MON-KHMER SUBGROUPINGS IN VIETNAM

DAVID D. THOMAS

It has been generally assumed, and rightly so, that the majority of the indigenous languages of southern Vietnam belong to the Mon-Khmer family; but apart from an unpublished study by Phillips¹ the internal classification of them has been largely a matter of conjecture until now. Data on these languages has recently become available in the form of survey word lists taken largely by the writer, by Harvey Taylor, and by Richard Phillips, sampling most of the dialect areas.² On the basis of a study of these, a tentative outline of the language relationships will be attempted.

Language relationships can only be established with certainty by a study of phoneme shifts and mergers, as their imprint is indelible, while lexical and syntactic features are more easily erased. These word lists, however, are not phonemic, so cannot be used for accurate phonological study. So this study is perforce a lexico-statistical study, hence only tentative, yet it is submitted with the confidence that the main outlines of it will stand when phonological comparisons can be made.

A glance at the cognate percentages shows a clearcut clustering of the percentages, with one large group clustering around 28-34%, a smaller group clustering around 43-50%, and a still smaller group around 60%. The percentages from 22% to 37% reveal a clean split between a northern group of languages (Katu, Brôu (Bru), Pacoh, etc.) and a southern group of languages (Chrau, Bahnar, Hrê, etc.), with all of the comparisons be-

¹ In the report by Richard L. Phillips on a survey undertaken for the Christian and Missionary Alliance. Phillips also presented a brief oral summary of it at a 1959 meeting of the Saigon linguistic club, a meeting which the writer was unfortunately not able to attend. The conclusions presented in this present paper were arrived at independently, but they agree to a large extent with Phillips' conclusions. Because of the shortness of the lists used (av. 130 words compared), the cognate percentages are higher than if Swadesh's full 200-word list had been used.

² These lists are available for consultation at the University of Saigon and the University of North Dakota.

	Katu H	ligh <u>Kat</u> u	Phương	Pacoh	Brôu (1)	B rôu (2)
Chrau	30	31	29	23	26	27
Koho (1)	31	30	29	25	29	29
Kơho (2)	28	32	28	22	26	27
Cua (1)	37	35	32	24	31	32
Cua (2)	32	30	29	26	29	30
Hrê	35	32	30	27	28	29
Sedang	31	33	29	27	31	31
Bahnar	32	34	31	27	34	34
Mơnơm	36	34	33	29	34	34
Jeh	33	33	32	26	30	32

tween these two groups and only the comparisons between these two groups falling within this range, as in the following chart:

Considering the limitations of the method and the probable inaccuracies⁴ in the word lists, this surprisingly close clustering of percentage figures must be taken as significant evidence for a sharp break between the two language groups. The line between the two groups falls geographically between the Jeh and the Katu, i.e., an east-west line about halfway between Quang Ngãi and Tourane. The existence of this break was suggested previously by Phillips.

This split is most strikingly demonstrated in the numerals, where the numbers 1, 2, 3, 4, 10 are apparently cognate almost unanimously. Then one set of words for 5-9 appears unanimously in the northern group, and a different set appears nearly unanimously in the southern group. This accords with my previous observation³ that numerals tend to be among the most persistent parts of the vocabulary of a language; this might perhaps indicate that early Mon-Khmer counting was based on a system of 4, and that decimal systems were adopted subsequent to the splitting up of proto-Mon-Khmer unity. The southern set of numerals is apparently cognate with both Mon and Vietnamese (except for Mon 'five', which is the northern word); and Khmer has the southern 'five', but uses compound numerals ('five plus one', etc.) for 6-9.

Within the southern group there appears to be a further division between a northerly group (Bahnar, Sedang, Hrê, Cua, etc.) and a southerly group (Chrau, Koho, Mnong, and Stieng). Geographically these two groups are separated by the large area of Malayo-Polynesian

³ "Basic Vocabulary in some Mon-Khmer Languages", *Anthropological Linguistics*, 2, no. 3 (1960), pp. 7-11. Also noted by Kroeber for Yokuts and Athabascan ("Semantic Contribution of Lexicostatistics", *IJAL*, 27, 1-8 (1961).

DAVID D. THOMAS

languages (Rade, Jarai, etc.), but statistically the break between the groups does not appear as sharp as that between the major groups discussed above. The percentages between these two groups cluster in the 40 's, as in the following chart:

	Cua (1)	Cua (2)	Hrê	Sedang	Bahnar	Monom	Jeh
Chrau	44	43	50	44	49	47	45
Koho (1)	43	38	48	39	46	45	47
Koho (2)	42	39	47	39	43	43	43
Mnong Rolom	39	39	48	46	46	46	44
Stieng	44	44	50	44	50	45	47

Cognate percentages between languages within the southern group range from 57% to 68%. The Koho percentages are consistently low (57-60), but it is possible that the higher Mnong, Chrau, and Stieng figures are a result of the fact that these three lists, alone among the lists used in this study, were compiled by linguists personally acquainted with the languages concerned. This may have skewed the results, though in the direction of greater reliability.

Within the northerly group Cua appears to be slightly divergent; although it shows 56-61% cognates with Hrê, it is only 50-53% cognate with the other languages in the group. Cua also shows more phonological deviation from the other members of the group, which possibly led to non-recognition of cognates. The others of the group, including Jeh, Rengao, and Halang, are 55-60% cognate with each other.⁴

In the northern major group there is similarly a binary split (also noted by Phillips), as shown by the following figures:

	Katu	High Katu	Phương (1)	Phương (2)
Pacoh (1)	40	45	50	55
Pacoh (2)	41	42	48	55
Brôu (1)	46	48	49	48
Brôu (2)	43	47	48	47

The two Phirorial lists gave only 75% cognate between themselves, but they are assumed to be the same language. The percentages between languages of the Katu group range from 62 to 72%. The percentages between Pacoh and Brôu range in the low 60's.

This then would suggest the following classification of the languages concerned:

⁴ As published in my "Các ngữ tọc trong tỉnh Kontum", Văn-hoa A-châu, 1959.

I. Katuic

A. Brôuan-

- 1. Brôu (Bru, Kalo, Leu, Galler, Muong Kong, Quang Tri Van Kieu)
- Pacoh (Pko, Bô River Van Kieu; subgroups Pacoh Pahi, Pacoh Ndyong, Pacoh Ta-oih)⁵
- 3. Ta-oih (in Laos)

B. Katuan

- 1. Katu (Teu)
- 2. High Katu
- 3. Phương (Hưu River Van Kieu, Phuang)
- II. Bahnaric
- A. Bahnaran South Bahnaric
 - 1. Bahnar (subgroups Golar, Alakong, Tolo, etc.)
 - 2. Rengao
 - 3. Sedang
 - 4. Halang (Kyon)
 - 5. Jeh (Dié, Strieng?)
 - 6. Monom (Bonam)
 - 7. Kayong (Same as Duân?)
 - 8. Hrê (Davak)
 - 9. Cua (Traw, Kor)
- B. Stiengan South Bahnaric
 - 1. Stieng (Budip, Budeh, Bulach, Bulo)
 - 2. Central Mnong (Pnong, Preh, Nong, Bunor, Rohong)
- **3.** Biat (Mnong Biat)
 - 4. Mnong Rolom (Rlâm)
 - 5. Mnong Gar
 - 6. Mnong Khwanh
 - 7. Koho (Sre, Maa, Chau-Ma, Tring, Chil, Sop, Nop, Lat, Pru, Rion, Laya)

8. Chrau (Bajieng, Ro, Mru, Jro, Butwa', Buham, Bu-prong, Bla, etc.) If Pinnow's subgroupings' are right, then the Jelung, Halong, Hagu, Dedrah, Kemrang, and Hejung should be added to the Bahnaran subgroup; and Kasseng, Alak, Kontu, Lavé, and So should be added to the

⁵ Findings by Phillips and by Richard Watson indicate the unity of Phương. Pacoh and Ta-oih seem to melt into each other.

⁶ I am indebted to Richard Phillips and Henry Blood for the information on the Mnong languages.

⁷ Heinz-Jurgen Pinnow, Versuch einer historischen Lautlehre der Kharia-sprache (Wiesbaden, Otto Harrassowitz, 1959). See especially the outline of the Austroasiatic family on pp. 1-6.

Brôuan group. Stieng, however, belongs to the Stiengan subgroup rather than to Khmeric, so the status of Pinnow's Pãr, Chong, and Angrak are put in doubt. Bih is said to be mutually intelligible with Rade, and is also said to have been at one time a dialect of Rade whose speakers *migrated from their original home to their present location between the* Rade and the Mnong; thus Bih would be Malayo-Polynesian rather than Mon-Khmer.

In all probability, several of the languages in Laos and perhaps also in Cambodia genuinely belong in the language groups outlined above. Some of the languages presented in my data do actually run over the borders into Cambodia and Laos.

Katuic and Bahnaric should probably be placed on a level with Mon and with Khmeric as major subdivisions of the Mon-Khmer family, because preliminary comparisons show Mon-Bahnaric as 33-36%, Khmer-Bahnaric 27-34\%, Mon-Katuic 28-33\%, Khmer-Katuic 24-25\%, and Mon-Khmer 32\%. All of these figures fall within the range of the Bahnaric-Katuic figures, and thus are presumably splits of approximately the same depth.

WORD LISTS⁸

English	Sedang	Katu	Brôu	Chrau
1. nose	môh	moh	múh	muh
2. eye	mañ	mat	moat	mat
3. ear	tuat	katŏr	kutôur	tôr
4. head	ko	âkoq	plau	bôq
5. mouth	rakong	bop	bouq	mưnh
6. tooth	haneq	kaniâng	kaneing	sềch
7. tongue	rapiê	ntak	liaiq	lopiêt

⁸ The original lists, except the Chrau, Stieng, and Mnong, were rough survey lists taken by people unfamiliar with the languages concerned. Thus both phonetically and phonemically the forms of the words were very inaccurate. For purposes of rough identification and rough lexicostatistic calculations the lists were deemed adequate for giving the broad outlines of the picture. However, phonemic analysis is now in progress in most of these languages and the results will shortly be available; so it didn't appear profitable to clutter the literature with inaccurate data. The four accurate lists published here are a representative sample to give the reader an indication of the degree of difference between the languages concerned and between presumed cognate forms. Other accurate lists can be furnished to enquirers as the newer data becomes available. Photocopies of the original lists can be furnished upon request to the Summer Institute of Linguistics, Box L-11, Saigon, Vietnam.

MON-KHMER SUBGROUPINGS IN VIETNAM

	English	Sedang	Katu	Brôu	Chrau
8.	shoulder	kasyah	chrlang	apal	poniq
9.	neck	krôk	tuar	takong	ngko
10.	hand	koq	tey	atêi	ti
11.	skin	kea	ngkar	ngkâr	ntô
12.	bone	kasyeng	nghang	nghang	ntìng
13.	fat	romañ	nchiâng	nseing	lovau
14.	blood	mahêámp	aham	aham	n'hàm
15.	heart	ihiam	yâyul	kớl palhaưm	nus
16.	intestines	hatêa/klea	luânh	ruaiq	tơlaq
17.	back	roq	hông	kloong	væt
18.	side	pangtêa		bran	jèt
19.	father	pa	ama	mpoaq	vàp
20.	mother	nôw	ameq	mpiq	mê
21.	husband	kanôw	kayik	kayak	siklô
22.	wife	kajay	ka-diâl	lakuoi	si-ùr
23.	child	kuat	akŏn	kon	kòn
24.	dog	chó	anuq	acho	so
25.	pig	chu	adork	alik	sưl
26.	chicken	í	atuit	ntruoi	iêr
27.	wing	maná	nang	khlap	ponar
28.	egg	kata	karau	tareil	chap
29.	rat	kanáy	chhâng are	kunâi	kine
30.	snake	pah	kaseng	kusân	vis
31.	fly	róy	raroi	ruai	rowei
32.	tree	luáq	long	aluang	chhơ
33.	woods	kong		arwih	nggô
34.	leaf	hlá	asorq(?)	sala	la
35.	bark	katôw	halăk	ndắh	mòq
36.	flower	rêaq	poq	piar	ngkau
37.	fruit	play	pale	palái	plai
38.	root	rê	riah	rêh	diyeh
39.	banana	priat	priq	priat	prìt
40.	grass	ña	boi	bát	kinji
41.	unhusked rice	báw	haviq	saro	va
42.	husked rice	páy	chineh	rakáu	phe
43.	salt	ро	poh(?)	boi	voh
44.	fire	ón	aih	ôuih	uinh
45.	smoke	ngôy	goyuâk	phêak	nhuq
46.	ashes	pló ón	blah	bắh	vùh

200				
English	Sedang	Katu	Brôu	Chrau
47. water	tea	dok	daurq	dàq
48. mountain	ngo	karung kakong		gung
49. earth	tanê	katiok	kuteiq	nteh
50. stone	hmô	dol	tamáu	tamô
51. ríver	téa Kan	karung	kroung	daq
52. sky	pleng	pleng	paloăng	trôq
53. day	hany	tangay	tangái	nar
54. night	kamaq	hayum	sadâu	mang
55. star	haloq	chitur	mantour	simanh
56. moon		kache	rliang kasâi	khai
57. cloud	syok	doluk	ramứl	tuq
58. rain	mêny	bă	mia	mi
59. road	'choát	kalong	rana	tròng
60. house	hngêny	dong	dồng	nhi
61. rope	kasáy	ngon(?)	kansái	chhe
62. one	môny	muy	muoi	mwòi
63. two	pêá	bor	bar	vàr
64. three	páy	pe	pái	pe
65. four	puán	puân	poun	pwồn
66. five	patáp	châng	saung	pram
67. six	tajów	chapat	tapoât	praw
68. seven	tapah	tapăl	tapul	poh
69. eight	tahéñ	takŏl	takual	phàm
70. nine	tachen	takia	takêh	sưn
71. ten	monychat	majet	muoi chít	mort
72. all	'taytang	babot	nyeq	leq
73. many	hen	bok	sa-ouri	goq
74. big	kan	gomak	toâr	maq
75. small	kuat	katuiq	kớt	kèn
76. long	syát	yal	kuti	jòng
77. short	nang nay	ep	kakéh	dêh
78. hot	tôw	pưih	kutâu	duh
79. cold	rahngêw	kau	sangeit	kakàt
80. red	khêy	brông	kusáu	porho
81. green	ñiat	taviâng	ramoong	sanh
82. black	praq	tam	kôum	sindôch
83. white	bông	bŏk	klok	vòq
84. right	paro-wañ	atuâm	atoam	ma
85. left	paro-êó	adai	avêr	gyau

MON-KHMER SUBGROUPINGS IN VIETNAM

	English	Sedang	Katu	Brôu	Chrau
86.	far	rahngê	chingai	yơng	ngài
87.	near	ache	dan	cheq	mờch
88.	good	lém	liâm	0	yah
89.	bad	ratôh	môp	sâuq	viêm
90.	dirty	kamônw	nhơp	nhơp	soq
91.	rotten	su-wáng	kung	nsóq	ôm
92.	heavy	hngáp	haleng	ntâng	kinjoq
93.	smooth	têá	sasil(?)	siel	ntiêl
94.	correct	cho			gàl
95.	walk	lám	vôiq	pauq ayong	sàq
96.	come	lám akô	dok	toâq	tot
97.	enter	mont	mot	mut	lap
98.	stand	sông	yong(?)	tayứng	tiyaq
99 .	sit	ôý-anay	tot	taku	guq
100.	lie	koy	bech	bêq	viq
101.	swim	klê	baluâh	loui	re
102.	to fly	kapah	par	pâr	par
103.	say	tapuy	praq	taq ntaung	nhai
104.	laugh	tó	kachâng	kacháng	gờm
105.	weep	krôw	nhim	nhiam	nhìm
106.	eat	ka	cha	cha	sa
107.	see	hlo	lei	nhêng	sưn
108.	hear	tang	châng	tamứng	chang
109.	smell	sú	huin	hôun	ta-nom
110.	bite	ret	kach	káp	kap
111.	spit	ka'chôw	katwiq	kuchóh	chhoh
112.	vomit	hêa	kâta	kuta	hòq
113.	die	hla	chet	kuchêit	chưt
114.	live	reh	mâmông	tamoong	hômrih
115.	hit	tok	mbi	toân	pom
116.	cut	chyeh	iât	kứt	chìt
117.	stab	tapet	tak	choat	jùh
118.	split	pa	ploh(?)	ploah	vlah
119.	squeeze	rang, rup	kapât	daíq	bat
	scratch	wo	kabŏk	piaiq	khwàch
121.	throw	wang	mpeq	tôi	hwot
122.	fall	kaneh	ntôq	dớm	vùng
123.	push	kachot	daluaq	kutớl	chhưl
124.	-	huá	pajuâk(?)	âk	dưk

201

DAVID D. THOMAS

English	Sedang	Katu	Brôu	Chrau
125. wash	jíw	erwoh(?)	ariau	rau
126. wipe	chuat	jut(?)	chut	jùt
127. rub	play	krdil, kôrjut	chut	
128. give	ám	dăng	youn	àn
129. take	syo	pai	êit	nhưp
130. sew	chep	ih	yêih	jinh
131. tie	takue	ngkat	chắq	nchap
132. dig	chia	pich(?)	piq	khwày
133. breathe	ihianm	ahâm	tangứh	ta-nom
134. blow	hluap	kabru	kuhôuh	khlôm
135. know	nany	nal	dáng	gưt
136. fear	takhen	kakhin	ngkắh	phung
semi-phone	mic list by	semi-phonemic	phonemic	phon.
Kenneth Sn	nith, using	list by	list by	liśt by
Richard Phi	llips' script	Eva Burton	John Miller	David
				Thomas

SUMMER INSTITUTE OF LINGUISTICS UNIVERSITY OF NORTH DAKOTA