

Five levels in Thai

Kiyoko Takahashi

Kanda University of International Studies

1. Introduction
2. Profile of the language
3. Subordination, coordination and parataxis
 - 3.1 Types of clause linkage
 - 3.2 Inventory of clause linkage markers
4. Causals
 - 4.1 Causals level I
 - 4.2 Causals level II
 - 4.3 Causals level III
 - 4.4 Causals level IV
 - 4.5 Causals level V
5. Conditionals
 - 5.1 Conditionals level I
 - 5.2 Conditionals level II
 - 5.3 Conditionals level III
 - 5.4 Conditionals level IV
 - 5.5 Conditionals level V
6. Concessives
 - 6.1 Concessives level I
 - 6.2 Concessives level II
 - 6.3 Concessives level III
 - 6.4 Concessives level IV
 - 6.5 Concessives level V
7. Discussion
 - 7.1 Distribution of clause linkage markers
 - 7.2 Order of clauses
 - 7.3 Comments on level IV
 - 7.4 Comments on levels III and V
8. Summary and concluding remarks
- Appendix

1. Introduction

The present chapter examines how the five levels in clause linkage (cf. Mie Tsunoda, 2012, this volume) are expressed in Thai, regarding causals, conditionals and concessives.

Thai has a very large number of clause linkage markers ('CLMs'). The present chapter has selected two CLMs for subordination for each of the three semantic areas: causal, conditional and concessive. In each pair of the CLMs, one is unmarked, while the other is marked semantically and/or stylistically.

The five levels in the clause linkage of Thai exhibit a wide range of interesting phenomena. The findings of the present paper include the following.

The six selected CLMs are often used in combination with another CLM and/or some other word. There is no CLM that is perfectly acceptable by itself at all of the five levels. Among these six selected CLMs, the three unmarked ones have wide distributions, while the three marked ones have very limited distributions.

Parataxis by itself is attested for causals and conditionals, but not for concessives. That is, parataxis by itself cannot have a concessive meaning. Nonetheless, it can have a concessive meaning if it involves *ʔàat càʔ ... kô dâʔ* ‘may’. (The formation of *ʔàat càʔ ... kô dâʔ* ‘may’ will be discussed in 6.5.)

Both for subordination and parataxis, the relative order of clauses plays an important role regarding the acceptability of sentences.

The sentential examples given below were constructed by the author or her two native speaker consultants, employing ‘Questionnaire for Five Levels’ (Tasaku Tsunoda, this volume-a). The acceptability judgements for all the constructed examples are from the two consultants who speak Central Thai. The main consultant is Akrachai Mongkolchai (Consultant AM). He was born and grew up in Samut Prakan province which is part of Bangkok Metropolitan Region. According to his acceptability judgements, the markers ‘?’ and ‘*’, which respectively mean ‘marginally acceptable’ and ‘not acceptable’, will be put in front of the examples in question. Another consultant or the vice-consultant is Tasanee Methapisit (Consultant TM). She was born and grew up in Bangkok. It will be mentioned how she reports her judgements concerning the acceptability of the examples when her judgements differ from the main consultant’s.

‘Questionnaire for Five Levels’ includes the following three parts: (i) 2. Sentences for elicitation (first stage): five levels of causal, conditional, and concessive, (ii) 3. Sentences for elicitation (second stage): other semantic areas, and (iii) 4. Sentences for elicitation (third stage): ‘but’ and ‘and’. The data obtained regarding the first stage is shown in Section 4 (causals), Section 5 (conditionals), and Section 6 (concessives). The data that concern the second stage and the third stage is given in Appendix.

2. Profile of the language

Thai belongs to the Tai branch of the Tai-Kadai language family. It is the official language of Thailand. The population of Thai speakers is 20,421,280 (*Ethnologue*, online version 2013).

Thai has the following phonemes: (a) consonants: /p, t, c, k, ʔ, ph, th, ch, kh, b, d, f, s, h, m, n, ɲ, l, r, w, y/; (b) vowels: /i, ii, e, ee, ε, εε, u, uu, ə, əə, a, aa, u, uu, o, oo, ɔ, ɔɔ/; (c) diphthongs: /ia, ua, ua/; and (d) tones: Mid, Low, Falling, High, Rising (e.g. maa, màa, mâa, máa, mǎa).

Thai is a typical isolating language. It exhibits zero-marking (neither

head-marking nor dependent-marking) and virtually no affixation (neither derivational nor inflectional). Thai has prepositions. However, like other functional morphemes, often they are not used, especially in oral discourse.

Thai shows a relatively tight connection between the verb (V) and the object noun phrase (O), and it can be considered configurational. The basic orders of clausal constituents are AVO and SV. Usually the A, the S, and the O are not marked for case, and therefore the case system is of the neutral type (A=S=O). Modifiers of a noun, e.g., demonstrative, classifier, and relative (or adnominal) clause, follow the noun. Thai abounds with serial verb constructions. A variety of ‘pragmatic particles’ (Iwasaki & Ingkaphirom 2005: 187-211) are used in Thai oral discourse. They express the speaker’s subjective stance towards the propositional information conveyed and/or towards the interlocutor sharing the given speech situation. By the term ‘stance’ I mean one’s feeling, intention, attitude, belief, assessment, perspective, and the like. We can hardly tell the exact number of pragmatic particles in Thai. The main reason for this is that the boundary between the authentic members of pragmatic particles and non-members is fuzzy. Besides a number of core members that have established their own respective pragmatic meanings, there are a number of peripheral members that have not done so. Another reason is that pragmatic particles are inherently variable. A range of pragmatic particles that a Thai speaker daily uses considerably differs not only among dialects or generations but also among individuals. (The final particles *sì?*, *thə?*, *ná?*, *lá?*, *rək* and *mán* could be regarded to be among the core members of Thai pragmatic particles, while the final particle *lá?* might be considered peripheral since one may identify it as a shortened form (a variant) of the perfective marker *lɛ̀w* ‘PFV’. The pragmatic senses of these particles will be explained in relevant sections below.)

The Thai writing system was created in the thirteenth century. There is an important difference between the written and the spoken languages that is relevant to the aim of the present chapter. That is, subordination is generally used in the written language, while parataxis is mainly used in the spoken language.

3. Subordination, coordination and parataxis

3.1 Types of clause linkage

As is the case with many other languages, classification of clause linkage types in Thai is not a straightforward matter. For the purpose of the present chapter, the clause linkage types in Thai can be classified into three groups: (i) subordination, (ii) coordination, and (iii) parataxis, as shown below. ‘X’ and ‘Y’ each represent clauses. For the reader’s convenience, examples of clause linkage markers (‘CLMs’) and sentenecs are represented with English words, not Thai words.

(i) Subordination

(i-1) Subordination proper, e.g.:

$s[X \text{ if}] + m[Y]$

‘If spring comes, flowers bloom.’

E.g. (2-2-1-1)-(a1) in 5.1.

$m[Y] + s[X \text{ because}]$

‘The ground is wet because it

rained.’ E.g. (2-1-1-1)-(b1) in 4.1.

(i-2) Quasi-subordination, e.g.:

$s[X \text{ Because}] + m[Y \text{ so}]$

‘Because it rained, so the ground is wet.’ E.g. (2-1-1-1)-(a4) in 4.1.

$s[X \text{ if}] + m[Y \text{ then}]$

‘If it rains, then don’t go out.’

E.g. (2-2-3-1)-(a2) in 5.3.

$s[X \text{ although}]$

$+ m[Y \text{ even.so}]$

‘Although it was raining, even so

he went out.’ E.g. (2-3-1-2)-(a2) in 6.1.

(i-3) Quasi-parataxis

$[X] + [Y \text{ so}]$

‘It rained, so the ground is wet.’

E.g. (2-1-1-1)-(a3) in 4.1.

(ii) Coordination

(ii-1) Coordination proper, e.g.:

$[X] \text{ but } [Y]$

‘It rained, but the ground is dry.’

E.g. (2-3-1-1)-(c2) in 6.1.

(ii-2) Quasi-coordination, e.g.:

$[X \text{ although even.so}]$

‘Although he wants to eat, but

even so he cannot eat.’ E.g. (2).

$+ \text{but} + [Y \text{ even.so}]$

‘It rained, and so the ground is wet.’ E.g., (2-1-1-1)-(c3) in 4.1.

$[X] + \text{and so} + [Y \text{ so}]$

$[X \text{ if}] + \text{and then} + [Y]$

‘If spring comes, and then flowers bloom.’ E.g. (2-2-1-1)-(a5) in 5.1.

(iii) Parataxis proper

(iii-1) $[X] + [Y]$

‘It rained. The ground is wet.’

E.g. (2-1-1-1)-(c1) in 4.1.

(iii-2) $[Y] + [X]$

‘Don’t go out. It is raining.’

E.g. (2-1-3-1)-(d1) in 4.3.

Specific details of these clause linkage types follow.

(iii) Parataxis proper

This does not employ any CLM. It just involves juxtaposition of two clauses.

(i) Subordination

In subordination proper, a CLM occurs at the beginning or the end of the subordinate clause or ‘supporting clause’ (Dixon 2009). The subordinate clause may precede or follow the main clause or ‘focal clause’ (Dixon 2009).

In quasi-subordination what may be considered a ‘subordinate’ clause always precedes what may be regarded as the ‘main’ clause. The formation of quasi-subordination typically involves a pair of CLMs. In the preceding subordinate clause, one CLM occurs at its beginning and/or one CLM

occurs at its end; I shall refer to such a CLM as ‘E-CLM’ (‘CLM occurring at the extremity position of a clause’). The other CLM appears before the predicate and after the subject noun phrase, if it is present, of the following main clause; I shall term such a CLM ‘AP-CLM’ (‘CLM adjunct to the predicate of a clause’). An E-CLM (such as *phrɔʔ* ‘because’ and *kô taam* ‘even so’) specifies the semantic or logical type of clause linkage. (*Kô taam* consists *kô* and the verb *taam* ‘follow’. *Kô* is a multifunctional discourse marker, and it can be translated as ‘then, so, even so’. It can also be used as an AP-CLM.) An AP-CLM (such as *cun* ‘then, so’ and *kô* ‘then, so, even so’) signals that the main clause containing it expresses a physical or logical consequence derived from a situation denoted by the preceding subordinate clause. An example of quasi-subordination:

- (1) s[*phrɔʔ* *cɛkan* *tòk*]
 because vase fall
 M[(*man*) *cun* *tèek*]
 (PRON) so become.broken
 LT: ‘Because the vase fell off, (it), so, became broken.’

(When glossing pronouns, I use the gloss ‘PRON (= pronoun)’, and not specific glosses, such as ‘1SG’, ‘2SG’, ‘3SG.M’, ‘3SG.F’ and so forth. The pronoun system in Thai, unlike that in Indo-European languages, has not been entrenched as a fixed paradigm, and it is sometimes difficult to provide such a specific gloss.)

The example (1) includes a pair of causal CLMs: *phrɔʔ* ‘because’ (an E-CLM) and *cun* ‘so’ (an AP-CLM). (Generally, a pronoun used as an argument or a complement/adjunct is often absent if the preceding clause contains a coreferential pronoun or NP used as an argument or a complement/adjunct; see (1).)

In quasi-parataxis, the first clause does not contain any CLM, but the second clause contains an AP-CLM, such as *cun* ‘then, so’ and *kô* ‘then, so, even so’. In everyday conversations, a causal expression often contains a colloquial AP-CLM *lɔɔy* ‘then, so’ (which derives from the motion verb *lɔɔy* ‘pass, go past’) or *kô lɔɔy* ‘then, so’ and it does not contain any E-CLM or I-CLM (see the definition of ‘I-CLM’ below), and as a result this yields instances of quasi-parataxis, e.g., (2-1-1-1)-(a3) in 4.1.

(ii) Coordination

In coordination proper, a CLM, such as *chanán* ‘and so’, *lakô* ‘and then’ or *tèe* ‘but’, occurs between two clauses. I shall refer to such a CLM as ‘I-CLM’ (‘in-between CLM’). (The formation of *chanán* ‘and so’ and *lakô* ‘and then’ will be discussed in 4.1, in the paragraph that follows (2-1-1-1)-(c1).) Quasi-coordination involves a CLM between two clauses, as is the case with coordination proper. Additionally the first clause contains one or two E-CLMs, as is the case with subordination proper. Furthermore, the second clause may contain one AP-CLM, as is the case with quasi-subordination. That is, quasi-coordination can be a combination of coordination proper, subordination proper and quasi-subordination. This will

help to appreciate the difficulty of classifying the Thai clause linkage types in a clear-cut manner. An example of quasi-coordination:

- (2) s[thǔŋ *kháw* *yàak* *kin* *man* *kô taam*] *tèe*
 although PRON want eat RPON even.so but
 _M[(*kháw*) *kô* *kin* *man* *mây* *dây*]
 (PRON) even.so eat PRON NEG POSS
 LT: ‘Although he wants to eat it, but (he), even so, cannot eat it.’

In (2), the first clause contains two E-CLMs: *thǔŋ* ‘although’ (which occurs at the beginning of the clause) and *kô taam* ‘even so’ (which occupies the end position of the clause). The second clause contains an AP-CLM: *kô* ‘even so’.

The multifunctional morpheme *kô* ‘then, so, even so’ basically functions at the discourse level. It often expresses the speaker’s stance such as response, hedging, or criticism/disagreement (Iwasaki & Ingkaphirom 2005: 175-177).

(i-2) Quasi-subordination and (ii-2) Quasi-coordination may look similar. However, (ii-2) differs from (i-2) in that it contains an I-CLM (‘in-between CLM’). (i-3) Quasi-parataxis differs from (iii) Parataxis proper in that it involves an AP-CLM.

AP-CLMs are used frequently. That is, (i-2) Quasi-subordination, (i-3) Quasi-parataxis, and (ii-2) Quasi-coordination are used frequently.

Subordination is generally used in the written language, while parataxis proper is mainly used in the spoken language.

As noted in Section 2, Thai abounds with serial verb constructions. Examples:

- (3) *cɛɛkan* *tòk* *tèek*
 vase fall become.broken
 ‘The vase fell off and became broken.’
 (4) *lûuk* *bɔɔn* *klîŋ* *pay*
 ball roll go
 ‘The ball went rolling.’

Serial verb constructions in Thai involve serialization of more than one verb phrase with no overt linker. A serial verb construction forms a single clause. This is evident from the fact that when it is modified by an aspectual marker or a modal marker, the whole construction is within the scope of the modification (Takahashi 2009). Examples (3) and (4) are mono-clausal, not bi-clausal. That is, they do not involve clause linkage. In view of this, serial verb constructions will not be included in the following discussion.

3.2 Inventory of clause linkage markers

Thai has a large number of CLMs in a wide range of semantic areas. These CLMs are of three types in terms of their structure: (i) a single morpheme,

(ii) a single compound word, and (iii) a form composed of a single morpheme or a single compound word and some other morpheme/word. The CLMs of (i) and (ii) are ‘simplex’, while those of (iii) are ‘complex’. For the three semantic areas under investigation, i.e. causal, conditional and concessive, simplex CLMs include the following.

Simplex CLMs

(a) Causal (‘because’, ‘so’)

AP-CLMs: *cunη, ləəy, thǔη, kô*.

E-CLMs in the initial position: *phrɔʔ, dūay*.

I-CLMs: *chanán, chaníi*.

(b) Conditional (‘if’, ‘then’)

AP-CLM: *kô*

E-CLMs in the initial position: *thāa, hàak*.

I-CLMs: *lakô, ηǎη*.

(c) Concessive (‘although’, ‘even so’)

AP-CLM: *kô*.

E-CLMs in the initial position: *thǔη, mée, méen, thǎη thǎη, hǎy, khanàat*.

I-CLMs: *têe, thǎwâa, yanηay yanηay*.

Complex CLMs include the following.

Complex CLMs

(a) Causal (‘because’, ‘so’)

AP-CLMs: *kô cunη, kô ləəy*.

E-CLMs in the initial position: *nūtaη càak, sùuup nūtaη maa càak, nūtaη càak wâa, nūtaη dūay, nūtaη dūay wâa, nūtaη tēe*.

I-CLMs: *daη nán, daη níi, phrɔʔ daη nán, phrɔʔ daη níi, phrɔʔ chanán, phrɔʔ chaníi, phrɔʔ hēt nán, phrɔʔ hēt níi*.

(b) Conditional (‘if’, ‘then’)

E-CLMs in the initial position: *thāa hàak, thāa hàak wâa, thāa phùua, thāa phùua wâa, thāa mée, thāa mée wâa, nay mūa, tòw mūa*.

I-CLMs: *thāa kranán, thāa chēn nán, thāa yàaη nán*.

(c) Concessive (‘although’, ‘even so’)

E-CLMs in the initial position: *thǔη mée, thǔη mée wâa, thǎη thǎη thīi, tòw hǎy*.

E-CLMs in the final position: *kô taam, kô ciη, kô dii, kô chāη*.

I-CLMs: *tēe wâa, tēe thǎwâa, hàak tēe, tēe kranán, thǔη kranán, mée kranán*.

Among the languages investigated in the present volume, in some languages the CLMs for causals outnumber those for conditionals and those for concessives, while in some other languages those for concessives outnumber those for conditionals and those for causals. There are also languages in which these three groups have approximately the same number of CLMs. Thai probably belongs to the last category.

As the representatives of these three semantic areas, the present chapter examines the following six CLMs. They all occur in the initial position of subordinate clauses.

- (a) Representatives of causal CLMs
phrɔʔ ‘because’, *nûaŋ càak* ‘because’.
- (b) Representatives of conditional CLMs
thâa ‘if’, *nay mûa* ‘if’.
- (c) Representatives of concessive CLMs
thûŋ ‘although’, *tháj tháj thîi* ‘although’.

In each pair of CLMs, one is unmarked, while the other is marked semantically and/or stylistically. Regarding the two causal CLMs, *phrɔʔ* ‘because’ has a generic meaning of causal. *Nûaŋ càak* ‘because’ (which consists of the verb *nûaŋ* ‘follow’ and the preposition *càak* ‘from’), too, has a generic meaning of causal. However, it is stylistically marked; it is rather bookish. It may be translated as ‘due to, following from’.

As for the two conditional CLMs, *thâa* ‘if’ has a generic meaning of conditional. *Nay mûa* ‘if’ (which consists of the preposition *nay* ‘in’ and the temporal conjunction/preposition *mûa* ‘when’) has a meaning of what may be termed ‘certainty’ conditional (as against ‘non-certainty’ conditional) or ‘conclusion-implied’ conditional. However, the meaning of *nay mûa* ‘if’ is not yet fully understood. Intuitively, it has a meaning such as ‘If X happens at all, Y is bound to happen’, ‘Now that X has happened, one should do Y’, and ‘Now that X has happened, one cannot help Y happening’. Due to its specialized meaning, *nay mûa* ‘if’ is generally incompatible with the questionnaire sentences and cannot be used by itself. (This will be shown in Section 5.)

Concerning the two concessive CLMs, *thûŋ* ‘although’ (which derives from the verb *thûŋ* ‘arrive’) has a generic meaning of concessive. *Tháj tháj thîi* ‘although’ consists of the reduplication form of the quantifier *tháj* ‘whole’ and the word *thîi*, which is a noun with the meaning of ‘place’ and which can also be used as a nominalizer. *Tháj tháj thîi* means, roughly speaking, ‘despite the existence of all these things/facts’. Depending on the context, it may indicate an emotional nuance, for example, ‘despite all these good (or bad) things/facts’.

In each of these three pairs of CLMs, the marked ones are often incompatible with some other word(s) in the same sentence, as alluded to above regarding *nay mûa* ‘if’. As will be expected, in terms of the five levels, the unmarked CLMs have wide distributions, while the marked CLMs have limited distributions. That is, this choice is convenient for the purpose of showing how different CLMs behave differently in terms of the five levels.

We shall now examine how causal, conditional and concessive meanings are expressed in Thai with respect to the five levels.

4. Causals

As mentioned in 3.2, we shall look at *phrǎʔ* ‘because’ and *nûaŋ càak* ‘because’ for subordination proper of causals. *Phrǎʔ* ‘because’ is unmarked and it is the less formal and the more common. It is perfectly acceptable at Levels I to IV, but not perfectly acceptable at Level V. *Nûaŋ càak* ‘because’ is marked and it is the more formal and the less common. It is attested at Levels I to IV, but not at Level V. Parataxis proper is attested at Levels I to III and V, but not at Level IV.

In the following illustration of the five levels, a sentence from ‘Questionnaire for Five Levels’ is given first, which is followed by its Thai translation(s). The clause linkage type of each of these examples will be clearly indicated.

4.1 Causals Level I

Subordinate clause: situation. Main clause: situation.

(2-1-1-1) Because the rain fell, the ground is wet.

(a) Subordination proper: s[X] + M[Y]

(2-1-1-1)-(a1) * s[*phrǎʔ fǎn tòk*]
 because rain fall
 M[*phúuun pìak*]
 ground be.wet

IM: ‘Because the rain fell, the ground is/becomes wet.’

So-called ‘stative verbs’ in Thai (such as *pìak* ‘be wet’ and *hǎw* ‘be hungry’) may have a stative reading (e.g. ‘be wet’) or an inchoative reading (e.g. ‘become wet’) depending on the discourse context — unless they co-occur with aspect marker(s) (such as *yùu* ‘CONT’, *léew* ‘PFV’ and *yaŋ* ‘IPFV, still, even so’).

(2-1-1-1)-(a2) * s[*nûaŋ càak fǎn tòk*]
 because rain fall
 M[*phúuun pìak*]
 ground be.wet

IM: ‘Because the rain fell, the ground is/becomes wet.’

(In terms of the classification of clause linkage types shown in Section 3, (2-1-1-1)-(a1), -(a2) are instances of (i-1) Subordination proper, and to be specific, instances of (i-1-1) s[X *because*] + M[Y].) The examples (2-1-1-1)-(a1), -(a2), which do not contain an AP-CLM in the main clause, are not acceptable. By contrast, the examples of (i-3) Quasi-parataxis and (i-2) Quasi-subordination below, i.e., (2-1-1-1)-(a3) to -(a5), which contain an AP-CLM, are acceptable.

In Thai, most of causal CLMs are used in rather formal expressions. (Nonetheless, *phrǎʔ* ‘because’ is less bookish than the other formal CLMs.)

As noted in 3.1, in informal conversations, a cause-and-effect or reason-and-result situation is often expressed with a sentence that contains the AP-CLM (*kɔ̌*) *lɔ̌ɔy* ‘then, so’. This CLM is colloquial. Also it does not exactly indicate the semantic type of clause linkage. It may have a temporal meaning or a causal meaning. The exact semantic type of clause linkage is not readily understood without discourse context. An example of (*kɔ̌*) *lɔ̌ɔy* ‘then, so’ is (2-1-1-1)-(a3). This is an instance of (i-3) Quasi-parataxis ([X] + [Y so]).

Quasi-parataxis

- (2-1-1-1)-(a3) s[*fɔ̌n tòk*]
 rain fall
 m[*phúuun* (*kɔ̌*) *lɔ̌ɔy* *piak*]
 ground so be.wet
 LT: ‘The rain fell, so the ground is/becomes wet.’

In contrast, the examples (2-1-1-1)-(a4), (a5) are literary expressions. They contain the AP-CLM *cun* ‘then, so’ in addition to the E-CLM *phrɔ̌p* ‘because’ or *núun cāk* ‘because’. They are instances of (i-2) Quasi-subordination (s[X because] + m[Y so]).

Quasi-subordination

- (2-1-1-1)-(a4) s[*phrɔ̌p fɔ̌n tòk*]
 because rain fall
 m[*phúuun cun piak*]
 ground so be.wet
 LT: ‘Because the rain fell, so the ground is/becomes wet.’
- (2-1-1-1)-(a5) s[*núun cāk fɔ̌n tòk*]
 because rain fall
 m[*phúuun cun piak*]
 ground so be.wet
 LT: ‘Because the rain fell, so the ground is/becomes wet.’

The E-CLM (*phrɔ̌p* ‘because’, *núun cāk* ‘because’) can be removed from (2-1-1-1)-(a4), -(a5) (Quasi-subordination). The resultant sentence is of Quasi-parataxis: (2-1-1-2)-(a6).

Quasi-parataxis

- (2-1-1-2)-(a6) [*dèk khon nán hǐw khâaw*]
 child CLF that be.hungry rice
 [*kháw cun rɔ̌ɔn hây*]
 PRON so cry
 LT: ‘The child is/becomes hungry (for) rice, so he cries.’

Furthermore, the example (2-1-1-1)-(a4) (Quasi-subordination) may include the I-CLM *chanán* ‘and so’. The resultant sentence is an instance of (ii-2) Quasi-coordination ([X because] + and so + [Y so]): (2-1-1-1)-(a7).

Quasi-coordination

- (2-1-1-1)-(a7) s[phró? fǒn tòk] chanán
 because rain fall and.so
 M[phúum cun piak]
 ground so be.wet
 LT: 'Because the rain fell, and so the ground is/becomes wet.'

Notice that (2-1-1-1)-(a8) (Quasi-coordination) is not acceptable because it does not contain the AP-CLM cun 'so' in the main clause ([X *because*] + *and so* + [Y]).

Quasi-coordination

- (2-1-1-1)-(a8) *s[phró? fǒn tòk] chanán
 Because rain fall and.so
 M[phúum piak]
 ground be.wet
 LT: 'Because the rain fell, and so the ground is/becomes wet.'

(b) Subordination proper: M[Y] + s[X]

- (2-1-1-1)-(b1) M[phúum piak]
 ground be.wet
 s[phró? fǒn tòk]
 because rain fall
 LT: 'The ground is/becomes wet, because the rain fell.'

- (2-1-1-1)-(b2) M[phúum piak]
 ground be.wet
 s[núan càak fǒn tòk]
 because rain fall
 LT: 'The ground is/becomes wet, because the rain fell.'

(c) Parataxis proper: [X] + [Y]

- (2-1-1-1)-(c1) [fǒn tòk]
 rain fall
 [phúum piak]
 ground be.wet
 LT: 'The rain fell. The ground is/becomes wet.'

The example (2-1-1-1)-(c2) is an instances of (ii-1) Coordination proper ([X] *and so* [Y]). It includes the I-CLM chanán 'and so'. (*Chanán* 'and so' is a reduced form of the combination of *chén* 'like, such as' and *nán* 'that'. It occurs in complex causal CLMs such as *phró? chanán* 'because and.so' (listed in 3.2) which is a reduced form of *phró? chén nán* 'because such.as that', i.e. 'for that reason'. It does not contain the AP-CLM cun 'so' in the main clause, and so it is not acceptable.

Coordination proper

- (2-1-1-1)-(c2) * [*fǒn tòk*] *chanán*
rain fall and.so
[*phúuun piák*]
ground be.wet
LT: 'The rain fell, and so the ground is/becomes wet.'

The example (2-1-1-1)-(c3) is an instance of (ii-2) Quasi-coordination ([X] *and so* [Y so]). Like (2-1-1-1)-(a6) above, it contains the AP-CLM *cun* 'so' in the main clause, and so it is acceptable.

Quasi-coordination

- (2-1-1-1)-(c3) [*fǒn tòk*] *chanán*
rain fall and.so
[*phúuun cun piák*]
ground so be.wet
LT: 'The rain fell, and so the ground is/becomes wet.'

(d) Parataxis proper: [Y] + [X]

- (2-1-1-1)-(d1) * [*phúuun piák*]
ground be.wet
[*fǒn tòk*]
rain fall
LT: 'The ground is/becomes wet. The rain fell.'
IM: 'The ground is/becomes wet, because the rain fell.'

Note that, for causals at Level I, (2-1-1-1)-(c1), in which the clause [X] precedes the clause [Y], is acceptable, but that (2-1-1-1)-(d1), which has the reverse order, is not acceptable.

(2-1-1-2) Because the child is hungry, he/she is crying.

(a) Subordination proper: s[X] + m[Y]

- (2-1-1-2)-(a1) * s[*phrǒ? dèk khon nán hǐw khâaw*]
because child CLF that be.hungry rice
m[*kháw rǒŋ hây*]
PRON cry
LT: 'Because the child is/becomes hungry (for) rice, he cries.'

Quasi-subordination

- (2-1-1-2)-(a2) s[*phrǒ? dèk khon nán hǐw khâaw*]
because child CLF that be.hungry rice
m[(*kháw*) *cun rǒŋ hây*]
(PRON) so cry
LT: 'Because the child is/becomes hungry (for) rice, so (he) cries.'

The example (2-1-1-2)-(a1) is not acceptable. In contrast, (2-1-1-2)-(a2) is acceptable; it contains the AP-CLM *cun* ‘so’. (2-1-1-2)-(a1) is an instance of (i-1) Subordination proper, to be precise, (i-1-1) $s[X \text{ because}] + m[Y]$, while (2-1-1-2)-(a2) is an instance of (i-2) Quasi-subordination ($s[X \text{ because}] + m[Y \text{ so}]$). The same applies to (2-1-1-2)-(a3) and (2-1-1-2)-(a4).

Subordination proper

- (2-1-1-2)-(a3) * $s[\underline{nûaŋ \text{ c}àak} \text{ d}èk \text{ khon} \text{ nán} \text{ hǐw} \text{ khâaw}]$
because child CLF that be.hungry rice
 $m[khâw \text{ r}óŋ \text{ hây}]$
PRON cry
LT: ‘Because the child is/becomes hungry (for) rice, he cries.’

Quasi-subordination

- (2-1-1-2)-(a4) $s[\underline{nûaŋ \text{ c}àak} \text{ d}èk \text{ khon} \text{ nán} \text{ hǐw} \text{ khâaw}]$
because child CLF that be.hungry rice
 $m[(khâw) \text{ cun} \text{ r}óŋ \text{ hây}]$
(PRON) so cry
LT: ‘Because the child is/becomes hungry (for) rice, so (he) cries.’

(b) Subordination proper: $m[Y] + s[X]$

- (2-1-1-2)-(b1) $m[dèk \text{ khon} \text{ nán} \text{ r}óŋ \text{ hây}]$
child CLF that cry
 $s[\underline{phr}ó? \text{ khâw} \text{ hǐw} \text{ khâaw}]$
because PRON be.hungry rice
LT: ‘The child cries because he is/becomes hungry (for) rice.’
- (2-1-1-2)-(b2) $m[dèk \text{ khon} \text{ nán} \text{ r}óŋ \text{ hây}]$
child CLF that cry
 $s[\underline{nûaŋ \text{ c}àak} \text{ khâw} \text{ hǐw} \text{ khâaw}]$
because PRON be.hungry rice
LT: ‘The child cries because he is/becomes hungry (for) rice.’

(c) Parataxis proper: $[X] + [Y]$

- (2-1-1-2)-(c1) * $[dèk \text{ khon} \text{ nán} \text{ hǐw} \text{ khâaw}]$
child CLF that be.hungry rice
 $[khâw \text{ r}óŋ \text{ hây}]$
PRON cry
LT: ‘The child is/becomes hungry (for) rice. He cries.’

The example (2-1-1-2)-(c1) is not acceptable. The example (2-1-1-2)-(c2) is also not acceptable. It is an instance of (ii-1) Coordination proper ($[X] \text{ and so } [Y]$).

Coordination proper

- (2-1-1-2)-(c2) * [*dèk khon nán hǐw khâaw*] *chanán*
 child CLF that be.hungry rice and.so
 [*kháw rǒng hây*]
 PRON cry
 LT: 'The child is/becomes hungry (for) rice, and so he cries.'
 IM: 'Because the child is hungry, he/she is crying.'

The examples (2-1-1-2)-(c3), -(c4) are instances of (ii-2) Quasi-coordination ($s[X \text{ because}]$ and $so_M[Y \text{ so}]$). They are acceptable. But if they do not contain the AP-CLM *cuuŋ* 'so' in the main clause ($s[X \text{ because}]$ and $so_M[Y]$), they are not acceptable.

Quasi-coordination

- (2-1-1-2)-(c3) [*phrǒ? dèk khon nán hǐw khâaw*]
 because child CLF that be.hungry rice
chanán [*kháw cuuŋ rǒng hây*]
 and.so PRON so cry
 LT: 'Because the child is/becomes hungry (for) rice, and so he cries.'
 (2-1-1-2)-(c4) [*nûaŋ càak dèk khon nán hǐw khâaw*]
 because child CLF that be.hungry rice
chanán [*kháw cuuŋ rǒng hây*]
 and.so PRON so cry
 LT: 'Because the child is/becomes hungry (for) rice, and so he cries.'

(d) Parataxis proper: [Y] + [X]

- (2-1-1-2)-(d1) * [*dèk khon nán rǒng hây*]
 child CLF that cry
 [*kháw hǐw khâaw*]
 PRON be.hungry rice
 LT: 'The child cries. He is/becomes hungry (for) rice.'
 IM: 'The child cries because he is/becomes hungry (for) rice.'

Consultant TM considers (2-1-1-2)-(d1) acceptable.

4.2 Causals Level II

Subordinate clause: situation. Main clause: situation + judgement.

- (2-1-2-1) Because the rain fell, the ground must be wet.

(a) Subordination proper: $s[X] +_M[Y]$

- (2-1-2-1)-(a1) * s[phrɔʔ fǒn tòk]
 because rain fall
 M[phúuun tɔŋ pìak]
 ground must be.wet
 IM: ‘Because the rain fell, the ground must be wet.’

Quasi-subordination

- (2-1-2-1)-(a2) s[phrɔʔ fǒn tòk]
 because rain fall
 M[phúuun cun tɔŋ pìak]
 ground so must be.wet
 LT: ‘Because the rain fell, so the ground must be wet.’

Consultant TM considers (2-1-2-1)-(a2) not acceptable. She comments that it becomes acceptable if the epistemic modal marker *tɔŋ* ‘must’ is removed from the main clause.

Subordination proper

- (2-1-2-1)-(a3) * s[núuaŋ càak fǒn tòk]
 because rain fall
 M[phúuun tɔŋ pìak]
 ground must be.wet
 IM: ‘Because the rain fell, the ground must be wet.’

Quasi-subordination

- (2-1-2-1)-(a4) s[núuaŋ càak fǒn tòk]
 because rain fall
 M[phúuun cun tɔŋ pìak]
 ground so must be.wet
 LT: ‘Because the rain fell, so the ground must be wet.’

Consultant TM considers (2-1-2-1)-(a4) marginally acceptable. She comments that it becomes acceptable if the epistemic modal marker *tɔŋ* ‘must’ is removed from the main clause.

Quasi-parataxis

- (2-1-2-1)-(a5) * [fǒn tòk]
 rain fall
 [phúuun cun tɔŋ pìak]
 ground so must be.wet
 IM: ‘Because the rain fell, the ground must be wet.’

Consultant TM considers (2-1-2-1)-(a5) marginally acceptable. She comments that it becomes perfectly acceptable if the subordinate clause contains the causal CLM *phrɔʔ* ‘because’ (‘Because the rain fell, so the ground must be wet’). See (2-1-2-1)-(a2) (Quasi-subordination).

- (b) Subordination proper: $m[Y] + s[X]$
- (2-1-2-1)-(b1) $m[phúuun \quad tōŋ \quad pìak]$
 ground must be.wet
 $s[phrǎʔ \quad fǒn \quad tòk]$
 because rain fall
 LT: 'The ground must be wet, because the rain fell.'
- (2-1-2-1)-(b2) $m[phúuun \quad tōŋ \quad pìak]$
 ground must be.wet
 $s[nûaŋ \quad càak \quad fǒn \quad tòk]$
 because rain fall
 LT: 'The ground must be wet, because the rain fell.'
- (c) Parataxis proper: $[X] + [Y]$
- (2-1-2-1)-(c1) $[fǒn \quad tòk]$
 rain fall
 $[phúuun \quad tōŋ \quad pìak]$
 ground must be.wet
 LT: 'The rain fell. The ground must be wet.'

Consultant TM considers (2-1-2-1)-(c1) marginally acceptable. She comments that it looks like a conditional sentence from which the conditional E-CLM *thâa* 'if' is omitted ('If the rain fell, the ground must be wet').

The example (2-1-2-1)-(c2) is acceptable. It includes the I-CLM *chanán* 'and so'. It is an instance of (ii-1) Coordination proper.

- Coordination proper
- (2-1-2-1)-(c2) $[fǒn \quad tòk] \quad \underline{chanán}$
 rain fall and.so
 $[phúuun \quad tōŋ \quad pìak]$
 ground must be.wet
 LT: 'The the rain fell, and so the ground must be wet.'

- Quasi-coordination
- (2-1-2-1)-(c3) $s[phrǎʔ \quad fǒn \quad tòk] \quad \underline{chanán}$
 because rain fall and.so
 $m[phúuun \quad \underline{cuŋ} \quad tōŋ \quad pìak]$
 ground so must be.wet
 LT: 'Because the rain fell, and so the ground must be wet.'
- (2-1-2-1)-(c4) $s[nûaŋ \quad càak \quad fǒn \quad tòk] \quad \underline{chanán}$
 because rain fall and.so
 $m[phúuun \quad \underline{cuŋ} \quad tōŋ \quad pìak]$
 ground so must be.wet
 LT: 'Because the rain fell, and so the ground must be wet.'

Consultant TM considers (2-1-2-1)-(c3), -(c4) marginally acceptable. She comments that those sentences become more natural if the epistemic

modal marker *tôŋ* ‘must’ is removed from the main clause. See (2-1-1-1)-(a7) (4.1).

- (d) Parataxis proper: [Y] + [X]
 (2-1-2-1)-(d1) * [*phúuun tôŋ piak*]
 ground must be.wet
 [*fôn tòk*]
 rain fall
 LT: The ground must be wet. The rain fell.’
 IM: ‘The ground must be wet, because the rain fell.’

Tôŋ ‘must’ has both an epistemic meaning, as shown in the examples above, and a deontic meaning, as shown in the examples below.

- (2-1-2-2) Because the rain is falling, he has to stay in the house.
 (a) Subordination proper: s[X] + m[Y]
 (2-1-2-2)-(a1) * s[*phrɔʔ fôn tòk yùu*]
 because rain fall CONT
 m[*kháw tôŋ yùu bâan*]
 PRON must stay house
 LT: ‘Because the rain is falling, he has to stay in the house.’

Consultant TM considers (2-1-2-2)-(a1) marginally acceptable.

- Quasi-subordination
 (2-1-2-2)-(a2) s[*phrɔʔ fôn tòk yùu*]
 because rain fall CONT
 m[*kháw cun tôŋ yùu bâan*]
 PRON so must stay house
 LT: ‘Because the rain is falling, so he has to stay in the house.’

- Subordination proper
 (2-1-2-2)-(a3) * s[*núuan càak fôn tòk yùu*]
 because rain fall CONT
 m[*kháw tôŋ yùu bâan*]
 PRON must stay house
 LT: ‘Because the rain is falling, he has to stay in the house.’

- Quasi-subordination
 (2-1-2-2)-(a4) s[*núuan càak fôn tòk yùu*]
 because rain fall CONT
 m[*kháw cun tôŋ yùu bâan*]
 PRON so must stay house
 LT: ‘Because the rain is falling, so he has to stay in the house.’

house.'

- (b) Subordination proper: $M[Y] + S[X]$
 (2-1-2-2)-(b1) $M[kh\acute{a}w \quad t\acute{o}n \quad y\grave{u}u \quad b\acute{a}an]$
 PRON must stay house
 $s[phr\acute{o}p \quad f\acute{o}n \quad t\acute{o}k \quad y\grave{u}u]$
 because rain fall CONT
 LT: 'He has to stay in the house because the rain is falling.'
 (2-1-2-2)-(b2) $M[kh\acute{a}w \quad t\acute{o}n \quad y\grave{u}u \quad b\acute{a}an]$
 PRON must stay house
 $s[n\acute{u}a\eta \quad c\acute{a}ak \quad f\acute{o}n \quad t\acute{o}k \quad y\grave{u}u]$
 because rain fall CONT
 LT: 'He has to stay in the house because the rain is falling.'
 (c) Parataxis proper: $[X] + [Y]$
 (2-1-2-2)-(c1) $[f\acute{o}n \quad t\acute{o}k \quad y\grave{u}u]$
 rain fall CONT
 $[kh\acute{a}w \quad t\acute{o}n \quad y\grave{u}u \quad b\acute{a}an]$
 PRON must stay house
 LT: 'The rain is falling. He has to stay in the house.'
 IM: 'Because the rain is falling, he has to stay in the house.'

Consultant TM considers (2-1-2-2)-(c1) not acceptable.

The example (2-1-2-2)-(c2) is acceptable. It includes the I-CLM *chanán* 'and so'. It is an instance of (ii-1) Coordination proper.

Coordination proper

- (2-1-2-2)-(c2) $[f\acute{o}n \quad t\acute{o}k \quad y\grave{u}u] \quad \underline{chanán}$
 rain fall CONT and.so
 $[kh\acute{a}w \quad t\acute{o}n \quad y\grave{u}u \quad b\acute{a}an]$
 PRON must stay house
 LT: 'The rain is falling, and so he has to stay in the house.'

Quasi-coordination

- (2-1-2-2)-(c3) $s[phr\acute{o}p \quad f\acute{o}n \quad t\acute{o}k \quad y\grave{u}u] \quad \underline{chanán}$
 because rain fall CONT and.so
 $M[kh\acute{a}w \quad \underline{cu\eta} \quad t\acute{o}n \quad y\grave{u}u \quad b\acute{a}an]$
 PRON so must stay house
 LT: 'Because the rain is falling, and so he has to stay in the house.'
 (2-1-2-2)-(c4) $s[n\acute{u}a\eta \quad c\acute{a}ak \quad f\acute{o}n \quad t\acute{o}k \quad y\grave{u}u] \quad \underline{chanán}$
 because rain fall CONT and.so

_M[*kháw* *cun* *tôŋ* *yùu* *bâan*]
 PRON so must stay house
 LT: 'Because the rain is falling, and so he has to stay in the house.'

Quasi-parataxis

(2-1-2-2)-(c5) [*fôn* *tòk* *yùu*]
 rain fall CONT
 [*kháw* *cun* *tôŋ* *yùu* *bâan*]
 PRON so must stay house
 LT: 'The rain is falling, so he has to stay in the house.'

(d) Parataxis proper: [Y] + [X]

(2-1-2-2)-(d1) * [*kháw* *tôŋ* *yùu* *bâan*]
 PRON must stay house
 [*fôn* *tòk* *yùu*]
 rain fall CONT
 LT: 'He has to stay in the house. The rain is falling.'

4.3 Causals Level III

Subordinate clause: situation. Main clause: situation + interpersonal effect.

(2-1-3-1) Don't go out because the rain is falling.

(a) Subordination proper: _s[X] + _M[Y]

(2-1-3-1)-(a1) * _s[*phrɔʔ* *fôn* *tòk* *yùu*]
 because rain fall CONT
_M[(*khun*) *yàa* *ʔə̀ɔk* *pay* *khâŋ* *nɔ̀ɔk* *sìʔ*]
 (PRON) PROH exit go outside PRT
 LT: 'Because the rain is falling, (you) don't go out (, I order you so).'
 IM: 'Don't go out because the rain is falling.'

(*Sìʔ* is a final particle. It expresses the speaker's conviction, firm belief, and the like. It may be translated as 'I order you so' when used in imperative expressions. In the context of other illocutionary force types, however, it is translated differently, e.g., *mây rúu sìʔ* '(NEG + know + *sìʔ*) (I) do not know, I tell you so' or *nân nâʔ sìʔ* '(that + PRT + *sìʔ*) 'That is it, I am convinced so'.)

Thai imperative sentences may contain the subject noun phrase (e.g., *khun* 'you' in (2-1-3-1)-(a1)). However, under normal circumstances the addressee is present in the directive speech act and therefore the noun/pronoun referring to him/her is not necessarily used. In Thai, illocutionary force types (such as imperative and interrogative) can be differentiated by means of formal formulaic phrases (e.g. *coŋ* 'IMP' + *VP* for imperative or *karunaa* 'IMP' + *VP* for entreaty) and/or final particles and/or suprasegmental phonemes such as pitch and intonation.

Quasi-subordination

- (2-1-3-1)-(a2) * s[phrɔʔ fǒn tòk yùu]
 because rain fall CONT
 M[(*khun*) cun yàa ʔòk pay khâŋ nôk sìʔ]
 (PRON) so PROH exit go outside PRT
 LT: 'Because the rain is falling, so (you) don't go out (, I order you so).'

IM: 'Don't go out because the rain is falling.'

Subordination proper

- (2-1-3-1)-(a3) * s[nûaŋ càak fǒn tòk yùu]
 because rain fall CONT
 M[(*khun*) yàa ʔòk pay khâŋ nôk sìʔ]
 (PRON) PROH exit go outside PRT
 LT: 'Because the rain is falling, (you) don't go out (, I order you so).'

IM: 'Don't go out because the rain is falling.'

Quasi-subordination

- (2-1-3-1)-(a4) * s[nûaŋ càak fǒn tòk yùu]
 because rain fall CONT
 M[(*khun*) cun yàa ʔòk pay khâŋ nôk sìʔ]
 (PRON) so PROH exit go outside PRT
 LT: 'Because the rain is falling, so (you) don't go out (, I order you so).'

IM: 'Don't go out because the rain is falling.'

(b) Subordination proper: M[Y] + s[X]

- (2-1-3-1)-(b1) M[(*khun*) yàa ʔòk pay khâŋ nôk sìʔ]
 (PRON) PROH exit go outside PRT
 s[phrɔʔ fǒn tòk yùu]
 because rain fall CONT
 LT: '(You) don't go out (, I order you so), because the rain is falling.'

- (2-1-3-1)-(b2) * M[(*khun*) yàa ʔòk pay khâŋ nôk sìʔ]
 (PRON) PROH exit go outside PRT
 s[nûaŋ càak fǒn tòk yùu]
 because rain fall CONT
 LT: '(You) don't go out (, I order you so), because the rain is falling.'

(c) Parataxis proper: [X] + [Y]

- (2-1-3-1)-(c1) [fǒn tòk yùu]
 rain fall CONT
 [(*khun*) yàa ʔòk pay khâŋ nôk sìʔ]
 (PRON) PROH exit go outside PRT
 LT: 'The rain is falling. (You) don't go out (, I order you

so).’

Consultant TM considers (2-1-3-1)-(c1) not acceptable.

The example (2-1-3-1)-(c2) is acceptable. It includes the I-CLM *chanán* ‘and so’. It is an instance of (ii-1) Coordination proper.

Coordination proper

- (2-1-3-1)-(c2) [fǒn tòk yùu] *chanán*
rain fall CONT and.so
[(khun) yàa ?òòk pay khâṇ nòòk sìʔ]
(PRON) PROH exit go outside PRT
LT: ‘The rain is falling, and so (you) don’t go out (, I order you so).’

Quasi-coordination

- (2-1-3-1)-(c3) *s[phrɔʔ fǒn tòk yùu] *chanán*
because rain fall CONT and.so
M[(khun) cuṇ yàa ?òòk pay khâṇ nòòk sìʔ]
(PRON) so PROH exit go outside PRT
LT: ‘Because the rain is falling, and so (you) don’t go out (, I order you so).’
IM: ‘Don’t go out because the rain is falling.’
- (2-1-3-1)-(c4) *s[nūaṇ càak fǒn tòk yùu] *chanán*
because rain fall CONT and.so
M[(khun) cuṇ yàa ?òòk pay khâṇ nòòk sìʔ]
(PRON) so PROH exit go outside PRT
LT: ‘Because the rain is falling, and so (you) don’t go out (, I order you so).’
IM: ‘Don’t go out because the rain is falling.’

Quasi-parataxis

- (2-1-3-1)-(c5) * [fǒn tòk yùu]
rain fall CONT
[(khun) cuṇ yàa ?òòk pay khâṇ nòòk sìʔ]
(PRON) so PROH exit go outside PRT
LT: ‘The rain is falling, so (you) don’t go out (, I order you so).’

(d) Parataxis proper: [Y] + [X]

- (2-1-3-1)-(d1) [(khun) yàa ?òòk pay khâṇ nòòk sìʔ]
(PRON) PROH exit go outside PRT
[fǒn tòk yùu]
rain fall CONT
LT: ‘(You) don’t go out (, I order you so). The rain is falling.’

- (2-1-3-2) Give the child food because he/she is hungry.

- (a) Subordination proper: s[X] + m[Y]
 (2-1-3-2)-(a1) * s[phrɔʔ dɛk khon nán hǐw khâaw]
 because child CLF that be.hungry rice
 m[(khun) ʔaw khanǒm hây kháw sìʔ]
 (PRON) take sweets give PRON PRT
 LT: ‘Because that child is/becomes hungry (for) rice, (you)
 give him sweets (, I order you so).’

Consultant TM considers (2-1-3-2)-(a1) marginally acceptable.

- Quasi-subordination
 (2-1-3-2)-(a2) * s[phrɔʔ dɛk khon nán hǐw khâaw]
 because child CLF that be.hungry rice
 m[(khun) cun ʔaw khanǒm hây kháw sìʔ]
 (PRON) so take sweets give PRON PRT
 LT: ‘Because that child is/becomes hungry (for) rice, so
 (you) give him sweets (, I order you so).’

- Subordination proper
 (2-1-3-2)-(a3) * s[nûtaŋ càak dɛk khon nán hǐw khâaw]
 because child CLF that be.hungry rice
 m[(khun) ʔaw khanǒm hây kháw sìʔ]
 (PRON) take sweets give PRON PRT
 LT: ‘Because that child is/becomes hungry (for) rice, (you)
 give him sweets (, I order you so).’

Consultant TM considers (2-1-3-2)-(a3) acceptable.

- Quasi-subordination
 (2-1-3-2)-(a4) * s[nûtaŋ càak dɛk khon nán hǐw khâaw]
 because child CLF that be.hungry rice
 m[(khun) cun ʔaw khanǒm hây kháw sìʔ]
 (PRON) so take sweets give PRON PRT
 LT: ‘Because that child is/becomes hungry (for) rice, so
 (you) give him sweets (, I order you so).’

- (b) Subordination proper: m[Y] + s[X]
 (2-1-3-2)-(b1) m[(khun) ʔaw khanǒm hây dɛk khon nán
 (PRON) take sweets give child CLF that
 sìʔ] s[phrɔʔ kháw hǐw khâaw]
 PRT because PRON be.hungry rice
 LT: ‘(You) give that child sweets (, I order you so),
 because he/becomes is hungry (for) rice.’
 (2-1-3-2)-(b2) m[(khun) ʔaw khanǒm hây dɛk khon nán
 (PRON) take sweets give child CLF that
 sìʔ] s[nûtaŋ càak kháw hǐw khâaw]
 PRT because PRON be.hungry rice

LT: ‘(You) give that child sweets (, I order you so), because he is/becomes hungry (for) rice.’

- (c) Parataxis proper: [X] + [Y]
 (2-1-3-2)-(c1) [dèk khon nán hǐw khâaw]
 child CLF that be.hungry rice
 [(khun) ?aw khanǒm hây kháw sì?]
 (PRON) take sweets give PRON PRT
 LT: ‘That child is/becomes hungry (for) rice. (You) give him sweets (, I order you so).’

The example (2-1-3-2)-(c2) is also acceptable. It includes the I-CLM *chanán* ‘and so’. It is an instance of (ii-1) Coordination proper.

Coordination proper

- (2-1-3-2)-(c2) [dèk khon nán hǐw khâaw] chanán
 child CLF that be.hungry rice and.so
 [(khun) ?aw khanǒm hây kháw sì?]
 (PRON) take sweets give PRON PRT
 LT: ‘That child is/becomes hungry (for) rice, and so (you) give him sweets (, I order you so).’

Quasi-coordination

- (2-1-3-2)-(c3) * s[phrɔʔ dèk khon nán hǐw khâaw]
 because child CLF that be.hungry rice
chanán
 and.so
 M[(khun) cun ?aw khanǒm hây kháw sì?]
 (PRON) so take sweets give PRON PRT
 LT: ‘Because that child is/becomes hungry (for) rice, and so (you) give him sweets (, I order you so).’
 (2-1-3-2)-(c4) * s[nûaŋ cāk dèk khon nán hǐw khâaw]
 because child CLF that be.hungry rice
chanán
 and.so
 M[(khun) cun ?aw khanǒm hây kháw sì?]
 (PRON) so take sweets give PRON PRT
 LT: ‘Because that child is/becomes hungry (for) rice, and so (you) give him sweets (, I order you so).’

Quasi-parataxis

- (2-1-3-2)-(c5) * [dèk khon nán hǐw khâaw]
 child CLF that be.hungry rice
 [(khun) cun ?aw khanǒm hây kháw sì?]
 (PRON) so take sweets give PRON PRT
 LT: ‘That child is/becomes hungry (for) rice, so (you) give him sweets (, I order you so).’

Consultant TM comments that sentences including the AP-CLM *cun* ‘so’ seems incompatible with the final particle *sì?* ‘PRT’.

- (d) Parataxis proper: [Y] + [X]
 (2-1-3-2)-(d1) [(*khun*) *ʔaw khanǒm hây dèk khon nán*
 (PRON) take sweets give child CLF that
sì?] [*kháw hǐw khâaw*]
 PRT PRON be.hungry rice
 LT: ‘(You) give that child sweets (, I order you so). He is/becomes hungry (for) rice.’

4.4 Causals Level IV

Subordinate clause: premise. Main clause: judgement.

- (2-1-4-1) Because the ground is wet, rain fell.
 IM: BECAUSE the ground is wet, I GUESS/ SUPPOSE/INFER/ CONCLUDE THAT rain fell.’

- (a) Subordination proper: s[X] + m[Y]
 (2-1-4-1)-(a1) * s[*phrǎ?* *phúuun pìak yùu*]
 because ground be.wet CONT
 m[*fǒn tòk léew*]
 rain fall PFV
 LT: ‘Because the ground is wet, the rain has fallen.’

Quasi-subordination

- (2-1-4-1)-(a2) * s[*phrǎ?* *phúuun pìak yùu*]
 because ground be.wet CONT
 m[*fǒn cun tòk léew*]
 rain so fall PFV
 LT: ‘Because the ground is wet, so the rain has fallen.’

Subordination proper

- (2-1-4-1)-(a3) ? s[*phrǎ?* *phúuun pìak yùu*]
 because ground be.wet CONT
 m[*fǒn khoṇ tòk léew lá? máṇ*]
 rain probably fall PFV PRT PRT
 LT: ‘Because the ground is wet, probably the rain has fallen.’

(The final particle *lá?* ‘PRT’ indicates the speaker’s emphasis on the fact that a change of situation has occurred.)

The example (2-1-4-1)-(a1) is not acceptable. However, the sentence becomes marginally acceptable if it contains the epistemic expression *khoṇ ... máṇ* ‘probably’, as in (2-1-4-1)-(a3). The expression *khoṇ ... máṇ* ‘probably’ is somewhat colloquial. *Khoṇ* is an adverb, while *máṇ* is a final particle. Both have epistemic meanings. *Khoṇ* expresses ‘probability’ or

inference based on deduction. It may be translated as ‘probably’ or ‘might’. In contrast, *mǎŋ* implies doubt: ‘I doubt, I guess’. The two independent morphemes for epistemic modality *khon* ‘probably, might’ and *mǎŋ* ‘I doubt, I guess’ are separable. However, the combination of the two is employed in the translation sentences. *Khon* indicates that the propositional content of the sentence derives from the speaker’s deductive inference; *mǎŋ* expresses the speaker’s guess embracing doubt. In addition, *mǎŋ* adds colloquiality to the sentential expression. In order to make some of the sentences listed in this subsection sound natural, both of *khon* ‘probably, might’ and *mǎŋ* ‘I doubt, I guess’ are required.

Quasi-subordination

- (2-1-4-1)-(a4) * s[*phrɔʔ* *phúuun* *pìak* *yùu*]
because ground be.wet CONT
M[*fǒn* *cun* *khon* *tòk* *léew* *láʔ* *mǎŋ*]
rain so probably fall PFV PRT PRT
LT: ‘Because the ground is wet, so probably the rain has fallen.’

Consultant TM comments on the sentence (2-1-4-1)-(a4) that the co-occurrence of the two lexical items, the AP-CLM *cun* ‘so’ and the epistemic modal marker *khon* ‘probably’, sounds odd. It is better without *cun* ‘so’.

Subordination proper

- (2-1-4-1)-(a5) * s[*núuŋ* *càak* *phúuun* *pìak* *yùu*]
because ground be.wet CONT
M[*fǒn* *tòk* *léew*]
rain fall PFV
LT: ‘Because the ground is wet, the rain has fallen.’

Quasi-subordination

- (2-1-4-1)-(a6) * s[*núuŋ* *càak* *phúuun* *pìak* *yùu*]
because ground be.wet CONT
M[*fǒn* *cun* *tòk* *léew*]
rain so fall PFV
LT: ‘Because the ground is wet, so the rain has fallen.’

Subordination proper

- (2-1-4-1)-(a7) ? s[*núuŋ* *càak* *phúuun* *pìak* *yùu*]
because ground be.wet CONT
M[*fǒn* *khon* *tòk* *léew* *láʔ* *mǎŋ*]
rain probably fall PFV PRT PRT
LT: ‘Because the ground is wet, probably the rain has fallen.’

Consultant TM considers (2-1-4-1)-(a7) acceptable.

Quasi-subordination

- (2-1-4-1)-(a8) * s[nûaη càak *phúuun* *pìak* *yùu*]
 because ground be.wet CONT
 M[*fǒn* *cūη* *khon* *tòk* *léew* *lá?* *máη*]
 rain so probably fall PFV PRT PRT
 ‘Because the ground is wet, so probably the rain has fallen.’

Consultant TM comments that the combination of the AP-CLM *cūη* ‘so’ and the epistemic modal marker *khon* ‘probably’ sounds odd and that it is better if it does not contain *cūη* ‘so’.

- (b) Subordination proper: M[Y] + s[X]
 (2-1-4-1)-(b1) M[*fǒn* *tòk* *léew*]
 rain fall PFV
 s[*phrǎ?* *phúuun* *pìak* *yùu*]
 because ground be.wet CONT
 LT: ‘The rain has fallen, because the ground is wet.’

Consultant TM considers (2-1-4-1)-(b1) marginally acceptable. She comments that it is better if the main clause does not contain the perfective marker *léew* ‘PFV’.

- (2-1-4-1)-(b2) M[*fǒn* *khon* *tòk* *léew* *lá?* *máη*]
 rain probably fall PFV PRT PRT
 s[*phrǎ?* *phúuun* *pìak* *yùu*]
 because ground be.wet CONT
 LT: ‘Probably rain has fallen, because the ground is wet.’
 (2-1-4-1)-(b3) ? M[*fǒn* *tòk* *léew*]
 rain fall PFV
 s[*nûaη càak* *phúuun* *pìak* *yùu*]
 because ground be.wet CONT
 LT: ‘The rain has fallen, because the ground is wet.’

Consultant TM considers (2-1-4-1)-(b3) not acceptable.

- (2-1-4-1)-(b4) ? M[*fǒn* *khon* *tòk* *léew* *lá?* *máη*]
 rain probably fall PFV PRT
 PRT s[*nûaη càak* *phúuun* *pìak* *yùu*]
 because ground be.wet CONT
 LT: ‘Probably rain has fallen, because the ground is wet.’

Note that (2-1-4-1)-(a1) (s[X] + M[Y]) is not acceptable, but that (2-1-4-1)-(b1) (M[Y] + s[X]) is acceptable. Similarly, (2-1-4-1)-(a2) (s[X] + M[Y]) is only marginally acceptable, but (2-1-4-1)-(b2) (M[Y] + s[X]) is acceptable. This indicates that at Level IV for causals, the order ‘M[Y] + s[X]’ is preferred to the order ‘s[X] + M[Y]’.

Consultant TM considers (2-1-4-1)-(c6) marginally acceptable.

- (2-1-4-1)-(c7) * s[nûaŋ cāk phúuun pìak yùu] chanán
 because ground be.wet CONT and.so
 M[fǒn cūn tòk léew]
 rain so fall PFV
 LT: 'Because the ground is wet, and so the rain has fallen.'
- (2-1-4-1)-(c8) ? s[nûaŋ cāk phúuun pìak yùu] chanán
 because ground be.wet CONT and.so
 M[fǒn cūn khon tòk léew lá? mán]
 rain so probably fall PFV PRT PRT
 LT: 'Because the ground is wet, and so probably the rain has fallen.'

Quasi-parataxis

- (2-1-4-1)-(c9) * [phúuun pìak yùu]
 ground be.wet CONT
 [fǒn cūn tòk léew]
 rain so fall PFV
 LT: 'The ground is wet, so the rain has fallen.'
- (2-1-4-1)-(c6) * [phúuun pìak yùu]
 ground be.wet CONT
 [fǒn cūn khon tòk léew lá? mán]
 rain so probably fall PFT PRT PRT
 LT: 'The ground is wet, so probably the rain has fallen.'
- (d) Parataxis proper: [Y] + [X]
 (2-1-4-1)-(d1) * [fǒn tòk léew]
 rain fall PFV
 [phúuun pìak yùu]
 ground be.wet CONT
 LT: 'The rain has fallen. The ground is wet.'
 IM: I guess the rain has fallen, because the ground is wet.'

Consultant TM comments that (2-1-4-1)-(d1) is acceptable if the second clause does not contain the continuous aspect marker *yùu* 'CONT'.

- (2-1-4-1)-(d2) [fǒn khon tòk léew lá? mán]
 rain probably fall PFV PRT PRT
 [phúuun pìak yùu]
 ground be.wet CONT
 LT: 'Probably rain has fallen. The ground is wet.'
- (2-1-4-2) Because he is alive, the doctor saved him.
 IM: BECAUSE he is alive, I GUESS/SUPPOSE/INFER/
 CONCLUDE THAT the doctor saved him.

- (a) Subordination proper: s[X] + m[Y]
 (2-1-4-2)-(a1) * s[phrɔʔ *kháw yaŋ mii chiiwít yùu*]
 because PRON still have life CONT
 m[mɔɔ *chûay hây kháw rôɔt chiiwít*]
 doctor help IND PRON survive
 LT: ‘Because he is still alive, the doctor helped him survive.’

Quasi-subordination

- (2-1-4-2)-(a2) * s[phrɔʔ *kháw yaŋ mii chiiwít yùu*]
 because PRON still have life CONT
 m[mɔɔ cun *chûay hây kháw rôɔt chiiwít*]
 doctor so help IND PRON survive
 LT: ‘Because he is still alive, so the doctor helped him survive.’

Subordination proper

- (2-1-4-2)-(a3) s[phrɔʔ *kháw yaŋ mii chiiwít yùu*]
 because PRON still have life CONT
 m[mɔɔ *khon chûay hây kháw*
 doctor probably help IND PRON
 rôɔt chiiwít léew lá? máŋ]
 survive PFV PRT PRT
 LT: ‘Because he is still alive, probably the doctor helped him survive.’

Consultant TM comments that (2-1-4-2)-(a3) sounds more natural if the phrase *yaŋ mii chiiwít* ‘to be still alive’ in the subordinate clause is replaced with the phrase *yaŋ mây taay* ‘still + NEG + die; not to die yet’ and the phrase *chûay hây kháw rôɔt chiiwít léew* ‘to help him survive’ in the main clause is replaced with the phrase *mây thôɔt thín kháw* ‘NEG + abandon + PRON; not to abandon him’ (‘Because he does not die yet, probably the doctor did not abandon him’).

Quasi-subordination

- (2-1-4-2)-(a4) * s[phrɔʔ *kháw yaŋ mii chiiwít yùu*]
 because PRON still have life CONT
 m[mɔɔ cun *khon chûay hây kháw*
 doctor so probably help IND PRON
 rôɔt chiiwít léew lá? máŋ]
 survive PFV PRT PRT
 LT: ‘Because he is still alive, so probably the doctor helped him survive.’

The example (2-1-4-2)-(a1) is not acceptable. In contrast, (2-1-4-2)-(a3) is acceptable; it contains *khon ... máŋ* ‘probably’. Similarly, (2-1-4-2)-(a5) is not acceptable, but (2-1-4-2)-(a7), which contains *khon ...*

mǎŋ ‘probably’, is marginally acceptable.

Subordination proper

- (2-1-4-2)-(a5) * s[*nûaŋ càak* *kháw yaŋ mii chiiwít yùu*]
 because PRON still have life CONT
 M[*mǎɔ̌ chûay hây kháw rôɔt chiiwít*]
 doctor help IND PRON survive
 LT: ‘Because he is still alive, the doctor helped him survive.’

Quasi-subordination

- (2-1-4-2)-(a6) * s[*nûaŋ càak* *kháw yaŋ mii chiiwít yùu*]
 because PRON still have life CONT
 M[*mǎɔ̌ cun chûay hây kháw rôɔt chiiwít*]
 doctor so help IND PRON survive
 LT: ‘Because he is still alive, so the doctor helped him survive.’

Subordination proper

- (2-1-4-2)-(a7) ? s[*nûaŋ càak* *kháw yaŋ mii chiiwít yùu*]
 because PRON still have life CONT
 M[*mǎɔ̌ khon chûay hây kháw*
 doctor probably help IND PRON
rôɔt chiiwít léew lá? mǎŋ]
 survive PFV PRT PRT
 LT: ‘Because he is still alive, probably the doctor helped him survive.’

Consultant AM comments that (2-1-4-2)-(a7) is only marginally acceptable because the bookish E-CLM *nûaŋ càak* ‘because’ is not stylistically suitable for this sentence.

Quasi-subordination

- (2-1-4-2)-(a8) * s[*nûaŋ càak* *kháw yaŋ mii chiiwít yùu*]
 because PRON still have life CONT
 M[*mǎɔ̌ cun khon chûay hây kháw*
 doctor so probably help IND PRON
rôɔt chiiwít léew lá? mǎŋ]
 survive PFV FRT PRT
 LT: ‘Because he is still alive, so probably the doctor helped him survive.’

(b) Subordination proper: M[Y] + s[X]

Here again, without *khon* ... *mǎŋ* ‘probably’, the sentences are not acceptable, but its inclusion renders them acceptable or marginally acceptable.

- (2-1-4-2)-(b1) *_M[*mǎɔ̌* *chûay* *hây* *kháw* *rǎɔ̌t chiiwít*]
 doctor help IND PRON survive
 s[*phrǎɔ̌?* *kháw* *yaɲ* *mii* *chiiwít yùu*]
 because PRON still have life CONT
 LT: 'The doctor helped him survive, because he is still alive.'
- (2-1-4-2)-(b2) _M[*mǎɔ̌* *khon* *chûay* *hây* *kháw*]
 doctor probably help IND PRON
rǎɔ̌t chiiwít *léɛw láʔ* *máɲ*]
 survive PFV PRT PRT
 s[*phrǎɔ̌?* *kháw* *yaɲ* *mii* *chiiwít yùu*]
 because PRON still have life CONT
 LT: 'Probably the doctor helped him survive, because he is still alive.'
- (2-1-4-2)-(b3) _M[*mǎɔ̌* *chûay* *hây* *kháw* *rǎɔ̌t chiiwít*]
 doctor help IND PRON survive
 s[*nûaɲ càak* *kháw* *yaɲ* *mii* *chiiwít yùu*]
 because PRON still have life CONT
 LT: 'The doctor helped him survive, because he is still alive.'
- (2-1-4-2)-(b4) ? _M[*mǎɔ̌* *khon* *chûay* *hây* *kháw*]
 doctor probably help IND PRON
rǎɔ̌t chiiwít *léɛw láʔ* *máɲ*]
 survive PFV PRT PRT
 s[*nûaɲ càak* *kháw* *yaɲ* *mii* *chiiwít yùu*]
 because PRON still have life CONT
 LT: 'Probably the doctor helped him survive, because he is still alive.'

Consultant TM considers (2-1-4-2)-(b3) not acceptable. Consultant AM comments on (2-1-4-2)-(b4) that like (2-1-4-2)-(a7) above, it is only marginally acceptable because the bookish E-CLM *nûaɲ càak* 'because' is not stylistically suitable for the sentence.

(c) Parataxis proper: [X] + [Y]

Here again, without *khon* ... *máɲ* 'probably', the sentences are not acceptable, but its inclusion renders them acceptable. (However, Consultant TM considers (2-1-4-2)-(c2) with *khon* ... *máɲ* 'probably' not acceptable.) Also, if the sentence contains the I-CLM *chanán* 'and so', it becomes acceptable; see (2-1-4-2)-(c3), -(c4). (Consultant TM considers (2-1-4-2)-(c3) not acceptable.) (2-1-4-2)-(c3), -(c4) are instances of (ii-1) Coordination proper.

- (2-1-4-2)-(c1) *[*kháw* *yaɲ* *mii* *chiiwít yùu*]
 PRON still have life CONT
 [*mǎɔ̌* *chûay* *hây* *kháw* *rǎɔ̌t chiiwít*]
 doctor help IND PRON survive

- LT: 'He is still alive. The doctor helped him survive.'
- (2-1-4-2)-(c2) [kháw yaŋ mii chíiwít yùu]
 PRON still have life CONT
 [mǎo khon chûay hây kháw]
 doctor probably help IND PRON
 rôot chíiwít léew lá? máŋ]
 survive PFV PRT PRT
 LT: 'He is still alive. Probably the doctor helped him survive.'

Coordination proper

- (2-1-4-2)-(c3) [kháw yaŋ mii chíiwít yùu] chanán
 PRON still have life CONT and.so
 [mǎo chûay hây kháw rôot chíiwít]
 doctor help IND PRON survive
 LT: 'He is still alive, and so the doctor helped him survive.'
- (2-1-4-2)-(c4) [kháw yaŋ mii chíiwít yùu] chanán
 PRON still have life CONT even.so
 [mǎo khon chûay hây kháw]
 doctor probably help IND PRON
 rôot chíiwít léew lá? máŋ]
 survive PFV PRT PRT
 LT: 'He is still alive, and so probably the doctor helped him survive.'

Quasi-coordination

- (2-1-4-2)-(c5) * s[phró? kháw yaŋ mii chíiwít yùu]
 because PRON still have life CONT
chanán
 and.so
 M[mǎo cun chûay hây kháw rôot chíiwít]
 doctor so help IND PRON survive
 LT: 'Because he is still alive, and so the doctor helped him survive.'
- (2-1-4-2)-(c6) * s[phró? kháw yaŋ mii chíiwít yùu]
 because PRON still have life CONT
chanán
 and.so
 M[mǎo cun khon chûay hây kháw]
 doctor so probably help IND PRON
 rôot chíiwít léew lá? máŋ]
 survive PFV PRT PRT
 LT: 'Because he is still alive, and so probably the doctor helped him survive.'
- (2-1-4-2)-(c7) * s[nûaŋ càak kháw yaŋ mii chíiwít yùu]
 because PRON still have life CONT

- chanán
and.so
M[mǎɔ̌ cun chûay hây kháw rɔ̌ɔt chiiwít]
doctor so help IND PRON survive
LT: 'Because he is still alive, and so the doctor helped him survive.'
- (2-1-4-2)-(c8) * s[nûan cāk kháw yaŋ mii chiiwít yùu]
because PRON still have life CONT
chanán
and.so
M[mǎɔ̌ cun khoŋ chûay hây kháw
doctor so probably help IND PRON
rɔ̌ɔt chiiwít léew lá? mǎŋ]
survive PFV PRT PRT
LT: 'Because he is still alive, and so probably the doctor helped him survive.'

Quasi-parataxis

- (2-1-4-2)-(c5) * [kháw yaŋ mii chiiwít yùu]
PRON still have life CONT
[mǎɔ̌ cun chûay hây kháw rɔ̌ɔt chiiwít]
doctor so help IND PRON survive
LT: 'He is still alive, so the doctor helped him survive.'
- (2-1-4-2)-(c6) [kháw yaŋ mii chiiwít yùu]
PRON still have life CONT
[mǎɔ̌ cun khoŋ chûay hây kháw
doctor so probably help IND PRON
rɔ̌ɔt chiiwít léew lá? mǎŋ]
survive PFV PRT PRT
LT: 'He is still alive, so probably the doctor helped him survive.'

(d) Parataxis proper: [Y] + [X]

Here again, without *khoŋ* ... *mǎŋ* 'probably', the sentences are not acceptable. Note, however, that its inclusion does *not* render them acceptable. (Consultant AM considers (2-1-4-2)-(d2) marginally acceptable; Consultant TM regards it to be not acceptable.)

- (2-1-4-2)-(d1) * [mǎɔ̌ chûay hây kháw rɔ̌ɔt chiiwít]
doctor help IND PRON survive
[kháw yaŋ mii chiiwít yùu]
PRON still have life CONT
LT: 'The doctor helped him to survive. He is still alive.'
IM: 'I guess that the doctor helped him survive, because he is still alive.'
- (2-1-4-2)-(d2) ? [mǎɔ̌ khoŋ chûay hây kháw
doctor probably help IND PRON

rôot chiiwít léew lá? máŋ]
 survive PFV PRT PRT
 [*kháw yaŋ mii chiiwít yùu]*
 PRON still have life CONT

LT: 'Probably the doctor helped him to survive. He is still alive.'

IM: 'I guess that probably the doctor helped him survive, because he is still alive.'

As noted above, (2-1-4-2)-(d2) is marginally acceptable or not acceptable, despite the fact that it contains *khon* ... *máŋ* 'probably'. The sentence becomes acceptable if the second sentence contains *phrǎ?* 'because', consequently becoming a subordinate clause. The resultant sentence is (2-1-4-2)-(b2) above: an instance of (i-1) Subordination proper.

4.5 Causals Level V

Subordinate clause: premise. Main clause: speech act.

(2-1-5-1) There is food here, because you are looking for food.

IM: BECAUSE you are looking for food, I SAY TO YOU
 'There is food here'.

(a) Subordination proper: s[X] + m[Y]

(2-1-5-1)-(a1) *s[*phrǎ?* *khun kamlaŋ hǎa khǎŋ kin yùu*]
 because PRON PROG seek food CONT
 m[*khǎŋ kin yùu troŋ ní ná?*]
 food be.located here PRT

LT: 'Because you are seeking [i.e. looking for] food, food is located here (, I suggest to you so).'

Quasi-subordination

(2-1-5-1)-(a2) *s[*phrǎ?* *khun kamlaŋ hǎa khǎŋ kin yùu*]
 because PRON PROG seek food CONT
 m[*khǎŋ kin cuŋ yùu troŋ ní ná?*]
 food so be.located here PRT

LT: 'Because you are seeking [i.e. looking for] food, so food is located here (, I suggest to you so).'

Subordination proper

(2-1-5-1)-(a3) *s[*nûaŋ càak khun kamlaŋ hǎa khǎŋ kin yùu*]
 because PRON PROG seek food CONT
 m[*khǎŋ kin yùu troŋ ní ná?*]
 food be.located here PRT

LT: 'Because you are seeking [i.e. looking for] food, food is located here (, I suggest to you so).'

Quasi-subordination

- (2-1-5-1)-(a4) *_s[nûaŋ càak *khun kamlaŋ hǎa khǎw kin yùu*]
 because PRON PROG seek food CONT
_M[*khǎw kin cūuŋ yùu troŋ ní ná?*]
 food so be.located here PRT
 LT: 'Because you are seeking [i.e. looking for] food, so food is located here (, I suggest to you so).'

(*Ná?* is a final particle (not a verb) which expresses the speaker's justification, intention, wishes, and the like while being considerate of the addressee's feeling. In expressions for the speech act of directives (such as suggestion, encouragement or command), it may be translated as 'I suggest to you so', 'I encourage you so' or 'I order you so'.)

- (b) Subordination proper: _M[Y] + _s[X]
 (2-1-5-1)-(b1) *_M[*khǎw kin yùu troŋ ní ná?*]
 food be located here PRT
_s[*phrǎ?* *khun kamlaŋ hǎa khǎw kin yùu*]
 because PRON PROG seek food CONT
 LT: 'Food is located here (, I suggest you so), because you are looking for food.'
 (2-1-5-1)-(b2) *_M[*khǎw kin yùu troŋ ní ná?*]
 food be located here PRT
_s[nûaŋ càak *khun kamlaŋ hǎa khǎw kin yùu*]
 because PRON PROG seek food CONT
 LT: 'Food is located here (, I suggest you so), because you are looking for food.'

(c) Patataxis proper: [X] + [Y]

The example (2-1-5-1)-(c1) is not acceptable. However, the sentence becomes acceptable if it contains a stance expression such as an epistemic one *lâ? sì?* 'I'm sure, I suppose so', e.g. (2-1-5-1)-(c2), or an interrogative one *chây máy* 'Is this correct?' or 'Right?', e.g. (2-1-5-1)-(c3). (*Lâ? sì?* 'I'm sure, I suppose so' are particles. They do not contain a verb. The particle *lâ?* is used when the speaker wants the interlocutor to make some response.) Also, if the sentence contains the I-CLM *chanán* 'and so', it becomes marginally acceptable; see (2-1-5-1)-(c4). (2-1-5-1)-(c4) is an instance of (ii-1) Coordination proper.

- (2-1-5-1)-(c1) * [*khun kamlaŋ hǎa khǎw kin yùu*]
 PRON PROG seek food CONT
 [*khǎw kin yùu troŋ ní ná?*]
 food be.located here PRT
 LT: 'You are looking for food. Food is located here (, I suggest you so).'
- (2-1-5-1)-(c2) [(*khun*) *kamlaŋ hǎa khǎw kin yùu*]
 (PRON) PROG seek food CONT

- (2-1-5-1)-(c3) *lâ? sì?*
PRT PRT
[*khǎw kin yùu troṇ ní ná?*]
food be.located here PRT
LT: '(You) are finding looking for food, I'm sure. Food is located here (, I suggest you so).'
- (2-1-5-1)-(c3) [(*khun kamlaṇ hǎa khǎw kin yùu*]
(PRON) PROG seek food CONT
chây máy
right?
[*khǎw kin yùu troṇ ní ná?*]
food be.located here PRT
'(You) are looking for food, right? Food is located here (, I suggest you so).'

Coordination proper

- (2-1-5-1)-(c4) * [*khun kamlaṇ hǎa khǎw kin yùu*]
PRON PROG seek food CONT
chanán [*khǎw kin yùu troṇ ní*
and.so food be.located here
ná?]
PRT
LT: 'You are looking for food, and so food is located here (, I suggest you so).'

Consultant TM comments that (2-1-5-1)-(c4) becomes acceptable if it contains another sentence expressing some action such as *chán læy ?aw maa hây* 'PRON + AP-CLM + take + come + give + BEN; so I take (it) for (you)' immediately after the I-CLM *chanán* 'and so' and before the latter sentence expressing a stative situation ('You are looking for food, and so I bring you food. Food is located here (, I suggest you so)').

Quasi-coordination

- (2-1-5-1)-(c5) *_s[*phrǎ? khun kamlaṇ hǎa khǎw kin yùu*]
because PRON PROG seek food CONT
chanán _M[*khǎw kin cun yùu troṇ ní*
and.so food so be.located here
ná?]
PRT
LT: 'Because you are looking for food, and so food is located here (, I suggest to you so).'
- (2-1-5-1)-(c6) *_s[*nûaṇ càak khun kamlaṇ hǎa khǎw kin yùu*]
because PRON PROG seek food CONT
chanán _M[*khǎw kin cun yùu troṇ ní*
and.so food so be.located here
ná?]
PRT

LT: ‘Because you are looking for food, and so food is located here (, I suggest to you so).’

Quasi-parataxis

- (2-1-5-1)-(c7) * [*khun kamlaŋ hǎa khǎw kin yùu*]
 PRON PROG seek food CONT
 [*khǎw kin cun yùu troŋ ní náʔ*]
 food so be.located here PRT
 LT: ‘You are looking for food, so food is located here (, I suggest you so).’

(d) Parataxis proper: [Y] + [X]

The example (2-1-5-1)-(d1) is not acceptable. But the sentence becomes acceptable if it contains a stance expression such as an epistemic/evidential one *hěn* ‘it seems’. (*Hěn* is a verb and it can also mean ‘see’.)

- (2-1-5-1)-(d1) * [*khǎw kin yùu troŋ ní náʔ*]
 food be.located here PRT
 [*khun kamlaŋ hǎa khǎw kin yùu*]
 PRON PROG seek food CONT
 LT: ‘Food is located here (, I suggest you so). You are looking for food.’
- (2-1-5-1)-(d2) [*khǎw kin yùu troŋ ní náʔ*]
 food be.located here PRT
 [*hěn (khun) kamlaŋ hǎa (khǎw kin) yùu*]
 see (PRON) PROG seek (food) CONT
 LT: ‘Food is located here (, I suggest you so). It seems that (you) are looking for (food).’

- (2-1-5-2) There is water here, because you are/look thirsty.
 IM: BECAUSE you are/look thirsty, I SAY TO YOU ‘There is water here’.

(a) Subordination proper: s[X] + m[Y]

- (2-1-5-2)-(a1) * s[*phrǎʔ hěn khun kamlaŋ hǎw nám*]
 because see you PROG be.hungry water
 yùu] m[*nám yùu troŋ ní náʔ*]
 CONT water be.located here PRT
 LT: ‘Because it seems that you are hungry (for) water, water is located here (, I suggest you so).’

Quasi-subordination

- (2-1-5-2)-(a2) * s[*phrǎʔ hěn khun kamlaŋ hǎw nám*]
 because see you PROG be.hungry water
 yùu] m[*nám cun yùu troŋ ní náʔ*]
 CONT water so be.located here PRT
 LT: ‘Because it seems that you are hungry (for) water, so water is located here (, I suggest you so).’

Subordination proper

- (2-1-5-2)-(a3) * s[nûaŋ càak hěŋ khun kamlaŋ hǐw nám
because see you PROG be.hungry water
yùu]
CONT
M[nám yùu troŋ ní náʔ]
water be.located here PRT
LT: 'Because it seems that you are hungry (for) water,
water is located here (, I suggest you so).'

Consultant TM considers (2-1-5-2)-(a3) marginally acceptable.

Quasi-subordination

- (2-1-5-2)-(a4) * s[nûaŋ càak hěŋ khun kamlaŋ hǐw nám
because see you PROG be.hungry water
yùu] M[nám cuaŋ yùu troŋ ní
CONT water so be.located here
náʔ]
PRT
LT: 'Because it seems that you are hungry (for) water,
so water is located here (, I suggest you so).'

(b) Subordination proper: M[Y] + s[X]

- (2-1-5-2)-(b1) * M[nám yùu troŋ ní náʔ]
water be.located here PRT
s[phrǎʔ hěŋ khun kamlaŋ hǐw nám
because see you PROG be.hungry water
yùu]
CONT
LT: 'Water is located here (, I suggest you so), because it
seems that you are hungry (for) water.'
- (2-1-5-2)-(b2) * M[nám yùu troŋ ní náʔ]
water be.located here PRT
s[nûaŋ càak hěŋ khun kamlaŋ hǐw nám
because see you PROG be.hungry water
yùu]
CONT
LT: 'Water is located here (, I suggest you so), because it
seems that you are hungry (for) water.'

(c) Parataxis proper: [X] + [Y]

- (2-1-5-2)-(c1) [hěŋ khun kamlaŋ hǐw nám yùu]
see you PROG be.hungry water CONT
[nám yùu troŋ ní náʔ]
water be.located here PRT
LT: 'It seems that you are hungry (for) water. Water is
located here (, I suggest you so).'

Note that if the verb *hěn* ‘see’ is absent from (2-1-5-2)-(c1) and the explicit epistemic/evidential meaning (‘it seems’) gets lost, the sentence is not acceptable.

The example (2-1-5-2)-(c2), which contains the I-CLM *chanán* ‘and so’, is not acceptable, even though it contains *hěn* ‘see’. It is an instance of (ii-1) Coordination proper. (Like (2-1-5-1)-(c2), -(c3) above, if (2-1-5-2)-(c2) contains *lâ? sî?* ‘I’m sure, I suppose so’ or *chây máy* ‘Is this correct?, Right?’ in the subordinate clause, it is acceptable.)

Coordination proper

- (2-1-5-2)-(c2) * [*hěn khun kamlaŋ hǐw nám yùu*]
 see you PROG be.hungry water CONT
chanán [*nám yùu troŋ ní nǎ?*]
 and so water be.located here PRT
 LT: ‘It seems that you are hungry (for) water, and so water is located here (, I suggest you so).’

Consultant TM considers that, as is the case with (2-1-5-1)-(c4) above, (2-1-5-2)-(c2) is acceptable if it contains another sentence expressing some action such as *chán ləy? paw maa hây* ‘PRON + AP-CLM + take + come + give + BEN; so I take (it) for (you)’ immediately after the I-CLM *chanán* ‘and so’ and before the latter sentence expressing a stative situation (‘It seems that you are hungry for water, and so I bring you water. Water is located here (, I suggest you so)’).

Quasi-coordination

- (2-1-5-2)-(c3) * s[*phrô? hěn khun kamlaŋ hǐw nám yùu*]
 because see you PROG be.hungry water CONT
chanán
 CONT and.so
 M[*nám cuŋ yùu troŋ ní nǎ?*]
 water so be.located here PRT
 LT: ‘Because it seems that you are hungry (for) water, and so water is located here (, I suggest you so).’
- (2-1-5-2)-(c4) * s[*nûaŋ càak hěn khun kamlaŋ hǐw nám yùu*]
 because see you PROG be.hungry water CONT
chanán
 CONT and.so
 M[*nám cuŋ yùu troŋ ní nǎ?*]
 water so be.located here PRT
 LT: ‘Because it seems that you are hungry (for) water, and so water is located here (, I suggest you so).’

Quasi-parataxis

- (2-1-5-2)-(c5) * [*hěn khun kamlaŋ hǐw nám yùu*]
 see you PROG be.hungry water CONT

[*nám* *cưu* *yùu* *troṅ níi náʔ*]
 water so be.located here PRT
 LT: 'It seems that you are hungry (for) water, so water is located here (, I suggest you so).'

The example (2-1-5-2)-(c5) is acceptable if it does not contain the AP-CLM *cưu* 'so'; see (2-1-5-2)-(c1) (Parataxis proper).

(d) Parataxis proper: [Y] + [X]
 (2-1-5-2)-(d1) [*nám* *yùu* *troṅ níi náʔ*]
 water be.located here PRT
 [*hěn khun kamləṅ hǐw nám yùu*]
 see you PROG be.hungry water CONT
 LT: 'Water is located here. It seems that you are hungry (for) water.'

5. Conditionals

We shall examine *thâa* 'if' and *nay mûa* 'if' for subordination of conditionals. *Thâa* 'if' is unmarked, being the common conditional CLM, while *nay mûa* 'if' is marked. It has a meaning of what may be termed 'certainty' conditional (as against 'non-certainty' conditional) or 'conclusion-implied' conditional. However, the meaning of *nay mûa* 'if' is not yet fully understood. Intuitively, it has a meaning such as 'If X happens at all, Y is bound to happen', 'Now that X has happened, one should do Y', and 'Now that X has happened, one cannot help Y happening'. The CLM *nay mûa* 'if' is incompatible with a description of a situation that occurs in non-specific, future circumstances. It is used for expressing a certainly realized condition, under which a certain situation is believed to occur. Due to its specialized meaning, *nay mûa* 'if' is generally incompatible with the questionnaire sentences and cannot be used by itself to translate them.

For subordination proper, *thâa* 'if' is attested at all of the five levels except for Level IV, at which it is acceptable if the sentence contains the epistemic expression *khon ... mǎṅ* 'probably'. *Nay mûa* 'if' is acceptable at Level IV only if the sentence involves *khon ... mǎṅ* 'probably'. At Level III it is acceptable if it is used in quasi-subordination, involving the AP-CLM *kô* 'then, so'. Parataxis proper is attested at Level I, and also at Level IV; at level IV it has to involve *khon ... mǎṅ* 'probably'.

5.1 Conditionals Level I

Subordinate clause: situation. Main clause: situation

(2-2-1-1) If spring comes, flowers bloom.
 (a) Subordination proper: s[X] + m[Y]

- (2-2-1-1)-(a1) s[thâa *thǔŋ* *rúduu bay máy phlì?*]
 if reach spring
 M[*dòk máy cà? baan*]
 flower IRR bloom
 LT: 'If (it) reaches spring, flowers bloom.'
 IM: 'If spring comes, flowers bloom.'

Quasi-subordination

- (2-2-1-1)-(a2) s[thâa *thǔŋ* *rúduu bay máy phlì?*]
 if reach spring
 M[*dòk máy kô cà? baan*]
 flower then IRR bloom
 LT: 'If (it) reaches spring, then flowers bloom.'
 IM: 'If spring comes, flowers bloom.'

For (a1), the temporal CLM *mûa* 'when' can be used in place of *thâa* 'if'.

Subordination proper

- (2-2-1-1)-(a3) s[mûa *thǔŋ* *rúduu bay máy phlì?*]
 when reach spring
 M[*dòk máy cà? baan*]
 flower IRR bloom
 LT: 'When (it) reaches spring, flowers bloom.'
 IM: 'When spring comes, flowers bloom.'

Quasi-subordination

- (2-2-1-1)-(a4) s[mûa *thǔŋ* *rúduu bay máy phlì?*]
 when reach spring
 M[*dòk máy kô cà? baan*]
 flower then IRR bloom
 LT: 'When (it) reaches spring, then flowers bloom.'
 IM: 'When spring comes, flowers bloom.'

The example (2-2-1-1)-(a1) may include the I-CLM *lâkô* 'and then'. (*Lâkô* 'and then' is a reduced form of the combination of *lɛɛw* 'PFV' and *kô* 'then, so'.) The resultant sentence is an instance of (ii-2) Quasi-coordination: (2-2-1-1)-(a5).

Quasi-coordination

- (2-2-1-1)-(a5) s[thâa *thǔŋ* *rúduu bay máy phlì?*] *lâkô*
 if reach spring and.then
 M[*dòk máy cà? baan*]
 flower IRR bloom
 LT: 'If (it) reaches spring, and then flowers bloom.'
 IM: 'If spring comes, and then flowers bloom.'

Subordination proper

- (2-2-1-1)-(a6) * s[nay mûa thǔŋ rúduu bay máy phlì?]
 if reach pring
 M[dòk máy cà? baan]
 flower IRR bloom
 LT: 'If (it) reaches spring, flowers bloom.'
 IM: 'If spring comes, flowers bloom.'

Quasi-subordination

- (2-2-1-1)-(a7) * s[nay mûa thǔŋ rúduu bay máy phlì?]
 if reach pring
 M[dòk máy kô cà? baan]
 flower then IRR bloom
 LT: 'If (it) reaches spring, then flowers bloom.'
 IM: 'If spring comes, flowers bloom.'

Quasi-coordination

- (2-2-1-1)-(a8) * s[nay mûa thǔŋ rúduu bay máy phlì?] lâkô
 if reach pring and.then
 M[dòk máy kô cà? baan]
 flower then IRR bloom
 LT: 'If (it) reaches spring, and then flowers bloom.'
 IM: 'If spring comes, flowers bloom.'

(b) Subordination proper: M[Y] + s[X]

- (2-2-1-1)-(b1) M[dòk máy cà? baan]
 flower IRR bloom
 s[thâa thǔŋ rúduu bay máy phlì?]
 if reach spring
 LT: 'Flowers bloom if (it) reaches spring.'
 IM: 'Flowers bloom if spring comes.'

- (2-2-1-1)-(b2) * M[dòk máy cà? baan]
 flower IRR bloom
 s[nay mûa thǔŋ rúduu bay máy phlì?]
 if reach spring
 LT: 'Flowers bloom if (it) reaches spring.'
 IM: 'Flowers bloom if spring comes.'

(c) Parataxis proper: [X] + [Y]

- (2-2-1-1)-(c1) [thǔŋ rúduu bay máy phlì?]
 reach spring
 [dòk máy cà? baan]
 flower IRR bloom
 LT: '(It) reaches spring. Flowers bloom.'
 IM: 'If spring comes, flowers bloom.'

Consultant TM considers (2-2-1-1)-(c1) not acceptable.

The example (2-2-1-1)-(c2), which contains the I-CLM *lâkô* ‘and then’, is not acceptable. It is an instance of (ii-1) Coordination proper.

Coordination proper

- (2-2-1-1)-(c2) * [*thǔŋ rúduu bay máy phlǐ?*] *lâkô*
 reach spring and.then
 [*dòk máy cà? baan*]
 flower IRR bloom
 LT: ‘(It) reaches spring, and then flowers bloom.’
 IM: ‘If spring comes, and then flowers bloom.’

Quasi-parataxis

- (2-2-1-1)-(c3) [*thǔŋ rúduu bay máy phlǐ?*]
 reach spring
 [*dòk máy kô cà? baan*]
 flower then IRR bloom
 LT: ‘(It) reaches spring, then flowers bloom.’
 IM: ‘If spring comes, flowers bloom.’

(d) Parataxis proper: [Y] + [X]

- (2-2-1-1)-(d1) * [*dòk máy cà? baan*]
 flower IRR bloom
 [*thǔŋ rúduu bay máy phlǐ?*]
 reach spring
 LT: ‘Flowers bloom. (It) reaches spring.’
 IM: ‘Flowers bloom if spring comes.’

The example (2-2-1-1)-(d1) is not acceptable for the intended meaning shown above. However, it is acceptable for the meaning of ‘Flowers will bloom until spring’. In this case, *thǔŋ* functions like a preposition with the meaning of ‘until’.

(2-2-1-2) If rain falls, I always stay in the house.

(a) Subordination proper: s[X] + m[Y]

- (2-2-1-2)-(a1) s[*thâa fǒn tòk*]
 if rain fall
 m[*chán cà? yùu baan*]
 PRON IRR stay house
 LT: ‘If the rain falls, I always stay in the house.’

Quasi-subordination

- (2-2-1-2)-(a2) s[*thâa fǒn tòk*]
 if rain fall
 m[*chán kô cà? yùu baan*]
 PRON then IRR stay house
 LT: ‘If the rain falls, then I always stay in the house.’

The example (2-2-1-2)-(a1) may include the I-CLM *lâkô* ‘and then’. The resultant sentence is an instance of (ii-2) Quasi-coordination: (2-2-1-2)-(a3).

Quasi-coordination

- (2-2-1-2)-(a3) [thâa *fǒn* *tòk*] *lâkô*
 if rain fall and.then
 [*chán* *cà?* *yùu* *bâan*]
 PRON IRR stay house
 LT: ‘If the rain falls, and then, I stay in the house.’

Subordination proper

- (2-2-1-2)-(a4) * s[*nay mûa* *fǒn* *tòk*]
 if rain fall
 M[*chán* *cà?* *yùu* *bâan*]
 PRON IRR stay house
 IM: ‘If the rain falls, I always stay in the house.’

Quasi-subordination

- (2-2-1-2)-(a5) * s[*nay mûa* *fǒn* *tòk*]
 if rain fall
 M[*chán* *kô* *cà?* *yùu* *bâan*]
 PRON then IRR stay house
 LM: ‘If the rain falls, then I always stay in the house.’

The examples (2-2-1-2)-(a4), -(a5) are not acceptable for the intended conditional meaning (‘If it rains, (then) I always stay home.’). Rather, they may be understood to express a causal meaning: ‘As/Since it rains, (so) I am going to stay home.’ This causal sense, I suppose, is based on such a conditional logic that ‘if the event of a rainfall happens at all, the event of my staying home is bound to happen; now it has started raining and so I am going to stay home’. It is noteworthy that the verb phrase in the main clause of (2-2-1-2)-(a4) and -(a5) readily co-occurs with the deontic marker *tôŋ* ‘must’ ((*kô*) *cà?* *tôŋ* *yùu* *bâan* ‘(then) must/have to stay home’). The sentences with *tôŋ* ‘must’ mean that ‘now that the event of a rainfall has happened, (then) I should stay home’, or with some emotional connotation such that ‘now that the event of a rainfall has happened, (then) I cannot help staying home’.

Quasi-coordination

- (2-2-1-2)-(a6) * s[*nay mûa* *fǒn* *tòk*] *lâkô*
 if rain fall and.then
 M[*chán* *kô* *cà?* *yùu* *bâan*]
 PRON then IRR stay house
 LM: ‘If the rain falls, and then I always stay in the house.’

Consultant TM comments that (2-2-1-2)-(a6) is acceptable if it contains

the phrase *rúu yùu léew wâa* ‘know + CONT + PFV + COMP; (I) had been aware that’ before the phrase *fǒn tòk* ‘the rain falls’ in the subordinate clause (‘If I had been aware that the rain would fall, and then I would stay in the house’).

- (b) Subordination proper: $M[Y] + S[X]$
- (2-2-1-2)-(b1) $M[chán\ cà? yùu\ bâan]$
 PRON IRR stay house
 $S[thâa\ fǒn\ tòk]$
 if rain fall
 LT: ‘I stay in the house, if the rain falls.’
- (2-2-1-2)-(b2) * $M[chán\ cà? yùu\ bâan]$
 PRON IRR stay house
 $S[nay\ mûa\ fǒn\ tòk]$
 if rain fall
 IM: ‘I always stay in the house, if the rain falls.’

The CLM *nay mûa* ‘if’ is generally incompatible with the sentences for conditionals that are given in ‘Questionnaire for five levels’ (Tasaku Tsunoda, this volume-a), and the sentences that contain it are generally not acceptable. See, for instance, (2-2-1-1)-(a4), -(b2), and (2-2-1-2)-(a3), -(b2) above. (They become acceptable under certain conditions; see (2-2-2-1)-(a3), (2-2-3-1)-(a4), (2-2-3-2)-(a4), (2-2-4-1)-(a4), -(b4) and (2-2-4-2)-(a4), -(b4).) This unacceptability of *nay mûa* ‘if’ is due to its semantic nature described at the beginning of Section 5. That is, *nay mûa* ‘if’ is incompatible with a description of a situation that occurs in non-specific, future circumstances. It is used for expressing a certainly realized condition, under which a certain situation is believed to occur. Specifically, it has a meaning such as ‘If X happens at all, Y is bound to happen’, ‘Now that X has happened, one should do Y’, and ‘Now that X has happened, one cannot help Y happening’. Consider, for example, the following sentences (written in English) in the questionnaire: (2-2-1-1) ‘If spring comes, flowers bloom’, and (2-2-1-2) ‘If rain falls, I always stay in the house’. These English sentences describe situations that occur in non-specific, future circumstances, and not certainly realized conditions, under which a certain situation is believed to occur.

- (c) Parataxis proper: $[X] + [Y]$
- (2-2-1-2)-(c1) $[fǒn\ tòk]$
 rain fall
 $[chán\ cà? yùu\ bâan]$
 PRON IRR stay house
 LT: ‘The rain falls. I stay in the house.’

The example (2-2-1-2)-(c2), which contains the I-CLM *lâkô* ‘and then’, is not acceptable. It requires the E-CLM *thâa* ‘if’ in the subordinate clause. See (2-2-1-2)-(a3) (Quasi-coordination). (However, Consultant TM

considers it acceptable.) (2-2-1-2)-(c2) is an instance of (ii-1) Coordination proper.

Coordination proper
(2-2-1-2)-(c2) * [fǒn tòk] lâkô
rain fall and.then
[chán cà? yùu bâan]
PRON IRR stay house
LT: 'The rain falls, and then I stay in the house.'

Quasi-parataxis
(2-2-1-2)-(c3) [fǒn tòk]
rain fall
[chán kô cà? yùu bâan]
PRON then IRR stay house
LT: 'The rain falls, then I stay in the house.'

Consultant TM considers (2-2-1-2)-(c3) marginally acceptable. She comments that the sentence sounds natural if it contains the E-CLM *thâa* 'if' in the subordinate clause. See (2-2-1-2)-(a2) (Quasi-subordination).

(d) Parataxis proper: [Y] + [X]
(2-2-1-2)-(d1) * [chán cà? yùu bâan]
PRON IRR stay house
[fǒn tòk]
rain fall
LT: 'I stay in the house. The rain falls.'
IM: 'I always stay in the house, if the rain falls.'

5.2 Conditionals Level II

Subordinate clause: situation. Main clause: situation + judgement.

(2-2-2-1) If rain falls tomorrow, he has to stay in the house.
(a) Subordination proper: s[X] + m[Y]
(2-2-2-1)-(a1) s[thâa phrûn ní fǒn tòk]
if tomorrow rain fall
m[khâw cà? tōŋ yùu bâan]
PRON IRR must stay house
LT: 'If the rain falls tomorrow, he has to stay in the house.'

Quasi-subordination
(2-2-2-1)-(a2) s[thâa phrûn ní fǒn tòk]
if tomorrow rain fall
m[khâw kô cà? tōŋ yùu bâan]
PRON then IRR must stay house

(2-2-2-1)-(b2) *_M[*kháw cà? tôŋ yùu bâan*]
PRON IRR must stay house

s[nay mûa *phrûn ní fǒn tòk*
if tomorrow rain fall
LT: 'He has to stay in the house, if the rain falls tomorrow.'

- (c) Parataxis proper: [X] + [Y]
(2-2-2-1)-(c1) * [*phrûn ní fǒn tòk*
tomorrow rain fall
[*kháw cà? tǎn yùu bâan*
PRON IRR must stay house
LT: 'The rain falls tomorrow. He has to stay in the house.'
IM: 'If the rain falls tomorrow, he has to stay in the house.'

The example (2-2-2-1)-(c1) is not acceptable for the intended meaning (i.e. conditional) shown above. Nonetheless, it is acceptable for a causal meaning: 'As/Because the rain falls tomorrow, he has to stay in the house'. That is, at Level II, when parataxis proper is employed and the clause order is '[X] + [Y]', a causal reading is acceptable, but a conditional reading is not.

The example (2-2-2-1)-(c2), which contains the I-CLM *lâkô* 'and then', is acceptable for the intended meaning (i.e. conditional). It is an instance of (ii-1) Coordination proper.

Coordination proper

- (2-2-2-1)-(c2) [*phrûn ní fǒn tòk* *lâkô*
tomorrow rain fall and.then
[*kháw cà? tǎn yùu bâan*
PRON IRR must stay house
LT: 'The rain falls tomorrow, and then he has to stay in the house.'
IM: 'If the rain falls tomorrow, he has to stay in the house.'

Quasi-coordination

- (2-2-2-1)-(c3) s[*thâa phrûn ní fǒn tòk* *lâkô*
if tomorrow rain fall and.then
M[*kháw kô cà? tǎn yùu bâan*
PRON then IRR must stay house
LT: 'If the rain falls tomorrow, and then he has to stay in the house.'
- (2-2-2-1)-(c4) * s[*nay mûa* *phrûn ní fǒn tòk* *lâkô*
if tomorrow rain fall and.then
M[*kháw kô cà? tǎn yùu bâan*
PRON then IRR must stay house
LT: 'If the rain falls tomorrow, and then he has to stay in the house.'

Quasi-parataxis

- (2-2-2-1)-(c5) * [phrûŋ níi fǒn tòk]
tomorrow rain fall
[khǎw kô cà? tŏŋ yùu bâan]
PRON then IRR must stay house
LT: 'The rain falls tomorrow, then he has to stay in the house.'
IM: 'If the rain falls tomorrow, he has to stay in the house.'

The example (2-2-2-1)-(c5) is not acceptable for a conditional meaning, but it is acceptable for a causal meaning.

(d) Parataxis proper: [Y] + [X]

- (2-2-2-1)-(d1) * [khǎw cà? tŏŋ yùu bâan]
PRON IRR must stay house
[phrûŋ níi fǒn tòk]
tomorrow rain fall
LT: 'He must stay in the house. Tomorrow the rain falls.'
IM: 'He has to stay in the house, if the rain falls tomorrow.'

- (2-2-2-2) If the child is/becomes hungry, he/she will surely cry.

(a) Subordination proper: s[X] + m[Y]

- (2-2-2-2)-(a1) s[thâa dèk khon níi hǐw khâaw]
if child CLF this be.hungry rice
m[(khǎw) cà? tŏŋ rǒŋ hây]
(PRON) IRR must cry
LT: 'If this child is/becomes hungry (for) rice, (he) must cry.'

Consultant TM comments that (2-2-2-2)-(a1) sounds natural if it does not contain the epistemic modal marker *tŏŋ* 'must'. This comment applies to all the sentences of (2-2-2-2) below.

Quasi-subordination

- (2-2-2-2)-(a2) s[thâa dèk khon níi hǐw khâaw]
if child CLF this be.hungry rice
m[(khǎw) kô cà? tŏŋ rǒŋ hây]
(PRON) then IRR must cry
LT: 'If this child is/becomes hungry (for) rice, then (he) must cry.'

Subordination proper

- (2-2-2-2)-(a3) * s[nay mûa dèk khon níi hǐw khâaw]
if child CLF this be.hungry rice

_M[(*kháw*) *cà?* *tôn* *rón* *hây*]

(PRON) IRR must cry

IM: 'If this child is/becomes hungry (for) rice, (he) must cry.'

Quasi-subordination

(2-2-2-2)-(a4) *_s[nay mûa dèk khon níi hǐw khâaw]
if child CLF this be.hungry rice

_M[(*kháw*) *kô* *cà?* *tôn* *róon hây*]

(PRON) then IRR must cry

IM: 'If this child is/becomes hungry (for) rice, then (he) must cry.'

(b) Subordination proper: ${}_M[Y] + {}_S[X]$

(2-2-2-2)-(b1) _M[*dək* *khon* *níi* *càʔ* *tôŋ* *róŋ hây*]
 child CLF this IRR must cry

s[thâa (kháw) hǎw khâaw]

if (PRON) be.hungry rice

LT: 'This child must cry if (he) is/becomes hungry (for) rice.'

(2-2-2-2)-(b2) *_M[*dək khon ní cà? tɔŋ rɔɔŋ hây*]
 child CLF this IRR must cry

s[nay mũa (kháw) hǎw khâaw]

if (PRON) be.hungry rice

LT: 'This child must cry if (he) is/becomes hungry (for) rice.'

(c) Parataxis proper: $[X] + [Y]$

(2-2-2)-(c1) * [dèk khon níi hǐw khâaw]
child CLF this be.hungry rice

[*kháw cà? tôŋ rɔɔŋ hây*]

PRON IRR must cry

LT: 'This child is/becomes hungry (for) rice. He must cry.'

IM: 'If this child is/becomes hungry (for) rice, he must cry.'

The example (2-2-2)-(c2), which contains the I-CLM *lâkô* ‘and then’, is acceptable for the intended meaning (i.e. conditional). It is an instance of (ii-1) Coordination proper.

Coordination proper

(2-2-2-2)-(c2) [dèk khon nǐi hǐw khâaw] lâkô
child CLF this be.hungry rice and.then

[*kháw cà? tôŋ rɔɔŋ hây*]

PRON	IRR	must	cry
------	-----	------	-----

LT: 'This child is/becomes hungry (for) rice, and then he

must cry.'

IM: 'If this child is/becomes hungry (for) rice, he must cry.'

Quasi-coordination

- (2-2-2-2)-(c3) s[thâa dèk khon níi hǐw khâaw] lâkô
 if child CLF this be.hungry rice and.then
 M[(kháw) kô cà? tôŋ róŋ hây]
 (PRON) then IRR must cry
 LT: 'If this child is/becomes hungry (for) rice, and then (he) must cry.'
 (2-2-2-2)-(c4) * s[nay mûa dèk khon níi hǐw khâaw]
 if child CLF this be.hungry rice
lâkô M[(kháw) kô cà? tôŋ róŋ hây]
 ane.then (PRON) then IRR must cry
 IM: 'If this child is/becomes hungry (for) rice, and then (he) must cry.'

Quasi-parataxis

- (2-2-2-2)-(c5) * [dèk khon níi hǐw khâaw]
 child CLF this be.hungry rice
 [kháw kô cà? tôŋ róŋ hây]
 PRON then IRR must cry
 LT: 'This child is/becomes hungry (for) rice, then he must cry.'
 IM: 'If this child is/becomes hungry (for) rice, he must cry.'

The example (2-2-2-2)-(c5) is not acceptable for a conditional meaning, but it is acceptable for a causal meaning.

(d) Parataxis proper: [Y] + [X]

- (2-2-2-2)-(d1) * [dèk khon níi cà? tôŋ róŋ hây]
 child CLF this IRR must cry
 [kháw hǐw khâaw]
 PRON be.hungry rice
 LT: 'This child must cry. The child is/becomes hungry (for) rice.'
 IM: 'This child must cry if he is/becomes hungry (for) rice.'

5.3 Conditionals Level III

Subordinate clause: situation. Main clause: situation + interpersonal effect.

(2-2-3-1) Don't go out if rain falls.

(a) Subordination proper: s[X] + M[Y]

- (2-2-3-1)-(a1) * s[thâa fǒn tòk]
 if rain fall
 M[(*khun*) yàa ?òòk pay khâη nòòk sìʔ]
 (PRON) PROH exit go outside PRT
 LT: ‘If the rain falls, (you) don’t go out (, I order you so).’

Quasi-subordination

- (2-2-3-1)-(a2) s[thâa fǒn tòk]
 if rain fall
 M[(*khun*) kô yàa ?òòk pay khâη nòòk sìʔ]
 (PRON) then PROH exit go outside PRT
 LT: ‘If the rain falls, then (you) don’t go out (, I order you so).’

The example (2-2-3-1)-(a1) is not acceptable. (However, Consultant TM considers it marginally acceptable.) In contrast, (2-2-3-1)-(a2) is acceptable; it contains the AP-CLM *kô* ‘then, so’. It is an instance of (i-2) Quasi-subordination. The same applies to (2-2-3-1)-(a3) and (2-2-3-1)-(a4).

Subordination proper

- (2-2-3-1)-(a3) * s[nay mûa fǒn tòk]
 if rain fall
 M[(*khun*) yàa ?òòk pay khâη nòòk sìʔ]
 (PRON) PROH exit go outside PRT
 LT: ‘If the rain falls, (you) don’t go out (, I order you so).’

Quasi-subordination

- (2-2-3-1)-(a4) s[nay mûa fǒn tòk]
 if rain fall
 M[(*khun*) kô yàa ?òòk pay khâη nòòk sìʔ]
 (PRON) then PROH exit go outside
 PRT
 LT: ‘If the rain falls, then (you) don’t go out (, I order you so).’

(b) Subordination proper: M[Y] + s[X]

- (2-2-3-1)-(b1) M[(*khun*) yàa ?òòk pay khâη nòòk sìʔ]
 (PRON) PROH exit go outside PRT
 s[thâa fǒn tòk]
 if rain fall
 LT: ‘(You) don’t go out (, I order you so), if the rain falls.’
- (2-2-3-1)-(b2) * M[(*khun*) yàa ?òòk pay khâη nòòk sìʔ]
 (PRON) PROH exit go outside PRT
 s[nay mûa fǒn tòk]
 if rain fall
 LT: ‘(You) don’t go out (, I order you so), if the rain falls.’

- (c) Parataxis proper: [X] + [Y]
 (2-2-3-1)-(c1) * [*fǒn tòk*]
 rain fall
 [(*khun*) *yàa* *ʔòɔk pay khâŋ nɔ̀ɔk sìʔ*]
 (PRON) PROH exit go outside PRT
 LT: ‘The rain falls. (You) don’t go out (, I order you so).’
 IM: ‘If the rain falls, (you) don’t go out (, I order you so).’

The example (2-2-3-1)-(c1) is not acceptable for the intended meaning (i.e. conditional) shown above. Nonetheless, it is acceptable for a causal meaning if the subordinate clause contains the continuous aspect marker *yùu* ‘CONT’: ‘As/Because the rain is falling, (you) don’t go out (, I order you so).’ That is, at Level III, when parataxis proper is employed and the clause order is ‘[X] + [Y]’, a causal reading is acceptable, but a conditional reading is not.

The example (2-2-3-1)-(c2), which contains the I-CLM *lâkô* ‘and then’, is not acceptable for the intended meaning (i.e. conditional). It is an instance of (ii-1) Coordination proper. Like (2-2-3-1)-(c1) above, it is acceptable for a causal meaning if the subordinate clause contains the continuous aspect marker *yùu* ‘CONT’: ‘The rain is falling, and so (you) don’t go out (, I order you so).’

- Coordination proper
 (2-2-3-1)-(c2) * [*fǒn tòk*] *lâkô*
 rain fall and.then
 [(*khun*) *yàa* *ʔòɔk pay khâŋ nɔ̀ɔk sìʔ*]
 (PRON) PROH exit go outside PRT
 LT: ‘The rain falls, and then (you) don’t go out (, I order you so).’
 IM: ‘If the rain falls, (you) don’t go out (, I order you so).’

Consultant TM considers (2-2-3-1)-(c2) acceptable. She comments that it sounds natural if the final particle *sìʔ* ‘PRT’ is replaced with the final particle *náʔ* ‘PRT’.

- Quasi-coordination
 (2-2-3-1)-(c3) s[*thâa fǒn tòk*] *lâkô*
 if rain fall and.then
 _M[(*khun*) *kô* *yàa* *ʔòɔk pay khâŋ nɔ̀ɔk sìʔ*]
 (PRON) then PROH exit go outside PRT
 LT: ‘If the rain falls, and then (you) don’t go out (, I order you so).’
 (2-2-3-1)-(c4) * s[*nay mûa fǒk tòk*] *lâkô*
 if rain fall and.then
 _M[(*khun*) *kô* *yàa* *ʔòɔk pay khâŋ nɔ̀ɔk*
 (PRON) then PROH exit go outside

sìʔ

PRT

LT: 'If the rain falls, and then (you) don't go out (, I order you so).'

Quasi-parataxis

(2-2-3-1)-(c5) * [*fǒn tòk*]

rain fall

[(*khun*) *kô* *yàa* *ʔòk* *pay* *khâŋ nòk* *sìʔ*]

(PRON) then PROH exit go outside PRT

LT: 'The rain falls, then (you) don't go out (, I order you so).'

IM: 'If the rain falls, (you) don't go out (, I order you so).'

Like (2-2-3-1)-(c1), -(c2) above, (2-2-3-1)-(c5) is not acceptable for a conditional meaning, but it is acceptable for a causal meaning if the subordinate clause contains the continuous aspect marker *yùu* 'CONT': 'The rain is falling, so (you) don't go out (, I order you so).'

 However, Consultant TM considers it acceptable for a conditional meaning.

(d) Parataxis proper: [Y] + [X]

(2-2-3-1)-(d1) * [(*khun*) *yàa* *ʔòk* *pay* *khâŋ nòk* *sìʔ*]

(PRON) PROH exit go outside PRT

[*fǒn tòk*]

rain fall

LT: '(You) don't go out (, I order you so). The rain falls.'

IM: '(You) don't go out (, I order you so), if the rain falls.'

The example (2-2-3-1)-(d1) is not acceptable for the intended meaning (i.e. conditional) shown above. Nonetheless, it is acceptable for a causal meaning if the subordinate clause contains the continuous aspect marker *yùu* 'CONT': '(You) don't go out (, I order you so), because the rain is falling'.

(2-2-3-2) Give the child food if he/she is/becomes hungry.

(a) Subordination proper: s[X] + m[Y]

(2-2-3-2)-(a1) * s[*thâa* *dèk* *khon* *nán* *hǐw* *khâaw*]

if child CLF that be.hungry rice

m[(*khun*) *ʔaw* *ʔaahǎan* *hây* *kháw* *sìʔ*]

(PRON) take dishes give PRON PRT

LT: 'If that child is/becomes hungry (for) rice, (you) give him dishes (, I order you so).'

Quasi-subordination

(2-2-3-2)-(a2) s[*thâa* *dèk* *khon* *nán* *hǐw* *khâaw*]

if child CLF that be.hungry rice

$M[(khun) \text{ } kô \text{ } ?aw \text{ } ?aahăan \text{ } hây \text{ } kháw \text{ } sî?]$
 (PRON) then take dishes give PRON PRT
 LT: 'If that child is/becomes hungry (for) rice, then (you) give him dishes (, I order you so).'

The example (2-2-3-2)-(a1) is not acceptable. (However, Consultant TM considers it acceptable.) In contrast, (2-2-3-2)-(a2) is acceptable; it contains the AP-CLM *kô* 'then, so'. It is an instance of (i-2) Quasi-subordination. The same applies to (2-2-3-2)-(a3) and (2-2-3-2)-(a4).

Subordination proper

(2-2-3-2)-(a3) * $s[nay \text{ } mûa \text{ } dèk \text{ } khon \text{ } nán \text{ } hǐw \text{ } khâaw]$
 if child CLF that be.hungry rice
 $M[(khun) \text{ } ?aw \text{ } ?aahăan \text{ } hây \text{ } kháw \text{ } sî?]$
 (PRON) take dishes give PRON PRT
 LT: 'If that child is/becomes hungry (for) rice, (you) give him dishes (, I order you so).'

Quasi-subordination

(2-2-3-2)-(a4) $s[nay \text{ } mûa \text{ } dèk \text{ } khon \text{ } nán \text{ } hǐw \text{ } khâaw]$
 if child CLF that be.hungry rice
 $M[(khun) \text{ } kô \text{ } ?aw \text{ } ?aahăan \text{ } hây \text{ } kháw \text{ } sî?]$
 (PRON) then take dishes give PRON PRT
 LT: 'If that child is/becomes hungry (for) rice, then (you) give him dishes (, I order you so).'

Consultant TM comments that (2-2-3-2)-(a4) sounds natural if it contains the deontic modal marker *khuan* 'should, ought to' in front of the phrase *?aw ?aahăan hây kháw* 'to give him dishes' in the main clause ('If that child is/becomes hungry for rice, then you should give him dishes (, I order you so)').

(b) Subordination proper: $M[Y] + s[X]$

(2-2-3-2)-(b1) $M[(khun) \text{ } ?aw \text{ } ?aahăan \text{ } hây \text{ } dèk \text{ } khon \text{ } nán \text{ } sî?]$
 (PRON) take dishes give child CLF that
 PRT
 $s[thâa \text{ } kháw \text{ } hǐw \text{ } khâaw]$
 if PRON be.hungry rice
 LT: '(You) give that child dishes, if he is/becomes hungry (for) rice.'

(2-2-3-2)-(b2) $M[(khun) \text{ } ?aw \text{ } ?aahăan \text{ } hây \text{ } dèk \text{ } khon \text{ } nán \text{ } sî?]$
 (PRON) take dishes give child CLF that
 PRT
 $s[nay \text{ } mûa \text{ } kháw \text{ } hǐw \text{ } khâaw]$
 if PRON be.hungry rice

LT: '(You) give that child dishes (, I order you so), if he is/becomes hungry (for) rice.'

Consultant TM considers (2-2-3-2)-(b2) not acceptable.

(c)Parataxis proper: [X] + [Y]

- (2-2-3-2)-(c1) * [dèk khon nán hǐw khâaw]
 child CLF that be.hungry rice
 [(khun) ?aw ?aahǎan hây kháw sì?]
 (PRON) take dishes give PRON PRT
 LT: 'That child is/becomes hungry (for) rice. (You) give him dishes (, I order you so).'
- IM: 'If that child is/becomes hungry (for) rice, (you) give him dishes (, I order you so).'

The example (2-2-3-2)-(c1) is not acceptable for the intended meaning shown above (i.e. conditional). Nonetheless, it is acceptable for a causal meaning: 'As/Because that child is/becomes hungry (for) rice, (you) give him dishes (, I order you so)'. That is, at Level III, when parataxis proper is employed and the clause order is '[X] + [Y]', a causal reading is acceptable, but a conditional reading is not.

The example (2-2-3-2)-(c2), which contains the I-CLM *lâkô* 'and then', is not acceptable. (However, Consultant TM considers it acceptable.) It is an instance of (ii-1) Coordination proper.

Coordination proper

- (2-2-3-2)-(c2) * [dèk khon nán hǐw khâaw] lâkô
 child CLF that be.hungry rice and.then
 [(khun) ?aw ?aahǎan hây kháw sì?]
 (PRON) take dishes give PRON PRT
 LT: 'That child is/becomes hungry (for) rice, and then (you) give him dishes (, I order you so).'
- IM: 'If that child is/becomes hungry (for) rice, (you) give him dishes (, I order you so).'

Quasi-coordination

- (2-2-3-2)-(c3) s[thâa dèk khon nán hǐw khâaw]
 if child CLF that be.hungry rice
lâkô
 and.then
 M[(khun) kô ?aw ?aahǎan hây kháw sì?]
 (PRON) then take dishes give PRON PRT
 LT: 'If that child is/becomes hungry (for) rice, and then (you) give him dishes (, I order you so).'
- (2-2-3-2)-(c4) s[nay mûa dèk khon nán hǐw khâaw]
 if child CLF that be.hungry rice

lākō

and.then

_M[(*khun*) kō *ʔaw ʔaahǎan hây kháw sìʔ*]

(PRON) then take dishes give PRON PRT

LT: 'If that child is/becomes hungry (for) rice, and then (you) give him dishes (, I order you so).'

Quasi-parataxis

(2-2-3-2)-(c5) * [*dèk khon nán hǐw khâaw*]

child CLF that be.hungry rice

[(*khun*) kō *ʔaw ʔaahǎan hây kháw sìʔ*]

(PRON) then take dishes give PRON PRT

LT: 'That child is/becomes hungry (for) rice, then (you) give him dishes (, I order you so).'

IM: 'If that child is/becomes hungry (for) rice, (you) give him dishes (, I order you so).'

(d) Parataxis proper: [Y] + [X]

(2-2-3-2)-(d1) * [(*khun*) *ʔaw ʔaahǎan hây dèk khon nán*]

(PRON) take dishes give child CLF that

sìʔ

PRT

[*kháw hǐw khâaw*]

PRON be.hungry rice

LT: '(You) give that child dishes (, I order you so). He is/becomes hungry (for) rice.'

IM: '(You) give that child food (, I order you so), if he is/becomes hungry (for) rice.'

The example (2-2-3-2)-(d1) is not acceptable for the intended meaning shown above (i.e. conditional). Nonetheless, it is acceptable for a causal meaning: '(You) give the child food (, I order you so), as/because he is/becomes hungry'. That is, again, at Level III, when parataxis proper is employed and the clause order is '[Y] + [X]', a causal reading is acceptable, but a conditional reading is not. However, Consultant TM considers it to be acceptable for a conditional meaning.

5.4 Conditionals Level IV

Subordinate clause: premise. Main clause: judgement.

(2-2-4-1) If the ground is wet, rain fell.

IM: IF the ground is wet, I GUESS/SUPPOSE/ INFER/ CONCLUDE THAT rain fell.

(a) Subordination proper: _s[X] + _M[Y]

(2-2-4-1)-(a1) * _s[*thâa phúuun pìak*]

if ground be.wet

M[*fǒn tòk léɛw*]
rain fall PFV

LT: 'If the ground is wet, the rain has fallen.'

Quasi-subordination

(2-2-4-1)-(a2) * s[*thâa phúuun pìak*]
if ground be.wet

M[*fǒn kô tòk léɛw*]
rain then fall PFV

LT: 'If the ground is wet, then the rain has fallen.'

Subordination proper

(2-2-4-1)-(a3) s[*thâa phúuun pìak*]
if ground be.wet

M[*fǒn khoŋ tòk léɛw láʔ máŋ*]
rain probably fall PFV PRT PRT

LT: 'If the ground is wet, probably the rain has fallen.'

Quasi-subordination

(2-2-4-1)-(a4) s[*thâa phúuun pìak*]
if ground be.wet

M[*fǒn kô khoŋ tòk léɛw láʔ máŋ*]
rain then probably fall PFV PRT PRT

LT: 'If the ground is wet, then probably the rain has fallen.'

The example (2-2-4-1)-(a1), -(a2) are not acceptable. In contrast, (2-2-4-1)-(a3), -(a4) are acceptable. They contain *khoŋ ... máŋ* 'probably'. The same applies to (2-2-4-1)-(a5) to -(a8).

Subordination proper

(2-2-4-1)-(a5) * s[*nay mûa phúuun pìak*]
if ground be.wet

M[*fǒn tòk léɛw*]
rain fall PFV

LT: 'If the ground is wet, the rain has fallen.'

Quasi-subordination

(2-2-4-1)-(a6) * s[*nay mûa phúuun pìak*]
if ground be.wet

M[*fǒn kô tòk léɛw*]
rain then fall PFV

LT: 'If the ground is wet, then the rain has fallen.'

Subordination proper

(2-2-4-1)-(a7) s[*nay mûa phúuun pìak*]
if ground be.wet

$_M[f\ddot{o}n \quad kho\eta \quad t\grave{o}k \quad l\acute{e}w \quad l\acute{a}?\quad m\acute{a}\eta]$
rain probably fall PFV PRT PRT
LT: ‘If the ground is wet, probably the rain has fallen.’

Quasi-subordination

(2-2-4-1)-(a8) $s[\underline{nay \ m\acute{u}a} \quad ph\acute{u}um \quad piak]$
if ground be.wet
 $_M[f\ddot{o}n \quad \underline{k\hat{o}} \quad kho\eta \quad t\grave{o}k \quad l\acute{e}w \quad l\acute{a}?\quad m\acute{a}\eta]$
rain then probably fall PFV PRT PRT
LT: ‘If the ground is wet, then probably the rain has fallen.’

Consultant TM considers (2-2-4-1)-(a8) marginally acceptable. She comments that (2-2-4-1)-(a7) without the AP-CLM *kô* ‘then’ is better than (2-2-4-1)-(a8) with it.

(b) Subordination proper: $_M[Y] + s[X]$
(2-2-4-1)-(b1) $*_M[f\ddot{o}n \quad t\grave{o}k \quad l\acute{e}w]$
rain fall PFV
 $s[\underline{th\acute{a}a} \quad ph\acute{u}um \quad piak]$
if ground be.wet
LT: ‘The rain has fallen, if the ground is wet.’
(2-2-4-1)-(b2) $_M[f\ddot{o}n \quad kho\eta \quad t\grave{o}k \quad l\acute{e}w \quad l\acute{a}?\quad m\acute{a}\eta]$
rain probably fall PFV PRT PRT
 $s[\underline{th\acute{a}a} \quad ph\acute{u}um \quad piak]$
if ground be.wet
LT: ‘Probably the rain has fallen, if the ground is wet.’

The example (2-2-4-1)-(b1) is not acceptable. In contrast, (2-2-4-1)-(b2) is acceptable. It contains *khoη* ... *máη* ‘probably’. The same applies to (2-2-4-1)-(b3) and (2-2-4-1)-(b4).

(2-2-4-1)-(b3) $*_M[f\ddot{o}n \quad t\grave{o}k \quad l\acute{e}w]$
rain fall PFV
 $s[\underline{nay \ m\acute{u}a} \quad ph\acute{u}um \quad piak]$
if ground be.wet
LT: ‘The rain has fallen, if the ground is wet.’
(2-2-4-1)-(b4) $_M[f\ddot{o}n \quad kho\eta \quad t\grave{o}k \quad l\acute{e}w \quad l\acute{a}?\quad m\acute{a}\eta]$
rain probably fall PFV PRT PRT
 $s[\underline{nay \ m\acute{u}a} \quad ph\acute{u}um \quad piak]$
if ground be.wet
LT: ‘Probably the rain has fallen, if the ground is wet.’

(c) Parataxis proper: $[X] + [Y]$
(2-2-4-1)-(c1) $*[ph\acute{u}um \quad piak]$
ground be.wet

- [*fǒn* *tòk* *léɛw*]
rain fall PFV
LT: 'The ground is wet. The rain has fallen.'
- (2-2-4-1)-(c2) * [*phúuun* *pìak*]
ground be.wet
[*fǒn* *khon* *tòk* *léɛw* *láʔ* *máŋ*]
rain probably fall PFV PRT PRT
LT: 'The ground is wet. Probably the rain has fallen.'
IM: 'If the ground is wet, I suppose/etc. that probably the rain has fallen.'

The example (2-2-4-1)-(c2) is not acceptable for the intended meaning (conditional) shown above. This is despite the fact that it contains *khon* ... *máŋ* 'probably'. At Level IV, generally parataxis proper cannot have a conditional reading, even when *khon* ... *máŋ* 'probably' is added. (2-2-4-2)-(c2) is an exception. It is acceptable for a causal meaning: 'Because/As the ground is wet, I suppose/etc. that the rain has fallen'. That is, at Level IV, when parataxis proper is employed and the clause order is '[X] + [Y]', a causal reading is acceptable, but a conditional reading is not.

The examples (2-2-4-1)-(c3), -(c4), which contain the I-CLM *lâkô* 'and then', are not acceptable. They are instances of (ii-1) Coordination proper.

Coordination proper

- (2-2-4-1)-(c3) * [*phúuun* *pìak*] *lâkô*
ground be.wet and.then
[*fǒn* *tòk* *léɛw*]
rain fall PFV
LT: 'The ground is wet, and then the rain has fallen.'
IM: 'If the ground is wet, I suppose/etc. that the rain has fallen.'
- (2-2-4-1)-(c4) * [*phúuun* *pìak*] *lâkô*
ground be.wet and.then
[*fǒn* *khon* *tòk* *léɛw* *láʔ* *máŋ*]
rain probably fall PFV PRT PRT
LT: 'The ground is wet, and then probably the rain has fallen.'
IM: 'If the ground is wet, I suppose/etc. that probably the rain has fallen.'

Consultant TM considers (2-2-4-1)-(c4) acceptable.

Quasi-coordination

- (2-2-4-1)-(c5) * s[*thâa* *phúuun* *pìak*] *lâkô*
if ground be.wet and.then
M[*fǒn* *kô* *tòk* *léɛw*]
rain then fall PFV
LT: 'If the ground is wet, and then the rain has fallen.'

- (2-2-4-1)-(c6) s[thâa *phúuun* *piak*] lákô
 if ground be.wet and.then
 M[*fǒn* kô *khon* *tòk* *léew* *lá?* *máŋ*]
 rain then probably fall PFV PRT PRT
 LT: 'If the ground is wet, and then probably the rain has fallen.'
- (2-2-4-1)-(c7) * s[nay mûa *phúuun* *piak*] lákô
 if ground be.wet and.then
 M[*fǒn* kô *tòk* *léew*]
 rain then fall PFV
 LT: 'If the ground is wet, and then the rain has fallen.'
- (2-2-4-1)-(c8) s[nay mûa *phúuun* *piak*] lákô
 if ground be.wet and.then
 M[*fǒn* kô *khon* *tòk* *léew* *lá?* *máŋ*]
 rain then probably fall PFV PRT PRT
 LT: 'If the ground is wet, and then probably the rain has fallen.'

Consultant TM considers (2-2-4-1)-(c8) not acceptable.

Quasi-parataxis

- (2-2-4-1)-(c9) * [*phúuun* *piak*]
 ground be.wet
 [*fǒn* kô *tòk* *léew*]
 rain then fall PFV
 LT: 'The ground is wet, then the rain has fallen.'
- (2-2-4-1)-(c10) ? [*phúuun* *piak*]
 ground be.wet
 [*fǒn* kô *khon* *tòk* *léew* *lá?* *máŋ*]
 rain then probably fall PFV PRT PRT
 LT: 'The ground is wet, then probably the rain has fallen.'
 IM: 'If the ground is wet, I suppose/etc. that probably the rain has fallen.'

Consultant TM considers (2-2-4-1)-(c10) acceptable.

(d) Parataxis proper: [Y] + [X]

- (2-2-4-1)-(d1) * [*fǒn* *tòk* *léew*]
 rain fall PFV
 [*phúuun* *piak*]
 ground be.wet
 LT: 'The rain has fallen. The ground is wet.'
- (2-2-4-1)-(d2) [*fǒn* *khon* *tòk* *léew* *lá?* *máŋ*]
 rain probably fall PFV PRT PRT
 [*phúuun* *piak*]
 ground be.wet
 LT: 'Probably the rain has fallen. The ground is wet.'

IM: 'If the ground is wet, I suppose/etc. that probably the rain has fallen.'

(2-2-4-2) If the child is crying, he/she is hungry.

IM: IF the child is crying, I GUESS/SUPPOSE/INFER/
CONCLUDE THAT he/she is hungry.

(a) Subordination proper: s[X] + m[Y]

(2-2-4-2)-(a1) * s[*thâa dèk khon ní rǒɔŋ hây*]

if child CLF this cry

m[*kháw hǐw khâaw léɛw*]

PRON be.hungry rice PFV

LT: 'If this child cries, he becomes hungry (for) rice.'

Quasi-subordinaton

(2-2-4-2)-(a2) * s[*thâa dèk khon ní rǒɔŋ hây*]

if child CLF this cry

m[*kháw kô hǐw khâaw léɛw*]

PRON then be.hungry rice PFV

LT: 'If this child cries, then he becomes hungry (for) rice.'

Subordination proper

(2-2-4-2)-(a3) s[*thâa dèk khon ní rǒɔŋ hây*]

if child CLF this cry

m[*kháw khon hǐw khâaw léɛw lá?*]

PRON probably be.hungry rice PFV PRT

máŋ]

PRT

LT: 'If this child cries, probably he becomes hungry (for)

rice.'

Quasi-subordinaton

(2-2-4-2)-(a4) s[*thâa dèk khon ní rǒɔŋ hây*]

if child CLF this cry

m[*kháw kô khon hǐw khâaw léɛw*]

PRON then probably be.hungry rice PFV

lá? máŋ]

PRT PRT

LT: 'If this child cries, then probably he becomes hungry (for) rice.'

The example (2-2-4-2)-(a1), -(a2) are not acceptable. In contrast, (2-2-4-2)-(a3), -(a4) are acceptable. They contain *khon ... máŋ* 'probably'. (However, Consultant TM considers (2-2-4-2)-(a4) not acceptable. She comments that it is acceptable if the main clause changes into the following: *kô khon pen phrǒ? kháw hǐw khâaw léɛw lá? máŋ* 'then (it) is probably because he becomes hungry for rice'.) The same applies to (2-2-4-2)-(a5), -(a6) and (2-2-4-2)-(a7), -(a8).

Subordination proper

- (2-2-4-2)-(a5) * s[nay mûa *dèk khon ní rǒɔŋ hây*]
 if child CLF this cry
 M[*kháw hǐw khâaw léew*]
 PRON be.hungry rice PFV
 LT: 'If this child cries, he becomes hungry (for) rice.'

Quasi-subordination

- (2-2-4-2)-(a6) * s[nay mûa *dèk khon ní rǒɔŋ hây*]
 if child CLF this cry
 M[*kháw kô hǐw khâaw léew*]
 PRON then be.hungry rice PFV
 LT: 'If this child cries, then he becomes hungry (for) rice.'

Subordination proper

- (2-2-4-2)-(a7) s[nay mûa *dèk khon ní rǒɔŋ hây*]
 if child CLF this cry
 M[*kháw khon hǐw khâaw léew lá?*]
 PRON probably be.hungry rice PFV PRT
máŋ
 PRT
 LT: 'If this child cries, probably he becomes hungry (for) rice.'

Quasi-subordination

- (2-2-4-2)-(a8) s[nay mûa *dèk khon ní rǒɔŋ hây*]
 if child CLF this cry
 M[*kháw kô khon hǐw khâaw léew lá? máŋ*]
 PRON then probably be.hungry rice PFV PRT PRT
 LT: 'If this child cries, then probably he becomes hungry (for) rice.'

(b) Subordination proper: M[Y] + s[X]

- (2-2-4-2)-(b1) * M[*dèk khon ní hǐw khâaw léew*]
 child CLF this be.hungry rice PFV
 s[thâa *kháw rǒɔŋ hây*]
 if PRON cry
 LT: 'This child becomes hungry (for) rice, if he cries.'
- (2-2-4-2)-(b2) M[*dèk khon ní khon hǐw khâaw léew lá? máŋ*]
 child CLF this probably be.hungry rice PFV PRT PRT
 s[thâa *kháw rǒɔŋ hây*]
 if PRON cry
 LT: 'Probably this child becomes hungry (for) rice, if he

cries.’

The example (2-2-4-2)-(b1) is not acceptable. In contrast, (2-2-4-2)-(b2) is acceptable. It contains *khon ... mǎŋ* ‘probably’. The same applies to (2-2-4-2)-(b3) and (2-2-4-2)-(b4). (However, Consultant TM considers (2-2-4-2)-(b4) not acceptable.)

- (2-2-4-2)-(b3) *_M[*dèk khon níi hǐw khâaw léew*]
 child CLF this be.hungry rice PFV
 s[*nay mûa khǎw rǒŋ hây*]
 if PRON cry
 LT: ‘This child becomes hungry (for) rice, if he cries.’
- (2-2-4-2)-(b4) _M[*dèk khon níi khon hǐw khâaw léew lá? mǎŋ*]
 child CLF this probably be.hungry rice PFV PRT PRT
 s[*nay mûa khǎw rǒŋ hây*]
 if PRON cry
 LT: ‘Probably this child becomes hungry (for) rice, if he cries.’
- (c) Parataxis proper: [X] + [Y]
- (2-2-4-2)-(c1) * [*dèk khon níi rǒŋ hây*]
 child CLF this cry
 [*khǎw hǐw khâaw léew*]
 PRON be.hungry rice PFV
 LT: ‘This child cries. He becomes hungry (for) rice.’
- (2-2-4-2)-(c2) [*dèk khon níi rǒŋ hây*]
 child CLF this cry
 [*khǎw khon hǐw khâaw léew lá? mǎŋ*]
 PRON probably be.hungry rice PFV PRT
 PRT
 LT: ‘This child cries. Probably he becomes hungry (for) rice.’
 IM: ‘If this child cries, I suppose/etc. that probably he becomes hungry (for) rice.’

The example (2-2-4-2)-(c1) is not acceptable. In contrast, (2-2-4-2)-(c2) is acceptable. It contains *khon ... mǎŋ* ‘probably’. It is an exception to the tendency noted above that at Level IV parataxis proper cannot have a conditional reading, even when *khon ... mǎŋ* ‘probably’ is added.

The examples (2-2-4-2)-(c3), -(c4), which contain the I-CLM *lākô* ‘and then’, are not acceptable. They are instances of (ii-1) Coordination proper.

Coordination proper

- (2-2-4-2)-(c3) * [*dèk khon ní rǒɔŋ hây*] *lâkô*
 child CLF this cry and.then
 [*kháw hǐw khâaw léɛw*]
 PRON be.hungry rice PFV
 LT: 'This child cries, and then he becomes hungry (for) rice.'
- (2-2-4-2)-(c4) * [*dèk khon ní rǒɔŋ hây*] *lâkô*
 child CLF this cry and.then
 [*kháw khon hǐw khâaw léɛw lá?*]
 PRON probably be.hungry rice PFV PRT
máŋ
 PRT
 LT: 'This child cries. Probably he becomes hungry (for) rice.'
 IM: 'If this child cries, and then I suppose/etc. that probably he becomes hungry (for) rice.'

Consultant TM considers (2-2-4-2)-(c4) acceptable.

Quasi-coordination

- (2-2-4-2)-(c5) * s[*thâa dèk khon ní rǒɔŋ hây*] *lâkô*
 if child CLF this cry and.then
 M[*kháw kô hǐw khâaw léɛw*]
 PRON then be.hungry rice PFV
 LT: 'If this child cries, and then he becomes hungry (for) rice.'
- (2-2-4-2)-(c6) s[*thâa dèk khon ní rǒɔŋ hây*] *lâkô*
 if child CLF this cry and.then
 M[*kháw kô khon hǐw khâaw léɛw*]
 PRON then probably be.hungry rice PFV
lá? máŋ
 PRT PRT
 LT: 'If this child cries, and then probably he becomes hungry (for) rice.'
- (2-2-4-2)-(c7) * s[*nay mûa dèk khon ní rǒɔŋ hây*] *lâkô*
 if child CLF this cry and.then
 M[*kháw kô hǐw khâaw léɛw*]
 PRON then be.hungry rice PFV
 LT: 'If this child cries, and then he becomes hungry (for) rice.'
- (2-2-4-2)-(c8) s[*nay mûa dèk khon ní rǒɔŋ hây*] *lâkô*
 if child CLF this cry and.then
 M[*kháw kô khon hǐw khâaw léɛw*]
 PRON then probably be.hungry rice PFV

láʔ máŋ]

PRT PRT

LT: 'If this child cries, and then probably he becomes hungry (for) rice.'

Quasi-parataxis

(2-2-4-2)-(c9) * [*dèk khon níi rɔɔŋ háy]*

child CLF this cry

[*kháw kô hǐw khâaw léɛw]*

PRON then be.hungry rice PFV

LT: 'This child cries, then he becomes hungry (for) rice.'

(2-2-4-2)-(c10) [*dèk khon níi rɔɔŋ háy]*

child CLF this cry

[*kháw kô khoŋ hǐw khâaw léɛw*

PRON then probably be.hungry rice PFV

láʔ máŋ]

PRT PRT

LT: 'This child cries, then probably he becomes hungry (for) rice.'

IM: 'If this child cries, I suppose/etc. that probably he becomes hungry (for) rice.'

Consultant TM considers (2-2-4-2)-(c10) not acceptable.

(d) Parataxis proper: [Y] + [X]

(2-2-4-2)-(d1) * [*dèk khon níi hǐw khâaw léɛw]*

child CLF this be.hungry rice PFV

[*kháw rɔɔŋ háy]*

PRON cry

LT: 'This child becomes hungry (for) rice. He cries.'

IM: 'If this child cries, I suppose/etc. that he becomes hungry (for) rice.'

(2-2-4-2)-(d2) * [*dèk khon níi khoŋ hǐw khâaw*

child CLF this probably be.hungry rice

léɛw láʔ máŋ]

PFV PRT PRT

[*kháw rɔɔŋ háy]*

PRON cry

LT: 'Probably this child becomes hungry (for) rice. He cries.'

IM: 'If this child cries, I suppose/etc. that probably he becomes hungry (for) rice.'

The example (2-2-4-2)-(d2) is not acceptable for the intended meaning (conditional) shown above. This is despite the fact that it contains *khōŋ ... máŋ* 'probably'. This sentence is acceptable for a causal meaning: 'As/Because probably this child becomes hungry [for] rice he cries'. That is,

again, at Level IV, when parataxis proper is employed and the clause order is '[Y] + [X]', a causal reading is acceptable, but a conditional reading is not.

5.5 Conditionals Level V

Subordinate clause: premise. Main clause: speech act.

(2-2-5-1) There is an umbrella here, if rain is falling.

IM: IF rain is falling, I SAY TO YOU THAT there is an umbrella here.

(a) Subordination proper: s[X] + m[Y]

(2-2-5-1)-(a1) s[thâa fǒn yaŋ tòk yùu]

if rain still fall CONT

m[rôm yùu troŋ níi náʔ]

umbrella be.located here PRT

LT: 'If the rain is still falling, an umbrella is located here, you know.'

(Rcall that *náʔ* 'I suggest to you so' is a particle, not a verb.)

Quasi-subordination

(2-2-5-1)-(a2) ? s[thâa fǒn yaŋ tòk yùu]

if rain still fall CONT

m[rôm kô yùu troŋ níi náʔ]

umbrella then be.located here PRT

LT: 'If the rain is still falling, then an umbrella is located here, you know.'

Consultant TM considers (2-2-5-1)-(a2) not acceptable.

Subordination proper

(2-2-5-1)-(a3) * s[nay mûa fǒn yaŋ tòk yùu]

if rain still fall CONT

m[rôm yùu troŋ níi náʔ]

umbrella be.located here PRT

IM: 'If the rain is still falling, an umbrella is located here (, I suggest you so).'

Quasi-subordination

(2-2-5-1)-(a4) * s[nay mûa fǒn yaŋ tòk yùu]

if rain still fall CONT

m[rôm kô yùu troŋ níi náʔ]

umbrella then be.located here PRT

IM: 'If the rain is still falling, then an umbrella is located here (, I suggest you so).'

Quasi-coordination

- (2-2-5-1)-(a5) ? s[thâa fǒn yaŋ tòk yùu] lâkô
 if rain still fall CONT and.then
 M[rôm kô yùu troŋ ní ná?]
 umbrella then be.located here PRT
 LT: 'If the rain is still falling, and then an umbrella is located here, you know.'
 (2-2-5-1)-(a6) * s[nay mûa fǒn yaŋ tòk yùu] lâkô
 if rain still fall CONT and.then
 M[rôm kô yùu troŋ ní ná?]
 umbrella then be.located here PRT
 IM: 'If the rain is still falling, and then an umbrella is located here (, I suggest you so).'

Consultant TM considers (2-2-5-1)-(a5) not acceptable.

- (b) Subordination proper: M[Y] + s[X]
 (2-2-5-1)-(b1) M[rôm yùu troŋ ní ná?]
 umbrella be.located here PRT
 s[thâa fǒn yaŋ tòk yùu]
 if rain still fall CONT
 LT: 'An umbrella is located here (, I suggest you so), if the rain is still falling.'
 (2-2-5-1)-(b2) * M[rôm yùu troŋ ní ná?]
 umbrella be.located here PRT
 s[nay mûa fǒn yaŋ tòk yùu]
 if rain still fall CONT
 IM: 'An umbrella is located here (, I suggest you so), if the rain is still falling.'
 (c) Parataxis proper: [X] + [Y]
 (2-2-5-1)-(c1) * [fǒn yaŋ tòk yùu]
 rain still fall CONT
 [rôm yùu troŋ ní ná?]
 umbrella be.located here PRT
 LT: 'The rain is still falling. An umbrella is located here (, I suggest to you so).'
 IM: 'If the rain is still falling, I inform you that an umbrella is located here (, I suggest to you so).'

The example (2-2-5-1)-(c1) is not acceptable for the reading (conditional) shown above. However, the sentence is acceptable for a causal meaning: 'As/Because the rain is still falling, I inform you that an umbrella is located here (, I suggest you so).'

The example (2-2-5-1)-(c2), which contains the I-CLM *lâkô* 'and then', is acceptable for the intended meaning (i.e. conditional). It is an instance of (ii-1) Coordination proper.

Coordination proper

- (2-2-5-1)-(c2) [fǒn yaŋ tòk yùu] lâkô
rain still fall CONT and.then
[rôm yùu troŋ ní ná?]
umbrella be.located here PRT
LT: 'The rain is still falling, and then an umbrella is located here (, I suggest you so).'

IM: 'If the rain is still falling, I inform you that an umbrella is located here (, I suggest you so).'

Quasi-parataxis

- (2-2-5-1)-(c3) * [fǒn yaŋ tòk yùu]
rain still fall CONT
[rôm kô yùu troŋ ní ná?]
umbrella then be.located here PRT
LT: 'The rain is still falling, then an umbrella is located here (, I suggest to you so).'

IM: 'If the rain is still falling, I inform you that an umbrella is located here (, I suggest to you so).'

(d) Parataxis proper: [Y] + [X]

- (2-2-5-1)-(d1) * [rôm yùu troŋ ní ná?]
umbrella be.located here PRT
[fǒn yaŋ tòk yùu]
rain still fall CONT
LT: 'An umbrella is located here (, I suggest you so). The rain is still falling.'

IM: 'If the rain is still falling, I inform you that an umbrella is located here.'

The example (2-2-5-1)-(d1) is not acceptable for the reading (conditional) shown above. However, the sentence is acceptable for a causal meaning: 'I inform you that an umbrella is located here (, I suggest you so), because the rain is still falling'. Here again, a conditional reading is not acceptable, but a causal reading is. That is, at Level V, when parataxis proper is employed and the clause order is '[Y] + [X]', a causal reading is acceptable, but a conditional reading is not.

(2-2-5-2) There is food here, if you are hungry.

IM: IF you are hungry, I SAY TO YOU THAT there is food here.

(a) Subordination proper: s[X] + m[Y]

- (2-2-5-2)-(a1) s[thâa khun hǐw khâaw]
if PRON be.hungry rice
m[khǒŋ kin yùu troŋ ní ná?]
food be.located here PRT
LT: 'If you are hungry (for) rice, food is located here, you

know.'

Quasi-subordination

- (2-2-5-2)-(a2) ? s[thâa *khun* *hǐw* *khâaw*]
 if PRON be.hungry rice
 m[*khǎw kin* kô *yùu* *troŋ níi náʔ*]
 food then be.located here PRT
 LT: 'If you are hungry (for) rice, then food is located here, you know.'

Consultant TM considers (2-2-5-2)-(a2) not acceptable.

(2-2-5-2)-(a3) is an additional example of *thâa* 'if' used at Level V for Subordination proper: s[X] + m[Y]. It is not a translation of (2-2-5-2)-(2-2-5-2)-(a5), which contains *nay mûa* 'if', is not acceptable.

Subordination proper

- (2-2-5-2)-(a3) s[thâa *khun* *kamləŋ* *hǎa* *khǎw kin* *yùu*]
 if PRON PROG seek food CONT
 m[*khǎw kin* *yùu* *troŋ níi náʔ*]
 food be.located here PRT
 LT: 'If you are seeking [i.e. looking for] food, food is located here (, I suggest you so).'

Quasi-subordination

- (2-2-5-2)-(a4) ? s[thâa *khun* *kamləŋ* *hǎa* *khǎw kin* *yùu*]
 if PRON PROG seek food CONT
 m[*khǎw kin* kô *yùu* *troŋ níi náʔ*]
 food then be.located here PRT
 LT: 'If you are seeking [i.e. looking for] food, then food is located here (, I suggest you so).'

Consultant TM considers (2-2-5-2)-(a4) not acceptable.

Subordination proper

- (2-2-5-2)-(a5) * s[nay mûa *khun* *hǐw* *khâaw*]
 if PRON be.hungry rice
 m[*khǎw kin* *yùu* *troŋ níi náʔ*]
 food be.located here PRT
 LT: 'If you are hungry (for) rice, food is located here (, I suggest you so).'

Quasi-subordination

- (2-2-5-2)-(a6) * s[nay mûa *khun* *hǐw* *khâaw*]
 if PRON be.hungry rice
 m[*khǎw kin* kô *yùu* *troŋ níi náʔ*]
 food then be.located here PRT
 LT: 'If you are hungry (for) rice, then food is located here

(, I suggest you so).’

Quasi-coordination

- (2-2-5-2)-(a7) ? s[thâa *khun* *hǐw* *khâaw*] lâkô
 if PRON be.hungry rice and.then
 M[*khǎw* *kin* kô *yùu* *troŋ ní* *náʔ*]
 food then be.located here PRT
 LT: ‘If you are hungry (for) rice, and then food is located here, you know.’

The example (2-2-5-2)-(a7) is marginally acceptable. Consultant TM comments that the sentence sounds more natural if the main clause does not contain the AP-CLM *kô* ‘then’.

- (2-2-5-2)-(a8) * s[nay mûa *khun* *hǐw* *khâaw*] lâkô
 if PRON be.hungry rice and.then
 M[*khǎw* *kin* kô *yùu* *troŋ ní* *náʔ*]
 food then be.located here PRT
 LT: ‘If you are hungry (for) rice, and then food is located here (, I suggest you so).’

- (b) Subordination proper: M[Y] + s[X]
 (2-2-5-2)-(b1) M[*khǎw* *kin* *yùu* *troŋ ní* *náʔ*]
 food be.located here PRT
 s[thâa *khun* *hǐw* *khâaw*]
 if PRON be.hungry rice
 LT: ‘Food is located here (, I suggest you so), if you are hungry (for) rice.’

(2-2-5-2)-(b2) is an additional example of *thâa* ‘if’ used at Level V for Subordination proper: M[Y] + s[X]. It is not a translation of (2-2-5-2). (2-2-5-2)-(b3), which contains *nay mûa* ‘if’, is not acceptable.

- (2-2-5-2)-(b2) M[*khǎw* *kin* *yùu* *troŋ ní* *náʔ*]
 food be.located here PRT
 s[thâa *khun* *kamlan* *hǎa* *khǎw* *kin* *yùu*]
 if PRON PROG seek food CONT
 LT: ‘Food is located here (, I suggest you so), if you are seeking [i.e. looking for] food.’
 (2-2-5-2)-(b3) * M[*khǎw* *kin* *yùu* *troŋ ní* *náʔ*]
 food be.located here PRT
 s[nay mûa *khun* *hǐw* *khâaw*]
 if PRON be.hungry rice
 LT: ‘Food is located here (, I suggest you so), if you are hungry (for) rice.’

- (c) Parataxis proper: [X] + [Y]
 (2-2-5-2)-(c1) * [*khun hǎw khâaw*]
 PRON be.hungry rice
 [*khǎw kin yùu troŋ ní náʔ*]
 food be.located here PRT
 LT: ‘You are hungry (for) rice. Food is located here (, I suggest you so).’
 IM: ‘If you are hungry (for) rice, I inform you that food is located here.’

The example (2-2-5-2)-(c2), which contains the I-CLM *lâkô* ‘and then’, is not acceptable. It is an instance of (ii-1) Coordination proper.

- Coordination proper
 (2-2-5-2)-(c2) * [*khun hǎw khâaw lâkô*]
 PRON be.hungry rice and.then
 [*khǎw kin yùu troŋ ní náʔ*]
 food be.located here PRT
 LT: ‘You are hungry (for) rice, and then food is located here (, I suggest you so).’
 IM: ‘If you are hungry (for) rice, I inform you that food is located here.’

Consultant TM considers (2-2-5-2)-(c2) acceptable.

- Quasi-parataxis
 (2-2-5-2)-(c3) * [*khun hǎw khâaw*]
 PRON be.hungry rice
 [*khǎw kin kô yùu troŋ ní náʔ*]
 food then be.located here PRT
 LT: ‘You are hungry (for) rice, then food is located here (, I suggest you so).’
 LT: ‘If you are hungry (for) rice, I inform you that food is located here.’

- (d) Parataxis proper: [Y] + [X]
 (2-2-5-2)-(d1) * [*khǎw kin yùu troŋ ní náʔ*]
 food be.located here PRT
 [*khun hǎw khâaw*]
 PRON be.hungry rice
 LT: ‘Food is located here (, I suggest you so). You are hungry (for) rice.’
 IM: ‘If you are hungry (for) rice, I inform you that food is located here.’

6. Concessives

We shall examine *thǔ̌n* ‘although’ and *thǎ̌n thǎ̌n thǐi* ‘although’ for subordination proper of concessives. *Thǔ̌n* ‘although’ is unmarked, being the common concessive CLM, with a generic meaning of concessive. *Thǎ̌n thǎ̌n thǐi* ‘although’ is marked and has a specialized meaning. Roughly speaking, it means ‘despite the existence of all these things/facts’. Depending on the context, it may have an emotional nuance, for example, ‘despite all these good (or bad) things/facts’.

For subordination proper, *thǔ̌n* ‘although’ is attested at all of the five levels. *Thǎ̌n thǎ̌n thǐi* ‘although’ is attested at Levels I, II and IV only. Generally parataxis proper is not acceptable. But it becomes acceptable if it involves *ʔàat càʔ...kô dǎy* ‘may’ (Level V).

6.1 Concessives Level I

Subordinate clause: situation. Main clause: situation.

(2-3-1-1) Although rain fell, the ground is dry.

(a) Subordination proper: s[X] + m[Y]

(2-3-1-1)-(a1) * s[*thǔ̌n fǒn tòk*]

although rain fall

m[*phúuun yaŋ hêeŋ*]

ground still be.dry

LT: ‘Although the rain fell, the ground is still dry.’

Consultant TM considers (2-3-1-1)-(a1) acceptable. She also comments that it sounds more natural if the E-CLM *thǔ̌n* ‘although’ is replaced with the E-CLM *khanàat* ‘although, even though reaching this extreme situation’ in the subordinate clause and the phrase *yaŋ hêeŋ* ‘still be dry’ is replaced with the phrase *yaŋ mây piak* ‘be still not wet’ in the main clause (‘Even though the rain fell, the ground is still not wet’). (The E-CLM *khanàat* derives from the noun *khanàat* meaning ‘size, dimensions, proportions’)

Quasi-subordination

(2-3-1-1)-(a2) s[*thǔ̌n fǒn tòk*]

although rain fall

m[*phúuun kô yaŋ hêeŋ*]

ground even.so still be.dry

LT: ‘Although the rain fell, even so the ground is still dry.’

Subordination proper

(2-3-1-1)-(a3) s[*thǎ̌n thǎ̌n thǐi fǒn tòk*]

although rain fall

m[*phúuun yaŋ hêeŋ*]

ground still be.dry

LT: ‘Although the rain fell, the ground is still dry.’

Quasi-subordination

- (2-3-1-1)-(a4) s[thán thán thî fǒn tòk]
 although rain fall
 M[phúuun kô yaŋ hêeŋ]
 ground even.so still be.dry
 LT: ‘Although the rain fell, even so the ground is still dry.’

The examples (2-3-1-1)-(a1) to -(a4) may include the I-CLM *têe* ‘but’. The resultant sentences are an instance of (ii-2) Quasi-coordination: (2-3-1-1)-(a5), -(a6).

Quasi-coordination

- (2-3-1-1)-(a5) s[thǔŋ fǒn tòk] *têe*
 although rain fall but
 M[phúuun (kô) yaŋ hêeŋ]
 ground (even so) still be.dry
 LT: ‘Although the rain fell, but (even so) the ground is still dry.’
- (2-3-1-1)-(a6) s[thán thán thî fǒn tòk] *têe*
 although rain fall but
 M[phúuun (kô) yaŋ hêeŋ]
 ground (even so) still be.dry
 LT: ‘Although the rain fell, but (even so) the ground is still dry.’

Consultant TM comments that (2-3-1-1)-(a5), -(a6) sound more natural when they include the AP-CLM *kô* ‘even so’.

- (b) Subordination proper: M[Y] + s[X]
- (2-3-1-1)-(b1) * M[phúuun yaŋ hêeŋ]
 ground still be.dry
 s[thǔŋ fǒn tòk]
 although rain fall
 LT: ‘The ground is still dry, although the rain fell.’
- (2-3-1-1)-(b2) M[phúuun yaŋ hêeŋ]
 ground still be.dry
 s[thán thán thî fǒn tòk]
 although rain fall
 LT: ‘The ground is still dry, although the rain fell.’

Consultant TM considers (2-3-1-1)-(b1) acceptable.

- (c) Parataxis proper: [X] + [Y]
 (2-3-1-1)-(c1) * [fǒn tòk]
 rain fall
 [phúuun yaŋ hêeŋ]
 ground still be.dry
 LT: 'The rain fell. The ground is still dry.'
 IM: 'Although the rain fell, the ground is still dry.'

The example (2-3-1-1)-(c1) is not acceptable. In contrast, (2-3-1-1)-(c2), which contains the I-CLM *têe* 'but', is acceptable. It is an instance of (ii-1) Coordination proper.

- Coordination proper
 (2-3-1-1)-(c2) [fǒn tòk] *têe*
 rain fall but
 [phúuun yaŋ hêeŋ]
 ground still be.dry
 LT: 'The rain fell, but the ground is still dry.'

- Quasi-parataxis
 (2-3-1-1)-(c3) [fǒn tòk]
 rain fall
 [phúuun *kô* yaŋ hêeŋ]
 ground even.so still be.dry
 LT: 'The rain fell, even so the ground is still dry.'
 IM: 'Although the rain fell, the ground is still dry.'

- (d) Parataxis proper: [Y] + [X]
 (2-3-1-1)-(d1) * [phúuun yaŋ hêeŋ]
 ground still be.dry
 [fǒn tòk]
 rain fall
 LT: 'The ground is still dry. The rain fell.'
 IM: 'The ground is still dry, although the rain fell.'

- (2-3-1-2) Although rain was falling, he went out.
 (a) Subordination proper: s[X] + m[Y]
 (2-3-1-2)-(a1) * s[*thǔŋ* fǒn tòk yùu]
 although rain fall CONT
 m[*kháw ?àak pay khâŋ nâak*]
 PRON exit go outside
 LT: 'Although the rain was falling, he went out.'

- Quasi-subordination
 (2-3-1-2)-(a2) s[*thǔŋ* fǒn tòk yùu]
 although rain fall CONT

$_M[kh\acute{a}w \quad k\acute{o} \quad ?\acute{o}k \quad pay \quad kh\acute{a}n \quad n\acute{o}k]$
 PRON even.so exit go outside
 LT: ‘Although the rain was falling, even so he went out.’

The example (2-3-1-2)-(a1) is not acceptable. In contrast, (2-3-1-2)-(a2) is acceptable. It contains the AP-CLM *k\acute{o}* ‘even so’. It is an instance of (i-2) Quasi-subordination. The same applies to (2-3-1-2)-(a3) and (2-3-1-2)-(a4).

Subordination proper

(2-3-1-2)-(a3) * $s[th\acute{a}n \quad th\acute{a}n \quad th\acute{i} \quad f\acute{o}n \quad t\acute{o}k \quad y\acute{u}u]$
 although rain fall CONT
 $_M[kh\acute{a}w \quad ?\acute{o}k \quad pay \quad kh\acute{a}n \quad n\acute{o}k]$
 PRON exit go outside
 LT: ‘Although the rain was falling, he went out.’

Quasi-subordination

(2-3-1-2)-(a4) $s[th\acute{a}n \quad th\acute{a}n \quad th\acute{i} \quad f\acute{o}n \quad t\acute{o}k \quad y\acute{u}u]$
 although rain fall CONT
 $_M[kh\acute{a}w \quad k\acute{o} \quad ?\acute{o}k \quad pay \quad kh\acute{a}n \quad n\acute{o}k]$
 PRON even.so exit go outside
 LT: ‘Although the rain was falling, even so he went out.’

(b) Subordination proper: $_M[Y] + s[X]$

(2-3-1-2)-(b1) $_M[kh\acute{a}w \quad ?\acute{o}k \quad pay \quad kh\acute{a}n \quad n\acute{o}k]$
 PRON exit go outside
 $s[th\acute{u}n \quad f\acute{o}n \quad t\acute{o}k \quad y\acute{u}u]$
 although rain fall CONT
 LT: ‘He went out, although the rain was falling.’

(2-3-1-2)-(b2) $_M[kh\acute{a}w \quad ?\acute{o}k \quad pay \quad kh\acute{a}n \quad n\acute{o}k]$
 PRON exit go outside
 $s[th\acute{a}n \quad th\acute{a}n \quad th\acute{i} \quad f\acute{o}n \quad t\acute{o}k \quad y\acute{u}u]$
 although rain fall CONT
 LT: ‘He went out, although the rain was falling.’

Consultant TM considers (2-3-1-2)-(b1) not acceptable. As noted at the beginning of Section 6 and also as shown in Table 1, *th\acute{u}n* ‘although’ has a wider distribution than *th\acute{a}n th\acute{a}n th\acute{i}* ‘although’, and *th\acute{a}n th\acute{a}n th\acute{i}* ‘although’ is often not acceptable where *th\acute{u}n* ‘although’ is acceptable. Despite this general tendency, (2-3-1-2)-(b1) is not acceptable (at least to Consultant TM), but (2-3-1-2)-(b2) is acceptable. This is because the specific concessive CLM *th\acute{a}n th\acute{a}n th\acute{i}* ‘although’ (or ‘despite the existence of all these things/facts’) is suitable for the content of (2-3-1-2)-(b2), whereas the non-specific concessive CLM *th\acute{u}n* ‘although’ is not. Probably not all but many Thai speakers seem to feel that (2-3-1-2)-(b1) lacks something. Preferably, the subordinate clause of (2-3-1-2)-(b1) (‘although the rain was falling’), which is fairly short, should contain, besides the non-specific E-CLM *th\acute{u}n* ‘although’, some additional concessive marker such as one

more E-CLM (e.g. *kô taam* ‘even so’) which helps emphasize the concessive sense.

- (c) Parataxis proper: [X] + [Y]
 (2-3-1-2)-(c1) * [*fǒn tòk yùu*]
 rain fall CONT
 [*kháw ?òk pay khâη nòk*]
 PRON exit go outside
 LT: ‘The rain was falling. He went out.’
 IM: ‘Although the rain was falling, he went out.’
 (2-3-1-2)-(c2) * [*fǒn tòk yùu*]
 rain fall CONT
 [*kháw yaη ?òk pay khâη nòk*]
 PRON still exit go outside
 LT: ‘The rain was falling. He still went out.’
 IM: ‘Although the rain was falling, he went out.’

The examples (2-3-1-2)-(c1), -(c2) are not acceptable. However, Consultant TM considers (2-3-1-2)-(c2) acceptable. It contains the aspect marker *yaη* ‘IPFV, still, even so’. It is still an instance of parataxis proper.

Also, if the example (2-3-1-2)-(c1) contains the I-CLM *têe* ‘but’, it becomes acceptable; see (2-3-1-2)-(c3), an instance of (ii-1) Coordination proper.

Coordination proper

- (2-3-1-2)-(c3) [*fǒn tòk yùu*] *têe*
 rain fall CONT but
 [*kháw ?òk pay khâη nòk*]
 PRON exit go outside
 LT: ‘The rain was falling, but he went out.’

Quasi-coordination

- (2-3-1-2)-(c4) s[*thǔη fǒn tòk yùu*] *têe*
 although rain fall CONT but
 _M[*kháw kô ?òk pay khâη nòk*]
 PRON even.so exit go outside
 LT: ‘Although the rain was falling, but even so he went out.’
 (2-3-1-2)-(c5) s[*thán thán thî fǒn tòk yùu*] *têe*
 although rain fall CONT but
 _M[*kháw kô ?òk pay khâη nòk*]
 PRON even.so exit go outside
 LT: ‘Although the rain was falling, but even so he went out.’

Quasi-parataxis

- (2-3-1-2)-(c6) * [fǒn tòk yùu]
rain fall CONT
[kháw kô ?òok pay khâη nòok]
PRON even.so exit go outside
LT: 'The rain was falling, even so he went out.'
IM: 'Although the rain was falling, he went out.'
- (2-3-1-2)-(c7) [fǒn tòk yùu]
rain fall CONT
[kháw kô yaη ?òok pay khâη nòok]
PRON even.so still exit go outside
LT: 'The rain was falling, even so he still went out.'
IM: 'Although the rain was falling, he went out.'
- (d) Parataxis proper: [Y] + [X]
(2-3-1-2)-(d1) * [kháw ?òok pay khâη nòok]
PRON exit go outside
[fǒn tòk yùu]
rain fall CONT
LT: 'He went out. The rain was falling.'
IM: 'He went out, although the rain was falling.'

6.2 Concessives Level II

Subordinate clause: situation. Main clause: situation + judgement.

- (2-3-2-1) Although rain fell, the ground may be dry.
(a) Subordination proper: s[X] + m[Y]
(2-3-2-1)-(a1) * s[thǔn fǒn tòk]
although rain fall
m[phúuη hêeη]
ground be.dry
LT: 'Although the rain fell, the ground is dry.'
(Acceptable for Level I)
IM: 'Although the rain fell, the ground may be dry.'
- (2-3-2-1)-(a2) * s[thǔn fǒn tòk]
although rain fall
m[phúuη yaη hêeη]
ground still be.dry
LT: 'Although the rain fell, the ground is still dry.'
(Acceptable for Level I)
IM: 'Although the rain fell, the ground may be dry.'
- (2-3-2-1)-(a3) * s[thǔn fǒn tòk]
although rain fall
m[phúuη khoy hêeη]
ground probably be.dry
LT: 'Although the rain fell, the ground is probably dry.'

- IM: ‘Although the rain fell, the ground may be dry.’
 (2-3-2-1)-(a4) s[thǔŋ fǒn tòk]
 although rain fall
 M[phúuun khon yaŋ hêeŋ]
 ground probably still be.dry
 LT: ‘Although the rain fell, the ground is probably still dry.’

The example (2-3-2-1)-(a3) contains *khon* ‘probably, might’, and it is not acceptable, while (2-3-2-1)-(a4) contains *yaŋ* ‘IPFV, still, even so’ in addition to *khon* ‘probably, might’, and it is perfectly acceptable. However, Consultant TM considers both (2-3-2-1)-(a3) and (2-3-2-1)-(a4) not acceptable.

The sentences listed in 4.4 contain the combination of the adverb *khon* ‘probably, might’ and the final particle *mǎŋ* ‘PRT’. As explained in 4.4, *khon* ‘probably, might’ alludes to the speaker’s deductive inference, while *mǎŋ* ‘PRT’ expresses the speaker’s guess embracing doubt. The sentences (2-3-2-1)-(a3), -(a4) above and (2-3-2-1)-(a7), -(a8), -(b3), -(b4), -(c3), -(c4) below contain only *khon* ‘probably, might’ and do not contain *mǎŋ* ‘PRT’. Even if the marginally acceptable or not acceptable sentences (i.e. (2-3-2-1)-(a3), -(a7), -(a8), -(b3), -(c3) and -(c4)) contain *mǎŋ* ‘PRT’, they do not become acceptable. The degree of acceptability of those sentences does not change by merely adding the sense of the speaker’s guess embracing doubt. The examples (2-3-2-1)-(a1), -(a2) do not contain such a word, and they cannot have the intended meaning, suitable for Level II. (They are acceptable for Level I. In fact, (2-3-2-1)-(a2) is the same as (2-3-1-1)-(a1) given for Level I in 6.1.)

Quasi-subordination

- (2-3-2-1)-(a5) * s[thǔŋ fǒn tòk]
 although rain fall
 M[phúuun kô hêeŋ]
 ground even.so be.dry
 LT: ‘Although the rain fell, even so the ground is dry.’
 IM: ‘Although the rain fell, the ground may be dry.’
 (Acceptable for Level I)
 (2-3-2-1)-(a6) * s[thǔŋ fǒn tòk]
 although rain fall
 M[phúuun kô yaŋ hêeŋ]
 ground even.so still be.dry
 LT: ‘Although the rain fell, even so the ground is still dry.’
 IM: ‘Although the rain fell, the ground may be dry.’
 (Acceptable for Level I)
 (2-3-2-1)-(a7) s[thǔŋ fǒn tòk]
 although rain fall
 M[phúuun kô khon hêeŋ]
 ground even.so probably be.dry

LT: ‘Although the rain fell, even so the ground is probably dry.’

IM: ‘Although the rain fell, the ground may be dry.’

Consultant TM comments that (2-3-2-1)-(a7) sounds more natural if the phrase *khon hêeη* ‘to probably be dry’ is replaced with the phrase *khon mây pìak* ‘to probably be not wet’ in the main clause (‘Although the rain fell, even so the ground is probably not wet’).

Note that the Quasi-subordination sentence (2-3-2-1)-(a7) is acceptable, while the Subordination proper sentence (2-3-2-1)-(a3) is not acceptable.

Quasi-subordination

(2-3-2-1)-(a8) s[*thũη fõn tòk*]
 although rain fall
 M[*phúuun kô khon yaη hêeη*]
 ground even.so probably still be.dry
 LT: ‘Although the rain fell, even so the ground is probably still dry.’

Consultant TM considers (2-3-2-1)-(a8) marginally acceptable.

The examples (2-3-2-1)-(a1) to -(a8) involve *thũη* ‘although’, while (2-3-2-1)-(a9) to -(a16) involve *thán thán thũ* ‘although’. There is a difference between them regarding their acceptability. As is the case with (2-3-2-1)-(a1), -(a2), the examples (2-3-2-1)-(a9), -(a10) cannot have the intended meaning, suitable for Level II. (They are acceptable for Level I. In fact, (2-3-2-1)-(a10) is the same as (2-3-1-1)-(a2) given for Level I in 6.1.) However, (unlike (2-3-2-1)-(a3), -(a4),) (2-3-2-1)-(a11) is not acceptable even when they contain *khon* ‘probably, might’ or *khon yaη* ‘probably/might still’.

Subordination proper

(2-3-2-1)-(a9) * s[*thán thán thũ fõn tòk*]
 although rain fall
 M[*phúuun hêeη*]
 ground be.dry
 LT: ‘Although the rain fell, the ground is dry.’
 IM: ‘Although the rain fell, the ground may be dry.’
 (Acceptable for Level I)

(2-3-2-1)-(a10) * s[*thán thán thũ fõn tòk*]
 although rain fall
 M[*phúuun yaη hêeη*]
 ground still be.dry
 LT: ‘Although the rain fell, the ground is still dry.’
 IM: ‘Although the rain fell, the ground may be dry.’
 (Acceptable for Level I)

(2-3-2-1)-(a11) * s[*thán thán thũ fõn tòk*]
 although rain fall

- (2-3-2-1)-(a12) $\text{M}[\text{phúuun} \text{ khoŋ} \text{ hêeŋ}]$
 ground probably be.dry
 LT: 'Although the rain fell, the ground is probably dry.'
 IM: 'Although the rain fell, the ground may be dry.'
- (2-3-2-1)-(a12) $\text{s}[\text{thán} \text{ thán} \text{ thîi} \text{ fôn} \text{ tòk}]$
 although rain fall
 $\text{M}[\text{phúuun} \text{ khoŋ} \text{ yaŋ} \text{ hêeŋ}]$
 ground probably still be.dry
 LT: 'Although the rain fell, the ground is probably still dry.'
 IM: 'Although the rain fell, the ground may be dry.'

Consultant TM considers (2-3-2-1)-(a12) not acceptable.

Quasi-subordination

- (2-3-2-1)-(a13) * $\text{s}[\text{thán} \text{ thán} \text{ thîi} \text{ fôn} \text{ tòk}]$
 although rain fall
 $\text{M}[\text{phúuun} \text{ kô} \text{ hêeŋ}]$
 ground even.so be.dry
 LT: 'Although the rain fell, even so the ground is dry.'
 IM: 'Although the rain fell, the ground may be dry.'
 (Acceptable for Level I)
- (2-3-2-1)-(a14) * $\text{s}[\text{thán} \text{ thán} \text{ thîi} \text{ fôn} \text{ tòk}]$
 although rain fall
 $\text{M}[\text{phúuun} \text{ kô} \text{ yaŋ} \text{ hêeŋ}]$
 ground even.so still be.dry
 LT: 'Although the rain fell, even so the ground is still dry.'
 IM: 'Although the rain fell, the ground may be dry.'
 (Acceptable for Level I)
- (2-3-2-1)-(a15) * $\text{s}[\text{thán} \text{ thán} \text{ thîi} \text{ fôn} \text{ tòk}]$
 although rain fall
 $\text{M}[\text{phúuun} \text{ kô} \text{ khoŋ} \text{ hêeŋ}]$
 ground even.so probably be.dry
 LT: 'Although the rain fell, even so the ground is probably dry.'
 IM: 'Although the rain fell, the ground may be dry.'
- (2-3-2-1)-(a16) $\text{s}[\text{thán} \text{ thán} \text{ thîi} \text{ fôn} \text{ tòk}]$
 although rain fall
 $\text{M}[\text{phúuun} \text{ kô} \text{ khoŋ} \text{ yaŋ} \text{ hêeŋ}]$
 ground even.so probably still be.dry
 LT: 'Although the rain fell, even so the ground is probably still dry.'
 IM: 'Although the rain fell, the ground may be dry.'

Consultant TM considers (2-3-2-1)-(a16) not acceptable.

Quasi-coordination

- (2-3-2-1)-(a17) * s[thǔŋ fǒn tòk] tɛɛ
 although rain fall but
 M[phúuun kô hɛɛŋ]
 ground even.so be.dry
 LT: ‘Although the rain fell, but even so the ground is dry.’
 IM: ‘Although the rain fell, the ground may be dry.’
 (Acceptable for Level I)
- (2-3-2-1)-(a18) * s[thǔŋ fǒn tòk] tɛɛ
 although rain fall but
 M[phúuun kô yaŋ hɛɛŋ]
 ground even.so still be.dry
 LT: ‘Although the rain fell, but even so the ground is still dry.’
 IM: ‘Although the rain fell, the ground may be dry.’
 (Acceptable for Level I)
- (2-3-2-1)-(a19) s[thǔŋ fǒn tòk] tɛɛ
 although rain fall but
 M[phúuun kô khoŋ hɛɛŋ]
 ground even.so probably be.dry
 LT: ‘Although the rain fell, but even so the ground is probably dry.’
 IM: ‘Although the rain fell, the ground may be dry.’
- (2-3-2-1)-(a20) s[thǔŋ fǒn tòk] tɛɛ
 although rain fall but
 M[phúuun kô khoŋ yaŋ hɛɛŋ]
 ground even.so probably still be.dry
 LT: ‘Although the rain fell, but even so the ground is probably still dry.’
- (2-3-2-1)-(a21) * s[thán thán thî fǒn tòk] tɛɛ
 although rain fall but
 M[phúuun kô hɛɛŋ]
 ground even.so be.dry
 LT: ‘Although the rain fell, but even so the ground is dry.’
 IM: ‘Although the rain fell, the ground may be dry.’
 (Acceptable for Level I)
- (2-3-2-1)-(a22) * s[thán thán thî fǒn tòk] tɛɛ
 although rain fall but
 M[phúuun kô yaŋ hɛɛŋ]
 ground even.so still be.dry
 LT: ‘Although the rain fell, but even so the ground is still dry.’
 IM: ‘Although the rain fell, the ground may be dry.’
 (Acceptable for Level I)
- (2-3-2-1)-(a23) s[thán thán thî fǒn tòk] tɛɛ
 although rain fall but

- M[*phúuun kô khoŋ hêeŋ*]
ground even.so probably be.dry
LT: 'Although the rain fell, but even so the ground is probably dry.'
IM: 'Although the rain fell, the ground may be dry.'
- (2-3-2-1)-(a24) s[*thán thán thî fôn tòk tē*]
although rain fall but
M[*phúuun kô khoŋ yaŋ hêeŋ*]
ground even.so probably still be.dry
LT: 'Although the rain fell, but even so the ground is probably still dry.'
IM: 'Although the rain fell, the ground may be dry.'

Consultant TM considers (2-3-2-1)-(a23), -(a24) not acceptable.

- (b) Subordination proper: M[Y] + s[X]
- (2-3-2-1)-(b1) * M[*phúuun hêeŋ*]
ground be.dry
s[*thǔŋ fôn tòk*]
although rain fall
LT: 'The ground is dry, although the rain fell.'
IM: 'The ground may be dry, although the rain fell.'
(Acceptable for Level I)
- (2-3-2-1)-(b2) * M[*phúuun yaŋ hêeŋ*]
ground still be.dry
s[*thǔŋ fôn tòk*]
although rain fall
LT: 'The ground is still dry, although the rain fell.'
IM: 'The ground may be dry, although the rain fell.'
(Acceptable for Level I)
- (2-3-2-1)-(b3) * M[*phúuun khoŋ hêeŋ*]
ground probably be.dry
s[*thǔŋ fôn tòk*]
although rain fall
LT: 'The ground is probably dry, although the rain fell.'
IM: 'The ground may be dry, although the rain fell.'
- (2-3-2-1)-(b4) M[*phúuun khoŋ yaŋ hêeŋ*]
ground probably still be.dry
s[*thǔŋ fôn tòk*]
although rain fall
LT: 'The ground is probably dry, although the rain fell.'
IM: 'The ground may be dry, although the rain fell.'

Consultant TM considers (2-3-2-1)-(b3) marginally acceptable.

In the paragraph that immediately precedes (2-3-2-1)-(a5) above, I noted the difference between (2-3-2-1)-(a1) to -(a4) and (2-3-2-1)-(a5) to -(a8) regarding their acceptability. Exactly the same difference is observed

between (2-3-2-1)-(b1) to -(b4) and (2-3-2-1)-(b5) to -(b8).

- (2-3-2-1)-(b5) *_M[*phúuun hêeŋ*]
ground be.dry
s[*thán thán thîi fôn tòk*]
although rain fall
LT: 'The ground is dry, although the rain fell.'
IM: 'The ground may be dry, although the rain fell.'
(Acceptable for Level I)
- (2-3-2-1)-(b6) *_M[*phúuun yaŋ hêeŋ*]
ground still be.dry
s[*thán thán thîi fôn tòk*]
although rain fall
LT: 'The ground is still dry, although the rain fell.'
IM: 'The ground may be dry, although the rain fell.'
(Acceptable for Level I)
- (2-3-2-1)-(b7) *_M[*phúuun khoŋ hêeŋ*]
ground probably be.dry
s[*thán thán thîi fôn tòk*]
although rain fall
LT: 'The ground is probably dry, although the rain fell.'
IM: 'The ground may be dry, although the rain fell.'
- (2-3-2-1)-(b8) *_M[*phúuun khoŋ yaŋ hêeŋ*]
ground probably still be.dry
s[*thán thán thîi fôn tòk*]
although rain fall
LT: 'The ground is probably still dry, although the rain fell.'
IM: 'The ground may be dry, although the rain fell.'
- (c) Parataxis proper: [X] + [Y]
- (2-3-2-1)-(c1) * [fôn tòk]
rain fall
[*phúuun hêeŋ*]
ground be.dry
LT: 'The rain fell. The ground is dry.'
IM: 'Although the rain fell, the ground may be dry.'
- (2-3-2-1)-(c2) * [fôn tòk]
rain fall
[*phúuun yaŋ hêeŋ*]
ground still be.dry
LT: 'The rain fell. The ground is still dry.'
IM: 'Although the rain fell, the ground may be dry.'
- (2-3-2-1)-(c3) * [fôn tòk]
rain fall
[*phúuun khoŋ hêeŋ*]
ground probably be.dry

- LT: 'The rain fell. The ground is probably dry.'
 IM: 'Although the rain fell, the ground may be dry.'
- (2-3-2-1)-(c4) * [fǒn tòk]
 rain fall
 [phúuun khon yaŋ hêeŋ]
 ground probably still be.dry
 LT: 'The rain fell. The ground is probably still dry.'
 IM: 'Although the rain fell, the ground may be dry.'

As noted above, parataxis proper is not acceptable for concessives (although it is possible for some of causals and conditionals; cf. Table 1). It is not acceptable even when it contains *khon* 'probably, might' or *khon yaŋ* 'probably/might still'. The same applies to (d) Parataxis proper: [X] + [Y], discussed below.

If (2-3-2-1)-(c4) contains the I-CLM *têe* 'but', it becomes acceptable; see (2-3-2-1)-(c5). (However, Consultant TM considers (2-3-2-1)-(c5) not acceptable.) (2-3-2-1)-(c5) is an instance of (ii-1) Coordination proper.

- Coordination proper
- (2-3-2-1)-(c5) [fǒn tòk] têe
 rain fall but
 [phúuun khon yaŋ hêeŋ]
 ground probably still be.dry
 LT: 'The rain fell, but the ground is probably still dry.'

- Quasi-parataxis
- (2-3-2-1)-(c6) * [fǒn tòk]
 rain fall
 [phúuun kô hêeŋ]
 ground even.so be.dry
 LT: 'The rain fell, even so the ground is dry.'
 IM: 'Although the rain fell, the ground may be dry.'
- (2-3-2-1)-(c7) * [fǒn tòk]
 rain fall
 [phúuun kô yaŋ hêeŋ]
 ground even.so still be.dry
 LT: 'The rain fell, even so the ground is still dry.'
 IM: 'Although the rain fell, the ground may be dry.'
- (2-3-2-1)-(c8) * [fǒn tòk]
 rain fall
 [phúuun kô khon hêeŋ]
 ground even.so probably be.dry
 LT: 'The rain fell, even so the ground is probably dry.'
 IM: 'Although the rain fell, the ground may be dry.'
- (2-3-2-1)-(c9) * [fǒn tòk]
 rain fall

[*phúuun kô khoŋ yaŋ hêeŋ*]
 ground even.so probably still be.dry
 LT: 'The rain fell, even so the ground is probably still dry.'
 IM: 'Although the rain fell, the ground may be dry.'

- (d) Parataxis proper: [Y] + [X]
 (2-3-2-1)-(d1) * [*phúuun hêeŋ*]
 ground be.dry
 [*fôn tòk*]
 rain fall
 LT: 'The ground is dry. The rain fell.'
 IM: 'The ground may be dry, although the rain fell.'
 (2-3-2-1)-(d2) * [*phúuun yaŋ hêeŋ*]
 ground still be.dry
 [*fôn tòk*]
 rain fall
 LT: 'The ground is still dry. The rain fell.'
 IM: 'The ground may be dry, although the rain fell.'
 (2-3-2-1)-(d3) * [*phúuun khoŋ hêeŋ*]
 ground probably be.dry
 [*fôn tòk*]
 rain fall
 LT: 'The ground is probably dry. The rain fell.'
 IM: 'The ground may be dry, although the rain fell.'
 (2-3-2-1)-(d4) * [*phúuun khoŋ yaŋ hêeŋ*]
 ground probably still be.dry
 [*fôn tòk*]
 rain fall
 LT: 'The ground is probably still dry. The rain fell.'
 IM: 'The ground may be dry, although the rain fell.'

(2-3-2-2) Although the rain stopped, he has to stay in the house.

- (a) Subordination proper: s[X] + m[Y]
 (2-3-2-2)-(a1) * s[*thũŋ fôn yùt*]
 although rain stop
 m[*kháw tŋ yùu bâan*]
 PRON must stay house
 LT: 'Although the rain stopped, he has to stay in the house.'

Quasi-subordination

- (2-3-2-2)-(a2) s[*thũŋ fôn yùt*]
 although rain stop
 m[*kháw kô tŋ yùu bâan*]
 PRON even.so must stay house
 LT: 'Although the rain stopped, even so he has to stay in

the house.’

The example (2-3-2-2)-(a1) is not acceptable. In contrast, (2-3-2-2)-(a2) is acceptable. It contains the AP-CLM *kô* ‘even so’. It is an instance of (i-2) Quasi-subordination.

Subordination proper

- (2-3-2-2)-(a3) * s[thán thán thî fǒn yùt]
 although rain stop
 M[khǎw tǎn yùu bâan]
 PRON must stay house
 LT: ‘Although the rain stopped, he has to stay in the house.’

Quasi-subordination

- (2-3-2-2)-(a4) * s[thán thán thî fǒn yùt]
 although rain stop
 M[khǎw kô tǎn yùu bâan]
 PRON even.so must stay house
 LT: ‘Although the rain stopped, even so he has to stay in the house.’

Consultant TM considers that (2-3-2-2)-(a3) is marginally acceptable and (2-3-2-2)-(a4) is acceptable.

Quasi-coordination

- (2-3-2-2)-(a5) s[thǔn fǒn yùt] têe
 although rain stop but
 M[khǎw kô tǎn yùu bâan]
 PRON even.so must stay house
 LT: ‘Although the rain stopped, but even so he has to stay in the house.’
- (2-3-2-2)-(a6) s[thán thán thî fǒn yùt] têe
 although rain stop but
 M[khǎw kô tǎn yùu bâan]
 PRON even.so must stay house
 LT: ‘Although the rain stopped, but even so he has to stay in the house.’

(b) Subordination proper: M[Y] + s[X]

- (2-3-2-2)-(b1) M[khǎw tǎn yùu bâan]
 PRON must stay house
 s[thǔn fǒn yùt]
 although rain stop
 LT: ‘He has to stay in the house, although the rain stopped.’

(2-3-2-2)-(b2) _M[*kháw tŏŋ yùu bâan*]
 PRON must stay house
_S[*thán thán thŭi fŏn yùt*]
 although rain stop
 LT: 'He has to stay in the house, although the rain stopped.'

(c) Parataxis proper: [X] + [Y]
 (2-3-2-2)-(c1) * [*fŏn yùt*]
 rain stop
 [*kháw tŏŋ yùu bâan*]
 PRON must stay house
 LT: 'The rain stopped. He has to stay in the house.'
 IM: 'Although the rain stopped, he has to stay in the house.'

The example (2-3-2-2)-(c2), which contains the I-CLM *têe* 'but', is acceptable. It is an instance of (ii-1) Coordination proper.

Coordination proper
 (2-3-2-2)-(c2) [*fŏn yùt*] *têe*
 rain stop but
 [*kháw tŏŋ yùu bâan*]
 PRON must stay house
 LT: 'The rain stopped, but he has to stay in the house.'

Quasi-parataxis
 (2-3-2-2)-(c3) * [*fŏn yùt*]
 rain stop
 [*kháw kô tŏŋ yùu bâan*]
 PRON even.so must stay house
 LT: 'The rain stopped, even so he has to stay in the house.'
 IM: 'Although the rain stopped, he has to stay in the house.'

Consultant TM comments that (2-3-2-2)-(c3) is acceptable if the main clause contains *yaŋ* 'still' after the AP-CLM *kô* 'even so' (*kháw kô yaŋ tŏŋ yùu bâan* 'even so he still has to stay in the house').

(d) Parataxis proper: [Y] + [X]
 (2-3-2-2)-(d1) * [*kháw tŏŋ yùu bâan*]
 PRON must stay house
 [*fŏn yùt*]
 rain stop
 LT: 'He has to stay in the house. The rain stopped.'
 IM: 'He has to stay in the house, although the rain'

stopped.’

6.3 Concessives Level III

Subordinate clause: situation. Main clause: situation + interpersonal effect.

(2-3-3-1) Let’s go out although rain is falling.

(a) Subordination proper: s[X] + m[Y]

(2-3-3-1)-(a1) * s[thǔ̌n fǒn cà? tòk yùu]
 although rain IRR fall CONT
 m[(raw) ?òk pay khân nôk dūay kan thè?]
 (PRON) exit go outside together PRT
 LT: ‘Although the rain is falling, (we) go out together (, I entreat you so) [= let’s go out].’

Consultant TM considers (2-3-3-1)-(a1) marginally acceptable.

Quasi-subordination

(2-3-3-1)-(a2) s[thǔ̌n fǒn cà? tòk yùu]
 although rain IRR fall CONT
 m[(raw) kô ?òk pay khân nôk dūay kan
 (PRON) even.so exit go outside together
 thè?]
 PRT
 LT: ‘Although the rain is falling, even so (we) go out together (, I entreat you so) [= let’s go out].’

(*Thè?* is a final particle which expresses the speaker’s emotional nudging at the addressee. It may be translated as ‘I entreat you so’ when used in the context of the entreaty type of illocutionary force.)

The examples (2-3-3-1)-(a1), -(a2) involve *thǔ̌n* ‘although’, while (2-3-3-1)-(a3), -(a4) contain *thǎn thǎn thǎi* ‘although’. (2-3-3-1)-(a1) is not acceptable (or only marginally acceptable by Consultant TM), but (2-3-3-1)-(a2) is perfectly acceptable; it contains the AP-CLM *kô* ‘even so’. It is not an instance of (i-1) Subordination proper, but an instance of (i-2) Quasi-subordination. The same does *not* apply to (2-3-3-1)-(a3) and (2-3-3-1)-(a4). Note in particular that (2-3-3-1)-(a4) is not acceptable despite the presence of the AP-CLM *kô* ‘even so’.

Subordination proper

(2-3-3-1)-(a3) * s[thǎn thǎn thǎi fǒn cà? tòk yùu]
 although rain IRR fall CONT
 m[(raw) ?òk pay khân nôk dūay kan
 (PRON) exit go outside together
 thè?]
 PRT
 LT: ‘Although the rain is falling, (we) go out together (, I

entreat you so) [= let's go out].'

Quasi-subordination

- (2-3-3-1)-(a4) * s[thán thán thî fǒn cà? tòk yùu]
 although rain IRR fall CONT
 M[(raw) kô ?òòk pay khâŋ nòòk dūay kan
 (PRON) even.so exit go outside together
 thə?]
 PRT
 LT: 'Although the rain is falling, even so (we) go out together (, I entreat you so) [= let's go out].'

- (b) Subordination proper: M[Y] + s[X]
 (2-3-3-1)-(b1) M[(raw) ?òòk pay khâŋ nòòk dūay kan thə?]
 (PRON) exit go outside together PRT
 s[thǔŋ fǒn cà? tòk yùu]
 although rain IRR fall CONT
 LT: '(We) go out together (, I entreat you so) [= Let's go out], although the rain is falling.'
 (2-3-3-1)-(b2) * M[(raw) ?òòk pay khâŋ nòòk dūay kan
 (PRON) exit go outside together
 thə?] s[thán thán thî fǒn cà? tòk yùu]
 PRT although rain IRR fall CONT
 LT: '(We) go out together (, I entreat you so) [= Let's go out], although the rain is falling.'

- (c) Parataxis proper: [X] + [Y]
 (2-3-3-1)-(c1) [fǒn tòk yùu]
 rain fall CONT
 [(raw) ?òòk pay khâŋ nòòk dūay kan thə?]
 (PRON) exit go outside together PRT
 LT: 'The rain is falling. (We) go out together (, I entreat you so) [= let's go out].'
 IM: 'Although the rain is falling, let's go out.'

Consultant TM considers (2-3-3-1)-(c1) not acceptable.

The example (2-3-3-1)-(c2), which contains the I-CLM *têe* 'but', is not acceptable. (However, Consultant TM considers it acceptable.) It is an instance of (ii-1) Coordination proper.

Coordination proper

- (2-3-3-1)-(c2) * [fǒn tòk yùu] têe
 rain fall CONT but
 [(raw) ?òòk pay khâŋ nòòk dūay kan thə?]
 (PRON) exit go outside together PRT
 LT: 'The rain is falling, but (we) go out together (, I entreat you so) [= let's go out].'

Quasi-coordination

- (2-3-3-1)-(c3) s[thǔn fǒn cà? tòk yùu] têe
 although rain IRR fall CONT but
 M[(raw) kô ?òok pay khân nôok dūay kan
 (PRON) even.so exit go outside together
 thè?] PRT
 LT: 'Although the rain is falling, but even so (we) go out together (, I entreat you so) [= let's go out].'
- (2-3-3-1)-(c4) * s[thán thán thī fǒn cà? tòk yùu] têe
 although rain IRR fall CONT but
 M[(raw) kô ?òok pay khân nôok dūay kan
 (PRON) even.so exit go outside together
 thè?] PRT
 LT: 'Although the rain is falling, but even so (we) go out together (, I entreat you so) [= let's go out].'

Quasi-parataxis

- (2-3-3-1)-(c5) [fǒn tòk yùu]
 rain fall CONT
 [(raw) kô ?òok pay khân nôok dūay kan thè?]
 (PRON) even.so exit go outside together PRT
 LT: 'The rain is falling, even so (we) go out together (, I entreat you so) [= let's go out].'
 IM: 'Although the rain is falling, let's go out.'

Consultant TM considers (2-3-3-1)-(c5) not acceptable.

- (d) Parataxis proper: [Y] + [X]
 (2-3-3-1)-(d1) [(raw) ?òok pay khân nôok dūay kan thè?]
 (PRON) exit go outside together PRT
 [fǒn tòk yùu]
 rain fall CONT
 LT: '(We) go out together (, I entreat you so) [= Let's go out]. The rain is falling.'
 IM: 'Let's go out, although the rain is falling.'

Consultant TM considers (2-3-3-1)-(d1) not acceptable.

- (2-3-3-2) Stay in the house although the rain stopped.

- (a) Subordination proper: s[X] + M[Y]
 (2-3-3-2)-(a1) * s[thǔn fǒn yùu]
 although rain stop
 M[(khun) yùu bāan thè?]
 (PRON) stay house PRT
 LT: 'Although the rain stopped, (you) stay in the house (, I

entreat you so).’

Quasi-subordination

- (2-3-3-2)-(a2) s[thǔn fǒn yùt]
 although rain stop
 M[(*khun*) kô yùu bâan thê?]
 (PRON) even.so stay house PRT
 LT: ‘Although the rain stopped, even so (you) stay in the house (, I entreat you so).’

The examples (2-3-3-2)-(a1), -(a2) involve *thǔn* ‘although’, while (2-3-3-2)-(a3), -(a4) contain *thán thán thî* ‘although’. (2-3-3-2)-(a1) is not acceptable, but (2-3-3-2)-(a2) is acceptable; it contains the AP-CLM *kô* ‘even so’. It is not an instance of (i-1) Subordination proper, but an instance of (i-2) Quasi-subordination. The same does *not* apply to (2-3-3-2)-(a3) and (2-3-3-2)-(a4). That is, (2-3-3-2)-(a4) is not acceptable despite the presence of the AP-CLM *kô* ‘even so’.

Subordination proper

- (2-3-3-2)-(a3) * s[thán thán thî fǒn yùt]
 although rain stop
 M[(*khun*) yùu bâan thê?]
 (PRON) stay house PRT
 LT: ‘Although the rain stopped, (you) stay in the house (, I entreat you so).’

Quasi-subordination

- (2-3-3-2)-(a4) * s[thán thán thî fǒn yùt]
 although rain stop
 M[(*khun*) kô yùu bâan thê?]
 (PRON) even.so stay house PRT
 LT: ‘Although the rain stopped, even so (you) stay in the house (, I entreat you so).’

(b) Subordination proper: M[Y] + s[X]

- (2-3-3-2)-(b1) * M[(*khun*) yùu bâan thê?]
 (PRON) stay house PRT
 s[thǔn fǒn yùt]
 although rain stop
 LT: ‘(You) stay in the house (, I entreat you so), although the rain stopped.’
- (2-3-3-2)-(b2) * M[(*khun*) yùu bâan thê?]
 (PRON) stay house PRT
 s[thán thán thî fǒn yùt]
 although rain stop
 LT: ‘(You) stay in the house (, I entreat you so), although the rain stopped.’

Consultant TM considers (2-3-3-2)-(b1) acceptable.

- (c) Parataxis proper: [X] + [Y]
 (2-3-3-2)-(c1) [*fǒn yùt*]
 rain stop
 [(*khun*) *yùu bâan thà?*]
 (PRON) stay house PRT
 LT: ‘The rain stopped. (You) stay in the house (, I entreat you so).’
 IM: ‘Although the rain stopped, stay in the house.’

Consultant TM considers (2-3-3-2)-(c1) not acceptable.

The example (2-3-3-2)-(c2), which contains the I-CLM *têe* ‘but’, is not acceptable. (However, Consultant TM considers it acceptable.) It is an instance of (ii-1) Coordination proper.

Coordination proper

- (2-3-3-2)-(c2) * [*fǒn yùt*] *têe*
 rain stop but
 [(*khun*) *yùu bâan thà?*]
 (PRON) stay house PRT
 LT: ‘The rain stopped, but (you) stay in the house (, I entreat you so).’

Quasi-coordination

- (2-3-3-2)-(c3) s[*thǔn fǒn yùt*] *têe*
 although rain stop but
 _M[(*khun*) *kô yùu bâan thà?*]
 (PRON) even.so stay house PRT
 LT: ‘Although the rain stopped, but even so (you) stay in the house (, I entreat you so).’
 (2-3-3-2)-(c4) * s[*thán thán thī fǒn yùt*] *têe*
 although rain stop but
 _M[(*khun*) *kô yùu bâan thà?*]
 (PRON) even.so stay house PRT
 LT: ‘Although the rain stopped, but even so (you) stay in the house (, I entreat you so).’

Quasi-parataxis

- (2-3-3-2)-(c5) * [*fǒn yùt*]
 rain stop
 [(*khun*) *kô yùu bâan thà?*]
 (PRON) even.so stay house PRT
 LT: ‘The rain stopped, even so (you) stay in the house (, I entreat you so).’
 IM: ‘Although the rain stopped, stay in the house.’

Consultant TM considers (2-3-3-2)-(c5) acceptable.

- (d) Parataxis proper: [Y] + [X]
 (2-3-3-2)-(d1) * [(*khun*) *yùu bâan thà?*]
 (PRON) stay house PRT
 [*fǒn yùt*]
 rain stop
 LT: ‘(You) stay in the house (, I entreat you so). The rain stopped.’
 IM: ‘Stay in the house, although the rain stopped.’

6.4 Concessives Level IV

Subordinate clause: premise. Main clause: judgement.

- (2-3-4-1) Although the doctor saved/cured him, he had not been sent for.
 IM: ALTHOUGH the doctor saved/cured him, I GUESS/
 SUPPOSE/INFER/CONCLUDE THAT he had not been sent
 for.
 (a) Subordination proper: s[X] + m[Y]
 (2-3-4-1)-(a1) * s[*thǔn mǎo chûay hây khâw rôot chiiwít*]
 although doctor help IND PRON survive
 m[*mǎo mây dâi thùuk rîak pay*]
 doctor NEG REAL PASS call go
 LT: ‘Although the doctor helped him survive, the doctor
 was not called in.’

Consultant TM says that the following expressions ((a’) and (b’)) are more natural than the expressions straightforwardly interpreted from English expressions of (2-3-4-1)-(a1), i.e., (a) *mǎo chûay hây khâw rôot chiiwít* ‘the doctor helped him survive’ and (b) *mǎo mây dâi thùuk rîak pay* ‘the doctor was not called in’: (a’) *mǎo chûay dâi chûay chiiwít khâw wáy* ‘the doctor helped his life retain’ and (b’) *khâw mây dâi rîak hây mǎo chûay* ‘he (the doctor’s patient) did not call the doctor to help (him)’.

- (2-3-4-1)-(a2) * s[*thǔn mǎo chûay hây khâw rôot chiiwít*]
 although doctor help IND PRON survive
 m[*mǎo khoṇ mây dâi thùuk rîak pay*]
 doctor probably NEG REAL PASS call go
 lá? máṅ
 PRT PRT
 LT: ‘Although the doctor helped him survive, probably the
 doctor was not called in.’

Quasi-subordination

- (2-3-4-1)-(a3) s[*thǔn mǎo chûay hây khâw rôot chiiwít*]
 although doctor help IND PRON survive

- (2-3-4-1)-(a4) $M[m\check{o} \quad k\check{o} \quad m\check{a}y \quad d\check{a}y \quad th\check{u}uk \quad r\check{i}ak \quad pay]$
 doctor even.so NEG REAL PASS call go
 LT: 'Although the doctor helped him survive, even so probably the doctor was not called in.'
- (2-3-4-1)-(a4) $s[th\check{u}n \quad m\check{o} \quad ch\check{u}ay \quad h\check{a}y \quad kh\check{a}w \quad r\check{o}t \quad chiiw\check{i}t]$
 although doctor help IND PRON survive
 $M[m\check{o} \quad k\check{o} \quad kh\check{o}n \quad m\check{a}y \quad d\check{a}y \quad th\check{u}uk \quad r\check{i}ak \quad pay \quad l\check{a} \quad m\check{a}n]$
 doctor even.so probably NEG REAL PASS call go PRT PRT
 LT: 'Although the doctor helped him survive, even so probably the doctor was not called in.'

The examples (2-3-4-1)-(a1), -(a2) are not acceptable. (Consultant TM considers (2-3-4-1)-(a2) marginally acceptable.) However, (2-3-4-1)-(a3), -(a4) are acceptable. (Consultant TM considers (2-3-4-1)-(a4) marginally acceptable.) They contain the AP-CLM *kô* 'even so'. They are instances of (i-2) Quasi-subordination. The same applies to (2-3-4-1)-(a5) to -(a7), which involve *thán thán thîi* 'although', not *thûn* 'although'.

Subordination proper

- (2-3-4-1)-(a5) * $s[th\check{a}n \quad th\check{a}n \quad th\check{i}i \quad m\check{o} \quad ch\check{u}ay \quad h\check{a}y \quad kh\check{a}w \quad r\check{o}t \quad chiiw\check{i}t]$
 although doctor help IND PRON survive
 $M[m\check{o} \quad m\check{a}y \quad d\check{a}y \quad th\check{u}uk \quad r\check{i}ak \quad pay]$
 doctor NEG REAL PASS call go
 LT: 'Although the doctor helped him survive, the doctor was not called in.'
- (2-3-4-1)-(a6) * $s[th\check{a}n \quad th\check{a}n \quad th\check{i}i \quad m\check{o} \quad ch\check{u}ay \quad h\check{a}y \quad kh\check{a}w \quad r\check{o}t \quad chiiw\check{i}t]$
 although doctor help IND PRON survive
 $M[m\check{o} \quad kh\check{o}n \quad m\check{a}y \quad d\check{a}y \quad th\check{u}uk \quad r\check{i}ak \quad pay \quad l\check{a} \quad m\check{a}n]$
 doctor probably NEG REAL PASS call go PRT PRT
 LT: 'Although the doctor helped him survive, probably the doctor was not called in.'

Quasi-subordination

- (2-3-4-1)-(a7) * $s[th\check{a}n \quad th\check{a}n \quad th\check{i}i \quad m\check{o} \quad ch\check{u}ay \quad h\check{a}y \quad kh\check{a}w \quad r\check{o}t \quad chiiw\check{i}t]$
 although doctor help IND PRON survive
 $M[m\check{o} \quad k\check{o} \quad m\check{a}y \quad d\check{a}y \quad th\check{u}uk \quad r\check{i}ak \quad pay]$
 doctor even.so NEG REAL PASS call go

- LT: ‘Although the doctor helped him survive, even so probably the doctor was not called in.’
- (2-3-4-1)-(a8) * s[thán thán thī mǎw chûay hây kháw
 although doctor help IND PRON
 rǎot chiiwít]
 survive
 M[mǎw kô khon mây dâi thûuk
 doctor even.so probably NEG REAL PASS
 rîak pay lá? mǎn]
 call go PRT PRT
 LT: ‘Although the doctor helped him survive, even so probably the doctor was not called in.’
- (b) Subordination proper: M[Y] + s[X]
- (2-3-4-1)-(b1) M[mǎw mây dâi thûuk rîak pay]
 doctor NEG REAL PASS call go
 s[thûn mǎw chûay hây kháw rǎot chiiwít]
 although doctor help IND PRON survive
 LT: ‘The doctor was not called in, although the doctor helped him survive.’
- (2-3-4-1)-(b2) M[mǎw khon mây dâi thûuk rîak pay
 doctor probably NEG REAL PASS call go
 lá? mǎn]
 PRT PRT
 s[thûn mǎw chûay hây kháw rǎot chiiwít]
 although doctor help IND PRON survive
 LT: ‘Probably the doctor was not called in, although the doctor helped him survive.’

The examples (2-3-4-1)-(b1), -(b2) are acceptable. (Consultant TM considers (2-3-4-1)-(b1) not acceptable.) The same does *not* apply to (2-3-4-1)-(b3) and (2-3-4-1)-(b4). That is, they are not acceptable. (2-3-4-1)-(b4) is not acceptable despite the presence of *khon ... mǎn* ‘probably’.

- (2-3-4-1)-(b3) * M[mǎw mây dâi thûuk rîak pay]
 doctor NEG REAL PASS call go
 s[thán thán thī mǎw chûay hây kháw
 although doctor help IND PRON
 rǎot chiiwít]
 survive
 LT: ‘The doctor was not called in, although the doctor helped him survive.’
- (2-3-4-1)-(b4) * M[mǎw khon mây dâi thûuk rîak
 doctor probably NEG REAL PASS call
 pay lá? mǎn]
 go PRT PRT

s[thán thán thî mǎo chûay hây kháw
 although doctor help IND PRON
 rǎot chiiwít]
 survive

LT: 'Probably the doctor was not called in, although the doctor helped him survive.'

(c) Parataxis proper: [X] + [Y]

(2-3-4-1)-(c1) * s[mǎo chûay hây kháw rǎot chiiwít]
 doctor help IND PRON survive
 M[mǎo mây dâi thùuk ríak pay]
 doctor NEG REAL PASS call go

LT: 'The doctor helped him survive. The doctor was not called in.'

IM: 'Although the doctor helped him survive, probably he had not been called in.'

(2-3-4-1)-(c2) * s[mǎo chûay hây kháw rǎot chiiwít]
 doctor help IND PRON survive
 M[mǎo khon mây dâi thùuk ríak pay
 doctor probably NEG REAL PASS call go
 lá? máŋ]
 PRT PRT

LT: 'The doctor helped him survive. Probably the doctor was not called in.'

IM: 'Although the doctor helped him survive, probably he had not been called in.'

If the examples (2-3-4-1)-(c1), -(c2) contain the I-CLM *têe* 'but', they become acceptable; see (2-3-4-1)-(c3), -(c4). (Consultant TM considers (2-3-4-1)-(c1), -(c2) marginally acceptable.) The examples (2-3-4-1)-(c3), -(c4) are an instance of (ii-1) Coordination proper.

Coordination proper

(2-3-4-1)-(c3) s[mǎo chûay hây kháw rǎot chiiwít] têe
 doctor help IND PRON survive but
 M[mǎo mây dâi thùuk ríak pay]
 doctor NEG REAL PASS call go

LT: 'The doctor helped him survive, but the doctor was not called in.'

(2-3-4-1)-(c4) s[mǎo chûay hây kháw rǎot chiiwít] têe
 doctor help IND PRON survive but
 M[mǎo khon mây dâi thùuk ríak pay
 doctor probably NEG REAL PASS call go
 lá? máŋ]
 PRT PRT

LT: 'The doctor helped him survive, but probably the doctor was not called in.'

Quasi-coordination

- (2-3-4-1)-(c5) s[thǔn mǎo chûay hây kháw rôot chiiwít]
 although doctor help IND PRON survive
 tɛɛ M[mǎo kô khoŋ mây dâi dâi
 but doctor even.so probably NEG REAL
 thùuk ríak pay lá? mán]
 PASS call go PRT PRT
 LT: 'Although the doctor helped him survive, but even so
 probably the doctor was not called in.'
- (2-3-4-1)-(c6) s[thán thán thî mǎo chûay hây kháw
 although doctor help IND PRON
 rôot chiiwít] tɛɛ
 survive but
 M[mǎo kô khoŋ mây dâi thùuk
 doctor even.so probably NEG REAL PASS
 ríak pay lá? mán]
 call go PRT PRT
 LT: 'Although the doctor helped him survive, but even so
 probably the doctor was not called in.'

Consultant TM considers (2-3-4-1)-(c6) not acceptable.

Quasi-parataxis

- (2-3-4-1)-(c7) * s[mǎo chûay hây kháw rôot chiiwít]
 doctor help IND PRON survive
 M[mǎo kô mây dâi thùuk ríak pay]
 doctor even.so NEG REAL PASS call go
 LT: 'The doctor helped him survive, even so the doctor
 was not called in.'
 IM: 'Although the doctor helped him survive, probably he
 had not been called in.'
- (2-3-4-1)-(c8) * s[mǎo chûay hây kháw rôot chiiwít]
 doctor help IND PRON survive
 M[mǎo kô khoŋ mây dâi thùuk
 doctor even.so probably NEG REAL PASS
 ríak pay lá? mán]
 call go PRT PRT
 LT: 'The doctor helped him survive, even so probably the
 doctor was not called in.'
 IM: 'Although the doctor helped him survive, probably he
 had not been called in.'

(d) Parataxis proper: [Y] + [X]

- (2-3-4-1)-(d1) * [mǎo mây dâi thùuk ríak pay]
 doctor NEG REAL PASS call go
 [mǎo chûay hây kháw rôot chiiwít]
 doctor help IND PRON survive

LT: 'The doctor was not called in. The doctor helped him survive.'

IM: 'I guess that the doctor had not been called in, although he helped him survive.'

(2-3-4-1)-(d2) * [mǎɔ̌ khoň mǎy dǎy thùuk riak pay
doctor probably NEG REAL PASS call go
láʔ mǎŋ]
PRT PRT

[mǎɔ̌ chûay hǎy kháw rǎɔ̌t chiiwít]
doctor help IND PRON survive

LT: 'Probably the doctor was not called in. The doctor helped him survive.'

IM: 'Probably the doctor had not been called in, although he helped him survive.'

Note that parataxis proper (i.e. (2-3-4-1)-(c1), -(c2) and (2-3-4-1)-(d1), -(d2)) is not acceptable, irrespective of the presence/absence of *khoň ... mǎŋ* 'probably'.

(2-3-4-2) Although the ground is wet, rain did not fall.

IM: ALTHOUGH the ground is wet, I GUESS/ SUPPOSE/ INFER/CONCLUDE THAT rain did not fall.

(a) Subordination proper: s[X] + m[Y]

(2-3-4-2)-(a1) * s[thǔŋ phúuun piak]
although ground be.wet
m[fǎn mǎy dǎy tòk]
rain NEG REAL fall

LT: 'Although the ground is wet, the rain did not fall.'

Quasi-subordination

(2-3-4-2)-(a2) * s[thǔŋ phúuun piak]
although ground be.wet
m[fǎn kô mǎy dǎy tòk]
rain even.so NEG REAL fall

LT: 'Although the ground is wet, even so the rain did not fall.'

Subordination proper

(2-3-4-2)-(a3) s[thǔŋ phúuun piak]
although ground be.wet
m[fǎn khoň mǎy dǎy tòk rǎk mǎŋ]
rain probably NEG REAL fall PRT PRT

LT: 'Although the ground is wet, probably the rain did not fall.'

(*Rǎk* is a final particle. It expresses the speaker's disagreement with the interlocutor's or the general public's opinion, assumption, expectation, and

the like.)

Quasi-subordination

- (2-3-4-2)-(a4) s[thǔn phúuun piak]
 although ground be.wet
 M[fǒn kô khon mây dây tòk
 rain even.so probably NEG REAL fall
 ròk máy]
 PRT PRT
 LT: 'Although the ground is wet, even so probably the rain did not fall.'

The examples (2-3-4-2)-(a1), -(a2) are not acceptable. (2-3-4-2)-(a3), which contains *khon* ... *máy* 'probably', is acceptable. (Consultant TM considers it marginally acceptable.) It is still an instance of (i-1) Subordination proper. (2-3-4-2)-(a4) is perfectly acceptable (and Consultant TM comments that it may become more natural if the main clause is replaced with the following expression: *kô khon mây chây fǒn tòk ròk máy* 'even so it is probably not the case that the rain fell'); it contains the AP-CLM *kô* 'even so' in addition to *khon* ... *máy* 'probably'. It is an instance of (i-2) Quasi-subordination. The same does *not* apply to (2-3-4-2)-(a5), -(a6), -(a7) and -(a8). That is, (2-3-4-2)-(a6) is not acceptable despite the presence of *khon* ... *máy* 'probably', and (2-3-4-2)-(a8) is not acceptable despite the presence of *kô* 'even so' and *khon* ... *máy* 'probably'.

Subordination proper

- (2-3-4-2)-(a5) * s[thán thán thi phúuun piak]
 although ground be.wet
 M[fǒn mây dây tòk]
 rain NEG REAL fall
 LT: 'Although the ground is wet, the rain did not fall.'
 IM: 'Although the ground is wet, I guess that the rain did not fall.'
- (2-3-4-2)-(a6) * s[thán thán thi phúuun piak]
 although ground be.wet
 M[fǒn khon mây dây tòk ròk máy]
 rain probably NEG REAL fall PRT PRT
 LT: 'Although the ground is wet, probably the rain did not fall.'

Quasi-subordination

- (2-3-4-2)-(a7) * s[thán thán thi phúuun piak]
 although ground be.wet
 M[fǒn kô mây dây tòk]
 rain even.so NEG REAL fall
 LT: 'Although the ground is wet, even so the rain did not fall.'

IM: ‘Although the ground is wet, I guess that the rain did not fall.’

- (2-3-4-2)-(a8) * s[thán thán thî phúuun pìak]
 although ground be.wet
 M[fôn kô khon mây dâi tók
 rain even.so probably NEG REAL fall
 rók mán]
 PRT PRT

LT: ‘Although the ground is wet, even so probably the rain did not fall.’

- (b) Subordination proper: M[Y] + s[X]
 (2-3-4-2)-(b1) M[fôn mây dâi tók]
 rain NEG REAL fall
 s[thûn phúuun pìak]
 although ground be.wet
 LT: ‘The rain did not fall, although the ground is wet.’
 (2-3-4-2)-(b2) M[fôn khon mây dâi tók rók mán]
 rain probably NEG REAL fall PRT PRT
 s[thûn phúuun pìak]
 although ground be.wet
 LT: ‘Probably the rain did not fall, although the ground is wet.’
 (2-3-4-2)-(b3) * M[fôn mây dâi tók]
 rain NEG REAL fall
 s[thán thán thî phúuun pìak]
 although ground be.wet
 LT: ‘The rain did not fall, although the ground is wet.’
 (2-3-4-2)-(b4) * M[fôn khon mây dâi tók rók mán]
 rain probably NEG REAL fall PRT PRT
 s[thán thán thî phúuun pìak]
 although ground be.wet
 LT: ‘Probably the rain did not fall, although the ground is wet.’

Consultant TM considers (2-3-4-2)-(b3) acceptable.

Note that, unlike (2-3-4-2)-(b2), (2-3-4-2)-(b4) is not acceptable despite the presence of *khon ... mán* ‘probably’. On the other hand, the meaning of (2-3-1-1)-(a2) at Level I (‘Despite the fact that the rain fell, the ground is still dry’) and that of (2-3-2-2)-(a4) at Level II (‘Despite the fact that the rain stopped, even so he has to stay in the house’), for example, are acceptable.

- (c) Parataxis proper: [X] + [Y]
 (2-3-4-2)-(c1) * [phúuun pìak]
 ground be.wet

- (2-3-4-2)-(c2) * [fǒn mây dây tòk]
rain NEG REAL fall
LT: 'The ground is wet. The rain did not fall.'
IM: 'Although the ground is wet, the rain did not fall.'
- * [phúuun pìak]
ground be.wet
- [fǒn khon mây dây tòk ròk máŋ]
rain probably NEG REAL fall PRT PRT
LT: 'The ground is wet. Probably the rain did not fall.'
IM: 'Although the ground is wet, probably the rain did not fall.'

The examples (2-3-4-2)-(c1), -(c2) are not acceptable (although (2-3-4-2)-(c2) contains *khon ... máŋ* 'probably').

Coordination proper

- (2-3-4-2)-(c3) * [phúuun pìak] têe
ground be.wet but
[fǒn mây dây tòk]
rain NEG REAL fall
LT: 'The ground is wet, but the rain did not fall.'
- (2-3-4-2)-(c4) * [phúuun pìak] têe
ground be.wet but
[fǒn khon mây dây tòk ròk máŋ]
rain probably NEG REAL fall PRT PRT
LT: 'The ground is wet, but probably the rain did not fall.'

Consultant TM considers (2-3-4-2)-(c3), -(c4) acceptable.

Quasi-coordination

- (2-3-4-2)-(c5) s[thǔŋ *phúuun pìak*] têe
although ground be.wet but
M[fǒn kô mây dây tòk]
rain even.so NEG REAL fall
LT: 'Although the ground is wet, but even so the rain did not fall.'
- (2-3-4-2)-(c6) s[thǔŋ *phúuun pìak*] têe
although ground be.wet but
M[fǒn kô *khon mây dây tòk*
rain even.so probably NEG REAL fall
ròk máŋ
PRT PRT
LT: 'Although the ground is wet, but even so probably the rain did not fall.'
- (2-3-4-2)-(c7) * s[thán thán thî *phúuun pìak*] têe
although ground be.wet but

_M[*fǒn kô mây dâi tók*]
rain even.so NEG REAL fall

LT: 'Although the ground is wet, but even so the rain did not fall.'

IM: 'Although the ground is wet, I guess that the rain did not fall.'

(2-3-4-2)-(c8) * _S[*thán thán thîi phúuun piák tɛɛ*]
although ground be.wet but

_M[*fǒn kô khoŋ mây dâi tók rók máŋ*]
rain even.so probably NEG REAL fall PRT

LT: 'Although the ground is wet, but even so probably the rain did not fall.'

Consultant TM considers (2-3-4-2)-(c5) not acceptable.

Quasi-parataxis

(2-3-4-2)-(c9) * [*phúuun piák*]
ground be.wet

[*fǒn kô mây dâi tók*]
rain even.so NEG REAL fall

LT: 'The ground is wet, even so the rain did not fall.'

IM: 'Although the ground is wet, the rain did not fall.'

(2-3-4-2)-(c10) * [*phúuun piák*]
ground be.wet

[*fǒn kô khoŋ mây dâi tók rók máŋ*]
rain even.so probably NEG REAL fall PRT

PRT

LT: 'The ground is wet, even so probably the rain did not fall.'

IM: 'Although the ground is wet, probably the rain did not fall.'

(d) Parataxis proper: [Y] + [X]

(2-3-4-2)-(d1) * [*fǒn may dâi tók*]
rain NEG REAL fall PRT PRT

[*phúuun piák*]
ground be.wet

LT: 'The rain did not fall. The ground is wet.'

IM: 'The rain did not fall, although the ground is wet.'

(2-3-4-2)-(d2) * [*fǒn khoŋ may dâi tók rók máŋ*]
rain probably NEG REAL fall PRT PRT

[*phúuun piák*]
ground be.wet

LT: 'Probably the rain did not fall. The ground is wet.'

IM: ‘Probably the rain did not fall, although the ground is wet.’

Note that parataxis proper (i.e. (2-3-4-2)-(c1), -(c2) and (2-3-4-2)-(d1), -(d2)) is not acceptable, irrespective of the presence/absence of *khon ... mǎn* ‘probably’.

6.5 Concessives Level V

Subordinate clause: premise. Main clause: speech act.

(2-3-5-1) There is food here, although you know this.

IM: ALTHOUGH you know this, I SAY TO YOU ‘There is food here’.

(a) Subordination proper: s[X] + m[Y]

(2-3-5-1)-(a1) * s[thǔn khun rǔu yùu]
 although PRON know CONT
 m[khǎw kin yùu troŋ ní nǎʔ]
 food be.located here PRT

LT: ‘Although you know (this), food is located here (, I suggest to you so).’

IM: ‘Although you know this, there is food here.’

Quasi-subordination

(2-3-5-1)-(a2) * s[thǔn khun rǔu yùu]
 although PRON know CONT
 m[khǎw kin kǎ yùu troŋ ní nǎʔ]
 food even.so be.located here PRT

LT: ‘Although you know (this), even so food is located here (, I suggest to you so).’

IM: ‘Although you know this, there is food here.’

Subordination proper

(2-3-5-1)-(a3) * s[thǎn thǎn thǐi khun rǔu yùu]
 although PRON know CONT
 m[khǎw kin yùu troŋ ní nǎʔ]
 food be.located here PRT

LT: ‘Although you know (this), food is located here (, I suggest to you so).’

IM: ‘Although you know this, there is food here.’

Quasi-subordination

(2-3-5-1)-(a4) * s[thǎn thǎn thǐi khun rǔu yùu]
 although PRON know CONT
 m[khǎw kin kǎ yùu troŋ ní nǎʔ]
 food even.so be.located here PRT

LT: ‘Although you know (this), even so food is located

here (, I suggest to you so).’

IM: ‘Although you know this, there is food here.’

- (b) Subordination proper: $M[Y] + s[X]$
- (2-3-5-1)-(b1) * $M[khǎɯŋ \text{ kin } yùu \text{ troŋ nǐi náʔ}]$
 food be.located here PRT
 $s[thǔŋ \text{ khun rúu yùu}]$
 although PRON know CONT
 LT: ‘Food is located here (, I suggest to you so), although you know (this).’
 IM: ‘There is food here, although you know this.’
- (2-3-5-1)-(b2) * $M[khǎɯŋ \text{ kin } yùu \text{ troŋ nǐi náʔ}]$
 food be.located here PRT
 $s[thǎŋ \text{ thǎŋ thǐi khun rúu yùu}]$
 although PRON know CONT
 LT: ‘Food is located here (, I suggest to you so), although you know (this).’
 IM: ‘There is food here, although you know this.’

Note that (i-1) Subordination proper and (i-2) Quasi-subordination (i.e. (2-3-5-1)-(a1) to -(b2)) is not acceptable.

- (c) Parataxis proper: $[X] + [Y]$
- (2-3-5-1)-(c1) * $[khun \text{ rúu yùu}]$
 PRON know CONT
 $[khǎɯŋ \text{ kin } yùu \text{ troŋ nǐi náʔ}]$
 food be.located here PRT
 LT: ‘You know (this). Food is located here (, I suggest to you so).’
 IM: ‘Although you know this, there is food here.’
- (2-3-5-1)-(c2) $[khun \text{ ʔàat càʔ rúu léew kô dǎy}]$
 PRON might IRR know PFV be.possible
 $[khǎɯŋ \text{ kin } yùu \text{ troŋ nǐi náʔ}]$
 food be.located here PRT
 LT: ‘You might know (this). Food is located here (, I suggest to you so).’

The example (2-3-5-1)-(c1) is not acceptable, but (2-3-5-1)-(c2) is acceptable; it contains the epistemic expression *ʔàat càʔ...kô dǎy* ‘probably, might’. It is still an instance of (iii) Parataxis proper. The same applies to (2-3-5-1)-(d1) and (2-3-5-1)-(d2) below. (*ʔàat* is an adverb which has an epistemic meaning of ‘possibly’. *Càʔ* is the irrealis marker. *Kô* is a multifunctional discourse marker (‘then, so, even so’), and it can also be used as an AP-CLM (i.e. a CLM adjacent to the predicate of a clause). *Dǎy* is a verb which indicates possibility.)

The example (2-3-5-1)-(c3) is not acceptable. (Consultant TM considers it marginally acceptable.) The example (2-3-5-1)-(c4), which

contains *ʔàat càʔ...kô dâʔ* ‘probably, might’, is acceptable. (2-3-5-1)-(c3), -(c4) are instances of (ii-1) Coordination proper.

Coordination proper

- (2-3-5-1)-(c3) * [*khun rúu yùu*] *têɛ*
 PRON know CONT but
 [*khǎɔŋ kin yùu troŋ ní náʔ*]
 food be.located here PRT
 LT: ‘You know (this), but food is located here (, I suggest to you so).’
- (2-3-5-1)-(c4) [*khun ʔàat càʔ rúu léɛw kô dâʔ*]
 PRON might IRR know PFV be.possible
têɛ [*khǎɔŋ kin yùu troŋ ní náʔ*]
 but food be.located here PRT
 LT: ‘You might know (this), but food is located here (, I suggest to you so).’

Quasi-coordination

- (2-3-5-1)-(c5) * s[*thǔŋ khun rúu yùu*] *têɛ*
 although PRON know CONT but
 M[*khǎɔŋ kin kô yùu troŋ ní náʔ*]
 food even.so be.located here PRT
 LT: ‘Although you know (this), but even so food is located here (, I suggest to you so).’
 IM: ‘Although you know this, there is food here.’
- (2-3-5-1)-(c6) * s[*thán thán thîi khun rúu yùu*] *têɛ*
 although PRON know CONT but
 M[*khǎɔŋ kin kô yùu troŋ ní náʔ*]
 food even.so be.located here PRT
 LT: ‘Although you know (this), but even so food is located here (, I suggest to you so).’
 IM: ‘Although you know this, there is food here.’

Quasi-parataxis

- (2-3-5-1)-(c7) * [*khun rúu yùu*]
 PRON know CONT

 [*khǎɔŋ kin kô yùu troŋ ní náʔ*]
 food even.so be.located here PRT
 LT: ‘You know (this), even so food is located here (, I suggest to you so).’
 IM: ‘Although you know this, there is food here.’
- (2-3-5-1)-(c8) * [*khun ʔàat càʔ rúu léɛw kô dâʔ*]
 PRON might IRR know PFV be.possible
 [*khǎɔŋ kin kô yùu troŋ ní náʔ*]
 food even.so be.located here PRT
 LT: ‘You might know (this), even so food is located here (,

I suggest to you so).’

Consultant TM considers (2-3-5-1)-(c8) marginally acceptable. She comments that it sounds more natural if it does not contain the AP-CLM *kô* in the main clause (i.e. Parataxis proper: (2-3-5-1)-(c2)).

- (d) Parataxis proper: [Y] + [X]
 (2-3-5-1)-(d1) * [khǎŋ kin yùu troŋ ní náʔ]
 food be.located here PRT
 [khun rúu yùu]
 PRON know CONT
 LT: ‘Food is located here. You know (this).’
 IM: ‘There is food here, although you know this.’
 (2-3-5-1)-(d2) [khǎŋ kin yùu troŋ ní náʔ]
 food be.located here PRT
 [khun ʔàat càʔ rúu léew kô dâi]
 PRON might IRR know PFV be.possible
 LT: ‘Food is located here. You might know (this).’

- (2-3-5-2) Work hard, although I am sorry for you.
 IM: ALTHOUGH I am sorry for you, I SAY TO YOU ‘Work hard!’

- (a) Subordination proper: s[X] + m[Y]
 (2-3-5-2)-(a1) * s[thǔŋ chán càʔ hěn cay khun]
 although PRON IRR sympathize.with PRON
 m[(khun) khayǎn tham ʔaan nòy náʔ]
 (PRON) be.industrious work a.bit PRT
 LT: ‘Although I sympathize with you, (you) are
 industrious and work a bit (, I encourage/order you so) [=
 be industrious and work a bit].’

Quasi-subordination

- (2-3-5-2)-(a2) s[thǔŋ chán càʔ hěn cay khun]
 although PRON IRR sympathize.with PRON
 m[(khun) kô khayǎn tham ʔaan nòy
 (PRON) even.so be.industrious work a.bit
 náʔ]
 PRT
 LT: ‘Although I sympathize with you, even so (you) are
 industrious and work a bit (, I encourage/order you so) [=
 be industrious and work a bit].’

The example (2-3-5-2)-(a1) is not acceptable. (Consultant TM considers it marginally acceptable.) In contrast, (2-3-5-2)-(a2) is acceptable; it contains the AP-CLM *kô* ‘even so’. It is an instance of (i-2) Quasi-subordination. The same does not apply to (2-3-5-2)-(a3), -(a4). Note in particular that (2-3-5-2)-(a4) is not acceptable, despite the presence of *kô*

‘even so’.

Subordination proper

- (2-3-5-2)-(a3) * s[thán thán thîi chán cà? hěn cay
 although PRON IRR sympathize.with
 khun]
 PRON
 M[(khun) khayǎn tham ɲaan nòy ná?]
 (PRON) be.industrious work a.bit PRT
 LT: ‘Although I sympathize with you, (you) are
 industrious and work a bit (, I encourage/order you so) [=
 be industrious and work a bit].’

Quasi-subordination

- (2-3-5-2)-(a4) * s[thán thán thîi chán cà? hěn cay
 although PRON IRR sympathize.with
 khun] M[(khun) kô khayǎn
 PRON (PRON) even.so be.industrious
 tham ɲaan nòy ná?]
 work a.bit PRT
 LT: ‘Although I sympathize with you, even so (you) are
 industrious and work a bit (, I encourage/order you so) [=
 be industrious and work a bit].’

(b) Subordination proper: M[Y] + s[X]

- (2-3-5-2)-(b1) M[(khun) khayǎn tham ɲaan nòy ná?]
 (PRON) be.industrious work a.bit PRT
 s[thǔn chán cà? hěn cay khun]
 although PRON IRR sympathize.with PRON
 LT: ‘(You) are industrious and work a bit (, I
 encourage/order you so) [= Be industrious and work a bit],
 although I sympathize with you.’
- (2-3-5-2)-(b2) * M[(khun) khayǎn tham ɲaan nòy ná?]
 (PRON) be.industrious work a.bit PRT
 s[thán thán thîi chán cà? hěn cay
 although PRON IRR sympathize.with
 khun]
 PRON
 LT: ‘(You) are industrious and work a bit (, I
 encourage/order you so) [= Be industrious and work a bit],
 although I sympathize with you.’

Note that (2-3-5-2)-(b1) (*thǔn*) is acceptable, but that (2-3-5-2)-(b2) (*thán thán thîi*) is not.

- (c) Parataxis proper: [X] + [Y]
 (2-3-5-2)-(c1) * [*chán hěn cay khun*]
 PRON sympathize.with PRON
 [(*khun*) *khayăn tham ɲaan nòy nǎ?*]
 (PRON) be.industrious work a.bit PRT
 LT: 'I sympathize with you. (You) are industrious and work a bit (, I encourage/order you so) [= Be industrious and work a bit].'
 IM: 'Although I sympathize with you, be industrious and work a bit.'

The example (2-3-5-2)-(c2) contains the I-CLM *têe* 'but', but it is still not acceptable. (Consultant TM considers it acceptable.) It is an instance of (ii-1) Coordination proper.

- Coordination proper
 (2-3-5-2)-(c2) * [*chán hěn cay khun têe*]
 PRON sympathize.with PRON but
 [(*khun*) *khayăn tham ɲaan nòy nǎ?*]
 (PRON) be.industrious work a.bit PRT
 LT: 'I sympathize with you, but (you) are industrious and work a bit (, I encourage/order you so) [= be industrious and work a bit].'

- Quasi-coordination
 (2-3-5-2)-(c3) s[*thǔn chán cà? hěn cay khun*]
 although PRON IRR sympathize.with PRON
têe M[(*khun*) *kô khayăn tham ɲaan*]
 but (PRON) even.so be.industrious work
nòy nǎ?
 a.bit PRT
 LT: 'Although I sympathize with you, but even so (you) are industrious and work a bit (, I encourage/order you so) [= be industrious and work a bit].'
 (2-3-5-2)-(c4) * s[*thán thán thîi chán cà? hěn cay*]
 although PRON IRR sympathize.with
khun *têe* M[(*khun*) *kô khayăn*]
 PRON but (PRON) even.so be.industrious
tham ɲaan nòy nǎ?
 work a.bit PRT
 LT: 'Although I sympathize with you, but even so (you) are industrious and work a bit (, I encourage/order you so) [= be industrious and work a bit].'

- Quasi-parataxis
 (2-3-5-2)-(c5) * [*chán hěn cay khun*]
 PRON sympathize.with PRON

[(*khun*) *kô khayăn* *tham ɲaan nòy*
(PRON) even.so be.industrious work a.bit
náʔ
PRT

LT: ‘I sympathize with you, even so (you) are industrious and work a bit (, I encourage/order you so) [= Be industrious and work a bit].’

IM: ‘Although I sympathize with you, be industrious and work a bit.’

- (d) Parataxis proper: [Y] + [X]
(2-3-5-2)-(d1) * [(*khun*) *khayăn* *tham ɲaan nòy náʔ*
(PRON) be.industrious work a.bit PRT
[*chán hěn cay* *khun*]
PRON sympathize.with PRON
LT: ‘(You) are industrious and work a bit (, I encourage/order you so) [= Be industrious and work a bit]. I sympathize with you.’
IM: ‘Work hard!, although I am sorry for you.’

Note that parataxis proper ((2-3-5-2)-(c1), (d1)) is not acceptable.

7. Discussion

7.1 Distribution of clause linkage markers

The distribution of the attested clause linkage markers in terms of the five levels is shown in Table 1. ‘+’ means ‘acceptable’, ‘-’ ‘not acceptable’, and ‘?’ ‘acceptable, but not perfectly’. If the judgements for the two examples (X-X-X-X-1) and (X-X-X-X-2) are the same, only one marker is used (e.g., ‘-’); if they are not, two different markers with a comma are used (e.g., ‘+, -’). A pair of unbracketed marker(s) and bracketed marker(s) (e.g., ‘-[?]’, ‘+, -[?, +]’) indicates that the judgements of the two native speaker consultants (Consultant AM and Consultant TM) are different. For example, ‘-[?]’ means that Consultant AM (the main consultant) considers it not acceptable (-), but Consultant TM (the vice-consultant) regards it to be marginally acceptable ([?]).

Table 1. Distribution of clause linkage markers

	I	II	III	IV	V
Subordinate clause	Situation	Situation	Situation	Premise	Premise
Main clause	Situation	Situation + Judgement	Situation + Interpersonal effect	Judgement	Speech act

Causals

Subordination

Subordination proper

<i>phrɔʔ</i> ‘because’	+, -	+, -[?]	+, -[?, +]	+ [?], -	-
with <i>khɔŋ ... mǎŋ</i> ‘probably’	irrelevant	irrelevant	irrelevant	+, ?	irrelevant
<i>nûaŋ càak</i> ‘because’	+, -	+, -	+, -	+ [-], ? [-], -	-
with <i>khɔŋ ... mǎŋ</i> ‘probably’	irrelevant	irrelevant	irrelevant	? [+]	irrelevant

Quasi-subordination

s[<i>phrɔʔ</i>] M[<i>cuaŋ</i>] ‘because’ ‘so’	+	+ [-]	-	-	-
s[<i>nûaŋ càak</i>] M[<i>cuaŋ</i>] ‘because’ ‘so’	+	+ [?]	-	-	-

Quasi-parataxis

s[] M[<i>kɔ̌ ləɔy /</i> <i>ləɔy / cuaŋ</i>] ‘so’	+	+, -[?]	-	-	-
---	---	---------	---	---	---

Coordination

Coordination proper

[] <i>chanán</i> [] ‘and so’	-	+	+	+ [-]	-
with <i>khɔŋ ... mǎŋ</i> ‘probably’	irrelevant	irrelevant	irrelevant	+ [-]	irrelevant

Quasi-coordination

s[<i>phrɔʔ</i> / <i>nûaŋ càak</i>] ‘because’ <i>chanán</i> M[] ‘and so’	+, -	+ [?]	-	- [?]	-
---	------	-------	---	-------	---

Parataxis proper

with <i>khɔŋ ... mǎŋ</i> ‘probably’	+, -	+ [?, -], -	+	-	+, -
with <i>lâʔ sìʔ</i> ‘I’m sure’ / <i>chây máy</i> ‘Right?’ / <i>hěn</i> ‘it seems’	irrelevant	irrelevant	irrelevant	+ [-], ? [-]	irrelevant
	irrelevant	irrelevant	irrelevant	irrelevant	+

Conditionals

Subordination					

Subordination proper					
<i>thâa</i> ‘if’	+	+	+[-], -[?, +]	-	+
with <i>khoŋ ... mǎŋ</i>	irrelevant	irrelevant	irrelevant	+	irrelevant
‘probably’					
<i>nay mǔua</i> ‘if’	-	-	-	-	-
with <i>khoŋ ... mǎŋ</i>	irrelevant	irrelevant	irrelevant	+[-]	irrelevant
‘probably’					

Quasi-subordination					
s[<i>thâa</i>] _M [<i>kǎ</i>]	+	+	+	-	?[-]
‘if’ ‘then’					
with <i>khoŋ ... mǎŋ</i>	irrelevant	irrelevant	irrelevant	+[-]	irrelevant
‘probably’					
s[<i>nay mǔua</i>] _M [<i>kǎ</i>]	-	-	+	-	-
‘if’ ‘then’					
with <i>khoŋ ... mǎŋ</i>	irrelevant	irrelevant	irrelevant	+{?}	irrelevant
‘probably’					

Quasi-parataxis					
s[] _M [<i>kǎ</i>]	+{?}	-	-{+}	-	-
‘then’					
with <i>khoŋ ... mǎŋ</i>	irrelevant	irrelevant	irrelevant	+[-], ?{+}	irrelevant
‘probably’					

Coordination					

Coordination proper					
s[] _M <i>lakǎ</i>] _M []	-{+}	+	-{+}	-	+, -{+}
‘and.then’					
with <i>khoŋ ... mǎŋ</i>	irrelevant	irrelevant	irrelevant	-{+}	irrelevant
‘probably’					

Quasi-coordination					
s[<i>thâa</i> / <i>nay mǔua</i>]	+, -	+, -	+, -	-	?[-], -
‘if’					
<i>lakǎ</i>] _M []					
‘and.then’					
with <i>khoŋ ... mǎŋ</i>	irrelevant	irrelevant	irrelevant	+[-]	irrelevant
‘probably’					

Parataxis proper					
with <i>khoŋ ... mǎŋ</i>	+[-], -	-	-	-	-
‘probably’	irrelevant	irrelevant	irrelevant	+, -	irrelevant

Concessives

Subordination

Subordination proper

<i>thǔŋ</i> ‘although’	+[-], -[+]	+, -	+, -[?, +]	+[-], -	+, -[?]
with <i>khon...</i> (<i>mǎŋ</i>) ‘probably’	irrelevant	?, -	irrelevant	+{?}, -{?}	irrelevant
with <i>khon yaŋ</i> ‘probably still’	irrelevant	+[-]	irrelevant	irrelevant	irrelevant
<i>thǎŋ thǎŋ thǐi</i> ‘although’	+, -	+, -[?]	-	-[+]	-
with <i>khon...</i> (<i>mǎŋ</i>) ‘probably’	irrelevant	-	irrelevant	-	irrelevant
with <i>khon yaŋ</i> ‘probably still’	irrelevant	+[-], -	irrelevant	irrelevant	irrelevant

Quasi-subordination

s[<i>thǔŋ</i>] ‘although’	m[<i>kǎi</i>] ‘even.so’	+	+, -	+	+, -	+, -
s[<i>thǔŋ</i>] ‘although’	m[<i>kǎi</i> <i>khon...</i> (<i>mǎŋ</i>)] ‘even.so’ ‘probably’	irrelevant	+	irrelevant	+	irrelevant
s[<i>thǔŋ</i>] ‘although’	m[<i>kǎi</i> <i>khon yaŋ</i>] ‘even.so’ ‘probably still’	irrelevant	+{?}	irrelevant	irrelevant	irrelevant
s[<i>thǎŋ thǎŋ thǐi</i>] ‘although’	m[<i>kǎi</i>] ‘even.so’	+	-	-	-	-
s[<i>thǎŋ thǎŋ thǐi</i>] ‘although’	m[<i>kǎi</i> <i>khon...</i> (<i>mǎŋ</i>)] ‘even.so’ ‘probably’	irrelevant	-	irrelevant	-	irrelevant
s[<i>thǎŋ thǎŋ thǐi</i>] ‘although’	m[<i>kǎi</i> <i>khon yaŋ</i>] ‘even.so’ ‘probably still’	irrelevant	+[-]	irrelevant	irrelevant	irrelevant

Quasi-parataxis

s[] m[<i>kǎi</i>] ‘even.so’	+, -	-	+[-]	-	-
s[] m[<i>kǎi</i> <i>yaŋ</i>] ‘even.so’ ‘still’	+	-	irrelevant	irrelevant	irrelevant
s[] m[<i>kǎi</i>] ‘even.so’	irrelevant	-	irrelevant	irrelevant	irrelevant

(khoy) yaŋ]						
‘(probably) still’						
s[?aat cà? ... kô dâŋ] m[kô]	irrelevant	irrelevant	irrelevant	irrelevant	-[?]	
‘may’						
Coordination						
Coordination proper						
[] tē []	+	+	-[+]	+[?], -[+]	-[?, +]	
‘but’						
[?aat cà? ... kô dâŋ] tē []	irrelevant	irrelevant	irrelevant	irrelevant	+	
‘may’						
Quasi-coordination						
s[thūŋ / thāŋ thāŋ thū]	+	+, -	+, -	+[?], -	+, -	
‘although’						
tē m[kô]						
‘but’ ‘even.so’						
s[thūŋ / thāŋ thāŋ thū]	irrelevant	+	irrelevant	irrelevant	irrelevant	
‘although’						
tē m[kô] khoy (yaŋ)]						
‘but’ ‘even.so’ ‘probably (still)’						
Parataxis proper						
with	-	-	+[?], -	-	-	
yaŋ ‘still, even.so’	-[+]	-	irrelevant	irrelevant	irrelevant	
with khoy ... (māŋ)	irrelevant	-	irrelevant	-	irrelevant	
‘probably’						
with khoy yaŋ	irrelevant	-	irrelevant	irrelevant	irrelevant	
‘probably still’						
with ?aat cà? ... kô dâŋ	irrelevant	irrelevant	irrelevant	irrelevant	+	
‘may’						

For each of the three semantic areas (i.e. causal, conditional, concessive), we selected two CLMs that can be used in subordination proper. Table 1 shows the following, among others.

These six CLMs are often used in combination with another CLM and/or some other word. There is no CLM that is perfectly acceptable by itself at all of the five levels. Among the six CLMs, *phrô?* ‘because’, *thāa* ‘if’ and *thūŋ* ‘although’ are semantically unmarked. They have wide distributions in terms of the five levels. Nonetheless, *phrô?* ‘because’ is not perfectly acceptable at Level V (cf. 4.5). (Parataxis proper is available instead.) *Thāa* ‘if’ is not acceptable at Level IV; it has to be accompanied by *khoy* ... *māŋ* ‘probably’ (cf. 5.4). *Thūŋ* ‘although’ by itself has yielded acceptable sentences at all of the five levels (cf. Section 6). However, at the same time, it has produced not acceptable or marginally acceptable

sentences at all of the five levels.

The other three CLMs (*nûaŋ càak* ‘because’, *nay mûa* ‘if’, *thăŋ thăŋ thîi* ‘although’) are semantically marked, and they have specialized meanings. They have very limited distributions. In particular, *nay mûa* ‘if’ generally cannot be used by itself, with just one exception, namely, (2-2-3-2)-(b2) in 5.3 (LT: ‘(You) give that child dishes (, I order you so), if he is/becomes hungry for rice.’). (This is an instance of Level III.)

Parataxis proper by itself is attested for causals and conditionals, but not for concessives. That is, parataxis proper by itself cannot have a concessive meaning. It can have a concessive meaning if it involves *Pàat cà? ... kô dâŋ* ‘may’ (Level V) (cf. 6.5). However, even when it employs *khon ... mǎŋ* ‘probably’, it cannot be used at Level IV (cf. 6.4). Parataxis proper by itself is available to conditionals, but it is limited to Level I only (cf. 5.1), and not available from Levels II to V (cf. 5.2 to 5.5). At Level IV, the sentence may be acceptable if it contains *khon ... mǎŋ* ‘probably’ (cf. 5.4). For causals (cf. Section 4), parataxis proper by itself can be used at Levels I to III, and V (not at Level IV), although there are not acceptable or marginally acceptable instances. At Level IV (cf. 4.4), the sentence may be acceptable if it contains *khon ... mǎŋ* ‘probably’. At Level V (cf. 4.5), the sentence may be acceptable if it contains *lâ? sî?* ‘I’m sure’, *chây mǎŋ* ‘right?’, or *hěn* ‘it seems’.

That is, at Level I, parataxis proper by itself may have a causal meaning or a conditional meaning, but not a concessive meaning. It has a causal meaning only at Levels I to III, and V (not at Level IV). This can be shown as follows.

- (5) Availability of parataxis proper by itself
causals > conditionals > concessives

7.2 Order of clauses

From Table 2 we can see which syntactic patterns are available for encoding causal, conditional, or concessive situations at the five levels. We shall look at (i-1) Subordination proper, and (iii) Parataxis proper. The symbols in the table indicate the following.

- + ‘acceptable’
- (+) ‘acceptable under a certain condition’
- ? ‘marginally acceptable’
- (?) ‘marginally acceptable under a certain condition’
- ‘not acceptable’

Bracketed judgements, e.g., [?], are provided by Consultant TM (the vice-consultant).

Table 2. Order of clauses

	I	II	III	IV	V
Subordinate clause	Situation	Situation	Situation	Premise	Premise
Main clause	Situation	Situation + Judgement	Situation + Interpersonal effect	Judgement	Speech act
Causals					
Subordination proper					
(a) _S [X] + _M [Y]					
<i>phrɔʔ</i>	-, -	-, -[?]	-[?], -[?]	-, (?), -, (+)	-, -
<i>nûaŋ càak</i>	-, -	-, -	-, -[+]	-, (?), -, (?)	-, -
(b) _M [Y] + _S [X]					
<i>phrɔʔ</i>	+, +	+, +	+, +	+ [?], (+), -, (+)	-, -
<i>nûaŋ càak</i>	+, +	+, +	+, +	?[-], (?), +, (?)	-, -
Parataxis proper					
(c) [X] + [Y]	+, -	+ [?], ?[+]	+ [-], +	-, (+), -, (+[-])	-, (+), +
(d) [Y] + [X]	-, -[+]	-, -	+, +	-, (+), -, (?[-])	-, (+), +
Conditionals					
Subordination proper					
(a) _S [X] + _M [Y]					
<i>thâa</i>	+, +	+, +	-, -	-, (+), -, (+)	+, +
<i>nay mûa</i>	-, -	-, -	-, -	-, (+), -, (+)	-, -
(b) _M [Y] + _S [X]					
<i>thâa</i>	+, +	+, +	+, +	-, (+), -, (+)	+, +
<i>nay mûa</i>	-, -	-, -	-, +[-]	-, (+), -, (+[-])	-, -
Parataxis proper					
(c) [X] + [Y]	+ [-], +	-, -	-, -	-, (-), -, (+)	-, -
(d) [Y] + [X]	-, -	-, -	-, -	-, (+), -, (-)	-, -
Concessives					
Subordination proper					
(a) _S [X] + _M [Y]					
<i>thûŋ</i>	- [+], -	-, (+[-]), -	- [?], -	-, (-), -, (-[?])	-, -[?]
<i>thăt thăt thî</i>	+, -	-, (+[-]), -	-, -	-, (-), -, (-)	-, -
(b) _M [Y] + _S [X]					
<i>thûŋ</i>	- [+], + [-]	-, (+), +	+, - [+]	+ [-], (+), +, (+)	-, +
<i>thăt thăt thî</i>	+, +	-, +	-, -	- [+], (-), -, (-)	-, -

Parataxis proper

(c) [X] + [Y]	-, -	-, -	+[-], +[-]	-, (-), -, (-)	-, (+), -
(d) [Y] + [X]	-, -	-, -	+[-], -	-, (-), -, (-)	-, (+), -

Although the numbers of the examples are not sufficient, the following general tendencies can be noted.

[1] Subordination proper

(a) Level IV

For causals (cf. 4.4), the order $_M[Y] + _S[X]$ is preferred to the order $_S[X] + _M[Y]$. Mie Tsunoda (2012: 402) notes that, at Level V (not Level IV) for causals in Japanese, $_M[Y] + _S[X]$ is preferred to $_S[X] + _M[Y]$. She also mentions that a similar tendency appears to be observed in the use of the causal CLM *because* of English, at Level V and also at Level IV. She cites the following examples from Sweetser (1990: 77).

- (6) *John loved her, because he came back.* (Level IV)
 (7) *What are you doing tonight, because there's a good movie on.*
 (Level V)

(They are instances of Level IV and Level V, respectively, according to the framework adopted for the present volume (Mie Tsunoda, 2012, this volume).) Mie Tsunoda (2012: 425) notes as follows in Note 16.

What lies behind this may be the iconicity principle: “the iconicity of sequence, whereby events are described in the order of their occurrence” (Haiman 1980: 533). The position of such a *kara*-clause of Japanese and a *because*-clause of English after the main clause may well be a means to indicate that the *kara*-/*because*-clause and the main clause do not express any cause-and-consequence relationship.

The above indicates that the preference for $_M[Y] + _S[X]$ over $_S[X] + _M[Y]$ for causals at Level IV in Thai is not an isolated phenomenon.

At Level IV, concessives (cf. 6.4), too, exhibit this preference (though slightly). In contrast, conditionals (cf. 5.4) do not show this preference at all. Both orders are equally acceptable (or equally unacceptable).

(b) Conditionals

On the whole, both $_S[X] + _M[Y]$ and $_M[Y] + _S[X]$ are equally acceptable. There is, however, one exception. At Level III (5.3), *thâa* ‘if’ is not acceptable in $_S[X] + _M[Y]$ (see (2-2-3-1)-(a1), (2-2-3-2)-(a1)), but it is acceptable in $_M[Y] + _S[X]$ (see (2-2-3-1)-(b1), (2-2-3-2)-(b1)). This is intriguing. It deviates from the iconicity principle. Greenberg (1966: 103) states as follows: ‘The order of elements in language parallels that in physical experience or the order of knowledge’. Specifically, regarding conditionals, Haiman (1980: 528) states as follows: ‘conditional protases almost always precede apodotes’. Conditional subordination $_S[X] + _M[Y]$ at Level III (interpersonal effect) requires the AP-CLM *kô* ‘then’ in the

following main clause. The use of *kô* alludes to a certain meaningful, though implicit, connection between the two pieces of information conveyed by the subordinate clause (or the previous discourse as a whole) and the main clause including *kô*. The speaker considers that the focal content expressed by the main clause including *kô* is a natural, inevitable or reasonable consequence of the supporting situation represented by the subordinate clause (or understood from the previous discourse). As such, *kô* often indicates the kind of the speaker's stance. The speaker may suggest that his/her perspective, understanding, or logic is behind his/her utterance with *kô*. The main clause of Thai bi-clausal expressions by and large contains *kô* or other AP-CLMs which mark the above-mentioned idea of reason-and-consequence (that is, they are mostly in the form of Quasi-subordination). This fact tells us that when Thai speakers present some complex information composed of supporting and focal parts, they tend to also express their stance as to how they view and understand the complex information by means of *kô* or other AP-CLMs.

(c) Causals

$M[Y] + S[X]$ is preferred to $S[X] + M[Y]$ at Levels I and III, and also Level IV (as seen in (a) above). That is, generally causals prefer $M[Y] + S[X]$ to $S[X] + M[Y]$. (They are hardly acceptable at Level V.) This, too, may be considered a deviation from the iconicity principle.

Sometimes the absence of an AP-CLM from the main clause in the sentence examined makes the sentence less acceptable. (See the discussion regarding the use of *kô* in conditional expressions in (b) above.) If an AP-CLM is present (that is, if the sentence is in the form of Quasi-subordination: $[X \text{ Because}] + [Y \text{ so}]$), the order ' $S[X] + M[Y]$ ' ($[X \text{ Because}] + [Y \text{ so}]$) (e.g. (2-1-1-2)-(a2), -(a4)) is as frequent as the order $M[Y] + S[X]$ ($[Y] + [Because]$) is.

(d) Concessives

As is the case with causals, on the whole, $M[Y] + S[X]$ is preferred to $S[X] + M[Y]$. If an AP-CLM is present, the order ' $S[X] + M[Y]$ ' ($[X \text{ Although}] + [Y \text{ even.so}]$) (e.g. (2-3-2-2)-(a2), (2-3-3-1)-(a2)) is as frequent as the order $M[Y] + S[X]$ ($[Y] + [Although]$) is.

[2] Parataxis proper

For conditionals, parataxis proper by itself is acceptable at Level I only. Furthermore it is acceptable only when the order is $[X] + [Y]$ (see (2-2-1-1)-(c1), (2-2-1-2)-(c1)), and it is not acceptable when the order is $[Y] + [X]$ (see (2-2-1-1)-(d1), (2-2-1-2)-(d1)). That is, it is acceptable only when the clause order conforms to the iconicity principle, where $[X]$ (reason) precedes $[Y]$ (consequence).

7.3 Notes on level IV

Sweetser (1990) gives the following English examples, among others.

(9) *John loved her, because he came back.* (Sweetser 1990: 77)

(10) *If she's divorced, (then) she's been married.* (Sweetser 1990: 116)

These are instances of Level IV according to the framework employed for the present volume. At Level IV, the main clause expresses the speaker's judgement, and the subordinate clause denotes a premise on which that judgement is based. (See Mie Tsunoda (2012: 384-385, this volume, 2.5).) (9) may be roughly paraphrased as follows: 'I conclude that John loved her because he came back'. (10) may be roughly paraphrased as follows: 'If she has been divorced, I conclude that she has been married'. Despite Sweetser's view, there are native speakers of English who consider sentences such as (9) and (10) not acceptable or at best marginally acceptable. In their view, such sentences become acceptable if their main clause contains an epistemic expression, such as (i) an adverb or the like, e.g. *maybe*, *probably*, *apparently*, (ii) an auxiliary verb, e.g. *may*, *must*, or (iii) a clause that contains a verb such as *guess*, *suppose*, e.g. *I guess*, *I suppose*. See Tasaku Tsunoda (this volume-b).

As far as the Thai examples examined are concerned, most of the sentences are not acceptable unless they contain *khon ... mǎn* 'probably'. There are only a few causal or concessive sentences that are acceptable without *khon ... mǎn* 'probably'. For example:

(2-1-4-1)-(b1) 'The rain has fallen, because the ground is wet.'
(Consultant TM considers this marginally acceptable.)

(2-1-4-2)-(b3) 'The doctor saved him, because he is still alive.'
(Consultant TM considers this not acceptable.)

(2-3-4-1)-(b1) 'The doctor had not been sent for, although the doctor saved him.'
(Consultant TM considers this not acceptable.)

(2-3-4-2)-(b1) 'The rain did not fall, although the ground is wet.'
(In addition, Consultant TM considers (2-3-4-2)-(b3) ('The rain did not fall, although the ground is wet') acceptable.)

It may be significant that all of them involve subordination proper, and that furthermore they have the ' $M[Y] + s[X]$ ' order, not the ' $s[X] + M[Y]$ ' order. It is relevant to mention that in English a causal subordination at Level IV 'by itself' is acceptable (at least for some speakers); see (9). As pointed out by Mie Tsunoda (2012: 402), the preferred order seems to be $M[Y] + s[X]$, not $s[X] + M[Y]$.

We have seen that at Level IV in Thai most of the sentences are not acceptable unless they contain *khon ... mǎn* 'probably'. It is important to note that there are also sentences that are not acceptable even though they contain *khon ... mǎn* 'probably'. That is, the presence of *khon ... mǎn* 'probably' is not always sufficient for the acceptability of sentences at Level IV.

7.4 Notes on levels III and V

Sentences at Levels III and V are addressed directly to the addressee. They usually contain a final particle, such as *sǐ?*, *thǎ?* or *nǎ?*, for interpersonal effect (Level III) or directive speech act (Level V). As stated in Section 2,

these particles express the speaker's feeling, intention, attitude or the like. Characteristically, *sì?* and *thà?* are used for prohibition, command, or hortation at Level III, and *ná?* is used for suggestion or encouragement at Level V. (In the case of subordination, these particles occur at the end of the main clause, and not necessarily sentence-finally.) (For examples, see 4.3, 4.5, 5.3, 5.5, 6.3 and 6.5.) Nonetheless, the presence of such a final particle is not always sufficient for the acceptability of sentences. There are sentences that contain a final particle and yet are not acceptable.

In sharp contrast, sentences used at other levels, which are not addressed to directly to the addressee, do not contain any of these intersubjective particles.

At Level V, some paratactic sentences require an expression such as the following: *lâ? sì?* 'I'm sure' (e.g. (2-1-5-1)-(c2)), *chây máy* 'Right?' (e.g. (2-1-5-1)-(c3)), *hěn* 'it seems' (e.g. (2-1-5-1)-(d2)), or *phát cà? ... kô dáy* 'may' (e.g. (2-3-5-1)-(c2), -(d2)). Without such an expression, these paratactic sentences are not acceptable.

8. Summary and concluding remarks

The present chapter has examined how the five levels in clause linkage are expressed in Thai. Thai has a very large number of CLMs. The present chapter has selected two CLMs that can be used for subordination proper for each of the three semantic areas: causal, conditional and concessive. These six CLMs are often used in combination with another CLM and/or some other word. There is no CLM that is perfectly acceptable by itself at all of the five levels.

In each pair of the CLMs, one is unmarked, while the other is marked, with a specialized meaning. The three unmarked CLMs (*phrô?* 'because', *thâa* 'if' and *thũn* 'although') have wide distributions in terms of the five levels. The three marked CLMs (*nũn càak* 'because', *nay mũa* 'if', *thán thán thĩ* 'although') have limited distributions. In particular, *nay mũa* 'if' generally cannot be used by itself to translate the relevant sentences in the questionnaire.

Parataxis proper by itself is attested for causals and conditionals, but not for concessives. For causals, it has yielded acceptable examples at Levels I, II, III and V (but not at Level IV). For conditionals, it is acceptable at Level I only, and furthermore it is acceptable only when the clause order conforms to the iconicity principle: $s[X] + m[Y]$. Also, there are instances in which parataxis proper becomes acceptable when it is not used by itself and involves an epistemic expression or some other expression.

In subordination proper, at Level IV, causals and concessives (though not conditionals) prefer $m[Y] + s[X]$ to $s[X] + m[Y]$. This preference may not be an isolated phenomenon crosslinguistically.

At Level IV, most of the sentences are not acceptable unless they contain *khon ... mán* 'probably'. There are only four sentences that are acceptable without *khon ... mán*. It may be significant that all of them

involve subordination proper, and that furthermore they have the ‘_M[Y] + _S[X]’ order, not the ‘_S[X] + _M[Y]’ order. However, the presence of *khon* ... *máy* is not always sufficient for the acceptability of sentences at Level IV.

At Levels III and V, sentences usually contain a final particle for interpersonal effect (Level III) or directive speech act (Level V). These particles express the speaker’s feeling, intention, attitude or the like. Nonetheless, the presence of such a final particle is not always sufficient for the acceptability of sentences.

At Level V, some paratactic sentences require an expression such as *lâ?* *sì?* ‘I’m sure’, *chây máy* ‘right?’, *hěn* ‘it seems’, or *phàat cà?...kô dâ?* ‘may’. Without such an expression, these paratactic sentences are not acceptable.

To conclude, the five levels in the clause linkage of Thai exhibit a wide range of interesting phenomena.

Acknowledgements

I am grateful to my native speaker consultants, Akrachai Mongkolchai and Tasanee Methapisit, for giving me accurate information about Thai bi-clausal expressions and useful comments and suggestions on relevant matters. I would also like to thank Tasaku Tsunoda (the editor of the volume) for a number of valuable comments on the early versions of this chapter.

This research is part of my overseas research (October 2012-February 2013) supported by Kanda University of International Studies’ Research Grant (No.11, 2012) and permitted by the National Research Council of Thailand (No.0002/6121).

Abbreviations

CLF - classifier; CONT - continuous; COP - copula; COMP - complementizer; IM - intended meaning; IMP - imperative; IND - inducement; IPFV - imperfective; IRR - irrealis; LT - literal translation; NEG - negative; NMLZ - nominalizer; PASS - passive; PFV - perfective; PROG - progressive; PRON - pronoun; PRT - subjective or intersubjective final particle; POSS - possibility; Q - question; QUOT - quotative; REAL - realization; REL - relativizer

References

- Greenberg, Joseph H. 1966. Some universals of grammar with particular reference to the order of meaningful elements. In *Universals of language*, Joseph H. Greenberg (ed.) (second edition), 73-113. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Dixon, R. M. W. 2009. The semantics of clause linking in typological

- perspective. In *The Semantics of Clause Linking: A Cross-Linguistic Typology*, Dixon, R. M. W. & Alexandra Y. Aikhenvald (eds), 1-55. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Haiman, John. 1980. Iconicity of grammar: Isomorphism and motivation. *Language* 56(3): 515-540.
- Iwasaki, Shoichi & Preeya Ingkaphirom. 2005. *A Reference Grammar of Thai*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Lewis, M. Paul, Gary F. Simons & Charles D. Fennig (eds). 2013. *Ethnologue: Languages of the World, 17th edition*. Dallas, Texas: SIL International. Online version: <<http://www.ethnologue.com>> (18 March 2013)
- Sweetser, Eve. 1990. *From Etymology to Pragmatics: The Mind-body Metaphor in Semantic Structure and Semantic Change*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Takahashi, Kiyoko. 2009. Basic serial verb constructions in Thai. *Journal of the Southeast Asian Linguistics Society* 1: 215-229.
- Tsunoda, Mie. 2012. Five-level classification of clause linkage in Japanese. *Studies in Language* 36(2): 382-429.
- Tsunoda, Mie. This volume. Five levels in clause linkage: an outline.
- Tsunoda, Tasaku. This volume-a. Questionnaire for five levels.
- Tsunoda, Tasaku. This volume-b. Five levels in English.

Appendix

3. Sentences for elicitation (second stage): other semantic areas

3.1. Time, temporal (1): simultaneous: ‘when, while’

(3-1-1) He came when I came.

- a. _M[*kháw maa thǔŋ*]
 PRON come arrive
 _S[*mǔua chán maa thǔŋ*]
 when PRON come arrive
 ‘He came when I came.’

(3-1-2) He worked while I was resting.

- a. _M[*kháw tham ɲaan*]
 PRON work
 _S[*tɔɔn (thî) chán phák phòɔn yùu*]
 portion (REL) PRON rest CONT
 ‘He worked while I was resting.’
- b. _M[*kháw tham ɲaan*]
 PRON work
 _S[(*nay*) *rawàaŋ thîi chán phák phòɔn yùu*]
 (in) between NMLZ PRON rest CONT
 ‘He worked while I was resting.’
- c. _M[*kháw tham ɲaan*]
 PRON work

s[(*nay*) *khàrà?* *thîi chán* *phák phòon yùu*]
 (in) a.while REL PRON rest CONT
 ‘He worked while I was resting.’

(3-1-3) I saw him walking.

a. *chán hén kháw dǎon*
 PRON see PRON walk
 ‘I saw him walking’

3.2. Time, temporal (2): ‘before’

(3-2-1) He came before I went out.

a. _M[*kháw maa thǔn*]
 PRON come arrive
 s[*kǎon (thîi) chán ?ǎok pay*]
 before (NMLZ) PRON exit go
 ‘He came before I went out.’

(3-3-2) He went out before the rain started.

a. _M[*kháw ?ǎok pay*]
 PRON exit go
 s[*kǎon (thîi) fǎn rǎam tòk*]
 before (NMLZ) rain begin fall
 ‘He went out before the rain started.’

3.3. Time, temporal (3): ‘after’

(3-3-1) He came after I went out.

a. _M[*kháw maa thǔn*]
 PRON come arrive
 s[*lǎn (càak) (thîi) chán ?ǎok pay*]
 after (from) (NMLZ) PRON exit go
 ‘He came after I went out.’

(3-3-2) He went out after the rain stopped.

a. _M[*kháw ?ǎok pay*]
 PRON exit go
 s[*lǎn (càak) (thîi) fǎn yùt*]
 after (from) (NMLZ) rain stop
 ‘He went out after the rain stopped.’

3.4. Negative conditional: ‘unless’

(3-4-1) Unless rain falls, I will go.

a. s[*thâa fǎn mây tòk*]
 if rain NEG fall
_M[*chán kô cà? pay*]
 PRON then IRR go
 ‘If rain does not fall, I will go.’

- b. _M[*chán* *cà?* *pay*]
 PRON IRR go
_S[*tò* *mûa* *fǒn* *mây* *tòk*]
 only when rain NEG fall
 ‘I will go only when rain does not fall.’

(3-4-2) I will not go unless he goes.

- a. _M[*chán* *cà?* *mây* *pay*]
 PRON IRR NEG go
_S[*thâa* *kháw* *mây* *pay*]
 if PRON NEG go
 ‘I will not go if he does not go.’
- b. _M[*chán* *cà?* *mây* *pay*]
 PRON IRR NEG go
_S[*tò* *mûa* *kháw* *mây* *pay*]
 only when PRON NEG go
 ‘I will not go only when he does not go.’

3.5. Concessive conditional

(3-5-1) Even if he goes, I will not go.

- a. _S[*thǔŋ* *kháw* *pay*]
 although PRON go
_M[*chán* *kô* *cà?* *mây* *pay*]
 PRON even.so IRR NEG go
 ‘Even if he goes, I will not go.’
- b. _S[(*thǔŋ*) *mée* (*wâa*) *kháw* *pay*]
 (although) although (QUOT) PRON go
_M[*chán* *kô* *cà?* *mây* *pay*]
 PRON even.so IRR NEG go
 ‘Even if he goes, I will not go.’

(3-5-2) Even if rain falls, I will go.

- a. _S[*thǔŋ* *fǒn* *tòk*]
 although rain fall
_M[*chán* *kô* *cà?* *pay*]
 PRON even.so IRR go
 ‘Even if rain falls, I will go.’
- b. _S[(*thǔŋ*) *mée* (*wâa*) *fǒn* *tòk*]
 (although) although (QUOT) rain fall
_M[*chán* *kô* *cà?* *pay*]
 PRON even.so IRR go
 ‘Even if rain falls, I will go.’

3.6. Location, locative

(3-6-1) I fell over where he fell over before.

- a. *chán* *hòk* *lóm* (*troŋ*) *thîi* (*thîi*) *kháw* *khəəy*
 PRON fall.over (just) place (REL) PRON ever

hòk lóm

fall.over

‘I fell over where he fell over before.’

(3-6-2) Where he lives, winter is cold.

- a. *thîi (thîi) kháw yùu rúduu năaw cà? năaw*
place (REL) PRON stay winter IRR be.cold
‘Where he lives, winter is cold.’
- b. *(nay) sathăan thîi (thîi) kháw yùu rúduu năaw*
(in) place (REL) PRON stay winter
cà? năaw
IRR be.cold
‘Where he lives, winter is cold.’

3.7. Manner

(3-7-1) She spoke as he had taught her to.

- a. *lôn phûut yàaŋ (thîi) kháw khəy sǎon hây*
PRON speak kind (REL) PRON ever teach IND
phûut
speak
‘She spoke as he had taught her to.’
- b. *lôn phûut bəp (thîi) kháw khəy sǎon hây*
PRON speak style (REL) PRON ever teach IND
phûut
speak
‘She spoke as he had taught her to.’
- c. *lôn phûut taam thîi kháw khəy sǎon hây*
PRON speak follow NMLZ PRON ever teach IND
phûut
speak
‘She spoke as he had taught her to.’
- d. *lôn phûut mǎan (thîi) kháw khəy sǎon hây*
PRON speak be.like (NMLZ) PRON ever teach IND
phûut
speak
‘She spoke as he had taught her to.’

(3-7-2) She talks like she has a cold.

- a. *lôn phûut mǎan lôn pen wát*
PRON speak be.like PRON have.a.cold
‘She talks like she has a cold.’
- b. *lôn phûut mǎan káp (wâa) lôn pen wát*
PRON speak be.like with (QUOT) PRON have.a.cold
‘She talks like she has a cold.’
- c. *lôn phûut yàaŋ káp (wâa) lôn pen wát*
PRON speak kind with (QUOT) PRON have.a.cold
‘She talks like she has a cold.’

- d. *lôn phûut raaw kâp (wâa) lôn*
 PRON speak approximately with (QUOT) PRON
pen wât
 have.a.cold
 ‘She talks like she has a cold.’
- e. *lôn phûut khlây (kâp) lôn pen wât*
 PRON speak resemble (with) PRON have.a.cold
 ‘She talks like she has a cold.’

3.8. Purpose

(3-8-1) I went to the river so that I could catch fish.

- a. *chán pay mēe nám phûa (thî) cà? càp*
 PRON go river in.order.to (NMLZ) IRR catch
plaa
 fish
 ‘I went to the river in order to catch fish.’
- b. *chán pay càp plaa thî mēe nám*
 PRON go catch fish at river
 ‘I went to catch fish at the river.’

(3-8-2) She cooked food so that they could eat.

- a. *lôn tham Paahăan hây khâw kin*
 PRON cook IND PRON eat
 ‘She cooked food for them to eat.’
- b. *lôn tham Paahăan phûa (thî) cà? hây*
 PRON cook in.order.to (NMLZ) IRR IND
khâw kin
 PRON eat
 ‘She cooked food in order for them to eat.’
- c. *lôn tham Paahăan phûa (thî) khâw cà?*
 PRON cook in.order.to (NMLZ) PRON IRR
dây kin
 REAL eat
 ‘She cooked food so that they could eat.’

3.9. Negative purpose

(3-9-1) In case he sees me, I will hide in the house.

- a. *s[phûa khâw cà? hên chán]*
 in case PRON IRR see PRON
_M*[chán cà? sôn tua yûu nay bân]*
 PRON IRR hide body stay in house
 ‘In case he sees me, I will hide in the house.’
- b. *s[phûa (thî) cà? mây hây khâw hên chán]*
 in.order.to (NMLZ) IRR NEG IND PRON see PRON
_M*[chán cà? sôn tua yûu nay bân]*
 PRON IRR hide body stay in house
 ‘In order to make him not see me, I will hide in the house.’

(3-9-2) Lest he speared me, I ran away.

- a. s[*kreeŋ wâa khâw ʔaat càʔ phûŋ hòk maa*
fear QUOT PRON might IRR hurl spear come
yaŋ chán
to PRON
M[*chán (kô) ləy wîŋ nǐi pay*
PRON so run flee go
'Fearing that he might spear me, I ran away.'
- b. s[*kreeŋ wâa khâw ʔaat càʔ phûŋ hòk maa*
fear QUOT PRON might IRR hurl spear come
yaŋ chán
to PRON
M[*chán cuŋ wîŋ nǐi pay*
PRON so run flee go
'Fearing that he might spear me, I ran away.'

3.10. Consequence/result

(3-10-1) He ran fast with the result that he fell over.

- a. *khâw wîŋ rew (kô) ləy hòk lóm*
PRON run fast so fall.over
'He ran fast and so fell over.'
- b. *khâw wîŋ rew cuŋ hòk lóm*
PRON run fast so fall.over
'He ran fast and so fell over.'

(3-10-2) He throw a net into the river with the result that he caught fish.

- a. *khâw thôt hɛ loŋ pay mɛe nám (kô) ləy*
PRON throw net descend go river so
dây plaa
come.to.have fish
'He throw a net into the river and so caught fish.'
- b. *khâw thôt hɛ loŋ pay mɛe nám cuŋ*
PRON throw net descend go river so
dây plaa
come.to.have fish
'He throw a net into the river and so caught fish.'

3.11. Please check the following, too, if you have time.

3.11.1. Circumstantial

(3-11-1-1) He caught fish by throwing a net into the river.

- a. *khâw càp plaa dây dooy thîi*
PRON catch fish come.to.have by NMLZ
thôt hɛ loŋ pay mɛe nám
throw net descend go river
'He caught fish by throwing a net into the river.'
- b. *khâw càp plaa dây dooy chây wíthii*
PRON catch fish come.to.have by use means

thôot hế loη pay mềe nám
throw net descend go river

‘He caught fish *by* throwing a net into the river.’

- c. *kháw càp plaa dây dūay wíthii*
PRON catch fish come.to.have with means
thôot hế loη pay mềe nám
throw net descend go river
‘He caught fish *by* throwing a net into the river.’

(3-11-1-2) He caught a kangaroo (or a bear) *without* spearing it.

- a. *kháw càp ciηcôo dây dooy thîi*
PRON catch kangaroo come.to.have by NMLZ
mây phûη hòok pay yaη man
NEG hurl spear go to PRON
‘He caught a kangaroo *without* spearing it.’
- b. *kháw càp ciηcôo dây dooy mây*
PRON catch kangaroo come.to.have by NEG
cháy wíthii phûη hòok pay yaη man
use means hurl spear go to PRON
‘He caught a kangaroo *without* spearing it.’
- c. *kháw càp ciηcôo dây dūay wíthii*
PRON catch kangaroo come.to.have with means
mây phûη hòok pay yaη man
NEG hurl spear go to PRON
‘He caught a kangaroo *without* spearing it.’

3.11.2. Additive

(3-11-2-1) *In addition to* catching a kangaroo (or bear), he found birds.

- a. *nôok càak kháw càp ciηcôo dây*
outside from PRON catch kangaroo come.to.have
léew yaη phóp nók (ʔiik dūay)
PFV still find bird (as well)
‘*In addition to* catching a kangaroo, he found birds.’

(3-11-2-2) *Besides* not catching any kangaroo (or a bear), he lost his spear.

- a. *nôok càak kháw càp ciηcôo mây*
outside from PRON catch kangaroo NEG
dây léew yaη tham hòok hăay
come.to.have PFV still make spear disappear
(ʔiik dūay)
(as well)
‘*Besides* not catching any kangaroo, he lost his spear.’

4. Sentences for elicitation (third stage): ‘but’ and ‘and’

4.1. ‘But’

4.1.1. Concessive (‘denial of expectation’)

(4-1-1-1) Rain fell, but the ground is dry.

- a. [fǒn tòk]
rain fall
[têe (wâa) phúuun yaŋ hêeŋ yùu]
but (QUOT) the.ground still be.dry CONT
'Rain fell, but the ground is dry.'
- b. [thǔŋ fǒn tòk]
although rain fall
[phúuun kô yaŋ hêeŋ yùu]
the.ground even.so still be.dry CONT
'Although rain was falling, he went out.'
- c. [thǎŋ thǎŋ thîi fǒn tòk]
although NMLZ rain fall
[phúuun kô yaŋ hêeŋ yùu]
the.ground even.so still be.dry CONT
'Although rain was falling, he went out.'

(4-1-2-2) Rain was falling, but he went out.

- a. [fǒn tòk yùu]
rain fall CONT
[têe (wâa) kháw ?òk pay]
but (QUOT) PRON exit go
'Rain was falling, but he went out.'
- b. [thǔŋ fǒn tòk yùu]
although rain fall CONT
[kháw kô ?òk pay]
PRON even.so exit go
'Although rain was falling, he went out.'
- c. [thǎŋ thǎŋ thîi fǒn tòk yùu]
although NMLZ rain fall CONT
[kháw kô ?òk pay]
PRON even.so exit go
'Although rain was falling, he went out.'

4.1.2. Semantic opposition

(4-1-3-1) This man is tall, but that man is short.

- a. [phûu chaay khon níi sǔuŋ]
man CLF this be.tall
[têe (wâa) phûu chaay khon nán tîa]
but (QUOT) man CLF that be.short
'This man is tall, but that man is short.'
- b. [phûu chaay khon níi sǔuŋ]
man CLF this be.tall
[nay khàná? thîi phûu chaay khon nán tîa]
in a.while REL man CLF that be.short
'This man is tall, but that man is short.'

- c. [phûu chaay khon níi sǔay]
man CLF this be.tall
[sùan phûu chaay khon nán tîa]
part man CLF that be.short
'This man is tall, but that man is short.'

(4-1-2-3) This kangaroo/bear/etc. is big, but that kangaroo/bear/etc. is small.

- a. [ciŋcôo tua níi yày]
kangaroo CLF this be.big
[têe (wâa) ciŋcôo tua nán lék]
but (QUOT) kangaroo CLF that be.small
'This kangaroo is big, but that kangaroo is small.'
- b. [ciŋcôo tua níi yày]
kangaroo CLF this be.big
[nay khàná? thîi ciŋcôo tua nán lék]
in a.while REL kangaroo CLF that be.small
'This kangaroo is big, but that kangaroo is small.'
- c. [ciŋcôo tua níi yày]
kangaroo CLF this be.big
[sùan ciŋcôo tua nán lék]
part kangaroo CLF that be.small
'This kangaroo is big, but that kangaroo is small.'

4.1.3. Contradicting evaluations

(4-1-2-1) This shirt is beautiful, but it is small.

- a. [sûa tua níi sǔay]
shirt CLF this be. beautiful
[têe (wâa) man lék]
but (QUOT) PRON be.small
'This shirt is beautiful, but it is small.'

(4-1-2-2) This house is beautiful, but it is small.

- a. [bâan lǎŋ níi sǔay]
house CLF this be. beautiful
[têe (wâa) man lék]
but (QUOT) PRON be.small
'This house is beautiful, but it is small.'

4.2. 'And'

4.2.1. Linking two situations

(4-2-1-1) He went to a hill and she went to a river.

- a. [kháw pay thîi nǎn khǎw]
PRON go at hill
[lôn pay thîi mǎe nám]
PRON go at river
'He went to a hill and she went to a river.'

(4-2-1-2) This man caught a kangaroo/bear/etc. and that man caught a fish.

- a. [phûu chaay khon nûi càp ciŋcôo dâi]
 man CLF this catch kangaroo come.to.have
 [phûu chaay khon nán càp plaa dâi]
 man CLF that catch fish come.to.have
 ‘This man caught a kangaroo and that man caught a fish.’

4.2.2. Order of the two situations

(4-2-2-1) He caught a kangaroo/bear/etc. and she cooked it.

- a. [kháw càp ciŋcôo dâi (maa) léew]
 PRON catch kangaroo come.to.have (come) PFV
 [(càak nán) lôn kô yâaŋ man]
 (from that) PRON then grill PRON
 ‘He caught a kangaroo and she cooked it.’

(4-2-2-2) I went and I found a kangaroo/bear/etc.

- a. chán pay cə ciŋcôo
 PRON go meet kangaroo
 ‘I went and found a kangaroo.’
 b. chán pay pàa léew kô cə ciŋcôo
 PRON go forest PFV then meet kangaroo
 ‘I went to the forest and found a kangaroo.’
 c. chán pay thǔŋ pàa kô cə ciŋcôo
 PRON go arrive forest then meet kangaroo
 ‘I went and arrived at the forest and found a kangaroo.’