Notes on structural distinctions in Malay dialects

ALEXANDER K. OGOBLIN

ABSTRACT
Some features of phonology, morphophonemics, and morphology are offered, which seem to be useful for classifying Malay dialects on structural basis. Dialectal differences with Standard Malay are illustrated on minor samples of Johor and Kelantan dialects recorded during author’s stay in Malaysia several decades ago.
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This paper contains minor samples of dialogue speech improvised by undergraduate students (about 20 years old) of Johor and Kelantan origin, at the University of Malaya some 40 years ago when I stayed there as a “foreign student”. Transcriptions from tape-recorder were made with their assistance and later used in teaching Malay dialects to students of Saint Petersburg University, along with texts and explanations by other authors, published since pre-www era till now.\(^1\) In comparative analysis of our material the

\(^1\) I am very thankful to Hein Steinhauer for his remarks and corrections on the first version of this paper, still I remain responsible for all its deficiencies.
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main attention is paid to features which seem to be most important for the typological classification of Malay dialects. Some data concerning such features are well established in available publications, meanwhile some other need further research. One may refer to several of comparison parameters between dialects (including close related isolects classified as separate languages) and the standard Malay (SM), Indonesian, and Malaysian, originating from a dialect of Johor-Riau centres of literary activity in the seventeenth-nineteenth centuries, or with the Proto-Malayic language according to its reconstruction in (Adelaar 1994). The following parameters reproduce a part of those presented in the survey (Adelaar 2005), but from somewhat different point of view, without reference to genealogy and inheritance.

I. The extension or shrinking of vowel phoneme inventories. The extremes on scale known about this feature are Kelantan with fifteen vowels, Patani with twelve vowels, and, on the other side, Brunei or Banjar Hulu with only three ([a], [i], [u]) (Abdul H. Mahmood 1994: 10; Chaiyanara 1983: 27; Adelaar 2005: 206, 210-212).

II. The character of word stress. Stress is a subject for special discussion in works on dialects of eastern Indonesia. Their stress is word-bound, distinguishing, for example ba’rat ‘west’ – bara’t ‘heavy’ in Kupang Malay (Steinhauer 1983: 44), compare Van Minde (1997) and Stoel (2005: 12-14). Such descriptions are supplied with examples of stress used in utterances. For western dialects of Sumatra and Malay Peninsula mostly the traditional definition of Malay stress is accepted (explicitly or by default): it falls on the penultimate word syllable unless this syllable contains the [ə] vowel, when the last syllable is the stressed one: [ba`rat] ‘west’ – [bara`t] ‘heavy’. The illustrations are usually words in isolation, without the context. The stress as meant according to this rule is the increased intensity of the syllable, which is in conformity with the nature of stress in Dutch and English.

However, the instrumental investigations of isolated (citational) words in Indonesian by Ludmila Zubkova and Amran Halim show the insignificance of intensity difference between the last and the penultimate syllables (Zubkova 1971; Halim 1974). The European perception of the Malay stress as a dynamic (intensive) one is probably conditioned by the tonal (pitch) contrast between both last syllables as well by the relative short duration of the [ə] vowel. Amran Halim defines Indonesian stress as tono-temporal, so that in his book stress markers denote change of pitch and duration of vowel and fall on the last or the penultimate syllable, the latter including penultima containing [ə]: itu’ ‘this’, saya’ ‘I, me’, sa’kit ‘ill’, be’li [ba’li] ‘to buy’ (Halim 1974: 44). In the description of stress in Indonesian by the present author in Alieva et al.

---

2 The difference of the modern Johor dialect with the traditional Johor-Riau written SM is emphasized in (Ismail Hussein 1973).

3 Compare special marks of highlighting word last syllables in the transcription of Jakarta children’s speech used in Kushartanti et al. (2015) (a syllable is louder, has a lengthened vowel or is sharply changed in pitch).
(1991: 62-64) the concepts of stress potential and of the rhythmic group are introduced, and expressive intonation types are indicated under which the stress shifts to the last word syllable (Alieva et al. 1991: 78-80), as well as the connection of stress with the informational structure (“topic - comment”) of the sentence (in somewhat different terminology). I pursued the intensity stress, in conformity with the stress in Russian (which actually is also the vowel duration). Indeed, such stress in SM is a potential component of intonation, marking rhythmic groups which may correspond to one word or more, so that intonation driven stress placement in most varieties of Malay is evident, with some notable exceptions. The intensity stress potential is not materialized in certain contexts, which allows the drop of the penultimate syllable, as for example in counting: \textit{tu, wa, ga}, for SM \textit{satu, dua, tiga}. Thus the traditional stress rule is cancelled. The word at peak of intensity is often the point of the new information (the comment); in wh-questions the stress would fall on the wh-pronoun. Meanwhile in groups peripheral in relation to the informational structure, the stress would often hit the last word.

Anyway, the stress character is relevant for the dialect classification. In the eastern creolized Malay dialects the final not stressed syllable is weak and drops (as a whole or partially) in words of high frequency: \textit{su < sudah ‘already’, dong < dorang ‘they’} et cetera, in contrast to many western dialects.

III. The syllable structure: C + VC. The feature common for dialects of Sumatra – Malay Peninsula area is a clear division of a word final syllable into consonantal onset and VC rime in analogy on isolects of China and Indochina, so that only the VC as a whole but not its V and C components are fit for comparison with SM and its assumed predecessors, Old Malay and Proto-Malayic. For instance, we cannot give a Minangkabau correspondence of the SM \textit{[u]} in the last closed syllable without mentioning the following consonant, compare SM \textit{[-uŋ]} – MIN \textit{[-uəŋ]}, SM \textit{[-us]} – MIN \textit{[-uyh]} et cetera. Compare Steinhauer (2018 in this volume) on Sungai Penuh Kerinci and the summary of Ernanda’s dissertation on Pondok Tinggi Kerinci (2017).

In Table 1 below the correspondences are presented between SM and Petalangan subdialect in the Riau province of Sumatra, both in Roman graphics, according to the dialect source text (Effendy1997). This edition of an epic narrative is a product of collective memory of several elderly connoisseurs from the local community. The book lacks hints on pronunciation, yet most of its features can be recognized from the spelling used by the editor, Tenas Effendy. In particular, the Petalangan isolect has no consonants corresponding to [h] and [γ]/[R], so \textit{turun, Johor} are spelt \textit{tuun, Jo-ou}.

\footnote{One unexplained exception is the dropping of the last syllable in Minangkabau interrogative pronouns: \textit{a – SM apa ‘what?’, ma – SM mana ‘which?’, sia – SM siapa ‘who?’} et cetera (Moussay 1998: 94).}
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Standard Malay | Petalangan subdialect
---|---
-is: habis, tangis, tulis | -i: abi, tangi, tuli
-ir: pikir, hilir, air | -ei: pikei, ilei, aei
-ih: putih, lebih | -ei: putei, lobei
-it: terbit | -it or -ik: tobit/tobik
-ur: tidur, air liur | -ou: tidou, aei liou
-us: putus, lurus | -ui: putui, luui
-uh: tujuh, tumbuh, penuh, jauh | -ou: tujou, tumbou, ponou, jauou
-a: nama, dua, kita, -nya | -o: namo, duo, kito,-nyo
-ar: benar, belajar, dengar | -e: bone, belaje, donge
-as: atas, luas, upas, emas | -e: ate, luwe, upe, ome
-ap: hadap, lenyap | -ap or -op: adapt, lonyop

Table 1. The correspondences between Standard Malay and Petalangan subdialect in the Riau province.

The final SM [-a] is replaced by [-o] like in Minangkabau and some other Sumatran Malay variants, but “o” also corresponds to the SM [ə]: SM cepat, tempat, entah, beri, dengar became copat, tompat, ontah, boi, donge (one exception is dengan [daŋan] – SM dengan). However, [ə] is retained in pre-penultimate syllables: negoi, tecium, seboang for SM negeri, tercium, seberang (and olau for SM beliau without [b] and [i] which are dropped). The spelling of “e” for [ɛ] and [ə] is the same, but we can identify the latter through its alternation with [u]: tedonge/tudonge for SM terdengar ‘to be heard’.5 The rimes -ak,-at, -am, -an, -ang are the same in SM and Petalangan.

Table 1 is of course no news for linguists working on western Malay dialects.6 The rimes are here only to highlight the historical trend of structural rapprochement in certain of these dialects to the structure of syllabic languages like Chinese, Burmese, or Vietnamese.

IV. The consonantal asymmetry of syllable structure. So in Kelantan the coda consonants are only three: [-ŋ], [-h] and [-ʔ], meanwhile almost all of more than twenty consonants may be the syllable onset. Consonant clusters are allowed at the word beginning (and, what is more, also geminated consonants in Kelantan). Such asymmetry may be labelled left-oriented. The other way round, the syllable end contains affricates, semi-voiced, pre-ploded, prenasalized or other complex consonant kinds in some dialects, not found as the syllable onset (Collins 1987: 39, 40, 48; Nothofer 1997: 32-50). Such asymmetry is right-oriented.

V. The degree of morphological complexity. This parameter may be split into several particular ones: the number of productive affixes, the number of affixal word patterns, the proportion of affixal words in the text, the rules of

5 Such [u] in the pre-penultima is regular in the transcript of another Riau epic text: bunamo = SM bernama, burito = SM berita, see Derks (1994).
6 Compare tables in Asmah (1977: 8-9).
reduplication et cetera. The different genres and styles should be accounted for. For instance, Minangkabau grammar (Moussay 1998) offers a lot of affixal derivation patterns, but they may represent the traditional folk-lore genres, meanwhile in everyday conversation their use is very restricted.

Now let us check in how far these typological parameters are reflected in minor samples of improvised speech. In the following transcript the phonemic signs are used, specifically to which some subphonemic and suprasegmental ones are added.

- slash/divides syntactic rhythmic groups; double slash // marks sentence boundaries; //?/ marks questions;
- [:] marks non-phonemic vowel lengthening, as a compensation of lost coda [-γ]/[-R] or as a part of intonation;
- [^] marks extra-short coda phoneme or its dropping before onset of the following word, compare colloquial Malay compounds keretapi ‘train’< kereta ‘car’ + api ‘fire’, harini ‘to-day’< hari ‘day’ + ini ‘this’.

Vowel nasalization is not marked, except for some words where it is more clearly pronounced. The optional glottal stop on morpheme onset is also omitted.

The language usage in the environment of the campus and of the capital city of Kuala Lumpur has, together with preferences typical for youngsters around the world, left traces in the speech of my informants. It includes English loan-words, in dialogues 1-2 with a tinge of the current student slang, and elements of the creolized “Low Malay” grammar.

Dialogues 1-2

A and B are grown up in Batu Pahat, Johor dialect region. They are used to speak Malay and English (the latter language since their school age), one student can also speak Javanese (A in dialogue 1 and B in dialogue 2).

1

1A. // e: / mãil / kaw datan dâyi mana / mãil //?/
2B. // ah / dγi kampun tadi /anu/ mingu lapas //
3A. // kanapr / balî kampun kô //?/
4B. // sγy / adâ hal pântiŋ a: /ta? pântiŋ / ta? balî? aku //
5A. // adə apa ka? rumah / mãıl //?/
6B. // ah //?/
7A. // kaʔ rumah / adâ^ apa / mãıl //?/
8B. // šuγ / kəjə kawin ni lah //</br>
9A. // šuγ / kəjə kawin // syapə kawin //?/</br>
10B. // ah //?/</br>
11A. // syapə kawin //?/</br>
12B. // bradə gua lah //</br>
13A. // daŋjan ... / daŋjan syapə //?/</br>
14B. // kaw pun ta? kənal / kalaw ku ckap //</br>

Translation

1. Hey, Mail, where have you come from?
2. Ah, just from [my] village, ehm, last week.
3. Why did you go back to [your] village?
4. There was an important issue, really so. I wouldn’t go back, were it not important.
5. What was it about at home, Mail?
6. Eh?
7. At home, what was it about, Mail?
8. Certainly, the wedding feast.
9. (mocking) Certainly, the wedding feast. Who married?
10. Eh?
11. Who married?
12. My brother.
13. With ... with whom?
14. You won’t know [her], even if I tell you.

2

15A. // sairi/kaw kənal ta? buda? tu la //?/</br>
16B. // buda? sekə sanəsta tu //?/ buda? yaŋ mana tu / māil //?/</br>
17A. // tah lah / lup^aku namə dia // timah tu la / pa ləi //</br>
18B. // o: / ti:mah // buda? yaŋ kəciy itu //</br>
19A. // kaw tau γumah diə / ta? //?/</br>
20B. // aku kənal diə / tapi aku ta? tau / γumah diə ka? manə // jauh ah // məmaŋ aku ... //</br>
21A. // jaŋə^na? kəmut soγəŋ //</br>
22B. // ta? ada / aku bətul ni / məmaŋ aku ta? tau rumah diə //</br>
23A. // iyə kə ni ε: //?/

24B. // šuy // aku ta? kəna / aku ta? mau kamu to sorəj ah //

25A. // ai se meme // sianaly skit //

26B. //oke la // kalaw kaw na? tau / dataŋ rumah aku // aku boləh tarəŋ rumah
dia / syapa dia / kaluarga dia// boləh tarəŋ //

27A. // yəka //?/ kaluaŋgə dia bəs ta? //?/

28B. // bəs / oran kayə tu //

29A. // ah //?/

30B. // oran kayə //

31A. // wah / ta? stendə la dəŋan aku //


33A. // kaw jaŋan na? pali aku ula? ah //

34B. // bətul // ini bətul // aku šuy unə // aku ta? bəhör unə orəŋ //

**Translation**

15. Sairi, do you know that girl?

16. A girl from the second semester? Which girl, Mail?

17. No idea. I forgot her name. Timah, what else?

18. Oh, Timah, that little one.

19. Do you know her domicile (literally, her house)?

20. I know her, but I don’t know where is her house. Well far away. I really…

21. Don’t cover up (anyone).

22. Not at all! I tell truth (literally, I am true). I really don’t know her domicile.

23. Is it really so?

24. Exactly. I don’t know. I have no intention to cover up (anyone).

25. I say, man. Have some pity [for me].

26. Okay. If you want to know, come to my place (literally, house). I can clarify [about] her house, who she is, her family. Can clarify.

27. So? (literally, yes?). Is her family of first class?


29. Eh?


32. Eh, no odds. Will be your benefit. [You’ll have] a large house, a lot of money.

33. (You) don’t make fun of me after all.

34. True, it is true. I am sure. I am no deceiver (literally, lying person).
Dialogues 3-4 A and B from Kota Baharu, Kelantan.
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35A. // boleh nañ sbanta //?/
36B. // bole //
37A. // manɔ γumõh ce? osəmẽ, ce?gu bəsə sakɔh mənəŋɔh to waRu //?/
39A. // a //
41A. // trimɔ kasih //

Translation

35. May I ask [a question]?
36. Yes (literally, May) //
37. Where is the house of Mr Osman, headmaster of the high school in Kota Baharu?
38. Oh, Mr Osman. (You) go here, take this road, [go] straight.
39. Well …
40. Then (you) turn to the left. There are two turns there, (you) turn to the left, then (literally, after that you) walk straight here [from here?], to that direction (literally, to there), you [‘ll] see the house, the blue [one], a blue house [with] a metal (literally, iron) fence. That one is his house.
41. Thank you.

4. Shopping

42A. // kain ni byarɔ selɔ //?/
43B. // kain ni selɔ duc γia sətəŋɔh //
44A. // duc γia sətəŋɔh ta? lih kuyè kɔ ?
45B. // duc γia duc lah //
46A. // duc γia duc //
47B. // nɔ? bəγarɔ elɔ tu //?/
48A. // duc elɔ ta? lih kuyè duc γia kɔ //?/ mati duc γia //?/
49B. // hah bole ah lah // nɔ? bəγarɔ elɔ //?/
50A.  // mayi du el //
51B.  // du^ el //?/ oke du c el // gapo lagi no? //?/ kasu? budlo? c //?/
53B.  // kasu? bata //?/ saiz byapo //?/
55B.  // masu? jah satu //
56A.  // saiz byapo //?/
57B.  // saiz pa? oleh ah // eh / pa?//
58A.  // byapo aglo //?/
59B.  // pa? gia samile puloh limo sen //
60A.  // ah / maha go ni eh //
61B.  // kasu? go ni eh tahel yate? / maha //
62A.  // ta? olih kurye ko ni //?/
63B.  // pa? gia satapah boleh ah // gapo lagi no? //?/
64A.  // we / komeno buye ni // buye plastik eh//

Translation

42.  How much is this cloth per meter (literally, per yard)?
43.  This cloth is two and a half dollar (literally, rial) per meter.
44.  Two and a half. Can it be lower?
45.  Two dollars [and] twenty (literally, 2 [cents]).
46.  Two dollars twenty.
47.  How many meter do you want?
48.  Two meter, may it be for two dollars? Two dollars definitely?
49.  Well, OK. How many meter?
50.  Let it be two meter.
51.  Two meter? OK, two meter. Anything more (literally, what more) do you want? Kid shoes?
52.  Uh huh, kid shoes. “Batya” shoes.
53.  “Batya” shoes? What size?
54.  It is for a school kid. [He] has just entered the first class.
55.  Entered the first class …
56.  What is it in size?
May be size four, eh ... four.
What is the price?
Four dollars 95 cents.
Oh, expensive shoes they are.
These shoes are hard-wearing, thus expensive.
Could it be lower?
May be four and a half. Any more you want?
What a beautiful flower. Plastic flower.
This one is three dollars, this one two dollars.

Comments

Some differences attested against SM (which is in usual spelling) in dialects of Johor (1-34) and/or Kelantan (35-65).

Stress as intensity peak and word truncation. Compare II above

Many cases in our samples comply with the traditional rule of stress. The penultimate syllable is the most intensive in kampuŋ (2, 3), baliʔ (4), rumah (5, 7), kawin (8, 9), jauh (20), memaiŋ (20), elɔ (49-51), bata (52-53), satu (54). The deviating case is [bañaʔ] ‘a lot’ (32) where the last syllable [-ñaʔ] seems to be more expressive and energetic than the preceding [ba-]. However, the same kind of syllables may be dropped in other contexts. Some words show alternation of bi- and monosyllables. In short forms ni, tu of demonstrative pronouns ini, itu the deictic component is weak, so that they mostly feature as markers of phrase boundaries.

```
SM boleh ‘can, may’ > lih (44, 48)
SM darjah ‘class’ > jah (54, 55)
SM kota ‘town’ > tɔ (35)
SM apa ‘what’ > pə (17), and apa (5, 7, 32)
SM harga ‘price’ > gɔ (60-61) and aγɔ (58)
SM ini ‘this’ > ni (6, 22-23, 54, 60-62, 64-65),
SM itu ‘that’ > tu (15-17, 40, 47), and ini (34, 38), itu (18, 32, 38)
```

The last syllable stress in words with the penultimate [a] also complies with the traditional stress definition: lapas (2), pɔntiŋ (4), bɔsa(:) (32, 37), mɔnagɔ (37), bɔsi (40), sɔtɔŋ (43-44, 63).

Monosyllabic words, apart from interjections, question tags and particles (eh, ah, a), include some monosyllabic loan-words which are stressed: sen ‘cent’, bes ‘first class’, streʔ ‘straight’; the loan-word šuŋ ‘really, in fact, certainly’ is also like an interjection. Besides, there are monosyllables resulting from dropping
the penultimate so that only the last syllable remains. The dropped syllable may contain the [ə] vowel as well as another vowel. The remaining syllable is stressed or not. The former mostly occurs in words with the penultimate [ə], the latter otherwise. One exception is the preposition kaʔ ‘in, at’ (5, 7), unstressed, produced by conversion from an adjective containing the penultimate [ə].

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{SM dekat ‘near, close’} & \quad \rightarrow \quad \text{kaʔ ‘in, at’ (5,7)} \\
\text{SM empat ‘four’} & \quad \rightarrow \quad \text{paʔ (57, 59)} \\
\text{SM entah} & \quad \rightarrow \quad \text{tah ‘no idea; I don’t know’ (17)} \\
\text{SM lapas ‘after’} & \quad \rightarrow \quad \text{pah (40)}
\end{align*}
\]

Reduction or dropping of the penultimate vowel is attested in the Johor sample only.

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{SM dari} & \quad \rightarrow \quad \text{d’yi ‘from’ (2)} \\
\text{SM lagI} & \quad \rightarrow \quad \text{li (17, compare on [-g-] below)} \\
\text{SM cakap ‘say’} & \quad \rightarrow \quad \text{ckap (14)}
\end{align*}
\]

In one word the second syllable and the [ə] vowel of the first are dropped:

\[
\text{SM sedikit ‘a bit, a little’} \quad \rightarrow \quad \text{skit (25, the [s] is palatalized)}
\]

There are other ways of shortening words in our samples not connected with the stress. Most of the following comments concern well-known items.

**Trisyllable > bisyllable**

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{SM Fatimah (female name)} & \quad \rightarrow \quad \text{timah (17, 18)} \\
\text{SM kasihan ‘have pity’} & \quad \rightarrow \quad \text{siŋ (25)}
\end{align*}
\]

**Dropping the onset consonant**

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{SM pulas ‘more; again’} & \quad \rightarrow \quad \text{ulaʔ (33)} \\
\text{SM punya (genitive postposition)} & \quad \rightarrow \quad \text{uʔa (34)} \\
\text{SM boleh ‘can, may’} & \quad \rightarrow \quad \text{oleh (57), oϊh (62)}^7
\end{align*}
\]

---

^7 Compare the same in Minangkabau (Moussay 1998: 210).
**Dropping intervocalic [-g-]**

SM [-g-] > [-Ø-]:

\[
\text{lagi ‘else; more; again’} > l\text{i} (17)
\]

Compare *lai* (idem) in Minangkabau, particles *juga – jua ‘too, also; even’ in SM, and Kedah *pi < SM pergi ‘go’. Not attested in the Kelantan sample: *lagi ‘more’ (51, 63), compare Abdul H. Mahmood (1994: 109), SM *pergi ‘go’ > gi (38).**

**Reduction or dropping of the coda vowel**

Attested before the initial vowel of the following word, in both samples.

\[
\text{SM *ada apa ‘what is the matter?’} > ad^s\text{: apə (5)}
\]

\[
\text{SM *lupa aku ‘I forgot’} > lupa^\text{: akə (17)}
\]

\[
\text{SM *dua ela ‘two meters’} > du^\text{: elə (51)}
\]

**The consonant [γ], [R] or [r] (less frequent) of SM**

It is mostly pronounced as postalveolar trill [r] by A in dialogue 1 and B in dialogue 2, probably due to his Javanese speech practice. The [r] in (41) may be imitating the language standard (as well as the coda [-ə] in [trimə kasih]). The well-known dropping of the coda [-γ] / [R] is present in almost all cases. Compare IV above.

\[
\text{SM [-γ]} > [-Ø]:
\]

\[
\text{besar ‘big’} > bəsə: (32), bəsə (37)
\]

\[
\text{sebentar ‘for a moment’} > sbəntə (35)
\]

\[
\text{pagar ‘fence’} > pəgə (40)
\]

In the pre-consonant position (in the penultimate syllable) there is a difference: [γ] is dropped or retained: SM *kerja ‘feast’ > kəjə (9), SM *harga ‘price’ > aγə (58), maybe by accident, usually it is followed by epenthetic [ə], as in SM *bekerja > bəkəγə (Abdul H. Mahmood 1994: 109).**

**The coda consonant [-l]**

Normally dropped in Kelantan samples, in Johor only once. Two specific correspondences are SM *kecil ‘small’ > kəciy (18). SM *ambil ‘take’ > ambe? (38). Similar variants (*ambiʔ, kəciʔ*) are known in various other dialects.

comel ‘beautiful’ > com (64)
konal ‘know’ > kønal (14, 15, 20) and køna (24)
mahal ‘expensive’ > maha (60-61)
rial ‘dollar, ringgit’ > γia (43-46, 58, 63, 65)

The coda [-t]

SM [-t] > [-ʔ]:
duit ‘money’ > duiʔ (32)
kasut ‘shoes’ > kasuʔ (51-53)
straight > streʔ (idem) (38, 40)

The syllable: onset and rime. Compare III above

SM -ak, -ah > -ʔ, -h in the Kelantan samples:
budak ‘kid’ > buʔə (51-52, 54)
nampak ‘to see’ > napʔə (40)
rumah ‘house’ > γumʔə (37, 40)
sekolah ‘school’ > sakəlʔə (37)
menengah ‘middle; secondary (school)’ > monəŋəh (37)

SM -an, -ang > Kelantan [-ɛ]
Osman > osənɛ (37. 38)
kurang > kuγɛ (44, 48. 62)
tahan > tahɛ (61)

In the Johor dialect this feature is not evident. Still we can remember
the spelling before the reform of 1972 in Malaysia, where some last syllable
letters “i” and “u” of the present SM were “e” resp. “o”: maseh ‘still’, kampong
‘village’, umor ‘age’. These “e” and “o” probably reflected the allophonic
lowering of the high vowels [i], [u] or, what is less probable, the raising of
the mid vowels [ɛ], [ɔ], so not separate phonemes, since the Johor dialect as
well as SM is considered to have only one level of mid-vowels, meanwhile the
Kelantan dialect has two levels, high-mid and low-mid. Thus the phonemic transcription [kampuŋ] (2, 3) is preferable.

Next to nothing is to tell about morphology, compare point V above. Both dialects use the prefix (or the proclitic) [sə/-s-] ‘one’ in [sətəŋɔ] ‘(one) half’ (43, 44), [soγəŋ] ‘someone’ (21, 24). In Kelantan dialogue 3 the verbal N-prefix is used comparable to SM meN-, in [ŋaŋɔ] (35) ‘ask’, obviously from N- + [taŋɔ] ‘question’. Dialogue 2 contains root verb [taraŋ] (26) ‘to explain, clarify’ instead the affixal verb in SM (menerangkan, with the active voice prefix meN- and the transitive suffix -kan). The Kelantan speaker B in dialogue 3 uses the loan-word [kɔna] (40) as the noun ‘corner’ and the verb ‘to turn’ without changing its outward form. On the whole the word-isolating technique predominates in samples of both dialects.

To conclude, it seems that such as in the above examples are a suitable tool for highlighting dialectal differences. Compare Michael C. Ewing (2018 in this volume). The typological comparison of dialects must continue handling other issues not touched upon here, in particular, trying to find correlations between different strata of the language structural hierarchy.

For instance, there may exist interconnection between the volume of vowel systems with their phonemic and prosodic oppositions on the one hand and the degree of morphologic complexity on the other. SM has lost a part of the Old Malay morphology but has acquired two mid vowels as an addition to four vowels of the latter. Kelantan and Patani dialects have lost the most part of affixes present in SM and show much further proliferation of vowels. Vice versa, the Brunei dialect has developed complication of morphology, combining two transitive suffixes in the same verb along with shrinking of the vowel inventory up to three phonemes, the schwa (e-pepet) vowel being lost. The research in this direction cannot be restricted by simplistic observations, it has to take into account social functions, contact situations and speech genres differentiation of dialects, all of which is beyond the reach of these notes.
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However, there is a prerequisite for creating two mid vowel levels through dropping of [ŋ] in such words as for example SM pasir ‘sand’ vs leher ‘neck’ and triggering the emergence of opposition between high-mid [e] and low-mid [ɛ] (similarly on back rounded vowels, as in tidur and Johor). This issue needs investigation.

The active voice prefix is also absent in verbs [kəmut] (21, 24) ‘to cover up’ and [pɔli] (33) ‘to make fun, mock’ (should be transitive ones), whose equivalents I can’t find in normative Malaysian dictionaries.


