

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

instability or ambivalence at the proto stage, probably not matching any of the attested current forms.

Addressee clauses (3c in C, R, S) all have the structure S–V–Prep.–Addr., so that structure should be posited for PSB. For the preposition Stieng and Rlâm use their broad-spectrum prepositions *a* and *ta*, but Chrau, lacking such a broad-spectrum preposition uses *bay* ‘with’. Perhaps a broad-spectrum preposition (**ta*?) should be posited for PSB.

In Chrau, the communicative verbs have been split into at least four classes. V1 verbs, like *ñaaɪ* ‘speak’, *ḍööm* ‘converse’, are used in 3a, b, c, etc., and require a Preposition before an Addressee, and require a Quote Introducer before a Quote. V2 verbs, like *chiɪh* ‘scold’, *lah* ‘scold’, *payoom* ‘praise’, are used in 3d, h, and require a Quote Introducer before a Quote. The V3 verb *paañ* ‘say’ cannot take an Addressee, and it takes no Quote Introducer since that would be homophonous with it. And *paañ* replaced PSB **lah* as the Quote Introducer. V4 verbs, like *siēr* ‘invite’, *paañ* ‘say, invite’, are used in 3j.

A transitive talking clause (3d in C, S) *S–V–O should be reconstructed for verbs like ‘scold’ or ‘praise’.

There was apparently no distinction between direct and indirect quotatives (3e, f) in Proto-South-Bahnaric. Form 3e S–V1–QuotInt.–Quot. is attested in Chrau and Stieng. The dropping of V1 gives a simpler form (3f in C, R, S) in which the Quote Introducer (C. *paañ*, R, S. *lah*) becomes the main verb *S–VQuot.–Quot. The verb *lah* ‘speak, scold’ is attested in C, R, S and probably served as both a VQuot. and a QuotInt. in PSB, but its QuotInt. function dropped out in Chrau. All these languages have many verbs that can function as V1, but only one that can function as QuotInt.

Simple quotative addressee clauses (3g) in Chrau and Stieng have the form S–V1–Prep.–Addr.–QuotInt.–Quot., in which V1 and QuotInt. are the same as in the direct and indirect quotatives (3e, f), and the Prep. is that in 3c. Rlâm has S–V1–Addr.–Quot. The modern forms could be accounted for by positing a PSB *S–V1:v/VQuot.: *lah*–Prep.–Addr.–QuotInt.: *lah*–Quot. Stieng seems to have this structure. Mnong Rlâm dropped the redundant second *lah*. Chrau dropped *lah* completely out of this construction by substituting *paañ* in the QuotInt. slot and by putting *lah* into the V2 class, which does not occur in the 3g construction.

The 3h form, used with Chrau class V2 verbs, does not have a Preposition before the Addressee. Data from other languages are lacking, so no conclusions can be drawn for PSB.

The longer quotative addressee form (3i) has the form *S–V1–*aan*–Addr.–*git*–Quot., as attested in C, S, R, with *aan...git* ‘let know’ functioning as a benefactive marker. In C there is an optional QuotInt. before the quotation; this may be a Chrau idiosyncrasy on the analogy of 3e.

Imperative clauses, with verbs like ‘invite, command, permit’ (3j) have the same form as 3f, ie. S–V–Addr.–Quot., attested in C, S, R, so may be reconstructed for PSB in that form. In Chrau, the 3f and 3j verbs are

homophonous in one instance, *paañ*, yielding an ambiguous clause. The causative verb *aan* ‘give, allow’ can also be used here (C, R, S).

Teaching clauses (3k) have the form S–V–*aan*–Addr.–git–Content (=3i) in C and P, perhaps reconstructable for PSB. Stieng lacks the **aan*. Only Bunar has S–V–Content–*ma*–Addr.

2. Existives

The simple existence – identified existence – transitive existence (existive possession) – naming – becoming group of clause types take a variety of forms, as may be seen from the following:

Mnong Bunâr

- B4b: *geh ngih ta ri* ‘There is a house there’ (MLC.2.11) (*ngih* ‘house’, *ri* ‘there’)
 B4c: *ta ti jêêng ngih* ‘Over there are houses’ (MLC.2.11)
 B4e: *buum jêêng du ntiil ndö sa* ‘A tuber is a kind of food’ (MLC.3.2) (*buum* ‘tuber’, *du ntiil ndö sa* ‘one kind of food’)
 B4f: *göp geh du play ngih* ‘I have a house’ (MLC.2.7) (*du play* ‘one cl.’)
 B4g: *göp NDjrêêt* ‘I am Djrêt’ (MLC.4.1)
 B4k: *amoh göp NDaan* ‘My name is Dan’ (MLC.4.1)
amoh ‘name’
geh ‘have’
jêêng ‘be’
ta ‘at’

Chrau

- C4a: *geh ñi* ‘There are houses’ (*ñi* ‘house’)
 C4b: *geh ñi u heeq* ‘There are houses here’ (*heeq* ‘this, here’)
 C4c: *u heeq geh ñi* ‘id.’
 C4d: *ñi heeq* ‘This is a house’
 C4e: *heeq la ñi* ‘id.’ (rare < Vietnamese)
 C4f: *añ geh ñi* ‘I have a house’
 C4g: *GaPe añ* ‘I am GaPe’
 C4h: *añ heeq GaPe* ‘id.’
 C4j: *añ saq GaPe* ‘I am named GaPe’
 C4k: *saq añ GaPe* ‘My name is GaPe’
 C4m: *añ tan’hya saq neh GaPe* ‘I named him GaPe’ (*neh* ‘him’)
 C4n: *neh jêêng yaw* ‘He became a tiger’ (*yaw* ‘tiger’)
 C4o: *añ ôôp vadaai jêêng/luh ñi* ‘I made the lean-to into a house’ (*vadaai* ‘lean-to’)
geh ‘be, have’
heeq ‘here, this one’
jêêng ‘become’
la ‘is’ (< Vietnamese)
luh ‘appear, become’
ôôp ‘make, do’
saq ‘name, be named’

tan'hya
saq 'to name'

Köho Sre

- K4a: *gös hiu* 'There are houses' (*hiu* 'house')
 K4b: *gös hiu têêng dq* 'There are houses here' (*KLC.9*) (*dq* 'here')
 K4e: *chi dq la hiu* 'This is a house' (*KLC.26*) (*chi dq* 'this')
khay lah/jêêng caw mih 'He is an American' (*OSS.189*)
 K4f: *añ gös kroac* 'I have oranges' (*KLC.14a*) (*kroac* 'orange')
 K4h: *chi dq kroac* 'This is an orange' (*KLC.14*)
 K4l: *sõndan añ la K'Poh* 'My name is K'Poh' (*KLC.14*)
 K4n: *khay jêêng/gös kliu* 'He became a tiger' (*OSS.189-190*) (*khay*
 'he', *kliu* 'tiger')
gös 'be, have, become'
jêêng 'become'
la, lah 'is' (< Vietnamese)
sõndan 'name'
têêng 'at'

Mnong Preh

- P4c: *tâm bri geh ne* 'In the forest there are rats' (*CMLL.28*) (*bri*
 'forest', *ne* 'rat')
 P4e: *gap jêêng BuNoong* 'I am a Mnong' (*CMLL.16*)
 P4f: *gâp geh pe nuyh koon* 'I have three children' (*CMLL.8*) (*pe nuyh*
koon 'three children')
 P4k: *moh sak gâp NDoong* 'My name is Dong' (*CMLL.7*)
geh 'have'
jêêng 'be'
moh sak 'name'
tâm 'in, at'

Mnong Rlâm

- R4a: *geh hih* 'There are houses' (*hih* 'house')
 R4b: *geh hih ta han* 'There are houses there' (*han* 'there')
 R4c: *to car Mriik mau hih* 'In America there are houses' (*MLLL.36*)
 (*car Mriik* 'America')
 ?R4d: *hih hô* 'This is a house' (*hô* 'this')
 R4e: *hô eh jêêng hih* 'This is a house' (*eh* 'this')
 R4f: *añ geh hih* 'I have a house'
 R4g: *Jhang añ* 'I am Jhang'
 R4i: *añ jêêng Jhang* 'id.'
 R4k: *nan añ Jhang* 'My name is Jhang'
 R4m: *añ nan to kan Jhang* 'I named him Jhang'
 R4o: *añ mhoq tùm hün njêêng hih* 'I made that shelter into a house'
 (*tùm hün* 'shelter')
geh 'have'
jêêng 'be'

<i>mau</i>	‘be’
<i>mhoq</i>	‘make, cause’
<i>nan</i>	‘name’
<i>njêêng</i>	‘become’
<i>ta, to</i>	‘at’

Stieng

S4a:	<i>geh ñi</i> ‘There are houses’ (<i>ñi</i> ‘house’)
S4b:	<i>geh ñi a nêy</i> ‘There are houses there’ (<i>nêy</i> ‘there’)
S4d:	<i>au ñi</i> ‘This is a house’ (<i>au</i> this, here’)
S4f:	<i>hêy geh ñi</i> ‘I have a house’
S4g:	<i>hêy Gape</i> ‘I am GaPe’
S4h:	<i>hêy au GaPe</i> ‘id.’
S4j:	<i>hêy chhak GaPe</i> ‘I am named GaPe’
S4k:	<i>chhak hêy GaPe</i> ‘My name is GaPe’
S4m:	<i>hêy chuôl bu chhak GaPe</i> ‘I named him GaPe’ (<i>bu</i> ‘him’)
S4o:	<i>hêy lôh nôm (lôh) biüt ñi</i> ‘I made the lean-to into a house’ (<i>nôm</i> ‘lean-to’)
<i>a</i>	‘at’
<i>biüt</i>	‘become’
<i>chhak</i>	‘name’
<i>chuôl</i>	to name’
<i>geh</i>	‘be, have’
<i>lôh</i>	‘appear’
<i>löh</i>	‘make, cause’

A simple existence clause *ExistV–S (4a) may be posited for Proto-South-Bahnaric on the evidence of C, K, R, S. And a PSB existence verb *geh is attested by B, C, (K?), R, S.

A located existence clause ExistV–S–Prep.–Loc. (4b) is attested by B, C, K, R, S with a demonstrative Loc. The locative preposition, however, is different in all five languages, leading one to suspect that perhaps PSB had no preposition there; but the need for a preposition (in a preposing language group) became felt, perhaps to avoid ambiguity with a homophonous N–Dem. noun phrase. Bunâr, Chrau and Preh data (4c) also include a transposed Prep.–Loc.–ExistV–S form, emphasising the Location rather than the Subject, which should probably be posited for PSB. Bunâr has different ExistV in 4b and 4c.

The simplest identification clause (4d) is Ident.–S, attested in C, R(?), or its reverse S–Ident. attested in S. It is not clear what should be reconstructed for PSB.

A copula-linked identification clause (4e) S–Cop.–Ident. is found in B, K, P, R. It is absent from Stieng and only borrowed in Chrau, the two most reliably attested languages in the sample. (Calques from Vietnamese or English are very possible in the language lesson books, the sources for most of the other language data.) The copula *jêêng* used in B, K, P, R, however, is a verb of becoming in Chrau (4n) and Rlâm (4o), so perhaps

PSB should be reconstructed without a copular identification clause form, then the northern tier of daughter languages expanded the use of *jêêng* ‘become’ to provide a copula.

A possession clause (4f) *S–Poss.–V–Item is clearly reconstructable from B, C, K, P, R, S, and the Possessive Verb in all of them is the existence verb *geh/gös of 4a, b. In PSB, apparently, existence and possession were parts of a single semantic category; perhaps possession should be viewed as transitive existence. (This use of have/be is paralleled by Vietnamese *có*, Thai *mii*, Khmer *mii*an, and many other South-East Asian languages.)

The personal identification clause (4g) is like the simple identification clause (4d), with Name³–S attested in C, R, and S–Name in B, S. Reconstruction is not clear. A topicalized form *S–Dem.–Name (4h) is more widely attested in C, K, S and should be reconstructed for PSB. Rlâm has also a copular form (4i) S–Cop.–Name, not to be reconstructed for PSB (see 4e).

A name clause (4j, k) is semantically very close to the personal identification clause. A form *S–NameN–Name (4j) with *sak* ‘body, name’ as the Name Noun can be reconstructed from C and S. And an alternate form *NameN–S–Name (4k) can be reconstructed from B, C, P, R, S. The *nan* ‘name’ in R is probably a loan from Radê. Köho also has a copular form (4l) with the borrowed Vietnamese copula *là*.

The naming clause (4m) has different forms in C, R, and S. The history of these is not clear.

A becoming clause (4n) *S–*jêêng*–O is probably reconstructable from C, K (see 4e). There is no outside support for the Köho variant S–*gös*–O, which is homophonous with the possession clause (4f).

The transforming clause (4o) has the form *S–V1–Form1–V2–Form2. C and R have *jêêng* as V2, probably reconstructable for PSB. C can also have *luh* as V2, but S has *luh* as V1. PSB *luh ‘go out’ must have been part of the PSB semantic field of transforming, but its syntactic use is not clear.

3. States

The ambient – stative – comparative – superlative – evaluative group of clause types tends to be S–V in South Bahnaric languages, though V–S state clauses are quite common.

Mnong Bunâr

- B5a: *naar aaö geh mih* ‘There will be rain today’ (MLC.4.2) (*naar aaö* ‘today’, *mih* ‘rain’)
 B5b: *klaang bôôk naar jêh* ‘It is noon already’ (MLC.2.2) (*klaang bôôk naar* ‘noon’)
 B5c: *naar aaö ji kat* ‘Today it is cold’ (MLC.4.2) (*ji kat* ‘cold’)
 B5d: *göp ji ngoot* ‘I’m hungry’ (MLC.2.2) (*ji ngoot* ‘hungry’)
geh ‘have’
jêh ‘already, now’

3. Structurally ‘name’ is the head of the Subject noun phrase, but semantically ‘I’ is still the Subject, as in the two preceding forms.

Chrau

- C5a: *kô mi* 'It is raining' (*kô* 'sky', *mi* 'rain')
 C5b: *nar tamvôôp een* 'It's noon now' (*nar* 'day', *tamvôôp* 'middle')
 C5c: *nar heeq takat* 'Today is cold' (*heeq* 'this', *takat* 'cold')
 C5d: *añ takat* 'I'm cold'
 C5e: *takat añ* 'I'm cold' (more common)
 C5f: *añ takat añ* 'id.' (emphasising 'I')
 C5g: *añ luh takat* 'I became cold'
 C5h: *añ takat dôông neh* 'I'm colder than him'
 C5i: *neh êêq takat ka añ* 'He's not as cold as me'
 C5j: *añ takat dôông leq* 'I'm the coldest of all'
dôông 'more than'
een 'already, now'
êêq 'not'
ka 'like, as'
leq 'all'
luh 'become, appear'

Kôho Sre

- K5b: *guul ngai rau* 'It is noon already' (KLC.11) (*guul ngai* 'noon')
 K5c: *ngai dq noat* 'Today is cold' (KLC.38) (*noat* 'cold')
 K5d: *añ kqpp* 'I'm sick' (KLC.22) (*kqpp* 'sick')
 K5g: *khay gölöh koop* 'He became sick' (OSS.190)
 K5i: *gö qqq niam be chi dq* 'They are not as good as this one' (KLC.33) (*niam* 'good', *gö* 'they')
 K5j: *chi dq buôn rlau jöh* 'This one is cheapest' (KLC.33) (*buôn* 'sell')
be 'as, like'
gölöh 'become'
qqq 'not'
rau 'already, now'
rlau jöh 'most, superlatively'

Mnong Preh

- P5a: *bri mih* 'it is raining' (CMLL.24) (*bri* 'jungle', *mih* 'rain')
 P5c: *naar aaö duh (ngan)* 'Today is (very) hot' (CMLL.23) (*naar aaö* 'today', *duh* 'hot')
 P5d: *rpual prah joong* 'A melon is long' (CMLL.29) (*rpual prah* 'melon', *joong* 'long')
 P5h: *gâp kataang löön ma may* 'I am stronger than you' (CMLL.23) (*kataang* 'strong')
löön ma 'more than'

Mnong Rlâm

- R5a: *mih* 'It is raining' (*mih* 'rain')
 R5c: *naar o kökat* 'Today is cold' (*naar o* 'today', *kökat* 'cold')
 R5d: *añ kökat* 'I'm cold'

- R5e: *kökat aĩ* 'id.'
R5g: *aĩ jêeng kökat* 'I became cold'
R5h: *an kökat hĩn ta kan* 'I'm colder than him'
R5i: *kan han ay so kökat blah aĩ* 'He is not as cold as me'
R5j: *aĩ kökat hĩn ta leq möt nih* 'I am the coldest of all'
ay so 'not'
blah 'as, like'
han 'not' (?)
hĩn ta 'more than'
jêeng 'become'
leq möt
nih 'all, everyone'
so 'see, perceive' (?)
- Stieng
S5a: *mi* 'It is raining' (*mi* 'rain')
mi lôh 'id.'
S5c: *'lêêk* 'It is cold' (*'lêêk* 'cold')
nar 'lêêk 'id.' (*nar* 'day, sun')
S5d: *hêy 'lêêk* 'I am cold'
S5e: *'lêêk, hêy aq!* 'Cold, indeed I am!'
S5f: *hêy 'lêêk hêy* 'I am cold'
S5g: *hêy lôh 'lêêk* 'I became cold'
S5h: *hêy 'lêêk huôs bu* 'am colder than him'
hêy teq a bu 'lêêk hêy 'I am colder than him/Beside him I'm cold'
S5j: *let pal nêy, 'lêêk hêy* 'I am the coldest of all/Of all of them I'm coldest'
- stative = \pm S + P:Vi (OSG.9)
aq 'exclamation'
bũt 'become'
huôs 'than, more than'
leet pal
nêy 'completely, all of them'
lôh 'appear, become'
teq a 'place beside, compare with'

There is no agreement on the form of the simple ambient clause (5a). Köho, Rlâm, and Stieng have a simple Amb. structure. Chrau and Preh use a dummy subject DumS–Amb. structure. Stieng can use a dummy verb Amb.–DumV structure. And Bunâr uses a *geh*–Amb. existve (4a) structure. This variety could perhaps be explained by positing a PSB simple *Amb. as in K, R, S. Chrau (which has been in close geographical proximity to Vietnamese) and Preh adopted a Vietnamese-like structure, treating the Ambient as an intransitive verb. The Bunâr form and the alternate Stieng form treat the Ambient as a noun. Positing a simple proto *Ambient would most easily account for the verb and noun developments. Nominal use of

the Ambient does appear also in Chrau in the form *mi sa neh* rain-eat-him 'he was heavily rained on'.

A time clause *Time-Adv. form (5b) can be reconstructed on the evidence of B, C, K.

A time-located ambient *Time-Amb. form (5c) is reconstructable from B, C, K, P, R.

A stative *S-State (5d), which is similar in form to the intransitive (1a), is reconstructable from B, C, K, P, R, S.

A reversed stative form *State-S (5e), emphasising the state, is reconstructable from C, R, S. The Stieng form seems to be more emphatic than the Chrau, and is normally accompanied by an emphatic final particle. An echo form *S-State-S (5f) is reconstructable from C, S, giving mild emphasis to the Subject.

An inceptive state *S-IncepV-State (5g) is reconstructable from C, K, R, S. The Inceptive Verb is *luh* in C, S, *jêêng* in R, and *gölös* (from *gös* ?) in K. These verbs have other PSB functions in 4a, e, n, o, and it is not clear which of these verbs should be reconstructed as the PSB Inceptive Verb.

A comparative state *S1-State-CompMk.-S2 (5h) is reconstructable from C, P, R, S. But the Comparison Marker is different in each language, so no conclusions can be drawn concerning the PSB Comparison Marker. Stieng also has a form S1-CompMk.-S2-State-S1.

For the negative comparison (5i) Chrau, Köho, and Rlâm have S1-Neg.-State-CompMk.-S2, which can probably be reconstructed for PSB.

The superlative (5j) has the form S-State-CompMk.-All, paralleling 5h, in Chrau and Rlâm. In Köho the form is S-State-Superl. In Stieng the form is All-State-S. Reconstruction is not clear.

4. Summary of reconstructions

The reconstructed Proto-South-Bahnaric forms may be summarised, with sample glosses, as below. Binomial slot : filler formulations are given when both the functional slot and the actual filler were discussed.

Communicatives

- 3a: *S-V-(Adv.) 'I speak (slowly)'
- 3b: *S-V-Link:?-Content 'I spoke about him'
- 3c: *S-V-Prep.:ta-Addr. 'I spoke to him'
- 3d: *S-V-O 'I scolded him'
- 3e: *S-V1-QuotInt.:lah-Quot. 'I spoke saying he went'
- 3f: *S-VQuot.-Quot. 'I said he went'
- 3g: *S-V1:v/VQuot.:lah-Prep.-Addr.-QuotInt.-Quot. 'I told him that I was going'
- 3h: ??
- 3i, k?: *S-V1-BenV:aan-Addr.-BenV:git-Quot. 'I let him know that I was going'
- 3j: *S-V:v4/aan-Addr.-Quot. 'I invited him to go'

Existives

- 4a: *ExistV:geh-S 'There are houses'

- 4b: *ExistV:geh-S-(Prep.:?)-Loc. 'There are houses there'
 4c: *Prep.-Loc.-ExistV-S 'Over there are houses'
 4d: ?*Ident.-S / ?*S-Ident.
 4e: (PNSB *S-Cop.:jêêng-Ident. 'That is a house')
 4f: *S-PossV:geh-Item 'I have a house'
 4g: ??
 4h: *S-Dem.-Name 'I here am GaPe'
 4i: -
 4j: *S-NameN:sak-Name 'I am named GaPe'
 4k: *NameN:sak-S-Name 'My name is GaPe'
 4l: -
 4m: ??
 4n: *S-V:jêêng-O 'He became a tiger'
 4o: *S-V1-Form1-V2-Form2 'He made the lean-to into a house'

Statives

- 5a: *Amb. 'It is raining'
 5b: *Time-Adv. 'It is noon now'
 5c: *Time-Amb. 'Yesterday it rained'
 5d: *S-State 'I am cold'
 5e: *State-S 'I am cold'
 5f: *S-State-S 'I am cold'
 5g: *S-IncepV:?-State 'I became cold'
 5h: *S1-State-CompMk:?-S2
 5i: *S1-Neg.-State-CompMk-S2 'I am not as cold as he'
 5k: ??

REFERENCES

- Evans, Helen & Peggy Bowen n.d. (c. 1965) *Kôho language course*. Dalat: Christian & Missionary Alliance mimeo.
 Haupers, R. & Đieu 'Bi n.d. (c. 1970). *Stieng phrase book*. Saigon: Summer Inst. Ling.
 Manley, T. M. 1972. *Outline of Sre structure* (Oceanic Ling. Spec. Publ. 12). Honolulu: Univ. Hawaii Press.
 Miller, Vera G. 1976. *An overview of Stieng grammar*. Grand Forks: Summer Inst. Ling.
 Phillips, R. L. 1963. *Mnong language course*. (ms.) microfiche Summer Inst. Ling.
 Phillips, R. L. & Y Kem Kpôr 1974. *Central Mnong language lessons*. Saigon: Summer Inst. Ling. & Min. Educ.
 Tang Hmok, Y. 1976. *Mnong Lam language lessons*. Summer Inst. Ling.
 Thomas, D. D. 1971. *Chrau grammar*. (Oceanic Ling. Spec. Publ. 7.). Honolulu: Univ. Hawaii Press.
 1983. *An invitation to grammar*. Bangkok: Mahidol Univ.
 Thomas, D. D. & Headley, R. K. 1970. More on Mon-Khmer subgroupings. *Lingua* 25, 398-418.
 Thomas, Dorothy M. 1969. Chrau affixes. *Mon-Khmer Stud.* 3, 90-107. Saigon: Summer Inst. Ling.

