also has bare singular NPs. The question we must ask is whether the bare NP is definite or indefinite. If we look at (17) and (18) we are inclined to call it indefinite:

(17) Saya melihat pokoh.
I see tree

"I see a tree."

(18) *Sekor anjing l masuk. Anjing l berbaring di bawah meja.
one-clf dog enter Dog lie down below table

"A dog came in. The dog lay down under a table."

In (17) the bare NP does not refer to any particular tree and in (18) it cannot be anaphorically related to a previously introduced discourse referent, i.e. it cannot bear a familiar index. Further, it also occurs in presentational contexts i.e. with the predicate ada in (19):

(19) Ada anjing di luar.
There is dog outside.

"There is a dog outside."

However, there are two problems with claiming that the bare NP is definite. The first concerns the fact that bare NPs are used to refer to unique entities—exactly the kind of thing for which English uses the definite article. So in (20) the interpretation of presiden is the President. This has to be a familiar referent:

(20) Presiden mau datang
President want come

"The President will come."

And in (21) matahari refers to the unique entity, the sun. Since it is a part of our perceptual world, it is represented at the topmost level of the file and is therefore familiar:

(21) Saya melihat matahari
I see sun

"I see the sun."

The second problem concerns the fact that bare NPs cannot occur with an indefinite reading in subject position. Thus (22) is ungrammatical:

(22) *Anjing masuk.
Dog enter

"A dog entered."

(23) is only acceptable when dog is preceded by a classifier, i.e. when the subject is clearly an indefinite. However, there is nothing in the theory of indefiniteness that predicts such a difference.

In light of these facts we cannot claim that the Indonesian bare NP is indefinite or ambiguous. The account that we propose here is that it is only generic, i.e. it names a kind just as the bare NP in Hindi does. This claim is substantiated by the fact that it occurs in generic sentences such as (23):
quantification since they do not introduce individual-level referents into the
discourse. Anaphora is sensitive to this. Further, the subject-object
asymmetry displayed by generic NPs is explained by recognizing that
predicates are sorted with respect to the level of argument they can take. On
the basis of the data we have looked at we suggest that bare singular NPs
are never ambiguous. The ambiguity perceived in their interpretation has to
do with genericity and the semantic operations involved in shifting from
kind-level to individual-level entities. The data we have analyzed here
strongly argue for the need to combine a Kamp-Hein style theory of
(In)definiteness with a Carlson-style theory of generics.

Notes

1 The observation that bare NPs have generic functions has been made
before, for example by Verma (1971) for Hindi and by Dardjowidjaja
(1983) for Indonesian.

2 Overt definites in Hindi are marked by the demonstrative wo "that".
Indefinites are preceded by the numeral ek "one". When unstressed it is
akin to "a", when stressed to "ore".

3 There is a possible "indefinite" reading of this sentence. In a situation
where the speaker knows that mail is brought by people of both sexes, (13)
could be used to assert that yesterday the mail was brought by a man (as
opposed to a woman). A more accurate translation would be "It was a man
who brought the mail". The sentence still presupposes the existence of a
discourse referent. We consider such readings to be related to the issue of
focus. An analysis of such focus related interpretations is beyond the scope
of this paper.

4 Our use of "individual-level" corresponds to Carlson's "object-level".
We do this to avoid confusion between the object-level term and the
syntactic object position.

5 The generic reading is more prominent, though the referential reading
is also available. Intonation helps in disambiguating the sentence. Pending
an analysis of focus, we treat he bare NP here as representing simple
ambiguity.

6 Overt definites in Indonesian are marked by the demonstrative itu
"that" or by the morpheme -nya. Overt indefinites are preceded by
classifiers.
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