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ABSTRACT

Five languages/dialects are traditionally spoken in the Nanning area: the Sinitic languages of Nanning Pinghua, Nanning Cantonese and Old Nanning Mandarin, and the indigenous Tai languages of Northern Zhuang and Southern Zhuang. They have all influenced each other in various ways, and equally interestingly, they have remained distinct in a number of ways. In this analysis, we will discuss aspects of this complex language contact situation from the viewpoint of Nanning Pinghua and Nanning Cantonese. A selection of similarities and differences in their phonology, lexicon and grammar will be presented. Curiously, Nanning Cantonese, which has been spoken in the area for about 150 years, in some respects resembles the indigenous Zhuang languages more in its phonology and grammar than does Nanning Pinghua, which has been spoken in the area for a millennium. In the last section of this analysis, we will discuss some of the possible sociolinguistic factors that might have caused this unusual outcome for language contact.
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6.1 INTRODUCTION
Nanning (南寧 Nǎnníng) is the capital of Guangxi Zhuang Autonomous Region (廣西壯族自治區 Guǎngxī Zhuàngzú Zìzhìqū) in Southern China. Situated on the Yong River (邕江 Yōngjiāng), a tributary of the Western Branch of the Pearl River, Nanning is the largest city upriver from the Pearl River Delta. Historically, the Nanning region was of great military importance to China due to its proximity to the Vietnamese border, and also its location within the territory of the indigenous Tai-speaking Zhuang people. Nowadays, this geographical importance has transformed into economic importance due to Nanning’s proximity to Vietnam and the Tai-speaking nations in ASEAN. This geographically strategic city has long attracted Han immigrants from various linguistic backgrounds. As a result, the linguistic environment in Nanning is complex, with a multiplicity of Sinitic languages spoken alongside the Tai languages indigenous to the area.

The distribution of languages in the Nanning area is somewhat concentric. The urban area is primarily Sinitic-speaking, and there are three Sinitic languages traditionally spoken in Nanning: Nanning Cantonese (南寧白話 Nǎnníng Báihuà) is primarily spoken in the city centre, and Nanning Pinghua (南寧平話 Nǎnníng Pínghuà) is primarily spoken in the surrounding suburbs and nearby rural areas. Within the city centre, there used to be an enclave of speakers of Old Nanning Mandarin (邕州官話 Yōngzhōu Guānhuà). However, most of the remaining speakers of this moribund language are now found in further-away villages/suburbs like 菠蘿嶺 Bōluólíng (most of the original speakers of Old Nanning Mandarin left in Nanning city centre shifted to speaking Nanning Cantonese). Rural villages further away are mostly Tai-speaking, and the Zhuang dialects are commonly divided into Northern Zhuang and Southern Zhuang, each belonging to a different branch of the Tai language family (Northern Tai and Central Tai
respectively). In addition to these five languages native to Nanning, nowadays there is also New Nanning Mandarin (南寧普通話 Nánníng Pǔtōnghuà, or 南普 NánPǔ), which is Nanning’s version of modern Standard Mandarin, and these days the lingua franca of Nanning. All these languages and dialects in Nanning have mutually influenced each other in different ways. In this analysis, we will discuss some aspects of this complex language contact situation from the viewpoint of Nanning Pinghua and Nanning Cantonese.² Many interesting aspects of this language contact situation can be seen when Nanning Pinghua and Nanning Cantonese are compared with each other, and also when they are compared with Zhuang, Standard Cantonese and Standard Mandarin. As for Cantonese, Standard Cantonese spoken in the Pearl River Delta is nowadays spoken far away from the Tai languages. However, even Standard Cantonese has a strong Tai substratum (e.g. Oūyáng Juéyà 1989, Lǐ Jingzhōng 1994, Bauer 1996, Huang Yuanwei 1997; Lǐ Jīnfāng 2002: 100-141), a witness to the existence of Tai-speaking people in Guangdong with whom later Chinese settlers from the north mingled.³ After the arrival of the first groups of

² Zhuang has, unsurprisingly, also been under the influence of Sinitic languages, but this is not discussed in this paper. For examples of Sinitic influence on Zhuang, see Wang Jūn (1962), Dài Qingxià (1992), Qín Xiǎoháng (2004), Sybesma (2008), Zhào Jīng (2008), amongst many others.

³ Genetically, it is known that Cantonese people are more than 50% Northern Chinese on their male line of descent and primarily ‘native’ (Kra-Dai, Hmong Mien or Austroasiatic) on their female line of descent (Wen et al. 2004; see also Gan et al. 2008 on the genetics of Northern Pinghua people, where the conclusion is that Northern Pinghua people are primarily ‘native’ on both the male and female lines of descent). In Wen et al. (2004)’s study of the genetic of Sinitic people in general, the ‘Northern Chinese’ Y haplogroups are (using the nomenclature at the time
Cantonese speakers in the mid-19th century, Nanning Cantonese subsequently evolved under strong Zhuang influences. As for Pinghua, Nanning Pinghua has been spoken in the Nanning area for at least one millennium. As to be expected, Nanning Pinghua is also influenced by Zhuang. Interestingly, however, with respect to many of its linguistic features, the longer-established Nanning Pinghua is less like the indigenous Zhuang than the ‘newly-established’ Nanning Cantonese. There are many examples of this, and in sections 2, 3 and 4 we will see such a selection. In the last section of this chapter, section 5, we will discuss the possible social-linguistic factors for this less-usual outcome of language contact.

of publication) O3 (M122) and O3e (M134), whereas the ‘Southern Natives’ Y haplogroups are O1* and O1b (M119-C) and O2a* and O2a1 (M95T). The ‘Northern Chinese’ mt haplogroups are A, C, D, G, M8a, Y and Z, whereas the ‘Southern Natives’ mt haplogroups are B, F, R9a, R9b and N9a. In Gan et al.’s (2008) study of the genetics of Northern Pinghua people, the ‘Han Chinese’ Y haplogroups are O3, O3a5 and O3a5a, the ‘Tai’ Y haplogroups are O1a and O2a*, and ‘Hmong-Mien’ Y haplogroups are O3* and O2a*. The majority of the Pinghua population sampled is of the ‘non-Sinitic’ O2a haplogroup (42.58%), while the second most frequent Y haplogroup, the ‘Sinitic’ O3a5a, is found only in 14.85% of the sampled population. As for the mitochondrial DNA data, the ‘Sinitic’ mt haplogroups are A, C, D, G, M8a, Y Z, the ‘Tai’ mt haplogroups are B4a, B5a, F1a, M7b1, M7b*, M* R9A and R9b, and the ‘Hmong-Mien’ mt haplogroups are B4a, B5a, M*, M7b*, C, B4b1, M7b1, F1a, B4* and R9b. The Pinghua population sampled primarily belongs to the B4a, B5a, M*, F1a, M7b1, and N* mt haplogroups, i.e. coinciding with the Tai and the Hmong-Mien population.
The following are brief introductions to the languages and dialects of the Nanning area and other explanatory notes. Cantonese is a member of the Yue Chinese subgroup of Sinitic (粤语). (We will discuss briefly the relationship between Yue and Pinghua below.) The first major wave of Cantonese people arrived in Nanning area about 150 years ago, around the time of the Opium Wars (mid-nineteenth century). The majority of them came from the Nanpanshun area (南海 Nánhǎi, 番禺 Pányǔ and 順德 Shùndé) just south of Canton in the Pearl River Delta. In the early days of the Republic of China (the 1910s), the numerically dominant Sinitic languages in Nanning were still Nanning Pinghua and Old Nanning Mandarin (Zhōu Běnlìáng et al. 2006); it was in the 1930s or the 1940s that Nanning Cantonese became numerically dominant in the city centre, as more and more Cantonese immigrants from the Pearl River Delta settled in the Nanning area due to the Nationalist – Communist Civil Wars and the Second World War.

Nanning Cantonese is largely mutually-intelligible with Standard Cantonese; their vocabularies are largely the same, their inventories of tones are the same, and segmentally they are not very different. When compared with Standard Cantonese, it is clear that Nanning Cantonese has been subject to Zhuang influence, to be discussed throughout this chapter. In this analysis, when ‘Cantonese’ is not further qualified, it refers to both Nanning Cantonese and Standard Cantonese.

Nanning Pinghua is a member of the Pinghua Chinese (平话) branch of Sinitic. There are various accents of Nanning Pinghua spoken in the different suburbs of Nanning; their phonological differences are obvious, but they are mutually intelligible. For daily interactions, there is no ‘standard’ accent of Nanning Pinghua which speakers uniformly gravitate towards. Nanning Pinghua is associated with the earliest Sinitic immigrants in the area; they arrived before the Mandarin and Cantonese speakers. There were already small groups of Han Chinese people in
Guangxi as early as the Qin Dynasty. (For instance, the canal 靈渠 Lingqú was excavated in northeastern Guangxi (in modern day 興安 Xīng’ān country) to link the Yangtze and Pearl River systems in 214 BC during the Qin Dynasty. The canal facilitated the migration of the first wave of Han Chinese immigrants into the modern day Guangxi, and subsequently Guangdong). The most important immigration event associated with the Pinghua speakers happened in 1053 AD: many Pinghua speakers claim that their ancestors were soldiers from the historical Shandong area (which includes parts of modern day Henan) who came in 1053 CE during the Northern Song Dynasty to wage a war with the local polity 大南 Daihnamz (Mandarin Dānnán) headed by the Zhuang leader 儂智高 Nungz Ciqgau (Mandarin Nóng Zhìgāo). Nowadays Pinghua speakers are found mainly along the old Guilin-Liuzhou-Nanning road (i.e. the Song Dynasty military route that the soldiers travelled along from the north to Nanning), and also along the various tributaries of the Pearl River which cross the Guilin-Liuzhou-Nanning road. In the Language Atlas of China (Wurm et al. 1987), Pinghua is divided into two types: Northern Pinghua and Southern Pinghua. Yú Jǐn (2007) classifies Pinghua into four types: 嶽江 Yōngjiāng (‘Yong River’), 官道 Guāndào (‘Official Road’), 融江 Rónɡjiāng and 潮江 Líjiāng. The former three are types of Southern Pinghua, whereas Lijiang Pinghua refers to Northern Pinghua.

4 The polity headed by 儂智高 Nungz Ciqgau and his father 儂全福 Nungz Cienzfuk (Mandarin Nóng Quánfú) had numerous name changes. The Nungz polity was at various times paying tribute to, or waging wars with, both the 宋 Sòng Dynasty of China to the north and the 李 Lý Dynasty of Đại Việt to the south. In the end the Nungz polity was crushed by Sòng; many Pinghua people claim that their ancestors were these Sòng soldiers.
Yongjiang Pinghua is the prototypical Southern Pinghua, spoken around Nanning and also in their immigrant communities elsewhere, primarily upriver to the west. Wherever grammar is concerned, ‘Nanning Pinghua’ in this paper refers to this type of Southern Pinghua;

- Guandao Pinghua is also a type of Southern Pinghua, and it is found to the east of Nanning, primarily along the road towards Liuzhou. The Pinghua dialects of 橫縣 Héngxiàn, 賓陽 Bīnyáng and 來賓 Láibīn are of this type; Binyang is famous for being the only county where Pinghua is the dominant language;

- Rongjiang Pinghua is spoken along the Róng River to the north of Liuzhou (Southwestern Mandarin is spoken in Liuzhou city itself). It is situated geographically in Northern Guangxi. However, its phonology is conservative like Southern Pinghua;

- Lijiang Pinghua is the prototypical Northern Pinghua, spoken around Guilin (Southwestern Mandarin is spoken in Guilin city itself). Its phonology is significantly Mandarinized. We know that the Mandarinization of the phonology is a later phenomenon, as the older Chinese loanwords in the indigenous languages of the area are Southern Pinghua-like (Qín Fèngyú pers.comm.).
Pinghua is a Sinitic language which does not have an influential urban variety. Except in Binyang, all the county towns and city centres in Pinghua-speaking parts of Guangxi are dominated by Cantonese or Mandarin speakers. (However, even Binyang Pinghua is not free from Yue-like features, as will be seen in some examples in the next few sections.)

The affiliation of Pinghua is still a contentious issue within Chinese linguistics, as Pinghua, and Southern Pinghua in particular, share many phonological similarities with Yue. One opinion is that Pinghua is a branch (or branches) of Yue (e.g. Liáng Jínróng 1997, 2000, Chén...
Another opinion is that just Southern Pinghua is a branch of Yue (Xiè Jiànyóu 2007), while Northern Pinghua is something else (possibly related to a range of Sinitic patois found in Southern Hunan). There is also Lǐ Liánjìn’s (e.g. 2003) opinion that Pinghua and Yue are separate branches of Sinitic, and that Goulou Yue (勾漏 Gōulòu) is in fact a type of Pinghua. Mài Yún (2010) concludes that Yue, together with Pinghua, split off from mainstream Chinese between Táng and Sòng Dynasties, when Guangxi and Guangdong were part of the 南漢 Southern Hán polity during the Five Dynasties and Ten Kingdoms period.

Later during the Southern Sòng Dynasty, Cantonese received a strong stream of influence from mainstream Chinese again; this new development in Cantonese has in turn spread from the Pearl River Delta, but has not quite reached as far west as the places where Goulou Yue and Pinghua are spoken.⁵ Mài Yún (2010) also correctly points out that Goulou Yue does in fact share many similarities with Pinghua (as also mentioned in Lǐ Liánjìn 2003). On the other hand, Zhāng Mǐn and Zhōu Liètíng (2003) observe that Goulou Yue shares more similarities with other Yue dialects than with Pinghua. The conclusion that can be gathered from these differing viewpoints is that Pinghua and Yue lie on a dialect continuum (ignoring the Cantonese enclaves, including

---

⁵ There is also Lǐ Jǐnfāng (2002)’s interesting viewpoint who recognizes there being later Cantonese influences which spread to some of the other Yue dialects. However, for him, Yue is itself not a single genealogical group: the various varieties of Yue are in fact separate (first order) branches of Sinitic; the non-Cantonese branches of Yue received Cantonese influences to various degrees, but otherwise their similarities are due to having a similar Kra-Dai substratum. It is true that it is difficult to identify innovations that are uniquely shared by all the Yue dialects.
the Nanning Cantonese enclaves, in Guangxi), and that the isoglosses between Pinghua-like and Cantonese-like features are not bundled along the border between Pinghua and Yue as shown in the Language Atlas of China (Wurm et al. 1987). The reader needs to keep in mind that while I demonstrate many differences between Nanning Pinghua and Cantonese in this paper, these are differences between the two opposite ends of the Pinghua-Yue dialect continuum (with Nanning Cantonese being a dialect that was transplanted from the Cantonese end of the dialect continuum directly into the Pinghua end of the continuum, geographically speaking). The linguistic features treated are not necessarily representative of all Pinghua dialects and all Yue dialects respectively. Many traits in Pinghua are also found in neighbouring Yue dialects of the Goulou type and the Lianzhou type (廉州 Liánzhōu, which is the old name of 合浦 Hépǔ), while the Guandao type of Pinghua, located just to the east of Nanning, sometimes patterns with Goulou Yue to the east and/or

6 Whether this is the result of Pinghua and Yue belonging to the same branch of Sinitic, or separate branches but with strong convergence along the border, is still difficult to conclude. More detailed studies on the Western Yue dialects and Pinghua dialects are urgently needed to solve this problem.

7 The Language Atlas of China (Wurm et al. 1987) mentions the 欽廉 Qinlián type of Yue. However, this name is a misnomer, as there are clearly two types of Yue dialects within this area. ‘Qín’ stands for 欽州 Qinzhōu; Qinzhōu and places like 北海 Běihǎi speak a type of Cantonese that is not very different from Standard Cantonese. On the other hand, ‘Lián’ stands for 廉州 Liánzhōu (i.e. 合浦 Hépǔ), and the Yue dialects in that area are not mutually intelligible with
Lianzhou Yue to the south rather than with Nanning Pinghua to the west. Some examples will demonstrate these features in the following sections.

The following are brief introductions to the other languages in the Nanning area. Old Nanning Mandarin is unfortunately not discussed further in this paper due to lack of data. Old Nanning Mandarin is phonologically a type of Southwestern Mandarin (similar to Guilin-Liuzhou Mandarin; see Zhou Benliang et al. 2006), but its grammar is primarily Pinghua- or Cantonese-like (Qin Fengyu p.c.). Old Nanning Mandarin was brought in by officials and merchants who came to Nanning from Northern Guangxi during the Ming and Qing dynasties. Old Nanning Mandarin was still one of the two dominant languages in Nanning city centre in the 1910s (Zhou Benliang et al. 2006). However, the number of Old Nanning Mandarin speakers dwindled as more and more Cantonese speakers settled in Nanning. The Mandarin enclave has since disappeared from Nanning city centre. Old Nanning Mandarin is now moribund, and its remaining speakers are dispersed in various rural villages.

Northern and Southern Zhuang belong to two separate branches of the Tai language family, and Tai is a branch of the Kra-Dai language family. The Tai language family is Cantonese (based on personal experience). Many authors (e.g. Mai Yun 2010) use the term Qinlian and assume that the entire region speaks a Cantonese type of Yue. See Chen Xiaojin and Chen Tao (2005) on the Yue dialects of Beihai area (including Hepu) where both types are demonstrated.

8 The Kra-Dai family is also known as Tai-Kadai. The name Kra-Dai, following Ostapirat (2000, 2004), is gaining in popularity.
commonly divided into three branches following Li Fang-Kuei (1960, 1977): Northern Tai, Central Tai and Southwestern Tai. The difference between Northern Zhuang and Southern Zhuang can be appreciated through the fact that most of the numerically important Tai languages like Lao, Thai, Shan and Tai Lü belong to just one branch of Tai (Southwestern Tai), whereas Northern and Southern Zhuang belong to two separate branches of Tai (Northern Tai and Central Tai, respectively). Nevertheless, the grammars of Northern Zhuang and Southern Zhuang are (supposedly) not strikingly different; the differences are mainly phonological and lexical (Zhāng Jūnrú et al. 1999: 393). The Tai languages are primarily SVO, but unlike Sinitic languages, most noun modifiers follow the head noun. In this paper, only examples from Northern Zhuang are given, as data from Southern Zhuang are comparatively rare. (Northern Zhuang data are plentiful as the Northern Zhuang dialect of Wuming (武鳴 Wǔmíng), the county neighbouring Nanning to the north, was chosen as the basis for Standard Zhuang by the Chinese government.)

The lack of Southern Zhuang data in this paper does not imply that the Zhuang influences on Pinghua and Yue were only from Northern Zhuang; Southern Zhuang has inevitably also played a role, but the quantity of influence from Northern versus Southern Zhuang (and influence from other Kra-Dai languages) on Pinghua and Yue dialects is difficult to assess at the moment, for the reasons given.

The language contact situation in Nanning area is part of the larger Guangxi language area (Qín Dōngshēng 2012). In the wider Southern Guangxi area, other than the language varieties

---

9 Standard Zhuang is now written in Roman script with no diacritics; the tones are indicated by letters at the end of a syllable. In the past, Zhuang was written in Chinese or Chinese-inspired characters, similar to how Vietnamese was first written with Chinese-like characters.
which exist in Nanning, there are also languages like Hakka, Goulou Yue and Lianzhou Yue with larger numbers of speakers, and the ‘smaller’ languages like Southern Min, Mien, Bunu, and Vietnamese.

Statistics on language usage is difficult to obtain. In terms of official ethnicity, in the 2010 national census, 50.90% of the population was Zhuang and 46.91% of the population was Han within the prefecture-level city of Nanning (including the six counties to the north and east governed by Nanning), which has a population of 6.66 million. Even within the six urban districts of Nanning (i.e. excluding the six counties), which has a population of 3.44 million, the Han people were in the minority (41.97%) at the end of 2009. It is difficult to estimate how much these ethnicity figures correspond to the level of language usage of the various languages. Impressionistically, many Nanning Cantonese speakers claim Zhuang ethnicity, whereas Nanning Pinghua speakers are nearly always Han.

The Nanning Cantonese data are primarily from Lín Yì and Qín Fèngyǔ (2008), abbreviated as ‘L&Q (2008)’ hereafter. The Nanning Pinghua data were collected by the author in Nanning. Unless otherwise indicated, the Nanning Pinghua data are in the accent of Weizilu (位子淥 Wèizilù; wɐi²² tʃi³³ lʊk²³) a village/suburb of Nanning to the west of the city centre and north of the river near Shangyao (上堯 Shàngyào; locally lɐŋ¹¹), from where the founders of the Weizilu village moved away. The Weizilu and Shangyao dialects are minimally different from the Pinghua dialect of Xinxu (Xīnxū; locally ʈʰɐm⁵³ ɦʊr⁵³), which is outlined in Zhāng Jūnórú (1987). The Northern Zhuang data come from various sources, as indicated in each instance.

10 The data are from www.nanning.gov.cn/n722103/n722135/n722481/n722721/854686.html; accessed 10th July 2012.
Phonology and vocabulary will be briefly discussed in sections 2 and 3 respectively, while various grammatical topics will be discussed in section 4. The conclusion and further discussions are found in section 5.

6.2 PHONOLOGY

The phonologies of Nanning Pinghua, Nanning Cantonese and Standard Cantonese share many similarities: they all have at least six tonemes, the stop codas of \(-p -t -k -m -n -\eta\), medial glides which are distributionally more dependent on the preceding consonant, and few contrastive places of articulation in the coronal region. Except for the last trait, these traits are largely absent in modern Mandarin dialects. On the other hand, these traits are fairly common in Far Southern China and Southeast Asia. Southern Pinghua and Yue dialects, in many cases, have all of these traits, and so do most Tai languages and Kam-Sui languages (another branch of Kra-Dai). Some of these traits are also found in a large number of Hakka, Southern Min, Mienic (e.g. Máo Zōngwǔ 2004) and Viet-Muong dialects in the region. In this section we will discuss three contact-induced phonological traits.

The first trait to be discussed is the distribution of the medial glides in Nanning Pinghua, Nanning Cantonese and Standard Cantonese; in this respect the three of them resemble Tai languages more than Sinitic languages. Most Sinitic languages have a maximum syllable structure of CGVX\(^T\), where C is a non-gliding consonant, G is a glide, V is a vowel, X is a consonant or vowel, and \(^T\) is tone. An example of a CGVX\(^T\) syllable in Mandarin is 天 tiān ‘sky’, where \(i\) is the medial glide (the medial glides are commonly analysed or represented as high vowels in Chinese linguistics). Ignoring tones for the moment, in Western linguistic tradition, a syllable of the shape CGVX would normally be analysed as having an ‘onset’, which is the CG
combination (provided that G is analysed as a glide and not a high vowel), and a ‘rime’ (if the remainder is to be analysed as one unit), which is the remaining VX combination. In the Chinese linguistic tradition, on the other hand, the syllable is first divided into an ‘initial’ (聲母 shēngmǔ), which consists of the initial C, and a ‘final’ (韻母 yùnmǔ), which is maximally the GVX combination. The initial – final analysis of syllable structure has to do with the fact that in most Sinitic languages, including Mandarin, the medial glide has a closer relationship with the following rime (the following VX unit) in terms of structural economy: if the syllable is divided into two, it is more economical to list inventories of C versus GVX rather than CG versus VX. Take the example of Standard Mandarin. If the syllable is split between C (initial) and GVX (final), e.g. t versus ian for 天 tiān, then there are 18 initials and 35 finals, a total of 53 categories. If the syllable is split between CG (onset) and VX (rime), e.g. ti versus an for 天 tiān, then there are 55 onsets and 21 rimes, a total of 76 categories. It is thus more economical to list inventories of C (initial) versus GVX (final) in Mandarin and most Sinitic languages.

The situation in the vast majority of Southern Pinghua and Yue dialects is different. In Nanning Pinghua, Nanning Cantonese and Standard Cantonese, the only medial glide is w and its occurrence depends more on the preceding consonant; in these dialects, the medial w occurs when the preceding consonant is k, kʰ or zero. (Nanning Shangyao Pinghua also has very marginal cases of tfw and tʰw.) In fact, the medial glides in these Southern Pinghua and Yue

---

11 The figures are from Duānmù Sān (2011), who actually rejects inventory economy as a factor in determining syllable structure, and advocates an onset-rime (i.e. CG versus VX) division of the syllable for all Sinitic languages.
dialects are so restricted in occurrence that it is common to posit a maximum syllable structure of
CVX rather than CGVX, with the C onset in CVX being any consonant including the glides of j
and w, and the clusters of kw and kʰw being analysed as single segments with secondary
articulation: kʷ and kʰw. For instance, Nanning Cantonese is described by L&Q (2008: 10) as
having the following inventory of onsets: p pʰ m f tʰ n l l tʃ tʃʰ /k k h h kʰ kʰw kʰj w.13 while the
rimes have the shape of V or VX (there is also a syllabic ŋ). The trait of G forming a closer
relationship with the preceding C rather than the following rime (VX) in Southern Pinghua and

12 In some Yue dialects, e.g. 東莞 Dōngguǎn and 台山 Táishān, what must have been syllable-
initial j and w have become z and v respectively (e.g. Lau Chun-fat 2007). The Yue of 台山
Táishān is also interesting in that on the surface they have the medial glides of j and w which are
clearly dependent on the following rime. However, on closer inspection, j is only followed by ɛ,
and w is only followed by ɔ. The opposite is also true: ɛ and ɔ are always preceded by j and w
respectively. The medial glides can be easily dispensed with in the underlying form; they are
predictable phonetic onglides in /ɛ/ and /ɔ/ respectively. On the other hand, there are some Yue
dialects where the medial glide cannot be dispensed with, e.g. Qīnzhōu Cantonese (Lin Qīnjuān
2008).

13 The transcription that L&Q (2008) use for Nanning Cantonese has been slightly modified to
align with the transcription used here for Nanning Pinghua and Standard Cantonese. Their onsets
<kw kwʰ> are rendered in this description as kʷ kʰw, their rimes <ŋ ek ŋ ŋ uk> are rendered here
as ŋ ik ŋ ŋ ŋk, and their tones <21 35 24> are rendered here 11 25 13. Their simplified Chinese
characters have also been substituted with traditional Chinese characters in this chapter.
Yue mirrors the behaviour in many Tai languages. In many Tai languages, medial glides and medial liquids clearly form a closer relationship with the preceding consonant. For instance, Wuming Zhuang is described as having the following inventory of onsets and rimes: onsets $p\ b\ m\ f\ t\ d\ n\ \theta\ l\ c\ k\ y\ \partial\ h\ j\ w\ \partial w\ pl\ ml\ kj\ kw$, while rimes have the shape V or VX (Zhang Jünrū et al. 1999: 51).  

The second phonological trait to be discussed is that Nanning Cantonese and Nanning Pinghua have a lateral fricative $l$ (or interdental fricative $\theta$ in some accents of Nanning Pinghua like Xinxu (心墟 Xīnxū) Pinghua), which contrasts phonemically with $j$ in Nanning Cantonese and in most Nanning Pinghua accents. In contrast, Standard Cantonese lacks $l$ or $\theta$. Amongst Yue dialects, Standard Cantonese and most Yue dialects in the Pearl River Delta are in fact in the minority in not having /l/ or /θ/; /l/ can be found as close to the Pearl River Delta as the Siyi (四邑 Siyī) region (e.g. Huang Jiányún (1990) for 台山 Táishān Yue). The $l$ or $\theta$ is also near universal in the Western Yue dialects. Looking at Zhuang dialects, most Zhuang dialects also have $l$ or $\theta$ (e.g. Standard Zhuang has a contrast between $\theta$ and $ɕ$). 

Having $l$ or $\theta$ is an areal phenomenon. However, the directionality of borrowing is not necessarily easy to determine. Linguists in China tend to attribute $l/\theta$ as a Kra-Dai trait that has diffused into Sinitic languages (e.g. Lǐ Jīnfāng 2002: 110, Mài Yún 2010). It is true that most Zhuang dialects have a $l$ or $\theta$. In other Kra-Dai languages, $l$ or $\theta$ is also found in most Hlai

---

14 Underlying long vowels followed by a consonant are realised with a schwa offglide, thus creating rimes with three segments, but this is only a surface phenomenon.

15 However, Shangyao and Xinxu Pinghua have merged them as $l$ and $\theta$ respectively.
dialects and Ngao Fon/ 村話 Cùnhùa in Hainan (Ostapirat 2008). However, this l or θ in Zhuang dialects is a reflex of what has been reconstructed as *s in Proto-Tai (Li Fang-Kuei 1977, Pittayaporn 2009), and this *s is unlikely to have been [l], as there was also a voiceless lateral onset *l which was much more likely to have been realized as [l].\footnote{In my opinion, however, it is possible for the Proto-Tai *s to be [θ].} That leaves the other possibility, i.e. *s > l/θ is an innovation in Sinitic languages that spread to Kra-Tai languages. With Sinitic languages, l or θ is found in several non-contiguous areas: Southern Pinghua-plus-Yue, various Sinitic dialects on the western coast of Hainan (Liu Xinzhong 2006: 54-55), Puxian Min (Liú Fúzhù 2007), several Northern Min dialects like 建甌 Jiàn’ōu and 政和 Zhènhé (e.g. Akitani 2008), and Hui at 黃山 Huángshān (Mèng Qinghui 1981). The change of *s > l/θ in all these Sinitic dialects is unlikely to be a retention from an older stage of Chinese, as there is no evidence of *s being pronounced anything like l or θ (judged by, e.g., the transliterations between Chinese and foreign languages at various periods of time), that is, unless they are all independent developments (and putting the Western Hainan case aside, as the direction of borrowing was clearly from Hlai to Sinitic due to the later arrival of Sinitic speakers). That leaves the only possibility that they have all been influenced by Kra-Dai languages at some point in time, and that l or θ was borrowed from Kra-Dai languages. This loops back to the argument that *s > l/θ was an innovation in Kra-Dai languages, which is problematic as we have seen above. Detailed studies are required to explain this phenomenon.
As for Nanning Cantonese, it is unclear whether Nanning Cantonese acquired $l$ after their arrival in Nanning, or whether they started off with $l$ when the Cantonese speakers were still in the Pearl River Delta. (Within Pearl River Delta, currently there is only the Cantonese of 佛岡 Fógāng which is reported as having $/l/$ (Mài Yún 2010: 228).) There are, however, other clearer examples of Sinitic languages having borrowed $l$ or $\theta$ in a short period of time after their arrival in Guangxi, e.g. Hakka of 馬山 Māshān has a contrast of $/\theta/$ vs. $/s/$ vs. $/ʃ/$ (Xìe Jìányǒu 2007: 262), and Southern Min of 平南 Pingnán has a contrast between $/l/$ and $/s/$ (Xìe Jìányǒu 2007: 288). Hakka and Southern Min in general are not known to have $l/\theta$, and these Sinitic dialects...
have only been spoken in Guangxi for less than 150 years (but some of these speakers were settled in Western Guangdong before their arrival in Guangxi).

The third phonological feature to be discussed is the historical development of the Entering tones.\(^\text{17}\) In Cantonese, and also in the vast majority of Yue dialects, the Upper and/or Lower Entering tone is further split into two, with the conditioning factor being vowel length (or the related vowel quality difference). For instance, for the Upper Entering tone in Cantonese, usually syllables with a short vowel have the high tone \([\text{5}]\), and syllables with a long vowel have the mid tone \([\text{3}]\), e.g. 北 [pek\text{5}] ‘north’, 百 [pa:ka]\text{3} ‘hundred’. Having a tone split with the Entering tone (‘Tone D’ in Kra-Dai studies) based on vowel length is also present in the majority of Kra-Dai languages, including Zhuang, but largely absent in other Sinitic languages and other families in the region, namely Viet-Muong and Hmong-Mien.\(^\text{18}\) Nanning Pinghua and the other Yongjiang type of Southern Pinghua also have one of their Entering tones, the Lower Entering tone, split

\(^{17}\) In traditional Chinese historical phonology, the reconstructed tone system of Middle Chinese has been divided into four main categories

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Tone</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>píng</td>
<td>Level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>shǎng</td>
<td>Rising</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>qù</td>
<td>Departing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>rù</td>
<td>Entering</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

These are further divided into two registers: yīn ‘upper’ and yáng ‘lower’). Correspondences are made in this article with the reflexes of these tonal categories in contemporary Sinitic languages.

\(^{18}\) Amongst Hmong-Mien languages, the splitting of the Entering tone based on vowel length seems to be only present in some Kimmun dialects (Mienic) in Yunnan (Máo Zōngwǔ 2004: 76, 82, 87) and Hainan (Lǐ Yúnbīng 2003: 695-696). This may have to do with the fact that these Kimmun dialects are all spoken in the vicinity of Kra-Dai languages.
into two. However, the conditioning factor in Nanning Pinghua is different from Yue and Zhuang; the conditioning factor is whether the initial in Middle Chinese is a sonorant (including the \(\text{云} *\text{ɦ} \) and \(\text{以} *\text{zero initial} \))\(^{19}\) or an obstruent. For instance, the *sonorant-initialed 域 (*\text{ɦ}wik) \(\text{wət}^{22}\) ‘region’, 葉 (*\text{lep}) \(\text{hip}^{23}\) ‘leaf’, 襪 (*\text{mjwot}) \(\text{mat}^{23}\) ‘sock’, versus the *obstruent-initialed 活 (*\text{ɣ}wat) \(\text{wət}^{2}\) ‘live’, 盒 (*\text{ɣ}op) \(\text{hap}^{2}\) ‘box’ and 罰 (*\text{bjwot}) \(\text{far}^{2}\) ‘punish’. Vowel length plays no role in the splitting of the Entering tone in Nanning Pinghua. This is one feature where Nanning Pinghua is less like Zhuang than Nanning Cantonese. (Despite this, the splitting of the Entering tone, based on the historical sonority of the initial, is not a defining feature of Pinghua; Guandao Pinghua dialects like 宾陽 Bīnyáng (Huáng Yīngfǔ \(2005\) are again like Yue in having their Entering tones split according to vowel length.)

In summary, we have seen that the phonology of both Nanning Pinghua and Nanning Cantonese are both conservative with respect to their codas and that they have many tones, like Zhuang languages. Also similar to Zhuang, medial glides have a closer relationship with the preceding onset consonant than with the following rhyme. We have also discussed the \(l\) or \(\theta\) phoneme as an areal phenomenon in Guangxi. We have seen one trait where Cantonese is more similar to Zhuang than to Nanning Pinghua: in Cantonese and Zhuang, one or both of the Entering tones are split, based on vowel length, whereas in Nanning Pinghua, the Entering tone is split, based on the sonority of the onset consonant in Middle Chinese.

---

\(^{19}\) Baxter (1992)’s transcription system of Middle Chinese is followed here. His ASCII-friendly symbols have been changed into IPA.
6.3 VOCABULARY

There are some interesting vocabulary differences amongst Nanning Pinghua, Nanning Cantonese and Standard Cantonese. In Nanning Pinghua, there are forms borrowed from Zhuang, whereas Standard Cantonese has a Sinitic form. Nanning Cantonese sometimes sides with Nanning Pinghua, and sometimes with Standard Cantonese. It is not surprising that Nanning Pinghua has Zhuang loanwords, even for some ‘basic’ vocabulary, as Pinghua has been spoken alongside Zhuang for at least one millennium. The following is a very small sample of vocabulary differences, including some differences in grammatical words, between Nanning Pinghua and Cantonese.

Nanning Pinghua has a first person inclusive pronoun 伝(隊) wun¹¹(tɔ̌i²²), c.f. Northern Zhuang vunz ‘person’ (also written as 伝 in Old Zhuang characters). (The exclusive pronoun is 我隊 ŋa¹³tɔ̌i²²). Northern Zhuang dialects tend to have a clusivity distinction (inclusive raeuz, exclusive dou), whereas Southern Zhuang dialects tend not to (Wěi Jǐngyún and Qín Xiǎoháng 2006: 3). Cantonese, and Yue dialects in general, have no clusivity distinction for their first person plural pronoun (e.g. Nanning Cantonese 我哋ŋa³ti²² for both inclusive and exclusive first person). Interestingly, Lianzhou Yue has the form wun³⁵ as its first person plural pronoun (with no clusivity distinction; Chén Xiǎojīn and Chén Tāo 2005: 400), which is probably related to Zhuang vunz as well;
Nanning Pinghua \( hei^{25} \) (and other forms like \( haw^{25} / hui^{35} / hei^{55} \)) ‘give’, c.f. Northern Zhuang \( hawj \) ‘give’, Proto Tai *hau\(^C\) ‘give’ (Pittayaporn 2009: 356). The tones do not match (Tai tone \( C \) usually corresponds with the Sinitic Rising tone, but \( hei^{25} \) etc. is in the Departing tone), but the high level pitch in \( hei^{55} \) and the rime in \( haw^{25} \) are phonetically similar to the Northern Zhuang \( hawj [hau^{55}] \).\(^{21}\) Nanning Cantonese has \( \text{給 } kei^{55} \) (< Guilin-Liuzhou Mandarin) or \( \text{畀 } pei^{25} \) ‘give’;

- Nanning Pinghua \( jan^{53} \) ‘cold’, c.f. Proto Tai *ʔjen\(^A\) ‘cool’ (Li Fang-Kuei 1977). Cantonese has \( \text{凍 } ton^{33} \) ‘cold’; Nanning Pinghua \( hej^{25} \) ‘too (non-tactile) hot’, c.f. Northern Zhuang \( hwngq \) ‘hot weather’.\(^{22}\)

\(^{20}\) In Nanning Shangyao: \( hei^{25} \). In Nanning 心墟 Xīnxū: \( haw^{25} \). In Nanning 石埠 Shíbù Pinghua: \( hui^{35} \). In Nanning 亭子 Tíngzǐ Pinghua: \( hei^{55} \) ‘give’.

\(^{21}\) Lín Yì (2010) mentions that ‘有學者 [some scholars]’ consider \( hawj \) ‘give’ in Zhuang is a loan from Chinese 許 ‘allow, promise, betroth’. It is a possibility that Proto-Tai borrowed this from Chinese; amongst the many arguments raised by Lín Yì that support this is the regular tonal correspondence between Tai Tone \( C \) and Sinitic Rising tone. In terms of the tone, the Nanning Pinghua \( hej^{25} \) is not a regular reflex of Middle Chinese 許 (*xjo\(^\text{RISING}\)). Moreover, 許 is not found as a verb meaning ‘give’ in other modern Sinic languages. The verb \( hej^{25} \) in Nanning Pinghua is likely to be a loan from Zhuang, or at least influenced by Zhuang.

\(^{22}\) Lín Yì (2003) considers the Proto Tai *ʔjen\(^A\) ‘cold’ and the Northern Zhuang \( hwngq \) ‘hot weather’ to be related to Chinese 凜 (*ʔjin\(^\text{LEVEL}\)) and 燊 (*jan\(^\text{LEVEL/DEPART}\)) respectively. Regular reflexes of these in Nanning Shangyao Pinghua would be 凜 \( en^{53} / in^{53} \) and 燊 \( jej^{11/22} \) respectively,
The following are a few examples where both Nanning Pinghua and Nanning Cantonese have Zhuang loans.

- Nanning Pinghua lek³ ‘a few’, Nanning Cantonese lek⁵ ‘a few’, c.f. Northern Zhuang saek ‘a few’. Nanning Pinghua also as the Sinitic 几 kəi³³, and Nanning Cantonese 几 kɪ²⁵ ‘a few’, c.f. Standard Cantonese 几 kəi²⁵ ‘a few’;


- Both Nanning Pinghua and Nanning Cantonese have len¹¹ ‘shiver’, c.f. Northern Zhuang saenz ‘shake, vibrate’. They also have the Sinitic word震 (Nanning Pinghua tfən³³, Nanning Cantonese tfən³³), c.f. Standard Cantonese has震 tsən³³ ‘shiver’;

- Nanning Pinghua pok² (tʃə³³) ‘pomelo’ (┿ tʃə³³ is a noun suffix; see §4.2), Nanning Cantonese pok⁵ lok⁵ ‘pomelo’, c.f. Northern Zhuang (mak-)bug ‘pomelo’ (mak- is ‘fruit’).

somewhat different from the actual forms in Shangyao Pinghua: jən⁵³ ‘cold’ and hwŋ²⁵ ‘non-tactile hot’ respectively. As for the words for ‘cold’, reflexes of Proto Tai *ʔjenʳ ‘cold’ are commonly found in Southwestern Tai languages, but less often encountered in Northern and Central Tai languages (which includes the Zhuang dialects). However, the comparative rarity of reflexes of *ʔjenʳ ‘cold’ in modern Zhuang dialects does not preclude the possibility that Southern Pinghua borrowed jən⁵³ from historically earlier Zhuang dialects. As for the words for ‘hot’, forms like Northern Zhuang hwŋq are not very widespread amongst the Tai languages in China as pointed out in Lín Yi (2003), and no one has reconstructed a similar form for Proto-Tai; hwŋq in Zhuang might be a form borrowed from Chinese.
Standard Cantonese *lok⁵ jeu⁵* ‘pomelo’, where *jeu⁵* is Sinitic, and *lok⁵* is perhaps also related to Northern Zhuang *lwg-* ‘melon, child’).

Not all vocabulary differences between Pinghua and Cantonese are due to Zhuang influence. Nanning Pinghua has many ‘basic’ words which are cognates with those in Mandarin, while Cantonese has distinct forms. With these Mandarin-like words, it is not necessarily the case that Nanning Pinghua has borrowed them from Mandarin; it is usually just the case that Nanning Pinghua has a form that is commonly found in other modern Sinitic languages, whereas Cantonese has a different Sinitic form (i.e. Pinghua and Cantonese retained different forms for the same meaning from older forms of Chinese). These vocabulary differences are not necessarily distinguishing features of Pinghua and Yue; many non-Cantonese Yue dialects also use forms that are cognates with Mandarin rather than with Cantonese. It is simply the case that the Cantonese forms have failed to supplant the corresponding forms in these other Yue dialects, which have otherwise received much influence from Cantonese. The following is a small sample of vocabulary differences between Nanning Pinghua, Nanning Cantonese and some other Yue dialects that are not caused by Zhuang influence. (Also quoted are relevant maps in the *Grammar, Lexicon or Phonetics* volume of the *Linguistic Atlas of Chinese Dialects* (Cáo Zhiyún et al. 2008).)²³

²³廉州 Liánzhōu (i.e. 合浦 Hépǔ) Yue data are from Chén Xiǎojīn and Chén Tāo (2005), 玉林 Yùlín Yue data are from Zhāng Mín and Zhōu Liètíng (2003), and 台山 Táishān Yue data are from Huáng Jiànyún (1990).
Nanning Pinghua 是 \( \tilde{\theta}^{22} \) ‘be’, vs. Cantonese 喔 \( \text{he}^{22} \) ‘be’ (also Hakka 喔 \( \text{he}^{53} \) ‘be’). 是 as a copula is also found in some Yue dialects in Guangxi, e.g. Lianzhou Yue 似 \( s^{2} \), Yulin Yue 似 \( s^{24} \) (see also Grammar map 038);

Nanning Pinghua 吃 \( h_{e}^{3} \) ‘eat’, Mandarin 吃 \( c\tilde{i} \) ‘eat’, vs. Cantonese 食 \( s^{2} \) ‘eat’. Actually many Yue dialects also use 吃 rather than 食 for ‘eat’, e.g. Taishan Yue 吃 \( h\text{ic}^{3} \) (see also Lexicon map 084);

Nanning Pinghua 看 \( h\text{an}^{25} / h\text{an}^{55} \) ‘look’, Mandarin 看 \( k\text{an} \) ‘look’, vs. Cantonese 睇 \( t\text{h}^{55} \) ‘look’. Lianzhou Yue also use 看 \( (\text{hun}^{44}) \) rather than a cognate of 睇 (see also Lexicon map 121);

Nanning Pinghua 鼻 \( p\text{et}^{2} \) ‘nose’ (Entering tone), Mandarin 鼻 \( b\text{i} \) ‘nose’ (descended from an Entering tone syllable), vs. Cantonese 鼻 \( p\text{et}^{22} \) ‘nose’ (Departing tone). 鼻 ‘nose’ having a -t coda is also found in Lianzhou Yue and some Goulou Yue dialects (see Xiè Jiànyōu 2007: 188, and Phonetics map 037);\(^{26}\)

\(^{24}\) In Shangyao Pinghua 似 \( \tilde{\theta}^{22} \); in Xinxu (心墟 Xīnxū) Pinghua \( \theta^{22} \); in all other accents of Nanning Pinghua there is a distinction between \( \tilde{\theta}^{22} \) and \( \theta^{22} / \tilde{\theta}^{22} \).

\(^{25}\) ‘Look’: \( h\text{an}^{25} \) in Shangyao and Xinxu Pinghua; \( h\text{an}^{55} \) in most other accents of Nanning Pinghua.

\(^{26}\) Standard Cantonese also has a fossilised form of ‘nose’ with a -t coda: 象拔蚌 \( t\text{sæ}^{22} \text{pet}^{2} \) \( p^{h} \text{ø}^{12} \) ‘geoduck clam’ is literally ‘elephant pull clam’, but \( \text{pet}^{2} \) was probably originally ‘nose’, i.e. ‘elephant nose clam’, given that geoduck clams resemble elephant trunks.
Nanning Pinghua 了 liú¹³ PERFECTIVE, Mandarin 了 le PERFECTIVE, versus Standard Cantonese 咗 tsɔ²⁵ PERFECTIVE, Nanning Cantonese 嗞 lai³³ PERFECTIVE; 了 as a perfective marker is also quite common in the Yue dialects in Guangxi and far western Guangdong (see also Grammar map 063).

Lastly, there are lexical items that have a different distribution to those outlined above. One example is the passive marker 挨 ‘suffer’ (for an agented or agentless passive construction), which is common across Guangxi, e.g. Nanning Pinghua and Nanning Cantonese 挨 yai¹¹, Guilin-Liuzhou Mandarin 挨 yæ²¹, Northern Zhuang ngaiz. Standard Cantonese has the obligatorily agented 界 pei²⁵ ‘give’ passive construction (see also Grammar map 095). Another example is the word for ‘wok’: in Nanning Pinghua 鏽 tfen⁵³ versus Cantonese 鑊 wɔk². The word 鏽 tfen⁵³ ‘wok’ is found throughout Pinghua dialects, and cognates are also found in some western Yue dialects and also in Xianghua to the north (tsʰon⁵⁵; Hilary Chappell pers.comm.) (see Lexicon map 109 and Lý Liánjin 2003).

In summary, Nanning Pinghua has more Zhuang loans than Nanning Cantonese. This is to be expected, as Nanning Pinghua has been in continuous contact with Zhuang much longer than has Nanning Cantonese. Nonetheless, Nanning Cantonese has also acquired many Zhuang loanwords during its short existence in the Nanning area. The Sinitic vocabulary of Nanning Pinghua and Nanning Cantonese share many similarities. Notwithstanding this, Nanning Pinghua sometimes has words resembling Mandarin rather than Cantonese-. This is not necessarily due to Mandarin influence; often these ‘Mandarin-sounding’ words are simply words that are commonly found amongst (non-Cantonese) Sinitic languages, as Pinghua has not been under the influence of Cantonese long enough to acquire these Cantonese words. Lastly, there are some words that are
commonly found amongst the various languages in Guangxi, and Nanning Cantonese has acquired them too within its short existence in Guangxi.

6.4 GRAMMAR

It is in the realm of grammar that the most surprising outcome in this complex language contact situation manifests itself. On the whole, the grammars of Nanning Pinghua and Nanning Cantonese are not radically different. However, there are some areas where the ‘newly’ established language of Nanning Cantonese resembles Zhuang more than the longer-established Nanning Pinghua, and Nanning Pinghua is in some cases ‘anti-Zhuang’ in its grammar. The following is a selection of grammatical differences amongst Nanning Pinghua, Nanning Cantonese, Standard Cantonese, Standard Mandarin and Northern Zhuang. (Some differences in the forms of the grammatical markers have already been discussed in §3 above.) In §§4.1 to 4.5 we will see examples of how Cantonese resembles Zhuang more than Nanning Pinghua. In §4.6 and §4.7 we will see how Nanning Cantonese has become even more Zhuang-like than both Standard Cantonese and Nanning Pinghua. In §4.8 we will discuss the difference in the ditransitive word order for ‘give’; the ditransitive word order for ‘give’ in Cantonese is often attributed to Zhuang influence, but the real situation is not so simple.

6.4.1 Gender affixes for animals

Without prolonged exposure, Nanning Pinghua is not very intelligible to speakers of Nanning Cantonese. Nevertheless, Nanning Pinghua is still grammatically, lexically, and phonologically much closer to Cantonese than Mandarin.
Nanning Pinghua is a curiosity amongst Southern Sinitic Languages. Southern Sinitic Languages, especially Far Southern ones like Yue and Hakka, not to mention Min in the Southeast, all of which have received the least influence from Mandarin, usually have gender suffixes for animals, e.g. Nanning Cantonese 雞公 $kvi^{55} - koŋ^{55}$ ‘cock/rooster’, 雞乸 $kvi^{55} - na^{25}$ ‘hen’, 雞項 $kvi^{55} - hoŋ^{22}$ ‘pullet’ (L&Q 2008: 144-145). (Standard Cantonese has the same forms except for 雞項 $kvi^{55} - hoŋ^{25}$ ‘pullet’). Tai languages also have gender suffixes, which is not surprising as noun phrases in Tai languages are strongly left-headed: e.g. Northern Zhuang gaeq-boux ‘cock/roosters’, gaeq-meh ‘hen’, gaeq-hangh ‘pullet’. On the other hand, Nanning Pinghua follows the ‘Northern Chinese’ pattern of using gender prefixes, e.g. Nanning Pinghua 公雞 $koŋ^{53} - kvi^{53}$ ‘cock/rooster’, 母雞 $mu^{13} - kvi^{53}$ ‘hen’, 項雞 $haŋ^{22} - kvi^{55}$ ‘pullet’. This is also generally the case in other Yongjiang Pinghua dialects, for instance, in 崇左新和 Xínhé, Chóngzuǒ (Liáng Wēihuá and Lín Yì 2009: 151), 崇左江州 Jiāngzhōu, Chóngzuǒ (Lǐ Liánjìn and Zhù Yàn’è 2009: 175), and the ones listed in Xiè Jiànyóu (2007: 1258-1261), namely 崇左四排 Sìpái, Chóngzuǒ, 南寧沙井 Shājǐng, Nánning, 扶綏龍頭 Lóngtóu, Fúsuí and 百色那華 Náhuá, Bāisè.

Looking into languages in the vicinity of Nanning Pinghua, gender prefixes are also used in Southwestern Mandarin, the dominant language in Northern Guangxi. However, the Mandarin of Northern Guangxi is somewhat mixed in having both gender prefixes and suffixes, unlike Nanning Pinghua and other Yongjiang Pinghua dialects, which are more uniformly prefixal. For Mandarin dialects in Northern Guangxi, the Linguistic Atlas of China (Cáo Zhìyún et al. 2008) shows the gender affixes in ‘boar’ and ‘sow’ being primarily suffixal (Lexicon maps 024 and 025). On the other hand, the data in Xie Jiànyóu (2007) show that the two Mandarin localities of 临桂 Línguì and 鹿寨雒容 Luòróng, Lùzhài are primarily prefixal for the gender affixes. In the
Having gender prefixes rather than suffixes is one trait where Nanning Pinghua is less Zhuang-like than Nanning Cantonese. However, this cannot serve as a defining feature of Southern Pinghua in general. For instance, to the immediate northeast of Nanning, Binyang Pinghua (a type of Guandao Pinghua) has gender suffixes rather than prefixes (Lin Yi pers.comm.).

6.4.2 Noun suffixes

The noun suffix 子 -tʃi33 is ubiquitous in Nanning Pinghua. The word 子 originally meant ‘son’ or ‘child’; in some noun compounds it still has that meaning or something clearly related, e.g. 孝子 hau35 tʃi33 ‘filial son’, 瓜子 kʷa53 tʃi33 (melon child) ‘seed’. The noun suffix 子-tʃi33 has a nominalizing function, when it is suffixed to verb roots, e.g. 扣子 kʰɐu25-tʃi33 (fasten-NOMLZ) ‘button’, 鑿子 tfak2-tʃi33 (chisel-NOMLZ) ‘chisel (n.)’. However, most of the time it is suffixed to noun roots (most of them monosyllabic), and the only function seems to be nothing other than prosodic – to make the word longer. Nanning Pinghua thus appears to have a dispreference for monosyllabic nouns, like Mandarin. The noun suffix 子-tʃi33 does not even have a diminutive meaning in many cases such as in the following examples of nouns that take this same suffix: 車子 tʃɛ53-tʃi33 ‘car’, 果子 ku33-tʃi33 ‘fruit’, 蕃子 tʃiu53-tʃi33 ‘banana’, 薄子 pok2-tʃi33 ‘pomelo’ (< Zhuang bwg ‘pomelo’), 蝦子 ha53-tʃi33 ‘shrimp’ (not ‘juvenile shrimp’ or ‘shrimp roe’), 星子 lən53-tʃi33 ‘star’, 鬚子 hu11-tʃi33 ‘moustache’, 椅子 ə33-tʃi33 ‘chair’, 窗子 tʃʰaŋ53-tʃi33 ‘window’, 亭
子 نشأ -تشا۱۳۳ ‘pavilion’ and 骰子 تاي -تفا۱۳۳ ‘dice’. Note that the diminutive suffixes are 兒 -ني۱۱–۵۵ and 仔 -تشا۱۳۳. Having a frequently used noun suffix is a trait more associated with Mandarin and Xiang (Wù Yúnjǐ 2005: 89-105) spoken to the north. Both 子 and 仔 (Mandarin زی and زای respectively) have long histories; in the Han dynasty (206 BC-220 AD), the word for ‘son’ was 子ژی in the north and 仔ژای in the south (Wù Yúnjǐ 2005: 100). Presumably the rampant use of 子 -تشا۱۳۳ is a Northern influence in Nanning Pinghua. However, it is difficult to determine how early, or how late, this Northern influence in Pinghua is.

In contrast to Nanning Pinghua, Cantonese is much less concerned with making nouns not monosyllabic. However, the derivative tone sandhi (into the [25] or [55] tone) in Cantonese is functionally similar to the noun suffix 子 -تشا۱۳۳ in Nanning Pinghua, and, similarly, it usually does not alter the semantics of the noun root. Derivative tone sandhi is ubiquitous in Standard Cantonese (e.g. 繩 سین۱۱ > سین۲۵ ‘rope’), but rarer in Nanning Cantonese (L&Q 2008: 90). Zhuang languages also do not show any dispreference for monosyllabic nouns.

The rampant use of the noun suffix 子 -تشا۱۳۳ is another trait which makes Nanning Pinghua resemble Zhuang less than does Nanning Cantonese for this feature of avoiding monosyllabic words, where such devices exist but are rarely used.

6.4.3 Position of adverbial 先 ‘first, ahead’

Sinitic languages tend to disprefer adverbials being in a postverbal position. Using the adverbial 先 ‘first, ahead’ as an example, Mandarin has 先 xiān which is placed before the verb, e.g. 你先吃蘋果 㑲 xiān chī píngguǒ (2SG first eat apple) ‘you eat the apple(s) first’. Standard Cantonese,
however, is known to have some adverbials, including 先 sin\(^{55}\) ‘first’,\(^{28}\) which are placed after a postverbal object, countering the general Sinitic trend of not having adverbials postverbally, e.g.

你飲湯先 nei\(^{13}\) jem\(^{25}\) sin\(^{55}\) (2SG drink soup first) ‘you eat the soup first’, 我走先 ηj\(^{12}\) tsu\(^{25}\) sin\(^{55}\) (1SG leave first) ‘I shall leave first’. The following is an example of 先 lin\(^{55}\) ‘first’ in Nanning Cantonese, for which the position is also post-verbal.

Nanning Cantonese

(1) 我 行 阿邊，你哋 行 嚕邊，睇下 邊個 到 先。

ηj\(^{13}\) hay\(^{11}\) a\(^{55}\)-pin\(^{55}\), ni\(^{13}\) t\(^{22}\) hay\(^{11}\) lu\(^{55}\)-pin\(^{55}\), t\(^{25}\)e\(^{13}\) ha\(^{13}\) pin\(^{55}\) k\(^{33}\) tu\(^{33}\) lin\(^{55}\).

1SG walk this-way 2PL walk that-way see TENT who arrive first

‘I walk this way, you walk that way, see who gets there first.’ (L&Q 2008: 336)

Having postverbal adverbials is often considered a Tai trait in Cantonese (e.g. Huang Yuanwei 1997: 71-72; Lì Jìnffǎng 2002: 116-117). The following are examples of the postverbal use of ‘first’ in Tai languages.

Northern Zhuang

(2) vih maz mbouj hawj gou gong?

\(^{28}\) Other examples of postverbal adverbials in Cantonese are 多 t\(^{55}\) ‘more’ (pre-object) and 添 t\(^{55}\)im ‘as well’ (post-object). The functional equivalents of these adverbials in Mandarin are pre-verbal.
for what NEG give 1SG first

‘Why do you not give it to me first?’ (Luó Limíng et al. 2005: 521)

Thai

(3) ไป ก่อนตาย ก่อน.

pāi kǒn tāaj kǒn.

go first die first

‘You go first, you die first.’ (said to someone trying new things)²⁹

(c.f. Cantonese 行先死先 hay¹¹ sin⁵⁵ set²⁵ sin⁵⁵ ‘one who does something first suffers first’.)

In the Linguistic Atlas of Chinese Dialects (Cáo Zhìyún et al. 2008), all of Guangxi, except the Xiang speaking corner in the northeast, is indicated as having the adverbial 先 ‘first, ahead’ placed after the verb (Grammar map 084). Nanning Pinghua and other Yongjiang Pinghua dialects are also said to have postverbal 先 ‘first, ahead’ (e.g. Nanning Tingzi Pinghua (Qín Yuǎnxióng, Wěi Shùguān and Biàn Chénglín 1997: 204); Chongzuo Jiangzhou Pinghua (Lǐ Liánjin and Zhū Yàn’é 2009), Chongzuo Xinhe Pinghua (Liáng Wěihuá and Lín Yí 2009: 320-321). However, in my Nanning Shangyao Pinghua data, 先 lin⁵³ is usually placed in front of the verb. This is a trait of Shangyao Pinghua which is different from both Zhuang and Cantonese.

Nanning Pinghua

²⁹ I would like to thank Pittayawat Pittayaporn for providing possible contexts for this expression.
佢就想找辦法先抓個筐果，

\[k\text{ai}^{13}\ tf\text{ou}^{22}\ l\text{ey}^{33}\ p\text{an}^{22}\ f\text{ap}^{3}\ l\text{in}^{53}\ n\text{a}^{53}\ k\text{a}^{55}\ k\text{\textsuperscript{\textdegree}\textdeg}\text{an}^{53}\ ku^{33},\]

3SG then think method first take DEM basket fruit

‘He thought of a way to take the basket of fruit first,’

Sometimes 先 lin^{53} is placed after the verb; in these cases, 先 lin^{53} has a spatial meaning (usually used in contrast to 後 heu^{22} ‘behind’). For instance, contrast 我先行\(\eta a^{13}\ lin^{53}\ hey^{11}\) (1SG first go) ‘I shall go first’, which is something that one might say as one departs, versus 我行先\(\eta a^{13}\ hey^{11}\ lin^{53}\) (1SG go first) ‘I shall go in front’, which is in contrast to something like 你行後 nef^{13} hey^{11} heu^{22} (2SG go after) ‘you will go behind’.

6.4.4 CL + N noun phrases

In isolation or in a preverbal position, Nanning Shangyao Pinghua does not allow noun phrases to begin with a bare classifier (‘[CL + N] noun phrases’); the classifier must be preceded by at least a demonstrative or a quantifier. This is similar to Mandarin.

---

30 Subsections §6.4.4 to §6.4.7 are also discussed in de Sousa (forthcoming).

31 This is the case in the varieties of Nanning Pinghua that I am familiar with. In the Nanning Tingzi Pinghua Dictionary (Qín Yuǎnxíóng, Wěi Shūguān and Biàn Chénglín 1997), there are also no examples of noun phrases that are preverbal classifier-initial. However, Bù Liánzēng gives one such example in the Pinghua of 四堂 Sitáng (2011: 97), a rural town to the northeast of
(5) *(個) 個 細佢仔  有 有 老子  老娘，
*(kəɔ 55) kəɔ 55  lvi 55 men 53 tfai 33  mi 13  jəu 13  lau 13 tfi 33  lau 13 nəŋ 53.
DEM  CL  child    NEG have father  mother
‘The child has no father or mother,’

(6) *(個) 只 新府 呢，穿 衫 個 陣 時 呢，
*(əә 55) tfəә 3  len 53 fəu 33  ne 55 ,  tfun 53  lam 53  kəɔ 55  tʃəә 22  li 11  ne 55.
DEM  CL  daughter_in_law  FP  wear clothes  DEM  CL  time  FP
要 佢 幫 扣 扣子。
need 3SG help  fasten  button
The daughter-in-law, when she put on clothes, she needed her [the servant] to help with
doing up the buttons,

On the other hand, [CL + N] noun phrases are ubiquitous in Cantonese and Zhuang. In
Cantonese, preverbal [CL + N] noun phrases have a definite interpretation. In Northern Zhuang,
pre-verbal [CL + N] noun phrases can be either definite or generic (see, e.g., Qin Xiāoháng (1995)
on the generic usage). Not allowing bare preverbal [CL + N] noun phrases is another trait that

Nanning city centre, and also one example from Binyang Pinghua (2011: 96), spoken further
northeast from Sitáng.
makes Nanning Pinghua less Zhuang-like than Nanning Cantonese (see also Wang Jian, this volume, on bare classifier phrases in Sinitic languages in general).

Nanning Cantonese

(7) 張凳放喺邊噠定？

\[tfæŋ^{55} \ fəŋ^{33} \ hwi^{25} \ pin^{55} \ təi^{33} \ təŋ^{22}\]

CL chair put LOC which CL place

‘Where should I put the chair?’ (L&Q 2008: 270)

(8) 只張小平啊，做嘢噉衣□嘅！

\[tʃɛk^{3} \ tfəŋ^{55} \ liu^{35} \ pʰŋ^{11} \ a \ tfu^{33} \ jɛ^{13} \ kem^{25} \ ji^{55} \ jau^{55} \ kɛ^{33}\]

CL Zhāng Xiàoping TOP do thing so careless MOD

‘This Zhāng Xiàoping, he does things so carelessly.’ (L&Q 2008: 276)

Northern Zhuang

(9) go faex maj ndaej vaiq.

CL tree grow VCOMP fast

‘Trees grow quickly.’ (Wěi Jingyún and Qin Xiàoháng 2006: 223)

(10) go faex raek dwk hat.

CL tree break VCOMP ONOM

‘The tree went crack ([haː^{35}]) and broke.’ (Wěi Jingyún and Qin Xiàoháng 2006: 231)
Nevertheless, in a postverbal position, Nanning Pinghua is the same as Cantonese and Zhuang: it allows [CL + N] noun phrases to occur postverbally; these postverbal [CL + N] noun phrases can be definite or indefinite, and specific or non-specific. Mandarin is different; it only allows [CL + N] noun phrase to occur postverbally, and they must be indefinite. According to Wang Jian (this volume), Nanning Pinghua thus belongs to Type V languages that have bivalent bare classifiers exclusively in the postverbal position. See de Sousa (2013) for examples of bare postverbal [CL + N] noun phrases.

6.4.5 Possession and association

All Sinitic languages have modifier markers (also known as attributive markers, subordinate markers, linkers, amongst many other names); they signify that the preceding constituent is a noun modifier (e.g. 的 de in Mandarin). Nanning Pinghua has a modifier marker 個 (kə)55. One prototypical function of the modifier marker is to indicate possession or association (in this construction, the number of the possessum is not specified).

Nanning Pinghua

(11) 我 個 書

ŋa13 kə55 ləi53

1SG MOD book

‘My book(s)’

(12) 老子 個 蛋糕

lau13 ɭi33 kə55 tan22 kau53
father MOD cake

‘Father’s cake(s)’

Nanning Cantonese whose modifier marker is 嘅 ke³³ is next exemplified:

Nanning Cantonese

(13) 門口 嘅 樹 擋 路 多，剪 開 啞 去 啦。

mun¹¹ hēu²⁵ ke³³ ky²² ty²⁵ lu²² tɔ⁵⁵ tfin²⁵ hɔɪ⁵⁵ ti⁵⁵ hy³³ la⁵⁵.

door MOD tree block road much cut open-COMPR go HOR

‘The tree in front of the door is too obstructing, let us chop it down so that it is less so.’

(L&Q 2008: 318)

Zhuang does not have a native modifier marker which is as multifunctional as the modifier markers in Sinitic languages. However, Zhuang does have a possessive marker, e.g. Northern Zhuang duh.

Northern Zhuang

(14) doxgaiq duh de

thing POSS 3SG

‘His/her thing(s)’ (Wèi Jìngyún and Qín Xiǎoháng 2006: 218)
Nevertheless, the modifier marker 嘅 ke in Cantonese and the possessive marker duh in Northern Zhuang are not the most commonly used constructions to indicate possession. In Cantonese, when the possessum is a tangible object, a classifier is used instead of a modifier marker to indicate possession. When a classifier is used to indicate possession, the possessum is singular, unless the non-singular classifier 喲 ti is used.32

Nanning Cantonese

(15) 佢 隻 嶠

\[kʰy_{13} tʃɛ_{3} tʃi_{25}\]

3SG CL son

‘His/her son’ (L&Q 2008: 278)

(16) 我 喲 嶠女 個 個 都 好 聽講。

\[ŋɔ_{13} ti_{55} tʃi_{25}^{-ny_{25}} kɔ_{33} kɔ_{33} ti_{55} hu_{25} tʰɛŋ_{55} kɔŋ_{25}.\]

1SG CL;NSG son-daughter CL CL all very listen-talk

‘All of my children are very obedient.’ (L&Q 2008: 319)

32 It takes the form N_{POSSESSOR}–CL–N_{POSSESSUM} and is not dissimilar to the Austronesian possessive classifiers coding alienability, particularly in Oceanic languages where pronominal affixes referring to the possessor are attached to a set of classifier-like free morphemes in combination with the separate possessed noun. These are however limited to a small number of general categories such as edible and potable objects, plants, weapons etc (see Chappell & McGregor 1996).
Possession in Northern Zhuang is usually zero-marked. However, since the classifier is most usually present (in front of the noun), on the surface the POSSP+CL(+N) possessive construction in Cantonese and the CL+(N)+POSSP possessive construction in Zhuang look identical, except for the (expected) difference in the position of the possessor phrase.

Northern Zhuang

(19) ponj saw kou

CL book 1SG

‘My book’

(Zhāng Jűnrú et al. 1999: 404)
(20)  \( \text{aen vanj mwngz} \)

CL bowl 2SG

‘Your bowl’

(Zhāng Jùnrú et al. 1999: 404)

(21)  \( \text{gij saw youq gwnz daiz cungj dwg gij mwngz hwj}. \)

CL:NSG book LOC top table all be CL:NSG 2SG FP

‘The books on the table all belong to you.’ (Luó Límíng et al. 2005: 484)

On the other hand, Nanning Pinghua does not usually allow the Cantonese-like (and Zhuang-like) PossP+CL(+N) possessive construction. A modifier marker must be used, except for some nouns like kin terms which allow possession to be zero-marked. This is another feature that makes Nanning Pinghua less Zhuang-like than Nanning Cantonese.

Nanning Pinghua

(22)  \( \text{細 蘇 [個 */ 隻 */ 的] 狗兒} \)

\( t\text{bi}^{55} t\text{i}^{53} [k\text{o}^{55}/* t\text{a}^{3}/* t\text{i}k^{7}] \)

Little Sū MOD CL CL:NSG dog-DIM

‘Little Sū’s puppy/ puppies’

6.4.6 ADJ + CL + N
Nanning Cantonese has diverged from Standard Cantonese and other Cantonese dialects in the Pearl River Delta due to strong Zhuang influence. There are many examples of this; in §4.6 and §4.7 we will discuss just two such examples.

In Standard Cantonese, there are many examples of CL + N noun phrases (as discussed in §4.4 above), e.g. 架車 ka33 tʃʰɛ55 (CL car) ‘the car’, 間屋 kan55 ōk5 (CL house) ‘the house’. If an adjective is added, it is most usually placed between the classifier and the noun (CL + ADJ + N), e.g. 架紅車 ka33 hʊŋ11 tʃʰɛ55 (CL red car) ‘the red car’, 間空屋 kan55 hʊŋ55 ōk5 (CL empty house) ‘the empty house’. Only size adjectives, primarily 大 tai22 ‘big’ and 細 sɐ33 ‘small’, can occur immediately in front of the classifier, and they are usually further modified by a degree adverb, e.g. 咁大間空屋 kɐ33 tai22 kan55 hʊŋ55 ōk5 (such big CL empty house) ‘such a big empty house’.

For other adjectives, the word order of ADJ + CL + N is not possible.

One way to resolve this, while keeping all the constituents in that order, is to insert a distal demonstrative between the adjective and the classifier (ADJ + DIST.DEM + CL + (N)). For instance, 空嗰間屋 hʊŋ55 kɔ25 kan55 ōk5 (empty that CL house) ‘the house which is empty’ is grammatical, whereas *空間屋 *hʊŋ55 kan55 ōk5 (empty CL house) is not grammatical. In fact, the adjective in 空嗰間屋 hʊŋ55 kɔ25 kan55 ōk5 (empty that CL house) ‘the house which is empty’ is actually in a relative clause. The most common relativization strategy in Standard Cantonese has the configuration of REL + DIST.DEM + CL + (N) where DIST.DEM is the distal demonstrative 呢 kɔ25. The proximal demonstrative 呢 ni55 cannot be used in this construction, e.g. *空呢間屋 *hʊŋ55 ni55 kan55 ōk5. In summary, ADJ + CL + N noun phrases are rare in Standard Cantonese.

Nanning Pinghua is the same as in Standard Cantonese in that ADJ + CL + N noun phrases are rare, and one way to resolve this is to insert a demonstrative between the adjective and the
classifier: ADJ + DEM + CL + (N), again making the adjective part of a relative clause. The difference with Standard Cantonese is that in Nanning Pinghua, both the neutral demonstrative 个 $kə^{55}$ and the distal demonstrative 二 $nᵯ^{22}$ can be used. In the following examples, it is ungrammatical to leave out the demonstratives. Notice that the $tik^5$ is a comparative suffix of the adjective, e.g. 細的 $lei^{55}-tik^5$ (small-SING) ‘smaller’, similar to 㖁 $tᵯ^5$ in Cantonese, which also functions as the non-singular classifier, as in Pinghua. It is not the Mandarin modifier marker 的 $de$.

Nanning Pinghua

(23) 細的 个 間 房 我 住,

$lei^{55}-tik^5$  $kə^{55}$  $kan^{53}$  $fʊŋ^{11}$  $ŋa^{13}$  $tʃəᵦ^{22}$,

small-SING  DEM  CL  room  1SG  stay

大的 个 間 房 你隊 住,

tai$^{22}$  $tik^5$  $kə^{55}$  $kan^{53}$  $fʊŋ^{11}$  $nəi^{13}$  $tᵯ^{22}$  $tʃᵦ^{22}$,

big-SING  DEM  CL  room  2PL  stay

最大 二 间 房 系 老師 住。

$tʃui^{55}$  $tai^{22}$  $nᵯ^{22}$  $kan^{53}$  $fʊŋ^{11}$  $hui^{25}$  $lau^{13}$  $lei^{53}$  $tʃᵦ^{22}$.

SUPL-big  DIST.DEM  CL  room  give  teacher  stay

‘I stay in the smaller room, you stay in the larger room, let the teacher stay in the largest room.’
Mandarin is similar in that \( \text{ADJ} + \text{CL} + \text{N} \) noun phrases are rare. In comparison with Nanning Pinghua and Standard Cantonese which have the \( \text{ADJ} + \text{DEM} + \text{CL} + (\text{N}) \) construction, Mandarin requires an extra modifier marker between the adjective and the demonstrative: \( \text{ADJ} + \text{MOD} + \text{DEM} + \text{CL} + (\text{N}) \). The adjective is again in a relative clause which also require a modifier marker in Mandarin. For example: 大的那個房間 \( dà \text{ de nà ge fángjiān} \) (big MOD that CL room) ‘the room which is big’.

On the other hand, in Nanning Cantonese, \( \text{ADJ} + \text{CL} + (\text{N}) \) noun phrases are quite common. The following are two examples. (Recall that the equivalents in Standard Cantonese would require a distal demonstrative between the adjective and the classifier.)

Nanning Cantonese

(24) 黃色支筆方寫得哂，黑色支重得。

\( wɔŋ^{11} fɨk^{2} tɨf^{5} pɨt^{5} mʊ^{13} tɛ^{25} tɛk^{5} lai^{33}, hʊk^{5} fɨk^{5} tɨf^{5} tʊŋ^{22} tɛk^{5}. \)

yellow colour CL pen NEG write can PRF black colour CL still can

‘The yellow pen is unusable, the black one can still be used.’ (L&Q 2008: 278)

(25) 媽糊高隻男崽好嚟嘅。

\( ma^{55} wʊ^{11} ku^{55} tɛk^{3} nam^{11} tɨp^{25} hʊ^{25} lɛk^{5} ke^{33}. \)

quite tall CL male child very capable MOD

‘The quite-tall boy is very capable.’ (L&Q 2008: 277)
Compare the \textit{ADJ + CL + N} construction in Nanning Cantonese with the \textit{CL + N + ADJ} construction in Northern Zhuang.

Northern Zhuang

(26) \textit{gou ndaenj haeuj aen ranz laep-saengsaeng bae.}

\begin{tabular}{l}
1SG squeeze enter CL house dark-IDEO go
\end{tabular}

‘I went into the pitchblack house.’ (Wěi Jīngyún and Qín Xiàoháng 2006: 226)

The \textit{ADJ + CL + N} template in Nanning Cantonese can be explained simply as the \textit{CL + N + ADJ} template in Northern Zhuang with the adjective shifted to the front to fit the Sinitic requirement of having right-headed noun phrases. A question that one might ask is why the adjective is shifted to the front of the classifier (\textit{ADJ + CL + N}) rather than between the classifier and the noun (i.e. the usual Sinitic word order of \textit{CL + ADJ + N}). In fact, both the \textit{ADJ + CL + N} word order and the \textit{CL + ADJ + N} word order are present in Nanning Cantonese. Given that many Nanning Cantonese speakers are ethnic Zhuang people who shifted to speaking Nanning Cantonese within the last one or two generations, having the \textit{ADJ + CL + N} word order is in fact understandable: the \textit{ADJ + CL + N} template in Nanning Cantonese requires less change from the \textit{CL + N + ADJ} template in Northern Zhuang in terms of surface adjacency of the constituents. It is also worth noting that in
Northern Zhuang, the classifier always precedes the noun immediately. A Nanning Cantonese speaker from a Zhuang background might thus have a preference for the adjective not intervening between the classifier and the noun.

6.4.7 Anaphoric use of lone classifiers

Another interesting feature in Nanning Cantonese is that lone classifiers can be used as discourse anaphors (i.e. they refer to previously mentioned referents). By ‘lone classifier’ I mean classifiers which occur without either a head noun or any modifiers such as a numeral or a demonstrative. This differs from the bare classifier, discussed in §6.4.4 above and chapter 4 in this volume, which forms a noun phrase with its head noun.

Nanning Cantonese

(27) 啲 狗 我 中意 隻，冇 中意 隻，隻 難睇 多。

\[ ti^{55} \ k\u^{25} \ \eta^{13} \ tf\u^{55} \ ji^{33} \ tf\ek^{3} \ \mu^{13} \ tf\u^{55} \ ji^{33} \ tf\ek^{3} \ tf\ek^{3} \ \nan^{11} \ t\b\i^{25} \ t^{35}. \]

CL:NSG  dog 1SG  like  CL  NEG  like  CL  CL  ugly  too

‘The dogs, I like this one, I do not like that one, that one is too ugly.’ (L&Q 2008: 277)

This is parallel to the anaphoric use of lone classifiers in Zhuang.

---

33 In Northern Zhuang, within a noun phrase, all noun modifiers follow the noun except for the classifier and numerals other than one, e.g. aen ranz ndeu (CL house one), song aen ranz (two CL house), sam aen ranz (three CL house).
In Nanning Pinghua, Standard Cantonese and Mandarin, lone classifiers cannot be used preverbally as an anaphor. In these languages, lone classifiers can only exist in a postverbal position, and they have an indefinite ‘one’ interpretation (a numeral ‘one’ can be inserted in front of the classifier with no change in semantics). This postverbal indefinite ‘one’ use of lone classifiers is also present in Nanning Cantonese and Northern Zhuang.

Nanning Pinghua

(30) 買 （一）隻 系 佢 欣 欢 啦！

\[mat^{13} \ (\varphi^3) \ tja^{13} \ hui^{25} \ koi^{13} \ h\text{m}n^{53} \ la^{55}\]

Standard Cantonese
Language contact in Nanning: Nanning Pinghua and Nanning Cantonese

(31) 買 (一) 隻 佢 玩 啦！

\[mai^{13} (ju^5) \text{ tʃek}^3 \text{ pet}^{25} \text{ kʰøy}^{13} \text{ wan}^{25} \text{ la}^{55}\]

Standard Mandarin

(32) 買 (一) 隻 給 他 玩 吧！

\[mài (yī) \text{ zhī} \text{ gěi} \text{ tā} \text{ wán} \text{ ba}\]

buy one CL give 3SG play HOR

‘Buy one for him/her to play with!’

Nanning Cantonese

(33) 你 打 死 我 隻 貓， 着 賠 翻 隻 我。

\[ni^{13} \text{ ta}^{25} \text{ li}^{25} \text{ tʃek}^3 \text{ meu}^{55}, \text{ tʃek}^2 \text{ pʰui}^{11} \text{ fan}^{55} \text{ tʃek}^3 \text{ nøy}^{13}\]

2SG hit die 1SG CL cat need compensate back CL 1SG

‘You killed my cat, you need to compensate me by getting me another one.’

(L&Q 2008 2008: 351)

Northern Zhuang

(34) neix lij miz geij duy bit, gou aeu duy.

this still exist few CL duck 1SG want CL

‘[T]here are still some ducks here, I want one[.]’

(Sio and Sybesma 2008: 191, quoting Qin Xiāoháng 1995:84)
6.4.8  Ditransitive word order for ‘give’

In the preceding subsections we have seen some syntactic differences between Nanning Pinghua and Nanning Cantonese that were caused by varying degrees of Zhuang influence. In this subsection we will discuss one example where the Zhuang influence is often thought of as clearly evident, but is in fact much less direct.

Cantonese and Nanning Pinghua have different ditransitive word orders for the verb ‘give’. ‘Ditransitive’ here refers to cases where both the objects are unmarked. Nanning Pinghua has the order of \textit{give + recipient + theme}. This word order is often associated with Northern Chinese. Nonetheless, this word order is also found in Southern China and Southeast Asia, e.g. Southern Min (e.g. \textit{Zhāng Mǐn} 2011) and Vietnamese (e.g. Nguyễn Đình-Hoà 1997: 115). The following is an example from Nanning Pinghua.

\begin{quote}
Nanning Pinghua

(35) 系佢錢, 佢就抓去賭。
\begin{verbatim}
 hei\textsuperscript{25} koi\textsuperscript{13} fin\textsuperscript{11}, koi\textsuperscript{13} təwu\textsuperscript{22} nu\textsuperscript{53} hoi\textsuperscript{25} tu\textsuperscript{33}.
give 3SG money 3SG then take go gamble
\end{verbatim}
‘If you give him/her money, s/he will take it to gamble.’
\end{quote}

\begin{quote}
On the other hand, Cantonese has the \textit{give + theme + recipient} ditransitive word order, as exemplified by the following example from Nanning Cantonese.
\end{quote}

\begin{quote}
Nanning Cantonese

\end{quote}
(36) [給/畀] 500 文銀 我 媽 過年。

\[kwí^{55} / pó^{25}] \ ɲ^{13}  \ pa^4  \ mën^{55} - ɲen^{11}  \ ɲ^{13}  \ ma^{55}  \ kɔ^{33}  \ nin^{11}.\]

give give five hundred yuan-money 1SG mother celebrate:New:Year’s

‘I gave my mother five hundred yuan for New Year’s.’ (L&Q 2008: 351)

The theme-recipient word order in Cantonese is often attributed to a Tai influence (e.g. Huang Yuanwei 1997: 72-73, Lǐ Jīnfāng 2002: 117). However, Zhuang actually has both the theme-recipient and the recipient-theme word orders.

**Wuming Northern Zhuang**

(37) \[te^{24} \ hau^{55}  \ kau^{24}  \ ɲo: ɲ^{24}  \ ʔan^{24}  \ ma:k^{35}.\]

3SG give 1SG two CL fruit

‘S/he gives me two pieces of fruit.’ (Zhāng Jūnrú et al. 1999: 423)

(38) \[mʊj^{31} \ hau^{55}  \ ɛiɔn^{31}  \ ho: ɲ^{24}  \ kau^{24}  \ luɔi^{24}?.\]

2SG give wage 1SG Q

‘Will you give me wages?’ (Zhāng Jūnrú et al. 1999: 423)

**Standard Northern Zhuang**

(39) \[gou  \ hawj  \ mwngz  \ bonj  \ saw  \ he.\]

1SG give 2SG CL book then

‘I’m giving you one book (i.e. not two).’ (Luó Límíng et al. 2005: 623)
Looking at the ditransitive word order in some other Kra-Dai languages, there are languages like Bouyei (i.e. the continuation of Zhuang in Guizhou to the north; Yù Cuiróng 2009: 131), and Mulam (Wáng Jūn et al. 2009: 599) with the Mandarin-like recipient-theme word order, whereas languages like Lakkja (Liú Bǎoyuán 2009: 267) and Thai (Thepkanjana 2010: 410) have the Cantonese-like theme-recipient word order. Kam is described by Lóng Yàohúng (2003: 164) as having the Mandarin-like recipient-theme word order, whereas by Liáng Mǐn (2009a: 208) as having the Cantonese-like theme-recipient word order. Similarly, Sui is described by Zhāng Jūnrú (2009: 523) as having the Mandarin-like recipient-theme word order, whereas by Lǐ Jīnfāng (2002: 117) as having the Cantonese-like theme-recipient word order. In addition, many of these Kra-Dai languages and others like Maonan (Liáng Mǐn 2009b: 674) and Lao (Enfield 2007: 363-366) have a variety of constructions to convey ‘give’, with one common strategy being the serial verb construction in the configuration of give + theme + give + recipient, which in languages like Lao and Thai is in fact less semantically restricted than the ditransitive give + theme + recipient construction. In Nanning Pinghua as well, there is more
than one ‘give’ construction: impressionistically, the serial verb ‘give’ construction in the word order *give + theme + give + recipient* is more common than the ditransitive ‘give’ construction (*give + recipient + theme*). The following is an example of the serial verb ‘give’ construction.

Nanning Pinghua

(42) 个 隻 男 孩子 呢 系 了 幾 隻 果 系 佢。

DEM CL male child TOP give PFV few CL fruit give 3SG

‘The boy then gave a few pieces of fruit to him.’

As there are a variety of constructions in various word orders to convey ‘give’ (and other trivalent events) in Kra-Dai languages, and it is possible that either of the *theme + recipient* or *recipient + theme* word orders could be due to a Chinese influence, the *theme-recipient* word order in Cantonese cannot be straightforwardly attributed to Kra-Dai influence.

In fact, the ditransitive ‘give’ construction (*give + theme + recipient*) in Cantonese (and many other Southern Sinitic languages) is probably an internal development. Looking at earlier documents of Cantonese from the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries, the serial verb ‘give’ construction (*give + theme + ‘to’ + recipient*) appeared earlier than the ditransitive ‘give’ construction (*give + theme + recipient*). As there were no alternatives to the serial verb ‘give’ construction in competition for expressing ‘give’ in earlier Cantonese, the coverb ‘to’ had the opportunity to be elided to create the ditransitive ‘give’ construction (*give + theme + recipient*). However, having a serial verb ‘give’ construction resembles Tai languages. Also notice that in Cantonese, only the ‘giving’ type of ditransitive sentences has the order of *verb + theme +
recipient; for other ditransitive sentences like ‘steal’ or ‘teach’, the order is the ‘usual’ Sinitic word order of verb + recipient + theme. (For the development of the ditransitive ‘give’ construction in Cantonese, see, e.g., Peyraube & Xu 1997, Phua 2007, Yiu 2010 and Chin 2010; for this development in Southern Sinitic languages in general, see Zhāng Mǐn 2011.)

It is interesting that Nanning Pinghua and Nanning Cantonese have different ditransitive word orders for ‘give’. While, the ditransitive ‘give’ construction (give + theme + recipient) in Cantonese cannot be directly attributed to Tai influence, the serial verb ‘give’ construction (give + theme + give + recipient) in both Cantonese and Nanning Pinghua is at least partially Tai inspired (see Zhāng Mǐn 2011).

A summary of the grammar points discussed in this section is provided below in §5.

6.5 CONCLUSION AND DISCUSSION

Nanning is a multilingual area: the Sinitic languages of Nanning Pinghua, Nanning Cantonese, Old Nanning Mandarin and New Nanning Mandarin are spoken alongside the indigenous Tai languages of Northern Zhuang and Southern Zhuang. In this analysis, we have looked at some of the outcomes of this language contact situation from the viewpoint of Nanning Pinghua and Nanning Cantonese, the two largest Sinitic languages spoken in the area.

On the whole, Nanning Pinghua and Nanning Cantonese share many similarities. This is particularly true of their phonologies, which has led to the widely held view within China these days that Pinghua, or Southern Pinghua at least, is a branch of Yue (which includes Cantonese) (§1). There are also some differences; in the preceding sections, we have discussed some of the differences between Nanning Pinghua and Nanning Cantonese, and also some of the differences that they both have with Standard Cantonese, Northern Zhuang and Mandarin. Sometimes the
differences between Nanning Pinghua and Nanning Cantonese are simply natural variations that exist amongst Sinitic languages; for instance, with respect to vocabulary, where Nanning Pinghua has many words which resemble Mandarin rather than Cantonese (§3). Sometimes Nanning Pinghua has Zhuang-like features, which Nanning Cantonese lacks, for instance, the numerous Zhuang loanwords in Nanning Pinghua not found in Cantonese (§3). This is predictable, since Nanning Pinghua has been spoken alongside Zhuang for at least one millennium, whereas Nanning Cantonese only arrived in the area about 150 years ago. Nonetheless, in most of this article we have shown that both Nanning and Standard Cantonese have many more Zhuang-like features than does Nanning Pinghua. Examples raised are:

- the splitting of the Entering tone based on vowel length (§2);
- gender suffixes for animals (§4.1);
- lack of dispreference for monosyllabic nouns (§4.2);
- adverbials like ‘first’ occurring post-verbally (§4.3);
- having pre-verbal \([\text{CL} + \text{N}]\) noun phrases (§4.4); and
- using a classifier to ‘link’ a possessor phrase and the possessum noun (§4.5).

In addition, we have seen that Nanning Cantonese has diverged from Standard Cantonese due to further influence from Zhuang (i.e. Nanning Cantonese has Zhuang-like features that are neither found in Nanning Pinghua, Standard Cantonese nor in Mandarin). The examples we have seen are:

- possessing \([\text{ADJ} + \text{CL} + \text{N}]\) noun phrases (§4.6); and
- anaphoric use of lone classifiers (§4.7).

We have also seen in §4.8 that Nanning Pinghua and Cantonese have different ditransitive word orders for ‘give’. The \(\text{give} + \text{theme} + \text{recipient}\) ditransitive word order for ‘give’ in Cantonese is
often attributed to a Zhuang influence, but we have seen in §4.8 that this matter is not as straightforward as commonly thought.

The fact that Nanning Cantonese often resembles Zhuang more than does Nanning Pinghua requires explanation. There are two reasons for this. The first reason is that Cantonese itself already has a strong Tai substratum (e.g. Ouyang Juéyá 1989, Lí Jingzhōng 1994, Bauer 1996, Huang Yuanwei 1997; Lǐ Jīnfāng 2002: 100-141), as mentioned in §1.

The second reason is that after the Cantonese people’s arrival in Nanning, there has been massive language shift from Zhuang to Nanning Cantonese. Aspects of this language transferral from Zhuang to Nanning Cantonese have been discussed in, e.g., Kwok Bit-Chee (2010) and Qin Fèngyú and Wáng Fúxiáng (2009). On the other hand, while Pinghua people have gradually accumulated many Zhuang loanwords and customs during the millennium of their presence in Guangxi, e.g. Pinghua shamanism, 師公 lei53 koy53, shares many similarities with Zhuang shamanism, Pinghua people have nonetheless traditionally kept a social distance from the Zhuang population. Pinghua people are known for the conservatism amongst the various ethnic groups in Guangxi (Xú Jiéshùn 1999). For instance, before the 1950s, intermarriage between Pinghua and Zhuang people in Nanning area was rare, and Pinghua people have largely excluded Zhuang people from their most important industry, which is the planting and processing of sugarcane (e.g. Zhū Zhìyàn 2004 portrays a rather unfriendly-type of relationship between the Sugarcane (i.e. Pinghua) people and the Zhuang people). The relatively distant relationship that Pinghua people had with Zhuang people has probably contributed to the slower rate of grammatical influence from Zhuang to Pinghua, at least in areas like Nanning where the concentration of Pinghua people is higher. Certainly, with a higher concentration of Pinghua people, they can afford to keep a social distance from the indigenous people. In addition, the arrival of the
prestigious Mandarin language in Nanning during the Ming dynasty has perhaps pulled the grammar of Pinghua somewhat towards the Mandarin grammatical profile.

Speakers’ attitude is an important social factor in contact situations (Thomason 2010: 38-39; Thomason 2001a: ch.4; Thomason 2001b; Fought 2010; Goméz Rendón 2008: ch.2; amongst others). The attitude of speakers towards the languages in contact, or the contact situation itself, often exaggerates the rate of contact-induced linguistic change (or retention), or produces unusual results in relation to the ‘normal’ outcomes of language contact caused by other social factors such as the intensity of contact, or linguistic factors such as typological distance. However, speakers’ attitude is also one of the less explored factors of language contact. This is due to the difficulty in formulating the notion of ‘speakers’ attitude’: the notion of ‘speakers’ attitude’ covers a wide range of phenomena, and the speakers themselves are not necessarily consciously aware of the attitude that they have towards the language contact situation. The linguistic outcome of this ‘attitude’ is even more difficult to predict than the other linguistic and social factors that are relevant in language contact situations. In this analysis, an attempt has been made to explain the unexpected difference in the kinds of contact-induced change in Nanning Pinghua and Nanning Cantonese, based on the speakers’ attitude towards the other languages in the area. It is hoped that a positive contribution can be made towards the study of the role of speakers’ attitude towards language contact situations.

In conclusion, we have seen that Nanning Pinghua and Nanning Cantonese, two (of the three) Sinitic languages in Nanning area, are both influenced by the indigenous Zhuang languages. Interestingly, however, the grammar of Nanning Cantonese, which has been spoken in the area for about 150 years, resembles the indigenous Zhuang languages more than Nanning Pinghua, which has been spoken in the area for at least one millennium. This probably has to do
with the massive language shift from Zhuang to Nanning Cantonese, and also the Pinghua people’s more conservative approach towards interactions with Zhuang people.
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