

THÎI FOR TWO

THE TWO FLAVORS OF THAI THÎI

Marcel den Dikken and Pornsiri Singhapreecha
CUNY Graduate Center and Thammasat University

1 Introduction

The Thai word *thîi*, qua functional element,¹ serves as a complementizer (Comp) in relative clauses, where it is not omissible (cf. Kobsiriphat 1988; Hoonchamlong 1991). An example of *thîi* qua complementizer is given in (1).

- (1) khon *thîi* chán phóp
 person THII I met
 'the/a person that I met'

But *thîi* also shows up in noun phrases with attributive postnominal adjectives, where it is optional in the general case:

- (2) khon (*thîi*) kèng
 person THII smart
 'the/a smart person'

In this paper, while taking *thîi*'s incarnation as a complementizer for granted, we focus on its other flavor: that of a *linker* of nouns and postnominal attributive adjectives.

The use of *thîi* as a linker is both syntactically and semantically different from that of *thîi* as a complementizer. That *thîi* in (2) (*khon thîi kèng*) is not a complementizer is not immediately obvious — after all, we might be dealing here with a reduced relative clause 'who is smart'; the fact that the Thai counterparts of English adjectives exhibit some verbal properties makes such an analysis conceivable in principle. However, two properties of Thai noun phrases with postnominal attributive adjectives conspire to suggest a different approach:

- (i) in existential and possessive 'have' constructions, *thîi* is impossible with certain classes of adjectives despite the fact that these adjectives are perfectly well usable as predicates of clauses (color adjectives being a case in point:² cf. (3a), where, as throughout, 'CLF' stands for 'classifier'), and
- (ii) the presence or absence of *thîi* in constructions in which it is optional on the surface has semantic consequences: in particular, when *thîi* is present, the noun phrase tends to take on a *contrastive* interpretation, as the minimal pair in (3b,c) shows

- (3a) chán mii rôm (**thîi*) sǐkhǐaw lǎaj khan
 I have umbrellas THII green many CLF
 'I have many green umbrellas'
- (3b) chán mii rôm jàj lǎaj khan
 I have umbrellas big many CLF
 'I have many big umbrellas'
- (3c) chán mii rôm *thîi* jàj lǎaj khan
 I have umbrellas THII big many CLF
 'I have many big (as opposed to small and medium-size) umbrellas'

As the prose translation tries to make clear, in (3c) *thîi jàj* signals contrast by adding the 'big as opposed to small and medium-size' reading.

Both syntactically and semantically, Thai *thîi* patterns with French *de*,³ which likewise occurs as a complementizer (cf. (4)) and as a linker (cf. (5)), being obligatory in its former incarnation and generally optional in the latter, just like Thai *thîi*.

- (4) il est impossible de faire cela
 it is impossible DE_{Comp} do that
 'it is impossible to do that'
- (5a) il y a une pizza chaude
 it there has a pizza hot-AGR
 'there is a hot pizza'
- (5b) il y a une pizza de chaude
 it there has a pizza DE_{Linker} hot-AGR
 'there is a hot pizza (as opposed to pizzas that are not hot)'

The parallel between *thûi* and *de qua* linkers goes further: as Milner (1978) points out, the use of (5b) (*une pizza de chaude*), with the linker *de*, signals a *contrast* between hot pizzas and pizzas which are not hot; in this respect (5b) is perfectly on a par with Thai (3b) as well.

For French *de* in (5b), an analysis which likens it to the use of *de* as a linker in other complex noun phrases (such as *cet imbécile de garçon* ‘that fool of boy’) leads to the postulation of a syntactic derivation in terms of inversion of a predicate around its subject, with the linker facilitating the inversion and surfacing as a reflex thereof. This paper develops an account of the syntax and semantics of Thai *thûi* and French *de qua* linker from the perspective of the predicate inversion analysis, and incorporating massive remnant movement inside the complex DP.

2 Quantificational and interpretive restrictions

We will start our discussion of ‘NP – linker – AP’ constructions with a review of the quantificational and interpretive restrictions imposed on the construction. We take our cue here from the extant studies of the French construction (see Milner 1978, Huot 1981, Azoulay-Vicente 1985, Hulk & Verheugd 1994, Kupferman 1981, 1994a,b, Lagae 1994, 1995, Hulk 1996, *i.a.*), and subsequently check the parallels with Thai, which turn out to be near perfect.

2.1 French

2.1.1 Quantification

A key property of the NP part of the French construction in (5b) is that it is typically *quantificational* in one of three ways, as illustrated in (6):

(6a) *NP is a wh-pronoun*

qui	*(de)	sérieux as-tu	rencontré?
who	of	serious have-you	met

(6b) *NP is an indefinite pronoun*

rien	*(d')	extraordinaire	n'est	arrivé
nothing	of	extraordinary	not-is	happened

(6c) *NP is a focused noun phrase*

je	n'ai	mangé	que	deux	pizzas
I	not-have	eaten	but	two	pizzas
(de)	chaudes				
of	hot-AGR				

Wh-pronouns and indefinite pronouns force the presence of *de*; cases in which the NP part of a complex noun phrase is focused (in the *ne ... que* 'only' construction illustrated in (6c)) are perhaps more natural with *de* than without it, but are certainly grammatical either way. What all three examples share in common is that the NP part of the complex noun phrase is quantificational. And indeed, it typically will be quantificational in one of these three ways in the 'NP – *de* – AP' construction.

There is one systematic exception to this generalization, as we already mentioned in parentheses above: in existential sentences (including possessive 'have' constructions), it is enough for the NP to meet the constraints generally imposed on NPs in existential clauses; so *any* indefinite noun phrase will do as the first member of the 'NP *de* AP' construction in those contexts — (7a,b) contrast minimally with (6c') as regards the nature of the predicate.

(7a)	il	y	a	deux	pizzas	(de)	chaudes
	it	there	has	two	pizzas	of	hot

(7b)	j'ai	deux	pizzas	(de)	chaudes
	I-have	two	pizzas	of	hot

2.1.2 Interpretation

The examples in (7) do not just deviate from the ones in (6a,b) when it comes to the quantificational properties of the NP part, but also when it comes to the need to use *de*: the linker is optional in (7), at least on the surface. But it turns out that whether or not *de* is inserted in examples of this type is not at all semantically

innocuous: the presence of *de* has a clear interpretive effect (where ‘interpretive’ is meant to be neutral between ‘semantic’ and ‘pragmatic’). In particular, with *de* included, the examples in (7) have the following two distinctive properties:

- (i) (7) with *de* receives a CONTRASTIVE interpretation: contrast between hot pizzas and pizzas which are not hot; cf. Milner (1978)
- (ii) (7) with *de* has AP represent OLD INFORMATION (whereas in the *de*-less counterparts AP represents new information); cf. Lagae (1994)

That AP is presuppositional in the ‘NP – *de* – AP’ construction is perhaps particularly clear from the fact that it cannot be focally stressed (cf. **il y a deux places de LIBRES et deux places d'OCCUPÉES* ‘there are two places of free and two places of occupied’; Hulk & Verheugd 1994:43, fn. 16). Lagae (1994) refers to the information structure of ‘NP – *de* – AP’ constructions, which has the unusual property of featuring the AP as old information, as an ‘*inverted*’ information structure. We will take up Lagae’s point in section 3, below, where it will be shown that there is a very real *syntactic* sense in which these linker constructions are inverted as well.

With the main restrictions on French ‘NP – *de* – AP’ constructions out on the table, let us now see how Thai ‘NP – *thîi* – AP’ constructions compare to their French counterparts.

2.2 Thai

2.2.1 Quantification

As a first-glance comparison of the French paradigm in (6) with the Thai examples in (8) shows, the parallels between the distributions of *de* and *thîi* are quite strong.

- (8a) NP is a wh-pronoun
 khun phóp khraj *(thîi) kèng?
 you met who THII smart

- (8b) *NP is an indefinite pronoun*
 māj mii araj (thîi) plææk kəətkhîn
 not have what THII strange happened
- (8c) *NP is a focused noun phrase*
 John kin pitsa (thîi) rŏn
 John ate pizza THII hot
 khææ sŏng chîn
 only two CLF

The match is not fully complete — (8b) is grammatical both with and without *thîi*, while (6b) in French forced the presence of *de*. That partial mismatch is not unexpected, however. Two things need to be borne in mind: (i) (8b) is formally an existential construction (cf. the use of *mii*), and as will be recalled from section 2.1, (ii) French existential constructions distinguish themselves from non-existential sentences in the optionality of the linker *de*. So the optionality of *thîi* in Thai (8b) reduces, in the light of French (7), to an independent difference between (6b) and (8b): the fact that the Thai sentence is an existential construction. This aside, then, the Thai facts in (8a–c) are fully parallel to the French paradigm in (6a–c) as far as the quantificational restrictions on the NP part are concerned.

2.2.2 Interpretation

Interpretively as well, there is a striking similarity between French ‘NP – *de* – AP’ constructions and their Thai counterparts with *thîi*. Recall from the discussion of French that the cases with *de* involve contrast and an AP expressing old information. It turns out that in Thai as well, the presence of *thîi* has interpretive effects of this type: speakers’ intuitions indicate that (9b), with *thîi*, is felicitous only in a context in which there is a contrast between pizzas that are hot and ones that are not, while (9a), lacking *thîi*, is not restricted in this way.

- | | | | |
|------|------------------------|------|--|
| (9a) | pitsa rŏn
pizza hot | (9b) | pitsa thîi rŏn
pizza THII hot
→ contrast reading |
|------|------------------------|------|--|

With reference to Lagae's observation about French that the use of *de*, in contexts in which it is optional in principle, signals that the AP expresses old information, we draw attention to the interpretive contrast between (10a) and (10b) in Thai:

- (10a) mii araj plææk kəətkhîn máj?
 have what strange happen Q
 'did anything strange happen?'
 (10b) mii araj thîi plææk kəətkhîn máj?
 have what THII strange happen Q

While (10a) is just a request for information, (10b) primes a reading in which the speaker expects that something strange might have happened. Thus, the property denoted by the AP is presuppositional (i.e., part of the old information) in (10b), while it is not in (10a). Once again, this is a perfect match of what we found for French.⁴

3 Analysis (I) — Predicate Inversion

3.1 *Copular inversion: Information structure*

The information structure properties of the 'NP – linker – AP' construction, in both French and Thai, are an essential cue to the analysis of this construction. Recall from section 2.1.2, above, that Lagae (1994) talks about an 'inverted' information structure: while in a subject–predicate (or modifiee–modifier) relationship, the former is usually the old information and the latter the new information, in the 'NP – linker – AP' construction it is precisely the other way around. We will take Lagae's point very seriously here, translating it, in fact, into a syntactic derivation of the 'NP – linker – AP' construction involving inversion of the predicate around its subject.

To set the case up, let us consider the alternation between (11a) and (11b), involving a copular sentence with a predicate nominal.

- (11a) John is my best friend [canonical copular sentence]
 OLD NEW
- (11b) my best friend is John [inverse copular sentence]
 OLD NEW

Following the terminology introduced by Moro (1997), we will refer to (11a) as a ‘canonical copular sentence’ and to (11b) as an ‘inverse copular sentence’. The default information structure representation of a canonical copular sentence is one in which the subject represents old information and the predicate supplies new information about it. In the inverse copular sentence in (11b), by contrast, the focus or new information is *John*, and *my best friend* is old information — and this information structure representation for inverse copular sentences is basically fixed: when you invert a predicate around its subject, the result is an information structure representation in which the post-copular noun phrase is invariably the focus (Declerck 1988 and references cited there).

3.2 *Copular inversion: Syntax*

The term ‘inverse copular sentence’ that we used with reference to (11b) appeals to an analysis of this construction type by which it is syntactically derived from the same underlying representation which also underlies (11a), via syntactic *inversion* of the predicate nominal around its subject. This analysis was developed in detail in the work of Moro (1997) and Den Dikken (1995), and subsequent work.

At the core of the account lies the hypothesis that subject–predicate relationships are syntactically projected in the form of a so-called ‘small clause’ (‘SC’ in the structures below):

- (12) [_{SC} [_{DP} *John*] [_{DP} *my best friend*]]

We can see the ‘naked’ SC on its own in the complement of verbs like *consider*, as in sentences like (13a) without *to be*:

- (13a) I consider John (to be) my best friend
 (13b) I consider my best friend *(to be) John

Since *consider* also has the option of selecting a *to*-infinitival complement clause, and since infinitival *to* must always be supported by some verbal element, we also find a variant of (13a) featuring *to be*; here, a copula is introduced outside the small clause, and it is this projection of the copula which serves as the complement of infinitival *to*, into whose specifier position the SC-subject is raised via A-movement (cf. (14b)).

- (14a) [_____ *to* [*be* [_{SC} [_{DP} *John*] [_{DP} *my best friend*]]]]
 (14b) [*John*_i *to* [*be* [_{SC} [_{DP} *t*_i] [_{DP} *my best friend*]]]]
 (14c) [*my best friend*_i [*to* [*be* [_{SC} [_{DP} *John*] [_{DP} *t*_i]]]]]

What interests us here is that (13b), which has the relative order of the two noun phrases reversed, is ungrammatical without *to be*. This gives us an argument for a *syntactic movement* analysis of inverse copular constructions. In particular, we can take the need to realize an overt copula in (13b) (as opposed to (13a)) to signal the fact that there has been syntactic movement of the predicate of the small clause in (12) across its subject, as depicted in (14c). Such movement instantiates raising to an A-position across an intervening A-position: the predicate in (14c) apparently has not taken 'the shortest move'; in such cases we need to call upon the copula to make the result come out right. The obligatory use of the copula in (13b) can be looked upon as a syntactic signal for the fact that apparently non-local movement has taken place.

Viewed this way, the copula (at least in these contexts) is really and truly a functional element: it serves as a *linker* element, facilitating the inversion of a predicate around its subject. Now, predication is by no means restricted to the sentential domain; so we may expect to find Predicate Inversion and the concomitant emergence of linker elements elsewhere as well. And indeed we do: (15) illustrates Predicate Inversion inside the complex noun phrase (cf. Den Dikken 1995, 1998). We understand (15) to mean that the property denoted by *idiot* is predicated of *doctor*, not the other way around. Hence underlyingly *idiot* is the predicate of *doctor*, the two of them starting out in a small clause of the type in (16a); the predicate is subsequently *inverted* around its subject (16b), and, concomitantly, we see a linker element emerge: *of*.

- (15) that idiot of a doctor
 (16a) [_{SC} [*a doctor*] [*idiot*]]
 (16b) [_{DP} *that* [*idiot*_i] [*of* [_{SC} [*a doctor*] [*t_i*]]]]]

French has constructions of the type in (15) as well; (17) is an example. As a matter of fact, French is much richer than English when it comes to Predicate Inversion inside the nominal phrase — for alongside (17), we also find (18), a case of inversion of an *adjectival* predicate around its subject inside a complex DP (see Den Dikken 1995, Hulk & Tellier 1997). Throughout, we find that in French the linker element signalling Predicate Inversion inside the complex nominal phrase is realized as *de* (see also Milner 1978 for the view that *de* is a copula-like element; Azoulay-Vicente 1985:32 rejects this — wrongly, in our view).

- (17a) cet imbécile de garçon
 that idiot of boy
 (17b) [_{DP} *cet* [*imbécile*_i] [*de* [_{SC} [*garçon*] [*t_i*]]]]]
 (18a) un drôle de type
 a funny of guy
 (18b) [_{DP} *un* [*drôle*_i] [*de* [_{SC} [*type*] [*t_i*]]]]]

With the analysis of (18a) given in (18b) in place, we are well on our way towards an analysis of the French construction illustrated in (5b), partially repeated here as (19a).

- (19a) une pizza de chaude
 a pizza DE_{Linker} hot-AGR
 (19b) ... [*chaude*_i] [*de* [_{SC} [*pizza*] [*t_i*]]]]]

What we know about the derivation of this construction, just by looking at the fact that the linker element *de* occurs in it, is that it will involve Predicate Inversion: the adjectival predicate *chaude* inverts with its subject *pizza* in the course of the derivation of (19a). That part of the derivation is depicted in (19b); it is parallel in all respects to what happens in (18b). But there is more going on in the derivation of (19a) — the underlying relative order of *pizza* and *chaude* must somehow be ‘restored’.

4 Analysis (II) — Beyond Predicate Inversion

We propose that the word order effect of Predicate Inversion is 'undone' later in the derivation of constructions of the type in (19a) via A'-movement of the NP-part of the construction around the landing-site of the raised predicate, with concomitant upward head-movement of the linker. Since space restrictions do not allow us to discuss the derivation of each case in detail, we have decided to take the bull by the horns and discuss what we believe is the most challenging and enlightening case: existential and possessive *have* sentences of the type seen in (3c), for Thai, and (7a,b), for French.

In examples of this type, our manoeuvring space is clearly restricted. The container noun phrase is smaller than DP here: the associate of the expletive in existential sentences and the complement of *have* cannot normally be full DPs (non-canonical cases aside). So 'restoration' of the underlying relative order of the NP and the AP cannot be the result of fronting to SpecDP. The structure of quantified noun phrases in Thai turns out to tell us exactly where the NP part of the 'NP – linker – AP' construction lands in existential and possessive *have* contexts, and also gives us insight into what else is going on in the derivation of these constructions.

Singhapreecha (2001) argues that quantifiers and classifiers project their own functional projections in the extended projection of the noun, between D and the base-NP (cf. also Tang 1990 for Chinese). More specifically, she argues that the classifiers and quantifiers themselves represent the *heads* of those functional projections. Like all other heads (given the theory of antisymmetry of syntax developed in Kayne 1994), both classifiers and quantifiers precede their complements in the underlying representation; since they end up to the right of the noun phrases that they are construed with, they will receive extended projections of the noun phrase in their specifier positions as a result of massive pied-piping movement in the course of the overt-syntactic derivation. Let us make this more precise, illustrating Singhapreecha's (2001) analysis on the basis of a particularly complex case like (20):

- (20) rôm (khan) jàj sǎam khan nán
 umbrella CLF big three CLF DEM
 ‘those three big umbrellas’

The complex noun phrase illustrated in (20) is head-final at the top level: the demonstrative (arguably a D-head in Thai; see also Tang 1990 for Chinese demonstratives) surfaces all the way at the end of the DP. What this means, on the assumption that D underlyingly precedes its complement, is that the entire complement of D has raised into SpecDP.

Continuing on from right to left, the next-to-last item in the complex DP is the classifier *khan*, another head. Interestingly, this classifier can occur *twice* in the complex noun phrase in (20): once between the head-noun and the adjective, and once in penultimate position. And even more interestingly, the occurrence of the classifier *khan* between the head-noun and the adjective turns out to be in *complementary distribution* with the linker element *thîi*, as a comparison of (20) and (21) shows.

- (21) rôm thîi jàj sǎam khan nán
 umbrella THII big three CLF DEM
 ‘those three big (as opposed to small or medium-size) umbrellas’

This, we believe, tells us (i) each token of the classifier *khan* is generated in the head position of its own Classifier Phrase (as in Singhapreecha 2001) and (ii) that the head position of the Classifier Phrase realized by the leftmost token of *khan* in (20) serves as the *landing-site* of movement of the linker *thîi* in (21).

With these two things in place, we can now flesh out the structure and derivation of the examples in (20) and (21). Let us start with the former, which is illustrated in (22). With NP realized as *rôm* and AP as *jàj*, (22e) delivers precisely the desired surface output for (20) with both instances of *khan* overtly spelled out. Alternatively, the token of *khan* in the head position of Clf1P (annotated here as *khan*¹) can remain unexpressed, in which case we derive the variant of (20) with only one instance of the classifier *khan*.

- (22a) [_{DP} Spec [*nán* [_{Clf2P} Spec [*khan*² [_{QP} Spec [*săam* [_{Clf1P} Spec [*khan*¹ [NP AP]]]]]]]]]]]
→ NP-to-SpecClf1P →
- (22b) [_{DP} Spec [*nán* [_{Clf2P} Spec [*khan*² [_{QP} Spec [*săam* [_{Clf1P} NP_i [*khan*¹ [_{t_i} AP]]]]]]]]]]]
→ Clf1P-to-SpecQP →
- (22c) [_{DP} Spec [*nán* [_{Clf2P} Spec [*khan*² [_{QP} [_{Clf1P} NP_i [*khan*¹ [_{t_i} AP]]]]]_j [*săam* _{t_j}]]]]]
→ QP-to-SpecClf2P →
- (22d) [_{DP} Spec [*nán* [_{Clf2P} [_{QP} [_{Clf1P} NP_i [*khan*¹ [_{t_i} AP]]]]]_j [*săam* _{t_j}]]]_k [*khan*² _{t_k}]]]
→ Clf2P-to-SpecDP →
- (22e) [_{DP} [_{Clf2P} [_{QP} [_{Clf1P} NP_i [*khan*¹ [_{t_i} AP]]]]]_j [*săam* _{t_j}]]]_k [*khan*² _{t_k}]]]_m [*nán* _{t_m}]]

Since we know independently, from the optionality of *khan*¹ in (20), that the head position of Clf1P can be empty, we can naturally exploit the Clf1 position in the structure as a *landing-site* for movement. And indeed, this comes in handy when it comes to the analysis of (21), depicted in (23).

- (23a) [_{DP} Spec [*nán* [_{Clf2P} Spec [*khan*² [_{QP} Spec [*săam* [_{Clf1P} Spec [_∅ [_{FP} Spec [F [NP AP]]]]]]]]]]]]]
→ AP-to-SpecFP (PI), with spell-out of F as linker *thîi* →
- (23b) [_{DP} Spec [*nán* [_{Clf2P} Spec [*khan*² [_{QP} Spec [*săam* [_{Clf1P} Spec [_∅ [_{FP} AP_a [*thîi* [NP _{t_a}]]]]]]]]]]]]]
→ NP-to-SpecClf1P + *thîi*-to-Clf1 →
- (23c) [_{DP} Spec [*nán* [_{Clf2P} Spec [*khan*² [_{QP} Spec [*săam* [_{Clf1P} NP_i [*thîi*_x [_{FP} AP_a [_{t_x} [_{t_i} _{t_a}]]]]]]]]]]]]]
→ Clf1P-to-SpecQP →
- (23d) [_{DP} Spec [*nán* [_{Clf2P} Spec [*khan*² [_{QP} [_{Clf1P} NP_i [*thîi*_x [_{FP} AP_a [_{t_x} [_{t_i} _{t_a}]]]]]]]_j [*săam* _{t_j}]]]]]
→ QP-to-SpecClf2P →
- (23e) [_{DP} Spec [*nán* [_{Clf2P} [_{QP} [_{Clf1P} NP_i [*thîi*_x [_{FP} AP_a [_{t_x} [_{t_i} _{t_a}]]]]]]]_j [*săam* _{t_j}]]]_k [*khan*² _{t_k}]]]
→ Clf2P-to-SpecDP →
- (23f) [_{DP} [_{Clf2P} [_{QP} [_{Clf1P} NP_i [*thîi*_x [_{FP} AP_a [_{t_x} [_{t_i} _{t_a}]]]]]]]_j [*săam* _{t_j}]]]_k [*khan*² _{t_k}]]]_m [*nán* _{t_m}]]

First, the AP inverts around its subject, ending up in the specifier position of a functional projection, here labelled FP (23b). Next, the NP raises *around* the fronted AP, to the specifier position of Clf1P, whose head here is base-generated empty. To make this legitimate, F (spelled out as *thîi*) raises up to Clf1. The interim result of the derivation through step (23c) is a word order in which, as desired, NP precedes *thîi* which in turn precedes AP. Whatever happens later in the derivation, *rôm thîi jàj* ‘umbrella THII big’ must remain a constituent, preserving its word order. Clf1P is the node which minimally dominates *rôm thîi jàj*; so this node we now raise to SpecQP, as in (23d). This step is identical to the Clf1P-to-SpecQP raising operation performed in (22c). And in fact, beyond (23c) everything in the derivation of (21) is exactly like what is going on beyond (22b) in the derivation of (20). For our purposes here, the only relevant step is the one depicted in (23c). It is this step which gets us the right word order for the ‘NP – linker – AP’ sequence — and what the Thai facts have shown us is that this word order is established fairly *low* in the structure. In fact, thanks to Thai, we have managed to put our finger on the precise point in the structure at which it happens: Clf1P, which is *below* the position of quantifiers. We intend the account developed on the basis of Thai to carry over to French.⁵

5 *Thîi* for two: Teasing the two flavors apart

In closing, we will address the fact that surface ‘NP – *thîi* – AP’ sequences in Thai are often ambiguous between a structure in which *thîi* is a linker in the sense of this paper (and hence, we are dealing with a derivation such as the one sketched above) and one in which *thîi* is a complementizer. The two structures are both interpretively and syntactically distinct, however.

Let us return first of all to the quantified ‘NP – *thîi* – AP’ example from the previous section, given in (21). What we find here is that (i) the quantifier *săam* ‘three’ and the classifier *khan* both follow the ‘NP – *thîi* – AP’ sequence, and (ii) there is a contrast reading of the kind we identified in the foregoing for AP–predicate inversion constructions inside the noun phrase.

Interestingly, now, a word order in which the quantifier and the classifier *precede* the *thîi*+AP sequence is grammatical as well; (24) illustrates this pattern:

- (24) rôm sǎam khan *(thîi) jàj nán
 umbrella three CLF THII big DEM
 ‘those three big umbrellas’

There are three respects in which (24) is different from (21): the first, and obvious way in which it differs is word order; but tracking this word order difference, we also find that *thîi*, while omissible in (21), is obligatory in (24), and we observe an interpretive distinction between (21) and (24) as well: while (21) obligatorily has the contrast reading typical of noun-phrase internal AP-inversion constructions with linker *thîi*, (24) does not force this special interpretation.

In view of this, we propose that (24) is fundamentally different from (21) (and (20) as well) as far as its syntax is concerned. In particular, we submit that *thîi jàj* in (24) is a *relative clause*, with *thîi* serving as a *complementizer*. The fact that *thîi jàj* in (24) shows up in a position to the right of the classifier and the quantifier and is strictly obligatory then fits in straightforwardly with what we find in other *thîi*-headed relatives:

- (25) rôm sǎam khan *(thîi) John sǎi maa nán
 umbrella three CLF THII John bought VPR
 TDE
 M
 ‘those three umbrellas that John bought’

So we have seen that *thîi* qua functional element has two flavors in Thai: it can be a linker (as in (21)) but it can also serve as a relative complementizer (as in (24) and (25)). We identified three diagnostics that help tease the two flavors of *thîi* apart: (i) word order, (ii) omissibility, and (iii) the forced contrast reading.

Notes

1. Here we set aside the lexical incarnations of *thii* as a noun ('land, real estate') or as a preposition.
2. Azoulay-Vicente (1985:211–12), drawing on work by Lucien Kupferman, shows that a similar restriction is at work in French existential and possessive 'NP – *de* – AP' constructions, as shown by the contrast between *il y a eu quelques chemises froissées/*bleues* 'there were some shirts of creased/blue'. See also Hulk & Verheugd (1994).
3. Though we will not have the opportunity to investigate the matter in detail here, parallels with Dutch/German genitival *-s* in things like *iets nieuws/etwas neues* 'something new-GEN' and with Chinese *de* will also be worth considering.
4. Examples in which the AP following *thii* is a focus can be identified as cases of *thii* qua complementizer; see section 5 for discussion of the two flavors of Thai *thii*.
5. The assumption needed here is that French noun phrases feature a projection of Cl_{fl} as well, whose specifier serves as a landing-site and whose head is null.

References

- Azoulay-Vicente, Abigail. 1985. Les tours comportant l'expression de + adjectif. Genève: Librairie Droz.
- Declerck, Renaat. 1988. Studies on copular sentences, clefts and pseudoclefts. Dordrecht: Foris/Leuven: Leuven University Press.
- Dikken, Marcel den. 1995. Copulas. Paper presented at GLOW Tromsø; ms., Vrije Universiteit Amsterdam/HIL.
- _____. 1998. Predicate Inversion in DP. Possessors, predicates and movement in the Determiner Phrase, ed. by Artemis Alexiadou and Chris Wilder, 177–214. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Hoonchamlong, Yuphaphan. 1991. Some issues in Thai anaphora: A government and binding approach. Madison: University of Wisconsin dissertation.

- Hulk, Aafke. 1996. L'«autre» *de*: Une tête quantificationnelle? *Langue française* 109. 44–59.
- _____. and Christine Tellier. 1997. Mismatches: Agreement in qualitative constructions. Ms., Universiteit van Amsterdam/HIL and Université de Montréal.
- _____. and Els Verheugd. 1994. Accord et opérateurs nuls dans les projections adjectivales. *Revue Québécoise de linguistique* 23: 17–46.
- Huot, Hélène. 1981. Constructions infinitives du français: Le subordonnant *DE*. Genève: Librairie Droz.
- Kayne, Richard. 1994. The antisymmetry of syntax. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Kobsiriphat, Wissanu. 1988. Empty categories in Thai. Seattle: University of Washington dissertation.
- Kupferman, Lucien. 1981. Il y a une place de libre: Study of a construction. *Linguistics* 18: 821–48.
- _____. 1994a. Une assignation de cas assez exceptionnelle. *Linguisticae Investigationes* VIII. 151–75.
- _____. 1994b. Typologie des constructions en *de*-adjectif. *Travaux de Linguistique et de Philologie* XXXII: 85–95.
- Lagae, Véronique. 1994. La prédication interne au groupe nominal. Les constructions du type « il y en a une de libre ». Diss., Katholieke Universiteit Leuven.
- _____. 1995. Deux constructions en *de* + adjectif. Ms., Université de Valenciennes & Paris III.
- Milner, Jean-Claude. 1978. De la syntaxe à l'interprétation: Quantités, insultes, exclamations. Paris: Editions du Seuil.
- Moro, Andrea. 1997. The raising of predicates. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Singhapreecha, Pornsiri. 2001. Thai classifiers and the structure of complex Thai nominals. *Proceedings of the 15th Pacific Asia Conference on Language, Information and Computation*, ed. by Benjamin T'sou, Olivia Kwong, and Tom Lai, 259–70. Hong Kong: Language Information Sciences Research Centre, City University of Hong Kong.
- Tang, Chih-Chen Jane. 1990. A note on the DP analysis of the Chinese noun phrase. *Linguistics* 28: 337–54.