This is to certify that the

thesis entitled

ENGLISH VERBS IN CHINESE: EVIDENCE FROM CONVERSATIONS AND TELEVISION TALK SHOWS

presented by

LING-YU LU

has been accepted towards fulfillment
of the requirements for

M.A. degree in LINGUISTICS

Major professor

DENNIS R. PRESTON

Date 8/23/94

ENGLISH VERBS IN CHINESE: EVIDENCE FROM CONVERSATIONS AND TELEVISION TALK SHOWS

By

Ling-Yu Lu

A THESIS

Submitted to
Michigan State University
in partial fulfillment of the requirements
for the degree of

MASTER OF ARTS

Department of Linguistics and Languages

1994

ABSTRACT

ENGLISH VERBS IN CHINESE: EVIDENCE FROM CONVERSATIONS AND TELEVISION TALK SHOWS

By

Ling-Yu Lu

The goal of this thesis is to describe the code-switching phenomenon of English verbs in Chinese spoken by Chinese-English bilinguals. The Chinese items which precede the English verbs govern them in certain particular ways, which can be quite complex psycholinguistically.

In the first part of this study, background information about code-switching and borrowing is reviewed. In the second part, the data are classified. In the last part, hypotheses are presented and discussed, and conclusions are made.

Both the usage of the English verbs in the data collected and the part of speech of Chinese elements followed immediately by English verbs are investigated on the basis of English grammar. From this, the frequency of English-like forms versus non English-like forms occurring after the Chinese lexemes can be determined.

The result shows that Chinese-English bilinguals tend to use a great deal of English plain verbs in their Chinese-English code-switching behavior. This phenomenon also supports some of the code-switching constraints and principles proposed by Pfaff (1979), Sridhar and Sridhar (1980) and Poplack (1980).

To my dear parents
and brothers,
Ling-Yi and Ling-Bei.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I wish to express my deepest gratitude to Dr. Dennis Preston, my thesis advisor. He suggested my research topic, and he suffered the consequences. Because of his immense bibliographical knowledge, I was spared many trips to the library. He showed me how to classify my data, and gave me new and interesting ideas about the differences between Chinese and English. Without his guidance and encourgement, I would never have finished this thesis so quickly. He made me feel worthy of my degree. I have always secretly thought of him as "Xiao3 Mao2 Lu2."

I would also like to thank Dr. Yen-Hwei Lin for her input into the analysis of my data and for her comments on my hypotheses. I am greatly indebted to her for giving me the opportunity to teach Chinese. This was one of the most important experiences I had while living in the U. S. She taught me how to teach Chinese, and by doing so, gave me valuable insight into my native language.

I also thank Dr. Grover Hudson for introducing me to the works of Appel and Muysken, without which I could not have written this thesis. He also helped show me the methodology for writing and organizing a thesis.

My indescribable thanks go to Freya Katkowsky, who spent many low-paid hours in cafes and restaurants all over East Lansing proof-reading this thesis.

I am also grateful to my special friend, Mr. Chih-Chou Chao for severely interrupting my thesis-writing by richly inspiring me to write modern Chinese poetry. Although he is entirely responsible for delaying my thesis, his inspiration caused me to publish two poems in the *Central Daily News* of Taiwan, which made the delay forgivable.

My sincere appreciation also goes to Wendy Winkeljohn for her prayers for me which all came true and all my friends who put up with me and helped me with my life and studies.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS[1]

ASSOC	associative (*-de*)
BA	*ba*
BEI	*bei*
CL	classifier
CRS	Currently Relevant State (*le*)
DUR	durative aspect (*zhengzai/zai*)
GEN	genitive (*-de*)
NOM	nominalizer (*de*)
PFV	perfective aspect (*-le*)
PL	plural (*-men, -xie*)
Q	Question (*ma*)
RF	Reduce Forcefulness (a, *la, ye*)
3sg	third person singular pronoun

[1] The list of abbreviations is adopted from Li and Thompson's terminology (1981: xxiii).

0. Introduction

Being a speaker of both Chinese and English, I have noticed that a significant number of English elements are mixed in Chinese-English bilinguals' discourse. Many studies suggest that lexical switching primarily involves nouns, verbs, and adjectives. Universally, nouns are the most easily and frequently borrowed category, while verbs, adjectives, adverbs and prepositions are transferred in decreasing scale (Haugen, 1956, 1972; Pfaff, Poplack, 1979; Gibbons, 1987; Lehiste, 1988; De Houwer, 1990; Myers-Scotton, 1993).

Code-switching studies have most frequently involved the switching of nouns and adjectives. However, the focus of my thesis is on the code-swtiching phenomenon of English verbs in Chinese. The way they enter Chinese sentences is remarkable. All of the data contain only English verbs in Chinese sentences uttered by bilingual speakers. The data are classified into different categories, which is determined by the part of speech of the preceding Chinese items. Because of the occurrence of the preceding Chinese items, the English verbs are governed in certain particular ways, which can be quite complex psycholinguistically. Although all the lexemes after the Chinese elements are English, that is, superficially English-like, they could not possibly be English-like in the minds of the bilingual speakers. Hypotheses are made about the occurrence of English verbs according to the frequency of their occurrence in these data. The measurement used here to determine their status as either English-like or non

English-like is to take a close look at the preceding Chinese elements from the point of view of English grammar.

Before stating the results, it is necessary to first survey the background information about code-switching and borrowing and the difficulty which has caused many debates over how to distinguish them. An important issue of bilingualism is revealed afterwards due to a lot of arguments among scholars concerning who is capable of making use of code-switching and/or borrowing.

In Chapter 1, the background information is given. Chapter 2 gives the information about the data I have collected. Chapter 3 presents the method used to analyze the data and the objective of this thesis. The data classifications are shown in Chapter 4 with hypotheses[2] for the English verbs occurring next to the Chinese elements within 'Chinese'[3] sentences. Special treatments about Chinese *ba* sentences in which English verbs are inserted will be seen in Chapter 5. Finally, Chapter 6 gives the conclusion drawn upon the code-switching phenomenon of English verbs in the Chinese language.

---

[2] I am indebted to Dr. Yen-Hwei Lin, for comments on my Chinese data classifications and the hypotheses for my data analyses through hours of communication.

[3] Note that each English verb or verbal phrase seems to be embedded in every Chinese-based sentence of these data, but this probably is not true from a psycholinguistic point of view, since it might be that the bilingual speaker is underlyingly thinking of the English sentence structure for their code-switching behavior especially when the word order or the phrase structure of both languages are identical. This indication from the aspect of sentence structure actually implies that the Chinese-English code-switching phenomenon is more complex than just word substitution.

1. Background

When two different cultures are interacting with each other, bilingualism, at the linguistic level, has attracted a lot of attention from social scientists and has led to many studies in code-switching (e.g., Rayfield, Weinreich, 1970; Blom & Gumperz, 1972; Anisman, 1975; McClure, Scotton & Ury, 1977; Huerta, Timm, 1978; Pascasio, 1979; Baker, Poplack, 1980; Grosjean, Gumperz, Lipski, 1982; Staczek, 1983), code-mixing (e.g., Ure, 1974; Espinosa, 1975; Kachru, Sridhar, 1978; Gibbons, 1979; Vaid, 1980; Gibbons, 1983; Appel & Muysken, 1987), language shift (e.g., Weinreich, 1970; Fishman, 1976; Trudgill & Tzavaras, 1977; Gal, 1979; Baetens Beardsmore, 1982; Veltman, 1983; Appel & Muysken, 1987; Fishman, Verivaki, 1990; Fishman, 1991) and language choice (e.g., Parkin, 1971; Scotton, 1976; Baetens Beardsmore, Grosjean, 1982; Gibbons, 1987; Preston, 1989; Fishman, 1991) in the bilingual community.

The subject of code-switching is receiving increasingly greater attention from sociolinguists, social psychologists and bilingual educators. The term 'code-switching', however, is difficult to define. The fact that every language borrows lexical items from other languages has caused controversial distinctions between code-switching and borrowing on the basis of arbitrary linguistic criteria, which has brought about considerable discussion among researchers (Weinreich, 1953; Heath, 1981; Baetens Beardsmore, 1982; Grosjean, 1982; Karttunen, 1985; Appel and

Muysken, 1987; Scotton, 1988c; Hamers and Blanc, 1989; Mougeon and Beniak, 1991; Treffers-Daller, 1991a; Myers-Scotton, 1992b, 1993).

In this chapter, the observations of code-switching and borrowing made by researchers and traditional points of view on the distinction between code-switching and borrowing are demonstrated in **1.1**, **1.2** and **1.3** respectively. Then a number of explanations from scholars are provided about how these points of view can be problematic and better solutions to distinguish code-switching from borrowing, as suggested primarily by Myers-Scotton (1993). In section **1.4**, some definitions made by scholars regarding bilinguals contrasted with monolinguals in order to distinguish carefully between code-switching and borrowing are shown.

1.1 Code-Switching

Although code-switching itself, a central part of bilingual discourse, has produced a great number of interesting effects on two or more languages which come in contact, the exact meaning of the term remains controversial and ill-defined. (The definitions of the 'bilingual' will be shown in **1.4** below.) The following statements illustrate several researchers' opinions on code-switching:

> "[Code-switching is] the alternate use of different languages" (Haugen, 1956).

> ". . . [code-switching] is code alternation within the same discourse" (Diebold, 1963: 56).

"The most likely explanation is that [a bilingual] has the capcity to activate the L2 system, carry out the semantic encoding, the selection of words and the syntactic organization while more or less mechanically producing in L1 material which has already been prepared for production" (Macnamara, 1967: 70).

"'Code-switching' has become a common term for alternative use of two or more languages, varieties of a language, or even speech styles" (Hymes, 1974: 103).

"We define code-switching as the use of two or more linguistic varieties in the same conversation or interaction. . . . The varieties may be anything from genetically unrelated languages to two styles of the same language." (Scotton and Ury, 1975: 1)

"[Code-switching is] the alternation of two languages" (Valdes Fallis, 1976).

". . . code-switching is the use of more than one language by communicants in the execution of a speech act" (Di Pietro, 1977: 275).

"A perfect bilingual may switch from language to language during a conversation. This phenomenon is called code-switching; again, in the ideal case all aspects are switched simultaneously." (Baetens Beardsmore, 1982: 2)

". . . I will define code-switching as the alternate use of two or more languages in the same utterance or conversation . . ." (Grosjean, 1982: 145).

"[Code-switching is] the use of two languages in one sentence" (Appel and Muysken, 1987: 172).

". . . code-switching [is] the alternate use of two languages by the same speaker during the same speech event" (Lehiste, 1988: 22).

> "Codeswitching[4] . . . is the selection by bilinguals or multilinguals of forms from an embedded variety (or varieties) in utterance of a matrix variety during the same conversation" (Myers-Scotton, 1993: 3).

> "Code-switching is the juxtaposition of sentences or sentence fragments, each of which is internally consistent with the morphological and syntactic (and optionally, phonological) rules of the language of its provenance" (Poplack, 1993: 5).

From the above thirteen statements, it is easy to see that code-switching is defined very differently by several scholars. These definitions range from an identification of code-swtiching as the use of two languages in one sentence or during the same speech event to the use of two or more languages in the same conversation, interaction, utterance or speech act. Many scholars have claimed that 'true' code-switching involves more than one lexeme, although Poplack and Sankoff (1988: 1178) have shown that borrowed forms or nonce forms used by Tamil/English and Finnish/English bilinguals are typically single lexemes showing morphological and syntactic integration into their native languages (Tamil & Finnish). In other words, not only can code-switching be a single word but also a phrase, a clause or a sentence (Clyne, 1967; Shaffer, 1978; Grosjean, 1982; Appel and Muysken, 1987; Gibbons, 1987; Poplack, Sankoff, and Miller, 1988).

---

[4] Unlike many other writers who hyphenate the term or prefer the term code-mixing, Myser-Scotton prefers to write codeswitching as one word, "since only one aspect of codeswitching will be characterized as actually involving the switching of the codes involved, and even this one aspect is better referred to as a switching of the underlying psycholinguistic procedures which yield the surface structures" (preface, i). In this thesis, code-switching and code-mixing are used interchangeably.

Myers-Scotton (1993) divides code-switching into intersentential code-switching, and intrasentential code-switching. The former "involves switches from one language to the other between sentences; that is, a whole sentence (or more than one sentence) is produced entirely in one language before there is a switch to the other language(s) in use in the conversation," while the latter "occur[s] within the same sentence or sentence fragment"[5] (p. 3-4). However, other researchers (Appel and Muysken, 1987: 118; Poplack, 1993: 5) think code-switching may occur at three various levels of linguistic structure: (1) Tag-swithing serves as a token of the bilingual character of a unilingual sentence and is named emblematic switching by Poplack (1980). This includes tags, exclamations, or parenthetical remarks in another language. For example, *well*, *anyway*, and *ok* are often spoken at the beginning of Chinese-English sentences by monolinguals with almost no English competence. (2) Intersentential switching occurs between sentences. (3) Intrasentential or Sentential switching occurs in the middle of a sentence. This type is also called code-mixing. Researchers like Kachru (1978) and his associates, and Swigart (1992) prefer to use code-mixing as a term for intrasentential switching. Myers-Scotton criticizes this for failing to distinguish code-switching from code-mixing (1993: 24).

[5] Based on the truth that there are indeed single code-switching lexemes occurring or embedded within one sentence, Weinreich's (1970) statement is evidently erroneous: "the ideal bilingual switches from one language to the other according to appropriate changes in the speech situation (interlocutors, topics, etc.), but not in an unchanged speech situation, and certainly *not within a single sentence*" (p. 73, italics mine).

When code-switching originating from the embedded language in the matrix language[6] takes place, it is necessary to take the main language into consideration. Appel and Muysken (1987) say:

> *Psycholinguistically* it makes most sense to think of the base [main] language as the dominant language of the bilingual speaker making the switch, since that language is the most important one in determining his verbal behaviour. *Sociolinguistically*, however, the notion of base language may be defined as the language in terms of which the discourse situation is defined, the unmarked linguistic code in a particular setting. *Grammatically*, the base language may be the one imposing a particular constraint for a particular case of switching if the notion makes any sense at all. (p. 121-22)

Researchers have not always adopted the notion of a main language. Weinreich (1970) was of the opinion that both the speaker and the listener can usually describe which, among the languages they are using, is the base language. According to Myers-Scotton's terminology, the main language is the matrix language (ML) in code-switching utterances. She defines (1993) the features of the matrix language as "the overall greater frequency of ML morphemes" (p. 173) and "the more dominant language, across the community, in terms of the *number* of types of interaction in which it is the more socially unmarked choice. More specifically, the ML is the language more unmarked for the specific *type* of interaction in which the CS utterances occur" (p. 67). Scotton (1988a) also claims

[6] Myers-Scotton (1993) refers to the matrix language as "the 'principal' language in CS [code-switching], the one 'around which something develops' ", while the embedded language is "fixed firmly in a surrounding mass" (p. 3). She says (1991) that both languages have unequal roles participating in code-swtiching; that is, "The Matrix Language (ML) is more activated and the occurrence of its morphemes is freer than that of the Embedded Language(s) (EL)."

that the frequency of an unmarked choice is greater than marked choices. Linguists often determine the main language by examining which language is uttered more and by investigating the content items (e.g., nouns, verbs or adjectives), the system items (e.g., determiners, prepositions), and the word order. The task, however, is not always as simple as expected, as Grosjean has mentioned (1982), since bilinguals also switch from language to language within the same utterance when a third participant or more is approached, or when the topic or the situation changes. Furthermore, "bilinguals also switch back and forth between languages within *one* semantic domain . . . , especially in communities where code-switching is extremely frequent and practically a norm (as among Puerto Ricans in East Harlem)" (p. 320-21). Built on the fact that it is far from easy to determine the principal language being used and that it is insufficient to merely examine the bilingual's utterances and question them, further studies are needed.

Finally, it is essential to note that, first, Lance (1975: 144) claims that the reason for switching from one language to the other is not simply because the bilingual speaker has vocabulary gaps in one language or the other; rather, the speaker may know words in both languages for the concept, and a specific word or phrase is just more readily available than others and closest to the tip of the tongue. Second, code-switching between two languages is not entirely random or arbitrary but does have certain constraints (Gumperz and Hernandez, 1971; Clyne,

1972; Timm, 1975; Lipski, 1977; Kachru, 1978; Pfaff, 1979; Sridhar and -Sridhar, 1980; Poplack, 1980; 1981; Sankoff and Poplack, 1981; Myers-Scotton, 1993). Pfaff makes a statement (1979: 314) that "surface structures common to both languages are favored for switches . . . ." Sridhar and Sridhar (1980: 412) propose their Dual-Structure Principle about their constraint on linear ordering as follows:

> The internal structure of the guest [embedded] constituent need not conform to the constituent structure rules of the host [matrix] language, so long as its placement in the host sentence obeys the rules of the host language.

Poplack also formulates the 'equivalence constraint':

> Code-switches will tend to occur at points in discourse where juxtaposition of L1 and L2 elements does not violate a syntactic rule of either language, i.e., at points around which the surface structures of the two languages map onto each other. According to this simple constraint, a switch is inhibited from occurring whithin a constituent generated by a rule from one language which is not shared by another (1980: 586).

That is to say, "when the phrase structure rules (that specify word order) of both languages are identical, switching is possible; otherwise, it is not" (W-oolford, 1983).

Aside from the equivalence constraint, Poplack (1980) also frames the Free Morpheme Constraint: no switch may take place between two morphemes which are morphologically bound to each other. This claim can be supported by the hypothesis that is made about the use of English plain forms of the verbal part of

verbal phrases in Chinese-English code-switched sentences. See Chapter 6 **Conclusion**.

1.2 Borrowing

Based on standard usage in Linguistics, borrowed forms are the same as loans (Myers-Scotton 1993: 164). Poplack (1993: 5) states that borrowing is the adaption of lexical material to the morphology and syntax and usually, to the phonological patterns of the recipient language. She also distinguishes loandwords from nonce (used only once) borrowings. The former is defined as "the full linguistic integration, native-language synonym displacement, and widespread diffusion, even among recipient-language monolinguals," whereas the latter need not satisfy the diffusion requirement, and their occurrences have no predictability, although they show the same patterns of morphological and syntactic integration but little phonological integration as established loanwords.

From Myers-Scotton's point of view, borrowing includes two forms: core borrowing forms and cultural borrowing forms. The status and occurrence frequency of the core borrowing forms are identical to those of the code-switching forms. They may minimally appear once or twice in a discourse with no predictability as to their recurrence. Having no relation to code-switching, cultural borrowing forms, however, can be predicted by their high relative frequency that they occur to stand for new concepts or objects as opposed to the indigenous forms

of the matrix language. They often come into the matrix language suddenly, for they are responsible for filling gaps.[7] Their encoding in the matrix language can be handled by paraphrasing or calquing (1993: 169, 206).

According to Haugen's (1956: 59-60) terminology, there are three different types of borrowing with regard to the distinction between importation and substitution. (1) Loanwords are the most common type without any morphemic substitution but only importation from the other language, such as the use of 'chic' in English, and integrated morphologically and phonetically into the base language. (2) Loanshifts occur without any morphemic importation but total substitution; so to speak, when a new concept or object from the donor language is represented entirely with a new grouping of words or morphemes already existing in the recipient language, the forms representing that concept or object still remain native to the donor language. A well-known example is 'wolkenkrabbe' in Dutch, 'gratte-ciel' in French, 'wolkenkratzer' in German and 'rascacielos' in Spanish. They are all based on English "skyscraper", but rather than borrowing the English word 'skyscraper', the morphemes 'sky' and 'scraper' are translated into the recipient languages (Baetens Beardsmor, 1982: 47; Appel and Muysken, 1987: 165). (3) Loanblends are the cases including 'hybrids' where only one part

[7] Sridhar and Sridhar (1980: 409) comment that 'fill[ing] gaps' is one of the ways to differentiate code-mixing/code-switching from borrowing. The meaning is that in code-mixing, "the mixed elements [core borrowings] do not necessarily 'fill gaps' in the host language," while it holds generally for the borrowing forms (cultural borrowings) that they often do 'fill gaps."

is morphemically imported from another language, and the other belongs to the base language. For example, the English morpheme [gum] of 'gum tree' has been imported into Australian German in [gumbaum], but the local German [baum] has been substituted for 'tree' (Grosjean, 1982: 313). This classification has been regarded by some researchers as rather confusing (e.g., Appel and Muysken, 1987: 164).

It is generally believed that when the bilingual decides to switch codes if the interlocutor is also bilingual, he or she may also borrow words from the other language to communicate and integrate them phonologically, morphologically and syntactically into the base language. The results of the borrowing process reveal that both borrowings (or loanwords) and code-switches tend to be content words which carry most of the semantic, pragmatic and cultural information, take the same inflections and occupy the same syntactic slots as corresponding base-language words. But, since both code-switching and borrowing undergo the same morphosyntactic procedures of the base language during production, it seems impossible to distinguish them.

1.3 Distinctions between Code-Switching and Borrowing

Appel and Muysken (1987) imply that we can use the concepts of langue and parole introduced by Ferdinand de Saussure to distinguish code-switching from borrowing; namely, "in abstract terms borrowing involves the integration of

two languages at the level of langue, and code mixing integration at the level of parole" (p. 121). The traditional criterion for distinguishing borrowing and code-switching is that borrowed forms are those which are morphologically and syntactically integrated into the base language but show little phonological integration, while code-switched elements are not integrated (e.g., Weinreich, 1953; Haugen, 1956; Hasselmo, Mackey, 1970; Lance, 1975; Grosjean, 1982; Lehiste, 1988; Poplack, 1993) This distinction, however, yields mixed results and is problematic. Appel and Muysken (1987: 172) point out two reasons: (1) "There may be different degrees of phonological adaptation for borrowed items." (2) Whether or not all non-adapted items are conspicuous cases of code-mixing is not evident. Myers-Scotton (1993) argues that sharpening the distinction between code-switching and borrowing by claiming that the "processes and how they undergo morphosyntactic procedures in language production" is poorly grounded because there is the possibility of partial/incomplete morphological integration for both borrowed and code-switched forms. She found much existing evidence that all borrowed forms are not completely morphologically integrated into the matrix language (e.g., semi-learned nouns borrowed into English from Latin and Greek without taking regular English plurals, such as datum or data/data or syllabus/syllabi, and the short of entry into the traditional Bantu 'people' classes for borrowed forms for persons in Swahili). As for singly occurring borrowings which are bare forms without inflections, they show incomplete morphological

integration by not being realized at all the requisite system morphemes of the matrix language (p. 183-91).

Myers-Scotton initially advocated the absolute and relative frequency of occurrence as the only criterion which holds in all cases to differentiate code-switching and borrowing. She (1993) writes that:

> It has long been recognized that a distinguishing characteristic of CS [code-switching] forms is that they occur possibly only once, and certainly not frequently, meaning that they have no predictability. And, of course, if a B [borrowing] form has been integrated into the ML to encode a particular concept, its occurrence can be predicted, at least part of the time and for some groups, when that concept comes up. (p. 194)

It is hence predictable that borrowed forms occur with more relative frequency than code-switched forms. Although relative frequency is a reliable measuring criterion by which the status of borrowings and code-switches originating from the embedded language can be established in many cases, Myers-Scotton remarks that methodological issues will turn out to be a problem, for it is admittedly arbitrary to decide how much relative frequency is enough.

In order to deal with the problem of frequency, Myers-Scotton found another way by changing the focus from the borrowed form based on the three-occurrence rule (a borrowed form is the one which occurs in a relatively large corpus at least three times) to the point of view of the code-switched form: "It is not that a B form must recur to be a B form; it is that a CS form must not recur in order to be a CS form," that is, code-switched forms are those "lexemes encoding

core concepts and occurring no more than twice in a relatively large corpus" (1993: 204-205).

To try to differentiate code-switching from borrowing, Myers-Scotton hypothesizes that "While the CS form may undergo many or all of the same ML morphosyntactic processes as the B form (and indigenous ML forms), the CS form is not entered in the ML mental lexicon"[8] (p. 192). For this, she provides with two types of evidence to support this claim: (1) code-switched forms with their lack of predictability, and (2) the bilingual versus monolingual status. Myers-Scotton suggests that code-switched forms are characterized by the principle that they occur probably only once or twice and, of course, less frequently compared to borrowed forms, which encode foreign concepts or objects, occur with high relative frequency and are integrated into the matrix language. Therefore, the relative lack of predictability can be treated as an important criterion in designating code-switches in comparison with borrowings. She also emphasizes that it is necessary to define a speaker as bilingual or monolingual based on the general observation that monolinguals do not use code-switched forms but borrowed forms in the base language in terms of her hypothesis that borrowed forms are part of their ML mental lexicon (p. 193-94). This consideration may affect the decision of labelling the forms that a speaker is using as code-switches

[8] Levelt (1989) defines the mental lexicon as "the store of information about the words in one's language" (p. 6).

or borrowings. Since it is elusive and not clear who is monolingual and who is not from the perspective of the language and from the speaker's own individual point of view, section **1.4** introduces the definitions given by several scholars mainly from a bilingual's standpoint as opposed to a monolingual's.

1.4 Distinguishing the Bilingual from the Monolingual in Code-Switching and Borrowing

From the perspective of language choice, as Ervin-Tripp (1968) says, "A speaker [monolingual or bilingual] in any language community who enters diverse social situations normally has a repertoire of speech alternatives which shift with situation" (p. 197). (For the situational switching, see below.) Monolinguals can only shift from one variety/style to another within one language;[9] for instance, from formal to informal, whereas bilinguals can not only switch between two languages when speaking to other bilinguals but can also change among varieties in a language when speaking to their monolingual counterparts. Gumperz (1972) likewise claims that the way in which bilinguals alternate between two languages is much the same as the way in which monolinguals choose among styles of a single language. "Where this is the case, the difference between monolingual and

[9] Some sociolinguistic investigators (Swain, 1972; Hymes, 1974; Scotton and Ury, 1977) claim that code-switching is not only a crucial phenomenon in bilingual studies but also a natural output of monoglots, which is related to the style-shift and the degree to which the monolingual is formal.

bilingual behaviour thus lies in the choice of linguistic symbols for socially equivalent processes" (Gumperz, 1967: 48).

According to Blom and Gumperz (1972), there exist two types of code-switching. (1) Situational switching is influenced by the setting, participants and topic. "The notion of situational switching assumes a direct relationship between language and social situation" (p. 424). This case has been studied by Scotton and Ury (1975) showing that the multilingual residents of Kenya use different languages to change the social distance between the interlocutors in one conversation. (2) Metaphorical switching is not heavily governed by the social situation. As Blom and Gumperz state:

> "Characteristically, the situations in question allow for the enactment of two or more different relationships among the same set of individuals. The choice of either (R) [the local dialect Ranamal] or (B) [the standard Bokmal] alludes to these relationships and thus generates meanings which are quite similar to those conveyed by the alternation between *ty* and *vy* in the examples from Russian literature cited by Friedrich (Chapter 9). We will use the term *metaphorical switching* for this phenomenon" (p. 425).

This sort of switching has been documented by Lindholm and Padilla (1978) from a Spanish-English bilingual child and by Sebba and Wootton (1984) between London English and London Jamaican.

The two types of code-switching, proposed by Blom & Gumperz, are confusing. Dr. Dennis Preston said (personal communication) that metaphorical code-swtching and situational code-switching differ mainly in what 'motivates';

namely, in metaphorical switching, the switching motivation comes from the speaker (inside) to shift his/her speech style from one to another in order to convey his/her own specific meanings to the listener during the discourse, whereas in situational switching, the switching motivation comes from the situation (outside) so that the speaker has to vary his/her speech style from one to another when the situation is changed during the discourse. The style of both types of switching can be transferred from formal to informal or vice versa.

From the aspect of bilingualism, Poplack (1979) writes that "Code-switching is a verbal skill requiring a large degree of competence in more than one language, rather than a defect arising from insufficient knowledge of one or the other" (p. 72). Baetens Beardsmore (1982) maintains that code-switching takes place given the minimal bilingual community which must exist. It means that "at least two interlocutors must share the same pair of languages." Switching from one language to another would more likely not occur if only one of the speakers is bilingual (p. 42). As above information noted, it seems quite evident that only bilinguals can do the switching from one language to another in a bilingual community, although they may also borrow words from another language. But how to define a bilingual? Witness the following statements:

> "In the extreme case of foreign language learning, the speker becomes so proficient as to be indistinguishable from the native speakers round him . . . . In the cases where this perfect foreign-language learning is not accompanied by loss of the native language, it results in bilingualism, native-like control of two languages." (Bloomfield, 1933: 55-56)

[Grosjean (1982: 232) states:] "For him [Macnamara], a bilingual is a person who possesses at least one language skill [speaking, listening, reading or writing] even to a minimal degree in a second language, for example, a native speaker of Swahili who speaks English but who never learned to read and write it" (Macnamara, 1967a).

"A true bilingual is someone who is taken to be one of themselves by the members of two different linguistic communities, at roughly the same social and cultural level" (Thiery, 1978: 146).

". . . I would like to define a bilingual as a person who is able to produce grammatical sentences in more than one language" (Baetens Beardsmore, 1982: 1).

"The 'true' bilingual, that is, the person equally fluent in two languages, could be characterized as having no permanent interference"[10] (Grosjean, 1982: 300).

". . . both languages are regularly accessed in normal interaction, and in the stable bilingual communities . . . , speakers [bilinguals] typically make use of both languages with the same interlocutors, in the same domains, and within the same conversational topic" (Poplack, 1993: 3).

[10] Grosjean (1982: 300) classifies interferences into four domains: pronunciation, spelling, syntax, and words and idiomatic expressions. It is reported (Baetens Beardsmore, 1982: 113) that both early (pre-adolescence) and late bilinguals may carry out code-switching and that early bilinguals often demonstrate easier interference-free output in their utterances, although the reason why is hard to explain.

The 'true' bilinguals that Thiery had studied are the ones who had learned their two languages before the age of fourteen, had been taught in both languages, had spoken both at home, and had moved from one language community to another during school years. Strikingly, these bilinguals can speak either language without any accent. There is no interference shown from either language when they are talking to monolinguals. Grosjean once tested a number of monolingual college students by asking this question: "If someone told you that X was bilingual in English and French, what would you understand by that?" Grosjean reports that:

> "The most frequent response (36 percent) was that X speaks both languages fluently, followed by X speaks English and French (21 percent), and by X understands and speaks English and French (18 percent). The same question asked of a group of bilinguals gave very similar results: speaking the two languages was the most frequent response (46 percent), followed by speaking the two languages fluently (31 percent)." (1982: 231)

He then asked both groups to rate the importance of a number of factors for definitions of bilingualism. 1 indicates not important and 5 very important. Among the factors, "fluent in two languages" was given a mean rating of 4.7 by monolinguals and 4.4 by bilinguals, "having both speaking and writing fluency in two languages" was given a rating of 4.0 by monolinguals and 3.6 by bilinguals, and "equal fluency in two languages" was rated 3.7 and 4.1 by two groups respectively (p. 231). Grsojean concluded from both groups' evaluation that fluency is the most important factor to describe a bilingual speaker. He stresses

once more that "a bilingual will develop his or her languages to the level of fluency that is needed for communication. . . . Once the bilingual has attained a stable level of fluency (and is no longer learning one or the other language), he or she may well continue to produce deviations in bilingual speech, but these rarely interfere with communication" by affecting the interchange of meaning (p. 307). In the end, he advances a crucial note from his survey that "monolinguals differed most from bilinguals on the very question of language use," for "fluency in each of the four basic skills in the two languages is determined primarily by language use, and in turn, language use is determined by need" (p. 236).

The investigation is, of course, quite narrow for defining a true bilingual. Since "lexical borrowing and code-switching are quite simply the result of the bilinguals' need to communicate with one another" (Grosjean, 1982: 330), it becomes indispensable to confirm first the definition of bilinguals, then the forms a bilingual is using as code-switches or borrowings can be possibly ascertained and measured.

2. Data Information

To study the occurrence of English verbs in Chinese by Chinese-English bilinguals, data was collected from conversations in the United States primarily between Chinese students and professors, both from mainland China and Taiwan, and television talk shows recorded only in Taiwan.

The Chinese students in America include undergraduates in different majors and graduates in different areas. Three of my informants are American Chinese undergraduates who immigrated to the United States when they were seven or eight years of age and who mainly speak Mandarin Chinese with their family members whenever at home. Two of them speak Chinese extremely frequently with nearly no problem communicating with native Chinese from mainland China and Taiwan, while the other uses Chinese less frequently. All these three do not have strong reading and writing abilities in Chinese, but they are still included in the data called 'Chinese native speakers.' A small number of conversations are obtained from Taiwan in which most of the interlocutors were English majors who have graduated from universities and are working in schools or trade companies.

A majority of the speakers are not fluent in speaking English due to the fact that they spend most of their time with their native counterparts. The only time they speak English is either in school or with their American classmates discussing papers and homework assignments. Some of them have American friends, but the

number is rather limited. All the speakers involved range in age from 19 to 40. Over eighty percent of the informants are females.

Almost all the conversations involving the Chinese speakers in America happened under very natural and unarranged situations without any indication that data were being collected. All of the data regarding the English verbs in Chinese are gained from every complete sentence uttered by speakers during their discourses which were not recorded. They were either written down immediately after English verbs were used in sentences during the conversation, or kept in mind as much as possible and written down as soon as the speakers left. The latter means was used most often, since it always embarrassed the informants after they were told what was being written down, which may affect the attitudes that the speakers have toward code-switching. One problem was that my overconcentrated listening attitude (not on what they said but on what English verbs they used and what Chinese items appeared before them) often made the informants uncomfortable and reluctant to speak. The other problem was that some of the informants felt uncomfortable when personal sentences were written down. This is also why a tape recorder was not used.

Not only do single English verbs occur in the Chinese sentences of these data, but, of course, English verbal phrases also take a big portion of the data corpus. "English verbs in Chinese," the topic of this thesis, involves entire English verbal phrases in Chinese as well. This expression actually indicates a single

English verb and the verbal part of an English verbal phrase at the same time. "English verbs" refers to both English verbs and verbal phrases, for they are not discussed separately in this thesis. Meanwhile, for the code-switching phenomenon of English verbs in Chinese, the terms 'switch', 'borrow' and 'mix' are used interchangeably, based on the truth that it is impossible to draw clear-cut lines among them.

In these data where each sentence carries either an English verb or an English verbal phrase, there are 475 sentences containing English verbs and 229 sentences containing English verbal phrases. That is to say, 475 English verbs and 229 English verbal phrases are there in these data. In other words, there are in total 704 verbal units in 704 sentences collected in these data.

3. Methods and Objectives

In an entire corpus of 704 verbal units in 704 sentences in the data, all the verbs following the Chinese elements are classified into fourteen different categories (see Chapter 4). The usage of the English verbs is investigated on the basis of English grammar. The part of speech of Chinese words followed immediately by English verbs is also determined from the point of view of English grammar. From this, the frequency of one form versus the other can be determined; that is to say, the frequency of English-like forms versus non English-like forms occurring after the Chinese lexems. For example, the occurrence of the English verb *imagine* after the Chinese word *keyi* (can/may) is considered English-like, because the part of speech of *keyi* is classified as a modal in English, and there is nothing wrong at all to have a plain English verb after a modal in terms of English grammar, whereas it is considered non English-like if the English verb *bargain* is said after the Chinese *xiang* (want), since *xiang* in Chinese is classified as an infinitive verb in English, and it is not allowed in English to have two verbs in a row without putting an infinitive marker *to* in between.

A superficial number of the frequency of English-like verbal forms occurring in the Chinese sentences will be provided after each category with specific and disputable examples presented. Discussions will go next for each category. For several categories which imply interesting and problematic notes, hypothses will be offered for further study.

Since there is very little research done on Chinese-English code-switching, especially on the aspect of English verbs in Chinese, one of the main goals of this study is to demonstrate the intriguing phenomenon of English verbal codes switched in Chinese and some of the properties that English verbs bear which are considerably triggered by the underlying information of the Chinese lexemes occurring before/after them, and vice versa. On the other hand, the frequency of English-like verbs occurring in Chinese sentences, based on the data collected, is the quantitative goal of this study.

4. Data Classification and Discussion

From the 704 sentences that have been collected, all the Chinese words governing the English verbs or verbal phrases are classified into the following main fourteen categories. Whether the English verbs in Chinese are English-like or not is determined by English grammar.

4.1 Non-Finites

4.1.1 Infinitive Forms

In this category, the following Chinese forms control the occurrence of English verbs which immediately follow them:

> jie (lend, borrow), qing (please), shi (is), wangji (forget), xiwang (hope), xuyao (need), you (have), young (use), zhao (find), da dianhua (make phone calls), meiyou banfa (has no ways), meiyou biyao (has no need), etc., and verbs expressing willingness like xiang/yao (want), yuanyi (be willing).

Examples:

(1) ni na ba yaoshi jie wo **duplicate** yi xia
you that CL key lend I duplicate a while
Would you lend me that key to duplicate?

hao bu hao?
good not good

(2) ni keyi fang ji ge yingwen qu **balance** yi xia.
you can put several CL English to balance a while
You can put in some English to balance (this situation).

(3) xiwang yong zhe ge dong xi lai **introduce** yixie culture.
hope use this CL east west come introduce some culture
We hope to use this to introduce some culture.

(4) zhe ji zhang ni ke bu keyi bang wo **copy**
this several CL you can not can help I copy
Can you copy these pages for me?

yi xia?
a while

(5) zhe zhuyao shi **compare culture differences**.
this mainly be compare culture differences
This is mainly to compare culture differences.

(6) zuihao neng you liang ge laoshi **go through**.
better can have two CL teacher go through
It is better to go through instruction from two teachers..

(7) wo xiang **drop** na yi ke.
I want drop that one course
I want to drop that course.

Of 118 sentences in this category, there are 71 (60.17%) sentences containing English-like verbal forms; that is, all of them appear in a plain form after the Chinese items *qu* and *lai*, which mean *to* in English. The standard used here to determine the English-like usage of English verbs occurring in the Chinese sentences is to expect that there should be a *qu* or *lai* in front of English verbs to divide the previous Chinese infinitive forms. Examples like (2) and (3), for instance, are considered English-like, while the rest (39.83%), in terms of English grammar, are considered non English-like because of their lack of a Chinese form *qu* or *lai* preceding another English verb. (None of the English verbs and verbal

phrases in these sentences begin with the English marker *to*.) Examples like (4) are English-like, since in English grammar it is optional to have an infinitive marker *to* (meaning *qu* or *lai* in Chinese) when English *help* occurs and another English verb follows.

However, above is not as simple as it may seem at first. From the point of view of both Chinese linguistics and psycholinguistics, these two percentages given above can be rather problematic. First, the 'infinitive verbs', in terms of English grammar, expressing willingness (e.g., *xiang/yao*: want, *yuanyi*: be willing) are actually auxiliary verbs in Chinese grammar (Li & Thompson, 1981; Cheng & Li, 1988). There would be no mistakes at all if a plain English verb follows any of these auxiliary verbs. Out of the 108 sentences in these data, there are 40 sentences (33.90%) containing this type of auxiliary verb, which actually should be put in **4.2 Modals and Modal-Like Forms**, but, in terms of English grammar, they belong to infinitive verbs and are regarded as non English-like because they do not have an infinitive marker *to* before an English verb on the surface.

Second, it is truly a psycholinguistic matter whether a Chinese infinitive form in Chinese-English bilinguals' minds is interpreted into English as only a single verb or actually a verb plus *to*. That is to say, whether *meiyou banfa* is interpreted as *has no ways* or *has no ways to*, and *wangji* as *forget* or *forget to* is doubtable and unknown. If the latter is the case, it would be then considered non

English-like if *qu* and *lai* are added between the Chinese and English verbs, since they become redundant in that position. Another interesting concern related to bilingual psycholinguistic interpretation can be seen from the following examples:

(8) ta-men zuo wan yihou hai yao hui lai gen wo-men
3sg-PL do finish after also must back come with I-PL
After they finish, they have to come back and report to us.

report.
report

(9) wo zuotian cai qu gen laoshi **make appointment** de.
I yesterday only go with teacher make appointment NOM
Not until yesterday did I go to the teacher to make an appointment.

(10) ta mei shi jiu qu san wennuan **happy** yi xia.
3sg not matter then go three warm happy a while
Whenever free, he would go to the bath house to enjoy himself for a while.

According to English grammar, there needs to be a marker *lai* before *report* in sentence (8) and a *qu* before *make appointment* in sentence (9). However, it would sound weird and quite redundant to have two such similar items in a row in these two sentences. There are 9 sentences of this kind in this category where the Chinese verbs *qu* (go/go to) and *lai* (come/come to) propably function not only as verbs, but also as the marker *to* at the same time. My hypothesis is that since *qu* and *lai* have the same pronunciation for both parts of speech, the infinitive markers *qu* and *lai* are deleted in these sentences to avoid repetition. Of the English items in the 9 sentences cited so far, two of them are clearly non English-like; that is, (9) and (10) above, where the verbal phrase should be *make an appointment* in the

former and *happy* is an adjective falsely used as a verb in the latter. However, these errors are not the focus of this study.

Except for the 9 sentences mentioned above in which the absence of *qu* and *lai* is possible for the sake of redundancy, all the other sentences collected in this category and superficially considered non English-like from the point of view of English grammar, in fact, freely allow the occurrences of *qu* and *lai* in Chinese. In this kind of sentences, the Chinese infinitive forms immediately precede the English verbs without the appearance of *qu* and *lai* are, we can say this way, modal-like forms. Of course, they are not in parallel with English modals. It is interesting to note that it is optional to have *qu* or *lai* between the modal-like Chinese forms and the English verbs in Chinese-English code-switching sentences, but it is prohibited in English to have a marker *to* between a modal and a plain verb except for the two units of English modals like *have to* and *ought to*.

If *qu* is put in before the English verbs of sentences (6) and (7), for example, a deeper distinction between them is that *qu* in (6) connotes 'in order to' in English, whereas *qu* in (7) is a simple infinitive complement. For the convenience, (6) and (7) will be repeated as (11) and (12) below with the assumed occurrence of *qu*:

(11) zuihao neng <u>you</u> liang ge laoshi <u>qu</u> **go through**.
better can have two CL teacher to go through
It is better to go through instruction from two teachers.

(12) wo xiang qu **drop** na yi ke.
I want to drop that one course
I want to drop that course.

Comparing (11) and (12) with English grammar, we can find that in Chinese, no matter whether *qu* or *lai* implies the meaning of *in order to* or is just an infinitive complement in English, it is always elective to have *qu* or *lai*, depending on the context, to be put in between the Chinese infinitive forms and the English verbs, while it is strictly needed in English to have *to* inserted between two verbs no matter whether *to* is associated with the meaning of *in order to* or is just an infinitive complement. A couple of serial verbs, however, are permitted in colloquial English without the marker *to*, for instance, *go see a movie* and *come have dinner*. Save for the small number of cases like these two, the occurrence of *to* is strictly governed in English.

4.1.2 *-ing* Form

The Chinese verb *qu*, corresponding to the English verb *go*, is classified in this category since it controls the occurrence of the English verb gerund switched into Chinese. According to English grammar, if there is a verb following *go*, it needs to be a gerund. In this category, only the English *-ing* forms occurring after the Chinese verb *qu* are considered, while true nominal gerunds (e.g., "Fishing is fun.") are excluded. In my data, there are only 5 sentences of this kind associated

with the English structure *go+V+ing*. 2 of them (40%) are regarded as English-like, and the other 3 (60%) non English-like in terms of English grammar.

Examples:

(13) shang ci wo-men qu **shopping** deshihou ye you kan
last time I-PL go shopping when too have see
When we went shopping last time, we saw them, too.

dao ta-men.
arrive 3sg-PL

(14) wo shang libaitian gen yi dui pengyou yiqi qu
I last Sunday with one bunch friend together go
I went picnicking with a bunch of friends last Sunday.

picnic.
picnic

Whether the speakers consciously know about the English rule that any English action verbs after *qu*, meaning *go* in English, should be in an *-ing* form when they are speaking is rather doubtable. It is possible that in speakers' minds the English *-ing* forms like (13) is simply treated as an English plain verb like (14). If this is really so, perhaps the five sentences in this subcategory should be moved up to **4.1.1 Infinitive Forms** where the issue of the 9 special sentences like (8), (9) and (10) are discussed.

4.1.3 Both Infinitive and *-ing* Form

Since the 10 sentences found in these data either embed an English *-ing* or a plain verb right after the Chinese verb *xihuan* (like), the function of it is then considered as the English lexeme *like,* which can precede both an *-ing* form and an infinitive form with an infinitive marker *to* in front. Among these 10 sentences, 3 (30%) are English-like since the English *-ing* forms like *fishing* and *shopping* are uttered after *xihuan*, while the other 7 (70%) are non English-like because either an *-ing* form is missing or a short of the infinitive marker *qu* or *lai*, corresponding to *to* in English, occurs. Whether the interpretation of *xihuan* in speakers' minds is *like* or *like to* is unknown.

Examples:

(15) wo xiansheng hen xihuan **fishing**.
I husband very like fishing
My husband likes fishing a lot.

(16) ta shizai hen xihuan **complain**.
3sg indeed very like complain
She indeed likes to complain a lot.

(17) ta hen xihuan **show off**.
3sg very like show off
He likes to show off a lot.

(18) mei ci ti dao ta de mingzi, wo jiu hen
every time mention arrive 3sg GEN name I then very
Whenever his name is mentioned, I just like to make fun of it.

xihuan **make fun of it**.
like make fun of it

It is interesting to note that, although there is not yet enough of this type of data to prove it, there seems to be a trend toward having a single English *-ing* verb after *xihuan* but hardly ever to have a gerund verb within an English verbal phrase. In (17) and (18), the only two verbal phrases found in these data where the verbal part (*show* and *make*) is not shown in an *-ing* form. I hypothesize that it would be impossible to insert the English bound morpheme *-ing* after *show* and *make* if both *show off* and *make fun of it* are underlyingly treated separately as single big verbal units (the only difference from a single-occurring verb is that the one verbal unit is longer), whereas it is easier to put an *-ing* form in for a single-occurring English verb, for the speakers probably think underlyingly that a single *-ing* form is simply a plain verb.

4.2 Modals and Modal-Like Forms

The following Chinese forms are classified as modal-like forms on the basis of English grammar:

yinggai (should, ought to), bixu/yao/dei (have to), xuyao/yao (need to),

keyi (can,may), nenggou/neng (can), hui (will, would), zueihao (had better).

Examples:

(19) wo juede wo-men yinggai **exchange** yi xia.
I feel I-PL should exchange a while
I think we should trade places for a while.

(20) ni-men keyi **figure out** lingwai yi ge fangfa.
you-PL can figure out another one CL way
You can figure out another way.

(21) wo-men zuihao **stick to** yi ge style.
I-PL better stick to one CL style
We had better stick to one style.

Out of 212 sentences collected in this category, there are 207 (97.64%) sentences where the switched English verbs and verbal phrases immediately following the Chinese modals are English-like forms; that is, all of them are bare forms after modals. If we move the 38 sentences out of **4.1.1** in which the auxiliary verbs expressing willingness are actually modals in Chinese, then from 252 sentences we will have 247 (98.02%) containing English-like forms after Chinese modals. The other 5 sentences (1.98%) containing non English-like forms can be observed from the following examples. It is quite possible that the three English forms in the examples below are simply considered to be plain verbs in the speakers' subconsciousnesses.

Examples:

(22) wo pa hui **lost** diao hen duo laoshi shangke jiang
I afraid would lost off very many teacher teach talk
I am afraid that I would miss many things that the teacher talks about

de dongxi.
NOM stuff
in class.

(23) xingqiyi yao gei xuesheng kaoshi, hai yao **grading**
Monday must give student test also must grading
On Mondays I have to test students and alao have to grade their

xuesheng de zuoye.
student ASSOC homework
homework.

(24) ni ma jiao ni yao **tender** yidian!
you mother ask you must tender a little bit
Your mother asked you to be a little more gentle!

4.3 Past Aspect

This category means that in a Chinese past-tense sentence which is determined by the past time unit in the sentence or the speaker's intent, the English verb mixed in this type of sentence is expected to be past tense from the point of view of English grammar. In 58 past tense sentences collected so far, 52 English verbal items (89.66%) are plain forms, while the other 6 items (10.34%) are in the past tense.

Examples:

(25) wo shang ci zhi **pay** 144 kuai.
I last time only pay 144 CL
Last time I just paid 144 dollars.

(26) yinwei wo **assume** ni hui zai a!
because I assume you will at RF
Because I assumed you were in.

(27) Laoshi shuo wo **did** a good job ye!
teacher say I did a good job RF
The teacher said that I did a good job!

(28) jintian zaoshang chezi kai dao yiban **broke down** le.
today morning car drive to half broke down CRS
My car broke down on the way to school this morning.

Both *did* in (27) and *broke* in (28) are still possible for the speakers to interpret underlyingly as two English bare forms.

4.4 Progressive Aspect

In Chinese, *zhengzai/zai* is a durative marker of activity verbs. Corresponding to English, *zai* is just like an English verb ending *-ing* together with the copula to express the durative nature of an event (Li & Thompson, 1981: 217). To put it in another way, the structure of *zai*, in terms of English, is *be+_-ing*. Examples:

(29) ta zai **take a shower**.
3sg DUR take a shower
He is taking a shower.

(30) wo zai **wonder** shibushi yinggai gei George 2.5.
I DUR wonder whether should give George 2.5
I am wondering whether we should give George 2.5.

(31) wo xianzai zhengzai **struggling**.
I now DUR struggling
I am now struggling.

Based on the above definition of the usage of *zai*, plain forms like (29) and (30) are all English-like, since *zai* has already taken the copula together with the bound morpheme *-ing*. Cases like (31) are considered non English-like, because the ending *-ing* is redundant. However, this can be totally the other way around if

in speakers' underlying interpretation *zai* only corresponds to the copula without the verb ending *-ing*. In 28 sentences of this kind, there are 7 sentences (25%) in which verbs plus ending *-ing* are discovered, while the rest (75%) are not. Given the figures (75%:25%), we may assume that the speakers interpret *zhengzai/zai* as *be+_-ing* in English.

4.5 Perfective Aspect

This category is based on Chinese perfective aspect markers like the perfective verb suffix *-le*, the adverb *yijing* (already), the negative perfective adverb *hai mei* or *hai meiyou* (not yet), and the interrogative perfective adverb *lemei* or *lemeiyou*, which always occurs at the end of a sentence. In 33 sentences collected for this category, there are 5 verb items (15.15%) in English-like perfect participle froms, while the remaining 28 (84.85%) are still plain forms. These, again, are just superficial figures. Of the 5 verbs, which are English-like participial forms, there are 3 in which the participial forms are the same as their plain forms. In this case, therefore, it is impossible to tell whether the bilinguals really know if the form they are using is a participle or just a plain verb. One example of this will be given in (35) below.

Examples:

(32) wo <u>hai mei</u> **check out**.
I still not check out
I have not checked out yet.

(33) ni **check in** lemei?
you check in yet
Have you checked in?

(34) wo yijing **make a final decision**, wo bu qu le.
I already make a final decision I not go CRS
I have already made a final decision. I am not going.

(35) wo yijing **quit** diao na ge gongzuo le.
I already quit off that CL job PFV
I have already quit that job.

(36) wo haoxiang yijing **done** le.
I seem already done PFV
It seems that I have already done it.

Superficially, the verb items like examples (32), (33) and (34) are considered non English-like because they are expected to be in a participial form. However, in the bilinguals' underlying interpretation, whether those Chinese perfective aspect markers correspond to the English perfective participial formula, *has/have+_-ed/en,* is uncertain. But if that is what the bilinguals really interpret, then the 27 plain verbs in these data ought to be considered English-like. The only perfective participial verb in (36), except the four English verbal items which have no tense distinction as in (35), should hence be counted as non English-like because its participial form becomes redundant. However, since *done* is an irregular participle, it is very possible that the speakers treat it just like a plain verb without noticing at all its participial nature as they are speaking. Therefore, it is difficult to assess the structure buried under the surface of *yijing done le* in (36). For this, we need certain special tests made for the bilinguals to discover the inside

story. Given the current percentage figures (84.38%:15.62%), an early hypothesis may be made that the bilingual speakers probably interpret the Chinese perfective aspect markers as *has/have+_-ed/en* in their minds, and that is why a bare form emerges on the surface.

4.6 Passive Coverb

In spoken Chinese, as Chao (1968: 703) indicates, "the *bei* construction is usually limited to disposal verbs . . . , usually of unfavorable meaning." In the *bei* construction, the object stands for the agent; that is, the performer of the passive voice sentence, while the patient, namely, the receptor, represents the subject of the sentence (Lin, 1981: 248; Liu, Zheng and Liu, 1989: 478). See (37) below. However, (37) is not the only form for the *bei* construction to occur. There are several variations of (37). Examples like (38) and (40) demonstrate that the object is brought immediately to the front of the main verb by a passive coverb *bei* when the agent is absent (Wang, 1959: 31; Li and Thompson, 1981: 492).

In 45 sentences in this category, all the English verbs occur either after the Chinese passive coverb *bei* or after the agent, which is placed in front of *bei*. There is one sentence which has an implication of adversity without the realization of *bei*. See example (39) below. Superficially, 17 (37.78%) sentences have English-like passive verbs, and 28 (62.22%) have plain verbs. Like in **4.5**, there are also two cases where the English participles are the same as their plain forms,

e.g., (40) below. Given the percentage (62.22%) above, an assumption can be made that the speakers probably often interpret *bei* as *be+_-ed/en* in English but not so often as they do for the perfect forms described in **4.5** above.

Examples:

(37) shang ge yue de fangzu ni bei Housing
last CL month ASSOC rent you BEI Housing
How much were you charged by Housing for last month's rent?

charge duo shao qian?
charge much little money

(38) zhe ge zi de yisi yijing bei **narrow down** le.
this CL word ASSOC meaning already BEI narrow down PFV
The meaning of the word has been narrowed down.

(39) shiliu ke de tape zenme dou (bei) **messed up** le?
sixteen lesson ASSOC tape how all messed up CRS
How come the tape for lesson 16 is all messed up?

(40) wo xiansheng ruguo bei **put in jail**, na jiu wan le!
I husband if BEI put in jail that then finish CRS
If my husband is put in jail, then everything would be ruined!

In these data, there is one sentence which is left out of this category and may be interesting to compare with (39):

(41) wo gaosu ta wo jintian **tied up**. "ni qu zhao Fukushima!"
I tell 3sg I today tied up you go look for Fukushima
I told her that I was tied up today. "You go find Fukushima!"

Form the point of view of Chinese grammar, there is indeed a passive voice in (39), which is confined to the indication of adverse message. (41) without the occurrence of *bei* may be considered as a passive sentence in the first place.

However, the participial verbal phrase *tied up*, I think, is not associated with the Chinese *bei* sentence structure but is probably performed by the speaker in an underlying English-based phrase structure embedded in a Chinese sentence. The phrase actually acts pretty much like an adjective instead, and its meaning can be equivalent to the Chinese adjective phrase *mang si le* (busy to death). Likewise, *tied up* can be a passive adjective, which is quite commom in English.

4.7 Do-Supports

In Chinese, the words which function just like *do/does not* in English are *bu/buyao* and *mei/meiyou*. Examples will be given for these in (42) and (43). *you mei you* in (44), which can express both a past and a perfective meaning, is put into this category according to the content. In 38 sentences of this type, all the English verbs (100%) are presented in a bare form.

Examples:

(42) yinwei you xie ren genban bu **care**.
because have some people basically not care
Because some people just do not care at all.

(43) qishi wo genban jiu mei **improve** wo de personality.
actually I basically just not improve I ASSOC personality
Actually, I did not improve my personality at all.

(44) ni you mei you **propose** yixie paper?
you have not have propose some paper
Did you propose some paper?

4.8 *rang* and *qu*

In this category, there are 18 sentences containing the Chinese verb *rang*, meaning let in English. All the English items (100%) following it are English-like plain infinitives in terms of English grammar. There is one sentence containing the Chinese verb *qu*, meaning *go/go to* in English. The English item following it is also a plain infinitive. In both standard and colloquial English, this sentence is considered English-like. See (47) below.

Examples:

(45) shangke deshihou jiu rang xuesheng **retell** zheng ge gushi.
teach when then let student retell whole CL story
While in class, just let students retell the whole story.

(46) xia xueqi wo xiang rang ni-men **co-teach**.
next semester I want let you-PL co-teach
Next semester I want to let you two co-teach.

(47) ni bei deng bao yihou you mei you qu **argue**?
you BEI publish newspaper after have not have go argue
Did you go argue after your name was published in the newspaper?

4.9 Question Word

The Chinese question word *zenme/zenmeyang* (how/how to) is found in these data placing before English verbs. Like **4.1.1**, the standard used to determine the English-like usage of the English verbs is to expect either *qu* or *lai*, functioning as an infinitive marker to in English, to occur after the Chinese question word and before the English verbs. Of the 26 sentences, only 5 (19.23%) embrace *qu*

between the Chinese question word *zenme/zenmeyang* and the English verbs, while the other 21 (80.77%) are counted as non English-like due to the lack of *qu* or *lai* appearing before the English verbs. Likewise, these cursory figures can be entirely the other way around if *zenme/zenmeyang* is interpreted underlylingly as *how to* rather than *how* by the speakers. Then *qu* in the five sentences may show repetition and redundance.

Examples:

(48) wo bu zhidao zenme qu **clarify** wo gang shuo de.
I not know how to clarify I just now say NOM
I do not know how to clarify what I said just now.

(49) yinwei wo bu zhidao yao zenmeyang **behave ike a**
because I not know must how behave like a
Because I do not know how to behave like a teacher.

teacher.
teacher.

4.10 Imperative

The 12 imperative sentences put in this category express either a command or a suggestion, and the listener to whom the imperatives are addressed is always a second person subject. All the English verbs after second person subject of the sentences collected in these data are plain forms (100%).

Examples:

(50) ni zai **repeat** yi bian hao bu hao?
you again repeat one time good not good
Would you repeat again?

(51) ruguo ni juede yinggai zhe yang, ni jiu **go for it**.
if you feel should this way you then go for it
If you think it should be this way, you just go for it.

4.11 First Person Habituals or Present

In this category, the English verbs (100%) after first person subject in the 31 sentences are all plain forms.

Examples:

(52) hao, hao, hao, wo **apologize**!
good, good, good, I apologize
Ok, Ok, Ok, I apologize!

(53) wo jiushi **make sure** eryi, mei bie de shi.
I just make sure only not other ASSOC matter
I am just making sure, nothing else.

(54) wo-men yinwei zhu zai yiqi, suoyi chang chang
I-PL because live at together so often often
Because we live together, we often cook together.

yiqi **cook**.
together cook

4.12 Second Person Habituals or Present

The English verbs (100%) collected in the 20 sentences of this category are all bare forms after second person subject.

Examples:

(55) ni zongshi **attack** wo de character!
you always attack I GEN character
You always attack my character!

(56) ni tai **care** le cai hui zhe yang la!
you too much care CRS then would this way RF
Because you care too much. That is why!

4.13 Third Person Singular

In the 19 sentences collected for this category, all the subjects are third person singulars. However, there are 4 English verbs (21.05%) with the presence of 's' for third person singular subject. 78.95% do not mark the verb.

Examples:

(57) yanjing xiao duo duo shao shao **implies** zhe ge
eye small much much little little implies this CL
Small eyes more or less imply that this person is comparatively

ren xingxong bijiao xiazhai.
person bosom comparatively narrow
narrow-minded.

(58) zhe you zen yang? zhe zhong shi **happens a lot**!
this again how way this kind matter happens a lot
So what? This kind of thing happens a lot!

(59) ta **pay** ni ma?
3sg pay you Q
She pays you?

(60) zhe zhong shi jianzhi **sound stupid**!
this kind thing simply sound stupid
This kind of thing just sounds stupid!

4.14 Third Person Plural

The subjects of the 14 sentences in this category are third person plurals. All these English verbs (100%) after third person plural subjects are unmaked or plain forms.

Examples:

(61) youde xuesheng ta-men hai **care** fenshu, keshi youde
some student 3sg-PL still care score, but some
Some students would care about the score, but some simply do not care

genban bu care.
basically not care
at all.

(62) zhe yang ta-men jiu rongyi **concentrate**.
this way 3sg-PL then easy concentrate
By this way, they can concentrate easily.

5. *ba*

The chief reason that the *ba* construction is different from the passive *bei* sentence is that the *ba* construction conveys an active voice. Since the *ba* construction is quite a unique structure in Mandarin, it is very difficult, in many occasions, to convey the exact meaning of the original *ba* sentence in clear English. Because of this reason, all 17 *ba* sentences are assembled together in this chapter and are classified on the basis of the above categories. In the *ba* construction, the preposition *ba* and its direct object,[11] which is the person or object disposed of, are always placed before a transitive verb. This verb, in Chinese-English bilingual sentences, is always switched by an English transitive verb (see the sentence constructions in the 6 categories below). In the bilingual speech, according to all 17 *ba* sentences, the *ba* construction is never changed when the verb is replaced by an English verb. The 17 *ba* sentences are grouped into the following six categories:

[11] According to Zou (1993: 716), the direct object of BA is the preverbal NP, which is "the logical object of the transitive verb but the surface object of BA."

5.1 Infinitive Verbs

The three Chinese infinitive verbs *jiao* (ask), *bang* (help) and *lai* (come) are found in the 3 *ba* sentences of these data. The main sentence construction in this category is:

subject Chinese infinitive verb *ba* direct object English verb

Examples:

(63) wo hui jiao ta-men ba zhe ge gushi **retell** kan kan.
I will ask 3sg-PL BA this CL story retell see see
I will ask them to retell this story.

(64) wo shi yao bang ni ba zhe ge position gei **hold**
I be want help you BA this CL position GEI hold
I want to help you hold this position.

zhu.
stay

(65) ta-men shuo yao jiao jingcha lai ba wo xiansheng
3sg-PL say want ask police come BA I husband
They said they were going to ask the police to come (to/and) put

put in jail.
put in jail
my husband in jail.

Because of the difficulty of translating *ba* sentences into English precisely, it is given an English translation corresponding to the original Chinese meaning as close as possible by removing the preposition *ba* and inserting its direct object after the English verb or the verbal part of an English verbal phrase. An approximate translation is presented in the third line of each example.

(63) is apparently considered non English-like, since observing from the English translation in the third line, there is no *qu* or *lai* functioning as an infinitive marker in English between *jiao* (ask) and *retell*. However, it is not easy to tell whether the interpretation of *jiao* is just *ask* or *ask to* in English by the bilinguals. The English verb *hold* in (64) is considered English-like because of the previous infinitive verb *bang* (help). According to Chinese grammar, (64) can still be a well-formed sentence without the element *gei*, which is placed before *hold* and indicates "the effect of strengthening the disposal function of the *ba* construction" (Li and Thompson, 1981: 482). (65) is considered English-like since from the aspect of colloquial English, it is optional to have *lai* (come) and *put in jail* in a row without *to* or *and* (see the translation in the third line).

5.2 Modals and Modal-Like Forms

The Chinese modals found in this category are *keyi* (can), *yinggai* (should, ought to) and *yao* (must, have to). After the Chinese modals, all the English verbs are English-like bare forms (100%). The main sentence structure for the 8 *ba* sentences collected in this category is:

subject Chinese modal *ba* direct object English verb

Examples:

(66) ni keyi ba zhe ci kaoti **extend** yi xia.
you can BA this time test extend a while
You can extend this test a little bit.

(67) ni yinggai ba ni ganggang shuo de zai **define**
you should BA you just now say NOM again define
You should explain again a little better what you said just now.

yi xia.
a while

5.3 Past Aspect

According to the speakers' content, the only 3 sentences collected below are non English-like, for the English verbs are not past tense. The main sentence structure is:

subject *ba* direct object English verb

(70) actually expresses an event that took place both in the past tense and the perfective tense. Since the aspect is optional, it is placed in this category. Again, the approximate translation is given in the third line by eliminating the preposition *ba* and placing its direct objects, which are underlined below, after the English verb *paraphrase* in (68) and verbal phrase *go over* in (70).

Examples:

(68) na zhi zhu shenme ye bu ting jiu ba
that CL pig what too not listen then BA
That pig did not listen at all and then just rejected that girl.

na ge nuhai gei **reject** le.
that CL girl GEI reject CRS

(69) wo zhishi ba na-xie zuozhe shuo de shaowei
I only BA that-PL author say NOM a little bit
I just paraphrased a little bit those said by the author.

paraphrase yi xia eryi.
paraphrase a while only

(70) wo jintian ba sheng ci dou **go over** le yi xia.
I today BA new word all go over PFV a while
Today I went over the new words for a while.

5.4 Perfective Aspect

Only one sentence in this category contains a tense marker *you mei you*, which can express both a past and a perfective event. It is determined to be put here because, according to the speaker, *you mei you* conveys a perfective meaning as opposed to a past event. (71) is superficially non English-like due to the bare form of *point out* after the Chinese perfective aspect marker *you mei you*. Of course, what the bilingual speakers really interpret the English perfective participle is still unknown. But observing from the data collected in **4.5 Perfective Aspect**, although they are not *ba* sentences, and given by the current figure showing the high frequency in the use of bare forms of English verbs in **4.5** (84.38%), it may be assumed here in **5.4** that the speakers possibly interpret the perfective aspect marker *you mei you* in the only *ba* sentence in this category as *has/have+_-ed/en*.

The *ba*-sentence structure is:

subject you mei you *ba* direct object English verb

Example:

(71) wo bu zhidao you mei you ba wo de key point
I not know have not have BA I ASSOC key point
I do not know whether I have pointed out my key point?

point out chu lai?
point out out come

5.5. First Person Habituals or Present

The only sentence collected in this category is English-like, because the English verb of the sentence is a plain form. The sentence structure is :

first person subject *ba* direct object English verb

Example:

(72) wo-men chang chang ba yi ge fixed term **refer** dao
I-PL often often BA one CL fixed term refer arrive
We often refer a fixed term to another meaning.

lingwai yi ge yisi.
other one CL meaning

5.6 Third Person Plural

In this category, there is only one sentence which has an English-like plain verb after third person plural subject in the *ba*-sentence structure:

third person plural subject *ba* direct object English verb

Example:

(73) yinwei ta-men ba data **transfer** guoqu deshihou cai hui
because 3sg-PL BA data transfer cross when then will
Because that is what will happen when they transfer the data there.

zhe yang.
this way

6. Conclusion

To summarize Chapters 4 and 5 from a superficial observation in terms of English grammar, the following Tables 1 and 2 show statistical figures of the frequency of English-like and non English-like verbs after the Chinese elements in each category. Table 3 is a combination of Tables 1 and 2 with the items shared only.

Table 1: Summary of Chapter 4 from a superficial observation

Classifications	Number of Sentences	English-Like Verbs	Non English-Like Verbs
Non-finites			
Infinitive forms	118	71	47
-ing form	5	2	3
Both infinitive & *-ing* form	10	3	7
Modals & modal-like forms	212	207	5
Past aspect	58	6	52
Progressive aspect	28	7	21
Perfective aspect	33	5	28
Passive aspect	45	17	28
Do-supports	38	38	0
rang & *qu*	18	18	0
Question word	26	5	21
Imperative	12	12	0
First person habituals or present	31	31	0
Second person habituals or present	20	20	0
Third person singular	19	4	15
Third person plural	14	14	0

Table 2: Summary of Chapter 5 from a superficial observation (*ba* sentences only)

Classifications	Number of Sentences	English-Like Verbs	Non English-Like Verbs
Infinitive verbs	3	2	1
Modals & modal-like forms	8	8	0
Past aspect	3	0	3
Perfective aspect	1	0	1
First person habituals or present	1	1	0
Third person plural	1	1	0

Table 3: Tables 1 and 2 combined (shared items only)

Classifications	Number of Sentences	English-Like Verbs	Non English-Like Verbs
Infinitive verbs	121	73	48
Modals & modal-like forms	220	215	5
Past aspect	61	6	55
Perfective aspect	34	5	29
First person habituals or present	32	32	0
Third person plural	15	15	0

From the perspective of English plain verbs without any affixation, the following tables 4 and 5 summarize the number of English plain verbs after the Chinese elements in each category in Chapter 4 and Chapter 5. Table 6 is a combination of Tables 4 and 5 with the items shared only.

Table 4: Summary of Chapter 4 in terms of English plain verbs after the Chinese elements

Classifications	Number of Sentences	English Plain Verbs	English Non-Plain Verbs
Non-finites			
Infinitive forms	118	116	2
-ing form	5	3	2
Both infinitive & *-ing* form	10	7	3
Modals & modal-like forms	212	207	5
Past aspect	58	54	4
Progressive aspect	28	21	7
Perfective aspect	33	31	2
Passive aspect	45	28	17
Do-supports	38	38	0
rang & *qu*	18	18	0
Question word	26	25	1
Imperative	12	12	0
First person habituals or present	31	31	0
Second person habituals or present	20	20	0
Third person singular	19	15	4
Third person plural	14	14	0

Table 5: Summary of Chapter 5 (*ba* sentences) in terms of English plain verbs after the Chinese elements

Classifications	Number of Sentences	English Plain Verbs	English Non-Plain Verbs
Infinitive verbs	3	3	0
Modals & modal-like forms	8	8	0
Past aspect	3	3	0
Perfective aspect	1	1	0
First person habituals or present	1	1	0
Third person plural	1	1	0

Table 6: Tables 4 and 5 combined (shared items only)

Classifications	Number of Sentences	English Plain Verbs	English Non-Plain Verbs
Infinitive verbs	121	119	2
Modals & modal-like forms	220	215	5
Past aspect	61	57	4
Perfective aspect	34	32	2
First person habituals or present	32	32	0
Third person plural	15	15	0

From Tables 4 and 5, it is justifiable to say that Chinese-English bilinguals tend to use a great deal of English plain verbs in their Chinese-English code-switching behavior. That is to say, they are apt to reduce the morpheme load of English in their code-switching sentences. The reason is due to the fact that there is no inflection in Chinese verbs and that the tense of a verb is determined by the time word of a sentence, tense markers like *le*, *yijing*, *hai meiyou*, *guo*, *zhengzai*, etc., and the speech content of the speaker. Appel and Muysken (1987: 87) comment that simplification is often led by the second-language learners under the influence of the first language.

Observing from Tables 4 and 5 in which 704 code-mixing sentences (687 in Chapter 4 and 17 in Chapter 5) are collected so far, there are only 39 English verbal items; namely, 6.12 per cent that are not plain forms. Among the 39 English non-plain verbal items, 26 (66.67%) are regular verbs and 10 (25.64%) irregular verbs. These irregular verbs are *broke* (2), *caught* (1), *did* (1), *done* (1),

left (2), and *lost* (3). Of the 26 regular verbs, 14 contain the morpheme *-ing*. It is very possible that both the regular verbs with the morpheme *-ing* and the irregular verbs are treated underlyingly as plain verbs by the bilingual speakers. The remaining 3 items (two adjectives, *happy* in **4.1.1 Infinitive Forms** and *tender* in **4.2 Modals and Modal-Like Forms,** and one English prefix 'e-' in **4.9 Question Word** from the English word *e-mail*) that are not English verbs but are placed in a verb position in Chinese.

For a precise interpretation, we would need to find out the deep structures of Chinese infinitive verbs, the progressive aspect marker *zhengzai/zai*, the perfective aspect markers like *-le*, *yijing*, *hai mei*, etc., the passive marker *bei*, and the Chinese question word *zenme/zenmeyang* in terms of English structure. If we could, we might understand why the bilingual speakers use such an overwhelming number of plain verbs in their code-mixing behavior. Perhaps there is no answer to this question for some speakers, because they may incorporate no English structures; therefore, what they use are only borrowed forms. It is necessary to notice that, in a bilingual speaker's mind, a verbal phrase in English might be treated as one whole verbal unit in Chinese. If so, it would be impossible to affix any bound morphemes, in terms of English grammar, to such verbs in neither a Chinese-syntax-built sentence nor an English-syntax-built sentence. For instance, if *check out* is treated just as a verbal unit by the speakers (in terms of Chinese, this verbal phrase is probably just a long verb, interpreted as '*checkout*', in

speakers' minds), then it is absolutely not permitted to insert a past or a perfective verbal suffix *-ed* or *-en* or a progressive verbal suffix *-ing* in the verb '*checkout*'. Likewise, a third person singular verbal suffix *-s* cannot be inserted into the verbal phrase *figure out*, either, if it is treated as a whole verb '*figureout*' in speakers' minds. And the speakers have no English models to suggesting suffixing to these 'unitized' forms, e.g., '*figureouts*'. The line of thinking supports the Free Morpheme Constraint formulated by Poplack (1980) that "no switch may take place between two morphemes which are morphologically bound to each other."

However, Appel & Muysken mention that sometimes it is not quite possible to maintain the original grammar in the process of relexification, particularly if function words from the new language are introduced as well (1987: 156). None of these data support this theory.

For the interesting phenomenon of Chinese-English code-switching, below are another four sentences where the former two show English verbs switched in Chinese-word-order sentences, while the latter two show both an English adjective and a noun switched into the English word order which is embedded in Chinese sentences.

Examples:

(74) wo **xiang** **try** **try** **kan**.
I think try try see
I want to try it.

(75) ni shuo ta **deserve bu deserve** wo?
you say 3sg deserve not deserve I
Do you think he deserves me or not?

(76) ni de xin yijing yi ge libai **late** le.
you GEN letter already one CL week late PFV
Your letter has been already one week late.

(77) ta keyi gei ni yi ge **ride**.
3sg can give you one CL ride.
He can give you a ride.

The four examples do not represent a clear-cut line where the speakers either use Chinese-syntax-built sentences or Chinese English-snytax-built sentences all the time in their code-switching behavior. Instead, the bilingual speakers are rather likely to use one sentence structure and then the other back and forth in their discourse or even half-and-half within a single code-switched sentence. A good deal of these data and my personal experiences conversing with the informants support this psycholinguistic idea: that it is scientifically difficult to determine which sentence structure in that language is used by the speakers. However, examples (76) and (77) support the Dual-Structure Principle proposed by Sridhar and Sridhar (1980) that as long as the placement of the embedded constituent in the main language obeys the rules of the main language, it is not really needed for the internal structure of the embedded switches to conform to the constituent structure rules of the main language. That is to say, *yi ge libai late le* in (76) and *gei ni yi ge ride* in (77) both follow the surface syntactic rule of Chinese langugae. In (76), the structure of *yi ge libai late le* is quite similar to the

Chinese nominal phrase structure, accepted only in colloquial Chinese: *yi ge libai duo le* (more than one week), though *late* is not semantically appropriate to occur in such a position in Chinese sentence, whereas in (77) the syntactic structure of *gei ni yi ge ride* is compatible with the Chinese word order: *gei ni yi ben shu* (give you a book), though there is no fixed interpretation in Chinese for *ride* in such a Chinese nominal position.

In addition, even though these are obvious replacements of Chinese vocabulary with that of English, both the formal aspect and the frequency and nature of usage in a particular community may result in the phenomenon of integration. Baetens Beardsmore suggests that the more a particular term of foreign origin is used in a bilingual's speech (and also in that of the monoglot too), the more integrated it must be (1982: 46). It is true that many English verbal items in these data, e.g., *call*, *copy*, *cut* and *pay*, probably have already been integrated into Chinese through the frequency of usage among bilinguals, especially when there is a coincidence that two words sound so much alike. *Ca* in Chinese and *cut* in English, *ku* in Chinese and *cool* in English, and *hou* (wait) in Chinese and *hold* in English not only have similar pronunciations but also share the same meanings. These are good examples that English words with sounds very similar to those permitted in Chinese have little difficulty being adapted (Brown, 1975:116; Appel and Muysken, 1987: 126). Casagrande (1954/5) summarizes research on American languages to support the idea that it is a gradual process for the

integration of borrowed elements, which may take generations. VanLoey (1958) has noted that language shift can occur as fast as in three generations. In the first generation, language A (the base or mother language) is exclusively used. In the second generation, language B is used at the same time with language A by so-called bilinguals. When the third generation arrives, language B becomes the exclusive one to be used by monolinguals. In younger generations, I have noticed that there are a large number of English words used by bilinguals or even unilinguals which are being underlyingly treated as Chinese words through American cultural influence; for example, some nominal items like *CD*, *disco*, *E-Mail*, *E.T.*, *FAX*, *IBM*, *MBA*, *mile*, *MTV*, *NBA*, *party*, *PC*, *pizza*, etc., some profanity in English, and verbal items used in Chinese syntactic structure like *cut*, *call* and *pay*, etc. For monoglots, these items can be pronounced in the English way without knowing the English language (Grosjean, 1982: 292).

It has been mentioned earlier in Chapter 1 that there are governed rules (see pages 9 and 10) for code-switching among languages which are in contact with one another. Nearly all of the English verbs and verbal phrases switched in the Chinese sentences, collected in these data and mentioned in Chapter 4, obey the equivalence constraint defined by Poplack (1980) and supported by Woolford (1983) in that they match the surface word order of the language of the verb and the verbal phrase of the Chinese language. Code-switching is well-inclined to take place when surface syntactic structures of both languages are common to each

other. Although examples (10) in **4.1.1** and (24) in **4.2** where both the English adjectives *happy* and *tender* do not match the surface word order of the language of the adjective in Chinese but correspond to the position of the Chinese verbs, it is possible that the bilingual informants simply treat them as two English verbs underlyingly, which would then match the language of the verb in Chinese.[12]

The quantitative analysis of each category in both Chapter 4 and Chapter 5 is only a superficial observation of the occurrence of English verbs in Chinese, but careful consideration should be given to the process of analyzing all these 'simple' trouble makers. Especially, particular tests made for bilingual speakers are needed to determine exactly their interpretations of the Chinese constructions in terms of English grammar. Interesting results remain to be seen in the future.

---

[12] This assumption is built upon the fact that in Chinese, adjectives can also function as verbs in many cases. Examples:

(78) wo hen kuaile.	(79) ta hen wenrou.
I very happy	3sg very gentle
I am very happy.	She is very gentle.

Thus, the usage of the English adjectives *happy* and *tender* in Chinese sentences is probably under the influence of the Chinese language.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Bibliography

Anisman, Paul H. 1975. *Some Aspects of Code-Switching in New York Puerto Rican English.* Bilingual Review II.

Appel, R. & Muysken, P. 1987. *Language Contact and Bilingualism.* London: Edward Arnold, 153-163.

Baetens Beardsmore, H. 1982. *Bilingualism: Basic Principles.* Clevedon: Tieto, 1-27.

Baker, C. 1988. *Key Issues in Bilingualism and Bilingual Education.* Clevedon: Multilingual Matters Inc.

Baker, O. R. 1980. Categories of Code Switching in Hispanic Communities: Untangling the Terminology. *Working Papers in Sociolinguistics.* Austin, Texas: Southwest Educational Development Laboratory.

Blom, J. P. & J. J. Gumperz. 1972. Social Meaning in Linguistic Structure: Code Switching in Norway. In J. J. Gumperz & D. Hymes (eds.), *Directions in Sociolinguistics: The Ethnography of Communication*, 407-34.

Bloomfield, L. 1933. *Language.* New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.

Brown, J. D. 1975. Spanish-English Code Switching. In E. Hemandez-Chavez (eds.), *El Lenguaje de Los Chicanos: Regional and Social Characteristics Used by Mexican Americans.* Arlington, Virginia: The Center for Applied Linguistics, 115-121.

Casagrande, J. B. 1954/55. Comanche Linguistic Acculturation. *International Journal of American Linguistics* 20.

Chao, Y. R. 1968. *A Grammar of Spoken Chinese.* Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press.

Cheng, M. & Li, D. 1988. *A Practical Chinese Grammar for Foreigners.* Beijing: Sinolingua.

Clyne, M. G. 1967. *Transference and Triggering.* The Hague: Martinus Nijhoff.

_____1972. *Perspectives on Language Contact: Based on a Study of German in Australia.* Melbourne: The Hawthorn Press.

De Houwer, A. 1990. *The Acquisition of Two Languages from Birth: A Case Study.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Diebold, A. R. 1963. Code-Switching in Greek-English Bilingual Speech. *Report of the Thirteenth Annual Round Table Meeting on Linguistics and Language Studies.* Washington: Georgetown.

_____1965. A Survey of Psycholinguistic Research, 1954-1964. *Psycholinguistics.* Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 242-255.

Di Pietro, R. 1977. Code-Switching as a Verbal Strategy among Bilinguals. In F. Eckman (ed.), *Current Themes in Linguistics: Bilingualism, Experimental Linguistics and Language Typologies.* Washington, D.C.: Hemisphere Publishing.

Ervin-Tripp, S. 1968. An Analysis of the Interaction of Language, Topic and Listener. In J. Fishman (ed.), *Reading in the Sociology of Language.* The Hague: Mouton.

Fishman, J. A. 1976. The Spread of English as a New Perspective for the Study of Language Maintenance and Language Shift. In B. B. Kachru (ed.), *Dimensions of Bilingualism: Theory and Case studies. Studies in Langugae Learning, I,* # 2. Urbana: Unit for Foreign Language Study and Research, University of Illinois.

_____1990. What Is Reversing Language Shift (RLS) and How Can It Succeed? *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development 11/1,* 2: 5-36.

_____1991. *Reversing Language Shift.* Clevedon, Avon: Multilingual Matters.

Gal, S. 1979. *Language Shift: Social Determinants of Linguistic Change in Bilingual Austria.* New York: Academic Press.

Gibbons, J. P. 1979a. Code Mixing and Koineising in the Speech of Students at the University of Hong Kong. *Anthropological Linguistics*.

_____1983. Code Choice and Code-Mixing in the Speech of Students at the University of Hong Kong. Unpublished Ph.D. thesis. Reading: Department of Linguistic Science, University of Reading.

_____1987. *Code-Mixing and Code Choice: A Hong Kong Case Study*. England: Multilingual Matters Inc.

Grosjean, F. 1982. *Life with Two Languages: An Introduction to Bilingualism*. Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 55-99.

Gumperz, J. J. 1967. On the Linguistic Markers of Bilingual Communication. *Journal of Social Issues, XXIII*, 2, 48-57.

_____1972. On the Communicative Competence of Bilinguals: Some Hypotheses and Suggestions for Further Research. *Language and Society*, 1, 1.

_____1982. *Conversational Code-Switching*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Gumperz, J. J. & E. Hernandez-Chavez. 1971b. *Cognitive Aspects of Bilingual Communication*. In Whiteley, 111-125.

_____1975. Cognitive Aspects of Bilingual Communication. In E. Hernandez-Chavez et al. (eds.), *El Lenguaje De Los Chicanos, Arlington*, 54-64.

Hamers, J. & M. Blanc. 1989. *Bilinguality and Bilingualism*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Hasselmo, N. 1970. Code-Switching and Modes of Speech. In Glenn G. Gilbert (ed.), *Texas Studies in Bilingualism*. Berline: DeGruyter, 179-210.

Haugen, E. 1956. *Bilingualism in the Americas: A Bibliography and Research Guide*. Alabama: University of Alabama Press.

_____1972. The Stigmata of Bilingualism. In A. Dil. (ed.), *The Ecology of Language*. Stanford: Stanford University Press.

Heath, J. 1981. A Case of Intensive Lexical Diffusion: Arnhem Land, Australia. *Language*, 57.

Huerta, A. G. 1978. Code Switching among Spanish-English Bilinguals: A Sociolinguistic Perspective. Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation. Austin: University of Texas at Austin.

Hymes, D. 1974. *Foundation In Sociolinguistics: An Ethnographic Approach*, Philadelphia.

Kachru, B. B. 1978. Towards Structuring Code-Mixing: An Indian Perspective. *International Journal of the Sociology of Language.*

_____1978. Code-Mixing as a Communicative Strategy in India. In J. E. Alatis (ed.), *International Dimensions of Bilingual Education.* Washington D.C.: Georgetown University Press, 107-24.

Karttunen, F. 1985. Nahuatl and Maya in Contact with Spanish. *Texas Linguistic Forum* 26, University of Texas Department of Linguistics, Austin.

Lance, D. M. 1975. Spanish-English Code Switching. In E. Hemandez-Chavez (eds.), *El Lenguaje de Los Chicanos: Regional and Social Characteristics Used by Mexican Americans.* Arlington, Virginia: The Center for Applied Linguistics, 138-153.

Lehiste, I. 1988. *Lectures on Language Contact.* Cambridge, Massachusetts: The MIT Press, 1-27, 99, 123.

Levelt, W. J. M. 1989. *Speaking: From Intention to Articulation.* Cambridge, Massachusetts: MIT Press.

Li, C. & S. Thompson. 1981. *Mandarin Chinese: A Functional Reference Grammar.* Berkeley: University of California Press.

Lin, H. T. 1981. *Essential Grammar for Modern Chinese.* Massachusetts: Cheng & Tsui Company, Inc.

Lindholm, K. J. & A. M. Padilla. 1978. Child Bilingualism: Report on Language Mixing, Switching and Translations. *Linguistics* 211, 23-44.

Lipski, J. M. 1977. Code-Switching and the Problem of Bilingual Competence. In M. Paradis (ed.), *Aspects of Bilingualism.* Columbia, SC: Hornbeam Press, 250-64.

_____1982. Spanish-English Language Switching in Speech and Literature: Theories and Models. In G. D. Keller (ed.), *The Bilingual Review/La Revista Bilingue, IX*, # 3. Eastern Michigan University Department of Foreign Languages and Bilingual Studies.

Liu, X., E. M. Zheng & S. H. Liu. (eds). 1989. *Practical Chinese Reader. Book II.* Beijing: The Commercial Press.

Mackey, W. F. 1970. Interference, Integration and the Synchronic Fallacy. *The Twenty-First Annual Round Table.* Washington: Georgetown, 195-223.

Macnamara, J. 1967a. The Bilingual's Linguistic Performance: A Psychological Overview. *Journal of Social Issues* 23, 59-77.

McClure, E. F. 1977. Aspects of Code-Switching in the Discourse of Bilingual Mexican-American Children. *Technical Report* # 44. Urbana: Center for the Study of Reading, University of Illinois.

Mougeon, R. & Beniak, E. 1991. *Linguistic Consequences of Language Contact and Restriction.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Myers-Scotton, C. 1991. Comparing Content and System Morphemes: Accounting for Structure in Intrasentential Codeswitching. NWAV 20 Conference. Georgetown University, Washington D.C., 1-8.

_____1992b. Comparing Codeswitching and Borrowing. *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development*, 13.

_____1993. *Duelling Languages: Grammatical Structure in Codeswitching.* New York: Oxford University Press.

_____& W. Ury. 1977. Bilingual Strategies: The Social Functions of Code-Switching. *Linguistics* 193, 5-20.

Parkin, D. 1971. Language Choice in Two Kampala Housing Estates. In W. H. Whiteley (ed.), *Language Use and Social Change.* London: Oxford University Press.

Pfaff, C. W. 1979. Constraints on Language Mixing: Intrasentential Code-Switching and Borrowing in Spanish/English. *Language* 55.

Poplack, S. 1979. Sometimes I'll Start a Sentence in Spanish Y TERMINO EN ESPANOL: Toward a Typology of Code-Switching. *Centro de Estudios Puertorriquenos Working Papers* 4, 1-79.

_____1980. Sometimes I'll Start a Sentence in Spanish Y TERMINO EN ESPANOL: Toward a Typology of Code-Switching. *Linguistics* 18, 581-618.

_____1981. Syntactic Structure and Social Function of Code-Switching. In R. Duran (ed.), *Latino Language and Communicative Behavior.* Norwood, NJ: Ablex, 169-84.

_____1993. Variation Theory and Language Contact: Concepts, Methods and Data. In D. R. Preston (ed.), *American Dialect Research.* Amsterdam/Philadelphia: Benjamins, 1-32, 251-86.

_____, D. Sankoff & C. Miller. 1988. The Social Correlates and Linguistic Processes of Lexical Borrowing and Assimilation. *Linguistics* 26 (1), 47-104.

Preston, D. R. 1989. *Sociolinguistics and Second Language Acquisition.* New York: Basil Blackwell Inc., 38-42.

Rayfield, J. R. 1970. *The Languages of a Bilingual Community.* The Hague: Mouton & Co. N. V.

Sankoff, D. & S. Poplack. 1981. A Formal Grammar for Code-Switching. *Linguistics*, 14: 3-43.

Scotton, C. M. 1976. Strategies of Neutrality: Language Choice in Uncertain Situation. *Language.*

_____1988a. Codeswitching as Indexical of Social Relationships. In M. Heller (ed.), *Codeswitching: Anthropological and Sociolinguistic Perspectives.* Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter, 151-86.

_____1988c. Differentiating Borrowing form Code-Switching. In K. Ferrara et al (eds.), *Linguistic Change and Contact: New Ways of Analyzing Variation, XVI.* Austin: University of Texas Press.

Scotton, C. M. & W. Ury. 1975. Bilingual Strategies: The Social Functions of Code- Switching. *International Journal of the Sociology of Language.*

_____1977. Bilingual Strategies: The Social Functions of Code-Switching. *Linguistics* 193, 5-20.

Sebba, M. & T. Wootton. 1984. *Conversational Code-Switching in London Jamaican.* University of York.

Shaffer, D. 1978. The Place of Code-Switching in Linguistic Contacts. In M. Paradis (ed.), *Aspects of Bilingualism.* Columbia, South Carolina: Hornbeam Press.

Sridhar, S. N. 1978. On the Functions of Code-Mixing in Kannada, *International Journal of the Sociology of Language.*

_____& K. Sridhar. 1980. The Syntax and Psycholinguistics of Bilingual Code-Mixing. *Canadian Journal of Psychology/Revue Canadienne de Psychologie* 34, 407-16.

Staczek, J. J. 1983. Code-Switching in Miami Spanish: The Domain of Health Care Services. In G. D. Keller (ed.), *The Bilingual Review/La Revista Bilingue, X,* # 1. New York: SUNY-Binghamton.

Swigart, L. 1992. Practice and Perception: Language Use and Attitudes in Dakar. Ph.D. dissertation. Seattle: University of Washington.

Thiery, C. 1978. True Bilingualism and Second Language Learning. In D. Gerver & H. Sinaiko (eds.), *Language Interpretation and Communication.* New York: Plenum Press.

Timm, L.A. 1975. Spanish- English Code-Switching: El Porque Y How-Not-To. *Romance Philology* 28, 473-82.

_____1978. Code-Switching in War and Peace. In M. Paradis (ed.), *The Fourth Lacus Forum.* Columbia: Hornbeam Press.

Trudgill, P. & G. A. Tzavaras. 1977. *Why Albanian-Greeks Are Not Albanians: Language, Ethnicity and Intergroup Relations.* London: Academic Press.

Ure, J. 1974. Code-Switching and Mixed Speech in the Register System of Developing Language. In A. Verdoodt (ed.), *Proceedings of the Third International Congress of Applied Linguistics, II.* Heidelberg: J. Groos Verlag.

Vaid, J. 1980. The Form and Functions of Code-Mixing in Indian Films: the Case of Hindi and English. *Indian Linguistics* 41.

Valdesat Fallis, G. 1976. Social Interaction and Code-Switching Patterns: A Case Study of Spanish/English alternation. In G. Keller (ed.), *Bilingualism in the Bicentennial and Beyond.* New York: Bilingual Press/Editorial Bilingue.

VanLoey, A. 1958. Les Problemes du Bilinguisme en Belgique, *Etudes Germaniques, XXIII*, 289-302.

Veltman, C. 1983. *Language Shift in the United States*. Hawthorne, New York: Mouton de Gruyter.

Verivaki, M. 1990. Language Maintenance and Shift in the Greek Community of Wellington, New Zealand. MA thesis, Victoria University, Wellington.

Wang, Huan. 1959. *Ba Zi Ju He Bei Zi Ju [Ba Sentences and Bei Sentences].* Shanghai: Shanghai Educational Publishing House.

Weinreich, U. 1970. *Languages in Contact: Findings and Problems*. The Hague: Mouton. Originally published 1953. New York: Linguistic Circle of New York.

Zou, K. 1993. The Syntax of the Chinese BA Construction. *Linguistics* 31 (4). New York: Mouton de Gruyter, 715-36.