

## LEXICAL CORRESPONDENCE BETWEEN MALAY AND VIETNAMESE

*(KESAMAAN LEKSIKAL ANTARA BAHASA MELAYU DAN  
BAHASA VIETNAM)*

Tran Thuy Anh, Mai Ngoc Chu, Abdul Latif Hj. Samian  
& Mohamad Zain Musa

### Abstract

---

There have been a number of research works on the relationship between Vietnamese and Malay, no agreement on this relation has been reached. Malay is one member of Western Indonesian language branch, sharing the same origin with Cham (mainland Austronesian language group). Meanwhile, Vietnamese belongs to Mon-Khmer language branch of Austro-Asiatic family, which distributes all over Vietnam around mainland Austro-Asiatic languages. There are currently two major ideas about the relation between Vietnamese and Malay: a) They have the same origin; b) They have contact with and borrow from each other. In general, Malay words corresponding to those in Vietnamese might be divided into two main categories: the first one is temporarily called "The inherent mutual base from the ancient time" and the second one is "The adoption of cultural word class in certain historical periods." The loan words can be identified easily in terms of lexical semantics when absolute correspondence is found in their meanings. Some words may have different meanings in two languages but they belong to the same semantic domain. Building an inventory table for the lexical correspondence between Malay and Vietnamese is not only important for lexicological research but also helps clarify the true nature of this relationship. Is it a relation of origin or one of contact? If it is contact, what are the cultural inferences from their linguistic similarity? Conversely, if it is origin, how close are they in their kinship?

---

**Keywords:** *lexical, correspondence, language, Austronesian, Mon - Khmer*

### Abstrak

---

Terdapat beberapa kerja penyelidikan mengenai hubungan antara Vietnam dan Melayu, tidak ada persetujuan mengenai hubungan ini telah dicapai. Bahasa Melayu adalah salah satu cabang bahasa Indonesia Barat, berkongsi asal yang sama dengan Cham ( tanah besar kumpulan bahasa Austronesia ). Sementara itu, Vietnam tergolong dalam cabang bahasa Mon-Khmer dari keluarga Austro-Asiatik, yang mengedarkan seluruh Vietnam di sekitar tanah besar bahasa Austro-Asiatik. Pada masa ini terdapat dua idea utama mengenai hubungan antara Vietnam dan Melayu: a) Mereka mempunyai asal yang sama; b) Mereka mempunyai hubungan dengan dan meminjam antara satu sama lain. Secara umum, kata-kata korespondensi dengan kata - kata Vietnam mungkin dibahagikan kepada dua kategori utama yang pertama dipanggil sementara sebagai "asal yang saling melekat dari zaman kuno" dan yang kedua adalah "Pengangkatan kelas kata

budaya dalam tempoh sejarah tertentu”. Kata pinjaman boleh dikenal pasti dengan mudah dari segi semantik leksikal apabila korespondensi mutlak didapati dalam makna mereka. Beberapa perkataan mungkin mempunyai makna yang berbeza dalam dua bahasa tetapi mereka tergolong dalam domain semantik yang sama. Membina jadual inventori untuk korespondensi leksikal antara bahasa Melayu dan Vietnam bukan sahaja penting untuk penyelidikan leksikologi tetapi juga membantu memperjelaskan sifat sebenar hubungan ini. Adakah hubungan asal atau hubungannya? Kalau hubungannya, apakah kesimpulan kebudayaan dari persamaan linguistik mereka? Sebaliknya, jika ia berasal, berapa dekatnya mereka dalam persaudaraan mereka?

---

***Kata kunci:*** leksikal, persamaan, bahasa, Austronesian, Mon - Khmer

## POSITION OF MALAY AND VIETNAMESE IN REGIONAL LANGUAGE SYSTEM

### Position of Malay in Regional Language System

In their own points of view, Malaysian linguists posit that most Asian languages belong to Austric phylum which is divided into three major families deriving from the same ancient root, namely:

- a) Austro-Asiatic family consisting of Nicobarese, Mon-Khmer, Munda, Vietnamese, etc;
- b) Sino-Tibetan family consisting of Chinese, Tibeto, Burman, etc;
- c) Austronesian family consisting of languages from Southeast Asia islands and peninsulas.

Austronesian family itself is divided into four major branches:

- a) Nusantara branch (aka Western Indonesia) consisting of 200-300 languages in which the most widely-spoken languages are Melayu, Jawa, Aceh, Bali, Taglog, Brugi, Timor, Malgah, Palau. Languages belonging to this branch in Indochina are Cham, Jarai, Ede, Raglai, and Churu in Vietnam.
- b) Melanesian branch consisting of Fiji, Sa'a, etc. used in Solomon, Guinea, Vanuatu, Samoa, Tonga.
- c) Micronesian branch consisting of Chamorro, Truk, Marshall, etc. used in Caroline Islands.
- d) Polynesian branch consisting of Samoa and Maori used in New Zealand.

Malay is included in Nusantara branch (Western Indonesia) and is among the most important languages of this branch (Mukhtarudin Mohd. Dain 1992). According to Vietnamese linguists, Sino-Tibetan, Austro-Asiatic and Austronesian are three distinctive language phyla, not three families in Austric phylum. However, whether they are believed to be 3 phyla or 3 groups, Austronesian phylum/family remains the one (phylum/group) with the highest number of languages. Austronesian languages are widely spoken not only in Southeast Asian islands but also mainland Southeast Asia.

Within Vietnamese border particularly and Indochina generally, Austronesian languages distribute patchily along with Mon-Khmer languages. The ethnic groups of Austronesian phylum scatter along areas of South Truong Son – Central Highlands and a narrow strip of coastal area in Central Vietnam. Austronesian languages in these areas are combined into one single group called languages of Cham family, aka Austronesian-mainland Southeast Asian family. There are five languages in this family:

- a) Cham language distributing in South Central Vietnam, Southwest Vietnam (with the population of around 100,000) and Cambodia.

- b) Jarai language of Jarai people in Gia Lai, Kon Tum and Dak Lak provinces: “Jarai” means “waterfall”. It is possible that these people used to reside in areas abundant with rivers and streams (such as Ia Yun, Ia Ly, Ia Pa, etc.). Jarai language is a major language in Vietnam’s Cham family with about 419,000 current users. Jarai language is divided into smaller languages in accordance with residing areas such as Jarai Chor, Jarai Hdrung, Jarai Arap, Jarai Mthur, Jarai Pleiku and Jarai Tbulan.
- c) Raglai language of Raglai people with four residential areas namely North Raglai, South Raglai, Raglai Cakja and Rai scattering along Binh Thuan, Ninh Thuan provinces or Central Highlands with around 122,200 speakers. Raglai people claim themselves to be “orang glai” which means “people living in forest”, differentiating themselves from Austronesian people living in coastal areas which are called “orang laut”.
- d) Ede language of Ede people (aka Rade) distributing mainly in Dak Lak, Khanh Hoa, Phu Yen and Gia Lai provinces with approximately 331,100 speakers. Ede’s residential area is abundant with streams and bamboo forests; hence, they claim themselves to be “orang Ede” with “ede” meaning “bamboo”.
- e) Churu language of Churu people distributing mainly in Lam Dong province with about 19,300 speakers. They claim themselves to be “orang Cru” with “cru” meaning “occupying new land”.

Although those above five languages have their own writing systems (either ancient scripts or Latinized ones), they are vastly different in terms of range of use and social functions, depending on the position and significance of the language itself within the community. Particularly Ede language has a certain social importance as it is considered a local common language (after Vietnamese) in Dak Lak province.

Though belonging to the same phylum, Austronesian languages in Vietnam and those in other Southeast Asian island countries have evolved in two distinctive directions. Austronesian languages in Vietnam, having been surrounded by and contacting with isolating-monosyllabic languages, have been evolving towards these isolating-monosyllabic ones; while Austronesian languages in island countries, Malay for instance, have developed affixes and become agglutinating, polysyllabic languages. Pham Duc Duong (1983) have proposed a hypothesis on this issue: prehistoric Southeast Asian languages had undergone a period of changes in their morphological systems, which resulted in their division into various streams. One of the most significant changes regarding morphology is the change in affixes towards two opposite directions: either eliminating affixes or developing them. Island Southeast Asian languages, due to their contact with Oceanic languages, developed affixes towards a new direction and became non-inflectional agglutinating polysyllabic languages under the name Austronesian family. On the contrary, the elimination of affixes to become isolating, monosyllabic languages occurred in Austro-Asiatic and Kam Tai families (Phạm Đức Dương 1983).

The classification of origin of Southeast Asian languages is a long-established practice; and it has still been debated until now. In 1906, Wilhelm Schmidt proposed a theory of an Austric language family which included Austro-Asiatic and Austronesia languages based on a comparison of 215 words between some languages of the two language groups (the concept of language group used by W. Schmidt is similar to the current concept of language family). According to Schmidt, Austro-Asiatic language family includes Mon-Khmer, Vietnamese and some other languages. Austronesia or Malayo-Polynesian language family includes Kadai, Indonesian. Schmidt claims that Austro-Asiatic language family and Austronesian language family share one morphological similarity that is affixation which includes prefixes and infixes.

The relationship between Malay and Vietnamese is nothing other than the relationship between Austronesian and Austro-Asiatic. According to Schmidt, Austronesian and Austro-Asiatic belong to the same Austric phylum, i.e. the same root. Until now it has not yet been agreed on the relationship between Austronesian and Austro-Asiatic languages in general, between Vietnamese and Malay in particular. Nevertheless, Vietnamese and Malay have had some relationships for long.

## Position of Vietnamese among Regional Languages

In the past, there were discussions on the origin of Vietnamese. In 1838, L. Taberd in his dictionary mistook that Vietnamese was a branch of the Sino language. His opinion was then opposed by many and has been neglected until now. Besides Taberd's, there are other agreeable opinions.

### Including Vietnamese in Tai Family

According to H. Maspero's idea in 1912, Vietnamese was included in Tai family. This idea remained influential over a relatively long period of time. Even W. Schmidt, though positing that Vietnamese belonged to Mon-Khmer family in 1905, also placed Vietnamese in Tai family in his 1926's research under H. Maspero's impact. According to H. Maspero, "Pre-Annamese (Vietnamese) evolved from a mixture of Mon-Khmer dialects, a Tai dialect and probably another unknown language, then Annamese borrowed a great number of Sino words. The language which exerted decisive impacts on the formation of modern Annamese as it is now, in my view, must definitely be a Tai language; therefore, Annamese should be grouped in Tai family" (Haudricour 1953).

H. Maspero (1912), a famous Orientalist, presented his own views on the origin of Vietnamese "*Étude sur la phonétique historique de la langue annamite : les initiales (Studies in Annamese historical phonetics: initial consonants)*". Regarding lexicology, obviously a lot of Vietnamese basic words have a close relationship with Mon-Khmer ones. H. Maspero pointed out that "it is an undeniable truth that there are a lot of Annamese words not only deriving from Mon-Khmer but also used the most, for instance, the counting system." Moreover, Vietnamese shares a lot of similar word classes with languages in Mon-Khmer branch such as Ba Na, Stieng, Rngao, etc. However, when comparing Vietnamese lexical items with languages in Tai family such as Siam (Thailand), Laotian, Black Tai, White Tai, Tho, Ahom, Shan and Ddoi, all of them somehow have words deriving from Tai. For example, "đồng" (Vietnamese) and "dunz" (Tai); "bè" (Vietnamese) and "be" (Tai), etc. Hence, solely basing on lexicology, we cannot conclude that Vietnamese is a language originating from Mon-Khmer family or Tai languages. Regarding grammar, particularly morphology, Vietnamese is closer to Tai because both languages are isolating ones whose syllable boundaries coincide with morpheme boundaries. On the contrary, Mon-Khmer has a system of prefix and infix to create derivatives and various parts of speech. For example:

	Vietnamese		Mon – Khmer	
	prefix	infix		rhyme
sửng	s-	n	eng	sneng (Bana)
xông	s-	r	ong	srong (Bana)

(We use the term *prefix* to indicate a supplementary morpheme preceding a root in a stem, which can be separated from a lexeme and can function in word formation. Infix is an affix locating between two stems, acting as a connector between two stems or between a root and a suffix).

Following are correspondences in Vietnamese and Mon-Khmer:

Vietnamese	Mon – Khmer
Kày [kày]	ang kal [ang kal](Khmer)
Rúi [rúi]	chomreah [chom –reah](Khmer)

Affixes do not exist in Vietnamese, Muong nor Tai languages. In terms of initial consonant clusters, there exist clusters with –r, –l in Vietnamese and Muong language like those in Tai, but there are no diverse combinations as those in Mon-Khmer (Haudricourt 1954). Vietnamese and Muong languages share a critically significant characteristic of having tones, which are similar to many Tai-like features. To arrive at that judgment, Maspero based himself on the following three reasons:

- a) The tone system is a component which is attached to typical features of a language family for possessing regular correspondence of tones among languages of the same family, such as among Tai or Sino dialects.
- b) When a language with no tones borrowed words from a tonal language, the tone(s) was/were not borrowed, such as Khmer words borrowed by Siamese language.
- c) The correlation among tones and initial sounds is similar in Vietnamese and Tai. This allows for a distinction between a series of high initial sounds (aspirated and fricative), which exerts no impact on tones, and plosive (voiceless), unaspirated sounds of the medium initial consonants.
- d) Using the above grounds, H. Maspero declares that Vietnamese must belong to Tai rather than Mon-Khmer language family, which has no tone at all.

### Vietnamese Is Considered An Austro-Asiatic Language

Continuous efforts of A.G. Haudricourt in the articles entitled *Position of Vietnamese Language in the Austro-Asiatic Language Family* (1953) and *Origins of Vietnamese Tones* (1954) have persuaded others that Vietnamese belongs to Austro-Asiatic family. This is also a theory that was recognized by James Logan in the middle of the 19<sup>th</sup> century. What was coined Mon-Annam by Logan in 1852 was called Mon-Khmer or Austro-Asiatic. Subsequent research works only reinforced A.G. Haudricourt's point, including those by N.D. Andreev (1958), Pinnow (1959), Jankhotov (1973) and M.Ferlus (1975), Diffloth, Gérard (1989) as well as many other linguists in Vietnam.

In order to prove the origin of Vietnamese language in Austro-Asiatic family, linguists have studied Vietnamese in comparison with Mon-Khmer and Tai via three aspects: lexicology, grammar and tones. Regarding lexicology, Jankhotov (1991), when citing some Vietnamese words that correspond with other Mon-Khmer languages and some with Tai languages, has found that there are typical coincidences between the Vietnamese lexicon and Mon-Khmer's, such as those indicating time, weather, e.g. *ngày* [ngà:y] (day) in Vietnamese corresponding with *ngai* in Mon-Khmer. Besides, there are many words that are similar in such topics as nature, animal, body parts, etc. This coincidence is best explained by relationship of origin. In other words, regarding the semantic aspect of coincident words in different languages, Vietnamese is in Mon-Khmer language family (Haudricourt 1954). These analyses supplement A.G. Haudricourt's point of view presented above.

A.G. Haudricourt (1953) and M. Ferlus (1975) both prove that within the Vietnamese lexicon, there are more words originating from Mon-Khmer language. Considering frequently used Vietnamese words such as: *tró:c* [tró:c] (đầu) (head), *tó:c* [tó:c] (hair), *mắ:t* [mắ:t] (eye), *tai* [tai] (ear), *mũi* [mũi] (nose), *miệng* [miệng] (mouth), *rắ:ng* [rắ:ng] (teeth), *lưỡ:i* [lưỡ:i] (tongue), *cổ* [cổ] (neck), *môi* [môi] (lip), *cắ:m* [cắ:m] (chin), *tay* [tay] (hand), A.G. Haudricourt believes they could be divided into three groups:

- a) Common words for most Austro-Asiatic languages: *tó:c*, *mắ:t*, *mũi*, *tay*.
- b) Words that only appear in Phong language but become different in different languages: *tró:c* [tró:c], *tai* [tai], *miệng* [miệng], *lưỡ:i* [lưỡ:i], *môi* [môi].
- c) Words that do not appear either in Muong or Phong but do appear in Mon-Khmer languages like *cổ*[cổ], *cắ:m*[cắ:m] or in Palaung – Wa (Khmou, Rieng): e.g. *rắ:ng* [rắ:ng] (Haudricourt 1953).

This allows for a reasonable conclusion that the lexicons of Vietnamese and other Mon-Khmer languages are related in their origin whereas Vietnamese and Tai languages are related due to their contact. Regarding grammar, while H. Maspero (1912) supposes that Vietnamese is closer to Tai languages as they show no signs of affixes, A.G. Haudricourt posits that previously, Vietnamese had prefixes to form words as Mon-Khmer languages by comparing *giết* (kill) – *chết* (die) in Vietnamese

Vietnamese	chết [chết] - giết [giết]
Mon	khyut [khuyt] - pacut [pa-cut]
Tai	tay[tay] - qa [qa]

ND. Andreev (1958) and M. Ferlus (1998) clarified A.G. Haudicourt's idea. Notably, M. Ferlus (1988) detected many ancient traces showing that initial consonant clusters in Muong, such as *tlaw – trau* (buffalo), are traces of ancient prefixes in Vietnames. It was possible that in the old time, Vietnamese was a language that had affixes for word formation, but its evolution over time has dropped such signs. Therefore, in terms of origin, Vietnamese is closer to Mon-Khmer than Tai. In terms of tones, Vietnamese has tones that are close to Tai's while Mon-Khmer languages are toneless. However, in the article *Origins of the Vietnamese Tones*, A.G. Haudicourt (1954) explained the origin of Vietnamese tones in two stages:

- a) From a toneless to a three-tone system due to the loss of final glottal sound ʔ- and -h.
- b) From a three-tone to a six-tone system due to the loss of voiced/voiceless contrast among initial consonants.

A.G Haudricourt (1954) has proved that Vietnamese has been through a development process from a toneless to a tonal system as it is today. In order to achieve the above conclusion, he based himself on Southeast Asian languages studies and realizes that there is a relation between tones and the first sounds of syllables: initial plosive voiced consonant corresponding with a low tone and vice versa. Also, there is a correspondence among Vietnamese tones and Mon-Khmer words ending with a particular sound. Therefore, originally, Vietnamese used to be toneless like other Mon-Khmer languages of the Austro-Asiatic family but during its development, new contacts gave birth to tones.

Since 1953, H. Maspero (1953) has been counter-argued by the increasing number of arguments and data, and hence his views lost their persuasiveness. Most researchers on the history of the Vietnamese language agree with A.G. Haudicourt: "The position of Vietnamese is in Austro-Asiatic family, between Palung-Wa group in the Northwest and Mon-Khmer in the Southwest" (Haudricourt 1953).

Furthermore, some suppose that Vietnamese is akin to Malayo-Polynesian branch. For instance, Binh Nguyen Loc claims that Vietnamese and Malay languages have the same origin (Binh Nguyễn Lộc 1973). However, such point has not been sufficiently proved so it is not convincing. Until now, it is possible to say that most have agreed that Vietnamese is an Austro-Asiatic language of Mon-Khmer branch. Even though Vietnamese has relation with Tai-Kadai since ancient times, and with Sino language profoundly, those relations are those of contact, not of kinship.

Linguists have coined this family "Austro-Asiatic" basing on its main geographic area of usage – South Asia. There are some branches, however, lying outside that area such as Munda, Khasi in East India, and languages of the Palung-Wa branch spreading as far north as South China (Yunnan). Austro-Asiatic is identified as the local language family that has been existing for the longest time in Southeast Asia. Others families like Tai-Kadai, Sino-Tibetan, or Austronesian are new migrants to the current area of the Austro-Asiatic family. If any Austro-Asiatic language still maintains the old form of CCVC structure in their syllables, it has the remnant of the old affixation method. Therefore, Austro-Asiatic consists of mostly Mon-Khmer languages and is considered to be a native branch with the least hybrids but also the largest number of language groups under the influences of languages of other families.

### **Some Features of Mon- Khmer Branch and Vietic (Viet-Muong) Group**

Vietic group is within Mon – Khmer branch, and includes eight languages:

- a) Vietnamese language

- b) Mong language
- c) Cuoï language (in Nghe An)
- d) Aream language (in Quang Binh)
- e) Chut language (in Quang Binh)
- f) Ma Lieng language (in Quang Binh and Ha Tinh)
- g) Pong language (in Nghe An)
- h) Aheu language (in Laos and Thailand) (Tran Tri Doi 1996)

According to researchers on the history of the Vietnamese language, Muong is the closest to Vietnamese because before the 12<sup>th</sup> century, the Vietnamese and Muong people shared the same language. In Mon-Khmer branch, besides Vietic group, there are Mon and Khmer groups. These two groups distribute as follows:

- a) Khmer group (including Khmer in Southern Vietnam, Khmer in Cambodia, and R'nam in Central Highlands);
- b) Mon group (including languages of Mon, Chao Bon in Thailand and Myanmar).

There are additional language groups also included in Mon-Khmer branch:

- a) Kha Mu group (including languages of Kho Mu, Xinh Mun, Khang Mang, O Du scattering in Northwestern mountainous areas in Vietnam)
- b) Katu group (including languages of Katu, Bru-Van Kieu, Ta Oi in Quang Binh, Quang Tri, Thua Thien – Hue, Quang Nam provinces and Laos)
- c) Bana group (including languages of Ba Na, Xo Dang, Mnong, Ko ho, Ma, Stieng residing in Central Highlands of Vietnam).

Mon-Khmer branch distributes in upland slopes in the centre of mainland Southeast Asia – from mountainous areas of North Indochina to Co Rat Highlands (Thailand), Boloven (Laos), Central Highlands (Vietnam). Due to their infrequent contact with languages of other typologies, Mon-Khmer is able to retain the ancient characteristics of Southeast Asian languages with the CCVC syllable structure and remnants of ancient affixation method, and has not given birth to the tone system. Hence, Mon-Khmer languages are considered a language branch which is indigenous with the least hybrids (Hữu Đạt, Trần Trí Dõi & Đào Thanh Lan 1998).

Austro-Asiatic distributes widely; Vietnamese therefore has various chances to have contact with languages of ethnic minorities of Tay-Thai, Meo-Yao, Tang-Mien in Northern Vietnam. In the South, apart from contacts with kinship-related languages such as Ba Na, Khmer, Vietnamese also has contacts with other mainland Austronesian languages, i.e. languages of the Cham group. In the Cham lexicon, there are Vietnamese words, even those from the Viet-Muong lexicon. These are words of the common Viet-Muong (*Viet-Muong commune*), e.g.:

Cham	Vietnamese
Poq [pɔq]	bóc [bóc]
Blo [blo]	lộ [lộ]
Krùm [krum]	sấm [sấm]
Tuh [tuh]	đồ [đồ]

The lexical correspondence between Vietnamese and Cham shown above demonstrates a possibility that they may have enjoyed a long period of contact. Though Vietnamese belongs to a diverse and rich language family with various languages of different ethnic groups, it still preserves its original elements and selects new ones to enrich its own identity.

### Relationship between Vietnamese and Malay

Although there have been a number of research works on the relationship between Vietnamese and Malay, no agreement on this relation has been reached. As mentioned above, Malay is one member

of Western Indonesian language branch, sharing the same origin with Cham (mainland Austronesian language group). Meanwhile, Vietnamese belongs to Mon–Khmer language branch of Austro-Asiatic family, which distributes all over Vietnam around mainland Austro-Asiatic languages. There are currently two major ideas about the relation between Vietnamese and Malay: a) They have the same origin; b) They have contact with and borrow from each other.

Based on Radhakrishnan's article, Reid found that the Nacowry language of Nicobar islanders, which is agreed as an Austro-Asiatic by all linguists, is highly similar in morphological means and functions to the Proto-Austronesian language. Due to the isolation of Nacowry, Reid posits that this similarity cannot be explained by the contact between the two languages, but possibly by the relationship of origin between Austronesian and Austro-Asiatic language families (Rozdextvenxki 1997). Also, Vietnamese and Malay possibly share the same origin and belong to one major language phylum like the afore-mentioned Austric.

In *Malay Origin of the Vietnamese Nation*, Binh Nguyen Loc 1973, points out the lexical semantic correspondence between the Vietnamese and Malay languages and regards them as sharing the same origin. In order to reach such conclusions, he compiled tables which compare the Vietnamese lexicon with those of Malay and other languages such as Muong, So-dang, Cham, Rogao, Sino, Thai, etc. Below are some examples:

Vietnamese	già [già]
Thai	cà [kà]
Muong	già [già]
Malay	tua [tua]

He asserts that though Vietnamese and Malay languages are slightly different in grammar, they certainly have the same origin. He refutes Nguyen Dinh Hoa's opinions that Vietnamese and Malay borrow from each other. Binh Nguyen Loc questions when it happened if the two languages borrowed from each other via interaction. He writes, "There is only one answer to this question: It occurred in antiquity when the two peoples were one. In other words, *we* and *they* were congeneric and shared the same habitat in antiquity." Binh Nguyễn Lộc 1973)

Rakssihadi (1976), in his article *The Relationship between Indonesian and Vietnamese Languages*, also affirms that they have a kinship relation. Rakssihadi (1976) investigates the relationship between Khmer language and Aceh language, which belongs to Western Indonesian branch and finds that they have an intimate relationship. Meanwhile, Vietnamese and Khmer both belong to Austro-Asiatic language family. Hence, it can be logically concluded that regarding genealogy and other aspects, Vietnamese must have a kinship relation with Aceh, which makes it related to Indonesian. Since their syntax is similar and so are the positions of nouns and adjectives in sentential order, it is very difficult to point out the relation between Vietnamese and Indonesia based on grammar only. Hence, Rakssihadi (1976) looks at the issue from the angle of word meaning. Based on some following evidence:

Vietnamese	Indonesian	Meaning
Ăn [ăn]	makan[ma-kan]	ăn (eat)
Uống [uống]	minum [mi – num]	uống (drink)
Anh [anh]	abang [a-bang]	anh (brother)

Rakssihadi (1976) posits that the similarity in origin must be demonstrated through a certain relation. The above evidence seemingly bears no intimate relation with one another; however, he analyzes the indefiniteness of verbs. For example, he analyzes the active mood of *makan*, which means "eat" and he concludes that *ăn* is *ăn* (eat) in Vietnamese. Furthermore, Rakssihadi also shows the relation between Vietnamese and Indonesian words by analyzing verb indefiniteness. For nouns and adjectives, Rakssihadi investigates their relationship via pronunciation and the use of prefixes. Basing himself on the similarities in invariable words, Rakssihadi concludes that Vietnamese and Indonesian bear a genealogical relationship. (Rakssihadi 1976)



Cham is one of mainland Austronesian languages. In 1989, Dr. Kern sorted Cham into Malayo-Polynesian language family. However, there are different ideas about kinship relationships of Cham. In *Leslanguesdumonde* (Languages of the World) A. Meillet and M. Cohen (1924), there are two different ideas about the position of Cham. In the chapter *Malayo-Polynesian languages* by G. Ferrand, Cham is sorted into this language family. Meanwhile, A.J. Przyluski (1924) sorts Cham into Austro-Asiatic languages as he finds that a lot of Cham words originate from Mon-Khmer and they outnumber other borrowing word groups. Cham and Mon-Khmer share a great number of roots, which belong to the basic, invariable word classes. Some examples are given below:

Cham	Mon – Khmer
Kròh [k ròh]	sũa [sũa]
Prùh [p rùh]	khịt mũi [khịt mũi]
Krôijq [k rôijq]	cam [kam]
Hakàn [ha kàn]	cái trồng [cái trồng]

Hence, Headley (1976) finds that “very ancient forms probably indicate an old root which affected both Cham and Mon-Khmer or was a common ancestor of languages from both Cham and Mon-Khmer branches”. Therefore, many people believe that Vietnamese and Malaysian might have the same origin. Even W. Schmidt (1906), in his research on Cham language, states that this language closely is related to Mon-Khmer language(s). This is based on the theory that if a language A shares certain lexical items with a language B and it also shares another number of lexical items with a language C, language A is a mixed language. Thence, Cham is a mixed language, which shares certain lexical items with Austronesian and Mon-Khmer languages. Austronesian words in Cham language appear in daily-used concepts of natural phenomena, body parts, animals, plants, actions, states, etc. Some examples are given below:

Cham	Malay	Vietnamese
Tanưh [ta –nưh]	tanah [ta-nah]	đất [đất]
Apuy [a-puy]	api [a-pi]	lửa [lửa]
haray [ha-ray]	hari [ha-ri]	ngày [ngày]
limo [li – mo]	lembu [lem-bu]	(con) bò [bò]

Here, there exists semantic and phonetic correspondence between Cham and Malay languages. The above examples also illustrate the relation between Vietnamese and Malay. Semantically, words in each row have the same meaning, and phonetically, one or two sounds may be pronounced similarly. Notably, regarding lexical relations, a considerable number of words in Cham and Mon-Khmer cannot be clearly categorized into any word class in either Austro-Asiatic or Austronesian language family. A number of words which are classified as Mon-Khmer lexicon by Headly can still be found in Malay language. Following are some examples:

Cham	Malay	Vietnamese
Klạn [k lạn]	telan [te-lan]	trăn [trăn]
Cwàq [c wàq]	jejak [je –jak]	đạp, giẫm [đạp], [giẫm]
Pọq [pọq]	buka [bu –ka]	bóc [bóc]

Is it true that Cham, Malay and Vietnamese share the same origin? A.G. Haudricourt (1966) does not agree upon the idea of mixed language. He asserts that Malay must belong to Austronesian language family. According to Haudricourt (1966), there are two hypotheses in classification: 1) If two lexical components are equal in value, then Cham, Malay and Vietnamese belong to the same language family; 2) If Vietnamese and Malay do not have the same origin, there will be a great number of common words and morphemes whose commonality is not by coincidence, but by borrowing from each other.

A.G Haudricourt’s (1966) hypothesis states that two lexical components differ from each other and are incomparable. One component is the root, the other is borrowing; language a

belonging to the same family with B borrows part of its lexicon from C. In his point of view, Cham and Malay belong to the same family and borrow part of their lexicon from Vietnamese. Language has developed in tandem with the consciousness formulation process, in close association with labour and the emergence of human and their society. Hence, it is most plausible to look at the evolution process of human society. Human development history has undergone a lot of periods, from primitive communism to class-based society associated with the formation of state. Likewise, languages also develop over different stages.

During primitive communal system, languages evolved in two distinctive directions: dispersal and merger. Disperse trend occurred when a tribe developed. Due to various reasons, such a tribe was naturally forced to disaggregate into independent tribes. During that time, linguistic differences emerged which were then reinforced through generations and eventually they became different languages derived from the same root. Merger occurred at the end of primitive communal system being in transition to class-based society. Some tribes voluntarily allied due to some certain reasons. Tribal alliance greatly facilitated languages to come into close contact with one another and hence exert impacts on one another, even though they may not be originally related. Normally there were two impacts: first, one tribal language outweighed others and became the common language for the whole alliance community. However, that common language was still subject to influences of those outweighed languages, and more or less changed its form. Second, language contact led to language mixture or even the creation of a new language. This was not an even mixture, nor a creation of a whole new language which was quite different from the languages involved in the contact or mixture. The new language still possessed the morphological structure of one of the 'ingredient' languages and took that one language as its (the new language) basis.

Ha Van Tan (1997) claimed that from the end of 3<sup>rd</sup> to the middle of 2<sup>nd</sup> millennium B.C.E, in Northern Vietnam there were a lot of archaeological cultures. It is possible that at that time tribes speaking Austro-Asiatic, Austronesian and Tay-Thai languages were residing in Vietnam. The connections still visible among these languages today allow us to infer that the intimacy among these language phyla four thousand years ago was greater and the intimacy among languages of families of phyla whose speakers were neighbours was even greater (Hà Văn Tấn 1997).

Moving further to Southern Vietnam, archaeologists discovered a culture called Sa Huynh. Its territory stretched from the Dong Nai River basin in the south up to Quang Nam, Da Nang in the north. The precise period of this culture has yet to be specified; however, some researchers said that the Sa Huynh culture belonged to the later part of the first millennium B.C.E. Ha Van Tan believed the Sa Huynh people were the direct predecessors of the residents who established the Kingdom of Champa. Towards the beginning of our Common Era (C.E), the Sa Huynh people must have spoken an Austronesian language which was not much different from the Cham inscriptions on the East Yen Chau stele in the 4th century. Nevertheless, the existence of ancient Austro-Asiatic groups in the Sa Huynh culture area could also have affected the Cham language during their long contact, which has left various Austro-Asiatic elements in the Cham language (Hà Văn Tấn 1997).

Dr. Hami and Kern (1989) both agreed that the Chamic language was among mainland Austronesian language families. This shed a light on the fact that there might have been a branch of the local Malay in the Indochinese peninsula. As Pham Duc Duong and Ha Van Tan said, these languages' family might have been in contact with the Austro-Asiatic family; therefore, nowadays the mainland Austronesian is still among the Mon-Khmer languages such as Ba Na, Stieng, Rngao, etc. – a proof of reciprocal influence among these languages.

It is the existence of Austronesian in Indochina that caused confusion among some French scholars who believed that all Vietnamese, Laos and Cambodians used mainland Austronesian languages. In fact, many of these people used languages in the Mon-Khmer's group. The mainland Austronesian branch resided to the east of the Mon-Khmer languages' area. The Chamic languages were spoken only in part of Cambodia's territory and in the South of Vietnam's Central Highlands.

That is the reason why it cannot be concluded that Vietnamese, Laotian and Cambodian were mainland Austronesian speakers.

When investigating the Cham lexicon, linguists realized many Mon-Khmer words which have deeper roots than loanwords in Cham's vocabulary. Besides newly migrated words from the neighbouring Mon-Khmer languages which do not have many differences from the original phonetics, some lexical items are comparatively reconstructed by Headley (Bùi Khánh Thế 1996) as the following:

Cham	Vietnamese
Kròh [k-roh]	sũa [sũa]
Tabwạq [tab-waq]	nôi [nôi]
Cwạq [cwaq]	kết [kết]
krô jk [krô jk]	cam [kam]

Therefore, possibly the very long contact between Austronesian and Mon-Khmer was not mono-directional; they borrowed words from each other (Bùi Khánh Thế 1996). The above data helps recognize the reciprocal relationship between Austronesian languages and Mon-Khmer languages, which was not established in recent time but at an unknown ancient age, and resulted in their mutual impact on each other.

In fact, linguists still have not reached an agreement in explaining the origin of Austronesian family. Benedict (1976) located the Austronesian languages' centre in the coastal area of Guangdong Province, the hometown of Tai-Kadai tribes. From that place, the Proto-Indonesian speakers immigrated to the islands in East Asia, South East Asia and Malay Peninsula. If so, the contact between Austronesian and Austro-Asiatic, which in this case was Mon-Khmer languages, had occurred since the prehistoric age. Researchers believed that Malay speakers tended to reside along coastal areas. Malaysian linguists also mentioned seaway, besides roads, as a means of transport to these Austronesian speakers from place to place in the Pacific Ocean. At that time, Vietnam could have served as a link from the mainland to the islands, and Malay people used this route on their journeys. As a result, the contact and influence between Austronesian and Mon-Khmer, especially Vietnamese, was inevitable.

J.Crawfurd (1852) a British linguist, examined languages in Sumatera, Jawa, Kalimantan and Polynesia. He concluded that Western Indonesian languages (Javanese) prevails all the finest parts of Jawa, while Malay languages have occupied the finest parts of Sumatera Island. Dyen (1965) posited that the origin of Austronesian family was right in Jawa - Sumatera. However, Haudricourt (1953) stressed that some traces of Austro-Asiatic were found among the Austronesian family on Sumatera Island. He also discovered some Mon-Khmer words in Malay vocabulary that did not exist in Chamic such as *cua* (*crab* in Vietnamese), *ketam* (Malay) and *k'tam* (Khmer) (Haudricourt 1953).

Consequently, it is necessary to research Malay and Vietnamese in terms of lexical correspondence to point out whether they had the same origin as Indonesian or they were only loanwords. Moreover, Haudricourt (1966) suggested another possibility of reciprocal borrowing between Austronesian and Austro-Asiatic. Yet the oldest borrowed word classes in Austronesian and Austro-Asiatic could possibly have originated from Sanskrit because all ancient Austronesian and Mon-Khmer states were under the influence of the Indian civilization. Among the Austronesian languages, especially Malay, the Sanskrit-originated words penetrated deeply into many lexical semantic domains; some even replaced the local words in the basic lexicon such as *manusia* (human), *muka* (eye), *rupa* (figure) etc.

In general, Malay words corresponding to those in Vietnamese might be divided into two main categories: the first one is temporarily called "The inherent mutual base from the ancient time" and the second one is "The adoption of cultural word class in certain historical periods." The loan words can be identified easily in terms of lexical semantics when absolute correspondence is

found in their meanings. Some words may have different meanings in two languages but they belong to the same semantic domain.

## ANALYSIS OF LEXICAL CORRESPONDENCE BETWEEN VIETNAMESE AND MALAY

### Viewpoint on Lexical Correspondence

To understand the relationship between two or more languages, comparison of words and forms of words (such as elements of word formation or phrase formation) is often made. As we know there exists a lexical correspondence between Malay and Vietnamese. However, it is necessary to identify whether this correspondence is from *borrowing* or *genetic relationship*. The two essential elements that allow researchers to place two languages in the same language family are (1) a common set of basic vocabulary, and (2) sets of recurring sound correspondences between the two languages (e.g., a sound in one language is the same or similar to a sound in numerous cognates (i.e., words with common origins) in another language, thereby establishing a pattern of correspondence) (Alves 2008). The criteria for determining genetic linguistic affiliation include the following: (1) quantity of basic vocabulary (inclusive), (2) patterns of phonological correspondences of basic vocabulary (inclusive), (3) number of languages in a language family having shared cognates (inclusive), (4) multiple possibilities among different language families (exclusive), (5) onomatopoeia (exclusionary) (Alves 2008).

The lexical correspondence between Vietnamese and Malay is examined based on basic vocabulary. According to Alves (2008), basic vocabulary includes word classes of a language that are not likely to disappear in the course of centuries or millenniums and tend to exist for a longer period of time than vocabulary which is not basic. We have categorized word classes into those denoting natural events, animals, nature and culture.

Therefore, before presenting detailed analysis, we would like to express our viewpoints on types of correspondence between the two compared languages.

**a) Correspondence of type A:** Consider the following corresponding words between Cham and Vietnamese

Cham	Vietnamese
Poq [pɔq]	bóc [bóc]
Blo [blo]	ló [ló]
Tap[tap]	đấp [đấp]

It can be seen from the above examples that:

- The meaning of the words is identical. They are basic words indicating natural events (such as sắm [sắm]) and very typical actions in Vietnamese language (bóc [bóc], ló [ló], đấp [đấp])
- Phonetically, though the correspondence is not absolute (one-to-one) but it can be recognized that the correspondence is regular (p in pɔq and b in bóc; kr in kùm and s in sắm, etc). This regular phonetic correspondence shows the rule of phonetic change that researchers in historical phonology often discuss.

Based on these above examples, we see that these words have correspondence and this correspondence has genetic tendency. We think that this correspondence has genetic tendency but not genetic relationship because if this correspondence is popular between the two languages, it is definite that the two languages are from the same language family. If the number of corresponding words is too few compared to other types of correspondence, this correspondence may originate from borrowing or genetic relationship. Therefore, when the number of corresponding words is too few, it is unlikely to conclude that the two languages have genetic relationship.

The correspondence of type A is very rare, which means that the two languages can hardly have genetic relationship.

Malay	Vietnamese
Siang [siang]	sáng [sáng]
Pulau [pu – lau]	cù lao [cù lao]
Piam [pi-am]	vàm [vàm]
Pak [pak]	bác [bác]
Long [long]	lớn [lớn]
Buang [bu-ang]	buông [buông]
Pah [pah]	bán [bán]
Tom [tom]	đâm [đâm]
Cair[chair]	chạy [chạy]
Lu [lu]	lúa [lúa]

Correspondence of type A has 12 cases in a total 200 cases, accounting for 6%.

### b) Correspondence of type B

When comparing two languages, it is not always the case that the phonetic correspondence is regular like in type A. Besides, their literal meaning is also different. However, the following examples are considered correspondence even though at first glance they bear no resemblance.

Cham	Vietnamese
Pi nàỳ [pi-nàỳ] con gái	nái [nái]
A kọq [a-kọq] đầu	sọ [sọ]
Kam [kam] lúa lép	cám [cám]
Mrạy [m-rạy] sợi chỉ	may [may]

We consider these above cases correspondence because:

- In terms of phonetics, even though the correspondence is not regular but the elements of word formation are identical (for example: nái and nàỳ in pinàỳ)
- In terms of meaning, at first glance they are not similar (for example pinàỳ means “female” and nái means “sow”). However, nái refers to female pigs that are raised for breeding piglets, while pinàỳ refers to females who can give birth. Thus there is similarity in terms of meaning, and it is like the similarity between hyponym and hypernym. This type of correspondence can hardly come from genetic relationship but tend to be from borrowing.

There are two reasons for this:

- Regarding phonetics, the irregularity of correspondence shows that it can hardly come from genetic relationship. The fact that elements of word formation are identical can prove that there might not be a phonetic change but a total acquisition.
- This may lead to the fact the meaning is divided into general meaning and specific meaning. When studying words of Vietnamese and Malay, those that belong to type B are borrowings. The two languages have a long history of contact, therefore borrowing happened a long time ago, which makes it hard to clearly identify whether the relationship is genetic or borrowing.

Malay	Vietnamese
Kulit [ku-lit]	lốt (da) [lốt]

Dengkut [deng–kut]	cụt (chân) [cụt]
Rintih [rin-tih]	rên rĩ [rên rĩ]
Jerit [je – rit]	rít [rit]
Cengkam [ceng –kam]	cằm [cằm]
Cancut [chan –chut]	xắn [xắn]
Lupa [lu-pa]	lu mờ [lu mờ]
Rayu [ray-u]	day dứt [day dứt]
Bual [bu-al]	bông đùa [bông đùa]
Pesan [pe-san]	sai [sai]
Turun [tu-run]	rụng [rụng]
Jatuh [ja –tuh]	tụt [tụt]
Masuk [ma- suk]	sục [sục]
Naik [naik]	nâng [nâng]
Buka [buka]	bóc [bóc]

Correspondence of type B has 32 cases, accounting for 15.5%.

### c) Correspondence of type C:

A possible correspondence is found here: a Malay word and a Vietnamese word may have the same meaning but their phonetic features are not totally identical. This difference can be explained and in many cases, they are considered as diverse forms of the same root in history. The following words are examples of this kind of correspondence:

Malay	Vietnamese	Ancient Vietnamese
Bulan [bu-lan]	trăng [trăng]	* blang
Belah [bơ–lah]	chẻ [chẻ]	*mlả
Telan [tơ-lan]	trăn [trăn]	* tlan

The above words are distinguished as lexical correspondences because of the following reasons:

- a) In terms of semantics, they are similar without any differences. They are basic words describing natural phenomenon (*trăng* [trăng]/*moon*), animals (*trăn* [trăn]/*python*) or verbs (*chẻ*[chẻ]/*split*).
- b) In terms of phonetics, at first glance, they may sound different, but if we examine the diversity of word forms in language history (either Vietnamese or Malay), it turns out that they share the same rules of phonetic change. For example, in the history of Vietnamese phonetics, the word *trăng* (*moon*) used to be *blang*[*blang*]. Hence, *blang* (Vietnamese) and *bulan* [bu-lan] (Malay) are regularly similar in accordance with the historical rule. Before the XVII century, the original purely Vietnamese words used consonant clusters “bl”, “tl” which then changed into “tr” such as *\*blang* (trăng), *\*tlan* (trăn), *\*blau* (trâu) etc. Thus, it can be clearly considered as a development law in the history of Vietnamese phonetics which is systematic and “regular”. This is the correspondence that shows the historical connection between the two languages.

Correspondence of type C has 11 cases in a total 200 cases, accounting for 5.5%.

- d) **Type D:** Another type of correspondence is structural simplification of words while their meaning is kept the same. The simplification is reflected in the reduction of word syllables.

Malay	Vietnamese
Mata [ma –ta]	mắt [mặ́t]
Sungai [su-ngai]	sông [sông]
Lumpur [lum – pur]	bùn [bùn]

In terms of meaning, these words have identical meaning, it is not necessary to find meaning from the semantic field or layers of meaning of each word group. In terms of phonetics, it is clear to see the phenomenon of simplification or omission of syllables in Vietnamese. For instance, the first syllable in Malay is omitted, leaving only the later syllable in Vietnamese such as *lumpur* [lum-pur] – *bùn* [bùn]. This simplification also occurs to the last syllable in Malay when the second syllable is deleted, leaving Vietnamese word with the shortest phonetic version such as *sungai* [su-ngai] – *sông* [sông]. After syllables are omitted, elements of word formation in Vietnamese and Malay are identical. In the case of the word *mắt* (eye), it is possible that the word *\*mta* existed in ancient language, which evolved into *mata* [ma-ta] in Malay and *mặ́t* in Vietnamese.

This correspondence has 126 cases, accounting for 63%. When considering this type of correspondence, we see that the relationship between the two languages is from borrowing. It can be explained that Malay and Vietnamese belong to the same language phylum, consisting of languages with affixes, and throughout the course of history, Vietnamese gradually became monosyllabic through the omission of syllables. However, this correspondence does not lead to a rule in phonetic change; therefore, it is not possible to consider this correspondence comes from genetic relationship.

After analysing the lexical correspondence between Vietnamese and Malay, we collected the following data:

**Table 1: Lexical correspondence in word classes**

No	Name of word class	Total number of words	Type A	Type B	Type C	Type D
1	Words denoting natural events	5	0	2	1	2
2	Words denoting time, weather	5	1	2	1	1
3	Words denoting topography, territory	10	2	2	0	8
4	Words denoting people, age, family	14	2	1	1	11
5	Words denoting parts of human body	8	0	2	1	5
6	Words denoting human gestures	17	0	5	0	12
7	Words denoting human emotions	5	0	4	0	1
8	Words denoting human actions	55	4	7	1	43
9	Words denoting animals	12	0	7	3	9
10	Words denoting nature of things	37	2	1	1	27
11	Words denoting trees	11	1	31	2	7
12	Words denoting culture	20				
	Total	200	12	31	11	126

### List of Malay – Vietnamese Correspondence

#### Letter A

No	Malay	Viet	No	Malay	Viet
----	-------	------	----	-------	------

1	Abah [a-bah]	Ba [ba]	5	Angkut [ang-kut]	Ong [ong]
2	Abuh [a-buh]	bụi [bụi]	6	Amat [a-mat]	rất [rất]
3	Adik ( adek) [a-dik]	Em [em]	7	Arang [a-rang]	Than [than]
4	Ajar [a-jar]	dạy [dạy]	8	Arus [a-rus]	dòng, luồng [dòng], [luồng]

**Letter B**

No	Malay	Viet	No	Malay	Viet
1	Basah [ba-sah]	ấm ướt [ấm ướt]	5	Bulan [bu-lan]	Trăng (blan) [trăng]
2	Basi [ba -si]	Thiu [thiu]	6	Bunga [bu -nga]	Bông hoa [bông hoa]
3	Batang [ba-tang]	Thanh [thanh]	7	Buta [bu -ta]	Mù [mù]
4	Barang [ba -rang]	Hàng hóa [ hàng hóa]	8	Buang [bu-ang]	Buông [buông]
5	Belah [be -lah]	Chê (blar)	9	Busung [bu - sung]	Sưng [sưng]
6	Betul [be -tul]	Đúng			

**Letter C**

No	Malay	Viet	No	Malay	Viet
1	Cabang [ca-bang]	Cành [cành]	9	Cerangah [che-ra-ngah]	Nhánh [nhánh]
2	Cair [chair]	Chây [chây]	10	Ceroboh [che-ro-boh]	Thô [thô]
3	Cakar [cha - kar]	Càng [càng]	11	Cicit [chi-chit]	chít [chít]
4	Cangkul [chang - kul]	Cuốc [cuốc]	12	Cuci [chu-chi]	Chùi [chùi]
5	Cangkum [chang - kum]	Ôm [ôm]	13	Cucu [chu-chu]	Cháu [cháu]
6	Cat [chat]	Trát [trát]	14	Congol [cho-ngol]	Nhò, ngoi [nhò], [ngoi]
7	Cengam [che -ngam]	Ngoại [ngoại]	15	Condong [chon-dong]	Chống [chống]
8	Cenuram [che-nu-ram]	Giảm [giảm]			

**Letter D**

No	Malay	Viet	No	Malay	Viet
1	Danau [da-nau]	Ao [ao]	6	Dengkut [deng-kut]	Cụt [cụt]
2	Dasar [da-sar]	Sàn [sàn]	7	Dengki [deng-ki]	Ki, keo kiệt [ki], [keo kiệt]
3	Dawai [da-wai]	Dây [dây]	8	Dengu [de-ngu]	Ngu [ngu]
4	Debu [de-bu]	Bụi [bụi]	9	Deru [de-ru]	Rú [rú]
5	Dengar [de-ngar]	Nghe [nghe]			

**Letter F**

No	Malay	Viet	No	Malay	Viet
1	Fikir [fi-kir]	Nghĩ [nghĩ]			



**Letter G**

No	Malay	Viet	No	Malay	Viet
1	Galas [ga-las]	Gánh [gánh]	4	Gong [gong]	Công [công]
2	Ganjar [gan -jar]	Giáo [giáo]	5	Goreng [go-reng]	Rán [rán]
3	Gayung [gay-ung]	Gáo [gáo]	6	Gunong [gu-nong]	Gò [gò]

**Letter H**

No	Malay	Viet	No	Malay	Viet
1	Halang [ha-lang]	Ngăn [ngăn]	3	Hisap [hi-sap]	Hít [hít]
2	Hirup [hi -rup]	Hút [hút]	4	Hejam [he-jam]	Nhắm [nhắm]

**Letter I**

No	Malay	Viet	No	Malay	Viet
1	Ibu [i-bu]	Bu [bu]	2	Ini [i-ni]	Ni [ni]

**Letter J**

No	Malay	Viet	No	Malay	Viet
1	Jatuh [ja-tuh]	Tụt, rưng [tụt], [rưng]	2	Jerit [je-rit]	Rít [rít]

**Letter K**

No	Malay	Viet	No	Malay	Viet
1	Kain [ka-in]	Vái [vái]	8	Kembung [kem-bung]	Bùng [bùng]
2	Kaya [kay-a]	Giàu [giàu]	9	Ketam [ke-tam]	Dạm, cua [dạm], [cua]
3	Kaki [ka-ki]	Cẩng [cẩng]	10	Kerbau [ker-bau]	Trâu [trâu] *blau
4	Kaku [ka-ku]	Cứng [cứng]	11	Kuno [ku-no]	Cỏ [cỏ]
5	Kandung [kan-dung]	Đựng [dựng]	12	Kikir [ki-kir]	Ki bo [ki bo]
6	Karam [ka-ram]	Đắm [dắm]	13	Kosong [ko-song]	Không, trống [không], [trống]
7	Kuku [ku-ku]	Móng, vuốt [móng], [vuốt]	14	Kuala [kua-la]	Cửa sông [cửa sông]
			15	Kumbang [kum-]	Ong [ong]

bang]

**Letter L**

No	Malay	Viet	No	Malay	Viet
1	Lama [la-ma]	Lâu [lâu]	7	Letak [le-tak]	Đặt [đặt]
2	Laman [la-man]	Sân [sân]	8	Liput [li-put]	Phủ [phủ]
3	Lantai [lan-tai]	Sàn [sàn]	9	Loceng [lo-cheng]	Chuông [chuông]
4	Labu [la-bu]	Bầu [bầu]	10	Longgar [long-gar]	Lồng [lồng]
5	Layur [lay-ur]	Héo rữ [héo rữ]	11	Longkang [long-kang]	Máng [máng]
6	Lembu [lem-bu]	Bò [bò]	12	Lubang [lu-bang]	Lỗ [lỗ]
			13	Lumpur [lum-pur]	Bùn [bùn]

**Letter M**

No	Malay	Viet	No	Malay	Viet
1	Mahan [ma-han]	Mắc, đất [mắc], [đất]	5	Mata [ma-ta]	Mắt [mắt] *mta
2	Malam [ma – lam]	Đêm [đêm]	6	Mati [ma-ti]	Mát [mát]
3	Mak [mak]	Má [má]	7	Minum [mi-num]	Uống [uống]
4	Makan [ma-kan]	Ăn [ăn]	8	Mual [mu-al]	Mưa (nôn) [mưa]

**Letter N**

No	Malay	Viet	No	Malay	Viet
1	Nganga [nga-nga]	Há [há]	2	Nona [no-na]	Na [na]

**Letter O**

No	Malay	Viet	No	Malay	Viet
1	Otak [o-tak]	Óc [óc]			

**Letter P**

No	Malay	Viet	No	Malay	Viet
1	Padat [pa-dat]	Đặc [đặc]	7	Pejal [pe-jal]	Rắn (đặc) [rắn]
2	Pakai [pa-kai]	Mặc [mặc]	8	Peluk [pe-luk]	Ôm [ôm]
3	Panjang [pan-jang]	Dài [dài]	9	Pisau [pi-sau]	Dao [dao]
4	Pak [pak]	Bác [bác]	10	Perut [pe-rut]	Ruột [ruột]

5	Papan [pa-pan]	Ván [ván]	11	Pulau [pu-lau]	Cù lao [cù lao]
6	Padang [pa-dang]	Đông [đông]			

### Letter R

No	Malay	Viet	No	Malay	Viet
1	Ranah [ra-nah]	Nát [nát]	4	Roboh [ro-boh]	Đồ [đồ]
2	Rajin [ra-jin]	Siêng [siêng]	5	Ronggah [rong-gah]	Họng [họng]
3	Rayu [ray-u]	Day dứt [day dứt]			

### Letter S

No	Malay	Viet	No	Malay	Viet
1	Salah [sa-lah]	Sai [sai]	10	Siap [si-ap]	Sấp [sấp]
2	Sahabat [sa-ha-bat]	Bạn [bạn]	11	Sibuk [si-buk]	Bận [bận]
3	Salak [sa-lak]	Sũa [sũa]	12	Silap [si-lap]	Sai lầm [sai lầm]
4	Sapu [sa-pu]	Xoa [xoa]	13	Sinar [si-nar]	Tia [tia]
5	Sayur [say-ur]	Rau [rau]	14	Suam [su-am]	ám [ám]
6	Sedikit [se-di-kit]	Ít [ít]	15	Sudah [su-dah]	Đã [đã]
7	Sedang [se-dang]	Đang [đang]	16	Sungai [su-ngai]	Sông [sông]
8	Sekam [se-kam]	Cám [cám]	17	Susu [su-su]	Sữa [sữa]
9	Senang [se-nang]	Dễ [dễ]			

### Letter T

No	Malay	Viet	No	Malay	Viet
1	Tamak [ta-mak]	Tham [tham]	9	Terbang [ter-bang]	bay
2	Tanah [ta-nah]	Đất [đất]	10	Tikam [ti-kam]	đâm
3	Tangan [ta-ngan]	Tay [tay]	11	Tompok [tom-pok]	Đốm
4	Tangga [tang-ga]	Thang [thang]	12	Tua [tua]	Già nua
5	Tembak [têm-bak]	Bắn [bắn]	13	Tumpul [tum-pul]	cùn
6	Teguk [te-guk]	ực [ực]	14	Tumbuh [tum-buh]	búp
7	Telan [te-lan]	Trăn [trăn] *tlan	15	Tudung [tu-dung]	vung
8	Terang [te-rang]	Sáng sũa [sáng sũa]			

### Letter U

No	Malay	Viet	No	Malay	Viet
1	Ubi [u-bi]	Củ [củ]			

## CONCLUSION

After researching lexical correspondence between Vietnamese and Malay, we recognized that the corresponding words tend to originate from borrowing. Considering types of correspondence, we tend to posit that the Malay–Vietnamese relationship was built more on borrowing because if Vietnamese and Malay could have belonged to the same family, and they both had affixes, then it must be explained that over history, Vietnamese evolved as a monosyllabic, isolating language by syllable reduction. Obviously the two languages have a long-standing contact, therefore, borrowing happened a long time ago. This makes it hard to clearly identify the boundary. There is a common rule in linguistics, that is only useful elements and oppositions are kept, redundant or irrelevant oppositions are elided. Vietnamese people and Malay people did trade and business with each other thousands of years ago. Language contact is related with change in structure of Vietnamese language due to Malay and may be vice versa. The reason of syllabic omission is the contact between Vietnamese and Malay which lead to friction in phonetic relationship between two words. However, this correspondence did not generate a new phonetic transformation rule which blurred Malay–Vietnamese familial relation.

Building an inventory table for the lexical correspondence between Malay and Vietnamese is not only important for lexicological research but also helps clarify the true nature of this relationship. Is it a relation of origin or one of contact? If it is contact, what are the cultural inferences from their linguistic similarity? Conversely, if it is origin, how close are they in their kinship?

## REFERENCES

- Andreev, Nikolaj Dmitrievič (Андреев, Н. Д.). 1958. К вопросу о происхождении вьетнамского языка (К вопросу о происхождении вьетнамского языка) (On the origins of the Vietnamese language). *Sovetskoe vostokovenie* 2: 101–111.
- Antoine Meillet & Marcel Cohen (eds.). *Les langues du monde* [Languages of the World]. Paris: Librairie Édouard Champion.
- Bình Nguyên Lộc. 1973. *Nguồn gốc Mã Lai của các dân tộc Việt Nam*, Nhà xuất bản Sài Gòn.
- Bùi Khánh Thế. 1996. *Ngữ pháp tiếng Cham*. Nhà xuất bản Giáo dục.
- Crawford, John. 1852. A grammar and dictionary of the Malay language : with a preliminary dissertation.
- Diffloth, Gérard. 1989. Proto-Austroasiatic creaky voice. *Mon-Khmer Studies* 15: 139–154.
- Dyen, I. 1965. *A lexicostatistical classification of the Austronesian language*. Int J Am Ling Memoir 19
- Ferlus, Michel. 1975. Vietnamien et Proto-VietMuong. *Asia Sud Est un Monde Insulindien* 6(4): 21-55.
- Ferlus, Michel. 1998. Les systèmes de tons dans les langues viet-muong [Tone systems in Viet-Muong languages]. *Diachronica* 15(1): 1–27.
- Hà Văn Tấn. 1997. *Theo dấu các văn hóa cổ*. Nhà xuất bản Khoa học Xã hội, Hà Nội.
- Haudricourt, André-Georges. 1953. La place du vietnamien dans les langues austroasiatiques [The position of Vietnamese in Austroasiatic]. *Bulletin de la Société de Linguistique de Paris* 49(1): 122–128.
- Haudricourt, André-Georges. 1954. De l'origine des tons en vietnamien, *Journal Asiatique* 242: 69-82. Reprinted in *Problèmes de phonologie diachronique*: 146-160.
- Haudricourt, André-Georges. 1966. The limits and connections of Austroasiatic in the northeast. In N. H. Zide (ed.), *Studies in comparative Austroasiatic linguistics*, 44–56. The Hague: Mouton.
- Headley R, K. 1976. *Some sources of Chamic vocabulary*. Austroasiatic Studies, Part I, Hawaii.
- Hữu Đạt, Trần Trí Dõi, Đào Thanh Lan. 1998. *Cơ sở tiếng Việt*, Nhà xuất bản Giáo dục, Hà Nội.

- IU. Rozdextvenxki.1997. *Những bài giảng ngôn ngữ học đại cương*, Nhà xuất bản Giáo dục, Hà Nội.
- Kern H.A. 1989. *Taaljundige gegevens terbipaling van het Stamland der Maleisch – Polynesische volken* (Versl.en med. Der Kon.Akad. van Wetenschappen, III.R., deel VI.
- Mark Alves. 2008. *Khái quát các nghiên cứu ngôn ngữ học về nguồn gốc của tiếng Việt*, Tạp chí Khoa học Đại học Quốc gia Hà Nội, Khoa học Xã hội và Nhân văn 24 187-202.
- Maspero, Henri. 1912. Étude sur la phonétique historique de la langue annamite: les initiales [Studies in Annamese historical phonetics: initial consonants]. *Bulletin de l'École Française d'Extrême-Orient* 12: 1–126.
- Mukhtaruddin, Mohd. Dain. 1992. *Pembinaan Babasa Melayu*. Kuala Lumpur: Dewan Bahasa dan Pustaka
- Pater Wilhelm Schmidt. 1906. *Die Mon-KhmerVolker*, Druck und Verlag von Friedrich Viewegund Sohn, Braunschweig.
- Paul K. Benedict. 1976. Austro-Thai and Austroasiatic. *Oceanic Linguistics Special Publications* No. 13, Austroasiatic Studies Part I: pp. 1-36.
- Phạm Đức Dương. 1983. *Tiếp xúc ngôn ngữ ở Đông Nam Á*. Nhà xuất bản Khoa học Xã hội, Hà Nội.
- Pinnow, Heinz-Jürgen. 1959. Versuch einer historischen Lautlehre der KhariaSprache [Towards a historical phonology of the Kharia language]. Wiesbaden: Otto Harrassowitz.
- Przyluski, Jean. 1924. *Les langues austro-asiatiques* [The Austroasiatic languages]. In Antoine Meillet & Marcel Cohen (eds.), *Les langues du monde* [Languages of the World]. 385–403. Paris: Librairie Édouard Champion.
- Rakssihadi. 1976. *Mối quan hệ giữa tiếng Indonesia và tiếng Việt*. Việt ngữ học, Viện Thông tin Khoa học Xã hội Việt Nam.
- S.E. Jankhotov. 1973. “Về sự phân loại các ngôn ngữ ở Đông Nam châu Á”. Tạp chí Ngôn ngữ, số 1, 1991, trang 73-78.
- Trần Trí Dõi .1996. “Các ngôn ngữ thành phần của nhóm Việt – Mường”, Tạp chí Ngôn ngữ số 3, tr 29-32.
- V.B. Kasevich. 1998. *Những yếu tố cơ sở của ngôn ngữ học đại cương*, Nhà xuất bản Giáo dục, Hà Nội.

Tran Thuy Anh (Ph.D)  
University of Social Sciences and Humanities - Hanoi  
Email: thuyanh@ussh.edu.vn

Mai Ngoc Chu (Ph.D)  
Professor  
University of Social Sciences and Humanities - Hanoi  
Email: maingocchu@gmail.com

Abdul Latif Hj. Samian(Ph.D)  
Professor  
Institute of the Malay World & Civilisation  
University Kebangsaan Malaysia.  
Email: abdlatif@ukm.edu.my

Mohamad Zain Musa(Ph.D)  
ISTAC  
International Islamic University Malaysia

Received: 16 September 2018

Accepted: 18 January 2019