本文章已註冊DOI數位物件識別碼

airiti Library

Nominal Predicates in Mandarin Chinese

漢語的名詞謂語

doi:10.6519/TJL.2007.5(2).4

Taiwan Journal of Linguistics, 5(2), 2007

臺灣語言學期刊, 5(2), 2007

作者/Author： 魏廷冀(Ting-Chi Wei)

頁數/Page： 85-130

出版日期/Publication Date：2007/12

引用本篇文獻時，請提供DOI資訊，並透過DOI永久網址取得最正確的書目資訊。

To cite this Article, please include the DOI name in your reference data.

請使用本篇文獻DOI永久網址進行連結:

To link to this Article:

http://dx.doi.org/10.6519/TJL.2007.5(2).4

DOI Enhanced

DOI是數位物件識別碼（Digital Object Identifier, DOI）的簡稱，
是這篇文章在網路上的唯一識別碼，
用於永久連結及引用該篇文章。

若想得知更多DOI使用資訊，

請參考 http://doi.airiti.com

For more information,

Please see: http://doi.airiti.com

請往下捲動至下一頁，開始閱讀本篇文獻

PLEASE SCROLL DOWN FOR ARTICLE

最完整的學術整合查詢平台—華藝線上圖書館 ● http://www.airitilibrary.com ● Find more academic articles on Airiti Library

Taiwan Journal of Linguistics
Vol. 5.2, 85-130, 2007

NOMINAL PREDICATES IN MANDARIN CHINESE*

Ting-Chi Wei

ABSTRACT

This article reconsiders Tang's (1998) analysis of Mandarin matrix small clauses (SC) in an attempt to get a better understanding of the structure of the Mandarin nominal predicate. It is found that the structures which the nominal predicate can take can be a bare NP or even not-so-bare projections. All the nominal predicates manifest a kind of modifier-modifiee pattern, which implements 'modificational predication' of the subject. Thus, the matrix SC is structurally "not-so-bare" rather than "bare". Finally, the claim of Mandarin indefinite/definite DP as an argument, not a predicate is further strengthened in this work.

Key words: nominal predicate, modifier-modifiee, modificational predication, NumP, indefinite

1. INTRODUCTION

In the literature, some linguists, such as Stowell (1989, 1991a, b), Longobardi (1994), Szabolcsi (1987, 1992, 1994), Tang (2001b), and Li (1998, 1999), have claimed that bare NPs are predicative, while DPs are non-predicative. This generalization implies that the internal structure of nominal expressions is closely related to the notion of predication. Here, two questions arise. First, is this DP/NP distinction general enough to be maintained in Chinese nominal expressions? Second, what is the

* This paper stems from the Chapter Two of my dissertation (Wei 2004). I am indebted to the committee members and the two TJL reviewers for their helpful comments, which have led to several significant improvements of this paper. Special thanks to Raung-fu Chung and Chen-Sheng Luther Liu for their enlightening suggestions and unfailing encouragement.

relationship between the structure of nominal expression and predication? Chinese linguists (Zhu 1982, Chao 1968, Tang 1979, Lü 1980 et al.) have noticed that some nominals can be taken as predicates just *via* an omission of the copular verb, *shi* 'be'. However, such observation still cannot explain why "nominal expression" sometimes can play the role of predicate and sometimes cannot. In this paper, we propose that predication is not determined by the omission of *shi* 'be', but by the semantic and syntactic properties of the nominal expression. Based on Tang's (1998) "bareness" analysis of the Mandarin "matrix epistemic small clauses" (SC) and nominal predicates, it is observed that his bare-NP predicate analysis cannot satisfactorily explain all the variations of Mandarin nominal predicates, which include not only the "bare" NP itself but also the "not-so-bare" Num-Massifier-NP (denoting quantity), Num-Count classifier-NP (denoting quantity), and NP modified by an adjectival with a *–de* affix. More importantly, all these variations are dominated by a general principle, that is, a modifier-modifiee pattern. Every nominal predicate is bound to be composed of a modifier and a modifiee, which interact with each other to trigger a type of predication called "modificational predication". This can be taken as the answer to the second question. On the other hand, we also find that the nominal predicate construction actually is not a "bare" small clause, but a fully-fledged clause with every potential projection ranging from CP to VP. This claim is sustained by the existence of abundant examples of adverbials or final particles within nominal predicate sentences. Furthermore, a preliminary observation of the semantic interaction between subject and the nominal predicate helps confirm the fact that an indefinite or definite DP is an argument, not a predicate. As a result, the answer to the first question is that a discussion of DP as an argument is tenable, while one of NP as a predicate is too powerful to include other nominal candidates in Mandarin.

The organization of this paper is as follows. Section 2 reviews Tang's analysis (1998) of Mandarin SCs and points out some problems in his analysis. Section 3 argues for a fully-fledged nominal predicate construction, with a modifier-modifiee pattern for Mandarin nominal predicates, the categories of which may be "bare" or "not-so-bare". Section 4 discusses examples of seeming nominal predicates. Section 5 reinterprets some "bareness" effects from the perspectives of our analysis and of Tang's (2005a, b) light *n*P analysis. Section 6 concludes this paper.

C.E.P.S.

2. TANG'S ANALYSIS (1998) OF SCs AND HIS PROBLEMS

In Tang's analysis, the difference between the English SC and the Chinese SC lies in the "bareness" of the SC structure. The English SC is structurally "not-so-bare" (Kitagawa 1985, Horstein & Lightfoot 1987, Bower 1993, Nakayama 1988, Déchaine 1993, and Laka 1994), meaning that it is a matured clausal structure with functional projections as shown in (1), while the Chinese SC is structurally "bare", indicating that it is a pure, lexical projection without any functional projections inside as in (2).

(1) a. I consider John a genius.
b. I consider $[_{CP\text{-}SC}$ C $[_{TP}$ John$_i$ $[_{T'}$ V-T $[_{vP}$ t$_i$ $[_{v'}$ *v* $[_{VP}$ t^V $[_{DP}$ a $[_{NP}$ genius]]]]]]]]][1]

(2) a. Wo dang ta shagua.
I consider him fool
'I consider him a fool.'
b. Wo $[_{vP}$ dang$_i$-v $[_{VP}$ ta $[_{V'}$ t$_i$ $[_{SC}$ PRO shagua]]]]
I consider him fool
'I consider him a fool.'

Tang (1998: 163-168) gives five pieces of evidence to support this contrast, including the distribution of adverbs, extraction of the predicate, extraction of the SC subject, the possessor of the predicate nominal, and the local binding of reflexives. The Chinese SC uniformly nullifies the above five phenomena because of its bareness of structure. Following Higginbotham (1985), he further interprets (2b) into a type of theta-binding satisfaction.[2]

---

[1] Tang (1998) assumes that the maximal projection of an English SC (SC) is CP. Given the Internal Subject Hypothesis, he assumes that the subject of an SC undergoes a merger with *v* and moves to the specifier of TP.

[2] Theta-binding is based on the notion that a nominal like *dog* in (i) has an open place in it and that nominals can serve as predicates in main clauses in many languages (Higginbotham 1985: 560). On the basis of these arguments, the word *dog* has a thematic grid as part of its lexical entry, represented as [dog, -V +N, <1>]. The head nouns do not take arguments when they form NPs with determiners or measure-words; instead, the position <1> is accessible to the element in Spec, which serves as a binder of it. Some

C.E.P.S.

(3) ....V[$_{\text{NP-SC}}$ Gen$_i$ [$_{\text{NP}}$ XP N$_i$]

Given that the Chinese SC contains no predicative head (Bower 1993) or extended projection (Grimshaw 1991), XP is the subject of SC in (3) and can be either PRO or overt nominal (when the matrix predicate belongs to verbs of speech, e.g., *ma* 'scold'). There is a generic operator adjoined to the bare lexical projection, NP, and freely theta-binding the predicate nominal, which is referential. In Higginbotham's approach (1985), (3) is well-formed because theta-binding is satisfied.

The "bareness" discrepancy between Chinese SC and English SC leads Tang to the parametrization of categorical features among languages such as English, Chinese, and Japanese. Tang (1998: 182) claims that the "combination" of the two primitive categorical features, substantive [N] and predicative [V], is subject to parametric variation. For instance, Chinese nouns contain a primary categorical feature, [N], along with a secondary primary categorical feature, [V]. Thus, Chinese nominals can be predicative in the bare SC. In contrast, English nouns contain only a primary categorical feature, [N]; that is, they cannot be predicative and need a fully-fledged clausal structure with functional projections (not-so-bare) to sustain their presence. Japanese nouns and adjectival nouns are divided into two types: (i) <N> (without *–ni*) and (ii) <N, V> (with *–ni*). It follows that the Japanese SC is sometimes "bare" and sometimes "not-so-bare", depending on the nature of the nouns.

After ensuring the parametric variation of the categorical features among languages, Tang (1998, 2001b, 2002a) extends the notion of the nominal predicates in SCs to that in the so-called "matrix epistemic small clause". His main thesis is that the nominal predicate sentence is not derived from the omission of the copulative verb *shi* 'be' (Chao 1968,

---

binder is required, but the number cannot exceed more than one. The operation of theta-binding is illustrated as below.

```
(i)        (NP,<1*>)
             /    \
          Spec   (N',<1>)
            |      |
            |     (N,<1>)
            |      |
           the    dog
```

Yue-Hashimoto 1969). It is a bare SC, the interpretation of which is just like that for an embedded SC, as shown in (4).

(4) a. [Subject [$_{N'}$ N]]
b. [Wo [$_{N'}$ Zhongguoren]]
I Chinese
'I am a Chinese.'
c. [$_{SC\text{-}NP}$ Gen$_i$ [$_{NP}$ Wo Zhongguoren$_i$]]
I Chinese

Tang (1998, 2002a) offers evidence to support his analysis. First, if a matrix SC is formed by deleting *shi* 'be', we expect that (5b) is grammatical, but it is not.

(5) a. Wo shi yige Zhongguoren.
I be one-Cl Chinese
'I am (a) Chinese.'
b. *Wo yige Zhongguoren.
I one-Cl Chinese

Secondly, only when *shi* 'be' is present do sentential adverbs and focus adverbs appear.

(6) a. Ta *yexu* shi Zhangsan.
he maybe be Zhangsan
'Maybe he is Zhangsan.'
b. Ta *zhi* shi haizi.
he only be child
'He is only a child.'
c. *Ta *yexu* Zhangsan.
he maybe Zhangsan
d. *Ta *zhi* haizi.
he only child

Thirdly, the sentential final particle *laizhe*, a past tense marker, cannot occur in the matrix SC, but it can in the copular sentence.

(7) a. *Ta qiongguangdan *laizhe*.
he poor-empty-egg Par

C.E.P.S.

b. (?)Ta shi qiongguangdan *laizhe*.
he be poor-empty-egg Par
'He is a poor guy!'

Fourthly, the copula-less sentence can only describe a present situation, not a past situation, while the presence of *shi* 'be' makes the description of the past possible.

(8) a. **qunian*, ta qiongguangdan.
last-year he poor-empty-egg
b. *qunian*, ta shi qiongguangdan.
last-year he be poor-empty-egg
'Last year, he was a poor man.'

Finally, pragmatically, in the contrastive context, the copula-less sentence denotes a categorical judgment with a selective and contrastive implication (Kuroda 1992), whereas a copular sentence with a number-classifier preceding the nominal does not denote categorical judgment.

(9) a. Wo Zhongguoren, ni Aozhouren.
I Chinese you Australian
'I am (a) Chinese, and you are an Australian.'
b. # Wo shi Zhongguoren, ni shi Aozhouren.
I be Chinese you be Australian

In addition to matrix SCs, Tang also considers empty verb sentences in Chinese, including transitive 'verbless' sentences and locative 'verbless' sentences. The characteristic of this type is that there is an empty verb between subject and nominal elements as in (10). In other words, the nominals here are not predicative by nature.

(10) a. Wo [$_{VP}$ [$_{V}$ [e] liangbu diannao]
I two-Cl computer
'I have two computers.'
b. Wu-li [$_{VP}$ [$_{V}$ [e] xueduo wenzi]
house-inside many mosquito
'There are many mosquitoes in the house.'

C.E.P.S.

Tang's analysis of bare matrix/embedded SCs in Chinese can be taken as a theoretical, pioneering work. However, there are two important issues which are not satisfactorily answered: (i) What is the nature of nominal predication in matrix and embedded small clauses? and (ii) Is the matrix SC really "bare"?

Under Tang's approach, the closest answer to the first issue lies in the secondary categorical feature of the predicate nominal, [V]. In other words, any noun that is counted as a predicate is such due to the categorical feature [V], which is lacking in English and which appears in some Japanese (adjective) nouns. Although this generalization is a kind of parametric variation and is supposed to be general, it still runs the risk of being "too general". For instance, look at the following "matrix epistemic SC" in Chinese.

(11) a. Ta shagua.
he fool
'He is a fool.'
b. Ta Zhongguoren.
he Chinese
'He is (a) Chinese.'
c. *Ta ren.
he person
d. *Ta yanjing. (cf. *Ta ta yanjing*.)
he eyes he big eyes

If the combination of categorical features in Chinese nouns, <N, V>, can guarantee the predicative status of nominals, then it is possible for any noun to be predicative. However, as we can see from (11c) and (11d), the bare noun *ren* 'human' and *yanjing* 'eyes' fail to be predicative, indicating that categorical feature analysis cannot capture the whole picture of Chinese nominal predicates and that there must be some other more restrictive generalizations, regularizing the predication of Chinese nominal predicates.

As to the second issue, Tang considers that the most direct way to understand the "matrix bare SC" is through the embedded SC, because both bare lexical projections are treated similarly. However, sometimes, such analogy may miss some crucial subtleties. Look at the following contrast.

C.E.P.S.

(12) a. Wo dang [ta xuesheng].
I consider he student
'I consider him (to be) a student.'
b. ??Ta xuesheng.
he student
'He is a student.'

In (12a), the embedded bare SC, [*ta xuesheng*] 'he-student', is legitimate in the context of the matrix verb, *dang* 'consider', but the very same bare SC cannot stand alone, as shown in (12b). It implies that there might be some semantic or syntactic constraints on the existence of the matrix bare SC and that the term, SC, should be used more cautiously to refer to the embedded SC only. As reviewed previously, Tang's assumption of the bareness of the nominal predicate in copula-less copulative sentences depends on a comparison with the behaviors of *shi* 'be' sentences. We admit that in comparison with copular sentences, nominal predicate sentences are "barer"; for instance, they disallow sentential adverb, *yexu* 'perhaps', and focus adverb, *zhi* 'only', past-tense final particle, *laizhe*, and time adverb, *qunian* 'last year'. Nevertheless, we do find many examples of nominal predicates with adverbs, final particle, and NP time as follows.

(13) a. Jintian *gang/yijing/dou* xingqi san. (Zhu 1982)
today just/already/all week three
'Today is just Wednesday; today is already Wednesday.'
b. Zuotian *cai* xingqi san.
yesterday just week three.
'Yesterday was just Wednesday.'

Chao (1968) and Zhu (1982) have already pointed out that nominal predicates can be preceded by adverbs. If such observations are correct, then Tang's bareness assumption of Chinese matrix small clause needs reconsidering. That is, the matrix bare SC, as a matter of fact, is "not-so-bare" due to the existence of adverb-licensing projections (Travis 1984, 1988). Hence, the data in (13) weaken Tang's analysis and cast doubt on the "bareness" of the nominal predicate sentences.

C.E.P.S.

3. THE STRUCTURE OF NOMINAL PREDICATE CONSTRUCTIONS

3.1 Modifier-Modifiee Pattern Within Nominal Predicates

This section is devoted to the exploration of nominal predication in Chinese. We capture a general modifier-modifiee pattern among nominal predicate sentences. Nominal predicates were brought to light as early by Chao (1968), Zhu (1982), and many others. To make a more thorough survey, we collect the data in the literature.

(14) a. Zhangsan shagua. (Zhu 1982, Tang 1998)
Zhangsan fool
'Zhangsan is a fool.'
b. Zhangsan Taiwan ren.
Zhangsan Taiwan person
'Zhangsan is (a) Taiwanese.'
c. Zhangsan zhong xuesheng.
Zhangsan middle student
'Zhangsan is a senior/junior high school student.'
d. Zhege haizi da yanjing.
this-Cl child big eye
'The child has big eyes.'
e. Cai yijin bakai qian.
Vegetable one-Cl eight-Cl money
'The price of vegetables is eight dollars a Taiwan *jin*.'[3]
f. Zuotian xingqi liu.
yesterday week six
'Yesterday was Saturday.'

Except for the sentences in (14a) which are subjective with an evaluative judgment, data from (14b) to (14f) are mostly objective with no personal judgment involved. Interestingly, this semantic and pragmatic discrepancy has a crucial impact on the syntactic representation. It is found that there is a kind of modifier-modifiee structural relation within the objective predicate nominal in order for it to be well-formed. For example, in (14b), the bare head noun, *ren* 'people'

[3] One Taiwan *jin* amounts to 0.6 kilogram.

C.E.P.S.

cannot stand alone without the support of the NP modifier, *Taiwan* 'Taiwan', as illustrated in (15).

(15) Zhangsan [*(Taiwan) [ren]]
Zhangsan Taiwan people
'Zhangsan is (a) Taiwanese.'

The fact that bare NPs cannot be predicates violates the general NP-predicate analysis, held by Stowell (1989), Longobardi (1994), Szabolcsi (1994), Tang (2001b), and Li (1998, 1999), indicating that their claims need modifying to fit Chinese data. The same reasoning also applies to the other types of data, from (14c) to (14f), each of which reveals some interesting facts about this modificational relationship. In (14c), the nominal, *xuesheng* 'student' is a two-syllable noun, which, however, is an inseparable unit and should be counted as a bare head noun. Again, in (14c, d), the bare head nouns without NP/AP modifier are unacceptable predicates, challenging the claim that only a bare NP can be a predicate, as follows.

(16) a. Zhangsan [??(zhong (xue)) [xuesheng]]
Zhangsan middle school student
'Zhangsan is a senior/junior high school student.'
b. Zhe haizi [*(da) [yanjing]].
this child big eye
'The child has big eyes.'

In (14e, f), we still can find the modifier-modifiee pattern. In (14e), the modifier is Num-Cl and modifiee is the head noun. This type is characterized by the fact that Num-Cl-N can be predicative. Num-Cl plays the role of modifier, and the head noun modifiee, which, sometimes, can be omitted if it can be predicted from the context as in (17a). (14f) also demonstrates that nominal predicate sentences expressing time also contain a modifier-modifiee pattern as shown in (17b).

(17) a. Cai yijin [bakai [(qian)]]
Vegetable one-Cl eight-Cl money
'The price of vegetables is eight dollars a Taiwan *jin*.'

C.E.P.S.

b. Zuotian [xingqi [liu]]
yesterday week six
'Yesterday was Saturday.'

The above analyses show that the nominal predicate constructions share a common property—the modifier-modifiee relationship within nominal predicates, with one exception, (14a). Nominal in (14a) is an inseparable epithet, conveying evaluative, subjective denotation, distinct from the examples (14b)-(14f) with an objective, descriptive meaning. If we assume that an operator, which is responsible for expressing the speaker's personal judgment, precedes the epithet, then the nominal structure of (14a) can be represented as below.

(18) Zhangsan [*OP* [shagua]].
Zhangsan fool
'Zhangsan is a fool.'

The operator transmits the speaker's personal opinion about the subject and it creates an unsaturated open space in which the noun can be a predicate (Higginbotham 1985 and Rothstein 1983). In some way, it functions just as a modifier, affecting and transforming the status of the modifiee to become a predicate.[4] Given this account, it follows that the analysis of NP-predicate needs reconsidering with respect to the syntactic status of the predicate nominal in Chinese and that modifier-triggering predication has to be taken into account to capture the relationship between predication and the structure of the nominal.

3.2 Syntactic Status of Nominal Predicates

Many linguists (Stowell 1989, 1991a, b, Longobardi 1994, Szabolcsi 1987, 1992, 1994, Tang 2001b, and Li 1998, 1999) agree that the bare NP is predicative, while the DP is non-predicative. For the Chinese language, Tang (1998, 2001b, 2002a) concludes that both SCs and matrix SCs follow this basic tenet: only the Bare NP can be predicative as in (19).

[4] We also can assume that objective nouns have an objective operator attached and that such case does not trigger predication but is considered a default meaning of the nominal predicate.

C.E.P.S.

(19) a. Wo dang [Zhangsan shagua].
I consider Zhangsan fool
'I consider Zhangsan a fool.'
b. * Wo dang [Zhangsan yige shagua].
I consider Zhangsan one-Cl fool
c. Zhangsan shagua.
Zhangsan fool
'Zhangsan is a fool.'
d. *Zhangsan yige shagua.
Zhangsan one-Cl fool

When the number-classifier *yige* 'one' precedes the head noun as in (19b) and (19d), the sentences become ungrammatical. On the other hand, Tang also admits that nominal predicates, denoting the character and quality of the subject, can be common nouns, proper names, and even numerals. That is to say, a sentence like (20) also belongs to his copula-less bare sentence.

(20) yibei kafei [wukai qian].
one-cup coffee five-Cl money
'A cup of coffee is five dollars.'

The Num-Cl-N structure in (20) becomes an apparent counter-example to the bare NP predicate analysis. In Tang's (1998: 148-9) footnote, Luther Liu and Yafei Li provide more Num-Cl-N examples, (21a, b) and (21c, d), respectively, which are interpreted from the angles of the fossilization of idioms or categorial change. For the former interpretation, the Num-Cl-N structures, such as *yipan sansha* 'a plate of loose sand' (21b), are regarded as a fossilized expression, and for the latter, as in (21c), *yige* 'one' is assumed to be internalized as a part of the adjectival modifier, in contrast to (21d) which still has an apparent Num-Cl-N structure. Furthermore, in order to escape the dilemma of the bare NP predicate analysis, Tang, in line with Cheng and Sybesma's (1998) analysis, suggests that mass-classifiers such as those in (21a, b) be actually base-generated at N, later moving to Cl (Tang 1998: 161).

C.E.P.S.

(21) a. Wo dang [*ta yi-keng dabian /yi-tuo niufen/*
I consider he one-pit shit one-lump cowshit
ban-dun feigang].
half-ton waste steel
'I consider him a good-for-nothing/a lump of cowshit/a half ton of waste steel.'

b. Wo dang tamen [*yi-pan sansha/*
I consider they one-plate loose-sand
yi-tan choushui].
one-pool stinking-water
'I consider them in a state of disunity/a pool of stinking water.'

c. Wo dang ta [*quan shijie zui da de yige shagua*].
I consider he all world most big De one-Cl fool
'I consider him the biggest fool in the whole world.'

d. *Wo dang ta *yige* [*quan shijie zui da de shagua*].
I consider he one-Cl whole world most big De fool

In fact, his assertion of N-to-Cl movement amounts to saying that the nominal predicate is not a bare NP, but at least a Cl-NP structure, and this argument obviously goes against the bare-NP predicate analysis. Furthermore, this explanation is also too weak to explain the contrast between the grammaticality of (20) and the ungrammaticality of (19b, d), both of which contain the same structure, Num-Count Cl-NP. In the following, we will propose that (20) and (21) can be accounted for in terms of the mass/count classifier distinction (Tai and Wang 1990, Croft 1994, Cheng and Sybesma 1999) and DP/NumP distinction (Li 1998, Longobardi 1994) and finally come to the conclusion that nominal predicates are sometimes bare nouns and sometimes "not-so-bare" nouns (Cheng and Sybesma 1999). This result obviously is not in conformity with the spirit of bare NP-predicate analysis.

The examples in (22) show that the "not-so-bare" Num-Massifier-NP as a nominal predicate can be found in the matrix clause with ease.

C.E.P.S.

(22) Tamen [$_{\text{NumP}}$ *yi-qun* *shagua*][5]
they one-group fool
'They are a group of fools.'

According to the classification of classifiers made by Tai and Wang (1990) and Croft (1994), classifiers that create a unit of measure are called mass-classifiers (massifiers) (e.g., *ping* 'bottle', *ba* 'handful', and *wan* 'bowl'), being used to measure mass nouns, which lack a built-in semantic partitioning. On the other hand, classifiers that simply name the unit in which the entity denoted by a noun naturally occurs are called count-classifiers (e.g., *ge*, *zhi*, and *wei*). Following this categorization, Cheng and Sybesma (1998, 1999) group *qun* 'group' in (22) as a massifier. Our first inference is that Num-massifier-N in (21a, b) and (22) is an eligible candidate for predicates especially when focusing on the quantity of the noun phrase. In contrast to mass classifiers, count classifiers in (19b, d) and (20) present different syntactic behaviors in the Num-count classifier-NP. *Ge* in (19b, d) and *kuai* 'dollar' in (20) are both grouped as count classifiers given the previous definitions. However, why is the former ungrammatical and the latter grammatical?

Here I will follow Li's (1998) proposal that a Num-Cl-N sequence can be analyzed either as a DP, denoting indefiniteness, or NumP, denoting quantity. We assume that although (19b, d) and (20) have the same superficial sequence, Num-Count Classifier-NP, those in (19b, d) are actually indefinite DPs, while those in (20) are quantity-denoting NumP as Num-massifier-NP in (21a, b) and (22). We propose that the crucial factor affecting the choice of DP/NumP lies in the existence of the (in)definiteness of the nominals in question. In the first place, when the subject is a proper name like *Zhangsan*, it tends to form a kind of identificational sentence by means of the insertion of the copulative verb *shi* 'be' before the indefinite object *yige shagua* 'a fool', which is

[5] I thank one reviewer for pointing out my mistake of classifying *tiao* 'stretch' as a massifier in (i), which, as Chao (1968:586) suggests, should be an individual classifier. In that sense, *yi-tiao xin* 'one-Cl heart' as a Num-Count Classifier-NP can still be predicative just like *wu-kai qian* 'five-Cl money' in (20) by denoting it as a quantity-denoting NumP. Thus, it will not pose a problem to my analysis.
(i) Dajia [$_{\text{NumP}}$ *yi-tiao* *xin*]
everyone one-Cl heart
'Everyone is of one heart; everyone unites.'

C.E.P.S.

defined by Li (1998) as a DP on the basis of the fact that it is the D that determines the (in)definiteness of a nominal, as illustrated in (23).

(23) [*Zhangsan*] shi [$_{DP}$[$_{D}$ e] [$_{NumP}$ *yige* *shagua*]]
Zhangsan be one-Cl fool
'Zhangsan is a fool.'

The well-formedness of (23) can be explained from both syntactic and semantic perspectives. Syntactically, in terms of Longobardi's (1994) analysis, depicting that an indefinite DP, an argument, can only stay at post-verbal position, not preverbal position, for the empty D head, like other empty categories, has to be lexically governed by a verb, like *shi* 'be', to satisfy the ECP. Hence, when a copulative verb is absent as in (19b, d), the empty D head of the argument DP will not be properly governed and the sentences are ungrammatical. Semantically speaking, according to Croft (1994), Paris (1981), and Iljic (1994), a count-classifier such as *ge* is, in a sense, a manifestation of individuation or singularization, meaning that it can extract discrete occurrences in the discourse/world context. The singularizing function of count-classifiers is just like D, which, in the terminology of Longobardi (1994), has the ability to identify a single unit from whatever is described by N(P) (cf. Higginbotham 1985). Here, we will take the position that the existence of a count-classifier may presuppose the presence of a covert D as in (23), because of their parallel function.

Can the indefinite DP analysis explain the examples provided by Yafei Li in (21c, d)? In (21d), its empty D head is not "properly governed" as (19b, d); thus, it is not available for consideration. As to (21c), a review suggests that the AP-*de*-Num-Cl-NP sequence *quan shijie zui da de yige shagua* 'the biggest fool in the world' may be an appositive phrase of the subject *ta* 'he', just as in my analysis of the definite NP *zhege shagua* 'this fool' as an appositive phrase of *Zhangsan* in (24).

(24) Zhangsan *zhege* *shagua*.
Zhangsan this-Cl fool
'Zhangsan this fool.'

We argue that (24) is not a sentence, but an appositive phrase. Evidence shows that it can be placed freely in the subject and object positions, or

C.E.P.S.

even the argument positions after the passive *bei* or the preposition *ba* and *gen* 'with' as in (25), indicating that it is a nominal constituent. In contrast, the real nominal predicate sentence *Zhangsan shagua* 'Zhangsan is a fool' cannot appear in those positions. Accordingly, (24) differs from the nominal predicate structure and the claim that DP cannot be a predicate still holds. Actually, the AP-*de*-Num-Cl-NP sequence *quan shijie zui da de yige shagua* 'the biggest fool in the world' behaves just like *zhege shaqua* 'this fool' in the contexts of (25), proving that the former can be regarded as an appositive phrase as well. Valid as it is, it seems that the appositive analysis can only account for the distribution of AP-*de*-Num-Cl-NP in the matrix clause (25) but not in the small clause. As shown in (26), the same sequence can alternatively serve as a predicate, while the appositive phrase *zhege shagua* 'this fool' cannot. We propose that in (21c) the modifier *quan shijie zui da de* 'the biggest in the world' triggers the predication of the following nominal modifiee *yi-ge shagua* 'a fool'. The modifier-modifiee complex is later predicated of the subject *ta* 'he' with the relation of identification. Such predication has its syntactic projection, something like PrP as held by Bowers (1993). The head can "properly govern" the empty D head within DP *yi-ge shagua* 'a fool'; hence, (21c) is well-formed,[6] since *zhege shagua* in a DP structure cannot trigger predication within small clause.

(25) a. [Zhangsan zhege shagua/Zhangsan quan shijie zui da de
Zhangsan this-Cl fool Zhangsan whole world most big De
yige shagua/ *Zhangsan shagua] hen ben.
one-Cl fool Zhangsan fool very stupid
'Zhangsan, this fool/the biggest fool in the world, is very stupid.'
b. Wo taoyan [Zhangsan zhege shagua/Zhangsan quan shijie
I hate Zhangsan this-Cl fool Zhangsan whole world
zui da de yige shagua/*Zhangsan shagua].
most big De one-Cl fool Zhangsan fool
'I hate Zhangsan, this fool/the biggest fool in the world.'

[6] We temporarily extend Longobardi's (1994) "lexical government" to "proper government", owing to the fact that we are not sure whether the Predicational Head is as what Bowers has claimed, a functional projection, which obviously is against "lexical government" analysis.

C.E.P.S.

c. Wo bei [Zhangsan zhege shagua/Zhangsan quan shijie
I Passive Zhangsan this-Cl fool Zhangsan whole world
zui da de yige shagua/ *Zhangsan shagua] pian le.
most big De one-Cl fool Zhangsan fool cheat Par
'I was cheated by Zhangsan, this fool/the biggest fool in the world.'

d. Wo ba [Zhangsan zhege shagua/Zhangsan quan shijie zui
I BA Zhangsan this-Cl fool Zhangsan whole world most
da de yige shagua/ *Zhangsan shagua] ci le.
big De one-Cl fool Zhangsan fool fire Par
'I fired Zhangsan this fool/the biggest fool in the world.'

e. Wo gen [Zhangsan zhege shagua/Zhangsan quan shijie
I with Zhangsan this-Cl fool Zhangsan whole world
zui da de yige shagua/*Zhangsan shagua] chifan.
most big De one-Cl fool Zhangsan fool dine
'I dined with Zhangsan this fool/the biggest fool in the world.'

(26) Wo dang [ta [quan shijie zui da de yige shagua/
I consider he all world most big De one-Cl fool
*zhege shagua]].
this-Cl fool
'I consider him the biggest fool in the world.'

Secondly, when the subject is a quantifier noun or a proper name such as in (20), it also can take a NumP with quantity denotation as its predicate. These sentences conform to Longobardi's analysis, because there is no empty D head existing and the Num head is also filled; therefore, the lexical government requirement is irrelevant. More examples similar to (20) are listed below.

(27) a. yige ren [$_{NumP}$ *yige pingguo*]
one-Cl person one-Cl apple
'There is one apple for each person.'

b. yige ren [$_{NumP}$ *yizhang chuang*]
one-Cl person one-Cl bed
'There is one bed for each person.'

The Num-Cl-N structures in (27) all express the meaning of quantity. But, a question arises: "Why cannot the Num-Count Cl-N in (23) be taken as a NumP predicate just like that in (27) to avoid the ECP

C.E.P.S.

violation?" It is proposed that the answer lies in the semantic matching between subject and predicate. Look at the following contrast.

(28) a. Zhangsan *yige* *erzi*.
Zhangsan one-Cl son
'Zhangsan has a son.'
b. Yangguo cai *yizhi* *shou*.
Yangguo just one-Cl arm
'Yangguo has just one arm.'
c. *Zhangsan *yige* *shagua*.
Zhangsan one-Cl fool
d. *Zhangsan *yige* *xuesheng*.
Zhangsan one-Cl student
e. (Mei) yige laoshi *yige* *xuesheng*.
Every one-Cl teacher one-Cl student
'Every teacher has a student.'

In (28a, b), *erzi* 'son' and *shou* 'arm' are a countable kinship term and a body-part of the subject, respectively. The whole sequence, Num-Count Cl-NP, apparently expresses quantity meaning when matching the subject, whereas in (28c, d) *shagua* 'fool' and *xuesheng* 'student' depict the (personality/profession) identity of the subject. When they are preceded by a Num-count classifier structure such as *yige* 'one', the whole sequence, *yige shagua/yige xuesheng* 'a fool/a student', conveys an indefinite meaning. That is to say, both sentences function as identificational sentences, which need a copular verb to license the zero D head of the second DP (Longobardi 1994).[7] But note that when the subject is a quantifier noun as in (28e), it requires a NumP to denote predicative quantity meaning. The contrast between (28d) and (28e) again shows that the semantic relationship between subject and predicate plays a role in determining the category of the second nominals, either DP or NumP. There is one thing in common among examples such as (20), (27), and (28a, b, e); that is, they all contain "quantity denotation" and the overt verb, *you* 'have', can be inserted in them. In other words, quantity denotation between subject and predicate will naturally require a NumP nominal to be a predicate, while identity denotation requires a

[7] For (28d), in contrastive context, it can be interpreted as 'Zhangsan has one student'. In this case, the same sequence is interpreted as a NumP denoting quantity just like (28e).

C.E.P.S.

DP argument along with an inserted verb like *shi* 'be'. Given that the "not-so-bare" NumP can be a predicate, Tang's bare NP predicate analysis needs further consideration.

Until now, we have found that in addition to some bare NP predicates as Tang claims, there still exist some "not-so-bare" nominal predicates, including the quantity-denoting Num-Massifier-NP and Num-Count Cl-NP and even ClP (e.g., *xingqi-liu* 'Saturday'). Moreover, it is interesting to note that the modifier-modifiee pattern plays a role in both bare and not-so-bare nominal predicates. What is more, we assume that [Num-Mass classifier] and [Num-Count classifier] can each be counted as a modifier, which along with the modifiee NP forms and triggers modificational predication. In the following, we will preliminarily analyze the structure of the bare NP, especially when it is modified by a nominal phrase or an adjectival phrase as in (14b-f), to see if the bare NP predicate analysis is too strong or too weak. It turns out that it is too strong to include some "not-so-bare' cases.

3.3 A Test of Bareness

So far, in fact, there is only one type which is able to be qualified as a pure bare NP predicate structure. It is (14a), which contains an epithet with a subjective and an evaluative denotation. The other examples from (14b-f) cannot be regarded as "pure" bare NP predicates, because there are modifiers, such as N(P), A(P), and even Num-Cl and Cl, preceding the modifiee of the bare N(P)s. The aim here is to carry out a preliminary investigation to discover whether this modifier is adjoined to a projection inside the NP or outside the NP. It is believed that this survey can make us better understand how "bare" the nominal predicate is. If the result shows that both alternatives are possible, then it is possible that the notion of modificational predication can be extended to the range of both "inside/outside NP", which directly supports our view that sometimes a "not-so-bare" nominal predicate is unavoidable. We will clarify this issue in terms of the notion of conjunction and ellipsis; that is, elements within an NP cannot be elided separately and should strictly follow the Lexical Integrity Hypothesis, regulating that no syntactic operation may affect part of a lexical item. If the deletion results in ungrammaticality, then the sequence in question should be an inseparable lexical item; otherwise, it belongs to syntactic operation.

Look at the following conjunction sentences.

C.E.P.S.

(29) a. *Zhangsan [shagua], Lisi [e]
Zhangsan fool Lisi
b. *Zhangsan [Kejia [ren]], Lisi [Minnan [e]]
Zhangsan Hakka person Lisi South-Min
c. *Zhangsan [daxue [xiaozhang]], Lisi [xiaoxue [e]]
Zhangsan university principal Lisi primary school
d. *Zhangsan [huang [toufa]], Lisi [bai [e]]
Zhangsan yellow hair Lisi white
e. Zhangsan [huang-se de [toufa]], Lisi [bai-se de [e]]
Zhangsan yellow-color De hair Lisi white-color De
'Zhangsan has yellow hair and Lisi has white.'
f. Cai [bakuai [qian]], huangdou [wukuai [e]]
vegetable eight-Cl money soybean five-Cl
'Vegetables are eight dollars, and soybeans are five.'
g. *Cai [bakuai [qian], huangdou [wu __[e]]
vegetable eight-Cl money soybean five
h. *Qunian [da [xuan]], jinnian [chu [e]]
last-year big election this-year preliminary
i. *Qunian [daxuan [nian]], jinnian [chuxuan [e]]
last-year big-election year this-year preliminary-election
j. *Wuyue [Duanwu [jie]], bayue [Zhongqiu [e]]
May Duanwu Festival August Mid-autumn

In the second conjunct, the bare NP head cannot be deleted by itself as in (29a, b, c, d, h, i, j). (29e) shows that when the modifier has an adjectival marker *–de*, the bare NP deletion is possible, indicating that the modifier is outside the NP projection. In addition, in (29f), the Num-Cl sequence can stand alone without the aid of the bare NP, but Num cannot exist without a classifier as shown in (29g), indicating that Num and Cl have to co-occur in Chinese (Tang 1990). (29i) and (29j) show that when the bare NP is deleted in the first conjunct, it has to be elided as well in the second and that when the bare NP is present in the first conjunct, it also has to be present in the second. That is, the presence/absence of the first bare NP is on a par with that of the second.

To account for these phenomena, we assume that the modifiers in (29a, b, c, d, h, i, j) are adjoined to N', which is inseparable, as shown

C.E.P.S.

below in (30a). The modifiers are preliminarily represented as A(P)/N(P).[8]

(30) a.

```
        NP
       /  \
          N'
         /  \
A(P)/N(P)   N'
            |
            N
```

As to (29e) and (29f), we postulate that adjectivals with –*de* as well as Num-Cl sequences are located at the positions outside the bare NP as illustrated in (30b). AP-*de* is adjoined to NP below the Num-Cl sequence, because it is possible to form nominal predicate with the Num-Cl-AP-*de*-NP structure as in (31a) instead of with the AP-*de*-Num-Cl-NP structure as in (31b), especially when the relationship between subject and nominal predicate is a kind of possession.[9] In addition, as discussed in (25), when the relationship is a kind of identification, AP-*de*-Num-Cl-NP is an appositive phrase as shown in (31c), not a nominal predicate in the matrix clause, whereas Num-Cl-AP-*de*-NP in (31d) is ruled out with D left ungoverned.[10] Hence, AP-*de* is placed under Num-Cl within a nominal predicate.

[8] NP projections may not satisfactorily explain the distinction between [OP [*shagua*]] 'fool' with derogatory meaning and *xuesheng* 'student'. It is possible that these modifiers in question occur under N within the lexical structure.

[9] I thank a reviewer for pointing out a problem in my previous analysis concerning the possibility of modification of AP-de over NumP or NP. That failure may be attributed to the fact that AP-de-Num-Cl-NP tends to induce a specific reading, generating a non-predicative DP.

[10] More discussions on possession and identification will be made in the next section.

C.E.P.S.

(30) b.

```
NumP
 / \
    Num'
     / \
 Num   ClP
        / \
           Cl'
          / \
        Cl   NP
             / \
   (AP-de)   NP
```

(31) a. yi-ge ren [$_{NumP}$ yi-ge hen-da-de [$_{NP}$ pingguo]].
one-Cl person one-Cl very-big-de apple
'Every person has a big apple.'

b. *yi-ge ren [hen-da-de [$_{NumP}$ yi-ge pingguo]].
one-Cl person very-big-de one-Cl apple

c. ta quan shijie zui da de yige shagua.
he whole world most big de one-Cl fool
'He, the biggest fool in the world.'

d. *ta yi-ge quan shijie zui da de shagua.
he one-Cl whole world most big de fool
'He is the biggest fool in the world.'

From (31), one thing is certain: Whether the modifier is outside or inside the NP, modificational predication is still at work. Thus, the predicate nominal can be either a bare NP or a not-so-bare nominal structure, including a Num-Mass Cl-NP, Num-Count Cl-NP (denoting quantity), ClP, or AP-*de*-NP.

3.4 Nominal Predicate Construction with Modificational Predication

In Section 2, we mentioned that Tang's claim of the existence of matrix bare SC will run into some problems. Not only is it structurally different from the SC as in (32), but also its 'bareness' is negated by the fact that some functional-head licensing adverbs, final particles, and NP-time adverbs are able to appear therein, as repeated below in (33).[11]

[11] Luther Liu (p.c.) points out that adverbs such as *gang* 'just' and *cai* 'just' denote the

(32) a. Wo dang [ta xuesheng].
I consider he student
'I treat him as a student.'
b. ??ta xuesheng.
he student

(33) a. Jintian *gang/yijing/dou* xingqi san. (Zhu 1982) (Adverb)
today just/already/all week three
'Today is just Wednesday; today is already Wednesday.'
b. *Zuotian cai* xingqi ri. (NP-time and adverb)
yesterday just week day
'Yesterday was just Sunday.'
c. Ta *yijing/dou* ershi sui *le*. (Zhu 1982) (Adverb and particle)
he already/all two-ten age Par
'He is already twenty years old.'

The examples in (32) and (33) directly support the claim that the notion of 'bareness' cannot adequately explain the structure of 'matrix SC'. A priori, a fully-fledged clause is postulated to satisfy the notion of "not-so-bare" with respect to matrix SCs and nominal predicates.

(34) $[_{CP}[_{IP}$ Subject [... $[_{PreP}$ ... $[_{NumP/NP}$ modifier $[_{N}$ modifiee]]]]]]

Convincing as it is, (34) is simply a generalization rather than an explanation, according to the comments of one of the reviewers of this paper. Thus, based on Lü 's (1941) phrase-clause transition analysis of the Chinese modifier-modifiee *Pian-Zheng-Shi* (偏正式), we propose a syntactic and semantic account to explain why the first elements within nominal predicates such as N-N, A-N, A-de-NP, (Adj-de) Num-Cl-NP, Cl-NP, and Mood-N can be recognized as modifiers in function and how the modifier-modifiee is modificationally predicated of the subject.

Via phrase-clause transition, Lü has claimed that the phrase *gao-shan* 'high-mountain' can turn into *shan-gao* 'mountain-high' and *wuxian-pu* (五線譜) 'staff' can be realized as *pu-(you) wuxian* (譜(有)五線) 'a staff with five lines'. In this vein, it is assumed that a "mini" clause can be identified within a nominal predicate. More specifically, the phrasal modifier-modifiee can be semantically realized as a clause with the

conception of "temporariness". Their cause and effect will be left for further research.

C.E.P.S.

modifiee as the subject and modifier as an adverbial modifier (argument) of an implicit verb, which interpretation varies with the diverse relationships between modifier and modifiee, as shown below.

(35) N-N:
a. Taiwan-ren
Taiwan-person 'Taiwanese.'
'People were born in Taiwan.'
'People were born into a Taiwanese family.'
'People live in Taiwan.'
'People originate from/come from the Taiwanese culture/land.'
etc.
b. kouzu- huajia (Instrument)
mouth-foot painter
'The painter paints with his mouth and feet.'
c. gaozhong- laoshi (Location)
high-school teacher
'Teachers teach at senior high schools.'
(36) A-N/Adj-de NP
da(-de)-yanjing (Degree)
big De eye
'The size of eyes is considered *as being big*.'
(37) Num-Cl-NP
a. bakuai-qian (Quantity)
eight-Cl-money
'The money amounts to eight dollars.'
b. yi-ge-xuesheng (Quantity)
one-Cl-student
'The number of students amounts to one.'
c. yi-tiao-xin (Quantity)
one-Cl-heart
'Hearts are unified as one.'
d. yi-duzi-qi (Quantity)
one-belly-anger
'Anger fills stomach.'
(38) Cl-NP
xingqi-liu (Quantity)
week-six
'The numeral six is counted on a weekly basis.'

C.E.P.S.

(39) Mood-N
OP-shagua (Manner)
fool
'The term *shagua* is interpreted in a subjective, derogatory way.'

The semantic function of the modifiers is to modify the postulated implicit verb and serve as an adverbial argument (Davidson 1967, Parsons 1990). If this assumption is on the right track, the source of the modificational predication may be partially derived from this implicit verb along with its modifier.[12]

In addition, we also find that there exist two basic relations between the modifiee and the matrix subject: Identification and possession as shown in (40). In fact, these relations can help to clarify whether a Num-Cl-NP is an indefinite DP or a quantity-denoting NumP, as discussed in Section 3.2, repeated here as (41). In (41a), the subject-modifiee relation is "identification"; thus, *yi-ge xuesheng* 'a student' is an indefinite DP, which cannot be a predicate. In (41b), the subject-modifiee relation is possession; consequently, *yi-ge xuesheng* 'a student' is interpreted as a predicative NumP here.

(40) a. Subject-modifiee relation: identification
Zhangsan Taiwan-ren.
Zhangsan Taiwan-person
'Zhangsan is (a) Taiwanese'

[12] This analysis does not imply that the modifier-modifiee has to be equal to the modifiee-modifier in meaning. For example, *da-yanjing* 'big eyes' does not necessarily have to be interpreted as *yanjing-da* 'eyes are big.' At least, when the time adverb *xiao-shi-hou* 'in the childhood' is attached, the two sequences perform differently in syntax and semantics.

(i) a. ??ta xia-shi-hou da-yanjing.
he in-the-childhood big-eye
'When he was small, he had big eyes.'
b. Ta xia-shi-hou yanjing da.
he in-the-childhood eye big
'His eyes were big when he was small.'

That is, the phrase-clause transition is only interpreted in the logical form.

C.E.P.S.

b. Subject-modifiee relation: possession
Zhangsan da- yanjing.
Zhangsan big-eye
'Zhangsan's eyes are big.'

(41) a. *Zhangsan yi-ge xuesheng. (Identification: non-predicative DP)
Zhangsan one-Cl student

b. yi-ge laoshi yi-ge xuesheng. (Possession: predicative NumP)
One-Cl teacher one-Cl student
'The number of the students that each teacher has is one.'

From the above, we lead to the conclusion that the modifier modifies an implicit verb, implementing modification and predication within the modifier-modifiee phrase, which as a whole is predicated of the matrix subject in the way of either identification or possession.

4. EXAMPLES OF SEEMING NOMINAL PREDICATES

There are three types of sentences that are *prima facie* similar to the nominal predicate sentences but after scrutiny show some traits distinct from those of nominal predicate construction. It is worth while to investigate them in detail to delineate a clearer picture of the nominal predicate. These ambiguous structures include equative sentences with proper names, implicit transitive sentences, and locative subject sentences.

4.1 Proper Names

Tang (1998, 2001b, 2002a) claims that a matrix SC like (42a) is in conformity with Chomsky's (1993, 1995) ideas of economy—with only one subject and one bare NP predicate being able to convey the meaning of identity. On the other hand, it is also possible that an empty verb, the meaning of which depends on the context such as *xuan* 'choose', may appear as in (42b), a so-called transitive 'verbless' sentence, which explanation sounds less comprehensible than (42a).

(42) a. [Wo [Zhangsan]]
I Zhangsan
'I am Zhangsan.'

b. Wo [e] Zhangsan, (ni [e] Lisi)
I Zhangsan you Lisi
'I [choose] Zhangsan, (and you [choose] Lisi).'

Temporarily putting aside the contrastive context needed as in (42b), we will focus on the syntactic feasibility of this sentence. There are at least three different views on the syntactic status of a Chinese proper name. First of all, as we have just reviewed, Tang (1998, 2001b, 2002a) considers it a bare NP. Secondly, Li (1999) thinks that it is base-generated at D or [Spec, DP] position with definite denotation; hence, the nominal is actually a DP (Abney 1987, Ritter 1995). According to Cheng and Sybesma (1999), following Longobardi (1994), a Chinese definite proper name may base-generate at N and then move to Cl position, driven by its property; that is, it is as a ClP. Tang's aim is to define the proper name as a predicate, while Li's and Cheng and Sybesma's attempts are from the perspective of argument-hood. In either case, for the predicative proper name, it might be a bare NP, a DP, or even a ClP.

The disadvantage of Tang's view is that the bare NP (nominal predicate) analysis of the proper name misses the definiteness of the nominal expression in (42a). He has claimed that the empty verb as a focus marker in (42b) can trigger the definiteness effect of the noun. For (42a), given that *Zhangsan* is a definite referential expression, it will violate the generalization that Chinese deictics (indexical expression), a type of definites, cannot be predicative, which he outlined in Tang (2002b).[13] What if the nominal predicate *Zhangsan* is indefinite in a non-episodic context, denoting the identity reading (Tang 2001a:208)? This assumption still cannot escape the fate of being ruled out given the potential indefinite projection, DP, which is not predicative (Longobardi 1994). Li's account is tenable in (42b), but not in (42a), because her DP

[13] Higginbotham (1987) and Stowell (1989) hold that English definite expressions cannot be predicative, either. However, Rapoport (1987:166) claims that English definite noun phrases can be a predicate and there is often ambiguous in a choice between a predicative and an equative reading as in (i).

(i) Urit is the professor.

a. Predicative reading: 'Urit has the property of being the professor; one of Urit's characteristics is that she is the professor.'

b. Equative reading: 'Urit and the professor are the same person; Urit is the one who is the professor.'

C.E.P.S.

analysis amounts to claiming that the proper name is an argument, not a predicate. Thus, a verb is needed to assign the accusative case to the DP. Cheng and Sybesma (1999) are skeptical about the existence of D elements in Chinese; they use the NumP to represent Chinese indefinite NPs and ClPs to define Chinese definite NPs. Here, a question arises: "Is the ClP pertinent to being a predicate?" After surveying the data from (14b-f), even though there is one example found to support this inference, that is, [$_{\text{ClP}}$ *xingqi* 'week' [*liu* 'six']] 'Saturday', it is easy to distinguish *Zhangsan* from the predicative *xingqi-liu* 'Saturday'. The former is definite, while the latter is generic. In addition, these two phrases are analyzed according to different theoretical bases. Cheng and Sybesma dispense with D in contrast to our analysis. Hence, their ClP cannot be taken for granted as a counterpart of the predicative ClP assumed in this work. In other words, their ClP analysis is not directly correlated with the predicative property of *Zhangsan*.

In the vein of Li's DP analysis of proper names, we propose that in (42a) there is an 'empty linking verb' intervening between the subject and the proper name (DP) as shown in (42b). In addition to the prevalent claim that the definite DP cannot be predicative, there are still three other significant features which distinguish (42a) from other predicate nominal constructions in (14b-f). In the first place, the proper name does not contain an evaluative or subjective judgment like the predicative nominal expression, *shagua* 'fool', in (14a). Second, the proper name does not show any modifier-modifiee pattern as in (14b-f). Third, in (42a), the subject and the proper name can be freely reversed as in (43a) and (43b, c), while examples (14b-f) cannot (Rapoport 1987).

(43) a. [Zhangsan [wo]]
Zhangsan I
'Zhangsan is I.'
b. Nage ren Zhangsan.
that-Cl person Zhangsan
'That person is Zhangsan.'
c. Zhangsan nage ren.
Zhangsan that-Cl person
'Zhangsan is that person.'

From these three unique properties, we assume that a sentence like (42a) is different from the previous nominal predicate sentences, which are

C.E.P.S.

reminiscent of Rapoport's (1987:133-136) and Akmajian's (1970:162) distinction between equative sentences and predicative sentences, respectively. In Rapoport's analysis, the crucial distinction that relates to our discussion lies in the referentiality of nominals. In equatives, there are two referential nominals (two definites); in predicatives, there is a non-referential nominal (no (in)definiteness effect) (cf. Rothstein 1983). In analogy, (42a) can be thought of as a parallel to the equative sentences, while (14b-f) to predicative sentences. Rapoport also thinks that proper names cannot be predicative, but equative. In addition, he also believes that this distinction is not deduced from the verb 'be', but from the direction of thematic role assignment. In predicatives, the post-copular XP has the ability to assign a theta-role; in equatives, it receives one. Here, we will not go into the details of theta-assignment, but we agree that the copular verb has no place in this distinction. Correspondingly, we postulate that there is an empty copular verb existing between the subject and the second nominal in (42a), represented as (42b). It follows that this empty verb can be an empty linking verb or an empty transitive verb, the meaning of which depends on context. With this empty verb, issues relating to the definiteness and projection of the proper name in (42a) or even those of definite nouns and pronouns in (43) can be captured. Given that the element in D can determine (in)definiteness, a proper name, with the DP projection (Li 1998), will be regarded as the definite argument of the empty verb.

It is worth while to note that although (42b) is analyzed as the representation of (42a), it will demonstrate different interpretations in different contexts. For example, when the empty verb is interpreted as 'choose', the subject and the following nominal in (42b) are not reversible. Actually, it is no longer an equative sentence expressing identity, but a transitive 'verbless' sentence, following Tang's terminology, which will be surveyed in the next section.[14]

---

[14] The example in (i) is analyzed as a typical nominal predicate construction. *Zhen(de)/jia(de)* 'true/fake' is the modifier and *Zhangsan* the modifiee. Given our analysis that modificational predication occurs within the range from syntactic NumP to lexical 'X, it follows that the proper name *Zhangsan* here may be at N position (Cheng and Sybesma 1999), not at D or the Spec of D position (Li 1999).

(i) Ta *zhen(de)* /*jia(de)* Zhangsan.
he real-Mod fake-Mod Zhangsan
'He is a/the real/fake Zhangsan.'

C.E.P.S.

4.2 Transitive 'Verbless' Sentences

Tang (1998, 2001a) specifies that the main characteristic of the type is that it contains an empty verb, which meaning will depend on the episodic context and that the second nominal expression is definite. We believe that the two sequences in (44a) are not nominal predicate sentences, and that (44b) and (44c) are ambiguous, interpreted either as a transitive 'verbless' sentence or as a nominal predicate sentence.

(44) a. Zhuxi nimen xuan shei? Wo [e] Zhangsan, ta [e] Lisi.
chairman you choose who(m) I Zhangsan he Lisi
'Whom did you choose as the chairman? I chose Zhangsan, and he Lisi.'
b. Wo [e] yifu hua.
I one-Cl picture
(i) *'I have a picture.'
(ii) 'I have one picture.'
c. Zhangsan [e] liangge erzi.
Zhangsan two-Cl son
'Zhangsan has two sons.'

In (44a), the empty verb can be realized as *xuan* 'choose', which makes the sentence irreversible and distinct from the equative construction. In (44b, c), when the empty verbs are interpreted as 'have', the sentences mean 'I have one picture', rather than 'I have a picture', and 'Zhangsan has two sons' instead of '*Zhangsan has any two sons,' respectively. Hence, according to Tang's analysis, *yifu hua* 'one picture', *liangge erzi* 'two sons', and *Zhangsan/Lisi* are all regarded as definite NPs, which are DPs in the sense of Li (1998, 1999). The empty verb is needed to assign a case and theta role to the following DP and even to "lexically-govern" the empty D head (Longobardi 1994). Below, we hold that it is also possible for an indefinite DP to be located in the position after the empty verb.

However, how can we explain the discrepancy between this analysis and our previous assertion that NumP denoting quantity can be predicative as in (14e), (20), (21a, b), (22) and (27)? In the following, we will try to integrate these two observations by investigating the functions of the Num-Cl-N sequences more closely. Semantically speaking, there are two types of Num-Cl-N. The first type refers to those Num-Cl-N

C.E.P.S.

sequences with two ambiguous interpretations in certain conditions. One interpretation results from an empty verb followed by definite/indefinite DP and the other from a quantity-denoting NumP. The second type refers to Num-Cl-N sequences with only a denotation of quantity.

In terms of the semantic correlation between subject and the following nominal, the first type of Num-Cl-N can be further sub-categorized into two sub-types. The first sub-type refers to those in which the relationship between subject and the nominal belongs to a kinship or whole-part relation as in (45). In addition to the quantity-denoting NumP interpretation in (45a, c, e), as we have proposed previously, this sub-type can also be explained *via* inserting an empty verb in front of the DP, which can be definite as in (45b, d) (Tang 1998) or indefinite/existential as in (45f).

(45) a. A: Wo bu zhidao Zhangsan ji-ge erzi.
I not know Zhangsan how-many-Cl son
'I don't know how many sons Zhangsan has.'
B: Zhangsan [$_{NumP}$ liangge erzi]
Zhangsan two-Cl son
'Zhangsan has two sons.' (Quantity)
b. A: Mali shen le liangge erzi ma?
Mary give-birth-to Par two-Cl son Q
'Did Mary give birth to two sons?'
B: shide, Mali [e] [$_{DP}$ liangge erzi]
yes Mary two-Cl son
'Yes, Mary gave birth to (the) two sons.' (Definite reading)
c. A: Wo bu zhidao nazhi mao jizhi jiao?
I not know that-Cl cat how-many-Cl foot
'I don't know how many feet that that cat has.'
B: Nazhi mao [$_{NumP}$ sanzhi jiao]
that-Cl cat three-Cl foot
'That cat has three feet.' (Quantity)
d. A: nazhi mao zhi sheng sanzhi jiao ma?
that-Cl cat only left three-Cl foot Q
'Does that cat have only three feet left?'
B: shide, nazhi mao [e] [$_{DP}$ sanzhi jiao]
yes that-Cl cat three-Cl feet
'Yes, that cat has only (the) three feet.' (Definite reading)

C.E.P.S.

e. [yizhi hama] [$_{NumP}$ yizhang zui] [$_{NumP}$ liangge yanjing]
one-Cl frog one-Cl mouth two-Cl eyes
[$_{NumP}$ sitiao tui]
four-Cl legs
'The numbers of a frog's mouth, eye, and leg are one, two, and four, respectively.' (Quantity)

f. [yizhi hama] [[e] yizhang zui] [[e] liangge yanjing]
one-Cl frog one-Cl mouth two-Cl eyes
[[e] sitiao tui]
four-Cl legs
'A frog has one mouth, two eyes, and four legs.' (Existential reading)

(46) a. A: ni shouchang tade hua ma.
you collect his picture Q
'Do you collect his pictures?'
B: you, wo [e] yifu hua.
have I one-Cl picture
'Yes, I have one of his pictures.' (Definiteness)[15]

b. A: ni you jifu hua.
you have how-many-Cl picture
'How many pictures do you have?'
B: Wo yifu hua.
I one-Cl picture
'I have one (picture).' (Quantity)

c. A: na sanbu diannao shei mai de.
that three-Cl computer who buy DE
'Who bought those three computers?'
B: Ta [e] liangbu diannao, wo [e] yibu diannao
he two-Cl computer I one-Cl computer
'He bought two of them, and I bought one.' (Definiteness)

d. A: ni you jibu diannao.
you have how-many-Cl computer
'How many computers do you have?'
B: Wo yibu diannao.
I one-Cl computer
'I have a computer.' (Quantity)

[15] A review points out that *yi-fu hua* 'one-Cl picture' should not be definite in this example, which is quoted from Tang's (2001b) analysis for illustration. I agree with the reviewer's judgment and think that both (46aB) and (46cB) should be specific readings.

C.E.P.S.

e. Laoshi shuo yige ren [e] yige pingguo
teacher say one-Cl person one-Cl apple
(i) 'For every x, x a person, there is a y, y an apple, and x__y'.'
'The teacher says that every person has an apple each.' (Existential reading)
(ii) '*For every x, x a person, there is a y, y the apple, and x__y.'
'*The teacher says that every person has a specific apple.'

f. Laoshi shuo yige ren [$_{NumP}$ yige pingguo]
teacher say one-Cl person one-Cl apple
'The teacher says that there is one apple per person.' (Quantity)

In the second subtype as in (46), *prima facie*, the subject and the following nominal are semantically unrelated, but they still can be placed together only if the semantic content of the empty verb is appropriately realized. In general, the empty verb can be naturally captured with the aid of the context, a salvaging device used to denote a presupposed set and to bridge the gap between subject and the DP (Tang 2001b) as in (46a, c). In (46a), the empty verb is realized as *shouchang* 'collect' and in (46c) as *mai* 'buy'. According to Tang (1998), the nominal DP after the empty verb is merely perceived as 'definiteness'. However, we find that when the subject is a quantifier phrase, the second nominal can be regarded as an indefinite DP as in (46e). For example, when the empty verb is interpreted as *fen* 'distribute' and *you* 'have', the DP turns out to be indefinite and existential with a distributive meaning. Of course, for the Num-Cl-N in this sub-type, as predicted, another alternative, quantity-denoting NumP, is also available and the NumP is considered as a predicate. Hence, like the first sub-type, besides quantity denotation, the DP after the empty verb can also be definite and indefinite. Even though (45) and (46) are similar and parallel, the discrepancies between them are two-fold. First, the semantic bond between the subject and the NP are closer in (45) than in (46). Second, owing to the previous reason, in general, (46) relies much more on the context to derive the connection between subject and the Num-Cl-N than (45) does, except for indefinite/existential Num-Cl-Ns in (45f) and (46f).

The second type of Num-Cl-N usually involves age, price, number and totality, which cause examples of this type to be interpreted as quantity-denoting NumPs as in (47). Moreover, as we have mentioned previously, the Num-Mass Classifier-N sequence, even when interpreted as an idiomatic expression, can be a predicate as well, as shown in (47d),

C.E.P.S.

which usually conveys a metaphoric connotation along with the quantity meaning. Even though a verb may possibly be inserted between the subject and the Num-Cl-N, it still does not affect its quantity interpretation.

(47) a. Cai yijin bakuai qian. (Price)
vegetable one-Cl eight-Cl money
'Vegetables are eight dollars a Taiwan *jin*.'
b. Ta sanshi sui. (Age)
he thirty age
'He is thirty years old.'
c. Tamen (yigong) yibai ren. (Totality)
they totally one-hundred person
'There are one hundred persons altogether.'
d. Tamen yipan sansha. (Massifier metaphor)
they one-Cl loose-sand
'They are a plate of loose sand (in a state of disunity).'

These two types of transitive 'verbless' sentences reflect the complexities of human cognition, which is actually dominated by the conception of economy (Chomsky 1993, 1995)—within the reachable range of human cognition, to say something in the briefest way. What manifests in this analysis is not a strict, clear-cut categorization, but a degree of scale. The sentences in (45) and (47) contain information rich and direct enough for listeners to make predicative connections with less effort than in the examples in (46), which instead have to rely much more on context/world knowledge to achieve full interpretation. The parsing processes, of course, cost more and make the sentences less perceptible once heard. Even though one of the interpretations of transitive 'verbless' sentences is not counted as a nominal predicate construction, the other potential quantity denotation still strictly observes the modifier-modifiee pattern.

4.3 Locative 'Verbless' Sentences

Our account of locative 'verbless' sentences in (48) is quite close to Tang's (1998).

C.E.P.S.

(48) a. Shan-shang jing (shi) chahua.
mountain-up all be camellia
'There are camellias all over the mountains.'
b. Wu-wai (yijing) (shi) yi-pian qihei. (Tang 1998)
house-outside already be one-Cl black
'There is a pall of darkness outside.'
c. Zhe fangjian-li (you) sanshan men.
this room-inside has three-Cl door
There are three doors in this room.'

Tang analyzes locative 'verbless' sentences in such a way that it is similar to the analysis of the transitive 'verbless' sentences. Both contain an empty verb between subject and the second nominal; in addition, Tang considers that transitive 'verbless' sentences (possessive construction) are on a par with existential constructions (Freeze 1992). In spite of these similarities, they differ in two respects. The first difference lies in the "definiteness" effect of the second nominal; the empty verb in the transitive 'verbless' sentence requires a definite complement, with which we only partially agree, whereas that in the locative 'verbless' sentence requires an indefinite complement. It follows that the sentences in (48) are characterized by their locative nominal subjects and their indefinite and existential nominal expressions, which are projected as DPs and functionally serve as an argument. In line with Longobardi (1994), an empty verb is required to license the indefinite DP.

The second difference centers on the semantic meanings of the spelled-out form of the empty verb 'have'. The empty verb in (45) and (46), when interpreted as *you* 'have', is a 'possessive' *you*, whereas that in (48) is an 'existential' *you*. This discrepancy results from the different properties of the subject. A transitive 'verbless' sentence requires an animate subject, which can 'possess' something, while a locative 'verbless' sentence anticipates an inanimate, locative subject, which generates an existential reading.

We have reviewed three types of seemingly predicate nominal constructions, equative sentences, transitive 'verbless' sentences, and even locative 'verbless' sentences, each of which may contain an empty verb with various meanings determined by context and world knowledge. Equatives anticipate an empty copular linking verb 'be',[16] transitive

[16] It is also possible to insert a semantically rich empty verb between subject and proper

C.E.P.S.

'verbless' sentences, an empty verb the meaning of which is determined by context/world knowledge, and locative 'verbless' sentences, an existential-reading *you* 'have' or other semantically matching verbs. Although they are not the nominal predicate constructions that we are concerned with, they do shed some light on the analysis of nominal predicate constructions.

5. A REINTERPRETATION OF SOME "BARENESS" EFFECTS

In this section, we will focus on the reinterpretation of the evidence ((5)-(9)), repeated below, that supports Tang's (1998) "bare matrix SC" and we further challenge Tang's light nP account (2005a, b).

5.1 Reinterpretation

(5) a. Wo shi yige Zhongguoren.
I be one-Cl Chinese
'I am (a) Chinese.'
b. *Wo yige Zhongguoren.
I one-Cl Chinese
(6) a. Ta yexu shi Zhangsan.
he maybe be Zhangsan
'Maybe he is Zhangsan.'
b. Ta zhi shi haizi.
he only be child
'He is only a child.'
c. *Ta yexu Zhangsan.
he maybe Zhangsan
d. *Ta zhi haizi.
he only child
(7) a. *Ta qiongguangdan laizhe.
he poor-empty-egg Par
b. (?)Ta shi qiongguangdan laizhe.
he be poor-empty-egg Par
'He is a poor guy!'

---

name, such as *jiao* 'call' and *xuan* 'elect'. In this case, it cannot be called an equative sentence but a transitive 'verbless' sentence, because subject and complement cannot be reversed freely.

C.E.P.S.

(8) a. *Qunian, ta qiongguangdan.
last-year he poor-empty-egg
b. Qunian, ta shi qiongguangdan.
last-year he be poor-empty-egg
'Last year, he was a poor man.'
(9) a. Wo Zhongguoren, ni Aozhouren.
I Chinese you Australian
'I am (a) Chinese, and you are an Australian.'
b. # Wo shi Zhongguoren, ni shi Aozhouren.
I be Chinese you be Australian

First of all, we have already discussed the reason why (5b) is ungrammatical. It is because in a sense the sentence is apt to be interpreted as a kind of "broadly-defined" equative sentence, indicating that in spite of its being an equative, the subject and predicate positions can not freely be reversed (in comparison with the strict, freely-reversed equative sentence, e.g., *ta Zhangsan* 'He is Zhangsan' and *Zhangsan ta* 'Zhangsan is he'). In this case, the sequence *yige Zhongguo ren* '(a) Chinese' is still realized as an indefinite DP. However, unlike sentences with a proper name as the predicate, locative 'verbless' sentences, and transitive possessive 'verbless' sentences, there is no pivotal 'empty verb' inserted between the subject and predicate positions to avoid the ECP violation (Longobardi 1994). In addition, from the perspective of Rapoport (1987) and Rothstein (1995), one of the prerequisites of an equative is the existence of two referential noun phrases. The indefiniteness of *yige Zhongguo ren* '(a) Chinese' is incompatible with this requirement because the sequence in question is non-referential. Thus, (5b) is not a well-qualified equative sentence. Moreover, *yige Zhongguo ren* '(a) Chinese' cannot be a NumP, either, because a quantity-denoting NumP expresses a kind of possessive relation between the subject *wo* 'I' and the NP *zhongguo ren* 'Chinese', which is hard to capture in (5b). Even though *yige Zhongguo ren* '(a) Chinese' conforms to the modifier-modifiee pattern, the well-formedness of the phrase still depends on its interaction with the subject in the sentence-internal fitting context as shown in (49) below. In (49a), it is a DP complement of the empty verb in a locative 'verbless' sentence. (49b) shows that the phrase, interacting with a quantifier subject, acts as an existential DP argument after an empty verb or as a NumP predicate. In (49c), the quantity-denoting NumP, *yiqun Zhongguo ren* 'a group of Chinese', is

C.E.P.S.

predicated of the matrix subject. Therefore, we conclude that the ungrammaticality of (5b) is not due to the "bareness" requirement of nominal predicates, as Tang claims, but due to a syntactic and semantic conflict between the matrix subject and the following nominal.

(49) a. Men-wai [e] yige Zhongguo ren. (DP)
door-outside one-Cl Chinese person
'There is a Chinese person outside the door.'
b. Yige laoshi yige Zhongguo xuesheng. (DP or NumP)
one-Cl teacher one-Cl Chinese student
(i) 'A teacher has one Chinese student.'
(ii) 'The number of Chinese students that a teacher has is one.'
c. Tamen yiqun Zhongguo ren. (NumP)
they one-group Chinese person
'They are a group of Chinese.'

As to the contrast in (6), it is found that (6c, d) will not pose a problem to our analysis. In the first place, we argue that the ungrammaticality of (6c) is not due to the bareness of this sentence, as Tang claims, but due to the semantic conflict between equative sentences with an empty verb and the adverbs such as *yexu* 'perhaps' and *dagai* 'probably'. An equative sentence with an empty verb expresses a straightforward correlation between the referential subject and the referential object. However, adverbs such as *yexu* 'perhaps' and *dagai* 'probably' convey a kind of non-straightforward denotation and this uncertainty makes the sentence sound unnatural. Replacing these adverbs with those with a straightforward and affirmative mood will improve the sentences a lot as in (50).

(50) a. Ta tieding Zhangsan.
he definitely Zhangsan
'He is definitely Zhangsan.'
b. Ta yiding Zhangsan.
he certainly Zhangsan.
'He is certainly Zhangsan.'

Here, a problem arises: "Why does a fully-fledged equative like (6a) tolerate adverbs with an uncertain denotation?" It is probable that the covert and overt form of *shi* 'be' go with different degrees of certainty of

C.E.P.S.

adverbs, since the overt form of *shi* can bear and load more specific information than the covert form, so that the overt *shi* can tolerate different levels of uncertainty, while the covert form of *shi* cannot. This may account for the grammaticality of (6a) with the uncertain adverbs such as *yexu* 'maybe'. As to (6d), without the adverb *zhi* 'only', the sequence **ta haizi* 'he-child' is still unacceptable in Mandarin. Moreover, *zhi* 'only' also cannot occur with the legitimate predicate nominal in Chinese as in (51a). But when it is replaced by another adverb *cai* 'just', the sentence becomes acceptable as (51b).

(51) a. *Ta *zhi* xiao xuesheng.
he only little/primary student
b. Ta *cai* xiao xuesheng (eryi).
he just little/primary student that-is-all(Par)
'He is just a primary school student; (that's all).'

From (51), it is found that *zhi* 'only' can not precede the nominal predicate, but another adverb *cai* 'just' can. Hence, (6c, d) cannot be taken as evidence to argue that it is their bare structures which cause awkwardness. Instead, it is the semantic interaction between the nominal predicate sentence and the adverb that determines the occurrence of adverbs, not the "bareness" of the structure.

Abundant counter-examples of (7a) and (8a) can be identified to argue against the "bare" structure of predicate nominal constructions. Sentences in (52) contain adverbs, like *yiqian* 'before', *congqian* 'before', *xianzai* 'now', *yijing* 'already' and *dou* 'all', the NP-time adverb *zuotian* 'yesterday', and the final particle *le*.

(52) a. Ta *zuotian* yeduzi qi.
he yesterday one-belly anger
'He was full of anger yesterday.'
b. Wo *yiqian* wuchi bacun, *xianzai* liuchi.
I before five-feet eight-inches now six-feet
'I was five feet eight inches tall before, and six feet now.'
c. Zhe xiaohai *congqian* huang toufa, *xianzai* bai toufa.
the child before yellow hair now white hair
'The child had yellow hair before, and now white hair.'

C.E.P.S.

d. Ta *yijing/dou* ershi sui le.
he already/all twenty age Par
'He is already twenty years old.'

Finally, we suspect that categorial judgment can be considered as a criterion to separate (9a) from (9b). From my informants, it seems (9b) also has the same reading as (9a).

From the above discussion, we cast doubt on Tang's five pieces of evidence distinguishing the 'bare matrix SCs' from sentences with *shi*. We do not intend to prove that the former is as a result of the omission of *shi* in the latter, but just attempt to reaffirm that, structurally speaking, nominal predicate constructions are actually "not-so-bare". Note that most nominal predicate sentences can have *shi* 'be' inserted between the subjects and the nominal predicates. When the insertion occurs, we assume that it will add focus to the meaning of the sentence. That is to say, the optional *shi* 'be' preceding a nominal predicate is like an emphatic marker (Shi 1994) or even a raising verb (Huang 1988) as follows.

(53) [[$_{IP}$ wo$_i$ [$_{VP}$ *shi* [$_{IP}$ t$_i$ [$_{PreP}$ [Taiwan [ren]]]]]]].
I be Taiwan people
'I am (a) Taiwanese.'

5.2 Light *n*P Account

Tang (2005a, b) re-analyzes the Chinese SC as being not-so-bare, as represented in (54). The light *n*P system is permitted in the bare phrase structure theory and the head *n* can be either phonetically null or overtly realized as a classifier as *ge* in (55a), which excludes the possibility of the existence of another projection Num (55b). What is more, *n*P also provides a position for an adverb *via* adjunction. Besides, a not-so-bare SC also tolerates the existence of C, *ma* in (55c).

(54) [$_{nP}$ Subject [$_{n'}$ *n* NP]]
(55) a. Ni ge sha dongxi!
you Cl silly thing
'You fool!'

C.E.P.S.

b. *Ni yi-ge shagua.
you one-Cl fool
'You are a fool.'
c. Ni xuesheng ma?
you student Q
'Are you a student?'

Even though this *n*P analysis is quite promising in providing evidence of the existence of light *n* in Chinese, it still cannot account for the following crucial contrast (56), which implies that the licensing of SC depends on factors such as the modifiee-modifier relation within the nominal predicate.

(56) a. *Ni xuesheng.
you student
b. Ni hao-xuesheng.
you good-student
'You are a good student.'

One of the reviewers of this paper questioned the contrast in (56) by pointing out that when a nominal predicate is informative enough, even a very bare NP such as *xuesheng* 'student' and *ren* 'person' can be a nominal predicate as in (57a, b).

(57) a. Ta xuesheng *(ma!/a!)
he student Part
'He is a student.'
b. Ta ren *(ma)? (cf. 55c)
he person Q
'Is he a human being?'
c. Zhangsan [*OP* [shagua]].
Zhangsan fool
'Zhangsan is a fool.'

We do not think of (57) as challenges to our analysis for two reasons. First, the so-called informativeness within the nominal predicate in question is actually derived from the exclamatory and question particles, each of which conveys a strong evaluative (skeptical) and subjective

C.E.P.S.

denotation, similar to that of the inseparable epithet *shagua* 'fool' in (18), repeated as (57c), in spite of the difference in the type of evaluative trigger. In (57a, b), it is the final particles that arouse the speaker's subjective attitude (modifier) toward the objective *xuesheng* 'student' (modifiee); thus, without them the sentences are still illicit. By contrast, in (57c) the epithet *shagua* projects the evaluative meaning from itself, forming a modifier-modifiee pattern. Second, the exclamatory or question particle still cannot be used to prove the legitimacy of a bare structure such as **ta ren* 'he person', because they can be attached to any non-clausal element and "repair" them as a full clause in certain contexts as in (58).[17] Thus, the attachment of the particles in (57a, b) does not imply that the bare nominal predicates in question are licit.

(58) a. [A mother tries to identify the boyfriend of her daughter from a picture.]
he ma?/ma!
he Q Part
'Is He?/He is!'
b. [A hunter tries to make sure whether a moving object in the dark is a human being or prey.]
ren ma?/ma!
person Q Part
'Is it a human being or something else?/It is just a human being.'

6. CONCLUSION

The conclusions of this chapter are tabulated and listed below.

[17] According to Tang (2001b), another popular salvaging device is contrast.
(i) a. Ta xuesheng, ni laoshi.
he student you teacher
'He is a student and you are a teacher.'
b. Ta ren, ni shen.
he human you god
'He is a human being and you are a god.'

C.E.P.S.

(59)

	Matrix SCs	The Structure of Nominal Predicates
Tang (1998)	Bare	Bare NP
Tang (2005a, b)	Not-so-bare	
Our analysis	Not-so-bare	Bare NP Not-so-bare Nominal

The structure of a nominal predicate can be as a bare NP (e.g., *shagua* 'fool') or as a "not-so-bare" Num-Massifier-NP (denoting quantity), a Num-Count classifier-NP (denoting quantity), or an NP modified by an adjectival with a *–de* affix. All the nominal predicates manifest a kind of modifier-modifiee pattern, which is 'modificationally predicated' of the subject. The modifier modifies an implicit verb, implementing modification and predication within the modifier-modifiee phrase, which later as a whole is predicated of the matrix subject *via* either an identification or a possession relation. Accordingly, the matrix SC is structurally "not-so-bare" rather than "bare". Finally, this analysis strengthens the claim that an indefinite/definite DP is an argument, not a predicate in Mandarin Chinese.

REFERENCES

Abney, Steve. 1987. *The English noun phrase and its sentential aspect*. Ph.D. Dissertation, MIT.

Akmajian, A. 1970. *Aspects of the grammar of focus in English*. Ph.D. Dissertation, MIT.

Bowers, John. 1993. The syntax of predication. *Linguistic Inquiry* 24: 591-656.

Chao, Yuen-Ren. 1968. *A grammar of spoken Chinese*. Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press.

Cheng, Lisa L.-S. and Rint Sybesma. 1998. Yi-wan tang, yi-ge tang: Classifiers and massifiers. *The Tsing Hua Journal of Chinese Studies*, New Series Vol. 28.3: 385-412.

Cheng, Lisa L.-S. and Rint Sybesma. 1999. Bare and not-so-bare nouns and the structure of NP. *Linguistic Inquiry* 30.4: 509-542.

Chomsky, Noam. 1993. A minimalist program for linguistic theory. In Kenneth Hale and Samuel Jay Keyser, eds., *The view from building 20: Essays in linguistics in honor of Sylvain Bromberger*, 1-52. Cambridge, Mass.: The MIT Press.

Chomsky, Noam. 1995. *The minimalist program*. Cambridge, Mass.: The MIT Press.

Croft, William. 1994. Semantic universals in classifier systems. *Word* 45: 145-171.

Davidson, Donald. 1967. The logical form of action sentences. In N. Rescher, ed., *The logical of decision and action*, University of Pittsburgh Press, Pittsburgh.

Déchaine, Rose-Marie. 1993. *Predicates across categories*. Ph.D. Dissertation, University of Massachusetts, Amherst.

Freeze, R. 1992. Existentials and other locatives. *Language* 68: 553-596.

Grimshaw, Jane. 1991. Extended projection. Ms., Brandeis University.

Higginbotham, James. 1985. On semantics. *Linguistic Inquiry* 16: 547-593.

Higginbotham, James. 1987. Indefiniteness and predication. In Eric J. Reuland and Alice G. B. ter Meulen, eds., *The representation of (in)definite*, 43-70. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Hornstein, Norbert, and David Lightfoot. 1987. Predication and PRO. *Language* 63: 23-52.

Huang, C.-T. James. 1988. Shuo '*shi*' he '*you*' (On 'be' and 'have' in Chinese). The *Bulletin of the Institute of History and Philology, Academia Sinica* 59.1: 43-64.

Iljic, Robert. 1994. Quantification in Mandarin Chinese: Two markers of plurality. *Linguistics* 32: 91-116.

Kitagawa, Yoshihisa. 1985. Small but clausal. In William H. Eilfort, Paul D. Kroeber, and Karen L. Peterson, eds., *Papers from the General Session at the Twenty First Regional Meeting of Chicago Linguistics Society*, 210-220. Chicago: Chicago Linguistics Society.

Kuroda, S.-Y. 1992. Judgment forms and sentence forms. In *Japanese syntax and semantics: Collected papers*. 13-77. Dordrecht: Kluwer Academic Publishers.

Laka, Itziar. 1994. *On the syntax of negation*. New York and London: Garland Publishing, Inc.

Li, Yen-hui Audrey. 1998. Argument determiner phrases and number phrases. *Linguistic Inquiry* 29: 693-702.

Li, Yen-hui Audrey. 1999. Form-function correspondence: Structures and interpretations of nominal expressions. In Yukinori Takubo, ed., *Comparative syntax of Japanese, Korean, Chinese, and English*, 147-186. Report of the International Scientific Research program. Kyushu University.

Longobardi, Giuseppe. 1994. Reference and proper names: A theory of N-movement in syntax and logical form. *Linguistic Inquiry* 25.4: 609-665.

Lü, Shuxiang. 1941. *Zhongguo wenfa yaolue*. (Key points in Chinese grammar). Beijing: Commercial Press.

Lü, Shuxiang, et al. 1980. *Xiangdai Hanyu babaici* (800 words in modern Chinese). Beijing: Commercial Press.

Nakayama, Mineharu. 1988. Empty copulas. In Yukio Stsu ed., *Mita Working Papers in Psycholinguistics I*, 121-128. Tokyo: Mita Psycholinguistics Circle, Keio University.

Paris, Marie-Claude. 1981. *Problèmes de syntaxe et de sémantique en linguistique chinoise* (Problems of syntax and semantics in Chinese linguistics). Collège de France, Paris.

C.E.P.S.

Parsons, Terence. 1990. *Events in the semantics of English: A study in subatomic semantics*. Cambridge: The MIT Press.

Rapoport, T. 1987. *Copular, nominal and small clauses: A study of Israeli Hebrew*. Ph.D. Dissertation, MIT.

Ritter, Elizabeth. 1995. On the syntactic category of pronouns and agreement. *Natural Language & Linguistic Theory* 13: 405-443.

Rothstein, S. 1983. *The syntactic forms of predication*. Ph.D. Dissertation, MIT.

Rothstein, S. 1995. Small clauses and copular constructions. In A. Cardinaletti and T. Guasti eds., *Small clauses, syntax and semantics 28*, New York: Academic Press.

Shi, Dingxu. 1994. The nature of Chinese emphatic sentences. *Journal of East Asian Linguistics* 3: 81-100.

Stowell, Tim. 1989. Subjects, specifiers, and X-bar theory. In Mark R. Baltin and Anthony S. Kroch, eds., *Alternative conceptions of phrase structure*, 232-262. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Stowell, Tim. 1991a. Small clause restructuring, In R. Freidin, ed., *Principles and parameters in comparative grammar*, 182-218. Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press.

Stowell, Tim. 1991b. The alignment of arguments in adjective phrases. In S. Rothstein, ed., *Perspectives on phrase structure: Heads and licensing. Syntax and semantics 25*. New York: Academic Press.

Szabolcsi, Anna. 1987. Functional categories in the noun phrase. In Istvan Kenesei, ed., *Approaches to Hungarian 2*, 167-190. Szeged: JATE.

Szabolcsi, Anna. 1992. Subordination: Articles and complementizers. In I. Kenesei and Cs. Pléh, eds., *Approaches to Hungarian 4: the structure of Hungarian*, 123-137. Szeged: JATE.

Szabolcsi, Anna. 1994. The noun phrase. In Ferenc Kiefer and Katalin Kiss, eds., *Syntax and semantics 27: the syntactic structure of Hungarian*, 179-274. San Diego, Calif.: Academic Press.

Tai, James and Lianqing Wang. 1990. A semantic study of the classifier *tiao*. *Journal of the Chinese Language Teachers Association* 25: 35-56.

Tang, Chih-Chen Jane. 1990. *Chinese phrase structure and the extended X'-theory*. Ph.D. Dissertation, Cornell University.

Tang, Sze-Wing. 1998. *Parametrization of features in syntax*. Ph.D. Dissertation, University of California, Irvine.

Tang, Sze-Wing. 2001a. The (non-)existence of gapping in Chinese and its implications for the theory of gapping. *Journal of East Asian Linguistics* 10: 201-224.

Tang, Sze-Wing. 2001b. Nominal predication and focus anchoring. In Gerhard Jäger, Anatoli Strigin, Chris Wilder, and Niina Zhang, eds., *ZAS Papers in Linguistics* 22: 159-172.

Tang, Sze-Wing. 2002a. Economy principles and Chinese verbless sentence. *Modern Foreign Languages* 95: 1-13.

Tang, Sze-Wing. 2002b. Some constraints on temporal predicative sentences in Chinese. *Zhongguoyuwen* 2002.3(288): 217-221.

C.E.P.S.

Tang, Sze-Wing. 2005a. Chinese small clauses revisited. Paper presented at the Workshop on Theoretical East Asian Linguistics (TEAL-3), Harvard University, July 22-23.

Tang, Sze-Wing. 2005b. On the family of light categories in Chinese. Paper presented at the Third International Conference on Formal Linguistics, Hunan University, Changsha, China, Sept. 23-25.

Tang, Ting-Chi. 1979. *Studies in Chinese syntax*. Taipei: Student Book Company.

Travis, Lisa. 1984. *Parameters and effects of word order variation*. Ph.D. Dissertation, MIT.

Travis, Lisa. 1988. The syntax of adverbs. In *McGill working papers in linguistics: special issue on comparative Germanic syntax*.

Wei, Ting-Chi. 2004. Predication and sluicing in Mandarin Chinese. Ph.D. Dissertation, National Kaohsiung Normal University.

Yue-Hashimoto, Anne. 1969. The verb 'to be' in modern Chinese. In John W.M. Verhaar, ed., *The verb 'be' and its synonyms 4*, 72-111. Dordrecht: D. Reidel.

Zhu, Dexi. 1982. *Yufa jiangyi* (Lectures on grammar). Beijing: Commercial Press.

Ting-Chi Wei
Graduate Institute of Taiwanese Cultures and Languages
National Kaohsiung Normal University
Kaohsiung, Taiwan 80201, ROC
tingchiwei@nknucc.nknu.edu.tw

漢語的名詞謂語

魏廷冀
國立高雄師範大學

本文重新檢視 Tang（1998）的漢語「主要小句」分析，以期更能夠掌握漢語名詞謂語的實際運作。我們發現，漢語名詞謂語的結構可以是「光棍」名詞組或者是「非光棍」之投射；所有的名詞謂語皆呈現一種「修飾語–被修飾語」的偏正關係，並且與主語形成一種「修飾主謂關係」；整個主要小句的結構與一般句無異，是一種「非光棍」結構，而非 Tang 所主張的「光棍」結構。此外本文也支持，漢語有定／無定名詞組為論元而非謂語之假設。

關鍵詞: 名詞謂語、偏正式、修飾性謂語、數量詞組、無定名詞

C.E.P.S.