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Chapter 1

Introduction

1.1 Background

Thai has often been characterized as a serializing language, i.e. a language that has monoclusal constructions which consist of a sequence of concatenated verbs, without any marking of dependency relation. These constructions are called “Serial Verb Constructions” or SVCs in the literature (cf. Bendix, 1972; Boadi, 1968; and Sebba, 1987) and are found in Thai, Chinese and several African languages. This dissertation is concerned with a subset of what have been traditionally considered SVCs in Thai; they all consist of a string of verbs one of which is the head of the base VP\(^1\) and others which are not semantic argument(s) of the head of the base VP. To illustrate this, an example of a string of verbs in which the non-initial verb is not the semantic argument of the head of the base VP is given in (1a). Leaving out the second verb in (1a) does not affect the grammaticality of the sentence, as seen in (1b).

(1) a. Narii kê? mûj sèd

Narii carve wood finish
Narii finished carving wood.

---

\(^1\) The definition of the base VP here is based on semantic considerations. In the propositional content of the sentence, the base VP carries the central meaning of the event encoded by the sentence (adapted from Miller, 1985: 33).
b. Narii  kè?  mâj

Narii carve wood

Narii carved wood.

The term “semantic argument” is intuitively defined. In example (1a), the verb $\text{ pérd} ‘finish$’ is not the semantic argument of the main predicate of carving ($kè?$) since it is not required by the semantics of the carving event. $\text{ pérd} ‘finish$’ contrasts with $\text{ māj ‘wood$’ which is a required participant in the carving event; Narii must carve something.

1.2 Data, Scope and Purpose

In this thesis, I investigate three types of constructions which are often considered “Serial Verb Constructions” or SVCs in the Thai literature (Kanchanawan, 1978; Thepkanjana, 1986). Since the term “Serial Verb Constructions” is not unanimously defined, I use the pre-theoretical term “verb complexes” to refer to the constructions in question. The three groups of verb complexes I study encode non-arguments of the head verb and modify the main situation (conveyed by the base VP) by providing: 1) directional information to the motion-related main situations, 2) aspectual information, or 3) expected result information (similar to that of Resultative Constructions in English). These three groups of verb complexes are illustrated in (2)-(4):

---

(I) Directional Serial Verb Constructions (Directional SVCs)

(2) Piti wîŋ troŋ jôon klàb khâw bân paj

Piti run go straight reverse return enter house go

Piti ran straight back in the house, away from the speaker.

(II) Aspectual Constructions (ACs)

(3) borisât ŋî ki kamlaŋ cà? sâaŋ tûk sèd

company this PROG be about to build building finish

This company is in the process of being about to finish constructing a building.

(III) Adjoining Constructions (AJCs)

(4) Piti tii contracts taaj

Piti hit snake die

Piti hit the snake dead.

The three verb complexes illustrated in (2)-(4) are also found in other serializing languages and are treated as Serial Verb Constructions by various scholars. They are illustrated below.

(5) Sranan - Motion Serial Verb Construction

Jan waak go a skuul

John walked go to school

John walked thither to school. (Winford, 1990:125)
I have two major goals in analyzing the three classes of verb complexes illustrated in sentences (2)-(4). First, I show that although the surface strings of all of these three verb complexes look the same, there is no uniform notion of serialization that can apply to the three groups of verb complexes. My second goal is to describe the structures of these three classes of verb complexes, which encode non-arguments, and their semantic compositions. I show that the three verb complexes involve different structures and that these structures do not perfectly correlate with the semantic subgroupings of the constructions. That is, there is no single syntactic structure specific to a semantically determined subclass of these verb complexes.
1.3 Overview of Thai syntax

Thai is a language that has a rather rigid SVO word order. The word order is crucial to determine the meaning of strings. In other words, we can tell whether an NP in a sentence is the subject or object from its position, i.e. whether it precedes or follows the verb. In general, complements occur after their heads, as we expect with a SVO language. Modifiers (such as adjectives or adverbs) usually occur after the elements that they modify. Examples are:

(8) **Head-complement order:** verb-object

Priida  tii  nnu

Priida hit snake

Priida hit the snake.

(9) **Head-modifier order:** verb-adverb

Priida  dën  rew

Priida walk fast

Priida walked fast.

(10) **Head-modifier order:** noun-adjective

tūk  kàw  nän  pen  khōŋ Priida

building  old  that  copula of  Priida

That old building belongs to Priida.
(11) **Head-modifier order:** noun - relative clause

nakrian  ðìi  khaján  dêjráb  khamchom  càak  khruu

student  who  diligent  receive  compliments  from  teacher

The student(s) who is/are diligent received compliments from the teacher.

Note that Thai is a language in which the order of heads and modifiers is rigid. All modifiers, except certain sentential modifiers such as *muawannii* ‘yesterday’, follow their heads. The morphology of Thai is simple in the sense that the language has no inflection and no agreement in person, number, etc. There is also no morphological case marking.

In this thesis, I investigate a portion of Thai lexical categories or parts of speech, in particular those of the motion verbs and aspect marking morphemes. This investigation is relevant to my study of Directional Serial Verb Constructions and Aspectual Constructions. I provide below examples of words from distinct parts of speech in Thai. Note that the categories in this list are pre-theoretically used and are borrowed from an English-centered tradition. Also, the list is not intended to be exhaustive, but merely to give a general idea of potential Thai lexical categories.

i) **Noun** e.g. rôd ‘car’

ii) **Pronoun** e.g. thêè ‘she’

iii) **Verb** e.g. phôb ‘find’

iv) **Adjective** e.g. lek ‘small’

v) **Adverb** e.g. jaŋ ‘still’
vi) **Preposition**  e.g.  käb  ‘with’

vii) **Question word**  e.g.  kraj  ‘who’

viii) **Numeral**  e.g.  sōŋ ‘two’

ix) **Classifier**  e.g.  lam - classifier for ‘airplane’, ‘boat’, and ‘ship’.

x) **Conjunction**  e.g.  lê? ‘and’

xi) **Nominalizer**  e.g.  kaan - combines with verbs to create deverbal nouns

xii) **Complementizer**  e.g.  thâu ‘that’

Thai researchers generally agree upon the above lexical categorization\(^3\) (adapted from Upakitsinlapasarn, 1937). Lexical categories other than nouns, verbs and adjectives in Thai are closed-classes\(^4\) (Talmy, 1985).

**1.4 Theoretical Framework and Tools**

**1.4.1 Head-Driven Phrase Structure Grammar: Introduction**

I use Head-Driven Phrase Structure Grammar (HPSG) as the theoretical framework in this thesis. HPSG is a grammatical theory concerned with the system of linguistic signs that constitute a language and which are, according to Pollard and Sag (1994:15) “structured

\(^3\) Note, however, that Thai linguists have recently investigated the traditionally-assumed categories of verbs and adjectives and concluded that, based on syntactic distributions, so-called adjectives in Thai behave virtually the same way as verbs. Therefore, adjectives might actually be a sub-class of verbs (Presithrathsint, 2000). Since this issue is orthogonal to this thesis, I do not take a position on it.

\(^4\) I assume that adverbs in Thai, which are derived from the class of adjectives by adding the prefix jàන ‘of the type’, constitute a closed-class.
complexes of phonological, syntactic, semantic, discourse, and other phrase-structural information”. Signs can be either words or phrases. To describe these signs, HPSG uses attribute-value matrices (AVMs), diagrammed as follows:

\[
\begin{array}{cc}
\text{ATTRIBUTE 1} & \text{VALUE 1} \\
\text{ATTRIBUTE 2} & \text{VALUE 2} \\
\ldots & \ldots
\end{array}
\]

An attribute can have an atomic value (a value for which no attribute is appropriate) or it can take another AVM as its complex value. All linguistic signs have at least two attributes: PHON and SYNSEM. The value of PHON is the featured representation of the phonological content of the sign. Since phonology is not the focus of this thesis, the feature PHON will henceforth be left out of all feature structures. According to Pollard and Sag (1994:16) “the information brought together within the SYNSEM attribute forms a natural class in the sense that it is precisely this information that has the potential of being subcategorized for by other signs.” The SYNSEM attribute can be divided into NONLOC(AL) and LOC(AL) information. Nonlocal information is necessary when discussing unbounded dependencies; again, since this information is irrelevant to the issues raised in this thesis, it is left out of all diagrams.

The information contained in linguistic signs, which is relevant to local trees, can be divided into (1) local syntactic properties which are encoded as the value of the CAT(EGORY) attribute, (2) local semantic properties which constitute the value of the CONTENT attribute, and (3) local contextual properties which are the value of the CONTEXT attribute. The attribute or feature CAT, which encodes categorial and subcategorization information, consists of:
(a) the HEAD feature, which gathers the information that is shared between the mother and the head-daughter of a local tree. For example, the agreement features need to be shared between the head noun *cats* and the phrase this noun heads, as illustrated below:

(12)

```
  phrase
     HEAD [1]
       cats
     HEAD [1] noun
       AGR [PER 3rd]
         NUM pl
```

In (12), the part-of-speech (noun) and agreement features are shared between the head daughter *cats* and the phrase *cats* heads. This is indicated in the diagram through the use of the co-numbered tags [1] preceding the shared structures. Since the sharing of head properties between the head daughter and the mother is common to all headed phrases, the Head Feature Principle is formulated as a general constraint to avoid redundancy in the grammar.

(13) **Head-Feature Principle** (HFP) (from Sag and Wasow, 1999)

In any headed phrase, the HEAD value of the mother and the HEAD value of the head daughter must be unified.

One crucial idea behind the HFP is to identify the category of the head and that of the phrase it projects, i.e. to disallow a verb to be the head of a PP (prepositional phrase), for example.
(b) the VALENCE features, which contain the subcategorization of words and phrases, i.e. the subject (SUBJ), complements (COMPS), or specifiers (SPR)\(^5\) for which the word or phrase subcategorizes. The VALENCE features allow lexical entries to specify what they can locally co-occur with by listing the particular kinds of dependents they select. For example, a VP will have the following feature specification

\[
\begin{array}{ll}
  \text{phrase} & \text{verb} \\
  \text{HEAD} & \emptyset \\
  \text{COMPS} & \langle \text{NP} \rangle \\
  \text{SUBJ} & \emptyset \\
\end{array}
\]

The AVM in (14) illustrates that the VP has an empty COMPS list, which means that the head verb has already combined with its required complement(s). But the SUBJ list contains an NP, meaning that this VP still needs to combine with a subject NP.

(c) the ARG-ST (ARGUMENT-STRUCTURE) attribute, which records the potential complements, and subjects of words. The difference between the ARG-ST attribute and the various VALENCE features is that the former puts together all arguments of a head in one list. With VALENCE features, the subject and complement(s) of a head occur in different lists, i.e. SUBJ and COMPS list, respectively. With the ARG-ST list, we can refer to both the subject and complement(s) of a head for the purpose of stating constraints that concern them both such as binding constraints. The AVM in (15) is a simplified representation of the lexical entry for the verb *eats*, and illustrates the relation between the VALENCE features and ARG-ST feature:

\[
\begin{array}{ll}
  \text{phrase} & \text{verb} \\
  \text{HEAD} & \emptyset \\
  \text{COMPS} & \langle \text{NP} \rangle \\
  \text{SUBJ} & \langle \text{NP} \rangle \\
\end{array}
\]

\(^5\) Here, specifiers refer only to determiners. They are not the focus of this thesis and are not discussed any further.
As illustrated in (15), the ARG-ST list of *eats* is the concatenation of its SUBJ and the COMPS lists. The first element in the ARG-ST list corresponds to the subject of *eats* and the second element in the list corresponds to its complement or object. Words generally obey the following Argument Realization Principle.

(16) **Argument Realization Principle (ARP)**

A word’s value for ARG-ST is $a \r b$, where $a$ is the word’s value for SUBJ and $b$ is its value for COMPS.

The symbol $\r$ stands for list concatenation. Intuitively, the ARP ensures that a head specifies all of the arguments that it needs to combine with to form a phrase whose category is determined by this head.

The CONTENT’s values encode the semantic information of signs. I adopt Davis’s (1996) proposal as to the representation of the value of the CONTENT attribute, namely, that lexical semantic relations are *types*[^1] or sorts rather than values of an attribute. This is because *types* of semantic relations predict the kinds and number of arguments associated with the relations (for examples, the presence of a *kill-relation* entails the presence of ACTOR and UNDERGOER, and the presence of an *ascend-rel* entails the presence of

[^1]: Linguistic *types* are classes of linguistic entities in a language system. Distinct linguistic entities are assigned to the same *type* on the basis of certain properties that they all share (Sag and Wasow 1999).
FIGURE and GROUND). To illustrate this, the simplified CONTENT of the Thai word *khûn* ‘ascend’ which encodes *ascend-rel* is shown in (17).\(^7\)

\[
(17) \begin{array}{l}
\text{CONTENT} \\
\text{FIGURE} j \\
\text{GROUND} k \\
\end{array}
\]

*khûn* ‘ascend’\(^8\)

The AVM in (17) shows that *ascend-rel*, as a motion-related semantic relation, is associated with the features FIGURE, which is the entity that moves, and GROUND (or PATH), which indicates where the motion takes place.

In (18), I illustrate how the subject and object of a verb are linked to the verb’s semantic roles. The lexical entry for the verb *eats* would be as follows (adapted from Davis and Koenig (2000) and Bouma et al. (2001)):

\[
(18) \begin{array}{l}
eats \\
\text{CAT} \\
\text{SYNSEM|LOC} \\
\end{array}
\]

\[
\begin{array}{l}
\text{HEAD} \ V[fin] \\
\text{SUBJ} \ \langle[3][3g]\rangle \\
\text{COMPS} \ \langle[4][acc]\rangle \\
\text{ARG–ST} \ \langle[3]\text{NP:}[1],[4]\text{NP:}[2]\rangle \\
\text{CONTENT} \ eat\_rel \\
\text{ACT} \ [1] \\
\text{UND} \ [2] \\
\end{array}
\]

---

\(^7\) Conventionally, in the AVMs, letters are used for attribute values when identity is not relevant, and co-numbered tags are used to mark identity of values.

\(^8\) Since I do not include the feature [PHON] in the AVMs, I informally represent the phonological forms of the AVMs with the linear glosses at the bottom of the feature structures.
The tags [1] and [2] after the colons indicate that the semantic contents of the NPs [3] and [4] in ARG-ST list are identical to the values of the ACT(OR) and UND(ERGOER) semantic roles of the semantic content of *eats*, respectively. Note that since the NON-LOC(AL) information is irrelevant to this thesis, from now on I simplify AVM structures and omit the SYNSEM|LOC paths in every AVM representation. For instance, a simplified representation of (18) is shown in (19).

(19) 

```
| eats |
| HEAD V[fn] |
| SUBJ ⟨[3][sg]⟩ |
| COMPS ⟨[4][acc]⟩ |
| ARG-ST ⟨[3]NP:[1],[4]NP:[2]⟩ |
| CONTENT ACT [1] |
| UND [2] |
```

The CONTEXT attribute encodes pragmatic information. Since pragmatics is not the focus of this thesis, the CONTEXT attribute is left out of all the AVMs.

To describe languages, a grammar in HPSG consists of three major components: a lexicon, principles and rules or schemata.

### 1.4.1.1 Lexicon

In HPSG, a large amount of linguistic information is posited in the lexicon which is allocated to phrase structure rules, levels of representations mediated by transformations, or feature checking in other theories. It would be inefficient to assume that this information is simply listed in the lexicon, as we would miss linguistic generalizations. Therefore, in
HPSG, the lexicon’s internal organization is designed to encode regularities and reduce redundancy. This is achieved by organizing linguistic types in the lexicon in a type hierarchy.

A type hierarchy reduces the redundancy in two ways. First, it determines appropriate features and constraints on linguistic types, namely, it ensures that a given feature structure contains only those features that are declared appropriate for one of its types. That is, instead of listing that the feature COUNT(ABLE) is relevant for nouns but irrelevant for verbs in every noun entry, we simply declare that the feature COUNT is not appropriate for the entire class of verbs, for instance. Second, type hierarchies reduce redundancy via inheritance. That is, subtypes inherit features and constraints from their supertypes. For example, the feature COUNT(ABLE) which is appropriate for the supertype noun is also appropriate for all subtypes of nouns. This is the traditional form of inheritance, called monotonic inheritance, namely, constraints on the supertype affect all instances of its subtypes without exception. Nevertheless, natural languages usually have exceptions. An intuitive alternative to monotonic inheritance, i.e. DEFAULT INHERITANCE, allows contradictory information associated with a subtype to take precedence over constraints that would otherwise be inherited from its supertype (Lascarides et al, 1996; Sag and Wasow, 1999: 172).

Lexical rules are a mechanism for further reducing redundancy and stipulations in the lexicon (apart from the hierarchical lexicon). Lexical rules derive lexical entries from lexical entries and consist of two components: input and output. The input is the left-hand side of the rule and the output is the right-hand side of the rule. To illustrate this, (20) is the result of applying the passive lexical rule to eats.
The above figure illustrates that for the lexical entry *eats*, there is a corresponding passive form *eaten*, whose value of the SUBJ list is [4]. In the ARG-ST list of *eaten*, the first element corresponds to the object or complement of the input *eats* (i.e. the NP tagged with [4]), and the active form’s subject can be optionally expressed by the *by*-phrase, whose complement is the NP tagged with [3], which corresponds to the subject of the entry *eats*.

### 1.4.1.2 Principles

A major principle in HPSG mentioned briefly above is the Argument Realization Principle (ARP). In this section, I revisit the ARP and discuss its role in HPSG grammars. The ARP states that “a word’s value for ARG-ST is \(a \rightarrow b\), where \(a\) is the word’s value for SUBJ and \(b\) is its value for COMPS”. Intuitively, the ARP ensures that the elements in the ARG-ST list (i.e. the elements that a head subcategorizes for) get realized as the subject or complement depending on the position of the elements in the ARG-ST list. To illustrate this, consider the following entry of the verb *eats*.
In (21), the first NP in the ARG-ST list is realized as the subject of *eats*, as indicated by the token-identity of the first NP in the ARG-ST list with the value of SUBJ ([3]). The second NP in the ARG-ST list gets realized as the object of *eats*, as shown by the token-identity of the second NP in the ARG-ST list with the member of the COMPS list ([4]). Furthermore, I assume, following Miller and Sag (1997) and Bouma et al. (2001), that ARP realizes every element in the ARG-ST list except those which are non-canonical synsem. Non-canonical synsem objects correspond to elements which are subcategorized for by a head, but which will not be realized locally. The basic assumption is that linguistic objects belong to the following synsem\textsuperscript{10} type hierarchy.

\begin{equation}
\text{Synsem type hierarchy}
\end{equation}

\begin{itemize}
\item canonical-synsem
\item non-canonical - synsem
\item gap-synsem
\item understood-synsem
\end{itemize}

Synsem objects can be further classified into two subtypes: canonical-synsem and non-canonical - synsem. Every normal linguistic object belongs to the type canonical-synsem. Non-canonical synsem includes gap-synsem and understood-synsem. Gap-synsem

\textsuperscript{10} The synsem type is the syntactic and semantic information of a linguistic sign.
elements in HPSG play a role similar to that of traces in a movement theory (cf. Bouma et al., 2001). *Understood-synsems* correspond to linguistic objects which can be left out from a clause, but which are recoverable from the context. For example, an entry of *listen* in the following sentence has a complement of *understood-synsem* type:

(23) Talk to your kids. They will listen.

The realization of the elements in the ARG-ST list of the entry of *listen* in (23) is shown in (24).

(24)

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{CAT} & \quad \text{listen} \\
\text{HEAD} & \quad V[\text{fin}] \\
\text{SUBJ} & \quad \{[3][\text{3pl}]\} \\
\text{COMPS} & \quad \{\} \\
\text{ARG-ST} & \quad \{[3]\text{NP}, [4]\text{PP}_{\text{understood-synsem}}\}
\end{align*}
\]

In the entry of *listen* in (24), the second element in its ARG-ST list which is an *understood-synsem* object does not get realized as the PP object of *listen* (i.e. *to you*), as indicated by the null value of COMPS. On the other hand, the first element in the ARG-ST list ([3]), a *canonical-synsem* element, gets realized as the subject of *listen*, i.e. *they*.

1.4.1.3 Schemata

The last component of an HPSG grammar consists of schemata that combine linguistic elements. I only describe below the schemata relevant to this thesis. These include: 1) the Head-Complement Schema, 2) the Head-Subject Schema, and 3) the Head-Adjunct Schema. The three schemata are governed by the Valence Principle.
(25) **Valence Principle** (Sag and Wasow, 1999)

Unless the rule says otherwise, the mother’s SUBJ and COMPS values are identical to those of the head daughter.

The Valence Principle ensures that the values of the VALENCE features are satisfied and canceled off at the right levels. To illustrate this, consider, first, the Head-Complement Schema.

(26) **Head-Complement Schema**

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{phrase} & \quad \text{H} \\
\text{COMPS } & \quad \text{COMPS }[2][n]
\end{align*}
\]

The Head-Complement Schema combines a head with its complement(s) to create a phrase. The above schema states that when a head word co-occurs with the element(s) in its COMPS list,\(^{11}\) its mother, which is a phrase, will contain an empty COMPS list. Intuitively, the schema states that if a verb, for instance, co-occurs with its subcategorized NPs or PPs, these elements will be canceled off the phrase that this verb heads. The application of this schema is illustrated in the following figure, which shows a simplified representation of the VP for the sentence *John read his books*.

---

\(^{11}\) Technically, only the values of the complement daughters’ SYNSEM attributes correspond to members of the head’s COMPS list.
The head verb *read* combines with its complement *his books* to form a verb phrase. According to the Valence Principle, the SUBJ value is preserved in the mother node of the VP in (23), but the value of the mother’s COMPS is null since its head daughter *read* already combined with *his books* so the value of COMPS (i.e. the NP tagged with [2]) is canceled off as specified in the Head-Complement Schema.

Next, I discuss the Head-Subject Schema.

(28) **Head-Subject Schema**

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{phrase} & \rightarrow [1] \\
\text{SUBJ } & \rightarrow [1]
\end{align*}
\]

The above schema combines a headed phrase with its subject to create a sentence. This schema is applied in (25) to create the sentence *John read his books.*
In (25), the VP *read his books* whose SUBJ value is the NP tagged with [1] combines with *John*, yielding a phrase which contains empty SUBJ and COMPS lists, i.e. a phrase whose SUBJ and COMPS values are satisfied, that is, a sentence.

The last schema discussed here is the Head-Adjunct Schema.

(30) **Head-Adjunct Schema**

\[
[phrase] \rightarrow [3][phrase]
\begin{align*}
\text{HEAD} & \quad \text{[MOD} [3]\text{]} \\
\text{phrase} & \quad \text{[MOD} [3]\text{]}
\end{align*}
\]

The MOD(IFY) feature in the Head-Adjunct Schema allows the adjunct or modifier to select the category of its modified element since, in (30), the tag [3] refers to the feature structure of a linguistic sign which is the modified element. To illustrate this, I present below the simplified representation of the VP of the sentence *John read his books quickly*, in which the adverb *quickly* modifies the VP *read his books*. 
Under the assumption that adverbs are lexically specified as [MOD VP], namely, adverbs modify verb phrases, the Head-Adjunct Schema licenses the VP *read his books quickly* in (31), and this VP can combine with the subject *John*, as shown in (29), to build the sentence *John read his books quickly*. Notice that the MOD feature of a modifier intuitively works in the same way as the SUBJ and COMPS features of a head, in the sense that the MOD feature allows the modifier to select its modified element, as the SUBJ and COMPS features allow a head to select their subjects and complements.

A final note in this section is that although I use HPSG as the theoretical framework of this thesis mainly for representational purposes, the basic assumptions and mechanisms in HPSG allow for a straightforward model of the selectional restrictions in Thai verb complexes. Namely, via SUBJ, COMPS, and/or MOD features, we can straightforwardly state the selectional restrictions that a syntactic element in the verb complex imposes on other elements, regardless of whether the former is the syntactic head or modifier. The

---

12 To prevent a phrase from being a grammatical sentence, in which elements in the ARG-ST list of the phrase’s head are all realized, but the phrase’s MOD value is not null (i.e. the phrase still needs to modify something), I assume that root clauses in Thai are [MOD < >]. In other words, I assume that the value of MOD for Thai root clauses must be null. The motivation for this assumption is discussed in more detail in Chapter 4.
importance of this particular aspect of HPSG will become clearer in my analysis of Thai Aspectual Constructions carried out in Chapter 4.

1.4.2 Minimal Recursion Semantics

Minimal Recursion Semantics (MRS) is the semantic framework that I use in this dissertation. MRS semantics was developed to provide meaning representations which do not force scope ambiguities to be resolved (Copestake et al., 1999). MRS is also useful to keep track of how much meaning remains to be encoded or decoded in generating sentences (Bouma et al., 1998).

The machinery of MRS is complex in the sense that MRS has several features designed to model scope relations among elements in a clause. MRS specifications that I use in this thesis are rather simple. To provide basic understanding of MRS specifications, I only describe MRS features relevant to this thesis.

(32) Simplified MRS representation of *John makes pizza*

\[
\text{INDEX} \ [4] \\
\text{KEY} \ [6] \\
\text{LZT} \begin{bmatrix}
\text{INDEX} & [4] \\
\text{KEY} & [6] \\
\text{LZT} & \begin{bmatrix}
\text{John}_{rel} & \begin{bmatrix}
\text{HNDL} & q \\
\text{EVENT} & [4] \\
\text{ACT} & [1] \\
\text{UND} & [2] \\
\end{bmatrix}
\end{bmatrix}
\end{bmatrix}
\end{bmatrix}
\]

MRS is a representation of the meaning of expressions as a set of Elementary Predications (EPs), whose members can be viewed as typically related via logical conjunction. An EP contains a semantic relation and argument(s) associated with that relation. In the MRS representation of the meaning of *John makes pizza* in (32), three
semantic relations or EPs corresponding to John, makes, and pizza appear in a list (LZT). The current assumption in MRS is that each lexical item has a single distinguished main EP, which is referred to as the KEY EP. A phrase’s KEY is equivalent to the semantic head of that phrase. The KEY of the sentence John makes pizza in (32) is tagged with [6] and is identified with the KEY EP of the verb makes.

An annotation added to an element in a phrase to specify its referent is an INDEX. In (32), the value of the INDEX of John makes pizza is identified with the EVENT value of the verb makes which heads this phrase. Intuitively, this means that the reference of the utterance “John makes pizza” is the event of making denoted by the verb makes. The LZT in (32) contains two other EPs which describe John and pizza. To refer to individual EPs, the feature HNDL is introduced. The value of the HNDL attribute named p, for example, identifies the predication associated with the NP John which is the subject of John makes pizza. The NPs John and pizza have the feature INST which indicates the instance of a nominal object.

The semantic head of a phrase is represented by the attributes KEY and INDEX in MRS structures. I assume that in a head-complement phrase, the phrase’s syntactic head becomes the semantic head of the phrase, meaning that the phrase’s KEY and INDEX values are identical to those of the syntactic head. For example, the KEY and INDEX of the phrase near John are identified with those of the head preposition near. However, in a head-modifier structure, the semantic head of the phrase is the modifier. Namely, the KEY and INDEX of the phrase red car, for instance, are identified with those of the adjective
red, which is the modifier. These assumptions\textsuperscript{13} capture the intuition on which expression in a phrase carries the most important information and are in line with the notion of semantic head in Pollard and Sag (1994). These assumptions on the semantic head are the basis of my semantic analyses of Aspectual Constructions and Adjoining Constructions carried out in Chapter 4 and 5.

I summarize in (33) the MRS features and the types of their values, which will be used to model the semantic compositions of various types of Thai verb complexes.

(33)

\[
\begin{array}{l}
mrs - struc \\
\text{INDEX index} \\
\text{KEY [HNDL handle]} \\
\text{LZT list (of relation(s))}
\end{array}
\]

1.4.3 Constituency Tests

One of the goals of this thesis is to determine the syntactic structures of the three groups of verb complexes mentioned in 1.2. I use a few constituency tests to determine the constituent structure of linguistic elements in a string. These tests include 1) the co-ordination test, where it is clear that the strings in question cannot be analyzed as instances of right-node raising (see details below), 2) the anaphoric do so test, and 3) the placement of adverbs. It is important to realize that some of these tests are not perfect indicators of constituency of linguistic elements in a string, as I discuss below.

\textsuperscript{13} Role and Reference Grammar (Van Valin and LaPolla, 1997) also makes similar assumptions regarding the semantic head of a phrase.
Constituency tests have long been used to determine the syntactic structure of a string of linguistic elements. However, not all constituency tests give reliable results. For example, right-node raising is problematic for the coordination test. Consider the following example (adapted from Trask, 1993:243)

(34) Lisa prepared, and Sean served, the cucumber sandwiches.

The construction in (34) consists of an apparent coordination of two sentences in which each sentence lacks its rightmost constituent, and a single further constituent, in this case *the cucumber sandwiches*, which appears on the right is interpreted as filling both gaps. In other words, right-node raising involves a missing element which is extraposed, and is not an ordinary instance of coordination.

Although Thai has no parallels of the English right-node raising example in (34), right-node raising does exist in Thai, as (35) shows:

(35) Priida hâj nã̂ŋstûu 1ê? hâj-juûum klôn kê ê dêkêk
Pриида give book and lend camera to children
Priida gave the book(s) and lent the camera to the children.

In (35), the constituent *kê ê dêkêk* ‘to children’ appear at the right edge of the sentence and fills both gaps of the verb phrases headed by *hâj* ‘give’ and *hâj-juûum* ‘lend’. Sentences such as (34)-(35), thus, cannot be interpreted as evidence for a particular constituent structure. As a result, in applying the co-ordination test in my analysis of Thai verb complexes, I make sure that the strings in question are not instances of right-node raising.
I also use the anaphoric VP \textit{tham jàaŋ-diawkan} ‘do the same’ to test the constituent structures of some of the Thai verb complexes. I consider \textit{tham jàaŋ-diawkan} ‘do the same’ the parallel of the English anaphoric VP \textit{do so},\textsuperscript{14} which has traditionally been considered an anaphoric VP that is syntactically, but not pragmatically, controlled\textsuperscript{15} (in the sense of Hankamer and Sag (1976)). Examples of sentences with pragmatically controlled anaphor and syntactically controlled anaphor in Thai are given in (36).

(36) (In the context where a child is throwing books from the table to the floor)

(a) Father: \textit{ja tham jàaŋ-diawkan} don’t do type-sample = the same

(*Don’t do the same.)

(b) Father: \textit{jàa tham jàaŋ-nán} don’t do type-that

Don’t do that.

Example (36a) shows that \textit{tham jàaŋ-diawkan} ‘do the same’ is not pragmatically controlled in the sense that it cannot be used where there is no syntactic antecedent, i.e. the antecedent is understood from the context. In such circumstances, the pragmatically controlled anaphor \textit{tham jàaŋ-nán} ‘do that’ must be used, as seen in (36b).

\textsuperscript{14} Note that the Thai anaphoric VP \textit{tham jàaŋ-diawkan} ‘do the same’ is more restricted than English \textit{do so} in the kinds of VPs that can be its antecedents. The verb \textit{tham} ‘do’ in Thai is semantically potent and can only be the anaphor of an agentive VP. Thus, \textit{tham} ‘do’ can be the anaphor of the VP \textit{wíŋ ‘run’}, but not that of the VP \textit{taaj ‘die’}.

\textsuperscript{15} The pragmatically controlled anaphoric VP counterpart of \textit{do so} is ‘\textit{do it}’ or ‘\textit{do that}’, as discussed in Hankamer and Sag (1976).
The *do so* test is traditionally considered a VP constituency test. It was first introduced by Lakoff and Ross (1966; 1976) as a test for the constituent structure of strings of words in a VP, i.e. to determine which constituents are sisters to the head verb and which constituents occur outside of the saturated verb phrase. The original assumption for the *do so* test is that “*do so* derives its interpretation from a preceding V” (Borsley, 1991). According to Lakoff and Ross (1976), *do so* replaces all of the constituents of a verb phrase and only those. This hypothesis was meant to explain the ungrammaticality of (37b), since *do so* in (37b) does not include all constituents of its antecedent VP, but leaves out the object NP *wine* in the antecedent and replaces it with *beer.*

(37) (Examples adapted from Przepiórkowski, 1999)

    a. John drank wine yesterday and I’ll *do so* today.
    b. *John drank wine yesterday and I’ll *do so* beer today.

Recently, however, Przepiórkowski (1999) has pointed out that the *do so* test is inappropriate as an indicator of constituency. He argues that the antecedents of *do so* are not strictly syntactically determined but, to some extent, pragmatically controlled. Przepiórkowski conducted a corpora search and found cases where *do so* has as antecedents something created out of generalization, enriched antecedents, or missing antecedents. Hence, his corpora search provides evidence that the English anaphoric *do so* is sometimes not syntactically parallel to its antecedent. Despite Przepiórkowski’s admonition, I will continue to use the anaphoric VP *tham jàan-diawkan* ‘do the same’ as a constituent test for Thai since its results always corroborate the results of other tests in my analysis of Thai verb complexes.
Another syntactic test that I use in this thesis is the placement of adverbs or adverbial phrases. Rangkupan (1997) applies the adverb placement test to ʰâj ‘give’ complex constructions in Thai to determine their constituent structure and dependency relations. Although her discussion is couched in Role and Reference Grammar terms (Van Valin and LaPolla, 1997), we can recast her analysis in terms of what occurs under the base VP and what occurs outside of the base VP.

In applying the adverb placement test, I hypothesize that adverbs mark the end of a VP in Thai, and can be distinguished from the complements of a head verb. To illustrate this, I first show in (38) that the order of complements in Thai is very rigid.

(38) a. Ukit ʰâj wĕɛn-phěd thîi hăa jàak mun-khâa nṳŋ
    Ukit give ring-diamond that seek hard value one
    láan baht kɛɛ Narii
    million baht to Narii
    Ukit gave the hard-to-find, one-million-baht valued diamond ring to Narii.

b. *Ukit ʰâj kɛɛ Narii wĕɛn-phěd thîi hăa jàak
    Ukit give to Narii ring-diamond that seek hard
    mun-khâa nṳŋ láan baht
    value one million baht
    (Intended meaning: Ukit gave, to Narii, the hard-to-find, one-million-baht valued diamond ring.)
Sentences in (38) show that the order among the direct object and indirect object of the verb *hâj* ‘give’ is fixed, despite the heaviness of the direct object headed by *wĕñ-phéd* ‘diamond ring’.

Adverbs or adverbial phrases in Thai occur after the constituents expressing arguments of the head verbs, as the examples in (41) illustrate.

(39) a. Ukit hâj wĕñ-phéd thîi hâa jâak mun-khâa nùn
    Ukit give ring-diamond that seek hard value one
    lâan baht kēε Narii jàaŋ-mâj-temcaj
    million baht to Narii unwillingly
    Ukit gave the hard-to-find, one-million-baht valued diamond ring to Narii unwillingly.

b. *Ukit hâj wĕñ-phéd thîi hâa jâak mun-khâa nùn
    Ukit give ring-diamond that seek hard value one
    lâan baht jàaŋ-mâj-temcaj kēε Narii
    million baht unwillingly to Narii
    (Intended meaning: Ukit gave the hard-to-find, one-million-baht valued diamond ring unwillingly to Narii.)
c. *Ukit ḥâj wēčén-phḗd thīi ḥāa jāak mun-khāa núŋ

Ukit give ring-diamond that seek hard value one
láan baht mūawaannīi kēc Narii

million baht yesterday to Narii

(Intended meaning: Ukit gave the hard-to-find, one-million-baht valued diamond ring yesterday to Narii.)

d. *Ukit ḥâj wēčén-phḗd thīi ḥāa jāak mun-khāa núŋ

Ukit give ring-diamond that seek hard value one
láan baht thīi ṣaann-liąŋ kēc Narii

million baht at banquet to Narii

(Intended meaning: Ukit gave the hard-to-find, one-million-baht valued diamond ring at the banquet to Narii.)

None of the three adverbial phrases: jāan-ńaț-temcaj ‘unwillingly’, mūawaannii ṣaann ‘yesterday’, and thīi ṣaan-liąŋ ‘at the banquet’ can occur between the two complements of the ditransitive verb ḥâj, as shown by the ungrammaticality of sentences (41b-d). But these adverbs, which do not have scope over each other, can be reordered among themselves, as the examples in (40) show.
(40a)  a. Ukit háj ṃɛn-phéd ðhìi ᵃa jàak mʊn-kхаa nʊŋ láaŋ
    Ukit give ring-diamond that seek hard value one million
    baht kɛɛ Narii ðhìi ᵇaːn-ńiąŋ jàaŋ-mᵃj-temcaj
    baht to Narii at banquet unwillingly

b. Ukit háj ṃɛn-phéd ðhìi ᵃa jàak mʊn-kхаa nʊŋ láaŋ
    Ukit give ring-diamond that seek hard value one million
    baht kɛɛ Narii jàaŋ-mᵃj-temcaj ðhìi ᵇaːn-ńiąŋ
    baht to Narii unwillingly at banquet

(40a-b) = Ukit unwillingly gave the hard-to-find, one-million-baht valued diamond ring to Narii at the banquet.

The facts that adverbs in Thai occur after the complements of a head verb and that they can be reordered among themselves without any change in scope indicate that adverbs mark the end of a VP in Thai. This is because if we assume that in Thai adverbs adjoin to VP as represented in (41), we can explain the possible reordering among adverbs in (40a-b).

(41) 

Any of the three adverbial phrases in (40) can adjoin to the VP in any of the three positions illustrated in (41), thus explaining the reordering possibilities among the three adverbial phrases. I conclude that the placement of adverbs can be used to test where the boundary of a VP is in Thai.
I have discussed in this section the hypotheses underlying the three constituency tests that I use in this thesis. I will assume throughout this thesis that these tests provide fairly good evidence for particular syntactic structures, provided they converge.

1.5 Organization and Overview of Results

This dissertation consists of six chapters. The four main chapters of the dissertation are analyses of three types of Thai verb complexes which encode non-arguments. I investigate Directional Serial Verb Constructions by first looking into previous analyses of Directional SVCs. I then discuss the constituent structure and ordering constraints of Thai Directional SVCs. I find that these SVCs comprise both a recursive structure and a complementation structure. Thai Directional SVCs also contain both free reordering of verb phrases and fixed positions of certain classes of verbs that can occur in the constructions. I provide models of the syntactic structures and the semantic composition in Thai Directional SVCs at the end of Chapter 2.

Some of the serial verbs discussed in Chapter 2 such as paj ‘go’ encode aspectual meaning when they combine with certain classes of non-motion verbs. I carry out the investigation of Aspectual Constructions (ACs) in two chapters. I describe the meanings, selectional restrictions, and possible combinations of Thai aspect-marking morphemes in Chapter 3. In chapter 4, I investigate the parts of speech of Thai aspect-marking morphemes and how they syntactically combine in ACs, as well as determine their scope relations. I show that the part-of-speech categories of Thai aspect-marking elements correlate with neither their positions in the clause nor the syntactic rules that combine them with the base
Lastly, I explain why most combinations of aspect-marking elements do not create scope ambiguities, and describe constraints which govern their scope interpretations.

In Chapter 5, I discuss Thai Adjoining Constructions (AJCs), which are similar to Resultative Constructions (RCs) found in many languages including English. But the verbs in a Thai AJC need not stand in a strict causal relation as generally is the case for RCs, and the resulting situation encoded in the AJC might not eventually occur, suggesting that Thai AJCs are not the exact parallel of RCs. Furthermore, which NP in the clause is co-indexed with the unexpressed subject of the resulting verb in a Thai AJC is grammatically underdetermined, and is partly pragmatically controlled.

Chapter 6 concludes the thesis and provides suggestions for future research.

1.6 Thai Phonemes

The following are charts of Thai consonant, vowel and tone phonemes which I use in the transcription of the data in this thesis.

Consonants

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stems</th>
<th>Bilabial</th>
<th>Labiodental</th>
<th>Alveolar</th>
<th>Palatal</th>
<th>Velar</th>
<th>Glottal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Stops</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>d</td>
<td>t</td>
<td>c</td>
<td></td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-voiced</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-voiceless</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>unaspirated</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>unaspirated</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Voiceless</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>aspirated</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fricatives</td>
<td>f</td>
<td>s</td>
<td>h</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nasals</td>
<td>m</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>η</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liquids</td>
<td></td>
<td>r, l</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glides</td>
<td>w</td>
<td></td>
<td>j</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Vowels**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Front Short, Long</th>
<th>Central Short, Long</th>
<th>Back Short, Long</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>i, ii</td>
<td>u, uu</td>
<td>u, uu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mid</td>
<td>e, ee</td>
<td>ξ, ξξ</td>
<td>o, oo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>ε, εε</td>
<td>a, aa</td>
<td>o, oo</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Tones**

- Mid unmarked
- Low ``
- Falling ``
- High ``
- Rising ``
Chapter 2

Directional Serial Verb Constructions

2.1 Introduction

Serial Verb Constructions (SVCs) are interesting cross-linguistically because they consist of two or more verbal heads which are not related to each other through a predicate-argument relation, but which still occur in what is considered a single clause. In this chapter, I discuss Thai Directional SVCs, which contain verbs that encode motion-related situations. An example of Directional SVC is shown in (1):

(1) Malii วิ่ง бросา จอด ข้ามสะพาน ทะลุออก ออกไป

Malii run go straight reverse cross bridge exit go

Malii ran straight back, crossing the bridge, out away from the speaker.

Sentence (1) consists of six verbs, which share a common subject: Malii. Semantically, Malii is the figure of the complex motion event encoded by the sequence of verbs in (1). The first verb in (1) denotes a manner of motion and the non-initial verbs encode a directed motion, which includes information about the path, direction, and/or deictic center of the motion event. Each verb in a Directional SVC describes the same, single event from a different perspective.

I argue that Thai Directional serial verb constructs include two kinds of syntactic structures: a recursive co-headed structure and a complementation structure. More specifically, I show that Directional SVCs in Thai are distinct from those found in other languages in terms of (i) the number of verbs that can occur in a SVC, (ii) their constituent
structure, (iii) the argument structures associated with certain verbs in SVCs, and (iv) the presence of ordering constraints among non-sister constituents.

This chapter proceeds as follows. I first explain the definition of SVCs that I adopt and provide examples of different types of SVCs that occur in Thai. Next, I give examples of Directional SVCs in languages other than Thai, as well as describe previous analyses of Directional SVCs in those languages. I show that previous analyses of Directional SVCs cannot account for the syntactic behavior of Thai Directional SVCs, particularly the presence of ordering constraints among non-sister constituents, and that previous analyses of Thai Directional SVCs are also incorrect about their constituent structure and the nature of the ordering constraints. I then present a syntactic analysis of Thai Directional SVCs. Finally, I model the semantic composition of verb complexes in Thai Directional SVCs.

2.2 Serial Verb Constructions in Thai

2.2.1 Definition of Serial Verb Constructions

I adopt Sebba’s (1987) definition of Serial Verb Constructions in (2) as a criterion to identify SVCs in Thai.

(2) In a sequence of the form V1(initial verb), V2(serial verb),

a. both V1 and V2 must be lexical verbs, i.e. must be capable of appearing as the only verb in a simple sentence.

b. If it is possible to conceive of V1 and V2 as denoting separate actions at all, then both V1 and V2 must have the same tense and aspect. Thus, for example, V1 may not be interpreted as ‘past’ if V2 is interpreted as ‘future’.
c. There must not be an ascertainable clause boundary between V1 and V2, i.e. they must be within the same clause.

d. No conjunction should separate the verbs in sequence.

2.2.2 Thai Serial Verb Constructions

In a previous analysis of Thai SVCs, Thepkanjana (1986) categorizes Thai SVCs according to their functions into four types as follows:

(I) Serial verbs complement the initial verb and indicate the cause or result of the event described by the initial verb. For example:

(3) Dara tham kēew tēe k

Dara do/make glass break

Dara broke the glass.

(II) Serial verbs modify the initial verb and indicate the direction of motion or aspect of the initial verb. For example:

(4) Directed motion

Dara dēn ᵉk

Dara walk exit

Dara walked out (of some place).
(5) **Aspectual**

Dara ขิด โดก

Dara think exit

Dara thought and reached a conclusion.

(III) Serial verbs act as grammatical markers. For example:

(6) Dara ถ่ม ขันบ้าน ห้าง Wira

Dara do homework give Wira

Dara did the homework for Wira.

(IV) Serial verbs express purposive or simultaneous actions. For example:

(7) **Simultaneous actions**

Wira ขาย นำสุทธิ Wิจ

Wira carry book run

Wira carried the book, running.

(8) **Purposive**

Dara มา คุย บ ชาน

Dara come talk with I

Dara came to talk with me.

The Directional SVCs studied in this chapter correspond to part of category (II) in Thepkanjana’s analysis. As we notice from examples (4) and (5), the same verb โดก ‘exit’ can have either a directional meaning, when it is literally interpreted, or an aspectual meaning when it is interpreted metaphorically. The choices between these meanings
depend on the semantics of the initial verbs that the serial verb combines with, namely, if the initial verb describes a motion-related event, the directional serial verb has its literal meaning. But if the initial verb does not describe a motion-related event, the directional serial verb is metaphorically interpreted and encodes an aspectual meaning. I assume that the relationship between the two uses is simply formal; they share neither syntactic nor semantic properties. I concentrate exclusively on the construction illustrated in (4) in this chapter and analyze the constructions illustrated in (5) in the next two chapters.

2.3 Previous Analyses of Directional SVCs

In previous generative literature, analyses of SVCs which are related to motion events in other languages assume that the sequence of verbs in these SVCs (i) have a head-complement relationship to each other (cf. Sebba, 1987; Winford, 1990), or (ii) belong to a multi-headed structure (Baker, 1989). In two studies of Directional SVCs in Sranan in the framework of Generalized Phrase Structure Grammar, Sebba (1987) and Winford (1990) suggest Immediate Dominance (ID) rules for the VP structure in which the initial verb (which denotes a manner of motion) subcategorizes for the serial verb (which indicates a directed motion). Some examples are:

(9) Jan waak go a skuul
    John walked go to school
    John walked thither to school. (Winford, 1990:125)

(10) dowwatra ben e dropu fadon na den wiwiri
dew-water PAST ASP drop fall LOC the-PL. leaf
    Dew was dripping on the leaves’ (Sebba, 1987:44).
Examples (9)- (10) are accounted for by Sebba’s ID rules (11)- (12) and Winford’s ID rules (13)- (14).

Sebba’s ID rules

(11) $\text{IVP} \rightarrow \text{V}[3] \text{ IVP [MOD,DIR]}$

$\text{V}[3] \rightarrow \text{waka (walk), ron (run), …}$

(12) $\text{IVP [MOD,DIR]} \rightarrow \text{V}[2] \text{ PP}$

$\text{V [2]} \rightarrow \text{go (go), kon (come), …}$

Winford’s ID rules

(13) $\text{VP} \rightarrow \text{H}[31] \text{ VP[DIR]}$

$\text{H}[31] \rightarrow \text{waak, ron…}$

(14) $\text{VP[DIR]} \rightarrow \text{H}[30] \text{ XP[LOC]}$

$\text{H}[30] \rightarrow \text{go, kon, …}$

The main difference between Sebba’s and Winford’s rules is that Winford assumes that the occurrences of intransitive verbs such as *go* ‘go’, *kon* ‘come’ as main verbs and as serial verbs are related to each other (1990:124). However, both Sebba’s and Winford’s rules are similar in that the serial verb phrase (*go a skuul* ‘go to school’ in (9)) is subcategorized for by the initial verb (*waak* ‘walk’ in (9)). These rules can generate a VP which consists of a head verb and a serial VP complement. For example, the syntactic structure of (9), according to Winford (1990), can be represented by the tree in (15).
The structure in (15) also applies to (10) as well because in their analyses, Sebba and Winford place the serial verbs go ‘go’, kon ‘come’, and fadon ‘fall’, in the same category of intransitive serial verbs.

In contrast to Sebba (1987) and Winford (1990), who suggest that verbs in Directional SVCs stand in a complementation relation, Baker (1989) suggests a double-headed verbal phrase structure where both heads theta-mark one NP argument for SVCs in Yoruba and Sranan, and where one head is embedded in another (as illustrated in (17)). Baker’s analysis is illustrated in (16) and (17), which is the structure of (16):¹

(16) **Yoruba** (example from Carstens, 1988)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>eye</th>
<th>fó</th>
<th>lo</th>
<th>s’óří</th>
<th>igi</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>bird</td>
<td>fly</td>
<td>go</td>
<td>to-top</td>
<td>tree</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The bird flew to the top of the tree.

¹ Note that here I only concentrate on the syntactic structure and leave out the details of theta-role assignment.
Baker claims that the structure in (17) allows both verbs fo ‘fly’ and lo ‘go’ to theta-mark the subject eye ‘bird’. Namely, while fo ‘fly’ is in a position where it can theta-mark eye ‘bird’ directly, the double-headed structure allows lo ‘go’ to indirectly theta-mark the subject eye ‘bird’.

As I show in the next section, the analyses of SVCs by Sebba (1987), Baker (1989), and Winford (1990) cannot apply to Thai Directional SVCs because the latter can include more than two verbs in a row and instantiate more than one syntactic structure.

Finally, Thepkanjana (1986) suggests that Thai Directional SVCs have a flat, iterative VP structure of the form VP → VP VP* (illustrated by the syntactic tree in ((18)), and argues that when several verbs occur in this construction, they must conform to the constraint on linear order shown in Table 2.1:
Table 2.1: Directional verbs and their specific linear order in SVCs (Thepkanjana (1986))

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Manner-of-motion verbs (or verbs that entail motion)</td>
<td>Geometric shape of the path</td>
<td>Direction with respect to the previous path</td>
<td>Direction with respect to the outside world</td>
<td>Direction with respect to speech act participant (deictic verbs)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(18)

```
(18) Malii wîn troj âûn klâb khâw pâj
```

Malii run go straight reverse return enter go

Malii ran straight back in, away from the speaker.

According to Thepkanjana, the following verb types (V1) can be modified by directional verbs (i.e. verbs from slots 2-5):

b. **travel verbs** - Examples: *dənthaŋ ‘travel’, thɔɔŋthiaw ‘wander for fun’, rɔɔn rèe ‘roam’ or ‘wander without purpose’

c. **‘take’ verbs** - Examples: ?aw ‘take’, ITCH’ay ‘grab’, yɛɛŋ ‘take forcibly’

d. **communication verbs, transactional verbs and the verb meaning ‘change’** (combining only with the serial verb *paj ‘go’ or maa ‘come’) - Examples: *phān ‘change’, *toorasàp ‘telephone’, khāaj ‘sell’

e. **destruction, disappearance verbs and certain stative verbs** (combining only with the serial verb *paj ‘go’) - Examples: *taaj ‘die’, hāaj ‘disappear’

The list of Thepkanjana’s possible initial verb (V1), excluding (d) and (e), suggests that serial verbs can be transitive or intransitive but must be related to or compatible with a motion event.

According to Thepkanjana (1986:138), the linear order among directional verbs can be conceived of as a cline. The left end represents semantic elements most internal or inherent to the path of motion and the right end represents those elements most external to it. For instance, the geometric shape of a path is one of the path’s inherent characteristics and verbs that describe it occur in slot 2. By contrast, verbs which encode characteristics of the path from the speech participants’ viewpoint, the least inherent property of paths, occur in slot 5; that is, in the position furthermost from the initial verb.

In contrast to Thepkanjana, I argue below for a different constituent structure of Thai Directional SVCs, that more than one phrase structural schema is involved in these

---

2 It should be noted that when verbs (d) and (e) combine with the mentioned serial verbs, the resulting meaning is not spatial. I claim that in combinations like this, the serial verb *paj ‘go’ or maa ‘come’ is
constructions, and that verbs which form a Directional SVC do not necessarily occur in the order shown in Table 2.1.

2.4 Constituent and Argument Structures of Thai Directional Serial Verbs

In this section, I investigate the constituent structure of Thai Directional SVCs and argument structures of verbs that occur in the SVCs.

2.4.1 Constituent Structure

I determine the constituent structure of Thai Directional SVCs on the basis of the adverb placement and anaphoric VP tests.

Adverb placement test

The adverb placement test supports two claims. First, it shows that serial verbs in Directional SVCs syntactically differ from complements of the initial verbs. Second, the test shows that there can be a VP break after any verb in the sequence of verbs in a SVC construct except before the last verb, when that verb is a deictic one.

Adverbs in Thai normally occur VP-finally. I assume that an adverb marks the boundary of a VP (see chapter 1). In other words, an adverb indicates that what comes before it is a VP. The placement of an adverb can, thus, be used to test where the VP break is in an SVC construct. The occurrence of adverbs in (19)-(21) shows that the serial verbs differ from complements in Thai, i.e. they are not sisters to the initial verb.

metaphorically interpreted and, instead of encoding a directional meaning, encodes aspectual meaning. The study of verbal elements which are used to encode aspect is presented in the next two chapters.
(19) **Head-complement**

a. Piti kin khâaw jaan?donreep

Piti eat rice feebly

Piti ate rice feebly.

b. *Piti kin jaan?donreep khâaw

Piti eat feebly rice

(Intended meaning: He ate rice feebly)

(20) **Equi verb: phajajaam ‘try’**

a. Piti phajajaam khên môtèsaj jaan?donreep

Piti try push motorcycle feebly

Piti tried to push the motorcycle feebly.

b. *Piti phajajaam jaan?donreep khên môtèsaj

Piti try feebly push motorcycle

(21) **Directional SVCs**

a. Piti đên ?dok jaan?donreep

Piti walk exit feebly

Piti walked out feebly

b. Piti đên jaan?donreep ?dok

Piti walk feebly exit

Piti walked out feebly.
Example (19) shows that an adverb cannot be inserted between the head verb and its nominal complement. Example (20) shows that an adverb cannot intervene between the equi verb *phajajaam* ‘try’ and its VP complement. In contrast, an adverb can occur between the initial verb and the serial verb in a Directional SVC, as shown in (21). Examples (19)-(21) show that serial verbs in a Directional SVC differ from the complements of the head verb or the initial verb.

In addition, the adverb placement test applied in (22)-(25) shows that the structure of a Directional SVC is recursive, namely, there can be a VP break after any verb in an SVC. However, there cannot be a VP break after the next-to-last verb when the last verb is a deictic verb. Notice that in the following examples, I use the adverbial phrase *dúajfiítháawbaw* ‘with light footsteps’ which semantically modifies the verb *døn* ‘walk’ (i.e. the first verb in (22)-(25)) to ensure that the adverb does not simply modify its immediately preceding verb.³

(22) Malii døn(1) ?òok (4b) won(2) kláb(4a) jóon(3) paj(5) dúajfiítháawbaw

Malii walk exit circle return reverse go with light footsteps

Malii walked out, circling, back, away from the speaker, with light footsteps.

---

³ The adverb *dúajfiítháawbaw* ‘with light footsteps’ can semantically modify only manner-of-motion verbs such as *døn* ‘walk’, as illustrated by the following examples:

i. Malii døn dúajfiítháawbaw
Malii walk with light footsteps
Malii walked with light footsteps.

ii. #Malií won dúajfiítháawbaw
Malií circle with light footsteps
(Intended meaning: Malií circled with light footsteps.)

When the adverb *dúajfiítháawbaw* ‘with light footsteps’ modifies the VP which is not headed by a manner-of-motion verb, such as *won* ‘circle’ in (ii), the sentence is implausible.
(23) Malii ðòok (4b) won (2) dùajfútháawbaw klàb (4a) jòon (3) paj (5)
Malii walk exit circle with light footsteps return reverse go
Malii walked out, circling, with light footsteps, back away from the speaker.

(24) Malii ðòok (4b) dùajfútháawbaw won (2) klàb (4a) jòon (3) paj (5)
Malii walk exit with light footsteps circle return reverse go
Malii walked out, with light footsteps, circling back away from the speaker.

(25) *Malii ðòok (4b) won (2) klàb (4a) jòon (3) dùajfútháawbaw paj (5)
Malii walk exit circle return reverse with light footsteps go
(Intended meaning: Malii walked out, circling, back, with light footsteps, away from the speaker)

Since adverbs mark the boundary of a VP, if the structure of Directional SVCs is iterative (i.e. VP --> VP VP* or VP --> V V*), we cannot explain reordering possibilities of the adverb in (22)-(24). But if we assume that adverbs adjoin to a VP and that a Directional SVC has a recursive structure VP --> VP VP, we can account for multiple possible positions of the adverb in (22)-(24).

Note that I illustrate only some possible positions for the adverb dùajfútháawbaw ‘with light footsteps’ in sentences (22)-(24). Other positions of the adverb are possible, except the one in (25). The fact that (25), in which the adverb occurs between the next-to-last verb and the last, deictic verb, is ungrammatical shows that there cannot be a VP break between these two verbs. Otherwise, the adverb placement test shows that there can be a VP break after any verb in a Directional SVC sequence.
The second test, the anaphoric VP *tham jàarđìawkan* ‘do so’ or ‘do the same’, can be used to test the constituent structure of a complex VP, under the assumption that the antecedent of ‘do so’ or ‘do the same’ has to be a VP constituent. This test yields a similar result to that of the adverb placement test, as illustrated below:

(26) Malii wìŋ1 jōɔŋ3 klàb4a ṭòɔk4b won2 paj5 lɛ? Piti kɔ?

*Malii run reverse return exit circle go and Piti then*

*do the same go straight come*

Malii ran back out away, circling, and Piti did the same straight towards the speaker.

(antecedent = the first four verbs in sequence - run + reverse + return + exit)

(27) Malii wìŋ1 jōɔŋ3 klàb4a ṭòɔk4b won2 paj5 lɛ? Piti kɔ?

*Malii run reverse return exit circle go and Piti then*

*do the same descend go straight come*

Malii ran back out away, circling, and Piti did the same down straight towards the speaker.

(antecedent = the first three verbs in sequence – run + reverse + return)
Sentences (26) through (28), and other possible sentences with different numbers of verbs as the antecedent that are not listed here, show that *tham jaaŋdiawkan ‘do the same’ can pick up as its antecedent an initial VP or an initial VP plus any following sequence of serial verbs in an SVC construct so long as the deictic verb does not differ between the antecedent VP and the anaphoric VP, as is the case for the ungrammatical sentence in (28). This means that the deictic verb cannot be separated from its preceding verb, and, unlike other verbs in the construct, does not form an independent VP at the exclusion of its preceding verb. The anaphoric VP test also suggests that verbs in a Directional SVC form a recursive VP-over-VP structure except when a verb in the SVC is followed by a deictic verb.

To summarize, the adverb placement test shows that serial verbs are different from complements of the initial verb. Moreover, the adverb placement and the do so tests show that there can be a VP break after any verb in a Directional SVC, except after the next-to-last verb, if the last verb is a deictic one. In other words, there is no VP break between the
deictic verb and its preceding verb as an adverb cannot be inserted between them and the anaphoric VP *do the same* and its antecedent cannot differ only in the deictic verb.

### 2.4.2 Argument Structures of Verbs in Directional SVCs

In this section, I describe the argument structure or subcategorization properties of verbs that occur in Thai Directional SVCs. Verbs which do not encode manner-of-motion in Directional SVCs allow optional arguments,\(^4\) as illustrated in (29).

\[ (29) \text{Piti } dәn \text{ kʰâam (sàphaan) } klàb \text{ (càak tâlàad) paj (rooŋrian)} \]

Piti walk cross (bridge) return (from market) go (school)

Piti walked, crossing (the bridge), back (from the market), away (to school).

In (29), the NP *sàphaan* ‘bridge’, the PP *càak tâlàad* ‘from the market’ and the NP *rooŋrian* ‘school’ are optional complements of the serial verbs *kʰâam* ‘cross’, *klàb* ‘return’ and *paj* ‘go’ respectively. The omission of complements is a property of directional verbs *as serial verbs* only, i.e. directional verbs cannot leave out their complements when they function as the only verb in a clause. This is illustrated by the ungrammaticality of the following sentences:

\[ (30) \quad *\text{Piti } kʰâam \]

Piti cross

\[ (31) \quad *\text{Piti } kʰâw \]

Piti enter

\(^4\) I will modify this hypothesis later.
(32) *Piti paj

Piti go

Based on the optional complement property of serial verbs, we can distinguish Directional SVCs as in (29) from sentences such as (33), which contains several VPs conjoined by ɿ ɿ ‘and’, and is ungrammatical since the verbs do not co-occur with their required complements.

(33) *Piti dən lèʔ khåam ɿ klàb ɿ lèʔ ɿ paj

Piti walk and cross and return and go

We have learned the constituent structure of Directional SVCs from the adverb placement and anaphoric VP tests and the argument structures of verbs that occur in the SVCs. From these tests, I conclude that the structure of the Thai Directional SVC in (34) is as shown in (35):

(34) Malii wînj(1) jōn(3) klàb(4a) troj(2) khåam(4a) saphaan paj(5)

Malii run reverse return go straight cross bridge go

Malii ran back straight, crossing the bridge, away from the speaker.

(35)
Namely, Thai Directional SVCs comprise either a recursive\(^5\) VP-over-VP structure or an extended complementation structure for the deictic verb and its preceding verb. Previous analyses of directional SVCs discussed in 2.3 are not sufficient to account for Thai Directional SVCs. Complementation approaches (Sebba, 1987 and Winford 1990) cannot explain the optional nature of the complements of directional serial verbs. The multi-head analysis of Directional SVCs by Baker (1989), in which one \(V\) is embedded in another (one \(V\) is subcategorized for by another \(V\)), cannot apply to Thai Directional SVCs because it predicts a type of argument sharing that does not occur in Thai Directional SVCs. This is because Baker’s multi-head analysis predicts that whatever argument occurs in the daughter \(V'\) will be shared by the mother \(V'\) as well, which is not borne out in Thai.

For example, the argument *saphaan* ‘bridge’ in *khâam saphaan* ‘cross the bridge’ in (34) is not shared by any other verb in the SVC sequence. It is also not clear how to apply Baker’s multi-head structure to the recursive structure of Thai Directional SVCs.

Finally, contrary to the hypothesis of Thepkanjana (1986), the recursive structure I assume in (35) predicts the possible reordering of verbs from slots 1-4b in Table 1.1. This is because the \(VP \rightarrow VP\ VP\) rule which generates the recursive VP-over-VP structure of Directional SVCs simply states that a \(VP\) in a Directional SVC has two other instances of \(VPs\) as its daughters. Without additional Linear Precedence (LP) statements, this rule does not determine the positions in the SVC in which verbs occur, hence the possibility of free-ordering among verbs from slots 1-4b. The reordering is indeed possible with one

\(^5\) Note that the recursive structure does not produce only the structure in (35), but generates spurious ambiguities or different ways of combining the \(VPs\) in a construct, without corresponding semantic differences. I discuss this issue in more detail in footnote 19.
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exception, which concerns the position of the manner-of-motion verbs (i.e. verbs from slot 1 in Table 1). I discuss the ordering constraints in detail in the next section.

In this section, I proposed that a sequence of Thai Directional SVC such as the one in (34) is formed through the use of two phrase structural schemata: a recursive VP → VP rule and a head-complement rule. Thai Directional SVCs thus involve two kinds of serializations: symmetric and asymmetric serializations, in the sense of Andrews and Manning (1999). All verbs in a symmetric serialization structure have equal status, meaning that the occurrence of one verb is not determined by another. Symmetric serialization is exemplified in Thai by the sequence of non-deictic verbs in Directional SVCs. Verbs in asymmetric SVCs do not have equal status (one verb is the complement of the other); the VP containing a deictic verb in Thai SVCs is an instance of asymmetric serialization.

2.5 Ordering Constraints

In this section, I describe the ordering constraints on Thai Directional SVCs and explain why previous approaches to Directional SVCs cannot account for the Thai data. As I mentioned, the VP-over-VP structure of Thai Directional SVCs suggests the possibility of reordering VPs, since they do not stand in a head-complement relationship with respect to one another.\(^6\) Reordering the VPs is indeed possible, as (36)\(^7\) shows. This contrasts with

---

\(^6\) The order of head vs. complements in Thai is strict, as I described in Chapter 1.

\(^7\) Examples in (36) also show that a Thai Directional SVC construct does not necessarily contain a manner-of-motion verb. More examples are:

(i) (3) (4a) (2) (4b) (5)

Piti jōn khām saphaan tròp khāw bān paj

Piti reverse cross bridge go straight enter house go

Piti went back, crossing the bridge, straight into the house, away from the speaker.
the specific linear order shown in Table 2.1.\(^8\)

(36) a. (3) (4a) (2) (4b) (5)

\begin{verbatim}
Piti j\text{"oo}n kh\text{"aa}m saphaan tr\text{"o}j ?\text{"o}k paj
\end{verbatim}

Piti reverse cross bridge go straight exit go

b. (2) (4b) (3) (4a) (5)

\begin{verbatim}
Piti tr\text{"o}j ?\text{"o}k j\text{"oo}n kh\text{"aa}m saphaan paj
\end{verbatim}

Piti go straight exit reverse cross bridge go

c. (4b) (2) (4a) (3) (5)

\begin{verbatim}
Piti ?\text{"o}k tr\text{"o}j kh\text{"aa}m saphaan j\text{"oo}n paj
\end{verbatim}

Piti exit go straight cross bridge reverse go

(36a-c) = Piti went back straight, crossing the bridge, out away from the speaker.

This reordering possibility is an argument against the flat structure that Thepkanjana (1986) proposes. This is because, generally, Thai is a strict word-order language, which means that the language generally imposes ordering constraints on sisters in a local tree. The flat structure, in which all verbs in sequence are sisters, would not explain why sentences in (36) escape these strict ordering constraints.

The examples in (36) are only some of the possible reordering of verbs from slots 2-4b in Table 2.1. Any reordering of verbs in a Directional SVC construct is possible with two exceptions. These involve the positions of manner-of-motion and deictic verbs. The

(ii) (4a) (4b) (5)

\begin{verbatim}
Piti kl\text{"a}b lo\text{"e}j paj
Piti return descend go
\end{verbatim}

Piti went back down, away from the speaker.
first constraint concerns manner-of-motion verbs, which, if present, must occur first in the sequence, as illustrated in (37) - (38).

(37) \[(1) \quad (4b) \quad (5)\]

a. Piti ḏën khūn paj

Piti walk ascend go

Piti walked up, away from the speaker.

\[(4b) \quad (1) \quad (5)\]

b. *Piti khūn ḏën paj

Piti ascend walk go

(38) \[(1) \quad (3) \quad (5)\]

a. Piti Ṗiŋ jōōn maa

Piti run reverse come

Piti ran back, toward the speaker.

\[(3) \quad (1) \quad (5)\]

b. *Piti jōōn Ṗiŋ maa

Piti reverse run come

Sentences (37) and (38) show that manner-of-motion verbs (or verbs from slot 1 in Table 2.1) must occur first in the SVC sequence. If they do not occur initially, the sentence is ungrammatical, as (37b) and (38b) show.

---

According to Thepkanjana, if verbs in Directional SVCs do not follow the order mentioned in Table 2.1, they denote separate motion events, and not a single complex motion event, an assumption that I do not agree with. Verbs in the SVCs in (36) can be reordered and still describe a single complex motion event.

---

8 According to Thepkanjana, if verbs in Directional SVCs do not follow the order mentioned in Table 2.1, they denote separate motion events, and not a single complex motion event, an assumption that I do not agree with. Verbs in the SVCs in (36) can be reordered and still describe a single complex motion event.
The second ordering constraint concerns deictic verbs, which, when present, must occur last in the SVC sequence.

(39) Piti wiŋ₁(1) khāam₄(4a) sàʔphaan paj₅

Piti run cross bridge go

Piti ran across the bridge, away from the speaker.

(40) Piti paj₅ wiŋ₁(1) khāam₄(4a) sàʔphaan

Piti go run cross bridge

Piti went to run across the bridge.

(41) Piti wiŋ₁(1) loŋ₄(b) bandaj maa₅

Piti run descend stairs come

Piti ran down the stairs, toward the speaker.

(42) Piti wiŋ₁(1) maa₅ loŋ₄(b) bandaj

Piti run come descend stairs

Piti ran to come down the stairs.

Example (39) and (41) contrasts with (40) and (42) in meaning. When the deictic verbs (paj ‘go’ and maa ‘come) do not occur last in the SVC sequence and precede any other verb, the deictic verbs encode a purposive meaning, as shown in (40) and (42). The crucial difference is that while (39) and (41) encode a single event, (40) and (42) denote a sequence of two separate events, the second of which is not entailed to occur.

We have seen that ordering constraints in Thai Directional SVCs involve manner-of-motion and deictic verbs. Nonetheless, as I hypothesize, when a Directional SVC construct contains neither manner-of-motion nor deictic verbs, a single schema of the form
VP $\rightarrow$ VP VP applies and yields the right results of “free” ordering among VPs, as shown below.

(43)

```
   S
  /  \  \
 VP  VP
 /    /  \
VP   VP
 /   /  \
NP  Piti thọj klab 'ok
```

Piti retreat return exit

Piti retreated back out.

The three verbs in (43), thọj ‘retreat’, klab ‘return’, and 'ok ‘exit’ can be freely reordered as predicted by the recursive VP-over-VP structure. The two ordering constraints bear on an SVC construct only when the construct contains a manner-of-motion and/or a deictic verb, as illustrated in (44):

(44)

```
   S
  /  \  \
 VP  VP
 /    /  \
VP   VP
 /   /  \
NP  VP1[FIRST] VP2 VP3 VP4 VP5[LAST]
 /   /   /   /   /   /   /
Malii witi(1) joon(3) klab(4a) 'ok(4b) won(2) paj(5)
 Malii run reverse return exit circle go
```

Malii ran back out, circling, away from the speaker.

In (44), the two VPs surrounded by boxes are the fixed positions in the Directional SVC construct. Crucially, it is not possible to impose a Linear Precedence (LP) statement on the
recursive VP-over-VP structure to ensure the right ordering in (44), namely, to specify that the VP containing the manner-of-motion verb ล่น ‘run’ must occur first in the sequence and that the VP consisting of วง วง ‘circle go’ must occur last. The VP → VP VP schema permits a VP in a Directional SVC to have two other instances of VPs as its daughters, but it cannot specify the relative order of VP₁ and VP₃ in (44), or VP₁ and VP₅, and so forth, since these VP pairs are not sisters.

Previous analyses of Directional SVCs discussed earlier are not sufficient to account for the ordering constraints on Thai Directional SVCs either. Subcategorization approaches of Sebba (1987) and Winford (1990) cannot formulate phrase structure rules that specify fixed positions of both manner-of-motion verbs and of the constituents containing deictic verbs since these constituents are not sisters in a local tree. The theta-role assignment approach of Baker (1989) also cannot explain the ordering constraints in Thai Directional SVCs because it incorrectly predicts a strict ordering of verbs in directional SVCs, since Thai is otherwise a rigid word order language.

To account for the fixed positions of particular classes of verbs in Directional SVCs, I present a syntactic analysis of Thai Directional SVCs in HPSG in the next section. Based on the assumption that words are informationally rich, lexical specifications allow us to associate constraints bearing on the positions in the SVCs with verbs in Directional SVCs. These lexical specifications, together with the new co-headed schema that I propose, can account for both the constituent structure and ordering constraints of Thai Directional SVCs.
2.6 Analysis of Thai Directional Serial Verb Constructions

2.6.1 Syntactic Analysis of Thai Directional Serial Verb Constructions

To model the structure and ordering constraints of Thai Directional SVCs, my analysis makes use of: 1) rich featural specifications on heads to organize classes of verbs according to their argument structures and ordering possibilities, 2) a new Head - Co-head schema, and 3) a default interpretation of the Head Feature Principle (cf. Sag, 2000), in which default head properties can be overridden by more specific information.

I model Thai Directional SVCs by proposing a few lexical specifications, two lexical rules and three syntactic rules or schemata. I start by presenting the relevant portion of the Thai lexical type hierarchy I assume in Figure 2.1:9

![Figure 2.1: A portion of Thai lexical type hierarchy](image)

Figure 2.1 shows that there are two types of verbs in Thai: main verb and serial verb. A crucial property of the supertype verb, which is inherited by its two subtypes is that a verb can occur as the only verb of a clause. Main verb refers to the union of verbs which do not occur in SVCs and verbs which must appear in the initial position of a Directional SVC sequence. In other words, main verbs are verbs which occur where heads are expected to occur in a head-initial language. In Directional SVCs, main verbs include manner-of-

---

9 I will revise this figure in Chapter 4.
motion and caused-motion\textsuperscript{10} verbs. Caused-motion verbs include verbs of type \textit{c} (‘take’ verbs) in Thepkanjana’s (1986) classification and verbs such as \textit{khwânaŋ} ‘throw’. \textit{Main verbs} that occur in an SVC differ from \textit{serial verbs} in another way. The first ones cannot leave out their required complements in the SVCs, as illustrated in (45).

\begin{enumerate}
\item[(45) a.] Priida \textit{?aw stûaphâa \textit{?òok (càak bân) paj}}
\begin{flushright}
Priida take cloth exit (from house) go
\end{flushright}

Priida took the cloth out (from the house) away.

\item[(45) b.] *Priida \textit{?aw \textit{?òok (càak bân) paj}}
\begin{flushright}
Priida take exit from house go
\end{flushright}

(\text{Intended meaning: Priida took (something) out (from the house) away.})
\end{enumerate}

In (45), the complement of \textit{?aw} ‘take’, namely \textit{stûaphâa} ‘cloth’, cannot be left out, as shown by the ungrammaticality of (45b), while the occurrence of the complement of directional serial verbs such as \textit{?òok} ‘exit’ is optional. Note, however, that \textit{?òok} ‘exit’ cannot leave out its complement outside of SVCs, i.e. when it occurs as the only verb in a clause, as shown below.

\begin{enumerate}
\item[(46)] *Priida \textit{?òok}
\begin{flushright}
Priida exit
\end{flushright}
\end{enumerate}

Thus, \textit{serial verbs} refer to verbs that can occur in a non-initial position in a Directional SVC sequence, and which can leave unexpressed some of their arguments (cf. 2.3.2).

\textsuperscript{10} See Choi and Bowerman (1991) and Kim (1997) for the use of the term “caused-motion”.
Differences in argument structures and ordering possibilities among verbs that can occur in Directional SVCs are captured by specifications of the attributes FIRST and DEFECTIVE, as illustrated in Figure 2.2.

![Figure 2.2: Type declarations for verb and its subtypes](image)

Verbs that can occur in a Thai Directional SVC specify differently the values of the features DEFECTIVE and FIRST, as shown in Figure 2.2. The values of the DEFECTIVE feature specify the realization possibilities of verbs’ argument structures. Namely, verbs which are [DEFECTIVE +] can occur without their otherwise required complements, while verbs specified as [DEFECTIVE -] must occur with their required complements. The values of the feature FIRST determines the positions of the verbs in Directional SVCs, which I discuss in more detail below.

I have now classified the syntactic categories of verbs that occur in Thai Directional SVCs. The combinations and ordering constraints of verbs in the SVCs are also partly determined by the meanings of verbs in SVCs. Verbs in Directional SVCs encode semantic relations which are subtypes of motion semantic relations. The basic hierarchy of semantic relations of verbs that occur in Directional SVCs is presented in Figure 2.3.
Figure 2.2 presents a brief hierarchy of meanings (i.e. semantic relations) of verbs that occur in Thai Directional SVCs. All verbs that occur in Thai Directional SVCs are classified as verbs which encode motion-rel (motion-related verbs). Motion-rel has three subtypes: directional-rel, deictic-rel, and non-deictic-rel. These subtypes are cross-classified. Namely, one subtype can be a subtype of two supertypes. For example, go-rel, the semantic relation coded by paj ‘go’ in Thai, is a subtype of both directional-rel and deictic-rel because it carries directional information of a motion event as well as deictic information, with the speaker as the deictic center. The cross-classification of directional-rel and deictic-rel contains go-rel (denoted by paj ‘go’) and come-rel (denoted by maa ‘come’). I henceforth call pai ‘go’ and maa ‘come’ “deictic verbs” for convenience. Non-deictic-rel is further classified into manner-of-motion-rel and caused-motion-rel.

Examples of subtypes of motions relations are shown at the bottom of Figure 2.2. For instance, take-rel is a subtype of caused-motion-rel.

In Directional SVCs, verbs that encode manner-of-motion-rel and caused-motion-rel are main verbs. Verbs that encode other semantic relations are serial verbs due to their
special argument (i.e. complement) structures. In lexically-specified terms, verbs that occur in Directional SVCs are classified as in (47).

(47) a. Manner-of-motion and caused-motion verbs are lexically marked as

\[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{DEFECTIVE} & - \\
\text{FIRST} & +
\end{array}
\]

The specification [DEFECTIVE -] will ensure that these verbs occur with their required complements. The feature-value [FIRST +] ensures that the VP occurs first in the SVC sequence.

b. Non-deictic directional verbs (verbs which encode relations other than \textit{deictic-rel}, \textit{manner-of-motion-rel} and \textit{caused-motion-rel}) are lexically marked as

\[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{DEFECTIVE} & + \\
\text{FIRST} & \text{boolean}
\end{array}
\]

The specification [DEFECTIVE +] allows these verbs to occur without their required complements \textbf{in the SVC}. Non-deictic directional verbs are underspecified for the feature [FIRST] since they can occur initially or in a non-initial position in Directional SVCs.

c. Verbs that take a deictic verb\textsuperscript{11} as complement\textsuperscript{12} are lexically marked as [FIRST -]. This specification will ensure that a VP headed by a verb from this class must occur last in the sequence of VPs in Directional SVCs.

Parts of the lexical specifications in (47) result from the application of the following two lexical rules.\textsuperscript{13} I delay examples which show derivations which involve these lexical rules until after I discuss the relevant syntactic schemata. The first lexical rule is needed to

\textsuperscript{11} I assume that deictic verbs (i.e. \textit{paj} ‘go’ and \textit{maa} ‘come’) are also serial verbs because their otherwise required complements can be left out, although deictic verbs are distinct from other serial verbs in other aspects, as I discuss in more detail below.

\textsuperscript{12} As the two constituency tests showed, a deictic verb is sister to (i.e. is a complement of) its preceding verb. I shortly present the lexical rule that creates the class of verbs which take deictic verbs as complements.
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ensure that *serial verbs* can leave out their otherwise required complements (cf. example (29)).

**Lexical Rule (LR) 1**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>HEAD</th>
<th>serial verb</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SUBJ</td>
<td>⟨[1]⟩</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COMPS</td>
<td>[2]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARG-ST</td>
<td>⟨[1]⟩ ⊕[2]list ⟨canonical - synsem⟩</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

→

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>HEAD</th>
<th>serial verb</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>COMPS</td>
<td>list synsem</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARG-ST</td>
<td>⟨[1]⟩ ⊕ list⟨synsem⟩</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The type *canonical-synsem* is relevant to the feature DEFECTIVE and is introduced in LR1 to indicate the typical relation between the ARG-ST and COMPS lists. Recall that the ARG-ST list of a head verb is typically the concatenation of SUBJ and COMPS lists. This means that, typically, the first element in the ARG-ST list of the verb is realized as the subject (illustrated by the co-indexing of [1] in the ARG-ST and SUBJ lists in LR1) and the other elements in the ARG-ST list are realized as complements (the co-indexing of [2] in the ARG-ST and COMPS lists). Lexical Rule 1 states that for every *serial verb* which subcategorizes for normal complements, indicated by the second sublist in the ARG-ST list which is a *canonical-synsem* list, there is a corresponding entry which has a special argument structure (i.e. is [DEFECTIVE+]) and subcategorizes for complements of the type *synsem*. This is indicated by the specification of the second sublist on the ARG-ST list in the output, namely a *synsem* list, which leaves open whether it is a list of *canonical-synsem* or *non-canonical-synsem* objects. Intuitively, the output of LR1 is an entry of serial verb whose complements can be normally realized (i.e. as *canonical-synsem* complements), or can be left out and recoverable from the context (i.e. as *understood-*

\[\text{ Instead of lexical rules, we can achieve the same results through the on-line combination of lexeme classes as advocated in Koenig (1999).}\]
Elements of the type *understood-synsem* refer to the complements of serial verbs in Thai Directional SVCs which can be left out but which are recoverable from the context.

The next lexical rule derives the entry of a motion verb which precedes a deictic serial verb and takes the deictic verb as its complement. The function of Lexical Rule 2 is to add to a non-deictic motion verb a valence requirement corresponding to the deictic serial verb and to ensure that the constituent headed by this motion verb occurs last in the SVC sequence.

**Lexical Rule (LR)2**

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{HEAD} \ [1] & \quad \text{verb} \\
\text{ARG} - \ S \ [2] & \\
\text{CONTENT} \ [\text{non-deictic\_rel}] \\
\end{align*}
\]

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{HEAD} \ [1] & \quad \text{FIRST} \\
\text{DEFECTIVE} & \\
\text{ARG} - \ S \ [2] & \quad \text{HEAD} \quad \text{serial verb} \\
\text{CONTENT} \ [\text{deictic\_rel}] \\
\end{align*}
\]

Lexical Rule 2 indicates that for every *non-deictic-verb* (i.e. verb that encodes a motion-related *non-deictic-rel*), there is a derived entry in which the ARG-ST is extended by having an added argument corresponding to a deictic verb. With its extended argument structure, the derived verb can then syntactically combine with the deictic verb via the Head-Complement schema. Furthermore, the output of LR 2 is also specified as [FIRST -] to ensure that this derived verb, which contains a deictic verb as an added element in its
ARG-ST list, occurs last in the SVC. The function of [DEFECTIVE-] is to insure that a verb phrase formed by combining the output of LR2 with a deictic verb can enter the Head-Subject Schema, and, therefore, function as the verb phrase of a clause, as I discuss shortly.

Apart from the above lexical rules, I propose that the following three schemata are needed to form a complex Thai Directional SVC. Schemata in HPSG serve as templates for permissible local phrase structure trees or configurations of immediate constituents (Pollard and Sag, 1994). Among the three schemata proposed, one schema is unique to Thai; i.e. the Head - Co-head Schema. These schemata and lexical rules together account for the constituency of VPs in Thai Directional SVCs and the fixed positions of the manner-of-motion verbs and motion verbs containing deictic verbs.

Schema 1\textsuperscript{14} - Head-Subject Schema (cf. Pollard and Sag, 1994)

\begin{enumerate}
\item [\textbf{HEAD} \[1\] \textit{verb}]
\item [\textbf{SUBJ} \{\}]
\item [\textbf{COMPS} \{\}]
\end{enumerate}

This schema is used to combine a VP with the subject NP to form a sentence. Recall that the Valence Principle states that unless the rule says otherwise, the mother’s SUBJ and COMPS values are identical to those of the head daughter. The Head-Subject schema says that once the VP combines with a subject NP, the value of SUBJ of that VP is “canceled.

\footnote{Notice that I only provide simplified figures to illustrate the three schemata, mentioning only the relevant feature structure descriptions.}
off” at the mother level. In Schema 1, from the bottom up, the VP’s SUBJ list consists of a single SYNSEM object, tagged [2]. This VP combines with the constituent [2] which is token identical to the synsem of the sole member of the VP’s SUBJ list, meaning that the constituent [2] satisfies the SUBJ description of the VP. The top feature structure’s SUBJ list is empty, as required by the Valence Principle. This means that the VP has been combined with the subject NP to form a sentence.

The Head-Subject Schema which I propose for Thai is a specialization this general Head-Subject Schema, as shown below.

(48) **Head-Subject Schema for Thai**

![Head-Subject Schema for Thai](image)

The Head-Subject Schema for Thai basically specifies that a subject of a clause needs to combine with a verb phrase whose head is a [DEFECTIVE-] verb. A verb can be [DEFECTIVE -] either by type specification (i.e. *main verbs* are type-declared to be [DEFECTIVE -], see figure 2.3), or as a result of constraints imposed by lexical rules (cf. LR2) or schemata such as the Head-Subject Schema, and the Head - Co-head Schema below.
Schema 2 conforms to Pollard and Sag’s Head-Complement Schema. Apart from its general use to combine all verbs with their complements, this schema is also needed to combine the deictic serial verb with its preceding verb since, as mentioned in 2.3, the deictic serial verb forms an immediate constituent with its preceding verb, i.e. it syntactically complements that verb.

**Schema 2:** Head-Complement Schema (cf. Pollard and Sag, 1994)

![Diagram of Schema 2](image)

In Schema 2, elements tagged [3]...[n] in the COMPS list of the head verb are token-identical to the synsems of the constituents [3]...[n] that this verb combines with. The elements in the COMPS list are then canceled off from the phrase’s mother; this is indicated by the null value of the COMPS list of the mother.

**Schema 3,** the Head - Co-head Schema,\(^\text{15}\) is unique to the Thai Directional SVC. This schema is defined as a schema that forms a head-co-headed phrase. A head-co-headed phrase is a subtype of headed-phrase. I assume, as Sag (2000) does, that the Head Feature Principle (HFP) is a default principle. The HFP states that in any headed phrase,

\(^{15}\)The name “head - co-head schema” might suggest that it is the schema for combining two lexical head verbs (which corresponds to “nuclear juncture”, a particular type of relation among complex units in a
the HEAD value of the mother and the HEAD value of the head daughter must be unified.
Assuming that the HFP is a default means that more specific information can take
precedence over what is specified by the HFP, as I discuss in more detail below. A
hierarchy of headed-phrase and its subtypes, as well as schemata which form these types
are illustrated in (49) and (50). (Note that I assume, following Sag (1997), that schemata
are types, which can form a hierarchy and be associated with certain constraints.)

\[(49)\]

```
hd-phrase
  \|-- strict-hd-phrase
  \|-- head-co-hd-phrase
  \|-- head-subject-phrase
  \|-- head-complement-phrase
```

\[(50)\]  

\[a.\] Schema for headed-phrase:

```
HEAD [ / [1] ]
HEAD [ / [1] ] …
```

\[b.\] Schema for strict-headed-phrase:\[^16^]

```
HEAD [ [1] / ]
```

---

verb phrase, in Role and Reference Grammar (Van Valin and LaPolla, 1997)), which is not the case. The schema combines two motion-related verb phrases and can apply recursively.

\[^16^\] The Head-Subject and Head-Complement Schemata are subtypes of strict-headed phrases. To be explicit, I present the schema for strict-headed-phrase, but, in fact, the current HPSG assumption is that strictness will be an automatic result of lack of conflicting information.
c. Schema for head-co-headed-phrase (Head - Co-head Schema)\textsuperscript{17} - preliminary version:

\[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{HEAD} \quad \text{FIRST} \\
\text{DEFECTIVE} \\
\end{array}
\]

A small portion of the hierarchy of headed-phrase is shown in (49). There are two subtypes of headed-phrase: strict-headed-phrase and head-co-headed-phrase. Head-subject-phrase and head-complement-phrase are subtypes of strict-headed-phrase. Schemata that define headed-phrase, strict-headed-phrase, and head-co-headed-phrase are illustrated in (50). Schema (50a) states that the head properties of the mother, tagged by [1], are by default identical to the head properties of the head daughter. The fact that the identification is only by default is indicated by the position of [1] after the slash. The assumption that head properties are identified by default means that the head properties of the phrase are typically identical to that of the single head daughter, but that they can be overridden by more specific information from the subtypes of headed-phrase. (50a)

\textsuperscript{17} As pointed out to me by Emily Bender (p.c.), one drawback of this schema is that it leads to spurious structural ambiguities. This is because the schema allows multiple groupings of VPs in an SVC, as illustrated by the following example.

i. Piti wîn won ʔɔ̂ɔk
   Piti run circle exit
   Piti ran, circling, out.
contrasts with (50b) in that the head properties tagged with [1] in (50b) are strictly required to be identical to that of the single head daughter, as indicated by the position of [1] before the slash. The strict head properties are identified between the head daughter and the mother in a monotonic inheritance manner and cannot be overridden.

Contrary to the schema for strict-headed phrases, the Head - Co-head Schema specifies which head properties are inherited from which head daughters. The mother in the Head - Co-head Schema shares the value of [FIRST] with that of the second daughter, and is specified as [DEFECTIVE -]. The schema states that the left daughter, which I call the head daughter, must be a VP\(^{18}\) whose [FIRST] and [DEFECTIVE] values must be able to unify with \([\text{FIRST} + \text{DEFECTIVE boolean}]\), and that the daughter on the right, or the co-head daughter, must be a serial verb phrase that can unify with \([\text{FIRST boolean} \text{DEFECTIVE boolean}]\). I assume that other head properties not specified in the schema are shared between the mother and the head daughter, the daughter on the left hand side. The Head - Co-head schema restricts the VPs that can enter the schema to ensure the appropriate positions and argument structures of VP in the SVC. I illustrate how these specifications only generate grammatical Directional SVCs through a few examples.

(51) Wira khwàŋŋ̆̊̊ linh ?ɔɔk paj

Wira throw rock exit go

Wira threw the rock out away.

---

The SVC in example (i) can have either the constituent structure [[run]\text{cycle}]\text{exit}]\text{VP} or [[run]\text{VP}[circle exit]\text{VP}. Nevertheless, this structural ambiguity has no semantic effect since all VPs in a Directional SVC describe the same, single event, as I discuss in 2.6.2.

\(^{18}\) This is specified in the Head - Co-head Schema by the empty COMPS list.
Two lexical rules apply to the serial verb Ꞅ‘exit’, as shown in (52)-(53).

(52) **Lexical Rule 1 applied to Ꞅ‘exit’ in sentence (51)**

LEXICAL RULE 1: Derives an entry of Ꞅ‘exit’ which can occur without its otherwise required complement. The input of the derivation in (52) shows that the basic entry of the serial verb Ꞅ‘exit’ subcategorizes for a canonical-synsem, i.e. PP complement that will get realized (Ꞅ‘exit from the school’, for example). However, the output from applying LR1 shows that there is a corresponding entry of Ꞅ‘exit’ specified as subcategorizing for a non-canonical-synsem, which therefore needs not syntactically realized.

---

19 Recall that the Argument Realization Principle requires that every element in the ARG-ST gets realized, except those which are non-canonical synsem.
(53) **Lexical Rule 2 applied to ?독k ‘exit’ in sentence (51)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>HEAD</th>
<th>1 serial verb</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ARG - S</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CONTENT</td>
<td>exit rel</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ \rightarrow \]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>HEAD</th>
<th>1 FIRST DEFECTIVE -</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ARG - S</td>
<td>2 ⊕</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HEAD</td>
<td>serial verb</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CONTENT</td>
<td>deictic rel</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Lexical Rule 2’s function is to add to the argument structure of a non-deictic-verb a valence requirement for a deictic verb, and to ensure that the constituent headed by that verb occurs last in the SVC, via the [FIRST -] specification. In (53), LR2 derives the entry of ?독k ‘exit’ in which a valence appropriate for a deictic verb is added to the ARG-ST, tagged [2], from the input entry, and this derived entry is also specified as [FIRST -] to assure that it heads the constituent which will occur last in the SVC sequence.

The feature-structures in (54) illustrate how the Head-Complement and the Head - Co-head schemata proceed in generating the Directional SVC in (51).

---

20 I discuss the function of [DEFECTIVE -] in the output of the rule shortly.

21 Notice that there is no rule ordering between LR1 and LR2. Namely, the ARG-ST in the input of LR2 can be either the ARG-ST associated with the basic entry of a serial verb, or the ARG-ST derived from LR1. This is because the functions of the two lexical rules differ in the sense that LR1 changes the synsem type of the complements of serial verbs while LR2 adds the valency appropriate for serial verbs to include a deictic verb.

22 These representations are simplified AVMs that contain only relevant syntactic information. Since I do not include the feature [PHON] in the AVMs, I informally represent the phonological forms of the AVMs with the glosses at the bottom of the feature structures.
(54)

```
[main verb]
HEAD     FIRST  [4]-
         DEFECTIVE -
SUBJ     ⟨NP⟩
COMPS    ⟨ ⟩
```

```
[serial verb]
HEAD     FIRST  [4]-
         DEFECTIVE -
SUBJ     ⟨NP⟩
COMPS    ⟨ ⟩
```

```
[khwaŋ hin 'throw rock']
```

```
[serial verb]
HEAD     FIRST  [4]-
         DEFECTIVE -
SUBJ     ⟨NP⟩
ARG-ST   ⟨(2)⊕(3)⟩
```

```
[3]Serial Verb
```

```
?dok 'exit'
```

```
paj 'go'
```
The constituent '?'ok paj ‘exit go’ is formed by the Head-Complement Schema. This schema combines '?'ok ‘exit’ with paj ‘go’ because the augmented valence of '?'ok ‘exit’ requires it to take a deictic verb as complement (cf. (47c) and Lexical Rule 2). The augmented-valence variant of the verb '?ok ‘exit’ is lexically marked as 

\[ \text{FIRST} \quad \text{-} \quad \text{DEFECTIVE} \quad \text{-} \quad \text{LNM OQP} \]

The overall VP '?ok ‘exit’ heads is therefore marked as 

\[ \text{FIRST} \quad \text{-} \quad \text{DEFECTIVE} \quad \text{-} \quad \text{LNM OQP} \]

in accordance with the constraints on the strict-headed-phrase\(^{23}\) that the head properties are strictly shared between the mother and the head daughter. The specification \([\text{FIRST} -]\) ensures that this VP occur last in this SVC. The verb khwâan hîn ‘throw rock’ then combines with '?ok paj ‘exit go’ by the Head-Co-head Schema to form the complex VP khwâan hîn '?ok paj ‘throw the rock out, away from the speaker’. The VP headed by the caused-motion verb khwâan ‘throw’ is \([\text{FIRST} +]\) according to (47a) and the Head Feature Principle, and this ensures its initial position in the SVC sequence. The VP khwâan hîn ‘throw rock’ is also marked as \([\text{DEFECTIVE} -]\) (cf. (47a)), which is a property derived from the fact that khwâan is a main verb, meaning that it must occur with its required complements.

Consider another example, (55), whose structure is shown in (56).

\(^{23}\) A head-complement phrase is a subtype of strict-headed-phrase.
(55) Wira khâam ?ō̂k paj

Wira cross exit go

Wira crossed (something) out, away from the speaker
(56)

\[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{Wira} \\
\text{khāam 'cross'} \\
\text{?dōk 'exit'}
\end{array}
\]

\[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{HEAD} [8] \\
\text{FIRST} [4] - \\
\text{DEFECTIVE -} \\
\text{SUBJ} \langle \text{NP} \rangle \\
\text{COMPS} \langle \rangle
\end{array}
\]

\[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{paj 'go'}
\end{array}
\]
The portion of the derivation in (56) which is different from (54) begins when ʔōok pajax ‘exit go’ combines with khâam ‘cross’. Khâam ‘cross’ is an entry derived through the application of LR1 and is [DEFECTIVE +], meaning that it can occur without its complement in an SVC. In sentence (55), khâam ‘cross’ does occur without its otherwise required NP complement, illustrated by its empty COMPS list in (56). Khâam ‘cross’ is lexically underspecified with respect to the feature [FIRST] (cf. (47b)), but the instantiation of the [FIRST]’s value of khâam in this particular sentence is [FIRST +], as required of the first daughter of the Head - Co-head Schema. When khâam ‘cross’ combines with ʔōok pajax ‘exit go’, the constituent khâamʔōok pajax is [DEFECTIVE -] although the head daughter khâam is [DEFECTIVE +]. The [DEFECTIVE -] attribute-value pair is specified by the Head - Co-head Schema, and it captures the idea that although the serial verb daughters have special valence structures (i.e. optional complements), they form an SVC which is as valid a VP as the one headed by a main verb (as in sentence (51)). The [DEFECTIVE -] specification from the Head - Co-head Schema is therefore used to override the [+ ] values of this feature from the head daughter. Finally, in (56), the whole SVC khâam ʔōok pajax ‘cross (something) out, away’, which is [DEFECTIVE -] combines with the subject NP Wirax through the Thai Head-Subject Schema(cf. (48))

Sentence (57) is not possible because it is not licensed by the Head - Co-head Schema. The verb phrase dën khūn pajax ‘walk up away’ cannot enter the Head - Co-head
Schema as the **co-head** daughter since this VP is not headed by a *serial verb*. This is illustrated in (58).

(57) *Piti jōon dën khūn paj

Piti reverse walk ascend go

(58) *

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{HEAD} & \quad \begin{cases}
\text{serial verb} & \text{FIRST} [3] + \\
\text{DEFECTIVE} + \\
\text{SUBJ} & \langle \text{NP} \rangle \\
\text{COMPS} & \langle \text{ } \rangle
\end{cases} \\
\text{HEAD} & \quad \begin{cases}
\text{main verb} & \text{FIRST} [4] \\
\text{DEFECTIVE} - \\
\text{SUBJ} & \langle \text{NP} \rangle \\
\text{COMPS} & \langle \text{ } \rangle
\end{cases}
\end{align*}
\]

\[jōon \text{ 'reverse'}\]

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{HEAD} & \quad \begin{cases}
\text{main verb} & \text{FIRST} [2] + \\
\text{DEFECTIVE} - \\
\text{SUBJ} & \langle \text{NP} \rangle \\
\text{COMPS} & \langle \text{ } \rangle
\end{cases} \\
\text{HEAD} & \quad \begin{cases}
\text{serial verb} & \text{FIRST} [4] - \\
\text{DEFECTIVE} - \\
\text{SUBJ} & \langle \text{NP} \rangle \\
\text{COMPS} & \langle \text{ } \rangle
\end{cases}
\end{align*}
\]

\[dën \text{ 'walk'}\] \quad \[khūn paj \text{ 'ascend go'}\]

The derivation in (58) is impossible as the phrase *dën khūn paj* 'walk up away' is of category *main verb* phrase, and, therefore, cannot enter the Head - Co-head Schema as the **co-head** daughter. Note that the problem is not with the **head** daughter, which in this case
is jōon ‘reverse’ - a serial verb phrase, since there is no constraint on whether a main or serial VP can be the head daughter. The only constraint regarding the head daughter is that it must share its category (main or serial) with its mother in the Head - Co-head Schema, as required by the Head Feature Principle.

Next, I illustrate in (60) why sentence (59), in which the VP containing a deictic verb does not occur last in the SVC, is ungrammatical.

(59) *Piti dën khûn paj jōon

Piti walk ascend go reverse

(60) a. *

```
          [main verb]
    HEAD  FIRST  +          HEAD  FIRST  [3]  +
     DEFECTIVE  -      DEFECTIVE  -

  SUBJ  (NP)          SUBJ  (NP)
  COMPS  ( )           COMPS  ( )

          [serial verb]
    HEAD  FIRST  -          HEAD  FIRST  [3]  +
     DEFECTIVE  -      DEFECTIVE  +

  SUBJ  (NP)          SUBJ  (NP)
  COMPS  ( )           COMPS  ( )

  khûn paj ‘ascend go’  jōon ‘reverse’
```
No matter whether we assume a left or right branching structure for (59), the combinations of VPs in (59) violate the constraints on the Head - Co-head Schema. In the left-branching structure in (60a), \textit{khûn paj} ‘ascend go’ which is [FIRST -] cannot enter the Head - Co-head Schema as the head daughter, which is required to be [FIRST+]. In the right-branching structure in (60b), \textit{den khûn paj} ‘walk up away’ identifies the value of its [FIRST] feature with that of \textit{khûn paj}, and, therefore, is [FIRST-]. As a result, \textit{dûn khûn
paj cannot enter the Head - Co-head Schema as the head daughter, and (59) is correctly ruled out.

Note that we want to prevent the Head - Co-head Schema from applying to sentences such as (61), which contain two verbs and one of them is a deictic verb. This is because if we assume that (61) is licensed by the Head - Co-head Schema, paj ‘go’ is then a co-head and an independent VP, and could be separated from ?ɔɔk ‘exit’ by an adverb, which is not true, as we saw in 2.4.1, repeated below.

(61) Piti ?ɔɔk paj
    Piti exit go
    Piti went out away.

(62) a. Piti ?ɔɔk paj jaɑnŋuadrew
    Piti exit go quickly
    Piti exited away quickly.

b. *Piti ?ɔɔk jaanŋuadrew paj
    Piti exit quickly go

Sentence (62b) shows that an adverb cannot be inserted between the deictic verb and the VP that precedes it. Thus, a deictic verb must combine with its preceding verb via the Head-Complement Schema. As a result, I propose a semantic constraint according to which the semantic relation denoted by the co-head in the Head - Co-head Schema must be a non-deictic-rel. This constraint will prevent the schema from applying to sentences such as in (61).
The revised Head - Co-head Schema states that the KEY of the second daughter is a semantic relation which is a non-deictic relation. This constraint prohibits *paj* ‘go’, which encodes a *deictic-rel*, in (61) from entering the Head - Co-head Schema and combining with *ʔoʔk* ‘exit’.
Finally, I show in (63) how (61) is licensed

(63)

As a result of applying LR 2 to ้ USAGE 'exit', the verb contains a valence requirement for a deictic verb ([3] in the ARG-ST list), and is specified as [DEFECTIVE -]. The specification [DEFECTIVE -] which results from the application of LR2 is necessary and allows the verb phrase ้ USAGE 'exit go' to enter the Thai Head - Subject Schema and combine with the NP Piti to form a grammatical sentence.

Notice that although a lot of machinery is involved in modeling the occurrence of deictic verbs, all of this machinery is necessary. Let me recapitulate the mechanisms which
ensure the correct position of the phrase containing a deictic verb and its appropriate constituent structure. These mechanisms include 1) Lexical Rule 2 which adds to a non-deictic motion verb a valence requirement corresponding to the deictic verb, 2) the feature \([\text{FIRST}]\) and its percolation from the co-head daughter in the Head - Co-head Schema, and 3) the \(\text{non-deictic-rel}\) specification in the revised Head - Co-head Schema. Now, there are two major characteristics of verb phrases in a Directional SVC which contain a deictic verb. First, it is a head-complement phrase in which the deictic verb complements its preceding verb. Second, if this head-complement phrase is to enter the Head - Co-head Schema, it must occur last. LR 2 and the Head - Complement Schema account for the first characteristic of the head-complement phrase containing a deictic verb. The feature \([\text{FIRST}]\) and its percolation in the Head - Co-head Schema accounts for the second characteristic. Now, as we want to prevent the Head - Co-head Schema (which combines two verb phrases separable from each other by an adverb) from applying to sentences such as (61), which contains a deictic verb, I specified in the revised Head - Co-head Schema that the value of the KEY of the co-head daughter is a \(\text{non-deictic-rel}\).

In conclusion, in this section, I modeled the syntactic structures and ordering constraints of Thai Directional SVCs by classifying classes of verbs according to their ordering possibilities and argument structures in the SVC. The two features \([\text{FIRST}]\) and \([\text{DEFECTIVE}]\) are necessary to model the constraints on the fixed positions of serial verbs and their special complement structures respectively. I also employed a \textit{default} interpretation of the Head Feature Principle. With these mechanisms, we can model Thai Directional SVCs through the new Head - Co-head Schema and the usual Head-

\[24\] This is because both \(\text{?dok} ‘exit’\) and \(\text{paj} ‘go’\), before the application of LR2, are \([\text{DEFECTIVE} +]\), if
Complement Schema. The Head - Co-head Schema insures that Thai Directional SVCs have a recursive structure,\textsuperscript{25} while the Head - Complement Schema ensures deictic VPs are sisters to the non-deictic motion verb that precedes them.

In the next section, I investigate the semantic composition of VPs in Thai Directional SVCs.

\textbf{2.6.2 Semantic Composition in Thai Directional Serial Verb Constructions}

In this section, I provide a method for representing the semantic composition in Thai Directional SVCs. The VPs in a Thai Directional SVC independently describe one single event from different perspectives. The semantic composition of VPs in a Directional SVC cannot therefore be carried out through \textit{functional application}, which assumes that meanings are composed by \textit{functors} being applied to their \textit{arguments}. Based on the assumption that each VP in a Directional SVC describes the same, single event from a different perspective, I preliminarily use \textit{intersective combination} in Minimal Recursion Semantics (MRS - Copestake et al. 1999) as the method of semantic composition for Thai Directional SVCs, as illustrated in (64)-(65).

\begin{itemize}
\item[they] do not co-occur with the non-subject members of their ARG-ST list, but the combination of the two verbs is in fact valid as a VP and can enter the Head - Subject Schema.
\item[25] One might want not to have a new schema for Thai Directional SVCs and consider reducing the Head - Co-head Schema to some sort of modification. This is an alternative that I explored. However, a feature of Thai Directional SVCs that modification cannot model is the need to inherit the feature [FIRST-] from the non-head daughter (i.e. the deictic verb and its preceding verb) to ensure its last position in the SVC sequence.
\end{itemize}
In the above semantic representation, *dən* ‘walk’ and *ʔoɔk* ‘exit’ each contributes an elementary predication (EP). Each EP in (65) describes the same event, as indicated by the token-identity of the tags for the value of the attribute INDEX. Note that the value of the INDEX is determined by the value of the EVENT attribute associated with the semantic relations of each motion verb. The single EP in each of *dən* ‘walk’ and *ʔoɔk* ‘exit’ becomes the verb’s main EP or KEY. The intersective combination of (64) is illustrated by the concatenated list of EPs in the mother node in (65). I assume that the KEY of the SVC in (64) is that of the head daughter, *dən* ‘walk’, following the assumption discussed in Chapter 1.
The assumption that the verbs in a Directional SVC describe the same, single event is, however, only true in a weaker sense of “same” event, as I now show. One way to determine whether two VPs describe the same event is to see whether the events described by the two VPs have the same beginning and end. If we identify events by looking at their beginning and end, we cannot say that all verbs in Directional SVCs describe the same event since some of the motion verbs only describe parts of the event that others describe, as illustrated below:

(66) Narii ṭìŋ troŋ jōn khàam saphaan ṭòok paj

Narii ran go straight reverse cross bridge exit go

Narii ran straight back, crossing the bridge, out away from the speaker.

In (66), the VP khàam saphaan ‘cross bridge’ does not necessarily describe an event which has the same beginning and end as those denoted by the other verbs in the sequence (e.g., ṭìŋ ‘run’ and troŋ ‘go straight’). In other words, khàam saphaan ‘cross bridge’ describes only a sub-part (i.e. sub-event) of the whole motion event encoded by (66). As a result, the assumption that the VPs in a Directional SVC describe the same, single event which (65) assumes is only true in a weaker sense; namely, each VP talks about the same motion event, even though some of the VPs describe parts of it only.

To model the fact that the verbs in a Directional SVC describe the same event only in a weaker sense, I adopt the idea that constructions contribute meaning. Several recent syntactic frameworks have adopted an alternative view of grammar in which constructions\(^{26}\) have primary ontological status; that form-meaning correspondences exist independently of particular words (see Fillmore et al., 1988; Goldberg, 1995; Kay 1997,
for the notion of construction). In keeping with this tradition I assume that the Thai Directional Serial Verb Construction carries with it certain meaning specifications. More precisely, the construction encodes a “part-whole” relation between the events described by its daughter VPs, as illustrated in the following example.

(67) Narii ᵒ𝑛 wœn ᵐœk

Narii walk circle exit

Narii walked, circling, out.

(68) 

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{INDEX [9]} & \\
\text{KEY [2]} & \\
\text{ARG [6]} & \oplus \text{ARG [8]} & \\
\end{align*}
\]

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{INDEX [6]} & \\
\text{KEY [2]} & \\
\text{LZT [10] \oplus [3] \oplus EVENT [6]} & \oplus \text{EVENT [6]} & \\
\text{ARG [4]} & \oplus \text{ARG [5]} & \\
\end{align*}
\]

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{INDEX [4]} & \\
\text{KEY [2]} & \\
\text{LZT [2] \text{walk}} & \text{EVENT [4]} & \\
\text{\quad dœn ‘walk’} & \\
\end{align*}
\]

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{INDEX [5]} & \\
\text{KEY [3]} & \\
\text{LZT [3] \text{circle}} & \text{EVENT [5]} & \\
\text{\quad won ‘circle’} & \\
\end{align*}
\]

\[\text{INDEX [8]} \quad \text{KEY [7]} \quad \text{LZT [7] \text{exit}} \quad \text{EVENT [8]} \]

\[\text{\quad ‘exit’} \]

---

\[\text{See Riehemann and Bender (1999) for a constructional treatment of predicative idioms.}\]
The figure in (68) is the semantic representation of (67). The idea behind the *part-whole-rel(ation)* is that every verb that occurs in the Directional SVC is ultimately a part of the same whole. Intuitively, the EVENT attribute of the *part-whole-rel* refers to the **whole** of this relation and the ARG attribute refer to the **part**. The values of the attributes EVENT and ARG are indices. Basically, (68) shows that the events [4] and [5] denoted by *dën* ‘walk’ and *won* ‘circle’ are parts of the same whole event, represented by [4] and [5] being arguments of a *part-whole* relation. Furthermore, [6] and the event [8] denoted by *ʔɔŋk* ‘exit’ are included in another EVENT [9]. Note that, assuming the transitivity of inclusion, the EVENT attribute of the lower mother node in (68) is included in the topmost mother node. Finally, notice that even though the walking event encompasses the whole motion event and the circling and exiting events are probably only parts of the event, this is not a problem since the *part-whole* relation needs not be proper. The semantic composition illustrated in (68) applies to the motion-event encoding VPs in Directional SVCs which are combined via the Head - Co-head Schema. I provide in (69) the Head - Co-head Schema incorporated with the semantic information of *part-whole* relation.
Basically, the schema in (69) states that the events [4] and [5] encoded by the head and the co-head daughter are parts of the same whole event.

For a motion-event encoding VP which has a deictic verb as a complement, I ensure that the deictic verb encodes the same event as the motion-event encoding VP that precedes it by event identification in the revised Lexical Rule (LR) 2 as follows:
The revised LR 2 semantically specifies that the values of the EVENT attribute of the deictic verb and of the verb that precedes it are identical. For example, (69) ensures that in *Piti ?dok paj ‘Piti exit go’, the verb ?dok ‘exit’ and its complement paj ‘go’ describe the same event.

The fact that all VPs in a Directional SVC describe the same single event might be taken to imply that the VPs share the same subject. However, this is not necessarily the case as shown in (71)-(73), which are examples of various possible control relations in Directional SVCs. Note that instead of discussing the following examples in terms of subject vs. object control, I discuss them in terms of structure sharing of semantic role values among VPs in Directional SVCs, which I find intuitively clearer.
(71) Wira ðen ?òök
Wira walk exit
Wira walked out.

(72) Wira khwâaŋ hìn ?òök paj
Wira throw rock exit go
Wira threw the rock out, away.

(73) Wira ïaw klòŋ kradàad ?òök paj
Wira take box paper exit go
Wira took the paper box out, away.

The VPs in (71) share the same subject, Wira, which is the FIGURE of both the walk_rel and exit_rel. However, in (72), Wira is the ACTOR of the verb khwâaŋ ‘throw’ but is not the FIGURE of exit_rel and go_rel. Instead, the NP hìn ‘rock’ is the FIGURE of exit_rel and go_rel. Sentence (73) is a case where Wira is both the ACTOR of ïaw ‘take’ and is the FIGURE of ?òök ‘exit’ and paj ‘go’, and there is also another FIGURE of exit_rel and go_rel, which is klòŋ kradàad ‘paper box’. From examples (71) through (73), we can see that a caused-motion verb differs from a manner-of-motion verb in that the former encode an embedded causal relation, which, by default, determines that its CAUSEE (hìn ‘rock’ in (72) or klòŋ kradàad ‘paper box’ in (73)) will be identified with the FIGURE

---

27 It should be noted that I make use of features that denote semantic roles here without taking time to present a proper theory of predications and the features or semantic roles that go with them, since it is not the focus of this dissertation. See Davis (2001) for a comprehensive discussion of these issues.
of the motion verbs that combine with it in the SVC. Among caused-motion verbs, the class of ‘take’ verbs is different in the sense that both the CAUSER and the CAUSEE of the verbs become the FIGUREs in the Directional SVCs. For example, in (73) both the CAUSER, Wira, and the CAUSEE: klòɔŋ kradāad ‘paper box’, are both the FIGUREs in the sense that both move. Semantic information regarding sharing of semantic role values must be encoded in the Head - Co-head Schema, an issue that goes beyond the scope of this thesis and which I do not spell out in detail here.

In conclusion, I presented, in this section, a model of the semantics of Thai Directional SVCs, in particular the fact that VPs in the SVC describe the same, single event. The weaker notion of the “same” motion event, which I showed to be relevant for Directional SVCs, is represented by assuming that Directional SVCs, as constructions, are associated with a part-whole constructional meaning.

### 2.7 Conclusion

Thai Directional SVCs are a new kind of SVC whose structure is not reduceable to previously described SVCs in the generative literature. Thai Directional SVCs are strings of verbs which partake in two structures: a VP-over-VP structure (generated by a new Head - Co-head Schema) and a complementation structure. Verbs that occur in Directional SVCs range from ordinary main verbs to serial verbs. Main verbs occur first in the SVCs, where heads are supposed to occur in Thai. Serial verbs are defined based on their special argument structures, and the fact that they can be freely reordered, at least for those which do not contain a deictic verb. The deictic serial verb and its preceding verb appear in the complementation structure and have a fixed order as predicted by the rigid word order of
heads and complements (cf. 1.4.4). The crucial point is that Thai Directional SVCs involve verbs which exhibit a special complement structure and show a dissociation between constituent structure and linear order that cannot be precisely modeled by simple category and subcategorization information typical of previous analyses of Directional SVCs (Sebba, 1987; Winford, 1990; Baker, 1989), or by the use of simple phrase structure rules of the form $A \rightarrow B C$, which can only encode linear relations among sister constituents. Nonetheless, within HPSG, the rich featural specifications of heads, in particular the features [DEFECTIVE] and [FIRST], and the mechanisms available for the percolation of specific head properties through the default Head Feature Principle allow for a straightforward model of Thai Directional SVCs.

Semantically, verbs in a Thai Directional SVCs describe the same, single event from different perspectives. Intersective combination in Minimal Recursion Semantics, as well as the construction-specific part-whole semantic relation, can efficiently account for the fact that all verbs in Thai Directional SVCs uniformly describe one single event, regardless of whether the verbs describe the whole motion event or only parts of it.
Chapter 3

Aspect morphemes in Thai

3.1 Introduction

The purpose of this chapter is to describe the properties of syntactic elements that mark aspect\(^1\) in Thai, i.e. what I call “aspect morphemes”. These properties include the meanings, positions in the clause, possible combinations, and semantic compatibility of the aspect morphemes. The study of properties of aspect morphemes in this chapter is the basis for investigating the structures of the occurrences of these aspect morphemes in a clause, which is carried out in the next chapter.

In a Thai verb phrase, there can be aspect morphemes in both pre-VP and post-VP positions. An example of such verb phrases, which I call Aspectual Constructions (ACs), is shown below:

(1) Wanna kamlaŋ càʔ kin khâaw sèd maa

Wanna PROG be about to eat rice finish PFCT(come)

Wanna is/was going to have finished eating rice.

In the above example, kamlaŋ marks progressive aspect and has the widest scope. càʔ can be translated as ‘be about to’ (see section 3.2.1.1.1 for a detailed discussion of the meaning of càʔ). These two morphemes combine with the VP containing sèd ‘finish’,

\(^1\) Here, I define aspect in a broad sense. Aspect refers to grammaticalized viewpoints that convey information about temporal properties of situations such as beginning, end, change of state, and duration (Smith 1997:1).
which marks the endpoint of the event of eating rice, and *maa* ‘come’, which encodes perfect aspect. All of these morphemes create a complex aspectual meaning, as the gloss shows.

(2) Wira râöm è‘? è‘an nàŋstūwì tòö

Wira start be about to read book continue

Wira started to continue reading a/the book.

In (2) *râöm* ‘start’ marks inchoative² aspect (Sookgasem, 1990) and co-occurs with *è‘*.

Another element that marks aspect in this clause is tòö ‘continue’, which occurs after the VP *è‘an nàŋstūwì* ‘read a/the book’.

This chapter proceeds as follows. I first list the Thai aspect morphemes (TAMs) that can occur in ACs. These aspect morphemes are provisionally grouped according to their positions in the clause. Next, I summarize the semantics of each morpheme. I then describe the possible positions in the clause of these morphemes. Finally, a description of the combinatorial properties of TAMs and their semantic compatibility is provided.

### 3.2 Thai Aspect Morphemes

The following table shows all elements that can occur in ACs, in their “default” or “basic”³ linear order.

---

² “Inchoative” aspect refers to the beginning of a state or activity.
³ Some of these elements can occur in variable positions, without altering the meaning of the clause. What I mean by ‘default’ or ‘basic’ here is that the ordering shown in Table 3.1 has, intuitively, a neutral focus structure, compared to other possible non-default orders.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>kamlaŋ: Progressive - PROG</td>
<td>VertexArray: get (permissive, ability)</td>
<td>maa: Perfect - PFCT (lit. come)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>càʔ: ‘be about to’</td>
<td>khûn: Semi-perfective - SPFV (lit. ascend)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>phûn: ‘just start’</td>
<td>loŋ: SPFV (lit. descend)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Post-inchoative)</td>
<td>khâw: Imperfective - IMPFV (lit. enter)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>rôm: start</td>
<td>?ók: SPFV (lit. exit)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Inchoative)</td>
<td>jùu: IMPFV (lit. be located)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>khûːj: experience</td>
<td>tôːː ‘continue’</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tôːː ‘continue’</td>
<td>sèd: ‘finish’</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tôːː ‘continue’</td>
<td>côb: ‘end’</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tôːː ‘continue’</td>
<td>paj: IMPFV (lit. go)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tôːː ‘continue’</td>
<td>paj: Perfective –PFTV (lit. go)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tôːː ‘continue’</td>
<td>sjia: PFTV (lit. lose, waste)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3.1: Thai Aspect Morphemes (TAMs)

There can be more than one morpheme from slots 1 and 3 in a string, provided that their meanings are compatible. This issue will be discussed in 3.2.1.1.3 and 3.2.1.2.4. Below are examples which illustrate the ordering of the various elements of an AC and some combinations of the morphemes.

(3) 1 1 2 3 4

Priida kamlaŋ càʔ sâŋ bân khûn maa

Priida PROG be about to build house SPFV come

Priida is going to build a/the house.  

---

4 Table 3.1 is labeled “Thai Aspect Morphemes (TAMs)” for mere mnemonic reasons. Table 3.1 also contains elements which do not mark aspects, but interact with aspect morphemes, as I will shortly discuss. Also, not all of the elements shown in Table 3.1 will be analyzed in this study. Elements which will not be analyzed are in italics.
Priida started to finish sewing cloth.

Priida just started to continue typing the letter.

Priida used to take this medicine before.

Note that, in my analysis, I do not include the morpheme /ékew ‘already’ which is treated as an aspect morpheme by certain Thai scholars (Sookgasem (1990), for example). I treat /ékew as a temporal adverb that means ‘already’, and not as an aspectual morpheme because /ékew’s distribution differs from other aspect morphemes. This can be seen from the short answer test, as shown in the following examples.

---

5 Due to the lexical semantics and scope interpretations of the aspect morphemes in examples (3)-(6), the translations of these sentences are only approximate and preliminary.
(7) Question: Piti thûb kêêw lêêw rûţu

Piti break glass already question marker

Did Piti already break the glass?

Answer: thûb lêêw

break already

(He) broke (it) already. 

(8) (the aspect morpheme šia marks the perfective aspect)

Question: Piti thûb kêêw šia rûţu

Piti break glass PERF question marker

Did Piti break the glass?

Answer: *thûb šia

break PERF

(Intended meaning: (He) broke (it).

While the temporal adverb lêêw ‘already’ can co-occur with the verb thûb ‘break’ in the short answer in (7), the aspect morpheme šia - PERF cannot, as shown in (8). I hypothesize that what I categorize as aspect morphemes in Table 3.1 encode aspectual information somewhat internal to the base verb. Therefore, mentioning the aspect morpheme in a short answer would make the sentence implausible as it would be redundant and does not add

\[\text{\footnotesize Note that nominal phrases can often be left out from Thai sentences, provided they can be inferred from the context.}\]
any new information. On the other hand, the temporal adverb \( l\varepsilon \psi w \) ‘already’ encodes external aspectual information which is a prominent piece of information and mentioning it in a short answer does not make the sentence implausible.

In the following section, I examine the semantic properties of Thai aspect morphemes.

### 3.2.1 Semantic Properties

The semantics of each morpheme from Table 3.1 is summarized below. It should be noted that my intention is not to create an exhaustive study of the semantics of Thai aspect morphemes. Therefore, I do not analyze the detailed semantics of individual morphemes but simply provide a summarized description for each morpheme from Table 3.1.

#### 3.2.1.1 Morphemes from Slot 1

The morphemes in this slot can be divided into two groups, according to their meanings: aspect morphemes and modal morphemes.

##### 3.2.1.1.1 Aspect Morphemes

Aspect morphemes from slot 1 in Table 3.1 are \( \text{kamlañ} - \text{PROG} \), \( \text{phēñ} - \text{Post-INCF} \), \( \text{càñ} \) ‘be about to’, \( \text{rē} \text{ñom} \) – start, and \( \text{khēñj} \) – experience. I start by discussing the semantics of \( \text{kamlañ} - \text{PROG} \).

---

7 Unless otherwise mentioned, the semantic descriptions of the morphemes in this section are my own.
Malii kamlaŋ kin khâaw

Malii PROG eat rice
Malii is/was eating rice, or
Malii is in the process of eating rice.

*Kamlaŋ is a morpheme which marks progressive aspect. The progressive aspect indicates that an action or an event is in progress at the interval of time that serves as the reference interval for the utterance. As shown in (7), kamlaŋ precedes the base VP in a sentence.

*Kamlaŋ cannot occur as the only verb in a clause, as shown in (8):

(10) kamlaŋ - PROG - cannot occur as the only verb in a clause

*Wanna kamlaŋ ṇaan (noun)
Wanna PROG work
(Intended meaning: Wanna is working)

In the following examples, I illustrate the selectional restrictions of kamlaŋ - PROG. It can co-occur with three Aktionsart classes of verbs: activity, accomplishment and certain state verbs.

---

8 The word ṇaan is a noun and not a verb because it can be followed by the possessive morpheme and an NP. For example, ṇaan khɔŋ Wira ‘Wira’s work’. The ability to occur in the possessive construction is a property unique to nouns in Thai.

9 My Aktionsart classes follow those proposed by Vendler (1957) and adopted by Van Valin and LaPolla (1997). This means that I use “achievements” to refer to instantaneous changes of states (or activities) and “accomplishments” to refer to temporally extended changes of state leading to a terminal point.
(11) **Activity**

Manii kamlaŋ wîŋ

Manii PROG run

Manii is/was running.

(12) **Accomplishment**

Manii kamlaŋ têêŋ naŋsawu

Manii PROG write book

Manii is/was writing a/the book.

**State**

(13) Manii kamlaŋ kròod

Manii PROG angry

Manii is/was angry.

(14) *Manii kamlaŋ pen krhuu

Manii PROG be teacher.

(Manii is/was being a teacher.)

In the case of state verbs, the selectional restrictions of kamlaŋ are a bit different from the English progressive. While both languages do not allow the combination of progressive aspect with permanent states, Thai allows the progressive to combine with certain temporary states, as shown in (11). To account for (11), I hypothesize that state verbs belong to a continuum of degree of permanence. The Thai progressive is compatible with temporary states because such states can be “in progress” at reference time (cf. the
definition of the progressive aspect above). This can be true for “being angry” but not for “being a teacher” or “being tall”. To support this claim, I provide the following minimal pair which shows that the notion of permanence is a continuum rather than a binary opposition.

(15) Wira kamlaŋ râk Wanna

Wira PROG love Wanna

(lit.) Wira is loving Wanna (he loves Wanna for the time being)

(16) #Wira kamlaŋ râk châad

Wira PROG love nation

(Wira is loving (his) nation.)

Assuming that the love that an individual has for his/her nation may last longer than (i.e. is less temporary than) the love that individuals have for one another, (16) is implausible.

From the two sentences in (15)-(16), we can also see that the degree of permanence of certain state verbs cannot be determined from the meaning of the base verbs, but can only be determined in the full sentential context in which such verbs occur.

Generally, kamlaŋ - PROG is not compatible with achievement verbs,11 as shown in (17):

---

10 The symbol # is used to mark sentences which are semantically implausible, as opposed to *, which is used to mark sentences which are syntactically impossible.

11 Except in the case of achievement (or semelfactive, in the sense discussed in Smith (1997:29)) verbs which receive an iterative interpretation. But, then, they are not true achievements. For example:

(i) Thana kamlaŋ khš? pratuu
    Thana PROG knock door
    Thana is/was knocking at the door.
(17) *thian kamlaŋ dàb

candle PROG become extinguished

(The candle was becoming extinguished.)

It should be noted that Sookgasem (1990) argues that sentences such as (18) show that kamlaŋ -PROG can combine with Extended Achievement verbs.

(18) Extended Achievement

Malii kamlaŋ maa-thũŋ Buffalo

Malii PROG come-reach(=arrive) Buffalo

Malii is/was arriving in Buffalo.

Assuming that maathũŋ is a single word which corresponds to English ‘arrive’, and that maathũŋ is an achievement verb, Sookgasem proposes that when kamlaŋ co-occurs with maathũŋ, the interval of the “arriving” eventuality can extend so much that this event becomes an accomplishment instead of an achievement (1990:178). According to Sookgasem, the sentence in (18) can be used to describe an event where Malii is on an airplane trying to land at the Buffalo airport. Since achievements code instantaneous changes of state, while accomplishments are “temporally extended changes of state leading to a terminal point” (Van Valin and LaPolla 1997: 42), Extended Achievements as in (18) are basically accomplishments by definition. Indeed, Extended Achievements as in (18) pass the verb classification tests for accomplishment (Dowty, 1979; Van Valin and LaPolla, 1997). Therefore, I maintain that kamlaŋ - PROG cannot combine with achievement verbs.
Another aspect morpheme that occurs in the same slot as kamlaŋ - PROG is phôŋ, which has a post-inchoative meaning (lit. ‘just start’), as shown in the following example:

(19) Manii phôŋ ?aan näŋsûiû

Manii POST-INC read book

Manii has just begun to read a/the book.

Post-inchoative aspect refers to the interval right after the beginning of a state or activity. I included phôŋ - POST-INC in Table 3.1 for completeness only. Syntactically, phôŋ does not behave differently from kamlaŋ, and, unlike kamlaŋ, it does not have semantic restrictions. Thus, I do not discuss this morpheme any further.

The morpheme cà? is often translated as ‘will’ in the Thai linguistic literature (see Sookgasem, 1990 among others), as shown in (20):

(20) Piti cà? khîan näŋsûiû

Piti will write book

Piti will write a/the book.

However, as we can see from the following sentence, cà? is not an absolute future tense morpheme.
(21) Piti là? rian cób parinyatrii naj pii 1973 tëë
Piti will study finish bachelor degr. in year 1973 but
bañγëən taaj sìa kòn
accidentally die lose before
Piti would have finished his bachelor degree in 1973 but he accidentally died.

In (21), là? can be viewed as a relative tense morpheme. Kanchanawan (1978) treats là? as a non-absolute future morpheme, which means that it indicates potentiality, assertion, determination, or volition, depending on the contexts in which it occurs, and the future meaning is merely implicated. According to Savetamalaya (1988), là? means ‘intend to’.

However, Savetamalaya’s claim is not correct because sentences such as (22) are possible.

(22) tonmáj là? lôm prö? lom rèëŋ
tree will fall because wind strong
The tree will fall down because of the strong wind.

In (22), là? cannot mean ‘intend to’ because its subject is not agentive. The morpheme là? has also been analyzed as a non-assertive modal or irrealis morpheme (Rangkupan, 2001). Here, I treat là? as an aspect morpheme that means ‘be about to’ as it encodes the preliminary stage of an eventuality. This meaning of là? will become obvious when là?

---

12 Notice that I do not assume that the immediate future implication which is associated with the phrase ‘be about to’ in English is part of the meaning of là?. Là?’s translation as ‘be about to’ is meant to refer to the preliminary stage of an eventuality only.
combines with certain aspect morphemes and is explained in more detail in 3.3. Cà? also contains a meaning that makes it similar to a modal morpheme; namely, cà? means that something has the potential for happening or being true in particular circumstances. Due to this modal-like meaning component, sometimes ‘might’ is the appropriate translation of cà? instead of ‘be about to’, as I shortly illustrate in example (27).

To confirm that cà? encodes neither absolute nor relative future tense, consider the following example.

(23) Priida phêŋ cà? phim côdmãaj tôô

Priida Post-INC be about to type letter continue

Priida just started to continue typing a/the letter.

The function of cà? in (25) is related neither to relative nor to absolute future tense. The gloss of (23) “Priida just started to continue typing the letter” might not reflect the denotation of cà?, which basically suggests that although Priida might not have actually typed any of the letter yet, he was about to.

Finally, note that cà? can combine with verbs from all Aktionsart classes.

(24) Activity

Piti cà? wîŋ

Piti be about to run

Piti was about to run
(25) **Accomplishment**

Piti  ça?  sâañj  bàan

Piti  be about to  build  house

Piti was about to build a/the house.

(26) **Achievement**

cà?  kòod  rá?bòod  thîi  tuèk  kàw

be about to  happen explosion  at  building  old

There was about to be an explosion/explosions at the old building.

(27) **State** (both temporary and permanent states)

Piti  ça?  kròod  mûa  dâajjin khâaw  ráaj

Piti  be about to  be angry  when hear  news  bad

Piti **might** be angry when he hears the bad news.

(28) Piti  ça?  pen  khruu

Piti  be about to  be  teacher

Piti will be a teacher.

The other two aspect morphemes that occur in slot 1 are  rûm – ‘start’ and  khøj – ‘experience’, which are exemplified below:

(29) **rûm** – ‘start’

Manii  rûm  jéb  phâa

Manii start  sew  cloth

Manii started sewing the cloth.
(30) \( kh\ddot{o}\ddot{a}j \) – ‘experience’

Priida \( kh\ddot{o}\ddot{a}j \) piin \( kh\ddot{a}w \)

Priida experience climb mountain

Priida experienced climbing mountain.

\( R\ddot{a}\ddot{e}m \) ‘start’ corresponds to a super-lexical morpheme in the sense discussed in Smith (1997). Super-lexical morphemes are used to select a narrow view of a situation or to focus on parts of situations (Smith, 1997:48). In this case, \( R\ddot{a}\ddot{e}m \) ‘start’ focuses on the beginning part of the situation. As for \( kh\ddot{o}\ddot{a}j \), whose literal meaning is ‘experience’, it has traditionally been considered a past tense morpheme (Kanchanawan, 1978, among others). More recently, the assumption that \( kh\ddot{o}\ddot{a}j \) marks the past tense has been rejected possibly because the past time interpretation that \( kh\ddot{o}\ddot{a}j \) has is merely inferred. Sookgasm (1990) treats \( kh\ddot{o}\ddot{a}j \) as an aspect marking element which means ‘experience’, and, although the aspectual-related meaning of \( kh\ddot{o}\ddot{a}j \) is minimal, I include \( kh\ddot{o}\ddot{a}j \) in Table 3.1 for referential purposes.

It should be noted that \( R\ddot{a}\ddot{e}m \) ‘start’ and \( kh\ddot{o}\ddot{a}j \) ‘experience’ can also occur as the only verb in a clause. But, then, their direct object complement must be an event-denoting NP. Examples are:

\[ Piti \, d\ddot{a}j \, kin \, kh\ddot{a}w \] ‘Piti got a chance to eat rice’, the meaning that \( d\ddot{a}j \) contributes is ‘get a chance to’, and \( d\ddot{a}j \)’s aspectual-related meaning is very minimal.

\[ \begin{align*}
13 \ & \text{Another morpheme, } d\ddot{a}j \ - \ \text{lit. ‘get’, when occurring pre-verbally, has also been considered a past tense morpheme. Again, I argue that the past tense interpretation of } d\ddot{a}j \ ‘get’ is merely implicated. In } Piti \, d\ddot{a}j \, kin \, kh\ddot{a}w \ ‘Piti got a chance to eat rice’, the meaning that } d\ddot{a}j \text{ contributes is ‘get a chance to’, and } d\ddot{a}j \text{’s aspectual-related meaning is very minimal.}
\end{align*} \]
(31) a. Wara ɾəəm ɲaan(noun) màj

Wara start work new
Wara started a new job.
b. *Wara ɾəəm salàd

Wara start salad
(Intended meaning: Wara started her salad.)

(32) a. Wara khɔɔj ɲaan(noun) nàk

Wara experience work hard
Wara experienced hard work.
b. *Wara khɔɔj ʔaakàad rɔɔn

Wara experience climate hot
(Intended meaning: Wara experienced a warm climate.)

That ɾəəm ‘start’ and khɔɔj – ‘experience’ as base verbs subcategorize for nouns that denote actions, and not simply any nouns, is shown by the ungrammaticality of sentences (31b)-(32b).
3.2.1.1.2 Modal Morphemes

The modal morpheme from slot 1 in Table 3.1 is ต้อง ‘must’.\textsuperscript{14} Even though ต้อง is not aspect morpheme, I include it in Table 3.1 to illustrate its interactions with Thai aspect morphemes.

The modal morpheme ต้อง is similar to ‘must’ in English. Namely, like ‘must’, ต้อง is ambiguous or vague between a deontic (obligation) and an epistemic (probability) meaning, as shown in (31).

\begin{equation}
\text{(33) Priida ต้อง สา ผ้า}
\end{equation}

Priida must wash cloth

Priida must wash the cloth./ Priida must be washing the cloth.

ต้อง can combine with verbs from all Aktionsart classes.

3.2.1.1.3 Possible Combinations of Morphemes from Slot 1

There can be more than one morpheme from slot 1 in a string, provided that the meanings of the morphemes that co-occur are compatible. The morpheme that occurs at the left most position (i.e. right after the subject) has the widest scope. Some examples of possible and implausible combinations are:

\textsuperscript{14} Note that ต้อง ‘must’ is not the only pre-verbal modal morpheme in Thai; it is simply picked as the representative of Thai pre-verbal modal morphemes, which include khuan ‘should’, 强有力 ‘might’, and น่า ‘probably’, for example.
(34) Priida kamlaŋ rəəm phim còdmäaj
Priida PROG start type letter
Priida is starting to type a letter.

(35) #Priida kamlaŋ khəəj piin khāw
Priida PROG experience climb mountain
(Intended meaning: Priida is experiencing climbing mountains.15)

(36) Manii kamlaŋ càʔ làan nāŋstūtu
Manii PROG be about to read book
Manii is going to read a/the book.16

(37) Manii càʔ kamlaŋ làan nāŋstūtu prûŋnî jen
Manii be about to PROG read book tomorrow evening
Manii might be reading a/the book tomorrow evening.17

(38) Wira tōŋ kamlaŋ hûŋ khāaw
Wira must PROG cook rice
Wira must be cooking rice.

15 Sentence (35) is semantically implausible because khəəj ‘experience’ implicates that the event encoded by the VP khəəj piin khāw ended, which is a meaning incompatible with the progressive marker kamlaŋ.

16 Sentence (36) literally means something like “Manii is in the process of being about to read a/the book”, which is analogous to the meaning of “Manii is going to read a/the book”. Hereafter, I use the short translation “be going to” for the combination of kamlaŋ - PROG and càʔ - ‘be about to’.

17 This is another example where càʔ is more appropriately translated as ‘might’. Since the meanings of individual aspect morphemes are not the focus of this thesis, I do not go further into investigating the detailed meaning of càʔ and whether or not its aspectual (‘be about to’) and modal (‘might’) uses correspond to two different meanings.
(39) Wira kamlaŋ tɔŋ hũŋ khāaw
Wira PROG must cook rice
Wira is having to cook rice.

(40) Wara cāʔ tɔŋ jēb phāa
Wara be about to must sew cloth
Wara might have to sew cloth.

(41) Wara tɔŋ cāʔ jēb phāa
Wara must be about to sew cloth
Wara must be about to sew cloth.

3.2.1.2 Morphemes from Slot 3

Morphemes from slot 3 can be provisionally divided into three groups: the modal morpheme dâj ‘get’, aspect morphemes with predicative meaning, and aspect morphemes with non-predicative meaning. I start by briefly describing the meaning of the modal morpheme dâj.

3.2.1.2.1 Modal Morpheme

Like tɔŋ ‘must’, dâj ‘get’ does not carry an aspectual meaning but encodes modality. The meanings that dâj ‘get’ encodes are similar to the root and deontic meanings of English can, as illustrated in the following example:
Piti tēnram dāj
Piti dance get
Piti was able to dance/ Piti was allowed to dance.

Out of context, the morpheme dāj is ambiguous between a root meaning ('be able to') and a deontic reading. Dāj is included in Table 3.1 for mere completeness and I do not describe its detailed semantics here.

3.2.1.2.2 Aspect Morphemes with Predicative Meaning

Three morphemes from slot 3 are aspect morphemes with predicative meaning or super-lexical morphemes. Aspect morphemes with predicative meaning refer to morphemes whose interpretations are approximately the same regardless of whether they occur as the base verb of a clause or not. These morphemes are tò ‘continue’, sèd ‘finish’, and còb ‘end’. According to Smith (1997:48), super-lexical morphemes are used to select a narrow view of a situation or to focus on parts of situations. As mentioned earlier, all three morphemes, tò ‘continue’, sèd ‘finish’ and còb ‘end’, can occur as the base verb in a clause.

- tò - ‘continue’ is used in the ACs to encode a continuative meaning. It can combine with verbs from the activity and accomplishment classes. Examples of tò ‘continue’ are shown in (43) - (45).

---

18 When co-occurring with achievement verbs, tò ‘continue’, like kamlañ - PROG, coerces the achievement verbs into an iterative interpretation. Coercion takes place when there is a conflict between
(43) tòò - ‘continue’ as base verb:

a. kammakaan tòò weelaa kaan-khèẹŋkhǎn

referee extend/continue time NOM-compete

The referee extended the time of the competition.

b. mɛɛ tòò dâaj

mother extend thread

The mother extended the thread.

c. *Piti tòò njaan khooŋ khǎaw

Piti continue work of he

(Intended meaning: Piti continued his work).

(44) tòò - ‘continue’ occurs in AC

Malii kin khǎaw tòò

Malii eat rice continue

Malii continued eating rice.

(45) tòò - ‘continue’ cannot combine with stative verbs

*Malii chuā ruąŋ phiŋ tòò

Malii believe issue ghost continue

(Intended meaning: Malii continued believing in ghosts.)
The subcategorization of $tɔɔ$ ‘continue’ as a base verb, exemplified in (43), is different from that of the other two super-lexical morphemes. Namely, $tɔɔ$ subcategorizes for an NP denoting an object which possesses length along a dimension. The length of the object can be temporal (43a) or spatial (43b). But $tɔɔ$, as shown in (43c), is not compatible with event-denoting NPs, which $sɛd$ ‘finish’ and $cɔb$ ‘end’ subcategorize for when they occur as base verbs. This distinction is important because, although from a semantic point of view, $tɔɔ$ ‘continue’, $sɛd$ ‘finish’, and $cɔb$ ‘end’ are all classified as super-lexical morphemes, $tɔɔ$ differs from the other two super-lexical morphemes in its selectional restrictions and will eventually be syntactically categorized differently from the other two super-lexical morphemes.

- $sɛd$ – ‘finish’ marks the endpoint (the completion) of an event. Unlike in English, when $sɛd$ ‘finish’ occurs as the base verb in a clause, it only subcategorizes for an event-denoting NP (see (46a-b)). In ACs, $sɛd$ ‘finish’ combines with accomplishment verbs or verbs that are coerced to have an accomplishment meaning (see (47)-(49)).

(46) $sɛd$ - ‘finish’ as base verb:

a. chawnaa $sɛd$ ɲaan(noun) naj naa

farmer finish work in field

The farmer(s) finished their work in the field.
b. *Wijada sèd náam-sôm

Wijada finish water-orange

(Intended meaning: Wijada finished the orange juice.)

(47) sèd - ‘finish’ in an AC with an accomplishment verb.

Manii kin khâaw sèd

Manii eat rice finish

Manii finished eating rice.

(48) sèd - ‘finish’ in an ACC with an activity verb coerced to have an accomplishment meaning.

Manii wîŋ sèd

Manii run finish

Manii finished running. (The running event is bounded in time or distance).

(49) sèd - ‘finish’ cannot combine with stative verbs:

*Manii chuâa ruâŋ phîi sèd

Manii believe issue ghost finish

(Intended meaning: Manii stopped believing in ghosts.)

- còb – ‘end’ has a similar meaning to sèd ‘finish’. It also has the same selectional restrictions as sèd ‘finish’.
(50) ḷòb - ‘end’ as base verb

Wira ḷòb pharákǐd

Wira end duty

Wira ended his duty.

(51) ḷòb - ‘end’ in an AC

a. Manii ṭàan nàŋśuũu ḷòb

Manii read book end

Manii ended/finished reading book.

b. Manii wíŋ ḷòb

Manii run end

Manii ended/finished running.

(52) ḷòb - ‘end’ cannot combine with stative verbs:

*Manii chúta rúŋa phĩi ḷòb

Manii believe issue ghost end

(Intended meaning: Manii ended her belief in ghosts.)

3.2.1.2.3 Aspect Morphemes with Non-predicative Meaning

The aspect morphemes from slot 3 which do not have a predicative meaning include three
semi-perfective morphemes, two perfective morphemes and two imperfective morphemes.

Semi-perfective morphemes
Thai has three semiperfective morphemes (see details below): *khùn* lit. ‘ascend’, *loŋ* ‘descend’, and *ʔòk* ‘exit’. As we can see from the glosses of examples (53a), (54a) and (55a), these morphemes are derived from directional verbs (cf. Chapter 2).

(53)  
a. **Directional meaning**

Wanna  dën  khùn  
Wanna walk ascend  
Wann walked up.

b. **Aspectual meaning**

Wira  têcŋ  kloan  khùn  
Wira compose poem SPFV(ascend)  
Wira composed a/the poem.

(54)  
a. **Directional meaning**

Piti  dën  loŋ  
Piti walk descend  
Piti walked down.

b. **Aspectual meaning**

thahāan  taaj  loŋ  
soldier die SPFV(descend)  
A/The soldier(s) died.
(55)  a. **Directional meaning**

Wira  "n  ?ðok

Wira  walk  exit

Wira  walked  out.

b. **Aspectual meaning**

Wira  tèŋ  kloenso  ?ðok

Wira  compose  poem  SPFV(exit)

Wira  composed  a/the  poem.

The serial verbs in (53a), (54a) and (55a) and their counterparts in (53b), (54b) and (55b) can be analyzed as diachronically and metaphorically related, an issue that goes beyond the scope of this thesis and which I do not pursue.

Thai semi-perfective morphemes are restricted to co-occur with verbs from the accomplishment class, except kʰûn  ‘ascend’, which can also combine with verbs from the achievement class.

- kʰûn  -  ‘ascend’ is the default semi-perfective (SPFV) morpheme in the sense that it does not require that the VP it combines with carries a particular meaning or presupposition.

Some examples of sentences containing kʰûn  ‘ascend’ are shown below:
(56) **Accomplishment**

Piti tɛɛn nァṣstuuu lɛɛm nuŋ nu[khʊn

Piti write book CL one SPFV(ascend)

Piti wrote a book.

(57) **Achievement**

kɔəd raʔbəəd khʊn

happen explosion SPFV(ascend)

There happened an explosion/explosions.

(58) *khʊn* ‘ascend’ does not co-occur with activity verbs

*Piti wɪŋ khʊn

Piti run SPFV(ascend)

(Intended meaning: Piti ran.)

(59) *khʊn* ‘ascend’ does not co-occur with stative verbs

*Piti rʊu phaasɑa faraŋsɛɛd khʊn

Piti know language France SPFV(ascend)

Piti knew French.

Semi-perfective aspect is different from perfective aspect in that the former does not entail the completion of seemingly telic event descriptions. To illustrate this, even though *khʊn* combines with an accomplishment verb in (56) and the object is bounded, the sentence still does not entail that the book was completed, as (60) shows:
Piti wrote a book but he did not finish it yet.

The aspect that khùn marks is semi-perfective, by which I mean that (56) describes a maximal subpart of an eventuality that would fit the eventuality description of Piti’s writing a book. In other words, semi-perfectivity entails that the event of Piti’s writing a book is bounded, i.e. it stops or ends, but does not require the event to be completed. That the eventuality described by a sentence containing a semi-perfective morpheme must include a boundary is shown by the ungrammaticality of sentences such as (61).

Piti wrote this book and is still writing it.

As pointed out in Koenig and Muansuwan (2000), sentence (61) is implausible because the semi-perfective requires that the activity of writing ends prior to speech time.

- loŋ - ‘descend’ combines with accomplishment verbs which have a destructive meaning, i.e. verbs which denote the end results of destruction or collision, for example. Loŋ also encodes semi-perfective aspect. Examples that illustrate the aspectual use of loŋ ‘descend’ are given in (62)-((64).

---

19 See Koenig and Muansuwan (2000) for a detailed study of the meaning of Thai semi-perfective morphemes.
 worker demolish house old SPFV(descend)

The workers demolished the/an old house.

(63) *lon ‘descend’ cannot combine with activity verbs

*Priida bon lon

Priida complain SPFV(descend)

(Intended meaning: Priida complained.)

(64) *lon ‘descend’ cannot combine with achievement verbs

*këød ra?bëød lon

happen explosion SPFV(descend)

(Intended meaning: There happened an explosion/explosions.)

(65) *lon ‘descend’ cannot combine with stative verbs

*Priida pen kon-leew lon

Priida be person-bad SPFV(descend)

(Intended meaning: Priida was a bad person.)

We can see that the aspect that lon encodes is not perfective from sentences such as (66), in which the completion of the event is negated in the second clause.

(66) worker demolish house old SPFV but house NEG collapse

The workers demolished the/an old house but the house did not collapse.
- ?òök - ‘exit’ combines with accomplishment verbs. It encodes the same aspectual information as khûn but adds a presupposition that the act was difficult to accomplish, as shown in (67).

(67)  Piti téɛŋ kloøn ?òök
Piti write poem SPFV(exit)

Piti was able to compose a/the poem.

Again, the aspect that ?òök ‘exit’ encodes is semi-perfective and not perfective. Evidence for this hypothesis can be seen in the following sentence.

(68)  Piti téɛŋ kloøn ?òök tɛɛ jaŋ n̥aj sêd
Piti write poem SPFV but still NEG finish

Piti was able to compose a/the poem but he hasn’t finished it yet.

The following examples show that ?òök ‘exit’ cannot co-occur with activity, achievement, or stative verbs:

(69)  Activity

*Piti wîŋ ?òök

Piti run SPFV(exit)

(Intended meaning: Piti was able to run.)

(70)  Achievement

*kèed ra?bèed ?òök

happen explosion SPFV(exit)
There happened an explosion/explosions.

(71) State

*Piti รู้ ท่าสั้น faràhsèed  orderBy

Piti know language France SPFV(exit)

(Intended meaning: Piti was able to know the French language.)

- Perfective morphemes

There are two perfective morphemes in slot 3 in Table 3.1: paj ‘go’ and sìa ‘lose’.

- paj - ‘go’ encodes perfective (PFTV) aspect when combined with change of state verbs.

Some examples are shown below:

(Examples (70)-(74) are from Thepkanjana (1987: 171)).

(72) khwordpress taaj paj

he die PFTV(go)

He died.

(73) kɛɛw tɛɛk paj

glass break PFTV(go)

The glass broke.

(74) namman ñòd paj

oil be gone PFTV(go)

The gas is all gone.
As mentioned above, perfective aspect entails the completion of the event described by a telic verb constellation. This is shown in (75), which forms a minimal pair with the semi-perfective morpheme $lo$ ‘descend’ in (62):

(75) $khon$ñ$aa$n $ru$û$u$ $bân$ $kâ$ $paj$

worker demolish house old PFTV(go)

The workers demolished the/an old house.

The demolition of the old house must be complete since it is impossible to subsequently negate the clause in (75), as shown in (76):

(76) $#khon$ñ$aa$n $ru$û$u$ $bân$ $kâ$ $paj$ $të$ $bân$ $måj$ $phañ$

worker demolish house old PFTV(go) but house NEG collapse

(Intended meaning: The workers demolished the/an old house but the house did not collapse.)

- $sîa$ - PFTV (lit. ‘lose, waste’) has the same restrictions as $paj$ ‘go’. Using $sîa$ as the perfective morpheme implicates that the change of state leads to a loss of some sort (Thepkanjana, 1987:171). Some examples of $sîa$ are:

(77) **Accomplishment**

$khon$ñ$aa$n $thû$b $tû$k $nân$ $sîa$

worker destroybuilding that PFTV(lose)

The workers destroyed that building.

---

20 A verb and its arguments form a verb constellation (Smith, 1997:17).
(78) **Change of state**

kéew  têek  śia

glass  break  PFTV(lose)

The glass broke.

Like *paj* ‘go’, the aspectual meaning that *śia* ‘lose’ carries is perfective because the morpheme entails the completion of the described event, as illustrated below:

(79) #khonŋaaneous  thúb  tûk  nán  śia  têe

workers  destroy  building  that  PFTV(lose)  but

 tûk  jaŋ  màj  phañ

building  still  NEG  collapse

(The workers destroyed that building, but the building didn’t collapse).

- **Imperfective morphemes**

- *khaw* – IMPFV (lit. ‘enter’) encodes imperfective aspect and its use is restricted to commands, as shown in the following example:

(80) Piti, tham kaanbaan  khaw

Piti, do  homework  IMPFV(enter)

Piti, do homework more and more.

*khaw* is included in Table 3.1 for completeness only. Since its usage is restricted and it does not interact with other aspect morphemes, I do not discuss it any further.
- *paj* - ‘go’ encodes an imperfective (IMPFV) aspect

When *paj* combines with verbs from the state, activity, or accomplishment classes, and is followed by a durational adverbial phrase, it encodes an imperfective meaning, as shown in (81)-(83):

(81) **State**

Wira chûa rûaŋ phi paj pen weelaa sãam pii

Wira believe issue ghost IMPFV(go) be time three year

Wira believed in ghosts for three years.

(82) **Activity**

Wira wîŋ paj pen weelaa sãam chûamooŋ

Wira run IMPFV(go) be time three hour

Wira ran for three hours.

(83) **Accomplishment**

Wira têeŋ kloön paj pen weelaa sãam chûamooŋ

Wira compose poem IMPFV be time three hour

Wira composed a/the poem/poems for three hours.

A durational adverbial phrase is necessary in a clause containing *paj* ‘go’ in order for *paj* ‘go’ to have an imperfective meaning, except in those cases in which *paj* is used to mark a backgrounding event, i.e. when *paj* is used to mark that an event provides the background of another event. This usage is similar to that of the **Imparfait** in French and is illustrated below.
Piti read book in moment that Manii then do homework IMPFV(go)

Piti was/is reading a/the book while Manii was/is doing her homework.

Like khāw ‘enter’, paj can also be used in imperative sentences and encode imperfective aspect, but with a slightly different meaning. This is illustrated in (85):

(85) Surii, tham kaanbânaj paj

Surii do homework IMPFV(go)

Surii, keep doing your homework.

Again, since the usage of paj illustrated in (85) is very restricted, I do not discuss this usage any further.

- jìu – lit. ‘be located’ is used in ACs to encode imperfective aspect. It can combine with verbs from all Aktionsart classes except verbs from the achievement class.\(^{21}\) Examples of jìu ‘be located’ are shown below:

---

\(^{21}\) Verbs from the achievement class are coerced to have an iterative interpretation when they combine with jìu.
(86) ḳu'u - ‘be located’ as base verb

Wanna ḳu'u bāan
Wanna be located home
Wanna is at/stays at home.

(87) ḳu'u - ‘be located’ in an AC

Wanna kin khāaw ḳu'u
Wanna eat rice IMPFV(be located)
Wanna was/is eating rice.

Sentences such as (87) might lead us to think that ḳu'u could be another progressive morpheme. However, since ḳu'u can co-occur with all stative verbs, while kamlaŋ cannot (see the contrast between (88) and (89)), I treat ḳu'u as an imperfective morpheme.

(88) Wijada chūa rtūaŋ phī ḳu'u
Wijada believe issue ghost IMPFV(be located)
Wijada believes in ghosts.

(89) *Wijada kamlaŋ chūa rtūaŋ phī
Wijada PROG believe issue ghost
(Wijada is believing in ghosts.)
3.2.1.2.4 Possible Combinations of Morphemes from Slot 3

There can be more than one element from slot 3 in a single AC clause. Super-lexical morphemes can co-occur with and precede several aspect morphemes which do not have predicative meaning. The reverse order is not allowed.\textsuperscript{22} To illustrate this, some examples are given below:

(90) a. Piti kh̄ian còdm̄aj tòö paj

Piti write letter continue IMPFV(go)\textsuperscript{23}

Piti continued writing a/the letter/letters.

b. *Piti kh̄ian còdm̄aj paj tòö

Piti write letter IMPFV(go) continue

(91) a. Piti kin khâaw sèd paj

Piti eat rice finish PFTV(go)

Piti finished eating rice.

b. *Piti kin khâaw paj sèd

Piti eat rice PFTV(go) finish

(92) a. Piti duu nàŋ còb paj

Piti watch movie end PFTV(go)

Piti ended/finished watching a movie.

\textsuperscript{22} I only report an observed fact here since my analysis (carried out in Chapter 4) does not explain the co-occurrence restriction of these predicative and non-predicative aspect morphemes, which is probably semantic in nature.

\textsuperscript{23} Paj ‘go’ here marks an imperfective aspect even though there is no durational time adverbial phrase which follows it. This is because the imperfective meaning, and not the perfective meaning, of paj ‘go’ is the one compatible with the continuative meaning encoded by tòö ‘continue’.
b. *Piti duu nàŋ paj còb

    Piti watch movie PFTV(go) end

Some combinations are simply not possible, probably due to redundancy. For example,

(93) *Piti duu nàŋ còb khùn

    Piti watch movie end SPFV(ascend)

3.2.1.3 Morpheme from Slot 4

- maa lit. ‘come’ encodes perfect (PFCT) aspect. It can combine with any class of verbs. The perfect morpheme maa ‘come’ is ambiguous between three readings, as shown below.

(94) **Existential**

    Piti kin hōŋjìthâak maa kòon

    Piti eat snail PFCT(come) before

    Piti has eaten snails before.

(95) **Continuative**

    Piti tèŋ kłoön maa

    Piti compose poem PFCT(come)

    Piti has been composing a/the poem.
Resultative

Piti tham khwaam-sa?àad bân maa
Piti do cleanliness house PFCT(come)
Piti has cleaned the house.

3.2.1.4 Possible Combinations of Aspect Morphemes from Slots 1 and 3 with the Perfect Morpheme

Examples (97)-(99) are sentences in which maa ‘come’ co-occur with morphemes from slot 1.

(97) Wanna kamlañ khïan raaj-naan maa
    Wanna PROG write report PFCT(come)
    Wanna has been writing a/the report.

(98) Wanna cà? khïan raajÌaan maa
    Wanna be about to write report PFCT(come)
    Wanna was/is about to have written a/the report.

(99) Wanna kamlañ cà? khïan raaj-naan maa
    Wanna PROG be about to write report PFCT(come)
    Wanna is going to have written a/the report.

The following examples are sentences in which maa ‘come’ combines with morphemes from slot 3.
Wijada has finished writing a/the report.

Wijada has written a/the report.

Sentence (102) is an example in which morphemes from slots 1, 3 and 4 co-occur.

Wijada is going to have written a/the report.

Due to the various possible scopes of the TAMs, each of the sentences (97)-(102) has potentially more than one meaning. However, the selected translation of each sentence seems the most typical meaning to the author. I discuss the different possible meanings of these combinations in more detail in 4.3.2.

I have described, in this section, the meanings of Thai aspect morphemes (TAMs). In the next section, I investigate the positions in the clauses in which these morphemes can occur.

### 3.2.2 Positional Properties of Thai Aspect Morphemes

As we have seen from the four slots in Table 3.1, TAMs can be classified into two groups: pre-VP and post-VP morphemes. The pre-VP morphemes are the morphemes from slot 1 in Table 3.1. The post-VP morphemes include the morphemes from slots 3 and 4. This
grouping is somewhat misleading because in certain ACs, in which a morpheme from slot 3 
occurs,\textsuperscript{24} morphemes from slots 1 can also occur after the base VP,\textsuperscript{25} as illustrated below:

\begin{enumerate}
\item[(103a)]
\begin{tabular}{c c c}
1 & 1 & \textit{Base VP} & 3 \\
\end{tabular}
\begin{tabular}{l}
Wilaj kamlaj cã? jéb phâa sèd \\
Wilaj PROG be about to sew cloth finish \\
\end{tabular}

\item[(103b)]
\begin{tabular}{c c}
\textit{Base VP} & 1 \\
\end{tabular}
\begin{tabular}{l}
Wilaj jéb phâa kamlaj cã? sèd \\
Wilaj sew cloth PROG be about to finish \\
\end{tabular}

\item[(103c)]
\begin{tabular}{c c c}
1 & \textit{Base VP} & 1 \\
\end{tabular}
\begin{tabular}{l}
Wilaj kamlaj jéb phâa cã? sèd \\
Wilaj PROG sew cloth be about to finish \\
\end{tabular}

\item[(103d)]
\begin{tabular}{c c c}
1 & \textit{Base VP} & 1 \\
\end{tabular}
\begin{tabular}{l}
#Wilaj cã? jéb phâa kamlaj sèd \\
Wilaj be about to sew cloth PROG finish \\
\end{tabular}
\end{enumerate}

(103a-c) = Wilaj is going to finish sewing cloth.

Note that sentence (103d) does not yield the meaning “Wilaj is going to finish sewing cloth” and is not possible due to semantic reason, as I shortly discuss in detail.

\textsuperscript{24} The perfect morpheme from slot 4, \textit{maa} ‘come’, does not behave the same way as morphemes from slot 3.

\textsuperscript{25} This fact was first observed by Sookgasem (1990). It is possible that sentences in (103) differ in focus structure, but the difference is not semantic in nature.
In (103a-c), *kamlaŋ* and *cà?* (as representative morphemes from slot 1) can occur before, after, or on the opposite sides of the base VP (with *kamlaŋ* preceding *cà?*; the reverse order is not allowed, as (103d) shows), when sèd ‘finish’ also occurs in the clause. This is
not possible when no morpheme from slot 3 is present, as the ungrammaticality of sentences (104c-d) shows.

The data I just presented support two claims. First, they support the claim that morphemes from slot 1 need to be followed by a VP. This hypothesis explains why sentences (104b-c) are not grammatical since there are no VP that follow kamlaŋ and/or çà? in the two sentences. Second, certain morphemes from slot 3 (sèd ‘finish’, among others) can form a constituent behaviorally similar to a VP, and can immediately follow morphemes from slot 1, as the base VP can. In the next section, I explore which morphemes from slot 3 in Table 3.1 behave as sèd ‘finish’ does.

### 3.2.3 Combinatorial Properties of Thai Aspect Morphemes

The last section shows that morphemes from slot 1 in Table 3.1 can occur in two different positions when morphemes from slot 3 are present. Nevertheless, not all morphemes from slot 3 allow morphemes from slot 1 to occur in postverbal position. The morphemes from slot 3 that allow a post-VP occurrence of slot 1 morphemes are: sèd ‘finish’, çòb ‘end’, and çòk SPFV (exit); other morphemes from slot 3 disallow it. Examples of sentences with çòb ‘end’ and çòk SPFV (exit) are shown below:

(105)  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>Base VP</th>
<th>3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Wan na</td>
<td>kamlaŋ</td>
<td>çà?</td>
<td>duu</td>
<td>nãŋ çòb</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wan na</td>
<td>PROG</td>
<td>be about to</td>
<td>watch movie</td>
<td>end</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Other morphemes from slot 3, e.g. *khūn* SPFV(ascend), do not allow morphemes from slot 1 in postverbal positions, as shown in examples (112) - (113).
What is interesting is that these differences in syntactic combinatorial properties do not perfectly correlate with possible semantic groupings of the morphemes in Table 3.1. For example, not all of the super-lexical morphemes behave the same way, as might have been expected, if semantic class was the sole factor determining the possibility for slot 1 morpheme to occur after the base VP. Namely, while sèd ‘finish’ and còb ‘end’ allow morphemes from slot 1 to co-occur with them in post-VP position, tòò ‘continue’ does not allow it. This is illustrated in (114)-(116):

(114)  
```
  I  I  Base VP  3
Wira kamlaŋ  càʔ  kʰian  nʔs̥uʔu  tòò
```

Wira PROG be about to write book continue

Wira is going continue writing a/the book.
Also, the semi-perfective morphemes ʔɔɔk ‘exit’ and khùn. ‘ascend’, as representatives of non-predicative morphemes from slot 3, do not behave uniformly in this respect either, as illustrated in (108)-(113).

I have now described the three basic classes of properties of Thai aspect morphemes: semantic, positional, and combinatorial properties. It should be noted that the combinatorial properties of TAMs do not seem to entirely follow from their semantics. In other words, the distribution of TAMs is not predictable from their semantics. Hence, the classification of TAMs into subgroups or the determination of the parts of speech of TAMs cannot be based merely on their semantics, but must be based on their distributional properties. This classification is carried out in the next chapter.

### 3.3 Restrictions in combining Thai aspect morphemes

The purpose of this final section is to specify co-occurrence restrictions between certain aspect morphemes. I focus on the restrictions which pertain to the progressive morpheme
*kamlan* - PROG and certain morphemes from slot 3 in Table 3.1. This is because *kamlan* behaves differently from other aspect morphemes from slot 1 when it combines with morphemes from slot 3.

The progressive morpheme *kamlan* can co-occur with *sèd* ‘finish’ and *còb* ‘end’ from slot 3 only when *cà?* ‘be about to’ is present,\(^{26}\) as illustrated by the ungrammaticality of sentences (118b)-(119b).

\[(117)\]
\[
\begin{align*}
a. & \quad \text{Priida} \quad \textit{kamlan} \quad \textit{tèn} \quad \textit{kloon} \quad \textit{khu?n} \\
& \quad \text{Priida PROG compose poem SPFV(ascend)} \\
& \quad \text{Priida is composing a/the poem (to the maximality of the event).}
\end{align*}
\]
\[
b. & \quad \text{Priida} \quad \textit{kamlan} \quad \textit{cà?} \quad \textit{tèn} \quad \textit{kloon} \quad \textit{khu?n} \\
& \quad \text{Priida PROG be about to compose poem SPFV(ascend)} \\
& \quad \text{Priida is going to compose a/the poem (to the maximality of the event).}
\]

\[(118)\]
\[
\begin{align*}
a. & \quad \text{Priida} \quad \textit{kamlan} \quad \textit{cà?} \quad \textit{tèn} \quad \textit{kloon} \quad \textit{sèd} \\
& \quad \text{Priida PROG be about to compose poem finish} \\
& \quad \text{Priida is going to finish composing a/the poem.}
\end{align*}
\]
\[
b. & \quad \text{*Priida} \quad \textit{kamlan} \quad \textit{tèn} \quad \textit{kloon} \quad \textit{sèd} \\
& \quad \text{Priida PROG compose poem finish}
\]

\(^{26}\)Notice that this restriction on Thai progressive morpheme is different from that of English, as “Peter is finishing composing a poem” is a possible sentence in English but not in Thai.
I hypothesize that ={`cà?` - ‘be about to’ allows kamlaj to co-occur with =`sed` ‘finish’ and =`còb` ‘end’ as a result of a needed aspectual shift from a punctual bounded event to an expanded bounded event. This shift is induced by =`cà?`. My hypothesis is that kamlaj - PROG requires the event descriptions it combines with to have duration, i.e. kamlaj is not compatible with punctual bounded events or achievements. =`Sèd` ‘finish’ and =`còb` ‘end’ encode derived achievements, i.e. they focus on an instantaneous final endpoint (cf. Smith, 1997:32). Hence, these two morphemes turn durative event descriptions into punctual bounded events and do not make the duration associated with the basic event descriptions of the VPs they modify available for kamlaj - PROG. The function of =`cà?` in (118)-(119) is to make the preliminary stages (associated with many achievement verbs) of the events =`ièŋ klöon sèd` ‘finish composing a poem’ and =`jàan nàŋstúwu còb` ‘end/finish reading a book’ available to meet kamlaj’s requirement. This hypothesis explains why (103d), in which kamlaj directly precede =`sèd` ‘finish’, is not possible as it is semantically anomalous.
It should be noted that \( ?\ddot{o}k \) SPFV(exit), which shares the same **syntactic** distribution as \( \ddot{se}d \) ‘finish’ and \( \ddot{c}\ddot{o}b \) ‘end’ in that it allows a post-VP occurrence of morphemes from slot 1, does not share \( \ddot{se}d \) and \( \ddot{c}\ddot{o}b \)’s **semantic** incompatibility with \( kamlaŋ \). Namely, \( ?\ddot{o}k \) can co-occur with \( kamlaŋ \) with or without \( \ddot{c}a=? \) being present, as shown in (120)-(121).

(120) Priida kamlaŋ tē̆ŋ kłoön \( ?\ddot{o}k \)

Priida PROG compose poem SPFV(exit)

Priida is being able to compose a/the poem.

(121) Priida kamlaŋ \( \ddot{c}a=? \) tē̆ŋ klooŋ \( ?\ddot{o}k \)

Priida PROG be about to compose poem SPFV(exit)

Priida is going to (be able to) compose a/the poem.

### 3.4 Conclusion

Since Thai lacks morphology, it marks aspect by using distinct words. In this chapter, I have described the semantic, positional and combinatorial properties of Thai aspect morphemes. We have seen that Thai has aspect morphemes in both pre-VP and post-VP positions, with some morphemes being able to occur in either position in some circumstances without altering the meaning of the clause. Similarly to the free ordering of certain VPs in Directional SVCs, the ordering flexibility of Thai aspect morphemes is interesting since Thai is generally a language with a rigid word-order. To account for the ordering of Thai aspect morphemes as well as their combinations, a detailed investigation
of the part-of-speech, and of the syntactic and semantic structures of Aspectual Constructions is needed. This analysis is presented in the next chapter.
Chapter 4

Parts of Speech and Structures of Thai Aspect

Morphemes

4.1 Introduction

In the last chapter, I have investigated the properties of individual aspect morphemes in Thai and their possible combinations. This chapter investigates the parts of speech of Thai aspect morphemes (TAMs) or event description modifiers\(^1\), and the syntactic and semantic structures (in terms of their relative scope) of their occurrences in Aspectual Constructions (ACs). Parts of speech of TAMs do not correlate with their pre-verbal or post-verbal positions. TAMs partake in universal syntactic structures of modification and complementation. Semantically, although multiple occurrences of TAMs in an Aspectual Construction are possible and this can potentially leads to scope ambiguities, few ambiguities ever arise in Thai ACs because possible ACs are constrained by the selectional restrictions and syntactic status as heads or modifiers of TAMs they contain.

The chapter proceeds as follows. First, I provide an analysis of the parts of speech of Thai aspect morphemes. Next, I examine the syntactic structures of ACs. Then, I discuss the possible scope relations among aspect morphemes in ACs. Finally, a formal representation of the syntactic structures in which TAMs enter and their relative scope is provided.
4.2 Parts of speech of Thai Aspect morphemes

It is not uncontroversial to determine the parts of speech of certain classes of words in Thai. This holds for Thai aspect morphemes. Thai researchers have associated these aspect morphemes with more familiar categories such as “auxiliaries” or “serial verbs” in previous analyses (Kanchanawan, 1978; Savetamalaya, 1988; Sookgasem, 1990). Kanchanawan (1978) classifies Thai aspect morphemes into subclasses of verbs: pre-serial verbs, auxiliaries, and post-serial verbs, according to their subcategorization requirements and positional properties. Savetamalaya (1988) and Sookgasem (1990) treat Thai aspect markers as auxiliaries associated with different featural specifications. Nevertheless, in previous studies of Thai aspect-marking system, the definition of the terms “auxiliaries” and “serial verbs” and the criteria used to decide which parts of speech Thai aspect morphemes belong to are not clearly stated.

Since Thai has almost no morphology, morphological properties of words cannot be used to determine parts of speech. As a result, parts of speech or lexical categories of TAMs are determined in this thesis exclusively from their distributional properties, namely, from the range of environments in which they can occur, under the assumption that part-of-speech specifications are needed when distributional distinctions among classes of words cannot be reduced to their semantics or valence properties.

To categorize Thai aspect morphemes, we can provisionally partition them into two groups: the group of TAMs that can occur before the base VP and the group that can occur only occur after the base VP. The first group consists of the morphemes from slot 1 in

---

1 Event description modifiers are modifiers that map an event description input to another event description. Aspect morphemes have generally been considered event description modifiers. For example, the progressive aspect maps a basic event description to a state (cf. De Swart, 1998).
Table 3.1, and the second group is composed of the morphemes from slot 3 and 4. Mnemonically, I call the first group **pre-VP TAMs**. A further distinction needs to be made among the elements in the second group, however. As we have already seen in 3.2.3, three morphemes from slot 3, *sèd* ‘finish’, *còb* ‘end’ and ?òok ‘exit’ must be distinguished from other morphemes in this slot, since only these three morphemes allow the occurrence of morphemes from slot 1 after the base VP. I mnemonically call *sèd* ‘finish’, *còb* ‘end’ and ?òok ‘exit’ **predicate-like TAMs** since they behave like predicative VPs in the sense that they can immediately follow pre-VP TAMs (cf. 3.2.2), and I call the rest of the morphemes from slot 3 and the perfect marker from slot 4 **post-VP TAMs**. This provisional classification is shown in the following table:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pre-VP TAMs</th>
<th>kamlaŋ - PROG, càʔ ‘be about to’, phên - POST-INC ‘just start’, râem ‘start’, khəaj ‘experience’, tôn ‘must’</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Post-VP TAMs</td>
<td>daj ‘get’, khûn - SPFV(ascend), loŋ - SPFV(descend), khâw - IMPFV (enter), ?òok - SPFV(exit), jiu IMPFV(be located), tòo ‘continue’, paj - IMPFV(go), paj - PFTV(go), ſûa PFTV(waste, lose), maa - PFCT(come)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Predicate-like TAMs</td>
<td>sèd ‘finish’, còb ‘end’ and ?òok ‘exit’</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 4.1: Preliminary classification of Thai aspect morphemes**

It should be noted that the terms pre-VP, post-VP, and predicate-like TAMs do not ultimately refer to the actual TAMs’ parts of speech. I use these terms to refer to the grouping in Table 4.1 only.

Major parts of speech in Thai are **nouns** and **verbs**. I start investigating the parts of speech of TAMs by determining whether TAMs share some properties with one of these two major parts of speech. Nouns in Thai possess two major properties: 1) nouns need a
copula in order to occur after the subject of a clause, and 2) only nouns can participate in the possessive structure. These properties are illustrated below:

(1) **Copula**
   a. Priida pen khruu(noun)
      Priida copula teacher
      Priida is a teacher.
   b. *Priida khruu
      Priida teacher

(2) **Possessive structure of nouns**
   ñaan(noun) khõõñ Wira khuuwangi laañ caan
   work of Wira copula wash dish
   Wira’s work is to watch the dishes.

Pre-VP TAMs do not share these properties with nouns, as illustrated below:

(3) a. Wijada kamlañ kröod
    Wijada PROG be angry
    Wijada is being angry.
   b. *Wijada pen kamlañ kröod
    Wijada copula PROG be angry

(4) a. Wijada tôñ rôm tham ñaan(noun)
    Wijada must start do work
    Wijada must start working
b. *râøm khoøŋ ŋaan pen siŋ thii Wijada tôŋ tham

start of work copula thing that Wijada must do

(Intended meaning: The start of the work is what Wijada must do)

Sentence (3a) becomes ungrammatical when a copula is inserted between the subject of the clause and the pre-VP TAM kamløŋ - PROG. In addition, pre-VP TAMs, exemplified by râøm ‘start’ in (4), cannot have the complement structure of nouns. In fact, pre-VP TAMs are similar to raising verbs, i.e. verbs that take a VP complement and do not assign a semantic role to their subject. An example of a raising verb is këød ‘happen’, and sentences containing këød are shown in (5) and (6). I provide examples of a pre-VP TAM, phøŋ ‘just start’, in (7) to show that pre-VP TAMs have the same distribution as raising verbs in Thai.

(5) rot këød sia

car happen break down

The car happened to break down.

(6) a. Piti këød tham ŋaan sëd

Piti happen do work finish

b. Piti tham ŋaan këød sëd

Piti do work happen finish

(6a-b) Piti happened to finish working.
(7)  a. Piti phēŋ tham ŋaan sèd
    Piti just start do work finish
b. Piti tham ŋaan phēŋ sèd
    Piti do work just start finish

(7a-b) Piti just started to finish working.

The examples in (6)-(7) show that raising verbs such as këōd ‘happen’, like pre-VP TAMs, are able to occur in the position after the base VP when predicate-like TAMs such as sèd ‘finish’ are present. Therefore, we can tentatively conclude that pre-VP TAMs belong to the same class as raising verbs in Thai.

Post-VP TAMs can be distinguished from nouns because they do not co-occur with a copula, and do not occur in the possessive structure, as illustrated below.

(8) khūn -SPFV(ascend) as base verb

a. Manii khūn bandaj
    Manii ascend stair
    Manii ascended the stairs.

b. *Manii pen khūn bandaj
    Manii copula ascend stair

(9) *Manii tèŋ kloon pen khūn
    Manii compose poem copula SPFV (ascend)
    (Intended meaning: Manii composed a/the poem.)
Examples (7)-(10) show that post-VP TAMs cannot co-occur with a copula in an AC. In addition, post-VP TAMs cannot participate in the possessive construction, as illustrated by the ungrammaticality of (11b).

Predicate-like TAMs can also be distinguished from nouns, as shown below:

(12) sèd ‘finish’ as base verb

a. Priida sèd ηaan

Priida finish work
Priida finish his work.

b. *Priida pen sèd ηaan

Priida copula finish work
(13) สด ‘finish’ in ACs

a. Priida tham น้าน สด
Priida do work finish
Priida finished working.

b. *Priidatham น้าน pen สด
Priida do work copula finish

The contrast between (13a) and (13b) show that predicate-like TAMs cannot co-occur with a copula in an Aspectual Construction. Furthermore, predicate-like TAMs do not occur in the possessive construction, as shown below:

(14) a. Wara ต้อง คอบ pharáʔkid
Wara must end duty
Wara must end her duty.

b. *คอบ khōŋ pharáʔkid pen น้าน ที่มี Wara ต้อง tham
end of duty copula thing that Wara must do

(Intended meaning: The end of her duty is the thing that Wara must do.)

As shown in (14b), the predicate-like TAM คอบ ‘end’ cannot have NP complements preceded by khōŋ ‘of’, meaning that it cannot occur in the possessive construction.

We have seen that pre-VP, post-VP, and predicate-like TAMs all are different from nouns. Moreover, pre-VP TAMs behave similarly to raising verbs, which, I assume, are a subclass of Thai verbs. Predicate-like TAMs are also like verbs in the sense that they can immediately follow pre-VP TAMs, like ordinary VPs do. Therefore, I conclude that pre-
VP and predicate-like TAMs share certain properties with Thai verbs, while post-VP TAMs do not have such properties (for example, post-VP TAMs cannot immediately follow pre-VP TAMs. See 3.2.3). As a result, I preliminarily propose that parts of speech in Thai can be classified as in figure 4.1.

![POS diagram]

... nouns verbs(pre-VP TAMs, predicate-like TAMs,...) markers(post-VP TAMs, ...)

**Figure 4.1: Preliminary version of parts of speech in Thai**

A further distinction needs to be made among pre-VP TAMs, however, since elements that have been classified as pre-VP TAMs behave differently with respect to negation.

Thai has three words encoding negation: māj, māj-dāj, and māj-chāj. The three negations are different in the foci they allow, and in their selectional restrictions. Māj - NEG1 allows a narrow focus or argument focus. Māj is followed by a VP in a clause, as illustrated in (15).

(15) Dara māj kin khāaw (tēɛ kin pizza)

Dara NEG1 eat rice but eat pizza

Dara did not eat rice (but ate pizza).

2 I assume that negations in Thai are a subclass of raising verbs since they do not assign a semantic role to their subject and their grammatical subject is the same as that of their complement. The exact category of Thai negation words is, however, not relevant to my analysis of TAMs.
The pre-VP TAMs râem ‘start’, khəəj ‘experience’ and tôŋ ‘must’ can be preceded by mâj, but mâj cannot precede kamləŋ - PROG, càʔ - be about to, or phên ‘just start’. These restrictions are illustrated in (16)-(21).

(16) Dara mâj râem tham ñaan

Dara NEG1 start do work
Dara did not start working.

(17) Dara mâj khəəj tham ñaan

Dara NEG1 experience do work
Dara did not experience working.

(18) Dara mâj tôŋ tham ñaan

Dara NEG1 must do work
Dara did not have to work.

(19) *Wijada mâj kamləŋ tham ñaan

Wijada NEG1 PROG do work

(20) *Wijada mâj càʔ tham ñaan

Wijada NEG1 be about to do work

(21) *Wijada mâj phên tham ñaan

Wijada NEG1 just start do work

It should be noted that mâj - NEG1 can also precede predicate-like TAMs, as illustrated below:
(22) Wilaj kin khâaw mâj sèd

Wilaj eat rice NEG1 finish

Wilaj did not finish eating rice.

(23) Wilaj duu nãŋ mâj còb

Wilaj watch movie NEG1 end

Wilaj did not finish/end watching a/the movie.

(24) Wilaj têɛŋ kloɔn mâj ʔòɔk

Wilaj compose poem NEG1 exit

Wilaj was not able to compose a/the poem.

In order for a negation operator to have narrow focus over a VP headed by kamlaŋ - PROG, çàl - be about to or phɛŋ ‘just start’, that VP must be preceded by another negation word, mâj-dâj - NEG2, as illustrated below:

(25) Wijada mâj-dâj kamlaŋ kin khâaw têɛ kamlaŋ

Wijada NEG2 PROG eat rice but PROG

kin pizza

eat pizza

Wijada is/was not eating rice but is/was eating pizza.
(26) Wijada mâj-dâj cà? kin khâaw tëɛ cà? kin
Wijada NEG2 be about to eat rice but be about to eat pizza
Wijada was not about to eat rice but was about to eat pizza.

(27) Wijada mâj-dâj phêŋ kin khâaw tëɛ phêŋ
Wijada NEG2 POST-INC eat rice but just start eat pizza
Wijada has not just started eating rice but has just started eating pizza.

In addition, mâj-dâj can precede predicate-like TAMs and ordinary verbs such as kin ‘eat’, as illustrated below.

(28) Priida tham kaan-bân mâj-dâj sëd
Priida do homework NEG2 finish
Priida did not finish doing his homework.

(29) Priida mâj-dâj kin pizza
Priida NEG2 eat pizza
Priida did not eat pizza.

Note that the third negation word mâj-châj - NEG3, which only allows verb focus, can precede all pre-VP and predicate-like TAMs. Finally, none of the three negation words can precede post-VP TAMs, as exemplified in (30).
This last fact confirms the distinction I made in figure 4.1 between verb-like (pre-VP and predicate-like TAMs) and non-verb (i.e., markers or post-VP) TAMs.

The selectional restrictions on Thai negation markers show that a distinction needs to be made among pre-VP TAMs. Pre-VP TAMs that can follow แม่ - NEG1 are classified as *full-verbs*, while those that cannot are classified as *partial-verbs*. The revised classification of Thai parts-of-speech is shown in figure 4.2. Note that in figure 4.2, I also incorporate the distinction between *main* and *serial verb* discussed in Chapter 2.

According to figure 4.2, Thai aspect morphemes are subtypes of either *verbs* or *markers*. TAMs which are verbs are further classified as either *full-verbs* or *partial-verbs*.
Predicate-like TAMs and three pre-VP TAMs, რდჰჯ - start, ჭჰყჯ ‘experience’ and ძჷ ‘must’, are full-verbs. კამჲ - PROG, ჰაჳ - be about to, and ჰოჷ - POST-INC are partial-verbs. Post-VP TAMs are markers. This classification allows us to straightforwardly state the selectional restrictions of Thai negation markers: მაჷ - NEG1 subcategorizes for full-verb phrases only, while მაჷ-დაჷ - NEG2 and მაჷ-ჩაჷ - NEG3 subcategorize for verb phrases. All negation markers can precede full-verbs. None of the negation markers subcategorizes for markers or post-VP TAMs. Notice that the elements surrounded by boxes in figure 4.2 are not further subtypes of parts of speech, but are merely examples of elements that belong to the parts of speech to which the boxes are linked.

The division into main and serial among full-verbs is relevant to the occurrence of Directional Serial Verb Constructions (Directional SVCs) discussed in Chapter 2. Ordinary verbs in Thai are specified as main full-verbs. Serial full-verbs are verbs that do not have to occur initially in a SVC sequence, and have a special valence structure in the SVCs. Main full-verbs, such as manner-of-motion and caused-motion verbs, if appearing in the SVCs, have to occur first in the SVC sequence, and they do not have a special valence structures.

Finally, verbs (including both full and partial-verbs) are, intuitively, elements that can occur in the ordinary verb position (OVP), i.e. the position immediately after the subject of a clause, with a meaning comparable to when they do not occur in this position. To illustrate why elements such as ძჷ ‘continue’ are not classified as verbs according to this property, consider the following examples of ჭი ‘eat’ (an ordinary main full-verb),
cà? ‘be about to’, sèd ‘finish’, còb ‘end’, ?òòk ‘exit’ and tòò ‘continue’, when they occur in the OVP and when they do not. The examples in (31)-(36) show that kin ‘eat’, cà? ‘be about to’ sèd ‘finish’, còb ‘end’, and ?òòk ‘exit’ can occur in the OVP, and have comparable meanings as when they do not occur in this position. In contrast, tòò ‘continue’ has incomparable meanings when occurring in the OVP and when appearing after the base VP.

(31) a. Malii kin ?aahán

Malii eat food

Malii ate food.

b. Malii tham ?aahán kin

Malii do food eat

Malii made some food to eat.

(32) a. Malii cà? tham ŋaan sèd³

Malii be about to do work finish

Malii was about to finish working.

³ Cà? ‘be about to’ needs a predicate-like TAM such as sèd ‘finish’ to be present in order for cà? to be able to occur in the non-OVP position. The presence of sèd ‘finish’ does not affect the claim I make that cà? has the same meaning whether it occurs in the OVP position or not.
b. Malii tham ṅaan cà? sèd

Malii do work be about to finish

Malii was about to finish working.

(33) a. Malii sèd ṅaan(noun)

Malii finish work

Malii finished her work.

b. Malii tham ṅaan sèd

Malii do work finish

Malii finished working.

(34) a. Manii còb nâathīi

Manii end duty

Manii ended her duty.

b. Manii tham nâathīi còb

Manii do duty end

Manii ended doing her duty.

(35) a. Wira ?òök càak ṅaan

Wira exit from work

Wira quit his work/job.

b. *Wira ?òök càak burìi

Wira exit from cigarette

(Intended meaning: Wira quit cigarettes.)
c. Wira tham Ṉaan /ɔɔk

Wira do work exit (SPFV)

Wira was able to and did work.

(36) a. Piti tɔɔ daaj

Piti continue/extend thread

Piti extended the thread.

b. *Piti tɔɔ Ṉaan

Piti continue work

(Intended meaning: Piti continued his work.)

c. Piti tham Ṉaan tɔɔ

Piti do wok continue

Piti continued working.

The meanings of ɔɔl ‘be about to’, sèd ‘finish’, cèb ‘end’, and /ɔɔk ‘exit’, when occurring in the OVP and in the post-verbal position are comparable. The morpheme /ɔɔk ‘exit’ is a bit different from sèd ‘finish’ and cèb ‘end’ in that /ɔɔk in the OVP needs a PP to follow it (cf. (35a)), but otherwise the semantic restriction it imposes on the elements it selects is the same as that of sèd ‘finish’ and cèb ‘end. Namely, the three predicate-like TAMs select an event-denoting phrase. This explains why (35b) is not possible. On the other hand, such a semantic restriction does not hold for tɔɔ ‘continue’. The meanings of tɔɔ
‘continue’ in (36a) and (36c) are not comparable. Namely, when ต่อ occurs in the OVP, it only subcategorizes for an NP denoting an object which possesses length along a dimension, as illustrated in (36a-b). However, when ต่อ ‘continue’ occurs postverbally, it is not restricted in the same way. This difference confirms the difference in part-of-speech classification diagrammed in figures 4.1 and 4.2; namely that endet ‘finish’, จบ ‘end’ and ออก ‘exit’ are verbs while the post-VP TAM ต่อ ‘continue’ is a marker.

In conclusion, Thai aspect morphemes are sorted into three different parts of speech: full-verb, partial-verb and marker. Full-verb and partial-verb are subclasses of verb, which is an independently attested major part of speech in Thai, while markers are a distinct category. Note that This part-of-speech classification of TAMs does not correlate with their positions in the clause or their meanings. TAMs are categorized as to their potential to be subcategorized for by other linguistic elements, in this case negation markers and other TAMs.

4.3 Structures of Thai Aspectual Constructions

4.3.1 Syntactic Structures of Thai Aspectual Constructions

In this section, I investigate the syntactic structures of Thai Aspectual Constructions. I apply a few constituency tests to determine the syntactic structure of Thai ACs. It should be noted that some of these tests do not constitute strong evidence for the structures I claim.
Nevertheless, I make the best use out of the tests, bearing in mind that these structures are not the only possible structures that one can posit from the available data.

I hypothesize that Thai aspect morphemes combine with the base VP through either complementation or modification. On one hand, pre-VP TAMs are heads which subcategorize for *verb phrases*; on the other hand, predicate-like and post-VP TAMs combine with the VP headed by a *full-verb* via modification. To illustrate this, an example of an AC with its informal structure is shown below:

(37)

```
S  VP
  VP  VP
    VP  Pred-like TAM  Post-VP TAM
NP  Pre-VP TAM  Pre-VP TAM  VP  Pred-like TAM  Post-VP TAM
  Piti  kamlan?  ca?  khan  raaj?aan  se?d  maa

Piti is going to have finished writing a/the report.
```

The correctness of the structure in (37) is partly determined by the possible scope relations among TAMs, which I discuss in 4.3.2. I assume in (37) that *khan raaj?aan* combines with *se?d* via the head-modifier structure,\(^5\) and *khan raaj?aan se?d* in turns combines with *maa*, again through modification. *Ca?l* combines with *khan raaj?aan se?d maa* through the
head-complement schema, and \( că? \) \( kñ\)an raaj\ñaan sèd maa finally becomes the complement of \( kaml\ñ \) - PROG. Notice that although only partial-verb pre-VP TAMs appear in example (37), I assume that all pre-VP TAMs syntactically combine with a VP via the head-complement schema. Complementation and modification are partially identified in (37) by the relative order between the TAMs and the base VP. TAMs which \textit{precede} the base VP combine with the base VP via \textit{complementation}. TAMs which \textit{follow} the base VP combine with the base VP via \textit{modification}.

In the following two sections, I determine the constituent structures of TAMs in ACs based on syntactic tests and observations, and I discuss the two structures which are involved in the tree in (37): head-complement and head-modification structure.

\textbf{4.3.1.1 Head-Complement Structure}

I argue that pre-VP TAMs are heads that subcategorize for a complement which is a \textit{verb phrase}, as illustrated in (38)- (45):

(38) \( *\text{Wanna} \quad \text{kaml}\ñ \)

\( \text{Wanna} \quad \text{PROG} \)

I assume that what follows a pre-VP TAM is a complement because if only a pre-VP TAM occurs in the VP of a sentence, the sentence becomes ungrammatical, as shown in (38).

\[5\] I assume that a head-modifier structure is licensed by the Head-Adjunct Schema (Pollard and Sag, 1994).
In (39), the NP ƞaan ‘work’ cannot satisfy the subcategorization requirement of the pre-VP TAM kamlaŋ - PROG. Pre-VP TAMs have to co-occur with a VP. We can see from (40)-(41) that pre-VP TAMs subcategorize for an element which is a simplex or complex verb phrase.

(40) Wanna kamlaŋ khoan raajñaan

Wanna is writing a/the report.

(41) Wanna kamlaŋ wîŋ klab

Wanna is running back.

The VP khoan raajñaan in (40) is a simplex VP, while the Directional SVC wîŋ klab in (41) is a complex VP.

Sentence (42) shows that a VP headed by the partial-verb kamlaŋ ‘PROG’ can be the complement of a pre-VP TAM. But if there is no verb following a pre-VP TAM, particularly, if what follows it is a marker, the sentence becomes ungrammatical, as shown in (43)-(45).
Wanna was about to be eating rice.

Wanna was about to eat rice.

Wanna was about to finish eating rice.

Wanna was about to compose a poem.
In (43a), the VP *kin khāaw* ‘eat rice’ is the complement of the pre-VP TAM *cà?* ‘be about to’, and in (44b), *sèd* ‘finish’ is the complement of *cà?*. However, as (45b) shows, *khûn* ‘ascend’ cannot be the complement of *cà?* since *khûn* is a *marker*, not a *verb*.

A constituency test which is potentially applicable to constructs containing pre-VP TAMs is the coordination test. I apply this test in examples (46)-(47).

(46) Wira kamlaŋ rôəm rûũ-mâҗ-kô? kheej têη njaaaj khûn

Wira PROG start or experience write novel ascend(SPFV)

Wira either is starting to write or experienced writing a novel.

(47) Wira rôəm cà? rûũ-mâҗ-kô? kamlaŋ khûn raajjaan

Wira start be about to or PROG write report

Wira might start writing or is writing a/the report.

Based on the assumption that only constituents of the same type can be coordinated, the sequence *kamlaŋ rôəm*, which is coordinated with the marker *khôej* ‘experience’, seems to form a constituent in (46). Similarly, *rôəm*, together with *cà?*, seems to be coordinated with *kamlaŋ* in (47). The coordination test shows that when there are more than one pre-VP TAM in an Aspectual Construction, they seem to form a constituent. However, I hypothesize that sentences (46)-(47) are instances of right node raising. Right-node raising is a construction consisting of an apparent coordination of two sentences in which each sentence lacks its rightmost constituent, and a single further constituent appearing on the right is interpreted as filling both gaps. An example of Thai right-node raising is shown in Chapter 1 and is repeated below.
(48) Priida ’hâj nâŋstûw 1ê? hâj-jûum klôn kêe dêkdêk

Priida gave the book(s) and lent the camera to the children.

A characteristic of right-node raising which makes it differ from coordination is that in right-node raising, there can be a pause before the conjunction, which is not the case for coordination. In each of (46)-(48), there can be a pause before the conjunction. If (46)-(47) involve right-node raising, the result of the coordination test in (46)-(47) cannot be used to determine the structure of pre-VP TAMs.

I assume that a pre-VP TAM combines with its VP complement as illustrated in (50), which is the structure of (49).

(49) Priida câ? kin khâaw 1ê? duu nâŋ

Priida was about to eat rice and watch movie.

In (49), the meaning of câ? ‘be about to’ has scope over both VPs kin khâaw ‘eat rice’ and duu nâŋ ‘watch movie’. This means that the structure of (49) is as shown in (50), in which câ? combines with a coordinated VP, and not as shown in (51). Note that the order of pre-VP TAMs and their complements follows the typical head-complement order in Thai.
Priida be about to eat rice and watch movie

When there are more than one pre-VP TAM, I assume the layered head-complement structure illustrated in (53), which is the structure of (52).

Piti PROG be about to must write report

Piti is going to have to write a report.
This is because all pre-VP TAMs take a *VP* as their complement (cf. (38) through (45)). The only structure for (52) which is consistent with this hypothesis is the layered structure in (53). In (53), ṭōη ‘must’ takes the base VP *khān* *raajīaan* ‘write report’ as its complement. ṭōη *khān* *raajīaan*, in turn, is a complement of *cāl*, and, *cāl* ṭōη *khān* *raajīaan* becomes *kamlan*’s complement.

A final note here is that in my analysis, pre-VP TAMs are **syntactic heads** which take a *VP* as a complement. However, due to their semantics as event-description **modifiers** mentioned earlier, one might not want to analyze pre-VP TAMs as syntactic heads, but as some sort of syntactic modifiers. From a semantic point of view, as will become clear later, it makes no difference whether pre-VP TAMs are analyzed as syntactic heads or syntactic modifiers because they are always semantic heads in the sense that they have scope over the VP they combine with. Note, however, that if pre-VP TAMs are analyzed as syntactic modifiers, their order with respect to the elements they combine with violate the consistent head-modifier order in Thai. Namely, while other syntactic modifiers follow the elements they modify in Thai (cf. Chapter 1), pre-VP TAMs, as syntactic modifiers, would precede the elements they modify. Furthermore, assuming that Thai negations are modifiers, their selectional restrictions on pre-VP TAMs (for example, *mâj*-NEG1 cannot precede all pre-VP TAMs) are easier to explain if pre-VP TAMs are **not** modifiers. This is because the negations can then select their complements, in this case pre-VP TAMs, in the same way as when they select ordinary verbs.
4.3.1.2 Head-Modifier Structure

In this section, I argue that a predicate-like or a post-VP TAM combines with a VP via modification, and that the predicate-like or the post-VP TAM is not part of the same local tree as the base verb (and its complement(s)).

The following example, in which the meaning of the predicate-like TAM }sèd

‘finish’ has scope over the coordinated VP, shows that }sèd ‘finish’ is not part of the same local tree as the head verb and its complement of either of the two VPs, but occurs outside of the coordinated VP.

(54) Piti trùad kaanbâan lê? khían raajñaan sèd

Piti correct homework and write report finish

Piti finished correcting the homework and writing the report.

(55) Structure of (54)

In (54), *Piti* did not finish only writing the report, but he finished correcting the homework as well. That is why I assume that }sèd ‘finish’ modifies the coordinated VP consisting of both trùad kaanbâan ‘correct the homework’ and khían raajñaan ‘write a/the report’, i.e.,
the structure in (55). Note that (54) is unlikely to be an instance of right-node raising because, unlike (48), there can be no pause before the conjunction \( \text{‘and’} \) in (54).

Post-VP TAMs syntactically behave in the same way as predicate-like TAMs, as illustrated by the following examples.

(56) Priida khwâaŋ kròɔb-rùub lèʔ thu b cɛɛkan šia

Priida throw frame-picture and break vase PFTV(lose)

Priida threw the picture frame and broke the vase.

(57) Structure of (56)

In (56), the perfective marker šia ‘lose’ has scope over both VPs khwâaŋ kròɔb-rùub ‘throw picture-frame’ and thu b cɛɛkan ‘break vase’, that is, both of these two events occurred in the past and ended. Therefore, I assume that (56) has the structure shown in (57). Sentence (56) is, again, not likely to be an instance of right-node raising because there can be no pause before the conjunction in the sentence.

The second constituency test, the adverb placement test, yields similar results to those of the coordination test. Namely, predicate-like and post-VP TAMs, as modifiers, occur outside of the base VP that they combine with, as illustrated below:
(58) Dara ṭiŋ sèd jàaŋkrâ?jòŋkrâ?jèèŋ
Dara run finish in limping manner
Dara finished running in limping manner.

(59) Dara ṭiŋ jàaŋkrâ?jòŋkrâ?jèèŋ sèd
Dara run in limping manner finish
Dara finished running in limping manner.

(60) Wira tèèŋ kłoön khûn jàaŋrûadrew
Wira compose poem SPFV(ascend) quickly
Wira composed the poem quickly.

(61) Wira tèèŋ kłoön jàaŋrûadrew khûn
Wira compose poem quickly SPFV(ascend)
Wira quickly composed the poem.

Adverbs in Thai occur VP-finally and mark the end of a VP. There, sèd ‘finish’ and khûn SPFV(ascend) occur outside of the VPs in (59) and (61), whose boundaries are marked by the adverbs jàaŋkrâ?jòŋkrâ?jèèŋ ‘in limping manner’ and jàaŋrûadrew ‘quickly’, respectively. The result of the adverb placement test can also be interpreted in another way. If we assume that adverbs, predicate-like, and post-VP TAMs are all VP modifiers, we predict that adverbs can occur either after the main VP or after the entire clause (cf. Chapter 1). This prediction indeed holds, as illustrated by the reordering possibilities of elements in question in sentences (58)-(61).
Another factor which supports my claim that predicate-like and post-VP TAMs are syntactic modifiers comes from the fact that the occurrence of these TAMs after the base VP follows the order typical of head-modifier structures in Thai, namely that modifiers follow heads.

Based on two syntactic tests and their order with respect to the base VP, I conclude that predicate-like and post-VP TAMs are not sisters to the base verb, in the way the base verb’s complements are, and combine with the base VP through modification. This is illustrated in (63) and (65) which are the structures of (62) and (64) respectively.

(62) Piti ມຸນໝາຍຈານ ພຸດ

Piti finished writing a/the report.

(63)

S

NP    VP

Piti ມຸນໝາຍຈານ

Piti write report finish

(64) Wira ທໍ່າງ ກລາວ ລຸນ

Wira has composed a/the poem.
Wira has composed a/the poem.

To summarize, despite the complexity of Thai Aspectual Constructions (ACs), only two major structures are involved in the combination of Thai aspect markers in ACs: an ordinary Head-Complement structure, and a Head-Modifier structure. An issue which remains to be explored is the various possible scope relations among TAMs in ACs, which are intricate and cannot always be obviously determined from the motivated syntactic structures. I discuss them in the following section.

4.3.2 Scope Relations in Thai Aspectual Constructions

Semantically, when there are more than one aspect marker in ACs, the scope of an aspect marker lies within the scope of the other(s). Scope here refers to the portion of a particular sentence which is interpreted as being semantically affected by an operator present in that sentence (in this case, an aspect morpheme). In this section, I discuss which aspect morphemes outscope which and what principles govern these scope relations.
4.3.2.1 Observations and Hypotheses on Scope Relations among Thai Aspect Morphemes

In this section, I describe two observations and present two hypotheses regarding scope relations in ACs.

Observations on scope relations in Thai ACs

O1- Among pre-VP TAMs, the pre-VP TAM which is closer to the subject of the AC clause has the widest scope. For example:

(66) Priida ca? khøej kradøodrôm

Priida be about to experience parachute

Priida was about to experience parachuting.

(67) Priida khøej ca? kradøodrôm

Priida experience be about to parachute

Priida experienced being about to parachute.

Each of (66)-(67) has only one fixed meaning, as shown by its translation. The difference in meanings in (66)-(67) results from ca? having the widest scope in (66) and khøej having the widest scope in (67). Ca? is closer to the subject in (66) and so is khøej in (67), hence my observation stated in O1.

---

Note that whether pre-VP TAMs can precede or follow the base VP, their relative scope remains intact.
O2 - The progressive marker kamlaŋ - PROG is not compatible with two predicate-like TAMs: sèd ‘finish’ and còb ‘end’, regardless of their relative scope.

Kamlaŋ cannot co-occur with these two predicate-like TAMs without că? - ‘be about to’ being present, as discussed in 3.3, and illustrated below.

(68) *Wira kamlaŋ ?àan nàŋstutu sèd/cob
Wira PROG read book finish/end

(69) Wira kamlaŋ că? ?àan nàŋstutu sèd/cob
Wira PROG be about to read book finish/end

Wira is going to finish/end reading a book.

Ca? enables the meaning of the base VP modified by sèd ‘finish’ or còb ‘end’ to be compatible with kamlaŋ - PROG, on the assumption that kamlaŋ has scope over predicate-like TAMs. Sentence (68) is still not possible under the interpretation that sèd ‘finish’ or còb ‘end’ has scope over kamlaŋ for a syntactic reason, which I discuss in detail below.

Next, I present two hypotheses concerning scope relations in ACs.

Hypotheses on scope relations in Thai ACs

H1 - Predicate-like and post-VP TAMs (henceforth, aspectual modifiers) only modify full-verb phrases.
The two syntactic schemata involved in ACs (i.e. Head-Complement and Head-Adjunct Schemata), do not restrict the relative scopes of pre-VP TAMs and aspectual modifiers. To illustrate this, consider example (70).

\[(70)\] Dara phêŋ laaŋ caan sêd

Dara POST-INC(just start) wash dish finish

Dara has just finished washing dishes.

The syntactic schemata I assume are involved in ACs predict that sentence (70) can have either of the following structures:

\[(71)\] a. 

```
  VP
 /\pre-VP TAM
|  |
/\base VP
|  |
  VP
 |  |
predicate-like TAM
Dara phêŋ laaŋ caan sêd
```

Dara POST-INC wash dish finish

b. 

```
  VP
 /\pre-VP TAM
|  |
/\base VP
|  |
  VP
 |  |
predicate-like TAM
Dara phêŋ laaŋ caan sêd
```

Dara POST-INC wash dish finish

Both structures in (71) are possible since the relevant syntactic schemata simply state that the pre-VP TAM *phêŋ* needs to combine with a complement which is a VP, and that the predicate-like TAM *sêd* needs to modify a VP. Therefore, one possible structure for (70) is the one shown in (71a), in which the predicate-like TAM modifies the base VP and the
resulting VP becomes the complement of $ph\hat{\eta}$. The other possible structure is shown in (71b), where $ph\hat{\eta}$ takes the base VP as its complement and $s\text{\`e}d$ modifies the VP headed by $ph\hat{\eta}$. If we assume that the two structures (71a) and (71b) are associated with two different meanings, it is hard to explain why (70) is not ambiguous and has only one interpretation, that in which $ph\hat{\eta}$, which encodes a post-inchoative aspect, has scope over $s\text{\`e}d$ ‘finish’. This problem is quite general. Most of the combinations of pre-VP TAMs and aspectual modifiers only yield readings in which pre-VP TAMs have scope over aspectual modifiers and not the other way around. This can be explained by Hypothesis 1 that aspectual modifiers only take full-verb phrases as their arguments. Based on this hypothesis, since kamlaŋ - PROG, càʔ ‘be about to’, and $ph\hat{\eta}$ - POST-INC are partial-verbs, and they determine the category of the constituents they head, they cannot be within the scope of aspectual modifiers. This hypothesis is illustrated in the tree in (72) revised from (71b).

\[(72) \quad * \]

```
(72)  *
      VP
        P-VP
          partial-verb
          base VP
          aspectual modifier

Dara ph\hat{\eta} laaŋ caan s\text{\`e}d
Dara POST-INC wash dish finish
```

**Legend:**

P-VP is a verb phrase headed by a partial-verb.
In (72), \textit{phêŋ} - POST-INC, combines with the base VP \textit{lâŋ caan} ‘wash dish’, and yields a P-VP, which the aspectual modifier \textit{sêd} ‘finish’ cannot modify.

To summarize, Hypothesis 1 is needed because our syntactic schemata, without further stipulations, do not tell whether the VP complement of a pre-VP TAM is modified by an aspectual modifier, or whether the VP which an aspectual modifier modifies includes a pre-VP TAM.

Hypothesis 1 predicts that the combinations of pre-VP TAMS which are \textit{full-verbs} (\textit{tôŋ} ‘must’, \textit{rêəm} ‘start’, and \textit{khôəj} ‘experience’) and aspectual modifiers, exemplified in (73), should lead to semantic ambiguities. This prediction indeed holds.

(73) Wira \textit{rêəm kê? mûj sêd}

Wira start carve wood finish

a. Wira started to finish carving wood.

b. Wira finished starting to carve wood.

The two possible interpretations of (73) result from either \textit{rêəm} ‘start’ having scope over \textit{sêd} ‘finish’ in (73a), or \textit{sêd} having scope over \textit{rêəm} in (73b), although one interpretation of (73), namely (73a), is more salient than the other.

The second hypothesis relevant to scope relations in ACs is the following:
H2 - Aspect morphemes which are syntactic heads have scope over their complements, and aspect morphemes which are syntactic modifiers have scope over their heads (i.e., the elements they modify).

Examples (74)-(75) illustrate this hypothesis, and their informal representations are provided in the next section.

(74)  Head-complement structure, the pre-VP TAM caa is the head

Piti  caa  tẹẹẹ  nẹụṣụwa

Piti  be about to  write  book

Piti was about to write a/the book.

caa ‘be about to’ is the semantic head in (74) because the VP tẹẹẹ  nẹụṣụwa ‘write book’ it combines with is within its scope.

(75)  Head-modification structure, the predicate-like TAM sẹd is the modifier

Piti  tẹẹẹ  nẹụṣụwa  sẹd

Piti  write  book  finish

Piti finished writing a/the book.

Sẹd ‘finish’ is the semantic head in (75) because the VP tẹẹẹ  nẹụṣụwa ‘write book’ it modifies is within its scope.
4.3.2.2 Informal Representations of Scope Relations among Thai Aspect morphemes

Having presented the general principles that govern scope relations among TAMs in the last section, I provide, in this section, informal representations of examples of combinations of TAMs. I start by presenting combinations of aspectual modifiers and VPs.

(76) a. Piti tèə nə̀sùuə sèd
   Piti write book finish
   Piti finished writing a/the book.

b. [finish [Piti write book]]

(77) a. Piti tèə nə̀sùuə khûn
   Piti write book SPFV(ascend)
   Piti wrote a/the book.

b. [MAX [Piti write book]] = Piti wrote a/the book to its maximality (i.e. the event ended.)

Legend:

MAX denotes the semantic constraint characterizing maximality.

(78) Informal representation of a head-modifier phrase (i.e. a base VP modified by an aspectual modifier, either a predicate-like or a post-VP TAM)

[2]
[1]
Base VP
aspectual modifier

---

7 In this section, I informally mark the relevant meanings and scope relations in ACs by using bracketing and indices. I explain the new terms or abbreviations that arise in the examples along the way.
8 See Koenig and Muansuwan (2000) for a definition of maximality associated with semi-perfective markers.
The index of a linguistic element indicates its referent. To illustrate this, in the head-modifier tree in (78), the index [2] of an aspectual modifier appears on the mother node since I assume that an aspectual modifier provides the referent of the verb phrase that contains it. The figure in (78) reads as follows: the aspectual modifier tagged with [2] has scope over [1] which is the base VP. In the example of head-modifier structure in (76), it is the “finishing” (marked by the predicate-like TAM ษ่ด ‘finish’) of the event which is talked about. In other words, I assume that the aspectual modifier is the “semantic head”, following Pollard and Sag’s Semantics Principle (1994:56), which basically states that the semantic head of a head-modifier phrase is the modifier daughter.9

When there are more than one aspectual modifier in an AC, as exemplified in (79), the modifier which occurs furthest away from the base VP has wider scope.10

(79) Piti สำก ผ่าา ษ่ด ปาจ

Piti wash cloth finish PFTV(go)

Piti finished washing cloth.

In (79), the perfective marker ปาจ outscopes ษ่ด ‘finish’, which, in turn, outscopes the base VP. This means that the finishing event (of washing cloth) occurred in the past and ended, as required by the meaning restriction of the perfective ปาจ.11

Pre-VP TAMs have scope over their VP complements. For example,

9 The modifier daughter is what Pollard and Sag (1994) call the adjunct daughter.
10 This assumption is generally true except for the combination of a semi-perfective and the perfect marker ม้า. I leave this idiosyncrasy of the semi-perfective - perfect combination to future research.
11 For a more thorough study of various combinations of Thai aspect morphemes, see Koenig and Muansuwan (In Preparation).
(80) a. Piti ca? teεη nāŋstūwu
   Piti be about to write book
   Piti was about to write a/the book.

b. [ABOUT TO [Piti write book]]

(81) Informal representation of (80)

[3]
[3] [1]
Piti ca? teεη nāŋstūwu

Piti be about to write book

According to Hypothesis 1 that aspectual modifiers only modify full-verb phrases, (82) has the scope represented in (83).

(82) a. Piti ca? teεη nāŋstūwu khunThe
   Piti be about to write book SPFV (ascend)
   Piti might write a/the book (to its maximality).

b. [ABOUT TO [MAX [Piti write book]]]

(83) Informal representation of the AC in (82)

[3]
[3] [2]
[3] [1] [2]
cā? teεη nāŋstūwu khunThe
be about to write book SPFV(ascend)
According to Hypothesis 1, *khūn* - SPFV(ascend) is an aspectual modifier and it can only modify a full-verb phrase, not the VP headed by *cà?*, which is a partial-verb phrase. The index [3] appears on the mother node in (83) because *cà?’s meaning has the widest scope in (82). The figure in (83) reads “*cà?’ outscopes the VP, which is itself modified by the semi-perfective marker *khūn* ‘ascend’”.

Among pre-VP TAMs, the progressive morpheme *kamlaŋ* behaves differently. As discussed in 3.3, the progressive morpheme by itself is not compatible with two predicate-like TAMs: *sèd* ‘finish’, *còb* ‘end’ since *sèd* and *còb* turn events encoded by the base VPs they modify into achievements, and achievements are incompatible with *kamlaŋ*. But *kamlaŋ* can co-occur with *sèd* ‘finish’ or *còb* ‘end’ when *cà?’ is present, as shown in (84)-(88).

(84)  
*Piti kamlaŋ tèɛŋ nāŋsūwu sèd/còb*  

Piti PROG write book finish/end  

(85)  
Piti kamlaŋ càʔ tèɛŋ nāŋsūwu sèd/còb  

Piti PROG be about to write book finish/end  

Piti is going to finish writing a/the book.
(86) Piti kamlņ̃ tēņ nāņstūtu cā? sēd/cōb

Piti PROG write book be about to finish/end

Piti is going to finish writing a/the book.

(87) Informal representation of (85)

(88) Informal representation of (86)

In (87), cā?, tagged with [4], must be the semantic head of the constituent cā? tēņ nāņstūtu sēd in order to allow kamlņ̃ to combine with the base VP modified by sēd ‘finish’, since kamlņ̃ by itself does not allow this combination. Sentence (86) is an instance in which kamlņ̃ and cā? occur after the base VP, but semantically (86) does not differ from (85) and (86) is informally represented in (88). In (88), the base VP tēņ nāņstūtu is in the immediate scope of sēd ‘finish’, although sēd ‘finish’ by itself is the
syntactic complement of ค่า and ค่า séd is, in turn, the syntactic complement of kamlan - PROG. I will discuss more how the composition proceeds in (88) in the next section.

In conclusion, we have seen that scope relations among Thai aspect morphemes are quite complex. Moreover, although syntactic rules for combinations of TAMs predict numerous scopal ambiguities, only few ambiguities actually arise due to the constraint that aspectual modifiers only modify full-verb phrases. Other than that, semantic compatibility among aspect morphemes, in particular the progressive and predicate-like TAMs, plays a significant role in determining possible scope relations.

In the next section, I provide a formal model of Thai Aspectual Constructions.

4.4 Formalization of Thai Aspectual Constructions

Regardless of whether aspect morphemes in Thai are heads or modifiers, they select the categories of the expressions they combine with via either the Head-Complement or Head-Adjunct Schema. In HPSG, the part of speech is represented as the value of the HEAD feature, which determines the category of the phrase of which a linguistic element is the head, and, therefore, is crucial for syntactic selection. To illustrate the part-of-speech information in HPSG format, I provide in (90) and (91) simplified entries which indicate the categorial traits of râm ‘start’, a main-full-verb, and kamlan - PROG, a partial-verb respectively.

(89)  [HEAD main full - verb]
(90)  [HEAD partial - verb]
4.4.1 Syntactic Representations

In this section, I discuss in detail the syntactic rules or schemata used to combine elements in ACs. I argue that, despite the complexity of Thai Aspectual Constructions, only two major schemata are involved in ACs. The first one is the *Head-Complement* schema (cf. Pollard and Sag, 1994), which is used to combine pre-VP TAMs with their complements. The second one is the *Head-Adjunct* schema (cf. Pollard and Sag, 1994).

**Head-Complement schema**

A head combines with the element(s) it subcategorizes for via the *Head-Complement* schema. This schema is illustrated below:

```
[HEAD [1]
  SUBJ ⟨2⟩
  COMPS ⟨⟩]
```

An instance of the *Head-Complement* schema with a *partial-verb* pre-VP TAM as the head, is illustrated\(^{12}\) below:

---

\(^{12}\) For representational purpose, the HPSG’s AVM structures are simplified and contain only the relevant information.
(91)

In ACs, the *Head-Complement* schema is needed to combine a pre-VP TAM (either an *full-verb* or a *partial-verb* one) with its complement, which is a phrase headed by a *verb*. Note that I specify that the complement of a pre-VP TAM must be of the type *verb*, and not *full-verb*, to allow the occurrence of more than one pre-VP TAM, as in sentence (92), whose simplified structure is shown in (93).

(92) Dara kamlaŋ cà? duu nəŋ

Dara PROG be about to watch movie

Dara is going to watch a movie.
In (93), cà?id combines with the base VP duu nǎŋ ‘watch movie’, and the constituent cà?id duu nǎŋ is headed by the partial-verb cà?id. Therefore cà?id duu nǎŋ is a partial-verb phrase. Since the valence properties of the pre-VP TAM kamlanŋ only require that it combine with constituents of the type verb, and leave open whether it is a full-verb or a partial-verb, kamlanŋ can combine with cà?id duu nǎŋ, whose head is a partial-verb.

Furthermore, by specifying that the complement of a pre-VP TAM must be of the type verb, we can correctly rule out markers to occur as complements of pre-VP TAMs.
**Head-Adjunct schema**

A modifier combines with the element it modifies via the *Head-Adjunct* schema, illustrated below:

![Head-Adjunct diagram]

In the *Head-Adjunct* schema, the MOD(IFIED) feature is used to capture the idea that adjuncts or modifiers are functions that take heads as arguments. The MOD feature allows the modifier to select the syntactic category of the element it modifies (i.e., its head). Through the MOD feature, an adverb can specify that it modifies a VP, for example. Note that I assume that for Thai, a verb phrase which can enter the Head-Subject Schema must be [MOD < >], i.e., the value of its MOD feature of must be an empty list. This is to prevent a verb phrase which contains only aspect-marking elements and has a non-null value of MOD, but lacks the base VP, from combining with the subject via the Head-Subject Schema to form a sentence (see below for more details).

An instance of the *Head-Adjunct* schema in which an aspectual modifier (a predicate-like or a post-VP TAM) occurs is shown below:

![Instance diagram]

As discussed in the last section, Thai aspectual modifiers take heads of type `full-verb` as their arguments; that is, they select `full-verb` phrases as their modified elements. This hypothesis predicts the ambiguity of sentences such as (73), repeated below.
(94) Wira rêom kề nú j sed

Wira start carve wood finish

a. Wira started to finish carving wood.

b. Wira finished starting to carve wood.

Sentence (94) has two syntactic structures, as illustrated in (95)-(96).

(95) Syntactic structure of the reading (94a)

```
[HEAD [6]
 SUBJ {1}
 COMPS {}]
```

```
[HEAD [6]
 SUBJ {1}
 COMPS {4}]
```

```
HEAD [2] MOD {3}
```

```
[HEAD [2] {full - verb}
 jêb phâa “sew cloth”]
```

```
HEAD [MOD {3}]
```

```
sed “finish”
```

**rêom ‘start’**
In (95), *sèd* ‘finish’ modifies the base VP *jèb phâa* ‘sew cloth’. Then¹³, *jèb phâa sèd* becomes the complement of *râom* ‘start’, yielding the reading (94a) in which *râom* has widest scope.

(96) Syntactic structure of the reading (94b)

On the other hand, in (96), *sèd* modifies the VP tagged [8], which is a *full-verb* phrase since its head, *râom* ‘start’, is a *full-verb*. This yields the interpretation (94b), in which *sèd* ‘finish’ has widest scope.

Thai ACs are generated by applying one or more of the Head-Complement and Head-Modifier schemata. Below, I illustrate through a few derivations how the mentioned schemata sanction only the grammatical sentences.

¹³ Note that transitional expressions such as “then” and “next” are used here in a logical sense, and do not
In (98), the base VP ģeb pha‘a ‘sew cloth’ combines with the modifier sèd ‘finish’ through the Head-Modifier schema. The VP ģeb pha‘a, tagged [3], which is the head daughter, passes up its HEAD value (i.e. [2]: the full-verb category of ģeb ‘sew’) and its SUBJ and COMPS specifications to the mother node, tagged [4], via the Head Feature and Valence reflect the order of application of the schemata.
Principles (cf. Chapter 1). Then, the partial-verb TAM cà? ‘be about to’ combines with [4]: jẹb phảa sèd via the Head-Complement schema. In other words, the value of the COMPS feature of the head cà? ‘be about to’ is satisfied by the phrase jẹb phảa sèd, tagged [4]. The value of COMPS of the topmost mother node in (98) is, therefore, null according to the Valence Principle, which cancels off the elements in the SUBJ or COMPS lists once such elements are combined with the head.

The derivation of the AC in (99), in which cà? occurs after the base VP, is shown in (100).

(99) Wilaj jẹb phảa cà? sèd

Wilaj sew cloth be about to finish

Wilaj was about to finish sewing cloth.
(100)

```
[HEAD [2] [MOD {}]]
SUBJ (1)
COMPS {}
```

```
[HEAD [7] [MOD {}]]
SUBJ (1)
COMPS {}
```

```
```

```
[HEAD [7] [MOD {}]]
SUBJ (1)
COMPS (6)
```

```
[6][HEAD [MOD {}]]
```

In (96), the partial-verb TAM ǎà combines with ńd ‘finish’ via the Head-Complement schema. Since ńd ‘finish’ belongs to the part of speech verb, it can satisfy the valence requirement of ǎà ‘be about to’. It should be noted that ǎà has a non-empty list in its MOD value. This is due to a constraint on the lexical class of verbs whose HEAD value is partial-verb that they share their MOD value with that of their complements (see below for more details). In this case, ńd ‘finish’, which complements ǎà, is [MOD [3]] and is shared with the head it complements. The motivation for this stipulation comes from the

---

14 All headed constituents have a MOD feature, but most often their values are none.
fact that although *ca? s?d* form a constituent, this aspectual phrase is by itself not grammatical and still needs to combine with the base VP. In other words, the phrase *ca? s?d* cannot enter the Head-Subject Schema since it contains a non-empty MOD list, meaning that *ca? s?d* still needs to modify something. But, because of the MOD feature of *ca? s?d*, the constituent *ca? s?d* is able to combine with the base VP through the Head-Modifier schema.\(^\text{15}\)

Sentence (101) is ungrammatical because the MOD feature of the constituent *ca? s?d* does not find its modified element. Since the modified element must occur to the left of (i.e. before) the modifier in Thai, the base VP *j?b phâa* in (101) cannot satisfy the MOD feature of *ca? s?d* because the base VP occurs to the right of *ca? s?d*, as shown in (102).

\[(101) \quad \text{*Wilaj ca? s?d j?b phâa} \]

\[\text{Wilaj be about to finish sewing cloth.}\]

\(^{15}\) For the semantic composition of sentences such as (100) in which “function composition” is needed, see Koenig and Muansuwan (In Preparation).
Next, I illustrate ACs containing both pre-VP and post-VP TAMs. The derivation of (103), is similar to (102) except that the aspectual modifier in this case is khửn SPFV(ascend), a *marker.*

(103) Wilaj cả? jéb phãa khửn

Wilaj be about to sew cloth SPFV(ascend)

Wilaj is going to sew the cloth.
Contrary to (103), sentence (105) is ungrammatical because *khūn cannot satisfy the subcategorization requirement of *cà?, since it is not a *verb but a *marker. Furthermore, the base VP *jéb phâa which occurs before *cà? cannot be the complement of *cà? since complements follow heads in Thai.

(105) *Wilaj jéb phâa kamlaŋ cà? khūn

Wilaj sew cloth PROG be about to SPFV(ascend)

In conclusion, despite the occurrences of aspect morphemes in Thai ACs both before and after the base VP, we only need two universal schemata to model the syntactic structures of Thai ACs, the Head-Complement schema and the Head-Modifier schema. In the next section, I formalize the scope relations of TAMs in ACs.
4.4.2 Scope relations in Thai Aspectual Constructions

In this section, I provide an account of scope relations among TAMs. To model the fact that an aspect morpheme has within its scope a constituent in an Aspectual Construction, I assume that the former takes as its semantic argument the HNDL\textsuperscript{16} of the latter. The semantic head status of an aspect morpheme is represented by identifying the INDEX and KEY of the mother of a phrase with those of the aspect morpheme. To illustrate this, consider example (70), repeated below.

(106) Dara phêñ laañ caan sêd

Dara POST-INC wash dish finish

Dara has just finished washing dishes.

In (106), the post-inchoative meaning of phêñ has widest scope and sentence (106) talks about the moment right after Dara finished washing the dishes (and not the finishing moment). To formalize this, the simplified semantic representations of phêñ - POST-INC and sêd ‘finish’ are shown in (107)-(108).

(107) Simplified semantic representation of phêñ - POST-INC

\[
\begin{bmatrix}
\text{INDEX} & [2] \\
\text{HNDL} & u \\
\text{EVENT} & [2] \\
\text{ARG} & p \\
\text{POST-INC}_\text{rel}
\end{bmatrix}
\]

\textsuperscript{16} Recall that the feature HNDL is used to identify individual elementary predications (EPs). See 1.4.2 for the description of HNDL.
(108) Simplified semantic representation of *sèd* ‘finish’

\[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{INDEX} \ [3] \\
\text{KEY} \\
\text{finish}_\text{rel} \\
\text{HNDL} \ v \\
\text{EVENT} \ [3] \\
\text{ARG} \ t \\
\end{array}
\]

The semantics of lexical entries for *phâŋ* and *sèd* are composed of an INDEX and a KEY. The KEY attribute of an aspect morpheme comprises an EVENT and an ARG attributes. The value of EVENT denotes the eventuality that an aspect morpheme introduces. The value of ARG refers to the situational semantic argument of an aspect morpheme.

The semantic representation of the VP in (106) is shown in (109).
(109) Simplified semantic representation of the VP in (106) (presented in its constituent-structure tree)

The value of the LZT attribute contains a concatenated list of all EPs (elementary predications) of a constituent, regardless of whether such constituent is a head-complement or a head-modifier structure. The semantic composition in (109) crucially follows Hypothesis 2 in 4.3.2.1 which states that aspect morphemes which are syntactic heads have scope over their complements, and aspect morphemes which are syntactic modifiers have scope over their heads. In (109), the aspectual modifier *sèd* ‘finish’ outscopes and takes as semantic argument the event of washing dishes, as shown by the fact that the HNDL of the
dishwashing event ([5]) is the ARG(UMENT) of sèd. Sèd is also the semantic head of the phrase lāañ caan sèd ‘finish washing dishes’, as indicated by the fact that the INDEX [3] and the KEY [6] from sèd becomes the INDEX and KEY of the mother node. Then, phɛŋ - POST-INC, which takes a VP as its complement, takes as its semantic argument the HNDL [1] of the phrase lāañ caan sèd ‘finish washing dishes’ itself, identified with that of sèd ‘finish’. This combination phɛŋ + lāañ caan sèd yields the meaning of (106) where phɛŋ has scope over sèd ‘finish’. Finally, the semantic head status of phɛŋ - POST-INC is illustrated by the fact that its KEY and INDEX values become the values of the corresponding attributes in the topmost mother node of the tree in (109).

To sum up, I employ the attribute HNDL, which is used in Minimal Recursion Semantics (MRS) to identify the predication that a linguistic element encodes, to model scope relations among TAMs in ACs. I assume that an aspect morpheme takes as its semantic argument (i.e. takes as the value of its ARG attribute) the HNDL value of the constituent it has scope over. Under this assumption, we can straightforwardly model scope relations in Thai ACs based on the head or modifier status of aspect morphemes, and the lexical semantics constraint on the combination of the progressive morpheme and sèd ‘finish’ or còb ‘end’.

---

17 See Copestake et al. (2001) for a similar proposal regarding modifiers in head-modifier structures.
4.5 Conclusion

In this chapter, I have shown that That aspect morphemes belong to two different major parts of speech in Thai: *verbs* and *markers*. These two parts of speech, however, do not suffice to capture the different properties of TAMs, and two subtypes of verbs, *partial-verbs* and *full-verbs*, are needed. This part-of-speech classification can explain the distribution of TAMs with respect to negations, as well as constraints on scope interpretations in ACs (see the hypothesis that aspectual modifiers only modify *full-verb phrases*). We have also seen that TAMs, as event description modifiers, can be syntactically realized in two ways: either through a head-complement or a head-modifier structure. This syntactic realization does not correlate with the part-of-speech classification of TAMs, but is predictable from their positions, i.e. whether they can precede or must follow a verb phrase. Regardless of whether TAMs are syntactically realized as heads (in the head-complement structure) or as modifiers (in the head-modifier structure), they are always the semantic heads of their local trees in the sense that they outscope the basic event description encoded by the VP they combine with. I argue that despite the potentially large number of scope ambiguities of combinations of TAMs, scope interpretations in most ACs are not ambiguous because of the requirement that predicate-like and post-VP TAMs modify *full-verb* phrases and the lexical semantics of certain TAMs. Finally, I showed that scope relations in ACs can be modeled in MRS through the use of HNDL values to refer to elementary predications that become semantic arguments of aspect morphemes.
Chapter 5

Adjoining Constructions

5.1 Introduction

In this chapter I discuss Adjoining Constructions (AJCs) in Thai, which are somewhat similar to Resultative Constructions (RCs) in English and have traditionally been analyzed as Resultative Serial Verb Constructions (Thepkanjana, 1986), although the range of resulting verbs and control relations that Thai AJCs allow is broader. Thai Adjoining Constructions belong to the class of what I call “Sequential Constructions”. A Sequential Construction consists of a sequence of verbs which share at least one argument and encode eventualities that occur in sequence. Examples of Sequential Constructions are:

(1) Narii likeness hòklóm

   Narii slide fall down

   Narii slid and fell down.

(2) Narii súwp nǎŋswaŋ ?àan

   Narii bought book read

   Narii bought a book to read.

Thai Adjoining Constructions are a subset of Sequential Constructions. An example of Thai AJCs is shown in (3). I provide an example of the English Resultative Construction in (4) to compare with (3).
Thai Adjoining Construction

Malii kwàad bāan sa'?aad

Malii sweep house clean
Malii swept the house clean.

English Resultative Construction

Mary swept the house clean.

Thai AJCs exhibit a wide range of possibilities in what can be a resulting verb.¹ For example, with respect to the same verb *kin* ‘eat’, two resulting verbs and two control relations are possible, as shown in (5)-(6).²

(5) Nikorn kin khâaw ñ

Nikorn eat rice be full
Nikorn ate rice (until he was) full.

(6) Nikorn kin khâaw mòd

Nikorn eat rice be gone
Nikorn ate rice (until it was) gone.

¹ I write the resulting verb in *italics* and underline the NP of which the resulting verb is predicated.
² This type of pragmatic control relation is also found in Mandarin Chinese. See Ng (1997) for a study of Mandarin *de* sentences (manner and extent) in Role and Reference Grammar. The following examples from Ng (1997:43) are comparable to the Thai sentences (5)-(6).

i. Ta shao zhū-ròu shao-de hên lèi
   3sg roast pig-meat roast-extent very tired
   S/he roasted the pig to the point that s/he was very tired.

ii. Ta shao zhū-ròu shao-de hên yíng
    3sg roast pig-meat roast-extent very hard
    S/he roasted the pig to the point that it was very hard.
In this chapter, I argue that Thai AJCs and English Resultative Constructions differ in the resulting verbs and control relations the two constructions allow. First, the resulting verbs in Thai AJCs merely encode “expected” results. Second, the phrase-structural configuration of AJCs does not determine the control relations they allow.

This chapter proceeds as follows. First, I compare Adjoining Constructions to conjoined clauses in Thai and point out their similarities and differences. Second, I describe constraints on the resulting verbs and control relations in Thai AJCs. Third, I review major analyses of English Resultative Constructions and point out the differences between English RCs and Thai AJCs. By pointing out the possible semantic modification of the resulting verbs by negation or modal markers, I demonstrate that Thai AJCs are indeed not the parallel of English Resultative Constructions. Fourth, I describe the semantic relations which hold between the first or matrix verb and the resulting verb in Thai Adjoining Constructions. Finally, I present a syntactic analysis of Thai Adjoining Constructions and provide their formal representations at the end of the chapter.

5.2 Data

There are two subsets of sequential Constructions in Thai: Ordinary Sequential Constructions and Adjoining Constructions. In both subtypes, the first verb phrase encodes the event that precedes the event coded by the resulting verb. These two subtypes only differ in that whereas there can be no interval of time between the temporal traces of the events described by the verbs in AJCs, there can be an interval of time between the events described by the verbs in Ordinary Sequential Constructions. In other words, the temporal trace of the eventuality denoted by the first verb in Adjoining Constructions necessarily
abuts or overlaps with the temporal trace of the second verb, while the temporal traces of the first and second verbs in Ordinary Sequential Constructions need not abut or overlap. This is shown in (7)-(8).

(7) **Ordinary Sequential Construction**

Prapha  hǎa  ɲàŋsùụ  ʔàan

Prapha seek book read

Prapha sought a/the book to read.

(8) **Adjoining Construction**

Prapha  hǎa  ɲàŋsùụ  phôb

Prapha seek book find

Prapha sought the book until she found (it).

In (7), the eventualities of seeking and reading a book do not necessarily abut or overlap. *Prapha* could seek a book to read it later, in fact the event of reading a book might not even actually occur. On the other hand, both the events of seeking and finding a book must have occurred for (8) to be felicitous, and the two events abut each other. In the following sections, I discuss the similarities and differences between Thai Adjoining Constructions and conjoined clauses, as well as the selectional restrictions and control relations that characterize Thai AJCs.
5.2.1 Adjoining Constructions and Conjoined Clauses

In this section, I show that adjoining constructions can be distinguished from conjoined clauses either by the realization of subject anaphors or by pragmatic inference.

In Thai, certain syntactic elements can sometimes be left out, provided that they are inferable from the context. The possible absence of conjunction in conjoined clauses makes certain AJCs indistinguishable from conjoined clauses. In the following example, the conjunction ˥‘and’ can be left out from the conjoined clauses, as shown in (9b).

(9) a. mûâkhuûûñíí Nicha ñënram ˥? duu naŋ ˥? faŋ
    last night Nicha dance and watch movie and listen
    pleŋ con düûk dùnn
    music until late
    Last night, Nicha danced and watched the movie and listened to music until late.

b. mûâkhuûûñíí Nicha ñënram duu naŋ faŋ pleŋ
    last night Nicha dance watch movie listen music
    con düûk dùnn
    until late
    Last night, Nicha danced, watched the movie, listened to music until late.

One might, then, think that at least some of what I call AJCs are in fact not different from a sequence of conjoined clauses with the conjunction left out. Thai AJCs clearly differ from

---

3 See Wechsler and Noh (To Appear) for an investigation of predicative resultatives and clausal resultatives in Korean, in which they too use null anaphors to distinguish between the two kinds of
conjoined clauses when the antecedent of the subject of the resulting verb is the direct object of the matrix verb, as illustrated in the following examples.

(10)  

(10)  

a. Nikorn páw thian lê? thian/man dab  
Nikorn blow candle and candle/it become extinguished  
Nikorn blew the candle, and the candle/it became extinguished.

b. *Nikorn páw thian lê? dab  
Nikorn blow candle and become extinguished

(11)  

(11)  

a. Nikorn paw thian thian/man dab  
Nikorn blow candle candle/it become extinguished  
Nikorn blew the candle, the candle became extinguished.

b. Nikorn páw thian dab  
Nikorn blow candle become extinguished  
Nikorn blew the candle out.

The sentences in (10) are conjoined clauses. In (10), the grammatical subject of the verb in the second clause is *thian* ‘candle’, which differs from the subject of the first clause, *Nikorn*. In this case, the realization of the subject of the second clause, as a pronoun or an NP, is obligatory, as illustrated by the ungrammaticality of (10b). This contrasts with sentences in (11), in which the realization of the grammatical subject of the second verb is optional, as shown in (11b). It is therefore not possible to analyze (11b) as an instance of unmarked conjunction. And I call the constructions as in (11b) Adjoining Constructions.
However, the same line of argument does not apply when the subjects of the first and second clauses are the same since, in this case, the realization of the subject of the second clause is optional for conjoined clauses as well, as shown in (12).

(12) Nikorn kin khâaw lê? (Nikorn/khâaw) ?îm
    Nikorn eat rice and (Nikorn/he) be full
    Nikorn ate rice (and) he was full.

(13) Nikorn kin khâaw ?îm
    Nikorn eat rice be full
    Nikorn ate rice (until he was) full.

Moreover, as I just discussed, the conjunction lê? ‘and’ can be left out from (12). There can therefore be a variant of (12) which is sting-equivalent to (13), which is an AJC. It is, therefore, not obvious how to distinguish between conjoined clauses such as (12) and AJCs such as (13). But what I call AJCs are in fact distinct from ordinary conjoined clauses in their interaction with certain time adverbial phrases, as I now show.

When the time adverbial phrase naj sa à am naathii4 ‘after/in three minutes’ combines with an Adjoining Construction, no ambiguity occurs.5 But ambiguities arise when naj sàam naathii combines with conjoined clauses. This is illustrated below:

---

4 This adverbial phrase means “the eventuality X holds after three minutes”, where X represents the meaning of the verb this adverbial phrase has scope over. Naj sàam naathii is similar to the meaning of adverbial phrases headed by dans in French (naj sàam naathii = dans trois minutes).

5 Note that when naj sàam naathii combines with Ordinary Sequential Constructions, no ambiguities arise. But the scope of naj sàam naathii in Ordinary Sequential Constructions is different from that in AJCs, as illustrated below:
(14) **Conjoined clauses**

\[
naj \quad s\text{\_aam} \quad naathii \quad Nikorn \quad kin \quad kh\text{\_aaw} \quad l\text{\_}? \quad (Nikorn/kh\text{\_}aw) \quad ?m
\]

in three minute Nikorn eat rice and (Nikorn/he) be full

After three minutes, Nikorn ate rice and he was full.

(15) **Adjoining Construction**

\[
naj \quad s\text{\_aam} \quad naathii \quad Nikorn \quad kin \quad kh\text{\_aaw} \quad ?m
\]

in three minutes Nikorn eat rice be full

Nikorn ate rice until he was full in three minutes.

Sentence (14) is ambiguous between a reading in which *Nikorn* started eating after three minutes and a reading in which he reached the resulting state of being full after three minutes. However, in (15), no such ambiguity occurs. Sentence (15) only means that *Nikorn* reached the state of being full after three minutes. Note that there is a variant of (14), in which *l\_?* is omitted and which is string-equivalent to (15). Nonetheless, I argue that sentences such as (15) are perceived as distinct from this variant of (14). Namely, for a Thai speaker, the sequence of verbs in (15) denotes something which is perceived as one single complex event and not two separate events, and the endpoint of such complex event is at the resulting state. This explains why although there is a variant of (14) which is not grammatically distinguishable from (15), (15) can be distinguished from (14) on pragmatic grounds. In other words, speakers do not access (15) as an instance of reduced conjoined

\[
(i) \quad naj \quad s\text{\_aam} \quad naathii \quad Malii \quad s\text{\_}\text{\_}u \quad n\text{\_}\text{\_}s\text{\_}\text{\_}u \quad ?a\text{\_}m
\]

in three minutes Malii buy book read

After three minutes, Malii bought a book to read.

Sentence (i) only means that after three minutes, the beginning of the sequence of buying a book to read took place.
clauses, but as a single clause. As a result, the ambiguities associated with sentences with conjoined clauses do not arise in AJCs such as (15).

5.2.2 Selectional Restrictions of Thai Adjoining Constructions

In Thai Adjoining Constructions, main verbs or matrix verbs (V1) which occur initially in the sequence of verbs can be accomplishment, achievement or activity verbs, but not state verbs, as shown below:

(16) Accomplishment

V1 V2

Prapha kin khâaw ìm

Prapha eat rice be full

Prapha ate rice until she was full.

(17) Achievement

V1 V2

khùad rabèød rèèk

bottle explode break

The bottle exploded (and became) broken.

---

6 Although most AJCs contain sequences of two verbs, more than two verbs can occur in AJC sequences. Instances of AJCs which contain more than two verbs can be found in 5.3.3.2.
(18) **Activity**

\[
\begin{array}{ll}
\text{V1} & \text{V2} \\
\text{chăn} & \text{wịị} & nụaj
\end{array}
\]

I run be tired

I ran until I was tired.

(19) **State**

\[
\begin{array}{ll}
\text{V1} & \text{V2} \\
\text{*Prapha} & \text{chuà} & \text{ruaị} & \text{phi} & \text{klua}
\end{array}
\]

Prapha believe issue ghost be feared

(Intended meaning: Prapa believed in ghost until she was afraid.)

Verbs that can occur in V2 position are usually verbs which denote eventualities that can be interpreted as being the expected result of the eventuality denoted by V1. V2 in adjoining constructions can be state, accomplishment or achievement verbs.

(20) **V2= State**

\[
\begin{array}{ll}
\text{Prapha} & \text{kin} & \text{khaaw} \ ?im
\end{array}
\]

Prapha eat rice be full

Prapa ate rice until she was full.
(21) **V2= Accomplishment**

Phon tii นุ้ย ตาจ

Phon hit snake die

Phon hit the snake dead.

(22) **V2= Achievement**

นิโครน หา นำ ข่วน-ขวาน พอบ

Nikorn seek present find

Nikorn sought the present and found (it).

When an activity verb occurs in V2 position in a Sequential Construction, there is no requirement that the temporal traces of the two verbs abut or overlap, and this results in a different kind of meaning, i.e. a purposive meaning, as in (7) and in the following example:

(23) **V2= Activity \(\rightarrow\) purposive meaning**

นิโครน หา นำาน ทาม

Nikorn seek work do

Nikorn sought a job to do.

---

\(^7\) The verb *ตาจ* ‘die’ in Thai is an accomplishment verb since it passes the tests for the class of accomplishment verbs (see Van Valin and LaPolla, 1997).
5.2.3 Control ⁸ in Thai Adjoining Constructions

Adjoining constructions in Thai allow several possible control relations, as shown below:

a) V2 is predicated of the subject of the matrix verb

(24) Traj kin khāaw ṭīm

Traj eat rice be full

Traj ate rice until he was full.

(25) Traj nān nāb

Traj lie down fall asleep

Traj lied down until he fell asleep.

b) V2 is predicated of the object of the matrix verb

(26) Prapha kin khāaw mòd

Prapha eat rice be gone

Prapa ate the rice up.

(27) Trai tii Ṧuu taaj

Trai hit snake die

Trai hit the snake dead.

c) V2 is predicated of the indirect object of a ditransitive matrix verb

(28) mēē pōnn nom lūuk ṭīm

mother feed milk child be full

The mother fed the milk to the child until the child became full.

---

⁸ By using the term “control” here, I refer to the phenomenon by which a non-matrix verb phrase with no overt subject is interpreted semantically as having some other NP in the sentence provide a referent for its unexpressed subject, and not to the class of control or “equi” verbs.
Although Thai Adjoining Constructions exhibit a wide range of possibilities in terms of both possible V2s and control relations, AJCs cannot be interpreted as having a depictive meaning, as (29) shows.

(29) Traj วิ่ง นุ่าจ

Taj run be tired

Taj ran to the point that he was tired.

*Taj ran while he was tired.

To convey the depictive meaning in the translation of (29), Thai uses another construction, illustrated in (30):

(30) Traj วิ่ง ท้อง นุ่าจ

Taj run while be tired

Taj ran while he was tired.

Sentence (29) also shows that, apart from the constraint on temporal traces in AJCs, a causal relation\(^9\) is obligatorily present in AJCs as well. This causal relation states that the eventuality coded by V2 is an expected result of the eventuality coded by V1 (this issue is discussed in more detail in 5.3.4).

\(^9\) I argue, however, that it is a “weak” causal relation (see details below).
5.3 Analysis

5.3.1 Overview of Previous Analyses of English Resultative Construction

In this section, I provide a summary of analyses of the English Resultative Construction, to point out the similarities and differences between the Resultative Construction in English and Adjoining Constructions in Thai. English resultative constructions have often been analyzed in terms of unaccusativity,\(^\text{10}\) i.e. the resultative phrase (in *italics* in the examples) is assumed to be predicated of a deep object\(^\text{11}\) (Simpson, 1983; Hoekstra, 1984; Levin and Rappaport Hovav, 1995), as shown in the following examples from English (examples (31)-(34) are from Wechsler (1997b)):

(31) John hammered the metal *flat*. (transitive matrix verb)
(32) The water froze *solid*. (unaccusative matrix verb)
(33) *The dog barked hoarse.* (*unergative matrix verb)
(34) Robert ran *clear of the fire.*

Since the resultative phrase has to be predicated of a deep object, it can appear with transitive (31) or unaccusative (32) matrix verbs, but not unergative verbs, as (33) shows. However, because sentences such as (34), in which the resultative phrase is predicated of the subject of the matrix verb, are possible, the unaccusativity hypothesis has more recently been rejected (Van Valin, 1990; Wechsler, 1997b; Rappaport Hovav and Levin, 1999). I will look into the analyses of Van Valin (1990), Wechsler (1997b), and Rappaport Hovav and Levin (1999) and focus on the way each deals with resultative phrases which are predicated of the subject of the matrix verb.

\(^{10}\) For a semantic, constructional account of the English Resultative Construction, see Goldberg (1995).
In an analysis in Role and Reference Grammar (RRG), Van Valin (1990) claims that the Aktionsart classes of matrix verbs can explain possible control relations in English RCs. Normally, matrix verbs that allow resultative phrases are either accomplishment or achievements, all of which have a result state as part of their inherent meaning (Van Valin 1990:255). For example, *Terry wiped the table clean* has the following LS (Logical Structure):

\[
\text{[wipe'} (\text{Terry})\text{]} \text{CAUSE} \text{[BECOME clean'} (\text{the table})]\]

In the LS in (35), which is the semantic representation of *Terry wiped the table clean*, the verb *wipe* is complex, and is decomposed into the causing part (CAUSE) and the result part (BECOME predicate’) in the LS. *Clean* is predicated of *the table*, as represented in the result part of the LS, i.e. following BECOME.

RRG also posits that in certain contexts verbs belong to different Aktionsart classes than that of their basic lexical meanings (Van Valin and LaPolla, 1997). Thus, the contrast between *Robert ran* and *Robert ran clear of the fire* can be viewed as an alternation between an activity and an accomplishment version of *run*. As pointed out in Van Valin and LaPolla (1997:99), if the motion has a definite goal, then the verb behaves like an accomplishment verb, and thus includes an inherent result state.

Wechsler (1997b) proposes that there exist two types of RCs in English:

a. Control Resultatives: Resultative constructions whose resultative phrase is predicated of a semantic argument of the matrix verb. Examples of Control Resultatives include (31), (32) and (34). The resultative phrase in Control Resultatives is predicated of the object or subject of the matrix verb depending on the semantics of the matrix verb.

---

11 This principle is also called DOR - Direct Object Restriction by Levin and Rappaport Hovav (1995).
b. **ECM (Exceptional Case Marking) Resultative**: English also has RCs which contain a resultative phrase whose subject of predication is NOT a semantic argument of the matrix verb. Examples of ECM Resultatives are:

(36) The dog barked itself harse. (‘fake reflexive’)
(37) Mary ran the soles off her shoes.

ECM Resultatives are not common across languages. For examples, Korean has Control Resultative Constructions but lacks ECM Resultatives (Wechler and Noh, to appear). According to Wechsler, Control Resultatives are subject to semantic sortal restrictions imposed by the matrix verbs. In other words, what can occur in the resulting verb is restricted, as illustrated by the following examples:

(38) Sally painted the door red/*beautiful/*noticeable.
(39) John hammered the metal flat/*beautiful/*safe.\(^{12}\)

Not all imaginable results are allowed to occur as the resulting verb of the matrix verbs in (38) and (39). Hence, Wechler proposes the **Canonical Result Restriction** to determine possible resulting verbs in English Resultative Constructions.

(40) **Canonical Result Restriction**: A control resultative must represent a ‘canonical’ or ‘normal’ result state of an action of the type denoted by the matrix verb.

Rappaport Hovav and Levin (1999) concur with Wechsler (1997b), among others, that the unaccusative hypothesis does not capture the possible range of data of English RCs. They, thus, propose that Resultative Constructions should be analyzed in terms of event structure and principles governing the mapping from the event structure of RCs to their syntax. They suggest that, normally, the resulting phrase is predicated of the NP which is

---

\(^{12}\) It should be noted that Boas (2000) suggests that the sentence “John hammered the metal safe” is plausible if the right context is found.
'the recipient of the transmitted force’. This assumption can explain resultative sentences such as “John hammer the metal flat” and “Terry wiped the table clean”, in which the metal and the table are the recipients of the transmitted force and are the subjects of the resulting verbs. Nevertheless, Rappaport Hovav and Levin point out that in non-canonical instances, where there is no NP denoting an entity which is the recipient of transmitted force, the resulting phrase is free to be predicated of the subject. This last assumption can explain sentences such as example (34): *Robert ran clear of the fire.*

5.3.2 Problems with Characterizing Thai Adjoining Construction as a Resultative Construction

There are problematic examples for the hypothesis that Thai Adjoining Constructions are the parallel of English Resultative Constructions since resulting verbs in Thai AJCs are less constrained and the control relations in Thai AJCs cannot be determined from the semantics of the matrix verb, as shown in (16) and (26), repeated below.

(41) Prapha  kin  khâaw  ṭim
Prapha eat  rice  be full
Prapa ate rice until she was full.

(42) Prapha  kin  khâaw  mòd
Prapha eat  rice  be gone
Prapha ate the rice up.

Examples (41)- (42) show that two results and two controllers of the resulting verb are possible with respect to the single matrix verb *kin* ‘eat’. Wechsler’s assumption of
Canonical Result Restriction could, in principle, explain Thai Adjoining Constructions if we assume that Thai AJCs are less constrained and allow more than one canonical result. For example, in (41) and (42), both the eater being full and the rice being gone are, in some sense, “canonical results” of the event of eating. However, Thai Adjoining Constructions also allow sentences such as:

(43) wua khwìd khwaaj ì bàadcèb

ox butt buffalo injured

The ox butted the buffalo injured.

A Wechsler style approach cannot explain why English sentences which correspond to (43) are not possible. This is because the injury is a canonical result of a butting event and sentences such as (43) should, in principle, be possible in English RCs. To explain why it is not possible for certain causal chains (cf. Talmy 1996) to be expressed by Resultative Constructions, Boas (2000) suggests that the distribution of English Resultative Constructions is idiosyncratic and conventionalized and cannot be justified on general grounds. He points out that while English generally allows the packaging of a causing and a caused event within a single sentence by combining a verb with a resultative phrase, thereby creating a causal chain, as in (44b)\(^{14}\), this packaging is not always possible, as shown in (45b).

(Examples (44)-(45) are from Boas, 2000:255)

(44) a. Jack ate his food. As a result of eating the food, the plate become clean.

---

\(^{13}\) This sentence is ambiguous as we cannot know, except from the context, which animal was injured. See a detailed discussion in 5.3.3.2. An analysis of similar ambiguities in Thai SVCs can be found in Foley and Van Valin (1984).

\(^{14}\) Sentences such as (44b) are not possible in Thai because (44b) is an instance of ECM Resultative (cf. Wechsler, 1997b) which does not exist in Thai.
b. Jack ate his plate clean.

(45) a. Brigid loaded the table with food. As a result of her loading the table with food, the table’s leg became bent.

b. *Brigid loaded the table’s leg bent.

Hence, Boas claims that English RCs are motivated by the speaker’s intention to convey a specific viewpoint on the outcome of an event, and that they are licensed by different meanings and conventionalized usage patterns associated with individual verbs (2000:248). Boas’ hypothesis explains why sentences such as (43) are not possible in English, on the assumption that there is no such conventionalized usage pattern associated with the verb “butt” in English.

The above discussion shows that Thai Adjoining Constructions and English Resultative Constructions are subject to different constraints: Thai AJCs are not subject to the conventionalized principles at work in English RCs. Thai AJCs are also crucially different from English RCs since so-called resulting verbs in Thai AJCs can be negated or can complement the modal marker ᵇ ᵇ ᵇ ‘must’, as illustrated in (46)-(48).

(46) a. Nikorn kin khâaw ᵇ ᵇ

Nikorn eat rice be full

Nikorn ate rice until he was full.

b. Negative version of (46a)

Nikorn kin khâaw mâj ᵇ ᵇ

Nikorn eat rice NEG be full

Nikorn ate rice, but he wasn’t full.
c. V2 as the complement of .Drop ‘must’

\[ \text{Nikorn kin khāaw Drop ñm} \]

Nikorn eat rice must be full

Nikorn ate rice and he must have been full.

(47) a. Nikorn kin khāaw ñd

Nikorn eat rice be gone

Nikorn ate the rice up.

b. Negative version of (47a)

\[ \text{Nikorn kin khāaw māj ñd} \]

Nikorn eat rice NEG be gone

Nikorn ate the rice, but the rice was not gone.

c. V2 as the complement of .Drop ‘must’

\[ \text{Nikorn kin khāaw Drop ñd} \]

Nikorn eat rice must be gone

Nikorn ate the rice and the rice must have been gone.

(48) a. Nikorn ðaw thian dāb

Nikorn blow candle become extinguished

Nikorn blew the candle until it was extinguished.
b. Negative version of (48a)

Nikorn pàw thian màj dab

Nikorn blow candle NEG become extinguished

Nikorn blew the candle, but it wasn’t extinguished.

c. V2 as complement of tôη ‘must’

Nikorn pàw thian tôη dab

Nikorn blow candle must become extinguished

Nikorn blew the candle, and it must have been extinguished.

Once V2 is negated or combines with tôη ‘must’, as in (46b-c), (47b-c) and (48b-c), the second verb cannot be said to result from or be caused by the first verb.\(^\text{15}\) Sentences (46b-c), (47b-c) and (48b-c) mean, rather, that the expected results\(^\text{16}\) of Nikorn being full, the rice being gone, and the candle being extinguished were not reached or should have been reached. Therefore, sentences in (46)-(48) differ from English Resultative Constructions, which involve a strict causal relation between the eventualities described by the matrix verb and the resultative phrase.

\(^{15}\) Note that I continue to call the verb that encodes the expected result in an AJC the resulting verb.

\(^{16}\) Since the “results” in Thai AJCs are merely expected, one might suspect that the causal relation that I claim to be present in AJCs needs not be specified (because the resulting or “caused” eventuality might not eventually occur) and could be pragmatically inferred. However, if we remove causality from the notion of expected result, we are left with mere expected succession or overlapping of temporal traces. The ontological status of expected succession or expected overlapping of two eventualities is questionable. Generally, we do not merely expect a situation A to be succeeded by a situation B, but we do expect that situation A has a certain result, a situation C, that naturally succeeds A. I therefore suggest that despite the fact that resulting situations in Thai AJCs are merely expected, causality is still part of the meaning of the constructions.
5.3.3 Syntactic Analysis of Thai Adjoining Constructions

In this section, I argue that the resulting verb in an Adjoining Construction behaves the same way as the complement(s) or inherent argument(s) of the matrix verb in that the resulting verb cannot be separated from the matrix verb and its argument(s) by an adverb. Also, in the light of the evidence shown in (46)-(48), I argue that the resulting verb constitutes a VP in an AJC since it can be the complement of mûj - NEG or tûn ‘must’, which we know are raising verbs (cf. Chapter 4). I then discuss argument sharing and control in Thai AJCs, which previous analyses of argument sharing in other serializing languages cannot account for.

5.3.3.1 Constituent Structure

I apply the adverb placement test to determine the syntactic structures of AJCs. As we saw from Chapters two and four, the usual adverb position in Thai is VP final. As shown by the ungrammaticality of the Adjoining Construction in (50), the adverb jàaŋ-muum-maam ‘untidily’, which is the manner adverb modifying the matrix verb kin ‘eat’, cannot occur before the resulting verb.

(49) Thana kin khâaw ʔìm  jàaŋ-muum-maam

Thanā eat rice full untidily

Untidily, Thana ate rice until he was full.

(50) *Thana kin khâaw jàaŋ-muum-maam ʔìm

Thanā eat rice untidily full
Sentence (51) shows that adverbs cannot intervene between the verb and the element(s) it subcategorizes for (i.e. inherent arguments).

(51) *Thanak kin jàaŋ-muum-maam khâaw

Thanâa eat untidily rice

(Intended meaning: Untidily, Thana ate rice).

Thus, with respect to the adverb placement test, resulting verbs in Thai AJCs behave the same way as complements of the matrix verb. In other words, syntactically, resulting verbs in Thai AJCs can be viewed as added complements

\[ \text{17} \]
although they are not inherent semantic arguments of the matrix verbs. Furthermore, the resulting verbs constitute VPs in AJCs, as seen from their ability to complement the modal marker tōŋ ‘must’ and the negation marker mâj - NEG.

The syntactic structure of the AJC in (52) is therefore as informally represented in the tree in (53).

---

17 I follow the general assumption that inherent semantic arguments of a head are syntactically realized as complements and non-inherent semantic arguments are typically syntactically manifested as modifiers or adjuncts, and that “complements” are syntactically different from “modifiers”. When I use the term “added complements”, I refer to non-inherent semantic arguments of a head which syntactically behave in the same way as the complements of that head. Examples of “added complements” in English are shown below.

i. The teacher proved to the class today that the theorem was wrong.

In (i) the VP modifiers to the class and today intervene between the head verb and its complement. Structurally, this means the two VP modifiers in (i) are sisters to the head verb and its complement in a local tree.

18 Note that in Thepkanjana’s (1986) analysis, the resulting verbs in Thai AJCs (which she calls “Resultative SVCs”) are complements. However, her analysis differs from mine. She treats the matrix verb in AJCs as an implicative verb which takes another verb as its complement. (An implicative verb denotes an event which, if it occurs, entails that another event also occurs.) Thus, she does not treat the resulting verb in AJCs as an added complement, but an argument required by the semantics of the matrix verb.

19 Sentences which contain both an adverb and a modal or negation marker, such as the following:

(i) ? Thana kin khaaw tōŋ ?im jàaŋ-muum-maam

Thanâa eat rice must full untidily

(Intended meaning: Untidily, Thana ate rice until he must have been full.)

which is implausible for pragmatic reason. Normally, to be pragmatically effective, a speaker has one focus in an utterance. However, (i) comprises two foci, i.e. the one conveyed by the adverb jàaŋ-muum-
(52) Thana kin khaaw ñim

Thana eat rice full

Thana ate rice until he was full.

(53) S
    VP
    NP VI NP VP2
    Thana kin khâaw ñim

Thana eat rice full

Thana ate rice until he was full.

5.3.3.2 Argument Sharing in Thai Adjoining Constructions

The verbs in Thai AJCs share at least one argument. The resulting verb in AJCs is predicated of the argument(s) which is/are shared. For instance, the resulting verb ñim ‘be full’ in (52) is predicated of Thana, which is the shared argument of the matrix verb kin ‘eat’ and the resulting verb. What is interesting about argument sharing in Thai AJCs is that there is no grammatical constraint as to which argument can be shared among the verbs in the AJCs. Examples (54)-(56) illustrate this point.

(54) mëc pûn khâaw lûuk ñim

mother feed rice child be full

The mother fed the child with the rice until the child became full.

maam ‘untidily’, and the other coded by the modal marker tûñ. This makes sentence (i) pragmatically ineffective and implausible.
The mother fed the child with the rice until the rice was gone.

The mother fed the child with the rice until the mother was tired.

Examples (54)-(56) show that any of the three arguments of the ditransitive verb *p̣ɔ̂on* ‘feed’ can provide a referent to the subject of the resulting verb, depending on the semantics of the resulting verb. Sentences such as (54)-(56) illustrate what I call “subject sharing”. “Object sharing” also exists in Thai AJCs, an example of which is shown in (22) and repeated below.

Nikorn sought the present (and) found (it).

Note that in (57), the matrix verb *hāa* ‘seek’ shares the referents of both of its subject (Nikorn) and object (*khɔ̂ɔŋ-khwǎn* ‘present’) with the resulting verb *phób* ‘find’. Subject and object sharing is found in other serializing languages. Sebba (1987) investigates argument sharing in Sranan SVCs and Baker (1989) investigates argument sharing in several serializing languages. According to Sebba and Baker, SVCs as in (58) are configurationally analyzed as illustrated in (59) and (61).
(58) (Example from Bamgbose, 1974)

Olú ti omo nàà subú

Olu push child the fall

Olu pushed the child down.

(59) Sebba’s representation of (58)

[Diagram of tree structure]

Olu push the child fall

Sebba, whose analysis is carried out in Generalized Phrase Structure Grammar, explains the object sharing in (58) by specifying “rules for subject and object assignment in serial sentences” (1987:129) that follow from lexical restrictions imposed by verbs participating in the SVCs. Two of Sebba’s rules for subject and object assignment shown in (60) specify the argument sharing and control relation found in (58).

(60) i. if a transitive verb has a sister NP, that NP is its object,

ii. an intransitive verb \( V_j \) has as its subject either the subject of \( V_1 \), if each \( V_n \), 

\( 1 < n < j \) is intransitive or the object of the closest \( V_n \), \( n < j \), which does have a direct object.

According to the first rule, the verb \( ti \) ‘push’ is sister to \( omo nàà \) ‘the child’, thus, \( omo nàà \) is \( ti \)’s object. According to the second rule, the object of \( V_1 \) \( ti \) ‘push’ is the subject of the verb \( subu \) ‘fall’. Thus, it is the child who fell down and not \( Olú \).
According to Baker (1989), the presentation of (58) is as shown in (61).

(61) Baker’s representation of (58)

```
S   I   VP
    |    |
    N P      V′
    O lú   t i   o m o n á a   s u b ú
```

Olu   push   the child  fall

Baker argues that *omo náa* ‘the child’ must receive two theta-roles from the two head verbs *ti* ‘push’ and *subú* ‘fall’. Baker makes two assumptions: (i) V2 must be lexically capable of assigning an internal theta-role, and (ii) its theta-role must be assigned to the object of V1 rather than to the subject of V1. With these two stipulations and the assumption that *subú* ‘fall’ is an unaccusative verb which is capable of assigning an internal theta-role to ‘the child’ in its V′ projection, Baker accounts for the control relation in (58); it is the child and not *Olu* who fell down.

Argument sharing in Thai AJCs challenge the analyses of argument sharing by both Sebba (1987) and Baker (1989) because in some AJC sentences, the controller is ambiguous. Consider the following Thai sentence which has two possible interpretations.

(62) wua khw’d khwaaj  taaaj
ox   butt   buffalo  die

The ox butted the buffalo dead (i.e. it could be the ox or the buffalo who died).
Notice that example (62) is comparable to (58) in that it contains a transitive matrix verb and an intransitive (unaccusative) resulting verb, but the Thai sentence allows the subject of the resulting verb taaj ‘die’ to be controlled by either the subject or the object of the matrix verb.

While Sebba’s analysis can account for one reading (i.e. it is the buffalo who died), it cannot account for the reading in which the ox died. This is because his rules for subject and object assignment predict only one reading, that in which khwaaj ‘buffalo’, the object of the verb khwìd ‘butt’, is the subject of the verb taaj ‘die’. Baker’s analysis cannot explain (62) either because, in (58), Baker stipulates that the external argument feature percolates from the first verb ti ‘push’ rather than from both verbs, and this disallows the reading in which the subject of the verb ti ‘push’ is also the subject of the verb subu ‘fall’. Thus, Baker’s analysis, if applied to the Thai sentence in (62), predicts that only khwaaj ‘buffalo’, the object of the verb khwìd ‘butt’, can control the subject of the verb taaj ‘die’. I discuss in section 5.4.1 how the formal model of Thai AJCs I propose predicts the ambiguities found in (62).

To sum up, I have discussed, in this section, argument sharing in Thai AJCs, as well as the ambiguous controller interpretation found in Thai AJCs. The latter poses a problem for previous analyses of argument sharing in serializing languages.

Before proceeding to the formal representations of Thai AJCs, I discuss in the next section what semantic relation must hold between the matrix verb and the resulting verb in Adjoining Constructions.
5.3.4 Semantic Relations in Thai Adjoining Constructions

In this section, my goal is to determine the kind of semantic relations that can hold between the matrix verb and the resulting verb in Thai Adjoining Constructions. Consider the following examples:

(63) Narii kin kʰâaw ŭm

Narii eat rice be full
Narii ate rice until she was full.

(64) Narii kin kʰâaw mâj ŭm

Narii eat rice NEG be full
Narii ate rice but she wasn’t full.

(65) Narii tham ŋaan mûaj

Narii do work be tired
Narii worked until she was tired.

(66) Narii tham ŋaan buâa

Narii do work be bored
Narii worked until she was bored.

As mentioned earlier, we cannot say that the relation between the matrix and resulting verb is strictly causal since the resulting verb can encode an event which does not actually occur (i.e. when the verb is negated, as in example (64)). Rather, the resulting verb in a Thai AJC describe the expected or possible result typically associated with the event conveyed by the matrix verb. I include the adverb “typically” in my description because it is not any imaginable result that can be coded in the resulting verb. Consider the following examples:
Narii eat rice ache stomach
Narii ate rice and had a stomach ache.
(#Narii ate rice until she had a stomach ache.)

Having a stomach ache is not a typical result of eating, and (67) is not an AJC but an instance of conjoined clauses, as (67) behaves differently from AJCs with respect to the distribution of adverbs. As we know, a characteristic of AJCs is that no adverbs can occur between the matrix verb (and its argument) and the resulting verb, as (68) shows. But the adverb *jaanmuummaam* ‘untidily’ can be inserted after the verb *kin khâaw* ‘eat rice’, and before the verb *pàud thôòë* ‘had a stomach ache’ in (67), as shown in (69):

(67)  Narii kin khâaw pùad(verb) thôòë

Narii eat rice ache stomach
Narii ate rice and had a stomach ache.

(68)  **Adjoining Construction**

*Narii kin khâaw jaanmuummaam ñim*

Narii eat rice untidily be full
(Intended meaning: Narii ate rice untidily until she was full.)

(69)  Narii kin khâaw *jaanmuummaam* pùad(verb) thôòë

Narii eat rice untidily ache stomach
Narii ate rice untidily and had a stomach ache.

To summarize, although the range of predicates that can occur as resulting verbs in AJCs is broad, not all imaginable results can occur in AJCs. The resulting verbs in AJCs must denote results typically associated with the events encoded by the matrix verbs.

---

20 Note that, as discussed in 5.2.1, there is a variant of (68) which is indistinguishable from an unmarked conjoined clause, which would be grammatical. However, as mentioned at the end of that section,
5.4 Formal Representations of Thai Adjoining Constructions

5.4.1 Resulting Verb and Argument Sharing in Thai Adjoining Constructions

In this section, I provide representations of how the resulting verb complements the matrix verb in an AJC, and how to formalize argument sharing. As we have seen from 5.3.3.1, although the resulting verb phrase in a Thai AJC is not an inherent argument of the matrix verb, it behaves like a syntactic complement in that it cannot be separated from the matrix verb by an adverb. To model that fact, I follow Wechsler (1997a,b) in appending the extended argument (in this case, the resulting verb phrase in AJCs) to the ARG-ST list of the head.\textsuperscript{21} This ensures that the resulting verb phrase is sister to the head verb, as are the inherent arguments of the head verb.

As introduced in Chapter 1, ARG-ST specifies the selected arguments of a lexical head. The ARG-ST list needs to be extended in order to account for non-semantic arguments that behave like complements, such as the resulting verb phrases in Thai AJCs. Before presenting the actual lexical rule whose function is to add an extended argument to the ARG-ST list of the matrix verb in an AJC, I show in (70) the hierarchy of the class of \textit{adjoining verbs}, which are verbs that can occur as the matrix verb in AJCs.

\textsuperscript{21} It should be noted, however, that this is not the only possible account of Thai AJCs. Other approaches which treat non-inherent arguments of the head verb as sisters to the head (such as Role and Reference Grammar (RRG)) can also account for Thai AJCs. In RRG, the logical structure of a resultative phrase introduces an “argument-adjunct” (which encodes the resulting event) to the core or the main predicate (Van Valin and LaPolla, 1997:161-162).
There are two subtypes of adjoining-verbs, ordinary-adjoining-verbs and object-sharing-adjoining-verbs. Every adjoining verb shares a subject\(^{22}\) with its resulting VP, which is a property inherited by both of its subtypes. In the hierarchy in (70), this is shown by the fact that there is the token-identity of the indices of NPs in the argument structure lists of the matrix verb and the resulting verb (see more details below). An instance of ordinary-adjoining-verbs is *kin* ‘eat’. Object-sharing-adjoining-verbs, of which *hāa* ‘seek’ is an instance, are adjoining verbs that additionally share their object with the resulting verb. This object sharing is shown in (70) by the fact that the index of second NP in the ARG-ST list (which corresponds to the object) of the object-sharing-adjoining-verb, is identical to that of an NP in the ARG-ST list of the matrix verb.

I propose that the lexical rule in (71) applies to verbs that can occur as matrix verbs in AJCs and derives entries which have the appropriate argument structure for the

\(^{22}\) Note that this is a shorthand for “sharing the referent of its subject with that of the resulting verb”. In HPSG, this means the indices of NPs which are subjects of the adjoining verb and the resulting verb are identical. Similarly, “object sharing” means that the adjoining verb shares the referent of its object with that of the resulting verb.
resulting VP to complement it. In other words, the lexical rule in (71) maps a *verb* input to an output which is an *adjoining verb*.

(71) Lexical Rule which adds to the ARG-ST list of an input an argument appropriate for the resulting VP

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{[HEAD} & \quad \text{verb} \\
\text{ARG-ST} \{2\}[\ldots\text{NP}_{1}\ldots]\] & \rightarrow \text{adjointing - verb} \\
\text{[ARG-ST} [2] & \oplus \left[\text{phrase} \\
\text{HEAD verb} & \right]
\end{align*}
\]

The above lexical rule states that for a *verb*, there is a corresponding entry which is an *adjoining verb*.\(^{23}\) Inputs to (71) have the ARG-ST list which contains at least one NP. Outputs of the rule in (71) have a VP added onto the ARG-ST list of the input and this VP shares an argument with that of the input, indicated by the identity of indices of the two NPs in the two ARG-ST lists. Note that the output of the rule used in an AJC construct will be an instance of either an *ordinary-adjoining-verb* or an *object-sharing-adjoining-verb*.

In (74)-(76), I provide representations for various entries of the matrix verb *kin* ‘eat’, including its basic lexical entry and derived entries for its occurrences in (72) and (73). Note that the derived entries for the occurrences of *kin* in (72) and (73) allow *kin* to combine with its resulting verb via the head-complement structure.

(72) Prapha kin khâaw ðún

Prapha eat rice be full

Prapha ate rice until she was full.

\(^{23}\) This amounts to saying that every verb can potentially be an *adjoining verb*, which is not an over-generalization if we assume that certain outputs are ruled out pragmatically.
(73) Prapha kin khàaw mòd

Prapha eat rice be gone

Prapha ate the rice up.

(74) Basic lexical entry of *kin* ‘eat’

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{HEAD} & : [1] \\
\text{SUBJ} & : [2] \text{NP} \\
\text{COMPS} & : [3] \text{NP} \\
\text{ARG-ST} & : [2] \text{NP:}[4], [3] \text{NP:}[5] \\
\text{CONT} & : \\
\text{KEY} & : \text{ACT} [4] \\
\text{ACT} & : \text{eat}_\text{rel} \\
\text{UND} & : [5]
\end{align*}
\]

In the ARG-ST of the basic lexical entry of *kin* ‘eat’, the verb subcategorizes for two NPs, which are realized as the subject and the complement of the verb. The tags [4] and [5] after the colons in the verb’s ARG-ST list indicate that the semantic contents of the NPs realized as subject and object are identical to the values of the ACT and UND semantic roles of the semantic content of *kin* ‘eat’, respectively.
(75) Derived entry for *kin* ‘eat’ when it combines with the resulting verb *ḥim* ‘be full’

![AVM representation]

In (75), the argument corresponding to the resulting verb phrase *ḥim* ‘be full’ is added onto the ARG-ST list of *kin* ‘eat’. The verb *ḥim* ‘be full’ subcategorizes for a single NP whose index ([7]) is token-identical with that of the first NP in the ARG-ST list of *kin* ‘eat’ which is realized as the subject of *kin* ‘eat’.

The following AVM is the representation of the derived entry for *kin* ‘eat’ (as a result of applying the lexical rule in (71) to the basic entry of *kin*) when it combines with the resulting verb *mòd* ‘be gone’.

---

24 The CONTENT in the AVM in (75) is preliminary and will be revised in the next section.
In (76), the argument corresponding to the resulting verb phrase *mòd* ‘be gone’ is added onto the ARG-ST list of *kin* ‘eat’. The resulting verb *mòd* ‘be gone’ subcategorizes for a single NP whose index ([8]) is the identical to that of the second NP in the ARG-ST list of the matrix verb *kin* ‘eat’, which is realized as the object of the verb *kin*.

For the case of object sharing in (57), repeated below, it can be modeled as shown in (78).

(77) Nikorn  hāa  khǭŋkhwān  phōb

Nikorn  seek  present  find

Nikorn sought the present (and) found (it).
(78)  the derived entry of *hãa ‘seek’* as an *object-sharing-adjoining-verb*, when it combines with the resulting verb *phôb ‘find’*

![Diagram](image)

Note that the entry of *hãa ‘seek’* in (78) is derived from the basic entry of *hãa* via the lexical rule in (71), when the derived entry is sort-resolved as an *object-sharing-adjoining-verb*. The argument sharing in (77) is illustrated in (78) by the token-identity of the index values of the NP subject and NP object ([10] and [11]) of *phôb ‘find’* with those of *hãa ‘seek’*.

Note that the description of *adjoining verbs* in (70) can account for cases of ambiguous controllers, which sentence (62), repeated below, illustrates.

(79)  wua khwìd khwaaj taaj
    ox butt buffalo die
    The ox butted the buffalo dead.
Assuming that *khwîd* ‘butt’ is an *ordinary-adjoining-verb*, *khwîd* is simply required to have one NP on its ARG-ST list whose index is token-identical to that of the single NP argument of *taaj* ‘die’. The exact determination of whether that NP corresponds to *wua* ‘ox’ or *khwaaj* ‘buffalo’ in (79) is left open as it is a pragmatic matter. What is important here is that the ambiguity found in (79) is predictable from the ARG-ST characteristics of *ordinary-adjoining-verbs*. This is unlike the approaches by Sebba (1987) and Baker (1989), whose interpretations of argument sharing are tied with fixed phrase structural configurations (as discussed in 5.3.3.2) and predict only one reading for sentences such as (79).

To summarize, we can model Thai AJCs by having matrix verbs additionally subcategorize for the resulting verb (see also Wechsler 1997a,b). These matrix verbs can then be classified as *adjoining verbs*, which are furthered subclassified according to whether they only share one or two arguments in their ARG-ST lists. This argument-structure (rather than phrase-structure) analysis of adjoining verbs can model both multiple and ambiguous control relations in Thai AJCs.

### 5.4.2 Semantic Representations of Thai Adjoining Constructions

In this section, I attempt to model the semantic information that Thai AJCs encode, in particular the fact that the relations among verbs in AJCs are not strictly causal, and that the resulting verb in AJCs conveys an *expected* result. I start by specifying the class of resulting verb. Next, I argue that an AJC encodes two types of semantic information: one is the relation among the participants in a situation (i.e. SITUATIONAL-CORE or SIT-CORE) and the other is a subset of circumstances or time indices against which such
relation is evaluated (i.e. MODAL-BASE\textsuperscript{25}--see background and detailed discussion of the sublexical modal component in Koenig and Davis, 2001). An example of an English verb whose denotation contains both a SIT-CORE and MODAL-BASE information is *deny*. *Deny*’s SIT-CORE is causing someone’s possession of something, and its MODAL-BASE is negation. These two components together yield the meaning of *deny*, namely that the transfer of possession did not happen. Note that the SIT-CORE meaning of *deny* is shared with other verbs in the same semantic field including *give, promise, owe* and *charge*, for example, but these verbs differ in their MODAL-BASE information.

I hypothesize that the notion of MODAL-BASE is relevant to Thai AJCs because the resulting verb in AJCs can be negated or modified by modal markers. I repeat some examples in (46), from 5.3.2, below.

\begin{align}
\text{(80) a.} & \quad \text{Nikorn kin khâaw ŭm} \\
& \quad \text{Nikorn eat rice be full} \\
& \quad \text{Nikorn ate rice until he was full.}
\end{align}

\begin{align}
\text{(80) b.} & \quad \text{Nikorn kin khâaw mûj ŭm} \\
& \quad \text{Nikorn eat rice NEG be full} \\
& \quad \text{Nikorn ate rice, but he wasn’t full.}
\end{align}

I assume that Thai AJCs contribute a “weak” causal semantic relationship.\textsuperscript{26} The resulting verb ŭm ‘be full’, which marks the expected result in (80), can be negated. This means that

\begin{flushright}
\text{\textsuperscript{25} See also the notion of modality in Kratzer (1981).}
\text{\textsuperscript{26} Similar to the construction-linked part-whole relation in Chapter 1, this weak causal relationship is contributed by Thai Adjoining Constructions and not by individual elements which occur in these constructions. But the Thai Adjoining Construction is lexical and not phrase-structural in that it consists of the class of adjoining verbs.}
\end{flushright}
the expected result was not reached. To illustrate this, consider the diagrams (81)-(82) which represent the semantics of the VPs in (80a) and (80b) respectively.

(81)

\[
\text{adjoining verb}
\]

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{ARG-ST} & \left\langle \ldots \text{VP} \right. \\
\text{KEY} & [5] \left[ \text{full-rel} \right] \\
\text{EVENT} & [2] \\
\end{align*}
\]

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{CONT} & \left\langle \text{KEY} \right. \\
\text{EVENT} & [1] \\
\end{align*}
\]

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{LZT} & \left\langle [4] \oplus \right. \\
\text{SIT-CORE} & [3] \left[ \text{cause-rel} \right] \\
\text{ACT} & [1] \\
\text{SOA-ARG} & [2] \\
\text{MODAL-BASE} & \left[ \text{expect_mb} \right] \\
\text{SOA-ARG} & [3] \\
\end{align*}
\]

The AVM in (81) illustrates the semantics of the VP *kin khâaw ņm* ‘eat rice full’ in (80a).

The EVENT [1] is the event of eating, and the EVENT [2] encoded by the VP which is added onto the ARG-ST of *kin* ‘eat’ refers to the event of being full. In (81), there are two Elementary Predications (EPs) in the LZT; the EP of *kin* ‘eat’([4]), the EP of the expected causal relation. The semantic content of the expected causal relation consists of two major components: SIT-CORE and MODAL-BASE. The SIT-CORE basically indicates that EVENT [1], which is the value of the feature ACT and corresponds to the eating event in this example, causes EVENT [2], the state of being full, the value of the SOA-ARG\(^{27}\) (State-of-Affair argument). In other words, the event of eating causes the eventuality of being full. But, crucially, the relation described in SIT-CORE, tagged [3], is merely
expected, as indicated by the fact that [3] is the value of the SOA-ARG in the \textit{expect-modal-base} component.

The AVM in (82) illustrates the portion of the semantic content of (80b) which differs from that of (80a) by the additional presence of a negation.

(82)

\[
\begin{align*}
\textit{adjoining verb} & \quad \text{ARG-ST} \quad \text{..} \oplus \text{VP} \\
\text{CONT} & \quad \text{KEY} \ [4] \quad \begin{Bmatrix}
\textit{full-rel} \\
\text{EVENT} \ [2]
\end{Bmatrix} \\
\text{LZT} & \quad [4] \oplus \\
\text{MODAL-BASE} & \quad \begin{Bmatrix}
\textit{expect_mb} \\
\text{SOA-ARG} \ [3]
\end{Bmatrix} \\
\text{SIT-CORE} & \quad \begin{Bmatrix}
\textit{cause_rel} \\
\text{ACT} \ [1] \\
\text{SOA-ARG} \ [2]
\end{Bmatrix} \\
\text{KEY} & \quad \begin{Bmatrix}
\textit{neg-rel} \\
\text{SOA-ARG} \ [5]
\end{Bmatrix}
\end{align*}
\]

The negation in (80b) is represented in (82) by a \textit{neg-rel} EP, which takes as the value of its SOA argument, the \textit{full_rel} meaning that the expected state of being full was not reached.

To summarize, I argued that two types of semantic relations are present in Thai AJCs: \textit{SITUATIONAL-CORE} and \textit{MODAL-BASE}. The notion of a sublexical modal component (following Koenig and Davis, 2001) can be applied to model the intuitive idea of “weak” causal relation and expected result in AJCs.

\footnote{This attribute differs from the attribute ARG employed in Chapter 4 in that the former is more specific; it refers to the semantic argument which is a state-of-affair.}
5.5 Conclusion

Adjoining Constructions in Thai have traditionally been characterized as Resultative Constructions. However, Thai AJCs differ from Resultative Constructions found in English and other languages in three important aspects. First, control relations in Thai AJCs are neither syntactically nor semantically constrained, but are pragmatically determined. Controllers in Thai AJCs cannot thus be determined through phrase-structural rules or principles as in the analyses of Sebba (1987) and Baker (1989). Second, the resulting situations in Thai AJCs might not eventually occur; the causal relation in Thai AJCs is only an expectation. Finally, the “expected” results indicate that the notion of sublexical modality is relevant to the semantics of Thai AJCs.
Chapter 6

Concluding Remarks

In this thesis, I have discussed three groups of Thai verb complexes which are not semantic arguments. I described their syntactic structures and the ways in which their meanings combine. A major finding of this thesis is that the three classes of verb complexes involve three different structures: head-complement, head-adjunct, and head-co-head structures and that these different syntactic structures do not correlate with the semantic domains that the three types of verb complexes express.

In what follows I summarize the more particular findings of the investigation of the three groups of Thai verb complexes. First, Directional Serial Verb Constructions in Chapter 2 have mainly a recursive structure, but with fixed positions for certain classes of verbs (manner-of-motion, caused-motion, and deictic verbs). To model Directional SVCs, I proposed the new Head - Co-head Schema, which semantically constrains the co-head daughter to denote non-deictic directional motion relations and allows featural specifications on VPs containing deictic verbs (whose position is fixed) to be passed up from the non-head (i.e. the co-head) daughter. Another salient property of Thai Directional SVCs is the exceptional valence structure of the class of serial verbs: they can leave out their otherwise required complements when they either occur in the Head - Co-head schema or when they are followed by a deictic verb. In other words, the occurrence of two or more serial verbs without their typical complements yields a valid VP, regardless of whether the verbs are combined via the Head - Co-head or Head - Complement schema.
I investigated Thai aspect-marking system in Chapter 3 and 4. Aspect-marking expressions in Thai occur both before and after the base VP. I illustrated that neither their positions, the syntactic rules that combine them with the base VP, nor their part-of-speech correlate with their semantics (as evidenced from the contrast between რათ ‘start’ and სედ ‘finish’ discussed below). Moreover, full-verb post-verbal aspectual morphemes are interesting in the sense that while they themselves are VP modifiers, they can also serve as complements of raising verbs, when such raising verbs occur after the base VP. Semantically, although the combinations of aspect morphemes potentially leads to a large number of scope ambiguities, few ever arise because of the fact that post-verbal aspectual morphemes must modify full-verb phrases.

In Chapter 5, I investigated Thai Adjoining Constructions, which are constructions similar to Resultative Constructions found in English and other languages. Like Resultative Constructions, Adjoining Constructions introduce an additional causal relation between the referent of the predicative head and the referent of its resultative phrase complement, but, by contrast to what happens in other languages, the result of the causal event might not eventually occur. Thus, the first property that makes Thai Adjoining Constructions differ from Resultative Construction is that the “result” in the former is merely expected. The second property that distinguishes Thai AJCs from typical Resultative Constructions is the fact that control relations in Thai AJCs are grammatically underdetermined, and can only be fully determined pragmatically.
My analysis of Thai verb complexes, which have traditionally been considered instances of serialization, shows that in fact there is no uniform notion of serialization,\(^1\) neither a syntactic or semantic one. If we want to apply the notion of serialization to these Thai verb complexes, we cannot define it on the basis of either the positions of verb complexes in the construct, the syntactic structures involved, or the semantic domains it expresses. To illustrate this, consider the two aspect-marking elements \(r\hbar m\) ‘start’ and \(s\hbar d\) ‘finish’ in the Thai Aspectual Constructions. If we treat the Aspectual Constructions as Serial Verb Constructions, these two elements should be uniformly classified as “serial verbs” from a semantic point of view. Nevertheless, \(r\hbar m\) ‘start’ precedes the base VP while \(s\hbar d\) ‘finish’ occurs after the base VP. They also combine with the base VP via a different syntactic schema, i.e. complementation for \(r\hbar m\) ‘start’, and modification for \(s\hbar d\) ‘finish’. The only property that \(r\hbar m\) ‘start’ and \(s\hbar d\) ‘finish’ have in common is that they both belong to the full-verb part-of-speech, which is a category that we cannot determine from presuming that Aspectual Constructions are SVCs and that aspect morphemes are serial verbs.

I have shown that Thai verb complexes that semantically encode non-arguments are syntactically expressed in either a head-adjunct, head-complement, or head-co-head structure. Among these three structures, only the head-co-head structure could potentially be redefined as serialization (as opposed to the other two universal structures). Nonetheless, the head - co-head structure does not correspond one-to-one to what it

\(^1\) See Andrews and Manning (1999) for a similar conclusion.
expresses. Namely, the structure is used to realize a subset of motion verbs, but there is still another small subset of motion verbs which are syntactically realized via the ordinary Head-Complement schema (i.e. those pairs which involve a non-deictic and a deictic-directional motion verb). This lack of one-to-one relationship between syntax and semantics is also true in the domain of Thai aspect-marking elements or event description modifiers; they can be either the heads of a head-complement structure or the adjuncts of a head-adjunct structure.
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