ACCOMPLISHMENT CONSTRUCTIONS IN THAI: DIVERSE CAUSE-EFFECT RELATIONSHIPS

Kiyoko Takahashi

Kanda University of International Studies
<kiyoko@kanda.kuis.ac.jp>

1 Introduction

In his work on the typology of event integration, Talmy (2000) points out the difference between English and Mandarin Chinese verbs of agentive activity in their preferred patterns of lexicalization with reference to the degree of fulfillment of the agent's intention to bring about a desired outcome of the action. According to him, English activity verbs are predominantly "fulfilled verbs" which express that an agent acts on a patient with the intention to cause a desired result and the intention is fulfilled (i.e. the result is realized), whereas Mandarin Chinese activity verbs are characteristically "conative verbs" which express not attained-fulfillment of the agent's intention but moot-fulfillment or implied-fulfillment, that is, the realization of the intended result is moot or merely implied and therefore it is defeasible. Whether the intended result is realized or not is beyond the referential scope of the lexical meaning of Mandarin Chinese activity verbs. To represent the achievement of the goal of the agent's action, compounds consisting of an activity verb and a change of state verb or state verb (e.g. **dǎ pò** 'hit + broken') are used in Mandarin Chinese. Similarly, the Thai language employs serial verb constructions to analytically represent the complex event beginning with the agent's action and ending up with the fulfillment of the agent's intention. However, resultative situations expressed by Thai serial verb constructions do not necessarily involve the agent's intention.

This study aims at investigating the semantics of accomplishment [1] constructions in Thai. In particular, I examine the event structure of events encoded by Thai accomplishment constructions. In this paper I use the term "accomplishment construction" to refer to Thai serial verb construction composed of two verb phrases [2] that represents a complex event consisting of two relevant events in succession, i.e., cause and effect events. Put differently, the accomplishment construction is a linguistic device to iconically encode two serial events holding a certain cause-effect relationship. The causal relation between the two events, namely a cause event brings about an effect event, can be graphically represented as follows: CAUSE → EFFECT. This invariable sequence of the two events corresponds to the fixed order of two verb phrases in the construction. As illustrated in (1) to (5) below, the former verb phrase (VP1) and the latter verb phrase (VP2) respectively represent a preceding cause event and a following effect event.

The examples below exemplify different causal relations between cause and effect events. In (1), someone's beating a box yields an expected broken state of the box. In (2), someone's spending money leads to disappearance of all the money. In (3), someone's drinking bootleg whisky leads to his inebriety. In (4), someone's stretching her line of sight away gives rise to her visual perception of some mountains. And in (5), something's falling off results in its destruction.

(1)   [tii   klɔɔŋ] VP1   [tὲɛk] VP2
         beat   box   be broken
         '(He) beat a box and it was broken.'

(2)   [cháy   ŋən] VP1   [mòt] VP2
         use   money   come to an end
         '(He) used money and it was used up.'

(3)   [kin   lâw thὑan] VP1   [maw] VP2
         eat   bootleg whisky   be intoxicated
         '(He) drank bootleg whisky and was intoxicated.'

(4)   [mɔɔŋ   pay] VP1   [hěn   phuu khǎw] VP2
         look   go   see   mountain
         '(He) looked away and caught sight of mountains.'

(5)   [tòk] VP1   [tὲɛk] VP2
         go down   be broken
         '(It) fell off and was broken.'

These patterns are possibly regarded as resultative constructions in a broad sense. (1), which is composed of VP1 for volitional activity and VP2 for change of state/location or state, exemplifies a typical resultative construction expressing a complex event of canonical causation (direct and intended causation), namely an agent directly acts on a patient for some purpose and the patient is physically affected in accordance with the purpose as a result. In Rappaport Hovav & Levin's (2001) syntactic terms, examples (1) to (5) can be classified as follows. (1) to (3) are "transitive-based" (i.e. the first verb is followed by an object argument) whereas (4) and (5) are "intransitive-based" (i.e. the first verb is followed by no object argument); (1) and (2) are "object-oriented" (i.e. the second verb predicates of the object of the first verb) whereas (3) to (5) are "subject-oriented" (i.e. the second verb predicates of the subject of the first verb). At any rate, the referent of the unnamed subject of VP2 must be the same as the referent of the object or the subject of VP1.

Thai accomplishment constructions are thus "subcategorized". However, I have also discovered that examples (1) to (5) have certain common properties, hence I categorize them into a single general category, i.e., accomplishment construction. I will explicate the semantic and syntactic characteristics of the accomplishment construction in Sections 2 and 3, respectively. I will argue that cause and effect events represented by the two verb phrases in the construction are in a coordinate relationship and yet they constitute a single macro-event. In Section 4, I will examine Thai arrival expressions which I consider a subtype of the construction. Section 5 is a summary of this study.

2 Semantic Characteristics

Our understanding of causal relation is basic in our mental life. A causal relation is composed of two asymmetrical semantic components: cause/reason and effect/result. The relationship between the first pair 'cause-effect' (i.e. a cause produces an effect in the spatio-temporal domain) involves phenomenal motivation, as in 'Because he bumped me, I

dropped the glass,' while the relationship between the second pair 'reason-result' (i.e. a reason accounts for a result in the logical domain) involves logical motivation, as in 'Because it was boring, I left' (cf. Givón 1990). Although causes and effects are semantic components for describing objective events occurring in the physical world, a link between a cause and an effect never exists as part of objective reality but is established due to human expectation, inference, reasoning, and the like. Thus, causal relations, whether they are phenomenal or logical, exist in relation to our interpretation of reality. I assume that each human individual acquires from everyday experiences the "idealized cognitive model (ICM)" (cf. Lakoff 1987) for causal relations, namely one situation is correlated with another situation. Thai speakers employ serial verb constructions to express such a cause-effect relationship. Two serial verb phrases used to express a cause-effect relationship are called accomplishment constructions in this study. The following discussion will reveal that despite the semantic diversity of the construction, all subtypes of the construction must be amenable to the same constraints with regard to the eventuality of accomplishment conceived by Thai speakers. This section addresses the following questions: (a) Exactly what cause-effect relationships do Thai accomplishment constructions express?; (b) What semantic conditions is the construction subject to?

VP2 in examples (1) to (5) above includes a "completive verb" in Noss's (1964) terminology, namely, **tɛ̀ɛk** 'be broken' in (1) and (5), **mòt** 'come to an end' in (2), **maw** 'be intoxicated' in (3), and **hěn** 'see' in (4). According to Noss (1964: 126), completive verbs occurring in VP2 signal "successful completion of attempted action." However, this explanation is not adequate for all completive verbs following VP1, since the action denoted by VP1 may not have originated in the agent's intention to achieve a certain goal, in other words, the person who performs the action may not be a typical agent with clear intention. This is the case with (2) where the person did not necessarily have the intention to use up his money. Furthermore, a cause event named by VP1 may sometimes not be an agent's action but a theme's process, as illustrated in (5). Therefore, I would prefer to say that completive verbs in VP2 express "realization of an expectable event (effect) as the result of a preceding event (cause)," which may or may not involve the intention of the agent in the preceding event. A piece of evidence to support this opinion is that the accomplishment construction has an affinity with an adverbial indicating involuntariness (such as **yàaŋ pen pay dây ʔeeŋ** 'automatically' and **yàaŋ mây rúu tua** 'involuntarily') as in (6). By contrast, an adverbial indicating the agent's volition (such as **phayaayaam** 'make an effort' and **yàaŋ coŋcay** 'intentionally') is normally not used as a modifier for the construction, as in (7).

(6) a. tii   klɔ̀ɔŋ tɛ̀ɛk   <u>yàaŋ pen pay dây ʔeeŋ</u>
         beat   box   be broken   automatically
         '(He) beat a box and it was broken automatically.'
    b. cháy   ŋən   mòt   <u>yàaŋ mây rúu tua</u>
         use   money come to an end involuntarily
         '(He) involuntarily used money and it was used up.'

(7) a.? <u>phayaayaam</u>   tii   klɔ̀ɔŋ tɛ̀ɛk
         make an effort   beat   box   be broken
    b.? cháy   ŋən   mòt   <u>yàaŋ coŋcay</u>
         use   money come to an end   intentionally

The expectation on the part of the speaker/conceptualizer is based on her consideration of the nature of the involved entities as well as the physical and cultural setting in which the entities are situated. Even if one does not have the intention to cause a specific effect, a certain effect would arise from one's activity given an appropriate setting, which we readily expect. We also know from our force-dynamic experiences in the physical world that an entity's motion mostly terminates and sometimes brings about some effect eventually.

VP2 in the accomplishment construction expresses realization of an effect event that delimits the duration of a preceding cause event denoted by VP1. The effect event denoted by VP2 bounds the complex event as a whole denoted by the combination of VP1 and VP2. In this sense, we may call the effect event a "delimiter event" or a "culminative event." There are a variety of subtypes of the delimiter event. For instance, (1) and (5) including **tɛ̀ɛk** 'be broken' involve a delimiter event of "destruction" (i.e. something has been destroyed); (2) including **mòt** 'come to an end' involves that of "exhaustion" (i.e. someone has used up something) or "disappearance" (i.e. something has disappeared); (3) including **maw** 'be intoxicated' involves that of "natural consequence" (i.e. someone/something has undergone a change of state/location as a matter of course); and, (4) including **hěn phuukhǎw** 'see mountains' involves that of "perception" (i.e. someone has perceived something). It is likely that the least specific and the most inclusive label for characterizing these various delimiter events is "natural consequence" (i.e. an entity undergoes a change as a matter of course). This means that any delimiter event is a natural consequence of a preceding cause event in the given circumstances.

It is noteworthy that there may be a considerable time span before the effect event manifests itself. The effect event named by VP2 may be of any simplex aspectual type (state or activity/process or achievement), while the cause event named by VP1 should be durative, or specifically, an activity/process or state that continues until the realization of an effect event expressed by VP2. Even though the duration of the cause event is fairly short, such as hitting and lifting, it must take some time until the effect event takes place. Below is a summary of combination patterns for the meanings of VP1 and VP2.

Table 1: *Combination Patterns for VP1 and VP2 in Thai Accomplishment Constructions*

	VP1: CAUSE; VP2: EFFECT
Pattern 1	VP1: volitional activity VP2: change of state/location or state
Pattern 2	VP1: non-specific but direct activity VP2: change of state/location or spontaneous action
Pattern 3	VP1: activity/process or state VP2: accumulation
Pattern 4	VP1: sensation-related activity VP2: perception/conception
Pattern 5	VP1: non-purposive activity or process VP2: change of state/location or state

Further explanation for each pattern is given below:

<Pattern 1>
    VP1: volitional activity (of agent)
    VP2: change of state/location or state (of patient)

This pattern consists of a transitive activity verb taking an affected entity as its object argument (e.g. **tii klɔ̌ɔŋ** 'hit a box,' **yók krapǎw** 'lift a bag,' **sák sûa** 'wash a shirt,' **cháy ŋən** 'use money') and an unaccusative verb indicating change of state/location (e.g. **tɛ̀ɛk** 'be broken,' **mòt** 'come to an end,' **khɯ̂n** 'ascend') or a state verb expressing transient property (e.g. **sàʔàat** 'clean') (cf. Kessakul & Methapisit 2000; Thepkanjana & Uehara 2004). This pattern is object-oriented, that is, the object of the first verb and the unnamed subject of the second verb refer to the same entity. For example:

(8)=(1) [tii   klɔ̌ɔŋ] VP1   [tɛ̀ɛk] VP2
       beat   box   be broken
       '(He) beat a box and it was broken.'

(9)   [sák sûa] VP1   [sàʔàat] VP2
       wash   shirt   clean
       '(He) washed a shirt and it became clean.'

(10)   [yók krapǎw] VP1   [khɯ̂n] VP2
       lift   bag   ascend
       '(He) lifted a bag and it moved upward.'

(11)=(2)   [cháy ŋən] VP1   [mòt] VP2
         use   money   come to an end
         '(He) used money and it was used up.'

Li & Thompson (1989: 54-56) has classified resultative verb compounds (RVC's) in Mandarin Chinese into four types, namely, types of "cause" (e.g. **dǎ pò** 'hit + broken'; **lā kāi** 'pull + open'), "achievement" (e.g. **xiē qīngchu** 'write + clear'; **mǎy dào** 'buy + arrive'), "direction" (e.g. **tiào quò qu** 'jump + cross + go'; **pǎo chū lái** 'run + exit + come'), and "phase" (e.g. **yòng wán** 'use + finish'; **guān diào** 'close + away'). Their classification in principle fits Thai accomplishment constructions of this pattern. Those like (8) can be categorized as cause type, those like (9) as achievement type, those like (10) as direction type, and those like (11) as phase type.

The subjects and objects of VP1 in (8) to (10) represent typical agents and patients, i.e., the former acts upon the latter by intention, while those in (11) does not. On the grounds that normally one does not want to use up one's money, it is likely that the person described in (11) kept dissipating his money with casual abandon until he encountered such an unfortunate situation that he had spent all the money. What is expressed by (11), therefore, cannot be regarded as canonical causation with typical agent and patient. Yet, the prior VP1 event (the person's using money) and the posterior VP2 event (the money's disappearance) are not completely independent of each other, but are undoubtedly considered to hold a

cause-effect relationship.

<Pattern 2>
> *VP1: non-specific but direct activity (of agent)*
> *VP2: change of state/location or spontaneous action (of patient)*

In this pattern, VP1 must contain the verb **tham** 'do' followed by a noun phrase indicating a patient, and VP2 contains mostly an unaccusative verb indicating a change of state/location (e.g. **hǎay** 'disappear,' **tòk** 'fall') or possibly an unergative verb expressing a spontaneous action. This pattern, like Pattern 1, is object-oriented, and it is quite a unique resultative construction which is used to encode a complex event of non-canonical causation, namely an agent acts on a patient either by intention or by chance but necessarily directly and then the patient undergoes a change of state/location. For example:

(12)   [tham   krapǎw] ᵥₚ₁   [hǎay] ᵥₚ₂
       do   bag   disappear
       '(He) directly acted on a bag and it disappeared.'

(13)   [tham   dèk] ᵥₚ₁   [tòk   nám] ᵥₚ₂
       do   child   go down   water
       '(He) directly acted on a child and the child fell into the water.'

(14)   [tham   chán] ᵥₚ₁   [wîŋ   nǐi] ᵥₚ₂
       do   PRONOUN   run   flee
       '(He) directly acted on me and I ran away.'

VP2 may consist of an unergative verb that represents an atelic activity (e.g. **wîŋ nǐi** 'run away'). However, the activity must be spontaneously initiated irrespective of volition, as in (14) where the patient was forced to run away because of some bad action by the unnamed agent (cf. Pothipath 1999).

<Pattern 3>
> *VP1: activity (of agent), process or state (of theme)*
> *VP2: accumulation (of patient by agent's activity, or of something as a result)*

The situation denoted by VP1 may be an activity/process or a state. The referent of the subject of VP1 in (15) to (17) below is an agent engaged in an activity; that in (18) is a theme undergoing a change of location; and, that in (19) is a theme simply exhibiting a state. VP2 must consist of the verb **dây** 'come into existence; get' followed by a noun phrase indicating an amount accumulated. This pattern designates what has been accumulated in terms of volume, distance or duration after continuance of an activity/process or a state denoted by VP1. Note that **dây** in (17) to (19) no longer has the agentive meaning 'get' due to the absence of an agent (cf. Takahashi & Methapisit 2004).

(15)   [càp   plaa] VP1   [dây   sǎm   tua] VP2
        catch   fish   come into existence; get   three   CLASSIFIER
        '(He) caught fishes and the number amounted to three.'

(16)   [khǐan còtmǎay] VP1   [dây   hâa   banthát] VP2
        write   letter   come into existence; get   five   CLASSIFIER
        '(He) wrote a letter and it amounted to five lines.'

(17)   [tham ŋaan   bɔɔrisàt] VP1   [dây   sɔ̌ɔŋ   pii] VP2
        work   company   come into existence   two   year
        '(He) worked for a company and the period amounted to two years.'

(18)   [lɔɔy   khʉ̂n pay] VP1   [dây   rɔ́ɔy   méet] VP2
        float   ascend go   come into existence   hundred   meter
        '(It) went up floating and the distance amounted to one hundred meters.'

(19)   [yen] VP1   [dây   sìp   naathii] VP2
        cool   come into existence   ten   minute
        '(It) was cool and the period amounted to ten minutes.'

<Pattern 4>
        VP1: sensation-related activity (of agent or experiencer)
        VP2: perception/conception (of experiencer)

This pattern consists of VP1 for activity giving rise to some sensation (e.g. touching, tasting, smelling, listening, looking) and VP2 for perception/conception. The referent of the subject of VP1 is concurrently an agent engaged in sensation-related activity and an experiencer enjoying perception/conception. Thus, this pattern is subject-oriented. VP1 may be transitive, as in (20) and (21), or intransitive, as in (22).

(20)   [dom   yaa] VP1   [dây   klìn   hɔ̌ɔm] VP2
        smell medicine   get   odor   fragrant
        '(He) smelled the medicine and had a fragrant smell.'

(21)   [faŋ   banyaay] VP1   [rúu rʉ̂aŋ] VP2
        listen lecture   understand
        '(He) listened to the lecture and understood.'

(22)=(4)   [mɔɔŋ   pay] VP1   [hěn   phuu khǎw] VP2
            look   go   see   mountain
            '(He) looked away and caught sight of mountains.'

(23) below is a marginal member of patterns 4 and 5. It looks like pattern 4 in that VP2 represents a perception/conception (seeing fresh vegetables). At the same time, it is similar to pattern 5 in that VP1 represents a non-purposive activity (going to a market with no intention to see fresh vegetables).

(23)   [pay   talàat] VP1   [hěn   phàk   sòt] VP2
         go   market   see   vegetables   fresh
        '(He) went to the market and caught sight of fresh vegetables.'

<Pattern 5>
   VP1: non-purposive activity (of agent) or process (of theme)
   VP2: change of state/location (of theme) or state (of experiencer)

This pattern consists of VP1 representing a non-purposive activity (e.g. **kin lâw thùan** 'drink bootleg whisky,' **dəən pay** 'walk away') or process (e.g. **tòk** 'go down') and VP2 representing a change of state/location (e.g. **thǔŋ ráan** 'arrive at the shop,' **tὲεk** 'be broken') or a state (e.g. **maw** 'be intoxicated'). This pattern also is subject-oriented. For example:

(24)=(3)   [kin   lâw thùan] VP1   [maw] VP2
             eat   bootleg whisky   be intoxicated
            '(He) drank bootleg whisky and was intoxicated.'

(25)   [dəən pay] VP1   [thǔŋ ráan] VP2
         walk   go   arrive shop
        '(He) walked away and arrived at the shop.'

(26)=(5)   [tòk] VP1   [tὲεk] VP2
             go down   be broken
            '(It) fell off and was broken.'

The referent of the subject of VP1 in (24) and (25) is an agent that executes an action, whereas that in (26) is a theme that undergoes a change of state/location. The agent in (24) and (25) is, however, a less typical agent that carries out an action for no particular purpose.

There are two important conditions on the semantics of the accomplishment construction. The fundamental one is that the actualization of the effect event denoted by VP2 should be at issue, since the speaker using the construction for the description of two serial events focuses on whether or not the latter effect event takes place as a result of the former cause event. The communicative function of the construction is to comment on whether an effect event does or does not arise from a cause event. The secondary condition is that a posterior effect event must be regarded as a natural consequence of a prior cause event. The crucial point is that the realization of an effect event should not be completely under control of the agent of a cause event. There must be something beyond the agent's control such as suitable circumstances and timeliness helping to bring about a certain resultant situation. If a consequent event is totally under the control of the agent of a cause event, then the two serial events may be regarded as merely two phases of a single event of the agent's manipulation which happen virtually instantly and can be compactly encoded by a single causative verb of non-alternating type (which does not have an intransitive variant) such as **khâa** 'kill' (cf. Thepkanjana 2000).

(27) khâa   man
      kill   PRONOUN
      '(He) killed it.'

However, when the focus of the speaker is placed on the result phase rather than the action phase of the causative event, she uses the accomplishment construction, as in (28), to depict the result phase as another event of outcome resulting from the preceding activity event.

(28) [khâa   man] _{VP1}   [tàay] _{VP2}
      kill   PRONOUN   dead
      '(He) killed it and it was dead.'

The speaker of (28) is concerned with the realization of the state of being dead. She conceptualizes that the activity event (killing an animate entity) and the inchoative event (dying of the animate entity) take place in succession and instantiate a cause-effect relationship.

The other possible interpretation of the situation in which the agent has control over the realization of an effect event is that the effect event is initiated by the agent and the same agent's prior action is carried out for the purpose of causing the effect event, as exemplified in (29). An indicator of the agent's volition (e.g. **phɨ̂a thîi cà?** 'in order to') can be added to such purposive activity expressions.

(29) a. pîŋ   plaa   (phɨ̂a thîi cà?)   kin
       grill   fish   (in order to)   eat
       '(He) grilled a fish to eat.'

     b. khɨ̂n   rót fay (phɨ̂a thîi cà?)   pay   chiaŋmày
       ascend train   (in order to)   go   Chiangmai
       '(He) rode a train to go to Chiangmai.'

These serial verb constructions primarily describe the agent's purposive action. They differ from the accomplishment construction in their syntactic behaviors as well (see the following section).

To summarize, the accomplishment construction expresses a macro-event of accomplishment that is composed of cause and effect events that occur in a series. The unnamed subject of VP2 is the same as the object or the subject of VP1. The speaker must concern herself with the realization of the effect event. The realization of the effect event must not completely be controlled by the agent of the cause event, and therefore there is room for the speaker to comment on success or failure of the realization of the effect event. There is a simple semantic condition on the combination of cause and effect events, that is, the effect event must be a "natural consequence" of the cause event. The effect event can be any kind of change as long as it is considered to naturally arise from the preceding cause event in a pragmatically appropriate manner in the given context. Not only good outcome but also ill outcome of the effect event can be taken as a natural consequence considering the

given particular circumstances.

3 Syntactic Characteristics

The accomplishment construction has two remarkable syntactic properties. First, the progressive aspect marker **kamlaŋ** cannot be included in the construction. Second, normally the negative **mây** is inserted between VP1 and VP2.

The telic (perfective) nature of the accomplishment construction is incompatible with progressive (imperfective) aspect. Therefore, (30) including the progressive marker **kamlaŋ** is unacceptable. In contrast, expressions of purposive activity, which is inherently atelic (imperfective), may include the progressive marker, as in (31).

(30) * kamlaŋ   tii   klɔ̀ɔŋ tὲɛk
      PROGRESSIVE   beat   box   be broken

(31)   kamlaŋ   pîŋ   plaa   kin
       PROGRESSIVE   grill   fish   eat
       '(He) was grilling a fish to eat.'

This shows that in (30) not VP1 representing a simplex event of activity alone but the combination of VP1 and VP2 representing a complex event of accomplishment as a whole is within the scope of modification of the progressive marker. Since the combined two verb phrases cooperatively express a single macro-event, they are not separately modified.

However, the negative **mây** is normally placed right before VP2, that is, an effect event denoted by VP2 alone is negated, as illustrated in (32) below. However, this is quite reasonable because a cause event is a precondition for a following effect event. Put differently, the existence of a prior cause event is presupposed for the emergence of a posterior effect event, the import of the accomplishment construction. It is abnormal for such a precondition to be negated.

(32) a. tii   klɔ̀ɔŋ mây   tὲɛk
        hit   box   NEGATIVE   be broken
        '(He) hit the box but it was not broken.'
     b. mɔɔŋ   pay   mây   hĕn   phuukhăw
        look   go   NEGATIVE   see   mountain
        '(He) looked away but did not catch sight of mountains.'

It is noteworthy that the degree of acceptability of the negative form varies depending on whether or not the context in question enhances the informativeness of the negative predicate (cf. Takahashi & Thepkanjana 1997). For instance, (32a) seems less acceptable than (32b), because we cannot readily imagine a suitable context for (32a) to be informative. A box's destruction is not always expected to occur as a result of hitting the box, and so (32a) putting emphasis on the negation of a resultant destruction is not very informative without a certain special context in which the destruction is expected. By contrast, seeing is commonly expected to occur as a result of looking. On this basis, (32b) telling failure of catching sight is informative and worth to mention.

It is also possible to negate the whole macro-event of accomplishment denoted by the

combination of VP1 and VP2 by putting the negative in front of VP1, as in (33), but it is more or less modal negation expressing contradiction. That is, what is negated in (33) is not purely the objective proposition overtly represented by the two verb phrases but rather the interlocutor's understanding or view with regard to the proposition.

(33)   mây   tii   klɔ̌ɔŋ tɛ̀ɛk
        NEGATIVE hit   box   be broken
        '(He) did not do in such a way that (he) hits the box and it is broken; It is not correct to believe that (he) hit the box and it was broken.'

On the other hand, the negative is normally placed in front of VP1 in purposive activity expressions, as in (34a), and at the front position of verbal compounds, as in (34b). (35a) and (35b), where the negative is placed between the two verb phrases, are awkward.

(34) a. mây   pîŋ   plaa   kin
      NEGATIVE grill   fish   eat
      '(He) did not grill a fish to eat.'
    b. mây   sɔ̀ɔp tòk
      NEGATIVE fail an examination
      (Lit: examine and go down)
      '(He) did not fail an examination.'

(35) a.? pîŋ   plaa   mây   kin
       grill   fish   NEGATIVE eat
    b.? sɔ̀ɔp   mây   tòk
       take an examination NEGATIVE go down

Compared with these expressions, VP2 in the accomplishment construction expresses a more substantial meaning, for it by itself can be negated, as shown in (32) above. It is impossible for only VP2 to be negated, unless the meaning of VP2 is substantial.

Based on the above discussion on syntactic behaviors of the accomplishment construction, I argue that VP1 and VP2 in the construction are in a coordinate relationship. Neither VP1 nor VP2 has a subordinate status, but their status is equal. Each of the two verb phrases expresses a concrete event that takes place in physical space and time. The two substantial sub-events expressed by the two verb phrases, i.e., cause and effect events, are coordinate events both of which are indispensable to a macro-event of accomplishment. The accomplishment macro-event as a whole is asserted, denied, demanded and asked about. But it is also possible for the latter effect event alone to be denied, since the cause and effect events are coordinate events.

4 Arrival as Accomplishment

In this section I will propose a new perspective in which Thai arrival expressions like (36) are viewed as a subtype of the accomplishment construction. The preceding locomotion event represented by VP1 and the following arrival event represented by VP2 can be regarded as a kind of cause and effect.

(36) a.=(25)   [dəən pay] ᵥₚ₁   [thɯ̌ŋ ráan] ᵥₚ₂
                walk go   reach shop
                '(He) walked away and arrived at the shop.'
      b. [lɔɔy maa] ᵥₚ₁   [krathóp   hǐn] ᵥₚ₂
         float come   collide with   stone
         '(It) came floating and struck the stone.'
      c. [thɔ̂ɔt ŋaw   loŋ] ᵥₚ₁
         stretch shadow   descend
         [thâap   bon   phɯ́ɯn   nám] ᵥₚ₂
         lay flat againston   surface   water
         '(It) stretched its shadow down and the shadow covered the surface of the water.'
      d. [phûŋ hɔ̀ɔk maa] ᵥₚ₁   [khâw sǔan] ᵥₚ₂
         dart lance come   enter garden
         '(He) threw a lance and it came in the garden.'

(36a) and (36b) are subject-oriented (the unnamed subject of VP2 has the same referent as the subject of VP1), while (36c) and (36d) is object-oriented (the unnamed subject of VP2 has the same referent as the object of VP2). Though the argument-linking type is different, their syntactic behaviors are basically identical.

Thai arrival expressions like (36) cannot be equated with English mono-clausal allative expressions (e.g. someone walked to somewhere; someone threw something into somewhere). Since an arrival verb (e.g. **thɯ̌ŋ** 'arrive,' **krathóp** 'collide with,' **thâap** 'lay flat against,' **khâw** 'enter') is dispensable in expressing such an allative sense, as in (37) below, the verb itself does not contribute to an allative sense. Its function is to denote a unique arrival event whereby the preceding locomotion event is delimited (cf. Takahashi, to appear).

(37) a. dəən pay   ráan
        walk go   shop
        '(He) walked to the shop.'
      b. lɔɔy   maa   thîi   hǐn
         float come place stone
         '(It) came floating to the place of the stone.'
      c. thɔ̂ɔt ŋaw   loŋ   bon   phɯ́ɯn nám
         stretch shadow   descend   on   surfacewater
         '(It) stretched its shadow down on the surface of the water.'
      d. phûŋ hɔ̀ɔk maa   thîi   sǔan
         dart lance come place garden
         '(He) threw a lance into the garden.'

While simplex locomotion expressions are compatible with progressive aspect, as in (38), arrival expressions including VP2 for arrival are incompatible with progressive aspect, as in (39).

(38) kamlaŋ   dəən pay (yaŋ) ráan
      PROGRESSIVE   walk go   (to)   shop
      '(He) was walking to the shop.'

(39) * kamlaŋ   dəən pay thǔŋ   ráan
      PROGRESSIVE   walk go   reach shop

Furthermore, VP2 in arrival expressions can be negated independently of VP1. For example:

(40) dəən pay mây   thǔŋ   ráan
      walk go   NEGATIVE reach shop
      '(He) walked away but did not reach the shop.'

I consider these syntactic phenomena as evidence to prove that VP2 in Thai arrival expressions like (36) is not an allative prepositional phrase that highlights the vector of the motion denoted by VP1 but it is an inchoative verb phrase that designates a resultant arrival event. If this analysis is correct, a typologically significant consequence is that in Thai ARRIVAL is not a basic form of the vector component of PATH of motion. Talmy (2000: 53-57) argues that the concept PATH comprises the following three main components that are structurally distinct: (a) Vector, (b) Conformation, and (c) Deictic. The vector component, in turn, consists of the three basic forms of ARRIVAL, TRAVERSAL, and DEPARTURE that a moving entity can execute in relation to a reference entity. He states that these three forms of the vector are quite possibly universal. However, I claim that the pervasive idea that ARRIVAL is a basic form of the vector on a par with TRAVERSAL and DEPARTURE is not applicable to Thai motion expressions. For one thing, in Thai an unmarked allative sense emerges from serialization of a path verb and a goal prepositional or noun phrase even if the allative preposition **yaŋ** 'to, toward' is not included, as illustrated in (37) above. What is more, in Thai ARRIVAL is verbally expressed as an achievement resulting from a preceding locomotion. That is, a preceding locomotion event is one event and a following arrival is another. For these reasons, it is unlikely that the vector component in Thai encompasses ARRIVAL as a basic form.

5 Conclusion

In this study I have defined two serialized verb phrases in Thai that respectively represent a preceding cause event and a subsequent effect event as the accomplishment construction. I have shown that there are a variety of combination patterns for the two verb phrases expressing cause and effect events. The combination of cause and effect events constitutes a complex accomplishment event. On the grounds that both cause and effect events expressed by the accomplishment construction are concrete and substantial, I consider them to have the same status as clausal constituents and to be in a coordinate relationship.

Notes
I would like to thank Robert De Silva and Andrew Simpson for their stylistic suggestions.

1. The term "accomplishment" was originally used by Vendler (1967: 102) to refer to one of the four distinctive categories of aspect that each verb inherently entails (i.e. Aktionsart). The accomplishment aspect is characterized as dynamic, telic (perfective) and non-punctual. In this study I extend the referential domain of this term to the aspectual nature of complex events expressed by the combination of two verb phrases.
2. A single verb phrase in Thai may consist of more than one verb. A traditional account is that the second verb functions as a subsidiary verb indicating an abstract notion associated with a physical meaning of the first verb, such as directedness of a motion.

References
Givón, Talmy. 1990. *Syntax: A Functional-Typological Introduction Vol.2*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
Kessakul, Ruetaiwan and Tasanee Methapisit. 2000. Resultative Constructions in Thai and the Related Issues. *Proceedings of the 5th International Symposium on Language and Linguistics: Pan-Asiantic Linguistics*, November 16-17, 2000.
Lakoff, George. 1987. *Women, Fire, and Dangerous Things: What Categories Reveal about the Mind*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.
Li, Charles N. and Sandra A. Thompson. 1989. *Mandarin Chinese: A Functional Reference Grammar*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
Noss, Richard B. 1964. *Thai Reference Grammar*. Washington, D.C.: Foreign Service Institute.
Pothipath, Vipas. 1999. *Analytic Causative Constructions in Thai*. Master's thesis, Chulalongkorn University.
Rappaport Hovav, Malka and Beth Levin. 2001. An Event Structure Account of English Resultatives. *Language Vol.77, No.4*.
Takahashi, Kiyoko and Kingkarn Thepkanjana. 1997. Negation in Thai Serial Verb Constructions: A Pragmatic Study. In Abramson, Arthur S. (ed.) *Southeast Asian Linguistic Studies in Honor of Vichin Panupong*. Bangkok: Chulalongkorn University Press.
Takahashi, Kiyoko and Tasanee Methapisit. 2004. Observations on Form and Meaning of **dây**. In Burusphat, Somsonge. (ed.) *Papers from the 11th Annual Meeting of the Southeast Asian Linguistics Society 2001*. Tempe: Program for Southeast Asian Studies Monograph Series Press, Arizona State University.
Takahashi, Kiyoko. to appear. Arrival Expressions in Thai: An Accomplishment Construction.
Talmy, Leonard. 2000. *Toward a Cognitive Semantics, Vol.2: Typology and Process in Concept Structuring*. Cambridge: MIT Press.
Thepkanjana, Kingkarn. 2000. Lexical Causatives in Thai. In Foolen, Ad and Frederike van der Leek. (eds.) *Constructions in Cognitive Linguistics*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
Thepkanjana, Kingkarn and Satoshi Uehara. 2004. Semantic Types of Resultative Predicate in Transitive-Based Resultative Constructions in Thai. In Burusphat, Somsonge.

(ed.) *Papers from the 11th Annual Meeting of the Southeast Asian Linguistics Society 2001*. Tempe: Program for Southeast Asian Studies Monograph Series Press, Arizona State University.

Vendler, Zeno. 1967. *Linguistics in Philosophy*. Ithaca, New York: Cornell University Press.