

Pre-publication draft of:

Kroeger, Paul. 2014. "Nominal and emphatic negation in Borneo."  
*Advances in research on linguistic and cultural practices in Borneo (A memorial to Peter Martin)*, ed. by Peter Sercombe, Michael Boutin, and Adrian Clynes. Borneo Research Council.

## CHAPTER X

### NOMINAL AND EMPHATIC NEGATION IN BORNEO

PAUL KROEGER

Graduate Institute of Applied Linguistics & SIL Intl.

#### 1 NOMINAL VS. NON-NOMINAL NEGATION<sup>1</sup>

In a number of Bornean languages, the marker used for clausal negation depends on the category of the predicate: one marker is used when the predicate is nominal (i.e., in equative or identificational clauses), and a different marker is used when the predicate is verbal or adjectival. This is, of course, the same pattern found in Malay: *tidak* is used when the predicate is verbal (1a) or adjectival (1b), while *bukan* is used when the predicate is nominal (1c).

- (1) a. Mereka *tidak* menolong kami.  
3pl NEG help 1pl.EXCL  
'They didn't help us.' [Sneddon 1996:195]
- b. Saya *tidak* lapar.  
1sg NEG hungry  
'I am not hungry.' [Sudaryono 1993:88]
- c. Dia *bukan/\*tidak* guru.  
3sg NEG teacher  
'She isn't a teacher.' [Sneddon 1996:195]
- d. Dia *bukan* tidur, tetapi ber-baring sahaja.  
3sg NEG sleep but MID-lie.down only  
'He is not sleeping, but only lying down.' [Asmah 1982:145]

In certain pragmatically restricted contexts, Malay *bukan* can also be used to negate verbal clauses as illustrated in (1d). Kroeger (to appear) argues that there are three distinct pragmatic factors which can, individually or in combination, license this verbal use of *bukan*: overt contrast, narrow (constituent) focus, and “metalinguistic negation” (Horn 1985, 1989).<sup>2</sup> For most of the Bornean languages discussed below, there is not enough information available to determine the specific pragmatic factors involved. However, it appears that in most of them, as in Malay, the nominal negator can be used in verbal clauses to mark some kind of “emphatic” negation.

I will refer to the category-based pattern illustrated in (1a–c) as a distinction between nominal vs. non-nominal negation. Dahl (2010:26) notes that “most typological work on negation has focused on standard negation, i.e. the negation constructions used in main verbal declarative clauses.”<sup>3</sup> For this reason the typology of non-standard (specifically, non-verbal) negation is less well established, and it is harder to make dogmatic claims in this area. But my impression is that a distinction between nominal vs. non-nominal negation is typologically somewhat unusual; it seems to be more common to find distinct negators used for verbal vs. non-verbal negation, where the non-verbal form is used for nominal, adjectival and prepositional predicates.

Blust (2009) has pointed out that a number of Western Malayo-Polynesian languages do use distinct forms for nominal vs. non-nominal negation. However, as discussed in section 2, this contrast is somewhat sporadic in its distribution, and northeastern Borneo (Sabah + Brunei) seems to be unusual for the very high percentage of languages in which the contrast is attested.

As demonstrated in section 3, the forms of the nominal negators in Malayic Dayak languages appear to be cognate with Malay *bukan*, suggesting that the contrast between nominal vs. non-nominal negation may be an inherited feature of the Malayic

languages. However, a variety of lexical sources for the nominal negator are attested in northeastern Borneo, suggesting that the contrast may be an areal feature rather than an inherited feature for these languages. In most of the languages in northeastern Borneo the nominal negator is (always or usually) accompanied by the particle *ko* ~ *ka*. I will suggest that this particle was historically a focus marker, which spread (in this specific use) via borrowing throughout the state of Sabah, and to some adjacent areas to the south and west. It is possible that the original source of this particle could have been Begak-Ida'an, but the evidence for this is far from conclusive.

## 2 GEOGRAPHICAL DISTRIBUTION

The lexical distinction between nominal vs. non-nominal negation is unevenly distributed across Borneo. Sabah appears to be the zone with by far the highest density of occurrence. As we will see, most if not all of the languages in the Northeast Borneo subgroup make the distinction, and a number of other Sabahan languages do as well. I will argue that the nominal negator may have spread via contact among the Sabahan languages. The distinction also seems to be very common among Malayic Dayak languages,<sup>4</sup> but this seems to be a retention from Proto-Malayic.

Outside of Sabah and adjacent areas in Brunei and East Kalimantan, and leaving Malayic Dayak aside for the moment, the pattern seems to be quite sporadic. For Sarawak I have definite evidence for distinct nominal vs. non-nominal negation only in three Lower Baram languages: Kiput, Dali and Narom (see footnote 10). I have little information about other areas of Kalimantan, but so far have found no examples there.

One might imagine that the unusual density of occurrence in Sabah is due to its proximity to the Philippines, but this explanation seems unlikely. The pattern is attested in the Philippines, but again seems to be quite sporadic. For example,

McFarland (1977) reports that within his sample of 24 northern Philippine dialects, only the two varieties of Gaddang use a unique marker for strictly nominal negation. Blust (2009:467) cites the following Philippine languages which appear to have a unique marker for nominal negation: Yakan (cf. Brainard and Behrens 2002:121), Tboli (cf. Forsberg 1992:101–5), and Bontoc (Reid 1976). Pending further information, there is at present no reason to propose a purely geographical explanation for the density of the contrast in Sabah.

Most if not all of the Sama-Bajaw languages do distinguish between nominal vs. non-nominal negation, and certainly there has been intensive contact between these languages and the languages of northeastern Borneo for some time. Blust (2010) suggests that Sama-Bajaw came originally from southeastern Borneo. Many interesting questions arise in this regard; however, I will not be able to consider the Sama-Bajaw data in any detail in the present study.

### **3 NOMINAL NEGATION IN BORNEO**

In this section I will illustrate the contrast between nominal vs. non-nominal negation in a number of Borneo languages. Following current terminology, I will refer to the form used with verbal predicates as the STANDARD NEGATION marker, and the form used with nominal predicates as the SPECIAL NEGATION marker. A number of these languages also have distinct forms for negative existentials, negative commands, etc., but I will not examine these forms here.

The correlation noted above between nominal negation and “emphatic” negation raises the possibility that syntactic category may not in fact be the conditioning factor in choosing between the two negators. Blust (2009:471) states: “It is possible that the description of these patterns of negation as associated with nominal or verbal constituents is misguided. Sentence examples in

the published sources suggest that negators of nominal constituents are often contrastive negatives.” For this reason, a critical part of the discussion will be to demonstrate (whenever possible) that the standard (i.e., verbal) negation marker cannot be used to negate nominal predicates.<sup>5</sup> This is a purely grammatical constraint, not pragmatically determined: only the nominal negator can be used to negate nominal predicates, and no special pragmatic factors are required to license this. This shows that syntactic category does in fact play a role in determining the choice of negator. However, there do seem to be pragmatic constraints on the use of the nominal negator to negate verbal predicates in most if not all of the languages discussed below.

### 3.1 MALAYIC DAYAK

Tjia (2007) states that in Mualang, a Malayic Dayak language spoken in western Borneo, *naday* is the standard negation marker for verbal and adjectival clauses (2a). Nominal predicates can only be negated with *ukay*, as illustrated in (2b). *Ukay* also occurs in verbal and adjectival clauses as a marker of contrastive negation (2c). Tjia states that *ukay* in verbal clauses does not necessarily deny the truth value of the described event or situation, in contrast to *naday* which always denies truth values.

- (2) a. Ia'    naday   bayik.  
       that  NEG    good  
       ‘That is not good.’ [Tjia 2007, ex. 9-101]
- b. Ia'    ukay/\*naday    uma       ku.  
       that  NEG            rice.field  1sg  
       ‘That is not my rice field.’ [Tjia 2007, ex. 9-102, 110]
- c. Ku    ukay   pulay.       Baru' ka'   angkat.  
       1sg  NEG  go.home   just   FUT  go  
       ‘I am not going home; I am just about to leave.’  
       [Tjia 2007, ex. 9-102, 110]

In Iban, *naday* seems to function as the negative existential while standard negation is marked by *ənda'* (3a-b). Nominal predicates can only be negated with *ukay* (3c), as in Mualang. *Ukay* can also be used in verbal clauses for contrastive negation (3d).

- (3) a. Lapa' iya ənda' datay?  
 why 3sg NEG come  
 'Why didn't he come?' [Asmah 1981:278]
- b. ənda' bəsay  
 NEG big  
 'is not big' [Asmah 1981:159]
- c. Kitay to' ukay/\*ənda' urang kampar dito'.  
 we this NEG person outside here  
 'We are not foreigners here.' [Asmah 1981:222]
- d. Ukay ngəna' əntukar tang ngəna' belon.  
 NEG use car but use airplane  
 'Not by car but by plane.' [Asmah 1981:212]

Adelaar (2005) states that in Selako, nominal predicates can only be negated with *bukatn*, while verbal and adjectival predicates are negated with *ana'*. (*Ana'* also seems to function as a negative existential.)

### 3.2 NORTHEAST BORNEO GROUP

Most of the indigenous languages of Sabah belong to the Northeast Borneo Group (Wurm 1983; King & King 1984). Blust (2010) refers to this same subgroup as the Southwest Sabah group. The major branches of the subgroup are Dusunic, Paitanic, Murutic, Bisayic, and Tidung. The contrast between nominal vs. non-nominal negation is attested in every branch.

**Dusunic.** In Kimaragang Dusun, the standard negation marker *amu'* is used for verbal and adjectival predicates (4a-b), while nominal predicates (4c) can only be negated with *okon (ko')*, cognate with Malay *bukan*. (The particle *ko'* is not obligatory, but

is almost always present. Moreover, *ko'* can be separated from *okon* by other clitic particles, e.g. the aspect particles *no* or *po* or the emphatic *=i'*.) Most, if not all, of the Dusunic languages of Sabah have cognate forms with these same functions. Kimaragang is discussed here as a representative of the Dusunic subgroup.

- (4) a. Amu' oku po mangakan...  
 NEG 1sg.NOM ASP AV.eat  
 (... tu' kaakan ku gima didiiri)  
 'I will not eat yet (because I ate just now, after all).'
- b. Amu' no mari opeet ino doruk  
 NEG ASP PRCL bitter that bamboo.shoot  
 ong arabus no.  
 if boiled ASP  
 'The bamboo shoot is no longer bitter, once it is boiled.'
- c. Kada matagur, okon.ko'/\*amu' tidi ku  
 don't scold NEG mother 1sg.GEN  
 ika!  
 2sg.NOM  
 'Don't scold me, you are not my mother!'

When *okon* is used to negate a verbal clause, it means something like 'It is not the case that ...' in contrast to *amu* which simply means 'not'. One typical use of *okon* is to contradict a proposition that has either been asserted (e.g. 5a) or might reasonably be assumed or expected under the circumstances, as in (5b). In these contexts the use of *amu'* is often less natural.

- (5) a. Doo maantad do manuk ilo', okon.ko'  
 3sg originally LNK chicken that NEG  
 binoli yo po.  
 buy.PAST.OV 3sg PRCL  
 'That was his chicken in the first place, he didn't buy it!'

- b. Okon.ko' bobogon dialo ilot tanak yo  
 NEG beat.OV 3sg that child 3sg  
 dat maanakaw, suuon nogi.  
 REL steal.HABIT order.OV PRTCL  
 'He doesn't beat that child of his who keeps on stealing, he  
 actually orders/sends him (to steal)!'

**Murutic.** The standard negator in Timugon Murut is *kalo*, used for verbs and adjectives (6a-b). The nominal negator *sala' ka* is used for NP predicates as in (6c). In pragmatically marked contexts, *sala' ka* can also be used to negate verbal clauses as illustrated in (6d). (In addition, the negative imperative marker, *pai' ru*, can sometimes be used in declarative sentences with verbal, adjectival or nominal predicates; this pattern will not be discussed here.)

(6) **Timugon Murut**

- a. Kalo binali ku.  
 NEG bought 1sg.GEN  
 'I did not buy (it).' [K. Brewis 1988:25]
- b. Kalo malasu' kupi ti.  
 NEG hot coffee this  
 'This coffee is not hot.' [K. Brewis 1988:23]
- c. Sala'=ka lalaing ku io.  
 NEG=PRTCL child 1sg.GEN 3sg.NOM  
 'He is not my child.' [K. Brewis 1988:10]
- d. Sala'=ka aku mangansak ra kaluu'.  
 NEG=PRTCL 1sg.NOM cook ACC rice  
 'I didn't cook rice.'<sup>6</sup> [R. Brewis et al. 2004:612]

Both the standard negator *kalo* and the nominal negator *sala' ka* may appear in sentence-initial position, followed by the interrogative particle *kia*, to produce what appears to be a biased yes-no question. (Compare the neutral question pattern in (7a).) It appears that *kalo* cannot co-occur with nominal predicates, but

*sala' ka* may occur in such questions with either nominal (7c) or verbal (7d) predicates. (Notice that the particle *kia* can occur between *sala'* and *ka*, showing that *ka* is a morphologically independent particle.)

(7) **Timugon Murut**

- a. Malasu' *kia* *kupi* *ti*?  
 hot Q coffee this  
 'Is this coffee hot?' [K. Brewis 1988:22]
- b. Kalo *kia* *malasu'* *kupi* *ti*?  
 NEG Q hot coffee this  
 'Isn't this coffee hot?' [K. Brewis 1988:22]
- c. Sala' *kia* *ka* *boborok* *mu*?  
 NEG Q PRCL yg.brother 2sg.GEN  
 'Isn't he your little brother?' [K. Brewis 1988:10]
- d. Sala' *kia* *ka* *mambasikal* *kou*?  
 NEG Q PRCL ride.bicycle 2pl.NOM  
 'Are you not going to cycle there?' [K. Brewis 1988:18]

The standard negator in Bookan Murut is *kaa*, while both *sala* and *suai* function as nominal negators, often interchangeably. *Kaa* is used for verbs and adjectives (8a-b). Only *sala* or *suai* can be used for NP predicates as in (8c). Doi & Doi (2003:38) state: “*Suai* and *sala* negate a noun or noun phrase but not a verb or verb phrase.” However, examples like (8d) seem to indicate that there are certain contexts where *sala* and *suai* can be used to negate verbal clauses as well.

(8) **Bookan Murut**

- a. Kaa *muoi* *aku* *da* *Kaningau*.  
 NEG go 1sg.NOM OBJ Keningau  
 'I will not go to Keningau.' [Doi & Doi 2003:39]
- b. Kaa *maansiu*.  
 NEG good  
 'It (the road) is not good.' [Doi & Doi 2003:37]

- c. Suai/Sala.ka aku ta ungau deeno.  
 NEG.PRTCL 1sg.NOM POSS cat that  
 ‘That is not my cat.’ [Doi & Doi 2003:38]
- d. Suai/Sala.ka aku namaal da gino.  
 NEG.PRTCL 1sg.NOM make OBJ that  
 ‘I didn’t make that.’<sup>7</sup> [Doi & Doi 2003:38]

**Paitanic.** The standard negator in Tombonuwo is *dai*, used for verbs and adjectives (9a-b). The nominal negator has the same form as its Kimaragang Dusun equivalent, *okon ko’*. This is the only negator which can negate NP predicates, as in illustrated in (9c). I do not have any examples of the nominal negator being used to negate verbal clauses in Tombonuwo. However, this is possible in the closely related Kalabuan, one of the Upper Kinabatangan dialects (10). No information is available concerning pragmatic factors which may be involved.

(9) **Tombonuwo**

- a. Dai aku ya moinging momupu.  
 NEG 1sg.NOM PRTCL like wash.clothes  
 ‘I don’t like to wash clothes.’ [King & King 1985:27]
- b. Dai sihat koyuan nio no.  
 NEG healthy body 3sg.GEN PRTCL  
 ‘His body is not healthy.’ [King & King 1985:20]
- c. Okon.ko’ alud ni apa’.  
 NEG.PRTCL canoe GEN father  
 ‘It is not father’s canoe.’ [King & King 1985:20]

(10) **Kalabuan**

- a. Okon.ko’ winaal mai itu so’ masa’  
 NEG.PRTCL done 1pl.GEN this DAT time  
 no’ pinusawaan situ.  
 GEN wedding this  
 ‘We shouldn’t do these things during this wedding.’  
 [Spitzack 1988:108]

- b. Okon.ko' angkang maali'.  
 NEG.PRTCL move strong  
 'It didn't move forcefully.' [Spitzack 1988:110]

**Tatana' (Bisayic).**<sup>8</sup> The standard negator in Tatana' is the same as in Bookan Murut, namely *kaa*. *Kaa* is used for adjectives and verbs (11a-b), but NP predicates can only be negated by the nominal negator *loin ko*, as in (11c). The examples in (12) show that *loin ko* can also be used to negate verbal clauses in contrastive or emphatic contexts. Example (12b) shows that *ko* is a morphologically independent particle.

- (11) a. *kaa nini' morogo...*  
 NEG also expensive  
 'That is not expensive.' [Chan & Pekkanen 1989:64]
- b. *kaa aku tio mokopongo.*  
 NEG 1sg.NOM this able.to.complete  
 'I cannot finish (it) in this time.' [Chan & Pekkanen 1989:73]
- c. *Loin ko disio baloi dino.*  
 NEG PRTCL his house that  
 'That house is not his.' [Chan & Pekkanen 1989:6]
- (12) *Loin ko idagang ku anak ku.*  
 NEG PRTCL be.sold 1sg.GEN child 1sg.GEN  
 'It's not like I'm selling my child.'  
 (said during bride-price negotiations)  
 [Chan & Pekkanen 1989:44]
- b. Tapi ino no magagau aku do  
 but that TOP worry 1sg COMP  
*loin tupo ko mokito, sarita' ani'*  
 NEG you.know PRTCL see story only

do komotutuaan do ingkoi kon.  
 GEN ancestors COMP like.that say  
 ‘But that is why I am worried, for it is not that (one) sees  
 (it); the ancestors only tell it is like that, they say.’  
 [Pekkanen 1984]

- c. Do mula ih, maso ulun Kina it rumikot do pomogunan  
 takau,

‘Long ago, when the Chinese people came to our land,’

*loin ko sumakoi do kapal.tarabang tapi*  
 NEG PRTCL ride.on ACC airplane but

*maya do Tongkang,*  
 used ACC *tongkang*

‘they did not ride on an airplane but rather came on a  
*tongkang,*’

*kapal gayo mamakai do layag.*

‘a big ship that used a sail.’

[<http://romregrecipes.blogspot.com/>]

**Tidung and Bulungan.** There is not much published information available on Tidung, but based on what is available it appears that Tidung also makes a lexical distinction between nominal vs. non-nominal negation. Beech (1908) describes two “dialects” of Tidung, namely Tarakan and Bulungan; but Jason Lobel (p.c.) states that Bulungan is a very different language, and does not even belong to Wurm’s Northeast Borneo Group (Blust’s Southwest Sabah group). Nevertheless, I will discuss the two languages together for convenience.

Beech lists the following forms for the Tarakan dialect: *nupa* ‘tidak’ vs. *anda* ‘bukan’; and for Bulungan: *kila* ‘tidak’ vs. *lain* ‘bukan’. He presents the following example of double negation creating a positive interpretation in Bulungan; note that the nominal negator precedes the non-nominal negator, as would be the case in the equivalent Malay construction.

- (13) *Lain aku kila d'mpar 'mpanau...*  
 'It isn't that I don't want to come, but ...'  
 [Beech 1908:48]

The basic category-based contrast in functions is demonstrated for Bulungan in examples (14a-c), from Asfandi, Syukrani & Yazidi (1990:103 ff.). Example (14d) shows the use of the nominal negator in a verbal clause, in an explicitly contrastive context.

- (14) a. *Aku kila ngirup kawa inon.* [verbal predicate]  
 'I did/will not drink that coffee.'  
 b. ... *sa kila rakat.* [adjectival predicate?]  
 'He is not afraid (even though surrounded by enemies).'  
 c. *Lain capi anu senembelinya piado tetapi payaw.*  
 [nominal predicate]  
 'It was not a cow that he butchered yesterday but a deer.'  
 d. *Sa lain kuman tetapi ngirup.* [verbal predicate,  
 'He did not eat, but he drank.' contrastive]

Jason Lobel (p.c.) has collected nominal negation forms in five dialects of Tidung: Tidung Bangawong *ongko*; Tidung Sambal (Sombol) *ingko*; Tidung Nunukan (Sembakung) *ando*; Tidung Mansalog *ongko*; Tidung Tarakan *kongko*. Notice that, whereas there is no trace of the *ko* particle in the Bulungan examples above, four out of the five dialects of Tidung have nominal negation forms ending in *-ko*.<sup>9</sup>

### 3.3 BELAIT AND TUTONG

In Belait (spoken in the sultanate of Brunei), Clynes (2005:435, 440) states that NP predicates can be negated only with *kay'*, whereas verbal and prepositional predicates are normally negated with *ndeh*.<sup>10</sup> When *kay'* is used to negate a verbal clause, it adds a "counter-to-expectation" element of meaning. A similar situation holds in the closely related Tutong language (Hj. Ramlee 2005; Adrian Clynes, p.c.). Only the nominal negator *ke'ka* can be used

to negate nominal predicates as in (15a). The “counter-to-expectation” use of *ke’ka* with (what appears to be) an adjectival predicate is illustrated in (15b). Example (15c) seems to involve a metalinguistic use.

(15) a. *ke’ka puot.*

NEG smoke  
‘(It’s) not smoke.’

b. *rupa’=ni jipun na’ ke’ka=ni ju’ot*  
appearance=3sg japanese DIST NEG=3sg bad/evil  
‘Apparently those Japanese weren’t bad (after all).’

(earlier there had been rumours that they were committing atrocities as they progressed)

[A. Clynes & Hj. Ramlee Tunggal, fieldnotes]

c. *ke’kah s-aluh an-ja(d)cau na’ od;*  
NEG one-day AV-weave DIST PRTCL

*kurang duwo telu aluh, pat aluh*  
less two three day four day

*baru menga’.*  
only.then finish

‘You don’t spend one day weaving that; it takes at least two, three or four days.’

[Hj. Ramlee, 2005]

### 3.4 BONGGI

Boutin (in press) reports that in Bonggi, spoken on an island off the northern tip of Borneo, the standard negation marker for verbal and attributive clauses is *nda’*, whereas nominal predicates can only be negated with *leidn ga* (fast speech pronunciation [‘leɪŋ gə]). *Leidn ga* can also be used with verbal and adjectival predicates in contrastive contexts, as illustrated in (16c).

(16) a. *Sia nda’ n-tuhal.*  
3sg.NOM NEG STAT-thin  
‘He is not thin.’

- b. Sia leidn.ga/\*nda' sigu hu.  
 3sg.NOM NEG / NEG teacher 1sg.GEN  
 'He is not my teacher.'
- c. Sia leidn.ga n-tuhal.  
 3sg.NOM NEG STAT-thin  
 Sia mo-lompukng.  
 3sg.NOM STAT-fat  
 'It is not the case that he is thin. He is fat.'

### 3.5 BEGAK

Goudswaard (2005) states that standard negation in Begak-Ida'an is marked by either *(a)pon* or *(n)inga*.<sup>11</sup> The standard negation of verbal and adjectival predicates is illustrated in (17a-b). Nominal predicates can only be negated with the combination *pon* (short form of *apon*) plus the particle *ka*, as illustrated in (17c). Goudswaard (2005:304) states: "The combination *pon ka* is most of the times pronounced as *pəngka* rather than as *pon ka*: the vowel /o/ of *pon* being reduced to schwa." In addition, *pon ka* can be used in verbal clauses to mark "strongly contrastive" negation (17d).

- (17) a. Siti apon/ninga' mangan bakas.  
 Siti NEG eat wild.pig  
 'Siti does not eat pork.' [Goudswaard 2005:300]
- b. Bua' ssom no apon/ninga' ammis.  
 fruit citrus yonder NEG sweet  
 'Yonder citrus fruit is not sweet.' [Goudswaard 2005:301]
- c. Ino pa asu matay, pon.ka anak mo.  
 yonder PRT dog dead NEG child 2sg.GEN  
 'This is a dead dog hey, this is not your child.'  
 [Goudswaard 2005:304]
- d. kəmo bugol rumo, pon.ka kəssu ino məgkot!  
 if alone 3sg NEG soon yonder work  
 '...if he is alone, he does not work fast at all!'  
 [Goudswaard 2005:304]

Sentence (18) provides an example of double negation which receives a positive interpretation. Note that the first (wider scope) negator is *pəŋka*.

- (18) aku pəŋka pon atow muli, aku atow, ...  
 1sg NEG NEG know return 1sg know  
 ‘It is not the case that I do not know how to go home, I do know.’ [Goudswaard 2005:305]

### 3.6 WEST COAST BAJAU

Miller (2007:340–41) reports that in West Coast Bajau, the standard negation marker *nya'* is used to negate verbal and adjectival predicates as illustrated in (19a-b). Nominal predicates can only be negated with the nominal negator *enggai* (19c). Miller states: “The word *enggai* frequently occurs with either the emphatic particle *do'* ... or the particle *ko'* (possibly short for *engko'*)” (2007:341). An example with *do'* is shown in (19d). As noted above, most if not all of the Sama-Bajaw languages distinguish between nominal vs. non-nominal negation; but none of the Sama-Bajaw languages in the Philippines add a particle to their nominal negator. This seems to be unique to West Coast Bajau. I will suggest below that the use of *ko'* in this context is the result of language contact: the particle may be a borrowing from some neighboring Sabahan language; or it may be (as Miller suggests) a shortened form of *engko'* ‘with, and’, which has lost its lexical semantic content, and which is used in this context under the influence of similar patterns in neighboring languages.<sup>12</sup>

- (19) a. Gai nya' temban ta' bandar.  
 3pl NEG stay PREP city  
 ‘They don’t live in the city.’ [Miller 2007, ex. 12.37]
- b. Ruma' e nya' oyo.  
 house DEM NEG large  
 ‘The house is not large.’ [Miller 2007, ex. 6.70]

- c. Aku enggai anak=nu...  
 1sg NEG child=2sg.GEN  
 ‘I am not your child.’ [Miller 2007, ex. 6.112]
- d. Anak kerabaw e manusia’ enggai do’  
 child buffalo DEM human NEG EMPH  
 anak kerabaw.  
 child buffalo  
 ‘The offspring of the buffalo was human, not a baby  
 buffalo.’ [Miller 2007, ex. 12.42]

Miller also says: “[*Enggai*] is also used for negating an entire proposition, when there is an alternative proposition being asserted or implied” (2007:341). Some examples of *enggai* negating verbal clauses are presented in (20a-b). Notice that the particle *ko*’ occurs after *enggai* in both examples.

- (20) a. ...iyo nembet jomo, enggai ko’ jomo  
 ...3sg chase person NEG PRT person  
 nembet iyo.  
 chase 3sg  
 ‘It (the snake) chases people, rather than people chase it.’  
 [Miller 2007, ex. 12.43]
- b. Suap-suap tu nya’ ketentuan ruo=ni,  
 hut DET NEG certain shape=3sg.GEN  
 podo enggai ko’ tinungguan.  
 because NEG PRT looked.after  
 ‘The hut was dilapidated, for it was not looked after.’  
 [Miller 2007, ex. 14.92]

#### 4 THE FORMS OF THE NOMINAL NEGATOR

Blust (2009:467) notes “a strong historical tendency in the more westerly part of insular Southeast Asia to innovate nominal

negators from words meaning ‘other, different’.” For example, Blust notes that the Lampung nominal negator *lain* is clearly cognate with Malay *lain* ‘other, different’ (cf. also the Yakan nominal negator *d<um>a’in*). Similarly, Malay *bukan* appears to be a reflex of *\*beken* ‘other, different’.<sup>13</sup> Blust notes that the original meaning is continued in Kelabit *bəkən* ‘other, different’; Ngaju Dayak *beken* ‘different, be distinct from; another’. To this list we might add Tatana’ *bokon* ‘other’; Biatah Land Dayak *buuku<sup>d</sup>n* ‘other, different’.

Several of the Borneo languages discussed above have nominal negators which appear to be cognate with *bukan*, namely Dusunic and Paitanic *okon* (*ko*’), Mualang and Iban *ukay*, Selako *bukatn*, and perhaps Belait *kay*’. (Kimaragang Dusun, and a number of other Dusunic dialects, preserve the internal cognates *okon* (*ko*’) ‘nominal negator’ vs. *wokon* ‘other’.) At least three have nominal negators which appear to be cognate with Malay *lain*, namely: Bonggi *leidn ga*; Tatana’ *loin ko*; Sabah Bisaya *lain ka*<sup>14</sup>; and Bulungan *lain*. One of the nominal negators in Bookan Murut, *suai*, appears to be cognate with Dusunic *suai* ‘different’. The nominal negator in Timugon Murut (also used in Bookan), *sala*’, appears to be cognate with Malay *salah* ‘wrong’. These forms are summarized in Table 1.

Table 1: Forms of the nominal negator

ETYMOLOGICAL MEANING	NOMINAL NEGATOR
<i>*bəkən</i> ‘other, different’	Malay <i>bukan</i> Dusunic, Paitanic <i>okon</i> Mualang, Iban <i>ukay</i> Selako <i>bukatn</i> ?Tidung ( <i>k</i> ) <i>ong-ko</i> ?Belait, Kiput, Dali, Narom <i>kay</i> ’
Malay <i>lain</i> ‘other’	Bonggi <i>leidn</i> Tatana’ <i>loin</i> Sabah Bisaya <i>lain</i> Bulungan <i>lain</i>

Dusunic <i>suai</i> ‘different’	Bookan Murut <i>suai</i>
?Malay <i>salah</i> ‘wrong’	Murutic <i>sala</i> ’
unknown	West Coast Bajau <i>enggai</i> Tidung ( <i>k</i> ) <i>ongko/ingko</i> Tarakan Tidung <i>anda</i> <sup>15</sup>

The variety of attested nominal negator forms with similar historical meanings supports Blust’s view that these forms are not inherited (as negators) from PAN or PMP, but represent parallel innovations. The distribution of the specific forms involved also raises some interesting questions.

It is not surprising that all three of the Malayic Dayak languages considered here have nominal negator forms which are cognate with Malay *bukan*. These are presumably retentions from Proto-Malayic. In contrast, a wide variety of forms are attested within the Northeast Borneo subgroup. Every branch of the subgroup (Dusunic, Paitanic, Murutic, Bisayic, Tidung) exhibits the contrast between nominal vs. non-nominal negation. In fact, I do not know of a single language within the Northeast Borneo subgroup that lacks this contrast, although many of these languages remain undescribed or underdescribed. However, based on the attested forms listed above (*okon* in Dusunic and Paitanic; *sala*’ and *suai* in Murutic; *loin* in Tatana’ (Bisayic); *anda* in Tarakan Tidung) no single form can be reconstructed for Proto-Northeast Borneo. We have to conclude that these forms represent parallel innovations.<sup>16</sup> These innovations presumably developed sometime after the five branches of the Northeast Borneo subgroup separated from each other.

While no single form of the nominal negator can be reconstructed for Proto-Northeast Borneo, most of the languages within this subgroup share a partial similarity in this form, namely the particle *ko* ~ *ka*: Dusunic and Paitanic *okon ko*; Murutic *sala*’ *ka*; Tatana’ *loin ko*; Tidung *ongko/ingko*. Similar particles occur as part of the nominal negator in Sabah languages that are not part of

the Northeast Borneo subgroup: West Coast Bajau *enggai ko'*; Bonggi *leidn ga*; Begak-Ida'an *pon ka ~ pəŋka*.<sup>17</sup>

It also seems likely that Tutong *ke'ka* might come historically from *kay' + ka*, and perhaps synchronically as well. Adrian Clynes (p.c.) informs me that the Tutong negator *ke'* can also be used by itself, without the particle *ka*, with the same meaning as *ke'ka*. Moreover, if *ke'ka* were a single morpheme synchronically, it would have very unusual phonotactics – [e] does not normally occur in penultimate syllables, and the sequence [ʔk] does not otherwise occur medially.

The particle by itself has various meanings in different languages. Boutin (2011) identifies the Bonggi particle *ga* as a marker of contrastive focus. Goudswaard (2005) similarly labels the Begak particle *ka* as a focus marker, although she points out (p.c.) that it rarely if ever occurs in isolation, but only as part of complex forms such as *ngod ka* 'because', *sebop ka* 'because'; so defining it as 'focus' is only a plausible conjecture. One of the primary meanings of Dusunic *ko'* when used independently is 'or'; but as in Begak, it often occurs in complex forms (*irad ko'* 'like'; *insan ko'*, *yang ko'* 'even though'). When the particle occurs as part of the nominal negator in these languages, it does not appear to make any consistent, compositional contribution to the meaning of the form as a whole. For other languages (e.g. Timugon, Tatana', West Coast Bajau) the particle has no independent meaning and occurs only as part of the nominal negator.

The wide distribution of this particle as part of the nominal negator seems to contradict the claim that these forms were independent innovations. But, as we have already noted, the wide variety of lexical sources for the negator shows that the lexical roots involved cannot be retentions from a single common proto-form. I propose the following resolution of this paradox: the various forms of the lexical part of the nominal negator are indeed separate innovations, but they are not (fully) independent

innovations. I suggest that the idea for the innovation may have spread via contact, as kind of calque, from one language group to the next. Thus the development of such forms represents a kind of areal feature in northeastern Borneo. We will discuss the origins of the particle in section 5.

## 5 NOMINAL NEGATION AND MARKED FOCUS

The data presented in section 3 demonstrate the connection noted by Blust (2009:471) between nominal negation and contrastive or “emphatic” negation. I argued above that no special pragmatic factors are required to license the use of the nominal negator for negating nominal predicates. However, the use of the nominal negator in verbal clauses does seem to be pragmatically restricted in all languages for which we have sufficient information to make a judgement. Even in the case of nominal predicates there is a correlation between negation and marked pragmatic status, because equative and identificational clauses are most likely to be negated in contrastive contexts, e.g. to correct cases of mistaken identity (whether spoken or implied).

Contrastive negation frequently involves a narrow focus interpretation, e.g. ‘They did not ride on an airplane but rather came on a *tongkang*’ (12c); ‘He is not thin, he is fat’ (16c). Kroeger (to appear) demonstrates that *bukan* is strongly preferred over *tidak* in Malay verbal clauses when a narrow focus interpretation is intended; and the same is likely true for many of the languages discussed above. This pattern is part of a wider cross-linguistic tendency for special (i.e., non-verbal) negators to replace standard negation markers in narrow focus contexts. The typological research of Veselinova (to appear, sec. 4.2.3) provides empirical evidence of this tendency. Of the 95 languages in her sample, 30 have what she calls ASCRIPTIVE negators, forms that are used to negate nominal and/or adjectival predicates but not verbal or existential clauses.<sup>18</sup> She states that the ascriptive negator is frequently used in verbal clauses with special or marked focus

structure, and specifically with narrow constituent focus, which Veselinova refers to as “constituent negation”. Of the 30 languages in her sample which have ascriptive negators, the ascriptive negator is known to be used as the “constituent negator” in 11 of them.<sup>19</sup>

Eriksen (2005:77) states that in languages that have a special “constituent negation” particle (by which he means negation with narrow focus interpretation), this particle is often the only possible negator for nominal predicates. He cites Koromfe (Gur) and Kresh (Nilo-Saharan) as specific African examples, but does not provide any statistical evidence regarding the strength of this tendency.

Eriksen’s comments suggest a second pathway by which nominal negators may develop. We have already mentioned the Western Malayo-Polynesian pattern described by Blust (2009:467), involving the semantic bleaching of words meaning ‘other, different’. It may also be possible for nominal negators to develop from markers of contrastive negation, by conventionalizing the pragmatic tendency noted above for the negation of equative and identificational clauses to be contrastive in nature.

The etymology of the nominal negator in Begak, *pon ka ~ pəŋka*, suggests that it may have developed in this second way. In contrast to most of the other languages we have discussed, the lexical source for this form is not a word meaning ‘other’ or ‘different’ or ‘wrong’. Rather, *pon* is an alternate form of the standard negator *apon*. Suppose that, at an earlier stage of the language, the particle *ka* in Begak functioned as a focus marker. The combination of standard negation plus focus particle could very plausibly have been a marker of contrastive or narrow-focus negation. Alternatively, this combination might originally have functioned compositionally to indicate “polarity focus”, i.e. focus on the negative polarity itself, and subsequently have become

lexicalized to cover contrastive and/or narrow-focus negation as well.

If this conjecture is on the right track, then it seems quite possible that an earlier form of Ida'an-Begak might have been the original source (or “donor language”) for the particle as part of the nominal negator in other Sabahan languages, including West Coast Bajau and the Northeast Borneo group.<sup>20</sup> The particle spread via borrowing, in the context of the semantic bleaching of words meaning ‘other’ or ‘different’ for use as nominal negators.

## 6 STRUCTURAL ISSUES

In most of the world’s languages, clausal negation is marked on the verb or verb phrase, whether by an affix on the verb, a negative auxiliary, or a particle associated with the VP (Dahl 1979, 2010; Payne 1985). Squamish (Dahl 1979:81) and Tongan (Payne 1985:208–9) are frequently-cited exceptions to this generalization. In both of these languages, standard negation actually involves a biclausal structure in which a negative matrix verb takes the negated clause as its complement. But this pattern is unusual, at least for standard negation.<sup>21</sup>

Kroeger (to appear) argues that the contrast between *tidak* vs. *bukan* in Malay verbal clauses lexicalizes a distinction between sentence vs. predicate negation. A variety of syntactic evidence indicates that *tidak* functions as part of the auxiliary system while *bukan* (in verbal clauses) is a sentence operator.

For most of the Borneo languages discussed here, there is not enough information available to address this issue; but in Kimaragang Dusun there is evidence indicating a structural contrast similar to that found in Malay. As noted above, the Kimaragang nominal negator, *okon*, can occur in verbal clauses in pragmatically marked contexts. When this happens, *okon* seems to function as a matrix predicate which takes a clausal argument,

much like the Squamish and Tongan negators mentioned above. The standard negator *amu'*, in contrast, occupies a clause-internal position immediately before the predicate.

One piece of evidence supporting this analysis comes from the distribution of second-position clitics. In clauses negated by the standard negator *amu'* there is only one position where second-position clitics may occur, namely immediately before the negated predicate. This is illustrated in exx. (4a-b), repeated here as (21a-b); the clitics are italicized. In verbal clauses negated by *okon*, however, second-position clitics occur after the negated verb as seen in (5a), repeated here as (22). This shows that the negator *okon* is structurally outside of the clause which is being negated.<sup>22</sup>

- (21) a. *Amu' oku po mangakan...*  
 NEG 1sg.NOM ASP AV.eat  
 'I will not eat yet (because I ate just now, after all).'
- b. *Amu' no mari opeet ino doruk ong*  
 NEG ASP PRCL bitter that bamboo.shoot if  
*arabus no.*  
 boiled ASP  
 'The bamboo shoot is no longer bitter, once it is boiled.'
- (22) *Doo maantad do manuk ilo', okon.ko'*  
 3sg originally LNK chicken that NEG  
*binoli yo po.*  
 buy.PAST.OV 3sg PRCL  
 'That was his chicken in the first place, he didn't buy it!'

Additional support for this analysis comes from the fact that when *amu'* and *okon* co-occur, i.e. in double negation, *okon* always occurs first, as illustrated in (23). This fact is predicted if *okon* is the matrix predicate while *amu'* is part of the complement clause. The same restriction is found in Malay when *bukan* co-occurs with *tidak*.

- (23) Okon.ko' amu matay o tulun.  
 NEG NEG die NOM.INDEF person  
 'It is not as if people do not die.'

## 7 CONCLUSION

As mentioned in section 1, I believe that a distinction between nominal vs. non-nominal negation is typologically somewhat unusual; a distinction between verbal vs. non-verbal negation seems to be more common. However, if a particular language makes a choice between two forms based on the category of the predicate, it is apparently fairly common for the non-verbal negation marker to negate verbal clauses in pragmatically marked contexts. Horn (1989:451–2) describes a “recurring morphosyntactic split between one negation employed for straightforward negative predications... and another employed for negating identity statements or non-verbal constituents...” He notes that in such cases, the form used in nonverbal or identificational clauses is, not infrequently, also used for contrastive and/or metalinguistic negation (Horn 1989:446).

I have suggested that focus played a key role in the development of the nominal negators in northern Borneo. This is consistent with the tendency noted by Veselinova for non-verbal negators to be used in marked focus contexts, which in turn can be seen as a sub-type of the pattern described by Horn, since contrastive and metalinguistic negation often involve narrow focus.

The lexical source of the nominal negators in most languages of northeastern Borneo, which developed through the semantic bleaching of words meaning ‘other’ or ‘different’, is not uncommon in Western Malayo-Polynesian (Blust 2009). What is remarkable is the relatively high number of separate innovations that seem to have taken place in northeastern Borneo to create nominal negators. It seems very unlikely that so many cases of the same basic process could have taken place independently within

such a small area. The pattern must have spread by contact in some way, but exactly how it may have progressed remains to be investigated.

## 8 REFERENCES

Adelaar, K. Alexander

2005 *Salako or Badameà, sketch grammar, texts and lexicon of a Kanayatn dialect in West Borneo*. Frankfurter Forschungen zu Südostasien 2. Berlin: Harrasowitz Verlag.

M. Asfandi Adul, Syukrani Maswan and A. Yazidi

1990 *Morfologi dan Sintaksis Bahasa Bulungan*. Jakarta: Pusat Pembinaan dan Pengembangan Bahasa.

Asmah Hj. Omar

1981 *The Iban language of Sarawak: a grammatical description*. Kuala Lumpur: Dewan Bahasa dan Pustaka.

1982 *Nahu Melayu mutakhir, edisi kedua* (Modern Malay grammar, 2<sup>nd</sup> edition). Kuala Lumpur: Dewan Bahasa dan Pustaka.

Beech, M.W.H.

1908 *The Tidong dialects of Borneo*. Oxford, At the Clarendon Press. <http://www.archive.org/details/tidongdialectsb00fokkgoog>

Blust, Robert

2009 *The Austronesian languages*. Pacific Linguistics 602. Canberra: Australian National University.

2010 The greater North Borneo hypothesis. *Oceanic Linguistics* 49,1: 44–118.

Boutin, Michael

(in press) Negation in Bonggi. Paper presented at the 10th conference of the Borneo Research Council.

- Brainard, Sherri, and Dietlinde Behrens  
 2002 *A grammar of Yakan*. Linguistic Society of the Philippines Special monograph no. 40, v. 1. Manila: Linguistic Society of the Philippines.
- Brewis, Kielo A.  
 1988 *Learn to Speak Timugon Murut: a series of 25 language lessons*. Sabah Museum and State Archives, Series C no. 1.
- Brewis, Richard, Philippa Silipah Majius and Kielo A. Brewis, eds.  
 2004 *Kamus Murut Timugon–Melayu: dengan ikhtisar etnografi* (Timugon Murut – Malay dictionary: with ethnographic sketch). Kota Kinabalu: Kadazandusun Language Foundation.
- Chan, Phyllis D. and Inka Pekkanen  
 1989 *Learn to speak Tatana'. A series of twenty-five language learning lessons*. Sabah Museum series C, 3. Kota Kinabalu: Sabah Museum and State Archives.
- Clynes, Adrian  
 2005 Belait. In Sander Adelaar & Nikolaus Himmelmann, eds., *The Austronesian Languages of Asia and Madagascar*. London & New York: Routledge, pp. 429–455.
- Dahl, Östen  
 1979 Typology of sentence negation. *Linguistics* 17: 79–106.  
 2010 Typology of negation. In *The Expression of Negation*, ed. by Laurence R. Horn. Berlin: De Gruyter Mouton, pp. 9–38.
- Doi, Akira and Keiko Doi  
 2003 *Learn to speak Bookan Murut: a series of twenty-five language learning lessons*. Sabah Museum Series C, 5. Kota Kinabalu: Department of Sabah Museum.
- Eriksen, Pål Kristian  
 2005 On the Typology and the Semantics of Non-verbal Predication. Ph.D. dissertation, Faculty of the Humanities, University of Oslo.

Forsberg, Vivian M.

1992 *A pedagogical grammar of Tboli*. Studies in Philippine linguistics, vol. 9, no.1. Manila: Linguistic Society of the Philippines and the Summer Institute of Linguistics.

Goudswaard, Nelleke

2005 *The Begak (Ida'an) language of Sabah*. Utrecht: LOT: Netherlands Graduate School of Linguistics.

Horn, Laurence R.

1985 Metalinguistic negation and pragmatic ambiguity. *Language* 61,1: 121–174.

1989 *A Natural History of Negation*. Chicago: University Of Chicago Press.

King, Julie K. and John Wayne King, eds.

1984 *Languages of Sabah: A survey report*. (Pacific Linguistics, Series C, No. 78). Canberra: Australian National University.

King, John Wayne and Julie K. King, compilers

1985 *Sungai language lessons*. Kota Kinabalu: Institut Linguistik SIL and Kementerian Kebudayaan, Belia dan Sukan.

Kroeger, Paul

(to appear) External negation and narrow focus in Malay/ Indonesian.

McFarland, Curtis D.

1977 *Northern Philippine linguistic geography*. Tokyo: Institute for the Study of Languages and Cultures of Asia and Africa.

Miller, Mark

2007 *A grammar of West Coast Bajau*. Ph.D. dissertation, The University of Texas at Arlington.

Payne, John R.

1985 Negation. In Timothy Shopen (Ed.), *Language typology and syntactic description: Grammatical categories and the lexicon, vol. 3: Clause structure*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, pp. 197–242.

Pekkanen, Inka

1984 Verb tense/aspect in Tatana discourse. In Fe T. Otnes and Austin Hale (series eds.), *Aspects of discourse I*. Studies in Philippine Linguistics 5:1, pp. 3–18.

[http://www.sil.org/asia/philippines/sipl/SIPL\\_5-1\\_003-018.pdf](http://www.sil.org/asia/philippines/sipl/SIPL_5-1_003-018.pdf)

(Haji) Ramlee Tunggal

2005 *Struktur Bahasa Tutong*. Bandar Seri Begawan: Dewan Bahasa dan Pustaka Brunei.

Reid, Lawrence A.

1976 *Bontok-English dictionary*. Pacific Linguistics, Series C. Canberra: Research School of Pacific Studies, Australian National University.

Sneddon, James

1996 *Indonesian reference grammar*. London & New York: Routledge; and St. Leonards NSW: Allen & Unwin.

Spitzack, John A.

1988 Kalabuan clauses. In Charles Peck (ed.), *Borneo language studies 1: Sabah syntax papers*. Language Data, Asian-Pacific Series, 14. Dallas: Summer Institute of Linguistics, pp. 100–48.

Tjia, Johnny

2007 *A Grammar of Mualang: An Ibanic Language of Western Kalimantan, Indonesia*. Leiden: LOT (Netherlands Graduate School of Linguistics).

Veselinova, Ljuba

(to appear) Typology of non-standard negators in simple indicative sentences. unpublished ms., Stockholm University.

Wurm, Stephen A., compiler

1983 Map 41: Northern part of Borneo. In *Language atlas of the Pacific area*, ed. by S. A. Wurm and Shiro Hattori. (Pacific Linguistics, Series C, No. 67). Canberra: The Australian Academy of the Humanities in collaboration with the Japan Academy.

## 9 ENDNOTES

---

<sup>1</sup> I would like to thank the following people for helpful comments on an earlier draft of this paper: Robert Blust, Juergen Burkhardt, Adrian Clynes, Nelleke Goudswaard Johansson, Jason Lobel, and Mark Miller.

<sup>2</sup> The clearest examples of metalinguistic negation are cases where what is being negated is not the literal propositional content of the statement, but rather the adequacy or appropriateness of the manner in which that content is expressed; e.g. *I'm not hungry, I'm starving*.

<sup>3</sup> Veselinova (to appear), which describes the results of a typological study of non-standard negation, is a serious attempt to address the gap noted by Dahl.

<sup>4</sup> This may also be true for the Malayic family as a whole; I have not tried to investigate the frequency of occurrence in Malayic languages beyond Malayic Dayak.

<sup>5</sup> Unfortunately, explicit statements on this issue are not available for all the languages under consideration here.

<sup>6</sup> The Malay translation provided for this sentence by R. Brewis et al. is a cleft, suggesting focus on the actor-subject; but the structure of the Murut does not appear to be a cleft.

<sup>7</sup> The English translation provided for this sentence by Doi & Doi does not indicate focus, but it is provided as a possible answer to the question 'Were you the one that made the ladder...?'

<sup>8</sup> Wurm (1983) classifies Tatana' as belonging to the "Bisayan" subgroup, together with (Sabah and Brunei varieties of) Bisaya. I use the term "Bisayic" for this subgroup, to avoid confusion with

---

the Bisayan languages of the Philippines. Jason Lobel (p.c.), in his new innovation-based subgrouping, classifies Tatana' quite differently, as being coordinate with Murutic and Papar in a "Greater Murutic" subgroup, with Bisaya and Lotud forming a separate subgroup. This may well turn out to be the correct classification.

<sup>9</sup> Notice that the Sembakung form is quite similar to the form reported by Beech for Tarakan.

<sup>10</sup> Very similar forms for the nominal and non-nominal negators occur in two Lower Baram languages of Sarawak, Kiput and Dali (Juergen Burkhardt, p.c.). Asmah (1983:644) lists *kai'* as the nominal negator for another Lower Baram language, Narom.

<sup>11</sup> Some speakers find a subtle difference in meaning between these two forms in certain contexts, but that difference is not relevant to our current discussion.

<sup>12</sup> Mark Miller (p.c.) informs me, "I did find one example in my corpus where the nominal negator is *enggai engko'* rather than *enggai ko'*, which would argue in favor of *ko'* being a shortened form of *engko'*. But this is the only such example in my corpus of texts."

<sup>13</sup> "*\*beken* can't be assigned to PAN, but only to what for lack of a better term I am calling 'Proto-Western Malayo-Polynesian', with known reflexes from Yami through the Cordilleran languages of Luzon to Hanunoo, the Bisayan languages, Aborlan Tagbanwa, Tiruray, Tausug, and various languages of Borneo, including Sabah, Sarawak and the Barito basin of SE Kalimantan." (Bob Blust, p.c.)

<sup>14</sup> Jason Lobel (p.c.).

<sup>15</sup> Perhaps cognate with the Iban standard negation marker *ənda'*; cf. also the standard negation markers in Tutong (*endo*) and Belait (*ndeh*) (Adrian Clynes, p.c.).

<sup>16</sup> Of course *okon* could turn out to be a retention from Proto-Dusun-Paitanic, if it turns out that there is other evidence supporting such a subgroup.

---

<sup>17</sup> Blust (2010) classifies Bonggi and Ida'an as members of a Northeast Sabah subgroup, and suggests that they are remnant populations which were pushed aside by the expansion of Dusunic and Sama-Bajaw populations.

<sup>18</sup> An additional 9 languages have a non-standard negator that can be used in both ascriptive and existential sentences, and perhaps some other constructions.

<sup>19</sup> I interpret her to mean that she has explicit information on this point for 11 languages; there may be other such cases for which the relevant information is not provided in her sources.

<sup>20</sup> Bonggi seems to have used a native particle, *ga*, perhaps patterned after the wide-spread use of *ka* ~ *ko* in neighboring languages. West Coast Bajau uses a native particle, *do'*, in alternation with the (possibly borrowed) particle *ko'*. In both cases the native particle is independently used to mark focus or emphasis.

<sup>21</sup> Horn (1989:460–62) comments at length on the rarity of “true sentential external negation” in natural language.

<sup>22</sup> When *okon* is used in negative imperatives, it is also possible for second-position clitics to occur in the matrix clause, immediately after *okon*. It is even possible for 2P clitics to occur in both clauses at once. When *okon* is used to negate a nominal predicate, however, there is no evidence of an internal clause boundary.