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This paper analyzes cit-e in various Taiwanese Southern Min constructions as extended from the numeral-classifier sequence cit8 e5 (一個) ‘one CL’. It is argued that cit8 e5, as the default classifier with a high frequency of occurrence in the cit-e + N construction, serves the core function of coding nounhood. This coding function is seen to extend onto non-members of N and assign certain N characteristics to the coded unit to fulfill the speaker’s communicative goal, resulting in the polygrammaticalization of cit-e. The multi-path functional shifts are found to be motivated on both cognitive and pragmatic grounds: Cognitively, the indiscrete nature of human categorization allows the possibility for mapping nominal features to non-nominal items; pragmatically, the speaker’s communicative intent motivates the coding of nounhood in non-canonical contexts, inviting various inferences in different contexts, which in turn are conventionalized with frequent use. The analysis highlights the dynamism and indeterminacy of linguistic categorization, as well as the intimate relation among cognitive structure, language structure, and language use.
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1. Introduction

In Taiwanese Southern Min, the default noun classifier e51 (個) is generally considered to be distinct from the verb classifier e7 (下). However, a careful look at Taiwanese Southern Min discourse data shows that these two classifiers, particularly
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1 The transliteration of Taiwanese Southern Min used in this paper generally follows the TLP A system (Taiwan Language Phonetic Alphabet). Tone 5 on the noun classifier e5 is a low-rising pitch contour [13], while tone 7 for the verb classifier e7 is mid-level [33]. For the sake of convenience, however, tones are left unspecified if they are irrelevant to our discussion. Mandarin transliteration follows the Pinyin system.
when preceded by the numeral cit8 (一) ‘one’, are far from easily distinguishable, unlike their corresponding forms in Mandarin yi ge and yi xia. For one thing, they share one identical segmental shape e, and their subtle difference in tone is often blurred under the phonological operation of tone sandhi, neutralization, and contraction. Furthermore, the numeral-classifier sequence cit-e occurs in a great variety of contexts to serve a wide range of semantic/grammatical/discourse functions, many of which do not reveal a clear distinction between noun or verb classifier.

This paper attempts to provide a unified account for the fuzzy distinction between the noun classifier and the verb classifier in Taiwanese Southern Min on the basis of prototype theory and conceptual mapping between linguistic categories (Hopper and Thompson 1984), as well as the role of the speaker’s communicative intent in discourse. It will be argued that the numeral-classifier sequence cit8 e5 (一個), being a prominent feature for a prototypical noun, essentially serves as a coding device for promoting ‘nounhood’ in the language, where overt morphological marking for categoriality is lacking. Specifically, the default nature of e5 permits the occurrence of non-prototypical nouns after the classifier, rendering it possible for cit8 e5 to be followed by a great variety of structures, each representing potentiality for structural reanalysis. Such possibility is further substantiated by the lexical meaning of cit8 ‘one’, which typically invites the pragmatic inferences of trivialization and individuation and thus leads to polygrammaticalization of cit-e in different constructions, to fulfill different communicative goals of the speaker in discourse.

The analysis here is based mainly on: a 20-hour recording of spoken data; the texts in Cheng et al. 2000; examples cited in Taiwanese Southern Min dictionaries (Wu 1990, Chen 1991); and related literature (Cheng et al. 1989, Zhou 1991). Section 2 will discuss the indistinctness between the noun classifier cit8 e5 (一個) and the verb classifier cit8 e7 (一下) as exhibited in the data. Section 3 will examine the distribution of cit-e and its reduced forms, and provides a descriptive analysis of the semantic/grammatical/discourse functions of its various uses in different contexts along the line of grammaticalization. Section 4 will argue that the multi-path functional shifts of cit8 e5 are motivated by its function as a marker for coding nounhood, with its use extended from marking prototypical members of N to coding non-prototypical and even non-members of N to promote their nounhood for various discourse considerations. Finally, Section 5 will recapitulate the findings of this study and discuss how they may highlight the intimate relation between cognitive structure and language structure, as well as the dynamism and indeterminacy of linguistic categorization.
2. E5 vs. e7—Are they clearly distinguishable?

E5 and e7 are generally taken to be two distinct morphemes, e5 being the default noun classifier roughly corresponding to Mandarin ge (個), and e7 a verbal classifier corresponding to Mandarin xia (下). Some typical contexts are illustrated below, in (1) and (2)-(3) respectively.

(1) a. *cit-e lang*  ‘a person’  
   一個 人  
   one CL person  

   b. *Cit-e koo-su*  ‘a story’  
   一個 故事  
   one CL story  

(2) a. *I ka gua phah cit-e.*  ‘He hit me once.’  
   伊 共 我 拍 一下  
   s/he DISP 1SG hit one CL  

   b. *Ceng kong sann-e.*  ‘The clock struck three times.’  
   鐘 摃 三下  
   clock strike three CL  

(3) a. *Tan cit-e.*  ‘Wait a moment.’  
   等 一下  
   wait one CL  

   b. *Hoo gua khoann cit-e.*  ‘Let me take a look.’  
   與 我 看 一下  
   give 1SG look one CL

However, the tonal manifestation of the different e instances in these canonical contexts does not seem to reveal a clear dichotomy between the two morphemes. In (1), e has tone 7, the sandhi tone for tone 5 of the noun classifier e5 (個). But e in (2), which occurs utterance-finally and thus takes its citation tone, may actually have either tone 5 (i.e., nominal e5) or tone 7 (i.e., verbal e7). In (3), cit- e is neutralized, both syllables having a low tone 3 value, which could be the reduced form of either the noun classifier or the verb classifier.2

---

2 It is interesting to note that speakers of Taiwan Mandarin often use the noun classifier ge in expressions such as xiao yi ge 笑一個 ‘show me a smile’, qin yi ge 親一個 ‘give me a kiss’, and bao yi ge 抱一個 ‘give me a hug’, where the verb classifier xia 下 is structurally expected. This suggests that a fuzzy distinction between noun and verb classifiers in Taiwanese Southern Min may not be a language specific phenomenon.
The indeterminacy between $e^5$ and $e^7$ is even more conspicuous when $cit-e$ occurs in some action-related constructions, where $cit-e$ signals meaning beyond that of quantifying or classifying. The inconsistent choice of the characters 個 and 下 in examples (4)-(6) below, extracted from Cheng et al. (1989:174-175), shows that sometimes even the linguist may not be making a clear distinction between a nominal $e^5$ (個) or verbal $e^7$ (下):

(4) a. *Cit-e* sit-chiu wann siak-phua khi.
   
   個 失手 碗 摔破 去
   CIT-E slip-hand bowl fall-broken go
   ‘With a slip of the hand, the bowl was dropped broken.’

   b. *Cit-e* bo sio-sim ceng-thau-a khi kuah-phua.
   
   不[無] 小心 指頭仔 去 割破
   CIT-E not careful finger go cut-broken
   ‘Due to my carelessness, I got a cut on my finger.’

(5) a. *I* teng-teng tih gua cia chia *cit-e-(a)* png, lim *cit-e-(a)* te.
   
   伊 定定 佇我 遮 食 一下仔 飯, lim 一下仔 茶
   3SG often at 1SG here eat CIT-E-DIM rice drink CIT-E-DIM tea
   ‘He often has some meals and drinks some tea in my place.’

   b. Gua u kap i kinn *cit-e-(a)* min.
   
   我 有 及 伊 見 一個(下)仔 面
   1SG have with 3SG see CIT-E-DIM face
   ‘I did get to meet him.’

(6) a. *mg* *cit-e* beng-piek.
   
   問 一個 明白
   ask CIT-E clear
   ‘to inquire in depth’

   b. *thit-tho* *cit-e* ciang song-khuai
   
   玩 CIT-E really happy
   ‘(I) had a lot of fun playing.’

   c. *khuann* *cit-e* ciang siong-se
   
   看 一個 明細
   look CIT-E really thorough
   ‘(I) took a thorough look (at it).’

According to Cheng et al., both $cit^8 e^5$ (一個) and $cit^8 e^7$ (一下) may correspond to Mandarin (yi) ge, and the choice between them does not seem to represent any functional difference. *Cit-e* (一個/下) in (4) marks the following action/event as quick
or sudden; in (5) it carries a casual tone and may also indicate small quantity; while in (6) it serves to introduce a complement. Notice that in (5b) both 个 and 下 are provided as free variants, which further suggests that somehow they are not clearly distinguished by the native speaker.

Such lack of clear distinction between nominal classifier e5 and verbal classifier e7 in constructions like (4)-(6) is reflected in their tonal realization. Cit-e in (4) is generally pronounced with a low tone 3 value, which could be the sandhi tone from cit8 e7 (as it is followed by a predicate) or the neutralized variant for either cit8 e5 or cit8 e7. Yet some informants allow a mid-level tone 7 pronunciation for e in (4), a sandhi tone from the tone 5 of e5. In (5)-(6), e is mostly pronounced with tone 7, which is most likely the sandhi tone for e5, as no pause is felt after cit-e. Some native speakers may also read e5 with tone 5 in (6), which they feel to be more forceful, placing more emphasis on the following complement. The tonal behavior of the sequence cit-e in these constructions thus seems to show a nominal cit-e preference, pointing to their possible relatedness to the noun classifier cit8 e5.

Thus, the generally assumed distinction between cit8 e5 as noun classifier and cit8 e7 as verb classifier is far from being consistently indicated in the data. A reasonable question to ask would therefore be whether the phonological similarity between them is mere coincidence or not. Or should this similarity suggest a conceptual overlap reflected in their functional indistinguishability?

In Section 3, we shall examine the distributional contexts of cit-e, and argue that its various uses may be satisfactorily captured along the line of grammaticalization, with the diverse functions seen as extensions of the nominal classifier cit8 e5.

3. Grammaticalization of cit-e

As a default classifier, e5 can co-occur with a wide range of nouns, either concrete or abstract. The following examples illustrate nouns denoting human referents in (7), inanimate objects in (8), objects not taking a specific classifier of their own in (9), and abstract ideas/concepts that neither denote concrete entities nor have shape in (10), as well as nouns derived from verbs in (11):

(7) a. cit-e lang  一個 人  ‘a person’
b. cit-e lau-su  一個 老師  ‘a teacher’
(8) a. cit-el/kha thang-a  一個 腳桶仔  ‘a bucket’
b. cit-e/te uann  一個 培碗  ‘a bowl’
(9) a. cit-e khai-kuan  一個 開關  ‘a switch’
b. cit-e phinn-kang  一個 鼻孔  ‘a nostril’
Thus, the nouns that may collocate with e5 are semantically diverse, having nothing in common except for their cooccurrence with e5. In fact, e5 is often used when people have trouble retrieving the appropriate classifier for a noun, as seen in (8) above.

In our data, the numeral-classifier sequence cît-e is found to occur in a variety of constructions, which can be grouped into four broad classes as follows, based mainly on syntactic function and semantic interpretation.

### 3.1 V + cît-e + N

Prototypically, cît-e is used as a numeral-classifier preceding a noun, forming with it an object NP in the V+[cît-e+N] construction, as illustrated in (12)-(15):

(12)  I  cît-ma kau  cît-e  lam pieng-iu.  
伊 這嘛 交 一個 男 朋友  
3SG now  make one CL male friend  
‘She has a boyfriend now.’

(13)  Ka  li  phue  cît-e  bak-kiann.  
共 你 配 一個 目鏡  
DISP 2SG match one CL eyeglasses  
‘(I’ll) get you a (pair of) eyeglasses.’

(14)  Gua  u  cît-e  bun-te.  
我 有 一個 問題  
1SG have one CL problem  
‘I have a problem.’

(15)  I  kong gua  su-iau co  cît-e  kiam-ca.  
伊 講 我 需 要 做 一個 檢查  
3SG say 1SG need do one CL examination  
‘He said that I needed to have an examination.’

The collocation of cît-e with a following noun in these examples reflects its prototypical use as a default numeral-classifier for nouns, cooccurring with: a human noun in (12), lam pieng-iu ‘boyfriend’; a noun denoting a concrete entity in (13), bak-kiann ‘glasses’; an abstract noun in (14), bun-te 問題 ‘problem’; and a derived
noun from a verb in (15), *kiam-ca* 檢查 ‘examination’, which denotes an event rather than an entity.

While *cit-e* in examples (12) through (15) is understood to mean ‘one’, in other V + [*cit-e* + N] sentences it tends to mean ‘a small quantity’ rather than a more literal reading:

(16)  
\[ A \quad loo_{\text{cit-e}}(a) \quad gu-ba \quad gu-doo \quad an-ne \quad toh \quad ho. \]
\[ \text{a \quad 滷 一個(仔) \quad 牛肉 \quad 牛肚 \quad 按呢 \quad 就 \quad 好} \]
\[ \text{DM \quad stew \quad CIT-E-DIM \quad beef \quad ox-stomach \quad like-this \quad just \quad good} \]
\[ \text{‘Just stew some/a little beef and (a) stomach of an ox, and it will do.’} \]

The ‘small quantity’ interpretation clearly arises from a conversational implicature induced by *cit* ‘one’: since it is the smallest counting number, its use in *cit-e* can induce a comparison with other numerals, with an inference of ‘being small in quantity.’ More examples of this in (17)-(20).

(17)  
\[ Li \quad ma \quad ci-cio \quad ciah \quad cit-e/ce-a \quad cui-ka \quad ciah \quad cau. \]
\[ \text{你 \quad 嘛 \quad 至少 \quad 食 \quad 一個(仔) \quad 水果 \quad 才 \quad 走} \]
\[ \text{2SG \quad also \quad at-least \quad eat \quad CIT-E-DIM \quad fruit \quad then \quad go} \]
\[ \text{‘Eat a little fruit at least before you go.’} \]

(18)  
\[ Lim \quad cit-e/ce-(a) \quad sio \quad thng \quad li \quad e \quad kam-kah \quad kha \quad song-khuai. \]
\[ \text{Lim \quad 一個(仔) \quad 燒 \quad 湯 \quad 你 \quad 會 \quad 感覺 \quad 卡 \quad 爽快} \]
\[ \text{drink \quad CIT-E-DIM \quad hot \quad soup \quad 2SG \quad will \quad feel \quad more \quad comfortable} \]
\[ \text{‘Have a little hot soup, and you will feel more comfortable.’} \]

(19)  
\[ Tak-ke \quad pua \quad cit-e/ce-(a) \quad kang. \]
\[ \text{逐家 \quad 撇 \quad 一個(仔) \quad 工} \]
\[ \text{everybody \quad spare \quad CIT-E-DIM \quad time} \]
\[ \text{‘Everybody spares a little time.’} \]

(20)  
\[ pue-iong \quad cit-e/ce-(a) \quad kam-ceng \quad kah \quad kuan-he. \]
\[ \text{培養 \quad 一個(仔) \quad 感情 \quad 及 \quad 關係} \]
\[ \text{cultivate \quad CIT-E-DIM \quad feeling \quad and \quad relationship} \]
\[ \text{‘Cultivate some affection and relationship.’} \]

Note that, when interpreted as ‘some, a little’, *cit-e* may contract to *ce7*, and may sometimes take the diminutive suffix -a (仔), thus reinforcing the notion of quantitative smallness.

Furthermore, *cit-e/ce* can also be followed by another numeral-classifier sequence to imply a sense of ‘insufficiency’ (Zhou 1991), as in (21)-(22):
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In fact, *cit-e/ce* here has lost its grammatical function as classifier, and serves more like an adverb signaling the speaker’s evaluation of the quantity expressed in the numeral-classifier sequence that follows, quite similar to ‘only’ or ‘just’ in English.

In some sentences, the ‘smallness’ interpretation may not pertain so much to the quantity of the referent denoted by the noun, as to the activity in question. This is especially true with nouns that have specific classifiers of their own, as exemplified in (23):

(23) a. *thiann cit-e kua* ‘listen to songs’
    b. *pang cit-e cui* ‘let water out’
    c. *cia cit-e png* ‘have a meal’
    d. *se cit-e bi* ‘wash rice’
    e. *hip cit-e siong* ‘take some pictures’
    f. *cih cit-e phue* ‘fold up quilts’

The specific classifiers for *kua* ‘song’, *png* ‘meal’, *bi* ‘rice’, *siong* ‘picture’, and *phue* ‘quilt’ are *siu* (首), *ting* (頓), *liap* (粒), *tiunn* (張), and *nia* (領), respectively. *Cit* 水 ‘water’ in (23b) is a mass noun, and thus often collocates with container classifiers such as *kong* (管) or *uann* (碗), but rarely takes the default classifier *e*. In all these examples, *cit e* does not specify the small quantity of the following noun, nor does it denote the sense of ‘one’. Rather, it serves to attribute a sense of casualness and triviality to the activity in question. This trivializing function is even more transparent in the contexts of (24) and (25), where *cit e* obviously signifies the activity denoted by the VP as trivial and thus insignificant.

(24) *Pi-giap tian-le si lang kheh lang,*
    畢業 典禮 是 人 kheh 人
    graduation ceremony COP person push person
even want eat CIT-E rice just hard
want take CIT-E picture just find no place
‘There was such a huge crowd in the graduation ceremony that it was difficult to find a space just to have a meal or to take pictures.’

In (24) the speaker is telling his father that there were so many people in the graduation ceremony that it was difficult to find a place to complete tasks as easy as ciah-png 食飯 ‘have a meal’ and hip-siong 翕相 ‘take pictures’. In other words, cit-e is employed to specify both these activities as trivial and easy to accomplish. Likewise, the speaker of (25), in complaining about her daughter’s reluctance to do the dishes, uses cit-e with the activity se-uann 洗碗 ‘wash dishes’, obviously to tone down the significance or difficulty of the chore. In her view, washing dishes is certainly less time-consuming and easier to accomplish, compared with the task of cooking, which by contrast is not marked with a trivializing cit-e.

The ‘trivial activity’ interpretation of cit-e in (24) and (25) may be regarded as arising from its coöcurring VP, since such activities as eating food, taking pictures, or doing dishes are normally considered as representing intrinsically trivial, daily routines. Yet, the trivializing meaning seems to have been conventionalized in contexts like (26), where cit-e is employed as an explicit means to downplay the significance of thak-ce 讀冊 ‘studying’, which in normal situations is not considered to be an insignificant daily routine.

(26) E-hiau thak cit-e cheh u siann-mi liau-put-khi?
able study CIT-E book have what remarkable
M cai iu-hau pe-bu, kam u-hau ni?

NEG know show-filial-piety-to parents QUE useful UFP

‘There is nothing remarkable in being good at studying. Is the academic achievement of any use if (he) shows no filial piety for his parents?’

From ‘small quantity’ in (16)-(20) to ‘insignificant activity’ in (23)-(26), the \( V + \text{cit-e} + N \) sequence has exhibited a process of structural reanalysis from \( V + [\text{cit-e} + N] \) to \( [V + \text{cit-e} + N] \). In other words, the nominal classifier sequence \text{cit-e}, which serves its prototypical function of quantifying its following noun, is reinterpreted as a modifier of the VP. The structural reanalysis comes with its inferred function of trivializing the activity: in (23)-(26), the noun preceded by \text{cit-e} is mostly non-referential, or even an empty O in a VO compound verb, and thus non-quantifiable semantically. The trivializing function of \text{cit-e} therefore must be taken at an abstract level, pertaining to the related \( V \), for if a \( V \) exerts only a trivial amount of effect on the O, then it follows pragmatically that the activity itself must be casual or insignificant.

The structural division between \( V + [\text{cit-e} + N] \) and \( [V + \text{cit-e} + N] \), however, is not always clear-cut. First, \( e \) here has a tone 7 realization,\(^3\) which is the sandhi tone for tone 5, suggesting that it somehow is still felt as an instance of \text{e5} the noun modifier. Furthermore, in some \( V + \text{cit-e} + N \) sequences it is far from easy to tell whether \text{cit-e} is intended to denote the small quantity of the object noun or the insignificance of the activity, or perhaps both. In (16)-(20), for example, the speaker may also be signaling the activities as trivial or casual. After all, if the activity itself effects only a small amount of result, then a reasonable inference is that it must not have cost any real trouble or effort.

### 3.2 \( V + \text{cit-e} \)

Structurally, the noun in a \( V + \text{cit-e} + N \) construction may be fronted, topicalized, or deleted, resulting in a \((N +) V + \text{cit-e} \) sequence, as shown in (27b-d).

\[
\begin{align*}
(27) \quad \text{a. Thau-ke, gua be \text{cit-e} ti-sim.} \\
\text{頭家 我 買一個 豬心。} \\
\text{boss 1SG buy one CL pig-heart}
\end{align*}
\]

‘Boss, I want to buy a pig heart.’

\(^3\) Some speakers have tone 3 for \( e \) in this structure. However, these speakers also often have a third tone in sandhi for a prototypical noun classifier \text{e5}, as in \text{cit-e lang} ‘a person’, which shows that the difference is dialectal.
Instances of such fronted or deleted nouns are common in the data, as shown in (28)-(30), where the fronting or deletion of the noun is evidently motivated by the speech context:

(28)  **Io-ci kah ti-sim lai ka be cit-e.**
     腰子及猪心来共買一個
     kidney and pig-heart come DISP buy CIT-E
     ‘Buy one/a few pig kidney(s) and heart(s).’

(29)  **Li si bo khuann <M nai-nai M> teh bo-iong hioh?**
     你是無看奶奶佇無閒 hioh
     2SG COP NEG see grandma ASP busy UFP
     A be hiau phue ci cit-e, toh-ting chit cit-e?
     也決曉被摺一個桌頂擦一個
     also NEG know quilt fold CIT-E table-top wipe CIT-E
     ‘Can’t you see that Grandma is busy? Why don’t you fold up the quilts and wipe the furniture?’

(30)  **Mai cu a, lan lai gua-kau chin-chai ciah cit-e/ce toh hoh a.**
     Mai煮矣咱來外口清彩食一個就好矣
     NEG cook UFP 1PLI come outside casually eat CIT-E just good UFP
     ‘Don’t bother to cook. Let’s just go out and get something to eat.’

In some V + cit-e sentences, the numeral-classifier function of cit-e may remain transparent, as in (27), where the literal meaning of ‘one’ is clearly intended. In others, however, the function of the post-verbal cit e without a noun following appears rather opaque. Cit-e in (28), though still felt to be quantifying the fronted/deleted noun **io-ci kah ti-sim** 腰子及猪心 ‘(pig)-kidney and pig-heart’, may not be intended to mean ‘one’ but rather ‘a few, some’. In (29), cit-e relates more to the VP as a whole, specifying the insignificance of folding the quilts and wiping the furniture rather than the quantity of the quilts and the tables. In (30), where an object N of ciah 食 ‘eat’ is absent, cit-e cannot be interpreted as quantifying any object, but is still inferred as referring to some object N, whatever it may be, and denotes it as trivial in amount, with the inference that the activity itself is also casual and trivial.

The structural indeterminacy of cit-e in these (N +) V + cit-e sentences may seem to parallel that observed in the V + cit-e + N sentences discussed above, but the absence
of an immediately following N in fact adds substantially to the functional opacity of \textit{cit-e}. First of all, \textit{cit-e}, situated at the end of the VP, is often subject to neutralization, unless the numeral sense of ‘one’ is highlighted (i.e., ‘one, but not two or three’). In fact, in cases where \textit{cit-e} has lost its literal meaning of ‘one’, the neutral tone is obligatory, as the reduction process iconically reflects its function of trivialization, either in the quantity of the implied object noun or the nature of the activity. Furthermore, without an overt noun immediately following, \textit{cit-e} dangling after the verb tends to be reinterpreted as structurally attached to the verb itself. In this way, the V + \textit{cit-e} construction extends to verbs which do not normally take an object NP, as in (31):

\begin{enumerate}
\item[(31)]
\begin{enumerate}
\item \textit{that cit-e}  
\begin{tabular}{l}
踢 一個
\end{tabular}  
\begin{tabular}{l}
kick CIT-E
\end{tabular}  
\text{‘kick once/a little bit’}
\item \textit{kiann cit-e}  
\begin{tabular}{l}
行 一個
\end{tabular}  
\begin{tabular}{l}
walk CIT-E
\end{tabular}  
\text{‘walk for a while/take a walk’}
\item \textit{ce cit-e}  
\begin{tabular}{l}
坐 一個
\end{tabular}  
\begin{tabular}{l}
sit CIT-E
\end{tabular}  
\text{‘sit for a while/sit a little’}
\item \textit{liau-kai cit-e}  
\begin{tabular}{l}
了解 一個
\end{tabular}  
\begin{tabular}{l}
understand CIT-E
\end{tabular}  
\text{‘understand a little bit’}
\end{enumerate}
\end{enumerate}

In such V + \textit{cit-e} sentences, \textit{cit-e} obviously serves to quantify the verb itself rather than any missing noun. In cases where the action can be counted with respect to its instances of occurrence, such as \textit{that ‘kick’} in (31a), \textit{cit-e} may serve as a verb classifier. In most cases, however, the trivialization of \textit{cit-e} often gives rise to the inference of ‘short duration’ or ‘casual manner’ of the activity, as in (31a-d). Examples (32)-(34) below further show that post-verbal \textit{cit-e} has lost its grammatical function as a noun classifier and has grammaticalized with a delimitative verbal aspect, denoting the quick and casual nature of the activity.

\begin{enumerate}
\item[(32)] \textit{Phah cit-e toh ho, m ho phah siunn tua-lat.}  
\begin{tabular}{l}
拍 一個 就 好 母 好 拍 傷 太力
\end{tabular}  
\begin{tabular}{l}
hit CIT-E just good NEG good hit too hard
\end{tabular}  
\text{‘Hit just a little bit; do not hit too hard.’}
\end{enumerate}
At this point, it may be worthwhile to point out that historically a verb classifier \textit{cit-e} may have been independently developed, analogous to the development of the Mandarin verb classifier \textit{xia}, which has been extended, from a verb denoting downward movement to a classifier measuring short, fast repetitions of actions (Wang 1985:279-280, 1989:39-40). However, the \textit{e7} origin is not always clear, as pointed out in Section 2. In other words, the verbal \textit{cit-e} and the nominal \textit{cit-e} may well have become neutralized in this context, as is plainly evident from the difficulty native speakers have in distinguishing them.

### 3.3 \textit{Cit-e} + VP, S

\textit{Cit-e} also occurs in a subordinate element, where it precedes a VP to signal forward linkage to the clause that follows. Such \textit{cit-e} instances may be placed clause-initially or after the topic/subject, as shown in (36) and (37):

(36) \textit{Cit-e thiam-tioh cit e siau-sit i toh cau chut-khi.}
\begin{quote}
一個 聽 著 這個 消息 伊 就 走 出去
CIT-E hear RM this CL news 3SG then run out-go
'On hearing the news, he ran out.'
\end{quote}

(37) \textit{Ti-a cit-e senn chut-lai, toh hong pho khi be a.}
\begin{quote}
豬仔 一個 生 出來 就 hong 抱 去 賣 矣
piglet CIT-E bear out then PASS hold go sell ASP
'As soon as the piglets were born, they were taken out for sale.'
\end{quote}

The function of \textit{cit-e} in these sentences may appear to differ drastically from that of a numeral-classifier, which prototypically quantifies its following noun. However, consider the default nature of the noun classifier \textit{cit-e}, which collocates not only with prototypical nouns, but also with peripheral ones; namely, abstract nouns, including nouns derived from verbs. Thus, the VP here may well be treated as a nominalized N which is
made quantifiable by *cit*-e, and its semantic and grammatical functions seem to support such an analysis. Here, *cit*-e quantifies the event as a whole along the line of trivialization: The 'trivial quantity' interpretation is mapped onto the temporal domain of the event represented by the VP, giving rise to the inference of its instantaneity. Furthermore, as the VP is nominalized, it also loses its predicative function, and serves to signal that the main predicate is to follow.

Notice that *cit e* here is unlikely to have developed from the verb classifier *cit8 e7* (一下). First of all, *cit8 e7* is restricted to post-verbal position, from which a *cit-e + VP* order would be hard to derive. Secondly, *cit8 e7* (一下) is by no means a default verb classifier and thus does not enjoy a high frequency of occurrence, which is often considered an essential factor motivating functional extension.

While *cit-e + VP* in (36) and (37) clearly serves to set the temporal frame of reference for the event in the main clause, in (38) it may well be an ambiguously temporal or causal reading.

(38) *Chu-lai* *cit-e u cinn, li khuann, cit-ching khoo la,*
    *kong an-ne co hue-ling-ki an-ne sia la.*
    'Look, since the family got wealthy, he makes paper airplanes with thousand-dollar bills and throws them.'

The rise of a causal reading for *cit-e* can be seen as a reasonable consequence of pragmatic association: When two events take place consecutively, one right after the other, the first event is often inferred as the cause of the second. The instantaneity of *cit-e u cinn* 'since having money' in (38) may thus allow both a temporal and a causal interpretation. In the context of (39) and (40), where a temporal sequence seems irrelevant, the causal dependency of *cit-e* VP on the main predication is conventionalized.

(39) *Cit-e than-thiann ciah cai-iann uan-cuan si cin-sit e.*
    'Only with an inquiry did he know that it was entirely true.'

(40) *Cit-e bo se-ji, i ka pue-a shiah phua-khi.*
    'With a little carelessness, he broke the glass into pieces.'
Note that the *cit-e + VP* construction is both structurally and functionally analogous to ‘on + V-ing’ or ‘with + nominalized VP’ in English, as can be seen from the translations of the examples in this section. Thus, it can be reasonably argued that in Southern Min, which lacks any overt morphological mechanism for nominalization, the *cit-e + VP* construction serves as an important means of fulfilling the function of nominalization.

### 3.4 V + *cit-e + C*

There are some instances of *cit-e* that do not serve to trivialize the quantity of any object or tone down the significance of an activity, rather, it introduces a state or an extent designated by the following complement that results from the preceding verb.

(41)  
\[
\begin{align*}
\text{tiam } & \text{gu-a-ce } \text{lang } e \quad \text{bin thau-ceng}, \\
\text{tiam } & \text{so-many person } \text{ASSC face front} \\
kong & \text{beh kah gua ket-lian-li,...honn honn}, \\
say & \text{want with 1SG marry UFP UFP} \\
hai & \text{gua hit-lo } <XX> \text{huam-hi } \text{cit-e } \text{hiam-a si}.
\end{align*}
\]

cause 1SG that-kind<XX> glad CIT-E nearly die  

’[He] said in the presence of so many people that he would marry me. I was so overwhelmed with delight that I almost dropped dead.’

Sentences like (41) are reminiscent of the V + *ge + C* sentences in Mandarin; cf. Biq 2000 and Wang 1985:257-258. As *ge* (in *chao ge tong-kuai* ‘quarrel/fight to one’s heart’s content’) introduces an extraordinary state (*tong-kuai* ‘to one’s heart’s content’) as the result of the verb (*chao* ‘quarrel’), *cit-e* in (41) introduces the exaggerated state (*hiam-a si* ‘nearly dead’) as the result of (*huann-hi* ‘feel excited’). However, the C after *ge* in the Mandarin structure is highly restricted, allowing only adjectivals like *tong-kuai*, and clauses which have been fossilized, such as *shui luo shi chu* 水落石出 ‘the water recedes and all the stones are exposed’ or *pianjia bu luo* 片甲不留 ‘nothing is left’. The corresponding C in Taiwanese Southern Min, on the other hand, allows a much wider variety of structures, ranging from an NP, an adjectival, a VP, to a clause, as shown in (42)-(45).
Examples (41)-(45) show that cit-e serves more like a connective introducing a resultative complement, which may or may not denote an extraordinary state. But notice that in all the V + cit-e + C sentences, the C always represents the foreground information of the sentence. In fact, if the C were left unsaid in discourse, the V + cit-e would be felt to be incomplete, with cit-e somehow signaling that a result of high information value is intended by the speaker. Huan-lo cit-e 煩惱一個 ‘worried so much’ in (46) nicely illustrates cit-e in such a use, where cit-e invites the inference of a significant extent of worry.

(46) Kong tioh lin hiann-ko honn, cit nng kang a bo tng-lai chu e,
講 著 兄哥 honn 這 個 工 抑無 轉來 屋 e
say RM 2PL brother UFP this two day or NEG return house UFP
a a bo cit-thong tian-ue tng-lai,
a 抑無 一通 電話 轉來
DM or NEG one-CL call return
gua an-ne, huan-lo cit-e.
我 按呢 煩惱 一個
1SG this-way worry CIT-E
siunn kong cit-lo hong-thai thing honn,
想 講 這號 風颱 天 honn
think COM this-kind typhoon day UFP
Speaking of your brother, he hasn’t come home for a couple of days. He didn’t even make a telephone call. I am so worried. I wonder whether he has gone mountain-climbing in such typhoon weather.’

One problem that might arise from our analysis here is that, in these $V + \text{cit-e} + (C)$ sentences, $\text{cit-e}$ does not seem to show structural dependence on its following $C$. In fact, it appears to hold a closer relation with the preceding $V$. This might suggest that $\text{cit-e}$ here is not related to the noun classifier $\text{cit8 e5}$ (一個) at all, but is derived from the verb classifier $\text{cit8 e7}$ (一下). Yet, the semantic function of $\text{cit8 e7}$ is essentially restricted to denoting ‘sudden, casual, and short’ activities, which is incongruous with the function of marking foregrounding. With a noun classifier analysis, on the other hand, the foregrounding function of $\text{cit-e}$ in $V + \text{cit-e} + (C)$ sentences can naturally be attributed to its role of introducing a prototypical N, which often represents a salient participant in discourse.

Furthermore, the structure of the Taiwanese Southern Min complement construction also offers some explanation for the apparent loose relation between $\text{cit-e}$ and the following $C$. The Taiwanese Southern Min complement construction, unlike that in Mandarin, allows negation and other complicated modification, as long as the complement represents the main predication of the sentence. In other words, the closely related $V$ and $C$ in a compound verb VO may be separated by a confirmation/negation marker $u/bo$ ‘have/not have’, an adverbial such as $ceng$ ‘very’, or a more complicated modifier, as shown in (47).

$\text{m cai u cau khi peh suann bo?}$

NEG know ASP run go climb mountain NEG

‘Speaking of your brother, he hasn’t come home for a couple of days. He didn’t even make a telephone call. I am so worried. I wonder whether he has gone mountain-climbing in such typhoon weather.’
The surface looseness between *cit-e* and its following C thus parallels that between a regular V and its complement. In other words, their apparent lack of structural dependence may well be due to the predicative function of the C in the sentence.

To recapitulate our discussion on the various functions of *cit-e* and its multi-path functional shifts, we summarize the polygrammaticalization of *cit-e* as follows.

**INDIVIDUATION**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Function</th>
<th>TRIVIALIZATION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>V + <em>cit-e</em> + N marking a salient N in discourse</td>
<td>V + [cit-e + N] noun classifier</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V + <em>cit-e</em> + C marking a salient result as main predicate</td>
<td>V + [cit-e + N] small quantity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V + <em>cit-e</em> suggesting a salient result</td>
<td><em>cit-e</em> + N small quantity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V + <em>cit-e</em> verb classifier</td>
<td><em>cit-e</em> + VP instantaneous occurrence of event as cause</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V + <em>cit-e</em> delimitative aspect</td>
<td><em>cit-e</em> + VP instantaneous occurrence of event as cause</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Pragmatic inferencing (metonymy)**

**Metaphorical extension/Structural reanalysis**

4. *Cit-e* as a marker for coding nounhood

Given our analysis of *cit-e* so far, we are now obliged to address the question of whether there are sufficient grounds for relating the various functions of *cit-e* in such a wide range of constructions, aside from their surface phonological similarity. Or, put differently, what motivation and mechanism(s) are there in language structure and language use that may motivate and facilitate *cit-e*’s polygrammaticalization? We propose that the key to the question lies in the prototype notion of categoriality, conceptual mapping and the speaker’s communicative intent in discourse.

Prototypicality of linguistic categories as expounded in Hopper and Thompson (1984) has its roots in the cognitive framework of prototypicality developed in Rosch
The basic hypothesis is that human categorization is neither arbitrary nor discrete, but proceeds from central to peripheral, with the central instances of a category being more ‘prototypical’ for that category. With linguistic categories, a form which is prototypical of its category tends to display all those characteristics that are representative of the category, and none which are representative of another. The less prototypical members of the category, on the other hand, will exhibit fewer characteristics of the category. The division between categories, therefore, is not discrete, but instead forms a continuum. Furthermore, the prototypicality of a form depends not only on its independently verifiable lexical-semantic properties, but crucially on its linguistic function in the discourse as intended by the speaker. Thus, a prototypical N will be maximally distinct from a prototypical V; but, in discourse contexts which do not select prototypical instances of the categories, the possibility of contrast between N’s and V’s is greatly reduced. In this sense, categoriality is imposed on linguistic forms by discourse, and the coding for the category depends heavily on the communicative intent of the speaker uttering the discourse.

Under this prototype theory, the basic category of N is viewed as “lexicalization of the prototypical discourse functions of ‘discourse-manipulable participant’” (Hopper and Thompson 1984:703). The coding of a participant in discourse depends very little on the logic-based semantic notion of ‘referentiality’, but much more heavily on its ‘manipulability’; i.e., whether it will be important enough in the subsequent discourse. In other words, what grammar signals for a noun as high or low in categoriality is the manipulability of the noun in discourse as perceived by the encoder. In discourse contexts where the role of a noun is perceived as non-manipulable, it will lose some coding features, morphological or syntactic, which are characteristic of a prototypical member of N. Hopper and Thompson discuss cases of such decategorization from different languages. Specifically, they point out that predicate nominals in Mandarin usually lack the classifiers associated with indefinite nouns, while the classifier is used if the nominal predicate is continued in the discourse. Thus (48b) suggests some further discussion of the role of cadres, such as an observation that s/he is expected to work harder or have different attitudes from others, etc.; but not so for (48a). From Hopper and Thompson (1984:716):

(48) a. 他 是 幹部
   Ta shi ganbu
   s/he is cadre
   ‘S/he is a cadre.’

b. 他 是 一個 幹部
   Ta shi yi-ge ganbu
   s/he be one-CL cadre
   ‘S/he is a cadre.’
The numeral-classifier sequence yi-ge thus serves as an important coding signal for a prototypical N, which shows high manipulability in discourse.

While Hopper and Thompson’s discussion focuses on cases of decategorization, our analysis works the other way around. We argue that the numeral-classifier sequence cit-e, with its frequent occurrence in cit-e + N construction, is a prominent coding feature characterizing a prototypical N, and that this coding function may be employed (or exploited) onto non-prototypical members or even non-members of N in certain contexts to make it more ‘noun-like’ so as to meet the speaker’s communicative goal. The extension of cit-e to the various constructions discussed in Section 3 all exemplify such a function for cit-e for promoting nounhood in one way or another, though the communicative intents that motivate the coding vary greatly.

In the case of ‘trivializing cit-e’ in V + cit-e + N sentences (cf. examples (17-20), (23-26) in Section 3.1), cit-e is typically inserted between V and N, where the N either does not have specific reference (such as ciah cui-ko 食水果 ‘eat fruit’ and lim sio thng 喝湯 ‘drink hot soup’), or merely serves as an empty object in a VO compound verb (such as thak-cheh 讀冊 ‘study’ and cu-png 煮飯 ‘cook’). The insertion of cit-e is thus non-canonical, and is motivated by the speaker’s communicative intent to promote the nounhood of the non-prototypical N and mark it as quantifiable, which constitutes one aspect of the N’s manipulability in the discourse. With the coding of cit-e, the non-referential or semantically empty noun is marked as ‘manipulable’, showing the speaker’s intent to somehow quantify the unquantifiable, thus inviting the inference of his intention to quantify the activity related to the N. In this way, the different interpretation between thak-cheh and thak cit-e cheh parallels that between ‘study’ and ‘do some studying’. The English examples clearly show how the activity of study, which is prototypically non-quantifiable and typically represented by a verb, is made quantifiable when the core activity is expressed in a nominalized form, with a semantically vacuous verb ‘do’ to fill the verb slot. Cit-e in this construction, we argue, serves as a linguistic device for marking this special type of nominalization to achieve the discourse function of quantification, trivializing either the amount of the objects or entities or the manner/significance of an activity. As its coding function for quantification extends to an activity, it is functionally indistinguishable from the independently developed verb classifier cit-e (一下). The functional overlapping and the phonological resemblance between the noun classifier cit-e and the verb classifier cit-e thus result in their neutralization in many contexts in Modern Taiwanese Southern Min (cf. Section 3.2).

The same function of coding nounhood is seen in the use of cit-e as a forward-linking connective in Section 3.3, only with a different scope. In the case of V + cit-e + N, cit-e marks its following N as manipulable, trivializing the N and inferentially its related V. In this way, the quantification of cit-e pertains to the internal composition of
the activity—its manner, duration, and the like. With \textit{cit-e + VP}, on the other hand, \textit{cit-e} marks the whole VP as high in N categoriality, coding the whole event as playing the role of a manipulable participant in the discourse. The trivializing function of \textit{cit-e} thus pertains to the complete event as a whole, giving rise to the ‘instantaneous’ interpretation, which serves to set the time frame for the following predicate. Such coding function for signaling nounhood is analogous to the gerund construction ‘on + V-ing…’ in English, which nominalizes the VP and derives from it an instantaneous reading as the temporal setting for the following predicate. Notice that the coding of \textit{cit-e} to promote the nounhood of the VP also signals its decategorization from V: the VP has lost its capacity as the main predicate of the sentence.

The connective use of \textit{cit-e} to introduce a resultative complement in Section 3.4 is an extension of \textit{cit-e} in coding N manipulability, but here the speaker’s intent is not that of quantification, but of grounding in discourse organization. Hopper and Thompson (1984:716) point out the discourse function of Mandarin \textit{yi-ge} as coding the continuity of a predicate nominal in the discourse. Li (2000) follows up this idea with his empirical study of Mandarin numeral-classifiers and concludes that numeral-classifiers are a grounding mechanism for marking the salience of the NPs they occur in. Notice that this foregrounding function of a numeral-classifier is in fact due to its more general function of coding a prototypical N, signaling it to be manipulable in the discourse. Thus, in the case of Taiwanese Southern Min \textit{V + cit-e + C} construction, \textit{cit-e} is seen to code the C, which is semantically a non-member of the N category, as if it were a manipulable N. Here the communicative purpose is for \textit{cit-e} to mark the C as a salient part of the sentence, whether the C is an NP, a VP or an S. The potential complexity of C in the \textit{V + cit-e + C} construction also offers support for the C introduced by \textit{cit-e} to be the salient part of the sentence: The C takes such elements as negative markers, aspects, intensifiers, etc., which all typically characterize main predication.

Thus far, we have argued that the various uses of \textit{cit-e} in different constructions are derived from its coding property for signaling the nounhood of its following N extended to non-prototypical members of N. But what enables a speaker to treat a non-(prototypical) member, such as a VP or a C, as if it were a N? We believe the possibility lies in the indiscrete nature of conceptual categories and linguistic categories. Thus a V, which prototypically decodes ‘reported events’, may be given some noun-like properties when taken for such aspects as its times of repetition, duration or degrees of significance. Likewise, a C, which is essentially an adjectival, may be noun-like when considered as a resulting state. Thus, processes of functional shift such as nominalization and verbalization have been attested in human languages (cf. Zhang and Fang 1996, Zhang 1998). Here, we propose that in Taiwanese Southern Min, where morphological marking for categoriality is lacking, \textit{cit-e} serves as a coding device for signaling nounhood, and further as a
mechanism for processes of nominalization which in languages like English are morphologically encoded.

Finally, the lexical meaning of the component units in cit-e, i.e., *cit* and *e*, also plays an important role in rendering the multi-path functional shifts possible. First of all, *e* as a default classifier is semantically vacuous and thus generalized and non-binding. Strictly speaking, it performs no classification function for grouping nouns, unlike sortal classifiers. In fact, its classification function is reduced to that of marking the general class N. In this sense, it acts like a ‘miscellaneous’ file in noun classification (Myers and Tsay 2000), cooccurring with a variety of noun types, called for use even when an appropriate specific classifier does not pop up at the moment of speech. It is this non-binding, non-restricting nature that enables *e* to take different members of N and code them as noun-like, and leads to its high frequency of occurrence. As high frequency often encourages and effects functional change (Bybee and Hopper 2001), the numeral-classifier *cit-e*, with its basic function of coding nounhood, is extended to a variety of constructions to fulfill the speaker’s communicative goals. In this connection, it should be noted that the verb classifier *e7* (下) lacks this default nature, and its frequency of occurrence is thus in no way comparable to that of *cit8-e5*. Therefore, functional extension from the verb classifier is highly impossible.

*Cit*, the number ‘one’, also plays a significant role in the process of *cit8-e5*’s extension, largely through pragmatic inferencing. First, being singular in nature, *cit*, when combined with the non-restricting classifier *e*, serves as a natural candidate for marking indefinite referential N’s, which is often used for marking prototypical N’s. Then, as the smallest the counting numbers, *cit* often invites a comparison with other numbers and thus derives the pragmatic inference of being ‘small in quantity’, ‘little or few’, or even ‘insufficient’. This leads to the trivializing function of *cit-e* in a variety of contexts, as seen in V + *cit-e* + N, V + *cit-e*, and *cit-e* + VP constructions. On the other hand, the inference evoked by *cit* may take the opposite route of individuation, since ‘one’ is often associated with ‘uniqueness’, and thus comes to signify ‘saliency and importance’. It is this route of individuation that results in *cit-e*’s function as marking foregrounding in discourse. The different routes of association thus lead to the development of its apparently contradictory functions of trivializing and foregrounding in different discourse contexts. Such pragmatic working of metonymic inferences in *cit-e*’s grammaticalization finds support in recent studies on historical pragmatics; cf. Traugott, forthcoming. These studies highlight the central role of invited inferences and the speaker’s subjectification in semantic change.
5. Conclusion

In this paper we have offered a unified account for the diverse functions of \textit{cit-e} in various constructions, in which the seemingly different uses are treated as grammaticalized from the default numeral-classifier sequence \textit{cit8-e5} (一個). Our analysis is grounded both on cognitive and pragmatic bases. The default noun classifier \textit{cit8-e5}, freely collocating with all types of nouns and its high frequency of occurrence in the \textit{cit-e + N} construction, performs the core function of coding nounhood. This coding function is then extended to units that are semantically non-members of N, with \textit{cit-e} serving in the new structures as a mechanism to promote the noun-like status of the coded unit, thus resulting in the multi-path functional shifts as the new uses are conventionalized. The cognitive ground for such functional shifts lies in the indiscrete nature of human categorization, which allows for the possibility of mapping certain features of a category onto non-prototypical members of the category to promote their categoriality. In the case of \textit{cit-e}, the marker for coding nounhood is employed as a mechanism of promoting the noun-like status of a non-N item, to achieve the speaker’s communicative goal in the discourse. Pragmatically, it is the speaker’s intent in discourse production and organization that motivates the non-canonical use of \textit{cit-e} with the non-N unit, which invites the distinct pragmatic inferences of trivialization and individuation, resulting in the multi-path functional shifts.

By relating the various \textit{cit-e} uses as grammaticalized from \textit{cit8-e5} as a marker for promoting nounhood, this analysis offers a reasonable account of the indistinct division between noun classifier and verb classifier. It also explains the indeterminacy of the status of \textit{cit-e} in such constructions as V + \textit{cit-e} + C and \textit{cit-e} + VP: Structurally \textit{cit-e} occupies the syntactic position of a connective, and structural perseverance from a noun-coding \textit{cit-e} still leaves it with some sense of a numeral-classifier sequence, as reflected in the mixed tonal manifestation and structural indeterminacy. Our analysis of the multi-path functional shifts of \textit{cit-e} and the cognitive and pragmatic factors which motivate its polygrammaticalization not only lend support to the dynamism of linguistic categorization, but also highlight the intimate relation among cognition, language use, and language structure.
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概念轉換與功能游移：
論台閩語「一個」的多重功能

李 櫻 王富美
國立台灣師範大學

本文以概念結構與語言結構的密切關聯為基礎，探索台閩語「一個」的多重語意、句法及言談功能。文中指出，「一個」為台閩語中名詞的「抵輔類詞」，在「一個+名詞」結構中出現頻率極高，具有標誌名詞的基本功能。而在言談互動中，說者為達成某些特殊的溝通目的，常藉助「一個」的名詞標誌功能，將之附加於非名詞之前，以賦予該語詞某些名詞屬性，也因此導致「一個」的多重語法化。而「一個」的多重功能游移，其驅動力來自認知與語用兩個層面。就認知層面而言，由於概念範疇之間並非壁壘分明，因此容許說者將名詞屬性轉移到非名詞的成員上。就語用層面而言，言談中的語境需求，常促使說者將非名詞標以名詞屬性，以達達特殊的語用隱涵；而此種語用隱涵若因高頻率的使用而制約化，就會形成「一個」的延伸結構功能。台閩語「一個」多重功能的現象，正突顯出語言範疇之間的模糊與變異性，以及語言結構與認知、語用之間的密切關聯。

關鍵詞：語法化，原型，語用推論