

akup

ARBEITEN DES KÖLNER UNIVERSALIEN - PROJEKTS

Nr. 56

LOCAL PREPOSITIONS
AND
SERIAL VERB CONSTRUCTIONS
IN THAI

Ulrike Kölver

July 1984

Herausgeber der Reihe:

Prof. Dr. Hansjakob Seiler

Universalienprojekt

Institut für Sprachwissenschaft

Universität

D - 5000 Köln 41

© bei den Autoren

C O N T E N T S

0.	Introduction	1
1.	Unmarked local constructions	2
2.	Static local relations	4
2.1.	Prepositions	5
2.2.	Multifunctionality of lexical items	9
3.	Directional local relations	11
3.1.	Prepositions	14
3.2.	Serial verb constructions	16
3.2.1.	Simple serial verb constructions	16
3.2.1.1.	<i>Order among directional verbs</i>	<i>17</i>
3.2.1.2.	Combination with other verbs	19
3.2.1.3.	Independent negation	20
3.2.1.4.	Deictic and anaphoric usage	20
3.2.1.5.	Independent negation in the deictic/ anaphoric variant	24
3.2.2.	Complex serial verb constructions	25
3.2.2.1.	Secondary verb + preposition	25
3.2.2.2.	Combination of secondary verbs	27
3.2.3.	Summary	29
4.	Conclusion	32
	Notes	34
	References	35

O. INTRODUCTION

The present paper is an attempt to describe a particular semantic domain in Thai, that of local relations, in terms of a gradual interconnection of what traditional descriptions usually regard as distinct and isolated categories. It is based on the well-known observation that isolating languages like Thai typically display a high degree of 'multifunctionality', or else of syntactic 'versatility' of very many lexical items.

This observation has led time and time again, particularly in the older literature, to the general, erroneous, conclusion that isolating languages do not genuinely distinguish word categories as do languages with a richer morphology, though, just as a descriptive tool, the traditional categorial inventory still seemed to best facilitate access for the foreign student.

More recent literature has, however, given up the long prevailing bias that categorial distinctions must necessarily be warranted by morphological material, and has rightly acknowledged that syntactic distribution provides just as valid evidence. Descriptive methods have sometimes been carried to the opposite extreme, however, claiming all kinds of word classes without providing sufficient syntactic evidence for the necessity of their distinction within the given system. Thus, multifunctionality of lexical items has usually not been described as such; instead, the student of an isolating language is often presented with a confusing amount of different categorial assignments of ever the same lexical instances.

Now, linguistic thought in recent years has approached the question of distinct categories - no matter whether in an isolating or any other type of language - in the growing insight that these, in reality, are not ever so many pigeonholes, as it were, in mutual isolation, but rather reflect ranges of gradual concepts with prototypical manifestations ('focal instances') which by a decrease, and complementary increase, of certain properties, merge into one another.

With respect to this approach, isolating languages, just

because of their morphological poverty, seem to provide much supporting evidence, for their multifunctional use of lexemes most clearly reveals such a gradual interconnection of categories.

In this sense, the paper presented here tries to add to the material evidence which, over recent years, has been forthcoming both from different linguistic schools in general and from investigations of various isolating languages in particular.

The semantic area studied in the following pages yields a clear systematic interconnection of three different categories, viz. that of nouns - as the focal instance of maximum syntactic independence -, that of verbs - as, conversely, the focal instance of maximally relational concepts -, and, as an intermediary category between these two, that of prepositions which the system lexically feeds from both these opposite ends.

The examples given in the course of this paper have been obtained from published grammatical literature, from Thai texts, and from informants. I should here like to thank Miss Jetanaa Wannasai and Mrs. Therdchai Verasilp for their kind and most helpful cooperation.

1. UNMARKED LOCAL CONSTRUCTIONS

In Thai, as in other languages of the isolating type, the simplest structural means of expressing a relation between words in an utterance is *signe zéro*, i.e. not specifying at all what kind of relation is intended, while the relation as such relies on order in the string.

This basic device may hold for local relations as well as for other ones. Thus, in order to indicate the site which an event or a participant of an event is related to, it may suffice to express it by an unmarked noun, the resulting string showing the same surface structure as a transitive clause would:

- (1) khǎw yùu bāan
he stay house
"He is at home".
- (2) khǎw nâp kâw?i
he sit chair
"He sits on a chair."

- (3) khǎw paj lamphuun
 he go Lamphun
 "He goes to Lamphun." "
- (4) khǎw klâp myaṅ thai
 he return country Thai
 "He returns to Thailand."

The fact that the nouns occurring after the verb have a local interpretation simply depends on the semantic interpretation of the constituents involved: in each case the verb itself implies a local complement provided by the noun following it. Thus, there is no overt distinction as to the kind of local relation involved. While (1) and (2) have a static interpretation, (3) and (4) have a directional one, but this fact is simply inferred from the meanings of the different verbs and otherwise leaves no trace in the construction. Equally, any transitive clause would have the same overt structure:

- (5) khǎw kin phonlâmâaj
 he eat fruit
 "He eats fruit."

The point of these identical surface structures is economy: as long as the meanings of the constituents "take care", as it were, of their possible mutual interrelation, any overt marking as to the semantic nature of these relations can be dispensed with.

Going by the uniform surface structure, one might, of course, say that all of the sentences (1) - (5) represent transitive clauses, and that there is no conceptual distinction between the respective semantic roles of a patient, a static or directional local complement in Thai. However, there is clear linguistic evidence for a conceptual distinction between these relations. This shows up as soon as the nouns following the verbs in (1) - (5) are substituted by interrogative pronouns. Compare:

- | | | |
|------|------------------|----------------------------|
| (1') | khǎw yùu thîinǎy | "Where is he?" |
| (2') | khǎw nâṅ thîinǎy | "Where does he sit?" |
| (3') | khǎw paj nǎj | "Where does he go?" |
| (4') | khǎw klâp nǎy | "Where does he return to?" |
| (5') | khǎw kin âraj | "What does he eat?" |

Not only do these interrogative substitutes set off a patient (substituted by àraj for inanimates, by khraj for persons) from a local complement, they also yield a difference between a static and a directional local complement. The former is usually represented by the composite marker th^hin^vay (lit. 'place which or where') while the latter is marked by the simple interrogative pronoun n^vaj "which" or "where". Thus, these relations are clearly conceived of as distinct. Nonetheless, the identical surface structure of the affirmative sentences is not to be overlooked either: it shows that these different relationships may merge into one another.¹

However, as we are particularly interested here in local relations, we shall not further pursue the question of gradient transitivity nor the semantic relations which most typically and pronouncedly reveal it.² Instead we shall take (1') - (5') as our starting point to look at local relations separately from other ones, and, within this scope, we shall try to see in which other ways the difference we encountered between static and directional local complements leaves its mark on the system.

In the following pages, therefore, we shall illustrate two different kinds of structural means Thai employs to mark local relations and which tie in with the distinction noted above.

2. STATIC LOCAL RELATIONS

In view of the unmarked constructions exemplified above it is obvious that they do not admit of a differentiation between specific varieties of local relations, as there is no paradigm of relators. In any event, the mere juxtaposition of the main constituents yields but the interpretation which their meanings lead one to expect as the most likely and natural one, i.e. structural unmarkedness quite automatically corresponds to semantic unmarkedness.

As soon as an utterance is designed to express any specific relation out of a paradigm of possible oppositions, overt markers

are, of course, required.

In this respect, static local relators differ significantly from directional ones, and we shall first look at the former variety.

2.1. PREPOSITIONS

In order to overtly specify the particular local relation of an event or entity in reference to a point or figure of orientation, Thai employs a paradigm of prepositions. These, however, differ among themselves in their categorial affiliation, i.e. these local relators display various degrees of multifunctionality in terms of various degrees of 'nominality': the items of the paradigm range from basically independent nouns via relational nouns (requiring a nominal complement), and further, via bound nominal morphemes, down to "intrinsic"³ prepositions.

The following examples illustrate the most common of these local relators:

- (6) mii tôn máp hráaw tôn nỳn nâa roon rian
 exist tree coconut (clf) one front school
 "There is a palmtree in front of the school."
- (7) khǎw rótnâam dǝok máaj lǎn bân
 he water flower back house
 "He waters the flowers behind the house."
- (8) rôt cǝt thi laan klaan mùubân
 bus stop place open-space middle village
 "The bus stopped in the open place in the middle of the village."
- (9) khǎw jyyn khâan nâatâan thaan sáaj
 he stand side window way left
 "He is standing beside the left window"
- (10) khoomfaj tâaj krâdaj sǎa paj lǝw
 lamp below stair broken go already
 "The lamp under the stair does not work."
- (11) takrâa yùu bon chán
 basket stay on shelf
 "The basket is on the shelf."
- (12) khǎw mâj khǝj phûut kâp khon naj bân
 he scarcely speak with person in village
 "He scarcely talks to the people in the village"

The underlined elements, which in these sentences, serve as local prepositions, differ from top to bottom as to their functions other than that, and there is a decrease in nominality from full noun to mere preposition.

Thus, the local relators in the first two examples are basically independent nouns denoting the body parts "face" and "back" respectively, and in this meaning, may by themselves figure as noun phrases without any accompanying modifiers:

- (13) dich tô lâa nâa
 I must wash face
 "I must wash my face!"
- (14) dich cê lă
 I hurt back
 "I hurt my back."

Now, body part terms are typical instances of relational nouns, or, more narrowly, of nouns denoting inherent possession implying a second term which denotes the possessor. In very many languages, including English, this leads to the consequence that a body part term usually does not occur by itself, but obligatorily requires a possessive modifier. This is not the case in Thai, however:⁴ though the notion of a possessor is certainly implied as much as in English, there is no need in Thai to give it an open expression. On the contrary, this very implication of the body part term would make an open reference to the possessor sound rather clumsy, once it can be inferred from the context. (This ties in with the general observation that Thai, like other languages of the isolating type, often works at a lower level of redundancy than English or other European languages.)

Thus, though the semantic status of a body part term in principle is not different in either type of language, the syntactic results are: a Thai noun denoting an inherently relational concept maintains independence on the syntactic level. It certainly may have a possessive modifier - if this happens to provide a first reference to the possessor's identity in a given discourse -, but it must not have one. Therefore, syntactically, body part terms do not differ from non-relational nouns.

At the same time, the relational meaning obviously serves

as the basis for adopting such lexemes in order to express part-whole relations, such as 'front-of' or 'back-of', generally. And this slight extension of meaning goes along with a corresponding slight decrease in independence as a free noun: specification of the part usually requires specification of the whole. Therefore, in this latter meaning, these lexemes always occur with a following nominal modifier:

(15) nâa bâan sĭi nâamtaan
 front house colour brown
 "The front of the house is brown."

(16) lăŋ aakhaan mâj sŭaj lăŋ
 back building not nice at all
 "The back side of the building does not look at all nice."

Still, the forms retain their nominal character to a pronounced degree, as they each occur as the head of a noun phrase.

A further decrease in independence is to be observed when these elements appear in the function of a modifier to another noun, such as kracòk nâa "front window pane/wind-shield" or bandaj lăŋ "back stairs", or in combination with other relational nouns such as khâaŋ lăŋ 'side back' "in the rear, at the back".

Finally, as the last stage of decreasing nominality and increasing relationality we encounter their usage as mere prepositions, as illustrated in the examples above.

Now, formally an expression like nâa bâan taken in itself admits of two different interpretations: (a) as an endocentric construction of head and modifier "front of the house", and, (b) as an exocentric prepositional phrase "in front of the house". Without a sentential context these alternatives cannot be distinguished. However, their relative difference as to their degree of nominality in either reading may become manifest in the following way: when a lexeme such as nâa functions as the head of an endocentric phrase it might be separated from its modifying noun by an intervening possessive relator: nâa khŏŋ bâan 'front belonging house' "front of house", while in prepositional use no other element may intervene. That is, the relatively higher degree of nominal independence of nâa in the former reading may show up syntactically.

Thus, lexemes like nâa and lăp cover a fairly wide range of distributions in which a gradual shift from maximum independence as a full noun to minimum independence as a preposition can be observed. The distributions illustrated here do not yet exhaust the full range of possibilities⁵, but they may suffice to show the principle.

Turning to our next items such as klaaŋ "middle" and khâaŋ "side" we find that they do not admit of the same degree of nominal independence: Their relational character is always reflected in their cooccurrence with a modifying element. Again, phrases like klaaŋ mùubâaŋ are open to both an endocentric and an exocentric reading: "middle of the village" and "in the middle of the village", respectively. As above, the former variety would tolerate the intervening possessive marker which the latter does not, and thus shows the relatively more nominal character of these lexemes in the former type of phrase.

Equally, lexemes like klaaŋ and khâaŋ may serve as modifiers to another noun in phrases such as khon klaaŋ 'person middle' "the middle one (in a group)" or "mediator, arbitrator".

Next, thîi 'place where' is still more dependent syntactically: It never occurs by itself, and when combined with other nouns does not admit of an intervening possessive marker: yet it still shows clear nominal affinity as it may serve to nominalize elements which are not nominal in themselves. Thus a verbal phrase as e.g. cùt rôt "to park a car" may be turned into the nominal compound thîicùtrôt "parking lot".⁶

Finally, our last three lexemes tâaj, bon and naj show a further decrease in nominality and a corresponding increase in prepositionality. Thus, tâaj occurs as a bound nominal form with both the meanings "south" and "underneath" in the modifier position of noun phrases and compounds such as thît tâaj 'direction south' "the south", khûa tâaj "south pole". It may also combine with nouns to form adjectival modifiers,

as e.g. tâajdin 'under earth' "subterranean", but otherwise only functions as a preposition as in (10) above.

Equally, bon "upper, on" and naj "inner, in" as well as e.g. n๓๓k "outer, outside" serve as modifiers in compounds like khon naj 'person inner' "insider", khon n๓๓k "outsider", khâaṅ bon 'side upper' "upper side, upstairs" and, much more frequently, just as static local prepositions.

In this way, the lexemes forming a paradigm of prepositions differ among themselves as to the degree of nominal properties they have, and this would seem to point to a gradual inter-connection between both these categories.

‡ 2.2. MULTIFUNCTIONALITY OF LEXICAL ITEMS

Our starting point in comparing the different syntactic environments of this specific set of lexemes has been their common function as static local prepositions. Now, taking this function for granted, one might of course argue that the remaining other functions of a given lexeme are irrelevant to the issue of its categorial assignment as a preposition. This would mean then that we may state the different functional capacities which a lexeme may serve quite independently of each other as ever so many distinct categorial affiliations with corresponding different meanings, - and this is what has usually been done in descriptions of Thai grammar so far.⁷

However, the view taken here ties in with another basic assumption which is currently gaining more and more recognition in different linguistic schools, viz. that linguistic phenomena may be of a "squishy" nature. That is, rather than pigeonholing distinct categories in mutual isolation from each other, it seems more adequate to observe and take into account what gradual properties they may display, both when looking at a given standard category in itself or when looking at the interrelations between different categories such as, in our case, nouns and prepositions.

Now, multifunctionality, or else syntactic "versatility" of single lexical items - one of the characteristic properties of isolating languages - would seem to provide valid evidence

to support this approach; for what our examples above illustrate is not merely multiple categorial affiliation of a lexical item. They also show how these items, without ever altering their forms, gradually shift in syntactic distribution, thus chaining together, different linguistic categories on a continuum.

In the case of nouns and static local prepositions, the criterion this gradual interconnection is based on is the relative degree of dependence of an item, its tendency to cooccur with a nominal complement that satisfies its relational implications. Here, maximum independence of such a cooccurrence is the typical property of nouns. Yet the category noun in itself has to be viewed as a gradual phenomenon in this respect, for independence turns out to be not just a plus/minus distinction, but rather a matter of degree.

Maximum dependence on the other hand is approached - in the limited section under consideration so far - when an item not only loses its independence, but also its capacity of heading an endocentric construction and finally ends up as a mere relator between nouns or between the syntactic constituents of a sentence.

Now, the functional diversity of our lexical items differs considerably in degree: thus, as we saw, there are lexemes which chiefly function at the prepositional end of this continuum and therefore, at least synchronically, show but faint nominal affinity.

By contrast, the lexemes which start out at the nominal end of our continuum, like nâa and lǎŋ, illustrate the shift from noun to preposition in its full range and thus prove free nouns as one of the ultimate sources of the category of prepositions. We shall see below that this is matched by an opposite source in the category of verbs.

Now, the phenomenon of gradual shifting in terms of functional diversity is not just a specific characteristic only of local relators in Thai. On the contrary, since multifunctionality is an all pervading phenomenon, descriptions which acknowledge this general property would seem a more fruitful approach to

the system as a whole. For, rather than saying, as has been one of the common opinions in the past, that isolating languages like Thai are somewhat deficient in their categorial distinctions, we would thus recognize the fact that different syntactic environments after all do warrant such distinctions, but we would at the same time be able to describe the intricate intertwining of these categories in terms of a gradual order. This might be extended beyond the scope of the present paper even for the limited inventory discussed so far, for, as was noted above, some of the lexical items considered here have further functional ramifications. However, as our investigation aims at an illustration of the interconnection between different categories just within the limits of a given semantic area, these ramifications cannot be further pursued in our present connection.

3. DIRECTIONAL LOCAL RELATIONS

When we next look at the special devices Thai employs to express directional local orientation, we shall use this term so as to cover its respective semantic varieties of direction towards a goal, direction from a source, and direction along or across an entity of orientation.

These various directional specifications differ in their degree of markedness, of course, in Thai as much as in other languages. Thus, goal is the most unmarked relation, source is more marked than goal, but less marked than direction along or across an entity. This shows up in the interpretation of unmarked constructions.

For, as we saw above in §1., the simplest structural means of expressing directionality consists in an unmarked construction where the main verb is a motion verb followed by an unmarked noun, as above in (3) khăw paj lamphuun "he goes to Lamphun". The same construction also occurs with other motion verbs, such as:

- (17) khăw cà maa krungthêep athít nâa
 he (fut) come Bangkok week next
 "He will come to Bangkok next week."

- (18) khǎw khâw h̄sɔŋ samùt
 he enter room book
 "He enters the library."
 (19) khǎw càak bâan maa naan l̄éew⁸
 he leave house come long already
 "He left his home long ago."

The only indication of directionality is in the verb itself. The semantic roles emerging, goal in (17) and (18), source in (19), are unambiguously determined for the respective verbs, i.e. are implied in their lexical meanings, and therefore need no overt marking. The implication of the semantic relation of goal, however, is much more frequent than that of source, while the other directional possibilities never go without an overt marking.

Unambiguity of direction is not necessarily implied however. There are other motion verbs which are open to a choice of interpretation, i.e. they merely specify an axis of motion without being determined as to which of the opposite directions is referred to. In this case, the appropriate interpretation cannot be gathered from the verb alone; instead it depends on the choice of the accompanying noun. Compare:

- (20) khǎw loŋ rya
 he descend boat
 'he descends into the boat'
 "He enters the boat."
 (21) khǎw loŋ rôtmeē
 he descend bus
 'he descends from the bus'
 "He leaves the bus."
 (22) khǎw kh̄yn rya
 he ascend boat
 'he ascends from the boat'
 "He leaves the boat."
 (23) khǎw kh̄yn rôtmeē
 he ascend bus
 'he ascends into the bus'
 "He enters the bus."

Here the local complements of the pair loŋ and kh̄yn can take the semantic roles of either goal or source of the motion depending on which direction is associated with the noun specifying the locality. In the case of boats the expression

quite literally reflects the fact that the common varieties of traditional craft are usually entered and left by a descending and ascending motion respectively, while with buses this happens in the reverse way.

However, in many cases nouns will not lend themselves to a clear interpretation in terms of directionality, and in such cases an unmarked construction will turn out to be insufficient to indicate directionality, even if it is implied in the verb. Thus there is no possible reading for a sentence like, e.g.

(24) *khăw loŋ mûubâan
 he descend village

which can neither be understood as implying the relation of goal nor that of source respectively. Additional directional specification is required to make the utterance intelligible.

As these examples once more illustrate, unmarked constructions will only do within a limited scope, viz., when an argument implied in the verb is represented by a noun which supplies a readily plausible interpretation to the construction as a whole. Where these conditions do not apply, as in (24) above, the unmarked construction becomes meaningless.

Similarly, motion verbs which do not by themselves imply a directional argument never take the unmarked construction:

(25) *khăw wîŋ bâan
 he run house

For a verb like wîŋ "run", which denotes just a manner of motion without implying any direction, an intended directional specification has to be indicated by an overt marker.

The same restriction applies to transitive verbs which, even when semantically requiring a directional complement, cannot syntactically accommodate it by mere juxtaposition of the constituents:

(26) *khăw sàj nám àaŋ
 he put water bowl

Besides the agent, the transitive verb sàj can take but one unmarked co-constituent, viz. the patient, while the local

constituent must be overtly characterized as such.

Finally, even for those cases where the unmarked construction is permissible, it must be remembered that the ways to frame an utterance always admit of choices which are largely a matter of the specific communicational intentions of a speaker. Thus, while unmarked constructions as the above are a normal way of expression in matter-of-fact informational exchange in the everyday language, any such information might be conveyed in more precise and explicit ways by means of overt specification.

The structural means Thai provides for these various needs may consist in (a) prepositions, (b) serial verb constructions, or (c) combinations of both in different degrees of complexity.

3.1. PREPOSITIONS

To a very limited extent directionality (in the sense defined above, p. 11) is marked by the prepositions we discussed above in 2.1., where they appeared as static local relators; some examples would be:

- (27) khǎw paj naj bâan
 he go in house
 "He goes into the house."
- (28) khǎw sàj nâam naj âaŋ
 he put water in bowl
 "He pours water into the bowl."
- (29) khǎw paj lǎŋ bâan
 he go behind house
 "He went behind the house."

Compared with the unmarked construction, (27) is more precise in its information, as it specifically states that the house is being entered, while the juxtaposition paj bâan may be understood both as "to the house" and "into the house". In (28), as we saw above, a local relator is required, since mere juxtaposition is not tolerated syntactically, and in (29) the preposition establishes a local relation more specific than that immediately implied in the verb itself. In these sentences the prepositions, otherwise used to mark static local relations, acquire a directional meaning which is mapped on to them by the directional implications of the

verb. For there is clear evidence that no directional meaning is inherent in them otherwise, if we look at sentences like:

(30) khǎw wīŋ naj sǎn
 he run in garden
 "He runs about in the garden."

(31) nók bin bon fáa
 bird fly on sky
 "The birds fly in the sky."

Both sentences contain verbs of motion which do not imply directionality, however. In such cases, though the verbs are dynamic, the prepositional phrases never have a directional interpretation, i.e. there is no possible reading 'run into the garden/fly up into the sky' which would have to be conveyed by different means. The local complements merely specify an area of motion which in itself is viewed as static. In other words, the prepositions in themselves have inherent static meanings and cannot bring about a directional relation.

Now, the construction type as in (27)-(29) is subject to narrow limitations. For one thing, certain directional verbs do not admit of an immediate combination with a static local preposition at all, thus, e.g. khâw "enter" and ǎk "go/come out" cannot form sentences like:

(32) *khǎw khâw naj bâan
 he enter in house

(33) *khǎw ǎk nǎk bâan
 he go out outside house

In order to overtly specify a directional relation, quite a different device is employed, viz. serial verb constructions which we shall discuss presently.

For another thing, even with those directional verbs which do allow combination with a preposition as in (27)-(29) above, there are fairly narrow restrictions on the lexical possibilities. Thus, while both paj "go" and maa "come" may combine with e.g. naj or lǎŋ, certain other combinations are precluded, e.g.

(34) *khǎw paj nǎk bâan
 he go outside house

is ungrammatical. Equally, the directional verbs khÿn "ascend"

and lon "descend" do combine with the prepositions bon "on" and tâj "under" respectively, but reject other combinations. Again, it is the device of serial verb constructions which is being used instead.

However, to the extent that there are permissible combinations with prepositions, these are employed within serial constructions in their turn, as we shall illustrate below in 3.2.2.1.

Before going on to the different varieties of these constructions, we must mention a very small number of prepositions which are intrinsically directional by themselves, e.g. têe "from", sùu "toward, to", yan "toward", as in:

- (35) khăw maa têt năj
 he come from where
 "Where does he come from?"

However, these prepositions were deemed quite uncommon in the colloquial language by my informants, and seem to have a certain literary flavour.

3.2. SERIAL VERB CONSTRUCTIONS

The common strategy of marking directional relations consists in stringing together two or more verbs into a serial construction, a device which is not only employed in the semantic field discussed here, but also in a variety of other semantic relations which we cannot go into now. There are different varieties of this structural device to be illustrated in the following pages.

3.2.1. Simple serial verb constructions

Besides occurring as main predicates the directional verbs illustrated above and a number of others may function as secondary verbs⁹ combining both among themselves and to other verbs denoting directional orientation. Further, these verbs may combine with prepositional phrases in their turn. The most common of these verbs are:

paj "go", maa "come", khâw "enter", jək "go out", càak "depart,

leave", khÿn "ascend", loŋ "descend", thÿn "arrive, reach a point", taam "follow", khâam "cross".

The constructions formed with the help of these verbs vary both in internal order and in complexity.

3.2.1.1. Order among directional verbs

These verbs may combine among themselves in common expressions like the following:

- (36) khăw khâw paj / khăw khâw maa
 he enter go he enter come
 "He went/came in."
- (37) khăw ðək paj / khăw ðək maa
 he go-out go he go-out come
 "He went/came out."
- (38) khăw khÿn paj / khăw khÿn maa
 he ascend go he ascend come
 "He went/came up."
- (39) khăw loŋ paj / khăw loŋ maa
 he descend go he descend come
 "He went/came down."

The internal order is fixed: both paj and maa always appear as secondary verbs with this subset of directional verbs to indicate the direction relative to the position of the speaker, thus there is no overt specification of a locality. This is one of the features by which the directional verbs differ among themselves: while some of them may occur without a following noun specifying a locality, others require a nominal complement, e.g. càak, e.g.

- (40) rôtfaj ðək càak sathâanii lɛɛw
 train go-out leave station already
 "The train has left the station."
- (41) khăw maa càak roonrian
 he come depart school
 "He comes from school."

There are no constructions of the type *khăw maa càak. At the same time, (41) illustrates the reverse internal order from that of (36)-(39), that is, maa now appears first, for, whenever càak combines to another verb, it must take the secondary position.

The same order is required for thÿn "reach", which differs from càak, however, in that it may occur without a following noun.

By the criterion of order among themselves our set of directional verbs therefore subdivides into three subsets:

- (a) khâw, òk, khÿn, lon always take the first position,
 (b) càak and thÿn always take the second one when combining among each other, as e.g. in òk càak "depart from", khÿn thÿn "ascend up to" (there are no combinations within each of the two groups).

As an intermediary group we get

- (c) paj and maa which have to follow the first group and precede the second one.

The remaining two verbs in our list, taam "follow and khâam "cross", which most frequently combine with this intermediary group of paj and maa, are equally flexible as to position; compare:

- (42) khâw taam maa mÿankan
 he follow come too
 "He came along too."

with (43), where taam appears as the secondary verb in which case it has to be followed by a nominal complement:

- (43) khâw maa taam raw
 he come follow we
 "He came after us."

The same reversal is observed for khâam:

- (44) (a) khâw khâam saphaan paj
 he cross bridge go
 "He went across the bridge."
 (44) (b) khâw paj khâam saphaan
 He went across the bridge."

Here the difference only seems to be which aspect of the action is viewed as the foregrounded rather than the backgrounded one.

We shall come back to both the order criterion and to that of obligatory cooccurrence with a following noun below in 3.2.2.2. and 3.2.3.

3.2.1.2. Combination with other verbs

As our next step, we shall try to illustrate occurrences of these verbs in relation to other verbs as main predicates:

- (45) khắ khàp rót paj roonrián
 he drives car go school
 "He drives to school."
- (46) khắ thót nám khắ naa
 he raise water enter field
 "He irrigates the field (by flooding it)."
- (47) khắ yók takrâa khýn bòk
 he lift basket ascend land
 "He lifted the basket ashore"
- (48) khaw dəənthaan thýn chianmàj
 he travel reach Chiangmaj
 "He travelled up to/as far as Chiangmaj."
- (49) mii fón tòk chúk taam chaajfàn thalee
 exist rain fall abundant follow edge coast
 "It rains abundantly along the coast."

The secondary verbs in these examples obviously correspond to prepositions in languages like English most of the time, and they are not infrequently thus labelled for Thai as well¹⁰, the argument being that there is no tangible difference between a verb thus employed and an intrinsic preposition. This does not seem quite appropriate as a principle of description, however.

For, as we argued above in 2.2., by this kind of analysis the lexemes under consideration are simply assigned to mutually unrelated categories, verbs on the one hand, prepositions on the other, without any attempt to account for the lexical identity of members of both these categories. However, just as in the case of nouns and prepositions, we see once more that multifunctionality of lexical items is not just a matter of random affiliation to a number of distinct categories; rather, it is a matter of gradual change in syntactic behaviour by which both these categories are interconnected.

For the secondary verbs differ among themselves as to their syntactic possibilities: above we already noted differences as to order regularities. As we go on now, we shall further observe such differences which, taken together, once more

amount to a continuum from verb to directional preposition, analogous to that between noun and static preposition.

3.2.1.3. Independent negation

Our first point of evidence in this respect is that in the above examples, one of the secondary verbs, viz. thỳn differs from all the others in that it may form constructions where it is susceptible of negation independently of the main predicate; see:

- (50) khǎw paj māj thỳn chianmāj
 he go not reach Chiangmaj
 "He did not go as far as Chiangmaj."

Though this type of construction is fairly restricted, i.e. it can be formed only in certain lexical combinations with main verbs, its occurrence as such shows that thỳn as a secondary verb still partakes in a property which unmistakably attests its verbal nature. While verbs may be directly negated, prepositions may not; thus the independent negation of a secondary verb must be considered one of the criteria to distinguish the respective more "verb-like" and more "preposition-like" nature of a given lexeme in this set. In this respect thỳn is found to behave more verb-like than any other secondary verb in this type of construction, as it is the only one admitting of an independent negation.

3.2.1.4. Deictic and anaphoric usage

In the sentences (45)-(49) the secondary verb is used to introduce a nominal complement specifying a particular locality. Besides these constructions there is another variety of serialization where a main verb is followed by a secondary one without such an explicit specification in terms of a following noun. We have already seen some examples of this variety in (36)-(39) above; further illustrations are sentences like the following:

- (51) khǎw thỳn tũa paj léəw
 he throw ticket go already
 "He has thrown the ticket away already."

- (52) khǎw ʔaw nǎpsǎy maa
 he take book come
 "He brought the book (here)."
- (53) khǎw yók rôt khÿn
 he lift car ascend
 "He lifted the car up."
- (54) faj dâp loŋ léew
 fire abate descend already
 "The fire has died down."
- (55) léew pít tûu khâw yàaŋ dæm
 then close cupboard enter kind previous
 "Then (he) closed the cupboard as before."
- (56) nâatàaŋ baan thîi sǎŋ pəət ɔk
 window (clf) second open go out
 "The second window opened."

The direction indicated by the secondary verbs in these sentences is either deictical in reference to the position of the speaker, as in (52) - and this is the most frequent use of both paj and maa in this type of construction, which is also apparent from (36)-(39) above. Or it is deictical in reference to the subject of the sentence, as in (51), (55) and (56). And finally, the secondary verbs may just mark an axis of direction, - vertical extension in the sentences (53) and (54) which may or may not imply reference to the position of either the speaker or the subject: while (53) implies a deictical connotation, (54) in the present example does not, for it simply expresses the common knowledge that an abating fire lowers itself to the ground, and this can be stated completely independently of a situational context. Thus, the deictical implications to a large extent depend on the actual utterance and its particular referential connections to its context.

Now, while secondary verbs with a following nominal complement are often considered as prepositions in the literature, their use in constructions like the above has gained them the reverse classification as postpositions by some authors¹¹. This means that besides the categorial assignments of both verb and preposition we are presented with yet a third independent categorial affiliation which, moreover, claims these lexical items as members of exactly opposite paradigms of relators.

In our present connection we may leave open the question whether a category of postpositions can be reasonably assumed for Thai at all.¹² In the case under consideration, however, this seems to be an unsatisfactory description, since it rather obliterates the obvious connection between both variants of construction. For, as our examples above show, the directional markers in each case imply some actual point of reference to be deduced from the utterance and its context. Moreover, the same type of construction may have an anaphoric interpretation in sequences like the following:

(57) (a) *thĩṅ cõtṁāaj paj tũu prajsanii lĕw rỹy yaṅ*
 throw letter go box mail already or not-yet
 "Did (you) put the letter into the mail-box or not yet?"

(57) (b) *thĩṅ paj lĕw*
 throw go already
 "Yes, (I) did."

In the answer both the main and the secondary verb are repeated without their respective arguments, since these are mapped onwards from the previous question. That is, anaphoric substitution of just the verb for an entire proposition does not only apply to the main verb, but to the secondary verb as well.

Now, the capacity of such anaphoric representation of contextually determined arguments which has adequately been termed 'zero-pronominal-reference' in the literature¹³ is one of the distinctive features of verbs in Thai. Therefore, in view of a sequence like (57) it seems justified to regard constructions without an overtly specified locality, as in (51)-(56) and (57) (b) as an anaphoric/deictic variant of our first type of serial construction, as in (45)-(49) and (57) (a). For, as there is no formal difference between constructions like (51)-(56) and (57) (b), as far as the secondary verb is concerned - in both cases it appears without a following noun - it is obvious that deictic vs. anaphoric usage is merely a matter of appropriate interpretation within a given context. Therefore, rather than needlessly assuming yet another categorial affiliation for lexemes like *paj* etc., it

seems more appropriate to regard their use in constructions like (51)-(56) and (57)(b) simply as a contextually determined variant of the first type of serial construction. Thus, in principle, both the constructions with and without an overt nominal complement do not give rise to mutually unconnected categorizations; they can more simply and more suitably be explained as contextually conditioned variants of each other.

What must be noted, however, is the fact that some of our secondary verbs admit of such anaphoric/deictic usage while others do not. This gives us another clue as to the distinction between verbal and prepositional properties of secondary verbs, respectively.

For, while a full verb typically may occur without overt representations of its arguments, the very 'raison d'être' of a preposition is its connection to a nominal complement. Thus, a genuine preposition would never appear in constructions like the above, and there are no utterances of the type:

- (58) *khăw sàj nănsŷŷ naj
 he put book in
 (59) *khăw thŷj tŷa sùu
 he throw ticket towards

That is, neither a static local preposition nor an inherently directional one can display the same capacity of implying some actual point of reference as the secondary verbs may in some cases.

In this respect khŷn, loŋ, khâw, ɔ̀k and thŷj as well as paj and maa still show a pronounced affinity to the category of full verbs. Yet the latter two, as we shall see below, retain verbal properties to a lesser degree than the first four by other criteria. Against these, the secondary verbs taam/khâam and càak always cooccur with a nominal complement and thus reveal a much closer affinity to genuine prepositions in this respect.

3.2.1.5. Independent negation in the deictic/anaphoric variant

Above we noted that all of the verbs considered here except one, viz. "reach a point" have lost negatability when occurring as secondary verbs in constructions like (45)-(49) above. Therefore, it is not surprising to find that the deictic/anaphoric variant we have just been discussing does not tolerate it either in most cases. What is indeed surprising, however, is the fact that there are certain exceptions to this general observation. Thus, one of our sentences above, viz. (53) was accepted by informants with a negation of the secondary verb:

(53') khăw yók rôt māj khÿn¹⁴
 he lift car not ascend
 "He was unable to lift the car up."

which does not simply negate the secondary part of the statement, but also brings about a modal connotation.

However, sentence (47) above, with its overt local specification, was ruled out as ungrammatical with an independent negation by my informants:

(47') *khăw yók takrâa māj khÿn bôk
 he lift basket not ascend land

In that set of examples, the secondary verb thÿn, as we noted, was the only one to tolerate an independent negation, and thÿn in fact also may be negated when employed anaphorically:

(60) raw nâaklua câ paj māj thÿn¹⁵
 we afraid (fut) go not reach
 "We are afraid we won't get there."

Thus thÿn seems to be less restricted in this respect than khÿn. And it must be noted too that independent negation of thÿn does not entail a modal connotation. This would seem to suggest that thÿn behaves more verb-like than khÿn as a secondary verb. While this is true for this particular criterion, thÿn does not behave this way in other respects (see below 3.2.2.2.).

Returning to the somewhat strange contrast between the acceptability of (53') as opposed to the unacceptability of an independent negation of khÿn in (47'), I do not have any explanation so far.

It must be noted, however, that there are analogous phrases with other secondary verbs in our sample, such as: khít māj ๓๓k 'think not come out' which means "be unable to think of something; something has slipped one's memory" which is evidently a metaphorical phrase roughly captured by a gloss like 'unable to make a thought come forth from one's memory' or something like that. Other cases are phūt māj ๓๓k 'speak not come out' "be struck dumb, be speechless at the moment"; kin māj khâw 'eat not enter' "unable to eat something, find something inedible"; nâj māj loj 'sit not descend' "unable to sit down".

There are quite a number of further examples of the same type for the secondary verbs khÿn, loj, khâw and ๓๓k while I did not find any for the other ones.

The examples quoted quite evidently represent idiomatic expressions and apparently cannot be mechanically reproduced for any of the combinations with main verbs these secondary verbs may form.

Since there are quite a host of further, non-localistic phrases of the same structure in Thai¹⁶, the problem of independent negation of a secondary verb is probably not solvable in terms of directional verbs alone. It would require a separate study in order to determine to what extent such structures provide a productive mechanism in the language, or, conversely, to what extent these have frozen into an inventory of fixed lexical expressions.

Yet taking the examples, such as they are, at their structural face value, they indeed supply us once again with evidence that some of our secondary verbs still partake in the distinctly verbal property of negatability. But they display it on a reduced scale: while any full verb is of course susceptible to negation all the time, our secondary verbs lose this property in most constructions and only retain it within a - possibly limited - set of fixed lexicalized phrases.

3.2.2. Complex serial verb constructions

We shall now look at those varieties of serial verb constructions which combine secondary verbs with prepositions or among

themselves or both.

For such combinations are extremely common; judging by the limited set of data studied for the present purpose perhaps even more so than simple serial constructions.

This means that, while both the categories of prepositions and of secondary verbs each comprise but a limited paradigm, the possibilities of their mutual interconnections open up a practically unlimited resource of local specifications, just as any language will have its specific means to proliferate local information indefinitely.

Therefore, it cannot be our point here to try and document the lexical variants as extensively as possible - which would lead to tiresome repetition of identical structures -, but rather to limit ourselves to an illustration of the structural varieties as such.

3.2.2.1. Secondary Verb + Preposition

As we pointed out above in 3.1., directional verbs, when used as main predicates, may combine with prepositions, but there are narrow limitations, structurally and lexically, to this device - since serial verb constructions are used instead. In order to introduce an overt directional specification into a sentence, the language avails itself, as we have seen, of directional verbs shifting towards prepositional features to different degrees, and it does but rarely rely on a directional interpretation of what basically are static local relators.

Once, however, directionality has been established by means of secondary verbs, these may in turn combine with prepositions to just the same extent as they may when being used as main predicates. Thus, we commonly find constructions like the following ones:

- (61) khăw yoon nănsyphim lon bon tó
 he throw newspaper descend on table
 "He threw the newspaper down on the table."
- (62) sĭan róng càak bon bān
 voice ring depart on house
 "A voice rang out from on top of the house."

- (63) khǎw sàj caan paj naj tâu
 he put plate go in cupboard
 "He put the plate into the cupboard."
- (64) khǎw dǎn maa thii sǎw thon
 he walk come place pole flag
 "He came walking to the flagpole."
- (65) rôt khôj khôj khlaan taam lǎn fũn wua
 bus gradually crawl follow back herd cow
 "The bus slowly crept on behind a herd of cows."

The local specifications in these sentences combine a directional and static one, indicated by the secondary verb and the prepositional phrase respectively, of which the latter marks the precise point of reference the direction is related to.

Now the fact that both kinds of relators do cooccur once more provides evidence as to the distinction between them. Since lexical items which belong to exactly the same substitution paradigm as a rule are mutually exclusive of each other, their combination within a sentence shows that the secondary verbs cannot just be lumped together with the prepositions of basically nominal origin into one and the same form class.

The distinction is further borne out by such cases where a secondary verb combines with one of the few and fairly rarely occurring prepositions of inherently directional meaning (cf. above 3.1.) as in the following example:

- (66) ... mǎn sǎajtaa thúk khon cōj mōj maa yan khǎw
 ... as-if look each person stare look come towards him
 "... as if everybody were staring at him."

3.2.2.2. Combination of secondary verbs

Another common variety of serial verb constructions makes use of various combinations of secondary verbs among themselves. Again, these complex serial constructions may combine with prepositional phrase in their turn. Some examples are:

- (67) sǎn sǎi lǎn sàad sōj khǎw maa
 sunray colour yellow pour shine enter come
 "Yellow sunrays came pouring in."
- (68) khùd din òk paj sàk mēet
 dig earth go-out go just meter
 "Dig the earth out just about a meter."

- (69) myy s³oŋ khâaŋ kô lûub lâj paj taam kh³en
 hand two side then rub go follow arm
 "Then (he) rubbed both hands along (his) arms."
- (70) khăw d³oŋ paj khâam than³on
 he walk go across road
 "He walked across the road."
- (71) khăw yip thonchâat ðok càak tûu
 he grasp flag go out depart cupboard
 "He took the flag out of the cupboard."
- (72) khăw ʔaw dins³o ðok maa càak tâaj tó
 he take pencil come-out come depart under table
 "He got the pencil out from under the table."
- (73) l³ew súk nâa loŋ paj naj nám
 then put face descend go in water
 "Then (he) dipped (his) face into the water."

These examples illustrate some of the most frequent and familiar combinations, but certainly do not exhaust the broad range of possibilities.

In their internal sequence these combinations follow the order rules observed above in 3.2.1.1.. That is, some of the secondary verbs always occur as first elements in a complex serial construction, viz. khâw, ðok, khÿn and loŋ, most usually followed by either paj or maa. There are no cross-combinations among these two pairs, such as *khÿn khâw or *loŋ ðok etc. (nor their reversal). However, the secondary verbs càak and thÿn always appear as second elements in a complex construction, in their turn most usually preceded by either paj or maa or a suitable secondary verb of the first group, in combinations such as ðok càak "out from", loŋ càak "down from", maa thÿn "up to, into".

Between these two groups there is a third one which is flexible as to position consisting of the secondary verbs paj, maa, taam and khâam; that is, this group conforms to the order constraints of the other two (cf. above 3.2.1.1.).

Otherwise, the regularities we observed for simple serial constructions are recursive in the more complex ones: a secondary verb admitting of deictic/anaphoric use does so no matter whether it occurs in a simple or a complex serial construction, while a secondary verb requiring a nominal complement equally requires it when following another

secondary verb.

The same rules also hold for combinations with prepositions as exemplified in (72) and (73), (cf. above 3.1. and 3.2.2.1.). In this respect, the narrow constraints as to compatibility between directional verbs and static prepositions observed above provide an obvious reason why several secondary verbs are so frequently strung together within a construction. For apart from the fact that such combinations increase the potential of variation among directional specifications, they also serve to introduce prepositional phrases other than those with which a given secondary verb may cooccur by itself. Thus, while e.g. khâw or loŋ do not combine with e.g. naj "in", paj and maa tolerate this particular cooccurrence. Therefore, when these are introduced additionally, they open up their own combinatory potential in turn. This device need not be resorted to if the preposition required were e.g. bon "on" in combination with e.g. loŋ (cf. above (61)).

In principle then, the more complex serial constructions operate by the same rules as the simpler ones.

In this respect, their different internal orders once more help us to distinguish between more or less verb-like syntactic behaviour of a given secondary verb. For the more complex formations are just repetitive processes of serialization operating on the next lower syntactic level. Therefore, just as a secondary verb in a simple serial construction follows its main verb, so it may in turn govern, or depend on, another secondary verb as borne out by the sequence (cf. above 3.2.1.1.).

3.2.3. Summary

Our observations have made it apparent that the lexical elements used to form serial constructions differ among themselves as to their respective degrees of "verbality" vs. "prepositionality". Just as in the case of nouns and prepositions, we observe an analogous gradience between the categories in terms of a gradual decrease of verbal properties in lexical items which originally figure in the category of full verbs.

As a first step there is the common and defining feature

of all these serial constructions that, once a full verb is adopted as a secondary one, it automatically sheds one of its arguments, viz., the agent which is now necessarily governed by the main verb the secondary verb depends on. At the same time it retains full government of its other argument which is just the reason for forming a serial construction at all. And in this respect a secondary verb controls just the type of construction it may control when used as a main predicate: it cooccurs with an unmarked local complement or with the range of prepositions it may govern as a full verb.

Beyond these common characteristics of any of the local serial constructions, the secondary verbs differ with respect to the criteria observed above, viz.:

- 1) Internal order: secondary vs. tertiary position in a complex serial construction.
- 2) Independent negation of the secondary verb.
- 3) Anaphoric/deictic use of the secondary verb (i.e. without an overt nominal complement).¹⁷

By these criteria, one group of secondary verbs, viz., khâw "enter", đók "go out", khÿn "ascend", loq "descend" emerges as retaining the highest degree of verbal properties: they always take the secondary position in a complex serial construction, never the tertiary one; there are cases of independent negation, and they may occur anaphorically or deictically. With respect to the second criterion, however, we have seen that negatability is considerably reduced, since the negation is not any more freely applicable to just any occurrence of these secondary verbs, but is limited to only certain expressions of an idiomatic tinge. Thus there is a tangible decrease in verb-like syntactic behaviour as compared to full verbs.

Next there is thÿn "reach" which as a secondary verb satisfies the criteria of independent negation and of anaphoric/deictic use, but on the other hand, in a complex formation always takes the tertiary position.

Now, it might be regarded an open question whether, by

the criterion of independent negation, th^vyn ranks higher in verbality than the members of the first group, for, as we noted, it is less restricted and less idiomatized with regard to this important criterion. Though this is of course a strong argument, it seems to me that it is balanced by the positional criterion, since this position may indeed coincide with that of a preposition in a complex serial construction and would thus attest the more prepositional status of th^vyn as compared to the former group.

A further decrease of verbal properties is observed for the pair paj "go"/maa "come". These still may anaphorically imply a local argument, but they are no longer open to independent negation and, as for position, both verbs are determined by the kind of other secondary verb they happen to cooccur with. Or, to put it another way, while they are governed by those secondary verbs which rank higher in verbality, they in turn will govern those which rank lower.

Once more, it may not appear altogether clear how th^vyn on the one hand and the pair paj/maa on the other rank in relation to each other. By the positional criterion, - paj and maa always precede th^vyn - one might regard the latter two as still relatively more verbal. Yet, as they are completely inaccessible to independent negation, this would be a strong counter-argument.

However, as there is no decisive evidence to settle this question one way or the other, it would seem that both th^vyn as well as the pair paj/maa by these different criteria each have reached an intermediary status in comparison to our first group on the one hand and the remaining items on the other.

Of these, the pair taam "follow"/khâam "cross" is flexible in position and may appear, just as the pair paj/maa in either the secondary or the tertiary position. When figuring in the last one, however, they have to be followed by a nominal complement and therefore have to be evaluated as relatively more prepositional than the former pair. There is no possibility of independent negation either.

Finally, as the last item of our verbal inventory, there is càak "depart from", which definitely comes nearest to the prepositional end of our continuum - always taking the tertiary position in a complex construction, rejecting independent negation and requiring an overt nominal complement.

On the other hand, even this last item has not fully acquired prepositional status, for there still remains a choice in which way the obligatory nominal complement is joined to it (and this equally applies to the pair taam/khâam): it may be just the noun itself or, alternatively, within the given lexical limits, a prepositional phrase, as exemplified in (65) and (72) above).

Thus, when these last secondary verbs immediately combine to a noun in phrases such as taam than^von "along the road", càak bân "from home, from the house", the construction cannot be distinguished from any other prepositional phrase. However, as soon as they precede another prepositional phrase in their turn, as in taam lán^vfúu "along/onwards behind the herd" and càak tâaj tó "from under the table" above, a clear difference in substitution paradigm is still manifest.

As the final step in our continuum we come to those truly and exclusively prepositional directional relators which, at least synchronically, do not display any verbal properties at all, i.e. those intrinsically directional prepositions such as têe "from", yaŋ, sùu "to/towards" which, however uncolloquial and stylistically restricted they may be, have to be included in this continuum as devices of the active system.

4. CONCLUSION

In the preceding paragraphs we have illustrated three kinds of structural devices to express local relations: (a) unmarked constructions, (b) prepositional phrases and (c) serial verb constructions. Of these, unmarked constructions may express both static and directional local relations, and thus may neutralize a distinction which is otherwise systematically

maintained in the language in that static local relations are differentiated in terms of prepositional phrases, whereas directional ones are established by means of serial verb constructions.

Both kinds of relators employed, prepositions on the one hand, secondary verbs on the other, contrast in their categorial affiliations to nouns and verbs respectively.

Thus, the distribution of static vs. directional marking evidently has an iconic touch, since the notion 'static' will more naturally be associated with typical nominality, while the notion of directionality more naturally ties in with dynamic properties typically inherent in verbs.

Now, as we have observed, both kinds of local relators differ among themselves as to their respective degrees of 'nominality' vs. 'verbality': on the one hand there is a decrease in nominal independence from full noun to intrinsic preposition to be observed in the paradigm of static local relators. On the other hand there is a gradual decrease in verbal properties in the paradigm of directional local relators which in its turn ends up in maximum prepositionality.

Thus, there is a continuum starting out from the two opposite ends of nouns and verbs respectively correlated to the functional notions of static vs. directional local orientation; both its branches interlock, as it were, in the common intermediary category of prepositions.

NOTES

- ¹ Similar phenomena are sometimes observable, too, in case marking languages: cf. German Karl ißt den ganzen Käse vs. Karl ißt den ganzen Tag for which interrogative substitution will likewise disambiguate the identical case marking as to the different semantic relations involved.
- ² Cf. Hopper/Thompson 1980 who conceive of transitivity not as a plus-minus property, but as a graded phenomenon.
- ³ The term is adopted from Kullavanijaya 1974:73.
- ⁴ On 'possessor deletion' vs. 'possessor obligatory' cf. Seiler 1983:18ff.
- ⁵ Most local relators also occur with temporal meanings. Further, lan may also figure as a classifier which would appear as a decrease in nominality by different criteria than those relevant here. Ultimately then, the interconnection of categories as apparent from multifunctional lexemes would present itself as something like a network of intersecting lines.
- ⁶ Equally, thîi has functional ramifications besides those illustrated here. It may also serve as a relative pronoun, as a classifier and as an ordinal marker. Thus, the functional section considered here would, in a broader description, have to be related to a more general functional designation of this lexeme.
- ⁷ Cf. e.g. Noss 1964, Panupong 1970.
- ⁸ maa as a secondary verb in (19) is used in a temporal sense in reference to the time of the utterance.
- ⁹ The term is adopted from Haas 1964.
- ¹⁰ Cf. e.g. Kullavanijaya 1974:81.
- ¹¹ Cf. Noss 1964:182ff.
- ¹² While Noss claims as postpositions some of the lexical items studied here, he terms those identical items 'completive verbs' in other parts of his grammar (127ff). Nowhere does it become explicit, however, what kind of syntactic differences these alternative categorizations rest on, nor are there any cross-references to acknowledge that they are, after all, identical lexemes. Therefore, as the grammar as a whole provides but very little syntactic material to account for the form-classes it postulates, the reader is left without a clue as to the recognition of a 'completive' vs. a 'postpositional' use, respectively, of a given occurrence of any of these items.
- ¹³ Cf. Grima 1978. As his study shows, redundancy in Thai is much lower than in English, for example. This general characteristic is, e.g. reflected in the capacity of verbs to anaphorically substitute for entire propositions. Where in European languages at least a "dummy" representation of arguments would be required in most cases, in Thai open representation of arguments which are readily identifiable

from the context would be regarded, if not as wrong, at least as unnecessarily laborious.

¹⁴Also cf. Grima 1978:64

¹⁵Noss 1964:127

¹⁶Cf. e.g. Haas 1964, s.v. mâj "not"

¹⁷The criteria considered here only in part coincide with those e.g. Paul 1982 considered valid for analogous constructions in Chinese. She also derives evidence from the occurrence and position of aspect markers. However, due to differences between Thai and Chinese generally, such a criterion is not applicable in Thai.

R E F E R E N C E S

- Grima, J.A. 1978, Categories of Zero Nominal Reference and Clausal Structure in Thai. Ph.D. dissertation, Univ. of Michigan.
- Haas, M.R. 1964, Thai-English Student's Dictionary. Stanford: Stanford University Press.
- Hopper, P. & S.A. Thompson 1980, "Transitivity in Grammar and Discourse". Language 56; 251-299.
- Kullavanijaya, P. 1974, Transitive Verbs in Thai. Ph.D. dissertation, Univ. of Hawaii.
- McFarland, G.B. 1944, Thai-English Dictionary. Palo Alto: Stanford Univ. Press and London: Oxford Univ. Press.
- Noss, R.B. 1964, Thai Reference Grammar. Washington D.C.: Foreign Service Institute, Dept. of State.
- Panupong, V. 1970, Inter-Sentence Relations in Modern Conversational Thai. Bangkok: Siam Society
- Paul, W. 1982, Die Koverben im Chinesischen. Köln: Institut für Sprachwissenschaft der Universität. (Arbeitspapier 40).
- Scovel, T.S. 1970, A Grammar of Time in Thai. Ph.D. dissertation. Univ. of Michigan.
- Seiler, H. 1983, POSSESSION as an Operational Dimension of Language. (=Language Universals Series, 2). Tübingen: Gunter Narr Verlag.

In der Reihe akup erscheinen die Arbeiten des Kölner Universalienprojekts (DFG-Projekt, Leitung Prof. Dr. Hansjakob Seiler). Die Nummern 1-15 sind erschienen als Linguistic Workshop I-III (LW I, LW II, LW III), München: Fink 1973-75.

1. Seiler, H. 1973, "Das Universalienkonzept", LW I, 6-19.
2. Lehmann, C. 1973, "Wortstellung in Fragesätzen", LW I, 20-53.
3. Ibañez, R. 1973, "Programmatische Skizze: Intonation und Frage", LW I, 54-61.
4. Brettschneider, G. 1973, "'Sexus' im Baskischen: Die sprachliche Umsetzung einer kognitiven Kategorie", LW I, 62-72.
5. Stephany, U. 1973, "Zur Rolle der Wiederholung in der sprachlichen Kommunikation zwischen Kind und Erwachsenen", LW I, 73-98.
6. Seiler, H. 1974, "The Principle of Concomitance: Instrumental, Comitative and Collective (With special reference to German)", LW II, 2-55.
7. Seiler, H. 1974, "The Principle of Concomitance in Uto-Aztecan", LW II, 56-68.
8. Lehmann, C. 1974, "Prinzipien für 'Universal 14'", LW II, 69-97.
9. Lehmann, C. 1974, "Isomorphismus im sprachlichen Zeichen", LW II, 98-123.
10. Seiler, H. 1975, "Die Prinzipien der deskriptiven und der etikettierenden Benennung", LW III, 2-57
11. van den Boom, H. 1975, "Zum Verhältnis von Logik und Grammatik am Beispiel des neuinterpretierten λ - Operators", LW III, 58-92.
12. Untermann, J. 1975, "Etymologie und Wortgeschichte", LW III, 93-116.
13. Lehmann, C. 1975, "Strategien für Relativsätze", LW III, 117-156.
14. Ultan, R. 1975, "Infixes and their origins", LW III, 157-205.
15. Stephany, U. 1975, "Linguistic and extralinguistic factors in the interpretation of children's early utterances", LW III, 206-233.

16. Ultan, R. 1975. "Descriptivity grading of Finnish body-part terms".
17. Lehmann, C. 1975. "Determination, Bezugsnomen und Pronomen im Relativsatz".
18. Seiler, H. 1975. "Language Universals and Interlinguistic Variation".
19. Holenstein, E. 1975. "Semiotische Philosophie?".
20. Seiler, H. 1976. "Introductory Notes to a Grammar of Cahuilla" (To appear in Linguistic Studies offered to Joseph Greenberg on the occasion of his 60th birthday).
21. Ultan, R. 1976, "Descriptivity in the Domain of Body-Part Terms".
22. van den Boom, H. 1976. "Bedeutungsexplikation und materiale Implikation".
23. Seiler, H. 1977(a). "The Cologne Project on Language Universals: Questions, Objectives, and Prospects".
Seiler, H. 1977(b). "Determination: A Functional Dimension for Interlanguage Comparison" (final version of Seiler, H. 1976. "Determination ...", published as akup 23, 1976.
(To appear in: Papers from the Gummersbach Conference on Language Universals. The Hague: Mouton).
24. Moshinsky, J, 1976. "Measuring Nominal Descriptivity".
25. Seiler, H. (ed.) 1976. "Materials for the DFG International Research Conference on Language Universals".
26. Walter, H. 1976. "Das Problem der Deskriptivität am Beispiel deutscher Verbalderivation".
27. Seiler, H. 1977. "Two Systems of Cahuilla Kinship Expressions: Labeling and Descriptive" (To appear in the Festschrift for Madison S. Beeler).
28. Holenstein, E. 1977. "Motive der Universalienforschung".
29. Virkkunen, P. 1977. "Zum Ausdruck der notivischen Bestimmtheit im Finnischen. Mit einer Schlußbemerkung zum typologischen Vergleich des Französischen und des Finnischen von Wolfgang Raible".
30. Kölver, U. 1977. "Nominalization and Lexicalization in Modern Newari".
31. van den Boom, H. 1978. "Paradigmenwechsel als Notationswechsel: Saussure - Chomsky".
32. Holenstein, E. 1978. "Von der Hintergebarkeit der Sprache (und der Erlanger Schule)".

33. Ramat, Paolo. 1978. "Y a-t-il une typologie profonde? (quelques considérations théoriques (et pratiques))".
34. Kölver, Ulrike. 1979. "Syntaktische Untersuchung von Numeralklassifikatoren im Zentralthai".
35. Holenstein, Elmar. 1979. "Zur Begrifflichkeit der Universalienforschung in Linguistik und Anthropologie".
36. Lehmann, Christian. 1979. "Der Relativsatz. Typologie seiner Strukturen. Theorie seiner Funktionen. Kompendium seiner Grammatik".
37. Serzisko, Fritz. 1980. "Sprachen mit Zahlklassifikatoren: Analyse und Vergleich".
38. Barron, Roger. 1980. "Das Phänomen klassifikatorischer Verben in nordamerikanischer Indianersprachen: Ein typologischer Versuch".
39. Seiler, H. 1980. "Two Types of Cahuilla Kinship Expressions: Inherent and Establishing".
40. Stachowiak, Franz-Josef. 1981. "Zum funktional-operationalen Ansatz in der sprachlichen Universalienforschung aus psycholinguistischer Sicht".
Lehmann, Christian. 1981. "On some current views of the language universal".
Serzisko, Fritz. 1981. "Gender, noun class and numeral classification: a scale of classificatory techniques".
41. Clasen, Berndt. 1981. "Inhärenz und Etablierung".
42. Seiler, Hansjakob. 1981. "POSSESSION as an Operational Dimension of Language".
43. Seiler, Hansjakob. 1982. "Possessivity, Subject and Objekt."
44. Mosel, Ulrike. 1982. "Possessive Constructions in Tolai".
45. Lehmann, Christian. 1982. "Rektion und syntaktische Relationen".
46. Lehmann, Christian. 1982. "Twenty-four questions on linguistic typology and a collection of answers".
47. Heine, Bernd/ Reh, Mechthild. 1982. "Patterns of grammaticalization in African languages".
48. Lehmann, Christian. 1982. "Thoughts on Grammaticalization. A programmatic sketch. Vol. I".
49. Kölver, Ulrike. 1983. "Indonesische Verbalpräfixe. Ein Beitrag zur Dimension INHÄRENZ und ETABLIERUNG".
50. Mosel, Ulrike. 1983. "Adnominal and Predicative Possessive Constructions in Melanesian languages".
51. Ostrowski, Manfred. 1983. "Zur Nomen:Verb-Relationierung im Wogulischen, Jurakischen und Jukagirischen".

52. van den Boom, Holger. 1983. "Zum Verhältnis von Logik und Linguistik im Bezug auf UNITYP-Grundsätze".
53. UNITYP-Forschergruppe. 1983. "Beiträge zum Problembereich Skalen und Kontinua".
54. Heger, Klaus. 1983. "Akkusativische, ergativische und aktivische Bezeichnung von Aktantenfunktionen".
55. Ostrowski, Manfred. 1984. "Zur Lokalisation im Wogulischen, Jurakischen und Jukagirischen".