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

References


