Goal of this talk

To typologically & quantitatively survey one category of dependent variables in three Tibeto-Burman languages:

Contact effects (within and cross-family origins)

In light of two categories of potential factors or predictors:

Linguistic (structural) factors

Extralinguistic (socio- and spatial) factors

Which factor(s) better explain the types of effects seen in these languages?

Contact Effects: Borrowing

(1) Nepali **lexical borrowing** in Nar:

\[ \text{fów-ce cæ-te.} \]

\[ \text{apple-DEF eat-IMPERF} \]

‘They are eating apples.’

(2) Nepali **morphological borrowing** in Gurung:

\[ \text{kro plu tsŏ-era} \]

\[ \text{wheat seed sow-SEQ} \]

‘Having sown the wheat seeds...’

Contact Effects: Code-switching

(3) **Gyalsumdo/Nepali code-switching**

\[ \text{arku-ko bungur-la ter-na gai} \]

\[ \text{condensed.water pig-LOC give-SUBORD cow} \]

\[ \text{atsu lanpu-la phoko ter-na in.particular cow-LOC pig give-SUBORD} \]

‘Either giving the condensed water to the pig or the cow...’

(4) **Gurung/Nepali code-switching**

\[ \text{ani tsato kjale ba ama “njo and.then here from father mother 1.PL} \]

\[ \text{paldina paldina” ani alikati care.NEG care.NEG and.then little.bit} \]

‘Then my parents said, “No I will not take care of you, I will not take care of you”...and then a bit (after)...’
Motivations for this study

- Many studies make generalized predictions and assess the power of these based largely on individual case studies (but cf. Matras 2007, Grenoble & Whaley 1998, Mougeon et al 1985).

Preview of findings

- Despite similar contact contexts and histories with Nepali, contact-effects are unevenly distributed across the three languages examined.
- Gyalsumdo and Nar-Phu show small amounts of lexical borrowing and lexical-level code switching, but are otherwise unaffected.
- Gurung shows more intense borrowing both lexically and grammatically (with and without nativization), along with frequent lexical and clause-level code-switching.

Motivations for this study

- We work in an area of cross-family contact with varying effects across languages of two sub-groups (Tamangic & Tibetic in contact with each other, and with Indic Nepali).
- Our methods give us access to parallel data types so to explore a several factors behind these varying effects.
- We may also examine whether more vulnerable languages in the same intense contact situation can be appreciated by the same factors as viable languages.

Preview of findings

- Some structural predictions are upheld (e.g. open class >> closed class and semantic classes; using as a pathway to borrowing).
- But not all are predictions are upheld or even relevant (e.g. typological proximity; “matter/pattern” differences).
- Rather, modified extra-linguistic (sociolinguistic and spatial) factors have more explanatory power for the observed cross-linguistic differences.
The languages in this study

This study is part of a five-year project incorporating parallel data collection methods to document four Tibeto-Burman languages of the Manang District of Nepal.

- **Gurung:** > 1000 across 11 VDC’s
- **Gyalsumdo:** < 400 in 3 VDC’s
- **Nar-Phu:** < 600 combined in 2 VDC’s

Spatial distribution of the languages

www.mananglanguages.org

The data in this study

**Project data:**
- Sociolinguistic interviews (administered in-person)
- Discourse samples (variety of genres)
- Lexical and sentence elicitation (in Manang/Kathmandu)

**Data used for this study:**
- Transcribed, interlinearized discourses from the three languages;
- Both genders represented, ages range from 20’s to 60’s;
- Genres include stimuli (Pear Story, Frog Story), procedurals, demonstrations, autobiographical monologues and multi-participant conversations.

Observations: Cases

Contact effect cases observed in each language

Gurung 39%
Gyalsumdo 23%
Nar-Phu 9%

Contact effect cases observed in the corpus

Gurung 84%
Gyalsumdo 27%
Nar-Phu 9%
Observations: Type

A preliminary hypothesis

High, long-established ‘lingualism’ correlates with more extensive contact effects (cf. Field 2002; Aikhenvald 2008; Thomason 2001).

BUT

All three languages have had roughly the same degree and timeline of contact with Nepali.

Every person with whom we have worked is (minimally) bilingual in their mother-tongue and Nepali.

A modified hypothesis

The proximity of language communities to Nepali-centric business and educational infrastructures (‘public’) correlates with more extensive contact effects.

In interviews with speakers who also provided texts, 3/6 Gurung, 1/2 Gyalsumdo and the Nar-Phu speaker all report reliance upon Nepali in public contexts, while the rest report mother tongue use.

Since language practices in public contexts do not correlate neatly with the divergent contact consequences across the languages, which factors do?

Linguistic structural factors: PoS

Part of speech:
Open class items (nouns, verbs, property concepts) are borrowable more so, or are borrowed before closed class items (discourse markers, particles, etc.).
Linguistic structural factors: Loan type

Open-class loans for Gyalsumdo & Nar-Phu reflect technological/cultural gaps more so than for Gurung.

**Gurung:**
- gana < Nep. ghan ‘hammer’;
- gadži < Nep. ‘jeep’;
- tsappal < Nep. cappal ‘sandal’;
- besi < Nep. ‘valley’;
- khola < Nep. ‘river’;
- dziro < Eng. ‘zero’;
- iskul < Nep./Eng. ‘school’;
- mastar < Nep./Eng. ‘teacher’

**Gyalsumdo:**
- ṭuris < Eng. ‘tourist’;
- tha ~ thaliṅ < Nep. thaali ‘plate’;
- bjan < Eng. ‘bank’;
- riphudzi < Eng. ‘refugee’;
- hotel < Eng.

**Nar-Phu:**
- jow < Nep. syau ‘apple’;
- rumal < Nep. rumal ‘hanky’;
- saikul < Eng. ‘cycle’

Linguistic structural factors

- Pattern Borrowing is a gateway to matter borrowing (cf. Matras & Sakel eds. 2007).
- This is difficult to survey in this sample.
- Gyalsumdo shows a slightly greater propensity to alter Nepali loaned open-class items to fit its segment & phonotactic profile, but not significantly so.

bjan < ‘bank’; thaliṅ ~ tha < thaali ‘plate’

kamani < ‘company’; ṭuris < ‘tourist’

Linguistic structural factors: Pattern

- Hildebrandt (2012): In Gurung, the acoustics of tone are decidedly Tamangic in their specific correlates (vs. Indic)—this appears to be a pattern effect from Manange.
- This also makes Manang Gurung different from other varieties of Gurung in this dimension.
- But this happens without any other clear contact effects in Gurung from other Tamangic languages in the region.
Extra-linguistic factors: Gender

Gender:
Men operate and interact more in the public sphere in Manang, so their discourse may reflect more contact effects.

Extra-linguistic factors: Genre

Genre:
Discourses involving community-external reference, or acknowledgement of an external audience will index this (more so) with elements from external sources.

Extra-linguistic factors: Attitudes

- Language attitudes correlate with degree of contact effects (‘acceptance’ facilitates lexical & grammatical effects).
- No interviewee is hostile towards the rising presence of Nepali.
- We have one survey question regarding respondent feelings about Nepali monolingualism in official environments.
- We have another question regarding the perceived value of M-T for cultural affiliation.
Extra-linguistic factors: Spatial factors

- A spatial variable appears to be an important factor contributing to these effects.
- Locational stability of language community correlates with increased contact effects (based on question V.B. 5 in our questionnaire).
- This is inspired by work from Mougeon et al (1985), Munshi (2010), Stanford (2012).

Extra-linguistic factors: Emigration

- Gyalsumdo and Nar-Phu report a heavier impact of: emigration to lower Manang/Kathmandu (and abroad) for employment, boarding schools outside of Manang, acquisition of Tibetan refugee I.D.’s for international relocation, etc.
- This affects younger generations, leaving (primarily) older populations in traditional communities
- This may account for the overall lack of Indic contact effects & counter examples to particular hypotheses

Interview excerpt from Gyalsumdo male

**Question V.B.5**
“In your opinion, will there still be children speaking Gyalsumdo in 10-15 years from now?”

“At this time, if Gyalsumdo children remain here, they must speak Gyalsumdo, even if they are not perfectly fluent. If they leave, they will speak whatever language they like, English or Nepali…”

Discussion

- Gurung shows the most intense contact effects and the most conformity to structural predictions.
- Gurung is also slightly more likely to tolerate Nepali phonological patterns in loaned and switched material.
- But extra-linguistic predictions are also equally important given the observed variation.
- One socio-spatial factor that does account for the Gurung vs. Gyalsumdo/Nar-Phu difference is locational stability.
Discussion

- Campbell & Muntzell (1992) distinguish between ‘sudden death’ vs. ‘radical death’ vs. ‘gradual death’.
- ‘Radical death’: rapid loss of speaker population, typically in an environment of political and cultural oppression; it occurs without obvious compromise to lexico-grammatical system.
  - Pipil & Lenca in El Salvador (Elmendorf 1981)
  - E. Sutherland Gaelic (Dorian 1982)

- Gyalsumdo and Nar-Phu are at a stage somewhere between the ‘radical’ and ‘gradual’ death continuum.
- These languages do not face extreme political/cultural pressures seen in other cases, and they may not die within the next single generation, but the dearth of younger speakers combined with shrinking local populations makes for a unique scenario of shift.
- The lack of interference from Nepali, combined with the restricted structural/semantic domains impacted in these systems is symbolic of their hybrid status.
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