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Introduction

Katuic is one language group under the Mon-Khmer language branch of the Austroasiatic family of languages. According to the Ethnologue (Lewis 2009) there are 147 Mon-Khmer languages. The other Mon-Khmer sub-families or linguistic clusters include Aslian, Bahnaric, Khasian, Khmuic, Pearic, Monic, Nicobar, Palaungic, and Viet-Muong, most of which are located in Mainland Southeast Asia. Figure 1 shows the location of Katuic languages.

Figure 1: Katuic languages of Mainland Southeast Asia
Katuic bibliography with selected annotations

Figure 2 shows the linguistic clusters in Mon-Khmer without showing some of the intermediate levels given in the Ethnologue (Lewis 2009) such as Eastern Mon-Khmer and Northern Mon-Khmer. The classification of some Mon-Khmer languages (including Mang) is not yet clear, and are not included in this bibliography.

Figure 2: Mon-Khmer language clusters of Mainland Southeast Asia

The classification of Mon-Khmer languages (even Katuic for that matter) is still debatable among scholars. A more detailed classification of Mon-Khmer languages is provided by Diffloth (2005) in Figure 3.

Figure 3: Classification of Austroasiatic languages according to Diffloth (2005)
The names for the Katuic languages in this bibliography are based on the Ethnologue (Lewis 2009). This Katuic annotated bibliography lists only materials and literature covering aspects of language, sociolinguistics, ethnography, culture, and anthropology.

The majority of references included here are based on a previous publication, the Katuic Bibliography (Choo 2009) which drew much of its information from the Southeast Asian Linguistics Archives (SALA) database. References that only contain partial fields of information in the SALA database were completed with searches from the internet and other resources; otherwise they were omitted (e.g. references with only titles and authors or without publishing information). One other source was Sidwell's 2008 working list. Arun Ghosh's work Bibliotheca Austroasiatica (Ghosh 1988) was also consulted in producing this bibliography.

The purpose of this annotated bibliography project is to assist researchers interested in Katuic languages. It is hoped that the compilation of annotated Katuic literature here will facilitate research into this language family by informing interested researchers of the available types of literature on Katuic and helping them make informed decisions on which readings would be useful to their work. This annotated bibliography is part of a broader effort to define the sociolinguistic situation in Mainland Southeast Asia.

Citations are listed alphabetically according to author names. The references are formatted closely to LSA (Linguistic Society of America) standards, but with slight modifications and additions when appropriate (Smith 2009). The bibliography format includes the language(s) discussed in the literature as a short sentence (or paragraph) following the reference. This could be as specific as a dialect (e.g. High Katu, Low Katu), or as broad as a language family (e.g. Austroasiatic, Tibeto-Burman). Two paragraphs of not more than 150 words make up the annotation that follows.

The first paragraph gives an overview of the referenced literature. The second paragraph may elaborate further on the paper's content, or may contain general points of linguistic or sociolinguistic interest. The use of italics in paragraphs indicates wordings that are direct quotations from the reference.

This compilation is very much a working document, and should not be considered a finished work. Most of the annotations (~60%) were selected based on the compiler's own research as a language surveyor. The remaining bulk of the readings were selected based on the previously published Katuic Bibliography (Choo 2009), in which only those references listed with URLs have been included in this paper. Some other references have been added based on their availability in the David Thomas library (Chiang Mai), the Payap University library, the Survey Unit library of the Linguistics Institute, and free online resources (e.g. SALA).

1 Full fields of information are what would be cited as a full bibliographic reference according to the Linguistic Society of America (LSA). Exceptions with regards to authors (“anonymous”) and year of publishing (“undated”) are made if these materials are cited by other researchers as main topics of reading for Katuic.
It should be noted that the annotations in this document are from English text materials. In some cases where the materials were non-English, the annotations were based off an English translation for portions of the literature, usually a one-page abstract or introduction. Due to the author's language limitations, some non-English literature on Katuic languages have not been read nor included in this list of annotations. Nevertheless, for the benefit of the reader, some of the more notable non-English text Katuic literature is listed in the appendix section of this document.

It is expected and hoped that annotations to Katuic literature will continue to be added to this bibliography. Please send references or queries to the following email address: marcus_choo@sil.org or SurveyCoord_MSEA@sil.org.
Abbreviations

ICAL      International Conference on Austroasiatic Linguistics
ICSTLL    International Conference on Sino-Tibetan Languages and Linguistics
ISLL      International Symposium on Language and Linguistics
LTBA      Linguistics of the Tibeto-Burman Area
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**Katuic bibliography: selected annotations**


Language(s): Mon-Khmer, Angku, Palaungic, Khasi, Monic, Khmer, Khmuic, Katuic, Bahnaric, Viet-Muong.

This paper compares human classifiers in Mon-Khmer languages. Descriptions of human classifiers in Mon-Khmer languages are provided. Two systems are suggested: elaborated (i.e. more than one classifier for human) and general. The paper then discusses the elaborated systems, examining different categories of classifiers. Adams concludes that while Mon-Khmer human classifiers differ widely lexically, the patterns indicate most classifier systems entail meanings referring to humans or something equivalent, e.g. “person”.

All Mon-Khmer languages have separate classifiers for humans except Angku, which has only one classifier system for humans and animals. Categories in elaborated systems vary. Palaungic, Khmer, and Mon are based on religion (e.g. monks) and politics (e.g. kings); Bahnar, Rongao: animateness, value (e.g. slaves), and size; Vietnamese, Muong: kinship and hierarchy (e.g. age). Many Mon-Khmer classifiers seem to be borrowings. Adams discusses changes in the classifier lexicon due to socio-political changes, e.g. Khmer pre-revolution vs. Khmer Rouge period.


Language(s): Mon-Khmer, Pacoh, Khasi, Sre, Temiar, Ruc, Khmer, Mlabri, Palaung, Chrau, Khmu, Bru, Katu, Bahnar, Jeh, Mon.

This paper compares causative verbs in 20 Mon-Khmer languages, looking specifically for patterns in their syntax and sentence structures. The analysis describes causative verbs according a matrix of categories (defining the type of phrase, e.g. transitive, intransitive, transitive locative, etc.) and complements (e.g. patient, agent, locative, means, etc.). Alves raises the question of reexamining language groupings and subgroupings based on the patterns of syntax observed in causative verbs.

Ten categories are identified from the data, together with five complements. Includes a brief section comparing the semantic and phonological patterns of causative verbs. Concludes that the locative causative category is common among the East Mon-Khmer languages (Bahnaric, Katuic, Vietic) while transitive and correspondent causatives are common across all Mon-Khmer languages.
Katuic bibliography with selected annotations

Language(s): Ruc, Vietnamese, Mon-Khmer, Chinese.

From abstract: “This report examines the linguistic genetic connections between Vietnamese and... Mon-Khmer... by looking at Ruc... This report is intended to build on previous work to help strengthen the contention that Vietnamese is a Mon-Khmer language”. This paper presents evidence based on phonological, morphological, lexical, and syntactic analysis of Ruc, showing similarities and traits with Vietnamese and Mon-Khmer languages. Proposes that Ruc provides a glimpse into the transition undertaken by Vietnamese from its Mon-Khmer origins to its current state.

Isolation has helped preserve particular features in Ruc. Ruc is lexically and phonologically similar to Vietnamese (e.g. tone system, 50% cognate percentage), but displays syllable structure and morphology akin to Mon-Khmer (e.g. sesquisyllabic, similar derivational affixes).

Language(s): Vietic, Katuic, Vietnamese, Ruc, Thavung, Mon, Mon-Khmer, Pacoh, Palaung, Wa, Bahnaric, Sengoi, Tai-Kadai.

This paper investigates the linguistic relationship between Vietic and Katuic by examining lexical items in both languages. 280 items from Austroasiatic-based languages were analyzed, revealing 40 items likely to be Vieto-Katuic cognates. The article contains a short paragraph citing phonological evidence for a Vieto-Katuic subgroup (e.g. certain features preserved in Katuic and Vietic, but changed in Bahnaric). Alves suggests possible etymological layers between Austroasiatic and Vietic, which he shows in 100 sample words at the end of the paper.

Etymological layers are suggested at Northern and Eastern Mon-Khmer, Eastern Mon-Khmer, Bahnaro-Vieto-Katuic, and Vieto-Katuic. The division of these etymological layers is supported by the increasing specialization of meanings in the word list items, e.g. earlier “Austroasiatic” items more generic such as “arm/hand”, “bird” and become narrower in definition further down the word list (e.g. “armpit”, “crow, duck” in various subgroups).
Katuic bibliography with selected annotations


Language(s): Pacoh.

From abstract: “Pacoh is a member of the Katuic group of the Mon-Khmer language family. It is spoken by about 10,000 people in the central highlands of Vietnam. The language is currently undergoing substantial change under the influence of Vietnamese. Pacoh shares many typological characteristics in common with other Mon-Khmer languages including a topic-comment style of basic SVO syntax. It is a classifier language with noun-modifier word order. The major word formation processes are prefixation with “presyllables” (deriving such things as causative verbs), infixation (deriving nouns from verbs, for example) and reduplication. In common with many other Mon-Khmer languages, Pacoh has a sesquisyllabic word structure in which presyllables are unstressed, and vowel phonemes show a distinction in register. This book describes the major features of Pacoh grammar and also contains a glossary of Pacoh words”.


Language(s): Pacoh, Katu, Bru, Taoih, Ruc, Palaung, Khasi.

From introduction: “The Pacoh pronoun system is exceptional... having morphologically distinct case-marked sets... serving a number of semantico-syntactic functions beyond their capacity as pronouns... this study... show (sic) these paths of grammaticalization and how they represent a number of linguistic processes in the syntactic evolution of lexical material”. Alves shows four examples of gradual changes in the semantico-syntactic functions of Pacoh pronouns (e.g. 3rd person dative and possessive → relator nouns, 3rd person plural pronoun → quantifier, and pronoun → conjunction).

Grammaticalization involves a semantic shift leading to the speakers' lack of awareness of the original forms. Similar grammaticalization is also found in other Mon-Khmer languages (Katu, Bru, Taoïh, etc.). Alves suggests that grammatical innovativeness is guided by syntactic constraints and posits three reasons for grammaticalization: “connecting of phonological materials, reanalysis of juxtaposed elements, and language contact (to fit certain grammatical functions not found before)”.

9

Language(s): Lavue, Moken, Urak Lawoi', Mon, Khmu, So.

From abstract: “This paper presents a result of a measurement of fundamental frequency (F₀) of vowels influenced by glottal finals in 6 different SEA languages... (Lavue, Moken, Urai Lawoi',... Mon, Khmu, So) to see if the F₀ behavior will support “tonogenesis theory” or not... The findings from this study seem to enhance the existence of a “register language – stage” before a “tonal language – stage” in tonal development related sequences”.


Language(s): Khmer, Old Mon, Mon-Khmer.

From preliminary remark: “... I wish to argue that the earlier reflex of modern Khmer /bVN-/ is a compound prefix, consisting of proto-Khmer *p- for the causative... and a nasal infix -N- for the frequentative”. Bauer analyzes the morphology of selected lexical items in Old Mon and Old-Middle-Modern Khmer, attempting to establish /p-/ and /-N-/ morphology as functionally distinct. Posits the /-N-/ infix in Khmer as a borrowing from Old Mon.

This paper contains a list showing commonalities in affixes, particles, and clitics between Mon and Khmer. States that Mon and Khmer have historically been in linguistic contact for a long time. Modern Khmer affixes seem to have evolved into three forms (/p-/, /CvN-/, /-m-/). Bauer argues that Khmer borrowed the nasal infix from Mon, because /-N-/ remains a productive and segmentable unit in Mon, and is contrastingly opaque in Khmer.


Language(s): Austroasiatic, Austronesian, Bahnar, Danaw, Guto, Indonesian, Juang, Kharia, Khmer, Khasi, Kurku, Mon, Mon-Khmer, Mundari, Miao-Yao, Micronesian, Palaung, Riang, Santali, Brou, Kantu, Kuy.
From introduction: “... we shall emphasize in this paper a comparison of phonological systems and of lexical forms. The basic question to be answered can be formulated as follows: in addition to the congruency in over-all configuration, which might be ascribed to areal factors, do Austro-Thai and Austroasiatic share a common corpus of roots from core vocabulary, sufficient to justify a conclusion that these two superstocks are genetically related, or are the lexical agreements that exist of a lesser order, to be explained in terms of borrowing/substratum or the like”.


Language(s): Vietnamese, Cham, Austronesian, Tay, Thai, Ksing Mul, Khmuic, Pacôh, Katuic, Mnong, Bahnaric.

This paper explores the linguistic relationships between the different languages in Vietnam, focusing on the convergence effects of language contact. Similarities are shown in six speech varieties from different language families (Vietnamese, Cham, Tay, Ksing Mul, Pacôh, Mnong), which include: orientational/directional, negative and causative constructions, and relator nouns. The data seems to show that language contact encourages sharing of features (that would otherwise be absent) across languages, resulting in a linguistic convergence among languages from different families.

Bui suggests that contact with other ethnic groups necessitates linguistic exchange, i.e. imitating/adapting speech patterns, learning other languages. Hence, language contact contributes to “modifications and changes of original form”. He provides a list of general features found in languages in Vietnam: change in stress position, reduction to monosyllables, development of consonant clusters, phonological changes, and tonogenesis (tone developing from register features). In summary: a paper on areal linguistics in Vietnam.


Language(s): Kui (Kuai, Suai), Katuic.
Katuic bibliography with selected annotations

From abstract: “This paper discusses the functions of kaʔ in oral Kui narrative in terms of the bipartite structure of discourse information, i.e. story line vs. non-story line. When kaʔ functions as a story line marker it marks four types of relationships: temporal sequence, consequence, change of orientation, and simultaneous events. Within non-story line information kaʔ functions as a conditional connector or adversative connector. It also functions to mark conclusion and formulaic finis or sequential nonevents”.

The data for this discussion comes from three narrative texts collected from a native Kui speaker from Khuton village, Surin province in Thailand. The story line types of discourse show more frequent use of kaʔ than non-story line types. The author suggests that the function of kaʔ is similar to that of kaʔ in Thai.


Language(s): Kui.

This paper presents an analysis of repetition in Kui narratives based on four narrative texts taken from Khuton village, Surin province in Thailand. Kui narrative repetition occurs in seven forms: verbatim, reduction, expansion, synonyms, cycles, pro-verbs, and negated antonyms. These forms perform various discourse functions: as linkages, previews, repeated attempts, rhetorical emphasis, contra-expectation, amplification, and summary. Each form and function is discussed and explained, with appropriate examples from sample texts.

Certain languages, such as Kui, employ repetition (a natural feature of the language) often to spread out the information load.


Language(s): Vietic, Katuic, Atel, Maleng, Ahoe, Cheut, Kri, Phong, Brou (Bru, So, Truk), Thaveung, Sek.

This document contains statistical data and people group profiles of the villages affected by the Nam Theun 2 reservoir project. The statistical data include population, ethnicities, languages, and livelihood information such as “average cash income”, “types of land use”, “crop production” etc.
The information is divided into two parts. Part 1 refers to villages directly in the reservoir project area, while part 2 refers to villages in the NBCA (National Biodiversity Conservation Area). The document contains wordlists that were used to differentiate between ethnic groups. There are 17 villages in the Reservoir area, and another 12 in the NBCA. Village profiles include information about the history, demographics, livelihood systems and activities, education status, and inter-village relationships.


Language(s): Lao, Tai-Kadai, Mon-Khmer, Khmu (Khmou), Hmong, Katu, Iu Mien (Yao), Kim Moun (Lantne), Lahu Na (Black Lahu), Black Tai, Red Tai, White Tai, Tai Theng, Ho Chinese (Yunnanese), Pboy Noy, Akha, Hmong-Mien, Vietnamese, Brou, Tri, Chalouy, Makong, Ta Oy, Katang, Nkriang (Ng), Trieng, Dak Cheung, Jru (Loven), Bahnaric, Nha Heun, Alak, Brao, Oy, Cheng, Moey, Yay (Nhang), Sek, Na, Lue, Thai, Phouan, Nyo, Thai Neua.

This paper discusses the national language policy and planning situation in Lao PDR, looking at the role of the national language and the country's linguistic diversity. Chamberlain opines that efforts to increase Lao use and improve literacy are unsuccessful, due to ineffectual education methods and language strategies which disregard cultural and sociolinguistic realities among ethnic minorities. Chamberlain expresses concern about the development of Lao, and discusses the extent of language use, Thai influence, and production of sufficient Lao reading materials. Chamberlain argues that current practices and methods are ineffective, and in fact are working against the very goals intended by the nation's language policies and plans.

Chamberlain describes some of the history leading up to the current language policies and language situation for some minority groups. In some areas, minority languages are used rather than Lao as the lingua franca. Language barriers (e.g. inability to communicate) exist throughout the country.


Language(s): Tai-Kadai, Hmong-Mien (Miao-Yao), Austroasiatic, Tibeto-Burman.

This document is a report on the indigenous people groups of Lao PDR. Included here are classifications of the different people groups, people profiles, inter-ethnic relationships, livelihood, and education levels.
People groups are classified ethnolinguistically. Chamberlain et al. state that the relationship between ethnic minorities and the majority Lao is good. The authors state that more research is needed on the indigenous peoples. Education levels among ethnic minorities is generally low. Very few ethnic minority women are educated. The authors advocate developing materials in ethnic minority mother tongues in conjunction with improving education advancement.


Language(s): Tai, Austroasiatic, Miao-Yao, Tibeto-Burman

From foreword: “The objective of this work is to introduce the reader to the rural ethnological and agro-socio-economic diversities of the rural areas of Laos. The research intends to show that human and rural development do not only result from rural development policy and national socio-economic development strategy, but are a process in which historical background, tradition, religion, farming system and territory management are parts of the development compromise”.

The division of chapters is by larger language families: Tai, Austroasiatic, Miao-Yao, and Tibeto-Burman. Each chapter discusses in detail their locations, languages spoken, lifestyle characteristics, livelihood, traditions, cultural practices, etc. Each chapter ends with a list of individual ethnic groups and a brief summary of their respective people profiles.


Language(s): So.

This document reports on a sociolinguistic survey of So in Northeastern Thailand. Word lists and sociolinguistic questionnaires were collected in five villages. The purpose of this survey was to determine the need for language development among So speakers in this region.

The So variety in Photi Phaisan was selected as the reference variety when eliciting information on attitudes about a prestige dialect. In general, most So locations seem to be maintaining their language and don't appear to have any trouble understanding or negative attitudes toward the Photi Phaisan variety.


This paper champions the idea of a dictionary database, which would contain a lexic on of the world's languages. The Intercontinental Dictionary Series project aims to “be an electronic database representing the entire range of human languages... bring(ing) together information on the languages of the world published in... different languages and scripts...”. Reference to Austroasiatic and Tai-Kadai is about how they should be included in the dictionary project. Presents a list of individual languages in Austroasiatic and Tai-Kadai (drawn from language experts), suggested as the varieties to be included in this project.

The appendix is a 1440-item word list (some added to the original list by C. D. Buck in 1949) for the collection of Austroasiatic and Tai-Kadai languages, presumably suggesting a measure of cultural appropriateness in this list. The list of languages is not exhaustive, consisting of varieties which this project considers most likely to be further researched.


Language(s): Austroasiatic, Mon-Khmer.

This 3 page document contains a list of published papers, articles, and other materials that were written by H. L. Shorto.

There are 23 publications in this list, the earliest from 1956. The last was published in 1990.


Language(s): Katu (Laos), Katu (Vietnam), Lao.
This paper shows how Katu (Lao and Vietnamese dialects) is written using Lao script, discussing in detail some of the problems. These problems deal with Katu linguistic features that are absent in Lao, e.g. syllabic nasals (Vietnam dialect), presyllables, and pre-/post-glottalization. The authors explain how these complications were handled to arrive at their proposed Katu orthography.

There are slight phonetic differences between the Katu dialects spoken in Laos and Vietnam. Vocabulary plays a more significant role in distinguishing between these dialects. Katu has four consonants and two vowels which do not match any sound in the Lao alphabet. It is noteworthy that choices to represent these phoneme-grapheme mismatches involve the readers' feelings and attitudes as much as any “scientific solution”. The paper contains generous word examples to illustrate the orthography choices made.


Language(s): Katu.

This paper describes affixes in the Katu variety spoken in Quang Nam and Quang Tin provinces, Vietnam, looking at their various forms and functions in verbs (the most common), adjectives, adverbs, nouns, and numbers. The various allomorphs for Katu affixes are also discussed. Prefix functions are differentiated by their structural differences and distribution in a sentence (some functions have similar forms). The paper contains many example words and phrases to illustrate the descriptions.

Katu has infixes and prefixes with the following main functions: as nominalizers, causatives, reciprocals, and expressing involuntariness. Prefixes can be combined to provide a sum of their individual functions/meanings into a phrase, e.g. compounding the causative and reciprocal prefixes provides a combined reciprocal causative function.


Language(s): Katu, High Katu, Low Katu.

This paper describes the Katu noun phrase. Descriptions apply to both Katu dialects (Low and High). The general tagmemic formula for Katu is presented and each tagmemic slot is described in detail i.e. what kinds of fillers may be used in each slot, syntactic structures and patterns etc. Examples sentences illustrate the analysis throughout the paper.

The Low Katu dialect is spoken in coastal Vietnam. High Katu is spoken in the highlands bordering Laos and Vietnam. Repetitions may occur for counters, numerals, classifiers, locatives, and modifiers; usually for emphasis.
Language(s): Katu (Laos).

This paper describes affixes in the Katu variety spoken in Lao PDR (Katu-L), which differs from the Vietnamese variety (Katu-VN). The article starts with an introduction of Katu-L syllable patterns, focusing on presyllables. Descriptions are based on inflectional meanings (e.g. causatives, reciprocals, nominalizers, verbalizers) and affix types (e.g. prefix, infix) and their forms. Each affix type is illustrated with examples showing word root and their affixed forms.

Differences between Katu-L and Katu-VN are stated (e.g. Katu-L does not compound prefixes into combinations, Katu-L words have two syllables at most, etc.). Includes a romanized transcription of Katu-L phones. Causative affixes are found on intransitive, transitive, and stative verbs. Katu-L affixes may take multiple forms for just one inflection (e.g. causatives appear as /pa-/, /pi-/, /ka-/ etc.). Costello notes cases where these inflections are also applied to borrowed terms.

Language(s): Mon-Khmer.

This two-page article shares several myths that are believed to be the source of the idiomatic expressions “fire” (meaning dominance) and “water” (meaning compliance) in Mon-Khmer culture.

The spirit of compliance appears to be the favored attitude. The stories seem to indicate that life characterized by “dominance” elements generally conclude negatively, i.e. confrontation, difficulties, catastrophe, wars, etc. Hence “compliance” is preferred to “dominance” in the Mon-Khmer worldview.

Language(s): Katu (Vietnam), Katu (Laos), Katuic.

This paper compares two Katu varieties from Vietnam and Laos, showing differences in the structure of prepositional phrases. Much of the paper consists of examples from Katu texts which show these differences.
Prepositional phrases and prepositions are common, although not compulsory, in the Vietnamese dialect of Katu. In contrast, the Laos dialect of Katu rarely uses prepositions. Also discussed is the use of relative pronouns: Vietnamese Katu has them, but Lao Katu does not.


Language(s): Katu (Laos).

This paper describes aspect and tense features in affixes of the Katu variety spoken in Lao PDR (Katu-L). Three types of tense and aspect markers are discussed: perfective aspect on verbs (subdivided into past and present), imperfective aspect on verbs, and completive aspect in nouns (also with sub-categories in past and present). Each section lists example words showing tense and aspect affixation according to type, comparing meanings between the root and their affixed forms.

The Katu variety in Lao PDR is spoken in Kalum district in Xe Kong province (also in Salavan province). Aspect prefixes in verbs are common in transitive type verbs, but are also attested in stative types. The imperfective aspect marker occurs in a variety of forms – at least 14 are attested in the data. Completive aspect features in nouns appear as prefixes, and seem related to the verbalization prefix in nouns.


Language(s): Brou (Mangkong, Tri), Phu Thai.

This report documents an anthropological survey of six villages (four Mangkong, one Tri, and one Phu Thai), to provide ethnological and socio-cultural information that support development projects for the Brou people. The contents include a historical background, Brou customs & practices, socio-economic data (e.g. wealth patterns, agricultural & livestock practices), natural resource management (e.g. forest products), and socio-cultural practices (e.g. health beliefs, gender roles, and education).

Daviau includes a rather detailed ethnography on the Brou, particularly the group's history, belief systems, socio-economic practices, customs, and traditions. This study affirms the belief that language (mother tongue) plays an important role in improving one's lifestyle (e.g. communicating health messages, education, culture preservation). Daviau also promotes the use of Brou in formal education.
Mon-Khmer Studies (MKS) 6: 39-57. 
Language(s): Mon-Khmer, Austronesian, Tai-Kadai, Miao-Yao, Palaungic, Aslian, 
Vü, Amok, Angku, Danaw, Lawa, Khamet (Lamet), Semai, Senoi, Jah Hut, Semelai, 
Temiar. 

This paper critiques a previous work by Benedict proposing an intermediate language substratum in Austro-Thai that is now extinct. Diffloth draws on Mitani's recent research in three Lawa varieties (Bo Luang, Umphai, and Ban Phae) and one Khamet/Lamet variety, using these to reconstruct a Proto-Palaungic phonology which he compares with Benedict's reconstruction. Differences are then discussed as evidence to his conclusion that “the proposed defunct substratumized Austro-Thai is not likely to have... existed”. 

Diffloth says Palaungic is characterized by “a gradual but eventually drastic reduction in the initial part of roots”. Apparently, Proto-Mon-Khmer had “rich morphology and disyllabic... roots”, which were reduced in modern Palaungic. He cites a phonological innovation (“flip flop” correspondence) where distinctions of two equal and opposite forms are swapped with each other, i.e. voiced → voiceless; voiceless → voiced). Includes a diagram illustrating the phonological innovation process in Palaungic languages.

Language(s): Khasi, Sre, Semai, Mon-Khmer. 

This paper analyzes expressives in three Mon-Khmer languages: Khasi, Sre, and Semai, arguing that expressives are linked to the notion of iconicity (i.e. word meanings are closely bound to their forms). Diffloth “draw(s) attention to certain easily observable phonological peculiarities of Mon-Khmer expressives [sic]”. He suggests expressives have a distinct phonology from the basic phonology of a language. Diffloth attempts to explain these differences as evidence for iconicity. He shows examples of different expressives, but with a particular morphology (or form), as possessing a connection in meaning (i.e. tying form to meaning, hence an “iconic value”). 

Reduplication appears a common morphological property in expressive phonology. Some interesting inference to iconicity in expressive phonology include: Khasi expressives with final [-k] encompassing a semantic idea of an “abrupt or forceful ending”, and Sre expressives with [w- -w] conveying the sense of “free, unobstructed movement”!
Language(s): Austric, Austroasiatic, Austronesian.

This paper argues the case for an Austric linguistic group (dismissed by Benedict in 1975) comprising Austronesian and Austroasiatic/ Mon-Khmer languages. Diffloth refutes Benedict's position in dismissing words (for lexical comparison) that do not fall into a preconceived idea of being “basic”. Proceeds to examine two etymologies (wood and bone), comparing their proto-forms for Austronesian and Austroasiatic, concluding that their similarities suggest a relationship between Austronesian and Austroasiatic that supports the Austric hypothesis.

Diffloth challenges Benedict's opinion of needing a “basic” word list for comparative analysis, referring to sociolinguistic situations where languages and words change or may even be replaced. Diffloth opines that “basic” words are more susceptible to change, even borrowing, because of more frequent use. Uncommon/ peculiar or taboo words which entail more specific meanings and are less used (hence less “basic”) tend to retain their original forms and are more appropriate for reconstruction.


Language(s): Austroasiatic, Mon-Khmer, Katuic, Pearic, Vietic, Talan, Ong, Pacoh, Chong, Vietnamese.

This paper suggests that Proto-Austroasiatic vowels may have contained “a two-way contrast between creaky... and clear voice”, independent of the register contrasts that evolved from devoicing of initial consonants. Three data sets are examined: Katuic (Talan, Ong), Pearic (Chong), and Vietic (Vietnamese). Diffloth shows how certain features in each language, which were thought of as related to registers originating from devoicing in initial consonants, may actually have been inherent features already present in that particular proto-language, possibly even at the Proto-Austroasiatic level.

Features examined in each language are: creakiness (Talan), glottalization (Talan and Chong), and tone (Vietnamese). Diffloth shows that the occurrence of these features do not correlate perfectly with the register features from initial consonant devoicing, offering this as evidence that a two-way contrast in vowels was already present in the proto-language. He concedes that more research is needed to substantiate his theory at the Proto-Austroasiatic level.
Linguistics of the Tibeto-Burman Area (LTBA) 16:1. 1-43. 

Language(s): Munda, Mon-Khmer.

This paper discusses the opposite typological traits between Munda and Mon-Khmer, 
pointing to the difference in rising and falling accents in either languages as the 
reason for their polar opposite characteristics. In particular, examines the differences 
in vowel phonologies between Munda and Mon-Khmer, explaining their respective 
changes (e.g. vowel harmony, vowel reduction, diphthongization, etc.) according to 
their stress and mora-timed syllable characteristics and also comparing with other 
stress and mora-timed languages.

Introduces language typologies according to specific features, e.g. head-dependant 
languages typically exhibit rising accent and prefixes (some infixes), dependant-head 
types have falling accents and suffixes. Explains words by syllabic rhythms defined 
as moras, beats, and measures (2 moras = 1 beat, 2 beats = 1 measure). Proposes that 
all languages try to map every word into one beat, demonstrated through syllable 
lengthening/ shortening. Includes the vowel phonologies for various Austroasiatic 
languages (e.g. Munda, Sora, Bru, Hre).

Dryer, Matthew S. 2001. Mon-Khmer word-order from a cross-linguistic perspective. 
Papers from the 6th annual meeting of the Southeast Asian Linguistics Society 
(SEALS) 1996, ed. by Karen L. Adams and Thomas J. Hudak, 83-99. Tempe, 
Arizona: Program for Southeast Asian Studies, Arizona State University. 

Language(s): Mon-Khmer.

This paper examines word order characteristics in some Mon-Khmer languages, 
arguing that these characteristics do not necessarily determine if a language is of VO/ 
OV (or head initial vs. final) typology. Dryer lists many examples of word order (e.g. 
noun→adjective, noun→demonstrative, adjective→intensifier) in Mon-Khmer 
languages, asserting that exceptions in these examples prove that languages cannot be 
generalized as head-initial or head-final via a set of predetermined universals. Dryer 
says that these exceptions are simply inexplicable random phenomena in languages.

Some parts appear unclear: Dryer (pg. 85) seems to say VO languages do not 
typically exhibit noun-adjective order (questionable?), yet he later writes (pg. 92) that 
noun-adjective order characteristics “are simply typical of VO languages”. He 
demonstrates with language data from other geographic locations that 
head→modifier order and VO/OV language typologies show no correlation. This 
article contains a table showing most Mon-Khmer languages display noun-adjective, 
noun-demonstrative, and noun-genitive order.
Katuic bibliography with selected annotations


Language(s): Tai-Kadai, Mon-Khmer, Sino-Tibetan, Hmong-Mien, Austronesian.

This paper discusses areal linguistics in Mainland Southeast Asia (MSEA). MSEA is introduced as having a rich history of language contact, resulting in many linguistic features being shared between genealogically distinct languages. Enfield argues for a paradigm shift from the study of “linguistic areas” to “areal linguistics”. He believes that all language change is a “process of social diffusion”, regardless of the process happening through inheritance or diffusion. Enfield believes only two variables need be considered when studying language change: the speakers and the linguistic items of a language.

One aspect of MSEA sociolinguistics is characterized by “widespread language loss in favor of major languages like Lao and Siamese”. Enfield includes some discussion on typological features common to MSEA e.g. large phoneme systems, tonal and register features, numeral classifier systems etc. He cites an example of tonogenesis through the intermediate process of phonetics and phonation change.


Language(s): Tai, Mon-Khmer (Bahnaric, Katuic, Vietic, Khmuic, Palaungic), Hmong-Mien (Hmongic, Mienic), Tibeto-Burman (Lolo-Burmese), Thémarou, Tariang (Talieng), Khmu, Lao, Ngkriang (Ngeq), Hmong, Thai, Vietnamese, French.

This short article gives an overview of the languages in Laos. Following a brief section on the historical background of the language situation in Laos, the article engages the sociolinguistic issues in the country and concludes with some bibliographic citations of previous linguistic research on languages of Laos.

Laos has a high degree of linguistic diversity, with four different “genetic” language families and between 70 to 120 distinct speech varieties in the country. The sociolinguistic issues in Laos involve intense language contact, a rapid shift toward the national language Lao, and multilingualism. Enfield laments the lack of comparative research on languages in Laos.


22
This paper discusses what is lost when a language dies. Minority languages are especially vulnerable to language death. Languages can be viewed as archives, which if extinct will result in irretrievable loss of valuable information to cultures and humanity. Therefore Enfield urges language documentation, especially those of minority groups. Laos is presented as a case study. Examples of languages being information archives are taken from the languages found here. The paper concludes with some discussion on the reasons for lack of research and documentation.

Enfield cites studies suggesting minority languages are lost for socio-economic gains. He considers languages as archives where linguistic items and structures contain information, express concepts and world views, and encode ethnographic information (i.e. culture). Still much can be learned and discovered about languages in Laos. Enfield questions the accuracy of the list of government recognized languages and ethnic groups.


From “about this book”: “This study presents estimates of various measures of poverty and inequality in the Lao PDR at a high level of spatial disaggregation. Highly detailed information on the spatial distribution of welfare across the country has been developed through the application of small-area estimation techniques on a combination of information from the 2003 Lao Expenditure and Consumption Survey and from the 2005 Population and Housing Census ... Since many poverty alleviation programs of the Lao PDR are geographically targeted, the results from this study can serve as an important source of information in order to improve the targeting of these programs by making use of more precise estimates of poverty at the district and village level”.

Also from “about this book”: “The analysis confirms that poverty incidence tends to be highest in mountainous areas, and further reveals that the poorest areas are found in the mountains of the southern part of the country. Nevertheless, the greatest numbers of poor people live in the lowland areas of the Mekong River corridor, where the population density is much higher than that of the sparsely populated upland areas”. These are areas with significant numbers of ethnic minorities.

Language(s): Kui, Bruu, So.

From abstract: “The purpose of this thesis is to examine and compare the phonological systems of Kui, Bruu and So. The phonological system of each language is described and comparisons are made of phonological inventories and the distribution of phonological units in order to determine their similarities and differences. Cognate sets are used to identify and analyze sound correspondences, some of which are explained by proposed phonological developments. Data were obtained from... dictionaries and the researcher's field notes”.

Also from abstract: “… the three languages... largely share the same syllable and word structure, register systems, and consonant and vowel systems. However, the differences are substantially adequate to determine the genetic relationship of the languages... it is concluded that Bruu and So are genetically more closely related to each other than either is to Kui, which lends support to the subgrouping of these languages within... Katuic… based on lexicostatistical evidence”.


This paper describes Mon-Khmer register features based on tongue root positions. Gregerson argues that register descriptions such as pitch, tenseness, breathiness, “open vs. close vowel” etc., are too impressionistic. He champions descriptions using tongue root position as more objective and reasonable, explaining in great detail how tongue root positions actually influence all the other impressionistic descriptions.

Tongue root positions influence the laryngeal or pharyngeal cavities, directly impacting the vocal and voice qualities of speech. This forms the basis of Mon-Khmer register features. Gregerson also shows how tongue root may affect, sometimes indirectly, other secondary speech qualities such as vowel harmony and pitch. The article also contains many references to tongue root influence in non-Asian languages (e.g. African, Mongolian).
binder, 495.95. Bangkok: David Thomas Library, ms.
Language(s): Kui.
This is a list of phrases collected in the Kui variety spoken in Samrongthap. The list
was collected on 1 January 1982. The phrases are numbered in sections from 1-18.
On average, each section contains about 5 individual phrases.
Breathy vowels are noted in this variety. Transcribed phones distinguish between
back, unrounded mid-low and back-unrounded mid.

Mon-Khmer Studies (MKS) 16-17: 109-142.
Language(s): Kui/ Kuy/ Kouy/ Kuay/ Suay.
This paper reports the findings of a linguistic survey conducted among Kui villages
in Surin and Sisaket province in Thailand. A 73-item wordlist (including 10 phrases)
was collected. 53 wordlists were collected; and apparently another 61 locations were
visited to enquire about the Kui language situation. The purpose of this survey was to
determine the number of Kui dialects (and their speakers), their locations, and their
relationships with one another.
Two main dialects (Kuay and Kuuy) were identified based on regular phonetic
differences (generally diphthongs vs. long vowels) in wordlist items. Another 3 sub-
dialects (Nhə, Nthaw/M'ai, and Pru:jai) are suspected based on observed
communication difficulties using Kui. Appendices include the 73-item wordlist, a
listing and map of all villages surveyed, and matrices showing exceptions to the
regular phonetic relationships between Kuay and Kuuy that were observed in a few
villages. The Kui population is estimated to be about 220,000 people.

Language(s): Ta'uaih, Ta'oih, Katang-Ta'oih.
This paper describes a preliminary Lao-based orthography for the Ta'uaih speech
variety from Ban Tung Wiih village, Salawan province in Laos, based on six story
texts (~1,500 words). Features described include initial consonants (single, clustered,
and prenasalized), final consonants, vowels, and presyllables. Phonemic lists
accompany each description, together with example words from the stories. Brief
comments on each phonemic choice are also provided (e.g. frequency of occurrence
in text, difficult choices, etc.).
Ta'oih, Ta'uaih, and Katang-Ta'oih appear to be dialects of the same speech variety. Presyllables appear to take the following forms: CV, CVC, CVN, and CCV.


Language(s): Austroasiatic, Mon-Khmer.

This paper calls into question the lexicostatistical analysis methods used by various researchers on Mon-Khmer languages, challenging their findings and conclusions in that these “have been made on grounds which are flawed if not substantially improper”. Hamp presents his opinions about the limitations of lexicostatistical methods and offers alternative principles of analysis which he feels would better support the claims made by other researchers.

Claims that “the surest and essential basis for subgrouping is that of exclusively shared innovation of replacement or addition”. Argues that cognate percentages should not be used to draw language relationships – instead, phonological analysis should be the grounds from which to categorize relationships.


Language(s): Austroasiatic, Cham, Vietnamese, Thai, Miao, Malay, Selung, Maa, M侬g, Bahnar, Mon, Khmer, Indonesian.

This paper discusses the difficulties in determining language relationships between Austroasiatic and other dominant languages in the region: Cham, Vietnamese, Thai languages, and Miao languages. This paper highlights some inadequacies in existing attempts to draw such language relationships; and also offers alternative analysis options.
Establishing the source of borrowings (Sanskrit or Indonesian) into Austroasiatic is complicated, given that both sources came via Cham which, in turn was influenced by both. Shows that Vietnamese is related to Austroasiatic through his treatment of Vietnamese tones in relating them to phonemic elements. Haudricourt concludes that Daic languages for now cannot be compared adequately with Austroasiatic for lack of data. Suggests some Miao-Yao vocabulary for comparison with Austroasiatic and proposes Miao-Yao as forming “a link between Austroasiatic and... Tibeto-Burman”.

Language(s): Austroasiatic, Austronesian, Austro-Thai, Austric.

From abstract: “In this paper... problems for the proposed genetic relationship (between Austroasiatic and Austronesian/Austro-Thai languages) are discussed, some new aspects of Austroasiatic linguistic history are briefly introduced, and some lexical, phonological, and morphological evidence supporting the Austric hypothesis is presented”. This paper (the first in a series of three) introduces the Austric hypothesis, its historical basis and origins, previous reviews of Austric, and some of the problems associated with it. Also discusses the reconstructions of Proto-Austroasiatic and Proto-Austric.

From abstract: “... Austroasiatic and Austro-Thai do share partial correspondence indicative of common origin, including agreement in the core vocabulary... Austric... can at last be acknowledged as a valid concept for areal language classification”. Hayes believes that genetic relationships are proven by the ability to reconstruct a parent language from a given set of descendant languages.

Language(s): Austroasiatic, Austronesian, Austro-Thai, Munda, Austric.

From purpose and objectives: “This paper purports to describe and evidenciate a series of phonological changes which took place at an early date in the history of the Austroasiatic language family and caused massive mutation in the consonant system... serving to clarify and explain some of the difficulties... encountered in finding the long-missing lexical evidence needed to verify the Austric hypothesis”. This paper (the second of three) discusses the development of consonants from Proto-Austroasiatic into their reflexes in Munda, Nicobarese, and Mon-Khmer, concluding that these consonant innovations obfuscate the lexical correspondences between these languages.
Hayes suggests three major consonant mutations in early Austroasiatic influential to descendant languages: palatalization, spirantization, and assibilition. Proto-Munda is unique from Austroasiatic with its additional retroflex consonants (Dravidian/Indic influence). Half of this paper lists sample cognate items which compare the developed consonant reflexes (spirants and stops) in Mon-Khmer, Munda, Austronesian, and Austro-Tai languages.


Language(s): Austroasiatic, Austronesian, Austro-Thai, Austric, Chamic, Malayo-Polynesian, Munda, Mon-Khmer.

From purpose and objectives: “The purpose of this paper is to demonstrate that... lexical correspondence does exist between Austroasiatic and Austronesian in the basic vocabulary... likely indicative of a genetic, rather than a contact relationship... (B)asic vocabulary reconstructions from Proto-Malayo-Polynesian (and) Formosan... will be presented... as a reference point for discovery of potential lexical correspondents in Austroasiatic”. Much of this paper compares (by semantic category) vocabulary between Austroasiatic and Austronesian (e.g. Proto-Malayo-Polynesian, Proto-Chamic) descendant languages. Concludes that Austroasiatic and Austronesian are genetically related, hence supportive of an antecedent language phylum in Austric.

Hayes explains the source data and analysis methodology, stating clearly any weaknesses and justifying any analysis methods that are less than robust. Hayes suggests three criteria for identifying loanwords which are discounted from his lexicostatistical analysis. He states that Austroasiatic reflexes generally retain the Austric root while its Austronesian equivalent has the more complex/innovative form.


Language(s): Tay-Nung, Yao, Vietnamese, Viet-Muong, Lolo, Cham, Hmong, Koho, Bru, Pakoh, Rongao, Jeh, Hrê, Sedang, Chru, Bahnar, Jarai, Ede, Tay, Laha, Pupeo, Yao, Haroi, Lakkia, May, Ruc, Laha, Thai.
This paper analyzes the phonetic systems for minority languages in Vietnam, looking at how these can best be represented by a Vietnamese script. Discussions are by tone systems, vowel systems (e.g. basic vowels, length, pitch, phonation), and consonant systems (e.g. initials, finals, clusters). The author prescribes a generic orthographic representation for each of the language features discussed, based on the author's opinion of practicality and acceptability.

This paper proposes a generic Vietnamese script-based alphabet for minority languages in Vietnam as more applicable and useful for minority language education. The author includes examples of vowel orthography choices, developed by other researchers. He analyzes 30 phonetic and 14 script systems, offering a simple dichotomy of minority languages in Vietnam: southern-based languages have binary phonation systems, and northern languages have tonal systems. The author says that “ethnic intellectuals” better understand the language and sound systems, which helps in transcription and orthography development.


Language(s): Mon-Khmer, Burmese Mon, Thai Mon, Kuy, Chaobon (Niakuol), Mal (Thin, Htin, Phay), Lawa, Chong (Chawng), Tampuon, Brao, Stieng, Souei, Nge? (Ngeh, Kriang), Bru (So), Alak, Loven.

This paper discusses vowel register phenomenon in Mon-Khmer languages using data from fifteen languages. Five stages are proposed, charting the development of register features from their original voiced-voiceless initial consonant distinction to their current registers. Each of these stages is illustrated by one or more of the fifteen Mon-Khmer languages analyzed.

Mon-Khmer register features are believed to originate from a contrastive series of voiced vs. voiceless initial consonants which developed into vowel registers described as “clear vs. breathy”, “tense vs. lax” etc. Registers develop following a linear pattern beginning with the voiced-voiceless initial consonant distinction. Changes in articulation of initial consonants correspond with allophonic variation in the vowels following the consonants. Registers continue to develop, eventually replacing the initial consonants as contrastive elements. The final stage is when registers themselves develop into contrasts in vowel position or diphthongization.

Language(s): Austroasiatic, Mon-Khmer, Kuy, Chaobon (Niakuol), Mal (Thin), Lawa, Chong (Chawng, Samre), Thai Neua, Mon, Tampuon, Brao, Stieng, Loven, Souei, Alak, Nge? (Ngeh, Kriang), Bru (So), Cambodian, Vietnamese, Pear, Khmu?.

This paper discusses word lists from 19 Mon-Khmer speech varieties. Of these, 15 varieties were collected by Huffman in Thailand, Cambodia, and Laos while the other four are from other researchers. The data is used to evaluate the glottochronological and lexicostatistical methods of comparing languages. Huffman concludes that core vocabulary is more applicable to specific language families/groups and lexicostatistics is more “useful in showing relative distance between languages within a given group... but absolute percentages are meaningless”.

Borrowing from Thai, Lao, or Cambodian is common in Mon-Khmer languages. The actual word lists collected by Huffman contain 2,000 items, but his analyzes is based on 100 and 500 words. From his data, Huffman proposes a list of 30 core items for the 19 varieties. The analyzes shows actual cognate percentages as inversely proportional to word list size. This paper contains a lengthy appendix showing actual cognate percentages between all 19 varieties (171 pairings).


Language(s): Mon-Khmer, Bahnaric, Katuic, Khmer, Vietnamese, Bru (Ubol), Nge?, Katang.
In this paper, Huffman discusses Mon-Khmer vowel permutations as a series of progressive changes from the original voiced-voiceless consonant system to a “transitional” system, to a “complete register” system, to a “restructured” system and finally to a “tonal” system. Vowel contrasts describe the different stages of transition and are manifested as tenseness vs. laxness, diphthongization vs. non-diphthongization, a mix between both systems, and finally as tone. Huffman explores the contrast in vowel diphthongization with data from Khmer, Bru, Nge?, and Katang. He theorizes “high-lax and low-tense vowels tend to be stable”, while diphthongization patterns emerge as lowered onsets and rising onsets in high-tense and low-lax vowels respectively.

The article shows that voicing correlates to vowel laxness (2nd register reflex) while voicelessness correlates to vowel tenseness (1st register reflex).


Language(s): Brôu

From abstract: “The forty one syllable nuclei of Brôu, a Mon-Khmer language of South Viet Nam, are described and their symbolization in an orthography constructed by the author is presented. The orthography was tested for appropriateness in two ways – (1) primers were written and the teachability of the orthography to non-literate native speakers was assessed and (2) native speakers literate in Vietnamese were asked to spell Brôu words using cardboard letters. The spelling experiment tested five features of the orthography – the representation of (1) contrasts in vowel length, (2) the relationship of final to medial vowels, (4) offglides as complex or simple nuclei and (5) non-register onglides as complex or simple. Results indicated that certain revisions in the proposed orthography are called for, particularly in the representation of tense-register vowels and non-register onglides”.


Language(s): Kuy.

This 4-page paper contains a 200-item word list for Kuy which is based on the Swadesh 200-word list. Johnston includes a short description of the symbols used in transcription.

Language(s): Katuic, Katu, Pakoh, Bru, Kui.

This paper analyzes the semantic domains of the Proto-Katuic lexicon, attempting to reconstruct a picture of Katuic culture. Katu, Pakoh, Bru, and Kui were compared to determine the proto-language. The resulting lexicon was then categorized following pre-defined semantic domains/clips, which relate to a particular cultural aspect. Sizes of each domain clip (i.e. numbers of words) were used to determine which cultural features were prominent in Katuic society. The authors conclude that first Katuic speakers were an agricultural society. Metallurgy, pottery, and weaving were not prominent features in Katuic culture.

Katu is viewed as more separate from Pakoh, Bru, and Kui. Katuic languages are “still subject to intensive influences from Thai, Vietnamese, ... Khmer”. Pre-defined semantic clips include: agriculture, domesticated animals, hunting and fishing, metals, textiles, housing, household articles, and musical instruments. Many Katuic words correspond with a Khmer form, and may have been borrowed from Khmer.


Language(s): Bruu.

This paper explores the phonetic distribution of the Bruu variety spoken in Woen Buek village, Ubon Ratchathani province, Thailand. The analysis covers syllable structures, registers, a proposed consonant and vowel inventory, and frequency of occurrence for each phone. Accompanying the consonant and vowel inventory are sample Bruu words showing the distribution of each phone/sound.

Bruu Woen Buek differs from the Vietnamese variety and seems to have developed nasalized vs. non-nasalized distinctions for glottal-initial syllables. Certain breathy vowels exhibit onglide and offglide characteristics. The appendix contains 56 pages of charts showing the distribution of every possible phone, likely based on the text in section 7. Phonetic features that do not fit the basic system (i.e. tonal contrasts, odd consonant clusters) are believed to be either borrowed or unique expressives in the language.


Language(s): Kui (Suai).
This paper analyzes the acoustic qualities of Kui spoken in Ban Sangkae village (Surin province, Thailand). A word list organized by register, length, and syllable structure was recorded and acoustically measured (e.g. formant and fundamental frequencies, duration, intensity). The information is then analyzed for indicative patterns and discussed. Thongkum claims similar acoustics are attested in connected speech as well as words spoken in isolation, and wonders if other Kui dialects contrast register by similar phonetic parameters.

The paper includes a chart of phonetic features (e.g. length, phonation, pitch) that define Kui register. Thongkum's results disagree with Gregerson's theory about correlation between vowel openness and register; and also with Fischer-Jørgensen et al. regarding correspondence between phonation and vowel duration. Acoustic results show 2nd register vowels have lower fundamental frequencies than 1st register, short vowels have higher fundamental frequencies than long, and clear vowels exhibit greater amplitude than breathy types.


Language(s): Bahnaric, Katuic, Ta-Oi, Kriang/Ngae?, Chatong, Kantu, Triw, Dakkang, Triang, Kaseng, Yaeh, Harak/Alak, Jru?/Laven, Lavi, Juk/Suai Yok Thong.

This book presents the classification and groupings of 13 Mon-Khmer languages in Xekong province (Laos). A 2,228-item word list was collected for each of the thirteen varieties. Lexical and phonological analysis are used to classify the languages, propose sub-groupings, and discuss proto-forms of the languages. Part of the book provides some background information into the sociolinguistic situation in Xekong.

The book is written in Thai script, but a one-page English abstract was obtained, from which this annotation was written. The 13 languages compose two groups: Bahnaric and Katuic. Seven of the 13 languages are newly described: Chatong, Triw, Dakkang, Kaseng, Yaeh, Lavi, and Juk. Most of the data in this book are from these 7 new varieties. From her data, L-Thongkum proposes three new sub-groupings within the two groups: Central-East Katuic, Southern-East Katuic, and North-West Bahnaric.


Language(s): Katuic, Kui, Suai, Bru, So, Souei, Pacoh, Katu (Laos), Katu (Vietnam), Kantu, Ta-oi', Kriang, Ngae', Chatong, Triw, Dakkang.
This paper presents a lexicon of words and their reconstructed Proto-Katuic forms. This lexicon contains 74 items, all of which relate to the semantic category of body parts. Each etymon contains a Thai and English gloss, proto-language reconstructions by the author and other researchers, and phonetic forms of the word in Katuic languages wherever available.

Data is from “published and unpublished materials on Katuic languages, e.g. dictionaries, wordlists, MA theses, etc., together with the author's field notes”. Mentions “cheek”, “mouth”, and “chin” as “the most interesting etymons”.


Language(s): Bahnaric, Katuic, Alak (Harak, Harlak), Chatong, Dak Kang, Kaseng, Katu, Laven (Jru'), Lavi (Savoeng), Nge' (Kriang), Suai (Juk), Ta Oi, Tariang, Tariw, Yaeh.

In December 1995, a survey was done in Xekong province (Laos), finding thirteen Mon-Khmer languages (Katuic and Bahnaric only). Five had never been studied before. Using lexical and phonological analysis, L-Thongkum proposes a classification of the five new languages. Data from all 13 languages is also used to discuss some aspects of Proto-Katuic and Proto-Bahnaric.

This paper was originally presented at the 9th Southeast Asian Linguistic Society conference in 1999, and published later in 2002. “Suai” is used as a Katuic and Bahnaric variety (both distinct). Minority languages Alak, Tariang, and Nge' are the lingua franca in Lamam, Dak Cheung, and Kaleum districts respectively. L-Thongkum claims the population in Xekong is multilingual in at least 2-3 languages. She seems to rely on Diffloth's work and proposes 3 Katuic sub-groupings: West, Central, and East; and 5 Bahnaric sub-groupings: North (further sub-divided into Northeastern and Northwestern), West, East, Central, and South.


Language(s): Mon-Khmer, Katuic, Pacoh, Katu, Phuong, Kantu, Ngkriang, Katang, Ong, Yir, Ta'oih, Brou, Kui, Bahnaric, Dakkang, Triw, Ta-o'i', Chatong, Kriang, So.
From 1997-1999, field research was conducted in Xekong, Laos. Word lists were collected for six Katuic languages. This paper attempts to reconstruct a version of Proto-Katuic adding the newly collected data to those previously collected and analyzed by other researchers. A new classification of Katuic languages is proposed from the resulting analysis. This paper concludes with some discussion about the differences with other historical reconstructions.

Word lists with 2,500-3,000 items were collected. 1,650 cognates were identified but only 1,500 were used for reconstruction. L-Thongkum believes the researcher's background influences the reconstruction of a proto-language. She advises aspiring comparativists to be familiar with the languages and culture being studied to reduce errors in their work. L-Thongkum proposes 4 Katuic sub-groups: West, North-East, Central-East, and South-East. Other observations include “Bru and So seem to share more cognates with Kui”, and Ta-oi' and Chatong serve as bridges between “East” subgroups.

Language(s): Sino-Tibetan, Sinitic, Tibeto-Burman, Karen, Miao-Yao, Austroasiatic, Mon-Khmer, Viet-Muong, Senoi-Semang, Tai-Kadai, Tai, Kadai, Malayo-Polynesian, Cham, Malay.
This volume contains ethnographic information on over 150 ethnic minorities in Mainland Southeast Asia. The ethnographies are organized according to: orientation (e.g. ethnonyms, locations, population numbers, history), settlement patterns and housing, economy, marriage, sociopolitical organization, religion, and bibliography.
The chapters are divided according to four major groups: Sino-Tibetan, Austroasiatic, Tai-Kadai, and Malayo-Polynesian. An introductory paragraph follows each major chapter, which is then further broken down by subgroupings, e.g. Mon-Khmer, Viet-Muong, and Senoi-Semang for Austroasiatic. Ethnographies for specific groups are presented under each of these subgroupings.

Language(s): Aryan, Dravidian, Mon-Khmer, Austric, Sanskrit.
Katuiic bibliography with selected annotations

This book contains 3-4 articles that explore the relationships between Indo-Aryan languages and those from other language families, e.g. Dravidian, Austroasiatic, Mon-Khmer, etc. The topics include Austric words in Indo-Aryan, Non-Aryan loanwords in Indo-Aryan, Sanskrit and Dravidian, and Pre-Aryan and Pre-Dravidian in India.

Apparently, these are translated articles from French scholars compiled into a book.

Language(s): Kuy.

From abstract: “This research was conducted in order to gain a broad overview of the dialects and basic sociolinguistic factors among the Kuy. The primary methods of assessment included the comparison of nine wordlists and the review of responses in selected locations to a sociolinguistic questionnaire. The wordlists were evaluated on the basis of lexicostatistic analysis to determine the outlines of different speech varieties, while the sociolinguistic data was assessed to determine salient attitudes held among the Cambodian Kuy”.

This report contains information on numbers of speakers, their locations, ethnonyms, and summaries of previous research. There appear to be four Kuy varieties (Mla, Ntua, Ntra, and “the Thmei commune” variety). Only the Ntua and Ntra varieties appear to have high vitality. All four dialects “appear to be fairly closely related lexically”.

Language(s): Aslian, Bahnaric, Katuiic, Khmer, Khmuic, Monic, Palaungic, Pearic, Viet-Muong, Chamic, Malayan, Moklen, Hmongic, Mienic, Burmic, Chin, Jingphoish, Karenic, Loloish, North Naga, Nungish, South Naga, Kadai, North Tai, Southwest Tai.

This paper describes languages in Mainland Southeast Asia that have been grouped into linguistic clusters according to genetic similarities. The authors describe 26 linguistic clusters by name, language family, population, location of speakers, and numbers of languages. A short paragraph discussing the languages, their sociolinguistic situation, and current language development is included. Each cluster section concludes with a list of recommended readings and bibliographic references.
For each cluster there is a map showing where the languages are spoken in the region, and also a photo of a representative member of the people group who speak one of the languages in that cluster.


Language(s): Aslian, Bahnaric, Katuic, Khmer, Khmuic, Monic, Palaungic, Pearic, Viet-Muong, Chamic, Malayan, Moklen, Hmongic, Mienic, Burmic, Chin, Jingphoish, Karenic, Loloish, North Naga, Nungish, South Naga, Kadai, North Tai, Southwest Tai.

From introduction: “The purpose of this paper is to provide a broad overview of the language families in Mainland Southeast Asia... to describe general features and linguistic clusters in these language families. In the future, we intend to discuss in greater detail the language development status within the linguistic clusters. This paper relies on information obtained through background research and by interviewing knowledgeable experts in the clusters described”.

Five major language families are discussed: Austroasiatic, Austronesian, Tai-Kadai, Hmong-Mien, and Sino-Tibetan. Maps showing locations of speakers for each language family are included. Brief descriptions are written for each language family, including numbers of speakers, their locations, languages in each family, history, sociolinguistic situation, and language development status.


Language(s): Kuy.

From abstract: “The goal of this thesis is to identify and compare the basic speech varieties of Kuy in Cambodia. A number of investigative measures are employed, including: comparing wordlists... analyzing sociolinguistic data... and testing comprehension”.

From abstract: “Results indicate that the lexical relationship between the Kuy speech varieties studied ranges from 82% to 100% similarity... four dialects are identified: Kuy Ntra, Kuy Ntua, Kuy Mai, and Kuy Mla. Phonological reconstruction shows that the varieties are very similar, with few sound change rules. Kuy Mai is more innovative and Kuy Ntra is more conservative, with Kuy Mla and Kuy Ntua in between”.
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Language(s): So, Kui.
From abstract: “This paper seeks to document and analyze the process of a So committee working together with a linguistic consultant who is familiar with the So language (to develop and standardize a So writing system)”. Mentioned in this paper is the history of So orthography development, summaries of meetings and workshops (e.g. discussions, choices, decisions), and the author's perspective of the overall process (e.g. benefits, remaining challenges).
Using Thai script to write So allows the literacy “principle of maximum transfer to the national language” to be met. The conscious effort to maximize So involvement in the process (e.g. meetings conducted in So) appear to encourage the So speakers to own and feel proud of the orthography project.

Language(s): Tai-Kadai (Lao-Thai), Mon-Khmer, Austroasiatic, Sino-Tibetan, Hmong-Mien, Katuic, Katang, Makong, Tri, Ta Oy, Katu, Kriang, Souay, Pacoh.
From introduction: “This Socio-Economic Atlas presents selected indicators of the human condition of the peoples of the Lao PDR. It contains a comprehensive set of maps showing a wide range of socio-economic aspects of the population of the Lao PDR”. This atlas, printed in Lao and English, comprises 9 sections. The section titles are: geographical overview, general demographic characteristics, migration, literacy, and education, ethnicity, and religion, economic activities, living conditions, poverty, and inequality, and a final section of appendices.
The maps showing ethnicity are based on ethno-linguistic categories. Lao literacy rates (73% for ages 15 and above) are also presented, with data based on simple “yes” or “no” responses to the question about ability in reading and writing Lao.

Language(s): Katuic, So, Bru.
This article analyzes lexicostatistic results of 18 Katuic word lists for varieties in Thailand, Laos, and Vietnam. Nine word lists were collected by the author in 1991 from Sakon Nakhon, Nakon Phanom, and Mukdahan provinces; nine were from other researchers, collected from 1968 to 1981. The WordSurv program was used to compute the cognate percentages between all 18 varieties.

The village demographics for the word lists are briefly discussed. The only language grouping referred to is Smith's (1981) classification. The lexicostatistic analysis concludes that the nine Katuic varieties collected in 1991 naturally fall into two groups: So and Bru. Two exceptions are mentioned, where the Bru varieties (Khamphakkut and Khoksa-at) appear closer to So.


Language(s): So, Bru, So Tri, Makong, Kui (Suay), Ta-oih, Katang, Katu, Pacoh.

This paper comprises two parts. Part 1 is an ethnographic writeup about the So people and their language discussing ethnonyms, linguistic affiliation, locations, population numbers, and anthropological and cultural features. Part 2 talks about the creation of a So writing system using Thai script. The phonology of So is introduced and the Thai letter choices to represent each So sound are presented. Each representation choice is illustrated with a So word example and its form in Thai. The paper concludes with a So story written in the Thai script.

It appears many So are assimilating to Thai lifestyles as observed in their house architecture and decreasing reliance on forest products. Generally, most So sounds have an equivalent match with a Thai letter. Parts of the So phonology not found in Thai include: two vowels, breathy register, and syllabic nasals. These are marked using selected Thai diacritics.


Language(s): So, Austroasiatic, Mon-Khmer, Bru, So Tri, Makong, Kui (Suay), Ta-oih, Katang, Katu, Pacoh.
This article analyzes discourse in 12 So texts. Text genres are limited to narratives (8), procedural (2), and hortatory (2) types. Most of the analysis discusses each genre's plot structure, e.g. introduction (title, aperture, stage), nucleus (peaks, steps, cycles), and conclusion (closure, summary, appeal), drawing evidence from the appropriate 12 sample texts. Other discourse elements discussed include participant reference (introduction, tracking etc.) and cohesion (boundary markers, connectives etc.).

Migliazza includes a comprehensive introduction to So (language, speakers, history, locations etc.) and an overview of So syntax and grammar. A detailed introduction about discourse analysis (e.g. definitions, structures, genres) precedes the analysis of So texts. Procedural and hortatory genres appear to have similar structures. Some unique aspects of So discourse are: procedural and hortatory texts do not require the text producer to be explicitly introduced to affirm authority or credibility, and post-peak transitions are non-obligatory in narratives.


Language(s): Tibeto-Burman, Sino-Tibetan, Austroasiatic, Mon-Khmer, Miao-Yao, Austroasiatic, Tai-Kadai.

This paper gives an overview of the languages of Mainland Southeast Asia (MSEA). Migliazza introduces the major language families found in MSEA and also presents different opinions about typological features common to the area. More than half of this paper consists of maps and diagrams showing language locations and relationships.

The major language families discussed are Austroasiatic (Mon-Khmer), Sino-Tibetan (i.e. Miao-Yao), Austroasiatic, and Tai-Kadai. Migliazza uses the term “melting pot of languages” to describe the areal linguistics of MSEA. He argues that the long history of contact between language families has resulted in considerable borrowing and mixing of linguistic features among MSEA language varieties, creating a common set of typological features unique to MSEA.


Language(s): So, Bru, So Tri, Kuui (Suay), Ta-oih, Katang, Makong, Katu, Pacoh, Katuic, Mon-Khmer, Austroasiatic.
This article lists examples of expressives in So, which form three basic functional categories: as descriptions of sounds, intensifiers, and idiomatic expressions. Reduplication features in all the examples given, sometimes in part, other times completely. Migliazza concludes by suggesting that expressives be considered a typological feature common to Southeast Asian languages, and encourages cross-linguistic research of this phenomenon in other Asian languages.

The article includes an overview of the So people, their locations and populations, and the So language (sociolinguistics, phonology, and orthography). In the language hierarchy of Thailand, Migliazza categorizes So as a marginal language. Most So sounds match with an equivalent Thai alphabet, allowing a So orthography to be developed. So sounds not found in Thai are marked explicitly with certain Thai diacritics e.g. breathy register and syllabic nasals.

Language(s): Brôu, Mon-Khmer.

From introduction: “In this paper, first the tagmemic and tagmatic formulae for the Common Substantive Phrase (noun phrase) will be presented. Then formulae will be given to show differences in ordering and differences in filler classes. The filler classes will be illustrated and restrictions on their cooccurrence will be mentioned. Finally, the Verb-centered phrase, the Clause-filled phrase, and the Speech-filled phrase will be presented more briefly”.

The Brôu substantive phrase appears mostly post-modifying, only Numerals and Classifiers occur before the Noun Head. The fully expanded form is rarely used in real speech. Brôu speakers prefer using shorter phrases/clauses for easier understanding. Most of the paper discusses the filler classes that occupy each tagmatic slot, e.g. what internal structures, dependencies, rules and restrictions govern the filling of each slot.

Language(s): Mon-Khmer, So, Bru, Lao, Isan, Thai, Nhaw, Kaleung, Yoy, Phu Thai.

This article presents results from a sociolinguistic survey conducted in 3 provinces in Northeastern Thailand (Mukdahan, Sakon Nakhon, and Ubon Ratchathani). 22 villages were surveyed. Results from 19 were reported. 18 were Katuic, with one classified as Vietic. The sociolinguistic aspects covered include contact with other language communities, history, ethnolinguistic identity, language use by domain, language attitudes, and opinions on language development.
The survey portrays ethnonymic identities as unclear. Autonyms and endonyms differ frequently. Geographic proximities do not necessarily correlate with linguistic similarities. Vernacular usage appears to be strong. Most communities have adequate fluency in Isan, but not Central Thai, although increased exposure to education is forming a future generation of adequately fluent Central Thai speakers. Attitudes to Central Thai and Isan are positive. There are also positive attitudes toward the vernacular, where many communities would like to have literature in their language.


Language(s): Bru, So, Kadazan-Dusun, Minokok, Sugut Kadazan, Garo, Kimaragang, Tebilung, Rungus, Lotud, Tatan'a, Bisaya, Van Kieu, Mangkong, Galler, Tri, Kataang, Kha.

From introduction: “This paper will... discuss... reasons for the concern of language maintenance (and) ... review some of the typologies... to categorize language maintenance situations for minority language groups (and) ... attempt to apply some of the variables... to two minority language situations in Asia (Kadazan-Dusun and Bru-So) in an attempt to evaluate the prospects of language maintenance”. Variables are defined (with assumptions), before being used to comparatively evaluate Kadazan-Dusun and Bru-So language situations. Concludes that Kadazan-Dusun communities are in a stronger situation for language maintenance.

The paper starts by defining language maintenance and shift, before discussing the social implications of language shift. Examples of variables/typology factors that influence language maintenance include: demographics (e.g. migration, population), status and development (e.g. economic status), institutional support and control (e.g. government policies), and attitudinal and affective factors (e.g. attitudes).


Language(s): Brû.

This is a 281-item word list for Brû Quang Tri, collected by the Millers in 1968.

Language(s): Katuic, So, Makong, Tri, Bru, Katang, Pacoh, Ta'uaih, Ngeq, Katu, Kui.

This paper documents orthography choices using the Thai alphabet system for six Katuic speech varieties in Thailand (two each from Ubon Ratchathani, Mukdahan, and Sakon Nakhon provinces) during a 2-4 week working session. The consonant and vowel phonologies common to all varieties are shown, and differences and exceptions in specific varieties are explained. Orthography choices are described, noting especially when perceptions affected choices and when they differed across varieties. Comparisons are sometimes made with earlier choices from other researchers and groups.

One problem was finding ways to represent non-Thai sounds using Thai graphemes. Language assistants sometimes disagreed how certain sounds should be written, making standardization difficult. All wanted to maintain their language, and believed having a written form for their language was the only way to prevent language death. The author notes that despite their different speech varieties, the language assistants displayed a strong “sense of being the same”.


Language(s): So, Bru, Kha, Tri, Makong, Siliq, Katang, Leun, Khua, Suai, Nheu, Kui, Kuay, Kha Tong Luang / Thavung, Pacoh, Ngeq, Katu, Ong, Ir, Ta-oih.

This paper presents results from a lexicostatistical study of Katuic languages. Primary data comes from a survey of 20 locations in Northeast Thailand. Other earlier word lists were also included in the study. The cognate percentages show relationships between the varieties, providing evidence for suggested language groupings. The authors also show certain lexical items can distinguish between language groupings or individual varieties. Six So-Bru locations from the survey were investigated further, identifying words with similarities between locations or uniqueness from each other.

The paper includes a comparison with similar research done by Huffman, Smith, and Migliazza. The Millers suggests three groups: North (So, Bru, Tri), West (Sui, Nheu, Kui), and Central (Ong, Ir). They propose further study on Katu, Pacoh, and Ngeq to clarify their positions within Katuic. Part of the study includes observations of interactions between speakers of different Katuic varieties at a language seminar (1993) and workshop (1994).
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Language(s): Brôu.

This paper examines the word classes in the Brôu language (Hương Hóa district, Vietnam). Some Brôu word classes discussed include: nouns, verbs, modifiers, adverbs, negativizers, classifiers, prepositions, locatives, quantifiers, demonstratives, connectives, and particles. Example sentences illustrate the syntax for each word class discussed. Some word class definitions are explained along the lines of structural occurrence possibilities.

Some interesting definitions include: (1) verbs primarily defined as words that can be preceded by “to want” (2) adjectives defined as words that can modify both nouns and verbs. Brôu syntax structures appear rather fluid – for some word classes, words may appear in different positions syntactically and yet mean the same thing. The paper contains 3 pages of classifiers identified from the language data.

Language(s): Katuic, Mon-Khmer.

This paper discusses elicitation problems associated with the 281-item wordlist used in the Millers' survey of Katuic languages in Northeast Thailand. From this word list, 78 lexical items were excluded in the comparison for the following reasons: problems between different languages of elicitation, homonyms, culturally foreign words, words with no generic categories, repetitions, multiple and inconsistent elicitation forms, disparity in ranges of meaning, and general difficulties in elicitation. Each of these problems is explained with brief accounts of the difficulties or errors that occurred when attempting to use these words to elicit a Katuic equivalent.

The full 281-item wordlist with words marked for exclusion can be found as an appendix to this article. Two particular lexical items in Katuic which do not have a generic category are “cut” and “leg”.

Language(s): Tai Men, Tai Meuy, Tai Pao, Lao Kaleung, Tai Khang, Hmong Khao (“White Hmong”), Tai Yang, Tai Senkap, Tai Oh.
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This book documents an anthropological survey done in Central Laos (South Bolikhamxai and North Khammouane), which was part of a feasibility study for a dam-construction project in the area. The survey took just over two weeks and covered 22 villages. Questions and observations formed the bulk of the findings. The author concludes that the proposed dam-construction project will bring benefit to the local population.

The contents include a summary of the population, livelihood, history and migration, productivity, habitation, culture, and socio-economic activities. All 22 villages are profiled in the penultimate chapter. Comparisons between swidden and paddy rice growing are discussed in detail. The author notes that the Nam Theun-Nam Gnouang area cannot support the increasing population numbers (birth and migration). He recommends assisted resettlement from these areas into the Nam Hai area.


Language(s): Austroasiatic, Munda, North Munda, South Munda, Nihal, Nicobarese, Aslian, Jahaic, Senoic, Semelaic, Mon-Khmer, Khasi, Monic, Khmeric, Pearic, Bahnaric, Katuic, Viet-Muong, Khmuic, Palaungic.

From preface: “This book is intended as an introductory guide to speakers of Austroasiatic languages in South and Southeast Asia”.

Four sub-families (Munda, Nicobarese, Aslian, and Mon-Khmer) are proposed and discussed, and individual languages in each sub-family are elaborated. Descriptions for each language include dialects, locations, ethnonyms, numbers of speakers, recent histories, and language use situations. Suggested readings are also listed whenever available. Maps showing locations of each language are found at the end of the book.


Language(s): Bru, Kui, Pakoh, Katu, Katuic.

This book compares word lists from four Katuic languages (Bru, Kui, Pakoh, and Katu) to attempt a lexical reconstruction of proto-Katuic. The word lists are from previous work by other researchers. A brief phonological description is given for each language. The phonological reconstruction of proto-Katuic is based on an analysis of the registers and syllable types, to determine correspondences for Proto-Katuic initials, prefixes, and vowels are suggested.

The proto-Katuic dictionary contains 1,241 lexical items. Each item includes forms in the four Katuic languages, hence the “comparative” nature of this dictionary. The author also includes an index of Proto-Katuic words and their meanings as well as the word lists for each of the languages (three varieties of Katu are found). Another appendix is devoted to the lexicostatistical analysis of the Katuic data.

Language(s): Bru, Muong Kong.

There are three Bru word lists here from Quang Tri. They are Pokah, Sei Krew, and Asok (not sure if these refer to placenames). A total of 187 words were collected for each variety. The end of the list contains 7 phrase lists for 4 varieties: (1 Muong Kong, 2 Bru, 1 unknown variety).

The 2 Bru varieties from the 7-item phrase list are from the Konay dialect.


Language(s): Brũ.

This paper describes the Brũ vowel system, attempting to find symmetry in the vowel phonology through four different methods of analysis (Register System, Extra Levels System, Gliding System, and Vowel States System). Each method is analyzed according to its advantages and disadvantages. No single system fully describes Brũ vowels in a symmetrical pattern. The authors conclude the Register System best fits the Brũ vowel system, showing some symmetry while obscuring the least of the language's notable features.

There are 10 basic Brũ vowels. Notable features include register (tense vs. relaxed, or tight vs. loose), length, tongue height, and glides. Registers seem to occur concurrently with differences in tongue height and upgliding, although the authors decided that for each method, only one feature was to be analyzed as the determining contrast. Note: page 210 is missing.


Language(s): Kui (Suai).

This document is a Kui (Suai)-Thai-English dictionary. The dictionary entries are arranged by point of articulation according to the phonetic alphabet.

Included here is a brief history on the dictionary project and a description of the language (history, locations, population etc.). Part of the description includes a rather comprehensive writeup on Kui phonology, examining consonant and vowel inventories, dialectal differences, stress, and intonation among others.

Language(s): So, Thavung, Vietic.

This paper studies the phonological structure of a Thavung variety in Thailand. A 2,105-item word list was collected, along with observations of daily language use. Thavung phonology shows 20 consonants and 12 vowels (including diphthongs). Vowels may be clear, creaky/tense, or breathy/lax. Thavung is mostly mono or disyllabic. Trisyllables are rare. Four pitch distinctions occur in relation to voice quality and syllable structure types.

Historically, Thavung speakers were isolated due to restricted access (risk from communists) and outsiders perceived the Thavung as being poor/primitive. Thavung appears to be undergoing language shift with pressure from Nyoh and Lao. Exogamy is the main reason for language loss. Two distinct varieties are apparent: “big So/traditional”, and “small So/mixed with Nyoh”. Noticeable features include presyllable reduction, and loanwords adapting to disyllabic structures. Evidence of language transition include: loss of some traditional Mon-Khmer features (e.g. final -l) and fewer vowel length distinctions.


Language(s): So (Thavung), Vietic.

This paper contains wordlist data collected for the So (Thavung) language spoken in Ban Nongwaeng village, Sakon Nakhon province, Thailand. The data is split into two parts – this paper contains the first part, i.e. words beginning with [b] to [ɲ].

The glossary contains the transcribed wordlist items (“partly phonetic”), which are arranged alphabetically. Equivalent meanings in Thai and English are provided. Symbols indicating grammatical categories are also assigned to each word.


Language(s): So (Thavung), Vietic.

This paper contains wordlist data collected for the So (Thavung) language spoken in Ban Nongwaeng village, Sakon Nakhon province, Thailand. The data is split into two parts – this paper contains the second part, i.e. words beginning with [p] to [ʔ].
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The glossary contains the transcribed wordlist items (“partly phonetic”), which are arranged alphabetically. Equivalent meanings in Thai and English are provided. Symbols indicating grammatical categories are also assigned to each word.


Language(s): Austro-Asiatic, Brau, Sou, Chieng, Oy, Loven, Talieng, Yae, Nha Heun, Sedang, Ca Tu, Ta Oi, Pa Co, Kui, Katang, Bru, Makong, So, Kaleung, Alak, Nghe, Khamu, Htin, Xinh Mun, Khang, O Du, Mlabri, Lamet, Samtao, Doi, Bid, Keu, Muong, Bo, Phong, Tum, Liha, Phon Sung, Thavung, Maleng, Krih, Lavy.

From backpage: “This book outlines the 41 Mon-Khmer speaking groups of Laos who belong to the Austro-Asiatic language family. This volume describes the history, costumes and crafts, design of houses and villages, agricultural economy, society and religious practices of each individual group. The text is supported by 195 color illustrations”.

Mentions 11 individual ethnic groups that make up the Katuic subfamily. Most of the population information is based on the 1995 Lao government census.


Language(s): Katuic, Kui/Kuy, Bru, Katu, Pacoh, Ong, Talan.

This webpage gives an overview of Katuic languages. Included here is a brief history of previous research and classification of Katuic languages, and an introduction to Katuic register/phonation features. The remaining section contains a list of recommended readings.

The webpage contains links to lexicons of individual Katuic languages (“if and as available”).
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This electronic book contains a selection of 16 papers that were presented at the 15th annual meeting of the Southeast Asian Linguistics Society (SEALS XV), held in the Australian National University (Canberra) from 22-25 April 2005. The papers cover a broad range of languages: Sinitic (Hakka, Taiwanese), Mon-Khmer (Khmer, Vietic, Katuic), Tibeto-Burman (Tani, Turung), Austronesian (Indonesian, Kavalan), Thai, and Japanese. The contents are organized into three sections: syntax and lexicon, phonology, and comparative Mon-Khmer.


This paper provides an update on the reconstruction of Proto-West-Bahnaric in 2000, that is being reviewed in context with Sidwell's recent reconstructions on Proto-Bahnaric and Proto-Katuic. Sidwell proposes amendments to the reconstructions of Proto-West-Bahnaric [ua] and [ia] diphthongs, explained in light of newer reconstructions of Proto-Bahnaric. He also analyzes six selected etymons which have similar forms in Proto-Katuic and Proto-West-Bahnaric, arguing that West Bahnaric borrowed these words from Katuic, and possibly even Khmer. Sidwell suggests that the consistent borrowing from Katuic into West Bahnaric may imply the social relationship dynamics between the groups.

Sidwell further claims that cognate percentages between West Bahnaric speech varieties are never less than 76%, and subgroups generally divide as Lavi and non-Lavi. He presents a reconstruction of Proto-West-Bahnaric vowels and consonants (initial and final). Sidwell believes that Western Bahnaric borrowed from Katuic and Khmer languages, while other Bahnaric groups were influenced by Chamic and Vietnamese.


Language(s): Katuic, Mon-Khmer, Khasi, Palaungic, Khmuic, Khmer, Vietic, Bahnaric, Pearic, Monic, Aslian, Nicobarese, Mon, Semai, Car, Kasong, Bahnar, Uu, Riang, Palaung, Kui, Bru, Ta'Oi, Kriang, Katu, Pacoh.
This paper explores the subgroupings in Mon-Khmer, specifically looking at the place of Katuic within this language family. The author includes discussions on past attempts by researchers to classify Mon-Khmer languages, and Katuic in particular. Sidwell introduces his reconstructions for Proto-Katuic vowels and consonants, and compares these with Proto-Mon-Khmer, and other Mon-Khmer languages. Sidwell analyzes and discusses the comparisons (i.e., how specific innovations may have occurred), concluding that Katuic stands as a valid Mon-Khmer subgroup and affirms the membership of Northern Mon-Khmer comprising Khasi, Palaungic, and Khmuic. The remaining Mon-Khmer subgroups are listed as: Vietic, Bahnaric, Khmer, Pearic, Monic, Aslian, and Nicobarese.

This paper describes how most Mon-Khmer languages reduced the original Proto-Mon-Khmer three-stop series (voiceless, voiced, implosives) to a two-stop series. Sidwell claims that “the raising of low central vowels is very common in Mon-Khmer”.

Language(s): Katuic, Mon-Khmer.

From abstract: “The present study compiles data from various sources, including recent fieldwork that has helped to reveal the extent and diversity of the family. Sixteen languages are compared to produce a comparative reconstruction of the Proto Katuic phonology and lexicon, including 1400 etymologies and reconstructions, and many wider MK comparisons. Katuic languages are particularly significant for their rich vowel systems, which are among the most complex in the world, and include contrastive phonation types or “registers”. In some cases these arose from the splitting of vowels in connection with changes in initial consonants. Interestingly it appears that register systems arose independently at least three times in the history of the Katuic family. The reconstruction of Proto Katuic reveals an archaic phonological system not far removed from Proto Mon-Khmer, and the study is augmented with an index of Proto Mon-Khmer reconstructions by the late Professor Harry Shorto”.

Language(s): Mon-Khmer, Chamic, Katuic, Bahnaric, Kui, Bru, So (Souei), Katu, Ta'oih, Pacoh, Jarai, Ede, Bahnar, Alak, Taliang, Khmer.
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This paper responds to a comparative-historical study done by Thurgood in 1999 between three languages: Chamic, Bahnaric, and Katuic. The 62 Proto-Chamic lexical items which Thurgood claims have a strong Katuic comparison, are compared more broadly to other varieties from Mon-Khmer and non-Mon-Khmer languages. The analysis shows only one word (“to mend/patch”) suggesting a unique Chamic-Katuic isogloss. The remaining words show evidence of other possible contact relationships, which would undermine the idea of solely “intense contact between” Chamic and Katuic.

Includes some history and geography of Chamic languages. A brief overview of Katuic and Bahnaric language families precedes the analysis discussion. The paper also includes an appendix showing the etymological analysis.


Language(s): Austroasiatic, Aslian, Bahnaric, Katuic, Khasian, Khmeric, Khmuic, Monic, Mon, Nyah Kur, Munda, Nicobaric, Palaungic, Pearic, Vietic.

From backpage: “The text is divided into two main parts; the first charts the emergence of the Austroasiatic hypothesis and its various guises, and reviews much of the literature which has addressed how constituent branches may (or may not) relate to each other, while the second part looks at each branch in detail, examining the history of scholarship and summarizing the state of the art. Many relevant maps and diagrams are reproduced, including some colour plates”.


Language(s): Austronesian, Roglai, Rade, Jôrai, Harôi, Chru, Western Cham, Chăm, Aceh/Atjeh.

This manuscript contains word lists for 8 Austronesian languages (Roglai, Rade, Jôrai, Harôi, Chru, Western Cham, Chăm, Aceh/Atjeh), collected from 1968 to 1974. The word lists used are similar, i.e. the 281-item word list.

Each word list has some phonemic or phonological assessment that was likely jotted down when the word lists were collected. These brief notes are found under the section “Key to orthography” at the end of each word list. There is also a phrase/clause list collected for Harôi, which is found under the title “preliminary grammar questionnaire”.
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Language(s): Tibeto-Burman, Sedang, Vietnam, Bahnaric, Katuic, Vietnamese, Mường, Austronesian, Tai, Hre, Halang, Cua, Bahnar, Vietnamese, Kơho Lach, Kơho Chil, Charu Jro, Rengao, Jeh, Pacôh, Katu, Bru, Stieng, Mnong, Kơho Sre, Rơglai, Radê, Jơrai, Haroi, Chru, Cham, Nùng, Black Tai.

This paper investigates the likelihood that the velar animal prefix is an areal linguistic phenomenon in Southeast Asia. The analysis first examines Sedang language data (Smith's Sedang-English dictionary) before expanding to include 26 other languages in Vietnam (16 Mon-Khmer, 6 Austronesian, 2 Tai, 2 Vietic) to see if this prefix hypothesis can be substantiated. Sedang data is analyzed statistically using five methods focused on syllabicity and initial consonant types. In the comparison across the 26 languages, Smith highlights 8 words which he believes have grounds for initial k- as a prefix. He concludes that Vietnamese languages demonstrate evidence for a velar animal prefix.

The tabulated comparison of 21 animal names across 26 languages in Vietnam occupies 5 pages. Smith includes a list of the Sedang animal names with “non-final” (initial) /k/ at the end of the paper.


Language(s): Mon-Khmer, Austroasiatic, Bahnar, Brao, Bru, Chrau, Halang, Hre, Jeh, Katu, Khmer, Mnong Bunor, Mnong Ralam, Muong, Ngeq, Pacôh, Rengao, Sedang, Sre, Stieng, Vietnamese.

This paper lists about 9 pages of bibliographic references on research into Mon-Khmer languages. A note at the end of this paper states “the Summer Institute of Linguistics has published... almost 200 titles relating to languages of Vietnam and Cambodia. Most... represent... literacy and educational materials... and data manuscripts... include(ing) anthropological articles, ethnographic texts, manuscript dictionaries, and field notes”.

All the references appear to be linguistically related, and include journal articles, book sections, unpublished manuscripts, and dictionaries. Topics cover a host of genres from grammars to dictionaries to morphological and comparative studies. Not all references carry English titles, suggesting their content may similarly be in a non-English language.

Language(s): Bahnaric, Katuic, Mon-Khmer, Cua, Jeh, Ngeq/Nkring, Pacoh, Rengo, Sedang.

From introduction: “… this paper … present (sic) the distribution and frequency of the final –VC clusters of six Mon-Khmer languages … to emphasize the areal patterns of distribution and frequency of these elements of word phonology and to use the higher frequency clusters as an aid for the discovery of cognate sets … and for the establishment of some Proto-Mon-Khmer...”

Frequency of occurrence for each –VC cluster is counted relative to the average occurrence of all –VC clusters, for more accuracy. Smith shows cognate sets are more easily identified by investigating words with high frequency of –VC occurrences. The paper contains a tentative reconstruction of Proto-Mon-Khmer, looking at 497 cognate sets, most of which were word choices with frequently occurring –VC clusters. The appendices include vowel and final consonant frequency matrices, a comparative dictionary, and an English gloss index of the 497 cognate sets.


Language(s): Sedang, Katu, Brôu.

This word list contains 136 items, collected for two Katuic varieties (Katu and Brôu), and one Bahnaric variety (Sedang). The word lists are from 1963.

The Sedang word list was transcribed by Smith using Richard Phillips' script. Burton transcribed the Katu list, while John Miller transcribed the word list for Brôu.


Language(s): Ngeq.

This paper contains a description of Ngeq phonemes. Ngeq consonants (total of 21) are described as stops (aspirated voiceless, unaspirated voiced/voiceless) and continuants (nasals, “non-nasals” a.k.a. liquids). Smith includes some discussion of consonant clusters, as well as descriptions for vowel features (lax vs. tense), length, and diphthongization. Example words accompany each phoneme description.

The paper contains consonant and vowel charts for Ngeq phonemes. Words with palatals in final position preceded by the /i/ vocoid tend to “raise the glided high vowels to a central position”.
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Language(s): Ngeq (Ngkriang, Khiang), Alak, Ta Oi, Brou.

This paper explores reduplicatives in Ngeq, looking at their functions, intonation, and forms in adverbials, nouns, and verbs. Most of the Ngeq reduplicatives in this paper are adverbial descriptives. Reduplicated nouns and verbs rarely appear. Smith provides a large number of examples, devoting much of the paper to describing the various structural forms found in Ngeq reduplicatives.

Ngeq dialects include Ngkriang and Khiang. Khiang is closer to Alak, while Ngeq is in between Ngkriang and Ta Oi. Ngeq speakers are referred to as “Brou” (not the language, but the people group). Reduplicatives are believed to be key to natural and idiomatic speech. Some forms produce specific functions, e.g. indicating pluralization, habitual states, generalization (nouns), and reciprocity (verbs).


Language(s): Taoih (Ta-ôih, Ta-uôih, Ta-uôt), Pa-koh, Ba-hi, Pa-hi, Bru-Vankieu, Katu, Katuic.

This four-page article discusses the pronoun system of Taoih in relation to case markings. Some comparisons are made with other Katuic varieties and unrelated languages (e.g. Austronesian, Uigur, Mongolian).

Solntseva discusses the Taoih pronoun system in four forms: initial, genitive, dative, and locative. Case markings are viewed as systemic, in that they are present only in specific functions and grammatical constructions. The article appears to end abruptly when beginning to discuss the genitive and dative forms.


Language(s): Kuay, Kui, Kui, Suai, Kuuy.

This paper analyzes the characteristics of register complex in the Kuay variety of Samrong village, Surin province, Thailand. Register 1 in Kuay is characterized by clear voice quality, while register 2 is breathy. This paper explores the vowel inventory for both registers, also looking at vowel length, height (glides), initial consonants and allophones, and pitch. Concludes that the Kuay register complex “has full regular correlates of voice quality and pitch, and partial correlates of vowel length, vowel height, and initial consonants”
Sukgasame refers to van der Haak, mentioning two dialects of the language: Kuuy and Kuay. Some allophones appear to be speech variations between adults and children. The paper mentions the acoustic analysis by Theraphan (L-Thongkum) which record the frequency characteristics of Kuay register complex.


Language(s): Suai (Kuay), Kuy, Lao.

This paper analyzes pitch in two Kuay dialects and compares them to tonal systems in two Lao varieties, arguing that pitch ranges in Kuay may actually equate to tone distinctions. Six pitch patterns are observed and described in relation to register type (clear/breathy), phonetic features, and syllable type. Sukgasame concludes that Kuay pitch patterns are equivalent to Lao tones, the similarity having arisen from “contact induced phonological change”.

The contents include a brief discussion of the methodology and an overview of Kuay and Lao phonology. Sukgasame defines register as “clusters of linguistic features working together as a combination of phonation type (or voice quality), pitch, voicing (etc.)... Normally, one or two features... becomes more prominent”. Tonal evolution in Kuay appears to start as: (1) internal innovations from devoicing → phonation → pitch, followed by (2) pitch becoming contrastive and assimilating to tone distinctions in the neighboring Lao language.


Language(s): Kuai, Kui, Suai, Khmer, Thai, Lao.

This paper explores linguistic change due to language contact by analyzing phonological variations in four Kuai-Kui dialects (3 in Thailand, 1 in Laos). Consonant systems for each dialect are constructed and compared with a reconstruction of Proto-Kuai. Comparisons range from obvious sound changes to allophonic variations in words. The author attempts to relate these changes and variations to contact from other languages (Khmer, Thai, and Lao).
Examples of phonological variations include: allophones in initial consonants including clusters, e.g. [pl- ~ p-], [kl- ~ kr-] and consonant changes, e.g. [r- > l-], [-c > -t] etc. Thai and Lao are viewed as prestige languages. The variations seem to suggest Kuai-Kui speakers adapting to Thai or Lao phonology. Kuai-Kui is spoken only in the home, sometimes competing with Thai and Lao. Outside the home, Kuai-Kui is rarely, if ever, used.


Language(s): Pokoh, Bru,

A 195-item word list was collected for four varieties from Thua Thien, Vietnam. Two are Pokoh, another two are suspected to be Bru. The varieties are distinguished by village placenames: Pokoh Con Tom, Pokoh Luo, Bru Hon Dai, and Bru Ba Thanh. The word lists were collected in 1960.


Language(s): Austroasiatic, Mon-Khmer, Palaungic, Munda, Austric, Austronesian (Malayopolynesian), Achinese, Finno-Ugric.

From introduction: “The purpose of this paper is to present in general outline a short summary of the main trends and developments in comparative work on the Mon-Khmer languages, and on Austroasiatic languages in general with special reference to Mon-Khmer, with a few evaluative comments”.

This paper mostly examines and critiques previous research into Austroasiatic and Mon-Khmer languages, including those of Schmidt, Haudricourt, Maspero, Cabaton, Sebeok, and others. At the time this article was published, the lack of data was a significant obstacle in determining language relationships.


Language(s): Katu, High Katu, Phuong, Pacoh, Bròu, Chrau, Koho, Cua, Hrê, Sedang, Bahnar, Momom, Jeh, Stieng, Mnong Rolom.
This paper provides a tentative outline of language relationships for a selection of around 10 Mon-Khmer languages spoken in Southern Vietnam. This paper suggests some groupings and subgroupings based on a lexicostatistical analysis of word lists. Cognate percentages are examined and clear breaks in the percentage numbers are used to cluster individual languages into specific groupings.

Thomas contends that language relationships are best attested through phonemic analysis. Nevertheless, Thomas states that his conclusions based on lexicostatistic analysis here broadly agree with phonemic analysis. He proposes Bahnaric and Katuic be recognized as subfamilies on par with Mon and Khmer. Thomas also proposes two subgroupings within Katuic: “Brôuan” and “Katuan”, and suggests a similar dual subdivision in Bahnaric: “Bahnaran” and “Stiengan”. Appended to this paper are four 136-item Mon-Khmer word lists: Sedang, Katu, Brôu, and Chrau.


This 3-page paper presents the divisions of the nine main sub-groups that are thought to exist in the Mon-Khmer family. The divisions are based on a lexicostatistical study of those Mon-Khmer languages.

Thomas suggests divisions that comprise: Pearic, Khmer, Bahnaric (North and South), Katuic, Khmuic, Monic, Palaung et al, Khasi, and Việt-Muòng. He also considers Vietnamese to perhaps be slightly distinct from other Việt-Muòng varieties due to heavy Sinitic influence.


Language(s): Mon-Khmer, Stieng, Central Khmer (Cambodian), Northern Khmer, Mon, Kuay, Halang, Chrau, Jeh, Cua, Katu, Koho, Pacoh, Kensiw, Northeastern Thai, Vietnamese, Nung.
This paper describes sesquisyllabic features in several Mon-Khmer languages. The author posits sesquisyllabic structures as a range occurring somewhere between mono and disyllabicity. Four scales of range are discussed in this paper, with definitions illustrated by example words from selected Mon-Khmer languages.

Sesquisyllabicity which leans toward disyllabic shows more vowel contrasts in the presyllable/minor syllable. Sesquisyllabicity is important in poetry, singing, and chanting, where syllable counts and breaks are prominent elements.


Language(s): Mon-Khmer, Pear, Kuy, Mal, Lawa, Muong, Bahnaric, Katuic, Pearic.

From Bibliotheca Austroasiatica (Ghosh 1988): “The paper adds to what is said in Thomas (1966) and broadens the scope of the enquiry to establish a Pearic branch and to roughly place Bahnaric, Katuic, and Pearic in a general Mon-Khmer framework. The paper concludes with selected “pivotal” wordlists of Pear, Kuy, Mal, Lawa, and Muong”.


Language(s): Mon-Khmer, Katuic, Brôu, Pacôh, Katu.

From abstract: “The principal problem in the historical reconstruction of Proto Mon-Khmer is the great diversity between the modern descendants. This paper proposes to simplify that problem by reconstructing the East-Katuic branch of the Mon-Khmer family. Three languages are compared: Brôu, Pacôh, and Katu”.


Language(s): Cham, Acehnese, Mon-Khmer, Bahnar, Rade, Jarai, Chru, Northern Roglai, Tsat, Malay, Austronesian.
From preface: “this monograph... is an exploratory study that first reconstructs Proto-Chamic and then, based on that reconstruction, focuses on 2,000 years of language contact and change. Central themes in this exploration include the adaptation of Chamic to the Southeast Asian linguistic area, the canonical restructuring of the basic shape of the word, major changes to the consonant and vowel inventories, the development of register, tone, and restructured register, and, of course, the role played by bilingualism in all these developments”.


Language(s): Kuy

From preface: “This... volume... seeks to locate the various areas in Thailand where... Kuy... is spoken, to discuss the phonological characteristics of the various Kuy dialects, to show where these dialects are found, and to classify the dialects into subgroups”.

This book is in Thai. From the English abstract, this book appears to provide a description of Kuy phonology, including discussion on apparent dialects (there are two major dialects). The majority of the book is maps showing the locations of Kuy communities in Thailand. These communities appear to be centered around Ubonratchathani, Srisaket, Surin, and Buriram provinces.


Language(s): Pwo Karen, Lahu Shi, Bru Woen Buek (Ubon Ratchathani), Kensiw (Maniq), So.

This paper presents case studies on orthography development in five minority language groups in Thailand (Karen, Lahu, Bru, Kensiw, and So). Four are based on the Thai script, with Lahu Shi using a Roman-based script.

Each article includes a profile on the language speakers, such as linguistic affiliation, locations, populations, and some history. Phonological characteristics for each language are presented and alphabet choices are also described, together with any problems encountered and how these were overcome. Concluding each article is a sample narrative text in the script of choice together with an English translation of the story.

Language(s): Bru Van Kieu.

This paper introduces a new interpretation of the Bru vowel system, as an improvement over the register system proposed by Phillips and the Millers in 1976. In this paper, the weaknesses of the register system are discussed, and a new vowel system incorporating a three-way register distinction between tight, regular, and lax is proposed in place of the binary contrast register system which necessitates heavy membership in diphthongs.

The new vowel system has 32 single vowels and 10 diphthongs, and proposes an additional register. This system appears to be more economical yet still maintains clear register distinctions in Bru (regular vs. tight, regular vs. lax). The primary difference seems to be in the interpretation of diphthongs in the register system.


Language(s): Katu.

From introduction: “The purpose of this paper is to present the personal pronoun system of Katu. There are eleven regular pronouns in Katu, divided by number (singular, dual, plural) and person (first, first-second, second, third)”.

Contents include some morphological analysis of pronoun morphemes. Three pronoun types for Katu are discussed: animate, inanimate, and locational. Pronoun phrases, regarded as pronoun expansions, are also analyzed. The article concludes with some examples of how Katu pronouns function in the language (e.g. subject, object, possessors etc.).


Language(s): Pacǝh.

This paper describes the phonological system for the Pacǝh high mountain dialect spoken in the Hué region, Vietnam. Vowel and consonant system charts are shown and each phoneme/phone is described. Example words help illustrate the descriptions and contrasts. The paper concludes with a discussion on Pacǝh syllable patterns (a.k.a. phoneme distribution).
Pacôh is closely related to Ta-oaih (Ta-ôî) and contains 30 vowel contrasts, i.e. short, long, and glides. Pacôh exhibits a unique symmetrical patterning, where consonants occur in equal measure word initially and finally. The voiced consonant stops /b, j/ have interesting allophonic distributions: preglottalized in word-initial positions and postglottalized in word-final.

Language(s): Pacoh.
From introduction: “The purpose of this paper is to present the gradual gradation levels in Pacoh, which is such that it sometimes appears impossible to divide between simple clauses, complex clauses, and complex or compound sentences”.

This paper starts by briefly describing the Pacoh clause structure. A tagmemic formula is introduced and variations of the common predicative (verb) clause are mentioned. Gradation levels are discussed in view of post-predicative/verbal extensions (e.g. adverbs, objects), subject extensions, and predicative/verbal extensions. The examples cited clearly show a gradual increase in possible extensions, some of which lead to ambiguity in deciding if more than a single clause is involved. Context, semantics, rhythm, shared tagmemes, and general order are listed as clues which help clarify if a clause is single or multiple.

Language(s): Pacoh.
From introduction: “The purpose of this study is to describe in detail the various kinds of reduplication which occur in Pacoh... The plan of this study is to describe reduplication under the following three divisions: reduplication of phonological units, reduplication of morphological units, and reduplication of syntactic units. Following this description, several kinds of reduplication are illustrated in texts. In this study more space is devoted to describing the reduplication of phonological units than the reduplication of morphological units...”.

From introduction: “Reduplication deserves investigation because of its semantic functions, its phonological shapes, its ability to span the divisions of phonology, morphology, and syntax, and its typological use... Other features of interest... are: ideophony,... binomialism... and style”.

Language(s): Ta-oi, Nge', Nyaheun, Jeh-Halang, Pacoh.
This one-page note shares some findings from a short linguistic workshop on Ta-oi, Ngeq, and Nyaheun held in Laos in 1968.

Watson notes that the Ngeq onglide system may correlate to register features. Ta-oi and Ngeq have post-glottalized nasals and liquids in consonant-final position. Nyaheun vowels appear to be shifting from length distinctions to an offglide system, but stress variations confuse interpretations between offglides, onglides, and/or palatalization/labialization. Nyaheun and Jeh-Halang contain many similarities.

Language(s): Pacoh.

From introduction: “The purpose of this paper is to present... both the linguistic forms and the social correlates of the Pacoh naming system”. Pacoh culture recognizes five specific kinds of names: given names, nicknames, teknonymy, lineal names, and totem names, which are discussed in this paper.

Given names tend to be monosyllabic and follow CV(C) patterns. Alliteration is common between sibling names, and occasionally rhyme (e.g. glottals appear word finally). Nicknames are usually a sequence of two words – the second word typically rhymes with the given name. Prefixes on names denote gender, e.g. Cu- in nicknames indicate males, Can- indicates females. Lineage names underline social implications in marriage, e.g. acceptable only between certain name types. The discussion on totem names refers to the Pacoh's origins and mentions certain taboos that influence these names.

Language(s): Pacoh.

This paper analyzes discourse elements in Pacoh, based on the narrative text Do Ân Mmín (“the industrious man”), looking specifically at the use of quotations to mark the hero's thoughts, the importance of three theme-lines (i.e. participant, event, concept), and the use of twelve devices to mark prominence.

The text is inserted at the end of section 1, including both literal and free translations. The author organizes the text discussion based on its plot (e.g. title, introduction, and development tagmemes) and grammatical structures (e.g. paragraphs, sentence, intonation), as well as its prosodic features (i.e. describing plot, prominence, and cohesion). Examples of prominence-marking devices include: degree of contrast, repetition, special words, etc.

Language(s): Pacoh.

From abstract (summary): “The goals of this grammar are threefold: first to learn more about the Pacoh language of Viet Nam and leave a record of the results for future students of Pacoh; second, to learn more about discourse structure, and third, to learn more about deep grammar and its correlations with surface grammar. The method followed emphasizes a particular discourse approach and a particular deep and surface grammar approach. The discourse approach calls for a thorough analysis of two expository texts, resulting in individual text grammars. These are next compared and contrasted with each other. Then they are compared and contrasted with analyzes of other discourse types”.


In this paper, Watson explains why he described Pacoh vowel systems differently between 1964 to 1980. His most recent description moves away from the traditional method of describing Mon-Khmer registers (e.g. “tense”, “lax”, and “breathy”). Watson instead describes Pacoh registers using tongue-root position (specifically tongue-root retraction) as found in African languages.

The article mentions three Pacoh dialects: Pahi, Alưoi, and High Pacoh, each differentiable by their words for “no” (negative). Watson believes describing Mon-Khmer vowel registers by tongue-root positions may be more specific and useful compared to traditional labels e.g. “tense”, “lax”, “pharyngealized” etc. Watson cautions that African tongue-root positions and Southeast Asian vowel registers do not correlate in straightforward matches, but suggests there are enough similarities that warrant further comparative study between both language families.


Language(s): Pakoh.
This paper analyzes two texts of Pakoh expository discourse. The analysis looks at discourse structure, identifying particular schemes that occur throughout the text/story. Also investigated, albeit more briefly, is the sentence structure of each discourse, focusing on particular units/particles which are believed to mark particular schemes. Watson concludes with a summary comparison between both texts (“Problem-Solution” vs. “Conclusion” discourse types), showing more similarities than differences.

Watson begins by clarifying the terminology employed throughout the paper, e.g. “Scheme” refers to “a stereotyped configuration of logical relationships between Propositions and/or other Schemes”. Both texts are interlinearized with an accompanying free translation. Watson refers to “Displays 2 and 4”, presumably a diagram showing an analysis of the scheme structure, but these are not found in the paper. Watson mentions an oral style related to “doubling” or “tripling”.


Language(s): Pacoh, Tal-ay, Pahi Tamprin, Pahi Axap, Vietnamese, English.

This dictionary contains an extensive compilation of Pacoh words and their equivalent meanings in English and Vietnamese. The dictionary is a rhyming dictionary, where words have been alphabetized following the backward end (final consonant) of each word.

The dictionary contains a brief introduction about the Pacoh language, mentioning three dialects (Tal-ay, Pahi Tamprin, and Pahi Axap). Reasons for the rhyming nature of the dictionary (i.e. arrangement of words according to their final consonants) are explained. The authors also provide an overview of the Pacoh orthography, showing how each sound is written.


Language(s): Pacŏ́h.

From introduction “The purpose of this paper is to present the personal pronoun system of Pacŏ́h with the meanings of the pronouns and their syntactic usages”. Pacŏ́h pronouns distinguish between first person, second person, and third person. They also recognize singular, dual, and plural forms.
Prefixation occurs in Pacôh pronouns to mark different functions. These prefixes show patterns in morphology and function, which are illustrated in three matrix sets showing pronoun forms as regular pronouns, indirect object, and possessives. Example sentences are used to describe pronoun forms, including the rules and contexts which govern their usage. Variations of pronoun phrases (termed as expansions) are also included in the discussion. The paper concludes with a section listing the various syntactic usages of Pacôh pronouns, i.e. subject, object, possessor etc.

Language(s): Pacôh.

From introduction: “This paper presents the affixes which occur with verb roots and the verbalizing affixes which occur on non-verb roots. The affixes discussed in this paper are derivational.” Pacôh prefixes may function as/for: causatives, reciprocals, causative-reciprocals, resultant-state, involuntary-ness, nominalizers, completives, pretence, and continuative-reduplicatives. Allomorphs for each prefix type are examined; conditions for their occurrence are not always predictable. Each prefix type is described with examples showing the affixed words and their roots.

Watson points out that verbs previously thought of as disyllabic could instead be monosyllables with prefixes. In text materials for analysis, affixed words occur in 50% of the sentences. Different affix types and their allomorphs can take similar forms; it may be that distinguishing them depends on the context of the phrase/clause.

Language(s): Pacoh, Mon-Khmer.

This paper describes the structure and constituent ordering of the Pacoh noun phrase. The Pacoh noun phrase constituents arrange themselves in the following order: quantification, classification, noun head, qualification, possession, and orientation. In this paper, each constituent is further analyzed and categorized, i.e. seven subclasses of general quantifiers, two types of classifiers, three types of compound nouns etc. All descriptions are supported with example sentences.
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Like some other Mon-Khmer languages, Pacoh speakers tend to use shorter phrases/clauses in actual speech. The fully expanded noun phrase is rarely used. Some interesting reduplication features are presented, e.g. subclass 1 of general quantifiers show a reduplicative consonant occurring with cardinal numbers from 1-5 and 10 (monosyllable morphemes); and reduplication marks the adjectives, not nouns, in single-termed predicative qualifications (adjectives/modifiers).


Language(s): Muong, Mon-Khmer, Bahnar, Sedang, Bonam, Keh, Rongao, Cua, Hre, Mnong Gar, Mnong Biat, Chrao, Koho, Katu, Bru, Pokoh, Boloven, La?ven, Alak, Kui, Khmer, Vietnamese.

This paper attempts to establish the place of Muong between Vietnamese and Mon-Khmer languages. It then lists 196 word correspondences between Muong and some Mon-Khmer languages, arguing that Muong (and by extension Vietnamese) is part of the Mon-Khmer family. Four points are drawn from the correspondences, and expounded upon: many correspondences exist between Muong and Mon-Khmer languages, Muong words seem to be intermediate forms between Vietnamese and Mon-Khmer forms, cognates occur over wide geographical area, and these cognate percentages are significant enough to support Muong being placed in the Mon-Khmer family.

The article summarizes the different perspectives about the relationship of Muong to other languages. The analysis includes a phoneme correspondence list in word-initial and word-final positions. The cognate percentage between Muong and Mon-Khmer language groups (defined as similarities with 3 or more individual Mon-Khmer languages) is calculated at 48%.


Language(s): Kuay.

This is a 281-item word list collected for the Kuay variety, south of Kanchanaburi in 1980.
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Appendix

The following titles by Diffloth, Ferlus, and Piat were written in French. Efimov's paper is in Russian.
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