The Syntax and Semantics of *GIVE*-Complex Constructions in Thai

Suda Rangkupan

Chulalongkorn University

Thai is known for exhibiting complex constructions with series of so-called verbs. *GIVE*-complex constructions are one of those that have been studied widely and repeatedly. This paper aims at investigating the syntax and semantics of *GIVE*-complex constructions in Thai. The study is based on the framework of Role and Reference Grammar. It has found that in terms of semantics, *hây* 'give' has many meanings. As a main verb in a complex construction, it has semantic restrictions on its subject and shared argument while such restrictions are not held when they occur in some types of constructions. This property is used as one of the criteria for identifying the category of *hây*. The paper claims that some types of *hây* are not a verb, but rather a clause linkage marker. Schematic representation of its meaning is proposed to account for its semantic similarities. In terms of syntax, the paper proposes tests for differentiating types of juncture and nexus of the construction. It is found that *GIVE*-complex constructions in Thai can be analyzed as core coordination, core subordination, and clausal cosubordination.

Key words: Thai, *GIVE*-complex constructions, core coordination, core subordination, clausal cosubordination

1. Introduction

This paper investigates the syntactic and semantic characteristics of complex constructions with the word *hây* 'give' in Thai. When occurring as a matrix verb in a complex construction, *hây* has two meanings: 'have (someone do something)' or 'let (someone do something)' as in (1) below. Moreover, it occurs in a non-matrix subclausal unit, forming various types of constructions, as shown in (2) to (4).

(1)   nuan   hây   jǔm   ʔàːn   nǎŋsɯ̌ː   kɔ̀n   nɔːn
        Nuan   give   Jum   read   book   before   sleep
        'Nuan had Jum read a book before going to bed.' or
        'Nuan let Jum read a book before going to bed.'

(2) nuan   bɔ̀ːk   hây   jŭm   ʔàːn   nǎŋsɯ̌ː
    Nuan   tell   give   Jum   read   book
    'Nuan told Jum to read a book.'

(3) nuan   yàːk   hây   jŭm   nâŋ   loŋ
    Nuan   want   give   Jum   sit   DIR
    'Nuan wanted Jum to sit down.'

(4) nuan   thúp   kɛ̂ːw   hây   tɛ̀ːk
    Nuan   hit   glass   give   be broken
    'Nuan hit the glass in order for it to be broken.'

Besides the above occurrences, *hây* occurs as a verb of possession transfer, meaning 'give', and as a beneficiary marker, translated as 'for' in English, as shown below respectively.

(5) nuan   hây   khàʔnǒm   jŭm
    Nuan   give   sweets   Jum
    'Nuan gave Jum the sweets.'

(6) nuan   kamlaŋ   tham   kaːnbâːn   hây   jŭm
    Nuan   ASP   do   homework   give   Jum
    'Nuan is doing homework for Jum.'

The multifunctionality of the word *hây* has attracted much research interest from various fields—syntactic, semantic, cognitive, typological, and historical. However, there seem to be quite a few disagreements. Dejthamrong (1970) and Indrambarya (1992) focus on the syntactic categories of the word *hây*. Dejthamrong (1970), using a structuralist framework, finds that *hây* can occur in the test frame for a verb and a preposition. Therefore, *hây* is analyzed as a multi-function word—ditransitive verb, causative verb, preposition, clause linkage marker, and postverb. However, Indrambarya (1992), using Lexicase Grammar (Starosta 1988), does not agree with her analysis of *hây* as a preposition and instead categorizes the same type of *hây* as a goal and benefactive adverb. Song (1997), following Traugott's theory of grammaticalization, considers *hây* to be a manner adverb. However, Thepkanjana and Uehara (forthcoming) argue that *hây* is not fully grammaticalized yet; rather, it is a reanalysis of a purposive marker.

In summary, many previous syntactic studies attempt to determine whether the word *hây* is a verb, a preposition, or an adverb (Dejthamrong 1970, Kullavanijaya 1974, Indrambarya 1992). The grammatical properties of *hây* in a complex construction, as shown in (1)-(4) have not been taken into close consideration. Thepkanjana (1986) is

one of the first researchers to look closely into the semantics of *hây*-complex constructions, which are analyzed as causative constructions. She also finds that the semantic property of the subject noun phrase can be used to differentiate subtypes of causative constructions. However, another semantic property that should be considered is the semantic classification of the co-occurring verb.

This paper, therefore, aims at analyzing the semantic properties of the core components of *hây* complex constructions—core arguments and the non-matrix verb. Based on the framework of Role and Reference Grammar (Van Valin 1993, Van Valin & LaPolla 1997), it proposes that the semantic similarities among various uses of *hây* can be explained in terms of a schematic representation of the semantic components of the lexical item. Consequently, whether *hây* in each construction type functions as a verb or a clausal linkage marker is independently decided from its syntactic and semantic relationship with other components in the construction. Moreover, a systematic analysis of the clausal structure of each construction type and the relationship between sub-clausal units is needed.

This research is mainly based on, but not limited to, an actual corpus of written and spoken data consisting of 100,633 words. The spoken data are transcripts of casual conversations, TV interviews, and parliamentary discussions. The written data are drawn from novels and newspaper articles on various topics, such as politics, education, health, entertainment, and sports. Sentences with *hây* are retrieved via a concordance program developed by Aroonmanakun (2001). Note that sentences are also constructed for comparison by native speakers of Thai.

The analysis begins with *hây* in a simple construction, including *hây* as a verb of possession transfer and as a beneficiary marker. The next section deals with *hây* as a matrix verb in a causative construction. Then, I investigate the clausal linkage types of constructions with *hây*, namely, jussive, desiderative, and purposive constructions. The findings lead to the justification for syntactic category of *hây* in each construction type.

2. Semantic properties of the lexical item *hây*

This section gives an introduction to the semantic properties of the lexical item *hây* in three kinds of environments: as a verb of possession transfer, as a beneficiary marker, and as a jussive verb. Two semantic aspects to be investigated are animacy restrictions on subject NPs and semantic classes of verbs.

2.1 *hây* as a verb of possession transfer

As a verb of possession transfer, *hây* is followed by two arguments, a theme

followed by a recipient. This order is fixed, and the other way around is ungrammatical. To illustrate,

 (7) nuan hây khaʔnǒm jǔm
    Nuan give sweets   Jum
    'Nuan gave Jum the sweets.'
 (8) *nuan hây jum   khaʔnǒm
    Nuan give Jum   sweets

As for animacy, *hây* requires its subject NP to be animate. Thus, a sentence with an inanimate subject is not acceptable.

 (9) *fǒn hây nám raw
    rain give water us
    'Rain gives us water.'

We cannot use sentence (9) to express *fǒn* 'rain' as having a semantic role of possessor with an intent to transfer the possession of *nám* 'water' to the receiver.

   Thus, the semantic representation of *hây* can be formulated as follows:

 (10) [**do′** (x, $\varnothing$) CAUSE INGR **have′** (y, z)]

The above logical structure is the semantic representation of the verb of possession transfer *hây* 'give', which is an achievement verb, represented by the modifier INGR. The *x* argument is a participant who transfers possession to the other participant, represented by the *y* argument, and the *z* argument is an object of transfer. As a causative achievement verb, *hây* involves an unspecified action causing another state of affairs, namely an achievement.

2.2 *hây* as a beneficiary marker

   As a beneficiary marker, *hây* expresses two kinds of beneficiaries, namely deputative beneficiaries and recipients. According to Van Valin & LaPolla (1997), a deputative beneficiary is the participant who receives benefit from the action without doing the action. That is, the actor who has the intent that the beneficiary need not do the action performs the action; the recipient is a participant who receives concrete objects from the actor. There are two kinds of recipients marked by *hây*, namely, intermediate and ultimate recipients.

(11) nuan   sák   phâː   hây   lûːk   saʔmɔ̌ː.
     Nuan   wash   clothes give   kid   always.
     lûːk   ləːy   sák   ʔeːŋ   mây   pen
     kid   thus   wash   self   not   able
     'Nuan always washes clothes for her kid. Thus, her kid does not know how
     to wash clothes her/himself.' (= 'Nuan washes clothes in her kid's place so
     that her kid does not have to do it.')

(12) nuan   yɪp   nǎŋsɯ̌ː khɔ̌ːŋ   lɔ̀n   hây   jǔm
     Nuan   grab   book   POSS   3F   give   Jum
     phrɔ́ʔ   jǔm   khɔ̌ː   duː
     because Jum   ask   look
     'Nuan grabbed her book and gave it to Jum because Jum asked to see it.'

(13) nuan   sɯ̌ː   khéːk   chín   nán   hây   lûːk
     Nuan   buy   cake   CL   DEM   give   kid
     phrɔ́ʔ   lûːk   yàːk   kin
     because kid   want   eat
     'Nuan bought that cake for her kid because her kid wanted to eat it.'

Sentence (11) illustrates the usage of *hây* as a deputative beneficiary while in sentences
(12) and (13) *hây* marks intermediate and ultimate recipients, respectively. An inter-
mediate recipient refers to a participant that has a semantic role as a goal; and an ulti-
mate recipient refers to a recipient to whom possession is transferred.

   Note that *hây* in Thai cannot be followed by an inanimate argument. Thus, the
following sentences are not possible.

(14) *nuan   thaːsǐː   hây   bâːn
     Nuan   paint   give   house
     'Nuan painted for the house.'

(15) *nuan   rɔ́ːŋphleːŋ hây   khwaːmsanùksanǎːn
     Nuan   sing   give   fun
     'Nuan sang a song for fun.'

   As for animacy, a beneficiary marker *hây* occurs only in a clause with an animate
subject, as shown by the unacceptable sentence below.

(16) *dæ̀ːt   sɔ̀ːŋ   hây   raw
     sunlight shine   give   us
     'The sunlight shines for us.'

Moreover, the beneficiary marker *hây* does not co-occur with state verbs or achievement verbs. To illustrate,

(17) *nuan   diːtɕay   hây   jŭm
     Nuan   be glad   give   Jum
     'Nuan was glad for Jum.'

(18) *nuan   tɕəː   kraʔpăw   thĭ   hăːy   pay   hay   jŭm
     Nuan   find   purse   REL   be lost   OPR   give   Jum
     'Nuan found the lost purse for Jum.'

The verb in (17) is a state verb and in (18) it is an achievement verb. Both are unacceptable sentences. Therefore, we conclude that a beneficiary marked by *hây* may co-occur only with an activity or accomplishment verb.

The semantic representation follows what Jolly (1993) has proposed for a purposive marker. She argues that *for* in English has two functions: causative and purposive; thus, it has two semantic components, as follows:

(19)   Semantic content of purposive *for*:
       a.   **want′** (x, LS_2)
       b.   DO (x, [LS_1 CAUSE LS_2])

To illustrate, an English sentence as in (20) can be semantically represented in a logical structure as shown below (Jolly 1993:303).

(20)   John baked a cake for Rita.

The above sentence has a benefactive *for*, which includes the two semantic components given in (19), as illustrated below:

[**want′** (John, LS_2)] ∧ [DO (John, [LS_1 CAUSE LS_2])]
   LS_1 = [**do′** (John) CAUSE [BECOME **baked′** (cake)]]
   LS_2 = [BECOME **have′** (Rita, cake)]

Therefore, a fully elaborated logical structure for (20) is as follows:

(20') [**want′** (John, [BECOME **have′** (Rita, cake)])] ∧ (John, [[**do′** (John) CAUSE
       [BECOME **baked′** (cake)]] CAUSE [BECOME **have′** (Rita, cake)]])

When the benefactive has a deputative reading, the interpretation for LS_2 is as follows:

$$LS_2 = NOT\ LS_1$$

Thus, when a sentence like (20) has a deputative interpretation, i.e. 'John baked a cake in place of Rita', that is to say, 'Rita did not bake a cake', its logical structure is represented as follows:

(20'') [**want′** (John, [NOT **do′** (Rita) CAUSE [BECOME **baked′** (cake)]])]
    ∧ [DO (John, [[**do′** (John) CAUSE [BECOME **baked′** (cake)]]
    CAUSE [NOT **do′** (Rita) CAUSE [BECOME **baked′** (cake)]]])]

In Thai, as shown above, it is found that *hây* has two readings: deputative beneficiary and recipient. Following Jolly (1993), sentences of the three beneficiary readings—deputative, intermediate recipient, and ultimate recipient—have the following logical structures:

(21) nuan sák phâː hây lûːk   (Deputative beneficiary)
    Nuan wash clothes give kid
    'Nuan washed clothes for her kid.'
(21') [**want′** (Nuan, LS_2)] ∧ [DO (Nuan, [LS_1 CAUSE LS_2])]
        LS_1 = [**wash′** (Nuan, phâː)]
        LS_2 = [NOT **wash′** (lûːk, phâː)]
(22) nuan yıp năŋsŭː khɔ̌ːŋ lɔ̀n hây jŭm (Intermediate recipient)
    Nuan grab book POSS 3F give Jum
    'Nuan grabbed her book and gave it to Jum.'
(22') [**want′** (Nuan, LS_2)] ∧ [DO (Nuan, [LS_1 CAUSE LS_2])]
        LS_1 = [**grab′** (Nuan, năŋsŭː)]
        LS_2 = [INGR **be-LOC′** (Jum, năŋsŭː)]
(23) nuan sɯ́ː khéːk chín nán hây lûːk (Ultimate recipient)
    Nuan buy cake CL DEM give kid
    'Nuan bought that cake for her kid.'
(23') [**want′** (Nuan, LS_2)] ∧ [DO (Nuan, [LS_1 CAUSE LS_2])]
        LS_1 = [**buy′** (Nuan, khéːk)]
        LS_2 = [INGR **have′** (lûːk, khéːk)]

To sum up, *hây* can be used as a beneficiary marker indicating a deputative beneficiary, an intermediate recipient, and an ultimate recipient. It co-occurs with

Suda Rangkupan

animate subjects only. Finally, it is only compatible with activity or accomplishment verbs.

2.3 *hây* as a matrix verb in a complex construction

So far we have seen that the lexical item *hây* can be syntactically categorized as a verb of possession transfer and a beneficiary marker. In this section we move to *hây* used in a complex construction as a matrix verb. An example is the following:

(24) nuan hây jǔm nâŋ loŋ
     Nuan give Jum sit OPR
     'Nuan had Jum sit down.' or 'Nuan let Jum sit down.'

We first consider its semantic restriction on animacy. The verb *hây* as a matrix verb of the construction requires an animate subject NP.

(25) nuan hây jǔm pɪt nâːtàːŋ
     Nuan give Jum close window
     'Nuan had Jum close the window.' or
     'Nuan let Jum close the window.'
(26) mɛ̌ː cháʔniː hây lûːk kin klûay kɔ̀ːn
     mother gibbon give offspring eat banana before
     'The mother gibbon had its offspring eat the banana first.' or
     'The mother gibbon let its offspring eat the banana first.'
(27) *phaːyúʔ hây jǔm pɪt nâːtàːŋ
     storm give Jum close window
     'The storm had Jum close the window.'
     'The storm let Jum close the window.'

In sentences (25) and (26) the subject NPs are animate, i.e. 'Nuan' and 'the mother gibbon'. However, sentence (27) is ungrammatical when the subject NP *phaːyúʔ* 'storm' is inanimate. Therefore, it is obligatory that the subject NP of the matrix verb *hây* be animate.

In terms of animacy, typically, the undergoer of the matrix verb *hây*, which is also the actor of the non-matrix verb, is also animate. However, it is also possible for the actor of the non-matrix verb to be inanimate, as shown below:

(28) nuan   hây   ʔaːkàːt   nay   hɔ̂ŋ   thàːytheː   saməː.
       Nuan   give   air   in   room   circulate   always.
       hɔ̂ŋ   tɕɯɯŋ   mây   ʔàp
       room   thus   not   be stuffy
       'Nuan let the air in the room circulate all the time. The room is, thus, not stuffy.'

Sentence (28) shows that an inanimate NP, *ʔaːkàːt* 'air', can be the undergoer of *hây* and the actor of the non-matrix predicate. However, it is not the case that any inanimate NP can occur as undergoer of the matrix verb *hây*. Consider the following examples.

(29) *nuan   hây   kɛ̂ːw   tɛ̀ːk
       Nuan   give   glass   be broken
       'Nuan had the glass become broken.' or
       'Nuan let the glass become broken.'
(30) nuan   hây   kɛ̂ːw   klîŋ   pay   rû̂ayrû̂ay   lɛ́ːwtɕɯŋ   tɕàp   wáy
       Nuan   give   glass   roll   DIR   continually   then   hold   OPR
       'Nuan let the glass keep rolling, and then she held it.'

We can see that a sentence with *kɛ̂ːw* 'glass' as an undergoer as in (29) is unacceptable, but the same NP as actor of an activity verb in (30) is acceptable. Therefore, there is no semantic restriction of animacy on the shared NP of the construction, but the semantic class of the non-matrix verb is restricted to activity and accomplishment verbs only. Compare the following data with the above.

(31) *nuan   hây   jŭm   diːtɕay
       Nuan   give   Jum   be happy
       'Nuan had Jum be happy.'
(32) *nuan   hây   jŭm   tɕəː   kràʔpǎw   thîː   hǎːy   pay
       Nuan   give   Jum   find   purse   REL   be lost   OPR
       'Nuan had Jum find the lost purse.'

Sentences (31) and (32) are not possible because the semantic class of the non-matrix verb is state and achievement, respectively.

    Another important semantic feature of *hây* involves the notion of causation. As suggested in the translation of the above data, the verb *hây* in this type of construction is ambiguous with respect to the semantic aspect of causation; i.e. without enough context, it could mean both 'have' and 'let'. For example,

(33) nuan   hây   jŭm   pay   ŋaːnlíaŋ
      Nuan   give   Jum   go   party
       a.   'Nuan let Jum go to the party.'
       b.   'Nuan had Jum go to the party.'

Sentence (33) is ambiguous in that it could be interpreted as either the participant *Jum* being forced by the other participant, *Nuan*, to perform the action of 'going to the party', or *Jum* being given permission to perform such an action. However, a specific sense of the verb is chosen in a particular context. To illustrate,

(34) nuan   hây   jŭm   pay   ŋaːnlíaŋ
      Nuan   give   Jum   go   party
      tháŋthîː   lɔ̀n   rúː   wâː   jŭm   klìat   ŋaːnlíaŋ
      although   3F   know   COMP   Jum   hate   party
       a. *'Nuan let Jum go to the party although she knows that Jum hates parties.'
       b.   'Nuan had Jum go to the party although she knows that Jum hates parties.'
(35) nuan   hây   jŭm   pay   ŋaːnlíaŋ
      Nuan   give   Jum   go   party
      tháŋthîː   tæːkɔ̀n   lɔ̀n   khəy   hâːm
      although   previously   3F   used to   forbid
       a.   'Nuan let Jum go to the party although she had forbidden her before.'
       b. *'Nuan had Jum go to the party although she had forbidden her before.'

We can see that the semantic ambiguity of *hây* can be eliminated in an adequate context: *hây* means 'have (someone do something)' in (34), but 'let' in (35).

Such unspecified causation can be explained in terms of force dynamic patterns, proposed by Talmy (1988). In his terms, "force dynamics" is a generalization of the linguistic notion of "causation"; it involves how entities interact with respect to force (Talmy 1988:49-50). There are two patterns of force dynamics that *hây* constructions refer to. First, a stronger force element impinges against another force element that has a tendency to rest, thus causing it to perform an action. An example of this pattern is (34) in which *Jum*, as a weaker force element, does not want to perform the action, but is forced to do so by *Nuan*, as a stronger force element. Second, a stronger force element disengages from another force element that has a tendency to move. This is exemplified by (35) in which *Nuan*, still a stronger force element, releases a blockage that could prevent *Jum* from performing an action. The property that both patterns share is that an agent is a stronger force element and a non-agent is a weaker one. Another example is as follows:

(36) nuan   hây   ʔaːkàːt   nay   hôŋ   thàːytheː   samɔ̌ː
     Nuan   give   air   in   room   circulate   always
       a. 'Nuan always lets the air in the room circulate.'
       b. *'Nuan always has the air in the room circulate.'

In (36), *Nuan* as an agent is a stronger force element while 'the air' has tendency to move, but without the disengagement performed by the agent the circulation would not occur. That is, the agent, say, opens the door, windows, etc. to allow the air to circulate. In this situation, *hây* is not ambiguous since the air has an inherent property to move, and the agent has power to allow the action by releasing any blockages.

Therefore, the important semantic component that the *hây* construction involves is that the agent's intent determines the non-agent's performing an action; i.e. the agent can force or allow the non-agent to do an action.

To sum up, there are two semantic restrictions on this type of construction: the subject NP must be animate and the semantic class of the non-matrix verb must be either an activity or accomplishment. Also, with respect to causation, the action in the non-matrix is performed in accordance with the intent of the agent.

Recall the semantic structure of *hây* as a beneficiary marker. We find that the schematic representation proposed by Jolly (1993) can also be applied here, since both constructions require an animate subject NP, must co-occur with activity or accomplishment verbs only, and have both an intent and causation as their semantic component.

Then, we could provide a semantic representation for the complex verb *hây* as follows:

(37) $[\textbf{want}' (x, LS_2) \wedge DO (x, [LS_1 \, CAUSE \, LS_2])]$
        $LS_1 =$ $[\textbf{do}' (x, \varnothing)]$
        $LS_2 =$ (1) $\textbf{do}' (y, [\textbf{pred}' (y) \, or \, (y, z)])$
           or (2) BECOME $\textbf{do}' (y, [\textbf{pred}' (y) \, or \, (y, z)])$

From this schema, the *x* argument intends for another action to occur as seen in the first component, i.e. $\textbf{want}' (x, LS_2)$. It is also an actor who performs an unspecified action to cause the action represented in LS_2. The unspecified action is represented as $[\textbf{do}' (x, \varnothing)]$. LS_2 represents a logical structure of the non-matrix verb and its arguments. LS_2 can be an activity or an accomplishment.

To illustrate, sentence (38) has the semantic structure represented in (38') below.

(38) nuan   hây   jǔm   pɪt   nâːtàːŋ
     Nuan   give   Jum   close   window
     'Nuan had Jum close the window.' or
     'Nuan let Jum close the window.'

(38') **want′** (nuan, [BECOME **do′** (Jum, [**close′** (Jum, nâːtàːŋ)])]) ∧ DO (nuan, [[**do′** (nuan, ∅)] CAUSE [BECOME **do′** (Jum, [**close′** (Jum, nâːtàːŋ)])]])

From the above, sentence (38) can be represented with two semantic components:

    a. **want′** (x, LS_2), where the *x* argument is *Nuan*, the *y* argument is *Jum*, and LS_2 is [BECOME **do′** (Jum, [**close′** (Jum, nâːtàːŋ)])]

    b. DO (x, [LS_1 CAUSE LS_2]), where LS_1 is the unspecified action done by the *x* argument, namely, [**do′** (nuan, ∅)]

To sum up, the construction with *hây* as a matrix verb requires an animate subject. Also, it allows only an activity or an accomplishment as a non-matrix verb. With respect to its causality, *hây* can be used in two types of situations: 1) a situation where a stronger force element expressed by the subject NP impinges against another force element, and 2) a situation where the stronger force element disengages barriers for the weaker force element to perform the action. Finally, the semantic structure of the matrix verb *hây* in this type of construction is consistent with that of the beneficiary marker *hây*; i.e. they both involve two semantic components: the intent and the causation.

3. Clausal linkage of the construction with *hây* as matrix verb

This section investigates the juncture and nexus type of complex constructions with *hây* as a matrix verb. We first begin with a review of the properties of nexus and juncture types in Thai. Then, given those properties, we characterize the construction in question.

3.1 Review of juncture and nexus types

According to RRG, complex sentences are recognized as having a layered structure such that a complex construction is a unit that exhibits a particular relationship with another unit. Such a complex unit is referred to as a juncture, and a relationship among junctures is called nexus. There are three kinds of junctures: nucleus, core and clause. Junctures can be related to one another in three nexus types: coordination, cosubordination, and subordination.

As a layered structure, a nuclear juncture is a core composed of multiple nuclei, a core juncture a single clause made up of multiple cores, and a clausal juncture a whole sentence made up of two or more clauses. A major characteristic of a nuclear juncture is the argument pooling. That is, the two verbs in the juncture act as if they are a single

predicate, so that they pool all their arguments together as a single set. As for core junctures, the two cores share at least one argument, and core operators may be allowed to have an independent scope over a particular core. In a clausal juncture, however, each clause is independent of the others with respect to the argument realization, so that arguments of the clauses are not structurally shared; rather any missing arguments are subject to pragmatic conditions of anaphor.

Nexus relations are relationships between two subclausal units in a juncture, thus making up nine possible combinations of nexus and junctures. Their properties can be broadly summarized as follows:

1) Coordination is a kind of relationship among linked juncts that are structurally independent at the level of juncture; for example, a clause in a clausal coordination construction can occur independently outside the clausal chain.

2) Subordination, either as an argument or a modifier, is a kind of part-whole relationship between a matrix unit and one or more structurally dependent juncts; for example, a subordinate clause cannot occur independently outside the clausal chain.

3) Cosubordination is a relationship among juncts that are interdependent due to being within the scope of one or more shared operators; for example, a construction in which one clause is dependent on another clause by virtue of shared tense is a cosubordination.

3.2 Characteristics of juncture types in Thai

In Thai there are two properties that differentiate juncture types, namely, the realization of arguments and the occurrence of adverbs.

The realization of arguments in a non-matrix subclausal unit is an important property for distinguishing types of juncture in Thai. As mentioned earlier, core arguments are pooled together in case of a nuclear juncture, and at least one argument is shared by multiple cores in a core juncture, while there is no argument sharing in a clausal juncture. That is to say, there are gaps or missing NPs in some types of predicates. Gaps or zeroes are allowed in many cases, but not all are of the same kind. There are two kinds of zeroes: a linking zero and an anaphoric zero. A linking zero is a zero that structurally occurs to yield cohesion among subclausal units, while an anaphoric zero is one that occurs by virtue of pragmatic principles.

We first consider the following set of examples:

(39) nuan   phlàk   tóʔ   tua   nán   lóm
      Nuan   push   table   CL   DEM   fall down
      'Nuan pushed that table down.'

(40) nuan   phlàk   tóʔ   tua   nán   tɕon   lóm
      Nuan   push   table   CL   DEM   until   fall down
        a.   'Nuan pushed that table until it fell down.'
        b.   'Nuan pushed that table until she fell down.'

There are two predicates in each of the above sentences, i.e. *phlàk* 'push' and *lóm* 'fall down', and two NPs, i.e. Nuan and *tóʔ tua nán* 'that table'. Sentence (39) shows a juxtaposition of the two predicates without any markers or conjunctions, while sentence (40) has a conjunction *tɕon* 'until' between the two predicates. Semantically, sentences (39) and (40) are very similar in terms of the description of a state of affairs. Both involve an action of 'pushing a table' indicated in the first predicate and the action of bringing about an event of 'falling down'. What is at stake here is that when the two predicates are linked by a conjunction, a context-free sentence like (40) could be ambiguous. That is, the participant who undergoes the event of 'falling down' could be either of the participants in the first predicate, i.e. 'Nuan' or 'that table', whereas in (39) the only possible interpretation is that it is the 'table' that undergoes the event of 'falling down'. To sum up, the ambiguity in (40) arises from the fact that the undergoer of the predicative verb 'fall down' is a discourse zero, subject to contextual construal. In (39) there is no ambiguity since the NP 'table' itself is interpreted as the undergoer of both the first predicate and the second predicate by virtue of the construction itself.

     The above semantic interpretation of the state of affairs and its participants shows the possibility for the position before a verb in the second predicate to have an argument, even in the form of zero. Based on sentence (39), we can apply a test for the acceptability of argument realization in the construction, as follows:

(41) *nuan   phlàk   tóʔ   tua   nán   tóʔ   tua   nán   lóm
      Nuan   push   table   CL   DEM   table   CL   DEM   fall down
(42) *nuan   phlàk   tóʔ   tua   nán   man   lóm
      Nuan   push   table   CL   DEM   3   fall down

The unacceptable sentences in (41) and (42) show that the realization of an NP as an argument for the second predicate is not possible. A well-formed sentence for this type of construction requires the second predicate to share its argument with the preceding predicate.

     Now we apply the same test to sentence (40), in which there is a conjunction before the second predicate.

(43) nuan   phlàk   tóʔ   tua   nán   tɕon   man   lóm
       Nuan   push   table   Cʟ   Dᴇᴍ   until   3   fall down
       'Nuan pushed that table until it fell down.'

(44) nuan   phlàk   tóʔ   tua   nán   tɕon   tuaʔeːŋ   lóm
       Nuan   push   table   Cʟ   Dᴇᴍ   until   self   fall down
       'Nuan pushed that table until she, herself, fell down.'

Sentences (43) and (44) are alternations of sentence (40). In these two sentences, when an undergoer of the rightmost predicate is overtly realized as *man* 'it' and *tuaʔeːŋ* 'self' respectively, the sentences remain grammatical. We can conclude then that a zero as an undergoer of the result predicate in a construction with a conjunction is not structural; rather, it is anaphoric in that its referent can be obtained via pragmatic principles.

Given this test for distinguishing types of zeroes in Thai complex constructions, we find that in a sentence with a conjunction linking two predicates, there is a position for a core argument before the linked predicate such that an omitted argument (if any) is subject to anaphoric principles. Therefore, we can say that in clausal junctures, core arguments in non-matrix predicates are optionally realized, and that any constructions that exhibit a zero as an obligatory property are nuclear or core junctures.

Another test for juncture type in Thai is the intervention of adverbs between two juncts. It is found that postverbal adverbs that modify the matrix verb occur at the end of the matrix clause in a clausal juncture. In a core juncture, adverbs that modify only the verb in the matrix core must occur after the non-matrix core, not the matrix core. But in a nuclear juncture, no adverbs that modify only the verb in the matrix nucleus are allowed. To illustrate,

(45) nuan   thúp   kɛ̂ːw   bay   nán   ræːŋræːŋ   tɕon   man   tɛ̀ːk
       Nuan   hit   glass   Cʟ   Dᴇᴍ   quite hard   until   3   be broken
       'Nuan hit that glass quite hard until it broke.'

(45') *nuan   thúp   kɛ̂ːw   bay   nán   tɕon   man   tɛ̀ːk   ræːŋræːŋ
        Nuan   hit   glass   Cʟ   Dᴇᴍ   until   3   be broken   very hard

Sentence (45) contains two clauses linked with a conjunction *tɕon* 'until', with an adverb *ræːŋræːŋ*, 'quite hard,' which modifies the activity verb *thúp* 'hit'. The adverb can occur at the end of the clause where the modified verb occurs only, so sentence (45') where the adverb is placed at the end of the other clause is unacceptable. Thus, sentence (45) is a clausal juncture.

Next we consider the occurrence of adverbs in a core juncture.

(46) phon   tɕhuan   nuan   kin   khâːw   duây   sĭaŋ   râːrəːŋ
      Phon   persuade   Nuan   eat   rice   with   voice   cheerful
      'Phon persuaded Nuan, with cheerful voice, to eat.'
(46') *phon   tɕhuan   nuan   duây   sĭaŋ   râːrəŋ   kin   khâːw
      Phon   persuade   Nuan   with   voice   cheerful eat   rice
(46'') *phon   tɕhuan   duây   sĭaŋ   râːrəŋ   nuan   kin   khâːw
      Phon   persuade   with   voice cheerful Nuan   eat   rice

In sentence (46) the postverbal adverb phrase *dûay sĭaŋrâːrəːŋ* 'with a cheerful voice' modifies the matrix verb *tɕhuan* 'persuade'. It occurs at the end of the clause containing two cores. Sentences (46') and (46'') are unacceptable when the adverb phrase occurs between the two cores, neither before nor after the shared argument. We conclude that in a core juncture, adverbs that modify only the matrix core are allowed but they must occur at the end of the core juncture, not between the two cores.

As for nuclear junctures, the matrix junct is not allowed to have an adverb specifically modify only the verb in the matrix. To illustrate,

(47) *nuan   thúp   kɛ̂ːw   bay   nán   rɛːŋrɛːŋ   tɛ̀ːk
      Nuan   hit   glass   CL   DEM   quite hard   be broken
(47') *nuan   thúp   kɛ̂ːw   bay   nán   tɛ̀ːk   rɛːŋrɛːŋ
      Nuan   hit   glass   CL   DEM   be broken   quite hard

In both (47) and (47') the adverb *rɛːŋrɛːŋ* 'hard' which modifies only the activity verb is not allowed to occur either at the end of the matrix nucleus or at the end of the juncture.

To sum up, in Thai there are two major features that distinguish complex constructions into different juncture types, namely, the realization of arguments and the occurrence of adverbs between two juncts. Nuclear junctures have pooled arguments and do not allow a matrix verb to be independently modified by a postverbal adverb. Core junctures have obligatorily shared arguments and allow a matrix verb to be independently modified by a postverbal adverb but require that the adverb occur at the end of the juncture. Clausal junctures do not have either pooled or shared arguments and require that a postverbal adverb (if any) occur at the end of the clause that contains the verb it modifies.

3.3 Characteristics of nexus types in Thai

According to RRG, there are three kinds of nexus relations, which are relationships

between two subclausal units, namely, coordination, cosubordination, and subordination. This paper proposes two tests to be used in distinguishing nexus types of constructions in question, namely, the *What*-question test for subordination and the operator dependency test for coordination and cosubordination.

First of all, a *What*-question test is to be used to find out whether the relationship between the two subclausal units at issue is subordination. In Thai, interrogative expressions occur *in situ*, so an NP in ordinary argument position can be replaced by a question word to form a question. To illustrate,

(48) nuan   hây   khàʔnǒm   jǔm
      Nuan   give sweets   Jum
      'Nuan gave Jum the sweets.'

(48') nuan   hây   ʔaray   jǔm
       Nuan   give what   Jum
       'What did Nuan give Jum?'

(48'') nuan   hây   khàʔnǒm   khray
        Nuan   give sweets   who
        'To whom did Nuan give the sweets?'

The above data illustrate question expressions in Thai. Sentence (48) is a non-question with the verb *hây* followed by two arguments: an undergoer and a recipient. To form a question asking about each argument, we replace each argument with a question word. In (48'), *ʔaray* 'what' is a question word for non-human arguments; in (48''), *khray* 'who' is for human arguments. These question words occur in the same position as arguments in non-question forms.

Likewise, in a complex construction a subclausal unit that functions as an argument can be replaced by the question word *ʔaray* in the same position. To illustrate,

(49) A: nuan   diːtçay   ʔaray
          Nuan   be glad   what
          'What is Nuan happy about?'

      B: nuan   diːtçay   thîː   wanníː   pen   wanyùt
          Nuan   be glad   COMP   today   be   holiday
          'Nuan is happy that today is a holiday.'

The issue is to discover the relationship between a clause marked by *thîː* and its preceding matrix unit in (49B). We ask the *What*-question in (49A), and find that (49B) is a possible answer for the question. We thus conclude that the *thîː* clause is an

argument subordination.

More examples are as follows:

(50)　A:　ʔnuan　　thúp　　ʔaray
　　　　　　Nuan　　hit　　what
　　　　　　'What did Nuan hit?'
　　　　B:　nuan　　thúp　　kɛ̂ːw　　bay　　nán　　tɛ̀ːk
　　　　　　Nuan　　hit　　glass　　Cʟ　　Dᴇᴍ　　be broken
　　　　　　'Nuan broke that glass.'

The part at stake is *kɛ̂ːw bay nán tɛ̀ːk*, meaning 'the glass is broken'. To find out if the construction is an argument subordination, we replace the string with the *What*-question word, as shown in (50A). The result is that the question, although grammatical, is not compatible with the intended answer; i.e. it is not a possible question for the associated answer. We conclude that the nexus is not an argument subordination.

In order to differentiate cosubordination from coordination, we apply a test of operator dependency. If one junct can be modified by operators independently from the other junct, they are related as coordination; if the two juncts are operator-dependent, they are related as cosubordination. However, operators correspond to the layered structure of the sentence; thus, what operators can be used to test for nexus type depends on juncture type. For example, core junctures can have independent nuclear operators in each core, but it would not count as a defining feature for core coordination. Therefore, the illustration of the test for nexus type is provided in the section of each type of construction after we investigate its juncture type.

This section summarizes a framework for dealing with complex constructions. According to RRG, complex constructions can be classified in terms of units and relationship among the units, as junctures and nexus. In order to identify the juncture and nexus type of each construction in Thai, some test frames are proposed. In the following sections we apply these tests to find out the juncture and nexus type of the constructions in question.

4. Juncture and nexus type of the construction with *hây* as a matrix verb

Based on the test proposed in §3, this section investigates the nexus and juncture type of complex constructions with *hây* as a matrix verb.

4.1 Juncture type

As shown earlier, an important criterion for identifying juncture types in Thai is the realization of syntactic and semantic arguments. In nuclear and core junctures, semantic arguments are either obligatorily pooled or shared, respectively, while in clausal junctures they are optionally realized, depending on pragmatic principles. Given this criterion, the complex construction with *hây* as a matrix verb is a core juncture. To illustrate,

(51) phon hây jǔm pay ŋaːnlíaŋ
      Phon give Jum go party
      a. 'Phon let Jum go to the party.'
      b. 'Phon had Jum go to the party.'

(52) *phon hây jǔm lɔn pay ŋaːnlíaŋ
      Phon give Jum 3F go party

In sentence (51) there are two verbs, *hây* 'give' and *pay* 'go', and two core arguments that are syntactically realized, *Phon* and *Jum*. The core argument *Jum* is the undergoer of the matrix verb *hây*, and also the actor of the non-matrix verb pay 'go'. (52) shows that the non-matrix verb 'go' cannot have its semantic argument syntactically realized. Thus, for this type of construction it is obligatory to have a shared core argument. Therefore, this type of construction is a non-clausal juncture since it has obligatorily shared core arguments.

Notice that the argument realization in this type of construction is not a kind of argument pooling since only the core argument that is an undergoer of the matrix junct is shared by the NP in a subject position of the non-matrix junct. To illustrate,

(53) nuan hây jǔm tɕàp sǒmsǐː wáy
      Nuan give Jum catch Somsri OPR
      'Nuan had Jum catch Somsri tightly.'

Sentence (53) shows that *Jum* is the only shared core argument; i.e. it is the undergoer of the verb *hây*, and also the actor of the two-place predicate verb *tɕàp* 'catch' in the non-matrix junct. But the NP *Somsri*, as the undergoer of the verb *tɕàp* 'catch', is not structurally shared by the matrix verb. We conclude then that the construction with *hây* as a matrix verb is not a nuclear juncture since semantic arguments are not pooled together; rather, it is a core juncture.

The above finding is confirmed when we apply the test of adverbial intervention.

For this type of construction adverbs can modify only the matrix core but they must occur at the end of the juncture, as shown below.

(54)   khǎw   hây   tɕhǎn   pay   ŋaːnlían   kàp   khǎw   **yàːŋsǐamâydây**
        3   give   1   go   party   with   3   reluctantly
   'He reluctantly let me go to the party with him.'

(54') *khǎw   hây   **yàːŋsǐamâydây**   tɕhǎn   pay   ŋaːnlían   kàp   khǎw
         3   give   reluctantly   1   go   party   with   3

(54'') *khǎw   hây   tɕhǎn   **yàːŋsǐamâydây**   pay   ŋaːnlían   kàp   khǎw
         3   give   1   reluctantly   go   party   with   3

Ungrammatical sentences (54') and (54'') show that a postverbal adverb, *yàːŋsǐamâydây* 'reluctantly' in this case, is not allowed to occur between the two juncts, neither before nor after the shared argument. However, when it occurs at the end of the juncture, as in (54), the sentence is possible. We conclude that this type of construction is a core juncture since only an adverb that modifies the matrix core is allowed, and it has to occur at the end of the core juncture, not between the two cores.

4.2 Nexus type of *hây* construction

Applying a *What*-question test to *hây* core juncture, we find that a non-matrix junct cannot be replaced by an equivalent question word as an argument can. Examples are shown below.

(55)   A: *nuan   hây   jǔm   ʔaray
           Nuan   give   Jum   what
       'What did Nuan have Jum do?'

       B: nuan   hây   jǔm   tɕàp   sǒmsǐː   wáy
           Nuan   give   Jum   catch   Somsri   OPR
       'Nuan had Jum catch Somsri tightly.'

(55') A: nuan   hây   jǔm   tham   ʔaray
           Nuan   give   Jum   do   what
       'What did Nuan have Jum do?'

The data above show that we cannot substitute a question word as an argument for the whole core. Rather, we have to use the verb of unspecified action *tham* 'do' before a question word as its argument as in (55'). Therefore, a non-matrix core in a *hây*-construction is not an argument of the verb *hây*, so it is not subordination.

Now we test for the dependency of operators between two cores. An important feature of core cosubordination is operator dependence. It is found that each core in a *hây* core juncture can have independent core operators. Therefore, the *hây* construction is core coordination. To illustrate,

(56) mɛ̂ː   tɔ̂ŋ   hây   jǔm   pay   ŋaːnlíaŋ   kàp   phon
      mother must   give   Jum   go   party   with   Phon.
      kɔ̂ː   phrɔ́ʔ   jǔm   rópráw
      then   because Jum   insist
      'Mother had to let Jum go to the party with Phon. That's because Jum insisted.'

(57) ?mɛ̂ː   hây   jǔm   tɔ̂ŋ   pay   ŋaːnlíaŋ   kàp   phon
      mother give   Jum   must   go   party   with   Phon.
      kɔ̂ː   phrɔ́ʔ   jǔm   rópráw
      then   because Jum   insist
      'Mother had Jum be obliged to go to the party with Phon. That's because Jum insisted.'

In (56) the modal of strong obligation *tɔ̂ŋ* 'must' is before the matrix verb *hây*, where the referent *mɛ̂ː* 'mother' is under obligation to 'allow' the situation in the non-matrix to occur, but the obligation is not extended over the situation in the non-matrix junct. The context following this sentence helps clarify that 'Jum' as the referent of the action 'going to the party' is not under obligation. On the contrary, in (57) the modal is before the non-matrix verb, and so the obligation is on the event of *Jum*'s going to the party with *Phon*, such that (57) is not acceptable because its meaning contradicts the next sentence. This means that each core is independent with respect to core operators. Therefore, the *hây* construction is not core cosubordination; rather, it is core coordination.

In this section, following RRG, the juncture and nexus type of a complex construction with *hây* as a matrix verb was investigated. Since the construction exhibits the argument sharing property, it is considered a core juncture. The result is confirmed by the fact that adverbs are not allowed to intervene between the two cores. A *What*-question frame is used to test for Thai argument subordination. To distinguish coordination from subordination, operator dependency is examined. It is found that the construction cannot be asked by a *What*-question, and that each core can be independently modified by core operators, so it is a core coordination.

5. *hây* in other complex constructions

This section investigates complex constructions that have the lexical item *hây* following verbs of various groups, forming three kinds of constructions: jussive, desiderative, and purposive constructions. The discussion for each type of construction begins with the semantic properties of each component in the construction, following §2. Then, the construction is categorized for its juncture and nexus types.

5.1 Jussive constructions

Jussive constructions involve a command, request, or demand made by one participant toward another participant in order for the latter to perform an action (Van Valin & LaPolla 1997:427). This type of construction in Thai is formed by communication verbs, as matrix verbs, which are followed by the *hây* juncture. Such verbs are *tɕhuan* 'persuade', *khɔ̌ː* 'ask for a favor', *bɔ̀ːk* 'tell', and *sàŋ* 'order'. An example is as follows:

(58) nuan   bɔ̀ːk   hây   jǔm   nâŋ   loŋ
     Nuan   tell   give   Jum   sit   DIR
     'Nuan told Jum to sit down.'

5.1.1 Semantic accounts

It seems obvious that when we talk about communication, it is only human communication to which we have access. Verbs in this group, therefore, require human actors. The other semantic question that we investigate is restrictions on the semantic class of verbs in the ultimate resultant state of affairs, expressed in the non-matrix junct of the *hây* juncture. It is found that the classes of verbs that cannot occur in the non-matrix junct of the *hây* juncture are achievement and state verbs, as shown below.

(59) mɛ̂ː   bɔ̀ːk   hây   jǔm   kin   khâːw
     mother   tell   give   Jum   eat   rice
     'Mother told Jum to eat.'
(60) mɛ̂ː   bɔ̀ːk   hây   jǔm   pay   ŋaːnlíaŋ   nán   kàp   phon
     mother   tell   give   Jum   go   party   DEM   with   Phon
     'Mother told Jum to go to that party with Phon.'
(61) *mɛ̂ː   bɔ̀ːk   hây   jǔm   tɕɔ: kràʔpǎw   thîː   hǎːy   pay
     Mother   tell   give   Jum   find   purse   REL   be lost   DIR
     'Mother told Jum to find the lost purse.'

(62) *mɛ̂ː   bɔ̀ːk   hây   jǔm   hǐw
   mother   tell   give   Jum   be hungry
   'Mother told Jum to be hungry.'

The above examples illustrate the co-occurrence of verbs in the non-matrix junct and communication verbs in the matrix. They are categorized as verbs of different semantic classes: *kin* 'eat' as activity, *pay yaːnlíay nán* 'go to that party' as active accomplishment, *tɕɔ:* 'find' as achievement, and *hǐw* 'be hungry' as state. The first two verbs are compatible with the jussive construction while the last two verbs are not. Therefore, we can conclude that the jussive construction does not allow an ultimate state of affairs to be an achievement or state.

So far, we have seen that the semantic characteristics of the jussive construction with communication verbs as matrix verbs are similar to the construction with *hây* as a matrix verb in many respects. First, both require the subject NP to be agent and the ultimate state of affairs to be some verb class other than state or achievement. Still, they differ in that participants in the communicative event must be animate and that the force dynamic pattern is determined by the construction type to be one of impingement.

Recall the example from a previous section in which a shared argument of a *hây* core juncture is allowed to be an inanimate NP, having a semantic role of force. In contrast, this is not allowed in a jussive construction with communication verbs as matrix verbs. To illustrate,

(63) nuan   hây   kɛ̂ːw   klîŋ   pay   rɯ̂ayrɯ̂ay
   Nuan   give   glass   roll   DIR   continually
   'Nuan let the glass keep rolling.'
(64) *nuan   bɔ̀ːk   hây   kɛ̂ːw   klîŋ   pay   rɯ̂ayrɯ̂ay
   Nuan   tell   give   glass   roll   DIR   continually
   'Nuan told the glass to keep rolling.'

The above data show that in a jussive construction the shared argument within the *hây* core juncture is required by the matrix verb, the communication verb, to be animate. It should be noted that one could imagine (64) a grammatical and acceptable sentence only if it occurs in an imaginary text such as a fairy tale or a story where the 'glass' is metaphorized as a person. In this case, the shared argument in (64) would be considered animate, rather than inanimate.

With respect to the force dynamic pattern, the interpretation of the situation in the ultimate core is limited to only one type of causation, i.e. impingement. In other words, the agent forces the non-agent to perform an action. What kind of obligation it is

depends upon the matrix verb itself; say, if the matrix verb is *sàŋ* 'order', the actor of the ultimate core is 'forced' under strong obligation while if it is *khɔ̌ː* 'request' or *tɕhuan* 'persuade', then, the actor is forced under weak obligation. By all means, they are obligations on the actor to perform the action without any ambiguity.

To sum up, this type of construction requires that core arguments and the state of affairs in the ultimate core be highly restricted. First, both participants involved in the action must be animate. Second, the action must be either an activity or an accomplishment. Finally, the force dynamic relation involved is one of impingement.

5.1.2 Clausal linkage

The juncture and nexus type of the jussive construction with *hây* is core coordination. As for its juncture type, shared arguments are obligatory in this construction, so it is a core juncture. To illustrate,

(65)   nuan   bɔ̀ːk   hây   jǔm   nâŋ   loŋ
        Nuan   tell   give   Jum   sit   Dɪʀ
        'Nuan told Jum to sit down.'

(66)   *nuan   bɔ̀ːk   lɔ̀n   hây   jǔm   nâŋ   loŋ
         Nuan   tell   3F   give   Jum   sit   Dɪʀ
        'Nuan told Jum to sit down.'

The above data show that there is a shared core argument, i.e. the actor of the communication verb *bɔ̀ːk* 'tell' and the actor of the verb *hây*; only one NP is syntactically realized.

Furthermore, to express the semantic relation of jussive, it is required that the undergoer of the matrix verb be the addressee that occurs as an actor in the ultimate core. Thus, the obligatorily shared argument is a semantic argument of three predicates, namely, the communication verb, *hây* and a verb in the ultimate core. This can be seen in the following examples.

(67)   phon   bɔ̀ːk   nuan   hây   jǔm   nâŋ   loŋ
        Phon   tell   Nuan   give   Jum   sit   Dɪʀ
        'Phon told Nuan, "Make Jum sit down".'

Sentence (67) is possible in Thai if one wants to express what is shown in the translation, but it is not a jussive construction. The request from the participant *Phon* is not a direct obligation upon the ultimate participant *Jum*, and it tends to be interpreted as just a quotation.

I therefore conclude that in a jussive construction the matrix verb of communication is related to the *hây* juncture at the core level because shared arguments are obligatory to yield the jussive construction.

Also, the test of adverbial intervention confirms that in a jussive construction the communication verb is related to the verb *hây* at the core level. To illustrate,

(68)   phon   bɔ̀ːk   hây   jŭm   nâŋ   loŋ   dûay   sĭaŋ   sùʔphâːp
        Phon   tell   give   Jum   sit   DIR   with   voice   polite
        'Phon told Jum to sit down with a polite voice.'

(69)   *phon   bɔ̀ːk   dûay   sĭaŋ   sùʔphâːp   hây   jŭm   nâŋ   loŋ
        Phon   tell   with   voice   polite   give   Jum   sit   DIR
        'Phon told Jum to sit down with a polite voice.'
        ?'Phon told with a polite voice, "Let Jum sit down."'

In (68) the adverb phrase *dûay sĭaŋ sùʔphâːp* 'with a polite voice', which modifies the matrix verb *bɔ̀ːk* 'tell', occurs at the end of the juncture. But when we put the adverb phrase between the communication verb and the *hây* juncture, the sentence is unacceptable, as seen in (69). We conclude, therefore, that in a jussive construction the communication verb is related to the *hây* juncture at the core level.

To test for argument subordination, we apply the *What*-question test as proposed before. It turns out that the jussive construction fails this test.

(70)   A: *phon   bɔ̀ːk   ʔàray
            Phon   tell   what
            'What did Phon tell?'

        B: phon   bɔ̀ːk   hây   jŭm   nâŋ   loŋ
            Phon   tell   give   Jum   sit   DIR
            'Phon told Jum to sit down.'

(70')   A: phon   bɔ̀ːk   hây   jŭm   tham   ʔaray
            Phon   tell   give   Jum   do   what
            'What did Phon tell Jum to do?'

The above data show that we cannot replace the *hây* core juncture with a question word to compose a question: (70A) is not an associative question for an answer in jussive form, as shown in (70B). A compatible question for (70B) would be (70'), where a verb of unspecified action *tham* 'do' replaces a verb in the ultimate core and then is followed by the question word *ʔaray* 'what'. Therefore, the relationship between the communication verb and the *hây* core juncture is not one of subordination.

To distinguish between coordination and cosubordination, we consider the semantic dependency of operators: operators can modify the matrix core independently. Therefore, the nexus is coordination.

(71)　mɛ̂ː　　tɔ̂ŋ　　khɔ̌ː　　hây　　jǔm　　kin　　khâːw
　　　　mother　must　ask　　give　Jum　eat　　rice
　　　　'Mother had to ask Jum to eat.'

In sentence (71) the modal of obligation *tɔ̂ŋ* 'must' occurs before the matrix verb *khɔ̌ː* 'ask', in which only the referent *mɛ̂ː* 'mother' is under obligation of 'asking for a favor'. Also, as discussed before, the degree of obligation on the participant of the ultimate core depends on the matrix verb. Since the matrix verb is *khɔ̌ː* 'ask for a favor', the obligation is weak. However, *tɔ̂ŋ* 'must' is a modal of strong obligation, and yet the *hây* juncture is compatible with the matrix verb modified by *tɔ̂ŋ*. This means that the matrix core can have independent core operators, and that the obligation on the participant in the ultimate core is not affected by such a modification. Therefore, this type of construction is core coordination.

Finally, the semantic representation of the jussive construction can be formulated as follows:

(72)　**want′** (nuan, [BECOME **do′** (Jum, [**close′** (Jum, nâːtàːŋ)])])
　　　　∧ DO (Nuan, [[**do′** (nuan, ∅)] CAUSE [BECOME **do′** (Jum, [**close′** (Jum, nâːtàːŋ)])]])

(72')　[**want′** (x, LS_2) ∧ DO (x, [LS_1 CAUSE LS_2])]
　　　　LS_1 = 　[DO (x, [**express**.(α).**to**.(β).**in.language**.(γ) ′ (x, y)])]
　　　　LS_2 = 　[do′ (y, [**pred′** (y) or (y, z)])] or [BECOME **pred′** (y) or (y, z)]
　　　　　　where 　α, γ 　= 　∅
　　　　　　　　　　β 　　= 　y

The schema proposed by Jolly (1993) is adopted. The participant represented by the *x* argument has intent for a state of affairs represented by LS_2. The participant *x* also performs a communicative action, represented by LS_1, with intent for an impingement on the other participant, represented by the *y* argument, to perform an action. The *y* argument is both the addressee of the communicative situation and the actor intended to perform an action in the ultimate core. Thus, the *y* argument is obligatorily shared by the matrix core of the communication verb and the *hây* core juncture. Note that the α and β arguments of **express′** are represented as zeroes because the utterance is unspecified and the language is irrelevant. As a matter of fact, it is not merely an utterance; rather, it

is an order of some kind. The semantic representation of *hây* is combined with that of a communication verb. The ultimate core, LS$_2$, requires animate subjects and verbs of activity or accomplishment.

The following illustrates the semantic representation of a jussive construction.

(73)　mɛ̂ː　　bɔ̀ːk　hây　jŭm　　kin　　khâːw
　　　mother　tell　give　Jum　　eat　　rice
　　　'Mother told Jum to eat.'

(73')　[**want′** (mɛ̂ː, [**do′** (Jum, [**eat′** (Jum, khâːw)])]) ∧ DO (mɛ̂ː, [[DO (mɛ̂ː, [**express′**.(α).to.(β).**in.language**.(γ)′ (mɛ̂ː, Jum)])] CAUSE [**do′** (Jum, [**eat′** (Jum, khâːw)])]])]

5.2 Desiderative constructions

Desiderative constructions involve the expression of a participant's attitude, judgment, or opinion regarding a state of affairs (Van Valin & LaPolla 1997:427). In Thai they are formed by verbs of psych-action followed by *hây* and a subclausal unit. Verbs of psych-action include *yàːk* 'want (informal)' *tɔ̂ŋkaːn* 'want (formal)', and *pràːtthanǎː* 'wish'.

An example of this type of construction is shown in (74):

(74)　jŭm　　yàːk　　hây　　nuan　　pay　　ŋaːnlíaŋ
　　　Jum　　want　　give　　Nuan　　go　　party
　　　'Jum wants Nuan to go to the party.'

Sentence (75) indicates a desire of the participant *Jum*, expressed as the subject NP, for an action of *Nuan*, another participant.

5.2.1 Semantic accounts

With respect to semantic restrictions, these verbs, by themselves, always require their subject NPs to be animate, as shown below.

(75)　jŭm　　yàːk　　pay　　ŋaːnlíaŋ　　kàp　　phon
　　　Jum　　want　　go　　party　　with　　Phon
　　　'Jum wanted to go to the party with Phon.'

(76) *phaːyúʔ   yàːk   phát   pay   thaːŋ   nán
     storm   want   blow   DIR   way   that
     'The storm wants to blow towards that direction.'

The data in (75) and (76) show that only an animate subject is allowed for the psych-action verb *yàːk* 'want'.

Besides animacy, another important semantic aspect is the semantic class of the verb in the non-matrix junct. There is no semantic restriction on the class of the verb that indicates an ultimate state of affairs intended by the participant expressed in the subject position. To illustrate,

(77) nuan   yàːk   hây   jŭm   kin   khâːw
     Nuan   want   give   Jum   eat   rice
     'Nuan wants for Jum to eat.'

(78) nuan   yàːk   hây   ʔaːkàːt   nay   hôŋ   thàːytheː
     Nuan   want   give   air   in   room   circulate
     'Nuan wants the air in the room to circulate.'

(79) nuan   yàːk   hây   jŭm   tɕəː   kràʔpǎw   thîː   hǎːy   pay
     Nuan   want   give   Jum   find   purse   REL   be lost   DIR
     'Nuan wants Jum to find her lost purse.'

(80) phon   yàːk   hây   rót   sǐa
     Phon   want   give   car   be broken
     phrɔ́ʔ   khǎw   mây   yàːk   pay   roːŋrian
     because   3   not   want   go   school
     'Phon wishes the car would break down because he does not want to go to school.'

Sentences (77) to (80) show instances of constructions with verbs from various classes: activity, accomplishment, achievement, and state, respectively. They show that verbs in the non-matrix junct are not restricted to only activity or accomplishment as in the case where *hây* is the only matrix verb in the juncture.

To sum up, a desiderative construction with a psych-action verb in the matrix core, followed by another junct beginning with *hây*, requires the subject to be animate, but the semantic class of the embedded verb is not restricted.

5.2.2 Clausal linkage

Regarding its juncture and nexus type, the desiderative construction with a psych-

action verb as a matrix verb preceding another junct beginning with *hây* is core subordination. It is related to the *hây* juncture at the core level because a postverbal adverb is allowed to modify the matrix verb but restricted to occur at the end of the juncture; it is subordination because it is compatible with the *What*-question test.

For this type of construction, there is no semantic argument that is shared by the two cores. To illustrate,

(81) phon   yàːk   hây   nuan   pay   ŋaːnlíaŋ
      Phon   want   give   Nuan   go   party
      'Phon wanted Nuan to go to the party.'

(82) phon   yàːk   pay   ŋaːnlíaŋ
      Phon   want   go   party
      'Phon wanted to go to the party.'

(83) *phon   yàːk   nuan
      Phon   want   Nuan
      'Phon wanted Nuan.'

In both sentences (81) and (82), the matrix verb is followed by a subclausal unit whereas in (83) a lexical argument *Nuan* follows. The data show that the psych-action verb *yàːk* 'want' can have only a subclausal unit, not a lexical argument. This means that the semantic structure of the verb *yàːk* does not have a semantic argument to be shared with a logical structure in another subclausal unit.

Although this type of construction does not exhibit the property of shared semantic arguments, it is classified as a core juncture when we apply the test of adverb intervention. To illustrate,

(84)   khăw   yàːk   hây   tɕhăn   pay   ŋaːnlíaŋ   kàp   khăw   **lŭakəːn**
       3   want   give 1   go   party   with 3   excessively
       'He wants badly for me to go to the party with him.'

(84') *khăw   yàːk   **lŭakəːn**   hây   tɕhăn   pay   ŋaːnlíaŋ   kàp   khăw
       3   want   excessively   give 1   go   party   with 3

Sentence (84) is acceptable when the postverbal adverb *lŭakəːn* 'excessively', which modifies the matrix verb *yàːk* 'want', occurs at the end of the juncture. But when we put the adverb after the psych-action verb and before *hây*, the sentence is unacceptable, as seen in (84'). We can conclude that a desiderative construction is a core juncture.

As for the nexus type, the *hây* core juncture can substitute for the argument position of the psych-action verb, as tested in a *What*-question, so it is classified as subordination. To illustrate,

(85) A: phon tôŋkaːn ʔaray ʔiːk lâʔ khraːwníː
          Phon want   what   again PPRT this time
          'What does he want this time?'

      B: khǎw tôŋkaːn hây tçhǎn pay ŋaːnlíaŋ kàp khǎw phrûŋníː
          3   want   give 1   go   party   with 3   tomorrow
          'He wanted for me to go to the party with him tomorrow.'

The question and answer in (85) show that the relationship between the two cores is one of argument subordination.

The semantic representation of a construction of this kind would be as follows:

(86) [**want′** (x, LS)]

From the above logical structure, the psych-action verb has two arguments: the *x* argument, and a subclausal unit, represented by LS, which expresses any kind of state of affairs. The following illustrates the semantic representation of the desiderative construction.

(87) nuan yàːk hây jǔm kin khâːw
      Nuan want give Jum eat rice
      'Nuan wants for Jum to eat.'

(87') [**want′** (Nuan, [DO (**eat′** (Jum, khâːw))])]

Sentence (87) is represented as a semantic structure in (87'), which has two arguments, a lexical argument and a core.

5.3 Purposive constructions

Purposive constructions involve an action performed with the intent of realizing another state of affairs (Van Valin & LaPolla 1997:427). In Thai, matrix verbs in this type of construction include a wide range of semantic fields; e.g. *baŋkháp* 'force', *plòy* 'release', *phlàk* 'push', *duŋ* 'pull', and *thúp* 'hit'. An example is as follows:

(88) nuan phlàk jǔm hây tòk nám
      Nuan push Jum give fall water
      'Nuan pushed Jum in order for her to fall into the water.'

Sentence (88) is made up of an activity verb *phlàk* 'push' as a matrix verb, followed by

another junct beginning with *hây*, expressing a state *tòk* 'fall' as an ultimate result.

5.3.1 Semantic accounts

With respect to the animacy restriction, verbs in this group allow an inanimate subject NP, but when they combine with a *hây* juncture, they require an animate subject NP.

(89) phaːyúʔ kamlaŋ phát pay thaːŋ tàʔlàːt
     storm PROG blow DIR towards market
     'The storm is blowing towards the market.'

(90) phaːyúʔ phát bâːn khǎw phaŋ
     storm blow house 3 be damaged
     'The storm blew his house down.'

(91) *phaːyúʔ phát hây bâːn khǎw phaŋ
     storm blow give house 3 be damaged
     'The storm blew in order for his house to be broken down.'

The above examples show the usage of the verb *phát* 'blow'. In a simple construction, as in (89), it can have an inanimate subject *phaːyúʔ* 'storm'. Likewise, in a causative construction in (90), the same verb allows an inanimate subject. However, when the matrix junct is followed by a junct with *hây* as in (91), the sentence is not possible. Therefore, we conclude that the purposive construction requires an animate subject.

As far as interclausal semantic relations are concerned, the fact that inanimate subjects are not compatible with this kind of construction confirms that this type of construction is not a causative construction, which requires an intentional agent in its semantic component. Rather, this construction is a purposive construction.

The next question concerns the semantic characteristics of the ultimate state of affairs in the non-matrix junct following *hây*.

(92) nuan phlàk kɛ̂ːw hây klîŋ pay rɯ̂ayrɯ̂ay
     Nuan push glass give roll DIR continually
     'Nuan pushed the glass in order for it to keep rolling.'

(93) nuan thúp kɛ̂ːw hây tɛ̀ːk
     Nuan hit glass give be broken
     'Nuan hit the glass in order for it to be broken.'

(94)   nuan   khon   námtaːn   hây   lá: laːy
         Nuan   stir   sugar   give   dissolve
         'Nuan stirred sugar in order for it to dissolve.'

(95)   nuan   lâːk   tɕhɯ̂ak   tháŋ   sɔ́ːŋ   sên   hây   bantɕop   kan
         Nuan   pull   rope   both   two   Cʟ   give   meet   each other
         'Nuan pulled both ropes in order for them to meet.'

Sentences (92)-(95) exemplify purposive constructions with an ultimate state of affairs from various semantic classes, namely, activity, state, accomplishment, and achievement respectively. Thus, we see that for this type of construction there is no restriction on the semantic class of the ultimate state of affairs.

At this point, we can summarize that the only semantic restriction affected by the occurrence of *hây* that remains in this type of construction is that of animacy on the subject NP.

5.3.2 Clausal linkage

In terms of clausal structure, the purposive construction can be classified as clausal coordination. Matrix verbs are considered to relate to the non-matrix junct at the clausal level because the construction does not require an obligatory shared argument and adverbs can intervene between the matrix verb and the *hây* juncture.

First, compare the following sentences:

(96)   nuan   dɯɯŋ   dâːy   hây   khàːt
         Nuan   pull   thread   give   be torn
         'Nuan pulled the thread$_i$ in order for it$_{i/j}$ to come apart.'

(97)   nuan   dɯɯŋ   dâːy   hây   dâːy   khàːt
         Nuan   pull   thread   give   thread   be torn
         'Nuan pulled the thread$_i$ to have it$_i$ become torn apart.'

Both (96) and (97) are instances of purposive constructions. In (96) there is a missing argument, i.e. the undergoer of the verb *khàːt* 'be torn', but the reference of the zero can be recovered as the undergoer of the matrix, i.e. *dâːy* 'thread'. Sentence (97) has the same interpretation as (96), but the undergoer of the ultimate state of affairs is realized as a full noun phrase. This shows that the missing argument, or zero, in a purposive construction is not obligatory.

Also, we can have a sentence in which only the undergoer of the ultimate core is realized, leaving a gap in the position of undergoer of the matrix verb, as shown below.

(98) nuan   dɯɯŋ   hây   dâːy   khàːt
      Nuan   pull   give   thread   be torn
      'Nuan pulled it$_{i/j}$ in order for the thread$_j$ to be apart.'

There is a zero as an undergoer of the matrix verb *dɯɯŋ* 'pull' in (98). However, its reference is not bound to the realized noun phrase in the ultimate core. It is possible that the zero refers to a noun phrase other than *dâːy* 'thread'. The following sentence illustrates such a possibility.

(99) raw   tɔ̂ŋ   tɕàp   tàʔkhèp   tháŋ   sɔ̌ːŋ   khâːŋ
      we   must   hold   seam   both   two   side
      lǽːw   dɯɯŋ   hây   dâːy   khàːt
      then   pull   give   thread   be torn
      'We must hold both seams$_i$. Then, we pull them$_i$ in order for the thread to come apart.'

The sentence in (99) shows that a zero argument of the matrix verb is not necessarily a null form of the undergoer of the ultimate junct. The undergoer of the verb *dɯɯŋ* is a zero pronoun referring to *tàʔkhèp* 'seam', not 'thread'.

The above shows that in a purposive construction the matrix junct is related to the non-matrix junct at the clausal level. This is confirmed by the fact that the two juncts can be intervened by adverbs. As an example:

(100) nuan   khàyàw   tóʔ   **ræːŋræːŋ**   hây   kɛ̂ːw   klîŋ   payma:
      Nuan   shake   table quite hard   give   glass   roll   DIR
      'Nuan shook the table hard in order for the glass to keep rolling.'
(101) ?nuan   khàyàw   tóʔ   hây   kɛ̂ːw   klîŋ   payma: **ræːŋræːŋ**
      Nuan   shake   table give   glass   roll   DIR   quite hard
      *'Nuan shook the table hard in order for the glass to keep rolling.'
      ?'Nuan shook the table in order for the glass to keep rolling strongly.'

In (100) the matrix verb is modified by an adverb *ræːŋræːŋ* 'hard' and it has to occur right at the end of the matrix junct; when it occurs at the end of the non-matrix unit, the sentence is unacceptable, as in (101). In other words, matrix adverbs occur between the two juncts in this type of construction, so the construction is a clausal juncture.

As for its nexus type, the non-matrix junct with *hây* cannot be substituted for the argument position of the matrix verb, as shown by the *What*-question test, so it is not argument subordination. To illustrate,

(102) A: *phon   dɯɯŋ   ʔaray
           Phon   pull   what
           'What did Phon pull?'
       B: nuan   dɯɯŋ   hây   dâːy   khàːt
           Phon   pull   give   thread be torn
           'Phon pulled it/them$_{i/j}$ in order for the thread$_j$ to be apart.'

The above data show that we cannot replace the *hây* non-matrix junct with a question word to compose a question. Thus, (103A) is not a compatible question for the answer in (102B). A compatible question for (102B) would be the question in (103) as follows:

(103) A: phon   dɯɯŋ   thammay
           Phon   pull   why
           'Why did Phon pull?'

The question in (103), with the question word *thammay* 'why', is acceptable for an answer that is a purposive construction with *hây* as in (102B). Therefore, the relationship between the matrix verb and the *hây* core juncture is not the argument subordination.

The following is to find out whether the purposive construction is coordination or cosubordination. Since the purposive construction is a clausal juncture, operators to be used would be clausal operators. Crucially, the last junct is not allowed to be independently modified by temporal operators.

Consider the following examples.

(104) nuan   tɕàʔ   khàyàw   tóʔ   hây   kɛ̂ːw   klîŋ   paymaː
       Nuan   FUT   shake   table give glass   roll   DIR
       'Nuan shook the table in order for the glass to roll back and forth.'
(105) *nuan   khàyàw   tóʔ   hây   kɛ̂ːw   tɕàʔ   klîŋ   paymaː
       Nuan   shake   table give glass   FUT   roll   DIR

From the above we see that sentence (104) has a future marker modifying the matrix verb *khàyàw* 'shake'. However, when we modify the ultimate junct with the same marker, as in (105), the sentence is not acceptable. Note that the ultimate state of affairs is a result intended by the participant, expressed by the subject NP, to occur subsequently. Therefore, the ungrammaticality of (105) cannot be ascribed to semantic factors.

It should be noted that a purposive construction with a conjunction *phɯ̂a* 'for (conj.)' has an irrealis marker, which is a clausal operator, as shown below.

(106) nuan khàyàw tóʔ phɯ̂a   kɛ̂:w tɕàʔ dây klîŋ payma:
       Nuan shake   table for (CONJ) glass IRR   get   roll   DIR
       'Nuan shook the table in order that the glass would roll back and forth.'

Sentence (106) shows that an irrealis modifier *tɕàʔdây* occurs in the non-matrix clause.

However, comparing the two kinds of purposive constructions in terms of temporal modification, we find that the one with a conjunction must be overtly marked for irrealis, while the one with *hây* cannot have an overt marker, but the irrealis reading is implied by virtue of the construction type. To illustrate,

(107) *nuan khàyàw tóʔ phɯ̂a   kɛ̂:w klîŋ payma:
        Nuan   shake   table for (CONJ) glass roll   DIR
        'Nuan shook the table in order that the glass would roll back and forth.'
(108) nuan khàyàw tóʔ hây   kɛ̂:w klîŋ payma:
       Nuan shake   table give glass roll   DIR
       'Nuan shook the table in order for the glass to roll back and forth.'

Therefore, the operator modification in the ultimate clause in a purposive construction with *hây* is not independent; rather, it relies on the overall construction. We conclude that the nexus type of the purposive construction with *hây* is cosubordination.

Thus, we can formulate the semantic representation of this type of construction as follows:

(109) [**want′** (x, LS$_2$)] ∧ [DO (x, [LS$_1$ cause LS$_2$])]

The schema proposed by Jolly (1993) is adopted. The participant represented by the *x* argument intends for a state of affairs represented by LS$_2$, which is caused to occur by an action represented by LS$_1$.

The following illustrates the semantic representation of the purposive construction.

(110) nuan khàyàw tóʔ hây   kɛ̂:w klîŋ payma:
       Nuan shake   table give glass roll   DIR
       'Nuan shook the table in order for the glass to roll back and forth.'
(110') [**want′** (nuan, [**do′** (kɛ̂:w, [**roll′** (kɛ̂:w)])])] ∧ [DO (nuan, [**shake′** (nuan, tóʔ) CAUSE <$_{DIR}$ [**do′** (kɛ̂:w, [**roll′** (kɛ̂:w)])])]>])]

Sentence (110) is represented as a semantic structure in (110'), which has two arguments, a lexical argument and a core.

Suda Rangkupan

5.4 *hây* and mood in Thai

According to my corpus of data, another type of construction is found:

(111) nuan khuan phûut kàp phûuyày hây sùʔphâap
       Nuan should speak with adults give polite
       'Nuan should speak with adults in such a way that it sounds polite.'

In this type of construction, the non-matrix verb is a verb of good quality or manner, such as *dii* 'good', and *thùuk* 'correct'.

Song (1997) has analyzed *hây* in this type of construction as having an adverb-forming function such that *hây sùʔphâap* is equivalent to 'politely'. However, it is found that this type of construction can occur only in some particular modes, i.e. compulsive, advisory, or obligative.[1] These modes are often marked by modal preverbs in Thai. The data in (112) show that this type of construction cannot be in the assertive mode.

(112) *nuan phûut kàp phûuyày hây sùʔphâap
       Nuan speak with adults give polite
       'Nuan spoke with adults in such a way that it sounded polite.'

Note that in Thai we can modify the main verb by adding another verb, forming a serial verb construction as shown below.

(113) nuan phûut sùʔphâap
       Nuan speak polite
       'Nuan speaks politely.'

Moreover, it is possible for the non-matrix verb to have a dummy subject man 'it' as illustrated in (114).

(114) nuan nâatɕàʔ phûut kàp phûuyày hây man sùʔphâap nɔ̀y
       Nuan should speak with adults give it polite FP
       'Nuan should speak with adults in such a way that it sounds polite.'

Therefore, *hây* in this case should not be analyzed as an adverb marker. Since the

---

[1] These mood categories follow Jespersen (1924).

construction allows a dummy subject to occur in the non-matrix clause, it should be a clausal juncture. Due to its restriction to some modes, so-called agent-oriented modality (Bybee et al. 1994:177), it should be analyzed as a special case of a desiderative construction which has only one component of the semantic schema, i.e. **want′** (x, LS). However, the argument *x* in this case does not refer to the subject of the sentence but to the speaker who imposes his/her attitude toward the event. Notice that there is not a CAUSE component in this type of construction. Therefore, it should not be grouped with the purposive construction as argued by Thepkanjana & Uehara (forthcoming).

5.5 The syntactic category of *hây*: a verb or a marker

We have seen that *hây* occurs after three kinds of verbs, forming three types of construction: jussive, desiderative, and purposive. The last question for this analysis is whether *hây* itself is a verb or a clausal linkage marker.

According to Van Valin & LaPolla (1997), linkage markers (LM) are a category of markers that function as linking subclausal units, including such elements as adpositions, determiners and case markers. Clausal linkage markers tend to occur in core and clausal junctures, not in nuclear junctures.

Since these three constructions are either core or clausal junctures, *hây* in these cases could be analyzed as LM. However, *hây* in purposive and desiderative constructions, on the one hand, and *hây* in jussive constructions, on the other, are different with respect to its occurrence in question. To illustrate,

(115) phon   bɔ̀ːk   hây   jǔm   tham   ʔaray
       Phon   tell   give   Jum   do   what
       'What did Phon tell Jum to do?'

(116) phon   tɔ̂ŋkaːn   ʔaray
       Phon   want   what
       'What does Phon want?'

(117) phon   dɯɯŋ   thammay
       Phon   pull   why
       'Why did Phon pull?'

From the above, to ask about a desire, which is presumably to be answered in a desiderative form, we do not include *hây* in a question. Likewise, to ask about a purpose, with an intended answer in a purposive form, *hây* is not expressed in a question. However, it is not the case for jussive, in which we do not have any other ways to express a question in such a form without *hây*. It is concluded that *hây* in a jussive construction functions as a verb proper while in a desiderative construction and a purposive

construction it is an LM.

Further evidence is the fact that the restriction on the semantic class of verbs in the ultimate core in a jussive construction is the same as that of the construction with *hây* as a matrix verb. That is, both a jussive construction and a construction with *hây* as a matrix verb do not allow state verbs or achievement verbs to occur in the ultimate core. In other words, the *hây* core juncture is simply conjoined to the matrix verb of communication; *hây* retains its semantic properties as a verb in this type of construction. However, in a desiderative construction and a purposive construction, a semantic class of a verb in an ultimate core or clause, respectively, is not restricted; rather, it can be any class, whether an activity, accomplishment, state, or achievement. This confirms that only *hây* in a jussive construction is a verb, while in a desiderative or purposive construction *hây* is a clause linkage marker.

To sum up, a *hây* subclausal unit occurs after verbs of various kinds, making up three different types of constructions. A jussive construction, composed of matrix verbs of communication followed by the *hây* core juncture, is core coordination. A desiderative construction is core subordination. It is formed by conjoining a matrix core of a psych-action verb with another core by the LM *hây*; and, the non-matrix core is an argument. A purposive construction, which is a clausal cosubordination, has two clauses conjoined by the LM *hây*.

6. Conclusion

This paper investigates *hây* complex constructions, aiming to find out the nature of the clausal linkage between *hây* and other verbs in the construction. It proposes that in order to achieve such a goal, the semantic properties of the lexical item in various types of constructions should be investigated in a unified manner. As a verb in simple constructions, *hây* is a verb of possession transfer and has a component of causation in its semantic structure. Besides, it is a beneficiary marker, indicating deputative and recipient beneficiaries, with two semantic components, namely, intent and causation. As a focus of interest, *hây* is also a matrix verb in a complex construction, involving the intent of one participant for an action performed by another participant to occur. Considering these three usages, we find shared semantic properties among them: *hây* requires an animate subject with an intent towards an action of another participant. Its semantic structure corresponds to the schema proposed by Jolly (1993) for a purposive marker in English, as shown in (118).

(118) $[\textbf{want}' (x, LS_2)] \wedge [DO (x, [LS_1 \wedge CAUSE\ LS_2])]$

When we investigate complex constructions with respect to these semantic components, we find that each construction has different restrictions on each component. A jussive construction, which is a core coordination, has the most restrictions on the semantic classes of LS$_2$, and an obligation on the other participant is required. A core coordination, with *hây* as a matrix verb, requires LS$_2$ to be only an activity or accomplishment as well, but does not impose a necessary obligation on the other participant. The psych-action construction has no semantic restriction on LS$_2$. But as an argument of the matrix verb, LS$_2$ is not structurally independent. In a purposive construction, the non-matrix clause marked by *hây* is structurally independent but it is operator-dependent in the sense that its temporal setting can be implicational only, by virtue of the construction type. To sum up, in terms of unit types, *hây*-complex constructions can be classified as either a core or a clause. In terms of the relationship between sub-clausal units, they exhibit all three types of nexus—coordination, subordination, and cosubordination. The juncture and nexus type of each construction can be summarized in the table below.

	Properties	Causative	Jussive	Desiderative	Purposive
Verb class	1. Activity & Accomplishment	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
	2. State & Achievement	No	No	Yes	Yes
Syntactic category		*Verb*	*Verb*	*LM*	*LM*
Juncture	1. Obligatorily shared argument	Yes	Yes	No	No
	2. Intervention of adverbs between cores	No	No	No	Yes
Juncture type		*Core*	*Core*	*Core*	*Clausal*
Nexus	1. What-test	No	No	Yes	No
	2. Independently modified by operators	Yes	Yes	Yes	No
Nexus type		*Coordination*	*Coordination*	*Subordination*	*Cosubordination*

This paper suggests that studying complex constructions in Thai requires an analysis of various kinds of semantic properties. The lexical item *hây* in a complex construction can be classified as a verb and a linkage marker. Considering only its syntactic behaviors is not adequate to account for its wide range of usages. By providing a consistent framework for both its semantics and syntax, RRG yields a unified account of this phenomenon.

References

Adams, Karen L., and Thomas John Hudak. (eds.) 1994. *Papers from the Second Annual Meeting of the Southeast Asian Linguistics Society 1992*. Tempe: Arizona State University.

Aroonmanakun, Wirote. 2001. Thai concordance. Provided by Department of Linguistics, Chulalongkorn University. http://www.arts.chula.ac.th/~ling/ThaiConc/.

Bybee, Joan, Revere Perkins, and William Pagliuca. 1994. *The Evolution of Grammar: Tense, Aspect and Modality in the Languages of the World*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Dejthamrong, Orathai. 1970. *Grammatical Functions of The Word "haj" in the Thai Language*. Bangkok: Chulalongkorn University MA thesis.

Grima, John. 1978. *Categories of Zero Nominal Reference and Clausal Structures in Thai.* Urbana-Champaign: University of Illinois dissertation.

Hansell, Mark. 1993. Serial verbs and complement constructions in Mandarin: a clause linkage analysis. *Advances in Role and Reference Grammar*, ed. by Van Valin, 197-233. Amsterdam and Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Indrambarya, Kitima. 1992. The grammatical function of "hây" in Thai. *Pan-Asiatic Linguistics: Proceedings of the Third International Symposium*, Vol. 3, 1163-1177. Bangkok: Chulalongkorn University Press.

Jespersen, Otto. 1924. *The Philosophy of Grammar*. London: George Allen & Unwin.

Jolly, Julia. 1993. Preposition assignment in English. *Advances in Role and Reference Grammar*, ed. by Van Valin, 275-310. Amsterdam and Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Joseph, Brian D., and Arnold M. Zwicky. (eds.) 1990. *When Verbs Collide: Papers from the 1990 Ohio State Mini-Conference on Serial Verbs*. Working Papers in Linguistics 39. Columbus: Ohio State University.

Kullavanijaya, Pranee. 1974. *Transitive Verbs in Thai*. Honolulu: University of Hawai'i dissertation.

Needleman, Rosa. 1973. *Tai Verbal Structures and Some Implications for Current Linguistic Theory*. Los Angeles: University of California dissertation.

Newman, John. (ed.) 1997. *The Linguistics of Giving*. Amsterdam and Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Pingkarawat, Namtip. 1989. *Empty Noun Phrases and the Theory of Control, with Special Reference to Thai*. Urbana-Champaign: University of Illinois dissertation.

Sebba, Mark. 1987. *The Syntax of Serial Verbs: An Investigation into Serialisation in Sranan and Other Languages*. Amsterdam and Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Seuren, Pieter A. M. 1990. Serial verb constructions. *When Verbs Collide: Papers from*

the 1990 Ohio State Mini-Conference on Serial Verbs, ed. by Brian D. Joseph and Arnold M. Zwicky, 14-33. Working Papers in Linguistics 39. Columbus: Ohio State University.

Song, Jae Jung. 1997. On the development of MANNER from GIVE. *The Linguistics of Giving*, ed. by John Newman, 327-348. Amsterdam and Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Starosta, Stanley. 1988. *The Case for Lexicase: An Outline of Lexicase Grammatical Theory*. London and New York: Pinter.

Talmy, Leonard. 1988. Force dynamics in language and cognition. *Cognitive Science* 12.1:49-100.

Thepkanjana, Kingkarn. 1986. *Serial Verb Constructions in Thai*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan dissertation.

Thepkanjana, Kingkarn, and Satoshi Uehara. (forthcoming). The verb of giving in Thai and Mandarin Chinese as a case of polysemy: a comparative study.

Van Valin, Robert D. Jr. (ed.) 1993. *Advances in Role and Reference Grammar*. Amsterdam and Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Van Valin, Robert D. Jr., and Randy J. LaPolla. 1997. *Syntax: Structure, Meaning and Function*. Cambridge and New York: Cambridge University Press.

Voorhoeve, Jan. 1975. Serial verbs in Creole. Paper presented at Hawai'i Pidgin and Creole Conference.

Wilawan, Supriya. 1993. *A Reanalysis of So-called Serial Verb Constructions in Thai, Khmer, Mandarin Chinese, and Yaruba*. Honolulu: University of Hawai'i dissertation.

Warotamasikkhadit, Udom. 1994. Is *hây* really a benefactive-causative in Thai? *Papers from the Second Annual Meeting of the Southeast Asian Linguistics Society 1992*, ed. by Karen L. Adams and Thomas John Hudak, 383-388. Tempe: Arizona State University.

Zwicky, Arnold M. 1990. What are we talking about when we talk about serial verbs? *When Verbs Collide: Papers from the 1990 Ohio State Mini-Conference on Serial Verbs*, ed. by Brian D. Joseph and Arnold M. Zwicky, 1-13. Working Papers in Linguistics 39. Columbus: Ohio State University.

Linguistic Department
Chulalongkorn University
Phyathai Road, Bangkok 10330
Thailand
Suda.R@Chula.ac.th

泰語「給」複合結構的句法及語意

Suda Rangkupan
朱拉隆功大學

　　泰語具有許多連結動詞的複合結構，其中「給」複合結構受到不少關注。本文以角色指稱語法來探討泰語「給」複合結構。我們發現 *hây*「給」有很多不同的語意。如果 *hây* 成爲複合結構中的主要動詞，其主語與共同論元會受到語意限制；如果 *hây* 出現在其他的結構裡，這種限制則不存在。我們以這樣的特性來辨別 *hây* 的詞類。本文認爲 *hây* 在某些結構中並非動詞，而是連結標記。我們以概要的方式來解釋其語意的共同性。在句法上，本文提出不同的測試來區分結構中的結合與聯繫關係。我們發現泰語中的「給」複合結構可以被分爲核心並列結構、核心附屬結構以及子句並附結構。

關鍵詞：泰語，「給」複合結構，核心並列結構，核心附屬關係，子句並附關係