Phonologists agree that vowel quantity is phonemic in Thai. The syllables which I wish to term linker-syllables have as vowel the phoneme /a/, a short vowel quantitatively speaking, usually realized as [ə]. Here are some examples, the linker-syllable being the middle one of the three: rāthabaan sāppadaa ; ṭēkkāraat ; phannanaa ; kammakaan ; thēepphanom ; sāttawāt etc. But the definition cannot rest here. To leave them as phonemically short syllables is not merely inadequate but misleading: they do not conform to the accepted phonological rule that all Thai syllables which are phonemically short must close with some final consonant or other. Only in artificial 'dictation' style do they close with a glottal final. Only in dictation style, moreover, do they bear the phonemic tone we would expect from their spelling. Otherwise, (in normal speech, that is) the pitch of the syllables seems to be self-adjusting, as unobtrusive as a linker should be, accommodating itself to the clear realization of tones in what went before and what is to come after.

These phenomena may be associated with the characteristics of the commonly found syllable of unstressed prefixation. A better way of describing it here (since prefixation is a morphological term, and the use of infra-lexical prefixation is not found in Standard Thai morphology) is as a trip-syllable or anacrusis syllable that ushers in the fully tonal, fully stressed, and fully formed syllable that succeeds it. The point at issue is not why it is there (borrowing, analogy, reduction of full word-prefixation etc.), but what it normally sounds like. Examples are found in kradāī, prātuu, saphaan, khanōm, lakoön, maphrāaw etc. Moreover, pitch behaviour suggests a talent for accommodation that has been held to be characteristic of linker-syllables. Evidence for this can be heard in the pronunciation of the minimal tone-pair khanā? (ʔəŋ) and khanā? (ʔəŋ). The letter khoō (ʔ) of khanā? produces a higher pitch than might be expected from the orthographic rules for tone; the khoō (ʔ) of khanā? a lower one. Both syllables seem to be acting as the pitch equivalents of upbeats in rhythm (shall we say 'non-tonemes') in order to enhance the downbeats (the tonemes) of their succeeding syllables.

The iambic foot (\_\_) which conveniently defines the rhythm of these words can easily be expanded into the cretic foot (\_/\_) by the preposing of a stressed beat. This is the framework in which
we can expect to find a linker-syllable. I wish, however, to focus attention upon a particular sort of linker-syllable. The examples chosen at the beginning of the paper, rātthabaan, sāppadaa etc., contained what appeared to be geminate articulations. The final closure of the first syllable was held over to become the initial stop for the linker-syllable. I say 'appeared to be' since I doubt whether the aural evidence for geminates (double consonants) is strong enough in every case to uphold the usual phonological requirement that final-stop phonemes and initial-stop phonemes in Thai never coincide utterly, never—as it were—conflate to a single phoneme doing the work of two. However, this point can be left in abeyance. (Double consonants will be written in this paper throughout for such linkages out of deference to the lexicographical status quo.) Whichever solution is preferred, gemination or conflation, I wish to concentrate on a sequence in the speech-stream passing from the vowel of the first syllable to the vowel of the second via a single consonantal stop-articulation only. Thus, I wish to exclude from consideration linker-syllable examples such as lāksanā?, sāṅkharāt, čākraphāt etc., excluding too, it is worth mentioning, such 'orthographo-phonemic' changes arising out of, say, the letters ū, o or a as occur in words like rāatchakaan, phanraajaa, phoñlamāaj and pâtsawin.

My final request by way of preliminary preconditions is that all words of obviously Indic origin be henceforth excluded from consideration for the time being. This cuts down the raw material dramatically. Every one of the above examples of linker-syllables is now ineligible. The reason for this precondition is that a knowledge of Indic morphology, combined with a knowledge of what conversion table should be applied to arrive at an acceptable Thai pronunciation for the borrowed morphology, leave no questions to be asked about the nature or the environment of linker-syllables in Thai once given the Indic stimulus. The basic fact is the borrowing; the linker-syllables are here, for Thai, secondary phenomena of predictable occurrence. Thus, it is not surprising to find no Indic borrowings with /ɳ/ as the consonant playing the final/initial articulation role for a linker-syllable sequence: /ɳ/ cannot be an initial articulation in Indic phonology. It cannot have been borrowed, so there was never a need, never a challenge to produce it. However, it is mildly surprising to find that there are no ɳ-initial linker-syllables in Thai at all, neither in Indic borrowings nor in native Thai words. We have good reason for excluding Indic borrowings from ɳ-initial possibilities, but what could the reason be for lack of ɳ-initial linkers in Thai? The quickest answer would be analogy. Some sort of Sprachbund influence due to heavy borrowing from Indic, with consequent heavy utilization of linker-syllables, inhibited the full range of eligible articulations in Thai (/ɳa-/ is found as a trip syllable in iambic rhythm and, of course, it is one of the normal final-stop consonants in Thai.) If we add glottal stop to the list of 'missing linkers' too, then a similar argument applies. Indic sandhi removed any possibility of a hiatus except for the visarga (not itself a glottal stop hiatus, incidentally) conventionalized at many removes as the Thai vowel sign ə. Now the
Visarga in Indic phonology was a final articulation only; it could, therefore, never serve as initial to an on-going syllable. It is pointless, therefore, to seek ρ-initial linkers in Indic borrowings. But there is some point in asking why native Thai forms refrain from its use too. It is eminently fitted to be both initial and final and shows evidence of participation in trip-syllables (ʔarɔj, for instance).

Let us at this juncture, however, provide some examples of some non-Indic, cretic rhythm trisyllables which are, for the most part, common enough as everyday Thai words. Only the n-linkage items seem, to my mind, rare and thus on the margins of a speaker's experience.

-kk- sòkkapròk; ṭykkathỳk; ṭëkkkarèk; tùkkataa; càkkacfi; sàkkalàat; chùkkachìì.
-kkh- ṭëekkhaneèk.
-tt- ṭèttaroɔ; bèttalèt; ṭùttalùt; ṭèttakhàt; ṭùttapyy.
-tt- sàpparòt; sàppadon; sàppanòk (variant: sàpphannòk)
-tph- sàpphaïjàk.¹⁰
-nn- channatùʔ; channaroön; channakàat.
-mm- kàmmajìi; kàmmathàn; ràmmanaa; sàmmalee.

Two sorts of comment may be made about these examples (which are not exhaustive, of course); one is to question the degree of 'nativeness' in any of them;¹¹ the other is to call for their rating in order of versatility—the degree of variety in phonemic make-up found under each heading. Dealing with the first comment, the series of examples beginning with the syllable /sàp-/ remind us of the common Pali word-prefix sabba- which converts to ąnw- (sàp-) in Thai (the Sanskrit form is sarva-, appearing in Thai as ąrn-, which may be either /sàp/ or /sàn/ in the first syllable), though we would expect an aspiration, /-pph/-, for the linker-syllable initial, which we regularly get in the Thai conversion of the Sanskrit form. sàpphajjàk is a case in point. The preponderance of /sàp/- syllables, therefore, might well be put down as a prefixation habit from a specific Indic form, leaving in doubt the native propensity to use p-initial linker-syllables. Similar remarks may be made about the ρchan-/- syllable in the n-initial linkages. Though extremely common in Indic, n-linkages are hard to find in native Thai. Whether ρchan is Indic in origin is highly questionable—it combines with a syllable spelled sutra (Thai ąùùt, ąñ) in the word channasùùt, and the Thai word channatùʔ looks suspiciously like jantù,—but whatever its origin, the highly restricted class of n-linkages is striking. With m-linkages the restrictions, though less striking, are still severe. The first syllable always ends in /-am/. Is this an analogical effect from Khmer infixation, perhaps, explaining why no /-im, -um, -em etc./ endings are utilized?

The suggestion to be put forward is that the p, n, and m-linkages are, on the whole, a suspicious lot for native Thai, whereas k and t-linkages are respectably normal. They are also more versatile in their compatibility with differing phonological environments, as will be shown.
Aspiration, however, seems to be the exception rather than the rule. Until it can be known for certain that all the data are gathered in, or that our sample sizes are proportionally representative in the fairest way, an impression is all that can be offered. For what it is worth, the impression is of scant findings for native Thai productive linking procedure with nasal consonants (none for velars, rare for dentals, and some few for bilabials), scant findings for bilabial stop linkage, and good, though admittedly modest, findings for velar and dental stops. In all the items so far cited, very few examples contained a first syllable of long vowel-quantity (ʔeékkarāék and ʔeékkhānēék) and very few had aspirate release for the linker's initial (ʔeékkhānēék and ʔāpphājōk, also perhaps sāpphānōk), the widest scope for variation in vowel quality, quantity and alternation between aspirate and non-aspirate plosion across the linkage itself being found in velar stop linkages. This was in striking opposition to the total absence of linkage possibilities for velar nasals.

These were but impressions, however. Are there other indications that non-nasal velarity provides a focus for native Thai linkage procedure? The reply to this question leads us from morphology to low-level syntax: it leads us from the one-word polysyllable to the juxtaposition of two words. Now it would be extremely easy to produce long lists of examples to suit any articulation desired for some sort of geminate juncture. For instance, taking as a basic pattern a monosyllabic word first plus an iambic rhythm word second (kradāat, pratuu etc.) almost any cretic foot can be arranged:

-kk- khlūk-kap?; -kkh- thōk-khamēen;
-tt- khāat-talāat; -tth- bōt-thanōn;
-pp- rāp-pathaaan; -pph- thāp-phamāa; etc.

This can hardly be called linkage at all, however, and remains mere syntactic juxtaposition. There is almost certainly true gemination here, unquestioned here, moreover, as a junctural feature that is not restrictive, and, given sufficient ingenuity, there might well be examples forthcoming of juxtapositions that have been impossible hitherto either on Indic or on native Thai phonological grounds. This is what is to be expected with the move into syntax. Phonological environments can no longer be restrictive at word-boundaries as they were at syllable boundaries within the word. But what if linkage, in addition to being catered for, speciously, by ingenuity, can actually be produced out of nothing in certain cases at this low syntactic level? What if a linker-syllable--and a true one at that--is, as it were, felt to be appropriate when passing from one monosyllabic word to the next?

There is in Bangkok vernacular Thai a very small group of two-word locutions in which a linker-syllable is found that is not found in Standard Thai. Where Standard Thai keeps to two stresses only (a spondee), vernacular Thai inserts an unstressed syllable to create the cretic foot we are now familiar with. The locutions are
The list is indeed very small. It is nevertheless evidence for the focussing of linkage procedure on non-nasal velarity. What it is not evidence for, however, is that this is a regular, widespread productive procedure. If we ask, if tokkacaį, why not *plèekkacaį; if hòkkalôm, why not *hàkkalân; if lùukkataa, why not *lùukkataan, then no adequate answer can be given. Speculation about the possibility of these three being special, separate and unrelated cases gets us nowhere. For instance, the tokkacaį pronunciation may be thought to reflect the sequence kacaį as in mii kacaį, mii kàcit kacaį where there can be no suggestion of linkage. Thus it becomes a special case, there being no need to hypothesize parallel forms *kalôm or *kataa. In mii kacaį, however, the syllable /ka-/ seems to be a reduced form of kève (mii kèc caj). Does this, then, imply that the sequence *tòk kèc caj exists in vernacular Thai? If not, namely, if kacaį (or perhaps kracaį) is a variant form of caj, then we must ask why it does not occur after plèek-, sùk- or nàk- etc. in the phrases plèek-caį, sùk-caį and nàk-caį. If the hòkkalôm pronunciation is held to be an instance of dissimilation, an attempt to keep the /k/ and /l/ phonemes well apart so as to avoid their coalescence into a /kl/ cluster, we must ask why hàk- lân, tàak-lom, nàk-lèn etc. have managed to escape this fate. And if the lùukkataa pronunciation is offered as a sample of a kind of assimilation--the holding over of the velar final to form an unattested ka- (or krà- ) variant of the following word, as probably happened with the attested variants nók-jaan/ nók-kàjàan, lùuk-dùm/ lùuk-kàdùm etc., then the suggestion is saying no more than has been said already, namely, that non-nasal velar finals tend to set this linkage procedure in motion. This, of course, may go hand-in-hand with a predisposition to develop krà- variants for quite other reasons--a need felt for formality deriving from a prestigious Khmer-type morphology in a disyllable, perhaps, e.g. tham/ kràtham, dòot/ kràdòot, and even ?àraj/ kràraj. Be that as it may, the focus upon non-nasal velarity for linking is justified by the evidence of the three vernacular linked-locations, even though the reasons why these three particular cases turn up are unfathomable.

More may be added to the list of three 'generated' linkages, however. Reservations will be duly pointed out. They arise out of differences in word status: free or bound relationships; derivational problems; real words that are partners as against partner-plus-dummy relationships. In other words, the line between morphology and syntax is often a debatable one. I hope, though, that the phonological evidence is invariably clear.

We are on fairly firm ground with chàkkaįjèe/ chàkkhaįjèe, both chàk and jèe being dictionary entries, the reservation here being simply the possibility of either aspirate or non-aspirate linkage. The former is usually cited in the dictionary transcriptions. Obviously, the word jèe collocates so closely with chàk that the aspiration feature of the linkage articulation ceases to be truly distinctive, as it did
Also in sāppanok/ sāpphanok. Specific, lexical collocation is not always a necessary precondition for linkage, however. Widest collocation can be found for a modal type pre-verb, māj-jāk/ mijāk, which associates itself with a whole word-class, the verb, and may do so by resort to velar linkage. The reservation here is that, being in itself an iambic rhythm, it will not yield a perfect cretic rhythm when juxtaposed with a monosyllabic verb (the pattern is /-/- instead of /-/-), e.g. mijākkāru, mijākkamaa, mijākkabāk etc.. Nevertheless, it is of great significance for velar linkage in vernacular speech and need not be masked be the insertion of the word cā- as an unstressed element before the verb, which so often happens with pre-verb modals like mākca-, chākca-, jākca- where no possibility of velar linkage seems to be tolerated. The only suggestion that could cancel out the significance of mijākka- linkage would be that the /ka-/ syllable was simply a reduced form of prepositional kāp or kē. As far as I know, this suggestion has not been made.

Let us now take, for example, the pair of words tākkateen and cākkacī. The latter contains the attested word-form cī, with an easily comparable meaning ('to tickle' as against 'to prod, poke'), conveying the impression that the cāk plus linkage might perhaps be merely a dummy, a sort of phonaesthetic elaboration. This would be borne out by the existence of other words with the same cākka- element —cākkacān is one—but unrelated in meaning. cākkacān, in turn, however, does have a meaning similar to that of the word tākkateen (they are both stridulating insects, 'the cicada' and 'the grasshopper' respectively) and it is here that the parallel appears to break down, since etymology (dialectology and, in this case, comparison with ancient Chinese reconstructed forms for 'cicada/grasshopper' words—-cancel and 蟋) gives full word status to tāk. tāk and cāk thus appear to be different reflexes of one and the same ancestral 'insect' word: cāk is not a dummy element here after all but the residue of a real word joined to its partner-word by velar linkage. A further member of the cāk set might be mentioned: the vernacular variant of rākṛē, cākkalē, fitting none of the specifications for the cases just mentioned, but providing a favourable phonological environment for velar linkage to occur, and with the imposition of a favoured pattern, cākka-, by substitution in the first syllable. Not far removed from the tākka- pattern, the sequence tūkka- produces three forms, tūkkataa, tūkkatū and tūkkatām. It is difficult to say whether, etymologically, the first or last syllables have ever been separable words.

Favoured patterns occur in linkages other than velar ones. We have already seen such a pattern exerting its influence in the sāp set for bilabial linkage. More evidence for this comes from the word sāpparaē, the etymology of which I assume to be the Indic (Sanskrit) śava, modern Thai sōp, compounded with the Khmer word praē, more commonly found in the infixed form bāmarē in Thai. We might expect a hypothetical form like *sāppharāē, but this has been constrained to follow the sāpparōt, sāppanok group's pattern. Bilabial nasal linkage produces what seems to be a kind of analogical pattern for the linkage of princely krom ranks. The analogy is with the small group of
kamma- pattern words (kammalî etc.), the syllable /krom/ basing itself on the behaviour of the syllable /kam/. We therefore arrive at the set krommamîyn, krommakhûn, krommalûn etc. and including the administrative department krommathâa and the quasi-Indic word for a kind of official document, krommathan. It is not far fetched to imagine the host of Indic borrowings with kamma- ( karma) as the first term in a compound being behind this whole phenomenon, eg. kammakaan, kammathâan, kammastî etc.

We have now come to a stage where we can speak of two habits or predispositions. On the one hand there is the habit of producing cretic rhythm where a simpler rhythm (a spondee) was an available possibility. A brief note will be added later to reinforce the idea that cretic rhythm is habit-forming in Thai, so much so, indeed, as to be able occasionally to inhibit other rhythms from asserting themselves—rhythms, that is to say, over and above the simple spondee. The other habit to be recognised is the predisposition to velar linkage in non-Indic words in Thai. Again, certain features are occasionally inhibited, or perhaps it would be better to say digested, swallowed up, in the identity of the velar linker. Take, for instance, the joining of the words sâk and pradlaw in vernacular Thai --sâkkadlaw. The /pra/- trip-syllable has been converted to /ka/- It is fruitless to ask if the conversion is elision with subsequent velar linkage from sâk, or whether it is assimilation of /pra/ to /kra/ (vernacular /pa/ to /ka/) after sâk. A similar conversion must have happened in the word sâakkabva, which etymology holds to have come from three words: sâak, khâaw and bya. If the etymologists are right, it has also happened in kâakkarun, where either the Tamil kurundam or the English corundum lies behind some such form as *kurun or *khorun that has been converted to karun by appending it to kâak. In the case of sâkkalëek a /kr/- cluster has been split. Forms such as krèek and kakëek are attested in dictionaries, but no independent form *karëek. Nor is there a form *rëek at all. sâkkalâat is supposed ultimately to be based on the Arabic sigillât which gave the English scarlet which gave the Hindi sakale. It has ended up as a typical cretic rhythm in Thai.

With the citation of known borrowings, however, it must be admitted that the situation is much more free-ranging. There is no particular predilection for velar linkage: lôttarî is just as regular a form as chôkkalaît, and no less likely a form either. Two reasons suggest themselves. One is that the hit-or-miss nature of selecting what is to be borrowed is unlikely to produce a large enough set of examples to check to see whether velar linkages predominate. The other is that 'foreignness', while still a nuance of feeling attached to a word, may provide its own phonological 'style' with distinct departures from normal expectations. Other sets with other nuances also have their own 'styles'. Many of the set of personal nicknames in Thai are highly idiosyncratic from the tonal point of view. From the rhythm point of view, place names (avoiding obviously Indic etymons) offer some examples of cretic rhythm with wide scope for different linkages: sàttahîp sounds just as normal as makkasân,
pàttanìi just as normal as bûkkhaloo; the pronunciation phâppadèn, normal enough in vernacular Thai, goes towards supplying bilabial linkage.

It seems, therefore, that at a level where the Thai language is, in some sense, self-conscious (mimicking, naming) we cannot expect to find the same relative proportions for the use of velar linkage, (as against other linkages), that we find in the more everyday function of language as a vehicle for simple communication. Here velar linkages seem to assert themselves unconsciously, as if there were some quality inherent in velar finals that, in the overall phonological system, made them prone to linking procedure. The question must be asked, then, whether there is anything discernibly weak or strong, stable or unstable, about final velarity under junctural pressures. We must seek a solution in the phonological system (not a conscious part of most native speaker's minds), rather than in conscious preferences for this or that sequence of sounds.

In the Thai consonant phoneme chart the velar row does show one deficiency: there is no velar equivalent for the voiced initial stops dōo and bōo. Nor is there evidence of a preglottalized /g/ or /q/ in any of the remoter dialects. Perhaps there is an inhibiting factor that makes co-ordination of velar and glottal stop articulation more difficult than for articulations further forward in the mouth? If some such thing turns out to be true, and if it is true also that glottal occlusion is concomitant for all dead syllable final-stop articulations in Thai, then the only candidate for velar final is the articulation that is appropriate to initial /k/. Glottal closure is presumed to be concomitant here, but the velar stop, as initial, has a fortis articulation with definite velic closure for non-nasality. Are these permissible concomitants for Thai dead syllable final-stop articulation? Could there not be a tendency remaining in the velar stop to exhibit its appropriateness to an initial role by encouraging the exploitation of any possibility whatever for release into a following linker-syllable?

The complement to this, a marginal inappropriateness for final-stop function, ought to mean that /k/ finals should be marginally unstable. This suggests a possible substitution for /k/, or its complete disappearance. Dialects other than Standard Thai or vernacular Bangkok Thai do exhibit these phenomena, final /k/ often being replaced by final glottal stop. Malay and most dialects of Cambodian exhibit them too, however, so the motive force behind this might be a Sprachbund tendency rather than the inherent weakness that I have suggested so far as being in the Thai phonology itself. In Standard Thai, the disappearance of final /k/ in unstressed words (càk as a pre-verb modal reducing to ca; màak as a head-noun prefix for the set 'nuts and fruits' reducing to ma-) is not very convincing evidence (the /-p/ final of kàp also disappears in unstressed position).

If speakers are barely conscious of a predisposition to velar linkage, the favouring of cretic rhythm is much nearer their con-
scious perceptions. Much more may be said about it. Indeed, I have
omitted a good proportion of examples simply because their linkages
did not constitute a problem. Open final plus linker, for example:
ťaalamîl, čiťaranâ, phâkhamâa etc.; homorganic consonantal juncture
(nasal followed by stop): sânk̡ataŋ, sâmpalhâŋ, thaántâwân etc.; hê-
terogeneous consonantal juncture: čhùklaḥûk, čhunlamun, kèekmârêek
etc.. But leaving linkage topics completely aside, we can follow the
cretic rhythm pattern still further. We have seen that in a line-up
of three words making a compound (sââk khâaw bya was one example;
phâa khâaw máâ is another), it is the middle one from which the stress
is often taken. But this could be thought to be a secondary phenomenon
arising out of two steps in derivation, the basic one being, say, in
such a compound as čhiîpakhâaw, the compounding of phâa and khâaw
first, tending to give an iambic rhythm (phrase-final stress), followed
by its compounding with čhiîj, which does not lose stress to the same
extent. But why is this so? If the loss of stress moves back once
(first step in deriving a compound from two words), why should it not
move back again (second step, deriving a compound from three words)?
After all, if we ignore multiple stress levels and confine ourselves
only to a stressed/ unstressed (downbeat/ upbeat) dichotomy, there are
at least two possible outcomes other than the cretic foot we are famili-
ar with: one is the bacchic foot ( / ), and the other the ana-
paest ( / ). Thai trisyllabic words exhibiting these features are,
for example, krâthanâhâŋ, mahâorî, tâlumphûk for the former, and,
at least according to Thai orthography, mâlakâô, kâlâmâŋ, sâranê for
the latter. Thai orthography is, however, occasionally betrayed. To
my ear, words such as phâjaâjâam, phâjaâbaân, kâlaâsî, mâlajjûu, which
should yield bacchic rhythm, seem to move towards a cretic rhythm by
way of the anapaest. It is the anapaest sequence of two weak stresses
together that is so difficult to pin down. It often seems that in cer-
tain contexts and at certain speeds (and for some speakers more than
others, perhaps) many 'orthographic' anapaests in Thai fall back on to
a strengthening of the first weak syllable. I often hear the above
words as mâlakâô, kâlâmâŋ, sâranê. I note an alternative attested
form for kâlâwâŋ, namely câalâwâŋ, which exaggerates this alternative
rhythm. Instead of bacchic rhythms I hear phîjââjâam, phîjâbaân,
kâlaâsî, mâlajjûu. In other words, I hear much the same rhythm for
these words as for câkkâçî, pàttakhât, sàpparôît, which in the ortho-
graphy are duly accounted for as cretic. Were I to insist I heard
anapaestic rhythm for these latter (which I sometimes do), it would
probably be put down to allegro forms—changes due to high speed of
delivery. What I perhaps should appeal for, then, is the admission
of 'andante forms' for those anapaestic-looking words which enter my
ear on certain occasions with a cretic rhythm.13

These observations and speculations are offered in the hope
that interested native speakers will assist in compiling a corpus of
linker-syllable words, including those of a phoneaesthetic type that
might be ephemeral as well as proper names and neologisms that might
be outside the public domain. Especially helpful would be a
coverage of provincial dialects in respect of linkage phenomena (or
its absence) which might help us to discover just how big a debt is
owed to borrowed morphology, a demand for which—or simply a taste for which—may have inspired new departures in Thai morphology with its attendant stresses and strains upon the Thai phonological system.

NOTES

1 A similar list with comments similar to those made in the opening paragraphs of this paper is to be found in Henderson 1949, p.198.

2 I leave out of consideration the phonology of final particles with, if the pun may be forgiven, their own 'particular' phonology. Here the short syllable is not merely allowed to have an open termination (to be 'live'—kham pen, that is) but in some cases must have one because of a minimal pair contrast, e.g. allegro forms of the Polite Particles: /há?/ for men, and, in interrogative sentences, /há/ for women.

3 See Gedney 1964, p.8: '...syllables having weak stress, usually prefixed to a normal syllable.'

4 Henderson 1949, p. 199-200, deals with these phenomena and includes besides unstressed /-a-/ in these syllables, the vowels /-i-/ and /-u-/ too. Apart from my own somewhat peremptory decision to exclude these from consideration (they make up a negligibly small part of the non-Indic wordstock, e.g. philýk, cipaathatá, kulii-kucce, surúj-súraaj etc.), there are misgivings in my mind about the attribution of totally relaxed tone to their occurrence in familiar Indic prefixes, su-, ni-, vi- etc., borrowed into Thai. Familiar words with su- prefixation seem most likely to relax to mid-level pitch, vi- prefixes least likely, whether borrowed as /phí/- or /wí/-.

5 I suspect there is sometimes a little more to it than merely a relaxed pitch—a tendency to converge towards the middle of the voice range (Gedney 1964, p.8: 'The tone on such syllables tends to be neutralized to a mid level pitch...'). Words like farán and thálýn often sound to me as if they should be transcribed fárån and thálýn when used affectively (as exclamations, in particular). The pitch of the first syllable seems to strike a balance across the middle of the voice range, like a see-saw.

6 (a) By rhythm I mean here an expected pattern of contrasts, invariant in the sense that each particular pattern is fixed for each particular unit under discussion. If the contrast is seen basically as between lack of stress and phonemic tone in a syllable on the one hand and the presence of some degree of stress and some allophone of
a tone on the other, i.e. if the crux here is lack of stress versus any stress at all, working always from the unstressed side, so to speak, rather than from any preoccupation with primary, secondary etc. levels of stress measured from a maximum, then what I have called rhythm will in a great many cases (viz. where the unit under discussion is a word) turn out to be word-stress. The assumption is that the lack of any impression of prominence is not attributable only to a wider context of sentence stress or style (rapid speech etc.) but is inherent in any form where a trip-syllable or a linker syllable plays a part. It is also assumed that such a trip- or linker-syllable will normally be relatively shorter in duration (see Noss 1972, p.41, for the word talâat), less resonant (not so much a question of loudness as the [ə] vowel quality, often whispered, especially so, of course, after aspires, affricates and fricatives) and less purposive about pitch (quite apart from whispering, the mid-voice range is precisely the range where the tones of Standard Thai short 'dead' syllables may not occur, so that any falling short from high or floating up from low may justifiably be termed 'less purposive') than other syllables. This is not to say that certain monosyllabic words may not be reduced to this condition of lack of prominence (see Noss 1972 and Samang 1972). Of course they may, but it will be assumed here that there are ways of restoring most of them to their former glory, ways which are not open to the true trip- or linker-syllable short of artificially syllabified dictation.

(b) The word foot is used merely as the usual partner word that goes with the metrical terms of Western Classical verse-scansion--iambic, cretic etc.. It refers to stress rather than to Classical syllabic quantity. Here I might note the Thai interpretation of the convention of Indic āra/īahu quantity in the scansion of chanda (/chan/) verse. Far from it being simply a question of short versus long vowels, the Thai īahu (light) syllable corresponds only with those syllables that would here be termed either trip-syllables or linkers, with the scope extended to include /i, u/ as well as /æ/ (see footnote 4), in acknowledgement of the three short vowels of Indic phonology. The aural impression is thus one of stress rhythm rather than one of quantity contrast. Indeed, from the point of view of beating time, all syllables save these, i.e. all fully formed syllables whether quantitatively long or short, are isochronous. A foot, then, here defines the extent of an expected pattern. It is not like the use of the word foot sometimes found in analyses of English sentence rhythm where it marks stress-groups headed by 'strong beats' somewhat like bar lines in music (see Noss 1972 and Woranut 1973). On the contrary, rather, there is not a single 'foot' mentioned in this paper that closes with a weak beat. The downbeat clearly belongs at the end of a bar here, not at the beginning. There are, moreover, three--iambic, anapaestic and bacchic--that begin the foot with upbeats and are perfectly normal.

7 The syllabification of C¹ V C² V C³ V ... into C¹ V C², C² V C³, C³ V ... is common in English. Hockett 1958 calls any C common to two consecutive syllables an interlude.
Indic linkers in -y- and -v- are found in Thai as /-jj-, -ww-/ e.g. sājjāsāt, jawwachon, where a geminate looking transcription is called for. They were left out of the list of examples at the commencement of this paper because the 'conversion table' does not make a neat correspondence in the vocalism. The consonantal nature of the semivowel held over for linking is plain, however, and in no way extraordinary. There are no repercussions upon the use of ʂ and ʐ in Thai orthography for the glide in centring diphthongs /-ia(-), -ua(-)/, which diphthongs count for one syllable beat only, not two as with linkage e.g. /|p|jā|būt|/ not /*|pj|a|būt|/;
/jū|wa|chon|/ not /*|jua|chon|/. The different rhythmic resolutions are interesting here, by the way.

See the Royal Institute Dictionary entry for วก. The Khmer word for 'dark' has been borrowed into Thai as /ɲaŋt/ (ɲונ) without trouble and is also entered in this dictionary.

I adhere to the dictionary reading and that of academic colleagues for the pronunciation of this word. Not-so-academic colleagues have insisted it is sàpphajšōk, citing the word jšōk as being 'much the same thing'. Oddly enough, the Royal Institute Dictionary offers some support for this in glossing the meaning of sàpphajšōk with the single entry jšōkjāw.

Gedney 1964 has an interesting observation on the frequency of tri-syllable morphology in dialects ranging from Siamese, through Red Tai and Black Tai, to White Tai. That prefixation is (or was) a common morphological process in Malay and Cambodian too is, of course, well known, and these languages constitute the most immediate likely influences upon an earlier, monosyllabic stage of Tai.

For /-ŋŋ-/, for example, we could have khoøn Ṽaŋñon; and for /-ʔʔ-/ we could suggest kɔʔ?ʔaraŋ.

When this paper was delivered, considerable disagreement was expressed (not surprisingly) about the observations in this paragraph. On the whole, the claim to hear cretic rhythm instead of anapaestic rhythm was greeted with scepticism. Two examples were produced, however, (with /-hi-/ as the unstressed syllable), māhidon and ṽāhiwaa, where cretic rhythm--against the dictates of orthography--was accepted.

Glossary

rātthabaan  รัฐบาล  'the government'
sàppadaa  สัปดาห์  'a week'
ʔèekkarāat  เอกการ  'independent sovereignty'
phannanaa  'to describe'
kammakaan  'a committee'
théepphanom  'goddess-figure performing anjali'
sättawát  'a century'
kradáat  'paper'
pratuu  'a door'
saphaan  'a bridge'
khanôm  'sweetmeats'
lakhoon  'dance-drama'
maphráaw  'coconut'
phiyk  'to be peculiar, odd'
cipaathâ?  'to be miscellaneous'
kulli-kucco  'to be all scrambled together'
surûj-surâaj  'to be a spendthrift'
khanâ?  'whilst, - time during'
khanâ?  'a group'
faràn  'Europeans, Westerners'
thaîyn  'to be cheeky, saucy'
lâksanà?  'a characteristic'
sângkhâjat  'the Prince Patriarch'
cákraphât  'an emperor'
ràatchakaan  'government service'
phanrajaaj  'a wife'
phônalamâaj  'fruit'
?àtsawin  'a knight'
sâjjasàat  'magic, sorcery'
jawwachon  'youth'
jûwachon  'var. of above'
pijâbût  'beloved child'
?àrj  'to be tasty'
sôkkaprèk  'to be dirty'
?ykkathyk  'to be clamorous'
?èkkkarâèk  'to be very grand'
tûkkataa  'a doll'
câkkacî  'to tickle'
sàkkalàat  'flannel-like cloth'
chûkkachii 'a base for a Buddha-image'
ʔéekkhânehék 'to be lounging in comfort'
ʔéttaroo 'to be in uproar'
bëttalët 'to be miscellaneous'
ʔùttalùt 'to be in confusion'
ʔëttakhât 'to be destitute'
ʔëttapyy 'to be in abundance'
sàpparôt 'pineapple'
sàppadon 'to be obscene'
sàppagóh 'to be nodding drowsily'
sàpphajëök 'to joke, to tease'
jëék jáw 'to joke, to tease'
channatù 'scalp infection'
channaroön 'the honey ant'
channakàat 'a grass-like herb'
këmmajëi 'velvet'
këmmathàn 'sulphur'
rammanaa 'type of uniface drum'
sàmmale 'to carouse drunkenly'
channasùut 'to do an objective analysis'
khùük kapì? 'to mix with shrimp-paste'
thëök khamëên 'to tuck up a phâkhamâa like a loin-cloth'
khàat talàat 'not to be on sale anywhere'
bót thanôn 'to level a road by rolling'
ráp pathaan 'to eat' (--- ?aahâan)
tháp phamâa 'the Burmese army'
khùòng-nàngwùn 'sweepingly curved'
kö? ?araj 'What island?'
tök Caj 'to be startled'
hôk löm 'to fall down'
lùuk taa 'eye, eyeball'
pleèk Caj 'to be puzzled'
hàk ëang 'to let someone down badly'
lùuk-taàn 'sugar-palm fruit'
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Term</th>
<th>Meaning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>mi këc caj</td>
<td>'to be more than willing'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sük-caj</td>
<td>'to be happy'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nàk-caj</td>
<td>'to be heavy-hearted'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tàak lom</td>
<td>'to let the wind dry something'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nák lën</td>
<td>'a player'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nôk-jaang</td>
<td>'an egret'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lûuk-dum</td>
<td>'a button'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tham/kratham</td>
<td>'to do, commit'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dûot/kradûot</td>
<td>'to leap'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>chákkajâ</td>
<td>'to have a tug-of-war'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mâj-jâk</td>
<td>'to feel the contrary should be so, ... ought to have ...'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tákkateen</td>
<td>'a grasshopper'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cákkacân</td>
<td>'a cicada'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>rákréé</td>
<td>'armpit'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>túkkatûj</td>
<td>'to be tiny, trifling'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>túkkatâm</td>
<td>'kind of black ore'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sàpparëè</td>
<td>'an undertaker'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kammmathân</td>
<td>'a meditation technique'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kammasût</td>
<td>'ownership'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sák pradyaw</td>
<td>'just a moment'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sàakkabya</td>
<td>'a pestle'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kàakkarun</td>
<td>'abrasive, emery paper'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lôttarûi</td>
<td>'lottery'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sàttahlip</td>
<td>'sud'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mákkasân</td>
<td>PN.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pàttaniî</td>
<td>PN.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bûkkhaloo</td>
<td>PN.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pháppadeen</td>
<td>PN.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fâalamîj</td>
<td>'cookpot lid'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ciaranaj</td>
<td>'to cut gems'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>phâakhàmà</td>
<td>'all-purpose cloth for personal use by men'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sàngkatañ</td>
<td>'tousled'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sàmpalân</td>
<td>'tapioca'</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
thaantawan  'sunflower'
chûklähûk  'to be flurried'
chunlamun  'to be chaotic'
kæekmarèèk  'to be a good-for-nothing rogue'
chiiphakhâaw  'Buddhist nuns'
krathanhân  'to be sudden'
mahöorii  'Thai orchestra'
talumphûk  'rice-pounder'
malakû  'papaya'
kalamân  'kitchen bowl'
saranèè  'mint'
phaajaajaam  'to try'
phaajaabaan  'to nurse'
kalaasîî  'seaman'
malaaju  PN.
calawan  'to be in confusion'
mâhidon  PN.
?âhiwaa  'cholera'
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