Classifier Systems in Mandarin Chinese and Japanese
Daiho Kitaoka
University of Ottawa

Problems & Proposal: With respect to Number realization, languages are often grouped into two types: plural marker languages (e.g., English) and classifier languages (e.g., Mandarin, Japanese). As such, it often appears to be assumed implicitly or explicitly, without substantial comparative scrutiny (e.g., Huang & Ochi 2014), that classifiers in the latter languages largely share morpho-syntactic and/or semantic properties (e.g., Borer 2005, Chierchia 1998).

In contrast, this paper provides a comparative study of two well-known languages that employ generalized (counting) classifier systems: Mandarin (1a) and Japanese (1b).

(1) a. *san ge   xuesheng*   (Mandarin)   **b.** *san nin   no   gakusei*   (Japanese)
     3   CL   student   3   CL   of   student
     'three students'   'three students'

Based on contrasts in the behaviour of bare nouns and numeral classifier phrases, I show that counting classifiers in Mandarin specify individualization, while ones in Japanese are (part of) nominal modifiers.

Mass-Count distinction: Contrary to somewhat widely held view (Borer 2005, a.o.), I argue that bare nouns in both Mandarin and Japanese have a grammaticized mass-count expressed syntactically (Cheng & Sybesma 1999 for Mandarin; Sudo 2015 for Japanese). I claim that the contrast between these two languages is related to how the mass-count distinction is encoded morphosyntactically. In Mandarin, classifiers denote countability (or mass) of a noun (Cheng & Sybesma 1999). (Note that this does not mean classifiers atomize.) On the other hand, a noun itself carries a count-mass property in Japanese (whether lexically encoded, or specified at or below a nominalizing head). This claim is supported by the fact that bare nouns in Japanese (but not in Mandarin) show largely overlapped distributions with quantified nouns as in (1b); whether a noun is modified by a numeral classifier, nominal phrases are neutral in specificity/definiteness, and number.

On General Number: I demonstrate another difference between Mandarin and Japanese; General Number (Corbett 2000). Although bare nouns in both languages can describe a plural entity, only Mandarin commonly employs general number (Rullmann & You 2003), whereas those in Japanese are morphologically neutral (as in *fish/sheep/you* in English). I show that the criteria for general numbers (in Chinese) listed in Rullmann & You are not fully applicable in Japanese. I consider this contrast in the interpretations of bare nouns to be further supporting evidence for the differences in the function of classifiers in these languages: In Mandarin, bare nouns denote general number, i.e., semantically neutral in number, and hence number should be specified by a numeral classifier (if a noun is not mass); in Japanese, on the other hand, bare nouns are full-fledged, and a numeral classifier is just to modify them.

DP Structure: I further illustrate the differing structural properties of nominal domain in Mandarin and Japanese. Following Zhang (2011), I demonstrate that the DP internal relative scope relations indicate the constituency of a counting ('individuating' for Zhang) classifier and a noun in Mandarin (excluding a numeral), as in (2a). In Japanese, on the other hand, it is shown that a numeral and a classifier form a constituent excluding a noun, as in (2b) (assuming that 'of' is inserted at PF; Watanabe 2008).

(2)a. [3 [CL student]] (= 1a, Mandarin)   **b.** [[3 CL] student]   (= 1b, Japanese)

Extensions: I lastly explore the application of the proposed typological analysis to other classifier languages (e.g., Korean, Cantonese, Southeast Asian languages). I show that classifiers in East and Southeast Asian languages can be (roughly) classified into two groups (Mandarin-type, Japanese-type) with respect to functions of (numeral) classifiers and nominal structures.

References

Borer, Hagit. 2005. *In Name Only*. New York, NY: Oxford University Press.

Cheng, Lisa, & Rint Sybesma. 1999. Bare and not so bare nouns and the structure of NP. *Linguistic Inquiry 30*(4): 504-542.

Chierchia, Gennard. 1998. Plurality of mass nouns and the notion of "Semantic Parameter." In Susan Rothstein(ed.), *Events and Grammar*, 53-103. Dordrecht: Kluwer Academic Publishers.

Corbett, Greville G. 2000. *Number*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Huang, C. T. James, & Masao Ochi. 2014. Remarks on classifiers and nominal structure in East Asian. In C. T. James Huang, & Feng-hsi Liu (eds.), *Peaches & Plums.* (Lanuage and Linguistics monograph series 54), 53-74. Taipei: Academic Sinica.

Rullmann, Hotze, & Aili You. 2003. General number and the semantics and pragmatics of indefinite bare nouns in Mandarin Chinese. In Klaus von Heusinger & Ken Turner (eds.), *Where semantics meets pragmatics*, 175–196. Amsterdam: Elsevier.

Sudo, Yasutada. 2015. Notes on the semantics of nouns and classifiers in Japanese. Paper presented at the 11th Workshop on Altaic Formal Linguistics (WAFL11, York, UK, June 2015).

Zhang, Niina. 2011. The constituency of classifier constructions in Mandarin Chinese. *Taiwan Journal of Linguistics 9*(1): 1-50.

Watanabe, Akira. 2008. The structure of DP. In Shigeru Miyagawa & Mamoru Saito (eds.), *The Oxford Handbook of Japanese Linguistics*, 513-540. New York: Oxford University Press