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Introduction

Tsat is an Austronesian language located on Hainan Island. The 1982 census lists 4131 Utsat people largely in the villages of Huihui and Huixin near Sanya on Hainan Island (which has recently been designated as a province), 3849 of whom still speak Tsat. Virtually all the Tsat speakers also speak one or more Chinese dialects, typically Fukienese or Cantonese, the languages of business, and Mandarin, the language of school.

Genetically the closest language to Tsat is the Northern Roglai of Vietnam, a Chamic language (Austronesian) which it split off from first around 982, with a second migration
probably around 1471. Despite the genetic closeness, Tsat is now radically different both phonologically and syntactically from N. Roglai. Phonologically, Northern Roglai is sesquisyllabic and atonal whereas Tsat is monosyllabic and fully tonal. Structurally, Northern Roglai is much, much more like the other Chamic languages of Vietnam which, in turn resemble the Mon-Khmer languages of the region, while Tsat, not surprisingly, is much like the Chinese dialects that surround it. Increasingly, all that remains of Tsat is the vocabulary, with the structure being Chinese, albeit with Tsat lexical items. Thus Tsat provides some exceptionally clear examples of contact-induced syntactic variation and change. Work has been done on genetic affiliations of Tsat (Benedict 1941), the history of the Chamic languages including Tsat (e.g. Thurgood 1999, 1996), and on the description of Tsat itself, Ouyang and Zheng (1983), Zheng (1986, 1997), with the later work by Zheng including numerous valuable observations on the influence of Chinese on Tsat, both identifying Chinese borrowings and commenting on Chinese structural influence.

Tsat contact

Changes in Tsat resulting from contact with neighboring languages of Hainan are quite obvious. Phonologically, it has gone from sesquisyllabic and registral to monosyllabic and tonal. Lexically, it contains four layers of borrowings reflecting contact patterns since the Tsat arrival in Hainan: a Hlai (= Li) strata, an early Chinese level reflecting early contact with speakers of Min dialects such as Hainanese and various Cantonese dialects, a later layer of contact with the Mandarin spoken by the army and officials, and most recently the Mandarin of the schools. The intensity of the last layer of contact looks to have initiated rapid and through restructuring of the language.
Here we will restrict our examination to four constructions with extant variation, two involving word orders that do not correlate with VO order (Dryer 1992) and two involving word orders that do correlate: genitive constructions, demonstratives and head nouns, adjectives and head nouns, and comparative constructions. All show the structural influence of Chinese.

Genitive (“associative”) constructions

The genitive patterns have been divided into those with full noun phrases as the genitive and those involving pronouns, reflecting the differences in their historical paths of change.

Genitives with full noun phrases

In Northern Roglai full NPs are postposed. In Tsat, even in the most colloquial, non-Sinicized texts, full GenNPs already show Chinese influence: all full genitive NPs are preposed with the genitive construction marked by *sa*. In the case of locative NPs, the preposed NPs look to be developing into prepositions. Elsewhere, the genitive marker is a marker of pre-head modification.

Northern Roglai: \textit{Nh GENNP}

(1) \textit{ga? sa:k} \hfill (Lee 1966:65)

roof house
‘the roof of the house’

Tsat (colloquial): GENNP sa³³ Nh


father’s older brother GEN house
bófù de fángzi
bófù de fángzi
‘father’s eldest brother’s house.’

(3) ?i³³?be²³ sa³³ ka:n³³.  (Zheng 1997:71)

river GEN fish
hélī de yú
hélī de yú
‘the fish in the river’

(4) ...pyay³³ sa³³ za:ŋ³².  (Zheng 1997:95)

...village GEN person
...cūn de rén
...cūn de rén
‘people of the village...’

Tsat (Mandarinized with ti³³) GENNP ti³³ HeadNP

the same pattern with the genitive borrowed from Mandarin
(5) tan³³ khua⁵⁵ ti³³ si³³ha:wa²⁴², la³³ pyay³³ sa³³ za:ay²⁴² (Zheng 1997:4.1.3)
arrive daybreak GEN after under village GEN person
dào tiānliàng de shīhòu xià cūn de rén
dào tiānliàng shīhòu, cūnlǐ de nánrén hé nǚrén...
‘Early the next morning, the villagers...’

(6) sui²⁴² tso²⁴² kay³³kak²⁴ kh:a.³³pʰ a:y³³ ti³³ sin³³zit²⁴ (Zheng 1997:3.3.3)
along with reform bloom GEN penetrate
suǐzhé gāigé kāifàng de shēnrù
suǐzhé gāigé kāifàng de shēnrù
‘As the Reform and Open-door policies continue...’

Mandarin: Poss de NP

(7) duìzhāng de érzi (Zheng 1997:71)
captain GEN child
‘the captain’s son’

(8) lǎoshī de shū (Zheng 1997:71)
teacher GEN book
‘the teacher’s books’
In the genitives, as with the other constructions, the more Mandarinized variants tend
to co-occur with borrowed Mandarin grammatical markers (which in some cases seem to
mark the construction), tend to have more Mandarin borrowings in the sentence (marked in
this paper through the underlining of both the borrowed Tsat term and its corresponding
Mandarin (in Pinyin)), and, if one examines the texts, occur in the more Mandarinized texts.
For instance, the text on the origin of the Tsat less Mandarin influence than does the text
describing the Japanese invasion of Hainan with its Mandarin influenced political content.

Table 1: Noun modification: Genitives (full NPs)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>simple modification</th>
<th>prehead $sa^{53}$ pattern</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N. Roglai</td>
<td>Nh GENNP</td>
<td>——</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colloquial Tsat</td>
<td>——</td>
<td>GENNP $sa^{53}$ Nh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mandarinized Tsat</td>
<td>——</td>
<td>GENNP $ti^{53}$ Nh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mandarin</td>
<td>——</td>
<td>GENNP $de$ Nh</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In the case of full noun phrases, the Northern Roglai post-head genitives have been
totally replaced by Chinese-influenced prehead genitive constructions. Nonetheless, contact
has resulted in variation as the colloquial pattern uses a Tsat genitive marker while the
Mandarinized pattern uses a borrowed genitive marker. Both patterns show the structural influence of Chinese.

Genitives with pronouns

Northern Roglai: Nh GENPr

(9) sa:k hā (Lee 1966:65)

house you
‘your house’

Tsat (colloquial): Nh GENPr

(10) yan³³ kaw³³ ki²⁴. (Zheng 1997:97)

hand I painful
shōu wǒ tòng
wǒ de shōu tòng.
‘My hand hurts.’

(11) ko²⁴ bu²⁴ naw³³ sa²⁴. (Zheng 1997:92)

head hair she messy
tóufa tā luàn
tā de tóufa luàn.
‘Her hair is messy.’
Tsat (Chinese influenced, with *sa*³³)

(12) *naw*³³ *sa*³³ *koi²⁴* *bui²⁴ *sa*²⁴.  
    she GEN head.hair messy
    tā de tóufa luàn
    tā de tóufa luàn.
    ‘Her hair is messy.’

(13) *ha*³³ *sa*³³ ?a²²-*sa:w²² *sa*³³ *ha*³³ .  
    you GEN elder.brother... seek you
    nǐ de sāo zhāo nǐ
    nǐ de sāo zhāo nǐ.
    ‘Elder brother’s wife seeks you.’

Mandarin:  GEN Pr Nh

(14) *wō fuqin shì tā bōfū*  
    I father be he uncle
    ‘My father is his uncle.’

    GEN Pr de Nh

(15) *wō de shōu tòng*  
    (Zheng 1997:97)
I GEN hand painful

‘My hand hurts.’

Table 2: Noun modification: Genitives (pronouns)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Simple modification</th>
<th>Prehead $sa^{33}$ pattern</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N. Roglai</td>
<td>Nh GENPr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colloquial Tsat</td>
<td>Nh GENPr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mandarinized Tsat</td>
<td>——</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mandarin</td>
<td>Pr Nh</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Demonstratives and head nouns

Like genitive pronouns, demonstratives are postposed in Northern Roglai and the colloquial Tsat, but preposed in Chinese-influenced Tsat and Mandarin. In the Chinese-influenced Tsat, however, the demonstratives are often accompanied by a genitive marker, a pattern that matches the adjective plus genitive construction immediately below, a construction that reflects Mandarin influence.

Northern Roglai:
(16)  sa:k ghen ?unì  

house big this  

‘this big house’


two person plural child good he this in house  

‘these two good children of his in the house’

Tsat:

(18)  ?ay scent ni Scient sat scent q? an  

water this truly cold  

shuǐ zhè zhēn lèng

zhè shuǐ zhēn lèng.  

‘This water is very cold.’

Tsat (Chinese influenced) (this + GEN) + clf

(19)  ni Scient sa Scient ta? pʰ an Scient pi Scient ki Scient lu Scient  

this GEN one clf CM much  

zhè de yī fèn bǐjiào duō

zhè yī fèn bǐjiào duō.  

‘This portion is bigger.’
 Needless to say, the demonstrative-noun order is a result of Chinese contact. This word order change induced by extensive and prolonged contact with Chinese is quite systematic and pervasive throughout the grammatical system of Tsat. It is found in texts collected from the same speaker by Zheng Yiqing in the 80s published in Zheng (1997). It is interesting to note that the borrowed patterns are found in texts that describe more recent phenomena, whereas the native patterns are used in texts of traditional stories.
### Table 3: Noun modification: Demonstratives

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>simple modification</th>
<th>prehead $sa^{35}$ pattern</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N. Roglai</td>
<td>Nh Dem</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colloquial Tsat</td>
<td>Nh Dem</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mandarinized Tsat</td>
<td></td>
<td>Dem $sa^{35}$ Nh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mandarin</td>
<td>Dem Nh</td>
<td>Dem CLF Nh</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Adjectives and head nouns**

N. Roglai has postposed adjectives as does the colloquial Tsat, while the Mandarinized Tsat and Mandarin itself have preposed adjectives.

N. Roglai: postposed adjectives

(23) *sa:k ghen ?unɨ*  
house big this  
‘this big house’

Tsat: postposed adjectives

(24) *nałtsun*I pioŋD poérieur*:  
bird big say

(Lee 1966:65)  
(Zheng 1997:1.1.9)
niǎo  dà  shuō

niǎo dà shuō:

‘The big bird said:....’

(25)  \(t^h\)un\(^{33}\)zaw\(^{33}\) pioj\(^{42}\) sin\(^{42}\)lian\(^{11}\),  (Zheng 1997:1.2.21)

tree  big  relax.in.cool.place

shù  dà  xiēliáng

dà shù xià xiūxi de,

relaxed under a big tree,

Tsat (Mandarin-influenced)  preposed adjectives

(26)  hu\(^{44}\)tsa.n\(^{42}\) mi\(^{33}\) san\(^{11}\) nay\(^{42}\) sin\(^{42}\) nay\(^{42}\) pa.w\(^{33}\),  ...  (Zheng 1997:4.2.1)

Tsat  we  believe  good  heart  good  reward

Huīzú  wōmen xīn  hǎo  xīn  hǎo  bāo

wōmen Huīzú rén xiāngxīn hǎo xīn de rén yǐdìng dédào bāo...

‘We Tsat people believe that people with kind hearts will be rewarded...’

(27)  ... kiu\(^{33}\) san\(^{43}\),  (Zheng 1997:2.1.1)

... old  village

... jiù  cūn

... jiù  cūn

‘... the old village’
preposed with *sa*³, a calque on Mandarin *de*

(28)  *na*³⁰ *sa*³³ *sa̍h³⁴ *huat⁴⁴,*  
      good GEN life
      hǎo de shēnghuó
      hǎo de shēnghuó
      ‘(the) good life’

Mandarin

(29)  *dà niǎo shuō*  
      big bird say
      ‘The big bird said:’

      preposed with *de*, a ‘genitive’ marker

(30)  *hǎo de shēnghuó,*  
      good GEN life
      ‘(the) good life’

Note that under the influence of Chinese, the preposed adjectives of Tsat are often accompanied by a genitive marker (or, as Li and Thompson (1981:113-116) term it, an “associative” marker).
The spread of the \( sa^{33} \) construction

The \( sa^{33} \) construction is a calque on the Mandarin de construction illustrated throughout this paper: \( X \; sa^{33}/de \; NP \), in which the first element (\( X \)) modifies the final NP. This construction, marked by , is expanding in use. Its initial use appears to have been with preposed genitive NPs involving full NPs and then expanded to other parts of the grammar. The three constructions already discussed show this movement from posthead to prehead using the \( sa^{33} \) construction (see Table 5).

Table 5: Noun modification: Spread of the \( sa^{33} \) construction

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Genitive NP</th>
<th>Genitive pr</th>
<th>Dem</th>
<th>Adj</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| N. Roglai   | Nh NP       | Nh Pr | Nh Dem | Nh Adj
|             |             |      |       |     |
For full NP genitives, the older Northern Roglai postposed NPs have been completely replaced by preposed NPs using the sa³³ construction; for genitive pronouns, the older postposed genitive pronouns are still used in more colloquial contexts, but in more Mandarinized speech these are now preposed. For demonstratives, the situation is more complex. All demonstratives were postposed in Northern Roglai and tend to retain this posthead position in the more colloquial Tsat. However, in the more Mandarized speech demonstratives are variably preposed through the use of the sa³³ construction. The distribution between the postposed and the preposed with sa³³ variants appears to correlate albeit only loosely with both the register and the type of NP involved. Adjectives were postposed in Northern Roglai, are postposed in the more colloquial Tsat contexts, and even in the most Mandarinized Tsat texts still remain postposed some of the time, at other times being preposed using the sa³³ construction. The use of this pattern has expanded beyond the examples in this paper to include prehead relative clauses, a construction highly marked highly marked for an SVO language like Tsat.

Comparative constructions
The existence of contact-induced word order variation is obvious in the two distinct Tsat comparative patterns: the native pattern is inherited from Chamic; the other is borrowed from Chinese:

- X - Adj - CM/ST native pattern
- X - CM/ST - Adj Chinese influenced pattern

In the native pattern, Zheng (1997:75) notes that the word order is quality-marker-standard (X - Adj - CM/ST), that is, the quality being compared, followed by the preposition lau $^{32}$ ‘CM; pass’ (which serves as the comparative marker), followed by the standard of comparison, typically a pronoun. The extent or degree of the quality may also be marked, in which case it is through modification of the quality.

When relationships are compared, the comparative marker is the preposition lau $^{32}$ ‘CM; pass; exceed’, derived from a verb. For example,

Tsat (colloquial):

(31) naw$^{53}$ m$^{42}$ lau$^{422}$ ha$^{51}$. (Zheng 1997:75)

he fat CM you

tā pāng bī nǐ
tā bī nǐ pāng.

‘He is fatter than you.’
(32)  \( lu^{33} pion^{32} la.w^{32} ?bo^{32}koy^{24} \).  (Zheng 1997:89)

coconut.palm  big   CM  pomelo

\( yêzi \ dà \ guô \ yêuzi \)

\( yêzi \ bǐ \ yêuzi \ dà. \)

‘The coconut palm is bigger than the pomelo.’

(33)  \( ?a^{32}ko^{33} ph\ ay^{32} kh\ an^{32} na:y^{32} la.w^{32} ?a^{32}th\ ay^{32} \).  (Zheng 1997:75)

elder.brother read  book  good  CM  younger.brother

gēge  dû  shū  hâo  guô  dìdi

gēge xuéxi bǐ  dìdi háo.

‘Elder brother studies more than younger brother.’

Tsat influenced by Chinese

However, as Zheng goes on to note, under the influence of Chinese, comparatives often follow a Chinese order, namely, comparative marker, standard, quality (X - CM/ST - Adj), using \( pi^{32} \) ‘CM; compare’ borrowed from Chinese to mark the comparison. For example:

(34)  \( kaw^{33} pi^{32} ha^{33} tsat^{33} tso^{33} kîv^{33} sun^{33} \).  (Zheng 1997:75)

I  CM  you  short  three inch

\( wŏ \ bǐ \ nǐ \ āi \ sān \ cûn \)

\( wŏ \ bǐ \ nǐ \ āi \ sān \ cûn. \)

‘I am three inches shorter than you.’
In these examples, both the word order and the comparative marker itself are Chinese. Instead of the native pattern of quality-standard-noun illustrated by the example in (1), we
have noun-marker-standard-quality exemplified by examples in (2a) to (2c). In fact, this kind of almost wholesale borrowing from Chinese is not confined to a limited number of grammatical structures in Tsat. In other words, it is quite pervasive throughout the grammatical system of Tsat.

Adverbs and conjunctions from Chinese

Adverbs, prepositions, and conjunctions are all borrowed from Mandarin.

Adverbs: (the examples given here are intensifiers)

(39) \( p^h \text{ ay}^{33} \text{ dia}^{24} \). \( p^h \text{ ay}^{33} \text{ sia}^{22} \text{ na}^{22} \). (Zheng 1997:76)

very  hot  extremely  good

\( \text{ t'ai } \text{ re} \)  \( f\text{eicha}ng \text{ hao} \)

\( \text{ t'ai re} \)  \( f\text{eicha}ng \text{ hao} \)

‘very hot’  ‘extremely good’

(40)  \( \text{ na}^{22} \text{ ye}^{22} \text{ kei}^{22} \).  \( \text{ sat}^{24} \text{ ti}^{35} \)

good  extremely  really white

\( \text{ hao } \text{ ji} \)  \( \text{ zhen bai} \)

\( \text{ haoji} \)  \( \text{ zhen bai} \)

‘extremely good’  ‘truly white’

Correlative conjunctions:
Both the Mandarin and the Tsat have exactly the same structure with the key morphemes borrowed from Mandarin.

Clausal conjunctions:

(41) $\text{ziu}^{33} \text{pa}^{33} \text{ziu}^{33} \text{ha}^{33}$. \hspace{1cm} (Zheng 1997:84)

both hungry and tired

$\text{yòu} \, \text{è} \, \text{yòu} \, \text{lèi}$

$\text{yòu} \, \text{è} \, \text{yòu} \, \text{lèi}$.  

‘Both hungry and tired.’

What makes these examples particularly interesting is that not only are they borrowed but that for the most part their syntax in Tsat matches their syntax in Mandarin. That is, what has been borrowed is a construction still marked by its characteristic lexical item.

Other Han influenced constructions
Not all Mandarin influence has resulted in patterns of synchronic variation. However, even when this sort of syntactic variation is no longer found, it is still fairly obvious that contact has been at work. Whenever Tsat word order patterns differ from those of the Chamic languages of Vietnam, they are either identical with or close to the patterns found in Chinese. And, of course, the fact that often times grammatical morphemes are borrowed together with the syntactic constructions, even serving to define the construction, is noteworthy.

Examples abound. In (43) below are three separate constructions showing Chinese syntactic influence. The first, indicated by the initial double underlining, is the extension of the prehead modification of the *sa33* construction to produce a prehead relative clause. This type of typologically marked prehead relative clause has developed under Chinese influence in at least three independent but parallel cases, once in Karen, once in Bai, and once in Tsat (Thurgood and Li, in preparation), has been extended, under the influence of Mandarin, to include other constructions quite new to Tsat.

(43) $\text{zheng1997:73}$

$$\text{di55 nan33 sa33 mo33 si11} \text{ may33 sa33}.$$

Lie down that GEN cow be female GEN

$tăng$ $nà$ $de$ huángniú $shì$ $mù$ $de$

$tăngzhe$ $de$ $nà$ $tóu$ huángniú $shì$ $mù$ $de$.

‘The yellow cow lying down is female.’

The second is the use of the Mandarin borrowing *si11* to mark the equative construction; the Chamic languages seem to use simple juxtaposition.
And the third is the use of a postposed sa\textsuperscript{11} as a nominalization in the may\textsuperscript{11} sa\textsuperscript{11} ‘female’. All three reflect Mandarin influence.

Other languages

None of this is restricted to Tsat, of course. Strikingly parallel developments are in progress throughout the Chinese dominated area of Asia. Everywhere where intense Chinese influence is manifested languages are undergoing major restructuring, resulting in word order variation and change. Contrary to the general belief that a very long period of time of persistent contact is needed for structural borrowing to occur, the wholesale restructuring is taking place quite rapidly. Intensity of contact more than duration seems to be the crucial factor. The level of bilingual proficiency and the instability of the social structure of the borrowing language seem to have a major impact on the length of time needed and the extent of the structural shift in contact induced changes.

Oroqen

For instance, in the southeastern and central dialect regions of Oroqen (a Tungusic language of the northeast; Li and Whaley 2000, Whaley, Grenoble, and Li 1999; Li 2000, Sun and Li 2001; Whaley and Li 1998, 2000), Chinese contact did not occur until after the settlement in the late 1950s and early 1960s. Nonetheless, within a short span of only a few decades, we already see signs of strong contact influence on the grammatical structure of the language. A case in point is the fact that one of our informants from the central dialect region
used the adverb *māfān*, which is a Chinese borrowing meaning ‘immediately’ spontaneously without noticing it. When fed the Oroqen word *diyajdʒi* meaning the same thing, he accepted it, but strongly prefers the Chinese borrowing. Interestingly enough, our informants from the western and northeastern dialect regions adamantly rejected the Chinese form insisting that it is not an Oroqen word.

Even in the northeastern dialect region where Oroqen is preserved the best, we saw strong Chinese influence, which is shown in the examples in (44).

(44) a) *fi timana ƞ̄na-ni yaʃa*

   you tomorrow go-2SG.PRES Q.2SG.PRES

   ‘Are you going tomorrow or not?’

b) *yaʃuʃa haʃi yaʃa*

   walk.PAST still-be Q.PAST

   ‘Went or not?’

In (44), we have two examples of the A-not-A question formation in Oroqen. Notice that the informant produced the Chinese *haishi* ‘still be: or not’ in 44b). She did so without realizing it at all until it was pointed out to her. This informant feels at ease with both languages. In fact, she possesses native proficiency in both Chinese and Oroqen.

This kind of phenomenon suggests that when a speaker reaches a certain level of bilingual proficiency, borrowing between the languages is much more readily than is generally assumed in the literature. Thus, it does not take a very long time for a language to shift to a completely different typological pattern in its grammatical structures. Central to the rate of such structural shifts are sociolinguistic factors, particularly, the so-called intensity of
contact. Our work suggests that for both Tsat and Oroqen a crucial factor has been schooling in Mandarin.

Mulam

In Mulam (Zheng 1988), a Kam-Sui language of the Guangxi area related ultimately to Thai, is undergoing many of the same changes Tsat is: borrowing of conjunctions, adverbs, and prepositions along with the introduction of constructions with new word orders under the influence of Chinese. In fact, Mulam even has its own equivalent of the sa₃ morpheme, built on a different genitive marker but, like its Tsat counterpart, resembling the de construction of Mandarin.

Zheng Guoqiao (1988:173), in discussing the Mulam borrowing of Chinese adverbs and conjunctions, notes that “degree and quantity adverbs are all borrowed from Han” and that “borrowed adverbs generally are subject to the same syntactic rules as Han”. That is, what is borrowed is not just a lexical item but a lexical item along with accompanying syntax--in short, a construction.

Mulam, despite being its geographical distance from Tsat, has calqued the de construction of Mandarin very much as Tsat has, and Mulam is borrowing many of the same constructions along the representative morpheme, leading to convergence with Mandarin. Sometimes this has produced variation with the native patterns competing with the borrowed patterns; in other cases, the native pattern has been completely replaced.

The Mulam data would benefit from a broader historical perspective. It is not just Mulam, but the whole Kam-Sui branch of Tai-Kadai that shows such developments. A particularly striking example can be found in Kam (Dong). The northern dialects often have
more evidence of Mandarin influence than the southern dialects. For a comparison that largely supplements this paper, see Edmondson (ms.) and Long and Zheng (1998).

Observations

In short, under intense Chinese similar, rapid restructuring is occurring in geographically distant languages belonging to distinct language families: in Tsat, an Austronesian language of Hainan; in Oroqen, a Tungusic language much farther to the north; and in Mulam, a Tai-Kadai language found south of the Yangtze.

Although not our major focus, it is obvious that sociolinguistic factors rather than structural factors that provide the impetus for the word order changes. Although some linguists consider structural similarity and functional congruence as the most important factors in cases of grammatical borrowing (e.g. Weinreich (1953)), Tsat and Oroqen seem instead to support Thomason and Kaufman’s contention (1988:35) that “it is the sociolinguistic history of the speakers, and not the structure of their language, that is the primary determinant of the linguistic outcome of language contact. Purely linguistic considerations are relevant but strictly secondary overall.” In the case of Tsat, a major impetus to wholesale restructuring has been the fluency brought about by schooling in Mandarin.

Most central to the data presented are the paths of diachronic change. Grammatically, one configurational grammatical structure is being replaced by another, construction-by-construction, with the older Chamic word order being replaced by its Mandarin equivalent. In some cases, the Mandarin-influenced construction, often marked by a transparently Mandarin grammatical morpheme, is simply a marked alternative, as with comparatives, but in other
constructions the word order of the native Chamic construction has been completely
superseded, as with the genitives. The word order changes have entered the language as
borrowed constructions, marked by a characteristic often-borrowed grammatical morpheme.
Still further influence is manifested in the overgeneralization of calques, cf. the spread of the
sa££ construction in Tsat.

The complex set of conditions responsible for the restructuring are only partly
explainable by internally and externally motivated principles proposed in the literature. A
profound understanding of the situation must take account of the dynamic changes that take
place in not only linguistic structures but in the social conditions as well. There is a range of
social factors that contribute to borrowing and structural shifts. In the case of Tsat,
encroaching bilingualism with a powerful dominant language (along with schooling and
social mobility), are among the most prominent factors that lead to the massive borrowing and
drastic structural shift.

The rapid changes taking place in these languages make it imperative that the nature
of the speech community be specified in far more detail than it is now and as quickly as
possible. We can already see that extensive language change in these particular languages
whose speaker community is constituted by bi- or multi-lingual linguistic and ethnic
minorities but the details need to be documented and the paths of change need to be
examined. A lot more work needs to be done and done quickly before the languages in
question cease to exist.

Finally, a comment on the obvious: It is the construction, rather than just its
characterizing grammatical morpheme, that is the typical unit of borrowing.
Acknowledgements

This paper is a modified version of a paper presented first at the Thirty-fourth International Conference on Sino-Tibetan Languages and Linguistics, held in Kunming, Yunnan, October 2001, at the Linguistics Society of America annual meeting, held in San Francisco, January 3-6, 2002, and at the Berkeley Linguistics Society meeting, February, 2002.

References


