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This paper is a study of some major clause types, in a preliminary attempt to push back our understanding of that segment of Bahnaric grammar to the Proto-South-Bahnaric stage. The data from the various languages, as will be apparent from the discussion, is 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. This study will draw most heavily on Chrau, Eastern Mnong (Rlăm), and Stieng, as representative languages of the group, with additional data from Kôho Srê and Central Mnong (Bunâr and Preh). The three main languages above are respectively at the southeastern, northeastern, and western edges of the South Bahnaric area, so should give a fairly good picture of the range of diversity.

The many clause types are grouped into major categories, as individual clause types do not stand alone in a grammar. This paper examines only the clause categories I have called transitives and locationals; communicatives, statives, and other categories are treated in a separate paper forthcoming.

In the following examples new vocabulary is held to a minimum. Function markers and main verbs are underlined in the text and listed at the bottom of each set of examples, other incidental vocabulary is glossed at its first occurrence in that set of examples. (Function markers indicate the syntactic function of the lexical morpheme that they accompany; in this data they include prepositions, postverbs, and certain topicalizing demonstratives and basic locatives. They are marked with a dotted underline. Main verbs have a solid underline.) The reference after each example is the source of the data, as described in Note 1.

1. Transitivity types

The intransitive-transitive-bitransitive group of clauses have a basic S-V-0 order in all of the South Bahnaric languages, with the IO having more than one possible position.

CHRAU
Cla) ánhr víq. 'I slept' (ánh ʻIʼ)
   víq ánhr 'id.' (To emphasize the verb)
Clb) ánhr pänh nën 'I hit him' (nën 'him')
Clc) ánhr sa (en) 'I have eaten (already)'
Cld) pën nöq ánhr nhö̜p en 'The knife I have taken already'
   (pën 'knife')
Cle) ánhr an nën pënh 'I gave him a knife' (rare)
Clf) ánhr an pënh nën iūn 'I gave him a knife'
Clg) ánhr an nën iūn du tong pën 'I gave him a knife' (du tong 'one classifier')
Ch) ánhr an pënh 'I gave a knife'
Clj) an ánhr iūn 'Give (it) to him'
Clk) an iūn 'Give it (to me)'

KÖHO SRÈ
Kla) án bic 'I slept' (OSS:162) (ánh 'I')
Klb) án bë̜i iār 'I am buying chickens' (KLC:14)
   (iār 'chickens')
Klf) án ai töröm rö̜pu in 'I gave wine to the buffalo'
   (OSS:178) (töröm 'wine', rö̜pu 'buffalo')

MNONG BUNĀR
Blb) gër sông piang 'I eat rice' (MLC:2.3) (gër 'I',
   piang 'rice')
Blf) gër an dak si mà may 'I gave you medicine' (MLC:3.4,5)
   (dak si 'medicine', mà 'you')
Blg) gër mplö̜q mà may prao rē̜l 'I'll give you back six
   piastres' (MLC:2.2) (prao rē̜l 'six piastres')
gâp an ap nóm du mlôm jâm² "I gave everyone one plate"
(MLC:7.3) (ap nóm 'everyone', du mlôm jâm 'one plate')

an 'give'
ma 'to'
mlôq 'give back'
sông 'eat'

MNONG PREH
Pla) gâp ji 'I'm sick' (CMLL:15) (gâp 'I')
Plb) gâp sông piâng 'I ate rice' (CMLL:2) (piâng 'rice')
Plc) gâp sông (jêh) 'I have eaten (already)' (CMLL:1)
Plg) gâp ân ma pêng dak si 'I gave him water to drink'
(CMLL:14) (pêng 'he', dak si 'water to drink')
Plh) may lô mlôq² ma gâp nôm 'You return (it) to me'
(CMLL:20) (may 'you', nôm 'self?'

ân 'give'
ji 'to be sick'
lô mlôq 'give back, return'
ma 'to'

MNONG RLÂM
Rla) ân dhul 'I ran' (MLL:18) (ân 'I')
    dhul ân 'id.' (Function not yet analyzed)
Rlb) ân pah kân 'I hit him' (kân 'him')
Rlc) ân sông (ru) 'I've (already) eaten' (MLL:1)
Rld) pênh hân ân ân ta kân 'That knife I gave to him'
    (pênh 'knife')
Rlf) ân ânh pênh ta kân 'I gave him a knife'

ân 'give'
dhul 'run'
hân 'that' Normally required in Rld.
pah 'hit'
sông 'eat'
ta 'to'

STIENG
Sla) hêy tuôt 'I ran' (hêy 'I')
    tuôt hêy 'id.' (To emphasize the verb)
Slb) hêy pêm bu 'I hit him' (bu 'him, someone')
Slc) hêy sa (hôi) 'I've eaten (already)'
Slc) pênh nêy hêy (ja) pêns hôi 'The knife I have taken
(already) (pênh 'knife', ja...hôi 'already')
Sle) hêy aan bu pênh 'I gave him a knife'
Slf) hêy aan pênh dâh bu 'I gave a knife to him'
Slg) hêy aan bu pênh di toong 'I gave him a knife' (di, toong
    'one classifier')
S1h) ᵇʸ aⁿ ᵇⁿ 'I gave (him) a knife'
       ᵇʸ ᵇⁿ 'id.'
S1i) ᵇʸ aⁿ bu 'I gave (it) to him'
S1j) aⁿ ᵇʸ 'Give (it) to me' (OSG:45)
S1k) aⁿ tô mêh 'Give it' ( tô mêh 'imperative ')

intransitive = ± S + Vi (OSG:10)
transitive   = ± S + Vtr + O (OSG:10)
bitransitive = ± S + Vbitr ± O ± IO (OSG:10)

aan     'give'
dāh     'to'
nêy     'that'
pôm     'hit'
pā̃s     'take, fetch'
sa      'eat'
tuōt    'run'
ṳn      'give'

From the foregoing data one can clearly reconstruct a
Proto-South-Bahnaric (PSB) intransitive *S-V pattern (1a), as
attested in all the languages for which we have intransitive
data, that is all except Mnong Bunâr. A *V-S pattern should
also be reconstructed, which gives emphasis to the verb,
attested in Chrau, Mnong Rlâm, Stieng.

A normal transitive *S-V-O (1b) is attested for all six
languages. Four of the languages (Chrau, Mnong Preh, Mnong
Rlâm, Stieng) show optional deletion of the Object (1c) with
'already', so this feature can be reconstructed for PSB. A
verb like 'eat', with a natural Object 'food', can freely take
this deleting form (1c); a verb like 'hit', with no natural
Object, would normally expect the Object to be stated in the
context before this deleting form can be used.

A fronted topocalized Object (1d) with demonstrative 'that
is attested by Chrau, Mnong Rlâm, Stieng with no contradictory
data, so can be reconstructed for PSB. Fronted topicalization
in PSB may well have required a demonstrative.

The bitransitives are more complicated. Each language is
different. The normal form with a simple Object is S-V-IO-O
(1e) in Stieng, S-V-O-Prep-IO (1f) in Bunâr, Rlâm, and Stieng,
S-V-O-IO-Postv (1f) in Chrau, and apparently S-V-Prep-IO-O
(1g) in Preh. The Chrau form is probably a weakening from the
complex clause form S-V₁-0-IO-V₂, in which the IO is also the
Subject of V₂, a form widely attested in Mon-Khmer, as in Chri
ǎnh an pīn nêh nham 'I gave him a knife to borrow', or ǎnh an
duōn nêh nđau 'I gave him a hat to wear'. The prepositions
used in Bunâr/Preh, Rlâm, and Stieng are not cognate.
All this seems to suggest that none of the above bitransitive forms are original PSB, but that PSB may perhaps have used the pre-Chrau/Khôho complex clause form *S-V₁-O-IO-V₂. This complex form was used to express purpose, instrument, bitransitives, etc., which is common Mon-Khmer usage. A verb *?yîn may be reconstructed, which could function in either V₁ or V₂ position (cf. Chrau iôn, Khôho în, Stieng ôn 'give, to', cogn. Vietnamese giúm 'help'??). *?yîn in V₂ eventually became grammaticalized as the marker of Indirect Object, postposed to the IO, as is preserved in Chrau and Khôho. But the use of *?yîn in a postpositional slot in a preposing language is abnormal, so the other four languages dropped the *?yîn. Bunâr and Rlâm substituted prepositions before the IO. Stieng changed the 0-IO order to IO-0 for the common form in Stieng, but it also secondarily took the Bunâr/Rlâm form. Preh compromised the Stieng and the Bunâr/Rlâm patterns to Prep-IO-0. Possibly the IO-0 Stieng form should be taken as being also the pre-Stieng-Preh form, to which Preh added a Prep in order to disambiguate the 0 and IO functions. Postulating a Pre-South-Bahnaric 0-IO-V₂ seems necessary in order to account for the otherwise anomalous postposed Chrau and Khôho *?yîn in prepositional languages.³
Bitransitives with a several-word Object (1g) move the Object to the end of the clause, as attested in C, K, B, P, S. This "heavy movement" may be assigned to PSB. In Bunât this movement can also delete the preposition.

Elliptical forms of the bitransitive (1h-1k) retain the characteristics of the full forms, so that Chrau retains the postverb i:n, Preh retains the preposition ma, and Stieng retains the absence of overt markers.

2. Locational types

The locative-putting-travel-propulsion clauses have a basic S-V-O-Loc order, in which the Locative may be a Location or an Origin/Destination.

CHRAU
C2a) âmh _u heq 'I am here' (âmh 'I', heq 'here')
                        âmh a tênh 'I am below' (tênh 'below')
C2b) âmh ŋûq u heq 'I live here' (ŋûq 'live')
C2c) âmh palây Jro 'I live in the Jro clan area'
C2d) âmh ŋûq tu 'I live in jail'
C2e) âmh cheg nênh sùng/z u nhi 'I put it in the house'
               (nhi 'house')
C2f) âmh söq 'I'm returning (home)'
C2g) âmh saq söq 'I'm going home'
C2h) âmh söq âmh 'I'm returning (home)'
C2i) âmh söq nhi 'I'm returning home'
                      âmh saq chô 'I'm going to market' (chô 'market')
C2j) âmh söq tâu nhi 'I'm returning home'
C2k) âmh saq tâu Sigor 'I'm going to Saigon'
C2l) âmh söq a Sigor 'I'm returning from Saigon'
C2m) âmh saq a Sigor tât Vahwa 'I went from Saigon to Bienhoa'
                        âmh a Sigor saq tâu/tât Vahwa 'id.'
                        âmh a Sigor söq (tâu) Vahwa 'I returned from Saigon to Bienhoa'
C2n) âmh vât nênh tâu Vahwa 'I took it to Bienhoa' (nênh 'he, it')
C2o) âmh vât nênh lûn a Sigor 'I took it out of Saigon'
C2p) âmh vât nênh söq tâu nhi 'I took it home'
C2q) âmh vât nênh a Sigor tât nhi 'I took it home from Saigon'
C2r) âmh söq nênh a nhi 'I fetched it from home'
C2s) âmh njân nênh saq hok 'I took him to study' (hok 'study')
KOHO SŘÈ

K2a) អាន ទូង ដ់ ខ្លួនឯង ‘I am here’ (KLC:13) អាន ‘I’, ដ់ ‘here’

K2b) អាន ឈឺ ណាម្ម រាជ  ‘I live in Dalat’ (KLC:38)

K2e) អាន ណាម្ម ខ្លួន ទូង ដ់ ខ្លួន ‘I put the baby here’ (KLC:22)

(K៻ន ‘baby’)

K2i) អាន រ៉ី ហេី ខ្លួន ‘I’m going home’ (KLC:27) ហេី ‘house’

K2k) អាន តែន ឈឺម្ម/ឈឺដី រាជរ៉ី  ‘I went to Đadông’ (OSS:70,72)

K21) អាន រ៉ី ខ្លួន រាជរ៉ី  ‘I returned from Đadông’ (KLC:32)

K2n) អាន ញេង សុំ តុំ ញុំ កូន ‘I brought a man to him’

(KLC:52) (ឈឺ ‘hím’)

bōh  ‘from’

ceŋ  ‘bring’
hō  ‘to’
lōt  ‘go’
öm  ‘live, stay’
ön  ‘put’
rϕ  ‘come, return’

ting  ‘at’

tōm, tam  ‘in, to’
tus, tus di  ‘come, to’

MNONG BÚNÂR

B2a) pang ប៉េ  ‘He is here’ (MLC:1.3) ប៉េ ‘he’,

B2b) gōp gūg ប៉េ ‘I live at SarPa’ (MLC:4.1)

(Bri ‘jungle’)

B2c) gōp ស្រាម  ‘I (live in) SarPa village’ (MLC:2.3)

B2e) gōp ជៃៃ ណូយ នូយ ប៉េ  ‘I put that thing in the

shirt pocket’ (MLC:4.4) ណូយ ‘that thing’, ប៉េ

‘shirt pocket’
B2f) gõp sit 'I went home' (MLC:8.6)
B2j) gõp sit ta ngïh 'I went home' (MLC:5.5)
B2k) gõp han ta SarPa 'I went to SarPa' (MLC:2.5)
B2l) gõp sit tag bah SarPa 'I came back from SarPa'
(MLC:8.6)
  gõp taq bah ngïh 'I came from the house' (MLC:4.1)
B2n) gõp leo ndð nay ta aò 'I brought that thing here'
(MLC:3.2) (ndð nay 'that thing')
B2p) gõp sok ndð nay leo ma may 'I'll bring that thing to you'
(MLC:4.3)

  bah 'at, side'
  bon 'village'
  cheq 'put'
  güq 'live'
  han 'go'
  leo 'bring'
  sit 'return home'
  sok 'bring, fetch'
  ta 'to, at'
  taq 'from, come from'
  töm 'in'

MNONG PREH
P2b) gõp gü ta DakNong 'I live/stay in DakNong' (CMLL:11)
(gõp 'I')
P2c) gõp bon DakNong 'I (live in) DakNong village' (CMLL:4)
P2f) gõp sit 'I'm going home' (CMLL:5)
P2g) gõp hân sit 'I'm going home' (CMLL:26)
P2j) gõp hõ sit ta ngïh 'I went home' (CMLL:12)
P2k) gõp hân ta DakNong 'I'm going to DakNong' (CMLL:5)
  gõp hân täm bri 'I'm going into the jungle' (CMLL:25)
  (bri 'jungle')
P2n) gõp tung leo sit ta ngïh 'I'll carry it home'
(CMLL:27)
P2r) gõp sok ta bah nây 'I'll take it from there' (CMLL:28)
(bah nây 'there')
P2s) gõp njûn leo may hân säm 'I'll lead you back for
treatment' (CMLL:16) (may 'you', säm 'treat')

  bah 'at'
  bon 'village'
  gü 'live, stay'
  hân 'go'
  hõ '??'
  leo 'bring (?)'
  njûn 'lead'
  sit 'go home'
sök  'take, fetch'
ta  'at, in'
tâm  'into (?)
tung  'carry'

MNONG RLĀM
R2a) ăn măng sōq 'I was underneath' (ăn 'I', sōq 'underneath')
R2b) ăn gük to Dalat 'I live in Dalat' (MLL:5)
   ān gük ta ă 'I live here, I am here' (ă 'here')
R2c) ăn ta buôn DungBa 'I am from DungBa village'
R2e) ăn cūt pēnh ta ă 'I put the knife here' (pēnh 'knife')
R2f) ăn du 'I'm going home' (MLL:5)
R2g) ăn sak du 'id.'
R2h) ăn du ān 'id.'
R2i) ăn du hih 'I'm going home' (hih 'house')
R2j) ăn du ta hih 'I'm going home'
R2k) ăn sak ta Dalat 'I'm going to Dalat'
R2l) ăn wēnh ān bah Dalat 'I'm returning from Dalat'
R2m) ān ṭōh pēnh hān bah DungBa troh Dalat 'I took the knife from DungBa to Dalat' (hān 'that')
R2n) ān ṭōh pēnh ta Dalat 'I took the knife to Dalat'
   (pēnh 'knife')
R2o) ān ṭōh pēnh bah Dalat 'I took the knife from Dalat'
R2p) ān ṭōh pēnh ta hih ān 'I took the knife to my house'
R2r) ān sōk bah hih ān 'I fetched (it) from my house'
R2s) ān ṭōh khăn riém rā 'I led him to study/go to school'
   (khăn 'him', riém rā 'study in school')

bah  'from'
buôn  'village'
cūt  'put'
ďōp  'take'
du  'return'
gük  'live, stay'
măng  'at'
sak  'go'
sōk  'fetch'
ta, to  'at, in'
troh/truh  'go to, arrive'
wēnh  'return, do again'

STIENG
S2a) hēy (a) au 'I am here' (hēy 'I', au 'here')
   hēy ā dēnh 'I am below' (dēnh 'below')
S2b) hēy gōq (a) au 'I live here'
S2c) hēy pōn Brah 'I am a resident of the Brah area'
S2d) hãy gôq tu 'I live in jail' (tu 'jail')
S2e) hãy teq a/knông nhi 'I put it in the house'
     (nhi 'house')
S2f) hãy sêq 'I returned'
S2g) hãy han sêq 'id.'
S2h) hãy sêq hãy 'id.'
S2i) hãy sêq nhi 'I returned home' (rare)
S2j) hãy sêq a Nhi 'id.' (normal)
S2k) hãy han (a) Brah 'I'm going to Brah' (han 'go')
S2l) hãy sêq a Bughin 'I'm returning from Bughin'
S2m) hãy han a Bughin tôt Brah 'I went from Bughin to Brah'
     (formal speech)
     hãy han Bughin, ja a Bughin Brah 'I went to Bughin,
     then from Bughin to Brah' (ja 'then')
S2n) hãy liêu teq a Brah 'I took it to Brah'
S2q) hãy liêu a Bughin teq a au 'I took it from Bughin to
     here'
     hãy pôôs teq a Nhi hãy pôôs a Bughin 'In taking it home
     I took it from Bughin'
S2r) hãy pôôs a Nhi 'I fetched it from home'
S2s) hãy jên bu han hok 'I took him to study' (hok 'study')
     a 'to, at, from'
     gôq 'live, stay'
     han 'go'
     jên 'escort'
     knông 'in'
     liêu 'take'
     pôôs 'area'
     pôôs 'take'
     sêq 'return'
     teq 'put, to'
     tu/tô 'at'
     tôt 'to'

From the 2a forms one can clearly reconstruct a Proto-
South-Bahnaric simple locative clause form *S-Prep-Loc,
attested in Chrau, Koho, Bunâr, Rlâm, Stieng. A range of pre-
positions is available in each language, and the Location may
be a direction, a noun, or a demonstrative; all this may be
assigned to PSB. In Stieng the Prep is optional before a
demonstrative; this seems to be a Stieng innovation, not
attested in the other languages.

A "dwelling" clause (intentional locative?) is normally
(2b) *S-V-Prep-Loc, as in Chrau, Koho, Bunâr, Preh, Rlâm,
Stieng, again with the Prep optional before a demonstrative in
Stieng. In 2c the name of a village or clan area (bon, palây,
pôh) implies living and belonging, so the verb is not needed;
this pattern is attested in Chrau, Bunâr, Preh, Stieng, so can be reconstructed for PSB. The absence of a Preposition with *tu 'jail' in 2d (Chrau, Stieng) is probably a pattern borrowed from Vietnamese (which is also the source of *tu), though the analogy with 2c may have helped the borrowing process.

A "putting" clause (2e) may be reconstructed as *S-V-(O)-Prep-Loc, as in Chrau, Koho, Bunâr, Rlâm, Stieng.

Simple travel clauses (2f-2l) seem to be basically *S-V-Prep-Dest/Orig (Chrau, Koho, Bunâr, Preh, Rlâm, Stieng). In 2f, with the verb 'to return' both the Prep and the Dest 'home' are deletable (Chrau, Bunâr, Preh, Rlâm, Stieng); and in C2m 'return' cannot take a second verb, and the preposition tâu is deletable. Form 2g, with two verbs in series, is attested in Chrau and Stieng, with no contrary evidence, so can be ascribed to PSB. The S-V-S form (2h) is found in Chrau, Stieng, and Rlâm, the three best attested languages in my data, so it likely is inherited from PSB. The S-V-S form emphasizes the verb action, so it probably is derived from the V-S form of 1a, with an anticipatory doubling of the Subject pronoun (S-V → V-S → S-V-S). In 2i, with certain common nouns as Destination, such as house or market, the preposition is deleted (Chrau, Koho, Rlâm). Forms 2j-1 show prepositions before the Destination and Origin, attested in Chrau, Koho, Bunâr, Preh, Rlâm, Stieng, but in Stieng the Prep before an Origin is optional.

Travel clauses with both an Origin and a Destination (2m) are attested in only Chrau and Stieng, and it is not normal speech in Stieng. (Perhaps it is assumed that usually one already knows the starting point?) In Chrau, with the normal S-V-Orig order, adding a Dest requires the verb tât, making a serial clause construction; but with the Orig fronted to S-Orig -V the Dest can take either the preposition tâu or the verb tât. Mnong Rlâm similarly requires a second verb truh/troh 'arrive'. So it seems quite possible that PSB did not permit both Origin and Destination in a simple clause, and that a two-clause construction was needed, as in Stieng or Rlâm, to state them both.

Propulsion clauses (2n-2s) in all six languages take the general form S-V-O-Prep-Orig/Dest, reconstructable for PSB. Again it seems likely that the inclusion of both Origin and Destination required a two-clause construction in PSB. When the Destination is an action rather than a location (2s in Chrau, Preh, Rlâm, Stieng) there is no preposition.
3. Summary of reconstructions

The reconstructed Proto-South-Bahnaric forms may be summarized, with sample glosses, as follows:

**Transitives**
*S-V \ `I slept`\n*S-V-O \ `I hit him`\n*S-V-already \ `I have eaten already`\n*O-that-S-V \ `That knife I have taken already`\n*S-V₁-O-I₀-V₂ \ `I gave him a knife (to own)`\n*S-V₁-I₀-V₂-O \ `I gave him (to own) a very long knife`\n
**Locationals**
*S-Prep-Loc \ `I am in the house`\n*S-V-Prep-Loc \ `I live here`\n*S-Loc \ `I belong to (live in) DaDong village`\n*S-V-(O)-Prep-Loc \ `I put it in the house`\n*S-V-Prep-Dest/Orig \ `I am going to/from Dalat`\n*S-V-Loc \ `I am going home/to market`\n*S-V \ `I am going home`\n*S-V₁-S \ `I am going (I am)`\n*S-V-O-Prep-Dest/Orig \ `I am taking it to/from Dalat`\n*S-V₁-O-Prep-Orig-V₂-Dest \ `I took it from Dalat went to DaDong` (I took it from Dalat to DaDong)\n*S-V₁-O-Clause \ `I took him to study`\n
If the foregoing reconstructions are correct, the Proto-South-Bahnaric language, spoken perhaps a millennium ago from Banmethuot to Saigon and from Dalat to Kratie, had clause structure quite similar to its modern daughter languages, with a basic S-V-O pattern, but with more verb serialization and clause serialization than its daughters, and with a bitransitive pattern slightly different from any of its daughters.
NOTES

1. The Chrau data is my own (see Thomas 1971). Köho Srê data is from Evans & Bowen n.d. (KLC) and Manley 1972 (OSS). Mnong Bunâr data is from Phillips ms. (MLC). Mnong Preh data is from Phillips & Kem 1974 (CMLL). Mnong Rlâm data is from Tang 1976 (MLL) plus personal communications from Evangeline Blood 1985 (unmarked). And Stieng data is from Miller 1976 (OSG) and from Haupers & 'Bi n.d. (SPB), plus personal communications from Ralph Haupers 1985 (unmarked). I was not able to recheck any of the data with native speakers, and vowel length, especially in Rlâm, is uncertain.

The transcriptions follow the original transcriptions except that the "whiskered" ᵃ and ᶷ have been rendered ᵃ and ᶷ, and in Stieng and Chrau c has been replaced by k. In some cases I have taken the liberty of replacing nouns and place names with other nouns and place names for reader ease. The two sources for Köho use different spelling conventions, so I have tried to convert OSS spellings to KLC spellings.

This paper was presented at the 1985 Sino-Tibetan conference in Bangkok. Kenneth Gregerson kindly commented on an earlier draft.

2. Köho hṕiŋ in the original transcription = hō. Rlâm bɾɔŋ = brŋ, cût = cût, ɡıt = ɡıt, hũn = hũn, sœq = sœ. Bunâr chhûng = chhûng, nōm = nōm. Preh mplôq = mplô. (These changes were made because of mechanical limitations.)

3. It is possible that PSB *ŋyin 'give' was originally formed as a doublet on *ŋən 'give'. The precise original form of both of these is uncertain, as neither one shows a normal set of cognate forms.
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