THE STATUS OF THE WORD 띄어 냅 IN THAI

KITIMA INDRAMBARYA

1. INTRODUCTION

There has long been controversy about the word 띄어 냅 ‘to give’ in Thai: about how many homophonous words 띄어 냅 exist in Thai and to which grammatical categories they belong. This paper examines the status of the form 띄어 냅 based on distribution and meaning. Within the Lexicase version of dependency grammar, this analysis classifies the form 띄어 냅 into six homophonous variants: three ditransitive verbs, two causative verbs, and an adverb.

The form 띄어 냅 is most commonly a verb carrying the meaning ‘to give’. However, there are several homophonous 띄어 냅’s, as illustrated in the following example:

(1) น้ า บอก ว่า ผู้ ล้า ใย ต่ำ ใย กิน ซี ใต้ ใย ลำ โม
    Noy say that mother cause Toy give key Dang cause repair
    ròt ใย ชมานัน ค่า? ตี ใย.
    car for otherwise will hit for
    Noy said that mother ordered Toy, under the threat of being hit, to give the key
    to Dang to fix the car for (mother).

The forms pronounced as 띄어 냅 in the example above differ in distribution and meaning. The purpose of this paper is to classify the Thai form 띄어 냅 into different categories based on their distribution and meaning. The syntactic framework used in this analysis is Lexicase, a version of dependency grammar developed by Stanley Starosta in the early 1970s. While the first part of this paper is an introduction, the second part is a review of previous analyses of 띄어 냅. Sections 3–5 provide a reanalysis of the form 띄어 냅: §3 discusses the ditransitive verbs 띄어 냅 ‘to give’; §4 discusses the causative verbs 띄어 냅; and §5 discusses the adverb 띄어 냅. The last part of the paper presents a conclusion.

2. PREVIOUS ANALYSES

2.1 PANUPONG 1970

Vichin Panupong’s work Inter-sentence relations in modern conversational Thai is a detailed structuralist analysis of spoken Thai based on the use of test frames. Panupong

---

1 This article is a revision of Indrambarya (1990). I would like to thank Professor Stanley Starosta and Marybeth Clark for their valuable comments regarding previous versions of this article.
(1970:122) proposes the two test frames (a) and (b) for ditransitive verbs, as shown in example (2).

(2) a. n 2 n n lēew
    b. n kamlag 3 n n (where n refers to NP lēew is an adverb of completion
        and kamlag is an adverb of progression)

Panupong states that any words which may replace 2 in (a) and 3 in (b) are to be labelled as ditransitive verbs. Since ḥāy in (3) fits in either position, it is an instance of a ditransitive verb in Panupong’s classification.

(3) a. Mēe ḥāy taŋ nit lēew.
    mother give money Nit already
    Mother has already given Nit some money. (Panupong 1970:122)

    b. Mēe kamlag ḥāy taŋ nit.
    mother in.progress give money Nit
    Mother is giving Nit some money. (Panupong 1970:122)

However, Panupong does not state how she would treat ḥāy in (4) below, in which the third NP of pattern (a) is replaced by a prepositional phrase.

(4) Mēe ḥāy taŋ kēe nit.
    mother give money to Nit
    Mother gave some money to Nit.

Panupong analyses ḥāy in (5) and (6) in terms of its function and considers it to be a “verbal linker” because it links two verbs. However, she does not state to which grammatical category (i.e. a noun, a verb, a preposition, or an adverb) this verb linker ḥāy belongs.

(5) Cōtmāy chabāp nii tōŋ āan ḥāy dii.
    letter issue this must read linker good
    This letter must be read carefully.

(6) Khruu sāŋ ḥāy āan nāgsī.
    teacher order linker read book
    The teacher ordered us to read a book. (Panupong 1970:164–165)

2.2 DEJTHAMRONG 1970

Orathai Dejthamrong (1970), Panupong’s student, investigates the grammatical function of ḥāy and finds five syntactically distinct but orthographically and phonemically identical forms of ḥāy. These forms are: a ditransitive verb, a preposition, a causative transitive verb, a clause linker, and a postverb functioning as part of the nucleus.

Dejthamrong defines ditransitive verbs in accordance with Panupong’s (1970) ditransitive verb test frames. However, Dejthamrong notes that there are three types of ditransitive verbs: those that require a preposition, such as sōŋ ‘to send’, as in (7); those that do not allow a preposition, such as tāk ‘to answer’ in (8); and those that may or may not have a preposition, such as ḥāy ‘to give’ in (9).
(7) a. *Lék sọŋ cömāy xrahāy.
Lek send letter Orathai
Lek sent the letter to Orathai.

b. Lék sọŋ cömāy kēe xrahāy.
Lek send letter to Orathai
Lek sent the letter to Orathai.

(8) a. Khāw tɔɔp khamthāam khɔɔ nī khrūu.
he answer question bunch this teacher
He answered this question for the teacher. (lit. He answered this question the teacher.)

b. *Khāw tɔɔp khamthāam khɔɔ nī kē khrūu.
he answer question bunch this to teacher
He answered this question for the teacher. (lit. He answered this question to the teacher.)

(9) a. Deeŋ hāy nāgsū dēkdēk.
Dang give book children
Dang gave the children some books.

b. Deeŋ hāy nāgsū kēe dēkdēk.
Dang give book to children
Dang gave some books to the children.

Verbs which require prepositions do not fit in Panupong’s verb test frame. Dejthamrong’s explanation for treating such verbs as ditransitive verbs is based on their overlapping distribution. They are included, according to Dejthamrong (1970:43), only because they may replace ditransitive verbs like hāy ‘to give’ and cēk ‘to distribute’ when such verbs are followed by a preposition.

Hāy in (10) and (11) is considered to be a preposition, since it fits in a preposition test frame, while hāy in (12) is identified as a causative transitive verb followed by a clause.

(10) Deeŋ yim hāy chān.
Dang smile give I
Dang smiled at me.

(11) Deeŋ kwhāat bāan hāy mēe.
Dang sweep house give mother
Dang swept the house for her mother.

(12) Deeŋ hāy nāŋ kwhāat bāan.
Dang cause younger.sibling sweep house
Dang had his younger sibling sweep the house.

Dejthamrong considers hāy in (13) and (15)–(18) to be instances of hāy functioning as a “clause linker”, which “introduces” a noun clause or an adverbial clause. For example, in (13a), hāy is analysed as a clause linker, introducing a noun clause, because hāy chān maa may be replaced by a noun nāgsū ‘book’, a direct object of the transitive verb t̄pkaan ‘to want’, as in (13b) (Dejthamrong 1970:100).
(13) a. Deeŋ ćiŋkaan háy cháŋ maa.
    Dang want I come
    Dang wants me to come.

b. Deeŋ ćiŋkaan náŋši.
    Dang want book
    Dang wants a book.

When háy occurs with the ditransitive verb bɔɔk ‘to tell, to order’, as in (14a), Dejthamrong treats the clause introduced by háy as a direct object of the verb because it may be replaced by the noun khàaw ‘news’, as shown in (14b), despite the meaning difference of the verb bɔɔk. However, according to Dejthamrong, “unlike other ditransitive verbs”, which require a direct object to precede an indirect object, the indirect object deeŋ ‘Dang’ precedes the direct object noun clause in (14a). To accommodate this fact, Dejthamrong (1970:101) stipulates that when the direct object is a noun clause, it appears after an indirect object.

(14) a. Khàaw bɔɔk deeŋ háy kláp bāan.
    he order Dang return home
    IO DO
    He ordered Dang to return home.

b. Khàaw bɔɔk khàaw deeŋ.
    he tell news Dang
    DO IO
    He told Dang the news.

In Dejthamrong’s analysis, the clause linker háy may introduce an adverbial clause modifying a verb, as in (15a) and (16a). Háy and the words that follow it constitute an adverbial clause because one could replace the clause with the adverb yàagray ‘how’, as in (15b), and thammay ‘why’, as in (16b) (Dejthamrong 1970:120–121).

    I will sleep comfortable
    I will sleep comfortably.

b. Chán cä? nɔɔn yàagray?
    I will sleep how
    How will I sleep?

(16) a. Nit yök kàw̄̄́̄tì háy khèsk nāŋ.
    Nit lift chair guest sit
    Nit got a chair for the guest to sit on.

b. Nit yök kàw̄̄́̄tì thammay?
    Nit lift chair why
    Why did Nit lift a chair?

Dejthamrong also considers the háy which can appear only at the beginning of a sentence to be a clause linker introducing an adverbial clause, as in (17a), because háy plus the words which accompany it may be replaced by yàagray yàagray ‘whatever happens’ in (17b) (Dejthamrong 1970:123).
      rain fall I then will go school
      Even if it rains, I will still go to school.

b.  Yapayayayay chan kho ca? pay roogrian.
    whatever happens I then will go school
    Whatever happens, I will still go to school.

Finally, Dejthamrong also sets up a category called postverb for the form hãy which appears after a transitive verb. The postverbal hãy functions as part of the nucleus, as illustrated in (18). However, she does not state to which syntactic category (e.g. noun, verb, adverb) this hãy belongs.

(18)  Mūa kät khāw hãy.
      dog bite he
      The dog bit him.

2.3 KULLAVANIJAYA 1974

Pranee Kullavaniyaya (1974), working within an early version of the Lexicase framework, discusses the ditransitive verb hãy, the causative verb hãy, and the derived preposition hãy. According to her analysis, a sentence like (19) is ambiguous. Read in one way, hãy is considered to be a preposition, a benefactive case assigned to its following noun.

(19)  Mēe yēp săa hãy lūuk.
      mother sew shirt for child
      +N       +P       +N
      +NM²     +B       +AC
      +AGT
      A mother sewed a dress for her child. (Kullavaniyaya 1974:85)

Example (19) also has another reading, in which hãy is a non-finite ditransitive verb. The sentence is interpreted as ‘Mother sewed the dress and gave it to the child’, as illustrated in (20).

(20)  Mēe yēp săa hãy lūuk.
      mother sew shirt give child
      +N       +V       +N
      +NM      -finite +AC
      +AGT

2 The lexicase abbreviations for case markers used by Kullavaniyaya (1974) are as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Case Forms</th>
<th>Case Relations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AC</td>
<td>ACC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>BEN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>DAT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NM</td>
<td>AGT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Agent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Benefactive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dative</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
By treating $h\ddot{a}y$ in (20) as a ditransitive verb, Kullavanijaya can account for sentences like (21), in which $h\ddot{a}y$ is followed by the preposition $k\ddot{a}p$.

(21) $M\ddot{e}+\quad y\ddot{e}p\quad s\ddot{h}a\quad h\ddot{a}y\quad k\ddot{a}p\quad l\ddot{u}uk$.
    mother sew shirt give to child
    $+V\quad +P\quad +N$
    $+C\quad +AC$
    $+DAT$

Mother sewed the dress and gave it to the child. (Kullavanijaya 1974:87)

Kullavanijaya explains that if $h\ddot{a}y$ in this example were considered to be a preposition, there would be two case markers for one actant: $h\ddot{a}y$ as a benefactive case marker and $k\ddot{a}p$ as a dative case marker. The question would remain as to which case should be assigned to the following noun $l\ddot{u}uk$. If $h\ddot{a}y$ is analysed as a verb, however, one does not encounter this problem, and $l\ddot{u}uk$ would receive, as expected, an ordinary dative case.

In Kullavanijaya’s analysis, $h\ddot{a}y$ in a sentence like (12) above and in (22) is considered to be a causative transitive verb, which takes a verb complement. Further, she points out that the ditransitive verb $h\ddot{a}y$ ‘to give’ and the causative verb $h\ddot{a}y$ are different lexical items which are not derivationally related in a synchronic sense (Kullavanijaya 1974:269–273). Her claim is based on two unique characteristics of the causative $h\ddot{a}y$. First, only $h\ddot{a}y$ ‘to cause’, but not causative verbs such as $s\ddot{a}g$ ‘to command’, may be embedded under non-causative verbs. For example:

(22) $Deen\quad c\ddot{a}\quad k\ddot{i}n\quad k\ddot{h}\ddot{\ddot{a}}aw\quad h\ddot{a}y\quad ?m$.
    Dang will eat rice cause full
    Dang will eat to make himself full. (Kullavanijaya 1974:272)

(23) $*Deen\quad c\ddot{a}\quad k\ddot{i}n\quad k\ddot{h}\ddot{\ddot{a}}aw\quad s\ddot{a}g\quad ?m$.
    Dang will eat rice command full
    Dang will eat to make himself full.

Second, only $h\ddot{a}y$ may occur with process verbs. For example:

(24) $Th\ddot{a}\ddot{\ddot{a}}\quad c\ddot{a}\quad h\ddot{a}y\quad c\ddot{h}\ddot{\ddot{a}}n\quad t\ddot{a}ay\quad r\ddot{\ddot{a}}\ddot{\ddot{o}}$?
    you will make I die fast is that so
    Do you want to make me die soon? (Kullavanijaya 1974:272)

(25) $*Th\ddot{a}\ddot{\ddot{a}}\quad c\ddot{a}\quad s\ddot{a}g\quad c\ddot{h}\ddot{\ddot{a}}n\quad t\ddot{a}ay\quad r\ddot{\ddot{a}}\ddot{\ddot{o}}$?
    you will command I die fast is that so
    Will you command me to die soon? (Kullavanijaya 1974:273)

2.4 Thepkarnchana 1986

In her study of verb serialisation in the Government and Binding framework, Kingkarn Thepkarnchana (1986) claims that $h\ddot{a}y$ in (26), as well as other words which have corresponding verbs, synchronically are verbs, not prepositions or coverbs. A coverb is defined, according to Thepkarnchana (1986:197), as a function word or a grammatical particle which has a nearly synonymous verb corresponding to it. However, this definition contradicts her claim that such forms are not coverbs, but verbs. Her claim for verbs is based on both semantic and syntactic arguments, although in her discussion of (26) she applies only a semantic criterion to the classification of the word $h\ddot{a}y$. 
Coverbs are “semantically depleted”. According to Thepkarnchana (1986:201), ʰây in (26) does not lose its semantic properties; it only loses its literal sense – to give something to Suda. However, it maintains the metaphorical interpretation, namely a favour that Suri bestows on Suda. From this interpretation, Thepkarnchana concludes that ʰây in this construction is a verb. However, her claim seems to contradict itself. If a word which loses its literal sense is not a coverb, what is semantically depleted?

Thepkarnchana advances two syntactic arguments for claiming that all words which have corresponding verbs are verbs. First, these words have the potential to occur as full verbs in isolation, while maintaining the same meaning. Thus, they can be analysed as verbs in other contexts as well. For example, the word khāam ‘to cross’ in (27a) may appear as a full verb in (27b) and is thus regarded as a verb rather than a preposition.

(27a)  Khâw dûn khâam saphaan pay.
     he walk cross bridge go
  He walked across the bridge.

b.  Khâw khâam saphaan pay.
     he cross bridge go
  He crossed the bridge. (Thepkarnchana 1986:205–206)

However, applying the same test to (26), we find that ʰây cannot appear as a free verb without changing the meaning from ‘for’ to ‘to give’, as shown in (28). Hence, by Thepkarnchana’s own criterion, ʰây in this instance is not a verb.

(28)  Surii ʰây sudaa.
     Suri for Suda
*Surii for Suda.
  Suri gave Suda (something).

Second, if a word can be negated, it is a verb. Thepkarnchana exemplifies this claim with khâam ‘to cross’.

(29)  Khâw kradōt mây khâam rià.
     he jump not cross fence
  He jumped, but failed to hurdle the fence. (Thepkarnchana 1986:206)

Since khâam ‘to cross’ in (30) may be negated, Thepkarnchana concludes that all words in Thai which have corresponding verbs have verbal status synchronically. However, Thepkarnchana has neglected to note that some adverbs, such as bôy ‘often’, may also be negated, as shown in (30b). Bôy is clearly not a verb, since it never appears as a free verb in Thai, as illustrated in (30c). It is evident that the negation test cannot reliably distinguish a verb from an adverb when the word in question occurs after another verb.

(30a)  Khâw maa thīi nīi bôy.
     he come at here often
  He comes here often.
b. \textit{Kháw maa thii nii mây bòy.}
   he come at here not often
   He does not come here often.

c. \textit{*Kháw bòy.}
   he often
   *He often.

3. DITRANSITIVE VERBS \textit{hây}

\textit{Hây} meaning ‘to give’ always functions as a verb. I claim that there are three ditransitive verbs \textit{hây} ‘to give’. \textit{Hây}_1 requires two bare noun phrases as its complements, as in (31). \textit{Hây}_2 requires, as its complements, a bare noun phrase followed by a prepositional phrase, as in (32). \textit{Hây}_3 differs from \textit{hây}_1 only in that it requires an additional verb complement and forbids a PP, as shown in (33).

(31) \textit{Lék hây}_1 cõtmâay deey.  
Lek give letter Dang  
Lek gave Dang a letter.

(32) \textit{Lék hây}_2 cõtmâay kée deey.  
Lek give letter to Dang  
Lek gave a letter to Dang.

(33) \textit{Chán hây}_3 náysûi dëkdèk ñaan.  
I give book children read  
I gave a book to the children to read.

In Thai, the nominal case forms, that is the case markings without a preposition, are found to be limited to the Nominative, Accusative, and Locative case forms. The Nominative marks a Patient (PAT) of an intransitive finite verb and an Agent (AGT) of a transitive finite verb. The Locative marks the locational noun of a locational verb as Locus case relation (LOC). Patient of transitive verbs and Correspondent actants are realised as the Accusative case form. The Locus actant of a non-locational verb and a Means actant, on the other hand, always occur as an immediate dependent of a preposition and carry the Accusative case form assigned by the regent preposition (Indrambarya 1994:62). The Patient Centrality Hypothesis, together with the One per Sent constraint, ensures that every verb must have a Patient in its case frame and that a clause may carry only one Patient (Starosta 1988:128,138). Since the ditransitive verb \textit{hây}_1 in (34) has two accusative nouns, only one of them will be assigned as Patient. The other must be a Correspondent actant. The question is which noun is assigned Patient and which Correspondent.

In a passive construction, an object (Patient) of a transitive verb is omitted and is interpreted as the Patient of the verb \textit{thiuk} or \textit{doon} (see P2P Control Rule in Appendix IV). Since only a transitive verb may be passivised in Thai, a passive construction may serve as

\footnote{Locational verbs are verbs which expect a dependent which is lexically marked as \([+\text{lctn}].\) These verbs are, for example, \textit{pây} ‘to go’ and \textit{yâu} ‘to stay’ (Indrambarya 1994:53).}
a test for the Patient case relation. Unfortunately, this process is not very productive in Thai and is subject to certain semantic constraints, so that neither of the two objects of ʰায₁ nor those of other ditransitive verbs may occur as Patient of ฐิุก, as shown in (34b) and (34c).

In this paper, I will assume that the semantically transferred object of the ditransitive verb ʰায₁, such as ค่อมำย ʻletterʼ, is assigned PAT in the same way that the bare transferred object of the ditransitive verb ʰায₂, which is the only accusative actant of the verb, is assigned PAT. Hence, in (34), ค่อมำย ʻletterʼ is PAT and ดีง ʻDangʼ is COR.

(34)a.

b. *ค่อมำย ฐิุก ลีก ʰায₁ ดีง.
letter undergo Lek give Dang
A letter was given to Dang by Lek.

c. *ดีง ฐิุก ลีก ʰায₁ ค่อมำย.
Dang undergo Lek give letter
Dang was given a letter by Lek.

Before arguing whether a form belongs to two separate lexical entries, one first needs to distinguish a complement, an argument that subcategorises a verb, from an adjunct, which by general rule may optionally occur with that verb. The distinction is tested here in two ways: by the Question Pull test and by the head substitution criterion.

Since Thai is a ‘pro-drop language’ (Cole 1987:606–607), that is a language which makes significant use of zero anaphora, any of the three arguments of ʰায₁ may be omitted contextually. When the arguments of verbs are omitted, the Question Pull test (Hasagawa 1988) may help to determine whether a verb is transitive or ditransitive. According to Hasagawa, given an utterance consisting of a verb with few or no other accompanying words, an addressee is expected to ask What-Who-questions about obligatory arguments, that is, complements, which are not clear in a conversation. Questions introduced by ‘why’, ‘where’, and ‘when’, which extract adjuncts, will be asked only after all required arguments are retrieved. Consider example (35):

(35) Speaker A: ลีก ʰায ค่อมำย
Lek give letter

Speaker B: ʰায krhay
give who

Speaker A: ʰায ดีง
give Dang

Because speaker A gave insufficient information about the word ʰায ʻto giveʼ to speaker B, speaker B is expected to inquire as to whom ลีก ʻLekʼ gave a letter. This shows that ʰায in (35) is looking for three arguments and must be interpreted as the ditransitive verb ʰায₁.
The head substitution test is another criterion for complement and adjunct distinction. Heads may differ in their ability to cooccur with a particular complement type, while an adjunct may occur freely with any head, subject to pragmatic considerations. Taking kēe deey 'to Dang' in (36) as an example, when the head hāy₂ is replaced with one or another verb denoting a transfer meaning, kēe deey 'to Dang', if it is a complement, should not be able to occur with such verbs, subject to pragmatic constraints. Example (36) shows that this is in fact the case. Since tōṛp 'to answer' may not appear with kēe deey, I conclude that kēe deey in (36) is a complement of hāy₂.

(36) Lēk hāy₂/*tōṛp cōtmāay kēe deey.
    Lek give/answer letter to Dang
    Lek gave/*answered the letters to Dang.

Hāy₂ is a locative ditransitive verb requiring three arguments. In (37), the subject khruu is AGT, and hāy₂ takes only one accusative actant. If a verb expects only one object, that object must be assigned Patient according to the Patient Centrality Hypothesis. Hence nāpsū must be PAT. Lēk 'Lek' is assigned the LOC case relation since it is the accusative actant of the locative preposition kēe 'to'.

(37)

```
\[\text{Khruu} \quad \text{hāy}_2 \quad \text{nāpsū} \quad \text{kēe}\]
\[\text{teacher} \quad \text{give} \quad \text{book} \quad \text{to}\]
\[\text{Nom} \quad \text{+trns} \quad \text{Acc} \quad \text{+P}
\quad \text{lék.}\]
\[\text{AGT} \quad \text{+lctn} \quad \text{PAT} \quad \text{+goal}
\quad \text{Lek}\]
```

The teacher gave a book to Lek.

The head substitution test below illustrates that ṭāan 'to read' in example (33) is a complement of hāy₃. Only hāy but not cēek 'to distribute' may occur with the embedded clause containing ṭāan, as shown in (38).

(38) Chan hāy₃/*cēek nāpsū dēdkē ṭāan.
    I give/distribute book children read
    I gave/distributed books to the children to read.

In Lexicase grammar, a form is considered to be two distinct lexical entries if it occurs in two distinct GRAMMATICALLY SIGNIFICANT ENVIRONMENTS A and B and there is a word X which may appear in pattern A but not in B and/or there is a word Y which may appear in B but not in A (Starosta 1988:98). Consider (39) and (40):

(39)a. Nit tōom nāmman rōt khan nii léew.
    Nit fill oil car vehicle this already
    Nit has already filled this car with gas.
b. *Nit tōom nāmman kēe rōt khan nii léew.
    Nit fill oil to car vehicle this already
    Nit has already filled the gas into this car.
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(40a).  *Kulaya m.čış p cōtmăy chabāp nān khruu.
   Kulaya deliver letter issue that teacher
   Kulaya delivered that letter to the teacher.

   b.  Kulaya m.čış p cōtmăy chabāp nān kēe khruu.
   Kulaya deliver letter issue that to teacher
   Kulaya delivered that letter to the teacher.

Tōm 'to fill' in (39) and m.čış p 'to deliver' in (40) can each appear in only one of the two constructions. Tōm 'to fill' may appear only in (39a) but not in (39b), while m.čış p 'to deliver' may appear in (40b) but not in (40a). The distribution shows that the two patterns exemplify two grammatically significant environments.

By this criterion, if a single form appears in both environments, it must belong to two separate verb classes and constitute two distinct lexical entries, since if two forms differ in either pronunciation, meaning, or distribution, they must be learned and stored separately. Thus, from the observation that the form häy can appear in both of the frames (a) and (b), as shown in examples (31) and (32), we can conclude that they are two distinct lexical items. häy₁ belongs to the same verb class as tōm 'to fill' in (39a), and häy₂ belongs to the same verb class as m.čış p 'to deliver' in (40b).

The grammatically significant environments criterion also shows that häy₁ in (31) and häy₂ in (33) belong to two different classes. Consider (41):

(41a).  Chān cēk₁ nāpsći dēkdēk.
   I distribute book children
   I distributed the books to the children.

   b.  Chān cēk₂ nāpsći kēe dēkdēk.
   I distribute book to children
   I distributed the books to the children.

   c.  *Chān cēk nāpsći dēkdēk tūan.
   I distribute book children read
   I distributed the books to the children to read.

Again, while the form häy may appear in both constructions (31) and (33), the form cēk 'to distribute' can be used in (41a) but not in (41c). Unfortunately, an example of a ditransitive verb other than häy which could occur in (41c) but not in (41a) has not been found. Nevertheless, the distribution exemplified in (41a) and (41c) is sufficient to show that the forms häy in the two patterns are two different lexical entries.

The words A and B are related by the synchronic derivational rule if they are distinct lexical items which are etymologically related and if (A:B) is a member of an analogical set {X:Y} which contains other pairs of lexical items related in the same way (Starosta 1988:63). Example (41) demonstrates that häy₁ and häy₂ are derivationally related, since there is the form cēk which may appear in both the (a) and (b) patterns of (41). However, since no other ditransitive verbs may appear in the same environment as häy₂, there is no derivational relationship between häy₁ and häy₂ or häy₂ and häy₃. The derivational rule which relates häy₁ to häy₂ may be formulated as follows (see abbreviations in Appendix I):
(42)  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>+crsp</th>
<th>:</th>
<th>+goal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>+trns</td>
<td></td>
<td>+lctn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-lctn</td>
<td></td>
<td>+trns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-xtns</td>
<td></td>
<td>-crsp</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n[+COR]</td>
<td></td>
<td>n[+LOC]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The derivational rule in (42) says that the ditransitive verb ญา₁ is related to the locative ditransitive verb ญา₂. The contextual features n[+COR] in the left column and the contextual features n[+LOC] in the right column illustrate that the Correspondent actant in ญา₁ corresponds to the Locus actant in ญา₂.

I consider the embedded verb แปล ‘to read’ in (33) (repeated as (43a) below) to be a transitive verb, the object of which is missing. This conclusion is based on the fact that แปล can be followed by an object which refers to part of the higher object, as shown in (43b).

(43a).  

Chán ญา₃ นักหนิ เด็กเด็ก แปล.

I give book children read

AGT  +trns PAT COR  +trns

I gave a book to the children to read.

b.  

Chán ญา₃ นักหนิ เด็กเด็ก แปล น่าอ่าน.

I give book children read cover

AGT  +trns PAT COR  +trns PAT

I gave a book to the children to read the cover.

The reason that I do not consider แปล in (43a) and (43b) to be two separate lexical items, an intransitive and transitive pair, is that I cannot find verbs which may occur in one of the two constructions but not the other. By the grammatically significant environments criterion, แปล in the two examples must therefore be regarded as a single lexical item.

In (43a) the missing object of the transitive verb แปล ‘to read’ is interpreted as นักหนิ ‘book’, which is the higher Patient (PAT). This relationship between the missing lower object and the higher object is stated informally in Pagotto’s account of English ‘Tough’ movement (Pagotto 1985:42). In Thai, I find that a similar relationship holds in verbs which carry the feature [+cntn] (continuing). The feature [+cntn] shows the continuation of actions between the regent verb and its dependent verb. I will formulate this relationship in terms of Lexicase control chaining rules, rules which state the relationship between words in different domains. Furthermore, the relationship between a lower direct object in (43b), which refers to part of the higher object, and the higher direct object could be accounted for by a similar rule which will not be formulated in this paper. The coreference between a missing Patient of an infinitival verb complement and the Patient of a regent continuing verb in example (43a) is accounted for by the Patient-to-Patient Control Chaining Rule.

\[4\] Domain: direct and indirect relationship between a lexical head and its dependent. \(X/Y\) is in the domain of \(X\) if \(X\) is the regent of \(Y\).
hereafter called the P2P Control Rule (Indrambarya 1994:299–301), as shown in (44). This rule applies only to a subset of verbs taking infinitival complement clauses.

(44)

a. \[
\begin{array}{l}
    \text{-fint} \\
    \text{ndex} \\
\end{array}
\quad \rightarrow \quad \begin{array}{l}
    \text{+[PAT]} \\
    \text{m} \\
\end{array}
\quad \begin{array}{l}
    \text{+[cntn]} \\
    \text{m} \\
\end{array}
\quad \begin{array}{l}
    \text{+[PAT]} \\
    \text{n}\text{-fint} \\
\end{array}
\]

b. The actor of the non-finite verb is interpreted as the closest available noun-headed dependent of a regent verb to the left of the embedded verb. (Indrambarya 1994:300)

As shown in (44), the P2P rule consists of two parts, one looking for a missing Patient of the lower clause in (44a) and another looking for an actor of the lower clause in (44b), only the first of which is formulated. A non-finite verb with ndex is looking for a Patient shown by [?+[PAT]]. The non-finite verb will find its Patient by copying the index m from [m+[PAT]] of the regent. The relationship between the non-finite verb and its regent is shown by the feature [n-fint] on the regent. That is, a regent is looking for a non-finite verb with an index n. The feature [+cntn] restricts this rule to apply only to continuing verbs and shows the continuation of actions between the regent verb and its dependent verbs (Indrambarya 1994:299–304). Moreover, the Redundancy Rule 1 (RR–1) states that the feature [+cntn] expects a non-finite transitive verb as its dependent, indicated by question mark in front of the features. When the requirement is fulfilled, each question mark is replaced by an index number (see Appendix II for members of continuing verbs in Thai).

RR–1 \quad [+cntn] \quad \rightarrow \quad \begin{array}{l}
    \text{+[PAT]} \\
    \text{m} \\
\end{array}
\quad \begin{array}{l}
    \text{+[cntn]} \\
    \text{m} \\
\end{array}
\quad \begin{array}{l}
    \text{+[PAT]} \\
    \text{n}\text{-fint} \\
\end{array}
\quad \begin{array}{l}
    \text{+[trns]} \\
\end{array}

The missing actor of the infinitival complement verb, on the other hand, is interpreted as the closest available noun-head dependent of a regent verb to the left of the embedded verb (see Pagotto 1985:44–45). The term ‘available nominal’ refers to a noun which is free in its governing category following Principle B of the Binding theory (Chomsky 1981:181). A governing category is defined here as the domain of the verb containing the missing Patient. In other words, to satisfy the binding requirement, an implied actor to the left of the embedded verb must not be coreferential with the missing Patient. As an example, consider (45).

---

5 This rule is a revision of the Patient-to-Patient Control Rule proposed in Indrambarya (1990:43).
6 The first letter n in ndex denotes the number for the index which specifies a given word’s position in a sentence.
He gave his friend’s younger sibling sweets to eat.

According to the P2P rule in (44), the missing Patient of the verb *kin* ‘to eat’ is coreferential with the higher Patient *khanôm* ‘sweets’. This implied coreferentiality is shown by [3[+PAT]] on the lexical matrix of *kin*. To search for the actor of the embedded verb *kin*, one looks to the left of *kin* to find two noun-headed dependents of the regent verb *hây*_3, namely *khanôm* ‘sweets’ and *nòög* *phían* ‘friend’s younger sibling’. If *khanôm* were chosen as an implied actor for *kin*, the Binding Principle would be violated. Since *khanôm* is already selected as a coreferential Patient, it is not an available noun. Hence, *nòög* *phían* ‘friend’s younger sibling’ is the implied actor for *kin* because it is the available noun closest to the embedded verb *kin*. This fact is shown by the implied feature 4[+actr] on the lexical matrix of *kin*.

Similarly, when the ditransitive verb *hây*_3 appears in an embedded clause, as in (46), the missing Patient of *hây*_3 is chained to the Patient *khanôm* ‘sweets’ of the higher verb *sû* ‘to buy’, while *dêeg* ‘Dang’, the first available noun phrase to the left of *hây*_3, is the actor. However, if the closer nominal *khanôm* were the actor, *hây*_3 would have 3[+PAT] as both actor and Patient, violating the Binding Principle. Likewise, the Patient of the lower verb *kin* ‘to eat’ is interpreted as *khanôm* ‘sweets’ by the feature 3[+PAT] in the same way as is the object of *hây*_3. The actor of *kin* is the closest available nominal, *dêkdêk*.

---

(46) **Dêeg**  *sû*₂  *khanôm*  *hây*_3  *dêkdêk*  *kin*₁.

Dang  buy  sweets  give  children  eat

1Index  2ndex  3ndex  4ndex  5ndex  6ndex

AGT  +trns  PAT  +trns  COR  +trns  -fint

+cntn  +cntn  3[+PAT]

+crsp  +crsp  5[+COR]

3[+PAT]  1[+actr]

4[-fint]  6[-fint]

Dang bought sweets to give to the children to eat.

The embedded clause containing *hây*_3 is considered to be a complement. In applying the head substitution test in (47), the heads *msoyg* ‘to look’ and *duu* ‘to search’ cannot occur with the embedded *hây* clause, while *hâa* ‘to search’ can.
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(47)  *d*ū*w/*m*ō*w/ʰāa  kha*n[ōm ʰây*₃ dēk*  kin₁.
Dang  search/look/search  sweets  give  child  eat
Dang  looked  for  sweets  to  give  to  the  child  to  eat.

The ditransitive verbs ʰây₁ and ʰây₂, as in (48) and (49), may appear in an embedded clause with a missing Patient, and undergo the P2P rule in the same way as ʰây₃ does. The index 3[+PAT] on ʰây₁ and ʰây₂ comes from the index 3[+PAT] of the higher verb ʰï₂ ‘to buy’, showing that the Patients of both verbs are coreferential. *Dēy* ‘Dang’, the first available NP to the left of the ʰây clause, is the actor of ʰây₁ as well as ʰây₂.

(48)  *Dēy*  ʰï₂  nâ*p*śī  ʰây₁  lék.
Dang  buy  book  give  Lek
Index  2ndex  3ndex  4ndex  5ndex
AGT  +trns  PAT  +trns  COR
     +cntn  +cntn
     3[+PAT]  +crsp
     1[+actr]  -fint
     4[-fint]  3[+PAT]
        1[+actr]

*Dēy* bought a book to give to Lek.

(49)  *Dēy*  ʰï₂  nâ*p*śī  ʰây₂  kēe  lék.
Dang  buy  book  give  to  Lek
Index  2ndex  3ndex  4ndex  5ndex  6ndex
AGT  +trns  PAT  +trns  +P  LOC
     +cntn  +cntn  +goal
     3[+PAT]  +ctn
     1[+actr]  -fint
     4[-fint]  3[+PAT]
        1[+actr]

*Dēy* bought the book to give to Lek.

The forms ʰây in (48) and (49) are considered to be verbs (as opposed to the adverb ʰây₆, to be discussed in §5 for the following reasons. First, as shown in (50a) and (50b), the forms ʰây in examples (48) and (49) above may appear as finite verbs independently, preserving the meaning of ʰây₁ and ʰây₂, respectively, and omit an understood object.

(50)a.  *Dēy*  ʰây₁  lék.
Dang  give  Lek
Dang  gave  (it)  to  Lek.

b.  *Dēy*  ʰây₂  kēe  lék.
Dang  give  to  Lek
Dang  gave  (it)  to  Lek.

Second, the auxiliary adverb câʔ ‘will’ may precede a verb, but not an adverb or a preposition (Noss 1964, Indrambary 1994). For example:

(51)a.  Chân câʔ pay  d*uu* nāg  phrû*n*ni.
I  will  go  look  movie  tomorrow
I  will  go  to  see  a  movie  tomorrow.
b. Chán tágcay cà? pay duu nāŋ phru̞gmi.  
I intend will go look movie tomorrow  
I intend to go to see a movie tomorrow.

I go look movie will often  
I go to see movies often.

I go look movie will with friend  
I go to see movies with a friend.

Hây₁ and hây₂ in an embedded clause may be preceded by cà?, which shows them to be verbs. Another piece of supporting evidence is based on a semantic test, namely the number of actions implied by the sentence. According to Li and Thompson (1973:267), if a sentence contains more than one action, there must be more than one verb. Since (48) and (49) contain two actions, to buy a book and to give it to lēk, the evidence suggests that each sentence has two verbs, sii ‘to buy’ and hây ‘to give’.

(52) a. Déem sii₂ nângšū cà? hây₁ lēk.  
Dang buy book will give Lek  
Dang bought a book to give to Lek.

b. Déem sii₂ nângšū cà? hây₂ kēe lēk.  
Dang buy book will give to Lek  
Dang bought a book to give to Lek.

4. CAUSATIVE VERBS hây

This section discusses two causative verbs hây: the personal causative verb hây₄ and the impersonal causative verb hây₅.

4.1 PERSONAL CAUSATIVE VERB hây₄

The causative verb hây₄, which carries the meaning of ‘to order, to cause or to allow’, is a non-verbal causative transitive verb which requires a sentential complement. Consider (53a) and (53b):

(53) a. Nit hây lēk cät dɔkkmaay.  
Nit cause Lek arrange flower  
Nit had Lek arrange the flowers.

b. *Nit khɔ̃rɔŋ lēk cät dɔkkmaay.  
Nit plead Lek arrange flower  
Nit pleaded with Lek to arrange the flowers.

7 Two major types of causative verbs are non-verbal and verbal causative verbs. Hây₄ and thamhây are instances of non-verbal causative verbs. Verbal causative verbs are, for example, khɔ̃rɔŋ₂ and sâŋ₂ (Indrambarya 1994:279).
The head substitution test tells us that the embedded clause is a complement, because only  hud   but not kh  "to plead" may appear with the embedded clause.

The verb thiuuk 'to undergo’ marks passive construction in Thai. Its subject is coreferential with the missing Patient object of the embedded transitive. Only transitive verbs, though not all transitive verbs, may occur in the thiuuk passive construction. Since hud in (53) may occur in the thiuuk passive construction, as illustrated in (54), lèk 'Lek’ as subject with hud is analysed as transitive verb in this study. This evidence eliminates the possibility that hud might be an intransitive verb taking a finite complement. In the Lexicase framework, a finite verb, by definition, is a verb which allows a subject.

(54) Lèk thiuuk mèe hud cût dòkmaay.
Lek undergo mother cause arrange flower
Lek was ordered by her mother to arrange the flowers.

The tree structure for (53a) is shown in (55). The personal causative transitive verb hud is marked in its lexical matrix with the feature [+caus,+ntnt,+trns,-mprs,-vrbl] (causative, intentional, transitive, non-impersonal, and non-verbal) to be distinguished from other causative verbs in Thai (Indrambary 1994:281). According to the Regular Actor Control Rule for infinitival complements (Starosta 1988:133; see Appendix IV), lèk ‘Lek’ is a Patient of the higher verb hud as well as the actor of the lower clause.

(55)

As with other Thai transitive verbs, the Accusative Patient of the causative transitive verb hud may be omitted. In this case, the Patient of the matrix verb is contextually bound and may be recovered by the index x in the lexicase external linking rule. The simplified version of the external linking rule is shown in (56). On the other hand, the actor of the lower non-finite complement verb is accounted for by the Regular Actor Control Rule. In other words, there are two types of missing constituents: one is a null anaphor which can be replaced by an overt noun and recovered by a widely applicable external linking rule; the other cannot be replaced by an overt noun and must be accounted for by a control chaining rule.

(56) | +trns | --&gt; [x[+PAT]]
    | ![+PAT] |

(57) Mèe hud cût dòkmaay.
mother cause arrange flower
Mother had someone arrange the flowers.
In (57), the missing object of a transitive verb ħây is not grammatically recoverable at the sentence level and so is given an arbitrary index x, as [x[+PAT]]. The index x is also assigned to the actor of the lower clause yielding [x[act]] in (57), according to the Regular Actor Control Rule for infinitival complements.

The causative verb ħây₄ may appear in an embedded clause as a complement of a manipulative verb. One reason for identifying this form ħây as a verb is that it may also appear as a main verb with the same syntactic frame and semantic reading, as shown in (58b) and (59b).

(58)a. Phô săŋ₂ manit ħây₄ kláp bâan.
father order Manít cause return house
Father ordered Manít to return home.

b. Phô ħây₄ manit kláp bâan.
father cause Manít return house
Father had Manít return home.

c. *Phô săŋ₂ manít phô ħây₄ kláp bâan.
father order Manít father cause return house
Father ordered Manít to return home.

(59)a. Khâw yût rôt khan nân ħây₄ dèk khâm thanôn.
he stop car vehicle that cause child cross street
He stopped that car to let a child cross the street.

b. Khâw ħây₄ dèk khâm thanôn.
he cause child cross street
He let a child cross the street.

c. *Khâw yût rôt khan nân khâw ħây₄ dèk khâm thanôn.
he stop car vehicle that he cause child cross street
He stopped that car to let a child cross the street.

The unacceptability of (58c) and (59c) when a subject is inserted shows that the embedded ħây₄ in (58a) and (59a) is non-finite.

I will apply the head substitution test to (58a) and (59a) to see whether the embedded clause introduced by ħây₄ is a complement. Consider (60) and (61):

(60) Phô *ħây₄/bôɔk/*tham manit ħây₄ kláp bâan.
father cause/order/make Manít cause return house
Father caused/ordered/made Manít (to) return home.

(61) Khâw yût/cûx/hâam rôt ħây₄ dèk khâm thanôn.
he stop/park/halt car cause child cross street
He stopped/parked/physically halted the car to let a child cross the street.

The unacceptability of ħây₄ and tham in (60) shows that the embedded clause containing ħây₄ is a complement. On the other hand, the embedded clause in (61) is an adjunct because all of the three verbs yût, cûx, and hâam can occur with the embedded clause.

The following subsection discusses the characteristics of ħây₄ in an embedded clause. Verbs which require the presence of the causative ħây₄ as their verb complement are referred to as manipulative verbs in this study. Semantically, manipulative verbs may be
divided into two subclasses: manipulative verbal causative verbs and manipulative resultative verbs.

4.1.1 PERSONAL CAUSATIVE VERB  

4.1.1.1 NON-CORRESPONDENT MANIPULATIVE VERBAL CAUSATIVE INTRANSITIVE VERBS

Non-correspondent manipulative verbal causative intransitive verbs are intransitive verbs which require only a Patient in their case frame. They include amûd'áat ‘to allow’, wañ ‘to hope’, yáak ‘to want’, kh:xh ‘to ask’, kh:xh:xh ‘to plead’, sàŋ ‘to order’, and so forth. In example (62), the actor of háy4 is interpreted as the upper Patient déeg ‘Dang’ in accordance with the Regular Control Rule for infinitival complements (P2a).

(62)  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dang</th>
<th>plead</th>
<th>háy4</th>
<th>lèk</th>
<th>tham</th>
<th>khéek</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Index</td>
<td>2ndex</td>
<td>3ndex</td>
<td>4ndex</td>
<td>5ndex</td>
<td>6ndex</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PAT</td>
<td>+caus</td>
<td>+caus</td>
<td>PAT</td>
<td>+trns</td>
<td>PAT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+mnpl</td>
<td>+ntnt</td>
<td>-fint</td>
<td>4[+actr]</td>
<td>6[+PAT]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+vrbl</td>
<td>-fint</td>
<td>mprs</td>
<td>6[+PAT]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-trns</td>
<td>1[+PAT]</td>
<td>+trns</td>
<td>1[+actr]</td>
<td>5[-fint]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Dang pleaded with Lek to make a cake.

4.1.1.2. CORRESPONDENT MANIPULATIVE VERBAL CAUSATIVE INTRANSITIVE VERBS

Correspondent manipulative verbal causative intransitive verbs require both Patient and Correspondent case relations in their case frames. They are, for example, sàŋ ‘to order’, kh:xh:xh ‘to plead’, waam ‘to ask’, bòk ‘to order’, and so forth. The object of the embedded verb háy is obligatory for these verbs. These verbs have manipulative verbal causative transitive verb homophones. Again, by the P2a Control Rule, háy finds its actor from the higher Patient lèk.
(63a)

Dang ordered Lek to make a cake. (lit. Dang ordered Lek to cause Lek to make a cake.)

(63b) *Lék nà? deenj sáŋŋ₂ háy lék tham khéeŋ.
Lek TOP Dang order cause Lek make cake
As for Lek, Dang ordered Lek to make a cake. (lit. Lek, Dang ordered to cause Lek to make a cake.)

(63c) *Lék thiuk₅ deenj sáŋŋ₂ háy lék tham khéeŋ.
Lek undergo Dang order cause Lek make cake
Lek was ordered by Dang to make a cake.

(63d) *Deenj sáŋŋ lék.
Dang order Lek
Dang pleaded with Lek.

The verb sáŋŋ₂ is analysed as a correspondent intransitive verb rather than a transitive one, because the noun phrase lék may not be topicalised, as shown in (63b), in contrast to an Accusative Patient of the homophonous transitive verb sáŋŋ₃, as shown in (64b), in §4.1.1.3.

Supporting evidence for treating sáŋŋ₂ as a correspondent intransitive verb is the fact that the verb sáŋŋ₂ may not occur as the dependent of a continuing verb, such as thiuk₅, which are interpreted by the P2P rule, as shown in (63c) (as opposed to sáŋŋ₃ in (64c) in the next subsection).

The embedded clause headed by háy is considered a complement because it is obligatory, as shown in the unacceptable (63d) without context.

4.1.1.3 MANIPULATIVE VERBAL CAUSATIVE TRANSITIVE VERBS

Manipulative verbal causative transitive verbs require both Agent and Patient in their case frames. They include sáŋŋ₂ ‘to order’, khék₅ ‘to plead’, waan₃ ‘to ask’, bɔk₃ ‘to order’, and so forth. The evidence for treating these verbs as transitive verbs stems from the fact that the missing object of háy is recovered by the P2P Control Rule, that the noun phrase lék can be topicalised, as in (64b), and that there is a related thiuk passive construction, as in (64c).
(64a). 

Dang ordered Lek to make a cake. (lit. Dang ordered Lek to cause (Lek) to make a cake.)

(64b). Lék nà? deęng sàŋŋ3 hây tham khéeék.

Lek TOP Dang order cause make cake 
As for Lek, Dang ordered (her) to make a cake. (lit. Lek, Dang ordered to cause to make a cake.)

(64c). 

Lek was ordered by Dang to make a cake.

The Patient of the embedded hây₄ is always coreferential with the higher accusative Patient of the transitive manipulative verbal causative verb, in accordance with the P2P Control Rule demonstrated earlier in (44). Thus in (64a), the missing Patient of hây₄ must be coreferential with the higher Patient lék ‘Lek’. Deęng ‘Dang’, the closest available NP to the left, serves as its actor. The Regular Control Rule applies to the lower verb tham ‘to make’, since the higher verb hây₄ does not match the description of the P2P rule. Thus, lék ‘Lek’ is the actor of the lower verb. The fact that the noun phrase lék may be topicalised in example (64b) illustrates that the verb sàŋŋ₃ is transitive.
This P2P Control Rule still applies correctly in the related passive construction in (64c). First of all, by the chaining rule linking the upper Patient and lower Patient in the passive construction (see Appendix IV), sāŋ3 ‘to order’ finds its missing Patient by copying the 1[+PAT] index from the regent verb thīuŋ. The actor of sāŋ3 is deeq ‘Dang’, the Correspondent actant of thīuŋ. Then, again in accordance with the P2P rule, the feature [?] [+PAT]] in the lexical matrix of the embedded háy4 copies the index of [1[+PAT]] from sāŋ. The other NP, deeq ‘Dang’, is the actor of háy4, since there are only two actants in this sentence and deeq ‘Dang’ is again the closest available NP to the left, which is a dependent of the regent verb thīuŋ. As in (64a), lek ‘Lek’, which is the actor of the lower verb thām ‘to make’, is identified as the higher Patient of its regent verb háy4 by the Regular Actor Rule.

When the object of háy4 is different from the patient of the higher verb, the sentence is unacceptable. As shown in (65), the object of háy is deeq ‘Dang’, while the object of the higher verb khơơōŋŋ2, ‘to plead’ is phöl ‘father’. The sentence hence is ungrammatical because it violates the P2P rule.

(65)  *Pūk  khơơōŋŋ2 phöl háy4  deeq pay thīuŋ.
Pook plead father cause Dang go travel
AGT +trns PAT +trns PAT
Pook pleaded with her father to allow Dang to go out.

Unlike the case of manipulative verbal causative intransitive verbs, the application of the Regular Actor Control Rule to a manipulative verbal causative transitive verb such as khơơōŋŋ2 in (66a) would give the wrong interpretation. Such a case would allow chān ‘I’, which is the object of khơơōŋŋ2, to be interpreted as the actor of the embedded háy4. The unspecified object of háy4 would be recovered contextually by the external linking rule, yielding an incorrect interpretation in which chān ‘I’ is causing some unspecified person to make a cake. The correct interpretation is that deeq ‘Dang’ pleaded with chān ‘I’ and hence causes chān to make a cake.

(66) a.  Deeq  khơơōŋŋ2  chān  háy4  thām  khéeįk.
Dang  plead  I  cause  make  cake
1ndex  2ndex  3ndex  4ndex  5ndex  6ndex
AGT  +cntn  PAT  +trns  +trns
     +mnpl  -fint  -fint
     +trns  *3[+actr]  *x[+actr]
     *3[+PAT]  *x[+PAT]
     4[-fint]

*Dang pleaded with me to cause somebody to make a cake. (lit.)

(66) b.  Deeq  khơơōŋŋ2  chān  háy4  thām  khéeįk.
Dang  plead  I  cause  make  cake
1ndex  2ndex  3ndex  4ndex  5ndex  6ndex
AGT  +cntn  PAT  +trns  +trns
     +mnpl  -fint  -fint
     +trns  1[+actr]  3[+actr]
     3[+PAT]  3[+PAT]  6[+PAT]
     4[-fint]

Dang pleaded with me to make a cake. (lit. Dang pleaded with me to cause (me) to make a cake.)
To get the proper rule to apply for the correct interpretation, we need the convention that a more specific rule (the P2P rule) applies before a more general rule (the P2a rule). That is, if a form is eligible to undergo either the Regular Control Rule or the P2P rule, the latter, which specifically applies to continuing verbs, should apply first.

In (66b), the application of the P2P rule yields the correct coindexing. The missing Patient of ห้าย is coreferential with the upper Patient ฉัน ‘I’ according to the P2P Control Rule. The actor of ห้าย, on the other hand, is ดี ‘Dang’, the closest available NP to the left of ห้าย. The actor of the lower verb ทำ ‘to make’ is ฉัน, the Patient of ห้าย, in accordance with the Regular Actor Control Rule.

4.1.2 PERSONAL CAUSATIVE VERB ห้าย EMBEDDED UNDER MANIPULATIVE RESULTATIVE VERBS

ห้าย ‘to cause, to make’ may appear to be embedded under manipulative resultative verbs which designate a change in the state of the Patient. Verbs of this class may be divided into two subclasses: correspondent manipulative resultative intransitive verbs, as in (67), and manipulative resultative transitive verbs, as in (68). The verb in the lower clause is a stative verb. However, it is questionable whether this ห้าย is even a verb and, if so, whether it is the same as the causative verb ห้าย.

(67)  
Kháw cà?   kin₃   kúaytliw h̄áy₄   kúaytliw m̄ót.  
he   will   eat   noodles   cause   noodles   use.up
PAT  +crsp  COR  
+caus  
+mnpl  -trns  
He will finish the noodles.

(68)  
Kháw cà?   kin₄   kúaytliw h̄áy₄   m̄ót.  
he   will   eat   noodles   cause   use.up
AGT  +caus  PAT  
+mnpl  
+trns  
He will finish the noodles.

Assuming that all verbs in Thai may appear as main verbs, if ห้าย in (67) and (68) is a verb, then the embedded clause containing ห้าย should be able to occur independently. Consider (69) and (70):

(69)  
*Kháw ห้าย   kúaytliw m̄ót.  
he   cause   noodles   use.up
He finished the noodles.

(70)  
*Kháw ห้าย   m̄ót.  
he   cause   use.up
He finished the noodles.

The forms ห้าย in (69) and (70) may not appear as main verbs without context. Hence one might conclude that ห้าย is not a verb in these constructions. However, this analysis in fact does consider ห้าย in (67)–(68) to be a verb, not an adverb, for two reasons. First, ห้าย in
(68) is similar to the causative háy discussed in the previous section in that it may take its own complement, namely kuaytław ‘noodles’. This is a major characteristic of a verb. An adverb, on the other hand, does not allow any dependent. Moreover, if háy were treated as an adverb, one would not be able to explain the presence of the second noun phrase kuaytław in (67), which is also a dependent of the regent verb kin₃.

Second, the control rules for infinitival clauses, namely the upper and lower actor control rule (P2a) and the P2P rule, are applicable to the háy clause in these two constructions. These control chaining rules are applicable only to a verb and not to an adverb. As in the case of manipulative causative intransitive verbs, háy in (67) finds its missing actor from a higher Patient, following the P2a Control Rule. Háy in (68), on the other hand, allows its missing object to be coreferential with the Patient of a higher verb in accordance with the P2P rule, as in the case of manipulative causative transitive verbs. Moreover, since these rules are control rules for infinitival complements, this analysis suggests that the háy clauses in (67) and (68) are complements.

Because of the similarities between háy in (67) and (68) and the causative transitive háy₄ discussed in §4.1.1, this analysis concludes that háy in (67) and (68) and the causative verb háy₄ discussed in §4.1.1, are the same lexical entry, namely the personal causative transitive verb. This conclusion is determined by the ability of háy in (67) and (68) to take its own complement and to undergo the control rules for complements. However, the fact that háy in these constructions may not appear in a corresponding main verb position, while all other embedded verbs can, remains unexplained. Further study of this construction may shed some light on the matter.

In parallel to the analysis of manipulative verbal causative verbs, manipulative resultative verbs can be syntactically divided into two classes: correspondent manipulative resultative intransitive verbs and manipulative resultative transitive verbs, depending on which control rule is applied to each construction. The tree structures of (67) and (68) are shown in (67’a) and (68’a), respectively.

### Correspondent Manipulative Resultative Intransitive Verbs

(67’a).

```
Khâw  câ?  3ndex  kuaytław  háy₄  môt.  
he    will   +V      noodles  cause  use.up
1ndex 2ndex +crsp  4ndex  COR   +V       noodles  use.up
Nom   +Adv   +mpn   5ndex  6ndex  +caus   7ndex
PAT    rslt  -trns  +trns   -trns   1[+actr]  6[+PAT]
actr
```

He will finish the noodles.

noodles  TOP he  will  eat  cause  noodles  use.up
As for noodles, he will finish them.
In (67'a), the verb kin is analysed as a corresponding manipulative resultative intransitive verb because its object kúaytìaw cannot be topicalised. The embedded verb háy finds its missing actor from the higher Patient kháw according to the Regular Actor Control Rule (P2a). Similarly, the lower verb mót finds kúaytìaw as its higher Patient. Now consider the manipulative resultative transitive verb kin in (68'a) and (68'b).

**Manipulative Resultative Transitive Verbs**

(68'a).

```
Kháw cà? 3ndex
he will +trns

kúaytìaw 4ndex
noodles PAT

háy4 5ndex
cause use.up

mót. -fint 6ndex
use.up -trns
```

He will finish the noodles.


noodles TOP he will eat cause use.up

As for noodles, he will finish them.

Unlike kin in (67'a), kin4 in (68'a) can occur in a topicalised construction, as shown in (68'b). Therefore, this study considers kin in (68'a) to be a transitive verb. The embedded verb háy finds its missing Patient from the higher Patient kúaytìaw ‘noodles’, written as [4[+PAT]], in accordance with the P2P Control Rule. The NP kháw ‘he’ is interpreted as the actor of the causative verb háy because kháw ‘he’ is the closest available nominal to the left.

Now consider the háy clause in the following sentences.

(71) *Kháw cà? kin1 kúaytìaw háy4 ãm.*

he will eat noodles cause full

*He will eat the noodles until he is full.*

(72) *Kháw cà? kin1 kúaytìaw háy4 tua?eey ãm.*

he will eat noodles cause self full

*He will eat the noodles until he is full.*

The verb kin1 in (71) and (72) is a non-extension transitive verb. It does not require the presence of a dependent non-finite verb complement. Hence, the clauses introduced by háy4 in (71) and (72) are infinitival adjuncts. The actor of háy4 in (71) and (72) is interpreted as the higher actor kháw ‘he’ in accordance with the control rule for infinitival adjuncts.

The missing Patient of háy4 in (71) is a null anaphor recovered by the external linking rule in (56), which assigns the arbitrary index x to [2[+PAT]]. Grammatically, the x index which is written as ‘xndex’ could be interpreted as anyone; however, one cannot make anyone else full by eating food. Pragmatic considerations thus narrow the interpretation of the subject of ãm to kháw. Then if kháw is the actor of ãm, it must, by the Regular Actor
Control Rule, be coreferential to the object of ḥāy. Since the actor and the Patient of ḥāy are coreferential with the same word, the object can be expressed only as a reflexive. This interpretation is supported when the reflexive pronoun tuaʔleeɡ ‘self’ is present, as in (72). Example (71) is rewritten with the tree structure in (71'). The optionality of a non-finite clause introduced by ḥāy is shown by the parentheses [5([-fint])] on the lexical matrix of kin₁.

(71')

Khāw cāʔ? he
3ndx will +trns 5ndx ʔm.
kuaytīaw noodles 4ndx +caus full
hāy₄ cause +trns 6ndx

He will eat the noodles until he is full.

An alternative analysis for ḥāy in (67), (68), (71) and (72) could be that ḥāy is an adverb, which would explain why ḥāy may not appear as a main verb. In such an analysis, ḥāy and the following noun in (67) and (72) could not form a constituent in Lexicase. However, the second kuaytīaw ‘noodles’ in (67) could then not occur as a sister of the head verb kin ‘to eat’, since that would make it a clause mate of a coreferential noun, the first kuaytīaw, violating the binding requirement that a noun must be free. The second kuaytīaw ‘noodles’ would instead have to be treated as the subject of the lower verb mōt ‘use up’. That is, the lower verb would be a finite verb. However, the reflexive pronoun tuaʔleeɡ in (72) cannot be treated in the same way. A reflexive in Thai, as in most languages, needs an antecedent in the same clause; and therefore tuaʔleeɡ cannot be the subject of the lower verb ʔm ‘to be full’. It must occur as a sister dependent of the verb kin ‘to eat’ in order to be bound with the subject khāw ‘he’. The drawback of this alternative analysis is that not only does one need two different structures for the two sentences, but also one more often finds cognitive verbs such as rīu ‘to know’ and ʔōk ‘to tell’, rather than action verbs such as kin ‘to eat’, followed by a finite verb. Thus, the verb analysis is preferable.

In short, I have demonstrated that there is a single personal causative transitive verb hāy₄ which may appear in an embedded clause as a complement or as an adjunct. As in Kullavanijaya (1974), the analysis presented here treats the causative hāy₄ and the ditransitive verbs hāy ‘to give’ as distinct lexical entries because of their differences in meaning and distribution.

4.2 IMPERSONAL CAUSATIVE TRANSITIVE VERB hāy₅

Impersonal verbs are verbs which do not allow referential subjects in their subcategorisation frame. In this paper hāy₅ ‘to let’ is analysed as an extension impersonal causative transitive verb requiring a non-finite verb complement. This section discusses two
functions of the impersonal causative verb ʰāy₅: as a marker for the third person imperative construction and as a complementiser.

4.2.1 IMPERSONAL CAUSATIVE TRANSITIVE VERB ʰāy₅ FUNCTIONING AS AN IMPERATIVE FOR THE THIRD PERSON

Semantically, ʰāy₅ ‘to let’ shows a speaker’s indifference regarding the performance or non-performance of a third person’s act. Consider (73a) and (73b).

(73)a. ʰāy₅ khruu maa cičiŋ thɔʔ.
    let teacher come true PRT
    +caus +V
    +mprs -fint
    +trns
    +xtns
    Let the teacher really show up.

b. *Thɔʔ ʰāy₅ khruu maa cičiŋ thɔʔ.
    you let teacher come true PRT
    You let the teacher really show up.

ʰāy₅ in example (73a) implies indifferance or defiance. Whether or not the action indicated in the ʰāy clause takes place will have no effect on the speaker. The insertion of the second person pronoun subject thɔʔ changes the grammaticality of the sentence, as illustrated in (73b). This incidence suggests that ʰāy₅ in example (73a) is an impersonal causative verb. Now consider the same ʰāy₅ in another example:

(74) ʰāy₅ khaw khoɔy pay siʔ.
    let he wait thither PRT
    +trns
    +caus
    +mprs
    Let him wait!

Sentence (74) may have another interpretation in which ʰāy is the personal causative transitive verb ʰāy₄ (see §4.1). In this case, it allows a subject insertion, as shown in (75).

(75) Thɔʔ ʰāy₄ khaw khoɔy pay siʔ.
    you cause he wait thither PRT
    +caus
    +trns
    -mprs
    You let him wait.

In other words, the impersonal causative ʰāy₅ and the personal causative ʰāy₄ differ only in that the latter allows a referential subject and the former does not. Another piece of supporting evidence for positing the impersonal causative ʰāy₅ as a separate lexical entry is the fact that only ʰāy₅, and no other Thai verb, allows third person imperatives. Consider (76).
Khɔɔy dìaw nà? wait soon how about How about (you) waiting for a moment?

This sentence has only one interpretation: a speaker asks the hearer to wait. There is no interpretation such that the speaker would ask the second person to cause a third party to wait. The difference between háy, in (74) and (75), and other verbs, leads us to the conclusion that háys in (74) is lexically marked as impersonal and deserves a separate lexical entry.

4.2.2 IMPERSONAL CAUSATIVE VERB háy FUNCTIONING AS A COMPLEMENTISER

Háys ‘to let’ may introduce a clause in complex sentences, which suggests that this háy is a conditional complementiser.

(77)a. Háys khruu maa ciçiç chán kɔɔ máy klua.
       let teacher come really I also not fear
       Given the teacher really showing up, I am not afraid.

b. *Thɔɔ háys khruu maa ciçiç chán kɔɔ máy klua.
       you let teacher come true I also not fear
       Given the teacher really showing up, I am not afraid.

This analysis considers the form háy in (77a) to be the impersonal verb háys functioning as a complementiser, not as a personal verb or a preposition. This decision is based on the following arguments. As with a verb in general, háy in (77a) may appear as a free verb in a root causative sentence, as shown earlier in (73a). Moreover, háy in (77a) does not allow the insertion of a subject, as shown in the ungrammatical (77b).

Note that (77b) would be acceptable if the form háy were the personal causative transitive verb háy4 ‘cause’ cooccurring with the complementiser mɛɛwàa ‘even if’, as shown in (78).

(78) Mɛɛwàa thɔɔ háy4 khruu maa ciçiç chán kɔɔ máy klua.
       even if you cause teacher come true I also not fear.
       Even if you really make the teacher show up, I am not afraid.

The contrast in the ability of (77a) and (78) to allow the presence of a subject shows that the form háy in (77) and in (78) are two separate lexical items. While háy4 in (78) is a personal verb, háys in (77) is an impersonal verb functioning as a complementiser, introducing a concessive clause in a complex sentence.

Due to this parallel in interpretation between (73) and (77), the form háy in these two constructions is considered to be the same impersonal causative háys. This semantic evidence however, does not provide conclusive evidence that háy in (77a) is an impersonal verb. An alternative analysis might be that it is a preposition functioning as a complementiser. The preposition mɛɛwàa ‘even if’ in (79), like háy in (77a), allows the main clause to take a consequence aspect such as kɔɔ ‘also’. Since mɛɛwàa, which occurs in the same syntactic position, is a preposition, by analogy one might analyse háy as a preposition. The possibility that háy in constructions such as (77a) might better be analysed as a preposition is left open for further study.
5 ADVERB ʰำยว

This section will investigate the form ʰำยว which appears in the frame:

NP  V [+trans]  NP   (NP)

in which the regent verb is a transitive verb and the noun following ʰำยว may be omitted contextually, as shown in the (a) and (b) examples of (80) and (81).

(80)a.  Nidaa th’hí  krapáw ʰำยว wiinaa.
        Nida carry bag for Weena
        Nida carried a bag for Weena.

b.  Nidaa th’hí  krapáw ʰำยว.
        Nida carry bag for
        Nida carried a bag for (someone).

(81)a.  Nidaa kʰâay  krapáw ʰำยว  dëey.
        Nida sell bag to Dang
        Nida sold a bag to Dang.

b.  Nidaa kʰâay  krapáw ʰำยว.
        Nida sell bag to
        Nida sold a bag to (someone).

ʰำยว in (80) carries a benefactive meaning ‘for’. In (81), ʰำยว is interpreted as a direction towards a goal, which may be equivalent to the English ‘to’. In the following sections, different tests are applied to determine the status of the form ʰำยว.

5.1 TESTS FOR THE SYNTACTIC CATEGORY OF ʰำยว

Various tests may be applied to determine the status of the form ʰำยว, which may appear in the frame: NP V NP   NP, in comparison with the characteristics of a verb, a preposition, and an adverb. To begin, let us examine verbs, prepositions, and an adverb representing each category. The two verbs taken as verb models are tôk ‘to fall’ and cèék ‘to distribute’, as shown in (82) and (83).

(82)  Khâw plâk dèk tôk lûm nân.
        he push child fall pit that
        He pushed a child down into that pit.

(83)  Dëey săi₂ khanôm cèék dëkdèk.
        Dang buy sweets distribute children
        Dang bought sweets to distribute to the children.

Two of the least controversial prepositions, kâp ‘with’ and phĩa ‘for’, have been selected to represent the characteristics of prepositions, as shown in (84) and (85). These two prepositions synchronically do not have corresponding verbs in the language.
(84)  Deep khuy riang nii karp lek.
Dang talk story this with Lek
Dang talked about this matter with Lek.

(85)  Pho thamgaan nark phia luuk.
father work heavy for offspring
A father works hard for his children.

Most adverbs in Thai are not followed by a noun. However, there exists an adverb wáy ‘lying’, which may or may not be followed by a locational noun, as shown in (86a) and (86b).

(86)a.  Khaw thit nágsii wáy.
he abandon book lying
He left a book.

b.  Khaw thit nágsii wáy báan nán.
he abandon book lying house that
He left a book at that house.

The status of the word wáy ‘lying’ is controversial. It could be argued that wáy is a preposition. However, I consider wáy to be an adverb for the reason that it fails to show the characteristics of verbs and prepositions in the tests presented in this paper (to be illustrated in the next section). Therefore, I treat wáy as an adverb cooccurring with the regent verb thing ‘to abandon’.

The four tests used to examine the status of háy in (80a) and (81a) are: the free-verb test, the number-of-actions test, the topicalisation of háy together with the following NP, and the topicalisation of the NP after the form háy. Since háy in (80b) and (81b) is not followed by a noun, only the first two tests are applicable.

If háy in these constructions is a verb, it should be able to occur as a free verb while maintaining the meaning and syntactic restrictions it carried in (80) and (81). Furthermore, the NP after háy should be topicalisable, while háy together with the following NP should not. Moreover, there should be more than one action implied by the sentence. If háy₆ is a preposition, as claimed in previous analyses (Dejthamrong 1970, Kullavanijaya 1974), then the NP after háy should not be independently topicalisable, but rather háy with the following NP should form a PP constituent which can be topicalised. In addition, háy should not be stranded at the end of the sentence. If háy₆ is an adverb of the same class as

---

8 The adverb cáʔ test exemplified in (51) and (52) in §3 yields only a one-way implication: an element immediately dominated by cáʔ is a verb. However, not all verbs may cooccur with cáʔ. For example, the presence of cáʔ before the verb tham is unacceptable.

*supriya háy chan cáʔ tham khanām.
Supriya cause I will make sweets
+V

Supriya made me make sweets.

Since háy in (80) and (81) does not allow the presence of cáʔ, this test is not a reliable criterion for determining the verbal status of háy in these constructions.
wāy ‘lying’, hāy together with the following NP should not be topicalisable, since they do not form a PP constituent, while the NP after hāy should be topicalisable (see §§5.1.1–5.1.4 for discussion). A summary of the results of these tests is shown in Table 1.

**TABLE 1: THE RESULT OF THE TESTS FOR THE STATUS OF hāy**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Free Verb</th>
<th>Number of Actions</th>
<th>Phrase Topicalisation</th>
<th>Toicalisation of NP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Preposition</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Verb</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adverb wāy</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hāy in (80a)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hāy in (80a)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hāy in (81b)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hāy in (81b)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The summary table shows that the free-verb test and the number-of-actions test agree that hāy in (80) and (81) could be either an adverb or a preposition but not a verb. Hāy with the following NP cannot be topicalised, as in the situation with a verb or an adverb, while the NP after hāy may be topicalised, as with the NP occurring after a verb and after the adverb wāy.

### 5.1.1 THE FREE-VERB TEST

Only a verb, but not a preposition or an adverb, may appear as a free verb representing a valid sentence.

(87) Dēk tōk lüm nān.
    child fall pit that
    A child fell into that pit.

(88) Deeg cēk dēkdēk.
    Dang distribute children
    Dang distributed (something) to the children.

(89) *Deeg kāp lēk.
    Dang with Lek
    Dang with Lek.

(90) *Phāo phia lāuk.
    father for offspring
    Father for children.

(91) *Khāw wāy bāan nān.
    he lying house that
    He lying at that house.

Since wāy may not appear as a free verb in (91), this test supports the proposition that wāy is not a verb. If hāy in the (a) and (b) examples of (80) and (81) is a verb, it should be able to appear as a free verb independently while preserving the meaning of hāy in (80) and (81).
(92)a. *Nidaa háy₆ wiinaa.
Nida for Weena

b. *Nidaa háy₆.
Nida for

(93)a. *Nidaa háy₆ deey.
Nida to Dang

b. *Nidaa háy₆.
Nida to

The fact that háy₆ in (92) and (93) cannot maintain the benefactive meaning ‘for’ or the directional meaning ‘to’ when appearing as a main verb indicates that háy in (80) and (81) is not a verb. Háy in these constructions is acceptable only when interpreted as ‘to give’.

5.1.2 THE NUMBER-OF-ACTIONS TEST

Li and Thompson (1973:176) have claimed that a sentence which contains more than one action should contain more than one verb. Although such subjective tests are not always reliable, it is apparent to Thai speakers that only (82) and (83) represent two actions, since both sentences contain a pair of verbs, plák ‘to push’ and tòk ‘to fall’, and síi₂ ‘to buy’ and cèek ‘to distribute’, respectively. On the other hand, sentences (84) and (85), containing the prepositions kàp ‘with’ and phìa ‘for’, and sentence (86), containing the adverb wày ‘lying’, express only one action. If háy in (80) and (81) is a verb, the sentences should denote more than one action. In these examples, to carry a bag for someone in (80) and to sell a bag to someone in (81) reflect only one action. Thus, the number-of-actions test provides a piece of supporting evidence that háy in (80) and (81) is not a verb.

5.1.3 THE TOPICALISATION OF háy₆ TOGETHER WITH THE FOLLOWING NP

While prepositional phrases may be topicalised, as in (94) and (95), verbs plus their objects may not be topicalised together, as shown in (96) and (97).

(94) Kàp lék nà? deey khɔɔy khuy riag níi.
with Lek TOP Dang ever talk story this
With Lek, Dang talked about this matter. (lit.)

(95) Phìa lûuk phɔɔ thampaan nàk.
for offspring father work heavy
For their children fathers work hard. (lit.)

(96) *Tòk lum nán khàw plák dèk.
fall pit that he push child
Into that pit, he pushed a child down. (lit.)
(97) *Cèek dèkdèk deej sì₂ khanom.
    distribute children Dang buy sweets
    To distribute to the children, Dang bought sweets. (lit.)

Consider the topicalisation of wáy together with the following NP in (98).

(98) *Wáy báan nán kháw thig nájsiū.
    lying house that he abandon book
    At that house, he left a book. (lit.)

Unlike a prepositional phrase, wáy with the following NP cannot be topicalised together. This supports our claim that wáy is not a preposition. Similarly, the unsuccessful topicalisation of háy plus the following NP in (99) and (100) show that háy in (80) and (81) does not have the characteristic of a preposition in Thai. This test shows that háy behaves like a verb and like an adverb.

(99) *Háy₆ wiinaa nídaa thih krapāw.
    for Weena Nida carry bag
    For Weena, Nida carried the bag.

(100) *Háy₆ deej nídaa kháy krapāw.
    to Dang Nida sell bag
    To Dang, Nida sold the bag.

5.1.4 THE TOPICALISATION OF NP AFTER háy₆

Examples (101) and (102) show that prepositions in Thai cannot be stranded and do not allow the following NP to be topicalised.

(101) *Lék ná? deej khuy riaŋ nii kāp bôybôy.
    Lek TOP Dang talk story this with often
    As for Lek, Dang often talks with (her) about this matter.

(102) *Lúuŋ ná? phǒo thampaan nák phía.
    offspring TOP father work heavy for
    As for children, fathers work hard for (them).

Examples (103), (104), and (105) show that NP occurring after verbs and the adverb wáy 'lying' may be topicalised. Both the verbs and the adverb wáy may be stranded.

(103) Lūm nán ná? kháw kháy plāk dèk tòk.
    pit that TOP he ever push child fall
    As for that pit, he once pushed a child down (into it).

(104) Dèkdèk ná? deej sì₂ khanom cèek.
    children TOP Dang buy sweets distribute
    As for the children, Dang bought sweets to distribute (to them).

(105) Báan nán ná? kháw thig nájṣii wáy.
    house that TOP he abandon book lying
    As for that house, he left a book (there).

Unlike NP after prepositions, the NP after háy₆ may be topicalised, similar to the NP after verbs and the adverb wáy.
(106) *Wiinaa nā? nidaa thē krāpāw hāy6*.  
Weena TOP Nida carry bag for  
As for Weena, Nida carried the bag for (her).

(107) *Deeg nā? nidaa khāay krāpāw hāy6*.  
Dang TOP Nida sell bag to  
As for Dang, Nida sold the bag to (her).

5.2 ANALYSIS OF hāy6

The results of the four tests agree that hāy in (80) and (81) behaves like the adverb wāy, rather than like a verb or a preposition. Verbs and prepositions are counterindicated by two tests. The free-verb test and the semantic test show that hāy in (80) and (81) is not a verb. Furthermore, the topicalisation of the NP after hāy6 and the impossibility of topicalising hāy6 with the following NP rule out the possibility that hāy6 is a preposition.

The present analysis considers hāy in both the (a) and (b) examples of (80) and (81) to belong to a single class of adverb, for the following reasons. First, since verbs in Thai have the potential to occur as free verbs, that is as main verbs of independent clauses, the inability of hāy6 to appear as a free verb, demonstrated in (92) and (93), provides a strong piece of evidence that hāy in (80) and (81) is not a verb. This claim is supported by the number-of-actions test. Second, in Lexicase, a preposition always needs a dependent cohead in an exocentric construction. If hāy6 were a preposition, then hāy6 together with the following NP should form a PP constituent and permit topicalisation. In contrast, examples (99) and (100) illustrate that hāy and the following noun phrase cannot be topicalised together. Third, although a preposition cannot be stranded, as shown in (101) and (102), hāy in (80) and (81) may be left stranded, as shown in (106) and (107), indicating that hāy is not a preposition. Finally, all of the four tests demonstrate that hāy exhibits the same characteristics as the adverb wāy.

Furthermore, our claim that hāy in (80) and (81) is an adverb also allows us to explain why the NP after hāy may be left out when the context is given, in contrast with the NP after a preposition in Thai, which may not be omitted. This claim is further supported by the analysis of the benefactive *gei* ‘for’ in Chinese, *cho* ‘for’ in Vietnamese, and *hir* ‘for’ in Tai Nung, which have the corresponding verb ‘to give’ and which have been analysed as derived adverbs when they appear without the presence of a following noun (Starosta 1985:224) for Chinese, and Clark (1992:146–147) for Vietnamese and Tai Nung).

Hāy in (80) and in (81) shows similarities in distribution, as discussed. I shall claim further that the form hāy in these two constructions belongs to a single lexical entry hāy6, despite the differences in interpretation. The difference in interpretation between (80) and (81) is governed by the difference in the classes of the regent verbs. When hāy6 appears with correspondent ditransitive verbs such as khāay2 ‘to sell’, sāhni2 ‘to teach’, and mākxp ‘to

---

9 This is analogous to the analysis of case inflection systems. The same case inflection may encode different meanings, depending on the verb or preposition with which it cooccurs, and no one would propose setting up distinct case inflection categories for different functions.
deliver', it is interpreted as a direction towards a goal, corresponding to the English ‘to’. Conversely, when it appears with non-correspondent transitive verbs such as sii, ‘to buy’, thii ‘to carry’, khāy1 ‘to sell’, and sǒn1 ‘to teach’, it carries the meaning of a benefactive action towards a goal and is interpreted as ‘for’. Thus the adverb hāy6 is represented by the localistic feature [+goal]. Moreover, as illustrated in (99) and (100), hāy and the following noun phrase do not form a constituent which can be topicalised together. This analysis hence considers the two elements to be grammatically independent of each other.

Since hāy6 behaves similarly in the two examples for each group (80) and (81), I will discuss only the constructions (80a) and (81a) in this section. Illustration (108) shows the tree structure of the clause containing the non-correspondent transitive verb thii ‘carry’. Thii allows but does not require the presence of the adverb hāy ‘for’ and the following correspondent noun wiinäa ‘Weena’, shown by the parentheses [4([+goal])] and [5([+COR])] on the governing verb thii. That is, hāy and wiinäa are both considered to be independent adjuncts of thii.

(108)

\[
\begin{array}{c}
thii \text{ carry} \\
Nidaa \text{ 2ndex} & krapāw \text{ hāy6} & wiinäa. \\
\text{Nida} \text{ +trns} & \text{bag} & \text{for Weena} \\
\text{1ndex} \text{ -crsp} & \text{3ndex} & \text{4ndex 5ndex} \\
\text{AGT} \text{ 5([+COR])} & \text{PAT} & \text{+Adv COR} \\
\text{4([+goal])} & \text{+goal} \\
\end{array}
\]

Nida carried a bag for Weena.

Unlike other adjuncts, hāy6 ‘for’ is needed to disambiguate a benefactive interpretation from a possessive interpretation. Hāy6 cannot be omitted if the benefactive interpretation is to be maintained, as illustrated in (109). In other words, hāy6 in (80a) and (108) is obligatory due to semantic interference.

(109) Nidaa thii krapāw wiinäa.
Nida carry bag Weena
*Nida carried a bag for Weena.
Nida carried Weena’s bag.

The tree structure of a sentence containing the correspondent ditransitive verb khāy2 ‘to sell’, which expects the cooccurrence of hāy6, is shown in (110). In other words, hāy and the following NP in this structure are complements of khāy2 ‘to sell’.

---

10 Besides this correspondent ditransitive verb khāy2, there is another correspondent ditransitive khāy3, which may cooccur with the preposition kēe ‘to’ and an optional adverb hāy6 indicating goal, as shown in the following examples (a) and (b).
There are two pieces of evidence supporting the claim that *hay*₆ and the following NP cooccurring with correspondent ditransitive verbs are complements, while *hay* and the following NP cooccurring with non-correspondent transitive verbs are adjuncts.

First, the goal adverb *hay*₆ cannot appear with the non-correspondent verb sū₁, ‘to buy’ to give the interpretation ‘to’. This is shown in the unacceptable interpretation of (111).

(111) *Nidaa yip₁ krapāw *hay*₆ deep.*

Nida pick up bag to Dang

*Nida picked up a bag to Dang.

Second, only the directional *hay*₆ may occur closer to the head, as in (112). Sentence (113) shows that the first *hay* can only be interpreted as the goal direction and not as the benefactive. This analysis suggests that the directional *hay*₆ is a complement, while the benefactive *hay*₆ is an adjunct.

(112) Chān m₅sp dōkkmany chōc nān *hay*₆ khruyay *hay*₆ khruyu léew.

I deliver flower bunch that to principal for teacher already

I have already delivered that bouquet of flowers to the principal for the teacher.

(113) Chān m₅sp dōkkmany chōc nān *hay*₆ khruyu *hay*₆ khruyay léew.

I deliver flower bunch that teacher for principal already

*I have already delivered that bouquet of flowers for the teacher to the principal.

I have already delivered that bouquet of flowers to the teacher for the principal.

Furthermore, the goal adverb *hay*₆ may occur with non-correspondent non-causative affect transitive verbs, such as dū₂ ‘to reproach’, and tii ‘to hit’, as in (114). In this case, the

\[\text{Nidaa} \quad \text{khāy}_3 \quad \text{krapāw} \quad \text{hay}_6 \quad \text{kēe} \quad \text{chān.}\]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Index</th>
<th>Nidaa</th>
<th>khāy</th>
<th>krapāw</th>
<th>hay</th>
<th>kēe</th>
<th>chān</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>sell</td>
<td>bag</td>
<td>to</td>
<td>to</td>
<td>I</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2ndex</td>
<td>3ndex</td>
<td>4ndex</td>
<td>5ndex</td>
<td>6ndex</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+trns</td>
<td>+Adv</td>
<td>+P</td>
<td>COR</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+crsp</td>
<td>+goal</td>
<td>+goal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Nida sold a bag to me.

b. *Nidaa khāy₃ krapāw kēe chān.*

Nida sell bag to 1

*Nida sold a bag to me.
sentence has a malefactive interpretation. The form ㎏ ayr does not precede a noun, and can be omitted, as shown in (115).

(114)  Dкаж чан  çaʔ tii thɔɔ ㎏ ayr
soon I will hit you
Any minute now, I will hit you.

(115)  Dкаж чан  çaʔ tii thɔɔ
soon I will hit you
Any minute now, I will hit you.

When ㎏ ayr in (114) is followed by a noun, it is interpreted as benefactive, as in (116).

(116)  Dкаж чан  çaʔ tii thɔɔ ㎏ ayr mée.
soon I will hit you for mother
For mother’s sake, I will hit you any minute now.

Because of the complementary distribution between the interpretation of the form ㎏ ayr in (114) and (116), the form ㎏ ayr in both sentences is considered to be the same lexical item ㎏ ayr. The differences in meaning may be attributed to pragmatic usage of the verb in each sentence. The goal adverb ㎏ ayr indicates malefactive meaning. Such verbs are, for example, kàt ‘to bite’, tii ‘to hit’, dįʔ ‘to reproach’ dąː ‘to scold’, krọɔt ‘to be angry’, and yèŋ ‘to snatch’. ㎏ ayr may also occur with verbs which do not carry unfavourable meanings by themselves, such as cùup ‘to kiss’, if the action is perceived as threatening or destructive.

In short, the form ㎏ ayr in (80) and (81) is shown to be a single word, namely an adverb ㎏ ayr indicating a goal. This ㎏ ayr may appear with non-correspondent transitive verbs to carry the benefactive meaning, as in (80) and (116), or the malefactive meaning, as in (114), in which case it marks an adjunct. When ㎏ ayr cooccurs with a correspondent ditransitive verb, it carries a directional meaning and is a complement. ㎏ ayr cooccurring with correspondent ditransitive verbs may carry the benefactive meaning only if there is an additional form ㎏ ayr bearing the directional interpretation.

Claiming that ㎏ ayr cooccurring with an optional noun is an adverb is somewhat counterintuitive when seen from the perspective of English grammar. However, as shown in earlier tests, the form ㎏ ayr in (80) and (81) fails to exhibit the prominent characteristics of prepositions and verbs. Thus, the adverb analysis is the most preferable one, linguistically. It is, however, possible that this adverb ㎏ ayr is derived from prepositions (Clark: pers. comm.). An alternative analysis which assumes that ㎏ ayr could be a transitive preposition when it is followed by a noun and an intransitive preposition when the following noun is not present (see Emonds 1976:172) is ruled out here, because to formalise such an analysis within the constrained theory of Lexicase is not possible.

6. CONCLUSION

This study concludes that there are altogether six different homophonous forms of ㎏ ayr in Thai. There are three homophonous ditransitive verbs ㎏ ayr: ㎏ ayr₁ requires two bare noun phrases as complements; ㎏ ayr₂ takes a bare noun phrase and a prepositional phrase as complements; ㎏ ayr₃ requires two bare noun phrases and a verb complement. The two causative verbs, namely the personal causative verb ㎏ ayr₄ and the impersonal causative verb
hāy₅, differ in their ability to allow a subject. Moreover, hāy₅ implies the speaker’s indifference to or defiance of the action of a third person. Finally, hāy₆, of the benefactive meaning ‘for’ and of the directional meaning ‘to’, is considered to be a single lexical entry of the adverb category because it fails to exhibit the characteristics of either verbs or prepositions, a finding which contrasts with Dejthamrong (1970) and Thepkarnchana (1986). Differences in interpretation in the different uses of hāy₆ are governed by the different classes of the regent verbs.

APPENDIX I: ABBREVIATIONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Acc</th>
<th>Accusative</th>
<th>lctn</th>
<th>location</th>
<th>PAT</th>
<th>Patient</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>actr</td>
<td>actor</td>
<td>lit</td>
<td>literal translation</td>
<td>PP</td>
<td>prepositional phrase</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adv</td>
<td>adverb</td>
<td>LOC</td>
<td>Locus</td>
<td>PRT</td>
<td>particle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>afct</td>
<td>affect</td>
<td>mnpl</td>
<td>manipulative</td>
<td>rslt</td>
<td>resultative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AGT</td>
<td>Agent</td>
<td>mprs</td>
<td>impersonal</td>
<td>TOP</td>
<td>topic marker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>caus</td>
<td>causative</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>noun</td>
<td>trns</td>
<td>transitive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cntn</td>
<td>continuing</td>
<td>ndex</td>
<td>index of</td>
<td>V</td>
<td>verb</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COR</td>
<td>Correspondent</td>
<td>Nom</td>
<td>Nominative</td>
<td>vrbl</td>
<td>verbal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>crsp</td>
<td>correspondent</td>
<td>NP</td>
<td>noun phrase</td>
<td>xtns</td>
<td>extension</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fint</td>
<td>finite</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>preposition</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

APPENDIX II: CONTINUING VERBS IN THAI

Continuing verbs are verbs which are interpreted by the Patient-to-Patient Control Rule (P2P). The following lists exemplify members of continuing verbs in Thai, based on Indramarya’s (1994) analysis.

1. Correspondent Continuing Intransitive verbs:

thiu₅₅ ‘to undergo’
doon₄ ‘to undergo’

2. Non-manner Continuing Non-manipulative Transitive Verbs:

hān₃ ‘to chop’
sāp₆ ‘to order (food)’
yip₃ ‘to pick up’
tii₅ ‘to hit’
sī₃ ‘to buy’
yēp₂ ‘to sew’

3. Non-manner Continuing Manipulative Transitive Verbs:

a. Verbal causative continuing transitive verbs

chāan₄ ‘to invite’
khāor·hōŋ₃ ‘to plead’
wān₄ ‘to ask’
sāp₇ ‘to order’
bōk₃ ‘to order’
chāy₇ ‘to order’
plāk₅ ‘to push’
nehnam₄ ‘to suggest’
chu₅ ‘to persuade’

b. Resultative Continuing Transitive Verbs

tii₆ ‘to hit’
khīan₆ ‘to whip’
yik ‘to pinch’
sī₄ ‘to buy’
kin₄ ‘to eat’
θāŋ ‘to memorise’

4. Correspondent Non-benefactive Transitive Verbs:

hāy₃ ‘to give’
5. Correspondent Benefactive Transitive Verbs:

\( c\text{ée}_k \) ‘to distribute’  \( \text{Ru}_a \text{t} \) ‘to show’  \( l\text{aw} \) ‘to relate’
\( p\text{ñn} \) ‘to feed to somebody’s mouth’

APPENDIX III: SUBCATEGORISATION OF MANIPULATIVE VERBS

Manipulative verbs are verbs which require the presence of the causative verb  Hóa in the embedded complement clause. The following table illustrates the subcategorisation of manipulative verbs which can be semantically divided into verbal causative manipulative and resultative manipulative verbs

\[+\text{mnpl}\]
\[\text{+-rslt}\]
\[\text{+-vrbl}\]
\[\text{+-caus}\]
\[\text{§4.1.1}\]

\[\text{-trns}\]
\[\text{+trns}\]
\[\text{-crsp}\]
\[\text{+crsp}\]

\( k\text{hô}_3\text{ô}_3 \text{ô}_1 \) ‘to ask’
\( s\text{ù}_1 \) ‘to order’

\[\text{§4.1.2}\]

\(-\text{trns}\]
\[\text{+crsp}\]

\( k\text{hô}_3\text{ô}_3 \text{ô}_2 \) ‘to ask’
\( s\text{ù}_2 \) ‘to order’

\( \text{kin}_3 \) ‘to eat’
\( \text{kin}_4 \) ‘to eat’

APPENDIX IV: CONTROL CHAINING RULES

1. Regular Actor Control Rule:

\[ ?[+\text{actr}] \]
\[ \text{-fint} \]
\[ \text{nndex} \]
\[ \rightarrow \]
\[ [\text{m}[+\text{actr}]] \]
\[ [\text{m}[+\text{PAT}]] \]
\[ [\text{n}[\text{-fint}]] \]

(Starosta 1992:47)

2. PAT-to-PAT Control Rule (P2P):

a. \[ ?[+\text{PAT}] \]
\[ \text{nndex} \]
\[ \rightarrow \]
\[ [\text{m}[+\text{PAT}]] \]
\[ [\text{m}[+\text{PAT}]] \]
\[ [\text{n}[\text{-fint}]] \]

b. The actor of the non-finite verb is interpreted as the closest available noun-headed dependent of a regent verb to the left of the embedded verb (Indrambarya 1994:300).
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