



Tai Ya in Thailand Present and Future: Reversing Language Shift

Thomas M. Tehan and Erin Dawkins

DEPARTMENT OF LINGUISTICS
FACULTY OF ARTS
PAYAP UNIVERSITY
CHIANG MAI, THAILAND

December 2010

Research Project #53-01

Tai Ya in Thailand Present and Future: Reversing Language Shift

Thomas M. Tehan and Erin Dawkins
Payap University and SIL International

Abstract

In 2007 the results of a sociolinguistic survey of the Tai Ya in Thailand were compiled. The purpose of the survey was to ascertain the likely need (or lack of need) for vernacular literature in Tai Ya in Thailand. This current research paper takes a different perspective on the data and investigates endangerment and vitality issues related to the respective Tai Ya speech communities in Thailand. First aspects of the survey report are summarized: the Tai Ya are put into a geographical and linguistic context, and the results of the survey relevant to vitality are discussed. Then those vitality results are compared to other selected people groups in Thailand. Joshua Fishman's Graded Intergenerational Disruption Scale (GIDS), Crystal's language revitalization prerequisites, the UNESCO committee's proposed language vitality and endangerment assessment, and Lewis and Simons' Extended GIDS are used to help analyze the significance of the results. These four vitality models indicate that the Tai Ya language is endangered. However, several things could be done to enhance the vitality of the language. It is not a foregone conclusion that Tai Ya in Thailand will become extinct, but the next decade or so is a crucial time if Tai Ya is to reverse its language shift to Northern Thai. The vitality of Tai Ya is also compared to a similar assessment of the Mpi language that was published in Mon-Khmer Studies (Tehan and Nahhas 2009). An interlinearized narrative of Tai Ya collected and prepared by Julie Kletzing is appended as an example of the Tai Ya language.¹

1 INTRODUCTION: ENDANGERED LANGUAGES AND REVERSING LANGUAGE SHIFT

Brenzinger et al. suggest that “at least 50 percent of the world’s more than 6,000 languages are losing speakers. We estimate that 90 percent of the languages may be replaced by dominant languages by the end of the twenty-first century” (2003:3), highlighting a catastrophic loss of language varieties in the world. Estimates of the total number of endangered languages range from 50% to 90% of the over 6,000 currently existing languages in the world, not counting the number of dialects that will pass away (for a few examples, see Crystal 2000, Krauss 1992, and Suwilai 1995). Just over 50% of the world’s languages are used by fewer than 10,000 mother-tongue speakers (Lewis and Simons 2010).

Joshua Fishman first coined the expression “language maintenance and language shift” during the 1963/64 school year (Fishman 1992:395). But it was a couple more decades before most of the academic world awoke to the crisis of endangered languages. Over the past two decades, an increasing number of researchers and activists have sought to document and/or help revitalize the endangered languages of the world. And yet the latest edition of the *Ethnologue* (Lewis 2009) is the first in its 50+ years of publication in which the total number of languages has decreased. “The pace of language shift and death appears to be growing. ... Of the 6,909 living languages now listed in the *Ethnologue*, 457 are identified as Nearly Extinct” (Lewis and Simons 2010).

2 INTRODUCTION TO THE TAI YA PEOPLE

The data for the 2007 survey was collected in August 2005 in two villages in Thailand: Ban Nam Bor Khaw and Ban Pa Sak Khwang (Dawkins 2007). Outside the village with the strongest Tai Ya speech community, Tai Ya is moribund: very few speakers remain, and these speakers are mostly older. In the village with the strongest speech community, Ban Nam Bor Khaw, Tai Ya would be considered endangered—survival is a possibility, but the language is under heavy pressure and only favorable circumstances will allow survival and growth.

It is natural to ask if Tai Ya is one language or two, as it is spoken by communities in both Thailand and China. The survey conclusions support the conclusion that Tai Ya is one language spoken in two countries. Many different languages exist under very different sociolinguistic situations in different places. When the vitality of a language is ‘measured’, it is really the vitality of a language in a certain speech community located in time and space that is measured. For convenience, two ‘localities’ are considered in Thailand. Tai Ya is one language, but the two communities are at different levels.

It is unlikely that Tai Ya will continue to be spoken by future generations in Thailand, although the situation is somewhat more hopeful in Ban Nam Bor Khaw than outside of it. The Tai Ya are shifting to the use of Northern Thai and Central Thai. They have no negative attitudes toward the Thai languages that would prevent their use of Thai literature. Thus, Tai Ya

¹ A portion of this paper was presented under the same title at the 42nd International Conference on Sino-Tibetan Languages and Linguistics. Chiangmai, Thailand. 2 November 2009.

literature need not be developed for the Tai Ya communities in Thailand because they are adequately served by Thai literature. If Tai Ya literature is developed in China, the Thailand communities could learn to use it, although orthography would be an issue. However, the Tai Ya communities in Thailand would need language development work if the language of their communities is to be preserved.

The Tai Ya are a Tai ethnic group, most of whom live in south-central Yunnan province, China. In the late 1920s and the 1930s, several waves of Tai Ya migrated to Chiang Rai province², Thailand. The Tai Ya of Thailand are a relatively small ethnic group, living among Northern Thai and other peoples.

2.1 Geography

The Tai Ya live in southern China and northern Thailand, as shown in Figure 1.



Figure 1: Tai Ya Areas in Southeast Asia (from MapMagic)

In Thailand, the first two Tai Ya villages established were Ban Nam Bor Khaw (บ้านน้ำบ่อขาว) and Ban Pa Sak Khwang (บ้านปากสักขวาง), just southwest of the “Golden Triangle” where Thailand, Laos, and Myanmar meet. Ban Nam Bor Khaw is in Sub-district Huai Khrai (ตำบลห้วยไคร้), District Mae Sai (อำเภอแม่สาย), Chiang Rai Province (จังหวัดเชียงราย). Ban Pa Sak Khwang is in Sub-district Mae Rai (ตำบลแม่ไร่), District Mae Chan (อำเภอแม่จัน), Chiang Rai Province (จังหวัดเชียงราย). The locations of these two Sub-districts are marked in Tai Ya Area Figure 2 below.

Today, Ban Nam Bor Khaw has the largest concentration of Tai Ya in Thailand. There are also Tai Ya families scattered throughout Chiang Rai province and other parts of Thailand. Some other Chiang Rai villages where Tai Ya reside include: Ban Nam Lat (บ้านน้ำลัด), Ban Wang Din (บ้านวังดิน), Ban Sang Khong (บ้านสังข์ทอง), and Ban Pratu Chiang Mai (บ้านประตูเชียงใหม่), all in District Muang Chiang Rai. Ban Nam Bor Khaw and Ban Pa Sak Khwang are easily accessible by car, about two kilometers from Ban Huai Khrai (บ้านห้วยไคร้) on Highway 1, north of Mae Chan. In all of these villages, Tai Ya live alongside other ethnic groups, such as Northern Thai, Chinese, and Shan.

² Thai administrative district terms are translated as follows: จังหวัด Jangwat = Province, อำเภอ Amphoe = District, ตำบล Tambon = Sub-district.



Figure 2: Districts Huai Khrai and Mae Rai, Chiang Rai Province, Thailand (from Encarta)

In China, the Tai Ya live in Xinping and Yuanjiang counties, in the Red River (Yuanjiang) valley, near the Ailao Shan mountains southwest of Kunming in south-central Yunnan province. The locations of these counties are marked in Figure 3 below.



Figure 3: Xinping, Yuanjiang and Mengyang Counties in Yunnan Province, China (permission not secured)

2.2 Tai Ya Language Classification

The Ethnologue (Lewis 2009) classifies Tai Ya [ISO 639-3 code: cuu] as: Tai-Kadai, Kam-Tai, Be-Tai, Tai-Sek, Tai, Southwestern, but does not classify it further within the Southwestern branch.

In recent research, Apiradee (2006) conducted lexical similarity comparison among Tai Nua varieties, and included some other Tai varieties in the study. Tai Ya was found to be 77-85 percent similar to various varieties of Tai Nua and 78-82 percent similar to other Tai varieties compared (Tai Lai, Tai Mao). The variety most similar to Tai Ya is Tai Nua of Jinggu (Yunnan Province, China) at 85% lexical similarity. However, when Apiradee statistically arranged all the compared varieties into four main groups, Tai Ya stands alone in its group.

2.3 Peoples and Languages

Tai Ya is one of several closely related Tai groups called the Huayaodai (Chinese for ‘Colorful Waist Tai’, referring to the colorful cloth belts worn by Huayaodai women). Tai Ya in Thailand use the terms Tai Ya and Huayaodai interchangeably.³ Many alternate names are found in the

³ In Thailand, Tai Ya is sometimes confused with a people group called ไทห้วย [tʰāi jai]. This name, however, refers to the Shan, a larger Tai ethnic group which lives in Myanmar and Thailand.

literature.⁴ In this report, the name ‘Tai Ya’ will be used to refer to the Tai Ya and their larger family.

It is estimated that there are 228 families (who are considered Tai Ya ethnically) living in Thailand with total population of approximately 1,000 people. For the Tai Ya in China, population estimates vary from a probable 34,000 to more than 63,000. Of those who are considered Tai Ya, it is estimated that most of them in China are Tai Ya speakers. The estimated population of Tai Ya speakers in Thailand is likely to be lower than the estimated 1,000 ethnic Tai Ya, since many of the young people cannot speak the language. Person and Yang (2002) estimate 500-600 speakers, while Ruengdet (1988) estimates 100 families.

What is the nature and extent of interactions between Tai Ya speakers in Thailand and in China? About 1/3 of the respondents had been to visit the Tai Ya in China, and all had met a Tai Ya person from China. The main reason for visiting China is to visit relatives. Those Tai Ya from China who visit Thailand usually do so to visit the relatives and friends who have visited them in China, or in some cases, to study.

The Thailand and China varieties of Tai Ya are likely to be intelligible. The lexicon and the tone systems are very similar. The Thailand Tai Ya report that they can understand the China variety and that it is only a little different from their speech. The nature and extent of contact is supporting evidence for the conclusion that these two groups of Tai Ya are likely to be able to share vernacular literature, if it existed. Of course, it also would depend on both speech communities choosing to use the same orthography.

2.4 Survey Results

Most of the data collection took place in Ban Nam Bor Khaw, which is the only village in Thailand where Tai Ya are a significant proportion of the population. Much evidence confirms that there is no noticeable division of varieties or groups of Tai Ya in Thailand.

Some of the results of the survey can be summarized as follows. It can be inferred from the research that most Tai Ya speakers master the Northern Thai language.

What are the attitudes of Tai Ya speakers toward Central Thai and Northern Thai? The Tai Ya people interviewed did not express any negative attitudes toward Central Thai or Northern Thai languages or people. Most had neutral or positive feelings about the children of the village speaking Northern Thai. Most had no preference when asked whether they would prefer their child to marry a Tai Ya or Thai/Northern Thai person. Another indicator of positive attitudes is the high rate of intermarriage of Tai Ya with Northern Thai people.

2.5 Language Vitality

What is the current vitality of the Tai Ya language in Thailand? It is weak. In the largest Tai Ya center, Ban Nam Bor Khaw, only some children speak the language fluently, according to the survey respondents. Northern Thai is the first language for many of the children. Northern Thai or Central Thai is used by more respondents with their spouses and children than Tai Ya. Half of married respondents are married to a non-Tai Ya person, and the younger generation is even more likely to intermarry, as the group is small and attitudes toward intermarriage are mostly neutral. Most respondents do believe, however, that at least some children in Ban Nam Bor Khaw will be speaking Tai Ya in twenty years.

2.6 Desire for Language Maintenance

Most Tai Ya in Thailand say that they want the children to learn Tai Ya, and they do not want the language to be lost. Almost all say that they would like to read Tai Ya if it were written. Some express a desire to have the language written down for preservation, if not for actual reading. Although there is some debate about whether Tai Ya has ever been written down, the Tai Ya of Thailand do not currently use any Tai Ya specific orthography.

The Tai Ya in Thailand have formed the Tai Ya Society to preserve and promote their culture and language. The Society organizes annual cultural events. At Natheetham Church in Ban Nam Bor Khaw, the Society has an office and a cultural display that includes a traditional woman's costume, photos, and a map of the Tai Ya migration route from China to Thailand.

⁴ Tai Ya, or sub-groups of Tai Ya, is sometimes referred to as Daiya (Dai Ya, Daija, Ya); Tai Chung (Cung, Chung, Tai Zhong); Tai Sai (Daisai); Tai Ka (Tai Kha, Dai Ka, Daikha, Tai Ke); ไตหย่า, ไตหย้า, and ไตหย๋า. The myriad references for these terms can be found in Dawkins (2007:3-4).

When asked what parts of being Tai Ya they would like to see their children and grandchildren continue, 16 respondents said the Tai Ya language. Others mentioned costume, dance, pride in their identity and a sense of community.

2.7 Bilingual Proficiency

Evidence from the survey indicates a high ability in Northern Thai for almost all Tai Ya people. Northern Thai was reported to be the first language and/or best language of many respondents. However, most respondents do consider Tai Ya to be their main ethnic identity.

Do Tai Ya speakers master either Central Thai or Northern Thai adequately? Actual bilingualism testing would be necessary to prove adequate bilingualism in Northern Thai, but it can be inferred from the research that most Tai Ya speakers do master Northern Thai adequately. The local leaders report that every sector of the population can speak Northern Thai well. The native Northern Thai speaker on the survey team reported that most of the respondents spoke Northern Thai like a native speaker. Eleven of 24 Individual Sociolinguistic Questionnaire respondents reported that they actually speak Northern Thai better than they speak Tai Ya.

2.8 Domains of language use

When asked about what language respondents themselves use in different situations, the responses were mixed. Some of the responses are summarized in Table 1.

“What language do you use ...”	Tai Ya	Northern Thai or other language	Both Tai Ya and another language	Total Respondents
With your parents	16	3	3	22
With your grandparents	16	1	2	19
With your grandchildren / nieces / nephews / cousin	4	15	3	22
With your spouse	5	8	0	13
With your children	4	8	2	14
With your siblings	11	8	4	23
At church	0	19	5	24
With your friends	1	8	15	24

Table 1 – Domains of language use (Dawkins 2007:13).

With older generation relatives, the majority of respondents reported using Tai Ya only. However, with their children and spouses, more than half of respondents reported not using Tai Ya at all. Many of the married respondents are, in fact, married to non-Tai Ya spouses.

2.9 Children’s language use

Table 2 shows the responses given by Ban Nam Bor Khaw residents about children’s language use and ability, which are primary indicators of language vitality. Only the responses given by Ban Nam Bor Khaw residents are included for this section, since this is the place where Tai Ya language vitality should be strongest; the other village where data was collected, Ban Pa Sak Khwang, has only a few Tai Ya families.

Question	“Do you think the children in this village speak Tai Ya well?”	
Responses	Yes	7
	No	6
	Only a few do	8
Total respondents		21
Question	“What language do Tai Ya children in this village speak when they play?”	
Responses	Tai Ya	3
	Northern Thai	12
	Both Northern Thai and Tai Ya	6
Total respondents		21
Question	“What language do Tai Ya children in this village speak first?”	
Responses	Tai Ya	5
	Northern Thai	13
	Both Northern Thai and Tai Ya	3
Total respondents		21

Question	“Twenty years from now, do you think the children in this village will still be able to speak Tai Ya?”	
Responses	Yes	8
	No	2
	“Some” or “a few” will	7
	Maybe	4
Total respondents		21

Table 2 – Children’s language use and ability

Table 2 illustrates that a majority of children in Ban Nam Bor Khaw are primarily Northern Thai speakers. According to the respondents, most children speak Northern Thai first and do not speak Tai Ya very well.

2.10 Survey Conclusions

Bilingual proficiency: *this research concludes that Tai Ya people in Thailand are able to use Central Thai and Northern Thai literature.*

Ethnolinguistic attitudes: *this research concludes that Tai Ya people in Thailand would accept Central Thai or Northern Thai literature.*

Language vitality: *this research concludes that any Tai Ya literature that would be developed might have a very small audience in Thailand due to weak language vitality.*

Desire for language development: *this research concludes that the Tai Ya of Thailand might be motivated to do their own language development for language preservation.*

Thus, Tai Ya of Thailand is an unlikely need for vernacular literature development, as preliminary research indicates high proficiency in Central Thai or Northern Thai and no negative attitudes towards those languages. In addition, language vitality is weak. However, there is probable intelligibility between Tai Ya in China and Thailand, indicating that shared literature could be possible if either variety were developed.

3 THE VITALITY OF TAI YA IN THAILAND

So what possible future work (both language development and research) might be attempted to benefit the Tai Ya? Perhaps a university would like to start a revitalization project; Tai Ya could be a good candidate for such a project. It would be worthwhile to survey the situation in China. The Tai Ya situation in Thailand is an ideal one for an MA thesis that would develop a proposed orthography for Tai Ya.

The remainder of this paper assesses the degree of endangerment of the Tai Ya language and suggests issues to be considered in striving to revitalize the Tai Ya language. To our knowledge, none of these ideas have been pursued in relation to Tai Ya in Thailand. Four different perspectives on language development and reversing language shift are applied to the survey data. First, Fishman’s GIDS (1991) is described, and some suggestions about Reversing Language Shift (RLS) among the Tai Ya language in Thailand are proposed. Second, some issues highlighted by Crystal (2000) on language revitalization prerequisites are also considered in relation to the Tai Ya language in Thailand. Third, the factors relating to language vitality and endangerment which were suggested by the UNESCO Ad Hoc Expert Group on Endangered Languages (Brenzinger et al. 2003) are considered and applied. Finally, some applications from Lewis and Simons’ Extended GIDS are considered.

3.1 Fishman’s GIDS

Since Joshua Fishman proposed his Graded Intergenerational Disruption Scale (GIDS 1991), it has been used regularly in language development and language endangerment research. The GIDS is summarized in the following sub-section. After that some suggestions for Reversing Language Shift (RLS) among the Tai Ya language in Thailand are proposed and compared to the Mpi language situation in Thailand. (See Nahhas 2005 and 2007a; Tehan and Nahhas 2007 which has a similar discussion.)

3.1.1 The Graded Intergenerational Disruption Scale

In chapter 4 of *Reversing Language Shift* (1991:81-121), Joshua Fishman proposed the GIDS to give sociolinguists and activists a scale to use in addressing the vitality and endangerment of a speech variety. The GIDS is designed as an indicator of the amount of disruption in the transmission of a language from one generation to another and the contribution of that disruption to the ongoing language shift process.

The GIDS is focused on reversing language shift. Language maintenance is another perspective on the same process, since reversing language shift results in language maintenance (cf. Lewis 1996:8). The GIDS is summarized in Table 3, beginning with the most endangered stage (Stage 8) and progressing through the less endangered stages. (The descriptions below are a distillation and expansion of Suwilai and Malone's (2003:2), as well as Lewis and Simons' (2010), reformulations of Fishman's various statements. For the original formulation of the GIDS, see Fishman (1991:81-121). For a short overview of the GIDS, see Spolsky (2004:186-190).)

Stage	Description
Stage 8	So few speakers (usually elderly grandparents) of the language are available that the community needs to re-establish language norms; often the expertise of outsiders is needed.
Stage 7	The older generation (those beyond child-bearing age) uses the language but children are not using it; the language is still spoken in the home and integrated somewhat into the family domain; however, the disruption is occurring between the child-bearing generation and the latest generation of children.
Stage 6	Language and identity socialization of children takes place in home and community; children are learning the oral language naturally in an intergenerational context; this is the threshold level for language maintenance, the level at which small languages continue to survive and even thrive (cf. Lewis 1996:8; Fishman 1991:92).
Stage 5	Language is used in a vital oral socio-cultural way in the community, and socialization involves extensive literacy, usually including non-formal local language schooling.
Stage 4	Local language is used in children's formal education in conjunction with the national or official language; the language is used in both the core (intimate) domains of the community and in the less intimate domains of primary education and literacy.
Stage 3	Local language is used in local and regional workplaces, where specialized language skills are not needed, by insiders and outsiders.
Stage 2	Lower governmental services and local / regional mass media are open to the local language.
Stage 1	Local language is used at the upper governmental level (although perhaps not exclusively), and for nationwide mass media and education.

Table 3 - GIDS summary

In part, Fishman's GIDS was proposed to enable an ordering of priorities for language planning to help speakers revitalize their language, i.e. reverse the shift of use from one language to another within a speech community. If a speech community desires to try to reverse language shift, the GIDS can help them prioritize actions that might be profitable. Fishman emphasized that to move a language from stage 7 to stage 4 one must first move it to stage 6, and only after attaining stage 6 can stages 5 and 4 be addressed. In other words, using the language in formal education will not reverse language shift. Grandparents must talk to their children and grandchildren in the local language. The number of informal domains in which the local language is used in the community also needs to be increased.

The GIDS can be read from Stage 1, as the least disrupted and thus least endangered rating, 'down' to the most disrupted and most endangered language situation at Stage 8. "Generally, the trend is that the trajectory of minoritized language communities is downwards on the scale and the descriptions of each stage are framed in terms of the loss of uses (functions, domains) and users" (Lewis and Simons 2010).

3.1.2 The GIDS applied to Tai Ya

When the GIDS is applied to the Tai Ya speech communities, it becomes obvious that the two communities (in the village of Ban Nam Bor Khaw and outside of it) are at different levels. The four upper levels (stages 4 to 1) do not apply to the Tai Ya situation at the moment.

Stage 8 seems to be the best descriptor for the Tai Ya outside of Ban Nam Bor Khaw since proficiency is limited mainly to older people.

Stage 7 is probably the best descriptor for the situation in Ban Nam Bor Khaw itself. Perhaps, Stage 6 is within striking distance. In comparison to the Mpi⁵, Tai Ya seems rather similar. (In Tables 4 and 5 below, the percentages associated with these aspects of the language communities are close and the sample size rather small.) Even though many Tai Ya children in Ban Nam Bor Khaw do not speak Tai Ya, some can speak a little and many do have a passive understanding.

About 67% of the 24 Tai Ya adults interviewed in Ban Nam Bor Khaw said they use Tai Ya with their parents and grandparents, so many children are still exposed to the language. About 62% of respondents reported that children learn Northern Thai first; about 24% reported that children learn Tai Ya first; about 14% reported that children learned Northern Thai and Tai Ya at the same time. Also, about 14% of the respondents said that children use Tai Ya when playing; about 57% of the respondents said that children use Northern Thai when playing; and about 29% of the respondents said that children mixed Tai Ya with Northern Thai when playing (Dawkins 2007:14). Note that this is not a claim that a percentage OF CHILDREN use a certain language. We do not have data to say that, since we did not interview the young children being spoken of, and the respondents were not even asked directly about their own children. Basically we have mixed perceptions about what a general group, ‘the village children’, do.

	Use vernacular at home	Learn Northern Thai first	Children use both languages when playing.
Mpi in Ban Dong	70%	70%	30%
Tai Ya in Ban Nam Bor Khaw	67%*	62%	25%

Table 4 - Comparison of Mpi and Tai Ya

*The question in the Tai Ya survey was about which people one uses the language with: 16 out of 24 said they used it with their parents and grandchildren, but only 4 or 5 out of 24 said that they used Tai Ya with spouses, children and grandparents. So 67% is a generous estimate (Dawkins 2007:13).

Table 5 compares Tai Ya and Mpi, and proposes some possible interventions to encourage the vitality of the Tai Ya language community.

Stage / Description	Tai Ya Situation	Possible Tai Ya interventions	Mpi Situation
Stage 8: A few elderly speakers.	The situation of Tai Ya outside of Ban Nam Bor Khaw seems to be at this stage. The language vitality there would be strengthened if it could attain Stage 7.	Time is needed for the younger people to spend in real life social situations with the older people who speak the language well. Recordings and transcriptions also need to be made, and the grammar and phonology need to be analyzed, because the time is approaching when the language will need to be relearned or re-taught from this documentation.	The situation in Ban Sakoen seems to be at this stage. The language vitality in Ban Sakoen would be strengthened if it could attain Stage 7.
Stage 7: The older generation uses the language but children are not using it.	The situation in Ban Nam Bor Khaw seems to be at this stage. Intergenerational transmission of Tai Ya is increasingly disrupted.	The Tai Ya could make an adaptation of language nests—small communities where Tai Ya is practiced in the socio-cultural context as a part of normal everyday life.	The situation in Ban Dong seems to be at this stage. Intergenerational transmission of Mpi is increasingly disrupted.

⁵ Mpi is a Tibeto-Burman language; there are two Mpi communities in Thailand (Nahhas 2005 and 2007a; Tehan and Nahhas 2007, 2009).

Stage 6: Children are learning the language naturally in an inter-generational context	In order to preserve the Tai Ya language, it is necessary for the Ban Nam Bor Khaw community to progress to Stage 6.	If the Tai Ya choose to strive for Stage 6, encouragement to value, appreciate and participate in the use of the Tai Ya language would be helpful. Outside experts could help to make the Tai Ya aware of what other endangered language communities in the world have done.	In order to preserve the Mpi language, it is necessary for the Ban Dong community to progress to Stage 6.
Stage 5: Language is vital in the community, involving extensive literacy.	Tai Ya is not at this level. However, attainment of this level could stabilize the language shift situation for Tai Ya, if it is built on a solid foundation of Stage 6.	Design and adoption of an orthography. Production of a primer and introductory Tai Ya readers in a voluntary literacy program. Other programs such as literature in use and development of ethno-musicological material could reinforce this Stage.	Mpi is not at this level. However, attainment of this level could stabilize the language shift situation for Mpi, if it is built on a solid foundation of Stage 6.

Table 5 - GIDS summary and application to Tai Ya: Stages 8 to 5

The Tai Ya language in Thailand is definitely endangered. Preservation of the Tai Ya language must begin immediately to have much hope of success. Outside of Ban Nam Bor Khaw, the language is in Stage 8, a level often called “moribund”. Unless some of the things suggested in Table 5 are done very soon, the language will die with the present grandparent generation. In Ban Nam Bor Khaw, the situation is somewhat better. However, it is important for the survival of this language that Tai Ya be preserved as the productive and useful language of all generations in the home, and as much as possible in the local community.

If Stage 6 can be attained, then development of an orthography and a literacy program could be a valuable support. However, until Stage 6 is attained, this kind of language development would likely serve only to document the language, not preserve its use. Introducing an orthography and trying to teach people to read Tai Ya would likely prove futile unless Stage 6 is reached. “One cannot jump across or dispense with Stage 6” (Fishman 1991:95; cf. 2000:4).

In terms of orthography and its effect on language vitality, how does Tai Ya compare to the languages of other minority people groups in South East Asia? Tai Ya, with no orthography, has the opposite problem of a few languages of South East Asia, where two or more orthographies split the language communities and dilute literacy efforts. Two of the more extreme examples of this are the Lisu with five proposed orthographies, not counting adaptations and revisions (Morse and Tehan 2000), and Akha with 10 contending orthographies (Kya Heh and Tehan 1999a, b; 2000). Many languages in the area have (just) one orthography (e.g. Western Lawa, see Nahhas 2007b). However, it is impossible to evaluate the effect of these orthographies on language vitality since an orthography probably would not have been developed had the language *not* had vitality to begin with.

An example of a language in Thailand that has an orthography that was developed for the purpose of language revitalization is Nyah Kur. Unfortunately, the presence of this orthography does not seem to be helping as much as one would hope (SIL MSEAG 2007). Eastern Lawa is an example of a language in Thailand without an orthography which, like Tai Ya, faces strong pressures to shift to Thai but, unlike Tai Ya and Mpi, has strong vitality (see Tehan and Nahhas 2009; Nahhas 2007b). It is very likely, of course, that an orthography would further strengthen the vitality of Eastern Lawa. These examples simply illustrate that, while it would certainly support language revitalization, the creation of an orthography is not the whole answer. Once again, in Fishman’s terms, you cannot skip Stage 6.

3.2 C. David Crystal’s ‘Six Prerequisites’

In a very accessible book on endangered languages, an additional perspective on endangered languages is provided by David Crystal’s six prerequisites for language revitalization. He describes these ‘six prerequisites’ as “progress towards the goal of language being used in the

home and neighborhood as a tool of intergenerational communication” (Crystal 2000:130). After explaining these six prerequisites below, they are applied in relation to the Tai Ya language situation in Thailand.

3.2.1 The Six Prerequisites

Crystal’s chapter 5 “What can be done?” is full of ideas for promoting revitalization (Crystal 2000:127-166). According to Crystal, real progress in language vitality depends on: (1) the language community itself being “interested in obtaining help,” (2) “a positive political climate,” and (3) the involvement of professionals in the pursuit of the agreed-upon tasks (Crystal 2000:102). The “six prerequisites” he proposes are described in Table 6. In addition to the six prerequisites, documentation, which he calls “a major enterprise,” is given a place in the summary table.

Prerequisite	Description
1	Increased prestige within the dominant community.
2	Increased wealth relative to the dominant community.
3	Increased relative power in the eyes of the dominant community.
4	A strong presence in the educational system.
5	A writing system for the language.
6	Access to electronic technology.
Documentation	Documentation is also suggested as a factor although it is not listed as a prerequisite.

Table 6 - Crystal’s (2000) six prerequisites for language revitalization

3.2.2 The Six Prerequisites applied to Tai Ya

The six prerequisites which Crystal proposes are applied to the Tai Ya situation in Thailand in the second column in Table 7, and the third column provides both (A) an assessment of the current situation for Tai Ya, as well as (B) some enhancements that might be attempted to improve the situation.

Prerequisite	Tai Ya Situation	Positive or Negative at Present
1 Prestige	It is not evident that the Tai Ya are reluctant to speak Tai Ya in the presence of Thai speakers. However, an increase in prestige could not hurt.	(A) At the moment there is no data about reluctance to use Tai Ya or about negative attitudes toward it. (B) Enhancement: an increase in Tai Ya media usage and perceived community activity, could result in increased visibility and prestige.
2 Wealth	Can they increase their economic status?	(A) Unknown. (B) Enhancement: tourism.
3 Power	How much power do they have? Can they be empowered?	(A) Unknown. (B) Enhancement: Thai Non-Formal Education, UNESCO, etc. involvement.
4 Presence in Education	At the moment, there is no known Tai Ya presence in education.	(A) Negative: Thai is dominant. (B) Enhancement: good materials, teacher training.
5 Writing	This seems very attainable if the community is willing to invest time and resources. An outside	(A) Negative: no orthography at present. (B) Enhancement: literacy materials.

	consultant could be of use here.	
6 Electronic techno-logy	If their economic status permits it, and if a suitable orthography can be developed, this factor can become positive.	(A) Unknown. (B) Enhancement: web page.
Document-ation.	There is some documentation on Tai Ya. More could certainly be done.	Needed: an orthography, grammars, more dictionaries, a text corpus of different patterns of discourse, interviews of people with specialized knowledge, audio and video recordings, etc.

Table 7 - Crystal's (2000) six prerequisites applied to Tai Ya

It is evident that in some ways the Tai Ya in Thailand are an exceptional minority language group for their size. Although the sizes and amounts of language use among the Tai Ya and the Mpi are similar, some of the issues highlighted by Crystal's prerequisites identify differences.

About #1 Prestige: There is no data about reluctance to use Tai Ya or negative attitudes toward Tai Ya language usage. Perhaps an important factor with the Tai Ya is their positive attitude toward Northern Thai, and thus assimilation to Northern Thai is not perceived as a threat. Also a key difference between Tai Ya and other groups is that Tai Ya and Northern Thai are so similar that they almost seem like dialects of the same language to the non-linguist.

#2 Wealth: The Tai Ya do not seem to be at an economic disadvantage relative to their neighbors. They are definitely better off than many minority language groups that Dawkins surveyed. Many of them are professionals and well-educated.

#3 Power: Similarly the Tai Ya do not seem to be at a relative power disadvantage either. Many Tai Ya are pastors, community leaders, professors, etc., among the Northern or Central Thai people. The main contact for the survey is a founder/director of a small multi-ethnic seminary. One woman was running for political office while the survey was being conducted, and the survey team visited a Tai Ya man who has some high rank in the Chiang Rai city office. They are definitely not your typical minority group when it comes to power, especially considering how small they are.

#4 Presence in Education: The Thai Ministry of Education does allow time in the school week for local content. It is possible that something that we do not know about has happened in the last couple of years. At the time of the survey, there was no official presence in the government schools. However, there are Tai Ya teachers and leaders in education. Also, they have had Tai Ya "classes" at the church sometimes to teach Tai Ya to the children. These classes are not part of Crystal's focus here; however, they do relate to Stage 5 of the GIDS.

#6 Electronic Technology: The Tai Ya definitely have access to technology, at least as much access as their NT neighbors. Also, there is a Tai Ya web page made by those in China; However, it is all written in Chinese characters, so it could not be used as a resource for this research.

The areas of overlap from Crystal's analytical scheme with applications from the GIDS include: support for more public use for the Tai Ya language, development of an orthography and accompanying literacy materials, and increased documentation. Areas of non-linguistic intervention to benefit Tai Ya vitality are suggested in Crystal's analysis: increased prestige, wealth and power might very well contribute to increased presence in the local educational system and increased use of electronic technology. It doesn't seem that the present Chinese character web-site will have any direct impact on Tai Ya language vitality in Thailand.

3.3 UNESCO's Nine Factors in Language Vitality and Endangerment

The UNESCO Ad Hoc Expert Group on Endangered Languages has proposed nine factors in language vitality and endangerment (Brenzinger, et al. 2003). For each factor, a scale from 0 to 5 is used to evaluate the vitality or endangerment of the language.

In Table 5 below, the factors relating to language vitality and endangerment which were suggested by the UNESCO Ad Hoc Expert Group on Endangered Languages (Brenzinger et al. 2003) are considered. In Table 6, they are applied to the Tai Ya language situation in Thailand, with Standard Thai, Northern Thai and Mpi added for reference.

“In contrast to Fishman’s GIDS, the UNESCO framework provides a richer set of categories at the weaker end of the scale. Note, however, that it does not differentiate the status of languages which are above Level 6 on the GIDS scale and lumps them all together under the single label of ‘Safe’” (Lewis and Simon’s 2010). An increasing number of languages are being described with this scale in the UNESCO Atlas of the World’s Languages in Danger. However, Tai Ya both in Thailand and in China is not described in the current edition as of September 2010⁶.

3.3.1 Nine Factors in Language Vitality and Endangerment

The following table is an adaptation of the UNESCO Ad Hoc Expert Group’s factors, as summarized and stated by Lewis (2006). The rating system that the Group gave to associate with each factor is discussed in Table 8. The Group did not give rating points for factor 2 in the absolute number of speakers, so we have used the values suggested for SE Asia in Tehan and Nahhas (2009).

3.3.1.1.1 Factor	Degree of Endangerment, Grade and Description
1. Intergenerational language transmission scale: ‘Speaker Population’	<p><i>Safe</i> 5 The language is used by all ages, from children up.</p> <p><i>Unsafe</i> 4 The language is used by some children in all domains; it is used by all children in limited domains.</p> <p><i>Definitively endangered</i> 3 The language is used mostly by the parental generation and up.</p> <p><i>Severely endangered</i> 2 The language is used mostly by the grandparental generation and up.</p> <p><i>Critically endangered</i> 1 The language is used mostly by very few speakers, of great-grandparental generation.</p> <p><i>Extinct</i> 0 There exists no speaker.</p>
2. Absolute number of speakers	<p>No point scale was associated with this factor in the original report. For the present paper, the following scale* was employed:</p> <p><i>less than 1000—0 points;</i></p> <p><i>1000-3000—1 point;</i></p> <p><i>3000-6000—2 points;</i></p> <p><i>6000-10,000—3 points;</i></p> <p><i>10,000-50,000—4 points;</i></p> <p><i>50,000-100,00—5 points;</i></p> <p><i>100,000 plus—6 points.</i></p>
3. Proportion of speakers within the total reference group (population)	<p><i>Safe</i> 5 All speak the language.</p> <p><i>Unsafe</i> 4 Nearly all speak the language.</p> <p><i>Definitively endangered</i> 3 A majority speak the language.</p> <p><i>Severely endangered</i> 2 A minority speak the language.</p> <p><i>Critically endangered</i> 1 Very few speak the language.</p> <p><i>Extinct</i> 0 None speak the language.</p>
4. Loss of existing language domains: ‘Domains and Functions’	<p><i>Universal use</i> 5 The language is used in all domains and for all functions.</p> <p><i>Multilingual parity</i> 4 Two or more languages may be used in most social domains and for most functions.</p> <p><i>Dwindling domains</i> 3 The language is in home domains and for many functions, but the dominant language begins to penetrate even home domains.</p> <p><i>Limited or formal domains</i> 2 The language is used in limited social domains and for several functions.</p> <p><i>Highly limited domains</i> 1 The language is used only in a very restricted domains and for a very few functions.</p> <p><i>Extinct</i> 0 The language is not used in any domain and for any function.</p>

⁶ Although Tai Ya both in Thailand and in China is not rated in this resource, the Mpi are rated as definitely endangered (UNESCO Atlas of the World’s Languages in Danger).

5. Response to new domains and media: 'New Domains and Media Accepted by the Endangered Language'	<p><i>Dynamic</i> 5 The language is used in all new domains. <i>Robust/active</i> 4 The language is used in most new domains. <i>Receptive</i> 3 The language is used in many domains. <i>Coping</i> 2 The language is used in some new domains. <i>Minimal</i> 1 The language is used only in a few new domains. <i>Inactive</i> 0 The language is not used in any new domains.</p>
6. Materials for language education and literacy: 'Accessibility of Written Materials'	<p>[no degree of endangerment labels associated]</p> <p>5 There is an established orthography, literacy tradition with grammars, dictionaries, texts, literature, and everyday media. Writing in the language is used in administration and education. 4 Written materials exist, and at school, children are developing literacy in the language. Writing in the language is not used in administration. 3 Written materials exist and children may be exposed to the written form at school. Literacy is not promoted through print media. 2 Written materials exist, but they may only be useful for some members of the community; and for others, they may have a symbolic significance. Literacy education in the language is not a part of the school curriculum. 1 A practical orthography is known to the community and some material is being written. 0 No orthography available to the community.</p>
7. Governmental and institutional language attitudes and policies: 'Official Attitudes Toward Language'	<p>[Degree of Support: no degree of endangerment labels associated]</p> <p><i>Equal support</i> 5 All languages are protected. <i>Differentiated support</i> 4 Minority languages are protected primarily as the language of the private domains. The use of the language is prestigious. <i>Passive assimilation</i> 3 No explicit policy exists for minority languages; the dominant language prevails in the public domain. <i>Active assimilation</i> 2 Government encourages assimilation to the dominant language. There is no protection for minority languages. <i>Forced assimilation</i> 1 The dominant language is the sole official language, while non-dominant languages are neither recognized or protected. <i>Prohibition</i> 0 Minority languages are prohibited.</p>
8. Community members' attitudes toward their own language: 'Community Members' Attitudes toward Language'	<p>[no degree of endangerment labels associated]</p> <p>5 All members value their language and wish to see it promoted. 4 Most members support language maintenance. 3 Many members support language maintenance; others are indifferent or may even support language loss. 2 Some members support language maintenance; others are indifferent or may even support language loss. 1 Only a few members support language maintenance; others are indifferent or may even support language loss. 0 No one cares if the language is lost; all prefer to use a dominant language.</p>

9. Type and quality of documentation: ‘Nature of Documentation’	<p><i>[Documentation rating: no degree of endangerment labels associated]</i></p> <p><i>Superlative 5</i> There are comprehensive grammars and dictionaries, extensive texts; constant flow of language materials. Abundant annotated high quality audio and video recordings exist.</p> <p><i>Good 4</i> There is one good grammar and a number of adequate grammars, dictionaries, texts, literature, and occasionally updated everyday media; adequate annotated high-quality audio and video recordings.</p> <p><i>Fair 3</i> There may be an adequate grammar or sufficient amount of grammars, dictionaries, and texts, but no everyday media; audio and video recordings may exist in varying quality or degree of annotation.</p> <p><i>Fragmentary 2</i> There are some grammatical sketches, word-lists, and texts useful for limited linguistic research but with inadequate coverage. Audio and video recordings may exist in varying quality, with or without any annotation.</p> <p><i>Inadequate 1</i> Only a few grammatical sketches, short wordlists, and fragmentary texts. Audio and video recordings do not exist, are of unusable quality, or are completely un-annotated.</p> <p><i>Undocumented 0</i> No material exists.</p>
---	---

Table 8 – UNESCO’s Nine Factors in Language Vitality and Endangerment

*It is not known if these are the best choices for this region of the world, but these figures allow what seem to be appropriate distinctions among many language groups in SE Asia.

Although totaling up the numbers from the table above makes assumptions about equal weighting of factors, the resulting sums allow for some comparison of a ‘vitality rating’ among languages that share the somewhat similar cultural and physical environment of SE Asia. Totals for a language consistently rated as the first, second, etc. choice in each box above, yields the following totals: Safe 45; Unsafe 36; Definitely Endangered 27; Severely Endangered 18; Critically Endangered 9; and Extinct 0.

3.3.2 The Nine Factors applied to Tai Ya

The following table is an adaptation of the UNESCO Group’s factors. Two Tai Ya communities are rated separately. Standard Thai is the standard variety of Thai used in education, government, national media, etc.; it is based on Central Thai. Northern Thai is the common spoken variety of the northern provinces of Thailand; it is not completely mutually (inherently) intelligible with Central Thai. A total for each column is supplied at the bottom of the table. It is not known to what extent these numerical totals are comparable, but it seems likely that they provide some means of comparison between language communities with large point totals being indicative of different degrees of speech community vitality. Mpi as spoken in Ban Dong (the strongest Mpi community) was assigned 18 points (= severely endangered) in Tehan and Nahhas (2009). Here Tai Ya as spoken in Ban Nam Bor Khaw was assigned 16 (= severely endangered) points, making it perhaps weaker than Mpi in Ban Dong and somewhat stronger than the mere 10 points (= critically endangered) of Mpi outside Ban Sakoen. However, neither Tai Ya speech community (nor Mpi) come close to the strength and vitality of Standard Thai (45 points = safe) or Northern Thai (34 points = unsafe) in Thailand.

3.3.2.1.1 Factor	OUTSIDE Ban Nam Bor Khaw	Ban Nam Bor Khaw	Mpi (2 communities separated by /)	Standard Thai	Northern Thai
1. Intergenerational language transmission scale	2 points: Severely endangered: used by a few grandparents	3 points: Definitely endangered: used by parental generation plus	2 / 3 points: Severely / Definitely endangered: used by a few grandparents / parental generation plus	5 points: Safe: used by all ages from children up	5 points: Safe: used by all ages from children up
2. Absolute number of speakers	0 points: few people	0 points: ca. 600 people	0 / 1 point: ca. 240 / 1250 people	6 points: millions of people	6 points: millions of people
3. Proportion of speakers within the total reference group	1 point: Critically endangered: Very few speak the language	3 points: Definitely endangered: a majority, but not all, speak the language	1 / 3 points: Critically / Definitely endangered: Very few / a majority, but not all, speak the language	5 points: Safe: all speak the language	5 points: Safe: all speak the language
4. Loss of existing language domains	1 point: Highly limited domains: very few domains and functions	2 points: Limited or formal domains: language is used in limited social domains and for several functions.	1 / 3 points: Highly limited / Dwindling domains: very few domains and functions / even the home is threatened	5 points: Universal use: all domains and functions	3 points: Dwindling domains: The language is in home domains and for many functions, but the dominant language begins to penetrate even home domains.
5. Response to new domains and media	0 points: Inactive: not used in any new domains	0 points: Inactive: not used in any new domains	0 points: Inactive: not used in any new domains	4 points: Robust and active: most new domains ^a	2 points: Coping: The language is used in some new domains ^b
6. Materials for language education and literacy	0 points: No orthography	0 points: No orthography	0 points: No orthography	5 points: Educational and governmental use	3 points: Written materials exist and children may be exposed to the written form at school; literacy is not promoted through print media
7. Governmental and institutional language attitudes and policies	3 points: Passive Assimilation: no explicit policy	3 points: Passive Assimilation: no explicit policy	3 points: Passive Assimilation: no explicit policy	5 points: Passive Assimilation (3 points) + Standard Thai is the assimilation goal (2 points) ^c	3 points: Passive Assimilation

8. Community members' attitudes toward their own language	1 point: Only <i>a few</i> members support language maintenance; others are indifferent or may even support language loss.	3 points: Many support, but some indifference	2 / 3 points: Some / Many support, but some indifference	5 points: All members value the language	3 points: <i>Many</i> members support language maintenance; others are indifferent or may even support language loss
9. Type and quality of documentation	2 points: Fragmentary but present	2 points: Fragmentary but present	2 points: Fragmentary but present	5 points: Superlative: Comprehensive	4 points: Good: There are a number of adequate grammars, dictionaries, texts, literature, and occasionally-updated everyday media; adequate annotated high-quality audio and video recordings.
Total	10	16	11 / 18	45	34

Table 9 – Evaluation of Tai Ya, Mpi, Central (Standard) Thai and Northern Thai According to UNESCO's Nine Factors

^a As in many languages of the world, the newest technology comes from outside with its own descriptive words also from outside. In Thailand, the words are usually 'Thai-ized' rather quickly and they become a part of the Thai language repertoire.

^b As in many languages of the world, the newest technology comes from outside with its own descriptive words also from outside. In Thailand, the words are usually 'Thai-ized' rather quickly and they become a part of the Standard Thai language repertoire; however, they are generally NOT adapted into Northern Thai per se.

^c The government policy is not different in the abstract. However, since Central Thai is the goal of that assimilation, it seemed logical to award full points to it. The scale is not made to rate the national languages, but this seems to follow the intent of the Group's rating system.

We hope to eventually compare these totals with more languages in the area.⁷ As we collect and evaluate data about SE Asian languages, perhaps this could be another step toward Fishman's 1966 dream of a worldwide language maintenance and language shift case-file (Fishman 1992:396).

The totals indicate that Tai Ya as spoken outside of Ban Nam Bor Khaw is critically endangered, while Tai Ya as spoken in Ban Nam Bor Khaw could be described as severely endangered. In fact, Tai Ya comes out a little weaker (i.e. perhaps a little more endangered) than Mpi. In agreement with the GIDS, Factor 1 highlights the need for more children to be using Tai Ya in more domains; notice how Factor 4 highlights the dwindling domains of use. Factor 2 highlights the need to have more speakers of Tai Ya, and the logical place to look for those speakers is among those who are ethnically Tai Ya and increasing the number of Tai Ya people who actually speak the Tai Ya language (Factor 3). All three of these evaluation schemes indicate the lack of an accepted orthography (Factor 6). Factor 7, Prerequisite 6 and GIDS level 5 all point to the possible contribution of official institutions, especially the educational system. Factor 8 and Prerequisite 1 both identify the need to increase the prestige of the language. Both Crystal and Factor 9 encourage increased variety and quality of documentation.

Intergenerational transmission is failing for the Tai Ya of Thailand. Only in Ban Nam Bor Khaw do there seem to be enough speakers to create a community of Tai Ya speakers, but even then the total numbers of Tai Ya speakers will remain a very small drop in relation to the Northern Thai speech community ocean in which they are immersed for work, worship, education and entertainment. The development of an orthography or the actual promotion of Tai Ya by the government and school system could add more 'points' to the totals. In addition, more points could be added if there were more documentation. Ideally, these increases in points (perhaps pushing the totals into the mid-20s) would indicate a strengthening of the vitality of Tai Ya in these communities.

3.4 Lewis and Simons' Extended GIDS

Lewis and Simons (2010) proposed an extension to the GIDS in the following areas:

1. Since the GIDS is rather static in its descriptions, they wanted to be able to distinguish between significantly different communities at a given GIDS Stage; for example, a Stage 6 community that was 'climbing' to a higher stage through language development, and a Stage 6 community that was experiencing language shift toward Stage 7 should have that difference reflected in some way.
2. Since the GIDS does not cover all languages, they wanted to extend both ends of the scale.
3. Since Stage 6 and below are focused on the role of disruption in language shift, they wanted to include aspects of developmental institutional roles in wider transmission language in Stage 5 and above.
4. Although the GIDS describes disruption in Stage 6 and below, another set of categories that highlight language revitalization could be helpful for language development.

As Lewis and Simons sought to respond to these issues, they also desired to incorporate descriptions from UNESCO's nine factors, as well as those employed in the Ethnologue. In the

⁷ For comparison, we did look at some Venezuelan languages rated in the UNESCO documents Appendix 1. At 10 points (= critically endangered) "Mapayo is a Cariban language no longer spontaneously spoken, but remembered by a handful of elders in a multi-ethnic community all of whose members communicate in Spanish, which is also the first language learned by all the Mapayo children. [At 21 points = severely endangered] Kari'na is a Cariban language as well, but has many more speakers, most of whom are bilingual. Some elders learned Kari'na as their first language and can speak it fluently, although nowadays Spanish is the preferred language for most Karina" (Brenzinger et al. 2003:19). If one changes the proper nouns, the descriptions seem a rather good fit for the Tai Ya speech communities outside and inside the village of Ban Nam Bor Khaw.

current edition, they categorize languages based primarily on number of speakers as: Living, Second language only, Nearly Extinct, Dormant and Extinct (Lewis 2009)⁸.

3.4.1 An Extended GIDS

Several pages of description can be found in Lewis and Simons (2010); the Levels are summarized in the following table. After the description column, a corresponding label from the UNESCO system is included.

Level	Label	Description	UNESCO
0	International	Internationally used for a broad range of functions.	Safe
1	National	Used in education, work, mass media, and government nationwide.	Safe
2	Regional	Used for local and regional mass media and government services.	Safe
3	Trade	Used for local and regional work by both insiders and outsiders.	Safe
4	Educational	Transmitted through public education.	Safe
5	Written	Used orally by all generations and effectively used in written form by parts of community.	Safe
6a	Vigorous	Used orally by all generations and learned by children as their first language. Stable or gaining strength.	Safe
6b	Threatened	Used orally by all generations but only some of the child-bearing generation are transmitting it to their children.	Vulnerable
7	Shifting	Used by the children-bearing generation among themselves but not transmitting it to their children.	Definitely Endangered
8a	Moribund	Used only by the grandparent generation.	Severely Endangered
8b	Nearly Extinct	Only oldest people know the language and they have little opportunity to use it.	Critically Endangered
9	Dormant	Used as a reminder of heritage identity for an ethnic community. No one has more than symbolic proficiency.	Extinct
10	Extinct	No one retains a sense of ethnic identity associated with the language, even for symbolic purposes.	Extinct

Table 10 – Lewis and Simons’ Extended GIDS (Lewis and Simons 2010 adapted)

A language can be assigned to a level based on the answers to five key questions. The questions are not elaborated in this present quick summary, but enough detail is given to allow discussion of Tai Ya and the other languages referred to in this research paper. The questions encourage engagement with vital factors involved in language maintenance and development—identity, vehicularity, the status of intergenerational transmission, literacy acquisition, and generational language use. The five key questions are:

1. What is the current identity function of language? Possible answers to this question: Historical, Heritage, Home and Vehicular. Vehicular refers “to the extent to which a language is used to facilitate communication among those who speak different first languages” (Lewis and Simons 2010).

⁸ Tai Ya or Mpi are rated as ‘Living’ (the default) in the current web edition of the Ethnologue (Lewis 2009), which only cites the vitality category if the language is NOT in the Living category.

2. What is the level of official use? Possible answers to this question: International, National, Regional and Not Official.
3. Are all parents transmitting the language to their children? Possible answers to this question: Yes and No.
4. What is the literacy status? Possible answers to this question: Institutional, Incipient and None.
5. What is the youngest generation of proficient speakers? Possible answers to this question: Great Grandparents, Grandparents, Parents and Children.

Question 1	Questions 2-5	Level	Label
Vehicular	2. International	0	International
Vehicular	2. National	1	National
Vehicular	2. Regional	2	Regional
Vehicular	2. Not official	3	Trade
Home	3. Yes; 4 Institutional	4	Educational
Home	3. Yes; 4. Incipient	5	Written
Home	3. Yes; 4. None	6a	Vigorous
Home	3. No; 5. Children	6b	Threatened
Home	3. No; 5. Parents	7	Shifting
Home	3. No; 5. Grandparents	8a	Moribund
Home	3. No; 5. Great Grandparents	8b	Nearly Extinct
Heritage		9	Dormant
Historical		10	Extinct

Table 11 – Lewis and Simons’ Extended GIDS (Lewis and Simons 2010 adapted)

In a personal communication, Paul Lewis (2010) also said that a language development program can be based on the answers to these questions in part, and he proposes that there are four of the levels in the Extended GIDS that are sustainable. As sustainable levels, each community can pick their desired target and commit resources to achieving and maintaining the appropriate level. The four levels are:

Level 10: an extinct language will no longer be spoken, even for symbolic purposes; however, it can be thoroughly documented and preserved (in that sense) for future generations of descendants as well as researchers.

Level 9: a dormant language will no longer be spoken by mother-tongue speakers, but it will remain an important part of the identity of the community as it is learned as a second language and employed symbolically at appropriate occasions.

Level 6a: a vigorous language is sustained orally as the community still uses it for daily functions and all children learn the language in the home and community.

Level 4: an educational language is a vigorous oral language that has sustainable literacy in established institutions.

3.4.2 The Extended GIDS applied to Tai Ya

The Extended GIDS which Lewis and Simons propose is intended to lead to applications depending on the community’s response to the implied question of which sustainable level is an appropriate target for it.

The Tai Ya in Thailand seem to be at Level 7 ‘Shifting’ and falling. Community activity is present to continue to support the language to be sustained at Level 9 ‘Dormant’, as there is a cultural center and cultural events that take place regularly. Also people travel to the Tai Ya

homeland in China to learn Tai Ya as a second language. A significant reorientation of resources would be needed in order for the Tai Ya to achieve and maintain a vigorous Level 6a.

The Mpi in Thailand also seem to be at Level 7 'Shifting' and falling. However, there does not seem to be a community commitment to do activities that maintain Level 9 'Dormant', and if nothing else is done, Mpi will likely fall to Level 10 'Extinct'. There is a certain amount of documentation; however, much more documentation could still be done with the few remaining speakers of the language.

4 CONCLUSION: THE FUTURE FOR TAI YA IN THAILAND

What would help the Tai Ya language to survive, grow, and prosper? First of all and foundationally, the Tai Ya speech communities themselves must decide that they will value and speak Tai Ya in the home and community, and that the children will be expected to learn it. This does not rule out multilingualism in Northern Thai and Central Thai. Various community events could serve to educate Tai Ya speakers of the necessity to pass the language along, and to improve the attitude of the Tai Ya toward their own language.

If this prerequisite foundation is addressed, an orthography could then be designed and adapted, followed by a primer and other literacy materials for use in local schools and in the community. These materials in themselves would be useless to maintain a vigorous language unless the foundation in the home and community is in place first. Tourism, media attention and a web page could increase the prestige of the language, and perhaps generate additional income to use on language development. No matter what, additional documentation is warranted: grammars, dictionaries, a text corpus, audio and video recordings, interviews of people with specialized knowledge, etc.

All three perspectives referenced in this paper identify the need for an orthography in helping to strengthen the vitality of an endangered language. An orthography is necessary to implement the literacy program of Fishman's stage 5. Crystal's fifth prerequisite is a writing system of the language. And in the UNESCO scheme, Factor 6, Tai Ya received 0 points for literacy and educational materials since Tai Ya lacks the requisite orthography. Perhaps an orthography would be helpful in maintaining an E-GIDS Level 9, as it would be easier to use Tai Ya for symbolic purposes.

There is one factor that is not highlighted by any of these evaluation schemes. One advantage that Tai Ya has over Mpi is the existence of a committee among the Tai Ya, whose function is to promote the language and culture.

Tai Ya is at a critical point. Time, energy and finances, if they are applied strategically, could make a crucial difference in preserving the language. It is possible that there will still be mother-tongue speakers of Tai Ya at the turn of the next century, and in fact the current members of the Tai Ya speech community in Thailand expect that (Dawkins 2007:14). But that possibility might only become reality if changes are made soon.

5 REFERENCES

- Apiradee Chantanaroj. 2006. A rapid sociolinguistic survey of selected Tai Nua Speech Varieties. Master's Thesis. Chiang Mai: Payap University.
- Brenzinger, Matthias, et al. 2003. Language vitality and endangerment. Paris: UNESCO Ad Hoc Expert Group on Endangered Languages.
http://portal.unesco.org/culture/en/ev.phpURL_ID=9105&URL_DO=DO_TOPIC&URL_SECTION=201.html (23 March 2006).
- Crystal, David. 2000. Language death. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Dawkins, Erin. 2007. A Sociolinguistic Survey of Tai Ya in Thailand. Chiang Mai, Thailand: Survey Unit, Department of Linguistics, Faculty of Humanities, Payap University, Research Project #205.
<http://li.payap.ac.th/Survey/SIL%20Survey%20Reports/A%20Sociolinguistic%20Survey%20of%20Tai%20Ya%20in%20Thailand.pdf> downloaded 13 October 2008.
- Fishman, Joshua A. 1991. Reversing language shift: Theoretical and empirical foundations of assistance to threatened languages. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.

- Fishman, Joshua A. 1992. Conference summary. in Willem Fase, Koen Jaspaert and Sjaak Kroon. Maintenance and loss of minority languages. 395-403.
- Fishman, Joshua A. 1996. What do you lose when you lose your language? Gina Cantoni, ed. Stabilizing indigenous languages. A Center for Excellence in Education Monograph. Flagstaff, AZ: Northern Arizona University. pages ???
- Fishman, Joshua A. 1996. Conclusion: Maintaining languages: What works? What doesn't? A Center for Excellence in Education Monograph. Flagstaff, AZ: Northern Arizona University. pages ???
- Fishman, Joshua A. 2000. Reversing language shift: RLS theory and practice revisited. Kindell, Gloria and M. Paul Lewis, eds. Assessing ethnolinguistic vitality: Theory and practice. pp. 1-26.
- Fishman, Joshua A. (ed.) 2001. Can threatened languages be saved? Reversing language shift, revisited: A 21st century perspective. Clevedon, UK: Multilingual Matters Ltd.
- Gordon, Raymond G., Jr. (ed.). 2005. Ethnologue: languages of the world, 15th edition. Dallas: SIL International. Online version: <http://www.ethnologue.com/>. Accessed 29 April 2005.
- Grimes, Barbara F. (ed.). 2000. Ethnologue: languages of the world, 15th edition. Dallas: SIL International.
- Kletzing, Juliette. 2009. Grammar sketch of Tai Ya. ms.
- Krauss, Michael. 1992. The world's languages in crisis. Language: Journal of the Linguistic Society of America. 68:1 (March) pp. 4-10.
- Kya Heh, Noel and Thomas M. Tehan. 1999a. A survey of Akha. Conference Alliance Internationale Linguistique Applique (AILA; International Association for Applied Linguistics), 1-7 August, Tokyo, Japan.
- Kya Heh, Noel and Thomas M. Tehan. 1999b. Akha language maintenance. Linguistics Department, Payap University Colloquium Series, 16 July. Chiangmai, Thailand.
- Kya Heh, Noel and Thomas M. Tehan. 2000. The current status of Akha. Payap Research and Development Institute Technical Paper #57. Payap University. Chiangmai, Thailand.
- Lewis, M. Paul. 1996. Language maintenance in seven K'iche' communities. SIL Electronic Working Papers 1996-002, July 1996. http://www.sil.org/silewp/1996/002/silewp_1996-002.html.
- Lewis, M. Paul. 2006. Towards a categorization of endangerment of the world's languages. SIL Electronic Working Papers 1996-002, July 1996. <http://www.sil.org/silewp2006-002.pdf> (23 March 2006).
- Lewis, M. Paul. (ed.). 2009. Ethnologue: languages of the world, 15th edition. Dallas: SIL International. Online version: <http://www.ethnologue.com/>. Accessed repeatedly since its publication.
- Lewis, M. Paul. 2010. personal communication.
- Lewis, M. Paul and Gary F. Simons. 2010. Assessing endangerment: Expanding Fishman's GIDS. *Revue Roumaine de Linguistique*, 55.103-20. (prepublication copy without pagination)
- Li Fang-kuei. 1960. A tentative classification of Tai Dialects. In S. Diamond (ed.), *Culture in History: Essays in Honor of Paul Radin*, pp. 958. New York.
- Morse, David and Thomas M. Tehan. 2000. How do you write Lisu? Proceedings of the Foundation for Endangered Languages Conference, September, Charlotte, NC.
- Nahhas, Ramzi W. 2005. Sociolinguistic survey of Mpi in Thailand. Chiang Mai, Thailand: Payap University Research Paper #202.
- Nahhas, Ramzi W. 2007a. Sociolinguistic survey of Mpi in Thailand. SIL Electronic Survey Reports. <http://www.sil.org/silesr/>. Forthcoming.
- Nahhas, Ramzi W. 2007b. Sociolinguistic survey of Lawa in Thailand. Chiang Mai, Thailand: Payap University Research Paper #203. Forthcoming.
- Person, Kirk and Yang Wenxue. 2002. The tones of Tai Ya. Paper presented at the 14th SEALS, Chulalongkorn University, Bangkok, May 19-21.
- Ruengdet Pankhuenkhat (เรืองเดช ปะนเขื่อนขัตติย.). 1988. ภาษาไทหยก. [The Tai Ya Language]. In ภาษาถิ่นตระกูลไทย [Dialects of the Thai Family]. Bangkok: Institute of Language and Culture for Rural Development, Mahidol University.

- SIL MSEAG. 2007. Sociolinguistic survey of Nyah Kur in Thailand. Unpublished manuscript.
- Suwilai Premisrirat. 1995. On language maintenance and language shift in minority languages of Thailand: A case study of So (Thavung). Presented at the conference on endangered languages in Tokyo.
- Suwilai Premisrirat and Dennis Malone. 2003. Language development and language revitalization in Asia. http://www.sil.org/asia/ldc/plenary_papers/suwila_and_dennis_malone.pdf (9 September 2005).
- Tehan, Thomas M. and Ramzi W. Nahhas. 2007. Mpi Present and Future: A First Look at Reversing Language Shift. Research Project #309 in Linguistics Department Research Series, Payap University, Chiangmai, Thailand.
- Tehan, Thomas M. and Ramzi W. Nahhas. 2009. Mpi Present and Future: Reversing Language Shift. Mon-Khmer Studies. Volume 38, 87-104.
- UNESCO. 2009. UNESCO Atlas of the world's languages in danger. UNESCO. <http://www.unesco.org/culture/ich/index.php?pg=00139>. Accessed repeatedly since its publication.

6 TAI YA NARRATIVE TEXT

Gibbon and Dragonfly
Collected by Juliette Kletzing, 2005

Gibbon and Dragonfly.001

kun³² taj³.ja²⁴ mi:³ k^həm³.tʃa:ŋ⁴² lai:²⁴ luŋ¹.
 kun³² taj³.ja²⁴ mi:³ k^həm³tʃa:ŋ⁴² lai:²⁴ luŋ¹
 person Tai Ya have tale many story
 *** **
 N Nprop V N QNT CLF

Tai Ya people have many tales.

Gibbon and Dragonfly.002

k^həm³.tʃa:ŋ⁴² luŋ¹ tu³ ka:w¹ ʔa³¹jin⁴² ʔa³¹te:³² muŋ³ tʃa:ŋ⁴² hai:²⁴
 k^həm³.tʃa:ŋ⁴² luŋ¹ tu³ ka:w¹ ʔa³¹jin⁴² ʔa³¹te:³² muŋ³ tʃa:ŋ⁴² hai:²⁴
 tale one that 1s hear father 3s tell a story so that
 *** **
 N CLF REL PRO V N PRO V ?

faŋ⁴⁵.

faŋ⁴⁵

listen to

V

One of the tales I heard my father tell for me to hear,

Gibbon and Dragonfly.003

luŋ¹ hɔ:ŋ⁴⁵ ʔɛ:⁴⁵.nu:⁴⁵ wa:²¹.
 luŋ¹ hɔ:ŋ⁴⁵ ʔɛ:⁴⁵.nu:⁴⁵ wa:²¹
 story of gibbon that
 *** **
 CLF PREP N REL

is a story of the gibbon,

Gibbon and Dragonfly.004

¹ŋe:⁴⁵.nu:⁴⁵ ɔ:k² lai:⁴⁵ ma:²¹.
¹ŋe:⁴⁵.nu:⁴⁵ ɔ:k² lai:⁴⁵ ma:²¹
 gibbon from where come
 *** **
 N PREP ? Vmot

where the gibbon comes from.

Gibbon and Dragonfly.005

le:² kɔ:² ¹ŋe:⁴⁵.nu:⁴⁵ kap³ mi:²⁴.tɔ:b³.ta:³² nuŋ⁴⁵ ka:⁴⁵ nuŋ⁴⁵ ma:²¹.
 le:² *kɔ:² ¹ŋe:⁴⁵.nu:⁴⁵ kap³ mi:²⁴.tɔ:b³.ta:³² nuŋ⁴⁵ ka:⁴⁵ nuŋ⁴⁵ ma:²¹
 and *** gibbon and dragonfly larva *** go *** come
 *** **
 CONJ *** N CONJ N *** Vmot *** Vmot

Also, the gibbon and the dragonfly larva, what their history is.

Gibbon and Dragonfly.006

ɔa:³¹te:³² ɔa:¹¹me:²³ nai:²⁴ tʃa:ŋ⁴² ha:²⁴ faŋ⁴⁵ wa:²¹.
 ɔa:³¹te:³² ɔa:¹¹me:²³ nai:²⁴ tʃa:ŋ⁴² ha:²⁴ faŋ⁴⁵ wa:²¹
 father mother like this tell a story so that listen to "
 *** ̣*** **
 N N ? V ? V QUOT

Father and mother told the story like this for me to hear:

Gibbon and Dragonfly.007

hu:³⁵ ma:²¹ ɔɔ:⁵².
 hu:³⁵ ma:²¹ ɔɔ:⁵²
 long come already
 *** **

ADJ Vmot Aspect

Gibbon and Dragonfly.008

ho:³⁵¹puŋ⁴² nan² mi:³ sɔ:⁴⁵ pu:⁴⁵ja:³.
 ho:³⁵¹puŋ⁴² nan² mi:³ sɔ:⁴⁵ pu:⁴⁵ja:³
 at first that then? have two husband and wife
 *** **
 ADV DEM ADV V NUM N

A long time ago, at the beginning, there was a couple.

Gibbon and Dragonfly.009

mi:³ lok³ sɔ:⁴⁵ to:³² pu:³tʃa:j³ to:³² pu:³ji:²⁴ŋ to:³².
mi:³ lok³ sɔ:⁴⁵ to:³² pu:³tʃa:j³ to:³² pu:³ji:²⁴ŋ to:³²
have child two person male person female person

V N NUM CLF N CLF N CLF

They had two children, one boy and one girl.

Gibbon and Dragonfly.010

het¹ k^haw² het¹ na:⁵² het¹ t^haj² het¹ na:⁵².
het¹ k^haw² het¹ na:⁵² het¹ *t^haj² het¹ na:⁵²
do rice do field do *** do field

tr N tr N tr *** tr N

They did rice farming (and other farming?)

Gibbon and Dragonfly.011

mi:³ ha:j³⁴ luŋ¹ het¹ na:⁵² la² het¹ waw⁴² ɔt⁴⁵ k^haw² kɔ:³² waw⁴²
mi:³ ha:j³⁴ luŋ¹ het¹ na:⁵² la² het¹ waw⁴² ɔt⁴⁵ k^haw² kɔ:³² waw⁴²
have year one do field but/and? do not fruit rice *** not

V N NUM tr N CONJ tr ADV N N PRT ADV

maʔ².

maʔ²

grow

Vtr

One year, they did the ricefield (is there this positive statement here, or just negative?), but could not grow neither rice nor fruit.

Gibbon and Dragonfly.012

tɔʔ¹ kɔ:³² tɔʔ¹ waw⁴² mi:³ p^hɛ:ŋ⁴⁵ tʃin³².
tɔʔ¹ kɔ:³² tɔʔ¹ waw⁴² mi:³ p^hɛ:ŋ⁴⁵ tʃin³²
poor *** poor not have things eat

ADJ *** ADJ ADV V N V

They were very poor and had nothing to eat.

Gibbon and Dragonfly.013

sɔŋ⁴⁵ pu:⁴⁵ja:³ ma:²¹ xɔ:n⁵² kan³ wa:²¹.
sɔŋ⁴⁵ pu:⁴⁵ja:³ ma:²¹ xɔ:n⁵² kan³ wa:²¹
two husband and wife come consult together "
*** *** *** *** ***
NUM N Vmot V P QUOT

They consulted with one another,

Gibbon and Dragonfly.014

tʃan³ nuŋ⁴⁵ het¹.
tʃan³ nuŋ⁴⁵ het¹
will how do
*** *** ***
AUX Q tr

"What will we do?"

Gibbon and Dragonfly.015

lok³ haw⁴³ waw⁴² mi:³ p^hɛ:ŋ⁴⁵ tʃin³².
lok³ haw⁴³ waw⁴² mi:³ p^hɛ:ŋ⁴⁵ tʃin³²
child 1pl not have things eat
*** *** *** *** ***
N PRO ADV V N V

Our children do not have anything to eat.

Gibbon and Dragonfly.016

tʃan³ nuŋ⁴⁵ het¹.
tʃan³ nuŋ⁴⁵ het¹
will how do
*** *** ***
AUX Q tr

What will we do?"

Gibbon and Dragonfly.017

tuŋ³ sɔŋ⁴⁵ kun³² kɔ:² wa:²¹.
tuŋ³ sɔŋ⁴⁵ kun³² *kɔ:² wa:²¹
both two person *** "
*** *** *** *** ***
QNT NUM N *** QUOT

Both of them said,

Gibbon and Dragonfly.018

ʔaw³ jaŋ³ na:j⁴².

ʔaw³ jaŋ³ *na:j⁴²

take like ***

*** **

Vtr ADV ***

"Let's do like this.

Gibbon and Dragonfly.019

ʔaw³ lok³ haw⁴³ ka:⁴⁵ pɛw³⁴ t^huən³⁵ hɛ⁴⁵.

ʔaw³ lok³ haw⁴³ ka:⁴⁵ pɛw³⁴ t^huən³⁵ hɛ⁴⁵

take child 1pl go release woods ?

*** **

Vtr N PRO Vmot V N ADV

We'll take our children and go leave them in the woods.

Gibbon and Dragonfly.020

ha:j²⁴ kx^ha:w⁴⁵ ka:⁴⁵ taj³² tʃin³² ho:³⁵ma:j⁴³ mak⁴⁵.mən⁴³.ho:³⁵.maj⁴³

ha:j²⁴ kx^ha:w⁴⁵ ka:⁴⁵ taj³² tʃin³² ho:³⁵ma:j⁴³ mak⁴⁵.mən⁴³.ho:³⁵.maj⁴³

let 3pl go look for eat root vegetables root vegetables

*** **

AUX PRO Vmot Vtr V N N

naj⁴⁵ t^huən³⁵ naj⁴⁵ pa:³⁴.

naj⁴⁵ t^huən³⁵ naj⁴⁵ pa:³⁴

in woods in forest

*** **

PREP N PREP N

Let them go look for root vegetables to eat in the woods.

Gibbon and Dragonfly.021

la²¹ haw⁴³ keo² ta:w¹ ma:²¹ la ma:²¹ het¹ tʃin³².

la²¹ haw⁴³ keo² ta:w¹ ma:²¹ *la ma:²¹ het¹ tʃin³²

then 1pl ? return come *** come do eat

*** **

PRT PRO ? V Vmot *** Vmot tr V

Then we'll come back and work on the farm."

Gibbon and Dragonfly.022

se:ŋ³² la²¹ kx^ha:w⁴⁵ kɔ:³² ʔɔ:n lok³ ka:⁴⁵ naj⁴⁵ t^hu:n³⁵.
 se:ŋ³² la²¹ kx^ha:w⁴⁵ kɔ:³² ʔɔ:n lok³ ka:⁴⁵ naj⁴⁵ t^hu:n³⁵
 think already 3pl *** take child go in woods
 *** *** *** *** *** *** *** ***
 V Aspect PRO PRT V N Vmot PREP N

Thinking that, they took the children into the woods.

Gibbon and Dragonfly.023

ka:⁴⁵ t^hu:n⁴⁵ naj⁴⁵ t^hu:n³⁵ la³² pɛw²⁴ ha:j²⁴ lok³ ka:⁴⁵ taj³²
 ka:⁴⁵ t^hu:n⁴⁵ naj⁴⁵ t^hu:n³⁵ *la³² *pɛw²⁴ ha:j²⁴ lok³ ka:⁴⁵ taj³²
 go arrive/reach in woods *** *** let child go look for
 *** *** *** *** *** *** *** ***
 Vmot V/PREP PREP N *** *** AUX N Vmot Vtr

tʃin³² mak⁴⁵.maj⁴³.ho:³⁵.mən⁴³ la²¹.
 tʃin³² mak⁴⁵.maj⁴³.ho:³⁵.mən⁴³ la²¹
 eat root vegetables already
 *** *** *** ***
 V N Aspect

When they arrived in the woods, they released the children to go look for root vegetables to eat.

Gibbon and Dragonfly.024

ma:p² lok³ wa:²¹.
 ma:p² lok³ wa:²¹
 lie child "
 *** *** ***
 V N QUOT

They lied to their children,

Gibbon and Dragonfly.025

ʔu:³² ʔa³¹te:³² ʔa¹me:²³ ka:⁴⁵ taj³² k^həm³ la:j³¹ su:⁴⁵ la²
 ʔu:³² ʔa³¹te:³² ʔa¹me:²³ ka:⁴⁵ taj³² k^həm³ la:j³¹ su:⁴⁵ la²
 Uh... father mother go look for place another 2pl regarding?
 *** *** *** *** *** *** *** ***
 PRT N N Vmot Vtr N/PREP? ADJ PRO PRT

ʔu:⁴⁵ na:j² na:⁴².

ʔu:⁴⁵ na:j² na:⁴²

stay here ***

*** ***

COP DEM PRT

"Uh..., Dad and Mom are going to look for (vegetables) at another place. \pause?
As for you, stay here, okay?"

Gibbon and Dragonfly.026

pɛw²⁴ ha:j²⁴ lok³ ʔu:⁴⁵ nan² la²¹.

*pɛw²⁴ ha:j²⁴ lok³ ʔu:⁴⁵ nan² la²¹

*** let child stay there -

*** *** *** *** ***

*** AUX N COP DEM PRT

They left the children there.

Gibbon and Dragonfly.027

kx^ha:w⁴⁵ la²¹ taw¹ ma:²¹ jɔ:^{ʔ52}.

kx^ha:w⁴⁵ la²¹ taw¹ ma:²¹ jɔ:^{ʔ52}

3pl then return come already

*** *** *** ***

PRO PRT V Vmot Aspect

Then they came back,

Gibbon and Dragonfly.028

ma:²¹ ʔu:⁴⁵ hɣ:n⁴² jɔ:^{ʔ52}.

ma:²¹ ʔu:⁴⁵ hɣ:n⁴² jɔ:^{ʔ52}

come stay house already

*** *** ***

Vmot COP N Aspect

came and stayed home.

Gibbon and Dragonfly.029

taw¹ ma:²¹ hɣ:n⁴² la²¹.

*taw¹ ma:²¹ hɣ:n⁴² la²¹

*** come house already

*** *** ***

*** Vmot N Aspect

Have come back home already,

Gibbon and Dragonfly.030

ma:²¹ het¹ tʃin³² het¹ p^hɛ:ŋ⁴⁵ la:j³⁵ ha:j³⁴.

ma:²¹ het¹ tʃin³² het¹ p^hɛ:ŋ⁴⁵ la:j³⁵ ha:j³⁴

come do eat do things many year

*** **

Vmot tr V tr N QNT N

they came and worked to grow food, working a lot of things, (working hard?) for many years.

Gibbon and Dragonfly.031

hu:ŋ³⁵ ha:j³⁴ ma:²¹ la:²¹.

hu:ŋ³⁵ ha:j³⁴ ma:²¹ la:²¹

long year come already

*** **

ADJ N Vmot Aspect

After many years had past,

Gibbon and Dragonfly.032

mi:³ ʔu:⁴⁵ mi:³ tʃin³² mi:³ k^haw² mi:³ p^hɛ:ŋ⁴⁵.

mi:³ ʔu:⁴⁵ mi:³ tʃin³² mi:³ k^haw² mi:³ p^hɛ:ŋ⁴⁵

have stay have eat have rice have things

*** **

V COP V V V N V N

they had enough for a living, they had food, they had rice, they had whatever.

Gibbon and Dragonfly.033

kɔ:³² ʔaw³ k^haw² ʔaw³ p^hɛ:ŋ⁴⁵.

kɔ:³² ʔaw³ k^haw² ʔaw³ p^hɛ:ŋ⁴⁵

*** take rice take things

*** **

PRT Vtr N Vtr N

They harvested rice and other things.

Gibbon and Dragonfly.034

la:²¹ sɛ:ŋ³² t^huŋ⁴⁵ lok³.

la:²¹ sɛ:ŋ³² t^huŋ⁴⁵ lok³

then think about about child

*** **

PRT V PREP N

Then they began missing their children.

Gibbon and Dragonfly.035

wat³ naj² la²¹.

wat³ naj² la²¹

that here already

*** **

REL DEM PRT

??

Gibbon and Dragonfly.036

se:ŋ³² t^huŋ⁴⁵ lok³ la²¹ ʔaw³ k^haw² ʔaw³ p^hɛ:ŋ⁴⁵ ka:⁴⁵ ha:⁴⁵ lok³.

se:ŋ³² t^huŋ⁴⁵ lok³ la²¹ ʔaw³ k^haw² ʔaw³ p^hɛ:ŋ⁴⁵ ka:⁴⁵ ha:⁴⁵ lok³

think about child already take rice take things go look for child

*** **

V PREP N PRT Vtr N Vtr N Vmot Vtr N

They missed their children and took rice and things and went to look for their children,

Gibbon and Dragonfly.037

ka:⁴⁵ taj³² ha:⁴⁵ lok³ naj⁴⁵ t^huŋ³⁵.

ka:⁴⁵ taj³² ha:⁴⁵ lok³ naj⁴⁵ t^huŋ³⁵

go look for look for child in woods

*** **

Vmot Vtr Vtr N PREP N

went to look for their children in the woods.

Gibbon and Dragonfly.038

ka:⁴⁵ to:j⁴⁵.tʃo³ lok³ ʔu:⁴⁵ naj⁴⁵ t^huŋ³⁵ nan² la²¹.

ka:⁴⁵ to:j⁴⁵.tʃo³ lok³ ʔu:⁴⁵ naj⁴⁵ t^huŋ³⁵ nan² la²¹

go find child stay in woods there already

*** **

Vmot V N COP PREP N DEM PRT

They went and found their children in the woods there.

Gibbon and Dragonfly.039

lok³ ko:³² ma:²¹ ha:⁴⁵ la²¹.

lok³ *ko:³² ma:²¹ ha:⁴⁵ la²¹

child *** come look for already

*** **

N *** Vmot Vtr PRT

Then the children came to them,

Gibbon and Dragonfly.040

kɔ:³² tʃo:³⁴ lok³ wa:²¹.

kɔ:³² *tʃo:³⁴ lok³ wa:²¹

*** ** child "

*** ** *** **

PRT *** N QUOT

then they invited the kids,

Gibbon and Dragonfly.041

ʔu:⁴³ lok³ ʔu:⁴³ ta:w¹ ka:⁴⁵ lɔk².

ʔu:⁴³ lok³ ʔu:⁴³ ta:w¹ ka:⁴⁵ lɔk²

Uhh... child Uhh... return go ?

*** ** *** ** *** **

PRT N PRT V Vmot ?

"Well, kids, uh, let's go back.

Gibbon and Dragonfly.042

naj²⁴.niw⁴⁵ la ʔa:³¹te:³² ʔa:¹¹me:²³ mi:³ tʃin³² jo:^{ʔ52}.

naj²⁴.niw⁴⁵ *la ʔa:³¹te:³² ʔa:¹¹me:²³ mi:³ tʃin³² jo:^{ʔ52}

now *** father mother have eat already

*** ** *** ** *** ** ***

ADV *** N N V V Aspect

Now, Dad and Mom have enough for a living.

Gibbon and Dragonfly.043

la³² ta:w¹ ka:⁴⁵ ʔu:⁴⁵ ka:⁴⁵ tʃin³² kap³ ʔa:³¹te:³² ʔa:¹¹me:²³.

la³² ta:w¹ ka:⁴⁵ ʔu:⁴⁵ ka:⁴⁵ tʃin³² kap³ ʔa:³¹te:³² ʔa:¹¹me:²³

PRT return go stay go eat and father mother

*** ** *** ** *** ** *** ** ***

*** V Vmot COP Vmot V CONJ N N

so go back and live and eat with Dad and Mom."

Gibbon and Dragonfly.044

lok³ sɔ:^{ʔ45} to:³² kɔ:² wa:²¹.

lok³ sɔ:^{ʔ45} to:³² kɔ:² wa:²¹

child two person *** "

*** ** *** ** ***

N NUM CLF PRT QUOT

Both of the kids said,

Gibbon and Dragonfly.045

ʔo:⁴⁵ ʔa³¹te:³² hu:⁴³ .

ʔo:⁴⁵ ʔa³¹te:³² hu:⁴³

*** father uh...

*** *** ***

EXCL N EXCL?

"Oh, Dad, uh,

Gibbon and Dragonfly.046

naj²⁴ .niw⁴⁵ la³² .

naj²⁴ .niw⁴⁵ la³²

now PRT

*** ***

ADV ***

now already,

Gibbon and Dragonfly.047

tu:³² kɔ:² k^hun³⁴ ʔɔ:k² tim³ to:³² .

tu:³² kɔ:² k^hun³⁴ ʔɔ:k² tim³ to:³² *.

1pl *** hair from whole body ***

*** *** *** *** *** ***

PRO PRT N PREP ADJ N ***

we have hair growing all over our bodies.

Gibbon and Dragonfly.048

tʃin³² mak⁴⁵ .maj⁴³ .ho:³⁵ .mən⁴³ .

tʃin³² mak⁴⁵ .maj⁴³ .ho:³⁵ .mən⁴³

eat root vegetables

*** ***

V N

We have been eating root vegetables.

Gibbon and Dragonfly.049

ʔu:⁴⁵ naj⁴⁵ t^hun³⁵ naj⁴⁵ pa:³⁴ .

ʔu:⁴⁵ naj⁴⁵ t^hun³⁵ naj⁴⁵ pa:³⁴

stay in woods in forest

*** *** *** ***

COP PREP N PREP N

Living in the woods,

Gibbon and Dragonfly.050

mi:³ mak⁴⁵.maj⁴³.ho:³⁵.mən⁴³ mi:³ la:j³⁵.
mi:³ mak⁴⁵.maj⁴³.ho:³⁵.mən⁴³ mi:³ la:j³⁵
have root vegetables have many
*** **
V N V QNT

there is plenty of root vegetable.

Gibbon and Dragonfly.051

hai:j³⁴ luŋ¹ mak⁴⁵.maj⁴³.ho:³⁵.mən⁴³ hai:j³⁴ sok¹ sa:m⁴⁵ pan³.
hai:j³⁴ luŋ¹ mak⁴⁵.maj⁴³.ho:³⁵.mən⁴³ hai:j³⁴ sok¹ sa:m⁴⁵ pan³
year one root vegetables year ripe three time
*** **
N NUM N N ADJ NUM N

In one year, the root vegetables are ripe three times,

Gibbon and Dragonfly.052

hɔ:ŋ⁴⁵ su:⁴⁵ la² het¹ t^haj² het¹ na:⁵² la² k^haw² la² sok¹ pan³ liw³².
hɔ:ŋ⁴⁵ su:⁴⁵ la² het¹ t^haj² het¹ na:⁵² la² k^haw² la² sok¹ pan³ liw³²
of 2pl then do farm do field rice then ripe time only
*** **
PREP PRO DEM tr N tr N N DEM ADJ N ADV

(but) yours, rice farming is only ripe one time.

Gibbon and Dragonfly.053

su³ ʔu:⁴⁵ naj⁴⁵ t^huŋ³⁵ naj⁴⁵ pa:³⁴ waw⁴² la:j³².
su³ ʔu:⁴⁵ naj⁴⁵ t^huŋ³⁵ naj⁴⁵ pa:³⁴ waw⁴² la:j³²
fight stay in woods in forest not can
*** **
V COP PREP N PREP N ADV V

Living in the woods is better (is 'fight' and 'can't' an idiom for comparison?).

Gibbon and Dragonfly.054

ʔa:³¹te:³² ʔa:¹me:²³ kɔ:² se:³⁴tʃaj³ lok³ waw⁴² tʃɔm⁴² taw¹ ka:⁴⁵ la².
ʔa:³¹te:³² ʔa:¹me:²³ kɔ:² se:³⁴tʃaj³ lok³ waw⁴² tʃɔm⁴² taw¹ ka:⁴⁵ la²
father mother *** be sad child not follow return go -
*** **
N N PRT Vintr N ADV V V Vmot PRT

The parents were sad that their children would not go back with them.

Gibbon and Dragonfly.055

lok³ kɔ:³² wa:²¹.

lok³ kɔ:³² wa:²¹

child *** that

*** *** ***

N PRT REL

The kids said that

Gibbon and Dragonfly.056

ʔu:⁴⁵ naj⁴⁵ t^hu:n³⁵ naj⁴⁵ pa:³⁴ hɔ:ŋ⁴⁵ tʃin³² kɔ:² mi:³ lai:³⁵.

ʔu:⁴⁵ naj⁴⁵ t^hu:n³⁵ naj⁴⁵ pa:³⁴ hɔ:ŋ⁴⁵ tʃin³² kɔ:² mi:³ lai:³⁵

stay in woods in forest of eat *** have many

*** *** *** *** *** *** *** *** ***

COP PREP N PREP N PREP V PRT V QNT

in the woods there are many things to eat.

Gibbon and Dragonfly.057

k^hu:n³ 'tun².maj⁴¹.

k^hu:n³ 'tun².maj⁴¹

go up tree

*** *** **

V N

They can climb trees,

Gibbon and Dragonfly.058

tɛo³⁵ tun⁴⁵ 'tun².maj⁴¹.

tɛo³⁵ tun⁴⁵ 'tun².maj⁴¹

swing/hang ? tree

*** *** ** **

V ? N

swing on the (branches of?) trees,

Gibbon and Dragonfly.059

li:².siu⁴⁵.saj⁴⁵ kwa:³.

li:².siu⁴⁵.saj⁴⁵ kwa:³

comfortable more

*** ** **

ADJ ?

it is more comfortable,

Gibbon and Dragonfly.060

li:² la:j³⁵ ʔu:⁴⁵ hɣ:n⁴².

li:² la:j³⁵ ʔu:⁴⁵ hɣ:n⁴²

good many stay house

*** **

ADJ QNT COP N

better than living in a house.

Gibbon and Dragonfly.061

ʔu:⁴⁵ hɣ:n⁴² la² waw⁴² la:j³² het¹ p^hɛ:ŋ⁴⁵.

ʔu:⁴⁵ hɣ:n⁴² la² waw⁴² la:j³² het¹ p^hɛ:ŋ⁴⁵

stay house - not can do things

*** **

COP N PRT ADV V tr N

Living at home, they do not know what they'll do.

Gibbon and Dragonfly.062

ʔu:⁴⁵ t^hu:n³⁵ ʔu:⁴⁵ pa:³⁴ la²¹.

ʔu:⁴⁵ t^hu:n³⁵ ʔu:⁴⁵ pa:³⁴ la²¹

stay woods stay forest -

*** **

COP N COP N PRT

Living in the woods,

Gibbon and Dragonfly.063

la:j³² ka:⁴⁵ nan² ka:⁴⁵ na:j².

la:j³² ka:⁴⁵ nan² ka:⁴⁵ na:j²

can go there go here

*** **

V Vmot DEM Vmot DEM

they can go here and there,

Gibbon and Dragonfly.064

la:j³² na:j²⁴ heo²¹ maj^{24?}

la:j³² na:j²⁴ heo²¹ maj²⁴

can like this swing wood?

*** **

V DEM? V ?

they can swing on the trees,

Gibbon and Dragonfly.065

tə³⁵ tun⁴⁵ 'tun².maj⁴¹.

tə³⁵ tun⁴⁵ 'tun².maj⁴¹

swing/hang ? tree

*** *** *** **

V ? N

hand on the trees,

Gibbon and Dragonfly.066

taj³² tʃin³² mak⁴⁵.maj⁴³.ho:³⁵.mən⁴³ la²¹.

taj³² tʃin³² mak⁴⁵.maj⁴³.ho:³⁵.mən⁴³ la²¹

look for eat root vegetables -

*** *** *** **

Vtr V N PRT

look for root vegetables to eat.

Gibbon and Dragonfly.067

k^{hə}3wan³¹ la:j³⁵ le² kɔ:² ʔu:⁴⁵ li:² la:j³⁵.

k^{hə}3wan³¹ la:j³⁵ le² kɔ:² ʔu:⁴⁵ li:² la:j³⁵

fun many and *** stay good many

*** *** *** *** *** ***

ADJ QNT CONJ PRT COP ADJ QNT

(It is) more fun and more comfortable.

Gibbon and Dragonfly.068

ʔa³¹te:³² ʔa¹¹me:²³ kɔ:² se:³⁴tʃa:j³.

ʔa³¹te:³² ʔa¹¹me:²³ kɔ:² se:³⁴tʃa:j³

father mother *** be sad

*** *** *** ***

N N PRT Vintr

The parents were sad.

Gibbon and Dragonfly.069

taw¹ ka:⁴⁵ hɣ:n⁴².

taw¹ ka:⁴⁵ hɣ:n⁴²

return go house

*** *** ***

V Vmot N

They went back home,

Gibbon and Dragonfly.070

na:j²⁴ tɔ:b³ ta:³² la³².

na:j²⁴ tɔ:b³ ta:³² la³²

like this close eye PRT

*** **

DEM? V V ***

They (put their hands to) cover their eyes like this,

Gibbon and Dragonfly.071

jaŋ³ taw¹ hɣ:n⁴².

jaŋ³ taw¹ hɣ:n⁴²

walk return house

*** **

V V N

and walked back home.

Gibbon and Dragonfly.072

ma:²¹ t^huŋ⁴⁵ 'tun⁴³.nam³¹ tok¹ ka:⁴⁵ naj⁴⁵ 'tun⁴³.nam³¹ jɔ:ŋ⁵².

ma:²¹ t^huŋ⁴⁵ 'tun⁴³.nam³¹ tok¹ ka:⁴⁵ naj⁴⁵ 'tun⁴³.nam³¹ jɔ:ŋ⁵²

come arrive/reach pond fall go in pond already

*** **

Vmot PREP N Vmot Vmot PREP N Aspect

They arrived at a pond and fell into the water.

Gibbon and Dragonfly.073

tok¹ ka:⁴⁵ naj⁴⁵ 'tun⁴³.nam³¹.

tok¹ ka:⁴⁵ naj⁴⁵ 'tun⁴³.nam³¹

fall go in pond

*** **

Vmot Vmot PREP N

They fell into the pond,

Gibbon and Dragonfly.074

taj² pɛ:n³⁵ pin³ meŋ⁴² mi:²⁴.tɔ:b³.ta:³².

taj² pɛ:n³⁵ pin³ meŋ⁴² mi:²⁴.tɔ:b³.ta:³²

die turn into be insect dragonfly larva

*** **

V V COP N N

died and turned into the bug, dragonfly larva.

Gibbon and Dragonfly.075

lok³ nan² ko:² kai:j³ pin³ 'ŋɛ:⁴⁵.nu:⁴⁵ jo:ŋ⁵².
lok³ nan² ko:² kai:j³ pin³ 'ŋɛ:⁴⁵.nu:⁴⁵ jo:ŋ⁵²
child that then? *** turn into be gibbon already
*** *** *** *** *** *** ***
N DEM PRT V COP N Aspect

Those children had turned into gibbons already.

Gibbon and Dragonfly.076

hu:³¹ wa:²¹ ʔa¹¹me:²³ mu:n³ tok¹ nam³¹ tai:j² la² mu:n³ ho:ŋ³¹
hu:³¹ wa:²¹ ʔa¹¹me:²³ mu:n³ tok¹ nam³¹ tai:j² la² mu:n³ ho:ŋ³¹
know that mother 3s fall water die - 3pl/3sg? cry
*** *** *** *** *** *** *** *** ***
Vst REL N PRO Vmot N V PRT PRO V

ha:⁴⁵ ʔa¹¹me:²³ mu:n³.
ha:⁴⁵ ʔa¹¹me:²³ mu:n³
look for mother 3pl/3sg?
*** *** ***
Vtr N PRO

They knew that Mom fell into the water and died, so they cried out for their mom,

Gibbon and Dragonfly.077

saw²⁴ haw⁴³ ʔa³¹jin⁴².
saw²⁴ haw⁴³ ʔa³¹jin⁴²
like 1pl hear
*** *** ***
PREP PRO V

like we hear,

Gibbon and Dragonfly.078

saw²⁴ haw⁴³ xaw¹ ka:⁴⁵ naj⁴⁵ t^hu:n³⁵ naj⁴⁵ pa:³⁴ la².
saw²⁴ haw⁴³ xaw¹ ka:⁴⁵ naj⁴⁵ t^hu:n³⁵ naj⁴⁵ pa:³⁴ la²
like 1pl enter go in woods in forest -
*** *** *** *** *** *** *** ***
PREP PRO V Vmot PREP N PREP N PRT

like (when) we we go into the woods,

Gibbon and Dragonfly.079

haw⁴³ ʔa³¹jin⁴² ʔe:⁴⁵.nu:⁴⁵ mun³¹ hɔŋ³¹.
haw⁴³ ʔa³¹jin⁴² ʔe:⁴⁵.nu:⁴⁵ mun³ - *¹ hɔŋ³¹
1pl hear gibbon 3pl/3sg? - *** cry
*** *** *** *** - *** ***
PRO V N PRO - *** V

we hear gibbons cry,

Gibbon and Dragonfly.080

hɔŋ³¹ hɔŋ³¹ ha:j²⁴ ha:j²⁴ hui³⁵ hui³⁵ hui³⁵ na² la².
hɔŋ³¹ hɔŋ³¹ ha:j²⁴ ha:j²⁴ hui³⁵ hui³⁵ hui³⁵ na² la²
cry cry so that so that hui hui hui - -
*** *** *** *** *** *** *** ***
V V AUX AUX ONOM ONOM ONOM PRT PRT

"Cry, cry, (is this instance of hong onomotopeia?), hui hui"

Gibbon and Dragonfly.081

mun³ hɔŋ³¹ ha:j²⁴ ha:⁴⁵ ʔa¹¹me:²³ mun³.
mun³ hɔŋ³¹ ha:j²⁴ ha:⁴⁵ ʔa¹¹me:²³ mun³
3pl/3sg? cry so that look for mother 3pl/3sg?
*** *** *** *** *** ***
PRO V ? Vtr N PRO

They are crying for their mom,

Gibbon and Dragonfly.082

le² kɔ:² pe:n³⁵ pin³ ʔe:⁴⁵.nu:⁴⁵ jɔ:⁵².
le² kɔ:² pe:n³⁵ pin³ ʔe:⁴⁵.nu:⁴⁵ jɔ:⁵²
and *** turn into be gibbon already
*** *** *** *** *** ***
CONJ PRT V COP N Aspect

then they turned into gibbons already.

Gibbon and Dragonfly.083

ʔa¹¹me:²³ kx^ha:w⁴⁵ kɔ:² ka:j³ pe:n³⁵ pin³ meŋ⁴² mi:²⁴.tɔ:b³.ta:³²
ʔa¹¹me:²³ kx^ha:w⁴⁵ kɔ:² ka:j³ pe:n³⁵ pin³ meŋ⁴² mi:²⁴.tɔ:b³.ta:³²
mother 3pl *** turn into turn into be insect dragonfly larva
*** *** *** *** *** *** ***
N PRO PRT V V COP N N

ka:⁴⁵ jɔ:⁵².

ka:⁴⁵ jɔ:⁵²

go already

*** **

Vmot Aspect

Their mom became a dragonfly larva bug.

Gibbon and Dragonfly.084

ta:j³ la pin³ luŋ¹ hɔ:ŋ⁴⁵.

*ta:j³ *la pin³ luŋ¹ hɔ:ŋ⁴⁵

*** be story of

*** **

*** COP N PREP

This is the story that,

Gibbon and Dragonfly.085

kx^ha:w⁴⁵ la:j³² xɔ:n⁵² kan³ ma:²¹

kx^ha:w⁴⁵ la:j³² xɔ:n⁵² kan³ ma:²¹

3pl can tell together come

*** **

PRO V V P Vmot

la:w² kɔ:² na:j²⁴ tʃa:ŋ⁴² kan³ ma:²¹.

la:w² kɔ:² na:j²⁴ tʃa:ŋ⁴² kan³ ma:²¹

*** like this tell a story together come

*** **

PRT PRT DEM? V P Vmot

has been told from generation to generation (which words are part of the idiom?
is 'like this' part of it?).

Gibbon and Dragonfly.086

la² pin³ k^həm³tʃaŋ⁴² hɔ:ŋ⁴⁵ taj³.ja²⁴.

la² pin³ k^həm³ - *tʃaŋ⁴² hɔ:ŋ⁴⁵ taj³.ja²⁴

then be place - *** of Tai Ya

*** **

CONJ COP N/PREP? - *** PREP Nprop

Then it became a tale of the Tai Ya.

13 October 2008—9 September 2010, Chiangmai, Thailand