# Form, Interpretation and Distribution of Nominal Expressions in Two Classifier Languages: A Comparative Study of Hmong and Vietnamese

Vincent H. Carveth<sup>1</sup>, Dustin A. Chacón<sup>1</sup>, Judith W. Fuller, Giang Le<sup>2</sup>, Hiroki Nomoto<sup>1</sup>, Andrew Simpson<sup>3</sup>, Hooi Ling Soh<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> University of Minnesota <sup>2</sup> Ohio Wesleyan University <sup>3</sup> University of Southern California

### 1. Background & Objectives

#### Research questions

- What are possible relationships between different forms of nominal expressions and (in)definiteness/(non-)specificity?
- How does the positioning of the nominal expressions in a sentence affect their interpretations?
- How do classifiers affect the interpretations of the nominal expressions they appear in?

#### Problem

Results of previous studies on different languages are often difficult to compare due to different research methods.

### **Objectives**

- To determine similarities and differences in the distribution and interpretation of different forms of nominal expressions in Hmong and Vietnamese using the same methodology.
- > To present results of a preliminary study making use of parallel Hmong and Vietnamese folktales.

#### 2. Method

#### Procedure

- 1. Identify all nominal expressions in the Hmong and Vietnamese folktales.
- 2. Categorize them by their syntactic types:
- b. Num-CI-N c. CI-N d. (Num)-(CI)-N-Det a. Bare N e. Poss-CI-N (Hmong) [The corresponding pattern in Vietnamese, i.e. N-CI-Poss, does not exist.]
- [Det: determiner; Cl: classifier; N: noun; Num: Numeral; Poss: possessor]
- 3. Determine their interpretation in context:
- Definite: The intended referent is uniquely identifiable by the speaker and the hearer.
- Specific indefinite: The intended referent is uniquely identifiable by the speaker.
- Non-specific indefinite : The referent is not uniquely identifiable by the speaker.
- 4. Note their syntactic positions:
- a. Subject
- b. Object

c. Object of preposition

### **Excerpts of folktales**

Hmong

Tab sis thaum txiv huab tais tuaj txog tom nkawd lub tsev come arrive at 3DUAL CL house there when man king but tus txiv tseem tab tom mus txiav taws lawm. Cl man still PROG go cut firewood COMPL Tsuas tshuav tus poj niam tib leeg nyob hauv tsev xwb.

'But when the king arrived at the couple's house, the man was out in the forest gathering wood. Only the wife was at home alone.'

one person stay in house only

('Tus neeg txiav taws, nws tus lau qaib thiab nws poj niam [The woodcutter, his rooster, and his wife]', Johnson 1985:257-265)

Vietnamese (translation)

only remain Cl wife

Khi nhà vua đến nhà đôi vợ chồng, when Cl king go house Cl wife-husband người chồng đã vào <mark>rừng</mark> kiêm <mark>củi</mark>. husband PAST enter forest fetch wood chĩ có người vợ một mình. Ó nhà in house only be Cl wife one person

#### 3. Results

#### Form/position/interpretation correlations observed in the Hmong folktale

	Subject	Object	Object of preposition	
Bare N	definite <sup>1</sup>	definite	definite	
	specific	specific	specific	
	non-specific	non-specific	non-specific <sup>2</sup>	
Num-CI-N	definite	definite	definite	
	specific	specific	specific	
	non-specific	non-specific	non-specific	
CI-N	definite	definite	definite	
	specific	specific	specific	
	non-specific	non-specific <sup>3</sup>	non-specific	

#### Form/position/interpretation correlations observed in the Vietnamese folktale

	Cubicot	Ohioot	Object of proposition	
	Subject		Object of preposition	
Bare N	definite	definite	definite	
	specific	specific	specific	
	non-specific	non-specific	non-specific	
Num-CI-N	definite	definite	definite	
	specific	specific	specific	
	non-specific	non-specific	non-specific	
CI-N	definite	definite	definite	
	specific	specific	specific	
	non-specific	non-specific	non-specific	

#### Notes

- 1. All instances are (txiv) huab tais 'king'.
- 2. All instances are *luag* 'others'.
- 3. Only one instance is observed, i.e. tus ab tsi '[CI] what'.

### 4. Generalizations from the Hmong and Vietnamese folktale data

#### Bare N

- H & V: occur with definite interpretations in all positions.
- > <u>H & V</u>: have non-specific indefinite interpretations in Object and Object-of-preposition positions.

### Num-CI-N

H & V: occur with indefinite interpretations (specific or nonspecific) in Object positions.

positions.

- CI-N H & V: occur with definite interpretations in Subject and Object
- > V: also occur with a definite interpretation in Object-ofpreposition position.
- > H: occur with non-specific indefinite interpretations in Object position.

### (Num)-(CI)-N-Det

- H & V: occur with definite interpretations in Object and Object-of-
- Preposition positions. > H: also occur with definite interpretations in Subject position.

### Poss-CI-N (Hmong)

> <u>H</u>: occur with definite interpretations in all positions.

## Subject

H & V: interpreted as definite.

### Object

H & V: interpreted as definite, specific or non-specific.

### Object of preposition

H & V: interpreted as definite or non-specific.

### 5. Discussion

### Relationship between definite CI-N and definite bare N

- Some classifier languages allow a CI-N sequence to occur with a definite interpretation (e.g., Cantonese, Wenzhou) while others do not (e.g., Mandarin, Min) (Cheng and Sybesma 2005). Hmong and Vietnamese pattern like Cantonese.
- Is there a connection between the existence of a CI-N sequence with a **definite** reading and the lack of a **definite** reading in a bare N in the same language?

	Cantonese	Mandarin
CI-N with a definite interpretation:	V	*
Bare N with a definite interpretation:	*	

(Cheng and Sybesma 1999, 2005)

Hmong and Vietnamese present a problem for this connection.

	Hmong	Vietnamese
CI-N with a definite interpretation:	$\sqrt{}$	
Bare N with a definite interpretation:	$\checkmark$	
		_

The connection also faces difficulty with data from Wenzhou discussed in Cheng and Sybesma (2005).

### Non-specific indefinite CI-N in Hmong

- According to Bisang (1999), Hmong CI-N sequence differs from Vietnamese and Cantonese in that Hmong cannot have non-specific indefinite interpretation whereas Vietnamese and Cantonese can (cf. Cheng and Sybesma 1999).
- However, we found one instance in our Hmong text where a CI-N form has a non-specific indefinite interpretation.
  - ... tiam si ho tsis muaj tus ab tsi li. Part not have Cl what Part but 'but there isn't anything (to prepare)!'

### 6. Future study

- We will determine
  - i. whether the form-interpretation pairs that we did not find in the folktales are possible, and
  - ii. whether the observations based on single items (see 3. Results) hold true with nouns in general.
- We will use questionnaires with sentences from the same folktales and some others, with some of the nominal expressions replaced with a selection of nominal expressions of different types. Native speakers of Hmong and Vietnamese will be asked to choose the form(s) that they find appropriate for the flow of the story (cf. Kassevitch 2005).

References 

Bisang, W. 1999. Classifiers in East and Southeast Asian languages: Counting and beyond. Numeral types and changes worldwide, ed. Gvozdanović, 113-185. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter. 🖵 Cheng, L. S. & R. Sybesma. 1999. Bare and not-so-bare nouns and the structure of NP. *Linguistic Inquiry* 30:509-542. 

Cheng, L. S. & R. Sybesma. 2005. Classifiers in four varieties of Chinese. In *The Oxford handbook of comparative syntax*, eds. G. Cinque & R. Kayne, 259-292. Oxford: Oxford University Press. 

Johnson, C. (ed.) 1985. Dab neeg Hmoob: Myth, legends & folk tales from the Hmong of Laos. St. Paul, MN: Macalester College Linguistics Department. 

Kassevitch, V. B. 2005. Syntactic and morphological markers in Burmese: Are they really optional? In *Studies in Burmese linguistics*, ed. J. Watkins, 67-86. Canberra: Pacific Studies. 

Simpson, A. 2005. Classifiers and DP structure in Southeast Asia. In *The Oxford handbook of comparative syntax*, 806-838.