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ABSTRACT
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INDEX WORDS: Contact-induced borrowing, Mandarin, Lexicon, A-not-A question, Chinese-ified, Adverbs, Time phrases, Contact situations, Accessibility and acceptability.
CONTACT-INDUCED CHANGES
FROM ENGLISH (L2) TO MANDARIN CHINESE (L1)

by

SHIH-JU YOUNG
B.A., The University of Georgia, 2004

A Thesis Submitted to the Graduate Faculty of The University of Georgia in Partial
Fulfillment of the Requirements for the Degree

MASTER OF ARTS

ATHENS, GEORGIA
2007
CONTACT-INDUCED CHANGE
FROM ENGLISH (L2) TO MANDARIN CHINESE (L1)

by

SHIH-JU YOUNG

Major Professor: Marlyse Baptista
Committee: Don R. McCreary
Dezso Benedek

Electronic Version Approved:

Maureen Grasso
Dean of the Graduate School
The University of Georgia
May 2007
DEDICATION

This thesis is dedicated to all members of my family. Without their constant financial and spiritual support, my dream of studying abroad and becoming a linguist would not have come true.

我将这篇论文献给我在美国，台湾，日本及天堂的家人。谢谢他们在我留美求学期间，多方面的给予我生活及精神上的支持与鼓励。
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to express my deepest thanks to my major professor, Dr. Marlyse Baptista, for her constant guidance and encouragement, and most of all for believing in me. I also want to thank Dr. Don R. McCreary for his advice and support. I also want to thank Dr. Dezso Benedek for being a member of my committee even though this has been one of his busiest years. Thanks also to Dr. Jared S. Klein for his willingness to guide me when I needed it the most. I would also like to thank Dr. Mi-Ran Kim for her advice and moral support. She was always there and ready to help me when I needed her. My thanks also go to Lynnette Lang for her word of encouragement and her patience in answering all my questions.
# TABLE OF CONTENTS

| ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS | ................................................................. | VI |
|-------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| CHAPTER           |                                                                                                  |
| 1 INTRODUCTION    | ........................................................................................................ | 1 |
| 2 LITERATURE REVIEW (LR) |.................................................................................. | 12 |
| 2.1 LR on language maintenance | .................................................................... | 12 |
| 2.1.1 Borrowing scale by Thomason and Kaufman (1988) | ........................................ | 13 |
| 2.1.2 Contact situations by Winford (2003) | ........................................................................ | 16 |
| 2.1.3 Four patterns of code-switching by Auer (1995) | ........................................................................ | 17 |
| 2.2 LR on Mandarin Chinese A-not-A question formation | ............................................... | 21 |
| 2.3 LR on Mandarin Chinese adverbs and time phrases | .................................................. | 34 |
| 2.3.1 Adverbs in English and Mandarin Chinese | ......................................................................... | 34 |
| 2.3.2 Time phrases in English and Mandarin Chinese | ....................................................................... | 38 |
| 3 CONTACT-INDUCED BORROWING: | CHINESE-IFIED LEXICON IN A-NOT-A QUESTION | .................................................................. | 41 |
| 3.1 Linguistic background | ........................................................................................................ | 43 |
| 3.1.1 Mandarin Chinese syllable structure | ........................................................................... | 43 |
| 3.1.2 Mandarin Chinese phonemic inventory | .................................................................................. | 46 |
| 3.2 Analysis | ................................................................................................................ | 47 |
| 4 CONTACT-INDUCED BORROWING: | STRUCTURAL INTERFERENCE ON THE ADVERB XIANI AND |
TIME PHRASES................................................................. 53

4.1 Linguistic background .......................................................... 53

4.1.1 Adverb xian1 ‘first, in advance’ ........................................... 53

4.1.2 Time phrases.................................................................... 55

4.2 Analysis.............................................................................. 56

5 SOCIAL MOTIVATIONS FOR BORROWING/CODE-SWITCHING IN TAIWAN......................................................... 59

5.1 Social motivations and prescriptivism .................................... 60

5.1.1 Social motivations.................................................................. 60

5.1.2 Prescriptivism................................................................. 63

5.2 Accessibility and Acceptability........................................... 63

6 DISCUSSION ...................................................................... 67

6.1 Topic fronting........................................................................ 68

6.1.1 Analysis on xian1 and time phrases........................................ 68

6.1.2 Analysis on A-not-A questions............................................... 69

6.2 Sankoff and Poplack’s (1981) Equivalence Constraint and Free Morpheme Constraint .................................................. 72

6.3 Other languages: Japanese and Spanish................................. 74

7 CONCLUSION .................................................................... 76

REFERENCES............................................................................. 78

APPENDICES ............................................................................. 83

A ROMANIZATION SYSTEM......................................................... 83

B CORRESPONDENT IPA SYMBOLS............................................ 84
CHAPTER 1
INTRODUCTION

Various investigations have been conducted on contact situations between speakers of different languages. Schmidt (1872), Schuchardt (1884), and Paul (1886) presented a great deal of research on the role language contact takes on and its effects on the study of the nature of language change. The debate over the nature of language change continued to be addressed well into the 20th century by scholars such as Sapir (1921) and Bloomfield (1933). Winford (2003) pointed out that one of the major topics about language contact among the historical linguists in the 19th century was the issue of whether the “family tree” model of genetic relationships among languages was actually compromised. Meillet (1921) and Oksaar (1972) both agreed that languages with mixed elements (grammar) did not exist. On the other hand, studies conducted by Schmidt (1872) and Whitney (1881) showed that language mixture was definitely possible; in fact, it was the result of contact. One of the great pioneers in the study of contact languages, Schuchardt (1872), provided abundant examples of contact-induced change from different situations, including Balkan contact and pidgin and Creole situations. Winford noted much of Schuchardt’s (1884) work is accompanied by details of the social context, the groups in contact, and other relevant socio-cultural data (Winford, 2003:8). In the 20th century, some scholars began to incorporate social context into the study of language contact and became aware that “differences in the social setting may lead to differences in the outcomes of contact” (Winford, 2003:10). Both Weinreich (1953) and Haugen (1950a, 1950b, 1953) emphasized the importance of studying language contact from both linguistic and socio-cultural angles. For instance, the pattern of borrowing from English into American Norwegian is directly related to the new domains that the Norwegian
immigrants needed to acquire to interact with the speakers of English. Therefore, “the chief foci of influence were the store, the government and the American neighbor” (Haugen, 1953:93), and, thus, “there was a preponderance of lexical borrowings in the economic and official spheres of activity. On the other hand, very little borrowing affected the vocabulary used at home or in religion, where interaction remained within the group” (Winford, 2003:39). Another example that clearly reflects the importance of economic or social factors is the Japanese contact with English in the mid-19th century. The defeat of China in the Opium Wars with Britain urged upon the Japanese the need to adopt Western concepts, especially in the scientific and military fields (Winford, 2003). As Ishiwata (1986, cited by Winford, 2003:32) pointed out, “these borrowings were motivated by the need for modernization in areas such as science, technology, and higher learning.” Furthermore, from his studies on factors that influence the degree and type of lexical borrowing among English and French bilingual and monolingual speakers in Canada, Poplack (1996) concluded that the rates of borrowing are more related to one’s social class and living environment than one’s age and language proficiency, and it is also dependent on the norms of community convention rather than on vocabulary need.

Winford (2003) stated that it is a natural tendency for speakers of different languages or dialects to find ways to bypass or break language barriers. In fact, speakers tend to compromise and accommodate their ways of expression when they are in contact with each other. Such contact may involve wide degrees of influence of one language on the other through simple lexical borrowing, structural alternation, and semantic shifting, sometimes even leading to the creation of a new contact language such as pidgin or creoles. During the period of Japanese modernization, approximately between the 7th and the 12th centuries, Chinese was seen as the main source of cultural and technological innovations and later became the most important contributor to the Japanese lexicon, with words such as shio, “salt,” and ine, “rice” (Loveday, 1996:31). Furthermore, Fuller (1996), who studies
Pennsylvania German, claims that it is changing toward English in structure, though the change is less obvious. Mougeon and Beniak suggest that “situations of unstable bilingualism promote structural influence from the dominant language on the minority language” (1991:180). Silva-Corvalán (1994) (cited by Winford 2003:66-67) presents various examples of structural changes in Los Angeles Spanish that have undergone English influence. For instance, atrás, “behind,” has acquired the English sense of “back” in a sentence such as: *Se lo dió p’atrás (< para atrás)*.

Generally speaking, three types of contact-induced outcomes can be categorized: those resulting in the preservation of speakers’ first language (language maintenance), those leading to partial or total abandonment of the first language in favor of another (language shift), and those involving serious restructuring and adopting elements from the language with which contact occurred (new contact language).¹ Language maintenance refers to a speech community’s preference, with or without actual contact with other languages, towards preservation of the first language. Preservation implies that the language changes only by small degrees in its subsystems—the phonology, morphology, syntax, and lexicon. Winford (2003:15) states that we can subdivide all the language shift situations into two categories. First, the language spoken by the minority group shifts either partially or completely to the language spoken by the majority. However, features of the first language of the minority tend to carry over into its version of the second language. For instance, the speakers of Norman French came to England in the Middle English period and influenced the lexicon and phonology of English. In some cases, the minority groups preserve their first language while, at the same time they acquire the dominant language for other purposes. Second, a language community is forced to have contact with other groups after being introduced into new communities by colonizers: “The indigenous community then adopts the foreign language

¹ Categorizations of contact situation were described by Winford (2003:11)
either as a replacement for its original native language(s), or as a second language to be used in addition to the latter. Such ‘indigenized’ varieties of a foreign language are especially common in areas that were formerly colonized by external powers” (Winford, 2003: 15). Indian English is one out of many examples. Sometimes, contact between two communities may involve some extreme restructuring and intensive changing from one language to another, eventually leading to the creation of new contact languages including pidgins, creoles, and mixed languages. For instance, Hawaiian Creole English, spoken by some residents in Hawaii, is a Creole language based on English. It started out as a pidgin that served as a communication tool among speakers of Hawaiian, Japanese, Chinese, Korean, Filipino, and Portuguese, among others, and eventually was adopted and acquired as a native language, i.e. recognized as a Creole (Tryon & Charpentier, 2004). Winford’s classification of contact situations is summarized in chapter 2. The contact situations presented in this study include those that involve face-to-face interactions between speakers from different languages and contact situations between speakers through media, such as foreign books, mass media, foreign movies, or language-learning textbooks. In other words, language contact can occur without the physical presence of the two speakers. Interactions between an individual and a medium constitute unique kinds of contact situations as well. Therefore, although contact among bilingual speakers may be ideal for language contact studies, other forms of contact may also give us valuable information. Again, it is important to point out that contact situations not only include face-to-face interactions but also distant contacts made through mass media, books, radio, literature, and so on. The LA Spanish situation described by Silva-Corvalán (1994) mentioned above, territorial invasions (as seen in the case of Norse-speaking Norwegians and Danes who invaded and settled in England, resulting in the adoption of a large amount of Norse function words and affixes), as well as the lexicon described by Thomason and Kaufman (1988) are all examples of actual contact. On the other hand, Japanese, Chinese (Taiwanese), and other languages that have borrowed words from
English were said to have a distant contact with English in particular via radio, cinema, and so on. Terms such as aisu kuriimu, “ice cream,” sangurasu, “sun glasses,” and pa:ti, “party,” were probably introduced by the cinema or other forms of mass media (Ishiwata, 1986).

The phenomena presented in this thesis fall in the category of language maintenance because, although certain English lexical items and a few structural interferences on the construction of adverbs and time phrases are being introduced into Chinese, the subsystems of Chinese such as phonology, semantics, other syntactic structures, and core lexicon remain relatively intact. As described by Thomason and Kaufman (1988), language maintenance can be subdivided into contact-induced borrowing and convergence. Depending on the degree of contact, borrowing situations can run from lexical borrowing only to lexical and slight structural borrowing to moderate structural borrowing. An example of the first borrowing situation is the borrowing term, ballet, from French into Modern English. Latin influence on Early Modern English and German influence on Romansh respectively are representatives of the slight and the moderate structural borrowings resulted from a more moderate to intense contact (Thomason and Kaufman, 1988:50). From the intensity of casual to moderate contact, this thesis aims to account for two contact-induced borrowings from English (L2) to Mandarin Chinese (L1). First, through contact with speakers of English, speakers of Chinese sometimes borrow from the English lexicon; such lexical elements become “Chinese-ified” phonologically and then syllabified to fit the Chinese CV syllable structure. Next, such a feature is integrated into Chinese A-not-A questions, which is a special kind of interrogative construction in the language (1).

---

2 L2 refers to a speaker’s second language.
3 The term “Mandarin” is an English translation of the old Bei3jing1 (北京) expression guan1-hua4 (官話) ‘official language.’ Both the official language of China and Taiwan are based on Bei3jing1 dialect with slight differences in vocabulary and grammar; however, due to political and geographical issues, since the 1950s, the official language of China is called pu3-tong1-hua4 (普通話) ‘common speech’, and the official language of Taiwan is called guo2yu3 (國語) ‘national language.’ The “Chinese” referred in this thesis refers to the official language of Taiwan.
4 L1 refers to a speaker’s native language.
(1) 你 不
Ni3 [hæ] bu4 [hæpi]?67
you ha(ppy) not happy
“Are you happy (or not)?”

Second, when more intensive contact takes place and the speakers’ knowledge of English has increased, interference on the structural level, such as word order, arises. This thesis focuses on the syntactic interference of English on the behavior of the Chinese adverb xian1, “first, in advance” (2a), and time phrases (2b), which are moved from the original pre-verbal position (Chinese) to the post-verbal position (English) when constructing a Chinese sentence.

(2)  a. 我 走 先
Wo2 tzou3 xian1!
I go first
“I’m going/leaving first!”

---

5 Numerals appearing next to each Chinese syllable represent “tone.” (Ladefoged, 2006)
- Tone 1: high, even, and constant tone
- Tone 2: rising tone that grows stronger
- Tone 3: first falling and fading, then rising and growing strong
- Tone 4: quickly falling and fading tone
There are occasions when no numerals apply to the syllables; in such cases, unstressed syllables are indicated and are sometimes referred to as “tone zero.”

6 Pin1ying1 (拼音) ‘romanization system’ used here is according to the TLPA (Taiwan Language Phonetic Alphabet). The correspondent zhu4yin1 fu2hao4 (注音符號) ‘Chinese phonetic alphabet’ is provided in the appendix.

7 I include tones along with my transcriptions even though it is irrelevant to the discussion. I found it necessary to include tones because Mandarin uses tones to distinguish meaning in the same way that the choice of a consonant or a vowel distinguishes meaning. (Ross & Ma, 2006)
- Tone 1 – ma1 (媽) ‘mother’
- Tone 2 – ma2 (麻) ‘numb’
- Tone 3 – ma3 (馬) ‘horse’
- Tone 4 – ma4 (罵) ‘scold’
- Neutral – ma (嗎) ‘question particle’
b. 我 有 個 考試 今天 晚上

Wo2⁸ you3 ge kou3-shi4 jin1-tian1 wan3-shang4.

I have CL⁹ test today night

“I have a test tonight.”

The Chinese A-not-A question type has been widely discussed syntactically as well as semantically in the literature including Cheng’s (1984), Zhu’s (1985), and Yuan’s (1993) studies on its relationship with other question-types and its categorization, its usage in pragmatics (Li & Thompson, 1979; Cheng, 1984; Yuan, 1993), and its formation (Li & Thompson, 1981; Tang, 1981; Huang, 1988; Dai, 1990; Hsiao, 2004). Scholars have approached the constructions of this type of question in different ways. Traditionally, Li and Thompson (1981) and Tang (1981) believe that an A-not-A question is constructed through the coordination of the affirmative form and its negative counterpart and that this type of question is derived from disjunctive questions (See subsection 2.2.1 for detailed derivation processes). However, Huang (1988) argues that this analysis violates the principle of lexical integrity (See subsection 2.2.2). Therefore, he proposes that A-not-A questions are actually generated by a morphological word formation rule: partial reduplication. Furthermore, in subsection 2.2.2, we see that the distribution of Chinese prepositional phrases also causes doubts about Li and Thompson’s (1981) and Tang’s (1981) analysis in A-not-A question formation. Nonetheless, this thesis adopts Hsiao’s (2004) approach to this question type, which claims that the copied material in an A-not-A question is actually a prosodic element (a syllable) rather than a morphological element (a morpheme). Similarities and differences

---

⁸ Sandhi: every syllable that is usually pronounced with tone 3 turns into a tone 2 when directly preceding another tone 3.
⁹ CL stands for classifier.
regarding Huang’s and Hsiao’s analysis of the A-not-A questions are discussed in subsection 2.2.2.

In Chinese, both the adverb xian1, “first, in advance,” and adverbial phrases (the time phrase in particular) are verb modifiers, which occur in pre-verbal positions (See subsection 2.3.1 and 2.3.2 for details). However, as discussed in chapter 5, data show otherwise when possible interference induced by language contact takes place.

Most likely, outcomes induced by contact situations, stated Winford (2003), are analyzed linguistically and/or psychologically (internal factors) and socially (external factors). Internal factors can usually be drawn from studying a language’s origin, history, and typological similarities with contact languages as well as linguistic-specific or universal constraints operating in certain situations. Internal factors such as a language’s origin and history have long been used in the study of historical linguistics to examine the relationships and backgrounds among languages and those that may have contact with each other historically. Typological similarities then provide evidence of possible connections and contacts among the languages. Moreover, in the study of Second Language Acquisition (SLA), typological similarities and differences between a speaker’s first and his/her second language are commonly used, as the basis to predict the possible transfers or interferences that may occur during the course of learning the second language (Gass & Selinker, 2001).

Thomason and Kaufman (1988) stated that, in slight to moderate borrowing, “source-language features that fit well typologically with functionally analogous features in the borrowing language tend to be borrowed first...less highly structured subsystems will have relatively independent elements, and the likelihood of a close typological fit with corresponding elements in another language will be greater” (1988:72-73). Since most languages have adverbial particles, according to Thomason and Kaufman (1988), it is still possible, and fairly easy, for the language to borrow a negative particle despite the fact that, in a borrowing language, a verbal affix has already been used to express negation. External
factors usually include the respective sizes (populations), power relationships, and class classifications between the language groups and the contact situations, from casual to intense, between the two. Those factors are thoroughly examined in the study of creole formation. Three general social conditions that cause the emergence of creole languages are identified by Mintz (1971): numbers of Europeans, Africans, and other groups present in each colony; the codes of interaction governing the statuses and the relationships of different groups; and the community settings within which the groups interacted. Bickerton (1981) suggested that Creoles developed in communities where the dominant group made up equal or less than 20% of the population. Moreover, Singler (1993) noted that patterns of contact depended on the type of economic activity in the community. For instance, in a setting characterized by small farm, numbers of Europeans and Africans were more or less the same; closer and longer interaction remained between the groups. In consequence, a Creole language that is closer to the settler dialect was produced. Furthermore, power relationships between the settlers and the slaves played an important role as well. For example, a domestic slave had more contact with Europeans than a skilled slave and had more chances to learn the second language variety of the settlers’ language. Again, both Weinreich (1953) and Haugen (1950a, 1950b) emphasized the importance of including relevant external factors in the study of language contact along with the linguistic factors. Studies on typological similarities and differences between two languages enable researchers to predict possible outcomes or errors that may be produced by speakers. Studies on contact situations based on sociological factors bring researchers close to environments that trigger the contact-induced linguistic transfer or interference. Therefore, this thesis intends to analyze and describe the phenomena from both linguistic and socio-cultural perspectives.

Three general social conditions are summarized from Mintz (1971:481).
I conclude that the occurrences of contact-induced change are related to a speaker’s degree of acceptability and accessibility. More precisely, acceptability and accessibility help explain the speaker’s preference for certain vocabulary and the listener’s perception of lexical or structural alterations. Generally speaking, greater accessibility results in greater acceptability (See section 5.2 for detailed analysis). Therefore, the lexicon from languages other than English can also be Chinese-ified and integrated in the A-not-A question if it can be broken down and fit into typical Chinese syllabic characteristics as well as pass the acceptability and accessibility tests.

The organization of this thesis is as follows:

- Chapter 2, the literature review, presents relevant proposals regarding the subjects of this study by various scholars. The Literature Review (LR) is further divided into three sections: 2.1 LR on language maintenance, 2.2 LR on Mandarin Chinese A-not-A question formation, and 2.3 LR on Mandarin Chinese adverbs and time phrases.
- Chapter 3, “Contact-Induced Borrowing: Chinese-ified Lexicon in the A-not-A Question,” discusses the Chinese A-not-A question formation, how English words get re-lexified or Chinese-ified, and possible theories behind why this interference happens. Included is a brief discussion of the Chinese syllable structure and its phonetics.
- Chapter 4, “Contact-Induced Borrowing: Structural Interference on ‘xian1’ and Time Phrases,” explores the Chinese adverb xian1, “first, in advance,” and the usage of time phrases. A brief review of Chinese syntax and parts of speech will be covered, followed by a discussion of possible causes for this type of structural interference.
- Chapter 5, “Social Motivations for Borrowing/Code-switching in Taiwan,” provides possible external factors that may contribute to such contact-induced
phenomena. A discussion on accessibility and acceptability will be conducted in the latter section of this chapter.

- Chapter 6, Discussion, brings other languages to the test. My hypothesis on the subject of the A-not-A question is that, as long as the borrowed words fit into one of the possible Chinese syllable structures, then the A-not-A questions produced with the integration of Chinese-ified foreign words are deemed acceptable among Chinese speakers.

- Chapter 7 will conclude this study.
CHAPTER 2
LITERATURE REVIEW (LR)

The objective of this thesis is to highlight two borrowing phenomena on both the lexical level induced by casual contact and the structural level induced by moderate contact with English. The first contact-induced borrowing is on the lexical level, involving integration of the borrowed English lexicon into Chinese A-not-A questions as demonstrated in (1). The second contact-induced borrowing is on the structural level where the adverb xian1 and time phrases in Chinese move from a pre-verbal position to a post-verbal position, which is identical to English sentences. An example of this was listed in (2). However, although borrowings do occur in the cases mentioned above, such contact-induced changes do not have a big impact on any other subsystems of Chinese. Therefore, the LR chapter is further divided into three sections. Section 2.1 discusses one type of contact-induced outcome, language maintenance, categorized by Winford (2003). Section 2.2 explores different interpretations proposed by scholars regarding the formation of Chinese A-not-A questions. Section 2.3 investigates the function and property of Chinese adverbs and time phrases with emphasis on their roles in sentence structure.

2.1 LR on language maintenance

This section is further divided into three subsections: In 2.1.1, the borrowing scale by Thomason and Kaufman (1988) presents contact-induced changes on both the lexical and the structural level in terms of the degree and duration of contact as well as typological distance. In 2.1.2, categorization of contact situations by Winford (2003) treats contact situations from a slightly different perspective, mainly categorizing contact situations by the political or
social status of the languages in contact. In 2.1.3, four patterns of code-switching, categorized by Auer (1995), are discussed.


We can generally trace 48 percent of the modern Japanese lexicon back to its Chinese origin, while about 75 percent of the words in English were borrowed from other languages during the course of its history (Winford, 2003:30-32). Lexical borrowing is the most common form of contact-induced change because such borrowing can occur under a wide array of conditions ranging from no contact to casual contact to intensive contact with speakers of the borrowing language. Outcomes of contact situations differ according to the intensity of contact, degree of bilingualism, linguistic factors, and external factors. Thomason and Kaufman’s (1988) borrowing scale (3), provides us with a broad picture of how the intensity of contact between speakers and typological distance between languages affect the elements being borrowed.

(3) Borrowing Scale

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stage</th>
<th>Lexical level</th>
<th>Structural level</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Casual contact (lexical borrowing only)</td>
<td>- Content words: Non-basic vocabulary will be borrowed before basic-vocabulary</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 2. Slightly more intense contact (slight structural borrowing) | - Stage 1
- Function words: Conjunctions and adverbial particles | - New phonemes with new phones in loanwords
- New orderings without typological disruption |
Shared by many scholars, the traditional view of structural borrowing, when initiated by speakers of the borrowing language, is the product of contact situations between bilingual individuals or groups in a joint speech community (Oksaar, 1972). However, Thomason and Kaufman (1988) argue that, although speakers who have good knowledge of the borrowed language would be ideal for large-scale borrowing, speakers in contact are not required to achieve bilingualism in order to have slight lexical and even structural borrowings. Stage 1 and 2 described in (3) show the phenomena of borrowings and changes that can still be introduced by casual and slight contact and by speakers who do not have much knowledge of other languages in contact. Thomason and Kaufman (1988) also stated that “most cases of slight structural borrowing that we have found involve borrowing from a prestigious literary language, and in these cases the source language is often known to the borrowers primarily or
only in its written form” (1988: 66). Furthermore, since contact through writing or literature does not require the physical presence of speakers of either contact language, in such a case, a joint speech community does not exist. In stages 3 to 5, active involvement of bilingual speakers in a joint speech community is likely in order to achieve moderate to heavy structural borrowing. Two elements, time and level of bilingualism, are related to the measurement of the intensity of contact situations, and the higher the level of a speaker’s competence of the borrowed language, the greater the chance that the speaker’s knowledge is enhanced by greater cultural pressure from the language group from which it is borrowed (Thomason and Kaufman, 1988; Weinreich, 1953): “Long-term contact with widespread bilingualism among borrowing-language speakers is a prerequisite for extensive structural borrowing” (Thomason and Kaufman, 1988:67). Cultural pressure is most obviously reflected by a politically dominant population on a subordinate group living within the same district. Moreover, sizes of the speaker groups of two languages in contact may also determine the direction of contact-induced changes, either from top-down or bottom-up. The extreme size disadvantage of the politically dominant group may allow cultural pressure from another group with a greater population, although it is less powerful politically, and this politically dominant group may be forced to become familiar with different languages/dialects within that speech community.

The major factors that promote greater intensity of contact, or greater cultural pressure on borrowing-language speakers are these: length of time- enough time for bilingualism to develop and for interference features to make their way into the borrowing language; many more source-language speakers than borrowing-language speakers; and either sociopolitical dominance of source-language speakers over borrowing-language speakers or intimate contact in mixed households and/or other social settings. (Thomason and Kaufman, 1988:72)
In addition to these social factors, typological distance seems to be relevant for predicting how much and what types of borrowing will occur. Thomason and Kaufman (1988) stated “the more internal structure a grammatical subsystem has, the more intricately interconnected its categories will be; therefore the less likely its elements will be to match closely, in the typological sense” (1988:72-73). As mentioned in chapter 1, the negative particle is borrowed into other languages even when the borrowing language has its own affix expressing negation. On the other hand, it is harder for a language expressing negation by a particle to borrow a negative verbal affix from others (Thomason and Kaufman, 1988).

2.1.2 Contact situations by Winford (2003)

Under language maintenance, Winford categorized contact situations from “casual” contact to contact among “unequal” bilingualism and to lexical among “equal” bilingualism according to the degrees and types of contact as well as the power relationships between the groups. Winford’s categorization of contact situations is summarized below in (4).

(4) Contact Situations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Contact situation</th>
<th>Setting</th>
<th>Outcome</th>
<th>Examples</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>“Casual” contact</td>
<td>- Minimal contact</td>
<td>- Lexical borrowing</td>
<td>English loans in Japanese</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Distant contact</td>
<td>from source language</td>
<td>Ex: <em>sarada</em> &lt; <em>salad</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“Unequal” bilingualism</td>
<td>- Contact between</td>
<td>- Borrowing from</td>
<td>- French on the Middle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>a dominant group</td>
<td>dominant language</td>
<td>English lexicon Ex: <em>canon</em></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

12 The contact situations were summarized from Winford (2003:30-37)
13 The term “distant” contact was used by Loveday (1996) to refer to marginal contact due to travel or exposure to the source language in the mass media, foreign language class, and so on.
14 Other examples are as such: *sangarasu* < *sun glasses*; *pātī* < *party*; *batō* < *bat*. Examples were drawn from Ishiwata (1986).
15 Borrowing in the opposite direction, from subordinate to dominant, also occurs but generally in different degree.
and a linguistic minority (minority tend to become bilingual) - Chinese on the Japanese lexicon. Ex: *uma* ‘horse’.

---

| “Equal” bilingualism | - More or less equal relationship in terms of power and prestige | - Borrowing would be more limited - More bi-directional - Low rate of lexical borrowing | - Treffers-Daller (1999) reports low rate of borrowings between French and Flemish and Alsatian. |

According to Winford’s categorization above, contact-induced borrowings are pretty extensive whether the speakers of both contact languages have casual or moderate contact or even no face-to-face interaction whatsoever. However, in the setting of “equal” bilingualism, the rate of lexical borrowing drops drastically.

2.1.3 Four patterns of code-switching by Auer (1995)

Code-switching is referred, by Winford (2003), “to those cases where bilingual speakers alternate between codes within the same speech event, switch codes within a single turn, or mix elements from two codes within the same utterance” (2003:103). Auer (1995) identifies four patterns of code-switching. Pattern 1 involves switches from code A to code B as in (5) where a bus conductor switches from Swahili to English when talking to a passenger or switches within a single speaker’s turn as in (6) where a market-vendor and a customer

---

16 It seems that the motivation of borrowing French lexicon into Middle English varies, and it was also related to the periods of time in which the lexicon was borrowed. For instance, terms such as *atom*, *nation*, and *finance* were borrowed by “need”; dining terms like *veal*, *pork*, and *beef*, as well as other terms like *arms*, *court*, and *legal* were most likely borrowed by “prestige”. Examples were drawn from Winford (2003).

17 Other examples are as such: *shio* ‘salt’ and *ine* ‘rice.’ Examples were drawn from Loveday (1996).

18 She finds that the proportion of French borrowings into the other language is around 2.0-2.5%, and borrowings from other language to French are around 0.9%. The statistic reflects the higher status of French and indicates high loyalty and language identity to the minority language.

19 Dialogue was taken from Myers-Scotton (1993a:134)

20 Dialogue was taken from Myers-Scotton (1993a: 40)
switch between Swahili and English during negotiation. These types of code-switching usually mark a shift in topic or activity type.

(5) (C: conductor; P: passenger)

C: Umelipa nauli ya basi? “Have you paid the bus fare?”
P: …
C: Unanda wapi? “Where are you going?”
P: Nafika Jerusalem. “I am going to Jerusalem [Housing estate].”
C: You must always say clearly and loudly where you are going to aright, OK?

(6) (V: vendor; U: customer.)

V: Habari, mheshimwa. Have some vegetables. “Hello, respected sir.” …
U: Mboga gain? Nipe Kabeji hizi. How much is that?
V: Five shillings only.
U: That’s too much. Sina pesa “I don’t have that much money.”

Pattern 2 involves a negotiation in a language of interaction. Participants usually switch from one code to another until the negotiation is finalized as seen in (7),21 where a mother switches between English and Cantonese with her son who finally answers the question in English.

(7) (M: mother; S: son)

M: Finished homework?
S: …

21 Dialogue was taken from Milroy and Wei (1995:125).
M: Steven, yiū mo wan sue? 

S: … I have finished.

Pattern 3 involves switching between languages, but neither one of them can be identified as the base language. In these cases, speakers may switch from within the same sentence or from clause to clause or from sentence to sentence. Example (8) illustrates inter-sentential switching of a Spanish/English bilingual. Pattern 4 refers to momentary switches, which do not interrupt/change the speech event as illustrated in (9).

(8) There was a guy, you know, que (that) he se monto (got up). He started playing with congas, you know, and se monto y empezo a brincar (got up and started to jump)…

(9) Hata siky hizi ni-me-decide kwanza kutumia sabuni ya miti

    even days these 1s-PRF-decide first to use soap of stick

    “[But] even these days I’ve decided first to use bar soap.”

Most frequently, code-switching involves partial degrees of borrowing, either from L1 or L2. As mentioned above, this may occur on several levels. Phonological borrowing is considered one of the most active forms of interference among speakers of different languages. A foreign accent is treated as a type of phonological borrowing, which usually occurs when language A lacks certain phonemes in language B (10a), when language A assumes certain phonemes that act the same in language B as in A (10b), or when a phoneme

---

22 Example was taken from Sankoff and Poplack (1981:11)
23 Example was taken from Myers-Scotton (1993b:4)
24 “ni”-subject prefix indicates 1st person singular
25 “me”- tense infix indicates perfect tense.
of language A or B in certain phonological environments requires the speaker to apply certain rules (10c) (Lehiste, 1988).

(10) a. Inter-dental fricative phonemes are not realized in Mandarin Chinese; therefore, one can predict that a Chinese learner of English may have a relatively harder time pronouncing this sound in comparison to alveolar stops, which are phonemes that exist in Chinese as well.

b. Aspirated voiceless alveolar stops in English are treated as allophones of the same phoneme /t/. However, in Korean, aspiration is treated as a separate phoneme. In other words, in English, aspiration may indicate a foreign accent, but in Korean, aspiration indicates different words.

c. In German but not English, word-final voiced obstruents are phonetically realized as their voiceless counterparts; this rule is also known as final devoicing. Therefore, a German speaker may carry over this final devoicing rule when trying to pronounce an English word. A pair of words, such as *half* and *have*, may then be misunderstood by English listeners.

According to Weinreich (1953), code-switching occurs more often across several sentences than within a single sentence as illustrated by (8) above. Lance (1969) also observed that code-switching is not entirely random; in fact, certain kinds of lexical items are more likely to be switched than others. He stated that the occurrence of code-switching is not the result of a speaker’s lack of vocabulary in one language. Rather, code-switching can also be realized in two ways: inter-sentential (between sentences) as given in (8) and intra-sentential (within a single sentence) as given in (9). The A-not-A question form being studied in this paper is a great example of intra-sentential code-switching. Grammatical borrowing presents a situation where elements of language B enter language A and are gradually grammatically integrated.
It can also be that a speaker of language A starts to speak language B and carries over elements of A into B (Lehiste, 1988). Another type of borrowing covered in this thesis is called syntactic borrowing. Syntactic borrowing appears when patterns of language A are carried over into language B and vice versa. (2a) and (2b) presented in the first chapter are excellent illustrations of this kind of borrowing; in this case, a pattern in English is carried over into Chinese.

2.2 LR on Mandarin Chinese A-not-A question formation

Cheng (1984) presented four types of question formation in the Chinese language: Question-word question (11a), A-or-B question (11b), A-not-A question (11c), and question-particle question (11d).

(11) a. 你什麼時候有空？

Ni3 shen2-me1 shi2-hou4 you3 kong4 ?

you what time have spare(time)

“When are you going to have time?”

b. 你喜歡白色還是藍色？

Ni2 xi3-huan3 bai2-se4 hai2-shi4 lan2-se4?

you like white-color or blue-color

“When which color do you like? White or blue?”

26 Ni3 ‘you’ can stand for either male or female. Though pronunciation for both terms is identical, they are distinguished by parts of the character. Male ni3 (你) contains the element referring to “person (人),” and female ni3 (妳) is presented by the element used for “female (女).” For the purpose of this thesis, the character 你 ni3 ‘you (male)’ is used as a conventional interpretation of ‘you.’
c. 你快乐不快乐？

\[ Ni3\ kuai4-le4\ bu2\ kuai4-le4? \]

you happy not happy

“Are you happy or not?”

d. 你快乐吗？

\[ Ni3\ kuai4-le4\ ma? \]

you happy PAR

“Are you happy?”

In English, (11c) and (11d) are both categorized as yes/no questions; however, (11c) is usually used when the speaker expects positive feedback from the listener; with (11d), the speaker would expect a negative response. Yes/no questions entail both affirmative forms and negative forms. In Chinese, an explicit “yes” or “no” need not be used; instead, the listener replies by using the word asked in the question and then, when constructing a negative form, attaches a \[ bu4 \] “not,” to the stem as illustrated in (12).

(12) Q: 你 好 不 好？

\[ Ni3\ hao3\ bu4\ hao3? \]

you good not good

‘How are you?’

27 The original pronunciation for ‘not’ in Chinese is \[ bu \] with tone 4, i.e. \[ bu4 \] ‘not,’ as in \[ bu4\ xian3 \] (不想) ‘not wanting.’ However, when directly following by a tone 4, it turns into a tone 2 for ease of articulation as in \[ bu2 \] qiu4 (不去) ‘not going.’

28 Unlike English, the phrase order of statements and yes-no questions with question particles is the same. No helping word (auxiliary) such as ‘do’ is involved.

29 PAR stands for particle.
A: Hao3 (好). “Yes!”
A: Bu4 hao3 (不好). “No!”

Zhang (1997) and Ross & Ma (2006) refer to the construction of A-not-A questions as actually being a Verb-not-Verb construction because the words that can be used in this type of question construction are really verbs and adjectival verbs as shown in (13).  

```
(13) Modal verb: 
Ta1 huei4 bu2 huei4 shuo1 zhong1-wen2
he can not can speak Chinese
“Can he speak Chinese?”

Action verb: 
Ta1-men31 mai4 bu2 mai4 jü2-zi
he PL sell not sell tangerine33
“Do they sell tangerines?”

Stative verb: 
Ni3 xi3-huan1 bu4 xi3-huan1 ta1
you like not like him
“Do you like him?”
```

---

30 Examples are drawn from Ross & Ma (2006: 153)
31 -men is the suffix that marks the plural form of pronoun; from wo3 ‘I’ to wo3-men ‘we.’
32 PL stands for plural marker
33 Mandarin makes no grammatical distinction between “mass” nouns and “count” nouns as well as whether they are “singular” or “plural.” To indicate the plurality of a noun, the noun is modified by a phrase contains “number” and “classifier.” When no number is used with a noun, the noun is understood as general and unspecified. Therefore, in one-to-one interpretation above, I marked it as singular, but according to the context, it later was translated as “general and unspecified” in the gloss.
Adjectival verb: 飛機 票 貴 不 貴?
Fei1-ji1 piao4 guei4 bu2 guei4
flight ticket expensive not expensive

“Are airplane tickets expensive?”

However, the focus of this thesis is not on the Chinese lexicon but rather the English lexicon borrowed into Chinese. As shown in chapter 3, both verbs and adjectives in English could be borrowed, integrated phonologically, and integrated in this question type. This thesis keeps the terminology of the A-not-A question as it is but is open to any other interpretations such as VP-not-VP question. Again, “A-not-A question” is still the term used in this thesis because the lexicon that is borrowed and Chinese-ified is not limited to verbs and only verbs. See chapter 3 for issues regarding which English words are more likely to be borrowed and integrated into Chinese A-not-A questions.

According to Tang (1981), the sentence structure of (11c) is derived from (11b). Moreover, (11c) can also be abbreviated by deleting the second character le4 of the two-character word kuai4-le4 to become the sentence shown in (14).

(14) 你 快 不 快樂 ？
Ni3 kuai4 bu2 kuai4-le4 ？
you happy not happy

“As you happy?”

As mentioned in chapter 1, the A-not-A question has been extensively investigated in several sub-fields as well as its categorization and relationship with other types of questions, its pragmatics, its formations and derivations. In the next subsection, different proposals by
scholars such as Wang (1967), Li and Thompson (1981), Tang (1981), Huang (1988), and Hsiao (2004), are presented and discussed with regard to the formation of A-not-A questions.

2.2.1 Wang (1967) & Li and Thompson (1981)

Li and Thompson (1981) claimed that an A-not-A question is constructed through the coordination of the affirmative form of a predicate and its negative counterpart. Furthermore, this form is historically derived from a disjunctive question, which contains the disjunctive conjunction hai2shi4, “or,” that is eventually omitted. The discussion of Li and Thompson can be best summarized by a paradigm stated by Wang (1967) as seen in (15).

(15) a.他 喜歡 這 本 書 還是 他 不 喜歡 這 本 書?
   Ta1 xi3-huan1 zhe4 ben3 shu1 hai2-shi4 ta1 bu4 xi3-huan1 zhe4 ben3 shu1?
   he34 like this CL book or he not like this CL book
   “Does he like this book, or does he not like this book?”

b.他 喜歡 這 本 書 他 不 喜歡 這 本 書?
   Ta1 xi3-huan1 zhe4 ben3 shu1(hai2-shi4)ta1 bu4 xi3-huan1 zhe4 ben3 shu1?
   he like this CL book he not like this CL book
   “Does he like this book, or does he not like this book?”

c.他 喜歡 這 本 書 不 喜歡 這 本 書?
   Ta1 xi3-huan1 zhe4 ben3 shu1 (ta1) bu4 xi3-huan1 zhe4 ben3 shu1?
   he like this CL book not like this CL book
   “Does he like this book or not like this book?”

34 “he” here is a conventional interpretation of the Chinese Ta’s/he, which can stand for either male (他) or female (她) and the neuter “it (它)”. 
d. 他喜歡不喜歡這本書？

Ta1 xi3-huan1 (zhe4 ben3 shu1) bu4 xi3-huan1 zhe4 ben3 shu1?

he like not like this CL book

“Does he like or not like this book?”

e. 他喜歡這本書不喜歡？

Ta1 xi3-huan1 zhe4 ben3 shu1 (ta1) bu4 xi3-huan1 (zhe4 ben3 shu1)?

he like this CL book not like

“Does he like this book, or doesn’t he?”

f. 他喜不喜歡這本書？

Ta1 xi3-bu4-xi3-huan1 zhe4 ben3 shu1?

he like - not - like this CL book

“Does he like this book or not?”

This paradigm shows the processes of constructing an A-not-A question quite clearly. (15a) is a full structure that is the disjunction of an affirmative and its negative counterpart. Sentence (15b) shows the deletion of the coordinating conjunction hai2-shi4, “or.” Sentences (15e-f) display a series of outcomes after applying the transformational rule of coordinate deletion to (15b). However, I suppose Wang assumed that readers already had some knowledge of this Chinese question form because he left out some important explanations on how the transition occurred from (15d) to (15f), in which the second syllable of the disyllabic verb in its first appearances is deleted.

35 Some claim that this type of construction is commonly used in Taiwanese but Mandarin speakers may find this construction odd.

From the perspective of socio-linguistics, Tang (1981) thought that the coordinate deletion (CD) applies not only to the phrasal level as seen in (15b-e) but also to the disyllabic word as seen in (15f). Examples (16a) and (16b), again, illustrate his point.

(16) a. 你 喜歡 (還是) 不 喜歡 這件 衣服?
   Ni3 xi3-huan1 (hai2-shi4) bu4 xi3-huan1 zhe4 jian4 yi1-fu2?
   “Do you like this cloth or not?”
   \[\rightarrow\] CD on phrasal level

b. 你 喜歡 不 喜歡 這件 衣服?
   Ni3 xi3-(huan1) bu4 xi3-huan1 zhe4 jian4 yi1-fu2?
   “Do you like this clothes or not?”
   \[\rightarrow\] CD on the disyllabic word in the first disjunct

He further stated that the motivation is due to the speaker’s language-use and preference for simplification. Tang also explained, from the language acquisition point of view, that the tendency for generalization in the development of L1 acquisition may be another cause of the deletion. However, Tang’s analysis described above seems problematic to scholars like Huang (1988) and Hsiao (2004). Huang (1988) (cited by Hsiao, 2004) claimed that Tang’s explanation violates the “principle of lexical integrity,” which accounts for why, while the object of a verb-phrase can be topicalized as shown in (17), the object of a verb-object cannot as shown below in (18).
(17) a. 瑪莉沒拿那本書

ma3-li4 mei2 na2 na4- ben3- shi1
Mary not take that CL book

“Mary did not take that book”

b. 那本書，瑪莉沒拿

na4- ben3- shi1, ma3-li4 mei2 na2
that CL book Mary not take

“That book, Mary did not take”

(18) a. 我沒小心.

wo3 mei2 xiao3-xin1.
I not pay-attention

“I did not pay attention.”

*b. 心，我沒小

xin1, wo3 mei2 xiao3
heart (attention) I not small (pay-)

Since the principle of lexical integrity states that coordinate deletion cannot delete the sub-part of a lexical word, it seems that deleting part of a word can violate the principle of lexical integrity. Hence, deleting the xin1- part in xiao3-xin1, “careful” (19a-b), and the kou3-part in kou3-ke3, “thirsty” (19c-d), clearly violates such a principle; both (19b) and (19d), however, are grammatical sentences in Chinese. As Hsiao (2004) asked, “Given that coordinate deletion must not over-apply inside a morphological word, how could these forms be derived through deletion?” (pp. 4).
(19) a. 你小心 不小心？

Ni3 xiao3-xin bu4 xiao3-xin1?

you careful not careful

“Are you being careful?”

b. 你小不 小心？

Ni3 xiao3 bu4 xiao3-xin1?

you (small) not careful

“Are you being careful?”

c. 你口渴 不口渴？

Ni3 kou3-ke3 bu4 kou3-ke3?

you thirsty not thirsty

“Are you thirsty?”

d. 你口不口渴？

Ni3 kou3 bu4 kou3-ke3?

you (mouth) not thirsty

“Are you thirsty?”

Moreover, there are two rules when using prepositional phrases in a Chinese sentence. First, the prepositional phrase (PP) occurs immediately before the verb phrase (VP).²⁶ Next, nothing can occur between the preposition and its noun phrase object (NP) as seen in (20a, b) respectively.

³⁶ In English, the prepositional phrase occurs immediately after the verb phrase as seen in the following sentences: They bought ice cream for younger brother; she went out with her family. (Ross & Ma, 2006) (Examples are mine)
Again, as pointed out by Ross and Ma (2006:88): “prepositions are always followed by an object noun phrase and a verb phrase.” The sentences shown below then should be ungrammatical (21a, b).

However, sentence (21b) is grammatical. How can we justify the licensing conditions in sentence (21b)? We know the answer would not be the coordinate deletion proposed by Li
and Thompson (1981) and Tang (1981) because prepositions in Chinese are always followed by a noun. Thus, Hsiao (2004) assumes that the construction of \textit{xi3-bu4-xi3huan1} is not due to deletion but to partial reduplication: “the second syllable in the syllable in the syllabic template is pre-linked with the negator \textit{bu} ‘not’, and then the wholesale copy of the stem is associated with the remainder of the two-syllable skeleton, one-to-one and from left to right…” (pp. 6). Therefore, the A-not-A question is also an example of reduplication caused from the pre-linking of the negator as demonstrated below in (22).\footnote{The diagram was taken from Hsiao (2004) (Re-creation mine).}

\begin{equation}
\text{xi3-huan1}
\end{equation}

\begin{equation*}
\begin{array}{c}
\text{bu4 xi3-huan1} \\
\downarrow \\
6 \delta + 6 \delta \rightarrow 6 \delta + 6 \delta \\
\text{== xi3 bu4 xi3-huan1}
\end{array}
\end{equation*}

She further states that what gets reduplicated is not the morpheme but the syllable. Specified by Chao (1968) and Ross and Ma (2006), one of the features in Chinese is that each syllable is associated with a meaning, unlike English, in which most of the syllables do not need to contain individual meaning. Furthermore, Dai (1990) believes that a majority of lexical items in modern Chinese are disyllabic, and the native speakers have a natural tendency to produce disyllabic words by reducing tri-syllabic words or phrases and even expanding monosyllabic words. For instance, although the noun suffix \textit{zi3} (子) does not carry any meaning, a one-syllable word may be turned into a two-syllable word with the addition of this suffix as seen in \textit{che1-zi} (车子) and \textit{pan2-zi} (盘子) where \textit{che1} and \textit{pan2} carry the core meaning of the
words. Some of the examples of abbreviating tri- or quadri-syllabic words into disyllabic words are as follows (23):

(23) Gong1-gong4 qi4-che1 (公共汽車) ‘public bus’ → gong1-che1
    Gao1-ji2 zhong1-xue2 (高級中學) ‘high school’ → Gao1-Zhong
    Fei1-ji1 chang3 (飛機場) ‘airport’ → Ji1-Chang3

In traditional American structuralist linguistics (Bloomfield, 1926), *morpheme* is defined as the “minimal meaningful element.” In Chinese, a word may contain several morphemes, but the meaning of every single morpheme may not distribute the meaning of the word, as demonstrated in (24). Therefore, the disyllabic word, in fact, is the “smallest meaning unit” to itself.

(24) a. 你 馬 不 馬虎 ？
    Ni3 ma3 bu4 ma3-hu1?
    You careless not careless
    “Are you careless or not?”

    b. 你 快 不 幸福 ？
    Ni3 kuai4 bu2 kuai4-le4?
    you happy not happy
    “Are you happy or not?”

If sentences (24a) or (24b) are constructed through partial morpheme reduplication, it would be hard to explain why morphemes *ma3*, “horse,” and *kuai4*, “fast,” do not contribute to the meaning of the words *ma3-hu1*, “careless,” and *kuai4-le4*, “happy.” Therefore, instead of
saying *ma3* and *hu1* are two separate morphemes, *ma3-hu1*, containing two syllables, is indeed the smallest meaningful unit of its own. We can use the other type of question formation, question-particle question, to test whether the reduplicated morphemes in (24a) and (24b) can stand alone, as demonstrated in (25) and (26).

(25)  

a. 你 馬虎 嗎 ？

*Ni3 ma3-hu1 ma?*

You careless PAR

“Are you careless?”

* b. 你 馬 嗎 ？

*Ni3 ma3 ma?*

You careless PAR

“Are you careless?”

(26)  

a. 你 快樂 嗎 ？

*Ni3 kuai4-le4 ma1?*

You happy PAR

“Are you happy?”

b. 你 快 嗎 ？

*Ni3 kuai4 ma1?*

“Are you happy?”

“Are you fast?”

---

38 The sentence *Ni3 kuai4 ma1 ‘Are you fast?’* is a grammatical sentence with indication of such question: “do you run fast?” However, in this case, the usage of kuai4 as intent to replace the whole word kuai4-le4 ‘happy’ is inappropriate.
However, if one considers the construction of an A-not-A question as a type of partial reduplication process, problems such as lexical integrity and the fact that prepositional phrases must be followed by a noun phrase can be solved. Therefore, it is safe to say that syllables, and not morphemes, are copied. Although a speaker has the right to choose whether he wants to abbreviate the form from *kuai4le4 bu2 kuai4le4* to *kuai4 bu2 kuai4le4*, a native Chinese speaker would prefer the latter to the former. We can conclude that in forming the A-not-A question, a speaker does not actually duplicate a single bound morpheme with its own meaning but simply copies a syllable.

2.3 LR on Mandarin Chinese adverbs and time phrases

According to Chao (1968), Hong (2000), and Ross and Ma (2006), adverbs in Chinese modify verbs or verb phrases, just as they do in English. However, unlike English adverbs, which are relatively free in distributions, Chinese adverbs occur only in the beginning of verb and prepositional phrases. There are some exceptions where the Chinese adverbs are placed at the beginning of the sentence; however, they are usually the result of a speaker’s desire for emphasis. Moreover, in Chinese, all phrases that indicate when something takes place are likely to occur at the beginning of the predicate; in other words, they occur right after the subject. However, it appears that when a time phrase is the emphasis of the sentence, it can occur sentence-initially. In the following sections, we look at adverbs and time phrases in Chinese and English with an emphasis on their distributions in the sentence.

2.3.1 Adverbs in English and Mandarin Chinese

In English, words recognized as adverbs can be seen either as the –ly words\(^\text{39}\), which tell the manner about verbs, or single-word adverbs, which specify time, location, and frequency...

---

\(^{39}\) However, many words and phrases not ending in –ly serve an adverbal function. For instance, the word *very*, even though it does not end with –ly, is indeed an adverb, as in “he drove a *very* nice car.” Moreover, words...
(Kolln & Funk, 2002). The –ly adverbs are usually derived from adjectives and are relatively free in their distributions. Examples in (27) show the distribution of the –ly adverb, *suddenly*, which can appear before the verb (a), at the beginning of the sentence (b), at the end of the sentence (c), as well as within a series of verb (d).

(27)  

a. The wind *suddenly* shifted.  
b. *Suddenly* the wind shifted.  
c. The wind shifted *suddenly*.  
d. The roof was *suddenly* blown off by a strong gust of wind.

Adverbs can be modified by quantifiers (28a, b), such as *very, quite, rather*, and also *more* and *most* to indicate comparative and superlative forms (28c).

(28)  

a. The old woman crooned *very softly*.  
b. The airline employees handled our luggage *rather carelessly*.

However, the order for some adverbs in English is restricted as seen in (29), where reversibility of the adverbial place and time is not allowed.

---

40 There are several kinds of adverbs and the distribution of each adverb is influenced by its kind.  
(a) Adverbs of Manner: “She moved *quickly*.”  
(b) Adverbs of Place: “She still lives *in Athens* now.”  
(c) Adverbs of Frequency: “She plays basketball *everyday*.”  
(d) Adverbs of Time: “She left *early*.”  
(e) Adverbs of Purpose: “She drives the car *slowly* to avoid hitting the branches.”  
Adverbs of manner are considered the most flexible of all. *Solemnly* the minister addressed her congregation; the minister *solemnly* addressed her congregation; the minister addressed her congregation *solemnly*. Adverbs of frequency can also appear before the main verb and between the auxiliary verb and the main verb: I *never* get up before ten o’clock; I have *rarely* gotten up before ten o’clock. Moreover, indefinite adverbs of time can appear in the same positions: He *finally* showed up; he has *recently* retired (CCC Foundation, 2007).  
41 Examples were taken from Kolln & Funk (2002: 112)  
42 Examples were taken from Kolln & Funk (2002: 113)  
43 Examples were taken from Kolln & Funk (2002: 113)
(29) a. I am going *there now*
   *b. I am going now there.*
   c. *Now I am going there.*
   d. *There I am going now.*

In Chinese, adverbs can only occur pre-verbally. Compare the following Chinese sentences with the ones mentioned above in (27a, b, and c). In English, the adverb *suddenly* can occur sentence-initially, before the verb, and at the end of the sentence. However, as shown in (30), the only sentence that is ungrammatical in Chinese is the one in which the adverb occurs in the post-verbal position (30c).

(30) a. 風突然轉向 
   *Fong1 tu2-ran2 zhuan3-xiang4*
   wind suddenly shift
   “The wind suddenly shifted.”

?b. 突然風轉向 
   *Tu2-ran2 fong1 zhuan3-xiang4*
   suddenly wind shift
   “Suddenly the wind shifted.”

*c. 風轉向突然 
   *Fong1 zhuan3-xiang4 tu2-ran2*

---

44 “*” indicates that the sentence is ungrammatical.
45 Some native Chinese speakers may prefer: *fong1tu2-ran2-jian1 zhuan3-xiang4*(風突然間轉向)
46 It may seem that sentence (b) is acceptable; however, sentences (a) and (b) differ semantically. “Suddenly” in (a) shows respond to the wind, i.e. the wind suddenly shifted; however, in (b), it shows respond to the spatial relation, i.e. in the course of a certain time, suddenly…the wind shifted.
The wind shifted suddenly.

Sentences in (31) again show that adverbs in Chinese can only occur pre-verbally; that is, before the verb and after the subject.

(31) a. 屋頂 突然 被 一 陣 強風 吹走

Wu1-ding3 tu2-ran2 bei4 yi2 zhen4 qiang2-fong1 chuei1-zou3.

The roof was suddenly blown off by a strong gust of wind.

b. 屋頂 被 一 陣 強風 突然 吹走

Wu1-ding3 bei4 yi2 zhen4 qiang2-fong1 tu2-ran2 chuei1-zou3.

The roof was suddenly blown off by a strong gust of wind.

*c 屋頂 被 突然 一 陣 強風 吹走

Wu1-ding3 bei4 tu2-ran2 yi2 zhen4 qiang2-fong1 chuei1-zou3.

The roof was suddenly blown off by a strong gust of wind.

---

47 In a Chinese passive sentence, the affected object occurs as the subject of the verb, and the agent occurs as the object of the proposition that marks passive. For example,

狗 咬 我 → 我 被 狗 咬

Gou3 yao3 wo3 → wo3 bei4 gou3 yao3

dog bite me I PASS dog bite

‘A dog bit me.’

PASS stands for passive voice
2.3.2 Time phrases in English and Mandarin Chinese

Like adverbs, time phrases in English can occupy several positions as seen in (32).\(^{49}\)

\begin{enumerate}
\item We hiked in the woods \textit{for several hours on Saturday}.
\item \textit{For several hours on Saturday} we hiked in the woods.
\item \textit{On Saturday} we hiked in the woods \textit{for several hours}.
\end{enumerate}

However, time phrases in Chinese are much more restricted. Time phrases including expressions that indicate present time (33a), habitual action (b), future time (c), and past events (d), always occur pre-verbally, right after the subject.

\begin{enumerate}
\item 我今天下午有课.
\end{enumerate}

\begin{center}
Wo3 \textit{jin1-tian1 xia4-wu3 you3 ke4}
\end{center}

\begin{center}
I today afternoon have class
\end{center}

“I have a class this afternoon.”

\begin{enumerate}
\item 我每天六点半去慢跑.
\end{enumerate}

\begin{center}
Wo3 \textit{mei3-tian1 liou4-dian3-ban4 qü4 man- pao3}
\end{center}

\begin{center}
I everyday six o’clock half go jogging
\end{center}

“I go jogging every day at 6:30.”

\begin{enumerate}
\item 我大后天有考试
\end{enumerate}

\begin{center}
Wo3 \textit{da4-hou4-tian1 you3 kao3-shi4}.
\end{center}

\(^{49}\) Examples were taken from Kolln & Funk (2002:115)
I three days from now have test

“I have a test three days from now.”

d. 我 昨天 晚上 三點 才 睡

Wo3 zuo2-tian wan3-shang4 san-dian3 cai2 shuei4

I yesterday night three o’clock only sleep

“I did not sleep until it was three last night.”

Time phrases that indicate duration, however, take place in the post-verbal position,\(^{50}\) and sometimes, both duration time phrase and time-when phrase can appear in the same sentence as in (34).

(34) a. 我 睡了 五個 小時

Wo3 shuei4-le wo3 ge xiao3-shi2

“I slept for 5 hours.”

b. 我 今天 下午 睡了 五個 小時

Wo3 jin1-tian1 xia4-wu3 shuei4-le wo3 ge xiao3-shi2

“I slept five hours this afternoon.”

\(^{50}\) However, when indicating the duration of something that has not occurred, the time phrase then appears pre-verbally. (Ross & Ma, 2006:246)

Wo3 liang3-tian1 mei2 shuei4-jiao4

“I haven’t slept for two days.”

\(^{51}\) Suffix “le” indicates that action is past or completed.
The distribution of an adverb and a time phrase is relatively flexible in English in comparison with Chinese. However, with increasing intensity of contact between the two, contact-induced changes are expected. Chapter 4 explores such changes.
CHAPTER 3

CONTACT INDUCED BORROWING:

CHINESE-IFIED LEXICON IN A-NOT-A QUESTIONS

As discussed in the literature review on the A-not-A question, in a sentence like (35a), a syllable, rather than a morpheme, is copied to satisfy phonological priority among most native speakers. This priority explains why a native speaker would prefer sentence (35a) over (35b).

(35) a. 你 快 不 快樂?
   
   Ni3 kuai4 bu2 kuai4-le4?
   
   You happy not happy
   
   “Are you happy?”

   b. 你 快樂 不 快樂
   
   Ni3 kuai4-le4 bu2 kuai4-le4?
   
   You happy not happy
   
   “Are you happy?”

Because syllables but not morphemes are copied, I assume that meaning does not play a crucial rule in the reduplication process, for the core meaning of the sentence is carried out by the second predicate52 located after bu2,53 “not.” In other words, because the meaning is

---

52 In 2.2, I mentioned that some scholars such as Li & Thompson (1981) and Tang (1981) refer to this type of question as VP-not-VP question. For that matter, I use the term “first predicate” to refer to the first appearance of the verb (or adjective) and “second predicate” to the second appearance of the verb (or adjective).

53 Please refer to footnote 28 for tone information regarding the bu ‘not’.
communicated by the second predicate within the context, the meaning of the sentence is already clear to the listener, and the repetition can be omitted. For example, although English is not a pro-drop language, the referent is frequently dropped in a conversation as long as the context has already been established and is understood by both the speaker and the listener as demonstrated in (36).

(36) (I’m/we’re) out to lunch.
    (I’ll/we’ll) be back at 5pm.
    (I’m/we’re) going to the store… (Do you) want to come?
    (You) ever been there? No, (I’ve) never been…

Therefore, one can account for how the sentences in (37) are recognizable as long as the listeners have knowledge of such a lexicon and understand the characteristics of an A-not-A question.

(37) a. Ni3 [ʰæ] bu4 happy?
    You happy not happy
    “Are you happy or not?”

b. Ni3 [ʌn] bu4 understand?
    you un- bu4 understand
    “Do you understand or not?”

c. Ni3 [ə] bu4 agree?
    You [schwa] not agree
    “Do you agree or not?”
The following question still remains: How can an English word such as *happy* be Chinese-ified in (37a)? Before we answer this question, we should review the basic syllable structure.

3.1 Linguistic background

3.1.1 Mandarin Chinese syllable structure

What is a syllable? Spencer (2005) stated that, although there is no conventional phonetic characteristic regarding the concept of a syllable, the structure of a syllable is often considered an important element for the phonological organization of the language: “moreover, syllabic organization seems to play an important role in speech perception and production” (Spencer, 2005: 38). The basic structure of a syllable is presented in (38), which contains an onset and a nucleus, the only obligatory part of the rhyme and coda.

![Diagram of syllable structure](image)

English, which is a “closed syllable” language, has very flexible syllabic structures that allow up to three consonants to occur in the onset position and up to four consonants in the coda position. They can be represented as (C)(C)(C)V(C)(C)(C). The individual syllables, in

---

54 As seen in “spring” [spən]
55 As seen in “glimpsed” [ɡlɪmpst]
English, do not carry meaning on their own. For instance, it makes no sense to ask about the meaning of [lɔ] or [bɔl] in the word syllable. However, in Chinese, each character corresponds to one syllable,\textsuperscript{56} which in English can be part of a word (“let”+”tuce”) or an entire word (“hot”). For example, the multi-syllable Mandarin word gu4shi4 (故事), “story,” is composed of the syllable gu4, “previous,” and shi4, “event.” Chinese syllables consist of three elements: initial sound, final sound, and tone. The initial sounds are consonants, and the final sounds are simple finals (single vowels), compound finals (diphthongs or triphthongs), or nasal finals (nasals in coda). Compared to English, Mandarin Chinese has a relatively simple syllabic structure. The basic sequence of consonants and vowels in a Chinese syllable can be represented as (C1)V(C2), where V denotes an obligatory vowel, which can be a monophthong as in ma1, “mother,” a diphthong as in bai2, “white,” or a triphthong as in kuai4, “fast,” and the initial consonant C1 and the final consonant C2 are optional (Hsu, 2002). Furthermore, in the case of (C1)VC2, the consonantal endings of closed syllables are limited to the nasal sound\textsuperscript{57} and the retroflex.\textsuperscript{58} A similar analysis can be represented by Japanese syllabic structure\textsuperscript{59}, a well-known open-syllable language. Example (39) presents two syllable structures: one for the Chinese word kuai4le4, “happy” (39a), and another one for the English word happy (39b).

\textsuperscript{56} In Chinese, there are a small number of syllables that does not associated with a semantic interpretation. The most common example is the suffix “zi (子),” which is usually added to nouns such as wa4zi (襪子) ‘socks,’ fang2zi (房), ‘houses’ and zhuo1zi (桌子) ‘tables.’

\textsuperscript{57} As seen in lìng2huen2 (靈魂) ‘soul, sprite (abstract figure).’

\textsuperscript{58} In the Beijing dialect of Mandarin, suffix er2 (兒) is always added to nouns and classifiers; however, the same situation does not often occur in Mandarin spoken in Taiwan.

\textsuperscript{59} Similar to Chinese syllable structure, the Japanese syllable structure can be represented as (C1)V(C2), and in the case of (C1)VC2, the consonant endings of closed syllables are limited to the nasal sound /n/ as seen in nihongo (日本語) ‘Japanese (language).’
Example (39a) is a representative of a syllabification for the two-syllable word in Chinese. As mentioned in the literature review of the A-not-A question (see 2.2), a native speaker of Chinese prefers to reduplicate the first syllable of a disyllabic word in the construction of A-not-A question. On the other hand, happy, as seen in (39b), contains two syllables; instead of syllabifying the word to [hæ] and [pi], in order to avoid ending in the lax vowel such as [æ], which is generally not allowed in English, [p] appears not only in the coda of the first syllable but also in the onset of the next. Such syllabication is known as ambisyllabicity, “the property of belonging simultaneously to two syllables” (Spencer, 2005: 98). However, in Chinese, ending in a lax vowel is permitted. In fact, ending with a vowel is the preferred option in Chinese. Therefore, a Chinese speaker will have no problem syllabifying happy into [hæ] and [pi], a similar pattern to (39a). By the same token, a Chinese speaker can treat an English word such as happy as a two-syllable Chinese word made up of [hæ] and [pi], integrating the word into an A-not-A question formation as seen in (37a) above. The first syllables in understand and agree are both qualified to be good Chinese syllables; thus, the A-not-A questions in (37b) and (37c) are acceptable. However, (37a) does present a phonemic problem for some Chinese speakers; the English phoneme /æ/ does not appear in Chinese. Consequently, some speakers may choose a more recognizable phoneme [o] and pronounce the syllable as [ho]. Therefore, to reflect the true state of contact-induced borrowing, we then need to familiarize ourselves with Chinese phonemes.
3.1.2 Mandarin Chinese phonemic inventory

A three-part description can be provided when dealing with the syllable in Mandarin Chinese: an initial consonant, a final, and a tone. The borrowed word *hong1pa1*, “home party,” mentioned above in 2.1.2, presents an interesting problem. One may wonder, since the Chinese syllable structure does allow nasal coda, if the first syllable should then end with a bilabial nasal, which is permissible in both Chinese and English. However, the phonemes /m/ and /n/ are categorized as one of the initial sounds (onset) in Chinese as shown in (38); they cannot be in the coda position. In fact, /m/ can only occur in an onset, and /n/ can only be accompanied by another vowel and fill the coda position. Therefore, instead of ending the first syllable with an /m/ as in the borrowing language, it ends with a recognizable Chinese final VC combination.

(38) Initials

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Bilial</th>
<th>Labio-dental</th>
<th>Alveolar</th>
<th>Retroflex</th>
<th>Alveo-Palatal</th>
<th>Velar</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Plosive</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>p</td>
<td>d</td>
<td>t</td>
<td>g</td>
<td>k</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nasal</td>
<td>m</td>
<td></td>
<td>n</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lateral</td>
<td></td>
<td>l</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affricate</td>
<td></td>
<td>z</td>
<td>c</td>
<td>zh</td>
<td>ch</td>
<td>j</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fricative</td>
<td></td>
<td>f</td>
<td>s</td>
<td>sh</td>
<td>r</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Approximant</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>r</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Although the initial sounds, those that occupy the onsets, may influence the borrowed lexicon phonetically, the final sounds, those occupying the nucleus and the coda (nasals only), are the

---

60 See appendix B for correspondent IPA symbols
important components of this study. Listed below in (39) is the inventory of possible final sounds in Mandarin Chinese distinguished by vowel quality.

(39) Finals

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Single final (V)</th>
<th>Compound final (V)</th>
<th>Nasal final (VC)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a-final</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>ai, ao</td>
<td>an, ang</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e-final</td>
<td>e, ê</td>
<td>ei, er</td>
<td>en, eng</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o-final</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>ou</td>
<td>ong</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>u-final</td>
<td>u</td>
<td>ua, uo, uai, ui</td>
<td>uan, un, uang, ueng</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ü-final</td>
<td>ü</td>
<td>üe</td>
<td>ün, üan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i-final</td>
<td>i</td>
<td>ia, iao, ie, iu</td>
<td>ian, in, iang, ing, iong</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.2 Analysis

The goal of this thesis is to explain how a borrowed word gets Chinese-ified and then integrated into the preferred structure, reduplicating only the first syllable rather than the whole word, of a Chinese A-not-A question. Because Chinese speakers prefer to use the syllable rather than the whole word when constructing an A-not-A question, when they code-switch within the same structure, rather than borrow the entire word directly, they break it down and make the word “Chinese-ified” as long as the “break-down” is within the domain of Chinese syllabic structure. The process of Chinese-ifying the English lexicon involves several layers. My intention here is to try to propose a step-by-step explanation on how the English lexicon integrates into the Chinese A-not-A formation as elaborated in (40-42). First, we look at an entire English word, disregarding the number of syllables it has that are borrowed. Next, the word is integrated into the structure of A-not-A question. Then, the word

---

61 See appendix B for correspondent IPA symbols
is syllabified within the domain of Chinese syllabic structure, not the domain of English syllabic structure. Finally, the reasonable duplicated syllable is chosen to fill the first predicate in the A-not-A question.

(40) Example: 你 怕 不 怕?

   ni3  pa4  bu2  pa4?

   a) afraid [afred]
   b) Ni3 afraid bu4 afraid?
   c) [ə] and [friː] → V
   d) Ni3 [ə] bu4 afraid?

   You afraid not afraid

   “Are you afraid or not?”

(41) Example: 他 白 不 白?

   ta1  bai2  bu4 bai2

   a) white [wait]
   b) ta3 white bu4 white?
   c) [wait] and [ta] → CV
   d) Ta3 [waɪ] bu4 white?

   He white not white(skin)

   “Does he look white?”

(42) Example: 他的 家 溫馨 不 溫馨?

   ta1-de  jia1 wuen1 bu4 wuen1-xin1

   a) homey [həmi]

   b) ta1-de jia1 homey bu4 homey?
c) [hɔn] and [mi] $\rightarrow$ CV-[+nasal]

d) $ta1-de$ $jia1$ [hɔn] $bu4$ homey?

he DE$^{62}$ house homey not homey

“Is his house homey?”

In addition, some borrowed lexicon may require some phonological processes before it can be integrated into an A-not-A question. First, words require the process of insertion (43).$^{63}$

(43) Example: 你 聰 不 聰明?

$ni3$ cong1 $bu2$ cong1ming2?

a) smart [smɔɭt]

b) $Ni3$ smart $bu4$ smart?

c) [si] and [mɔɭt] $\rightarrow$ [si]: CV - /l/ insertion to become an open syllable

d) $Ni3$ [si] $bu4$ smart?

you smart not smart

“Are you smart?”

Second, one-syllable words ending with consonants usually undergo a process of deletion (44).$^{64}$ However, on some occasions, the deletion of a final consonant in a multi-syllable word may be due to incomplete learning or careless pronunciation. I, in chapter 5, will discuss this issue further.

---

$^{62}$ DE is used to indicate genitive. Hence, ta3 ‘s/he’ becomes ta3 de ‘his/her’

$^{63}$ “Insertion” is a type of phonological processes when a segment does not present in the phonemic form is added in the phonetic form. English example: /sʌməʊŋ/ $\rightarrow$ [sʌmpəʊŋ] ‘something.’ (Tserdanelis & Wong, 2004)

$^{64}$ “Deletion” is a type of phonological processes when a segment is removed from its phonetic form. English example: /ɔfən/ $\rightarrow$ [əfən] ‘often.’ (Tserdanelis & Wong, 2004)
Example: 你 熱 不 熱?

Ni3 re4 bu2 re4

e) hot [hot]

f) Ni3 hot bu4 hot?

g) [ha] → [ha]: CV-/t/ deletion to become an open syllable

h) Ni3 [ha] bu4 hot?

you hot not hot

“Are you hot?”

Third, sometimes if the phonemes presented in a word are not accessible to the users, especially those second language users, they often replace those phonemes with the ones that they are familiar with, usually from their first language. For instance, the example mentioned in 3.1 showed the second phoneme [hæ] becomes [ha] because Chinese does not have the phoneme [æ]. On some occasions, speakers may recognize a phoneme as identical to their native language’s; however, due to some constraints, they may still need to replace it with another phoneme to solve the problem. The example explained earlier in subsections 2.1.2 (p.18) and 3.1.2 (p.48) regarding the term hong1pa1, “home party,” showed that instead of ending with the bilabial nasal /m/, Chinese speakers prefer to end with the combination of the vowel and alveolar nasal /n/. In other words, although the phoneme /m/ is included in the Chinese inventory, it is categorized as an initial sound that can only occur in the onset. Therefore, speakers would rather replace it with another familiar sound, /n/ in this case, that can occupy the coda. Below is a chart65 of English words that have been Chinese-ified by Chinese speakers in actual speech events regarding the A-not-A question formation.

---

65 Data were collected during a trip to Taiwan and among friends living in Georgia.
### (45) Examples

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>English Word</th>
<th>A-not-A question</th>
<th>English Word</th>
<th>A-not-A question</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sad (adj.)</td>
<td>[sæ] bu2 sad?</td>
<td>Diverse (adj.)</td>
<td>[ðaɪ] bu4 diverse?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tired (adj.)</td>
<td>[taɪ] bu2 tired?</td>
<td>Agree (v.)</td>
<td>[ə] bu4 agree?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bitter (adj.)</td>
<td>[bi] bu4 bitter?</td>
<td>Accept (v.)</td>
<td>[ə] bu4 accept?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sour (adj.)</td>
<td>[sau] bu2 sour?</td>
<td>Understand (able) (v.; adj.)</td>
<td>[ʌn] bu4 understand?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cold (adj.)</td>
<td>[kəʊ] bu2 cold?</td>
<td>Unreasonable (adj.)</td>
<td>[ʌn] bu4 unreasonable?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eat (v.)</td>
<td>[yi] bu2 eat?</td>
<td>Spicy (adj.)</td>
<td>[si] bu4 spicy?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Come (v.)</td>
<td>[kəʊm] bu2 come</td>
<td>Special (adj.)</td>
<td>[si] bu4 special?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Share (v.)</td>
<td>[ʃeə] bu4 share?</td>
<td>Smart (adj.)</td>
<td>[si] bu4 smart?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Humorous (adj.)</td>
<td>[hju] bu4 humorous?</td>
<td>Study (v.)</td>
<td>[si] bu4 study?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Like (v.)</td>
<td>[laɪ] bu4 like?</td>
<td>Supply (v.)</td>
<td>[saɪ] bu4 supply?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sell (v.)</td>
<td>[sɛl] bu2 sell?</td>
<td>Bias (adj.)</td>
<td>[bæɪ] bu4 bias?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

According to Haugen and (1950b) and Muysken (1981b), there is a hierarchy order specifying that certain items, depending on their part of speech, tend to be borrowed first. Open-class items, such as nouns, adjectives, and verbs, have higher accessibility than the closed-class items, such as conjunctions and pronouns; therefore, they are greater in the scale of borrowability (46).\(^6\)

---

\(^6\) “The hierarchy of borrowability” is summarized from Muysken (1981b)
(46) Hierarchy of borrowability

nouns > adjectives > verbs > prepositions >
coordinating conjunctions > quantifiers > determiners >
pronouns > subordinating conjunctions

In Chinese, only verbs and adjectives (or what some may call an adjectival verb) can be used in forming an A-not-A question. Data in (45) above show that the most frequently borrowed words are verbs and adjectives as well. Furthermore, since both adjectives and verbs are leading the scale, they are more accessible for the users.

On a semantic level, the transition of the “original” A-not-A question (47a) to an “altered” A-not-A question sentence (47b), is a logical and predictable occurrence.

(47)  

a. 這個 東 西 好 不 好 吃?

Zhe4 ge  dong-xi  hao3  bu4 hao3 chi1?

this  CL  stuff  good  not  good  eat?

“Does it (this stuff) taste good?”

b. 好 不 好 吃? 這個 東 西

hao3  bu4 hao3 chi1?  Zhe4 ge  dong-xi

good  not  good  eat  this  CL  stuff

“Does it (this stuff) taste good?”

Generally speaking, this may be due to Chinese speakers’ preferences for introducing the main focus of the sentence at the beginning of the sentence. (Please see section 6.1 for more discussion on this topic).
CHAPTER 4
CONTACT-INDUCED BORROWING:
STRUCTURAL INTERFERENCE ON "XIAN1" AND TIME PHRASES

In intensive contact situations, structural interference may occur. Comparing the examples of the two different types of speakers introduced in this study, we can conclude that the speakers studied in chapter three have undergone less contact than those in chapter four. Thomason and Kaufman (1988) divided contact situations into five stages: casual contact, slightly more intense contact, more intense contact, strong cultural pressure, and very strong cultural pressure. They further indicated that each stage has its own expected or preferred outcomes. In stage one, casual contact or distant contact (Lehiste, 1988) interference is most likely to occur at the lexical level. In stage two, involving a slightly more intense contact, interference may include slight structural borrowing and also the borrowing of conjunctions and adverbial particles. This chapter aims to describe the function of the Chinese adverb xian1, "first, in advance," and time phrases (time-when phrases) and the changes they undergo when speakers are in contact with a language that assigns a different distribution to them.

4.1 Linguistic background

4.1.1 Adverb xian1, "first, in advance"

The Mandarin adverb xian1, "first, in advance," usually pairs up with other adverbs, such as zai4 (再), "then, again," and ran2-hou4 (然後), "then, afterwards," to indicate the relationship "first… then …" as seen in (48) and (49).
先 VP 再 VP

\(xian1 \quad Zai4\)

Example: 先 買 票, 再 買 飲料

\(Xian1 \quad mai3 \quad piao4, \quad zai4 \quad mai3 \quad yin3-liao4\)

first buy ticket then buy drink

“You first buy the ticket, and then buy the drink.”

先 VP 然後 VP

\(xian1 \quad ran2-hou4\)

Example: 先拿飲料, 然後付錢

\(Xian1 \quad na2 \quad yin3-liao4, \quad ran2-hou4 \quad fu4 \quad qian2\)

first take drink afterwards pay money

“First get the drink, and afterwards pay for it.”

\(Xian1\) is also used with adverb cai2, “only then,” to indicate that some events only occur after something (50).

先 VP 才 VP

\(xian1 \quad cai2\)

Example: 先 做 完 功課, 才 出去.

\(Xian1 \quad zuo4 \quad wan2 \quad gong1-ke4, \quad cai2 \quad chu1-qu4\)

first do finish homework only then out-go

“You first finish your homework and only then go out.”

\(^{67}\) Chinese is a topic-drop language; therefore, since the subject ni3 ‘you’ has already been indicated in the context, repetition is not necessary.
Xian¹ may also be used with a straightforward meaning as seen in chapter 2, indicating the notation of “first, in advance.” Such a sentence is repeated here for comparison purposes (51).

(51) 我 先 走
    Wo³ xian¹ tzou³!
    I first go
    “I am going to go first.”

In English, the “first” cannot only appear in the post-verbal position but also at the beginning of the sentence and even in the middle (52), whereas the adverb xian¹, “first, in advance,” in Chinese always appears in a pre-verbal position, as in (51).

(52) a. I am going to go **first**.
    b. **First**, I am going to go…
    c. I am **first** going to go…

(52a) and (52b,c) differ in terms of listeners’ perceptions. In sentence (52b) and (52c), listeners would expect some form of direction or destination from the speaker, i.e. “You are first going to go **where**?” and “First, you are going to go **where**?” In Chinese, the adverb xian¹ always occurs pre-verbally. (52b) emphasizes more the order, “first,” whereas (52c) emphasizes the location, “where.”

4.1.2 Time phrases

In Chinese, time phrases occur pre-verbally as well since they are often categorized as adverbial phrases (53); on the other hand, English time phrases occur freely in a sentence as
adverbs—at the end, at the beginning of the sentence, or in the middle only—depending on what is emphasized (54).

(53) 我 今天 晚上 有 個 考試

Wo3 jin1-tian1 wan3-shang4 you3 ge  kau3-shi4.

I today night have CL test

“I have a test tonight.”

(54) a. I have a test **tonight**

b. **Tonight**, I have a test.

c. I, **tonight**, have a test

4.2 Analysis

When a Mandarin speaker becomes familiar with the usage of “first” in English, it may influence the way he or she constructs such sentences in Mandarin from supposedly a pre-verbal position to a post-verbal position as demonstrated in (55).

(55) a. 我 走 先

Wo2 tzou3 shian1.

I go first

“I am going to go first.”

b. 我 去 買 點 東西 先

Wo3 qu4 mai2 dian3 dong1-xi1 shian1.

I go buy little thing first

“I am going to buy some stuff first.”
c. 你可以過去先
Ni3 ke2-yi3 Kuo4-qu4 shian1
You can go-there first
“You can go there first.”

d. 你要我過去先還是你要我
Ni3 yau4 wo3 kuo4-qu4 shian1 hai2-shi4 ni3 yau4 wo3
you want me go-there first or you want me
回家等你先?
huei2 jia1 duan2 ni3 shian1?
return home wait you first
“Do you want me to go there first, or do you want me to go home and wait for you?”

e. 你要不要我去買先?
Ni3 yau4 bu2 yau4 wo3 qu4 mai3 shian1?
You want not want me go buy first
“Do you want me to buy (the stuff) first?”

Some structural interference involving time phrases is illustrated below in (56).

(56)  a. 我不想去那裡明天
Wo3 bu4 xiang3 qu4 na4-li3 ming2-tian1.
I not want go there-LOC tomorrow
“I don’t want to go there tomorrow.”

---

68 Implied by context.
69 LOC stands for locative.
b. 他 有 來 學校 昨天

“He did come to the school yesterday”

c. 他 回來 禮拜天

“He is coming back on Sunday.”

From a prescriptive point of view, sentences listed in (55) and (56) are grammatically incorrect. However, from a descriptive point of view, the sentences are semantically interpretable despite the fact that the word order has changed. In chapter 6, I intend to document and explain such “prescriptively ungrammatical” but “descriptively acceptable” time-phrase sentences, along with A-not-A questions. However, before we get into linguistic analyses on issues such as topic fronting, the equivalence constraint, or the free morpheme constraint, it is worth examining in chapter 5 social motivations for borrowing/code switching in Taiwan, to explain the social background of Taiwan as well as possible external factors that may contribute to the production of such phenomena induced by contact. In brief, the main objective of chapter 5 is to highlight the social factors specific to the Taiwanese case and not necessarily applicable to other contact situations.
CHAPTER 5
SOCIAL MOTIVATIONS FOR
BORROWING/CODE-SWITCHING IN TAIWAN

As mentioned in the introductory chapter, the study of external factors is important in helping us define and characterize linguistic properties especially in the study of contact-induced changes. Examining external factors helps us to answer the following questions: How do we categorize the contact situation in a speech community? How do we document the changes? How do we analyze the changes? Most importantly of all, how do we account for the changes? While typological differences and similarities between the two contact languages may allow us to predict the possible outcomes, other external factors, are worth considering. For instance, a speaker's proficiency and attitude and tolerance towards the contact languages and the social norms of the speaker’s community are important variables worth considering. More precisely, whether a speaker encourages and values or disapproves borrowings from other languages has an impact on the type of the contact situation that arises. Therefore, this chapter aims to provide possible factors that encourage the speakers in Taiwan to code-switch even though the contact between the English native speakers is at its minimum.

This chapter is divided into two sections: Section 5.1 introduces the term “prescriptivism” and intends to describe several socially-motivated factors that lead to constant borrowings and code-switching by Chinese speakers; section 5.2 discusses the concepts of accessibility and acceptability.
5.1 Social motivations and prescriptivism

5.1.1 Social motivations

As mentioned above, contact situations can be grouped into two major categories: face-to-face contact and distant contact. I categorize the contact situations between English and Chinese among Chinese speakers in Taiwan as “casual” (or “passive”) and heavily socially-motivated. Taiwanese people are indirectly exposed to English through TV programs, movies, music, radio stations, sports broadcasting, advertisements, etc. People may not have actual contact with an English speaker, but they passively receive information about English. Unlike the former British colonies in South Asia, where English was deeply rooted in the communities, Taiwan, as mentioned above, does not have this level of interaction with the English. Therefore, it is important to consider the possible external factors in the situation of Taiwan.

A speaker’s motivation is one of the many factors that should be taken into consideration. In syntactic analysis, movements, or feature checking, require certain motivations. The same reasoning applies to contact-induced changes. As stated by Weinreich (1953), two factors that motivate some types of borrowing or change are “prestige” and “need.” Pidginization occurs when speakers of different languages try to communicate with each other for “needs” to conduct business, negotiate a trade, etc. Borrowing also occurs when one language “needs” to include new terms from other languages in order to resolve ambiguity or insufficiency in a given language. Borrowing from Chinese into Japanese in the Middle Ages is a good example of the need of Japanese for modernization (Winford, 2003). In addition, there are times when the needs for borrowed terms are purely simple; this is especially true for “distant” contact, “the need to designate new things, persons, places, and concepts” (Weinreich, 1953:56). For instance, during the summer, the new concept of
"home party" was introduced by the American-born Chinese who went to Taiwan for vacation. Such expressions are the product of borrowing. Not only was the term "home party," needed for introducing a new concept that did not originally exist in Chinese, but it should also be noted that some borrowings are time-sensitive and target-specific and sometimes even generational. For instance, the best chance for such a “partying” term to surface is during summer or winter vacation, and the main audience who might encounter this term would be the young and those who like to party. Therefore, when school starts and party-time is reduced, this term may gradually disappear. However, this term may reappear the following year or every now and then and may even eventually become one of the more stable borrowed terms. It would be interesting to follow up on the development of this term.

Language can also be important in the political arena. For Taiwan, the need to separate itself politically from Mainland China and to silently claim its independence encourages Mandarin Chinese speakers to learn or at least use some Taiwanese terms. In addition, the government of Taiwan, in recent times, has been promoting the Taiwanese dialect, as they view Taiwanese as a political weapon that can be used to defend the identity of Taiwan. Other kinds of borrowings under distant contact seem to be motivated by prestige or fashion. In some countries, a language other than a speaker’s native language is sometimes considered more prestigious; by speaking that language, the speaker boosts his own image, power, social class, etc. As Bloomfield (1933) noted, speakers usually find it more sophisticated to borrow from the higher or more popular language.

Borrowings may also express an ideological choice. Currently, English is still considered one of the major forces among language communities for its frequent use in social

---

When Chinese integrated foreign lexicon into the language, several strategies are used: examples drawn from Ross & Ma (2006:10-11)

1. Luo2-si1-fu (羅斯福) ‘Roosevelt.’ → foreign pronunciation + Chinese syllable structure
2. Shou3-ji1 (手機) ‘cell phone < hand machine’ → meaning + function
3. Xin4-yong4 ka3 (信用卡) ‘credit card < trust card’ → meaning + foreign pronunciation
communication, cross-cultural interaction, academic dominance, and international representation. According to a survey conducted by the King Car Education Foundation in December 2005 of 2059 parents in Taiwan, up to 80% of Taiwanese parents indicated that they hope the government will declare English the second official language of Taiwan. 97% of the parents said that they believe better English fluency will lead to better job opportunities, and 85% of the parents believe that, by enhancing the English proficiency of the Taiwanese people, Taiwan could compete better with other nations. Furthermore, in 2005, the Taiwanese Ministry of Education began to regulate English programs in primary schools for the 3rd grade and above. While English is now taught beginning in the 3rd grade, the survey shows that 40% of elementary students started to learn English at a pre-school age. Data also indicate that over 70% of movies shown in movie theaters are American movies with original speech, and over 50% of the population have HBO or another type of English-language TV programming. Additionally, people who speak English (at varying levels of fluency) are considered as having higher status and have a better chance of getting promoted. English, in a sense, has become a must-have key to the door of a better future. Moreover, English is often considered by younger generations as a norm for living style and a symbol of fashion. Therefore, it is “cooler” as well as “fashionable” to code-switch. Furthermore, people may constantly code-switch in order to promote self-image as well as to elevate self-status among others. Again, those people may not have extensive knowledge of English; in fact, they may only know one or two words of English. Theoretically, code-switching represents a phenomenon of bilingualism; however, in the case of Taiwan, the phenomenon of code-switching can be introduced by people who barely have the ability to construct an English sentence or even recognize the English alphabet.
5.1.2 Prescriptivism

The factors presented above lead me to the concept of “prescriptivism” in linguistics. The term “prescriptivism” is commonly used to refer to the socially/educationally-imposed rules for the use of language, whereas “description” refers to the use of language actually, as it occurs in natural speech. In this section, I adopt the term “prescription” to refer to declarations of what individuals consider to be good rules. Moreover, if these rules are conservative, individuals may be resistant to language change.

In the situation of Taiwan, as mentioned above, individuals are encouraged to learn English as early as possible and due to some social pressures and expectations, individuals are “expected” to code-switch. Such social norms no doubt have affected the role of English in speakers’ minds as being the symbol of success, fashion, and prestige. In other words, it changes speakers’ attitudes towards the English language from being defensive to being tolerating and supporting.

5.2 Accessibility and acceptability

It should not be assumed that every native speaker of Chinese would agree on the contact-induced changes described in chapter 3 and 4. “Accessibility” and “acceptability” play important roles in speakers’ abilities to produce the altered A-not-A questions and listeners’ perceptions of and tolerance for such types of interference. These two terms are closely related. Words must be accessible by speakers in order for them to become acceptable. The “ideal” relationship between these two is clearly reflected in the following diagram (57): Greater accessibility results in greater acceptability.
Compare the following three sentences in (58):

(58)  a. 這 碗 麵 好 不 好 吃
     zhi4 wan3 mian4 hao3 bu4 hao3 chi1?
     This CL noodle delicious not delicious
     “Is this bowl of noodles delicious or not?”

     b. 這 碗 麵 [di] 不 delicious
     zhi4 wan3 mian4 [di] bu4 delicious?
     This CL noodle delicious not delicious
     “Is this bowl of noodles delicious or not?”

     c. 這 碗 麵 お 不 おいしい
     zhi4 wan3 mian4 [o] bu4 oishii?
     This CL noodle delicious not delicious
     “Is this bowl of noodles delicious or not?”
Depending on the speakers’ or listeners’ backgrounds, the degree of accessibility and acceptability varies. For instance, I found sentence (58b) more acceptable than (58c) because the English language appears to be more accessible to me. Another way of measuring accessibility is through the speakers’ or listeners’ familiarity with a language. Since English has become a major second language in Taiwan, one might conclude that people in Taiwan would find (58b) more “reasonable” than (58c), but that preference does not mean (58c) is unacceptable. For example, an international student studying in Japan might find (58c) more acceptable than (58b) for exactly the same reason. I would also like to point out that not all speakers who have access to English may produce sentences like (56c) and (58b), and not all listeners who have access to the same language will find these two sentences acceptable. Below is a chart (59) constructed with the intention of explaining the relationships between the language users, both speakers and listeners, and the ideas of accessibility (AS) and acceptability (AP).

(59)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Speakers</th>
<th>Listeners</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1 - AS → - AP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2 - AS → + AP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>3 + AS → - AP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>4 + AS → + AP</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

From the speakers’ perspective, it is safe to assume that speaker 1 will not feel comfortable producing sentence (58b), not to mention sentence (56c). Speaker 2, whose accessibility is a bit higher than speaker 1, may still have a hard time creating sentence (56c) but may feel less hesitant to try (58b). Someone with accessibility equal to or higher than speaker 2 may feel
comfortable switching between English and Chinese. I deliberately did not include speakers who have low accessibility but high acceptability because, without any input from another language, the speakers have nothing to base it on. From the listeners’ perspective, it is interesting to point out listener 2 because s/he shows that low accessibility does not affect perception towards these sentences. On the other hand, listener 3 shows that higher accessibility does not necessarily equal higher acceptability. However, we expect this case to be rare.

Therefore, we should revise the AS-AP diagram presented in (57) to the following (60): where [-AS, +AP] and [+AS, -AP] are included as well.

(60)

As mentioned above, contact situations are different for the two phenomena discussed in this study. Knowledge of English is not required for speakers to integrate a borrowed word to a Chinese A-not-A question. Speakers might have only heard people using the word or heard it on the radio and might not even be able to spell out the word; however, they have no problem using it in their spoken language. On the other hand, more knowledge of English is needed in order for speakers to switch back and forth on the sentential level. They will at least need to know the basic word order for both Chinese and English and will need to be comfortable with both structures.
CHAPTER 6
DISCUSSION

I have proposed that any word that can be syllabified within the domain of a Chinese syllable sequence is a perfect candidate to fill in, or to be code-switched, in an A-not-A question. Words from any language are suitable for integration into A-not-A questions if, and only if, such a word can be analyzed and tested by Chinese syllable sequences. However, there are some restrictions on the selection of words. Only adjectives and verbs are suitable for this type of phonological change, and only they would make sense semantically. On the sentential level, it is not the case that all features can be “induced” by contact with other languages; only those that make syntactic or at least semantic sense can be “changed”. Section 6.1 presents such occasions and section 6.2 intends to test those sentences to see if they are in accordance with the syntactic constraints, namely the Equivalence Constraint and the Free Morpheme Constraint, on code-switching suggested by Sankoff and Poplack (1981). Subsection 6.3 intends to put other languages to test. The reason I have chosen Japanese and Spanish as my other languages is that I have higher accessibility and acceptability (see 5.2) to these two languages compared to any others. I rank myself as a [+AS: +AP]\(^{71}\) speaker and listener in Japanese and a [+AS:-AP]\(^{72}\) speaker in Spanish.

\(^{71}\) “AS” stands for accessibility, and “AP” stands for acceptability. It is my hypothesis that a speaker who has higher accessibility [+AS] has greater possibility of being high in acceptability [+AP], compared to those who have relatively low accessibility [-AS].

\(^{72}\) It is also possible to have a person who has high accessibility [+AS] but low acceptability [-AP]. This can be explained from both social and psychological perspectives. For instance, a person’s attitude towards the contact language as well as his/her loyalty towards his/her first language may all contribute to the fact that this person has sufficient language competence but a low level of performance (in both production and reception).
6.1 Topic fronting

6.1.1 Analysis on xian1 and time phrases

From a prescriptive point of view, sentences listed in (48), (55), and (56) are grammatically incorrect. However, all these sentences are semantically interpretable and syntactically explainable despite the fact that the word order has changed. The motivation of such movements is not clear. Since in Chinese xian1 is often used with other adverbs to express “first…then…,” the listener usually expects some form of solution or answer from the speaker. For example, compare the following two sentences in (61):

(61)  a. 我 先 去 學校

   wo3 xian1 qu4 xue2-xiao4

   I first go school

   “I am going to school first.”

b. 我 去 學校 先.

   wo3 qu4 xue2-xiao4 xian1

   I go school first

   “I am going to school first.”

When a listener hears sentence (61a), he or she expects something more from the speaker like “then…what?” or “then…do you need me to do anything afterwards?” Sentence (61b), with xian1 located at the end of the sentence, which is not permitted in Chinese, has a sense of completeness. Speakers who have syntactic knowledge of English may use such strategies to avoid ambiguity for the listeners. Now, compare the following two sentences in (62):
Both sentences (62a) and (62b) express one’s feeling towards home; however, (62b) yields a stronger sense of home-sickness than (62a) because a Mandarin speaker tends to move the focus, the topic of the sentence, to the front. Although such movement is not allowed in Chinese prescriptive descriptions of syntax, after being in contact with English, which allows such types of constructions, Mandarin speakers have the “reason” (allowed in one of the languages they know) and “motivation” (topic-fronting) to displace the time phrases in Chinese sentences.

6.1.2 Analysis on A-not-A questions

An analysis of A-not-A sentences can yield similar results to the one just stated above. Depending on the purpose and the intention of the speaker, one may keep the A-not-A phrase at the beginning of the sentence to emphasize the question as seen in (63) or move other phrases to the beginning of the sentence to change the focus as seen in (64).
(63) a. (你) 去 不 去 學校?
(Ni3) qu4 bu2 qu4 xue2-xiao4?
you go not go school
“Are you going to the school?”

b. (你) 想 不 想 買 這隻 狗?
(Ni3) xiang3 bu4 xiang3 mai3 zhe4 zhi1 gou3?
you want not want buy this CL dog
“Do you want to buy this dog?”

(64) a. 學校, 你 去 不 去?
Xue2-xiao4, ni3 qu4 bu2 qu4?
school you go not go
“The school, are you going?”

b. 這隻 狗, 你 想 不 想 買?
Zhe4 zhi1 gou3, ni3 xiang3 bu4 xiang3 mai3 ?
this CL dog you want not want buy
“This dog, do you want to buy?”

The sentences presented in (63) are both considered a typical A-not-A construction where the main focus stays to the question itself. However, as shown in (64a, b), the focus changed when the noun phrases were introduced to the beginning of the sentences. Although both sentences are acceptable, a speaker using (64a) not only has his/her emphasis on the school,
but has also prepared a follow-up question for receiving negative feedback or explanations from the listener. Therefore, we can consider the sentences in (63) as a “straight-forward-yes-no” type of question because the purpose of the question is to get feedback from others, regardless of whether the feedback is positive or negative. On the other hand, when a speaker uses the “NOUN+A-not-A” type of construction as seen in (64), s/he expects to receive positive feedback. When this is not the case, s/he would want to know why and maybe ask an alternative question. We can consider this type of construction as an “indirect-confirm-yes-no” question because the speaker has already assumed the answer s/he would receive. Therefore, the purpose of this question is really for purposes of confirmation. Compare the two different reactions by the speaker in (65) and (66) below:

(65) A: Ni3 xiang3 bu4 xiang3 mai3 zhe4 zhi1 gou3? “Do you want to buy this dog?”
B: Bu4 xiang3! “(I) don’t want to!”
A: O! “Oh!”

(66) A: zhe4 zhi1 gou3, Ni3 xiang3 bu4 xiang3 mai3? “This dog, do you want to buy?”
B: Bu4 xiang3! “(I) don’t want to!”
A: Wei4 shen2me? Ni3 bu2 shi4 yi4 zhi2 hen3 xiang2 mai3 zhe4 zhong3 gou3 ma1?
  “Why, don’t you always want to buy this kind of dog?”
B: …

Again, although the sentences in (61) and (62) are considered ungrammatical, speakers who have some amount of contact with another language that carries these structures may find them acceptable and produce them naturally. These examples not only describe several contact-induced phenomena, but also support or provide underpinning two constraints proposed by Sankoff and Poplack’s (1981).
6.2 Sankoff and Poplack’s (1981) Equivalence Constraint and Free Morpheme Constraint

One of the two code-switching constraints stated by Sankoff and Poplack (1981) is the equivalence constraint, which expresses that:

“The order of sentence constituents immediately adjacent to and on both sides of the switch point must be grammatical with respect to both languages involved simultaneously. This requires some specification: the local co-grammaticality or equivalence of the two languages in the vicinity of the switch holds as long as the order of any two sentence elements, one before and one after the switch point, is not excluded in either language” (Sankoff and Poplack, 1981:57).

In other words, code-switching at an intra-sentential level can occur if and only if the word order immediately before and after the switch point is grammatically possible in both languages. However, the examples given below in (67) clearly show that although Chinese does not allow time phrases to appear sentence-finally, because of the contact with English, which allows time phrases at the end, such sentences are still produced by native Chinese speakers.

(67)  a. 他 昨天 早上 有 來 學校.

   Ta1 zuo2-tian1 zao3-shang4 you3 lai2 xuei2-xiao4.

   he yesterday morning have come school

   “He, yesterday morning, came to school.”

   ⇒ Ta1 yesterday morning you3 lai2 xuei2-ziao4.

   (Does not violate the equivalence constraint)

   b. 昨天 早上. 他 有 來 學校.

   zuo2-tian1 zao3-shang4, Ta1 you3 lai2 xuei2-xiao4.

   yesterday morning he have come school
“Yesterday morning, he came to school.”

→ *Yesterday morning, ta1 you3 lai2 xuei2-ziao4.*

(Does not violate the equivalence constraint)

c. 他 有 來 學校 昨天 早上.

*Ta1 you3 lai2 xuei2-xiao4 zuo2-tian1 zao3-shang4.*

he have come school yesterday morning

“He came to the school yesterday morning.”

→ *Ta1 you3 lai2 xuei2-ziao4. yesterday morning.*

(Violates the equivalence constraint)

Another constraint Sankoff and Poplack propose is the free morpheme constraint: no switches are allowed between a stem and its affixes and few switches are allowed within set phrases and idiomatic expresses. They stated that: “a switch may not occur between a bound morpheme and a lexical form unless the latter has been phonologically integrated into the language of the bound morpheme.” A couple of A-not-A questions listed in (68) appear to violate this constraint; however, I argue that this constraint does not even apply to these sentences because (1) the format of an A-not-A question is considered as a set phrase and (2) the reduplicated unit is considered a syllable (sound) rather than a morpheme (meaning).

(68)  a. 你 累 不 累?

*Ni3 lei4 bu2 lei4?*

you tired not tired

“How are you?”

→ *Ni3 tired bu4 tired?*

(Does not violate free morpheme constraint but violate equivalence constraint)
As stated above in (67) and (68), we now know that this study is not restrained by the equivalence constraint or free morpheme constraint; rather, it appears that the intensity and duration of the contact and other social factors play a much more important role.

6.3 Other languages: Japanese and Spanish

Since Japanese is an open-syllable language that carries syllabic structures similar to Chinese, we can generally assume that any Japanese word can be integrated into the Chinese A-not-A question form, as shown in (69).

(69) a. 你 覺得 她 か 不 かわいい
Ni3 jue2-de2 ta1 [ka] bu4 kawaii?
You feel her cute not cute
“Do you think that she’s cute or not?”
The same may apply to Spanish as seen in (70).

(70) Spanish: 你 覺得 她 bo- 不 bonida

\[ Ni3 \ juei2-de2 \ tal \ [bɔ] \ bu4 \ [bɔnida] \]

you think she pretty not pretty

“Do you think that she is pretty?”
CHAPTER 7
CONCLUSION

This thesis has introduced two contact-induced phenomena among Chinese speakers in Taiwan and those from Taiwan living in Georgia. For a speaker to integrate a borrowed English word and Chinese-ify it based on the preference of the Chinese syllabic structure, some amount of casual contact with English is necessary. For a speaker to construct a Chinese sentence involving the adverb xian1, “first, in advance,” or the time phrase jin1-tian1, “today,” with English word order, more intense contact with English is a prerequisite.

There are several factors that contribute to the outcomes of borrowing. Linguistically, typological distance between the borrowed and the borrowing languages may play an important role in which features would be borrowed into the language. As mentioned above in chapter 3, nouns, adjectives and verbs are the three most common lexical items borrowed from one language to another. Additionally, since the basic composition of a Chinese A-not-A question is Subject (optional) + VP or ADJP + bu4 (or bu2) ‘not’ + VP or ADJP (i.e., the same as the one that appear in the first predicate) + NP, one could expect the English lexicon that is being borrowed and Chinese-ified to be either a verb or an adjective but not a noun.

In addition to the linguistic factors, this thesis has spent a great deal of space discussing the social factors including “need,” “prestige,” “intensity of contact situation,” “political purpose,” “fashion,” and others that may contribute to these contact-induced changes mentioned in this thesis. As noted by Bloomfield (1933) and Loveday (1996), speakers may find it more sophisticated or superior to borrow from the language that is popular, i.e. English in this case. Furthermore, Winford (2003) pointed out that “differences in borrowing or code-mixing patterns across bilingual communities have also been explained in terms of
differences in perceptions of group identity” (2003:41). This clearly explains why some people in Taiwan, although they may not have much knowledge of English, “pretend” or act like they are very comfortable using the English lexicon.

Discussions about acceptability and accessibility help to explain speakers’ preferences for certain vocabulary and listeners’ perceptions of lexical or structural alterations. My positing the concept of acceptability and accessibility is not only to try to describe which words or structures are most likely to be borrowed but also to explain the nature of contact-induced changes. People with the same amount of input (accessibility) from a foreign language produce different outcomes and may have different claims toward those contact-induced borrowings (acceptability).

I later concluded in chapter 6 that the lexicon from languages other than English can also be Chinese-ified and used in the A-not-A question if it can be broken down and fit into typical Chinese syllabic properties, and these two contact-induced changes serve as exceptions to both the equivalence constraint and the free morpheme constraint. Of course, when studying those contact-induced borrowings, many factors should be considered and applied. It would be great, for future studies, to visit the speech community involved in contact situations, and to interview, collect, and observe the actual outcomes of contact-induced changes.
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APPENDIX A

Romanization System

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>INITIALS (CONSONANTS)</th>
<th>FINALS (VOWELS)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ㄅ → b</td>
<td>ㄑ → a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ㄆ → p</td>
<td>ㄕ → o</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ㄇ → m</td>
<td>ㄝ → e</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ㄇ → f</td>
<td>ㄗ → ê</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ㄈ → d</td>
<td>ㄙ → ai</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ㄉ → t</td>
<td>ㄧ → ei</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ㄊ → n</td>
<td>ㄫ → ao</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ㄋ → l</td>
<td>ㄮ → ou</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ㄬ → g</td>
<td>ㄪ → an</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ㄭ → k</td>
<td>ㄣ → en</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ㄮ → h</td>
<td>ㄪ → ang</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ㄯ → j</td>
<td>ㄥ → eng</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ㄺ → q</td>
<td>ㄬ → er</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ㄻ → x</td>
<td>ㄧ → i</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ㄼ → zh</td>
<td>ㄨ → u</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ㄽ → ch</td>
<td>ㄩ → ü</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ㄾ → sh</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ㄿ → r</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ㄺ → z</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ㄘ → c</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ㄹ → s</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX B

Correspondent IPA symbols

\[
\begin{align*}
[p] & \rightarrow \ b & [s] & \rightarrow \ s \\
[p^h] & \rightarrow \ p & [t^h] & \rightarrow \ c \\
[m] & \rightarrow \ m & [\varnothing], [\varkappa] & \rightarrow \ e \\
[f] & \rightarrow \ f & [\varepsilon] & \rightarrow \ ê \\
[t] & \rightarrow \ d & [ai] & \rightarrow \ ai \\
[t^h] & \rightarrow \ t & [ei] & \rightarrow \ ei \\
[n] & \rightarrow \ n & [\alpha]\beta & \rightarrow \ ao \\
[l] & \rightarrow \ l & [\alpha\alpha] & \rightarrow \ ou \\
[k] & \rightarrow \ g & [\alpha\alpha] & \rightarrow \ an \\
[k^h] & \rightarrow \ k & [\alpha\alpha] & \rightarrow \ en \\
[x] & \rightarrow \ h & [\alpha\eta] & \rightarrow \ ang \\
[t\varsigma] & \rightarrow \ j & [\varepsilon\eta] & \rightarrow \ eng \\
[t\varsigma^h] & \rightarrow \ q & [\alpha\varepsilon] & \rightarrow \ er \\
[\varepsilon] & \rightarrow \ x & [i] & \rightarrow \ i \\
[ts] & \rightarrow \ zh & [\iota] & \rightarrow \ u \\
[ts^h] & \rightarrow \ ch & [\iota] & \rightarrow \ ü \\
[\varsigma] & \rightarrow \ sh & [\alpha] & \rightarrow \ a \\
[\zeta] & \rightarrow \ r\text{ (fricative)} & [\omega] & \rightarrow \ o \\
[\alpha] & \rightarrow \ r\text{ (Approximant)} \\
[t\varsigma] & \rightarrow \ s
\end{align*}
\]