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1. Introduction

Language is intimately related to culture, history, economic conditions, and particularly to political power. Language policy and political determinants often heavily influence the development of language. The island of Taiwan alone, has undergone three significant political and language shifts within the past two centuries: Japanese promotion under Japanese occupation (1895-1945), Mandarin promotion under the Kuomintang (KMT) Nationalist government rule (1949-1987) and, most recently, Taiwanese promotion under the Democratic Progressive Party (DPP) Taiwanese government rule (1987-Present). Although language changes on a national level usually have a political backdrop, the social and linguistic determinants, such as language contact, also contribute to the results of linguistic hybridization among its speakers.

In order to analyze and discuss the linguistic situation in Taiwan, one must first examine the languages at issue. Although Mandarin was previously and still is currently semi-standardized across the Taiwan straits, each region speaks its own local version of it, usually reflecting influence from the native dialects of the area. These regional variations of Mandarin are perhaps not even as great as the differences between British and American English, but are definable. For example, the typical version of Mandarin spoken in Taiwan exhibits four major differences from the Mandarin spoken in Beijing: 1) The retroflex series of initials has generally merged with the dental sibilants z-, c-, s-. 2) The retroflex -r suffix common in Beijing is rarely used in Taiwan. 3) The neutral tone is used much less often than in Beijing. 4) The third tone, which in Beijing falls sharply and then rises back up, tends in Taiwan to conclude as a “creaky” tone, i.e., at a speaker's lowest voice pitch, without rising. These characteristics are likely attributable, at least in part, to influence from the Taiwanese dialect widely spoken throughout
the Taiwan area. Apart from these four major differences, there are also some relatively minor vocabulary and grammatical differences between the Mandarin spoken in Taiwan and on the Chinese mainland.

For many years, under the KMT government, the Chinese dialects like Taiwanese and Hakka, as well as the aborigine languages, were discriminated against in Taiwan. In the process of ensuring that everyone mastered the common national language, Mandarin, the KMT government downplayed the importance of other dialects and languages. The benefit of this policy was the dismantling of language barriers between different linguistic and cultural groups; the drawback was the neglect of rich linguistic traditions. Taiwanese is still widely spoken in Taiwan today, especially outside of the Taipei area. On the other hand, Hakka appears far less common among younger generations, who favor Mandarin and/or Taiwanese. The “original people” of Taiwan, also known as Shandiren or Yuanzhumin in Mandarin, constitute less than 2% of the island’s population (roughly 400,000, out of a total population in Taiwan of 21.5 million). There are nine major tribal groups recognized today, all of whom live in the mountainous central and eastern regions of Taiwan, along with the tiny community of Yami who live on isolated Orchid Island. Many of their aboriginal tongues, such as the Pingpu language, now face extinction because of the language death occurring in younger generations who rarely learn these dying languages. Furthermore, due to historical and also current trend-setting and proximity reasons, Japanese has remained in existence within daily Mandarin and Taiwanese utterances. Historically and presently, Mandarin has adopted various Taiwanese and Japanese phrases and sayings, creating a version of Mandarin unique to Taiwan. Also, due to the rise in globalization, English has become increasingly prevalent in Taiwan schools and in Taiwanese society.

1 Perhaps more similar to the differences between Brazilian and Portuguese Portuguese.
This thesis aims to accomplish three main goals: 1) present a historical-political background to preface and explain the presence of various languages (dialects) in Taiwan, 2) examine language contact and language change in Taiwan as a result of political colonization, specifically the promotion of Japanese, Mandarin, and Taiwanese, respectively; 3) conclude by speculating about the direction of language development in Taiwan.

2. Historical-Political Background

The following sections examine the relationship between the KMT’s rule and its language policy on the one hand and the politics of the Taiwanese Language Movement on the other. Furthermore, this thesis also touches upon the ideology underlying claims about language embraced by different political camps, such as the Japanese government, the KMT and DPP. Language ideology is a cluster of beliefs held by a group and to their political, economic, and symbolic interests. Thus an analysis of language ideology will lead to a better understanding of social relationships in a specific society. Moreover, this thesis discusses the KMT government’s language policy, especially the policy after the government reconsolidated itself on the island in 1949 and examines the consequences of this policy, focusing on discussion on as what may be termed as the “Chinaization” ideology of this language policy. Examining the Taiwanese Language Movement which has been promoted in the last decade and its relations to the Taiwanese opposition against KMT dominance, this thesis also analyzes the ideology articulated by the promoters of this language movement that explains relationships between language, culture, and identity. Finally, it discusses the problem of the “nation-state model” of language planning, which is shared by the KMT’s language policy and shared by the Taiwanese Language Movement.
As R.D. Grillo (1989) indicates, a number of recent studies have shown that "any study of linguistic dominance, linguistic hierarchy and linguistic inequality is inevitably a political study..." As far as unequal relations among different languages are concerned, language is viewed as a "contested object," and the "politics of language is about conflict and struggle" (Grillo, 1989: 7, 17). Language planning efforts are relevant to fundamental processes of language change; governments regard language planning as a way to foster attachment to, and involvement in, the national system (Eastman 1983). Many have argued that Taiwan’s political climate has been the single most important influence in the language development, and due to dramatic changes since the mid-1980s, language policies and development have undoubtedly been overtly effected.

One of the most important consequences of Taiwan’s democratization is the Taiwanese Language Movement, which aims to revive this major "local language" and which symbolizes the recent, rapid growth of local identity awareness among the Taiwanese. The promoters of the movement reject the official definition of Taiwanese as a "dialect." For them, bilingual education and the establishment of a Taiwanese pronunciation and writing system are crucial to the rebirth of the language. The movement poses a threat to the status of Mandarin as a national language and the symbol of Chinese identity and political dominance of the KMT.

The language problem in Taiwan raises questions about the “nation-state model” which underlies much language policy and language planning (Wu 1997). In other words, underlying the call for linguistic homogeneity is the need to mobilize political support for the modern state; the promotion of the usage of an official language forms a major part of the attempt to homogenize the society and culture, to create a “national identity.” The nation-state model of language planning has become an essential principle of the modern state system. However, the
nation-state ideology underlying official language policy in a multiethnic and multilingual society like Taiwan has tended to result in linguistic oppression.

2.2 The promotion of Japanese during the Colonial Era

Defeated by the Japanese in the Sino-Japanese War, the Qing court turned Taiwan over to them in 1895 and Taiwan remained a Japanese colony until 1945. On the second day of the occupation the Taiwan General Government (T.G.G.) established a Bureau of Educational Affairs to which Izawa Shuji (伊澤修二) was appointed the head. Izawa announced that the first priority of Taiwanese education was to make the new citizens learn Japanese (Li C.1996a:115). However, resistance to formal education was high in the early part of the fifty years of Japanese rule, since prior to the Japanese occupation in 1895, Taiwan did not have an extensive public education system. To offer a slightly smoother transition to the locals, in the early years of Japanese occupation the medium of instruction was first instituted in the local dialects of Hakka and Taiwanese. Common schools offered a core of Japanese language and mathematics, some basic sciences, and a considerable amount of classical Chinese. Chinese was offered to attract students away from the popular private Chinese schools. However, the Japanese soon felt it was very important for the Taiwanese to learn the Japanese language so that they would feel a part of the Japanese empire. In 1903, the Japanese government decreed a ban on importation of Mainland Chinese books and magazines.

By 1920, the school-aged Taiwanese population in common school had increased to 25% (Tsurumi, 1979; Tsurumi, 1977). It was during the early 1920s that the policy of accommodation and gradual assimilation was officially changed to positive assimilation. Many common schools completely phased out classical studies. Taiwanese demanded more secondary and higher education, either in Taiwan or Japan. Therefore, traditional Chinese schools became
less attractive to the Taiwanese and many Taiwanese accommodated this change by taking Chinese lessons after attending a common school. In 1922, the Japanese language officially replaced Chinese as the official language of education in all schools and all reading and writing were taught in Japanese in the common schools. There became very few opportunities to become literate in Chinese because all printed material was in Japanese. Since written Japanese borrowed heavily from Chinese, the literate Japanese could understand some of the Chinese ideographs, and vice-versa, but pronunciation was different, as was usage. In the 1930s, the Japanese government instituted compulsory six-year Japanese education, which resulted in the sole usage of Japanese at all levels of school (Cheng, 1979).

In 1937, the T.G.G. completely banned Taiwanese and Classical Chinese in the public schools and thus teachers would punish all those who spoke Taiwanese in school. In 1939, government banned all the private schools where the Taiwanese people were formally educated in classical Chinese texts in Taiwanese (Ong S. 1995:126). During this period “the policy of spreading Japanese was related to colonization and the imposition of sovereign rule on another race; moreover this policy was not only one of administration and economics but of total assimilation of the Taiwanese. In order to be assimilated, education and the spreading of Japanese were indispensable” (Sugimoto 1971).

Below is a statistical chart of the percentage of the Taiwanese population able to comprehend Japanese during a forty-year span (from 1905 to 1944), as published by the colonial Taiwan General Government. It shows how successfully the Japanese language policy had been implemented: by 1944, 71% of the Taiwanese understood Japanese one year before the end of colonization.

Table 2.2. The Growing Percentage of Taiwanese Population Understanding Japanese (1905-1944) (Sugimoto 1971)
2.3 “Chinaizing Taiwan”: The promotion of Mandarin

Anticipating victory over Japan in World War II, the KMT government in China began planning to takeover Taiwan in 1944. After the end of World War II, the Allied Forces left the occupation of Taiwan to Chiang Kai-shek, who was still holding on to large parts of China with his Nationalist forces. The Taiwanese, who had been under Japanese rule from 1895 through 1945, initially welcomed the KMT forces, but their joy soon changed into sorrow and anger, when the new authorities invoked repressive acts towards the native Taiwanese.

There were many clashes between the Mainlanders (*waishengren*) and the Taiwanese (*benshengren*). Many Taiwanese were much more educated than the Mainlander, since the Mainlanders had been engaged in combat with the Japanese for many years. As a result of the fatigue and hatred resulting from years of war, the Mainlanders felt the Taiwanese were poisoned by Japanese education and needed to be completely re-educated (Cheng, 1979). Native Taiwanese skills at using Japanese were often ridiculed and their technical knowledge unappreciated. The Taiwanese, on the other hand, viewed the Mainlanders as backward and resented Mainlanders for their ignorance and for their ridicule of Taiwanese customs and language. This attitude of a native Taiwanese and Mainlanders split existed because although the Mainlanders were Chinese, they were still considered outsiders as Taiwan was not their home (Cheng, 1979). Only 15% of Taiwan’s population were Mainlanders and spoke Mandarin or other dialects. Of the remaining population on Taiwan, 71% originated from the Fujian province and spoke Taiwanese, while 12% were Hakka from Guandong or Fujian.
During the Civil War while the KMT and CCP were fighting for power, Chiang Kai-shek dispatched the head of the Taiwan Investigation Committee responsible for the planning of the takeover, General Chen Yi—who later became the first governor of Taiwan—to Taiwan to set up an interim government. Members of the Nationalist government immediately replaced Japanese administrators and teachers; as on the Mainland, Mandarin became the sole medium of instruction. Japanese was entirely forbidden and Japanese periodicals, movies, and radio broadcasts were banned. Essentially, the KMT regarded any use of Japanese as extremely unpatriotic by the KMT (Kubler, 1985). The demanding task faced by the KMT government was on the one hand to “de-Japanize” and on the other to “Chinaize” (中化) the people of the island. The re-socialization project relied heavily upon the promotion of the national language. In 1946, six months after the end of World War II, the Taiwan Provincial Committee for the Promotion and Propagation of the National Language, under the KMT government, initiated the National Language Movement on the island. Characteristic of the dual enterprise of “de-Japanization” and of “Chinaization,” the stated goals of the Committee were: 1) “to recover the Taiwanese dialect so as to enable the public to learn the national language by comparison between the dialect and the national language,” and 2) “to eradicate the influence of Japanese as reflected in the daily speech of the people,” (Tse, 1986).

On April 2, 1946, the KMT authorities on Taiwan announced a Mandarin Movement for the province and established a Committee for the Promotion of Mandarin. At the same time, the Republic of China government announced a set of “Means for the Implementation of Mandarin Promotion in all the Cities and Counties of Taiwan.” The six principles they decided upon were:

1. Implement the revival of the native languages of Taiwan and learn Mandarin from a comparison with other dialects.
2. Emphasize the reading pronunciation of the Chinese characters and from them infer the
Mandarin sound.
3. Sweep clean Japanese phraseology and read written Chinese directly in Mandarin so as to achieve the return of writings to their origins.
4. Study the contrast of the various word classes (in Mandarin), enrich the content of the language, and construct a newly-born national language.
5. Employ the Mandarin Phonetic Alphabet to bridge the gap to the will of the people to amalgamate it with Chinese culture.
6. Encourage people's attitudes toward learning and increase the efficiency of instruction.

(Chang, 1974, 51)

According to the goals of the Committee, it seemed that the KMT's language policy was one of “multilingualism,” since it was postulated upon the recovery of “the Taiwanese dialect.” The reality of the policy, however, was a strict monolingualism that promoted Mandarin as the national language. In 1946, schooling began to be conducted in Mandarin, and the government banned all Japanese columns in newspapers and magazines (Chen & Chen, 1989). Taiwanese intellectuals who were accustomed to Japanese information suffered a particularly hard blow as a direct result of this policy. Thus, one can argue that those generations who had received education in Japanese suddenly became “illiterate” under the rule of the new government. Some have attributed the vigor of the Mandarin campaign to the KMT's hatred of Japanese and their fear of allegiance to Japan and a fear of Taiwanese independence.

On February 27, 1947 a policeman of the Taiwan (Formosa) Monopoly Bureau saw a woman selling smuggled cigarettes on the streets of the capital, Taipei. When he tried to seize her tray and money, she pulled away, and he struck her a crashing blow on the head with his revolver butt. She died at his feet. An angry mob gathered, and the police shot into the crowd, killing one person and wounding others. Forthwith a year and a half of gathering hatred for an inefficient, autocratic, corrupt administration exploded into large-scale unarmed public protests against the repression and corruption of the KMT.

For some ten days, Chiang still on the mainland and his governor Chen Yi kept up the pretense of negotiations with leaders of the protest movement, but at the same time they sent
troops from the mainland. As soon as the troops arrived, they began rounding up and executing people, in particular scholars, lawyers, doctors, students and local leaders of the protest movement. In total between 18,000 and 28,000 people were killed. Thousands of others were arrested and imprisoned in the “White Terror” (白色恐怖時期) era which took place in the following decade. Many of these people remained imprisoned until the early 1980s. Until a few years ago, the events of 1947 were a taboo subject on the island. The KMT authorities did not want to be reminded of this blemish of their past, and the general population did not dare to speak out for fear of retribution by the KMT’s secret police.

The island-wide revolts, which came to be known as the “228” Taiwanese Uprising (二二八事件), ended with a massacre and ensuing decades of purge. These events resulted in constant hostility between the Taiwanese and Mainlanders. In fact, the Taiwan Independence Movement developed as a consequence of the Uprising. It is difficult to overestimate the influence of the Uprising on Taiwan’s politics, which in turn shaped the island’s linguistic ecology.

2.3.1 Ethnic Tensions between the Mainlanders and Native Taiwanese

Defeated by the CCP, the KMT central government fled to Taiwan in 1949 and the island remained under martial law until 1987. Relations between the Mainlanders and Taiwanese became highly uneasy after 1949, when a sudden influx of about two million Mainlander refugees followed. The KMT state reiterated that it was the single legitimate government of China and that the CCP was an “usurper.” The KMT aimed to “recover the mainland and liberate fellow countrymen,” but on the other hand, the KMT suppressed the Taiwanese opposition, especially any activity suspected of separatism.
In the dual context of the intense struggle between the states on both sides of the Taiwan Strait and the ethnic tension between the state and society within the island, the KMT government promoted Mandarin as a major instrument to achieve national unity and as a powerful weapon to destroy the Communist “bandits.” First, all non-Mandarin languages in Taiwan, including Taiwanese, Hakka, and aboriginal languages, were relegated to “dialects” by the KMT state, and the use of these “dialects” was considered a threat to national cohesion and unity. Only Mandarin was given the title of “language” and was recognized as the National Language or Guqyu. While this sort of ideology is neither foreign nor new in the history of modern Chinese nationalism, it was only in Taiwan, under these particular circumstances, that the KMT state possessed the capacity to turn the ideology into reality. The national language was regarded as the single official language of the Republic of China, to the extent that it was not just viewed as a standard language, a common norm, but an orthodoxy defended by the political hegemony. The government held Mandarin as the focal point of linguistic unity and ethnic harmony and served as the marker of KMT dominance.

The KMT’s regulation disallowing Taiwanese to organize any opposition party, or hold any national level elections, such as presidential and legislative elections and forbade the Taiwanese freedom of the press, represented obvious Taiwanese oppression. Public use of Taiwanese or Hakka was with few exceptions, and the government officially disallowed it in the military, schools, and government position (Cheng 1979). The Taiwan Provincial Government required that all civil servants speak Mandarin during office hours and also stipulated the “national language” as the language in the court of law. The KMT’s language ideology revealed itself through a variety of approaches, primarily through education and the media.

2.3.2 Educational Reform under the KMT
Recognizing the profound dissemination of Japanese indoctrination, the KMT government realized the importance of education as an effective means of re-socialization, nationalism, and unification. Hence, Chen Yi claimed that the teaching of Chinese history and Mandarin as the national language should play a central role in this educational project (Chen & Chen, 1989).

Since 1946, schooling had been conducted in Mandarin and in 1965, the government forbade students, especially those in elementary and high schools, to speak dialects in school. If they did, they were punished in various degrees. By contrast, the Mainlander students were normally free from this humiliation. Since Mandarin became a marker of Mainlander identity, Mainlander students were more willing to learn the language than the Native Taiwanese. In fact, Mandarin became regarded as their “new mother-tongue” regardless of province or area of the mainland from which their parents came. In the modern state, the educational system played a decisive role in the construction, legitimization, and imposition of an official language. By devaluing popular modes of expression and imposing recognition of the legitimate language, it fashioned similarities from which derives the community of consciousness, the cement of the nation (Bourdieu, 1991). In Taiwan, schools played this role rather successfully.

In September 1956, the National Taiwan Normal University established a Mandarin Education Center for training primary and secondary teachers to teach Mandarin. Beginning in 1958, all teacher training schools and colleges in Taiwan initiated periodic Mandarin proficiency testing for all their students and added a required examination in Mandarin, which must be passed in order to graduate. The promotion of Mandarin was quite successful and by July 1, 1959, the Committee for the Promotion of Mandarin was officially disbanded. However, shortly thereafter, in 1970, the Ministry of Education again revived efforts to promote Mandarin. The Ministry of Education announced the following six measures:
1. Immediately revive the Committee for the Promotion of Mandarin in The Ministry of Education to make unified plans and positively oversee the promotion work of the Mandarin committees at every level.

2. Increase funding for personnel in the Committee for the Promotion of Mandarin in the provincial capital and the chief cities of each county.

3. To achieve the goals of the Mandarin movement, we should start simultaneously from the following four aspects:
   a. Strengthen Mandarin education in the schools and cultivate Mandarin-teaching personnel.
   b. Strengthen Mandarin education in society and start supplemental education programs in the villages, in mines, factories, among adults in the aboriginal tribes, and for all those who lack formal schooling.
   c. Improve radio and television programs. The amount of foreign language and dialect programming should be decreased and Mandarin programs increased.
   d. Strengthen Mandarin education among the overseas Chinese; make use of textbooks, records, and films, etc. to promote Mandarin language abroad.

4. Ask the people's representatives to use Mandarin when speaking at conferences so as to increase its influence.

5. Require organizations, schools, offices, and all public areas to use Mandarin. Civil servants and, above all, teachers in the school should set an example for others.

6. To increase interest in speaking Mandarin, various kinds of contexts and activities should be employed that increase awareness among the people of the importance of speaking Mandarin.

(Taiwan Provincial Government, Government Information Office, 1975, 174-175).

2.3.3 Language regulation in the Media (Newspapers, Television, and Radio)

In 1948 to furthering the promotion of Mandarin, the Ministry of Education established the Mandarin Daily News, a newspaper printed in Chinese characters with the Zhuyin Fuhao phonetic alphabet printed alongside to aid reading among not only children, but to also foster accurate pronunciation among the natives.

The government regulations of language were not merely in printed media, but also in visual media. The KMT severely restricted the use of non-Mandarin languages on television,
which served as another major agent of socialization. In 1962, when the first television channel first operated, the KMT authorities limited non-Mandarin programs to less than 16% of the total broadcast time. However, Taiwanese programs became more and more popular despite restriction, simply because it was the mother tongue of the majority of the population. Thus, television stations sometimes ignored the restrictions and the number of Taiwanese programs reached their peak around 1971.

In response, the KMT further suppressed Taiwanese programs. In 1972, the Bureau of Culture of the Ministry of Education stipulated that non-Mandarin programs should be decreased, and that Taiwanese programs, which included soap operas, puppet shows, traditional Taiwanese operas, and commercials, should take up less than one hour per day on each channel. Moreover, the Radio and Television Law, enforced after 1976, specified: “The ratio of the use of the national language by radio broadcasts must not be less than 55%; for television, this ratio must not be less than 70%. The use of dialects should decrease year by year” (Hung, 1985). Those surviving traditional Taiwanese operas and puppet shows on television were forced to use Mandarin in the early 1970s. In 1976 Taiwanese programs broadcast on TV and radio were limited to 20% of the total number of programs. Moreover, budgeting constraints often caused the content and production of Taiwanese programs, to border “vulgar entertainment” when compared with Mandarin programs, because of their minimal resources. Thus, normally, the roles depicted in these programs were low socioeconomic status: the illiterate, peasants, workers, fishermen, and the like. Thus Taiwanese and the Taiwanese were represented by a most powerful agent of socialization as a marker of backwardness, vulgarity, ignorance, and so on.

The humiliating image of Taiwanese portrayed by television speaks volumes about the reality of Taiwanese on the island in the past century, as a consequence of the official language policy. First, the Taiwanese literary reading system, which had already been seriously
undermined under Japanese colonization, was on the edge of death because of the suppression of Taiwanese language education. As a result, traditional Taiwanese high culture meditated by this system, like the recitation of classical poems and essays in Taiwanese, had become nearly foreign to the younger generation of native Taiwanese. Taiwanese was reduced to a colloquial language which only dealt with daily affairs. Even its vocabulary about everyday life began decreasing and part of it has already been replaced by Japanese and Mandarin phrases (Hung, 1985). This led to the phenomenon of code-mixing, especially when new ideas and things, such as ‘computer network,’ ‘washing machine,’ ‘microwave,’ ‘hamburger’ were discussed. The more new ideas and things are dealt with, the more Mandarin was used (Yang, 1991). Taiwanese had gradually lost its basic function as a medium of cultural production and reproduction.

2.3.4 Factors contributing to the success of Mandarin promotion

Referring to the great success of promoting Mandarin and another dialect within a vast population whose first language is only remotely connected to the target language, Kubler (1985) concludes that organized promotion of a language by the government has a definitive effect on the development of a particular language, as he believes that Mandarin in Taiwan could not have gained such a prevalent status had it not been for governmental promotion.

Kubler also attributes socio-political factors to the promotion of Mandarin in Taiwan. When the Nationalist government moved to Taiwan in 1949, original Beijing Mandarin speakers were only a small percentage of the immigrants. They demonstrated a sharp contrast with the numerous Shanghainese speakers because the latter were politically and economically more powerful than the former. This social elite included the president and his cabinet, financial tycoons, and a large group of professors, teachers and publishers (Cheng 1985).
The greatest threat to Mandarin's status was Taiwanese, since it was the mother tongue of about 70% of the people on the island and many Taiwanese believed it to be the rightful official language, rather than Mandarin which was barely spoken in Taiwan prior to 1949. In fact, the Taiwanese opposition had used Taiwanese as an effective instrument to awaken ethnic consciousness and to mobilize support “bensheng pride” and speaking Taiwanese. This mobilization constituted a great domestic challenge to the dominance of the KMT state. As a result, any public encouragement of the use of Taiwanese could have been regarded as an anti-KMT action or even a sign of support for Taiwanese independence.

A second dimension of the KMT language ideology derives from the perception of Communist China as an external threat to the legitimacy of the KMT state. In addition to ethnic tensions that existed within the island, competition with the Communists for the legitimate representation of China had conditioned politics in Taiwan. In this regard, the usage of Mandarin as a national language became a testimony of the “Chineseness” of the KMT state. Although no longer asserting the “legitimate representation of China,” but rather “Taiwanese Independence,” the DPP governing Taiwan today shares this struggle, but now from a political and linguistic separatist stance.

2.3.5 Implications of successful Mandarin Promotion

A number of studies showed that before the mid-1980s, there was evidence of a decrease in usage of Taiwanese among younger benshengren, especially among the intellectual stratum. According to Wei-jen Hung’s fieldwork, the younger a Taiwanese was, the less his or her ability to speak the mother tongue (Hung, 1992a.). In addition, Hsuan-fan Huan’s study found 1) that the younger the people to whom the Taiwanese college students speak with, the larger the number of those who use Mandarin, and 2) that the use of the national language is the first
choice in their social activities (Huang, 1988). An example of the consequence of KMT monolingualism was the fact that, in 1987, when the political atmosphere began to change dramatically, television stations could not find any qualified Taiwanese newscasters when they tried to add a short Taiwanese news segment to their shows. In 1992 television programs were further restricted to 10% of the total number of television shows aired. (Li C.1996b).

Secondly, a linguistic hierarchy was established when Taiwanese was devalued as a “dialect.” As previously stated, it was associated with backwardness, crudeness, illiteracy, low socio-economic status, rurality, and so forth. In contrast, Mandarin as the national “language” represented modernity, refinement, literacy, urbanity, high socio-economic status, and so on. The linguistic hierarchy corresponded to the ethnic one in the political arena: Mainlanders as the dominant and Taiwanese as the dominated.

By 1991 Taiwan’s Mandarin-speaking population was at 90% (Huang 1993). Kang (1996) surveyed the students in the mother tongue classes in Taipei County and found that most parents spoke Mandarin rather than the mother tongues to their children. On average, nearly 72% of language use at home was Mandarin. I use a table to show the situation below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Language</th>
<th>Father to child</th>
<th>Mother to child</th>
<th>Between siblings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mandarin</td>
<td>66.5%</td>
<td>69.7%</td>
<td>79.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taiwanese</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>14.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hakka</td>
<td>2.4%</td>
<td>2.5%</td>
<td>1.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Austronesian</td>
<td>0.7%</td>
<td>0.7%</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others*</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
<td>3.4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Parents deceased or no siblings

In sum, the promotion of Mandarin as the national language by the KMT state on the island revolved around the state’s enterprise of “Chinaizing” both itself and the Taiwanese: to claim that the island represented “an integral part of China,” to legitimize its rule, and to justify
itself as a representative of China. To achieve this goal, the government disciplined the local languages, especially Taiwanese. Until recent years, the KMT’s policy of promoting Mandarin as the single politically legitimate language remained unchanged.

2.4 The Taiwanese Language Movement

The contemporary native political movement was initiated in the second half of 1980s. The leader of the KMT, President Chiang Ching-kuo, the son of former leader Chiang Kai-shek, died in 1988. His Vice President, Lee Teng-hui, who was born in Taiwan and was generally regarded as a Taiwanese, succeeded Chiang and became the first Taiwanese president who served from 1988 to 2000.

Lee used to claim that, "the KMT was a foreign regime." He proposed to allow the foreign KMT become a native KMT for the Taiwanese. Due to his policy of "Taiwanization," some radically conservative KMT members in 1993 resigned from the KMT and organized the Chinese New Party (CNP) (新黨) in 1993. As stated in the manifesto of CNP: "The New Party affirms the goals of our nation’s Founding Father Dr. Sun Yat-sen, to preserve national unity." The unification between Taiwan and China was thus the goal of the CNP.

Generally speaking, there are three main political parties in Taiwan, which represented three different ideologies and attitudes toward national status, at the end of twentieth century. First, there is the Taiwanese party, the DPP, which regards itself as an identity for Taiwanese and is the promoter of Taiwanese independence, who wish to build the "Republic of Taiwan." Second, there is the KMT party, which represents the identity of both Taiwanese and Chinese, and supports of the "Republic of China on Taiwan." The numbers of supporters of those three parties were reflected in the percentage of total votes each party received in the Legislative Election of December 1998. DPP received 29.55%, KMT 46.39%, and CNP 7.05%.
The Taiwanese opposition movement has developed rapidly since the mid-1980s. Encouraged by this development, the Taiwanese Language Movement emerged in the late 1980s and the use of Taiwanese came to symbolize political discontent and ethnic loyalty. Although not clearly articulated by a single leader, the general goal of the Taiwanese Language Movement has been to rejuvenate the language. The efforts to achieve this goal involve 1) the re-evaluation of Taiwanese linguistic quality and cultural significance based on a comparison between Taiwanese and Mandarin; 2) the advocacy of bilingual, or even multilingual, education; and 3) the establishment of a Taiwanese pronunciation symbol and writing system. All of these efforts are intended to undermine the dominance of Mandarin and to challenge the KMT's “Chinaization” (中國化) of Taiwan. The movement can be viewed as an enterprise for “Taiwanizing” (台灣化) the island.

A strong opponent of the movement is the development of local identity, as suggested by the promoters’ view on the relationship between language and culture. For them, language serves as a carrier of culture, and the decline of a language symbolizes the atrophy of a specific cultural tradition on which one's ethnic identity hinges. Wei-jen Hung (1992) goes to the extreme to argue that “for the Taiwanese, Mandarin is equal to a “foreign language” and that the “local languages” on the island are the single media by which Taiwanese particularities can be expressed.” Traditional Taiwanese culture, Hung also notes, had declined, and “it has been assimilated and replaced by Northern Chinese culture which is represented by Mandarin” (Hung, 1992a: 24). Such awareness of the decline of local tradition suggests the awakening of ethnic consciousness. In this regard, Chi-tun Hsu (1992) is more radical than Hung. He rejected the notion that “Taiwanese literature is part of Chinese literature” and asserts that “literature in Taiwan should be developed in the Taiwanese language.” He believes that Taiwan has its own
particular history and has developed a society and culture distinct from that of the mainland. In these discourses about Taiwanese language, culture, and history, one notes that historical relationships between China as the core and Taiwan as the periphery have been reversed. The island is constantly “Taiwanized” to such a degree that a specific cultural tradition, which some believe to be different from Chinese culture, is constructed, despite the close connection between China and the island throughout history. The constructed cultural tradition justifies the development of local identity, and this identity in turn confirms the constructed tradition.

Bilingual education has been viewed as an effective way to revive Taiwanese. In 1989, candidates from the DPP, listed bilingual education as part of their platform. Seven of them were elected and tried to conduct bilingual education in the elementary and junior high schools of their districts. However, because the city and county councils were controlled by the KMT, the budget for their efforts was cut.

While the attempt to carry out bilingual education in the end of the 1980s failed, the promotion of the use of Taiwanese had already led to a “revival” of the language: Taiwanese theatre and films reappeared; Taiwanese pop songs flourished; a number of writers tried expressing themselves in Taiwanese; many university students organized Taiwanese associations; some Taiwanese dictionaries, studies and magazines were published, etc. In fact, a few promoters believe that bilingual education is insufficient. Instead, they argue that the Hakka and aboriginal peoples should also enjoy the right to receive education in their mother tongues. Thus advocates such as Wei-jen Hung call multilingual education “local language education,” regarding it as an effective means to develop local identity and as the most important basis on which “local autonomous cultural progress” can be achieved (Hung, 1992a).

Aside from a literature movement of the 1990’s there is another battlefield: the vernacular education movement. Since the 1980s, the Taiwanese have shown concern about the
need for vernacular education; they have become aware that they have been losing their vernacular languages, and some have protested against the monolingual Mandarin-only policy. Several organizations devote themselves to the vernacular languages movement, including the Taiwanese Writing Forum organized in 1991, Yam Poetry Club, 1991, Association of Taiwanese Languages, 1991, Students Taiwanese Promotion Association, 1992, Taiwanese Promotion Association, 1995 and Taiwanese Casual Report, 1996. These organizations have demanded the right to use Taiwanese in public places, including the mass media, and the right to carry out vernacular education.

Several counties governed by the then opposition DPP began to compile vernacular teaching materials and conduct mother tongue education. The most remarkable milestone was achieved on January 9, 2000, when the conservative Ministry of Education, following a vocal demonstration by a coalition of Taiwanese language activists, decided to make it compulsory for primary school children to learn one of Taiwan’s native languages starting in 2001. Beginning the next academic year, first- through sixth-graders in the country’s primary schools will have to spend one or two hours a week learning vernacular languages, in addition to Mandarin (Taipei Times, January 9, 2000); this is still far from the ideal but certainly represents an improvement, in their opinion.

2.5 The “Problematic” Nation-State Model

The Chinese National Language Movement, which emerged at the beginning of the twentieth century, represented efforts to establish a modern Chinese state. As Er-min Wang notes, modern Chinese language reform, which preceded the National Language Movement, was stimulated by China’s weakness and the foreign threat in the late nineteenth century. Linguistic
engineering was intended to save the country, and the concept of a national language closely related to Chinese nationalism (Wang, 1982).

The KMT state in Taiwan embraced the idea of the Chinese National Language Movement. Confronted with internal and external challenges to its legitimacy, the KMT state tried to portray itself as the single heir to traditional Chinese culture. As previously stated, the enterprise of “Chinaizing” the island politically, socially, and culturally can be regarded as an effort to legitimate the rule and to mobilize Taiwanese support in the struggle with Communist China. The promotion of Mandarin formed a major part of this enterprise and showed the interest of the KMT state in what Grillo refers to it as “ethnicizing itself.” The KMT state “nationalized” itself to such an extent that the nation is “statisized”: the “traditional Chinese culture” was appropriated, one might even say monopolized, by the KMT state. The state regarded itself as a “guardian of Chineseness” and thus any exaltation of local culture on the island, especially the promotion of the use of Taiwanese, tended to be viewed as a potential threat to “Chineseness,” to the state’s legitimacy. The KMT state, the Chinese nation, Chinese culture, and Mandarin were all identified with one another. The enactment of the nation-state model as a solution to the problem of political unity culminated in the KMT’s “Chinaization” endeavor.

The Taiwanese Language Movement faces a problem similar to that inherent in the nation-state model of language policy. A number of studies about language problems in different societies have pointed out this fact: “Movements to save minority languages ironically are often structured around the same received notions of languages that have led to their oppression and/or suppression…” (Woodward & Schieffelin, 1994: 9). The Taiwanese Language Movement is precisely characterized by this irony.
Like many other post-colonial places in the world, Taiwan is a multiethnic and multilingual society. The problem faced by the Taiwanese Language Movement thus derives from the idea that “every minority has its own minorities.” A movement intended to save a minority language may turn out to be a new form of oppression that threatens other minority languages. The Taiwanese Language Movement only acutely feels this dilemma, since speakers of this language are actually the majority of the population. In this sense, the dilemma felt by a minority language movement is very similar to that inherent in the practice of the national language ideology, i.e. “whether language can be politically instrumentalized without becoming a means of suppression and making it ever more difficult for different language groups to live together peacefully” (Coulmas, 1988:12). The weakness of the national language ideology and a minority language movement is strongly related to political mobilization based on ethnic identity. Any drawing of clear boundaries implies labeling, exclusion, and suppression. The problem is how people of diverse ethnic groups can unite at a time when they are becoming so aware of their separate ethnic backgrounds. This is a dilemma inherent in the construction of the nation-state, namely, how to balance national identity (cohesion) with ethnic equality (multilingualism and multiculturalism).

After the identification as a Taiwanese nation during the era of the Japanese occupation, came an era of confused identity (i.e., Taiwanese consciousness versus Chinese consciousness). This was mainly caused by the new immigrants who came into Taiwan along with Chiang around 1949, and most of them still identify themselves as Chinese nowadays. In addition, the KMT’s sinization of Taiwan also played an important role in the construction of national identity. More than one million (Huang 1993: 25) solders and refugees, who currently make up 13% of Taiwan's population, came to Taiwan along with the KMT regime around 1949, while the Mainland China was under the control of the CCP. According to Hu-chhiong Ong (1993),
54% of Mainlanders identified themselves as Chinese, only 7.3% identified themselves as Taiwanese, and the rest are neutral. In other words, even in the recent present, most of those Mainlanders still identify themselves as Chinese.

Differences of opinion about national identity cause some people to express themselves virulently on the question of language. However, the pluralization of society in Taiwan makes the problem increasingly difficult to resolve. Hsuan-fan Huang, in a recent survey, discovered that in both city and countryside, a common form of language usage is a combination of Mandarin and Taiwanese, perhaps also Hakka, and even Japanese and English.

In short, the people of Taiwan today remain divided on the view of themselves and their political affiliation and ethnicity. Their diversity of national identity has not only affected political issues regarding Taiwan’s national status, but also cultural and linguistic issues, evidenced by politically instituted language policies and natural language contact.

Virtually everywhere, language policy conflicts are fueled by a politics of identity in which rhetorical strategies are deployed on behalf of two competing public values: national unity and equality. One of the primary preconditions of contemporary language policy conflicts. Before a state can experience conflict over language policy, it must have multiple languages within its jurisdiction, as evidenced in Taiwan’s historical and present linguistic situation and language policy towards Japanese, Mandarin, and Taiwanese under the respective governments.

However, despite political language polities, language contact is exceedingly omnipresent facts of life in many countries of the world, particularly between Mandarin and Taiwanese in Taiwan today. Through contacts with members of other languages or dialects, people incorporate new words and language rules into their own tongues and/or adopt other people’s languages (in part or sometimes in whole) as their own. These adaptations result in changes to what linguists refer to as the corpus and the status of the affected languages (Schmidt 2000:39).
The corpus of the language refers to its “body” (i.e. vocabulary, spelling, meanings, pronunciation, rules of grammar, etc.), while its status is related to the language’s prestige and prevalence of use in the various linguistic domains of a given society (Fishman, 1972). Therefore, in order to analyze the linguistic situation in Taiwan today, one must not only take into consideration the historical influences of language in present-day Taiwan, but also the current language contact occurring and its specific linguistic entities, which is consequently discusses in the following section.

3. Linguistic analysis of language contact in Taiwan

As mentioned in the preceding historical political background sections, immediately after the Japanese surrendered in 1945, and people of Chinese ethnicity regained Taiwan, the government evoked strong Mandarin promotion policies, which ultimately became a monolingualism of the official language, Mandarin, until the recent decade where the DPP has begun advocating and promoting “Mother-tongue” (母語) education campaigns. However, because the KMT had been in power for over 40 years, mainstream society still operates heavily in Mandarin, out of habit and an educationally more developed ability in Mandarin than Taiwanese, since Mandarin was the official education language as well. Therefore, the discussion of linguistic hybridization looks at Mandarin as the mainstream and borrower and Japanese and Taiwanese as the languages in which it borrows from.

The so-called “contact theory” is the fundamental framework for the linguistic analysis portions of this thesis because the external factors of language change which are initiated by language contact are no less important than its internal factors. As Rickford (1987) explains, from the perspective of current sociolinguistic theory, the study of language and dialects in
contact is important for our understanding of the mechanics of, and motivation for, synchronic variation and diachronic change. There is a general consensus that intensive language contact is a powerful external promoter of language change (Silva-Corvalan 1994).

Khin-Hoann Li (2000) adapted the ten possible language contact types defined by Ehlich (1994) into the eight he found applicable to China and Taiwan's linguistic history and current situation:

1) There is exchange in border regions of language A and B which could result in a large variety of individual bilingualism or a mixed language.

2) **Sporadic contact**: Language contact is necessitated by trade in its elementary form and could result in a pidgin.

3) **Intrusion**: A massive movement from country A to B.
   a) The expansion of a religion. The agents of religion make use of the newly introduced language; laymen participate in a passive manner and only marginally. Some examples are Buddhism in China, use of Latin in the Catholic Church in Europe, and use of the Amoy Bible translation in the Taiwan Presbyterian Church.
   b) Contact is brought about by immigration into country B, and could result in total individual loss of language A and very good acquisition of language B.

4) **Aggression**: the case of martial contact of A with B, resulting in the language of the victor being forced upon the defeated. This could result in language supremacy in which the invader's imposition is continued to the point of elimination of language B, e.g., Mandarin speakers in Tibet. Another possible result is the formation of a mixed language with language A's prestige dominant over and intake from language B, e.g., Taiwan Mandarin with Taiwanese features in Taipei.

5) **Ingression**, the case of colonization: Colonizers from area A remain in area B and establish political and economic institutions, e.g., Japanese and Mandarin in Taiwan. This results in colonial supremacy and leads to a specific type of language, Creole.

6) **Imprehension**: language intake in a narrow sense of the word. For example, kanji in Japan.

7) **Implantation**: the recruiting of whole immigration groups (e.g., recruiting of foreign workers) from country A to B such as Cantonese or Japanese in Hawaii. This results in group bilingualism and language loss for the subsequent generations.

8) **Intection**: the case of a new institutional or political superstructure being laid over both language A and B, e.g., Japanese and Mandarin over Austronesian, Taiwanese and Hakka. The genuine language option in the case of intection is a developed multilingualism and multiculturalism.
In Taiwan's case, for the contact of Amoy and Taiwanese, Type 3a (Intrusion) is the nearest category. The contact of Japanese and Taiwanese, and of Mandarin and Taiwanese, both fall into Type 5, ingestion, a type of colonization, as well as into Type 4, aggression, a case of martial contact.

Furthermore, language contact that is enforced by deliberate language policy and language planning leads to language shift, pidginization, creolization or even language death. As Labov notes:

> it is well known that catastrophic events have played a major role in the history of all languages, primarily in the form of population dislocation: migrations, invasions, conquests, and massive immigrations. Other abrupt political changes have led to alterations in the normative structure of the speech community, with radical substitutions of one prestige norm for another, and consequent long-term effects on the language” (Labov 1994:24).

Language changes caused by colonial language policies in Taiwan are such catastrophic changes. As mentioned earlier, Japanese and Mandarin were introduced to Taiwan by the colonial, political powers from Japan and Mainland China respectively, with overwhelming influence on Taiwanese speech and writings. Most Taiwanese writers wrote in Japanese in the Japanese colonial era, and wrote in Mandarin in the Chinese colonial era. Only a few of them endeavored to write in Taiwanese as a way of resistance.

From 1895 to the present, there were three occurrences of politically induced language contacts in Taiwan. The first one was language contact with a language which belongs to a totally different family, Japanese. The second contact was with a distinct language in the same language family, Mandarin. The third contact is with Taiwanese back with Mandarin and with Japanese remnants in both Taiwanese and Mandarin.

It is evident that language contact in Taiwan has been very extensive and intensive. As a result, many lexical substrata have been identified by linguists (Norman 1988). While language
users are not aware of this foreign origin, they are conscious of contemporary loanwords. As Koeh states:

Local layers include the Austroasiatic layer, the Austronesian layer, Archaic Chinese, and Classical Chinese. The non-local layers include the church register, Japanese loanwords, and the Mandarin loanwords. There are also loanwords from other foreign languages, such as Dutch and English. Taiwanese has so many layers that it has become a language like the typical Taiwanese nine-layer cake” (Koeh 1935:121).

According to Gao & Liu (1958), there are only 1266 loanwords including 40% of Japanese graphic loans (i.e., words borrowed from Japanese through the Chinese characters) into modern Mandarin. The low borrowing rate suggests that Mandarin is a homogeneous type of language or that Mandarin has experienced a lower degree of contact. I hypothesize that Taiwanese is not as conservative as Mandarin in terms of adaptability of loanwords. Like Japanese or English, it is a heterogeneous type of language which has high percentage of loanwords.

Other manifestations of language contact include Borrowing, Loan Words (LW) Code-Switching (CS), and Code-Mixing (CM), which are discussed in further detail in the following sections.

3.1 **Borrowing**

3.1.1 **Definition of borrowing**

Hock and Joseph provide a basic definition of borrowing as “the adoption of individual words or even of large sets of vocabulary items from another language or dialect” (Hock and Joseph 1996:253). Haugen defines borrowing as “the attempted reproduction in one language of patterns previously found in another” (Haugen 1972:81), where reproduction refers to the creation of a new form in the recipient language on the model of a form in the source language. In other words, if a speaker of language A reproduces new linguistic patterns, not in the context
of the language in which he or she learned them, but in the context of language B, he or she may be said to have "borrowed" them from language A to language B. Hansell (1989:18) adapts Haugen's definition so that it will fit the purely lexical area: lexical borrowing is the attempted reproduction in one language of signs previously found in another.

3.1.2 Types of borrowing

Bloomfield (1933) distinguishes dialect borrowing, where the borrowings are from within the same language (i.e. Mandarin and Taiwanese), and cultural borrowing (i.e. Japanese or English with Mandarin), where the borrowings are from a different language. This distinction, he argued is relative since there is no absolute distinction to be made between dialect boundaries and language boundaries. Besides, Weinreich (1953) claimed that the mechanisms of interference, abstracted from the amount of interference, would not be different whether the contact is between two different languages from different families or two different dialects or two sub-varieties of the same language. Bloomfield also distinguishes between ordinary cultural borrowing and intimate borrowing which occurs when two languages are spoken in what is topographically and politically a single community resulting from conquest or migration. Based on such a distinction, the borrowings occurring between Taiwanese or Mandarin with English and that of Taiwanese and Mandarin with Japanese should fall into separate categories, with the former as an example of cultural borrowing, and the latter of intimate borrowing. Likewise, borrowings that occur between Mandarin and Taiwanese also fit into the intimate borrowing group.

Hansell (1989) uses Bloomfield's terms "cultural contact" and "intimate contact" to categorize language contact slightly differently. He believes that cultural contact is language contact that results from cultural diffusion but does not require widespread bilingualism; in
contrast, intimate contact is characterized by widespread societal bilingualism, and by the wide
variety of functions that both languages are used. As a matter of fact, in Taiwan, the borrowing
phenomenon happens not only from the upper language (i.e., Mandarin) to the lower language
(i.e., Taiwanese), but also takes place the other way around (Hansell 1989, Kubler 1985, Wei
1984, Cheng 1985 & 1997). Nevertheless, some do not agree with the distinction that
Bloomfield and Hansell make between culture and language because they believe that language
contact is also culture contact. Thus, an intimate contact cannot solely be a language contact
and not a culture contact.

With respect to borrowing, Thomason & Kaufman (1988:74-6) use intensity of contact
as a measure of borrowing scale. They provide five types of contact in terms of intensity of
contact: 1) Casual contact which only undergoes lexical borrowing on the content word level. 2)
Slightly more intense contact which involves some function words (e.g., conjunctions,
adverbials). 3) More intense contact: more function words (e.g., prepositions and postpositions),
derivational affixes, inflectional affixes, pronouns, numerals, and minor structural features. 4)
Strong cultural pressure: moderate structural borrowing. 5) Very strong cultural pressure: heavy
structural borrowing. From Thomason and Kaufman's intensity theories, one can breakdown
the language contact between Japanese, Mandarin, and Taiwanese even further and support the
claim that besides government instituted language policies, natural language contact also
significantly influences the composition of the language. Since Taiwan's population consists of
speakers who have undergone the politically instituted language policies of monolingual
education in either Japanese and Mandarin respectively and those native Taiwanese who
continue to speak Taiwanese as a mother-tongue at home or to non-Mandarin speaking elders,
in any given instance of interaction or verbal communication within or across these linguistic
groups, relate to the level of intensity and thus the extent and magnitude of linguistic influence.
3.1.3 Lexical borrowing

Since languages and dialects do not exist in a vacuum, the languages their speakers come in contact with others. A very common result is lexical borrowing—the incorporation of foreign features into the native language by speakers of that language: the native language is maintained but is somewhat changed by the addition of the incorporated features.

Weinreich (1974) lists six reasons for lexical borrowing: 1) The designative inadequacy of a vocabulary in naming new things; that is, the need to designate new things, persons, places, and concepts. 2) Low frequency of words. 3) For resolving the clash of homonyms. 4) A constant need for synonyms. 5) Insufficiently differentiated in some semantic fields. 6) Prestige of social value.

In considering the structure of a language, the vocabulary of a language is considered less restrictively structured than syntax or morphology, making it more liable to be borrowed. Therefore, in a borrowing situation the first foreign elements to enter the borrowing language are typically lexical items. There appears to be a hierarchy of borrowing, as Hock and Joseph (1996) note that “the most successful resistance to borrowing is offered by basic vocabulary, words referring to the most essential human activities, needs, etc. such as *eat, sleep, moon, rain, do, have, be,* or function words essential in syntax, such as the demonstrative pronouns *this and that,* the definite article *the,* or conjunctions like *and, or, if,* and *when.*” They also note that, “although verbs are borrowed more easily than basic vocabulary, they nevertheless are not as readily borrowed as nouns...and the relative resistance of verbs and especially of basic vocabulary does not mean that they are impervious to borrowing.” Finally, they conclude that other most commonly borrowed words are “names for new artifacts and cultural items which are subject to
frequent change.” In other words, when the need arises, such as technological advances or inventions, etc. new words are created to accommodate.

The theory which stresses the general importance of social factors of language contact dates back to the 1930s. The first relevant statement was made by Valentin Kiparsky in a comment to Vocadlo's 1938 paper Some Observations on Mixed Languages With reference to lexical borrowing, Kiparsky asserted that, “the ability of the so-called 'homogeneous' languages to receive borrowing depends not on the linguistic structure of the language, but on the politico-social position of the speakers” (Kiparsky 1938:176, cited by Thomason and Kaufman 1988).

The structure of a language, as Rayfield (1970) notes, is not the most decisive reason for lexical borrowing, as he claims that the structural differences between the borrowing and source languages are relatively unimportant when compared to cultural and individual factors. Scotton and Okejji (1973) claim that the type of cultural contact serves as the primary variable in determining the amount and type of borrowing. In other words, one can argue that lexical borrowing does not depend on the character of the grammatical structure of the languages in contact, but rather on a series of factors of a social nature. Although affected by political shifts, on the individual rather than national level, a series of factors of a social nature appear to play a significant role as well. Thomason & Kaufman (1988) to build up a framework for contact-induced change in their book Language Contact, Creolization, and Genetic Linguistics argue that “it is the sociolinguistic history of the speakers, and not the structure of their language, that is the primary determinant of the linguistic outcome of language contact” (Thomason & Kaufman 1988:35).

The language contact situation in Taiwan supports the above theories. Although Japanese and Chinese are partially similar with respect to written characters, pronunciation and grammar generally differ. However, the existence of such similarity does not serve as the
purpose or motivation for the borrowing to occur, but rather, it is due to the political shifts and government induced language policies and thus language contact that produced extensive borrowing between the two languages. With respect to Mandarin and Taiwanese, it is a fact that they are more similar than Mandarin and Japanese are since they belong to the same general language family, however, syntactic and phonological differences still widely exist. As with Japanese, the borrowing occurring between Mandarin and Taiwanese, however, does not result from linguistic similarity, but rather stems from political promotion and social interaction.

3.2 Loanwords

Loanwords are the aliens in the lexicon. They appear marked as code-switching or code-mixing upon initial contact, and then they become borrowed loanwords, which are finally relexified into the local layer of the borrowing language.

Weinreich distinguishes lexical interferences as a) simple words: outright transfer and extensions of native words on the basis of foreign models, and b) compound words and phrases: 1) transfer of analyzed compounds; 2) reproductions in terms of equivalent native words, including loan translations, loan renditions, and loan creations; 3) hybrid compounds.

Another considerable type of loan word is return loanwords, which are words that have been borrowed and then returned to the original language. For example, Japanese loanwords which originally were borrowed from classical Chinese, and were then borrowed into modern Taiwanese or Mandarin again. Liu (1995) referred to them as “round-trip diffusion via Japanese,” whereas Masini (1993) distinguished them as simply “return loans.”

3.2.1 Loanwords during the Chinese and Japanese Eras
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There were many pseudo-Mandarin loanwords in the Japanese era, a phenomenon consistent with the fact that writers of that era were able to read classical Chinese in Taiwanese pronunciation. Most writers of the current, younger generation have lost this capability as they were educated in Mandarin and studied classical Chinese in Mandarin. Therefore, contemporary Taiwanese are obligated to code-switch to Mandarin whenever the need to use classical Chinese arises. Even so, classical Chinese vocabulary does not show up often in the writing of the second era novelists. In contrast, an increase of Mandarin loanwords is evidence of the impact of the Mandarin-only policy even on the conscious resisters.

Obviously, the sense of mission of language revitalization and Taiwanese cultural nationalism drove the novelists in the second era to resist Mandarin loanwords in their writing. It is also suspected that the purism of the novelists also had a strong impact in their writings. Some writers in the second era, like Beng-jin Tan, attempted to use Japanese loanwords to emphasize the difference between Taiwanese and Mandarin, or to imply that Taiwanese are not Chinese. The same sentiment also appeared in 1947 when the "228" Massacre occurred. During the fighting, many Taiwanese deliberately spoke Japanese. They were perhaps eager to show that there were clear-cut features that distinguish Taiwanese from Chinese.

3.2.2 Japanese Loanwords

Hansell observes that Japanese loanwords enter Taiwanese through two parallel routes: phonetic loans and graphic loans; resulting in doublets in each case. The most frequent form of adaptation concerns the phonetic shape of the foreign term. The phonetic shape of the word is determined by its own phonetic system, regardless of the phonetic shape of the word in the borrowing language. Some phonetic loans survive until the present day, a phenomenon which tends to be more common with words related to food, new fashion trends (music, dance,
clothing), and of course just some miscellaneous ones as well. One hypothesis behind the survival of these words is that it incorporates a notion of a covert prestige in keeping and speaking these words as noticeably foreign or borrowed words, or simply that it is the first stage of initial step for borrowing. Another hypothesis is that when a lexical item is borrowed through reproduction of a written signifier it can adopt both the meaning and the written form of the foreign term. Graphic loans however, are only possible if the two languages share the same ideographic writing system, like Chinese and Japanese do (partially). The relationship between the semantic content and the graphic shape of the words need not be mediated by the phonemic shape. Overall, around 850 Japanese graphic loans currently exist in Chinese (Masini 1993:148).

To help the reader better understand the borrowing phenomenon, I have included the following examples:

In (1), the concept of “gas” has been first borrowed from English by the Japanese through katakana (Japanese Romanization for foreign words). Chinese then borrowed the Japanese phonetic loan and adopted it to suit both a Taiwanese and Mandarin pronunciation of the word, as seen in (1a) and (1b). Then, Chinese characters were also assigned to represent the concept, (1c), which transforms the word into a graphic borrowing, because it is Chinese characters based on written Japanese. It is important to note that the sequence of borrowing is from English to Japanese to Taiwanese and finally to Mandarin, because it shows the language contact situation in Taiwan very clearly, with Taiwanese interacting with the Japanese people, making such a borrowing, and when Mandarin speakers subsequently arrive on Taiwan, they modify the word to fit their pronunciation.
Another example of a similar borrowing is shown with the word English loan of *club*, as in nightclub, not the stick-like object. However, in this case, the sequence is slightly different and allows for the word to become not only a phonetic borrowing but also a graphic one. (2) becomes (2a) through a phonetic loan because the Taiwanese mimic the Japanese pronunciation of the English word through a Taiwanese spin. Characters are assigned like with (1) and most loan words, usually with a strong phonetic element, but also with an equally strong semantic equivalence like in (2b) which maintains a close phonetic pronunciation, but the characters of a “倶” meaning *full*, “樂” meaning *happiness* and “部” meaning *assembly* combine to convey the meaning of “place full of happiness,” which is essentially the meaning or purpose of what a club is like. A graphic loan also takes places because after assigning Chinese characters to the word, the Taiwanese pronunciation changes to give the Chinese characters a Japanese reading to represent *club* rather than its initial phonetic borrowing of the Japanese pronunciation.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Japanese</th>
<th>Taiwanese pronunciation</th>
<th>Chinese characters</th>
<th>Taiwanese reading</th>
<th>Mandarin reading</th>
<th>English gloss</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(2) kurabu</td>
<td>(2a) khu-la2-buh (2b) 部樂</td>
<td>(2c) ku-lok8-pou7</td>
<td>(2d) ju4le4bu4</td>
<td>club</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

From the Japanese colonial era, often items relating to everyday life, such as (3) through (7) were readily borrowed and used.

---

2 The Romanizations are in the Taiwanese system, because the Hanyu Pinyin used to Romanize Mandarin cannot accurately represent Taiwanese phonetics.

3 Romanization of Chinese words throughout this thesis are usually based on the Hanyu Pinyin system.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Romanization</th>
<th>characters</th>
<th>Pronunciation</th>
<th>Pronunciation</th>
<th>gloss</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(3) bentoo</td>
<td>便當</td>
<td>pian3-tong</td>
<td>bian4dang1</td>
<td>lunch box</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(4) ryooli</td>
<td>料理</td>
<td>liau7-li2</td>
<td>liao4li3</td>
<td>cuisine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(5) obasan</td>
<td>歐巴桑</td>
<td>ou2-ba2-san7</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>old women(add)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(6) ojisan</td>
<td>歐吉桑</td>
<td>ou2-ji2-san7</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>old men (add)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(7) -san</td>
<td>桑</td>
<td>san</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(8) genkan</td>
<td>玄關</td>
<td>hian5-koan</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>hallway</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(8a.) ---</td>
<td>走廊</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>zou3lang2</td>
<td>hallway</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(9) byooin</td>
<td>病院</td>
<td>peN7-iN7</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>hospital</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(9a) ---</td>
<td>醫院</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>yi1yuan4</td>
<td>hospital</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(10) benjyo</td>
<td>便所</td>
<td>pian7-sou2</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>restroom</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(10a). ---</td>
<td>廁所</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>ce4suo3</td>
<td>restroom</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Some words like (3) and (4) were later phonetically and graphically borrowed into Mandarin by giving the *kanji* (Chinese characters in Japanese) a Mandarin reading to it. Many of these loan words are originally from English loanwords mostly written in Japanese kana; some of them are graphic loanwords which were written in Chinese characters in Japanese, and rendered with Taiwanese pronunciations. People are often so familiar with the words that they do not think that they are loanwords. Yao (1992) discusses the phenomena of phonological adjustment when Japanese words are borrowed into those local languages. For example, (5) obasan (歐巴桑) and (6) ojisan (歐吉桑) have remained as Japanese-Taiwanese loanwords, but are used so readily to address elder men and women as a result of habit during the Japanese occupation, that even the Mainlanders began to and still use those terms of address regularly and often forget that they are borrowed terms or do not realize how far back the borrowing originated. It is also extremely common for the Taiwanese to use the Japanese version of “sir” or “madam” or *(san)* rather than
their own term of ẩn2shang7 based on the Chinese character representation of the Mandarin reading of ẩn1sheng1 (先生).\(^4\)

(8), (9), and (10), unlike the rest of the examples, did not manage to make it into the Mandarin lexicon as a loan word and only exist as the Mandarin equivalents in (8a), which is a completely different combination of words, because (8) *xuanqian for ‘玄關’ does not exist in Chinese, as zoulang ‘走廊’ or walkway the original Chinese word is used to mean hallway. (9) shows the Taiwanese word for hospital PeN7-iN7 ‘病院’, which is a graphic borrowing from the Japanese byooin ‘病院,’ because the characters are the same, but is also a phonetic borrowing because the pronunciations are similar as well.\(^5\) The Mandarin version of the word hospital as represented in (9a), maintains the 院 suffix, thus making it only a graphic borrowing, since it differs in pronunciation across Japanese, Taiwanese, and Mandarin. Another comparable example is in (10) where the Taiwanese use pian7-son2 ‘便所’ which is graphically borrowed from the Japanese banjo ‘便所.’ (10a) is similar to (9a) in that it is a hybrid, due to the 所 suffix, but utilizes a different modifier to give the Mandarin utterance in (10a) of ce4 suo3 ‘廁所’ as opposed to the Japanese banjo ‘便所’ and Taiwanese pian7-son2 ‘便所.’ Essentially, many graphic transfers relating to everyday life, such as (3) and (4) were borrowed first into Taiwanese and then

\(^4\) Not to be confused with the Japanese meaning of the kanji meaning teacher or doctor.

\(^5\) It is interesting that to represent hospital, the Japanese and Taiwanese focus on the sick aspect, thereby using ‘廁,’ whereas Mandarin focuses on the healing aspect of the word and uses ‘醫’ as the modifier for the establishment.
subsequently into Mandarin, however, there are other words like (9) and (10) that failed to enter the Mandarin lexicon and exist only in Taiwanese.

Haugen (1972) divides loanwords into three types according to their extent of morphemic substitution: none (i.e., loanwords), partial (i.e., loanblends), or complete (i.e., loanshifts): 1) Loanwords: morphemic importation without substitution; 2) Loanblends: morphemic substitution as well as importation, such as a “hybrid” involving a discoverable foreign model; 3) Loanshifts: morphemic substitution without importation. Khou (1993) collected more than four hundred Japanese loanwords from the Taiwan literature of the Japanese colonial period and categorized them into four kinds of borrowing: phonetic borrowing, loan translation, loan blend and semantic borrowing. Most of these Japanese loanwords belong to the first two categories. Among them, only eighty-some are left in today’s Taiwanese, because either Taiwanese or Mandarin terms were created and substituted the Japanese, since many of the Japanese terms were quite cumbersome and long. Khou only defined four as loan blend (11) through (14) and three of them are graphic borrowing (15) through (17), which are among the words that are no longer apart of Taiwanese.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Japanese</th>
<th>Romanization</th>
<th>English gloss</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>11) 改札係員</td>
<td>kaisatsu kakari-im</td>
<td>ticket examiner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12) 差押官</td>
<td>sashiosaekan</td>
<td>court officer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13) 皮革包</td>
<td>kaban</td>
<td>purse</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14) 炊事関</td>
<td>suizi-ma</td>
<td>kitchen</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(11) through (14) are considered loan blends or hybrids because of the combination and morpheme mixture of having a Chinese suffix of 員 (yuán), 官 (guān), 包 (bāo) and 間 (jiān), respectively. (15) through (17) however, are graphic loans because of the usage of Chinese characters with a Japanese meaning. In (15), the Japanese and Chinese share the same meaning
of the words. Although, (16) exists in modern Chinese, with a similar definition of ‘vigor or vitality,’ its Classical Chinese definition was ‘one’s essential energy or life force.’ (17) does not exist in Mandarin at all, much less to convey the meaning of happy, as happy is gao1xing4 ‘高興’ or kuai4le4 ‘快樂.’

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Japanese</th>
<th>Romanization</th>
<th>English gloss</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(15) 叮嚀</td>
<td>teinei</td>
<td>to do thing with tender and care</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(16) 元氣</td>
<td>genki</td>
<td>energy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(17) 陽氣</td>
<td>youki</td>
<td>be happy</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Many Japanese loanwords are actually return loans, which are words that have been borrowed and then returned to the original language. In other words, Japanese loanwords that were originally borrowed from classical Chinese, and were then borrowed into modern Taiwanese or Mandarin again. Liu (1995) referred to them as “round-trip diffusion via Japanese.” Similarly, Masini (1993) distinguished them as simply “return loans.” In some cases a Taiwanese speaker knew the new concepts and their words through the Japanese rather than the classical Chinese. Take for example, (18) which is a Japanese loanword because a Taiwanese speaker during the Japanese era knew it basically because it was Japanese. For that reason, (18) falls into the Japanese loan word category; however, if a Taiwanese speaker used it in the Chinese era, it ought to be a Mandarin loanword.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characters</th>
<th>Japanese</th>
<th>Mandarin</th>
<th>Taiwanese</th>
<th>English gloss</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(18) 夫婦</td>
<td>hu-hu3</td>
<td>fu1fu4</td>
<td>an1-a-bo7</td>
<td>husband and wife (married couple)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3.2.3 Taiwanese Loanwords

During the KMT rule in Taiwan, although the government restricted the usage and often punished the users of Taiwanese in public areas such as schools and offices, the Taiwanese sometimes continued to speak its mother-tongue in households, especially those who lived outside of Taipei. As such, some of the Mainlanders who interacted with these Taiwanese outside of school or the workplace often picked up common phrases and words such as (19) through (22) and have relexified them into their speech.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Chinese characters⁶</th>
<th>Taiwanese</th>
<th>Mandarin</th>
<th>English gloss</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(19) 隨便</td>
<td>qing cai</td>
<td>sui bian</td>
<td>whatever</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(20) 笨蛋</td>
<td>da ko dai</td>
<td>ben dan</td>
<td>stupid, idiot</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(21) 頭腦壞掉</td>
<td>takapaiki</td>
<td>tounao huaidiao</td>
<td>‘broken head’ mental</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(22) 神經</td>
<td>shodo⁷</td>
<td>shenjing</td>
<td>mental</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As one might notice, (19) through (22) are phrases used to ridicule others, which often becomes one of the quickest borrowings in colloquial speech from natural language contact.

3.2.4 Taiwanese and Mandarin Hybridization

A recent trend in the linguistic hybridization and borrowing situation in Taiwan is the practice of giving Taiwanese words or the specific arrangement of the Chinese characters to produce the Taiwanese version of that concept, a Mandarin pronunciation, most of the time as word play or with a joking nature. Consider (23), (24), and (25).
Taiwanese pronunciation | Chinese characters (based on Taiwanese pronunciation) | Mandarin pronunciation | Mandarin version | Character (Mandarin) gloss
--- | --- | --- | --- | ---
(23) hiong2-hiong2 | 熊熊 | *xiong2xiong2 | yi1xia4zi | 一下子 all of a sudden
(24) u3-zu4 | 鬱卒 | *yu4zu2 | you1yu4 | 憂鬱 depressed
(25) gu1mo4 | 龜矛 | ?gui2mao2 | mao2dun4 | 矛盾 indecisive
(26) sui7 | 水 | shui | piao4liang4 | 漂亮 pretty
(27) dong1-suan2 | 凍蒜 | *dong suan | dang3xuan3 | 黨選 election

It can be argued that these are phonemic loans, but there is something else occurring, because of the added dimension of a common written language and the play on words or joking nature rather than simply borrowing across dialects and offering a slightly different phenomena. Since spoken Taiwanese does not have its own written equivalent and relies on a written form of Mandarin, people often find an alternate way of representing the Taiwanese speech by using the sounds of Chinese characters to replicate the sounds of Taiwanese. Within the younger generation, usually of speakers of Taiwanese (the borrowed language) rather than of Mandarin (the borrowing language), has taken that practice and modified it even further by partially returning it to Mandarin in not saying the Taiwanese pronunciation, but rather the Mandarin pronunciation of the phonetic loan. As shown in (23), in Taiwanese one expresses the notion of ‘suddenly,’ differently than in Mandarin. Consider the Mandarin sentence in (23a) and the Taiwanese sentence in (23b) which represent the usual utterances from each. However, in (23c), the linguistic variation and hybridity occurs.

(23a). 我突然忘記了。
   i suddenly forget -asp
   Wo3 yi1xia4zi3 wang4ji4 le.
   'I suddenly forgot.'
In (23c) one sees a few things occurring and notices some characteristics of the sentence. For one, (23c) is a primarily Mandarin sentence, with Taiwanese elements. Since such borrowing is slightly complex, one must trace the steps of borrowing carefully to best explain its nuances of this new utterance. Rather than using the word for *suddenly* in Mandarin, one selects the Taiwanese word. However, when inserted into the Mandarin sentence, one does not keep the Taiwanese pronunciation, but adopts the Mandarin reading of the characters (which is usually ungrammatical in Mandarin) instead. One can argue that this loan is a return loan, since the characters were originally Chinese, but used to represent Taiwanese utterances since Taiwanese does not have its own written language and shares the Chinese characters used to represent Mandarin. However, one can also argue that this is simply a loan-blend or hybrid, if looking at the whole sentence. In that case, one can also speculate that it is a form of code-switching or code-mixing. Regardless of which category one classifies this sort of borrowing in, one can clearly see that within the multiple dimensional cyclical sort of borrowing and code-switching between Mandarin to Taiwanese to
Mandarin, the younger generation has taken linguistic hybridity to a new level and made it more fluid and the language more “alive” in the sense that the twists and turns within this sort of borrowing is not only an increase in borrowing levels, but also an evident increase in the speed and complexity in which borrowing occurs, as felt while tracing the steps revealed in this example.

Another fascinating observation is that the Mandarin pronunciation of (25) has become a member of the Mandarin lexicon in Taiwan, whereas (23) and (24) have not, or at least has not yet. The combination of the characters in all but (26) are technically ungrammatical in Mandarin and do not exist. However, because of the language contact situation in Mandarin and Taiwanese in Taiwan, one suggests that these items are not entirely incorrect but rather have simply become a hybrid. Although (26) shui (水) exists in Mandarin, it means water and not pretty, the loan occurs here again, for its phonetic similarities to the Taiwanese pronunciation, minus the retroflex. However, because a retroflexed—sh initial does not exist in Taiwan Mandarin, it serves as a considerably close homonym.

3.2.5 Acronyms of Taiwanese words

Another salient observation is the adoption of the acronym from Western abbreviation techniques, in (28) and (29), which represents the Taiwanese slang phrases.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Taiwanese slang</th>
<th>Characters</th>
<th>Mandarin</th>
<th>Pinyin</th>
<th>Acronym</th>
<th>English</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(28) Lao Ko-Ko</td>
<td>老古董</td>
<td>lao3 gu2dong3</td>
<td>LKK</td>
<td>LKK</td>
<td>old fogy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(29) Song Pia-Pia</td>
<td>慾饕餮</td>
<td>su2qi4</td>
<td>SPP</td>
<td></td>
<td>no class, no</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Both Mandarin and Taiwanese speakers import acronymic words such as (28) and (29) rather readily in their daily colloquial speech, especially to friends and family. Also, instances of people using such slang or written examples in pop-culture magazines, television and radio programs are also quite common. Not directly related, but amusingly tangential to such, (30) and (31) which are the titles of author and screen-play writer Qiong Yao’s popular television dramas, show that these are now being commonly referred to with acronyms on websites and often is more searchable than using the full title. Such practices can be attributed to technological advances for communication and Internet usage, but also to the phonetic Romanization of words that make acronyms more conducive than before. Also, it is important to note that this usage of acronyms was first borrowed into Taiwanese in examples like (28) and (29) and then into Mandarin in examples like (30) and (31).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Chinese characters</th>
<th>Mandarin Pronunciation</th>
<th>Acronym</th>
<th>English Gloss</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(30) 遠珠格格</td>
<td>Huan2zhu1 Ge2ge</td>
<td>hzgg</td>
<td>Peal Princess</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(31) 情深深雨濛濛</td>
<td>qing2shen1shen1 yu3meng2meng</td>
<td>qssymm</td>
<td>Love is deep, Rain is Hazy</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In sum, there were 60% commonly shared lexical items between Mandarin and Taiwanese thirty years ago, but now there are nearly 85% (Cheng 1990:9). This implies an escalation of the borrowing of Mandarin after Taiwanese came into direct contact with Mandarin (Tsai 1997, 123). These are lexical items sharing the same Chinese characters (the same etymons) and the same meanings. The high rate of the commonly shared lexical items is the result of the language contact and borrowing as well as common heritage. That is, they can be local words sharing the same etymons, as Cheng (1987a) explains. If they are loanwords, they are graphic loans because Taiwanese and Mandarin share the same written language. Cheng also
notes that among commonly shared lexical items, the rate of occurrence of content words is much higher than that of function words (84% vs. 49.5%), because function words often share the same classical Chinese etymons and therefore are not easily borrowed and are rather easily retained. Such a study suggests that as Taiwanese has become increasingly integrated into life and society in Taiwan, Mandarin has undergone various changes in the oral and written language, creating a hybrid of “Taiwan Mandarin,” distinctive of the Mandarin used in Mainland China.

In theory, in responding to external influences and assuming the linguistic features of the languages with which it comes into contact, the lexicon can either simply adopt a feature of another language without transformation or adapt it to its own system. In practice, whenever a language absorbs a foreign expression, one or more aspects of it undergo some change (Masini 1993), which can all be seen from the language contact of Japanese, Mandarin, and Taiwanese in Taiwan from past to present.

4. Code-mixing (CM) and code-switching (CS)

Code-mixing and borrowing should not be considered two fundamentally different language contact phenomena, since it is impossible both at a theoretical and at a practical level, to differentiate between both phenomena (Treffers-Daller 1994: 243). There are important theoretical and practical advantages to an approach that considers code-mixing and borrowing as fundamentally similar since many syntactic features are now assumed to be part of the lexicon. On the other hand, grammar rules are reduced as far as possible to general, abstract principles that many languages have in common. Since there are no fundamental theoretical differences between code-mixing and borrowing, it is not surprising that these
distinctions are hardly possible in practice. Both code-mixing and borrowing may be considered cases of the interaction of two lexicons (Treffers-Daller 1994).

Poplack et al. (1988) distinguish two basic patterns of borrowing—nonce and established—which show similar linguistic characteristics, contrasting thereby with unambiguous code-switches. They have established a set of criteria to distinguish code-switches from borrowings, e.g., level of phonological assimilation, level of social integration, discourse function, frequency of occurrence. They define well-established loanwords as those which may no longer be perceived as borrowed by either dictionaries or the speakers themselves. Those that occur only once in the corpus are called “nonce borrowings.” They claim that the consequences for a theory of bilingualism of systematically mistaking code-switching for borrowing for vice-versa are even more serious (Poplack et al. 1988: 53).

However, some also believe that both “unambiguous” CS and “ambiguous” CM can both be considered a kind of borrowing. Although it may only occur once, one could argue that the phenomenon could occur more when there is a need in the speech community.

Holmes (1992:50) argues that “code-mixing suggests the speaker is mixing up codes indiscriminately or perhaps because of incompetence, whereas the switches are very well-motivated in relation to the symbolic or social meanings of the two codes.” The speakers convey affective meaning as well as information in the code-switching. In other words, if a Taiwanese speaker interspersed Mandarin words in a conversation it would be due to the speaker’s inability to express the thought or utterance in the respective language. However, Jang (1995) claims that attempting to maintain the loanwords by pronouncing them in Taiwanese is not that easy and hence the most common phenomenon is code-mixing or code-switching. He calls this language layer an ‘embedding layer.’ Shi (1993:24) investigate the phenomenon of code-mixing with 20 undergraduate students who usually speak Taiwanese. The result is that an average of 25% of the
students used Mandarin lexical items, and among those Mandarin lexical items, 4.4% were even directly pronounced in Mandarin. In other words, even a student who is usually speaking Taiwanese still needs to use 4.4% Mandarin code-mixing words. Those words do not have equivalents in Taiwanese, but are common Mandarin words. Thus Shi suspects that this is because even a fluent Taiwanese speaker still thinks in Mandarin most of the time out of an arguably educationally and politically imposed habit and the phenomenon reflects the fact that the scope of the Taiwanese language use is shrinking in various places. One may then hypothesize that the results of the Taiwanese Language Movement will not truly surface until possibly the next generation of young people, as the current generation may have been wedged in between two distinct language policies and thus slightly different social contacts, pop culture and media.

Tsai (1997) puts Mandarin code-mixing under the rubric of “Mandarin Borrowing.” She explains that all the words associated with the administration, trade, financial activities, formal social activities, recently prospered industry, and medication, etc., which are available in Taiwanese are all literary correspondents to their Mandarin counterparts. So long as there is a need to use these expressions in daily life, there will be corresponding Taiwanese words for them on the condition that their morphological structures are shared by these two languages. Whenever the Taiwanese pronunciation of the characters is unknown to the speaker, there will be code mixing. Those words of high frequencies in code mixing may be due to the lexical differences between these two languages, or words in specialized fields such as philosophy, art, mathematics, physics, chemistry, and medical therapies, which are not commonly used, or newly introduced inventions such as computer software, hardware, or new diseases, such as AIDS, or those related to schools.
More specifically, code-mixing or code-switching often exists in literature even though the reader may not necessarily be able to tell by the Chinese characters, since Taiwanese and Mandarin share the same written language. Nevertheless, Mandarin loanwords are not necessarily pronounced in Mandarin or necessarily Mandarin. They could be Taiwanese, as many Japanese loanwords are if they are graphic or phonetic borrowings or even localized with hybrid borrowing. A nonce borrowing will not be considered Taiwanese unless the borrowing becomes more frequent and transforms into a phonetic borrowing. Most of words do not have any variation because if the variation is available most likely the borrowing will not take place. They are all graphic loans but probably nonce borrowing from code-mixing that has no source for. Unlike spoken language, language written in Chinese characters does not indicate the phonetic values that can show the phenomena of code-mixing or code-switching clearly.

Khin-hoann Li (2000) reveals that Ho Loa, a prominent Taiwanese writer that was exposed to a Mandarin environment for many years after 1945, reveals his efforts to learn and practice Mandarin in his use of Mandarin loanwords in his writings. (32) is an example from Loa’s short story, “Lily in the Thorn-bush.”

(32) 對這-kioh 壞東西(hoai7-tong-si7) 害得 七-khap-八笑
toward this bad thing/person hurt RC seven eight laugh
‘From this bastard [I] was framed so badly.’

Pronouncing hoai7-tong-si7 in this way is very strange and is most likely not Taiwanese. Taiwanese pronounces bai7 tang-sai word by word, but it is not a Taiwanese variation, because the Taiwanese variation would be bai7-a2. One attributes this instance as Loa’s attempt at using Mandarin.
In (33) and (34), *guo* '過' is actually not just one lexical item, because it is actually two different lexical items, since there are different meanings. The one meaning of 'sorry' as shown in (33) is a Mandarin loanword, but in (33) the meaning is used to mean 'hard to pass' which is also a Taiwanese local item. Both are also examples from Loa's "Lily in the Thorn-bush.

(33) 雖是英雄 *ia7* 難過美人關。

sui shi yinxiong IA7 nanguo meirenguan

although is hero hard pass beautiful person passage

'It is even hard for a hero to pass a beauty's temptation'

(34) 若是伊 *ka-ti7* 心內真難過。

ruoshi yi KA-TT7 xinrui xhen nanguo

if is Pron. heart within really hard pass

'But he himself feels very sorry'

(33) and (34) are both also evidence of code-switching within literature. Increased or readily performed code-switching naturally produces more instances of linguistic hybridization, in not only speech, but written language. (32) through (34) showed examples of literature with Mandarin as the dominant language, (35) through (36) are examples of Taiwanese as the dominant and Mandarin becoming the loans that interspersed. (35) is from Loa's "A-nia2 e5 Bak-sai2".

(35) 虛張聲勢 (假佯喝-hiam3 裝做濟濟人).

Hi-tiuN-siaN-se3 (ke2-iaN2 hoah-hiam3 chng-cho3 che7-che7 lang5.)

'pretend to shout as they have many people'
Also, throughout the years, Taiwanese writing has adopted the tradition of expressing code-switching with quotation marks as in (36), from Beng-jin Tan’s “Hoan-po5 Mia7-an3.”

(36) 講若抗命，就 beh "通通 槍斃"。

gang-na kong-mia3 jiu5 tong1tong1qiang1bi4

“[He] said if against the order, will be ‘all shot to death’”

These lexical items in the code-switching are surely Mandarin because the author is very kind to show the readers with quotations. They are all nonce borrowings. They are borrowed from the donor language only sporadically. The item “抗命” or go against the order is also a Mandarin loanword.

Finally, Hung (1992) claims that when writing about sex, or talking about sex, Taiwanese people often switch to Mandarin or even English terms which they do not feel as shy about uttering as they do about the Taiwanese terms. He that these lexical items have cognate relations among Japanese, Taiwanese and Mandarin, some of the words share identical Chinese characters and hence are easily borrowed. They are several options for interpreting the channel of borrowing: 1) If there is a continuity in Taiwanese population through generations, there are four possibilities: Japanese words from classical Chinese but with Japanese pronunciation; classical Chinese in Japanese pronunciation; borrowed into Taiwanese and in Taiwanese pronunciation; survived through Chinese era, and reinforced as shared items and authors are sure that readers can read and understand. 2) There is no continuity between the two generations of Taiwanese speakers, writers and readers since the education and communication among Taiwanese, during the Chinese era, have been completely monopolized by KMT. Therefore
some of the sex-related lexical items for writers like Lui Tan or Beng-jin Tan were first heard in Mandarin pronunciation and then were newer associations with Taiwanese characters reading in Taiwanese. 3) There is some degree of continuity observable at least in common words.

Beng-jin Tan wrote some novels about sex including topics, including homosexual and incestuous behavior, which were generally taboo as well as political writings before the release of the 40-year long martial law over Taiwan in 1986. The topic of sex has become very popular in Mandarin literary writing but not in Taiwanese writing. Taiwanese writers have been very brave in writing politics, but “sex” remained a taboo until Tan's “A-chhun5.” However, his writing about sex has had many repercussions among the Taiwanese language activists, as he was blamed for going too far and not producing any benefit for the Taiwanese Language Movement.

One suspects that those Taiwan novelists who write in Mandarin but code-switch to Taiwanese dialogues from time to time are thinking in Mandarin when writing Mandarin and thinking Taiwanese when writing in Taiwanese. The readers also try to follow the same pattern when reading their novels but suffering from reading their Taiwanese part due to the chaotic way of writing Taiwanese through using Chinese characters as the writer pleases. Therefore there is little continuity among common words through these writers. It is very odd that there is no continuity through generations for Taiwanese lexical items, but it appears to be the truth. Most of readers read Mandarin novels with Mandarin pronunciations only.

Over a decade ago, Yen Ling Lee applied a theoretical construct based on J. Fishman’s eight domains of: family, friendship, neighborhood, internal, employment, religion, education, and administration to investigate Mandarin vs. Taiwanese code-switching in Taiwan. Lee distributes a survey comprised of questions on the choice of variety in different domains to Mandarin-Taiwanese students from Taiwan at the University of Illinois. Lee’s results reveal the following: (1) Language choice of Mandarin vs. Taiwanese was not random, as Lee discovered
that the use of Mandarin was predominantly used in the friendship, internal, employment, religion, education, and administration domains and had limited use in the family and neighborhood domains. The use of Taiwanese was correspondingly predominant in the family and neighborhood domains and had limited use in the friendship and religion domains. (2) Within each domain, factors influencing language choice may be isolated, based on age of participant, seriousness of topic, urban vs. rural settings, and nature of discourse. (3) The bilingual situation in Taiwan during that time was fairly unstable—there was an evident shift toward the predominance of Mandarin supported by its growing use in the intimate domain (Lee 1981:121-136). Although Lee did not survey students of the Taiwanese community in Taiwan, they serve as a rather representative group and their results reflect the language contact and Code-switching situation under the KMT rule. There have yet to be any extremely current studies conducted on the present code-switching situation, however, one can speculate that it has evolved towards the direction of an increase in Taiwanese now, under the DPP, but due to the years of education and habit of Mandarin fostered under the KMT, although an increase in usage in all realms, Taiwanese has not (at least not yet) replaced Mandarin in Taiwan.

In sum, it is evident that as a result of politically instituted language policies through education and mass media, Taiwan has undergone three significant language shifts: Japanese, Mandarin, and Taiwanese. The linguistic hybridization revealed in the linguistic analysis from the perspective of language contact, borrowing, loan words, code-mixing and code-switching, literally speak for itself, because whether past or present, Taiwan’s linguistic situation is a mixture far more than it is a purity. Therefore, one ventures to say that although political language policies can greatly and overtly shift the mainstream language in a given area, natural language contact continues to take its usual course and through personal or media-based interaction,
language continues to grow and change readily within the social and cultural planes within society.

5. Conclusion

The context for language change includes a real-world system of meanings as they are constructed through perceptual experiences and through the language shared by the speech community. Culture will encompass institutions, artifacts, lifestyles, and the body of knowledge about these and other aspects of the world shared by a group of people.

The lexicon of a language tells the story of the culture of those who are in the same speech community. Cultural forces determine the strength of associations between words and particular social groups. Changes in material culture, in lifestyles, in the economy, and in institutions have led to losses and gains in the lexicon (Johnson 1996). Of all the linguistic levels, vocabulary is the most sensitive to cultural change since it is tied referentially to the culture itself. In other words, vocabulary exhibits closer ties to culture than other language features. In order to talk about lexical change one must to discuss cultural change. New objects, new concepts and new lifestyles within a culture all require new words to meet these needs in society or culture. On the other hand, as knowledge of certain domains of life fades, or objects and tools are no longer relevant, the words for them also fade.

The lexicon of a language always reflects certain ways of thinking about the world. Lakoff (1987) claims that lexical meaning is embodied in experiential networks of “idealized cognitive models.” These models form and structure our concepts of the world and thus are a way of describing what “words” mean by demarcating which objects can appropriately be designated by which terms. Cultural or cognitive models for categories and prototypes are encoded in the lexicon, which change as our understanding of the world changes. The
vocabulary offers clues about how speakers conceptualize the world, how they organize their knowledge, and how deep their knowledge goes in specific areas (Johnson 1996). Within Taiwan, due to political shifts and related language policies of Japanese, Mandarin, and Taiwanese promotion, the lexicon of the version of speech and writing in Taiwan appears vastly unique to the island. In observing the common vocabulary and code-switching occurring rather frequently in media, literature, and personal speech, one is able to understand the “culture” of the island and its people.

Language contact inevitably leads to bilingualism (Appel & Muysken: 1987). Generally speaking, there are two types of bilingualism: societal and individual. Societal bilingualism occurs when in a given society two or more languages are spoken. Taiwan stands as a nearly bilingual society because of its large population of individual bilinguals of Taiwanese and Mandarin speakers, with still a fairly large population of additional bilinguals to trilinguals, when including Japanese. Code-switching and borrowing by one language from another is somewhat based on some minimum of bilingualism between the two languages. For any large-scale borrowing a considerable group of bilinguals has to be assumed. It is thus perhaps most accurate to identify the language of Taiwan’s people as a “hybrid;” although, still rather Mandarin dominant. As revealed in this thesis, whether in literature or speech, one can frequently find sentences that exhibit a mixture of language, such as a basically Mandarin sentence leavened with words from other tongues. The mixture of languages represents, to a considerable degree, the mixture of cultures. For people who prefer the purity of a single language, this means chaos. Purists see “hybridization” as nothing more than mish-mash and confusion, or merely a popular fad that lacks depth. But anyone who does some research into the origin of languages will quickly discover that it is impossible to discover any truly pure language. People who today call for a “return to Taiwanese” or “priority for Mandarin,” whether assuming a political stance or a
cultural agenda, are in fact setting themselves at odds with the natural language environment. This is all the more so considering that “cultural diversity” around the world appears to be gaining respect in the late twentieth century. Cultural pluralism is stimulating, and if the results are cumulative and interactive, there are certain to be benefits on a societal and individual level. Although, it is also an undeniable fact that “culturally pluralizing” languages which penetrate from outside a culture often create status distinctions in the colonial territory, and are an obstacle to local elite identification with their own culture. However, if young people of Taiwan today were to have the right to decide which language to use, the younger generation who will lead Taiwan in the twenty-first century might suggest that questions of provincial origin or group identity are not important. It simply matters whether the language “feels right” for expressing just what one means.

The resurgence of Taiwanese is undoubtedly linked to the current political environment and the social atmosphere of “bensheng pride” it has encouraged. In the long run, it may turn out that “Mandarin Chinese only” or “Taiwanese first” are merely transient historical moments. Thus in all the political, social, or economic theories, posing the question: what is the best path to steer between encouraging local culture and maintaining access to larger language communities? To answer this question, one cannot deny the inherent linguistic theory steering development, which reveals that the real language world has its own rules. Perhaps the best way is to “respect the present.” Perhaps expressions like LKK or SPP—in which people actually say the Roman letters as abbreviations mirroring Western acronyms, for the phonetically spelled Taiwanese terms are the real future of speech in Taiwan: a great melting pot of linguistic, political, and social history and global presence.
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