

**Bottles of milk and cups of sugar:
A cross-linguistic perspective on measure constructions**

Éric Mathieu
emathieu@uottawa.ca

Gita Zareikar
g.zareikar@uottawa.ca

The present study aims to explain why measure words in some languages (English, French, Hebrew) necessarily take an *-s* (*two bottles of milk versus *two bottle of milk*) in other languages (Azeri, Persian, Ojibwe) measure words can surface in the singular (the equivalent of *two bottle of milk* is grammatical).

If we assume *-s* in English-type languages is responsible for division in measure constructions (Borer 2005), we face the following puzzle: What is responsible for division in Azeri-type languages in the absence of the plural? We argue that, for a number of reasons, it cannot be the numeral (*two*) and propose that division is performed, in the absence of a plural, by measure words themselves (as in Chierchia 1998, Stavrou 2003, Acquaviva 2008, among others). We argue that whether or not plural marking appears on the measure word depends on a higher projection that expresses the counting function (distinct from the classifying/measuring function, Rothstein 2010). Measure constructions thus provide evidence for the idea that, in addition to the dividing plural, we need a higher, counting plural, bolstering the hypothesis that the plural comes in many flavours (Acquaviva 2008, Harbour 2008, Wiltschko 2008, 2012, Butler 2012, Mathieu 2012, 2013, 2014). Thus the proposed structure for Azeri type languages will be as follow:

[#P two [DivP cup [NP sugar]]]

We argue that the Div⁰ head can be occupied by the dividing plural (English-type languages, sound plurals in Arabic) or Chinese-type classifiers – Borer’s (2005) proposal – but also by singulative markers, diminutive markers, broken plurals (Mathieu 2012) and, as we argue in this study, measure words. The plural marker that appears on English measure words was argued to be a higher plural, distinct from the dividing plural that is generated under Div⁰. The higher plural is generated under #⁰ in a counting projection.

In conclusion we argue that there exists, in addition to the dividing plural (Borer 2005), a counting plural whose function is not to divide, but as its name suggests, to count. The folk view that plurality is about counting thus appears to be on the right track and cannot be completely ignored, even if we grant a dividing function to the plural as is done in Borer (2005) and else-

where. Measure constructions are good illustrations of why we need a higher, counting, non-dividing plural, adding existing evidence to the claim that the plural is not one but many (Acquaviva 2008, Harbour 2008, 2012, Wiltschko 2008, 2012, Butler 2012, Mathieu 2012, 2013, 2014).

References

- Acquaviva, Paolo. 2006. Goidelic inherent plurals and the morphosemantics of number. *Lingua* 116: 1860-1887.
- Acquaviva, Paolo. 2008. *Lexical plurals: A morphosemantic approach*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Borer, Hagit. 2005. *In name only. Structuring Sense, Volume I*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Borer, Hagit, and Sarah Ouwayda. 2010. Men and their apples: Dividing plural and agreement plural: Paper presented at GLOW in Asia VIII, Beijing Language and Culture University.
- Butler, Lindsay Kay. 2012. Crosslinguistic and experimental evidence for non-number plurals. *Linguistic Variation* 12: 27-56.
- Chierchia, Gennaro. 1998. Plurality of mass nouns and the notion of 'semantic parameter'. In Susan Rothstein (ed.), *Events and grammar*, 53-103. Dordrecht: Kluwer.
- Corbett, Greville. 2000. *Number*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Greenberg, Joseph H. 1972. Numeral classifiers and substantival number: Problems in the genesis of a linguistic type. *Working Papers on Language Universals* 9: 2-39.
- Harbour, Daniel. 2008. Mass, non-singularity, and augmentation. *MIT Working Papers in Linguistics* 49: 239-266.

- Mathieu, Eric. 2012. Flavors of division. *Linguistic Inquiry* 43: 650-679.
- Mathieu, Eric. 2013. On the plural of the singulative. *McGill Working Papers in Linguistics*.
Guest edited by Ivona Kucerova. Accessed August 1, 2014.
<http://people.linguistics.mcgill.ca/~mcgwpl/McGWPL/2013v23n01/Mathieu2013.pdf>
- Mathieu, Eric. 2014. Many a plural. In Ana Aguilar-Guevara, Bert Le Bruyn, and Joost Zwarts (eds), *Weak referentiality*, 157-181. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Ott, Dennis. 2011. Diminutive-formation in German: Spelling out the classifier analysis. *Journal of Comparative Germanic Linguistics* 14: 1-46.
- Rothstein, Susan. 2010. The semantics of count nouns. In Logic, language, and meaning, Maria Aloni, Harald Bastiaanse, Tikitou de Jager, and Katrin Schulz (eds.), 395-404. Berlin: Springer.
- Stavrou, Melita. 2003. Semi-lexical nouns, classifiers and the interpretation(s) of the pseudo-partitive construction. In Martine Coene and Yves D'Hulst (eds.), *From NP to DP, Volume 1*, 329-354. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Wiltschko, Martina. 2008. The syntax of non-inflectional plural marking. *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory* 26: 639-694.
- Wiltschko, Martina, 2012. Decomposing the mass/count distinction. Evidence from languages that lack it. In Diane Massam (ed.), *Count and mass across languages*, 120-146. Oxford: Oxford University Press