Review of the doctoral dissertation *Lost and added in translation: A corpus-based study on Chinese numeral classifiers in translation between Chinese and English*, written by Saizhu Hu at at the Faculty of English, Adam Mickiewicz University in Poznań, Poland, under the supervision of Dr. Marcin Kilarski, Associate professor of Adam Mickiewicz University

Reviewed by:
One-Soon Her
Chair Professor
Department of Foreign Languages and Literature
Tunghai University
Taiching, Taiwan 407224
Email: onesoon@gmail.com, hero@thu.edu.tw
Homepage: https://onesoonher.github.io/info/index.html

This dissertation, which is in the form of a monograph, aims at a corpus-based analysis of Chinese numeral classifiers, elements occurring between numerals or demonstratives and nouns, in the translation between Mandarin Chinese and English. Such a focus on the realistic comparison between the use of numeral classifiers and its corresponding manifestation in English, based on a parallel corpus of translated texts between the two languages, is indeed unique and original and hence fills an important gap in the research on numeral classifiers. Such a contribution should be recognized and surely welcomed, as in the already very extensive literature on numeral classifiers, indeed relatively little research has been reported on the semantic contribution of numeral classifiers based on corpus data in Chinese and their representation regarding their functionality in translated texts in English. The subject matter dealt with in the dissertation is thus a special feature of the dissertation, which has largely accomplished what it set out to do.

Given its clearly stated research aims, the dissertation has offered a fairly good coverage of existing literature. It has thus adequately reviewed the previous syntactic and semantic analyses of Mandarin numeral classifiers and discussed the implications in terms of the comparative study between the classifier phrases in Mandarin and the nominal phrases in English. The presentation of materials is logical and well-structured, the language of the dissertation is likewise lucid and easy to understand, and the formal layout follows the norm within linguistics. A PhD degree based on the dissertation is therefore warranted.

There are several areas where I would like to make suggestions for the author to consider if she wishes to pursue the research on numeral classifiers further or has a plan to revise the dissertation and publish it as a monograph down the road. I will only discuss issues that I think are important and thus leave out some of the details for the author to explore for herself.

The first issue is the use of the terms 'numeral classifiers' and 'measure words', referring to the two kinds of elements that may appear between a numeral and a noun in Chinese. For example, for the two phrases 三本書 *san ben shu* 'three books' and 三箱書 *san xiang shu* 'three boxes of books', 本 *ben* is called a 'numeral classifier', and 箱 *xiang*, a 'measure word' in the dissertation. Indeed, the terminologies used in the literature referring to the two types of counting units vary greatly and can be rather confusing. As pointed out by Wu and Her (2021:42), such terms for the former type include 'classifier', 'count-classifier', count-noun classifier', 'individual classifier', 'qualifying classifier', 'sortal classifier', etc., and those for latter include 'measure word', 'mass-classifier', 'mass-noun classifier', 'massifier', 'mensural classifier', 'measural classifier', 'quantifier', among others. And in works that recognize that the two types of elements form a single lexical category, the terms used also vary quite a bit, including 'classifier', 'numeral classifier', 'quantifier', 'measure word', 'measure', 'unit word', and 'numerative', etc.

I have come to the conclusion in recent years, however, that it is best to refer to the entire category consisting of these two (sub)types of elements as NUMERAL CLASSIFIERS, and two subtypes as SORTAL CLASSIFIERS and MENSURAL CLASSIFIERS, respectively. More specifically, it is by now fairly well-established in the formalist literature that numeral classifiers form a single category *syntactically*, hence sharing an identical syntactic structure, while it distinguishes two subcategories *semantically*, hence having somewhat different behavior attributable to their different semantics. A good analogy is the syntactic category of nouns and its two subcategories, count nouns and mass nouns, distinguished primarily on semantic grounds.

This brings us to the next issue. Given the fact that the dissertation focuses on sortal classifiers (called 'numeral classifiers' in the dissertation), it is important to know how exactly to distinguish them from mensural classifiers. After all, it would not be interesting to study the English translation of mensural classifiers in Mandarin, as most, if not all, mensural classifiers easily find lexical counterparts in non-classifier languages. For example, in 三箱書 *san xiang shu* and *three boxes of books*, the mensural classifier *xiang* in Mandarin corresponds to the noun *box* in English, but in 三本書 *san ben shu* 'three books', the sortal classifier *ben* cannot be translated. (We

will see momentarily that, arguably, it can be translated as the so-called plural marker [-s].) The dissertation can benefit from recent work by me and associates on setting up explicit criteria for such a distinction and the application of such criteria to identify sortal classifiers in Mandarin (Her and Lin 2015), Taiwan Southern Min (2020), Taiwan Hakka (2014), and Japanese (2014).

In the dissertation, a total of 105 sortal classifiers are identified and used in the corpus analyses. There are two areas for improvement. First, there are a number of mensural classifiers misidentified as sortal classifiers, e.g., 節 *jie* 'dection', 簾 *lian* 'curtain', 頁 *ye* 'page', 層 *ceng* 'layer', 滴 *di* 'drop', among others. All of the so-called kind classifiers are in fact mensural classifiers. An important characteristic of sortal classifiers is that they subcategorize for count nouns. Kind classifiers can occur with pretty much every noun. Second, there are a number of numeral classifiers that are ambiguous between sortal and mensural classifiers. For example, 部 *bu* in 一部書 'a set of books' is a mensural classifier, but in 一部汽車 'a car', it is a sortal classifier. Another example is 把, and 一把刀 can be either 'a knife', which is the more prominent reading of the sortal classifier, or 'a handful knives', which is a less prominent reading of 'handful'. The author can refer to Her and Lin (2015) for more detailed deliberation and a list of sortal classifiers identified.

Finally, the dissertation appropriately reviewed the literature on gender, another common grammatical means of nominal classification. It would have been better to also discuss the divergence and convergence between sortal classifiers and morphosyntactic plurals. It is thus important to first distinguish between semantic plurals, e.g., the /-s/ morpheme in English, and morphosyntactic plurals, e.g., 們 *men* in Mandarin. A crucial characteristic of the former is that they are not involved in agreement, e.g., subject-verb agreement, while the latter must be involved in agreement with another element, either inside or outside of the nominal phrase, e.g., *one apple/two apples*, *Two apples are enough, but one apple is not.* Furthermore, let's use 三本書 *san ben shu* and *three books* as an example again: the lexical item 三 corresponds to *three* and 書 corresponds to *book*; thus, the only thing left for the sortal classifier 本 to correspond to is the morphosyntactic /-s/ morpheme for plurality.

As demonstrated in Tang & Her (2019), sortal classifiers and *morphosyntactic* plurals are in complementary distribution in the nominal phrase, hence supporting Borer's (2015) view that sortal classifiers and plural markers are the two sides of the same coin converging semantically and syntactically. The dissertation can thus benefit from a more substantial review of this view and also explore the correspondence between the behavior of Chinse sortal classifiers and English number (singular/plural)

in the corpus study. Yet, bare nouns in the two languages diverge significantly, which will be another very interesting issue to explore in a corpus study. However, that seems to be beyond the scope of the dissertation.

All in all, the dissertation has admirable merits and fills an important research gap in the study of numeral classifiers in its investigation of the semantic contribution of numeral classifiers based on corpus data in Chinese and their representation regarding their functionality in translated texts in English.

Chen, Meng-Ying 陳孟英、Hsieh, Miao-Ling 謝妙玲、Her, One-Soon 何萬順. 2020. 台灣閩南語分類詞之檢驗 (Distinguishing classifiers in Taiwan Southern Min)。《語言暨語言學》(Language and Linguistics) 21.3: 375-407.

Her, One-Soon 何萬順、Lin, Kun-Han 林昆翰. 2015. 分類詞與量詞的區分：以台灣華語為例 (Distinguishing classifiers and measure words: A Case study of Taiwan Mandarin)。《漢語學報》(*Chinese Linguistics*) 2015.4: 56-68.

Liao, Jia Yu 廖家昱. 2014. 區分客語中之分類詞 (Identifying Classifiers in Hakka). MA thesis, National Chengchi University.

Tang, Marc. 2014. A GIS Typological Analysis of the Convergence and Divergence among Numeral Classifiers, Genders and Plural Markers in the World's Languages. MA thesis, National Chengchi University.

Tang, Marc and One-Soon Her. 2019. Insights on the Greenberg-Sanches-Slobin Generalization: Quantitative typological data on classifiers and plural markers. Folia Linguistica 53.2: 297-331.

Wang, Wei 王維. 2014. 界定日語中的分類詞. Identifying classifiers in Japanese. MA thesis, National Chengchi University.

Wu, Jiun-Shiung and One-Soon Her. 2021. Taxonomy of numeral classifiers and measure words: A formal semantic proposal. In Chungmin Lee, Youngwha Kim, and Byeong-uk Yi (eds.), *Numeral Classifiers and Classifier Languages: Chinese, Japanese, and Korean*, 40-71. Routledge, 40-71.