1. INTRODUCTION
My interest in Thai stems from my experiences as a foreign language teacher in Thailand and as a student of the Thai language. The root of the problems and difficulties in learning Thai as well as in teaching a foreign language to Thai students is, in my opinion, the lack of an adequate, up to date and binding grammar of Standard Thai. To look at Standard Thai from the perspective of Thai as a Foreign language is a necessity for both learners of Thai as a Foreign language as well as for Thai teachers of foreign languages at Thai universities and language institutes. Foreign language teaching is contrastive language teaching and the student as well as the teacher, Thai and foreigner alike, need to be able to refer back to a reliable description of the Thai language. In this paper I will try to give an example of the role computer technology may play in developing such a description.
Anyone who deals with Standard Thai under the premises of Foreign Language Teaching will meet with three obstacles: first, there is no comprehensive up-to-date description of modern Standard Thai. The existing reference books in Thai and in English have been written over 35 years ago (Haas 1964, Noss 1964) and disagree on essential subjects such as word classes and word function. Manfred Kummer’s Grundlagen einer kommunikativen Grammatik für das Thailändische (Foundations of a Communicative Grammar of Thai) is, as far as I know, the only attempt to develop a comprehensive grammar of spoken Standard Thai based on linguistic research in the fields of pragmatics and socio-linguistic. Unfortunately, this attempt has not been developed beyond a preliminary state. It is by now 16 years old - not to mention the fact that it is written in German which makes it unattainable for most of the students and linguists and excludes itself from international discussion. Already in 1900, the German scholar Oscar Frankfurter was aware of the necessity to reach an international audience and wrote his Elements of Siamese Grammar in English.
The second of the three obstacles is that the many courses teaching Thai to foreigners do not take into account the developments in the grammatical presentation of modern languages and of the findings of the research in the field of Foreign Language Teaching. These language courses are not based on a reliable concept of contrasting source and target language but almost exclusively follow the audio-lingual system. They mainly teach phonetics and later on add some general statements for example about the strict Subject-Predicate-Object-word order or the use of classifiers. Usually, these statements are based more on intuition than on empirical data (which is not to say that intuition necessarily leads to incorrect statements).
Finally, the multitude of linguistic studies on singular phenomena of the Thai language is of a rather exclusively academic nature and neither addresses the need of the learner of Thai as a Foreign language to understand certain phenomena of Standard Thai nor the need of the Thai teacher of foreign languages to contrast phenomena of the foreign language with those of his and the learner’s native language Thai.
One of the advantages of a computer-assisted examination of Thai texts is that it allows to look at linguistic phenomena on a large scale, may verify or falsify hypotheses or intuitions and thus may lead to **new** insights, ideas and hypotheses. Computer technology helps making available large amounts of texts, either spoken or written and presents the tools to quickly browse through them. Unfortunately, the computer regards a language as a systematically structured object of examination and doesn’t account for irregularities and fluctuations in the field of semantics. The subtle semantic tints that are saturated with culturally specific meanings and attitudes probably only fully grasped by a native speaker elude the computer’s software as well as the analytical Western eye and the scope of Western academic terminology. This is especially the case with a language as context-dependable and semantically ambiguous as Thai.

2. **SUBJECT MATTER AND PREPARATORY WORK**

My specific interest is the representation of tense and aspect in contemporary Standard Thai. The chronological narrative order is the natural time axis of a language with such a strong tradition of literature, historiography and religious teaching by word of mouth as Thai (Chetana 1998). Temporal relations are usually self-evident and thus do not necessarily need explicit marking. What has happened first will be narrated first. It is sufficient to situate events by time adverbials such as **วันนี้** or **ปัจจุบัน**, usually in topical position.

Chronological narrative order and time adverbials, however, say nothing about the completion, the beginning or the state of progression of an activity and their subsequent relation to other activities. Sometimes, these aspects are a semantically inherent characteristic of the main verb. Often, they need to be marked explicitly. I have looked at such **markers of aspectual relation** and, in order to get a broader picture, at conjunctions that mark interclausal chronology.

For the purpose of this paper, I have looked at the presentation of preverbal โอน in standard reference and teaching material and compared it with its actual use in two different kinds of texts. I have generated two concordances, one from the soap opera รักเราไม่ฟังเห็น published between September 22 and November 10, 1999, in the Thai Rath-newspaper’s online version, and the second one from a compilation of articles of three issues of the online version of the magazine ฟังวิทยานธรรม from September, October and November 1999. I have selected the soap-opera from Thai Rath as an example for a text whose language is close to every-day spoken language. It consists mainly of dialogues that are supposed to be realistic and comprehensible to the average reader. I am aware of the fact that especially the language of soap operas varies greatly according to the social status of the characters involved. I think, however that this more a matter of the lexicon than of the function and syntactic

---

1 In German linguistics, the term “Aktionsart” – *manner of action* (Bussmann 1990:59pp) is used to refer to the different states of progression an activity verb may imply, as for instance in “verbrennen – to burn to the point of complete destruction” as opposed to “brennen – to burn” or in “einschlafen – to pass from the state of being awake into the state of sleep” as opposed to “schlafen – to sleep.”
position of words. As for the text compilation from the ติ้งปูวัฒนธรรม-magazine, it serves as an example for the written language of the educated middle class. One of the problems in drawing evidence from these concordances is that they list every appearance of a chain of symbols regardless of its co-text. Thus, a เทศ-concordance will list all the ดุนเคย as well, and in the ให้ concordance we find every primary verb, every compound verb such as ให้ยืน, as well as every postmodifying modal. Thus, it is necessary to build sub-concordances. In the case of ให้, I have also generated a concordance of the negation ไม่ให้ since the tense-related function of ให้ seems to appear more frequently in the negation than in the affirmative.

3. PREVERBAL ให้ IN STANDARD REFERENCE AND TEACHING MATERIAL

ให้ is a frequently used word whose semantic properties change with its syntactic position, giving evidence to Starosta’s statement that “[…] a word is not a form, nor a form plus associated meaning, but a form plus meaning plus distribution.” (Starosta 1993:8). As a main verb it means to receive or to obtain and can be followed by a direct object. As a secondary verb it can be positioned either before or behind a main verb. In the position behind the main verb it is used to express agreement, confirmation, readiness or ability and can be preceded by an object or another extension of the main verb. In the position in front of the main verb, it takes on semantic properties resembling very much those of the English to get. There is no space left for any kind of extension between preverbal ให้ and the main verb. Thus, preverbal ให้ could be characterized as the beginning of a verb concatenation or a verb that requires a verbal extension.

There seems to be no disagreement that one of the semantic properties of preverbal ให้ is the marking of past time or completion of an activity. Mary Haas (1964) labels preverbal modifying ให้ as adverb-auxiliary and gives its meaning as “get to, got to, did (indicating past time)” (p.178). The immediately following subentry is ให้ที่ which is explained as “did, did do.” (ibd.). McFarland (1995) gives as the fourth and last meaning of ให้ “an auxiliary verb and sign of the past tense” and as example “ได้ไป” (p.338). Noss (1964) does not mention the affirmative preverbal ให้ but only the negative ไม่ให้, belonging to the so called /mâj/ class of modals. He explains that it is “Commonest in past situations but also occurs in present and future situations regarded as not capable of change.” (p.139) The absence of an explanation for the affirmative ให้ indicates to me that its alleged time related function is a relatively recent occurrence and that, at least at Noss’ times, it still carried the meaning of the
primary verb to get, to receive. Oscar Frankfurter (1900) explains “The past is indicated by the words ได้, and แล้ว. The former precedes the modified word and has the meaning of the imperfect; […]” (p.84) Frankfurter’s confinement within the patterns of a Latin proto-grammar becomes obvious when he further writes “In combination we have ได้ and แล้ว when a pluperfect meaning is to be given […]” (p.85) Campbell (1968) gives a rather confusing explanation of the issue. After saying that “the past tense may be indicated by putting the word DY in front of the verb.” He continues: “This form of the past tense is not very often used except with a few words such as ‘to receive’, ‘to hear’ etc. which almost invariably take DY in front of them in the past tense.”(p.73), leading to the wrong assumption that ได้รับ and ได้ยิน are the past tense versions of the verbs รับ and ยิน. Bisang (1992) considers, contrary to Noss, the preverbal affirmative ได้ but not the negating preverbal ไม่ได้. He categorizes ได้ as a Tense-/Aspect-/Modality-marker and comes to the conclusion that as a TAM-marker it has retained its meaning of to obtain but has in many contexts developed from here the function of a marker of past time. He maintains, however, that this function is secondary to the meaning “to get to.” (p.349) 2 กัลเชีย ทองหล่อ (1977) in his standard ภาษาไทย simply states that preverbal ได้ marks past tense as does เท. (p.245) 3 กัลเชีย apparently tries to force Latin based grammatical patterns on to Thai. He explains for instance that the sentence เราจะไปที่สนาม is an expression of the ‘future perfect’ เป็นอดีตกาลในอนาคต (p.248).

Like Noss, Anthony (1968) gives prominence to the negative preverbal ไม่ได้. He introduces ได้ preceding the main verb in the second part of Foundations of Thai and explains “When day precedes the main verb, it no longer means ‘can’ but signals past time. It most frequently appears in the negative--may day--but the use of day alone as a signal for past time has become increasingly frequent.” (p.341) Equally, the A.U.A. Thai Language course introduces preverbal ได้ in its negating version: “มาย ดย ... This denies the occurrence of an action and hence almost always refers to the past (I didn’t ....).” (Brown 1991:137) In Book 3 of the language course, the aspctual character of preverbal ได้ is mentioned expressively. “Preceding a verb, this [ได้] shows the accomplishment or completion of the verb.” (Brown 1969:218)

Among the non-English language Thai courses, Gilles Delouche gives in his Méthode de Thaï an explanation similar to that of Campbell. He explains that ได้ is used with verbs of activity which in itself carry the meaning of reception. As examples he gives two sentences, one with ได้รับ and one with ได้ยิน. (p.96). As with Campbell, this statement gives room to the misleading assumption that ได้ will not be used in front of

---

2 “Als TAM-Zeichen schließlich behält däy seine Bedeutung von “erlangen” bei, entwickelt aber daraus in vielen Kontexten die Funktion als Vergangheitszeichen. Diese Funktion ist aber – wie Scovel (1970:88f.) bemerkt – eher sekundär zur Bedeutung ‘to get to’.”

3 “เสริมด้วยภาษา [...] อ. บอกถิ่นภาษา ได้เกี่ยวกับ ได้ เกี่ยวกับ...
other than those two verbs รับ and ดิน. As for the negating ไม่ได้, Delouche emphasizes its aspektual character. Kummer (1991) explains that preverbal ได้ is used to mark limited proceedings or facts situated in the past. In the Grundlagen einer kommunikativen Grammatik (1985), he lists ได้ as an example of a modal that can be pre- or postpositioned, adding in a footnote that ฤก and โอน belong to the same class, meaning, of course, the class of prepositioned modals. He seems to be oblivious of the fact that ฤก and โอน can be followed by the agent while preverbal ได้ can never be separated from the following verb. Apart from being an example for the difficulties of describing the meaning and function of a linguistic phenomena of Thai, this short overview also shows inadequacies and inconsistencies in the use of Western terminology. Preverbal ได้ is called a marker of past tense, past time or aspect, or simply a word referring to the past. All reference and teaching materials distinguish between preverbal affirmative ได้ and preverbal negating ไม่ได้ without making an exact distinction between the meaning and the function of them.

4. PREVERBAL AFFIRMATIVE ได้ AND NEGATING ไม่ได้ IN COMPUTER GENERATED CONCORDANCES

4.1. Negating preverbal ไม่ได้
Since there seems to be a general agreement in the literature that the negating preverbal ไม่ได้ is more frequently used to refer to past time or aspect of completion than the affirmative preverbal ได้ and since Anthony’s and Noss’s explanations suggest that the affirmative preverbal ได้ is used in analogy to, or has derived from, the negating ไม่ได้, I have looked at concordances of ไม่ได้ first. I have discarded all occurrences of the main verb ได้ since I regard it as an independent lexical entry. I have divided the occurrences of preverbal ไม่ได้ into six groups. The source of each example is marked by either (soap) if it comes from the Thai Rath rendering of the

4 “Par ailleurs, ได้ sert à marquer l’accompli dans les phrases négatives, [...]” (p.97)
5 “Ebenfalls vor dem prädikativen Ausdruck wird die Partikel ได้ zur Bezeichnung eines in der Vergangenheit liegenden, begrenzten Vorgangs oder eines Sachverhalts ausgedrückt [...]” (p.79)
6 “Modale Komponenten sind in Zusammensetzungen vor- oder nachgestellt: ไปได้ [...] gehen können ไปไม่ได้ [...] gegangen sein [...]” (p.44)
7 “In die gleiche Klasse wie ด้วย sind ฤก [...] in Kontakt kommen und โอน [...] schlagen, treffen einzuordnen. [...]” (p.45, footnote 1)
TV soap opera วีรบุรุษกรรมบาน or (silpa) if it comes from the compilation of articles from the นิตยสารวิทยาการ. The six groups are distinguished by semantic criteria and the distribution of the examples depends to a large extent on my interpretation of their meaning. There are certainly other distributions possible. Especially the distinction between 4.1.4. Reinforcement of ordinary ไม-negation and 4.1.5 The non-occurrence of an expected, anticipated or plausible event or activity is often unclear. This has, however, no bearings for my main purpose to look for instances where preverbal ถ้า has the functions of referring to past time. The six groups are as follows:

4.1.1. Denial of opportunity
4.1.1.1. ข้าว到这里เสียก็ไม่รับกลับเพราะตั้งแต่แม่ยังไม่เคยกิน (soap)
4.1.1.2. ปัญหาต่างๆ ถ้ายังไม่เคยเกิด (silpa)
4.1.1.3. […] ว่า คงไม่เคยพบใครมีคิดถือนานนั้น ๆ (soap)

4.1.2. Conveyance of past time
4.1.2.1. ขณะที่เกิดขึ้นไม่ต้องบอกคำว่าของวันอันตร (…) (soap)
4.1.2.2. พ่อแม่คงไม่เคยส่ง (soap)
4.1.2.3. […] เมื่อหลายวันคิดถ้าไม่ได้รวมเป็นราชาสามอาวุธ (silpa)

4.1.3. Emphasis of state or intention, marking a statement as definite
4.1.3.1. ไม่เคยกินว่า แต่นายอย่างนี้ปญหาที่บ้าน (soap)
4.1.3.2. ไม่ไปไม่เคยกินกินอาหารราชองการ […] (silpa)
4.1.3.3. […] ถ้าจะไม่เคยกินกินเที่ยวเช้าแต่แรกก็จะแก่ ๆ เช้ามุ่ย (silpa)

4.1.4. Reinforcement of ordinary ไม-negation
4.1.4.1. ความรักที่แท้จริงไม่เคยขึ้นอยู่กับความเพราะกิจที่ชอบแทน (soap)
4.1.4.2. […] บอกว่าเราคงไม่เคยจริงใจได้มีคิดเสีย (soap)
4.1.4.3. […] เพลินไม่มักกินไฟ เพราะไม่ได้รักคุณมาก (soap)
4.1.4.4. […] ประสบการณ์นั้นเคยรู้แต่ไม่เคยจ้างเถื่อนให้ราชการทำกิจที่อื่น […] (silpa)
4.1.4.5. […] แค่ความหมายจะไม่ระบุข้อจนจิวิจัยขึ้น แต่ก็คิดความหมายว่า […] (silpa)
4.1.4.6. หนังสือพิมพ์ไม่เคยจะยืดเวลา […] (silpa)
Reference to past time appears to be most clearly in the examples of group 4.1.2. However, this reference does not appear to depend clearly and exclusively on the preverbal modifier ได้. In examples 4.1.2.1., the introductory conjunction ขณะที่ indicates the temporal relationship between the given subordinate and the following main clause. In example 4.1.2.3., it is the particle ดัง that refers to a situation before a given historical event. If preverbal ได้ would be omitted in both these sentences, they may sound awkward or unidiomatic but their temporal reference would not be any less clear than before. It is only in sentence 4.1.2.2. that preverbal ได้ seems to be the only word that clearly leads the reader to know that the parent’s neglect is a matter of the past. Clear references to the past is also found in the examples 4.1.3.2., 4.1.3.3. and 4.1.4.6. but this reference is a matter of inherent narrative logic while the function of preverbal ได้ is clearly to give weight to a statement.

Except for 4.1.6. Idiomatic use, the semantic value of negation dominates in all groups, even to the extent that in the examples 4.1.3.3. and in 4.1.4.5. the modal จะ appears in front of ไม่ได้. In none of the sentences, the possible reference to past time takes preference over the marking of negation. Theoretically, the ไม่ใช่-negation can be replaced by a simple ไม่-negation without changing the time reference of the statement as a whole. These observations suggest that ได้ in preverbal ไม่ได้ is certainly not primarily a means to mark reference to past time.

A special case seems to be the expression ไม่ได้ตั้งใจ which is frequently used to affirm the unintentionality of one’s action. The logic of chronology demands that such a statement can only be made when the unintended act has happened but the prime semantic value of ไม่ได้ตั้งใจ is not aspect or time but emphasis of the denial of intention. Besides, ไม่ได้ตั้งใจ appears to have acquired an almost idiomatic status. At least, I did not find any example of the analogous affirmative status ได้ตั้งใจ. The reference to past time in the formulation ไม่ได้รับ is also due to inherent narrative logic and not to specific marking. The affirmative ได้รับ is best translated as to get or to receive while the single main verb รับ usually takes the meaning of to take.
4.2. Affirmative preverbal ได้

The observation that the negation in preverbal ไม่ได้ is of stronger semantic value than the aspectual or temporal references may appear as self-evident. In most languages, negating modals carry a dominating element of emphasis. It is thus necessary to look at the use of preverbal affirmative ได้ and see how its use corresponds with the use of preverbal ไม่ได้.

The semantic value of preverbal ได้ resembles in many ways those of the English secondary verb to get. It covers the whole spectrum of meaning from having an opportunity to, being able or achieve to do something and anticipating the result or stating the purpose of a certain action. With this meaning it stands at the beginning of a verb concatenation. (In analogy, the English secondary verb has to be complemented by an infinitive clause.) Apart from that, preverbal ได้ may also be used to give emphasis to a statement. In the following, I have distinguished three semantically defined groups all of which are related to the meaning of the primary verb ได้: opportunity, ability and achievement, result and purpose. In many cases, however, an exact distinction is not possible. An opportunity or an achievement may for instance be the result of an activity. Thus the decision on how to classify an example depends necessarily to a large extent on interpretation. I have also looked for statements where preverbal ได้ appears predominantly as a means of emphasis and in a co-text of unambiguous past time reference.

4.2.1. Opportunity

4.2.1.1. จากนั้นพูดคุยเป็นโอกาสให้คุณเห็นใจคุณทั้งปวง (soap)

4.2.1.2. ห้าสิ่งที่คุณจะได้ทั้งหมด คุณก้าวไปได้วย (soap)

4.2.1.3. เมื่ออาชีวะรุ่นแต่ละยุคสมัย หนึ่งในไตรยางค์ (silpa)

4.2.1.4. ปริญญาตรีต้องเป็นมาณฑะกิจ ๒ ครั้ง และจะได้รับแง้มถึงกึ่ง ๑ ครั้ง (silpa)

4.2.1.5. อย่างไรก็ตาม คุณที่ได้ The Last Emperor ฉบับไม่ […] (silpa)

4.2.2. Ability and Achievement

4.2.2.1. […] ที่ศรีโอทัยหลักฐานในหนังสือแกรมหนัง (silpa)

4.2.2.2. ในปัจจุบันสำนักที่ตั้งอยู่ที่หันตราเอาไว้ […] (silpa)

4.2.2.3. เขากับปัญหาดังกล่าวจะเจาะจงกินถ้วย (soap)

4.2.2.4. ถ้าเกิดคุณได้มากรับชาเยลีกอล์ฟที่วัดทองคำจริง (soap)
4.2.3. Result and Purpose
4.2.3.1 [...] เพื่อที่จะได้ไม่จำเป็นต้องย้อนไป [...] (silpa)
4.2.3.2. แปลงมากกว่าหุลุน ค่อนข้างจะเป็นรูปดูเหมือนเป็นสี.include (silpa)
4.2.3.3. เนื่องจากที่มีวัตถุอยู่นี้ดูเหมือนได้มีกลิ่นของเขา (soap)
4.2.3.4. เนื่องจากนี้จากสูตรหนึ่งต่างเลย ถึงได้กลับมาหน้าเธอ (soap)
4.2.3.5. พร้อมก็ดีเรื่องราวในบ้านให้เกิดอะไร (soap)

4.2.4. Emphasis
4.2.4.1. รู้จักได้ดีสิมี))^ก่อนล่าๆ [...][silpa]
4.2.4.2. เล่าสั้นกว่าขำว่าอย่าได้ดับจนมานานนี้อีก (soap)

4.2.5. Past time reference
4.2.5.1. ราชยางสุภาระรำรำค่า วิจัยจากตั้งตึกข้าวข้าวข้าวซึ่งมีกาก 4 แห่ง.
ไม่ประจำสนามทวารณ 2500 (silpa)
4.2.5.2. เมื่อปี พ.ศ. ๒๔๘๑ นางคลอด พบใบใหญ่ของพยาบาลกับต่ำสุดสิ้น ได้เทาร่างกันจนถึง[...] (silpa)
4.2.5.3. ภาษาไปได้ไปด้วยจันและพูดว่า [...][silpa]
4.2.5.4. รู้เกิดขึ้นพร้อมเดือนในวัน [...][silpa]
4.2.5.5. ใครมีนักบอกว่าได้บอกข่าวถึงหลายครั้งว่าตอบได้ไม่ได้มีอะไร (soap)

Past time reference appears most clearly in group 4.2.5., but again it is not the function of preverbal ให้ alone to mark this reference. In the sentences 4.2.5.1. and 4.2.5.2., time is given by time adverbials. In the sentence 4.2.5.4., aspect is specifically marked by แล้ว. In 4.2.5.5., the indirect speech and the adverbial หลายครั้ง clearly mark the event as being completed while ให้ serves more as a means to emphasize the statement. As for 4.2.5.3., the inherent logic of narrative chronology makes any specific marking of time or aspect optional. In all five examples the primary semantic value of preverbal ให้ could be described as that of giving emphasis, rather like the English did in a sentence such as I did tell him several times instead of I told him.

In none of the examples from the other groups, preverbal ให้ appears as a primary means to refer to past time. Again, preverbal ให้ can be omitted without changing the time reference.
5. CONCLUSION

My survey of preverbal negating ไม่ ำ และ preverbal affirmative ได้ suggests that preverbal ได้ is hardly ever used as a means to mark past time reference. I found no example where the determination of time or aspect would depend solely on preverbal ได้. In all cases it could be omitted without changing the temporal or aspeクトal character of the sentence. If it is necessary to mark time or aspect it is done so either by time adverbials or by genuine markers of aspect such as แต่ or แล้ว. Often, the logic of narrative chronology suffices to convey the temporal relationship between events and activities.

Although I cannot claim to have looked at a representative cross-section of Thai sentences, my observations give rise to the supposition that the information in existing reference material on the subject of the function of preverbal ได้ is in many cases misleading. Mary Haas’ translation of the adverb-auxiliary ได้ as get to, got to, did (p.178) certainly describes the meaning of preverbal ได้ accurately, but in my opinion, did should not be qualified as indicating past time but instead as giving weight to or emphasizing. McFarland’s description of preverbal ได้ as an auxiliary verb and sign of the past tense appears to be insufficient. Noss’ statement that preverbal ได้ is “Commonest in past situations but also occurs in present and future situations regarded as not capable of change” (p.139) is vague, but at least, he does not suggest that preverbal ได้ indicates or marks past time by itself. I do agree with Bisang that preverbal ได้ basically retains the meaning of to obtain but once this has been acknowledged, preverbal ได้ cannot, in my opinion, be categorized as a TAM-marker. I regard it rather as a semi-modal whose meaning closely resembles that of the English to get to and that is positioned at the beginning of a verb concatenation because it requires a verbal extension.

Apart from the question whether preverbal ได้ is a linguistic means to establish past time reference or not, the examples I have looked at have revealed a variety of meanings and functions of preverbal ได้ that may be intuitively clear but which are not dealt with systematically in the standard reference material. Mary Haas, at least, lists the many other possible meanings of preverbal ได้ in separate lexical entries.

The purpose of my examination of has been to demonstrate the discrepancies between the information in reference material and the actual language use and to underline the urgency and the necessity to develop a Learner’s Grammar of Standard Thai that is based on a corpus of authentic texts. A systematical computer-assisted survey of an extensive corpus of contemporary Standard Thai language material should reveal new insights and may lead to findings that could be quite different from what is found in the existing and often unquestioned reference material. Such a survey will be a prerequisite for the development of a reliable and extensive description of the Thai language.
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