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Chierchia (1998) has proposed a Nominal Mapping Parameter Hypothesis, arguing that in some languages (classifier languages), NPs are argumental and can thus occur freely without determiner in argument position; in others (Romance) they are predicates, and this prevents NPs from occurring as arguments, unless the category D(eterminer) is projected; finally, there are languages (Germanic or Slavic) which allow both parameter setting predicts the presence or absence of the determiner. This hypothesis predicates that languages with a generalized classifier system should not be expected to have overt definite determiners. In this paper, we introduce a morpheme Su in Nuosu-Yi (a Tibeto-Burmese language with SOV word order, spoken in the southwest of China) and some newly found data. We argue that Su is a definite determiner in the nominal domain; Yi therefore provides empirical evidence for the existence of definite determiner in classifier languages. We also look into clausal domain of Yi and argue that in the clausal domain, Su is a complementizer, either introducing a relative clause or a complement clause.

The present paper has three goals: 1) To identify and generalize the functions of Su by providing exhaustive descriptions of the syntactic distribution of it under the framework of the generative grammar. 2) To show whether there is a correlation between (overt) determiners and classifiers. 3) To show the implication of our analysis—on one hand, the new data helps us to re-examine the current theories on NPs and DPs by Chierchia (1998, 2008, 2009), Longobardi (1994, 2005), Cheng and Sybesma (1999, 2005), Bošković (2010), etc; on the other hand, our analysis sheds light on the research on the relevant topics in other East Asian languages.

1. Su in nominal domain

Su occurs in the final position of nominal phrases containing classifiers. When the ‘Noun+Num+CL+Su’ phrase appears in object positions, it only receives definite interpretation (1). When the ‘Noun+Num+CL+Su’ phrase occurs in subject positions, it has definite interpretation only with stage level predicates (2), but it is ambiguous with individual level predicates —either denoting definite or generic, as in (3).

(1) tshq33 mu33 s33 ma33 su31 bu33 o44.
   3s horse three CL SU look for go SFP
   ‘He went to look for the three horses.’

(2) mu33 s33 ma33 su33 li44ndo33 o44.
   horse three CL lose SFP
   ‘The three horses got lost.’

(3) mu33 s33 ma33 su33 s33 tu33 va55 bu13.
   horse three CL SU three thousand Yuan give
   a. The three horses cost three thousands Yuan. (Definite)
   b. Any three horses cost three thousands Yuan. (Generic)

When the numeral is ‘one’, the ‘Noun+one+CL+Su’ phrase has generic reading only, illustrated in (4). When the numeral ‘one’ is omitted, the ‘Noun+CL+Su’ phrase could have either definite reading (5a) or generic reading, shown in (5).

(4) mu44 tshq33 ma33 su33 s33 tu33 va55 phu33.
   Horse one CL SU three thousand Yuan worth
   ‘Any single horse is worth three thousands Yuan.’
   Not: ‘The horse costs three thousands Yuan.’
When Su is omitted, the nominal phrases containing classifiers can never receive definite interpretation; they receive indefinite reading in object positions, as given in (6), and either indefinite or generic reading in subject positions depending on whether the predicate is state level predicate or individual level predicate, illustrated in (7) and (8).

(6) \text{tsh}^{33} \text{mu}^{33} \text{su}^{33} \text{ma}^{33} \text{bo}^{33} \text{o}^{44}. \quad \text{(Indefinite)}
\begin{align*}
3s & \text{horse} \quad 3\text{CL} & \text{look for} & \text{go} & \text{SFP} \\
\text{He went to look for three horses.}
\end{align*}

(7) \text{mu}^{33} \text{su}^{33} \text{ma}^{33} \text{li}^{44} \text{ndo}^{33} \text{o}^{44}. \quad \text{(Indefinite)}
\begin{align*}
\text{horse} & \quad 3\text{CL} & \text{lose} & \text{SFP} \\
\text{Three horses got lost.}
\end{align*}

(8) \text{mu}^{33} \text{su}^{33} \text{ma}^{33} \text{tu}^{33} \text{va}^{55} \text{b}^{31}. \quad \text{(Generic)}
\begin{align*}
\text{horse} & \quad 3\text{CL} & \text{three thousand dollar} & \text{give} \\
\text{Every three horses cost three thousand dollars.}
\end{align*}

\text{Su} cannot co-occur with bare argument NPs: it has to appear with classifiers, as in (9).

(9) \text{mu}^{33} \text{a}^{44} \text{dz}^{44} \text{su}^{33} \text{ma}^{33} \text{li}^{44} \text{ndo}^{33} \text{o}^{44}. \quad \text{(Definite)}
\begin{align*}
\text{horse} & \quad \text{SU} & \text{lose} & \text{SFP} \\
\text{The horse(s) got lost.}
\end{align*}

Note that, \text{Su} is not demonstrative and it can not co-occur with demonstratives.

(10) \text{mu}^{33} \text{a}^{44} \text{dz}^{44} \text{su}^{33} \text{ma}^{33} \text{li}^{44} \text{ndo}^{33} \text{o}^{44}. \quad \text{(Definite)}
\begin{align*}
\text{horse} & \quad \text{DEM} & \text{three CL} & \text{SU} & \text{lose} & \text{SFP} \\
\text{The (Those) three horses got lost.}
\end{align*}

As we have shown in (3) and (5), \text{Su} phrase could be ambiguous—either denoting definite or generic depending on the type of the predicate. However, the supersegmental strategy—tone sandhi can also eliminate this referential ambiguity. The tone that undergoes tone sandhi is shorter and lighter than the original tone in phonetic feature in Yi: when the original tones are stressed, marked as 33 tone in Yi, when the tones that undergo tone sandhi are unstressed, they are marked as 44 tone. In (5) (repeated as (11)), the three morphemes in the phrase are all in original tones (33 tones), and the whole phrase is ambiguous. When the classifier undergoes tone sandhi and gets unstressed, the whole phrase turns to have definite interpretation only (12a); while when the noun undergoes tone sandhi and get unstressed; the phrase has generic interpretation only, as in (12b).

(12)
\begin{align*}
\text{a. } \text{mu}^{33} \text{su}^{33} \text{ma}^{33} \text{su}^{33} \text{tu}^{33} \text{va}^{55} \text{b}^{31}. & \quad \text{(Definite)} \\
\text{horse} & \quad \text{CL} & \text{SU} & \text{three thousand dollar} & \text{give} & \text{SFP} \\
\text{The horse costs three thousand dollars.}
\end{align*}

\begin{align*}
\text{b. } \text{mu}^{33} \text{su}^{33} \text{ma}^{33} \text{su}^{33} \text{tu}^{33} \text{va}^{55} \text{b}^{31}. & \quad \text{(Generic)} \\
\text{horse} & \quad \text{CL} & \text{SU} & \text{three thousand dollar} & \text{give} & \text{SFP} \\
\text{Each horse costs three thousand dollars.}
\end{align*}

2. \text{Su in clausal domain}

\text{Su} can also participate in the clausal domain. When it appears in clausal domain, it behaves like a complementizer, either introducing relative clauses which modify the head(less)
nouns or introducing complement clauses to factive verbs or nouns.

2.1 Relative clauses introduced by Su

Su can either introduce headed relative clauses (13) or headless relative clauses (14), and both external argument and internal argument can be relativized.

(13) \[ \text{sheep} \text{ Mary herd SU fat/beautiful very fat/beautiful} \]

‘The sheep that Mary herds are very fat.’

(14) \[ \text{head noun } [ \text{RC Su } \text{ u su nda } \text{ nda}] \]

‘The one who herds sheep are very beautiful.’

The referential features of the nouns modified by the relative clauses are parallel to those of bare nouns, which can either be definite, indefinite, or generic. When the modified noun appears with classifiers, the clausal level Su (complementizer) must be omitted in this sentence, and the whole classifier phrase has indefinite interpretation only, as shown in (15).

(15) \[ \text{dish Mary cook Asp SU CL John AGENT LIGHT V eat SFP} \]

‘John has eaten up a dish that Mary cooked.’

If we want to add definite reading to (15), we have to add the nominal level ‘Su’ to the right of the classifier, but the clausal level Su still cannot occur.

(16) \[ \text{dish Mary cook Asp SU CL SU John AGENT LIGHT V eat SFP} \]

‘John has eaten up the dish that Mary cooked.’

2.2 Su in complement clause

Clauses introduced by Su can be the complement of factive verbs and nouns.

(17) \[ \text{John bi su Mary dmj su } \text{ na dmj o}\]

‘I know that Mary knew that John has been out.’

Su appears final position of sentences, in which Su introduces a complement to the omitted copula ‘be’, as in (18).

(18) \[ \text{John ho tsu nu la o su qm}\]

‘It is the certain that John will come soon.

Some clauses introduced by Su can be analyzed as either relative clause or complement clause. That is to say, some sentences are ambiguous. For example:

(19) \[ \text{zo zu mi ndo su na usu mo o}\]

a. interpretation: I saw the student that (he) smokes. (relative clause)

b. interpretation: I saw that the student smoke. (complement clause)

3. The previous studies and their problems

Su is rarely discussed in the literature, and the syntactic status of Su is not commonly agreed on. Su has variously been claimed to be an adjectival modifier, topic marker, and particle denoting definiteness (Chen 1985, 1989); a particle with definite reading, topic marker and stance marker (Hu, 2002), a nominalizer, particle with definite function, and gerundive marker (Liu and Gu 2005, 2010). These analyses have the following problems. First, the data are insufficient and some are incorrect. Secondly, the correlation and connection among the different uses of Su have not been made, which lead to inconsistent and non-unified analyses on Su. Thirdly, the previous analyses on Su only emphasize on the
descriptive side, so the explanation to the Su-related phenomena is not provided.

4. Our proposal

In this paper, we argue that overt determiners do exist in classifier languages; Su is a definite determiner of semantic type <<e, t>, <e, t>>, which turns properties into arguments in the nominal domain in Yi. We adopt Chierchia (1998)’s view on the semantic type of bare nouns in classifier languages—bare nouns are of type <e>. This analysis of bare nouns can help us to explain why bare nouns in Yi can be arguments and why the determiner Su cannot combine with bare nouns directly. Meanwhile, Su is a complementizer in the clausal domain either introducing a relative clause which modifies the (empty) head noun or introducing a complement clause. We also argue that there no correlation between (overt) determiners and classifiers: classifier languages can have overt determiners, opposing to what Bošković (2010) suggests, and the function of classifiers are not the same as that of determiner, opposing to what Cheng and Sybesma (1999) propose.

Historically, we argue that Su undergoes different stages of grammaticalization which explains the correlation between the definite determiner and the complementizer in Yi. Syntactically, we propose the structure in (20) for the definite phrase mu33 su33 ma33 su33 ‘the three horses’ in (2) and we propose that the ambiguity of the phrase in (19) is due to two different structures as in (21) and (22).
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5. Implication

Our analysis has the following implications. Empirically, it helps us to work on a unified analysis on Su in the nominal domains and clausal domain. Theoretically, the proposal leads us to re-think some related theories on classifiers and determiner, such as Chierchia (1998), the DP hypothesis Longobardi (1994, 2005), Cheng & Sybesma (1999), Bošković (2010). Typologically, our analysis sheds light on the research on the relevant topics in other East Asian languages.

6. Conclusion

In this paper, we argue that Su is an overt definite determiner of semantic type <<e, t>, <e, t>> in the nominal domain, turning predicates or propositions into arguments. Yi therefore provides empirical evidence for the possibility that classifier languages can have overt determiners. In the clausal domain, Su is the complementizer, either introducing relative clauses which modify the head(less) nouns or introducing complement clauses to factive verbs and (empty) nouns. Historically, we argue that Su undergoes different stages of grammaticalization which explains the correlation between the definite determiner and the complementizer.
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