Periphrastic causative constructions in Patani Malay

Jakrabhop IAMDANUSH and Pittayawat PITTAYAPORN
Chulalongkorn University
jakrabhop@gmail.com, Pittayawat.P@chula.ac.th

This paper discusses periphrastic causative constructions in Patani Malay, which is a Malay dialect spoken in Thailand’s Deep South. The result shows that Patani Malay has three types of periphrastic causative constructions, namely waʔ‘do’ construction, wi ‘give’ construction and waʔwi construction. Compared to Indonesian, Malaysian Colloquial Malay and Eastern Malay varieties, the constructions in Patani Malay are quite different from those in its sister languages, but they are more similar to the ‘Thai tham ʻdoʼ, haj ʻgiveʼ and tham haj’ constructions with respect to the choice of causative verbs, syntax and semantics. Given the history of the Patani Malay language and its speakers, the similarity between periphrastic causative constructions in Patani Malay and Thai is likely to be a result of long-term asymmetrical language contact, as Thai has been and is still the more prominent language in the area.

1. Introduction

Although Malay is one of the best-studied Austronesian languages, some of its varieties have not been sufficiently investigated. Among the least understood dialects is Patani Malay (PM) spoken in the four southernmost provinces of Thailand, namely Pattani, Yala, Narathiwat and part of Songkhla. Genetically, it is closely related to Kelantan and other Malay dialects spoken in north-eastern peninsular Malaysia.

Being on the margin of the Austronesian world, the dialect finds itself in a unique contact situation on the Southeast Asian Mainland. While most Malay varieties have come in contact with other Austronesian languages, the languages of European colonists and the languages of later migrants, PM has been influenced by Thai, a member of the Tai branch of Kra-Dai, formerly known as the Tai-Kadai family, since at least the 16th century. Though not as isolating as its Chamic cousins in Central Vietnam and Southern China, it shows many features typical of Mainland languages but is uncommon among its agglutinative sisters in Insular Southeast Asia, e.g. 8-way contrast in the vowel system (compared to typical 5- or 6-way contrast in other Malay dialects), aspiration contrast in voiceless stops, monosyllabicity and less use of affixation (Smalley 1994:172; Uthai 1993; Uthai 2011). PM is especially similar to Thai in its syntactic structure. The syntactic similarity is most clearly observed in the morpheme-by-morpheme correspondence between PM and Thai sentences as illustrated by the examples in PM (1a) and in Thai (1b) compared to its Standard Malay equivalent in (2).

---

1 An earlier version of this paper was presented at the 23rd Annual Meeting of Southeast Asian Linguistics Society held at Chulalongkorn University in May 2013. This paper is a part of the first author’s dissertation entitled “Causative constructions in Mainland Austronesian languages spoken in Southern Thailand” with financial support from the Ratchadaphiseksomphot Endowment Fund of Chulalongkorn University (RES560530179-HS).

2 The term Patani Malay is used here instead of Pattani Malay which is found in many scholarly works (e.g. Smalley 1994), as the term Patani refers to an ancient Malay state including the whole Patani Malay-speaking area, while the term Pattani refers to a province in southern Thailand which is only a part of the Malay-speaking area in Thailand.
(1) a. \(ж \) \(ad\) \(ан\)\(ж\) \(ду\)\(э\)
3SG have child male two CLF

‘He has two sons.’

(adapted from Mana 1979)

(2) Dia ada dua orang anak lelaki.
3SG have two CLF child male

‘He has two sons.’

While the numeral and classifier precede the noun phrase in the Standard Malay example,\(^3\) they follow it in the PM and Thai sentences. This syntactic resemblance makes PM an important case study of language contact in which a language is shifting its typological characteristics to fit the structural profile common in the linguistic area.

Among the isolating features that PM has adopted, the periphrastic causative construction illustrated by (3) is particularly revealing. First of all, it differs from the same construction in other Malay varieties with respect to the etymological origins of the causative verbs. Although it seems like all Malay varieties introduce causative clauses with markers developed from verbs meaning ‘do’ and ‘give’, causative verbs in each variety originated from different verb forms in the proto-language. This suggests that periphrastic causative constructions in PM may be an innovation unique to the language. Data regarding the periphrastic causative construction in some Malay varieties is available, as well as data from other languages of the area. This allows for a systematic comparison between PM and other languages, including the dominant language of the area, Thai.

(3) a. \(ж\) \(в\)\(а\)\(г\) \(ад\) \(ги\) \(т\)\(и\)\(ж\)
3SG CAUS younger.sibling cry

‘He made the brother cried.’

b. \(ж\) \(в\) \(э\)\(д\) \(г\)\(и\) \(к\)\(о\)\(н\)
3SG CAUS younger.sibling go market

‘He made the brother go to the market.’

c. \(ж\) \(в\)\(н\)\(н\) \(э\)\(д\) \(м\)\(у\)\(р\)
3SG CAUS younger.sibling angry

‘He made the brother angry.’

This paper argues that periphrastic causative constructions in PM are more similar to the correspondent constructions in Thai than to those in its sister languages due to interference from Thai caused by language contact. After giving a brief historical background of the Malay-speaking area (section 2), it provides general information about causative construction (section 3). An explanation of PM periphrastic causative constructions based on fieldwork data collected by the first author and additional data from various sources, such as grammatical descriptions, textbooks for non-native speakers and phrasebooks can be found in section 4. Most importantly, the paper compares the PM constructions to their correspondents in Thai and other varieties of

\(^3\) Although one may argue that post-nominal numerals and classifiers also exist in Standard Malay, it is likely to be caused by influence from non-standard variants and clearly marked in comparison with pre-nominal ones.
Malay (section 5), showing that the constructions in PM are more similar to those in Thai than to those in its sister languages. The conclusion (section 6) is given at the end.

2. Historical background of the Patani Malay-speaking area

To understand the PM periphrastic construction from a contact perspective, it is necessary to take into account the history of its speakers. Unfortunately, few works dedicated specifically to Patani history are available, the best known being Syukri (1985). Therefore, this brief historical introduction is based mainly on Andaya & Andaya’s (2001) work on the history of Malaysia and Wyatt’s (2004) work on the history of Thailand. Information from non-historical works, such as Smalley (1994), Uthai (2011) and Denudom (2013) is also included.

The current PM-speaking area was once a small but flourishing trading state that descended from ancient Indianised kingdoms that emerged in the first millennium. In the 16th century, under the rule of the Inland dynasty, the kingdom became a vassal state of Siam (Thailand), but still retained a high degree of autonomy. The relationship between Patani and Siam during this period was largely turbulent as attested to by the number of wars fought during the 17th and 18th centuries. After the foundation of Bangkok, the newly established Chakri dynasty of Siam asked for tributes and obeisance from the northern Malay states. Patani refused and was invaded by Siamese troops. As a consequence, Patani was divided into seven smaller vassal states under the control of Songkhla, then a city firmly under Siamese suzerainty.

In the late 19th and early 20th centuries Bangkok started to take full control of its vassal states. In 1906, the seven states were merged into a single administrative unit called Monthon Pattani administered by a commissioner appointed by Bangkok. Later, the system was abolished, and the monthon was divided into four PM-speaking changwat, namely Pattani, Yala, Narathiwat and part of Songkhla. Since the introduction of these reforms, people in the area have suffered from centralization policies, especially under the rule of King Vajiravudh (1910–1925) and Field Marshal Plaek (1938–1944), during which assimilation based on nationalist ideology was attempted. Although compulsion from the Siamese/Thai government might have caused many ethnic groups to assimilate, PM speakers have successfully retained their ethnic identity.

Despite the tremulous political relationship between Patani and Siam/Thailand, historical sources seem to suggest that the migration of Tai speakers into the current PM-speaking area started in the 16th century. According to Hikayat Patani, sixty prisoners (of unknown origin, but possibly non-Tai-speaking) from Pegu (Bago, in current Burma) and one hundred prisoners from Lan Xang (roughly present-day Lao PDR and northeastern Thailand), possibly Tai-speaking, were given to King Mudhaffar Syah of the Inland dynasty as gifts during his visit to Ayutthaya before the second siege of Ayutthaya by Bayinnaung (a Burmese king) in 1564 (Teeuw & Wyatt 1970:81, 157). In addition, Thai chronicles also record a migration of approximately five hundred families from Songkhla, Phatthalung and Chana to Patani after the sultanate was broken down into the seven vassal states (Prachum phongsawadan1914:5; Suthasat 1976:120).

As well as these pre-modern migrations, Tai speakers have moved into the area in recent decades. During Field Marshal Sarit’s regime (1959–1963), the Bangkok

---

4 Tai refers to the language family as a whole, while Thai is reserved for the language or people of Thailand.
government started a forced migration of about 200,000 ethnic Lao\(^5\) from north-eastern provinces to the three southern provinces through the “Self Developing Community” programme. Approximately 100,000 more people also migrated into the area in 1970s (Denudom 2013:28–29).

As a result of the political history mentioned above, the present-day PM-speaking area is a multilingual society. Not only are Thai and PM spoken, a number of Muslims from other ethnic groups such as Arabs and Pakistanis have also lived there for centuries (Joll 2012). Similar to other Malay states of Malaysia, the Chinese form an important part of the population. Although the Thai language has been gaining prominence due to the spread of education and the role of the mass media, PM is still spoken by the majority of the population as part of their ethnic maintenance. Compared to other minority groups of Thailand, PM ethnicity is still relatively strong.

According to the latest (2010) census (National Statistical Office 2012d), 1,467,369 people aged five and over countrywide were listed as using Malay/Yawi\(^6\) as their home language. In the three provinces alone,\(^7\) there are 1,365,452 PM speakers (National Statistical Office 2012a, 2012b, 2012c). However, language shift among PM speakers has been reported especially in urban areas. As most Muslims in the area are ethnic Malay, the existence of non-Malay-speaking Muslims suggests that a language shift is currently taking place. Figure 1 shows that the percentage of Malay speakers has always been lower than the percentage of Muslim in the area. One interpretation is that a significant portion of the non-Malay speaking Muslims have shifted to the Thai language. However, the ratio has not changed in a decade, with 96.47% of PM-speaking Muslim in 2000 compared with 96.08% in 2010. This suggests that though a language shift has occurred, it has not increased as the percentage of PM speakers has not decreased. Therefore, PM is still in a healthy condition.

Like most ethnolinguistic minorities in Thailand, these PM speakers are bi- or multilingual. They use PM among themselves and use Thai, the official language and lingua franca of the country, to communicate with people from other ethnic groups.\(^8\) However, younger generations and some older people are reported to use their language less but speak a mixture of PM and Thai increasingly. Revealingly, these bilingual speakers also exclusively use Thai among ethnic Malays in certain situations, especially outside the home or the village and when speaking on topics relating to the outside world (Salaemae 2000; Masor 2012). In summary, most PM speakers use more than one language in their daily life.

---

\(^5\) Lao is a close relative of Thai, spoken roughly in the area of former Lan Xang.

\(^6\) In Thai, this word, pronounced /jaːˈwiː/, is one of the terms referring to the PM dialect, but in Malay the term *Jawi*, pronounced /ɟawi/, actually refers to the Arabic-based script used for writing Malay prior to the arrival of the Malaysian and Indonesian Latin-based writing system.

\(^7\) The census does not provide data of each amphoe in Songkhla province, four of which are PM-speaking areas. Therefore, only data from the three provinces are included here.

\(^8\) In the past, as PM speakers were (and still are) the majority of the area, many ethnic Thai and Chinese were able to speak Patani Malay. Nowadays, although older Thai and Chinese are still able to communicate in the language, the younger generation solely uses Thai.
3. Causative construction

The causative construction has been studied for decades from various perspectives. However, previous studies do not agree on the exact definition of the construction. This paper adopts Song’s (2013) definition of the causative construction as a linguistic expression referring to a macro-situation consisting of two micro-situations, namely causing and caused events. A causing event is carried out by a causer. And the caused event is carried out by a causee as a result of the causer's action. An example of a causative construction is illustrated in (4).

(4) Mary made John apologise for what he had said.

In this sentence, Mary’s action is the causing event, and the apologising is the caused event. Mary is the causer, as she is an agent of the causing event. Similarly, John is considered the causee, as he is the agent of the caused event. Note that it is unknown what action Mary takes exactly to make John apologise, as this paper discusses only periphrastic causative construction where the causing event is not clearly specified.

Pioneering works on causative constructions (e.g. Nedjalkov & Sil’nickij 1969a cited in Kulikov & Sumbatova 1993; Comrie 1985) classify causative constructions by morphological criteria into three types: lexical, morphological and syntactic (or periphrastic) causatives. A lexical causative is the use of different verbs to denote a causative event, e.g. to die and to kill, as killing someone is causing someone to die. In many languages, labile verbs, which can be both intransitive and transitive (with causative meaning), e.g. to break, are also counted as lexical causatives. Lexical causatives are characteristically unpredictable and unproductive. In contrast, a morphological causative is the derivation of causative verbs by means of morphological processes usually affixation, e.g. öl ‘die’ and öl-dür ‘kill’ in Turkish. Lastly, a syntactic causative is the use of separate verbs to denote the causing event and the caused event.

---

9 The raw numbers of speakers from both censuses are not comparable statistically, as in 2000 census the data were collected from speakers aged five and above, while in 2010 census, numbers of speakers below age of five are also collected.
However, a syntactic causative can also be classified into two types depending on the number of clauses in the sentence, i.e. monoclausal (nonperiphrastic) and biclausal (periphrastic). In monoclausal or nonperiphrastic causative, the verb denoting caused event immediately follows the causative marker. While in biclausal or periphrastic causatives, noun denoting causee immediately follows the causative verb. The following examples in Spanish exhibit both types of syntactic causative.

(5)  
\begin{enumerate}
  \item \textit{María hizo salir a Pedro.}  
  María make.PST.PFV.IND.3SG go.out-INF to Pedro  
  ‘María made Pedro leave.’
  
  \item \textit{María hizo que Pedro salga.}  
  María make.PST.PFV.IND.3SG that Pedro go.out-PRS.SBJV.3SG  
  ‘María made Pedro leave.’  
\end{enumerate}  
(adapted from Rangponsumrit 2005:95)

While in (5a) \textit{salir} in its infinitive form follows \textit{hizo} immediately and forms a single clause, (5b) is biclausal since the verbs \textit{hizo} and \textit{salga} have different subjects. It is the latter type as in (4) and (5b) that is the subject of this paper.

A sizeable body of literature on causative constructions (including the work mentioned above and Talmy 1976; Dixon 2000; Shibatani & Pardeshi 2002) focuses on the relation between forms and meaning. According to these works, many parameters seem to determine the type of linguistic forms denoting different causative events. These include properties of verbs (e.g. transitivity and lexical meaning of verbs) and the nature of an event (e.g. directness of the causing event, intention of the causer, control over the caused event by the causee, etc.). Following this tradition, this paper analyses the periphrastic causative constructions in PM, in terms of how the semantic properties of different causative events affect the linguistic expressions that speakers use.

4. Patani Malay periphrastic causative constructions

Although there is no previous work focusing on periphrastic causative constructions in PM, many works on the language mention the topic. In her thesis on the grammar of PM based on a dialect of Taba village on the Kolok (Golok) river in Narathiwat province, Doomkum (1984:136) states that there are three causative verbs in the dialect, namely \textit{buwaʔ} (the word \textit{waʔ} is used in this paper) ‘do’, \textit{bui} (or \textit{wi}) ‘give’ and \textit{buwaʔ bui} (\textit{waʔ wi}). These verbs are consistent with the typological survey by Heine & Kuteva (2002) which claims that causative markers can develop from lexical verbs meaning ‘do’, ‘give’ and ‘take’ through grammaticalisation. Similarly, Uthai (1993:112) states that, although the use of the prefix \textit{pəɣ-} (cognate to Standard Malay \textit{per-}) and the use of initial gemination are found as means of deriving causatives, the causative verb \textit{waʔ wi} is also used in the language.

The syntax of all the constructions in PM is identical. The causer (X) is the first element of the construction. It is followed by the causative verb (V\textsubscript{CAUS}). The second clause begins with the causee (Y) which is followed by the verb denoting the caused event (V). This [X V\textsubscript{CAUS} Y V] pattern is illustrated by (3).

The primary data used in the current analysis are elicited from native PM speakers aged 20–30 from the three PM-speaking provinces in Southern Thailand. Additional data from existing materials include academic works, textbooks and phrasebooks. Therefore, the data is a fair representative of PM spoken by various generations of speakers and different speech registers.
Note that causation can also be expressed in PM using verbs with lexical meaning to denote more concretely what the causer does, as in the following examples. However, this type of expression is not considered a causative construction here according to Song’s (2013) definition adopted here.

(6) əpah əbuh buwi mass
after.that boil PURP cooked
‘Then boil (fish balls) until cooked.’ (adapted from Pannara 1994:358)

(7) ule hido? kənɔ basoh buwi cuci
vegetable live must wash PURP clean
‘Fresh vegetables must be washed clean.’ (adapted from Intarachat 1984:97)

In (6) which is explaining how to cook a certain food, the fish balls must be cooked by boiling. And in (7) which is a suggestion from doctor, fresh vegetables must be cleaned by washing before consuming. However, as the causing event is already expressed using an ungrammaticalised verb, the morpheme wi (buwi) here is used to denote purpose, i.e. boiling is done to make fish balls cooked and washing is done to make vegetable cleaned respectively.

4.1 waʔ ‘do’ construction

The first periphrastic causative construction in PM is the waʔ construction. The causative verb waʔ is sometimes pronounced as buwaʔ, which looks more similar to its cognate buat in Standard Malay. They both mean ‘do’ and can be traced back to Proto-Austronesian (Wolff’s *búsat ‘do, make’; Blust’s *buhat ‘do, make’ and Dempwolff’s *bu’at ‘do, create’ (Wolff 2010:789)). Examples of this construction are given below.

(8) adɔ s-ʌYe waʔ pasu jatoh
have INDF-man CAUS vase fall
‘Someone caused the vase to fall.’

(9) sah waʔ kıtɔ yusin
Sah CAUS 1SG sad
‘Sah made me sad.’ (Doomkum 1984:137)

The two examples above show the semantics of this construction. The causers of both sentences are animate, while the causees can be either animate or inanimate. And although it cannot be understood from the examples without knowing the context of the events, the causers in both examples do not have an intention to make the events occur. Moreover, the causees in both examples lack control over the caused events, i.e. the vase in (8) cannot control its falling and “me” in (9) cannot control the sadness that was caused by Sah. The following example is ungrammatical as the causer is inanimate. Compare to example (8) above.

(10) *aŋin waʔ pasu jatoh
wind CAUS vase fall

4.2 wi ‘give’ construction

The second construction is the wi construction. The causative verb wi is sometimes pronounced as w:i (with a long initial or geminate consonant possibly due to word shortening) or buwi. It is possibly cognate to beri ‘give’ in Standard Malay, as the pair is similar to many other cognate pairs, e.g. w:apɔ–berapa ‘how much, how many’,
w:aniŋ–berani ‘brave’, etc. The proto forms of the causative verb are Wolff’s *beyay ‘give’, Blust’s *beRAY ‘give’ and Dempwolf’s *bayaj ‘give’ (Wolff 2010:762). Examples of the wi construction are as follows:

(11) allah wi krəbe anɔ? jo tu la namɔ ismɔʔe
    Allah CAUS sacrifice child 3SG DEF EMPH name Ismail
    ‘Allah has (Ibrahim) sacrifice the son of him named Ismail.’

(12) kalu nɔʔ wi ambɔ tulos apɔ kɔjaʔ buleh
    if FUT CAUS 1SG help what tell can
    ‘If you want me to help, you can tell.’ (Phasa Malayu 2008)

Doomkum (1984:136) states that the causative verb wi is used when a causer makes a command. Thus the causer must be animate, as supported by the examples above. Both Allah and the listener in (12) are animate entities. Moreover, those who do as commanded must also be animate, as Ibrahim in (11) and “me” in (12) are in the examples. And as they are commands, the causers certainly have the intention to command. Lastly, both Ibrahim and “me” have control over their action, i.e. Ibrahim can control or choose whether he will sacrifice his son or not, and the “me” can also choose to help or not to help. The following examples are ungrammatical, as in (13) the cause is inanimate and in (14) the causee cannot control the caused event.

(13) *adɔ s-ye wi pasu jatoh
    have INDF-man CAUS vase fall

(14) *sah wi kitɔ yusig
    Sah CAUS 1SG sad

Although it is not of concern within the scope of this research, it should be noted that this construction has more than one reading. The first reading is as mentioned above, while in the other reading, example (11) may mean Allah allowed Ibrahim to sacrifice his son in a permissive sense, especially when the example is heard with no context given. The following example also has two readings.

(15) pɔʔ wi kitɔ jadi sɔdadu
    father give 1SG become policeman

  a. ‘Father had me be a policeman.’
  b. ‘Father let me be a policeman.’ (Doomkum 1984:187)

In example (15a), the father forced or commanded his child to be a policeman, while in example (15b) the child wanted to be a policeman and the father allowed him/her to do so.

4.3 waʔwi construction

Unlike the previous two constructions, the causative verb waʔwi in this construction is bimorphemic, i.e. consists of the morphemes waʔ ‘do’ and wi ‘give’. Examples of this construction are as below.

(16) aniqiŋ waʔwi yumɔh puŋɔh
    wind CAUS house collapse
    ‘The storm made the house collapsed.’
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(17) \( jɔ \ waʔwi \ tali \ putuh \)
3SG CAUS rope tear
‘He made the rope torn (intentionally).’

(18) \( jɔ \ waʔwi \ sayemadu \ jatoh \ bowoh \ solego? \)
3SG CAUS beehive fall down disperse
‘The dog made the beehive fall dispersedly (by shaking).’

(19) \( jɔ \ waʔwi \ pɔʔ \ te \ adeʔ? \)
3SG CAUS father hit younger.sibling
‘He caused father to hit younger sibling.’

While the previous two constructions have restrictions on the animacy of the causer, as the causer must be animate in both constructions, this construction allows for both animate causers as in (17), (18) and (19) and inanimate ones as in (16). Also, the causee in this construction can be animate as in (19) or inanimate as in (16), (17) and (18), unlike the \( wi \) construction, in which only animate causees are allowed. Causers may either have intention as in (17) and (18) or not have one as in (16) and (19). And lastly, causees may either have control over caused events as in (19) or not have one as in (16), (17) and (18). This is consistent with Doomkum (1984:136) who states that this construction is found denoting general causation other than causation that can be expressed by the previous constructions.

The semantics of the three constructions can be summarised as in the table below.

**Table 1. Semantics of periphrastic causative constructions in Patani Malay**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Animate causer</th>
<th>Animate causee</th>
<th>Intention of causer</th>
<th>Control of causee</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>( waʔ ) construction</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>±</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( wi ) construction</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( waʔwi ) construction</td>
<td>±</td>
<td>±</td>
<td>±</td>
<td>±</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

From the information in Table 1 above, it seems that the \( waʔwi \) construction can be used to denote every causative event. From the data collected by asking informants to perform grammatical judgement, the causative verbs \( waʔ \) and \( waʔwi \) can occur in identical contexts but seem to convey different meanings, as in the examples below.

(20) \( mohamaʔ \ waʔ \ khədijəh \ tijʔ? \)
Mohammad CAUS Khadijah cry
‘Mohammad made Khadijah cry.’
(21) mohamaʔ waʔwi khɔdijoh tijɔʔ
Mohammad CAUS Khadijah cry
‘Mohammad (intentionally?) made Khadijah cry.’

From the four parameters used in this analysis, only the intention of the causer can differentiate between these two examples, as the agents of both clauses are obviously animate entities and the event of “crying” cannot be controlled. While in example (20), the causer has no intention, the causer in (21) has intention to do the causing event, i.e. Mohammad does something intentionally to make Khadijah cry.

Although the causative verbs waʔ and waʔwi can occur in identical contexts, the causative verbs wi and waʔwi are not likely to occur in identical contexts, as shown by the examples below.

(22) mɔʔ wi adeʔ tubeʔ gi bɔli baye
     mother CAUS younger.sibling leave go buy thing
     ‘Mother made younger sibling go out to buy something.’

(23) ?mɔʔ waʔwi adeʔ tubeʔ gi bɔli baye
     mother CAUS younger.sibling leave go buy thing

While example (22) is certainly grammatical, example (23) is counted as ungrammatical by some informants, but just “strange” by others. As with the comparison between (20) and (21) above, the only parameter among those used here that is different in (22) and (23) is the intention of the causer, since both causer and causee are animate and the causee can obviously control his/her action. However, there may be other parameters, such as volition of the causee, that can distinguish between these constructions in similar contexts. But as this kind of waʔwi construction never occurs outside an elicitation session, the question cannot currently be answered.

5. Patani Malay periphrastic causative constructions as a result of contact

The three periphrastic causative constructions in PM are revealing from the point of view of language contact. Its analytical nature strongly suggests a drift from the agglutinating to the isolating type. While Malay varieties such as Indonesian and Standard Malaysian make greater use of morphological causatives, PM predominantly uses periphrastic constructions to convey causative meaning. This is similar to its Thai neighbour. More importantly, the PM system as a whole is likely to appear more Thai than Malay. More specifically, the PM periphrastic causative constructions depart from the correspondents in their Malay sisters with respect to etymological origins of causative verbs, word order, and meaning of causative verbs.

5.1 Comparison with other Malay varieties

A considerable amount of work has been done on causative constructions in Malay varieties but unfortunately little focuses on periphrastic causative constructions or provides a sufficiently detailed description for comparative study. Therefore, the discussion in this paper is severely restricted. However, a preliminary comparison suggests that the periphrastic causative constructions in other Malay varieties differ markedly from PM.

Indonesian, the official language of Indonesia, is perhaps the best-studied of Malay varieties as evidenced by the data and description available. Winarti (2009), whose work focuses on morphological causative constructions and the membuat ‘do’ periphrastic causative construction, states that three verbs in Indonesian are used as
causative verbs, namely *membuat* ‘do’, *membikin* ‘do’ and *menyebabkan* ‘cause’. Unfortunately, to the best of our knowledge, no discussion of the latter two is available. Therefore, only the *membuat* construction is compared to the PM *waʔ* construction in this paper.

The causative verb *membuat* is an inherited Proto-Austronesian word and a cognate to the PM *waʔ*. It is the most common causative verb used in Indonesian periphrastic causatives. In addition to the shared etymology, the ‘do’ constructions in the two languages also have the same word order. Sentences (24) and (25) illustrate the pattern \([X V_{CAUS} Y V]\) of the Indonesian *membuat* construction which is similar to one in PM.

(24) *Angin kencang membuat daun pepohonan rontok.*
\[
\begin{array}{llll}
\text{wind} & \text{strong} & \text{CAUS} & \text{leaf} \ \text{tree} \ \text{fall} \\
\end{array}
\]
‘A strong wind made the leaves of the trees fall off.’

(SEAlang Library http:// sealang.net/indonesia/bitext.htm)

(25) *Ali membuat orang itu datang.*
\[
\begin{array}{llll}
\text{Ali} & \text{CAUS} & \text{man} & \text{DEF} \ \text{come} \\
\end{array}
\]
‘Ali made the man come.’

(Arka 1993:1)

Despite the superficial similarity in form, the semantics of the *membuat* construction is markedly different from that of the *waʔ* construction in PM. In particular, the causer of the *membuat* construction can be either animate or inanimate, unlike PM, which restricts the causers of the *waʔ* construction to animate nouns. While Ali in (25) is animate, the wind in (24) is inanimate. This contrasts with the corresponding construction in PM, in which the causer must be animate.

Furthermore, the ‘do’ constructions in the two languages also differ with respect to the control of the causee. To illustrate, the man in (25) does have control over the caused event, while the causee in the *waʔ* construction in PM does not have control. In summary, the *membuat* construction seems to denote general causation, while the meaning of the *waʔ* construction is more specific. Table 2 is a comparison between the *waʔ* construction in PM and the *membuat* construction in Indonesian.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Animate causer</th>
<th>Animate causee</th>
<th>Intention of causer</th>
<th>Control of causee</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PM <em>waʔ</em> construction</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>±</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indonesian <em>membuat</em> construction</td>
<td>±</td>
<td>±</td>
<td>±</td>
<td>±</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In addition to the *membuat* construction in Indonesian, Malaysian Colloquial Malay, more often referred to simply as Colloquial Malay, is another Malay variety that uses superficially similar syntactic constructions that are semantically quite different from
their PM correspondents. The language is defined as the non-regional Malay variety spoken in everyday life among ethnic Malays in Malaysia (Koh 1990). Koh (1990:175–176) mentions two causative verbs that are used in the constructions in this variety of Malay, namely kasi ‘give’ and bagi ‘give, allow’. Both forms are not cognates to any of the PM causative verbs and cannot be reconstructed in Proto-Austronesian (Wolff 2010). With respect to word order, Malaysian Colloquial Malay shows a [X V\textsubscript{CAUS} V Y] pattern as illustrated in (26) and (27). Therefore, the constructions in both languages may have developed separately.

(26) ... gua mau kasi lupa itu sedih-sedih punya cerita  
1SG want \textsubscript{CAUS} forget that sad POSS story  
‘... I wanted to (make myself) forget those really sad stories.’ 
(adapted from Koh 1990:175)

(27) Saja nak bagi nampak baik sikit.  
only want \textsubscript{CAUS} see good little  
‘(I) just wanted to look nice.’ 
(Koh 1990:176)

While in PM the pattern is [X V\textsubscript{CAUS} Y V], the pattern of the construction in Malaysian Colloquial Malay is different, i.e. the verb denoting the causing event is immediately followed by the verb denoting the caused event in both kasi and bagi constructions. However, the causees are omitted in examples (26) and (27) above. Therefore, it cannot be said with certainty where actually the nouns denoting the causee should be.

Koh (1990:175–176) reports that the kasi construction occurs often with non-stative verbs, while the verb denoting the caused event in the bagi construction may be stative. The distinction between the constructions in Malaysian Colloquial Malay is quite different from the distinction between PM constructions, as in PM, where the semantic properties of the verb, such as stativity or transitivity, are not crucial parameters.

As shown by the comparison with the Malay varieties just mentioned, PM is clearly different with respect to the form and meaning of its periphrastic causative constructions. An interesting observation is that neither Indonesian nor Malaysian Colloquial Malay uses a bimorphemic causative verb similar to the PM \textit{waʔwi}. Only some dialects spoken in Peninsular Malaysia have been reported to use a bimorphemic causative verb \textit{buat bagi} ‘do-give’ (Foong-Ha Yap, p.c.). Unfortunately, no description of this construction is available. Note that these dialects are geographically adjacent to Malaysia and very close to the Thai border. In summary, the periphrastic causative constructions seem to set PM apart from other Malay varieties further away from the Southeast Asian mainland.

Apart from the two Malay varieties spoken in the western part of the Malay world just discussed, a group of Malay varieties known collectively as Eastern Malay dialects included in this discussion are Manado Malay, North Moluccan Malay, Ambon Malay, Kupang Malay, Larantuka Malay, Ternate Malay and Papuan Malay, which are contact varieties developed as a result of Malay’s role as lingua franca throughout the archipelago (Paauw 2008). These varieties rely largely on the use of auxiliaries or verbs when expressing causation. They use verbs which are cognates to Standard Malay \textit{bikin} ‘make’ and \textit{kasi} ‘give’ as causative auxiliaries/verbs. The examples below show use of cognates of \textit{bikin} in (28) and of \textit{kasi} in (29) in Eastern Malay varieties.
(28) a. Manado Malay

Dia so bek ing bodok pa torang
3SG ASP CAUS stupid at 1PL
‘He made a fool of us.’
(adapted from Stoel 2005:34, 2.34 cited in Paauw 2008:226)

b. North Moluccan Malay

Satu saat ada bik in rame.
one time ASP CAUS merry
‘One time (they) were making merry.’
(adapted from Voorhoeve 1983:10, Text IV cited in Paauw 2008:227)

c. Ambon Malay

Dolo orang tatu a dong i tu mau bik in bodo ana-ana itu...
before people old 3PL DEM want CAUS stupid child~PL DEM
‘In the old days, parents liked to fool their children…’
(adapted from Paauw 2008:227)

d. Kupang Malay

Dong bek in mati tikus pake batu.
3PL CAUS die mouse use stone
‘They killed the mouse with stone.’
(Jacob & C. Grimes 2007:4 cited in Paauw 2008:228)

e. Ternate Malay

baru ngana bikini dabu-dabu manta...
then 2SG CAUS spicy.condiment raw
‘And then you make a raw spicy sauce.’
(adapted from Litamahuputty 2012:119)

f. Papuan Malay

yo, dong dua deng Wili tu bikini puseing mama
yes 3PL two with Wili D.DIST CAUS be.dizzy/confused mother
‘Yes! He and Wili there worried their mother.’
(adapted from Kluge 2014:235)

(29) a. Manado Malay

Untung le ngana da kase inga pa kita
luck DP 2SG ASP CAUS remember at 1SG
‘He made a fool of us.’
(adapted from Stoel 2005:34, 2.34 cited in Paauw 2008:226)

b. North Moluccan Malay

Tərəs si paitua ini tərəs kasi tau bilang sama si laki itu.
then ADD old.man DEM directly CAUS know say to ADD man DEM
‘Then the old man told that man strightaway.’
(adapted from Voorhoeve 1983:9, Text IV cited in Paauw 2008:226)
c. Ambon Malay

*Lalu antua kasi pulang kembali itu anak.*

‘Then she returned the children to their homes.’

(adapted from Paauw 2008:227)

d. Kupang Malay

*Andia ko sampe di Kupang, dapa kasi barana Yeni dan Febi.*

‘After arriving in Kupang, we were given two more children, Yeni and Febi.’

(adapted from Paauw 2008:228)

e. Ternate Malay

*kita kase nae barang, …*

1SG CAUS go.up thing

‘I loaded the goods, …’

(adapted from Litamahuputty 2012:121)

f. Papuan Malay

*ko kasi sembu sa punya ana ini*

2SG CAUS be.healed 1SG POSS child D.PROX

‘You healed this child of mine!’

(adapted from Kluge 2014:234)

Although the examples above show the use of syntax to denote causation, the *bikin* and *kasi* constructions are different from the PM ones in many aspects. First, all the examples are in \[X \text{ V CAUS V Y}\] pattern, unlike PM \[X \text{ V CAUS Y V}\]. Second, although it is not discussed in the sources, the semantics of the constructions seems to be different from the corresponding constructions in PM. In the *bikin* construction, the unintentionality restriction is not applied as suggested in (28), compared to the *waʔ* construction in PM in which the causer does not intend to perform the causing event. Moreover, in the \[X \text{ kasi V Y}\] construction the causee does not have control over the caused event as in (29), in contrast to the *wi* construction in PM. Some of the causees, such as in (29e), are even inanimate. Lastly, the auxiliaries in the Eastern Malay varieties are also not cognates of causative verbs in PM. The difference just mentioned is that the causative auxiliaries/verbs in Eastern Malay varieties and PM represent separate development.

An interesting case is Larantuka Malay, which, unlike other Eastern Malay varieties, uses a verb *bua* ‘make’, possibly cognate to *buat* in Standard Malay, as causative auxiliary/verb. Although the causative auxiliary is from the same etymological sources as PM *waʔ*, the pattern is still \[X \text{ V}_{\text{CAUS}} \text{ V Y}\] which is not the same pattern as in PM. The grammaticalisation of *buat* as the causative markers in PM and Larantuka Malay thus seems to be a parallel innovation.

(30) *Kita ni kua, kita ni bisa bua rubo poN–poN kaju.*

1SG DEM strong 1SG DEM can CAUS fall.down tree-PL wood

‘I am strong, I can make trees fall down.’

(adapted from Paaauw 2008:229)

However, there are also Eastern Malay varieties that use the pattern \[X \text{ V}_{\text{CAUS}} \text{ Y V}\] similar to PM. The example (31) in Ternate Malay and (32) in Papuan Malay below illustrate such a pattern.
(31) **paitua kase paitua pe kaka sana di Tobelo pegang pulo itu.**
old.man give old.man POSS older.sibling there in Tobelo hold island that

‘He let his older brother in Tobelo manage the island.’
(adapted from Litamahuputty 2012:123)

(32) a. **kalo de minta kesembuang, setan kasi de sembu**
if 3SG ask recovery evil.spirit give 3SG be.healed

‘When he/she asks for recovery, the evil spirit has her healed.’
(adapted from Kluge 2014:458)

b. **de pu swami biking de sakti hati to?**
3SG POSS husband make 3SG be.sick liver right?

‘Her husband made her feel miserable, right?’ (Kluge 2014:458)

Although the examples (31) and (32) above show a pattern similar to PM, their semantics are rather different. The example (31) in Ternate Malay, unlike the *wi* construction in PM which can be read either as causative or permissive senses as in (15), can be only read with a permissive sense, i.e. it can only mean ‘He let his older brother in Tobelo manage the island’, not ‘He had his older brother in Tobelo manage the island’. In Papuan Malay, although Kluge does not provide an explanation for the examples (32), it is still obvious that the construction is different from the PM one in terms of the etymological origin of causative verbs and the semantics of the constructions. The caused events, i.e. being sick and being healed, cannot be controlled by the causees. And as in most Eastern Malay varieties, the causative verbs are not cognates to ones in PM. This superficial similarity does not indicate a shared historical development between PM and Ternate or Papuan Malay.

To summarise, the similarity, i.e. employing the syntactic domain to denote causation, between Eastern Malay dialects and PM is superficial and common among many other languages. Moreover, the etymological origins of most of the causative auxiliaries/verbs, syntactic patterns and semantics of the constructions are different and show nothing in common. The so-called similarity, therefore, is not due to the fact that the languages are related, but parallel development in each language.

5.2 **Comparison with Thai**

An explanation for the divergence of periphrastic causative constructions in PM from other Malay varieties is possibly language contact. When compared to causative constructions in Thai, the three PM periphrastic causative constructions show striking similarities to Thai constructions marked by causative verbs that have been grammaticalised from semantically-equivalent morphemes.

Pothipath (1999) identifies three periphrastic causative constructions in Thai, namely *tham*¹ ‘do’, *haj*³ ‘give’ and *tham’haj*³ constructions. The causative verbs correspond to *wa*, *wi*, and *wa?wi* in PM respectively. This striking correspondence is suggestive of a Thai influence on PM. More importantly, the word orders and meanings of corresponding constructions are too similar to be due to chance. With respect to word order, Thai shares with PM the [X *V*<sub>CAUS</sub> Y V] pattern as illustrated in (33). The similarity, however, is not clear evidence for Thai influence because it can be argued to be a universal tendency. More specifically, Durie (1997) points out that when a language employs the syntactic domain to express causation, there are only two patterns available either monoclausal [X *V*<sub>CAUS</sub> Y Y] or biclasusal [X *V*<sub>CAUS</sub> Y V].
(33) *khwaːm rak  tham haj thon taː bɔːt
love CAUS  human blind

‘Love makes us blind.’

More conclusive evidence comes from the semantics. The three constructions in Thai are restricted by the animacy of the causer, the animacy of the causee, the intention of the causer, and the control of causee, exactly like PM. The first periphrastic causative construction to be discussed is the tham construction, exemplified in (34) and (35).

(34) khaw tham ke:w te:k
3SG CAUS glass break

‘He broke the glass.’

(35) khaw tham chan tok naːm
3SG CAUS 1SG fall water

‘He caused me to fall into water.’

Sentences (34) and (35) above are semantically similar to (8) with the animate causers having no intention to cause the caused events and with the causees having no control over the caused events. Sentences (36) and (37) are ungrammatical because in (36) the floor is inanimate and because the causee has control over the caused event in (37).

(36) *phwːn luːn tham chan tok naːm
floor slippery CAUS 1SG fall water

(37) *khaw tham chanʔaːn naŋ sɯː5
3SG CAUS 1SG read book

The second periphrastic causative construction is the haj ‘give’ construction, which consists of two types. In the first type, illustrated by (38), the mother as the causer is animate and has an intention to make the causee go to the market. In addition, the causee is also animate and has control over the caused event, i.e. going.

Example (39) is ungrammatical because the causee does not have control over the falling into the water. This restriction is similar to the PM wi construction in (11) and (12).

(38) meː3 haj nɔːŋ paj talaː2
mother CAUS younger.sibling go market

‘The mother told younger sibling to go to market.’

(39) *khaw haj nɔːŋ tok naːm
3SG CAUS younger.sibling fall water

The second type of haj construction is further classified into three types according to the meaning of the verbs. However, they will be discussed here as a single type as they are still similar according to the parameters used here. The construction is as in the following example.

---

10 Pothipath (1999) distinguishes altogether five types of the ‘give’ construction but three of them are not periphrastic causative construction according to the definition adopted in this paper. Pothipath’s third type seems to have a permissive rather than causative meaning. As for the fourth and the fifth types, they occur without causer and occur with the particle kɔː ‘then, so’, respectively.
This type is different from the first type as the robot is inanimate. Therefore, it also does not have control over the caused event.

The last periphrastic causative construction in Thai is the \textit{tham}^{1} \textit{haj}^{3} construction. It differs from the other two by being unmarked with respect to animacy, intention and control as illustrated in the following examples.

(41) \textit{naːj}^{1} \textit{thanaː}^{1} \textit{khaːn}^{1} \textit{jaj}^{2} \textit{phuː}^{3} \textit{niː}^{4} \textit{ʔeːŋ}^{1} \textit{thiː}^{3} \textit{tham}^{1} \textit{haj}^{3}

\textit{banker} \phantom{.} \textit{great CLF} \phantom{.} \textit{this} \phantom{.} \textit{EMPH REL} \phantom{.} \textit{CAUS}

\textit{thanaː}^{1} \textit{khaːn}^{1} \textit{kasi}^{1} \textit{ʔ}^{1} \textit{k}^{1} \textit{ɔːn}^{1} \textit{thaj}^{1} \textit{pen}^{1} \textit{keː}^{1} \textit{loː}^{1} \textit{riː}^{3} \textit{jaj}^{1}

\textit{kasikorn.bank} \phantom{.} \textit{become} \phantom{.} \textit{gallery} \phantom{.} \textit{big}

'It is this important banker that made Kasikorn Bank into a big gallery.'

(adapted from Pothipath 1999:78)

(42) \textit{khwaːm}^{1} \textit{rak}^{4} \textit{tham}^{1} \textit{haj}^{3} \textit{chan}^{5} \textit{miː}^{1} \textit{lom}^{1} \textit{haːj}^{5} \textit{caj}^{1}

\textit{love} \phantom{.} \textit{CAUS} \phantom{.} \textit{1SG} \phantom{.} \textit{have} \phantom{.} \textit{breath}

'Love makes me continue breathing.'

(43) \textit{chan}^{5} \textit{khoŋ}^{1} \textit{maj}^{3} \textit{ʔaːt}^{2} \textit{tham}^{1} \textit{haj}^{3} \textit{th}^{1} \textit{ɤː}^{1} \textit{plian}^{2} \textit{caj}^{1}

\textit{1SG} \phantom{.} \textit{CONJC NEG POT} \phantom{.} \textit{CAUS} \phantom{.} \textit{2SG} \phantom{.} \textit{change mind}

'I may not be able to make you change your mind.'

The examples above show that in the \textit{tham}^{1} \textit{haj}^{3} construction the semantic restrictions associated with the other constructions do not apply. The causers, i.e. the banker in (41), love in (42) and “I” in (43) and the causees, i.e. Kasikorn Bank in (41), the world in (42) and “you” in (43), can be either animate or inanimate. Furthermore, the causer may have intention as in (41) and (43), or have no intention as in (42). Moreover, the causees may have control over the caused event as in (43) or may not have such control as in (41) and (42). The construction is extremely similar, if not identical, to the \textit{waʔwi} construction in PM.

The semantics of periphrastic causative constructions in Thai and in PM is compared in the Table 3.

The similarity between the periphrastic causative constructions in these two languages is thus too striking to be due to chance but must be explained as a result of language contact. This interpretation is consistent with the asymmetrical contact situation PM speakers find themselves in. PM and Thai have been spoken in adjacent and overlapping areas for centuries. And as the PM-speaking area has been under Siamese/Thai control, PM speakers are bilinguals using PM among people of the same ethnic group and using Thai with people of other ethnic groups. Moreover, PM speakers are exposed to Thai in many aspects of their lives, such as formal education and the mass media. In contrast, Thai speakers in the area, especially of recent generations, can pass a day without knowing a single word of PM. Therefore, the fact that PM sides with Thai rather than its Malay sisters is most likely a result of interference from the dominant Thai language.
Table 3. Comparison of periphrastic causative constructions in Patani Malay and Thai

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Animate causer</th>
<th>Animate causee</th>
<th>Intention of causee</th>
<th>Control of causee</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PM waʔ construction</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>±</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thai tham' construction</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>±</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PM wi construction</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thai haj' construction\textsubscript{1}</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thai haj' construction\textsubscript{2}</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PM waʔwi construction</td>
<td>±</td>
<td>±</td>
<td>±</td>
<td>±</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thai tham’haj’ construction</td>
<td>±</td>
<td>±</td>
<td>±</td>
<td>±</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6. Conclusion

From the data and discussion above, it can be seen that PM is more similar to its Mainland neighbour than to its Insular relatives and that the periphrastic causative constructions in PM and Thai are very similar in terms of both syntax and semantics, while the PM constructions are quite different to corresponding constructions in the other Malay varieties, such as Indonesian, Malaysian Colloquial Malay and Eastern Malay dialects. This similarity may be due to the convergence of PM toward Thai caused by the asymmetrical language contact that have existed in the history of the PM-speaking area. However, more studies need to be done in order to gain a more complete understanding. For a more complete picture, more comprehensive data on this construction in PM is needed. Moreover, data from people of different generations and linguistic repertoires may also show changes and variation brought by the progression of the language toward the Mainland Southeast Asian model. Moreover, to discuss the language contact phenomenon in general, other aspects of the language, such as other constructions, may also need to be investigated in order to clarify the effects of interference from other languages on PM.
Abbreviations

1  first person  LOC  locative
2  second person  PERM  permissive
3  third person  PL  plural
ADD  address  POT  potential
ASP  aspect  PRS  present
CAUS  causative  PURP  purposive
CLF  classifier  FUT  future
CONJC  conjectural  INDF  indefinite
D  deictic  NEG  negative
DEF  definite  PFV  perfective
DEM  demonstrative  POSS  possessive
DIST  distal  PROX  proximate
DP  discourse particle  PST  past
EMPH  emphatic  SBJV  subjunctive
F  female  SG  singular
IND  indicative
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