1. Introduction

A. Introducing the Classifier-Modifier Construction

- Certain Thai nouns cannot be modified by adjectives like big, which must modify instances of a kind, in the absence of a classifier

  \[(1) \quad N\text{-}(\text{Clf})\text{-}\text{Adj} \]

  a. *khaw \text{ kin} \text{ som} \text{ yay} \\
     3 \text{ eat} \text{ orange} \text{ big} \\
  b. \text{ khaw} \text{ kin} \text{ som} \text{ luuk-} \text{ yay.} \\
     3 \text{ eat} \text{ orange} \text{ clf-} \text{ big} \\
     'He ate big oranges.'
  c. *\text{ khaw} \text{ kin} \text{ som} \text{ luuk} \\
     3 \text{ eat} \text{ orange} \text{ clf}

- But with other nouns, the classifier is optional

  \[(2) \quad N\text{-}(\text{Clf})\text{-}\text{Adj} \]

  a. \text{ khaw} \text{ suu} \text{ baan} \text{ yay.} \\
     \text{ he} \text{ buy} \text{ house} \text{ big} \\
     'He bought a big house.' \quad \text{(a mansion, the big kind of house)}
  b. \text{ khaw} \text{ suu} \text{ baan} \text{ laŋ-} \text{ yay.} \\
     \text{ he} \text{ buy} \text{ house} \text{ clf-} \text{ big} \\
     'He bought a big house' \quad \text{(a house which is big for a house)}

- (1b) and (2b) exhibit what I call the "classifier-modifier" construction

- Goal of the paper: explain why the contrast in classifier optionality exists

  - Are (1) and (2) structurally distinct?
  - Are (2a) and (2b) structurally distinct?
  - What does this tell us about the grammar of classifiers in general?

---

1 Special thanks to Maria Polinsky for comments and advice, and Phii Denv and other Thai staff at Le’s Vietnamese Restaurant for graciously pondering the grammaticality of many of the sentences in the handout.
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2. Background on Classifiers & Thai

- Thai is an isolating language with no inflectional and little derivational morphology.
- Head initial, SVO word order
- No tense, wh-in-situ, sentence final question & aspect particles, etc.
- Generalized numeral classifiers (3), bare nouns used as arguments

(3) The classic classifier paradigm

a. mii dek nai paa.
   exist child in forest
   ‘There are children in the forest.’

b. mii dek sɔɔŋ *(khon) nai paa.
   exist child two clf in forest
   ‘There are two children in the forest.’

c. *mii sɔɔŋ dek nai paa
   exist two child in forest

- Additionally, a number of quantifiers must occur with classifiers:

d. mii dek laay *(khon) nai paa.
   exist child several clf in forest
   ‘There are two children in the forest.’

e. dek thuk *(khon) yuu nai paa.
   child several clf cop:loc in forest
   ‘Every child is in the forest.’

f. dek baŋ *(khon) yuu nai paa.
   child several clf cop:loc in forest
   ‘Some of the children are in the forest.’
• These facts alone are usually cited to show that classifiers are required to “individuate” the noun for quantification (for a formal implementation, see Krifka 1995).

• The data below demonstrate that in certain instances classifiers denote singularity:

(4) The ‘Singularity Effect’ in Thai
   a. dek nii
      child this
      ‘This child.’
      ‘These children’
   b. dek khon- nii
      ‘This child.’
      *‘These children’

3. Restrictions on the Classifier-Modifier Construction

A. Semantic interpretation of Classifier-Modifier Constructions
   • Reminder: Some nouns require classifiers when modified by some adjectives (e.g. big), (1)
   • When the classifier is optional, the semantic difference can be tricky to pin down (Kookiattikoon 2001):

(5) N-(Clf)-Adj
   a. khaw sʉʉ baan yay.
      he buy house big
      ‘He bought a big house.’  (a mansion, the big kind of house)
   b. khaw sʉʉ baan laŋ- yay.
      he buy house clf- big
      ‘He bought a big house’  (a house which is big for a house)

(6) a. khaw mai kin sat- yay.
      3 neg eat animal big
      ‘They don’t eat big animals.’
      (= They don’t eat cows, elephants, giraffes, horses, whales)
   b. khaw mai kin sat tua- yay.
      3 neg eat animal clf big
      ‘They don’t eat big animals.’
      (= They don’t eat big squirrels, big chickens, big shrimp, big frogs)

• Generalization: Classifier-Modifiers modify tokens, not types.
A’. Semantic selection of Classifier-Modifier Constructions

- The adjective sometimes will also select for a specific classifier for clear semantic reasons:

(7) Classifier selection

a. nakrian saam khon
   student three clf:person
   ‘Three students.’

b. nakrian tua yay
   student body big
   ‘The big student.’

c. *nakrian khon yay

- There is no reason to think that tua is a ‘mass’ or ‘measure’ word and not a classifier: it functions as the generalized animal classifier (12e, f) and the classifier for pants, shirts, tables, and chairs (the folk explanation is that they all have arms and legs).

B. Constrastive use of Classifier-Modifier Constructions

- Within a discourse, classifier-modifier constructions are used contrastively:

(8) Contrastive Use of Clf + Adj

a. chaw.naa khʉʉy pop kap faraŋ khon nai mai?
   farmer prf meet with westerner clf NPI Q
   ‘Has the farmer ever met any WESTERNERS?’

b. khaw khʉʉy pop kap faraŋ khon ruay laay khon...
   3 prf meet with westerner clf rich several clf
   ‘He’s met several RICH westerners before…’

c. tɛɛ khaw mai khʉʉy pop faraŋ khon con.
   but 3 neg prf meet westerner clf poor
   ‘but he’s never met a POOR one.’

d. tɛɛ khaw mai chɔɔp faraŋ suan maak
   3 like westerner part much
   ‘He likes most westerners…’

d. tɛɛ khaw mai chɔɔp faraŋ khon ruay khon ŋok.
   but he neg like westerner clf rich clf mean
   ‘But he doesn’t like RICH, STINGY ones.’

- Generalization: The discourse referent Y of a classifier-modifier construction is anaphoric to an antecedent discourse referent X such that Y ⊂ X (Kolliakou 2004, see §5).
C. Iterativity of Classifier-Modifier Constructions

- A classifier-modifier construction can iterate and occur in DPs with other classifiers:

\[(9)\]

a. \(N + (\text{Clf} + \text{Adj}) + (\text{Clf} + \text{Adj})\)

\[\text{maa tua sii.dam tua yay}\]
\[\text{dog clf black clf big}\]

‘The big, black dog.’

b. \(N + (\text{Clf} + \text{Adj}) + \text{Num} + \text{Clf}\)

\[\text{maa tua yay ɔɔŋ tua}\]
\[\text{dog clf big two clf}\]

‘Two big dogs.’

c. \(N + (\text{Clf} + \text{Adj}) + \text{Clf} + \text{Dem}\)

\[\text{maa tua yay tua nii}\]
\[\text{dog clf big clf this}\]

‘This big dog.’

D. Obligatoriness of Classifier-Modifier Constructions with certain nouns

- Certain adjectives can only directly modify a select set of nouns (Kookiattikoon 2001):

\[(10)\]

\(\ast N + \text{Adj}\)

a. **น่าสนใจ yay e. โรด-มอเตอร์ไซค์ yay

\[\text{book big}\]
\[\text{motorcycle big}\]

b. *? nakrian yay f. **ก่อน yay

\[\text{student big}\]
\[\text{person big}\]

c. *? som yay g. **กับยู yay

\[\text{orange big}\]
\[\text{radio big}\]

d. *? kluay yay h. **ส้ม yay

\[\text{banana big}\]
\[\text{notebook big}\]

- Here, a classifier must intervene between the noun and the adjective:

\[(11)\]

\(N + \text{Clf} + \text{Adj}\)

a. น่าสนใจ lem- yay e. โรด-มอเตอร์ไซค์ khan- yay

\[\text{book clf- big}\]
\[\text{motorcycle clf- big}\]
Another set of nouns can be directly modified by an adjective, unlike those in (10):

(12) \(N + \text{Adj}\)

\begin{align*}
\text{a.} & \quad \text{baan} \quad \text{yay} & \quad \text{d.} & \quad \text{rot} \quad \text{yay} \\
& \quad \text{house} \quad \text{big} & \quad & \quad \text{car} \quad \text{big} \\
\text{b.} & \quad \text{to} \quad \text{ʔ} \quad \text{yay} & \quad \text{e.} & \quad \text{sat} \quad \text{yay} \\
& \quad \text{table} \quad \text{big} & \quad & \quad \text{animal} \quad \text{big} \\
\text{c.} & \quad \text{can} \quad \text{yay} & \quad \text{f.} & \quad \text{plaa} \quad \text{yay} \\
& \quad \text{plate} \quad \text{big} & \quad & \quad \text{fish} \quad \text{big}
\end{align*}

They can also have an intervening classifier:

(13) \(N + \text{Clf} + \text{Adj}\)

\begin{align*}
\text{a.} & \quad \text{baan} \quad \text{lang} \quad \text{yay} & \quad \text{d.} & \quad \text{rot} \quad \text{khan} \quad \text{yay} \\
& \quad \text{house} \quad \text{clf} \quad \text{big} & \quad & \quad \text{car} \quad \text{clf} \quad \text{big} \\
\text{b.} & \quad \text{to} \quad \text{ʔ} \quad \text{tua} \quad \text{yay} & \quad \text{e.} & \quad \text{sat} \quad \text{tua} \quad \text{yay} \\
& \quad \text{table} \quad \text{clf} \quad \text{big} & \quad & \quad \text{animal} \quad \text{clf} \quad \text{big} \\
\text{c.} & \quad \text{can} \quad \text{bai} \quad \text{yay} & \quad \text{f.} & \quad \text{plaa} \quad \text{tua} \quad \text{yay} \\
& \quad \text{plate} \quad \text{clf} \quad \text{big} & \quad & \quad \text{fish} \quad \text{clf} \quad \text{big}
\end{align*}
• The forms in (12) are often be lexicalized into a true compound, indicating a likely tight syntactic and semantic relationship between the two:

(14) **Lexicalization of N + big**
   a. baan-yay
      house-big
      ‘The main house’
   b. khruu-yay
      teacher-big
      ‘a headmaster, principal’
   c. ruaŋ-yay
      story-big
      ‘A bad incident, a fiasco’

4. Analysis: Classifier-Modifier as a reduced relative clause

Quick Background

• Thai adjectives are stative predicates, which are common in isolating languages. That is, they require no copula:

(15) peter baa crazy
    ‘Peter’s crazy.’

A. The Proposal

**Hypothesis:** The classifier + modifier construction is a reduced relative clause

**Predictions:**
   i) classifiers must occur with relative clauses (CPs)
   ii) classifier + modifier exhibits tense, aspect, & adverbial modification
   iii) the construction is licit only with predicative modifiers
(16)  a. **Proposed Structure for N + Adj**

```
NP
   NP AP
   |   |
 N' A'
|   |
 N A
sat yay
animal big
‘The big animal/Big animals’
```

b. **Proposed Structure for N + Clf + Adj**

```
ClfP
   NP Clf'
   |   |
 N' Clf CP
|   |
 N
sat tua ___ yay
animal clf EC big
‘The BIG animal’
```

- **Assumptions**
  - no movement
  - Following Cheirchia (1998) bare NPs in Thai can appear with no higher structure (15a)
  - NP merges to the spec of the highest XP in a DP if there are classifiers (15b-d)

**B. Arguments for the proposal**

i) the construction occurs with relative clauses

ii) the construction must be able to exhibit tense and aspect

iii) the construction is restricted to predicative adjectives (Bollinger 1967)
i) the construction occurs with relative clauses
(17)  N + Clf + RC
   a. nakrian (khon) thii tenlam leew ai maak
      student clf- rel dance already shy very
      ‘The student(s) who has danced already is very shy.’
   b. nakrian (khon) thii kamlaŋ ca tenlam ai maak
      student clf- that progressive asp dance shy very
      ‘The student(s) who is just about to dance is very shy.’

   • As expected, we can put an overt relative clause head (thii) in with an adjective:
(18)  Adjectival RC
   baan (laŋ-) thii yay suay-ŋam
   house clf- rel big beautiful
   ‘The house that is big is beautiful.’

ii) the construction should be able to exhibit tense and aspect
   • Tense and aspect are expressed primarily adverbially in Thai
(19)  Tense & Clf + Mod
   dek khon huu múə.wan.nii son maak
   child clf- hungry yesterday naughty very
   ‘The kid who was hungry yesterday is very naughty.’
(20)  Aspect & Clf + Mod
   dek khon im leew son maak
   child clf- full already naughty very
   ‘The kid who is already full is very naughty.’

iii) the construction is restricted to predicative adjectives (Bollinger 1967)
   • Intersective (predicative) vs. non-intersective (attributive) adjectives:
(21)  a. a young scientist
   b. a scientist that is young
   c. a nuclear scientist
   d. * a scientist that is nuclear
(22)  a. The book old with wear sat on the shelf.
   c. A mere man can’t save the world.
   d. * A man that is mere can’t save the world.
• We find the same distinction in Thai using the Classifier-Modifier Construction as a test:

(23) \( N + \textbf{Nominal modifier} \)
    a. nakri\( \text{-라인} \) phaet
        student medicine
        ‘medical students’
    b. khru phisik
        teacher physics
        ‘physics teachers’
    c. nok pa
        bird jungle
        ‘wild birds’

(24) \[^{\ast} N + \textbf{Clf} + \textbf{Nominal modifier} \]
    a. \[^{\ast} nakri\( \text{-라인} \) khon-phaet
        student clf- medicine
        ‘medical students’
    b. \[^{\ast} khru khon-phisik
        teacher clf- physics
        ‘physics teachers’
    c. \[^{\ast} nok tua- pa
        bird clf- jungle

• In contrast predicate nouns like materials (*This watch is silver*) can occur with a classifier:

(25) \( N + \textbf{Material Adjective} \)
    a. nok platik
        bird plastic
        ‘A plastic bird.’
    b. nok tua- platik
        bird clf- plastic
        ‘A plastic bird.’
    c. ban maai
        house wood
        ‘A wooden house.’
    d. ban laa-\( \text{-} \) maai
        house clf- wood
        ‘a wooden house’
Classifiers resolve ambiguity between the two types of modifiers:

(26) a. phuɔn kaw
    friend old
    ‘a long-standing friend’
    ‘a familiar friend’

b. phuɔn khon kaw
    friend clf old
    *‘a long-standing friend’
    ‘a familiar friend’

Verbal modifiers have a predicative interpretation when a classifier precedes them:

(27) N + **Verbal modifier**
    a. nakrian tenlam
        student dance
        ‘dance students’

    b. khru wainam
        teacher swim
        ‘swim teachers’

    c. nok phuut.dai
        bird talk.able
        ‘talking birds’

(28) N + Clf + **Verbal modifier**
    a. nakrian khon- tenlam
        student clf- dance
        ‘a student who is dancing’

    b. khru khon- wainam
        teacher clf- swim
        ‘a teacher who is swimming’

    c. nok tua- phuut.dai
        bird clf- talk.able
        ‘a bird who is talking’

---

2 Thai has two adjectives ‘old’. *Kɛɛ* is used specifically to describe the age of people and animals. *Kaw* describes the age of inanimate objects as well as the uses in (21) for animates.
C. Summary of Syntactic Proposal

- The forms in (2a) vs. (2b) are structurally distinct:

(29) a. **Proposed Structure for N + Adj**

```
NP
  NP AP
  |   |
N' A'
  |   |
N A
sat yay
animal big
‘The big animal/Big animals’
```

b. **Proposed Structure for N + Clf + Adj**

```
ClfP
  NP Clf
  |   |
N' Clf CP
  |   |
N Clf
sat tua yay
animal clf big
‘The BIG animal’
```

(30) **Properties of Classifier-Modifier Construction**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Property</th>
<th>N + Adj</th>
<th>N + Clf + Adj</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>used contrastively</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>token-type adjectives restricted</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✗</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>restricted to predicate adjectives</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
• The relative clause analysis accounts for the following properties of the Thai Classifier-Modifier construction:
  i) Obligatory with token-modifying adjectives like ‘big’, and thus modifies tokens, not kinds
  ii) Prohibited with non-intersective adjectives
  iii) used contrastively

• A problem? Coordination of different categories
  (31) mi [[sat yay] le [krarok tua yay]] nai pa nan exist animal big and squirrel clf big in forest that
  ‘There are big animals and big squirrels in that forest.’ (Kookiattikoon 2001)

  ▪ But we can do this in English as well (Polinsky, PC):
  (32) The bank and under the bed are good places to store your money.

• From this, I conclude the classifier-modifier construction is predicative, and it is syntactically a “reduced” relative

5. A Crosslinguistic Comparison

• Greek nouns modified by adjectives can have multiple definite articles (*the red the book*)
• Alexopoulou & Wilder (1998) argue that Greek polydefinites derive from reduced relatives.
• Polydefinite NPs share a number of properties with Thai Classifier-Modifier Constructions

(33) Comparison of Polydefinites with Classifier-Modifier

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Property</th>
<th>Polydefinites</th>
<th>Clf - Modifier</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>prenominal</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>×</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>postnominal</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iterative</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>restricted to predicative adjectives</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>used contrastively (adj. focus)</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>used with discourse-old referents</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
i) Obligatory when adjective is postverbal

(34) \[ \text{D} + \text{A} + (\text{D}) + \text{N} \]

\begin{align*}
\text{to} & \quad \text{kokino} \quad \text{vitliov} \\
\text{the red} & \quad \text{the book} \\
\text{‘The red book.’}
\end{align*}

(35) \[ \text{D} + \text{N} + *(\text{D}) + \text{A} \]

\begin{align*}
\text{to} & \quad \text{vitliov} \quad \text{to} \quad \text{kokino} \\
\text{the book} & \quad \text{the red} \\
\text{‘The red book.’}
\end{align*}

ii) Applies iteratively with adjectives (& word order is free)

(36) a. \[ \text{to} \quad \text{vitliov} \quad \text{to} \quad \text{kokkino} \quad \text{to} \quad \text{megalo} \]

\begin{align*}
\text{the book} & \quad \text{the red} \quad \text{the big}
\end{align*}

b. \[ \text{to} \quad \text{megalo} \quad \text{to} \quad \text{kokkino} \quad \text{to} \quad \text{vitliov} \]

c. \[ \text{to} \quad \text{megalo} \quad \text{to} \quad \text{vitliov} \quad \text{to} \quad \text{kokkino} \]

d. \[ \text{to} \quad \text{kokkino} \quad \text{to} \quad \text{vitliov} \quad \text{to} \quad \text{megalo} \]

e. \[ \text{to} \quad \text{vitliov} \quad \text{to} \quad \text{megalo} \quad \text{to} \quad \text{kokkino} \]

iii) Prohibited with non-intersective & non-restrictive adjectives

(37) \textbf{Non-intersective adjectives}

a. \[ \text{o} \quad \text{porin} \quad (*\text{o}) \quad \text{proedhros} \]

\begin{align*}
\text{the former} & \quad (*\text{the}) \quad \text{president}
\end{align*}

b. \[ \text{i} \quad \text{apli} \quad (*\text{i}) \quad \text{simbtosi} \]

\begin{align*}
\text{the mere} & \quad (*\text{the}) \quad \text{coincidence}
\end{align*}

iv) Its use is contrastive (Kolliakou 2004)

(38) A: What did you get Yanni for Christmas?

B: \[ \text{Tu} \quad \text{pira} \quad [\text{focus} \quad \text{tin} \quad \text{asimenia} \quad \text{PENA}] \]

\begin{align*}
\text{to-him} & \quad \text{I-got} \quad \text{the silver} \quad \text{pen}
\end{align*}

B: \[ \text{*Tu} \quad \text{pira} \quad [\text{tin} \quad \text{asimenia} \quad \text{tin} \quad \text{pena}] \]

A: And what did you get Diane?

B: \[ \text{Tis} \quad \text{pira} \quad [\text{focus} \quad \text{tin} \quad \text{CHRISI} \quad \text{pena}] \]

\begin{align*}
\text{to-her} & \quad \text{I-got} \quad \text{the gold} \quad \text{pen}
\end{align*}

B: \[ \text{Tis} \quad \text{pira} \quad [\text{tin} \quad \text{chrisi} \quad \text{tin} \quad \text{pena}] \]

\begin{align*}
\text{to-her} & \quad \text{I-got} \quad \text{the gold} \quad \text{the pen}
\end{align*}
• Generalizations in the literature pertaining to Greek polydefiniteness

(39) **Kolliakou’s Polydefiniteness Constraint:**
The discourse referent Y of a polydefinite is anaphoric to an antecedent discourse referent X such that \( Y \subset X \).

(40) **Alexiadou & Wilder’s Polydefiniteness Constraint:**
An adjective permits [polydefiniteness] only if it can be used predicatively.

• Both of these also seem to be true of the classifier + modifier construction. The connection must be in the relative clause structure.

• Differences:
  i. Greek adjectives occur pre- and postverbally, with free word order
  ii. While some languagees use classifiers as definite “articles” of a sort, Thai does not

• Possibly related constructions in other languages: Mandarin ‘de’, also Hebrew & Swedish polydefiniteness

6. Implications and Open Questions

• Competing analyses of classifiers in the literature
  - Adverbials (Fukushima 1991, 1993)
  - Lexical categories, argument heads

• Classifiers and definiteness
  - Classifiers can function as a marker of singular definiteness in Cantonese, Vietnamese, and Hmong among others:

(41) nguoi chong rat tot Vietnamese
    clf husband very good
    ‘The husband was very good.’ (Daley 1998)

(42) tus tsov tshaib tshaib plab Hmong
    clf tiger hungry hungry stomach
    ‘The tiger was very hungry.’ (Jaisser 1987)
- The relationship between the classifier + modifier construction and polydefiniteness creates another connection between definite-like articles and classifiers

- Outstanding questions:
  - Can the Kaynean analysis of Simpson (2005) be extended to account for the Clf-Modifier construction?
  - What about more complex instances of the classifier-modifier construction?

(43)  

a. sat tua sii.dam tua yay
     animal clf black clf big
     ‘The big black animal.’

b. Proposed Structure for N + (Clf + Adj) + (Clf + Adj)

(44)  

a. sat tua sii.dam sɔɔŋ tua
     animal clf black two clf
     ‘Two black animals.’
b. **Proposed Structure for N + Clf + Adj + Num + Clf**

```
ClfP (DP?)
  NP_i
    |      Clf`
    N'          ClfP
    |            Clf`
    N            Clf`

Clf     CP
sat      tua      sii.dam
animal   clf      black
'two clf

Two black animals.'
```

**Appendix: Other Thai classifier-modifier data, constituency, etc.**

- Classifier-modifier constituents can appear in the putative demonstrative position, and can occur after the number + classifier constituent:

  (45) a. maa tua sii.dam tua yay  sọọŋ tua
dog  clf  color.black  clf  big  two  clf
'Two black dogs.'  (*Two dogs that are black*)
b. maa sọọŋ tua sii.dam
dog  two  clf  black
'The two black dogs.'
c. maa sọọŋ tua sii.dam tua yay (?)
dog  two  clf  black  body  big
'The two big black dogs.'
c. ?? maa sọọŋ tua tua sii.dam
dog  two  clf  clf  black
*but!*
d. nakrian sọọŋ khon tua yay
student  two  clf  clf  big
• The animate specific size-classifier tua can occur after a classifier as long as that classifier is not the same one.

• The ‘determiner’ use of adjectives cannot co-occur with an overt ‘one’ or demonstrative after the classifier:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{(46)} & \quad \text{a. } \text{maa (tua) sii.dam tua } \nu\eta \\
& \quad \text{dog clf black clf one} \\
& \quad \text{‘A black dog.’}
\end{align*}
\]

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{b. } & \quad * \text{ maa tua } \nu\eta \text{ sii.dam} \\
& \quad \text{dog clf one black}
\end{align*}
\]

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{c. } & \quad \text{maa (tua) sii.dam tua nii} \\
& \quad \text{dog clf black clf this} \\
& \quad \text{‘This black dog.’}
\end{align*}
\]

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{d. } & \quad * \text{ maa tua nii sii.dam} \\
& \quad \text{dog clf this black}
\end{align*}
\]

• Classifier-modifier constructions can appear ‘floated’ from a bare NP:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{(47)} & \quad \text{a. khaw kin bia paileew khuat yay } \s\text{s}\nu\eta \text{ khuat} \\
& \quad 3 \text{ eat beer go.already bottle big two bottle} \\
& \quad \text{‘He already drank two big bottles of the beer.’}
\end{align*}
\]

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{b. } & \quad \text{khaw kin bia khuat yay paileew s\nu\eta } \text{ khuat} \\
& \quad 3 \text{ eat beer bottle big go.already two bottle} \\
& \quad \text{‘He already drank two bottles of the big bottles of beer.’}
\end{align*}
\]

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{c. } & \quad * \text{khaw kin bia paileew yen } \s\text{s}\nu\eta \text{ khuat} \\
& \quad 3 \text{ eat beer go.already cold two clf}
\end{align*}
\]

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{d. } & \quad \text{khaw kin bia yen paileew s\nu\eta khuat} \\
& \quad 3 \text{ eat beer cold go.already two clf} \\
& \quad \text{‘He already drank two bottles of the cold beer.’}
\end{align*}
\]

References


