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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 ʔaat câʔ … ʔɔ̀ dây ‘may’. (The formation of ʔaat câʔ … ʔɔ̀ dây ‘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 Akrechtai 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 ‘?’, 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, ?, ph, th, ch, kh, b, d, f, s, h, m, n, ŋ, l, r, w, y/; (b) vowels: /i, ii, e, ee, eɛ, ɯ, ɯɯ, ə, əə, a, aa, u, uu, o, oo, ɔ, ɔɔ/; (c) diphthongs: /ia, ɯa, ua/; and (d) tones: Mid, Low, Falling, High, Rising (e.g. maa, màa, mãa, màa, màa). 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 sìɁ, thə̀Ɂ, náɁ, láɁ, rɔ̀k and máŋ could be regarded to be among the core members of Thai pragmatic particles, while the final particle láɁ might be considered peripheral since one may identify it as a shortened form (a variant) of the perfective marker lԑ́ԑw ‘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 sentences are represented with English words, not Thai words.
(i) Subordination

(i-1) Subordination proper, e.g.:  
\[ s[X \text{ if}] + M[Y] \]  
\[ M[Y] + s[X \text{ because}] \]  
‘If spring comes, flowers bloom.’  
E.g. (2-2-1-1)-(a1) in 5.1.  
‘The ground is wet because it rained.’  
E.g. (2-1-1-1)-(b1) in 4.1.

(i-2) Quasi-subordination, e.g.:  
\[ s[X \text{ Because}] + M[Y \text{ so}] \]  
\[ s[X \text{ if}] + M[Y \text{ then}] \]  
‘Because it rained, so the ground is wet.’  
E.g. (2-1-1-1)-(a4) in 4.1.  
‘If it rains, then don’t go out.’  
E.g. (2-2-3-1)-(a2) in 5.3.  
‘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.:  
\[ [X \text{ although even so}] \]  
\[ + \text{but} + [Y \text{ even so}] \]  
\[ [X] + \text{and so} + [Y \text{ so}] \]  
‘Although he wants to eat, but even so he cannot eat.’  
E.g. (2).  
‘It rained, and so the ground is wet.’  
E.g., (2-1-1-1)-(c3) in 4.1.  
‘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.  
‘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 phrɔ́Ɂ ‘because’ and kɔ̂ taam ‘even so’) specifies the semantic or logical type of clause linkage. (Kɔ̂ taam consists kɔ̂ and the verb taam ‘follow’. Kɔ̂ 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 cɯŋ ‘then, so’ and kɔ̂ ‘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[phrɔ́Ɂ cɛɛkan tɔk]    because  vase    fall
M[(man) cɯŋ tɛ̀ɛk]    (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: phrɔ́Ɂ ‘because’ (an E-CLM) and cɯŋ ‘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 cɯŋ ‘then, so’ and kɔ̂ ‘then, so, even so’. In everyday conversations, a causal expression often contains a colloquial AP-CLM ləəy ‘then, so’ (which derives from the motion verb ləəy ‘pass, go past’) or kɔ̂ ləəy ‘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’, lakɔ́ ‘and then’ or tɛ̀ɛ ‘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 lakɔ́ ‘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) $s[\text{thɯ̌ŋ kháw yàak kin man } \text{kɔ̂ taam}] \text{ tɛ̀ɛ}$

although PRON want eat RPON even.so but

\[
M[\text{(kháw) kɔ̂ kin man mây dây}]
\]

(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: thɯ̌ŋ ‘although’ (which occurs at the beginning of the clause) and kɔ̂ taam ‘even so’ (which occupies the end position of the clause). The second clause contains an AP-CLM: kɔ̂ ‘even so’.

The multifunctional morpheme kɔ̂ ‘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) $\text{ceɛkan tòk tɛek}$

vase fall become.broken

‘The vase fell off and became broken.’

(4) $\text{lûuk bɔɔn klin pay}$

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: cɯŋ, ləəy, thɯ̌ŋ, kɔ̂.
   E-CLMs in the initial position: phr5ʔ, dûay.
   I-CLMs: chanán, chaníi.
(b) Conditional (‘if’, ‘then’)
   AP-CLM: kɔ̂
   E-CLMs in the initial position: thâa, hàak.
   I-CLMs: lakɔ̂, náy.
(c) Concessive (‘although’, ‘even so’)
   AP-CLM: kɔ̂.
   E-CLMs in the initial position: thɯ̌ŋ, mɛ́ɛ, mɛ́ɛn, tháŋ tháŋ, hây, khanàat.
   I-CLMs: tɛ̀ɛ, tháwâa, yaŋŋay yaŋŋay.

Complex CLMs include the following.

Complex CLMs
(a) Causal (‘because’, ‘so’)
   AP-CLMs: kɔ̂ cɯŋ, kɔ̂ ləəy.
   E-CLMs in the initial position: nɯ̂aŋ càak, sɯ̀ɯp nɯ̂aŋ maa càak, nɯ̂aŋ càak wâa, nɯ̂aŋ dûay, nɯ̂aŋ dûay wâa, nɯ̂aŋ tɛ̀ɛ.
   I-CLMs: daŋ nán, daŋ níi, phr5ʔ daŋ nán, phr5ʔ daŋ níi, phr5ʔ chanán, phr5ʔ chaníi, phr5ʔ hèet nán, phr5ʔ hèet níi.
(b) Conditional (‘if’, ‘then’)
   E-CLMs in the initial position: thâa hàak, thâa hàak wâa, thâa phûua, thâa phûua wâa, thâa mée, thâa mée wâa, nay mûa, tɔ̀ɔ mûa.
   I-CLMs: thâa kranán, thâa chên nán, thâa yàaŋ nán.
(c) Concessive (‘although’, ‘even so’)
   E-CLMs in the initial position: thɯ̌ŋ mée, thɯ̌ŋ mée wâa, thãŋ thãŋ thãŋ, tɔ̀ɔ hây.
   E-CLMs in the final position: kɔ̂ taam, kɔ̂ ciŋ, kɔ̂ dii, kɔ̂ chãŋ.
   I-CLMs: tɛ̀ɛ wâa, tɛ̀ɛ thâwâa, hàak tɛ̀ɛ, tɛ̀ɛ kranán, thɯ̌ŋ 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

\(\text{phr} \text{ʒp} \) ‘because’, \(\text{nɯ̂aŋ càak} \) ‘because’.

(b) Representatives of conditional CLMs

\(\text{thâa} \) ‘if’, \(\text{nay mɯ̂a} \) ‘if’.

(c) Representatives of concessive CLMs

\(\text{thɯ̌ŋ} \) ‘although’, \(\text{tháŋ tháŋ thîi} \) ‘although’.

In each pair of CLMs, one is unmarked, while the other is marked semantically and/or stylistically. Regarding the two causal CLMs, \(\text{phr} \text{ʒp} \) ‘because’ has a generic meaning of causal. \(\text{nɯ̂aŋ càak} \) ‘because’ (which consists of the verb \(\text{nɯ̂aŋ} \) ‘follow’ and the preposition \(\text{càak} \) ‘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, \(\text{thâa} \) ‘if’ has a generic meaning of conditional. \(\text{nay mɯ̂a} \) ‘if’ (which consists of the preposition \(\text{nay} \) ‘in’ and the temporal conjunction/preposition \(\text{mɯ̂a} \) ‘when’) has a meaning of what may be termed ‘certainty’ conditional (as against ‘non-certainty’ conditional) or ‘conclusion-implied’ conditional. However, the meaning of \(\text{nay mɯ̂a} \) ‘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, \(\text{nay mɯ̂a} \) ‘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, \(\text{thɯ̌ŋ} \) ‘although’ (which derives from the verb \(\text{thɯ̌ŋ} \) ‘arrive’) has a generic meaning of concessive. \(\text{tháŋ tháŋ thîi} \) ‘although’ consists of the reduplication form of the quantifier \(\text{tháŋ} \) ‘whole’ and the word \(\text{thîi} \), which is a noun with the meaning of ‘place’ and which can also be used as a nominalizer. \(\text{tháŋ tháŋ thîi} \) 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 \(\text{nay mɯ̂a} \) ‘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 \textit{phrɔ́Ɂ} ‘because’ and \textit{nɯ̂aŋ càak} ‘because’ for subordination proper of causals. \textit{Phrɔ́Ɂ} ‘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. \textit{Nɯ̂aŋ 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[\textit{phrɔ́Ɂ} fǒn tòk] because rain fall
   m[phúun piak] 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, \textit{phrɔ́Ɂ} ‘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 (kɔ̂ ləəy ‘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 (kɔ̂ ləəy ‘then, so’ is (2-1-1-1)-(a3). This is an inatence of (i-3) Quasi-parataxis ([X] + [Y so]).

Quasi-parataxis
(2-1-1-1)-(a3) s[fõn tõk]
     rain fall
M[phùúun (kɔ̂ ləəy 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 cuŋ ‘then, so’ in addition to the E-CLM phrɔ́Ɂ ‘because’ or nɯ̂aŋ càak ‘because’. They are instances of (i-2) Quasi-subordination (s[X because] + M[Y so]).

Quasi-subordination
(2-1-1-1)-(a4) s[phrɔ́Ɂ fõn tõk]
     because rain fall
M[phùúun cuŋ piak]
ground so be.wet
LT: ‘Because the rain fell, so the ground is/becomes wet.’

(2-1-1-1)-(a5) s[nɯ̂aŋ càak fõn tõk]
     because rain fall
M[phùúun cuŋ piak]
ground so be.wet
LT: ‘Because the rain fell, so the ground is/becomes wet.’

The E-CLM (phrɔ́Ɂ ‘because’, nɯ̂aŋ càak ‘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 khāaw]
     child CLF that be.hungry rice
[khāw cuŋ rèŋ háy]
     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).

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 (kɔ̂ ləəy ‘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 (kɔ̂ ləəy ‘then, so’ is (2-1-1-1)-(a3). This is an inatence of (i-3) Quasi-parataxis ([X] + [Y so]).
Quasi-coordination

(2-1-1-1)-(a7) $s[\text{phr}\ddot{o} \text{ fön } \text{ tôk}] \text{ chanán}$

because rain fall and.so

$m[\text{phúúun } \text{ cuŋ } \text{ piak}]$

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 $\text{cuŋ}$ ‘so’ in the main clause ($[X$ because] + $\text{and so}$ + $[Y]$).

Quasi-coordination

(2-1-1-1)-(a8) * $s[\text{phr}\ddot{o} \text{ fön } \text{ tôk}] \text{ chanán}$

Because rain fall and.so

$m[\text{phúúun } \text{ piak}]$

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) $m[\text{phúúun } \text{ piak}]$

ground be.wet

$s[\text{phr}\ddot{o} \text{ fön } \text{ tôk}]$

because rain fall

LT: ‘The ground is/becomes wet, because the rain fell.’

(2-1-1-1)-(b2) $m[\text{phúúun } \text{ piak}]$

ground be.wet

$s[\text{muŋ } \text{ câak } \text{ fön } \text{ tôk}]$

because rain fall

LT: ‘The ground is/becomes wet, because the rain fell.’

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

(2-1-1-1)-(c1) $[\text{fön } \text{ tôk}]$

fall rain

$[\text{phúúun } \text{ piak}]$

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 $\text{so}$} $[Y]$). It includes the I-CLM $\text{chanán}$ ‘and so’. ($\text{Chanán}$ ‘and so’ is a reduced form of the combination of $\text{chên}$ ‘like, such as’ and $\text{nán}$ ‘that’. It occurs in complex causal CLMs such as $\text{phr}\ddot{o} \text{ chanán}$ ‘because and.so’ (listed in 3.2) which is a reduced form of $\text{phr}\ddot{o} \text{ chên } \text{nán}$ ‘because such.as that’, i.e. ‘for that reason’). It does not contain the AP-CLM $\text{cuŋ}$ ‘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
[phɯ́ɯn piak]
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 cɯŋ
‘so’ in the main clause, and so it is acceptable.

Quasi-coordination

(2-1-1-1)-(c3) [fǒn tòk] chanán
    rain fall and.so
[phɯ́ɯn cɯŋ piak]
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) * [phɯ́ɯn piak]
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 Leve 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[phrɔ́Ɂ dèk khon nán hǐw khâaw]
because child CLF that be.hungry rice
M[khâaw rɔ́ɔŋ hây]
PRON cry
LT: ‘Because the child is/becomes hungry (for) rice, he
cries.’

Quasi-subordination

(2-1-1-2)-(a2) s[phrɔ́Ɂ dèk khon nán hǐw khâaw]
because child CLF that be.hungry rice
M[(khâaw) cɯŋ rɔ́ɔŋ 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 cɯŋ 'so'. (2-1-1-2)-(a1) is an instance of (i-1) Subordination proper, to be precise, (i-1-1) s[X because] + M[Y], while (2-1-1-2)-(a2) is an instance of (i-2) Quasi-subordination (s[X because] + M[Y so]). The same applies to (2-1-1-2)-(a3) and (2-1-1-2)-(a4).

**Subordination proper**

(2-1-1-2)-(a3) * s[nɯ̂aŋ càak dèk khon nán hǐw khâaw] because child CLF that be.hungry rice

M[kháw rɔ́ɔŋ hây] PRON cry

LT: ‘Because the child is/becomes hungry (for) rice, he cries.’

**Quasi-subordination**

(2-1-1-2)-(a4) s[nɯ̂aŋ càak dèk khon nán hǐw khâaw] because child CLF that be.hungry rice

M[(kháw) cɯŋ rɔ́ɔŋ 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 khon nán rɔ́ɔŋ hây] child CLF that cry

s[phrɔ́Ɂ kháw hǐw khâaw] because PRON be.hungry rice

LT: ‘The child cries because he is/becomes hungry (for) rice.’

(2-1-1-2)-(b2) M[dèk khon nán rɔ́ɔŋ hây] child CLF that cry

s[nɯ̂aŋ càak kháw hǐw 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 khon nán hǐw khâaw] child CLF that be.hungry rice

[kháw rɔ́ɔŋ 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] and so [Y]).
Coordination proper

(2-1-1-2)-(c2) * [dèk khon nán hǐw khâaw] chanán
child CLF that be.hungry rice and.so
[khâaw rɔ́ɔŋ 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 because] and so M[Y so]). They are acceptable. But if they do not contain the AP-CLM cɯŋ ‘so’ in the main clause (S[X because] and so M[Y]), they are not acceptable.

Quasi-coordination

(2-1-1-2)-(c3) [phrɔ́Ɂ dèk khon nán hǐw khâaw]
because child CLF that be.hungry rice
chanán [khâaw cɯŋ rɔ́ɔŋ hây]
and.so PRON so cry
LT: ‘Because the child is/becomes hungry (for) rice, and so he cries.’

(2-1-1-2)-(c4) [nɯ̂aŋ càak dèk khon nán hǐw khâaw]
because child CLF that be.hungry rice
chanán [khâaw cɯŋ rɔ́ɔŋ 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 rɔ́ɔŋ hây]
child CLF that cry
[khâaw 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)  * $[ph\dot{r}3]\ f\ddot{oon} \ t\ddot{o}k$

because rain fall
$M[ph\ddot{uu}un \ t\ddot{a}g \ piak]$

ground must be.wet

IM: ‘Because the rain fell, the ground must be wet.’

Quasi-subordination
(2-1-2-1)-(a2)  $[ph\dot{r}3]\ f\ddot{oon} \ t\ddot{o}k$

because rain fall
$M[ph\ddot{uu}un \ c\ddot{u}ng \ t\ddot{a}g \ piak]$

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 $t\ddot{a}g$ ‘must’ is removed from the main clause.

Subordination proper
(2-1-2-1)-(a3)  * $[nn\ddot{u}n \ c\ddot{a}ak] \ f\ddot{oon} \ t\ddot{o}k$

because rain fall
$M[ph\ddot{uu}un \ t\ddot{a}g \ piak]$

ground must be.wet

IM: ‘Because the rain fell, the ground must be wet.’

Quasi-subordination
(2-1-2-1)-(a4)  $[nn\ddot{u}n \ c\ddot{a}ak] \ f\ddot{oon} \ t\ddot{o}k$

because rain fall
$M[ph\ddot{uu}un \ c\ddot{u}ng \ t\ddot{a}g \ piak]$

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 $t\ddot{a}g$ ‘must’ is removed from the main clause.

Quasi-parataxis
(2-1-2-1)-(a5)  * $[f\ddot{oon} \ t\ddot{o}k]$

rain fall
$[ph\ddot{uu}un \ c\ddot{u}ng \ t\ddot{a}g \ piak]$

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 $ph\dot{r}3$ ‘because’ (‘Because the rain fell, so the ground must be wet’). See (2-1-2-1)-(a2) (Quasi-subordination).
(b) Subordination proper: $M[Y] + s[X]$

$(2-1-2-1)-(b1)$

\[\text{ground must be wet} \]
\[\text{because rain fell} \]

LT: ‘The ground must be wet, because the rain fell.’

$(2-1-2-1)-(b2)$

\[\text{ground must be wet} \]
\[\text{because rain fell} \]

LT: ‘The ground must be wet, because the rain fell.’

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

$(2-1-2-1)-(c1)$

\[\text{rain fall} \]
\[\text{the ground must be wet} \]

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 $\text{thâa ‘if’}$ 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 $\text{chanán ‘and so’}$. It is an instance of $(ii-1)$ Coordination proper.

Coordination proper

$(2-1-2-1)-(c2)$

\[\text{rain fall and so} \]
\[\text{the ground must be wet} \]

LT: ‘The rain fell, and so the ground must be wet.’

Quasi-coordination

$(2-1-2-1)-(c3)$

\[\text{because rain fall and so} \]
\[\text{the ground so must be wet} \]

LT: ‘Because the rain fell, and so the ground must be wet.’

$(2-1-2-1)-(c4)$

\[\text{because rain fall and so} \]
\[\text{the ground so must be wet} \]

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 տսղ ‘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) * [փհաուն տսղ փիակ]
ground must be.wet
[ֆուն տոկ]
rain fall
LT: The ground must be wet. The rain fell.’
IM: ‘The ground must be wet, because the rain fell.’

Տսղ ‘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: ս[X] + մ[Y]
(2-1-2-2)-(a1) * ս[փրսփ ֆուն տոկ յոււ]
because rain fall CONT
մ[խավ տսղ յոււ բաան]
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) ս[փրսփ ֆուն տոկ յոււ]
because rain fall CONT
մ[խավ կուն տսղ յոււ բաան]
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) * ս[նիան կաակ ֆուն տոկ յոււ]
because rain fall CONT
մ[խավ տսղ յոււ բաան]
PRON must stay house
LT: ‘Because the rain is falling, he has to stay in the house.’

Quasi-subordination
(2-1-2-2)-(a4) ս[նիան կաակ ֆուն տոկ յոււ]
because rain fall CONT
մ[Խավ կուն տսղ յոււ բաան]
PRON so must stay house
LT: ‘Because the rain is falling, so he has to stay in the
(b) Subordination proper: \(M[Y] + S[X]\)

\[(2-1-2-2)-(b1) M[\text{kháw tɔ̂ŋ yùu bāan}]\]

PRON must stay house

\(S[\text{phrɔ́Ɂ fǒn tòk yùu}]\)

because rain fall CONT

LT: ‘He has to stay in the house because the rain is falling.’

\[(2-1-2-2)-(b2) M[\text{kháw tɔ̂ŋ yùu bāan}]\]

PRON must stay house

\(S[\text{nɯ̂aŋ càak fǒn tòk yùu}]\)

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) \[\text{fǒn tòk yùu}\]\]

rain fall CONT

\(\[\text{kháw tɔ̂ŋ yùu bāan}\]\)

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 \(\text{chanán} ‘and so’\). It is an instance of (ii-1) Coordination proper.

Coordination proper

\[(2-1-2-2)-(c2) \[\text{fǒn tòk yùu} \text{chanán}\]

rain fall CONT and.so

\(\[\text{kháw tɔ̂ŋ yùu bāan}\]\)

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) \[\text{phrɔ́Ɂ fǒn tòk yùu} \text{chanán}\]

because rain fall CONT and.so

\(\[\text{kháw cuŋ tɔ̂ŋ yùu bāan}\]\)

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) \[\text{nɯ̂aŋ càak fǒn tòk yùu} \text{chanán}\]

because rain fall CONT and.so
M[kháw cɯŋ t̂ŋ yùu bāan]
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) [fǒn tòk yùu]
rain fall CONT
[kháw cɯŋ t̂ŋ yùu bāan]
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 t̂ŋ yùu bāan]
PRON must stay house
[fǒn 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) *[phrɔ́Ɂ fǒn tòk yùu]
because rain fall CONT
M[(khun) yàa ?ɔ̂ɔk pay khâŋ nɔ̂ɔk sìɁ]
(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.’

(SiɁ 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 sìɁ ‘(NEG + know + siɁ) (I) do not know, I tell you so’ or nân nâɁ sìɁ ‘(that + PRT + siɁ) ‘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[phr3ʔ fön tôk yùu]
because   rain   fall   CONT
M[(khun) cuŋ yàa ṭɔ̀ɔk pay khâŋ nɔɔk siʔ]
(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[nûan càak fön tôk yùu]
because  rain  fall  CONT
M[(khun) yàa ṭɔ̀ɔk pay khâŋ nɔɔk siʔ]
(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[nûan càak fön tôk yùu]
because  rain  fall  CONT
M[(khun) cuŋ yàa ṭɔ̀ɔk pay khâŋ nɔɔk siʔ]
(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 ṭɔ̀ɔk pay khâŋ nɔɔk siʔ]
(PRON)  PROH  exit  go  outside  PRT
s[phr3ʔ fön tôk 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 ṭɔ̀ɔk pay khâŋ nɔɔk siʔ]
(PRON)  PROH  exit  go  outside  PRT
s[nûan càak fön tôk 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) [fön tôk yùu]
rain  fall  CONT
[(khun) yàa ṭɔ̀ɔk pay khâŋ nɔɔk siʔ]
(PRON)  PROH  exit  go  outside  PRT
LT: ‘The rain is falling. (You) don’t go out (, I order you
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) \[\text{fǒn tòk yùu} \quad \text{chanán} \]
\[\text{rain fall} \quad \text{CONT} \quad \text{and so} \]
\[(khun) \quad \text{yàa} \quad \text{ʔɔ́k pay khâŋ nɔ̀ɔk si?}\]
\[(\text{PRON}) \quad \text{PROH exit go outside} \quad \text{PRT}\]
LT: 'The rain is falling, and so (you) don’t go out (, I order you so).'

Quasi-coordination

(2-1-3-1)-(c3) * \[\text{phrɔ́Ɂ fǒn tòk yùu} \quad \text{chanán} \]
\[\text{because rain fall} \quad \text{CONT} \quad \text{and so} \]
\[(khun) \quad \text{cɯŋ yàa} \quad \text{ʔɔ́k pay khâŋ nɔ̀ɔk si?}\]
\[(\text{PRON}) \quad \text{so PROH exit go outside} \quad \text{PRT}\]
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) * \[\text{ɲɯ̂əŋ càak fǒn tòk yùu} \quad \text{chanán} \]
\[\text{because rain fall} \quad \text{CONT} \quad \text{and so} \]
\[(khun) \quad \text{cɯŋ yàa} \quad \text{ʔɔ́k pay khâŋ nɔ̀ɔk si?}\]
\[(\text{PRON}) \quad \text{so PROH exit go outside} \quad \text{PRT}\]
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) * \[\text{fǒn tòk yùu} \]
\[\text{rain fall} \quad \text{CONT} \]
\[(khun) \quad \text{cɯŋ yàa} \quad \text{ʔɔ́k pay khâŋ nɔ̀ɔk si?}\]
\[(\text{PRON}) \quad \text{so PROH exit go outside} \quad \text{PRT}\]
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) \[\text{(khun) yàa} \quad \text{ʔɔ́k pay khâŋ nɔ̀ɔk si?}\]
\[(\text{PRON}) \quad \text{PROH exit go outside} \quad \text{PRT}\]
\[\text{fǒn tòk yùu} \quad \text{rain fall} \quad \text{CONT} \]
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) * $s[\text{phrɛ́Ɂ} \text{dèk} \text{khon} \text{nân} \text{hǐw} \text{khâaw}]$

because child CLF that be.hungry rice

$m[(\text{khun}) \text{Ɂaw} \text{khanǒm} \text{hây} \text{khâaw} \text{sìʔ}]$

(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) * $s[\text{phrɛ́Ɂ} \text{dèk} \text{khon} \text{nân} \text{hǐw} \text{khâaw}]$

because child CLF that be.hungry rice

$m[(\text{khun}) \text{Ɂaw} \text{khanɁom} \text{hây} \text{khâaw} \text{sìʔ}]$

(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) * $s[\text{nɯ̂aŋ çǎak} \text{dèk} \text{khon} \text{nân} \text{hǐw} \text{khâaw}]$

because child CLF that be.hungry rice

$m[(\text{khun}) \text{Ɂaw} \text{khanɁom} \text{hây} \text{khâaw} \text{sìʔ}]$

(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) * $s[\text{nɯ̂aŋ çǎak} \text{dèk} \text{khon} \text{nân} \text{hǐw} \text{khâaw}]$

because child CLF that be.hungry rice

$m[(\text{khun}) \text{Ɂaw} \text{khanɁom} \text{hây} \text{khâaw} \text{sìʔ}]$

(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) * $m[(\text{khun}) \text{Ɂaw} \text{khanɁom} \text{hây} \text{dèk} \text{khon} \text{nân} \text{sìʔ}]$

(PRON) take sweets give child CLF that

$s[\text{phrɛ́Ɂ} \text{khâw} \text{hǐw} \text{khâaw}]$

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) * $m[(\text{khun}) \text{Ɂaw} \text{khanɁom} \text{hây} \text{dèk} \text{khon} \text{nân} \text{sìʔ}]$

(PRON) take sweets give child CLF that

$s[\text{nɯ̂aŋ çǎak} \text{khâw} \text{hǐw} \text{khâaw}]$

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

\[(c)\text{ Parataxis proper: } [X] + [Y]
\]
\[(2-1-3-2)-(c1) \quad [\text{dèk} \text{ khon} \text{ nán} \text{ hiw} \text{ khâaw}]\]
\[\text{child CLF that be.hungry rice}\]
\[\text{[(khun) ʔaw khanǒm háy khâw siʔ]}\]
\[\text{(PRON) take sweets give PRON PRT}\]
\[\text{LT: ‘That child is/becomes hungry (for) rice. (You) give him sweets (, I order you so).’}\]

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.

\[\text{Coordination proper}\]
\[(2-1-3-2)-(c2) \quad [\text{dèk} \text{ khon} \text{ nán} \text{ hiw} \text{ khâaw}] \text{ chanán}\]
\[\text{child CLF that be.hungry rice and so}\]
\[\text{[(khun) ʔaw khanǒm háy khâw siʔ]}\]
\[\text{(PRON) take sweets give PRON PRT}\]
\[\text{LT: ‘That child is/becomes hungry (for) rice, and so (you) give him sweets (, I order you so).’}\]

\[\text{Quasi-coordination}\]
\[(2-1-3-2)-(c3) \quad * \text{[phrʔ2 dèk khon nán hiw khâaw]}\]
\[\text{because child CLF that be.hungry rice chanán}\]
\[\text{and so}\]
\[\text{M[(khun) cuŋ ʔaw khanǒm háy khâw siʔ]}\]
\[\text{(PRON) so take sweets give PRON PRT}\]
\[\text{LT: ‘Because that child is/becomes hungry (for) rice, and so (you) give him sweets (, I order you so).’}\]

\[(2-1-3-2)-(c4) \quad * \text{[nűaŋ cãak dèk khon nán hiw khâaw]}\]
\[\text{because child CLF that be.hungry rice chanán}\]
\[\text{and so}\]
\[\text{M[(khun) cuŋ ʔaw khanǒm háy khâw siʔ]}\]
\[\text{(PRON) so take sweets give PRON PRT}\]
\[\text{LT: ‘Because that child is/becomes hungry (for) rice, and so (you) give him sweets (, I order you so).’}\]

\[\text{Quasi-parataxis}\]
\[(2-1-3-2)-(c5) \quad * [\text{dèk} \text{ khon} \text{ nán} \text{ hiw} \text{ khâaw}]\]
\[\text{child CLF that be.hungry rice}\]
\[\text{[(khun) cuŋ ʔaw khanǒm háy khâw siʔ]}\]
\[\text{(PRON) so take sweets give PRON PRT}\]
\[\text{LT: ‘That child is/becomes hungry (for) rice, so (you) give him sweets (, I order you so).’}\]
Consultant TM comments that sentences including the AP-CLM ciuy ‘so’ seems incompatible with the final particle sìɁ ‘PRT’.

(d) Parataxis proper: [Y] + [X]
(2-1-3-2)-(d1) [(khun) Ɂaw khanôle hây dêk khon nân
(PRON) take sweets give child CLF that
sìɁ] [khâw hîw 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[phr5ʔ phūum piak yùu]
because ground be.wet CONT
m[fǒn tòk lézw]
raíin so fall PFV
LT: ‘Because the ground is wet, so the rain has fallen.’

Quasi-subordination
(2-1-4-1)-(a2) * s[phr5ʔ phūum piak yùu]
because ground be.wet CONT
m[fǒn cuŋ tòk lézw]
raíin so fall PFV
LT: ‘Because the ground is wet, so the rain has fallen.’

Subordination proper
(2-1-4-1)-(a3) ? s[phr5ʔ phūum piak yùu]
because ground be.wet CONT
m[fǒn khoŋ tòk lézw láʔ máŋ]
raíin probably fall PFV PRT PRT
LT: ‘Because the ground is wet, probably the rain has fallen.’

(The final particle láʔ ‘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 khoŋ … máŋ ‘probably’, as in (2-1-4-1)-(a3). The expression khoŋ … máŋ
‘probably’ is somewhat colloquial. Khoŋ is an adverb, while máŋ is a final
particle. Both have epistemic meanings. Khoŋ expresses ‘probability’ or
Inference based on deduction. It may be translated as ‘probably’ or ‘might’. In contrast, máŋ implies doubt: ‘I doubt, I guess’. The two independent morphemes for epistemic modality khoŋ ‘probably, might’ and máŋ ‘I doubt, I guess’ are separable. However, the combination of the two is employed in the translation sentences. Khoŋ indicates that the propositional content of the sentence derives from the speaker’s deductive inference; máŋ expresses the speaker’s guess embracing doubt. In addition, máŋ adds colloquiality to the sentential expression. In order to make some of the sentences listed in this subsection sound natural, both of khoŋ ‘probably, might’ and máŋ ‘I doubt, I guess’ are required.

Quasi-subordination
(2-1-4-1)-(a4) * S[p hrɔ́Ɂ phùu ɯ́ɯn piak yùu]  
    because ground be.wet CONT  
M[tõn cuŋ khoŋ tôk leɛw láʔ máŋ]  
    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 cuŋ ‘so’ and the epistemic modal marker khoŋ ‘probably’, sounds odd. It is better without cuŋ ‘so’.

Subordination proper
(2-1-4-1)-(a5) * S[nɯ̂aŋ càak phùu ɯ́ɯn piak yùu]  
    because ground be.wet CONT  
M[tõn tôk leɛw]  
    rain fall PFV  
LT: ‘Because the ground is wet, the rain has fallen.’

Quasi-subordination
(2-1-4-1)-(a6) * S[nɯ̂aŋ càak phùu ɯ́ɯn piak yùu]  
    because ground be.wet CONT  
M[tõn cuŋ tôk leɛw]  
    rain so fall PFV  
LT: ‘Because the ground is wet, so the rain has fallen.’

Subordination proper
(2-1-4-1)-(a7) ? S[nɯ̂aŋ càak phùu ɯ́ɯn piak yùu]  
    because ground be.wet CONT  
M[tõn khoŋ tôk leɛw láʔ máŋ]  
    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) *\[nɯ̂aŋ càak phɯ́ɯn piak yùu\]
because ground be.wet CONT
\[fǒn cɯŋ khoŋ tòk lԑ́ԑw láʔ máŋ\]
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 cɯŋ ‘so’ and the epistemic modal marker khoŋ ‘probably’ sounds odd and that it is better if it does not contain cɯŋ ‘so’.

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

(2-1-4-1)-(b1) \[fǒn tòk lԑ́ԑw\]
rain fall PFV
\[phrɔ́Ɂ phɯ́ɯn piak yùu\]
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 lԑ́ԑw ‘PFV’.

(2-1-4-1)-(b2) \[fǒn khoŋ tòk lԑ́ԑw láʔ máŋ\]
rain probably fall PFV PRT PRT
\[phrɔ́Ɂ phɯ́ɯn piak yùu\]
because ground be.wet CONT
LT: ‘Probably rain has fallen, because the ground is wet.’

(2-1-4-1)-(b3) \[nɯ̂aŋ càak phɯ́ɯn piak yùu\]
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) ?\[fǒn khoŋ tòk lԑ́ԑw láʔ\]
rain probably fall PFV PRT
\[nɯ̂aŋ càak phɯ́ɯn piak yùu\]
PRT 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 ‘\[s[X] + m[Y]\]’.
(c) Parataxis proper: [X] + [Y]

(2-1-4-1)-(c1)  *

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{Tōn} & \quad \text{tōk} & \quad \text{léw} \\
\text{phûum} & \quad \text{piak} & \quad \text{yùu} \\
\text{fôn} & \quad \text{be.wet} & \quad \text{CONT} \\
\text{rîn} & \quad \text{fall} & \quad \text{PFV} \\
\end{align*}
\]

LT: ‘The ground is wet. The rain has fallen.’

(2-1-4-1)-(c2)

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{phûum} & \quad \text{piak} & \quad \text{yùu} \\
\text{fôn} & \quad \text{be.wet} & \quad \text{CONT} \\
\text{fǒn} & \quad \text{khoŋ} & \quad \text{tōk} & \quad \text{léw} & \quad \text{lȁ?} & \quad \text{máŋ} \\
\text{rîn} & \quad \text{probablist} & \quad \text{fall} & \quad \text{PFV} & \quad \text{PRT} & \quad \text{PRT} \\
\end{align*}
\]

LT: ‘The ground is wet. Probably the rain has fallen.’

The example (2-1-4-1)-(c1) is not acceptable. But (2-1-4-1)-(c2), in which the second sentence contains khoŋ ... máŋ ‘probably’, is acceptable. (It is an instance of parataxis proper.) Also, (2-1-4-1)-(c3) and -(c4), both of which contain the I-CLM chanán ‘and so’, are acceptable. (They are instances of (ii-1) Coordination proper.) Additionally (2-1-4-1)-(c4) contains khoŋ ... máŋ ‘probably’.

Coordination proper

(2-1-4-1)-(c3)

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{phûum} & \quad \text{piak} & \quad \text{yùu} & \quad \text{chanán} \\
\text{fôn} & \quad \text{tōk} & \quad \text{léw} \\
\text{be.wet} & \quad \text{CONT} & \quad \text{and.so} \\
\text{rîn} & \quad \text{fall} & \quad \text{PFV} \\
\end{align*}
\]

LT: ‘The ground is wet, and so the rain has fallen.’

(2-1-4-1)-(c4)

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{phûum} & \quad \text{piak} & \quad \text{yùu} & \quad \text{chanán} \\
\text{fôn} & \quad \text{khoŋ} & \quad \text{tōk} & \quad \text{léw} & \quad \text{lȁ?} & \quad \text{máŋ} \\
\text{rîn} & \quad \text{probablist} & \quad \text{fall} & \quad \text{PFV} & \quad \text{PRT} & \quad \text{PRT} \\
\end{align*}
\]

LT: ‘The ground is wet, and so probably the rain has fallen.’

Consultant TM considers (2-1-4-1)-(c3), -(c4) not acceptable.

Quasi-coordination

(2-1-4-1)-(c5)  *

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{s[phrɔ́Ɂ]} & \quad \text{phûum} & \quad \text{piak} & \quad \text{yùu} & \quad \text{chanán} \\
\text{be.cause} & \quad \text{ground} & \quad \text{be.wet} & \quad \text{CONT} & \quad \text{and.so} \\
\text{M} & \quad \text{fôn} & \quad \text{cûŋ} & \quad \text{tōk} & \quad \text{léw} \\
\text{fall} & \quad \text{PRT} & \quad \text{PRT} \\
\end{align*}
\]

LT: ‘Because the ground is wet, and so the rain has fallen.’

(2-1-4-1)-(c6)  *

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{s[phrɔ́Ɂ]} & \quad \text{phûum} & \quad \text{piak} & \quad \text{yùu} & \quad \text{chanán} \\
\text{be.cause} & \quad \text{ground} & \quad \text{be.wet} & \quad \text{CONT} & \quad \text{and.so} \\
\text{M} & \quad \text{fôn} & \quad \text{cûŋ} & \quad \text{khoŋ} & \quad \text{tōk} & \quad \text{léw} & \quad \text{lȁ?} & \quad \text{máŋ} \\
\text{probablist} & \quad \text{fall} & \quad \text{PFV} & \quad \text{PRT} & \quad \text{PRT} \\
\end{align*}
\]

LT: ‘Because the ground is wet, and so probably the rain has fallen.’
Consultant TM considers (2-1-4-1)-(c6) marginally acceptable.

(2-1-4-1)-(c7) * [nɯ̂aŋ càak phùuun piak yùu] chanán
because ground be.wet CONT and.so
M[fǒn cɯŋ tòk léew]
LT: ‘Because the ground is wet, and so the rain has fallen.’

(2-1-4-1)-(c8) ? [nɯ̂aŋ càak phùuun piak yùu] chanán
because ground be.wet CONT and.so
M[fǒn cɯŋ khoŋ tòk léew láʔ máŋ]
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) * [phùuun piak yùu]
ground be.wet CONT
[fǒn cɯŋ tòk léew]
rain so fall PFV
LT: ‘The ground is wet, so the rain has fallen.’

(d) Parataxis proper: [Y] + [X]
(2-1-4-1)-(d1) * [fǒn tòk léew]
rain fall PFV
[phùuun piak 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 khoŋ tòk léew láʔ máŋ]
rain probably fall PFV PRT PRT
[phùuun piak 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) $s[phr5] kháw yaŋ mii chīwít yùu$  
because PRON still have life CONT 
$m[ɔɔ chûay hây khâw rɔ̂ɔt chīwít]$  
doctor help IND PRON survive 
LT: ‘Because he is still alive, the doctor helped him survive.’

Quasi-subordination

(2-1-4-2)-(a2) $s[phr5] kháw yaŋ mii chīwít yùu$  
because PRON still have life CONT 
$m[ɔɔ cum chûay hây khâw rɔ̂ɔt chīwít]$  
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) $s[phr5] kháw yaŋ mii chīwít yùu$  
because PRON still have life CONT 
$m[ɔɔ khoŋ chûay hây khâw]$  
doctor probably help IND PRON 
$rɔ̂ɔt chīwít lԑ́ԑw lԑ̄w māŋ]$  
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 $yaŋ mii chīwít$ ‘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 $chûay hây khâw rɔ̂ɔt chīwít lԑ̄w$ ‘to help him survive’ in the main clause is replaced with the phrase $mây thɔ̂ɔt thíŋ khâw$ ‘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) $s[phr5] kháw yaŋ mii chīwít yùu$  
because PRON still have life CONT 
$m[ɔɔ cum khoŋ chûay hây khâw]$  
doctor so probably help IND PRON 
$rɔ̂ɔt chīwít lԑ̄w lԑ̄w māŋ]$  
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 $khoŋ … māŋ$ ‘probably’. Similarly, (2-1-4-2)-(a5) is not acceptable, but (2-1-4-2)-(a7), which contains $khoŋ …

 máŋ ‘probably’, is marginally acceptable.

Subordination proper
(2-1-4-2)-(a5) * S[mɯ́aŋ c̀aak kháw yaŋ mii chiiwít yùu]
  because PRON still have life CONT
M[mɔ̀ɔ chûay hây kháw rɔ̀ɔt 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[mɯ́aŋ c̀aak kháw yaŋ mii chiiwít yùu]
  because PRON still have life CONT
M[mɔ̀ɔ c’un chûay hây kháw rɔ̀ɔt 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[mɯ́aŋ c̀aak kháw yaŋ mii chiiwít yùu]
  because PRON still have life CONT
M[mɔ̀ɔ khoŋ c’hûay hây kháw]
  doctor probably help IND PRON
rɔ̀ɔt chiiwít lԑ́ԑw láɁ máŋ
  survive PFV FRT 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 máŋ ‘because’ is not stylistically suitable for this sentence.

Quasi-subordination
(2-1-4-2)-(a8) * S[mɯ́aŋ c̀aak kháw yaŋ mii chiiwít yùu]
  because PRON still have life CONT
M[mɔ̀ɔ c’un khoŋ chûay hây kháw]
  doctor so probably help IND PRON
rɔ̀ɔt chiiwít lԑ́ԑw láʔ máŋ
  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 khoŋ ... máŋ ‘probably’, the sentences are not acceptable, but its inclusion renders them acceptable or marginally acceptable.
(2-1-4-2)-(b1) *_{[mɔ́ɔ chûay hây kháw rɔ̂ɔt chiiwít]}
doctor help IND PRON survive
_{[phrɔ́Ɂ kháw yaŋ 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) _{[mɔ́ɔ khoŋ chûay hây kháw]
doctor probably help IND PRON
_{[rɔ̂ɔt chiiwít lԑ́ԑw  láɁ máŋ]_
survive PFV PRT PRT
_{[phrɔ́Ɂ kháw yaŋ 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) _{[mɔ́ɔ chûay hây kháw rɔ̂ɔt chiiwít]}
doctor help IND PRON survive
_{[nɯ̄aŋ càak kháw yaŋ 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) ?_{[mɔ́ɔ khoŋ chûay hây kháw]
doctor probably help IND PRON
_{[rɔ̂ɔt chiiwít lԑ́ԑw  láɁ máŋ]_
survive PFV PRT PRT
_{[nɯ̄aŋ càak kháw yaŋ 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 nɯ̄aŋ càak ‘because’ is not stylistically suitable for the sentence.

(c) Parataxis proper: [X] + [Y]
Here again, without khoŋ … máŋ ‘probably’, the sentences are not acceptable, but its inclusion renders them acceptable. (However, Consultant TM considers (2-1-4-2)-(c2) with khoŋ … máŋ ‘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 yaŋ mii chiiwít yùu]_
PRON still have life CONT
_{[mɔ́ɔ chûay hây kháw rɔ̂ɔt chiiwít]_
doctor help IND PRON survive
LT: ‘He is still alive. The doctor helped him survive.’

(2-1-4-2)-(c2) [kháw yaŋ mii chiíwít yùu]
PRON still have life CONT
[mɔ̀ khôŋ chúay háy kháw rɔ̂ɔt chiíwít]
doctor probably help IND PRON survive
LT: ‘He is still alive. Probably the doctor helped him survive.’

Coordination proper
(2-1-4-2)-(c3) [kháw yaŋ mii chiíwít yùu] chanán
PRON still have life CONT and.so
[mɔ̀ chúay háy kháw rɔ̂ɔt chiíwít]
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 chiíwít yùu] chanán
PRON still have life CONT even.so
[mɔ̀ chúay háy kháw rɔ̂ɔt chiíwít]
doctor probably help IND PRON survive
LT: ‘He is still alive, and so probably the doctor helped him survive.’

Quasi-coordination
(2-1-4-2)-(c5) * s[phrɔ́Ɂ kháw yaŋ mii chiíwít yùu] because PRON still have life CONT chanán
and.so
m[mɔ̀ chúay háy kháw rɔ̂ɔt chiíwít]
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[phrɔ́Ɂ kháw yaŋ mii chiíwít yùu] because PRON still have life CONT chanán
and.so
m[mɔ̀ chúay háy kháw rɔ̂ɔt chiíwít]
doctor so probably help IND PRON survive
LT: ‘Because he is still alive, and so probably the doctor helped him survive.’

(2-1-4-2)-(c7) * s[muôn càak kháw yaŋ mii chiíwít yùu] because PRON still have life CONT
Quasi-parataxis

(2-1-4-2)-(c5) * [kháw yaŋ mii chiiwit yùu]
   PRON still have life CONT
[mo chúay háy kháw rɔt chiiwit]
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 chiiwit yùu]
   PRON still have life CONT
[mo khoŋ chüay háy kháw rɔt chiiwit]
doctor so probably help IND PRON survive
LT: ‘He is still alive, so probably the doctor helped him survive.’

(d) Parataxis proper: [Y] + [X]
Here again, without khoŋ ... máŋ ‘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) * [mo chüay háy kháw rɔt chiiwit]
doctor help IND PRON survive
[kháw yaŋ mii chiiwit 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) ? [mo khoŋ chüay háy kháw]
doctor probably help IND PRON
As noted above, (2-1-4-2)-(d2) is marginally acceptable or not acceptable, despite the fact that it contains khoŋ … máŋ ‘probably’. The sentence becomes acceptable if the second sentence contains phrɔ́Ɂ ‘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[phrɔ́Ɂ khun kamlæŋ hǎa khoŋ kin yùu]
           because PRON PROG seek food CONT
        m[khoŋ kin yùu troŋ nǐ náʔ]
           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[phrɔ́Ɂ khun kamlæŋ hǎa khoŋ kin yùu]
           because PRON PROG seek food CONT
        m[khoŋ kin cùn yùu troŋ nǐ náʔ]
           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[mùn càak khun kamlæŋ hǎa khoŋ kin yùu]
           because PRON PROG seek food CONT
        m[khoŋ kin yùu troŋ nǐ náʔ]
           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)  
*$_s$[nɯ̂aŋ câak khun kamlæ gₕ hɔ̌ɔŋ kin yùu]  
because PRON PROG seek food CONT
$_m$[khɔ̌ɔŋ kin cuŋ yùu troŋ nií náʔ]  
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).’

(Náʔ 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)  
*$_m$[khɔ̌ɔŋ kin yùu troŋ nií náʔ]  
food be located here PRT
$_s$[phrsʔ khun kamlæ gₕ hɔ̌ɔŋ 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)  
*$_m$[khɔ̌ɔŋ kin yùu troŋ nií náʔ]  
food be located here PRT
$_s$[nɯ̂aŋ câak khun kamlæ gₕ hɔ̌ɔŋ 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 lâʔ sìʔ ‘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). (Lâʔ sìʔ ‘I’m sure, I suppose so’ are particles. They do not contain a verb. The particle lâʔ 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 kamlæ gₕ hɔ̌ɔŋ kin yùu]  
PRON PROG seek food CONT
[khɔ̌ɔŋ kin yùu troŋ nií náʔ]  
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) kamlæ gₕ hɔ̌ɔŋ kin yùu]  
(PRON) PROG seek food CONT
Consultant TM comments that (2-1-5-1)-(c4) becomes acceptable if it contains another sentence expressing some action such as *chán ləəy Ɂaw 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)’).
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 khɔ̌ɔŋ kin yùu]
PRON PROG seek food CONT
[khɔ̌ɔŋ kin cɯŋ yùu troŋ níi 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) * [khɔ̌ɔŋ kin yùu troŋ níi náʔ]
food be.located here PRT
[khun kamlaŋ hǎa khɔ̌ɔŋ 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) [khɔ̌ɔŋ kin yùu troŋ níi náʔ]
food be.located here PRT
[hěn (khun) kamlaŋ hǎa (khɔ̌ɔŋ 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 TÔ YOU ‘There is water here’.

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

(2-1-5-2)-(a1) * s[phrɔ́Ɂ hěn khun kamlaŋ hǐw nám]
because see you PROG be.hungry water
yùu] M[nám yùu troŋ níi 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[phrɔ́Ɂ hěn khun kamlaŋ hǐw nám]
because see you PROG be.hungry water
yùu] M[nám cɯŋ yùu troŋ níi 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[nɯ̂aŋ càak hěn khun kamlaŋ hiw nám
because see you PROG be.hungry water
yùu]
CONT
M[nám yùu troŋ níi 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[nɯ̂aŋ càak hěn khun kamlaŋ hiw nám
because see you PROG be.hungry water
yùu]
M[nám cɯŋ yùu troŋ níi]
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).’

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

(2-1-5-2)-(b1) * M[nám yùu troŋ níi náʔ]
water be.located here PRT
S[phrɔ́Ɂ hěn khun kamlaŋ hiw 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 níi náʔ]
water be.located here PRT
S[nɯ̂aŋ càak hěn khun kamlaŋ hiw 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) [hěn khun kamlaŋ hiw nám yùu]
see you PROG be.hungry water CONT
[nám yùu troŋ níi 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 lāɁ sìɁ ‘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 kamlæŋ hǐw nám yùu]
see you PROG be.hungry water CONT
chanán [nám yùu troŋ níi náɁ]
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 ləəy Ɂaw 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[phr5? ʰěn khun kamlæŋ hǐw nám because see you PROG be.hungry water yùu] chanán CONT and.so
M[nám cuŋ yùu troŋ níi náɁ] 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[nîtaŋ càak ʰěn khun kamlæŋ hǐw nám because see you PROG be.hungry water yùu] chanán CONT and.so
M[nám cuŋ yùu troŋ níi náɁ] 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 kamlæŋ hǐw nám yùu] see you PROG be.hungry water CONT
The example (2-1-5-2)-(c5) is acceptable if it does not contain the AP-CLM *cuŋ* ‘so’; see (2-1-5-2)-(c1) (Parataxis proper).

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

\[
[\text{nam} \ yùu \ troŋ \ níi \ ná]\ \\
\text{water} \ so \ be.located \ here \ PRT
\]

\[
[\text{hèn} \ khun \ kamlag \ hiw \ nám \ yùu]\ \\
\text{see} \ you \ PROG \ be.hungry \ water \ CONT
\]

LT: ‘Water is located here. It seems that you are hungry (for) water.’

5. Conditionals

We shall examine *thâa* ‘if’ and *nay mɯa* ‘if’ for subordination of conditionals. *Thâa* ‘if’ is unmarked, being the common conditional CLM, while *nay mɯa* ‘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 mɯa* ‘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 mɯa* ‘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 mɯa* ‘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 *khoŋ … màŋ* ‘probably’. *Nay mɯa* ‘if’ is acceptable at Level IV only if the sentence involves *khoŋ … màŋ* ‘probably’. At Level III it is acceptable if it is used in quasi-subordination, involving the AP-CLM *kɔ̂* ‘then, so’. Parataxis proper is attested at Level I, and also at Level IV; at level IV it has to involve *khoŋ … màŋ* ‘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) \[ \text{thāa thūng rūduu bay máy phlì?} \]
if reach spring
M\[dɔ̀ɔk máy cā? baan\]
flower IRR bloom
LT: ‘If (it) reaches spring, flowers bloom.’
IM: ‘If spring comes, flowers bloom.’

Quasi-subordination
(2-2-1-1)-(a2) \[ \text{thāa thūng rūduu bay máy phlì?} \]
if reach spring
M\[dɔ̀ɔk máy kɔ̂ cā? baan\]
flower then IRR bloom
LT: ‘If (it) reaches spring, then flowers bloom.’
IM: ‘If spring comes, flowers bloom.’

For (a1), the temporal CLM \text{mùa} ‘when’ can be used in place of \text{thāa} ‘if’.

Subordination proper
(2-2-1-1)-(a3) \[ \text{mùa thūng rūduu bay máy phlì?} \]
when reach spring
M\[dɔ̀ɔk máy cā? baan\]
flower IRR bloom
LT: ‘When (it) reaches spring, flowers bloom.’
IM: ‘When spring comes, flowers bloom.’

Quasi-subordination
(2-2-1-1)-(a4) \[ \text{mùa thūng rūduu bay máy phlì?} \]
when reach spring
M\[dɔ̀ɔk máy kɔ̂ cā? baan\]
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 \text{lâkɔ̂} ‘and then’. (\text{lâkɔ̂} ‘and then’ is a reduced form of the combination of \text{lԑ́ԑw} ‘PFV’ and \text{kɔ̂} ‘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) \[ \text{thāa thūng rūduu bay máy phlì?} \]
if reach spring
M\[dɔ̀ɔk máy cā? baan\]
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 múáa thùng ruđuu bay máy phli?] 
    if reach pring 
M[dɔ̀ɔk máy c̱̃ɔ̆ 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 múáa thùng ruđuu bay máy phli?] 
    if reach pring 
M[dɔ̀ɔk máy ḵ̱ɔ̆ c̱̃ɔ̆ 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 múáa thùng ruđuu bay máy phli?] lâkɔ̂ 
    if reach pring              and.then 
M[dɔ̀ɔk máy ḵ̱ɔ̆ c̱̃ɔ̆ 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[dɔ̀ɔk máy c̱̃ɔ̆ baan] 
    flower IRR bloom 
S[thåa thùng ruđuu bay máy phli?] 
    if reach spring 
LT: ‘Flowers bloom if (it) reaches spring.’ 
IM: ‘Flowers bloom if spring comes.’

(2-2-1-1)-(b2)  * M[dɔ̀ɔk máy c̱̃ɔ̆ baan] 
    flower IRR bloom 
S[nay múáa thùng ruđuu bay máy phli?] 
    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)  [thùng ruđuu bay máy phli?] 
    reach spring 
[dɔ̀ɔk máy c̱̃ɔ̆ 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 lák大豆and then’, is not acceptable. It is an instance of (ii-1) Coordination proper.

Coordination proper
(2-2-1-1)-(c2) * [thɯ̌ŋ rɯ́duu bay máy phlìɁ] lák大豆 reach spring and.then
[dɔ̀ɔk máy cǎ? 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) [thɯ̌ŋ rɯ́duu bay máy phlìɁ] reach spring
[dɔ̀ɔk máy kɔ̂ cǎ? 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) * [dɔ̀ɔk máy cǎ? baan] flower IRR bloom
[thɯ̌ŋ rɯ́duu bay máy phlìɁ] 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, thɯ̌ŋ 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[chǎn cǎ? yǔu bāan] 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[chǎn kɔ̂ cǎ? yǔu bāan] 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 \( \text{lak}\) ‘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) \[ [\text{tha a f\(\text{o n t\(\text{o k}\) lak}\) and.then} \]
\[ \begin{align*}
\text{[ch\(\text{\'an c\(\text{\'a y\(\text{u b\(\text{\'a an}\) PRON IRR stay house Remaining Language: ‘‘(2-2-1-1)-(a1) may include the I-CLM ‘and then’.\’’\]\]}
\]}
\]
\]}
\]

**Subordination proper**

(2-2-1-2)-(a4) \* [s\(\text{\text{\text{nay m\(\text{\'u a f\(\text{o n t\(\text{o k}\]}}\) IM: ‘‘(2-2-1-1)-(a1) may include the I-CLM ‘and then’.\’’\]\]}
\]

**Quasi-subordination**

(2-2-1-2)-(a5) \* [s\(\text{\text{\text{nay m\(\text{\'u a f\(\text{o n t\(\text{o k}\]}}\) IM: ‘‘(2-2-1-1)-(a1) may include the I-CLM ‘and then’.\’’\]\]}
\]

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 \( t\text{\text{\text{\'o y}}\) ‘must’ ((k\(\text{5 c\(\text{\'a y\(\text{u b\(\text{\'a an\) PRON then IRR stay house Remaining Language: ‘‘(2-2-1-1)-(a1) may include the I-CLM ‘and then’.\’’\]\]}
\]
\]

(2-2-1-2)-(a6) \* [s\(\text{\text{\text{nay m\(\text{\'u a f\(\text{o n t\(\text{o k}\]}}\) IM: ‘‘(2-2-1-1)-(a1) may include the I-CLM ‘and then’.\’’\]\]}
\]

Consultant TM comments that (2-2-1-2)-(a6) is acceptable if it contains
the phrase rúu yùu lԑ́ԑw 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[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 mɯ̂a fǒn tòk]
if rain fall
IM: ‘I always stay in the house, if the rain falls.’

The CLM nay mɯ̂a ‘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 mɯ̂a ‘if’ is due to its semantic nature described at the beginning of Section 5. That is, nay mɯ̂a ‘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 lâkɔ̂ ‘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
(2-2-1-2)-(c2) is an instance of (ii-1) Coordination proper.

Coordination proper

\[
(2-2-1-2)-(c2) \quad * \quad \begin{array}{l}
\text{[fǒn tòk]} \\
\text{and then}
\end{array}
\begin{array}{l}
lâkɔ̂ \\
\text{fall}
\end{array}
\begin{array}{l}
\text{[chán cà? yùu bāan]} \\
\text{PRON IRR stay house}
\end{array}
\]

LT: ‘The rain falls, and then I stay in the house.’

Quasi-parataxis

\[
(2-2-1-2)-(c3) \quad [fǒn tòk]
\begin{array}{l}
rain \\
\text{[chán kɔ̂ cà? yùu bāan]} \\
\text{PRON then IRR stay house}
\end{array}
\]

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: \([Y] + [X]\)

\[
(2-2-1-2)-(d1) \quad * \quad \begin{array}{l}
\text{[fǒn tòk]} \\
\text{rain}
\end{array}
\begin{array}{l}
\text{[chán cà? yùu bāan]} \\
\text{PRON stay house}
\end{array}
\]

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: \(s[X] + m[Y]\)

\[
(2-2-2-1)-(a1) \quad \begin{array}{l}
\text{s[thâa phràŋ níi fǒn tòk]} \\
\text{if tomorrow rain fall}
\end{array}
\begin{array}{l}
\text{[kháw cà? tɔ̂ŋ yùu bāan]} \\
\text{PRON IRR must stay house}
\end{array}
\]

LT: ‘If the rain falls tomorrow, he has to stay in the house.’

Quasi-subordinaton

\[
(2-2-2-1)-(a2) \quad \begin{array}{l}
\text{s[thâa phràŋ níi fǒn tòk]} \\
\text{if tomorrow rain fall}
\end{array}
\begin{array}{l}
\text{[kháw kɔ̂ cà? tɔ̂ŋ yùu bāan]} \\
\text{PRON then IRR must stay house}
\end{array}
\]
LT: ‘If the rain falls tomorrow, then he has to stay in the house.’

Subordination proper  
(2-2-2-1)-(a3)  * $[\text{nay mɯ̂a} \text{ phrûŋ níi fǒn tòk}]$
\hspace{0.5cm} \text{if tomorrow rain fall}
M[$\text{kháw cãʔ tɔŋ yùu bāan}$]
\hspace{0.5cm} \text{PRON IRR must stay house}
LT: ‘If the rain falls tomorrow, he has to stay in the house.’

Quasi-subordinaton  
(2-2-2-1)-(a4)  * $[\text{nay mɯ́a} \text{ phrûŋ níi fǒn tòk}]$
\hspace{0.5cm} \text{if tomorrow rain fall}
M[$\text{kháw k₃ cãʔ tɔŋ yùu bāan}$]
\hspace{0.5cm} \text{PRON then IRR must stay house}
LT: ‘If the rain falls tomorrow, then he has to stay in the house.’

The examples (2-2-2-1)-(a3) and (2-2-2-1)-(a4), -(a5) all involve nay mɯ́a ‘if’. (2-2-2-1)-(a3), -(a4) are not acceptable, but (2-2-2-1)-(a5) is. (In passing, (2-2-2-1)-(a5) is not a translation of (2-2-2-1).) These sentences are additional instances in which the same CLM is acceptable in some sentences although it is intended to be used at the same level, i.e. Level II in these examples. However, Consultant TM consideres (2-2-2-1)-(a5) not acceptable. She comments that it is acceptable if the conditional E-CLM nay mɯ́a ‘if’ is replaced with the temporal E-CLM mɯ́a ‘when’ (‘When spring comes, flowers must bloom’).

Quasi-subordinaton  
(2-2-2-1)-(a5) $[\text{nay mɯ́a} \text{ thûŋ rûduu bāy m湟 phlîʔ}]$
\hspace{0.5cm} \text{if reach spring}
M[$\text{dɔ̀ɔk m湟 k₃ tɔŋ baan}$]
\hspace{0.5cm} \text{flower then must bloom}
LT: ‘If (it) reaches spring, then flowers have to bloom.’
IM: ‘If spring comes, flowers must bloom.’

(b) Subordination proper: M[Y] + $[X]$
(2-2-2-1)-(b1) M[$\text{kháw cãʔ tɔŋ yùu bāan}$]
\hspace{0.5cm} \text{PRON IRR must stay house}
$[\text{thâa phrûŋ níi fǒn tòk}]$
\hspace{0.5cm} \text{if tomorrow rain fall}
LT: ‘He has to stay in the house, if the rain falls tomorrow.’

(2-2-2-1)-(b2) * M[$\text{kháw cãʔ tɔŋ yùu bāan}$]
\hspace{0.5cm} \text{PRON IRR must stay house}

\[ [nay mɯ̂a phrûŋ níi fǒn tòk] \]
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) * \([phrûŋ níi fǒn tòk]\)
tomorrow rain fall
\[ [kháw cãʔ tãŋ yùu bâan] \]
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 \(lâk\) ‘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) \([phrûŋ níi fǒn tòk]\) \(lâk\)
tomorrow rain fall and.then
\[ [kháw cãʔ tãŋ yùu bâan] \]
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) \([thâa phrûŋ níi fǒn tòk]\) \(lâk\)
if tomorrow rain fall and.then
\[ [kháw kɔ̂ cãʔ tãŋ yùu bâan] \]
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) * \([nay mɯ̂a phrûŋ níi fǒn tòk]\) \(lâk\)
if tomorrow rain fall and.then
\[ [kháw kɔ̂ cãʔ tãŋ yùu bâan] \]
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
   [khâw kɔ̂ càʔ tɔ̂ŋ yùu bāan]
   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) * [khâw càʔ tɔ̂ŋ yùu bāan]
   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 hiw khâaw]
   if   child CLF this be.hungry rice
   m [(khâw) càʔ tɔ̂ŋ rɔ́ɔŋ 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 tɔ̂ŋ ‘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 hiw khâaw]
   if   child CLF this be.hungry rice
   m [(khâw) kɔ̂ càʔ tɔ̂ŋ rɔ́ɔŋ 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 mɯ̂a dèk khon níi hiw khâaw]
   if   child CLF this be.hungry rice
M[(kháw) càʔ tāŋ rɔ̄ŋ háy]
(PRON) IRR must cry
IM: ‘If this child is/becomes hungry (for) rice, (he) must cry.’

Quasi-subordination
(2-2-2)-(a4) * [nay muàa dèk khon nū hīw khāaw]
if child CLF this be.hungry rice
M[(kháw) kɔ̀ càʔ tāŋ rɔ̄ŋ háy]
(PRON) then IRR must cry
IM: ‘If this child is/becomes hungry (for) rice, then (he) must cry.’

(b) Subordination proper: M[X] + S[Y]
(2-2-2)-(b1) M[dèk khon nū càʔ tāŋ rɔ̄ŋ háy]
child CLF this IRR must cry
S[thāa (kháw) hīw khāaw]
if (PRON) be.hungry rice
LT: ‘This child must cry if (he) is/becomes hungry (for) rice.’
(2-2-2)-(b2) * M[dèk khon nū càʔ tāŋ rɔ̄ŋ háy]
child CLF this IRR must cry
S[nay muàa (kháw) hīw khāaw]
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 nū hīw khāaw]
child CLF this be.hungry rice
[khāw càʔ tāŋ rɔ̄ŋ háy]
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 lâkɔ̀ ‘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)-(c2) [dèk khon nū hīw khāaw] lâkɔ̀
child CLF this be.hungry rice and.then
[khāw càʔ tāŋ rɔ̄ŋ háy]
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)-(c3) s[thɔa dɛk khon níi hǐw khɔaw] lâkɔ̂
if child CLF this be.hungry rice and.then
M[(khɔaw)  kɔ cɔ tɔŋ rɔɔŋ hɔy]
then IRR must cry
LT: ‘If this child is/becomes hungry (for) rice, and then
(he) must cry.’
(2-2-2)-(c4) * s[nɔɔ muɔa dɛk khon níi hǐw khɔaw]
if child CLF this be.hungry rice
lâkɔ̂ M[(khɔaw)  kɔ cɔ tɔŋ rɔɔŋ hɔy]
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)-(c5) * [dɛk khon níi hǐw khɔaw]
child CLF this be.hungry rice
[khɔaw kɔ cɔ tɔŋ rɔɔŋ hɔy]
(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)-(c5) is not acceptable for a conditional meaning,
but it is acceptable for a causal meaning.

(d) Parataxis proper: [Y] + [X]
(2-2-2)-(d1) * [dɛk khon níi cɔ tɔŋ rɔɔŋ hɔy]
child CLF this IRR must cry
[khɔaw hɔw khɔaw]
(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 fôn tôk]
    if  rain  fall
M[(khun) yâa ʔɔk pay khâŋ nɔ̂ɔk  sịʔ]
(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 fôn tôk]
    if  rain  fall
M[(khun) kɔ  yâa ʔɔk pay khâŋ nɔ̂ɔk  sịʔ]
(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 kɔ ‘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 mɯ̂a fôn tôk]
    if  rain  fall
M[(khun) yâa ʔɔk pay khâŋ nɔ̂ɔk  sịʔ]
(PRON) PROH exit go outside  PRT
LT: ‘If the rain falls, (you) don’t go out (, I order you so).’

(2-2-3-1)-(a4) S[nay mɯ̂a fôn tôk]
    if  rain  fall
M[(khun) kɔ  yâa ʔɔk pay khâŋ nɔ̂ɔk  sịʔ]
(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) yâa ʔɔk pay khâŋ nɔ̂ɔk  sịʔ]
(PRON) PROH exit go outside  PRT
S[thâa fôn tôk]
    if  rain  fall
LT: ‘(You) don’t go out (, I order you so), if the rain falls.’

(2-2-3-1)-(b2)  * M[(khun) yâa ʔɔk pay khâŋ nɔ̂ɔk  sịʔ]
(PRON) PROH exit go outside  PRT
S[nay mɯ̂a fôn tôk]
    if  rain  fall
LT: ‘(You) don’t go out (, I order you so), if the rain falls.’

(2-2-3-1)-(c1) * [fǒn tòk]
    rain fall
    [(khun) yāa ?ɔɔk pay khâŋ nɔ̂ɔk 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 lâkδ ‘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]  lâkδ
    rain fall and.then
    [(khun) yāa ?ɔɔk pay khâŋ nɔ̂ɔk 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 náɁ ‘PRT’.

Quasi-coordination
(2-2-3-1)-(c3) s[thâa fǒn tòk]  lâkδ
    if rain fall and.then
    m[(khun) kɔ yàa ?ɔɔk pay khâŋ nɔ̂ɔk 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 mɯ̂a fǒk tòk]  lâkδ
    if rain fall and.then
    m[(khun) kɔ yàa ?ɔɔk pay khâŋ nɔ̂ɔk]
    (PRON) then PROH exit go outside

Quasi-parataxis

(2-2-3-1)-(c5) * [tön tōk]

\(\text{LT: ‘If the rain falls, and then (you) don’t go out (, I order you so).’}\)

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.

(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[thāa dēk khon nān hīw khāaw] if child CLF that be.hungry rice

\(\text{M[(khun) paw pāahān hāy khāw siʔ] (PRON) take dishes give PRON PRT}\)

\(\text{LT: ‘If that child is/becomes hungry (for) rice, (you) give him dishes (, I order you so).’}\)

Quasi-subordination

(2-2-3-2)-(a2) [s[thāa dēk khon nān hīw khāaw] if child CLF that be.hungry rice

\(\text{LT: ‘If the rain falls, (you) don’t go out (, I order you so).’}\)

\(\text{IM: ‘The rain falls, then (you) don’t go out (, I order you so).’}\)
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 kɔ̀ ‘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 mɯ̂a dèk khon nán hǐw khâaw]
if child CLF that be.hungry rice
M[(khun) ?aw ?aahǎan hây khâaw sǐʔ]
(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 mɯ̂a dèk khon nán hǐw khâaw]
if child CLF that be.hungry rice
M[(khun) kɔ̀ ?aw ?aahǎan hây khâaw sǐʔ]
(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 k hun ‘should, ought to’ in front of the phrase ?aw ?aahǎan hây khâaw ‘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)’).
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) *

\[
\text{[dèk khon nán hǐw khâaw]}
\]

child CLF that be.hungry rice

\[
[((khun) Ɂaw Ɂaahǎan hây khâw sí?)]
\]

(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 lâkš ‘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) *

\[
\text{[dèk khon nán hǐw khâaw] lâkš}
\]

child CLF that be.hungry rice and.then

\[
[((khun) Ɂaw Ɂaahǎan hây khâw sí?)]
\]

(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\[
\text{[thâa dèk khon nán hǐw khâaw] lâkš}
\]

if child CLF that be.hungry rice and.then

\[
[((khun) Ɂaw Ɂaahǎan hây khâw sí?)]
\]

(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\[
\text{[nay mɯ̂a dèk khon nán hǐw khâaw]}
\]

if child CLF that be.hungry rice
and then
\[ \text{プリント版: (khun) ไก่ ข้าว ผัก ผัก ผัก} \]
(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) *
\[
[\text{プリント版: (khun) ไก่ ข้าว ผัก ผัก ผัก}]
\]
(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) *
\[
[\text{プリント版: (khun) ไก่ ข้าว ผัก ผัก ผัก}]
\]
(PrON) take dishes give child CLF that
PRT
\[
[\text{プリント版: (khun) ไก่ ข้าว ผัก ผัก ผัก}]
\]
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) *
\[
[\text{プリント版: (khun) ข้าว ผัก ผัก ผัก}]
\]
if  ground be.wet
M[fõn tòk lɛ́w]

rain fall PFV

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

Quasi-subordination
(2-2-4-1)-(a2) * s[tha phùum piak]  
  if ground be.wet
M[fõn kɔ tòk lɛ́w]
  rain then fall PFV

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

Subordination proper
(2-2-4-1)-(a3) s[tha phùum piak]  
  if ground be.wet
M[fõn khoŋ tòk lɛ́w 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[tha phùum piak]  
  if ground be.wet
M[fõn kɔ khoŋ tòk lɛ́w 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 mɯa phùum piak]  
  if ground be.wet
M[fõn tòk lɛ́w]
  rain fall PFV

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

Quasi-subordination
(2-2-4-1)-(a6) * s[nay mɯa phùum piak]  
  if ground be.wet
M[fõn kɔ tòk lɛ́w]
  rain then fall PFV

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

Subordination proper
(2-2-4-1)-(a7) s[nay mɯa phùum piak]  
  if ground be.wet
M[ fö̋n kʰőŋ tôk léêw láʔ măŋ]
   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[nay múa phûuun piak]
   if ground be.wet
M[ fö̋n kʰőŋ tôk léêw láʔ măŋ]
   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 kʰ ‘then’ is better than (2-2-4-1)-(a8) with it.

(b) Subordination proper: M[Y] + s[X]
(2-2-4-1)-(b1) *M[ fö̋n tôk léêw]
   rain fall PFV
s[ thâa phûuun piak]
   if ground be.wet
LT: ‘The rain has fallen, if the ground is wet.’
(2-2-4-1)-(b2) M[ fö̋n kʰőŋ tôk léêw láʔ măŋ]
   rain probably fall PFV PRT PRT
s[ thâa phûuun 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 kʰőŋ ‘probably’. The same applies to (2-2-4-1)-(b3) and (2-2-4-1)-(b4).

(2-2-4-1)-(b3) *M[ fö̋n tôk léêw]
   rain fall PFV
s[nay múa phûuun piak]
   if ground be.wet
LT: ‘The rain has fallen, if the ground is wet.’
(2-2-4-1)-(b4) M[ fö̋n kʰőŋ tôk léêw láʔ măŋ]
   rain probably fall PFV PRT PRT
s[nay múa phûuun 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) * [ phûuun piak]
   ground be.wet
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 khoŋ … máŋ ‘probably’. At Level IV, generally parataxis proper cannot have a conditional reading, even when khoŋ … 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 lâkɔ̂ ‘and then’, are not acceptable. They are instances of (ii-1) Coordination proper.

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

Quasi-coordination
(2-2-4-1)-(c5) * [thâa phúùun piak] lâkɔ̂
   if ground be.wet and.then
   [fɔn kɔ̂ tɔk lɛw]
   rain then fall PFV
   LT: ‘If the ground is wet, and then the rain has fallen.’
(2-2-4-1)-(c6) \[ thâa phûuun piak \] lâkô̂
if ground be.wet and.then
M[fôn kô̂ khoŋ tôk lԑ̂w láʔ màŋ]
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) * \[ nay muå phûuun piak \] lâkô̂
if ground be.wet and.then
M[fôn kô̂ tôk lԑ̂w]
rain then fall PFV
LT: 'If the ground is wet, and then the rain has fallen.'

(2-2-4-1)-(c8) \[ nay muå phûuun piak \] lâkô̂
if ground be.wet and.then
M[fôn kô̂ khoŋ tôk lԑ̂w láʔ màŋ]
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) * \[ phûuun piak \]
ground be.wet
[fôn kô̂ tôk lԑ̂w]
rain then fall PFV
LT: 'The ground is wet, then the rain has fallen.'

(2-2-4-1)-(c10) ? \[ phûuun piak \]
ground be.wet
[fôn kô̂ khoŋ tôk lԑ̂w láʔ màŋ]
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) * \[ fôn tôk lԑ̂w \]
rain fall PFV
[phûuun piak]
ground be.wet
LT: 'The rain has fallen. The ground is wet.'

(2-2-4-1)-(d2) \[ fôn khoŋ tôk lԑ̂w láʔ màŋ \]
rain probably fall PFV PRT PRT
[phûuun 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) * $s[\text{thaá dêk khon níi rɔ̀ɔŋ hây}]$
if child CLF this cry

$m[\text{kháw hiw khâaw lԑ́ԑw}]$
PRON then be.hungry rice PFV
LT: ‘If this child cries, he becomes hungry (for) rice.’

Quasi-subordination

(2-2-4-2)-(a2) * $s[\text{thaá dêk khon níi rɔ̀ɔŋ hây}]$
if child CLF this cry

$m[\text{kháw kɔ̂ hiw khâaw lԑ́ԑw}]$
PRON then be.hungry rice PFV
LT: ‘If this child cries, then he becomes hungry (for) rice.’

Subordination proper

(2-2-4-2)-(a3) $s[\text{thaá dêk khon níi rɔ̀ɔŋ hây}]$
if child CLF this cry

$m[\text{kháw khoŋ hiw khâaw lԑ́ԑw lǎ? mǎŋ}]$
PRT PRT
PT
LT: ‘If this child cries, probably he becomes hungry (for) rice.’

Quasi-subordinaton

(2-2-4-2)-(a4) $s[\text{thaá dêk khon níi rɔ̀ɔŋ hây}]$
if child CLF this cry

$m[\text{kháw kɔ̂ khoŋ hiw khâaw lԑ́ԑw lǎ? mǎŋ}]$
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 khoŋ … mǎŋ ‘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: kɔ̂ khoŋ pen phrɔ́Ɂ kháw hiw khâaw lԑ́ԑw lǎ? mǎŋ ‘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 mɯ̂a dèk khon níi rɔ́ɔŋ hây]
  if child CLF this cry
M[kháw hǐw khâaw lԑ́ԑw]
  PRON be.hungry rice PFV
LT: ‘If this child cries, he becomes hungry (for) rice.’

Quasi-subordination

(2-2-4-2)-(a6)  
S[nay mɯ̂a dèk khon níi rɔ́ɔŋ hây]
  if child CLF this cry
M[kháw kɔ hǐw khâaw lԑ́ԑw]
  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 mɯ̂a dèk khon níi rɔ́ɔŋ hây]
  if child CLF this cry
M[kháw khoŋ hǐw khâaw lԑ́ԑw láʔ máŋ]
  PRON probably be.hungry rice PFV PRT
LT: ‘If this child cries, probably he becomes hungry (for) rice.’

Quasi-subordination

(2-2-4-2)-(a8)  
S[nay mɯ̂a dèk khon níi rɔ́ɔŋ hây]
  if child CLF this cry
M[kháw kɔ khoŋ hǐw khâaw lԑ́ԑw]
  PRON then probably be.hungry rice PFV
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 níi hǐw khâaw lԑ́ԑw]
  child CLF this be.hungry rice PFV
S[thâa kháw rɔ́ɔŋ hây]
  if PRON cry
LT: ‘This child becomes hungry (for) rice, if he cries.’

(2-2-4-2)-(b2)  
M[dèk khon níi khoŋ hǐw khâaw]
  child CLF this probably be.hungry rice
S[thâa kháw rɔ́ɔŋ 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 khoŋ … máŋ ‘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 khoŋ níi híw khâaw lɛ́ɛw]
child CLF this be.hungry rice PFV
S[nay mɯ̂a khâw rɔ́ɔŋ hây]
if PRON cry
LT: ‘This child becomes hungry (for) rice, if he cries.’

(2-2-4-2)-(b4) M[dèk khoŋ níi khoŋ híw khâaw
child CLF this probably be.hungry rice
lɛ́ɛw láʔ máŋ]
PFV PRT PRT
S[nay mɯ̂a khâw rɔ́ɔŋ 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 khoŋ níi rɔ́ɔŋ hây]
child CLF this cry
[khâaw híw khâaw lɛ́ɛw]
PRON be.hungry rice PFV
LT: ‘This child cries. He becomes hungry (for) rice.’

(2-2-4-2)-(c2) [dèk khoŋ níi rɔ́ɔŋ hây]
child CLF this cry
[khâaw khoŋ híw khâaw lɛ́ɛw láʔ?
PRON probably be.hungry rice PFV PRT máŋ] 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 khoŋ … máŋ ‘probably’. It is an exception to the tendency noted above that at Level IV parataxis proper cannot have a conditional reading, even when khoŋ … máŋ ‘probably’ is added.

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

(2-2-4-2)-(c3) * [dèk khon níi rɔ́ɔŋ hây] lâkɔ̂
child CLF this cry and.then
[kháw hǐw khâaw lԑw]
PRON be.hungry rice PFV
LT: ‘This child cries, and then he becomes hungry (for) rice.’

(2-2-4-2)-(c4) * [dèk khon níi rɔ́ɔŋ hây] lâkɔ̂
child CLF this cry and.then
[kháw khoŋ hǐw khâaw lԑ ́ԑw láʔ]
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-coordinaton

(2-2-4-2)-(c5) * [thâa dèk khon níi rɔ́ɔŋ hây] lâkɔ̂
if child CLF this cry and.then
[kháw kɔ̂ hǐw khâaw lԑw]
PRON then be.hungry rice PFV
LT: ‘If this child cries, and then he becomes hungry (for) rice.’

(2-2-4-2)-(c6) * [thâa dèk khon níi rɔ́ɔŋ hây] lâkɔ̂
if child CLF this cry and.then
[kháw kɔ̂ khoŋ hǐw khâaw lԑw]
PRON then probably be.hungry rice PFV
láʔ máŋ]
PRT PRT
LT: ‘If this child cries, and then probably he becomes hungry (for) rice.’

(2-2-4-2)-(c7) * [nay mɯ̂a dèk khon níi rɔ́ɔŋ hây] lâkɔ̂
if child CLF this cry and.then
[kháw kɔ̂ hǐw khâaw lԑw]
PRON then be.hungry rice PFV
LT: ‘If this child cries, and then he becomes hungry (for) rice.’

(2-2-4-2)-(c8) * [nay mɯ̂a dèk khon níi rɔ́ɔŋ hây] lâkɔ̂
if child CLF this cry and.then
[kháw kɔ̂ khoŋ hǐw khâaw lԑw]
PRON then probably be.hungry rice PFV
Quasi-parataxis

(2-2-4-2)-(c9) *
\[
\text{dèk} \quad \text{khon} \quad \text{níi} \quad \text{rɔ́ɔŋ hây}
\]
\[
\text{child} \quad \text{CLF} \quad \text{this} \quad \text{cry}
\]
\[
[kháw \quad kɔ \quad \text{hǐw} \quad khâaw \quad lԑ́ԑw]
\]
\[
\text{PRON} \quad \text{then} \quad \text{be.hungry} \quad \text{rice} \quad \text{PFV}
\]
LT: ‘This child cries, then he becomes hungry (for) rice.’

(2-2-4-2)-(c10) *
\[
\text{dèk} \quad \text{khon} \quad \text{níi} \quad \text{rɔ́ɔŋ hây}
\]
\[
\text{child} \quad \text{CLF} \quad \text{this} \quad \text{cry}
\]
\[
[kháw \quad kɔ \quad \text{khọŋ hǐw} \quad khâaw \quad lԑ́ԑw]
\]
\[
\text{PRON} \quad \text{then} \quad \text{probably} \quad \text{be.hungry} \quad \text{rice} \quad \text{PFV}
\]
\[
láʔ \quad \text{mάŋ}
\]
\[
PRT \quad PRT
\]
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) *
\[
\text{dèk} \quad \text{khon} \quad \text{níi} \quad \text{hǐw} \quad \text{khâaw} \quad \text{lԑ́ԑw}
\]
\[
\text{child} \quad \text{CLF} \quad \text{this} \quad \text{be.hungry} \quad \text{rice} \quad \text{PFV}
\]
\[
[kháw \quad \text{rɔ́ɔŋ hây}]
\]
\[
\text{PRON} \quad \text{cry}
\]
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) *
\[
\text{dèk} \quad \text{khon} \quad \text{níi} \quad \text{khọŋ hǐw} \quad \text{khâaw}
\]
\[
\text{child} \quad \text{CLF} \quad \text{this} \quad \text{probably} \quad \text{be.hungry} \quad \text{rice}
\]
\[
lԑ́ԑw \quad \text{lάʔ \quad mάŋ}
\]
\[
\text{PFV} \quad \text{PRT} \quad \text{PRT}
\]
\[
[kháw \quad \text{rɔ́ɔŋ hây}]
\]
\[
\text{PRON} \quad \text{cry}
\]
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 \text{khọŋ} \ldots \text{mάŋ} ‘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) $s[\text{thâa fôn yaŋ tòk yûu}]$
   if rain still fall CONT
   $m[\text{rôm yûu troŋ nîi náʔ}]$
   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) $s[\text{thâa fôn yaŋ tòk yûu}]$
   if rain still fall CONT
   $m[\text{rôm kɔ̂ yûu troŋ nîi náʔ}]$
   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) $s[\text{nay mɯ̂a fôn yaŋ tòk yûu}]$
   if rain still fall CONT
   $m[\text{rôm yûu troŋ nîi náʔ}]$
   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) $s[\text{nay mɯ̂a fôn yaŋ tòk yûu}]$
   if rain still fall CONT
   $m[\text{rôm k3 yûu troŋ nîi náʔ}]$
   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)  ? [thâa fôn yan tòk yùu] lâk₃
if rain still fall CONT and then
M[rôm k₃ yùu troŋ níi náʔ]
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)  * [nay mɯ̂a fôn yan tòk yùu] lâk₃
if rain still fall CONT and then
M[rôm k₃ yùu troŋ níi náʔ]
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 níi náʔ]
umbrella be.located here PRT
s[thâa fôn yan 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 níi náʔ]
umbrella be.located here PRT
s[nay mɯ̂a fôn yan 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)  * [fôn yan tòk yùu]
rain still fall CONT
[rôm yùu troŋ níi náʔ]
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 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 lâk₃ ‘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)  
[.rnn  yq  t.  yw]  
[.rn  .k]  
[.m  yw  trn  n  n]  
[.n  l]  
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)  *
[.rnn  yq  t.  yw]  
[.rn  .k]  
[.m  yw  trn  n  n]  
[.n  l]  
LT: ‘The rain is still falling, 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).’

(d) Parataxis proper: [Y] + [X]
(2-2-5-1)-(d1)  *
[.m  yw  trn  n  n]  
[.n  l]  
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[th. khun  hiw  khwäw]  
[.m  khôn  yw  trn  n  n]  
[.n  l]  
LT: ‘If you are hungry (for) rice, food is located here, you
know.’

Quasi-subordination

(2-2-5-2)-(a2)  
? s[thâa khun hîw khâaw]  
  if PRON be.hungry rice  
  M[khɔ̌ɔ ŋ k i n k ɔ̂ 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 kamlaŋ hâa khɔ̌ɔŋ kin yùu]  
  if PRON PROG seek food CONT  
  M[khɔ̌ɔŋ 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 kamlaŋ hâa khɔ̌ɔŋ kin yùu]  
  if PRON PROG seek food CONT  
  M[khɔ̌ɔŋ kin kɔ̂ 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 hîw khâaw]  
  if PRON be.hungry rice  
  M[khɔ̌ɔŋ 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 hîw khâaw]  
  if PRON be.hungry rice  
  M[khɔ̌ɔŋ kin kɔ̂ yùu troŋ níi náʔ]  
  food then be.located here PRT  
LT: ‘If you are hungry (for) rice, then food is located here
Quasi-coordination

(2-2-5-2)-(a7) *\[
\text{thâa} \quad \text{khun} \quad \text{hiw} \quad \text{khâaw} \]
\text{lâk}\overset{\text{if}}{\text{PRON}} \text{be.hungry} \quad \text{rice} \quad \text{and.then} \quad \text{M[khɔ̌ɔ ŋ k i n \ kɔ̂ yùu \ troŋ níi \ náʔ]}
\text{food} \quad \text{then} \quad \text{be.located} \quad \text{here} \quad \text{PRT}
\text{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 kɔ̂ ‘then’.

(2-2-5-2)-(a8) \[
\text{thâa} \quad \text{khun} \quad \text{hiw} \quad \text{khâaw} \]
\text{lâk}\overset{\text{if}}{\text{PRON}} \text{be.hungry} \quad \text{rice} \quad \text{and.then} \quad \text{M[khɔ̌ɔ ŋ k i n \ kɔ̂ yùu \ troŋ níi \ náʔ]}
\text{food} \quad \text{then} \quad \text{be.located} \quad \text{here} \quad \text{PRT}
\text{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) \[
\text{khɔ̌ɔ ŋ k i n \ yùu \ troŋ níi \ náʔ]}
\text{food} \quad \text{be.located} \quad \text{here} \quad \text{PRT}
\text{S[thâa} \quad \text{khun} \quad \text{hiw} \quad \text{khâaw}]
\text{if} \quad \text{PRON} \text{be.hungry} \quad \text{rice}
\text{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) \[
\text{khɔ̌ɔ ŋ k i n \ yùu \ troŋ níi \ náʔ]}
\text{food} \quad \text{be.located} \quad \text{here} \quad \text{PRT}
\text{S[thâa} \quad \text{khun} \quad \text{kamlæ̃ŋ} \quad \text{hǎa} \quad \text{khɔ̌ɔ ŋ k i n \ yùu]}
\text{if} \quad \text{PRON} \text{PROG} \text{seek} \quad \text{food} \quad \text{CONT}
\text{LT: ‘Food is located here (, I suggest you so), if you are seeking [i.e. looking for] food.’}

(2-2-5-2)-(b3) *\[
\text{khɔ̌ɔ ŋ k i n \ yùu \ troŋ níi \ náʔ]}
\text{food} \quad \text{be.located} \quad \text{here} \quad \text{PRT}
\text{S[nay mûa} \quad \text{khun} \quad \text{hiw} \quad \text{khâaw]}
\text{if} \quad \text{PRON} \text{be.hungry} \quad \text{rice}
\text{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) * $[\text{khun} \quad \text{hǐw} \quad \text{khāaw}]$

PRON be.hungry rice

$[\text{khɔ̌ɔŋ} \quad \text{kin} \quad \text{yùu} \quad \text{troŋ} \quad \text{níi} \quad \text{náʔ}]$

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 $\text{lâkδ}$ ‘and then’, is not acceptable. It is an instance of (ii-1) Coordination proper.

Coordination proper

(2-2-5-2)-(c2) * $[\text{khun} \quad \text{hǐw} \quad \text{khāaw}] \quad \text{lâkδ}$

PRON be.hungry rice and.then

$[\text{khɔ̌ɔŋ} \quad \text{kin} \quad \text{yùu} \quad \text{troŋ} \quad \text{níi} \quad \text{náʔ}]$

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) * $[\text{khun} \quad \text{hǐw} \quad \text{khāaw}]$

PRON be.hungry rice

$[\text{khɔ̌ɔŋ} \quad \text{kin} \quad \text{kɔ̂} \quad \text{yùu} \quad \text{troŋ} \quad \text{níi} \quad \text{náʔ}]$

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) * $[\text{khɔ̌ɔŋ} \quad \text{kin} \quad \text{yùu} \quad \text{troŋ} \quad \text{níi} \quad \text{náʔ}]$

food be.located here PRT

$[\text{khun} \quad \text{hǐw} \quad \text{khāaw}]$

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 ʔɯ̌ŋ ‘althouth’ and ʔάŋ ʔάŋ ʔǐi ‘although’ for subordination proper of concessives. ʔɯ̌ŋ ‘althouth’ is unmarked, being the common concessive CLM, with a generic meaning of concessive. ʔάŋ ʔάŋ ʔǐi ‘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, ʔɯ̌ŋ ‘althouth’ is attested at all of the five levels. ʔάŋ ʔάŋ ʔǐi ‘although’ is attested at Levels I, II and IV only. Generally parataxis proper is not acceptable. But it becomes acceptable if it involves ʔàat câʔ…kɔ̂ day ‘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[ʔɯ̌ŋ fǒn tòk] although rain fall
m[phɯ́ɯn yàŋ hɛ̂ɛŋ] 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 ʔɯ̌ŋ ‘althouth’ is replaced with the E-CLM ʔhanàiàt ‘althouth, even though reaching this extreme situation’ in the subordinate clause and the phrase yàŋ hɛ̂ɛŋ ‘still be dry’ is replaced with the phrase yàŋ mây piak ‘be still not wet’ in the main clause (‘Even though the rain fell, the ground is still not wet’). (The E-CLM ʔhanàiàt derives from the noun ʔhanàiàt meaning ‘size, dimensions, proportions’)

Quasi-subordination
(2-3-1-1)-(a2) s[ʔɯ̌ŋ fǒn tòk] although rain fall
m[phɯ́ɯn kɔ̂ yàŋ hɛ̂ɛŋ] 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[ʔάŋ ʔάŋ ʔǐi fǒn tòk] although rain fall
m[phɯ́ɯn yàŋ hɛ̂ɛŋ] ground still be.dry
LT: ‘Although the rain fell, the ground is still dry.’

Quasi-subordination
(2-3-1-1)-(a4) \( s[\text{thán thán thîi fõn tòk}] \)
\( m[\text{phûuun k̂̂ yag ĥēŋ}] \)
although rain fall
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 \( t̂ê \) ‘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) \( s[\text{thûn fõn tòk}] \ t̂e\)
although rain fall but
\( m[\text{phûuun (k̂̂) yag ĥēŋ}] \)
ground (even so) still be.dry
LT: ‘Although the rain fell, but (even so) the ground is still dry.’

(2-3-1-1)-(a6) \( s[\text{thán thán thîi fõn tòk}] \ t̂e\)
although rain fall but
\( m[\text{phûuun (k̂̂) yag ĥēŋ}] \)
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 \( k̂̂ \) ‘even so’.

(b) Subordination proper: \( m[Y] + s[X] \)
(2-3-1-1)-(b1) \( * m[\text{phûuun yag ĥēŋ}] \)
ground still be.dry
\( s[\text{thûn fõn tòk}] \)
although rain fall
LT: ‘The ground is still dry, although the rain fell.’

(2-3-1-1)-(b2) \( m[\text{phûuun yag ĥēŋ}] \)
ground still be.dry
\( s[\text{thán thán thîi fõn tòk}] \)
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   
  [phûuûn  yañ  hêêŋ]  
  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 têê ‘but’, is acceptable. It is an  
instance of (ii-1) Coordination proper.

Coordination proper

(2-3-1-1)-(c2) [fǒn  tòk]  têê  
  rain fall but   
  [phûuûn  yañ  hêêŋ]  
  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   
  [phûuûn  kɔ̂  yañ  hêêŋ]  
  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) * [phûuûn  yañ  hêêŋ]  
  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[thûûng  fǒn  tòk  yùu]  
  although rain fall CONT  
  m[khâw  ?ɔɔk  pay  khâg  nɔɔk]  
  PRON exit go outside  
  LT: ‘Although the rain was falling, he went out.’

Quasi-subordination

(2-3-1-2)-(a2) s[thûûng  fǒn  tòk  yûu]  
  although rain fall CONT

M[khâw kɔ́ɔk pay khâŋ nɔ̂ɔk]
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 kɔ́ ‘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[tháŋ tháŋ thîi fǒn tòk yùu]
although rain fall CONT
M[khâw kɔ́ɔk pay khâŋ nɔ̂ɔk]
PRON exit go outside
LT: ‘Although the rain was falling, he went out.’

Quasi-subordination
(2-3-1-2)-(a4) s[tháŋ tháŋ thîi fǒn tòk yùu]
although rain fall CONT
M[khâw kɔ́ɔk pay khâŋ nɔ̂ɔk]
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[khâw kɔ́ɔk pay khâŋ nɔ̂ɔk]
PRON exit go outside
s[tháŋ fǒn tòk yùu]
although rain fall CONT
LT: ‘He went out, although the rain was falling.’

(2-3-1-2)-(b2) M[khâw kɔ́ɔk pay khâŋ nɔ̂ɔk]
PRON exit go outside
s[tháŋ tháŋ thîi fǒn tòk yùu]
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, thûŋ ‘although’ has a wider distribution than tháŋ tháŋ thîi ‘although’, and tháŋ tháŋ thîi ‘although’ is often not acceptable where thûŋ ‘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 tháŋ tháŋ thîi ‘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 thûŋ ‘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 thûŋ ‘although’, some additional concessive marker such as one
more E-CLM (e.g. *kɔ̂ taam ‘even so’) which helps emphasize the concessive sense.

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

\[(2-3-1-2)-(c1)\] * [fǒn tòk yùu]

\[\text{rain fall CONT}\]
\[\text{kháw ?ɔ̂ɔk pay khâŋ nɔ̂ɔk}\]
\[\text{PRON exit go outside}\]
\[\text{LT: ‘The rain was falling. He went out.’}\]
\[\text{IM: ‘Although the rain was falling, he went out.’}\]

\[(2-3-1-2)-(c2)\] * [fǒn tòk yùu]

\[\text{rain fall CONT}\]
\[\text{kháw yaŋ ?ɔ̂ɔk pay khâŋ nɔ̂ɔk}\]
\[\text{PRON still exit go outside}\]
\[\text{LT: ‘The rain was falling. He still went out.’}\]
\[\text{IM: ‘Although the rain was falling, he went out.’}\]

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 \(yaŋ\) ‘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 \(tɛ̀ԑ\) ‘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] \(tɛ̀ԑ\)

\[\text{rain fall CONT but}\]
\[\text{kháw ?ɔ̂ɔk pay khâŋ nɔ̂ɔk}\]
\[\text{PRON exit go outside}\]
\[\text{LT: ‘The rain was falling, but he went out.’}\]

Quasi-coordination

\[(2-3-1-2)-(c4)\] \(s[\text{thɯ̌ŋ fǒn tòk yùu}] tɛ̀ԑ\)

\[\text{although rain fall CONT but}\]
\[\text{kháw kɔ̂ ?ɔ̂ɔk pay khâŋ nɔ̂ɔk}\]
\[\text{PRON even so exit go outside}\]
\[\text{LT: ‘Although the rain was falling, but even so he went out.’}\]

\[(2-3-1-2)-(c5)\] \(s[\text{thán thán thîi fǒn tòk yùu}] tɛ̀ԑ\)

\[\text{although rain fall CONT but}\]
\[\text{kháw kɔ̂ ?ɔ̂ɔk pay khâŋ nɔ̂ɔk}\]
\[\text{PRON even so exit go outside}\]
\[\text{LT: ‘Although the rain was falling, but even so he went out.’}\]
Quasi-parataxis

(2-3-1-2)-(c6) * [fǒn  tòk  yùu]
  rain  fall  CONT
  [kháw  kɔ  ʔɔk  pay  khâŋ nɔ̂ɔk]
  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  kɔ  yǎŋ  ʔɔk  pay  khâŋ nɔ̂ɔk]
  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) * [thɯ́ŋ  fǒn  tòk]
  although  rain  fall
  M[phɯ́ɯn  hɛ̂ɛŋ]
  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.’

(2-3-1-2)-(a1) * s[thɯ́ŋ  fǒn  tòk]
  although  rain  fall
  M[phɯ́ɯn  yap  hɛ̂ɛŋ]
  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.’

(2-3-1-2)-(a3) * s[thɯ́ŋ  fǒn  tòk]
  although  rain  fall
  M[phɯ́ɯn  khoŋ  hɛ̂ɛŋ]
  ground  probably  be.dry
LT: ‘Although the rain fell, the ground is probably dry.’

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[thɯ́ŋ  fǒn  tòk]
  although  rain  fall
  M[phɯ́ɯn  hɛ̂ɛŋ]
  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[thɯ́ŋ  fǒn  tòk]
  although  rain  fall
  M[phɯ́ɯn  yap  hɛ̂ɛŋ]
  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[thɯ́ŋ  fǒn  tòk]
  although  rain  fall
  M[phɯ́ɯn  khoŋ  hɛ̂ɛŋ]
  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)  
\[ \text{although} \ \text{rain} \ \text{fall} \]
\[ \text{ground} \ \text{probably} \ \text{still} \ \text{be.dry} \]

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

The example (2-3-2-1)-(a3) contains *khoŋ* ‘probably, might’, and it is not acceptable, while (2-3-2-1)-(a4) contains *yaŋ* ‘IPFV, still, even so’ in addition to *khoŋ* ‘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 *khoŋ* ‘probably, might’ and the final particle *máŋ* ‘PRT’. As explained in 4.4, *khoŋ* ‘probably, might’ alludes to the speaker’s deductive inference, while *máŋ* ‘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 *khoŋ* ‘probably, might’ and do not contain *máŋ* ‘PRT’. Even if the marginally acceptable or not acceptable sentences (i.e. (2-3-2-1)-(a3), -(a7), -(a8), -(b3), -(b4), -(c3) and -(c4)) contain *máŋ* ‘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)  
\[ \text{although} \ \text{rain} \ \text{fall} \]
\[ \text{ground} \ \text{even.so} \ \text{be.dry} \]

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)  
\[ \text{although} \ \text{rain} \ \text{fall} \]
\[ \text{ground} \ \text{even.so} \ \text{still} \ \text{be.dry} \]

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)  
\[ \text{although} \ \text{rain} \ \text{fall} \]
\[ \text{ground} \ \text{even.so} \ \text{probably} \ \text{be.dry} \]
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 phase \textit{khoŋ hɛ̂ɛŋ} ‘to probably be dry’ is replaced with the phrase \textit{khoŋ 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) $S[\text{thɯ̌ŋ} \ fǒn \ tòk]$
\begin{align*}
\text{although} & \quad \text{rain fall} \\
M[\text{phɯ́ɯn} \ \text{kɔ̂} \ \text{khoŋ} \ \text{yaŋ} \ \text{hɛ̂ɛŋ}] & \quad \text{ground} \quad \text{even so} \quad \text{probably} \quad \text{still} \quad \text{be dry} \\
\end{align*}
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 \textit{thɯ̌ŋ} ‘although’, while (2-3-2-1)-(a9) to -(a16) involve \textit{tháŋ tháŋ thîi} ‘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 \textit{khoŋ} ‘probably, might’ or \textit{khoŋ yaŋ} ‘probably/might still’.

Subordination proper

(2-3-2-1)-(a9) $S[\text{tháŋ tháŋ thîi} \ fǒn \ tòk]$
\begin{align*}
\text{although} & \quad \text{rain fall} \\
M[\text{phɯ́ɯn} \ \text{heŋ}] & \quad \text{ground} \quad \text{be dry} \\
\end{align*}
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) $S[\text{tháŋ tháŋ thîi} \ fǒn \ tòk]$
\begin{align*}
\text{although} & \quad \text{rain fall} \\
M[\text{phɯ́ɯn} \ \text{yaŋ} \ \text{heŋ}] & \quad \text{ground} \quad \text{still} \quad \text{be dry} \\
\end{align*}
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) $S[\text{tháŋ tháŋ thîi} \ fǒn \ tòk]$
\begin{align*}
\text{although} & \quad \text{rain fall} \\
\end{align*}
M[phaltum khoŋ heŋ]
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)  
\[ \text{tháŋ tháŋ thîi fôn tôk} \]
although rain fall
M[phaltum khoŋ yaŋ heŋ]
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)  * \[ \text{tháŋ tháŋ thîi fôn tôk} \]
although rain fall
M[phaltum kɔ̂ heŋ]
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)  * \[ \text{tháŋ tháŋ thîi fôn tôk} \]
although rain fall
M[phaltum kɔ̂ yaŋ heŋ]
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)  * \[ \text{tháŋ tháŋ thîi fôn tôk} \]
although rain fall
M[phaltum kɔ̂ khoŋ heŋ]
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)  
\[ \text{tháŋ tháŋ thîi fôn tôk} \]
although rain fall
M[phaltum kɔ̂ khoŋ yaŋ heŋ]
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[thɯ̌ŋ fɔn tɔk] tɛ̣c
although rain fall but
M[phɯ́ɯn kɔ̂ hɛŋ]
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[thɯ̌ŋ fɔn tɔk] tɛ̣c
although rain fall but
M[phɯ́ɯn kɔ̂ yan hɛŋ]
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[thɯ̌ŋ fɔn tɔk] tɛ̣c
although rain fall but
M[phɯ́ɯn kɔ̂ khoŋ hɛŋ]
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[thɯ̌ŋ fɔn tɔk] tɛ̣c
although rain fall but
M[phɯ́ɯn kɔ̂ khoŋ yan hɛŋ]
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[θάŋ θάŋ θîi fɔn tɔk] tɛ̣c
although rain fall but
M[phɯ́ɯn kɔ̂ hɛŋ]
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[θάŋ θάŋ θîi fɔn tɔk] tɛ̣c
although rain fall but
M[phɯ́ɯn kɔ̂ yan hɛŋ]
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[θάŋ θάŋ θîi fɔn tɔk] tɛ̣c
although rain fall but
M[ปูุม ถิ่น ข่า ถิ่น hēeŋ]
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[ทับ ทับ ทับห์ ฝน ตก] ตี๋
although雨 fall but
M[ปูุม ถิ่น ข่า ยัง ถิ่น hēeŋ]
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[ปูุม hēeŋ]
ground be.dry
S[ทับฝนตก]
although雨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[ปูุม ยัง ถิ่น hēeŋ]
ground still be.dry
S[ทับฝนตก]
although雨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[ปูุม ข่า hēeŋ]
ground probably be.dry
S[ทับฝนตก]
although雨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[ปูุม ข่า ยัง ถิ่น hēeŋ]
ground probably still be.dry
S[ทับฝนตก]
although雨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[phɯ́ɯn hɛ̂ɛŋ]
  ground be.dry
  s[thán thán thîi fǒn 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[phɯ́ɯn yan hɛ̂ɛŋ]
  ground still be.dry
  s[thán thán thîi fǒn 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[phɯ́ɯn khoŋ hɛ̂ɛŋ]
  ground probably be.dry
  s[thán thán thîi fǒn 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[phɯ́ɯn khoŋ yan hɛ̂ɛŋ]
  ground probably still be.dry
  s[thán thán thîi fǒn 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)  * [fǒn tòk]
  rain fall
  [phɯ́ɯn hɛ̂ɛŋ]
  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)  * [fǒn tòk]
  rain fall
  [phɯ́ɯn yan hɛ̂ɛŋ]
  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)  * [fǒn tòk]
  rain fall
  [phɯ́ɯn khoŋ hɛ̂ɛŋ]
  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
   [phɯ́ɯn khoŋ yaŋ hɛ̂ɛŋ]
   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 cinditionals; cf. Table 1). It is not acceptable even when it contains khoŋ ‘probably, might’ or khoŋ 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 tɛ̀ԑ ‘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] tɛ̀ԑ
   rain fall but
   [phɯ́ɯn khoŋ yaŋ hɛ̂ɛŋ]
   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
   [phɯ́ɯn kɔ̂ hɛ̂ɛŋ]
   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
   [phɯ́ɯn kɔ̂ yaŋ hɛ̂ɛŋ]
   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
   [phɯ́ɯn kɔ̂ khoŋ hɛ̂ɛŋ]
   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
(d) Parataxis proper: \([Y] + [X]\)

\[(2-3-2-1)-(d1) \ast [phɯ́ɯn \ hɛ̂ɛŋ] \]

ground be.dry

\[fǒn \ tòk\]

rain fall

LT: ‘The ground is dry. The rain fell.’

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

\[(2-3-2-1)-(d2) \ast [phɯ́ɯn \ yàŋ \ hɛ̂ɛŋ] \]

ground still be.dry

\[fǒn \ tòk\]

rain fall

LT: ‘The ground is still dry. The rain fell.’

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

\[(2-3-2-1)-(d3) \ast [phɯ́ɯn \ khoŋ \ hɛ̂ɛŋ] \]

ground probably be.dry

\[fǒn \ tòk\]

rain fall

LT: ‘The ground is probably dry. The rain fell.’

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

\[(2-3-2-1)-(d4) \ast [phɯ́ɯn \ khoŋ \ yàŋ \ hɛ̂ɛŋ] \]

ground probably still be.dry

\[fǒn \ tòk\]

rain fall

LT: ‘The ground is probably still dry. The rain fell.’

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

\[(2-3-2-2) \text{ Although the rain stopped, he has to stay in the house.}\]

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

\[(2-3-2-2)-(a1) \ast s[thɯ̌ŋ \ fǒn \ yùt] \]

although rain stop

\[kháw \ tŋ \ yùu \ bāan\]

PRON must stay house

LT: ‘Although the rain stopped, he has to stay in the house.’

Quasi-subordination

\[(2-3-2-2)-(a2) \ast s[thɯ̌ŋ \ fǒn \ yùt] \]

although rain stop

\[kháw \ kɔ̂ \ tŋ \ yùu \ bāan\]

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 kɔ̂ ‘even so’. It is an instance of (i-2) Quasi-subordination.

Subordination proper

(2-3-2-2)-(a3) * s[thāŋ thāŋ thīi fǒn yùt] although rain stop
M[khāw tŋ yùu bāan] PRON must stay house
LT: ‘Although the rain stopped, he has to stay in the house.’

Quasi-subordination

(2-3-2-2)-(a4) * s[thāŋ thāŋ thīi fǒn yùt] although rain stop
M[khāw kɔ̂ tɔ̂ŋ yùu bāan] 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[thūŋ fǒn yùt] tɛ̀ԑ although rain stop but
M[khāw kɔ̂ tŋ yùu bāan] 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[thāŋ thāŋ thīi fǒn yùt] tɛ̀ԑ although rain stop but
M[khāw kɔ̂ tŋ yùu bāan] 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[khāw tŋ yùu bāan] PRON must stay house
s[thūŋ fǒn yùt] although rain stop
LT: ‘He has to stay in the house, although the rain stopped.’
The example (2-3-2-2)-(c2), which contains the I-CLM tɛ̀ԑ ‘but’, is acceptable. It is an instance of (ii-1) Coordination proper.

Coordination proper

(2-3-2-2)-(c2)  
* [fǒn yùt]  tɛ̀ԑ  
rain stop  but  
[kháw tŋ yùu bāan]  
PRON must stay house  
LT: ‘The rain stopped, but he has to stay in the house.’
IM: ‘Although the rain stopped, he has to stay in the house.’

Quasi-parataxis

(2-3-2-2)-(c3)  
* [fǒn yùt]  
rain stop  
[kháw kɔ̂ tŋ yùu bāan]  
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 kɔ̂ ‘even so’ (kháw kɔ̂ yaŋ tŋ yùu bāan ‘even so he still has to stay in the house’).

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

(2-3-2-2)-(d1)  
* [kháw tŋ yùu bāan]  
PRON must stay house  
[fǒn 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...’
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) \* sl[\( \text{thɯ̌ŋ fǒn càʔ tòk yùu} \)]
although rain IRR fall CONT
m[(\( \text{raw} \) ?ɔ̂ɔk pay \( \text{khaŋ nɔʔk dùay kan} \) thəʔ)]
(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) sl[\( \text{thɯ̌ŋ fǒn càʔ tòk yùu} \)]
although rain IRR fall CONT
m[(\( \text{raw} \) kɔ̂ Ɂɔ̀ɔk pay \( \text{khaŋ nɔʔk dùay kan} \) thəʔ)]
(PRON) even so exit go outside together PRT
LT: ‘Although the rain is falling, even so (we) go out together (, I entreat you so) [= let’s go out].’

(Thəʔ 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 thɯ̌ŋ ‘although’, while (2-3-3-1)-(a3), -(a4) contain tháŋ tháŋ thîi ‘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 kɔ̂ ‘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 kɔ̂ ‘even so’.

Subordination proper
(2-3-3-1)-(a3) \* sl[\( \text{tháŋ tháŋ thîi fǒn càʔ tòk yùu} \)]
although rain IRR fall CONT
m[(\( \text{raw} \) ?ɔ̂ɔk pay \( \text{khaŋ nɔʔk dùay kan} \) thəʔ)]
(PRON) exit go outside together 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) * $[\text{thàŋ thàŋ thîi fǒn cät tok yùu}]$
although rain IRR fall CONT
M[\begin{array}{l}
\text{(raw)} \\
\text{(PRON)} \\
\end{array}]
\text{kɔ̀ ɔ̀ɔk pay khâŋ nɔ̂ɔk dûay kan thɔ̀ɛ́]
\end{array}$
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) $M[\begin{array}{l}
\text{(raw)} \\
\text{(PRON)} \\
\end{array}]
\text{ɔ̀ɔk pay khâŋ nɔ̂ɔk dûay kan thɔ̀ɛ́]
\end{array}$
PRT
LT: ‘(We) go out together (, I entreat you so) [= Let’s go out], although the rain is falling.’
(2-3-3-1)-(b2) * $M[\begin{array}{l}
\text{(raw)} \\
\text{(PRON)} \\
\end{array}]
\text{ɔ̀ɔk pay khâŋ nɔ̂ɔk dûay kan thɔ̀ɛ́]
\end{array}$
PRT
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) $[\begin{array}{l}
\text{fǒn tok yùu} \\
\end{array}]$
\begin{array}{l}
\text{rain fall CONT} \\
\text{PRON} \\
\end{array}$
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 tɛ̀ԑ ‘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) * $[\begin{array}{l}
\text{fǒn tok yùu} \\
\end{array}]$
\begin{array}{l}
tɛ̀ԑ \\
\text{rain fall CONT but} \\
\text{PRON} \\
\end{array}$
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) $\text{thû̂ñ fõn cã? tõk yûu} \quad \text{tè̂g}$

although rain IRR fall CONT but

M[{$(\text{raw})$ \text{kõ? ?ɔ̂ɔk pay kʰäŋ nɔ̂ɔk dûay kan}$]

(PRON) even.so exit go outside together

thə̀Ɂ

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) $\text{thãŋ thãŋ thîi fõn cã? tõk yûu} \quad \text{tè̂g}$

although rain IRR fall CONT but

M[{$(\text{raw})$ \text{kõ? ?ɔ̂ɔk pay kʰäŋ nɔ̂ɔk dûay kan}$]

(PRON) even.so exit go outside together

thə̀Ɂ

PRT

LT: ‘Although the rain is falling, but even so (we) go out together (, I entreat you so) [= let’s go out].’

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

Quasi-parataxis

(2-3-3-1)-(c5) $[\text{fõn tõk yûu}]$

rain fall CONT

[$(\text{raw})$ \text{kõ? ?ɔ̂ɔk pay kʰäŋ nɔ̂ɔk dûay kan thə̀Ɂ}$]

(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)-(d1) not acceptable.

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

(2-3-3-1)-(d1) $[\text{thû̂ñ fõn yûu}]$

although rain stop

M[{$(\text{khun})$ yûu bään thə̀Ɂ}$]

(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) * $[\text{thɯ̌ŋ} \ fǒn \ yùt]$ although rain stop
  $M[(\text{khun}) \ kɔ̂ \ yùu \ bāan \ thə̀Ɂ]$ (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 thɯ̌ŋ ‘although’, while (2-3-3-2)-(a3), -(a4) contain tháŋ tháŋ thîi ‘although’. (2-3-3-2)-(a1) is not acceptable, but (2-3-3-2)-(a2) is acceptable; it contains the AP-CLM kɔ̂ ‘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 kɔ̂ ‘even so’.

Subordination proper
(2-3-3-2)-(a3) * $[\text{tháŋ tháŋ thîi} \ fǒn \ yùt]$ although rain stop
  $M[(\text{khun}) \ yùu \ bāan \ thə̀Ɂ]$ (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) * $[\text{tháŋ tháŋ thîi} \ fǒn \ yùt]$ although rain stop
  $M[(\text{khun}) \ kɔ̂ \ yùu \ bāan \ thə̀Ɂ]$ (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) * $M[(\text{khun}) \ yùu \ bāan \ thə̀Ɂ]$ (PRON) stay house PRT
  $s[\text{thɯ̌ŋ} \ fǒn \ yùt]$ although rain stop
LT: ‘(You) stay in the house (, I entreat you so), although the rain stopped.’

(2-3-3-2)-(b2) * $M[(\text{khun}) \ yùu \ bāan \ thə̀Ɂ]$ (PRON) stay house PRT
  $s[\text{thǎŋ thǎŋ thǐi} \ fǒn \ yùt]$ 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) [fōn yùt]

rain stop

[((khun) yùu bān thɔ́p)]

(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 tɛ̀ԑ ‘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) * [fōn yùt] tɛ̀ԑ

rain stop but

[((khun) yùu bān thɔ́p)]

(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[thɯ̌ŋ fōn yùt] tɛ̀ԑ

although rain stop but

[((khun) kɔ̂ yùu bān thɔ́p)]

(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[θ̄n tʰə̌ŋ tʰii fōn yùt] tɛ̀ԑ

although rain stop but

[((khun) kɔ̂ yùu bān thɔ́p)]

(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) * [fōn yùt]

rain stop

[((khun) kɔ̂ yùu bān thɔ́p)]

(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: \([Y] + [X]\)

\[(2-3-3-2)-(d1)\]

\[
(\text{PRON}) \text{ stay house PRT} \\
\text{rain stop}
\]

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: \(s[X] + m[Y]\)

\[(2-3-4-1)-(a1)\]

\[
\text{although doctor help IND PRON survive} \\
\text{doctor NEG REAL PASS call go}
\]

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) \(mɔ̌ɔ chûay hây kháw rɔ̂ɔt chiiwit\) ‘the doctor helped him survive’ and (b) \(mɔ̌ɔ mây dây thùuk rîak pay\) ‘the doctor was not called in’: (a’) \(mɔ̌ɔ chûay dây chûay chiiwit kháw wáy\) ‘the doctor helped his life retain’ and (b’) \(kháw mây dây rîak hây mɔ̌ɔ chûay\) ‘he (the doctor’s patient) did not call the doctor to help (him)’.

\[(2-3-4-1)-(a2)\]

\[
\text{although doctor help IND PRON survive} \\
\text{doctor probably NÉG REAL PASS call go}
\]

LT: ‘Although the doctor helped him survive, probably the doctor was not called in.’

Quasi-subordination

\[(2-3-4-1)-(a3)\]

\[
\text{although doctor help IND PRON survive}
\]

\[m\ddot{o} k\ddot{a} m\ddot{a} y\ d\ddot{a} y th\ddot{u}uk r\ddot{a} k\ pay\]

\[M\ddot{o} k\ddot{o} m\ddot{a} y\ d\ddot{a} y th\ddot{u}uk r\ddot{a} k\ pay\]

\[M[m\ddot{o} k\ddot{o} m\ddot{a} y\ d\ddot{a} y th\ddot{u}uk r\ddot{a} k\ pay]\]

\(\text{doctor even.so NEG REAL PASS call go}\)

\(\text{LT: ‘Although the doctor helped him survive, even so probably the doctor was not called in.’}\)

\(2-3-4-1)-(a4)\)

\[s[th\ddot{a}n th\ddot{a}n th\ddot{u}i m\ddot{o} ch\ddot{u}ay h\ddot{a}y kh\ddot{a}w r\ddot{a} st chiiwif]\]

\[s[th\ddot{a}n th\ddot{a}n th\ddot{u}i m\ddot{o} ch\ddot{u}ay h\ddot{a}y kh\ddot{a}w r\ddot{a} st chiiwif]\]

\(\text{although doctor help IND PRON survive}\)

\(\text{LT: ‘Although the doctor helped him survive, even so probably the doctor was not called in.’}\)

\(2-3-4-1)-(a4)\)

\[M[m\ddot{o} k\ddot{o} m\ddot{a} y\ d\ddot{a} y th\ddot{u}uk r\ddot{a} k\ pay]\]

\[M[m\ddot{o} k\ddot{o} m\ddot{a} y\ d\ddot{a} y th\ddot{u}uk r\ddot{a} k\ pay]\]

\(\text{doctor even.so probably NEG REAL PASS call go}\)

\(\text{LT: ‘Although the doctor helped him survive, even so probably the doctor was not called in.’}\)

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 \(k\ddot{a}\) ‘even so’. They are instances of (i-2) Quasi-subordination. The same applys to (2-3-4-1)-(a5) to -(a7), which involve \(th\ddot{a}n th\ddot{a}n th\ddot{u}i\) ‘although’, not \(th\ddot{a}n\) ‘although’.

Subordination proper

\(2-3-4-1)-(a5)\) * \[s[th\ddot{a}n th\ddot{a}n th\ddot{u}i m\ddot{o} ch\ddot{u}ay h\ddot{a}y kh\ddot{a}w r\ddot{a} st chiiwif]\]

\(\text{although doctor help IND PRON survive}\)

\(\text{LT: ‘Although the doctor helped him survive, the doctor was not called in.’}\)

\(2-3-4-1)-(a6)\) * \[s[th\ddot{a}n th\ddot{a}n th\ddot{u}i m\ddot{o} ch\ddot{u}ay h\ddot{a}y kh\ddot{a}w r\ddot{a} st chiiwif]\]

\(\text{although doctor help IND PRON survive}\)

\(\text{LT: ‘Although the doctor helped him survive, probably the doctor was not called in.’}\)

Quasi-subordination

\(2-3-4-1)-(a7)\) * \[s[th\ddot{a}n th\ddot{a}n th\ddot{u}i m\ddot{o} ch\ddot{u}ay h\ddot{a}y kh\ddot{a}w r\ddot{a} st chiiwif]\]

\(\text{although doctor help IND PRON survive}\)

\(\text{LT: ‘Although the doctor helped him survive, probably the doctor was not called in.’}\)
LT: ‘Although the doctor helped him survive, even so probably the doctor was not called in.’

(2-3-4-1)-(a8) $S[thāŋ thāŋ thīi mɔ̌ɔ chûay hây kháw $although$ doctor$ help$ IND$ PRON$ survive$

$r̄ɔ̂ɔt chiiwít]$ $M[mɔ̌ɔ kɔ̌ khoŋ mây dây thîuk doctor$ even.so$ probably$ NEG$ REAL$ PASS$ rîak$ pay$ láʔ$ māŋ]$ $call$ 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) $M[mɔ̌ɔ mây dây thîuk rîak pay]$ $doctor$ NEG$ REAL$ PASS$ call$ go$

$s[thû̌m mɔ̌ɔ chûay hây kháw r̄ɔ̂ɔt chiiwít]$ $although$ doctor$ help$ IND$ PRON$ survive$

LT: ‘The doctor was not called in, although the doctor helped him survive.’

(2-3-4-1)-(b2) $M[mɔ̌ɔ khoŋ mây dây thîuk rîak pay]$ $doctor$ probably$ NEG$ REAL$ PASS$ call$ go$

$láʔ$ $māŋ]$ $PRT$ $PRT$

$s[thû̌m mɔ̌ɔ chûay hây kháw r̄ɔ̂ɔt chiiwít]$ $although$ 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 khoŋ … mây ‘probably’.

(2-3-4-1)-(b3) $* M[mɔ̌ɔ mây dây thîuk rîak pay]$ $doctor$ NEG$ REAL$ PASS$ call$ go$

$s[thāŋ thāŋ thīi mɔ̌ɔ chûay hây kháw $although$ doctor$ help$ IND$ PRON$ survive$

$r̄ɔ̂ɔt chiiwít]$ $LT: ‘The doctor was not called in, although the doctor helped him survive.’$

(2-3-4-1)-(b4) $* M[mɔ̌ɔ khoŋ mây dây thîuk rîak$ $doctor$ probably$ NEG$ REAL$ PASS$ call$

$pay$ láʔ$ māŋ]$ $go$ PRT$ PRT
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 tēe ‘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) $s[mɔ̌ɔ chûay hây khâw rɔ̂ɔt chiiwít] tēe$
doctor help IND PRON survive but
doctor NEG REAL PASS call go
LT: ‘The doctor helped him survive, but the doctor was not called in.’

(2-3-4-1)-(c4) $s[mɔ̌ɔ chûay hây khâw rɔ̂ɔt chiiwít] tēe$
doctor help IND PRON survive but
doctor probably NEG REAL PASS call go láʔ máŋ
PRT PRT
LT: ‘The doctor helped him survive, but probably the doctor was not called in.’
Quasi-coordination

(2-3-4-1)-(c5) $\text{thàʊŋ} \ m̄ɔ̃ \ cʰûây \ h̄ây \ kʰâw \ r̄sɨ̄ \ cʰiɪwɨ́̃}$

although doctor help IND PRON survive
$tɛ̂ɛ̂ \ M[\ m̄ɔ̃ \ k̄ô \ h̄ỗ \ m̄ãy \ d̄āy]$

but doctor even.so probably NEG REAL
$\text{thûuk} \ rîak \ pài? \ m̄âŋ]$

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) $\text{thâŋ \ thâŋ \ thîi}$

although doctor help IND PRON
$r̄sɨ̄ \ cʰiɪwɨ́̃}$

doctor help IND PRON survive but
$M[\ m̄ɔ̃ \ k̄ô \ h̄ỗ \ m̄ãy \ d̄āy \ thûuk$

doctor even.so probably NEG REAL PASS
$rîak \ pài? \ m̄âŋ]$

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) $* \ M[\ m̄ɔ̃ \ cʰûây \ h̄ây \ kʰâw \ r̄sɨ̄ \ cʰiɪwɨ́̃]$}

doctor help IND PRON survive
$M[\ m̄ɔ̃ \ k̄ô \ h̄ỗ \ m̄ãy \ d̄āy \ thûuk \ rîak \ pài? \ m̄âŋ]$

doctor even.so probably 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) $* \ M[\ m̄ɔ̃ \ cʰûây \ h̄ây \ kʰâw \ r̄sɨ̄ \ cʰiɪwɨ́̃]$}

doctor help IND PRON survive
$M[\ m̄ɔ̃ \ k̄ô \ h̄ỗ \ m̄ãy \ d̄āy \ thûuk$

doctor even.so probably NEG REAL PASS
$rîak \ pài? \ m̄âŋ]$

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) $* \ [\ m̄ɔ̃ \ m̄ãy \ d̄āy \ thûuk \ rîak \ pài? \ m̄âŋ]$}

doctor NEG REAL PASS call go
$[\ m̄ɔ̃ \ cʰûây \ h̄ây \ kʰâw \ r̄sɨ̄ \ cʰiɪwɨ́̃]$}

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)

*[mɔ̌ɔ khoŋ mây dây thùuk rîak pay* 
| doctor | probably | NEG | REAL | PASS | call | go |
| láʔ mây|
PRT | PRT
| [mɔ̌ɔ chûay hây kháw rɔ̂ɔt chiïwít]* 
| 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 khoŋ … máy ‘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[thɯ̌ŋ phûûun piák]* 
| although | ground | be.wet |
| fôn mây dây tòk|
| rain | NEG | REAL | fall |

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

Quasi-subordination
(2-3-4-2)-(a2)* s[thɯ̌ŋ phûûun piák]* 
| although | ground | be.wet |
| fôn kɔ̂ mây dây 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[thûûn phûûun piák]* 
| although | ground | be.wet |
| fôn khoŋ mây dây tòk rɔ̀k máy|
| rain | probably | NEG | REAL | fall | PRT | PRT |

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

(Rɔ̀k 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) $\text{S}\{\text{thŭŋ phŭun piak}\}$

although ground be.wet

$\text{M}\{\text{fŏn kʰ khoŋ măy dăy tŏk}\}$

rain even.so probably NEG REAL fall

$\text{răk măŋ}\}$

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 $\text{khoŋ} \ldots \text{măy} \text{ ‘probably’}$, 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: $kʰ \text{khoŋ măy cʰăy fŏn tŏk răk măŋ}$ ‘even so it is probably not the case that the rain fell’); it contains the AP-CLM $kʰ$ ‘even so’ in addition to $\text{khoŋ} \ldots \text{măy} \text{ ‘probably’}$. 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 $\text{khoŋ} \ldots \text{măy} \text{ ‘probably’}$, and (2-3-4-2)-(a8) is not acceptable despite the presence of $kʰ$ ‘even so’ and $\text{khoŋ} \ldots \text{măy} \text{ ‘probably’}$.

**Subordination proper**

(2-3-4-2)-(a5) $\star \text{S}\{\text{thăn thăn thįi phŭun piak}\}$

although ground be.wet

$\text{M}\{\text{fŏn măy dăy tŏk}\}$

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) $\star \text{S}\{\text{thăn thăn thįi phŭun piak}\}$

although ground be.wet

$\text{M}\{\text{fŏn khoŋ măy dăy tŏk răk măŋ}\}$

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) $\star \text{S}\{\text{thăn thăn thįi phŭun piak}\}$

although ground be.wet

$\text{M}\{\text{fŏn kʰ măy dăy tŏk}\}$

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)  * $[\text{thán thán thì phùun piak}]$

although ground be.wet

$\textbf{M}[\text{fŏn kš khoŋ mây dày tòk}$

rain even.so probably NEG REAL fall

$r̕k m̄y]$ PRT PRT

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

(b) Subordination proper: $\text{M}[Y] + \text{s}[X]$

(2-3-4-2)-(b1) $\textbf{M}[\text{fŏn mây dày tòk}$

rain NEG REAL fall

$\text{s}[\text{thùn phùun piak}]$

although ground be.wet

LT: ‘The rain did not fall, although the ground is wet.’

(2-3-4-2)-(b2) $\textbf{M}[\text{fŏn khoŋ mây dày tòk r̕k m̄y}]$

rain probably NEG REAL fall PRT PRT

$\text{s}[\text{thùn phùun piak}]$

although ground be.wet

LT: ‘Probably the rain did not fall, although the ground is wet.’

(2-3-4-2)-(b3)  * $\textbf{M}[\text{fŏn mây dày tòk}$

rain NEG REAL fall

$\text{s}[\text{thán thán thì phùun piak}]$

although ground be.wet

LT: ‘The rain did not fall, although the ground is wet.’

(2-3-4-2)-(b4)  * $\textbf{M}[\text{fŏn khoŋ mây dày tòk r̕k m̄y}]$

rain probably NEG REAL fall PRT PRT

$\text{s}[\text{thán thán thì phùun piak}]$

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 khoŋ … m̄y ‘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)  * $[\text{phùun piak}]$

ground be.wet
[r̂̄̄̀n m̈̄̄̀y ḍ̄̄̀y ṭ̣̄̄̀k] 
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.’

(2-3-4-2)-(c2) *

[p̄ūūn pīāk]  
ground be.wet

[r̂̄̄̀n khoŋ m̈̄̄̀y ḍ̣̄̄̀y ṭ̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣"
M[фон  kɔ̀  mây  dây  tòk]
    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)  * [tfand  thán  thuí  phûuun  piak]  têc
    although  ground  be.wet  but
M[фон  kɔ̀  khoŋ  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.’

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

Quasi-parataxis
(2-3-4-2)-(c9)  * [phûuun  piak]
    ground  be.wet
[фон  kɔ̀  mây  dây  tòk]
    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)  * [phûuun  piak]
    ground  be.wet
[фон  kɔ̀  khoŋ  mây  dây  tòk  ròk  máŋ]
    rain  even.so  probably  NEG  REAL  fall  PRT  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)  * [фон  may  dây  tòk]
    rain  NEG  REAL  fall  PRT  PRT
[phûuun  piak]
    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)  * [фон  khoŋ  may  dây  tòk  ròk  máŋ]
    rain  probably  NEG  REAL  fall  PRT  PRT
[phûuun  piak]
    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 khoŋ … máŋ ‘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[thɯ̌ŋ khun rúu yùu]
although PRON know CONT
m[khɔ̌ɔŋ kìn yùu troŋ níi náʔ]
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[thɯ̌ŋ khun rúu yùu]
although PRON know CONT
m[khɔ̌ɔ ŋ kìn kɔ̂ yùu troŋ níi náʔ]
even.so food 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[thán thán thîi khun rúu yùu]
although PRON know CONT
m[khɔ̌ɔŋ kìn yùu troŋ níi náʔ]
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[thán thán thîi khun rúu yùu]
although PRON know CONT
m[khɔ̌ɔŋ kìn kɔ̂ yùu troŋ níi náʔ]
even.so food be.located here PRT
LT: ‘Although you know (this), even so food is located
(b) Subordination proper: \(M[Y] + s[X]\)

\[(2-3-5-1)-(b1)\]
\[
* M[khɔ̌ɔŋ kin yùu troŋ níi náɁ]
\]
\[
food be.located here PRT
\]
\[
s[thùn khun rúu yùu]
although PRON know CONT
\]
LT: ‘Food is located here (, I suggest to you so), although you know (this).’

IM: ‘There is food here, although you know this.’

\[(2-3-5-1)-(b2)\]
\[
* M[khɔ̌ɔŋ kin yùu troŋ níi náɁ]
\]
\[
food be.located here PRT
\]
\[
s[thán thán thûi khun rúu yùu]
although PRON know CONT
\]
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: \([X] + [Y]\)

\[(2-3-5-1)-(c1)\]
\[
* [khun rúu yùu]
PRON know CONT
\]
\[
[khɔ̌ɔŋ kin yùu troŋ níi náɁ]
food be.located here PRT
\]
LT: ‘You know (this). Food is located here (, I suggest to you so).’

IM: ‘Although you know this, there is food here.’

\[(2-3-5-1)-(c2)\]
\[
* [khun ṭàat că̂p rúu sidebar kɔ̀ díây]
PRON might IRR know PFV be.possible
\]
\[
[khɔ̌ɔŋ kin yùu troŋ níi náɁ]
food be.located here PRT
\]
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 ṭàat că̂p...kɔ̀ díây ‘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. (ṭàat is an adverb which has an epistemic meaning of ‘possibly’. Ĉàp is the irrealis marker. Kɔ̀ 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). Díây 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 Ɂàat càɁ...kɔ̂ dây ‘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 rūu yùu] tɛ̀ԑ PRON know CONT but [khɔ̀ŋ kin yùu troŋ níi náɁ] 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 Ɂàat càɁ rūu léew kɔ̂ dây] PRON might IRR know PFV be.possible tɛ̀ԑ [khɔ̀ŋ kin yùu troŋ níi náɁ] 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) * [thɯ̌ŋ khun rūu yùu] tɛ̀ԑ although PRON know CONT but [khɔ̀ŋ kin kɔ̂ yùu troŋ níi náɁ] 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) * [tháŋ tháŋ thîi khun rūu yùu] tɛ̀ԑ although PRON know CONT but [khɔ̀ŋ kin kɔ̂ yùu troŋ níi náɁ] 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 rūu yùu] PRON know CONT [khɔ̀ŋ kin kɔ̂ yùu troŋ níi náɁ] 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 Ɂàat càɁ rūu léew kɔ̂ dây] PRON might IRR know PFV be.possible [khɔ̀ŋ kin kɔ̂ yùu troŋ níi náɁ] 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 kɔ̂ in the main clause (i.e. Parataxis proper: (2-3-5-1)-(c2)).

(d) Parataxis proper: [Y] + [X]
(2-3-5-1)-(d1) * [khɔ̂ŋ kin yùu troŋ níi 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) [khɔ̂ŋ kin yùu troŋ níi náʔ] food be.located here PRT
[khun ʔat c̀ăp rúu ʔɛ̀w kɔ̂ dǎy] 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[thɯ̌ŋ chán c̀ăp hɛ̀n cay khun] although PRON IRR sympathize.with PRON
[khun khayān tham ɡaan nɔ̀y 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[thɯ̌ŋ chán c̀ăp hɛ̀n cay khun] although PRON IRR sympathize.with PRON
[khun kɔ̂ khayān tham ɡaan nɔ̀y] (PRON) even.so be.industrious work a.bit nāʔ 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 kɔ̂ ‘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 kɔ̂.
‘even so’.

Subordination proper

(2-3-5-2)-(a3)  
* s[tháŋ tháŋ thîi chán cā? hěn cay  
although PRON IRR sympathize.with  
khun] PRON  
M[(khun) khayǎn tham gaan nỳ 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[tháŋ tháŋ thîi chán cā? hěn cay  
although PRON IRR sympathize.with  
khun] PRON  
M[(khun) kɔ̂ khayǎn] (PRON) even.so be.industrious  
tham gaan nỳ 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 gaan nỳ ná?] (PRON) be.industrious work a.bit PRT  
s[thɯ̌ŋ chán cā? 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 gaan nỳ ná?] (PRON) be.industrious work a.bit PRT  
s[tháŋ tháŋ thîi chán cā? 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) (thɯ̌ŋ) is acceptable, but that (2-3-5-2)-(b2) (tháŋ tháŋ thîi) is not.
(c) Parataxis proper: [X] + [Y]

(2-3-5-2)-(c1) * [chán hěn cay khun]
PRON sympathize.with PRON
[(khun) khayǎn tham āaan nɔ̀y náʔ]
( wholesalers) 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 tɛ̀ɛ ‘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] tɛ̀ɛ
PRON sympathize.with PRON but
[(khun) khayǎn tham āaan nɔ̀y náʔ]
( wholesalers) 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[thɯ̌ŋ chán cǎʔ hěn cay khun]
although PRON IRR sympathize.with PRON
tɛ̀ɛ m[(khun) kɔ̂ khayǎn tham āaan]
but (PRON) even.so be.industrious work
nɔ̀y náʔ]
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[thāŋ thāŋ thîi chán cǎʔ hěn cay
although PRON IRR sympathize.with
khun] tɛ̀ɛ m[(khun) kɔ̂ khayǎn
PRON but (PRON) even.so be.industrious
tham āaan nɔ̀y náʔ]
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) kɔ̂ khayǎn tham ɲaan nɔ̀y nāʔ]  
(PRON) even.so be.industrious work a.bit nāʔ]  
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) khayǎn tham ɲaan nɔ̀y nāʔ]  
(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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subordinate clause</th>
<th>Main clause</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Situation</td>
<td>Situation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Situation + Judgement</td>
<td>Situation + Interpersonal effect</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Premise</td>
<td>Premise</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speech act</td>
<td>Speech act</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Causals

#### Subordination

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subordination proper</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>phrɔ́Ɂ ‘because’</td>
<td>+, -</td>
<td>+, -</td>
<td>+, -[?], +</td>
<td>+[?], -</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>with khọŋ ... màŋ</td>
<td>irrelevant</td>
<td>irrelevant</td>
<td>irrelevant</td>
<td>+, ?</td>
<td>irrelevant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘probably’</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nûay càak ‘because’</td>
<td>+, -</td>
<td>+, -</td>
<td>+, -</td>
<td>+[-], [-?], -</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>with khọŋ ... màŋ</td>
<td>irrelevant</td>
<td>irrelevant</td>
<td>irrelevant</td>
<td>?[-]</td>
<td>irrelevant</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Quasi-subordination

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Quasi-subordination</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>s[phrɔ́Ɂ] s[ciun]</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+[-]</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘because’ ‘so’</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>s[nûay càak] s[ciun]</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+[-]</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘because’ ‘so’</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Quasi-parataxis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Quasi-parataxis</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>s[ ] s[kɔ̂ləəy / ləəy / ciun]</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+, -[?]</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘so’</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Coordination

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Coordination proper</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>[ ] chanán [ ]</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+[-]</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘and so’</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>with khọŋ ... màŋ</td>
<td>irrelevant</td>
<td>irrelevant</td>
<td>irrelevant</td>
<td>+[-]</td>
<td>irrelevant</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Quasi-coordination

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Quasi-coordination</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>s[phrɔ́Ɂ] s[nûay càak]</td>
<td>+, -</td>
<td>+[-?]</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘because’ chanán s[ ]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘and so’</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Parataxis proper

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parataxis proper</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>phrɔ́Ɂ ‘because’</td>
<td>+, -</td>
<td>+[-?], -</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+, -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>with khọŋ ... màŋ</td>
<td>irrelevant</td>
<td>irrelevant</td>
<td>irrelevant</td>
<td>+[-], [-?], -</td>
<td>irrelevant</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Conditionals

<p>| | | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>lîp sìp ‘I’m sure’ / chây màŋ ‘Right?’ / hên ‘it seems’</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Subordination

**Subordination proper**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subordinating element</th>
<th>Condition</th>
<th>Subordinating element</th>
<th>Condition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><em>thāa</em> ‘if’</td>
<td>+</td>
<td><em>khong</em> ‘probably’</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>nay mɯ̂a</em> ‘if’</td>
<td>-</td>
<td><em>khong</em> ‘probably’</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subordinating element</th>
<th>Condition</th>
<th>Subordinating element</th>
<th>Condition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><em>thāa</em> ‘if’</td>
<td>+</td>
<td><em>khong</em> ‘probably’</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>nay mɯ̂a</em> ‘if’</td>
<td>-</td>
<td><em>khong</em> ‘probably’</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Quasi-subordination**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subordinating element</th>
<th>Condition</th>
<th>Subordinating element</th>
<th>Condition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><em>(thāa) s[kɔ̂]</em></td>
<td>+</td>
<td><em>(khong) mɯ̂a</em> ‘then’</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>(nay mɯ̂a) s[kɔ̂]</em></td>
<td>-</td>
<td><em>(khong) mɯ̂a</em> ‘then’</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Quasi-parataxis**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subordinating element</th>
<th>Condition</th>
<th>Subordinating element</th>
<th>Condition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><em>(thāa / nay mɯ̂a)</em></td>
<td>+</td>
<td><em>(khong) mɯ̂a</em> ‘then’</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Coordination

**Coordination proper**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Conjunction</th>
<th>Condition</th>
<th>Conjunction</th>
<th>Condition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><em>lakɔ̂</em> ‘and then’</td>
<td>-</td>
<td><em>khong</em> ‘probably’</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Quasi-coordination**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Conjunction</th>
<th>Condition</th>
<th>Conjunction</th>
<th>Condition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><em>(thāa / nay mɯ̂a)</em></td>
<td>+,-</td>
<td><em>(khong) mɯ̂a</em> ‘then’</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Parataxis proper**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Conjunction</th>
<th>Condition</th>
<th>Conjunction</th>
<th>Condition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><em>(khong) mɯ̂a</em> ‘then’</td>
<td>+,-</td>
<td><em>(khong) mɯ̂a</em> ‘then’</td>
<td>+,-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Concessives

Subordination

Subordination proper

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Concessive</th>
<th>with khoŋ...(máŋ)</th>
<th>with khoŋ yaq</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>thɯ̌ŋ ‘although’</td>
<td>irrelevant ?, -</td>
<td>irrelevant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘probably’</td>
<td>irrelevant</td>
<td>irrelevant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>khoŋ yaq</td>
<td>irrelevant</td>
<td>irrelevant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘probably still’</td>
<td>irrelevant</td>
<td>irrelevant</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Quasi-subordination

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Concessive</th>
<th>with khoŋ...(máŋ)</th>
<th>with khoŋ yaq</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>thɯ̌ŋ ‘although’</td>
<td>irrelevant</td>
<td>irrelevant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘probably’</td>
<td>irrelevant</td>
<td>irrelevant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>khoŋ yaq</td>
<td>irrelevant</td>
<td>irrelevant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘probably still’</td>
<td>irrelevant</td>
<td>irrelevant</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Quasi-parataxis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Concessive</th>
<th>with khoŋ...(máŋ)</th>
<th>with khoŋ yaq</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>+, -</td>
<td>irrelevant</td>
<td>irrelevant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+, -</td>
<td>irrelevant</td>
<td>irrelevant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+, -</td>
<td>irrelevant</td>
<td>irrelevant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+, -</td>
<td>irrelevant</td>
<td>irrelevant</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
(khoŋ) yaŋ
‘(probably) still’

\[\{kʰət ɕàʔ … kʰ ɨdə\}\] sl[kʰ]    irrelev. irrelev. irrelev. irrelev. -[?] [\(\text{‘may’}\)]

Coordination

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Coordination proper</th>
<th>-</th>
<th>+</th>
<th>[+?]</th>
<th>-</th>
<th>-</th>
<th>-</th>
<th>-</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>[tɛ̀ԑ]</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-[+]</td>
<td>+[?], -[+]</td>
<td>-[?], +</td>
<td>-[?], +</td>
<td>-[?], +</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Quasi-coordination

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Quasi-coordination</th>
<th>-</th>
<th>+</th>
<th>-</th>
<th>+</th>
<th>-</th>
<th>+</th>
<th>-</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>{thᵰuː̄ / thᵰuː thᵰuː thᵰuː}</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Parataxis proper

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parataxis proper</th>
<th>-</th>
<th>-</th>
<th>-</th>
<th>-</th>
<th>-</th>
<th>-</th>
<th>-</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>yang ‘still, even.so’</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>with khoŋ ...máŋ ‘probably’</td>
<td>irrelevant</td>
<td>irrelevant</td>
<td>irrelevant</td>
<td>irrelevant</td>
<td>irrelevant</td>
<td>irrelevant</td>
<td>irrelevant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>with khoŋ yaŋ ‘probably still’</td>
<td>irrelevant</td>
<td>irrelevant</td>
<td>irrelevant</td>
<td>irrelevant</td>
<td>irrelevant</td>
<td>irrelevant</td>
<td>irrelevant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>with [kʰət ɕəʔ … kʰ ɨdə] ‘may’</td>
<td>irrelevant</td>
<td>irrelevant</td>
<td>irrelevant</td>
<td>irrelevant</td>
<td>irrelevant</td>
<td>irrelevant</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
sentences at all of the five levels.

The other three CLMs (นูกำ ‘because’, นัยม่า ‘if’, ถ้าถ้า ‘although’) are semantically marked, and they have specialized meanings. They have very limited distributions. In particular, นัยม่า ‘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 ผัดคำ … กิ่ง่าย ‘may’ (Level V) (cf. 6.5). However, even when it employs ขอย … ม่า ‘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 ขอย … ม่า ‘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 ขอย … ม่า ‘probably’. At Level V (cf. 4.5), the sentence may be acceptable if it contains ถ้าม่า ‘right?’, or เห็น ‘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) 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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subordinate clause</th>
<th>I</th>
<th>II</th>
<th>III</th>
<th>IV</th>
<th>V</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Main clause</td>
<td>Situation</td>
<td>Situation</td>
<td>Situation + Interpersonal effect</td>
<td>Premise Judgement</td>
<td>Premise Speech act</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Situation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Situation +</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Judgement</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subordination</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Causals</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subordination proper</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(a) s[X] + m[Y]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>phrɔ́Ɂ</td>
<td>- , -</td>
<td>- , -</td>
<td>- , -</td>
<td>- , -</td>
<td>- , -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nɯ̂aŋ câak</td>
<td>- , -</td>
<td>- , -</td>
<td>- , -</td>
<td>- , -</td>
<td>- , -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(b) m[Y] + s[X]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>phrɔ́Ɂ</td>
<td>+ , +</td>
<td>+ , +</td>
<td>+ , +</td>
<td>+ , +</td>
<td>+ , +</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nɯ̂aŋ câak</td>
<td>+ , +</td>
<td>+ , +</td>
<td>+ , +</td>
<td>+ , +</td>
<td>+ , +</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parataxis proper</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(c) [X] + [Y]</td>
<td>+ , -</td>
<td>+ [+?], [++]</td>
<td>+ [+?], [++]</td>
<td>+ , -</td>
<td>+ , -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(d) [Y] + [X]</td>
<td>- , [-+]</td>
<td>- , -</td>
<td>- , -</td>
<td>- , -</td>
<td>- , -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conditionals</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subordination proper</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(a) s[X] + m[Y]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>thâa</td>
<td>+ , +</td>
<td>+ , +</td>
<td>+ , +</td>
<td>- , -</td>
<td>+ , +</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nay mɯa</td>
<td>- , -</td>
<td>- , -</td>
<td>- , -</td>
<td>- , -</td>
<td>- , -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(b) m[Y] + s[X]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>thâa</td>
<td>+ , +</td>
<td>+ , +</td>
<td>+ , +</td>
<td>- , -</td>
<td>+ , +</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nay mɯa</td>
<td>- , -</td>
<td>- , -</td>
<td>- , -</td>
<td>- , -</td>
<td>- , -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parataxis proper</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(c) [X] + [Y]</td>
<td>+ [-]</td>
<td>- , -</td>
<td>- , -</td>
<td>- , -</td>
<td>- , -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(d) [Y] + [X]</td>
<td>- , -</td>
<td>- , -</td>
<td>- , -</td>
<td>- , -</td>
<td>- , -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concessives</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subordination proper</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(a) s[X] + m[Y]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>thịŋ</td>
<td>- , -</td>
<td>- , [-+]</td>
<td>- , [-+]</td>
<td>- , -</td>
<td>- , -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>thịŋ thịŋ thịŋ</td>
<td>+ , -</td>
<td>- , [-+]</td>
<td>- , -</td>
<td>- , -</td>
<td>- , -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(b) m[Y] + s[X]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>thịŋ</td>
<td>- , -</td>
<td>- , [-+]</td>
<td>- , -</td>
<td>- , -</td>
<td>- , -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>thịŋ thịŋ thịŋ</td>
<td>+ , -</td>
<td>- , -</td>
<td>- , -</td>
<td>- , -</td>
<td>- , -</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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), thāa ‘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 apodoses’. Conditional subordination \(S[X] + M[Y]\) at Level III (interpersonal effect) requires the AP-CLM kɔ̂ ‘then’ in the
following main clause. The use of kɔ̀ 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 kɔ̀. The speaker considers that the focal content expressed by the main clause including kɔ̀ is a natural, inevitable or reasonable consequence of the supporting situation represented by the subordinate clause (or understood from the previous discourse). As such, kɔ̀ 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 kɔ̀. The main clause of Thai bi-clausal expressions by and large contains kɔ̀ 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 kɔ̀ or other AP-CLMs.

(c) Causals

\[s[X] + m[Y] \] 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 kɔ̀ in conditional expressions in (b) above.) If an AP-CLM is present (that is, if the sentence is in the form of Quasi-subordination: \([X \, Because] \, + \, [Y \, so]\), the order \(['s[X] + m[Y]'] \) \((X \, Because] \, + \, [Y \, so]) \) (e.g. (2-1-1-2)-(a2), -(a4)) is as frequent as the order \([m[Y] + s[X]] \) \((X \, Because] \, + \, [Y \, so]) \) 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 \(['s[X] + m[Y]'] \) \((X \, Although] \, + \, [Y \, even.so]) \) (e.g. (2-3-2-2)-(a2), (2-3-3-1)-(a2)) is as frequent as the order \([m[Y] + s[X]] \) \((X \, Although] \, + \, [Y \, even.so]) \) 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 khoŋ … máŋ ‘probably’. There are only a few causal or concessive sentences that are acceptable without khoŋ … máŋ ‘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 \(S\[X\] + M\[Y\]\), not \(M\[Y\] + S\[X\]\).

We have seen that at Level IV in Thai most of the sentences are not acceptable unless they contain khoŋ … máŋ ‘probably’. It is important to note that there are also sentences that are not acceptable even though they contain khoŋ … máŋ ‘probably’. That is, the presence of khoŋ … máŋ ‘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 sìʔ, thāʔ or nāʔ, 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, \(si\) and \(tha\) are used for prohibition, command, or hortation at Level III, and \(na\) 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: \(la\ si\ ‘I’m sure’\) (e.g. (2-1-5-1)-(c2)), \(chay may\ ‘Right?’\) (e.g. (2-1-5-1)-(c3)), \(hèn ‘it seems’\) (e.g. (2-1-5-1)-(d2)), or \(pät cä\ … \kä däl ‘may’\) (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 (\(phr\) ‘because’, \(thå\ ‘if’ and \(thåthy\ ‘although’\) have wide distributions in terms of the five levels. The three marked CLMs (\(núùn cå\ ‘because’, \(nay mùu\ ‘if’, \(thåy thåy thåi\ ‘although’\) have limited distributions. In particular, \(nay mùu\ ‘if’\) 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 \(khøy … mág \ ‘probably’\). There are only four sentences that are acceptable without \(khøy \ \mág\). It may be significant that all of them
involves subordination proper, and that furthermore they have the ‘M[Y] + S[X]’ order, not the ‘S[X] + M[Y]’ order. However, the presence of khoŋ … māŋ 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 lâɁ sìɁ ‘I’m sure’, chây máy ‘right?’, hěn ‘it seems’, or ṭăat câ?… kɔ̂ dây ‘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.
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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 thūŋ]
      PRON come arrive
   s[mɯ̂a chán maa thɯ̌ŋ]
      when PRON come arrive
   ‘He came when I came.’

(3-1-2) He worked while I was resting.
   a. M[kháw tham ŋaan]
      PRON work
   s[tɔɔn (thîi) chán phák phɔ̀ɔn yùu]
      portion (REL) PRON rest CONT
   ‘He worked while I was resting.’
   b. M[kháw tham ŋaan]
      PRON work
   s[(nay) rawaāŋ thîi chán phák phɔ̀ɔn yùu]
      (in) between NMLZ PRON rest CONT
   ‘He worked while I was resting.’
   c. M[kháw tham ŋaan]
      PRON work

(3-1-3) I saw him walking.
   a.  chán hën kháw dɔn
       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 thûŋ]
       PRON come arrive
       ʃ[khöŋ (thûi) chán ?òɔk 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 ?òɔk pay]  
       PRON exit go
       ʃ[khöŋ (thûi) fôn rûam tûk]  
       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 thûŋ]
       PRON come arrive
       ʃ[lâŋ (càak) (thûi) chán ?òɔk 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 ?òɔk pay]  
       PRON exit go
       ʃ[lâŋ (càak) (thûi) fôn yûi]  
       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.  ʃ[thâa fôn mây tûk]  
       if rain NEG fall
       M[chán k̩̀ cà?  pay]  
       PRON then IRR go
       ‘If rain does not fall, I will go.’
b. \[chán cā? pay\]
   PRON IRR go
\[tôɔ mûa fûn mây tôk\]
   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. \[chán cā? mây pay\]
       PRON IRR NEG go
\[thāa khâw mây pay\]
       if PRON NEG go
       ‘I will not go if he does not go.’
   b. \[chán cā? mây pay\]
       PRON IRR NEG go
\[tôɔ mûa khâw mây pay\]
       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. \[thûŋ khâw pay\]
       although PRON go
\[chán kû cā? mây pay\]
       PRON even.so IRR NEG go
       ‘Even if he goes, I will not go.’
   b. \[((thûŋ) mûc (wâa) khâw pay\]
       (although) although (QUOT) PRON go
\[chán kû cā? mây pay\]
       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. \[thûŋ fûn tôk\]
       although rain fall
\[chán kû cā? pay\]
       PRON even.so IRR go
       ‘Even if rain falls, I will go.’
   b. \[((thûŋ) mûc (wâa) fûn tôk\]
       (although) although (QUOT) rain fall
\[chán kû cā? pay\]
       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. \[chán hûk lûm (troj) thîi (thîi) khâw khâs\]
       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 rûduu nǎaw cà? nǎaw
   place (REL) PRON stay winter IRR be.cold
   ‘Where he lives, winter is cold.’

b. (nay) sathǎan thîi (thîi) kháw yùu rûduu nǎaw
   (in) place (REL) PRON stay winter
   cà? nǎaw
   IRR be.cold
   ‘Where he lives, winter is cold.’

3.7. Manner

(3-7-1) She spoke as he had taught her to.

a. lɔ̀n phûut yàaŋ (thîi) kháw khoɔy sɔɔ̃ hây
   PRON speak kind (REL) PRON ever teach IND
   phûut
   speak
   ‘She spoke as he had taught her to.’

b. lɔ̀n phûut bɛɛp (thîi) kháw khoɔy sɔɔ̃ hây
   PRON speak style (REL) PRON ever teach IND
   phûut
   speak
   ‘She spoke as he had taught her to.’

c. lɔ̀n phûut taam thîi kháw khoɔy sɔɔ̃ hây
   PRON speak follow NMLZ PRON ever teach IND
   phûut
   speak
   ‘She spoke as he had taught her to.’

d. lɔ̀n phûut mɯ̄aŋ (thîi) kháw khoɔy sɔɔ̃ 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. lɔ̀n phûut mɯ̄aŋ lɔ̀n pen wàt
   PRON speak be.like PRON have.a.cold
   ‘She talks like she has a cold.’

b. lɔ̀n phûut mɯ̄aŋ kâp (wâa) lɔ̀n pen wàt
   PRON speak be.like with (QUOT) PRON have.a.cold
   ‘She talks like she has a cold.’

c. lɔ̀n phûut yàaŋ kâp (wâa) lɔ̀n pen wàt
   PRON speak kind with (QUOT) PRON have.a.cold
   ‘She talks like she has a cold.’
d. ローン phûut raaw ข้าพเจ้า (ว่า) ローン
PRON speak approximately with (QUOT) PRON
pen วัด
have.a.cold
‘She talks like she has a cold.’

e. ローン phûut คล้าย (ข้าพเจ้า) ローン pen วัด
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. ช่าง pay เหมือน phûa (ที่) บางคน capt
PRON go river in.order.to (NMLZ) IRR catch
ปลา
fish
‘I went to the river in order to catch fish.’

b. ช่าง pay บางคน phûa ที่ เหมือน
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. ローン ทำอาหาร ห้าม ข้าพเจ้า คู่
PRON cook IND PRON eat
‘She cooked food for them to eat.’

b. ローン ทำอาหาร phûa (ที่) บางคน ห้าม
PRON cook in.order.to (NMLZ) IRR IND
ข้าพเจ้า
PRON eat
‘She cooked food in order for them to eat.’

c. ローン ทำอาหาร phûa (ที่) ข้าพเจ้า คู่
PRON cook in.order.to (NMLZ) PRON IRR
เรียก ให้
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. ส[phûa ข้าพเจ้า คู่ เกิด ช่าง]
in case PRON IRR see PRON
เมื่อ[ช่าง คู่ สอน ตัว อยู่ ใกล้ บ้าน]
PRON IRR hide body stay in house
‘In case he sees me, I will hide in the house.’

b. ส[phûa (ที่) คู่ มาย ห้าม ข้าพเจ้า เกิด ช่าง]
in.order.to (NMLZ) IRR NÉG IND PRON see PRON
เมื่อ[ช่าง คู่ สอน ตัว อยู่ ใกล้ บ้าน]
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. 뮹[k्रɛŋ ṭάa ᵃháw ṭāat ᵃa ᵃhūŋ ᵃhaŋ ᵃmaa
      fear QUOT PRON might IRR hurl spear come
      ṭāŋ ᶜʰán]
      to PRON
      ᵃ[ᶜʰán (kʰ₅ lәəy ṭʰᵣ ᵃ BH ᵃ pay]
      PRON so run flee go
      ‘Fearing that he might spear me, I ran away.’
   b. 饧[kɾɛŋ ṭάa ᵃháw ṭāat ᵃa ᵃhūŋ ᵃhaŋ ᵃmaa
      fear QUOT PRON might IRR hurl spear come
      ṭāŋ ᶜʰán]
      to PRON
      ᵃ[ᶜʰán ɕɯŋ ᵃBH ᵃ 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. ᵃháw ᵃBH ᵃ rew (kʰ₅ lәəy ᵃhūŋ ᵃlóm)
      PRON run fast so fall.over
      ‘He ran fast and so fell over.’
   b. ᵃháw ᵃBH ᵃ rew ɕɯŋ ᵃhūŋ ᵃlóm
      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. ᵃháw ᵃh΀ replay ᵃhůŋ ᵃmён ᵃ lóm
      PRON throw net descend go river so
dâya plaa
      come.to.have fish
      ‘He throw a net into the river and so caught fish.’
   b. ᵃháw ᵃh΀ replay ᵃhůŋ ᵃmён ᵃ ɕɯŋ
      PRON throw net descend go river so
dâya 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. ᵃháw ᵃcᵃp plaa dây ᵃ dyi thîi
      PRON catch fish come.to.have by NMLZ
      th΀ replay ᵃhůŋ ᵃmён
      throw net descend go river
      ‘He caught fish by throwing a net into the river.’
   b. ᵃháw ᵃcᵃp plaa dây ᵃ dyi ɕhày wîthiī
      PRON catch fish come.to.have by use means
(3-11-1-2) He caught a kangaroo (or a bear) without spearing it.

a. *kháw câp cîngcôo dây dooy thîi*
   PRON catch kangaroo come.to.have by NMLZ
   mây phûŋ hɔ̀ɔk pay yañ man
   NEG hurl spear go to PRON
   ‘He caught a kangaroo without spearing it.’

b. *kháw câp cîngcôo dây dooy mây*
   PRON catch kangaroo come.to.have by NEG
   cháy withii phûŋ hɔ̀ɔk pay yañ man
   use means hurl spear go to PRON
   ‘He caught a kangaroo without spearing it.’

c. *kháw câp cîngcôo dây düay withii*
   PRON catch kangaroo come.to.have with means
   mây phûŋ hɔ̀ɔk pay yañ 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. *nɔ̂ɔk câa kháw câp cîngcôo dây*
   outside from PRON catch kangaroo come.to.have
   lês w yañ phóp nók (Ɂìik düây)
   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. *nɔ̂ɔk câa kháw câp cîngcôo mây*
   outside from PRON catch kangaroo NEG
   dây lês w yañ tham hɔ̀ɔk hāay
   come.to.have PFV still make spear disappear
   (Ɂìik düây)
   (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’)

thɔ̀ɔt hɛ̀ loŋ pay mɛ̀ nám
throw net descend go river
‘He caught fish by throwing a net into the river.’

c. *kháw câp plaa dây düay withii*
   PRON catch fish come.to.have with means
   thɔ̀ɔt hɛ̀ loŋ pay mɛ̀ nám
   throw net descend go river
   ‘He caught fish by throwing a net into the river.’
(4-1-1-1) Rain fell, but the ground is dry.
   a. \([\text{fǒn tòk}]\)
   rain fall
   \([tɛɛ (wâa) phûuun yag hɛɛŋ yùu}]\)
   but (QUOT) the.ground still be.dry CONT
   ‘Rain fell, but the ground is dry.’
   b. \([\text{thɯ̌ŋ fǒn tòk}]\)
   although rain fall
   \([phûuun kɔ̂ yag hɛɛŋ yùu}]\)
   the.ground even.so still be.dry CONT
   ‘Although rain was falling, he went out.’
   c. \([\text{tháŋ tháŋ thîi fǒn tòk}]\)
   although NMLZ rain fall
   \([phûuun kɔ̂ yag hɛɛŋ yùu}]\)
   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. \([\text{fǒn tòk yùu}]\)
   rain fall CONT
   \([tɛɛ (wâa) khâw ?ɔɔk pay}]\)
   but (QUOT) PRON exit go
   ‘Rain was falling, but he went out.’
   b. \([\text{thɯ̌ŋ fǒn tòk yùu}]\)
   although rain fall CONT
   \([khâw kɔ̂ ?ɔɔk pay}]\)
   PRON even.so exit go
   ‘Although rain was falling, he went out.’
   c. \([\text{tháŋ tháŋ thîi fǒn tòk yùu}]\)
   although NMLZ rain fall CONT
   \([khâw kɔ̂ ?ɔɔk pay}]\)
   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. \([\text{phûu chaay khon nîi sùuŋ}]\)
   man CLF this be.tall
   \([tɛɛ (wâa) phûu chaay khon nán tià}]\)
   but (QUOT) man CLF that be.short
   ‘This man is tall, but that man is short.’
   b. \([\text{phûu chaay khon nîi sùuŋ}]\)
   man CLF this be.tall
   \([nay khânà? thiî phûu chaay khon nán tià}]\)
   in a.while REL man CLF that be.short
   ‘This man is tall, but that man is short.’
c. \([phuu\ chaay\ khon\ ni\ s\ uu]\)
   man CLF this be.tall
\([s\ uu\ phuu\ chaay\ khon\ n\ an\ ti\ a]\)
   part m\ an 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. \([ci\ ng\ coo\ tua\ ni\ y\ ay]\)
      kangaroo CLF this be.big
   \([t\ e\ c\ (wa\ a)\ ci\ ng\ coo\ tua\ n\ an\ lek]\)
      but (QUOT) kangaroo CLF that be.small
      ‘This kangaroo is big, but that kangaroo is small.’
   b. \([ci\ ng\ coo\ tua\ ni\ y\ ay]\)
      kangaroo CLF this be.big
   \([n\ a\ y\ khan\ n\ a\ thi\ i\ ci\ ng\ coo\ tua\ n\ an\ lek]\)
      in a.while REL kangaroo CLF that be.small
      ‘This kangaroo is big, but that kangaroo is small.’
   c. \([ci\ ng\ coo\ tua\ ni\ y\ ay]\)
      kangaroo CLF this be.big
   \([s\ uu\ ci\ ng\ coo\ tua\ n\ an\ lek]\)
      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. \([s\ uu\ tua\ ni\ s\ uuay]\)
      shirt CLF this be. beautiful
   \([t\ e\ c\ (wa\ a)\ m\ an\ lek]\)
      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. \([ba\ an\ l\ an\ ni\ s\ uuay]\)
      house CLF this be. beautiful
   \([t\ e\ c\ (wa\ a)\ m\ an\ lek]\)
      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. \([khaw\ pay\ thi\ i\ no\ en\ khaw]\)
      PRON go at hill
   \([l\ an\ pay\ thi\ i\ m\ ec\ nam]\)
      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. \[\text{phûu chaay khon níi câp ciŋcôo d â y}\]
   man CLF this catch kangaroo come.to.have
\[\text{phûu chaay khon nán câp plaa d â y}\]
   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. \[\text{kháw câp ciŋ côo dây (maa lԑ́ԑw)}\]
   PRON catch kangaroo come.to.have (come) PFV
\[\text{(càak nán) lɔ̀n ɔ̂ y â a ŋ  man}\]
   (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. \[\text{chán pay cəə ciŋcôo}\]
   PRON go meet kangaroo
   ‘I went and found a kangaroo.’

b. \[\text{chán pay pàa lԑ́ԑw kɔ̂ cəə ciŋcôo}\]
   PRON go forest PFV then meet kangaroo
   ‘I went to the forest and found a kangaroo.’

c. \[\text{chán pay thɯ̌ŋ pàa kɔ̂ cəə ciŋcôo}\]
   PRON go arrive forest then meet kangaroo
   ‘I went and arrived at the forest and found a kangaroo.’