It is generally argued that English has Amount Relative, i.e., AR, as some people call it degree relatives (DegRCs). According to Carlson (1977), some sentences with definite determiners and non-cardinal quantifiers will be affected by the definiteness restriction on There-Insertion (Milsark 1974), in that the existentiality of "there" calls into effect in the syntactic structure. Also, following Kayne, the idea of *many books was proposed by Grosu and Landman (1998) to argue for the sortal internal relative structure of DegRCs. In light of this, I investigate the issue that whether Chinese has corresponding Amount Relative as well, in line with Huang's four kinds of existential sentences in Chinese (1987).

To illustrate, the Chinese corresponding *there, you "there-is" is given and compared in (1) and (2).

(1) a. Zai zhuo-shang you liang-zhang zhi
   at table-top have two-piece paper
   "There are two pieces of paper on the table"

   b. *Zai zhuo-shang you na liang-zhang zhi
      at table-top have that two-piece paper
      "There are that two pieces of paper on the table"

(2) a. (Zai zhuo-shang you) liang-zhang Daiyu mai de zhi
     at table-top have two-piece Daiyu buy Re paper
     "(On the table, there are) two pieces of paper that Daiyu bought"

     b. (Zai zhuo-shang you) na liang-zhang Daiyu mai de zhi
        at table-top have that two-piece Daiyu buy Re paper
        "(On the table, there are) that two pieces of paper that Daiyu bought"

For the first sight, it seems that English should have the same phenomena. But, it doesn't, at least, not completely.

(3) a. There are two pieces of paper on the table.

     b. *There are that two pieces of paper on the table.

(4) a. There are two pieces of paper that John bought.

     b. *?There are that two pieces of paper that John bought.

     c. *Two pieces of paper that there were.
d. That two pieces of paper that there were.

As Huang (1987) pointed out that some existential sentences in Chinese exhibit what Safir (1982) call *definiteness effects* (DEs), I will show that *definiteness effects* are actually suppressed with the occurrence of this special relativization, as illustrated in (1) b and (2) b, and further illustrated in (5) b and (6) b

(5) a. Lai le liang-wei tongxue come Perf two-CL classmate  
"Two classmates came"

b. Lai le na liang-wei tongxue come Perf that two-CL classmate  
"That two classmates came"

(6) a. Lai le liang-wei dai maozi de tongxue come Perf two-CL wear hat Re classmate  
"Two classmates who wear hat came"

b. Lai le na liang-wei dai maozi de tongxue come Perf that two-CL wear hat Re classmate  
"That two classmates who wear hat came"

It is generally agreed that pre-verbal subject is definite. However, we observer that not only *Na liang-wei dai maozi de tongxue lai le* "That two classmates who wear hat came" is grammatical but (6) b is too; one is subject in preverbal position and the other in postverbal position. In order to capture the different surface structures, I will further outline my account in section 1. In section 2, determiner-complementation approach and head-raising approach will be taken respectively to account for the structure in Chinese; also, strong-weak features will be mentioned. In section 3, a semantic difference between two structures in Chinese will be briefly elaborated. In section 4, *Negation Island* will be used to further support, say, (6) b, as opposed to (6) a, in addition to that, lack of *stacking* is used to argue for the existence of AR. In section 5, a conclusion would be made: Chinese has the similar phenomena to AR, but not necessarily an amount issue, but more a definiteness issue.