Chapter 7
UFPs in Taiwan and language contact

7.1 Introduction

In chapters 3–6, I have discussed the functions of the three Taiwan Mandarin UFPs *a*, *la* and *ê* in conversation. In this chapter, I take a closer look at these three UFPs and discuss their emergence in Taiwan Mandarin on the basis of the socio-historical and linguistic background of the formation of today's Taiwan Mandarin introduced in chapter 2. I propose that the UFP *la* is a result of "imposition" (Van Coetsem 1988, Winford 2005) from Southern Mǐn, whereas Mandarin *a* is relexified (Lefebvre 1998, 2001) due to the influence of Southern Mǐn UFP *a*. The UFP *ê*, which neither exists in Mandarin nor in Southern Mǐn, has possibly been imported to Taiwan Mandarin from Jiāng-Huái Mandarin. Besides discussing the influence of different Sinitic varieties on Taiwan Mandarin, I take *a* as an example to illustrate the reverse influence of Mandarin on Taiwan Southern Mǐn. Lastly, I look at the possible motivation for a Taiwan Mandarin speaker when it comes to the choice between a Mandarin UFP and a non-Mandarin one when both are available.

7.2 The emergence of Taiwan Mandarin UFPs *la*, *a* and *ê*

7.2.1 An imposed UFP in Taiwan Mandarin: *la*

When languages are in contact, the transfer of features is unavoidable. Van Coetsem (1988: 3) distinguishes two types of transfer, *borrowing* and *imposition*, which can be explained by "agentivity," i.e. the agent of transfer:

> The role of the speaker is of crucial importance to our definitions of *borrowing* and *imposition*. From the viewpoint of a speaker who comes in active contact with another language, there is a *source language* and a *recipient language*. If the recipient language speaker is the agent, as in the case of an English speaker using French words while speaking English, the transfer of material (and this naturally includes structure) from the source language to the recipient language is *borrowing (recipient language agentivity)*. If, on the other hand, the source language speaker is the agent, as in the case of a French speaker using his French articulatory habits while speaking English, the transfer of material from the source language to the recipient language is *imposition (source language agentivity)*. (original italics)

As mentioned in chapter 2, Southern Mǐn is the most influential Sinitic variety in Taiwan. According to DoS (2002), 76.9 percent of Taiwan's population has a Southern Mǐn language background. Many Taiwanese people are Mandarin-Southern Mǐn bilinguals. Nowadays, Southern Mǐn is still widespread in southern Taiwan and is used as the main language of communication in private settings.

It is thus reasonable to assume that, in the 1950s, when Taiwan Southern Mǐn speakers (the agents of the source language) learned Mandarin as a second language, it was natural for them to *impose* features (or, material, in Van Coetsem's (1988) terms) of Taiwan Southern Mǐn, the source language, to Mandarin, the recipient language. Van Coetsem (ibid.) claims that "the transfer of material from the source language to the recipient language primarily concerns less stable domains, particularly vocabulary, in borrowing, and more stable domains, particularly phonological entities, in imposition." Nonetheless lexical imposition can still occur. In his study on the imposition of Cantonese on Mandarin, Chen (2011: 96) claims that Cantonese speakers often impose words from Cantonese to Mandarin while speaking Mandarin.

In chapter 4, I presented an analysis of the use of UFP *la* in Taiwan Mandarin. As mentioned, the use of *la* in Taiwan Mandarin can be divided into two types: fused *la* and simplex *la*. My observation confirms P. Wu's (2005) observation that the use of fused *la* in Taiwan Mandarin corresponds to the use of *la* in mainland Mandarin. The use of simplex *la*, on the other hand, corresponds to the use of *la* in Southern Mǐn. I argue that, analogous to the imposition of Cantonese words reported by Chen's (2011: 96), the use of simplex *la* in Taiwan Mandarin can be regarded as an example of lexical imposition. That is, while learning (and speaking) Mandarin, Southern Mǐn speakers transfer the property of *la* from Southern Mǐn (the source language) to Mandarin (the recipient language).

At an earlier stage of the contact situation, the imposition of simplex *la* may be regarded as code-switching by speakers with a Southern Mǐn background. Nowadays, however, the use of *la* is no longer code-switching since *la* has been fully incorporated into the Taiwan Mandarin UFP system. Providing criteria for judging whether a language element is a code-switch, Thomason (2001:133) claims that "if monolingual speakers of the receiving language use a source language element in speaking their language, it is probably safe to conclude that that element has become an interference feature: speakers cannot code-switch to or from a language they do not know at all."

Apparently, *la* is not the only item involved in this kind of lexical imposition. It is common to hear people in Taiwan use other Southern Mĭn UFPs such as *hoNn* or *hioh* while speaking Mandarin (for a detailed list, see table 2.1). However, compared to *hoNn* and *hioh*, the use of which is more restricted to speakers with a Southern Mĭn background, *la* is also used by speakers who do not have a Southern Mĭn background, such as Hakka speakers or Mandarin monolinguals.

For these non-Southern Mĭn speakers, the use of *la* may result from "passive familiarity" (Thomason 2001: 139), meaning that "a speaker acquires a feature from a language that s/he understands (at least to some extent) but has never spoken actively at all" (ibid.). A factor accelerating the acquisition of *la* may lies in the phonetic similarity between the Southern Mĭn *la* (i.e. the simplex *la*) and Mandarin *la* (i.e. the fused *la*). As mentioned in chapter 2, I believe that the analogy, or similarity, with regard to form and function, may be an important factor facilitating the transfer (see Van Hell and De Groot's (1998) discussion about cognates and language contact). On the other hand, Southern Mĭn UFPs lacking a formal counterpart in Mandarin, such as *hoNn* and *hioh*, are not perceived as Mandarin elements. All my Taiwanese informants believe that the deployment of *hoNn* or *hioh* in Mandarin conversation is a salient feature of Southern Mĭn-accented Mandarin. However, they do not associate *la* with Southern Mĭn-accented Mandarin.

7.2.2 A relexified UFP in Taiwan Mandarin: *a*

In chapter 3, I showed that the use of UFP *a* in today's Taiwan Mandarin deviates to some extent from its "normative" use in standard Mandarin. For example, the attachment of high-pitch *a* to a discourse topic is not accepted by mainland Mandarin speakers (for details see 3.4.4). The high *a* can, however, be used in Southern Mĭn to mark a discourse topic. I therefore propose that this use in Taiwan Mandarin results from Southern Mĭn-Mandarin language contact.

In the previous section, I argued that the simplex *la* can be seen as a result of lexical imposition from Southern Mĭn onto Taiwan Mandarin. As simplex *la* does not exist in mainland Mandarin, it is fully imposed: the transfer includes all the features of Southern Mĭn *la*. The UFP *a*, on the other hand, exists in both mainland Mandarin and Southern Mĭn (see table 2.1). Given the fact that *a* has distinct functions in both varieties, the emergence of Taiwan Mandarin *a* is not simple lexical imposition, but has traits of relexification (Lefebvre 1998, 2001). In her discussion of creole genesis, Lefebvre (1998, 2001) proposes that relexification plays a central role in creole genesis:

> The lexical entries of the lexicons of the substratum languages are copied, and the phonological representations in these copied lexical entries are replaced with phonological representations derived from the phonetic strings of the superstratum language or by null forms. The second step is referred to as relabelling. The choice of the pertinent phonetic string in the superstratum language to relabel a copied lexical entry is based on their use in specific semantic and pragmatic contexts such that […] the semantics of the superstratum string must have something in common with the semantics of the substratum lexical entry that is being relabelled. (Lefebvre 2001: 11)

Lien (2010: 195) has extended Lefebvre's relexification to language contact in more general terms. He suggests that

> if two languages are in contact, a lexical entry in the target language is selected and relabeled, i.e. this lexical entry receives semantic and syntactical features of the source language (Lefebvre 1988). The lexical entry selected from the target language must have something in common with respect to the semantic and syntactical features of the source language.

If we extend this definition to the pragmatic functions of the UFPs under discussion here, then it seems reasonable to postulate that the high-pitch *a* in Taiwan Mandarin can be accounted for in terms of relexification: Taiwan Mandarin high-pitch *a* and Taiwan Southern Mǐn high-pitch *a* are similar with regard to their syntactic positions (both are in utterance-final position), pragmatic functions (as shown in 3.4.4, they can be used in similar contexts), and phonological representations.

Before closing this section, I return to 3.4.3 where I gave an example demonstrating how a low-pitch *a* is used to introduce a discourse topic. In contrast to the high-pitch use, this use is acceptable for mainland Mandarin speakers. In other words, in my Taiwan Mandarin data, the low-pitch and high-pitch *a* are both found to introduce a discourse topic. As Thomason (2001: 85–88) states, when two languages are in contact, the interference may lead to the loss of an existing feature, the addition of a new feature, or a replacement in the recipient language. It seems that in the case of Taiwan Mandarin *a*, the use of high-pitch *a* in discourse-topic introduction is an additional feature. Its emergence has not (or not yet) lead to the loss of the low-pitch *a* in the same context. One possible explanation for the co-existence is that the high-pitch *a* carries a different function (i.e. to activate the ad-

dressee's knowledge state) from low-pitch *a* (i.e. to show the activation of the speaker's own knowledge) when introducing the discourse topic.

7.2.3 An imported UFP in Taiwan Mandarin: *ê*

As shown in table 2.1, the UFP *ê*, despite of its frequent use in Taiwan Mandarin, neither exists in standard Mandarin (i.e. *guóyǔ* in Taiwan or *pǔtōnghuà* in mainland China)[1] nor in Southern Mǐn. In both standard Mandarin and Southern Mǐn, the particle *ê* is commonly used at utterance-initial position, and functions as an interjection. The following examples are taken from a normative dictionary published in mainland China, the *Xiàndài Hànyǔ cídiǎn* 'Contemporary Chinese Dictionary' (CASS 2010: 358)[2]:

(1) a. ē, nǐ kuài lái!
PRT 2_{SG} quick come
'Hey, come here quickly!'

b. é, tā zěnme zǒu le?
PRT 3_{SG} why go PRT
'How come he left?'

c. ě, nǐ zhè huà kě bù duì ya!
PRT 2_{SG} this word but NEG right PRT
'Come on, what you said is not correct!'

d. è, wǒ zhè jiù lái!
PRT 1_{SG} this just come
'Okay, I will come in a moment!'

Like in standard Mandarin, the Southern Mǐn particle *ê* [ɛ] also occurs in utterance-initial position only and not in utterance-final position. Example (2) is taken from Tung (2001: 318):

---

[1] Huang et al. (1997: 152) also claim that *ê*, when occurring in utterance-final position, is not used in standard Mandarin.

[2] According to CASS (2010: 358), the utterance-initial *ê* [ɛ] can also be pronounced as *ei* [eɪ]. The normative dictionaries in Taiwan, for example, He (1987) and MoE (1994), likewise write that *ê* is used in utterance-initial position.

(2) <S e5, i1 kong2 an3ne1 kam2 tioh8? S>
PRT 3_{SG} say this.way whether right
'Is it right that he said it this way?'

If the utterance-final *ê* neither exists in standard Mandarin nor in Southern Mǐn, how has it emerged in Taiwan Mandarin? Does it originate from another Sinitic variety?

If it is true that *ê* comes from another Sinitic variety, it is reasonable to assume that *ê* was first used by the first-generation mainland immigrants. If this assumption is correct, then *ê* must be attested in the Mandarin spoken by first-generation migrants from the Mainland. Since no spoken corpora were established at that time, I relied on radio plays. As mentioned in chapter 2, immigrants from the mainland controlled the mass media in Taiwan before the lifting of Martial Law in 1987. As also mentioned in chapter 2, only 7.7 percent of the employees of the *Broadcasting Corporation of China*, the main radio station in Taiwan, were local non-mainlanders (see Cheng: 1988: 99). In order to test my hypothesis, I checked two episodes of a radio play recorded in the 1960s.[3]

I found that the UFP *ê* is used in both episodes. The fact that the almost all of the speakers and authors of these plays are mainlanders supports my hypothesis that *ê* must have been in use in the initial phase of Mandarin-Southern Mǐn language contact. I then interviewed 13 mainland Chinese persons with distinct dialect backgrounds in order to locate the possible source language of *ê* geographically. All these informants confirmed that *ê* is not used in the standard Mandarin in China (i.e. *pǔtōnghuà*).[4] Significantly, among the 13 informants, only Jiāng-Huái Mandarin speakers coming from Ānhuī, Northern Jiāngsū and Nánjīng city confirm that they use the UFP *ê* when speaking Mandarin.[5] This appears to correspond to what Chao

---

[3] The titles of these two radio plays are: *Wàn rén bǎotǎ* 'A precious tower made by ten thousand people' and *Shēng cái yǒu dào* 'There's a way to make fortune'. They were both produced by the *Broadcasting Corporation of China* in the 1960s.

[4] Although some of them admit that they occasionally use short *ê*-attached phrases such as *bù zhīdào ê* 'I don't know' or *méiyǒu ê* 'no', they believe that this kind of usage results from the influence of Taiwan TV drama series, which are very popular in mainland China.

[5] Note that although the Jiāng-Huái Mandarin speakers accept the use of *ê* to some extent, all of my mainland informants do not accept *ye* and judge it "Taiwanese-accented."

(1926: 905) and R. Li (1995: 107) report about the use of the UFP *ɛ* in the Nánjīng dialect. Examples (3a) to (3c) are quoted from Chao (ibid.):[6]

(3) a. pu ʂɨ tsəmə tsɔ də ɛ!
NEG be so do DE PRT
'It should not be done in this way!'

b. t'a piŋ mɛ jɔ ki ɛ!
3_{SG} at.all NEG have go PRT
'He didn't go!

c. pu ʂɨ tɕ'ɨ lə dʑiu suan lə ɛ!
NEG be eat ASP just count ASP PRT
'Don't think you can get away with eating it!

Although Chao (1926) does not provide any conversational contexts for these examples, he mentions that these utterances are used as disagreements, which is similar to what we have discussed in 5.4.3. The examples below are taken from R. Li (1995: 107). He maintains that the UFP *ɛ* in the Nánjīng dialect can be attached to a declarative sentence (see (4a)), or an imperative sentence (see (4b)).

(4) a. ni ʂɨ kanpu ɛ,
2_{SG} be cadre PRT

tsəmə nəŋ dʑiaŋ tsə tsɔŋ pu futsərən di hua?
how can say this CL NEG responsible DE saying
'You are a cadre. How could you say such irresponsible things?'

b. pu jau kuaŋ dʑiaŋ hua, tɕ^{h}ɨ tɕ^{h}ai ɛ!
NEG must only say saying eat dish PRT
'Don't just talk, eat!'

My informant from Nánjīng confirms that the use of *ɛ* in examples (3a–c) and (4a) is quite similar to the use of *ê* in Taiwan Mandarin: *ɛ* is also triggered by a situation

[6] The examples in Chao (1926) are written in Chinese characters. I have transcribed the examples in International Phonetic Alphabet (IPA) without tones according to the pronunciation of my informant from Nánjīng.

which deviates from the speaker's assumption. By using *ε*, the speaker foregrounds the utterance to which it is attached. Although the *ε*-attached utterance in (4a) is followed by a question, my informant said that the following utterance need not be explicitly uttered. I thus argue that example (4a) can still be considered a case similar to the *ê*-attached disagreement discussed in 5.4.3.[7]

Except for Nánjīng, the UFP *ε* also exists in some other Chinese dialects in Ānhuī, Jiāngsū and Zhèjiāng provinces, for example, Yángzhōu and Jīnhuá dialects. Examples (5a) and (5b) are taken from R. Li (1996a: 108 and 1996b: 123).

(5) a. liɪ suoʔ sənmənʔ o t'iŋ pəʔ tɕ^{h}iŋts^{h}u ɛ!
2$_{SG}$ say what 1$_{SG}$ hear NEG clear PRT
'What did you say? I could not hear it clearly!'

b. kəʔ kəʔ tifɑŋ kɤsiŋ ɛ!
this CL place clean PRT
'This place is clean!'

The dialect data above provide additional support for my claim that the UFP *ê* was possibly first imposed on Mandarin by people from the Nánjīng and Ānhuī/Jiāngsū/Zhèjiāng area and was then imported to Taiwan by the Mandarin spoken by these first-generation mainland immigrants. As mentioned in chapter 2, people from Jiāngsū and Zhèjiāng had high positions in education, politics and economy (cf. Ang 1992: 239–240, Tang 1999). In previous studies, Wú dialects have been mentioned as one important lexical contributor to Taiwan Mandarin (cf. Tang 2002). In addition, Jiāng-Huái Mandarin, spoken "in central Ānhuī, and Jiāngsū north of Yangtze, as well as in the region of Nánjīng" (Norman 1988: 191), has obviously also played a role in the formation of Taiwan Mandarin UFP system.

---

[7] I have not found the "imperative" use in example (4b) in my Taiwan Mandarin data. It is not easy to explain why only certain functions have been transferred and others not. The partial transfer of functions is in line with Matras and Sakel's (2007: 835–6) claim that the "outcome [of contact-induced change] need not, however, be a one-to-one correspondence between form and function throughout the construction." For Taiwan Mandarin *ê*, we can merely identify this incongruity. Since Taiwan Mandarin *ê* results from different stages of language contact involving different varieties, more data would be required to ascertain exactly when and under what circumstances a certain function of the source language, i.e. marking imperatives, has been dropped.

7.3 Influence of Mandarin on Southern Mǐn: *a*

My discussion in section 7.2 focused on the influence from Southern Mǐn and other Sinitic varieties on the emergence of Taiwan Mandarin UFPs. My conclusion is, in brief, that simplex *la* is the result of lexical imposition from Southern Mǐn, *a* is the result of relexification due to the influence of Southern Mǐn, and *ê* is an UFP imported by the Jiāng-Huái Mandarin speakers. In this section, I will discuss the influence in a reverse way: Has Mandarin also influenced the use of Taiwan Southern Mǐn UFPs?

In previous literature on language contact, the mutual interference is regarded as a common situation. Thomason (2001:76) states that "it is fairly easy to find examples of mutual interference,[…]." As Heine and Kuteva (2005:4) also mention, "the term model language [i.e. language which provides the model of transfer] and replica language [i.e. language which makes use of that model] are relative notions, in that a given language can be associated with both roles." Although the degree of mutual influence is not easy to define, instances of interference from Mandarin in Southern Mǐn have been discussed in some previous studies.

Luo (2005: 12), for example, claims that due to Mandarin influence of, sound changes in Southern Mǐn spoken by the younger generation in Taiwan have occurred. One example is the voiced bilabial stop [b] in Southern Mǐn, which is often replaced by the bilabial nasal [m]: the word *paq1baq5* 'to help' is pronounced as *paq1maq5*. Luo (ibid.: 16) believes that this phenomenon is a kind of "wrong analogy." As the voiced bilabial stop [b] only exists in Southern Mǐn and not in Mandarin, speakers who are more proficient in Taiwan Mandarin and less proficient in Southern Mǐn take one bilabial consonant in Mandarin [m] to replace the original consonant [b]. Examining the lexical influence of language policies on Taiwanese novel-writing, C. Li (2008: 65) claims that "Mandarin influence increased due to the KMT's Mandarin language policy" and "an increase of Mandarin loanwords is evidence of the impact of the Mandarin-only policy even on those who consciously resist its influence" (ibid.: 77).

In his study on Taiwan Southern Mǐn personal pronouns, Tsai (2011: 41) divides his 60 informants into three equal-sized groups: (i) older generation, who are older than 65 and only proficient in Southern Mǐn; (ii) middle-age generation, who are between 36 and 60. Members of this group have been educated in Mandarin, but their daily-used language is Southern Mǐn; in other words, all members in this group are Southern Mǐn-dominant. Group (iii) represents the young generation aged between 20 and 35. Members of this group have also been educated in Mandarin, but

still use Southern Mĭn at home. Tsai assumes that members of this group may be more proficient in Mandarin, or equal-proficient in Mandarin and Southern Mĭn.

Tsai (ibid.: 71) found out that the members of the middle-age and young generation cannot distinguish the different meanings of Southern Mĭn personal pronouns. For instance, *guan2* 'my, our' in Southern Mĭn can refer to both singular and plural first person pronoun when it has a possessive interpretation before a noun: *guan2 ma1-ma1* 'my mother, our mother'. However, in Mandarin, there is a clear distinction between singular and plural pronouns. Therefore speakers of these two groups apply the Mandarin distinction when speaking Southern Mĭn and believe that *guan2* only stands for the plural. Tsai (ibid.: 72) thus claims that "the Southern Mĭn-Mandarin bilinguals are influenced by Mandarin when they recognize the Southern Mĭn personal pronoun."

In the case of utterance-final particles, the influence of Mandarin can also be observed. Liang (2004: 90) notes that some younger generation speakers in Taiwan use the Mandarin question UFP *ma* when posing a question in Southern Mĭn.

Chung (2007: 473) also observes that the Mandarin UFP *ma* and *ba* are often used by the younger generation in Taiwan when speaking Southern Mĭn. The following examples in Southern Mĭn are taken from Chung (ibid.), with my glosses. Examples (6a) and (6c) are commonly used in Taiwan nowadays, whereas (6b) and (6d) are the 'pure' Southern Mĭn equivalents.

(6) a. si5kan1 u7 kau3 ma?
time have enough PRT
'Do we have enough time?'

b. si5kan1 u7 kau3 bo?
time have enough NEG
'Do we have enough time?'

c. i1 kho2 ling5 e7 lai5 ba.
3_{SG} possible will come PRT
'Perhaps he will come.'

d. i1 kho2 ling5 e7 lai5 hoNn/la.
3_{SG} possible will come PRT
'Perhaps he will come.'

Of the three UFPs analyzed in this study, *a* is the only one that originally exists in Mandarin. When comparing the use of *a* in Taiwan Mandarin and in Southern Mĭn, it turns out that most if not all usages are attested in both varieties. This leads to the question as how to identity directions of language contact in the use of *a*. In the case of the two Mandarin UFPs *ma* and *ba*, matters are more straightforward: they originally did not exist in Southern Mĭn and they were imposed by younger Taiwan Southern Mĭn speakers who were more proficient in Mandarin. Against this backdrop I assume that a similar process may account for the use of the UFP *a* in Taiwan Southern Mĭn.

In order to test this hypothesis, it is necessary to clarify what the original use of Taiwan Southern Mĭn *a* was, i.e. the use of *a* prior to contact with Mandarin. I have therefore pursued a diachronic comparison by looking at data documented during the period 1930–1950 and data provided by I. Li (1999). Examples (7a)–(7g) are collected from Higashikata (1931), Ogawa (1931) and X. Li (1950).[8] For the purpose of comparison, I divide the examples below according to I. Li's (1999) functional categories. According to my re-categorization, the UFP *a* in Southern Mĭn in the period 1930–1950 can occur in questions, exclamatives, imperatives, vocatives, agreement/disagreement and declaratives:

(7) a. Questions (Higashikata 1931: 1–2)

to2ui7 a?
where PRT
'Where?'

b. Exclamatives (Ogawa 1931: 1)

sui2 a!
beautiful PRT
'It's beautiful!'

[8] The original example sentences and explanations presented by Higashikata (1931), Ogawa (1931) and X. Li (1950) are in Japanese and Chinese. Transcriptions, glosses and English translations are mine.

c. Imperatives (Ogawa 1931: 1)

khi3 a!
go PRT
'Go!'

d. Vocatives (Higashikata 1931: 1–2)

a1pa5 a!
father PRT
'Dad!'

e. Agreement (X. Li 1950: 394)

tioh8 a!
right PRT
'Right!'

f. Disagreement (X. Li 1950: 394)

an3ne1 be7 sai2leh0 a!
this NEG do PRT
'This will not do!'

g. Declaratives (X. Li 1950: 394, 406)

co3 lang5 cong2 ai3 u7 chun5 thian1li2 a!
do person always must have preserve natural.principle PRT
'As human beings, people must follow the natural principle!'

ce1 hue1 sit8cai7 ue7 a cin1 sui2 a!
this flower really paint DE really beautiful PRT
'This flower is painted beautifully!'

In comparison to the examples above, I. Li's (1999) data contain more categories. She (ibid.: 134) claims that the low-pitch UFP *a3* can be used in the contexts of "reception of information." She points out that this particle can be used after *an3ne1*

'in this way', to show "the speaker's reception of what the addressee X just said, and may sometimes be further taken as his request for the addressee's confirmation on the validity of the message." Example (8) is taken from I. Li (ibid., my transcription).

(8) 1 A a in1 kiann2 to7 hoNn, <M bă M> ciong1 in1 tau1=
PRT 3_{SG} son just PRT BA BA 3_{SG} home

2 A =soo2u7 e5 cai5san2 long2 khi3 chong3 khui1 cit8 king1,..
all DE property all go make open one CL

3 A chiau1kip4 chi7tionn5, cin1 toa7 king1 an3ne1.
super market really big CL like.this

→ 4 B an3ne1 a3?
like.this PRT

5 A a in1 lau7bu2 to7 huan2tui3 la.
PRT 3_{SG} mother just OPPOSE PRT

A1-3: And her son just, took, took all the possessions of their family to open, open a, supermarket, a really big one, like this.
B4: Like this?
A5: And their mother just objected to it.

Interestingly, in her study on the discourse functions of *an3ne1* in Taiwan Southern Mĭn, Chang (2002: 106) claims that when *an3ne1* occurs "in a reply to acknowledge the previous speaker's speech," it is "followed by a final particle *o/ho^{n}/hio* (i.e. *o/hoNn/hioh*)." In other words, when *an3ne1* occurs in the context "reception of information," it is usually followed by other particles such as *o*, *hoNn*, or *hioh*. My Taiwan Southern Mĭn informants, who are over 50 and fully proficient in Taiwan Southern Mĭn, also find it more natural to use *o/ho^{n}/hio* in this context instead of *a3*.

How can we explain the differences between the observations by different scholars concerning the use of UFP in the context of "reception of information"? One obvious explanation is the influence of Mandarin. The use in (8) mentioned by I. Li (1999) is quite similar to what I observed for Mandarin (Lin 2003: 80–81): the low-pitch Mandarin UFP *a* can be used in exactly the same context (i.e. the

reception of information). We may thus assume that this function was imposed on Southern Mǐn by younger speakers who are more proficient in Mandarin.

So far I have demonstrated the mutual influence between Taiwan Mandarin and Taiwan Southern Mǐn in the use of UFPs. In 7.2.2, I have proposed that the "non-normative" use of *a* in Taiwan Mandarin is due to influence by Southern Mǐn. However, as discussed in this section, Southern Mǐn has also changed due to constant contact with Mandarin. Southern Mǐn speakers, on the one hand, have transferred Southern Mǐn functions of *a* to Mandarin. On the other hand, they have also transferred the function of Mandarin *a* to Southern Mǐn. It is not possible to tell whether the use of UFP *a* in both Taiwan Mandarin and Taiwan Southern Mǐn will converge in the future. However, it is undeniable that the use of *a* in Taiwan Mandarin is getting closer to Southern Mǐn and not to standard.

7.4 Taiwan Southern Mǐn UFP in Taiwan Mandarin: *nê*

As listed in table 2.1, many Taiwan Southern Mǐn UFPs, such as *hoNn*, *lê* or *nê*, are found in my Taiwan Mandarin spoken data, although the degree varies depending on each speaker's idiolect. In the last section, I will discuss the use of one of these Southern Mǐn UFPs *nê*, and compare its use with Taiwan Mandarin UFP *ê* in the same contexts.

The reason why I make such a comparison is that, while working on my data, I noticed that many instances of *nê* are seemingly replaceable with *ê*.[9] For example, in (9), the daughter D suggests that her mother M, who is in her sixties, should walk to a department store. Here, speaker M attaches *nê* to her assessment in line 2, which is based on the information "it's far to walk there," which M thinks may be neglected by D.

(9)	1 D	qíshí	nǐ	kěyǐ	zǒulù	qù	ê!	
		actually	2_{SG}	can	walk	go	PRT	
→	2 M	zǒulù	mán	yuǎn	de	nê!		
		walk	quite	far	DE	PRT		

[9] There are two kinds of *nê* [nɛ] in my data: a high-pitch *nê* and a low-pitch *nê*. In my Taiwan Mandarin data, out of a total of 25 instances of *nê*, 16 instances are low-pitch *nê* and 9 instances are high-pitch *nê*. According to my informants from Taiwan, all the occurrences of low-pitch *nê* and *ê* are interchangable, whereas the occurrences of high-pitch *nê* cannot be substituted by *ê*. In this section, only the occurrences of the low-pitch *nê* are discussed.

3	D	wǒ-	wǒ	shì-	dōu	shì	zǒulù	de	a↑!
		1_{SG}	1_{SG}	be	all	be	walk	DE	PRT

D1: Actually you can go by walking!
M2: It's far to walk there!
D3: I…I always go by walking!

My Taiwan Mandarin informants also confirm that the *nê* in line 2 can be replaced by *ê* and that the replacement does not lead to any different interpretation. This judgment leads to a question: if the *nê* and ê are interchangeable, what was the motivation for the speaker to use *nê* instead of *ê*?

One reason of such a direct imposition of the Taiwan Southern Mĭn UFP *nê* may be the speakers' lack of proficiency in Mandarin, as Chen (2011: 93) argues. In the 21-minute conversation preceding and following this excerpt, speaker M, who is in her sixties, switches to Southern Mĭn from time to time. Judging from her age and her behavior in the conversation, it is very likely that she is probably less proficient in Mandarin. However, language proficiency alone cannot explain the choice of languages, as the following examples show.

In (10), the female speaker F, who is in her thirties, attaches *nê* to the phrase *wàngjì le* 'I forgot', which indicates that she does not have sufficient knowledge to answer the question of the male speaker M.

(10)	1	M	nándào	dōu	méi	yǒu	yī	chǎng	bǐsài,
			is.it.possible	all	NEG	have	one	CL	competition
	2	M	ràng	nǐ	yìnxiàng	bǐjiào	shēnkè	ma?	
			let	2_{SG}	impression	more	deep	PRT	
→	3	F	kěshì	hǎoxiàng	dōu-	wàngjì	le	nê.	
			but	seem	all	forget	ASP	PRT	

M1-2: Don't you recall any competition which makes you impressed?
F3: but it seems…I forgot.

In the previous discussion during the same conversation, the same speaker F attaches *ê* to the phrase *bù zhīdào* 'I don't know', which similarly indicates her

insufficient knowledge to the issue in question (compare (10)). In other words, speaker F uses alternatively both *nê* and *ê* in a similar context.

(11)	1 M	ei:	wǒ	wàngjì-	tā	shì	bú	shì	yíng-
		uh	1_{SG}	forget	3_{SG}	be	NEG	be	win
	2 M	jiù	shì	yín	shānpǔlāsī			háishì	āgéxī?
		just	be	win	PN			or	PN
→	3 F	bù	zhìdào	ê.	wǒ	dōu	wàngjì	le.	
		NEG	know	PRT	1_{SG}	all	forget	ASP	

M1-2: …I forgot- did he win- just beat Sampras or Agassi?
F3: I don't know. I forgot all that.

Compared to speaker M in (9), speaker F, who is younger, does not switch to Southern Mǐn in the 21-minute conversation. We can assume that her proficiency in Mandarin is better than speaker M. If it is the case, what is the reason for F to use both *nê* and *ê*?

Before answering this question, it is important to ascertain whether *ê* and *nê* are really interchangeable. My informants from Taiwan have confirmed that all instances of *ê* presented in chapter 5 can be replaced by *nê*. Significantly, they indicate that the *nê*-attached utterances sound "more Southern Mǐn-accented," which means, the speakers would sound as if they are more proficient in Southern Mǐn.

Moreover, some of these informants mention that compared to *ê*, the use of *nê* sounds more like a "*sajiao* style of speaking." *Sajiao* (i.e *sājiāo*), as mentioned in chapter 5, is defined by Yueh (2012: 1) as "persuasive talk that generally means *to talk or behave like a child for persuasive purposes*" (original italics).[10] As *nê* is regarded as a typical UFP in Taiwan Southern Mǐn (cf. Chen 1989, I. Li 1999, etc.), my informants' judgment that "the *nê*-attached utterances sound more Southern-Mǐn accented" is not surprising. In contrast to *ê*, the UFP *nê* is initialed with a nasal sound. The "nasal style," according to Farris (1995: 16), is one of the very typical characteristics of *sajiao* in Taiwan. It is thus natural for Taiwan Mandarin speakers to associate this nasal-prefaced particle with connotations of *sajiao*.

[10] Yueh (2012: 185) indicates a typical feature for *sajiao*: the *wáwayīn* 'baby's voice'. She points out that this feature refers to specifically "a high-pitched, sharp, sweet, nasal way of talking."

As I did not find other instances of *nê* in the speech of speaker M in example (9), it is not easy to judge whether the language proficiency is the only reason that motivates her to use *nê*. However, from examples (10) and (11) we see that *ê* and *nê* are deployed interchangeably by the same speaker in the same type of context. Now let us go back to the question whether *ê* and *nê* are interchangeable for the speaker. What makes her/him decide which one to deploy when speaking Taiwan Mandarin? A possible answer can be found in the "markedness model" proposed by Myers-Scotton (1993). As she writes (1993: 75),

> [S]peakers have a sense of markedness regarding available linguistic codes for any interaction but choose their codes based on the persona and/or relation with others which they wish to have in place. This markedness has a normative basis within the community, and speakers also know the consequences of making marked or unexpected choices. Because the unmarked choice is 'safer' (i.e. it conveys no surprises because it indexes an expected interpersonal relationship), speakers generally make this choice. But not always. Speakers assess the potential costs and rewards of all alternative choices, and make their decisions, typically unconsciously.

As mentioned above, *nê* is generally regarded a typical Southern Mĭn UFP. It is also agreed that *nê* has a connotation of *sajiao*. The deployment of *nê* in Taiwan Mandarin can thus be regarded as a "marked choice," according to the general convention within the Taiwan Mandarin speech community. The deployment of *ê*, on the other hand, is an "unmarked" use in Taiwan Mandarin conversation. As Myers-Scotton (1999: 1270) claims, "speakers selecting marked choices are attempting to construct a new norm for the exchange—possibly with the hope that this new norm also will hold for future exchanges with the same participants and situational features." I thus argue that, by using *nê* in Taiwan Mandarin conversation, a speaker chooses an unexpected way to convey his/her communicative intention (consciously or unconsciously), for example, to express intimacy, or to show group solidarity/ ethnic identity (for example, to strengthen the identity of being a Taiwanese). [11]

[11] Regarding the Mandarin influence on Southern Mĭn, I have not found any instances of *ê* in Taiwan Southern Mĭn conversation.

7.5 Conclusion

In this chapter, I first discussed the possible reasons for the emergence of the three Taiwan Mandarin UFPs *la*, *a* and *ê* from the perspective of language contact. I posit that *la* is a result of lexical imposition (Chen 2011, Van Coetsem 1988) of Southern Mǐn on Taiwan Mandarin, whereas the UFP *a* is a relexified particle due to the influence of the Taiwan Southern Mǐn UFP *a*. The UFP *ê* has possibly been imported to Taiwan by Jiāng-Huái Mandarin speakers.

In addition to discussing the influence of Southern Mǐn and Jiāng-Huái Mandarin on Taiwan Mandarin, I have also explored the reverse influence, particularly, the influence of Mandarin on the use of the Southern Mǐn UFP *a*. Lastly, using *nê* as an example, I investigated the choice between two UFPs that are functionally identical in one type of context in a Taiwan Mandarin conversation.