FURTHER TYPOLOGICAL STUDIES IN SOUTHEAST ASIAN LANGUAGES

A. CAPELL

1. INTRODUCTION

1.1. *GENERAL REMARKS*

This paper is called "further" typological studies, because it is a sort of long-delayed sequel to a paper presented to the London Conference of 1961 on Southeast Asian linguistics by F.J. Honey and E.H.S. Simmonds, which embraced Thai and Vietnamese: 'Some elements of nominal structure compared'. To this first paper may then be added one read to the similar conference of 1965 by E.J.A. Henderson under the title 'The Typography of Certain Phonetic and Morphological Characteristics of South-East Asian Languages'.

The present paper extends the study to the verb phrase and brings in other languages, as will be described below.

In the original paper, after a very helpful comparison of the structure of noun phrases in Thai, Vietnamese and Chinese, the authors added: "It would be interesting to extend the work (a) by comparing descriptive systems of the verbal complexes of the three languages, and (b) attempting to apply the method of description of the nominal systems of, say, Khmer and Malay." (p.77). In this paper such an attempt is made, with still other languages added.

The paper has further aims as well, which are in a way by-products of the main aim of the descriptive comparison. In a paper presented to the 1965 London Conference, I outlined a typological approach to language description which I called "concept domination". This, in brief, works on the recognition of a certain bias in languages in many parts of the world, towards elaboration of either the noun phrase or the verb phrase in an utterance. Some languages appear to be more interested in

the details of how an event took place than in who or what performed it. In such languages, the **VP** may be morphologically elaborate, including complex systems of aspects, moods and tenses, inclusion of subject and object markers in the verbal complex, often along with indicators of direction and other details of the action. This may be called *event domination*, and in the S.E. Asian region Santali provides an example. Other languages seem to be more interested in the actor and/or the goal, and the **NP** then shows class or gender, number, case, and often the verb marks neither person nor number, and aspect, tense and mood or marked syntactically and not morphologically. The interest is in the **NP**, and these languages may be called *object-dominated*. The abbreviations **ED** and **OD** are used. Other languages, again, appear to be equally interested in both event and object - the African Bantu languages have elaborate noun class systems with concord, and these are involved as much in the verbal complex as in the nominal. These are *double dominated* (**DD**). They do not occur in the Southeast Asian region. Still others, such as English and most of the Austronesian languages, show little bias in either direction, and the morphology of such languages is comparatively simple. In the extreme case of Chinese and similar languages, there is no overt morphology at all. Most of the southeast Asian languages belong to this type, which is called *neutral domination* (**ND**).

In 1969 I produced a book entitled *A Survey of New Guinea Languages*, in which this typology was used as a basis of arrangement. A reviewer wrote that the author seemed to have lumped together all languages he could not account for under other headings as "neutral domination", with no further analysis. To a degree that is true, and the author was not forgetful of it even while he did it. In New Guinea **ND** is comparatively rare, and there was no need to subcategorise the group, any more than to account for the verbal classification of the Athapascan languages of North America, which have no counterpart in New Guinea.

The languages of Southeast Asia, however, provide an opportunity for refining one's thinking about subdivisions within the **ND** class. It is therefore part of the aim of this paper to do this, in addition to taking up the challenge of Honey and Simmond's paper. It seeks to show that although **ND** would by implication be a homogeneous group, it is not really so, and subdivisions within it can be made similar to those made within the other classes, both in the original paper and in the *Survey*. English and Thai, for instance, show differences amid common qualities. The paper therefore seeks to examine languages classifiable as **ND**, but differing among themselves so that **ND** can be further analysed as the other groups have been.

The 1965 paper by Henderson was concerned with just this type of language that in the "domination" arrangement would be classified as ND. The paper was a phonological examination, and studied the distribution of eight phonetic features spread over sixty languages and India to Oceania. The presence of tone is, of course, a differentiating feature, but it is not relevant in concept domination typology, which functions rather on the morphological and syntactic levels. Even so, the materials used here suggest further avenues of research rather than attain positive conclusions, and they are meant to do so. Although the primary purpose is to provide the necessary subdivisions of the ND type of language, the present study should also lead on to other matters which are not part of this paper, such as the question of what type of deep structure lies behind languages so different in structure as Bantu, Latin and Chinese. It has been suggested that only noun, verb and adjective are represented (as one category) in the base, but it seems doubtful whether adjective can be regarded as primary anywhere. Again it has been suggested that perhaps prepositions derive from verbs. These languages of southeast Asia, like those of the ND group in West Africa, have evidence to offer in this matter. However, it may be put forward as an idea, that the search for universals in language is not so simple as some of the searchers appear to think, and that there is probably no "deep structure" of language as such, traceable through a process of differential development in time and space. These aspects of linguistic research cannot be pursued here, but the paper, if developed to its logical conclusion, could well open up research also in this decidedly different field.

1.2. *LANGUAGES AND MATERIALS USED*

The languages used in the paper on which the present one is based are Thai, Vietnamese and Chinese. Thai has been added as an obvious extension. Korean and Japanese are also obvious extensions as representing north-east Asia; in the south, Khmer is equally called for. Outside this area again, there is the extensive Austronesian family, whose western members impinge on, and indeed intermingle with, the other families. An attempt has been made therefore to give as fair coverage as possible of the languages of this family which are in touch with the other families employed. This means, of course, Malay, but nearer to the field of the other languages, Jarai and Rhade information has been employed, and a missionary among the "Sea Gypsies" of the islands west of Thailand kindly provided material in Urak Lawoi'. Mr Hogan's work here is good, but he has produced his material in a modified Thai script, because the peoples form part of Thailand and it seemed more practical

to produce literacy materials for them in the script employed in the national language - although this could only be done with some modification for certain letters of the Thai alphabet. Moken material was unfortunately unavailable except for a few odd notes. On the southern side of this western Austronesian, the Atjeh language and the Cham dialects offered themselves as near neighbours: and it must not be forgotten that there is a Cham language on the island of Hainan which is very little known to the outside world. This Cham has developed a tonal system based on that of the local Chinese.

1.3. *SCOPE OF THE PAPER*

In the paper presented in 1961, study was confined to the noun phrase. It is desirable therefore to begin from that point here also, to enable a clear study to be made, embodying the results achieved in the previous paper. Towards the end of their paper, Honey and Simmonds stated, "It would be premature to draw any firm concluisons from such facts (as they had shown in the course of the study), but it would be interesting to extend the work by (*a*) comparing descriptive systems of the verbal complexes of the three languages, and (*b*) by attempting to apply the method of description to the nominal forms of, say, Khmer and Malay." It was this suggestion that gave the lead into the present paper, which attempts to cover just these fields: to describe the verb phrase and to extend the scope of languages in the way that has been mentioned above.

Burmese was not originally included in the paper, but on second thoughts it has been added. It was omitted because it steps outside the strict SEA area: it belongs to the Tibeto-Burman group of languages (Wolfenden:1929; Pring (1963) and other authors on general linguistic classification) and thus lies apart from the Mon-Khmer (MK) and Austronesian (AN) languages which form the basis of the paper. But it is in geographical company with them and is as worthy of inclusion as Chinese, Korean and Japanese. It serves in a number of cases to point up contrasts between the structures of the various types, perhaps more in the NP than in the VP. There is much argument about the interpretation of VP in Burmese, too much to be even summarised here. Alliott's paper on 'The verbal syntagma in Burmese' (Alliott 1965:283-308) is the latest and probably the fullest, and is taken here as the guide - but it should be studied in full. In the VP also, tense, voice and mood rather than aspect seem to be dominant, more so than in the MK languages and even the AN languages used here.

Readers of Russian can also use the *Birmanskiy Jazyk* in the Asiatic series of the Moscow Academy of Sciences (Maun Maun Njun etc., 1963)

and some articles in the volume *Jazyki Jugo-Vostočnoj Azii* (Moscow 1967) dealing with various aspects of the language. As in so many of the languages that use local alphabets, transcription in Roman letters varies tremendously among different authors, and it can probably not be claimed that the forms used here are always mutually consistent or even self-consistent, but for the readers intended this will not provide a serious difficulty. Books by W.S. Cornin (1946) and J.A. Stewart (1955) have also been used here.

2. THE NOUN PHRASE

Seeing that there is in most of the languages agreement about the absence of morphological indication of number, gender or case relationships, the first subject of treatment in the noun phrase is the presence of adjuncts in the **NP**. A simple adjunct such as *'that'* or *'good'* may be either preposed or postposed, so that mere presence of **D** or **A** in the phrase provides nothing diagnostic either typologically or genetically. Where, however, more than one adjunct is present in the **NP**, more variety of arrangement is possible and the complex **NP** consisting of the **D**, **N** and **A** may be of importance.

The adjective-noun (**AN**) phrase comes first in the present treatment. The Chinese, Korean and Japanese order is **A + N**, the other languages all have **N + A**, and this includes Khmer and the Austronesian languages. Examples:

English *'a good man'*

Group A	**A + N**	Chinese	xǎo rén
		Korean	chohŭn saram
		Japanese	yoi hito
		Burmese	ˋlɛauŋ té lu
Group B	**N + A**	Thai	phûuchaaj dii
		Vietnam	ŋù'o'i tốt
		Jarai	mnuih 'o'i
		Khmer	mənùs l?aa
		Malay	orang (jaŋ) baik
		Ur. Law.	urak badji?
		Moken	mnut amon
		Atjeh	urö'əŋ gèt
		Burmese	lū ˋkauŋ

Numeral adjectives may in some of the languages precede the noun, with or without coefficients. Coefficients will be mentioned more fully

below. Jarai shows lu mnuih, *'many people'*, in which the adjective lu, *'many'* is treated as a numeral and precedes the noun,* and Malay oraŋ banjak, *'people many'*, as a rule without the ligative jaŋ, which is often optional and may make a slight difference in meaning which is not of concern here.

If the adjunct is demonstrative (D), the same dichotomy of languages is found: *'that man'*, Chinese nèige rén; Korean, ku saram; Japanese sono hito; as against Thai phûuchaaj nán; Vietnam ŋù'o'i ấy; Khmer menùs nuh; Jarai mnuih ʔanŏn; Malay araŋ itu; Ur. Law. urak itu; Moken mnut idup. Temiar elaborates its demonstratives to three positions, but the order is still N + A.

When both D and A are present, as in *'that good man'*, there is more scope for variation, but in point of fact once again two divisions only appear: in languages where A precedes, so does D, so that there is a direct parallel to English *'that good man'* (D + A + N), or an arrangement N + A + D, and in the latter case N + D + A is to be construed as N + D is A, i.e. *'that man is good'*. The phrase *'that good man'* becomes therefore:

Group 1	Chinese	nèige xăo ren
	Korean	ku chohun saram
	Japanese	sono yoi hito
Group 2	Thai	phûuchaaj dii nán
	Vietnam	ŋù'o'i tốt ấy
	Khmer	menùs lʔɑh nuh
	Jarai	mnuih ʔo'i ˋʔanăn
	Malay	oraŋ (jaŋ) baik itu
	Ur. Law.	urak badji itu
	Moken	mnut amon idup
	Atjeh	uro'əŋ gèt nan
	Burmese	lu ˋlcauŋ

If the adjective becomes predicative, as in *'that man is good'*, a change of order takes place, in such a way that the demonstrative shows the end of the noun phrase and the beginning of the predicate. This rearrangement is found in other languages in other parts of the world also. Here, each language group proceeds in the same way: it places the adjective in the predicate position at the end of the sentence, but according to its original pattern, a difference is still preserved between the two groups:

*But a recent Scripture translation has mŏnuih lu.

	Topic	*Comment*
Chinese	nèige rén	xǎo
Khmer	menùs nuh	l?aa
Jarai	mnuih ?anăn	?o'i
Malay	oraŋ itu	baik
Ur. Law.	urak itu	badji?
Burmese	di lu	ˋkauŋ tɛ́

At this stage, however, some differences of practice begin to appear. Korean and Japanese may verbalise the adjective and so produce a morphological change in its shape: Korean ku saram chosso. Japanese has also its subject markers wa and ga (ŋa): sono hito ŋa yoi (des'). In Malay there is an alternative baik-lah oraŋ itu, where -lah serves to disjoin the adjective from the noun and to emphasise it.

The next subject of comparison is the expression of ownership. There are several patterns in the languages concerned: 1. the owner precedes the object owned and is linked with it by a possessive particle; 2. the object precedes and is connected with the owner by a particle in the style of English *'house of (my) father'*; 3, the object precedes, followed immediately by the possessor without particles of any kind. These three methods are not absolutely exclusive; they may occur together in a language with semantic differences or with different usages. In Ur. Law. for instance, *'my book'* is either surac na?ku or surac ku.

1. In Chinese the particle di links possessor and possessed: wǒ di šū, *'I of book'*, *'my book'*; rén di šū, *'man of book'*, *'man's book'*. The same pattern reappears in Japanese: watakusi no hon, and in Korean, na ŭi ch'aek, all in the same relative order. These languages are again to be classed togerher, typologically, though of course not morphologically.

2. The second group is formed by the northern members of the southern group: Thai, năŋsŷy khŏoŋ phŏm, *'book possession I'*, *'my book'*, and Vietnam, sách cu'a tôi, analysed the same way.

3. The southern languages of the southern group, including the Austronesian, dispense with a connective particle altogether, and the structure is adjectival: *'book I'*: Khmer, siəvphèu khñom, Jarai mo'nu khəo, *'bird I'*, and Malay buku saja, *'book I'*. Similarly Temiar, deeg Aloŋ, *'Along's house'*; deeg yee?, *'house I'*, *'my house'*, Atjeh kitab lɔ̄n, *'book I'*, and Ur. Law. either surac-ku or surac na?ku.

If the possessive phrase is expanded by attributive words in the noun phrase, the arrangement is determined by the general rules as to word-order in the given language, e.g.

Khmer: nənùs thom bəy knèak nìh
man tall three person this
'these three tall men', without possessive, and with possessive:
phtèak thmay khñom nùh,
house new I this
'this new house of mine'. In the first instance, Urak Lawoi has
səmiya tiŋi tiga urak ini
man tall three person this
and in the second it has
rumah baru na?ku ini
house new my this

There are differences of order as against Khmer in these. But there is also for *'my five grandchildren'* –

Khmer: cau khñom pram nèak
grandson I five person

Urak Lawoi: cucu lima urak na?ku
grandchild five person I

Jeh does not use numeral coefficient in its
ana? limaŋ lōn
child five I

In Malay a similar phrase is kedua anak saya ini, *'two son I this'*, *'these two sons of mine'*, for which Urak Lawoi has rumah baru na?ku ini, *'this new house of mine'*, as above, keeping ini to the end as phrase closer. In both Khmer and Malay there is a degree of flexibility in the arrangement. In Japanese the possessor takes precedence of the possessed in the phrase
watakusi no kono futari no musuko
I of this two of child
'these two sons of mine', to which Chinese wǒ di jè ciǎŋ gè érdz corresponds.

In the languages in general, predicative forms of possessives usually require repetition of the noun, as in Urak Lawoi rumah ini rumah na?k, *'house this house my'*, i.e. *'this house is mine'*.

The following Table presents a summary of the possessive constructions in the various groups:

Group 1	N_1 + p + N_2	Chinese Korean Japanese
Group 2	N_2 + p + N_1	Thai Vietnamese
Group 3	N_2 + N_1	Khmer Jarai Malay Atjeh Urak Lawoi

where N_1 is the possessor, N_2 the object possessed and p the connecting particle, of whatever nature. A more detailed subdivision could be made by distinguishing the character of the particle involved in Groups A and B, for these, in point of fact, are not quite the same.

A point is brought out in Honey and Simmond's article, that in Chinese the possessive marker is used after a clause to make it adjectival, i.e. what in European grammars is called a relative clause: *'the book which you bought yesterday' → 'you yesterday buy's book'*, where *-s* stands for Chinese **di**. The construction rank shifts the clause (to use a London School's expression) downward to the status of an adjective, even though a phrasal one, and it precedes the noun to which it belongs because an adjective normally does this in Chinese. The other languages might be expected to show differences in their procedures parallel to their differences from Chinese, and this is actually the case. At the same time, the northern languages, which have hitherto agreed with Chinese (as seen in the preceding matrices) do not do so in this case. Perhaps the fact that Korean and Japanese are inflectional, as against Chinese, may account for the differences. Taking the given example, *'where is the book that you bought yesterday?'* -

Chinese shows:

(nǐ tswó tien maǐ)-di šū dzày nǎli?
(you yesterday buy) 's book at where?

None of the northern languages agrees with this construction. Thus:

Korean. **tangsin ŏje san ch'aek i ŏdi isso?**
you yesterday buy book where is?

Japanese: **anata ga kinō katta hon wa doko desu ka?**
you yesterday bought book where is?

In these two languages, the whole adjectival clause precedes the noun to which reference is made, as a single adjective would do. As the languages have verbal inflection, however, and markers of subject and object, these are all involved in their normal places. The principle is the same as in Chinese; the form varies by reason of the different structures of the languages.

When the southern languages are studied, an abrupt difference appears: an equivalent to the English relative pronoun is found, at least in its general usage, though the various particles are not truly translation equivalents. They have been referred to as "attributive linking particles" (ALP), and can be shown in the examples from Thai and Vietnamese:

Thai: náŋsyỳ lêm thîi khun sỳy mŷa wan nîi jù thîi-nǎj?
book item ALP *you buy yesterday stay where?*

Vietnamese: sách mà anh mua hêm-quyen ở dâu?
book ALP *you buy yesterday stay where?*

In Khmer, there is again a departure, and most authors seem to have no difficulty in translating dael by the English *'who, which'*:

siəvphèu dael lo:k məl-ten nɤu-ʔae naʔ
book which you yesterday buy where?

Amongst the languages that possess a relative pronoun that - whatever its ultimate origin - can be ranked funtionally as such is Malay and a large number of the Western Austronesian languages, most of which are outside the scope of the present paper. In Malay, for instance, the type sentence stands:

di-mana-kah buku itu yaŋ saudara sudah beli kelmarin?
at-where -? book that wh. (you) perf. buy yesterday?

By way of contrast, however, the mainland AN languages tend not to have any expressed relative particle at all, e.g.

Jarai mo' nu ih boŋ hotai
bird you eat-raw liver,
'the bird whose liver you eat raw' and

Ur. Law. surac kaw beli kemari tet baji?
book you buy yesterday not good,
'the book you bought yesterday is not good'

surac kaw beli kemari dudoʔ peʔʔ
book you buy yesterday sit where?
'where is the book you bought yesterday?'

answering to the Malay example above.

In Malay, however, yaŋ can also be used as a kind of nominaliser, without an expressed noun, like English *'one'*, substituting for the noun: yaŋ baik *'the good one'*, etc. This would suggest that historically yaŋ is, like equivalents in many other languages, a demonstrative rather than a true relative.

In Burmese the treatment of the relative is governed by the fact that a relative clause is logically an adjective, and as the adjective precedes the noun, the relative clause precedes the entire subject of the sentence just as in Japanese. There is, however, no equivalent to the Japanese no (or for that matter to the Chinese di). The order of elements is governed by the **SOV** ordering of the sentence, and the fact that **NP = A - N.** The examples that followe are culled from various parts of Stewart (1955:55ff), retaining his transliterations.

1. **Relative clause as subject:**

mə-ˋhma-tɛ′ ˋshe shəya
not mistake-makes
'a doctor who makes no mistakes'

mə-θe-tɛ′ ˋshe shəya
not -die-s doctor
'a doctor who does not die'

There are also certain markers which can replace an unexpressed noun, chiefly tha as in mə-hou?-tha, *'what is not true'*.

2. **Relative clause as object:** as might be expected, such a clause is set bodily before the verb, in the grammatical position of **O** of **SOV** - and, as in most SEA languages, **S** as a pronoun may not be expressed, so that we get, e.g.

ˋmiŋ ˋpyɔ-that mə-youŋˋ-phu
you say-what not-believe
'I don't believe what you say.'

The Subject *'I'* is not expressed; the negative is a discontinuous mə...phu. A longer example (Stewart, p.58) is:

mya′′myolwiŋ ˋyetɛ′ ʃwelɛ?kau? shotɛ′ wu?thus′′la
Mya Myo Lwin write Golden-Bangle call story-?
'What about the story "The Golden Bangle", by Mya Myo Lwin?'

3. **Relative clause as oblique case in sentence:**

θu ˋθwa-ði′ myo′-go cun-dɔ ˋgaun-swa θi′-ba-ði.
he going town-Obj. I well know
'I am quite aware that he is going to town.'

Here the entire clause which is the object of *'know'* precedes the main verb, as an object should. In other cases a similar result is obtained with oblique phrases, as in

θwa-jin-de neiyagou
he-wants-to-go place-to
'the place where he wants to go' (Cornyn:130)

It is desirable to say something more about numeral coefficients at this point in the treatment of NP constructions in the various languages. The use of such definers is common even as far east as Polynesia, but they seem to have their centre on the Asian mainland. Yet the picture that has been establishing itself throughout the earlier part of this paper breaks down at this point. As much has been written on the subject, it is not proposed to illustrate NCs here in any quantity. They are described in parts of Honey and Simmonds' paper. All that is necessary here is to extend the discussion to cover the new languages introduced here. The abbreviation used will be NC for 'numeral coefficient'. Two divisions of NC occurrence must be distinguished: some languages use the NC apart from the numeral construction, along with adjectives where no N is present (this is a connection with Malay usage of yaŋ, although of course not historically so), e.g. Thai lèm yǎy nîi *'item large this'* for *'this large one'*, like Malay yaŋ besar ini; others do not do this. This type will be labelled AC for 'adjective coefficient'. When a noun is present, the adjective coefficient is not always required. In Khmer the usage of NC is more limited than in some of the other languages. Jacob states that "In certain kinds of counting the NC follows the numeral in close conjunction; in other cases the numeral follows the noun also in close junction." She also adds (p.330) that "any word that occurs following a numeral is held to belong to the category of NC. Many word forms belong to both categories of N and NC".

In the Jarai group, Radé shows NC or its absence: namboh ceh, *'six jars'* (Malay tempayan enam buah (N + num. + NC)); pluh dua čô mnuih, *'twelve man'*, and Jarai, mo'nu ha dro'i, *'bird one body'*; sa čô mnuih, *'one man'*; pă mta mno'ŋ, *'four face thing'* mta pă, *'four (such things)'*.

In longer phrases the uses in the different languages may be exhibited more briefly:

Chinese	D	+	[n	+	c]	+ A	+	N
	jè		liǎŋ-been			dā		šū
	this		*two*			*large*		*book*
Thai	N	+	A	+	[n	+	c]	+ D
	nǎŋ-sŷy		yày		sɔ̌ɔŋ		lêm	nîi
	book		*large*		*two-item*			*this*

Vietnamese [n + c] + N + A + D
hai quyên sách lớn này

Jaray N + [n + ca]
mo'nu ha dro'i

Malay [n + c] + N + A + D
dua buwah buku besar ini

Khmer N + [n + c]
nɛəknipɔn pi ru:p
writer two person

N + [n + c]
chə: bɛy daəm
tree three trunk

Urok Lawoi? N + [n + c]
burok sa ikol
bird one tail

There are similar uses in the other mainland Austronesian languages, e.g. Radé: phuŋ pluh čô mnie êra, *'ten young women'*; êma čô hlám phuŋ, *'five of the young women'*; êma čô thəo min, *'five of them were foolish'*.

In summary, the occurrences of numeral and adjective coefficients can be set out in the diagram:

	NC	AC
Chinese	+	+
Korean	+	-
Japanese	+	-
Thai	+	+
Vietnam	+	+
Khmer	(+)	+
Jarai	+	+
Malay	+	(+)
Burmese	+	-

The AC is bracketed for Malay because there the ALP yaŋ takes the place before the adjective which functions as N; otherwise there is no connective between N and A.

The only other NP construction (from the western point of view) of which mention will be made here is one that in eastern - and African - languages is often regarded as a VP construction. This is the expression of locality whether place or movement. In English the category of the

preposition, *'ON the table', 'IN the room', 'give it TO me'*, etc. comes into play here. In the languages here under study, some use what are really verbs, *'speak give him'*, for *'say to him'*. The so-called isolating languages seem to have a tendency to this usage, and in the Oceanic languages prepositions not unusually prove to be disguised verbs, one in one language, the other in another, or even capable of indicating tense. Not all these languages actually do this; Urak Lawoi? is one that does not - but then this is Austronesian. Here we find, e.g. kami məlaw jaŋan kunja, *'I say to him'*. The vocabulary glosses jaŋan as *'with', 'and'*. This is still not *'to'*, which is de?, as in kami tete na? pi de? patay, *'we are not going to the bush'*.

In Chinese these usages have been classed in several ways - first, as a coverb, "an occasional function of certain functive verbs": nǐ gěi ta bān jwōdz, *'you give him move table'*, i.e. *'move the table for him'*; wó yùŋ kwaìdz chr̄fan, *'I use chopsticks eat food'*, i.e. *'I eat with chopsticks'*. In some cases the word order suggests that the verb is being used adverbially and so becomes final: tā dàu ʃàŋhǎi chyu, *'he reach Shanghai go'*, i.e. *'he is going to Shanghai'*. In other cases the second verb becomes a coverb immediately following the first and these have been called "postverbs", as in tā sùŋ gei wǒ yìběn ʃū, *'he send give me one book'*. i.e. *'he sent me a book'*. Again, a resultative verb may be used: tā chr̀ wán le fàn le, *'he eat finish past rice finish'*, i.e. *'he has finished his meal'*.

Another language in which this type of category transfer (again from a western viewpoint) commonly takes place is Khmer, and some examples as given by Jacob (op. cit. p.77) follow. She, however, distinguishes major and minor verbs, and in the present section she says, "in past sentences (i.e. earlier examples in the book) it has been possible to pause and begin a new phrase after an independent noun construct or an adverbial construct. In sentences having two verb constructs a phrase may end immediately before the second verb, e.g.
vì:ə tèñ siəv phöu nì (~ı) ?aoy khñom, 'he bought these books for me ('to give me')" *

Other examples on the following page include:

khñom yɔ̀:k sɔmbot(r) töu pos(te)
I take letter go post
'I am taking the letter to the post-office.'

vì:ə trəlɔp pì: tì: nìh töu phtèah
he turn from place this go house
'He is returning home from here.'

*Some modifications of Jacob's spelling are used wherever the book is quoted here.

khñom nɔ̀əm ko:n cëñ pì: sa:la: rì̀ən
I lead person child from room - learn
'I led the child out of the school.'

It is not necessary to multiply examples of this usage in which the action is analysed differently from the European languages, and indeed differently from any language in which case relationships are formally recognised.

Feature / *Language*	AN	NA	DN	ND	diS	ALP	POS-	COEFF
Korean	+	-	+	-	+	-	-	+
Japanese	+	-	+	-	+	-	-	+
Chinese	+	-	+	-	+	-	-	+
Vietnamese	-	+	-	+	-	+	-	+
Thai	-	+	-	+	-	+	-	+
Lao	-	+	-	+	-	+	-	+
Khmer	-	+	-	+	-	-	+	+
Malay	-	+	-	+	-	-	+	+
Rade etc.	-	+	-	+	-	-	+	+
Atjeh	-	+	+	-	+	-	+	+
Urak Lawoi?	-	+	-	+	-	-	+	+
Burmese	+	+	+	-	-	-	+	+

SUMMARY TABLE I

KEY:

AN = adjective before noun
NA = noun before adjective
DN = demonstrative before noun
ND = noun before demonstrative
diS = **di** (= *'of'*) segment, or other language equivalent
ALP = attributive linking particle
POS- = no possessive connecting link
COEFF = numeral coefficients present

3. THE VERB PHRASE

3.1. *INTRODUCTION*

Honey and Simmonds did not include a study of the verb phrase in their original paper, but suggested that such a study would be a useful widening of the typology. The addition is therefore made in the present paper. As the number of languages has been increased, the extension of the themes covered is likewise desirable. Certain parts of the themes were treated by Glazova (1967:257-75). She, however, used fewer languages than are envisaged here, viz., Vietnamese, Thai, Lao and Chinese only. Moreover, her treatment is confined to the perfective aspect of the verb, positive and negative.

In all cases except the formation of derived forms such as causatives, the functional indicators in those languages are free forms. This would follow from the isolating nature of the languages. The only possibilities of variation in isolating languages is the order of the indicators and how many features are included in a given language. The subgroupings within ND will depend on these variables. The available arrangements seem to be:

1. S + i + V
2. S + V + i

where S = subject, V = verbs, and i = indicator; and in some cases a third, with repetition of indicators,

3. S + i + V + i.

The examination made will arrange the languages into what proves to be two contrasting groups or possibly three. In the scope available at present it is impossible to treat the variations in all the details Glazova has given, but it appears that order (1) is found in Malay, Rade and other AN languages, Thai and Vietnamese; order (2) in Chinese, which also in certain verb types shows order (3). The position of the negative is also important. If this is indicated by n, the orders will be formulated as

1. S + n + i + v
2. S + n + V + i
3. S + i + n + V + i.

Practically all the languages seem to share the situation in which a verbal expression unmarked morphologically for time can be construed as either past, present or future according to context, unless and until otherwise defined, and this whether aspect-tense differentiation is available or not.

The treatment of VP will be arranged under the following heads:

1. **Inflecting Languages**, represented by Korean and Japanese in the north and including Burmese in the south, for this language allows of agglutinative compounding under certain conditions. None of these languages belong to either the Mon-Khmer (MK) or Austronesian (AN) groups. Korean and Japanese are both to be ranked as Altaic languages, and Burmese belongs to the Sino-Tibetan family.

2. **Languages with Minimal Inflection**, occupying a sort of middle position between the inflecting and the isolating languages. The AN group belong here; Malay and the north-eastern relatives: Jarai, Rade, Cham, etc. and on the far west Urak Lawoi?, Moklen and Moken, with Atjeh in the south-west. The position of Atjeh has been much disputed: it is accepted here as a member of AN. Apart from AN, there is also Khmer (MK) to be fitted into this group, and by presumption other MK languages which are not included in the paper. For some of these see papers by Robins and Jacob in *Lingua*, 1965, Part II. Khmer and others of these languages have some possibility of inflection, chiefly through infixation, as Jacob's paper brings out.

3. **Isolating or Uninflecting Languages.** Chinese is probably the best known example of these languages, although it has historical connections with Sino-Tibetan as a whole. The Tai group, of which Thai and Lao are the representatives here, must also be included.

Within the subject, "Verb Phrase", the elements to be considered are tense, aspect, mood and voice. Not all these are distinguishable in all the languages: in Chinese, for instance, tense seems to be a redundant term, and the same is true of other languages also. An attempt will be made to collect the evidence for each element under the one heading.

In a full treatment, all the MK languages would beed to be studied individually and the results tabulated. This is not feasible at present, especially as some, such as Sakai and Senoi, are imperfectly recorded.

In spite of what is said here about arrangement, the inflecting languages stand so isolated that it is convenient to take them together as a geographical group and deal with all the structural elements in them in sequence. They can then assume their proper place in the subsequent tabulation.

One feature that is common to all the groups is the absence of person indicators in the verb, even where suffixation is present. If the actor is represented by a pronoun it is usually unexpressed unless emphasised. This happens regardless of the linguistic group concerned. Another common feature is the indication of social rank or politeness, which may show itself in the verbal inflection or in a pronoun where the verb is uninflected. In Korean and Japanese it will appear twice if the

subject is expressed, and may appear a third time if there is an expressed pronoun object also.

3.2. *THE FULLY INFLECTED LANGUAGES*

The system of social ranks common to the northern countries enters into the conjugation of the verb. Similar social ranking systems are found in Malay, Javanese and other societies, and to a degree they affect the languages in various ways, but as the two northern languages are the only ones which express social facts in the morphology of the verb by suffixes of a rather elaborate nature, they are also the only ones in which these social facts are also involved in the grammar of the languages. Nor is it only a matter of social rank: there is the matter of politeness apart from social rank. People will use the polite forms across ranks, it is true, but also between themselves within the same social rank so that these simply become polite forms of the verbs, not rank forms as such - social rather than political. If the two overlap, that is incidental. Korean is rather more elaborate than Japanese in this instance, and both are more elaborate than Javanese or Bali. Korean can express up to five degrees of politeness, whereas Javanese does not go beyond three. In both instances the politeness is expressed through the use of special vocabulary, but in Korean and Japanese it is expressed chiefly through grammatical forms of the verb, though there may also be special nouns or pronouns. It is, then, the grammar of politeness that sets the two northern languages farthest apart, rather than the sociolinguistic fact of rank and its expression.

In the present paper, these elaborated honorific forms are involved only so far as they appear overtly in the verbal systems. In both languages the system operates by (1) replacement of a "common" verb by an honorific or humble form, and (2) by a grammatical change in the verb ending - sometimes both at once. Korean has both honorific and polite or rank forms. The operations to be distinguished are, then:

1. replacement of word by word;
2. grammatical indication with or without (1).

In the other languages to be considered the tendency is to idiosyncratic (syntactic and lexical) expression rather than grammatical forms. Thus the factors to be considered are:

i. rank v. politeness - forms and special words;
ii. moods and tenses in each type of verb;
iii. methods of person indication.

As in these languages person is not marked in the termination of the verb, it is necessary to look at pronominal forms and other ways of

expressing person as acting or addressed. This can be done only very partially in this paper.

(a) *Korean*

Korean is the most northerly in geographical order. It has a number of verb classes, marked by vowels which serve to indicate moods. As a rule person is not marked. To the verb stem or base is added an honorific if called for, then tense marker, mood (or class) marker, and finally the appropriate politeness marker. The result is a set of four possible additions to a verb stem:

Stem + Honorific + Mood + Politeness.

Mood is here being interpreted to include certain sentence medial connective markers as in Japanese. These are equivalent to some at least of the sentence-medial (SM) forms of the Papuan languages in many regions of New Guinea. The morphemes are:

honorifics - here {-ɯsi-}
tense - present: -ə-
past: -əss-
future: -kess-

as with məg-, *'eat'*: məgɯs(i)- *'someone honorable eats'*; present məgə-, past məgəsse-, future məgess-. On the past stem may be built by combination with other suffixes a pluperfect, məgəsəsse-, and a future perfect məgəssəkkesse-, which are literary rather than colloquial forms. A useful Table of combinations is found in S.E. Martin, *Korean in a Hurry*, p.129. The various combinations of this type build up some 500 different forms.

There are also verbs honorific by nature, not used except to or about one's superiors, and there are compound verbs, parallel in each case to similar Japanese usages.

These rank forms must be distinguished from polite forms, which are used in rather different circumstances. As in Japanese, there are honorific nouns as well as verbs, and even honorific case endings. The polite suffixes, which come as finals in the VP, are independents of the honorifics, which come immediately after the stem, so that *'he laughs'* will be usə as a verbal form, usəyo as a polite form, and usɯseyo as an honorific polite form, involving both -ssɯ- and -yo. On the other hand, while the ordinary verb *'give'* is tʃuə- (polite form), the honorific verb is tɯrya, polite tɯryəyo. This system also is paralleled in Japanese.

In fact there are five styles of speech available for the Korean who is perfectly enculturated; the forms differ as between statement, question, common and proposition: for statement, -sɯmnida, -ɯmnida (formal),

-nunda, -nda or -da/-ta (plain), -ne (familiar); authoritative -so, -uo and intimate in -u, -a, -e - and to this latter may be added -yo to soften them in terms of politeness.

The expression of the negative is peculiar to the language, and differs thus from Japanese. There are two forms: a prefix an(i)- or a suffix -ji-anso. Thus *'does not eat'* may be an-moguo or mog ji-anso. Japanese lacks any equivalent to the prefix form, which is stronger than the suffix and has the overtone of dislike or lack of habit, which Japanese does not distinguish. The an- root is really *'not be'*; -ji is a gerundial ending, so that ji-anh- is *'...ing not be'*, and it is here that tense is marked. There is also the potential mot followed by ha- "causative", so that capsu-, *'eat'* > mot-capsu- (>moccapsu-), *'is not able to eat'*.

In addition, there are linking and disjoining forms of the verb which cannot be expanded here, but something must be said about verb compounds, which are much as in Japanese but differ from the Chinese methods of construction.

(c) *Japanese*

In Japanese the same general typology is seen as in Korean. Honorifics are present, and they are either nouns, verbs or verb-endings. The first is not considered here (although it includes forms used pronominally); the other two are relevant.

The Japanese verb does not mark person: in some honorific verbs, person reference is inherent in the verb itself. Passives, causatives, passive-causative, potential alternatives and desideratives are marked by suffixes which are independent of tense and aspect indication. There are three conjugation classes, distinguishable by four stems applicable to root form, negative base, certain present, and conditional base respectively. These will be found set out in any Japanese grammar. What will be called here "themes", marked "certainty" and "probability", along with the tense scheme of the two may be set out as follows:

THEME: CERTAINTY		THEME: PROBABILITY
kas-u *'lend'*	Present	kasau kasō *'probably lends or will lend'*
kas-ita *'lent'*	Past	kasi-te-rō *'probably lent'*

These are indicative forms. There is also an imperative: kase, *'lend'*; a conditional, kase-ba, *'if...lends'*; kasi-ta-ra(ba), *'if...had lent'*; and a concessive, kasi-ta-redo, *'although...has lent'* - also kasi-ta-keredo.

All these themes and tenses can be negated by means of a negative verb, naka-, becoming -nai in the present. The only exceptional form is -mai in the probable present-future. Alternative is marked by a suffix -tari: the inflection of a neighbouring verb enables tense and other features to be made clear, e.g. nai-tari warat-tari site orimas, *'sometimes crying sometimes laugh-doing (I) am'*, i.e. *'sometimes I am crying, sometimes laughing'*. These forms are historically derivable from -te ari, the participle -te, combined with an older past tense of aru, *'be'*.

Further historical analysis of these forms is possible, but not relevant to the present purpose in outlining typologies of present-day SEA languages.

Honorifics are indicated in a number of ways in Japanese -

(i) by means of prefixes: go-, o-, mi-, whose usages are relatively fixed. They are normally applicable to nouns, but o- is somtimes prefixed to a verb to provide a polite imperative: o mati nasai, *please wait'*; o mati asobase, *'vouchsafe to wait'* is also possible.

(ii) by means of a special set of honorific or humble nouns: these are not relevant here.

(iii) by means of a set of verbal suffixes: (1) -mas(u), which is conjugable, e.g. ki- maʃō, *'will probably come'*, in ordinary polite conversation. There is a corresponding negative, e.g. certain present: mase-nu, past masen desita: some forms are not used; (2) a somewhat stronger auxiliary gozarimas(u) is also in use.

(iv) a set of honorific or humble words is found: an ordinaty verb is replaced by one of these, or the causative or passive (potential) verb is used in place of the simple form:

	GENERAL	HONORIFIC	HUMBLE
'give'	yaru	kudasaru; tamau	ageru
'go'	iku	o ide nasaru	mairu
'say'	iu	ossayaru	mōsu

The passive potential variety is shown in kikasite kudasai, *'causing to hear condescend'*, *'please tell me'*; nani to ossyaimasita, *'what did you (hon.) say?'*.

It is clear that these conjugation types in Korean and Japanese are related to each other, and that their roots lie in sociolinguistic causes, which are more elaborate here than in the other languages-areas. Their differences from those of the other SEA languages (Austronesian as well as Mon-Khmer) will appear in due course.

3.3. *LANGUAGES WITH LESS INFLECTION*

Korean and Japanese obviously stand apart from the other languages here treated. At the same time, however, certain chords are found in each - or most of the languages. These are the expression of either social rank or politeness or both. Such factors operate in Chinese, and indeed in most of the SEA languages no matter to what linguistic group they belong. The same social factors seem to have been operative throughout. It does not matter whether a language is of one type or another: any type may possess means of indicating honorific situations or their opposite. Throughout SEA pronouns as a rule are hardly to be regarded as a separate speech category from the noun. They are in general nouns, as are such expressions as *'Your Highness'* in English and **'Exzellenz'** in German. This is true of Thai, Vietnam and related languages. Neither does it matter whether the language is inflectional or not. It seems therefore suitable at this point to resume the method adopted in Section 2, of setting out the occurrences of similar or related structures in the languages *seriatim*, rather than taking each language separately. This was done for Korean and Japanese because in them the differences from general SEA are qualitative, not merely lexical.

In the Austronesian (AN) languages Malay is taken first. It is the best known, but it will appear that the lesser AN languages do not necessarily agree with Malay practice or even structure. They have all in greater or lesser degree been influenced by the MK languages. An unpublished paper by Ernest W. Lee on 'Southeast Asian Areal Features in Austronesian Strata of the Chamic Languages', issued by the Summer Institute of Linguistics and the University of Texas at Arlington is one of a number that set out these divergences very clearly.

In Malay the chief stress is on aspect rather than on tense. Tense indication plays a very minor role and is made only when needed: to this extent the language agrees with Vietnam and other non-AN languages. Either time is not formally marked (except by any required adverb) or an auxiliary verb is used which in an independent form has another meaning. Thus **nanti**, *'wait'* is used colloquially in Peninsular Malay at least, for the future: *'I wait to do it'* means *'I intend, want to or shall, do it'*. In Indonesia **akan** is general, in Malay more literary, and this ia a preposition, *'to, for, concerning'*. There is also **hendak, dak**, *'wish'*.

The aspect markers are divided into two main groups: perfective and imperfective -

PERFECTIVE	IMPERFECTIVE
sudah	sedaŋ
telah	teŋah
habis	lagi, masih

All these precede the verb to which they refer: saya sedaŋ makan, *'I am eating'*; saya sudah makan, *'I have eaten'*. The differences between the various words in the same column are stylistic rather than semantic: sudah and telah are interchangeable as far as meaning goes, but there are differences in style and level of speech. Sedaŋ and masih are commoner than teŋah and lagi - but again this is not a strictly linguistic fact in the normal sense of "linguistic".

In these languages, a certain amount of inflection is possible. A set of prefixes and suffixes - in some also limited infixation - is possible, especially in the formation of the causative. In the AN languages this provides not only a link between them and PAN but also a stepping stone to certain of the MK languages. The line of demarcation between methods of indicating the cause of an action is determined by the presence or absence of inflection in this group of languages. Inflection on any large scale usually lifts the language out of the ND class and sets it into one of the other classes, which for this region is always the EV class. Yet within the ND class itself there can be more than one way of indicating causation. Thus in Jarai:

ih	pŭ	bro'i	prŏŋ
you	*raise*	*make*	*good*

a verb bro'i, *'make'* occurs. But as such it is a causative, not a "manufacturing" verb; its literal meaning is *'give'*, as in

bro'i	ko'	go'mo'i	bŏŋ	huă	djŏp	rim	hro'i
give	*to*	*us*	*food*	*enough*		*for*	*today*

In Jarai bro'i is used in a manner parallel to Khmer qaoy, *'give'*, which also has a causative function. This does not happen in Malay or in other PAN languages. The form bro'i represents PAN* bəɣay, *'give'*.

In Ur. Law. the verb *'make'* appears also as a causative: buwac (Malay buwat, also PAN), as in buwac bri badji?, *'improve it, make it good'*; buwac bri pañak, *'lengthen it'*. The remarkable point here is that *'give'* (bri) is actually combined in the phrase with buwac; *'make it give length'*, etc. seems to be the idea. Two types of causative formation have been joined. The other auxiliaries of mood and aspect agree fairly well with Malay: ini kami buwac baleh, *'this I can do'* (Ml. ini

saya boleh buwat) with slightly different word order. The negative tet goes with the auxiliary: ini kami buwac tet baleh. Tense markers are more definite than in Malay, and precede the verb: ña teŋah mareh, *'he is coming'*; ña na? mareh, *'he will come'* (in which na? represents Malay hendak, *'wish'* and mareh is mari, PAN *maɣi). But the past marker follows the verb, i.e. it is treated as an aspect, not a tense: mareh da?, *'he has come'*. In lapal da?, *'is hungry'* tne marker indicates quite definitely a "state assumed" force, while kami pi da?, *'I went'* shows past action: both ideas combined. There is an alternative method of expression: buwac suc da?: *'he has done it'*, where suc appears to answer to Malay sudah. Although tet is the normal negative, the future has timaw, as in ña timaw buwac, *'he will not do it'*; bɨlarak timaw bri kañaw makat buwah puhok kayu itu, *'you must not eat the fruit of that tree'*. Yet timaw is not dehortative: jaŋan is shared with Malay in jaŋan (-na?) buwac, *'don't do this'*. This jaŋan, however, has a homonym meaning *'to'*: ami melaw jaŋan kuña, *'I said to him'*. A full analysis on this point is not available.

In the other languages yet to be considered, the tendency is to find both aspect and tense expressible separately and in some cases a difference of arrangement is found: tense particles come before the verb, aspect particles (=A) follow it. Thus in Radé,

Aspect phrases: S - V - A ñu ŋà leh
he do perf. = 'he has done it'.

Tense phrases: S - T - V ñu so'raŋ ŋà
he fut. do = 'he will do it'.

In Radé as in Ur. Law. negation takes precedence over tense: it is more important to know if something did not or will not happen.

The remainder of the Radé forms may be given at this point, as diagnostic of the general type of this subbranch of AN. Radé shares the placing of the perfective after the verb, while the others precede it, as in Urak Lawoi?. There is no marker for specifically present time or indefinite time; perfective, negative, imperative and permissive are markedly particles following the verb, thus

Phrase patterns: S + neg_1 + t + V + neg_2

ñu amâo so'raŋ čih ôh
he not shall write not
'he will not write it'.

or a substitute negative:

nũ amâo so'raŋ alo' mao
he not shall again get
'he will not get any more'.

Present (general) is unmarked in all the languages.

Past + leh: ñu ŋà leh, *'he has done it'*, *'he did it'*.

Future so'raŋ + : ñu so'raŋ ŋà, *'he will do it'*.

Mood imperative - + bě' (cf. Atjeh): ŋà bě', *'do it'*.
potential - du'i + V: ñu ŋà du'i, *'he can do it'*.
permissive - + boh: ih ɓǒ'ŋ boh, *'you may eat it'*. Malay boleh.

Purpose clause is joined to main verb by či'aŋ ñu *'want'*, used as a main verb in, e.g. ñu ci'aŋ ɓǒ'ŋ, *'he wants to eat (ɓǒ'ŋ)'*. A further example of subordination appears in ŋà či'aŋ d'un, *'cause that you enter, make you enter'*. A reciprocal form is marked by bi: ya di ih bi lač hdǒ'ŋ diih? *'what do you say of each other?'*, while the reflexive is marked by pô: ih amâo du'i bi mtlaih ih pô oh, *'you cannot save yourself'*.

The Atjeh language fits the AN pattern in general, although there has been much discussion as to the real history of the language. In regard to this some notes from Uhlenbeck (1967:876) may be of use in summary: "(Cowan) thought it possible that Atjeh and Cham perhaps together with Selong, a language spoken in the Mergui Archipelago, constitute one subgroup related to the Malayo-Polynesian language", and earlier (p.859), "Since 1940 no new contributions of any great importance have been made to our knowledge of Achehnese after the fundamental work of Snouck Hurgronje (1893, 1900 and 1906)". Cowan's article (1948) compares Atjeh with the MK languages as well as with Cham.

In point of fact, the language uses an infix which rather suggests MK practice; but its verbal system is not based on aspect but quite clearly on tense. The common AN causative prefix *pa appears as pö-, e.g. lömah, *'see, look at'*, caus. pölömah, *'cause to see'*, but there are also derivatives in -mö- and -öm- (Cowan 1948:439). There is a perfective marked by postposition, however, as in

oh nö-pö-djö-et laŋet ŋon bömu le Potö Alah
when create heaven and earth PERF *Lord God*
'when the Lord God had finished creating heaven and earth...'

Similarly, the status of na, *'present time'* is somewhat uncertain - it corresponds to Malay ada, *'be, exist'*: na dua musim, *'there are two seasons'*; it appears in djinoe na mantoŋ, *'there are still (such and such things)'*, of which the past form is djinoe hana le, *'now there are no more'*; *'in a short time'* is hana treb le, *'not long* PERF'.

Person can be marked in the verb by short forms of the pronouns, which in the singular become really double expressions: kee ka ku dja?, *'I* PAST *I go'*, i.e. *'I went'*; and these can appear without markers: ku tob, *'I prick'*; lo:n plueŋ, *'I go away'* - kee and lo:n are both different rank forms of first person singular pronouns. Future time is marked by tem: lo:n tem lo:n dja?, *'I will go'*, and past time by ka: ku ka lo:n dji, *'I saw him'*; udjöən ka dji-toh, *'rain has fallen'*. Negation is marked by hana: laŋet hana lömah le, *'the sky is no more visible'*. This marker precedes the tense markers when both are used: han tem, *'will I not'*, lit. *'not will'*. The past marker ka can also be a marker of condition attained: pöe töŋku ka nö mökawən?

? *sir* PAST RESPECT *married?*

'Are you married?'

to which the answer is simply: ka, *'Yes, I am'*. Where there is no value in the time article as such, it can be omitted: lo:n tiŋgai di... *'I am staying at'*.

The only marking of mood seems to be between indicative and imperative. In the latter, no marking is necessary in the positive: preh, *'wait!'*; in the negative the marker is be?, which is probably an MK element, already mentioned in Radé, Jarai.

Although this account is brief, it does seem to show the uncertain status which Cowan ascribed to the language: there is evidently a strong MK element in it, and the problem is linked with the general position of the mainland AN languages. As this is not a paper on genetic connections, the question cannot be examined further here.

Outside the AN languages, there remain a certain number of languages in which remnants of inflection are found. These are discussed by Shorto (1963:52ff) and include Palaung, Riang-Liang, and Praok amongst the northern MK languages. An article by Jacob in the same volume (Jacob 1963:62ff) discusses similar phenomena in Old Mon and Old and Modern Khmer. In the modern languages there are such derivatives as so:m, *'ask'* > smo:m, *'beggar'*; chù:əñ, *'conduct business'* > chmù:əñ, *'businessman'*: here the infix -m- serves to produce nouns of agent. There are also -n-, *'making a utensil'*, another -m- which is causative (slap, *'die'* > somlap *'kill'*), a noun-forming -mn- (kaət, *'be born'* > komlaət, *'birth'*) and certain less common infixes (Jacob 1968:183-4). Khmer can therefore be regarded as a language in which limited inflection still takes place, as in the languages of the northern area, though indeed still more limited than theirs.

The Khmer verb may be treated in this intermediate section of the paper, before the isolating languages in the strict sense of the term. It is difficult to decide whether to class a marker as a tense or an

aspect sign: usually it is safer to look at the resulting state than at the action itself, for the time of the action is often determined simply by an accompanying adverb as in vì:ə tə:w phsa:r, *'he go market'*, which may be either in process, intended, or accomplished. Once a context is given to an utterance there is no need to indicate details of time. The bulk of the precision markers precede the verb; a few follow it and there are some discontinuous forms, although in these the simple forms can also be used. A second element such as tè: usually adds emphasis. In the following lists Jacob's transliterations are in general preferred:

PRECEDING		FOLLOWING	
ba:n	*'get'*: perfective	tè:	emphasis, especially mɨn...tè:.
dael	*'already'*: perfective	haəy	completive
nɨw	*'remain'*: permanent state	rù:əc	*'finished'*: often ru:əc haəy.
nɨŋ	futurity: state unchanged	laəy	emphasis after negative: *'not at all'*
mɨn	negation ± tè:.		
kɔmpuŋ	continuation (Thai kamlaŋ)		
cop	*'desire'*, near future (Thai ca)		
tro:v	*'necessity'*; as 2nd verb, *'rightly'*		
ʔaoy	*'give, let, allow, cause'*		
kaət	*'be born'*: ability		

Actually there is quite a long list of other such markers set out in the grammars, many of which can also lead an independent life: it is a matter of phraseology rather than of single words. A few can be briefly illustrated in contexts drawn from various sources. Thus: vè:lì:ə dɔl haəy, *'the time has arrived'*; khñom ba:n mak, *'I have arrived'*; khñom mɨn tə:w tè:, *'I am not going'*, *'I did not go'*. Ba:n is one of those which can act as a full verb. Gorgoniev gives the example nè:ək ba:n prak khae ponma:n, *'you get money month how-much?'*, i.e. *'how much a month do you get?'*. There are also ó?:puk nɨw knoŋ bɔntùp, *'father is in his room'*; khñom coŋ tə:w pos(te), *'I want to go to the post-office'*; kɔ̀ət tro:v nɨw bɔntùp kɔ̀ət, *'she has to stay in her room'*; lɔ̀:k prəñap tèw na:, *'you rush (go) where?'*; khñom ba:n mə:l kom nùh, *'I have seen that film'*.

3.4. *THE UNINFLECTED LANGUAGES*

For these languages the Chinese verbal system provides the most suitable beginning. It is actually somewhat apart from some of the others and, of course, widely apart from the inflected Korean and Japanese. Although the features listed earlier are present - all languages must be

able to express human requirements - the usual divisions of Chinese verbs are into different categories, which are really semantic-syntactic groupings, in which aspect is expressed rather than time.

With the Chinese system of aspect markings, however, another combines which may be spoken of as phrasal verbs, and these are syntactically ordered arrangements of independent verbs whose mutual relationships within sentences determine the actual value of each of them in a given case. Thus one may speak of "stative verbs" which include items which in English are classified as adjectives - like *'large'* in *'this house is large'* as against *'I want a large house'*, and *'always'* in *'he is always talking'*. As against these are found "functive verbs" which function independently, denoting an act or event (including *'having'* a thing). Then there is a class of "coverbs", which are not usually paralleled in European languages but are sometimes found in African and Oceanic languages, e.g. instrumental *'with'* in *'I eat with chopsticks'*, which becomes *'I use chopsticks eat rice'; 'he is going to Peking'*, which becomes *'he reach Peking go'*. There are also other special groups such as "post-verbs", including dzaì, usually translated into English as *'at'*, but really *'to be at (a place)'*; "resultative verbs" (as will appear in other languages in this paper also), e.g. *'I can't understand this book'*, becoming *'I look not understand this book'*. There are auxiliary verbs, just as in other languages. For the moment, attention will be limited to functive verbs, to indicate how aspect/time relationships are marked in this language.

In time relationships, present time is not marked unless attention is being drawn to some exact time. This is common in all these SEA languages of the uninflected type, and has appeared already in some which do have inflection. So there is

jeì	rén	dzwò	syà
this	*man*	*sit*	*down*

which may be stative, *this man is seated'*, or active, *'this man sits down (after doing something else)'*, or it may be regarded as a present or past act. In this setting the negative is bú: rén bú dzwò syà, *'the man does not sit down, is not seated'*. There is also a negative méi which is used in certain grammatical situations such as questions, and with the verb *'have'*.

For the very brief treatment of the aspects, which is all that can be attempted here, Yuen Ren Chao's *Grammar of Spoken Chinese* serves as the basis. Some of his examples are used, but the system of transliteration differs from his. The aspects in his account of the language are chiefly:

1. Perfective, marked by -le, as in wǒ hō-le, *'I have drunk'*, i.e. *'I did drink and now have finished doing so'*; nǐ gǎn chē-le, *'you drove a carriage'*. It will be noticed that this marker is a toneless enclitic, and Yuen Ren Chao holds that it does not derive from laí *'come'*, but from liǎo, *'finish'*, and this seems to be quite correct. This verb, as tonic, finite form, may itself be followed by its atonic derivative, as in nǐ liǎo-le ʃì, *'you have finished the business'*.

2. Progressive, marked by a verb which is radically jaú, *'cause, send, put on'*, but may be colloquially abbreviated as far as -je or even -j, e.g. taì-yaŋ haí syé-j, *'the sun is still rising'*; wǒ syǎŋ-j nǐ ne, *'I am thinking of you'* - strengthened by means of the particle ne (see his pp. 801-2). A compound verb in the progressive is broken: wǒ kàn dièn-yǐŋ lai-j, *'I was watching movies'*.

3. Inchoative, based on chǐ laǐ, *'start'*, as in tā-men wǎn wǎn hū ján ku chǐ laǐ-le, *'they were playing and playing and suddenly began to cry'*.

4. An indefinite time past may be marked by gwǒ, *'have you ever (eaten)?'*, being answered by chī gwò, *'(I) have eaten (it, sometime in the past)'*.

All these examples show a basic arrangement subject, verb, aspect marker (SVA). This is the order also in the Austronesian Radé, Malay (with occasional exceptions, which have been pointed out). In the MK languages the preferred order is SAV, as Glazova notes in her first set of examples:

Vietnamese	tôi đa dọc quyèn sách nay
Thai	phôm dâj an năŋsỳy lèm nîi
Lao	khoi dâj an năŋsỳy lèm nîi
Khmer	khñom ba:n məəl siəwphɨw nih

all meaning *'I have read this book'*. In all of these the order is aspect-verb, with no tense marker (in agreement with Chinese but in reverse order), while the AN languages follow a different pattern, e.g. Malay saja sudah membaca kitab ini or buku ini (Indonesia).

Moving across for a moment to the matter of negation, this makes a difference in the order of elements in perfective utterances. In Thai, Lao and Khmer the negative precedes the perfective, in Vietnamese it follows, and in Thai and Lao the tense or aspect marker may be omitted in order to show that there is no intention of completing the action - not that it just has not been completed. In Chinese the negatives precede the verb immediately in any type of sentence, so that SNVA is the logical order under all circumstances.

Some languages also present a continuative-perfective or "completive". Glazova's example will again serve: as against Chinese wǒ kàn-le chè ben syūla, *'I have finished reading the book'*, in which the perfective le or la occurs, the other languages have a different particle and a different order.

In fact, a distinction is possible between a perfective and what may be called a completive aspect. In English such a distinction is made by the use - generally - of *'up'* after adverb: *'I ate it up'* is something more than *'I ate it'* or *'I have eaten it'*. The sentence *'Cut this tree down', 'Alright, now cut it up'* highlights the distinction very clearly, and also shows that a completive is not limited to a past tense: it may occur with a present (*'I am cutting it up'*) or a future (*'I shall cut it up later'*). The use of the adverbial *'up'* in English is contradicted by the use of *'down'* in Ancient Greek - kat-esthío:, *'I eat it up'*, lit. *'I eat it down (till there is nothing left)'*. In Melanesian Pidgin, *'Drink up your medicine'* is similarly daunim marasin. This is a possible subject of a separate essay (Capell 1978); the point at the moment is to show that a completive as against a perfective is possible also in at least some of the SEA languages, though methods of expression vary from language to language. The examples above show its applicability - and so does Glazova's Russian ja dočital knigu, do- indicating the completiveness. This is really the construction Glazova calls "resultative", for which Russian usually supplies equivalents by prefixation to the verbal stem. In the present group of languages a marker of result is added after the verb. In Thai and Lao cop or cop lɛw; in Khmer the form is V + cop + N + haəy. In fact she shows that two formulae are possible, one answering to Russian do-čitat', *'read through'* and the other pročitat', *'spend time reading'*. For the first set she gives:

Vietnamese	dọc hết quyển sách nay
Thai	an năŋsўy lêm nîi cop léw
Lao	an naŋsyy lêm nîi cop léw
Khmer	məəl cop siəwphɨw mɨl nih haəy
Chinese	kàn wǎn-la che ben ʃū la

For the second set she gives *'I spent time reading this book'*:

Vietnamese	tôi dọc quyển sách nay rồ'i
Thai	phồm an năŋsўy lêm nîi léw
Lao	khoi aŋ năŋsўy lêm nîi léw
Khmer	khñom məəl siəwphɨw mɨl nih haəy
Chinese	wǒ kàn-la che ben ʃū la

For details, including negativisation, reference may be made to the original article of Glazova.

Some of the languages have a fairly lengthy set of particles, either before or after the verb, showing types of action: a mixture of tense and aspect forms results. In Vietnam, for instance, one finds the simple verb used without particle if a context makes clear what is intended - present, past or future event, but greater definition is always possible. The hay indicates custom: ŋu'o'i An-nam hay uống nu'ớ'c chè, *'Annamese are accustomed to drink tea'*. This hay is to be distinguished from hãy used with some imperatives. Process can be indicated by đaŋ or du'o'ŋ; on daŋ (or đu'o'ŋ) đọc quyển sách, *'you are reading the book'*. Past action is shown by đã preceding the verb: tôi đã oŋ quển sách, *'I did read the book'*, and full completion (perfect tense) by có, *'have'* as in English: tôi có oŋ quyển sách, *'I have read the book'*. An immediate past can be shown by mớ'i: nó mớ'i đi, *'he has just gone'*, while other particles of very similar meaning are also available: rồi before the verb or xon or xon rồi after it. Future time can be left, like the others, to context or be marked by sẽ before the verb: nó sẽ đi, *'he will go'*. More immediate action can be expressed as with the past by mớ'i or here also by sắp, as in nó sắp đi, *'he is just about to go'*.

Mood as known in European languages - the mental aspect of the utterance - is not marked in Vietnamese: a conjunction nếu, *'if'*, can be used, but there is no prescribed construction with it. There is, however, a set of auxiliary verbs expressing various modifications of the action, that do not need to be treated here. The Vietnamese grammars will provide examples.

As in Khmer, so in Thai and Lao there are preposed and postposed particles, and both aspect and tense are present. In fact, the two can be combined in a unit, as in Thai khuan lé:w, *'should perfective'*, i.e. *'should have done something'*. This form occurs even in an abbreviated response to, e.g. *'Should he have gone?'* - Khuan lé:w, *'Yes, he should'*, which is very much like the English corresponding, and English also is a ND language.

In Thai markers of tense are clear, and simple markers precede the verb. The contrast is between past and future action: if a present time is involved, it is morphemically indicated only as a progressive or habitual, to be mentioned below. A verb with no tense marker is taken within a context. A folk-tale beginning Khrâŋ nỳn jaŋ mii laa tua nỳŋ, *'time one be donkey body one'* means *'There was once a donkey'*; then it goes on kamlaŋ daan hăa ?aahăn, *'walking seek food'*, and here kamlaŋ is the marker of progressive aspect, independently of time.

Future time is marked in Thai by cà? as in khun cà? sýy ?àraj, *'you will buy what?'*, *'what will you buy?'*; khăw cà? sýy khɔɔŋ thîi năj? *'where will they shop?'*. Past time, if marked at all, is shown by dâj

as in phôm dâj faŋ *'I listened'* or sy̌aŋ khɔɔŋ khou dâj phrɔ́?, *'her voice was beautiful'*. These two markers are used in simple statements where time needs to be expressed.

Aspect is marked in rather different ways: here the progressive or continuative is marked in ways not entirely synonymous. The continuation of an action is marked by kamlaŋ (Khmer kɔmpuŋ) as in the story text above, and in náam khâaŋ kamlaŋ tòg, *'the dew is falling'*. The other marker can be superadded: in the actual text from which the preceding example was taken the phrase is náamkhâaŋ tòg juu bon bajmáj bajjâa, lit. *'dew fall stay on leaves grass'*, i.e. *'the dew fell-and-stayed on the leaves of grass'*, and that is the literal meaning of jùu - *'stay'*: khă̌w phuud jùu, *'he was (or is) talking'*.

Perfective state is marked by lé́:w which follows at the end of the phrase and indicates that an action is past and completed. It is stronger than a simple past tense. It may be preceded or even replaced by maa, *'come'*, i.e. the state has *'arrived'*: phôm paj maa lé́:w, *'I have been'*, lit. *'I go come complete'*. T.G.H. Strehlow in his notes *Thai for Beginners* remarks that "although you know the word ma as the verb *'come'*, it can occur after a verb, and then it puts the first verb into the perfect tense: paj nă̌j maa? *'where have you been?'* - and this is lit. *'go where come'*. The two elements can be separated: raw daan maa naan lé́:w, *'we have been walking a long time'*." It is, however, possible to omit the marker altogether: Strehlow quotes Haas, *Spoken Thai*, Vol.I, p. 108, No.13:

phôm rian pha:să̌a thaj nínɔ̀ɔj mŷa jaŋ jùu naj A.
I study language Thai a-little-while yet stay in America

The SEA omission of pronouns and tense markers appears very clearly here.

Other aspect markers are possible: ability - dâj, homonymous with dâj *'past time'* is one of these markers; there is also a dâj = *'get'*, which would seem to identify with the ability marker:

dâj ŋən mâj dâj
get money not can
'Can't you get any money?'

The negative mâj would be linked with Chinese méi, so that Thai mâj dâj = Chinese méi yǒu, *'not have'*. Duty is expressed by khuan, as mentioned earlier, when it was noted that this can become perfectivised: khuan paj lé́:w, *'should have gone'*.

In Lao the general picture is precisely as in Thai, and very few examples are needed. It is possible here to express a progressive or immediate future by the phrase kamlaŋ ca? - not cà?: Lao tones often

differ from Thai – as in khôôj kamlaŋ ca? paj sýkhɔ̌ɔŋ, *'I'm going shopping'*; kamlaŋ and jūu can be combined, as in phēən kamlaŋ hian nǎŋsɤ̌y jūu, *'he is studying'*. Here a continuous process rather than a short act still uncompleted is the theme. The two languages agree in using lέεw as perfective sign: Lao has phēən paj báan lέεw, *'he has already gone home'*; kaafee jen lέεw *'the coffee has got cold'*.

The Burmese verbal system stands rather apart from the others, as may be expected from the different affiliation of the language. There are more than ten analyses of it; that followed here, in matters of doubt and discussion, is usually Alliott's (Alliott 1965:283-309).

As in the normal cases of an uninflecting language, the verb stem itself, essentially monosyllabic, is unchangeable, but combinations of verb stems as in Chinese is possible. There are various syntactic ways of distinguishing combination of stem + stem from stem + auxiliary. Wolfenden (1929:199) says: "direct evidence of the former use by Burmese of pronominal prefixes of the old (i.e. Tibeto-Sinitic) order with verbs is lacking, but the universal occurrence of aspirated initials in verbs having transitive or causative senses, which points to the former existence of directive elements in the language, makes it fairly safe to conclude that subjective prefixes also formerly occurred, since the original and normal Tibeto-Burman verb form could never appear with directive element only". He then goes on to offer evidence for the former existence of directive or objective infixes - which again sets Burmese apart from the SEA languages hitherto dealt with in this paper.

The basic divisions within the class "verb" is between functive and stative, as in Chinese. The reference is to action or process against state, including adjective constructions (in western terms). In Alliott's setting out, functives include "punctative sentence, with one exponent, the final verb particle pi, the negative sentence, marked by the final particle phu (but with a preverbal particle mə simultaneous), and affirmative sentence marked by finals te and me. Stewart (1955:29) spells these tɛ and mɛ, the former present or past time, a narrative particle, and the latter future; pi marks completion. Alliott illustrates by θwa: pi, *'he has set out, he has gone'*; mə θwa: mɛ, *'he didn't go; (I)'m not going, (I) won't go'*; θwa: tɛ, *'he goes, went'*; θwa: mɛ, *'he will go'*. Other students treat the particles rather differently, and there is especially uncertainty about the true value of pi. Alliott contains a discussion of previous definitions and why she takes her own stand (p.296ff.), but this is not needed here.

The category of auxiliary verbs is as important in Burmese as in the other languages studied here, and serves to link Burmese more closely to them than its other, rather separative, features. Alliott defines

the situation well: The name auxiliary "is applied to a class of some 25 items whose function is to characterise the degree, likelihood, suitability, possibility etc. of the verb. The members of this word-class are established because, in a negative verbal syntagma, the negative prefix always precedes the verb head and not the auxiliary verb. Auxiliary verbs are distinguished from particles because, in most cases, a homonymous main verb of the same or similar meaning exists, and because they co-occur with certain particles but not with each other." (op. cit. p.287). Stewart calls these "enclitic verbs" (p.42ff.).

The stative verb forms, which include "adjectives" were mentioned in section 2 of the paper. Cornyn (1945:I/131) exemplifies (using a different orthography) by: lú kâundê, *'the person is good'*; lûgâun, *'good person'*, and kâundè lú, *'good person, or person who is good'*, and goes on: "The latter type is used where the modifying verb is itself modified: lú θei? kâundé, *'the person is very good'*; θwe? kâundè lú, *'a very good person, or a person who is very good'*.

Moods and aspects are distinguishable from tenses, unlike Chinese. There is an indicative and an imperative mood, with markers, the latter with zero final particle in the positive and ne in the negative. Alliott distinguishes two aspects which she calls culminative and cumulative, marked by to for the former, oun and θwei for the latter. Her explanatory examples include mə pyo:ne to, *'don't tell him, then'*. In that case, *'don't talk'* which is culminative, as against mə pyo:ne oun, *'don't speak (yet), don't say any more'*, which is cumulative. Stewart's definitions are different, and he does not speak of aspects: tɔ́, *'imminence, acceptance of the inevitable'*: θwa: tɔ′ mɛ, *'I am just going'*; ˋhiŋ məʃi′ tɔ^phu, *'there's no curry left (so it's no good asking for more)'* (p.32) and oun which he transliterates as ˋouŋ, *'further action in the future'*: ci^ouŋmɛ, *'I will take a further look; I will look into the matter again'* (p.31). In his lists there are 34 particles called "subsidiary verb particles" (pp. 31ff. and 43ff.).

This outline is sufficient to show that Burmese pursues a course in the verb that in general does not coincide with those of the other SEA languages, whether MK or AN.

	PRE-POSED	*PERFECTIVE*		*NEGATIVE POSTPOSED*	*PAST*		*PRESENT*		*FUTURE*		*CON-TINU-OUS*	*REPETITIVE*	
		NEGATIVE PREPOSED	*POST-POSED*		*POSITIVE*	*NEGATIVE*	*POSITIVE*	*NEGATIVE*	*POSITIVE*	*NEGATIVE*		*POSITIVE*	*NEGATIVE*
CH.			+la, le	meí+V+la, le	V+pst(la, le)	mei+V+pst	V	bù+V	+V+	bù+V		V+Rep	meí+V+Rep
VIET.		P+Neg+V				chu'a+Pst+V						V+R	Neg.V_1V_2, Neg.VR
THAI												V_1V_2	
LAO	P+V	Neg+P+V	V+O+P	P+V+P	Pst+V	Neg+Pst+V	V	Neg+V	f+V	f+Neg+V	C+V		VNR
KHM.												V+R	NV_1V_2, NVR
MLY.	P+V				(pst)+V	Neg+Pst+V	(Pres)+V				V+C	V+i	N+V+-i
RADE					V+P	Neg+V+P					C+V		
ATJ.					Pst+V	Neg+Pst+V	V	Neg+V	f+V	neg+F+V		V+R	NVR
UR.L.			V+P		V(only)	Neg+V							
BURM.					V+P	mə+V+phu	V+tɛ	mə+V+phu	V+f(mɛ)	mə+V+phu	V+C		

SUMMARY TABLE II: VERB PHRASE FORMATIONS IN THE LANGUAGES OF SOUTHEAST ASIA

(Based on translation of Glazova's article (op. cit. p. 273) with addition of other languages treated in this paper. Some items of information were not available.)

4. CONCLUSION: TYPOLOGIES OF NEUTRAL DOMINATION

This paper began as an attempt to test what subdivisions may appear among languages designated as "neutrally dominated", ND being defined as the lack of bias towards either object or event. It is now time to reach some conclusion about this.

Typology contrasts with genetic classification. This fact was stressed in the original paper by Honey and Simmonds (pp.71-2). The genetic froups already established on the evidence of comparative historical linguistics are taken as given: Tibeto-Burman-Sinitic, Mon-Khmer, Austronesian. The problem of the exact classification of Atjeh in this system still remains. A structural typology may to a degree overlap genetic classification (Greenberg 1957:34-45; 1963:58-90, especially 83-90). This fact has sometimes led to conclusions undervaluing typology, but this is wrong. What is the relation between ethnic origins and linguistic type still remains unknown, but this does not mean that such a relationship should be denied. In the present study the first contrast is between inflection and its absence. The inflected languages here treated do not only differ in the degree of morphological complication, as they must, but also in conceptualisation of the verbal action, in ways possibly unexpected from those which are uninflected or minimally inflected, such as Malay - both types of neutral domination. They agree with the other languages in expressing social rank, but do it in ways differing from those of the other languages. Korean and Japanese express a different set of verbal circumstances in ways which differ from those of the isolating languages.

There is a tendency for certain differences to appear between the languages as members of a class: the AN languages depart from the MK languages chiefly in the VP. They do not follow the Sinitic pattern at all. In NP they pattern as noun+adjective or noun+connective+adjective (ALP above). This appears not only in the Austronesian languages but also in a few of the MK languages, such as Thai and Lao. In having no "link" for possessives they agree with Khmer, but some coefficients are present as N+number+coefficient.

The majority of the AN languages are not ND but ED - event-dominated. The inclusion of Khmer and Atjeh is justified perhaps by the partial inflection shown in both, but is is also possible to set these languages on the upper end of the ND scale.

The crossing of language families in this paper is deliberate. Typology is not bound up with a language family. As Honey and Simmonds point out, there may also be Sprachbund processes at work. Moreover, any cross-influences (apart from the most likely one of word borrowing) might become apparent in that way.

Taking now the languages that can be classified as ND: how do these differ structurally among themselves? What subclasses of ND suggest themselves? One such might be on the basis of SVO, SOV or some other arrangement on the level of syntax. In point of fact, this subgrouping does not produce results in this instance. Korean and Japanese are the only SOV languages among them, and these are both ED. The only arrangement is SVO, and this is common to MK and AN languages. Hence this type of subgrouping can be overlooked - it appears also on Greenber's demonstration in *Universals of Language* (1963:86), where the three sentence types mentioned appear to be fairly haphazard. Sentence formation, then, is irrelevant.

What, then, of phrase level formation? This has been the chief subject of this paper, and the two Tables produced (as well as the smaller constituent Tables) are the results. Table I, in which the features of NP are set in matrix form provides a résumé of Section 2; those of VP are similarly gathered together in Table II.

In the forms of the NP and VP in the ND languages (and in the first case also the ED languages) the following four sets of possibilities seem to present themselves:

1. Governing elements and particles follow N; they precede V.
2. Governing elements and particles follow both N and V.
3. Governing elements and particles precede N and V.
4. Governing elements and particles precede N, follow V.

The next step towards subdividing ND is to test out these possibilities and determine which of them actually occurs in SEA languages as here treated. The data referred to in *Universals of Language* can also be compared in order to test any wider validity of the propositions made above for ND languages. Korean and Japanese may be omitted here as they are not ND languages - or else the word endings (suffixes) may be regarded, as historically they perhaps were, independent particles which have lost status. In this case these languages will fit into subgroup 2: both types of particles follow both N and V. This is fairly normal in ED languages. The formal implications of the domination concept have yet to be worked out: the author's previous treatment has been primarily semantic rather than formal.

Of the four types given above, Proposition 1 is seen in Vietnamese, where A and D follow N, but verbal markers precede the verb; Malay provides another example. Chinese and Burmese both illustrate No.4. There is no example of proposition 3 - not that there could not be, for English provides one from another area. Of proposition 2 the only examples are the two ED languages just mentioned. Again, there is no logical reason for their absence, and they may well occur elsewhere, especially,

perhaps, in West Africa. The coefficients of numeration are not diagnostic (those of adjectives are!), as they occur in all the languages, of whatever type. As stated, those for ALP constructions are assessible.

The present study of subgroupings with ND results in the following scheme:

ND 1. (N+; +V) Vietnam; Malay and AN generally; Thai, Lao, Khmer.
ND 2. (N+; V+) none: Korean and Japanese are ED.
ND 3. (+N; +V) none - but English is an example.
ND 4. (+N; V+) Chinese; Burmese.

There is a strong tendency for noun-adjective and noun-demonstrative to cooccur, while adjective-noun and demonstrative-noun similarly cooccur. This is understandable. It means that all noun qualifiers are thought out before the noun is expressed, but strangely enough, the verbal action tends to be thought out before any qualifications of it. This is a matter of semantics in deep structure, outside the scope of the present study, but not without value in their own sphere of deep structure grammar. This phenomenon again is independent of general sentence structure, whether SVO or not - and suggests that deep structure may be based on phrases as much as complete utterances. In the SEA area, SVO is by far the commonest type: it is only the two ED languages and Burmese that depart from it.

Although numeral coefficients are not diagnostic, because they are found in all the types of language treated here, their arrangement in the phrase may provide a ground for subgrouping. Number + classifier is the order in Burmese, classifier + number in Japanese; either order may be followed in Malay and AN as here represented. This may - or may not - indicate that the use of coefficients is a borrowing in AN languages, but this raises difficulties in the wider patterning, for they are marked in Micronesia and present, though less marked in parts of Melanesia and present on a lesser scale again in parts of Polynesia. If they are borrowings, they are ancient, probably of AN period, before there was much differentiation of PAN.

Another contrast is provided by the position of the perfective marker, whether before or after the verb. In Malay and AN generally there is no agreement. In Malay the marker precedes; in the other AN languages it follows the verb, as it does also in Burmese and Chinese. The Radé leh, Atjeh le, could be related to Chinese le, la, but it is not likely, if the latter is an abbreviation of liǎo; and in the Thai-MK languages treated here there is a double perfective: P + V + P.

Glazova, in summing up, mentions the identity of aspect-tense constructions as a sure sign of mutual dependence within the area. Vietnam, Thai, Lao, and Khmer have structural identity of verbal constructions in

many instances, but Vietnam differs from the others in four cases. Chinese, however, has many peculiarities - she does not include Burmese, but it can be noticed that some of the Chinese peculiarities can be seen also in that language. This is comprehensible in terms of the Tibeto-Burman-Sinitic family relationships, rather than to the fact that Glazova mentions, that Chinese is isolated geographically from the other languages. She lists four points of contrast in Chinese from the other languages, but adds that "nothwithstanding the fact that Chinese stands apart in relation to the languages of the Indochinese linguistic area, we should note the agreement of a whole series of the indicators themselves: Chinese la/liǎo - Thai, Lao, lé:w; Chinese méi - Thai mâj; Chinese bù - Lao bo; Chinese tsen - Vietnamese tu'ŋ, of which she says: "all this bears witness to the strengthening of morphological influence, and the work on historical monuments gives possibility to investigators to determine the question in connection with what period such influence might be practical." These questions, of course, lie outside the present study, but Glazova has done right to draw attention to them. The main purpose of this paper has been to follow up the suggestion originally made by Honey and Simmonds. The second is to provide grounds for subdividing the admittedly rather heterogeneous contents of the "neutral domination" concept. Both have been carried through within the limits of a reasonable length for such a paper, and it remains perhaps to include the languages of the extreme north of the Indochinese regions, such as Palaung, Riang and others - but this must be left till later.

REFERENCES

ALLIOTT, A.J.

1965 'Categories for the Description of the Verbal Syntagma in Burmese'. *Lingua*, Part II:283-309.

CAPELL, A.

1969 *A survey of New Guinea Languages*. University of Sydney Press.

1978 forthcoming 'Ups and Downs'. *Talanya* vol. 6.

CORNYN, W.S.

1946 *Spoken Burmese*. 2 vols. Henry Holt & Company.

COWAN, H.K.J.

1948 'Aanteekeningen Betreffende de Verhouding van het Atjesch tot de Mon-Khmer-Talen'. *Bijdragen TLV* 104:429-514.

GLAZOVA, M.G.

1967 'Glagolnye Konstrukcii v. Jazykax Indokitajskogo Areala'. *Jazyki Jugo-Vostočnoj Azii*. 257-75. Moscow: Akademia Nauk SSSR, Institut Narodov Azii.

GORGONIEV, J.A.

1963 *Kategorija Glagola v. Sovremennom Khmerskom Jazyke*. Moscow.

GREENBERG, J.H.

1957 *Essays in Linguistics*. University of Chicago Press.

1963 (edited) *Universals of Language*. Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press.

HAAS, M. and H.R. SUBHANKA

1945 *Spoken Thai*. 2 vols. Henry Holt and Company.

HOGAN, D.W.

1972 'Men of the Sea: Coastal Tribes of South Thailand's West Coast'. *Journal of the Siam Society* 60/1:205-34. Also MSS. notes prepared for present writer.

HONEY, P.J. and E.H.S. HENDERSON

1963 'Thai and Vietnamese: Some Elements of Nominal Structure Compared'. In: H.L. Shorto, ed. 1963:71-8.

JACOB, M.

1968 *Introduction to Cambodian.*

MARTIN, S.E.

1954 *Korean in a Hurry.* Charles E. Tuttle Company.

ROLFE, G.E. and T.W.

1956 *Spoken Lao.* Book One. American Council of Learned Societies.

SHORTO, H.L., ed.

1963a *Linguistic Comparison in South East Asia and the Pacific.* London: School of Oriental and African Studies, University of London.

1963b 'The Structural Patterns of Northern Mon-Khmer Languages'. In: Shorto, ed. 1963:45-61.

STEWART, J.A.

1955 *Manual of Colloquial Burmese.* London: Luzac & Company.

UHLENBECK, E.M.

1967 'Indonesia and Malaysia'. In: T.A. Sebeok, ed. *Current Trends in Linguistics.* Vol.2. 847-98. Mouton.

WOLFENDEN, S.N.

1929 *Outlines of Tibeto-Burman Linguistic Morphology.* London: Royal Asiatic Society.