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**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).

\[(1)\text{ a. } san\ ge\ xuesheng \text{ (Mandarin)}\quad \text{b. } san\ nin\ no\ gakusei \text{ (Japanese)}
\]
\[3\text{ CL student} \quad 3\text{ CL of student} \]
\[\text{‘three students’} \quad \text{‘three students’}\]

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.
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