1 Grammar Profile

1.1 Morpho-Syntax

1.1.1 Head position

Thai is generally considered to be a head initial language, despite the mandatory occurrence of
time and manner adverbs, mood particles, and question particles head-finally.

SVO word order

Thai exhibits basic SVO word order in transitive clauses:

(1) pʰiiŋ kʰun sii cʰɔɔn.sɔɔm
friend you buy spoon.fork
‘Your friend bought silverware.’

Complementizer order

Complementizers also precede their complements in embedded (2) and relative (3) clauses,
which obligatorily occur after the noun.

(2) pʰɔm kʰɪt wâa [aːhān fârəŋ mài aɾoŋ lîj]\nI:MALE think COMP [food western NEG delicious at all]
‘I think that western food isn’t delicious at all.’

(3) róṭ tʰîi nàkrian sii
 car REL student buy
 ‘The car that the student bought’

NP-Internal Ordering

Noun phrases in Thai have the head noun obligatorily at their left boundary:
Adpositions

Thai adpositions precede their object. The sentence below is also an example of a presentational construction in Thai. The pleonastic subject is usually omitted.

(5) (man) műi kʰon yì? nai khrìŋ,tʰɔp
    (it) have person much in Bangkok
    ‘There are a lot of people in Bangkok.’

Sentence-final particles

While Thai appears to be head-initial, there are a number of particles that must occur at the end of the clause. For an analysis of word-final aspectual elements in Thai, see (Koenig and Mueansuwan 2005):

Clause-final question particle, honorifics:

(6) kʰun.phɔɔ kin plàa mái kháp?
    HON.father eat fish QUES HON.male
    ‘Do you eat fish?’ (could be used addressed to your father)

Word-final negation, modality:

(7) khun.pʰɔɔ kin plàa (mai) dãi
    HON.father eat fish NEG able
    ‘Dad can(n’t) eat fish’

Word-final aspect:

(8) khun.pʰɔɔ kin kʰɔɔ yùu
    HON.father eat rice PROG
    ‘Dad is eating’

Word-final adverbials:

(9) kʰun.pʰɔɔ kin plaa reeo.reeo
    HON.father eat fish quickly
    ‘Dad eats fish quickly.’

1.1.2 Morphological type

Isolating

1.1.3 Case system

There is no case marking.

1.1.4 Verbal Agreement

No subject or object agreement.

1.1.5 Transitivity Patterns

While there is no valence-affecting morphology, there are verbs that serve to form periphrastic passives, causatives and applicatives:

Passive:

Thai has three main passive auxiliaries, each which implies different levels of adversity to the speaker. The traditional passive tʰiuk (lit: ‘touch’) has a relatively neutral meaning (10), though
there is a slight implication of some adversity on the part of the subject-patient. The more negative auxiliary, *doon*, has a quite negative reading for the subject (11). The auxiliary with more positive connotations for the subject, *dâi-râp*, has a much more limited distribution and agents cannot be overtly expressed (12). The first two of these have identical structure and productivity, and can be used to passivize almost any transitive verb. One structural point of interest is the fact that the agent, which is optional for all three auxiliaries, must occur between the passive and main verb when present.

\[
\begin{align*}
&\text{(10) } \text{kamooj t'ûuk (tamrîat) càp} \\
&\hspace{1em}\text{thief \hspace{5mm} \textit{PASSIVE (police) catch}} \\
&\hspace{1em}\text{‘The thief was arrested (by the police).’}
\end{align*}
\]

\[
\begin{align*}
&\text{(11) } \text{nákrian doon (k'ruu) dàa} \\
&\hspace{1em}\text{student \hspace{5mm} \textit{PASSIVE (teacher) scold}} \\
&\hspace{1em}\text{‘The student was scolded (by the teacher).’}
\end{align*}
\]

\[
\begin{align*}
&\text{(12) } \text{c'ân dâi-râp *(p'ìîɔn) c'iin lêeo} \\
&\hspace{1em}\text{I:INFORMAL \hspace{5mm} \textit{PASSIVE *(friend) invite already}} \\
&\hspace{1em}\text{‘I’ve already been invited *(by my friend).’}
\end{align*}
\]

\section*{Causatives:}

When not lexical, the Thai causative is expressed periphrastically. There are three main causatives in Thai, which imply different amounts of causation or control on the part of the controller when used. The required word order for these constructions is NP\textit{CAUSER-CAUS-NP\textit{CAUSEE-VP}}.

The causative verb which expresses the most direct control on the part of the causer is *t'am* ‘do, make.’ Causatives with this verb can express direct or indirect causation:

\[
\begin{align*}
&\text{(13) } \text{nákrian t'am cerjka tâek} \\
&\hspace{1em}\text{student \hspace{5mm} \textit{CAUS} vase \hspace{5mm} \textit{break}} \\
&\hspace{1em}\text{‘The student broke the vase’ (intentionally or unintentionally)}
\end{align*}
\]

There is also clear evidence that this causative is compatible with indirect causation in that inanimate causees can serve as its subject. When used with animate causees, *t'am* expresses very strong control:

\[
\begin{align*}
&\text{(14) } \text{mêe t'am n'ɔq̆ kiin mák'ìòh pai} \\
&\hspace{1em}\text{mother \hspace{5mm} \textit{CAUS} younger.sibling \hspace{5mm} \textit{eat eggplant \hspace{5mm} go}} \\
&\hspace{1em}\text{‘Mother made my little sibling eat all his eggplant’}
\end{align*}
\]

This sentence does not carry the implication of the child having wanted to eat the eggplant beforehand, but rather of direct causation on the part of the mother.

A second, less direct causative is expressed with the verb *hâj* ‘give.’ This weak causative occurs more frequently with animate objects than the strong causative above, as it often is used as a permissive causative:

\[
\begin{align*}
&\text{(15) } \text{mêe hâj n'ɔq̆ kiin k'ànôm} \\
&\hspace{1em}\text{mother \hspace{5mm} \textit{CAUS} younger.sibling \hspace{5mm} \textit{eat sweets}} \\
&\hspace{1em}\text{‘Mother let my little sibling eat sweets’}
\end{align*}
\]

The stronger control entailed on the part of the causee with this weak causative as opposed to the stronger causative is shown by the former’s inability to occur with verbs that are not intentional:

\[
\begin{align*}
&\text{(16) } \text{n'ɔq̆ *hâj/t'am mêe p'ìî.t'wâh} \\
&\hspace{1em}\text{younger.sibling \hspace{5mm} \textit{CAUS} mother \hspace{5mm} \textit{spoil.hope}} \\
&\hspace{1em}\text{‘My younger sibling let my mother be disappointed’} \\
&\hspace{1em}\text{‘My younger sibling disappointed my mother.’}
\end{align*}
\]
Note that this also shows the strong control entailed by the stronger causative.

The last grammatical causative in Thai is intermediate between the two above, and is represented by a compound verb with the two causatives above as its components:

\[
\text{(17) siəŋ} \ \text{təam.hājdeŋ} \ \text{fiin.noon} \\
\text{noise CAUS child wake.sleep} \\
\text{‘The noise made the child wake up.’}
\]

These three causatives together comprise the most frequently use and grammaticalized instances of the Thai causative.

The causative hāj also combines with a set of manipulative verbs that are traditionally object control verbs in other languages. Thus, the following sentences are ungrammatical if the causative element is removed:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{(18) a. mət} & \ \text{baŋkhaŋ} \ \text{hāj} \ \text{nəŋ} \ \text{kin} \ \text{kənōm} \\
\text{mother force.CAUS younger.sibling eat sweets} \\
\text{‘Mother forced my little sibling to eat sweets’}
\\
\text{b. mət} & \ \text{chakchuan.hāj} \ \text{nəŋ} \ \text{kin} \ \text{kənōm} \\
\text{mother persuade.CAUS younger.sibling eat sweets} \\
\text{‘Mother persuaded my little sibling to eat sweets’}
\\
\text{c. mət} & \ \text{bok.hānəŋ} \ \text{kin} \ \text{kənōm} \\
\text{mother tell.CAUS younger.sibling eat sweets} \\
\text{‘Mother told my little sibling to eat sweets’}
\end{align*}
\]

These sentences are structurally identical to other causative forms.

Applicatives:

The Thai applicative uses the same verb as the weak causative, hāj ‘give,’ only rather than occuring as the matrix verb with a sentential complement, it now occurs as a postverbal particle that takes a NP object, much like a preposition. However, the only preposition which can convey this meaning, pʰi ‘for, in order to,’ has a meaning which implies something more like obligation or service to the object rather than the benefactive meaning of hāj. The benefactive construction is quite productive and can be used with virtually any verb, with acceptability subject mostly to semantic plausability.

\[
\text{(19) məa təaj hāj câw.kənəŋ} \\
\text{dog die BEN owner} \\
\text{‘The dog died for his owner.’}
\]

1.1.6 Null Arguments

According to traditional labels, Thai is both a subject and object pro-drop language. In discourse contexts, subjects which represent discourse prominent, old information are frequently omitted. A construction where subjects frequently drop are questions, as it is often clear from context who is being asked. For example:

\[
\text{(20) kin rī yəŋ} \\
\text{eat or still} \\
\text{‘Have you eaten?’}
\]

Objects are omitted less frequently than subjects, if for no other reason than Thai discourse tense to prefer alligning topics and subjects. However, if it is clear from context who the omitted argument is referring to, object pro-drop is allowed:
Q: kin ahān fārāŋ booj.booj māj
eat food western often Q
‘Do you eat western food often?’

A. kʰɗj̄̚ kin, tɛ̀ māj cʰɔp m̀ak.maj
PERF eat but NEG like very.much
‘I’ve eaten western food, but I didn’t really like it.’

1.1.7 Non-Finite Categories
Thai verbs do not inflect to show whether they are finite or infinitive. However, there are two particles/prefixes which can appear with a verb to mark that the verb is non finite. The first of these is a preverbal particle, kaan, which can combine with any verb to make a gerundial:

(22) kaan tʰaa sī nám.man sànûk
NOM apply paint oil fun
‘Painting is fun.’

The infinitival marker caʔ has a number of uses in Thai and can appear next to verbs in a number of environments. We will see the most relevant of these, the infinitival use, in §7. It should be noted that both of these markers, including the nominalizer above, are optional and frequently omitted in colloquial speech.

1.2 Matrix Clause

1.2.1 Basic word order
SVO

1.2.2 Alternate word orders
In everyday speech, topicalization patterns abound in Thai. These can topicalize subjects, objects, or oblique, and can leave the gap empty (22) or use resumptive pronouns (23). Topicalization is almost always to the beginning of a sentence when used in discourse, and it is usually marked by a demonstrative (nán ‘that’, nǐ ‘this’) or topicalization marker (nì, ni, nà):

(23) pʰiān nū nu kʰ’on nǐ āpʰiʳădii rāk m̀ak
friend FEM CLF:human this Apiradi love a lot
‘This friend of mine, Aphiradee loves (him) a lot’

(24) pʰɔ dèk kʰ’on nā kʰàw kràdûk hàk lècw
father child CLF:human this he bone break ASP
‘The father of this child, he had broken bones’
(from Iwasaki & Ingkaphirom (2005), pp. 360, 369)

A Num/Q+Clf constituent can float from both subjects and objects to the end of the sentence, and have scope effects with any modal (potential) or negative particles that may be there:

(25) a. dèk thù̀k.khɔn pai roŋ.rian mai dāì
child every.CLF:human go school NEG can
‘Every child can’t go to school’ (ambiguous)

b. dèk pai roŋ.rian thù̀k.khɔn mai dāì
child go school every.CLF:human NEG can
‘Not every child can go to school’

c. dèk pai roŋ.rian mai dāì thù̀k.khɔn
child go school NEG can every.CLF:human
‘Every child can’t go to school’ (ambiguous)
These quantifiers can float to the end of an embedded clause as well, though they must occur inside of speech and question particles (see (6)).

1.2.3 Ordering of nominal and pronominal arguments
Word order in the main clause is the same regardless of whether arguments are nominal or pronominal.

1.3 Embedded Clause

1.3.1 Basic word order
SVO

1.3.2 Verbal agreement
Thai does not have agreement.

1.3.3 Restrictions on tense, aspect, mood
There are no limitations on voice in embedded clauses: embedded complements, whether finite or infinitive, can appear as both passive or active.

1.3.4 Possible morphological categories of the embedded clause

Finite Complements
Thai has two finite complementizers, *waā* and *thī*, the latter of which is also used as a the complementizer for relative clauses (4). The choice of complementizer is selected by the matrix verb. Verbs of speech and psych predicates tend to select the former (25), while stative verbs of evaluation and emotion select the latter (26):

(26) a. dēk.dēk khit waā suuŋ céŋ luuj
    children think COMP tiger cool totally
    ‘Kids think tigers are totally cool’

b. dēk.dēk rūusūk waā (khāw) māj sābaaj
    children feel COMP (3P) NEG well
    ‘The children don’t feel well’

(27) a. pií.sāw khāw māj cēpcaj thī raw māj khūuj
    older.sister 3P NEG hurt COMP 1P NEG PERF

    phōp kan
    meet RECIP

    ‘His/her/their older sister isn’t hurt that we haven’t met.’

b. phōm chōokdīi thī (phōm) māj jūu bàn phōm
    1S:MALE lucky COMP NEG stay house
    ‘I’m lucky that I wasn’t at my house’

None of the clauses headed by these complements have any limitations on aspect or voice.

Non-finite Complements
Non-finite complements in Thai are identifiable by a number or distributional generalizations relating to their inability to occur with aspect markers, and the preverbal infinitival particle *cā?* (27). Evidence for the biclausalilty of these constructions is provided in (28) (see also 9.3.2):
As is shown in the examples above, the infinitival marker cà? is optional in these contexts, and it can also appear as thuí-cà?. When cà? is omitted from the clause, it appears to be a serial verb construction. However, the fact that cà? is licensed in these environments distinguishes it from true serial verb constructions.

1.3.5 Non-control complements

Serial Verbs

Thai liberally makes use of verb serialization, and it is important to distinguish between the different types. As was just stated, infinitival complements often appear to be serialized with the matrix verb, Iwasaki and Ingkaphirom (2005) calls this subordinate serialization. Also requiring identity of subject is the coordination type of serialization, which can be further split into purposive/sequential (29a), motion (29b) (see Muansawan 2001 for discussion), and simultaneous (29c) serialization:

(30) a. phôm dɔ̀n paj kîn nàán
    1S:MALE walk go eat water
    ‘I walked over to drink water.’

b. rót wîŋ troŋ klàp khâw paj nàj rooŋ.rót
car run straight return enter go in garage
    ‘The car backed straight into the garage.’

c. chaawnaa dɔ̀n cuuŋ khwaay phààn maa
    farmer walk tug water.buffalo pass come
    ‘The farmer walked through tugging a buffalo.’


The last example above demonstrates that the different subtypes of coordintated serialization can occur in the same clause, as ‘walk’ and ‘tug’ are simultaneous, are juxtaposed with the purposive ‘pass come’ which themselves form a motion serial chain. It also demonstrates that if one of the verbs in a serial chain is transitive, the object must come immediately after that verb.

In all of the instances of serialization above, the verbs all share the same subject. However, other types of serialization, which Iwasaki and Ingkaphirom (2005) call the ‘hybrid’ type, can have either the same or different subjects for the serialized verbs. These fall into two subtypes, causative (30a) and resultative (30b, c) serialization:
(31) a.  phôm sâŋ lûuk (hâj) paj riâk mûo
     1:S:MALE order child (CAUS) go call doctor
     ‘I ordered the child to go call a doctor.’

    b.  nûŋ kin khâaw (mâj) im
     YNG.SIBLING eat rice (NEG) full
     i. ‘My younger brother ate his food until he was full.’
     ii. ‘My younger brother ate his food but wasn’t full.’

    c.  khâw láâng caan (mâj) saâat
     3 wash dish (NEG) clean
     i. ‘They washed the dish clean.’
     ii. ‘They couldn’t washed the dish clean.’

(Raising)

Thai has a number of raising predicates. A number of these such as tââ (cà) and duu.mûun (cà) can exhibit either overt raising (31b) or a pleonastic subject (31a, 32):

(32) a.  (mâñ) duu.mûun wââ dêk.dêk mâj såbaaj
     3PN.INAN appear COMP children NEG well
     ‘It appears the children aren’t well.’

    b.  dêk.dêk duu.mûun cà? mâj såbaaj
     children appear FUT NEG well
     ‘The children appear to be not well’

(33) a.  (mâñ) tââ wââ fôn cà tok
     3PN.INAN seem COMP rain ASP fall
     ‘It seems that it’s going to rain’

    b.  fôn tââ cà? tok
     3PN.INAN seem ASP rain
     ‘It seems that it’s going to rain’

The above sentences are clearly biclausal, as both can be independently negated (31). Another group of raising verbs exhibits the same properties, allowing independent negation in the two clauses and not selecting subjects. However, these verbs, mostly aspectual, obligatorily trigger raising:

(34) a.  fôn ruum cà? tok
     rain begin ASP fall
     ‘it began to rain’

    b.  *mâñ ruum fôn cà? tok

    c.  fôn yang mâj ruum cà? tok
     rain still NEG begin ASP fall
     ‘It hasn’t started raining yet’

    d.  fôn ruum cà? mâj tok
     rain begin ASP NEG fall
     ‘It started to not rain’
2 Control Profile

2.1 forward subject control into a non-finite complement

2.1.1 Example structure

(35) phôm yaàk [(thîi cà?)] klap baân
1:S:MALE want ((COMP) INF) return home
‘I want to go home.’

(36) phôm ph'yaayam [(thîi cà?) ɔɔk pai]
1:S:MALE attempt ((COMP) INF) leave go
‘I’m trying to leave.’

(37) phôm sāamāat [(thîi cà?) klap baân]
1:S:MALE able ((COMP) INF) return home
‘I am able to go home.’

2.1.2 Predicates participating in the construction

verb, desiderative, yaak ‘want’, cʰɔp ‘like’, ɗŋkaan ‘desire’

verb, implicative, pʰaayayam ‘attempt’, lôn ‘try’

verb, modal, sāamāt ‘able’

2.1.3 Evidence in support bi-clausal structure

The hallmark of infinitival complements in Thai is the licensing of the infinitival marker cà?, which functions as a mood/aspect marker in finite clauses. While cà? is optional, it is obligatory when the complementizer thîi occurs as well, though both markers are optional. While thîi can also occur as the complementizer in finite complements, there it licenses a full finite clause below it (6.4), while in infinitives it obligatorily occurs only with cà?. Thus, aspectual preverbs besides cà? are not permitted in infinitival clauses.

(38) a. phôm yaàk [(thîi cà?)] (*kʰɔɔj) klap baân
1:S:MALE want ((COMP) INF) PERF return home
‘I want to go home’

b. phôm yaàk [(thîi cà?) (*kamlaŋ) klap baân]
1:S:MALE want ((COMP) INF) PROG return home
‘I want to go home’

The complex and implicational distribution of ((thîi cà?) can be seen both as marking infinitival clauses in Thai as well as giving clues as to the structure of those clauses. While overt subjects are not allowed in subject control constructions, were they allowed they would occur between these two particles (see 9.3.3, 10).

The aspectual particle cà? generally carries a semantic meaning of either uncertainty or future eventhood in finite clauses (something like a subjunctive). However, it’s use in these specific structures is again selected by the predicate, though it is optional. The licensing of this particle could be responsible for the ungrammaticality of additional aspectual markers, as the imperfective is aspectually saturated in the appearance of this particle.

It seems to be the case that these two particles are syntactic placeholders. Thus, the fact that there is specific selection of a dummy complementizer and a dummy aspect particle in Thai is itself an indication that these structures are biclausal; such has often been the assumption for, e.g., English to.

Another clear piece of evidence that subject control structures in Thai are biclausal is the ability of negation to appear in both the matrix and the subordinate clause:
While negation is allowed in both clauses, even simultaneously, the negated subordinate clause must describe a salient action such as quitting a bad habit or holding one's breath.

However, the strongest tests for biclausality are the ability of multiple adverbs to modify each clause, as in the following sentence:

(41) wan.níí dek yaàk pai thíòw phruùn.níí
today child wants go walk tomorrow
‘Today the child wants to go out (shopping, etc.) tomorrow’

The ability for separate temporal adverbs to occur in both the upper and lower clause indicates these sentence’s biclausal structure.

2.1.4 Evidence of structural position for unexpressed argument

There is additional evidence that there is an empty subject based on the subject-oriented anaphor èeŋ which is ambiguously bound by the subjects of either verb:

(42) khàw yàak (((thíí) cà?) tham kaan.baàn èeŋ])
she want (((COMP) INF) do homework SELF

i. ‘she herself wants to do homework.’ (no outside influence)
ii. ‘she wants to do homework herself.’ (working alone)

The ambiguous interpretation of these clauses seems to show that there is some sort of empty category in the infinitival clause. However, èeŋ is a long-distance anaphor and as such, the fact that it is bound does not tell us that there is a subject for the second clause, though the ambiguous semantics are at least a clue.

Also, the fact that an overt NP cannot occur between the infinitival complimentizer and mood particle indicates that this is not a finite complement, and that the gap is not simply a covert pronoun (“little pro”):

(43) Dìiòw yaàk [thíí (*khàw) [cà? klap baàn]]
NAME want (*3) INF return home

‘Dìiòw wants (*him,) to go home.’

Thus, there seems to be an empty category as the subject of the lower clause.

2.1.5 Selectional restrictions

Non-volitional DPs cannot be subjects of the proposed control verbs, which indicates that these are not semantically empty raising verbs.

(44) %*fòn saàmaàt (((thíí) cà?) tôk])

rain able (((COMP) ASP) rain

‘The rain is capable of falling.’
2.1.6 Control type: obligatory

Basic interpretational facts tell us that the subject of the matrix predicate must also be considered the subject of the infinitive verb:

(45) khāw čhɔ́p [((thii) [cà?] duun.taaŋ]]
    3 NEG ((COMP) ASP) travel
    “He, likes eчин to travel.”

In (43), we see that the subject of the subordinate clause is the same as the subject of the main clause. This confirms that this is obligatory control, as are all of these subject control verbs.

2.2 subject control into adjunct

2.2.1 Example structure

(46) pho[m] klap bàn [phuua[[(thii) cāʔ] tham kaan.baán]]
    I-MALE return home for ((COMP) INF) do homework
    ‘I went back home (in order) to do my homework.’

(47) khāw pɔət kɔok.naːm [phuua[[(thii) cāʔ] láŋ caan]]
    3 open faucet for ((COMP) INF) wash dishes
    ‘He turned on the faucet (in order) to wash the dishes.’

2.2.2 Predicates participating in the construction

preposition, purposive, phuua ‘for, in order to’

2.2.3 Evidence in support bi-clausal structure

This structure passes multiple tests for biclausality, such as separate adverbs (47), separate negation (48), and separate aspect (49) —— unlike subject control:

(48) muwa.waan.niː chān khap lót rew rew [phuua[[(thii) cāʔ] mǎa]
    yesterday 1s drive car fast for ((COMP) INF) come
    tuŋ waan.niː]
    arrive today

    “Yesterday I drove my car fast in order to arrive today.”

(49) dɛk niː māj paj lɔŋ.liaŋ [phuua [((thii) cāʔ] māj]
    child this NEG go school for ((COMP) INF) NEG
    liaŋ khā.nit.saat]]
    learn mathematics

    i. These children don’t go to school in order to not learn math.
   ii. These children don’t go to school in order to not learn math!

(50) dɛk long thiː sanaam.bin čhuːj.čhuːj [phuua [((thii) cāʔ)]
    child get.off at airport only for ((COMP) INF)
    khɔːyuu thiː prathɛt.faranse]]
    PERF be.loc at country.France

    ‘The kid got off the plan just in order to have been to France.”

This construction is roughly equivalent to the English construction "in order to" or German "um...zu.”
2.2.4 Evidence of structural position for unexpressed argument

The clearest evidence for an empty category in the adjunct control clause is the acceptability of reflexives in the adjunct that are bound by the matrix subject:

(51) a. khāẉ pāi thiaw [pʰuua (((thīi) [ càʔ] hāj tua.èŋ)]
   he go walk for ((COMP) INF) give .body.self
   rāaŋwan])]
   reward

   ‘He went out (in order) to give himself a reward.’

b. mēc klap bān [pʰuua (((thīi) [ càʔ] hāj kē dēk pāi
   mother return home for ((COMP) INF) CAUS child go
   nǎn)])]
   sleep

   ‘The mother returned home (in order) for her child to go to sleep.’
   (lit: The mother returned home in order to have her child go to sleep)

While in (50a), the word hāj is simply the verb ‘give,’ taking two objects, hāj in (50b) is serving as a causative (§4.6), which still has an obligatory interpretation of having the matrix subject as its subject. The causative is always used when the purpose of the action is that another argument perform an agentive rule; this follows straightforward from the semantics of the construction, as the activity in the adjunct (thus, “the child going to sleep” in (50b)) still has a causal relationship with the matrix clause and the agent of that clause.

Like forward subject control, in most instances an overt pronoun or argument is not acceptable in the subject position of the adjunct clause:

(52) phōm klap bān [pʰuua[((thīi) [ (* phōm/khāẉ) càʔ) tham
   1:MALE return home for ((COMP) (*1:MALE /3 ) INF) do
   kaaan.bān)])]
   homework

   ‘I went home (in order) to do my homework.’

In (51), we see that the adjunct clause cannot have an overt subject. However, an overt subject, coreferential with the matrix subject, can be licenced by the change-of-state preverb dāj, similar to English ‘get’. We see this particular verb used in the baseline sentence below:

(53) phōm dāj klap pāj prāthēt.thaj
   1:MALE get return go Thailand
   ‘I got to return to Thailand.’

Above, the verb dāj licences the change-of-state reading of the sentence, indicating that an opportunity has been created to perform the action where there was none before. When dāj appears in the adjunct control structure under discussion, it licenses an overt subject which no longer must be coreferential with the matrix subject:
While the specific reason for an overt subject in the adjunct clause in this construction is not clear, the fact that it is licensed only in this specific environment indicates that in most instances, it is there but obligatorily controlled by the subject. While a pronoun can occur in the subject position of the adjunct when licensed by \textipa{dâj}, so can a reflexive:

\begin{verbatim}(55) phôm klap bàn [phuâ[thî [phôm/khâw cà? dâj tham]
 I:MALE return home for COMP 1:MALE/3 INF get do

kaan.bânan]]]

doa homework

'I went home (in order) for me/him to be able to do my/his homework.'

It is not clear why this locally bound reflexive is able to appear as the subject of this adjunct. However, its presence, like the pronouns in (53), is predicated on the existence of \textipa{dâj}. All of these pronouns can occur without \textipa{dâj}, but speakers report that something feels as if it is missing from the sentence. Sentences with \textipa{dâj} are often offered as corrections.

2.2.5 Selectional restrictions
Matrix verbs followed by the purpose adjunct must have a volitional subject. If the main clause has an inanimate object such as rain, the adjunction of a purpose clause seems to imbue that subject with volitionality, as in “The rain fell in order to wter the crops.”

2.2.6 Control type
Control in these clauses is always obligatory.
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