Introduction

In recent years more and more attention has been paid by linguists to the analysis of units of discourse larger than the sentence; for it has been found that analysis of sentences in isolation misses many important meaningful relationships that exist between sentences—that sentences are not thrown together indiscriminately, but there is selection (conscious or unconscious by the speaker) and ordering. Therefore, no matter what the "difference in theory, terminology ... all this can be said to have a common concern--the isolation of linguistic features that differentiate a coherent (connected) sequence of sentences (a text) from an agglomerate of sentences."¹ But preoccupation with merely surface structure features such as sentence connectivity or equivalence chain recursions as was attempted by Harris (1952, 1963) can also be misleading and unrewarding unless meaning is brought into the analysis. This latter Harris was not willing to allow for.

Many linguists, therefore, are beginning to probe beneath the surface phenomena of language to ascertain the meaningful relationships that reside at the more abstract levels of language. Thus, the notion that all that linguists need to study and analyze are well-formed sentences in isolation, which are the product of an homogeneous speech community (Chomsky, 1965), or that one must be confined to sentence boundaries, is becoming increasingly suspect as more and more investigation is being pursued to ascertain the true status of deep structure and the relation of semantic configurations to syntactic structures. The Chomskyan notion of deep structure as being composed of "lexical items each with its complement of grammatical features" which are transformed into surface structures,² and that the semantic component is, as it were, off to one side and available to both the deep structure and surface structure for picking meanings through rules of semantic interpretation, has been seriously questioned by linguists such as McCawley (1968, 1971) Chafe (1970) and, recently, Lakoff (1971). McCawley insists that it is in the deepest structure of deep semantics that the plot, setting, participant identification and other information resides. For instance, in reference to the choice of pronoun morphemes in Japanese, McCawley says, "I believe that what is going on here is that the choice of pronouns and verbs is dependent on features attached to the entire discourse rather than to individual lexical items and that the politeness morpheme mas is attached by a transformation to the appropriate verb if the relevant discourse features are present."³ In this same vein he says, "In the case of non-anaphoric (that is, deictic) pronouns, the choice of gender is always made on the basis of presuppositions concerning the intended referent."⁴

In Standard Thai, before using a first person pronoun, the
speaker employs certain sociolinguistic rules (rules internalized since childhood) that determine which pronouns, out of a grid of over twenty, will be used (Cooke 1968; Palakornkul 1972; Hatton 1973). "A choice of pronominal variants is not made arbitrarily. On the contrary, there are systematic rules to guide and govern the speaker's choice." Of course, in most instances, the factors of sex, age, social status, etc., are well-known by the speaker, but in other instances there is a conscious selection on the part of the speaker. In both cases there is first a cognitive decision affected by the rules mentioned above and then there is a selection of a linearized lexical item which verbalizes the speaker's intention.

Chafe (1970) equates the deep structure of language with semantics and insists that these semantic configurations are linearized in post-semantic processes, and then are realized in the surface structure through various transformations. Further processes take place before the realization of these configurations on the phonological stratum.

One of the more serious attempts at discourse analysis on a deeper and more abstract level has been attempted recently by Grimes and Glock (1970) in their analysis of Saramaccan narrative patterns. They note several interesting things:

1. Verb Phrase Strings. They observe first of all the difficulty of dealing with verb phrase strings where there are "referential restrictions that involve partial ordering of events by time, so that no verb in a string denotes action that takes place before the action of a verb that comes earlier in the string. There are also restrictions on the place of occurrence of certain verbs relative to others. These restrictions are hard to manage in terms of surface grammars alone; but in terms of the relation of deep structures to grammar ..."

It seems, though, that the relationships of these verbs described by Grimes and Glock could take the form of types or roles and case relations (Fillmore 1968). Some work on this aspect has been done by Taber (1966), Nida (1973) and recently by Grimes (1972). The work of the latter two is of special interest for the theoretical working out of this present paper and will be discussed in more detail later (cf. Method of Analysis, p. 7).

2. Old and New Information. There is also the problem of new and old information which is vital to an analysis of discourse structure (Halliday 1967). Grimes and Glock note in their article that often because of the constraints of old information, sentences can carry very little new semantic material. So that in a sentence such as a-bal sopu 'he-bought soap,' both the subject a- 'he' and the verb bal 'buy' are old information carried over from preceding sentences. Only sopu 'soap,' being new information, is added by the semantic deep structure.

3. Semantic Redundancy. These linguists also trace the use of
'motion verbs' which recur regularly in the narration of a trip, and how these are cycled through the discourse. They note that in one discourse unit, semantic information (motion verbs) which is spelled out in four sentences, uses only two sentences later on to state a similar amount of information. They conclude, "It is evidence of the kind just given that makes sentence oriented grammars seem less complete than they once did. It is also one reason why sentences are treated as part of the surface grammar and not as part of the deep structure." \(^8\)

4. Directional Verbs. Grimes and Glock were also able to deduce that a certain Saramaccan text, which they elicited, must have been uttered in the area of Paramaibo. They based this conclusion on an analysis of the patterns of distribution of the verbs 'come' and 'go'. \(^9\) This phenomenon appears in Thai discourse also, and will be discussed later in this paper.

There is one further factor which needs consideration, for it has loomed large in recent discussions by linguists--and that is the matter of language competence and the related notion of well-formed and ill-formed sentences. The idea that all linguists need to do is to analyze well-formed sentences in isolation is becoming increasingly suspect as more and more work is being done on the true role of deep structure and its relationship to semantics. The notion of well-formedness needs to be widened to take in the discourse unit as a whole, for a sentence that might be considered ill-formed in isolation might actually be well-formed when taken in relation to the whole discourse. Conversely, a so-called well-formed sentence in isolation might be ill-formed when placed in the context of extended discourse and in the light of socio-cultural rules. For instance, there might be a noun or a noun phrase in the subject position when a pronoun would be adequate, as the noun or noun phrase has become old information. But a supposedly ill-formed sentence might have ellipsis where a pronoun does not appear in the surface structure at all, and yet when the sentence is considered in the light of the discourse context, the pronoun which represents old information is obviously present at some deeper level, and is certainly present as a semantic unit.

Palakornkul in her discussion of Thai pronominal strategy says, "... in dyadic speech communication in Thai which involves one sender, one receiver and one referent, all nouns and pronouns can be deleted and the sentence remain perfectly grammatical." \(^10\) The point here, though, is that deleted nouns or pronouns which appeared as linearized lexical items in the surface structure are still present as semantic units even though surface ellipsis has occurred.

Linguists are still grappling with the problem of determining on which level of the grammar these pronominalized forms are realized. Chafe reasons that "... if linear order is relevant to the determination of what can be pronominalized, then pronominalization must take place after linearization." \(^11\) But in extended discourse, as long as the noun or noun phrase is old information, whether it appears in pronominalized form or not, in the surface structure, it still continues on as seman-
tic 'stuff' or information in a deep level of abstraction. This also will be discussed in more detail later in this paper.

A sentence in well-formed discourse will have such features as anaphora in the form of third person pronouns or articles ('the' in English) which have the intra-textual function of pointing back to old information, or there may be ellipsis such as in a one-word answer given to a question composed of several words. This one-word answer is a well-formed sentence when considered in the light of previous discourse.

Furthermore, the notion of linguistic competence must go beyond the purely grammatical rules of language (Hymes 1968) and take in the socio-cultural rules of language use. Chomsky admits that "grammaticalness is only one of the many factors that interact to determine acceptability." 12 But he nowhere allows for socio-cultural factors that will mold the meaningful relationships between elements in sentences or elements across sentence boundaries. Because of this lack in Generative Transformational theory, Hymes argues for a theory of competence where "socio-cultural factors have an explicit and constitutive role." 13 In the same vein Chafe says, "... a theory of competence must bear a relationship to language use, and there is no reason that it is a virtue for this relationship to be as obscure as possible ... a theory of competence which is more closely related to performance is preferable to one which is more distantly related." 14 Fortunately, many linguists are taking this avenue of linguistic research seriously and are presently carrying on research in many languages. This present paper is a modest attempt to deal with a feature which plays an important role in Thai discourse, namely, directional verbs.

Method of Analysis

General. The following analysis of Thai discourse will attempt to use some of the notions advanced by scholars who were mentioned in the introduction to this paper, in order to find the meaningful relations in the deep semantics of Thai discourse. I will take a short unit of Standard Thai discourse (a paragraph of narrative) which has appeared in a novel called The Four Kingdoms by Kukrit Pramoj, a famous Thai novelist and newspaperman. 15 Particular attention will be paid to the sentence $S_6$ (cf. Thai text, p. 10) which will be used as a sample sentence. I will not rigorously define the notion 'sentence' because throughout this analysis I will be dealing with the manner in which the elements that form these surface sentences relate to other elements in the discourse unit in terms of their deep semantic components. I will attempt to show that such sentences as $S_6$ are ambiguous when analyzed in isolation and considered in their surface form only. In other words, $S_6$ can be translated cross-culturally (in this paper into English) only when the semantic structure of this sentence and surrounding sentences has been analyzed.
I will pay particular attention to the matters of old and new information, anaphora, socio-linguistic presuppositions and directionality of events in time and space. These are all vital to an understanding of what is happening in Thai discourse.

Specific. I will attempt to develop the insights of Grimes and Nida concerning role and case relations in discourse structure. Nida (1973) develops the notion of Nuclear Structures "which consist of an event nucleus and various types of satellites in case relation to the event ... case relations may be indicated only by the order and selection of particular classes of constituents. As a basis for analysis what counts is not the formal structure but the semantic relations." Nida would say that a sentence such as the following,

(1) Tom saw her coming

has two underlying nuclear structures, namely:
   a. Tom saw her
   b. She comes

These are formalized on a deep level of abstraction in a way similar to these formulations:

(2) Object₁(Agent) Event₁(action) Object₂(Patient)

(3) Object₂(Agent) Event₂(stative)

Grimes' approach to this is similar to Nida's except that he uses different terminology. He calls "nuclear structures" propositions. These propositions are composed of arguments and predicates, where the predicate has the logical function of expressing a semantic relationship between two or more items (Nida's objects) which are called arguments. This expression, consisting of the predicate and its arguments, is a proposition. So the English sentence 'Jack kills John' is a proposition which has two arguments that are related by the predicate 'kill'. Grimes, like Nida takes into consideration role relationships, so that the proposition above would diagram as follows:

```
  kills  
   / 
  Agent
 /   
JOHN 
/     
Patient
 /     
JACK  
```

On the other hand, Nida's linearized formulation of this sentence would be something like the following:

(4) John kills Jack - Object₁(Agent) Event(Action) Object₂(Patient)
Part of the Thai discourse unit which will be analyzed in this paper will be reduced to nuclear structures in a similar fashion to Nida's model in order to find the true relationships between the various surface structure sentences so as to be able to translate $S_6$ and the rest of the unit of discourse successfully. I will also note the various relationships between nuclear structures, such as additive, disjunctive, unfolding and if necessary will show any logical relationships which will affect the choice of surface structure lexical items.

Translation

Translation is not a surface phenomenon in language. This has become evident in the experience of linguists who have engaged in cross-cultural translation. The process of translation, especially between non-cognate languages, involves the redistribution of semantic components through the selection of different transformations, or in the case of a discourse unit, for the reordering of the sentences to better fit the textual order of the receptor language. So, it is held that the sentences $S_6$ in the following unit of Thai discourse is ambiguous and thus untranslatable, until a rigorous analysis has been made of the semantic components of the sentence and then its relationship to other sentences in the discourse has been analyzed carefully.

The Text

1  2  3  4 - 5  6
$S_1$ - phlọọj dænd khâam laan-bån châa-châa ... 21
N walk across lawn very slowly

7  8  9  10  11
$S_2$ - phlọọj dænd phàan tôn-khâaw-kràdàe ...
N walk DIR tree - kràdàe

12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20
$S_3$ - thúg jàaŋ rfiąg phlọọj hâj jùd hâj liaw mãoŋ
every-thing call N to stop to turn look

21 22 23 24 - 25 26 27 28 29 30
$S_4$ - tẹẹ phlọọj kẹp kâaw-khâa dænd paj con thỳŋ bandaj
but N CNJ step-out walk DIR up to stairs

31 32
làn tỳg
behind house
S5 - phoo thynn cha laan phloj kə? lon khlaan
as soon as AUX verandah N CNJ get down crawl

S6 - phoo khaw paj klaj caaw-khun-pho kə? lon
as soon as enter go near T father CNJ get down
DIR DIR

48
kràab
prostrate oneself (to show reverence)

S7 - ləaw kə? nən kom-nāa ?aw myy khā?
then CNJ sit bow-head take hand pick at floor
krādaan

S8 - rōo fañ wāa thān cə? phūud wāa jáanraj
wait hear RLTV PRN AUX say RLTV what

S9 - (a) mya nān jūu såg-khrūu-nyŋ
when sit AUX a moment

S10 - màj mií sīəŋ ?əraj cəag caaw-khun-pho leəj
NEG have sound any from T father at all

S9 - (b) phloj kə? lon kràab ?līg-khrān-nyŋ
N CNJ get down prostrate once more

kāa khūaj
cover embarrassment

nəg-cəag sīəŋ krāʔəam ləʔ? sīəŋ būan nām-māag
aside from sound clearing CNJ sound spit betel-nut juice
throat
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Analysis

1. Zero Anaphora. Standard Thai has a very complex pronominal reference system (especially in the area of first and second person pronouns), because of the necessity in dyadic situations of establishing the socio-linguistic factors of age, sex, social status, etc. Despite this, however, narrative discourse is full of zero anaphora in the surface structure, as in the sample sentence $S_6$ and other sentences in the discourse unit under discussion. In fact, the employment of a third person pronoun in $S_6$ would not only be poor style but would sound redundant and queer to a Thai. English would have required two instances of the word *she* in this sentence--once before the word *khàw* and the second time before the word *lòq*. This phenomenon of zero anaphora is found right through the whole unit of discourse. In fact, in the surface structure after $S_5$ there is no explicit anaphoric reference to *phlòj* again until $S_9(b)$ where *phlòj* comes into focus again, since the embedded material concerning the actions of her father has intervened between $S_6$ and $S_9(b)$.

2. Directional Forms. These words are variously called Post-Position verbs (Noss, 1964), Post Verbals (Panupong, 1970), Secondary Verbs (Haas, 1964), Verboids (Edward, 1964) and Auxiliary Verbs (Mundhenk, 1967). However, all these linguists agree that the directional forms do not function grammatically as real verbs in their position following the main verb of a clause, but are auxiliaries which shape the meaning of the predication as to its direction in time and space. "The class meaning is orientation of action with respect to space and time relationships and the forms together constitute a kind of aspectual system for the verb." This set of directional forms can be divided into three sub-sets. The first one is composed of the lexical items *khàw*, *lòq*, *khûn* and *làn*, which in this analysis will be labelled DIR$_1$. These have very complex internal relationships and exclude each other entirely. The second sub-set includes the forms *paj* and *maa*, which will be labelled DIR$_2(a)$ and DIR$_2(b)$, respectively. This sub-set has the main function of showing directionality in reference to a participant who is the focus of attention in the discourse. For instance, in a sentence such as the following (5),

(5) naaj dam ?lòq maa càag hòcon
    Mr. N leave DIR$_2(b)$ from room

the *maa* indicates that the focus of attention lies with a participant outside the room. So the translation would be (6):
(6) Mr. Dam came out of the room.

In (6) we get the impression that someone other than Mr. Dam is the participant in focus because of the use of the word came. But the translation of a slightly different Thai sentence (7),

(7) naaj dam deen ʔɔːŋ maa c`aag hɔɔŋ
Mr. N walk DIR₁ DIR₂(b) from room

would be as the following (8):

(8) Mr. Dam walked out of the room.

This English translation cannot clearly represent the directionality regarding participants that is present in the Thai unless we add, for instance, the preposition towards in English, resulting in the following sentence (9):

(9) Mr. Dam walked out of the room towards us.

A final remark concerning this sub-set is that all the members can co-occur with the members of sub-set I.

The third sub-set contains such words as ʔɔːŋ and thɔɔŋ, which will be labelled DIR₃. This sub-set can co-occur with both sub-set I and II, but always follows either immediately after the main verb or after the noun or noun phrase immediately following the main verb. The following sentence is an example (10):

(10) khāw deen thɔɔŋ paj thaaŋ bandaj
PRN walk DIR₃ DIR₂(a) toward stair

All these directional forms that we have been discussing can function as main verbs in the surface structure of the language, and thus one would be tempted structurally to call them homonyms. Semantically, they still contain the component of directionality, but where they are main verbs, the component of an event or action becomes foremost, with the presupposition of an agent being involved and also the option of a goal (Fillmore, 1971). For instance, in the following sentence (11):

(11) m̄ya-waan-nfi phŏm paj kruŋthēeb
yesterday PRN go Bangkok

the paj now has more than a semantic component of directionality; for it has become the main event word in the sentence, carrying with it the component of action directed towards Bangkok. But in (12),

(12) m̄ya-waan-nfi phŏm khāb rōd paj kruŋthēeb
yesterday PRN drive car DIR₂(a) Bangkok

the main semantic component of paj is now directionality.
Analysis of Sample Sentence $S_6$

In sample sentence $S_6$, the problem is whether the form khâw is semantically an event or is merely showing the component of directionality. Syntactically it is the main verb of a clause in the surface structure; but we need to investigate the surrounding context to ascertain its real function semantically. Taking this sentence in isolation, there would be no way of knowing which of the two English Translations (13) or (14) is essentially the correct one.

(13) As soon as (she) went in (to the verandah) close to ...

(14) As soon as (she) got close to ...

(13) indicates that she (phlooj) is entering an enclosed area and approaching her father; but (14) shows that she is already in the enclosed area and has got near to her father. Here the notion of 'physical space' becomes important. phlooj is entering the physical space envelope around her father. Of course the narrator could have made this information more explicit in the surface structure by saying (15):

(15) phoo khlaan khâw paj klâj ...
    as soon as crawl DIR$_1$ DIR$_2(a)$ near to ...

Where the insertion of the verb khlaan would have clearly shown what event was going on, and also revealed that khâw is functioning as a directional form. But that would have been redundant, for the previous context already shows the meaning of this sentence clearly. A similar example of this phenomenon is in a sentence such as the following (16):

(16) naaj dam deen khâw paj hâa câw-naaj khâw
    Mr. N walk DIR$_1$ DIR$_2(a)$ see boss PRN

if Mr. Dam is outside the boss' office and someone has come out and told him to go in and see his boss. Then the sentence (16) would translate as in (17):

(17) Mr. Dam walked in to see his boss.

for he is outside the room and walking into an enclosed space. But if the man is already in the office and his boss calls over to him

(18) Dam, will you come over here a minute, please?

then (16) would translate as (19):

(19) Mr. Dam walked over to his boss.

The point here is that in order to pinpoint the exact semantic components of khâw in this sentence we must be aware of the presuppositions that Mr. Dam is either outside or inside the office. In (16), of course, Dam is the focus of attention, which is shown by the use of
the form paj. "Focus of attention" here, of course, refers to the viewpoint of the speaker or writer.

So, we are forced to look at the immediate context preceding S₆ to find out the real meaning of this sentence. In this case, the presupposition in the mind of the reader would be that phloaj is crawling through the verandah and that this event of crawling is still going on in S₆. The context then shows quite plainly that khaw in S₆ must be understood not as an event but as a relational form indicating directionality. Or to use the analogy of a nuclear structure, khaw is a satellite of the nucleus event khlaan 'crawl'. Notice that this same argument holds for the auxiliary form thyŋ in S₅. This word shows the completeness of the action of the event deən 'walk' in S₄, so that the translation would be as in (20):

(20) As soon as (she) walked up to...

or in better English style (21):

(21) As soon as (she) reached...

With the form loŋ in S₆ the author has put it before the verb krāab in the surface structure, thus indicating that it has not only the semantic component of directionality downwards but it has also taken on the semantic component of a bodily action in a downwards direction, preceding the second action of prostration. So in a translation we would have to insert the words 'got down and prostrated herself' rather than just 'prostrated herself'. If the author was intending only the action of prostration to be stressed he would word the sentence as follows (22):

(22) ... kɔʔ krāab loŋ
    CNJ prostrate DIR₁

Therefore, when these directional forms appear before another verb not included in the set of directional forms, the form takes on the function of a full event semantically.

Another observation which I would like to make is that this analysis reveals how syntax and semantics are combined. The position of the directional form in the surface structure reveals whether we will treat it as a main verb or an auxiliary (that is if it is explicitly preceding another verb); but in order to find out the exact semantic components involved we have to analyze the preceding context in the discourse structure. Here presuppositions both semantic and sociocultural enter in to guide our analysis. But if the directional form appears to be the main verb and is not followed by other verbs except directional auxiliaries, we still have to go beyond syntax and find what semantic constraints are operating at a deeper level which will mold the meaning of this surface structure form.
Focus

phalcoj, in the previous paragraphs before this discourse unit, has been the focus of attention. So, in S₆ she remains in focus until the end of this discourse unit. The meaning of cāw-khun-phāco 'Lord father's' actions in S₁₀ are peripheral to the narrative and don't take phalcoj out of focus. If, however, the form maa had been used in S₆ instead of paj, this would have showed that phalcoj's father was now the participant considered in focus by the author. This would have been revealed in the English translation as in (23):

(23) As soon as (she) came close to her father...

Semantic Structure of the First Three Sentences

We still have to investigate the semantic relationships between the three clauses in S₆ and also the relationship of S₆ to the context immediately preceding, in order to translate S₆ adequately. In this section I will be using the model employed by Nida (1973) referred to earlier in this paper, where the discourse is reduced to nuclear structures composed of an event nucleus and other forms in case relationships to this event.²⁹

1. List of nuclear structures (Nuc)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Nuc</th>
<th>Object₁(Agent)</th>
<th>Event₁</th>
<th>Object₂(Experiencer)</th>
<th>(X)³⁰</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>S₃</td>
<td>thūg jāng</td>
<td>rīg</td>
<td>phalcoj</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nuc₂</td>
<td>phalcoj</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nuc₃</td>
<td>phalcoj</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S₄</td>
<td>phalcoj</td>
<td></td>
<td>kāw-khāa dēen</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nuc₅</td>
<td>phalcoj</td>
<td></td>
<td>dēen - paj</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S₅</td>
<td>phalcoj</td>
<td></td>
<td>thỳn chàìyaŋ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nuc₆</td>
<td>phalcoj</td>
<td></td>
<td>lōŋ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nuc₇</td>
<td>phalcoj</td>
<td></td>
<td>khłaan</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S₆</td>
<td>phalcoj</td>
<td></td>
<td>klāj cāw-khun-phāco</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Relationship of the Various Nuclear Structures

The Nuc₂ and Nuc₃ are the content of Nuc₁, and Nuc₄ is in a disjunctive (Chafe, 1970) or contrastive relationship to Nuc₁-₃. This is revealed by the surface form taa. The first four nuclear structures are, in turn, in an unfolding or additive relationship to previous discourse (not recorded here) where phlooj is walking toward the house, but stops momentarily to notice different trees in the garden which bring back many happy memories. Nuc₅ is in an immediate additive relationship to Nuc₄; but it also provides the time setting for Nuc₆ and Nuc₇. Besides this it unfolds the forward progress of phlooj from previous discourse. These three nuclear structures 5-7 are also in an additive relationship to each other; but are then in an unfolding relationship to events outside this unit of discourse. Nuc₈ unfolds the event of Nuc₇, but also provides the time setting for Nuc₉ and Nuc₁₀. These latter two are in an additive relationship to each other. But the three nuclear structures 8-10 are in an unfolding or progressive relationship to both the immediate discourse and to discourse outside this unit. These relationships can be diagrammed as in Fig. 1 below.

Translation

With this analysis before us we can now proceed to translate these four sentences into English, unravelling the ambiguity of S₆.

"Everything called out to phlooj to stop and look around her; but instead she walked right on till she came to the stairs behind the house. As soon as she reached the verandah she got down and crawled. Then when she was close to her father she got down and prostrated herself before him."

Summary

This paper has attempted to show that analysis of isolated sentences misses many important meaningful relationships which can only be ascertained through the analysis of nuclear structures or semantic units on a deeper or more abstract level of language. No claim has been made that these findings are conclusive; but the analysis does clearly show that translation is a deep structure phenomenon where the translator is concerned with the transference of units of meaning rather than a literal transfer of surface structure phenomenon into other language.
Analysis of anaphora, directional forms, focus, etc., in Standard Thai has pointed up the necessity of resolving seeming ambiguity of meaning in isolated sentences through the study of connected discourse. This in turn has forced the analysis to proceed at a deeper level than surface structure.

I have also pointed out that the study of directional forms both in the syntax and in their semantics, forces one to tentatively admit that linguists such as McCawley, Lakoff and Chafe have a point when they insist that semantics and syntax should not have such a clear dividing line in a grammar.
APPENDIX

English Gloss of Directional Forms

a. Sub-set I.

khỳn 'upwards or newly arrived on the scene'

(24) khāw jīb nāngšỳ khỳn maa
PRN pick book khỳn DIR1(up) DIR2(b)

(25) man kỳyd - khỳn mỳa-rew-rew-níi (happened)
PRN came - khỳn DIR1 just recently

lonŋ 'direction downward, departing from the scene'

(26) khāw phaa-kan thīŋ kōon-hỳn lonŋ paj naj khuu
PRN AUX throw stone lonŋ DIR1 DIR2(a) in moat

(27) khāw mōnŋ lonŋ paj naj hāw lỳg
PRN look DIR1 DIR2(a) in chasm deep

khāw 'direction toward another participant or into an enclosed space'

(28) sỳā rāaj wīŋ khāw paj naj pàa
tiger fierce run DIR1 DIR2(a) into forest

(29) khāw deenn khāw maa klāj phŏm thūg-thîi thūg-thîi
PRN walk DIR1 DIR2(b) near PRN every second

?òog 'direction away from participant (not necessarily the one who
is in focus or the center of attention), or out of an en-
closed space'

(30) khāw deenn ?òog maa càag hònŋ
PRN walk ?òog DIR1 DIR2(b) from room

b. Sub-set II.

paj 'action away from the participant who is the center of at-
traction or focus'

(31) khāw deenn ?òog càag hònŋ paj
PRN walk ?òog DIR1 from room DIR2(a)

maa 'action toward the participant who is the center of attrac-
tion or focus'
(32) khāw ṭōg maa cāaq hōcān
PRN leave DIR₂(b) from room

c. Sub-set III.

phāan 'direction through an enclosed space or past a stationary object'

(33) khāw ḏēn phāan nāa-bān phöm thūg wan
PRN walk DIR₃ front-house PRN every day

(34) khāw wīn phāan laan-bān jān rūd-rew
PRN run DIR₃ lawn house very quickly

thōj 'action away from another participant, etc., but facing the other participant'

(35) khāw ḏēn thōj pāj thān tān bandāj
PRN walk DIR₃ DIR₂(a) towards stair

NOTES


6 Chomsky (1971) dismisses Chafe's argument in one sentence (footnote on p. 187) insisting that Chafe's attempt to get rid of the distinction between syntax and semantics is merely a terminological one. This is of course Chomsky's argument against other critics such as McCawley and Lakoff. But the argument of his critics is more cogent than Chomsky is willing to admit. If one is dealing with sentences in isolation then it might be argued that Chomsky's notion that a "theory which generates quadruples (P,s,d,S) shows no empirical difference between the 'syntactically based' standard
theory and the 'semantically based' alternative..." (p. 196). But when one attempts to find meaningful relations between sentences in discourse, McCawley's, Lakoff's and Chafe's arguments for a grammar without a clean break between syntax and semantics becomes more appealing.


Ibid., p. 145.


Palakornkul, op. cit., p. 26. In this respect she gives a typical example from Thai discourse (dyadic situation) where no pronouns are employed in the surface structure at all.

A: ʔoonhoo ʔuaj can 'Wow. (the dress) (is) very pretty.' phaan maj? syy maa mýaráj? 'Expensive (question)?
Buy when?'

B: syy tóon lód raákhaa 'Buy time lower price'
lóon sàj duu maj? 'Try put on (interrogative?)'


Dell Hymes, On Communicative Competence, pre-publication copy, 1968, p. 3.

Chafe, op. cit., p. 66.

Only the Standard Thai language which is spoken in Bangkok and the neighboring plains of Thailand will be discussed. It is the prestige and official language of Thailand, a country with a population of over forty million people. It is also the language which is normally used in the news media, on T.V. and radio broadcasts and is supposedly used in all the schools, universities and government offices throughout the country.

See Michael Moerman, A Little Knowledge, Southeast Asia Series, University of California, Berkeley, California 94720, Reprint No. 348, where he shows that in order to understand the Thai idiom 'sľa nāa sľa taa' in a sentence where a Thai grandfather, Norm, says, "If they don't marry, I won't accept a settlement. sľa nāa sľa taa (Literally: lose face, lose eyes) (I) will take (him, i.e., Sam) to jail", we must have a thorough understanding of the sociocultural presuppositions which operate in that culture.

Eugene Nida, Componential Analysis of Meaning, pre-publication manuscript, 1973, pp. 177-178.
This analysis is similar to Nida's work with the translation model where he posited underlying kernels composed of objects and events, abstracts and relationals. This notion (cf. Nida 1952, 1964: 59-69; Nida and Taber 1969:41-55; Nida 1973) helped translators to avoid the mistake of confusing surface structure verbs with objects in the deep structure and vice-versa, where often the surface structure verb was a portmanteau realization of both an event and an object in the deep structure. Or as in Greek, a surface structure noun could be a portmanteau representation of an event and object in the deep structure. Nida's treatment of nuclear structures in his latest work carries the idea of kernels deeper to include case relationships and roles. He has also included his notion of abstracts under the heading of events, following Chafe (1970).

Labov (1972) in an article called Rules for Ritual Insults makes a good case for the need to analyze these deep structure propositions in order to understand the meaning of surface structure configurations. He analyzes the dialogue sequence in American English

A: Are you going to work tomorrow?

B: I'm on jury duty.

Where the answer means "no" or "I'm not going to work tomorrow," for the presupposition underlying the answer is that jury duty is not considered work. Labov then formulates a rule of discourse "If S₂ then (E) S₁ where (E) is an existential operator, and from this proposition there is inferred an answer to A's request, (E) S₁."

The phonemic transcription used in this paper is basically that found in Noss's Thai Reference Grammar. The capitalized symbols used in the text gloss as follows:

N - name
CNJ - conjunction
T - title
PRN - pronoun
RLTV - form introducing a relative clause
NEG - negative

The three dots ... indicate that there is considerable discourse between this sentence and the following sentence S₂, as the author digresses and describes the various things which phlōĉj sees in the garden. This information is not vital to the following analysis.

Most Thai names are unmarked for sex, so that if some other name beside phlōĉj had been used in this sentence we would have had further ambiguity. However, phlōĉj, which means 'gem', and other such names referring to jewels of various kinds, are usually reserved for females; but the name phèd 'diamond', for instance, is
reserved for males, as it has the connotation of great hardness.


One of the interesting examples of the use of these words in Thai is in letters and telephone conversations. In a letter one says 'I will come to see you' (PRN cà? maa-hãa PRN); but in a telephone conversation one says, 'I will go to see you' (PRN cà? paj-hãa PRN). In the first case the recipient of the letter is considered the focus of attention; but in the case of the telephone conversation the speaker is in focus.

It is not necessary for the development of this paper to rigorously define the notion main verb.

The ( ) mean that the word enclosed does not appear explicitly in the Thai surface structure, but must be included in an English translation.


Here the socio-cultural presuppositions in the minds of the Thai readers are important. The word kràab is extremely difficult to translate successfully into English without some embellishments. phlcoj's father is of noble birth and therefore his daughter must show extreme respect when coming close to him. kràab is the action of lowering oneself to the floor with legs drawn up and to one side, then bowing the face to the hands which are held in prayerful position against the floor. As soon as the person has done this he or she may return to sitting position, but with head down still showing respect.

In this analysis I will only note the case relationships explicitly; such as agent, patient, etc. But all the events will be lumped under that one title.

The (X) signals that the following nuclear structure is the content of the previous - what someone or something did or said.

In Thai the forms paj and maa can also appear in sentences such as these at the end of the sentence or following the main verb.
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