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0. Introduction. In this study I wish to present the main features of some Jeh clause connectives. In doing so, it is assumed that some sort of semantic characterization describes the underlying unity which may be expressed by more than one syntactic form. Recent semantically oriented efforts in linguistics have made effective use of notions from predicate calculus to symbolize semantic structure. Following that general approach, interclausal relations in Jeh are viewed as 'predicates' and the clauses they connect as 'arguments' or 'terms' (in the logical sense of these designations). Against this background specific aspects of the syntactic encoding of these relations in Jeh are described informally.
1. Conjunction. The semantic structure underlying interclausal CONJUNCTION may be diagrammed as follows:

\[ \text{Proposition} \]
\[ \text{Predicate} \quad \text{Argument} \quad \text{Argument} \]
\[ \text{CONJUNCTION} \]
\[ _{bu_1}, \quad \emptyset \quad \text{'and'} \]
\[ \text{Clause}^4 \quad \text{Clause} \]

Sentences (1)-(4) below are examples of Jeh CONJUNCTION in its ultimate surface realization:

1. A-Wī bu$_1$ A-Tinh bloh choō David and Tinh past return
   'David and Tinh have come home.'

2. A-Wī bloh choō bu$_1$ A-Tinh bloh choō David past return and Tinh past return
   'David has come home and Tinh has come home.'

3. Chök 'bök Kuan bu$_2$ tèl wal dôh tôdrong but hon(orific) district then answer say give matter
   'nhai-nhuai bloh tūm nî, bu$_1$ sang kl ên 'bök this and that past every all and after this he hon.
   Kuan bu$_2$ wal êih bloh dôh gu 'bök thay district then say himself past give pl(ural) hon. teacher
   pògang bloh châu chök long āy. medicine past go get up there recently
   'The District Chief then answered saying all he had to say about the matter, and after this, he, the District Chief, then said he himself had just sent the medics to go up and get her.'

4. Ên kât nah hau, au kât nah mou.
   he lie side there I lie side here
   'He dropped over there, I dropped over here (during an ambush).'

Notice first that sentence (1) constitutes an example of Jeh phrasal conjunction, in which the two names A-Wī and A-Tinh are conjoined by bu$_1$. While the question of how best to explain phrasal conjunction has been debated in linguistic literature, one very plausible approach is to derive (1) from a conjunction of two clauses as in (2). That is, in (2) by deleting the material bloh choō from clause$_1$, since it is identical with that in clause$_2$, one obtains exactly sentence (1). Assuming this analysis, one may say that bu$_1$ expresses the notion of CONJUNCTION in a fairly straightforward way. The association of phrasal and sentence conjunction through the use of the form bu$_1$ placed syntactically directly between the two conjoined constituents.
is helpful, because there occurs another homophonous form which I have numbered $bu_2$ which has different syntactic and semantic char-
acteristics and must therefore be kept distinct. Sentence (3) pro-
vides examples of both $bu_1$ CONJUNCTION and $bu_2$ SEQUENCE (dis-
cussed further in section 2). Sentence (4) reflects the fact that CON-
JUNCTION may be signalled syntactically by simple juxtaposition of
the two conjoined clauses with no overt linking morpheme present
(i.e. $\emptyset$, or asyndeton in classical grammar). In fact, statistically
$\emptyset$ is a far more frequent manifestation of CONJUNCTION than is $bu_1$.

2. Sequence. The logical basis for the interclausal relation SE-
QUENCE is diagrammed as:

```
                 Prop
              /   \   /
             /     \ /  
            Pred   Arg   Arg
               |      |    |
               |      |    |
               SEQUENCE
              /   \   /   
             /     \ /     
            bu_2, $\emptyset$ 'then'
```

Sentences (5)–(8) below manifest Jeh SEQUENCE:

(5) Y-Chei sak kótão wâh Yâ bu_2 Y-Chei skin sugar cane share Gr(andma) eat Gr then
tôsip jip cha kótão Y-Chei sak dôh. break suck eat sugar cane Y-Chei skin give

'Y-Chei skinned sugar cane to share with Grandma; Grandma then broke, sucked and ate the sugar cane Y-Chei had skinned for her.'

(6) Yuan sang tâp hop, bu_2 potou dôh nhlàh kât. we past meet then show give house sleep

'We'll finish meeting, then show you where to sleep.'

(7) Baâ tônoh dôh bålên tôdörong i bloh sang (ên) Father explain give them matter this past finish (he)
        bu_2 choô kât. then go home sleep

'Father finished explaining to them about this matter then went home to sleep.'

(8) Chau chût reng 'ya mih tang bû, choô Grandchild goes search tobacco at place corn returns
      wâh Yâ. share Gr
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'Grandchild goes and searches for tobacco in the cornfield, (then) returns to share with Grandma.'

SEQUENCE is manifested by the form bu₂ 'then' (homophonous with bu₁ CONJUNCTION described in section 4). Semantically SEQUENCE relates temporally ordered events. Syntactically, note that bu₂ occurs not between two clauses as does bu₁ but rather as in sentence (5) directly following the subject of the second clause, i.e. following Yā. In sentence (6) bu₂ occurs directly between the two clauses, but this is because the subject of Clause₂ has been deleted. Sentence (7) shows that if an optionally deleted subject (e.g. ēn) needs to be clarified, the Jeh speaker introduces it preceding bu₂. Example (8) illustrates simple juxtaposition of Clause₁ and Clause₂, i.e. bu₂ is replaced by Ø morphemic marking.

DISJUNCTION in Jeh may be described in terms of the following structure:

```
Prop
   |     |     |
Pred | Arg | Arg |
   |     |     |
DISJUNCTION   Prop₁ (Alternative) Prop₂ (Alternative)
   |     |     |
a 'or' Ø...duh 'or...also' Clause Clause
```

Sentences (9)-(13) below exemplify DISJUNCTION in Jeh:

(9) Mi chú pojou a dei chú pojou?
you go market or not go market

'Are you going to the market or not going to the market?'

(10) Mi chú pojou a dei?
you go market or not

'Are you going to the market or not?'

(11) Ėn chú pojou a Ėn chú học heh?
he go market or he go study huh

'Is he going to the market or is he going to study?'

(12) Mi chú jbing a tōk se?
you go foot or ride car

'Are you going on foot or by car?'

(13) Au chú jbing, (au) tōk se duh 'lou.
I go foot I ride car also can

'I can go on foot, or I can also go by car.'
DISJUNCTION in Jeh is expressed by the form a 'or' positioned following Clause$_1$ and preceding Clause$_2$. The only constraint on the order of propositions is that a negative proposition must appear as Clause$_2$ as in sentence (9). Notice that the normal elliptical version of (9) is (10), in which repetitious material has been deleted from Clause$_2$ leaving behind only dei 'negative'. The elliptical form (10) occurs more often than the full form (9). Sentence (11) reflects that not only negative-positive alternatives, but also two positive propositions may be related by DISJUNCTION. Sentence (12) reflects that a 'or' appears in questions, but (13) shows that in statements DISJUNCTION has Ø interclausal link and a Clause$_2$ preverbal duh 'also' as its manifesting form.

4. **Condition.** CONDITION in Jeh is diagrammed as follows:

```
   Prop
   |   |
  Pred  Arg  Arg
   |   |   |
CONDITION Prop$_1$ Prop$_2$
   |   |   |
 tau  'if' (Protasis) (Apodosis)
   |   |   |
Clause$_1$ Clause$_2$
```

Sentences (14) and (15) below illustrate Jeh CONDITION

(14) Tau ka dei liam, ēn dei wā cha.
    if fish not good she not want eat
    'If the fish is not good, she doesn't want to eat it.'

(15) Tau Baā dei chlu səsoō dei, doh Boō duh tōloō ka tī.
    if Father not go look to find later Grandfather
    also burn on hand
    'If Father had not gone to find it, later Grandfather also
    would have gotten burned on his hand.'

(16) *Mi kau au, tau mi tau 'mriah.
    you call me if you see rain
    'You call me, if you see it raining.'

The semantic relation CONDITION is manifested as tau 'if'. The proposition which states the conditioning factor, that is the traditional 'protasis', occurs only as Clause$_1$ followed by the conditioned proposition, or 'apodosis', as Clause$_2$. Tau 'if' is attached directly before Clause$_1$. Sentences (14) and (15) then are grammatical, but (16) is ungrammatical in Jeh.

5. **Purpose.** The diagram following describes PURPOSE in Jeh:
Sentences (17)–(20) below are examples of Jeh PURPOSE:

(17) Au dōh mi lian la ruat dōh au phei.
I give you money in order to buy give me rice
'I'll give you money to buy rice for me.'

(18) Baā chîu reng koh rojēl la lon
Father go search chop bamboo in order to sharpen
pī amal.
make punji
'Father is going out to chop bamboo in order to sharpen it
for a punji stick.'

(19) Au dōh mi lian (au) wā mi ruat dōh au phei.
I give you money I want you buy give me rice
'I'll give you money I want (in order for) you to buy me rice.'

(20) Au dōh mi lian chîu ruat dōh au phei.
I give you money go buy give me rice
'I'll give you money to go buy rice for me.'

PURPOSE is commonly expressed in Jeh by positioning the form la 'in order to' between Clause₁ which manifests a 'Means' proposition and Clause₂ which manifests an 'End' proposition, e.g. sentences (17) and (18). There is also another PURPOSE construction as in (19), in which the subject in Clause₁ is identical with the subject of a verb wā 'want' which commands Clause₂. While the full construction including the parenthesized subject' au 'I' (sentence (17)) is possible in Jeh, it rarely occurs. Rather wā stands between Clause₁ and Clause₂ and constitutes the real surface signal for PURPOSE. In fact, wā in this sense and wā literally meaning 'want', seem to have become distinct because of this construction. Sentence (20) shows that PURPOSE may be expressed with no overt morpheme marker (i.e. Ø).

6. Concession. The semantic structure typifying interclausal CON-CESSION is diagrammed as follows:
Sentences (21)–(23) exemplify CONCESSION in Jeh:

(21) Daā au dei 'nhoh, ēn duh khōm au chīu.  
'Even though I don't want to, he still forces me to go.'

(22) ēn duh khōm au chīu ih lōk, daā au dei 'nhoh.  
'He still really forces me to go, even though I don't want to.'

(23) Y-'Lay dei wa tīh wa, ēn bloh rõgày tan mok.  
'(Even though) Y-'Lay isn't big yet, she is already skillful at weaving blankets.'

The concessive notion is regularly expressed by daā 'even though' which attaches immediately before Clause₁ when it manifests the protasis, as in sentence (21). Note, however, that the protasis may, though less frequently, appear as Clause₂. In case CONCESSION receives no overt marker (∅), the protasis occurs as Clause₁ as in (23).

7. Amplification. The structure of interclausal AMPLIFICATION in Jeh may be diagrammed as follows:

Sentences (24)–(26) below exemplify Jeh AMPLIFICATION

(24) Y-Chēi dei kōyau, ēn bā wah Yā 'long.  
Y-Chēi not selfish she carry share Grandma wood

'Y-Chēi is not selfish, she carries wood to share with Grandma.'
(25) Dôk ēn duh rdmaā jei, dei ei pol la cha. monkey he also hard up very not any cooked rice to eat 'The monkey he is also very hard up, (he) hasn't any cooked rice to eat.'

(26) Dei ei a ai wah Yā 'ya, au Yā arah not any who share Grandma tobacco I Grandma neglected jei. very 'There is no one sharing tobacco with Grandma, I Grandma am very neglected.'

Semantically AMPLIFICATION relates a proposition that makes a general statement with one that adds specific detail to the theme. Syntaxically no overt morpheme (Ø) marks the relation and the generalizing Prop₁ may occur either as Clause₁ as in (24) and (25) or it may appear as Clause₂ as in (26).

8. Adversion. Interclausal ADVERSION in Jeh is diagrammed as follows:

\[\text{Prop} \leftarrow \text{Pred} \downarrow \text{ADVERSION} \quad | \quad \text{Arg} \leftarrow \text{Prop₁} \quad | \quad \text{Arg} \leftarrow \text{Prop₂} \]

\[\text{chōk, } \text{Ø} \quad \text{'but'} \quad \text{(Thesis)} \quad \downarrow \quad \text{Clause₁} \quad \text{(Antithesis)} \quad \downarrow \quad \text{Clause₂}\]

Sentences (27)-(32) exemplify ADVERSION in Jeh:

(27) Ėn pī nhlah chōk gù phi ēn bu chuh pōroō lōi. he make house but those enemy his then fired burn up 'He built a house, but his enemies then burned it up.'

(28) Baā jėng 'yaā mēe chlu leng play chōk nhlah Father therefore took older go pick fruit but house toō lay roō. further keeps burn 'Father therefore carried brother to go pick fruit, but the house kept on burning.'

(29) Ėn ruat ca chōk ca bu om. he buy fish but fish then spoiled 'He bought fish, but the fish then spoiled.'
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(30) Ėn pit bli chök 'wăn bu tung lòi. she plant corn but someone then steal all
'She planted corn but someone then stole it all.'

(31) Boō jah kip, ēn dei jah kônei. Grandfather get turtle he not get rat
'Grandfather got a turtle, (but) he didn't get a rat.'

(32) Au pî nhläh, au dei jah 'way. I make house I not get live
'I built a house, (but) I didn't get to live in it.'

ADVERSION is explicitly signalled by the form chök 'but', which is positioned syntactically between Clause₁ and Clause₂. Prop₁ as 'Thesis' is invariably encoded as Clause₁ while Prop₂ 'Antithesis' is always Clause₂. With this overt marker chök the antithesis always introduces a change of subject along with contrastive material, i.e. a dramatic or undesirable turn of events, or a situation contrary to expectation, sentences (27)-(30). Notice that in sentences (31) and (32) simple juxtaposition of Clause₁ and Clause₂ expresses the adversative sense; when the subject of Clause₁ and Clause₂ is the same, Ø interclausal link is obligatory.

9. Reason. The following diagram typifies Jeh REASON:

```
Prop

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pred</th>
<th>Arg</th>
<th>Arg</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>REASON</td>
<td>Prop₁</td>
<td>Prop₂</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(Basis)</td>
<td>(Consequence)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>yol, jëng 'because, therefore'</td>
<td>Clause</td>
<td>Clause</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
```

Sentences (33)-(38) below are examples of REASON in Jeh:

(33) Yol au jíf, au jëng châu nhläh pògang. because I sick I therefore go house medicine
'Because I am sick, I am therefore going to the hospital.'

(34) Au châu nhläh pògang yol au jíf I go house medicine because I sick
'I'm going to the hospital because I am sick.'

(35) A-Thao Ėn bloh châu mih 'long gri, Ėn jëng tau A-Thao he past go to tree banyan he therefore see plâk jöh. bird peck
'A-Thao he went to the banyan tree, he therefore saw the birds pecking.'

(36) Yol A-Thao bloh chiu mih 'long gri, ēn jēng because A-Thao past go to tree banyan he therefore tau plāk jōh. see bird peck

'Because A-Thao went past the banyan tree, he therefore saw the birds pecking.'

(37) Ēn ruat ka yol ka bu om. he buy fish because fish then spoiled

'He bought fish, but the fish then spoiled.'

(38) Au wā ruat hmān yol au dei lian. I want buy clothes because I not money

'I want to buy clothes but I don't have money.'

The predicate REASON establishes an explanatory connection between events and the logical or practical basis for them. Syntactically, when Prop₁ (Basis) appears as Clause₁ and Prop₂ (Consequence) appears as Clause₂, the former is preceded by yol 'because' and the latter contains jēng 'therefore' as in sentence (33). If the order is reversed, however, as in (34), notice that while yol permutes with Prop₁ (Basis) to a Clause₂ position, jēng can never be fronted to a position in Clause₁ expressing Prop₂ (Consequence). Jēng always inserts directly following the subject of Clause₂. As illustrated in (35), yol is optional preceding Clause₁, while jēng is obligatory in Clause₂. Comparison of (35) and (36) reveals the fact that the emphatic construction A-Thao ēn 'A-Thao he...' cannot co-occur with yol in Clause₁.

An interesting kind of ellipsis takes place in Jeh involving the form yol. Consider sentence (37) which seems to say, 'He bought fish because (yol) the fish then spoiled'. However, as the translation under (37) makes clear, there is an adversative element present also. When I began studying Jeh, my reaction to this kind of sentence was that it showed yol to mean both 'but' and 'because', a rather unusual semantic range. The native speaker, however, explains that part of the meaning has not been made overt. I reconstruct the situation as deriving from the following underlying structure:
That is, a proposition containing a REASON relation has been embedded in a proposition containing an ADVERSION relation. However, ADVERSION receives no explicit expression as chôk 'but', though the thesis proposition is expressed ('he bought fish'). The lower predicate yol does, on the other hand, appear along with its Basis proposition ('the fish then spoiled'), but the consequence proposition 'he could not eat fish' is elliptically absent. Thus, yol in this construction signals the elliptical frustration of the events of Clause₁, while Clause₂ overtly manifests the reason for the frustration. Sentence (38) further illustrates this usage of yol, Clause₁ expressing a desire ('I want to buy clothes'), with yol here signalling an elliptical unfulfilled desire ('I'm not able to buy clothes'). The reason is overtly expressed in Clause₂ ('I don't have money').

FOOTNOTES

1. I wish to express thanks to my language helpers for their patient help with this study. Also appreciation is due Kenneth Gregerson who supplied the theory and the mode of presentation and constantly encouraged and helped during the writing of the paper.

2. Jeh is a Mon-Khmer language spoken by 10,000 people in Kontum Province, South Vietnam. My research on Jeh has been under the auspices of the Summer Institute of Linguistics.

3. Work (by now well-known) such as Bach (1968), Fillmore (1968), Grimes (1968), McCawley (1968), Langendoen (1969) and Lakoff (1970).
4. In the semantic diagram, clauses are labelled $\text{Clause}_1$ and $\text{Clause}_2$ to indicate syntactic order only when there is a correlation between proposition-type and clause order (see under \textit{SEQUENCE}, \textit{CONDITION}, etc.). In the case of coordinate relation \textit{CONJUNCTION} and \textit{DISJUNCTION}, however, clause order cannot be categorically stated, since either proposition can usually appear in either $\text{Clause}_1$ or $\text{Clause}_2$ position (though negative propositions in \textit{DISJUNCTION} are constrained to appear in $\text{Clause}_2$.)
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