

N. J. Enfield and Bernard Comrie

Mainland Southeast Asian languages

State of the art and new directions

1 Mainland Southeast Asia and its people

Mainland Southeast Asia (hereafter: MSEA) can be broadly defined as the area occupied by present day Cambodia, Laos, Peninsular Malaysia, Thailand, Myanmar, and Vietnam, along with areas of China south of the Yangtze River. Also sometimes included are the seven states of Northeast India, and—although here the term ‘mainland’ no longer applies—the islands from Indonesia and Malaysia running southeast to Australia and West Papua (see Map 1).

There are no exact borders around the MSEA area. Different scholars draw lines in different places. But there is nevertheless a core (Comrie 2007: 45). MSEA is always taken to include Indochina—Vietnam, Laos, and Cambodia—together with Thailand, and, usually, Peninsular Malaysia and part or all of Myanmar (see Map 2).

This book covers the broader scope of Greater MSEA, with several chapters moving beyond the core area of Indochina and Thailand, in all directions; see chapters in this book by Vittrant and by Jenny on Myanmar (cf. Bradley 1995; Watkins 2005), by Post on Northeast India (cf. Morey and Post 2008, 2010; Hyslop, Morey, and Post 2011, 2012, 2013), by Gil on Insular Southeast Asia (cf. Adelaar and Himmelmann 2005; Blust 2013a, b), and by de Sousa on Southern China (cf. Bauer 1996; Ansaldo and Matthews 2001; Chappell 2001).

MSEA is a tropical and sub-tropical area with rugged and well-forested hills and river systems running from higher altitudes in the northwest to the plains and deltas of the south. Among the biggest rivers are the Mekong, the Brahmaputra, the Red River in North Vietnam, the Salween and Irrawaddy rivers in Myanmar, the Pearl and Yangtze rivers in China, and the Chaophraya in central Thailand. The lower reaches of these river systems are well-fertilized plains, which have attracted people partly because of the mobility the environment affords, but also because of the suitability for paddy rice farming. Paddy farming, in which rice plants are kept continually flooded as they grow, requires management of water via systems of dikes and channels (Hartmann 1998). This method is significantly more productive than upland dry-field methods, and can support larger populations (Bellwood 1992: 90). It also reduces biodiversity.



Map 1: Greater mainland Southeast Asia: present day Cambodia, Laos, Peninsular Malaysia, Thailand, Myanmar, and Vietnam, along with China south of the Yangtze River, Northeast India, and Insular Southeast Asia.

MSEA has seen a long and complex history of human movement, contact, and diversification. Evidence from genetics and archaeology suggests that there has been human activity in the area since some 40,000 years ago, when conditions were very different from today. At around 20,000 years ago, global sea levels were 120m lower than now (Chappell and Shackleton 1986; Tooley and Shennan 1987), implying different possibilities for human movement and livelihoods. Then, one could walk on dry land in a straight line from the site of present-day Ho Chi Minh City to Kuala Lumpur, and then in another straight line to Bali and again up to Brunei (Vorisi 2000; Oppenheimer 2011; White 2011). While a fair amount is known from bioarchaeological evidence about more recent human activity in the pre-agricultural period (Oxenham and Tayles 2006), the time horizon of comparative linguistics is limited to the last few thousand years (for recent reviews, see Enfield 2011a). Just behind that horizon are the beginnings of agriculture in MSEA some 4000 or so years ago.



Map 2: Core mainland Southeast Asia: present day Cambodia, Laos, Vietnam, Thailand, and neighbouring parts of China, Malaysia, and Myanmar.

A widely accepted view is that the people of MSEA once spoke Austroasiatic languages in a ‘continuous distribution’, and that this distribution was ‘broken up by the historical expansions of the Chinese, Tai, Vietnamese, Burman and Austronesian (Malay and Cham) peoples’ (Bellwood 1992: 109; cf. Sidwell and Blench 2011: 338 and *passim*; Post 2011). By what mechanism did this take place? Some have argued that modern ethnolinguistic diversification in MSEA was associated with demic diffusion (Bellwood 1992; Blust 1994; Higham 2002; Edmondson and Gregerson 2007). This implies the incoming migration of groups of people who rely on agriculture, and who can thereby support large populations. The incomers replace less populous and less powerful existing forager populations (Ammerman and Cavalli-Sforza 1971; Cavalli-Sforza, Menozzi, and Piazza 1993; Nichols 1992).¹ An alternative to demic diffusion is cultural diffusion, whereby resident populations remain in place, but adopt new practices and ways of speaking. According to O’Connor (1995: 987), ‘there is no direct evidence that an actual influx of immigrants ever displaced earlier peoples’ in MSEA. He argues instead that an ‘agricultural paradigm’ is what diffused, bringing with it a ‘society-shaping complex’ (see Jonsson 2011, 2014 for discussion). For other critiques of the application of a demic diffusion model in MSEA see White (2011) on the view that hunter-gatherer communities have played a central role in shaping modern MSEA ethnographic diversity, and Fix (2011) on the genetics of ethnolinguistic diversification, in which he presents an alternative to the standard account of demic diffusion in the Malay Peninsula, with a model he calls *trickle-effect colonization*.

Regardless of whether one thinks the historical process of peopling and ethnolinguistic diversification in MSEA was driven primarily by the spread of people or by the spread of ideas—here, more work is needed—the modern distribution of ethnolinguistic groups is clear. In lowland areas, populations are denser, more culturally and linguistically homogeneous, and more closely affiliated with state political power. In upland areas, populations are sparser, more culturally and linguistically diverse, and have limited if any access to infrastructure, education, or power. The dominant lowland populations are clearly dis-

¹ Demic diffusion is the spread of genes. It is usually associated with the outcomes of migration. In world history, this has often involved the movement of groups who have adopted agriculture, and who are therefore more populous and viable than those (e.g., hunter-gatherers) who are resident in the area being entered. Demic diffusion may be associated with population displacement or replacement, but this need not necessarily be the case. There may be genetic admixture between an incoming population and a resident population, such that some fraction of the genes of the resident population survives. We are grateful to Mark Stoncking and Dan Dediu for clarification of these points.

tinct from each other in terms of political identity ('the Thai' vs. 'the Lao' vs. 'the Khmer', etc.), but the upland minority populations that straddle these nations have something in common: they are politically and geographically marginalized.

The upland areas in which many MSEA minorities live are conjoined in a single, elongated area, crossing political borders and encompassing 'virtually all the lands at altitudes above roughly three hundred meters all the way from the Central Highlands of Vietnam to northeastern India' (Scott 2009: ix). This area has been referred to as *Zomia*, a term coined by Van Schendel (2002) in making the point that arbitrary research areas can be constructed and reified by 'academic politics', as he puts it (cf. Michaud 2010). Van Schendel's proposal of a Zomia area is a conceptual exercise, useful because it counteracts the politically sanctioned alternatives. The term has gained some recognition (though ironically not without danger of creating the reification it was warning against; Jonsson 2011, 2014), particularly due to Scott (2009). According to Scott, it is not that the inhabitants of Zomia simply share the fate of having been marginalized by states. Instead, he argues, they share a cultural distaste for being governed: they have chosen to remain isolated from central government control.

We do not have space in this introduction for more on the detailed history of human activity—peopling and migration, social contact and cultural shift, state formation and avoidance, war and peace—in MSEA. For further information, see Tarling (1993), Scott (2009), and Enfield (2011a).

2 Mainland Southeast Asian languages

The degree of linguistic diversity in MSEA (i.e., the number of languages per square km) is high (Enfield 2011b), and it is highest in upland areas. Lower language density in lowland areas is likely related in part to geographical factors and their implications for the nature of social networks (see Nettle 1999). In historical demographic processes of the kinds noted above, formerly diverse lowland communities in MSEA have become homogenized by a combination of two processes. One process was ethnolinguistic shift. Some groups stayed where they were but stopped passing on their languages and identities to their children, instead adopting the languages and identities of new dominant groups. This process can be observed all over MSEA today. Another process was out-migration, typically to more isolated hill areas (Scott 2009). Geographical isolation is a force that still promotes language diversity in the region, where former diversity of lowland areas is on its last legs. Many of the lowland lan-

guages are heavily endangered or extinct (Enfield 2006, Bradley 2007, Suwilai 2007). This is quickened by effects of the concentration of political power of modern nation states in the lowlands. In recent decades, processes of language standardization in MSEA nations (Simpson 2007) have helped to heavily reduce language diversity.

The languages of MSEA are from five major language families: Sino-Tibetan, Tai-Kadai, Hmong-Mien, Austroasiatic, and Austronesian.² There are nearly 600 distinct languages spoken in greater MSEA.³ If we exclude the China and India data, thus representing the core MSEA area, the number of languages is about half this amount; see Table 1.

Table 1: A breakdown of numbers of languages in MSEA, separated into language families.

	Core MSEA	Greater MSEA
Austroasiatic	122 (44%)	138 (24%)
Sino-Tibetan	74 (26%)	288 (49%)
Tai-Kadai	51 (18%)	93 (16%)
Austronesian	25 (9%)	26 (4%)
Hmong-Mien	8 (3%)	38 (7%)
Total	280	583

The very high linguistic diversity (i.e., the number of languages) in north-east India and southern/southwestern China adds dramatically to the number of languages included in the area. It also reverses the relative proportion of Sino-Tibetan and Austroasiatic languages.

The MSEA area is unusual in global terms in that there is good agreement among scholars as to the basic language family affiliation of known languages. There are unresolved issues about lower level subgroupings and there are unre-

² The Andamanese languages are located just outside MSEA as defined here; though we note with interest new work on these lesser-known languages: see Abbi's recent reference grammar (2012) and dictionary (2013) of Great Andamanese.

³ Data are from glottolog.org, accessed in May 2014. Many thanks to Harald Hammarström for his input and assistance. Core MSEA was defined for this count as Cambodia, Laos, Myanmar, Thailand, and Vietnam; Greater MSEA included this, along with Peninsular Malaysia, areas of India east of 90 degrees (i.e., the states of Arunachal Pradesh, Nagaland, Manipur, Mizoram, Assam, Meghalaya, and Tripura) and China south of the Yangtze river (specifically, the provinces of Zhejiang, Jiangxi, Hunan, Guizhou, Yunnan, Guangxi, Guangdong, Fujian, and Hainan).

solved hypotheses about possible macro-groupings. But for every known language, scholars agree as to which of the five main language families it fits into. This is unusual firstly because it means that each language's basic affiliation is apparently uncontroversial, and secondly because it suggests that there are no language isolates (Blench 2011: 125-126).⁴ For a survey of the historical linguistic background, see Sidwell (2013).

Following is a list of some of the typological features that characterize MSEA languages (drawing mostly from Enfield 2005: 186-190, 2011b: 69-70; see further references there):

Sound system features

- Large vowel systems (it is sometimes difficult to determine how many vowels a system has; there are alternative analyses of features such as diphthongs and phonation splits).
- Common underlying structure of vowel phoneme system (often 9-place, symmetrical; hi-mid-low by front-central-back).
- Long versus short vowel distinctions.
- Many more consonants are possible in initial position than in final position; syllables have an initial-and-rhyme structure.
- Preference for one (major) syllable per word, with many languages featuring minor syllables or pre-syllables in an iambic pattern (see chapters of this volume by Pittayaporn, Butler, Post, and Brunelle and Kirby).
- Lexical contrast is marked by laryngeal features including pitch and phonation type, often in combination; tone systems are complex (number of tones ranges from 4 to 15 in number, with counts for a language differing depending on the analysis chosen); phonation type systems usually distinguish two registers, e.g., 'clear' versus 'breathy'; lexically contrastive pitch and phonation type are strongly correlated in functional and historical terms.
- Gap in voiced stop series at velar place of articulation (no voiced 'g').

⁴ Not considered in this chapter are sign languages. The sign language used in Ban Khor, Thailand (Nonaka 2004) appears to be an isolate, and there are surely more of its kind. Among spoken languages in MSEA there is Kenaboi, now extinct, and known only from two early 20th century word lists. Hajek (1998) refers to Kenaboi as 'unclassified' but does not call it an isolate. Benjamin (2006) summarizes and analyses the available data as far as is possible. His view is that Kenaboi is 'a specially-invented form of speech', a 'taboo-jargon' associated with forest collecting trade. Kenaboi had large proportions of both Austroasiatic and Austronesian vocabulary, along with some unexplained forms. The data are too tenuous to establish whether it was an isolate or not.

Morphosyntax-semantics system features

- No inflectional morphology (no case, gender, number, or definiteness marked on noun phrases, no agreement or tense-marking on verbs); note that *derivational* morphology is widespread and sometimes highly productive in Austroasiatic languages of MSEA (see Alves this volume).
- Open class items—mostly nouns and verbs—serve functions that are expressed by dedicated functional morphemes (including bound morphology) in other languages, e.g., nominals as prepositions, verbs as aspect markers, comparative markers, adversative passive markers, and valence-changing devices (Clark and Prasithrathsint 1985; Kölver 1991; Ansaldo 1999).
- Widespread use of verb serialisation (meaning a range of different kinds of predicative structures that use combinations of verbs), with a rich array of types and functions in each language (Bisang 1991).
- Order of major constituents of the clause tends to be relatively flexible within languages, sensitive to pragmatic factors (though verb-object constituent order is dominant); noun phrases tend to be left-headed, and may have discontinuous constituents, especially when classifiers are involved.
- Zero anaphora: noun phrases may be ellipsed when their referents are contextually retrievable (this combined with flexibility in constituent order results in quite variable surface options; for a case study see Enfield 2007: 271-284).
- Extensive use of topic-comment structure in clauses.
- Large set of labile or ambitransitive verbs, especially of the causative/inchoative or unaccusative type (e.g., Lao *hak2* can mean transitive ‘snap’ or intransitive ‘is/has been snapped’).
- Rich inventories of sentence-final particles that make subtle distinctions in sentence type, stance, evidentiality, and combinations thereof.
- Rich inventories of ideophones (or ‘expressives’) and other expressive forms, including rhyming four-syllable expressions, and productive elaborative rhyming devices.
- Numeral classifiers and related systems of nominal classification (see Blench this volume).
- Complex pronominal systems, with multi-level social-deictic meanings.

Some of the most noteworthy commonalities among MSEA languages concern their *lack* of marking of certain semantico-grammatical categories. Most notably, as remarked upon in the list above, the languages almost entirely lack inflectional morphology in the usual sense of that term (i.e., including agreement, case, gender/number/definiteness on noun phrases, tense-marking on

verbs). For an overview of selected national languages, see Comrie (1990), while Goddard (2005) presents a more topic-oriented approach; see also Vittrant and Watkins (forthcoming).

3 Linguistics of MSEA: New developments

This book presents new developments in linguistics of the MSEA area, but it is not our intention to offer a general or comprehensive review of all current work. In this section, we briefly discuss a few ways in which MSEA linguistics has progressed in recent years.

3.1 Conferences and publications

The community of scholars working on MSEA linguistics is steadily growing. The South East Asia Linguistic Society (SEALS)—founded by Martha Ratliff and Eric Schiller at Wayne State University, Detroit, in 1990—will hold its 25th annual meeting in 2015. Prior to 2009, proceedings of SEALS meetings were published in edited volumes. Since then they have appeared in the open-access *Journal of the Southeast Asian Linguistics Society* (for which, see <http://www.jseals.org/>). The SEALang Projects website (<http://www.sealang.net>) is an invaluable resource that makes accessible a range of primary and secondary sources on MSEA languages. Other regular publishing venues for research on MSEA languages include the journals *Mon-Khmer Studies* (an open-access journal, see <http://www.mksjournal.org/>) and *Linguistics of the Tibeto-Burman Area* (see <http://sealang.net/sala/ltba/htm/index.htm>). Some recent interdisciplinary explorations of ethnolinguistic diversification have focused on languages of MSEA and neighbouring places (e.g., Sagart, Blench, and Sanchez-Maras 2005; Enfield 2011a). The last 10 years have seen the publication of multiple landmark overviews of MSEA language families, including Tai-Kadai (Diller, Edmondson, and Luo 2008), Sino-Tibetan (Thurgood and LaPolla 2003; cf. Matisoff 2003a), Austroasiatic (Jenny and Sidwell in press; cf. Shorto 2006), and the Austronesian languages of MSEA (Thurgood 1999; Grant and Sidwell 2005; Larish 2005; Blust 2013b: 70-75).

3.2 New descriptive work

A key measure of progress in an area is the production of reference materials based on new empirical research.⁵ Full-sized descriptions of MSEA languages published since the turn of the century include grammars of Semelai (Kruspe 2004), Jahai (Burenhult 2005), Garo (Burling 2004), Deuri (Jacquesson 2004), Mongsen Ao (Coupe 2007), Lao (Enfield 2007), Anong (Sun and Liu 2009), Hainan Cham (Thurgood, Thurgood, and Li 2014), Turung (Morey 2010), the Tai languages of Assam (Morey 2005), Lisu (Yu 2007), Thai (Higbie and Thinsan 2003; Iwasaki and Ingkaphirom Horie 2005) and Cambodian (Haiman 2011). Numerous grammars have been completed as PhD dissertations; just in the area of northeast India, for example, see grammars of Galo (Post 2007), Atong (van Breugel 2014), and Karbi (Konnerth 2014). Sketches or partial descriptions have appeared on languages including Pacoh (Alves 2006), Kri (Enfield and Diffloth 2009), and Arem (Ferlus 2014), and detailed descriptions have appeared of specific domains of grammar such as phonetics/phonology; see for example Watkins (2002) on Wa and Coupe (2003) on Ao. Major dictionaries of minority languages are less abundant; two notable examples are Watkins (2013) on Wa and Svantesson et al. (2013) on Kammu Yùan. An important preoccupation of descriptive linguistics globally is the documentation of endangered languages; for excellent examples of new empirical work with this orientation in the MSEA context, see Morey (2005, 2010; see also Suwilai 1998, 2008).

A significant amount of new data and analysis from MSEA languages has become available on most if not all domains of interest to linguists, and on most if not all language families and sub-areas of MSEA. As just one example, here we mention the Aslian languages of Peninsular Malaysia. In the last decade or so, we have seen the publication of typological overviews of the Aslian languages as a group (Matisoff 2003b), new reference grammars (Kruspe 2004; Burenhult 2005), other descriptive materials (Burenhult and Wegener 2009; Wnuk forthcoming), new interdisciplinary research on the history and diversification of ethnolinguistic subgroups (Burenhult, Kruspe, and Dunn 2011; Dunn et al. 2011; Bulbeck 2011; Fix 2011; Oppenheimer 2011; Dunn, Kruspe, and Bu-

⁵ We mention here only a selection of those recent materials that are published in English, though we note that a substantial descriptive literature on MSEA languages is being published in other languages, including Chinese, French, Indonesian, Thai, and Vietnamese (for some examples, see: Bo 2002; Bon 2014; Buakaw 2012; Chen 2005; Gai 2002; Giaphong 2004; Kosaka 2000; D. Li 2003, 2004; Y. Li 2003; Lidz 2010; Mao, Zongwu, and Yunbing Li 2002, 2007; Mayuree 2006; Ploykaew 2001; Samarina 2011; Seng Mai 2012; Shee 2008; Shintani 2008; Srisakorn 2008; Wayesha 2010).

renhult 2013), and field research on the psychological implications of semantic systems that are indigenous to Asian languages and world views (Burenhult and Majid 2011; Majid and Burenhult 2014; Wnuk and Majid 2014). Not only is this breadth and depth of new work improving our basic understanding of MSEA languages and their socio-historical contexts, it is also helping to balance our perspective on the MSEA area, with effects on our image of what a Southeast Asian language is typically like (see below). The availability of new descriptive materials means that we can progress in the field by testing existing proposals and by continuously expanding the scope of our work (see Pittayaporn 2009 for a good illustration of this point).

3.3 New methods

As new methods in linguistic research are being developed and applied in linguistics globally, so they are being developed and applied in mainland Southeast Asia. In phonetics and phonology, for example, new instrumental and computational technologies are rapidly transforming the realms of possibility in data collection and analysis, both by making new kinds of measurement possible, and by making the equipment smaller and more portable for fieldwork; see Edmondson and Esling (2006: 172-175) for the use of laryngoscopy to study the phonetics of breathy vocal register in Jianchuan Bai (spoken in Yunnan), and Brunelle (2009) for the use of electroglottography to study register in Cham dialects in Vietnam (see also Brunelle, Nguyễn, and Nguyễn 2010 on Northern Vietnamese). Newly-developed statistical techniques are being applied with interesting results: in historical linguistics, probability-based bioinformatic techniques are being used for exploring cladistic representations of language relatedness (see for example Burenhult, Kruspe, and Dunn 2011); and in areal typology, statistical modelling is being used to test dependencies among phonological features, language history, and language contact (Brunelle and Kirby this volume). In lexical and grammatical work, new field methods are being applied in the exploration of semantic fields, in a range of functional and conceptual domains (see, for example Burenhult 2006; Wnuk and Majid 2014; Enfield 2015). There is an increasing interest in combining methods in order to further our knowledge of the area's languages, for example in the interdisciplinary collaborations of historical work (Sagart et al. 2005; van Driem 2007; Enfield 2011a). And computational power is being exploited in building larger and better databases of, or including, MSEA languages (Dryer and Haspelmath 2013; Donohue et al. 2013).

3.4 Historical-comparative linguistics

Research in historical-comparative linguistics continues apace in MSEA. At the level of sub-grouping, advances are being made in all the major language families. Old hypotheses are being tested with new data and techniques, and new hypotheses are being put forward. The appearance of new data, in particular, has made an important difference, enabling, for example, Pittayaporn (2009) to propose a new reconstruction of Proto-Southwestern-Tai phonology, Sidwell (2009) to offer an improved account of vowels in Proto-Mon-Khmer, and Matisoff (this volume; cf. Matisoff 2003a) to re-examine the place of the Jingpho language within Tibeto-Burman. In research on historical Hmong-Mien, Ratliff (2010) has recently provided an assessment of previous work and offers substantial new reconstructions, with consideration of their implications. Historical Austroasiatic has seen substantial developments, including a suspension of the assumption of a highest-level split between Munda and Mon-Khmer. It is no longer widely assumed that ‘Mon-Khmer languages’ represent descendants of a single ancestor language below Proto-Austroasiatic (although the term is still useful with the meaning ‘non-Munda Austroasiatic languages’; for a range of perspectives on this, see discussion in Sidwell and Blench 2011; Diffloth 2011; Sagart 2011; and Van Driem 2011). Similarly, in Sino-Tibetan linguistics, assumptions are being questioned. For example, recent reconsiderations of the position of Chinese in the family have assigned it to a lower-level subgroup rather than the standard placement as a high major branch; more subgroups of Sino-Tibetan are identified, and the time-depth of reconstructed proto-Sinitic is pushed back to well before Old Chinese (Blench and Post 2013; Van Driem 2013).

3.5 Language in social life

Numerous lines of work in linguistics deal with the role of language in social life. An important theme in recent work in MSEA is the sociolinguistics of language endangerment, and associated issues including language protection and revitalization; for an example, see Phattharathanit (2012) on identity maintenance in Lanna (cf. Bradley 2007, Suwilai 2007). Research on linguistic politeness continues, mostly in relation to national languages, and with reference to the languages’ elaborated systems of social deixis, for example in their systems of personal pronouns, and the pragmatic alternatives that effectively create open class systems for person reference (Cooke 1968; Haas 1969; Luong 1990; Enfield 2015: Ch. 5). The more complex documented systems of person reference

are those belonging to the major literate languages of the area, including Thai, Cambodian, Vietnamese, and Burmese (Cooke 1968). There has been recent work in this domain on languages including Lao (Enfield 2007: Ch. 5, 2015: Ch. 5). On Vietnamese, see Sophana (2008) on politeness strategies, and Sidnell and Shohet (2013) on avoidance strategies (see also Luong 1988). Linking social life to central concerns of historical linguistics and typology, there has been recent work on sociolinguistic conditions for borrowing (Alves 2009); for similar work see Thurgood (2010) comparing two varieties of Cham with the Tibeto-Burman language Anong. A new line of work in MSEA is conversation analysis; Enfield (2013) presents several case studies of Lao language in conversation; Hà (2010, 2013) presents studies of Vietnamese conversation with a focus on the role of prosody, for example in repair and backchannelling (see also Umaporn 2007 on backchannelling in Mon).

3.6 Changing perceptions

Like in any area, linguistics in MSEA is subject to preconceptions. As soon as an idea becomes something of an orthodoxy it is right to revisit and question it. We are pleased that several chapters in this book raise and sometimes challenge certain assumptions about the linguistics of this area.

3.6.1 The idea of a typical MSEA language

Comrie (2007: 45) finds that, on measures taken using data from the *World Atlas of Language Structures* (Haspelmath et al. 2005), ‘Thai turns out to be the most typical of the three major national languages of Mainland Southeast Asia considered here.’⁶ This conclusion is shared by Dahl (2008). This of course does not mean that Thai is the most typical of all MSEA languages, although this is often assumed to be the case. The national languages of the area are the better-described and better-known languages, and they happen to share many typological features that characterize Thai, such as a tendency for monosyllabicity, a lack of productive affixation, and an elaborate numeral classifier system. But there are many MSEA languages whose properties differ from these and many other properties found in Thai and other national languages like Vietnamese. In

⁶ The idea that a language may be ‘typical’ of an area seems to be an intuitive one, but the relevant sense in which a language can be said to be typical is seldom defined.

fact, many languages of the area lack these features. Within MSEA linguistics one's view of what is typical may depend on one's academic background, and, especially, on which language one worked on first, or has worked on most, in one's research career. If, for example, one's earliest and most in-depth work on MSEA languages was on Lao (as is the case with the first author here), then languages like Lao and Thai would seem typical. They are typologically very similar to other major languages like Vietnamese. Another researcher's background would suggest otherwise. The viewpoint professed by our colleague Gérard Diffloth is that a typical MSEA language lacks lexical tone, has complex phonotactics including syllable-initial consonant clusters, and has productive derivational morphology, quite a contrast from the oft-cited set of features of MSEA languages (see Henderson 1965; Capell 1979; Suwilai 1987; Kruspe 2004; cf. Alves 2001, this volume). The problem with treating the area's major national languages as reference points is not only that they are a tiny sample but that they are known to be not like the rest, due to factors including (1) they are spoken by very large, often urbanized populations, (2) they are spoken as second languages by large sections of the population, (3) they are official languages, used in major education systems, media and broadcasting, and legal documents.

3.6.2 Nominal classification

MSEA is often cited in typologies of nominal classification as an area that has numeral classifiers (cf. Grinevald 2000; Aikhenvald 2000). Recent research shows that systems of nominal classification in MSEA can be more complex than this. They not only contain the classic numeral classifier type, consisting of a large set of classificatory nominals that are used whenever something is being enumerated, but also systems that resemble the *noun class* systems found widely in Africa and the Amazon, and ancillary systems that resemble numeral classifiers but which are involved in the use of more simple modifiers such as demonstratives and specifiers. Enfield (2007: 119-156) shows that in Lao there are in fact four distinct grammatical systems of nominal classification, of which numeral classifiers are one (see Blench this volume).

3.6.3 Sesquisyllables

Researchers of the sound structure of words in MSEA languages often refer to the idea of 'sesquisyllables' and even the property of 'sesquisyllabicity'. This

term was introduced by Matisoff (1973) to refer to the ‘one-and-a-half syllable’ form of words found in many MSEA languages (see Henderson 1952; Shorto 1960, and the chapters by Butler and by Pittayaporn in this volume). The term has not always been applied in an exact or consistent way. In a narrow sense, it can refer specifically to a syllable with schwa epenthesis between elements of an initial consonant cluster; that is, a syllable whose onset is phonologically /CC/ but phonetically [C^əC]. In a broad sense, it can refer to any word that has an iambic structure, with the main stressed syllable coming at the end. Consider the following three words in Kri (Enfield and Duffloth 2009): /cakaan/ [caka:ŋ] ‘to measure something by handspans’, /ckaən/ [c^əka:ŋ] ‘a hand span’, and /caən/ [ca:ŋ] ‘buttress of a tree’ (or /kaənʔ/ [ka:ŋʔ] ‘chin/jaw’). In the broad sense, both /cakaan/ [caka:ŋ] and /ckaən/ [c^əka:ŋ] are sesquisyllabic, while in the narrow sense, only /ckaən/ [c^əka:ŋ] is. In this book we include two chapters—those by Butler and by Pittayaporn—that make a significant advance here not only by insisting that we be consistent and precise in the use of such terms, but by turning to empirical and theoretical accounts in order to offer motivated solutions, making the intuitive idea of sesquisyllabicity accountable to current theory and data in theoretical phonology and articulatory phonetics. Butler calls for more thoughtful consideration of the terms, and seeks to make progress by holding certain phonological ideas of syllable structure accountable to phonetic behaviour that can be experimentally tested. Pittayaporn takes a broader comparative approach to the problem, offering a typology of sesquisyllabic languages, defining the distinct meanings that this term can have.

3.6.4 Tone phonetics and phonology

An oft-cited feature of MSEA languages is that many of them are tone languages. When asked what this means, most linguists would agree with Yip (2002:1): ‘A language is a “tone language” if the pitch of the word can change the meaning of the word.’ But as linguists of MSEA languages since Henderson (1952, 1965, 1967) have insisted, it is wrong to think that *pitch* is the sole or defining feature of a tone system in MSEA (see the chapters by Brunelle and Kirby and by Sidwell in this volume; see also Abramson and L-Thongkum 2009): ‘It is important to recognize that pitch is frequently only one of the phonetic components of “tone” as a phonological category. ... A phonological tone is in our area very frequently a complex of other features besides pitch—such as intensity, duration, voice quality, final glottal constriction and so on.’ (Henderson 1967: 171). From this perspective, while tone and phonation type are sometimes considered to be distinct phonological organizations, they should instead be treat-

ed as instances of a single sound system property insofar as they each involve the use of laryngeal features for lexical contrast. Pitch contours, distinctions in phonation, and other glottalic effects are all produced in the larynx, by the vocal folds, and are all articulatorily independent of segmental speech sounds produced with the lips, teeth, and tongue (i.e., consonants). Tone and phonation are intimately bound, and not essentially distinct. For this reason we recognize that the sound system of an MSEA ‘tone’ language such as Vietnamese is not of a different species from that of a classical MSEA ‘register’ or ‘phonation type’ language such as Kri (Enfield and Diffloth 2009). Most systems that are identified as one or the other (in phonological terms) actually display properties of both (in phonetic terms).

3.6.5 MSEA as a linguistic area

In research on areal linguistics, a great deal of new empirical and conceptual work from around the world has improved our understanding of historical processes of ethnolinguistic diversification, contact, and convergence, while at the same time some of the basic tenets of areal linguistics have come under question (Stolz 2002; Muysken 2008). MSEA has been widely regarded as a classic linguistic area with close parallelism in structure between neighbouring languages that have no demonstrable common ancestor (see Henderson 1965; Capell 1979; Clark 1989; Matisoff 1991; Bisang 1991; Enfield 2005; Comrie 2007; Dahl 2008; Vittrant and Watkins forthcoming). The cause of this parallelism is widely assumed to be language contact. While several chapters in this volume examine typological parallels across language families and interpret these as evidence of effects from language contact, the chapters by Sidwell, Ratliff, and Brunelle and Kirby call for caution in jumping to that conclusion. If neighbouring but unrelated languages share typological features this can also be a result of parallel language-internal development (cf. Thurgood 1998; Enfield 2005). That possibility is equally deserving of consideration, and so the idea that convergence is due to contact should not be assumed without question.

4 Summary preview of this book

We have organized the 13 chapters of this book into four parts, as follows.

Part 1: Language relatedness in MSEA. The four chapters of Part 1 address the issue of language relatedness, which can be either a result of contact, or of shared inheritance of features from a common ancestor. Three of the chapters address a central problem for areal linguistics discussed in the last section, namely the overly seductive nature of language contact as an explanation for parallel structure observed in languages which are not genealogically related. Careful case studies are presented, each in a domain of phonology. Ratliff shows that word initial prenasalization can emerge independently in unrelated languages from common causes in syllable-level processes ('front-end collapse', related to sesquisyllabicity, treated in Part 3). Sidwell makes the point with regard to cases of tonogenesis/registrogenesis and their systemic relation to syllable structure. Brunelle and Kirby explore the example of tone typology and the parallel occurrence of tonogenesis in the languages of the area, making the case that language-internal processes are at work. In the last chapter of Part 1 on language relatedness, Matisoff addresses the issue of determining internal relations between subgroups of a language family, with a fine-grained case study of the relationship between Jingpho and the Luish group of languages.⁷

Part 2: Boundaries of the MSEA area. Part 2 explores ways in which the borders of an MSEA linguistic area may be rightly thought to extend beyond the core MSEA area shown in Map 1, above; it brings four chapters together that look at extensions in four directions: Jenny to the west in Myanmar, Post to the north west in India, Gil to the south east in Insular Southeast Asia and West Papua, and de Sousa to the north and north east in China.

Part 3: Defining the sesquisyllable. In Part 3, two chapters concentrate on the category of 'sesquisyllabicity', a widely-used term, but one that is often vague or ambiguous in meaning. Both Butler and Pittayaporn raise the bar considerably, insisting that the term be used in a way that is grounded in theory, experimentation, and clear definitions, rather than meaning something roughly like 'has iambic syllables'. Pittayaporn proposes a typology of sesquisyllabic languages.

Part 4: Explorations in MSEA morphosyntax. Part 4 offers explorations in the morphosyntax of MSEA languages: Alves surveys the rich morphological marking found in Mon-Khmer languages of core MSEA (i.e., non-Munda languages of the Austroasiatic family); Blench examines the origins of nominal classification, responding to a new understanding of this domain as being richer than merely numeral classifiers, and looking at underlying processes by

⁷ Note that there is an online-only appendix to Matisoff's chapter, available at the book's webpage: <http://www.degruyter.com/view/product/449361>

means of a comparison with some African languages; and Vittrant looks into the semantico-grammatical typology of motion event expression, assessing the contribution of MSEA languages to the global typology of motion events.

These studies are of course just a thin slice of the rich, diverse, and substantial work that is currently being produced in MSEA linguistics. But we think that the chapters of this book convey a sense of the state of the art in this field, of where MSEA linguistics is at, and where it is heading. And while much progress has been made, there is of course much to be done. There are hundreds of languages in the area, and thousands of research questions that need answering. We have much to look forward to in the coming years of research on the languages of mainland Southeast Asia.

Acknowledgements

We gratefully acknowledge financial support from the Max Planck Institute for Evolutionary Anthropology (Department of Linguistics), the Max Planck Institute for Psycholinguistics (Language and Cognition Department), and the European Research Council (through grant 240853 ‘Human Sociality and Systems of Language Use’). The editors co-convened a conference on the book’s theme, held at MPI EvA in Leipzig, 29 November to 1 December, 2012. We are grateful to Julia Cissewski and Claudia Bavero for their organizational assistance in Leipzig, and to Julija Baranova for her help in Nijmegen. We thank Maarten van den Heuvel for his tireless and brilliant formatting and technical assistance in preparing the manuscript for publication, and Angela Terrill at Punctilious Editing (<http://www.punctilious.net/>) for first-class copy-editing and indexing. For comments and suggestions on a draft of this introduction, we thank Roger Blench, Jeremy Collins, Mark Donohue, David Gil, Pittayawat Pittayaporn, Mark Post, Martha Ratliff, and Paul Sidwell. Finally, we thank all the contributing authors for their patience and input, as well as all those who attended and contributed to the workshop, especially Christian Bauer, Walter Bisang, and Niclas Burenhult.

References

- Abbi, Anvita. 2012. *Dictionary of the Great Andamanese language: English - Great Andamanese - Hindi*. Delhi: Ratna Sagar.
- Abbi, Anvita. 2013. *A grammar of the Great Andamanese language: An ethnolinguistic study*. Leiden: Brill Academic.

- Abramson, Arthur S. & Theraphan L-Thongkum. 2009. A fuzzy boundary between tone languages and voice-register languages. In G. Fant, H. Fujisaki & J. Shen (eds.), *Frontiers in phonetics and speech science*, 149-155. Beijing: The Commercial Press.
- Adelaar, Alexander & Nikolaus P. Himmelmann. 2005. *The Austronesian languages of Asia and Madagascar*. London: RoutledgeCurzon.
- Aikhenvald, Alexandra Y. 2000. *Classifiers: a typology of noun categorization devices*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Alves, Mark J. 2001. What's so Chinese about Vietnamese? In Graham W. Thurgood (ed.), *Papers from the Ninth Annual Meeting of the Southeast Asian Linguistics Society*. 221-242. Phoenix: Arizona State University.
- Alves, Mark J. 2006. *A grammar of Pacoh: A Mon-Khmer language of the central highlands of Vietnam* (Shorter Grammars). Canberra: Pacific Linguistics.
- Alves, Mark J. 2009. Sino-Vietnamese grammatical vocabulary and sociolinguistic conditions for borrowing. *Journal of the Southeast Asian Linguistics Society* 1. 1-9.
- Ammerman, A. J. & L. L. Cavalli-Sforza. 1971. Measuring the rate of spread of early farming in Europe. *Man* 6(4). 674-688.
- Ansaldo, Umberto. 1999. *Comparative constructions in Sinitic: areal typology and patterns of grammaticalisation*. Stockholm: Stockholm University dissertation
- Ansaldo, Umberto & Stephen J. Matthews. 2001. Typical Creoles and simple languages: The case of Sinitic. *Linguistic Typology* 5(2/3). 311-24.
- Bauer, Robert S. 1996. Identifying the Tai substratum in Cantonese. In *Pan-Asiatic linguistics: Proceedings of the Fourth International Symposium on Languages and Linguistics V, 1806-1844*. Bangkok: Mahidol University.
- Bellwood, P. 1992. Southeast Asia before prehistory. In N. Tarling (ed.), *The Cambridge history of Southeast Asia: from early times to c. 1800* (Vol.1). New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Benjamin, Geoffrey. 2006. Hervey's "Kenaboi": lost Malayan language or forest-collecting taboo jargon? Manuscript.
- Bisang, Walter. 1991. Verb serialization, grammaticalization and attractor positions in Chinese, Hmong, Vietnamese, Thai and Khmer. In Hansjakob Seiler & Waldfried Premper (eds.), *Partizipation: Das sprachliche Erfassen von Sachverhalten*, 509-62. Tübingen: Gunter Narr Verlag.
- Blench, Roger. 2011. The role of agriculture in the evolution of Mainland Southeast Asian language phyla. In N.J. Enfield (ed.), *Dynamics of human diversity: The case of mainland Southeast Asia*, 125-152. Canberra: Pacific Linguistics.
- Blench, R. & M. W. Post. 2013. Re-thinking Sino-Tibetan phylogeny from the perspective of North East Indian languages. In N. Hill & T. Owen-Smith (eds.), *Trans-Himalayan linguistics*, 71-104. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Blust, Robert. 1994. The Austronesian settlement of Mainland Southeast Asia. In Karen L. Adams & Thomas John Hudak (eds.), *Papers from the Second Annual Meeting of the Southeast Asian Linguistics Society*, 25-83. Tempe, AZ: Arizona State University.
- Blust, Robert. 2013a. Southeast Asian islands and Oceania: Austronesian linguistic history. In Peter Bellwood (ed.), *The encyclopedia of global human migration. Volume 1: Prehistory*. Oxford: Wiley-Blackwell.
- Blust, Robert. 2013b. *The Austronesian languages (revised edition)*. Canberra: Asia-Pacific Linguistics.
- Bo, Wenze. 2002. *A study of Mulao*. Beijing: The Nationalities Press.

- Bon, Noëllie. 2014. *Une grammaire de la langue stieng, langue en danger du Cambodge et du Vietnam*. Lyon: Université Lumière Lyon 2 dissertation.
- Bradley, David. 1995. *Studies in Burmese languages* (Papers in Southeast Asian Linguistics 13). Canberra: Pacific Linguistics.
- Bradley, David. 2007. Language endangerment in China and Mainland Southeast Asia. In Matthias Brenzinger (ed.), *Language diversity endangered* (Trends in Linguistics: Studies and Monographs), 278–302. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Breugel, Seino van. 2014. *A grammar of Atong*. Leiden: Brill.
- Brunelle, Marc. 2009. Contact-induced change? Register in three Cham dialects. *Journal of the Southeast Asian Linguistics Society* 2. 1–22.
- Brunelle Marc, Nguyễn Duy Dương & Nguyễn Khắc Hùng. 2010. A laryngographic and laryngoscopic study of Northern Vietnamese tones. *Phonetica* 67. 147–169.
- Buakaw, Supakit. 2012. *A phonological study of Palaung dialects spoken in Thailand and Myanmar, with focuses on vowels and final nasals*. Bangkok: Mahidol University doctoral dissertation.
- Bulbeck, David. 2011. Biological and cultural evolution in the population and culture history of Homo sapiens in Malaya. In N.J. Enfield (ed.), *Dynamics of human diversity: The case of mainland Southeast Asia*, 207–255. Canberra: Pacific Linguistics.
- Burenhult, Niclas. 2005 *A grammar of Jahai*. Canberra: Pacific Linguistics.
- Burenhult, Niclas. 2006. Body part terms in Jahai. *Language Sciences* 28. 162–180.
- Burenhult, Niclas, N. Kruspe & M. Dunn. 2011. Language history and culture groups among Austroasiatic-speaking foragers of the Malay Peninsula. In N.J. Enfield (ed.), *Dynamics of human diversity: the case of Mainland Southeast Asia*, 257–275. Canberra: Pacific Linguistics.
- Burenhult, Niclas & Asifa Majid. 2011. Olfaction in Asian ideology and language. *The Senses and Society* 6(1). 19–29.
- Burenhult, Niclas & Claudia Wegener. 2009. Preliminary notes on the phonology, orthography and vocabulary of Semnam (Austroasiatic, Malay Peninsula). *Journal of the Southeast Asian Linguistics Society* 1. 283–312.
- Burling, Robbins. 2004. *The language of the Modhipur Mandi (Garo)*. Volume I: Grammar. New Delhi: Bibliophile South Asia.
- Capell, Arthur. 1979. Further typological studies in Southeast Asian languages. In Nguyen Dang Liem (ed.), *South-East Asian linguistic studies* (Vol. 3), 1–42. Canberra: Pacific Linguistics.
- Cavalli-Sforza, L., P. Menozzi & A. Piazza. 1993. Demic expansions and human evolution. *Science* 259(5095). 639–646.
- Chappell, Hilary. 2001. Language contact and areal diffusion in Sinitic languages. In Alexandra Y. Aikhenvald & R. M. W. Dixon (eds.), *Areal diffusion and genetic inheritance: Problems in comparative linguistics*, 328–57. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Chappell, J. & N. J. Shackleton. 1986. Oxygen isotopes and sea level. *Nature* 324(6093). 137–140.
- Chen, Guoqing. 2005. *Kemieyu yanjiu* [A study of Kemie]. Beijing: Minzu chubanshe.
- Clark, Marybeth & Amara Prasithrathsint. 1985. Synchronic lexical derivation in Southeast Asian languages. In Suriya Ratanakul & Suwilai Premsrirat (eds.), *Southeast Asian linguistic studies presented to André-G. Haudricourt*, 34–81. Bangkok: Mahidol University.
- Clark, Marybeth. 1989. Hmong and areal South-East Asia. In David Bradley (ed.), *Papers in Southeast Asian Linguistics No.11, Southeast Asian Syntax*, 175–230. Canberra: Pacific Linguistics.

- Comrie, Bernard (ed.). 1990. *The major languages of East and South-East Asia*. London: Routledge.
- Comrie, Bernard. 2007. Areal typology of mainland Southeast Asia: what we learn from the WALS maps. In Pranee Kullavanijaya (ed.), *Trends in Thai linguistics* [Manusya Special Issue 13], 18–47. Bangkok: Chulalongkorn University.
- Cooke, Joseph R. 1968. *Pronominal reference in Thai, Burmese and Vietnamese*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Coupe, A.R. 2003. *A phonetic and phonological description of Ao: a Tibeto-Burman language of Nagaland, north-east India*. Canberra: Pacific Linguistics.
- Coupe, A. R. 2007. *A grammar of Mongsen Ao*. (Mouton Grammar Library 39). Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Dahl, Östen. 2008. An exercise in ‘a posteriori’ language sampling. *Sprachtypologie Und Universalienforschung* 61(3). 208–20.
- Diffloth, Gérard. 2011. Austroasiatic word histories: boat, husked rice and taro. In N.J. Enfield (ed.), *Dynamics of human diversity: The case of mainland Southeast Asia*, 295–313. Canberra: Pacific Linguistics.
- Diller, Anthony V. N., Jerold A. Edmondson & Yongxian Luo. 2008. *The Tai-Kadai languages*. London: RoutledgeCurzon.
- Donohue, Mark, Rebecca Hetherington, James McElvenny & Virginia Dawson. 2013. *World phonotactics database*. Canberra: Australian National University. <http://phonotactics.anu.edu.au>. (accessed July 2014).
- Driem, George van. 2007. Austroasiatic phylogeny and the Austroasiatic homeland in light of recent population genetic studies. *Mon-Khmer Studies* 37. 1–14.
- Driem, George van. 2011. Rice and the Austroasiatic and Hmong-Mien homelands. In N.J. Enfield (ed.), *Dynamics of human diversity: The case of mainland Southeast Asia*, 361–390. Canberra: Pacific Linguistics.
- Driem, George van. 2013. Trans-Himalayan. In Nathan Hill & Tom Owen-Smith (eds.), *Trans-Himalayan linguistics*. Berlin: Mouton De Gruyter.
- Dryer, Matthew S. & Martin Haspelmath (eds.). 2013. *The World Atlas of Language Structures Online*. Leipzig: Max Planck Institute for Evolutionary Anthropology. <http://wals.info>. (accessed July 2014).
- Dunn, Michael, Niclas Burenhult, Nicole Kruspe, Sylvia Tufvesson & Neele Becker. 2011. Aslian linguistic prehistory: A case study in computational phylogenetics. *Diachronica* 28(3). 291–323.
- Dunn, Michael, Nicole Kruspe & Niclas Burenhult. 2013. Time and place in the prehistory of the Aslian languages. *Human Biology* 85. 383–399.
- Edmondson, Jerold A. & John H. Esling. 2006. The valves of the throat and their functioning in tone, vocal register and stress: laryngoscopic case studies. *Phonology* 23(2). 157–191.
- Edmondson, Jerold A. & Kenneth J. Gregerson. 2007. The languages of Vietnam: Mosaics and expansions. *Language and Linguistics Compass* 1(6). 727–749.
- Enfield, N. J. 2005. Areal linguistics and mainland Southeast Asia. *Annual Review of Anthropology* 34. 181–206.
- Enfield, N. J. 2006. Languages as historical documents: The endangered archive in Laos. *South East Asia Research*, 14(3), 471–488.
- Enfield, N. J. 2007. *A grammar of Lao*. (Mouton Grammar Library 38). Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

- Enfield, N. J. (ed.). 2011a. *Dynamics of human diversity: the case of mainland Southeast Asia*. Canberra: Pacific Linguistics.
- Enfield, N. J. 2011b. Linguistic diversity in mainland Southeast Asia. In N. J. Enfield (ed.), *Dynamics of human diversity: The case of mainland Southeast Asia*, 63–80. Canberra: Pacific Linguistics.
- Enfield, N. J. & Gérard Difflloth. 2009. Phonology and sketch grammar of Kri, a Vietic language of Laos. *Cahiers de Linguistique - Asie Orientale* 38(1). 3–69.
- Enfield, N. J. 2013. *Relationship thinking: Agency, enchrony, and human sociality*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Enfield, N. J. 2015. *The utility of meaning: What words mean and why*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Ferlus, Michel. 2014. Arem, a Vietic language. *Mon-Khmer Studies* 43(1). 1–15.
- Fix, Alan. 2011. Origin of genetic diversity among Malaysian Orang Asli: An alternative to the demic diffusion model. In N. J. Enfield (ed.), *Dynamics of human diversity: The case of mainland Southeast Asia*, 277–291. Canberra: Pacific Linguistics.
- Gai, Xingzhi. 2002. *A study of Tanglang*. Beijing: The Nationalities Press.
- Giaphong, Suchada. 2004. *Plang grammar as spoken in Huay Namkhun village, Chiang Rai province*. Bangkok: Mahidol University MA thesis.
- Goddard, Cliff. 2005. *The languages of east and southeast Asia*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Grant, Anthony & Paul Sidwell. 2005. *Chamic and beyond: studies in mainland Austronesian languages*. Canberra: Pacific Linguistics.
- Grinevald, Colette. 2000. A morphosyntactic typology of classifiers. In Gunter Senft (ed.), *Systems of nominal Classification*, 50–92.
- Hạ, Kiều Phương. 2013. Prosodic means in repair initiation as an activity in Northern Vietnamese conversation. In D. Hole & E. Löbel (eds.), *Linguistics of Vietnamese - an international survey*, 35–54. Berlin & New York: De Gruyter Mouton.
- Hạ, Kiều Phương. 2010. Prosody of Vietnamese from an interactional perspective: ở, ừ and vâng in backchannels and requests for information. *Journal of the Southeast Asian Linguistics Society* 3(1). 56–76.
- Haas, Mary Rosamond. 1969. Sibling terms as used by marriage partners. *Southwestern Journal of Anthropology* 25(3). 228–235.
- Haiman, John. 2011. *Cambodian: Khmer*. (London Oriental and African Language Library 16). Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Hajek, John. 1998. Kenaboi: an extinct unclassified language of the Malay Peninsula. *Mon-Khmer Studies* 28. 137–149.
- Hartmann, John. 1998. A linguistic geography and history of Tai Meuang-Fai (Ditch-Dike) techno-culture. *Language and Linguistics* 16(2). 67–101.
- Haspelmath, Martin, Matthew S. Dryer, David Gil & Bernard Comrie (eds.). 2005. *The World Atlas of Language Structures*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Henderson, Eugénie. J.A. 1952. The main features of Cambodian pronunciation. *Bulletin of the School of Oriental and African Studies* 14. 149–174.
- Henderson, Eugénie. J.A. 1965. The topography of certain phonetic and morphological characteristics of South East Asian languages. *Lingua* 15. 400–434.
- Henderson, Eugénie J.A. 1967. Grammar and tone in South East Asian languages. *Wissenschaftliche Zeitschrift der Karl-Marx-Universität Leipzig* 16(1/2). 171–178.

- Higbie, James & Snea Thinsan. 2003. *Thai reference grammar: The structure of spoken Thai*. Bangkok: Orchid Press.
- Higham, C. 2002. *Early cultures of mainland Southeast Asia*. Bangkok: River Books.
- Hyslop, G., S. Morey & M. W. Post (eds.). 2011. *North East Indian linguistics Vol. 3*. New Delhi: Cambridge University Press India.
- Hyslop, G., S. Morey & M. W. Post (eds.). 2012. *North East Indian linguistics Vol. 4*. New Delhi: Cambridge University Press India.
- Hyslop, G., S. Morey & M. W. Post (eds.). 2013. *North East Indian linguistics Vol. 5*. New Delhi: Cambridge University Press India.
- Iwasaki, Shoichi & Preeya Ingkaphirom Horie. 2005. *A reference grammar of Thai*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Jacquesson, François. 2004. *Le deuri: Langue tibéto-birmane d'Assam*. Leuven & Paris & Dudley, MA: Peeters.
- Jenny, M. & P. Sidwell (eds.). forthcoming 2015. *Handbook of the Austroasiatic languages*. Leiden: Brill.
- Jonsson, Hjorleifur. 2011. Ethnology and the issue of human diversity in Mainland Southeast Asia. In N.J. Enfield (ed.), *Dynamics of human diversity: The case of mainland Southeast Asia*, 109–122. Canberra: Pacific Linguistics.
- Jonsson, Hjorleifur. 2014. *Slow anthropology: Negotiating difference with the lu Mien*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell Southeast Asia Program Publications.
- Konnerth, Linda. 2014. *A grammar of Karbi*. Eugene, OR: University of Oregon dissertation.
- Kosaka, Ryuichi. 2000. *A descriptive study of the Lachi Language: Syntactic description, historical reconstruction and genetic relation*. Tokyo: Tokyo University of Foreign Studies doctoral dissertation.
- Kölver, Ulrike. 1991. Local prepositions and serial verb constructions in Thai. In Hansjakob Seiler & Waldfried Premper (eds.), *Partizipation: das sprachliche Erfassen von Sachverhalten*, 485–508. Tübingen: Narr.
- Kruspe, Nicole. 2004. *A grammar of Semelai*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Larish, Michael D. 2005. Moken and Moklen. In Nikolaus P. Himmelmann & Alexander Adelaar (eds.), *The Austronesian languages of Asia and Madagascar*, 513–533. London: RoutledgeCurzon.
- Lebar, F., G. Hickey & J. Musgrave. 1964. *Ethnic groups of Mainland Southeast Asia*. New Haven: HRAF Press.
- Li, Daqin. 2003. *A study of Geman*. Beijing: The Nationalities Press.
- Li, Daqin. 2004. *Sulong Yu yanjiu* [A study of Sulong]. Beijing: Minzu Chubanshe.
- Li, Yongsui. 2003. *A study of Sangkong*. Beijing: The Nationalities Press.
- Lidz, Liberty A. 2010. A descriptive grammar of Yongning Na (Mosuo). University of Texas at Austin doctoral dissertation.
- Luong, H. V. 1988. Discursive practices and power structure: Person-referring forms and socio-political struggles in colonial Vietnam. *American Ethnologist* 15(2). 239–253.
- Luong, H. V. 1990. *Discursive practices and linguistic meanings: The Vietnamese system of person reference*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Majid, Asifa & Niclas Burenhult. 2014. Odors are expressible in language, as long as you speak the right language. *Cognition* 130(2). 266–270.
- Mao, Zongwu & Yunbing Li. 2002. *A study of Jiongnai*. Beijing: Central Nationalities University Press.

- Mao, Zongwu & Yunbing Li. 2007. *Younuoyu Yanjiu* [A study of Younuo]. Beijing: Minzu University of China Publishing House.
- Matisoff, James A. 1973. Tonogenesis in Southeast Asia. In Larry M. Hyman (ed.), *Southern California occasional papers in Linguistics*, No. 1, 72–95. Los Angeles: University of Southern California.
- Matisoff, James A. 1991. Areal and universal dimensions of grammatization in Lahu. In Elizabeth Closs Traugott & Bernd Heine (eds.), *Approaches to grammaticalization*, 383–453. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Matisoff, James A. 2003a. *Handbook of Proto-Tibeto-Burman*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Matisoff, James A. 2003b. Aslian: Mon-Khmer of the Malay Peninsula. *Mon-Khmer Studies* 33. 1–58.
- Mayuree, Thawornpat. 2006. *Gong: An endangered language of Thailand*. Bangkok: Mahidol University doctoral dissertation.
- Michaud, Jean (ed.). 2010. Editorial – Zomia and beyond. [Special Issue]. *Journal of Global History* 5(2). 187–214.
- Morey, Stephen. 2005. *The Tai languages of Assam - a grammar and texts*. Canberra: Pacific Linguistics.
- Morey, Stephen. 2010. *Turung - a variety of Singpho language spoken in Assam*. Canberra: Pacific Linguistics.
- Morey, Stephen & M. W. Post (eds.). 2008. *North East Indian linguistics* (Vol. 1). New Delhi: Cambridge University Press India.
- Morey, Stephen & M. W. Post (eds.). 2010. *North East Indian linguistics* (Vol. 2). New Delhi: Cambridge University Press India.
- Muysken, Pieter. 2008. *From linguistic areas to areal linguistics*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Nettle, Daniel. 1999. *Linguistic diversity*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Nichols, Johanna. 1992. *Linguistic diversity in space and time*. Chicago: Chicago University Press.
- Nonaka, Angela M. 2004. The forgotten endangered languages: Lessons on the importance of remembering from Thailand's Ban Khor Sign Language. *Language in Society* 33(5). 737–767.
- O'Connor, Richard A. 1995. Agricultural change and ethnic succession in Southeast Asian states: A case for regional anthropology. *The Journal of Asian Studies* 54(4). 968–996.
- Oppenheimer, Stephen. 2011. MtDNA variation and southward Holocene human dispersals within Mainland Southeast Asia. In N.J. Enfield (ed.), *Dynamics of human diversity: The case of mainland Southeast Asia*, 81–108. Canberra: Pacific Linguistics.
- Oxenham, Marc & Nancy Tayles. 2006. *Bioarchaeology of Southeast Asia*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Phattharathanit Srichomthong. 2012. Identity maintenance in Lanna (Northern Thai). *Journal of the Southeast Asian Linguistics Society* 5. 67–84.
- Pittayaporn, Pittayawat. 2009. Proto-Southwestern-Thai: A new reconstruction. *Journal of the Southeast Asian Linguistics Society* 2. 119–143.
- Ploykaew, Pornsawan. 2001. *Samre grammar*. Bangkok: Mahidol University doctoral dissertation.
- Post, Mark W. 2007. *A grammar of Galo*. Melbourne: La Trobe University dissertation.
- Post, Mark W. 2011. Prosody and typological drift in Austroasiatic and Tibeto-Burman: Against “Indosphere” and “Sinosphere”. In S. Srichampa, P. Sidwell & K. J. Gregerson (eds.), *Aus-*

- troasiatic studies: Papers from International Conference on Austroasiatic Linguistics (ICAAAL4)* [Mon-Khmer Studies Special Issue 3], 198–211. Canberra: Pacific Linguistics.
- Ratliff, Martha. 2010. *Hmong-Mien language history*. (Studies in Language Change 8). Canberra: Pacific Linguistics.
- Sagart, Laurent, Roger Blench & A. Sanchez-Mazas (eds.). 2005. *The peopling of East Asia: putting together archaeology, linguistics and genetics*. New York: RoutledgeCurzon.
- Sagart, Laurent. 2011. The Austroasiatics: east to west or west to east? In N.J. Enfield (ed.), *Dynamics of human diversity: The case of mainland Southeast Asia*, 345–359. Canberra: Pacific Linguistics.
- Samarina, Irina. 2011. *Jazyki gelao: Materialy k sopostavitel'nomu slovarju kadajskich jazykov* [Gelao languages: materials for a comparative dictionary of Kadai languages]. Moskva: Academia.
- Scott, James C. 2009. *The art of not being governed: An anarchist history of upland Southeast Asia*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.
- Schendel, Willem van. 2002. Geographies of knowing, geographies of ignorance: jumping scale in Southeast Asia. *Environment and Planning D: Society and Space* 20(6). 647–668.
- Seng Mai, Ma. 2012. *A descriptive grammar of Wa*. Chiang Mai: Payap University MA thesis.
- Shee, Naw Hsar. 2008. *A descriptive grammar of Geba Karen*. Chiang Mai: Payap University MA thesis.
- Shintani, Tadahiko. 2008. *The Palaung language: the comparative lexicon of its southern dialects*. Tokyo: Research Institute for Languages and Cultures of Asia and Africa (ILCCA).
- Shorto, H. L. 1960. Word and syllable pattern in Palaung. *Bulletin of the School of Oriental and African Studies* 23(3), 544–557.
- Shorto, H. L. 2006. *A Mon-Khmer comparative dictionary*. (Edited by Paul Sidwell). Canberra: Pacific Linguistics.
- Sidnell, Jack & Merav Shohet. 2013. The problem of peers in Vietnamese interaction. *Journal of the Royal Anthropological Institute* 19(3). 618–638.
- Sidwell, Paul. 2009. Proto-Mon-Khmer vocalism: Moving on from Shorto's "Alternances." *Journal of the Southeast Asian Linguistics Society* 1. 205–214.
- Sidwell, Paul. 2013. Southeast Asian Mainland: linguistic history. In Peter Bellwood (ed.), *The encyclopedia of global human migration Volume 1: Prehistory*, 259–268. Oxford: Wiley-Blackwell.
- Sidwell, Paul & Roger Blench. 2011. The Austroasiatic Urheimat: the southeastern riverine hypothesis. In N.J. Enfield (ed.), *Dynamics of human diversity: The case of mainland Southeast Asia*, 315–343. Canberra: Pacific Linguistics.
- Simpson, Andrew (ed.). 2007. *Language and national identity in Asia*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Sophana Srichampa. 2008. Patterns of polite expressions in Vietnamese. *The Mon-Khmer Studies Journal* 38. 117–147.
- Srisakorn, Preedaporn. 2008. *So (Thavung) grammar*. Bangkok: Mahidol University dissertation.
- Stolz, Thomas. 2002. No Sprachbund beyond this line! On the age-old discussion of how to define a linguistic area. In Paolo Ramat & Thomas Stolz (eds.), *Mediterranean languages: Paper from the MEDTYP Workshop, Tirrenia, June 2000*, 259–281. Bochum: Universtätsverlag Dr. N. Brockmeyer.
- Sun, Hongkai, & Guangkun Liu. 2009. *A grammar of Anong: Language death under intense contact*. [edited translation and annotation, with the translation, editing, annotation and

- expansion by Graham Thurgood, Fengxiang Li, and Ela Thurgood]. (Languages of the Greater Himalayan Region). Leiden: Brill.
- Suwilai Preamsirat. 1987. *Khmu, a minority language of Thailand*. Canberra: Pacific Linguistics.
- Suwilai Preamsirat. 1998. Language maintenance and language shift in minority languages of Thailand. In Kazuto Matsumura (ed.), *Studies in endangered languages: Papers from the International Symposium on Endangered Languages, Tokyo, November 18-20 1995*, 191–211. Tokyo: Hituzi Syobo.
- Suwilai Preamsirat. 2007. Endangered languages of Thailand. *International Journal of the Sociology of Language* 186. 75-93.
- Suwilai Preamsirat. 2008. Orthography development: A tool for revitalizing and maintaining ethnic minority languages. *Journal of Language and Culture* 26. 18–34.
- Svantesson, Jan-Olof, Raw Kam, Kristina Lindell & Håkan Lundstrom. 2013. *Dictionary of Kam-mu Yuan language and culture*. Honolulu: University of Hawai'i Press.
- Tarling, N. 1993. *The Cambridge history of Southeast Asia: from early times to c. 1800* (Vol. 1). Cambridge University Press.
- Thurgood, Graham. 1998. The development of the Chamic vowel system: the interaction of inheritance and borrowing. In David Thomas (ed.), *Papers in Southeast Asian Linguistics No. 15: Further Chamic Studies*, 61–90. Canberra: Pacific Linguistics.
- Thurgood, Graham. 1999. *From ancient Cham to modern dialects: two thousand years of language contact and change*. Honolulu: University of Hawai'i Press.
- Thurgood, Graham. 2010. Hainan Cham, Anong, and Eastern Cham: Three languages, three social contexts, three patterns of change. *Journal of Language Contact - VARIA* 3. 39–61.
- Thurgood, Graham & Randy J. La Polla. 2003. *The Sino-Tibetan languages*. London: Routledge.
- Thurgood, Graham, Ela Thurgood & Fengxiang Li. 2014. *A grammatical sketch of Hainan Cham: History, contact, and phonology*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Tooley, M. J. & Ian Shennan (eds.). 1987. *Sea level changes*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Umaporn, Sungkaman. 2007. Backchannel response in Mon conversation. *Mon-Khmer Studies* 37. 67–85.
- Vittrant, Alice & Justin Watkins (eds.). forthcoming. *Mainland South East Asia linguistic area: The languages*. Boston & Berlin: De Gruyter.
- Voris, Harold K. 2000. Maps of Pleistocene sea levels in Southeast Asia: Shorelines, river systems and time durations. *Journal of Biogeography* 27(5). 1153–1167.
- Watkins, Justin. 2002. *The phonetics of Wa. Experimental phonetics, phonology, orthography and sociolinguistics*. Canberra: Pacific Linguistics.
- Watkins, Justin (ed.). 2005. *Studies in Burmese linguistics*. Canberra: Pacific Linguistics.
- Watkins, Justin. 2013. *Dictionary of Wa* (2 vols). Leiden: Brill.
- Wayesha, Ahsi James. 2010. *A phonological description of Leinong Naga*. Chiang Mai: Payap University MA thesis.
- White, Joyce C. 2011. Cultural diversity in Mainland Southeast Asia: a view from prehistory. In N.J. Enfield (ed.), *Dynamics of human diversity: The case of mainland Southeast Asia*, 9–46. Canberra: Pacific Linguistics.
- Wnuk, Ewelina. forthcoming. Semantic specificity in verbs of perception in the context of ethnobiology in Maniq. Nijmegen: Radboud University.
- Wnuk, Ewelina & Asifa Majid. 2014. Revisiting the limits of language: The odor lexicon of Maniq. *Cognition* 131(1). 125–138.
- Yip, Moira. 2002. *Tone*. (Cambridge Textbooks in Linguistics). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Yu, Defen. 2007. *Aspects of Lisu phonology and grammar, a language of Southeast Asia*. Canberra: Pacific Linguistics.

