Global locomotory body motion (GLBM) is defined as an animate being’s locomotion by means of body parts that results in the change of its location as a whole. Verbs for GLBM (e.g. walk, run, crawl, swim, etc.) are so basic as to be found in every natural language. The main purpose of this paper is to investigate semantic properties of GLBM verbs in Thai. It is found that Thai GLBM verbs show at least three levels of specificity in depicting the respective GLBMs: general level, rather specific level, and specific level. In addition, the paper demonstrates that incorporate meanings of the verbs give rise to their syntactic constraints in collocating with directional verbs.
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1. INTRODUCTION

In her study on serial verb constructions in Thai, an isolating language, Chuwicha (1993) states that when a verb for “primary action” and a verb for “non-primary action” co-occur in the string, the former occurs in the first position and the latter occurs in the second position. Primary action and non-primary action are defined as action in which we can perceive clearly which body parts are used in carrying out the action and as action in which we cannot perceived clearly so, respectively. A sentence composed of a primary action verb and a non-primary action verb represents a single but semantically complex event (e.g. วิ่งลีก ‘run and avoid someone or something at the same time’). Such a cognitive and psychological distinction between primary and non-primary actions is crucial in examining the interface between meanings and syntactic behaviors of Thai verbs. I assume further that primary action verbs can be classified into subclasses according to the degree of specificity in representing the action events.
This paper deals with verbs for global locomotory body motion (e.g. walk, run, crawl, swim, etc.) in Thai. By the term “global locomotory body motion” (henceforth, GLBM), I mean an animate being’s locomotion by means of body parts that results in the change of its location as a whole. A GLBM verb can be labeled either as a manner-of-motion verb and/or a primary action verb. Like other manner-of-motion verbs (e.g. rush, march, drive, row, roll, swing, twist, drift, soar, etc.), GLBM verbs express a motion in a manner. In addition, GLBM verbs, as well as other primary action verbs (e.g. sit, kick, throw, scratch, clap, nod, cry, sip, look, smell, wink, etc.), specifically indicate body parts. In this paper, semantic properties of Thai GLBM verbs are mainly investigated. Their syntactic constraints in collocating with directional verbs are also examined in a tentative fashion.

2. DATA

All of GLBM verbs have the following two semantic characteristics in common. First, they represent a locomotion event. By the term “locomotion,” I mean motion that involves a horizontal or vertical change of location. What is more, they explicitly specify as to what body parts to be used for the locomotion. Accordingly, neither motion verbs which do not indicate particular body parts (e.g. ฯวด‘move,’ ฯะา‘lunge,’ ฯี ‘parade,’ ฯิ ‘chase,’ etc.) nor primary action verbs (or agentive motion verbs) which do not necessarily indicate locomotion (e.g. ฯอม‘topple,’ ฯี ‘stand,’ ฯผล ‘lean to one side,’ etc.) are our present concern. As far as the data I have collected are concerned, there are thirty GLBM verbs (including four pairs of synonyms) in Thai. All items of Thai GLBM verbs that I have found in my data are listed below:


2. SEMANTIC COMPONENTS EMPLOYED IN ANALYZING THAI GLBM VERBS

It has been found that the semantic incorporation of Thai GLBM verbs can be analyzed by employing the following five semantic components: (1) INSTRUMENTALITY, (2) VELOCITY, (3) DIRECTIONALITY, (4) MEDIUM, and (5) MANNER. Besides the above five semantic components, Thai GLBM verbs have other semantic components, i.e., (6) TRAVEL or the fact of motion and (7) ACT or cause of motion, in common. However, the aim of this study is to investigate the internal system of Thai GLBM verbs. Therefore, we will examine semantic incorporation of Thai GLBM verbs by focusing exclusively on the five
components whose specific features function as distinctive features among Thai GLBM verbs. All of these components are employed in Miller and Johnson-Laird’s (1976) analysis of verbs for motion in English. But my usage of these terms in this study is not the same as theirs.

Miller and Johnson-Laird (1976: 526-558) investigate English motion verbs from a psychological, especially perceptual, point of view. They comment that intransitive ‘travel’ expresses the simplest type of change of location, and they exemplify several patterns of semantic incorporation, i.e. the relation between the complex concept and its components, of English verbs of traveling. ‘Hurry,’ for example, incorporates the fact of the simple motion (TRAVEL) and its manner (RAPIDITY). They, thus, regard rapidity or velocity as a subset of the MANNER category, whereas I regard it as an independent category. This modification is on the grounds that conceptualized values of VELOCITY are significant to differentiate among Thai GLBM verbs.

Miller and Johnson-Laird (1976: 547-552) examine English intransitive agentive motion verbs (e.g. walk, run, crawl, swim, etc.), which mean that an agent (animate being) uses an instrument (his body parts) to allow him to travel along a path (from a starting point via intermediate locations to an end point) through the air or on land or water. They have concluded that this type of verbs incorporate the following four semantic components: TRAVEL (the motion per se), ACT (the agent’s intention to make himself move), PATH (the whole path along which the motion is carried out), and INSTRUMENTALITY (the agent’s body). Miller and Johnson-Laird (1976: 550-551) define ‘walk, run, crawl, climb and swim’ as verbs for “main global locomotory motion,” and furthermore take ‘walk and run’ and their hyponyms (e.g. march, lumber, saunter, mince, stagger, sprint, etc.) as well as further specialized types (e.g. dance, skate, skip, hop, etc.) for subsets of the major category of verbs for “traveling by foot on land.” They suggest that since we have no trouble to understand walking on air or water, the conventional restriction to “land” could be considered part of our general knowledge rather than our linguistic knowledge. I think that the semantic feature “on land” is a “default value” of MEDIUM in the case of locomotion of animate things living on land, especially human beings, and such a default value is marked only when contrasted with other possible specific values.

Miller and Johnson-Laird’s MEDIUM category consists of the following three subsets: moving on land or air or water. But I categorize its subsets in another way: moving through a gas or liquid or solid thing. This rearrangement is based on the fact that Thai has a unique GLBM verb that is distinguished from other GLBM verbs because of having a specific value of MEDIUM, i.e., moving through a solid thing. Moreover, I think that the distinction between the features “on land” and “in air” is redundant, because of the fundamental distinction between the features “legs or limbs” and “wings” of INSTRUMENTALITY. That is, when using “wings” as instrument of locomotion, the medium in which the locomotion takes place must be “air.”

In my opinion, the features of PATH should be restricted to concepts concerning “path orientation” or “relative direction” which may be formed with a starting point and an endpoint (e.g. towards an endpoint) or which may arise from interaction with a certain object (e.g. cross an object). It appears that Thai GLBM verbs do not entail the PATH component at all. Directional features as determined by the gravity or a global orientation or “absolute directions” (e.g. up, north, downhill) or determined by an intrinsic orientation of the moving body or “intrinsic directions” (e.g. back, left side) should be considered DIRECTIONALITY, independently from PATH. In addition, path configuration or “path gestalt” (e.g. meander path, path with some obstacle, rather short path, path on something) should be considered
features of MANNER, but not of PATH. In short, in my analysis of Thai GLBM verbs, I have found that the general, rather inclusive PATH category is divided into the three distinct categories: (1) DIRECTIONALITY, (2) PATH and (3) MANNER. The features of DIRECTIONALITY are characterized either by “absoluteness” if related to gravity or a global orientation (e.g. up/down, north/south/east/west) or by “intrinsicness” if related to an intrinsic orientation of the moving body (e.g. front/back, left/right). The features of PATH (e.g. towards an endpoint, thither/hither, around something, through something) are characterized by “relativeness,” while the features of MANNER (e.g. path configuration) are characterized by “uniqueness.” Apart from path configuration, the MANNER component of Thai GLBM verbs encompasses such miscellaneous things as agent’s intention or attitude, agent’s posture, body parts used in a supplementary fashion to characterize the movement, and so on. They are all characterized by uniqueness and we cannot differentiate among Thai GLBM verbs accurately unless we take such uniqueness into consideration.

There is evidence in favor of my hypothesis that the general concept “path of motion” might be composed of the three different semantic components, namely, (1) DIRECTIONALITY (“absolute directions” such as ‘downward’ and “intrinsic directions” such as ‘forward’), (2) PATH (“path orientation” or “relative directions” such as ‘towards a goal’), and (3) MANNER (“path gestalt” such as ‘meander path’). These three semantic components are cognitively and psychologically distinguishable, as follows. The features of DIRECTIONALITY, inherent directions, can have a “positive default value.” Inherent directions, I assume, should have a “contrary” relationship (rather than a “contradictory” relationship) with one another in the system. Therefore, we can choose one of the directions as a default value. The features of MANNER, on the other hand, cannot have a “positive default value,” because each of them is unique and incomparable with any other features in the component. That is, they have a “contradictory” relationship. We cannot choose such a unique and incomparable feature as a default value. But, instead, we may think of a “negative default value” or “contradictory value” of them (i.e. ‘unmarked’). By contrast, features of PATH cannot have any default values, since the relationship among them is neither “contrary” nor “contradictory.” They are arbitrarily chosen in each context. Their relationship is, therefore, highly “relative.” It is impossible to determine a default value among such “relative” features. This very “relativeness” (or “context-dependency”) in forming “path orientation” seems to prevent its specific features from being incorporated in GLBM verbs. In comparison, natures of “absolute” and “intrinsic” directions are inherent in GLBMs (or “context-free”), so that they could be incorporated in GLBM verbs.

To summarize, Miller and Johnson-Laird’s MANNER, PATH and MEDIUM categories must be re-examined for the purpose of describing semantic incorporation of Thai GLBM verbs as follows. First, their MANNER is divided into VELOCITY and MANNER; secondly, their PATH is divided into DIRECTIONALITY, MANNER and PATH (though Thai GLBM verbs do not incorporate PATH); and thirdly, their MEDIUM is viewed in a fresh perspective (gaseous or liquid or solid matter). Hence the following novel categories of semantic components for the analysis of Thai GLBM verbs: (1) INSTRUMENTALITY: body parts used for locomotion, which may specify the agent type as well (e.g. wings of bird); (2) VELOCITY: rapidity of locomotion; (3) DIRECTIONALITY: direction of locomotion, including “absolute” and “intrinsic” directions; (4) MEDIUM: a gaseous or liquid or solid thing in which locomotion takes place; (5) MANNER: various kinds of manner with respect to locomotion, including “mental” and “physical” manner. Each semantic component above has a default value as follows: (1) INSTRUMENTALITY: legs (or ‘wings’ in case of locomotion through the air; ‘fins and a tail’ in case of locomotion in the water); (2) VELOCITY: a conceptualized speed for each type of GLBM, or a speed that we regard as
natural and normal; (3) DIRECTIONALITY: forward; (4) MEDIUM: gaseous matter; (5) MANNER: unmarked manner.

2. SEMANTIC PROPERTIES OF THAI GLBM VERBS

Tables below show specific or marked values of semantic components that Thai GLBM verbs incorporate.

**Table 1: Semantic incorporation of WALK/RUN group**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>VELOCITY</th>
<th>DIRECTIONALITY</th>
<th>MANNER</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>dean</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kāaw</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>khayèek</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>yomething</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ram</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>luy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>yàanjàn</td>
<td>slow</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>wīn</td>
<td>fast</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 2: Semantic incorporation of JUMP group**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DIRECTIONALITY</th>
<th>MANNER</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>kradōot / dōot</td>
<td>up</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>up &amp; forward</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kracoon / coon</td>
<td>up &amp; forward</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 3: Semantic incorporation of MOVE LITTLE BY LITTLE group**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>INSTRUMENTALITY</th>
<th>DIRECTIONALITY</th>
<th>MANNER</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>khyàeap</td>
<td>hip (arm)</td>
<td>little by little</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>krathàeap</td>
<td>hip (arm)</td>
<td>in a sitting posture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>thàt</td>
<td>hip (arm)</td>
<td>in a sitting posture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>krathòt / thòt</td>
<td>hip (arm)</td>
<td>in a sitting posture</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 4: Semantic incorporation of CRAWL/CLIMB group**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>INSTRUMENTALITY</th>
<th>VELOCITY</th>
<th>DIRECTIONALITY</th>
<th>MANNER</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>khlaan</td>
<td>leg &amp; arm</td>
<td>slow</td>
<td>little by little</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>khuùup</td>
<td>limbless body</td>
<td>fast</td>
<td>meander-path</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lúay</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>path-on-something</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tày</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>piìn</td>
<td>arm &amp; leg</td>
<td>slow</td>
<td>up / down</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>takaay</td>
<td>arm &amp; leg</td>
<td>fast</td>
<td>up / down &amp; forward</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 5: Semantic incorporation of FLY group

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>INSTRUMENTALITY</th>
<th>VELOCITY</th>
<th>DIRECTIONALITY</th>
<th>MANNER</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>bin</td>
<td>wing</td>
<td>slow</td>
<td>rather short path</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>phôô</td>
<td>wing</td>
<td>fast</td>
<td>down &amp; forward to snatch away</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6: Semantic incorporation of WORM/SWIM group

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>INSTRUMENTALITY</th>
<th>DIRECTIONALITY</th>
<th>MEDIUM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>chay</td>
<td>wormlike body (&amp; limb)</td>
<td>forward</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>wâay</td>
<td>fin &amp; tail / arm &amp; leg</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.1 WALK/RUN group

dâen ‘walk’ is the simplest GLBM verb, for all of its semantic components have a default value, i.e., legs (INSTRUMENTALITY), a natural and normal speed to move by legs on land (VELOCITY), forward (DIRECTIONALITY), gaseous matter (MEDIUM), and unmarked manner (MANNER). It is concluded that dâen ‘walk’ expresses the simplest and general locomotion of animate beings, especially human beings.

kâaw ‘stride,’ khayêek ‘hobble,’ yôôn ‘walk stealthily,’ ram ‘move about gracefully or rhythmically,’ and luy ‘wade, walk through’ represent walking in a particular manner. kâaw ‘stride’ gives attention to every step. khayêek ‘hobble’ emphasizes an unbalance between the right leg and the left leg. Besides legs, we use other body parts in the locomotion events denoted by yôôn ‘walk stealthily’ and ram ‘move about gracefully or rhythmically’: in the former event, we walk on ‘tiptoe’ in order not to make a sound; and in the latter event, we move ‘arms and fingers’ as well as legs. luy ‘wade, walk through’ implies the agent’s determination in moving ahead against some obstacle that lies along the path of locomotion (e.g. wade, walk through fire, walk in muddy water, etc.).

yân ‘walk slowly’ and wîn ‘run’ have every default value except VELOCITY. yân ‘walk slowly’ specifies a low speed, while wîn ‘run’ specifies a high speed. That is, yân ‘walk slowly’ and wîn ‘run’ represent respectively walking at a lower or higher speed than the walking denoted by dâen ‘walk.’ According to Miller and Johnson-Laird (1976: 551-552), the distinction between ‘walk’ and ‘run’ in English is not based on velocity of motion. Rather, it is based on whether or not one foot or the other is always touching the ground. Indeed, it is possible to speak of walking rapidly or walking slowly, or to speak of running rapidly or running slowly. Yet, I insist that it is “velocity” that distinguishes wîn ‘run’ and yân ‘walk slowly’ from dâen ‘walk.’ I should make it clear what I mean by the term VELOCITY. I use it not in a physical sense (i.e. moving slowly or rapidly in the real world) but in an abstract sense (i.e. moving at a slower or faster pace than what we regard as natural and normal). Naturally, physical values of the speed of a locomotion may vary according to each individual or each situation. The important point to note is that the speed of a locomotion denoted by
each GLBM verb is not related to such physical rapidity. But it is conceptualized VELOCITY of each locomotion type.

\[ \text{yáaŋ ‘walk slowly’ and wín ‘run’ represent rather simple GLBM events which specify no other semantic features with respect to locomotion than VELOCITY (i.e. slower or faster than the normal locomotion by legs on land). That is to say, specific values of VELOCITY function as distinctive features among the three verbs for ‘simple walking’ in Thai (i.e. \text{daan ‘walk,}’, yáaŋ ‘walk slowly,’ and wín ‘run’). In addition, as we shall see later, verbs for ‘crawling’ (i.e. khlæn ‘crawl,’ khûwup [worm] crawl,’ and luýay ‘[rather long animate thing without limbs] crawl’), verbs for ‘climbing’ (i.e. tây ‘climb or creep something,’ piin ‘clamber’ and takay ‘climb quickly’) and verbs for ‘flying’ (i.e. bin ‘fly,’ phôo ‘fly to and fro’ and chôop ‘swoop down and snatch away’) are also differentiated from one another according to their specific values of VELOCITY (i.e. normal or slow or fast speed). VELOCITY is so significant as to differentiate among subtypes of Thai GLBM verbs.}

\[ \text{4.2 JUMP group}
\]

Jumping is a sudden spring by legs. Of course, jumping is not as natural for human beings as walking or running, but it is by no means abnormal. Sometimes we have to jump for a certain reason, so that our jumping is a familiar sight in everyday life.

The distinction among members in this group is due to their different values of DIRECTIONALITY. kradôot/dôot ‘jump’ represents the simplest type of jumping. It specifies neither which horizontal direction, how long, nor how many times to jump, so that it encompasses various hyponyms such as springing, leaping, hopping, skipping, prancing, etc. kracoon/coon ‘bounce into’ expresses very sudden jumping for a certain reason (e.g. because of surprise) whose direction must be upward and forward at the same time, that is, moving ahead by spring. In addition, it implies jumping only once, not many times. If the direction of jumping is not the combination of upward and forward, or the number of times of jumping is more than once, we do not name the jumping kracoon/coon, but kradôot/dôot.

On the other hand, kracoon/coon ‘pounce upon’ expresses a complex event. It expresses not only jumping in the combined direction of upward and forward (like kracoon/coon ‘bounce into’ just mentioned), but also catching at something eventually. The last two types can be distinguished from the first type on the basis of their distinct directions of jumping. It may be also possible to account for their difference in terms of agent’s intention in jumping. kradôot/dôot ‘jump’ and kracoon/coon ‘bounce into’ are neutral in this regard, i.e., the agent may or may not have a certain intention in jumping. In contrast, kracoon/coon ‘pounce upon’ expresses the agent’s specific intention and the eventuality, i.e., the agent pounces upon something and catches it at last.

\[ \text{4.3 MOVE LITTLE BY LITTLE group}
\]

GLBMs in this group are characterized by their common MANNER feature: moving little by little. Its steps are shorter than the normal walking steps. While khyèap ‘move little by little’
represent moving little by little regardless of the agent’s posture; krathàap ‘move little by little in a sitting posture,’ thàat ‘move forward little by little in a sitting posture,’ and krathòt/thòt ‘move backward little by little in a sitting posture’ depict moving little by little in a sitting position, which may be somewhat strange because of moving by hips (and arms) instead of legs. Sitting on the floor and moving in a sitting posture are never extraordinary for those who are familiar with Thai traditional style of living, however. We may say that the feature “moving in a sitting posture,” which some Thai GLBM verbs incorporate, is a specimen of culturally significant cognitive feature.

Since khyàap ‘move little by little’ has the default value of INSTRUMENTALITY (i.e. legs), it can be regarded as a rather simple verb for ‘moving little by little.’ khyàap ‘move little by little’ and krathàap ‘move little by little in a sitting posture’ are neutral with respect to direction of locomotion. In contrast, thàat ‘move forward little by little in a sitting posture’ and krathòt/thòt ‘move backward little by little in a sitting posture’ specify contrastive directions: forward vs. backward. DIRECTIONALITY is the only factor that can distinguish the former from the latter. 8 This supports my argument that specific features of DIRECTIONALITY can function as distinctive features among Thai GLBM verbs.

4.4 CRAWL/CLIMB group

Common characteristics among GLBMs denoted by verbs of this group, except a special one indicated by tày ‘climb or creep on something,’ is that the axis of the locomotory body is parallel to the direction of a path along which the locomotion is carried out. The direction of a path of ‘crawling’ is normally horizontal, whereas the direction of a path of ‘climbing’ is normally vertical.

khlaan ‘crawl’ has a specific value of INSTRUMENTALITY: moving by both legs (or knees) and arms (or elbows). It expresses the simplest ‘crawling.’ khuùup ‘[worm] crawl’ and luày ‘[rather long animate thing without limbs] crawl’ denote further specific types of crawling in terms of INSTRUMENTALITY and MANNER. The agent of the former is a worm with many limbs (e.g. measuring worm, silk worm, etc.); therefore, it is inevitable for it to move “little by little.” The agent of the latter is, on the other hand, a rather long animate thing without limbs (e.g. snake, tapeworm, etc.); accordingly, it is inevitable for it to move along a “meander path.” The speeds of the two types of ‘crawling’ are also contrastive. The former is slow, the latter is rapid.

The simplest verb for ‘climbing’ is tày ‘climb or creep on something.’ This versatile verb has a specific, though rather inclusive, value regarding MANNER: moving along a path on something (e.g. mountain, tree, wall, rock, rope, or whatever). It does not specify as to what agent, what speed, and what direction to climb. For example, “a human’s careful walk on a log lying horizontally” or “a squirrel’s tree-climbing” or “an ant’s crawling on the floor” can be regarded as a kind of locomotion indicated by tày. piin ‘clamber’ and takaay ‘climb quickly’ denote further specific types of climbing. Both of them represent moving by both arms and legs more or less vertically. But they differ in terms of DIRECTIONALITY, VELOCITY, and MANNER. The former indicates an upward or downward, as well as
forward or backward, climbing with difficulty at a rather low speed, such as human being’s
clambering over steep rocks; whereas the latter indicates an upward or downward, as well as
forward but never backward, climbing quickly with effort for some reason (e.g. to escape
from a danger), such as cat’s going up a tree. If the climbing is not rapid, it is not called
takaay. VELOCITY is an important factor of takaay ‘climb quickly.’

4.5 FLY group

What is common among the three GLBMs of this group is that they are locomotions of
winged creatures such as bird, butterfly, and so on. Flying or moving by wings in the air is the
most natural and normal locomotion for winged creatures. The flying event expressed by bin
‘[winged creature] fly’ is universal. It is not limited to any particular flying manner of any
particular type of winged creature. In contrast, phôo ‘[bird] fly to and fro’ and chôop ‘[bird
of prey] swoop down to snatch away’ express specific types of flying. They are different from
bin ‘fly’ in terms of VELOCITY, DIRECTIONALITY and MANNER. The former expresses
flying along a rather short path. The speed of flying must not be swift. The latter specifies one
phase of a particular flying event carried out by a bird of prey. Properly speaking, the bird’s
swooping event encompasses at least the following three phases. The initial phase is swooping
down at the target prey (i.e. moving down); the next phase is taking hold of it by talons (i.e.
reaching the target and then turning the direction); and the final phase is snatching it away (i.e.
moving up). But the event denoted by chôop ‘swoop down to snatch away’ specifies the first
phrase only. The last two phases are expected, but not necessarily take place, i.e., the bird
may fail to snatch a prey away. In contrast to phôo ‘fly to and fro,’ the speed of chôop
‘swoop down to snatch away’ must be swift.

4.6 WORM/SWIM group

This type of GLBM verbs have specific values of MEDIUM. chay ‘worm into’ indicates
moving through a solid matter (or anything to be holed by worms) and wâyay ‘swim’ indicates
moving in a liquid matter (or water). Human beings’ locomotion normally takes place in a
gaseous matter (or air). Especially, it is impossible for human beings to move through a solid
thing by means of their body parts. The agent of ‘worming’ is naturally limited to worms that
can eat a hole in something solid (e.g. the ground, wall, book, tree, body, etc.). On the other
hand, the most natural agent of ‘swimming’ is a fish who has fins and a tail. It is possible,
however, for other animate beings, including human beings, to swim about by means of arms
and legs instead of fins and a tail.

Apart from their specificity concerning MEDIUM, chay ‘worm into’ and wâyay ‘swim’ are
not specific very much. They are, so to speak, all-round GLBM verbs. chay ‘worm into’ can
represent almost all kinds of moving through a solid thing. Similarly, wâyay ‘swim’ can
represent almost all kinds of moving in a liquid thing. It is not necessary for us to categorize
locomotions that occur in a solid or liquid medium into detailed subclasses, because such
categories are of little use for us who live on land and who do not have any body parts
developed for burrowing into something. We cannot easily observe how fish swim about and
how worms worm into solid things, either.
5. SYNTACTIC CONSTRAINTS DERIVED FROM MARKED DIRECTIONAL FEATURES

It is noteworthy that, unlike manner-of-motion verbs in English (cf. Levin 1993), some Thai GLBM verbs show their specific features of DIRECTIONALITY. When I speak of DIRECTIONALITY, I do not mean “physical” directions. But I mean “conceptualized” or “lexicalized” directions. Some of the verbs entail “absolute” directions (e.g. directions denoted by such lexical items as ‘up/down’) and “intrinsic” directions (e.g. directions denoted by such lexical items as ‘front/back’) that belong to the DIRECTIONALITY component. But Thai GLBM verbs do not entail “relative” directions or “path orientation” that belong to the PATH component (e.g., direction determined by relative points, deictic directions, directions denoted by such lexical items as ‘across,’ ‘through,’ etc.). In this chapter, it will be shown that the conceptualized values of DIRECTIONALITY that some Thai GLBM verbs incorporate, indeed, affect syntactic behaviors of the verbs.

Although Thai GLBM verbs by themselves can be understood to mean a locomotion in a certain direction implicitly, they can appear together with various kinds of directional verbs (such as ลอน ‘descend’ and ไป ‘go’) to characterize a path of the locomotion explicitly, as exemplified below.

(3) นก นาฬิกา ที่ นก ลำเลียง ช่วย ฟูงปลาเล็ก
gull IMPERFECTIVE swoop down school of fish small
‘A gull is swooping down onto the small school of fish.’

(4) นก เย็น ได้ ช่วย ลอน ซึ่ง ลูกก่าย
eagle PERFECTIVE swoop down descend peck chick
‘An eagle swooped down to peck at a chicken.’

(5) เด็ก กัดด้วย ขูดยื้อ
child jump rope
‘A child jumped a rope.’

(6) ลูก ข้าว กัดด้วย ขูดยื้อ ปัน ปัน แห่ง หนู
uncle PROPER NOUN jump ascend go on stage
‘Uncle KAA jumped up onto the stage.’

Thai GLBM verbs of some specific kinds are incompatible with the following three directional verbs: ท้อ ‘retreat,’ หรือ และ ขึ้น ‘ascend’ or/and ลง ‘descend.’ The first verb indicates an “intrinsic” direction (i.e. 'backward'). The last two indicate “absolute” directions (i.e. ‘upward’ and ‘downward’). Let us consider the following infelicitous examples.

(7) * ลูก ท้อ
close, go through retreat
(8) * kracoon/coon ท้อ
drop into retreat
(9) * kracoon/coon ท้อ
pounce upon retreat
I assume that the GLBM verbs that cannot appear with thọy ‘retreat’ have a common lexicalized directional feature, namely, “moving ahead,” which is contrary to the direction denoted by thọy ‘retreat.’ The infelicity of sentences in (7) to (13) comes from the incompatibility between the moving direction specified by the GLBM verb (i.e. forward) and the direction denoted by thọy ‘retreat’ (i.e. backward). Since we can say, for example, deen thọy ‘move back by walking,’ kraddōt/dōt thọy ‘move back by jumping,’ and bin thọy ‘move back by flying,’ the agent of a locomotion expressed by deen (simple walking) or kraddōt/dōt (simple jumping) or bin (simple flying) can retreat. In contrast, the agent of locomotions expressed by the above-mentioned verbs that are incompatible with thọy ‘retreat’ must make progress always and never retreat. It is concluded that those verbs specify a directional feature “forward” or “anti-backward,” while deen ‘walk,’ kraddōt/dōt ‘jump’ and bin ‘fly’ do not specify such a directional feature.

chòop ‘swoop down to snatch away’ is not compatible with khuôn ‘ascend,’ either, as in (18). chòop denotes the first step of swooping, that is, moving down at a prey. The resultative phase of the swooping event cannot be named by chòop, but expressed by another verb for ‘flying’ (i.e. bin khuôn ‘flying up’) instead. In this regard, it should be noticed that English ‘swoop’ can collocate with either ‘down’ or ‘up’ (i.e. ‘swoop down’ or ‘swoop up’). Furthermore, ‘swoop’ can collocate with other lexical items that have a certain directional meaning (e.g. ‘swoop off,’ ‘swoop away’). Thus, it is obvious that Thai chòop has higher specificity in terms of DIRECTIONALITY than English ‘swoop.’ Levin and Rappaport
Hovav (1992: 264) argue that no English verb which inherently specifies direction also specifies manner. But the same is not said of Thai verbs.

ram ‘move about gracefully or rhythmically’ can appear together with neither lonj ‘descend,’ as in (14), nor khuôn ‘ascend,’ as in (16). This verb expresses moving about gracefully or rhythmically, or dancing. Usually such a locomotion is carried out within a limited space of a stage. The normal stage (of Thai dance) is flat, so that we can hardly imagine upward or downward movements during the dance. This constraint arises from our world knowledge.

luy ‘wade, walk through’ is incompatible with all of the three verbs (i.e. thọy ‘retreat,’ khuôn ‘ascend’ and lonj ‘descend’) as respectively exemplified in (7), (15) and (17). The locomotion denoted by this verb is carried out against an obstacle that prevents the agent from moving ahead in a certain way (i.e. river, marsh, fire, etc.). The vertical directions of the locomotion should be variable according to sorts of the obstacle. luy indicates just “forward” or “anti-backward” direction, paying no regard to its vertical distinction (i.e. upward or downward). This verb refuses to specify “absolute directions.” The reason may be that it depicts an integrate locomotion event composed of multiple phases. Each phase may have a different absolute direction from one another. The cohesion among the phases of the event is owing to the agent’s firm attitude in moving ahead. It is implied that, even though there is an obstacle, the agent is determined to keep progressing by getting over the difficulty. It may be said that the event expressed by luy highlights a specific feature of MANNER, i.e., the agent’s attitude (or “mental manner”).

6. SYNTACTIC CONSTRAINTS DERIVED FROM NOT INCORPORATING PATH COMPONENT

Now we shall discuss on collocation between a Thai GLBM verb and an adverbial/verb phrase that specifies salient locations on a path of locomotion: a departure point or an endpoint (i.e. phrases including caàk ‘leave’ or thùn ‘reach’ respectively). Since all of Thai GLBM verbs behave in the same way in this regard, the simplest GLBM verb (i.e. daan ‘walk’) alone is discussed below.

(19) * daan thùn bân
   walk reach home
(20) daan caàk rooñ rian
   walk leave school
   ‘walk from school’
(21) daan pay/maa thùn bân
   walk go/come reach home
   ‘walk (TOWARDS) and reach home’
(22) daan caàk rooñ rian thùn bân
   walk leave school reach home
   ‘walk from the school to home’
**daan** ‘walk’ cannot be followed directly by endpoint marker (i.e. *thũŋ* ‘reach’), but by starting-point marker (i.e. *caāk* ‘leave’), as in (19) and (20) respectively. It is likely that the incompatibility of **daan** ‘walk’ with **thũŋ** ‘reach’ in (19) comes from the fact that **daan** ‘walk’ does not have any features of PATH. A locomotion event without a certain endpoint, like expression (20), does not necessarily involve “path orientation,” because its path may have not yet been determined. Yet a locomotion event with a certain endpoint, like expression (19), must involve “path orientation,” because its path has already been determined. Consider sentence (21), in which either of deictic directional verbs (i.e. *pay/maa* ‘go/come’ or ‘towards here/there’ or ‘thither/hither’) is placed before **thũŋ** ‘reach’ or endpoint marker. Sentence (21) is acceptable, perhaps because *pay/maa* ‘go/come’ functions as path marker, which is interpreted as ‘TOWARDS’ in the English gloss. It seems reasonable, therefore, to conclude that **daan** ‘walk,’ or rather Thai GLBM verb, does not involve concepts concerning PATH or “relative directions.” In other words, it is impossible for us to imagine a certain “path orientation” of a locomotion denoted by a Thai GLBM verb by itself. The verb needs path marker (e.g. *pay/maa* ‘go/come’) or starting-point marker (e.g. *caāk* ‘leave’) when followed by endpoint marker (e.g. **thũŋ** ‘reach’), in order to specify a certain “path orientation” towards the endpoint, as shown in (21) and (22) respectively. In sentence (22), both the starting point (i.e. *roọŋ rian* ‘school’) and the endpoint (i.e. *baān* ‘home’) are expressed, so that we can determine the whole path without path marker.

7. CONCLUSION

In conclusion, Thai GLBM verbs show at least three degrees of specificity in depicting the respective locomotion events: the lowest degree, low degree, and high degree. In other words, they express GLBMs on at least three levels: general level, rather specific level, and specific level. **daan** ‘walk’ shows the lowest degree of specificity. **luy** ‘wade, go through’ and **tày** ‘climb or creep on something,’ for example, show a rather low degree of specificity. The former specifies the agent’s determination in moving (“mental manner”). By contrast, the latter specifies a route of locomotion (“physical manner”). **chöop** ‘swoop down to snatch away,’ on the other hand, shows a high degree of specificity. It specifies a particular value of the four semantic components: INSTRUMENTALITY (wings), VELOCITY (fast), DIRECTIONALITY (anti-backward as well as downward), and MANNER (in order to snatch a prey away). I assume that Thai manner-of-motion verbs as a whole must have a systematic variety with respect to specificity.

This paper also illustrates, though in a tentative fashion, that the facts that some of Thai GLBM verbs entail specific features of DIRECTIONALITY (i.e. “absolute” or “intrinsic” directions) and that all of them do not entail any features of PATH (i.e. “relative” directions or “path orientation”) do cause syntactic constraints in co-occurring between the verbs and directional verbs.

I hope to have made some contribution to typological study of languages by offering new data with respect to manner-of-motion verbs of the primary sort, i.e. GLBM verbs, in Thai.
FOOTNOTES

1 The data for this study are derived partially from the Thai language corpora which belong to the Linguistics and Knowledge Science Laboratory (LINKS) within the National Electronics and Computer Technology Center (NECTEC) of the National Science and Technology Development Agency (NSTDA), the Ministry of Science, Technology and Environment, Thailand. Thanks are due to the organization for permission to use the corpora.
2 Animate things shown in the braces after English glosses are the agents of locomotions denoted by the respective GLBM verbs.
3 In Talmy’s (1985) terminology, the seven semantic components may be called as followings: (1) Figure or Manner, (2) Rate, (3) Path, (4) Manner, (5) Manner or Attitude, (6) Motion and (7) Agentive.
4 Zubin and Choi (1984: 334) argue that “gestalt” and “orientation” are conceptual organizing principles underlying the entire spatial lexicon. I assume that these contrastive spatial concepts are also useful in analyzing conceptualized path of motion.
5 This characterization is based on Levinson’s (1996) categorization of frames of reference for spatial description: “intrinsic, relative and absolute frames of reference.”
6 For details of the distinction between the two concepts with regard to negation, i.e. ‘contraries’ and ‘contradictories,’ see Lyons (1977: 772).
7 Although ‘forward’ is the default value of DIRECTIONALITY, I intentionally give some verbs ‘forward’ value, because the locomotions expressed by the verbs are incompatible with ‘backward’ direction. That is, ‘forward’ in the chart stands for ‘anti-backward.’
8 that and krathôt/thôt are hardly used to represent locomotion in modern colloquial Thai. Moreover, it appears that nowadays most Thai people do not differentiate among the meanings of the four verbs for ‘moving little by little.’
9 A human being’s moving about in the deep water is denoted by another verb, i.e., dam ‘dive, submerge.’
10 * before an example means that the expression is unacceptable.
11 My term “marker” does not have grammatical connotations. I mean by the term a lexical item that semantically marks a certain concept. It does not matter, therefore, what grammatical status the lexical item has.
12 It is, however, possible for expression (19) to appear in limited special context, in which the notion of physical movement is not regarded as significant. For example, daen thúŋ bân kô phâk phó̀n ‘When we (walk and) reach home, we will take a rest.’ But the following expression, from which daen ‘walk’ is removed, is more natural than the above example: thúŋ bân kô phâk phó̀n ‘When we reach home, we will take a rest.’
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