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1. Introduction

In December 1995, I had a great opportunity to visit the province of Sekong, Lao PDR for one week. I learned a great deal about the Mon-Khmer speaking peoples and their languages during this field trip. I managed to collect about 450 Lawi and Tariang words, and 680 Harak words, which made this field trip more worthwhile than I had expected before my departure from Bangkok. I should have got more work done, if good data on the ethnic minorities of Sekong had been available, and if I had had a chance to educate myself about the Bahnaric languages and had prepared a suitable word list.

When I returned from my Sekong field trip, I was asked by Gérard Diffloth, James R. Chamberlain, Jacques Lemoine and Michel Ferlus about the Lawi, i.e., are they Austronesian or Austroasiatic? I was puzzled by this question. I believe that the Lawi cannot be anything else but an Austroasiatic (Mon-Khmer) speaking group.¹ They even reminded me of the Lavuo? of Maehongsorn. I found out later why this puzzling question was asked. Chazée (1995) says in his book: Atlas des ethnies et sous ethnies du Laos that “the Lawi can be Austronesian, a separate branch of ...I /r/ is preserved, whereas it was lost in Jorai, Rhade and Cham.”² In order to be scientific as a linguist should, I will try my best to show in this paper some good evidence that Lawi is a West Bahnaric language.³ As for Harak and Tariang, classification is still problematic.

2. The Mon-Khmer ethnic groups of Sekong

Sekong is a new province in Southern Laos. It had been a district of Salavan until 1984 when it became a separate province. Sekong shares borders with Salavan in the North and Northwest, with Champasak in the Southwest, with Attapue in the South and with Quang Nam Danang (Vietnam) in the East. From the municipality of

¹I have worked on several Mon-Khmer languages of different branches; Lavuo?, Paroak, Mla Bri, T’in, Mon, Nyah Kur, Kui, Bru, Chong and Samre; my experience does help me identify with no difficulties that Lawi is a Mon-Khmer language.

²I would like to thank Ferlus for translating and sending me this information from Paris via the e-mail.

³At the 4th Pan Asiatic Linguistic Conference organized by Mahidol University in January 1996, I had a chance to discuss briefly with Diffloth and let him quickly look at my field notes. He suspected that Lawi was West Bahnaric.
Sekong to the Lao-Vietnamese border which is about 104 kilometres, there used to be a trail for the local people to travel on foot. In 1993, a temporary dirt road was constructed. However, travelling by means of modern vehicles is impossible in the rainy season. The province of Sekong comprises four districts; Tha Taeng, Lamam where the Governor's Office is located, Kaluem, and Dak Chueng which shares a border with Quang Nam Danang. The province is cut across by the Sekong River. This river, the backbone of the province, starts in Vietnam and meets with the Mae Khong River inCambodia.

The population of Sekong is about 63,000. It consists of thirteen Mon-Khmer ethnic groups and one Lao-Tai group (Lao Lum or Lowland Lao). The distribution of the thirteen Mon-Khmer ethnic groups in the four districts of Sekong is as follows:

Tha Taeng: Katu, Suai, Nge’(Kriang), Taliang (Tariang)
Lamam: Alak (Harak), Lawi (Hawi), Ta’oi (Ta’uas), Laven, Suai, Kaseng
Kaluem: Katu, Nge’ (Kriang), Chatong
Dak Chueng: Taliang (Tariang), Yaeh, Dakkang, Taliw (Tariw)

The number of villages, households, families and population are given in Table 1.\textsuperscript{4}

\textbf{Table 1} The census of Mon-Khmer ethnic groups in Sekong

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ethnicity</th>
<th>Villages</th>
<th>Households</th>
<th>Families</th>
<th>Total population</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Katu</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>868</td>
<td>1,604</td>
<td>16,725</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taliang (Tariang)</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>2,717</td>
<td>2,772</td>
<td>11,407</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harak (Alak)</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>2,272</td>
<td>2,309</td>
<td>9,505</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yaeh</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>991</td>
<td>996</td>
<td>6,435</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nge’ (Kriang)</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>537</td>
<td>592</td>
<td>5,505</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ta’oi (Ta’uas)</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>178</td>
<td>1,641</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suai</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>163</td>
<td>169</td>
<td>1,610</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laven</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>280</td>
<td>281</td>
<td>1,526</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taliw (Tariw)</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>176</td>
<td>1,236</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chatong</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>638</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lawi</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>185</td>
<td>492</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kasaeng</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dakkang</td>
<td>(no data)</td>
<td>(no data)</td>
<td>(no data)</td>
<td>(no data)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Lawi\textsuperscript{5} language data were collected at Ban Lawi Phang (or Fang) Daeng, Lamam district. At this village, there were about 151 Lawi speakers. Three Lawi villages are found in Lamam: Ban Phang Daeng, Ban Lam Phan and Ban Noy. The Lawi used to live in Dak Chueng district near the Lao-Vietnamese border,

\textsuperscript{4}I feel thankful to Than Thongdee Sothsam, the Head of Information and Public Relations of the province of Sekong, Lao PDR, for providing me with the figures in Table 1.

\textsuperscript{5}The villagers told me that they used to call themselves /sa‘wvng/.
around Huay Yuet, Phu Luang. After the second Indochina war, they moved to the places where they live at present. The data on Harak were collected at Ban Kasang Kang and Ban Pa-aw; the informant was originally from Ban Kasang. Ban Kasang Kang is also located in Lamam district. It comprises five hamlets: Ban Kasang Luang, Ban Kasang Kang, Ban Kasang Noy, Ban Man and Ban Sating. The population of Kasang Kang village is 501. There are also 4-5 Harak villages along the dirt road from the municipality of Sekong which is in Lamam, to Dak Chueng. The Tariang village where the language data were collected is Ban Dak Lan, Dak Chueng district. The Tariang living here migrated from Ban Chavan which was in Phu Thong Ko. The population of this Tariang village is about 150. During the Vietnam War, Dak Chueng was bombed badly; therefore, there are no old Tariang villages left. The places where they live at present are new settlements.

3. Lawi as a West Bahnaric language

Thomas (1979:174-177) gives 34 vocabulary items which he thinks are distinctively northern, southern or western. Unfortunately, I have only 25 items in my Lawi data. The good ones, about 13 items, are chosen to illustrate that Lawi should be classified as West Bahnaric. In Table 2, the Lawi words are from my field notes, the rest are the generalized forms given by Thomas (1979).

Table 2. Lexical evidence for West Bahnaric

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gloss</th>
<th>Lawi</th>
<th>Other West Bahnaric languages</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(item 1) ‘sky’</td>
<td>krom</td>
<td>krum (Laven, Oi, Nyahuen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(item 2) ‘star’</td>
<td>pa’tor</td>
<td>mantuar (Cheng, Laveh, Laven, Oi, Nyahuen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(item 4) ‘flower’</td>
<td>pur</td>
<td>pur (Cheng, Laveh, Laven, Oi, Nyahuen, Brao)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(item 6) ‘tooth’</td>
<td>pyį</td>
<td>pyį (Cheng, Laveh, Laven, Oi, Nyahuen, Brao)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(item 18) ‘egg’</td>
<td>kle</td>
<td>kle (Cheng, Laveh, Laven, Oi, Nyahuen, Brao)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(item 23) ‘tail’</td>
<td>sɔi</td>
<td>suay (Cheng, Laveh, Laven, Oi, Nyahuen, Brao)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(item 25) ‘five’</td>
<td>sɔŋ</td>
<td>song (Cheng, Laveh, Laven, Oi, Nyahuen, Brao)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(item 27) ‘sand’</td>
<td>pi’hac</td>
<td>phaic (Cheng, Laveh, Laven, Oi, Nyahuen, Brao)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(item 29) ‘horn’</td>
<td>ta’kuai</td>
<td>takuy (Laveh, Laven, Oi, Nyahuen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(item 30) ‘fish’</td>
<td>trų</td>
<td>trų (Cheng, Laveh, Oi, Brao)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(item 32) ‘ear’</td>
<td>ta’pit</td>
<td>pit (Cheng, Laveh, Laven, Oi, Nyahuen, Brao)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(item 33) ‘head’</td>
<td>tɔįh</td>
<td>tuyh (Cheng, Laveh, Laven, Oi, Nyahuen, Brao)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(item 34) ‘shoulder’</td>
<td>pa</td>
<td>paw (Cheng, Laveh, Laven, Oi, Nyahuen, Brao)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Based on the lexical evidence as illustrated in Table 2, there is no doubt that Lawi is a West Bahnaric language.

4. The place of Harak and Tariang

After comparing my Harak data with Alak words given in Thomas (1979) as examples, I am certain that Harak and Alak are dialects of the same language. A comparison of Alak and Harak vocabulary can be found in Table 3. The two major differences in Table 3 that should be noticed are: *-l is retained in Alak but becomes
/w/ in Harak; and the old implosives merge with voiced obstruents which still remain voiced in Harak but become voiceless in Alak. Some of the differences probably stem from different ways of transcribing. Harak does not have vowel length distinction.

Table 3 Comparison of Alak and Harak vocabulary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gloss</th>
<th>Alak</th>
<th>Harak</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>'sky'</td>
<td>prah</td>
<td>brah</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'star'</td>
<td>plin</td>
<td>blun</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'tree'</td>
<td>qlong</td>
<td>lon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'flower'</td>
<td>bakao</td>
<td>papau (?)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'nine'</td>
<td>-ciin</td>
<td>ti'cin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'tooth'</td>
<td>sanep</td>
<td>te'ne'ner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'launder'</td>
<td>roh</td>
<td>ra'roh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'woman'</td>
<td>aken</td>
<td>kan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'egg'</td>
<td>katap</td>
<td>ka'tap</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'tail'</td>
<td>ting</td>
<td>ten</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'five'</td>
<td>pram</td>
<td>pa'dam</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'year'</td>
<td>hanam</td>
<td>ha'nam</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'sand'</td>
<td>phaic</td>
<td>ba'hac</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'grass'</td>
<td>bat</td>
<td>bat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'horn'</td>
<td>ke</td>
<td>ny'kai</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'fish'</td>
<td>ka</td>
<td>ka</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'monkey'</td>
<td>amau</td>
<td>mau</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'car'</td>
<td>tor</td>
<td>n'to</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'head'</td>
<td>kāl</td>
<td>gau</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'uncooked rice'</td>
<td>pahay</td>
<td>pa'hai</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'ten'</td>
<td>cit</td>
<td>jījīt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'buffalo'</td>
<td>karpiu</td>
<td>ki'piu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'liver'</td>
<td>kłom</td>
<td>kłym</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'tree trunk'</td>
<td>tōm</td>
<td>tūm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'seven'</td>
<td>tampōh</td>
<td>ti'pōh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'leg'</td>
<td>cın</td>
<td>jju'm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'salt'</td>
<td>pioh</td>
<td>bōh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'bird'</td>
<td>cem</td>
<td>tām</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As for Tariang, what I have in hand for a comparison is a three-page handout by Diffloth distributed at the 24th International Conference on Sino-Tibetan Languages and Linguistics, Bangkok-Chiangmai, October, 1991. Ten Tariang words from this handout are compared with the ones from my Tariang field notes. There is no doubt that they are dialects of the same language. Vowel length in Tariang is not distinctive.

---

6I think that the /w/ should be 'velarized or dark /l/'. Generally speaking, the phonetic characteristic of velarized [i] is somewhat similar to closed back unrounded vowel [ur].

7Diffloth told me that he had many thousands of Tariang words which he collected from a Tariang refugee.
Table 4  Comparison of Tarieng and Tariang vocabulary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gloss</th>
<th>Tarieng</th>
<th>Tariang</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>'one'</td>
<td>muty</td>
<td>mui</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'two'</td>
<td>bar</td>
<td>bar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'three'</td>
<td>peː</td>
<td>pe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'four'</td>
<td>puən</td>
<td>puən</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'five'</td>
<td>pədams</td>
<td>ba' dams</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'six'</td>
<td>traw</td>
<td>ta'rw</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'seven'</td>
<td>təpəh</td>
<td>ta'pəh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'eight'</td>
<td>təŋha'm</td>
<td>tan'ha'm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'nine'</td>
<td>kəcəm</td>
<td>ka'cən</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'ten'</td>
<td>koji't</td>
<td>ka'ji't</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'star'</td>
<td>bran</td>
<td>ta'meŋ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'tooth'</td>
<td>pəŋ</td>
<td>puŋ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'tail'</td>
<td>səry</td>
<td>suai</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'head'</td>
<td>tus</td>
<td>tus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'left (side)'</td>
<td>cəʔiaw</td>
<td>paʔiaw</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'nail'</td>
<td>kəri'as</td>
<td>ka'ri'as</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'four'</td>
<td>puən</td>
<td>puən</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'elephant'</td>
<td>ruas</td>
<td>ruas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'tuber'</td>
<td>buəm</td>
<td>buəm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'axe'</td>
<td>cuəŋ</td>
<td>təuəŋ</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The place of Harak and Tariang within Bahnaric is problematic, i.e., specialists of Mon-Khmer comparative and historical linguistics have different opinions and also change their minds as time goes by and more data are available. At one point, Alak was classified as a Katuic language. A short summary can be given as follows:

Harak (Alak, Harlak, Harlaak) - Katuic (Thomas 1966 and 1973, Thomas and Headley 1970)
- West Bahnaric or Laven-Brao (Matras and Ferlus 1971, Huffman 1986)
- North Bahnaric or Bahnar-Sedang (Thomas, cited in Ferlus 1974, and in Parkin 1991, Ferlus, personal communication in 1996)
- Central Bahnaric (Thomas 1979)
- Northwest Bahnaric (Diffloth, personal communication in 1996)

Tariang (Tareñ, Tareng, Triëng, Tarieng) - Katuic or So-Souei (Ferlus 1974)
- West Bahnaric or Laven-Brao (Ngô Đức Thịnh and Trương Văn Triêng, Taliang Sinh, cited in Ferlus, 1974)
- Northwest Bahnaric (Diffloth, personal communication in 1996)

In section 3 of this paper, I have already proved that Lawi is a West Bahnaric language. If Lawi is West Bahnaric, then, I do not think that Harak and Tariang are
West Bahnaric. Thomas (1979) and Diffloth (personal communication in 1996) agree upon dividing the Bahnaric branch into five sub-branches:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Thomas (1979)</th>
<th>Diffloth</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- North Bahnaric</td>
<td>- West Bahnaric</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- South Bahnaric</td>
<td>- Northwest Bahnaric</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- West Bahnaric</td>
<td>(Alak, Tarieng)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Central Bahnaric (Alak)</td>
<td>- North Bahnaric</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Eastern Bahnaric</td>
<td>- Central Bahnaric</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- South Bahnaric</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Diffloth (1991:2) proposes the following Bahnaric dendrogram:

![Dendrogram diagram]

The unlabeled (........) is now named “Northwest Bahnaric” (Diffloth, personal communication). Unfortunately, an explanation and other details are not available. Twelve lexical items, which are among the thirty-four recommended by Thomas (1979), are selected from my Lawi, Harak and Tariang field notes to show where Harak and Tariang may fit. Lawi words are included in Table 5 in order to be used as references since we know for sure that it is West Bahnaric.

**Table 5** Classification based on lexical evidence

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gloss</th>
<th>Lawi</th>
<th>Harak</th>
<th>Tariang</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>'sky'</td>
<td>krom (W)</td>
<td>brah (Katuic)</td>
<td>pliŋ (N)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'star'</td>
<td>pa'tor (W)</td>
<td>bluŋ (N)</td>
<td>ta'men (S)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'flower'</td>
<td>pur (W)</td>
<td>pa'pau (S)</td>
<td>?a'pioŋ (W)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'tooth'</td>
<td>pɔŋ (W)</td>
<td>tca'neŋ (N)</td>
<td>purŋ (W)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'egg'</td>
<td>kłe (W)</td>
<td>ka'tap (N)</td>
<td>ka'leŋ (W)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'tail'</td>
<td>səi (W)</td>
<td>teŋ (N, S)</td>
<td>suai (W)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'five'</td>
<td>səŋ (W)</td>
<td>pa'dam (N, S)</td>
<td>ba'dam (N, S)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'sand'</td>
<td>pi'hac (W)</td>
<td>ba'hac (W)</td>
<td>braŋ (N, S)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'horn'</td>
<td>ta'kuai (W)</td>
<td>ŋ'kai (N, S)</td>
<td>?a'kuai (W)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'fish'</td>
<td>truŋ (W)</td>
<td>ka (N, S)</td>
<td>ka (N, S)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'ear'</td>
<td>ta'pit (W)</td>
<td>ŋ'to (S)</td>
<td>tuŋ (N)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'head'</td>
<td>tuŋiŋ (W)</td>
<td>gauŋ (N)</td>
<td>tus (W)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Ferlus suggests the word ‘paddy’ to be investigated for the classification; he points out that it should be /cEh/ in West Bahnaric but something else in other
branches of Bahnaric (Ferlus, personal communication in 1996). My data confirm his opinion: ‘paddy’ /tɛh/ (Lawi, W), /mˈba/ (Harak, N) and /aˈba/ (Tariang, N).

The twelve lexical items in Table 5 and an extra one suggested by Ferlus do show that Lawi is West Bahnaric, whereas Harak and Tariang have a mixture of northern, western and southern elements; therefore, it is difficult to say exactly where they fit. I think that this is one of the reasons why Thomas (1979) places Alak in the Central sub-branch, “a very loose central group” and Diffloth proposes a new sub-branch, namely, “Northwest Bahnaric”.

To help the Mon-Khmer specialists find a proper place for Harak and Tariang from phonological grounds and to illustrate some of the patterns of Lawi, Harak and Tariang vowel correspondences, forty-eight additional words are given. They might also be useful for a reconstruction of Proto-Bahnaric vowels. Proto-North-Bahnaric forms reconstructed by Smith (1972) are also given. (See Table 6.)

**Table 6 Examples of Lawi, Harak and Tariang vowel correspondences**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pattern of correspondence</th>
<th>Gloss</th>
<th>Lawi</th>
<th>Harak</th>
<th>Tariang</th>
<th>Proto-NB</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ay/ia/ai aw aw</td>
<td>‘wind’</td>
<td>kaˈjav</td>
<td>kiˈjaw</td>
<td>kiˈjaːl</td>
<td>*kayal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>‘mortar’</td>
<td>taˈpja</td>
<td>taˈpau</td>
<td>taˈpaːl</td>
<td>*apal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>‘see’</td>
<td>tay</td>
<td>taw</td>
<td>tɑl</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ie e ia</td>
<td>‘good’</td>
<td>tiˈniem</td>
<td>lem</td>
<td>liam</td>
<td>*lem</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>‘fingernail’</td>
<td>kaˈniæh</td>
<td>kiˈneːh</td>
<td>kaˈriæs</td>
<td>*caqneyh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>‘root’</td>
<td>rieh</td>
<td>reh</td>
<td>?aˈriæs</td>
<td>*reyh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>‘hail’</td>
<td>priɛv</td>
<td>pre</td>
<td>príał</td>
<td>*prəl</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ie ai e</td>
<td>‘bamboo (kind of)’</td>
<td>?aˈtie</td>
<td>ḏai</td>
<td>de</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>‘bamboo (kind of)’</td>
<td>lie</td>
<td>lai</td>
<td>ṭaˈle</td>
<td>*pale</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>‘husked rice’</td>
<td>pʰiɛ</td>
<td>paˈhaj</td>
<td>baˈhe</td>
<td>*pʰe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>‘three’</td>
<td>pɛ</td>
<td>pai</td>
<td>pe</td>
<td>*pe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o/oi ooi ua</td>
<td>‘monitor’</td>
<td>taˈkot</td>
<td>taˈkot</td>
<td>taˈkuat</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>‘child’</td>
<td>kɔn</td>
<td>kɔn</td>
<td>kuan</td>
<td>*kon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>‘four’</td>
<td>pɔn</td>
<td>pɔn</td>
<td>puan</td>
<td>*pun</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>‘shin’</td>
<td>pɔi̯h</td>
<td>pɔi̯h</td>
<td>puas</td>
<td>*pɔyh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>‘elephant’</td>
<td>rɔi̯h</td>
<td>roih</td>
<td>ruas</td>
<td>*royh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>uo u uɛ</td>
<td>‘path’</td>
<td>tʁuŋ</td>
<td>ḏtʊŋ</td>
<td>tʁʊŋ</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>‘axe’</td>
<td>tʁuŋ</td>
<td>tʊŋ</td>
<td>tʊŋ</td>
<td>*chant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>r ɔ a</td>
<td>‘seven’</td>
<td>prh</td>
<td>tiˈpɔh</td>
<td>taˈpah</td>
<td>*tapaŋ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>‘laundry’</td>
<td>rəˈrʊh</td>
<td>rəˈrʊh</td>
<td>rah</td>
<td>*rɔŋ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>w i iɛ</td>
<td>‘banana’</td>
<td>prʊt</td>
<td>prɪt</td>
<td>priɔt</td>
<td>*prīt</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

MKS 27:109-117 (c)1981 Science Archive, University of Technology and Education of Sweden.
The examples given in Table 6 seem to indicate that each language has its own historical phonology. I begin to doubt whether Harak and Tariang should be placed within the same sub-branch of Bahnaric, i.e., Northwest, as suggested by Diffloth. Perhaps, we need a more suitable name for a kind of loose or flexible sub-branch in which the Bahnaric languages, such as Harak, Tariang and so forth, can fit, since this type of language has a combination of western, northern and southern characteristics. On a lexical basis, Harak has more northern and southern vocabulary, whereas Tariang has more western vocabulary. In Dak Chueng district where the majority of the Tariang live, there are also other Mon-Khmer ethnic groups, i.e., the Yaeh (perhaps Jeh, a North Bahnaric language), Dakkang and Tariw. I hope to go back to Dak Chueng again so that I can work with the Dakkang and Tariw, then, I will be able to contribute much more to Mon-Khmer linguistic studies.
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