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1. Introduction

Although there are a large number of studies concerning the resultative constructions, most of them are focused primarily on English and other European languages (Boas 2003, Napoli 1992, Rothstein 2004, to name just a few). Various articles also cover comparison of English with East Asian languages such as Japanese and Korean (Kageyama 1996, Wechsler and Noh 2001, among others) for the purpose of inquiring the universal nature of the resultative constructions. In contrast, studies of the resultatives in Southeast Asian languages including Thai, the target language of the present study, are, as far as I know, quite limited.

Thepkanjana & Uehara (henceforth referred to as T & U) (2002, to appear) and Iwasaki & Ingkaphirom (2005) observe that Thai employs the serial verb construction (hereafter, SVC) to represent what corresponds to the resultative construction in English and other languages. Close scrutiny, however, is needed to explicate a finer distinction among Thai V-NP-RP (resultative predicate) strings such as shown below.

(1) a. narong yiŋ sūa taay
   Narong shoot tiger die/dead
   ‘Narong shot the tiger dead.’
In this paper, I will investigate the Thai sentences which are equivalent to English resultatives with a view to identifying the range of resultative constructions in Thai. Specifically, I will classify the V-NP-RP strings into three types according to syntactic properties and clarify the semantic differences between them.

2. English Resultatives and Corresponding Thai Constructions

The resultative constructions are simplex sentences that represent an event consisting of two subevents: a causing subevent denoted by the verb phrase and a result subevent denoted by the secondary predicate, the RP (Kageyama to appear). Although many types of sentences are subsumed under the general category of resultative constructions in the literature, the sentences that I deal with as the resultative constructions are limited to those in which the RP describes the state-change of the object that is affected by the action denoted by the verb(1). English resultatives are illustrated as follows:

(2) a. Stephanie painted the wall red.
    b. Minna stabbed the criminal dead.

b. narõ phlàk pratuu pàet
   Narong push door open
   ‘Narong pushed the door open.’

c. narõ sàk phâa saʔàat
   Narong wash clothes clean
   ‘Narong washed the clothes clean.’

d. narõ tii loohà bεn
   Narong pound metal flat
   ‘Narong pounded the metal flat.’
c. Heidi shook her husband awake.

(3) a. Carlos broke the chocolate into pieces.
   b. Matt shot the man to death.
   c. David knocked John into unconsciousness.

The resultative predicates in English may be either adjectival phrases as in (2) or prepositional phrases as in (3).

As Kageyama (to appear) points out, the form of resultatives varies from language to language. The sentences in (4) and (5) are typical Thai counterparts of the English resultatives in (2) and (3), respectively.

(4) a. Stephanie thaasli fāa-phanâŋ pen sli-dēŋ
   ‘Stephanie painted the wall red.’
   b. Minna thēŋ phûu-ráay taay
   ‘Minna stabbed the criminal dead.’
   c. Heidi kha yàw saamii kh cc thē hây tûwn
   ‘Heidi shook her husband awake.’

(5) a. Carlos bi chôkkool êt pen chín-chín
   ‘Carlos broke the chocolate into pieces.’
   b. Matt yiŋ phûu-chaay con taay
   ‘Matt shot the man to death.’
   c. David chók John con salôp
   ‘David knocked John into unconsciousness.’

The Thai expressions which correspond to the English resultatives are
divided into four types. I will refer to them as the pen type as in (4 a) and (5 a), the SVC type as in (4 b), the hây type as in (4 c), and the con type as in (5 b, c).

First, the pen type in (4 a) and (5 a) is characterized by the copula pen, placed in front of RPs, which describes the superficial qualities of the object entities such as color and size. The English sentences in (2 a) and (3 a), equivalent to (4 a) and (5 a), are identified as “inherent resultatives” (Kageyama 1996), where the main verb entails the resultant state denoted by the RP. In other words, the result state is specified in the LCS (lexical conceptual structure) of the main verb (Kageyama 1996, to appear).

Secondly, the SVC type in (4 b), which is identified by T & U (to appear) as the Thai resultative construction, is formed with two serial verbs of which the first denotes the causing subevent and the second represents the caused subevent. The third type, the hây type in (4 c), involves the preposition hây, glossed as ‘cause’, which designates intentional causation of the caused subevent. Lastly, the con type in (5 b, c), characteristically marked by the preposition con ‘until’, indicates that the action denoted by the verb is iterated until the result state denoted by the con phrase is obtained. If the result state is brought about by a single action instead of an iterated action, the preposition con does not show up as in (6 a, b).

(6) a. Matt yiŋ phûu-chaay taay
    Matt shoot man die/dead
    ‘Matt shot the man dead.’

b. David chók John salòp
    David hit John unconscious
    ‘David knocked John unconscious.’

Although each type of RP has a distinct characteristic, the Thai sentences in (4)–(6) are all simplex sentences denoting an event with cause-effect
relation. All of these types of Thai expression can thus be deemed resultative constructions.

Among the various types of Thai resultative, the semantic characteristics of the pen type and the con type are fairly straightforward. On the other hand, the SVC type and the hây type seem very similar in their semantics, since both of them merely express two sequential events with a cause-effect relation. In the next section I will examine the difference between these two types as well as the resultative SVC shown by T & U (to appear).

3. Thai Resultative Construction

As mentioned earlier, T & U (2002, to appear) as well as Iwasaki & Ingkaphirom 2005) argue that Thai utilizes serial verb constructions to represent the meaning of English resultative constructions. The SVC frequently appears in isolating languages like Thai in which “no verbal morphology distinguishes finite and nonfinite verb forms” (Iwasaki & Ingkaphirom 2005: 231). T & U (to appear) further point out that the SVC is typically used to describe events which occur sequentially without a discernible interval. In this section, I will suggest that Thai resultative SVCs should be divided into two types, “resultative SVCs” and “sequential SVCs,” based on a semantic definition of the resultative constructions. Then, I will subcategorize the V-NP-RP strings into four types.

3. 1. Thepkanjana & Uehara’s Analysis of Thai Resultatives

In their analysis of Thai resultatives, T & U (to appear) divide main verbs of Thai resultatives into two types, “implied-result verbs” and “entailed-result verbs” as shown in (7) and (8), respectively.
(7) a. somchaay sák sûa saʔàat
    Somchaay wash shirt clean
    ‘Somchaay washed his shirt clean.’

    b. somchaay rîit sûa rîap
    Somchaay iron shirt smooth
    ‘Somchaay ironed his shirt smooth.’

(8) a. tamrùat khâa phûuraay taay
    police kill criminal die, dead
    ‘The police killed the criminal (and he/she was dead).’

    b. somchaay chiik phâa khàat
    Somchaay tear cloth torn
    ‘Somchaay tore the cloth (and it was torn).’

T & U argue that the actions denoted by implied-result verbs (e.g. chêt ‘wipe,’ thûu ‘wipe forcefully,’ láaʔ ‘wash, rinse,’ khwàat ‘sweep,’ and sák ‘wash (clothes)’) do not necessarily attain the expected result states implied by the second verbs, whereas the actions denoted by entailed-result verbs (e.g. khâa ‘kill,’ chiik ‘tear,’ hàk ‘break,’ tàt ‘cut,’ pôok ‘peel,’ and thamlaay ‘destroy’) must necessarily induce the attainment of result states. They also note that the implied-result verbs describe an atelic activity whereas the entailed-result verbs express a telic accomplishment.

According to T & U, the above classification is motivated by a difference in the acceptability of result cancellation, as shown in the following examples from T & U:

(9) somchaay sák sûa tàeæ sûa mây saʔàat(2)
    Somchaay wash shirt but shirt not clean
    ‘Somchaay washed the shirt but it did not come out clean.’

(10)*somchaay khâa malææ tàeæ malææ mây taay
    Somchaay kill bug but bug not die/dead
‘Somchaay killed some bugs but they did not die.’

Besides the two types of Thai resultatives, T & U introduce four types of RP: “confirmed-implicature RPs” as in (7), “cancelled-implicature RPs” as in (11a), “anti-implicature RPs” as in (11b), and “other-event RPs” as in (11c).

(11) a. somchaay sák sùa mây sa?àat
    Somchaay wash shirt not clean
    ‘Somchaay washed his shirt but it did not come out clean.’

b. somchaay sák sùa sòkkapròk
    Somchaay wash shirt dirty
    ‘Somchaay washed his shirt but it came out dirty.’

c. yàa sák sùa khàat ná
    do not wash shirt torn final particle
    ‘Do not wash the shirt in such way that it gets torn in the process.’

T & U note that sentences with cancelled-implicature RPs like (11a) are ambiguous between an interpretation in which the result state expected from the main verb is not successfully attained and another interpretation in which the action has brought about an unexpected result mây sa?àat ‘not clean’ or ‘dirty’. My four informants, however, accept (11a) only in the former interpretation.

Even though sentence (11a) is totally acceptable in the former interpretation, what I want to claim here is that it should not count as a resultative construction. The state mây sa?àat is not an RP because the shirt was not clean in the first place and hence (11a) cannot be paraphrased as “The shirt came to be in a ‘not-clean’ state as a result of Somchaay’s washing it.” I will refer to SVCs like (11a) as “sequential SVCs.” If we exclude sequential SVCs from the category of resultative
constructions, the SVCs that T & U identify as Thai resultatives can now be divided into two classes, “true” SVCs and “quasi” SVCs, which I will discuss later.

Now let us move on to the two types in (11 b) and (11 c). Although T & U show dirty in (11 b) as an anti-implicature RP, none of my informants accepts it as an RP and instead they interpret sûa sôkkapròk as an NP with an attributive adjective meaning ‘dirty clothes.’ A similar example is shown below.

(12)#naroŋ khàat cężkan sôkkapròk

Narong polish vase dirty

‘Narong polished the dirty vase.’

Still, (12) could be accepted as a resultative construction in a very particular context, for example in a situation in which someone witnessed Narong made the vase dirty because he polished it with a sooty cloth, and shouted naroŋ khàat cężkan sôkkapròk ‘Narong polished the vase dirty!’ to another person.

Lastly, I’d like to argue that sentence (11 c) is not really a resultative SVC but a sequential SVC. In this case, the action expressed by sák ‘wash’ does not seem to directly cause the result state signified by khàat ‘torn’. Suppose Somchaay hand-washed fragile satin clothes too hard and inadvertently tore it. This accident actually occurred during the washing event, but not as a result of the washing event itself. The tearing event was brought about because of the coincident event like the pulling of the sleeves too hard. Thus, the washing event and the tearing event in somchaay sák sûa khàat ‘Somchaay washed the shirt torn’ are not associated with a cause-effect relation, even though these two events occur without a noticeable interval.

To summarize, I have shown that the various types of SVCs that T &
U (to appear) give as Thai resultative constructions cover certain constructions which do not qualify as resultatives. This is caused by the fact that T & U’s definition of resultative construction is too broad. I propose that the resultative construction should be limited to simplex sentences which describe the causing and caused subevents which are lined by a cause-effect relation. Following this definition, the SVCs discussed by T & U should now be divided into two types: sequential SVCs, which simply denote two sequential events, and resultative SVCs, which are true resultative constructions. Sequential SVCs are not regarded as resultatives.

3. 2. Classification of Thai Resultatives

One of the controversial issues in Thai linguistics is whether the language encompasses the lexical category “adjective.” By observing that adjectives syntactically behave almost the same as verbs in Thai, where verbs and adjectives have no specific inflections, Prasithrathsint (2000) claims that the category “adjective” is unnecessary for this language. However, I maintain that the category “adjective” is required in Thai, as other researchers treat Thai words such as dīi ‘good’ and sūai ‘beautiful’ as “adjectives” based on the functional and semantic standards (Iwasaki & Ingkaphirom 2005, Sookgasem 1996, Tanaka 2004).

We can draw a line between verbs and adjectives in superficially identical types of V-NP-RP strings. Because ellipsis frequently occurs in Thai, the sentences in (13) look ostensively the same. Nevertheless, a distinction will emerge with further scrutiny.

(13) a. naroŋ yiŋ sūa taay
   Narong shoot tiger die/dead
   ‘Narong shot the tiger dead. (The tiger actually died.)’
First of all, (13 a) is clearly differentiated from (13 b–d) when they are compared to the sentences in (14) with the preposition ʰʰᵃʸ.

(14) a. nar{o}_ yiʔ sūa ʰʰᵃʸ taay
   Narong shoot tiger CAUSE die/dead
   ‘Narong shot the tiger to make it dead (but the tiger may not be dead).’

b. nar{o}_ phlāk pratuu ʰʰᵃʸ pə̂t
   Narong push door CAUSE open
   ‘Narong pushed the door open.’

c. nar{o}_ sák phāa ʰʱ ay saʔàaat
   Narong wash clothes CAUSE clean
   ‘Narong washed the clothes clean.’

d. nar{o}_ tii loohà ʰʰʰ ʰʰʰ
   Narong pound metal CAUSE flat
   ‘Narong pounded the metal flat.’

The sentences in (13 b–d) without ʰʰᵃʸ designate the same meanings as those in (14 b–d) with ʰʰᵃʸ, respectively, while the interpretations of (13 a) and (14 a) are markedly different in terms of the attainment of the result state, as their English translations indicate. This observation suggests
that the sentences in (13 b−d) are not “true” SVCs but are NP1-V-NP2-Adjective strings in which the preposition ʰây is omitted from (14 b−d). In fact, regarding (13 b) and (13 d), some of my informants accept pratuu ʰæt and loohà ʰɛn only as NPs with postmodifier adjectives, interpreting them as meaning pratuu thîi ʰæt ‘the open door’ and loohà thîi ʰɛn ‘the flat metal,’ respectively. I will refer to these “quasi” SVCs like (13 b−d) as verb-adjective constructions (VACs).

What brings about the difference between (13 a) and (13 b−d)? This issue is also associated with the lexical category of the RPs in (13). Taay ‘die/dead’ in (13 a) is a verb, whereas ʰæt ‘open’ in (13 b), saʔàat ‘clean’ in (13 c), and ʰɛn ‘flat’ in (13 d) are regarded as adjectives. The difference between these two types could be related to the controllability of the caused subevent. The adjectival RPs indicate that the occurrence of the state-change depends completely on external force. On the other hand, the state-change described by the SVC suggests that the change is also associated with the internal factor of the object entity. That is, the agent of the action cannot entirely control the occurrence of the change. Consider the following resultative SVC:

(15) narọŋ tɛ sânifiant ʰɛn
Narong kick Santi unconscious
‘Narong kicked Santi unconscious.’

Although the change of Santi’s becoming unconscious in (15) is instigated by the kicking action, the change is somehow autonomic. To describe such an autonomic or internal change, Thai uses verbs to confirm that the change is brought about successfully. Because of this characteristic, the phrase ʰây taay in (14 a) barely signifies the aim of the action, which may not be attained, and thus it is not an RP.

Let us turn to the distinction between the VACs in (13 b−d). There is
a difference in acceptability among these sentences. The most acceptable one is sák phàa sa?àat ‘wash the clothes clean’ in (13 c) and the least acceptable one is tii loohà bëën ‘pound the metal flat’ in (13 d), though it is still construable as a resultative. Although (13 c) is considered as the most acceptable sentence in (13 b–d) and there seems to be no ambiguity as to the interpretation of phàa sa?àat as phàa thìi sa?àat ‘the clean clothes,’ yet one of the informants interpreted sa?àat as the manner adverb, yàa yàa sa?àat ‘cleanly’(3). The most acceptable sentence as resultative is thus phlàk pratuu pëët ‘push the door open.’ Both (13 b) and (13 c), however, are fairly acceptable compared with tii loohà bëën ‘pound the metal flat,’ because the result state is easily induced by the action in which the listener can easily infer the result state. The preposition hây is required more strictly as the cause-effect relation becomes less inferable.

(16) çâw-chaay çùup thèè tììwìì
   prince   kiss her awake

‘The prince kissed her awake.’

Kageyama (to appear) notes that a pragmatic implicature of the action denoted by the main verb may serve as a potential factor in determining the acceptability of resultatives in English. Because of this, the frequency of omitting hây is higher with sentences like (13 b) and (13 c) than with sentences like (13 d) and (16).

The difference between the type phlàk pratuu pëët ‘push the door open’ and the type sák phàa sa?àat ‘wash the clothes clean’ is whether the RP is a verb-derived adjective. Pëët ‘open’ is a verb-derived adjective whereas sa?àat ‘clean’ is not. In an analysis of Thai transitive verbs, Thepkanjana (1997 : 267–268) argues that transitive causative verbs like pëët ‘open’ and pìt ‘close’ show a causative/inchoative/stative alternation, where pratuu pëët encompasses two meanings: ‘The gate opened’ and
The gate is opened.’ According to this analysis, pät and pit function both as intransitive verbs and as adjectives. This suggests that phlàk pratuu pät ‘push the door open’ can be either an SVC or a VAC with hày omitted.

Thai V-NP-RP sequences like (13), which superficially appear to fall into the same group, can be classified into four types: “Resultative SVC” (e.g. yi gà taay ‘shoot dead’), “VAC frequently without hày” (e.g. sák sa?àat ‘wash clean’), “VAC possibly without hày” (e.g. tii (hày) bëe ‘pound flat’), and “VAC necessarily with hày” (e.g. cùup hày tūwūn ‘kiss awake’). In the next section, I will focus on the causing event denoted by the main verb and investigate the semantic relation between Vs and RPs in detail.

4. The Class of Resultatives and Lexical Information

Following the definition of the resultative construction in section 1, four types (and three subtypes) of Thai resultative constructions were demonstrated, as summarized in the table in (17).

(17) Classification of Thai Resultative Predicates

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RP type</th>
<th>subtype</th>
<th>example</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>pen NP</td>
<td></td>
<td>thaasii pen sī –dëe ‘paint red’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V 2</td>
<td></td>
<td>yi gà taay ‘shoot dead’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>frequently without hày</td>
<td>sák sa?àat ‘wash clean’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>possibly without hày</td>
<td>tii (hày) bëe ‘pound flat’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>necessarily with hày</td>
<td>cùup hày tūwūn ‘kiss awake’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>con V/A</td>
<td></td>
<td>yi gà con taay ‘shoot to death’</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Resultatives with con + V/A RPs, as in (5 b, c), are equivalent to English resultatives with to/ into prepositional RPs. The pen + NP-type, as
in (4a) and (5a), on the other hand, describes the result state which is entailed by the main verb.

Kageyama (to appear) elaborates on his 1996 classification of inherent resultatives (where the result state is entailed in the LCS of the main verb) and derived resultatives (where the result state is not entailed in the LCS of the main verb) by dividing the group of derived resultatives into two subgroups and thus ending up with three major types of resultative predicate: (i) RPs based on “entailments,” (ii) RPs based on “implications,” and (iii) RPs based on “implicatures.” Each type contains two subtypes: The “entailment” type includes (A) freeze solid-type (the state-change is entailed in the LCS of the main verb, and the event type of the main verb is transition), and (B) wash clean-type (the state-change is entailed in the LCS of the main verb, and the event type of the main verb is process); the “implication” type includes (C) wipe clean-type (the LCS of the main verb is ACT (on) though, it implies a specific result state of the object entity), and (D) shake awake-type (the main verb designates an unspecific result state, and so employing the RP is available if the result state is conventional); the “implicature” type includes (E) kiss awake-type (the main verb does not involves the result state and the RP is pragmatically available under certain intentional situation), and (F) water the tulips flat-type (this type describes an accidental result induced by the action denoted by the main verb, and thus the sentence is less acceptable)(4).

In light of Kageyama’s (to appear) typology of resultative predicates, the resultatives in Thai appear to be limited within Types A to E. The pen-type resultative falls into Type A. The VAC frequently without háy-type resultative corresponds Type B. Thai “cleaning verbs” such as sák ‘wash (cloths)’, laaŋ ‘wash (dishes)’ khwàat ‘sweep’, chét ‘wipe’ probably
designate the result state sa?àat in their LCS. Because of this, resultatives containing such cleaning verbs are mostly allowed without the preposition häy. The resultative SVCs (and the corresponding con-type resultatives) will belong to Type C. Since the specific result state is not associated with the LCS of yi? ‘shoot,’ both taay ‘die’ and cèp-bàat ‘wound’ are acceptable as RP. The RCs of VAC possibly without häy-type fall into Type D. Because the LCS of main verbs of this type contains only unspecific result state, some speakers do not accept the sentence when häy is omitted. Lastly, Type E will match RCs of the VAC necessarily with häy-type. The acceptability of the sentence without häy of this type is exceedingly low, since the state-change in this type occurs only under very specific circumstances.

In addition, Type F cannot be expressed with resultative constructions in Thai. Instead, the “tham-häy causative,” which shows an “indirect causation” (Iwasaki & Ingkaphirom 2005: 330), is employed to describe events which would be represented by Type F resultatives in English.

(18) a.* sunák hàw thaarók (hây) tūwn
    dog bark baby CAUSE awake
    ‘The dog barked the baby awake.’
    (intentional reading)

    b. sunák hàw tham-hây thaarók häy tūwn
    dog bark make(CAUSE) baby CAUSE awake
    ‘The dog barked and made the baby awake.’

Under the definition of the resultative constructions assumed in this paper, it follows that Thai is more limited than English in terms of producing resultatives (Kageyama to appear), contrary to T & U’s (to appear) opposite claim that Thai allows a wider range of resultative
constructions than English.

5. Conclusion

In this paper, I have clarified the definition of the resultative construction. I have suggested that Thai resultative constructions include the configurations of V-NP-\text{pen}-NP, V-NP-(hây)-A, V-NP-con-V/A in addition to the serial verb construction. T & U (to appear) claim that Thai resultatives under their broad definition are less restricted than English resultatives to produce a wider range of sentences. I have discussed the opposite view, based on the definition of resultative construction that the resultative constructions express events involving cause-effect relation. I have also pointed out that not all V-NP-V/A strings, which were claimed to be serial verb constructions, are not really serial verb construction. I have proposed that Thai resultatives involve four syntactically characterized types, pen type, con type, SVC type, and VAC type, the last of which are in turn subcategorized into three subtypes. It is revealed that the syntactic difference of Thai resultative is related with the semantic relation between the main verb and the resultative predicate.

Notes

1. Resultative constructions of location-change like John walked the dog to the store (Rothstein 2004: 84) are not discussed here.
2. The IPA “æ” which is used in T & U’s examples indicates the same vowel as “ә” used here.
   (i) Yoko-wa huku-o kirei-ni aratta
       Yoko-top clothes-acc (to become)clean/clean-ly} washed
‘Yoko washed the clothes {clean/completely}.’

Kageyama (to appear) argues that some researchers recognize that kirei-ni has resultative-reading, although Kageyama (1996) reports that it is used as a manner adverb in sentences like (i).

(4) One more type, (G) “cry one’s eyes out-type,” is introduced in Kageyama (to appear). This type contains “idioms” in which the combination of verb, object, and RP is very limited.
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