

ENGLISH LOANWORDS IN MANDARIN CHINESE

By

LAUREN ASIA HALL-LEW

A Thesis Submitted to The Honors College

In Partial Fulfillment of the Bachelors degree
With Honors in

Linguistics

THE UNIVERSITY OF ARIZONA

AUGUST 2002

Approved by:

Dr. Jane H. Hill
Department of Anthropology

STATEMENT BY AUTHOR

This thesis has been submitted in partial fulfillment of requirements for a degree at The University of Arizona and is deposited in the University Library to be made available to borrowers under rules of the Library.

Signed: _____

Abstract

The language change which results from language contact can be examined on many levels, one of which is the phenomenon of *borrowing*, or the use of a lexical item in language A by the speakers of language B. This paper looks specifically at the language contact of two of the world's most visible languages and details the resultant language change when words from International English are borrowed into standard Chinese.

Borrowed words, or *loan words* were collected based on pilot research in the People's Republic of China in Fall, 2001. The loan words were then analyzed for phonological, morphosyntactic, semantic, and sociolinguistic factors. The frequency of English loan words was found to have increased in Mandarin in the past decade, particularly in the realms of technology and communication, pop culture and entertainment, and politics. The borrowings are consequently spoken and understood by younger interlocutors and speakers who study English, and ideas of a loan word's integration into Mandarin varies accordingly. The results of this examination contribute to the general literature in anthropological linguistics and more generally contain implications for English's status as a global language and the emerging role of Chinese in a likewise international sphere.

1.0 Introduction

Standard Chinese is by far the world's largest speech community and has been so for many years (Bloomfield, 1933: 44; Grimes, 1996). In the past century, English has become the strongest international lingua franca; probably the only "world language" today in terms of politics, entertainment, and

technology (Brumfit, 1982, Crystal, 1997). Current political pressures and modern technological advances compel interaction between these two giant linguistic communities. The result is language change – notably the influence of English and its international phraseology on the more regionally-confined Chinese (Fishman et al., 1975: 77). As cultural concepts from native English-speaking countries become international in their domain, the words to express them are borrowed into the genetically dissimilar and culturally contrastive Chinese language. The linguistic interaction of the world’s two most visible languages is the focus of this study.

2.0 Borrowing

Borrowing is a natural process of language change whereby one language adds new words to its own lexicon by copying those words from another language. The words which are borrowed (although “it is more like a kind of stealing,” Haugen, 1953: 363; or a kind of copying, Trask, 1996: 18; since ‘borrowed’ words are never ‘returned’ to the donor language) are called ‘borrowings’ or ‘loan words.’ The process of borrowing “is one of the most frequent ways of acquiring new words, and speakers of all languages do it” (Trask, 1996: 18). One of the initial reasons for borrowing is when one language has a semantic “gap” in its lexicon (i.e., when there is no existing word in the

language with the same meaning as a the loan) and needs to borrow a term to express the necessary idea or concept (Trask, 1996; see Haugen, 1953: 373 and Poplack et al., 1988, for discussion). For example, *disini* in Chinese comes from “Disney” in English, a word obviously of United States roots and with no pre-existing synonym in Chinese. In the case of bilingual speakers, words may also be borrowed if the speaker retrieves the L2 (language learned after the native language) word faster than the L1 (native language) word (Haugen, 1953: 375). Sociolinguistic reasons for borrowing include using foreign terms as euphemisms or, as is generally the case, building a sense of speaker identity (Hill and Hill, 1986: 118-120; Katamba, 1994: 194-95; Trask, 1996: 39). Weinreich (1963: 56-61) lists a number of specific reasons for borrowing and emphasizes that borrowing is a result of language contact and thus a result of culture contact (Weinreich, 1963: 5-6; see also Dil, 1981: 4). Fishman, Cooper and Conrad (1975: 80-82) list domains of contact to include urbanization, economy, education, religion, and politics (see also Hill and Hill, 1986: 157). The socioeconomic status of the speakers has been shown to be a determinant factor of borrowing rates, in both the type of words and the quantity of words (Poplack, Sankoff and Miller, 1988).

The process by which a foreign word becomes a loan word is gradual (Bloomfield, 1933: 450). True loan words are typically regarded as

phonologically, morphologically, and grammatically integrated into the host language (Bloomfield, 1933; Haugen, 1953; Sankoff et al., 1990). Fantini (1985: 146) recognizes two levels of borrowing: ‘pure’ borrowing, where the word retains all its native features, and ‘adjusted’ borrowing, where the word adapts to the structural criteria of the host language. Bloomfield (1933) and Olmsted (1986) distinguish between three levels of linguistic integration: words used but retaining foreign phonology, words partially integrated into the borrowing language, and words fully integrated and indistinguishable (Andrews, 1999: 9-13; see also Hill and Hill, 1986: 198). Sometimes a borrowing may never become nativized (Katamba, 1994: 200) and occasionally the loan word will actually affect the borrowing language itself (Bloomfield, 1933: 453-55). Poplack and Sankoff (1984) measured the degree of a loan word’s integration into the language by frequency of use, native synonymy replacement (i.e., existing words in the L1 will be replaced by the new loan words with similar meanings), morphophonemic/syntactic integration (adapting to the sound and grammar systems of the L1), and speaker acceptability.

There are two types of loan words. The first type is phonologically similar in the donor language form and the borrowing language form. This ‘transliterated’ loan word is used in the borrowing language with the closest possible sound and the closest possible meaning to the original word. For

example, Chinese *baibai* is basically identical to English “bye-bye” and is used in the same contexts. In contrast are calques (a French word for “copy,” also called ‘translations’ or ‘loanshifts’) where the borrowed term consists of foreign form and meaning with native morphophonology (Haugen, 390; Katamba, 193; Romaine, 57; Trask, 21; Weinreich, 48). For example, Chinese *yaogun* can be translated [“shake” + “stone”] with the meaning of the English-based “Rock’n’Roll” music style. Transliterations, here simply called loans, will be addressed in this study in comparison and contrast to calques. Sometimes a foreign concept will be borrowed and a native term used to express it (Bloomfield, 1933: 455-85). Again for example, Chinese *diannao* for English “computer.” This final type of borrowing is cited by Haugen (1953: 403), who points out that the native word has no phonological similarities to the foreign word. These arguably do not constitute true loan words, and will not be considered here. Complex motivations lie behind the form a loan word takes in the borrowing language, and such motivations are based on the patterns of word formation in both the donor and borrowing languages.

However, each individual member of the same speech community will adapt a borrowed word to varying degrees (Romaine, 1995: 59). Speakers of the same native language may also vary in the degree to which they personally use

the loan word, and the degree to which they consider a loan word to be integrated into their lexicon (Hill and Hill, 1986: 345; Katamba, 1994: 200).

Previous research shows that most loan words undergo some semantic alterations from the borrowing process (Weinreich, 1963: 53-55). Such change can result in either semantic broadening or narrowing. ‘Broadening’ is when the referent of a certain term is generalized to a wider range of things and ‘narrowing’ (or ‘specialization’) is when a general term comes to refer to a more specific thing than the original referent (Trask, 1996: 42; Weinreich, 1963: 55).

Determining that semantic change exists between the donor language and the borrowing languages is not nearly as difficult as determining precisely why and how these changes occur. Lass (1980; cited in Wee, 1998: 187) concludes that the components “of language change are so complex that they will perhaps never be understood (well enough) to state precisely why a specific change occurred ... or to predict when one will occur ... and what it will be” (Lass, 1980). Hopper and Traugott (1993; cited in Wee, 1998:188-89) propose three general pathways for the process of semantic change: changes due to child language acquisition, changes due to community interaction, and changes due to communicative situations. The first view takes language change to be based on children’s mistakes in acquisition; this explanation in itself cannot possibly be the sole source of change, though possibly contributory. The second view sees

semantic change in the light of pidgin formation, where changes in language are due to communication needs. The third view puts language change as based on numerous personal interactions where innovations in meaning occur and are used repeatedly until they become an accepted form in the lexicon. This last solution ties in well with the semantic alterations of borrowed words, where a single term is used in two different ways in two different speech communities, and is used in such a way based on the conventional use of that community. Borrowing is a process based on the linguistic background and use of communities of speakers.

A general explanation for the mere existence of semantic change in borrowing comes from Kay (1995):

Loan words are especially open to modification, both on entering the language, and with time. One reason is that the meaning or usage of a word in its original language may not be fully understood; nor need it be, as loan words are used without reference to their source words. Another is that, with words of foreign origin, there is no deep cultural motivations to protect their original meanings. The flexibility of form and meaning of loanwords enables them to adapt easily to the structure of the host language, and current trends and needs.

(Kay, 1995:72)

Any word that is borrowed crosses cultural boundaries as well as linguistic, and this opens the doors to semantic variation.

2.1 Frequency of Borrowing

Weinreich (1968) claimed that a morpheme is more likely to be borrowed the less (syntactically) bound it is. Various studies have shown that content words (nouns, which are the least-bound forms, followed by verbs and adjectives) and interjections are generally borrowed more often than function words, which are in turn borrowed more frequently than inflectional particles (Andrews, 1999; Haugen, 1953; Poplack et al., 1988; Sankoff et al., 1990; Weinreich, 1963). Syntax is, generally speaking, the least likely component of a language to be borrowed (Romaine, 1995: 64; see Hill and Hill, 1986: 233, for a discussion of counter-examples). Also frequently borrowed are brand names, place names, greetings, sayings, slang terms, and expressions (Fantini, 1985: 152). The types of words that are borrowed tend to be related to the majority culture behind the donor language, because “the less culturally bound an item, the less likely the possibility of a ready synonym in the other language” (Fantini, 1985: 150). It is important to remember, however, that there are exceptions and counter-examples to all of these generalizations, and that the motivations for borrowing cannot be wholly generalized (Romaine, 1995: 64-67).

Katamba (1994:191) distinguishes between direct and indirect borrowing. Indirect borrowing is when language E receives a loan word from language A by way of languages B, C, D, etc. Direct borrowing is when the borrowing is

transferred directly from A to B. Words borrowed directly undergo less phonological change from that one transliteration than from the multiple transliterations in indirect borrowing (Katamba, 1994: 191). Interviews with Chinese L1 speakers reveal that many words borrowed into Chinese from English came by way of Japanese or Taiwanese; however, loans borrowed directly are easier to identify and confirm superficially and are the focus of this paper.

There are a few notable exceptions between this study and comparable research. Previous work (Fantini, 1985; Hill and Hill, 1986; Poplack and Sankoff, 1984; Poplack, Sankoff, and Miller, 1988; Sankoff, Poplack and Vanniarajan, 1990) has focused on loan words as used in a bilingual community with speakers of varying bilingual ability. Such a linguistic area yields a much higher frequency of loan words (which is the judge of integration in Poplack and Sankoff, 1984) than does a monolingual community; indeed, despite this, a bilingual speaker uses loan words for an average of only 1% of her verbal output (Poplack, Sankoff, and Miller, 1988).

In contrast, this study examines English loan words in the monolingual Chinese-speaking communities of the People's Republic of China. Monolingual communities have a much lower frequency of loan words than comparable bilingual studies, therefore this study will examine rare-occurrence loan words that are normally excluded in bilingual studies. Although bilingual speakers

provide a greater quantity of data for research, they also present the complication of employing code-switching rather than borrowing. For example, the event where the L2 term is accessed faster than the L1 cognate becomes a factor in the use of loans. Therefore, to complicate a study of borrowings with the usage of bilinguals is detrimental to accurate analysis of linguistic situations where a (basically) monolingual culture adopts foreign loans on a consistent whole (for excellent bilingual research, however, see Poplack, Sankoff, and Miller, 1988). Research in a monolingual community therefore reduces and possibly eliminates the chance for occurrences of code-switching, even though it also reduces the number of borrowed tokens available for study. In addition, identifying borrowed terms in a monolingual community has a greater chance of locating terms that are established within a community rather than terms used by an individual speaker who is proficient in the L2. Taking terms from a corpus of public speech rather than private speech (Poplack, Sankoff and Miller, 1988; Poplack and Sankoff, 1984) further ensures this level of integration.

Statistically it is predicted that this will lead to a very small number of tokens. Poplack, Sankoff and Miller calculated that 0.83% of the total speech in their data consisted of loan words, and of that, only 7% could be considered truly wide-spread in that community. Such a low frequency of loans suggests that, for any given corpus study of actual speech, some integrated borrowings may only

occur once or twice. Single occurrences have been traditionally treated as nonce borrowings, which are one-time uses by a particular bilingual speaker that are not recognizable to monolinguals (Sankoff, Poplack and Vanniarajan, 1990; Weinreich, 1963: 11). Poplack, Sankoff and Miller (1988: 58) found that nonce borrowings “constitute only about 10% of the average (bilingual) speaker’s repertoire of borrowed types.” Because of its lack of genetic similarity, and therefore its stark difference to English in terms of phonology, morphology, and syntax, Chinese is particularly likely to have a much lower frequency of loan words than other Indo-European languages, or even languages like Japanese which has a written phonetic system. Further, China is hugely diverse, both geographically and linguistically, and so it will take a single loan word much longer to standardize across the population (see Cheng, 1985).

This paper looks at a public corpus (radio news speech) a diverse linguistic area in a more peripheral province of China. Because loan words occur rarely in real, monolingual, speech, and because of the generally low frequency of borrowings from English into Chinese, this study will discuss rare borrowings in conjunction with higher-frequency loans. The goal is to highlight a specific situation as a revealing perspective of the borrowing phenomenon in general.

3.0 English as a Global Language: The Chinese Context

The English language has historically been an enthusiastic borrower of foreign words. “Well over half the words” in the English language have been borrowed from other languages (Trask, 1996: 18). Words have often been borrowed into English from more ‘prestigious’ languages such as French and German. Prestige is only one reason for borrowing, yet it is a general pattern that less-prestigious languages tend to borrow the terms of more prestigious languages (Bloomfield, 1933: 476; Romaine, 1995: 47). Even if the borrowing process is complicated by other factors (e.g., speakers who want to keep their native language ‘pure’), the prestige of the interacting languages is a likely factor (Hill and Hill, 1986: 103-117). Borrowing words because of prestige is logically practical for the speaker; a prestige language is presumably spoken by people of wealth and power, so facility in that language is advantageous to the borrower for personal advancement.

Chinese language contact with the English language has always had economic and political motivations, beginning with the first stage in the late Ming dynasty (words for “opium” and “company” are credited as originating then; Tai and Chan, 1999). Following the Opium War (ending in 1942), China was exposed to extensive contact with Western science, technology, military, economy, and politics, which in turn began a much grander period of borrowing, where transliterations came to be used in addition to the calques used before

(examples include *kafei* for “coffee” and *shafa* for “sofa”; Tai and Chan, 1999).

The expansion of religion is another obvious source for language contact; Christian missionaries from Europe and the United States have been credited with the beginning of the spread of English, coining new words (calques) in standard Chinese such as *tili* (geography), *lienpeng* (federation), and *honghai* (navigation) (Kelley, 2000). The influence of English has continued through the years with the United States’ economic and political power, including the spread of American pop culture. Trask (1996: 20) notes that “English itself has become the most prestigious language on earth, and today English is primarily a donor language.”

Andrews (1999: 41) claims that “the acquisition of English is a status symbol among much of the world’s youth.” As of January 1, 1975, English was the official or co-official language of 37 countries (Fishman et al., 7), and was spoken in 86 countries as of 1996 (Grimes). Today it is taught as a foreign language world-wide, sometimes as the main second-language, meaning that it is the L2 that is taught earliest in school and for the longest amount of time.

China is a prime example of this, having “the largest number of learners of English as a foreign language in the world” (Crystal, 1985; cited in Yong and Campbell, 1995: 377). Roughly twenty years ago the Chinese government began to require that all middle school students begin the study of English. Today the instruction of English begins even in at the primary school level in larger cities

like Beijing and Shanghai. Around the same time, many Chinese universities began to require that all university students, regardless of major, must pass with a score of at least 60% the College English Test (CET) “band four” in order to receive their Bachelor’s degree. In 1997, Dvoring cited 250 million students of English in the People’s Republic of China. The foreign language classroom is a particular situation of language contact where the speakers are consciously and actively using an L2 and integrating vocabulary from the L2 into their native lexicon for further reinforcement and practice. Just as bilingual speakers are the bearers of loan word transference between languages (Andrews, 1999; Haugen, 1953; Poplack and Sankoff, 1984; Poplack, Sankoff and Miller, 1988; Sankoff, Poplack and Vanniarajan, 1990; Weinreich, 1963), students of English are likely to introduce English terminology into their native linguistic community. Although mainland China is lacking in significant English-Chinese bilingual communities, a high number of EFL students suggests that a high number of English loan words may be present in the Chinese lexicon.

Wu (1985; cited in Yong and Campbell, 1995: 378) found that English is used by Chinese speakers for certain sociolinguistic effects. In Hong Kong especially, through the city’s large economic influence and China’s economic reforms since the 1980s (Gao, 2000: 66), the ‘modern’ fashion is to prefer English *basi* for “bus” to the native Chinese synonym *gonggongqiche*, ‘public shared

automobile' and the English *baibai* for "bye-bye" over *zaijian*, "see you again;" Gao, 2000: 66. The use of these English-based terms by a younger, fashionable population of speakers suggests that the use of English loan words may serve to indicate social status. Although the semantic change is greater for the transliterated words, the communicative function is enhanced by this marker of self-identity.

The conscious usage of English for a specific semantic purpose is not even uncommon at an official level. According to one Western writer, the People's Republic of China instructed their students of English to "try to use familiar English words but give their meaning and ideological twist favorable to Chinese communist ideas so they could influence and internationally unaware public into the communist way of thinking" (Dovring, 16). Such a doctrine inevitably creates new versions of English words with major, politically significant, changes in lexical-/phrasal-semantics.

4.0 Proposed Methods

This study examines English loan words predominantly among speakers from Yunnan Province, as well as Metropolitan (Beijing, Xi'an, and also Taiwan)

dialects of Mandarin.¹ Conclusions are based on a corpus of potential English loan words (e.g., see Poplack and Sankoff, 1984). The Yunnan area is rich in linguistic diversity, with so-called ‘Standard Mandarin’ being the official dialect and numerous local dialects spoken in and around Kunming. Although this variation has a heavy influence on the standard Mandarin, the influence of US English is likely to be more marked (see Haugen, 1953: 361, for markedness in borrowing).

This paper addresses differences in linguistic (phonological, morphological, and grammatical) features, semantic change, the semantic domain of borrowed words, the contrast between loans and calques, and(/or) the sociolinguistic variables (type of speech event, gender, age, language attitudes, socioeconomic class, level of education, and bilingual ability) of the speaker and audience. The study also addresses loan word occurrence in real discourse and the effect of speaker attitude on use.

Determining a word’s loan status depends on that word’s etymology. By definition, a loan will have etymology in its donor language but not in the borrowing language (Hill, 2002). Here it is helpful that Chinese and English are genetically unrelated; much research on borrowing focuses on two related

¹ The issue of variation and dialect diversity is a hotly debated topic in the People’s Republic of China. References here to “Standard Chinese” or “Mandarin” are only to refer to the current linguistic convention.

languages, such as English and French (Poplack, Sankoff and Miller, 1988) and this study provides a contrast to that. Determining loan words will be based on personal interviews and the advisement of Chinese L1 speakers, as well as the Oxford Chinese/English dictionary and the *Hanyu Wailaici Cidian* (literal gloss: the “Chinese-Language Foreign-Come-Word Dictionary;” 1985).

Because this sample is from a monolingual population, phonological variation among the Chinese L1 speakers is predicted to be low. Further, Poplack, Sankoff and Miller (1988) present convincing evidence that monolinguals or low-level bilinguals are more likely to integrate borrowings into native phonology.

4.1 Predictions

This study predicts that the frequency of English loan words has increased in Standard Chinese within the past few years (since the reintegration of Hong Kong, for example) and that these loans fall into the spheres of technology, communications, and pop culture, and are consequently spoken and understood by younger interlocutors. This hypothesis challenges Romaine’s suggestion that a speaker’s “ability to keep two languages separate may be enhanced... (with) different orthographies, such as Chinese and English” (1995: 96) and suggests

instead that cultural contact supercedes linguistic factors in affecting the borrowing process.

4.2 Location: Kunming, Yunnan, P.R.C.

Kunming, the capital of Yunnan Province, was the optimal site for acquiring speaker perceptions and language attitudes, as well as acquiring the list of actual loans and their histories. Kunming is a city of approximately four-million people in a fairly under-researched area of Southwest China. It boasts a population of 23 official minority nationalities and a number of minority languages. Nearly all research was conducted in Kunming in the vicinity of the Yunnan University and Yunnan Normal University campuses, with the exception of follow-up research which was conducted with Chinese-L1 graduate students at the University of Arizona in Tucson. Overall, twenty-seven interviews were conducted in Kunming and nine interviews in Tucson.

4.3 Description of the loan words

Refer to Appendix I for the comprehensive list of loan words. These words are compiled from those identified by Chinese-L1 speakers, those taken from the *Hanyu Wailaici Cidian*, and some obtained from my personal observations.

The interview sheets and spoken interview questions evaluated native speakers' familiarity and usage of each word as well as their intuition on the demographics of who uses the words and approximately when they entered the standard language.

5.0 English vs. Chinese sound systems

Chinese has no consonant clusters (Li & Thompson, 3). There is a finite set of twenty-two consonants which can occur syllable-initial and a different set of thirty-seven allowed finals (Li & Thompson, pp. 3-6). Syllables have a minimum VC and a maximum CGVC/CGVG (where G = 'glide;' Duanmu, 1990). In addition, each syllable can be assigned one of four tones or a neutral tone. In addition to having a specific phonological construction, each Chinese syllable has a particular 'meaning' of its own.

In contrast, English syllables can start and end with highly complex consonant clusters. There is more freedom as to what sounds can sit in syllable-initial and syllable-final positions. English has no lexical tone. The vowel system is also different from Chinese, for example lacking the unrounded-high-back vowel or dialectically distinct r-colored vowels. Further, individual syllables do not necessarily hold specific semantic value in the manner that Chinese syllables do.

5.1 Optimality Theory perspective

Optimality Theory (OT), is a fairly recent theory of phonology based on the ideas of phonological features and ‘constraints’ on those features. OT is characterized by the ranking of phonological constraints which are said to comprise the characteristics of a phonological system. The ranking of constraints is thought to be language specific, so contact between two languages leads to the interaction of two different rankings of constraints. Puckett (1999) discusses this phenomenon for English borrowings into Mandarin Chinese. A summary of her results is one perspective on sound change in the borrowing process.

Puckett states, “English consonants generally map, in one-to-one correspondence, to Mandarin consonants in borrowed words, preserving as many phonetic contrasts as Mandarin allows” (4). The systematic correlation of sounds allows a convenient comparison of phonetic features between loan words and original words. Puckett’s analysis shows that consonant place of articulation is almost always maintained, but that vowels rarely maintain the same quality. Puckett notes that variation in vowels is more acceptable with rigidity in consonant features; much research in dialectology and sound change in general suggests that variation among vowels is generally much more frequent than among consonants.

Consonants however are still difficult to find patterned correlations for; “voicing is phonemic in English but not in Mandarin, and aspiration is phonemic in Mandarin but not in English” (Puckett, 8). In other words, Chinese stop consonants do not have a voicing distinction that English does, but Chinese does have a distinction for aspiration that English stops do not. In addition, Puckett addresses the /t/-/l/ distinction present in English but not in Chinese and concludes that “due to lack of contrast, when either of these English segments appear in an onset, they both become the Mandarin /l/” (12).

Puckett discusses the effect of the Chinese lexical tone, noting that tones must be assigned to English tone-less words, and that this “account(s) for the slow nativization process,” (7) and “the low frequency of phonetic borrowings” (8).

5.2 “Loan Syllables” and “Calque Syllables”

Hirano (1994) states that a loan word will be borrowed as close to the original form as possible. There are two ways of being true to that original form; by copying the word’s meaning (a calque/translation) and by copying the word’s sound (a transliteration). Often, the two can be mutually exclusive. This is especially the case for English and Chinese, and loan words between the two follow a varying strategies to compensate.

Gao (2000: 64-66) discusses the differentiation between transliterations and calques/translations in how English words are borrowed into Standard Chinese. Examples that he gives of transliterated borrowings are *disi* for ‘toast’ and *duosi* or *dishi* for ‘taxi’ (Gao, 2000: 64). Transliteration is also the preferred action for proper names, like *yinggelan* for ‘England’ (Gao, 2000: 65). In contrast are examples of translation, such as *chuzuqiche*, literally ‘rent out automobile’, meaning ‘taxi’ and *meiguo*, literally ‘beautiful country’, meaning ‘America’ (the *mei* is from *America*, so this is also a bit of transliteration; Chinese L1 speakers with little investment in the English language have argued that it is only a transliteration; Gao, 2000: 65). Many Chinese loans combine elements of both transliteration and translation, as in the famous case of *kekou kele*, which is the translation for Coca-Cola and literally means ‘good taste (and) happy’. Novotna (1968) calls such constructions “hybrid words,” Puckett calls these “semantic-phonetic hybrids,” (Puckett, 16) and here they will be called “hybrid loans.”

For the sake of this paper, syllables which aim to correspond to the sound of the loan word will be called “loan syllables” and syllables which aim to correspond to the meaning of the loan word will be called “calque syllables.” The choice of strategy and the combination of strategies creates variation in the overall borrowing process from English to Chinese. Since English to Chinese is a borrowing process from a non-isolating language into an isolating language, and

each morpheme in Chinese has both isolated phonological structure and isolated meaning, the mapping of a multi-syllabic non-isolating English word into Chinese must be a slow, conscious process with both phonological and semantic considerations. Therefore, sometimes the strategy will favor phonological similarity over semantic similarity, or visa-versa, and thus the “loan” vs. “calque” syllable distinction is crucial.

In this data, two curious semantic domains of words appear as straight calques; music and politics. Music gives us *yaogun* “Rock’n’Roll” and *zhongjinshu* “Heavy Metal” (music), where *yao* = “shake,” *gun* = “roll,” *zhong* = “heavy,” and *jinshu* = “metal.” Words of politics include *quanqiuhua* = “globalization;” from “globe + ‘-ization’,” *shangyahu* = “commercialization;” from “commercial + ‘-ization’,” and *shimaozuzhi* = (literally) “World-Trade-Organization.” With so few tokens, it is impossible to make any generalizable statements, yet the correlations are interesting to note. This type of calqued loan word differs sharply in Chinese from the much more common transliterated loan. Based on interview feedback, these calques are considered by native speakers to be “real Chinese words” which are so much a part of the Chinese language that their semantic origins in English are hardly considered or even denied.

About half of the words are complete loans, meaning that every syllable of the word is a loan syllable. A loan is determined to be complete when either totally new characters were invented for the loan syllables (as in *kāfē* “coffee”; and *níngmèng* “lemon”;), or the syllables chosen to combine in formation of the new word have no similar meaning to that word (as in *qiāokèlì* “chocolate,” where *qiāo* = “skillful,” *kè* = “restrain,” and *lì* = “power/ strength”).

All other words fall somewhere in the middle, as hybrid loans. In Chinese there are further two ways in which I consider a loan to be hybrid. One is made in combining loan syllables with calque syllables (as in *muotuoche* where *muotuo* is used for its sound and *che* means “car,” altogether meaning “motorcycle” or *jiuba* = “(alcohol-serving) bar,” where the syllable *ba* sounds like “bar” but *jiu* is straight calques meaning “alcohol”). The other form of mixed loan is when the loan syllable is chosen with an attempt to get close to the meaning of the original word (i.e., an attempt to find a loan syllable with the qualities of a calque syllable). A favorite example of this is the word *bèngjī* = “bungee,” where *bèng* = “leap/jump” and *jī* = “extreme.” This technique is especially popular with proper nouns in advertising, such as *koukè kèlè* = “Coca Cola” which roughly translates to “good-taste-happy,” or *bāngbāoshì* = “Pampers” which syllable-to-syllable translates to “help-baby-support.”

Even for complete loans and individual loan syllables, most English loans must undergo some phonological change to adapt to the Chinese sound system. Chinese has phonological restrictions of co-occurrence that are different from those in English, so English words must change their phonological characteristics when borrowed into Chinese (see Duanmu, 1990 and Goh, 1996, on obligatory onsets). A list of some apparent changes is below:

	<u>English sound</u>	<u>change to Chinese</u>	<u>examples</u>
1a.	CCV	CV	Pizza/ <i>bisa</i> , Micro/ <i>maike</i> ,
1b.	CCV	CV.CV	Asprin/ <i>asipilin</i> Disney/ <i>disini</i>
2a.	CVC	CV (null)	Saxophone/ <i>sakesifeng</i> , Shirt/ <i>xu</i> , Chocolate/ <i>qiaokeli</i> , Bar/ <i>ba</i> , Cartoon/ <i>katong</i> , Model/ <i>mote</i> , Guitar/ <i>jita</i>
2b.	CVC	CV.CV	Jeep/ <i>jipu</i> , Tank/ <i>tanke</i>
3.	CVN, CVM	CVNG	Lemon/ <i>ningmeng</i> , System/ <i>xitong</i> , -phone/ <i>feng</i> , Romance/ <i>langman</i> , Sandwich/ <i>sanmingzhi</i> , Cartoon/ <i>katong</i>
4.	RV/LV	LV	Romance/ <i>langman</i> , Radar/ <i>leida</i> , Karaoke/ <i>kalaOK</i>

Changes (3) and (4) are not surprising, because Chinese has a higher frequency of syllable-final /_/ than English, and (as stated in the section on OT) Chinese basically lacks the /r/-/l/ distinction that English has.²

Changes (1) and (2) can be combined into a simple rule:

<u>English</u>		<u>Chinese</u>
CCV or CVC	→	CV or CV.CV

The recent development has been to adapt English loans with their foreign phonology retained, without this adaptation to Chinese. Examples include “W.T.O.,” “email,” “CD/VCD,” and “party.” Informants suggested that these forms were often “easier” to say than the Chinese loans, and they often used these forms in casual conversation. David Kelley, in an email correspondence in July 2000, cites the increasing use of words spelled in Roman lettering used in Chinese newspapers. He says, however, that calques and loans are still the main, preferred methods of borrowing.

² Puckett’s OT analysis states that both /r/-initial and /l/-initial syllables will become /l/-initial in Chinese. However, my data does provide the counter-example of English “lemon” going to Chinese *ningmeng*

6.0 Morphological and Grammatical Changes

All the cited loans are free morphemes, and almost all of them are nouns or proper nouns. The exceptions are four: *ku* “cool” and *pengke* “punk,” which are both adjectives (and both pop-culture slang), and *hai* “Hi” and *baibai* “Bye-bye,” which are both standard greetings/expressions.

Little evidence was found of Chinese morphology borrowed from English. Two informants suggested that the placement of “-hua” (“-ism” or “-ization”) at the end of words such as *quanqiu hua* (globalization) and *shangyehua* (commercialization) is borrowed from the morphology of English. Tai and Chan (1999) cite an adaptation of “European-inspired affixation” following the Opium War.

There is no evidence that contact with English has altered the grammar of Chinese. Borrowed nouns, for example, occupy the same sentence location as native nouns and are subject to the same inflections. Chinese has little inflection, so this fact has arguable not been thoroughly tested; we can say, however, that where nouns take a plural inflection in English (e.g., one pie and two pies), the plural of borrowed *pai* “pie” does not take any inflection (e.g., *yi ge pai*, *leung ge pai*).

giving /l/ → /n/, showing that these simple rules as well as OT-based rules are by no means infallible.

7.0 Semantic Change

All of the words are highly bound to modern Western culture. They fall into the following domains: technology and communication, pop culture and entertainment, and politics. Because the meaning of the words is bound so tightly to Western culture, none of the borrowings from technology, communication, or politics experience any semantic change (i.e., the referents are the same). The few that do fall into the general realm of pop culture.

When semantic change does occur, narrowing occurs more often than broadening. For example, *paidui* indicates not just any “party” but a meeting that is specifically informal, with younger participants, often with only two people, and perhaps romantic. *Asipilin* “Asprin” refers not to any medicine for pain (as the meaning has been broadened in English to include) or to a brand of medicine, but only to an ingredient in some medicines. Similarly, *weitaming* “vitamin” is used in reference to medicine, and its cognate *weishengsu* is used when talking about substances naturally in the body. *Ka(pian)* refers not to any “card” but specifically for cards for the telephone or business. *Mote* does not apply to all the things which the word “model” in English applies; it only refers to people who work as (fashion) models. And *ku* “cool” can refer to certain objects, but not people (e.g., it cannot be used like “She’s a cool doctor,” possible in English).

One interesting case of semantic change involves neither broadening nor narrowing, and that's of the word *puke*. From the word "poker," *puke* refers to a card game but not specifically to the game played with the same rules which govern the Western game called poker. In fact, it refers to a specific card game with completely different rules.

Some words which have native synonyms retain their English meanings but adopt meanings which are slightly different from their Chinese counterparts. For example, *disike* "disco" has a narrowed reference only to dance halls that play disco-style, faster music (*wuting* "dance hall" applies to all places where one can dance).

It might be expected that all words which have native synonyms will have meanings slightly different from the native words. But for *leishe*, *maikefeng*, *sangna*, *jita*, *dishi*, *basi*, *wentaming*, *hai*, and *baibai*, the meaning is exactly the same with their respective equivalents, *jiguang*, *huatong*, *zhengqiyu*, *liuxianqin*, *chuzuche*, *gonggongqiche*, *weishengsu*, *ni hao*, and *zaijian* (meaning, respectively, "laser," "microphone," "sauna," "guitar," "taxi," "bus," "vitamin," "Hi," and "Bye-bye.")

The single case of possible semantic broadening is the word *katong*, "cartoon." *Katong* can be used for both comic-books (*katongxu*) and cartoon television/movies (*katongpian*). Comic-books can also be called *manhua* and

cartoon television/movies can also be called *donghuapian*. In this case, however, the word needs the suffix-modification to cover both of these meanings.

8.0 Integration of Words

Integration of loan words into Chinese was judged by the existence/use of native synonyms and by asking about loan usage in interviews with native-speaker informants. Speakers were asked if they were familiar with the words and if they personally used the words. Speakers overall were familiar with most of the words. Many of the Kunming informants (about 10 of 27) said that they know the terms *paidui* “party” and *basi* “bus” but they don’t use them in their own speech. At least four informants said the same thing about the following words: *xuejia*, *kefeiyin*, *pai*, *yujia*, *puke*, *leishe*, and *zhongjinshu* (respectively, “cigar,” “caffeine,” “pie,” “yoga,” “punk,” “lazer,” and “Heavy Metal”). Twelve informants said they weren’t even familiar with the term *tuokouxu* for “talk show.” All of the words that Puckett took directly from the *Hanyu Wailaici Cidian* (aforementioned Chinese loanword dictionary) without consultation with native speakers, were only occasionally familiar to my informants. The following words were unfamiliar only to people over 40 years of age: *hai*, *yintewang*, *basi*, *hanbaobao*, *kele*, and *ku* (respectively, “Hi,” “internet,” “bus,” “hamburger,” “cola,” and “cool”).

For loans with native synonyms, informants were asked if they preferred the native word, the loan word, or used both equally. For the options of *hai* vs. *Ni hao* (“Hello”), *baibai* vs. *zaijian* (“Bye-bye”), and *(da)di(shi)* vs. *chuzuqiche* (“Taxi”), the majority of respondents said they used the two optional terms about equally. Most said that they used *gonggongqiche* more often than the Hong Kong/Taiwan term *basi* for “bus;” one informant claimed that *basi/bashi* is used for small private buses and *gonggongqiche* is used for big public buses (appropriately, because *gong* literally means “public). Overall, informants used *ku* “cool” more often than the rough translation *hen hao* “very good.”

Finally, speakers were asked if the loan words sounded foreign or not; i.e., the question attempted to test for conscious awareness that the word was a borrowing. The majority of informants said that *disike*, *kalaOK*, *paidui*, and *baibai* sounded foreign (i.e., not fully integrated; “disco,” “karaoke,” “party,” and “byebye,” respectively) whereas *kapian*, *xitong*, *ningmeng* and *luoji* (“card,” “system,” “lemon,” and “logic,” respectively) sounded just like native Chinese (i.e., integrated). The questionable word was *langman*, “romance,” which about half of the respondents said sounded foreign and about half said did not. An interesting note about these words: *disike*, *kalaOK*, and *paidui*, “disco,” “karaoke,” and “party,” were all said to sound like Hong Kong or Taiwan dialects, or Japanese, rather than English.

Revisiting Fantini's (1985:146) two levels, 'pure' borrowings retain all their native features and 'adjusted' borrowings adapt to the structural criteria of the host language. In general, most loans are 'adjusted;' only a few words are truly 'pure' according to this definition (notably for Chinese: *party*, *e-mail*, *hai*, and *baibai*). On Bloomfield and Olmsted's (1986) three levels (not phonology integrated, partially integrated, and fully integrated), these specific 'pure' words can be said to "remain foreign," while most of the words fall into the second level of partial integration, and a few words (such as *xitong*, *ningmeng*, and *kapian* "system," "lemon," and "card") can perhaps be called fully integrated. As of now, none of these words have seemed to affect the general Chinese language except on the level of synonymy replacement.

Interviewees were questioned as to their reasons and situations for using so-called 'pure' English borrowings in Chinese. One common answer was that it is sometimes "easier" to use the pure loan than the native synonym or even the adjusted loan. For example, "*email*" may be retrieved before *dianzixinjian* or even *yimeier* because it is "easier to say." Given that *yimeier* is derived from the Chinese lexicon and *email* is not, this response is questionable; it is likely that there are other factors influencing this preferred usage.

Interviewers were also asked when they felt the loans had been introduced into Chinese (since 1990, since 1980, or before 1980). Some of the words which

people agreed were introduced within the past ten years include *yintewang*, *ku*, *paidui*, *kapian*, and *hai* (respectively, “internet,” “cool,” “party,” “card,” and “Hi”). Some of the words said to have been introduced in the past twenty years include *kafei*, *muotouche*, *yaogun*, *disini*, and *baibai* (“coffee,” “motorcycle,” “Rock’n’roll,” “Disney,” and “byebye”). Most informants said that *xuejia* “cigar” and *ningmeng* “lemon” were introduced before 1980. Some of the answers to this question varied with the age of the informant. For example, for the words *maikefeng* “microphone” and *langman* “romance,” informants older than 30 years old reported that the words were used before 1980, whereas informants younger than 30 said they’d entered the language in the past twenty or even ten years. This indicates that the level of integration is related both to how long the word has been used in the language and the demographics of the speaker.

9.0 Sociolinguistic Variables and Speaker Variation

The final question on the interview form asked about the use of borrowings with respect to age (young people, older people, or all ages). In general, words such as *paidui*, *ku*, *hai* and *baibai* (“party,” “cool,” “Hi,” and “byebye”) were said to be used by young speakers more than old. Many words, such as *kele*, *kafei* and *aspilin* (“cola,” “coffee,” and “asprin”) were reported used by all ages, and no words were said to be used exclusively by older speakers.

Again there was an interesting response to the word *langman*, where exactly half of the informants felt it was used by all people and half that it was used only by young people. This “romance” mystery seems to indicate the extent to which speakers believe the use of language corresponds to the habits of people. Young speakers view the experience of romance as limited to the younger generation. They infer that older people have no use for the word *langman* because they have no romantic experiences, and interestingly they infer further that they never even had such experiences when they were younger (see the opinion that *langman* was not used before the 1980’s)!

When this question is compared to the actual responses by informants about their own personal use (again respective to age), it is not at all that possible to say that certain loans are used exclusively by young speakers. One 65-year-old informant reported to use most all of the listed words (except *yintewang* “internet” and *tuokouxiu* “talk show”). He also reported an earlier introduction of loans into Chinese than most of the other informants (most of his answers indicated use before 1980). The notable fact about this particular speaker is that he studied English for a number of years.

This leads to the new hypothesis that people who study an L2 will use loans from that L2 more than monolingual L1 speakers. This is consistent with previous research in bilingual communities (e.g., Poplack, Sankoff, and Miller;

1988) which demonstrates that “highly bilingual speakers are importers of lexical innovations, as evidenced by their preference for nonce and unattested borrowings.” Although none of the informants were true bilinguals, only three of the 36 interviewees (all of the them over 40 years old) had never studied English, and those three reported a much lower use of English borrowings. However, a much larger test sample is needed to claim statistical validity, and in particular uneducated young people need to be studied to rule out diachronic considerations.

Informants attending the University of Arizona came from a wide variety of geographical backgrounds. Three informants were from Taiwan, and as mentioned earlier Taiwan is more cosmopolitan and more a port of entry for foreign culture than even Beijing, which is also a metropolitan area where some of the informants originated from. One would expect Taiwanese informants to use more of those terms marked as ‘unfamiliar’ to the Kunming residents, and indeed they do, recognizing more of the *Hanyu Wailaici Cidian* words such as *gali*, *diuci*, and *falao*, “curry,” “deuce,” and “pharoah.” However, these interviews were conducted in the United States, so these informants are more educated and proficient in English; therefore, they are compared to their counterparts who were raising on mainland China. Answers were variable, but in general the terms known and used by the mainland speakers seemed about the same as the Taiwan natives. Again, it appears that level of education/fluency in

English seems to be the factor which overrides native dialect, as well as age. A much more comprehensive study on dialect variation is necessary to make any theoretical claims at this point.

10.0 Discourse Occurrence

4.5 hours of evening news were recorded while in Kunming; of this, 2/3 is provincial Yunnan news, and 1/3 is national CCB news. A Chinese L1 speaker³ listened to the recordings and catalogued all occurrences of loan words. The results show that English loan words are, in general, not highly integrated into the discourse style of radio speech in China.

The following loans occurred frequently in their mixed- or directly-transliterated form: *meiguo*, “America,” *yingguo*, “England,” *bushi*, “(President) Bush,” *MBA* “MBA,” *IBM* “IBM,” *kele* “Cola,” and *xitong*, “system.” Notice that all of these words, except for *xitong*, are proper nouns and do not have native synonyms. For those words which occurred and do have Chinese counterparts, *CD/guangpan* “C.D.,” *disike/xiandaiwu* “Disco,” *yimei'er/dianziyoujian* “E-mail,” *yintewang/wangluo* “internet,” *disi/dishi/chuzuqiche* “taxi,” and *WTO/shimaozuzhi* “WTO,” the transliterated form did occur but the calque or the

³ This Chinese L1 speaker is Shaomei Wang, graduate student in Chinese literature at the Univ. of Arizona, Spring 2002. Originally from Xi'an, China, she speaks fairly ‘prototypical’ Mandarin Chinese.

native synonym occurred more often. For example, *WTO* occurred eight times and its counterpart *shimaozuzhi* occurred nine times, and more strikingly, the forms *yimeier* “email” and *dishi* “taxi” never occurred in the radio news at all, but it was the native speaker’s intuition that they occur much more often in casual speech than their respective counterparts *dianziyoujian* and *chuzuqiche*. The above words are the only ones from this study (see Appendix) which occurred in these 4.5 hours of speech. Further study to determine real statistical evidence with some sort of corpora concordance is necessary to claim any patterns, and data from a corpus of interactive speech is likely to be much more informative.

The native listener found no difference in loan word usage between the national and local news. This is probably due to the fact that, because of the great dialect variation in Chinese radio listeners, the radio announcers are specifically trained to use the same consistent speech style.

11.0 Language Attitudes

However, if we assume that the level of English proficiency is directly related to the use of English loans in Chinese, then the use of loans becomes a social marker directly related to level of education, and consequently of social status. This correlates with the use of English in general. The interviewees gave particular evidence that English is a prestige language in China.

The president of the newly established Yunnan Normal University International Language and Culture College said, on the founding of the college (November 19, 2001), that most of the world needs to learn English because it is the language of the world's developing economy and the key to understanding the techniques of developed countries. Various informants said that English was now necessary to get a good job, to develop a higher standard of living, to participate in business, advanced technology, scientific research, and to develop China itself, particularly with inclusion in the World Trade Organization. In Europe, "workers who speak English often command salaries 25% to 35% above those who don't" (Associated Press, 2001). One informant passed on a familiar saying, that a professor who speaks English has more knowledge than a professor who possesses her own library. Said one Chinese language teacher, "English is the *putonghua*⁴ of the world!"

English is seen as a prestige language also by how it is used in social interaction. The interviews included a question as to if the speakers spoke any English words when speaking Chinese to other Chinese people, and why. Most said they did not, but those who did said they did it very informal situations, and only for fun. A few informants said that a person can even appear pretentious if they use English too much or at an inappropriate time. If English expresses

⁴ The term *putonghua* is Standard Chinese for "Standard Chinese."

arrogance, it is most likely associated with higher education and status. This prestige extends to Chinese speaking communities beyond the borders of mainland China; Singaporeans are reported as saying that “English adds ‘class’ and elevates a person’s social statuses” (Chineseroots.com).

The prestige of English is evident even through a process of indirect borrowing, or perhaps in conjunction with the in-between language or dialect. The words *dishi* “taxi,” *basi* “bus,” and *paidui* “party” entered Chinese first through either Taiwan or Hong Kong dialects, where the speakers are more connected to Western culture. Most informants viewed these words as currently non-nativized, not because they sound like English, but because they still sound like these other Chinese dialects.

A note: throughout this text the loan words have been referred to as “English” words, but since English has borrowed so many of the loans itself it is important to remember that English is also acting as the in-between language in many cases. For example, the words *sauna*, *jazz*, *Muslim*, *tofu*, *cocoa/chocolate*, and *pizza* came from Finnish, West African languages, Arabic, Japanese, Nahuatl through Spanish, and Italian through French, respectively. The author assumes, based on factors of social contact, that these words have indeed been borrowed by Chinese from English, rather than the native language (e.g., it is highly unlikely that Chinese borrowed *qiaokeli* “chocolate” from Nahuatl, or even from Spanish).

The only case where it is really not clear is when the language involved is Japanese, as in *kalaOK*. As Kelley (2000) points out, Chinese “*kafei*” is more similar to the French word for coffee, and the Japanese word is closer to the English form. So whether the term *kafei* was borrowed from French or from English via Japanese is very difficult to tell. Sometimes, the English word might have a transliterated form in Japanese, such as the word for computer, but from Japanese to Chinese the word becomes a calque (e.g., *diannao* “computer”). Thomason and Kaufman (1988) argue that the structural similarity between languages has equal or lesser effect on borrowing rates than does the sociopolitical history between two linguistic communities. If we agree with this argument, then the question of English vs. Japanese is indeed difficult to resolve.

Tai and Chan (1999) discuss periods of political contact as the historical catalysts for borrowing. The current (Fall, 2001) political situation is an excellent advent for such as occurrence, as we see with the words *WTO/shimaozuzhi* “WTO,” *taliban* “Taliban,” and *aolinpike* “Olympics.” Many of the interviewees noted the global economy and WTO as main reasons to study English. A few also noted that the years since 1990 have been a time of rapid International-English loan words entering Chinese.

12.0 English as a Global Language

The abstract implications of the prestige of English in China and the high number and influence of English words on Chinese add to the current discussion on the status of English as a global language (e.g., see Linguist List 13.881). David Crystal published a comprehensive book in 1997 on the status of English, the general concept of a global language, and the facts pointing to overlap between the two. The following discussion is based on this text.

A language has global status when “it develops a special role that is recognized in every country” (2). This recognition can be achieved by either giving that language official status or making it a priority in foreign-language teaching (3); China has opted for the latter strategy. Not only is English “the language most widely taught as a foreign language,” but it is “the chief foreign language to be encountered in schools” (3-4).

Crystal makes a specific contrast between English and Chinese: “nearly a quarter of the world’s population is already fluent or competent in English ... between 1.2 and 1.5 billion people ... even (written) Chinese ... is known to only some 1.1 billion” (4-5). Crystal argues that what makes a language a dominant one is the “cultural power” that it is associated with (5). Thus it is not the population of native speakers, nor is it the “ease” of learning or the so-called

pleasing acoustics of the language which give a universal language its ubiquity, but rather it is “the political power of its people – especially their military power” (7). The United States is currently one of the top military powers in the world, but with China steadily advancing as a counterpart. Observing the consequences of language change through the resulting processes of language contact will be an important study in coming years.

13.0 Conclusion

Borrowing can have a tremendous effect on large-scale language change. Through borrowing, “a language can acquire new phonemes and new morphological patterns” which “have a very substantial effect upon the phonology or morphology of (that) borrowing language” (Trask, 1996:309). In addition to changes in phonology or morphology, significant changes in semantics can occur both for borrowing languages and between different dialects of the same language. Dialects of English and languages that borrow English loan words have a significant effect on the definition of the English language and its present day semantic diversification.

However, in spite of English’s debated “world language” status and its growing influence in Chinese speaking areas, the actual influence of English on the Chinese language is relatively minimal in comparison to studies in other

linguistic communities. For example, in the borrowing relationship of English and Tamil there are constraints of syntax on the borrowed words (Sankoff, Poplack, and Vanniarajan; 1990). Yet despite various typological differences between English and Chinese, the process is still fairly superficial, demonstrating mostly one-to-one mappings of nouns, greetings, and culturally-specific items. It appears that Chinese remains quite robust in the face of global English.

Works Cited

- Andrews, David R. 1999. *Sociocultural Perspectives on Language Change in Diaspora: Soviet immigrants in the United States*. Amsterdam and Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company.
- Bloomfield, Leonard. 1933. *Language*. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.
- Brumfit, Christopher (ed.). 1982. *English for International Communication*. Oxford: Pergamon Press.
- Cheng, Robert L. 1985. "Group Interest in Treating Words Borrowed into Mandarin and Taiwanese." *Anthropological Linguistics*. pp. 177-185.
- Crystal, David. 1997. *English as a Global Language*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Danesi, Marcel. 1985. *Loanwords and Phonological Methodology*. Ottawa, Canada: Didier.
- Dil, Anwar S. 1981. *Language Diversity and Language Contact: Essays by Stanley Lieberman*. Stanford, California: Stanford University Press.
- Dovring, Karen. 1997. *English as a Lingua Franca: double talk in global persuasion*. Westport, Connecticut and London: Praeger.
- Duanmu, San. 1990. *A Formal Study of Syllable, Tone, Stress, and Domain in Chinese Languages*, Ph.D dissertation, MIT.
- Fantini, Alvino E. 1985. *Language Acquisition of a Bilingual Child: a sociolinguistic perspective (to age ten)*. England: Multilingual Matters Ltd.
- Fishman, Joshua A., Robert L. Cooper and Andrew W. Conrad. 1977. *The Spread of English: the sociology of English as an additional language*. Rowley, Mass.: Newbury House Publishers, Inc.
- Gao, Mobo C. F. 2000. *Mandarin Chinese: an introduction*. Oxford and New York: Oxford University Press.

- Goh, Bee Chen. 1996. *Negotiating with the Chinese*. Aldershot Hants, England; Brookfield, VT: Dartmouth Publishers.
- Haugen, Einar. 1953. *The Norwegian Language in America: a study in bilingual behavior*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.
- Hill, Jane and Kenneth Hill. 1986. *Speaking Mexicano*. Tucson, Arizona: The University of Arizona Press.
- Hong, Wei. 1995. "An Analysis of Language Changes in China since the 1980's." *Linguistische Berichte*. pp. 143-154.
- Katamba, Francis. 1994. *English Words*. London and New York: Routledge.
- Kubler, Cornelius. 1985. *A Study of Europeanized Grammar in Modern Written Chinese*. Taipei, Taiwan: Student Book Co., Ltd.
- Lass, R. 1980. *On explaining Language Change*. Cambridge: Cambridge Univ. Press.
- Li, Charles N. and Sandra A. Thompson. 1981. *Mandarin Chinese: A functional reference grammar*. Berkeley and Los Angeles, CA: University of California Press.
- Liu, Cheng Tan. 1985. *Hanyu Wailaici Cidian*. Shanghai, China: Shanghai Tzau Shu Chau Pan She.
- Masini, Federico. 1993. "The Formation of Modern Chinese Lexicon an Its Evolution Toward a National Language: The period from 1840 to 1898." *Journal of Chinese Linguistics*. United States.
- Novotna, Zdenka. 1968. *Archiv Orientalni: Quarterly Jrnl of African, Asian, and Latin-American Studies*. Prague, Czechoslovakia. 118: no. 36-37; 295-325.
- Olmsted, Hugh M. 1986. "American interference in the Russian language of the third-wave emigration: Preliminary notes." *Folia Slavica* 8: 91-127.
- Poplack, Shana and David Sankoff. 1984. "Borrowing: the synchrony of integration." *Linguistics* 22: 99-135.

- Poplack, Shana, David Sankoff and Christopher Miller. 1988. "The social correlates and linguistic processes of lexical borrowing and assimilation." *Linguistics* 26: 47-104.
- Puckett, Bonnie. 1999. "Limited Phonology of English Loanwords in Mandarin Chinese: an Optimality Theory Approach." Term Paper, Cornell University.
- Romaine, Suzanne. 1995. *Bilingualism*. 2nd ed. Oxford, United Kingdom and Cambridge, Mass.: Blackwell.
- Sankoff, David, Shana Poplack and Swathi Vanniarajan. 1990. "The case of nonce loan in Tamil." *Cambridge Variation and Change* 2: 71-101.
- Tai, James H-Y. , and Marjorie K. M. Chan. 1999. "Some Reflections on the Periodization of the Chinese Language." *Studies in Chinese Historical Syntax and Morphology: Linguistic essays in honor of Mei Tsu-lin, [=Collection des Cahiers de Linguistique d'Asia Orientale]*, ed. By Alain Peyraube and Chaofun Sun. Paris: Ecole des Hautes Etudes en Sciences Sociales. 223-239.
- Trask, R.L. 1996. *Historical Linguistics*. London: Arnold.
- T'ung, P.C. and D.E. Pollard. 1982. *Colloquial Chinese*. New York, NY: Routledge.
- Weinreich, Uriel. 1963. *Languages in Contact*. The Hague: Mouton & Co.
- Yong, Zhao and Keith P. Campbell. "English in China." *World Englishes* 14: 377-390.

Electronic Documents

Associated Press. "International – European Cover Story." *The Great English Divide*. Aug. 13, 2001, date accessed Aug. 18, 2002.

Chineseroots.com Newsletter. cs@chineseroots.com, date accessed Feb. 1, 2002.

Grimes, Barbara F., ed. 1996. *Ethnologue*. 13th Ed. Summer Institute of Linguistics, Inc. <http://www.sil.org/ethnologue/top100.html>, date accessed Jan. 4, 2002.

Hill, Jane. Email correspondence. Date Accessed Apr. 4, 2002.

Kelley, David B., Ph.D. Email correspondence. Monday, Jun. 10, 2000.

Linguist List. <http://www.linguistlist.org>. Issue 13.881, *Disc: Economic Value of Lang Diversity*, date accessed Mar. 30, 2002.

Yu, Sihyeon Shelley. Email correspondence. Date accessed Oct. 1, 2001.

Appendix: Loan word list⁵

English	Chinese
Alcohol	<i>a'er ke'er</i>
America	<i>meiguo*</i>
Asprin	<i>asipilin</i>
Bar	<i>jiuba</i>
Belief	<i>bilifu</i>
Brandy	<i>boilandi</i>
Bungee	<i>bengji</i>
Bus	<i>basi</i>
Bush (G.W.)	<i>bushi*</i>
Bye-bye	<i>bai-bai</i>
C.D.	<i>"C.D."</i>
Caffeine	<i>kafeiyin</i>
California	<i>jiazhou</i>
Canada	<i>jianada*</i>
Captain	<i>jiabidan</i>
Card	<i>ka</i>
Carnation	<i>kangnaixin</i>
Cartoon	<i>katong</i>
Champagne	<i>xiangbin</i>
Chocolate	<i>qiaokeli</i>
Cigar	<i>xuejia</i>
Clarinet	<i>kelaliniete</i>
Clinton (Pres.)	<i>kelinten*</i>
Cocktail	<i>jiwei jiu</i>
Coffee	<i>kafei</i>
Cola (Pepsi/Coca)	<i>kele (baishi/kouke)*</i>
Compost	<i>kangbosite</i>
Cool (slang)	<i>ku</i>
Crayon	<i>gulirong</i>
Curry	<i>gali</i>
Cushion	<i>guchen</i>
Deuce	<i>diusi</i>
Disco	<i>disike</i>
Disney	<i>disini</i>

⁵ Words with an asterix* mark those words present in the Radio News corpus

E-mail	<i>yimeier</i>
England	<i>yinguo</i>
Fallacy	<i>falashi</i>
Frisbee	<i>fulisibi</i>
Gameboy	<i>dingbo</i>
Gavotte	<i>jiafute</i>
Gill	<i>ji'er</i>
Glee	<i>geli</i>
Glycerine	<i>gelisilin</i>
Goal	<i>gao'er</i>
Grain	<i>keleng</i>
Group	<i>gelubu</i>
Guitar	<i>jita</i>
Hamburger	<i>hanbao(bao)</i>
Heavy metal (music)	<i>zhong jinshu</i>
Hi / Hey	<i>hai / hei</i>
Internet	<i>yintewang</i>
Joule	<i>jiao'er</i>
Karaoke	<i>kalaOK</i>
K.F.C.	<i>kendeji</i>
Laser	<i>leishe</i>
League	<i>lige</i>
Lemon	<i>ningmeng</i>
Listerine	<i>lisidelin</i>
Logic	<i>luoji</i>
Mask	<i>masike</i>
McDonalds	<i>maidanglao</i>
Mexico	<i>moxiguo</i>
Mickey Mouse	<i>milaoshu</i>
Microphone	<i>maikefeng</i>
Model	<i>mote</i>
Mosaic	<i>mosaic</i>
Motorcycle	<i>muotuoche</i>
Muslim	<i>musilin</i>
Nike	<i>nike</i>
Nylon	<i>nilong</i>
Oil of Olay	<i>oulaiya</i>
Okay	<i>oukai</i>
Olympics	<i>aolinpike</i>

Pampers	<i>bangbaoshi</i>
Party	<i>paidui</i>
Penny	<i>bennei</i>
Pharoah	<i>falao</i>
Pie	<i>pai</i>
Pizza	<i>bisa</i>
Poker	<i>puke</i>
PriceSmart	<i>puersimate</i>
Punk	<i>pengke</i>
Queer	<i>ku'er</i>
Rabbi	<i>labi</i>
Radar	<i>leida</i>
Recorder	<i>likeda</i>
Rock'n'roll	<i>yaogun / gunshi</i>
Romance	<i>langman</i>
Ruby	<i>lubi</i>
Rye	<i>la'ai</i>
Sandwich	<i>sanmingzhi</i>
Sauna	<i>sangna</i>
Saxophone	<i>sakesifeng</i>
Sergeant	<i>shazhande</i>
Sharp	<i>xiapu</i>
Show	<i>xiu</i>
Sofa	<i>shafa</i>
Sony	<i>suoni</i>
Substance	<i>sabusitansi</i>
System	<i>xitong*</i>
T-shirt	<i>T-xu (-shan)</i>
Talk Show	<i>tuokouxiu</i>
Taxi	<i>disi</i>
Tennis	<i>tingnishi</i>
Tractor	<i>tuolaji</i>
Treason	<i>tulisun</i>
Trick	<i>telike</i>
Tyrant	<i>dailande</i>
Vitamin	<i>weitaming</i>
W.T.O.	<i>shimaozuzhi / "W.T.O."</i>
Yoga	<i>yujia</i>
Yo-Yo	<i>youyou</i>

Special Thanks

This paper was inspired and guided by Dr. Jane Hill, professor of Linguistic Anthropology at the University of Arizona, Tucson, Arizona, U.S.A., and the official advisor for this project. This paper would also not be possible without the assistance of Ms. Wu Min, teacher of Standard Chinese to foreign students at Yunnan Normal University, Kunming, Yunnan, China, who acted as the on-site advisor for this project. Finally, the hours and effort that Shaomei Wang and all my informants gave to this project were absolutely essential to the completion of this study.