

COMMUNICATIVES, EXISTIVES, AND STATIVES IN PROTO-SOUTH-BAHNARIC¹

David Thomas

0. *Introduction*

This paper is a study of some communicative, existive, and stative clause types in South Bahnaric languages, comparing them, and postulating some Proto-South-Bahnaric (PSB) forms. The data from the various languages, as will be apparent from the discussion, are uneven in both quantity and quality, so that the present paper must be considered preliminary.

The South Bahnaric languages are the southern section of the Bahnaric branch of Mon-Khmer (Thomas & Headley 1970), located mostly in southern Vietnam, with some spilling over into Cambodia. I draw most heavily on Chrau, Eastern Mnong (Rlâm), and Stieng, as representative languages of the group, with additional data from Kôho Sre and Central Mnong (Bunâr and Preh). The three main languages above are respectively at the south-eastern, north-eastern, and western edges of the South Bahnaric area, so should give a fairly good picture of the range of diversity.

In the examples, words whose main significance seems to be as functors rather than as content words are underlined. Vocabulary items, mostly nouns and adjectives, whose meaning is not basic to the structure of the clause, are glossed beside their first occurrence. Functors and central verbs, i.e. elements that are basic to the clause structure, are listed and glossed below the set of examples. It would be desirable to list other verbs that take the same structure, but in most cases I am limited to the published data sources.

In the reconstructions, an agreement of Chrau, Rlâm, and Stieng is taken as sufficient evidence to reconstruct it for Proto-South-Bahnaric. An agreement of just Chrau and Stieng is also considered sufficient if there is no contrary evidence.

1. *Communicatives*

The talking – perceiving – quoting – informing group of clause types have a basic Speaker—V—Addressee—Information order in all the daughter languages.

1. This is a companion article to “Some Proto-South-Bahnaric Clause Grammar”, paper delivered to the 18th Sino-Tibetan Conference, Bangkok, 1985. (*Mon-Khmer Stud.* 15, 1989, 111-24). That article dealt with transitivity and locational clause types. The numbering of the examples here follows on the previous numbering.

The clause presentation is based on my clause components outline (Thomas 1983: 137-42). It is semantically based, looking for and comparing the forms which manifest the desired meanings.

Mnong Bunâr (= B)

- B3a: göp ngööi ngach ‘I speak fast’ (Phillips 1963 = *MLC*. 1.1) (*ngach* ‘fast’)
B3k: göp ntay an naao BuNoong *ma khôn ay* ‘I will teach the Mnong language to you’ (*MLC*.4.2) (*naao BuNoong* ‘Mnong language’, *khôn ay* ‘you f.pl.’)
ma ‘to’
ngööi ‘speak’
ntay an ‘teach’

Chrau (= C)²

- C3a: aň ñaai (*yuur yuur*) ‘I speak (slowly)’
C3b: aň ñaai *siq neh* ‘I talk about him’ (*neh* ‘him’)
aň ñaai sinlô ñi heq ‘I talk about this house’ (*ñi heeq* ‘this house’)
aň naai siq sinlô ñi heeq ‘id.’
C3c: aň ñaai *bay neh* ‘I spoke to him’
C3d: aň *chiih neh* ‘I scolded him’
C3e: aň ñaai *paañ neh saaq* ‘I said he went/I said “He went”’
C3f: aň *paañ neh saaq* ‘I said he went’
aň paañ, neh saaq ‘I said, “He went”’

2. The Chrau data are my own (see Thomas 1971); the Köho Sre data are from Evans & Bowen n.d. (indicated as KLC) and Manley (OSS); the Mnong Bunâr data are from Phillips Ms. (*MLC*); the Mnong Preh data are from Phillips & Kem (1974; *CMLL*); the Mnong Rlâm data are from Tang (1976; *MLLL*), plus personal communications from Evangeline Blood (1985; unmarked), and the Stieng data are from Miller 1976 (*OSG*), plus personal communications from Ralph Haupers (1985; unmarked). I was not able to recheck any of the data with native speakers.

Because of varied spelling conventions used in the different sources, I have standardised the writing of length as *VV*, the voiceless velar stop as *k*, and the final glottal stop as *q*. The ‘whiskered’ *o* and *u* are rendered here as *ö* and *ü*. The Köho *o* with the lowered dot is rendered *ø*.

Four different spelling systems have been used for Köho in the past (Manley 1972:39), so I have converted the data from the different sources to the so-called SIL system, as it more closely matches the spelling of the other South Bahnaric languages.

In some cases I have taken the liberty of replacing nouns and place names with other nouns and places names for reader ease.

In the original sources shortness/length is marked as follows:

	Usual Markings		Other Markings	Environments	
	short	long		only short	only long
Bunâr	v	v,ê,ô	-i/y, u/o, ü/ö	-h, -?	-Ø
Chrau	v, â, ü	v, ê, ö, ô	-i/y, u/o		-Ø
Köho KLC	vN, vT	vN, vT	-i/y, u/o		-Ø
OSS	v	v	v=vq		-Ø
Preh	v, â	v, ê, ü, ö, ô	-i/y, u/o	-h, -?	-Ø
Rlâm	v, ü	v	-i/y, u/o	-h, -?	-Ø
Stieng	v	vv			-Ø

A combined phonetic chart of the vowels would be:

	Front	Central	Back	
High	i	ü	u	
	ê	ö	ô	iê, üö, uô are
	e	â	o	centralising offglides
Low		a	q	

- C3g: *añ ñaai bay neh paañ añ saaq* 'I told him that I was going'
 C3h: *añ chiih neh paañ neh saaq* 'I scolded him, saying that he went'
 C3i: *añ ñaai aan neh güit (paañ) añ saaq* 'I spoke letting him know I was going'
 C3j: *añ paañ neh saaq* 'I invited him to go'
 añ siêr neh saaq 'I invited him to go'
 añ aan neh saaq 'I allowed him to go'
 C3k: *añ paðau neh güit troong Chrau* 'I'll teach him the Chrau language'

<i>aan</i>	'permit, allow'
<i>aan...güt</i>	'let...know'
<i>bay</i>	'with, to'
<i>chiih</i>	'speak, scold'
<i>güt</i>	'know'
<i>ñaai</i>	'speak'
<i>paðau</i>	'teach'
<i>paañ</i>	'say, saying, invite'
<i>siêr</i>	'invite'
<i>siq</i>	'concerning (lit. returning)'

Köho Sre (= K)

- K3a: *añ (qəq) ðös* 'I (don't) speak' (Manley 1972 = OSS.217)
 añ ðös adaar adaar 'I speak slowly' (Evans & Bowen, n.d. = KLC.2) (*adaar* 'slow')
 K3j: *añ jaaq mē saao* 'I invite you to eat' (KLC.63) (*mē saao* 'you eat')
 ðös 'speak'
 jaaq 'invite'

Mnong Preh (= P)

- P3a: *gâp ngööi ngach* 'I speak fast' (Phillips & Kem 1974 = CMLL.18) (*ngach* 'fast')
 P3j: *gâp jaq may sôông sa* 'I invite you to eat' (CMLL.2) (*sôông sa* 'eat')
 P3l: *gâp nti aan an may git nau BuNoong* 'I will teach you Mnong' (CMLL.16)
 an...git 'inform, let know'
 jaq 'invite'
 ngööi 'speak'
 nti aan 'teach'

Mnong Rlâm (= R)

- R3a: *añ ngööi bröq bröq* 'I am speaking slowly' (*bröq bröq* 'slowly')
 R3b, c: *añ ngööi ta kan* 'I spoke to/about him' (*kan* 'him')
 R3f: *añ lah kan saak* 'I said he went/ I said "He went"' (*saak* 'go')
 R3g: (*laai*) *añ lah ta kan añ saak* 'I told him I was going'
 R3i: *añ ngööi aan kan güit añ saak* 'id.'
 R3j: *añ ndööm kan saak* 'I invited him to go'

- R3k: *añ aan kan saak* 'I allowed him to go'
aan 'allow, give, let'
lah 'say'
laai 'past' Preferred in R3g.
ndööm 'invite'
ngööi 'speak'
ta 'to, for, etc.'

Stieng (= S)

- S3a: *hêy mor (dreet dreet)* 'I speak (slowly)'
S3b: *hêy chhuôr baak bu* 'I spoke about him' (*bu* 'him')
S3c: *hêy lah a bu* 'I spoke to him'
S3d: *hêy lah bu* 'I scolded him'
S3e: *hêy chhuôr lah bu han* 'I said that he went/I said "He went"' (*han* 'go')
S3f: *hêy lah bu han* 'I said that he went'
S3g: *hêy lah a bu, lah hêy han* 'I told him that I was going'
S3i: *hêy lah aan bu giüt (lah) hêy han* 'I spoke informing him that I was going'
S3j: *hêy maañ/siêr bu han* 'I invited him to go'
S3k: *hêy aan bu han* 'I let him go'
S3l: *hêy tti bu giüt mor Södiêng* 'I taught him to speak Stieng'
a 'to, for, from, etc.'
aan 'allow, let'
baak 'matter, concerning'
chhuôr 'relate, tell'
giüt 'know'
lah 'say, scold, tell'
maañ 'command'
mor 'speak'
siêr 'invite'
tti 'teach'

From the foregoing data one can immediately reconstruct an intransitive talking clause (3a) as Proto-South-Bahnaric *S—V—(Adv.), attested in all six daughter languages. The presence of an adverb or a negative with this construction seems to be preferred.

For 'talking about' clauses (3b), all three attested languages have S—V—Link—Content, but the type of Link varies from a preposition (Rlâm) to a generic noun (Stieng, Chrau) or a motion verb (Chrau). The first Chrau form, with a verbal Link, may possibly be a calque on Vietnamese *vê*, and it is not attested in my data from the other languages. The second Chrau form, with a nominal Link, is matched by Stieng; it could of course, also be a calque on Vietnamese *việc*, but it seems to be a more general South-East Asian pattern, and Stieng has been under less Vietnamese influence than Chrau. The Rlâm form is ambivalent for 3b and 3c. The wide variation in South Bahnaric forms here might seem to indicate some