

## Covariance of syntactic and phonological contact effects in Eastern Cham

Kenneth Baclawski Jr. (University of California, Berkeley)

In this paper, we identify syntactic variation in Eastern Cham (Austronesian: Vietnam) that covaries with phonological variation. Eastern Cham is an endangered language in an intense contact relationship with Vietnamese (Austroasiatic) (cf. Brunelle & Văn Hân 2015). Previous research has demonstrated that a number of Vietnamese phonotactic features have been borrowed into Eastern Cham, at least in some populations (Blood 1961; Baclawski 2016). Of particular interest are two variables: (1) [r] ~ [y, z] and (2) [ŋ] ~ [ŋ<sup>m</sup>] / V<sub>rd</sub>\_. Both [y, z] and [ŋ<sup>m</sup>] pass available diagnostics for Vietnamese contact effects (cf. Poplack & Levey 2010).

A sociolinguistic survey of 30 native speakers recorded in Vietnam in 2015 demonstrates that there is intra-speaker variation with both variables: 20 and 28 of the 30 speakers, respectively, use both variants at least once in the survey. These variables both correlate with village, such that the contact variant is seen more in villages with greater economic contact with the broader monolingual Vietnamese community. Finally, neither of these variables show any signs of speaker salience.

A novel observation is that Eastern Cham syntax also shows variation. In particular, Eastern Cham *wh*-phrases may be topicalized in certain discourse contexts (1; Baclawski 2015). Some speakers, however, reject these utterances outright (2). A natural hypothesis for this variation is the borrowing of a Vietnamese syntactic effect, as *wh*-topicalization is likewise ungrammatical in Vietnamese (3).

- |     |   |              |
|-----|---|--------------|
| (1) | Context: A: ‘I already invited somebody to the party.’<br><i>ploh, thay, zut ʔa</i><br>after who friend invite<br>B: ‘Who did you invite then?’ (Speaker NNA) | Eastern Cham |
| (2) | {*} <i>zut ʔa {thay} bǎŋ lɔ mɔ</i><br>friend invite who eat meat cow<br>‘Who did you [friend] invite to eat beef?’ (Speaker NTNT)                             | Eastern Cham |
| (3) | {*} <i>Bạn mời {ai} ăn thịt bò?</i><br>friend invite who eat meat cow<br>‘Who did you [friend] invite to eat beef?’   | Vietnamese   |

To test this hypothesis, 5 of the 30 speakers above took part in syntactic elicitation. Three speakers accepted utterances like (1–2), while two rejected them. The former group also uttered few occurrences of the contact phonological variants (exemplified by Speaker NNA in Table 1), while the latter group uttered more than average (Speaker NTNT). Thus, phonological variation appears to covary with syntactic variation in terms of these contact effects. This result generally supports the idea that syntactic variation can be determined by sociolinguistic factors (Grondelaers & Speelman 2007, a.o.). It is hypothesized that a high instance of phonological contact effects indicates that speakers are choosing certain attitudes towards bilingualism that are

accompanied by a contact-influenced grammar (cf. Matras 2009); conversely, low instances of these phonological contact effects are accompanied by the non-contact-influenced grammar. The lack of salience for the phonological and syntactic variation supports a conclusion that syntactic variation is the result of processing factors.

Table 1: Eastern Cham phonological and syntactic contact effects

	Speaker NNA	Whole sample (n=30)	Speaker NTNT
/r/ → [y, z]	18%	57%	100%
/ŋ/ → [ŋ <sup>m</sup> ] / V <sub>rd</sub> _	35%	59%	74%
wh-topicalization	☐		☐

---

Baclawski Jr., Kenneth. 2015. "Topic, focus, and wh-phrases in Cham and Moken." Paper presented at *Information Structure in Spoken Language Corpora 2* (ISSLAC2). Paris, France. December 2, 2015.

Baclawski Jr., Kenneth. 2016. "Triglossia in Eastern Cham." Paper presented at *New Ways of Analyzing Variation Asia-Pacific* (NWAV-AP4). National Chung Cheng University, Chiayi, Taiwan. April 23, 2016.

Blood, Doris. 1961. "Women's Speech Characteristics in Cham." *Asian Culture* 3: 111-114.

Brunelle, Marc & Phú Văn Hãn. 2015. "Colloquial Eastern Cham." In Paul Sidwell & Matthias Jenny [eds.], *The Languages of Southeast Asia*. Mouton de Gruyter.

Brunelle, Marc. 2009. "Diglossia and monosyllabization in Eastern Cham." In James Stanford & Dennis Preston (eds.), *Variation in Indigenous Minority Languages*. John Benjamins.

Grondelaers, Stefan & Dirk Speelman. 2007. "A variationist account of constituent ordering in presentative sentences in Belgian Dutch." *Corpus Linguistics and Linguistic Theory* 3: 161-193.

Matras, Yaron. 2009. *Language Contact*. Cambridge University Press.

Poplack, Shana & Stephen Levey. 2010. "Contact-induced grammatical change: A cautionary tale." In P. Auer & J. E. Schmidt (eds.), *Language and space – An international handbook of linguistic variation (vol. 1): Theories and methods*: 391–419. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.