Bipartite negatives in Chamic

Ernest W. LEE
Summer Institute of Linguistics

1. Introduction

1.1 Background

Most of the Chamic languages of Vietnam are characterized by bipartite negatives, also sometimes called double negatives (e.g. Dahl 1979) or linked negatives (Payne 1985). Bipartite negatives were undoubtedly a feature of Proto-Chamic and provide a good test case for some of the typological hypotheses.

The description of Roglai negatives covered in Section 2 provides a fairly comprehensive coverage of the negatives of Roglai, the Chamic language with which I am most familiar. Section 3 treats the negatives of the other Chamic languages. Section 4 summarizes the bipartite negative particles of the Chamic languages treated, and discusses briefly the negative particles reconstructed for Proto-Chamic. Section 5 considers the typology of the bipartite negatives in the Chamic languages along with the origin of the negative forms of Chamic.

The stimulus for this paper came from an article by Early (1993) on a language of Vanuatu entitled "The Tripartite Negative in Lewo." Special appreciation goes to Dr. Brenda Boerger for constructive comments on an earlier version of my paper. Dr. Boerger has studied Natugu, the language of Santa Cruz Island in the Solomon Islands which also has bipartite negatives.

1.2 Orthographies

The orthographies used in this paper are the same as those in the materials cited. With the exception of Haroi, these are the standard orthographies that were in use at the time they were published. The citations from Haroi follow the phonemic symbols used by Mundhenk (1977). The values of many of the letters for the various languages are straight forward, and since the focus of this paper is not on sounds, only a few symbols with their values are mentioned here.

Like Vietnamese, Roglai c = /k/ before nonfront vowels and in word final position. Preglottalized stop consonants are written with a preceding apostrophe in some cases and with a bar through the consonant in others. Some languages symbolize the palatal sounds with $č$ and $ñ$ and others use ch and nh, following Vietnamese. Cham, Rade, and Jorai use a bar for both /ʔb/ and /ʔd/, i.e., $ƀ$ and $đ$, but Chru and Roglai use the bar only with /ʔd/. Chru uses the apostrophe with b,

hence *b*, but Roglai uses only a plain *b* and a *v* if it is not preglottalized. All of the languages with preglottalized nasal consonants use the apostrophe for them. Word final glottal stop in Roglai is written with *q* and in Cham with *k*.

Vowel length is written with a grave accent (ˋ), shortness with a breve (˘), and nasalization with a tilde (˜). The one exception is that Roglai vowels which are both long and nasal are written with a Vietnamese *hoi* tone mark (ˀ). The breve on word final vowels symbolizes a combination of shortness and glottal stop. In Chru the grave on word final vowels symbolizes a combination of length and glottal stop. Like Vietnamese, *ê* and *ô* represent mid front and mid back vowels, respectively, and *ư* and *ơ* represent high and mid central vowels, respectively, in all of the languages which have them.

Although phonemic in at least part of the languages and reconstructed for Proto-Chamic, syllable initial glottal stop is not written anywhere except as a hyphen between vowels where it indicates that the second vowel begins a new syllable which starts with a glottal stop.

1.3 Abbreviations

The following abbreviations are used in glosses for grammatical categories:

cl	=	classifier
intj	=	interjection
neg	=	negative
NEG1	=	preverbal negative
NEG2	=	postverbal negative
AFF	=	affirmative
ques	=	question

2. Roglai negatives

2.1 Negative particles

There are five primary negative particles in Roglai. These fall into two subclasses. Three precede the verb and are here designated as class {NEG1}.

The particle *buh* 'not' is the standard preverbal negative and is homophonous with verb *buh* 'to see' and with the affirmative particle *buh* which has an existential sense. The existential sense of *buh* is glossed in examples as 'AFF' since it carries an oppositional contrast to *buh* as 'NEG1'. The affirmative use of *buh* is treated below in 2.6. In examples *buh* 'not' will be glossed simply as 'NEG1'.

The particle *ca* 'not yet' is homophonous with *ca* 'first' (adverbial sense) which occurs only clause finally. They are undoubtedly historically related (see 5.3). In examples, *ca* 'not yet' will be glossed as 'NEG1 (not yet)'.

The particle *đong* 'don't' is borrowed from Vietnamese *đừng* 'don't'. In examples *đong* will be glossed as 'NEG1 (don't)'. The particle *đong* is frequently followed by the particle *di* with no apparent difference in meaning. The meaning and function of *di* here is unclear, although it is homophonous with the preposition *di* 'toward' and possibly historically related to E. Cham *di* 'intensive negative' (see 3.3 and 5.3).

The other two negative particles follow the verb and are normally clause final. They comprise the class {NEG2}.

The particle *oh* 'not' is the standard postverbal negative and is glossed simply as 'NEG2'.

The particle *uroi* 'neither' is not common and is glossed as 'NEG2 (neither)'.

There are additional negative related particles with restricted use: *soh* 'delimiter', *haloi* 'at all', *đoi* 'at all' and *uthou* expressing doubtful veracity. These fall outside the scope of the primary negative particles and their usage is considered in 2.5.

2.2 Standard negated clauses

The normal negated clause in Roglai will have both a {NEG1} and a {NEG2}. Roglai is an SVO language and the canonical clause structure is: X S NEG1 V O X NEG2 where X represents various peripheral clause elements. The label V is used to cover both verbs and complements since the clause order is the same whether subject plus verb or subject plus complement. The typology of Roglai bipartite negatives is treated in section 5 along with the other Chamic languages.

Intransitive clauses with NEG1 *buh* 'not'. Examples (1) and (2) contrast an affirmative and a negative intransitive clause. The normal position of {NEG2} is clause final although some exceptions are noted below in 2.3 in the section on constituents following *oh* 'NEG2'. In example (2) the {NEG2} follows the prepositional phrase.

(1)   *Amã*   *não*   *paq*   *apu.*
           Father   go   to   rice field.
           Father went to the rice field.

(2)   *Amã*   *buh*   *não*   *paq*   *apu*   *oh.*
           Father   NEG1   go   to   rice field NEG2
           Father didn't go to the rice field.

The {NEG1} may also precede the subject as in (3) with no difference in meaning apart from being a marked construction. There are likely discourse or stylistic constraints.

(3)   *buh   Amã   não   paq   apu   oh.*
            NEG1   Father   go   to   rice field NEG2
            Father didn't go to the rice field.

Intransitive clauses with NEG1 *ca* 'not yet'. These are exemplified
in (4) and (5) in presubject and postsubject positions.

(4)   *Amã   ca   não paq apu   oh.*
            Father   NEG1 (not yet)   go   to rice field NEG2
            Father hasn't gone to the rice field yet.

(5)   *Ca   Amã   não   paq   apu   oh.*
            NEG1 (not yet)   Father go   to   rice field   NEG2
            Father hasn't gone to the rice field yet.

Intransitive clauses with NEG1 *đơng* 'don't'. This is the strong
negative imperative and normally occurs without an overt subject as illustrated in
(6).

(6)   *Đơng   não   jeq   oh.*
            NEG1 (don't)   go   close   NEG2
            Don't go near it.

Example (7), however, illustrates NEG1 (don't) with both optional *di* (see
2.2) and optional overt subject.

(7)   *Đơng di   mugơq não paq hiã   oh.*
            NEG1 (don't) you(pl) go   to there NEG2
            Don't go there.

The standard negativer *buh* functions as an ordinary negative imperative
with or without a second person pronoun as in (8-10).

(8)   *Hã   buh   hueq   di   nhũ   oh.*
            you (sg) NEG1   fear   toward   him   NEG2
            Don't be afraid of him.

(9)   *buh   hueq   di   nhũ   oh.*
            NEG1   fear   toward   him   NEG2
            Don't be afraid of him.

(10)   *Ca   nãu   oh.*
            NEG1 (not yet)   go   NEG2
            Don't go yet.

Transitive clauses with {NEG1}. Examples (11-13) illustrate each
of the {NEG1} particles *buh* 'NEG1' and *ca* 'NEG1 (not yet)' in transitive

clauses. In each case only examples with {NEG1} in postsubject position are given. As in the examples, {NEG2} always follows the object.

(11)   *A wơi*   *buh*   *tanãq vu   oh.*
         Mother   NEG1   cook   rice   NEG2
         Mother didn't cook the rice.

(12)   *A wơi   ca   tanãq   vu   oh.*
         Mother   NEG1 (not yet)   cook   rice   NEG2
         Mother hasn't cooked the rice yet.

(13)   *Ðong   tanãq vu   oh.*
         NEG1 (don't) cook   rice   NEG2
         Don't cook the rice.

Clauses with NEG2 *urơi* 'neither'. This particle is not common and occurs only in conjunction with a preceding clause which has *oh* 'NEG2 (not)' as in example (14). Actually, *urơi* can be viewed as comprising a prefix meaning 'not' (derived from *oh)* plus *rơi,* but *rơi* does not occur elsewhere in Roglai to my knowledge. Chru, however, has *rơi* and Cham has *ray* meaning 'also'. Thus, the derivation from 'not' plus 'also' is likely historically.

(14)   *Lacu   duah   iaq,   buh uq?   Buh   buh   oh.*
         Lacu   search   look for see   ques NEG1 see   NEG2
         Did Lacu see it [grandfather's pipe] when he searched for it? No, he didn't.

         Lanu   iaq,   buh luq?   Buh   buh   urơi.
         Lanu   look for see   ques NEG1 see   NEG2 (neither)
         Did Lanu brother of Lacu] see it when he looked for it? No, he didn't either.

2.3 Complex negative clauses

Constituents preceding verb of negative clause. Prepositional phrases or subordinate clauses filling a peripheral role in the clause preceding the verb will also precede both NEG1 and the subject as with the temporal clause in (15). Only the subject can come between {NEG1} and the verb, although the verb may have other particles which are part of the verb phrase such as *khiãng* 'want to'.

(15)   *Tuq   leq   ca   truh   paq   lơt   oh   mã*
         When   fall   NEG1 (not yet)   arrive at   ground   NEG2   but

         dua   drơi lumõng vhum   còq   hiã   va   gơq   atlơng
         two   cl   tiger   lion   white   that   lead   together throw

         mãq   chreh   la   khrãh   lawah.
         take   tear   at   midst   air

When he [the tiger] had not yet reached the ground, the two white lions together caught him and tore him up in midair.

Example (16) illustrates an embedded clause which has been moved from its normal position following the verb to an emphatic preverbal position where it also precedes NEG1. The normal position of *boc matah* 'eat raw' would be following *joc* 'be possible'.

(16)   *Hayou,   sa-ai,   boc matah buh   joc   oh?*
         how,   older sibling   eat   raw   NEG1 possible NEG2
         How, brother, can't you eat it raw?

Constituents following NEG2 *oh*. Standard clauses have the second negative in clause final position even with embedded structures as in examples (17-18).

(17)   *Cou buh   hueq di   hã   ghong hiã oh.*
         I   NEG1   afraid toward you (sg) big   that NEG2
         I'm not afraid of you even though you are big.

(18)   *Acoi   buh   vroi nhũ   ngãq alah   oh.*
         Grandfather NEG1 give him   do   lazy   NEG2
         Grandfather didn't allow him to be lazy.

There are, however, occasional exceptions with long or complex clauses in which *oh* may be followed by another constituent of the main clause. In (19) a locative prepositional phrase follows *oh* and in (20) an embedded clause functioning as the object of *thou* 'know' follows *oh*.

(19)   *Buh   buh nhũ   pìq joc   tra   oh   paq la-o*
         NEG1 AFF he   sleep able more NEG2 at   crown
         tiac.
         bamboo (sp.)
         He could no longer sleep at the crown of the bamboo.

(20)   *O anõ, Acoi   buh   thou oh   aloi uràc   mã*
         Oh boy Grandfather NEG1 know NEG2 what person but
         nãu   lua.
         go   hunt
         Oh, my boy, I don't know who will go hunting.

It is also possible for an occasional sentence final particle to follow *oh* (21). As such the final particle is not part of the clause structure and is characterized by preceding juncture and its own intonation pattern.

(21)   *Dong   nãu jeq   oh,   yoh.*
         NEG1 (don't)   go   close NEG2 intj
         Don't go near it! Ok?

Omission of NEG2. Occasionally NEG2 *oh* will be omitted from the clause, especially if the clause is long or complex, but omission of *oh* is regarded as atypical by the native speaker. In examples (22) through (24) the omitted *oh* is shown in the normal expected position by including it inbrackets.

(22)　　　*buh　buh　nhũ　thou　chacuai　dòq　la　hiã [oh].*
　　　　　NEG1 AFF　he　know　lizard　stay at　there
　　　　　He didn't know the lizard was there.

(23)　　　*Adoi　　　　buh　thou hayou　ngãq　mã　joc [oh].*
　　　　　Younger sibling NEG1 know how　do　but　able
　　　　　I don't know what I can do about it.

The NEG2 can also be omitted following the first half of compound sentences.

(24)　　　*Đong　　　di papo đuaiq [oh], buh　tla　di　nhù*
　　　　　NEG1 (don't) di run　flee,　　NEG1 escape from　him
　　　　　oh.
　　　　　NEG2

　　　　　Don't run, we can't escape from him.

2.4 Negative response constructions

Tag responses. Negative tag responses may be responses to questions or denial of a statement. The minimal negative response is one of the {NEG2} particles *oh* 'NEG2' or *uroi* 'NEG2 (neither)'. The question and response of (26) assumes the question and response of (25) in preceding context.

(25)　　　*Hã　　não　luq?　Oh.*
　　　　　You (sg)　go　ques　NEG2
　　　　　Are you going? No.

(26)　　　*Amã　não　luq?　Uroi.*
　　　　　Father go　ques　NEG2 (neither)
　　　　　Is Father going? Nor him either.

The minimal tag response with *ca* 'NEG2 (not yet)' is NEG1 + NEG2, that is, *ca oh*. Example (27) contains a response to a statement and (28) to a question.

(27)　　　*Amã　não　vloh.　Ca　　　　oh.*
　　　　　Father　go　already.　NEG1 (not yet)　NEG2.
　　　　　Father has already gone. Not yet, he hasn't.

(28)　　　*Amã　não　vloh?　Ca　　　　oh.*
　　　　　Father　go　already?　NEG1 (not yet)　NEG2.
　　　　　Has Father already gone? Not yet.

An extremely common tag response is the combination of NEG1 (*buh*) plus AFF (*buh*) plus {NEG2} (*oh* 'not' or *uroi* 'neither'). See 2.6 for further discussion of the affirmative particle. The combination of NEG1 plus AFF can also occur in standard clauses as in (19) and (22) above but is much less common than in tag constructions. In the sequence *buh buh* the final /h/ of NEG1 *buh* is commonly lost in speech, hence /bu buh/, but the full form is conventionally written. Example (29) illustrates *buh buh oh*.

(29)   *Hã   não luq?   Buh   buh   oh*
          you(sg)   go   ques NEG1   AFF   NEG2
          Are you going? No.

It is also possible for two tag responses to be used together as in (30).

(30)   *Hã   não˘ luq?   Oh,   buh   buh   oh.*
          you(sg)   go   ques NEG2   NEG1   AFF   NEG2
          Are you going? No, I'm not.

Expanded responses. Responses are frequently expanded to include the significant part of the clause being negated. This expanded response may also be preceded by a separate minimal tag response. Example (31) begins with such a minimal tag response and the part denied by the tiger in the response is the first two words of the boy's accusation *chac hã* 'perhaps you'.

(31)   *Nhũ   tinhã   làiq,   "Chac   hã   boc koi*
          He   asked   saying perhaps you(sg) ate grandfather

          móq   cou." Lumong hiã   nhũ   làiq,   "Oh,   buh
          grandmother my   Tiger   that... he   said   NEG2   NEG1

          djoq   cou oh."
          correct I   NEG2

          He inquired, "Perhaps it was you that ate my grandparents?" That tiger...he said, "No, it wasn't I."

Note in (32) that the portion of the monkey's statement denied by the turtle is only the verb *matai* 'die'.

(32)   *Jacra   làiq,   "...apui boc hã   matai biaq."*
          Monkey   said   fire   eat you die   shortly

          Cura   làiq,   "Oh,   buh   buh   matai oh."
          Turtle said   NEG2   NEG1   AFF   die   NEG2

          Monkey said, "...the fire will consume you and you will die shortly." Turtle replied, "No, I won't die."

2.5 Other negative or negative-like particles

There are at least four additional particles which have a negative connotation, or which have a special function in negative constructions.

The delimiting particle *soh* 'only'. Verbs and nouns may be followed by *soh* to indicate something is restricted, limited, or lacking. The verb phrase *dòq soh* 'be idle' is composed of the verb *dòq* 'stay' plus *soh*. Compare this with Vietnamese *ở không* 'be idle' composed of *ở* 'stay' plus *không* 'not'. The phrase *vrơi soh* 'give gratuitously (nothing expected in return)' from *vrơi* 'give' plus *soh*. This also is parallel to Vietnamese *cho không* 'give gratuitously' from *cho* 'give' plus *không* 'not'. Example (33) illustrates *vrơi soh* with the object fronted.

(33)   *Suraq   hiã   nhū   vrơi   soh.*
         book   that he   gave   only.
         He gave that book gratuitously.

The noun phrases *amã soh* 'barren man' and *awơi soh* 'barren woman' are composed of *amã* 'father' and *awơi* 'mother', respectively, plus *soh*. A childless couple is often referred to as *awơi amã soh* 'mother father only'. Vietnamese also has noun plus *không* 'not' constructions with a similar limiting meaning such as *tay không* 'empty handed, bare handed' composed of *tay* 'hand' plus *không* 'not'.

The questioning particle *uthơu* 'I wonder'. This sentence final particle is composed of the prefix *u-* 'not' from NEG2 *oh* plus *thơu* 'know' and expresses the speakers doubt or uncertainty about what he has just said.

(34)   *Hã   nãu iaq   khat cơu voh cunĩ Thu   vloh*
         You(sg) go look at cloth I   wash earlier dry   already

         uthơu.
         I wonder

         Go check the cloth I washed a while ago. I wonder if it's dry.

A few other words have the prefix *u-* 'not' although it is currently not an active prefix. Examples are *ukhơih* 'not well' from *khơih* 'be recovered' and *ukhit* 'taboo, not allowed' possibly from *khin* 'to dare, be brave'. (The final consonant of *khin* is not a /t/ as would be expected following the oral vowel /i/ but is possibly conditioned by the related nominal *kahnĩn* 'bravery' composed of *khin* and the nominalizing infix {-an-} where final /n/ is expected.) The particle *urơi* 'NEG2 (neither)' discussed in 2.1 and 2.2 above also has the prefix *u-*.

The emphatic particles *halơi* and *dơi* 'at all'. These two particles when used in negative constructions are similar in meaning but differ in distribution. Both normally occur immediately preceding {NEG2}, but *halơi* is

used with nominal elements as in (35) and *dơi* is used with verbal elements as in (36). In non-negative constructions *halơi* means 'what, which' and *dơi* means 'period of time'.

(35)   *Nhũ   buh   hmũ   caya   halơi   oh.*
             He   NEG1   have   thing   at all   NEG2
             He doesn't have anything at all.

(36)   *Nhũ   buh   nãu   dơi   oh.*
             He   NEG1   go   at all   NEG2
             He didn't go at all.

2.6 The affirmative particle buh *'AFF '*

The affirmative particle *buḥ* 'AFF' has a special relationship to the negative constructions in Roglai. As already noted, it is homophonous with *buh* 'to see'.

Distributionally, there is a clear difference between the two although in some contexts they are potentially ambiguous, as in the tag responses in (14) above where I have glossed it as 'see', because 'see' was the verb in the questions it answered. As an affirmative particle, *buh* has an existential sense very similar to Vietnamese *có* 'to have, possess, exist'. It is most common in negative tag responses as in (29). In nontag negative statements it differs from *buh* 'to see' in that if *buh* 'NEG1' precedes the subject then *buh* 'AFF' must also precede the verb as in (19) repeated here as (37). (The sequence *buh buh* is pronounced *bu buh* in most normal speech.)

(37)   *Buh   buh   nhũ   pìq   jơc   tra   oh   paq   la-o*
             NEG1   AFF   he   sleep   able   more   NEG2   at   crown

             tiac
             bamboo (sp.)
             He could no longer sleep at the crown of the bamboo.

This contrasts with the subject preceding the negative plus affirmative combination *buh buh* as in (38).

(38)   *Ơ   sa-ai,   cơu   buh   buh   thơu   hã   oh.*
             oh   brother   I   NEG1   AFF   know   you   NEG2.
             Oh, I didn't recognize you, brother.

With *buh* 'NEG1' plus *buh* 'to see' the subject will either precede both or will come between them as in (39) and (40), respectively.

(39)   *Cơu   buh   buh   hã   oh.*
             I   NEG1   see   you   NEG2
             I didn't see you.

(40)   *Buh   cou   buh   hã   oh.*
             NEG1 I   see   you   NEG2
             I didn't see you.

        I have no recorded instances of *buh buh...buh* 'NEG1 AFF...see', but it is possible.

        Occasionally, the verb *hmū* 'to have' will also be used in a way similar to *buh* 'AFF' as in (41).

(41)   *Buh   hmū   hujàt   sa   ben   oh.*
             NEG1 have   rain   one   little NEG2
             It didn't rain at all.

        The significance of this use of 'have' is considered further in section 5.

3. Negatives in other Chamic languages

        In this section are included only Chamic languages spoken in Vietnam which are discussed in considerably less detail than the Roglai system. The languages included are Rade, Jorai, Eastern Cham, Haroi and Chru.

        Of these languages Haroi alone does not have bipartite negatives. Because all of the others do have bipartite negatives, the same class names used for Roglai, that is, {NEG1} and {NEG2}, will also be used for each language to facilitate comparison even though Haroi has only {NEG1}. Also, for each language the standard NEG1 will be glossed simply as 'NEG1' and the standard NEG2 as 'NEG2'. The nonstandard negatives will have fuller explanatory glosses. Although the negative systems of any two languages do not match entirely, there are a number of parallel constructions.

        The canonical order of all the languages is SVO, and apart from Haroi which has no {NEG2}, the canonical order with the negatives is: X S NEG1 V O X NEG2 where X represents optional peripheral clause elements. This is the order already observed for Roglai above in 2.2.

3.1 Rade

        The {NEG1} particles for Rade are *amâo* the standard 'NEG1', *ka* 'NEG1 (not yet)', and *dăm* 'NEG1 (don't)'. The only {NEG2} particle in the data available is *ôh* 'NEG2'.

        In the texts available there are few exceptions to the canonical word order (X S NEG1 V O X NEG2), but probably because the texts were prepared for a school reader. The last few texts of the reader are slightly edited and transcribed stories and contain the only noncanonical patterns, particularly some clauses with no {NEG2}. All of the negative particles are illustrated in canonical constructions in (42-44).

(42)   *Ama   amâo mâo   kan ôh*
            Father NEG1 have fish NEG2
            Father doesn't have any fish.

(43)   *H'Ri   ka   amâo hla   ôh*
            H'Ri   NEG1 (not yet) have kite NEG2.
            H'ri doesn't have a kite yet.

(44)   *Đaˇm   bŏng kâo ôh...*
            NEG1 (don't)   eat   me   NEG2...

            Don't eat me...

Most of the clauses with no {NEG2} are in subordinate clauses or poetry as
in examples (45) and (46), respectively. The only instance observed of {NEG1}
preceding the subject is also in the poetic (46), but it can likely occur elsewhere. No
instances with {NEG2} preceding an object were observed.

(45)   *Tơdah ŏng   amâo răng,   ŏng   sơrăng   djiê*
            if   you   NEG1 take-care you   will   die
            If you don't beware, you'll die...

(46)   *Mâo   bruă   amâo ñu   mă*
            have   work   NEG1 he   do
            Has work, but doesn't do it.

3.2 Jorai

The {NEG1} particles for Jorai are *bu* the standard NEG1, *ka* 'NEG1 (not
yet)' and *'năm* 'NEG1 (don't)'. Note that the standard NEG1 *bu* is cognate with
Roglai NEG1 *buh* but with regular loss of /-h/, and *'năm* 'NEG2 (don't)' is
cognate with Rade *đăm* 'NEG2 (don't)' with preglottalized nasal instead of
preglottalized voiced stop. The {NEG2} particles are *ôh* 'NEG2' and *tah* 'NEG2
(contrast)'. Unlike Roglai and Rade, there is no evidence in the data available of a
{NEG2} particle preceding the subject, but this may be due to the nature of the
available texts, which are stories written for a school reader. The texts are
reasonably natural, but noncanonical patterns are less likely to appear than would be
the case from transcribed texts. There was, however, one instance of an object
following {NEG2}. Examples (47-49) illustrate the three {NEG1} particles with
the standard NEG2.

(47)   *Kâo   bu   hơmâo prăk   ôh*
            I   NEG1 have   money NEG2
            I don't have any money.

(48)   *Waih ka   nao hrăm   ôh*
            Waih NEG1 (not yet) go   study NEG2
            Waih doesn't go to school yet.

(49) *'Năm   uă   koni   wa   ôh.*
      NEG1 (don't) play   stringed-instrument uncle NEG2.
      Don't play uncle's *koni.*

In the texts availble only *bu* 'NEG1' and *'na⋁m* 'NEG1 (don't) occur with *tah* 'NEG2 (contrast) as in (50-51)

(50) *Ama   Waih nao kai   Wa   Waih bu   kai*
      father Waih go   plow uncle Waih NEG1 plow
      tah.
      NEG2 (contrast)

      Ñu   nao   ataih.
      he   go   far

The father of Waih went to plow. [But] Waih's uncle didn't go plow. [Instead] he went far away.

(51) *Amôn   H'Ri...   buh bonga hiam. Ñu   pě   pioh*
      nephew   H'Ri...   see flower nice   he   pick put
      amăng   hokă
      in   basket

      H'Ri   rai   ră   ko   ñu,   'Năm   pě   bonga   dong
      H'Ri   come say to   him,   NEG1 (don't) pick flower continue

      tah."   Ñu   bu   tŭ   ôh
      NEG2 (contrast) he   NEG1 receive NEG2

H'Ri's nephew...saw the nice flowers. He picked some and put them in a basket. H'Ri came and said to him, "Don't pick the flowers." But he didn't pay any attention.

In (52) *ôh* 'NEG2' precedes the object making the object marked. Note also that although there are two negative clauses, *ôh* 'NEG2' only occurs in the second one.

(52) *Todah   bu   homâo ko   gru⋁   ta   bu   homâo*
      if   NEG1   have   for buzzard we (incl) NEG1 have

      bong ôh   rosa anai...
      eat   NEG2 deer this

If it weren't for the buzzard, we would have this deer to eat...

3.3 Eastern Cham

Eastern Cham also has a bipartite negative system but differs somewhat from the other Chamic languages. D. W. Blood (1977) does not describe the system as being a bipartite system, but it seems best here to consider it as such. Eastern Cham contrasts formal and informal speech, and the negatives also reflect this contrast. It would appear, however, that the bipartite system may be in the process of breaking down, although in formal speech there is evidence of a possible tripartite negative.

Informal speech. The {NEG1} particles for informal speech are *ka* 'NEG1 (not yet)' and *di* 'NEG1 (intens.)'. The {NEG2} particle is *ô* NEG2'. Since there is no standard {NEG1} in informal speech, it means that many negative clauses have only the NEG2. Typologically, it is rare to have a negative only at the end of the clause following the object in an SVO language. As already noted above the canonical order of clause elements is: X S NEG1 V O X NEG2. Examples (53-54) have only the NEG2, and although both have transitive verbs, neither have an explicit object.

(53)   *Mư   kau   pôch   ô.*
           father   my   scold   NEG1
           My father won't scold.

(54)   *Chuh   mưng   djuh   ô.*
           burn   with   wood   NEG2
           It is not burned with wood.

Informal clauses with both a {NEG1} and {NEG2} are illustrated in (55-56), and both have explicit objects.

(55)   *Nhu   ka   thau   khăr   ô.*
           He   NEG1 (not yet)   know   script   NEG2
           He doesn't know the script yet.

(56)   *Nưk   di   păng   amek   amư   ô.*
           child   NEG1 (intens.)   listen   mother   father   NEG2
           The child doesn't listen to his parents at all.

Mrs. Blood does not treat prohibitive forms under the category of negatives, but I include them here because they have been included in the other languages above and structure similarly. The only form of interest is *jôi*, which occurs both as a {NEG1} and as a {NEG2}. Although Mrs. Blood does not distinguish prohibitives for formal and informal speech, the very nature of prohibitives would cause one to expect them to be normally informal. In Cham this is reflected by *jôi* occurring as final particle, with or without preverbal *jôi*. The final *jôi* is preceded by a slight pause and begins on a high pitch which drops sharply.

(57)   *Jôi*   *ngăk*   *yau*   *năn*   *jôi!*
              NEG1 (don't) do   like   that   NEG2 (don't)
              Don't do that, don't!

(58)   *Di*   *tamư* *dalam* *ia*   *ôi!*
              (??)   enter   inside   water   NEG2 (don't)
              Don't go in the water!

Mrs. Blood does not give a gloss for *di* in example (58), but it would appear that it may be the intensive NEG1. If it is the intensive negative, this would further support the prohibitive form as being informal speech since *di* 'NEG1 (intens)' does not occur in formal speech (see below).

One further negative particle listed by Mrs. Blood deserves noting here. It would also appear to be characteristic of informal speech. This is the final particle *kê* which I gloss as 'NEG2 (emph. denial)'. It is used as a negative response as in (59).

(59)   *Dahlăk*   *mǔk*   *kê.*
              I   take   NEG2 (emph.denial)
              I didn't take it!

Formal speech. For formal speech known as *dôm glong* 'speaking high' Mrs. Blood gives preverbal *ôh* as the usual form of the negative. This I would interpret as the standard NEG1. Her examples also include *ôh ka* 'not yet', which could be interpreted either as 'NEG1 (not yet)', or as a sequence of the standard NEG1 plus 'NEG1 (not yet)'. As in informal speech, so in the formal there is also only one {NEG2}. The form is the same as in informal speech, but she gives it as an intensifier in formal speech. As I understand her description (1977:40), however, the occurrence of the *ô* is the norm. She says, "In formal speech...preverbal *ôh* is the usual form of negative. Most often this negative is intensified [strengthened?] by adding final particle *ô*." This, along with the fact that final particle *ô* alone is the standard negative in informal speech, leads one to question whether the negative clause with *ô* in formal speech is actually a marked clause. Mrs. Blood (1977.63), although not focusing on negatives, glosses *ô* simply as 'neg.' in her examples. Nevertheless, respecting Mrs. Blood's analysis, I gloss *ô* in formal speech as 'NEG2 (intens)'.

I assume that historically the NEG1 *ôh* and the NEG2 *ô* are both reflexes of Proto-Chamic *?oh* 'NEG2' with loss of final /*h/ in the final particle. Example (60) has only *ôh* 'NEG1'. Example (61) has both *ôh* 'NEG1' and *ô* 'NEG2 (intens).

(60)   *Hray*   *dĭt*   *ôh*   *hik*   *takôi*   *mư nŭk.*
              day   Sunday   NEG1   cut   throat   chicken
              Chickens are not killed on Sunday.

(61)   *Urang lingiu   ôh   tamứ hu   dalăm   hum*
                person outside   NEG1   enter have inside   shelter

                ô.
                NEG2 (intens).

                An outsider is not permitted in the shelter at all.

Only one example was given with *ôh ka* 'not yet', and it has the final *ô* 'NEG2 (intens)' with it. If as suggested above, *ôh ka* is interpreted as a sequence of *ôh* 'NEG1' plus *ka* 'NEG1 (not yet)', then *ôh ka...ô* would constitute a rare tripartite negative. For purposes here I am glossing *ôh* and *ka* as though a sequence of negatives. It is also conceivable that *ka* not be considered as a negative at all in formal speech, but this seems counterintuitive since it is a negative in informal speech. (Mrs. Blood did not include 'yet' in her free translation.)

(62)   *Di kal năn dahlăk   ôh   ka   thau   gĕt*
                In when that   I   NEG1 NEG1 (not yet) know anything

                ô.
                NEG2 (intens)

                In those days I did not yet know anything at all.

According to D.L. Blood (1977:63), a negative coordinate sentence joined by *thŏng* 'and' always contains both preverbal *ôh* 'NEG1' and clause final *ô* n 'NEG2 (intens)' as in (63), but one joined by *ngăn* 'or' does not ordinarily contain clause final *ô* as in (64). He attributes the latter to *ngăn* having the sense of 'nor' in this context.

(63)   *Dahlăk   ôh   yeh   dray thŏng   pagăp   bok   mứta*
                I   NEG1   boast self   and   compare cheek eye
                urang
                person

                ô.
                NEG2 (intens)

                I don't boast about myself and don't compare my attributes with someone else.

(64)   *Dahlăk   ôh   yeh   dray ngăn   pagăp   bok   mứta*
                I   NEG1   boast self   or   compare cheek eye
                urang.
                person
                I neither boast of myself nor compare myself with another.

Mrs. Blood (1977:42) lists one further final particle which could also be interpreted as a {NEG2} in formal speech. It is the particle *tra*, which means 'later, more' in temporal phrases. As a final particle, *tra* occurs only in negative constructions containing preverbal *ôh*. In these constructions she glosses *tra* as 'anymore'. Following the system used in this paper, it could be glossed as 'NEG2 (anymore)'. This is assuming that it does not occur with clause final *ô* and this is the case in all of her examples as in (65).

(65)   *Tapai   ôh   khin   mǔnhum   ia   tra.*
          rabbit   NEG1   dare   drink   water NEG2 (anymore)
          Rabbit would not dare drink water anymore.

3.4 Chru

The negative system of Chru appears to be undergoing simplification. Although it has a bipartite negative construction parallel to the other Chamic languages, {NEG2} appears to be optional rather than the norm. It is, however, very common and occurred in roughly half of the negative constructions in the texts available.

The {NEG1} particles are *'buh* 'NEG1' and *ka* 'NEG1 (not yet)'. If Chru has a prohibitive form, it did not occur in the texts. The only {NEG2} particle observed is *ou* glossed simply as 'NEG2'. (It is possible that *ou* also functions as a {NEG1}, but was unclear from the available data.) Examples (66-67) illustrate *'buh* 'NEG1', both with and without *ou* 'NEG2', and examples (68-69) illustrate *ka* 'NEG1 (not yet)' with and without *ou* 'NEG2'. There was one example in the texts of *'buh* and *ka* occurring together. I assume this is an unusual but possible construction, and it is given in (70). It is parallel to the E.Cham *ôh ka* in 3.3.

(66)   *Ja   Ka   'buh   hũ   toloi   kǒnhang.*
          Ja   Ka   NEG1   have   rope   waist
          Ja Ka doesn't have a belt.

(67)   *Ja   Sa   'buh   hũ   thong   ou.*
          Ja   Sa   NEG1   have   knife   NEG2
          Ja Sa doesn't have a knife.

(68)   *Ama   ka   akǎ   kǒbàu.*
          Father NEG1 (not yet)   tie   buffalo.
          Father hasn't tied the buffalo yet.

(69)   *Kou   ka   hù   priǎ   ou.*
          I   NEG1 (not yet) have   money   NEG2
          I don't have any money yet.

(70)   *...nhũ   'buh   ka   thou   hũ   sa   sruh   chim   dò*
          he   NEG1   NEG1 (not yet) know   have one   nest   bird   stay

> *jĕ   anih nhũ koh iuh.*
> near place he   cut firewood
>
> He didn't yet know there was a bird's nest near the place
> where he was cutting firewood.

Example (71) illustrates both the subject preceding and following *'buh* 'NEG1', although the subject following *'buh* is a marked construction.

(71)   *Tŏrpai lăi , "Ô, 'buh   nhũ   'bŏng rŏlo hã. Iah kŏu*
        Rabbit   say   oh   NEG1 he   eat   flesh you if   I
        nao   nhũ   'buh   khin 'bŏng ralo   hã."
        go   he   NEG1 dare eat   flesh you
        Rabbit said, "Oh, he won't eat you. If I go, he won't dare eat you."

Although the canonical position of *ŏu* 'NEG2' is clause final, it is occasionally possible for it to be followed by the object or another particle. In the response to the question in (72) the object follows *ŏu* and is clearly in a marked position and is itself a clause.

(72)   *"...Wa tă   hu   gai   gŏlih   kŏbàu   pŏjo?"*
        uncle cut   have stick fight buffalo yet?
        "Did you cut a stick to beat the buffalo yet, Uncle?"

        "Kŏu tă   ka   hũ   ŏu   gai   gŏlih kŏbàu."
        I   cut NEG1 (not yet) have NEG2 stick fight buffalo
        "I haven't cut a stick yet to beat the buffalo."

3.5 Haroi

Of the Chamic languages of Vietnam for which I have access to data on the negatives, Haroi alone does not have a bipartite negative. Unfortunately, the only data currently available to me is from Goschnick (1977), but since the article is on clause structure, Goschnick would have included bipartite negatives had there been any. From the Haroi word lists available there are three negative forms: *soh* 'not', *oh* 'not', and *ka* 'not yet'. I am uncertain what the difference is between *soh* and *oh*, but *soh* is apparently the standard negative since it is the one Goschnick illustrates in her article. All of the other Chamic languages of Vietnam have a particle similar to *soh* (cf. Roglai in Section 2.5) meaning 'only' or 'nothing' which could possibly be a shortening of some other particle (e.g. *sa* 'one') plus *oh* 'not'.

Goschnick (1977.108) analyses the negative as a part of the verb phrase and calls it a verification tagmeme. Haroi is an SVO language and the negative particle precedes the verb (73) although it can be separated from the verb by an attitude particle as in (74).

(73)   *Kau soh   nàu pə Sen-Hòa.*
         I   NEG1 go   to Sen-Hoa
         I did not go to Sen-Hoa.

(74)   *Kau soh   čèang nàu pə Sen-Hoa.*
         I   NEG1 want   go   to Sen-Hoa
         I don't want to go to Sen-Hoa.

4. Proto-Chamic negative particles.

In order that the various Chamic negative particles can be more readily compared, they are summarized in two charts, one with {NEG1} particles and the other with {NEG2} particles. Particles in parentheses whether {NEG1} or {NEG2} are optional, but in each case there will be an obligatory particle in the other negative slot of the sentence. As noted in the appropriate places above, {NEG2} is occasionally deleted in Rade, Jorai, and Roglai but is not listed as optional since it is the norm for the {NEG2} to occur.

	Standard	Not yet	Prohibition	Miscellaneous
Rade	amâo	ka	đăm	
Jorai	ɓu	ka	'năm	
Roglai	buh	ca /ka/	đơng	
Chru	'buh	ka, 'buh ka		
ECham-Formal	ôh	ôh ka		
ECham-Informal		ka	(jôi)	di 'intensive'
Haroi	soh	ka	oh (???)	
Proto-Chamic	*ʔbuh	*ka		

Chart 1. Chamic {NEG1} forms (preverbal)

	Standard	Prohibition	Miscellaneous
Rade	ôh		
Jorai	ôh		tah 'contrast'
Roglai	oh		urơi 'neither'
Chru	(ơu)		
ECham-Formal	(ô)		tra 'any more'
ECham-Informal	ô	jôi	kê 'emphatic'
Proto-Chamic	*oh		

Chart 2. Chamic {NEG2} forms (postverbal)

Charts 1 and 2 are undoubtedly incomplete for some of the languages since much of the information has been drawn from limited resources. It is also possible that I have interpreted a few forms as negative particles which other analysts would not, as for example, Eastern Cham *tra* (see section on formal speech in 3.3). The

focus of this paper, however, is the shared features and patterns of the negative particles whether phonological, grammatical, or semantic.

Proto-Chamic forms cited below are from Lee (1966). From the {NEG1} chart, it is readily apparent that the most stable form is *ka* 'NEG1 (not yet)' and is reconstructed for Proto-Chamic as *ka* 'NEG1 (not yet)'. The next most frequently occurring cognate NEG1 forms are the standard NEG1 with Roglai *buh,* Chru '*buh,* and Jorai *bu* which are phonetically and phonemically more similar than appears in the orthography since all begin with ['b]. This is reconstructed as *ʔbuh* in Proto-Chamic. The only other clearly related forms in the NEG1 chart are the prohibition forms of Rade and Jorai which are *dăm* and '*năm,* respectively. Since Rade and Jorai are closely related as Highland Chamic languages, no Proto-Chamic form is reconstructable. Roglai prohibition form *dong* is a Vietnamese loan, but I do not know the source of Cham *jôi*. The Chru and Haroi materials available to me did not have prohibition forms, but since the other four languages do, I rather expect that Proto-Chamic may have had one as well.

Some of the other {NEG1} forms will be commented on subsequently under the treatment of the origin of the forms in 5.3.

In the {NEG2} chart either *oh, ôh,* or *ô* occurs in all of the languages except Chru which has *ou.* Proto-Chamic *oh* 'NEG2' is reconstructed. Chru *ou* is likely from Proto-Chamic *oh* 'NEG2' along with loss of final /*-h/ and diphthongization of /*o/. Although Eastern Cham has only shortened *ô* as a NEG2, it does have the fuller *ôh* as a {NEG1} with both presumably from *oh.* Haroi is not included in the {NEG2} chart since it does not have a bipartite negative construction, but it does have *oh* as a preverbal negative in the {NEG1} chart.

The remaining {NEG2} forms appear to be localized post Proto-Chamic developments since apart from reflexes of *oh* no two languages share cognate {NEG2} forms.

5. Typology of Chamic negatives

5.1 Bipartite negative typology

All of the Chamic languages of Vietnam are basically isolating SVO languages. For the most part particles are used for grammatical functions. This is somewhat atypical as far as Austronesian languages are concerned, but is an areal feature shared with Vietnamese and surrounding Mon-Khmer languages. The Chamic languages all have a very small set of prefixes which are primarily derivational in nature. They also have the nominalizing infix {-an-} which, to the best of my knowledge, is fossilized in all of them.

As already noted, all of the Chamic languages of Vietnam except Haroi have bipartite negative constructions. Thus, it is useful to look at the typology of such bipartite constructions. Typologically, bipartite negatives are not uncommon in languages with negative particles. Payne (1985.224) speaks of

"... the strong tendency for particle negatives to be emphasized and reinforced, sometimes by addition to the particle itself ... but more frequently by the addition of a further particle elsewhere in the sentence, forming a pair of linked negatives."

In SVO languages, the first negative of the bipartite construction will most commonly be preverbal following the subject. The second negative is postverbal, most frequently immediately following the verb, but may be elsewhere following the verb (Payne 1985.224-5, Dahl 1979.81-2). It is interesting to note that Lewo of Vanuatu (Early, 1993.1), possibly the only language attested to have a regular tripartite disjunctive negative, has the first negative immediately preceding the verb and two postverbal particles. One postverbal particle immediately follows the verb and the other is in clause final position. In the Chamic languages the {NEG1} is normally immediately before the verb (including Haroi which has only the one negative slot), although at least in Roglai, and occasionally in Rade and Chru, {NEG1} may precede the subject due to discourse or stylistic variations. There are also a few verb phrase level particles which may intervene between {NEG1} and the verb proper, as example (75) in Roglai, in which *khiang* 'want' separates *buh* 'NEG1' and the main verb *nău* 'go'.

(75)   *Amã   buh   khiang   nău   oh.*
         Father NEG1   want   go   NEG2
         Father doesn't want to go.

The {NEG2} is for the most part a final particle in the Chamic languages and normally follows the object. Practically, however, it is frequently immediately following the verb simply because there is no object or other postverbal constituents in many clauses. Any exceptions to {NEG2} as a final particle are marked constructions as discussed for Roglai in 2.3.

In summary, the typical Chamic negative clause type is X S NEG1 V O X NEG2, again with X representing optional peripheral elements. Since this is the case for all Chamic languages having bipartite negatives, we can also reconstruct a Proto Chamic clause type with bipartite negatives: *X S NEG1 V O X NEG2. We see then that the Chamic negative clause type conforms to typological expectations of SVO languages having bipartite negatives, except that typologically {NEG2} is more *likely to occur immediately following the verb rather than in clause final position* as in Chamic.

It remains to be seen at what stage in the development of the language the bipartite negative developed in Chamic. There is no trace of a bipartite negative in closely related Aceh of Sumatra, with the possible exception of *goh...lom* and *hana...lom* both meaning 'not yet' Apparently *goh* does not occur elsewhere with any related meaning, but *hana* is one of the main negatives and *lom* means 'another, more, again' in non-negative contexts (Durie, personal communication, 1995). The *-oh* of *goh* looks suspect of being cognate with PC *oh* 'NEG2'. It is also conceivable that the *g-* of *goh* is related to the *k-* of PC *ka* 'NEG1 (not yet).

My own guess, from the limited data, is that Aceh may possibly have shared the bipartite negatives and now has only residual evidence of them.

Other languages of Southeast Asia have a type of negative that could be considered as bipartite in which a second word strengthens the negative, but I don't know of any outside of Chamic with a clear bipartite negative. In the following examples (76) provided by David Thomas (personal communication), the postverbal particle requires the presence of the preverbal particle.

(76)   Vietnamese   không   có   dâu
         Northern Khmer   man   mien   tee
         Chrau   êq   gĕh   uy
         Thai   mây   mii   lɔɔy
                             not   have   not at all
                             'not have at all'

In Vietnamese dâu means 'where, anywhere' in other contexts. In Northern Khmer the tee can stand alone meaning 'no' in the same way that the Chamic languages use the standard {NEG2} alone as a negative as in example (25) above. Thomas did not indicate whether Northern Khmer tee, Chrau uy, and Thai lɔɔy have other meanings in other contexts like Vietnamese dâu, but I would assume that they probably do.

Roglai also uses dɔi and halɔi to strengthen the negative in the sense of 'at all' (see above in 2.5), but oh 'NEG2' still follows them as in examples (35-36). If the citations above from other languages of Southeast Asia are bipartite, then the Roglai constructions could be analyzed as tripartite.

Other aspects of typology relevant to the bipartite negatives is the function of preverbal and postverbal negatives (5.2) and the origin of the negative forms (5.3).

5.2 Typology of {NEG1} in contrast with {NEG2}.

Although there is not much available to me on the function of preverbal versus postverbal negatives in bipartite constructions, in this section I want to look briefly at some of possible diachronic developments and the synchronic status in Chamic.

Diachronic development. Dahl (1979:88) cites Jespersen (1917) as saying,

> The history of negative expressions in various languages makes us witness the following curious fluctuation: the original negative adverb is first weakened, then found insufficient and therefore strengthened, generally through some additional word, and this in its turn may be felt as the negative proper and may then in course of time be subject to the same development as the original word.

This type of development is referred to as Jespersen's Cycle. Dahl (1979: 95) says,

> It is thus tempting to assume that preverbal Neg placement is a natural tendency which may be disturbed by an equally natural diachronic process, viz. Jespersen's Cycle. If this is the case, one would expect the languages where this has happened to exhbit tendencies to return to preverbal placement. Some evidence for this can be found in modern Scandinavian.

In Chamic, apart from Eastern Cham, there is no evidence of the first negative, that is, {NEG1} being supplanted by the second negative {NEG2}. As noted above in the discussion of negatives in informal speech in Eastern Cham, the normal standard negative is postverbal *ô* 'NEG2' with no preceding {NEG1}. Optionally *di* 'NEG1 (intensive)' may precede the verb. The origin of the *di* is unknown although is homophonous with the preposition meaning 'at'. In addition, the prohibition form for Eastern Cham is obligatory in final position, but optional in preverbal position. One would expect informal speech to reflect the most recent development in the language with formal speech reflecting older more conservative usage. Formal speech by contrast has *ôh* 'NEG1' with an optional *ô* 'NEG2' to intensify it. What is a bit ironic is that of the Chamic languages with bipartite negatives, Eastern Cham alone has *ôh* in preverbal position and that in formal speech; the others have it only in clause final position (see 2.5, however, for reflexes of *ôh* as a prefix). Formal speech in Eastern Cham supports a preverbal position of the negative being the norm, but hardly supports the notion of a movement from postverbal to preverbal position as a recent development.

It is in the informal speech that we would expect the evidence of recent movement, but informal speech appears to reflect a beginning stage of losing the preverbal position. On the other hand, it does appear that either *ôh* moved from final position to preverbal position at some time in Cham or that *ôh* was a Proto-Chamic preverbal negative which the other languages, except possibly Haroi, have lost. The second alternative seems more likely and is considered in 5.3.

The preverbal position of *ka* 'NEG1 (not yet)' shows no change, except that in the only example available from formal speech it is preceded by the NEG1 *ôh*. It is obligatory in both preverbal and postverbal positions in informal speech. Note that the apparently bipartite Aceh forms for 'not yet' are the only possible trace of a relationship between Aceh negatives and Chamic bipartite negatives (5.1).

Since it appears that apart from *ka* preverbal negatives seem to be losing ground in informal speech, it is possible that if the preverbal position continues to weaken, then the postverbal forms may follow Jesperson's Cycle and move to the preverbal position and the postverbal position be lost.

Synchronic status. Another aspect of the typology is the synchronic status of the preverbal and postverbal negatives. Dahl (1979:89) notes,

Neg would appear to be a simple, un-decomposable concept; thus it is baffling to see that it may be expressed by two separate morphemes. Following the French grammarians Damourette and Piho, Tesnière (1959) uses the terms 'discordantiel' and 'forclusif' for the two Neg markers. According to him, the 'discordantiel', as it were, 'switches off' the affirmative concept, then the 'forclusif' 'switches on' the negative concept. It is hard to evaluate this rather metaphorical explanation of the functioning of the two particles. Another remark made by Tesnière is perhaps of greater value. He points out that in French, the *ne...pas*, which expresses what we might call categorical Neg, is opposed to at least two kinds of restricted or qualified constructions, viz. *ne...quère* 'hardly' and *ne...que* 'only'. Thus the 'discordantiel' might be said to mark the general negative nature of the statement, whereas the 'forclusif' specifies it. I have not been able to estblish whether this applies also to other languages with double Neg particles.

The status of the Chamic languages provides a good case to examine the notion of whether the first negative serves as a generic negative and the second as a specific. The evidence for Chamic is that there is a generic negative in both preverbal and postverbal positions and specific negatives in both positions. If anything, the evidence indicates that the postverbal position ('discordantiel') in Chamic tends to be more generic than the preverbal ('forclusif'). Thus for Chamic, the evidence gives some support to the opposite of what might have been expected. Boerger (personal communication, 1995), however, indicates that the bipartite negatives in Natugu of the Solomon Islands operate precisely as Dahl has suggested.

Looking again at Charts 1 and 2, we can see that most of the languages have three {NEG1} particles, a standard particle, a 'not yet' particle, and a prohibition particle. Eastern Cham has an additional intensive particle in informal speech. In postverbal position, two of the five languages with bipartite negatives (Rade and Chru) have evidence in the data for only one negative, and the others have only two. (Cham actually has three but only two in formal and two in informal speech. The standard *ô* occurs in both speech types and the other two apparently occur in only one speech type each). Furthermore, apart from a standard NEG2 reflecting Proto-Chamic *oh*, the form and function of the {NEG2} particles in each language is different indicating that they are probably local developments. As noted above in section 4, we can reconstruct two preverbal negatives but only one postverbal negative for Proto-Chamic.

5.3 Origin of Chamic negative particles

We have considered the typology of the Chamic negative clause structure, but what about the origin of the negative particles and of their functions? From the evidence above in section 4, there were at least three Proto-Chamic negative particles, two {NEG1} particles *?buh* and *ka* and one {NEG2} particle *oh*.

The particle *?buh is too widely distributed (Roglai, Jorai, and Chru) to see it as derived from any source other than a common Proto-Chamic. The particle *ka occurs in all of them, and clear reflexes of *oh occur in all except Chru which has ou so that there is no question as to whether they were Proto-Chamic.

How do these and other forms relate to the expected typology of origin?

Origin of Proto-Chamic *oh 'NEG2' and *soh 'nothing'. The origin of *oh is likely completely lost in antiquity. It does not appear to be related to any other known words from which it could have been derived. It could be related to *soh which has been glossed as 'nothing' to cover a variety of related meanings in the daughter languages, but it seems more likely that *soh may have derived from a combination of *oh with another word (perhaps *sa 'one') rather than *oh being derived from *soh. Haroi is the only language which utilizes *soh as a full clause level negative. This has already been mentioned above in section 3.5.

Origin of Proto-Chamic *ka 'NEG1 (not yet)'. The particle *ka 'NEG1 (not yet)' is reflected in all of the Chamic languages of Vietnam as ka. Its origin may be lost in obscurity, but at least Roglai and Cham, and perhaps others, use it as a clause final particle in the sense of 'first', that is, that one event must precede another. The latter use is parallel to Vietnamese đã 'first', but the Vietnamese form is homophonous with the past time particle not with a negative particle. It is clear that the meanings of the two uses of ka in Roglai and Cham are related, and since negatives tend to derive from other forms, it is very likely that the sense of 'first' preceded the negative use, even though the latter is obviously very old.

Origin of Proto-Chamic *buh 'NEG1' and Rade amâo 'NEG1'. Payne (1985:222) briefly touches on the origin of negative verbs, noting that "some evidence, both direct and circumstantial, exists that in at least some cases the negative verb is simply a negative form of the verb 'be'." Although none of the negative particles in Chamic appear to function as verbs, they could still originate from verbs. Payne mentions (1985: 223) negative particles as sometimes being reduced forms of negative verbs.

The negative particle *?buh of Proto-Chamic could well have originated from *?buh 'see'. The use of buh as an affirmative particle in Roglai has a fairly close correlation with buh 'to see', and in some contexts it is difficult to determine whether it is the affirmative particle or verb. Rade, Jorai, Cham, and Chru use reflexes of Proto-Chamic *hmǝu 'have' in short negative responses in much the same way Roglai uses the affirmative particle although Roglai can also use hmǔ to have' in the same sense. All of them use the reflexes of *hmǝu in an existential sense as well as for Chru in example (76).

(76)   *Hu   sa   o`m...*
         there was a   morning
         One morning...

Vietnamese *có* 'have' is also very much the same, so it appears likely to be an areal feature.

This use of 'have' in the Chamic languages as an existential verb and affirmative form probably accounts for the origin of Rade *amâo* 'NEG1'. It is very likely that *amâo* derives from Proto-Chamic **oh* 'not' plus Rade *mâo* 'have'. It is clearly a single particle in Rade having reduced in conformity with the canonical word pattern.

Proto-Chamic **oh* as both 'NEG1' and 'NEG2'. This possibility for the origin of Rade *amâo* 'NEG1' leads me to hypothesize that the negative **ʔbuh* was originally derived from **oh* plus **ʔbuh* 'see' or possibly **ʔbuh* 'AFF' and that the **oh* was subsequently lost in Jorai, Roglai, and Chru leaving only reflexes of **ʔbuh* as the standard NEG1 whereas in Eastern Cham, the reflex of **buh* was lost leaving only *ôh* as the standard NEG1. Not only would this hypothesis account for the simple replacement of the **ʔbuh* of **oh ʔbuh* with *mâo* in Rade, but would also help to explain the use of *u-* as a negative prefix in Roglai (cf. 2.5).

If this hypothesis is valid, then it is possible that Proto-Chamic or some intervening levels had other double constructions which are only weakly attested today. It is possible that there was also an **oh ka* 'not yet' which is attested in Eastern Cham formal speech. By substitution of *buh* in **oh ka* for the original **oh*, we can also account for the occasional Chru compound negative *'buh ka* 'not yet'. It is further possible that there was a combination of **oh di* 'intensive negative(?)', which accounts for the current use of *di* in Eastern Cham informal speech where preverbal *ôh* has been lost. It could also account for the unexplained occasional use of *di* in the Roglai prohibitive construction.

Although this hypothesis does not help us discover the origin of **oh* in Chamic, it does suggest that it was first a preverbal negative which was then generalized to the postverbal position to strengthen the negative. If this is the case, then we have Proto-Chamic **oh* as both 'NEG1' and 'NEG2'.

Origin of other negatives in Chamic languages. Two additional negatives occurring only in specific Chamic languages have been touched on in the discussion of the respective languages above. The remaining ones may be derived from words which still exist, but which I am unaware of. The two already mentioned elsewhere are summarized here. Roglai *uroi* 'NEG2 (neither)' is probably from *oh* 'NEG1' plus **roi* which although not attested in Roglai is cognate with Chru *roi* and Cham *ray* both meaning 'also'. This meaning would provide the expected semantics for *uroi*. Eastern Cham *tra* 'NEG2 (anymore)' is clearly related to *tra* 'later, more' (cf. Roglai *tra* 'more' and Chru *tra* 'will, shall'). Besides these two, Jorai *tah* 'NEG2 (contrast)' may possibly be cognate with Roglai *tah* 'to turn' (I have no dictionary available with me to see if Jorai also has a cognate form).

REFERENCES

Aday Bach Akhar Cham Birau: Tapuk 1, 3 (I Learn to Read New Cham: Books 1, 3). 1970. Saigon, Ministry of Education.

Adoi Posram Ponuai Chru: Top 1-3. (I learn the Chru language: Books 1-3). 1972. Saigon, Ministry of Education.

Blood, David L. 1977. "A three-dimensional analysis of Cham sentences." *Papers in South East Asian Linguistics No. 4: Chamic Studies,* eds. David Thomas, Ernest W. Lee, and Nguyen Dang Liem, 53-76. Canberra: Pacific Linguistics A-48.

Blood, Doris Walker. 1977. "Clause and sentence final particles in Cham." *Papers in South East Asian Linguistics No. 4: Chamic Studies,* eds. David Thomas, Ernest W. Lee, and Nguyen Dang Liem, 39-51. Canberra: Pacific Linguistics A-48.

Burnham, Eugene Cortney. 1976. *The Place of Haroi in the Chamic Languages.* Unpublished M.A. thesis, University of Texas at Arlington.

Cou Hoc Vunga Suraq: Sanap Radlai: Book 3. Saigon: Ministry of Education.

Dahl, Osten. 1979. "Typology of sentence negation." *Linguistics* 17:79-106.

Durie, Mark. 1985. *A Grammar of Acehnese on the basis of a Dialect of North Aceh.* Dordrecht, the Netherlands: Foris Publications.

Early, Robert. 1993. "The tripartite negative in Lewo." Paper presented at the First International Conference on Oceanic Linguistics at Port Vila, Vanuatu.

Goschnick, Hella. 1977. "Haroi clauses." *Papers in South East Asian Linguistics No. 4: Chamic Studies,* eds. David Thomas, Ernest W. Lee, and Nguyen Dang Liem, 105-124. Canberra: Pacific Linguistics A-48.

Jespersen, Otto. 1917. "Negation in English and other languages." *Historisk-filolgiske Meddelelser* 1:5.

Kou Kcum Hriam Dlang (I begin to Learn to Read [Rade]. 1967. Saigon: Department of Education.

Kou Pophun Hram Hra (I begin to Learn to Read [Jorai]). 1967. Saigon: Department of Education.

Lee, Ernest Wilson. 1966. *Proto-Chamic Phonologic Word and Vocabulary.* Unpublished PhD dissertation, Indiana University.

Mundhenk, Alice Tegenfeld. 1977. "Haroi phonemes." *Papers in South East Asian Linguistics No. 4: Chamic Studies,* eds. David Thomas, Ernest W. Lee, and Nguyen Dang Liem, 1-15. Canberra: Pacific Linguistics A-48.

Payne, John R. 1985. "Negation." *Language typology and syntactic description: Vol 1, Clause structure,* 197-242, ed.Timothy Shopen. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Savary, Fr. Corentin. 1973. *Dictionnaire Roglai, Vietnamien, Francais.* Trung-Tam Thuong Dien-Khanh (Dien Khanh Montagnard Center): Dien Khanh, Vietnam.