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

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 Mnoch (Rlâm), and Stieing, as representative languages of the group, with additional data from Kôho Sre and Central Mnoch (Bunar 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 Stieing is taken as sufficient evidence to reconstruct it for Proto-South-Bahnaric. An agreement of just Chrau and Stieing 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 Stu. 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 Bunär (= B)**

B3a: *gęp ngööi ngach* 'I speak fast' (Phillips 1963 = _MLC_. 1.1) (*ngach* 'fast')

B3k: *gęp nтай 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'

*nтай an* 'teach'

**Chrau (= C)**

C3a: *aњ ŋääai (yuur yuur)* 'I speak (slowly)'

C3b: *aњ ŋääai siŋ neŋ* 'I talk about him' (*neŋ* 'him')

*aњ ŋääai siŋlño ni heŋ* 'I talk about this house' (*ni heŋ* 'this house')

*aњ naaŋ siŋlño ni heŋ *iĎ.*

C3c: *aњ ŋääai bay neŋ* 'I spoke to him'

C3d: *aњ chiih neŋ* 'I scolded him'

C3e: *aњ ŋääai paaŋ neŋ saaq* 'I said he went/I said "He went"'

C3f: *aњ paaŋ neŋ saaq* 'I said he went'

*aњ paaŋ, neŋ 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 Bunär data are from Phillips Ms. (_MLC_); the Mnong Preh data are from Phillips & Kem (1974; _CMLL_); the Mnong Rlăm data are from Tang (1976; _MLL_); 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 *V'l*, the voiceless velar stop as *k*, and the final glottal stop as *ʔ*. 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:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Usual Markings</strong></th>
<th><strong>Other Markings</strong></th>
<th><strong>Environments</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>short</td>
<td>long</td>
<td>only short</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Bunär</strong></td>
<td>v</td>
<td>-i/y, u/o, ü/ö</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Chrau</strong></td>
<td>v, ā, ü</td>
<td>-i/y, u/o</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Köho KLC</td>
<td>vN, vT</td>
<td>-i/y, u/o</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OSS</td>
<td>v</td>
<td>v=vq</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Preh</strong></td>
<td>v, ā</td>
<td>-i/y, u/o</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Rlăm</strong></td>
<td>v, ü</td>
<td>-i/y, u/o</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Stieng</strong></td>
<td>v</td>
<td>-Ø</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A combined phonetic chart of the vowels would be:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>High</th>
<th>Central</th>
<th>Back</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>i</td>
<td>ü</td>
<td>u</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ē</td>
<td>ö</td>
<td>üö</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e</td>
<td>ā</td>
<td>o</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>ʔ</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

iē, üō, uō are centralising offglides.
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C3g: aň ñaai bay neh paaň aň saaq 'I told him that I was going'
C3h: aň chiuh neh paaň neh saaq 'I scolded him, saying that he went'
C3i: aň ñaai aan neh güt (paaň) aň saaq 'I spoke letting him know I was going'
C3j: aň paaň neh saaq 'I invited him to go'
aň siĕr neh saaq 'I invited him to go'
aň aan neh saaq 'I allowed him to go'
C3k: aň padau neh güt troong Chrau 'I'll teach him the Chrau language'

aan 'permit, allow'
aan...güt 'let...know'
bay 'with, to'
chiuh 'speak, scold'
güt 'know'
ñaai 'speak'
padau 'teach'
paaň 'say, saying, invite'
siĕr 'invite'
siq 'concerning (lit. returning)'

Köho Sre (= K)
K3a: aň (qqq) dŏs 'I (don't) speak' (Manley 1972 = OSS.217)
aň dŏs adaar adaar 'I speak slowly' (Evans & Bowen, n.d. = KLC.2) (adaar 'slow')
K3j: aň jaaq mĕ saao 'I invite you to eat' (KLC.63) (mĕ saao 'you eat')
dŏs 'speak'
jaaq 'invite'

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

Mnong Rlăm (= R)
R3a: aň ngŏoĩ brŏq brŏq 'I am speaking slowly' (brŏq brŏq 'slowly')
R3b, c: aň ngŏoĩ ta kan 'I spoke to/about him' (kan 'him')
R3f: aň lah kan saak 'I said he went/ I said "He went"' (saak 'go')
R3g: (laai) aň lah ta kan aň saak 'I told him I was going'
R3i: aň ngŏoĩ aan kan güt aň saak 'id.'
R3j: aň ndŏoũm kan saak 'I invited him to go'
R3k: aĩ aann kan saak ‘I allowed him to go’
aan  ‘allow, give, let’
lah  ‘say’
lai  ‘past’ Preferred in R3g.
ndōōm ‘invite’
ngōōi ‘speak’
ta ‘to, for, etc.’

Stieng (= S)
S3a: hěy mor (dreet dreet) ‘I speak (slowly)’
S3b: hěy chhuôr baak bu ‘I spoke about him’ (bu ‘him’)
S3c: hěy lah a bu ‘I spoke to him’
S3d: hěy lah bu ‘I scolded him’
S3e: hěy chhuôr lah bu han ‘I said that he went/I said “He went”’ (han ‘go’)
S3f: hěy lah bu han ‘I said that he went’
S3g: hěy lah a bu, lah hěy han ‘I told him that I was going’
S3i: hěy lah aan bu güt (lah) hěy han ‘I spoke informing him that I was going’
S3j: hěy maan/siēr bu han ‘I invited him to go’
S3k: hěy aan bu han ‘I let him go’
S3l: hěy tti bu güt mor Sōdıèng ‘I taught him to speak Stieng’
a ‘to, for, from, etc.’
aan ‘allow, let’
baak ‘matter, concerning’
chhuôr ‘relate, tell’
güit ‘know’
lah ‘say, scold, tell’
maan ‘command’
mor ‘speak’
siēr ‘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 viêc, 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 Râm use their broad-spectrum prepositions a and ia, but Chrau, lacking such a broad-spectrum preposition uses hay ‘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 ñaai ‘speak’, dôôm ‘converse’, are used in 3a, b, c, etc., and require a Preposition before an Addresser, and require a Quote Introducer before a Quote. V2 verbs, like chiih ‘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 Addresser, 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 siër ‘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. Râm 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 Râm 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 aahn...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, i.e. 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 Bunår

B4b:  
geh ngih ta ri ‘There is a house there’ (MLC.2.11) (ngih ‘house’, ri ‘there’)

B4c:  
ta ti jëeng ngih ‘Over there are houses’ (MLC.2.11)

B4e:  
buom jëeng du ntil ndö sa ‘A tuber is a kind of food’ (MLC.3.2) (buom ‘tuber’, du ntil 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 Ndjrëét ‘I am Djrët’ (MLC.4.1)

B4k:  
amoh göp NDaan ‘My name is Dan’ (MLC.4.1)

amoh  ‘name’

geh  ‘have’

jëeng  ‘be’

ta  ‘at’

Chrau

C4a:  
geh nii ‘There are houses’ (nii ‘house’)

C4b:  
geh nii u heeq ‘There are houses here’ (heeq ‘this, here’)

C4c:  
u heeq geh nii ‘id.’

C4d:  
nii heeq ‘This is a house’

C4e:  
heeq la nii ‘id.’ (rare < Vietnamese)

C4f:  
añ geh nii ‘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 jëeng yaw ‘He became a tiger’ (yaw ‘tiger’)

C4o:  
añ òóp vadaai jëeng/luh nii ‘I made the lean-to into a house’ (vadaai ‘lean-to’)

geh  ‘be, have’

heeq  ‘here, this one’

jëeng  ‘become’

la  ‘is’ (< Vietnamese)

luh  ‘appear, become’

òóp  ‘make, do’

saq  ‘name, be named’
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tan'hya
saq
‘to name’

Kòhò Sre
K4a: gòs ḥiu ‘There are houses’ (ḥiu ‘house’)
K4b: gòs ḥiu têéng ḏò ‘There are houses here’ (KLC.9) (ḏò ‘here’)
K4e: chi ḏò la ḥiu ‘This is a house’ (KLC.26) (chi ḏò ‘this’)
      khay lah/jëéng caw mih ‘He is an American’ (OSS.189)
K4f: ań gòs kroac ‘I have oranges’ (KLC.14a) (kroac ‘orange’)
K4h: chi ḏò kroac ‘This is an orange’ (KLC.14)
K4i: sǒndan ań la K’Poh ‘My name is K’Poh’ (KLC.14)
K4n: khay jëéng/gòs kliu ‘He became a tiger’ (OSS.189-190) (khay
      ‘he’, kliu ‘tiger’)
      gös ‘be, have, become’
      jëéng ‘become’
      la, lah ‘is’ (< Vietnamese)
      sǒndan ‘name’
      têéng ‘at’

Mnong Preh
P4c: tām bri geh ne ‘In the forest there are rats’ (CMLL.28) (bri
      ‘forest’, ne ‘rat’)
P4e: gap jëéng BuNãoong ‘I am a Mnong’ (CMLL.16)
P4f: gāp geh pe nuyh koon ‘I have three children’ (CMLL.8) (pe nuyh
      koon ‘three children’)
P4h: moh sak gāp NĐoong ‘My name is Dong’ (CMLL.7)
      geh ‘have’
      jëéng ‘be’
      moh sak ‘name’
      tām ‘in, at’

Mnong Rlâm
R4a: geh hih ‘There are houses’ (hih ‘house’)
R4b: geh hih ta han ‘There are houses there’ (han ‘there’)
R4c: tō car Mrīük mau hih ‘In America there are houses’ (MLLL.36)
      (car Mrīük ‘America’)
?R4d: hih hō ‘This is a house’ (hō ‘this’)
R4e: hō eh jëéng hih ‘This is a house’ (eh ‘this’)
R4f: ań geh hih ‘I have a house’
R4g: Jhang ań ‘I am Jhang’
R4i: ań jëéng Jhang ‘id.’
R4k: nan ań Jhang ‘My name is Jhang’
R4m: ań nan to kan Jhang ‘I named him Jhang’
R4o: ań mhoq tūm ḥiınd nǰëéng hih ‘I made that shelter into a house’
      (tūm ḥiınd ‘shelter’)
      geh ‘have’
      jëéng ‘be’
mau ‘be’

mhoq ‘make, cause’

nan ‘name’

njëeng ‘become’

ta, to ‘at’

Stieng
S4a: geh ni ‘There are houses’ (nį ‘house’)
S4b: geh ni a nęy ‘There are houses there’ (nęy ‘there’)  
S4d: au ni ‘This is a house’ (au this, here)
S4f: hęy geh ni ‘I have a house’
S4g: hęy Gape ‘I am GaPę’
S4h: hęy au GaPę ‘id.’
S4i: hęy chhak GaPę ‘I am named GaPę’
S4k: chhak hęy GaPę ‘My name is GaPę’
S4m: hęy chuöl bu chhak GaPę ‘I named him GaPę’ (bu ‘him’)
S4o: hęy lōh nöm (lōh) buł ni ‘I made the lean-to into a house’ (nöm ‘lean-to’)

a ‘at’

buł ‘become’

chhak ‘name’

chuöl to name’

geh ‘be, have’

lōh ‘appear’

lōh ‘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. Bünăr, Chrau and Peh 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. Bünăr 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 jëeng used in B, K, P, R, however, is a verb of becoming in Chrau (4n) and Rlambil (4o), so perhaps
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PSB should be reconstructed without a copular identification clause form, then the northern tier of daughter languages expanded the use of jëëng '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/göös 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 mit, Khmer mitan, 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. Rîâm 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 (4i) 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–jëëng–O is probably reconstructable from C, K (see 4e). There is no outside support for the Köho variant S–göös–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 jëëng 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 bóök naar jëh 'It is noon already' (MLC.2.2) (klaang bóök 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'
jëh '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: aî takat ‘I’m cold’
C5e: takat aî ‘I’m cold’ (more common)
C5f: aî takat aî ‘id.’ (emphasising ‘I’)
C5g: aî luh takat ‘I became cold’
C5h: aî takat dôông neh ‘I’m colder than him’
C5i: neh êêq takat ka aî ‘He’s not as cold as me’
C5j: aî 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’

Köhô Sre
K5b: guul ngai rau ‘It is noon already’ (KLC.11) (guul ngai ‘noon’)
K5c: ngai dô noat ‘Today is cold’ (KLC.38) (noat ‘cold’)
K5d: aî koôp ‘I’m sick’ (KLC.22) (koôp ‘sick’)
K5g: khay göôh koop ‘He became sick’ (OSS.190)
K5i: gö gôq niâm be chi dô ‘They are not as good as this one’ (KLC.33) (niâm ‘good’, gö ‘they’)
K5j: chi dô buôn rla u jöh ‘This one is cheapest’ (KLC.33) (buôn ‘sell’)
be ‘as, like’
göôh ‘become’
gôq ‘not’
rau ‘already, now’
rlau jöh ‘most, superlatively’

Mnong Preh
P5a: bri mih ‘it is raining’ (CMLL.24) (bri ‘jungle’, mih ‘rain’)
P5c: naar aâô duh (ngan) ‘Today is (very) hot’ (CMLL.23) (nar aâô ‘today’, duh ‘hot’)
P5d: rpual prah joong ‘A melon is long’ (CMLL.29) (rpual prah ‘melon’, joong ‘long’)
P5h: gâp kataang löôn ma may ‘I am stronger than you’ (CMLL.23) (kataang ‘strong’)
löôn 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: aî kökat ‘I’m cold’
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R5e: kökat aṅ ‘id.’
R5g: aṅ jëeng kökat ‘I became cold’
R5h: an kökat hin ta kan ‘I’m colder than him’
R5i: kan han ay so kökat blah aṅ ‘He is not as cold as me’
R5j: aṅ kökat hin ta leq möt nih ‘I am the coldest of all’
ay so ‘not’
blah ‘as, like’
han ‘not’ (?)
hin ta ‘more than’
jëeng ‘become’
leq möt
nih ‘all, everyone’
so ‘see, perceive’ (?)

Stieng

S5a: mi ‘It is raining’ (mi ‘rain’)
    mi lōh ‘id.’
S5c: ‘lēek ‘It is cold’ (‘lēek ‘cold’)
    nar ‘lēek ‘id.’ (nar ‘day, sun’)
S5d: hēy ‘lēek ‘I am cold’
S5e: ‘lēek, hēy aq! ‘Cold, indeed I am!’
S5f: hēy ‘lēek hēy ‘I am cold’
S5g: hēy lōh ‘lēek ‘I became cold’
S5h: hēy ‘lēek huôs bu ‘am colder than him’
    hēy teg a bu ‘lēek hēy ‘I am colder than him/Beside him I’m cold’
S5j: let pal nēy, ‘lēek hēy ‘I am the coldest of all/Of all of them I’m coldest’

stative = ∓ S + P:Vi (OSG.9)
aq ‘exclamation’
būt ‘become’
huôs ‘than, more than’
leet pal
nēy ‘completely, all of them’
lōh ‘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. existive (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 Chhrau 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 Chhrau, 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, *jeēng in R, and *gölōs (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) Chhrau, Kōho, 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 Chhrau and Rlâm. In Kōho 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’
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4b: \*ExistV:geh–S–(Prep.?:?)–Loc. ‘There are houses there’
4c: *Prep.–Loc.–ExistV–S ‘Over there are houses’
4e: (PNSB *S–Cop.:jēeng–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:jēeng–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: ??
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