Journal of the Southeast Asian Linguistics Society 1 (2009): 215-229

BASIC SERIAL VERB CONSTRUCTIONS IN THAI

Kiyoko Takahashi
Kanda University of International Studies
kiyoko@kanda.kuis.ac.jp

0 Abstract
This paper aims to provide a comprehensive classification of Thai 'basic serial verb constructions' (henceforth, basic SVCs) composed of two verb phrases serialized. My claim is as follows. The classification of Thai basic SVCs should be based primarily on temporal relationship between the two sub-events represented by the two verb phrases as well as the degree of assertiveness (or factuality) of each of the two verb phrases. Causation-related classes of verbs, such as 'agentive verbs', and restrictedness-related classes of verbs, such as 'minor verbs' (Aikhenvald 2006), are not crucial factors for the classification. Rather, the aspectual and modal classes of verbs, such as 'durative verbs' and 'non-implicative verbs' (Karttunen 1971, Givón 1973), are the most relevant factors.

1 Introduction

As Foley 2008 points out, the range of types of complex events expressed by SVCs differs from language to language. To adequately classify SVCs in a verb-serializing language, we must take into consideration the language's characteristic morpho-syntactic properties and the speakers' culture-particular conceptualizations of complex events. SVCs are thus language-specific both morpho-syntactically and semantically.

The main purpose of this paper is to demonstrate a comprehensive classification of basic SVCs in Thai. 'Basic SVC' is defined as construction in which two verb phrases are serialized with no overt linker (Chuwicha 1993). The two verbs in the construction designate a certain substantial event or situation (action, process, change, state, and so on) and share at least one nominal argument, which may or may not be explicitly expressed. Thai basic SVCs are exemplified in (1) to (4) below.[1] All these examples express a single complex event comprising two substantial sub-events, which is construed by Thai speakers.

(1) *tòk* *tɛ̀ɛk*
fell be broken
(It) fell off and (it) was broken.

(2) *lǎy* *maa*
flow come
(It) came flowing.

(3) *tham* *khǎay*
make sell
(He) made (it) to sell (it).

(4) *yàak* *kin*
want eat
(He) wanted to eat.

Basic SVCs must consist of two verb phrases and must not include a lexical item effecting valency change, i.e., a voice-related lexical item to be used to increase or reduce a nominal argument in the given verb phrase. Examples (5) and (6) respectively have the 'causative' marker *hây* 'CAUSATIVE' (< *hây* 'give') and the 'benefactive' marker *hây* 'BENEFACTIVE' (< *hây* 'give') followed by an additional nominal argument (i.e. *phûan* 'friend'), and so they are not basic SVCs.

(5) *hây* *phûan* *láaŋ* *caan*
CAUSATIVE friend wash dish
(He) caused/allowed (his) friend to wash dishes.

(6) *láaŋ* *caan* *hây* *phûan*
wash dish BENEFACTIVE friend
(He) washed dishes for (his) friend.

Similarly, examples (7) through (11) are not basic SVCs either because they are not composed of two verb phrases proper.

(7) *chák* *hĭw*
INCHOATIVE be hungry
(He) is beginning to be hungry.

(8) *dây* *pay*
REALIZATION go
It is realized that (he) goes.

(9) *kin* *dây*
eat POSSIBILITY
It is possible that (he) eats.

(10) *khít* *yùu*
think CONTINUOUS
(He) is thinking.

(11) *ʔûan* *khûn*
fat INCHOATIVE
(He) got fatter.

One of the two constituents of these predicates is a functional morpheme that is more or less grammaticalized: example (7) includes the 'inchoative' aspect marker *chák* 'INCHOATIVE' (< *chák* 'draw') in the first position; example (8) includes the 'realization' modal/aspect marker *dây* 'REALIZATION' (<*dây* 'emerge') in the first position; example (9)

includes the 'possibility' modal marker *dâay* 'POSSIBILITY' (< *dâay* 'emerge') in the second position; example (10) includes the 'continuous' aspect marker *yùu* 'CONTINUOUS' (< *yùu* 'be located') in the second position; and, example (11) includes the 'inchoative' aspect marker *khûun* 'INCHOATIVE' (< *khûun* 'ascend') in the second position.

This paper is organized in the following way. Section 2 addresses the compositional system of the structure of basic SVCs and identifies four main types of complex events represented by the constructions. Section 3 proposes a new perspective from which Thai basic SVCs are properly categorized into 'symmetrical' and 'asymmetrical' types. Section 4 lists up all subtypes of the four main types of Thai basic SVCs, and examines the semantic and syntactic properties of each type. Discussions in Sections 3 and 4 will reveal that the primary parameters for the classification of the semantic types of Thai basic SVCs are the aspectual distinction 'durative vs. non-durative situations' and the modal distinction 'factual vs. non-factual situations'. On the contrary, the hitherto often examined, famous distinctions 'agentive vs. non-agentive situations' and 'situations denoted by verbs from a restricted vs. non-restricted class' have little relevance or are at most secondary parameters. In Section 5, I will give concluding remarks.

2 Compositional system of the structure of basic SVCs

In my previous study on basic SVCs in general (Takahashi 2006), I posited two primary dimensions for classifying complex events expressed by basic SVCs, namely the dimensions of 'temporality' and 'factuality (or the degree of assertiveness)'. The definitions of these two concepts are spelled out in (12).

(12) Two most important dimensions for classifying complex events expressed by basic SVCs (Takahashi 2006) are:

a. Temporality: temporal relation between two sub-events represented by the two verb phrases in a basic SVC, i.e., 'consecutive' vs. 'simultaneous'
b. Factuality (the degree of assertiveness): the existential status of each of the two sub-events, i.e., 'factual (assertive)' vs. 'non-factual (non-assertive)'

I would assume that subtypes of complex events denoted by basic SVCs in any verb-serializing languages systematically differ in these two dimensions. Previous studies of Thai SVCs (Chuwicha 1993, Diller 2006, Iwasaki & Ingkaphirom 2005, Muansuwan 2002, Sereecharoensatit 1984, Sudmuk 2005, Thepkanjana 1986/2006, Wilawan 1993, *inter alia*) mainly consider the former temporal dimension, leaving the latter modal dimension untouched, which leads to an incomplete classification of the constructions.

Considering the factors of temporality and factuality, we can classify complex events expressed by basic SVCs into the following four main types.

(13) Four main types of complex events expressed by basic SVCs

a. Type of 'complex event of natural consequence': two factual events occur consecutively, e.g., (1) *tòk tɛ̀ɛk* 'fall (factual) + be broken (factual)'
b. Type of 'complex event with two facets': two factual events occur simultaneously, e.g., (2) *lăy maa* 'flow (factual) + come (factual)'

c. Type of ‘complex event of purposive activity’: a factual event and a non-factual event occur consecutively, e.g., (3) *tham khăay* ‘make (factual) + sell (*non-factual*)’
d. Type of ‘complex event integrated’: a factual event and a non-factual event occur simultaneously, e.g., (4) *yàak kin* ‘want (factual) + eat (*non-factual*)’

The dichotomy of ‘factual vs. non-factual situations’ comes from the theory of ‘the ontology of situation’ postulated by Johnson (1981). He rephrases ‘the ontology of situation’ as “the degree to which the situation can be considered as a real part of the course of events in the actual world, as opposed to being part of some projected course of events which has not yet been actualized” (ibid.: 146). According to him, the existential status of a situation is divided into two contrastive categories, as stated in (14).

(14) Two contrastive categories of the existential status of situation (Johnson 1981)

a. Real, determined or ‘manifest’ (i.e. factual) situation: at least one complete instance of the situation is a historical fact that is known to a human observer
b. Projected, hypothesized or ‘imminent’ (i.e. non-factual) situation: no complete instance of the situation is a historical fact

In my opinion, the factuality dimension is directly related to what Croft (2001) calls ‘Complex Figure’ vs. ‘Figure-Ground’ constructions. The terms ‘figure’ and ‘ground’ originate in Gestalt psychology. The figure is a part of our experience which we pay attention (a focal entity); in contrast, the ground is a part of our experience to which we do not attend (the background) (Benjafield 1993: 55). Croft (ibid.: 327) considers what is asserted in coordination and adverbial subordination to be figure-like, and relates the basic conceptual distinction between coordination and adverbial subordination with the Gestalt distinction between Complex Figure and Figure-Ground sentences. Specifically, “[I]n coordination, both clauses are asserted, in line with its complex figure construal”, whereas “[I]n adverbial subordination, only the main clause is asserted, because only the main clause is the figure of the sentence” (ibid.: 338). Endorsing his argument for applying the Gestalt distinction ‘Complex Figure vs. Figure-Ground configurations’ to the analysis of complex sentences, I approach basic SVCs from the same perspective. The resultant categorization of basic SVCs is shown in (15).

(15) ‘Complex Figure’ vs. ‘Figure-Ground’ types of basic SVCs

a. Coordination-like Complex Figure SVCs, (13a) and (13b): the combination of two assertive verb phrases representing a factual situation (VP1: factual + VP2: factual)
b. Subordination-like Figure-Ground SVCs, (13c) and (13d): the combination of an assertive verb phrase representing a factual situation and a non-assertive verb phrase representing a non-factual situation (VP1: factual + VP2: *non-factual*)

Table 1 below illustrates the two-dimensional classification of basic SVCs that I maintain. The table helps us visualize the systematized structure of basic SVCs with the parameters of temporality (consecutive or simultaneous event construction) and factuality (construction consisting of two factual events or of a factual event and a non-factual event).

Table 1: Two-dimensional classification of basic SVCs

	Symmetrical, **Complex Figure** construction	Asymmetrical, **Figure-Ground** construction
Consecutive event construction	Basic SVCs for complex event of **natural consequence**, e.g. (1) Factual sub-event → Factual sub-event	Basic SVCs for complex event of **purposive activity**, e.g. (3) Factual sub-event → *Nonfactual* sub-event
Simultaneous event construction	Basic SVCs for complex event with **two facets**, e.g. (2) Factual sub-event = Factual sub-event	Basic SVCs for complex event **integrated**, e.g. (4) Factual sub-event = *Nonfactual* sub-event

To recapitulate, 'complex events of natural consequence' (13a) are represented by Complex Figure SVCs of the consecutive event type; 'complex events with two facets' (13b) are represented by Complex Figure SVCs of the simultaneous event type; 'complex events of purposive activity' (13c) are represented by Figure-Ground SVCs of the consecutive event type; and, 'complex events integrated' (13d) are represented by Figure-Ground SVCs of the simultaneous event type. I will elaborate on the natures of these four main types in Section 4.

3 Symmetrical vs. asymmetrical SVCs

Before going on to particularly discuss the two-dimensional classification of Thai basic SVCs in the following section, I would like to clarify how my classification differs from Diller's (2006), which accords with the analysis of Aikhenvald (2006).

In her cross-linguistic study of SVCs, Aikhenvald (2006) offers two main types of SVCs, namely 'symmetrical' and 'asymmetrical' SVCs. As indicated in (16), if an SVC encompasses a 'minor' verb (a verb from a restricted class, like a motion verb and a posture verb), the SVC is regarded as asymmetrical.

(16) Aikhenvald's (2006) classification of SVCs

a. Symmetrical SVCs: SVCs consisting of 'major' verbs, viz., verbs from an unrestricted class
b. Asymmetrical SVCs: SVCs including a 'minor' verb, viz., verb from a restricted class (e.g. motion verb, posture verb)

Her classification connotes an insightful generalization regarding evolution of linguistic constructions, namely, the combination of two 'major' verbs in the symmetrical type tends to become lexicalized while a 'minor' verb in the asymmetrical type tends to become grammaticalized.

However, I have found that this classification is not accurately applicable to Thai basic SVCs. For one thing, Thai verbs are largely polysemous or polyfunctional, and so the range of their usage is quite wide. This means that verb classes in Thai mostly have fuzzy boundaries. What is more, Thai verb classes, except for the classes of so-called directional verbs (*khûn* 'ascend', *loŋ* 'descend', *khâw* 'enter', *ʔɔ̀ɔk* 'exit') and of deictic verbs (*pay* 'go', *maa* 'come'), are seldom restricted. For example, the class of posture verbs in Thai is by no means a restricted class. There are many verbs of bodily state and action in Thai (cf. Chuwicha 1993). Naturally, the great majority of Thai basic SVCs comprise two 'major'

verbs. Based on these facts, I would claim that as for the types of Thai basic SVCs, the dichotomy of 'symmetrical vs. asymmetrical' should not be equated with that of 'lexical-semantically balanced vs. unbalanced' (basic SVCs consisting of two major verbs vs. of a major verb plus a minor verb) as Aikhenvald (2006) argues for. Rather, the dichotomy of 'symmetrical vs. asymmetrical' should be equated with that of 'modally balanced vs. unbalanced' or that of 'Complex Figure vs. Figure-Ground' in Croft's (2001) terminology (basic SVCs consisting of two assertive verbs vs. of an assertive verb plus a non-assertive verb) as I have explicated in the preceding section (see Table 1 above).

4 Subtypes of complex events denoted by Thai basic SVCs

In the following subsections, I will examine subtypes of each of the four main types of complex events represented by Thai basic SVCs.

4.1 Complex event of natural consequence

The first main type is the type of complex event of natural consequence. I have attested five semantic patterns of this event type, as exemplified in (17) to (21) below. Though many of these examples have been popularly called 'resultative constructions' (e.g. Enfield 2007, Iwasaki & Ingkaphirom 2005, Thepkanjana 2006), I call them 'accomplishment constructions' (Takahashi 2007). I have been arguing against the pervasive idea that this construction in Thai corresponds to resultative construction defined in other languages, which is usually regarded as a kind of 'secondary predication construction', or more generally 'adjunct construction', in which a 'head' (or 'main') verb phrase is followed by a 'non-head' (or 'subsidiary') verb phrase. My basic idea is that Thai accomplishment construction encoding complex event of natural consequence like those in (17) to (21) are a kind of coordination-like Complex Figure construction consisting of two assertive verb phrases, each of which is neither 'head' nor 'non-head'.

(17) VP1: action + VP2: change of state/location or state

a. *cháy* *mòt*
use come to an end
(He) used (it) and (it) was used up.
b. *tii* *tɛ̀ɛk*
beat be broken
(He) beat (it) and (it) was broken.

(18) VP1: non-specific but direct action + VP2: change of state/location

a. *tham* *hăay*
do disappear
(He) directly acted on (it) and (it) disappeared.
b. *tham* *tòk*
do fall
(He) directly acted on (it) and (it) fell off.

(19) VP1: action/process or state + VP2: accumulation

a. *càp* *dây* *săam* *tua*
catch emerge three CLASSIFIER
(He) caught (them) and the number (of them) amounted to three.
b. *yen* *dây* *nùŋ* *chûamooŋ*
cool emerge one hour
(It) was cool and the period (of being cool) amounted to one hour .

(20) VP1: sensation-related action + VP2: perception/conception

a. *mɔɔŋ* *hěn*
look see
(He) looked away and (he) saw (it).
b. *faŋ* *rúu rûaŋ*
listen understand
(He) listened to (it) and (he) understood (it).

(21) VP1: non-purposive action or process + VP2: change of state/location or state

a. *dùuum* *maw*
drink be intoxicated
(He) drank (it) and (he) was intoxicated.
b. *pay* *thŭŋ*
go arrive
(He) went away and (he) arrived.

The second verb phrase in these examples expresses realization of an effect event as the result of a preceding cause event denoted by the first verb phrase. The effect event may or may not be durative, while the cause event is typically durative. Even if the period of the cause event is pretty short (e.g. hitting), it must take some time until the effect event comes into existence. The important point is that even when the cause event involves an agent, the realization of the effect event should not be completely under control of the agent, and there must be something beyond the agent's control, such as suitable circumstances and timeliness helping to bring about a certain resultant situation. The communicative function of this SVC type is to comment on whether or not an effect event arises from a cause event. The speaker must concern himself with the realization of the effect event.

Both the static 'continuous' aspect marker *yùu* 'CONTINUOUS' (< *yùu* 'be located') and the dynamic 'progressive' aspect marker *kamlaŋ* 'PROGRESSIVE' (<*kamlaŋ* 'power') cannot be included in examples (17) to (21), because the telic nature (i.e. entailing a clear endpoint) of this SVC type is incompatible with the imperfective (atelic) aspect. Normally, the negative marker *mây* is inserted between the first and the second verb phrases and the effect event alone is negated, as illustrated in (22).

(22) *cháy* *mây* *mòt*
use NEGATIVE come to an end

(He) used (it) but (it) was not used up.

It is also possible to negate the whole event by putting the negative marker in front of the first verb phrase, as in (23).

(23) *mây* *cháy* *mòt*
NEGATIVE use come to an end
(He) did not do in such a way that (he) uses (it) and (it) is used up.
It is not correct to believe that (he) used (it) and (it) was used up.

Note that to express a purposive activity with a clear intention to bring about a certain goal situation in the future (usually in the imperative mood), Thai speakers employ another kind of predicates which utilize the causative marker, as in (24) and (25).

(24) *cháy* *hây* *mòt*
use CAUSATIVE come to an end
(He) used (it) in order to use (it) up.
Use (it) up!

(25) *cháy* *hây* *lŭa*
use CAUSATIVE remain
(He) used (it) to bring about the result that some part (of it) is left.
Use (it) leaving some part (of it)!

4.2 Complex event with two facets

The second main type is the type of complex event with two facets. There are relatively diverse semantic patterns for this event type, as exemplified in (26) to (29) below.

The first verb in the pattern (26) is a verb for bodily state or action in general, which subsumes not only what is called 'stance' or 'posture' (cf. 'stance-activity constructions' Diller 2006, 'associated posture constructions' Enfield 2002, 'posture SVCs' Thepkanjana 2006) but also a variety of bodily action which are frequently called 'manner' (cf. 'manner SVCs' Thepkanjana 2006).

(26) VP1: bodily state/action + VP2: concurrent action

a. *yím* *hĕn dûay*
smile agree
(He) smiled; (he) agreed. (He agreed smiling.)
b. *rîip* *tham*
hurry do
(He) hurried; (he) did (it). (He did it in a hurry.)

The bodily action represented by the first verb in the pattern (26) may be a 'primary action' (Chuwicha 1993) in which we can perceive clearly which body part is used (e.g., *yím* 'smile', *nâŋ* 'sit', *dəən* 'walk') or a 'non-primary action' (Chuwicha 1993) in which we cannot perceive so clearly (e.g., *rîip* 'hurry', *chûay* 'help', *rə̂əm* 'begin').

The second verb in the pattern (27) is a deictic verb denoting a concrete motion away from or toward a certain reference point in the physical world.

(27) VP1: action/process + VP2: deictic direction (*pay* 'go' or *maa* 'come')

a. *wîŋ* *pay*
run go
(He) ran; (he) went away from a reference point. (He ran away.)
b. *lɔɔy* *maa*
float come
(It) floated; (it) came toward a reference point. (It came floating.)

The first verb in the pattern (28) is a verb of perception (e.g. seeing, hearing).

(28) VP1: perception + VP2: action/process

a. *hěn* *lǎy*
see flow
(He) saw (it) flowing.
b. *dâyyin* *hŭarɔ́?*
hear laugh
(He) heard (her) laughing.

The second verb in the pattern (29) is a stative verb expressing the speaker's view or evaluation regarding the manner or the resultant state of the situation described by the first verb phrase, which entails the event-participants named by the nominal arguments of the verb.

(29) VP1: action/process or state + VP2: state

a. *phûut* *phìt*
speak wrong
(He) spoke (it); (it) was wrong. (He spoke it wrongly.)
b. *rúu* *dii*
know good
(He) knew (it); (it) was good. (He knew it well.)

Previously, predicates of the pattern (29) have been variously named, say, 'modifying verb serialization' (Bisang 1995), 'event-argument constructions' (Diller 2006), 'depictive secondary predication' (Schultze-Berndt & Himmelmann 2004, Enfield 2005), 'depictive or adverbial complementation' (Enfield 2007), and so forth.

Although apparently examples (26) to (29) above express quite different kinds of complex events, they do have the following same event structure in terms of temporality and factuality: two factual sub-events arise simultaneously. It is noteworthy that both the two sub-events must be durative. The reason for this is that there must be a certain time span for the two sub-events to concur.

Owing to their inherent atelic nature (i.e. not entailing a well-defined endpoint), examples (26) to (29) may include the imperfective (continuous or progressive) aspect marker, as illustrated in (30) and (31).

(30) *nɔɔn* *ʔàan* *yùu*
lie read CONTINUOUS
(He) was reading lying.

(31) *kamlaŋ* *rîip* *tham*
PROGRESSIVE hurry do
(He) was doing (it) in a hurry.

Normally, the negative marker is put before the first verb phrase to negate the whole event, as in (32).

(32) *mây* *nɔɔn* *ʔàan*
NEGATIVE lie read
(He) did not do in such a way that (he) reads lying.
It is not correct to believe that (he) read lying.

The behaviour with respect to negation of the second verb phrase differs among different tokens, as in (33) to (35).

(33) *phûut* *mây* *phìt*
speak NEGATIVE wrong
(He) spoke (it); (it) was not wrong. (He spoke it not wrongly.)

(34) ? *nɔɔn* *mây* *ʔàan*
lie NEGATIVE read
(He) lied; (he) did not read.

(35) ?? *rîip* *mây* *tham*
hurry NEGATIVE do
(He) hurried; (he) did not do.

4.3 Complex event of purposive activity

The third main type is the type of complex event of purposive activity. There is only one semantic pattern for this event type, as indicated in (36).

(36) VP1: purposive action + VP2: *intended situation*

a. *khûn* *rót fay* *pay* *chiaŋmày*
ascend train go Chiangmai
(He) took a train to go to Chiangmai.
b. *yâaŋ* *kin*
roast eat

(He) roasted (it) to eat (it).

The terms 'purposive action' and 'intended situation' in (36) are not the terms for lexical semantic classes of verbs. These nomenclatures imply the event-participant's desire or hope, as the following. Any factual activity that the person in question is engaged to achieve a goal (goal-oriented action) can be regarded as 'purposive action', and any non-factual, albeit substantial, situation that is hopefully expected to bring about after some purposive action (desirable situation) can be considered as 'intended situation'. This is the reason why we cannot determine a particular lexical aspect of verbs that could be used to express 'purposive action' and 'intended situation'.

To overtly express that the event represented by the second verb phrase is an intended, non-factual event, we may put the linker *phûa* 'in order to' before the second verb phrase, as in (37).

(37) *khûn rót fay phûa (thîi cà?) pay chiaŋmày*
ascend train in order to go Chiangmai
(He) took a train in order to go to Chiangmai.

This pattern, which involves a positive activity, may be modified by the progressive aspect marker, as in (38).

(38) *kamlaŋ tham khăay*
PROGRESSIVE make sell
(He) was making (it) to sell (it).

Normally, this pattern is not negated. Possibly, the negative marker is placed in front of the first verb phrase to negate the whole event, as in (39).

(39) *mây khûn rót fay pay chiaŋmày*
NEGATIVE ascend train go Chiangmai
(He) did not do in such a way that (he) takes a train to go to Chiangmai.
It is not correct to believe that (he) took a train to go to Chiangmai.

It is awkward if only the second verb phrase expressing a non-factual situation is negated, as in (40).

(40) ? *khûn rót fay mây pay chiaŋmày*
ascend train NEGATIVE go Chiangmai
(He) took a train not to go to Chiangmai.

The second verb phrase in this pattern describes a certain situation intended, or more specifically, a non-factual desirable situation expected to result from a prior purposive action. Such a situation is typically affirmative and has a positive value (cf. Takahashi & Thepkanjana 1997).

4.4 Complex event integrated

The fourth main type is the type of complex event integrated. Only one semantic pattern indicated in (41) belongs to this event type. Many linguists take predicates of this pattern as 'complementation constructions' (e.g. Enfield 2007, Thepkanjana 2006).

(41) VP1: mental activity related to a non-factual action + VP2: *action*

a. *khîi kìat* *tham*
be indolent do
(He) felt indolent to do.
b. *sŏn cay* *rian*
be interested study
(He) was interested in studying.

This pattern contains a verb of mental activity concerning a non-factual action, such as a verb of desire, dislike, decision, efforts, and the like. Givón 1973 calls this kind of verbs (e.g. want, plan, try, prefer, hate, dread, intend, etc.) 'non-implicative modality verbs'. The irrealis marker *càʔ* may occur in front of the second verb phrase, as in (42).

(42) *khîi kìat* (*thîi*) *càʔ* *tham*
be indolent IRREALIS do
(He) felt indolent to do.

It is a static expression specifying a certain feeling, and therefore it is compatible with the continuous aspect marker, as in (43).

(43) *khîi kìat* *tham* *yùu*
be indolent do CONTINUOUS
(He) felt indolent to do.

Normally, the negative marker is put in front of the first verb phrase to negate the whole event, as in (44).

(44) *mây* *sŏn cay* *rian*
NEGATIVE be interested study
(He) was not interested in studying.

It is odd to negate only the second verb phrase representing a non-factual action toward which some feeling is directed, as in (45) and (46).

(45) ? *sŏn cay* *mây* *rian*
be interested NEGATIVE study
(He) was interested in not studying.

(46) ?? *khîi kìat* *mây* *tham*
be indolent NEGATIVE do
(He) felt indolent not to do.

4.5 Summary

The characteristics of the four main semantic patterns of Thai basic SVCs discussed above are summarized in Table 2 below. From this Table, we can easily see that each pattern has its own characteristics that is shown in each row of the table. What is important is that any tokens of a single pattern, in common, have the same characteristics. This can be regarded as a piece of evidence to prove the adequacy of the way of classifying Thai basic SVCs that I propose.

Table 2: Characteristics of four main semantic patterns of Thai basic SVCs

	Progressive reading □↦ℱ↦·˙ VP1 VP2	Continuous reading VP1 VP2 □_ˆ_	Negation of VP1+VP2 ℱ↦□□ VP1 VP2	Negation of VP2 VP1 ℱ↦□□ VP2
Pattern 1 for 'complex event of natural consequence' (13a) **Factual VP1 → Factual VP2**	×	×	(✓)	✓
Pattern 2 for 'complex event with two facets' (13b) **Factual VP1 = Factual VP2**	✓	✓	✓	✓/?
Pattern 3 for 'complex event of purposive activity' (13c) **Factual VP1 → *Nonfactual* VP2**	✓	×	(✓)	?
Pattern 4 for 'complex event integrated' (13d) **Factual VP1 = *Nonfactual* VP2**	×	✓	✓	?

The distinctive syntactic and semantic features among the four patterns listed in Table 2 are briefly accounted for, as follows. The pattern 1, representing two factual events concatenated, cannot co-occur with the imperfective (continuous or progressive) aspect marker, and normally only the second verb phrase is negated. The pattern 2, representing two concurrent factual events, can co-occur with the imperfective aspect marker, and normally the combination of the two verb phrases is negated. Only the second verb phrase can be negated, given some fitting referent scene. The pattern 3, representing a prior factual event and a posterior non-factual event, may co-occur with the progressive aspect marker, and normally it is not negated. And, the pattern 4, representing a factual event and a non-factual event that arise at the same time, can co-occur with the continuous aspect marker, and normally the combination of the two verb phrases is negated.

5 Conclusion

Such linguistic notions as 'event-participant's agency or controllability', which is often referred to as one of the main factors forming a causative situation, and 'the degree of restrictedness of verb classes', based on which Aikhenvald (2006) distinguishes between minor and major verbs, have been widely recognized as significant, presumably due to the fact that these notions indeed underlie the syntax and the semantics of many languages in the world, especially of Indo-European languages which most linguists are familiar with. However, the present study has revealed that these notions have little relevance to the fundamental compositional system of Thai basic SVCs.

In conclusion, the central claim of the present study is that complex events represented by Thai basic SVCs should be categorized primarily in terms of temporality (consecutive or simultaneous two events) and factuality (two factual events or a factual event plus a non-factual event), which are two different human perspectives needed in the minimum conceptualization of eventness.

Notes

I would like to thank the audience of the SEALS 18 conference (the 18th Annual Meeting of the Southeast Asian Linguistics Society, Kuala Lumpur, May 21-22, 2008) for helpful and insightful comments on an earlier version of this paper. Thanks are also due to Bruce Horton for stylistic suggestions.

1. The constructed examples in this paper are considered to be acceptable by native speakers of the Thai language.

References

Aikhenvald, Alexandra Y. 2006. Serial verb constructions in typological perspective. In Aikhenvald, Alexandra Y. and R. W. Dixon (eds.) *Serial Verb Constructions: A Cross-linguistic Typology*, 1-68. Oxford, Oxford University Press.

Benjafield, John G. 1993. *Cognition*. New Jersey, Prentice-Hall.

Bisang, Walter. 1995. Verb serialization and converbs—differences and similarities. Haspelmath, Martin and Ekkehard König (eds.) *Converbs in Cross-Linguistic Perspective: Structure and Meaning of Adverbial Verb Forms—Adverbial Participles, Gerunds—*, 137-188. Berlin, Mouton de Gruyter.

Chuwicha, Yajai. 1993. *Clausehood in Serial Verb Constructions in Thai*. Ph.D. dissertation, Chulalongkorn University.

Croft, William. 2001. *Radical Construction Grammar: Syntactic Theory in Typological Perspective*. Oxford, Oxford University Press.

Diller, Anthony V. N. 2006. Thai serial verbs: Cohesion and culture. In Aikhenvald, Alexandra Y. and R. W. Dixon (eds.) *Serial Verb Constructions: A Cross-linguistic Typology*, 160-177. Oxford, Oxford University Press.

Enfield, N. J. 2002. Cultural logic and syntactic productivity: Associated posture constructions in Lao. In Enfield, N. J. (ed.) *Ethnosyntax: Explorations in Grammar and Culture*, 231-258. Oxford, Oxford University Press.

Enfield, N. J. 2005. Depictive and other secondary predication in Lao. In Himmelmann, Nikolaus P. and Eva Schultza-Berndt (eds.) *Secondary Predication and Adverbial Modification: The Typology of Depictives*, 377-389. Oxford, Oxford University Press.

Enfield, N. J. 2007. *A Grammar of Lao*. Berlin, Mouton de Gruyter.

Foley, William A. 2008. The notion of 'event' and serial verb constructions: Arguments from New Guinea. In Khanittanan, Wilaiwan and Paul Sidwell (eds.) *Papers from the 14th meeting of the Southeast Asian Linguistics Society 2004*, 129-156. Canberra, Pacific Linguistics.

Givón, Talmy. 1973. The time-axis phenomenon. *Language* 49.4: 890-925.

Iwasaki, Shoichi and Preeya Ingkaphirom. 2005. *A Reference Grammar of Thai*. Cambridge, Cambridge University Press.

Johnson, Marion R. 1981. A unified temporal theory of tense and aspect. In Tedeschi, Philip, J. and Annie Zeanen (eds.) *Syntax and Semantics, Vol.14: Tense and Aspect*, 145-175. New York, Academic Press.

Karttunen, Lauri. 1971. Implicative verbs. *Language* 47.2: 340-358.

Muansuwan, Nuttanart. 2002. *Verb Complexes in Thai*. Ph.D. dissertation, The State University of New York at Baffalo.

Schultze-Berndt, Eva and Nikolaus P. Himmelmann. 2004. Depictive secondary predicates in crosslinguistic perspective. *Linguistic Typology* 8: 59-131.

Sereecharoensatit, Tasanee. 1984. *Conjunct Verbs and Verbs-in-Series in Thai*. Ph.D. dissertation, University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign.

Sudmuk, Cholthicha. 2005. *The Syntax and Semantics of Serial Verb Constructions in Thai*. Ph.D. dissertation, University of Texas at Austin.

Takahashi, Kiyoko. 2006. A two-dimensional classification of complex events represented by basic serial verb constructions. Paper presented at The 4th International Conference on Construction Grammar, Tokyo University, Tokyo, September 1-3, 2006.

Takahashi, Kiyoko. 2007. Accomplishment constructions in Thai: Diverse cause-effect relationships. *Papers from the 13th Annual Meeting of the Southeast Asian Linguistics Society 2003*, 263-277. Canberra, Pacific Linguistics.

Takahashi, Kiyoko and Kingkarn Thepkanjana. 1997. Negation in Thai serial verb constructions: A pragmatic study. In Abramson, Arthur S. (ed.) *Southeast Asian Linguistic Studies in Honor of Vichin Panupong*, 273-282. Bangkok, Chulalongkorn University Press.

Thepkanjana, Kingkarn. 1986. *Serial Verb Constructions in Thai*. Ph.D. dissertation, University of Michigan.

Thepkanjana, Kingkarn. 2006. Properties of events expressed by serial verb constructions in Thai. Paper presented at the 11th Biennial Rice Symposium: Intertheoretical Approaches to Complex Verb Constructions, Rice University, Texas, March 16-18, 2006.

Wilawan, Supriya. 1993. *A Reanalysis of So-called Serial Verb Constructions in Thai, Khmer, Mandarin Chinese, and Yoruba*. Ph.D. Dissertation, University of Hawai'i.