1. A Puzzle

Chinese *you* 'have', when construed as existential, is traditionally analyzed as a modal verb or an auxiliary (see Y.-C. Li 1972, R. Cheng 1978, Huang 1988, L. Cheng, 1991, Tsao & Y. Cheng 1997, among many others). Nevertheless, problems arise when we take a closer look at *you* in terms of both its syntactic distribution and semantic interpretations. There are actually three variants of existential *you*, presentational *you* in (1a), partitive *you* in (1b), and specific plural *you* in (1c):

(1) a. you ren lai-le.
    have person come-Inc
    'There is/are a person/people coming.'

b. you-de ren lai-le.
    have-DE person come-Inc
    'Some of the people are coming.'

c. you-(yi)-xie ren lai-le.
    have-one-some person come-Inc
    'Some people are coming.'

When presentational *you* and partitive *you* are instead put in a postverbal object position, the sentences are simply out, as evidenced by (2a,b) respectively:

(2) a. * Akiu pian-le you ren.
    Akiu cheat-Prf have person
    'Akiu cheated someone.'

b. * Akiu pian-le you-de ren.
    Akiu cheat-Prf have-DE person
    'Akiu cheated some of the people.'

c. ? Akiu pian-le you-(yi)-xie ren.
    Akiu cheat-Prf have-one-some person
    'Akiu cheated some people.'

Specific plural *you*, in contrast, may marginally appear postverbally, as evidenced by (2c).

On the other hand, while presentational *you* is systematically blocked from preverbal object positions, partitive *you* and specific plural *you* are allowed in the same position, as shown by the contrast between (3) and (4,5):

(3) a. * Akiu dui you ren bu manyi.
    Akiu to have person not satisfied
    'Akiu is not satisfied with someone.'

b. * Akiu ba you ren pian-le.
    Akiu BA have person cheat-Prf
    'Akiu cheated someone.'

c. * Akiu bei you ren pian-le.
   Akiu by have person cheat-Prf
   'Akiu was cheated by someone.'
(4)  a. Akiu dui you-de ren bu manyi.
   Akiu to have-DE person not satisfied
   'Akiu is not satisfied with some of the people.'
 b.? Akiu ba you-de ren pian-le.
   Akiu BA have-DE person cheat-Prf
   'Akiu cheated some of the people.'
 c.? Akiu bei you-de ren pian-le.
   Akiu by have-DE person cheat-Prf
   'Akiu was cheated by some of the people.'
(5)  a. Akiu dui you-(yi)-xie ren bu manyi.
   Akiu to have-one-some person not satisfied
   'Akiu is not satisfied with some people.'
 b. Akiu ba you-(yi)-xie ren pian-le.
   Akiu BA have-one-some person cheat-Prf
   'Akiu cheated some people.'
 c. Akiu bei you-(yi)-xie ren pian-le.
   Akiu by have-one-some person cheat-Prf
   'Akiu was cheated by some people.'

In this paper, we argue that while presentational you counts as a sentential unselective binder, partitive you and specific plural you are to be treated as determiners. Section one examines the status of you from a historical perspective, proposing that the partitive and specific plural readings derive from a pronominal construal of you in Archaic Chinese as a result of grammaticalization. In section two, we show that the presentational reading is only one of a few construals licensed by sentential unselective binding, which may range over either individuals or events. Section three proceeds to taking on the issue where the specificity and the plurality come from in presence of youxie-NP. In section four, we argued for a head-first analysis of youde-NPs, which is independently motivated by a structural distinction between measure words and genuine classifiers in Chinese.

1. Predicate you on the fly: a historical perspective
To start with, we summarize the spectrum effects observed throughout (1-5) as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>you-reanalysis</th>
<th>you-NP</th>
<th>you-de-NP</th>
<th>you-(yi)-xie-NP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NP1: internal subjects</td>
<td>ok</td>
<td>ok</td>
<td>ok</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NP2: dui-NPs</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>ok</td>
<td>ok</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NP3: bei-NPs</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>ok</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NP4: ba-NPs</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>ok</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NP5: postverbal objects</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

On the surface, it looks as if Chinese you has undergone a downward incorporation into the
argument NP to its right: the closer the argument is, the more likely the incorporation will succeed. This supposedly diachronic process is visualized in the tree diagram (6):²

Here we may well explore the intuition by claiming that the chance of you being incorporated into an argument NP to its right should be rated against the distance in-between. However, it is unclear how to formulate the idea in a productive manner, and there is no evidence whatsoever for a downward movement in the historical development of Chinese.

In this paper, we would like to try out an alternative based upon some solid historical fact: In Archaic Chinese, predicate you has evolved into a pronoun, akin to some in English. Grammaticalization of this sort started as early as the pre-Qin period, as evidenced by (7) and (8) (cf. Yang & He 1992):
ri you shi zhi. (from Shijing [The Book of Odes])
    sun have eat it
    'The sun, someone ate it.'

you yun zi tian. (from Yijing [The Book of Change])
    have fall from sky
    'Something fell from the sky.'

In light of this observation, we assimilate partitive you to its English counterpart, as illustrated in the following diagram:

```
(9)        D P
           DP
              PP
               some
                  P
                       DP
                           of
                               the
                                   people
```

Under this approach, partitive you is treated as a pronoun, occupying a D position, while the remain material in a youde-NP is analyzed as a PP complement, as illustrated below:

```
(10) first approximation:

          D: head
          PP: complement
          DP
            you
              P
                  NP
                      de
                          ren
```

We may reasonably assume that this is the first step of the historical development. Here I will take you as the de facto head of the entire DP, followed by a PP complement. Nonetheless, this cannot the entire story, as there is no evidence whatsoever to support the preposition status of de. We will return to address this issue in section four.

Now how about specific plural you? It is generally accepted that a D can be occupied either by a determiner (when followed by a NumP) or by a pronoun (when standing alone or followed by a PP). It is therefore highly possible that partitive you has undergone further grammaticalization, changing into a genuine determiner. The result is the specific construal in question:
The position is supported by that the fact that specific plural *you* behaves very much like typical determiners such as *mou* 'certain' in (12b), *zhe* 'this' in (12c), and *na* 'that' in (12d):

(12) a. you-(yi)-xie (*de) ren lai-le.
    have-one-some DE person come-Inc
    'Some people are coming.'

b. mou-(yi)-xie (*de) ren lai-le.
    certain-one-some DE person come-Inc
    'Certain people are coming.'

c. zhe-(yi)-xie (*de) ren lai-le.
    this-one-some DE person come-Inc
    'These people are coming.'

d. na-(yi)-xie (*de) ren lai-le.
    that-one-some DE person come-Inc
    'Those people are coming.'

When expressing plurality, all of the above determiners cooccur with *yi-xie* 'one-some', and cannot take the modifier marker *de*. The plurality of a *you-xie* NP is then attributed to *yi-xie*. We will examine its property more closely, and provide a fine-grained semantics in section three.

Questions remain when we consider the general word order in Chinese nominals: Do we really want to say that Chinese NPs could be head-first as sketched in (10)? As a matter of fact, Huang (1995) has proposed that, as Chinese evolved into its modern age, the head-parameter setting also changed, shifting from head-final to head-first. The diachronic evidence comes from Mei's (1991) observation that a verb-complement compound like *ya-si* 'crush-die' are intransitive in Ancient Chinese, but transitive in Modern Chinese, as illustrated in the following derivation:

(13) 

The idea is that if we view the transitivization as a change of headness, everything will fall
out naturally. That is, since Ancient Chinese is head-final, the intransitive verb *si* 'die' is the head, and the entire compound inherits its intransitivity. On the other hand, modern Chinese is head-first, and it is the transitive verb *ya* 'crush' which counts as the head. As a result, the entire compound becomes transitive. On the synchronic front, Huang elicits support from Y. Li's finding that a verb-complement compound can only be intransitive in Japanese, which is a typical head-final language. This is shown by the contrast between (14a) and (14b):

(14)  
(a)  John-wa Mary-o naguri-korosi-ta.  
John-Top Mary-Acc beat-kill-Past  
John beat and killed Mary.  
(b)  * John-wa Mary-o naguri-shin-da.  
John-Top Mary-Acc beat-die-Past  
John beat Mary, and she died.  

All in all, it seems safe to assume that Chinese has shifted into the head-first setting in a gradual and subtle manner. What is lacking here is a fine-grained syntax and semantics of the three types of *you*, which is imperative for making our case here. We will begin with presentational *you* in the next section.

2. You as an unselective binder

An ideal testing ground for the quantificational property of presentational *you* is so-called Taiwanese Mandarin. Standard Mandarin, a dialect spoken around the Beijing area, employs a suffix *-le* to express perfective aspect, as in (15a), whereas perfective *you* only occurs optionally in negation, as in (15b):

(15)  
(a)  Akiu qu-le Beijing.  
Akiu go-Prf Beijing  
'Akiu has gone to Beijing.'  
(b)  Akiu mei (you) qu Beijing.  
Akiu not have go Beijing  
'Akiu has not gone to Beijing.'  
(c)  Akiu you qu Beijing. (Taiwanese Mandarin)  
Akiu have go Beijing  
'Akiu has indeed gone to Beijing.'  

This phenomenon of functional replacement has been noted long time ago by Wang (1965). Now under the influence of Taiwanese, a dialect of Southern Min, *you* is "resurrected" as an aspect marker in Taiwanese Mandarin, behaving in line with perfective have in English. Since here perfective *you* serves as an existential quantifier ranging over a Davidsonian event argument rather than the subject NP (cf. (1a)), it would be interesting to see whether it is "unselective" enough to license other elements in a given sentence.

The answer seems to be positive. First consider (16a), a typical Taiwanese Mandarin sentence:

(16)  
(a)  Akiu you chi dongxi. (Taiwanese Mandarin)  
Akiu have eat thing  
'Akiu has indeed eaten something'
The postverbal object *dongxi* 'thing' gets a typical existential closure reading, which means that it is interpreted as non-specific. On the other hand, *you* triggers existential quantification over the event argument associated with *chi* 'eat', which licenses the perfective reading of (16a), as illustrated by (16b). When object shift occurs, as in (17a), *you* quantifies over the fronted NP instead, and the perfective aspect is replaced by a generic tense, as in (17b).

(17) a. Akiu *you* dongxi chi.  
   Akiu have thing eat  
   'There is something for Akiu to eat.'  
   (non-specific reading + generic tense)  

b. Gen₆ *you* x dongxi(x), E  

Crucially, *you* patterns with existential closure in licensing the non-specific reading of (17a), a sure indication of the presence of unselective binding.

Another piece of evidence has to do with the fact that *you-de*-NPs and *you-xie*-NPs require contrastive focus construals when object shift occurs:

(18) Akiu *you-de* dongxi chi, *(you-de dongxi bu chi).*  
   Akiu have-DE thing eat have-DE thing not eat  
   'Akiu eats some of the things, and does not eat the others.'

(19) Akiu *you-(yi)-xie* dongxi chi, *(you-(yi)-xie dongxi bu chi).*  
   Akiu have-one-some thing eat have-some thing not eat  
   'Akiu eats some things, and does not eat some other things.'

The *you-de*-NP of (18) as a whole is under focusing, where *you* 'have' is an integrated part of the focused constituent. The same thing happens to the *you-xie*-NP in (19). Our theory thus predicts that *you*-NPs cannot appear in contrastive focus constructions, since the unselective binding (i.e., non-specific) construal of (17a) is incompatible with contrastive focusing. This is indeed the case, as evidenced by (20):

(20) * Akiu *you* dongxi chi, *you* dongxi bu chi.  
   Akiu have thing eat have thing not eat  
   'There is something which Akiu eats, and there is something which Akiu does not eat.'

Moreover, since the *you*-NP is not a constituent, the preverbal object should be able to shift further. This prediction is again borne out by the definite construal of *dongxi* 'thing' in (21a):

(21) a. Akiu dongxi *you* chi. (Taiwanese Mandarin)  
   Akiu thing have eat  
   'Akiu has indeed eaten the thing.'  
   (definite reading + perfective aspect)  

b. *you* ch(Akiu, v₆ dongxi(x), E)
Being scoped over by *dongxi*, *you* again serves as an unselective binder of the event argument, as illustrated by the semantic representation (21b). The bare NP object, on the other hand, gets interpreted as definite.6 This versatility of *you* confirms that unselective binding works in a sentential magnitude for Chinese (Tsai 1994, 1999). Similar conclusions have been drawn by Huang (1998) and Lin (1997) concerning lexical operators such as *mei* 'have-not' and *ge* 'each' respectively.

3. **You as a strong determiner**

To understand the behavior of specific plural *you*, it is imperative to understand the syntax and semantics of its sidekick *yi-xie* 'one-some'. Our hunch here is that *yi-xie* NPs are essentially collective, i.e., either as members of a group, as in (22), or as a single unit, as shown by the contrast between (23a) and (23b):

(22) zhe-(yi)-xie xuesheng pici piping.
    this-one-some student mutually criticize
    'Members of this group of students criticized each other.

(23) zhe-(yi)-xie xuesheng he na-(yi)-xie xuesheng pici piping.
    this-one-some student and that-one-some student mutually criticize
    a. This group of students and that group of students criticized each other.
    b.# This group of students criticized each other, and that group of students
criticized each other

In other words, when *yi-xie* appears before a noun, the noun behaves just like a collective noun in English.

In light of the above observation, we would like to entertain the possibility that *yi*- 'one' serves a collective operator rather than a cardinal predicate, mapping the plurality associated with -*xie* 'some' into an atom, i.e., aggregating members of the set of students into a single unit. This operation results in the group interpretation (cf. Link 1983, 1984, Landman 1989a,b). Similar usage can be found in the sentential adverbial yi of (24):

(24) ta yao yi tong jiang-hu.
    he want one rule river-lake
    'He want to unite the lands as one.'

It follows that what *you* contributes to a youxie-NP is the specificity, which in turn qualifies it as a strong quantifier in Milsark’s (1974) sense.

4. **You as a partitive determiner**

Now how about partitive *you*? As noted by Gennaro Chierchia (p.c.), in a English partitive construction, *some* can be decomposed into *some* and an implicit head noun denoting the relation "part-of", as illustrated below:
The same analysis, in our opinion, carries over to its Chinese counterpart but with a twist, as represented by the following diagram:

Here we adopt Simpson's (2001) view that de should be treated as a "bleached" determiner in a nominal projection, which is supported by typological correlations from Japanese and languages of the Tibeto-Burman group. At the first glance, this move seems to be a long shot, as it is widely held that Chinese NPs are head-final. In the following discussion, we will demonstrate that there is strong evidence suggesting that Chinese NPs are not uniformly head-final. First compare (27a,b):

There are essentially two groups of classifiers in Chinese. The first group are classifiers in the true sense, as in (27a), which are unique to the so-called classifier languages (cf. Tang 1990, Cheng & Sybesma 1998, A. Li 1999). The other may be called measure words, as in (27b), which co-occurs with an optional de, and can be found across languages. The intuition we would like to explore here is that the de facto head of (27a) is ren 'person', denoting individuals, whereas that of (27b) is bang 'pound', denoting quantities, as illustrated by (28a,b) respectively:
Under this view, classifiers are essentially functional categories, individuating a mass denotation into countable atoms or minimal parts, given that Chinese nouns are uniformly mass a la Chierchia (1995). On the other hand, measure words are lexical categories, expressing quantities or amounts with respect to some form of measurement. It follows that the phrase-final noun of (27b) can be nothing but the head of the complement of bang 'pound', as in (28b).

As Jim Huang (p.c.) points out, the following sentence is ambiguous between the individual reading of (29a) and the amount reading of (29b):

(29) Akiu zuotian he-le san-bei shui.
Akiu yesterday drink-Prf three-cup water
a. 'Akiu drank three cups of water yesterday.' (denoting individuals)
b. 'Akiu drank three servings of water yesterday.' (denoting quantities)

The intuition can be further sharpen by considering the contrast between (30) and (31), whose interpretations correspond to (29a) and (29b) respectively:

(30) Akiu zuotian ba san-bei (*de) shui he-le.
Akiu yesterday BA three-cup DE water drink-Prf
'Akiu drank three specific cups of water yesterday.' (denoting individuals)

(31) Akiu yi-tian he san-bei (de) shui.
Akiu per-day drink three-cup DE water
'Akiu drinks three cups of water per day.' (denoting quantities)

In (30), the BA-construction requires a specific object, and thereby disambiguate the sentence. Only the individual reading is available. By contrast, the generic context of (31) is incompatible with the individual reading, and prefers the amount reading.

An even stronger argument for our treatment can be built upon the distribution of Chinese demonstrative. First we distinguish two types of demonstratives in Chinese, one is contrastive, as in (32a); the other is appositive, as in (32b):
(32) a. wo yao jian na-ge Akiu, bu shi zhe-ge Akiu.
   'I want to meet that Akiu, not this Akiu.' (contrastive)
b. jiao na-ge Akiu lai zher!
   'Ask that Akiu to come here.' (appositive)

Now the prediction is that a quantity-denoting nominal should be unable to take a contrastive demonstrative, since there is no such notion as "this quantity" vs. "that quantity" if we are talking about exactly the same amount. This is indeed the case. First compare (33a,b):

(33) a. wo zuotian mai-le san dai mi.
   'I bought three (specific) bags of rice yesterday.' (denoting individuals)
b. wo zuotian mai-le san dai (de) mi.
   'I bought (the amount of) three bags of rice yesterday.' (denoting quantities)

Dai 'bag' functions as a classifier in (33a), resulting in the specific reading. On the other hand, dai is a measure word in (33b), hence the amount reading. The same distinction is maintained between (34a,b), where the demonstrative can only be interpreted as contrastive in the former, and appositive in the latter:

(34) a. wo yao na san dai mi.
   'I want those three bags of rice.' (individuals → contrastive)
b. wo yao na san dai (de) mi.
   'I want that rice, the amount of which is three bags.' (quantities → appositive)

It is therefore established that the individual readings are compatible only with a contrastive demonstrative, while the quantity readings get along only with an appositive one. We also correctly predict that the typical measure word bang 'pound' is blocked in the presence of a contrastive demonstrative:

(35) a. wo yao na san bang (de) rou.
   'I want that meat, the amount of which is three pounds.'
b.* wo yao na san bang (de) rou, bu shi zhe san bang (de) rou.
   '*I want these three pounds of meat, not those three pounds of meat.'

Furthermore, it may well be the case that measure words like bei 'cup' or dai 'bag' are on the fly to their true classifierhood: As illustrated by (36), bei 'cup' becomes a genuine classifier by raising to a classifier head, and the remnants collapse into one single head noun:
If *bei* stays in-situ, then it remains as a measure word, resulting in the quantity interpretations:

The last piece of evidence comes from the syntactic behavior of *-men*, a plural/collective suffix for [+human] NPs. A. Li (1998) argues quite forcefully that *-men* serves as the head of a number projection (NumP), standing higher than ClP but lower than DP. Now consider the third person plural pronoun *ta-men* 'they', which is formed by adjoining the plural suffix *-men* from Num to D, as sketched below:

This proposal correctly predicts that sentences like (39a,b) are bad:

(39) a. *wo dui san-ge xuesheng-men tebie hao.*  
I to three-CL student-MEN especially nice  
'I am especially nice to three students.'

b. *wo dui xuesheng-men san-ge tebie hao.*  
I to student-MEN three-CL especially nice

(39a) is ruled out because *-men* cannot undergo lowering to its right, as sketched below:
(39b) is ruled out in violation of relativized minimality, where the successive head movement skips an intervening head, i.e., the classifier \textit{ge}, as illustrated in (41):

Moreover, her analysis correctly rules in sentences like (42):

(42) wo dui ta-men san-ge tebie hao.
     I to he-MEN three-CL especially nice
     'I am especially nice to them three.'

As illustrated below, nothing gets in the way of the Num-to-D raising:

(43)
If Li's treatment proves to be on the right track, the following contrast between measure words and classifiers receives a straightforward account under our approach. That is, (44b) is ruled out along with (39a) for reasons just mentioned:

(44) a. na san-ge xuěshēng hen youxiu.
   that three-CL student very outstanding
   'Those three students are very outstanding.'

b.\* na san-ge xuěshēng-men hen youxiu.
   that three-CL student-MEN very outstanding

In contrast, when we substitute a measure word \(\text{zu}\) 'group' for the classifier \(\text{ge}\) in (44b), the sentence improves dramatically, as evidenced by (45b):

(45) a. na san-zu xuěshēng hen youxiu.
   that three-group student very outstanding
   'Those three groups of students are very outstanding.'

b. na san-zu (de) xuěshēng-men hen youxiu.
   that three-group DE student-MEN very outstanding

The phenomena receives a straightforward account once we adopt the view that the subject NP of (45b) assumes the following structure:

(46)

```
DP
   /\ NumP
  /   \ D N
 na san NP
   /\ N DP
  /   \ zu de NumP
     /\ xuěshēng-men NP
```

Here \(\text{xuěshēng-men}\) 'students' is viewed as a subcategorized complement of the measure word \(\text{zu}\), and \(-\text{men}\) as part of the complement DP. In contrast to the invalid derivation in (35), where the classifier \(\text{ge}\) creates a blocking effect for head movement, nothing prevents \(N\) from joining \(\text{Num}\) in the complement DP of (46).
5. Conclusion
To sum up, we now have a much clearer picture of what's going on in the three types of Chinese existential constructions, which can be decomposed as follows:

\[\text{you NP} \rightarrow \text{sentential operator … bare NP} \quad \text{(presentational)}\]
\[\text{you-de NP} \rightarrow \text{determiner + (part) + DP complement} \quad \text{(partitive)}\]
\[\text{you-(yi)-xie NP} \rightarrow \text{determiner + collective operator + head noun} \quad \text{(specific plural)}\]

Nevertheless, this only provides a partial account of the dilemma we encountered in section one: At one end of the spectrum, presentational \textit{you} counts a sentential unselective binder, and therefore cannot be adjacent to an object except when subject raising and object shift both occur (cf. (17)). At the other end, since \textit{you} has become an integrated part of a \textit{youxie}-NP, it may appear in virtually any NP position. The gray area surrounding \textit{youde}-NPs, however, does not have an obvious solution from the fine-grained syntax presented in section four. In other words, the synchronic analysis cannot be the whole story. It should be supplemented by our finding on the diachronic front: In comparison with specific \textit{you}, partitive \textit{you} is only halfway grammaticalized. The ambiguous structural status of \textit{you} in (26) should be correlated with its "on-the-fly" character from a historical point of view. In other words, the downward incorporation envisioned in (6) is only an illusion, which is created by the gradual change of the categorical status of \textit{you}, that is, existential predicate \rightarrow pronoun \rightarrow determinant.
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1. The abbreviations used in this paper are glossed as follows: Acc: accusative case; Inc: inchoative aspect; Past: past tense; Prf: perfective aspect; Top: topic marker.
4. One reviewer questions the validity of treating \textit{you} as an unselective binder, based on the following data:
   (i) Aku itou zhezhi ji chi.
   Aku have this chicken eat
   (ii) Aku zuo dongxi chi.
   Aku cook thing eat
(i) shows that the fronted object NP can also be definite, and one may wonder what \textit{you} quantifies over in this case.
   It is also suggested that \textit{you} can be analyzed as a possessive verb, in line with \textit{zuo} 'cook' in the serial verb construction (ii). Nevertheless, there are two arguments against taking the above approach: Firstly, while (ii) can be paraphrased as (iii), there is no way for (17a) to be interpreted the same way, as evidenced by the deviance of (iv):
   (iii) Aku zuo dongxi lai chi.
   Aku cook thing come eat
   'Aku will cook something in order to eat.'
   (iv) * Aku you dongxi lai chi.
   Aku have thing come eat
   'Aku has something in order to eat.'
   The quantificational reading of \textit{dongxi} in (ii) is thus licensed by existential closure under the irrealis tense. Secondly, (i) actually has a factual flavor, and cannot stand alone, as illustrated by (v) and (vi):
   (v) Aku you zhezhi ji chi, jiu gou le.
   Aku have this chicken eat then enough Inc
   'It will be enough given that Aku can eat this chicken.'
Akiu have this chicken eat be because he pay-Prf money

'The reason Akiu can eat this chicken is because he has paid the money.'

Here you does not quantify over an argument, but predicates upon a proposition instead, asserting the truth of the proposition. There is also an issue as to which syntactic category you falls into when construed as an unselective binder. Our view is that you occupies a light verb position in syntax, while serving as an operator in semantics. This is by no means surprising, since all the epistemic modal verbs have this sort of property.

5. Note that (20) may improve when a partitive reading is intended. This is because, for some Chinese speakers, de can be dropped under contrastive construals like (18). Hence the confusion.

6. As for how the bare NP receives the definite interpretation, see Cheng & Sybesma (1999) and A. Li (1997) for a syntactic treatment a la Longobardi (1994).

7. In essence, we are saying that there is no mass-count distinction for Chinese classifiers, contra Cheng & Sybesma's (1998, 1999) proposal to distinguish classifiers from massifiers (mass classifiers).

8. For a comprehensive discussion of the historical development of Chinese classifiers, see Peyraube (1997).
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