

RESULTATIVE CONSTRUCTION IN THAI AND THE RELATED ISSUES*

Ruetaivan Kessakul^()*
*Tasanee Methapisit^(**)*

0. Introduction

The subject of resultative construction has been studied in a number of languages. Although some debatable theoretical issues, i.e. the relationship between syntax and semantics, are still open, there is much interest in issues of predication as well as the status of the second noun in the resultative construction. That is, in the former case, the semantic interaction between an action predicate and a result predicate has been accounted for in various ways. Put simply, the resultative phrase forms a complex predicate¹ with the matrix verb, as found in Green (1973), or the resultative is an argument of the verb as found in Carrier and Randal (1988), among others². In the latter case, an explicit claim that the second noun is a direct object is found in Levin and Rappaport Hovav (1995). Related to this, Goldberg (1995) uses the term *patient*, whereas Van Valin (1990a) uses the term *undergoer* to account for the status of the second noun in the resultative construction.³ On the other hand, Hoekstra (1988) claims that the second noun is the subject of a small clause.

In this paper, Thai data is discussed as an additional example to provide some support for the view that the interpretation of resultatives is mainly based on semantic terms, and at the same time, the resultative construction itself is also derived by compositional means in the syntax. To this end, the transition marker 'con¹', literally meaning 'until', is used as a parameter.

We propose that resultative construction based on transitive verbs is the typical pattern of Thai. Thus, the transition marker 'con¹' cannot occur in this type of resultative construction. However, we don't reject the idea that there is an occurrence of 'con¹' between some transitive verbs, as well as the idea that unergative activity verbs and result verbs can also yield the resultative sense. In this case rather, a conjunction as widely understood as 'con¹' should be viewed as the transition marker of an event in which the action denoted by the activity verb has to be iterative or durative before the effect on the second noun is achieved.

Further, we suggest that resultative phrases, which specify a particular state as the result of an action denoted by the first verb, can have a range of possibly conceivable resultant states, which we call Scalar Construal of resultant state⁴. In other words, although the resultant state is brought about by the activity verb, it is not necessarily semantically bound by the meaning of the activity verb. The resultative phrases, therefore, are not fixed by any grammatical reasons, but rather are variable in accordance with the potential for perception in the real world. Consequently, this reflects

^(*)The University of Tokyo

^(**)Tokyo University of Foreign Studies

the properties of the second noun as an important factor, at which stage the N_2 can undergo its change of state.

Finally, we briefly mention the distinctive nuance in the resultative construction brought about by two different markers, i.e. the transition marker 'con'¹ (until), and the mood emphasis marker 'sia'⁵ (literally meaning 'to be damaged'). Moreover, the matter is further complicated when these two markers are combined together as 'sia'⁵ con'¹. In any event, for the sake of argument, the main discussion about resultative construction in Thai in this paper takes only the transition marker 'con'¹ into consideration. A comparison of these markers will also be made in other related issues.

We will then close this paper with the outcome of our analysis indicating the characteristics of each construction.

To begin with, the background information on resultative construction in English and Japanese is mentioned in section 1.

1. Background

Before beginning the main discussion of Thai, the Resultative construction in English and Japanese, based on some recent works, is discussed in brief below.

1.1 The English Resultative Construction

In spite of the controversial issue of whether or not the resultative construction should be appropriately predicted from the compositional means of syntax or in purely semantic terms, the resultative construction in English can be divided as shown below. Note that we take either AP or PP as resultative phrases. As a result, the syntactic form of resultative construction in English can be represented as follows:

[N_1 V N_2 AP/PP], in which N_1 stands for the instigator, V is the activity verb, N_2 indicates an entity which undergoes the change of state, and AP or PP is an achieved state brought about by the matrix verb.

(1) Resultative construction based on transitive verbs.

e.g. Woolite safely soaks all your fine washables *clean*. (Levin and Rappaport Hovav, 1995, p.34 (1a))

(2) Resultative construction based on unergative verbs. In this case, the addition of a postverbal NP is required.

a. Fake reflexives: He talked himself *hoarse*.

b. Non-reflexives: The dog barked the baby *awake*.

c. Body part: She cried her eyes *out*.

(3) Resultative construction based on unspecified object verbs.

e.g. Drive your engine *clean*. (L & R, 1995, p.37 (10d))

(4) Resultative construction with passive

e.g. She was shaken *awake* by the earthquake. (L & R, 1995, p.39 (18c))

(5) Resultative with unaccusative verbs.

e.g. The vase broke *into pieces*.

According to Levin and Rappaport Hovav (1995), there are two classes of unaccusative verbs that cannot occur in the resultative construction. Those are stative unaccusative verbs such as *remain* and verbs of inherently directed motion such as *go*,

come, arrive. This is attributed to the fact that the matrix verb in the resultative construction needs to be dynamic and therefore, stative unaccusative verbs do not qualify. Likewise, verbs of inherently directed motion are incompatible with the resultative construction due to the fact that they tend to take goal phrases to indicate the end-point of location, rather than resultative phrases which specify the achieved state. This view is in line with what Goldberg (1995) mentions as the Unique Path Constraint.

1.2 The Japanese Resultative Construction

We will turn now to the resultative construction in Japanese. According to Kageyama(1996) and Washio (1997), Japanese expresses the resultative construction comparatively in a limited scope. Namely, Japanese permits resultative construction based on some transitive verbs only, which implies the change of state of the patient. In addition, Japanese also permits a broad sense of resultative construction, in which the change of state of a patient is further specified without any overt action or causing the patient to go into an achieved state. The syntactic form of resultative construction in Japanese can be represented in two ways as in (6a) and (6b).

(6) a. [N₁ N₂ V₁ V₂]

b. [N₁ N₂ ATP V]

Again, the representation form of N₁ and N₂ in (6) refers to the instigator and the patient, respectively. The difference is that in (6a) the relationship between action and result is shown in the form of a compound verb in which V₁ denotes the action, whereas V₂ is either an unaccusative verb denoting result or a transitive verb with the implication of change of state. According to Matsumoto (1997), most, but not all of the cases of such compound verbs are right-headed compounds, viz. V₂ is viewed as a head, while V₁ is merely a modification of cause, manner, or means. (See Matsumoto(1997) for further details of the reversed type: left-headed compounds). On the other hand, in (6b) the term ATP adopted here belongs to Washio(1997). It stands for "Adjective-type phrase", which functionally corresponds to the AP in the English construction. To see the illustration of these points, consider the examples below.

(7)a. ooame-de dosha-ga kuzure-ochi-ta

heavy rain-Inst earth and sand-Nom. crumble-fall down-Past

'The heavy rain caused the landslide.'

b. taroo-wa doa-wo oshi-ake-ta

Taro-Top Jiro-ACC push-open

'Taro pushed the door open.'

(8) taroo-wa kabin-wo konagona-ni wat-ta

Taro-Top vase-ACC into pieces break-Past

'Taro broke the vase into pieces.'

(9) kabin-wa konagona-ni ware-ta

vase-Top into pieces be broken-Past

'The vase broke into pieces.'

As shown above, the compound verb 'kuzure-ochita' in (7a), a past form of 'kuzure-ochiru'(crumble-fall down) shows the combination between action 'kuzure-' in V₁ and result 'ochita' in V₂, whereas in (7b) 'oshi-aketa', a past form of 'oshi-akeru' (push-open)

shows a transitive compound verb in which the first verb 'oshi' represents means of the action and 'akeru' represents an action implying the change of state of the door. On the other hand, in (8) 'konagona-ni' (into pieces) corresponds to ATP, which is brought about by the activity verb 'wat-ta', a past form of 'waru' (break). In addition, (9) illustrates resultative construction in a broad sense. That is, the ATP 'konagona-ni' (to pieces) is used merely to further specify the achieved state denoted by the unaccusative verb 'ware-ta', a past form of 'waru' (be broken).

It is worth noting that some Japanese transitive verbs, which can occur in the resultative construction, are mainly less informative transitive verbs such as 'waru' (break), 'nuru' (paint), 'someru' (dye), 'kooraseru' (freeze), and 'fuku' (wipe), among many others. In contrast to this, transitive verbs which are more informative on the action, as well as the unergative verbs in Japanese, cannot occur in the resultative construction. We compare unacceptable Japanese examples with their free translation equivalents in English below.

(10) *kare-wa kanaduchi-de kinzoku-wo taira-ni tatai-ta
 he-Top hammer-Inst metal-ACC flat beat-Past
 'He hammered the metal flat.'

(11) *kare-wa kutsu-ga boroboro-ni hashit-ta
 he-Top shoes-Nom be torn to shreds run-Past
 'He ran his shoes threadbare.'

It is clearly seen that in (10) the verb 'tatai-ta', a past form of 'tataku' (beat) is unacceptable in the resultative construction, in spite of the fact that (10) is perfectly acceptable without the ATP 'taira-ni' (flat). Likewise, (11) is undoubtedly acceptable when the phrase 'kutsu-ga boroboro-ni' (shoes threadbare) is deleted.

Up to now, we have tried to give two distinctive pictures of resultative construction between English and Japanese briefly. As noted above, English has a wide variety of verbs that occur in this construction, whereas Japanese has more restriction. Put simply, Japanese permits only some transitive verbs with the implication of change of state to occur in resultative construction. Keeping this in mind, we turn now to the investigation of resultative construction in Thai.

2. Resultative Construction in Thai

In discussing the resultative construction found in Thai, we begin with the scope of this article as well as the approach adopted in this paper.

2.1 Scope

It is widely acknowledged that resultative construction is found in complex eventualities which derive accomplishment sense as a result of the interaction between activity and state. In other words, we limit the scope of resultative construction to the case in which the interpretation of accomplishment is brought about by two predicates, i.e. an activity verb in V_1 and a result verb in V_2 . Therefore, the case of accomplishment sense denoted by a lexical accomplishment verb, such as *hak*² (break), *p@@t*² (open), *pit*² (close), is beyond the scope of the present work. In relation to this, see Thepkanjana (1999) for an interesting discussion about lexical causative verbs.

Moreover, we reject the construction in which an achieved state is merely further specified by a more informative modifier, and where an action or a manner that causes the achieved state is unspecified. In this instance, examples like (5) and (9), repeated here as (12-13), along with their counterparts in Thai, as shown in (14) are not taken into consideration.

(12) Eng.: The vase broke into pieces.

(13) Jpn.: kabin-wa konagona-ni ware-ta
vase-Top into pieces be broken-Past

(14) Tha.: cEE¹kan¹ tEEk² pen¹ chin⁴chin⁴
vase be broken into pieces

As a result, the syntactic forms of resultative construction in Thai are represented as in (15), below.

- (15) a. [N₁ V₁ N₂ (con¹) V₂]
b. [N₁ V₁ con¹ N₂ V₂]

In the above syntactic forms, N₁ stands for the instigator. V₁ indicates the action that enables the change of state in N₂. N₂, thus, refers to any entity participating in an event which undergoes its change of state by the motivation of V₁. Finally, V₂ shows the result that makes the action denoted by V₁ come to an endpoint of state. The distinction of the syntactic forms between (15a) and (15b) is the appearance of the transition marker 'con¹' and its position in the construction. Without going into details, we can safely assume that the syntactic form in (15a) is used when the action denoted by V₁ is a transitive verb (two-place predicate), whereas it is an intransitive verb (one-place predicate) in (15b). We will turn to give more detailed discussion about this matter later.

2.2 Approach and Hypothesis

As stated earlier, this paper adopts both a semantic and syntactic approach to explaining the linguistic phenomenon of resultative construction. That is, we support the view that resultative construction is basically interpreted from semantic terms. Meanwhile, we agree that the compositional means found in syntax also plays an important role in the construction. Consequently, we use the transition marker 'con¹', literally meaning 'until', as a parameter to classify the activity verbs that can occur in the construction. In discussing this view, we will define the transition marker 'con¹' and put forward a hypothesis concerning the possible occurrence of 'con¹' in each construction.

2.2.1 Some points about 'con¹'

Here we define the transition marker 'con¹' as a syntactic entity used to denote a certain amount of time needed for an action in V₁ to progress before going into the endpoint of state signified by a result verb in V₂. In other words, when the effect of V₁ on N₂ is achieved gradually, via duration or repetition, the transition marker 'con¹' is used to emphasize the time consumption of the action in V₁ that eventually leads to the achieved state in V₂. In this instance, 'con¹' can be thought of as a linguistic device used to help the addressee perceive complex eventualities with respect to the real world. In this paper, we propose that resultative construction in Thai can be divided into three types based on the possibility of 'con¹' that appears in the construction.

2.2.2 Hypothesis and Proposed Patterns

At this point, we might suggest a hypothesis concerning the incorporation of 'con¹' into the syntactic form of resultative construction in Thai as follows:

Hypothesis: If V₁ is an activity verb that brings about an almost instantaneous result, 'con¹' is disallowed to occur in the construction. However, if the direct effect of V₁ on N₂ consumes a certain length of time before achieving its endpoint of state, 'con¹' can optionally occur in the construction. Moreover, if an achieved state is brought about after an action is performed for a fairly long time or constantly repeated, 'con¹' is obligatorily required.

Based on our hypothesis pointed out above, resultative construction in Thai can be divided into three types. That is, the first type shows the incompatibility of 'con¹', whereas the second type deals with the option of incorporating 'con¹'. Finally, the third type concerns the obligation to use 'con¹'. Each type will be discussed accordingly in the next section.

Having given a suggestion about the syntactic constraint in relation to the incorporation of the transition marker 'con¹', we further propose some semantic constraints viewed as the basic concept for the interpretation of resultative construction in Thai.

Semantic constraints:

- (a) Accomplishment interpretation of resultative construction in Thai is drawn from the interaction between two predicates, namely, an activity verb and a result verb.
- (b) The N₁ tends to be an animate instigator or, at least, has the power to transmit force.
- (c) The N₂ which undergoes a change of state must hold the semantic relation with N₁, at least, in some of the following ways:
 - (1) Patient or theme, which is generally conceived of as a subcategorized NP of V₁.
 - (2) Default N₂, which is, in particular, co-referential with N₁.
 - (3) Body part, i.e. N₂, holds the metonymic relationship with N₁. In other words, N₂ is a part of N₁.
 - (4) Any participants of complex eventualities.

3. Main discussion

As proposed in the previous section, resultative construction in Thai is mainly divided into three types with regard to the incorporation of the transition marker 'con¹'. The combination of two predicates in each construction can be illustrated as follows:

- (a) 'con¹' is incompatible: V₁ = causative verbs and V₂ = change of state or state verbs
- (b) 'con¹' is optional: V₁ = activity verbs and V₂ = change of state or state verbs
- (c) 'con¹' is obligatory: V₁ = activity verbs and V₂ = state verbs

Now we will discuss them in turn starting with the first type in which 'con¹' is incompatible.

2.1 'con¹' is incompatible [N₁ V₁ N₂ V₂ Modifier]

In this construction, V₁ is a causative verb which implies a certain aspect of the

resultant state, and V_2 is a change of state or state verb which yields the result brought about by the action of V_1 . Since the resultative construction is composed of cause and result, for the sake of convenience, we will refer to V_1 as a cause verb and V_2 as a result verb. The status of N_2 in this construction is apt to be patient or theme. Put simply, N_2 is both the patient of a cause verb and, at the same time, the theme of a result verb. The two predicates in this construction are exemplified in Table 1, below.

Table 1

V ₁ Cause Verb	V ₂ Result Verb	Modifier ⁷
khoon ³ (to topple)	lom ⁴ (to topple over)	mot ² l@@y ¹ (completely)
chiik ² (to tear)	khaat ² (to be torn)	pen ¹ chin ⁴ chin ⁴ (into pieces)
phaw ⁵ (to burn)	may ³ (to be burned)	mot ² l@@y ¹ (completely)
tham ¹ laay ¹ (to destroy)	sia ⁵ haay ⁵ (to be damaged)	yap ⁴ y@@n ¹ (extremely damaged)
thaa ¹ (to paint)	pen ¹ sii ⁵ (to be colored)	khaaw ⁵ (white), among the like.
yOOm ⁴ (to dye)	pen ¹ sii ⁵ (to be colored)	dam ¹ (black), among the like.

In fact, all of the cause verbs raised in Table 1 imply a certain aspect of change of state, and they tend to occur alone without the result verbs to supplement an achieved state. In general, therefore, result verbs do not co-occur with cause verbs unless the modifiers are accompanied, or in a case where the speaker intends to emphasize the situation by providing more information. Consider the examples below.

(16) khaw⁴ khoon³ ton³may⁴
 he topple tree

‘He cut down the tree(s).’

(17) ton³may⁴ lom⁴
 tree topple over

‘The tree(s) toppled over.’

In (16), the action of *khoon³* (topple) implies the state in (17), that is, the tree toppled over. Consequently, the case where *khoon³* and *lom⁴* co-occur in a simple declarative sentence, that which describes the physical change of state rather than an abstract one⁸, is rarely found independent of the context. Supposing that one saw a group of people cut down the trees completely, which is an unexpected event, one might say something like the sentence in (18).

(18) phuak³khaw⁴ khoon³ ton³may⁴ lom⁴ mot² l@@y¹
 they topple tree topple over completely

‘They cut down the trees completely.’

In this instance, the modifier ‘mot² l@@y¹’ in (18) emphasizes the speaker’s feeling and further specifies the achieved state of the trees as being toppled over completely. It is worth noting that this modifier, i.e. mot² l@@y¹ (completely), can be employed to test the combination of a cause verb and a result verb used in this group for acceptability. As this stands, it is reasonable to think that the combination of a cause verb and a result verb of this kind really exists in spoken language.

Therefore, it is appropriate to apply our parameter, i.e. the incorporation of ‘con¹’, to this first type of resultative construction. Recall that our suggestion for the first type

is that 'con¹' is incompatible with this construction. Namely, 'con¹' cannot occur in front of a result verb. Consider the examples below.

- (19) * khaw⁴ khoon³ ton³ may⁴ con¹ lom⁴
 he topple tree until topple over
 ● 'He cut down the tree until it toppled over.'

- (20) * khaw⁴ phaw⁵ cot² maay⁵ con¹ may³
 he burn letter until be burned
 ● 'He burned the letter until it was burnt.'

- (21) * khaw⁴ thaa¹ baan³ con¹ pen¹ sii⁵ khaaw⁵
 he paint house until be colored white
 ● 'He painted his house until it became white.'

Based on the unacceptability of the examples above, the result shows, as expected, that 'con¹' cannot occur in front of a result verb. This is attributed to the fact that the action and result occur almost instantaneously. Therefore, a transition marker 'con¹, which denotes the time consumption of an action, is undoubtedly incompatible with this kind of predicate. In (19), the endpoint of the action which causes the tree to be unsteady, and the timing of the tree falling onto the ground happens continuously and with no delay. Likewise, in (20) the moment the letter is set on fire, it is immediately burned, and in (21) the moment the white paint is put on the surface of the house, it becomes white. It is clearly seen that the endpoint of the action which is denoted by a cause verb, and the entry into a new state of the result verb is nearly instantaneous. As a consequence, 'con¹' is disallowed to function as a transition marker leading to an achieved state.

2.2 'con¹' is optional [N₁ V₁ N₂ (con¹) V₂ (Modifier)]

The relation between two predicates is, again, represented in the form of cause and result, where V₁ is a transitive activity verb, including an unspecified object verb, which denotes cause, and V₂ is a change of state verb or a state verb denoting result. This second type differs from the first one due to the variability of the possible result caused by the action of V₁ which has an effect on N₂, whereas in the first type, the result brought about by the action of V₁ is rather fixed. Of course, such a variable result also depends on the physical nature of N₂ as well. We are going to discuss this matter in further detail in the next section. Turning now to the point at issue, some examples of the two predicates that fall into this group are illustrated in Table 2.

Table 2

V ₁ Cause Verb	V ₂ Result Verb
kat ² (to bite)	khaat ² (to be torn); phang ¹ (to be damaged); taay ¹ (to be dead)
tii ¹ (to beat)	tEEk ² (to be broken); nuam ³ (to a pulp); taay ¹ (to be dead)
ying ¹ (to shoot)	baat ² cep ² (to be injured); taay ¹ (to be dead)
paw ² (to blow)	dap ² (to blow out); tEEk ² (to explosion)
riit ³ (to iron)	riap ³ (to be flat); may ³ (to be burned)
chon ¹ (to bump)	lom ⁴ (fall over); bup ² (to be dented)

Considering the syntactic form represented above, the transition marker 'con¹' and modifier are shown in parentheses which means they are optional. Since 'con¹' denotes the time consumption of an action before it achieves an end state, the appearance of 'con¹' in the second type of resultative construction makes no difference in consideration of the whole event in the sentence without 'con¹'. Rather the nuance in duration and repetition of an activity verb makes it different. A comparison of the following examples reveals what is going on.

(22) a. khaw⁴ tii¹ nguu¹ taay¹

he beat snake be dead

'He beat the snake to death.'

b. khaw⁴ tii¹ nguu¹ con¹ taay¹

he beat snake until be dead

'He beat the snake to death.'

We might try to make the case that in (22b) the nuance of the action 'beating' is induced on the snake via duration and repetition, before the snake undergoes its state-change from being alive to being dead. However, there is no such reading found in (22a).

2.3 'con¹' is obligatory [N₁ V₁ con¹ N₂ V₂ (Modifier)]

The third type of resultative construction in Thai features cause denoted by an unergative activity verb, as well as some transitive verbs that allow the omission of an unspecified object, and the result that is represented in a state verb. In this group, we can further divide into three sub-groups based on the different characteristics of N₂. Namely, the N₂, which undergoes its change of state, is regarded as default NP, body part, and any participant in the event.

N₂ as Default NP

The view we have introduced above implies that when the affected NP is coreferential with the subject, that is the instigator N₁, it sounds redundant to repeat the affected entity with another NP. Consequently, in this case, N₂ is deleted from the surface syntactic structure. This type of resultative construction, in which the affected entity is coreferential with subject, corresponds to the sentence with a reflexive fake object in English. Consider the following sets of words.

(23) dek² rOOng⁴ hay³ con¹ lap² pay¹

baby cry until sleep go: ASPECT

'The baby cried himself / herself to sleep.'

(24) khaw⁴ d@@n¹ con¹ nYay²

he walk until be tired

'He got tired as a result of walking for a long time.'

(25) khaw⁴ kin¹ con¹ ?im²

he eat until full

'He ate himself sick.'

(26) khaw⁴ dYYm² con¹ maw¹

he drink until get drunk

'He drank himself unconscious.'

2.3.1 N₂ as Body Part

Moreover, the affected entity can also be a body part which holds the semantically metonymic relationship, i.e. part-whole relation with subject of the clause. Put simply, while the subject or instigator is considered a whole person, the body part is viewed as an affected entity. Some simple examples will suffice to show this. Consider the examples below.

- (27) khaw⁴ rRRng⁰hay⁴ con¹ taa¹ buam¹
he cry until eyes swell
'He cried his eyes out.'
- (28) khaw⁴ ta¹koon¹ con¹ siang⁵ hEEp²
he shout until voice hoarse
'He shouted himself hoarse.'
- (29) khaw⁴ ?ay¹ con¹ naa³ dEEng¹
he cough until face red
'He coughed himself red in the face.'

2.3.2 N₂ as Any Other Participants

Finally, the third group exhibits other characteristics of an affected entity which is neither a coreferential NP represented in default NP nor a body part of a subject. Rather, any other participants found here refer to an instrument or object of preposition, which is affected by the action of subject via duration and repetition. We will illustrate what is meant here by citing some English examples. For example, *He ran his shoes threadbare*; *He ran the pavement thin*; *Drank your teapot dry*, among others. Now, consider the Thai examples from (30) to (32), below.

- (30) khaw⁴ d@n¹ con¹ son³rOOng¹thaaw⁴ sYk²
he walk until heels of shoes be worn out
'He has worn out the heels of his shoes by walking a lot.'
- (31) khaw⁴ khian⁵ con¹ din¹sOO⁵ thuu³
he write until pencil get blunt
'He wrote until his pencil became blunt.'
- (32) khaw⁴ phuut³ con¹ chan⁴ bYa²
he speak until I get tired
'He spoke a lot until I got sick and tired of his speaking.'

Based on our observations, the affected entities tend to be instruments, such as the heels of shoes and the pencil as in (30) and (31), respectively. Moreover, an object of preposition can be viewed as an affected entity as well, like the addressee in (32).

To sum this all up, the varieties of resultative construction we have specified so far are collated in Table 3.

Table 3 Varieties of Resultative Construction in Thai

Appearance of con ¹	V ₁ Cause	V ₂ Result
Incompatible Transitive causative verb		Change of state/state verb
Optional	Transitive activity verb	Change of state/state verb

Obligatory	Unergative verb;	State verb
	Unspecified object verb	

Based on our analysis of resultative construction in Thai, our discussion has led us to the conclusion that, among these three types, the second type is reasonably considered to be the typical pattern of resultative construction in Thai. This view is based on the grounds that a cause verb, i.e. transitive activity verb, can appear with resultative phrases without the mediation of the transition marker 'con¹' or modifiers. On the other hand, since the first type depends on the emphasis of modifiers such as 'mot² l@y¹', literally meaning "completely", it seems appropriate to view it as a peripheral pattern of resultative construction. In addition, the third type should be treated as a rather marginal pattern which is remote from the central member of the group, and can possibly be viewed as containing biclausal complex eventualities.

Moreover, it is of considerable interest that in unergative based resultative construction, as well as in unspecified object verb based construction, English tends to use reflexives as fake objects, especially in the case where an affected entity is coreferential with the subject. On the contrary, if a resultative phrase modifies any change of state of a subject, Thai tends to use the pattern with default NP. This can be attributed to the distinctive nature of the clause between these two languages. Namely, English is likely to hold the causative nature of the main clause as pointed out by L. Levin, Mitamura, and Mahmoud, cited in B. Levin and Rappaport Hovav (1995, p.74). However, Thai is apt to use the successive nature of the serial verb unit to present complex eventualities, event by event, along the temporal axis. In other words, in Thai, the happening of an event₁, viz. *e*₁, motivates *e*₂ which, then motivates *e*₃ to *e*_n. On these grounds, we can further explain the obligatory appearance of 'con¹' found in the third type. That is, by and large, an unergative verb cannot take a resultative phrase unless the mediation of 'con¹' is used to denote the process of an action conducted via duration and repetition, and which eventually motivates an achieved state. We will close this section by going into the related issues featuring two relevant topics, that is, the scalar construal of resultant state, and the comparative analysis among the two markers, i.e. 'con¹' (until), and 'sia⁵' (to be damaged), as well as the combined pattern 'sia⁵ con¹', respectively.

4. Other Related Issues

We will begin with the matter of scalar construal of resultant state, followed by a comparison of two markers used in resultative construction in Thai.

1.4 Scalar Construal of Resultant State

As briefly mentioned in the introduction, resultant state needs not to be necessarily fixed, especially in the second type which is the typical pattern of resultative construction in Thai. It is worth noting that in this paper we do not treat resultative phrases apart from what is regarded as degree on the grounds that degree definitely entails the change of state. However, it is not the case for the reverse. We turn now to what we call scalar construal of resultant state. This view is presented in Kessakul (1999, ms), and is based on the fact that the achieved state has a scale of achievement ranging from the lowest degree to the highest. Certainly, this is in accordance with the

perception found in the real world. We will illustrate what we mean here by considering the cases of English below.

(33) English case

She beat him *black and blue* / *to a pulp* / *to death*.

In addition, the resultant state can also be perceived in an unexpected way. In other words, an action may yield the result in contrast to the general expectation. Consider the case of washing in Chinese, and ironing in Thai, respectively.

(34) Chinese case (the example (b) and (c), cited from Talmy (1998, ms))

(a) wo ba chen-yi xi gan-jing le

I Obj shirt wash clean Perf.

'I washed the shirt clean.'

(b) wo ba chen-yi xi zang le

I Obj shirt wash dirty Perf.

'I washed the shirt, but it came out dirty than before.'

(c) wo xi pou le chen-yi

I wash torn Perf. shirt

'I washed the shirt, and it got torn in the process.'

(35) Thai case

(a) khaw⁴ riit³ sYa³ riap³

he iron shirt flat

'He ironed the shirt flat.'

(b) khaw⁴ riit³ sYa³ may³ riap³

he iron shirt not flat

'The shirt became pleated as a result of his ironing.'

(c) khaw⁴ riit³ sYa³ may³ pen¹ ruu¹

he iron shirt be burned become a hole

'He burnt a hole into the shirt by ironing.'

Notice that the word 'may³' in 35 (b) and (c) is only an accidental resemblance in phonetic representation, and in fact, has a different spelling in Thai.

Moreover, the scalar construal of resultant state is attributed to the physical nature of an affected entity as well. See the example (36), featuring Thai.

(36) a. su¹nak⁴ kat² rOOng¹thaw⁴ khaat²

dog bite shoes be torn

'The shoes became torn as a result of the dog's biting.'

b. su¹nak⁴ kat² khOOng⁵len³ tEEk²

dog bite toy be broken

'The toy became broken as a result of the dog's biting.'

c. su¹nak⁴ kat² luuk³nok⁴ taay¹

dog bite baby bird die

'The baby bird died as a result of the dog's biting.'

Based on the examples above, it is clearly seen that resultant state varies due to the physical nature of an affected entity. That is, the shoes can be torn, while the toy is able to be broken by the power of the dog's biting. Meanwhile, such a small creature as baby bird may lose its life by the same cause.

2.4 A comparison between 'con¹' and 'sia⁵'

In this subsection, we will briefly discuss the different nuance brought about by an emphasis marker 'sia⁵' or pronounced as 'sa?⁴' in colloquial style, compared to the transition marker 'con¹' found in resultative construction. For the sake of convenience, we use the original form 'sia⁵' in this paper.

As we have seen, the transition marker 'con¹', literally meaning 'until', is employed in the second type and third type of resultative construction in Thai in order to denote the length of time of an action before it enters an endpoint of state. Thus, 'con¹' implies that the result comes out via the duration and repetition of an action without considering the attitude of the speaker.

On the other hand, 'sia⁵', which literally means 'to be damaged', is used to emphasize the subjective mood of the speaker in addition to the slight implication of duration and repetition of an action. However, whether the subjective mood of the speaker is positive or negative depends on the context, although it tends to yield a negative sense. The examples below illustrate what is meant by this distinction.

(37) a. khaw⁴ yiap² dOOK²may⁴ bEEn¹

he step flower flat

'He stepped the flower flat.'

b. khaw⁴ yiap² dOOK²may⁴ con¹ bEEn¹

he step flower until flat

'He made the flower flat by stepping on it for a period of time or repeatedly.'

c. khaw⁴ yiap² dOOK²may⁴ sia⁵ bEEn

he step flower EMP. flat

'He made the flower flat by stepping on it, with the subjective mood of the speaker.'

Among the examples above, (37a) merely shows the flower becoming flat by the action of 'stepping'. On the other hand, in (37b), 'con¹' adds the meaning of duration as well as repetition of the action to the fact identified in (37a). Moreover, the emphasis marker 'sia⁵' in (37c) shows the strong evaluation of the speaker against the action of 'stepping' which makes the flower flat. As a consequence, the distinction between 'sia⁵' and 'con¹' can be explained by the different focus of attention of the speaker. That is, 'sia⁵' is used when the speaker intends to evaluate the action that brings about a result, and hence the speaker's attention is placed on action rather than result. In contrast, 'con¹' is employed to focus on result. The examples below serve to support the distinction between these two connectives pointed out above.

(38) khaw⁴ phuut³ sia⁵ / *con¹ rew¹ chiaw¹

he speak be damaged / until fast Discourse M.

'He spoke so fast (with the evaluation of the speaker).'

In (38), the action of his speaking is focused and evaluated as being fast by the speaker. It is clearly seen that in such an evaluation 'con¹' is unacceptable due to its result-placed focus.

However, it is also possible for the two markers, i.e. ‘sia⁵’ and ‘con¹’, to co-occur as we can see in (39).

(39) khaw⁴ yiap² dOOk²may⁴ sia⁵ con¹ bEEEn¹
 he step flower EMP until flat

Of course, in this case, both the subjective mood of the speaker along with duration and repetition are readable. As noted above, when the emphasis marker ‘sia⁵’ is employed, it implies a result due to the fact that the speaker evaluates the outcome brought about by the action. However, it is not the case for reverse. This is because ‘con¹’ merely identifies the fact without any subjective feeling of the speaker.

5. Conclusion

By way of conclusion, it seems appropriate to remark that resultative construction in Thai is mainly interpreted from semantics. In addition, we also employ the transition marker ‘con¹’ as a syntactic parameter to classify verbs, particularly action-denoting verbs that occur in each type. Based on our analysis, we have found that in the first type where ‘con¹’ is incompatible, a causative verb can appear with a resultative phrase without any incongruity, if a modifier accompanies it. Moreover, we might suggest that the combination between a transitive verb, including an unspecified object verb, and a change of state verb / state verb is the typical pattern, on the grounds that they can co-occur without the mediation of ‘con¹’ as well as a modifier. Finally, the most marginal case is the third type featuring an unergative verb, as well as an unspecified object verb, that denotes the action of the clause along with the obligatory appearance of ‘con¹’, that leads the action to an end state. We will close this paper with the outcome of resultative construction in Thai based on our analysis as shown in Table 4 below.

Table 4

Items	Type 1	Type 2	Type 3
Types of action verbs	Causative UOV	Transitive UOV	Unergative
The occurrence of ‘con ¹ ’	Incompatible	Optional	Obligatory
Possible result	Rather fixed	Variable	Unlimited
Status of RC	Peripheral	Typical	Marginal
(UOV stands for Unspecified Object Verb)			

Notes

*We are deeply grateful to Prof. Yoshiki Nishimura of the University of Tokyo for his valuable comments on the first draft of this paper, and for his kindly giving us many good chances to present the earlier versions of this paper. Thanks also go to all of the participants in the 2nd Cognitive Linguistic Forum 1999 in Kyoto as well as those in the linguistic seminar of Language and Information Sciences, the University of Tokyo, for their stimulating questions. Lastly, but not least, we would like to thank Mr. Vuthichai Ampornaramveth, a researcher of National Institute of Informatics, for the

corpus data on Thai related to the resultative construction.

1. The term 'complex predicates' is also adopted in Matsumoto (1996) featuring, mostly, the left headed compound verbs and right-headed compound verbs in Japanese.
 2. For further details, see the brief, but broad perspectives on resultatives in "The Encyclopedia of Language and Linguistics" Vol.6, R.E.Asher (edited-in-chief), Pergamon Press (1994)
 3. The terms that refer to the second noun in resultative construction are employed with a slightly different nuance. Namely, Levin and Rapaport Hovav (1995) adopt the term *direct object* to refer to the second noun which bears a normal argument relation to the matrix verb, the non-subcategorized NP, and reflexives. On the other hand, Goldberg (1995) employs the term *patient* in order to explain the status of the reflexive fake object as a semantic argument of resultative construction, and says that Van Valin (1990a) uses the term *undergoer* to indicate any argument which can be passivized.
 4. The notion 'Scalar Construal of Resultant State' is proposed in Kessakul (1998), the paper presented at the 2nd Cognitive Linguistic Forum, Kyoto University, held on the 18th and 19th of September 1998.
 5. Washio (1997) uses the term 'weak resultatives' to refer to a transitive-based resultative construction, the only one pattern that Japanese allows, in which a resultative phrase merely further specifies result denoted by an action verb. On the other hand, English permits both strong and weak resultatives.
 6. In fact, some linguists treat resultatives as either accomplishment or achievement. In this paper, we limit the scope to the sense of accomplishment only.
 7. The modifier VP represented in the form of 'pen¹ N' in Thai denotes two slightly different senses, namely, 'BECOME STATE' and 'BE AT STATE'. For 'BECOME STATE', in fact, is *klaay¹ pen¹ N*, but the word *klaay¹* tends to be omitted in conversation, and thus it is pronounced as *pen¹ N*, a form that accidentally resembles that of 'BE AT STATE'. Consequently, the way to distinguish these two is to judge from the context.
 8. The combination of *khoon³* (topple) and *lom⁴* (fall over) can be used as a compound verb which does not allow any argument to occur between them, and denotes the abstract meaning. The example below illustrates *khoon³lom⁴* which means to take power away from a government.
- (a) faay² khaan⁴ tOOng³kaan¹ khoon³lom⁴ rat⁴tha¹baan¹
 opposition parties want topple government
 'The opposition parties want to topple the government.'

References

1. Goldberg, Adele E. 1995. *Constructions: A construction grammar approach to argument structure*. Chicago and London: The University of Chicago Press.
2. Kageyama, Taro 1996. *Dooshi Imiron—Gengo to Ninchi no Setten—*[Verb Semantics: The Interface of Language and Cognition], Nichi-Ei Taishoo Kenkyuu Series (5),

Kurosio Publishers.

3. Kessakul, Ruetaivan (ms). *Taigo no Kekkakoobun* [The Resultative Construction in Thai]. The paper presented at the 2nd Cognitive Linguistic Forum, held at Kyoto University. 18th and 19th of September, 1999.
4. Levin, Beth and Malka Rappaport Hovav 1995. *Unaccusativity: At the Syntax-Lexical Semantics Interface*. Cambridge, Massachusettes: The MIT Press.
5. Matsumoto, Yo 1996. *Complex predicates in Japanese: A Syntactic and Semantic Study of the Notion 'Word'*, Kurosio Publishers & CSLI Publications.
6. Nakagawa, Yozo 1992. 'CR Tadooshibun ni Tsuite—Ninchi Gengogaku Kanten kara—'[CR Transitive Construction: From Cognitive Linguistic Perspective]. In *Chuugokugogaku* [the Study of Chinese Linguistics], no.239. Chuugokugo Gakkai.
7. Nishimura, Yoshiki 1998. 'Kooisha to Shieki Koobun'[Actor and Causative Construction]. In *Koobun to Jishoo Koozoo* [Construction and Event Structure], Minoru Nakau (ed.), Nichi-Eigo Hikaku Sensho (5), The Second Part: 108-203, Kenkyuusha Publishers.
8. Sybesma, Rint 1999. *The Mandarin VP: Studies in Natural Language and Linguistic Theory*. Vol.44. Dordrecht/ Boston/ London: Kluwer Academic Publishers.
9. Talmy, Leonard. (ms). *A Typology of Event Integration*. State University of New York, Buffalo
10. Thepkanjana, Kingkarn 1999. 'Lexical Causatives in Thai'. In Ad Foolen and Frederike van der Leek (eds.), *Construction in Cognitive Linguistics*. 259-281. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
11. Washio, Ryuichi 1997. 'Resultatives, Compositionality and Language Variation', *Journal of East Asian Linguistics* (6): 1-49
12. *The Encyclopedia of Language and Linguistics*, R.E. Asher (editor-in-chief), Vol.7, 1994. 3562-3566. Pergamon Press.

PHÂN TÍCH CÁC VỊ NGỮ ĐỘNG DANHTỪ PHỨC HỢP TRONG TIẾNG TETUN VÀ KAMBERA (TÓM TẮT)

Marian Klamer

Trong nhiều ngôn ngữ, vị ngữ “phức hợp” (complex predicates) kết hợp một động từ (“phi đối cách”) với một danh từ chỉ bộ phận cơ thể nhằm diễn tả cảm xúc hoặc những thuộc tính của cơ thể ở một người nào đó, chẳng hạn như trong tiếng Anh *My heart bleeds* “I’m sad” (*Tim tôi rỉ máu* - “Tôi đang buồn”). Trong bài thảo luận này tôi sẽ phân tích các kết hợp [Động từ - Danh từ] trong hai ngôn ngữ có liên quan thuộc ngữ hệ Nam Đảo ở miền Đông Indonesia là Tetun (Van Klinken 1977) và Kambera (Klamer 1988). Ví dụ như (Tetun) : *nawan sa’e* “(have) ascending breath” - “(có) hơi thở dâng cao” > “be angry” - “đang giận”, *isin manas* “have a hot body” - “có thân mình nóng” > “bị sốt”; (Kambera) : *hamu eti* “be good-livered, have a good liver” - “gan tốt”, “có lá gan tốt” > “be happy” (“vui sướng”), *mbana ihi* “have a hot body” > “be feverish” - “bị sốt”).

Tôi bắt đầu bằng việc giải thích tại sao các vị ngữ là động danh từ trong những ngôn ngữ này dường như là nguyên nhân dẫn đến một nghịch lý trong quá trình phân tích (analytical paradox). Một mặt, những tổ hợp vị ngữ VN là những đơn vị hình thái học, chẳng hạn như khi chúng hành chức như yếu tố cơ sở cho quá trình phái sinh (gây khiến, tác động) về mặt hình thái học (như trong (2)). Mặt khác, V (động từ) và N(danh từ) có thể tách biệt nhau về mặt cú pháp (như trong (3a,b)) :

Trong phần hai của bài thảo luận tôi sẽ cố gắng dung hòa thuộc tính kép này của những vị ngữ VN theo quan điểm từ vựng luận. Theo quan điểm của Jackendoff (1997) mà chủ trương rằng chúng ta cần một lý thuyết miêu tả từ vựng nhằm tách cấu trúc khái niệm của một yếu tố từ vựng ra khỏi những đặc trưng cú pháp của nó về mặt từ vựng. Giả định rằng những đơn vị từ vựng (lexcial items) có sự phù hợp về qui tắc giữa Cấu trúc khái niệm của từ /Lexcical Conceptual Structure (LCS), Cấu trúc cú pháp của từ /Lexcical Syntactic Structure (LSS) và Cấu trúc âm vị học của từ / Lexcical Phonologycal Structure (LPS), tôi đưa ra một biểu thức miêu tả từ vựng cho những vị ngữ VN trong tiếng Tetun và Kambera mà những ngôn ngữ xem V và N như là một đơn vị trong LCS chứ không phải trong LSS :

(4) LCS	:	[PREDICATE _Z (THEME _A)]	LOCATION _B
LSS	:	V _Z N _A	N _B

Vì thế, bằng cách tách ngữ nghĩa và cấu trúc tham tố của một yếu tố từ vựng ra khỏi những đặc trưng cú pháp của nó, ta mới có thể giải thích được thuộc tính kép của các vị ngữ vừa như là những đơn vị từ vựng vừa như là một ngữ đoạn cú pháp.