

Lexical comparison of Katuic Mon-Khmer languages with special focus on So-Bru groups in Northeast Thailand

John & Carolyn MILLER
Summer Institute of Linguistics

1. Introduction

Several extensive studies have been conducted on Mon-Khmer languages of Northeast Thailand. These have included phonology (Pailin 1980; Gainey 1985; Darunee 1986), morphology (Ekawit 1983), syntax (Malai 1980; Pattiya 1981; Chollada 1986), and lexicon (Gutwein 1980; Theraphan & Puengpa 1980). Some of these such as *Gainey and Ekawit have been comparative in nature. Other articles (Thomas & Headley 1970; Huffman 1977; Smith 1981; Migliazza 1991, 1992)* have discussed lexicostatistical comparison of the languages of the area.

The present study, while in no way extensive, adds data from several communities in Northeast Thailand not previously included in the literature. It looks at them from the perspective of their place in the wider Mon-Khmer language picture, but it also looks in greater detail at some of the languages or dialects which are within one sub-group of the family. The study will refer to lexicostatistical comparisons based on computer comparison of lists using the WORDSURV computer program, but it will also report impressions of the speakers of these various dialects about degrees of sameness and difference of other dialects or languages as well as observations on interaction between speakers. Finally, it will look at some of the common vocabulary items which contribute to this feeling of "sameness" or "difference" across language and dialect boundaries.

2. Background and scope of the study

Data used in this study come from a variety of sources. In addition to the literature listed above, we made use of the fairly extensive wordlist collection of Katuic languages found in the Summer Institute of Linguistics (SIL) David Thomas Library in Bangkok (See Appendix). Lists which represented locations in Thailand were rechecked for accuracy where possible. Later these were rechecked again in comparative format with lists from locations said to represent the same or a similar dialect to check for synonyms or those with slightly different shades of meaning which were shared by speakers in both locations. Problems in using lists which came from a wide variety of sources and which had been elicited using different languages of wider communication resulted in the exclusion from comparison of a number of forms on the original 281-word list. These problems are discussed in an earlier paper (Miller, J. 1994). As a result of checking comparative lists, two additional words ('mortar' and 'not') were disqualified.

Primary data was collected during a two-year project carried out under the auspices of the National Research Council of Thailand. Initially permission was given to work in three provinces of the Northeast -- Sakon Nakhon, Mukdahan, and Ubon Ratchathani. Consequently, primary data is limited to those locations. Secondary data from Nakhon Phanom was available, but this was not rechecked, nor were communities said to be living in Udorn Thani, Nong Khai, or other areas investigated. This should be done in order to complete the study. Another gap in the study is the absence of data from the extensive Vietnamese and Northern Khmer communities resident in Northeast Thailand. The decision to exclude these groups was based on the fact that these languages are much more widely known and more adequately described in the literature, but the presence of these Mon-Khmer communities in the area should certainly be noted.

On the basis of the wordlists and from information given by speakers from the various Mon-Khmer language communities, six communities were selected for further study. These six communities came from within the grouping which has sometimes been called North Katuic (Thomas 1966; Smith 1981) or West Katuic (Bradley n.d.; Diffloth 1980). Members of this sub-group are said by Smith to include Katang, Makong, Siliq, Sui, So, and Bru. Dorothy Thomas (1976) includes Bru with Pacoh and Katu in her reconstruction of Proto-East Katuic, and Bradley (n.d.) and Ethnologue (1992) place Katang as East Katuic. Ethnologue (1992) lists as West Katuic most of the languages classified by Smith as North Katuic with the exception of Katang. Bradley's Western Katuic includes most of Smith's North Katuic but also includes Kuy/Suai as part of the group as does Ethnologue. Diffloth (1980) notes that Souei-Kuy clearly are distinct from the So-Bru dialects which are part of the West Katuic sub-group. This sub-group (Kuy, Nheu and Kuay) are, in fact, the only groups in what Smith considers West Katuic.

Chollada (1986) questions the inclusion of Sui within the North Katuic group. Given the level of confusion about language or dialect names within the group, this question is appropriate. One of the Sui lists which we processed was clearly a part of the So-Bru group, and some of the So-Bru groups said that they are sometimes called Suoi. But most of the Sui/Suoi/Suai lists more closely resembled those of the Nheu-Kui-Kuay group. The same confusion with the terms So, Bru, Makong/Mangkong, Kha which are used to designate Katuic groups either in Thailand or Laos make it difficult to use any of these terms with precision. Some of the problems relating to language names used in Northeast Thailand and Southern Laos have been addressed in an earlier paper (Miller, C. 1994).

Most of the Mon-Khmer groups in our area of study were of the So-Bru-Kha-Tri group. These seem to have a close relationship with Makong (or Mangkong), Siliq, and Katang groups in Laos. We did not have any data for Leun (Smith 1981) or Khua (Bradley n.d.) which are also said to be members of the group. For purposes of this paper, we will refer to the group as North Katuic, since the North vs. South distinction seems more helpful overall to distinguish them from the other members of the Katuic sub-family. We will refer to the Suai-Nheu-Kui-Kuay group as West Katuic.

From the six locations selected for further study (See Section 5), a thesaurus of approximately 1500 words was elicited through the medium of Thai, Isan, or any of the other So-Bru dialects which were available. In addition, some text material was collected (both oral and written) and a trilingual conversation booklet produced with a vernacular language component.

During the course of the project there were some occasions in which speakers from the various communities had opportunity to meet and interact with each other. Two principal occasions fostered this. The first was a seminar in 1993 when representatives from Kui Sisaket, Bru Dong Luang, Bru Nong Yang and So Kusuman came together to discuss the history of their groups and how to write their languages using Thai characters. At that time they each produced a small picture book with their own language, Thai and English captions. The second occasion was a workshop in 1994 when representatives of the six selected So-Bru dialects came together to discuss orthographic conventions and to prepare diglot versions (vernacular Mon-Khmer language and Thai) of a health booklet discussing prevention and treatment of diarrhea at the village level. Observing interaction on these occasions and listening to discussions about dialect differences were instructive.

3. Lexicostatistic relationships between Mon-Khmer language communities in Northeast Thailand and those in neighboring areas

Lexicostatistic comparison is of limited value for predicting intelligibility or postulating genetic relationship. However, as Huffman (1976:552) pointed out, it is “useful in showing relative distance between languages within a given group of languages and using a given corpus of vocabulary.” Used with caution and in conjunction with other indicators, it can be a helpful tool for verifying hypotheses about language relationships.

Wordlists in the provinces under study were collected from 20 locations where people were said to speak a dialect of So, Kha, Bru or Suoi. With the exception of So as spoken in the village of Nong Weng, Song Dao, Sakon Nakhon, all of these proved to be within the Katuic sub-family. To these were added for comparison six Katuic lists collected in Thailand by Migliazza, van der Haak and Woykos, and Pailin (See Figure 1). A key to the designations, locations, and sources of the lists is found in the appendix.

The percentage of shared cognates for the Katuic lists ranged from 61 to 99 percent. At the higher end of the scale are the So-Bru-Tri lists. These relate to each other at a range of 76 to 99 percent. For these locations, there is no place in the matrix where the relationship to the next closest dialect drops below 90%. This would seem to indicate a grouping of these lists which is distinct from the languages/dialects represented by the Suai-Nheu-Kui-Kuay lists.

k so - huay phra
94 j so - pha thay
94 94 l so - na kham
93 94 96 E so - pho thi phal san
92 94 96 97 m so - kusuman
92 92 95 95 96 t bru - rom klaw
90 89 93 93 95 99 D bru - pak chong
90 89 93 92 94 97 95 r bru - kham phak kut
88 89 92 90 93 94 93 93 a bru - kok sa-at
87 88 90 91 94 94 94 95 98 z bru - nong hay
88 90 92 91 94 95 94 95 98 100 B bru - kham wae
86 87 89 90 91 92 92 93 95 96 96 U bru - hin taek
89 89 91 92 94 93 92 94 96 96 96 95 n tri - na phiang kaw
84 84 86 86 89 90 88 89 92 93 94 89 93 A bru - dong sen kew
80 82 83 85 87 87 86 86 90 91 90 88 91 91 V bru - na sua lai
81 82 84 85 86 87 86 87 89 89 89 87 90 91 96 c bru - nong yang
84 85 87 88 89 92 89 91 92 93 93 90 92 93 93 95 p bru - dong luang
83 83 84 85 87 89 87 87 89 90 90 88 90 93 94 96 96 q bru - tiw
79 79 80 82 84 86 85 84 88 88 88 85 88 90 91 95 96 98 W bru - phon hai
79 80 80 80 82 83 81 81 85 85 86 82 87 89 87 88 88 87 85 e bru - woen buek
<u>77 76 79 77 78 81 78 80 85 83 83 81 85 86 85 84 84 84 82 93 M bru - tha long</u>
62 63 64 63 64 64 62 63 65 63 65 63 67 64 63 64 64 63 61 67 65 F suai - keng ruang
63 62 64 63 64 64 65 63 65 63 65 65 65 63 63 63 64 64 63 65 66 83 J nheu - sisaket
65 65 66 66 66 68 67 65 68 67 68 66 70 67 65 65 67 65 63 69 67 85 81 s kul - surin
<u>66 66 66 65 66 67 67 65 68 67 68 66 69 66 64 64 66 65 63 68 66 78 76 82 I kuay - kanchanaburi</u>
24 25 26 26 27 27 26 25 26 26 26 24 26 26 26 28 27 27 27 27 26 24 23 23 24 C so - nong weng

Figure 1. Percent of shared cognates between Mon-Khmer language groups resident in Thailand (Solid lines separate major groupings)

The relationship between the Suai-Nheu-Kui-Kuay lists is not as close as the relationship between the So-Bru-Tri lists, but these relate to each other at between 78 and 85 percent and could be said to form a group distinct from the So-Bru-Tri group. They relate to the So-Bru-Tri group at shared cognate levels ranging between 61 and 68 percent.

The figures for the So-Bru-Tri cognate relationships given in Figure 1 are considerably higher than those given by Migliazza (1991, 1992) for some of the same groups. Figures given in his 1992 article, although these are higher than the percentages given in the 1991 article, are still considerably lower than those of this study. Perhaps the exclusion of many problem words on the list as well as more rigorous checking of comparative lists resulted in the higher percentages.

Although the language spoken in Nong Weng, Sakon Nakhon is said to be So, it is clearly not part of the generally recognized So language group. It relates to other So lists at only 24% to 27%, and is equally distant from all other Katuic groups. The people of Nong Weng recognize this, but indicate they are known only as So here in Thailand. One woman said she heard that they had been called Kha Tong Luang back in Laos from where they came over a hundred years earlier. From information given in the village about their place of origin, it would seem that Nong Weng represents the Thavung language and belongs within the Vietic branch of Mon-Khmer languages, though we have made no comparative calculations to substantiate this placement.

To try to get a broader perspective on the relationship of the Thailand-based Katuic groups, the twenty-five Katuic lists were compared with twenty-five

additional Katuic lists taken by ourselves or others, either in Laos or Vietnam or from refugees from one of those areas (See Figure 2). A listing of these sources is found in the appendix to this paper. The database itself is on file with the National Research Council and SIL's David Thomas Library in Bangkok. Double lines on the matrix separate the North Katuic groups from other groups. Single lines for North Katuic groups indicate close dialect groupings, while dotted lines show close relationships with other dialects. Other Katuic groups are divided into West Katuic (Suoi, Suai, Nheu, Kuy and Kuay), Pacoh, Central Katuic (Ong, Ir, Bru Thateng, Ta-oih), Ngeq and two Katu groups.

The cognate percentages in the So-Bru group of languages in this study are consistently higher than those proposed by Migliazza, Smith, or Huffman. The percentages for lists other than So-Bru groups were not widely different, but they generally ranged from five to seven percentage points higher.

Smith's Katuic section of his study of 45 Mon-Khmer languages covered many of the same languages as this study, but for five of the groups (Ngeq, Ta-oih, Katang, Suoi and So) this study employed lists from more than one location, for Katang five, for Suoi four, and for So six. In all but nine comparisons our figures were five percent or more higher than Smith's. Only in the Siliq/Suoi comparison was ours lower (Smith 78%; ours 72%). For seven comparisons with Smith our figures are from 14% to 22% higher (Mangkong/Katang 76%-90%, Mangkong/Siliq 75%-91%, Pacoh/So 49%-66%, Mangkong/So 64%-82%, Siliq/Bru 70%-88%, So/Bru 64%-85%, Mangkong/Bru 68%-90%). This may reflect the imprecision in the use of the terms "Mangkong" or "Bru," so that the dialects used by his study and ours may actually be quite different.

Our study overlaps with Huffman's in only four languages: Ngeq, Bru, Suoi and Kui. When comparing our figures with Huffman's average percentages between his 500 and 100 word lists we find less discrepancy than with the Migliazza and Smith studies. Taking an average percent from multiple lists from three of these languages (i.e. Ngeq four locations, Suoi four locations, and Bru nineteen locations), of the six comparisons only one of Huffman's figures is greater than ours: Bru/Suoi (our 67% to his 68%). In the five other comparisons our figures are higher: Ngeq/Suoi 54%-52%, Ngeq/Bru 59%-54%, Bru/Kui 67%-62%, Ngeq/Kui 57%-49%, Kui/Suoi 79%-67%.

The North Katuic group of So-Bru-Tri lists from Figure 1 is joined here by Sui Champhon, Siliq, Makong, and Katang lists. Suoi/Suai lists from Saravan and Pakse join the Suai, Nheu, Kui and Kuay lists from Thailand. Pacoh (as noted by Smith) does not have a close relationship with any other group represented here. It relates most closely to the Ong-Ir-Bru Thateng-Ta-oih lists, but it is almost as close to the So-Bru-Tri-Katang-Makong-Siliq group as it is to this group. The Ngeq lists form a group, the members of which relate to each other at 80 to 90 %. Ngeq with the Ong-Ir-Ta-oih group constitute what Smith calls Central Katuic. However, because the percentages of shared cognates between Ngeq and these other groups have such a wide range (63-77%), we have chosen for the present to keep Ngeq separate from the Central group.

k so - huayphra																												
94 j so - phathay																												
94 94 l so - nakham																												
92 93 94 N so - khammouan																												
93 94 96 95 E so - pho thl phal san																												
92 94 96 95 97 m so - kusuman																												
92	92	95	93	95	96	t bru - romklaw																						
90	89	93	92	93	95	99 D bru - pak chong																						
90	89	93	90	92	94	97 95 r bru - khamphakut																						
88	89	92	90	90	93	94	93	93	a bru - kok sa-at																			
87	88	90	90	91	94	94	94	95	98 z bru - nonghay																			
88	90	92	91	91	94	95	94	95	98 100 B bru - kham wae																			
86	87	89	89	90	91	92	92	93	95	96	96	U bru - hin taek																
89	89	91	91	92	94	93	92	94	96	96	96	95	n trl - naphlang kaw															
84	84	85	83	85	86	89	87	88	89	89	89	89	93 b bru - quang trl															
80	80	82	80	81	84	85	82	83	88	87	88	84	88 90 O makong - sepone															
78	78	80	80	80	81	84	81	83	87	88	87	85	88 88 91 T sliq - phalane															
84	84	86	84	86	89	90	88	89	92	93	94	89	93	90	89	90	A bru - dong sen kew											
79	80	81	82	82	84	87	84	85	88	89	89	86	90	88	86	91	94	L sui - champhon										
80	82	83	84	85	87	87	86	86	90	91	90	88	91	89	86	87	91	92	V bru - na sua lai									
81	82	84	83	85	86	87	86	87	89	89	89	87	90	88	84	86	91	91	96	c bru - nongyang								
84	85	87	85	88	89	92	89	91	92	93	93	90	92	91	87	88	93	93	93	95	p bru - dongluang							
83	83	84	83	85	87	89	87	87	89	90	90	88	90	88	86	88	93	93	94	96	98 q bru - tiw							
79	79	80	80	82	84	86	85	84	88	88	88	85	88	85	84	85	90	80	91	95	96 98 W bru - phon hai							
79	80	80	79	80	82	83	81	81	85	85	86	82	87	87	92	89	89	86	87	88	88	87	85	e bru - woen boek				
77	76	79	76	77	78	81	78	80	85	83	83	81	85	86	89	89	86	84	85	84	84	84	82	93	M bru - tha long			
74	75	76	74	75	77	78	76	77	81	80	81	78	82	82	88	84	82	79	80	81	81	82	80	89	85	w katang - na du		
75	77	78	76	77	79	80	78	78	84	83	83	81	84	85	90	88	84	81	83	81	83	81	79	90	87			
73	73	75	74	74	76	78	76	76	80	80	81	77	82	83	88	85	81	80	81	80	81	81	79	89	85			
72	71	74	73	73	75	76	75	76	79	78	79	77	81	80	88	84	79	77	78	78	78	77	87	83				
69	69	70	71	70	73	75	71	73	76	76	77	72	78	75	81	81	77	77	76	75	77	75	74	82	79			
70	70	71	71	71	74	73	72	70	72	73	74	69	75	69	75	72	73	70	71	71	72	72	71	74	70			
88	88	68	68	67	69	70	68	67	70	69	71	87	72	69	73	70	69	67	68	68	68	65	73	69				
83	65	65	64	66	68	67	64	65	68	68	67	63	69	65	68	68	68	63	65	68	68	64	62	69	64			
62	63	64	62	63	64	64	62	63	65	63	65	63	67	65	68	65	64	61	63	64	64	63	61	67	65			
63	62	64	63	63	64	64	65	63	65	63	65	65	65	64	67	64	63	61	63	63	64	64	63	65	66			
65	65	66	66	66	66	68	67	65	68	67	68	68	70	68	72	68	67	63	65	65	67	65	63	69	67			
66	66	68	65	65	66	67	67	65	68	67	68	68	69	67	71	67	66	63	64	64	68	65	63	68	66			
65	66	68	67	65	67	69	67	67	67	66	68	67	68	70	67	64	64	64	64	65	67	66	62	64	64			
68	67	71	67	68	69	72	70	71	71	71	73	70	72	71	71	70	69	68	68	68	69	69	65	68	68			
65	66	67	67	65	67	69	68	68	71	70	73	69	69	69	71	68	68	66	65	67	68	67	63	68	66			
63	63	65	65	64	65	68	68	66	66	68	66	68	68	67	65	65	63	63	64	65	65	61	65	64				
62	61	63	61	61	62	63	63	62	63	63	64	62	64	65	64	60	61	63	58	59	60	62	61	58	62	61		
61	61	63	63	61	63	65	64	64	65	64	66	63	66	65	65	63	63	60	61	63	63	64	60	63	62			
58	59	59	59	60	60	61	62	59	60	60	61	59	61	62	60	59	59	58	58	61	61	61	57	61	59			
60	61	61	60	60	60	61	62	60	61	60	61	60	62	63	61	58	59	57	58	59	59	60	55	60	59			
56	58	59	58	57	57	59	59	58	58	58	58	57	59	59	59	57	55	55	57	56	58	57	53	58	58			
56	56	57	57	57	57	59	58	58	58	58	57	58	59	59	58	57	58	57	57	57	59	59	54	59	58			
52	51	52	53	51	51	53	53	51	51	51	52	51	52	54	54	52	50	50	48	49	51	50	46	50	51			
45	45	47	46	46	47	48	48	48	48	48	48	48	48	48	48	46	47	47	45	44	47	46	42	45	44			

Figure 2. Percent of shared cognates between fifty Katuic Mon-Khmer word lists

w katang - na du																											
91 Y katang - wapl																											
96 91 x katang - ravlang																											
93 90 91 v katang - saravan																											
83 84 83 81 y katang - taleuang																											
72	72	71	72	70	Z suol - phalane																						
72	72	71	72	68	78 K sual - saravan																						
68	71	68	68	66	72	76	X sual - sukuma																				
67	68	67	67	60	70	74	83	F sual - keng ruang																			
68	68	65	66	60	68	71	75	83	J nheu - sisaket																		
70	69	69	69	65	75	75	81	85	81	e kul - surin																	
68	69	67	69	65	72	78	78	78	78	82	lkuay - kanchanaburi																
65	65	65	63	60	58	58	54	54	52	57	58	h pacoh - thua thlen															
72	71	71	69	64	61	61	57	57	54	59	58	74	R ong - pakse														
72	71	71	70	63	60	58	57	57	55	58	58	67	85 S lr-saravan														
68	68	68	67	60	58	58	55	57	56	58	58	68	88	83	d bru - thateng												
63	64	63	61	58	56	54	54	54	54	56	54	69	80	76	84	P ta-oh - saravan											
67	64	65	64	58	60	58	56	58	59	62	58	69	82	80	86	86	Q ta-oh - lao ngam										
62	61	62	59	55	56	55	54	54	54	57	56	64	72	69	75	77	77	f ngeq - pakse									
63	61	63	60	54	55	54	54	55	54	58	58	68	73	70	77	81	81	89 H ngeq - sedone									
60	60	61	59	54	55	52	53	55	54	57	56	65	67	65	72	73	71	83 86 g ngeq - tray river									
59	59	60	58	54	54	53	52	53	53	57	54	62	66	63	70	71	69	80 81 90 G ngeq - sekong									
54	55	55	53	50	49	50	49	47	46	51	51	65	59	55	57	58	56	61	61	60	58	u katu sana - sekong					
45	47	47	45	42	45	42	41	42	40	44	44	50	44	45	43	42	43	45	43	45	45	l katu - quang nam					

Figure 2, continued

Also as noted by Smith (1981), the position of Katu within Katuic is very tenuous. Smith places Katu within Katuic since this is its closest connection, but with scores ranging from the high thirties to the high fifties its relationship is not close. Only with Pacoh from Thua Thien does the percentage of shared cognates of the Laos-based group go over sixty. Nor do the two Katu groups (from Sekong, Laos and Quang Nam, Vietnam and referred to in this paper as Katu-L and Katu-V) appear to be closely related to each other, showing a relationship of only 58% shared cognates.

4. Lexical items which join and separate Katuic groupings of languages

Looking at a much broader spectrum of Mon-Khmer languages, Huffman (1976) and Smith (1981) note approximately twenty to thirty words (16 of them overlapping between the two studies) which are widely shared by most of the groups. With the more closely related Katuic languages the number is even higher. Forty-two of the words, for example, have only one cognate set. These include 'day', 'year', 'water', 'earth', some animals, some body parts, some fruits, etc. Most notable perhaps are the numbers from 'one' to 'ten' where all have one cognate set with the possible exception of 'one' where the only exception to the usual /muəy/ is Bru Thateng with /miw?/.

For another twenty-nine words most of the lists fell into one cognate set, but a small number had a second set. Sometimes the exceptions were one group of languages. For example, while other groups had /uyh/ for 'firewood', the Ngeq, Thateng and Ta-oih group had /rəm/. Similarly, where others had /ata/ for 'duck', these groups plus Ir and Katu-L had /tadak/. Quite often the single exception was one or the other or both of the Katu lists. This was true of the words for 'silver', 'flower', 'louse', 'head', 'neck', 'spit', 'drink', 'name', 'road', and 'thin'.

Some of the groupings in this category were rather unusual. For example, all lists had something similar to /mantor/ for 'star' except Tiw and Phon Hai in Dong Luang who had /mpɔn/. Bru Kok Sa-at joined Siliq and Bru Thateng with /dɔŋ/ for 'tail' where all others had /sɔy/. It is possible that /dɔŋ/ has a more specialized meaning, since other respondents said, when asked, that it is used only of birds. All lists had /par/ for 'fly' except Nong Yang which gave /pə/. All groups gave /rəyh/ for 'wash' except Ir which gave /kasəl/.

Looking at the WORDSURV data base for these lists, we believe that some words seem to be useful indicators of language groupings. Some of these are presented in the tables below. No effort has been made to distinguish length or register in the forms listed. Where minor differences occur, a single form (generally the most common) has been chosen to represent the similar forms. At the same time, differences within the same cognate set are sometimes noted (e.g. /dar/ and /diŋ/ for 'know') where these seem significant. The symbol /a/ represents a low backed /ɒ/.

4.1 Table 1 shows a fairly broad grouping which merges what might be called, for the sake of brevity, the So-Bru groups and the Kui-Kuay groups, or the North Katuic and the West Katuic groups. Heavier lines on this and following

tables show divisions between North Katuic, West Katuic, Pacoh, Central Katuic and Katu languages.

So, Bru, Pacoh and Katu-V use the form /malɔŋ/ for ‘sky’ but change to /mat manɑŋ/ for ‘sun’ (lit. ‘eye of the sky’). The Kui, Ta-oih, Ong, and Ir lists change from /mplah/ for ‘sky’ to /mbarŋ/ in the term for ‘sun’. Only Ngeq retains /prah/ for ‘sky’ in both expressions. Bru Woen Buek shares the form /plɛŋ/ with Katu-V, the only other language to use this form.

In the word for ‘wind’ the Ong, Ir, Ta-oih, Ngeq and Katu-L use a form reminiscent of the Austronesian form /aŋin/ for ‘wind’. Pacoh joins Ngeq and Katu in the word for ‘rain’ while in the word for ‘foot’ it joins with all the Central Katuic lists. In ‘smoke’ it is joined with only Ong, Ir and Ta-oih; Ngeq and the two Katu lists are each different.

In the word for ‘rat’ all the Katang lists (with the exception of Woen Buek, which generally follows Katang but here uses the form /kunay/) join the Pacoh, Ong, Ir, Ngeq and Ta-oih lists. This is an unusual affiliation.

Table 1. Words shared by North Katuic and West Katuic subgroups

WORD:	sky	sun	wind	rain	field rice
So	malɔŋ	manɑŋ	kayal	mia	trɔ
Bru	malɔŋ	mat manɑŋ	kuyal	mia/mɛa	sarɔ
Siliq	malaŋ	manɑŋ	kayal	mea	carɔ
Makong	malɔŋ	--	kuyal	miə	carɔ
Katang	prah	manɑŋ	kayal	mia/mɛa	trɔ
Suai	priəh	mat manɑŋ	kuyal	ma	sɔ
Kuay	prah	mnaŋ	khayal	mia	hrɔ
Nheu	phlah	manɑŋ	kayia ^h	ma	the
Kui	plah	nniaŋ	kayal	mia	sa
Pacoh	rbaŋ	mat rbaŋ	seaŋ	bɔ	trɔ
Ong	prah	mtaŋ	ŋin	tɔŋ	sɔ
Ir	para	rabaŋ	ŋin	tɔŋ	hariə
Ta-oih	prah	mat mpaŋ	ŋin/ŋin	tɔŋ	sɔ
Ngeq	prah	mat mbaaŋ/ mat prah	ŋin/ŋin	bɔ	əm
Katu-L	mbarŋ	mat mbarŋ	aŋin	bɔ	harɔ
Katu-V	plɛŋ	mat plɛŋ	adi?	bɔ	harɔ

Table 1. (cont.)

WORD:	mother	rat	thigh	smoke
So	mpe?	kunay	(ku?) lu	piak
Bru	mpe?	kunay	(ka) lu/ lu (nuam)	piak
Siliq	mpe?	kunay	ka lo	---
Makong	mpi?	kunay	lu	phia?
Katang	mpi? / ameh	abel	(ka) nlu	pahia?
Suai	mphie? / ame?	kanay	(ka) lu	piə?
Kuay	mpe?	kanay	lu	piak
Nheu	me	kanay	kən lu	piə?
Kui	me?	kunay	lu	mpi?
Pacoh	aʔi	abil	pilaw	kuyə?
Ong	ɔy	bəl	parlaw	karye
Ir	oy	bel	parlaw	karye
Ta-oih	əy	bəl / bul	parlaw / tamplaw	karɲi?/karn a
Ngeq	əy / əy	bəl / bəl	tanəmplaw/ mplaw	palut
Katu-L	ikan	abuat	---	chuŋ
Katu-V	ame?	sɔŋdɔŋ	malaw	ŋaytək

4.2 In the next group of words shown in Table 2 the Kuay-Nheu-Kui (West Katuic) lists have a different form from the So-Bru (North Katuic) lists. Most often, the Siliq and Makong lists join the So-Bru form. Katang and Suai seem to hold a position in the middle between the Northern and Western groups. Most frequently, Katang joins the Northern and Suai the Western, but this is not always the case. In the following words the Suai lists either share the So-Bru form or are divided, with some using the So-Bru form and some using the Kuay-Nheu-Kui form. In the case of the word 'tiger', the Nheu and Ir lists surprisingly share the So-Bru form. In the word 'skin', only the West Katuic lists have /sape/, all others have /ŋkar/.

For the word 'what', Suai has both the So-Bru form and one similar to Ir. For 'older sister' it has either the common form /əy/ or the form /adih/ which is shared with no other group.

Table 2. Words in Katang and Suai which pattern sometimes with North Katuic and sometimes with West Katuic

WORD:	tiger	skin	what	older sister	scratch
So	kula	ŋkar/cikar	ntrow	əy	akar
Bru	kula	ŋkar/ŋkəl	ntɾəw	əy	akar
Siliq	kula	ŋkar	ndrəw	əy	akar
Makong	kula	ŋkar	---	əy	kakar
Katang	kala/braw	ŋkar	ntɾəw/ntɾəh	əy	kakar/kar
Suai	kula/pəl/ mphriəw/ camrəŋ	saŋkal/ sape?	ntraw/amɔ?	əy/adih	ŋkal
Kuay	cuah thaw	sabək	ntua	say kam	kawac
Nheu	kala	sape?	maŋa	say kamoy	kawat
Kui	acəl	kabe?	na	əy	kawat
Pacoh	rʔay	ŋkar	aməh	amɔ?	kavat
Ong	riap	ŋkar	amay	mɔ?	ngkar
Ir	kala?	ŋkər	mɔ?	mɔ?	kar
Ta-oih	lem	ŋkər/kar	aməh	aykan/mɔ?	ngkar/kawat
Ngeq	lem/mbat	ŋkar	aməh/aməh	mək/aykan	kawat
Katu-L	alu?	ŋkar	ʔəŋ	imɔ?	kape?
Katu-V	agot	ŋkar	hawraw	mamɔ?	bəayh

Katang sometimes uses the So-Bru form, sometimes the Kuay-Nheu-Kui form, sometimes it gives both forms or a different form. In the following examples (see Table 3), it joins the North Katuic lists, while Suai goes with the West Katuic lists.

In the word for 'know' the difference between the North Katuic and West Katuic is not great, but it is consistently different. For this entry the Pacoh and Ngeq share a form which is different from the Ong, Ir and Ta-oih lists. In the word for 'mountain' only the West Katuic group and Katu-V do not use the form /koh/. In the word for 'tongue' only the North Katuic group does not use the form /nta?/. Pacoh and the Ong-Ir-Ta-oih group share the words 'see', 'far' and (except for Ta-oih) 'straight' with the Northern group. And Ta-oih, Ngeq and Katu share the word 'vomit' with them.

In the words for 'buy' and 'long' the Katang lists are divided between the Northern and Western forms, but in the word for 'father' they follow the Northern.

Pacoh has the same form as Katu-L for 'buy', where Ong and Ir have the Northern form, but in the word for 'father' Pacoh, Ong, Ir and Ta-oih join Ngeq.

Table 3. Words which show a clear division between North Katuic & West Katuic

WORD:	mountain	tongue	see	far	straight
So	kəh	lʉəyh	həm/həm	yəŋ	tanəŋ
Bru	kəh	liəyh	həm/həm	yəŋ	tanəŋ
Siliq	kəh	liayh	həm	yəŋ	tanəŋ
Makong	koh	liayh	həm	yəəŋ	tanəŋ
Katang	koh	lʉayh	həm	yəŋ	tanəŋ
Suai	bru	ntaʔ	pəʔ	caŋay	canop/satəp /cəŋ
Kuay	bru	ntaʔ	pəp	caŋhay	tanəŋ
Nheu	blu	taʔ	siə	saŋay	sanəp
Kui	bru	ntaʔ	pəʔ	ŋhay	trəŋ
Pacoh	koh	ntaʔ	hom	yəŋ	tinəŋ
Ong	kuh	ntaʔ	həm	yəŋ	tanəŋ
Ir	koh	ntəʔ	hom	yən	tanən
Ta-oih	koh	ntak	həm/crum	yəŋ	yəŋ/ŋəŋ
Ngeq	koh	ntak	tamuh/carum/cuk	caŋay	yəŋ
Katu-L	kəh	ntak	akah	taŋay	nəŋ
Katu-V	bol	ntak	ləy	caŋay	tapat

WORD:	vomit	know	long	buy	father
So	kuta	daŋ	kuti	cəŋ	mpiah
Bru	kuta	daŋ	kuti	cəŋ	mpuah
Siliq	uta	daŋ	kuti	cəŋ	mpoa
Makong	kata	daŋ	kati	cəŋ	mpua
Katang	kata	daŋ	kati/kayəŋ/ ntrəŋ	cəŋ/tuar	mpua
Suai	kuʔuət/səŋ/ nceh	diŋ	rəŋ/ntrəŋ	tuar/tol	anoʔ
Kuay	kaʔuat	diŋ	ntrəŋ	tur	mpuhʔ/aw
Nheu	saʔo	diŋ	ləŋ	tuy	phu
Kui	kaʔut	diŋ	ntrəŋ	tol	anuʔ

Table 3. (cont.)

Pacoh	tiʔoʔ	cəm	təyʔ	pləy	aʔam
Ong	kateʔ	həy	kayəŋ	cəŋ	am
Ir	katəʔ	hoi	kayəŋ	cəŋ	um
Ta-oih	kataʔ	həy	kayəŋ/kaŋəŋ	cəŋ	əm
Ngeq	kataʔ	cəm	cəŋ	cəŋ/wak	um/uəm
Katu-L	kitaʔ	nal	kayəŋ	pləy	akəŋ
Katu-V	kata	nal	yal	kəl	akəŋ

In Table 4 the words for 'sky' and 'tie' show Katang joining the Suai-Kuay-Nheu-Kui group. And in the word for 'mosquito' it is joined also by Makong. In a few words (e.g. 'sand' as shown in section 4.5, 'fish' and 'pull') the Siliq list joins with Makong and Katang to go together with the Western group.

Table 4. Words in Katang which pattern with West Katuic

WORD:	sky	tie	mosquito	fish	pull
So	mabəŋ	cəʔ	rayəŋ	siaʔ	ti
Bru	mabəŋ	cəʔ	rayəŋ	siəʔ	ti
Siliq	mabəŋ	cəʔ	rayəŋ	ka	dəʔ
Makong	mabəŋ	cəʔ	muəyh	aka	katəŋ
Katang	prah	sat	muayh	aka	dəwʔ/kantəŋ/ti
Suai	prah	sat	məh	aka	ntəŋ/nəŋ
Kuay	prah	sat	suc	ka	tiəŋ
Nheu	phlah	sat	mah	ka	nəŋ
Kui	plah	sat	muah	aka	ntəŋ
Pacoh	rbaŋ	təŋ	rayəŋ	boay	luʔ
Ong	prah	cok	moyh	peʔ	luʔ
Ir	prah	coʔ	moyh	peʔ	katəŋ
Ta-oih	prah	kən/ret	yiw/harŋay	koiʔ	luʔ
Ngeq	prah	kən/kuat	məs/jiw	plaʔ	luʔ/kantəŋ
Katu-L	mbaŋ	təŋ	ayew	asiw	luʔ
Katu-V	pləŋ	ŋkuat	rayəŋ	kadəŋ	kəwʔ

4.5 Table 5 shows words which demonstrate unusual configurations of similarity and difference. In the word 'die', for example, only the Kuay-Nheu-Kui lists and some of the Suai use the form /leh/. The North Katuic groups and the more distant Pacoh, Ngeq, Ta-oih and Katu groups all use the form /kacet/.

The word for 'white' shows a mixture of the forms /klək/, /blay/ and /bək/. It is possible that there is some difference in meaning represented here. In Bru Quang Tri, for example, the word /blay/ refers to lightness of skin and the word /klək/ to whiteness of objects, but this seems not to be the distinction for other groups where one or the other is used generically. The respondent from Woen Buek said the two words are used there interchangeably.

While most of the groups have some form of /piəŋ/ or /puŋ/ as part of the term for 'spider', the West Katuic groups share the form /way/ as a part of the expression, and Ngeq shares the form /daŋ/ with both Katu groups.

In the word for 'sand' the Siliq, Makong and Katang lists join the West Katuic, but Pacoh and Katu-V join the So-Bru lists, all of which have /cuah/.

Table 5. Words showing unusual configurations of similarity and difference

WORD:	die	white	spider	sand
So	kucit	blay/klək	apiəŋ (ku)	cuah
Bru	kucit	klək/blay	apiəŋ (ku)	cuah
Siliq	kucet	klək	apiəŋ	saŋaj?
Makong	kacet	klək?	apiəŋ	caŋaj?
Katang	kacit	klək	mpiəŋ (ku)	saŋaj/haŋaj
Suai	kacet/leh	bək/blay	piən way	saŋkac
Kuay	kacet	blay	puŋ way	sakac
Nheu	leh	bəə?	piŋ way	sa?at
Kui	leh	bua?	poŋ way	takac
Pacoh	kucet	play	apiəŋ	coah
Ong	kacet	klək?	mpiŋ	hakay?
Ir	kacet	bli?	mpiŋ	hakay?
Ta-oih	kacet	bək	piŋpaŋ	hakay?
Ngeq	kacit/poŋ	bək	tuŋdaŋ	pahac/haŋkeŋ
Katu-L	cet	bək	adaŋ	akəŋ
Katu-V	cet	bək	adaŋ	suah

4.6 Although most of the places where So and Bru differ are discussed in the next section, the following words are included in this section because they show comparisons which are interesting on this more general level (See Table 6). For example, in the word for 'fear', the So lists join with the West Katuic and Katu-L while Ong, Ir, and Ta-oih join with North Katuic.

In the word for 'man' the So lists and some of the Bru lists use /rakəŋ/, which is similar to Pacoh, Ong, Ir, Ta-oih and Ngeq, while others use the form /camiaŋ/ which is shared by Siliq. Similarly, with 'wife' Katang uses /rlaw/, which is shared by no other group and Nheu is unlike other Western lists with /be thoy/.

In the word for 'woman' the So lists share a form with the Western group. The Bru lists have a variety of forms shared with So, Siliq, Makong, Katang, Pacoh, Ong, Ir, Ta-oih and Ngeq. The word for cooked rice is generally /doy/, except for So with /awah/, Ta-oih with either /pəy/ or /doy/, Ngeq with /pəy/, and the two Katu groups.

Table 6. Words showing distinctions within the North Katuic subgroup

WORD:	fear	man	woman	wife
So	atuang	rakəŋ	rapay	mpay
Bru	ŋkəh	rakəŋ/cami aŋ	masem/ ɲavua/rapay/ kan	mpay/lakuəy
Siliq	ŋkəh	camiaŋ	macem	lukuy
Makong	ŋkəh	ralaw	masem	rukuay?
Katang	ŋkəh	ralaw	masem/cavua	lukuay/kandel
Suai	tuəŋ	kantruh	kan/kapay	kandel
Kuay	tuəŋ	kantruh	kapay	kantel
Nheu	tuəŋ	be? thoy	be? kan	kadiə
Kui	atuŋ	ntruh	kapay	ndel
Pacoh	adah	koŋ	kan	kampay
Ong	ŋkə	koŋ	kan	kampay
Ir	ŋko?	koŋ	kun	kapay
Ta-oih	ŋkəh	koŋ	kan	kadial/kampay
Ngeq	ɲu?	koŋ	kan	kadial
Katu-L	tatuŋ	ndrəih	ndil	kadial
Katu-V	kapən	parduih	padil	kadial

Table 6. (cont.)

WORD:	pounded rice	cooked rice	crossbow	near
So	asəʔ	avah	tamiŋ	cakiat
Bru	asəʔ/rakaw	doy	tamiŋ/sana	ceʔ
Siliq	ashəʔ	doy	cana	ceʔ
Makong	asəʔ	doy	cana	ceʔ
Katang	asəʔ	doy	sana	cəʔ
Suai	lakaw	doy	sana	ɲəl/ncon
Kuay	ŋkaw	doy	sana	biat
Nheu	lakaw	doy	sana	lim
Kui	ŋkaw	doy	---	ɲcal
Pacoh	asəʔ	doy	tumiŋ	taman
Ong	səʔ	doy	tamiŋ	taman
Ir	seʔ	doy	tamiŋ	tamən
Ta-oih	harkə	pəy/doy	tamiŋ/panən	taman
Ngeq	rakə/pahay	pəy	panaŋ	taman
Katu-L	abih	nna	panaŋ	yuaʔ taŋay
Katu-V	careh	aviʔ	panaŋ	dan

5. Relationship between North Katuic Mon-Khmer groups in Northeast Thailand and in other areas

Looking at the material already presented, one might conclude that all the North Katuic groups found in Thailand and Laos fit easily into one language group as a language chain or language conglomerate. And perhaps the concept of language conglomerate might be a helpful one in considering this group. For one thing, percentages of shared cognates are high (See Figure 3). All are within the eighties to high nineties range. With the exception of Bru Woen Buek, all have at least one other group with which they share at least 90% lexical similarity.

E	so	-	pho	thi	phai	san		
95	t	bru	-	rom	klaw			
90	94	a	bru	-	kok	sa-at		
86	90	92	A	bru	-	dong sen kew		
88	92	92	93	p	bru	-	dong luang	
80	83	85	89	88	e	bru	-	woen buek

Figure 3. Percent of shared cognates for six So-Bru groups of Northeast Thailand

5.1 So-Bru groups chosen for further study

In choosing the six locations of North Katuic groups for more in-depth study, we attempted to choose places which represented both linguistic and geographic range within Thailand. Each of these villages with the possible exception of Dong Sen Kew represents a larger dialect area within Thailand. Pho Thi Phai San, Kusuman, Sakon Nakhon (PT) represents all the So Villages in Amphoe Kusuman (with the exception of Na Phiang Kaw and Na Phiang Mai) as well as neighboring areas of Nakhon Phanom. Malai (1980) estimates this to be over 35,000 speakers.

Rom Klaw, Nikhom Kham Soi, Mukdahan (RK) represents three villages in that district as well as six villages in Tambon Kok Tum in Dong Luang district, Mukdahan. This is not a large group, perhaps around 3,000 speakers, but it seems strategically placed linguistically between So Kusuman and other groups generally referring to themselves as Bru or Tri.

Kok Sa-at, Phang Khone, Sakon Nakhon (KS) represents three villages in that district as well as five villages in the neighboring district of Phanna Nikhom and one or two in Amphoe Meuang. This might be an estimated three to five thousand speakers. They say they came from the Meuang Wang area near the Vietnamese border. These villages are said by speakers from Phang Khone and Panna Nikhom, as well as speakers from Na Phiang Kaw and Na Phiang Mai, Kusuman, to be very close to the same dialect, although a few differences were noted by them. Inhabitants of Na Phiang acknowledge that their dialect is very different from that spoken elsewhere in Kusuman district. Older people in Na Phiang say they came from Meuang Boualapha near the Vietnam border and that their dialect is called Tri, though they generally now go by the designation So as more widely known. Young people in these villages, unlike other villages in the district, are losing facility in the use of their language.

Dong Sen Kew, Chanuman, Amnat Charoen (DS) represents a dialect from the Sepone area of Laos. Although a few other villages along the river in areas of Mukdahan are said to come from the same area, some of them have not retained the use of their language. In Na Seuai Lai people under age 30 do not actively use the language. In Dong Sen Kew also this is true of the younger generation. Some of them can understand it, but no longer speak it. Nong Yang and Nong Yang Noi, Sanot Noy, Mukdahan, with a combined population of roughly 1,500 continue to use the language, but fear that it will not be retained for more than another generation.

Dong Luang, Mukdahan (DL) represents some ten villages in Tambon Dong Luang and another eight villages in the nearby tambons of Fang Deng and Nong Khen. This includes an estimated eight to ten thousand speakers. The villages in Fang Deng and Nong Khen were said not to be exactly like those in Dong Luang, but quite close.

Woen Buek, Khong Chiam, Ubon Ratchathani (WB) represents two villages in that district of Thailand. Although residents of both Woen Buek and Tha Long say that they speak the same dialect, some differences were noted, and the two lists demonstrate only 93% shared cognates. They continue to have contact with speakers of the same dialect on the other side of the border. According to Theraphan and Puengpa (1980) they migrated from an area farther north, probably the eastern part of what is now Salavan Province. It is from this area and the area north and east of there that most of the Katang lists come. So it is not surprising that Woen Buek dialect seems to be a link with Katang, although people from Woen Buek say they do not know the term 'Katang' and use only the term 'Bru' to refer to themselves.

For purposes of comparison we have included in the following charts the Bru dialect which we studied in Quang Tri Province of Vietnam (QT). This seems to us to be most similar to the group in Thailand which calls itself Tri and comes from the border area of Laos and Vietnam (See Figure 4). As mentioned above, this group is found in the villages of Na Phiang Kaw and Na Phiang Mai, Kusuman, and is going through a period of rapid language shift and assimilation to Isan and Thai. Bru friends currently living in the border areas of Laos and Vietnam have confirmed that 'Tri' is very close to the dialect spoken in Khe Sanh district of Quang Tri and now also in resettled areas around Banmethuot in the central highlands of Vietnam.

E so - pho thi phai san					
95	t	bru	-	rom	klaw
90	94	a	bru	-	kok sa-at
85	89	89	b	bru	- quang tri
86	90	92	90	A	bru - dong sen kew
88	92	92	91	93	p bru - dong luang
80	83	85	87	89	88 e bru - woen buek

Figure 4. Percent of shared cognates for six So-Bru groups of Northeast Thailand and Bru spoken in Quang Tri, Vietnam

5.2 Interaction between representatives of different dialects

As part of the survey procedure, we asked people from the various villages visited which villages spoke the same as they did, which villages spoke differently but were understood by them, and which villages spoke their language but so differently that they could not understand them. This was not always helpful, because not all groups had had contact with each other or even knew of each other's existence. But groups in Mukdahan province generally had had some contact with each other and with the So people in Kusuman. And the groups in Sakon Nakhon were aware of each other's existence and of their linguistic similarity or

dissimilarity. The groups in Amnat Charoen and Ubon had not had previous contact with others.

At the 1993 seminar there was considerable interest in a shared history and in the fact that they were part of a larger ethnolinguistic community which extended to Laos and even to Vietnam. There was interest in the different ways of expressing common vocabulary items, but all communication was done through the medium of Thai or Isan except with participants who came from the same area. Despite shared history, shared minority status, and shared cultural interests, the linguistic distance between So, Bru (Dong Luang and Nong Yang) and Kui seemed to keep the feeling of shared identity at a fairly abstract level.

This was not true of the 1994 workshop at which representatives of the six communities represented in Figure 3 came together. The feeling of shared identity was immediate and frequently expressed. This was true despite intelligibility problems which ranged from minor to severe. Though most of them were meeting for the first time and in some cases had been completely unaware of the others' existence, they frequently expressed a feeling of being, on some level, the same group. This was true in a way which had not been true at the seminar the year before. In fact, one participant said in evaluating the second session that it was much better than the first since the languages were closer and closer friendships had been established. After the 1994 session participants wanted each other's names and addresses in order to keep in touch. In visiting villages since the workshop we have found that some of them have done this.

However, the same man who spoke of language closeness and who had come to the session thinking they might agree on a standard way of writing their languages, went away with a new appreciation for the differences among them. These include differences in phonology and in the way they perceive the sounds of their language in relation to the sounds of the Thai language. These differences have been discussed in an earlier paper (Miller and Miller 1994). But the differences most sharply noted were lexical differences. For example, a man from Kok Sa-at asked the man from Dong Sen Kew if his wife was Bru. The man from Dong Sen Kew drew a complete blank. His word for wife was /lakuoy/ not /mpay/. On another occasion, when two young men from Woen Buek came to stay with us, one of the young men politely excused himself and said he was going to /sah/. We were completely mystified, since people from groups we had previously entertained used the word /chon/ to mean 'go up', a word with which we were familiar from Bru Vietnam.

Perhaps at one time it might have been possible to speak of a language "chain" in which each link relates to a close degree with the next link. This is still true to a certain extent as one studies the matrix in Figure 2. There is indeed a "linking" aspect in which one dialect can be said to relate closely to those immediately preceding and following it on the chart. This has been indicated by the dotted lines on the matrix. But, whether because of geographic mixing or dialect divergence, it is difficult for us to place the six groups we worked with in a linear order.

Although the matrix and the charts indicate a linear order, this is perhaps an oversimplification. While the figures probably give an accurate picture of linguistic

distance, they do not have a direct correlation to mutual intelligibility. For example, according to the percentages, it should be possible for us to speak Bru Quang Tri, and be able to communicate with speakers of Bru Dong Luang at least as easily, if not more easily, than with those of Bru Woen Buek. But this is not the case. We have a great deal of trouble understanding Bru Dong Luang but can understand Bru Woen Buek fairly well. We had occasion to visit a village in Dong Luang with a Bru friend originally from Quang Tri area and observed him switch to Lao after a period of trying unsuccessfully to communicate in Bru.

On the other hand, the linguistic distance as reflected in the percent of shared cognates is certainly not irrelevant. Looking at the chart from left to right, speakers of So communicated most easily with the participants from Rom Klaw. They were also able to communicate with the participants from Kok Sa-at, but said that with any of the others they preferred to use Lao.

Similarly, Rom Klaw could communicate with the participants from Pho Thi Phai San and Kok Sa-at, but other dialects were more difficult. A participant from Dong Sen Kew told us he had been reading aloud in his village a text in Rom Klaw dialect written by another participant and was asked if he was reading Vietnamese!

Kok Sa-at participants became good friends with the participants from Woen Buek, inviting them to come to their village to visit, but in most exchanges they had to use Lao to be understood well. The Kok Sa-at participants indicated, however, that they could understand the Rom Klaw and even the Pho Thi Phai San participants. They felt that they could not understand the Dong Luang dialect.

The participant from Dong Sen Kew was able to communicate in Bru with the participants from Kok Sa-at and Woen Buek. We did not observe interaction between him and the participant from Dong Luang. He had gone with us earlier to visit a So village and found that it was impossible for him to communicate with the people there in Bru.

Bru Woen Buek speakers say they can understand Bru Dong Sen Kew and Bru Dong Luang fairly well, but none of the others.

Our own range of comprehension on the basis of our knowledge of Bru Quang Tri went from poor with So, to fairly poor with Rom Klaw, fairly good with Kok Sa-at, good with Tri (not shown here), good with Dong Sen Kew, poor with Dong Luang and fairly good with Woen Buek. As we began to learn some of the vocabulary differences, our comprehension increased somewhat, but it still remains limited except for those dialects closest to ours.

6. Specific lexical items which join and separate groups

Something of the complexity and barrier to understanding may perhaps be appreciated by looking at some common lexical items and how they are shared or not shared by the various groups. Most commonly cited by the speakers themselves in referring to dialect difference are the expressions for 'to eat rice' and 'Where are you going?' The words for 'cooked rice' and 'where' are included on the charts below. These along with the words for 'woman', 'roof', and the 'negative'

word show that PT and RK share a form used by none of the other groups, although an RK speaker was heard to use both words for 'cooked rice' in one recorded text. The number of words included in our data which are shared exclusively between PT and RK is fairly high. Examples of these are shown in Table 7.

Table 7. Words shared by PT & RK

WORD:	cooked rice	woman	roof	where	negative
PT	awah	rapay	panol	mɔʔ	mpiəyh
RK	awah/doy	rapay	padol	mɔʔ	mpiəyh/ha
KS	doy	masəm	manoəl	leʔ	tə
QT	doy	mansəm	mpuəl	leʔ	tə
DS	dɔy	mansəm	pəlɔn	leʔ	tə
DL	doy	kan	ŋklɔŋ	leʔ	tə
WB	doy	mansəm	krəŋ	leʔ	tə

WORD:	how much	meet	lose	comb hair	wing
PT	saməʔ	rakop	ciʔ	carah sək	rapɛŋ
RK	mah mɔʔ	rakəp	ciʔ	sirah sək	lapɛŋ
KS	maleʔ	ramɔh	pit	asiət sək	khlap
QT	mh leʔ	ramɔh	pət	cik plə	khlap
DS	maleʔ	lamɔh	pit	asiət sək	khrap
DL	maleʔ	lamɔh	pit	asiət sək	khlap
WB	maleʔ	ramɔh	pit	sasiə soʔ	salap

Another common grouping (See Table 8) brings KS together with PT and RK. This is shown in the following examples. Only DL has the form /ap/ for 'many'.

Table 8. Words shared by PT, RK & KS

WORD:	don't	friend	bashful	choose	many
PT	səʔ	kana	rapiəŋ	aləʔ	palayʔ
RK	səʔ	kana	rapiəŋ	ləʔ	palayʔ
KS	səʔ	kana	lapiəŋ	aləʔ	palayʔ
QT	coy	yəw	kasiət	rəəh	saʔəy
DS	cəy	yau	kaman	aliəh	sa-uy
DL	cəy	mə	kamai	ləəh	ap
WB	ncoy	mu	kumal	riəh	saʔəy

WORD:	hungry	smile	stone	man	wife
PT	mahaŋ	ŋeh	kol	rakaŋ	kapay
RK	mahaŋ	ŋeh	kol	lakəŋ	mpay
KS	mahaŋ	ŋeh	kol	lakəŋ	mpay
QT	paŋiəih	kabuyʔ	tamau	samiəŋ	lakuəy
DS	maŋiəih	ŋum	tamau	samiəŋ	lakuəy
DL	ariaŋ	ŋum	tamau	kən	lakuəy
WB	maŋiəih	rabuyʔ	tamau	law	lakuəy

In Table 9 in the words used for 'hundred', 'visit' and 'needle', QT joins with PT and RK. Only WB has the form /kase/ for 'hundred'. In the word for 'narrow' DS and DL have the same form as PT and RK.

Table 9. Words shared by PT & RK with others

WORD:	hundred	visit	needle	narrow
PT	kalam	saʔəh	carəm	ruam
RK	kalam	siʔəh	chirəm	rəm
KS	ruay	pəʔ məʔ	ncin	kat
QT	kulam	saʔəh	sarəm	hep/kat
DS	luay	ŋam	ncin	ruam
DL	ruay	pəʔ məʔ	chi	ruam
WB	kase	paʔ məʔ	mancil	kep

In Table 10 the words for 'right' and 'left', 'shoulder', and 'cow' show QT has the same word as PT, RK and KS, and DS joins these in the words for 'play', 'crossbow', 'bind' and 'go up'. For these last four DL and WB share a similar form.

Table 10. Words in which DS joins sometimes with PT, RK, KS & QT and sometimes with DL and WB

WORD:	right side	left side	shoulder	cow
PT	atəm	avel	apal	ntrəʔ
RK	atam	aver	apal	ntɔʔ
KS	atam	aver	apal	ntruaʔ
QT	atam	aver	apal	ntrəʔ
DS	kəy	tə kəy	tampaʔ	takenj
DL	kəy	tə kəy	lampaʔ	takenj
WB	kəy	to kəy	lampaʔ	takenj

WORD:	play	crossbow	bind	go up
PT	lə	tamiəŋ	caʔ	con
RK	lə	tamiəŋ	cəʔ	con
KS	alə	tamiəŋ	caʔ	con
QT	ləyʔ	tamiəŋ	caʔ	con
DS	lə	tamiəŋ	caʔ	cɔn
DL	lachaʔ	sana nu	sat	səh
WB	rachaʔ	sana no	sat	səh

In a number of cases (See Table 11) WB and QT pattern together, as, for example, in the words 'small', 'kick', 'smile' (shown above), 'butterfly' and 'guava'. WB has both forms for 'small', but said that /kəyʔ/ is smaller than /ket/. The most common form for 'guava' is similar to the Lao form, while the other form is similar to the Vietnamese form. It would seem unlikely, however, that WB would have borrowed a form from Vietnamese. In the word for 'black' WB and QT are joined by DL.

Table 11. Words shared by WB & QT

WORD:	small	kick	butterfly	guava	black
PT	kəyʔ	təʔ	khij khap	sada	ɛŋ
RK	kəyʔ	təʔ	klun khlap	sida	ɛŋ
KS	kəyʔ	təʔ	khaŋ khlap	sada	ɛŋ
QT	kət	cəh	tang atər	ɔyʔ	kum
DS	kəyʔ	təʔ	khang khap	sada	ɛŋ
DL	kəyʔ	təʔ	akan akhlap	sida	kum
WB	ket/kəyʔ	kacəh	taŋ atir	ɔyʔ	kum

In the words for 'sell' and 'happy' DS shares a form with WB (See Table 12). And in 'mud' and 'fan' both DS and DL share the WB form. In the word for 'pay back' RK, KS and QT all share a form with WB.

Table 12. Words showing similarity between QT, DS, WB and sometimes DL

WORD:	sell	happy	mud	fan	pay back
PT	tət	rəʔ	triək	apək	aləp
RK	tac	rɔʔ	apeʔ	apək	kulah
KS	tac	ruaʔ	krɛʔ kuteʔ	apək	kulah
QT	ceʔ	buy	luʔ	ratiʔ	kulah
DS	ceʔ	luaʔ buy	loʔ	manək	aləp
DL	tayʔ	luaʔ	loʔ	atiʔ	alap
WB	ciʔ	ruaʔ buy	nloʔ	tatiʔ	kulah

In some cases only one list differs from the forms given by all the others. The most commonly differing list is the QT list. Some illustrations of this are given in Table 13. The form for 'win' is particularly noteworthy, since the form given by all other groups has the exact opposite meaning in QT dialect where it means 'lose'. The common form for 'win' in this dialect, /ca/, also means 'eat'. The term /riap/ also means 'succeed.'

Table 13. Words found only in QT

WORD:	pounded rice	win	move residence	mute	chew
PT	asəʔ	pe	ɲay	kʉʔ	abat
RK	asəʔ	pe	ɲay	kʉʔ	abat
KS	asəʔ	pe	ɲay	kʉʔ	abat
QT	rakaw	ca/riap	deʔ	ɾɔŋ	ɾjan
DS	asəʔ	pe	ɲay	kʉʔ	abat
DL	asaʔ	pe	ɲay	kək	abat
WB	asəʔ	pe	ɲay	kʉʔ	bubat

The WB list also has a number of items which are unique to that list. Some of these are given in Table 14.

Table 14. Words found only in WB

WORD:	mosquito	knife	urinate	hear	fish
PT	rayoŋ	acu	ciklom	taməŋ	siəʔ
RK	rayoŋ	acu	ciklum	taməŋ	siəʔ
KS	rayoŋ	acu	ciklum	taməŋ	siəʔ
QT	rayoŋ	acu	kuklum	taməŋ	siaʔ
DS	rayoŋ	acu	akum	taməŋ	siəʔ
DL	rayoŋ	aco	ŋkloŋ	taməŋ	siəʔ
WB	muayh	mpiət	kakrua	saŋat	aka

For the other groups, a few forms are unique or shared with only one other group. The word for 'hand' given by RK conveys the meaning of 'finger' in some of the other groups. DS borrows the Lao form for charcoal (which is the same in Vietnamese and is ultimately borrowed from Chinese) and QT uses the Vietnamese form for 'bridge', but PT has a form which is unlike the others for these two items (See Table 15).

Table 15. Words showing wide variation

WORD :	hand	swollen	tomorrow	charcoal	bridge
PT	ati	ɛh	panə	raʔəh	makuəŋ
RK	nɔy	bəŋ	manə	acah	radɔr
KS	ati	ayh	manə	kucah	adɔl
QT	ati	ayh	parnə	kucah	kəw
DS	ati	ayh	pranə	than	adən
DL	ate	bəŋ	samɔʔ	kacah	ladəy
WB	atəy	ayh	pharnə	kucah	radəyʔ

Some of the most frequently occurring lexical items are pronouns, and Table 16 indicates that while these are similar, they do not always match. For example, even though WB lists the form /kəʔ/ for first person singular, it is not used as frequently as the respectful /kəw/ or the form /ŋkɔʔ/ which is used with friends or peers. The form /həyʔ/ is used with superiors or in-laws. KS recognized the form /kəʔ/, but said it is mostly used by the Tri of Na Phiang. DL gives /kəʔ/ as being the common form and /ŋkɔʔ/ as being more deferential.

Second person singular is more similar. Only PT gives a separate form /bɛʔ/ as being more familiar and used with younger persons. WB gives /atow/ as a form used with friends or peers and /ŋia/ as used with superiors or parents-in-law.

Table 16. Personal pronouns

WORD:	I (sg.)	you (sg.)	he/she
PT	ŋkuaʔ	bɛʔ/may	an/alay
RK	ŋkɔʔ	məy	an/alay
KS	ŋkuaʔ/kəʔ	may	an
QT	kəʔ	məi	an
DS	kəʔ	may	an/alay
DL	kəʔ/ŋkɔʔ	may	an
WB	kəʔ/ŋkɔʔ/kəw/həyʔ	məy/atow/ŋia	an

WORD:	we(excl.)	we(incl.)	you(pl.)	they(spec.)	they(indef.)
PT	hiʔ	hiʔ	vak bɛʔ/ vak may	vak an/ vak alay	naw
RK	hiʔ	hay	apay	alay	naw
KS	hiʔ	hay	mu mpay/əŋiə	alay	naw
QT	heʔ	hay	əŋia	aləy	naw
DS	heʔ/chum heʔ	hay/chum hay	əŋia/chum əŋia	alay/chum alay	---
DL	heʔ/chum heʔ	hay/chum hay	mpay/chum mpay	alay/chum alay	naw
WB	mahəy	hay/mahay	məŋia	ləy	naw

7. Conclusion

The materials which we have collected generally support the groupings postulated by Smith for the wider Katuic sub-family. Figure 5 shows the language groups presented in this study. Those listed as North Katuic constitute a language conglomerate which is closely interrelated. While some North Katuic groups will occasionally use the term Sui or Suai to refer to themselves or their language, it seems more appropriate to use this term in referring to the language group which is part of the West Katuic group. The relationship between Ngeq and other members of what Smith calls Central Katuic needs further study. According to the lists available to us, its relationship to Central Katuic is marginal. It would also be helpful to find out if other groups exist to link the two Katu groups for which we have data (Katu-L and Katu-V). The relationship of either Katu list to the other groups said to be Katuic is much more distant.

KATUIC		
	North Katuic	
		So
		Bru
		Tri
		Makong/Mangkong
		Siliq
		Katang
	West Katuic	
		Sui/suoi/Suai
		Nheu
		Kui
		Kuay
	Pacoh	
	Central Katuic	
		Ong
		Ir
	Ngeq	
	Katu (Laos)	
	Katu (VN)	

Figure 5. Chart of Katuic groups represented in this study

For the North Katuic groups, it is easy to understand how intelligibility breaks down when we look at the many common words which differ between groups. From our observation, even though phonologies vary somewhat between groups, the differences in vocabulary are more critical in affecting intelligibility than are the minor phonological changes. It is possible to postulate a threshold of around 90% where communication between the Bru groups studied becomes difficult. But even where percentages are higher, comprehension is not evenly distributed because of differences in core vocabulary. Should contact between the groups studied become more frequent, intelligibility would certainly improve.

Appendix: Wordlists coded for comparison with WORDSURV, including information about the list

SYMBOL: A

TITLE: bru - dong sen kew
 SOURCE: Language Survey
 LANG: Bru Dong Sen Kew, T. Kham Khew,
 A. Chanuman, C. Ubon
 TECH: Carolyn Miller
 DATE: 16 Feb 93
 LANG CONTACT: Survey
 SPEAKER: 2 men: Nai Seng Mun Dii (62 yrs
 old), and Nai Khen Mun Dii (68 yrs old)
 COMMENTS: The older people still know and
 use Bru, but say the children don't know
 how to speak Bru.

SYMBOL: B

TITLE: bru - kham wae
 SOURCE: Language Survey
 LANG: Bru Kham Wae, T. Lai, A.
 Nikhom, C. Sakon Nakhon
 TECH: Carolyn Miller
 DATE: 13 Jan 93
 LANG CONTACT: Survey
 SPEAKER: Two women named Phang and
 Thai
 COMMENTS:

SYMBOL: C

TITLE: so - nong weng
 SOURCE: Language Survey
 LANG: So Nong Weng, A. Song Dao, C.
 Sakon Nakhon
 TECH: Carolyn Miller
 DATE: 12 Jan 93
 LANG CONTACT: Survey
 SPEAKER: 2 women: Me Noi Duang Dai
 (65yrs), Som Phon Phat Kham Tan
 (46yrs)
 COMMENTS: These people originally came
 from Khammouan, Laos. The children
 don't speak So anymore.
 Language seems to be Thavung.

SYMBOL: D

TITLE: bru - pak chong
 SOURCE: Language Survey
 LANG: Bru Pak Chong, T. Kok Tum, C.
 Mukdahan
 TECH: Carolyn Miller
 DATE: 13 March 1993
 LANG CONTACT: Survey
 SPEAKER: Nang Payun (wife of village head
 -age 35)

COMMENTS: Same dialect as Na Hin Kong

SYMBOL: E

TITLE: so - pho thi phai san
 SOURCE: Language Survey
 LANG: So - B. Pho Thi Phai San, T. Pho Thi
 Phai San, A. Kusuman, C. Sakon Nakhon
 TECH: Carolyn Miller
 DATE: 19 February 1993
 LANG CONTACT: Survey
 SPEAKER: Young woman around 18 yrs of
 age, Saw Prakaphon Chamat
 COMMENTS:

SYMBOL: F

TITLE: suai - keng ruong
 SOURCE: Language Survey
 LANG: Suai Keng Ruong, T. Na Cha Loui,
 A. Na Cha Luoi, C. Ubon
 TECH: Carolyn Miller
 DATE: 4 Feb 93
 LANG CONTACT: A couple of hours
 SPEAKER: 2 men: Akam Sut Thanang
 (38yrs), Suk Thante (32 yrs)
 COMMENTS: Many people here do not use
 the Suai language anymore, though some
 know it.

SYMBOL: G

TITLE: ngeq - sekong
 SOURCE: List taken in Vientiane
 LANG: Ngeq/Ngkriang
 TECH: Nancy Costello
 DATE: 17 June 1992
 LANG CONTACT: First contact
 SPEAKER: Bun Mui, age 47
 COMMENTS: Speaker is from B. Ha Vi, M.
 Kalum, K. Sekong. Mother is Alak from
 B. Heung; father Ngeq from Ha Vi. Says
 there are Katu & Lao to the north of them;
 Jatong to the south; Alak to the west.

SYMBOL: H

TITLE: ngeq - sedone
 SOURCE: Katuic Word Lists No. 2,
 SIL Bangkok Library 495.97
 LANG: Ngeq
 TECH: Carolyn Miller
 DATE: 16 Feb 1988
 LANG CONTACT: In Ban Na Pho Refugee
 Camp
 SPEAKER: Som Chai, age 20

COMMENTS: Says lowlanders call them Ngeq; Bru call them Ngkrieng; they call themselves Krieng. Comes from B. Non Sa-at, T. Huai He Ba Chiang, M. Tran Suk, K. Champassak. Left 4 yrs. earlier.

SYMBOL: I

TITLE: kuay - kanchanaburi
SOURCE: Katuic Word Lists No. 2
SIL Bangkok Library 495.97

LANG: Kuay

TECH: Pailin Yantreesing

DATE: August 1980

LANG CONTACT: ??

SPEAKER: ??

COMMENTS: Location - south of Kanchanaburi.

SYMBOL: J

TITLE: nheu - sisaket
SOURCE: Katuic Word Lists No. 2,
SIL Bangkok Library 495.97

LANG: Nheu, B. Phaen Kho, Sisaket

TECH: Taweeporn

DATE: Jan 8, 1973

LANG CONTACT: 4 months

SPEAKER: ??

COMMENTS:

SYMBOL: K

TITLE: suai - saravan
SOURCE: Katuic Word Lists No. 2,
SIL Bangkok Library 495.97

LANG: Suai

TECH: Feikje v.d. Haak

DATE: 18 February 1988

LANG CONTACT: First contact

SPEAKER: Tien Sinprasert, age 28

COMMENT: Taken in Na Pho camp said there were two groups of Kui in his area, the lowland who were Buddhist and the upland who are animist and speak like Feikje. 12 years in camp already with family. Came from Beungkham, Saravan.

SYMBOL: L

TITLE: sui - champhon
SOURCE: Katuic Word Lists No. 2,
SIL Bangkok Library 495.97

LANG: Sui, B. Songpia, T.

Sakheunnaa, M. Champhon,
K. Savannakhet

TECH: Chinda Kommala

DATE: 22 Jan 1979

LANG CONTACT: Survey

SPEAKER: Mr. Phet Boonhuang, age 28

COMMENTS:

SYMBOL: M

TITLE: bru - tha long

SOURCE: Survey

LANG: Bru, B. Tha Long, T. Huay Phai,
A. Khong Chiam, C. Ubon

TECH: Carolyn Miller

DATE: 12 March 1993

LANG CONTACT: Survey

SPEAKER: Thi Pheung Pha, female, age 34

COMMENTS: Like Woen Buck.

SYMBOL: N

TITLE: so - khammouan

SOURCE: Katuic Word Lists No. 2,
SIL Bangkok Library 495.97

LANG: So

TECH: Chinda Kommala

DATE: 22 Jan 1979

LANG CONTACT: Survey

SPEAKER: Mr. Suan Somphonpakdii, age 23

COMMENTS: From B. Phonbok, T.
Vienglouang, M. Gnommalad, K.
Khammouan

SYMBOL: O

TITLE: makong - sepone

SOURCE: Katuic Word Lists No. 2,
SIL Bangkok Library 495.97

LANG: Makong

TECH: Dorothy Thomas and David Andrianoff

DATE: 29 May 1978

LANG CONTACT: Survey

SPEAKER: Kabuat

COMMENTS: From Sepone, Savannakhet.

SYMBOL: P

TITLE: ta-oih - saravan

SOURCE: Katuic Word Lists No. 2,
SIL Bangkok Library 495.97

LANG: Ta-oih

TECH: John Miller

DATE: 16 Feb 1988

LANG CONTACT: First contact

SPEAKER: Khamphui

COMMENTS: Parents from Saravan near VN border but moved to Sedone. Many Ta-oih moved to that area. Left home at age 7 to study at Pakse.

SYMBOL: Q

TITLE: ta-oih - lao ngam

SOURCE: Katuic Word Lists No. 2,
SIL Bangkok Library 495.97

LANG: Ta-oih

TECH: Chinda Kommala

DATE: 6 Feb 1979

LANG CONTACT: Survey

SPEAKER: Mr. Phornxay Boonsii, age 25
COMMENTS: From B. Dong, T. Laongam,
 M. Laongam, K. Saravan.

SYMBOL: R
TITLE: ong - pakse
SOURCE: Katuic Word Lists No. 2,
 SIL Bangkok Library 495.97
LANG: Ong
TECH: David Thomas and Chinda Kommala
DATE: 30 May 1978
LANG CONTACT: Survey
SPEAKER: Nu Sai
COMMENTS: From Phalay, M. Pantha
 Udom, Sedon (off the road from Pakse to
 Paksong).

SYMBOL: S
TITLE: ir - saravan
SOURCE: Katuic Word Lists No. 2,
 SIL Bangkok Library 495.97
LANG: Ir, B. Pakkha, T. Hui Pa-at,
 M. Saravan, K. Saravan
TECH: Chinda Kommala
DATE: 26 Sept 1978
LANG CONTACT: Survey
SPEAKER: Mr. Korn Seang Thaweesook
 and Mr. Poothorn Phasavanh.
COMMENTS: Also known as Inh.

SYMBOL: T
TITLE: siliq - phalane
SOURCE: Katuic Word Lists No. 2,
 SIL Bangkok Library 495.97
LANG: Siliq, B. Nasaku, Phalan, K.
 Savanannakhet. Near Keng Kok.
TECH: David Thomas and Chinda Kommala
DATE: 30 May 1978
LANG CONTACT: Survey
SPEAKER: Mr. Kham
COMMENTS: Said it was similar to Ta-oih.

SYMBOL: U
TITLE: bru - hin taek
SOURCE: Language Survey
LANG: Bru, B. Hin Taek, T. Lay,
 A. Phanna Nihom, C. Sakon Nakhon
TECH: Carolyn Miller
DATE: 11 March 1993
LANG CONTACT: Survey
SPEAKER: Sale' Keu Saya and
 Kanthi Hung Huan
COMMENTS: Same dialect as Kham Wae.

SYMBOL: V
TITLE: bru - na sua lai
SOURCE: Language Survey

LANG: Bru, B. Na Sua Lai, T. Kham Phalay,
 A. Muang, C. Mukdahan
TECH: Carolyn Miller
DATE: 13 March 1993
LANG CONTACT: Survey
SPEAKER: Sian (f, 60yrs), Udom (m, 50yrs)
COMMENTS: People at Dong Seng Kew,
 Ubon said these were the same. These
 people said they were like Nong Yang,
 MKD. Young people no longer speak the
 language.

SYMBOL: W
TITLE: bru - phon hai
SOURCE: Language Survey
LANG: Bru, B. Phon Hai, T. Nong Khen, A.
 Dong Luang, C. Mukdahan
TECH: Carolyn Miller
DATE: 16 April 1993
LANG CONTACT: Survey
SPEAKER: Nang Phieng Sua Khampho
 (f, 33yrs) and Nang Thu Wong Kason
 (f, 30 yrs)
COMMENTS: Said to be a bit different from
 T. Dong Luang, but came from there.

SYMBOL: X
TITLE: suai - sukuma
SOURCE: Taken at Na Pho Refugee Camp
LANG: Suai, M. Sukuma, K. Champassak
TECH: Recorded and transcribed by
 Khamphuy; checked and put in phonetic
 script by C. Miller
DATE: 29 June 1993
LANG CONTACT: Survey
SPEAKER: Mr. Ma Douang Udom
COMMENTS:

SYMBOL: Y
TITLE: katang - wapi
SOURCE: Taken at Na Pho Refugee Camp
LANG: Katang, B. Dan Na Lao, M.
 Lakhonpheng or Wapi, K. Saravan
TECH: Recorded and transcribed by
 Khamphuy; checked and put in phonetic
 script by C. Miller
DATE: June 1993
LANG CONTACT: Survey
SPEAKER: Mr. But Da Tong Dara
COMMENTS:

SYMBOL: Z
TITLE: suoi - phalane
SOURCE: Taken at NKP from a visitor
LANG: Suoi, B. Non Seng, T. Dong Pho Si
 M. Atsapheng Thong, K. Savannakhet

TECH: Written in Lao script by speaker;
checked and rewritten in Bru VN script by
J. Miller

DATE: 22 April 1994

LANG CONTACT: Few days visit

SPEAKER: Mr. Nhiang Vong Suwan

COMMENTS: His home is along Highway 9,
12 kms past Muang Phalane toward VN
border. Mother and Father were both
Suoi. There were 4 children in the family.
He has 8 living children. There are 7
Suoi villages coming from a place called
Napho. All the villages where the word
Napho occurs in the name are Suoi
villages. Some of the villages have 40 or
more families. His own village has 20
some families.

SYMBOL: a

TITLE: bru - kok sa-at

SOURCE: Katiuc Word Lists No. 2,
SIL Bangkok Library 495.97

LANG: Bru - B.Kok Sa-at, T.Lae, A.Phang
Khon, C.Sakon Nakhon, Thailand

TECH: John and Carolyn Miller

DATE: 11 Feb 1988

LANG CONTACT: One visit

SYMBOL: b

TITLE: bru - quang tri

SOURCE: Katiuc Word Lists No. 2,
SIL Bangkok Library 495.97

LANG: Bru - Khe Sanh, Quang Tri, Vietnam

TECH: John and Carolyn Miller

DATE: 3 Sep 1968; corrected 1993

LANG CONTACT: from 1962 to 1975

SYMBOL: c

TITLE: bru - nong yang

SOURCE: Katiuc Word Lists No. 2,
SIL Bangkok Library 495.97

LANG: Bru - B.Nong Yang, T.Sanot Noi
A.Dong Luang, C.Mukdahan, Thailand

TECH: John and Carolyn Miller

DATE: 8 Feb 1988; corrected 30 Dec 1992

LANG CONTACT: Two visits

SPEAKER: On second visit, Me Ban Thom
(around 45 yrs.) and Nang Pahat (around
25 yrs)

COMMENTS: Different from Ban Biat and
other villages in T. Dong Luang. Bru
name is Nong Nyiang; the Lao, Nong
Nyang; the Thai, Nong Yang. This has
led some confusion of lists.

SYMBOL: d

TITLE: bru - thateng

SOURCE: Katiuc Word Lists No. 2,
SIL Bangkok Library 495.97

LANG: Bru - Thateng, Laos

TECH: Chinda Kommala

DATE: 11 Dec 1978

LANG CONTACT: Survey at the Ubon
Camp

SPEAKER: Sinh Vilaywan, age 26

COMMENTS: Language spoken in
B.Lawang, T.Kok-phun, M.Thateng,
K.Saravan. Other languages that are also
in the same district: Bru, Ngeq, and Alak.

SYMBOL: e

TITLE: bru - woen buek

SOURCE: Language Survey

LANG: Bru --B.Woen Buek, T. Khong Chiam
A.Khong Chiam, C. Ubon Rachathani,
Thailand

TECH: Carolyn Miller

DATE: 5 February 1993

SPEAKER: Som Chai Pheung Dong, Male 41

LANG CONTACT: Survey

COMMENTS: Brian Migliazza used earlier list
done by Pattiya.

SYMBOL: f

TITLE: ngeq - pakse

SOURCE: Katiuc Word Lists No. 2,
SIL Bangkok Library 495.97

LANG: Ngeq -- B.Laksipha, Pakse, Laos

TECH: David Thomas and Chinda
Kommala

DATE: 29 May 1978/79??

LANG CONTACT: 3 hour visit in
Ubon Refugee Camp

SPEAKER: Buntan Darasen (around 40 years
old) from B. Laksipha, Pakse, Laos; and
with assistance from Chinda Kommala
(around 30 years old) from B.Beng, T.Sen
Wang, LANG: M.Sutabali, K.Saravan,
Laos

SYMBOL: g

TITLE: ngeq - tray river

SOURCE: Katiuc Word Lists No. 2,
SIL Bangkok Library 495.97

LANG: Nkriang on the Tray River, Laos

TECH: Ron Smith

DATE: 12 March 1969

LANG CONTACT: 20 months

COMMENTS: Those along the Sekong river
speak what is called Ngeq. Nkriang is the
main dialect; Ngeq is a dialect which has
had contact with the Ta-oih.

SYMBOL: h
 TITLE: pacoh - thua thien
 SOURCE: Katuic Word Lists No. 2,
 SIL Bangkok Library 495.97
 LANG: Pacoh, Thua Thien province,
 Vietnam
 TECH: Dick and Sandy Watson
 DATE: August 1972
 LANG CONTACT: since 1961
 COMMENTS: Spoken in the area west of
 Hue, dialects of NE Pahi (north of My
 Chanh river) and SE Pahi (from Asau
 Valley west).

SYMBOL: i
 TITLE: katu - quang nam
 SOURCE: Katuic Word Lists No. 2
 SIL Bangkok Library 495.97
 LANG: Katu, An Diem, Quang Nam, Vietnam
 TECH: Nancy Costello
 DATE: 25 July 1968
 LANG CONTACT: 1963-68
 COMMENTS: This is known also as Low
 Katu. High Katu is spoken in the area
 close to the Laotian border.

SYMBOL: j
 TITLE: so - pha thay
 SOURCE: BL Migliazza wordlist (WL #1)
 LANG: So, B.Pha Thay, A. Tha
 Uthen, C.Nakhon Phanom,
 Thailand
 TECH: Brian Migliazza
 DATE: 22 August 1991
 LANG CONTACT: Survey
 SPEAKER: Female, age 65
 COMMENTS: Tape #1.

SYMBOL: k
 TITLE: so - huay phra
 SOURCE: BL Migliazza wordlist (WL #2)
 LANG: So, B.Huay Phra, A. Tha Uthen,
 C. Nakhon Phanom, Thailand
 TECH: Brian Migliazza
 DATE: 22 August 1991
 LANG CONTACT: Survey
 SPEAKER: Male, age 62
 COMMENTS: Tape #2.

SYMBOL: l
 TITLE: so - na kham
 SOURCE: BL Migliazza wordlist (WL #3)
 LANG: So, B.Na Kham, A.
 Phonsawaan, C. Nakhon Phanom,
 Thailand
 TECH: Brian Migliazza
 DATE: 31 August 1991

LANG CONTACT: Survey
 SPEAKER: Male, age 51
 COMMENTS: Tape #3.

SYMBOL: m
 TITLE: so - kusuman
 SOURCE: Katuic Word List No. 2, SIL
 Bangkok Library 495.97
 LANG: So, B.Kusuman, T. Kusuman
 A.Kusuman, C.Sakon Nakhon, Thailand
 TECH: Malai Lerthirunwong
 DATE: August 1980; rechecked by C. Miller
 10 Jan 93
 LANG CONTACT: Survey
 SPEAKER: Padit Monpak, male 23, and Cun
 Monpak, female 53
 COMMENTS: Last 17 entries not checked.

SYMBOL: n
 TITLE: tri - na phiang kaw
 SOURCE: Katuic Word Lists No. 2,
 SIL Bangkok Library 495.97
 LANG: Tri, B.Na Phiang Kaw, T.Na
 Phiang, A.Kusuman, C.Sakon
 Nakhon, Thailand
 TECH: Carolyn Miller
 DATE: 11 February 1988; rechecked on
 14 January 1993
 LANG CONTACT: Survey
 SPEAKER: Two different women 50 and
 60 yrs old

SYMBOL: o
 TITLE: bru - nong yang
 SOURCE: BL Migliazza wordlist (WL #12)
 LANG: Bru, B.Nong Yang, T. Sanot Noy,
 A.Dong Luang, C.Mukdahan, Thailand
 TECH: Brian Migliazza
 DATE: 29 August 1991
 LANG CONTACT: Survey
 SPEAKER: Male, age 27
 COMMENTS: Tape #12; same village as c.

SYMBOL: p
 TITLE: bru - dong luang
 SOURCE: BL Migliazza wordlist (WL #13)
 LANG: Bru, B.Dong Luang,
 A.Dong Luang, C.Mukdahan, Thailand
 TECH: Brian Migliazza; checked by Carolyn
 Miller in Nong Mak Suk
 DATE: 29 August 1991; rechecked 30 Dec
 1992
 LANG CONTACT: Survey
 SPEAKER: Male, age 40-50; rechecked
 with three women age 50, 35 and 18
 COMMENTS: Tape #13.

SYMBOL: q
 TITLE: bru - tiw
 SOURCE: Survey List
 LANG: So, B.Tiw, T. Fang Deng, A. Dong Luang, C. Mukdahan, Thailand
 TECH: Brian Migliazza; rechecked by Carolyn Miller
 DATE: 29 August 1991; rechecked 2 April 93
 LANG CONTACT: Survey
 SPEAKER: Male, age 40-50; male 41
 COMMENTS: Tape #14.

SYMBOL: r
 TITLE: bru - kham phak kut
 SOURCE: Survey List
 LANG: Bru, B.Kham Phak Kut, T. Kok Tum, A.Dong Luang, C.Mukdahan, Thailand
 TECH: Brian Migliazza; rechecked by Carolyn Miller
 DATE: 29 August 1991; rechecked 2 February 1993
 LANG CONTACT: Survey
 SPEAKER: Male, age 31; female 30, and male 20
 COMMENTS: Tape #15.

SYMBOL: s
 TITLE: kui - surin
 SOURCE: Katuic Word Lists No. 2, SIL Bangkok Library 495.97
 LANG: Kui, B.Samrongthap, C.Surin, Thailand
 TECH: Feikje v.d. Haak and Brigitte Woykos
 DATE: July 1980
 LANG CONTACT: 20+ years
 SPEAKER: Beulah Johnston
 COMMENTS: Recorded the wordlist from Beulah's knowledge.

SYMBOL: t
 TITLE: bru - rom klaw
 SOURCE: Katuic Word Lists No. 2, SIL Bangkok Library 495.97
 LANG: bru -- B.Rom Klaw, T.Rom Klaw, A.Nikhom Kham Soi, C.Mukdahan
 TECH: Thaythun Boun Ma
 DATE: 4 Oct 1988
 LANG CONTACT: Self recorded
 COMMENTS: Native speaker typed 1st list; rechecked by Carolyn Miller 29 December 1992. Originally from Keng Na, Taleng, Pak Song. Lived near Dong Luang for a while. Moved here 13 years previously.

SYMBOL: u
 TITLE: katu sana - sekong
 SOURCE: Katuic Word Lists No. 2, SIL Bangkok Library 495.97
 LANG: Katu Sana, Ahiing village, Kalum District, Sekong Prov., Laos (about 150 Ks from Saravan)
 TECH: Nancy Costello
 DATE: 15 June 1992
 LANG CONTACT: 2 hours
 SPEAKER: Kamleuan Sulavan
 COMMENTS: The list was taken in Vientiane.

SYMBOL: v
 TITLE: katang - saravan
 SOURCE: Taken from refugees (about 15) in Na Pho Refugee Camp, Nakhon Phanom, Thailand
 LANG: Katang Saravan, Laos
 TECH: Beulah Johnstone and Janice Saul
 DATE: 29 May 1978
 LANG CONTACT: A few hours
 SPEAKER: Suriphan, Bunthawi, Buncan
 COMMENTS:

SYMBOL: w
 TITLE: katang - na du
 SOURCE: Na Pho Refugee camp, Nakhon Phanom, Thailand
 LANG: Katang Na Du, B. Na Hong, M. Na Du, T. Na Du, K. Saravan, Laos (NE of Saravan town)
 TECH: Carolyn Miller
 DATE: 16 Feb 88
 LANG CONTACT: A few hours
 SPEAKER: ?? 51 yrs old
 COMMENTS: Left his village 1949 and Laos in 1975.

SYMBOL: x
 TITLE: katang - raviang
 SOURCE: Na Pho Refugee Camp, Nakhon Phanom, Thailand
 LANG: Katang Raviang, Saravan Province, Laos
 TECH: John D Miller
 DATE: 12 Feb 88
 LANG CONTACT: A few hours
 SPEAKER: Khamparn Lalouangpheth Nukon, 40 yrs old
 COMMENTS: Village of Raviang is about 46 Ks from Saravan town. Wife is from the village of Talian about 12 Ks from his village.

SYMBOL: y

TITLE: katang - taleuang

SOURCE: Na Pho Refugee Camp,
Nakhon Phanom, Thailand

LANG: Katang Taleuang, B. Cheng
Noi, M. Khong Sadon, T. Daan, K.
Saravan

TECH: Carolyn Miller

DATE: 12 Feb 88

LANG CONTACT: A few hours

SPEAKER: ?? , 37 yrs old

COMMENTS: The man said the village
of Taleuang is 300 Ks from other
Katang. Only a few Katang in his
village. Left home in 1975. His
wife is Lao. He calls himself Bru
Kataan, as do others in his village.

SYMBOL: z

TITLE: bru - nong hay

SOURCE: Language Survey

LANG: So, B. Nong Hai Nhay, T. Lae, A.
Phang Khon, C. Sakon Nakhon

TECH: Carolyn Miller

DATE: 13 Jan 93

LANG CONTACT: A couple hours

SPEAKER: Bok (a woman about 37 yrs old),
Pa Chak (a man about 26 yrs old)

COMMENTS: The sociolinguistic form
indicates they prefer to be called Thai/Lao,
but people giving the word list called
themselves Bru.

REFERENCES

- Bradley, D. n.d. in *Map of Mainland Southeast Asia (North) & Hainan*. Australian Academy of the Humanities.
- Chollada Jungprasert. 1986. "Clauses in So (Bruu) of Dong Luang, Mukdahan province." M.A. thesis, Mahidol University.
- Darunee Kulachol. 1986. "The phonology of So at Amphoe Dongluang, Mukdahan province." M.A. thesis, Mahidol University.
- Diffloth, Gerard. 1980. "Registre, devoisement, timbre vocalique: leur histoire en Katouique." Paper for a Mon-Khmer etymological lexicon project, University of Chicago.
- Ekawit Chinawat. 1983. "A Comparative study of the morphological processes of Kui, Bruu and So." M.A. thesis, Chulalongkorn University.
- Gainey, Jerry. 1985. "A Comparative study of Kui, Bruu, and So phonology from a genetic point of view." M.A. thesis, Chulalongkorn University.
- Grimes, Barbara, ed. 1992. *Ethnologue: Languages of the World*, 12th edition. Dallas: Summer Institute of Linguistics.
- Gutwein, Eugene. 1980. "So rhyming dictionary." Unpublished ms. 206 pp.
- Huffman, F.E. 1976. "The relevance of lexicostatistics to Mon-Khmer languages." *Austroasiatic Studies, Part 1*, ed. Philip N. Jenner et al, pp. 539-574. Honolulu: University of Hawaii Press.
- Malai Lerthirunwong. 1980. "A syntactic description of So: an Austronesian language in Thailand." M.A. thesis, Mahidol University.
- Migliazza, Brian. 1991. "So and Bru in Northeast Thailand." Paper presented at the 24th International Conference on Sino-Tibetan Languages and Linguistics, Bangkok.
- Migliazza, Brian. 1992. "Lexicostatistic analysis of some Katuic languages." Paper presented at the 3rd International Symposium on Language and Linguistics, Chulalongkorn University.
- Miller, Carolyn. 1994. "Perceptions of ethnolinguistic identity, language shift and language use in Mon-Khmer language communities of Northeast Thailand." *MKS* 23:83-101.
- Miller, John. 1994. "Evaluation of the wordlist used in a Mon-Khmer research project in Northeast Thailand." *MKS* 23:67-81.
- Miller, John and Carolyn. 1994. "Notes on phonology and orthography in several Katuic Mon-Khmer groups in Northeast Thailand." Unpublished manuscript.
- Pailin Yantreesingh. 1980. "The Phonology of the Kuay language of Suphanburi with comparison to the Kuy language of Surin." M.A. thesis, Mahidol University.
- Pattiya Jimreivat. 1981. "Clauses and phrases in Bru." M.A. thesis, Mahidol University.
- Smith, Kenneth D. 1981. "A Lexico-statistical study of 45 Mon-Khmer languages." *Linguistics Across Continents*, ed. Andrew Gonzalez and David Thomas, pp. 180-205. Manila: Summer Institute of Linguistics and Linguistic Society of the Philippines.
- Theraphan L. Thongkum and See Puenga. 1980. *A Bruu-Thai-English Dictionary*. Bangkok: Chulalongkorn University.
- Thomas, David. 1960. "Basic Vocabulary in some Mon-Khmer Languages." *AL* 2.3:7-11.

- Thomas, David. 1966. "Mon-Khmer subgrouping in Vietnam." *SCAL*, ed. Norman H. Zide, pp.194-202. Le Hague: Mouton
- Thomas, David. and Robert Headley. 1970. "More on Mon-Khmer subgrouping." *Lingua* 25:398-418.
- Thomas, Dorothy. 1976. *A Phonological reconstruction of Proto-East Katuic*. Grand Forks, University of North Dakota. 103 pp.

Received: 29 August 1994

Summer Institute of Linguistics
281/4 Soi Sri Phuan
Rim Klong Prapa Fang Sai
Bangkok 10800
Thailand