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1 NOMINAL VS. NON-NOMINAL NEGATION

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). 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.” 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 \( ko \sim ka \). 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,\(^4\) 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. 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]

    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 *ǝnda’* (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 ǝnda’ datay?
   why 3sg NEG come
   ‘Why didn’t he come?’ [Asmah 1981:278]

   b. ǝnda’ bǝsay
      NEG big
      ‘is not big’ [Asmah 1981:159]

   c. Kitay to’ ukay/*ǝnda’ urang kampar dito’.
      we this NEG person outside here
      ‘We are not foreigners here.’ [Asmah 1981:222]

   d. Ukay ngǝna’ ǝntukar tang ngǝna’ 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 PRTCL 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 PRTCL
   ‘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.ENG
   ‘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.ENG 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.’ [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 PRTCL yg.brother 2sg.GEN
   ‘Isn’t he your little brother?’ [K. Brewis 1988:10]
d. Sala’ kia ka mambasikal kou?
   NEG Q PRTCL 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**
   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.’ [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).** 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
c. Do mula ih, maso ulun Kina it rumikot do pomogun nan takau, 

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

\[
\text{loin ko sumakoi do kapal.tarabang tapi} \quad \text{NEG PRTCL ride.on ACC airplane but}
\]

\[
\text{maya do Tongkang, used ACC tongkang}
\]

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

\[
\text{kapal gayo mamakai do layag.}
\]

‘a big ship that used a sail.’

[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: \textit{nupa} ‘tidak’ vs. \textit{anda} ‘bukan’; and for Bulungan: \textit{kila} ‘tidak’ vs. \textit{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, contrastive]
‘He did not eat, but he drank.’

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*.

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*. 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 sIaluh anIja(d)cau na’ od;
      NEG oneIday 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 [ˈleiŋ 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. 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 pongka 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. kǝmo bugol rumo, pon.ka kǝssu ino mǝgkot!
      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 *pǝngka*.

(18) *aku pǝngka pon atow muli, aku atow, …*

\[ \begin{array}{ll}
1sg & \text{NEG} \\
\text{know} & \text{return} \hspace{1cm} 1sg \hspace{0.5cm} \text{know} \\
\end{array} \]

‘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.\(^\text{12}\)

(19) a. *Gai nya’ temban ta’ bandar.*

\[ \begin{array}{ll}
3pl & \text{NEG} \\
\text{stay} & \text{PREP} \hspace{1cm} \text{city} \\
\end{array} \]

‘They don’t live in the city.’ [Miller 2007, ex. 12.37]

b. *Ruma’ e nya’ oyo.*

\[ \begin{array}{ll}
\text{house} & \text{DEM} \\
\text{NEG} & \text{large} \\
\end{array} \]

‘The house is not large.’ [Miller 2007, ex. 6.70]
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<a’in >). Similarly, Malay *bukan appears to be a reflex of *beken ‘other, different’. Blust notes that the
original meaning is continued in Kelabit bǝkǝn ‘other, different’;
Ngaju Dayak beken ‘different, be distinct from; another’. To this
list we might add Tatana’ bokon ‘other’; Biatah Land Dayak
bukw’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; 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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ETYMOLOGICAL MEANING</th>
<th>NOMINAL NEGATOR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>*bǝkǝn ‘other, different’</td>
<td>Malay *bukan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dusunic, Paitanic okon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mualang, Iban ukay</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Selako bukatn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>?Tidung (k)ong-ko</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>?Belait, Kiput, Dali, Narom kay’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malay *lain ‘other’</td>
<td>Bonggi *leidn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tatana’ *loin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sabah Bisaya *lain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bulungan *lain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dusunic suai ‘different’</td>
<td>Bookan Murut suai</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>?Malay salah ‘wrong’</td>
<td>Murutic sala’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>unknown</td>
<td>West Coast Bajau enggai</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tidung (jongko/ingko</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tarakan Tidung anda</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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. 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-Id’a’an *pon ka ~ pongka.*

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. 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.19

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 ~ pǝngka, 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. 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.

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.\textsuperscript{22}

(21) a. Amu’ *oku po mangakan…
   \text{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
   \text{NEG ASP PRTCL bitter that bamboo.shoot if}
   \text{arabus no. boiled ASP}
   ‘The bamboo shoot is no longer bitter, once it is boiled.’

(22) Doo maantad do manuk ilo’, okon.ko’
   \text{3sg originally LNK chicken that NEG}
   \text{binoli yo po. buy.PAST.OV 3sg PRTCL}
   ‘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.
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9 ENDNOTES

1 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.

2 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*.

3 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.

4 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.

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

6 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.

7 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…?’

8 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.

Notice that the Sembakung form is quite similar to the form reported by Beech for Tarakan.

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.

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.

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.”

*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.)

Perhaps cognate with the Iban standard negation marker anda’; cf. also the standard negation markers in Tutong (endo) and Belait (ndehe) (Adrian Clynes, p.c.).

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.
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.

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

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.

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.


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.