# URAK LAWOI', MALAY AND THAI
## SOME SYNTACTIC COMPARISONS

David W. Hogan

This paper arose out of a preliminary study of the syntax of the Urak Lawoi' language in the light of recent studies in Malay and Thai. This study was aimed at providing a sound basis for a more detailed analysis of Urak Lawoi' syntax. It showed that there were many basic similarities between the syntax of the three languages. Where Malay syntax and Thai syntax diverge, Urak Lawoi' follows Malay in some respects and Thai in others. In addition it has some syntactic features not found in either of the other two languages.[1]


1.      INTRODUCTION

1.1     The Urak Lawoi' are an animistic tribe of Malay racial stock who live on the shores of islands off the west coast of South Thailand from Phuket Island to the Malay border. In Sopher's phraseology they are strand-dwellers rather than boat-dwellers or sea nomads (Sopher 1965:51,62,82-83). They are estimated to number between 2500 and 3000 people. They have much in common with the Malay people of the area, and there has been some intermarriage. With a few exceptions, the Malay people of this coast have adopted the Thai language, but the Urak Lawoi' people still speak their own language, which is closely related to Malay. The influence of the Thai culture is having an increasing effect, yet there are still many Urak Lawoi' who are fluent only in their own language, and it is the language normally used in the village.

1.2.    Publications on Thai and Malay which have been consulted are as listed in the bibliography.[2]

1.3     Phonologically, Urak Lawoi' has obviously closer links with Malay than it has with Thai. The phonemes of Urak Lawoi' have a close resemblance to the primary phonemes of Malay as

described by Abdullah (1974:6ff) with a consistent pattern of phonological changes between the two languages.[3] Any variations could be due to the intrusion of the Thai patterns. Urak Lawoi' resembles Malay in being a non-tonal language in contrast to the tonal Thai. The intonation patterns of Urak Lawoi' are basically the same as those of Malay, as described by Payne (1970:8ff).

1.4     Lexically, Urak Lawoi' has strong affinities with Malay. Using Dyen's lexicostatistical approach to compare the two languages, the Swadesh 200-word list (Samarin, 1967:220) shows 68.6% of the words in Urak Lawoi' as being cognate with the common conversational equivalent in Malay. A further 22.4% of the Urak Lawoi' words have Malay cognates which are not necessarily the common conversational equivalent, leaving 8.9% with no cognates immediately evident. With only one list of Urak Lawoi' words available and no access to Dyen's original lists, this data has its limitations, but it seems that Urak Lawoi' may be regarded as on the fringe of being a dialect of Malay, and definitely belonging to the Malayan Sub-family of Dyen's Malayic Hesion.

Of the languages in this Malayic Hesion, Achinese is the one which is closest to Urak Lawoi' geographically, being just across the Straits of Malacca from Adang Island group, the southern extremity of the tribe. As Dyen's list shows Achinese as not in the Malayan Sub-family, and as having a much lower percentage of Malayan cognates (43.7%) than Urak Lawoi' has, it is presumed that Urak Lawoi' belongs to the Malayan Sub-family rather than the Achinese. I have discussed this with Collins, a current student of Achinese and he agrees with this presumption.

It is noticeable that most of the words which have Malay cognates appear to be words with an authentic Malay origin. Modern Malay has a good sprinkling of words of Arabic, Portugese, Dutch and English origins which have been introduced into the language through the influence of European settlers or Islamic vocabulary, but practically none of these appear in Urak Lawoi'. For instance, Brown (1956) lists 24 words or expressions of Arabic origin in "Country Malay". Of these only two have evident Urak Lawoi' cognates (*akal* 'mind' and *asal* 'origin'). This may be due to the fact that the Urak Lawoi' are not Moslems. On the other hand it suggests that they have been secluded from the main current of the Malay language for many centuries.

1.5     When Urak Lawoi' syntax is compared with that of Thai and Malay, it is evident that there are similarities in the basic syntactic patterns of the three languages. On the other

16

hand there are places where Urak Lawoi' follows the Malay
pattern, places where it follows the Thai pattern, and places
where it establishes a unique pattern of its own. The debat-
able question is whether these variations reflect the genetic
inheritance which has been retained from some remote proto-
language, or are instead alien intrusions, of comparatively
recent introduction.

## 2. PLACES WHERE MALAY, THAI AND URAK LAWOI' HAVE SIMILAR SYNTACTIC PATTERNS.

Two places where the three languages have a similar syntactic
pattern are the word-classes and the active clause.

2.1    What are basically the same major word classes are
described by Payne (1970), Abdullah (1974) and Asmah (1968)
for Malay, and by Noss (1964) and Vichin (1970) for Thai.
Terminology differs but Asmah's may be taken as representative
as she divides Malay words into the three classes of nominals,
verbals and function words.  The main disagreement is as to an
additional class of adverbs which are postulated by Abdullah
(1974:29ff) for Malay and by Vichin (1970:160ff) for Thai.  In
both cases this is a comparatively small and closed group of
words which the other writers describe as being either modal
(or auxiliary) verbs or as function words or the equivalent.
The main difference between the two languages at this level is
the existence of a function word sub-class of sentence par-
ticles in Thai which Malay does not have.[4]
       Urak Lawoi' has the same general pattern of word classes
as Malay and Thai, but follows Malay rather than Thai in having
no sentence particles.

2.2    The favourite clause construction in Thai, Malay and
Urak Lawoi' is what may be described as the active, declarative
clause.  The basic syntactic pattern for minimal forms of these
clauses is similar for the three languages, and may be described
briefly as in Table 1.
       The order of the elements in these clauses is identical
in the three languages, with the one exception shown in the
footnote.  The same restrictions apply as to which elements are
obligatory and which are optional.  When inversion occurs the
restrictions and possibilities are similar, with slight vari-
ations in the Ditransitive clause.  In all three languages the
insertion of optional secondary elements is similar with the
majority of such elements appearing clause-initially or
finally.  More contrast between the languages appears when the
nuclear clause in its minimal form is expanded to include
several peripheral elements.

## TABLE 1: THE ACTIVE CLAUSE

| CLAUSE TYPES | SUBJECT | PREDICATE | INDIRECT OBJECT | OBJECT |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Nominal Clause: | +NP | +NP | - | - |
| Verbal Clauses: | | | | |
|   Intransitive: | ±NP | +VP | - | - |
|   Transitive: | ±NP | +VP | - | ±NP |
|   Ditransitive: | ±NP | +VP | ±NP[1] | ±NP |

([1]In Thai the Indirect Object follows the Object)

## 3. PLACES WHERE URAK LAWOI' SYNTAX FOLLOWS THE MALAY PATTERN.

Phonologically and lexically, UL resembles Malay (1.3 and 1.4 above); in having no sentence particles, it follows Malay rather than Thai (2.1 above). It also follows Malay in its morphological system of affixation. Thai has very little affixation and forms derivatives by a process of compounding words, while inflectional aspects are signalled with auxiliary verbs and particles. Malay has a system of prefixes and suffixes which operate both derivationally and inflectionally, plus a very limited class of infixes. Urak Lawoi' retains a modified form of some of the Malay prefixes, but has none of the suffixes.

3.1 The main Malay affixes as described by Abdullah may be listed as in Table 2.

### TABLE 2: MAIN MALAY AFFIXES

Nominal affixes:   pe-, peN-, ke-, ke--an.

Verbal affixes:

| | |
|---|---|
|   Intransitive: | se-, ke-, -an, ke--an. |
|   Transitive: | per-, -kan, -i. |
|   Voice: | meN-, di-, ter-, ber-. |

3.1.1 Urak Lawoi' has some of the nominal prefixes, but they are not used as extensively as in modern Malay, and they do not fully agree with the Malay pattern. Samples are listed in Table 3.

## TABLE 3: URAK LAWOI' NOMINAL PREFIXES

| per- | melaw 'to speak' | permelaw 'a word' |
|---|---|---|
| peN- | suroh 'to order' | penyuroh 'a messenger' |
| | takoc 'to be afraid' | penakoc 'timidity' |
| | sakëq 'to be ill' | penyakëq 'a patient' |
| ge- | lebëh 'more' | gelebëh 'a transgressor' |

3.1.2 Urak Lawoi' does not have the Intransitive or Transitive verbal affixes. Where Malay would use -*kan* or -*i* to make an intransitive word transitive, Urak Lawoi' uses a verbal construction.

Malay:   *orang itu membersarkan sawah    nya.*
'Man    that enlarged      ricefield his.'

U.L.:    *urak itu buwac bri benak naq nya besal.*
'Man    that made  so  field of  him large.'

In Thai this sentence could use the verb *khayǎay* "to enlarge", but it can also be expressed in a form paralleling the Urak Lawoi' sentence above:

Thai:    *khon nán   tham hây naa   khǒong khǐaw yày.*
'Man    that made so  field of    him   large.'

This could be regarded as a case where Urak Lawoi' follows the Thai pattern.

3.1.3 Urak Lawoi' has the three Voice prefixes which have an Active or Middle Voice aspect *meN-, ter-, ber-,* but not the Passive Voice prefix *di-.* These three prefixes are in common use with the *meN-* prefix often abbreviated to *N-,* see Table 4.

## TABLE 4: URAK LAWOI' VERBAL PREFIXES

| meN- | tari 'to dance' | menari 'dances' (abbrev.: nari) |
|---|---|---|
| | katöc 'to be sleepy' | mengatöc 'dozes'(abbr.: ngatöc) |
| ter- | kena 'to touch' | terkena 'touched unexpectedly, collided' |
| ber- | alëh 'to turn about' | beralëh 'to turn oneself about' |

This is a clear case where Urak Lawoi' follows the Malay pattern.

19

## 4. PLACES WHERE URAK LAWOI' SYNTAX FOLLOWS THE THAI PATTERN.

Three places where Urak Lawoi' follows the Thai syntactical pattern are in the passive clause construction, the verbal phrase, and the frame for identifying the word-class of verbs.

4.1    The passive voice in formal Malay has "the potentiality of a complement with *oleh* and a verb in the *di-* or *ter-* form as an exponent of P...." (Payne, p.86). More colloquial Malay often uses a construction with the auxiliary verb *kena* 'to touch, to experience'. Examples:

Malay:    *Ahmad di-pukul oleh Ali.*    (formal)
'Ahmad was-hit   by    Ali.'

*Ahmad kena pukul.*   (colloquial - no agent expressed)
'Ahmad experienced hitting.'

*Ahmad kena Ali pukul dia.*   (colloquial - agent ex-
'Ahmad experienced Ali hitting him.'          pressed)

As stated above Thai has no prefixes so has nothing paralleling the first Malay construction above. It does have direct equivalents for the other two constructions, using the Thai verb *thùuk* which has a similar area of meaning to *kena,* but is always used of an unfortunate or unhappy experience:

Thai:    *khon khamooy nán   thùuk       tamrùat càp.*
'man   thief    that experienced   police    arrest.'

Here Urak Lawoi' resembles Thai in having no potentiality for a verb with *di-* or *ter-* in this construction, and no preposition equivalent to *oleh.* Its passive forms therefore follow the pattern of the colloquial forms of Malay above which is similar to the Thai pattern:

U.L.:    *Mat kena pukol*
'Mat experienced hitting'

*Mat kena lĕk pukol nya*
'Mat experienced Lek hitting him.'

4.2    It will be necessary to consider the verbal phrase as a primary element of the clause in a little more detail, considering first the verbal phrase in Malay, then in Thai and finally in Urak Lawoi'.

4.2.1 From the books under reference it is difficult to compile a complete picture of the Malay verbal phrase, but Table 5 gives an approximation of this phrase.

# TABLE 5: MALAY VERBAL PHRASE

| PERIPHERY | | | NUCLEUS |
|---|---|---|---|
| Outer | | Inner | |
| ±Adjunct ±Auxiliary$_2$ | | ±Auxiliary$_1$ | +Head Verb |

It will be noted that the Head Verb is phrase-final. Auxiliaries which can appear as Auxiliary$_1$ are stated by Payne to be auxiliaries which can also function as Head Verbs, a small and closed class. Asmah calls these Auxiliaries Modal Verbs. Auxiliaries which can appear as Auxiliary$_2$ are mainly particles which Asmah has labelled as Aspect Verbs. The words which can appear as Adjuncts are not listed by Payne or Lewis, but they appear to be what Abdullah lists as Adverbs of Mood and of Aspect (Abdullah, 1974:277-278). It appears that the Adjuncts and Auxiliary$_2$ in the outer periphery may be moved to appear clause-initially, but that Auxiliary$_1$ in the inner periphery does not have this possibility. It seems there can be one, two or three Auxiliaries appearing in either of these Auxiliary positions, subject to restrictions as set out by Payne (1970: 65-67). There is a small sub-group of the modal verbs which can precede the aspect verbs in Auxiliary$_2$ position.

Payne and Lewis do not regard a verbal sequence containing more than one head verb as being a sequence of verbs or a verb phrase, but it is either resolved by transformation, or the second head verb is regarded as Predicate in an included clause, or parataxis between co-ordinate clauses is assumed (Lewis 1969:37). One example given is:

Malay: *dia pergi menchari musand berjanggut*

       S    P$_1$     P$_2$          O

'He has-gone to-look-for a bearded civet-cat.'

In this *pergi menchari* is regarded as two predicates with two head verbs. It will be noted that the first of these is a verb of motion.

4.2.2 The Thai verbal phrase is analysed by Vichin (1970:83ff) as in Table 6.

Vichin lists 19 words which operate as Pre-nuclear auxiliaries and says they may combine in various ways with as many as three appearing together. They may be divided into those that precede the Negator (Aux$_{1n}$) and those that follow the Negator (Aux$_{n1}$) (Vichin, 1970:130ff). Of these Aux$_{1n}$ are all particles, but some members of the Aux$_{n1}$ class are words that can stand alone, similar to the Malay modal verbs.

# TABLE 6: THAI VERBAL PHRASE

| Pre-nuclear Auxiliary | Nucleus | Post-nuclear Aux. Modifier |
|---|---|---|
| $\pm(\pm\text{Aux}_{1n}\ \pm\text{Negator}\ \pm\text{Aux}_{nl})$ | $\pm$Pre-verb $+$Head Verb $\pm$Post-verb | $\pm\text{Aux}_2$ $\pm$ Adj. |

Vichin specifies that there may be a sequence of verbs in the Head verb position in the nucleus, but only one pre-verb and/or one post-verb. She lists only two pre-verbs, *pay* 'action towards' and *maa* 'action away from'. Noss (1964:133ff) calls these Modals and lists 12 members of the class in all. The post-verbs are listed by Vichin as four: *pay* 'away from the speaker', *maa* 'towards the speaker', *way* 'removed from the scene temporarily', *sia* 'removed from the scene permanently'. Noss calls these post-positions and lists ten members of the class, saying they form an aspectual system for the verb.

Vichin (1970:129) lists the Thai Post-nuclear auxiliary as having only two representatives *yuu* and *lǽǽw*, which may be given the meanings of 'action continuing' and 'action completed' respectively. They generally appear clause-finally after the Object and Modifier, associated with other particles in what Noss calls the Codaphrase. In some cases they may be followed by the Modifier as shown by Vichin.

It is obvious that there is quite a contrast between the Malay and the Thai verbal phrases, particularly in the Thai capability for a Pre-verb, Post-verb and Post-nuclear auxiliary. On the other hand the Thai Pre-nuclear auxiliary in many ways seems to parallel the Malay verbal periphery.

A sequence of head-verbs of the kind which Payne and Lewis regard as separate predicates in Malay is regarded as a sequence of verbs or a verb-group in Thai. It is possible that in the Malay sentence quoted above, *dia pergi menchari musang berjanggut* the word *pergi* 'go' may be operating similarly to the Thai pre-verb, but there is insufficient evidence to make a decision.

4.2.3 Turning now to Urak Lawoi', in some respects it follows the Malay pattern, but in other respects it follows the Thai pattern. The tentative pattern on the analysis to date is given in Table 7.

# TABLE 7: URAK LAWOI' VERBAL PHRASE

| Pre-nuclear Periphery | Nucleus | Post-nuclear Periphery |
|---|---|---|
| $\pm$Adjunct $\pm\text{Aux}_2$ $\pm\text{Aux}_1$ | $\pm$Pre-verb $+$ Head-verb $\pm$Post-verb | $\pm\text{Aux}_3$ |

22

The pattern of the Pre-nuclear Periphery has a general similarity with both Malay and Thai. Auxiliaries appearing as $Aux_1$ can be classed as Modal Verbs, and include words like *belěh* 'can', *kena* 'to experience', or they may be particles such as *naq* 'will, future'. Auxiliaries appearing as $Aux_2$ are particles only which may be classed as Aspect verbs. This has an interesting illustration in the word *kena*, which appears in both positions with different meanings in each position. As $Aux_2$ it is a particle meaning 'must', while as $Aux_1$ it is a word, a Modal verb meaning 'to experience':

U.L.:    *nya    naq    kena    mati*     'He will experience death'

        Subj $Aux_1$  $Aux_1$    HV

        *nya kena naq    mati*        'He must (future) die'

        Subj $Aux_2$ $Aux_1$   HV

If these two sentences are phrased as a question by adding the interrogative particle *ger* finally, the answer to the first question could be the single word *kena*, but in the second case the whole verb would have to be repeated *kena naq mati*, because in $Aux_2$ position *kena* is a particle and cannot be used as a complete utterance.

Further research is needed as to the placement of the Negator, but it seems that it normally precedes the auxiliaries:

U.L.:    *nya    tet    patoc    naq    mati*      'He is not worthy to die'

        Subj Neg   $Aux_2$    $Aux_1$ HV

        *nya    tet    belěh    mati*        'He cannot die'

        Subj Neg   $Aux_1$    HV

It does not seem correct to include the Negator as $Aux_1$ as Payne and Lewis have done in Malay. Asmah's analysis of it as a function word seems more correct.

In the above respects the Urak Lawoi' verbal phrase resembles Malay, but it also has the Thai potential for Pre-verbs, Post-verbs and Post-nuclear auxiliaries.

In the Pre-verb position the main exponents are *pi* 'action away from the speaker' and *marǎh* 'action towards the speaker', as in Thai. Since in U.L. each step of a process must be stated, it is not normal to say, "He looked for a cat", but rather to say, "He went and looked for a cat", or "He came and looked for a cat"; i.e. *nya pi sari měw* or *nya marǎh sari měw*. This seems to parallel the Malay illustration above,

*dia pergi menchari musand berjanggut* 'He has gone to look for a bearded civet-cat', but this does not agree with Payne's analysis, and the evidence is sketchy.

In the Post-verb position there are various exponents similar to those in Thai, such as: *pi* 'away from the speaker', *maräh* 'towards the speaker', *turot* 'descending', *terbĕq* 'emerging'. These are similar to the Thai post-verbs in that they are not closely bound to the nucleus as the pre-verb is, but may be separated from it by the Object:

U.L.: *nya naq amet barak itu maräh*

Subj $Aux_1$ HV      Obj     Vpost

'he will take goods those come'
(He will bring those goods)

In the Post-nuclear $Aux_3$ position only three particles have been recorded: *taroh* 'removed from the scene temporarily', *buwak* 'removed from the scene permanently', *daq* 'action completed'. In Thai the particles corresponding to the first two of these are grouped with the Post-verb by Vichin and Noss, but in Urak Lawoi' it seems more natural to group the similar particles with $Aux_3$ with which they are closely linked in clause-final position. The third U.L. particle *daq* is the translation of the Thai *lǎǎw* 'already' which occurs in the $Aux_2$ position in Thai. Where one of the other particles occurs with *daq* in this position, *daq* is always final.

U.L.: *nya pi daq*

Subj HV $Aux_3$

'He go already' (He went)

*nya tingan barak itu buwak*

Subj HV    Obj    $Aux_3$

'He discarded goods those finally'
(He threw away those goods (finally)).

*nya turot cǎw pi kaq Tokkha buwak daq*

Subj Vpre HV Vpost LocP      $Aux_3$    $Aux_3$

'He descends rows goes to Tongkah finally already'.
(He went down and rowed away to Tongkah (finally and decisively)).

The UL Post-nuclear Auxiliary is similar to the Thai Post-nuclear Auxiliary rather than to the Thai sentence

24

particle referred to in Sec.2.1. In both languages the Post-nuclear Auxiliary is closely linked to the verb-phrase, even when discontinuous from it, and there can be a Post-nuclear Auxiliary in more than one clause in the sentence. The Thai sentence particle always occurs clause-finally, and there is normally only one clause in the sentence with a sentence particle or sentence particle codaphrase. In Thai, the Post-nuclear Auxiliary constitutes a kind of aspectual system for the verb, while the sentence particle expresses the "attitude of the speaker to what he is saying" (Noss, 1964:183-184, 200-201).

Thai: *phom im sã-láǎw: sì.*

(1  2    3)

Here (1) *sã* is a Post-nuclear Auxiliary, meaning 'removed from the scene permanently'; (U.L. *buwak*);

(2) *láǎw* is a Post-nuclear Auxiliary, meaning 'already', (U.L. *daq*);

(3) *sì* is a sentence particle, meaning 'this is the correct behaviour' (No U.L. equivalent).

Translated into Urak Lawoi' this becomes:

Urak Lawoi': *ku kenyang daq*
'I'm already full'

The U.L. speaker would not use *buwak* in this sentence, and he has no equivalent for the Thai *sì*. Although Urak Lawoi' resembles Malay in having no sentence particles of this type, yet both Urak Lawoi' and Malay have interrogative, syntagmatic and emphatic particles which may occur phrase or clause-finally, as illustrated in the Urak Lawoi' specimen text at the end of this article. It will be seen that although much in the Urak Lawoi' verbal phrase follows the Malay pattern, yet there is much that seems to be an intrusion from Thai.

4.3    The identification of word-classes has always been difficult in Malay. The system of affixation operates very flexibly to permit nouns and verbs to be formed from various stems, but often the stem itself is used as a noun or a verb without any affix to indicate its word-class. Some such stems can be used both as a noun and a verb in different contexts, so it is often difficult to decide whether a particular stem is a noun or a verb. Asmah uses syntactical characteristics to determine the membership of word-classes, supplemented by the morphological paradigms words from each class may enter. For verbs she uses the favourite Malay sentence pattern N1 V (N2) and states that verbs occur at V.

She also gives an endocentric construction into which verbs may enter (all verbs?) and states that morphologically they are characterised by the presence of certain affixes. In practice the affixes are often omitted in colloquial Malay.

For Thai word-classes Vichin uses the framework method extensively, with frames for practically every class of word and function word. Her frame for Verbals is affected by the Thai Post-nuclear auxiliary, which enables a double frame which would seem to increase the accuracy of her method. Her first pair of testing frames is:

1. a)   1  2  *lǽɛw*          (*lǽɛw* 'already' – a post-nuclear
                                                            auxiliary)

   b)   1  *kamlang*  3    (*kamlang* 'continuous action' – a pre-
                                                            nuclear auxiliary)

"Any word which may occupy place 1 in both frames is labelled a 'noun'. Any word which may occupy both place 2 in the first frame and place 3 in the second is labelled an 'intransitive verb'." (Vichin 1970:120). She has similar frames for other types of verbs. It is apparent that this frame is inherently more reliable than Asmah's as it does not need a prior decision as to whether a sentence is of the favourite pattern or not. However its effectiveness hinges on the use of a Post-nuclear auxiliary in one sub-frame and a pre-nuclear auxiliary in the other, a facility which the Malay verbal phrase does not offer.

Although Urak Lawoi' verbals can be found by using Asmah's frame they can be identified much more precisely by a frame similar to Vichin's. The fact that such a frame can be used for them highlights the fact that the Urak Lawoi' verbal phrase follows the Thai pattern as set out in paragraph 4.2.3 above. The Urak Lawoi' frame for this is as follows:

U.L.:  1. a)   1  2  *daq*       (*daq* = Thai *lǽɛw*)

        b)   1  *tengah*  3    (*tengah* = Thai *kamlang*)

Here, as in Thai, any word which may occupy place 1 in both frames is labelled a "noun", and any word which may occupy both place 2 in the first frame and place 3 in the second, is labelled an "intransitive verb".

## 5.    PLACES WHERE URAK LAWOI' HAS A UNIQUE PATTERN

The most striking unique pattern found in Urak Lawoi' is its use of a syntagmatical final particle *ter* in various capacities both as a verbal comma and also as a linker of parallel constructions. In this it is sometimes linked with the Emphatic Particle *ler* which occurs in a similar clause final position. This has no direct parallel in Malay apart from the particles

*pun* and *lah*, but *pun* does not seem to be used so extensively or in as many different contexts as *ter*.

Thai has emphatic particles similar to the Malay *lah* and the Urak Lawoi' *ler*, but nothing equivalent to the Urak Lawoi' *ter*.

The Urak Lawoi' *ter* is not only used in contrasts of this nature, but is commonly used as a verbal comma phrase-, clause- and sentence- finally. A number of the ways in which it may be used are shown in the specimen Urak Lawoi' text in Section 6 below, marked A, B, C, etc.:

A, B, C – Phrase-finally

D – Phrase-finally combined with *ler*

E – Clause-finally in an embedded Relative Clause in parallel with

F – a similar clause using *ler* for contrast.

G, H – phrase-finally after parallel locational phrases.

I, J – phrase-finally after parallel locational phrases.

K – sentence finally, repeating the theme of the story.

This is a feature which does not appear in Thai or Malay and it is interesting to speculate whether it is something which Urak Lawoi' has acquired as an alien intrusion, and if so, from where. Alternatively, is it rather a feature of some proto-language which only Urak Lawoi' has retained? It would be interesting to know if any other languages of the area have such a feature.

It may be theorised that Urak Lawoi' uses this as a topic marker or verbal comma particle. There are times when such a verbal break is helpful in spoken speech, and it is noticeable how it is used naturally even by elderly speakers of the language. An illustration of how it may be helpful was found when translating some verses from Acts chapter 17. Part of verse 31 was typed in this form:

      *krana    ari    krac    hukup    Tuhat*

      'because day    cut    judgment    God'

*tengaq daq*

'appointed Ppt.'   (because God has appointed a day of judgment).

The informant was very puzzled over this verse and read it through several times without revealing his problem. Then it became apparent that he was taking no notice of the space after *hukup* and so was reading ....*ari krac hukup Tuhat*

27

'the day of judging God', which he knew was not intended.
This problem was solved by inserting *ter* after *hukup*, which
made it clear that this was the end of the phrase, that *Tuhat*
was the start of a new phrase.

Similarly it is noticeable that when a U.L. reader is
reading unfamiliar material containing the particle *ter*, he
automatically reads it with the intonation and pause of a non-
final phrase or clause.

6.    SPECIMEN TEXT:  Part of a narrative, "The War comes
      to Terbak".

1. *ha, naq menyarĕq lagu kala prak nutu.    kala prak*
   Ah, will tell     story time war  before.   Time war

                  (A)                                    (B)
2. *nutu   ter,  hu, kapan terbak käqkäq     pac ter,   naq*
   before Spt.[5] oh, aeroplane   propellors four Spt,   will

3. *maräh timaq sagol,    päc   lawoc kita, lawoc tupoq*
   come  shoot junk,      place sea  ours, sea   village

4. *Terbak kita ni.    nya tima,   sekali, duwa kali, tiga*
   Terbak ours this.   He shoots,  once,        twice,  three

5. *kali, nya timaq. kaqgiter nya terbak pi  ho,  pi   kaq*
   times, he  shoots. So       he  flies  goes far, goes to

6. *soq lawoc. giter nya parĕq pulak, parĕq  nya timaq*
   side sea.    So    he  returns again, returns he  shoots

                        (C)
7. *pulak. urak dĕq sagol ter, nya turot  cäw pi kaq Tokkha*
   again.  Men in junk  Spt, they descend row go to  Tongkah

8. *buwak    daq.  cäw dĕq Tokkha giter, nya parĕq  dĕq*
   finally Ppt.  Row to Tongkah so,      they return  later,

9. *belakak, nya timaq pulak, timaq yu  sagol belah, belah*
          he shoots again, shoots until junk burns  burns

28

10. *berapi apa.     koq  semiya dĕq tupoq  ni  berlari,*

    flaming altogether. Group men   in  village this run,

11. *dumiq besal tuhu muda cay-baday kaq atas bukĕq, pakac*

    little big   old  young scatter  to  upon hills,  together

                                    (D)
12. *lari.  a,  setengah koq  kilaki ter ler,  nu  hati beni-*

    run.  Ah,  some    group men  Spt Ept, who heart  bold

        (E)                                (F)
13. *brani dikiq    ter,  nu pakac    dudoq menyengŏq ler,*

    a little Spt,  who together stay   watching   Ept,

                            (G)                      (H)
14. *lihac  dĕq puhot kelamĕl   ter, pac  non-kelinong ter,*

    looking from tree coconut  Spt, place hiding       Spt,

                        (I)                    (J)
15. *yu caq,  linong daq ter,  dĕq  puhot kelamĕl ter,  pakac*

    until,   hiding Ppt Spt place tree  coconut Spt,  together

                                                    (K)
16. *cengŏc lihac,  kapan terbak nya timaq sagol beras ter*

    watch  see,   aeroplane    he shoot junk  rice Spt.

Free translation: Ah, I will tell you a story of the war long
ago. During the war, a four-engined aeroplane came and shot
up a junk in the sea here, right in front of our village of
Terbak. He shot once, twice, three times. Then he flew right
out to sea. Then again he came back, and shot up the junk
again. The men in the junk abandoned their ship and rowed off
to Tongkah (Phuket). After they had gone, the plane came
again and shot and kept on shooting till the junk was burning,
a mass of flames. All the people in the village ran away.
Big and little, old and young, they all scattered around the
hills. Some of the men who were a little bolder stayed behind
and watched, hiding among the coconut trees. There hiding
among the coconut trees they watched and saw the aeroplane
shoot up the rice junk.

29

# BIBLIOGRAPHY

Abdullah Hassan, 1974. *The Morphology of Malay*. Kuala Lumpur, Dewan Bahasa dan Pustaka.

Asmah Haji Omar, 1968. "Word Classes in Malay". *Anthropological Linguistics*, 10: 12-22.

Brown, C.C., 1956. *Studies in Country Malay*. London, Luzac.

Dyen, Isidore, 1965. *A Lexicostatistical Classification of the Austronesian Languages*. Baltimore, Waverly Press Inc.

Gumperz, John J., and Robert Wilson, 1971. "Convergence and Creolisation". In Dell Hymes (Ed.) *Pidginisation and Creolisation of Languages*. Cambridge, Cambridge University Press.

Haas, Mary R., 1964. *Thai-English Students' Dictionary*. Stanford, Stanford University Press.

Hogan, David W., 1972. "Men of the Sea: Coastal Tribes of South Thailand's West Coast". *Journal of the Siam Society*, 60 (1).

————————— 1976. "Urak Lawoi' (Orang Laut)". In William A. Smalley (Ed.) *Phonemes and Orthography: Language Planning in Ten Minority Languages of Thailand*. Canberra, Pacific Linguistics, Series C - No 43.

————————— MS. *Some Modifications in the Orthography for Urak Lawoi'*.

Ismail Hussein, 1973. "Malay Dialects in the Malay Peninsula". *Nusantara*, 3: 69-79.

Lewis, M.B., 1969. *Sentence Analysis in Modern Malay*. Cambridge, Cambridge University Press.

Maxwell, W.E., 1914. *A Manual of the Malay Language*. London, Kegan Paul Trench Trubner & Co. Ltd.

Mohamed Ali bin Mohamed and A.E. Coope, 1952. *Malay Dialogues with Colloquial Grammar*. London, MacMillan & Co. Ltd.

Noss, Richard B., 1964. *Thai Reference Grammar*. Washington DC, Foreign Service Institute.

Payne, E.M.F., 1970. *Basic Syntactic Structures in Standard Malay*. Kuala Lumpur, Dewan Bahasa dan Pustaka.

Samarin, William J., 1967. *Field Linguistics*. New York, Holt Rinehart and Winston.

Sopher, David E., 1965. "The Sea Nomads". In *Memoirs of the National Museum*, 5. (Singapore).

Vichin Panupong, 1970. *Inter-Sentence Relations in Modern Conversational Thai*. Bangkok, The Siam Society.

# NOTES

[1]    I have made a study of Urak Lawoi' since 1967, residing on Phuket
Island, South Thailand until 1971. Since then I have made ex-
tended field trips there annually. After reducing the language
to writing, a phonemic orthography was devised, using the Thai
script, and various Bible selections and stories have been
translated, including the Gospel of Mark. I am currently working
on further translation and linguistic tasks connected with the
language, including the preparation of a primer for illiterates
and preparing material for a lexicon.

[2]    Of the Malay authors listed, Payne (1970) gives a structural
description of Malay up to sentence level; Lewis (1969) applies
Payne's analysis to a detailed study of some Malay texts;
Abdullah (1974) has an emphasis on Malay morphology, while Asmah
(1968) deals with the classification of Malay words into their
various classes. Older books by Maxwell (1914), Mohamed Ali and
Coope (1952) and by Brown (1956), describe a colloquial form of
Malay which has a closer resemblance to Urak Lawoi' than modern
Bahasa Malaysia has.

Of the Thai authors, Haas (1964) has a brief outline of Thai
phonemes, derivation and syntax and then classifies each word in
terms of her word-classes; Noss (1964) first describes the
phonological structure of Thai and then concentrates on syntax
up to the clause level; Vichin (1970) first gives the grammati-
cal framework for sentence, phrase and word level, and then shows
differing patterns of inter-sentence relationships.

[3]    A paper is under preparation on the pattern of phonological
phrases between Malay and Urak Lawoi'. Significant features
are:                            .
(a)  Malay words of three syllables are frequently abbreviated
in Urak Lawoi', either by the omission of a syllable or by a
process of contraction and metathesis.

| M. | delapan | 'eight' | U.L. | lapat |
|---|---|---|---|---|
|  | dahaga | 'thirst' |  | daga |
|  | selesëma | 'a cold' |  | serma |
|  | sebarang | 'the other bank' |  | serbak |
|  | manusia | 'mankind' |  | mesiya, semiya |

(b)  In some words which modern Malay pronounces as one syllable,
U.L. pronounces as two distinct syllables, often following the
pattern of older Malay spelling (which presumably reflected an
earlier pronunciation of the word concerned. In some cases U.L.
has an intervocalic *h w y* and in one case *j*.

31

```
M. prau (perahu)  'boat'           U.L. prahu
   air (ayer)     'water'               aye
   tiang          'pole'                tihak
   siang          'daylight'            siyak
   buah           'fruit'               buwah
   baik           'good'                bajiq
   (cf. M. kebajikan 'righteousness')
```

(c) Final syllable initial consonant where Malay has pre-nasalis-
ation before voiceless stop, U.L. has a homorganic voiceless stop.
Where Malay has pre-nasalisation before a voiced stop U.L. has a
homorganic nasal.

```
M. sumpah       'to curse'      U.L. supah
   bintang      'a star'             bitak
   kunci        'a lock'             kuci
   Tongkah      'Phuket town'        Tökkha
   tambah       'to increase'        tamah
   mandi        'to bathe'           mani
   panjang      'long'               panyak
   ringgit      'dollar'             ringëq
```

Two interesting exceptions are:

```
M. negri        'a country'     U.L. nanggri
   tidur        'to sleep'           tinoq
```

(d) Final nasals become an unreleased voiceless stop at the same
point of articulation, except where the syllable commences with a
nasal.

```
M. padam        'extinguish'    U.L. padap
   hutan        'jungle'             hutat
   datang       'to come'            datak
   bangsa       'race'               baksa
   senang       'easy, etc'          senang
```

(e) Final voiceless stops in Malay *p,k* become final glottal *q*
in U.L. Final voiceless stop *t* becomes U.L. final *c* (-iq) after
central and back vowels and final glottal after front vowels.

```
M. genap        'enough'        U.L. genaq
   sakit        'sick'               sekëq
   cepat        'fast'               cepac (cepaiq)
   masok        'enter'              masoq
   waktu        'time'               waqtu
```

(f) Final alveolar lateral *l* in Malay becomes final *n* in U.L.
Final alveolar *r* has dialectical variations, becoming [l, r, y]
in different dialects of U.L.

|  |  |  |  |
|---|---|---|---|
| M. tinggal | 'to leave' | U.L. tingan | |
| besar | 'large' | | besal/besar/besay |

(g) Final spirant *s* in Malay becomes [ih] in U.L. which is phonemicised as *s* after central and back vowels, and it becomes [h] after front vowels (phonemicised as *h*).

|  |  |  |  |
|---|---|---|---|
| M. atas | 'upon' | U.L. atas | [ataih] |
| putus | 'to cut off' | putus | [putuih] |
| habis | 'finished' | habih | [habih] |

4  The Thai language has sentence particles occurring clause-finally, but normally only once per sentence, rather than once per clause (Noss, 1964: 200 ff).  These sentence particles often occur in clusters at the ends of clauses in what Noss calls a codaphrase with a maximum length of four lexemes.  Noss says, "The general class meaning of sentence particles is 'attitude of the speaker towards what he is saying'", and their meaning "can be only vaguely stated, because a great deal depends on the emotional interplay between speakers".  "Some have close ties with specific syntactic elements in the clause", such as the interrogative particles *mǎy* and *rɏy*.  A possible maximum sequence is given by Noss as:

Thai:  khun mây-pay kàp-khǎw: rŏk-rɏy-khráp nîi.
(1    2        3        4)

   'Well, (you mean) you're not going with them?'

Noss gives the meaning of these four particles as:

1. 'not that'

2. 'is the assumption correct?'

3. 'reinforcement of the speaker's status with respect to the hearer', also indicating that the speaker is a male.

4. 'the class member is similar to that of the vocative .... in that the effect is to call the hearer to his senses.'

Urak Lawoi' and Malay do not have any sentence particles of this type, but have interrogative, syntagmatic and emphatic particles which may occur clause- or phrase-finally.  Some of these are illustrated in the specimen text at the end of this article.

5  Abbreviations:  Spt - syntagmatic particle.
Ept - emphatic particle.
Ppt - past particle.