Individuation and Grammatical Number Marking in English and Japanese

Tomoko YASUTAKE

(Department of Teaching Japanese as a Foreign Language)

0. Introduction

This paper is about the cognitive status of nominal expressions in English and Japanese, and its implication on the universals of number delimitation devices. Following partly the findings in my earlier studies, I argue that a bare noun[1] functions as a class-designator and that when it is made part of a syntactic NP, the cognitive status of the represented entity (entities) is variously coded by the singular/plural morphology, determiners and other delimitative constituents of the NP. This will be reviewed in the light of two pairs of notions 'individuation' and 'boundedness'.

The paper is organized as follows: in section 1, a sketch of the grammatical number marking on English nouns is given. Section 2 reviews the class-designating function of bare nouns, along with preliminary arguments for the cognitive analysis of noun delimitation. In section 3, the analysis of nominals in terms of individuation/non-individuation is given, showing why it is favored over the long-established analysis with two pairs of features [±count] and [±plural]. In section 4, a distinction between bounded and unbounded noun phrases is proposed. Section 5 is an attempt at a unified analysis of the number delimitation devices in both languages.

Some general conclusions to be drawn from this work are: 1) bare nouns by themselves are class-designators; 2) singularity/plurality marking reflects the speaker's cognition of the entity/entities as individuated; 3) noun phrases with determiners and/or other delimitative markers represent the entities as bounded, whereas non-delimited noun phrases represent the entities as unbounded; 4) an identical denumeration system is at work in the marking of English uncountable nouns and Japanese nouns in general.

1. Grammatical number marking in English

Nominal expressions in English carry a variety of lexical, grammatical and pragmatic markers. Consider the following short discourses:

(1)　*A Kentucky judge,* after hearing *a moonshining case,* said to *the defendant,* "Although *you were* not caught using *it, we* found *equipment* on *your premises* capable of producing *alcohol. We* are therefore going to find *you* guilty". (M)

(2)　*Gorsch* was *the man who* played *the cello* at *the moving-picture theater* in *town.* Unfortunately, *he* had *a reputation* for being *none* too good *a player.* "*None* too good," perhaps, was hardly *the word,* for if *the truth* be told, he was worse than *any* of *his fellow musicians* and was forever being bullied by *the conductor* for *that reason.* (T)

The italicized noun phrases above reflect the cognitive status of the represented entities. Some appear as bare nouns, some are coupled with articles, some are marked by bound morpheme (-s) and others take the form of proper nouns and pronouns. A speaker, thus, must always be sensitive to the quantity and delimitability of the referent(s)[2], beside making the decision whether to represent the nominal as definite or indefinite.

Gillon (1996. 458) summarizes the number marking system in English as follows:

(3)　Nouns have associated with them two pairs of features: ±*CT,* whereby mass nouns and count nouns are

distinguished from one another, and $\pm PL$, whereby singular and plural nouns are distinguished from one another. $\pm CT$ are lexical features, and hence stipulated in a noun's lexical entry, whereas $\pm PL$ are syntactic features, freely assigned, modulo certain constraints. To begin with, any noun with the feature $+CT$ must be assigned exactly one of the features $\pm PL$; and any noun with the feature $-CT$ must be assigned the feature $-PL$.

The time-honored view expressed in (3) accounts for the existence of the following paradigm of concrete and abstract nouns[3].

(4) a. poem $[+CT,-PL]$, poems $[+CT,+PL]$, poetry $[-CT,-PL]$

　　b. machine $[+CT,-PL]$, machines $[+CT,+PL]$, machinery $[-CT,-PL]$

However, it is easy to point out, as in the following pairs of sentences cited from Hancock (1990), that many nouns can be used both in countable form and uncountable form.:

(5) a. My girlfriend has *beautiful hair.*

　　b. There were *some hairs* in my soup.

(6) a. The teacher gave us *paper* to write our compositions on.

　　b. You have to use *a better paper*[4].

(7) a. All our six children are on *the bed /*bed* at the moment.

　　b. All our six children are in *bed/*the bed* at the moment[5].

Hair and *paper*, which are normally uncountable, are used as countables in (5b) and (6b), respectively and *bed*, which is countable, is treated as uncountable in (7b).

Furthermore, the problems in (8), raised by MaCawley (1975, 1979) and Mufwene (1981) and the semantics of concrete-abstract pairs of nouns, epitomized in (9), seem to underwrite the skepticism about (3):

(8) a. Why in English some mass nouns have a singular form, e.g., *power, knowledge, rice, water, wine,* and *alcohol* while some others have a plural form, e.g., *clothes, dregs, (do the) dishes.*

　　b. Some mass nouns alternate between a plural form and a singular, e.g., *praise/praises* and *power/powers.*

　　c. *Beans* and *noodles* have both the count and mass uses as reflected in the phrases *how much/many beans* and *how much/many noodles.*

(9) The denotation of the noun 'poem' is the set of all poems in the universe of discourse, and the denotation of 'poetry' is the set whose sole member is the greatest aggregate of which the noun is true.

2. Bare nouns in Japanese

As we have noted above, singular/plural languages like English have a way of making the noun phrase reference explicit. The definite and indefinite articles explicitly denote the discourse status of the referent and the singular/plural morphology marks the numeral information of the object. In numeral classifier languages, which have no explicit signaling device for the referential status of the object, other than deictics, nouns prototypically occur in bare form.

In what follows, our discussion shall center around the number marking systems and shall have little to do with the definiteness marking, except in connection with the indefinite article, which is a prototypical multifunctional item, serving, at one and the same time, to mark the entity as discourse-new as well as to indicate its number.

When a speaker utters (10) below, s/he may well have a certain individuated object(s) in mind, but that information is not formally coded by the linguistic expression. It is up to the hearer to make the most accessible assumption about the objects based on discourse-pragmatics.

(10) Watashi wa kesa *tamago* o tabemashita.

　　　I　　　　TP this morning egg AC ate

　　　'I ate (lit.) egg this morning'

This can mean either 'I ate an egg' or 'I ate eggs'. As I have discussed elsewhere (Yasutake 1989), the so-called plural suffixes, such as *-tachi, -ra, -domo*, are in fact collective markers, which should not to be taken as equivalent to English plural suffixes. For example, *niisan-tachi* means 'big brother and others'. It may but

not necessarily designate 'two or more big brothers'.

Phenomena to be investigated include the following contrast between English and Japanese:

(11) a. I read *a book*.

    b. I read *books*.

    c. I read *some books*.

(12) a. Watashi wa *hon* o yomimashita.

      I   TP book AC read

    b. Watashi wa *is-satsu no hon* o yomimashita.

      I   TP one volume LK book AC read

    c. Watashi wa *hon* o *is-satsu* yomimashita[6].

      I   TP book AC one volume read

    'I read a book'

Of these, (12a) contains a bare noun, whereas (12b) and (12c) are examples with a numeral classifier -*satsu*. (I shall return to the cognitive function of numeral classifiers in section 5 below.) The three sentences in (12) can all be used to report the same situation, which can be represented as (11a) in English. This may be taken to mean that according to Japanese cognition system, the English sentence (11a) is three ways ambiguous.

Conversely, the three sentences in (11) can all be translated into (12a). The speaker of (12a), in normal circumstances, is understood to be referring to a specific book or books that s/he read. But the sentence itself does not convey that piece of information. The inference is based on the rest of the sentence, discourse -pragmatics and shared background knowledge[7]. That there was at least one book that was read by the speaker is pragmatically certain, but it may well be that the speaker read more than one book. There is no indication of the identity, including the number, of the book(s) that s/he read, since it is outside the concern of the speaker of (12a).

The difference between the three sentences in (12), centers around the representation of the object of action. The unmarked meaning of (12a), out of context, would be the same thing as (13) below.

(13) I did *book*-reading (not cooking, dancing, washing, etc.)

The speaker's principal intention here is to report the type of activity s/he was engaged in — the identity of the object of action is irrelevant to the speech situation. The object-incorporation in English and the bare noun expression in Japanese are thus coding devices for the cognitively non-prominent status of the object.

I have argued, in Yasutake (1988), that bare noun by itself does nothing but denotes a class of entity and that reference to a specific entity, if any, is generally indicated by deictic expressions, postpositional particles, lexical semantics and discourse pragmatics. It is often the hearer/reader's responsibility to pragmatically supply the missing information and to infer the intention of the speaker/writer. Compare the following two pairs of expressions.

(14) a. get on *a train*   b. change *trains*

(15) a. *ressha* ni noru   b. *ressha* o nori-kaeru

      train   board   change

In both (14a) and (14b), the number of the train(s) is explicitly marked, but not in (15). Discourse-pragmatics dictates Japanese hearers/readers to infer that the train in (15a) refers to one train, whereas in (15b), since the expression means to get out of one train and get into another one, that the speaker/hearer have to be talking about more than one train.

In order to argue for this point by drawing data from a naturally occurring discourse, let us look at the Japanese version of the discourse (2) above. All the common nouns in this short discourse take the form of a bare noun, while in (2), all but one are accompanied by an article.

(14) Gorsch wa *machi* no *katsudo-shashin-kan* de *cello* o hiku *kakari* deshita.

               TP town LK moving-picture theater in   AC play person-in-charge was

      Keredomo anmari jozu de nai toiu *hyoban* deshita. Jozu de nai dokoro de wa

      but   not-so good is not QT reputation was   hardly is

      naku, jitsu wa   *nakama* no*gakushi* no naka-de wa ichiban heta deshita kara,

      not   in fact   fellow   musician among most   poor   therefore

itsudemo *gakucho* ni ijimer-are-ru no deshita. (T)

always   conductor by bullied COMP

This illustrates that, in Japanese, a speaker/writer may felicitously use bare nouns irrespective of the referential status of the object. When a bare noun is interpreted as referential, the specific reference to a member(s) or an instance(s) of it is not part of the linguistic meaning but of the assumption made by the hearer/reader. In English, on the other hand, it is not necessary for the hearer/reader to infer the number of referents, since the number of the referent(s) of practically all the common nouns is explicitly marked. We will show below that English bare nominals like those found in (1) and (2) are to be treated on a par with Japanese ones.

3. Individuation and denumerability

Generally speaking, English and Japanese common noun in syntagmata normally appears in one of the five 'delimitative' environments in (15) and (16), respectively:

(15) a. *a/an/one*+N (e.g. I read *a book*.)

 b. Number+N+-*s* (e.g. I read *two books*.)

 c. Non-Numeral Quantifier+N+(-*s*) (e.g. I read *several books*.)

 d. bare N+-*s* (e.g. I like *books*.)

 e. bare N (e.g. *Man* is mortal.)

(16) a. Number+Classifier+*no*+N (e.g. *Ni-satsu no hon o* yomimashita.)

 b. N+Number+Classifier (e.g. *Hon o ni-satsu* yomimashita.)

 c. Non-Numeral Quantifier+*no*+N

  e.g. *Takusan no hon o* yomimashita. 'read many books'

 d. N+Non-Numeral Quantifier (e.g. *Hon o takusan* yomimashita.)

 e. bare N (e.g. *Hon* o yomimashita.)

In order to account for the similarities and differences between the two languages, we shall explore the role played by various delimitative devices.

We have seen above that the distinction between count and noncount nouns is not necessarily inherent in 'real world' denotata and that the justification for the count/noncount distinction is based on the grammatical characteristics of the English noun. In this connection, what is intriguing is the fact pointed out by McCawley (1968) that, in English, plural count nouns pattern like singular mass nouns in all significant respects. For example, they both take no (or a zero indefinite) article, they both participate in a partitive construction, and in English they both take a zero generic article rather than the generic *the* of singular count nouns. Look at the following examples.

(17) a. *Gold* is valuable.   (mass N)

 b. *Women* are fickle.   (plural count N)

 c. *The automobile* is an invention of the devil.   (singular count N)

Mufwene (1981) introduced the notion of 'individuated' vs 'non-individuated' as basic analytical units of the category of 'number'. He set up the following postulates for the number marking practices in natural languages.

(18) a. 'Individuated' and 'non-individuated' are basic analytical units of the category of 'number'.

 b. From a semantic point of view, individuation is the operation by which a set is specified as individuated, and non-individuation is the operation by which a set is specified as non-individuated.

 c. In singular/plural languages the notion of 'individuated' vs 'non-individuated' combine indiscriminately with mass and count nouns.

 d. In numeral classifier languages, a classifier serves to designate the basic unit of individuation.

The distinction of individuated/non-individuated noun phrases is not a dichotomous but scaler notion. The following is Mufwene's scale proposed for English (slightly modified).

(19) Mufwene's Individuated-Non-individuated Delimitative Scale for English

INDIVIDUATED				NON-INDIVIDUATED

$a/an/one$ + N + ϕ	Number + N + s	Non-Num. Q + N + $(-s)$	bare N + $-s$	bare N + ϕ

$\longleftarrow$ ———————————— "denumerable" ———————————— $\longrightarrow$

$\longleftarrow$ ———————— 'non-denumerable' ———————— $\longrightarrow$

From the perspective of the present paper, the point to be noted is the overlapping of what is denumerable and what is non-denumerable. Nouns appearing in any form, excepting bare form, are semantically denumerable (have some explicit signaling device). At the same time, those without numeral quantification, the types (15c) and (15d), represent the entity as non-individuated whole, hence 'denumerable'. However, they are not to be placed on equal footing with bare nominals, because the plural morphology keeps the entity's denumerability potential lurking.

It is evident that the model (19) has some clear advantages over the standard count/mass distinction. First, it provides explanations for the complications concerning the number marking in English. Second, it can treat various languages, especially those without singular/plural morphology, on the same ground with singular/ plural languages.

Mufwene did not discuss Japanese, but it is not difficult to postulate the individuated-non-individuated scale for Japanese along the lines noted above[8]:

(20) Individuated-Non-individuated Delimitative Scale for Japanese

INDIVIDUATED			NON-INDIVIDUATED

Num + Cl + no + N	N + Num + Cl	Non-Num Q + no + N	N + Non-Num Q bare N

$\longleftarrow$ ——————— ————— 'non-denumerable' ——————— $\longrightarrow$

According to (20), Japanese nouns are all formally non-denumerable. Classifiers are needed to code the numeral information of the individuated entities. This by no means implies that a Japanese speaker does not perceive concrete objects like 'table', 'tree', 'pen', 'book', 'egg' , etc. as discrete entities. It is simply that formally a Japanese noun by itself does not code individuation.

The semantic function of numeral classifiers is to discontinuate and concretize the referent — to provide a unit of individuation to the class of entities designated by the noun. Metaphorically speaking, they give nouns concrete shapes that can be seen and touched. In this sense, Japanese nouns are like English mass nouns. Our model unmistakably captures the resemblance — they both occupy the non-individuated end position on the scale.

We have seen that Japanese nouns normally appear in bare form, just like English mass nouns. It is the lexical contents and discourse-pragmatics that provide numeral information of the nominal referent. Also, restrictive modifiers serve to individuate the referent, making further delimitation of the noun practically unnecessary as in (21):

(21) a. *Okashina hagaki* ga aru Doyobi no yugata *ichiro no uchi* ni kimashita.
    peculiar   postcard NM one Saturday LK evening GN house came
    'One Saturday evening, *a most peculiar postcard* arrived at *Ichiro's house*' (T)

   b. *Teka-teka   kami o waketa mura no wakamono* ga ikioi-yoku donatte-imashita.
    sleekly   hair   AC parted village LK young-fellow NM powerfully shouted
    '*One young fellow from the village with a neat parting in his sleek hair* was shouting louder and louder'
                                                                                       (T)

My proposal to treat countability and plurality, not as a fully lexico-syntactic process, but as a cognitive process of representing the entity according to its position in the individuated-non-individuated scale is also advantageous in the following respect. That is, it enables the treatment of English bare nominals such as the italicized nouns in the following (22), as well as the ones noted in (1) and (2), in exactly the same manner as Japanese bare nominals.

(22) a. *Man* is mortal.

   b. the moving-picture theater in *town* (cf. (2) above)

   c. They escaped from *prison*.

These same nouns are used to refer to individuated entities in (23):
    (23) a. *A man* came to see you.
        b. John left *the town*.
        c. *A new prison* was built next to the police station.
The only difference between Japanese and English bare nominals is that English nouns tend to show countability preference. For instance, *thoughtfulness, absentmindedness, oversight, advice* and *vanity* show preference for non-individuated representation, while others such as *table, hand, pen* and *desk* favor individuated representation. For one practical reason, that of reducing the number of lexical entries in a semantic dictionary, our model is preferable to Quirk et al.'s (1985: 247) treatment of items like the italicized nouns in (22), (23) and (24) as 'nouns with dual class membership' or Declerck's (1991:39) reclassification analysis.
    (24) a. What we need most of all is *peace*.
        b. *A peace* like the one we know now is exceptional in history.

    The fact exemplified by (24) shows that restrictive modification in English serves to represent the entity as individuated, just as in Japanese. This leads us to another important feature of bare nouns, viz. the referential 'unboundedness'. We will address this issue in the next section.

4. Bounded and unbounded noun phrases

    The semantic distinction of 'bounded' vs 'unbounded', as far as I know, was first introduced by Declerck (1991: 58-60) for describing the use of certain tense forms. A sentence is bounded if it represent a situation as reaching a terminal point. Otherwise it is unbounded. Look at the following:
    (25) a. John read *the letter*. (bounded)
        b. John was reading *the letter*. (unbounded)
    (26) a. John drank *whisky*. (unbounded)
        b. John drank *five glasses of whisky*. (bounded)
        c. John drank *glasses of whisky*. (unbounded)
    (27) a. Bill handed out the Labour Party badge to *a party activist present*. (bounded)
        b. Bill handed out the Labour Party badge to *112 party activists*. (bounded)
        c. Bill handed out the Labour Party badge to *party activists*. (unbounded)
As pointed out by Declerck, the distinction between bounded and unbounded sentences is similar to the distinction between count and mass nouns. Like bounded sentences, count nouns represent their referents as delimited: neither unbounded sentences nor mass nouns represent their referents as having boundaries.
    What is most significant about the particular examples in (26) and (27), from the perspective of the present paper, is that what distinguishes these sentences is not so much the tense forms but the numeral property of the italicized noun phrases. It therefore seems reasonable to propose the following distinction between bounded and unbounded noun phrases:
    (28) A noun phrase is bounded if it represents a delimited object(s). Otherwise it is unbounded.
The following noun phrases are bounded.
    (29) Proper nouns; Determiner/Number+nominal; *All (of)* /*some*[9] +nominal
The following noun phrases are unbounded.
    (30) Bare nouns; Bare plurals; Non-numeral quantifier (except *all (of)* /*some*) +nominal
The hypothesis (28) can account for the difference in the following pairs of expressions.
    (31) a. Bill read *a poem* [*three poems*] last night. (bounded)
        b. Bill read *poetry* last night. (unbounded)
    (32) a. *A litre* [*three litres*] of water ran out of the tap. (bounded)
        b. (*Litres of*) *water* ran out of the tap. (unbounded)
    Boundedness is not directly connected to referentiality. Non-referential and generic noun phrases with the indefinite article are bounded — they are semantically delimited by the indefinite article, which signals 'one member of the class N'.
    The bounded/unbounded distinction is closely related to the individuated/non-individuated scale discussed

above. Both concern the formal properties of noun phrases. However, these two notions need to be kept apart. The bounded/unbounded is a dichotomous distinction, whereas the individuated/non-individuated scale forms a continuum. The dividing line of bounded and unbounded noun phrases lies in the middle of the individuated -non-individuated denumerability scale--thereby dividing the noun phrases with non-numeral quantification into two camps. Those with *all* (*of*) /*some* are bounded, whereas those with other non-numeral quantifiers belong to the unbounded camp.

5. Numeral classifier system and partitive construction as denumerating devices

As we saw in the previous sections, a Japanese noun prototypically represents an entity as non-individuated. For compensation, Japanese has a rich system of numeral classifiers, with each classifier designating a class/shape/unit of nouns. For example:

(33) a. ip-*pon* no ki 'one tree'
      one stick tree
   b. ni-*satsu* no hon 'two books'
      two volume book
   c. san-*bai* no mizu 'three cups of water'
      three cup water

Each classifier establishes the denumerability of the entity and denotes a part of a whole.

In English, too, certain partitive constructions exist. Though the plural morphology, indefinite article and numeral quantifiers separately or jointly mark the denumerability for most nouns, certain partitive nouns are needed to delimit the reference of some nouns. For mass nouns, specifically, the following array of expressions exists to mark partition in respect of quantity (cf. Quirk et al. 1985: 249-251):

(34) a. a *piece* of advice   [general partitive]
   b. three *sheets* of paper [typical partitive]
   c. a *cup* of coffee   [unit partitive]
   d. two *pints* of milk.   [measure partitive]

I should argue that the function of the italicized expressions above, which delimit the reference of mass nouns, is essentially the same as that of Japanese numeral classifiers.

Plural morphology in English and other singular/plural languages is attached to nouns referring to things recognized as denumerable. They do not need classifiers—we can say, for example, *one dog, two dogs, three dogs. . .*, since 'dog' is conceived as a concrete physical entity that constitutes a unit of measurement for itself. Nevertheless, it is possible to find a parallel construction with those nouns, too. Consider the following, which Quirk et al. (1985) call "partition in respect of quantity':

(35) that *kind* of dog, a *sort* of automobile, these *types* of gun [quality partitive]

Here, too, the italicized nouns serve to delimit the reference—in terms of quality.

The following construction with plural count nouns also denotes a part of a whole. What is notable is that they are all collectives just like the Japanese expressions with the so-called plural suffixes, -*tachi*, -*ra*, -*domo*, etc.

(36) a large *crowd* of people, a (huge) *flock* of bird/sheep, a (small) *herd* of cattle, a *bunch* of flowers

Numeral classifiers and partitive constructions can both be used for abstract nouns. (34a) is an example with a partitive. The following are examples with classifiers:

(37) a. San-*bon* no home run 'three home runs'
      three stick LK
   b. Ik-*kai* no shiken 'one exam'
      one time LK exam

One of the remaining problems concerns the alternation of prenominal and postnominal delimitation in Japanese, exemplified by (12b) and (12c) above. To fully explicate this issue would require another paper, but there are reasons to believe that the prenominal and post nominal numeral classifiers denote different cognitive status of the referent. Data drawn from naturally occurring discourses attest to different degrees

of individualization coded by the two positions, viz. prenominal denumeration codes the cognitively individuated status of the entity (entities), and postnominal denumeration the non-individuated status. Partial evidence for this claim comes from the fact that pre nominal delimitation is generally excluded from non-referential positions in the following (38b) and (39b):

(38) a. *Denwa ip-pon* ko-nai. '(They) don't even telepone me once'
　　　　telephone 1 stick come not

　　 b. ?*Ip-pon no Denwa* (mo) ko-nai.

(39) a. *Shatsu o nan-mai ka* kaimashita. '(I) bought several shirts'
　　　　shirt　 AC what sheet Q bought

　　 b. ?*Nan-mai ka no shatsu o* kaimashita.

When the number of referent(s) is important or relevant to the following discourse, it is usually marked prenominally, whereas when it belongs to background information, delimitation is done postnominally. In the following (cited from T), the italicized nominals in (40) denote a discourse prominent participant or a significant number, whereas those in (41) denote lesser degrees of individuation:

(40) a. *Ip-piki no haiiro no tori ga* oritekimashita. 'A gray bird flew down'
　　　　one head LK gray LK bird AC descended

　　 b. Zo wa *hap-pa no wara* o tabeta. 'The elephant ate eight bundles of straw'
　　　　elephant TP eight bundle LK straw AC ate

(41) a. *Mizu o ip-pai* nonde iru to. . . ' When (he) was drinking a glass of water'
　　　　water AC one glass drinking be and

　　 b. *Shika ga go-rop-piki* aruite iru. 'Five or six deer are walking'
　　　　deer　 NM five or six head walking be

　　 Space limitation does not permit us to discuss the status of so-called linking particle *no* in Japanese and the preposition *of* in English here, including the possibility of parallel explanation of these two function words. It is to be pursued in a different paper.

6. Conclusion

　　 In this paper, I have examined the forms and logic of nominal delimitation in English and Japanese, from the perspective of the speaker/writer's cognitive judgment and the hearer/reader's interpretation. Starting from the observation that bare nominals are prototypically class-designators, I have discussed the nature of various number marking devices, and pointed out the drawbacks of the standard distinction of English nouns into countables and mass, in favor of the cognitive analysis in terms of 'degrees of individuation'. I also argued for the semantic distinction of 'bounded' and 'unbounded' noun phrases. According to our model, concerning the two occurrences of coffee in (42), for example, a cognitive account such as (43) will be given:

(42) They had a *coffee,* because *coffee* aids digestion after a copious meal.

(43) A *coffee* here reflects the speaker's cognition of the object as individuated, while *coffee* represents a non -individuated abstract notion. The former is bounded in reference, and the latter unbounded.

　　 The similarities and differences between Japanese and English bare nouns are summarized as follows:

(43) a. They are both class-designators.

　　 b. Their ordinariness in Japanese and their infrequency in English are the outcome of different coding practices in the two languages.

　　 c. In syntagma, they are potentially ambiguous, i.e. their forms underdetermine their referential status, in Japanese, but not in English. (cf. (11) and (12))

Notes

1. In my previous studies, I used the term 'unmarked noun' to refer to an unqualified formally singular noun. Here I adopt the term 'bare noun' to avoid unnecessary confusion with the notion connected with the markedness theory.

2. Petersen (1988) discusses this issue from the perspective of L2 acquisition.

3. Other concrete-abstract pairs are: *laugh~laughter, permit~permission, medicine~medication, peasant-peasantry*, etc.
4. Hancock (1990:54), writing in the context of ESL, gives the following explanation.
   If you want to use *paper* as a countable noun, you have to use *a piece*. If you want to use it as an uncountable noun, you don't use the article.
5. Hancock's (1990:98) explanation is as follows:
   Because this is an expression meaning that you are asleep or haven't got up, you don't use the article.
6. There is another marked word order, viz. *watashi wa hon is-satsu o yomimashita,* but we will not discuss this type here.
7. This type of inference generally accounts for the interpretation of ellipses which are abundant in Japanese discourse.
8. Mufwene treated Omani as an example of numeral classifier language. However, it is not to be regarded as a prototypical numeral classifier language, since, in Omani, unlike Japanese, numeral classifiers are needed only for non-denumerable nouns.
9. *Some* is known to be ambiguous. Still, it is evidently a marker of bounded noun phrase in any of its use.

Sources of Data

Miyazawa Kenji. 1996. *The Tales of Miyazawa Kenji* (trans. John Bester). Tokyo: Kodansha. (Abbreviated to T)
Nierenberg, G.I. and H. Celero. 1973. *Meta-talk: How to uncover the hidden meanings in what people say.* New York: Barnes & Nobles. (Abbreviated to M)

References

Allan, K. 1980. Nouns and countability. *Language* 56: 541-67.
Declerck, R. 1991. *A comprehensive descriptive grammar of English.* Tokyo: Kaitakusha.
Gillon, B.S. 1996. Collectivity and distributivity internal to English noun phrases. *Language sciences* 18.443-468.
Greenberg, J.H. 1978. Generalizations about numeral systems. *Universals of human language,* vol 3. J. H. Greenberg, ed. Stanford Univ. Press.
Hancock, P. 1990. *Is that what you mean?: 50 common mistakes and how to correct them.* London: Penguin Books.
Kuno, S. 1970. Some properties of non-referential noun phrases. *Studies in general and Oriental linguistics.* R. Jakobson and S. Kawamoto. eds. Tokyo: TEC Company, Ltd.
——. 1973. *The structure of the Japanese language.* Cambridge, MA: The MIT Press.
McCawley, J. 1968. Review of current trends in linguistics 3. *Language* 44. 556-93.
——. 1979. *Adverbs, vowels and other objects of wonder.* Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
Mufwene, S.S. 1981. Non-individuation and the count/mass distinction. *CLS* 17: 221-238.
Petersen, M. 1988. *Nihonjin no Eigo.* Tokyo: Iwanami Shoten.
Quirk, R. et al. 1985. *A comprehensive grammar of the English language.* Harlow, Essex: Longman.
Yasutake, T. 1988. Muhyo-meishi no imi-goyoron: Ruihyoji to kotaishiji. *Studies in foreign languages & literature* 24. 59-72.
——. 1989. On number marking principles in Japanese. *The bulletin of Aichi University of Education* 38.15-27.