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Abstract

This thesis presents a description of verbal complementation in Khmer. The theoretical framework used in this thesis is that of Lexical-Functional Grammar. Three major types of verbal complements and their characteristics have been investigated at length.

There are two types of sentence-like (S-like) complements in Khmer: S-like complements with a complementiser and S-like complements without a complementiser. This study shows that the characteristics of S-like complements without a complementiser are similar to those of S-like complements with a complementiser, except that only S-like complements with a complementiser can be preceded by the negative or the polar question particle. The interpretations of pronouns in S-like complements with and without a complementiser are the same as that of simple sentences. There is no control relation in S-like complements either with or without a complementiser. As Khmer is a pro-drop language, an argument in S-like complements with and without a complementiser can also be unexpressed. The interpretation of an unexpressed argument in S-like complements with and without a complementiser is free as is that of normal clauses.

Controlled complements in Khmer are classified into subject-controlled complements and object-controlled complements. The controller of the unexpressed complement subject is an argument in the matrix clause. Although the strings produced by a complement-taking predicate followed by a controlled complement are superficially similar to those of serial verb constructions, it can be shown that controlled complements are lexically specified by the matrix predicate whereas the verbal structures following the first verb in serial verb constructions are not.

In addition to these three major types of complements, this study investigates the verb qay in complements. Although qay has many meanings and functions, this study mainly focuses on the verb qay meaning 'to have someone do something; to allow'. When qay introduces a complement, it retains characteristics of verb. However, it is proposed that the verb qay in complements can be classified as the predicate qay and the non-predicate qay. Characteristics of the predicate qay and those of the non-predicate qay in complements are examined. Of all complement constructions discussed in this study, complements containing qay are the most
interesting ones.

It is shown that formalisms of Lexical-functional Grammar are well suited for analysing complement constructions in Khmer. Although a string associated with a complement containing the predicate qaoy and that associated with a complement containing the non-predicate qaoy look superficially similar, LFG formalisms provide different analysis for these similar strings.
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CHAPTER 1

Introduction

This chapter introduces the scope, purpose and organisation of the study (section 1.1). The theoretical framework used in this analysis is described in section 1.2. In sections 1.3 and 1.4, I have included a review of the literature on the Khmer language as well as the methodology which I used in data collection.

1.1 Scope, purpose and organisation of the study

This study is concerned with the investigation of verbal complementation in Khmer. Complements are defined as a type of embedded clause functioning as an argument of a predicate (Noonan, 1985:42-43; Ransom, 1986:1; Dixon, 1987:2; Givón, 1990:515). A predicate which can subcategorise for a complement is called a "complement-taking predicate" (CTP). In Khmer, a complement normally follows the complement-taking predicate. The primary purpose of the study is to describe and analyse types of verbal complements in this language. In addition to this, some relevant studies of other languages in South-East Asia will also be discussed as some characteristics of verbal complementation in these languages are comparable to those of verbal complementation in Khmer.

The control relation in complement constructions as well as pro-drop phenomena are interesting issues that have been widely discussed for many languages. In this study, I will also look at the possible control relations in each type of complement construction in Khmer. The concept of control will be discussed in section 1.2.2. Since Khmer is also a pro-drop language, another purpose of the study is to investigate how control in complement constructions and pro-drop in this language interact.

1 Khmer belongs to the Austroasiatic language family. The Khmer dialect used in this study is the Central Khmer dialect which is spoken in the Kingdom of Cambodia. For more details of this language, see Chapter 2: A general introduction to the Khmer language.
The analysis of this study is based on the framework of Lexical-Functional Grammar (LFG) because this framework seems well suited for an analysis of my data. This study is intended as a preliminary description of complementation in Khmer and does not attempt to extend the theoretical concepts of the chosen framework or argue against any other theories. In addition, my findings within LFG theory can be translated into other frameworks.

The organisation of this study is as follows: Chapter 1 presents the scope, purpose and organisation of the study as well as some theoretical concepts relevant to the analysis. In addition to this, a review of the literature on the Khmer language is included. In Chapter 2, I will provide readers with an overview of Khmer grammar. In Chapter 3 - Chapter 5, three types of Khmer verbal complements are discussed at length. Characteristics of each complement type are investigated in each chapter and the classes of complement-taking predicates which can precede each complement type are presented. In Chapter 3, sentence-like complements with a complementiser are examined. This is followed by a discussion of sentence-like complements without a complementiser in Chapter 4. Chapter 5 investigates controlled complements in Khmer. Chapter 6 is devoted to a discussion of the form gaoy and its use in complements. The conclusion of the thesis is presented in Chapter 7. The distribution of the complement-taking predicates and types of complements are listed in the appendix.

1.2 Theoretical framework

To provide readers with an overview of the theoretical concepts used in this study, this section presents a summary description of Lexical-Functional Grammar. Some relevant concepts of other theories will also be mentioned briefly.

1.2.1 Basic concepts of Lexical-Functional Grammar

Lexical-Functional Grammar provides a formally explicit and coherent theory of how surface structures are related to representations of meaningful grammatical functions (Bresnan, 1982a:4; Kaplan and Bresnan, 1982:173-174). Grammatical functions are treated as primitives in this framework; they are assumed to be universals although they are encoded in different ways in each language. For example, configurational languages such as English, Chinese or Khmer map grammatical functions from the functional structure (f-structure) (section 1.2.1.2) to positions in the constituent structure (c-structure) (section 1.2.1.1). In non-configurational languages such as Japanese or Malayalam, these functions are mapped to case features rather than c-structure nodes. In LFG, only lexical rules can change
the grammatical functions of constituents (Bresnan, 1982a:8).

Grammatical functions can be sub-classified as follows:

1) Grammatical functions

   Subcategorisable      Non-subcategorisable

   Semantically unrestricted       Semantically restricted

   SUBJ      OBJ       OBL      COMP      XCOMP     ADJUNCT     XADJUNCT

Grammatical functions such as SUBJ, OBJ, COMP, XCOMP are subcategorised for by a predicate whereas ADJUNCT and XADJUNCT are not. For instance, the prepositional phrase on the table in (2) functions as an oblique since it is subcategorised for by the predicate to put.

2) Jack put the glass on the table.

In contrast, the prepositional phrase on the table in (3) is an adjunct. The predicate to dance in (3) does not select for this prepositional phrase.

3) Jack danced on the table.

Subcategorisable grammatical functions are directly mapped onto semantic or thematic roles in a lexical predicate-argument structure (Bresnan and Mchombo, 1987:757). Grammatical functions which are semantically unrestricted are not linked to any specific role. For example, SUBJ (or Subject) can be an agent, a theme or a patient whereas OBJ (or Object) can be a theme or a patient.

Semantically restricted functions can be linked to certain thematic roles. OBL (or Oblique) is used to refer to the object of an adposition. An OBL can be assigned certain thematic roles, for instance, OBLGO is associated with a GOAL argument. OBJ2 is the secondary object of ditransitive verbs which may have different properties from OBJ. In (4), Jill functions as OBJ and a pot plant is OBJ2.

4) Jack gave Jill a pot plant.

The evidence for treating Jill as OBJ rather than OBJ2 comes from passive
constructions. The OBJ or Jill in (4) can undergo passivisation, as shown in (5). In contrast, it is ungrammatical to passivise OBJ2 or a pot plant. This is illustrated in (6).

5) Jill was given a pot plant by Jack.
6) *A pot plant was given Jill by Jack.

In addition to this, verbs in many languages with case agreement do not show object agreement with OBJ2 (Bresnan and Moshi, 1990:150-157). In early versions of LFG, OBJ2 was treated as a semantically unrestricted function (Bresnan, 1982b:287). In later work, however, OBJ2 is classified as semantically restricted object since it can have individual thematic roles in the same way as OBL (Bresnan and Kanerva, 1989:25; Her, 1990:55).

The grammatical functions COMP and XCOMP differ in their control properties. XCOMP is a functionally controllable clause whereas COMP is not (Bresnan, 1982b:355). XCOMP is an abbreviation for a disjunction of NCOMP (predicative nominal), ACOMP (predicative adjective), PCOMP (predicative prepositional phrase) and VCOMP (infinitive or participle complement) (Falk, 1984:489). The underlined proposition in (7) is COMP in Khmer whereas that in (8) has a grammatical function as NCOMP.

7) kōat prap thaa niarrii kampun ńam baay
he tell COMP Nieree Cont eat rice
'He told (someone) that Nieree was eating.'

8) kōat ciq qawpuk pūqmaq kņom
he be father friend I
'He is the father of my friend.'

The control relation in XCOMP, as in example (9), will be discussed in section 1.2.2.

9) niarrii coulcāt sasei sambat
Nieree like write letter
'Nieree likes writing a letter.'

(see below)
XADJUNCT and ADJUNCT, which are not subcategorised for by the predicate, are adverbial and prepositional modifiers of the predicate (Kaplan and Bresnan, 1982:214). XADJUNCT differs from ADJUNCT in that the former is a functionally controlled clause whereas the latter is not. In other words, they are distinct from each other in the same way that XCOMP differs from COMP. In addition to these grammatical functions, TOPIC and FOCUS are defined as grammaticalised discourse functions (Bresnan, 1993:47). Topic designates what has previously been mentioned or assumed in the discourse whereas focus designates something that is not presupposed (Chafe, 1976; Bresnan and Mchombo, 1987:746).

Although there are some other sub-types of XCOMP in Khmer, I will only focus on the control relation of VCOMP in this study.
Within the LFG framework, each sentence in a language has associated with it a c-structure and an f-structure. C-structure represents the superficial constituency and f-structure represents meaningful grammatical functions. C-structure and f-structure are constructed from the grammar and the lexicon by an algorithm. In this study, c-structure and f-structure are described in sections 1.2.1.1 and 1.2.1.2, respectively. In addition to this, the lexicon plays a very important role in LFG because grammatical relations are lexically encoded by assigning grammatical functions to the predicate-argument structure. Argument structure (a-structure) represents semantic properties of grammatical functions assigned by the verb. The LFG concept of the lexicon will be presented in section 1.2.1.3.

1.2.1.1 Constituent structure

There is only a single level of constituent structure or c-structure in LFG, which represents information about linear precedence and dominance relations. This structure is the input to phonology (Kaplan and Bresnan, 1982:175). Lexical items encoded in the c-structure are in fully inflected forms and are presented in a linear order.

An element in the c-structure can be associated with a grammatical function in the f-structure by a functional equation. For example, the phrase structure rules of example (10) can be annotated as given in (11) - (13).

10) Mary saw a man.

11) S → NP VP
    \( \uparrow\text{SUBJ}=\downarrow \) \( \uparrow=\downarrow \)

12) NP → (Det) N
    \( \uparrow=\downarrow \) \( \uparrow=\downarrow \)

13) VP → V NP
    \( \uparrow=\downarrow \) \( \uparrow\text{OBJ}=\downarrow \)

The 'up-arrow' refers to the f-structure of the mother node whereas the 'down-arrow' corresponds with the f-structure of the ego node. The equation \( \uparrow=\downarrow \) is assigned to exocentric and endocentric constructions of which the head is a major category. All maximal projections can be associated with \( \uparrow(G)=\downarrow \) where G is a variable of grammatical functions such as SUBJ, OBJ. The c-structure of example (10) is given in (14).
Lexical items are represented in this c-structure with their complete lexical entries attached to the forms. Information in these lexical entries will be discussed in section 1.2.1.3. Numerical subscripts are abbreviations of variables in the f-structure, not the c-structure. However, I will also use the subscripts as a notational convenience for explaining the relationship of constituents in the c-structure. The functional equations in the c-structure above can be explained in the following steps. The equation $\uparrow = \downarrow$ above all pre-terminal nodes, $N_4$, $V_5$, Det$_7$ and $N_8$, means that information about the ego node is the same as that of the mother node, and is passed up to the mother node. The equation $\uparrow \text{SUBJ} = \downarrow$ above the node $NP_2$ means that all functional information carried by $NP_2$ goes into the SUBJ part of the f-structure associated with the mother node $S_1$. The equation $\uparrow \text{OBJ} = \downarrow$ above the node $NP_6$ indicates that all functional information carried by $NP_6$ goes into the OBJ part of the f-structure associated with its mother node $VP_3$. $NP_6$ is the maximal projection formed by a determiner (Det$_7$) and a noun (N$_8$). The annotation $\uparrow = \downarrow$ above the node $VP_3$ means that information about the ego node is equivalent to information about its upper node, and is passed up to its upper node. Therefore, the grammatical function OBJ is passed up from $VP_3$ to $S_1$. So, this OBJ is the OBJ not only of the VP but also of the whole S. Since $V_5$ contains a PRED value which is passed up to the upper node, this PRED value is the PRED value of $VP_3$ and $S_1$.

An f-structure which encodes information about grammatical functions can

---

2 In later discussion, I will only present NP as a node in the c-structures; N is assumed to be generated under NP, but for reasons of clarity, will not be included in every c-structure.
be built from the functional description (f-description) generated by the c-structure rules and the lexicon (Kaplan and Bresnan, 1982:180-203). An f-description is a collection of statements specifying properties of the string in f-structure (Kaplan and Bresnan, 1982:181). The f-description of example (10) is given in (15). The variable \( f_1 \) in an f-description is associated with the node \( S_1 \) in the related c-structure. Other variables in an f-description can be associated with nodes which have the same numerical subscript in the related c-structure.

15) a. \( f_1 \text{ SUBJ} = f_2 \)
   b. \( f_1 = f_3 \)
   c. \( f_3 \text{ OBJ} = f_6 \)
   d. \( f_1 \text{ OBJ} = f_6 \)
   e. \( f_2 = f_4 \)
   f. \( f_3 = f_5 \)
   g. \( f_6 = f_7 \)
   h. \( f_6 = f_8 \)
   i. \( f_4 \text{ PRED} = 'MARY' \)
   j. \( f_5 \text{ TENSE} = \text{PAST} \)
   k. \( f_5 \text{ PRED} = 'SEE ((\uparrow \text{SUBJ}) (\uparrow \text{OBJ}))' \)
   l. \( f_7 \text{ SPEC} = A \)
   m. \( f_7 \text{ NUM} = \text{SG} \)
   n. \( f_8 \text{ NUM} = \text{SG} \)
   o. \( f_8 \text{ PRED} = 'MAN' \)

The equation (a) is created by substituting \( f_1 \) for \( \uparrow \) and \( f_2 \) for \( \downarrow \). Thus, the value \( \text{SUBJ} \) of \( f_1 \) is equivalent to the value of \( f_2 \), as shown in (16).

16) \[
\begin{bmatrix}
\text{SUBJ} \\
2
\end{bmatrix}
\]

The c-structure does not determine the value of \( f_2 \); this is determined by the lexical entry. The lexical entry for \textit{Mary}, as in (15 (i)), specifies \( \text{PRED} = 'MARY' \). Since \( N_4 = \text{NP}_2 \), this means that \( \text{PRED} 'MARY' \) is the value of \( f_2 \), as shown in (17).
17) \[
\text{SUBJ} \quad 2,4 \quad \text{PRED } '\text{MARY}'
\]

Given that statement (b) in the f-description (15) indicates that \( f_1 = f_3 \), the f-structure can then be expanded as in (18).

18) \[
\text{SUBJ} \quad 2,4 \quad \text{PRED } '\text{MARY}'
\]

Since the lexical entry for \textit{saw} in \( V_5 \) provides the PRED value for \( f_1 = f_3 \) (in (b)) and \( f_3 = f_5 \) (in (f)), namely 'SEE', the f-structure which includes the lexical entry for \textit{saw} is given in (19).

19) \[
\text{SUBJ} \quad 2,4 \quad \text{PRED } '\text{MARY}'
\]
\[
\text{PRED} \quad '\text{SEE } ((\text{SUBJ} (\text{OBJ}))')
\]
\[
\text{TENSE} \quad \text{PAST}
\]

The value OBJ of \( f_6 \) is built up similarly. The complete f-structure of example (10) is illustrated in (20) below.

20) \[
\text{SUBJ} \quad 2,4 \quad \text{PRED } '\text{MARY}'
\]
\[
\text{PRED} \quad '\text{SEE } ((\text{SUBJ} (\text{OBJ}))')
\]
\[
\text{TENSE} \quad \text{PAST}
\]
\[
\text{OBJ} \quad 6,7,8 \quad \text{SPEC } A \quad \text{NUM } SG \quad \text{PRED } '\text{MAN}'
\]

In the next section, the concept of the f-structure will be further discussed.

1.2.1.2 Functional structure

Functional structure or f-structure encodes information about grammatical relations such as principles of constraint agreements, control and binding, government and extraction (Bresnan and Mchombo, 1986:292; Bresnan, 1994:104). The format for f-structure is a set of attributes and their corresponding values. An attribute is the
name of a grammatical function or feature such as SUBJ for a subject, OBJ for an object, NUM for number and CASE for case. Values for a grammatical feature can be expressed in three forms. Values can be symbols, such as SG (or singular) for the NUM feature or NOM (or nominative) for the CASE feature. Values may also be expressed either as a semantic form such as:

\[
\begin{align*}
21) \quad & \text{PRED 'SEE ('(SUBJ) (OBJ)'')'}
\end{align*}
\]

or as a f-structure such as:

\[
\begin{align*}
22) \quad & \text{SUBJ [PRED 'MAN']}\text{DEF + ']}
\end{align*}
\]

Although c-structures determine properties of f-structures, there is no direct mapping from c-structures to f-structures. Different c-structures may share the same f-structure and vice-versa. There are three main well-formedness conditions in the f-structure to rule out overgeneration.

23) Functional Uniqueness
Information about the same grammatical function must be consistent.

24) Functional Completeness
Every grammatical function is lexically required to be functionally present.

25) Functional Coherence
All grammatical functions, including the grammaticalised discourse functions FOC(US) and TOP(IC), must be linked to lexical argument structure, either anaphorically or by identification with a syntactic function.

\[
\text{(Bresnan, 1993:47)}
\]

Completeness and coherence conditions require that every argument function must be expressed syntactically within the c-structure headed by the predicate, or expressed morphologically on the head itself, or else remain unexpressed (i.e.) anaphorically or functionally controlled (Bresnan and Mchombo, 1987:752). For instance, the verb to hand subcategorises for either SUBJ, OBJ and OBJ2 or SUBJ, OBJ and OBL. Since example (26) only contains SUBJ and OBJ2, it is incomplete.
26) *Mary hands the girl.

Example (27) is incoherent since there are more grammatical functions than are required by the verb *to hand*. The verb *to hand* cannot subcategorise for both OBJ2 and OBL in the same sentence.

27) *Mary hands the girl a toy to the girl.

1.2.1.3 Lexicon

In the lexicon of a language, a lexical entry contains its categorial specification and a set of functional annotations. All properties of each lexical item in a sentence are included in the lexicon. Lexical entries contain 'up-arrow', but not 'down-arrow' since information about the lexical items is always passed up to its upper node in the f-structure. The value of the PRED feature within the quotes represents the meaning of a lexical item. Not all lexical items have a PRED feature. A lexical item which has no semantic significance cannot be assigned a PRED feature (Grimshaw, 1982:114). A form which has the PRED value in its lexical entry is known as a *semantic form*; those that subcategorise for one or more grammatical functions are called *lexical forms* (Bresnan, 1982b:304). In the lexical entry of a verb, the grammatical functions or arguments for which the verb subcategorises are enclosed in angle brackets following the PRED value. For instance, the lexical items in example (10) can have lexical entries as illustrated in (28) - (31).

28) \[ \text{Mary} \; \text{N (↑PRED) = 'MARY'.} \]

29) \[ \text{see} \; \text{V (↑PRED) = 'SEE ((SUBJ) (OBJ))'} \]
\[ (↑TENSE) = \text{PAST}. \]

30) \[ \text{a} \; \text{DET (↑SPEC) = A} \]
\[ (↑NUM) = \text{SG}. \]

31) \[ \text{man} \; \text{N (↑PRED) = 'MAN'} \]
\[ (↑PERS) = 3 \]
\[ (↑NUM) = \text{SG}. \]

The lexical entries of the lexical items illustrated in (28) - (31), can be read as follows: the notation (↑PRED) = 'MARY' in (28) means that the f-structure of the node dominating Mary (i.e., NP₂ in the c-structure (14)), has a PRED value which is MARY. Thus, 'MARY' is the value of the PRED of the SUBJ in the f-structure (20). The lexical entry in (29) indicates that the form see is a verb with a PRED value 'SEE'. This verb subcategorises for a SUBJ and an OBJ and it is past tense. The form a in (30) has the grammatical category of determiner of which the SPEC feature is A and
the NUM feature is singular. The form man in (31) has the grammatical category of noun. The notation $(\uparrow{\text{PRED}}) = '\text{MAN}'$ in (31) can be read as 'my mother's f-structure has a PRED value which is MAN'.

In LFG, some arguments which bear grammatical functions can be unrealised in the c-structure. However, they are interpreted as anaphors or PRO in the f-structure. Like a pronoun, PRO is a semantic form. It can be introduced in the format of $(\uparrow{\text{G PRED}}) = '\text{PRO}'$ as a part of the lexical entry of a lexical form which governs that grammatical function (or G) (Bresnan, 1982b:326). This equation means that the grammatical function G which is unexpressed in the c-structure has a PRED value of PRO in the f-structure. The concept of PRO in LFG and grammatical functions which can have a PRED value of PRO are discussed in section 1.2.2.1, which discusses PRO as relevant to control, and in section 1.2.3.

There are two types of functional equations in LFG. The schemata in (28) - (31) are all defining equations. These equations always assert particular values for features of the lexical items (Kaplan and Bresnan, 1982:210). In other words, they define information of a lexical item which is passed up to the f-structure of the upper node. The second type of equation is the constraining equation. Constraining equations express conditions that must be satisfied by the f-structure, otherwise the f-structure is ill-formed. These conditions, which are represented by the notation '$=c$', do not provide information directly but constrain information from elsewhere (Kaplan and Bresnan, 1982:207; Grimshaw, 1982:103). The lexical entry of progressive is, as in (32), illustrates the use of constraining equation.

32) is $\quad V, (\uparrow{\text{TENSE}}) = \text{PRESENT}$$\quad (\uparrow{\text{SUBJ NUM}}) = \text{SG}$$\quad (\uparrow{\text{PRED}}) = '\text{PROG} ((\uparrow{\text{VCOMP}})')$$\quad (\uparrow{\text{VCOMP PARTICIPLE}}) =_c \text{PRESENT}$$\quad (\uparrow{\text{VCOMP SUBJ}}) = (\uparrow{\text{SUBJ}}).$

(Kaplan and Bresnan, 1982:209 (70))

The fourth equation is the constraining equation. It constrains a feature whose value must be defined elsewhere. This equation will be evaluated after the defining equations are processed. In this case, it is required that the PARTICIPLE feature of VCOMP must have the PRESENT value. The string in (33) is well-formed and the constraining equation is satisfied as the PARTICIPLE feature of the VCOMP following is has the PRESENT value.

33) Mary is sitting.

The PRESENT value is defined by the lexical entry for sitting, as given in (34).
34) *sitting V, (↑PRED) = 'SIT ((↑SUBJ))'
    (↑PARTICIPLE) = PRESENT.

In contrast, the PARTICIPLE feature of the form sits in example (35) does not have the PRESENT value. The string is therefore ungrammatical because no defining equation has supplied the value demanded by the constraining equation.

35) *Mary is sits.

1.2.2 Control theory

Control is defined as a relation of referential dependence between an unexpressed argument (or controlled element) and its antecedent (Bresnan, 1982b:317; Manzini, 1983:423; Mohanan, 1983:642; Sag and Pollard, 1991:63). The antecedent element or controller with which the controlled element is coreferential can be either an expressed or an unexpressed argument. For instance, the overt matrix subject of example (36) in Khmer functions as the controller of the unexpressed complement subject.

36)  kḥom can yum tiːt
    I want cry again
    'I wanted to cry again.'

The controller of the unexpressed complement subject can also be unexpressed, as shown in (37). It is presupposed that the speaker and the listener know who they are talking about.

37) can yum tiːt
    want cry again
    '(Someone) wanted to cry again.'

In this section, the concept of control in the LFG framework is introduced first (section 1.2.2.1). Control concepts in other theories are briefly presented in section 1.2.2.2.

1.2.2.1 Control in LFG

In LFG, lexically-induced control is a property of the functional structure, not the constituent structure (Mohanan, 1983:641; Simpson and Bresnan, 1983:49). The controlled element is unrealised in the c-structure but it is encoded in the f-structure. There are two types of control in this theory – functional control and anaphoric control.

The first type of control is Functional control. It is the relation that holds
between an antecedent in the main clause and the unexpressed subject in an XCOMP or an XADJUNCT (Bresnan, 1982:321-326; Sells, 1985:165). In this study, I will not discuss control relations in adjuncts. Functional control requires that the controlled subject shares the identical grammatical features with the controller (Bresnan, 1982b:321; Simpson and Bresnan, 1983:55). For instance, in a case-marking language, the case of the controlled subject and that of the controller must be the same. The second type of control in LFG is anaphoric control. Unlike functional control, anaphoric control requires only an identity of reference between the controller and the controlled element (Bresnan, 1982b:321; Simpson and Bresnan, 1983:55). The case of the controlled subject is not necessarily identical to that of the controller. Anaphoric control relates a functional anaphor or 'PRO' with its controller (Bresnan, 1982b:326). In a language with case-marking agreement, it is easier to identify which type of control a construction has because the case of the controlled subject and that of the controller are the same if the control relation is functional control. In a language with no such case agreement, such as Khmer, it is difficult to decide what type of control is involved in a particular circumstance. However, I will treat all control discussed in this study as functional control since a lexical subject never occurs within an XCOMP. For details and examples, see chapter 5 Controlled complement.

The functional control relation between the unexpressed subject of an XCOMP and its antecedent argument is expressed by a control equation in the lexical entry of the matrix predicate. A control equation is a functional annotation which matches the f-structures of the controller and the controlled element. This equation can be presented in the format \((\mathcal{G}) = (\mathcal{X}_{\text{COMP} \text{SUBJ}})\). For instance, the controller of the unexpressed complement subject of promise in (38) is the matrix subject.

38) John promised Mary to leave.

The lexical entry of the predicate promise includes the control equation, as shown in (39).

39) promise: V, \((\mathcal{PRED}) = \text{'}PROMISE ((\text{SUBJ}) (\text{OBJ}) (\text{XCOMP}))\text{'}\)
\((\mathcal{X}_{\text{COMP} \text{SUBJ}}) = (\mathcal{T}_{\text{SUBJ}})\)
\((\mathcal{T}_{\text{TENSE}}) = \text{PAST}.\)

The control equation means that the subject of promise is the subject of the XCOMP. In contrast, the controller of the complement subject of persuade in (40) is the matrix object.

40) John persuaded Mary to leave.

The control equation in the lexical entry of persuade, as shown in (41), indicates that
the object of *persuade* is the subject of XCOMP.

(41) persuade: \( V, (\uparrow \text{PRED}) = \text{PERSUADE} \langle (\text{SUBJ}) \langle \text{OBJ} \rangle \rangle \langle \text{XCOMP} \rangle \rangle \)
\( (\uparrow \text{XCOMP \, SUBJ}) = (\uparrow \text{OBJ}) \)
\( (\uparrow \text{TENSE}) = \text{PAST}. \)

As shown in (42) and (43), control can be indicated in the f-structure by means of a line linking the identical substructures. Since the lexical entry of *promise* specifies that the matrix subject is the controller of the unexpressed complement subject, the line in (42) links the unexpressed complement subject with the matrix subject.

(42) 
```
  SUBJ  PRED 'JOHN'
  PRED  'PROMISE \langle (\text{SUBJ}) \langle \text{OBJ} \rangle \rangle \langle \text{XCOMP} \rangle \rangle'
  OBJ  PRED 'MARY'
  XCOMP [ SUBJ [ ] ]
        PRED  'LEAVE \langle (\text{SUBJ}) \rangle'
```

The control equation in the lexical entry of *persuade* indicates that the matrix object is the subject of XCOMP. Therefore, the line in (43) links the unexpressed complement subject with the matrix object.

(43) 
```
  SUBJ  PRED 'JOHN'
  PRED  'PERSUADE \langle (\text{SUBJ}) \langle \text{OBJ} \rangle \rangle \langle \text{XCOMP} \rangle \rangle'
  OBJ  PRED 'MARY'
  XCOMP [ SUBJ [ ] ]
        PRED  'LEAVE \langle (\text{SUBJ}) \rangle'
```

1.2.2.2 Other theories of control

In this section, other theories of control are briefly mentioned. Some grammatical terms used in LFG are the same as those used in these theories, however, they are defined in different ways.

Within Government and Binding theory (GB), control is encoded at the phrase structure level. Two types of control are recognised in this theory – obligatory control and optional control (Chomsky, 1981:74-79; Manzini, 1983:423-424; Sells, 1985:75; Haegeman, 1991:256-259). In obligatory control, the controlled element is obligatorily coreferential with an argument in the dominating clause. The controlled element of the optional control relation, in contrast, can have an arbitrary
interpretation. It can corefer to an antecedent outside the sentence.

The controlled element in GB is referred to as PRO. PRO is one of the four empty categories assumed in GB; these categories are NP-trace, PRO ('big PRO'), pro ('little pro') and variable. PRO is distinct from other types of empty categories in that PRO is restricted to the ungoverned position; PRO only occurs in the subject position of non-finite clauses. An overt pronoun and other types of empty categories never occur in this position (Chomsky, 1981:56, 66; Haegeman, 1991:251, 263).

It should be noted that PRO in GB has a different interpretation from PRO in LFG. In LFG, PRO is a grammatical anaphor in the f-structure, though it is unrealised in the c-structure. In addition, the position of PRO in LFG is not restricted to the subject of non-finite clauses. PRO in LFG can occur in the same positions as an overt pronoun depending on the restrictions of a language. Another type of empty category in GB which has some equivalent characteristics to PRO in LFG is pro. This empty category or pro is assumed for pro-drop phenomenon. The other two empty categories in GB, NP-trace and variable are not relevant here.

In Head-driven Phrase Structure Grammar (HPSG), control follows semantic principles (Sag and Pollard, 1991). Sag and Pollard propose that the unexpressed subject in verbal and nominal complements share the same semantic control constraints. In addition, the controller can have various syntactic functions.

Sag and Pollard classify verbs into 3 classes: Commitment type, such as *promise, agree, try, intend*, Orientation type, such as *want, desire, wish* and Influence type, such as *order, persuade, command, instruct*. Verbs in each class share the same control constraints and this is predictable by the semantic role of the matrix verbs. For example, verbs of the commitment type are controlled by the committor, orientation type by experiencer and influence type by influenced participant. The VP complements are identified in terms of *State of affairs* (SOA) which is one of the predicate arguments.

The unexpressed subject of an SOA is bound to a different participant depending on the SOA type. The semantic generalisation of the controller assignment is given as:
44) Given a nonfinite VP or predicative complement C, whose semantic content C' is the soa-arg of a soa s whose relation is R, the unexpressed subject of C is linked to:

A. the influenced participant of s, if R is of influenced type
B. the committor participant of s, if R is of commitment type
C. the experiencer participant of s, if R is of orientation type.

(Sag and Pollard, 1991:66 (13))

To sum up, the concepts of control relation in the three theories discussed here vary. In both LFG and GB, control is treated as a purely syntactic phenomenon. In HPSG, it is assumed to be predictable from semantic principles.

1.2.3 Pro-drop phenomenon

Pro-drop is a linguistic phenomenon in which an unexpressed element under certain conditions has a pronominal interpretation (Bresnan, 1982b:384; Haegeman, 1991:416). In this section, I will first present the concept of pro-drop in LFG. This is followed by a discussion of the concept of pro-drop in GB. Pro-drop in HPSG will not be discussed.

1.2.3.1 Pro-drop in LFG

In the LFG framework, null elements in control and null elements in pro-drop phenomenon are treated as the same. Although the null elements are unexpressed in the c-structure, they are present in the f-structure. These null elements have a semantic form as 'PRO'. Bresnan (1982b:385) proposes that pro-drop is limited to SUBJ, OBJ and OBJ2, and that PRO cannot occur in OBL position.

To account for pro-drop phenomenon in various languages, Mohanan (1983) modifies Bresnan's proposal to a parametricised principle. This principle is cited here as (45).

45) A nuclear grammatical function may be interpreted as PRO in f-structure_a (if it is the subject_b (of a non-finite clause)).

(Mohanan, 1983:650 (39))

Each language has different constraints on this principle. The unexpressed grammatical functions in English, for example, are restricted to the subject position of
non-finite clauses. The complete specification of the principle is, therefore, applied to English. Italian and Spanish are examples of languages of which the unrealised grammatical function can only occur in the subject position of a finite and a non-finite clause. This means that the condition (b) does not apply to Italian and Spanish. The distribution of the null element in Malayalam and Warlpiri is free, that is, the parametricised principle without conditions (a) and (b) is applied to Malayalam and Warlpiri. Data in Khmer fits in nicely with the parametricised principle without conditions (a) and (b). The distribution of the null element in Khmer is the same as Malayalam and Warlpiri. As can be seen in section 2.5, the grammatical functions SUBJ, OBJ and OBJ2 can be unexpressed whereas OBL cannot.

1.2.3.2 Pro-drop in GB

There are extensive studies on pro-drop phenomenon in Government and Binding literature. These studies include amongst others, Chomsky (1981); Fisher (1985); Cole (1987); Huang (1984, 1989) Jaeggli and Safir (1989) and Hoonchamlong (1991). Control and pro-drop are treated as different issues in this framework. As mentioned in section 1.2.2.2, control refers to the occurrence of PRO in the un gover ned position, i.e., the subject position of non-finite clauses. PRO in GB is assumed as having the features [+anaphoric, +pronominal] (Chomsky, 1981:335; Haegeman, 1991:415). In contrast, pro-drop is related to the occurrence of pro. This pro is treated as having the features [−anaphor, +pronominal] (Chomsky, 1981; Haegeman, 1991:415). This means that pro can occur in the same positions as overt pronouns. A number of works on pro-drop within GB framework only focus on the occurrence of pro in the subject position of finite clauses (Chomsky, 1981; Huang, 1989; Jaeggli and Safir, 1989). However, the studies of pro-drop phenomenon in languages in South-East Asia reveal that pro can also occur in the object position of finite clauses (Fisher, 1985; Cole, 1987; Hoonchamlong, 1991).

1.3 Review of the literature on the Khmer language

Khmer is one of the better known languages in the Austroasiatic language family and is the official language of the Kingdom of Cambodia. A relatively large amount of linguistic research has been done on this language, in the areas of phonetics and phonology, morphology and lexicon, grammatical outlines as well as comparative and historical linguistic studies. However, there is not much work which discusses complements in Khmer. In this section, only literature relevant to complementation will be mentioned. Further details of Khmer literature can be found in Huffman's bibliography and index of mainland Southeast Asian languages and linguistics (1986).
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There have been a number of outlines of the Khmer grammar. These outlines describe the Khmer writing system and the structure of the language from the phonological level, morphological level, word classes up to sentence types. The main purpose of these works (Maspero, 1915; Gorgoniyev, 1966; Jacob, 1968; Huffman, 1970a, 1970b; Ehrman, 1972) is to produce suitable materials for language teaching. These studies also provide some valuable details which are useful in syntactic analysis.

Within the last three decades, a number of works on Khmer syntax have been produced. The majority of these studies have focused on serial verb constructions, a well-known characteristic of Khmer as well as other languages in South-East Asia. These studies include Mikami (1979); Goral (1986); Schiller (1991) and Wilawan (1993). All of these studies compare characteristics of Khmer serial verb constructions with those of other languages. For instance, Wilawan (1993) focuses her analysis on Thai data and confirms the pattern with Khmer, Yoruba and Mandarin Chinese data. I will provide details of some points of these studies where they are relevant to my discussion.

Other studies of Khmer syntax include the study of complement clauses versus relative clauses by Comrie and Horie (to appear) and the study of Khmer anaphora (Fisher, 1985). Comrie and Horie investigate characteristics of nominal complements in Khmer through a comparison with relative clauses. They compare Khmer examples with English and Japanese examples. This article is a preliminary report.

In "The syntax and semantics of anaphora in Khmer", Fisher (1985) discusses a syntactic and semantic analysis of Khmer anaphora. With regard to syntax, Fisher applies the principles of Binding theory to forms which can substitute for a noun phrase. These substitute forms include personal pronouns, titles, kinship terms, personal names, full noun phrases and null pronominals. Fisher classifies each type of these forms on the basis of their distribution in a variety of constructions. For example, the form klûn, in example (46), is interpreted as an anaphor because klûn always co-indexes with the matrix subject of the simple clause.

46) boppha khâñh klûn niw knû ph teivei
   Boppha, see self, loc in T.V.
   'Boppha saw herself on T.V.' (Fisher, 1985:55 (11.a))

However, when compared with the English counterpart, klûn 'self' in Khmer has a wider range of usage. The form klûn can occur in the subject position of an embedded clause and corefer to the matrix subject (p.68-74). It should be noted that there was variation in the grammaticality judgements among my Khmer informants.
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My informants prefer another reflexive pronoun kluanquaen to kluan. Details of the distinction between these two reflexive forms is a topic for further research. I will discuss the interpretation of these two reflexive forms where they are relevant to this study of complementation.

In addition to the syntactic studies listed above, I feel that it is important to mention some Khmer dictionaries which I have used in my research. Khmer has a very extensive monolingual dictionary (Buddhist Institute, 1967, 1968). This dictionary not only includes a full Khmer vocabulary but also provides contextualised examples of usage. There are also some good bilingual dictionaries; the Khmer - English dictionaries compiled by Jacob (1974) and Headley et al (1977) provide valuable assistance to non-native speakers of Khmer in comprehending the meaning of Khmer words as well as understanding some Khmer expressions. I have used these dictionaries to help in glossing some of the examples presented in this thesis.

1.4 Data

The data used in this analysis is based on natural spoken and written discourse as well as elicited data. The spoken and written discourse provide general information about the language as well as some basic characteristics of complement types. Nevertheless, to work in detail on a specific aspect of language, elicited examples have proven to be necessary as well, in order to fully investigate some syntactic patterns.

I collected the majority of my data during the fieldwork in January - June 1993 at the Amphoe of Aranyaprathet, Prachinburi province (now Sakaew province), Thailand. In this area, which is right on the border between Thailand and the Kingdom of Cambodia, there is a large and long standing Khmer community which maintains regular contact with other Khmer communities in the Kingdom of Cambodia. At first, I asked my informants to tell stories and I transcribed some of those stories. Other stories, however, were not allowed to be transcribed. The informants told stories from their own personal lives and felt uncomfortable about having them used for research purposes. Consequently, I used a number of modern Khmer plays in cassette tapes as well as Khmer textbooks, short stories and novels which were commercially available in the Khmer market near the border. In addition, Khmer short stories and novels have also been published in Khmer communities overseas, such as in France and in the United States of America. I chose to rely largely on these public materials out of respect for my informants' desire for privacy.

I worked with my informants in transcribing selected Khmer plays, since the
quality of recording some of the plays was not so good. In addition to this, I also transcribed some short stories and texts. The transcription used for the plays and short stories is Huffman's system (1970a:13-57, 1970b). I also use this transcription system throughout Khmer examples in the thesis. The plays, short stories and textbooks which have been used extensively in this study are listed as follows:

a) qanqiəboh qay qoun niw tiinaa (a short story)
b) saen cambaen (a short story)
c) tiəay sneehaa (a play)
d) kampoŋcaam cam snee (a play)
e) səəλəthəə (a textbook)
f) News from the Khmer radio recorded whilst in Aranyaprathet

Some characteristics of complement types were not fully evident in the discourses listed above. It was, therefore, necessary to elicit data from the informants in order to obtain a complete description of complementation. I began the process by collecting a list of complement-taking predicates from dictionaries. I placed these predicates into appropriate contexts and tested the predicates with the informants. If the sentences or contexts which I used were not acceptable, my informants explained how to use those predicates and created a new sentence or context for these predicates. Sometimes, my informants assisted by suggesting further predicates with a similar or opposite meaning to the one which I was working on. They also provided contexts in which these other predicates could be used.

In addition to my Khmer informants in Thailand, a number of Khmer native speakers in Canberra have supplied me with more data both before and after my period of fieldwork. The informants in Canberra were also used to recheck sentences which had previously been tested with my Khmer informants in Thailand. There were three male informants and three female informants, all of whom were born in the Kingdom of Cambodia. Information on each informant is presented in Table 1.1.

The style and the grammaticality judgements of Khmer speakers sometimes vary. Due to this variation, the examples which are presented in this study are based on the dialect of my main informant which represents the majority of speakers' judgements. The variation in grammaticality judgements will also be discussed later when relevant.
## Informants

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Informants</th>
<th>Sex</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Birth place</th>
<th>Dialect(s) spoken</th>
<th>Period of time in Australia</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A (main informant)</td>
<td>female</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>Phnom Penh</td>
<td>Phnom Penh</td>
<td>7 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>female</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>Phnom Penh</td>
<td>Phnom Penh</td>
<td>6 months</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>male</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>Kampong Thom</td>
<td>Phnom Penh, Kampong Thom</td>
<td>5 months</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>male</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>Phnom Penh</td>
<td>Phnom Penh</td>
<td>6 months</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>male</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>Phnom Penh</td>
<td>Phnom Penh</td>
<td>13 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>female</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>Phnom Penh</td>
<td>Phnom Penh</td>
<td>7 years</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1.1: Information on informants in Canberra

---

3 There are some phonetic and lexical variations amongst Khmer dialects. However, I have not found any obvious syntactic variations while I was collecting the data.

4 Although informant C was born in Kampong Thom, he has lived in Phnom Penh for 16 years.
CHAPTER 2

A general introduction to the Khmer language

2.1 Introduction

In order to give the reader an orientation relevant to further discussion on Khmer complementation, this chapter provides some general information on the language. The genetic classification and grammatical typology of the Khmer language are presented in section 2.2. Nouns, verbs and their modifiers as well as some other word classes are discussed in section 2.3. Khmer has a number of words which are cross-classified for word class. As these words sometimes cause ambiguity, some relevant words are discussed in section 2.4. Some examples of pro-drop phenomena in Khmer are presented in section 2.5 and some Khmer sentence types are given in section 2.6.

2.2 Genetic classification and grammatical typology

Khmer or Cambodian, is one of the most well-known languages of the Austroasiatic language family. Khmer forms its own branch (Khmeric branch) in the Mon-Khmer sub-family (Thomas and Headley, 1970:8; Parkin, 1991:63-64). This language is the official language of the Kingdom of Cambodia (Kampuchea) and is also spoken in the Mekhong delta area of Vietnam and in the southern part of North-Eastern Thailand.

The Khmer people call themselves kmae and refer to Khmer speakers in other places as kmae followed by a geographical term. The Khmer people in the northeastern part of Thailand call themselves kmae or kmae lao* which means 'Upper Khmer' or Northern Khmer. The Northern Khmer people call the Khmer people in the Kingdom of Cambodia kmae kraom, meaning 'Lower Khmer', since geographically the Kingdom of Cambodia is lower than the Korat plateau where they live. As for the Khmer people in the Kingdom of Cambodia, they call themselves kmae or kmae kandaal, meaning 'Central Khmer' and call the Khmer people in the Mekong delta area of Vietnam kmae kraom, Lower Khmer (Thong, 1985:103-117). This is a traditional

* Phonetically, Northern Khmer speakers call themselves [khmear]. There is no phonemic distinction for words with and without the final [r] in Khmer.
criterion of classifying Khmer subgroups. However, based on phonological and lexical criteria, Khmer people can identify more specific regions where other Khmer people come from. It seems that there are many more Khmer dialects than these three main varieties. The linguistic classification of this language needs to be further investigated.

Khmer is a non-tonal language and its stress is not phonemic. It has no significant inflectional morphology. Although it formerly had affixation, such affixation as is found in modern Khmer is fossilised. The productive affixation in Khmer is derivational and does not directly show grammatical relations or semantic roles. Affixation is limited to original Khmer words and old words borrowed from Pali (P), Sanskrit (S) or Thai (T). Here are some examples of Khmer affixation.

Original Khmer words:
1) daɔ 'to walk' → damnaɔ 'journey'
2) niyiyɔ 'to speak' → kaa-niyiyɔ 'speaking'

Words borrowed from Pali, Sanskrit or Thai:
3) toh 'guilt' (S) → bantoh 'to blame'
4) khaenj 'bold' (T) → kamhaenj 'to threaten, menace'

Khmer basic sentence structures are S(subject) – V(erb) – O(bject), as illustrated in examples (5) and (6).

5) boɔŋ kampuŋ tɔɔɔ kaa niw saałaa
   elder sibling Cont do work be school
   'The brother was working at school.'

6) mdaay wiyɔ koun
   mother hit child
   'The mother hit (her) child.'

While this constituent order is fixed, old information in a sentence can be omitted. For further discussion, see section 2.5: Pro-drop.

Sentences in Khmer need not have an overt tense marker. The interpretation of time reference can be either past, present or future depending on the context, for instance:

7) kʰom tiw psaa
   I go market

---

1Thai is a language in the Tai language family. Both Thai and Khmer have a large source of vocabulary which includes items borrowed from each other as well as from Pali and Sanskrit. Syntactically, Thai and Khmer also share a number of similarities (Huffman, 1973:488-509).
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This sentence can be interpreted as 'I am going to the market', 'I went to the market', 'I go to the market' or 'I will go to the market' depending on the context. The English translation of the unmarked time reference for sentences in this study will basically be past tense. If the past tense translation is not compatible with the context, other appropriate English tense markers will then be applied.

When old information, especially an object, is in focus, it can be topicalised to form an O - S - V construction. The underlined noun phrases in examples (8) and (9) function as the topicalised objects.

8) koun proh kñom wiây tae koun srây kñom
   child    male I    hit    but    child    female I
   min dael wiây sah
   not ever    hit    at    all

'I hit my son but I never hit my daughter.'

9) nēaq nuh kñom sqap nah
   person that I    hate    Ints

'I hate that person very much.'

Topicalisation in Khmer can be long-distance. An argument in an embedded clause can be topicalised and occur at the beginning of the sentence. The subject of the embedded clause in (10) is topicalised whereas (11) shows a topicalisation of the object of the embedded clause. The symbol ∅ indicates the normal position where a topicalised argument should occur.

10) siawphiw nih niəiī baan prap kñom thaa ∅
    book    this    Nieree    Past    tell    I    COMP ∅
    tlay nah
    expensive Ints

'This book, Nieree told me that (it) is very expensive.'

11) siawphiw nih niəiī baan prap kñom thaa qñwpuk
    book    this    Nieree    Past    tell    I    COMP    father
    niəŋ coulčat ∅ nah
    she      like    ∅    Ints

'This book, Nieree told me that her father likes (it) very much.'

Like other languages in South-East Asia, serial verb constructions are very productive in Khmer. Serial verb constructions refer to a sequence of verbs which correspond to a single proposition or event (Hale, 1991:8; Clark, 1992:147). These constructions can indicate temporal, directional, instrumental, causative, locative, benefactive or purposive relationships, as in the following examples.

12) mdaay tiw psaa trəlp mɔok wiň haây
    mother    go    market    return    come    back    already

'(My) mother has been to the market.'

* See example (178) on p.52.
13) baaŋ srey daŋ tiw psaə
elder sibling female walk go market
'The elder sister walked to the market.'

14) khom tiw ŋam baay
I go eat rice
'I went to eat.'

15) kōt yōk siawphiw tralap tiw bantup wiŋ
he take book return go room back
'He took the book(s) back to (his) room.'

16) mit qaŋ daŋ spay niŋ yōk tiw naa
friend -self uproot cabbage this take go where
'Where are you going to take the cabbage that you uprooted?'

Serial verb constructions have similar structures to controlled complements. However, controlled complements are subcategorised for by the main verb whereas the verbal structures following the first verb in serial verb constructions are not. Some characteristics of serial verb constructions will be discussed in comparison with those of controlled complements in section 5.4.

Passivisation in Khmer was formerly only an adversative passive. An adversative passive construction expresses an unfavourable effect on the matrix subject referent, as illustrated in (17) and (18).

17) kōt traw kmae krahaam samlap
he Pass Khmer Rouge kill
'He was killed by the Khmer Rouge.'

18) niarī tiw mdaay wiŋ
Nieree Pass mother hit
'Nieree was hit by (her) mother.'

If the predicate in a passive sentence does not imply an unfavourable effect, the passive sentence is odd. This is exemplified in (19) and (20).

19) ?kōt traw kmae krahaam sasaŋ
he Pass Khmer Rouge praise
'He was praised by the Khmer Rouge.'

20) ?niarī tiw mdaay sralañ
Nieree Pass mother love
'Nieree was loved by (her) mother.'

Due to the influence of western languages, a non-adversative passive construction with some predicates has become more acceptable in Khmer, as shown in (21).

21) niarī tiw sot qañcæŋ tiw mæŋ kon
Nieree Pass Sot invite go see movie
'Nieree was invited by Sot to go to see the movie.'
The acceptability of non-adversative passive constructions in Khmer seems to be similar to the situation in Thai. Diller (1988:302-303) notes that some complex structures in Thai are influenced by foreign languages (particularly English). These include the change of the adversative passive construction to a non-adversative passive.

Cross-linguistically the subject in an active sentence corresponds to an oblique or is unexpressed in a parallel passive construction (Bresnan, 1982a:8-10; Keenan, 1985:263). However, the agent subject in a passive construction in Khmer is not marked differently to its form in an active construction. As shown in examples (17), (18) and (21) above, the agent subject in a passive construction is not marked prepositionally. This characteristic of the passive construction in Khmer is similar to that of the passive constructions found in Thai and Vietnamese, noted by Keenan (1985:260, 264). Keenan further proposes that as languages in South-East Asia are verb-serialising languages, it is plausible to analyse passive constructions in these languages as a type of serial verb constructions (p.260). Andrews (personal communication) suggests that the passive construction in Khmer looks like a complement construction in which an object is controlled in a manner perhaps similar to a complement object deletion in English. In other words, traw is a verb which subcategorises for a SUBJ and an SCOMP, with the SCOMP's OBJ is coreferential with the SUBJ of traw. A study of the passive construction in Khmer and the comparative study of these constructions of languages in South-East Asia are interesting issues for further research.

Subordinate clauses in Khmer are roughly classified into three types: relative clauses, adverbial clauses and complement clauses. In this section, relative clauses and adverbial clauses are mentioned briefly. Complementation will be discussed in detail in following chapters.

Relative clauses are used to modify nouns. They are normally introduced by the form dael. There is a gap in Khmer relative clauses, that is, there is no constituent in the relative clause that expresses the relativised noun. The symbol $\phi$, in (22) and (23), indicates the position that the relativised noun should occur in a normal clause.

22) pkaa dael khom coulc$\phi$ b amph$\phi$ kii pkaa kolaap
flower, Rel I like $\phi$ the most be flower rose
'The flower that I like the most is the rose.'

23) kmei$\eta$ dael $\phi$ kampu$\eta$ dao moo$\phi$ nuh ri$\eta$
child Rel $\phi$ Cont walk come that study
pukae nah clever Ints
'The child who is coming is very good at studying.'

Adverbial clauses usually have adverbial complementisers preceding the
propositions. An adverbial clause may occur before or after the main clause. However, it is preferable to begin a sentence with an adverbial clause, as shown in (24) and (25).

24) mun nin tiw rian khom traw dam baay
   before lrl go study I must cook rice
   'Before going to school, I had to cook rice.'

25) bae nan min tiw khom kao min tiw dae
   if she not go I D.M. not go as well
   'If she does not go, I do not go either.'

2.3 Word Classes

Word classes in Khmer are quite similar to those of other languages in South-East Asia. They share the same word classes such as nouns, pronouns, classifiers, demonstratives, adjectives, verbs, adverbs, negators, prepositions, complementisers and particles. The classification of word classes in this research is based on the position of words in sentences. Words belong to the same word class when they occur in the same structural position and share the same grammatical properties. Some word classes, which are relevant to this study, are discussed below.

2.3.1 Nouns and noun phrases

2.3.1.1 Nouns

Nouns in Khmer do not inflect for plurality, gender or case marking. A head noun is at the beginning of a noun phrase. Modifiers follow their head noun and a determiner occurs at the end of a phrase. The basic noun phrase pattern is as follows:

26) Head noun - (Adjective)* - (Possessor) - (Numeral) - (Classifier) - (Determiner).

(Adjective)* indicates the possibility of multiple occurrences of adjective. Examples (27) - (34) below show various structures of noun phrases. The head nouns are underlined.

27) ckae kmaw nih
    dog black this
    'This black dog'

28) ptēah thom pōw sao nuh
    house big colour white that
    'That big white house'

29) niw kunlaen nuh mian ptēah dap
    be place that have house ten
    'There are ten houses in that place.'
30) **tnam** pii krōop nih
   medicine two Clf this
   'These two pills'

31) **kbal** dael tāəpniŋ cañ nuh ...
   steamer Rel just now leave that ...
   'That steamer which just left ...' (Huffman, 1970b:183)

32) **koun** sroay (rabah) look
    child female (of) you
   'Your daughter(s)'

33) sah ruəm tnaq (rabah) kee məneq
    student join classroom (of) he one Clf
   'One of his classmates'

34) camnal (rabah) qaen nih ...
    doubt (of) you this ...
   'Your doubt'

The possessive marker **rabah** in (32) - (34) is in parentheses as it is generally optional with an animate possessor. The possessive marker **rabah** is not used with an inanimate possessor. The symbol (?**rabah**) in (35), means that the phrase is odd if there is the possessive marker **rabah** in the phrase.

35) twia (?**rabah**) pteəh
    door (?of) house
   'The door of the house'

2.3.1.2 Adjectives

An attributive adjective modifies a preceding noun in a noun phrase construction. In examples (36) and (37), the adjectives kmaw 'black' and touc 'little' modify the nouns sampugt 'cloth' and kmein 'child' respectively.

36) sampugt kmaw nih lqoa nah
    cloth black this beautiful Ints
   'This black cloth is very beautiful.'

37) kmein touc nuh kei̱l peek
    child little that lazy too much
   'That little child is too lazy.'

Predicative adjectives can occur in the same syntactic position as verbs, that is, there is never any copula verb in between an adjective and its subject. In examples (36) and (37), lqoa 'beautiful' and kei̱l 'lazy' function as predicative adjective. The underlined forms, as illustrated in examples (38) and (39), are also predicative adjective.
38)  pte̊h kəom thom hae̊y sqaat ti̊t
   house I big and clean too
   'My house is big and clean too.'

39)  kəom kicil tɔɔt kaa nah tɔay ni̊h
   I lazy do work Ints day this
   'I am too lazy to do (any) work today.'

In addition, adjectives in Khmer can also be modified in the same way as verbs, that is, adjectives can be preceded by a negator, as in (40) and they can be preceded by an auxiliary, as in (41).

40)  pte̊h kəom min thom sah
    house I not big at all
    'My house is not big at all.'

41)  kəom kampun kicil tɔɔt kaa nah peel ni̊h
    I Cont lazy do work Ints time this
    'I am too lazy to do (any) work now.'

It seems that adjectives are similar in some ways to stative verbs. Unlike action verbs, both adjectives and stative verbs can be modified by an intensifier nah. An adjective and a stative verb in examples (42) and (43), being modified by nah, are grammatical whereas example (44) which has an action verb modified by the intensifier is ungrammatical.

42)  kɔɔt² thɔt nah
    he fat Ints
    'He is very fat.'

43)  kəom cɔ̄r̥l nah
    I wonder Ints
    'I was very surprised.'

44)  *kɔɔt daɔ nah
    he walk Ints

Nevertheless, there are two reasons to separate adjectives from verbs. The first is that only adjectives can immediately take the comparative form, as illustrated in (45).

45)  kəom thom ciɔŋ look
    I big than you
    'I am bigger than you.'

Although examples (46) and (47) can be understood by the meaning of each word in the

---

2The third person pronoun kɔɔt in Khmer can be glossed as either 'he', 'she' or 'they' in English. For convenience, kɔɔt will be glossed as 'he' unless the context specifies that it should be translated as 'she' or 'they'.
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string, they are unacceptable.

46) ?kñom cñal ciong kee
   I wonder than he

47) ?kñom dao ciong look
   I walk than you

Action and stative verbs need to be modified by an adverb such as craan 'many, more' before taking the comparative form. Examples (48) and (49) are the natural comparative construction with action and stative verbs.

48) kñom cñal craan ciong kee
   I wonder many than he
   'I was more sceptical than him.'

49) kñom dao cñaay ciong look
   I walk far than you
   'I walked further than you.'

The second reason for separating adjectives from verbs is that only adjectives can be immediately used as a modifier in noun phrase constructions. A determiner can differentiate whether a construction of a noun and an adjective is under S or NP. Only a construction which can be modified by a determiner is a noun phrase. When compared with sentences (36) and (37) above, examples (50) and (51) cannot be interpreted as sentences. They are noun phrases and mean 'This very beautiful black cloth' and 'That too lazy little boy' respectively.

50) #sampilgt kmaw lqaa nah nih
    cloth black beautiful Ints this

51) #kmeiñ touc kcil peek nuh
    child little lazy too much that

Examples (52) and (53) demonstrate that action and stative verbs cannot be in an attributive position, while (54) shows that a relative clause can give the intended meaning.

52) *kmeiñ cñal nih
    child wonder this

53) *kmeiñ dao nih
    child walk this

54) kmeiñ dael kampuñ dao moom nih
    child Rel Cont walk come this
    'The child who is walking towards (us).'

Sentences in Khmer, then, can have a phrase structure as in either (55) or (58).

The phrase structure of (55) is illustrated in (56) and the c-structure is illustrated in (57).
55) \[ S \rightarrow NP \ AP \]

56) srey nih sqaat nah
   girl this nice Ints
   'This girl is very nice.'

57) 

Example (59) and (61) illustrate the string for the phrase structure (58). The c-structures of examples (59) and (61) are presented in (60) and (62), respectively.

58) \[ S \rightarrow NP \ VP \]

59) srey nih kampum twaa kaa
   girl this Cont do work
   'This girl is working.'

60) 

61) srey nih mokk pii pnum piñ
   girl this come from Phnom Penh
   'This girl came from Phnom Penh.'
2.3.1.3 Classifiers

Classifiers are optional in Khmer. When a classifier occurs in a noun phrase construction, it follows a numeral. The classifiers in examples (63) and (64) are in parentheses since they can be omitted.

63) tnam buan (krodp) medicine four Clf 'Four pills.'

64) manuh bay (neaq) nuh person three Clf that 'Those three persons'

2.3.1.4 Determiners

Determiners in Khmer can be sub-classified into demonstratives and the definite article. There are two optional demonstratives: nih which is a demonstrative expressing an object close or near the speaker and nuh which expresses an object far from the speaker. They are directly equivalent to this and that in English respectively. These two forms are not variable for plurality, that is, the interpretation of a demonstrative as singular or plural will depend on the context. A demonstrative usually occurs at the end of a noun phrase indicating the noun phrase boundary. This is shown in (65) and (66).

65) ptéah thom nih haay niŋ ptéah touc nuh taŋ house big this and house small that D.M. muaynaa sqaat ciŋ which one nice than 'This big house and that small one, which one is nicer?'

66) kñom coulcət srøy nih ciŋ srøy nuh I like girl this than girl that 'I like this girl than that one.'
There is another word which can occur in the roughly same position as these demonstratives. Semantically nin only expresses definiteness; it has an article-like function in Khmer. This article is also optional, as are demonstratives. Examples (67) - (69) are some examples of the use of nin.

67) ɓaŋ phiset camkak poot nin ɓaŋ twaɑ kluaŋqaer høy
Phisit corn field NIN you do body-self Part
(kampaŋcaaam cam snee)

'Phisit, do you look after (LIT: do) the cornfield by yourself?'

68) A: qoun kom pruɑy tlaɑy naa muoɑ barmnaɑm yoaŋ
you don’t worry day wh- one wish we
kon nin baan samræc
certainly Irrl get succeed

'Don't be worried, some day our wish will certainly have success.'

B: hii! taɑ kaal naa tiw dael haw thaa tlaɑy naa nin
Excl D.M. time wh- go Rel call as day wh- NIN
(tiaso sneehaa)

'Oh! whatever day would that be called?'

69) kanlae̱ nin kmian qwæy kua qaoy qahcaa tee
place NIN not have what suitable marvellous Part
(tiaso sneehaa)

'There is nothing interesting in the place.'

The article nin may co-occur with nuh, as in (70). However, the co-occurrence between nin and nih, as in (71) is not acceptable to most speakers.

70) kæpal nin nuh mook piii naa
ship NIN that come from where

'Where did that ship come from?'

71) ?sraey nin nih kñom piŋcat bamphon
girl NIN this I like the most

For the meaning 'I prefer this girl the most.'

2.3.1.5 Pronouns

The choice of personal pronouns is one of the distinguishing features of social register in Khmer. Personal pronouns show the relationships among the speaker, the hearer and the referent. In addition, pronouns have only one form no matter what grammatical function they take. The following are examples of personal pronouns in Khmer.³

---

First person pronouns
qañ 'I' (showing intimacy or showing that the speaker is superior to the listener)
kñom 'I' (the most neutral first person pronoun)
baañ 'I' (indicating that the speaker is older than the listener and intimate to the listener)
niañ 'I' (indicating that the speaker is a female and younger than the listener)
yëañ 'we'

Second person pronouns
qañ 'you' (showing intimacy)
néaq 'you' (a polite word, usually used with a female listener)
look 'you' (used with someone who is highly respected)
baañ 'you' (indicating that the listener is older than the speaker and intimate to the speaker)
baañ phii 'you' (indicating that the listener's name is 'Phee' and she is older than the speaker)
niañ 'you' (indicating that the listener is a female and younger than the speaker)

Third person pronouns
kọọt 's/he, they' (used for a person or persons who the speaker respects)
kee 's/he, they' (used for a person in a lower class or a younger person)
woo 's/he, it, they' (used for animals, things or children)
baañ 's/he' (used for a person who is older than the speaker and/or the listener)
niañ she (used to refer to a woman or a girl who is younger than the speaker)

Kinship terms such as baañ 'elder sibling' and proper names can also be used as personal pronouns indicating intimacy, although proper names are seldom used as first person pronouns. Kinship terms can also be used as a title and can co-occur with proper names as in baañ phii in the second person pronoun set. As a pronoun such as niañ and a kinship term can be either the first person, second person or third person pronoun, the interpretation of the pronoun and the kinship term depends on context.
In addition to these personal pronouns, the form kluan⁴ and kluanqaen can function as reflexive pronouns in Khmer. As illustrated in (72) and (73), these two forms can be used interchangeably and they are coreferential with the matrix subject.

72) yɔəŋ təw cuəy kluan/kluanqaen
    we must help body/body-self
    'We must help ourselves.'

73) kɔət khɔən kluan/kluanqaen knoŋ kɔŋcaq
    he see body/body-self in mirror
    'He saw himself in the mirror.'

However, the reflexive forms which should be used in a sentence depends on the predicate they co-occur with. In the above examples, my informants prefer kluanqaen to kluan. In contrast, kluan is preferable in examples (74) and (75) below.

74) nĩrrii samlap kluan/kluanqaen
    Nieree kill body/body-self
    'Nieree killed herself.'

75) chum choo tɛəh day plic kluan/kluanqaen thaa
    Chum stand clap hand forget body/body-self COMP
    bɔŋ muk tʊəhɔŋkɔkɔtɔn
    obstruct face audience (sɔyɔlɔθɔə)
    'Chum stood up, clapped hands and did not realise that he obstructed the view of the audience.'

The study of reflexive pronouns in Khmer is an interesting issue for further research.

As illustrated in (76) and (77), Khmer also has two demonstrative pronouns; nih 'this or these' and nuh 'that or those'. These two forms share the same forms as demonstratives.

76) nih cǐə siəwphiw
    Dem be book
    'This is a book/ These are books.'

77) nuh koun kɔŋom
    Dem child I
    'That (is) my child.'

Example (78) shows that the article nin cannot replace nih or nuh in this function.

78) *nin cǐə siəwphiw
    NIN be book

⁴ Although Fisher (1985:55-74) considers kluan to be the only reflexive pronoun in Khmer, my informants accept both kluan and kluanqaen as reflexive pronouns. The interpretation of reflexive forms in each complement construction will be further discussed in the following chapters.
2.3.2 Verbs and verb phrases

Verbs in Khmer do not inflect for tense, aspect or mood and there is no subject-verb agreement either. The interpretation of time reference, aspect and mood depends on the context (especially adverbs of time) or is based on the speaker's and listener's understanding. The verb-phrase string in Khmer can be illustrated as in (79).

79) (Pre-verbal adverb) – (negator) – (Auxiliary) – Main verb – (Object) – (Post verbal adverb).

In this section, auxiliaries and adverbs will be presented before verbs.

2.3.2.1 Auxiliaries

The auxiliaries can be preceded by the negator and they are followed by a main verb. There are three auxiliary slots in Khmer. Auxiliaries in the first slot include
tloap 'used to' dael 'ever'.

The matrix predicate of examples (80) - (82) is modified by an auxiliary in the first slot.

80) niæii tloap kraok laæn pii præim
Nieree used to wake up up from dawn
'Nieree used to wake up at dawn.'

81) tao look dael tiw leen srok kmae tee
D.M. you ever go play Cambodia Part
'Have you ever been to Cambodia?'

82) knom min dael tiw leen srok kmae tee
I not ever go play Cambodia Part
'I have never been to Cambodia.'

Auxiliaries in the second slot which are used to clarify the time reference or mood of the sentences consist of:6

baan describes an event that has occurred before the time being
talked about and thus expresses actual action or a realis mood
(Past),

---

5 Some auxiliaries such as dael 'ever', baan ‘the past tense marker’, traw ‘must’ and kua ‘should’ developed from the verbs. In this study, however, they are treated as auxiliaries when they precede the matrix predicate.

6 The form baan and nin are polysemous forms. They can have more than one function. For more detail, see section 2.4: Words belonging to more than one class.
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kampun expresses an event that is occurring during the time locus (Cont(inous)), and

nin expresses an event in the future or an event that has not occurred yet, that is, a non-actual action or the irrealis mood (Irrl).

In this study, auxiliaries in the second slot will be used as one of the main criteria in analysing verbal complements in Khmer.

The action with the past tense marker in (83) has already taken place. When the matrix predicate is modified by the continuous marker, as in (84), it implies that the action is happening at the time locus of the speech moment. The action with the irrealis marker, as in (85), has not yet happened.

83) yoon baan favm baay
    we Past eat rice
    'We had dinner.'

84) yoon kampun favm baay
    we Cont eat rice
    'We are having dinner.'

85) yoon nin favm baay
    we Irrl eat rice
    'We will have dinner.'

The past tense marker baan can be preceded by a negator whereas it is unusual to negate the continuous marker kampun and the irrealis marker nin. Khmer simply negates the main verb and omits the continuous and the irrealis markers. An adverb of time can be inserted to indicate time reference instead. The following examples show the co-occurrence between the negator and each tense marker.

86) yoon min baan tiw saalaa tee
    we not Past go school Part
    'We did not go to school.'

87) yoon min (*kampun) tiw saalaa
    we not Cont go school
    'We are not going to school.' (*kampun) means that the sentence is ungrammatical if the form kampun is inserted.

Examples (88) and (89) show that the irrealis marker cannot be either preceded or followed by the negator.

Although Thai, a language which has similar structures to Khmer, can have the negator to be inserted after the irrealis marker indicating intention not to perform the action, in Khmer the negator cannot be inserted either before or after the irrealis marker.
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88) យើង មិន (*នឹង) ទិញ សាលាន (ស្លៀក)

We won't go to school (tomorrow).

89) យើង (*នឹង) មិន ទិញ សាលាន (ស្លៀក)

We not go to school tomorrow.

Auxiliaries in the third slot mark the modality of the verb they modify. Auxiliaries that can occur in the third slot include:

- **qaac** 'able to'
- **traw** 'must'
- **kuo** 'should'.

The predicate of examples (90) - (91) is modified by an auxiliary in the third slot.

90) យើង ឈ្នូ ធ្វើ ក្រោយ nih baan tōn peel

'We are able to finish this work on time.'

91) យើង traw da₃ tiw saalaa

'We must walk to school.'

Auxiliaries in the third slot can be immediately preceded by a negator, as illustrated in (92) - (93).

92) យើង min qaac ឈ្នូ ធ្វើ ក្រោយ nih baan tōn peel tee

'We are not able to finish this work on time.'

93) kōt min traw da₃ tiw saalaa tee

'He does not have to walk to school.'

Khmer speakers normally consider that there is no need to put auxilies adjacent to each other since auxilies already have their own time referent. However, Khmer auxilies in this study are grouped into three slots according to the ability of co-occurrence of auxilies in each slot. Auxilies in the first slot never precede auxilies in the third slot, as demonstrated in (94) and (95).

94) *kōt dael kuo da₃ tiw saalaa

'My mother used to work in the hospital.'

95) *nīrii tlôp qaac tbaaľ sampust

Nieree used to able to weave cloth

The auxilies in the first slot; tlôp 'used to' and dael 'ever' cannot co-occur with kampun 'continuous' and nin 'irreals' in the second slot because of the semantic incompatiblility. However, the auxilies in the first slot can precede the past tense marker baan of the second slot, as shown in (96) and (97).

96) mdaay k侬 tlôp baan ឈ្នូ ធ្វើ kaa nih mantrīpeet

'My mother used to work at hospital.'
Examples (98) - (99) illustrate that an auxiliary in the second slot can be followed by an auxiliary in the third slot.

98)  kfiom baan traw chup rian daoy qat luy
     I Past must stop study because deprive money
     'I had to stop studying because of lacking money.'

99)  yao nih gaaq tao kaa nih baan too peel
     we lrl able do work this able on time
     'We will be able to finish this work on time.'

2.3.2.2 Adverbs

There are three types of adverb in Khmer: pre-verbal adverbs, post-verbal adverbs and clausal adverbs.

Pre-verbal adverbs precede the verb or the adjective they modify. They express frequency or temporality. Most pre-verbal adverbs cannot be preceded by a negator. Here are some examples of pre-verbal adverbs:

- probael cia, 'probably'
- craen tae, 'usually'
- kamroa, 'rarely'
- ceh tae, 'always'
- srat tae, 'immediately'
- minsaw, 'hardly'.

Example (100) is a grammatical sentence with the pre-verbal adverb craen tae 'usually'.

100)  kfiom craen tae daa tiw saalaa
     I usually walk go school
     'I usually walk to school.'

When the pre-verbal adverb is preceded or followed by a negator, as in (101) and (102), the sentences are ungrammatical.

101)  *kfiom min craen tae daa tiw saalaa
     I not usually walk go school

102)  *kfiom craen tae min daa tiw saalaa
     I usually not walk go school

Some pre-verbal adverbs are inherently negative. As illustrated in (103) and (104), the form saw never stands on its own; the form minsaw 'hardly' is best treated as one single unit.
103) köat minsaw srual kluean panmaan tee
    he  hardly well  how many Part
  'He is not quite well.'

104) cnam mun kñom minsaw baan mokk leen pteah
    year  before  I  hardly  Past  come  play  house
köat tee
he  Part
  'Last year, I hardly came to visit him.'

Post-verbal adverbs occur after a verb, an adjective or an adverb itself. They cannot directly be preceded by a negator. In addition, they can be sub-classified into two groups: positive and negative post-verbal adverbs. Positive post-verbal adverbs which can occur in either positive or negative sentences include

- nah 'intensifier (Ints)'
- kraylaen 'very much'
- ciñkkee 'the most'
- bamphot 'the most'
- haay 'already'
- dae 'as well'
- phaan 'too'
- mleh 'so'
- tiat 'again'
- tōen 'on time'
- ṇikñōap 'often'.

The positive post-verbal adverbs in examples (105) - (108), occur in positive sentences.

105) kmeiIJ nuh s9aat bamphot
    child  that  nice  the most
  'That is the nicest child.'

106) kñom soum tiw phaan
    I  ask  go  too
  'I'd like to go too.'

107) kñom cañ tiw mōdaañ tiat
    I  want  go  once  again
  'I want to go again as well.'

108) niarii tiw psaa ṇikñōap nah
    Nieree  go  market  often  Ints
  'Nieree goes to the market very often.'

The positive post-verbal adverbs in examples (109) and (110) occur in negative sentences.

109) baa niarii min tiw kñom koañ min tiw dae
    if  Nieree  not  go  I  D.M.  not  go  as well
  'If Nieree is not coming, I will not go either.'

110) chum niw min skōal niarii tiat
    Chum  still  not  know  Nieree  again
  'Chum still does not know Nieree.'
Negative post-verbal adverbs, such as

\[ \text{sah} \quad \text{'at all'} \quad \text{lagy} \quad \text{'at all'} \]

always occur in negative sentences. This is exemplified in examples (111) and (112).

111) \( \text{kñom min con tiw sah} \)
\( \text{I not want go at all} \)
'I don't want to go at all.'

112) \( \text{kñom min mion luy lagy} \)
\( \text{I not have money at all} \)
'I don't have any money at all.'

As \( \text{sah} \) in (113) and \( \text{lagy} \) in (114) occur in positive sentences, examples (113) and (114) are ungrammatical.

113) \( * \text{kñom con tiw sah} \)
\( \text{I want go at all} \)

114) \( * \text{kñom mion luy lagy} \)
\( \text{I have money at all} \)

Most adverbs of manner share the same form with adjectives, i.e., one form has two functions depending on words they modify; for example, \( \text{lqaa} \) can mean either 'good' or 'well'. In example (115), \( \text{lqaa} \) functions as an adjective modifying a noun \( \text{cot} \) 'heart'.

115) \( \text{køøt mion cot lqaa nah} \)
\( \text{he have heart good Ints} \)
'He is a good person.' (LIT: 'he has a good heart'.)

In example (116), \( \text{lqaa} \) is an adverb modifying a verb \( \text{dæo} \) 'to walk'.

116) \( \text{srcy nuh dæo lqaa nah} \)
\( \text{lady that walk well Ints} \)
'That lady walks very elegantly.'

Other examples of adverbs of manner include

\[ \text{craøn} \quad \text{'many, more'} \quad \text{touc} \quad \text{‘little’} \]
\[ \text{yuu} \quad \text{‘long’} \quad \text{liøn} \quad \text{‘quickly’}. \]

The adverbs \( \text{liøn} \) 'quick' in (117) and \( \text{yuu} \) 'long' in (118) modify the verbs \( \text{dæo} \) 'to walk' and \( \text{niw} \) 'to be, stay', respectively.

117) \( \text{kmeøt nih dæo liøn nah} \)
\( \text{child this walk quick Ints} \)
'This child walks very quickly.'
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118) kñôm niw kônlaen nih yuu nah mœk haay
I be place this long Ints come already
'I have lived here (in this place) a long time ago.'

Clausal adverbs modify the whole sentence. They are adverbs of time and place such as:

- pii mun 'before'
- rœl tñay 'everyday'
- mun damboun 'at the beginning'
- kônlaen nih 'here'.

Since clausal adverbs modify the whole sentence, they can occur either at the beginning or the end of the sentence. Examples (119) and (120) illustrate the clausal adverbs in sentence final position.

119) kñôm tiw saalaa rœl tñay pii mun
I go school everyday before
'I went to school everyday, before (this time).'

120) mïn tae srøy kônlaen nih
have only girl here
'There are only girls here.'

In examples (121) and (122), the clausal adverbs occur at the beginning of the sentences.

121) pii mun kñôm tiw saalaa rœl tñay
before I go school everyday
'Before (this time), I went to school everyday.'

122) kônlaen nih mïn tae srøy
here have only girl
'Here, there are only girls.'

2.3.2.3 Verbs

The fact that verbs in Khmer do not inflect for tense or aspect and the fact that there is no subject-verb agreement cause a problem for defining verbs in the language. Other languages which present similar problems of analysis, such as Thai, have a number of criteria to define whether or not words are functioning as verbs. These criteria include the ability to occur in the position in the test frame for verbs; the ability to be negated by a negator; the ability to be nominalised by the nominalisers; the ability to occur as a predicator in a context of a yes-no question; the ability to occur in a kernel sentence, etc. (Sriphen, 1982:8-33). Nevertheless, these criteria are not absolute. Some criteria may be incompatible with some verbs while other criteria seem to be applicable with some other word classes as well as with verbs. In addition, it seems that no single criterion can be used to capture the characteristics of all verbs in a language.
In this study, words in Khmer are defined as verbs by the following criteria: 8

A) The ability to be negated by the negator min.

Most forms that can be negated by min are classified as verbs. For example, qaan 'to read' and moox 'to come' in (123) - (124) can be negated by min and thus are verbs.

123) yoeq min qaan siowphiw nih tee
      we not read book this Part
      'We don’t read this book.'

124) koot min moox leen ptsoh knom sah
      he not come play house I at all
      'He has never been to play at my place.'

B) The ability to be modified by an auxiliary; baan or nin.

Words which can be modified by the past tense marker baan or the irrealis marker nin are classified as verbs. Since qaan 'to read' and moox 'to come' can be modified by nin and baan, as shown in (125) - (126), they are grouped in the same word class, verbs.

125) yoeq nin qaan siowphiw nih
      we Irrl read book this
      'We will read this book.'

126) koot baan moox leen ptsoh knom
      he Past come play house I
      'He has been to play at my place.'

There are three copula verbs in Khmer. The forms kii and ciom are used to equate two noun phrases which refer to the same referent while niw expresses location. When compared with niw, kii and ciom do not have full verbal characteristics. As shown in (127), kii cannot be modified by any auxiliary whereas ciom may be modified by an auxiliary, as in (128).

127) *cnam mun knom nin kii kruu
      year next I Irrl be teacher

128) cnam mun knom nin ciom kruu
      year next I Irrl be teacher
      'Next year, I will be a teacher.'

Neither kii nor ciom can be negated by the verbal negator min. When the copula verb kii or ciom is negated by the verbal negator min, as in (129) and (130), the sentences

---

8 Although the characteristics of predicate adjectives fit in with these criteria, they belong to a different word class, as discussed in section 2.3.1.2: Adjectives above.
are ungrammatical.

129) *proh nuh min kii puəqmaq baan kñom
male that not be friend elder sibling I

130) *proh nuh min ciə puəqmaq baan kñom
male that not be friend elder sibling I

When the constructions are negated, these copula verbs are replaced by the negator min mëen 'not correct'. Other uses of min mëen will be discussed in section 2.3.3.1. Examples (131) and (132) show the grammatical positive and negative sentences with nominal predicates. In example (132), ciə can optionally remain in the sentence.

131) proh nuh (kii/ciə) puəqmaq baan kñom
male that (be) friend elder sibling I
'That man is my brother's friend.'

132) proh nuh min mëen (ciə) puəqmaq baan kñom tee
male that not correct (be) friend elder sibling I Part
'That man is not my brother's friend.'

Although kii and ciə do not share these two properties with other verbs, Khmer speakers still consider these two forms as verbs.

A main verb in Khmer can be a single verb or a group of verbs. An object noun phrase and a locative noun phrase immediately follow a verb. For example, the matrix predicate of example (133) is a compound verb9 and its object koun kñat 'his child' occurs immediately after the verb. Example (134) also has an object immediately following the verb whereas in (135), the verb is followed by a locative.

133) mdaay sdəy-bontoh chum āikñōp nah
mother speak-blame Chum often Ints
'Chum's mother often blamed him.' (LIT: The mother often blamed Chum.)

134) kñat tīn laan tməy
he buy car new
'He bought a new car.'

135) kñom tïw psaaw haaw təlp məok pteəh wiñ
I go market and then return come house back
'I went to the market and then came back home.'

Since an object noun phrase and a locative noun phrase in Khmer can follow a main verb, I will follow Andrews (1985:98) in treating an object as a noun phrase in a transitive sentence which receives the treatment normally accorded to the Patient of a primary transitive verb; namely immediate post-verbal position and ability to be

---

9I will not differentiate between the terms 'compound verb' and 'serial verb construction' in my work.
passivised. As discussed in section 2.2, passivisation in Khmer is normally an
adversative passive, the matrix object as in example (133) can undergo passivisation.
This is exemplified in (136).

136) chum traw mdaay sday-bantoh niknep nah
Chum Pass mother speak-blame often Ints
'Chum was often blamed by (his) mother.'

A locative noun phrase does not receive the full treatment as an object noun phrase
does. Although a locative noun phrase can directly follow the matrix predicate, it
cannot be passivised, as illustrated in (137).

137) *psaa traw khom tiw
market Pass I go

In Khmer, if a verb is ditransitive, a theme object comes before a recipient
object, as shown in (138) - (139).

138) sot qao y tnampul niarii
Sot give poison Nieree
'Sot gave Nieree poison.'

139) mdaay banocok tnam koun
mother feed medicine child
'The mother fed a child medicine.'

The order of objects is fixed. If the objects change their position, the sentence is
ungrammatical, as can be seen in (140) and (141).

140) *sot qao y niarii tnampul
Sot give Nieree poison

141) *mdaay banocok koun tnam
mother feed child medicine

Andrews (1985:124) proposes that in a ditransitive construction, the recipient
should be viewed as the OBJ, since it determines the properties normally associated
with the grammatical function OBJ in a given language. One test that is often used to
provide evidence for treating the recipient object of a ditransitive verb as OBJ comes
from the fact that the recipient object can be passivised whereas the theme object cannot.
The passivisation test which indicates that a recipient object has a characteristic of OBJ
and a theme object does not, can also be applied with objects of ditransitive verbs in
Khmer. When a recipient object undergoes passivisation, as shown in (142) and (143),
the sentences are acceptable. These examples have an implication that there is an
unfavourable effect on the matrix subject referent.

142) niarii traw qao y tnampul
Nieree Pass Sot give poison
'Nieree was given poison by Sot.'
143) koun traw mdaay bañcok tnam
child Pass mother feed medicine
'The child was given (LIT: fed) medicine by (his) mother.'

If a theme object is passivised, as in (144) and (145), the sentences are ungrammatical.

144) *tnampul traw sot qaoy nierii
poison Pass Sot give Nieree

145) *tnam traw mdaay bañcok koun
medicine Pass mother feed child

This supports Andrews' supposition.

However, Andrews' observation does not seem to hold for Khmer word order restriction. Since Khmer is an SVO language, the position normally associated with the grammatical function OBJ is immediately following the verb. As shown in (138) - (139), a theme object in a Khmer ditransitive construction precedes a recipient object.\(^\text{10}\)

The issue of grammatical functions of arguments in Khmer merits further investigation. For the sake of convenience, I will assume a recipient object of ditransitive verbs in Khmer to be OBJ and a theme object to be OBJ2. This has no bearing on the analysis of complementation discussed here.

It should be noted that there is another construction associated with a ditransitive construction in Khmer. A recipient object of some ditransitive verbs can be preceded by a preposition-like verb. As illustrated in (146), a recipient object of qaoy 'to give' can be preceded by the form tiw 'to go'.

146) sot qaoy tnampul tiw nierii
Sot give poison go Nieree
'Sot gave poison to Nieree.'

The preposition-like verb tiw 'to go' in (147) is marked by "?" as some Khmer speakers do not accept a recipient object of bañcok 'to feed' preceded by tiw.

147) mdaay bañcok tnam ?tiw koun
mother feed medicine go child

2.3.3 Other word classes

2.3.3.1 Negators

Negators in Khmer are mostly used to modify a verb or an adjective. Different

\(^\text{10}\)The order of objects in ditransitive verbs in Thai is also the same as that of Khmer. A theme object comes before a recipient object.
negators negate different types of phrases, for instance, some negators only modify a proposition. Although there is a range of negator, only some negators will be discussed here.

The negator min is used in formal speech as well as informal speech or written texts. It can negate either a verb or an adjective, as shown in examples (148) - (151).

148) kõat min niyiy qway sah*
   he not say what at all
   'He did not say anything at all.'

149) pkaa nih min sqaat tee
   flower this not beautiful/nice Part
   'This flower is not beautiful/nice.'

150) look sasei min saam tee
   you write not proper Part
   'You didn't write (it) properly.'

151) kôm twa kaa nih min baan tee
   I do work this not able Part
   'I am unable to do this work.'

The form pum is used to negate a verb or an adjective, as in (152). It is preferable in a literary text.

152) yaa naa-yaa naa kaa kee pum qaac canliäh mänuh
   however-Redup D.M. they not able refuge person
   cõn pii mantriipet kaat dae
   leave from hospital able Part
   (qôngkîboh qêy qoun niw tiinaa)
   'Anyhow, they cannot take refuge people from the hospital.'

As example (153) shows, kom is used to express negative imperative; prohibition.

153) kom daa tiw cñaay peek
   don't walk go far too much
   'Don't go too far.'

The form min meen 'not correct', preceding a constituent, contradicts a belief which the speaker thinks that someone holds. In (154), min meen is put in front of baan 'my brother' indicating that baan did not perform the action whereas it is inserted before niw lôc daam chão 'to be in the tree' in (155) to show a contrast with the fact from the following clause. The form min meen can also be used to contradict a verb phrase, as shown in (156).

154) min meen baan tee dael luac ksaek kao kêm
   not correct elder sibling Part Rel steal necklace I
   '(It) was not (my) brother who stole my necklace.'

* When sah is omitted as in

148') kõat min niyiy qway
   he not say what

qway can be either indefinite pronoun or a Q-word. That is, (148') can mean either 'He did not say anything'
This form is also used to negate a proposition which has a non-verbal feature. To negate the copula constructions in (157) and (158), min meen is applied, as can be seen in (159) and (160).

157) nih kii ckae
   this be dog
   'This is a dog.'

158) kooat ciə kruu knom
    he be teacher I
    'He is my teacher.'

159) nih min meen ckae tee
    this not correct dog Part
    'This is not a dog.'

160) kooat min meen (ciə) kruu knom tee
    he not correct be teacher I Part
    'He is not my teacher.'

The form tee can be used as the negative response, similar to No in English; tee can also function as a particle. The form tee in (161.A) is a polar question particle while tee in (161.B) is the negative response.

161) A: tao look can baan baay tiat tee
    D.M. you want get rice more Part
    'Do you want some more rice?'

B: tee knom cqaet haay qaakun craan
    no I full already thank much
    'No, I am full now. Thank you very much.'

2.3.3.2 Complementisers

Complementisers embed one clause within another clause. They are called "Subordinate conjunctions" by some grammarians. Some complementisers and prepositions share the same forms in Khmer, for example:

mun 'before' daoy 'by'.

Nevertheless, they belong to different word classes. A preposition precedes a noun or a
noun phrase (indicating the semantic role of the following noun phrase) while a complementiser introduces an embedded clause. There are still a number of words which have a single function.

Complementisers such as

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{baø} & \quad \text{'if'} \\
\text{baan ciø} & \quad \text{'the reason why'}
\end{align*}
\]

always precede an adverbial or a complement clause. The underlined forms in examples (162) - (165) function as complementisers.

162) baø miøn luy kñom caŋ tīñ laan
if have money I want buy car
'If I have some money, I want to buy a car.'

163) qat tooh kñom rook waentaa min khōøn
excuse I look for glasses not see
tee baan ciø kñom yiit bøntac
Part reason why I slow little
'I'm sorry; I couldn't find my glasses, and that is why I'm a little late.'
(Huffman, 1970b:214)

164) daøy qåwpuk kñom ciø cah prittiæcaa mōnēq
by father I be old old teacher one person
mīn kee koorup-rōaqqaan craën
have they respect-Redup many
(qañkiøboh qøy qoun niw tiinaa)
'Because my father is a former teacher, there are many people who respect (him).'</n
165) kñom min døŋ thaa kōøt tiw naa tee
I not know COMP he go where Part
'I did not know where he went.'

2.3.3.3 Prepositions

A number of prepositions in Khmer share the same forms with complementisers. Prepositions normally precede a noun or a noun phrase. Examples of prepositions are as follows:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{knon} & \quad \text{'in'} \\
\text{qae} & \quad \text{'at'} \\
\text{pii} & \quad \text{'from'}.
\end{align*}
\]

In examples (166) - (169), the underlined forms are followed by nouns and function as prepositions.

166) look kruu twaa kaa knon saalaa
Title-teacher do work in school
'The teacher works in school.'
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2.3.3.4 Particles

In Khmer, there are several types of particles: discourse markers,\(^{11}\) topic markers, exclamations, responses and final particles. Only the final particle tee is discussed here since it plays an important role in analysing complementation.

The final particle tee normally occurs in negative sentences or polar questions. It indicates the scope of negative proposition or question. It may occur at the end of a clause or a sentence. Examples (170) - (172) show that the scope of negation covers the whole sentence since tee is at the end of the sentence whereas (173) - (175), the scope of negation is within the clause.

170) taœ look ſam baay tee
D.M. you eat rice Part
‘Will you eat rice?’

171) tee kifom min toœn ſam baay tee
No I not yet eat rice Part
‘No, I have not eaten yet.’

172) chum min qaoy luy niœri tee
Chum not give money Nieree Part
‘Chum did not give Nieree a sum of money.’

173) mœyaœ tiœt buœn doœŋ tee thaa riœmcboœŋ
one kind more you know Part COMP colleague
datiœ tiœt doucciœ buœŋ kœœŋ cin kan sun niœw
other more like Kuong Chin Kan Soun be
qaœnaœ ſœœh riœ slap
where alive or die
(qœœkiaœbœ qaœ qœœn niœw tiœnaœ)
‘One more thing, do you know where our other colleagues such as Kuong, Cin and Kan Soun are, and whether they are still alive or dead?’

\(^{11}\)For more details on discourse markers, see Poo-israkij (1994:119-128).
They did not think of bringing any valuable things with them except cloth in one small suitcase, and a little bit of money, gold and jewels.

I don't know about this, you go (and) ask by yourself.'
2.4 Words belonging to more than one class

There are a number of words which are cross-classified for word class. These words can have more than one meaning or one function. Normally, the meaning or the function can be defined by their position and context. Here are examples of the words relevant to this study.

2.4.1 baan

baan in (183) functions as a main verb meaning 'to get, receive'.

183) look baan praq khae panmaan?
you get salary how much
'How much salary do you get?'

When the adverb baan follows a verb phrase, it shows completion or ability. This is shown in (184) and (185).

184) ... eon phot pii phuum baan cnaay bantooc ...
... leave free from from village able far a little ...
(qaŋkiəboh qoun niw tiinaa)
'... (when we) left the village for a short distance ...'

185) khoom tiw psaa baan
I go market able
'I can go to the market.'

In (186), baan precedes a verb phrase, indicating that the event has occurred in the past or expresses the actual event. In this example, baan functions as an auxiliary.

186) khoom baan tiw psaa
I Past go market
'I have already gone to the market.'
Huffman (1970b:74-75) claims that the different positions of baan in the following sentences provides little or no change in meaning:

187) kñom baan tiw pii daaIJ
I Past go two Clf
'I've gone (been able to go) twice.' (Huffman, 1970b:75)

188) kñom tiw baan pii daaIJ
I go able two Clf
'I've gone twice.'

Nevertheless, there is a distinction in when to use the sentences. In (187), the action is interpreted as actual or complete; the matrix subject referent has already been there twice. The action in (188) is not necessarily complete - the matrix subject referent may have been there only once and still have an opportunity to go there again.

2.4.2 nin

When nin precedes a verb phrase, it functions as a tense marker expressing future. This is illustrated in (189).

189) kñom nin tiw psaa
I IrÍl go market
'I will go to the market.'

It can also indicate the hypothetical mood or irrealis, as in (190).

190) bao kñom mían luy kñom nin tiñ ptēah
if I have money I IrÍl buy house
'If I have a sum of money, I will buy a house.'

In (191) and (192), nin is a conjunction combining words.

191) kñom tiw psaa tiñ trøy nin mōan
I go market buy fish and chicken
'I went to the market (in order to buy / and bought) fish and chicken.'

192) sôt nin niosis ciô puqmaq kñom
Sot and Nieréé be friend I
'Sot and Nieréé are my friends.'

The form nin which can function as a preposition is followed by an oblique noun phrase, as shown in (193).

193) krawat pōa qey sam nin qaaw khīaw cah nih
necktie colour what proper with shirt dark blue this
'What colour tie goes with this dark blue shirt?' (Huffman, 1970b:150)

12 The phonological form nin has three different written forms in Khmer.
When nin modifies a noun as in (194), it functions as an article; expressing definiteness.

194) kñom kampunñ rɔɔk siɔɔphiw muɔy siɔɔphiw nin
    I         find book  one book NIN
mian kraap pɔɔ saa
have cover colour white
'I am looking for a book. It (the book) has a white cover.'

2.5 Pro-drop

Khmer is a pro-drop language. Grammatical functions such as SUBJ, OBJ and OBJ2 can be unexpressed whereas OBL cannot. The interpretation of the antecedent of the null element depends on the context and the speaker's and listener's understanding. Various extra grammatical factors\(^\text{13}\) are involved in whether a pronoun is realised or not. Fisher (1985:145) proposes that the social relationship between the speaker and the addressee in Khmer is one factor which can cause "pronoun avoidance". When the speaker is uncertain of the social relationship between himself and the addressee, the speaker tends to avoid using a pronoun referring to himself or to the addressee. For instance, the speaker of example (195.A) avoids using a pronoun for the addressee whereas the speaker of (195.B) does not use a pronoun referring to himself.

195) A: tiw naa nin
      go where Part
      'Where are (you) going?'

      B: baat tiw twaa kaa
      Part go do work
      'Yes, (I) am going to work.'

A noun phrase which is not relevant to the topic of the conversation can also be unexpressed. In (196), the speaker does not focus on the person who built the library but he is only focusing on the library or the place.

196) bannaalay nih son yuu nah mɔɔk haaɔy
    library this build long Ints come already
    'This library was built a long time ago.'

In addition, when a noun phrase has previously been mentioned in a discourse, it can be omitted. For example, to answer the question 'Who hit you?', the matrix object can optionally be omitted. When the matrix object is unexpressed, the answer for

\(^{13}\)Diller (1993:406) notes that pronouns in Thai can be omitted depending on various factors. These include lexical semantics, pragmatic predictability and sociolinguistic sensitivity. The study of factors which cause grammatical functions in Khmer to be unexpressed needs to be further investigated.
that question can be presented as in (197).

197) mdaay wiay
mother hit
'(My) mother hit (me).'

In contrast, if the question is 'Who did the mother hit?', the matrix subject can then be unexpressed, as shown in (198).

198) wiay koun
hit child
'(She) hit (her) child.'

Both the subject and the object of the same sentence can also be omitted if they are previously mentioned. Example (199) presupposes that the speaker and the listener know what the subject and the object of the sentence are.

199) khaan haay
see already
'(Someone) has seen (something) already.'

Examples (200) and (201) illustrate that either OBJ or OBJ2 of a ditransitive verb can be omitted.

200) knom qaoy luy haay
I give money already
'I gave (someone) the money already.'

201) knom qaoy kout haay
I give he already
'I gave him (something) already.'

As shown in (202), both OBJ and OBJ2 of a ditransitive verb can be unexpressed.

202) knom qaoy haay
I give already
'I gave (someone) (something) already.'

An oblique or prepositional object, however, cannot be stranded. Sentences are ungrammatical if an oblique is missing. Examples (203) and (204) containing overt obliques are grammatical.

203) siwphiw niw koon bantup
book be in room
'The book is in the room.'

204) kout trolup mok pii saala haay
he return come from school already
'He has come back from school already.'

As prepositional objects are missing, examples (205) and (206) are ungrammatical.
Khmer also has some verbs which have been delexicalised and behave similar to prepositions. In example (207), qaov meaning 'to give' indicates that kôm is a recipient.

207) mdaay tîn num qaov kôm
mother buy sweet give I
'(My) mother bought a sweet for me.'

In (208), dal 'to arrive' is used to express a location, Phnom Penh.

208) kôst môk dal pnûm piên mun kee
he come arrive Phnom Penh before they
'He was the first person who reached Phnom Penh.'

Unlike an oblique, an object of these preposition-like verbs can be omitted and the sentences are still grammatical. Although kôm I' and pnûm piên 'Phnom Penh' in examples (207) and (208) are unrealised, as shown in (209) and (210), the sentences remain grammatical.

209) mdaay tîn num qaov
mother buy sweet give
'(My) mother bought a sweet for (me).'

210) kôst môk dal mun kee
he come arrive before they
'He was the first person who reached (Phnom Penh).'

If qaov and dal were prepositions, the omission of their object will cause the sentences to be ungrammatical. However, as qaov and dal are verbs, examples (209) and (210) are still grammatical.

2.6 Sentence types

Sentence types in Khmer can be either declarative, interrogative or imperative. Most examples presented above are declarative. In this section, only interrogative and imperative are discussed.

2.6.1 Interrogative

Interrogative can be divided into polar questions and information questions. Polar questions are identical to affirmative constructions except that polar questions end with têe, rîi or rîîêe particles. Thomas (1976:100) proposes that the usage of these particles are slightly different. The form têe is used when the main verb in questioned while rîi or rîîêe is used to ask only one phrase in a clause. In the discussion of complements, I will only apply têe as a test. Example (211) shows the affirmative
construction in Khmer.

211) look 남 baay  
you  eat  rice  
'You eat/ate rice.'

When tee or rii is inserted, as in (212) and (213), the sentences become polar questions.

212) look 남 (baay) tee  
you  eat  (rice)  Part  
'Do you eat rice?' (This question can be used as an invitation as well. 'Would you like to have a meal with us?'. In this case, the object baay can be optionally omitted.)

213) look  남 baay rii  
you  eat  rice  Part  
'Do you eat rice?' (This sentence can only be a polar question.)

Q-words in Khmer include

qwāy 'what'  
haet qwāy 'why'  
yaan douc mdāc 'how'.

In addition, Q-words in Khmer can also be formed by a noun plus naa:

tii naa or kənlaen naa or qae naa 'where'  
kaal naa or peel naa 'when'  
nēq naa 'who'  
muāy naa 'which one'  
srāy naa 'which lady'.

The word order of information questions is also identical to affirmative constructions; the Q-word simply replaces the constituent being questioned, as shown in (214) - (216). However, Khmer people prefer to have the Q-word haet qwāy 'why' at the beginning of the question and have prūah 'because' introduce the reason. This is exemplified in (217).

214) look 남 qwāy  
you  eat  what  
'What are you eating?'

215) nēq naa 남 baay  
who  eat  rice  
'Who ate rice?' or 'Who is eating rice? (I don't know that person.)'

216) look 남 baay niw tii naa  
you  eat  rice  be  where  
'Where did you eat rice?'
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217) A: haet quway look min nam baay why you not eat rice

'Why don't you eat rice?'

B: prōh knom min klian sah
because I not hungry at all

'Because I am not hungry.'

2.6.2 Imperative

Imperative in Khmer also have the same structure as affirmative except that there is no overt subject. The understood subject is interpreted as an addressee. This is exemplified in (218) and (219).

218) nam baay
eat rice

'Eat rice!'

219) leej tii nih
play here

'Play here!'

There are degrees of expressing politeness or intensity in Khmer imperatives. These can be shown by some pragmatic particles at the beginning of imperative constructions. These pragmatic particles share the same form with verbs. In this position, however, they do not have verbal features. The prohibitive marker kom 'don't' cannot precede these pragmatic particles. The illocutionary force for the constructions without these pragmatic particles is a command or an order, as shown in (218) and (219) above. However, when a pragmatic particle such as soum 'please'\textsuperscript{14} is inserted, as in (220), the illocutionary force becomes a request.

220) soum nam baay
please eat rice

'Please eat rice.'

If the construction begins with the pragmatic particle qańcaōn,\textsuperscript{15} it expresses an invitation, as (221) shows.

221) qańcaōn pisaa baay
Qańcaōn eat rice

'Please eat rice.' (very polite)

\textsuperscript{14}The form soum can function as a verb 'to ask for a request; to ask a favour' as well (Jacob, 1974:200).

\textsuperscript{15}The pragmatic particle qańcaōn developed from the verb qańcaōn 'to invite'. For a discussion of grammaticalisation of qańcaōn, see section 5.3.1.1.
The form **cou**\textsuperscript{16} indicates a request mode to someone younger than the speaker. Example (222) can be used in a situation in which a mother talks to her child.

\begin{center}
\textbf{222)} \textsc{cou} \textsc{khamprəŋ} \textsc{twaə} \textsc{kaa}  \\
Part \hspace{0.2cm} \textacutentry hard \hspace{0.2cm} \text{do} \hspace{0.2cm} \textacutenwork  \\
'\text{Work hard.}'
\end{center}

The c-structure of example (220) is shown in (223).

\begin{center}
\begin{tabular}{c}
\textsc{part} \\
\textsc{vp}  \\
\textsc{s} \\
\hline \\
\textsc{soum} & \textsc{ñam} & \textsc{baay}
\end{tabular}
\end{center}

When a pragmatic particle is inserted, a second person form can occur after the pragmatic particle, as (224) - (226) show.

\begin{center}
\textbf{224)} \textsc{soum} \textsc{look} \textsc{ñam} \textsc{baay}  \\
\text{please} \hspace{0.2cm} \text{you} \hspace{0.2cm} \text{eat} \hspace{0.2cm} \text{rice}  \\
'\text{Please (you) eat rice.'}
\end{center}

\begin{center}
\textbf{225)} \textsc{qançoən} \textsc{look} \textsc{qom} \textsc{cam} \textsc{tiinïh}  \\
\text{Uncle} \hspace{0.2cm} \text{wait} \hspace{0.2cm} \text{here}  \\
'\text{Please (you, LIT:uncle) wait here.'}
\end{center}

\begin{center}
\textbf{226)} \textsc{cou} \textsc{qoun} \textsc{məol} \textsc{thaerəqsaə} \textsc{kaun}  \\
\text{Part} \hspace{0.2cm} \text{younger sibling} \hspace{0.2cm} \text{look} \hspace{0.2cm} \text{look after} \hspace{0.2cm} \text{child}  \\
\text{(saen cɔmbaɛŋ)}  \\
'May (you, LIT:wife)\textsuperscript{17} take good care of (our) child.'
\end{center}

The c-structure of (224) is presented in (227).

\textsuperscript{16}Huffman (1970b:32) considers **cou** as more imperative than **soum**: "...(*cou*) is confined to pedagogical or prescriptive admonitions on the part of a teacher or parents ...".

\textsuperscript{17}In Khmer, the kinship terms **boan** 'elder sibling' and **qoun** 'younger sibling' can also be used as pronouns between husband and wife.
A hierarchy of pragmatic particles which ranges from a command to a polite form of request or invitation may be as follows:

\[
\begin{array}{c|c}
\emptyset & \text{order (can be interpreted as impolite)} \\
\text{soum} & \text{request in general (please)} \\
\text{cou} & \text{request for younger addressee} \\
\text{qănčǝn} & \text{request or invitation} \\
\text{soum qănčǝn} & \text{very polite request or invitation for higher addressee}
\end{array}
\]

Prohibition is expressed by the insertion of kom before the verb, as in (228).

\[
228) \quad \text{kom} \quad \text{ňam} \quad \text{baay} \\
\quad \text{Don't eat rice.}
\]

Example (229) shows that the second person form can precede the prohibitive kom.

\[
229) \quad \text{look} \quad \text{kom} \quad \text{ňam} \quad \text{baay} \\
\quad \text{You don't eat rice.}
\]

The pragmatic particle soum 'please' can still occur before the prohibitive kom and an optional second person form, as in (230) while (231) shows that qănčǝn cannot be followed by the prohibitive kom. Example (230) is a request for someone not to do something. As shown in (231), it is semantically incompatible to invite someone not to do something.

\[
230) \quad \text{soum (look) kom} \quad \text{ňam} \quad \text{baay} \\
\quad \text{please (you) don't eat rice} \\
\quad \text{'Please don't eat rice.'}
\]

\[
231) \quad \text{*qănčǝn kom} \quad \text{ňam} \quad \text{baay} \\
\quad \text{Qănčǝn don't eat rice}
\]

The c-structure of (230) is illustrated in (232).
The pragmatic particles used in an imperative sentence type cannot be preceded by the prohibitive kom. As kom is followed by soum and qaṅceān, examples (233) and (234) are ungrammatical.

233) *kom soum leen tii nih
    don't please play here

234) *kom qaṅceān leen tii nih
    don't qaṅceān play here

Khmer has another subtype of imperative which is referred to as jussive. The discussion of the jussive sentence type is deferred to section 6.2.3.

---

18 If soum and qaṅceān are interpreted as verbs, the prohibitive kom can precede these verbs, for instance:

A) kom soum kōaet leen tii nih
don't ask he play here
'Don't ask him to play here.'

B) kom qaṅceān niārii ġam baay
don't invite Nieree eat rice
'Don't invite Nieree for dinner.'
CHAPTER 3

Sentence-like complements with a complementiser

3.1 Introduction

This chapter provides a discussion of sentence-like* complements with a complementiser in Khmer. The normal position of S-like complements with a complementiser is after a complement-taking predicate. A complement proposition preceded by a complementiser shares the same structure as a simple clause, that is, it is formed by a subject and a predicate.

The term "Complementiser" or "COMP" may be used in a broad sense to refer to grammatical words functioning as a linker of unequal clauses, linking a subordinate clause to its matrix clause. However, "Complementiser" used in this study has a restricted function. It is defined as a grammatical word which links a complement clause with its complement-taking predicate. I will refer to other grammatical words which link a subordinate clause such as an adverbial clause to its main clause as "adverbial complementiser".

There are two complementisers in Khmer – thaa and dael. The thaa complementiser is more commonly used than the dael complementiser. Section 3.2 discusses S-like complements with the thaa complementiser. The form thaa is introduced first (section 3.2.1). Classes of complement-taking predicate which can be followed by an S-like complement with the thaa complementiser are presented in section 3.2.2. In section 3.2.3, I will investigate characteristics of S-like complements with the thaa complementiser. It is argued in section 3.2.3.2 that complement propositions following the thaa complementiser can be either direct or indirect speech. Sentence types of S-like complements with the thaa complementiser will be examined in section 3.2.4. Section 3.2.5 presents the grammaticalisation of the form thaa from a predicate to a complementiser as well as the comparison of the thaa complementiser and the equivalent complementiser wâː in Thai. Section 3.2.6 is a summary of the section.

* I use the term 'S-like complement' as a descriptive term for all complements that look like they contain the structure of an ordinary sentence.
S-like complements with the *dael* complementiser are discussed in section 3.3. The form *dael* is introduced first (section 3.3.1). Classes of complement-taking predicates which precede an S-like complement with the *dael* complementiser are presented in section 3.3.2. In section 3.3.3, characteristics of S-like complements with the *dael* complementiser are examined in a similar way to those of S-like complements with the *thaa* complementiser. Sometimes, the *dael* complementiser can be substituted for by the adverbial complementiser *daoy*. In section 3.3.4, I will discuss the similarity of these two forms. Section 3.3.5 presents a comparison of the *dael* complementiser in Khmer and the *thiː* complementiser in Thai. A summary of the section is given in section 3.3.6.

The *dael* complementiser and the *thaa* complementiser are compared in section 3.4. Section 3.5 discusses the interpretation of anaphora in S-like complements with a complementiser in Khmer. The conclusion of this chapter is presented in section 3.6.

### 3.2 S-like complements with the *thaa* complementiser

In this section, the form *thaa* as well as characteristics of S-like complements with the *thaa* complementiser are discussed.

#### 3.2.1 The form *thaa*

The *thaa* complementiser developed historically from the verb *thaa* 'to say'. When the form *thaa* occurs in the main verb position, as shown in (1) and (2), it means 'to say'.

1) klah thaa mʊok pii kaa-tamleq krɔarbæk niy
some say come from Nom-drop bomb of
kaŋtɔg qaakaahsocɔa satiŋnɔŋɔʁat
troop air republic

(qaŋkiɔboh qay qoun niw tiinaa)

'It is said (that this) came from the bomb-dropping of the republic air force.'

2) klah thaa sɔmnal cheh tɔŋ j nih kii-ciɔ snaa daay
some say ruins on fire together this be work
pʊaŋ kmae kruhɔam dael baan dot bəmplaŋ
group Khmer Rouge who Past set fire to destroy
cəl throw away ...

(qaŋkiɔboh qay qoun niw tiinaa)

'It is said that these ruins were caused by the Khmer Rouge who had set fire to (the place) to destroy (it) ... '

The meaning of *thaa* is not always the same as 'to say' in English. In some contexts, *thaa* has a negative implication. The meaning of *thaa* is then similar to 'to blame or criticise', as shown in example (3).
3) kôm min hîn tiw têe klaac maq thaa
   I not dare go Part worried Mum say
   'I dare not go (because) I am worried that Mum will blame (me).'

On his discussion of verb concatenation constructions in languages in South-East Asia, Goral (1986:428) claims that the form thaa following the matrix predicate, as cited in (4), is a quotative verb.

4) kôm kit thaa têk thêe kruů-pêt lqâ ciñ
   I think say do doctor good than
   'I think it would be better to be a doctor.' (Huffman, 1970b:100, cited from Goral, 1986:424 (c-8))

However, some good pieces of evidence show that the form thaa preceded by the matrix predicate no longer has any verbal features. Firstly, the form thaa in this position cannot be modified by an auxiliary. When the form thaa following the matrix predicate is modified by the past tense marker, as in (5), or it is modified by the irrealis marker, as in (6), the sentences are ungrammatical.

5) *kôm kit baan thaa têk thêe kruů-pêt lqâ ciñ
   I think Past Thaa do doctor good than

6) *kôm kit mîn thaa têk thêe kruů-pêt lqâ ciñ
   I think Irrl Thaa do doctor good than

As illustrated in (7), when the form thaa is negated, the sentence is ungrammatical.

7) *kôm kit mîn thaa têk thêe kruů-pêt lqâ ciñ
   I think not Thaa do doctor good than

The form thaa following the matrix predicate cannot subcategorise for an argument. Example (8) is ungrammatical – the noun phrase sot cannot function as the subject of the form thaa.

8) *kôm kit sot thaa têk thêe kruů-pêt lqâ ciñ
   I think Sot Thaa do doctor good than

Three pieces of evidence indicate that the form thaa following the matrix predicate is not a verb. The form thaa in this position is best analysed as a complementiser.

Huffman (1970b:360) and Mikami (1979:102) claim that the form ciñ has the same function as thaa, i.e., a complementiser. Mikami provides the following example to support his claim that these two forms can be substituted. This example is cited here as (9).

9) kôm dâñ thaa (or ciñ) kôêt mîn prûpûân
   I know COMP he have wife
   'I know that he is married.' (Mikami, 1979:102) (transcription revised)
According to my informants, the sentence with the thaa complementiser is acceptable whereas that with the form cig is not. As illustrated in (10) and (11), the form cig cannot be used as a complementiser following other complement-taking predicates.

10) kñom kit thaa/*cig twɔɔ kruu-pɛet lqaa ciŋŋ I think COMP do doctor good than 'I think that it would be better to be a doctor.'

11) kɔɔt prap thaa/*cig kñom twɔɔ khoh he tell COMP I do wrong 'He told (someone) that I have done something wrong.'

When dæŋ 'to know' is followed by the form cig, it can only occur as an expression min dæŋ cig 'not to know for sure'. Example (9) will be grammatical with the expression min dæŋ cig, as shown in (12).

12) kñom min dæŋ cig kɔɔt mian prapuŋŋ I not know for sure he have wife 'I do not know for sure (if) he is married.'

In colloquial speech, the expression min dæŋ cig can also be followed by the thaa complementiser, as in (13).

13) kñom min dæŋ cig thaa kɔɔt mian prapuŋŋ I not know for sure COMP he have wife 'I do not know for sure if he is married.'

The fact that the form cig cannot follow other complement-taking predicates and that the expression min dæŋ cig can be followed by the thaa complementiser indicates that cig is not a complementiser.

3.2.2 Predicates taking S-like complements with the thaa complementiser

The thaa complementiser is used to introduce new information and can be preceded by the following types of complement-taking predicates (CTPs):

Utterance predicates:

- prap: 'to tell'
- niyisay: 'to say'
- saarəpiŋp: 'to confess'
- prapau: 'to give advice'
- sdu: 'to complain'
- rihkũan: 'to criticise'
- pdampdol: 'to sue'
- pdam: 'to pass a message'
- tlaen: 'to announce'
- riaproŋp: 'to describe'
- panyuŋp: 'to explain'
- bantoh: 'to blame'
- titian: 'to criticise'
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Perception predicates:
- danh 'to know'
- criap 'to know'
- khoēn 'to see'
- sankeet 'to notice'

Belief predicates:
- ciō 'to believe'
- nik 'to think'
- cñal 'to wonder'

Predicates of fearing:
- klaac 'to be afraid'
- pruøy klaac 'to be worried'

Manipulative predicates:
- bāncia 'to order'
- neenōam 'to suggest'

Commitment predicates:
- samrāccat 'to decide'
- sanyaa 'to promise'

When the perception predicates lii 'to hear' and khoēn 'to see' are followed by an S-like complement with the thaa complementiser, the complement proposition is interpreted as an acquisition of knowledge, not a direct perception.

The time reference of complement proposition following predicates of fearing in Khmer are more restricted than that of complement proposition following predicates of fearing in English. In English, predicates of fearing can be used to inform someone that something bad has already happened. In other words, the matrix subject referent has already known the result of the complement action. The complement action following predicates of fearing in English can be in perfect tense, as shown in (14).

14) I am afraid he has already died.

The modality of the proposition preceded by predicates of fearing in Khmer is irrealis. Although the complement predicate can be preceded by the past tense marker, the matrix subject referent still does not know the truth value of the complement action. For more detail, see section 3.2.3.1 and section 4.3.1.2.

The co-occurrence of each type of complement-taking predicate and an S-like complement with the thaa complementiser is demonstrated in examples (15) -
(21). The complement proposition with the thaa complementiser, occurring after a manipulative predicate as in (20), is quotative. That is, the actual words that the matrix subject referent or 'the teacher' said are repeated.

15) sot rikhūn sophiep thaa niŋ kcil min
Sot criticise Sophiep COMP she lazy not
yɔɔk cɔt tuq daŋ niŋ pəələkam
pay attention with activity
'Sot criticised Sophiep (saying) that she is lazy (and) does not pay attention to the activity.'

16) kʰom li thaa look baan tǐŋ pteəŋ tʰəəy
I hear COMP you Past buy house new
'I heard that you have bought a new house.'

17) kee yʊəl thaa baŋ jəŋ mən sruə kluən
he understand COMP elder sibling not well
'He thinks that (his) brother is not well.'

18) baonaa kit thaa dam tiw twəə kaa
Baonaa think COMP Dam go do work
'Baonaa thought that Dam has gone to work.'

19) nîəə prɔuyklæa thaa koun niŋ kliən baay
Nieree worried COMP child Irıl hungry rice
'Nieree is worried that (her) child will be hungry.'

20) look kruu bəʃiŋə thaa tiw леŋ qae nuh
teacher order COMP go play there
'The teacher ordered, "(Students) go (and) play over there".'

21) kọət saməəcat thaa nɛɵə kəə tae twəə kəəkaa nih
he decide COMP you should do work this
'He decided that you should do this work.'

3.2.3 Characteristics of S-like complements with the thaa complementiser

This section discusses characteristics of S-like complements with the thaa complementiser. S-like complements with the thaa complementiser have similar characteristics to simple sentences. The complement predicate can be modified by an auxiliary relative to the time of the matrix clause (section 3.2.3.1). Examples from Khmer texts suggest that the occurrence of the thaa complementiser is not a good criterion to distinguish direct speech from indirect speech in Khmer (section 3.2.3.2).

3.2.3.1 Auxiliary insertion

In this section, the possibility of an auxiliary insertion with respect to classes of complement-taking predicates will be examined.
(1985:209) point out that the time reference of a subordinate clause can be characterised relative to either the time reference of the matrix clause or that of the speech moment. The time reference of certain subordinate constructions in a language may be relative to the time reference of the matrix clause while the time reference of other constructions is relative to that of the speech moment.

In Khmer, the temporal locus is the action of the matrix clause. The possibility of auxiliary insertion depends on semantic constraints of the matrix predicate. An auxiliary can be freely inserted in the complement clause which follows an utterance predicate, a perception predicate, a belief predicate or a predicate of fearing.

When the past tense marker baan modifies the complement predicate, as in (22) - (24), it indicates that the complement action has already taken place at the time locus.

22) kọọt baan prap kном thaa kọọt baan twoọ kaa
   he Past tell I COMP he Past do work
   nih haay
   this already
   'He told me that he has already done this work.'

23) kном baan lìi thaa niọrii baan tiw leen tikchuu
   I Past hear COMP Nieree Past go play waterfall
   haay
   already
   'I heard that Nieree has already been to the waterfall.'

24) niọrii ciọcęọq thaa kọọt baan trọọp tiw haay
   Nieree believe COMP he Past return go already
   'Nieree believes that he has already returned back (home).'

Although the past tense marker can be inserted before the complement predicate following a predicate of fearing, as in (25), the matrix subject referent still does not know whether the complement action is true or not. The matrix subject referent is worried that the complement action might have happened.

25) chum pruọylaac thaa koun baan kliọn baay
   Chum worried COMP child Past hungry rice
   haay
   already
   'Chum is worried that (his) child was hungry already.'

When the irrealis marker nin is inserted before the complement predicate, it suggests that at the time locus, the complement action has not taken place. This is exemplified in (26) - (29).

26) kọọt baan prap kном thaa kọọt nin twoọ kaa
   he Past tell I COMP he Irral do work
   'He told me that he would work.'
27) kñom baan lìi thaa nirirì nìn tiw leen tikchuù
I Past hear COMP Nieree Irrl go play waterfall
sqæek
tomorrow
'I heard that Nieree would go to the waterfall tomorrow.'

28) nirirì cjàcèaq thaa kòøt nìn tralap tiw ptëòh
Nieree believe COMP he Irrl return go house
'Nieree believes that he will go back home.'

29) chum prùykaláac thaa kòøt nìn kliàn baay
Chum worried COMP child Irrl hungry rice
'Chum is worried that (his) child will be hungry.'

The insertion of the continuous marker kämpun, as in (30) - (33), suggests that
the complement action is happening during the time frame of the matrix clause.

30) kòøt baan prap kñom thaa kòøt kùmpun twàà kaa
he Past tell I COMP he Cont do work
'He told me that he was working.'

31) nirirì cjàcèaq thaa kòøt kùmpun twàà kaa nììh
Nieree believe COMP he Cont do work this
'Nieree believes that he is doing this work.'

32) kñom baan lìi thaa look qom kùmpun chìi
I Past hear COMP uncle Cont sick
'I heard that the uncle was sick.'

33) chum prùykaláac thaa kòøt kùmpun kliàn baay
Chum worried COMP child Cont hungry rice
'Chum is worried that (his) child is hungry.'

The semantic constraints of manipulative and commitment predicates,
however, do not allow an auxiliary to be freely inserted within S-like complements
with the thaa complementiser. S-like complements with the thaa complementiser
following manipulative predicates are normally direct imperatives, as shown in (34).

34) look kruu bänçìo thaa kòøt søh tralap tiw tnaq rìøn
teacher order COMP student Past return go classroom
'The teacher ordered, "Students go back to the classroom".'

Examples (35) - (37) are ungrammatical as there is an auxiliary inserted in the
complement clause preceded by a manipulative predicate.

35) *look kruu bänçìo thaa kòøt søh baan tralap tiw
teacher order COMP student Past return go
tnaq rìøn
classroom

36) *look kruu bänçìo thaa kòøt søh nìì tralap tiw
teacher order COMP student Irrl return go
tnaq rìøn
classroom
The meaning of commitment predicates presupposes that the complement action following a commitment predicate will take place after the time of the matrix predicate. Therefore, only the irrealis marker can optionally be inserted, as illustrated in (38).

38) kəɔt sʊnyaa thaa ɣəɛŋ (nɨŋ) twəɔ kaa nɨh
he promise COMP we (Irrl) do work this
haŋy already
təa tiw tiət continue go again
'He promised that we would continue to do this work.'

The past tense marker and the continuous marker, being incompatible with the semantic constraints, then cause the sentences to be ungrammatical, as (39) and (40) show.

39) *kəɔt sʊnyaa thaa ɣəɛŋ baan twəɔ kaa nɨh
he promise COMP we Past do work this

40) *kəɔt sʊnyaa thaa ɣəɛŋ ƙʊmpuŋ twəɔ kaa nɨh
he promise COMP we Cont do work this

3.2.3.2 Direct and indirect speech

In English, there are clear criteria to distinguish direct speech from indirect speech. These criteria include the change of pronoun deixis (Palmer, 1986:163), the change of tense, the change of distance and the insertion of that (Quirk et al, 1973:341). For instance:

41) John said, 'I will see you here tomorrow'.
42) John said that he would see me there the next day.

Example (42) is an indirect form of example (41). The complementiser that marks the indirect speech proposition. The pronoun 'I' in (41) refers to John while 'you' refers to the reporter or the speaker of example (42). When the speaker of example (42) reports what John said, as in (42), he uses 'he' to refer to John and 'me' to the speaker himself. There is a change of tense or "Back-shift" (Quirk et al, 1973:342) from will in (41) to would in (42). In addition, there may be some changes of adverbial of time and place.

Other languages, however, do not have these criteria. For example, the
difference between direct and indirect speech in Yoruba cannot be differentiated by the change of verb form or the change of adverbial of time or place (Bamgbose, 1986:78-79). However, indirect speech in Yoruba differs from direct speech by the change of pronoun reference and some other criteria such as the use of some specific verbs only with indirect speech, the distinctive form of certain sentence type. For instance, indirect imperatives in Yoruba always have the particle kí 'let' after the matrix predicate, as shown in (43).

\[43\) olu so fún ayò pé kí ó máa bó
   Olu say give Ayo COMP let he PROG come
   'Olu told Ayo that he should be coming.' (Bamgbose, 1986:78 (3.a))

The characteristics of Khmer complement propositions are similar to those of Yoruba. Unlike English, Khmer does not have the change of tense or 'Back-shift'. Compare (44) with (45) below, the verb form as well as the auxiliary of indirect speech in (45) remain the same as those of the direct speech sentence in (44). Therefore, the change of tense cannot be used to differentiate direct from indirect speech in Khmer. Example (45) differs from (44) in that there is a thaa complementiser, a change of the pronoun reference and a change of the adverbial of time.

\[44\) kôat niyiay, 'kñom niŋ twɔɔ kaa tŋay nih'
   he; speak I_{*j} IrIr do work day this
   'He said, "I will work today".'

\[45\) kôat niyiay thaa kôat niŋ twɔɔ kaa tŋay nuh
   he; speak COMP he_{*j} IrIr do work day that
   'He said that he would do work that day.'

At first, it seems that the thaa complementiser in Khmer can distinguish direct from indirect speech. If there is no thaa complementiser, the proposition cannot be indirect speech. Example (44) never has the meaning, 'He said that I would work that day'. This shows that the thaa complementiser is required for an indirect speech proposition.

However, examples from texts below show that a complement proposition following the thaa complementiser can be either direct or indirect speech. The complement proposition in (46) is the actual question that the matrix subject referent asked. The complement subject qaen 'you' refers to the narrator or kñom 'I' in the main clause.

\[46\) ... cuəŋkaal wiə suə kñom thaa 'taə qaen yoɔɔk
   ... sometimes they ask I COMP D.M. you take
   kmaoc kwɔn nih tiw caol niw qaenaa ...hii ...
   corpse crippled this go throw away be where ...Excl ...
   (qɔŋkiəboh qəy qoun niw tiinaa)
   '...sometimes, they asked me, "Where did you take this crippled body to?".'
If the speaker wishes to use indirect speech, it is necessary to convert the complement subject qaen 'you' to the pronoun kənom 'I', as shown in (47).

47) wiə suə kənom thaa kənom yəok kmaoc kwən
   they ask I COMP I take corpse crippled
   nih tiw caol niw qaenaa
   this go throw away be where
   'They asked me where I took this crippled body to.'

Direct speech imperatives commonly occur after the thaa complementiser. Examples (48) - (50) show that imperative complements after the thaa complementiser are direct speech.

48) qəwpuk kmeik kənom stuh tiw baək tiw haəy
   father in-law I get up go open door and then
   niyiə thaa 'soʊm mit kouən cam bantəc'
speak COMP please comrade child wait a little bit
   (qaŋkiəboh qəy qoun niw tiinaa)
   'My father-in-law got up to open the door and then said, "Please (you) wait a minute."'

49) cloəp boə nəəq baan məək chup niw piə
   guard three Clf Past come stop be from
   muk pəəq kənom haəy sraek prəkəuk thaa
   front house I and then shout announce COMP
   'mit souwan kraok laŋ qaŋkəa soʊm qaŋkəa mit
   comrade Suwan get up up organisation ask invite comrade
   tiw cuəy piəbaal səəy məənəəq kəmpənə coq pəəq
   go help take care of lady one Clf Cont have a labour pain
   ciə klen'
   be strong
   (qaŋkiəboh qəy qoun niw tiinaa)
   'Three guards came to my house and shouted, "Comrade Suwan, Get up! The organisation would like to invite you to look after a lady who is having labour pains."'

50) sam suə tiw qəwpuk thaa ...
   Som ask go father COMP ...
   nih camqəl rəbəh kənom muəy'
   with doubt of I one
   (səyləθəə)
   'Som asked his father, "Please Dad clarify my doubt!".'

To sum up, indirect speech in Khmer is always introduced by the complementiser whereas a direct speech proposition can be optionally preceded by the thaa complementiser. Therefore, the occurrence of the thaa complementiser is not a good criterion to distinguish direct speech from indirect speech. Pronoun deixis is a better criterion to differentiate direct and indirect speech.
3.2.4 Sentence types of S-like complements with the thaa complementiser

This section investigates sentence types of S-like complements with the thaa complementiser. It is argued that S-like complements with the thaa complementiser share similar characteristics with simple sentences. Sentence types of S-like complements with the thaa complementiser can be either declarative, interrogative or imperative depending on the semantic implication of the matrix predicate.

3.2.4.1 Declarative

Declarative complements can be preceded by an utterance predicate, a perception predicate, a belief predicate, a commitment predicate or a predicate of fearing. As can be seen from the above examples, affirmative complements have the same structure as simple sentences. The negative complement is marked by the insertion of the negator min before the complement predicate, as in (51) and (52). If the predicate is modified by an auxiliary, the negator also precedes the auxiliary. 1

This is illustrated in (53).

51) niəri kit thaa cindaa min srul kluaŋ
    Nieree think Comp Chinda not well
    'Nieree thought that Chinda is not well.'

52) chum daŋ thaa kət min məok tee
    Chum know COMP he not come Part
    'Chum knows that he is not coming.'

53) sot prap thaa niəri min baan tiw psaa tee
    Sot say COMP Nieree not Past go market Part
    'Sot said that Nieree didn't go to the market.'

When a complement proposition is negated, the negative particle tee 2 can occur only at the end of the sentence, as shown in (52) and (53). Examples (54) and (55) are ungrammatical if tee is interpreted as the negative particle.

---

1 Not all auxiliaries can co-occur with the negator. For instance, the continuous marker kompun never co-occurs with the negator. For discussion of the negator and an auxiliary, see section 2.3.2.1: Auxiliaries.

2 The tee particle in Khmer serves as either a polar question particle or a negative particle. The tee particle in examples (52) and (53) above can also be interpreted as the polar question particle. On the discussion of Khmer final particle, Eilfort and Schiller (1990:131) argue, "... tee almost never occurs in cases where a subordinate clause is overtly negative but the main clause is not. ...". The data on complement constructions show that this is not the case. In addition, tee can be freely inserted when only the complement clause is negated, provided that it occurs in the right position, as illustrated above.
54) *chum ḏəŋ tee thaa kōst min mōok
Chum know Part COMP he not come

55) *sot prap tee thaa niārii min baan tiw psaa
Sot say Part COMP Nieree not Past go market

If the tee particle in (54) and (55) functions as a polar question particle, however, the sentences are perfect. Example (54) means 'Does Chum know that he did not come?' whereas (55) means 'Did Sot say that Nieree didn't go to the market?'. Such questions are discussed in section 3.2.4.2.

The matrix predicate is negated by the insertion of the negator min before the main verb and the complement structure after the thaa complementiser is unchanged. The negative particle tee which modifies the matrix clause can occur either at the end of a sentence or before an S-like complement with the thaa complementiser. Examples (56) and (58) which have tee at the end of the sentences have the same translation as (57) and (59) which have tee immediately before the thaa complementiser.

56) kāom min baan prap thaa niārii luāc luy
I not Past say COMP Nieree steal money
kōst tee
he Part

57) kāom min baan prap tee thaa niārii luāc luy
I not Past say Part COMP Nieree steal money
kōst
he
'I didn't say that Nieree stole his money.'

58) sōt min ḏeŋ thaa qawpuk kōst slap tiw haay
Sot not know COMP father he die go already
pee
Part

59) sōt min ḏeŋ tee thaa qawpuk kōst slap tiw haay
Sot not know Part COMP father he die go already
'Sot didn't know that his father had died.'

The c-structure of example (58) can be presented as follows:
The c-structure of example (59) where the tee particle occurs before the S-like complement with the thaa complementiser is presented in (61).

When the matrix predicate is negated, the negative particle can occur either at the end of the sentence or before an S-like complement with the thaa complementiser. However, if the complement predicate is negated, the tee particle only occurs at the end of the sentence. The fact that the negative particle tee which modifies the matrix clause can occur either at the end of the sentence or before an S-like complement with the thaa complementiser suggests that the tee particle should be generated under the VP node rather than under the S node.
3.2.4.2 Interrogative

Interrogative propositions have a Q-word replacing the word being questioned\(^3\) and the thaa complementiser remains at the beginning of the complements. Interrogative complements can follow some utterance predicates, belief predicates or perception predicates, such as:

\[
\begin{array}{ll}
\text{cumrió́p} & \text{'to inform'} \\
\text{ṣpal} & \text{'to wonder'} \\
\text{daŋ} & \text{'to know'} \\
\text{ṣaŋsay} & \text{'to suspect'} \\
\text{yūdl} & \text{'to understand'}.
\end{array}
\]

Examples (62) - (65) show interrogative propositions of S-like complements with the thaa complementiser.

62) kñom cumrió́p look kruu thaa haet qwāy baan ciò
   I inform teacher COMP why reason why
   kñom min baan cuay baoh samqat tnaq rion
   I not Past help clean classroom
   'I informed the teacher of the reason why I did not help to clean the classroom.'

63) baonaa sgu thaa dam tiw naa
   Baonaa ask COMP Dam go where
   'Baonaa asked where Dam had gone.'

64) yæŋ ṣpal thaa rbiap nih twæŋ yæŋ douc mdōc
   we wonder COMP method this do how
   'We wondered how to use this method.'

65) sōt daŋ thaa nēŋ naa min baan mōk
   Sōt know COMP who not Past come
   'Sōt knew who did not come.'

The c-structure of example (65), as given in (66), represents the scope of the question within the complement clause.

\(^3\) Most Q-words in Khmer occur in place, however, haet qwāy 'why' normally occurs at the beginning of the sentence. For more detail, see section 2.5: Sentence types.
If a Q-word occurs before the thaa complementiser, the scope of the question is only within the matrix clause. Examples (67) and (68) below show that the sentential complements are statements whereas the matrix clauses are questions.

67) haet qwgy baan ciə sot dəŋ thaa knom kampuŋ
    why reason why Sot know COMP I Cont
twəa mhoup do food
'Show did Sot know that I was cooking food?'

68) sot prap nəːqnaa thaa niərii min srual kluən
    Sot tell who COMP Nieree not well
'Who did Sot tell that Nieree was not well?'

The c-structure of example (68) is illustrated as (69).

69) 

The structure of a polar question in Khmer is similar to that of a declarative sentence except that a polar question is marked by the polar question particle tee at the end of the sentence. Example (70) is a statement. To form a polar question, tee is inserted at the end of the sentence, as in (71). The discourse marker tao which
marks a question can optionally be inserted at the beginning of the sentence.

70) chum niř tiw leen pteah kōat
    Chum Irrl go play house he
    'Chum will visit his house.'

71) tā chum niř tiw leen pteah kōat tēe
    D.M. Chum Irrl go play house he Part
    'Will Chum visit his house?'

When the matrix clause of a complex sentence is a polar question, however, the tēe particle can occur in two positions. It may occur either at the end of the sentence, as in (72), or before the thaa complementiser, as in (73).

72) tā look saarāphiap thaa yaaŋ baan twaŋ khoh tēe
    D.M. you confess COMP we Past do wrong Part
    'Did you confess that we did (something) wrong?'

73) tā look saarāphiap tēe thaa yaaŋ baan twaŋ khoh
    D.M. you confess Part COMP we Past do wrong
    'Did you confess that we did (something) wrong?'

These two sentences have the same truth-value meaning. Nevertheless, there is a slight difference in the use of these two sentences. Example (72) focuses on the content of the subject's confession whereas example (73) focuses on whether or not the subject did confess. Example (73) which has the polar question particle tēe right after the verb is preferable since more emphasis is given in example (73) than in example (72) which has tēe at the end of the sentence.

When the polar question particle tēe is at the end of a sentence, there are two interpretations. The tēe particle in example (74) can modify verbs either in the main clause or in the complement clause.

74) sot sau thaa tay niř niarii tiw twaŋ kaa tēe
    Sot ask COMP day this Nieree go do work Part
    'Did Sot ask whether Nieree went to work today?'
    OR
    'Sot asked whether Nieree went to work today.'

The phrase structure of the first interpretation (which has the particle modifying the main verb) is presented in (75).
The interpretation that 'Sot asked whether Nieree went to work today' (which has the particle modify the complement predicate) has the following phrase structure:

When tee is inserted before the complement clause as in (77), only the main verb is in questioned.

77) sot suə tee thaa ṭnaj nih niərii tiw ṭwaa kaa
   Sot ask Part COMP day this Nieree go do work
   'Did Sot ask that Nieree went to work today?'
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Example (77) thus has the following c-structure:

The occurrence of the tee particle at the end of the sentence is ambiguous. The scope of the polar question particle in this position can cover either the complement clause or the whole sentence. In addition, the tee particle which modifies the matrix clause can also occur before an S-like complement with the thaa complementiser. The possibility that the tee particle modifying the matrix clause can occur either at the end of the sentence or before an S-like complement with the thaa complementiser indicates that the tee particle should be generated as a daughter node of VP rather than S.

3.2.4.3 Imperative

Utterance predicates and manipulative predicates can be followed by either a direct imperative or an indirect imperative complement proposition. Examples (79) and (80) are direct imperatives. The understood subject of the complement propositions is the addressee, that is, the actual words of the original speaker are repeated. The discussion of indirect imperatives will be deferred to Chapter 6.

79) maq prap thaa cam niw qae mōst twiā
Mum tell COMP wait be at mouth door
'Mum told (us), "Wait at the front door".'

80) look kruu bānciā thaa koun sāh touc-touc niw cam
teacher order COMP student small-Redup be wait
knōq bāntup koun sāh thom-thom māk twēe pāllākam
in classroom student big-Redup come do activity
'The teacher ordered, "The small students stay in the classroom, the big students come to do the activity".'
Direct prohibitive complements have the prohibitive kom at the beginning of the propositions, as shown in (81) and (82).

81) look qom prap thaa kom tiw kanlaen nuh
uncle tell COMP don’t go place that
'The uncle told (us), "Don't go to that place".'

82) sophiæp 附属 nii thaa kom ruøcam phiset
Sophiep incite Nieree COMP don't wait Phiset
'Sophiep urged Nieree, "Don't wait for Phiset".'

3.2.5 Grammaticalisation of the form thaa

It is widely accepted that the verb ‘to say’, in African, Asian and Creole languages, can be grammaticalised to be a complementiser of verbs of saying and then be expanded to become a complementiser of all types of matrix verbs (Kihm, 1990:53; Hopper and Traugott, 1993:14-15; Lord, 1993:206-208). The verb thaa ‘to say’ in Khmer as well as the verb meaning ‘to say’ in some other South-East Asian languages have undergone grammaticalisation in this way. Hmong, a language of hill tribe people spoken in Burma, Thailand and Laos, also has a complementiser developed from a verb meaning ‘to say’ (Jaisser, 1984:27).

Thepkanjana (1986) shows that the Thai verb wāː has two lexical entries; wāː meaning ‘to say’ and wāː meaning ‘to blame, scold’ (p.222). The verb wāː which means ‘to say’ obligatorily subcategorises for a complement whereas the verb wāː meaning ‘to blame, scold’ optionally subcategorises for a human object. The wāː complementiser which develops from the verb wāː ‘to say’ in Thai is used to introduce a complement proposition in a similar way to the thaa complementiser in Khmer. Thepkanjana also shows some examples in which wāː as a verb in Thai can be followed by the wāː complementiser. However, Khmer speakers tend to avoid the repetition of the forms thaa. When the verb thaa ‘to say’ or ‘to blame’ is followed by the thaa complementiser, as in examples (83) and (84), my informants do not accept the sentences. They consider the sentences as in (83) and (84), bad and these sentences cannot be used especially in written texts.

83) *baøŋ̯ thaa thaa mdaay mɔok haøy
elder sibling say COMP mother come already
For the meaning ‘The elder brother said that the mother has already come.’

4 The meaning of 附属 in Khmer implies that the speaker persuades the addressee to do something bad. As to incite in English cannot be used with direct speech, to urge is used for the translation of this example.

5 As my Thai data is taken from a number of various sources, the transcription used in the Thai examples will be my own.
84) *kōt thaa kñom thaa kñom keil nah
   he blame I COMP I lazy Ints
For the meaning 'He blamed me for being lazy.'

In colloquial speech, the co-occurrence of the predicate thaa 'to say' and the thaa complementiser may be acceptable in a negative sentence, as in (85) or in a polar question, as in (86). In other words, the double occurrences of the form thaa seem to be more acceptable when they are not adjacent.

85) ?boor thaa tee thaa mdaay mok haey
   elder sibling not Past say Part COMP mother come already
   'The elder brother did not say that the mother has already come.'

86) ?boor thaa tee thaa mdaay mok haey
   elder sibling say Part COMP mother come already
   'Did the elder brother say that the mother has already come?'

The case where the repetition is ill-formed can also be found in other languages. Dench and Evans (1988:36-37) discuss morphological sequence conditions in Australian languages that the double occurrences of the same morpheme in some languages are ungrammatical while this constraint only applies to identical allomorphs in other languages.

To avoid the repetition, it is preferred to have the utterance predicate thaa 'to say' followed by an S-like complement without a complementiser, as shown in (87). For a discussion of S-like complements without a complementiser, see Chapter 4.

87) boor thaa mdaay mok haey
   elder sibling say mother come already
   'The elder brother said that the mother has already come.'

As illustrated in (88), another alternative to avoid the repetition of the forms thaa is to substitute the predicate thaa 'to say' with a predicate of a similar meaning such as niyöy 'to say'.

88) boor niyöy thaa mdaay mok haey
   elder sibling say COMP mother come already
   'The elder brother said that the mother has already come.'

Most of the studies in Thai syntax consider that the form wā: following a verb such as utterance predicates functions as a complementiser (Ekniyom, 1982:78; Sriphên, 1982:202; Thepkanjana, 1986:223). Like Goral (1986) who claims that the form thaa following a complement-taking predicate in Khmer is a quotative verb, Pingkarawat (1989) argues that wā: following utterance verbs (or communication verbs, in her study) functions as a verb. Pingkarawat discusses Thematic control in
Thai based on Government and Binding Theory and focuses on quotative compound verbs. These are equivalent to the combination of utterance predicates and the complementiser (wâ: in Thai). She argues that

"...communication and mental state verbs in Thai cannot take propositional complements directly; they must take the complements whose verb is wâ: 'say', and the verb wâ:, in turn, takes propositional complements." (Pingkarawat, 1989:133)

Pingkarawat claims that the form wâ: following utterance verbs can be preceded by a noun phrase subject. Therefore, wâ: in this position is still a verb. One of Pingkarawat's examples is cited as follows:

89) yay bôk phim [yây wâ: [khêñ n hâ:y]]
   Yai tell Phim Yai say things lost
   'Yai told Phim, stating that things were lost.' (Pingkarawat, 1989:136)

However, many Thai native speakers do not agree with her judgement.6 In addition, when the same sentence is translated into Khmer, it is interpreted as either two separate sentences or a clause which contains thaa is quotative, as the translations in (90) and (91) show.

90) sot prap niərii kñom thaa røbøh bat tiw haøy
    Sot tell Nieree I say thing disappear go already
    'Sot told Nieree. I said (that) things were lost'
    OR
    'Sot told Nieree, "I said (that) things were lost".'

91) sot prap niərii kɔt thaa røbøh bat tiw haøy
    Sot tell Nieree he say thing disappear go already
    'Sot told Nieree. He said (that) things were lost'
    OR
    'Sot told Nieree, "He said (that) things were lost".'

The sentence is ungrammatical if it is analysed as one single sentence. To form one sentence only, there must not be a noun phrase which functions as a subject preceding thaa. At least in Khmer, thaa following utterance predicates does not have the ability to take a noun phrase as its subject.7 The grammatical sentence which has a similar translation to the Thai sentence above is:

92) sot prap niərii thaa røbøh bat tiw haøy
    Sot tell Nieree say thing disappear go already
    'Sot told Nieree that things were lost.'

---

6Hoonchamlong (1991:259-263) criticises Pingkarawat's analysis of wâ: and concludes that wâ: in this position is a complementiser.

7For more discussion on the function of thaa as a complementiser, see section 3.2.1: The form thaa.
The function of thaa as a complementiser in Khmer has been expanded – it conjoins with other adverbial complementisers. The combinations such as

prūah 'because' + thaa in prūāthaa 'because (that)'

and

baə 'if' + thaa in baəthaa 'if (that)'

are normally seen in written language and formal spoken style. For instance,

93) baə(thaa) kñom mian trōap craən kñom niŋ tiw
if I have treasure many I Irri go
leŋ srok kraaaw
play country outside
'If I had a lot of treasure, I would travel overseas.'

94) ... qaa prūah(thaa) ... prahaelcia qatəyə phiihkuə
... glad because ... probably former monk
kmae krahaam haw tiw cuəp
Khmer Rouge call go meet
(saen cambaeŋ)
'... (Sukhon) was glad because probably (it was) the former monk who is (a member of) the Khmer Rouge called (Sukhon) to meet (him).'

In (93) and (94), either baə or baəthaa and prūah or prūāthaa can be used to link adverbial clauses to main clauses.

As illustrated in (95), the combination of the copula verb kii and the thaa complementiser as kii thaa is used to introduce an exemplifying proposition. Jacob (1993:271) considers this combination as a direct translation of the French phrase 'c'est à dire' (that-is to-say).

95) kanłaeŋ klah ... mian phiaŋ pruəŋ pəntae
place some ... have state excellent but
kanłaeŋ klah tiaŋ niŋ yapaŋ daŋ klęy tiw
place some more still impoverished by short go
kii thaa knəŋ tambən klah niŋ mian qaŋməŋ
be in place some still have matter
khookhiə kumреŋ kumhaeŋ bumphiə banlaəc ...
cruel unpleasant threaten cause fear frighten ...
(News)
'In some places, we have already improved the situation but other places are still impoverished; in short, in some places, there still is violent oppression.'

The development of the word thaa in Khmer can be shown in a diagram as

96) a verb a complementiser a complementiser an adverbial complementiser 'to say' for utterance verbs for know/believe verbs
3.2.6 Summary

The most common complementiser in Khmer is developed from the verb thaa 'to say'. Utterance predicates, perception predicates, predicates of fearing and belief predicates can be followed by an S-like complement with the thaa complementiser. S-like complements with the thaa complementiser have similar characteristics to simple sentences. The complement proposition following the thaa complementiser is normally formed by a subject and a predicate. An auxiliary can modify the complement predicate with respect to the meaning of the matrix predicate. A complement proposition after the thaa complementiser can be either direct or indirect speech. S-like complements with the thaa complementiser can be affirmative, interrogative or imperative, showing the same range of sentence type as simple sentences. The tee particle which modifies the matrix clause can occur either before the thaa complementiser or at the end of the sentence whereas the tee particle which modifies the complement clause only occurs at the end of the sentence. The Q-word replaces the word being questioned and the thaa complementiser still introduces the complement proposition. Imperative complement propositions are normally direct speech. The usage of this complementiser has been extended; it can co-occur with other adverbial complementisers.

3.3. S-like complements with the dael complementiser

This section provides a discussion of S-like complements with the dael complementiser. Functions and meanings of the form dael are discussed first (section 3.3.1). Following this, complement-taking predicates which can precede S-like complements with the dael complementiser are presented (section 3.3.2). Characteristics of S-like complements with the dael complementiser are discussed in section 3.3.3. The similarity of the dael complementiser and the form daoy is presented in section 3.3.4. In section 3.3.5, the distributions of the dael complementiser and the thit complementiser in Thai are compared. Section 3.3.6 presents the summary of the section.

3.3.1 The form dael

The earliest form of dael was found in Old Khmer period dated at 629 A.D. (Jenner, 1982:121). According to Jenner, the form dael could have the following functions and meanings:

a) an intransitive verb meaning 'to be constant, unchanged, the same',

b) an intransitive verb meaning 'to be handed down (unchanged), transmitted, passed on; to be left over',
c) a general relative (or a relativiser) who, which, where, when,
d) an adverb meaning 'at some (any) time, ever (in past)

(Jenner, 1982:121).

The first meaning of dael 'to be constant, the same' seems to be lost in the Modern Khmer. This meaning of dael is replaced by the related form dadael. Example (97) shows the form dael meaning 'leftover, second hand, used article'.

97) ñam baay dael kee
    eat rice leftover they
    'To eat (something) leftover.' (adapted from Headley, 1977:293)

When conjoining a relative clause to an antecedent constituent, dael follows the head noun and precedes the relative clause, as in (98).

98) proh dael qaŋkuy qae nūh ciə bən proh kəm
    man Rel sit there be elder brother I
    'The man who is sitting over there is my elder brother.'

Unlike Jenner's classification, the form dael meaning 'ever' is classified as an auxiliary in this study. Pre-verbal adverbs in Khmer cannot be preceded by the negator min whereas the form dael can be preceded by the negator. As shown in (99) and (100), the form dael occurs especially in the interrogative or negative sentences (Headley, 1977:293).

99) look dael tiw qaŋkəa-wōat tee
    you ever go Angkor Wat Part
    'Have you ever been to Angkor Wat?'

100) kəm min dael tiw qaŋkəa-wōat tee
    I not ever go Angkor Wat Part
    'I have never been to Angkor Wat.'

When the form dael functions as a complementiser, it links an S-like complement with the matrix clause, as shown in (101) and (102).

101) kəm qaə nəh dael kəʊat trəw cnaot
    I glad Ints COMP he correct lotteries
    'I am very glad that he won the lotteries.'

102) niərrī kʰəŋ nəh dael sot koʊəq niəŋ
    Nieree angry Ints COMP Sot tell a lie she
    'Nieree was angry that Sot told her a lie.'

The dael complementiser is only used with factive predicates. It seems that the dael complementiser has developed from the verb dael. There seems to be a semantic connection of the dael complementiser and the meaning 'unchanged'. Nevertheless, more historical study of this form is needed.
3.3.2 Predicates taking S-like complements with the dael complementiser

The dael complementiser can be followed by a factive complement. Only factive predicates, as presented below, can precede an S-like complement with the dael complementiser.

Factive predicates:

- **baargom** 'to be sad, worried'
- **kwacat** 'to be worried'
- **klaac** 'to be afraid'
- **qancat** 'to be disappointed'
- **sqap** 'to hate'
- **ranthoatcat** 'to be frightened'
- **thuñ** 'to be bored'
- **touccat** 'to be disappointed'
- **qaa** 'to be glad'
- **treikqaa** 'to be glad'
- **pincat** 'to be satisfied'

Some predicates in this list are only factive* and can only be followed by the dael complementiser. However, other predicates such as klaac 'to be afraid' and phiy 'to be afraid' can also be non-factive. These non-factive predicates become factive only when they are followed by an S-like complement with the dael complementiser. When these predicates are followed by an S-like complement with the dael complementiser, it implies that something has already happened or that the event need not have happened but the matrix subject referent is certain that it will. The matrix subject referent has some feeling towards the bad consequence or the result of that.

Complement clauses preceded by the dael complementiser are old information. It is presupposed that a listener and a speaker have already known this information. The matrix predicate of examples (103) - (107) is followed by an S-like complement with the dael complementiser.

103) kñom qaa nah dael kőet mock leen ptëõh kñom
I glad Ints COMP he come play house I
'I am very glad that he visited my house.'

104) qoun kaa sdaay dae dael qoun min baan
I D.M. regret as well COMP I not able
niw ruwm taam kaa-qañcøañ robõh baan
stay join follow invitation of you
(tiasay sneehaa)
'I regret as well that I could not stay and join (the party) according to your invitation.'

* The normal definition of "factive" only implies that the event has already happened.
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105) mdaay kňom treikqqa nah dael baan dæŋ thaa
mother I glad Ints COMP Past know COMP
kňom nĩn trɔlap mõok ptẽah wĩn
I Irrl return come house back
'My mother is very glad to know that I am coming back home.'

106) kňom sapbaay-riikriəy dael nẽŋ baan mõok leen
I glad-glad COMP you Past come play
ptẽah kňom trãy nĩh
house I day this
'I'm glad that you could visit my house today.'

107) kňom klaac nah dael cao mõok samlap kõœt qaŋcœŋ
I afraid Ints COMP thief come kill he so
'My mother is very afraid because the thieves came to kill him that way.'

3.3.3 Characteristics of S-like complements with the dael complementiser

In this section, characteristics of S-like complements with the dael complementiser are examined.

3.3.3.1 Auxiliary insertion

The time reference of S-like complements with the dael complementiser is relative to that of the matrix clause. When the past tense marker is inserted before the complement predicate, as in (108) - (111), it indicates that at the time locus, the complement action has already taken place.

108) sot sdaay nah dael niœrii min baan mõok leen
Sot regret Ints COMP Nieree not Past come play
ptẽah kœt
house he
'Sot regretted that Nieree did not visit his house.'

109) kœt prōkan nah dael yœŋ min baan tiw qaŋcœŋ
he offended Ints COMP we not Past go invite
kaa kœt dal ptẽah
marriage he arrive house
'He was offended that we did not go to his house and invite him to the marriage.'

110) niœrii riikriœy nah dael niœŋ baan tiw leen tikchuu
Nieree glad Ints COMP she Past go play waterfall
trãy nĩh
day this
'Nieree was glad that she had been to the waterfall today.'

111) sot klaac nah dael cao baan mõok plan ptẽah
Sot afraid Ints COMP thief Past come rob house
'Sot was afraid because the thieves came to rob the house.'

If the complement predicate is modified by the irrealis marker, the
complement action has not yet happened at the time of the matrix clause. The matrix subject referent, however, is certain that the complement action will take place. This is exemplified in (112) - (114).

112) mdaay kñom piñcat nah dael kñom níŋ riwpkaa mother I pleased Ints COMP I Irrl marry ciomuay chum with Chum
'My mother was pleased that I would marry Chum.'

113) cindaa pruyah nah dael sot níŋ tway tiBrian Chinda worried Ints COMP Sot Irrl do soldier 'Chinda was worried because Sot was going to be soldier.'

114) niarii riikriay nah dael niŋ níŋ tiw leen tikipuu Nieree glad Ints COMP she Irrl go play waterfall tŋay nih day this 'Nieree is glad that she is going to the waterfall today.'

When klaac 'to be afraid' is followed by an S-like complement with the dael complementiser, it presupposes that the complement action has already taken place. When the irrealis marker níŋ modifies the complement predicate, as in (115), the sentence is unacceptable. Although (115) is structurally correct, problems with its logic make example (115) unacceptable.

115) ??sot klaac nah dael cao níŋ mook plan pteyy Sot afraid Ints COMP thief Irrl come rob house

As shown in (116) - (118), the insertion of the continuous marker indicates that the complement action is happening during the time locus.

116) sot kwolcat nah dael koun kōt kampun chii Sot worried Ints COMP child he Cont sick 'Sot was worried that his child was sick.'

117) kñom pruyah baarcom nah dael kruasaa yaeŋ I grieve Ints COMP family we kampun mian tuq klaocpsaa Thom muay douc nih Cont have sorrow big one as such 'I feel very grief-stricken that our family is in (such) great sorrow.'

118) sot phiy nah dael tiBrian kampun daŋ praciacüaŋ Sot afraid Ints COMP soldier Cont chase people qañcəŋ so 'Sot is afraid that the soldiers were chasing people as such.'

3.3.3.2. Sentence type of S-like complements with the dael complementiser

Unlike the thaa complementiser, the dael complementiser can only be
followed by indirect speech or thought. The pronouns look 'you' in (119) and kñom 'I' in (120) refer actually to the addressee and the speaker of the sentences. The complement subjects look 'you' in (119) and kñom 'I' in (120) cannot be interpreted as being coreferential with the matrix subject. That is, the complement propositions are not direct speech forms.

119) kñom qaa nah dael look baan rian cap
   I glad Ints COMP you Past study finish
   'I was glad that you finished your study.' (*I was glad (that), "I finished my study").

120) niarri sdaay nah dael kñom min traw cnaot
    Nieree regret Ints COMP I not correct lotteries
    'Nieree regretted that I didn't win the lotteries.' (*Nieree regretted (that), "I didn't win the lotteries").

A proposition following the dael complementiser can be affirmative as in (121) or negative as in (122).

121) sot qaa nah dael koot traw cnaot
    Sot glad Ints COMP he correct lotteries
    'Sot was very glad that he won the lotteries.'

122) sot qaa nah dael niarri min traw cnaot
    Sot glad Ints COMP Nieree not correct lotteries
    'Sot was very glad that Nieree didn't win the lotteries.'

Since the truth of the proposition is assumed, they cannot be questions. Propositions in (123) and (124) are questions, hence, they are ungrammatical.

123) *look qaa dael neeqnaa traw cnaot (tee)
    you glad COMP who correct lotteries (Part)

124) *look qancot dael koot mook peel naa
    you upset COMP he come when

In addition, imperative or prohibitive complements cannot be preceded by the dael complementiser either. Example (125) is ungrammatical if the complement proposition is interpreted as an imperative complement, rather it is declarative.

125) kñom qaa nah dael cam tii nih
    I glad Ints COMP wait here
    This sentence cannot mean *'I was glad, "Wait here".' However, it can mean 'I was glad that (someone/I) waited here.'

Example (126) is ungrammatical as the prohibitive kom modifies the complement predicate.

126) *kñom sdaay nah dael kom tiw leen qae nuh
    I regret Ints COMP don't go play there
    This sentence cannot mean *'I regretted, "Don't go to play there".'
Moreover, epistemic modals which express probability such as 
kug 'should' qaac 'may'
cannot occur in the complement proposition following the dael complementiser, as 
shown in (127) and (128).

127) *kñom sdaay nah dael niŋ kug chup twaa kaa
   I regret Ints COMP she should stop do work

128) *maq pruqy nah dael cindaa qaac tiw
   Mom worried Ints COMP Chinda may go
twaa tiqhian
do soldier

The following examples illustrate that the polar question particle tee, being 
inserted either before the dael complementiser or at the end of the sentence, only 
modifies the main verb.

129) look qa qoa tee dael koun look bəncap kaa saksaa
   you glad Part COMP child you finish study
ruac haay accomplish already

130) look qa dael koun look bəncap kaa saksaa
   you glad COMP child you finish study
ruac haay tee accomplish already Part
'Are you glad that your child has already finished his study?'

These two sentences have the same truth-value. The former question, however, 
seems to be preferable since the matrix predicate is more emphasised than the one in 
which the tee particle occurs at the end of a sentence. The polar question particle 
tee in example (130), cannot modify the complement proposition. There can be only 
one c-structure for (130), as given in (131).
3.3.4 Similarity of dael and daoy

Propositions after factive predicates provide an evaluation of mental attitude of the matrix subject referent as well as inherently indicate reasons why he or she has such an emotion. An adverbial complementiser daoy, meaning (slightly similar to) 'because' (Headley, 1977:295)8 or 'through the fact (that); because (of)' (Jacob, 1993:269) may be substituted for dael. Examples (132) and (133) have the same truth-value meaning, while (134) and (135) also share the same interpretation.

132) sot qqa nah dael niərii baan qaŋqaŋ kōt tiw Ints COMP Nieree Past invite he go
   sot glad
   'Sot was glad that Nieree invited him to (her) place.'

133) sot qqa nah daoy niərii baan qaŋqaŋ kōt tiw Ints by Nieree Past invite he go
   sot glad
   'Sot was glad as Nieree invited him to (her) place.'

134) miŋ qqa nah dael kmuay baan cəŋ mək niw aunt glad Ints COMP niece Past leave come stay
   tae piu nēq only two Clf
   'I am glad that both of you come to stay together.'

135) miŋ qqa nah daoy kmuay baan cəŋ mək niw aunt glad Ints by niece Past leave come stay
   tae piu nēq only two Clf
   'I am glad because/since both of you come to stay together.'

Nevertheless, the adverbial complementiser daoy can be used in a broader sense. It can express a manner, as in (136).

136) klah twə ciə bat kəmbat poothaw daoy luəc
   some pretend disappear knife axe by steal
   tiw yəok kap ciə suməj
   go take bury be secret
   (qəŋqiəboh qəy qoun niw tiinæa)
   'Some pretended to lose (their) knife and axe by stealing and burying (them) in secret.'

The form daoy may indicate a reason, as illustrated in (137).

---

8According to Headley (1977:295), the form daoy can also have other meanings. It can be a verb 'to stick to' or a preposition 'by, with, along, in a ... manner'.
The form *daoy* and the *dael* complementiser can be substituted in only one position: following a factive predicate and introducing a complement proposition. The reason that the substitution is acceptable might be because propositions following factive predicates also indicate the reason why the matrix subject referent has such an emotion as well as providing information on what causes the matrix subject referent to have that emotion. Hence, *daoy* which marks a reason can only replace *dael* which introduces a factive proposition. The case where a complementiser being used with factive predicates takes the same form as the complementiser introducing a reason clause can also be found in other languages. An example of this occurs in Basque (Ransom, 1986:143). Ransom mentions that a complementiser for emotive factive predicates -elako, in certain dialects of Basque, shares the same form with the adverbial complementiser meaning 'because'.

### 3.3.5 Comparison of the *dael* complementiser in Khmer and the *thi:* complementiser in Thai

When compared with Khmer, Thai is similar in having the form *thi:* *(ca?)* introducing factive and result-type complements (Diller, 1993:403). In addition, both the form *thi:* in Thai and the form *dael* in Khmer can function as relativisers. However, the form *thi:* in Thai developed from the noun *thi:* 'place or space' whereas the form *dael* in Khmer developed from a verb. Unlike the form *dael* in Khmer, the form *thi:* in Thai has other functions. It can be a classifier for land, place and a preposition 'at, in' (Haas, 1964:241).

Complements introduced by *thi:* *(ca?)* in Thai can be preceded by a wider range of complement-taking predicates than S-like complements with the *dael* complementiser in Khmer display. Ekniyom (1982:75-78, 100-101) considers embedded clauses preceding by *thi:* *(ca?)* as non-assertive clauses which represent given information. She classifies predicates which can take complements introduced by *thi:* *(ca?)* into three groups. The first group includes verbs expressing emotional or psychological reactions such as:
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phacay 'to be pleased'
plékay 'to be surprised'
dicay 'to be glad'
chā 'to believe'
chôp 'to like, enjoy'
siädavy 'to regret'

Ekniyom, 1982:75).

A proposition following mental predicates denotes a future event. Therefore these predicates especially require the form thī: ca?9 as a complementiser. Here are some examples of mental predicates:

khît 'to think'
dicay 'to be glad'
tâtsincay 'to decide'
patisêt 'to refuse'
sânya: 'to promise'
yâk 'to want'

Ekniyom, 1982:76).

The syntactic difference between the first and the second groups is that the subject of the embedded clause following predicates of the second group is obligatorily unexpressed and controlled by the matrix subject while this constraint is not necessarily applied with the predicates of the first group (Ekniyom, 1982:75-76).

The last type of predicates which can take thī: designates an evaluation of a given situation or event. Evaluative presentative verbs include

chôkdi: 'to be lucky'
nâbibio 'to be boring'
lâchā 'incredible'
khîrsâidi: 'to be fortunate'


Predicates which subcategorise for an S-like complement with the dael complementiser in Khmer are comparable to some predicates in group one and group two of Ekniyom's list. However, other equivalent predicates such as 'to want', 'to promise' and 'to refuse' which can be followed by a complement introduced by the form thī: in Thai are only followed by a subject-controlled complement10 in Khmer. Khmer never has these predicates followed by an S-like complement with the dael complementiser. The symbol (*dael) in examples (138) - (140) means that there cannot be the dael complementiser in the sentences.

138) kñom caŋ (*dael) twːō kaa nih
I want COMP do work this
'I wanted to do this work.'

9The form ca? on its own is a pre-verbal tense marker for future tense.

10Subject-controlled complements are discussed in detail in section 5.2.
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139) sot sanyaa (*dael) twɔɔ kaa nih
    Sot promise COMP do work this
    'Sot promised to do this work.'

140) niɔrrii patiseet (*dael) twɔɔ kaa nih
    Nieree refuse COMP do work this
    'Nieree refused to do this work.'

In addition, some predicates such as 'to hope', 'to think' and 'to believe' in Thai can be followed by either the wāi or the thi: complementiser, verbs with parallel meanings in Khmer can only be followed by the thaa complementiser, as shown in (141) - (143).

141) kñom saŋkhim thaa/*dael niɔŋ niŋ tiw cuæp kñom
    I hope COMP she Irrl go meet I
    'I hope that she will come to see me.'

142) sot kit thaa/*dael niɔŋ niŋ tiw cuæp kñom
    Sot think COMP she Irrl go meet I
    'Sot thinks that she will come to see me,'

143) niɔrrii ciation thaa/*dael niɔŋ niŋ tiw cuæp kñom
    Nieree believe COMP she Irrl go meet I
    'Nieree believes that she will come to see me.'

Thai evaluative predicates are comparable to the structure of kuæqyoy plus a factive predicate in Khmer. As shown in (144) and (145), the combination of kuæqyoy and a factive predicate forms a phrase equivalent to English adjectives -able/-ible (Huffman, 1970b:246; Headley, 1977:129).

144) kuæqyoy qap s ok nah dael niw pteɔh tae mæŋŋæp qaæŋ
    suitable bore Ints COMP be house alone
    'It is boring to stay home alone.'

145) kuæqyoy sdaay nah dael look min baan mɔɔk nih
    suitable regret Ints COMP you not Past come this
    'It is unfortunate that you did not come.'

3.3.6 Summary

The second complementiser in Khmer is dael. This complementiser shares the same form with a verb 'to be left over, unchanged', an auxiliary 'ever' and a relative pronoun. The dael complementiser introduces old information with factive predicates. The complement predicate of S-like complements with the dael complementiser can be modified by an auxiliary with respect to the time reference of the matrix clause. Complement propositions after the dael complementiser can only be an indirect statement, not a question or a command.

The dael complementiser can sometimes be substituted for by the form daoy 'because'. However, daoy can be used in wider contexts. The form thi: in Thai
is used in a similar way to the form dael in Khmer. Although thõ developed from a noun and dael seems to develop from a verb, both thõ in Thai and dael in Khmer can function as relativisers and complementisers. When thõ is a complementiser, however, it can be preceded by a wider range of complement-taking predicates than the dael complementiser in Khmer.

3.4 Comparison of dael and thaa

Factive predicates can sometimes be followed by the thaa complementiser as well as the dael complementiser, as illustrated in (146) - (148). Nevertheless, when compared with the dael complementiser, thaa is generally less preferable. Propositions preceded by the thaa complementiser can be either true or false whereas the complement clauses with dael must be factive. For instance, when the dael complementiser is used, the matrix subject referent in (146) is worried because his son has already made a decision to be a soldier. If the thaa complementiser is used, there is no such an implication. If dael introduces the complement proposition in (147), it implies that the matrix subject referent himself has experienced that the complement subject referent is cruel. When thaa is used, the matrix subject referent may just hear a rumour that the complement subject referent is cruel from someone else. However, he is still afraid about this.

146) kõat pruay nah thaa/dael koun kõat nih twaa tiæhian
   he worried Ints COMP child he Irrl do soldier
   'He is worried that his son will be a soldier.'

147) kñom klaac nah thaa/dael kõat kaac peek
   I afraid Ints COMP he cruel too much
   'I am afraid that he is too cruel.'

148) kñom qaa nah thaa/dael kõat nih trælap mook wiñ
   I glad Ints COMP he Irrl return come back
   'I am glad that he will come back.'

The following situation is provided to demonstrate the difference between the two complementisers. Concerning an accident in which a mother and her son died, (A) asked (B) what he thought about this accident. (B) could express his feeling with an S-like complement introduced by either the thaa or the dael complementiser. However, propositions after the two complementisers are different.

149) A: qampii riaŋ nih look kit yaarñnaa
    about story this you think how
    'What do you think about this matter?'
The proposition following the thaa complementiser, in (149.B), is contradictory to the fact. In addition, the speaker adds kua 'should' expressing epistemic value of the complement. As illustrated in (150), the proposition after the thaa complementiser cannot be used with the dael complementiser.

150) *kñom (kit) sdaay dael níaŋ pum kúa yóok koun mäkk sah
I (think) regret COMP she not should take child come at all
'I regretted that she should not take her child along at all.'

If (B) wants to answer by using dael, the proposition after dael must be factive, as shown in (151).

151) kñom (kit) sdaay dael níaŋ nòom koun mäkk
I (think) regret COMP she lead child come
'I regretted that she brought her child along.'

Another distinction between the dael and thaa complementisers is that only a complement clause following the dael complementiser can be topicalised. Propositions following the dael complementiser are old information and normally old information in Khmer can be topicalised. Examples (152) and (153) are the normal structure in which an S-like complement with the dael complementiser follows the matrix predicate.

152) kñom rikriay nah dael nèeq baan mäkk tnyy nih
I glad Ints COMP you Past come day this
'I am very glad that you could come today.'

153) kñom khäng nah dael kee mäkk niyiy camgaak
I angry Ints COMP he come speak mock
we
'I am very angry that he came to mock us (like this).'</n
As illustrated in (154) and (155), the complement proposition with the dael complementiser can be topicalised.

154) dael nèeq baan mäkk tnyy nih kñom rikriay nah
COMP you Past come day this I glad Ints
'That you could come today, I am very glad.'

155) dael kee mäkk niyiy camgaak yzan kñom khäng nah
COMP he come speak mock we I angry Ints
'That he came to mock us (like this), I am very angry.'
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Example (156) shows that the topicalised complement clause with the thaa complementiser is ungrammatical.

156) *thaa nĩŋ pum kua nōam koun mōok sah
COMP she not should take child come at all
kʰom sdaay nahn
I regret Ints

3.5 Anaphora in S-like complements with a complementiser

This section discusses the interpretation of anaphora in S-like complements with a complementiser. The interpretation of a pronominal in S-like complements with a complementiser is presented first (section 3.5.1). In section 3.5.2, the interpretations of reflexive forms in the complement subject and in the complement object positions are presented. Section 3.5.3 discusses the interpretation of null arguments in S-like complements with a complementiser. For convenience, S-like complements with the complementiser discussed in this section are arbitrarily glossed as indirect speech.

3.5.1 Interpretation of a pronominal

As shown in (157) - (161), a complement proposition introduced by a complementiser normally is a complete clause. When the complement subject is a noun phrase or the first or second person pronoun, the interpretation is straightforward. For instance, the complement subject in (157) is Sot while the complement subject in (158) is the addressee.

157) kʰom prap thaa sot nĩŋ caŋ pliom
I tell COMP Sot Irl leave immediately
'I told (someone) that Sot would leave immediately.'

158) kʰom daŋ thaa look twaŋ kaa nih min
I know COMP you do work this not
haŋ tee
ready Part
'I knew that you could not finish this work.'

159) k守住 ciŋɛeq thaa sot nĩŋ riŋqam kumroŋkkaa
he believe COMP Sot Irl prepare project
nuh dal samroŋ
that until finish
'He believes that Sot would finish that project.'

160) sot saŋyaa ciŋmuŋ kʰom thaa kʰom nĩŋ baan
Sot promise with I COMP I Irl get
kɔɔkqa twaŋ qaatuŋ mun
job do week next
'Sot promised me that I would get a job next week.'
161) kñom qaa nah dael koun kñom baan riən cap
I glad Ints COMP child I Past study finish
'I am glad that my child finished school.'

When the complement subject is the third person pronoun, however, there can be some ambiguities. For instance, the third person pronoun kōət in (162) - (164) can be interpreted as having either the matrix subject, (the matrix object) or someone else in the context as its antecedent. The subscripts under kōət 's/he' indicate the possibilities of the antecedent of the complement subject.

162) sot panyuəl wicat thaa kōət dən riən
Sotŋi explain Wichetj COMP s/he/ij/k know story
n uh həəy
that already
'Sotŋi explained to Wichetj that s/he/ij/k knew that story already.'

163) sot prap wicat thaa kōət tiw twəə kaa baan
Sotŋi tell Wichetj COMP s/he/ij/k go do work able
'Sotŋi told Wichetj that s/he/ij/k was able to go to work.'

164) sot qaa nah dael kōət baan kəkəa twəə
Sotŋi glad Ints COMP s/he/ij/k get work do
'Sotŋi was very glad that s/he/ij/k has got a job.'

When the pronoun kōət 's/he' occurs in a complement object position, it can be coreferential with either the matrix subject, the matrix object or the antecedent noun phrase previously mentioned in the discourse. The subscripts under kōət in examples (165) - (167) indicate the possibilities of its antecedent.

165) chum cumriəp wichat thaa niərīi moək rəək kōət
Chumŋi inform Wichetj COMP Niereek come seek s/he/ij/l
'Chumŋi informed Wichetj that Niereek came to see him/her/ij/l.'

166) chum prap sot thaa niərīi mən caŋ cəəp kōət
Chumŋi tell Sotŋi COMP Niereek not want meet s/he/ij/l
'Chumŋi told Sotŋi that Niereek did not want to meet him/her/ij/l.'

167) sot qaa nah dael niərīi skəəl kōət
Sotŋi glad Ints COMP Niereek know s/he/ij/k
'Sotŋi was very glad that Niereek knows him/her/ij/k.'

The interpretation of a pronominal in S-like complements with a complementiser is free, like that in simple sentences.
3.5.2 Interpretation of reflexive forms

In Khmer, the reflexive form kluənqaen\(^1\) can occur in the subject position. When the reflexive form kluənqaen functions as the complement subject, it is coreferential with the matrix subject. This is exemplified in (168) and (169).

168) niərii kit thaa klunqaen min lqa
Nieree, think COMP body-self, not nice
‘Nieree, thinks that she herself is not nice.’

169) cindaa niy Hoy thaa klunqaen twɔɔ kaa nih min
Chinda, say COMP body-self, do work this not
baan tee
able Part
‘Chinda, said that she herself could not do this work.’

If the reflexive form klunqaen functions as the complement object, as in (170) - (171), the grammaticality judgements of Khmer speakers vary. Some consider that it can only be coreferential with the complement subject. However, when an appropriate context is specified, others accept klunqaen as coreferential with either the complement subject or the matrix subject. For instance, in the situation where Nieree was crying, someone may use example (170) to explain the reason for this.

170) niərii prap cindaa thaa sot sqap klunqaen
Nieree, tell Chinda, COMP Sot, hate body-self,/*j/k
‘Nieree, told Chinda that Sot, hated himself/herself.’

171) niərii prap cindaa thaa sot sruln klunqaen
Nieree, tell Chinda, COMP Sot, love body-self,/*j/k
‘Nieree, told Chinda that Sot, loved himself/herself.’

When the reflexive form klun replaces the form klunqaen, as shown in (172) - (174), there can also be two interpretations of its antecedent. Either the matrix subject or the complement subject can be the antecedent of klun. However, the interpretation of the preferable antecedent of klun seems to depend on the predicate with which klun co-occurs. Khmer speakers' first interpretation of examples (172) and (173) assigns the matrix subject as the antecedent of the reflexive form klun.\(^12\) However, they interpret the complement subject in (174) to be the preferable antecedent of klun.

---

\(^{1}\)There are two reflexive forms in Khmer – klun and klunqaen. There seems to be no distinction between these two forms in the complement subject position. As my informants prefer klunqaen to klun in this position, I will only show examples with klunqaen.

\(^{12}\)This interpretation agrees with Fisher's analysis of klun (Fisher, 1985:70).
172) niarii prap cindaa thaa sot sqap kluann
Niereei tell Chinda COMP Sot hate bodyi/*j/*k
‘Niereei told Chinda that Sot hated himself/heri/*j/*k.’

173) niarii prap cindaa thaa sot srulañ kluan
Niereei tell Chinda COMP Sot love bodyi/*j/*k
‘Niereei told Chinda that Sot loved himself/heri/*j/*k.’

174) niarii prap cindaa thaa sot nin samlap kluan
Niereei tell Chinda COMP Sot lrrl kill bodyi/*j/*k
‘Niereei told Chinda that Sot would kill himself/heri/*j/*k.’

Only the matrix subject or the complement subject can be an antecedent of the reflexive forms. The reflexive forms cannot be coreferential with a noun phrase previously mentioned in a context, as shown in (175).

175) niarii prap cindaa thaa sot srulañ kluan
Niereei tell Chinda COMP Sot love body
‘Niereei told Chinda that Sot loved himself/heri/*j/*k.’

When the reflexive forms kluan and kluanqaen occur in the complement subject position, both are coreferential with the matrix subject. In this position, however, kluanqaen is preferably used to kluan. When these reflexive forms function as the complement object, they can be coreferential with either the matrix subject or the complement subject. However, the preferable interpretations of the antecedent of these reflexive forms are slightly different. The preferable interpretation for kluan requires the matrix subject to be its antecedent. In contrast, the first interpretation of the reflexive form kluanqaen assigns the complement subject to be its antecedent. A further study of the reflexive forms in Khmer is needed.

3.5.3 Interpretation of missing arguments

As a pro-drop language, Khmer allows a subject, an object or an object2 to be unexpressed. When a complement subject has previously been mentioned, it can be omitted. The interpretation of an antecedent for the missing complement subject need not obligatorily be local; that is, the missing complement argument can assign its antecedent outside the sentence. In this way, unexpressed complement subjects are just like subjects in simple sentences.

As illustrated in (176) and (177), utterance predicates such as prap ‘to tell’ and panyual ‘to explain’ can have a free interpretation for the missing complement argument. For more detail, see section 2.5: Pro-drop.
subject. Either the matrix subject, the matrix object or a person who has been mentioned in the discourse can be interpreted as the antecedent of the missing subject, depending on the context:

176) kee prap kñom thaa ø traw tiw cuo fleeting.Tell COMP øi_j/k must go meet
qñkàa mñáa=t tiot
organisation once more
(qñkùñboh qñy qoun niw tiinaa)
'They told me that (they/I/ someone else) had to go to meet the organisation again.'

177) sot panyúal wicott thaa ø døj rían
Sotj explain Wichetj COMP øi_j/k know story
nùh hagy
that already
'Sotj explained to Wichetj that (Sot/Wichet/someone else) knew that story already.'

The c-structure of sentence (177) is as follows:

178)

```
S
  NP
     V
        NP
         S'
          COMP
              S
                VP
```

Although the complement subject is unexpressed in the c-structure, it has the semantic form in the f-structure as a PRO.¹⁴

---

¹⁴The term "PRO" here is used in the different sense from "PRO" in Government and Binding theory; see section 1.2.2: Control theory.
The interpretation of a missing subject of an S-like complement with a complementiser following other types of CTPs is the same as the one following utterance predicates, as the subscripts in (180) - (184) show:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subj</th>
<th>Pred 'SOT'</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pred</td>
<td>'EXPLAIN ((SUBJ) (OBJ) (SCOMP))'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Obj</td>
<td>Pred 'WICHET'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subj</td>
<td>Pred 'PRO'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pred</td>
<td>'KNOW ((SUBJ) (OBJ))'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Obj</td>
<td>Pred 'STORY'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spec</td>
<td>That</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asp</td>
<td>Complete</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The interpretation of a missing subject of an S-like complement with a complementiser following other types of CTPs is the same as the one following utterance predicates, as the subscripts in (180) - (184) show:

180) kñom døŋ thaa ø twʌɔ kaa nih min
     I_i know COMP ø_ij do work this not
     haay tee
     ready Part
     'I knew that (I/someone else) could not finish this work.'

181) sot lī thaa ø traw cnao't
     Sot_i hear COMP ø_ij correct lotteries
     'Sot heard that (Sot/someone else) has won the lotteries.'

182) kɔɔt ciʌɛaqu thaa ø nĩ̊ nriopc̃ kumroŋkaa
     he_i believe COMP ø_ij Irrl prepare project
     nuh dal samræc
     that until finish
     'He believes that (he/someone else) will finish that project.'

183) sot sanyaa ciʌmuay kñom thaa ø nĩ̊ baan
     Sot_i promise with I_j COMP ø_ij/k Irrl get
     kockaa twʌɔ qaatit mun
     job do week next
     'Sot promised me that (he/I/someone else) will get a job next week.'

184) kñom qɔa nah dael ø baan rɔn cap
     I_i glad Ints COMP ø_ij Past study finish
     'I am glad that (I/someone else) finished school.'

The first interpretation of the missing subject in (180) - (184) refers to the matrix subject. Nevertheless, there can be another interpretation in which the missing complement subject need not be coreferential with an argument in the matrix clause and has a noun phrase outside the sentence as its antecedent. The complement subject can be interpreted as someone who has been previously mentioned in the discourse as well as the matrix subject and/or the matrix object. The context in which that sentence occurs is used to clarify which antecedent noun phrase the missing subject refers to. The examples above show that the interpretation for the
missing complement subject is free and is similar to that of simple sentences. The complement subject can refer to any antecedent noun phrase which matches the interpretation.

Not only the complement subject can be omitted, Khmer also allows the complement object to be unexpressed. In (185) and (186), the complement objects are omitted.

185) sot prap niarii thaa look kruu caŋ cuap ɸ
   Sot\textsubscript{i} tell Nieree\textsubscript{j} COMP teacher\textsubscript{k} want meet ɸ\textsubscript{i/j/k}
   'Sot\textsubscript{i} told Nieree\textsubscript{j} that the teacher\textsubscript{k} wants to see (someone\textsubscript{i/j}).'

186) sot riikriy nah dael cinda\textsubscript{a} caŋ cuap ɸ
   Sot\textsubscript{i} glad Ints COMP Chinda\textsubscript{j} want meet ɸ\textsubscript{i/k}
   'Sot\textsubscript{i} was glad that Chinda\textsubscript{j} wants to see (someone\textsubscript{i/k}).'

Either Sot, (Nieree) or someone previously mentioned can be interpreted as the complement object. The complement object is then interpreted as having a semantic form as 'PRO'.

Example (187) below shows that both the complement subject and the complement object in the same complement clause can be unexpressed.

187) kōōt prap thaa ɸ khōōn ɸ haay
   he\textsubscript{i} tell COMP ɸ see ɸ already
   'He told (someone) that (someone) has seen (someone or something) already.'

There can be various interpretations for example (187). The matrix subject in (187), may be analysed as an antecedent of the missing subject as well as an antecedent of the missing object. If the missing complement subject corefers to the matrix subject, the sentence means 'He told (someone) that he has seen (someone or something) already'. Example (187) is modified by the co-indexing subscripts in order to show the coreferentiality and renumbered as example (187.A) below.

187.A) kōōt prap thaa ɸ khōōn ɸ haay
      he\textsubscript{i} tell COMP ɸ\textsubscript{j} see ɸ\textsubscript{j/k} already
      'He\textsubscript{i} told (someone\textsubscript{j}) that (he\textsubscript{j}) has seen (someone\textsubscript{j/k}) already.'

When the matrix subject is interpreted as the antecedent of the missing complement object, the sentence means 'He told (someone) that (someone) has seen him already'. The co-indexing subscripts used in (187.B) indicate that the matrix subject functions as the antecedent of the missing complement object.

187.B) kōōt prap thaa ɸ khōōn ɸ haay
      he\textsubscript{i} tell COMP ɸ\textsubscript{j/k} see ɸ\textsubscript{j} already
      'He\textsubscript{i} told (someone\textsubscript{j/k}) that (someone\textsubscript{j/k}) has seen (him\textsubscript{j}) already.'
The second interpretation can occur in a situation such as a group of soldiers lost in a forest who are looking for help. When they hear the helicopter flying over them, someone may simply say khən̂ hə̄y which means that someone in the helicopter has already seen him/them. The context in which a sentence occurs is used to clarify which noun phrase is an antecedent for the missing argument.

The fact that the unexpressed complement object can be coreferential with the matrix subject indicates that Khmer is not a null-topic language, unlike Chinese as stated by Huang (1984). In her syntactic analysis of Khmer anaphora, Fisher (1985:99-118) also shows some similar examples to support her argument that Huang's null object parameter should be expanded. Cole (1987) and Hoonchamlong (1991) also make a similar observation for Thai.

All possible interpretations for example (187) are represented in (188) below. The subscript $\phi_i$ refers to the matrix subject, $\phi_j$ to the matrix object and $\phi_k$ to someone previously mentioned in the context.

\[
\begin{align*}
&\phi_i, \\
&\phi_j, \\
&\phi_k, \\
&\phi_{i,j}, \\
&\phi_{i,k}, \\
&\phi_{j,k}
\end{align*}
\]

\[
\begin{align*}
&\phi_{i,k}, \\
&\phi_{i,j}, \\
&\phi_k, \\
&\phi_j, \\
&\phi_i
\end{align*}
\]

188) he$_i$ tell $\phi_j$ COMP has seen $\phi_{i,j}$ already $\phi_{i,k}$ $\phi_k$

The interpretation of example (187) shows that both the missing complement subject and the missing complement object can be a PRO. The c-structure and f-structure of (187) are demonstrated below as (189) and (190) respectively.
In the c-structure (189) above, neither the complement subject nor the complement object is expressed. However, both the complement subject and the complement object have a semantic form as PRO in the f-structure (190) below.

The interpretation of the unexpressed complement subject as well as that of the missing complement object are free.

3.6 Conclusion

Sentence-like complements with a complementiser in Khmer have a similar structure to simple sentences. They are formed by a subject and a predicate and are always introduced by a complementiser. There are two complementisers in Khmer – thaa and dael. The thaa complementiser is the most common complementiser in Khmer. It developed from a verb thaa 'to say'. S-like complements with the thaa complementiser normally introduce new information whereas S-like complement with the dael complementiser introduce old information or factive. An auxiliary can modify a complement predicate with respect to certain types of matrix predicates. Indirect speech complements are obligatorily preceded by a complementiser whereas direct speech complements can optionally follow the thaa complementiser. The occurrence of the thaa complementiser is, therefore, not a good criterion to
differentiate direct speech from indirect speech in Khmer. S-like complements with the theaa complementiser can be either declarative, interrogative or imperative. S-like complements with the dael complementiser, however, are always indirect speech and can only be declarative. Characteristics of complement proposition following the theaa and the dael complementisers are summarised in Table 3.1.

The interpretation of the pronominal subject and the pronominal object in S-like complements with a complementiser is free, like that of simple sentences. When the complement subject as well as the complement object of S-like complements with a complementiser have previously been mentioned in the context, they can be omitted. The interpretation of an unexpressed argument in S-like complements with a complementiser is also free, like that of the pronominal arguments. The reflexive forms can occur in both subject and object positions of S-like complements with a complementiser. There is no distinction when kluon and kluonqaen function as the complement subject; they are coreferential with the matrix subject. When the reflexive forms occur in the complement object position, they can be coreferential with either the matrix subject or the complement subject. However, there is a distinction of the preferable antecedent. The first interpretation of kluon assigns the matrix subject as its preferable antecedent whereas that of kluonqaen assigns the complement subject as its preferable antecedent. More research is needed on Khmer reflexive forms.

Although both a free pronoun and a reflexive pronoun can be coreferential with the matrix subject, Khmer speakers use the bound pronoun or the reflexive pronoun when they want to dispell ambiguity.

Some predicates discussed in this chapter can be followed by an S-like complement with or without a complementiser. In the next chapter, I will discuss these types of predicates as well as characteristics of S-like complements without a complementiser. In doing so, I will be investigating differences in the implications of these two complement types.
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characteristics of complement proposition</th>
<th>thaa</th>
<th>dael</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1) Direct speech</td>
<td>±</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2) Sentence types: a) declarative</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>b) interrogative</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>c) imperative</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3) Factive</td>
<td>±</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4) Topicalisation</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3.1: The distribution of characteristics of S-like complements with a complementiser

Perception predicates:
- see
- hear

Predicates of fear:
- to be afraid
- be afraid

Belief predicates:
- to guess, to suppose
- to doubt
CHAPTER 4

Sentence-like complements without a complementiser

4.1 Introduction

This chapter presents a discussion of sentence-like complements without a complementiser. The normal position of S-like complements without a complementiser is the same as that of S-like complements with a complementiser, that is, they normally follow a complement-taking predicate. Complement-taking predicates which can be followed by an S-like complement without a complementiser are quite limited. They are:

Perception predicates:
khōaŋ  'to see'
līi  'to hear'

Predicates of fearing:
klaac  'to be afraid'
phiy  'to be afraid'
kraen  'to be in fear, in awe of'
pruay klaac  'to be worried'

Belief predicates:
smaan¹  'to guess, to suppose'
sansay  'to suspect, to doubt'

¹ Another possible structure for this verb is to have smaan 'to guess' in an adverbial clause such as taam kñom smaan 'in my opinion, from my point of view', as shown in (A).

A) taam kñom smaan kumroog kaa nih prohæl ciø lqøa
   as I guess project this probably good
   'In my opinion, this project is probably good.'
Utterance predicate:

thaa 'to say'.

When an S-like complement without a complementiser follows these predicates, the basic sentence structure will be NP1 - V1 - NP2 - VP2. This is exemplified in (1) - (4).

1) kñom khaœn niœrii twœc mhoup nih
   I see Nieree do food this
   'I saw Nieree cook this food.'

2) sot klaac cao samlap niœrii
   Sot afraid thief kill Nieree
   'Sot is afraid (that) the thief will kill Nieree.'

3) kñom sanœy kmein nih luœc luy kñom
   I suspect child this steal money I
   'I suspect this child has stolen my money.'

4) kñom thaa kœst ŋam baay ruœc haay
   I say he eat rice ready already
   'I say (that) he has already finished his dinner.'

In section 4.2, two pieces of evidence will be provided to show why the NP2 - VP2 sequence following these predicates is interpreted as a single unit, that is, as an S-like complement without a complementiser. This is followed by an investigation of characteristics of S-like complements without a complementiser in section 4.3. As the predicates listed above differ in their properties, they will be discussed individually. Section 4.4 presents a comparison of S-like complements with and without a complementiser. Section 4.5 discusses the insertion of the form tae between the complement-taking predicates and their S-like complement without a complementiser. In section 4.6, the interpretation of an anaphora in S-like complements without a complementiser will be discussed. The conclusion of the chapter is given in section 4.7.

4.2 Interpretation of NP2 - VP2 as a single unit

In this section, it is argued that NP2 in the NP2 - VP2 sequence does not receive a semantic role directly from the matrix predicate. The NP2 - VP2 sequence, in contrast, functions as an argument of the predicate. There are two pieces of evidence which support this argument.

Firstly, the NP2 in the NP2 - VP2 sequence cannot be passivised. When examples (1) - (4) in section 4.1, undergo passivisation, the sentences are ungrammatical. This is illustrated in examples (5) - (8).

5) *niœrii trœw kñom khaœn twœc mhoup nih
   Nieree Pass I see do food this
Chapter 4: S-like complements without a complementiser

6) *cao trgw sot klaac samlap niɔii
   thief Pass Sot afraid kill Nieree

7) *kmeiŋ nih trgw kŋom saŋsaŋ luɔc luy kŋom
   child this Pass I suspect steal money I

8) *kɔat trgw kŋom thaa ŋam baay ruɔc haɔy
   he Pass I say eat rice ready already

The ungrammaticality of example (8), can be excluded because of semantic reasons. However, the fact that other examples are ungrammatical suggests that the NP2 in the NP2 - VP2 sequence is not directly subcategorised for by the matrix predicate.

Secondly, the NP2 - VP2 sequence which follows the complement-taking predicates listed in section 4.1, semantically functions as a single unit. When the predicates subcategorise for a noun phrase object, they produce a different meaning from the predicates which subcategorise for the NP2 - VP2 sequence.

Kirsner and Thompson (1976) discuss various complement constructions preceded by sensory verbs in English. When the complement construction is a that-clause, as in (9), it is interpreted as an indirect report about a situation.

9) We saw that they crossed the road.

If the predicate is followed by an infinitive or a gerund complement, as in (10), the complement is a direct perception (Kirsner and Thompson, 1976:205; Dirven, 1989:118).

10) We saw them cross/ crossing the road.

Although them in (10), is in the objective form, Kirsner and Thompson argue that the whole construction them cross the road functions as the argument of saw. Kirsner and Thompson provide some more examples in which the whole complement event is globally perceived while the referent of the complement subject is not necessarily perceived in the same manner. In other words, the complement event is interpreted as one single argument of the predicate. Their examples include:

11) We saw the invisible nerve gas kill all the sheep (but of course we didn't actually see the invisible nerve gas itself). (Kirsner and Thompson, 1976:209 (30))

12) I smelled Sylvia spraying the living room (but I couldn't smell Sylvia herself). (Kirsner and Thompson, 1976:209 (32))

In Khmer, the NP2 - VP2 sequence preceded by the predicates listed in section 4.1 can be interpreted in a similar way as the English infinitive complement following sensory verbs. Each complement-taking predicate will be discussed
individually.

4.2.1 Perception predicates

A perception predicate lai 'to hear' can subcategorise for a noun phrase object only when the object involves actual noise or voice, as in (13) and (14).

13) sot lai samleə caap  
   Sot hear noise  
   'Sot heard the noise of birds.'

14) kñom lai səckday prakaah nuh həay  
   I hear matter announce that already  
   'I have already heard that announcement.'

As can be seen in (15), when a noun phrase which does not involve noise, such as a proper noun, follows the predicate lai 'to hear', the sentence is ungrammatical.

15) *sot lai niərii  
   Sot hear Nieree

However, lai 'to hear' can be followed by the NP2 - VP2 sequence, as shown in (16) and (17).

16) sot lai niərii yum  
   Sot hear Nieree cry  
   'Sot heard Nieree cry.'

17) kñom lai kmeiŋ kmeiŋ leŋ qae kraw  
   I hear child-Redup play outside  
   'I heard children play outside.'

The NP2 - VP2 sequence in (16) and (17) is subcategorised for by the predicate lai 'to hear' as one single unit.

Another perception predicate khoan 'to see' can subcategorise for either a noun phrase object, as in (18) or an S-like complement without a complementiser, as in (19).

18) kñom khoan sot  
   I see  
   'I saw Sot.'

19) kñom khoan sot daw məok  
   I see  
   'I saw Sot come.'

When khoan 'to see' subcategorises for a complement, the whole event is perceived as one single unit. In sentence (20) the matrix subject referent saw not only the thieves but he saw the whole event take place, whereas in sentence (21) the matrix subject
referent did not actually see the storm but he saw the actual destruction of the storm.

20)  kôm  baan  khōañ  cao  dot  plōañ  bamplaañ  phuum  kôm
      I  Past  see  thief  set  fire  on  destroy  village  I
      'I saw the thieves set fire to destroy my village.'

21)  kôm  khōañ  kyal  pyuh  baok  bamplaañ  ptēañ  kōat
      I  see  storm  blow  destroy  house  he
      'I saw the storm destroy his house.'

4.2.2 Predicates of fearing

Predicates of fearing show a clear distinction between a noun phrase object and a sentential complement. When the predicates subcategorise for a noun phrase object, as in (22) and (23), the sentences imply that the matrix subject referent (Sot) has a specific feeling towards the matrix object referent (the Khmer Rouge) all the time, no matter what they do.

22)  sot  klaac  puañ  kmae  krāhōam
      Sot  afraid  group  Khmer  Rouge
      'Sot was afraid of the Khmer Rouge.'

23)  sot  pruøy  klaac  kmae  krāhōam
      Sot  worried  Khmer  Rouge
      'Sot was worried about the Khmer Rouge.'

On the other hand, the predicates of fearing in examples (24) and (25), which subcategorise for a complement indicate that the matrix subject referent (Sot) has the feeling towards a specific action. In (24), Sot was afraid of the action with the Khmer Rouge pointing a gun at him, rather than a feeling directly related to the agent of the action.

24)  sot  klaac  puañ  kmae  krāhōam  samlap
      Sot  afraid  group  Khmer  Rouge  kill
      'Sot was afraid (that) the Khmer Rouge will kill (him).' 

25)  sot  pruøy  klaac  kmae  krāhōam  cap  toh
      Sot  worried  Khmer  Rouge  catch  guilty
      'Sot was worried (that) the Khmer Rouge will suspect (him).'

4.2.3 Belief predicates

Although the belief predicate smaan 'to guess' can be followed by a noun phrase object, as in (26), the sentence cannot be understood on its own. The interpretation of example (26) depends on the context. It might be used in various contexts such as "If I have to choose who will win the competition, ..." or "If I have to point out who stole the money, ...".
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26) ... kñom smaan kmeiŋ nih
... I guess child this
'... I guess this child.'

If smaan 'to guess' is followed by an S-like complement without a complementiser, the possible contexts are restricted. Example (27) can occur in a situation where the matrix subject referent believes that someone stole his money.

27) kñom smaan kmeiŋ nih luac luy kñom
I guess child this steal money me
'I guess this child stole my money.'

Another belief predicate sansay 'to suspect' can subcategorise for either a noun phrase object or a complement. As illustrated in (28), when sansay 'to suspect' subcategorises for a noun phrase object, it usually has an implication that the object referent might have done something wrong such as steal the money or break a window.

28) kñom sansay kmeiŋ nih
I suspect child this
'I suspect this child.'

However, when sansay 'to suspect' is followed by a complement, there is no negative implication. In sentence (29), the child did not do anything wrong and the whole complement proposition is interpreted as one single unit.

29) kñom sansay kmeiŋ nih min sruŋ klun
I suspect child this not well
'I suspect this child was sick.'

In example (30), the matrix subject referent does not suspect any specific person but he suspects that a specific event has taken place at the market.

30) kñom sansay kee bān kñia qae psaa
I suspect they shoot each other at market
'I suspect they shot each other at the market.'

4.2.4 Utterance predicate

The utterance predicate thaa has different meanings depending on what it subcategorises for. Only thaa meaning 'to blame or criticise' can subcategorise for a noun phrase object, as in (31) and (32).

31) kōat thaa kñom
he blame I
'He criticised me.'
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32) kōót thaa kñom kcil nah
    he blame I lazy Ints
    'He criticised me for being lazy.'

The utterance predicate thaa 'to say', however, subcategorises for a complement, as shown in (33) and (34).

33) kñom thaa kōót min mōok tee
    I say he not come Part
    'I say that he will not come.'

34) niñii thaa kōót kmpuuj pisaa baay
    Nieree say he Cont eat rice
    'Nieree said that he was having dinner.'

When the verb thaa meaning 'to say' subcategorises for a noun phrase object, as in (35), the sentence is ungrammatical.

35) *kñom thaa kōót
    I say he

As discussed in Chapter 3, most utterance predicates are followed by an S-like complement with the thaa complementiser. The predicate thaa 'to say' is the only utterance predicate which can be followed by a complement proposition without the thaa complementiser. The reason for this is probably because it is phonologically repetition to have two adjacent forms of thaa in the same sentence. As illustrated in (36), when the predicate thaa is followed by the complementiser thaa, the sentence is ill-formed.

36) *kñom thaa thaa kōót min mōok tee
    I say COMP he not come Part
    For the meaning 'I say that he will not come.'

4.2.5 Summary

Two pieces of evidence suggest that the NP₂ - VP₂ sequence following the predicates listed in section 4.1, is best analysed as an S-like complement without a complementiser. The NP₂ in the NP₂ - VP₂ sequence cannot be passivised and the matrix predicate subcategorises for the NP₂ - VP₂ sequence as one single unit. The most straightforward analysis of sentences which contain an S-like complement without a complementiser is as in the diagram (37).
4.3 Characteristics of S-like complements without a complementiser

In this section, some characteristics of S-like complements without a complementiser are investigated; these characteristics are the possibility of auxiliary insertion (section 4.3.1), negator insertion (section 4.3.2) and the insertion of the tee particle (section 4.3.3). These characteristics of S-like complements without a complementiser vary depending on the semantic restrictions of the matrix predicates.

4.3.1 Auxiliary insertion

It is noticeable that Khmer people do not frequently put an auxiliary within an S-like complement without a complementiser. They consider that the time reference of S-like complements without a complementiser is understandable from the context. However, an auxiliary may sometimes be inserted in an S-like complement without a complementiser to make the time reference explicit.\(^2\) The occurrence of an auxiliary in an S-like complement without a complementiser is discussed according to the type of predicate.

4.3.1.1 Perception predicates

The time reference of the complement following the perception predicates occurs approximately at the same time as that of the matrix action. Only the continuous marker *kampun* can be inserted into the complement clause. In examples (38) and (39), the continuous marker is inserted to emphasise that the complement action was continuing during the time of the matrix action.

\(^2\) Jacob (1993:269) considers that the insertion of an auxiliary such as the continuous marker *kampun* may be influenced by the present participle in French. The structure without *kampun* is the more usual structure in Khmer.
38) niɔrri khɔɔn kee kɔmpuŋ chaluoŋ knia
   Nieree see they Cont quarrel each other
   'Nieree saw them quarrelling with each other.'

39) cinɔa lii koun kɔmpuŋ yum
   Chinda hear child Cont cry
   'Chinda heard (her) child crying.'

Examples (40) and (41) are ungrammatical as the past tense marker and the irrealis marker are inserted into the complement propositions.

40) *niɔrri khɔɔn kee baan chaluoŋ knia
    Nieree see they Past quarrel each other

41) *niɔrri khɔɔn kee niŋ chaluoŋ knia
    Nieree see they Irrl quarrel each other

4.3.1.2 Predicates of fearing

The modality of the complement preceded by predicates of fearing is inherently irrealis. The complement action is an event that the matrix subject referent expects to happen. However, at the time of the matrix clause, it is not yet known whether or not the expected action will actually occur. The irrealis marker can be inserted in an S-like complement without a complementiser following predicates of fearing, as shown in (42).

42) kfiɔm klaac kee niŋ somlap sot
    I afraid he Irrl kill Sot
    'I am afraid (that) he will kill Sot.'

Example (43) is ungrammatical as the S-like complement without a complementiser following a predicate of fearing is modified by the past tense marker.

43) *kfiɔm klaac kee baan somlap sot
    I afraid he Past kill Sot

Although the continuous marker kɔmpuŋ can be inserted in the complement proposition, the situation in which this sentence can be used is very rare. Example (44) may occur in the context where the speaker knows the exact time that the complement action is taking place.

44) #kfiɔm klaac kee kɔmpuŋ somlap sot
    I afraid he Cont kill Sot
    'I am afraid (that) he is killing Sot.'

4.3.1.3 Belief predicates

The action of the matrix clause is the temporal locus for an S-like
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complement without a complementiser following belief predicates. When an S-like complement without a complementiser is modified by the past tense marker baan, as in example (45), it indicates that the complement action has already taken place.

45) kñom sanṣay kmeiñ nih baan luœc luy kñom
I suspect child this Past steal money I
'I suspect this child has stolen my money.'

If the irrealis marker is inserted into the complement clause, as in (46), the complement action has not yet happened. However, the child may be acting suspiciously. He may be walking to and fro in front of the speaker's office attempting to see whether or not there is anyone in the office. As a result, the matrix subject referent thinks that this child is going to do something wrong.

46) kñom sanṣay kmeiñ nih nɪ̀n luœc luy kñom
I suspect child this Irrl steal money I
'I suspect this child will steal my money.'

When the continuous marker is embedded into an S-like complement without a complementiser, as in (47) and (48), it suggests that the complement action is happening during the time reference of the matrix clause.

47) kñom smaan nioñ kampun miñ pty puñh
I guess she Cont have pregnancy
'I guess (that) she is pregnant.'

48) kñom sanṣay kōṅ kampun chiì
I suspect he Cont sick
'I suspect (that) he is sick.'

4.3.1.4 Utterance predicate

S-like complements without a complementiser preceded by the utterance predicate thaa 'to say' can be modified by an appropriate auxiliary depending on their time reference which is relative to that of the matrix clause. This is exemplified in (49) - (51).

49) sot thaa nìrīi baan mōok hañy
Sot say Nierree Past come already
'Sot said (that) Nierree came already.'

50) sot thaa nìrīi nìn mōok sqaek
Sot say Nierree Irrl come tomorrow
'Sot said (that) Nierree would come tomorrow.'

51) sot thaa nìrīi kampun dāw mōok
Sot say Nierree Cont walk come
'Sot said that Nierree is coming.'
4.3.2 Negator insertion

The negator *min* can be inserted either before the matrix predicate or before most complement predicates. The scope of the negator is over the proposition in which it occurs. When the matrix predicate is negated, the scope of the negation is only over the matrix clause, as (52) - (56) show. For instance, in (52) it implies that the complement subject referent may or may not eat something but the matrix subject referent has not seen that action. If the complement subject referent in (53), cried, the matrix subject referent did not hear that.

52) *kñom min khoān kōat ŋam qwāy sah*
    'I haven’t seen him eating anything.'

53) *sot min lī loun yum sah*
    'Sot didn’t hear (his) child crying at all.'

54) *niarii min phiy cao mōk tee*
    'Nieee is not afraid (whether or not) the thieves will come.'

55) *kōat min baan sānṣay yāwō twōō khoh sah*
    'He didn’t suspect (that) we have done something wrong at all.'

56) *kñom min baan thaa kōat nīw ptēh tee*
    'I didn’t say (that) he was at home.'

When the complement predicate is negated, as shown in (57) - (60), the scope of the negation is only over the complement clause. In (57), it suggests that the matrix subject referent has kept an eye on the complement subject referent all the time and has seen that the complement subject referent kōat has eaten nothing. The implication in (58) suggests that Nieee may be a friend of the thieves. At the appointed time, the thieves have not come yet. So, Nieee is afraid that they might not come.

57) *kñom khoān kōat min ŋam qwāy sah*
    'I have seen him eat nothing.'

58) *niarii phiy cao min mōk tee*
    'Nieee is afraid (that) the thieves will not come.'

59) *kñom smaal kmeiŋ nīw min baan lūā luy kñom tee*
    'I guess (that) this child did not steal my money.'
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60) kɲom thaa kɔt min niw ptɛh tee
    I say he not stay house Part
'I say (that) he was not at home.'

However, an S-like complement without a complementiser which is preceded by the perception predicate lii 'to hear' can only be positive. As the complement predicate is negated, example (61) is ungrammatical. In Khmer, lii 'to hear' can only be used for actual sounds. The matrix subject referent or Sot in (61), cannot actually hear the child not crying.

61) *sot lii koun min yum səh
    Sot hear child not cry at all

4.3.3 Insertion of the tee particle

The tee particle can indicate either a negative sentence or a polar question. Only the matrix predicate can be questioned. When tee functions as the polar question particle, it can only be inserted at the end of sentences, as shown in (62) - (65). There can be only one interpretation of the polar question particle. The scope of question is over the whole sentence. The polar question particle tee cannot be interpreted as modifying the complement proposition. In other words, the polar question particle tee cannot occur under the lower VP node.

62) look khaə n kɔt kampuŋ rəwūl twə a kaa tee
    you see he Cont busy do work Part
'Do you see he is busy with (his) work?'

63) nιrri klaac tiəhion dən cap tee
    Nierree afraid soldier chase catch Part
'Are you (Nierree) afraid (that) the soldiers will arrest (you)AGAIN?'

64) kɔt saŋsay yəŋ luac luy kɔt tee
    he suspect we steal money he Part
'Does he suspect we stole his moneyAGAIN?'

65) look thaa nιrii mɔok tee
    you say Nierree come Part
'Did you say (that) Nierree cameAGAIN?'

The c-structure of example (64) is presented in (66).
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If the polar question particle tee occurs before what looks like an S-like complement without a complementiser, it separates the string into two individual clauses. Examples (67) - (70) consist of two separated clauses.

67) look khaan tee koot kampuŋ rəwʊŋ təwə kaa
   you see Part he Cont busy do work
   'Do you see? He is busy with (his) work.'

68) niarii klaac tee təhiən dəŋ cap haəy
   Nieree afraid Part soldier chase catch already
   'Are you (Nieree) afraid? The soldiers were arresting (people).'

69) koot səŋsay tee yəəŋ luəc luy koot
   he suspect Part we steal money he
   'Does he suspect? We stole his money.'

70) koot thaa tee niarii məək
    he say Part Nieree come
    'Did he say? Nieree came.'

To join these two clauses into one sentence, the tee particle must occur at the end of the sentence, as shown in (62) - (65) above, or there must be the thaa complementiser linking the two clauses. For instance, example (71) is analysed as one sentence when the thaa complementiser is inserted before the complement proposition.

71) koot səŋsay tee thaa yəəŋ luəc luy koot
    he suspect Part COMP we steal money he
    'Does he suspect that we stole his money?'

As mentioned in sections 3.2.5 and 4.2.4, it is a repetition to have the thaa complementiser follow the predicate thaa 'to say'. To combine two clauses in example (70), another utterance predicate which has a similar meaning to thaa 'to say' may be added before the tee particle. In (72), thaa then functions as a complementiser.

72) koot niyiə thaa niarii məək
    he say Part COMP Nieree come
    'Did he say that Nieree came?'
When the matrix predicate is negated, the tee particle also occurs at the end of the sentence, as (73) - (76) show.

(73) kñom min baan lìi kóøt niïiøy qampii riøŋ nih tee
    I not Past hear he speak about story this Part
'I didn't hear him talk about this story.'

(74) sot min klaac cao môøk plan tee
    Sot not afraid thief come rob Part
'Sot is not afraid (that) thieves will come to rob (him).'

(75) kóøt min baan sôøsøy yœøø twøø khoh tee
    he not Past suspect we do wrong Part
'He did not suspect (that) we have done something wrong.'

(76) kñom min baan thaa yœøø twøø khoh tee
    I not Past say we do wrong Part
'I didn't say (that) we have done something wrong.'

However, the sentences are ungrammatical if the negative particle tee occurs before S-like complements without a complementiser. This is illustrated in (77) - (80).

(77) *kñom min baan lìi tee kóøt niïiøy qampii riøŋ nih
    I not Past hear Part he speak about story this

(78) *sot min klaac tee cao môøk plan
    Sot not afraid Part thief come rob

(79) *kóøt min baan sôøsøy tee yœøø twøø khoh
    he not Past suspect Part we do wrong

(80) *kñom min baan thaa tee yœøø twøø khoh
    I not Past say Part we do wrong

The c-structure of (74) which has the tee particle at the end of the sentence is presented in (81).

(81)

As can be seen in (82) - (85), if the complement predicate is negated, the negative particle can only occur at the end of the sentence. However, the scope of the
particle is only over the complement proposition.

82) sot khoa cindaa min nam qwey laay tee
    Sot see Chinda not eat what at all Part
   'Sot has seen Chinda eat nothing.'

83) sot klaac cao min maka tee
    Sot afraid thief not come Part
   'Sot is afraid (that) the thief will not come.'

84) niori sau say cindaa min srul klwan tee
    Nieree suspect Chinda not well Part
   'Nieree suspects (that) Chinda is sick.'

85) kfiom thaa yoa min baan twag khoh tee
    I say we not Past do wrong Part
   'I said (that) we have not done anything wrong.'

The c-structure of example (83) is as follows:

86)

When predicates discussed in this chapter are followed by an S-like complement without a complementiser, the tee particle can only occur at the end of the sentence. The tee particle can modify either the matrix predicate or the complement predicate. The fact that the tee particle cannot precede an S-like complement without a complementiser whereas it can precede an S-like complement with a complementiser is one syntactic difference between these two complement constructions; this will be further discussed in section 4.4.

4.3.4 Summary

To conclude, the characteristics of S-like complements without a complementiser following each class of complement-taking predicates are different. These differences follow from semantic restrictions of the matrix predicates, not from
the syntactic structures. Only the continuous marker can modify S-like complements without a complementiser which are preceded by perception predicates. This modification emphasises that the complement action is happening during the time of the matrix clause. The complement proposition preceded by predicates of fearing can be modified by the irrealis marker since the result of the complement action has not been known yet. The time reference of S-like complements without a complementiser following belief predicates and the utterance predicate is relative to that of the matrix predicate. Any auxiliary can be inserted before the complement predicate.

S-like complements without a complementiser which follow most predicates, can be modified by the negator min. S-like complement without a complementiser following the perception predicate līi 'to hear', however, cannot be negated because of the semantic reasons. Unlike S-like complements with a complementiser, S-like complements without a complementiser cannot be preceded by the teē particle. When the sentence is negative or is a polar question, the teē particle can only occur at the end of the sentence. Only the matrix predicate can be questioned. It is not possible to question a complement introduced by these predicates. When an S-like complement without a complementiser is negated, the teē particle occurs at the end of the sentence.

4.4 Comparison of S-like complements with and without a complementiser

Most predicates discussed in this chapter can subcategorise for an S-like complement without a complementiser as well as for an S-like complement with a complementiser. When these predicates precede an S-like complement with a complementiser, the complement proposition is normally introduced by the thaa complementiser. In addition, if predicates of fearing are followed by an S-like complement with the dael complementiser, the complement proposition is factive. As discussed in sections 3.2.5 and 4.2.4, Khmer speakers tend to avoid the double occurrences of the form thaa. Example (36) is repeated here as (87).

87) *kñom thaa thaa kōt min mōk teē
   I say COMP he not come Part
'I said (that) he did not come.'

In this section, the utterance predicate thaa 'to say' will not be discussed.

As previously mentioned in section 4.2, perception predicates in English can

\[^{3}\text{For more detail, see section 3.4: Comparison of dael and thaa.}\]
be followed by either an infinitive, a participial clause or a that-clause complement. An infinitive complement which is preceded by perception predicates denotes a direct perception of a situation and has the contemporaneous time reference with that of the matrix clause (Kirsner and Thompson, 1976:205; Dirven, 1989:117; Dixon, 1991:125). For instance, the matrix subject referent in (88) actually saw someone leave the house.

88) I saw him leave the house.

When *to see* is followed by a that-clause or a tensed clause, the complement does not necessarily denote the event seen, but rather what can be mentally interpreted from the physical perception (Kirsner and Thompson, 1976:206-207; Dirven, 1989:118; Dixon, 1991:128). The matrix subject referent in (89) need not perceive the complement action directly but he may see a piece of evidence, such as the door was locked. As a result, the matrix subject referent concluded that the complement subject referent has already left the house.

89) I saw that he left the house.

The different implications of an infinitive complement and a tensed clause complement following perception predicates in English are comparable to those of S-like complements without and with a complementiser in Khmer. When perception predicates *lii* 'to hear' and *khəañ* 'to see' are followed by an S-like complement without a complementiser, the matrix subject referent actually perceives the complement action. All examples (90) - (93) below imply that the whole complement action is directly perceived. The matrix subject referent himself saw or heard the complement action.

90) sot *lii* niərii yum
    Sot hear Nieree cry
    'Sot heard Nieree cry.'

91) baonaa baan *lii* niərii niyigyi ciəmuay chum
    Baonaa Past hear Nieree speak together with Chum
    'Baonaa heard Nieree speak to Chum.'

92) kñom khəañ kəat daə tiw kənlaŋ nuh
    I see he walk go place that
    'I saw him walk to that place.'

93) kñom baan khəañ kəat luəc rəbəh nuh
    I Past see he steal thing that
    'I saw him steal that thing.'

If the perception predicates are followed by an S-like complement with the *thaaw* complementiser, it implies that the matrix subject referent does not directly perceive the complement action. The complement is interpreted as an acquisition of
knowledge. To put it another way, the complement is an indirect report of a situation. Example (94) presumes that Sot did not really hear Nieree crying. He may have heard that Nieree cried from someone else.

94) sot lii thaa niɔrii yum  
Sot hear COMP Nieree cry  
'Sot heard that Nieree cried.'

In example (95), there is an implication that the mother did not actually see the arrival of the guests. However, she might have heard the noise in the living room or she might have seen a car parking in front of the house.

95) maq khɔɔn thaa pʰiəw mɔok dal haay kaa  
Mum see COMP guest come arrive already D.M. caŋ tiw tɔtu  
leave go receive  
'(When) the mother saw that the guests have already come, (she) then went to greet (them).'</p>

As an S-like complement without a complementiser preceded by a perception predicate only denotes a directly perceivable situation, the complement proposition in an S-like complement with a complementiser can sometimes be incoherent with an S-like complement without a complementiser. The complement propositions in (96) - (98) must be introduced by the thaa complementiser. The symbol *((thaa)) means that the thaa complementiser cannot be omitted, otherwise the sentences are ungrammatical.

96) kʰom lii *(thaa) look baan tiw leεŋ tikchuu  
I hear COMP look Past go play waterfall  
'I heard that you have been to the waterfall.'

97) kʰom lii *(thaa) look kampuŋ chi  
I hear COMP you Cont sick  
'I heard that you are sick.'

98) kʰom baan khɔɔn *(thaa) kɔat tɔɔɔ khoh  
I Past see COMP he do wrong  
'I saw that he did something wrong.'

The semantic distinction between S-like complements with and without a complementiser which are preceded by predicates of fearing and belief predicates is not clear. It seems to be a matter of individual variation whether S-like complements with or without a complementiser are preferred. A semantic study of Khmer complement-taking predicates is required. Examples (99) and (100) of which the matrix predicate is followed by an S-like complement without a complementiser have the same meaning as examples (101) and (102) of which the predicate is followed by an S-like complement with a complementiser. The complement proposition can be either true or false.
99) kñom kraen kôat kliân baay
   I worried he hungry rice
   'I was worried (that) he was hungry.'

100) kñom santsay chum twa qway khoh muay
   I suspect Chum do what wrong one
   'I suspected (that) Chum has done something wrong.'

101) kñom kraen thaa kôat kliân baay
   I worried COMP he hungry rice
   'I was worried that he was hungry.'

102) kñom santsay thaa chum twa qway khoh muay
   I suspect COMP Chum do what wrong one
   'I suspected that Chum has done something wrong.'

In addition to this, an appropriate auxiliary can be inserted before the complement predicate of S-like complements with or without a complementiser which are preceded by the belief predicates. This is exemplified in (103) - (105). The thaaj complementiser is put in parenthesis since its omission does not change the meaning of the sentences or cause the sentences to be ungrammatical.

103) kñom santsay (thaa) niarii niŋ prap sot qampii rian nih
   I suspect COMP Nieree Irrl tell Sot about story this
   'I suspect that Nieree will tell Sot about this story.'

104) kñom santsay (thaa) niarii kampuj twa kaa
   I suspect COMP Nieree Cont do work
   'I suspect that Nieree is working.'

105) kñom santsay (thaa) niarii baan duy rian nih
   I suspect COMP Nieree Past know story this
   haay already
   'I suspect that Nieree has already known this story.'

As discussed in section 4.3.1, the complement proposition following a predicate of fearing can only refer to future (or present) if there is no complementiser. The irrealis marker can modify the complement predicate. This is illustrated in (106).

106) kñom klaac kmae krahaam niŋ samlap koun kñom
   I afraid Khmer Rouge Irrl kill child I
   'I am afraid (that) the Khmer Rouge will kill my son.'

When a predicate of fearing is followed by an S-like complement with a complementiser, however, any appropriate auxiliary can be inserted before the complement predicate. This is exemplified in (107) - (109).

107) kñom klaac thaa kee niŋ samlap sot
   I afraid COMP he Irrl kill Sot
   'I am afraid that he will kill Sot.'
108) ₃fiom kraeIJ thaa kee kampunJ taam ṭēk ₃fiom
I worried COMP he Cont follow seek I
'I am worried that he is looking for me.'

109) ₃fiom kraeIJ thaa kee baan ṭrälap tiw ṭēh haay
I worried COMP he Past return go house already
'I am worried that he has already gone back home.'

Although the complement predicate in (109) is modified by the past tense marker baan, the matrix subject referent still does not know whether or not the complement proposition is true.

There is one major syntactic difference between S-like complements with and without a complementiser. Only S-like complements with a complementiser can have the tee particle inserted before the complement proposition. The tee particle can function as either the negative particle or the polar question particle. When tee is inserted before an S-like complement with a complementiser, as in (110) - (113), the complement proposition remains a part of the sentence. The tee particle in (110) and (111) is the negative particle.

110) chum min baan khāṇī tee thaa niāriī kampunJ
cum not Past see Part COMP Nieree Cont
twāə kaa
do work
'Chum did not see that Nieree was working.'

111) kōət min baan saŋsay tee thaa niāriī baan
cum not Past suspect Part COMP Nieree Past
twāə khoh
do wrong
'He did not suspect that Nieree has done (something) wrong.'

The tee particle in (112) and (113) functions as the polar question particle.

112) chum khāṇī tee thaa niāriī kampunJ twāə kaa
cum see Part COMP Nieree Cont do work
'Did Chum see that Nieree was working?'

113) kōət saŋsay tee thaa yēəŋ tiw bat
cum suspect Part COMP we go disappear
'Did he suspect that we have gone (somewhere)'

In contrast, if the negative particle tee is inserted before an S-like complement without a complementiser, the sentence is ungrammatical. This is illustrated in (114) and (115).

114) *chum min khāṇī tee niāriī kampunJ twāə kaa
Chum not see Part Nieree Cont do work
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115) *kōt min baan sansay tee niərii baan
twɔɔ khoh
do wrong

As discussed in section 4.3.3, although the polar particle *tee can be inserted before a string which looks similar to an S-like complement without a complementiser, it separates the sentence into two individual clauses. This is illustrated in (116) and (117). The *tee particle in examples (114) and (115) above can also be interpreted as the polar question particle. Example (114) can mean 'Don't you (Chum) see? Nieree is working' whereas (115) means 'Doesn't he suspect (it)? Nieree has done something wrong', respectively.

116) #look khɔɔn tee niərii kampun twɔɔ kaa
you see Part Nieree Cont do work
'Do you see (it)? Nieree is working.'

117) #kōt sansay tee ʃaəŋ tiw bat
he suspect Part we go disappear
'Did he suspect (it)? We have gone (somewhere)._'

There seem to be constraints to prevent the *tee particle from occurring before an S-like complement without a complementiser. This is probably related to the presence or the absence of a complementiser. The reason that the *tee particle can only precede S-like complements with a complementiser may be because this type of complement is more independent than S-like complements without a complementiser. S-like complements without a complementiser seem to be more dependent and closely joined to the matrix predicate. Unfortunately, traditional phrase structure rules cannot show the greater independence of these complements compared to S-like complements without a complementizer. (see insertion)

Although the *tee particle cannot precede either an S-like complement without a complementiser or a noun phrase object, an S-like complement without a complementiser does not have the same characteristics as a noun phrase. As shown in (118), a noun phrase can immediately follow a preposition.

118) kōt sansay gampii riaŋ nih
he suspect about story this
'He suspects about this story.'

An S-like complement without a complementiser, however, cannot be immediately preceded by a preposition, as shown in (119).

119) *kōt sansay gampii kmeiŋ luəc luy
he suspect about child steal money

For more detail of the ungrammaticality of the *tee particle before an object noun phrase, see section 2.3.3.4: Particle.
Example (119) can be grammatical if there is a nominaliser such as \textit{kđay} 'case', precede an S-like complement without a complementiser, as shown in (120).

\begin{equation}
\text{kôat sanşay qampii kđay kmein luoc luy}
\end{equation}

\begin{equation}
\text{he suspect about case child steal money}
\end{equation}

'He suspects about the case that the child stole the sum of money.'

4.5 Insertion of \textit{tae}

In this section, the insertion of the form \textit{tae} is discussed. The form \textit{tae} can precede S-like complements without a complementiser. However, it does not function as a complementiser, but an adverb. As illustrated in (121) and (122), the form \textit{tae} can immediately occur in between complement-taking predicates listed in section 4.1 and their following S-like complement without a complementiser.

\begin{equation}
\text{kñom pruay tae kôat mian cumpii tjiun}
\end{equation}

\begin{equation}
\text{I worried Tae he have fever heavy}
\end{equation}

'I was worried (that) he had a strong fever.' (This is the only thing that I was worried about.)

\begin{equation}
\text{sot smaan tae nįrri min srui kluan}
\end{equation}

\begin{equation}
\text{Sot guess Tae Nieree not well}
\end{equation}

'Sot guessed (that) Nieree was sick.' (However, she was not sick.)

The position of \textit{tae} seems to be the same as a complementiser, nevertheless, it does not function as a complementiser. The form \textit{tae} is a post-verbal adverb – it can only occur in between a verb and its argument, as in (123). The particle tôm can optionally be inserted at the end of the sentence to express limitation.

\begin{equation}
\text{kñom fiam tae baay (tôm)}
\end{equation}

\begin{equation}
\text{I eat Tae rice (Part)}
\end{equation}

'I only ate rice.'

It should be noted that the distribution of \textit{tae} is more restricted than other adverbs; \textit{tae} cannot occur with an intransitive verb. It is possible that \textit{tae} should instead be treated as a quantifier, since it always precedes a noun phrase. If it is a quantifier, it is the one that is used only for an argument following a verb. However, this is not an important issue here; I will refer to \textit{tae} as "Adverb". The important point is that it is not a complementiser.

Since an S-like complement without a complementiser functions as an argument of a predicate, \textit{tae} can immediately precede the complement proposition.

\footnote{The form \textit{tae} in Khmer can function as an adverb 'only' or the contrastive conjunction 'but'. For more detail, see Poo-israkij (to appear).}
Examples (124) and (125) show that tae can occur before an S-like complement without a complementiser.

124) khom klaac tae wiə samlap sot
    I afraid Tae he kill Sot
'I was afraid (that) he will kill Sot.'

125) khom sɑŋsay tae kmeiŋ nih luəc luy kee
    I suspect Tae child this steal money they
'I suspected this child had stolen their money.'

Examples (126) and (127) have the thaa complementiser in parenthesis since klaac 'to be afraid' and sɑŋsay 'to suspect' can be followed by an S-like complement either with or without the thaa complementiser.

126) khom klaac (thaa) wiə samlap sot
    I afraid (COMP) he kill Sot
'I was afraid (that) he will kill Sot.'

127) khom sɑŋsay (thaa) kmeiŋ nih luəc luy kee
    I suspect (COMP) child this steal money they
'I suspected this child has stolen their money.'

Although examples (124) and (125) above show that tae can precede the complement proposition, tae is not a complementiser. Examples (128) and (129) below show that the form tae can occur before the thaa complementiser. However, it has been observed that Khmer speakers prefer to have only either tae or thaa in the sentence rather than having both of them consecutively.

128) khom klaac tae (thaa) wiə samlap sot
    I afraid Tae (COMP) he kill Sot
'I am afraid that he will kill Sot.'

129) khom sɑŋsay tae (thaa) kmeiŋ nih luəc luy kee
    I suspect Tae (COMP) child this steal money he
'I suspect (that) this child steal his money.'

In addition to this, the form tae can precede a noun phrase object which is followed by an S-like complement with a complementiser, as (130) shows. The tee particle can optionally be inserted after the noun phrase object to indicate limitation.

130) khom cumriəp tae look qom tee thaa sot slap
    I inform Tae uncle Part COMP Sot die
tiw haəŋ
go already
'I told only (my) uncle that Sot died.'

The fact that tae can also occur before a noun phrase object followed by an S-like complement with a complementiser indicates that tae is not a complementiser.

When the form tae is inserted after the predicates listed in section 4.1 and
their S-like complement without a complementiser, it implies negativity. When the adverb tae occurs between a perception predicate or an utterance predicate and its S-like complement without a complementiser, the form tae expresses limitation. In (131), the matrix subject referent emphasises that he only saw Nieree come out of the room. He did not see other person else come out of the room and/or he did not see Nieree do other things.

(131) k∫om khøeq tae niøii caø møok pii bantup
I see Tae Nieree leave come from room
'I only saw Nieree come out of the room.'

Example (132) is used in a context where the speaker teaches a child not to pick up a flower in the public garden.

(132) kom thaø tae beh baoc pkaa ... kaa min trøw dae
don't say Tae pick up flower ... D.M. not correct Part
'Don't say (that) you only picked a flower ..., it is not right (to do so).'

If tae is preceded by a belief predicate or a predicate of fearing, it expresses limitation and contradiction. There can be an optional contrastive clause following the complement proposition. Example (133) indicates that Nieree did not come to the meeting, but the matrix subject referent had been thinking for a period of time that Nieree would have come.

(133) k∫om smaan tae niøii møok baan pantae kaapit
I guess Tae Nieree come able but truth
niøii min baan møok tee
Nieree not Past come Part
'I thought (that) Nieree could come but the truth was that Nieree did not come.'

In (134), the matrix subject referent had been suspecting for a while that the complement subject referent stole something. Nevertheless, the matrix subject referent found out later that the complement subject referent did not steal it.

(134) k∫om saøsay tae wiø niø luœ røbah nuh
I suspect Tae he Dem steal thing that
pantae taam pit wiø min baan luœ tee
but follow truth he not Past steal Part
'I suspected (that) he stole that thing but the truth was he did not steal (it).'

A contrastive clause in (135) suggests that the matrix subject referent was worried whether Nieree would be sick for a while and knew later that she was well.

(135) baøaa kraøø tae niøii chiø pantæ kaapit niøø
Baøaa worried Tae Nieree sick but truth she
srul ciø well
'Baøaa was worried (that) Nieree was sick but the truth was she was well.'
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4.6 Anaphora in S-like complements without a complementiser

This section investigates the interpretation of anaphora in S-like complements without a complementiser. The interpretation of a pronominal complement subject is presented first (section 4.6.1). This is followed by the interpretation of reflexive forms in section 4.6.2 and the interpretation of null arguments in section 4.6.3.

4.6.1 Interpretation of a pronominal

When a third person pronoun such as kōat 's/he' occurs in the complement subject position of S-like complements without a complementiser, it can be coreferential with either the matrix subject or an antecedent noun phrase which has previously been mentioned. The subscripts under the pronoun kōat 's/he' in (136) - (138) indicate that either the matrix subject referent or someone else previously mentioned in the context can function as its antecedent.

136) nigii kraeIJ mgIJ mIJ rrugn
   Niereei worried shei/j have pregnancy
   'Niereei is worried (that) shei/j will be pregnant.'

137) chum smaan kōat twōa kaa nih min baan tee
   Chumi guess heej work this not able Part
   'Chumi guessed heej cannot do this work.'

138) sot thaa kōat min tiw tee
   Soti say heej not go Part
   'Soti said (that) heej did not go.'

The semantic restrictions of perception predicates, however, prevent the matrix subject from being a possible antecedent of the pronominal complement subject. The pronominal subject kōat in (139) and (140) refers to a noun phrase which has previously been mentioned in a discourse.

139) nigii kraeIJ mgIJ mIJ rrugn
   Niereei, hear s/he ejab mock laugh at Chum
   'Niereei, heard him/her mock laugh at Chum.'

140) sot khaeIJ kōat daα tiw kanlaeIJ nuh
   Soti, see s/he ejab walk go place that
   'Soti saw him/her walk to that place.'

4.6.2 Interpretation of reflexive forms

When the reflexive form kluonqaen functions as the subject of S-like complements without a complementiser, it can only be coreferential with the matrix subject. This is exemplified in (141) - (145). Although examples (141) and (142) are
structurally grammatical, Khmer speakers consider them to be pragmatically odd. Example (141) can be used in a situation in which Sot watched a video-tape showing his own actions and example (142) can be used to describe Nieree listening to herself on a tape.

141) #sot khoan kluonqael caol knoen bantup
    Sot see body-self enter in room
    'Sot saw himself enter the room.'

142) #niorii lii kluonqael yum
    Nieree hear body-self cry
    'Nieree heard herself cry.'

143) niorii kraej kluonqael mian ptiy puah
    Nieree worried body-self have pregnancy
    'Nieree is worried (that) she herself is pregnant.'

144) chum smaan kluonqael traw cnaot
    Chum guess body-self correct lotteries
    'Chum guesses he himself win the lotteries.'

145) sot thaa kluonqael min tiw tee
    Sot say body-self not go Part
    'Sot said (that) he himself did not go.'

When the reflexive form kluonqael occurs in the complement object position, it can corefer to either the matrix subject or the complement subject, as shown in (146) - (150). However, the complement subject is the preferable antecedent of this reflexive form. A case where the matrix subject of example (146) is interpreted as the antecedent of the reflexive form is similar to that of example (141); Nieree is watching a video recording a situation in which Chum hits Nieree.

146) #niornii khoan sot wiay kluonqael
    Nieree, see Sotj hit body-selfi;j
    'Nieree, saw Sotj hit herself.'

147) niorii lii chum niyiay rook kluonqael
    Nieree, hear Chumj speak seek body-selfi;j
    'Nieree, heard Chumj call himself.'

148) niorii kraej cindaa nij titian kluonqael
    Nieree, worried Chinda, Irrl blame body-selfi;j
    'Nieree, is worried Chinda, would blame her/herself.'

149) chum smaan cindaa nij cuay kluonqael
    Chumj, guess Chinda, Irrl help body-selfi;j
    'Chumj guesses Chinda, would help him/herself.'

150) sot thaa cindaa nij wiay kluonqael
    Sotj, say Chinda, Irrl hit body-selfi;j
    'Sot, said (that) Chinda, would hit him/herself.'
When the reflexive form kluon replaces kluanqaen, as in (151) - (155), either the matrix subject or the complement subject can be its possible antecedent. However, it is preferable for kluon to be coreferential with the matrix subject.

151) #nìeriì khoænh sòt wìay kluon
   Nìerreì see Sò' hit body
t
 'Nìerreì saw Chumj hit her/himself.'

152) nìeriì lì chum nìiyìay ròk kluon
   Nìerreì hear Chumj speak seek body
 'Nìerreì heard Chumj call her/himself.'

153) nìeriì kraeñ cindaa nìñ titàñ kluon
   Nìerreì worried Chinda, Irrl blame body
t
 'Nìerreì is worried Chinda would blame her/herself.'

154) chum smàan cindaa nìñ cuøy kluon
    Chumj, guess Chinda, Irrl help body
t
 'Chumj guesses Chinda would help him/herself.'

155) sòt thàa cindaa nìñ wìøy kluon
    Sòtì say Chinda, Irrl hit body
 'Sòtì said (that) Chinda would hit him/herself.'

The reflexive pronoun in the complement object position can only assign its antecedent to either the matrix subject or the complement subject, not a noun phrase outside the sentence. The subscript indices in (156) show that a noun phrase outside the sentence is excluded from being the possible antecedent of the reflexive pronouns.

156) sòt thàa cindaa nìñ wìøy kluon(qaeñ)
    Sòtì say Chinda, Irrl hit body
 'Sòtì said (that) Chinda would hit him/herself.'

4.6.3 Interpretation of missing arguments

As Khmer is a pro-drop language, an argument which has previously been mentioned can be omitted in the following discourse. When the complement subject is unexpressed, as in (157) and (158), either the matrix subject or a noun phrase previously mentioned can be the antecedent of the unexpressed complement subject. For example, out of context, the missing complement subject of example (157) can be interpreted as being coreferential to the matrix subject. That is, someone was worried that he or she would cry so that the guards would hear or know where he or she was. However, in the story, it is very obvious that the complement subject is not the same as the matrix subject. The story describes an event when the Khmer people were hiding from the Khmer Rouge in the jungle. When the Khmer people realised that there were some Khmer Rouge guerillas nearby, they had to hide and keep as quiet as
possible. The mothers put their hands over the mouths of their children to prevent the children from crying since they did not want the Khmer Rouge guerillas to know where they were.

\[157\] \(\emptyset \) klaac \(\emptyset\) yum lii \(\emptyset\) dal puap clœp \(\emptyset_i\) worried \(\emptyset_{ij}\) cry hear arrive group guard

\(\text{(saen cambaen)}\)

'Someone_{i} was afraid that someone_{ij} would cry and the guard would hear.'

\[158\] kôost thaa \(\emptyset\) kompuŋ twaə kaa knoŋ bantup \(\text{he}_{i}\) say \(\emptyset_{ij}\) Cont do work in room

'He_{i} said (that) (he_{i} or someone else_{j}) has been working in the room.'

When the subject of S-like complements without a complementiser following a perception predicate is unexpressed, it has the same interpretation as that of a pronominal subject following this predicate. It cannot be coreferential with the matrix subject. This is illustrated in (159) and (160).

\[159\] niœrii lii \(\emptyset\) criŋ knoŋ bantup

\(\text{Nieree}_{i}\) hear \(\emptyset_{*ij}\) sing in room

'Nieree_{i} heard (someone_{*ij}) sing in the room.'

\[160\] sot khœñ \(\emptyset\) leenŋ knoŋ suœnbbaa

\(\text{Soti}_{j}\) see \(\emptyset_{*ij}\) play in garden

'Soti saw (someone_{*ij}) play in the garden.'

The c-structure of example (160) can be illustrated as:

\[161\]

\(\text{Although the complement subject is unexpressed in the c-structure (161) above, it has a semantic form as PRO in the f-structure (162).}\)
The examples in this section show that there is no control relationship between the unexpressed complement subject and the matrix argument. The interpretation of the unexpressed argument in an S-like complement without a complementiser can be the same as that of normal clauses as well as that of S-like complements with a complementiser.

4.7 Conclusion

In this chapter, characteristics of S-like complements without a complementiser have been examined. Most predicates discussed in this chapter can be followed by either S-like complements with or without a complementiser. When the perception predicates are followed by an S-like complement without a complementiser, the matrix subject referent directly perceives the complement action. However, the complement event is indirect knowledge if the predicates precede an S-like complement with a complementiser. There is no obvious semantic distinction between S-like complements with and without a complementiser which follow belief predicates or predicates of fearing. This depends on individual variation in preference. The occurrence of the utterance predicate thaă 'to say' followed by the thaă complementiser is phonologically repetitive. Unlike other utterance predicates, the predicate thaă 'to say' is normally followed by an S-like complement without a complementiser. The possibilities of auxiliary insertion and negator insertion in S-like complements without a complementiser depend on the semantics of the matrix predicates. The distribution of characteristics of S-like complements without a complementiser and the complement-taking predicates is illustrated in Table 4.1.

The syntactic difference between S-like complements with and without a complementiser is that only S-like complements with a complementiser can be preceded by the tee particle whereas S-like complements without a complementiser can only have the tee particle inserted at the end of the sentence. The possibility of the tee particle insertion is a particular characteristic of S-like complements with a complementiser. S-like complements with a complementiser are more independent than S-like complements without a complementiser. In other words, S-like
complements without a complementiser are closely joined to the matrix predicate.

The adverb tae can be inserted between the complement-taking predicates and their S-like complement without a complementiser. The insertion of tae implies negativity. If tae is inserted after a belief predicate or a predicate of fearing, it indicates a contradiction of the complement proposition. The insertion of tae after other predicates implies limitation. The interpretation of pronouns in S-like complements without a complementiser is the same as that of normal sentences and S-like complements with a complementiser. As Khmer is a pro-drop language, both the complement subject as well as the complement object which have been previously mentioned in the discourse can be unexpressed. The interpretation of unexpressed arguments in S-like complements without a complementiser is free as that of pronouns in S-like complements without a complementiser. When the reflexive form occurs in the complement subject position, it is coreferential with the matrix subject. The preferred interpretation of the antecedent of the reflexive form kluon in the complement object position assigns the matrix subject as its antecedent whereas it is preferable for kluonqaen to assign the complement subject as its antecedent.

The preferred interpretation of the antecedent of the reflexive form kluon in the complement object position assigns the matrix subject as its antecedent whereas it is preferable for kluonqaen to assign the complement subject as its antecedent.

The string produced by a complement-taking predicate followed by an S-like complement without a complementiser is similar to that associated with a complement-taking predicate followed by an object-controlled complement. In the next Chapter, I will discuss differences between these two types of complement as well as investigate characteristics of controlled complements.
Table 4.1: The distribution of characteristics of S-like complements without a complementiser with classes of complement-taking predicates

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characteristics of S-like complements without a complementiser</th>
<th>perception predicates</th>
<th>predicates of fearing</th>
<th>belief predicates</th>
<th>utterance predicate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. auxiliary insertion</td>
<td>Cont</td>
<td>Irrl (Cont)</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. negative insertion</td>
<td>±</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. preceded by the *tee particle</td>
<td>−</td>
<td>−</td>
<td>−</td>
<td>−</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Variation with S-like complements with the <em>tha</em> complementer</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Controlled complements

5.1 Introduction

Controlled complements are complements in which the subject is always unexpressed and controlled by an argument of the matrix clause. Controlled complements were called 'Equi- (NP) deletion construction' in early Transformational Grammar. It was proposed by Transformational linguists that the complement subject is deleted when it is coreferential with an argument in the matrix clause (Noonan, 1985:66; Trask, 1993:92). This terminology is still frequently used.

There are two types of controlled complements in Khmer – subject-controlled complements and object-controlled complements. Section 5.2 discusses subject-controlled complements in Khmer. Some tests which identify the control relationship between the unexpressed complement subject and the matrix subject are provided. The classes of subject-controlled predicates are listed in section 5.2.1. Characteristics of subject-controlled complements are examined in section 5.2.2.

Object-controlled complements are discussed in section 5.3. The same tests which identify the antecedent of the unexpressed subject of subject-controlled complements are also applied with object-controlled complements. The object-controlled predicates are presented in section 5.3.1. The string produced by a complement-taking predicate followed by an object-controlled complement is superficially similar to that associated with an S-like complement without a complementiser, that is, the matrix predicate is followed by an NP2 - VP2 sequence. The NP2 of the former construction, however, is semantically specified by the matrix predicate whereas the NP2 of an S-like complement without a complementiser is not. In section 5.3.1.1, I will discuss the grammaticalisation of the object-controlled predicate gāncañ to be the respect form for the addressee. Characteristics of object-controlled complements are investigated in section 5.3.2. Complements containing the non-predicate gaoy share some similar characteristics with object-controlled complements. Complements containing the non-predicate gaoy will be discussed in the next chapter.
Section 5.4 presents a comparison of controlled complements and serial verb constructions. The conclusion of this chapter is given in section 5.5.

5.2 Subject-controlled complements

Subject-controlled complements are complements in which the unexpressed subject is controlled by the matrix subject. The underlined propositions of examples (1) - (7) are subject-controlled complements.

1) niərii cappdaam twaə̆ kaa
   Nieree  begin do work
   'Nieree began to work.'

2) chum chup cūəq baarəy haəy
   Chum  stop smoke cigarette already
   'Chum has stopped smoking already.'

3) yəən smaqcət twə̆ tiəhian
   we volunteer do soldier
   'We volunteered to join the army.'

4) kōst sanyaa ciəmuay kəməm nīn riəpcaam əkəkaa nih
   he promise with I Irrl prepare  project this
   'He promised me to prepare this project.'

5) niərii can nəm kuytiəw
   Nieree want eat noodle
   'Nieree wanted to have noodles.'

6) kəməm kham twə̆ kaa nih pi khae məək haəy
   I try hard do work this two month come already
   'I have tried to do this work for two months.'

7) kəməm pləc tin kaasaet
   I forget buy newspaper
   'I forgot to buy a newspaper.'

The unexpressed complement subject is controlled by the subject of the matrix clause. There cannot be an overt noun phrase occurring inbetween the matrix predicate and the complement proposition. Examples (8) - (14) are ungrammatical as there is a noun phrase intervening between the matrix predicate and its complement.

8) *niərii cappdaam cindaam twaə̆ kaa
   Nieree begin Chinda do work

9) *chum chup niərii cūəq baarəy haəy
   Chum stop Nieree smoke cigarette already

10) *yəən smaqcət sət twə̆ tiəhian
    we volunteer Sot do soldier
11) *kőst sanyaa címuay kňom sot niŋ riapcam
   he promise with I Sot Irrl prepare
   kęckaa nih
   project this

12) *niœrii caŋ cindaa ŋam kuytiaw
    Nieree want Chinda eat noodle

13) *kňom kham sot twea kaa niŋ pii khæ mɔɔk
    I try hard Sot do work this two month come
    haæy
    already

14) *kňom plic sot tiŋ kaasaet
    I forget Sot buy newspaper

Even if the overt noun phrase which intervenes between the complement-taking predicate and the controlled complement has the same form as the matrix subject itself, the sentences are still ungrammatical. This is illustrated in (15) - (21).

15) *niœrii cappdaam niœrii twea kaa
    Nieree begin Nieree do work

16) *chum chup chum cuŋ baarøy haæy
    Chum stop Chum smoke cigarette already

17) *yaŋŋ smaŋcät yaŋŋ twea tia⁠hian
    we volunteer we do soldier

18) *kőst sanyaa címuay kňom kőst niŋ riapcam
    he promise with I he Irrl prepare
    kęckaa nih
    project this

19) *niœrii caŋ niœrii ŋam kuytiaw
    Nieree want Nieree eat noodle

20) *kňom kham kňom twea kaa niŋ pii khæ mɔɔk
    I try hard I do work this two month come
    haæy
    already

21) *kňom plic kňom tiŋ kaasaet
    I forget I buy newspaper

The ungrammaticality of examples (8) - (14) and examples (15) - (21) indicates that there cannot be an overt subject noun phrase intervening between the matrix predicate and its controlled complement.

In some languages such as English, there is a test to identify the control relationship between the unexpressed complement subject and its controller (Manzini, 1983:423-424; Haegeman, 1991:256). A reflexive form which occurs in the complement object position must be bound within its own clause. In other words, a
reflexive form in the complement object position must agree in gender and number with the unexpressed complement subject. The reflexive pronoun himself in (22) is coreferential with the unexpressed complement subject and the matrix subject whereas herself in (23) is coreferential with the unexpressed complement subject and the matrix object.

22) John promised Mary to dress himself/*herself.

23) John told Mary to dress *himself/herself.

These examples show that to promise in (22) is a subject-controlled predicate whereas to tell in (23) is an object-controlled predicate.

In Khmer, the reflexive form kluanqaen does not inflect for gender or number with its antecedent. However, I will still use the coreferentiality of the reflexive form and its antecedent as a test to identify types of controlled complements. In addition to this, I will consider the issue of how effective this test is for both subject-controlled complements and object-controlled complements.

When the reflexive form kluanqaen occurs in the object position of a subject-controlled complement, it is coreferential with the matrix subject. This is exemplified in (24) - (30).

24) niarii cappdaam wiay kluanqaen
   Niereei begin hit body-selfi
   'Niereei began to hit herself.'

25) chum chup wiay kluanqaen
    Chumi stop hit body-selfi
    'Chumi stopped hitting himself.'

26) yaaei smaqat riapcam kluanqaen
    wej volunteer dress body-selfi
    'Wej volunteer to dress ourselves.'

27) niarii sanyaa ciowuay sot ni riapcam kluanqaen
    Niereei promise with Sotj Irri dress body-selfi
    'Niereei promised Sotj to dress herself/*himself.'

28) niarii caan wiay kluanqaen
    Niereei want hit body-selfi
    'Niereei wanted to hit herself.'

29) knom pyiayiarn cuay kluanqaen
    Ij try help body-selfi
    'Ij tried to help myself.'
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30) kñom plic cluh mæl kluaŋqaŋ knoŋ kaŋcaq
   I$_1$ forget look body-self$_1$ in mirror
   'I$_1$ forgot to have a look at myself$_1$ in the mirror.'

The coreferentiality between the reflexive form and the matrix subject in examples (24) - (30) is not a good test since there is only one candidate for an antecedent of the reflexive form in most examples. However, if the reflexive form kluaŋqaŋ is replaced by a third person pronoun, as shown in (31) - (37), a pronoun in a complement object position cannot be coreferential with the matrix subject.

31) niṟiŋi capptadam wiay niaŋ
    Nieree$_i$ begin hit she*$_{i/j}$
    'Nieree$_i$ began to hit her*$_{i/j}$.'

32) chum chup wiay kee
    Chumi$_i$ stop hit he*$_{i/j}$
    'Chumi$_i$ stopped hitting him*$_{i/j}$.'

33) niṟiŋi smaqcøt riŋpcam niaŋ
    Nieree$_i$ volunteer dress she*$_{i/j}$
    'Nieree$_i$ volunteer to dress her*$_{i/j}$.'

34) niṟiŋi sayaŋ ciamuay cindaa niŋ riŋpcam niaŋ
    Nieree$_i$ promise with Chindaj$_j$ Irri dress she*$_{i/j/k}$
    'Nieree$_i$ promised Chindaj$_j$ to dress her*$_{i/j/k}$.'

35) niṟiŋi caŋ wiay niaŋ
    Nieree$_i$ want hit she*$_{i/j}$
    'Nieree$_i$ wanted to hit her*$_{i/j}$.'

36) sot pyiŋyiam cuay kee
    Soti$_i$ try help he*$_{i/j}$
    'Soti$_i$ tried to help him*$_{i/j}$.'

37) sot plic cluh mæl kee knoŋ kaŋcaq
    Soti$_i$ forget look he*$_{i/j}$ in mirror
    'Soti$_i$ forgot to have a look at him*$_{i/j}$ in the mirror.'

The reason that the third person pronoun in an object position of a controlled complement cannot be coreferential with the matrix subject is because the matrix subject is the controller of the unexpressed complement subject. As a pronoun is free within its minimal clause (Bresnan, 1982b:327, 340-341), the pronoun in a complement object position cannot assign the matrix subject, which is the controller of the subject within its own clause, to be its antecedent.

In addition to this, when a subject-controlled complement is modified by the
adverbial phrase \textit{tae m\textipa{\textaeq} qa\textipa{\textaeq}} 'alone, by oneself',\footnote{The adverbial phrase \textit{tae m\textipa{\textaeq} qa\textipa{\textaeq}} is formed by \textit{tae} 'only', \textit{m\textipa{\textaeq}} 'one person' and \textit{qa\textipa{\textaeq}} 'self'.} as shown in (38) - (44), it suggests that the complement subject performs the complement action alone.

38) \textit{n\textipa{\textiiri}} cappda\textipa{\textwm} tw\textipa{\textwe} kaa tae m\textipa{\textaeq} qa\textipa{\textaeq}
\hspace{1em} Nieree began do work alone

'Nieree began to work alone.'

39) chum chup c\textipa{\textuaq} baa\textipa{\textwe} tae m\textipa{\textaeq} qa\textipa{\textaeq}
\hspace{1em} Chum stop smoke cigarette alone

'Chum stopped smoking alone.'

40) k\textipa{\textoa}t smaqcat tw\textipa{\textwe} ti\textipa{\textthia}n tae m\textipa{\textaeq} qa\textipa{\textaeq}
\hspace{1em} he volunteer do soldier alone

'He volunteered to join the army alone.'

41) k\textipa{\textoa}t sanyaa ni\textipa{\textiij} riapcam k\textipa{\textka}k\textipa{\textkaa} nih tae m\textipa{\textaeq} qa\textipa{\textaeq}
\hspace{1em} he promise l\textipa{\textri} prepare project this alone

'He promised to prepare this project alone.'

42) \textit{n\textipa{\textiiri}} co\textipa{\texten} \textipa{\textham} kuyti\textipa{\textaw} tae m\textipa{\textaeq} qa\textipa{\textaeq}
\hspace{1em} Nieree want eat noodle alone

'Nieree wanted to have noodles alone.'

43) k\textipa{\textno}m kh\textipa{\textam} tw\textipa{\textwe} kaa nih tae m\textipa{\textaeq} qa\textipa{\textaeq}
\hspace{1em} I try hard do work this alone

'I tried to do this work alone.'

44) k\textipa{\textno}m plic ti\textipa{\textin} kaasaet tae m\textipa{\textaeq} qa\textipa{\textaeq}
\hspace{1em} I forget buy newspaper alone

'I forgot to buy a newspaper alone.'

Most examples in (38) - (44) can be paraphrased by an additional clause,\footnote{The adverbial \textit{tae m\textipa{\textaeq} qa\textipa{\textaeq}} 'alone' can also modify the matrix predicate. If \textit{tae m\textipa{\textaeq} qa\textipa{\textaeq}} modifies the matrix predicate, the matrix predicate is also repeated in the additional paraphrase clause, as shown in (A).}

\begin{itemize}
  \item \textit{n\textipa{\textiiri}} cappda\textipa{\textwm} tw\textipa{\textwe} kaa tae m\textipa{\textaeq} qa\textipa{\textaeq} kii k\textipa{\textm\texti\textia}n n\textipa{\texte\textaeq}nnaa
  \hspace{1em} Nieree begin do work alone be have no anyone

  \textit{cappda\textipa{\textwm}} tw\textipa{\textwe} kaa ci\textipa{\textmu\textau}y n\textipa{\textiiri} te\textipa{\textee}
  \hspace{1em} begin do work with Nieree Part

  'Nieree alone began to work, that is, there was no one to begin to work with her.'
\end{itemize}
45) nigiri cappaqm t西瓜 kaa tae mənəeq qaen kii
   Nieree begin do work alone be
   kmian³ nēaqnaa t西瓜 kaa ciqmuy niqiri tee
   have no anyone do work with Nieree Part
   'Nieree began to work alone, that is, there was no one to work with Nieree.'

46) kōst smaqcst t西瓜 tiqmion tae mənəeq qaen kii
   he volunteer do soldier alone be
   kmian nēaqnaa t西瓜 tiqmion ciqmuy kōst tee
   have no anyone do soldier with he Part
   'He volunteered to join the army alone, that is, there was no one to join the
   army with him.'

47) kōst sanyaa niŋ riapcam kackaa nih tae mənəeq qaen
   he promise irrli prepare project this alone
   kii kmian nēaqnaa riapcam kackaa nih ciqmuy kōst tee
   be have no anyone prepare project this with he Part
   'He promised to organise this project alone, that is, there was no one to
   organise this project with him.'

48) nigiri caŋ нима kuytigw tae mənəeq qaen kii kmian
   Nieree want eat noodle alone be have no
   nēaqnaa нима ciqmuy nigiri tee
   anyone eat with Nieree Part
   'Nieree wanted to have noodles alone, that is, there was no one to have
   noodles with Nieree.'

49) kōfom kham t西瓜 kaa nih tae mənəeq qaen kii
   I try hard do work this alone be
   kmian nēaqnaa t西瓜 kaa nih ciqmuy kōfom tee
   have no anyone do work this with I Part
   'I tried to do this work alone, that is, there was no one to do the work with
   me.'

Due to semantic restrictions of some predicates, the paraphrase clause cannot be added
in some examples. For instance, a subject-controlled complement following the
aspectual predicate chup 'to stop' in (39), and that following the achievement predicate
plīc 'to forget' in (44), cannot be followed by an additional paraphrase clause. This is
exemplified in (50) and (51).

50) *chum chup cūaq baarəy tae mənəeq qaen kii
   Chum stop smoke cigarette alone be
   kmian nēaqnaa cūaq baarəy ciqmuy chum tee
   have no anyone smoke cigarette with Chum Part

51) *kōfom plīc tiŋ kaasaet tae mənəeq qaen kii kmian
   I forget buy newspaper alone be have no
   nēaqnaa tiŋ ciqmuy kōfom tee
   anyone buy with I Part

³The predicate kmian is formed by a prefix k- and the predicate mian 'to have'. It functions
as a negative existential predicate, 'there is no'.
The fact that the reflexive pronoun in the complement object position is coreferential with the matrix subject whereas the third person pronoun in the same position cannot and the fact that the oblique noun phrase in a paraphrase clause is coreferential with the complement subject and the matrix subject suggest that the unexpressed complement subject is controlled by the matrix subject.

In section 5.2.1, Khmer complement-taking predicates which can subcategorise for a subject-controlled complement are presented. This is followed by an investigation of the characteristics of subject-controlled complements in section 5.2.2.

5.2.1 Subject-controlled predicates

Classes of complement-taking predicates which can precede a subject-controlled complement are as follows:

**Aspectual predicates:**
- **cappdaam** 'to begin'
- **rúamcam** 'to wait'
- **leen** 'to cease'

**Commitment predicates:**
- **smagc3t** 'to volunteer'
- **salmrc3t** 'to decide'
- **tan3c3t** 'to determine'
- **son3mat** 'to agree, promise'
- **kit** 'to intend'

4Unlike English, **sonyaa 'to promise'** in Khmer does not subcategorise for an object, but it subcategorises for an oblique, as shown in (A).

A) kñom sanyaa * sot/ciamuay sot tiw santuuc tray sqaaek
I promise * Sot/ together with Sot go fish (v) fish tomorrow
'I promised Sot to go fishing tomorrow.'

5One of my informants does not accept the meaning of **sonamot** as 'to promise'. He considers there is only one meaning of **sonamot** which is 'to suppose'. According to the Khmer - English dictionaries and information from other informants, however, **sonamot** can also mean 'to promise' but the usage is more limited than **sonyaa 'to promise'**. Unfortunately, I have not found any example of **sonamot** in my texts.

6When the predicate **kit** subcategorises for an S-like complement with the thaa complementiser, it means 'to think' and is a member of belief predicates.
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Predicate</th>
<th>Meaning</th>
<th>Predicate</th>
<th>Meaning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>pediseet</td>
<td>'to refuse'</td>
<td>piñcat</td>
<td>'to be willing'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sopbaaycat</td>
<td>'to be pleased'</td>
<td>riikriay</td>
<td>'to be pleased'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>stēaqtar</td>
<td>'to hesitate'</td>
<td>tiitaq</td>
<td>'to hesitate'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>qakcat</td>
<td>'to be reluctant'</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>prōmpriang knia</td>
<td>'to agree'</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>coh samrahn knia</td>
<td>'to agree'</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>rōapruam knia</td>
<td>'to unite (to do something)'</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>prōatday knia</td>
<td>'to join force (to do something)'</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Desiderative predicates:
- can 'to want'
- coulcot 'to like'
- suu 'to venture'
- knahknaen 'to make an effort'
- pyiɔyiam 'to try'
- hian 'to dare'

Achievement predicates:
- plie 'to forget'
- bat 'to lose (a desire)'
- kacwiazh 'to avoid'
- lōn 'to test'
- lōn 'to test'
- ceh 'to know how'

The co-occurrence of the subject-controlled predicates and their complement is illustrated in (52) - (60).

7 Some commitment predicates such as piñcat 'to be willing', sopbaaycat 'to be pleased' can be factive predicates when they are followed by an S-like complement with the dael complementiser.

8 The predicates which co-occur with the reciprocal pronoun knia 'each other' as prōmpriang knia 'to agree' are complex predicates. They are used with a plural subject. If a singular subject is used with these predicates, as in (A), the sentence is ungrammatical.

A) *niarii prōmpriang knia tawo taam yoobol prathian
   Nierii agree do follow opinion leader

9 can 'to want' in Khmer always subcategorises for a complement. Unlike the verb to want in English, it cannot be immediately followed by an NP object. The symbol *(ñam) in (B), indicates that the verb 'to eat' cannot be omitted.

B) kñom can *(ñam) baay
   I want eat rice
   I wanted to eat rice.
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52)  niəri cappdaam  tseau  kaa
     Nieree  begin  do  work
     'Nieree began to work.'

53)  kʰom  leŋ  tiw  leŋ  bia  haøy
     I  cease  go  play  card  already
     'I have stopped going to play cards already.'

54)  kʰom  samraçaat  rʊat  mɔɔk  khaet  kamponçaam
     I  decide  run  come  province  Kampong  Cham
     'I decided to escape to Kampong Cham.'

55)  chum  bərnuŋ  niŋ  riən  kasikam
     Chum  intend  Irrl  study  agriculture
     'Chum decided to study agriculture.'

56)  yəŋ  prəmpriŋkniə  cṛœəh  look  cat  ciə  prəthiən  phuum
     we  agree  select  Chet  be  leader  village
     'We agree to select Chet as the leader of the village.'

57)  look  yiəy  kʰom  coulcət  tseau  tìən
     grand  mother  I  like  do  merit¹⁰
     'My  grandmother  likes  doing  merit.'

58)  kʰom  suu  slap  ciə  ciəŋ  riəpkəa  ciəmuəy  kəət
     I  venture  die  good  than  marry  with  he
     'I'd  rather  die  than  marry  with  him.'

59)  kʰom  khaan  cuəp  niərii  yuu  nah  mɔɔk  haøy
     I  miss  meet  Nieree  long  Ins  come  already
     'I  have  not  met  Nieree  for  a  long  time.'

60)  niərii  qakcət  tiw  leŋ  ptəəh  chum
     Nieree  reluctant  go  play  house  Chum
     'Nieree  was  reluctant  to  go  to  Chum's  house.'

Complement-taking predicates presented in this section subcategorise for a subject-controlled complement. The unexpressed complement subject is controlled by the subject of the matrix clause. In LFG, the control relation that the complement subject is coreferential with the matrix subject is specified by the control equation in the lexical entry of the matrix predicate. For example, the lexical entries of example (52) will be as follows:

61)  cappdaam:  V, (ᵀPRED) = 'BEGIN ((SUBJ) (VCOMP))'
       (ᵀVCOMP SUBJ) = (ᵀSUBJ).

The c-structure of example (52) is presented in (62).

¹⁰tseau  tìən  is  a  Buddhist  custom  whereby  Buddhists  give  something  to  people  or  spirits,  not  to  monks,  in  order  to  gain  merit.
The functional annotations in the c-structure (62) can be explained as follows: the annotation \( \uparrow \text{VCOMP} = \downarrow \) above the node VP\(_5\) means that all functional information carried by VP\(_5\) goes into the VCOMP part of the f-structure of its mother node VP\(_3\). The equation \( \uparrow = \downarrow \) above the node V\(_4\) means that information carried by V\(_4\) is passed up to its mother node. Since the lexical entry for cappdaam in V\(_4\) specifies that cappdaam has the PRED value, namely 'BEGIN', this PRED value of cappdaam is then passed up to VP\(_3\). The functional equation \( \uparrow = \downarrow \) above the node VP\(_3\) indicates that all functional information of VP\(_3\) is passed up to its mother node S\(_1\). Therefore, the PRED value of cappdaam is further passed up to S\(_1\) and the grammatical function VCOMP is then the grammatical function of S\(_1\). The equation \( \uparrow \text{SUBJ} = \downarrow \) above the node NP\(_2\) means that all functional information carried by the node NP\(_2\) goes into the SUBJ part of the f-structure of its mother node S\(_1\).

Although the complement subject is unexpressed in the c-structure (62), the lexical entry of the matrix predicate cappdaam 'to begin' indicates that the matrix subject is the controller of the unexpressed complement subject. This is illustrated by the line linking between the matrix subject and the unexpressed complement subject in the f-structure (63).

63) 

5.2.2 Characteristics of subject-controlled complements

In this section, some characteristics of subject-controlled complements are investigated; these characteristics are the possibility of auxiliary insertion (section ...
5.2.2.1 Auxiliary insertion

Neither the past tense marker *baan* nor the continuous marker *kampun* can modify the predicate in subject-controlled complements. Examples (64) - (70) are ungrammatical as the complement predicates are modified by the past tense marker *baan*.

64) *nīrīi cappdaam baan twaē kaa
   Nieree begin Past do work

65) *chum chup baan čūq baaray haay
   Chum stop Past smoke cigarette already

66) *yōōn smaqčat baan twaē tiohiōn
   we volunteer Past do soldier

67) *kōōt sanyaa baan riapcam kāckaa nīh
   he promise Past prepare project this

68) *nīrīi cōn baan nam kuytāw
   Nieree want Past eat noodle

69) *kōm kham baan twaē kaa nīh pīi khae
   mōk haay come already

70) *kōm plic baan tīn kaasaet
    I forget Past buy newspaper

As the complement predicates in (71) - (77) are modified by the continuous marker *kampun*, examples (71) - (77) are all ungrammatical.

71) *nīrīi cappdaam kampun twaē kaa
   Nieree begin Cont do work

72) *chum chup kampun čūq baaray haay
   Chum stop Cont smoke cigarette already

73) *yōōn smaqčat kampun twaē tiohiōn
   we volunteer Cont do soldier

74) *kōōt sanyaa kampun riapcam kāckaa nīh
    he promise Cont prepare project this

75) *nīrīi cōn kampun nam kuytāw
    Nieree want Cont eat noodle
76) *knom kham kampun twaa kaa nih pii khae
I try hard Cont do work this two month
mook haay
come already

77) *knom plic kampun tiN kaasaet
I forget Cont buy newspaper

The time reference of a subject-controlled complement following a commitment predicate, however, is dependent on the time reference of the matrix predicate. It refers to a hypothetical event relative to the time reference of the matrix predicate. Chung and Timberlake (1985:243) suggest that a form which expresses the future tense and the irrealis mood in many languages can morphologically be the same. However, the future tense is used for an event which is presumed to be certain to occur while the irrealis mood is used for a potentially possible event. In Khmer, the irrealis marker nin can be inserted before a subject-controlled complement following a commitment predicate. The insertion of the irrealis marker, however, does not express the future tense. It marks the potential mood relative to the time reference of the matrix clause, that is, the complement action never occurs before the matrix action. This is illustrated in (78) - (82).

78) koot bamrun nin sansam luy tiN ptEah
he intend Irrl save money buy house
'He intends to save some money to buy a house.'

79) niiri stEaq staa nin kciay luy pii thEaqniakia
Nieree hesitate Irrl borrow money from bank
'Nieree hesitates to borrow some money from a bank.'

80) yaoe samraacat nin dam banlae
we decide Irrl plant vegetable
'We decided to plant vegetables.'

81) cindaa pdacnacat nin ruat kac kluan cah pii
Chinda determine Irrl run avoid body leave from
ptEah
house
'Chinda decided to run away from the house.'

82) knom kit nin tiw cuay baan knom qae
I intend Irrl go help elder sibling I at
siamriap
Siam Riep
'I intended to help my brother at Siam Riep.'

The matrix predicate, however, can be modified by an auxiliary. When the matrix predicate is modified by the irrealis marker, as in (83) - (86), it implies that neither the matrix action nor the complement action has taken place.

83) niiri nin cappdaam twaa kaa sqaek
Nieree Irrl begin do work tomorrow
'Nieree will begin to work tomorrow.'
84) głoś niż chup cūq baarøy sqaek
  he lrl stop smoke cigarette tomorrow
'He will stop smoking tomorrow.'

85) niarii niż can ham kuytiw
  Nieree lrl want eat noodles
'Nieree will want to have noodles.'

86) knom niż khām twāc kaa nih
  l lrl try hard do work this
'I will try hard to do this work.'

If the matrix predicate is modified by the past tense marker baan, as in (87) - (92), it suggests that the matrix action has already taken place. However, the truth value of the complement action depends on the semantic restrictions of the matrix predicate. If the matrix predicate is true, the complement actions in (87) and (88), are supposed to be true when the matrix predicate is true.

87) niarii baan cappdaem twāc kaa
  Nieree Past begin do work
'Nieree began to work.'

88) chum baan chup cūq baarøy haøy
  Chum Past stop smoke cigarette already
'Chum has already stopped smoking.'

The achievement predicate such as plic 'to forget' implies the falsity of the complement action. If the matrix predicate in (89) is true, the matrix subject referent did not buy a newspaper.

---

11 Subject-controlled predicates in some languages can be classified according to the truth value of the complement action. For instance, Givón (1990:533) considers predicates in English which require the subject of the complement clause to be obligatorily coreferential with the matrix subject 'modality verbs'. Modality verbs can be sub-divided according to the property of implicativity into implicative verbs, neg-implicative verbs and non-implicative verbs (Givón, 1980:342; Givón, 1984:118). If the matrix clause with an implicative verb is true, it implies the truth of its complement clause. For instance, example (A) suggests that Bill performed a complement action.

A) Bill managed to escape.

The truth of the matrix clause with a neg-implicative verb suggests the falsity of the complement action. If the matrix clause with a neg-implicative verb, as shown in example (B), is true, it suggests that its complement action does not take place, that is, Bill did not escape.

B) Bill failed to escape.

A non-implicative verb does not imply the truth of the complement clause one way or another. In example (C), Bill may or may not escape.

C) Bill wanted to escape.
Chapter 5: Controlled complements

89) kñoin baan plic tiñ kaasaet
   I Past forget buy newspaper
   'I forgot to buy a newspaper.'

Most subject-controlled predicates do not have these implications. If the matrix predicate is true, the complement action can be either true or false. This is exemplified in (90) - (92).

90) yaœn baan smaqçat twœo tiöhian
    we Past volunteer do soldier
    'We volunteered to join the army.'

91) kɔst baan sanyaa niŋ riœpcam kɔckaa nih
    he Past promise irrl prepare project this
    'He promised to prepare this project.'

92) niœri baan caŋ ñam kuytœw
    Nieree Past want eat noodle
    'Nieree wanted to eat noodles.'

The only auxiliary that can modify subject-controlled complements is the irrealis marker. When the irrealis marker modifies a subject-controlled complement following a commitment predicate, it indicates the potential mood, not the future tense. The matrix predicate, however, can be modified by an auxiliary.

5.2.2.2 Negator insertion

A subject-controlled complement following most of the complement-taking predicates listed in section 5.2.1 cannot be negated. This is exemplified in examples (93) - (96).

93) *chum chup min cœq baarœy tee
    Chum stop not smoke cigarette Part

94) *yaœn smaqçat min twœo tiöhian tee
    we volunteer not do soldier Part

95) *niœrii caŋ min ñam kuytœw tee
    Nieree want not eat noodle Part

96) *kñom plic min tiñ kaasaet tee
    I forget not buy newspaper Part

Nevertheless, a subject-controlled complement following a commitment predicate, the desiderative predicate pyiœyiœm 'to try' or the aspectual predicate cappdaœm 'to begin' can be negated. The negation of a complement predicate implies that the matrix subject referent has an intention not to perform the complement action. For example, the matrix subject referent in (97) has an intention not to have two wives. The matrix subject referent in (98) decided not to help Sot any more whereas the matrix
subject referent in (99) deliberately stopped working:

97) kōt piyajiam min yacak propiun pii
    he try not take wife two
    'He tries not to have two wives.'

98) y Neo tančat min cuay twa twa kaa sot tiat tee
    we determine not help do work Sot more Part
    'We determine not to help Sot work any more.'

99) kammaka cappdaam min twa kaa tiat haay
    worker begin not do work more already
    'The workers began to stop working again.'

The matrix predicates, however, can be negated. The truth value of the complement action depends on semantic restrictions of the predicates. In (100), neither the complement action nor the matrix action has occurred.

100) niərii min baan cappdaam twa kaa sah
    Nieree not Past begin do work at all
    'Nieree did not begin to work at all.'

The negation of the matrix predicates such as chup 'to stop' and plic 'to forget' implies the falsity of the complement action. In (101), the matrix subject referent still smokes cigarettes whereas in (102), the matrix subject referent bought a newspaper.

101) chum min chup cuay baaray tee
    Chum not stop smoke cigarette Part
    'Chum does not stop smoking.'

102) kñom min plic tin kaasaet tee
    I not forget buy newspaper Part
    'I did not forget to buy a newspaper.'

When the matrix predicates in (103) - (106) are negated, the complement action can be either true or false. In (103) - (106), the matrix subject referent may either perform or not perform the complement action.

103) sot min smaqat twa twa tiahan tee
    Sot not volunteer do soldier Part
    'Sot did not volunteer to join the army.'

104) kōt min baan sanyaa niŋ riapcam kackaa nih
    he not Past promise IrIr prepare work this
    Part
    'He did not promise to prepare this work.'

105) niərii min caŋ nam kuytiauw tee
    Nieree not want eat noodle Part
    'Nieree did not want to have noodles.'
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106) kñom min kham twaa kaa nih tee
I not try hard to do work this Part
'I did not try hard to do this work.'

5.2.2.3 Insertion of the tee particle

Unlike an S-like complement with a complementiser, the tee particle cannot be inserted before a subject-controlled complement. Examples (107) - (113) are all ungrammatical as the negative particle tee is inserted before a subject-controlled complement.

107) *nirií min cappdaam tee twaa kaa
Nieree not begin Part do work

108) *chum min chup tee cüaq baaray
Chum not stop Part smoke cigarette

109) *yœaŋ min smaqcêt tee twaa tiœhían
we not volunteer Part do soldier

110) *kœt min baan sanyaa tee niŋ riœpcam kœckaa nih
he not Past promise Part Irrl prepare project this

111) *nirií min caŋ tee ŋam kuytiaŋ
Nieree not want Part eat noodle

112) *kñom min kham tee twaa kaa nih
I not try hard Part do work this

113) *kñom min plic tee tiŋ kaasaet
I not forget Part buy newspaper

However, examples (114) - (120) are grammatical as the negative particle tee occurs at the end of the sentence.

114) nirií min baan cappdaam twaa kaa tee
Nieree not Past begin do work Part
'Nieree has not began to work yet.'

115) chum min chup cüaq baaray tee
Chum not stop smoke cigarette Part
'Chum does not stop smoking.'

116) yœaŋ min smaqcêt twaa tiœhían tee
we not volunteer do soldier Part
'We did not volunteer to join the army.'

117) kœt min baan sanyaa niŋ riœpcam kœckaa nih tee
he not Past promise Irrl prepare project this Part
'He did not promise to prepare this project.'

118) nirií min caŋ ŋam kuytiaŋ tee
Nieree not want eat noodle Part
'Nieree did not want to have noodles.'
119) kñom min 'kham twɔɔ kaa nih tee
I not try hard do work Part
'I did not try hard (enough) to do this work.'

120) kñom min (baan) plic tiŋ kaasaet tee
I not (Past) forget buy newspaper Part
'I did not forget to buy a newspaper.'

When the tee particle functions as the polar question particle, it must occur at the end of the sentence. Examples (121) - (127) demonstrate that the polar question particle tee cannot be inserted before subject-controlled complements.

121) * nĩrii cappdaɔm tee twɔɔ kaa
Nieree begin Part do work

122) * chum chup tee cůq baarɔy haay
Chum stop Part smoke cigarette already

123) * yɔɔŋ smaqcɔt tee twɔɔ tiɔhɔɔn
we volunteer Part do soldier

124) * kɔɔt sanyaa tee nĩŋ riɔpcɔm kɔɔkɔɔ nih
he promise Part Irrl prepare project this

125) * nĩrii caŋ tee  ámb kuytiɔw
Nieree want Part eat noodle

126) * look kham tee twɔɔ kaa nih
you try hard Part do work this

127) * look plic tee tiŋ kaasaet
you forget Part buy newspaper

When the polar question particle tee occurs at the end of the sentence, as in (128) - (134), the sentences are grammatical. The scope of the question particle covers the whole sentence.

128) nĩrii nĩŋ cappdaɔm twɔɔ kaa nih tee
Nieree Irrl begin do work Part
'Will Nieree begin to do this work?'

129) chum (nĩŋ) chup cůq baarɔy tee
Chum (Irrl) stop smoke cigarette Part
'Does Chum stop smoking?'

130) look smaqcɔt twɔɔ tiɔhɔɔn tee
you volunteer do soldier Part
'Did you volunteer to join the army?'

131) kɔɔt sanyaa nĩŋ riɔpcɔm kɔɔkɔɔ nih tee
he promise Irrl prepare project this Part
'Did he promise to prepare this project?'
5.2.2.4 Presence of a complementiser

A subject-controlled complement cannot be preceded by the thaa complementiser. This is exemplified in examples (135) - (140).

135) *niñii cappdaêm thaa twəə kaa
Nieree begin COMP do work

136) *chum (niŋ) chup thaa cüəq baarəy
Chum (Irri) stop COMP smoke cigarette

137) *look smaqcət thaa twəə tiəhian
you volunteer COMP do soldier

138) *niñii caŋ thaa ŋam kuytiəw
Nieree want COMP eat noodle

139) *kñom kham thaa twəə kaa nih pii khæ mook
I try COMP do work this two month come
haəy already

140) *look plic thaa tiñ kaasaet
you forget COMP buy newspaper

Nevertheless, some commitment predicates listed in section 5.2.1, can be followed by either a subject-controlled complement or an S-like complement with a complementiser. When these predicates are followed by a subject-controlled complement, the complement subject is always unexpressed and is coreferential with the matrix subject, as shown in (141) - (145).

141) yəəŋ samrəcət cattəŋ chum ciə prəthiən
we decide establish Chum be leader
'We decided to have Chum as our leader.'

142) kəət sanyəa niŋ cam kñom qəə saaαa
he promise Irri wait I at school
'He promised to wait for me at the school.'

143) kñom kit twəə damnaə tiəw srok kraaw
I intend do journey go overseas
'I intended to go overseas.'
As illustrated in (149) and (150), S-like complements preceded by some commitment predicates can also be introduced by the dael complementiser. As discussed in section 3.3, S-like complements with the dael complementiser are factive.
discussed. The only auxiliary which can modify subject-controlled complements is the irrealis marker. The insertion of the irrealis marker in between a commitment predicate and its subject-controlled complement expresses the potential mood, not the future tense. A subject-controlled complement preceded by a commitment predicate, the desiderative predicate pyiayiam 'to try' or the aspectual predicate cappdaam 'to begin' can be negated. The negation of a subject-controlled complement suggests an intention of the matrix subject referent not to perform a complement action. Subject-controlled complements cannot be preceded by the tee particle. The tee particle can only occur at the end of the sentence. Unlike S-like complements with a complementiser, subject-controlled complements cannot be preceded by a complementiser. Nevertheless, some commitment predicates can be followed by either a subject-controlled complement or an S-like complement with a complementiser. When these predicates are followed by a subject-controlled complement, the complement subject is always unexpressed and must be coreferential with the matrix subject. If these predicates are followed by an S-like complement with a complementiser, the complement subject can be overt and it need not be coreferential with the matrix subject.

5.3 Object-controlled complements

Object-controlled complements are complements in which the unexpressed subject is controlled by the matrix object. When a predicate is followed by an object-controlled complement, the matrix object referent is interpreted as performing the complement action. The underlined propositions in (151) - (155) are object-controlled complements.

151) niarii qaαcαn look qom ααm baay
Nieree invite uncle eat rice
'Nieree invited the uncle to have dinner.'

152) tolaakaa haw niarii tiw sua cammaay
judge call Nieree go ask answer
'The judge called Nieree for questioning.'

153) maq haw koun tiw psaa
mother call child go market
'The mother called (her) child to go to the market.'

154) kmae krahaam kahhaw praicaoam tiw twaa srae
Khmer Rouge call people go do ricefield
'The Khmer Rouge called the people to work in the ricefield.'

155) sot babual niarii mook leen ptεh
Sot persuade Nieree come play house
'Sot persuaded Nieree to visit (his) house.'

As demonstrated in examples (156) - (160), there cannot be an overt noun phrase
functioning as the complement subject intervening between the matrix object and the complement.

156) *ニアリイ 仏もおお look qom kōt ōam baay
ニアリイ invite uncle he eat rice

157) *トラアカア haw ニアリイ sot tiw suō camlaay
judge call Nieree Sot go ask answer

158) *マオ haw koun look qom tiw psaa
mother call child uncle go market

159) *カメ ジャアム カフハウ procūtān sot tiw twō
Khmer Rouge call people Sot go do

160) *ソト にあうる ニアリイ cindaa moök leen ptēoh
Sot persuade Nieree Chinda come play house

In this section, the same tests which identify the control relationship between the unexpressed complement subject and the matrix subject are applied. Here too, I will evaluate how effective the reflexive test is.

When the reflexive pronoun occurs in the object position of object-controlled complements, as in (161) - (164), there are two possible interpretations of each sentence. The reflexive pronoun can be coreferential with either the matrix subject or the matrix object. For instance, if the matrix subject referent in (161), is a shop assistant and the matrix object referent is trying a new dress, the matrix subject referent may invite the matrix object referent to have a look at herself. The matrix object is therefore the antecedent of the reflexive pronoun. This is the preferred interpretation.

In contrast, when the matrix subject referent herself is trying a new dress, she may invite the matrix object referent to come and have a look how she is. In this case, the matrix subject is interpreted as the antecedent of the reflexive pronoun. However, there is a variation of grammaticality judgement. Some Khmer speakers do not accept the matrix subject as the antecedent of the reflexive in the complement object position. The symbol '?' indicates that the indexing is acceptable only for some speakers.

161) ニアリイ 仏もおお cindaa cluh mōō kluaŋqenh knoŋ kāŋçaq
ニアリイ invite Chinda; look body-self in mirror
'Nieree invited Chinda to look at her/herself in the mirror.'

162) ニアリイ haw cindaa cluh mōō kluaŋqenh knoŋ kāŋçaq
ニアリイ call Chinda; look body-self in mirror
'Nieree called Chinda to look at her/herself in the mirror.'

163) ニアリイ カフハウ sot cluh mōō kluaŋqenh knoŋ kāŋçaq
ニアリイ call Sot; look body-self in mirror
'Nieree called Sot to see her/himself in the mirror.'
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164) sot babuəl niərii cluh məəl kluənqaəŋ knoŋ kaŋcaq
      Sotı persuade Nierë ēj look body-selfŋ/j in mirror
      'Sotı persuaded Nierë ēj to look at himŋ/j/herselfŋ/j in the mirror.'

Unlike English, the reflexive form test in Khmer does not show a proper result for identifying the controller of the unexpressed subject of a controlled complement in examples (161) - (164). However, if the reflexive pronoun in (161) - (164) is replaced by a third person pronoun, as shown in (165) - (168), the matrix object cannot be interpreted as the antecedent of the pronoun. However, as the subscript indices show the pronoun in the complement object position can be coreferential with either the matrix subject or a noun phrase retrievable in the context.

165) niərii qaŋcaŋ cinđaa cluh məəl niəŋ knoŋ kaŋcaq
      Nierë ēj invite Chindaŋ look sheŋ/j in mirror
      'Nierë ēj invited Chindaŋ to look at herŋ/j in the mirror.'

166) niərii haw cinđaa cluh məəl niəŋ knoŋ kaŋcaq
      Nierë ēj call Chindaŋ look sheŋ/j in mirror
      'Nierë ēj called Chindaŋ to look at herŋ/j in the mirror.'

167) niərii kahhaw cinđaa cluh məəl niəŋ knoŋ kaŋcaq
      Nierë ēj call Chindaŋ look sheŋ/j in mirror
      'Nierë ēj called Sotŋ to see herŋ/j in the mirror.'

168) sot babuəl chum cluh məəl kee knoŋ kaŋcaq
      Sotı persuade Chumŋ/j look heŋ/j in mirror
      'Sotı persuaded Nierë ēj to look at himŋ/j/herselfŋ/j in the mirror.'

The reason that the third person pronoun in a complement object position cannot have the matrix object as its antecedent is similar to that discussed in section 5.2. As the matrix object functions as the controller of the unexpressed complement subject and a pronoun is free within its own clause (Bresnan, 1982b: 327, 340-341), the matrix object cannot be assigned as the antecedent of the pronoun in a complement object position. This suggests that a controlled complement is best analysed as an object-controlled complement.

The tae maneəq qaen test also provides the same result as that of the third person pronoun test. As discussed in section 5.2, the adverbial phrase tae maneəq qaen 'alone, by oneself' can modify the complement proposition. When this adverbial phrase modifies an object-controlled complement, an oblique in an additional paraphrase clause has to be coreferential with the matrix object. This is exemplified in (169) - (172).

12The proper names in examples (161) - (164) are slightly changed in order that both of the proper names in the matrix subject and the matrix object positions have the same gender.
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169) níríiri qa’írcóñ look qom ñâm baay tae manéqqa qaeñ
Níree invite uncle eat rice alone
kii kmian nêqnaa ñâm baay ciómuay look qom tee
be have no anyone eat rice with uncle Part
'Níree invited the uncle to have dinner alone, that is, there was no one to have dinner with the uncle.'

170) tolaakaa haw níríirí tiw suó címlaay tae manéqqa qaeñ
judge call Níree go ask answer alone
kii kmian nêqnaa tiw suó címlaay ciómuay níríirí tee
be have no anyone go ask answer with Níree Part
'The judge called Níree for questioning alone, that is, there was no one to go for questioning with Níree.'

171) maq haw koun tiw psaa tae manéqqa qaeñ kii kmíon
mother call child go market alone be have no
nêqnaa tiw psaa ciómuay koun tee
anyone go market with child Part
'The mother called (her) child to go to the market alone, that is, there was no one to go to the market with the child.'

172) sot babual níríirí mook leen ptéñ tae manéqqa qaeñ
Sot persuade Níree come play house alone
kii kmian nêqnaa mook leen ptéñ ciómuay níríirí tee
be have no anyone come play house with Níree Part
'Sot persuaded Níree to visit his house alone, that is, there was no one to visit his house with Níree.'

If the oblique noun phrase in the paraphrase clause, as in (169) - (172) above, is coreferential with the matrix subject, the sentences are ungrammatical. This is exemplified in examples (173) - (176).

173) *níríirí qa’írcóñ look qom ñâm baay tae manéqqa qaeñ
Níree invite uncle eat rice alone
kii kmian nêqnaa ñâm baay ciómuay níríirí tee
be have no anyone eat rice with Níree Part

174) *tolaaakaa haw níríirí tiw suó címlaay tae manéqqa qaeñ
judge call Níree go ask answer alone
kii kmíon nêqnaa tiw suó címlaay ciómuay tolaakaa tee
be have no anyone go ask answer with judge Part

13 The oblique noun phrase can be coreferential with the matrix subject if the matrix predicate is also repeated in the paraphrase clause, as in (A).

A) níríirí qa’írcóñ look qom ñâm baay tae manéqqa qaeñ kii kmíon
Níree invite uncle eat rice alone be have no
nêqnaa qa’írcóñ look qom ñâm baay ciómuay níríirí tee
anyone invite uncle eat rice with Níree Part
'Níree invited the uncle to have dinner alone, that is, there was no one else who invited the uncle to have dinner other than Níree.'
The fact that the oblique noun phrase in a paraphrase clause is coreferential with the matrix object also suggests that the matrix object functions as the controller of the unexpressed complement subject.

In section 5.3.1, predicates which can be followed by an object-controlled complement will be presented. This is followed by a discussion of the grammaticalisation of the object-controlled predicate qaⁿc₉₉ in section 5.3.1.1. The characteristics of object-controlled complements are investigated in section 5.3.2.

### 5.3.1 Object-controlled predicates

The existing data suggests that predicates which can be followed by an object-controlled complement are as follows:

- qaⁿc₉₉: 'to invite'
- haw: 'to call'\(^{14}\)
- kahhaw: 'to call'\(^{15}\)
- babu₉: 'to persuade'\(^{16}\)

These predicates belong to the class of manipulative predicates. Another predicate which can subcategorise for an object-controlled complement is qaⁿqy 'to have someone do something; to allow'. This predicate will be discussed in detail in chapter 6. Examples (177) - (181) illustrate the co-occurrence of the object-controlled predicates and their object-controlled complement.

---

\(^{14}\) The meaning of the verb haw 'to call' in Khmer is more limited than the meanings of to call in English. The verb haw subcategorising for an object noun phrase means 'to attract someone's attention' whereas the verb haw under this discussion means 'to request or to order'.

\(^{15}\) The predicate kahhaw is glossed as 'to call' as well. However, it has a negative implication. This verb implies that the person who is called has to do something that s/he does not want to or has to do something by force.

\(^{16}\) Unlike to persuade in English, of which the preferable interpretation is that the matrix object himself performs the complement action, babu₉ 'to persuade', used in many contexts, implies that both the matrix subject and the matrix object referents perform the complement action together.
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177) niərii qaŋceəŋ lookqom ńam baay
Nieree invite uncle eat rice
'Nieree invited the uncle to have dinner.'

178) tolaakaa haw niərii tiw suə camlaəy
judge call Nieree go ask answer
'The judge called Nieree for questioning.'

179) maq haw koun tiw psaa
mother call child go market
'The mother called (her) child to go to the market.'

180) kmae krahoam kahhaw praçiəcəən tiw twəə srae
Khmer Rouge call people go do ricefield
'The Khmer Rouge called the people to work in the ricefield.'

181) sot babuəl niərii məɔk leəŋ pteəəh
Sot persuade Nieree come play house
'Sot persuaded Nieree to visit (his) house.'

The underlined proposition or the NP₂ - VP₂ sequence in examples (177) - (181) is superficially similar to an S-like complement without a complementiser, discussed in Chapter 4. The matrix predicate of examples (182) - (184) is followed by an S-like complement without a complementiser.

182) sot khaəə niərii luəc luy
Sot see Nieree steal money
'Sot saw Nieree steal the money.'

183) nəəqəəık klaac cao məɔk samlap
people afraid thief come kill
'The people are afraid that the thieves will come to kill them.'

184) kee saŋsay kəəm baan twəə khoh qwəə muəəy
they suspect I Past do wrong what one
'They suspect that I have done something wrong.'

However, one good piece of evidence indicates that the NP₂ - VP₂ sequence in (177) - (181), cannot be analysed as an S-like complement without a complementiser. The NP₂ in the NP₂ - VP₂ sequence following an object-controlled predicate can be passivised whereas the NP₂ in the NP₂ - VP₂ sequence of an S-like complement without a complementiser cannot. When the matrix object following object-controlled predicates is passivised, as illustrated in (185) - (188), the sentences are still grammatical.

185) niərii trəə kee qaŋceəŋ tiw cuəp meetəəp
Nieree Pass they invite go meet commander
'Nieree was invited to meet the commander.'

186) niərii trəə tolaakaa haw tiw suə camlaəy
Nieree Pass judge call go ask answer
'Nieree was called for questioning.'
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The people were called to work in the ricefield.'

'Sot was persuaded to steal some money.'

Examples (189) - (191), of which the subject of an S-like complement without a complementiser is passivised, are ungrammatical.

The fact that the NP2 of the NP2 - VP2 sequence following the object-controlled predicates listed in section 5.3.1 can be passivised whereas the NP2 of an S-like complement without a complementiser cannot, indicates that the NP2 - VP2 sequence following the object-controlled predicates cannot be analysed as an S-like complement without a complementiser. Furthermore, the NP2 of the NP2 - VP2 sequence following the object-controlled predicates receives a semantic role from the matrix predicate whereas the NP2 of an S-like complement without a complementiser does not.

As the semantic meaning of the predicates listed in this section indicates that the matrix object performs a complement action, the controlled complement is best analysed as an object-controlled complement. The matrix object functions as the controller of the unexpressed complement subject. Example (177) is repeated here as (192) and the lexical entry of the object-controlled predicate goficggfi 'to invite' is given in (193).

The c-structure of example (192) is presented as (194).
The functional annotations $\uparrow_{\text{OBJ}}=\downarrow$ and $\uparrow_{\text{VCOMP}}=\downarrow$ above the nodes $\text{NP}_5$ and $\text{VP}_6$ mean that all functional information carried by the nodes $\text{NP}_5$ and $\text{VP}_6$ goes into the OBJ part and VCOMP part of the f-structure of their mother node $\text{VP}_3$. The annotation $\uparrow=\downarrow$ above the node $\text{V}_4$ means that information about $\text{V}_4$ is equivalent to that of the upper node. Since the form $\text{qañceañ}$ contains the PRED value, namely 'INVITE', this PRED value is passed up to its upper node $\text{VP}_3$. The equation $\uparrow=\downarrow$ above the node $\text{VP}_3$ indicates that all functional information of its own node is passed up to its mother node. Therefore, the PRED value of $\text{qañceañ}$ is the PRED value of the whole sentence and the grammatical functions OBJ and VCOMP are the grammatical functions of the sentence. The f-structure of example (192) is thus:

$$
\begin{align*}
\text{SUBJ} & \quad \text{PRED 'NIEREE'} \\
\text{PRED} & \quad \text{INVITE } \langle (\text{SUBJ} \text{ (OBJ) (VCOMP)}) \rangle' \\
\text{OBJ} & \quad \text{PRED 'UNCLE'} \\
& \quad \langle \text{SUBJ } [ \ ] \rangle \\
\text{VCOMP} & \quad \text{PRED 'EAT } \langle (\text{SUBJ} \text{ (OBJ)}) \rangle' \\
& \quad \text{OBJ } \quad \text{PRED 'RICE'}
\end{align*}
$$

5.3.1.1 Grammaticalisation of the form $\text{qañceañ}$

This section presents a discussion of grammaticalisation of the form $\text{qañceañ}$. The form $\text{qañceañ}$ 'to invite' is one of object-controlled predicates in Khmer. When $\text{qañceañ}$ functions as an object-controlled predicate, it can be followed by an object and an object-controlled complement, as in (196).

$$
\text{chum } \text{qañceañ niñii tiw leñ tikchuu} \\
\text{Chum invite Nieree go play waterfall} \\
\text{'}Chum invited Nieree to go to the waterfall.'}
$$

However, the form $\text{qañceañ}$ which precedes the matrix predicate in (197) - (199) does
not function as an object-controlled predicate. The insertion of the form ឈាណាដស only
expresses the speaker's respect for the addressee; the speaker may be younger than the
addressee or has a social status lower than the addressee. In (197) - (199), the matrix
subject referent did not invite anyone to do something. The speaker of example (197)
and the speaker (A) in (198) simply ask a question about the matrix subject referent. In
addition, the speaker B in (198) only answers the question of (A). She does not invite
the matrix subject referent to visit her uncle. The narrator in (199) simply tells a story
about his uncle.

197) អាចមិន សូត្រុក ឈាណាដស ថ្មី កំពុង បង្កើត ដើម្បី ការ់ មិន បាន អប់
  'Do you go to school, today?' (LIT: 'Today, does teacher go to teach?')

198) A: ... សូត្រុក កុំ សូត្រុក ឈាណាដស ថ្មី កំពុង បង្កើត មនុស្ស ញូនសុត
  'Where are the uncle and the aunt, Tharee?'

B: ការី ការី អាច ឈាណាដស ថ្មី កំពុង បង្កើត មនុស្ស ញូនសុត
  'Yes, Dad and Mum have gone to visit my uncle in the East 2-3 days
  already.'

199) ពោល ពណ៌ន មេតារ-មេតារ ញូនសុត កុំ គុត ឈាណាដស ថ្មី ពោល
  'When there was a meeting, I noticed that the uncle always came to the meeting
  place before anyone.'

If the respect form ឈាណាដស is applied with the speaker himself, as in (200), the
sentence is still grammatical. However, pragmatically Khmer people consider the
speaker of that sentence bizarre since the speaker seems to flatter himself.

200) កុំ ឈាណាដស ថ្មី កំពុង បង្កើត មនុស្ស ញូនសុត
  'I went to have dinner.'

There cannot be an overt noun phrase following the respect form ឈាណាដស. Examples
(201) - (204) are ungrammatical if ឈាណាដស is interpreted as expressing
respect.

201) សូត្រុក កុំ បង្កើត មនុស្ស ញូនសុត

202) សូត្រុក កុំ បង្កើត មនុស្ស ញូនសុត
203) *caah paa niŋ maq qa nocheːn niaŋ tiw leŋ pteːŋh
look qom kŋom
uncle I

204) *peel pracum kŋom sankeet khœn qom qa nocheːn
time meeting I observe see uncle Qa nächste
sot mœŋk dal tii pracum mun kee
Sot come arrive meeting place before they

However, if qa nocheːn in examples (201) - (204) is interpreted as an object-controlled verb 'to invite', the sentences are acceptable. The form qa nocheːn in (205) - (208) is glossed as 'to invite' to differentiate from the respect form qa nocheːn in (201) - (204).

205) look kruu qa nocheːn niaŋítiw bāŋriŋ tee caah
teacher invite Nieree go Part Part
'Did you invite Nieree to teach?'

206) look qom proh look qom sraŋ qa nocheːn cindaa tiw nœa
uncle aunt invite Chinda go where
'Where did the uncle and the aunt invite Chinda to go?'

207) caah paa niŋ maq qa nocheːn niaŋ tiw leŋ pteːŋh
yes Dad and Mum invite she go play house
look qom kŋom
uncle I
'Yes, Dad and Mum invited her to visit my uncle's house.'

208) peel pracum kŋom sankeet khœn qom qa nocheːn
time meeting I observe see uncle invite
sot mœŋk dal tii pracum mun kee
Sot come arrive meeting place before they
'When there was a meeting, I noticed that the uncle always invited Sot to the meeting place first.'

The respect form qa nocheːn retains some verbal features. It can be preceded by an auxiliary as well as by the verbal negator min. Examples (209) and (210) show that qa nocheːn is preceded by the past tense marker baan and the irrealis marker nin, respectively.

209) look qom baan qa nocheːn tiw nœa bat tiw haŋy
uncle Past Qa neste go where disappear go already
'Where did the uncle go?'

210) look kruu nœ qa nocheːn tiw saalaŋ tee caah
teacher fœ Qa neste go school Part Part
'Are you going to school?'

Examples (211) and (212) show that the negator min can also precede the respect form qa nocheːn.

211) tŋay nœ look kruu min qa nocheːn tiw bœŋriŋ tee caah
day this teacher not Qa neste go teach Part Part
'Today, don't you (the teacher) go to teach?'
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212) kōt min qañcææn tiw naa mook naa sah
  he not qañceæn go where come where at all
  'He does not go anywhere.'

If an auxiliary is inserted after the respect form qañcææn, as shown in (213) - (214), the sentences are ungrammatical.

213) *look qom qañcææn baan tiw naa bat tiw haay
  uncle qañceæn Past go where disappear go already

214) *look kruu qañcææn nin tiw saalaa tee caah
  teacher qañceæn irr go school Part Part

The negator cannot occur after the respect form qañcææn either. This is illustrated in (215) - (216).

215) *tryay nih look kruu qañcææn min tiw baqriæn tee caah
  day this teacher qañceæn not go teach Part Part

216) *kōt qañcææn min tiw naa mook naa sah
  he qañceæn not go where come where at all

In addition to this, the form qañcææn can also function as the pragmatic particle indicating a request or an invitation in imperative sentence type. The form qañcææn in (217) and (218) functions as the pragmatic particle.

217) qañcææn cam qae nih
  qañceæn wait at here
  'Please wait here.'

218) qañcææn tiw ciamuæy knia
  qañceæn go together with each other
  'Please come together.'

Unlike normal predicates in imperative sentence type, the pragmatic particle qañcææn cannot be negated by the prohibitive kom. The predicates in examples (219) and (220) can be negated by the prohibitive kom.

219) kom cam qae nih
  don't wait at here
  'Don't wait here.'

220) kom tiw ciamuæy knia
  don't go together with each other
  'Don't come together.'

If the prohibitive kom precedes the pragmatic particle qañcææn, as in (221) and (222), the sentences are ungrammatical.

221) *kom qañcææn cam qae nih
  don't qañceæn wait at here
222) *kom qaćcən tiw ciəmuay kniə
don’t Qancən go together with each other

The fact that the pragmatic particle qaćcən in the imperative sentence type cannot be negated suggests that form qaćcən in this position has undergone grammaticalisation.

5.3.2 Characteristics of object-controlled complements

In this section, some characteristics of object-controlled complements are discussed in the similar way as those of subject-controlled complements. These are whether object-controlled complements can be modified by an auxiliary (section 5.3.2.1), whether they can be negated (section 5.3.2.2), whether the tce particle can be inserted before object-controlled complements (section 5.3.2.3) and whether they can be preceded by a complementiser (section 5.3.2.4).

5.3.2.1 Auxiliary insertion

Unlike the predicate of subject-controlled complements, the predicate of object-controlled complements cannot be modified by an auxiliary. When the irrealis marker is inserted before the predicate of object-controlled complement, as in (223) and (224), the sentences are ungrammatical.

223) *niəri qaćcən look qom nin ŋam baay
Nieree invite uncle Irrl eat rice

224) *tolaakaa haw niəri nin tiw suə camlaay
judge call Nieree Irrl go ask answer

Examples (225) - (228) are also ungrammatical. Neither the past tense marker baan nor the continuous marker kampun can be inserted before a complement predicate.

225) *kmae krahaam kahhaw praciəcən baan tiw twəə
Khmer Rouge call people Past go do
srae ricefield

226) *sot babuəl niəri baan moək leen pteəh
Sot persuade Nieree Past come play house

227) *niəri qaćcən look qom kampun ŋam baay
Nieree invite uncle Cont eat rice

228) *tolaakaa haw niəri kampun tiw suə camlaay
judge call Nieree Cont go ask answer

However, the matrix predicate can be modified by an auxiliary. The scope of the auxiliary modification covers the whole sentence. If the matrix predicate in (229) - (230) is true, the complement action has not happened yet.
Chapter 5: Controlled complements

229) niri min qapceq min look qom nam baay
    Nieree lrr invite uncle eat rice
    'Nieree will invite the uncle to have dinner.'

230) tolaakaa niri haw niri tiw su camlaqy
    judge lrr call Nieree go ask answer
    'The judge will call Nieree for questioning.'

The past tense marker baan modifies the matrix predicates in (231) and (232). If the matrix action is true, the complement action has already taken place.

231) kmae krhhom baan kahhaw praciqun tiw twae
    Khmer Rouge Past call people do do
    ricefield
    'The Khmer Rouge called the people to work in the ricefield.'

232) sot baan babuul niri mook leen ptqy
    Sot Past persuade Nieree come play house
    'Sot persuaded Nieree to visit (his) house.'

5.3.2.2 Negator insertion

Unlike a predicate in S-like complements without a complementiser or that in subject-controlled complements, a predicate in object-controlled complements cannot be negated. The negator min cannot be inserted before the complement predicate, as illustrated in (233) - (236).

233) *niri qapceq min twae srae
    Nieree invite uncle not do ricefield

234) *mdaay haw niri min tiw twae kaa
    mother call Nieree not go do work

235) *kmae krhhom kahhaw praciqun min ceq pi
    Khmer Rouge call people not leave from
    pnum piq
    Phnom Penh

236) *sot baan babuul niri min baoh samqaat saalaa
    Sot Past persuade Nieree not sweep clean school

The matrix predicate, nevertheless, can be negated. When the matrix predicate is negated, the scope of negation is over the whole sentence. None of the complement actions of examples (237) - (240) have taken place.

237) niri min qapceq min look qom nam baay tee
    Nieree not invite uncle eat rice Part
    'Nieree did not invite the uncle to have dinner.'

238) tolaakaa min haw niri tiw su camlaqy tee
    judge not call Nieree go ask answer Part
    'The judge did not call Nieree for questioning.'
239) kmae krahaam min kahhaw praciæcoon tiw twee
Khmer Rouge not call people go do srae tee ricefield Part
'The Khmer Rouge did not call the people to work in the ricefield.'

240) sot min babuaal niarii mook leen ptèah tee
Sot not persuade Nieree come play house Part
'Sot did not persuade Nieree to visit (his) house.'

5.3.2.3 Insertion of the **tee** particle

The **tee** particle can function as either the negative particle or the polar question particle. As illustrated in (237) - (240) in section 5.3.2.2 above, the negative particle **tee** can occur at the end of the sentence. Examples (241) - (244) are ungrammatical as the negative particle **tee** occurs before an object-controlled complement.

241) *nigrii min qaæcoæ look qom tee ñam baay
Nieree not invite uncle Part eat rice

242) *tolaakaal min haw niarii tee tiw sau camlaay judge not call Nieree Part go ask answer

243) *kmae krahaam min kahhaw praciæcoon tee tiw
Khmer Rouge not call people Part go srae ricefield
doo twee
doo ricefield

244) *sot min babuaal niarii tee mook leen qae ptèah
Sot not persuade Nieree Part come play at house

The polar question particle **tee** has the same behaviour as the negative particle **tee**. Examples (245) - (248) are all ungrammatical because the polar question particle **tee** occurs before an object-controlled complement.

245) *niarii qaæcoæ look qom tee ñam baay
Nieree invite uncle Part eat rice

246) *tolaakaal haw niarii tee tiw sau camlaay judge call Nieree Part go ask answer

247) *kmae krahaam kahhaw praciæcoon tee tiw twee
Khmer Rouge call people Part go do srae ricefield
doo twee
doo ricefield

248) *sot babuaal niarii tee mook leen ptèah Sot persuade Nieree Part come play house

As shown in (249) - (252), the polar question particle **tee** can occur at the end of the sentence. The scope of the question particle is over the whole sentence.
249) niorii qafi eem look qom nam baay tee
Nieree invite uncle eat rice Part
'Did Nieree invite the uncle to have dinner?'

250) tolaakaa haw niorii tiw su camlaay tee
judge call Nieree go ask answer Part
'Did the judge call Nieree for questioning?'

251) kmae krahaam kahhaw praciqcuon tiw twee srae
Khmer Rouge call people go do ricefield tee Part
'Did the Khmer Rouge call the people to work in the ricefield?'

252) sot babuul niorii moox leen ptelah tee
Sot persuade Nieree come play house Part
'Did Sot persuade Nieree to visit (his) house?'

5.3.2.4 Presence of a complementiser

Unlike an S-like complement without a complementiser, an object-controlled complement cannot be preceded by a complementiser. Examples (253) - (256) are ungrammatical because the thaa complementiser precedes an object-controlled complement.

253) *niairii qafi eem look qom thaa nam baay
Nieree invite uncle COMP eat rice

254) *tolaakaa haw niorii thaa tiw su camlaay
judge call Nieree COMP go ask answer

255) *kmae krahaam kahhaw praciqcuon thaa tiw
Khmer Rouge call people COMP go twee srae
do ricefield

256) *sot babuul niorii thaa moox leen qae ptelah
Sot persuade Nieree COMP come play at house

5.3.3 Summary

To sum up, the predicate of object-controlled complements can neither be modified by an auxiliary nor be negated, unlike that of some subject-controlled complements. In contrast, object-controlled predicates can be modified by an auxiliary and can be negated. The scope of time reference and negation is over the whole sentence. Like subject-controlled complements, neither the tee particle nor the thaa complementiser can precede an object-controlled complement.
5.4 Comparison of controlled complements and serial verb constructions

In this section, the comparison of controlled complements and serial verb constructions is presented. It is widely accepted that verbs in serial verb constructions are conjoined without any linker. However, criteria that linguists use to define serial verb constructions vary. For examples, Foley and Olson (1985:18) and Hale (1991:8-12) consider that verbs in serial verb constructions can share any core argument. For example, verbs in serial verb constructions can share the same subject or the object of the first verb can be the subject of the following verb. Hale further suggests that serial verb constructions are one single unit and that one or more verbs in the construction normally undergo lexical process and function as a modifier of the first predicate (Hale, 1991:8-12). Schiller's classification of serial verb constructions is similar to those of Foley and Olson, and Hale. Either a subject or an object argument can be shared by verbs in serial verb constructions (Schiller, 1991:30-31). Dealing with serial verb constructions of South-East Asian languages, Clark (1992:147-148) defines serial verb constructions as constructions in which only the subject argument is shared by verbs in the constructions. Wilawan's definition of serial verb constructions is similar to that of Clark's. She only focuses on a serial verb construction which has a shared subject (Wilawan, 1993:133-134).

As in other languages in South-East Asia, serial verb constructions\(^{17}\) are productive in Khmer. Serial verb constructions are defined in this study as structures in which verbs occurring in sequence without any linker denote one single unit. Examples (257) - (264) present some types of Khmer serial verb constructions.\(^{18}\) These types of serial verb constructions are adapted from Baker's classification of serial verb constructions in the Kwa languages of West Africa (Baker, 1991:79-81).

257) nìæìi qaŋkuy niw knoŋ bantup  
Nieree sit be in room  
(‘Nieree sat in the room.’)  

258) kōat rūst mōk dal pīēah  
he run come arrive house  
(‘He ran back to the house.’)  

---

\(^{17}\)There has been a good deal of research on Khmer serial verb constructions. For more detail, see section 1.3: Review of the literature on the Khmer language.

\(^{18}\)It should be noted at the first stage that the study of serial verb constructions in Khmer is beyond the scope of this research and that the purpose of this discussion is simply to differentiate controlled complements from serial verb constructions.
259) niəriiqəŋkuy sasei sambat
Nieree sit write letter
'Nieree sat writing a letter.' (Manner)$^{19}$

260) niəriibəohsamaqt pəəh
Nieree sweep clean house
'Nieree cleaned the house.' (Causative)$^{20}$

261) niəriibəohsqaat ptəəh
Nieree sweep house clean
'Nieree swept the house clean.' (Resultative)

262) kəəttvəəmhoup ləəq
he do food sell
'He cooked food to sell (it).' (Purposive)

263) kəətyəək kambatcaq kmaekrahaam
he takknife stab Khmer Rouge
'He took a knife to kill the Khmer Rouge.' (Instrumental)$^{21}$

264) kəət tɨɨmhoup prakeenlook əəq
he buy food give22 monk
'He bought food for the monk.' (Benefactive)$^{23}$

The surface string associated with serial verb constructions, as illustrated in
(257) - (260), is similar to that produced by a complement-taking predicate followed by
a subject-controlled complement, in (265) - (268).

265) kəətchup cuəaq baarəyhaəy
he stop smoke cigarette already
'He stops smoking already.'

---

$^{19}$It is debatable whether this sentence denotes one single unit or a co-ordinate sentence. In this study, however, this sentence is interpreted as one single unit.

$^{20}$Khmer causative construction can be expressed in different structures. Some examples of causative constructions in Khmer are illustrated in section 6.3.4: Other functions of the form gaoy. In example (260), the predicate samaqat 'to clean' is derived from the adjective sqaat 'to be clean' and the infix -am-.

$^{21}$Schiller, however, considers examples similar to this sentence a purposive serial verb construction rather than an instrumental one. He argues that an instrumental noun phrase in Khmer is marked by a preposition (Schiller, 1991:111, 124).

$^{22}$The predicate prakeen 'to give' is only used with monks. Khmer has a number of predicates meaning 'to give'. For ordinary people, gaoy or cuun is used. The predicate cuun is used with someone older or in the higher position than the subject referent.

$^{23}$Schiller (1991:118) also considers that a benefactive noun phrase in Khmer is indicated by the preposition samrap 'for'. However, there is a different implication when a benefactive noun phrase is marked by a verb gaoy or verbs with similar meaning and the preposition samrap. For more details, see section 6.3.4: Other functions of the form gaoy.
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The surface string associated with serial verb constructions, in (261) - (264) is comparable to that produced by a complement-taking predicate preceding an object-controlled complement, in (269) - (271).

Some characteristics of serial verb constructions are also similar to those of controlled complements. As illustrated in (272), a subject-controlled complement preceded by a commitment predicate sanyaa 'to promise' can be negated.

Examples (273) and (274) show that the verbal structure following the first verb in the resultative type of serial verb constructions can also be negated.

On his discussion of the typology of serial verb constructions, Schiller (1990:396; 1991:154) claims that the Khmer sentences, cited here as (275) and (276), have the same interpretation.
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275) koun baoh ptēǝh sʔaat
child sweep house clean
'The child sweeps the house clean.' (Schiller, 1990:396, (8.a))

276) koun baoh samʔaat ptēǝh
child sweep clean(caus) house
'The child sweeps the house clean.' (Schiller, 1990:396, (8.b))

According to my informants, these two sentences belong to different types of serial verb constructions. The first sentence is a resultative sentence meaning 'The child sweeps the house clean' while the second one is a causative construction and just has the meaning 'The child cleans the house'. When the second sentence is used, it does not necessarily mean that the house will be clean after the child cleans it. Moreover, the negator min can be inserted before sqaat 'clean' in the first sentence or (275), as shown in (273) above, but min cannot be inserted before the second verb of the causative construction or (276). This is exemplified in (277).

277) *koun baoh min samʔaat ptēǝh
child sweep not clean house

As shown in (278) - (283), the verbal structure following the first verb of other serial verb construction types cannot be negated. Nevertheless, the grammaticality judgements of Khmer speakers vary. The symbol * before the examples indicates that they are ungrammatical when the negator min is inserted before the verbal structure. Although examples with the symbol ? are understood, they denote two sequential events and therefore are not serial verb constructions.

278) *niǝrii qǝŋkuy min niw knon bantup
Nieree sit not be in room

279) ?kɔt rùst min mook dal ptēǝh
he run not come arrive house
'He ran (but) did not come to the house.'

280) ?niǝrii qǝŋkuy min twǝǝ qwǝǝ sah
Nieree sit not do what at all
'Nieree sat and did nothing.'

281) ?kɔt twǝǝ mhoup min luǝq
he do food not sell
'He cooked food (but) not for sell.'

282) *kɔt yɔck kambɔt min caq kmae krahoam
he take knife not stab Khmer Rouge

283) *kɔt tın mhoup min prakeen look san
he buy food not give monk

As shown in (284) and (285), a subject-controlled complement preceded by a commitment predicate can be modified by the irrealis marker nin. The insertion of the
irrealis marker indicates the potential mood.

284) niərii sanyaa niŋ cam cindaa qae pəaa
Nieree promise IrIr wait Chinda at market
'Nieree promised to wait for Chinda at the market.'

285) yəəŋ stəɔqstəii niŋ kəɔy luy səŋ ətəə
we hesitate IrIr borrow money build house
'We are hesitating to borrow the money to build a house.'

When the verbal structure following the first verb in serial verb constructions is modified by the irrealis marker, as illustrated in (286) - (291), some are ungrammatical and others can be understood as involving two sequential events.

286) *niərii qaŋkuy niŋ niw knəŋ bəntuŋ
Nieree sit IrIr be in room
287) *koɔt rəaat niŋ məɔk dal ətəə
he run IrIr come arrive house
288) ?niərii qaŋkuy niŋ səsəi sambat
Nieree sit IrIr write letter
'Nieree sat down (in order to) write a letter.'
289) ?koɔt təəɔ mhoup niŋ luyəŋ
he do food IrIr sell
'He cooked the food (in order to) sell (it).'
290) ?koɔt yəɔk kəmbat niŋ caŋ kmae krəaam
he take knife IrIr stab Khmer Rouge
'He took a knife (in order to) stab the Khmer Rouge.'
291) ?koɔt təni mhoup niŋ prəəken look səŋ
he buy food IrIr give monk
'He bought the food (in order to) give (it) to the monk.'

As serial verb constructions are similar to the strings produced by a complement-taking predicate and a controlled complement, some linguists consider the controlled complements one type of serial verb construction. For instance, Mikami (1979:95-117) analyses Khmer controlled complements preceded by the matrix predicate as one type of serial verb construction.

Wilawan (1993) discusses Khmer serial verb construction and analyses a regent verb (the first verb) of examples (292) - (294) below, as being followed by a dependent complement verb. The transcription in examples (292) - (294) has been revised.

292) wiə daɔ tiə saalaariəŋ
he walk go school
'He walked to school/ He went walking to school.' (Wilawan, 1993:150 (281))
293) *wiɔ yɔɔk ceik tiw ptiwɔh
   he take banana go house
   'He took the banana to the house.' (Wilawan, 1993:158 (301))

294) *wiɔ yɔɔk sakuubaa daaq daŋhaam
   he use scuba breathe
   'He used the scuba diving gear to breathe.' (Wilawan, 1993:160 (307))

Wilawan (1993:136-173) claims that the characteristics of these examples are similar to those of subordinate complement constructions in that the order of the verbs cannot be reversed and the noun phrase following the dependent verb in (292) - (294) can be topicalised.

Nevertheless, it can be argued that serial verb constructions differ from controlled complements. Controlled complements are lexically specified by the matrix predicate whereas verbal structures following the first verb in serial verb constructions are not. When a sentence occurs on its own without a specific situation, a controlled complement cannot be omitted whereas a verbal structure following the first verb in serial verb constructions can. When subject-controlled complements in (265) - (268) are omitted, the sentences are ungrammatical, as shown in (295) - (298).

295) *kɔɔt chup
    he stop

296) *niarii caŋ
    Nieree want

297) *kɔɔt samraacat
    he decide

298) *niarii plic
    Nieree forget

When object-controlled complements of examples (269) - (271) are missing, as illustrated in (299) - (301), examples (299) and (300) are acceptable with ellipsis of an understood argument while (301) is ungrammatical.

---

24When a sentence occurs in an appropriate context, any argument including a complement can be omitted. The complement in a contrastive clause in example (A) is superficially missing whereas example (B) shows that the verbal structure following the first verb in a serial verb construction can also be unexpressed in a contrastive clause.

A) kɔɔm caŋ tiw pɔɔa tae niarii min caŋ j tee
   I want go market but Nieree not want Part
   'I wanted to go to the marker but Nieree didn’t.'

B) kɔɔm tiŋ mbou̯ pʁɔkəŋ lʊok sɔŋ tae niarii min baan tiŋ j tee
   I buy food give monk but Nieree not Past buy Part
   'I bought the food for the monk but Nieree didn’t.'
However, verbal structures following the first verb in serial verb constructions are not lexically specified by the first predicate. Therefore, they can be omitted. When verbal structures of examples (257) - (264) are omitted, as shown in (302) - (307), the sentences are still grammatical. Examples which share the same matrix predicate are repeated once. For example, the matrix predicates of examples (257) and that of (259) are the same, they are presented as (302).

302) nigrii qaľkuy
Nieree sit
'Nieree sat down.'

303) kōst ruat
he run
'He ran.'

304) nigrii baoh pteah
Nieree sweep house
'Nieree swept the house.'

305) kōst twač mhoup
he do food
'He cooked food.'

306) kōst yōok kambat
he take knife
'He took a knife.'

307) kōst tiľ mhoup
he buy food
'He bought (some) food.'

When the first verb in Wilawan's examples occurs in a sentence without its dependent verb, as shown in (308) - (310), the sentences are still grammatical. This shows that dependent verbs in examples (292) - (294) do not function as complements.

25 If the predicate kahhaw is substituted by another object-controlled predicate haw 'to call', the sentence is grammatical but it means 'The Khmer Rouge called for the attention of the people'. It does not have a manipulative implication.
There is another distinction between an object-controlled complement and the comparable serial verb constructions. The matrix object preceding an object-controlled complement can be passivised. Examples (185) - (188) which are discussed in section 5.3.1 are repeated here as (311) - (314).

311) niərii trəw kee qaːcən̄ tiw cuəp meetəap
Nieree Pass they invite go meet commander
‘Nieree was invited to meet the commander.’

312) niərii trəw tolaakaa haw tiw suə comlaaey
Nieree Pass judge call go ask answer
‘Nieree was called for questioning.’

313) praciaːuŋ trəw kmae krahaam kahhaw tiw twəɕ srae
people Pass Khmer Rouge call go do ricefield
‘The people were called to work in the ricefield.’

314) sot trəw puəq maq babuəl tiw luə luy
Sot Pass friend persuade go steal money
‘Sot was persuaded to steal some money.’

However, the matrix object in serial verb constructions in examples (261) - (264), cannot undergo passivisation in Khmer. This is illustrated in (315) - (318).

315) *ptə ah trəw niərii baoh sqaat
house Pass Nieree sweep clean

316) *mhoup trəw kəst twəɕ ləɕq
food Pass he do sell

317) *kambət trəw kəst yəok caq kmae krahaam
knife Pass he take stab Khmer Rouge

318) *mhoup trəw kəst tiŋ prakeen look səŋ
food Pass he buy give monk

As noted in section 5.3.1, the passive structure with the predicate qaːcən̄ ‘to invite’, in example (311), seems to be influenced by the western passive construction. Nevertheless, it is acceptable. Khmer speakers, however, do not accept the passive
structure of serial verb constructions, as shown in (315) - (318) and consider these examples inappropriate.

To conclude, although the surface strings produced by a complement-taking predicate followed by a controlled complement are similar to those associated with serial verb constructions, controlled complements are different from verbal structures in serial verb constructions. Controlled complements are lexically specified by the matrix predicate and cannot be omitted whereas verbal structures following the first verb in serial verb constructions are not. In addition, the matrix object followed by an object-controlled complement can be passivised while it is ungrammatical to passivise the matrix object in serial verb constructions.

5.6 Conclusion

Controlled complements in Khmer are complements of which the subject is unexpressed and is always controlled by an argument of the matrix clause. There are two types of controlled complements – subject-controlled complements and object-controlled complements. The unexpressed subject of subject-controlled complements is locally controlled by the matrix subject whereas the unexpressed subject of object-controlled complements is controlled by the matrix object. In LFG, the control equation specified in the lexical entry of the complement-taking predicate indicates which matrix argument controls the unexpressed complement subject.

Subject-controlled predicates are classified into aspectual predicates, commitment predicates, desiderative predicates and achievement predicates. The manipulative predicates which can be followed by object-controlled complements are qaícān 'to invite', haw 'to call', kahhaw 'to order' and babuál 'to persuade'. Other manipulative predicates, however, are followed by complements containing the non-predicate qaoy. The discussion of complements containing the non-predicate qaoy will be discussed in Chapter 6.

A subject-controlled complement following a commitment predicate can be modified by the irrealis marker nin. The insertion of the irrealis marker indicates the potential mood, not the future tense. A subject-controlled complement following some predicates, can also be negated. Unlike subject-controlled complements, object-controlled complements can neither be modified by an auxiliary nor be negated. The tee particle cannot be inserted either before subject-controlled complements or before object-controlled complements. The tee particle can only occur at the end of the sentence. The thaa complementiser cannot precede subject-controlled complements or object-controlled complements either. Nevertheless, some commitment predicates can be
followed by either a subject-controlled complement or an S-like complement with a complementiser. When these predicates are followed by a subject-controlled complement, the complement subject must be unexpressed and be coreferential with the matrix subject. If the predicates subcategorise for an S-like complement with a complementiser, the complement subject can be expressed and it is not necessarily coreferential with the matrix subject. The distribution of the characteristics of subject-controlled and object-controlled complements are summarised in Table 5.1.

The surface strings produced by a controlled complement following a complement-taking predicate are similar to those associated with serial verb constructions. However, controlled complements are lexically specified by the matrix predicate whereas verbal structures of serial verb constructions are not. In addition to this, the matrix object preceding an object-controlled complement can be passivised whereas the matrix object in serial verb constructions cannot undergo passivisation.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characteristics of controlled complement</th>
<th>Subject-controlled complements</th>
<th>Object-controlled complements</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Auxiliary insertion</td>
<td>Irrealis only</td>
<td>−</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Negator insertion</td>
<td>−</td>
<td>−</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Preceded by the tee particle</td>
<td>−</td>
<td>−</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Presence of a complementiser</td>
<td>−</td>
<td>−</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5.1: The distribution of characteristics of controlled complements
Chapter 6

Qaoy and its usage in complements

6.1 Introduction

This chapter presents a discussion of the form qaoy and its usage in complement constructions. There are a number of homophonous forms of qaoy. The main verbs qaoy have various meanings, including a common meaning 'to give'. The meanings of the main verbs qaoy can be differentiated by the arguments which qaoy subcategorises for. The main verb qaoy 'to have someone do something; to allow' will be focused in this chapter. This meaning of the verb qaoy plays an important role in the discussion of complements containing qaoy. Classes of complement-taking predicates which can subcategorise for complements containing qaoy include manipulative predicates, utterance predicates, desiderative predicates and commitment predicates.

As no one has studied the form qaoy and its usage in complements in detail, I will first review relevant studies of similar structures in two other South-East Asian languages – Hmong and Thai (section 6.2). This is followed by a discussion of functions and meanings of the form qaoy (section 6.3). In this section, the function of qaoy as a main verb is focused. To begin the analysis of the usage of the form qaoy in complement constructions, general observations of complements containing qaoy are presented (section 6.4). Complement-taking predicates which can be followed by a complement containing qaoy are listed in section 6.4.1. Section 6.4.2 presents a comparison of the form qaoy and the form thaa – the true complementiser in Khmer.

Section 6.5 presents the analysis of the usage of qaoy in complement constructions. I will propose that the form qaoy in complement constructions can be classified into the predicate qaoy and the non-predicate qaoy. Section 6.5.1 discusses the predicate qaoy in complement constructions. In section 6.5.2, it is argued that the form qaoy has undergone grammaticalisation and is a non-predicate verb. Section 6.5.3 discusses the combination of the non-predicate qaoy and the predicate qaoy.
Although superficially there is only one form of qaoy, there exist two forms of qaoy in the f-structure.

A controlled complement following object-controlled predicates discussed in Chapter 5, can optionally contain qaoy; this is discussed in section 6.6. The function of the form qaoy in S-like complements with the thaa complementiser is examined in section 6.7. Section 6.8 and section 6.9 present a discussion of the predicates soum and cuay respectively. The conclusion of the chapter is presented in section 6.10.

6.2 Review of relevant research

Before I present a discussion of the form qaoy and its usage in complements, some relevant studies in two other South-East Asian languages – Hmong and Thai – will be reviewed. The form kom in Hmong and the form hay in Thai can occur in complement constructions similar to the form qaoy in Khmer. In reviewing these issues, four main questions are addressed.

a) When the form kom in Hmong and the form hay in Thai function as the main verb, which arguments do they subcategorise for?

b) What is the word class of the form kom in Hmong and the form hay in Thai when they occur in complement constructions?

c) When the matrix predicate is followed by an object as well as a complement containing kom in Hmong or hay in Thai, is the coreferentiality between the matrix object and the complement subject following the form kom in Hmong and the form hay in Thai obligatory?

d) How many interpretations are possible for these constructions?

6.2.1 Complements containing kom in Hmong

The form kom in Hmong can be a main verb meaning 'to order' (Jaisser, 1984:42). Jaisser provides many tests to show that kom as in (1), is a verb. These criteria include the ability to be negated, the ability to be modified by an auxiliary, and the ability to be modified by the polar question particle.

1) kuv kom nws mus
   I order him go
   'I ordered him to go./ I told him to go.' (Jaisser, 1984:43 (1))

However, Jaisser does not show which arguments the predicate kom 'to order' subcategorises for.
When the form kom is preceded by other main verbs, it introduces an embedded clause. Jaisser considers the embedded clause containing kom as a complement. She argues that the form kom introducing complements does not share any abilities with the predicate kom. Therefore, Jaisser analyses the form kom in (2) and (3), as a complementiser (p.48-51).

2) kuv xav kom nej ua twjywm I want COMP you be quiet 'I want you to be quiet.' (Jaisser, 1984:51 (25))

3) kuv tsis yuam kom nws mus I Neg force COMP he go 'I don't force him to go.' (Jaisser, 1984:52 (28))

Jaisser discusses the fact that the matrix object can be coreferential with the complement subject and either of them can be unexpressed, as shown in (4) and (5).

4) kuv ntuas lis kom mus I advise Lee COMP go 'I advised Lee to go.' (Jaisser, 1984:63 (1.a))

5) kuv ntuas kom lis mus I advise COMP Lee go 'I advised Lee to go.' (Jaisser, 1984:63 (1.b))

In addition, both the matrix object and the complement subject can occur in the same sentence, as in (6).

6) kuv ntuas lis kom lis mus I advise Lee COMP Lee go 'I advised Lee to go.' (Jaisser, 1984:63 (2))

To account for this phenomenon, Jaisser proposes the "Random Pronoun Deletion Rule". This rule allows the coreferential noun phrases either in the matrix object or the complement subject position to be deleted (p.74).

However, Jaisser also notes that in some examples, the complement subject is not necessarily coreferential with the matrix object. According to Jaisser, the empty subject of the complement following kom in (7), can refer to either the unexpressed matrix object or someone mentioned previously. The unexpressed matrix object in (8), can be coreferential with the subject of the complement following kom or can refer to someone mentioned previously (p.77). Despite this fact, the Random Pronoun Deletion Rule can be applied to these examples.

7) koj mus qhia kom ø paub you go inform COMP know (Jaisser, 1984:77 (20.b))
8) koj mus qhia ø kom lawv paub
you go inform COMP they know
‘Go and let them know.’ (LIT: Go and tell them so that they know) (Jaisser, 1984:77 (20.c))

To sum up, information on Hmong shows that the form kom can function as a verb ‘to order’. However, it is unclear which arguments this predicate subcategorises for. When the form kom introduces a complement proposition, Jaisser analyses it as a complementiser. It does not share any verbal characteristics with the predicate kom. Although Jaisser discusses in detail the coreferentiality of the matrix object and the complement subject, this coreferentiality is not obligatory, as seen in the examples. According to Jaisser, there is only one kom complement construction which is discussed in her study.

6.2.2 Complements containing hay in Thai

The form hay in Thai can be a verb meaning ‘to give; to allow; to let; to have someone do something’ (Haas, 1964:596; Noss, 1964:159-162). As a main verb, hay has been studied in detail both syntactically and semantically. The problem of identifying the word class of the form hay in complement constructions, and the problem of explaining the coreferentiality between the noun phrase before and the noun phrase after the form hay have also been discussed at length over the past twelve years. I will be concentrating on a review of three major works which have been done on an embedded clause containing hay in Thai. In addition, I will also be referring to a number of other minor works which have been done on this subject.

Sriphen (1982:111-122) argues that the main verb hay is a manipulative verb. It involves a situation where the matrix subject referent gets someone to do something. Sriphen further discusses Thai verb phrases where hay follows the main verb of the construction. She analyses hay in that construction as a complementiser since phonetically it is unstressed as opposed to the verb hay. Sriphen also argues that hay in this position is semantically insignificant and syntactically loses all predicative characteristics (p.144-159). Sriphen claims that the subject of the verb after the hay complementiser is obligatorily coreferential with the matrix object (p.225). According to Sriphen, examples (9.A) - (9.D) below, have the same interpretation. The deletion of Dam in either position is optional. In addition, Dam can occur in both the matrix

---

1 Huffman (1973) has noted many similarities between Thai and Khmer structures. These include the functional parallelism between hay in Thai and qao in Khmer (p.498).

2 Ransom (1988:371-372) also considers hay in Thai as a complementiser for an action complement.
object and the complement subject positions, as in (9.A) or Dam in both positions can be omitted, as in (9.D). Examples (9.B) and (9.C) show that the noun phrase in either position can be omitted.

9.A) đẹn bọk đam hät đam pay
Dang tell Dam HAY Dam go
'Dang told Dam to go.'

9.B) đẹn bọk đam hät — pay
Dang tell Dam HAY go

9.C) đẹn bọk — hậu đam pay
Dang tell HAY Dam go

9.D) đẹn bọk — hậu — pay
Dang tell HAY go (Sriphen, 1982:225)

Not all Thai linguists agree with Sriphen’s proposals, however. Sereechareonsatit (1984:224) argues against Sriphen’s claim by pointing out that the meaning of words in Thai cannot be distinguished by the stress pattern. Moreover, later works on Thai provide evidence that hậu in the hậu constructions can be negated. Thus, hậu retains verbal characteristics (Thepkanjana, 1986:68-69). Concerning the coreferentiality between the matrix object and the complement subject following hậu, some examples from Ekniyom’s3 and Thepkanjana’s works show a contradiction to Sriphen’s claim. In one of Ekniyom’s examples, as shown in (10), both the matrix object and the subject of the clause following hậu can occur overtly and have different referents.

10) ph5: kamcháp mê: hậu lụ:klụ:k pra? phit tua
Dad emphasise Mum HAY child i behave self
hậu ø pen khon di:
HAY øi be person good
'Dad emphasised to Mum (to see to it) that the children behave themselves as good people.' (Ekniyom, 1982:86 (101))

The additional implication in Thepkanjana’s example, as in (11), suggests that the matrix object is not coreferential with the subject of the clause following hậu.

11) suri: takon hậu suda: pọt pratu:
Suri shout HAY Suda open door
'Suri shouted so that Suda would open the door.' (Suri did not necessarily shout to Suda.) (Thepkanjana, 1986:64 (83))

Thepkanjana (1986:22-46) analyses the main verb hậu based on its semantic properties as an indirect causation verb. The main verb hậu requires the referent of

---

3Although Ekniyom (1982:83) realises that the form hậu introducing the hậu complements can be negated, for the purpose of her analysis, she assumes that it is a complementiser.
the subject to be human. The matrix subject referent must have an intention to arrange for something to happen or to get someone to do something. When compared with other causative verbs in her discussion, the subject referent of  hay is "passive" as this subject referent only gives or allows his permission for someone to perform something. The subject referent of  hay himself does not do the action.

Thepkanjana illustrates that utterance predicates in Thai can be followed by a complement containing  hay. In this position,  hay is analysed as a verb since it can be negated. Thepkanjana considers an utterance predicate followed by the  hay construction, as in (12) below, to consist of three propositions: (a) the matrix subject referent said something, (b) the matrix subject referent's action caused or might have caused something and (c) the result is that the complement subject referent performed the action (p.65).

12) suri: phūt  hay suda: pay hā: mō:
Suri speak HAY Suda go find doctor
'Suri spoke in such a way that Suda would go to see a doctor.' (Thepkanjana, 1986:64 (85))

I assume from the proposition (b) that Thepkanjana proposes that the matrix subject functions as the controller of the unexpressed subject of the verb  hay. However, some of her examples are contradictory to this claim. As illustrated in (13) below (and also in (11) above), Thepkanjana herself shows that the matrix subject need not be the controller of the unexpressed subject of the predicate  hay. Her additional implication suggests that there can be someone else arranging Suda's action.

Suri ask HAY Suda do dinner
'Suri asked for Suda to prepare dinner.' (Suri might have asked someone to arrange Suda's doing it.) (Thepkanjana, 1986:64 (82))

Thepkanjana further discusses non-implicative verbs4 followed by the  hay construction, which she interprets as involving causation (p.75). The subject referent of non-implicative verbs has some influence or some effect on the accomplishment of the complement action performed by another subject referent in the sentence (p.73). For example,

14) suri: yā:k  hay suda: tham ṇā:n nā:k
Suri want HAY Suda do work hard
'Suri wanted Suda to work hard.' (Thepkanjana, 1986:72 (95))

Thepkanjana claims that  hay in this position can also be negated, as shown in (15).

---

4Non-implicative verbs do not imply the truth value of the complement clause.
The negation of 罇 amsung implies irony.

15) suri: รัก ไม่ ทำ ดี Sudi ทำงาน ยาก
Suri want not HAY Suda do work hard
'Suri wanted not to let Suda work hard.' (Thepkanjana, 1986:72 (99))

Thepkanjana thus considers 罇 amsung in this position as a verb 'to let'; its unexpressed subject is controlled by the matrix subject (p.83-84). Thepkanjana therefore proposes to translate the form 罇 amsung in this position as 'to let', as shown in (16) (and in (15) above).

16) suri: รัก ทำ ดี Sudi ดู หนัง
Suri want HAY Suda go look movie
'Suri wanted to let Suda go to a movie.' (Thepkanjana, 1986:84 (121))

Within Government and Binding framework, Pingkarawat (1989) applies the control theory to account for control relationships in Thai. Pingkarawat claims that the main verbs 罇 amsung 'to give' and 'to allow' subcategorise for the same arguments; a subject, a direct object and an indirect object (p.163). When the main verb 罇 amsung 'to allow' is followed by a complement clause, as in (17), the complement clause which is underlined functions as a direct object.

17) นุ่น ทำ ดี Phim resign
Nuan HAY Phim resign
'Nuan had Phim resign.'

Furthermore, Pingkarawat argues that there is an empty indirect object preceding the complement clause, as shown in (18). This empty indirect object is coreferential with the complement subject (p.165).

18) นุ่น ทำ [Phim resign]
Nuan HAY Phim resign
'Nuan had Phim resign.' (Pingkarawat, 1989:165 (12'))

Pingkarawat applies a "Pragmatic principle" to account for the coreferential relationship between the empty indirect object and the complement subject. She defines the "Pragmatic principle" as a principle that assigns an antecedent in the discourse or in the context to an element (p.77). By this principle, Pingkarawat analyses the complement subject or 'Phim' in (18) as the pragmatic antecedent of the empty indirect object (p.166). Pingkarawat also claims that 罇 amsung 'to allow' is a thematic control verb which assigns control of the embedded subject to the empty indirect matrix object (p.166). According to Pingkarawat, the thematic control is a type of control which can apply to a lexical noun phrase as well as to a pro (p.133). Nevertheless, Pingkarawat does not provide any example in which 罇 amsung 'to allow' can be followed by an overt indirect object as well as the complement clause.

Pingkarawat further analyses an embedded clause containing 罇 amsung following
the predicate such as บอก 'to tell' as an adjunct (p.175) while an embedded clause containing hay following ยัง 'to want' as a complement (p.190). The embedded clause containing  hay in examples (19) and (20) is an adjunct.

19) นูน บอก เล็ก [e1 หาย e2 [e3 วิน หุก วัน]]
Nuan tell Lek HAY run every day
'Nuan told Lek to run every day.' (Pingkarawat, 1989:167 (9'))

20) นูน บอก e1 [e2 หาย e3 [เล็ก วิน หุก วัน]]
Nuan tell HAY Lek run every day
'Nuan told Lek to run every day.' (Pingkarawat, 1989:167 (13))

In contrast, the embedded clause containing  hay, as in (21), is a complement.

21) นูน ยัง [e1 หาย e2 [e3 ล่าม คาม]]
Nuan want HAY wash dishes
'Nuan wanted to have someone wash the dishes.'
OR
'Nuan wanted to have the dishes washed.' (Pingkarawat, 1989:190 (35))

Her argument is that there cannot be another noun phrase functioning as the object of ยัง 'to want'. However, the verb บอก 'to tell' can take an embedded clause containing  hay as well as another two object noun phrases, as shown in (22). Therefore, the embedded clause containing  hay following บอก 'to tell' is not a complement of the matrix predicate.

22) นูน บอก ขวามคิ่น เล็ก [e1 หาย e2 [e3 วิน หุก วัน]]
Nuan tell truth Lek HAY run every day
'Nuan told the truth to Lek to have her run every day.' (Pingkarawat, 1989:168 (15))

Pingkarawat proposes the principles of Argument Inheritance to account for the control relationship between arguments of the embedded hay clause and arguments in the matrix clause. Unlike control theory, this principle allows multiple antecedent assignment which can apply with a pro both in the subject position and in the object position (p.172-174). She explains how empty noun phrases in example (20) above, are assigned their antecedents in the hay clause as follows:

"... Now I will show how all the empty NPs in (13) [Example (20) in this study] are assigned their antecedents. e1 is assigned an antecedent by Pragmatic principles. It can take any NP in the context as its antecedent as long as this is not prohibited by the

5 It should be noted that this is the restriction of the predicate itself. The predicate ยัง 'to want' in Thai, unlike to want in English, never subcategorises for an object noun phrase.
DJR (Disjoint Reference). Thus e₁ cannot take nuan as its antecedent since this is prohibited by the DJR. However, nothing prevents e₁ from taking lēk as its antecedent. In fact, lēk is the only available antecedent found in context. Assume that e₁ takes lēk as its antecedent. Now, since the embedded h ayır clause is an adjunct to the matrix VP, the principle of Argument Inheritance will apply and assign nuan as an antecedent of e₂, and assign e₁ as an antecedent of e₃. Since h ayır is a thematic control verb, the complement subject lēk is assigned control to e₃. Since e₃ is coreferent with e₁ through the principle of Argument Inheritance, and e₁ is coreferent with lēk through Pragmatic principles, e₃ and lēk are thus coreferential and the thematic control is well observed." (Pingkarawat, 1989:179)

Unlike Pingkarawat's analysis, Hoonchamlong (1991:221-222) proposes different subcategorisations for the two meanings of the main verb h ayır in Thai. The main verb h ayır to give' subcategorises for a subject, a direct object and an indirect object whereas h ayır to allow; to have someone do something' subcategorises for a subject and a sentential complement. Nevertheless, neither Pingkarawat nor Hoonchamlong provides a detailed analysis of the main verb h ayır. In addition to this, Hoonchamlong agrees with Thepkanjana's and Pingkarawat's arguments that h ayır preceded by a manipulative predicate can be negated and has a verbal behaviour (p.223). She further notes that h ayır in complements containing h ayır has the generalised meaning of 'transferring' (p.224).

To summarise, research on Thai provides various answers for the questions addressed at the beginning of section 6.2. There are different approaches to the analysis of the form h ayır in an embedded clause. Some linguists (such as Sriphen, 1982) analyse the form h ayır in an embedded clause as a complementiser whereas others (Thepkanjana, 1986; Pingkarawat, 1989; Hoonchamlong, 1991) consider that the form h ayır in this position is a verb. Although Sriphen (1982) claims that the coreferentiality between the matrix object and the noun phrase following h ayır is obligatory, examples from other research show that the coreferentiality is not necessarily obligatory (Ekniyom, 1982; Thepkanjana, 1986). Except Pingkarawat, who argues that a construction containing h ayır can be either a complement or an adjunct, most studies consider a construction containing h ayır as a complement and there is only one type of complement containing h ayır.

In Khmer, except Huffman (1973) who proposes that embedded clauses containing qaov in Khmer and h ayır in Thai share some similar characteristics, no one
has studied the function of the form qaoy and its usage in complements in detail. In my study, I will first discuss meanings and functions of the form qaoy (section 6.3). The analysis in this section will focus on the main verbs qaoy. Some pieces of evidence will be provided to show that the main verb qaoy in Khmer can subcategorise for different arguments depending on the meaning. This is followed by a discussion of the form qaoy in complement constructions (section 6.4). When qaoy occurs in an embedded clause, it is argued that qaoy is a verb, not a complementiser. This treatment is similar to the analysis proposed by Thepkanjana (1986), Pingkarawat (1989) and Hoonchamlong (1991). Furthermore, I will propose two forms of qaoy in complement constructions: the predicate qaoy and the non-predicate qaoy (section 6.5). I will show that Pingkarawat's analysis of hay in an embedded clause in Thai does not work for the form qaoy in Khmer. An embedded clause containing qaoy in Khmer is a complement, not an adjunct.

6.3 Meanings and functions of the form qaoy

The form qaoy is a verb first found in a Khmer inscription dated at 611 A.D. (Jenner, 1982:432). There are a number of homophonous forms of qaoy. The meanings and functions of qaoy vary depending on its position and the context. I will first present the meanings of the main verb qaoy. This is followed by a discussion of other functions of the form qaoy.

6.3.1 Main verb qaoy 'to give'

Jenner (1982:432) proposes that the first meaning of qaoy is 'to give'. In this meaning, qaoy subcategorises for a subject, an object2 and an object, as demonstrated in (23) - (25).

23) kōt qaoy baay kñom haay
   he give rice I already
   'He gave me some rice already.'

24) ndaay qaoy luy koun
   mother give money child
   'The mother gave (her) child a sum of money.'

As noted in section 2.3.2.3, the theme object of ditransitive verbs in Khmer is referred to as OBJ2 and the recipient object as OBJ. The order of these objects is fixed; the theme object comes before the recipient object. If the order of objects is reversed, the sentence is ungrammatical, for instance

A) *kōt qaoy kñom baay
   he give I rice
25) kñom qaoy luy (tiw)7 mənəh kraa
   I give money (go) person poor
   'I gave the poor a sum of money.'

As Khmer is a pro-drop language, it is possible for one object or both objects
of the main verb qaoy 'to give' to be unexpressed. As shown in (26), the object of the
main verb qaoy in example (23) is omitted whereas example (27) shows that the
object2 of the main verb qaoy in example (23) is unexpressed.

26) kōst qaoy baay haøy
   he give rice already
   'He gave (someone) some rice already.'

27) kōst qaoy kñom haøy
   he give I already
   'He gave me (something) already.'

Example (28) shows that both objects of the predicate qaoy 'to give' can be unrealised.

28) kōst qaoy haøy
   he give already
   'He gave (someone something) already.'

The verb qaoy 'to give' can be followed by a purposive adjunct. The
recipient object (of qaoy) is the preferable antecedent of the unexpressed subject of
the following purposive adjunct. In (29), kñom 'I' functions as the subject of pēəq 'to
wear' and chum 'Chum' in (30) and koun 'child' in (31) are the subject of ŋam 'to eat'
and tiw tiñ baay 'to buy some food' respectively.

29) kōst qaoy qaaw kñom pēəq
   he give shirt I wear
   'He gave me a shirt to wear.'

30) niərii qaoy baay chum ŋam
    Nieree give rice Chum eat
    'Nieree gave Chum some food (rice) to eat.'

31) mdaay qaoy luy koun tiñ baay
    mother give money child buy rice
    'The mother gave her child a sum of money to buy some food (rice).'

There cannot be an overt subject of the purposive adjunct. As shown in (32)
- (34), when there is an overt adjunct subject, the sentences are ungrammatical.

32) *kōst qaoy qaaw kñom niərii pēəq
    he give shirt I Nieree wear

7tiw originally means 'to go', can be optionally inserted, and functions similar to a preposition
indicating a recipient.
The semantic of the situation in examples (29) - (31) above prevents the matrix subject from being a possible antecedent of the unexpressed subject of the purposive adjunct. For instance, example (31) cannot have the meaning *'The mother gave her child a sum of money for the mother to buy some food (rice)'*. However, in an appropriate context, the matrix subject can also be an antecedent of the unexpressed adjunct subject as well. In (35), either the recipient object or the matrix subject can be interpreted as an antecedent of the unexpressed adjunct subject.

35) kñom qaoy luy nēq kroa twē tian
   I give money the poor do merit
   'I gave the poor a sum of money (for him) to donate (to a charity).'
   OR
   'I gave the poor a sum of money (in order) to gain merit.'

In order to make the sentence clear that only the matrix subject is the antecedent of the adjunct subject, the adverbial complementiser daǔmbay 'in order to' can be added. As illustrated in (36), there is only one meaning for this sentence.

36) kñom qaoy luy nēq kroa daǔmbay twē tian
   I give money the poor in order to do merit
   'I gave the poor a sum of money in order to gain merit.'

The theme object of qaoy 'to give' is normally inanimate and does not control the unexpressed adjunct subject.

The lexical entry of the main verb qaoy 'to give' is given in (37).

37) qaoy: V, (↑PRED) = 'GIVE ⟨(SUBJ) (OBJ2) (OBJ)⟩'.

The c-structure of the main verb qaoy 'to give', as in example (31), is presented in (38).
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The functional annotations in this c-structure can be explained as follows: the functional equation \( \uparrow \text{ADJUNCT}=\downarrow \) above the node VP\(_7\) means that the functional information carried by VP\(_7\) goes into the ADJUNCT part of the f-structure of its mother node VP\(_3\). The equations \( \uparrow \text{OBJ2}=\downarrow \) and \( \uparrow \text{OBJ}=\downarrow \) above the nodes NP\(_5\) and NP\(_6\) indicate that information about the ego nodes NP\(_5\) and NP\(_6\) is information about the OBJ2 and OBJ of the f-structure of the mother node. The annotation \( \uparrow \text{OBJ}=\downarrow \) above the node VP\(_4\) means that information about the ego node VP\(_4\) is the same as information about its mother node. Since the lexical entry for qaoy in VP\(_4\) specifies that qaoy has the PRED value, namely 'GIVE', this PRED value of qaoy is then passed up to VP\(_3\). The equation \( \uparrow \text{OBJ}=\downarrow \) above the node VP\(_3\) means that all functional information carried by the ego node or VP\(_3\) is direct information about its mother node S\(_1\) in the f-structure. Therefore, the PRED value of the node VP\(_4\) is further passed up to S\(_1\) and the grammatical functions OBJ2 of the node NP\(_5\), OBJ of the node NP\(_6\) and ADJUNCT of the node VP\(_7\) are also the grammatical functions of the main clause. The annotation \( \uparrow \text{SUBJ}=\downarrow \) above the node NP\(_2\) indicates that NP\(_2\) bears a particular grammatical function SUBJ with respect to its mother node S\(_1\).

The clause tin baay in the c-structure of example (31) is analysed as an ADJUNCT since it is not subcategorised for by the main verb qaoy. The unexpressed subject of ADJUNCT is controlled by the recipient object of the predicate qaoy. The f-structure of this example is presented as (39).

\[
\begin{array}{c|c}
\text{SUBJ} & \text{PRED 'MOTHER'} \\
\text{PRED} & \text{PRED 'GIVE ((SUBJ) (OBJ2) (OBJ))'} \\
\text{OBJ2} & \text{PRED 'MONEY'} \\
\text{OBJ} & \text{PRED 'CHILD'} \\
\text{ADJUNCT} & \text{PRED 'BUY ((SUBJ) (OBJ))'} \\
& \text{OBJ PRED 'RICE'}
\end{array}
\]

6.3.2 Main verb qaoy 'to have someone do something; to allow'

The main verb qaoy can also mean 'to have someone do something' or 'to allow'. These meanings of the verb qaoy are an extension of the first meaning i.e. 'to give' (Jenner, 1982:432). These two meanings of the manipulative predicate qaoy are differentiated by the context. For instance, the form qaoy in (40) can have two interpretations. The first interpretation suggests that the son did not want to go to school but the father made him go. The second interpretation implies that the father gave permission for his son to attend school. The manipulative verb qaoy does not
have a strong implication of manipulation or command as other manipulative predicates such as banhkham 'to order; to force', bancia 'to order' do. Although examples (41) and (42) can also have two interpretations, the interpretation presented here is the most likely.

40) qəwpuk qaoy koun tiw saalaa
   father Qaoy child go school
   'The father made (his) son go to school.'
   OR
   'The father allowed (his) son go to school.'

41) qəwpuk qaoy koun dam banlae
   father Qaoy child plant vegetable
   'The father had (his) child plant the vegetables.'

42) qəwpuk qaoy koun tiw məal kon
   father Qaoy child go see movie
   'The father allowed (his) child to see the movie.'

There seem to be two possibilities for analysing the underlined proposition or the NP2 - VP2 sequence which is preceded by the main verb qaoy 'to have someone do something; to allow'. Firstly, the NP2 - VP2 sequence can be analysed as a single unit or an S-like complement without a complementiser. Secondly, the NP2 can be interpreted as the object of the main verb qaoy and the VP2 functions as an object-controlled complement.

However, there is a good piece of evidence that the characteristics of the NP2 - VP2 sequence following the main verb qaoy 'to have someone do something; to allow' are similar to those of object-controlled complements discussed in Chapter 5. The NP2 in the NP2 - VP2 sequence following the main verb qaoy can be passivised. Examples (43) and (44) show the passive construction with the main verb qaoy 'to have someone do something; to allow'. There is an implication that the matrix subject referent in (43) and (44), did not want to perform the complement action.

43) yəŋ traw kmae kruhəam qaoy tiw twəə srae
we Pass Khmer Rouge Qaoy go do ricefield
   'We were made to do the work in the ricefield by the Khmer Rouge.'

44) sot traw kee qaoy tiw cuəp meetōəp
   Sot Pass they Qaoy go meet commander
   'Sot was made to meet the commander.'

The fact that the NP2 can be passivised indicates that the NP2 is subcategorised for by the predicate qaoy.

Moreover, the characteristics of the NP2 - VP2 sequence following the main verb qaoy 'to have someone do something; to allow' are similar to those of object-controlled complements. As illustrated in (45) - (47), the VP2 in the NP2 - VP2
sequence following the main verb qaoy cannot be modified by an auxiliary.

45) *qəwpuk qaoy koun nin dam banlae
    father Qaoy child Irrl plant vegetable

46) *qəwpuk qaoy koun baan tiw məəl kon
    father Qaoy child Past go see movie

47) *qəwpuk qaoy koun kampun tiw məəl kon
    father Qaoy child Cont go see movie

However, the main verb qaoy can be modified by an auxiliary, as shown in (48) and (49). The time reference of the NP2 - VP2 sequence is contemporaneous with that of the matrix verb. In (48), the child has not planted the vegetables yet whereas in (49), the child has already gone to see the movie.

48) qəwpuk nin qaoy koun dam banlae
    father Irrl Qaoy child plant vegetable
    'The father will have (his) child plant the vegetables.'

49) qəwpuk baan qaoy koun tiw məəl kon
    father Past Qaoy child go see movie
    'The father allowed (his) child to see the movie.'

The proposition following the predicate qaoy is always positive. The VP2 in the NP2 - VP2 sequence following the main verb qaoy cannot be negated. Examples (50) and (51) are ungrammatical as the negator min is inserted before the VP2.

50) *qəwpuk qaoy koun min dam banlae
    father Qaoy child not plant vegetable

51) *qəwpuk qaoy koun min tiw məəl kon
    father Qaoy child not go see movie

The predicate qaoy itself can be negated, as shown in (52) and (53). When the main verb qaoy is negated, the scope of negation is over the whole sentence. In (52), the child did not plant the vegetables and in (53), the child did not go to see the movie.

52) qəwpuk min qaoy koun dam banlae tee
    father not Qaoy child plant vegetable Part
    'The father did not have (his) child plant the vegetables.'

53) qəwpuk min qaoy koun tiw məəl kon tee
    father not Qaoy child go see movie Part
    'The father did not allow (his) child to see the movie.'

The tee particle cannot be inserted before the NP2 - VP2 sequence following the main verb qaoy, as shown in (54) and (55).

54) *qəwpuk qaoy tee koun dam banlae
    father Qaoy Part child plant vegetable
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55) *qəwpuk qaoy tee koun tiw məał kon
father Qaoy Part child go see movie

However, the tee particle can occur at the end of the sentence. The tee particle in examples (52) and (53) above is the negative particle whereas the tee particle in examples (56) and (57) below functions as the polar question particle.

56) qəwpuk qaoy koun dam bənlae tee
father Qaoy child plant vegetable Part
'Did the father have (his) child plant the vegetables?'

57) qəwpuk qaoy koun tiw məał kon tee
father Qaoy child go see movie Part
'Did the father allow (his) child to see the movie?'

The thaa complementiser cannot be inserted before the NP₂ - VP₂ sequence following the main verb qaoy. If the thaa complementiser is inserted, as illustrated in (58) and (59), the sentences are ungrammatical.

58) *qəwpuk qaoy thaa koun dam bənlae
father Qaoy COMP child plant vegetable

59) *qəwpuk qaoy thaa koun tiw məał kon
father Qaoy COMP child go see movie

In a proper context, the NP₂ - VP₂ sequence following the main verb qaoy can be unexpressed. This is exemplified in (60).

60) niərii caŋ tiw leŋ tikchuu pantae qəwpuk niəŋ
Nieree want go play waterfall but father she
min qaoy
not Qaoy
'Nieree wanted to go to the waterfall but her father did not allow (her to go).'

As Khmer is a pro-drop language, the NP₂ in the NP₂ - VP₂ sequence can be omitted, as shown in (61) and (62). The matrix subject, however, cannot be interpreted as the performer of the complement action.

61) qəwpuk qaoy dam bənlae
father Qaoy plant vegetable
'The father had (someone) plant the vegetables.'

62) qəwpuk qaoy tiw məał kon
father Qaoy go see movie
'The father allowed (someone) to see the movie.'

When only the VP₂ in the NP₂ - VP₂ sequence is omitted, as in (63), the sentence is ungrammatical for the verb qaoy 'to have someone do something; to allow'. Nevertheless, example (63) can be grammatical if the form qaoy means 'to give' and (63) means 'The father gave (his) child (something)'.

55) *qəwpuk qaoy tee koun tiw məał kon
father Qaoy Part child go see movie
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63) *qəwpuk qaoy koun
catfather Qaoy child

As discussed in Chapter 5, it is unacceptable to omit an object-controlled complement. Example (64) illustrates a parallel example of another object-controlled predicate kahhaw 'to call'. Since the object-controlled complement is missing, example (64) is ungrammatical.

64) *kmae krahaam kahhaw praciauon
Khmer Rouge call people

The fact that the VP2 in the NP2 - VP2 sequence following the predicate qaoy cannot be omitted as is an object-controlled complement following other object-controlled predicates suggests that the predicate qaoy 'to have someone do something; to allow' and other object-controlled predicates share the same characteristic. If the complement clause is omitted, its controller must be unexpressed as well.

All characteristics of the NP2 - VP2 sequence following the main verb qaoy 'to have someone do something; to allow' are similar to those of object-controlled complements. The main verb qaoy 'to have someone do something; to allow' is best analysed as an object-controlled predicate. Unlike the main verb qaoy 'to give' which can be followed by an adjunct, the main verb qaoy 'to have someone do something; to allow' subcategorises for an object-controlled complement. The lexical entry of the verb qaoy 'to have someone do something; to allow' can then be as follows:

65) qaoy: V, (↑PRED) = ‘QAQY ((↑SUBJ) (↑OBJ) (↑VCOMP))’
(↑VCOMP SUBJ) = (↑OBJ).

The control equation in the lexical entry of qaoy indicates that the unexpressed complement subject is controlled by the matrix object.

The c-structure of example (41) which is repeated here for convenience as (66), is given in (67).

66) qəwpuk qaoy koun dam banlae
catfather Qaoy child plant vegetable
'The father had (his) child plant the vegetables.'
In contrast to the lexical entry of the verb qaoy 'to give', the lexical entry of the verb qaoy 'to have someone do something; to allow' specifies that the verb qaoy 'to have someone do something; to allow' subcategorises for a VCOMP. VP6 then has the grammatical function of VCOMP. The functional annotations in the c-structure (67) are explained as follows: the equation \( \uparrow \text{VCOMP}=\downarrow \) above the node VP6 indicates that the functional information carried by VP6 goes into the VCOMP part of the f-structure of the mother node VP3. The node NP5 bears a grammatical function OBJ with respect to its mother node VP3. The annotation \( \uparrow \text{OBJ}=\downarrow \) above the node V4 means that information about V4 is equivalent to that of the upper node. Since the form qaoy contains the PRED value, namely 'QAOY', the PRED value of qaoy is passed up to VP3. The equation \( \uparrow \text{SUBJ}=\downarrow \) above the node VP3 indicates that all functional information of VP3 is the same as the functional information about its mother node S1. Therefore, the PRED value of qaoy is the PRED value of the whole sentence. In addition, the grammatical function OBJ carried by NP5 and the grammatical function VCOMP carried by VP6 are also passed up to S1. The equation \( \uparrow \text{SUBJ}=\downarrow \) above the node NP2 shows that all functional information of NP2 goes into the SUBJ part of the f-structure of its mother node S1.

The f-structure of example (66) is as follows:

(68)
\[
\begin{align*}
\text{SUBJ} & \quad \text{PRED 'FATHER'} \\
\text{PREP} & \quad 'QAOY \ll (\text{SUBJ} \text{OBJ} \text{VCOMP})' \\
\text{OBJ} & \quad \text{PRED 'CHILD'} \\
\text{VCOMP} & \quad \text{PRED 'PLANT \ll (\text{SUBJ} \text{OBJ})'} \\
\text{OBJ} & \quad \text{PRED 'VEGETABLE'}
\end{align*}
\]

6.3.3 Jussive qaoy

The form qaoy 'to have someone do something; to allow' has been grammaticalised in the jussive sentence type (called 'injunctive' by Gorgoniiev
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(1966)). Jussive\(^8\) is a subtype of imperative which expresses a will such as a command or a request in all pronouns. As illustrated in (69) - (72), the jussive sentence type in Khmer is marked by the form qaoy.

69) mdaay kmeik kñom pool tæ tæc thaa bæ tik ðah
    mother-in-law I say a little COMP if milk
    mdaay tlay soum qaoy yaηη baan cuàpcum
    mother have value please Qaoy we able meet
    kniø wiñ each other back

   (qañkìaøboh qaøy goun niw tìnìaa)
   'My mother-in-law said abruptly that if there is a bond between mother and child (LIT: if mother's milk has value), may we meet each other again.'

70) sraa qaøy kœø baan dae qaøy tæ wiø liquor what D.M. able as well Qaoy only it
    klaø bæntæc strong a little
   'Any liquor will do, but let it be a little bit strong.'

71) bæc qaæñ koøhæq qaøy qaæñ prlaøñ tìæq if you tell a lie Qaoy you have exam fall
   'If you tell a lie, may you fail the exam.'

72) soum qaøy kòøt bat chiø please Qaoy he disappear sick
   'May he recover (from fever or sickness).'

Other languages such as Yoruba\(^9\) (Bamgbose, 1986:79) or Tagalog (Kroeger, 1991:111) have a particle to mark the jussive or optative sentence type. However, the form qaøy which marks the jussive sentence type in Khmer is a verb.\(^10\) The form qaøy as well as other predicates in the imperative sentence type can be negated by the prohibitive kom whereas pragmatic particles which introduce the imperative sentence type in Khmer cannot. As illustrated in (73) and (74), the prohibitive kom can be inserted before the jussive qaøy.

73) prasoàbøø baøø kbaøt quøun wiøn qaøy
    if elder sibling betray younger sibling back Qaoy
    baøø too-møøøn kom qaøy soq
    elder sibling sorrow don't Qaoy happy

   (tìøøy sneøøhæa)
   'If I betray you, let me be sad and don't let me have any happiness.'

---

\(^8\)This definition is adapted from Lyons (1977:745-748) "... A jussive sentence, then, will be one of a grammatically defined classes of sentences that are characteristically used to issue mands ...." (p.748). Lyons defines "mands" as a general term for commands, demands, requests, entreaties, etc (p.745).

\(^9\)Bamgbose (1986:79) analyses the form kì originally a verb 'to let' as a particle introducing indirect imperatives.

\(^10\)A predicate which occurs in the imperative or the jussive sentence type cannot be modified by an auxiliary.
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74) bag kmae krahoam puam stēeq cam bañ kom
if Khmer Rouge hide halt wait shoot don't
qaoy kast krūhtaşq teşagqah kniçi ... 
Qaoy happen accident all together each other ...
(qoqkişiȝbok qay qoun niw tiinaa)

'If the Khmer Rouge are hiding to shoot us, don't let us have this accident all together ...'

The predicates of examples (75) and (76) which are imperatives, can also be negated by the prohibitive kom.

75) kom niyiay lian peek
don't speak quick too much
'Don't speak too fast.'

76) kom sasei lao toq
don't write on table
'Don't write on the table.'

When the prohibitive kom precedes the pragmatic particles such as soum and gâncëaŋ, as shown in (77) and (78), the sentences are ungrammatical.

77) *kom soum niyiay lian peek
don't please speak quick too much

78) *kom gâncëaŋ niyiay lian peek
don't Qancëaŋ speak quick too much

In addition, the pragmatic particle soum 'please' can modify the jussive qaoy in a similar way to other predicates in the imperative sentence type. The insertion of soum expresses politeness. The jussive qaoy in (79) - (81) is modified by the pragmatic particle soum.

79) bag tik doh mdaay tlay soum qaoy yǝǝŋ
if milk mother have value please Qaoy we
baan cuapcum kniçi wiñ
able meet each other back
(qoqkişiȝboh qay qoun niw tiinaa)

'If there is a bond between mother and child (LIT: if mother's milk has value), may we meet each other again.'

80) soum qaoy look prulag cōeq
please Qaoy you have exam pass
'May you pass your exam.'

81) soum qaoy kñom cuap koun kñom mdaag tıät
please Qaoy I meet child I once again
'May I meet my child again.'

Examples (82) and (83) illustrate the parallel use of the pragmatic particle soum with other predicates in the imperative sentence type.
82) soum niyiay yiit yiit
   please speak slow-Redup
   'Please speak slower.'

83) soum sasei ləc toq
   please write on table
   'Please write on the table.'

As can be seen from examples (69) - (72) above, the jussive sentence type can be used with all pronouns. The pragmatic particle, however, can only be used with the addressee. The second person form can optionally be inserted after the pragmatic particle. This is exemplified in (84) - (86).

84) soum look niyiay yiit-yiit
   please you speak slow-Redup
   'Please speak slower.'

85) qančən look sasei ləc toq
   Qancən you write on table
   'Please write on the table.'

86) cou look sasei ləc toq
   Part you write on table
   'Write on the table.'

The insertion of subject in the imperative is impossible when the subject is other than the second person form. Examples (87) - (89) are ungrammatical as the noun phrase following the pragmatic particles does not refer to the addressee.

87) *qančən kəm sasei ləc toq
   Qancən I write on table

88) *cou kəat sasei ləc toq
   Part he write on table

89) *soum koun sasei ləc toq
   please child write on table

This sentence cannot mean 'Please let the child write on the table'. However, if koun functions as a second person pronoun, this sentence is acceptable and means 'Please (you/son) write on the table'.

The fact that the jussive qaoy can be negated by the prohibitive kom and can be modified by the pragmatic particle soum in the same way as other predicates in the imperative sentence type can, suggests that the jussive qaoy is a verb, not a pragmatic particle.

Nevertheless, the jussive qaoy has a characteristic different from other predicates in the imperative sentence type. The understood subject of the normal predicate in the imperative sentence type is the addressee. As illustrated in (84) - (86) above, when the pragmatic particle modifies the predicate in the imperative sentence
type, a second person pronoun can be inserted after the pragmatic particle. In contrast, the subject of the jussive qaoy is unidentified and cannot be related to any argument in the sentence. For instance, in examples (71) and (72) which are repeated here for convenience as (90) and (91), there cannot be a subject of the jussive qaoy. The addressee cannot function as the subject of the jussive qaoy. The conditional sentence in (90) suggests that the addressee himself was cursed. The addressee cannot be interpreted as the controller of the form qaoy. In (91), the addressee cannot allow or cause kōat 'he' to recover from the fever.

90) baə qaə koohaq qaoy qaə qaoy prolaŋq tliəq
    if you tell a lie Qaoy you have exam fall
    'If you tell a lie, may you fail the exam.'

91) soum qaoy kōat bat chii
    please Qaoy he disappear sick
    'May he recover (from fever or sickness).'

As illustrated in (92) and (93), a second person pronoun cannot be inserted before the jussive qaoy.

92) *baə qaə koohaq qaə qaoy qaoy prolaŋq tliəq
    if you tell a lie you Qaoy have exam fall

93) *soum look qaoy kōat bat chii
    please you Qaoy he disappear sick

The jussive qaoy has a characteristic distinct from the main verb qaoy 'to have someone do something; to allow'. Unlike the object-controlled predicate qaoy of which the object can be passivised, the NP₂ in the NP₂ - VP₂ sequence following the jussive qaoy cannot undergo passivisation. When (90) and (91) are passivised, as shown in (94) and (95), the sentences are ungrammatical.

94) *baə qaə koohaq qaə qaoy trow qaoy prolaŋq tliəq
    if you tell a lie you Pass Qaoy have exam fall

95) *kōat trow soum qaoy bat chii
    he Pass please Qaoy disappear sick

The passive construction of the predicate qaoy 'to have someone do something; to allow' is presented in (96) to compare with the ungrammatical passive construction of the jussive qaoy.

96) yəəə trow kmae krəhaam qaoy tiw təəə srae
    we Pass Khmer Rouge Qaoy go do ricefield
    'We were made to do the work in the ricefield by the Khmer Rouge.'

The fact that the NP₂ in the NP₂ - VP₂ sequence following the jussive qaoy cannot be passivised suggests that the NP₂ is not directly subcategorised for by the
The jussive qaoy. The jussive qaoy is best analysed as only subcategorising for a sentential complement. The lexical entry of the jussive qaoy is as follows:

\[
97) \text{qaoy: } V, (\uparrow\text{PRED}) = \langle \text{QAQY \langle (SCOMP) \rangle} \rangle.
\]

The c-structure of example (91) can be illustrated as in (98).

\[
98)
\]

The functional annotations in this c-structure can be explained in the following steps. The equations \(\uparrow\text{SUBJ}=\downarrow\) and \(\uparrow\text{=}\downarrow\) above the nodes NP6 and VP7 indicate that the information about NP6 is information about the SUBJ part of the f-structure of the mother node and that the functional information of the node VP7 is direct information about its mother node S5. The equation \(\uparrow\text{SCOMP}=\downarrow\) above the node S5 indicates that all the properties of the node S5 are properties of the grammatical function SCOMP of the f-structure of its mother node VP3. The annotation \(\uparrow\text{=}\downarrow\) above the node V4 means that information about the ego node is direct information about its mother node VP3. Since qaoy has its own PRED value, the PRED value of qaoy is then passed up to VP3. The equation \(\uparrow\text{=}\downarrow\) above the node VP3 indicates that the functional information carried by the node VP3 is passed up to its mother node S1. The whole sentence then receives the PRED value from qaoy and the value of the SCOMP of the node S5 is then passed up to S1.

The f-structure of example (91) is given in (99).

\[
\]

* Although it is usually assumed in LFG that all sentences have subjects, Bresnan and Kanerva (1989:28) note that it is not clear that the 'subject constraint' holds for all languages.
The c-structures of the normal imperative sentence types of examples (82) and (84) are presented in (101) and (103), to show that the c-structures of the normal imperative sentence types are similar to that of the jussive qaoy. Examples (82) and (84) are also repeated here for convenience as (100) and (102).

100) soum niyiy yiit yiit
    please speak slow-Redup
    'Please speak slower.'

101)

The c-structure (101) illustrates that a VP without an overt subject can be generated under node S. As the c-structure (103) shows, the NP subject can optionally be generated under S.

The grammaticalisation of the main verb qaoy 'to have someone do something; to allow' to introduce the jussive sentence type is similar to the grammaticalisation of the verb to let in English. The full verb to let meaning 'to
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ALLOW, TO PERMIT’ IS GRAMMATICALISED TO BE A PRAGMATIC PARTICLE OF IMPERATIVE OR OPTATIVE MOOD (QUIRK ET AL, 1985:148). THIS FORM CAN INTRODUCE A FIRST OR THIRD PERSON IMPERATIVE, FOR EXAMPLE:

104) Let us all work hard. (Quirk et al, 1973:202)

105) If anyone shrinks from this action, let him speak now. (Quirk et al, 1973:202)

106) Let the world take notice. (Quirk et al, 1985:148)

HOPPER AND TRAUGOTT (1993:10-14) DISCUSS A NUMBER OF GRAMMATICALISED CHARACTERISTICS OF THE FORM TO LET. THESE INCLUDE A SHIFT IN MEANING FROM A PERMISSION OR ALLOWING TO BE EXTENDED AS ONE’S SUGGESTING SOMEONE ELSE TO DO SOMETHING, THE EXTENSION OF POSSIBLE SUBJECTS FROM THE FIRST PERSON TO OTHER PERSONS.

THE PRECEDING DISCUSSION SHOWS THAT THE MAIN VERB QAÖY ‘TO HAVE SOMEONE DO SOMETHING; TO ALLOW’ CAN BE GRAMMATICALISED TO INTRODUCE THE JUSSIVE SENTENCE TYPE. THE JUSSIVE QAÖY DOES NOT SUBCATEGORISE FOR A SUBJECT. IT ONLY SUBCATEGORISES FOR A SENTENTIAL COMPLEMENT. UNLIKE OTHER PRAGMATIC PARTICLES WHICH MARK THE IMPERATIVE SENTENCE TYPE IN KHMER, THE JUSSIVE QAÖY RETAINS THE CHARACTERISTICS OF A VERB. THE PROHIBITIVE KOM CAN PRECEDE THE JUSSIVE QAÖY WHEREAS IT IS UNGRAMMATICAL FOR THE PROHIBITIVE KOM TO PRECEDE OTHER PRAGMATIC PARTICLES.

6.3.4 OTHER FUNCTIONS OF THE FORM QAÖY

IN ADDITION TO ITS ROLE AS A MAIN VERB, QAÖY ALSO HAS SOME OTHER FUNCTIONS. IN THIS SECTION, I WILL BRIEFLY CONSIDER SEVERAL OF THESE FUNCTIONS AND DISTINGUISH THEM FROM THE MAIN-VERB TYPES PREVIOUSLY DISCUSSED.

THE FORM QAÖY CAN FOLLOW THE FIRST VERB OF A SERIAL VERB CONSTRUCTION, AS SHOWN IN (107) AND (108).

107) mdaay tiñ num qaöy koun (fähig)
mother buy sweet Qaöy child (eat)
‘The mother bought a sweet for (her) child (to eat).’

108) niérer criel qaöy yäng (sáp)
Nieree sing Qaöy we (listen)
‘Nieree sings for us (to listen).’

IN THIS CONSTRUCTION, THE FORM QAÖY INTRODUCES A BENEFATIVE NOUN PHRASE. THE ADJUNCTS IN (107) AND (108) ARE PUT IN PARENTHESES TO SHOW THAT QAÖY CAN BE FOLLOWED BY EITHER A NOUN PHRASE OR A NOUN PHRASE AND AN EMBEDDED CLAUSE. THE UNEXPRESSED
subject of the adjunct in (107) and (108) is coreferential with the benefactive noun phrase. Although qaoy in this position has a similar function to a preposition,\textsuperscript{11} it is actually a verb. In Khmer, prepositions cannot be stranded – they must be followed by an overt oblique.\textsuperscript{12} However, when the object of qaoy in (107) and (108) has previously been mentioned, it can be unexpressed. This is illustrated in (109) and (110).

\begin{verbatim}
109) m\textipa{d}\textipa{a}\textipa{y} t\textipa{\textcircled{i}}n num qaoy
   mother buy sweet Qaoy
   'The mother bought a sweet for (someone).'</n
110) n\textipa{i}\textipa{\textcircled{r}}ii c\textipa{\textcircled{i}}\textipa{\textcircled{\textcircled{a}}} qaoy sdap
   Nieree sing Qaoy listen
   'Nieree sings for (someone) to listen.'
\end{verbatim}

Bresnan (1982b:385) proposes that only SUBJ, OBJ and OBJ2 can be unexpressed in a pro-drop language. If qaoy were a preposition, the omission of an oblique will violate the rule of pro-drop. However, since qaoy is a verb, its object in examples (109) and (110) can be unexpressed without modification to Bresnan’s proposal.

Schiller (1991:118) argues that his educated Khmer informants prefer to mark a benefactive noun phrase in Khmer with the preposition somrap 'for' rather than with the verb qaoy. He considers that the benefactive in Khmer is only expressed by the preposition (p.127). Nevertheless, when the form qaoy, which marks the benefactive noun phrase, as shown in (106) and the recipient noun phrase, as in (111) is replaced by the preposition somrap 'for', the sentence using somrap has different implications from that with qaoy. In (111), it is implied that my sister actually received the food, that is, the matrix subject referent took the food and gave it to my sister. Example (112), however, cannot have this implication. This sentence simply means that the matrix subject referent took the food which was prepared for my sister; my sister may or may not have the food as a result of the activity described in (112).

\begin{verbatim}
111) k\textipa{\textcircled{o}}t y\textipa{\textcircled{c}}k m\textipa{\textcircled{h}}oup qaoy pq\textipa{\textcircled{u}}n k\textipa{n}om
   he take food Qaoy younger sibling I
   'He took the food to my sister.'

112) k\textipa{\textcircled{o}}t y\textipa{\textcircled{c}}k m\textipa{\textcircled{h}}oup somrap pq\textipa{\textcircled{u}}n k\textipa{n}om
   he take food for younger sibling I
   'He took the food (prepared) for my sister.'
\end{verbatim}

\textsuperscript{11}Clark and Prasithrathsint (1985:38) consider the form qaoy in this position to be a preposition derived from a verb.

\textsuperscript{12}For more detail, see section 2.5: Pro-drop.
In addition, the verbs indicating a benefactive noun phrase vary depending on degrees of respect associated with the referent of the benefactive noun phrase. The benefactive noun phrases in examples (113) and (114) are put in parentheses as they can be optionally unexpressed. In (113), the verb cuun 'to send' marks a benefactive noun phrase of which the referent is respected by the matrix subject referent.

113) kñom y:,:,k mhoup cuun (look yiaγ) haγy  
'I took the food (to my grandmother).'

The predicate prakeen 'to give' is used when the benefactive noun phrase refers to a monk, as shown in (114).

114) kñom y:,:,k mhoup prakeen (looksaŋ) haγy  
'I took the food (to the monk).'

When the form qaoy introduces a purposive adjunct, it expresses a wish, a request or an order. Examples (115) and (116) are statements and the form cbah and chap express manner. When the form qaoy precedes cbah and chap, as in (117) and (118), qaoy cbah and qaoy chap are purposive adjuncts. They express a request or an order.

115) (kɔot) niyi遴 cbah  
(he) speak clear  
'(He) speaks clearly.'

116) twɔɔ kaa chap  
do work quick  
'(Someone) did the work quickly.'

117) soum niyi遴 qaoy cbah  
please speak Qaoy clear  
'Please speak clearly.'

118) twɔɔ kaa qaoy chap  
do work Qaoy quick  
'Do the work quickly!'

The form qaoy can function as a conjunction meaning 'in a ... manner, in order to, so as to' (Jacob, 1974:240; Headley, 1977:1493). This function of qaoy is exemplified in (119).

119) kñom kit thaa bannac niŋ slap trɔw tɔɔ day  
I think COMP since lrrl die must fight  
ciamuay puɔŋ niŋ qaoy qah cɑt ɔŋ together with group this Qaoy all gone heart before  
(qaŋkisboh qaoy qoun niw tiinaa)  
'I think that since (I) will die, I must fight with this group with all my effort.'

The combination of qaoy and tae as qaoytae functions as an adverbial complementiser with a meaning similar to 'so long as, provided that', as (120) shows.
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120) A: tñay kraoy kñom nín nõem puæq yœn
day after I Irrl lead group we
tiw leën tikchuu
go play waterfall
'Next time, I will lead you to (visit) the waterfall.'

B: qaoy tæ tì yœn nín tiw ciæ min khaan
provided that true we Irrl go for sure
(kampûñçaam cam snee)
'Provided that this is true, we will definitely go.'

The existing data suggest that when qaoy is combined directly with the verbs twgg 'to do', nõem 'to lead', bandaal 'to cause, to create' or kug 'to be suitable', a causative meaning is implied. These combinations, as exemplified in examples (121) - (124), appear to be highly lexicalised.

121) tii bomphot chum kquæt kquæt yaañ craœn twgg qaoy
at last Chum vomit vomit as many cause
kee baan thuu knœn klœn
he Past loose in body
(søylesaiñ)
'At last, Chum vomited violently and this made him feel better.'

122) kom qaoy kœt dœn riœn nih tee
don't Qaoy he know story this Part
nõem qaoy kœt rittæ khœn tœt
cause (LIT: lead-Qaoy) he increasingly angry again
'Don't let him know about this story. (It) will cause him to get angry again.'

123) peel phiy klœn ræwæt tœn nih kmœn
time afraid strong wound together this not have
bandaal qaoy chœ cap qøæy bææc sah...
due/to hurt catch what a little at all...
(qañkiañ kæ qøn niw tiinaa)
'When (we) are very frightened, these wounds do not hurt (us) at all.'

124) kñom kit sapsæp tiw kua qaoy
I think thoroughly go suitable (LIT: should-Qaoy)
kmæn baœn wicæt nah
Shy Wichet Ints
(tœsøy sneehaa)
'(After) I think carefully, (I) am very ashamed (of Wichet).'

To sum up, the examples in this section, show that some specific meanings and functions of qaoy vary between contexts. Although the interpretation of the form qaoy in some contexts can be specified, the function of the form qaoy in other contexts is ambiguous. The study of the form qaoy in other specialised constructions is an interesting topic for further research.
6.4 General observations on complements containing qaoy

To begin the analysis of complements which contain qaoy, this section provides two general observations on complements containing qaoy.

6.4.1 Predicates taking complements containing qaoy

Manipulative predicates as well as predicates in other classes which are inherently manipulative can subcategorise for complements containing qaoy. These predicates are listed as follows:

Manipulative predicates:
- bafcio 'to order'
- qanuñaat 'to allow'
- neenöam 'to suggest'
- ŋüňämpya 'to incite'

Prohibitive predicates:
- haam 'to prohibit'
- haampa besides 'to prohibit'
- khoa 'to prevent'

Utterance predicates:
- prap 'to tell'
- koohaq 'to tell a lie'

Desiderative predicates:
- can 'to want'

13 Unlike to force in English, the meaning of bafcio 'to order' in Khmer does not imply the truth value of the following complement.

14 The manipulative predicates such as neenöam 'to suggest', komruñ 'to urge' and ŋüňämpya 'to incite' can also be followed by an S-like complement with the thaa complementiser. However, these predicates are classified as manipulative predicates since it is more usual for these predicates to be followed by a complement containing qaoy.

15 Prohibitive predicates are treated as a subtype of manipulative predicate. Although these predicates are inherently negative, they require a negator to be obligatorily inserted before qaoy. The meaning of a double negative construction is similar to normal negation in English.

16 These utterance predicates involve a manipulation. For example, when koohaq 'to tell a lie' is followed by a complement containing qaoy, it implies that the matrix subject referent tells someone a lie in order to get someone do something.
Commitment predicates:

somræccat 'to decide'

sanyaa 'to promise'

tæncat 'to determine'

yàelprærm 'to agree'

cuøy 'to help'

Aspectual predicates:

chup 'to stop'

cappdaem 'to begin'.

Examples (125) - (127) show the manipulative predicates followed by complements containing qaoy whereas (128) - (131) are examples of other types of complement-taking predicates (CTPs) followed by complements containing qaoy. The interpretation of the form qaoy in these examples varies depending on the context. In this section, I will, for convenience, present only the most common translation.

125) look kruu qaunäaat qaoy koun sɑh trəlo p təəh teacher allow Qaoy student return go house wiñ back 'The teacher allowed students to go back home.'

126) mit soan baan bɑ̃ciq qaoy yoon bambaek comrade San Past order Qaoy we break cua knio ciə krum touc-touc row each other be group little-Redup (qaŋkiaboh qaoy qoun niw tiinaa) 'Comrade San ordered us to separate into small groups.'

127) sot bɑŋkham qaoy niərii twəə kaa nih Sot order Qaoy Nieree do work this 'Sot ordered Nieree to do this work.'

128) sot prap qaoy niərii chup ʃəm baay Sot tell Qaoy Nieree stop eat nee 'Sot told Nieree to stop eating.' (This implies that 'Sot ordered Nieree to stop eating'.)

129) chum sanyaa qaoy koun kəət tiw məəl kon Chum promise Qaoy child he go look movie 'Chum promised to have his child to watch the movie.'

130) cindaa caŋ qaoy sot cuøy twəə kaa Chinda want Qaoy Sot help do work 'Chinda wanted Sot to help (her) do the work.'

131) niərii chup qaoy cindaa məək twəə kaa tʃəl Nieree stop Qaoy Chinda come do work again haøy already 'Nieree stopped having Chinda come to work.'

The truth value of the complement in these Khmer sentences is different from that of English translation. In Khmer, an event in a complement clause may or may not take place whereas an event in the English counterpart must be true.
6.4.2 Comparison of qaoy and thaa

The form qaoy in the complement constructions, as illustrated in (125) - (131) above, is similar to the complementisers, in some respects. The form qaoy and the complementisers can follow a complement-taking predicate and occur at the beginning of the complement proposition. In some positions, thaa and qaoy share the same word class – verbs. However, there are some dissimilarities between the forms qaoy and thaa, which indicates that thaa is a true complementiser while qaoy is a verb occurring at the beginning of the complement. Consider the following examples:

132) sot sanyaa thaa chum nin tiw twee srae
   Sot promise COMP Chum Irrl go do rice field
   'Sot promised (someone) that Chum would go to work in the rice field.'

133) sot sanyaa qaoy chum tiw twee srae
   Sot promise Qaoy Chum go do rice field
   'Sot promised to have Chum go to work in the rice field.'

Various facts indicate that thaa and qaoy, in the two examples above have different functions. Firstly, the thaa complementiser cannot be negated. To negate thaa in this position results in an ungrammatical sentence, as in (134). The form qaoy which occurs at the beginning of the complement, however, can be negated as shown in (135).

134) *sot sanyaa min thaa chum nin tiw twee srae
   Sot promise not COMP Chum Irrl go do rice field

135) sot sanyaa min qaoy chum tiw twee srae
   Sot promise not Qaoy Chum go do rice field
   'Sot promised not to have Chum go to work in the rice field.'

Secondly, CTPs which are followed by an S-like complement with the thaa complementiser cannot have the irrealis marker nin inserted immediately before the thaa complementiser. This is exemplified in (136). In contrast, some CTPs which take a complement containing qaoy allow the irrealis marker to be inserted before qaoy, as (137) shows. This also shows that thaa, in this position, is no longer a verb while qaoy retains a verbal feature.

136) *sot sanyaa nin thaa chum nin tiw twee srae
    Sot promise Irrl COMP Chum Irrl go do rice field

137) sot sanyaa nin qaoy chum tiw twee srae
    Sot promise Irrl Qaoy Chum go do rice field
    'Sot promised to have Chum go to work in the rice field.'

The last fact which indicates that thaa and qaoy have different functions is the possibility of the particle insertion. Only S-like complements with a complementiser can have the tee particle inserted before the complement proposition.
As can be seen in (138) and (139), the thaa complementiser can be preceded by the tee particle while qaoy cannot.

138) sot sanyaa tee thaa chum niŋ tiw.twɔɔ srae
   Sot promise Part COMP Chum Irrl go do rice field
   'Did Sot promise (someone) that Chum would go to work in the rice field?'

139) *sot sanyaa tee qaoy chum tiw.twɔɔ srae
   Sot promise Part Qaoy Chum go do rice field

If the tee particle occurs at the end of the sentence, as shown in (140) and (141), the sentences are grammatical.

140) sot sanyaa thaa chum niŋ tiw.twɔɔ srae tee
   Sot promise COMP Chum Irrl go do rice field Part
   'Did Sot promise (someone) that Chum would go to work in the rice field?'

141) sot sanyaa qaoy chum tiw.twɔɔ srae tee
   Sot promise Qaoy Chum go do rice field Part
   'Did Sot promise to have Chum go to work in the ricefield?'

To summarise, three pieces of evidence indicate that the form qaoy does not have the same features as the true complementiser thaa. The form qaoy can be negated and in some cases can be modified by the irrealis marker whereas the thaa complementiser cannot. Moreover, the tee particle cannot be inserted before the form qaoy while the tee particle can be added before the thaa complementiser.

6.5 Analysis of complements containing qaoy

In this section, I concentrate on analyses of complements containing qaoy. The analyses in this section are based on whether the form qaoy has undergone grammaticalisation, and characteristics of complements containing qaoy with respect to the matrix predicates. Two forms of qaoy are focused – the predicate qaoy and the non-predicate qaoy.

6.5.1 Predicate qaoy 'to have someone do something; to allow' in complements

When a complement containing qaoy is preceded by a desiderative predicate, a commitment predicate or an aspectual predicate, the form qaoy functions as a predicate 'to have someone do something; to allow'. As illustrated in (142) - (145),

17 This analysis of the predicate qaoy in complements is similar, in some respects, to the treatment of the Thai ḡay complement proposed by Thepkanjana (1986) and Pingkarawat (1989).
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the matrix subject referent arranges or organises something for the object referent of the predicate qaoy to perform as an action. For example, the matrix subject referent in (142) did something because he wanted the object referent of the predicate qaoy to do this work whereas Chum in (143) exercises authority to have Nieree do this work. In example (144), it implies that we have done something in order that Sot becomes our leader.

142) kñom caŋ qaoy kōst twē kaa nih
   I want Qaoy he do work this
   'I wanted to have him do this work.' (I arranged something for him to get this job.)

143) chum sonyaa qaoy niərii twē kaa nih
   Chum promise Qaoy Nieree do work this
   'Chum promised to allow Nieree to do this work.'

144) we samrēcct qaoy sot ciə prathīən
   we decide Qaoy Sot be leader
   'We decided to have Sot as our leader.'

145) chum chup qaoy niərii mook baoh somqaat ptēəh
    Chum stop Qaoy Nieree come sweep clean house
    'Chum stopped Nieree from coming to clean his house.'

The characteristics of the form qaoy in this complement construction are similar to those of the main predicate of subject-controlled complements. Firstly, there cannot be an overt noun phrase which functions as the subject of intervening between the form qaoy and the matrix predicate. This is exemplified in (146) - (149).

146) *kñom caŋ niərii qaoy kōst twē kaa nih
    I want Nieree Qaoy he do work this

147) *chum sonyaa kñom qaoy niərii twē kaa nih
    Chum promise I Qaoy Nieree do work this

148) *we samrēcct cindaa qaoy sot ciə prathīən
    we decide Chinda Qaoy Sot be leader

149) *chum chup cindaa qaoy niərii mook baoh somqaat ptēəh
    Chum stop Chinda Qaoy Nieree come sweep clean house

Although the overt noun phrase which functions as the subject of qaoy has the same form with the matrix subject, the sentences are still ungrammatical, as illustrated in examples (150) - (153).

150) *kñom caŋ kñom qaoy kōst twē kaa nih
    I want I Qaoy he do work this
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151) *chum sanyaa chum qaoy niarii tsoo kaa nih
   Chum promise Chum Qaoy Nieree do work this

152) *yee nd samaraccaat yee nd qaoy sot cia prathian
   we decide we Qaoy Sot be leader

153) *chum chup chum qaoy niarii mook baoh samqaat
   Chum stop Chum Qaoy Nieree come sweep clean
   pteeh
   house

The meaning of commitment predicates allows the following predicate to be modified by the irrealis marker nin. The insertion of the irrealis marker, as in (154) and (155), indicates the potential mood.

154) chum sanyaa nin qaoy niarii tsoo kaa nih
   Chum promise IrI Qaoy Nieree do work this
   'Chum promised to have Nieree do this work.'

155) yee nd samaraccaat nin qaoy sot cia prathian
   we decide IrI Qaoy Sot be leader
   'We decided to have Sot as our leader.'

Like other predicates which introduce subject-controlled complements following a desiderative predicate or an aspectual predicate, the form qaoy, as in (156) - (158), cannot be modified by an auxiliary.

156) *knom caa nin qaoy koot tsoo kaa nih
    I want IrI Qaoy he do work this

157) *knom caa baan qaoy koot tsoo kaa nih
    I want Past Qaoy he do work this

158) *chum chup kumpuq qaoy niarii mook baoh
    Chum stop Cont Qaoy Nieree come sweep
    samqaat pteeh
    clean house

As discussed in Chapter 5, whether or not a predicate in subject-controlled complements can be negated depends on the semantic restrictions of the matrix predicates. The fact that the form qaoy, as in (159) and (160), can be negated by the verbal negator whereas qaoy in (161) and (162) cannot, is the restrictions of the matrix predicates, not that of the complement containing qaoy. In examples (159) and (160), there is an implication that the matrix subject referent has done something so that the object referent of qaoy does not perform the following complement action.

159) chum sanyaa nin qaoy niarii tsoo kaa nih
    Chum promise not Qaoy Nieree do work this
    'Chum promised not to allow Nieree to do this work.'
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160) ɣən samraəcat  min qaoy sot ciə prathion
we decide not Qaoy Sot be leader
'We decided not to have Sot as our leader.'

161) *kʃom can  min qaoy kəst twəə kaa nih
I want not Qaoy he do work this

162) *chum chup min qaoy niəri məʁək baoh samqaat
Chum stop not Qaoy Nieree come sweep clean
ptəθ house

The fact that the form qaoy following a desiderative predicate, a commitment predicate or an aspectual predicate shows the same behaviour as the predicates introducing subject-controlled complements suggests that the form qaoy functions as the predicate qaoy 'to have someone do something; to allow'. Its unexpressed subject is controlled by the matrix subject. The relevant lexical entries of example (142) which is repeated here for convenience as (163), are given in (164) and (165).18

163) kʃom can qaoy kəst twəə kaa nih
I want Qaoy he do work this
'I wanted to have him do this work.' (I arranged something for him to get this job.)

164) can: V, (↑PRED) = 'WANT ((↑SUBJ) (↑VCOMP))'
(↑VCOMP SUBJ) = (↑SUBJ).

165) qaoy: V, (↑PRED) = 'QAOY ((↑SUBJ) (↑OBJ)(↑VCOMP))'
(↑VCOMP SUBJ) = (↑OBJ).

The lexical entry of can 'to want' which is followed by a complement containing qaoy is the same as the lexical entry of can 'to want' which is followed by other predicates in its complement. The lexical entry in (164) indicates that the predicate can 'to want' subcategorises for a SUBJ and a VCOMP. The subject of the VCOMP is controlled by the subject of can. The lexical entry of the form qaoy in (165), is the same as the lexical entry of the main verb qaoy 'to have someone do something; to allow' in (65) which is discussed in section 6.3.2. The form qaoy in this lexical entry is a predicate and subcategorises for a SUBJ, an OBJ and a VCOMP. The control equation of the predicate qaoy 'to have someone do something; to allow' indicates that the object of qaoy is the controller of the following VCOMP subject.

The c-structure of example (163) is as follows:

18The lexical entries for commitment predicates and aspectual predicates will be similar to those presented here. They subcategorise for subject-controlled complements.
From the bottom of the c-structure (166), the functional equation $\uparrow \text{OBJ}=\downarrow$ above the node NP$_7$ indicates that all functional information carried by the node NP$_7$ goes into the OBJ part of the f-structure of its mother node VP$_5$. The $\uparrow \text{VCOMP}=\downarrow$ above the node VP$_8$ indicates that all the functional information carried by the node VP$_8$ goes into the VCOMP part of the f-structure of the mother node VP$_5$. The annotation $\uparrow = \downarrow$ above the node V$_6$ means that information carried by V$_6$ is the same as that of the mother node. Since the lexical entry of qaoy specifies the PRED value for qaoy, namely 'QAOY', this PRED value is passed up to VP$_5$. The PRED value of VP$_5$ then comes from the predicate qaoy. VP$_5$ also has the equation $\uparrow \text{VCOMP}=\downarrow$ attached to it. The interpretation of this equation is similar to that above the node VP$_8$, that is, all functional information carried by the node VP$_5$ is equivalent to the VCOMP part of the f-structure of its mother node or VP$_3$. The equation $\uparrow = \downarrow$ above the node V$_4$ indicates that information about V$_4$ is equivalent to that of the mother node. Since V$_4$ contains the PRED value, namely 'WANT', the PRED value of con is then passed up to VP$_3$. The functional annotation $\uparrow = \downarrow$ above the node VP$_3$ means that all functional information of VP$_3$ is the same as that of the mother node or S$_1$. This means that the grammatical function VCOMP of the node VP$_5$ which is passed up to VP$_3$ is further passed up to S$_1$, and S$_1$ receives the PRED value from the node V$_4$ or con 'to want'. The grammatical function VCOMP of VP$_5$ is the grammatical function of the main clause and the predicate con 'to want' is the predicate of the main clause. The symbol $\uparrow \text{SUBJ}=\downarrow$ above the node NP$_2$ means that all functional information carried by NP$_2$ goes into the SUBJ part of the f-structure of the mother node S$_1$.\(^{19}\)

---

\(^{19}\)As the explanation of the annotation $\uparrow \text{SUBJ}=\downarrow$ is the same for all c-structures, it will not be repeated in the explanation of other c-structures.
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The f-structure of example (163) is then presented as:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{SUBJ} & \quad \text{PRED } 'I' \\
\text{PRED} & \quad \text{WANT } ((\text{SUBJ}) (\text{VCOMP})) \\
\text{SUBJ} & \quad [ ] \\
\text{PRED} & \quad \text{QAOY } ((\text{SUBJ}) (\text{OBJ}) (\text{VCOMP})) \\
\text{OBJ} & \quad \text{PRED } 'HE' \\
\text{VCOMP} & \quad [ ] \\
\text{VCOMP} & \quad \text{PRED } 'DO' ((\text{SUBJ}) (\text{OBJ})) \\
\text{OBJ} & \quad [ ] \\
\text{VCOMP} & \quad \text{PRED } 'WORK' \\
\text{SPEC} & \quad \text{THIS}
\end{align*}
\]

The lexical entry of the predicate \textit{can} 'to want' specifies that the subject of the predicate \textit{qaoy} is controlled by the matrix subject whereas the lexical entry of the predicate \textit{qaoy} 'to have someone do something; to allow' specifies that the subject of \textit{twəə kaa} 'to do work' is controlled by the object of \textit{qaoy}.

When a desiderative predicate, a commitment predicate or an aspectual predicate is followed by a complement containing the predicate \textit{qaoy}, it indicates that the matrix subject referent does not perform the lowest complement action. If the sentence is true, the lowest complement action is performed by the object referent of the predicate \textit{qaoy}. Examples (142) - (145) are repeated here for convenience as (168) - (171). In (168), kōst 'he', not kñom 'I' did this work whereas Nieree in (169), not Chum did this work.

168) kñom \textit{can} qaoy kōst twəə kaa nih
'I wanted to have him do this work.' (I arranged something for him to get this job.)

169) chum sanyaa qaoy nīrī twəə kaa nih
Chum promise Qaoy Nieree do work this
'Chum promised to allow Nieree to do this work.'

170) yəəŋ samrəcət qaoy sot ciə prəthiən
we decide Qaoy Sot be leader
'We decided to have Sot as our leader.'

171) chum chup qaoy nīrī mōk baoh samqaat pəəh
Chum stop Qaoy Nieree come sweep clean house
'Chum stopped Nieree from coming to clean his house.'

Since \textit{qaoy} functions as the complement predicate, it cannot be omitted. If the predicate \textit{qaoy} in examples (168) - (171) is missing, as illustrated in (172) - (175), the sentences are ungrammatical. This follows from the analysis.
If the matrix subject referent himself performs the complement action, the matrix predicate is simply followed by that complement action. This also follows from the analysis. As illustrated in examples (176) - (179), the matrix subject referent has an emotional commitment or intention toward the event or the action referred to in the complement. For instance, if the sentence is true, the matrix subject referent kñom 'I' in (176) or Chum in (177), did this work himself.

176) kñom caŋ twæ kaa nih
   I want he do work this
   'I wanted to do this work.'

177) chum sonyaa twæ kaa nih
    Chum promise do work this
    'Chum promised to do this work.'

178) niriói samraatre sot ci prathion
    Nieree decide be leader
    'Nieree decided to be a leader.'

179) chum chup mook baoh samqaat ptëah
    Chum stop come sweep clean house
    'Chum stopped coming to clean the house.'

The object of the predicate qaoy may be unexpressed, as in (180) - (183). The matrix subject cannot be analysed as the controller of the unexpressed subject of the lowest complement. The control equation in the lexical entry of the predicate qaoy assigns its object, not its subject to be the controller of the following complement subject. The object of the predicate qaoy is interpreted as PRO in the f-structure. (see below)

180) kñom caŋ qaoy twæ kaa nih
    I want Qaoy do work this
    'I wanted to have (someone) do this work.'

181) chum sonyaa qaoy twæ kaa nih
    Chum promise Qaoy do work this
    'Chum promised to have (someone) to do this work.'

This PRO cannot be co-referential with the matrix subject since the matrix subject does not function as the controller of the complement subject. The interpretation of PRO and that of a free pronoun in the object position of the predicate qaoy in complements are the same.
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182) yeṣu samraccat qaoy cie prathian we decide Qaoy be leader 'We decided to have (someone) as our leader.'

183) chum chup qaoy mooq baoh samqaat ptēah Chum stop Qaoy come sweep clean house 'Chum stopped (someone) from coming to clean his house.'

The c-structure of example (180) can be illustrated as follows:

184)

The functional annotations of the c-structure (184) can be explained in a similar way to those of the c-structure (166) above, except that the object of the predicate qaoy is unexpressed in the c-structure (184). However, the unexpressed object of the predicate qaoy has a semantic form as PRO in the f-structure (185) below. The lexical entry of the predicate qaoy indicates that the missing object of qaoy is the controller of the lower complement subject.

185)

In the first type of the complement containing qaoy, the form qaoy is analysed as the predicate qaoy 'to have someone do something; to allow'. The
unexpressed subject of the predicate qaoy is controlled by the matrix subject. The control relation of the predicate qaoy assigns the object of the predicate qaoy to be the controller of the following VCOMP subject. Since the matrix subject has already been analysed as the controller of the unexpressed subject of the predicate qaoy, it cannot be assigned as the controller of the unexpressed subject of the lower VCOMP.

In the next section, I will propose an analysis of the grammaticalised qaoy.

### 6.5.2 Non-predicate qaoy in complements

In this section, it is argued that the form qaoy in a complement following a desiderative predicate in some contexts, a manipulative predicate or an utterance predicate has undergone grammaticalisation. The form qaoy no longer subcategorises for an argument. I will refer to this grammaticalised qaoy as the non-predicate qaoy.20 In section 6.5.2.1, the non-predicate qaoy preceded by a desiderative predicate is discussed. Although there is no syntactic evidence to differentiate the non-predicate qaoy from the predicate qaoy following a desiderative predicate, these two forms of qaoy are distinguished by the semantic implications. Section 6.5.2.2 discusses the non-predicate qaoy following a manipulative predicate or an utterance predicate.

#### 6.5.2.1 non-predicate qaoy marking a switch of the subject referent

The form qaoy following a desiderative predicate in some contexts is grammaticalised. As shown in (186) and (187), the form qaoy no longer means 'to have someone do something; to allow'. The matrix subject referent in (186) and (187) cannot organise or arrange anything for the complement action following the form qaoy to be fulfilled. The matrix subject referent can simply express a wish or a desire for the complement action following the form qaoy to happen to someone else.

186) sot can qaoy niarri traw cnaot
    Sot want QAoy Nieree correct lotteries
    'Sot wants Nieree to win the lotteries.'

187) cindaa praatthanaa qaoy mdaay mien troap craan
    Chinda wish QAoy mother have treasure many
    'Chinda wishes for (her) mother to have many treasure.'

When the matrix subject referent wishes or wants something to happen to himself, the predicate can 'to want' can simply be followed by a subject-controlled complement, as shown in (186 a).

186a) sot can traw cnaot
    'Sot wants to win the lotteries.'

---

20 The form goficoofi is another non-predicate verb in Khmer. The predicate goficoofi 'to invite' has been grammaticalised to express respect to the addressee, nevertheless, it retains some verbal features. For more details, see section 5.3.1.1: Grammaticalisation of the form goficoofi.
Syntactically the form qaoy in examples (186) and (187) has similar characteristics to those of the predicate qaoy following a desiderative predicate, discussed in section 6.5.1. As demonstrated in (188) and (189), there cannot be an overt noun phrase which functions as the subject of qaoy intervening between the matrix predicate and the form qaoy even though this noun phrase has the same form as the matrix subject.

188) *sot can qaoy niaiiri trow cnaot  
Sot want Sot Qaoy Nieree correct lotteries

189) *cindaa praathanaa qaoy mdaay mion troap  
craen  
Chinda wish Chinda Qaoy mother have treasure

The form qaoy following a desiderative predicate cannot be modified by an auxiliary, as shown in (190) and (191).

190) *sot can min qaoy niaiiri trow cnaot  
Sot want Irrl Qaoy Nieree correct lotteries

191) *cindaa praathanaa baan qaoy mdaay mion troap  
craen  
Chinda wish Past Qaoy mother have treasure

As illustrated in (192) and (193), the form qaoy following a desiderative predicate cannot be negated either.

192) *sot can min qaoy niaiiri trow cnaot  
Sot want not Qaoy Nieree correct lotteries

193) *cindaa praathanaa min qaoy mdaay mion troap  
craen  
Chinda wish not Qaoy mother have treasure

Nevertheless, these are general restrictions of the desiderative predicates. They are not restrictions unique to the form qaoy.

Although the form qaoy loses its meaning, it cannot be omitted from the sentences. If qaoy is missing, as shown in (194) and (195), the sentences are ungrammatical.

194) *sot can trow cnaot  
Sot want Nieree correct lotteries

195) *cindaa mdaay mion troap craen  
Chinda wish mother have treasure many

As discussed at the beginning of the section, the matrix subject referent
cannot arrange the complement action following the form qaoy to take place. Unlike the predicate qaoy discussed in section 6.5.1, the form qaoy in these contexts has undergone a process of grammaticalisation. Since qaoy no longer subcategorises for an argument, it does not have a PRED feature. The form qaoy is best analysed as the non-predicate qaoy. The form qaoy in this construction indicates a change of the subject referent. The matrix subject referent expresses a wish for something to happen to someone else, not to himself. Although there is no noun phrase following the form qaoy, as in (196) and (197), the matrix subject referent cannot be interpreted as the subject of the complement action following qaoy.

196) sot can qaoy traw cnaot
   Sot want Qaoy correct lotteries
   'Sot wanted (someone) to win the lotteries.'

197) cindaa praalthanaa qaoy mi*n tröap craen
   Chinda wish Qaoy have treasure many
   'Chinda wishes for someone to have many treasure.'

To show that the occurrence of the form qaoy marks the change of the subject referent in this construction, the feature \[^{\text{COMP SUBJ SB}} = \]
introduced into the lexical entry of the form qaoy. This feature is adapted from Simpson and Bresnan [Subjective] feature.

Simpson and Bresnan (1983) apply the feature [Subjective] to account for obviative control in Warlpiri. An obviation system in Warlpiri which determines the reference of a controlled subject in non-finite clauses is marked by the insertion of a complementiser suffix to a non-finite verb. For instance, when the suffix -karra is inserted, it indicates that the controller subject is coreferential with the matrix subject, as (198) shows.

198) ngarrka ka wirnpirli-mi kuluparnta,
    man-ABS PRES whistle-NPST bellicose-ABS
    karli jarnti-minja-karra
    boomerang-ABS trim-INF-COMP
    'The bellicose man is whistling while trimming the boomerang.' (Simpson and Bresnan, 1983:51 (3))

21 This feature does not hold when the complement subject following qaoy is a reflexive pronoun kluaqaen; or a pronoun or an NP which is coreferential with the matrix subject. As illustrated in (A, B), the matrix subject is interpreted as the antecedent of the complement subject. Khmer speakers can use this complement construction together with the reflexive form or a coreferential pronoun or noun to make the meaning more emphatic. Nevertheless, this structure is pragmatically redundant since the predicate can 'to want' itself subcategorises for a subject-controlled complement.

A) ktom can qaoy kluaqaen/ ktom traw cnaot
   I want Qaoy body-self/I correct lotteries
   'I want myself/me to win the lotteries.'

B) niirii can qaoy niirii traw cnaot
   Nieree want Qaoy Nieree correct lotteries
   'Nieree want Nieree to win the lotteries.'
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If the matrix object functions as the controller of the following clause, however, the non-finite verb is marked by the suffix -kurra, as in (199).

199) kurdu-ngku ka karnta nya-nyi, ngurlu yurrpa-minja-kurra
child-ERG PRES woman-ABS see-NPST seed-ABS grind-INF-COMP
'The child sees the woman grind mulga seed.' (Simpson and Bresnan, 1983:53 (7))

To differentiate these two complementisers, the feature [Subjective] is introduced. [+Subjective] means that there must be a controller with the SUBJ function in the f-structure while [-Subjective] means that this is not the case (Simpson and Bresnan, 1983:59). Simpson and Bresnan also propose the feature [Objective] to cover the whole obviation system of Warlpiri. This feature is not discussed here as it is not relevant to the characteristics of the form qaoy.

The case of the form qaoy in Khmer is different from that of complementisers in Warlpiri. As discussed in section 6.4.2, the form qaoy has different characteristics from thaa, the true complementiser in Khmer. The occurrence of the form qaoy, nevertheless, excludes the matrix subject noun phrase from being a possible antecedent of the complement subject following qaoy. The feature \[↑COMP SUBJ SB = -\]^* means that the subject of the complement following the form qaoy cannot have the antecedent with the SUBJ function within the same f-structure. This feature of the form qaoy is one way to indicate the switch of the subject referent in this complement construction. As these desiderative predicates in Khmer never subcategorise for an object noun phrase, a complement proposition following the non-predicate qaoy marking a switch of the subject referent is best analysed as an SCOMP.

The lexical entries of examples in which can 'to want' is followed by a complement containing the non-predicate qaoy are presented in (201) and (202) below. Example (186) is repeated here for convenience as (200).

200) sot can qaoy niəii trəw ćnaot
Sot want Qaoy Nieree correct lotteries
'Sot wanted Nieree to win the lotteries.'

201) can: \[V, (↑PRED) = 'WANT ((↑SUBJ) (↑SCOMP))'\]
\[↑qaoy =_{c} +.\]

202) qaoy: \[V, ↑COMP SUBJ SB = -\]
\[↑qaoy = +.\]

The lexical entry (201) indicates that can 'to want' subcategorises for a SUBJ and an

^* This feature can be applied to either a sentential complement (SCOMP) as discussed in this section or a controlled complement which will be discussed in the following section. I then use COMP in a broader sense covering both SCOMP and VCOMP.
SCOMP. The constraining equation in (201) indicates that the form qaoy cannot be omitted in the f-structure and that qaoy does not provide information directly but constraining information comes from elsewhere. If the form qaoy is omitted, the f-structure is ill-formed and the sentence will be ungrammatical. As given in (202), the form qaoy in this lexical entry is a verb but does not subcategorise for an argument. To put it another way, qaoy does not have a PRED feature.

The c-structure of example (200) is as follows:

203)

From the bottom node of the c-structure, the functional annotations \( \uparrow \text{SUBJ}=\downarrow \) and \( \uparrow =\downarrow \) above the nodes NP\(_8\) and VP\(_9\) indicate that all functional information carried by NP\(_8\) is information of the SUBJ part of the f-structure of its mother node or S\(_7\) and that all information carried by VP\(_9\) is information directly about the mother node S\(_7\). The functional equation \( \uparrow \text{SCOMP}=\downarrow \) above the node S\(_7\) shows that the functional structure of the ego node S\(_7\) is equivalent to the functional structure SCOMP of the mother node VP\(_5\). The annotation \( \uparrow =\downarrow \) above the node V\(_6\) means that information about the ego node is equivalent to that of the mother node. This qaoy does not provide any PRED value to the upper node as the lexical entry of qaoy specifies that qaoy is a non-predicate verb. However, it adds \( \uparrow \text{qaoy} = + \) to the f-structure of the mother node. The equation \( \uparrow =\downarrow \) above the node VP\(_5\) means that information about VP\(_5\) is the same as that of the mother node; and is passed up to the mother node. The value SCOMP of the node VP\(_5^*\) is then equivalent to the value SCOMP of the node VP\(_3\). The annotation \( \uparrow =\downarrow \) above the node V\(_4\) indicates that functional information of the node V\(_4\) is direct information about its mother node VP\(_3\). Since can in V\(_4\) has its own PRED value, this PRED value is then passed up to VP\(_3\). As VP\(_3\) has the equation \( \uparrow =\downarrow \) attached to it, the PRED value of can as well as

* Since the form qaoy does not have a PRED value, no grammatical function is assigned to this node.
the grammatical function SCOMP are then passed up to $S_1$ which is the highest node. In other words, $S_7$ becomes SCOMP of the matrix predicate even though a verb qaoy intervenes.

The f-structure of example (200) is satisfied by the constraining equation of the lexical entries. The f-structure (204) shows that the matrix predicate subcategorises for a SUBJ and an SCOMP. The value [+] of the non-predicate qaoy indicates that the form qaoy cannot be omitted, otherwise the f-structure is incoherent and inconsistent.

\[
\begin{align*}
204) & \quad [ \\
& \quad \text{SUBJ} \quad \text{PRED 'SOT'} \\
& \quad \text{PRED} \quad 'WANT ((\text{SUBJ} \ (\text{SCOMP}))' \\
& \quad \text{qaoy} \quad + \\
& \quad \text{SCOMP} \quad [ \\
& \quad \text{SUBJ} \quad \text{PRED 'NIEREE'} \\
& \quad \text{OBJ} \quad \text{PRED 'LOTTERIES'} \\
\]
\end{align*}
\]

The feature $[\uparrow \text{COMP SUBJ SB} = -]$ is significant especially when the complement subject is unexpressed. The SCOMP subject of example (205) is missing.

\[
\begin{align*}
205) & \quad \text{Sot want Qaoy correct lotteries} \\
& \quad 'Sot wanted (someone) to win the lotteries.'
\end{align*}
\]

The c-structure of example (205) can be presented as follows:

\[
\begin{align*}
206) & \quad \text{S}_1 \quad \text{NP}_2 \quad \text{VP}_3 \quad \text{VP}_4 \quad \text{VP}_5 \quad \text{VP}_6 \quad \text{VP}_7 \quad \text{VP}_8
\end{align*}
\]
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The annotation schemata in this c-structure can be explained in a similar way to those in the c-structure (203) above. The difference between the c-structure (203) and the c-structure (206) is that SCOMP in the c-structure (206) has no overt noun phrase subject. Although the SCOMP subject is unexpressed in the c-structure, it is interpreted as PRO in the f-structure (207). The feature \[^{↑}\text{COMP SUBJ SB} = -\] is added to the feature value of the SCOMP subject or PRO. This indicates that the matrix subject cannot be interpreted as an antecedent of the SCOMP subject.

207) \[
\begin{align*}
\text{SUBJ} & \quad \text{PRED 'SOT'} \\
\text{PRED} & \quad '\text{WANT }\langle(\text{SUBJ} \langle \text{SCOMP})\rangle'$ \\
\text{qaoy} & \quad + \\
\text{SCOMP} & \quad \begin{align*}
\text{SUBJ} & \quad \begin{align*}
\text{PRED} & \quad '\text{PRO'} \\
\text{SB} & \quad -
\end{align*} \\
\text{PRED} & \quad '\text{WIN }\langle(\text{SUBJ} \langle \text{OBJ})\rangle'$ \\
\text{OBJ} & \quad \text{PRED 'LOTTERIES'}
\end{align*}
\end{align*}
\]

To conclude, the form qaoy in the complement following a desiderative predicate in some contexts has undergone grammaticalisation. The occurrence of the non-predicate qaoy in this complement construction marks the switch of the subject referent in Khmer. As there is no syntactic distinction between the predicate qaoy and the non-predicate qaoy in complements following a desiderative predicate, sometimes, it is ambiguous which form of qaoy is used in a sentence.

In general, a switch-reference system is a phenomenon in which a verb in the language is marked differently according to the relationship of the subject of one clause and the subject of another syntactically related clause (Haiman and Munro, 1983.ix; Comrie, 1993:7; Stirling, 1993:1). The switch reference morpheme in a language can be either a clitic, an affix, an independent morpheme or a particle (Stirling, 1993:22-25). Foley and Van Valin (1984:339) note that switch-reference systems are "always associated with verb-final languages" while Stirling (1993:12) suggests that switch-reference systems tend to be related to complex verb morphology. Switch-reference system also tends to be an areal feature rather than language specific (Stirling, 1993:5). Jacobsen (1967) notes the typological and genetic relationship of switch-reference systems of North American Indian languages whereas Austin (1981) discusses the switch-reference system of indigenous languages

\[\text{22 Whilst Foley and Van Valin examine a large range of data, all their examples describe co-ordinate structures, not complement structures. This might explain their prediction.}\]
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Although Khmer is neither a verb-final language nor a complex verb morphology language, the occurrence of the form qaoy in the complement is one way of expressing the switch of subject referent in the Khmer complement construction. This characteristic of switch-reference in some specific constructions can also be found in other languages in South-East Asia. Diller (1993:409) points out that the form hây in Thai, which has a similar function to qaoy in Khmer, can specify switch-reference in a controlled-action construction. Although Jaisser (1984:57-58) considers kom which is grammaticalised from the verb kom 'to order', a complementiser, she notes that the occurrence of the form kom also indicates the change of the subject referent in the complement construction. The study of the grammaticalisation of the verb 'to allow; to order' to mark a switch-reference in complement constructions of languages in South-East Asia is another interesting issue for further research.

6.5.2.2 Non-predicate qaoy marking object-controlled complements

This section proposes an analysis of complements containing qaoy which are preceded by a manipulative predicate or an utterance predicate. This type of complement containing qaoy is the most common type. Unlike previous analyses on similar structures in Hmong and Thai, I will argue that the form qaoy in complements preceded by a manipulative predicate or an utterance predicate has undergone grammaticalisation. It has different characteristics from the predicate qaoy following a desiderative predicate or a commitment predicate discussed in section 6.5.1.

As discussed in section 6.2, previous studies in Hmong and Thai have focused on the similar constructions to this type of complement in Khmer. Most linguists (Jaisser, 1985; Sriphen, 1982; Thepkanjana, 1986) argue that there is only one type of embedded clause containing kom in Hmong or hây in Thai. An embedded clause containing kom in Hmong or hây in Thai which is preceded by a desiderative predicate (which is similar to complements containing the predicate qaoy discussed in section 6.5.1 and complements containing the non-predicate qaoy discussed in section 6.5.2.1) and the one preceded by a manipulative predicate or an utterance predicate share the same structure. In contrast, Pingkarawat (1989) considers an embedded clause containing hây following a desiderative predicate to be a complement and an embedded clause containing hây following an utterance predicate to be an adjunct.

Pingkarawat argues that the utterance predicate bôk 'to tell' in Thai can be followed by two object noun phrases as well as an embedded clause containing hây.
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Her example is repeated here as (208).

\[\text{208) nuən bək khwa:mciŋ lék [e1 háy e2 [e3 wîŋ thûk wan] every day 'Nuan told the truth to Lek to have her run every day.' (Pingkarawat, 1989:168 (15))}\]

Thus, the clause containing háy in Thai is an adjunct, not a complement. Nevertheless, Pingkarawat's argument cannot be applied to Khmer. In Khmer, when an utterance predicate prap 'to tell' is followed by two object noun phrases, an embedded clause containing qaoy cannot occur in that sentence. Example (209) is ungrammatical since the predicate is followed by two object noun phrases as well as an embedded clause containing qaoy.

\[\text{209) *nìəri prap cindaqa qaoy rûət rōəl tŋay Nieree tell Chinda truth Qaoy run every day}\]

A sentence with prap 'to tell' can be grammatical if the matrix predicate is followed by either two object noun phrases or a recipient object and an embedded clause containing qaoy. As illustrated in (210), prap 'to tell' subcategorises for two object noun phrases. The predicate prap 'to tell' in example (210) does not have a manipulative implication.

\[\text{210) nìəri prap cindaqa kaapit qaoy Nieree tell Chinda truth Qaoy run every day 'Nieree told Chinda the truth.'}\]

The predicate prap 'to tell' in (211), is followed by a recipient object and an embedded clause containing qaoy. Unlike prap 'to tell' in (210), the predicate prap 'to tell' in (211) has an inherently manipulative implication.

\[\text{211) nìəri prap cindaqa qaoy rûət rōəl tŋay Nieree tell Chinda Qaoy run every day 'Nieree told Chinda to run everyday.'}\]

If the recipient object noun phrase is replaced by the theme object, as demonstrated in (212), the sentence is ungrammatical. When this type of embedded clause containing qaoy occurs in a sentence, the matrix predicate requires its object to be animate. The matrix object is interpreted as the controller of the complement action following qaoy. This will be discussed later in this section.

\[\text{212) *nìəri prap kaapit qaoy rûət rōəl tŋay Nieree tell truth Qaoy run every day}\]

The fact that prap 'to tell' can be followed by either two object noun phrases or a recipient object and an embedded clause containing qaoy suggests that prap 'to
tell' can occur in various constructions. However, this does not reveal the grammatical function of an embedded clause containing qaoy.

In comparison to prop 'to tell', manipulative predicates and other utterance predicates which can precede the same type of embedded clause containing qaoy as prop 'to tell' does, can be used to identify the grammatical function of an embedded clause containing qaoy. These predicates require the embedded clause containing qaoy to be in the sentence. Although examples (213) - (215) can be understood in contexts, Khmer speakers consider them to be incomplete.

213) ?qwpuk bəŋkham kñom
father force I
'(My) father ordered me (to do something).'</n
214) ?kmae krahaam bəñcia yaœy
Khmer Rouge order we
'The Khmer Rouge ordered us (to do something).'</n
215) ?koun qaœwəa mdaay
child beg mother
'The child begged the mother (to do something).'</n
To complete these sentences, an embedded clause containing qaoy can be added. This is exemplified in (216) - (218).

216) qaœwpuk bəŋkham kñom qaoy twəa srae
father order I Qaoy do ricefield
'(My) father ordered me to work in the ricefield.'</n
217) kmae krahaam bəñcia yaœy qaoy caœn pii
Khmer Rouge order we Qaoy leave from
mantriipet hospital
'The Khmer Rouge ordered us to leave the hospital.'</n
218) koun qaœwəa mdaay qaoy tĩn num
child beg mother Qaoy buy sweet
'The child begged the mother to buy some sweet.'

The fact that manipulative predicates and utterance predicates require an embedded clause containing qaoy in a sentence suggests that these predicates subcategorise for an embedded clause containing qaoy. An embedded clause containing qaoy is, therefore, best analysed as a complement, not an adjunct. By analogy to these predicates, a proposition containing qaoy following the utterance predicate prop 'to tell' discussed above, is also interpreted as a complement.

When the complement containing qaoy is preceded by a manipulative predicate or an utterance predicate, as in (219) - (222), the matrix object is interpreted as the controller of the unexpressed complement subject following the form qaoy. For
instance, if example (219) is true, Wichet has done this work. In other words, the matrix object referent performs the complement action following the form qaoy.

219) sot prap wicat qaoy tɔɔɔ kaa nih
Sot tell Wichet Qaoy do work this
'Sot told Wichet to do this work.'

220) chum qɔŋwua niɔrii qaoy tɔalɔɔ mɔɔɔ wın
Chum beg Nieree Qaoy return come back
'Chum begged Nieree to come back.'

221) meetɔɔɛ bɑɔɔi tiɔhii qaoy dɔɔi prɔɔi sauɔɔn
commander order soldier Qaoy chase people
caŋ pįi pnum pǐi
leave from Phnom Penh
'The commander ordered the soldiers to chase the people away from Phnom Penh.'

222) cindaa bɔŋkham koun qaoy tiw ɲuut tik
Chinda order child Qaoy go have a shower
'Chinda ordered (her) child (for him) to have a shower.'

The function of the form qaoym in examples (219) - (222) contrasts with that of the main verb qaoym 'to have someone do something; to allow'. As illustrated in (223), the noun phrase which occurs before the main verb qaoym 'to have someone do something; to allow' functions as the subject of qaoym. Since the main verb qaoym 'to have someone do something; to allow' is an object-controlled verb, the matrix subject cannot be interpreted as the controller of the complement subject following the verb qaoym. In example (223), Wichet functions as the subject of the predicate qaoym. Example (223) cannot mean 'Wichet did the work for someone' but it only means 'Wichet allowed someone to do this work/ Wichet had someone do this work'.

223) wicat qaoym tɔɔɔ kaa nih
Wichet Qaoy do work this
'Wichet allowed (someone) to do this work.'
OR
'Wichet had (someone) do this work.'

In addition, the order of the subject and the object of the predicate qaoym must be fixed. For instance, Wichet in (224) functions as the subject of the main verb qaoym 'to have someone do something; to allow' whereas Nieree is the object of qaoym.

224) wicat qaoym niɔrii tɔɔɔ kaa nih
Wichet Qaoy Nieree do work this
'Wichet allowed Nieree to do this work.'
OR
'Wichet had Nieree do this work.'

As illustrated in (225), when the object of qaoym or 'Nieree' precedes the main verb qaoym, the sentence is ungrammatical.
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225) *wicet niərii qaoy twəə kaa nih
       Wichet Nieree Qaoy do work this

The fact that the matrix object referent preceding a complement containing qaoy in examples (219) - (222) performs the complement action following the form qaoy suggests that the form qaoy in this complement construction, differs from the main verb qaoy. The form qaoy in this complement construction has undergone grammaticalisation. It does not subcategorise for an argument.

The following examples are given to support my argument that the form qaoy in this construction does not subcategorise for an argument. Examples (226) - (229) are ungrammatical since the matrix object cannot function as the subject of qaoy in the contrastive clause.23

226) *sot prap wicet qaoy twəə kaa nih tae
       Sot told Wichet Qaoy do work this but
       wicet min qaoy
       Wichet not Qaoy

227) *chum qaŋwəa niərii qaoy trəlap məook wiñ tae
       Chum beg Nieree Qaoy return come back but
       niərii min qaoy
       Nieree not Qaoy

228) *meetöap bəncia tiəhian qaoy dən prəciəcəun
       commander order soldier Qaoy chase people
       cən pii pnum pɨn tae tiəhian min qaoy
       leave from Phnom Penh but soldier not Qaoy

229) *cindaa bəŋkham koun qaoy tiw ɲuut tik tae
       Chinda order child Qaoy go have a shower but
       koun min qaoy
       child not Qaoy

As illustrated in (230) - (233), if the form qaoy is missing, the sentences are unacceptable. My Khmer informants do not accept these sentences even though the meaning of the sentences can be understood.

230) *sot prap wicet twəə kaa nih
       Sot told Wichet do work this

231) *chum qaŋwəa niərii trəlap məook wiñ
       Chum beg Nieree return come back

232) *meetöap bəncia tiəhian dən prəciəcəun cən
       commander order soldier chase people leave
       pii pnum pɨn
       from Phnom Penh

23See section 6.5.3 for further discussion of this test with the predicate qaoy.
The complements containing qaoy share some characteristics with object-controlled complements discussed in Chapter 5. Firstly, the matrix object followed by the complement containing qaoy can undergo passivisation. This is exemplified in (234) - (237). There is an additional implication that the matrix subject referent in the passive construction was not willing to perform the complement action.

234) wicew traw sot prap qaoy twaa kaa nih
Wichet Pass Sot tell Qaoy do work this
'Wichet was told (by Sot) to do this work.'

235) niirii traw chum qaowaa qaoy tralap mok wii
Nieree Pass Chum beg Qaoy return come back
'Nieree was begged (by Chum) to come back.'

236) tiishan traw meetoap baang qaoy daa praci ciuon
soldier Pass commander order Qaoy chase people
'The soldiers were ordered (by the commander) to chase the people.'

237) koun traw mdaay baangham qaoy tiw nhuut tik
child Pass mother order Qaoy go have a shower
'The child was ordered (by the mother) to have a shower.'

Secondly, the complements containing qaoy cannot be modified by an auxiliary, as illustrated in (238) - (241).

238) *sot prap wicew baan qaoy twaa kaa nih
Sot told Wichet Past Qaoy do work this

239) *chum qaowaa niirii baan qaoy tralap mok wii
Chum beg Nieree Past Qaoy return come back

240) *meetoap baang tiishan niin qaoy daa praci ciuon
commander order soldier Irrl Qaoy chase people
cen pii pnum pin
leave from Phnom Penh

241) *cindaa baangham koun niin qaoy tiw nhuut tik
Chinda order child Irrl Qaoy go have a shower

Unlike other predicates which introduce object-controlled complements, the form qaoy in the complement construction can be negated. The verbal negator min can be inserted before the form qaoy which follows a manipulative predicate or an utterance predicate, as in (242) - (245).

242) sot prap wicew min qaoy twaa kaa nih
Sot tell Wichet not Qaoy do work this
'Sot told Wichet not to do this work.'
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243) chum qaNguaa niarii min qaoy tralap mook wiñ
Chum beg Nieree not Qaoy return come back
'Chum begged Nieree not to come back.'

244) meetõap bañcia tiñhian min qaoy deni pracõcúõn
commander order soldier not Qaoy chase people
cañ piñ pnum piñ
leave from Phnom Penh
'The commander ordered the soldiers not to chase the people away from Phnom Penh.'

245) cindaa bañkham koun min qaoy leen biõ
Chinda order child not Qaoy play card
'Chinda ordered (her) child (for him) not to play cards.'

As can be seen in (246) - (249), the form qaoy can also be negated by the prohibitive kom, due to the semantic feature of the matrix predicate.

246) sot prap wicõt kom qaoy twee kaa niñ
Sot tell Wichet don't Qaoy do work this
'Sot told Wichet not to do this work.'

247) chum qaNgwaa niarii kom qaoy tralap mook wiñ
Chum beg Nieree not Qaoy return come back
'Chum begged Nieree not to come back.'

248) meetõap bañcia tiñhian kom qaoy deni pracõcúõn
commander order soldier not Qaoy chase people
cañ piñ pnum piñ
leave from Phnom Penh
'The commander ordered the soldiers not to chase the people away from Phnom Penh.'

249) cindaa bañkham koun kom qaoy leen biõ
Chinda order child don't Qaoy play card
'Chinda ordered (her) child (for him) not to play cards.'

As noted in section 6.4.1, a number of prohibitive manipulative predicates require a negator to be obligatorily inserted before qaoy. This is illustrated in (250) and (251). The meaning of this double negative construction is similar to normal negation in English.

250) niarii haam sot min qaoy cuq baarëy
Nieree forbid Sot not Qaoy smoke cigarette
'Nieree forbade Sot to smoke cigarettes.'

251) koun kmeiñ bañqak maq min qaoy tiw twee
child prevent Mum not Qaoy go do
kaa work
'The child prevented (his) Mum from going to work.'

The form qaoy following utterance predicates such as prap 'to tell' and qaNgwaa 'to beg', moreover, can be modified by the pragmatic particle soum 'please'.
Examples (252) - (254) in which the form qaoy is preceded by the pragmatic particle soum 'please' indicate a request.

252) sot prap wicgt soum qaoy twə kaa nih
    'Sot told Wichet to please do this work.'

253) nīerī qiṃwaa pdəy soum kom qaoy mian
    Nierëe beg husband please don't qaoy have
    'Nierëe begged (her) husband to please not have a new wife.'

254) kñom qiṃwaa kōst soum qaoy lēŋ kñom
    'I begged him to please release me.'

The form qaoy following the matrix predicates which express strong manipulation cannot be modified by the pragmatic particle soum. Examples (255) - (257) are not ungrammatical, however, they are pragmatically odd.

255) #meetōp bānçō tīhiōn soum qaoy dən
    commander order soldier please qaoy chase
    The commander ordered the soldier to please chase the people from Phnom Penh.

256) #cindaa bōŋkham koun soum qaoy tiw ńut tik
    Chinda order child please qaoy go have a shower
    'Chinda ordered her child to please have a shower.'

257) #kñom qaヌuŋaat koun sōh soum qaoy chup samraŋ sōn
    I allow student please qaoy stop rest before
    'I allowed the students to please have a rest.'

The fact that the form qaoy following a manipulative predicate or an utterance predicate does not subcategorise for an argument suggests that the form qaoy has undergone a process of grammaticalisation. The good piece of evidence that the form qaoy in this construction can still be negated, nevertheless, indicates that the form qaoy retains a verbal feature. The form qaoy in this complement construction is best analysed as the non-predicate qaoy. Although complements containing the non-predicate qaoy which follow a desiderative predicate discussed in section 6.5.2.1 function as an SCOMP, complements preceded by a manipulative predicate or an utterance predicate is best interpreted as VCOMP. Unlike a desiderative predicate, a manipulative predicate and an utterance predicate can subcategorise for an object as well as a complement containing the non-predicate qaoy.

The lexical entries of example (219) which is repeated here for convenience as (258), are given below:
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258) sot prap wicət qaoy twəə kaa nih
Sot tell Wichet Qaoy do work this
'Sot told Wichet to do this work.'

259) prap: \[ V, (\uparrow PRED) = 'TELL ((\uparrow SUBJ)(\uparrow OBJ)(\uparrow VCOMP))' \]
\[ (\uparrow VCOMP SUBJ) = (\uparrow OBJ) \]
\[ \uparrow qaoy = _c +. \]

260) qaoy: \[ V, \uparrow COMP \text{ SUBJ SB} = - \]
\[ \uparrow qaoy = +. \]

As illustrated in (259), the predicate prap 'to tell' subcategorises for a SUBJ, an OBJ and a VCOMP. The object of prap 'to tell' functions as the controller of the VCOMP subject and there must be the form qaoy. The constraint equation included in (259), indicates that the form qaoy must occur in the f-structure, otherwise the f-structure is inconsistent and incoherent. The lexical entry of the non-predicate qaoy shown in (260) is the same as that of the non-predicate qaoy marking a switch of the subject-referent illustrated in (202) above. As shown in (260), the form qaoy in these lexical entries is analysed as a verb without a PRED feature. Although it does not subcategorise for an argument, it retains a verbal feature. The feature \[ [\uparrow COMP \text{ SUBJ SB} = -] \] of the non-predicate qaoy is compatible with the characteristic of this complement construction. The matrix subject cannot be interpreted as the controller of the complement action following the non-predicate qaoy. The control equation of prap 'to tell' indicates that the matrix object is the controller of the VCOMP subject. The c-structure of example (258) is given in (261).

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{S}_1 & \quad \uparrow \text{SUBJ} = \downarrow \\
\text{NP}_2 & \quad \uparrow = \downarrow \\
\text{VP}_3 \quad \uparrow \text{OBJ} = \downarrow \\
\text{NP}_5 \quad \uparrow = \downarrow \\
\text{VP}_6 \quad \uparrow \text{VCOMP} = \downarrow \\
\text{sot} & \quad \text{prap} \\
\text{wicət} & \quad \text{qaoy} \\
twəə & \quad \text{kaa nih}
\end{align*}
\]

From the bottom of the c-structure (261), the functional equation \[ \uparrow \text{VCOMP}=\downarrow \] above

\[ ^{24} \text{For a detail discussion of this feature of non-predicate qaoy, see section 6.5.2.1.} \]
the node VP₈ means that the functional information carried by the node VP₈ goes into the VCOMP part of the f-structure of the upper node or VP₆. The annotation ↑=↓ above the node V₇ means that information about V₇ is equivalent to that of its mother node VP₆. This qaoq does not provide any PRED value to its upper node as it is a non-predicate verb. However, this qaoq adds ↑qaoq = + into the f-structure of its mother node. The equation ↑=↓ above the node VP₆ indicates that information about its own node and that about the mother node are the same. Therefore, the functional information VCOMP carried by the node VP₈, which is passed up to VP₆, is further passed up to the node VP₃. The equation ↑OBJ=↓ above the node NP₅ indicates that all information carried by NP₅ goes into the OBJ part of the f-structure of the upper node VP₃. The equation ↑=↓ above the node V₄ indicates that information about V₄ is equivalent to information about VP₃. As V₄ contains the PRED value, namely 'TELL', this PRED value is passed up to VP₃. As VP₃ also has the equation ↑=↓ attached to it, information about V₄ and those about NP₅ and VP₆ are then passed up to S₁. In other words, S₁ receives the PRED value from V₄ or prap and the grammatical functions OBJ and VCOMP are then the grammatical functions of the highest node or S₁ in the f-structure.

As the interaction between the c-structure and the f-structure plays a crucial role in the discussion of this section, I will show how the f-structures of examples in this section are built. An f-structure can be built from information in the c-structure and the lexicon via f-description. For detail of f-descriptions, see section 1.2.1.1. Numerical subscripts in the f-descriptions are variables in the f-structure, not the c-structure.

The f-description for example (258) includes equations as given in (262). These equations along with information from the lexicon build up the f-structure (263).

262) a. \( f_1 \text{SUBJ} = f_2 \)
   b. \( f_1 = f_3 \)
   c. \( f_3 = f_4 \)
   d. \( f_3 \text{OBJ} = f_5 \)
   e. \( f_1 \text{OBJ} = f_5 \)
   f. \( f_3 = f_6 \)

---

25In this study, I will only show relevant equations for each f-description. The equation \( f_1 \text{SUBJ} = f_2 \) is assumed in all f-descriptions; it will not be repeated in other f-descriptions.
g. \( f_6 = f_7 \)

h. \( f_6 \text{ VCOMP} = f_8 \)

i. \( f_3 \text{ VCOMP} = f_8 \)

j. \( f_1 \text{ VCOMP} = f_8 \)

k. \( f_4 \text{ PRED} = 'TELL (&SUBJ) (OBJ) (VCOMP)' \)

l. \( f_7 \text{ qaoy} = + \)

These equations can be read as follows: in (a), the value of the \( \text{SUBJ} \) of \( f_1 \) is equivalent to the value of \( f_2 \). As given in (b), the values of \( f_1 \) and \( f_3 \) are equated. Since the lexical entry for \( \text{prap} \) in \( f_4 \) provides the \( \text{PRED} \) value for \( f_3 = f_4 \), namely \('TELL'\), the \( \text{PRED} \) value of \( f_1 \) is then equivalent to the \( \text{PRED} \) value of \( f_4 \). The equations (d) and (e) means that the value of the \( \text{OBJ} \) of \( f_3 \) and \( f_1 \) is equivalent to the value of \( f_5 \). As shown in (f) and (g), the values of \( f_3 \) and \( f_6 \) as well as the values of \( f_6 \) and \( f_7 \) are equated. Since the lexical entry for \( \text{qaoy} \) in \( f_7 \) does not provide the \( \text{PRED} \) value for \( \text{qaoy} \), no \( \text{PRED} \) value is added to \( f_6 \) or \( f_3 \). However, it adds \( \uparrow \text{qaoy} = + \), as given in the equation (l). This information is required by the constraining equation in the lexical entry of the matrix predicate. As given in (h), the value of the \( \text{VCOMP} \) of \( f_6 \) is equivalent to the value of \( f_8 \). Since the values of \( f_1, f_3 \) and \( f_6 \) are equated, as the equations (b) and (f) show, the values of the \( \text{VCOMP} \) of \( f_3 \) and that of \( f_1 \) are also equivalent to the value of \( f_8 \). This is given in (i) and (j). The \( f \)-structure (263) is well-formed as the value of the form \( \text{qaoy} \) has a + value which is required by the lexical entry (259).

```
263) SUBJ [ PRED 'SOT' ]
PRED 'TELL (&SUBJ) (OBJ) (VCOMP)'
OBJ [ PRED 'WICHET' ]
qaoy +
VCOMP [ SUBJ [ ] ]
[ PRED 'DO (&SUBJ) (OBJ)' ]
OBJ [ PRED 'WORK' ]
[ SPEC THIS ]
```

In a slightly different c-structure, the matrix object can occur after the form \( \text{qaoy} \). Examples (264) - (267) in which the matrix object follows the form \( \text{qaoy} \), have the same interpretation as examples (219) - (222) in which the matrix object precedes
the form qaoy.

264) sot prap qaoy wicət twəə kaa nih
Sot tell QAoy Wichet do work this
'Sot told Wichet to do this work.'

265) chum qaŋwa qaoy niərii trələp moök wiŋ
Chum beg QAoy Nieree return come back
'Chum begged Nieree to come back.'

266) meetəo pənəciə qaoy tiahìən dən prəciəəən
commander order QAoy soldier chase people
caŋ piə pnum piŋ
leave from Phnom Penh
'The commander ordered the soldiers to chase the people away from Phnom Penh.'

267) cindaə bənχəm qaoy koun tiw ɲuut tik
Chinda order QAoy child go have a shower
'Chinda ordered (her) child (for him) to have a shower.'

Since qaoy is still a verb, an NP can be generated after qaoy by the phrase structure rules.26 This NP, however, functions as an OBJ of the matrix predicate prap 'to tell', not an OBJ of qaoy. The form qaoy in this complement construction does not have a PRED feature; thus it does not subcategorise for an argument. Example (264) shares the same lexical entries with example (258) discussed above. However, the c-structure (268) and the subscript index in the f-structure (270) of example (264) are slightly different from the c-structure (261) and the subscript index in the f-structure (263) of example (258).

268)
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The functional annotations of the c-structure (268) can be explained as follows: the equations $\uparrow \text{OBJ}=\downarrow$ above the node NP\textsubscript{7} and $\uparrow \text{VCOMP}=\downarrow$ above the node VP\textsubscript{8} indicate that all functional information carried by the nodes NP\textsubscript{7} and VP\textsubscript{8} goes into the OBJ part and the VCOMP part of the f-structure of the mother node VP\textsubscript{5}. The equation $\uparrow=\downarrow$ above the node V\textsubscript{6} indicates that information about V\textsubscript{6} is equivalent to information about the upper node; and is passed up to the upper node. This qaoy does not provide any PRED value to its mother node, but it adds $\uparrow \text{qaoy} = +$ into the f-structure of the mother node. The annotation $\uparrow=\downarrow$ above the node VP\textsubscript{5} means that information about the ego node is information about its mother node or VP\textsubscript{3}. Therefore, the grammatical functions OBJ carried by NP\textsubscript{7} and VCOMP carried by VP\textsubscript{8} are passed up to be the grammatical functions of the upper node or VP\textsubscript{3}. The annotation $\uparrow=\downarrow$ above the node V\textsubscript{4} indicates that information about V\textsubscript{4} is the same as that about VP\textsubscript{3}. As the lexical entry for prap in V\textsubscript{4} provides the PRED value for V\textsubscript{4}, namely 'TELL', this PRED value is then passed up to VP\textsubscript{3}. Since information about VP\textsubscript{3} also holds for S\textsubscript{1}, the PRED value carried by V\textsubscript{4} is then the PRED value of the main clause and the grammatical functions OBJ carried by NP\textsubscript{7} and VCOMP carried by VP\textsubscript{8} are the grammatical functions OBJ and VCOMP of the main clause.

The f-description for example (264) includes the equations as given in (269). The f-structure (270) is built up in the usual way.

269) a. $f_1 = f_3$
   
   b. $f_3 = f_4$
   
   c. $f_3 = f_5$
   
   d. $f_5 = f_6$
   
   e. $f_5 \text{OBJ} = f_7$
   
   f. $f_3 \text{OBJ} = f_7$
   
   g. $f_1 \text{OBJ} = f_7$
   
   h. $f_5 \text{VCOMP} = f_8$
   
   i. $f_3 \text{VCOMP} = f_8$
   
   j. $f_1 \text{VCOMP} = f_8$
   
   k. $f_4 \text{PRED} = '\text{TELL} \langle (\text{SUBJ}) (\text{OBJ}) (\text{VCOMP}) \rangle'$
   
   l. $f_6 \text{qaoy} = +$

The equations as given in (269) can be read in a similar way to those in the f-description (262) above. As given in (a), $f_1$ and $f_3$ share the same value. Since the
lexical entry for prap in \( f_4 \) provides the PRED value for \( f_3 = f_4 \), the PRED value of \( f_1 \) is equivalent to the PRED value of \( f_4 \). As qaoy in \( f_6 \) does not contain the PRED value, no PRED value is added to \( f_5 \) even though the values of \( f_5 \) and \( f_6 \) are equated, as shown in (d). As given in (l), the lexical entry for qaoy adds \( \uparrow_{\text{qaoy}} = + \) which is required by the constraining equation in the lexical entry of the matrix predicate. Although the OBJ or \( f_7 \) is located in an embedded VP, it becomes OBJ of the main clause, because \( f_5 = f_3 = f_1 \), as indicated in (a) and (c). To put it another way, the value of \( f_7 \) which is equivalent to the value of the OBJ of \( f_5 \) is also the same as the values of the OBJ of \( f_3 \) and \( f_1 \). This is possible as qaoy in \( f_6 \) has no PRED value. The OBJ can be generated after qaoy by the phrase structure rule, but this OBJ is not subcategorised for by qaoy. The f-structure of example (264) is similar to that of example (258), however, the subscripts in the f-structure (270) are slightly different from those in (263).

As can be seen in (271) - (274), the matrix object can occur overtly both before and after the form qaoy.

271) sot prap wicat qaoy wicat twao kaa nih
Sot tell Wichet Qaoy Wichet do work this
'Sot told Wichet to do this work.'

272) chum qaowao niirii qaoy niirii tralap moak wi
Chum beg Nieree Qaoy Nieree return come back
'Chum begged Nieree to come back.'

273) meetooap baicio tiavian qaoy tiavian dao praciacuun
commander order soldier Qaoy soldier chase people
penh
'commander ordered the soldiers to chase the people away from Phnom Penh.'

The commander ordered the soldiers to chase the people away from Phnom Penh.
Example (271) also shares the same lexical entries with examples (258) and (264). The c-structure of example (271) can be presented as:

In this c-structure, the functional annotations \( \uparrow \text{OBJ} = \downarrow \) and \( \uparrow \text{VCOMP} = \downarrow \) above the nodes \( \text{NP}_8 \) and \( \text{VP}_9 \) indicate that all functional information carried by \( \text{NP}_8 \) and \( \text{VP}_9 \) goes into the OBJ part and the VCOMP part of the f-structure of the mother node \( \text{VP}_6 \). The equation \( \uparrow = \downarrow \) above the node \( \text{V}_7 \) means that information about \( \text{V}_7 \) is equivalent to information about \( \text{VP}_6 \); and is passed up to \( \text{VP}_6 \). The lexical entry of \( \text{qaoy} \) in \( \text{V}_7 \) indicates that this \( \text{qaoy} \) is a non-predicate verb; it does not provide the PRED value to the sentence but it adds +qaoy to the f-structure of its mother node. As information about \( \text{VP}_6 \) also holds for \( \text{VP}_3 \), the grammatical functions OBJ carried by \( \text{NP}_8 \) and VCOMP carried by \( \text{VP}_9 \) are then the grammatical functions of \( \text{VP}_3 \). The annotation \( \uparrow = \downarrow \) above the node \( \text{V}_4 \) means that information about the ego node is information about its mother node. The PRED value of \( \text{V}_4 \) which is specified by the lexical entry of \( \text{prap} \) 'to tell' is then passed up to \( \text{VP}_3 \). Since information about the node \( \text{VP}_3 \) is equivalent to information about \( \text{S}_1 \), the PRED value carried by \( \text{V}_4 \) is then passed up to \( \text{S}_1 \); and the grammatical function OBJ carried by \( \text{NP}_5 \) and \( \text{NP}_8 \), and the grammatical function VCOMP carried by \( \text{VP}_9 \) are the grammatical functions OBJ and VCOMP of the main clause.

It should be noted that the occurrence of OBJ in two positions in the c-structure is not consistent with the interpretation of the uniqueness condition given by Kaplan and Bresnan (1982:274). The uniqueness condition specifies that a particular attribute may have at most one value (Kaplan and Bresnan, 1982:181). Each PRED is assumed to have a unique value, and they cannot be merged. However, Andrews (1990:516) argues that the interpretation of this condition as presented is too
strong. He provides examples of some languages, such as Irish in which both the verb form and the pronoun can be used to specify the PRED value of the subject, and Spanish in which an object pronominal clitic can occur in the same sentence with an object noun phrase, which violate Kaplan and Bresnan' uniqueness condition. Evidence in Khmer also shows that it is necessary in some circumstance to merge PRED.\(^{27}\) This issue merits further investigation.

Khmer speakers, nevertheless, consider this structure redundant. They prefer to have only one overt form of the matrix object in the sentence, to avoid the redundancy. It has also been observed that Khmer speakers prefer the occurrence of the matrix object right after the matrix predicate or before the non-predicate qaoy to the occurrence of the matrix object after qaoy. The sequence of the MV - NP - qaoy is more natural since the matrix object immediately follows the predicate which subcategorises for it.

The equations as given in (276) are included in the f-description of example (271).

\[
\begin{align*}
276)\ a. &\quad f_1 = f_3 \\
b. &\quad f_3 = f_4 \\
c. &\quad f_3 \text{OBJ} = f_5 \\
d. &\quad f_1 \text{OBJ} = f_5 \\
e. &\quad f_3 = f_6 \\
f. &\quad f_6 = f_7 \\
g. &\quad f_6 \text{OBJ} = f_8 \\
h. &\quad f_3 \text{OBJ} = f_8 \\
i. &\quad f_1 \text{OBJ} = f_8 \\
j. &\quad f_6 \text{VCOMP} = f_9 \\
k. &\quad f_3 \text{VCOMP} = f_9 \\
l. &\quad f_1 \text{VCOMP} = f_9 \\
m. &\quad f_4 \text{PRED} = '\text{TELL} ((\text{SUBJ}) (\text{OBJ}) (\text{VCOMP}))' \\
\end{align*}
\]

\(^{27}\) As discussed in section 6.2, the same phenomenon also occurs in languages geographically close to Khmer. The same noun phrase can occur both before and after the form kom in Hmong (Jaisser, 1984:63) and hay in Thai (Sriphen, 1982:225).
The equations in (276) can be read as follows: as given in (a), \( f_1 \) and \( f_3 \) share the same value. Since the lexical entry for prap in \( f_4 \), as given in (m), provides the PRED value for \( f_5 = f_4 \), namely 'TELL', the PRED value of \( f_1 \) is then equivalent to the PRED value of \( f_4 \). The equations (c) and (d) indicate that the values of the OBJ of \( f_3 \) and \( f_1 \) are equivalent to the value of \( f_5 \). The equation (e) indicates that \( f_3 \) and \( f_6 \) share the same value. As the equation (f) means that the values of \( f_5 \) and \( f_7 \) are equated and as the lexical entry for qaoy in \( f_7 \) indicates that this qaoy does not have the PRED value, no PRED value from \( f_7 \) is added to the value of \( f_6 \) and \( f_3 \). As given in the equation (n), the lexical entry for qaoy adds \( \uparrow \text{qaoy} = + \) to the values of \( f_6 \) and \( f_3 \). The values of the OBJ of \( f_6, f_3 \) and \( f_1 \) are the same as the value of \( f_8 \). This is given in (g) - (i). As discussed above, in some circumstance, it is necessary for the PRED value to be merged. The value of \( f_8 \) and the value of \( f_5 \) are merged and become the values of the OBJ of \( f_3 \) and \( f_1 \). As given in the equations (j) - (l), the values of the VCOMP of \( f_6, f_3 \) and \( f_1 \) are equivalent to the value of \( f_9 \). The f-structure of example (271) is thus given in (277).

277) \[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{SUBJ} \\
\text{PRED} \\
\text{OBJ} \\
\text{qaoy} \\
\text{VCOMP}
\end{array}
\begin{array}{c}
\{ \text{PRED 'SOT'} \} \\
'\text{TELL } ((\text{SUBJ}) (\text{OBJ}) (\text{VCOMP}))' \\
5,8 \{ \text{PRED 'WICHET'} \} \\
+ \\
\{ \text{PRED 'DO } ((\text{SUBJ}) (\text{OBJ}))' \} \\
\{ \text{PRED 'WORK'} \} \\
\{ \text{SPEC THIS} \}
\end{array}
\]

1,3,4,6,7

In addition to this, when the noun phrase objects occur overtly both before and after the non-predicate qaoy, the noun phrase object following the non-predicate qaoy can be replaced by a pronoun.\(^{28}\) The subscripts in (278) - (281) show that the pronoun following the non-predicate qaoy is coreferential with the matrix object.

\(^{28}\)There can be two interpretations for a pronoun following the form qaoy. The pronoun following the form qaoy need not be coreferential with the preceding object. In this section, I will only focus on the interpretation of a pronoun which is coreferential with the preceding noun phrase object. For a detail discussion of the interpretation in which the pronoun following the form qaoy is not coreferential with the matrix object, see section 6.5.3: Combination of the non-predicate qaoy and the predicate qaoy.
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278) sot prap wicat qaoy kee twa kaak nih
      Sot, tell Wichetj Qaoy hej do work this
'Sot told Wichet to do this work.'

279) chum qaow naarii qaoy nion tra lap moek wi
    Chum, beg Nieree, Qaoy shej return come back
'Chum begged Nieree to come back.'

280) meetoo baencia tiehion qaoy pua kee dion
      commander, order soldier, Qaoy group theyj chase
      praciacin caen pip num pin
      people leave from Phnom Penh
'The commander ordered the soldiers to chase the people away from Phnom Penh.'

281) cindaa ban khom chum qaoy kee tiw nuut tik
      Chinda, order Chum, Qaoy hej go have a shower
'Chinda ordered (her) child (for him) to have a shower.'

When the pronoun following the non-predicate qaoy is coreferential with the preceding noun phrase object, its semantic information such as number and gender must be consistent with the noun phrase object preceding the non-predicate qaoy. For instance, Wichet in (278) is a male name, therefore it cannot be replaced by nign which is a female pronoun. This is illustrated in (282).

282) *sot prap wicat qaoy nion twa kaak nih
      Sot, tell Wichetj Qaoy shej do work this

Furthermore, as shown in (283) - (285), kinship terms which can be used as personal pronouns in some contexts cannot be used in this situation either.

283) *sot prap wicat qaoy caw twa kaak nih
      Sot, tell Wichetj Qaoy grandchildj do work this

284) *chum qaow naarii qaoy pqoun tra lap
      Chumj beg Nieree, Qaoy younger siblingj return
      moek wi
      come back

285) *cindaa ban khom chum qaoy koun tiw nuut tik
      Chinda, order Chum, Qaoy childj go have a shower

The fact that a kinship term cannot replace the noun phrase following the non-predicate qaoy as does a pronoun suggests that the pronoun in this position does not have its own pronominal reference; it only retains grammatical information which is consistent with that held by the preceding noun phrase object. This pronoun is best analysed as a pronoun without a PRED feature.

The fact that the non-PRED pronoun can occur in the same sentence with the noun phrase object in Khmer is similar to a subject marker in Chichewa. Bresnan and
Mchombo (1986:289-290, 292) discuss the fact that a subject marker in Chichewa can lose its referential property but retains its grammatical information such as person, number and gender, which is consistent with that carried by the subject noun phrase. Since the PRED feature of this subject marker in Chichewa is absent, functional uniqueness does not prevent the co-occurrence of a subject marker with a subject noun phrase within the verb phrase.

Example (278) which shares the same lexical entries with examples (258), (264) and (271) above has the c-structure as given in (286).

The c-structure (286) can be explained in a similar way to the c-structure (275). The f-description of example (278) include equations similar to those in the f-description (276). Although no PRED value of NP$_8$ or $f_8$ is passed up to the f-structure of its mother node, grammatical information carried by NP$_8$ or $f_8$ is included in the f-structure of its mother node. As NP$_8$ is a non-PRED pronoun, functional uniqueness is still satisfied. The study of a non-PRED pronoun in Khmer is another interesting issue for further theoretical investigation. The f-structure of example (278) is as follows:
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The matrix object which has previously been mentioned can be unexpressed, as shown in (288) - (291), since Khmer is a pro-drop language.

288) sot prap qaoy twɔɔ kaa nih
   Sot tell Qaoy do work this
   'Sot told (someone) to do this work.'

289) chum qaɔwɔ qaoy tʁɔlɔp mɔɔk wiŋ
   Chum beg Qaoy return come back
   'Chum begged (someone) to come back.'

290) meetɔɔp bɑɔɔɔ qaoy daŋ praciɔɔɔɔŋ caŋ pii
   commander order Qaoy chase people leave from
   Phnom Penh
   'The commander ordered (someone) to chase the people away from Phnom Penh.'

291) cindaa bɔŋkham qaoy tiw ɲuut tik
   Chinda order Qaoy go have a shower
   'Chinda ordered (someone,) (for him,) to have a shower.'

The c-structure of example (288) can be illustrated as follows:
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The functional equations in the c-structure of example (288) can be explained in a similar way as those in the previous c-structures. However, there is no overt noun phrase object in the c-structure (292). The f-description of example (288) includes the equations as given in (293).

293) a. \( f_1 = f_3 \)

b. \( f_3 = f_4 \)

c. \( f_3 = f_5 \)

d. \( f_5 = f_6 \)

e. \( f_5 \text{VCOMP} = f_7 \)

f. \( f_3 \text{VCOMP} = f_7 \)

g. \( f_1 \text{VCOMP} = f_7 \)

h. \( f_4 \text{PRED} = '\text{TELL ((SUBJ) (OBJ) (VCOMP))} ' \)

i. \( f_6 \text{qaoy} = + \)

The equations given in (293) can also be read in a similar way to the equations given in (262) or (269) above, except that there is no information about the value of OBJ in this f-description. Although the matrix object is unexpressed in the c-structure (292), it is interpreted as PRO in the f-structure (294) below.
In summary, the form qaoy in a complement construction preceded by a manipulative predicate or an utterance predicate is grammaticalised: it does not subcategorise for an argument. Nevertheless, it retains a verbal feature; it can be negated. The form qaoy in this construction is best analysed as a non-predicate verb. It does not have a PRED feature. In this construction, the matrix predicate subcategorises for a SUBJ, an OBJ and a VCOMP. The matrix object functions as the controller of the unexpressed VCOMP subject. Due to the fact that the form qaoy in this construction is a non-predicate verb, there can be two positions which the matrix object can occur; either before or after the form qaoy. If the matrix object occurs overtly both before and after the non-predicate qaoy, the noun phrase following qaoy can also be substituted by a pronoun. This pronoun does not have a referential property; it only provides grammatical information. Unlike the predicate qaoy which has a wide range of manipulative meaning, from 'to allow' to 'to have someone do something', the non-predicate qaoy does not have a manipulative meaning. The manipulative meaning of a sentence comes from the main verb.

6.5.3 Combination of the non-predicate qaoy and the predicate qaoy

In this section, I will discuss the combination of the non-predicate qaoy and the predicate qaoy in a complement construction. As shown in (295) - (297), the predicate of a complement containing the non-predicate qaoy is the verb qaoy itself.

295) #mdaay prap qaoy qawpuk qaoy koun ñam baay
mother tell Qaoy father Qaoy child eat rice
'The mother told the father to allow the child to eat.'
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296) #sot neenom qaoy cindaa qaoy niiri twaa
   Sot suggest Qaoy Chinda Qaoy Nieree do
   kaa nih
   work this
   'Sot suggested Chinda to have Nieree do this work.'

297) #caanwaan bancia qaoy look kruu qaoy chum
   principal order Qaoy teacher Qaoy Chum
   pralaa krup muk wici
   have exam complete subject
   'The principal ordered the teacher to have Chum have an exam for every subject.'

It should be noted at the first stage that the double use of qaoy, as in (295) - (297), causes the structure to become redundant but Khmer speakers accept it. For purposes of the analysis, I will use the structure of two overt forms of qaoy to illustrate differences between the two forms of qaoy.

If the two forms of qaoy occur next to each other, as in (298) - (300), the sentences are even less acceptable.

298) ?mdaay prap qwpuk qaoy qaoy koun nam baay
   mother tell father Qaoy Qaoy child eat rice

299) ?sot neenom cindaa qaoy qaoy niiri twaa
   Sot suggest Chinda Qaoy Qaoy Nieree do
   kaa nih
   work this

300) ?caanwaan bancia look kruu qaoy qaoy chum
   principal order teacher Qaoy Qaoy Chum
   pralaa krup muk wici
   have exam complete subject

The first qaoy in this construction is the non-predicate qaoy and has its own typical characteristics, as discussed in section 6.5.2. The second qaoy in this construction has different characteristics from the first qaoy. The matrix object in this construction can function as the controller of the unexpressed subject of the second qaoy. As shown in (301) - (303), a contrastive clause of which the predicate is qaoy, may be added to the sentence. Unlike the non-predicate qaoy discussed in section 6.5.2.2, the matrix object of examples (295) - (297) can function as the subject of qaoy in the contrastive clause in (301) - (303).

301) mdaay prap qaoy qwpuk qaoy koun nam baay
    mother tell Qaoy father Qaoy child eat rice
    tae qwpuk niw min qaoy koun nam tiat tee
    but father still not Qaoy child eat again Part
    'The mother told the father to allow the child to eat but the father still didn't allow the child to eat.'
302) sot neenōam qaoy cindaa qaoy niōrii twēa kaa
Sot suggest Qaoy Chinda Qaoy Nieree do work
nih tae cindaa niw min qaoy niōrii twēa kaa nih
this but Chinda still not Qaoy Nieree do work this
tiet tee
again Part
'Sot suggested to Chinda to have Nieree do this work but Chinda still didn't allow Nieree to do this work.'

303) caaŋwaŋ bańciō qaoy look kruu qaoy chum pralōŋ
principal order Qaoy teacher Qaoy Chum have exam
krup muk wiciō tae look kruu min qaoy tīt
complete subject but teacher not Qaoy again
'The principal ordered the teacher to have Chum have an exam for every subject but the teacher still didn't allow (it).'

The second qaoy subcategorises for the noun phrase following it as its object. Unlike the first qaoy discussed in section 6.5.2, the second qaoy does not allow the following noun phrase to occur before it. This is illustrated in (304) - (306).

304) *mdaay prap qaoy qōwpuk koun qaoy ŋam baay
mother tell Qaoy father child Qaoy eat rice

305) *sot neenōam qaoy cindaa niōrii qaoy twēa
Sot suggest Qaoy Chinda Nieree Qaoy do
kaa nih
work this

306) *caaaŋwaŋ bańciō qaoy look kruu chum qaoy
principal order Qaoy teacher Chum Qaoy
pralōŋ krup muk wiciō
have exam complete subject

Like the non-predicate qaoy, the second qaoy in this structure can be negated, as shown in (307) - (309).

307) mdaay prap qaoy qōwpuk min qaoy koun ŋam baay
mother tell Qaoy father not Qaoy child eat rice
'The mother told the father not to allow the child eat rice.'

308) sot neenōam qaoy cindaa min qaoy niōrii twēa
Sot suggest Qaoy Chinda not Qaoy Nieree do
kaa nih
work this
'Sot suggested to Chinda not to have Nieree do this work.'

309) caaŋwaŋ bańciō qaoy look kruu min qaoy chum
principal order Qaoy teacher not Qaoy Chum
pralōŋ krup muk wiciō
have exam complete subject
'The principal ordered the teacher not to have Chum have an exam for every subject.'

The fact that the second qaoy in this complement construction can subcategorise for arguments and can be negated suggests that the second qaoy is
the predicate qaoy 'to have someone do something; to allow'. The lexical entries of example (295) which is repeated here as (310) are illustrated below.

310) mdaay prap qaoy qawpuk qaoy koun ñam baay  
   mother tell Qaoy father Qaoy child eat rice  
   'The mother told the father to allow the child to eat.'

311) prap:  
    V, (↑PRED) = 'TELL ((↑SUBJ) (↑OBJ) (↑VCOMP))'  
    (↑VCOMP SUBJ) = (↑OBJ)  
    ↑qaoy =c + .

312) qaoy:  
    V, ↑qaoy = +  
    (↑COMP SUBJ SB = − ).

313) qaoy:  
    V, (↑PRED) = 'QAOY ((↑SUBJ) (↑OBJ) (↑VCOMP))'  
    (↑VCOMP SUBJ) = (↑OBJ).

As indicated in (311), the predicate prap 'to tell' subcategorises for a SUBJ, an OBJ and a VCOMP. The unexpressed VCOMP subject is controlled by the matrix object. The constraining equation ↑qaoy =c+ which is attached to the lexical entry of prap 'to tell' expresses a condition that must be satisfied by the f-structure. The form qaoy cannot be omitted in the f-structure and it does not provide information directly but the constraining equation comes from elsewhere. Like the non-predicate qaoy discussed in section 6.5.2, the first qaoy in the lexical entry (312) is the non-predicate qaoy. It is a verb but does not subcategorise for an argument. In other words, it does not have a PRED feature. The feature [↑COMP SUBJ SB = − ] means that the subject of the following complement cannot have an antecedent with the subject function within the f-structure. This feature of the non-predicate qaoy is compatible with the lexical entry of prap 'to tell' since the control equation of prap 'to tell' indicates that the object of prap 'to tell' is the controller of the following VCOMP subject. As illustrated in (313), the second qaoy is the predicate qaoy 'to have someone do something; to allow'. It subcategorises for a SUBJ, an OBJ and a VCOMP. The control equation of the predicate qaoy indicates that the unexpressed VCOMP subject following the predicate qaoy is controlled by the object of qaoy. The c-structure of example (310) can be presented as:
The functional annotations in this c-structure can be explained as follows:

The annotations $\uparrow_{\text{OBJ}} = \downarrow$ and $\uparrow_{\text{VCOMP}} = \downarrow$ above the nodes NP10 and VP11 indicate that all functional information carried by NP10 and VP11 goes into the OBJ part and the VCOMP part of the f-structure of the mother node VP8. The functional equation $\uparrow = \downarrow$ above the node V9 means that information about V9 is equivalent to that about VP8. Since the lexical entry for qaoy in V9 provides the PRED value for qaoy, the grammatical function VCOMP carried by VP8 then gets the PRED value from qaoy. The equation $\uparrow_{\text{OBJ}} = \downarrow$ above the node NP7 and the equation $\uparrow_{\text{VCOMP}} = \downarrow$ above the node VP8 mean that all functional information carried by the nodes NP7 and VP8 is information of the OBJ part and the VCOMP part of the f-structure of their upper node VP5. The annotation $\uparrow = \downarrow$ above the node V6 means that information about its own node is equivalent to that about its mother node. As this qaoy has no PRED value, it does not add a PRED value to the mother node, but it provides $\uparrow_{\text{qaoy}} = +$ into the f-structure of its mother node. Information about the OBJ part of the node NP7 and that about the VCOMP part of the node VP8 are passed up to VP3 via the equation $\uparrow = \downarrow$ above the node VP5. The equation $\uparrow = \downarrow$ above the node V4 means that all functional information about its upper node is equivalent to that about its own node. Since the lexical entry for prap in V4 provides the PRED value for V4, namely 'TELL', this PRED value of V4 is then passed up to VP3. As information about VP3 also holds for S1, the PRED value of V4 and the grammatical functions OBJ carried by NP7 and VCOMP carried by VP8 are passed up to S1. The sentence then receives its PRED value from prap and the grammatical functions OBJ and VCOMP carried by NP7 and VP8 are the grammatical functions of the main clause.

The f-description of example (310) includes the equations, as given in (315).
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315) a. \( f_1 = f_3 \)
b. \( f_3 = f_4 \)
c. \( f_3 = f_5 \)
d. \( f_5 = f_6 \)
e. \( f_5 \text{ OBJ} = f_7 \)
f. \( f_3 \text{ OBJ} = f_7 \)
g. \( f_1 \text{ OBJ} = f_7 \)
h. \( f_5 \text{ VCOMP} = f_8 \)
i. \( f_3 \text{ VCOMP} = f_8 \)
j. \( f_1 \text{ VCOMP} = f_8 \)
k. \( f_8 = f_9 \)
l. \( f_8 \text{ OBJ} = f_{10} \)
m. \( f_8 \text{ VCOMP} = f_{11} \)
n. \( f_4 \text{ PRED} = \text{'TELL (SUBJ) (OBJ) (VCOMP)'} \)
o. \( f_6 \text{ qaoy} = + \)
p. \( f_9 \text{ PRED} = \text{'QAOY (SUBJ) (OBJ) (VCOMP)'} \)

The equations given in (315) can be read in the following step. As indicated in (a), \( f_1 \) and \( f_3 \) share the same value. Since the lexical entry for \text{prap} in \( f_4 \) provides the PRED value for \( f_3 = f_4 \), namely 'TELL', the PRED value of \( f_1 \) is therefore equivalent to the PRED value of \( f_4 \). The lexical entry for \text{qaoy} in \( f_6 \) does not provide the PRED value for \( f_5 = f_6 \), thus no PRED value is added to \( f_5 \). However, the lexical entry for \text{qaoy} adds \( \uparrow \text{qaoy} = + \), as given in (o), to the f-structure of the mother node. This is required by the constraining equation in the lexical entry of the matrix predicate. The values of the OBJ of \( f_5, f_3 \) and \( f_1 \) and the values of the VCOMP of \( f_5, f_3 \) and \( f_1 \) are equivalent to the value of \( f_7 \) and the value of \( f_8 \), respectively. These are given in the equations (e) - (g) and the equations (h) - (j). Unlike qaoy in \( f_6 \), the lexical entry for qaoy in \( f_9 \) provides the PRED value for \( f_8 = f_9 \), namely 'QAOY', the PRED value of \( f_8 \) is then equivalent to the PRED value of \( f_9 \). The value of the OBJ of \( f_8 \) and the value of the VCOMP of \( f_8 \) are equivalent to the values of \( f_{10} \) and \( f_{11} \).

The f-structure of example (310), as illustrated below, is satisfied by the constraining equation of the lexical entry for \text{prap} 'to tell'. The first qaoy does not provide a PRED value, but it adds \( \uparrow \text{qaoy} = + \) to the f-structure of its mother node. If
this qaoy is omitted in the f-structure, the f-structure is incoherent and inconsistent with the lexical entry given in (311). The second qaoy is the predicate which subcategorises for a SUBJ, an OBJ and a VCOMP. The object of qaoy is the controller of the unexpressed subject of the following VCOMP.

\[
\begin{array}{l}
\text{SUBJ} \\
PRED \\
OBJ \\
qaoy \\
VCOMP \\
\end{array}
\begin{array}{l}
2 \text{[ PRED 'MOTHER'] } \\
\text{TELL }((\text{SUBJ}) (\text{OBJ}) (\text{VCOMP}))' \\
7 \text{[ PRED 'FATHER'] } \\
\text{[ SUBJ [ ] } \\
\text{PRED 'QAOY }((\text{SUBJ}) (\text{OBJ}) (\text{VCOMP}))' \\
\text{OBJ [ PRED 'CHILD'] } \\
\text{VCOMP [ SUBJ [ ] } \\
\text{PRED 'EAT }((\text{SUBJ}) (\text{OBJ}))' \\
\text{OBJ [ PRED 'RICE'] } \\
\end{array}
\]

As noted at the beginning of the section, it is preferred not to have two forms of qaoy in the same sentence. To avoid this, Khmer speakers prefer to have only one qaoy in the construction, as (317) - (319) show.

317) mdaay prap qwwpuk qaoy koun nam baay
mother tell father Qaoy child eat rice
'The mother told the father to allow the child to eat.'

318) sot neanom cindaa qaoy niorei twaa kaa nih
Sot suggest Chinda Qaoy Nieree do work this
'Sot suggested Chinda to have Nieree to do this work.'

319) caanywaan baici look kruu qaoy chum pralaaan
principal order teacher Qaoy Chum have exam
krupt muk wicic complete subject
'The principal ordered the teacher to have Chum have an exam for every subject.'

Example (317) shares the same lexical entries with example (310). However, the c-structure of example (317) is slightly different from that of (310). Information in the f-structure of example (317) is equivalent to that of example (310) but the variables presented in the f-structure (317) are slightly different. Lexical-Functional Grammar allows different c-structures to share the same f-structure. The c-structure of example (317) which is input to the phonology is presented in (320). When there
are two forms of qaoy in adjacent, phonology reduces two adjacent qaoy's to one.

320)

The functional schemata of the c-structure (320) can be explained as follows: the equations ↑OBJ=↓ and ↑VCOMP=↓ above the nodes NP₁₀ and VP₁₁ means that the functional information carried by the nodes NP₁₀ and VP₁₁ goes into the OBJ part and the VCOMP part of the upper node VP₈ respectively. Since the lexical entry for qaoy in V₉ specifies the PRED value for qaoy and since V₉ has the equation ↑=↓ attached to it, the PRED value of qaoy is then passed up to VP₈. The PRED value of VCOMP is thus equivalent to that of V₉. The annotation ↑=↓ above the node V₇ means that information about V₇ is equivalent to that about its upper node. However, this qaoy does not add the PRED value to VP₆ as its lexical entry specifies that it is a non-predicate verb. This qaoy adds ↑qaoy = + into the f-structure of its mother node. The grammatical function VCOMP carried by VP₈ is passed up to VP₃ via the equation ↑=↓ above the node VP₆. The annotation ↑OBJ=↓ above the node NP₅ indicates that all functional information carried by NP₅ is information of the OBJ part of the f-structure of its mother node VP₃. The equation ↑=↓ above the node V₄ means that information about V₄ is the same as that about VP₃. As the lexical entry for prap provides the PRED value for prap, namely 'TELL', this PRED value is then passed up to VP₃. Since the annotation ↑=↓ above the node VP₃ means that all functional information of VP₃ is equivalent to that of its mother node or S₁, the PRED value of V₄ and the grammatical functions OBJ and VCOMP carried by NP₅ and VP₈ are all passed up to S₁. Therefore, the PRED value of prap is the PRED value of the main clause and the grammatical functions OBJ and VCOMP are also the grammatical functions of the main clause.

The f-description of example (317) includes the equations, as shown in (321).
The equations in (321) can be read in a similar way as those in (315) except that some numerical subscripts of variables in (321) are different from those in (315).

The f-structure of example (317) is shown in (322).

322) `SUBJ [ PRED 'MOTHER']

PRED 'TELL ((SUBJ) (OBJ) (VCOMP))'

OBJ 5[ PRED 'FATHER']

qaoy +

SUBJ 6[ PRED 'QAOY ((SUBJ) (OBJ) (VCOMP))' ]

VCOMP 8,9 VCOMP 10[ PRED 'CHILD']

OBJ 11[ PRED 'RICE']`
As shown in (323) - (325), the noun phrase following the form qaoy can be replaced by a pronoun. The subscript indices in (323) - (325) show that the pronoun following the form qaoy is not coreferential with the matrix object.

323) mdaay prap qaowpuk qaoy kee fiam baay
mother, tell father, Qaoy hek eat rice
'The mother told the father to allow him to eat.'

324) sot neenòm cindaa qaoy niong twɔɔ kaa nih
Soti suggest Chinda Qaoy shek do work this
'Soti suggested Chinda to have her do this work.'

325) caaŋwaaŋ bañcio look kruu qaoy kee pralɔŋ
principal, order teacher, Qaoy hek have exam
krup muk wicio complete subject
'The principal ordered the teacher to have him have an exam for every subject.'

The pronoun in (323) - (325) has its own referential property, unlike the pronoun following the non-predicate qaoy which is coreferential with the matrix object, discussed in section 6.5.2.2. To put it another way, the pronoun in (323) - (325) behaves like a normal pronoun and has its own PRED feature. When there is only one overt form of qaoy, the interpretation of the pronoun following the form qaoy is ambiguous. This pronoun can or cannot have its own pronominal reference. The context determines whether the pronoun following the form qaoy is interpreted as coreferential to the matrix object or not.

In the following discussion, I will only show one overt form of qaoy. When there is only one overt form of qaoy and all arguments are present in the sentences, as shown in (317) - (319) above, it is understood that the construction is the combination of the non-predicate qaoy and the predicate qaoy. However, as Khmer is a pro-drop language, an argument which has previously been mentioned can be unexpressed. Sometimes it is ambiguous which construction is used in a context since either the matrix object or the object of the predicate qaoy can be omitted. This is exemplified in (326) - (329). In example (326), the father told Nieree to call Sot. Therefore, when Nieree went to call Sot, Nieree is the understood object of the predicate prap 'to tell' – the father directly talked to Nieree, not Sot.

326) A: niɔrii tiw haw sot mɔɔk cuəp puk mɔɔh
Nieree go call Sot come meet Dad Part
Nieree! Go and call Sot to meet me.'

B: sot puk prap qaoy sot tiw cuəp
Sot Dad tell Qaoy Sot go meet
'Sot! Dad told (me for) Sot to meet him.'
By the same criteria, the principal in (327) did not necessarily order the students directly. He may have had a meeting with all the teachers in the school and told the teachers his policy.

327) caaŋwaŋ principal bānic cigar qaoy koun sah pralaaŋ subject krup have exam complete
'The principal ordered (someone, i.e. teachers) to have the students have an exam for every subject.'

The object of the predicate qaoy can also be unexpressed. In (328.B), the unexpressed object following the predicate qaoy refers to Nieree who is a niece, not to the speaker (B). The speaker (B) in this context cannot be the antecedent of the unexpressed object of the predicate qaoy since (B) or the speaker has already been to that place.

328) A: niarri niw tii naa Nieree be where
'Where is Nieree?'
B: niŋ min baan mok tee prūŋ maŋ baan she not Past come Part because Mum Past prap khom min qaoy mok leŋ tii nih teŋ khom tell I not qaoy come play here and then I min hian nōm niŋ mok not dare bring she come
'She didn't come because you told me not to let (her) come to play here and then I dare not bring her along.'

In (329), "the teacher" may be interpreted as the controller of the unexpressed complement subject following the form qaoy, that is, the complement is analysed as a complement containing the non-predicate qaoy indicating an object-controlled complement. For instance, a teacher may ask for leave to further his study. He may have some problems with his own study. The principal then may suggest that the teacher have an exam for every subject which may prevent him from failing. However, if this sentence is used in the situation where teachers in a school are having difficulty in evaluating the students' competence, the principal may suggest that all teachers do the same in every subject, that is, to have students have an exam for every subject.

329) caaŋwaŋ principal nōdōm look kruu qaoy pralaaŋ subject krup have exam complete
'The principal suggested to the teachers to have (the students) have an exam for every subject.'

Although the matrix object or the object of the predicate qaoy can be unexpressed in
the sentence, it has a semantic form as PRO in the f-structure.

In this section, the analysis of the combination of the non-predicate qaoy and the predicate qaoy in a complement construction has been proposed. The non-predicate qaoy can be followed by a complement which takes qaoy as its predicate. Nevertheless, Khmer speakers consider the construction with two forms of qaoy redundant and prefer to have only one overt qaoy. When there is only one overt form of qaoy in this construction, this construction looks superficially similar to the construction which has a complement containing the non-predicate qaoy marking object-controlled complements. As Khmer is also a pro-drop language, the construction is ambiguous.

6.6 Predicates which optionally take complement containing qaoy

This section deals with predicates which can optionally subcategorise for the complement containing the non-predicate qaoy. Object-controlled predicates discussed in Chapter 5, can optionally be followed by a complement containing the non-predicate qaoy. The predicates in examples (330) - (332) are followed by an object-controlled complement.

\[
330) \text{ni\textregisteredee haw koun baoh samqaat pt\textasciidoUBLEm{\textasciidoUBLEe}h} \\
\text{Nieree call child sweep clean house} \\
\text{'}Nieree called\textsuperscript{29} (her) child to clean the house.'
\]
\[
331) \text{k\textregisteredom q\textasciidoUBLEn\textregisteredeeq\textasciidoUBLE look qom m\textasciidoUBLEok pisaa baay} \\
\text{I invite uncle come eat rice} \\
\text{'}I invited (my) uncle to have dinner.'
\]
\[
332) \text{cindaa babual wic\textasciidoUBLEt tiw santuuc tr\textasciidoUBLEy} \\
\text{Chinda persuade Wichet go fish (v) fish} \\
\text{'}Chinda persuaded Wichet to go fishing.'
\]

Examples (333) - (335) differ from those in (330) - (332) above in that the matrix predicate in (333) - (335), is followed by a complement containing the non-predicate qaoy.

\[
333) \text{ni\textregisteredee haw koun qaoy baoh samqaat pt\textasciidoUBLEm{\textasciidoUBLEe}h} \\
\text{Nieree call child Qaoy sweep clean house} \\
\text{'}Nieree called (her) child to clean the house.'
\]
\[
334) \text{k\textregisteredom qa\textasciidoUBLEn\textregisteredeeq\textasciidoUBLE look qom qaoy m\textasciidoUBLEok pisaa baay} \\
\text{I invite uncle Qaoy come eat rice} \\
\text{'}I invited (my) uncle to have dinner.'
\]

\textsuperscript{29}As noted in Chapter 5, when the predicate haw 'to call' followed by a complement, its meaning is similar to 'to order'. The meaning of haw 'to call' in Khmer is more limited than to call in English.
335) cindaa babuol wicat qaoy tiw santuuc tray
Chinda persuade Wichet Qaoy go fish (v) fish
'Chinda persuaded Wichet to go fishing.'

The characteristics of complements containing the non-predicate qaoy also allow the matrix object to occur after the form qaoy. This is illustrated in (336) - (338).

336) niirii haw qaoy koun baoh samqaat peteh
Nieree call Qaoy child sweep clean house
'Nieree called (her) child to clean the house.'

337) kfiom qaonde qom mok pisaa baay
I invite Qaoy uncle come eat rice
'I invited (my) uncle to have dinner.'

338) cindaa babuol qaoy wicat tiw santuuc tray
Chinda persuade Qaoy Wichet go fish (v) fish
'Chinda persuaded Wichet to go fishing.'

Although the predicate qaoy is an object-controlled predicate, it is redundant for the main verb qaoy 'to have someone do something; to allow' to be followed by the complement containing the non-predicate qaoy, as shown in (339) and (340).

339) #qwpuk qaoy koun qaoy dam banlae
father Qaoy child Qaoy plant vegetable
For the meaning, 'The father had the child plant the vegetables.'

340) ?qwpuk qaoy qaoy qaoy koun dam banlae
father Qaoy Qaoy Qaoy child plant vegetable

There is no obvious reason why the form qaoy is optional with these object-controlled predicates. The grammaticality judgements of Khmer speakers differ in this respect. Some Khmer speakers consider the object-controlled complement more polite than the complement containing the non-predicate qaoy. Others propose that the complement containing the non-predicate qaoy flows more easily than the object-controlled complement, by analogy with other manipulative predicates. The option of which type of complement used with these object-controlled predicates seems to depend on the style of the speaker.

6.7 qaoy in S-like complements with the thaa complementiser

In this section, the function of the form qaoy in S-like complements with the thaa complementiser is discussed. The form qaoy in this complement construction can function as a full verb\(^3\) 'to have someone do something; to allow'. As a full verb,

---

\(^3\)As a full verb in S-like complements with the thaa complementiser, qaoy can also mean 'to give'. However, this meaning of qaoy will not be discussed here.
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Qaoy can subcategorise for a subject. This is exemplified in (341) - (343).

341) mit saan baan bañcia thaa meetáap
    comrade San Past order COMP commander
qao y yøŋ bambaek cuø kniø
Qaoy we break row each other
'Comrade San ordered that the commander allowed us to separate from each other.'

342) sot prap thaa kōøt qaoy niørii chup ñam baay
    Sot tell COMP he Qaoy Nieree stop eat rice
'Sot told that he allowed Nieree to stop eating.'

343) kōøt sonyaa thaa look kruu qaoy kñom criøŋ
    he promise COMP teacher Qaoy I sing
muøy bat
one Clf
'He promised that the teacher would allow me to sing one song.'

The full verb qaoy 'to have someone do something; to allow' in S-like complements with the thaa complementiser has similar characteristics as other normal predicates in S-like complements with the thaa complementiser. The full verb qaoy can be negated as well as be modified by an auxiliary, based on the semantic features of the matrix predicate. Examples (344) - (346) show that the form qaoy can be negated.

344) mit saan baan bañcia thaa meetáap min
    comrade San Past order COMP commander not
qao y yøŋ bambaek cuø kniø
Qaoy we break row each other
'Comrade San ordered that the commander did not allow us to separate from each other.'

345) sot prap thaa kōøt min qaoy niørii chup ñam baay
    Sot tell COMP he not Qaoy Nieree stop eat rice
'Sot told that he did not allow Nieree to stop eating.'

346) kōøt sonyaa thaa look kruu min qaoy kñom criøŋ
    he promise COMP teacher not Qaoy I sing
'He promised that the teacher would not allow me to sing a song.'

The form qaoy in an S-like complement with a complementiser which is preceded by a commitment predicate can only be modified by the irrealis marker whereas that preceded by an utterance predicate can be freely modified by an auxiliary. This is exemplified in (347) - (349).

347) sot prap thaa kōøt min qaoy niørii chup ñam baay
    Sot tell COMP he îrî Qaoy Nieree stop eat rice
'Sot told that he would allow Nieree to stop eating.'

348) sot prap thaa kōøt baan qaoy niørii chup ñam baay
    Sot tell COMP he Past Qaoy Nieree stop eat rice
'Sot told that he allowed Nieree to stop eating.'
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349) kōt sanyaa thaa look kruu nǐŋ qaoy kñom criŋ
he promise COMP teacher IrIr Qaoy I sing
muay bat
one Clif

'He promised that the teacher would allow me to sing a song.'

In addition to this, the form qaoy in S-like complements with the thaa complementiser can be interpreted as the jussive qaoy. When the form qaoy is interpreted as the jussive qaoy, the complement proposition is an indirect imperative. As discussed in Chapter 3, a complement proposition after a manipulative predicate or an utterance predicate, as in examples (350) and (351), are direct imperatives. The understood subject of the complement propositions is the addressee. The unexpressed subject in (350) as well as the pronoun nǐŋ 'you', in (351), refers to the matrix object or kñom 'I'.

350) kōt bańciā kñom thaa kom tralap mōok wiŋ
he order I COMP don't return come back

'He ordered me, "Don't come back".'

351) look kruu prap kñom thaa cou nǐŋ kñom rIan
teacher tell I COMP Part you try hard study

'The teacher told me, "(You) study hard".'

To convert the direct imperatives, in (350) and (351), to indirect imperatives, the jussive qaoy must be inserted, as shown in (352) and (353). The complement subject kñom 'I' which is coreferential to the matrix object can be added in (352) while the pronoun nǐŋ 'you' in (353), is converted to kñom 'I' which also corefers to the matrix object. The pragmatic particle cou in (351) can only occur in a direct imperative. As (353) is indirect imperative, cou is omitted.

352) kōt bańciā kñom thaa kom qaoy kñom tralap
he order I COMP don't Qaoy I return mōok wiŋ
come back

'He said that I should not come back.' (LIT: 'He ordered me that I should not come back.')

353) look kruu prap kñom thaa qaoy kñom khām rIan
teacher tell I COMP Qaoy I try hard study

'The teacher told me that I should study hard.'

If the jussive qaoy in the indirect imperative is omitted, the sentence is ungrammatical or else the complement proposition is a declarative. As illustrated in (354), when the jussive qaoy is missing, the sentence is ungrammatical. The prohibitive kom cannot be used to negate a noun phrase.
The complement proposition in (355) cannot be interpreted as an indirect imperative, rather it is a declarative.

355) look kruu prap kñom thaa kñom khom rian
teacher tell I COMP I try hard study
'The teacher told me that I studied hard.'

The difference between direct and indirect imperatives in some other languages can be expressed in a similar way. Bamgbose (1986:78-79) notes that indirect imperatives in Yoruba are always introduced by the particle kí 'to let' after the complementiser.

The c-structure of an indirect imperative in S-like complements with the thaa complementiser has the same c-structure as the jussive qaoy given in (98) in section 6.3.3. The c-structure of example (352) can be illustrated as follows:

When the form qaoy occurs in S-like complements with the thaa complementiser, it can be interpreted as a full verb 'to have someone do something; to allow' or the jussive qaoy. If the form qaoy is a full verb, it can subcategorise for a subject. The full verb qaoy can also be negated and be modified by an auxiliary. The jussive qaoy in S-like complements with the thaa complementiser marks an indirect imperative.
6.8 Discussion of soum and som 'to ask'

Comrie (1984:452) discusses the fact that a verb which can express different speech acts can be analysed as either a subject-controlled or an object-controlled verb. For example, when the verb *to ask* in English expresses a polite directive, it is an object-controlled verb, as shown in (357).

357) Otto asked Helga to leave the room. (Comrie, 1984:452 (9))

The verb *to ask*, however, can also be interpreted as 'to ask permission to'. In this case, it subcategorises for a subject-controlled complement, as demonstrated in (358).

358) Otto asked Helga to be allowed to leave the room. (Comrie, 1984:452 (10))

The case *soum* and *som* 'to ask' in Khmer, however, is different from that of *to ask* in English. In the written language, the forms *ʧiŋ soum* 'to ask for a request' and *ʧiŋ som* 'to ask for permission' are distinct from each other. Khmer linguists (Huffman, 1970b:59; Jacob, 1974:202) have noted that in colloquial speech, these two forms have been merged and become *som*. Headley (1977:1170, 1190) further notes that only *soum* can function as a pragmatic particle 'please' whereas *som* cannot.

However, it has been observed that in a normal conversation, Khmer speakers can sometimes identify when *soum* or *som* should be used in the context. For example, the form *soum* is used in example (359) as the matrix subject referent asked a request for the matrix object referent to look after the necklace.

359) kʰom soum puk thae rəqsaak ksaek kaa ni phaŋ
     I ask Dad look after necklace this too
     'I asked you (Dad) to look after this necklace.'

Example (360) implies that the matrix subject referent asked for permission to perform the complement action, therefore, *som* is appropriate in this context.

360) kʰom baan som rat tiw twəə kaa qae cungenbot
     I Past ask state go do work at country
     'I have made a request to the government to go to work in the country.'

Nevertheless, Khmer speakers frequently mix these two forms together in colloquial speech and use *som* for either 'to ask for a request' or 'to ask for permission'.

---

31 Another predicate which has similar meaning to *som* and *soum* is *sua* 'to ask (a question)'. The predicate *sua* 'to ask (a question)' is followed by an S-like complement with the *thaa* complementiser of which the complement proposition is a question.
When they are asked which (written) form of som they are using, they are confused and could not identify which form should be used. For instance, out of context, examples (361) and (362) are ambiguous. The reflexive form which functions as a complement object can be coreferential with either the matrix subject or the matrix object.

361) kñom som niarii ṃuṭ tik kluaŋqaŋ
   I_1 ask Nieree_1 have a shower body-self_1/j
   'I asked Nieree for me to have a shower myself.'
   OR
   'I asked Nieree for her to have a shower herself.'

362) kñom som niarii riəpcam kluaŋqaŋ
   I_1 ask Nieree_1 get dress body-self_1/j
   'I ask Nieree for me to dress myself.'
   OR
   'I asked Nieree for her to dress herself.'

The interpretations of these two examples can be clarified by an additional clause. If the matrix subject referent performs the complement action, examples (361) and (362) may be followed by (363). One situation in which these examples can be used is in a hospital. The matrix subject referent may be shy of Nieree who is a nurse and therefore he asked permission to have a shower himself or to dress himself.

363) prũah kñom qian niarii nah
   because I shy Nieree Ints
   '... because I am shy of Nieree.'

When the matrix object is the controller of the unexpressed complement subject, however, another reason, as shown in (364), is added to examples (361) and (362). In these examples, Nieree may be a little child and the matrix subject referent is looking after Nieree. The matrix subject referent might have something to do. So, he makes a request and asks if Nieree can have a shower herself or dress herself.

364) prũah kñom rəwul nah
   because I busy Ints
   '... because I am very busy.'

To avoid confusion between the subject-controlled complement and the object-controlled complement, Khmer speakers prefer the verb som 'to ask' to be followed by the complement containing the non-predicate qaoy instead of a normal object-controlled complement. Examples (365) - (368) have only one interpretation, that is, Nieree is the person who performs the complement action. The matrix object can either precede the form qaoy, as in examples (365) and (366), or follow the form qaoy, as in examples (367) and (368).
6.9 Discussion of cuːy 'to help'

In this section, the manipulative predicate cuːy 'to help' in Khmer will be discussed. When only the object of cuːy 'to help; to assist' gets involved in the action following cuːy 'to help', this predicate is followed by a complement containing the non-predicate qaoy. In addition, it will be shown that when cuːy means 'to help; to be participant in', there can be at least two different structures.
Sag and Pollard (1991:95-96) propose two meanings of *to help* in English. When *to help* means 'to assist', it requires an overt object. The matrix object referent is the controller of the complement action. For example, Mary not Bill, in (373), is the person who gets a job.

373) Bill helped Mary get a job.

Sag and Pollard interpret *to help* 'to assist' as an object-controlled verb of their influence type.32

The verb *to help* in the second meaning 'to be a participant in' is an intransitive verb. It does not require an object, for instance:

374) The tutor helped mark the papers.

As an intransitive verb, *to help* is neither a subject-controlled nor an object-controlled verb. Sag and Pollard provide some unacceptable examples, cited here as (375) and (376), to argue that *to help* 'to be a participant in' in English is not a subject-controlled verb.

375) ??The barbers were grateful that John had helped to shave himself.
(Sag and Pollard, 1991:96 (105.a))

376) #John helped to get tenure. (Sag and Pollard, 1991:96 (105.b))

Sag and Pollard argue that (375) is bad for many native speakers of English and that John in (376) cannot be interpreted as the person who gets tenure. Example (376) can only have the pragmatically strange interpretation in which John is a member of a collective entity which jointly gets tenure (p.96).

In Khmer, when only the object of the predicate *cugy* 'to help' functions as the controller of the action following *cugy* 'to help', the predicate *cugy* 'to help' must be followed by a complement containing *gaoy*. In (377), only Nieree is the person who gets a job whereas in (378), *khöm* 'I' will be the person who meets the mother, not *kōt* 'he'. In other words, the matrix subject referent does not get involved in the complement action at all. The meaning of *cugy* 'to help' in these examples is equivalent to 'to assist'.

---

32Sag and Pollard (1991:66) classify complement-taking predicates in English into three types: influence type, commitment type and orientation type. The unexpressed complement subject of predicates in the influence type is controlled by the influenced participant or the object of the predicate whereas the unexpressed subject of predicates in the commitment and orientation types is controlled by the committor participant and the experiencer participant, i.e., the subject.
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377) sot cuay ni₉i₉i qaoy baan kaa twɔɔ
Sot help Nieree Qaoy get work do
'Sot helped Nieree get a job.'

378) kɔ₉i₉i ni₉i₉i cuay k₉i₉om qaoy cu₉i₉ par mdaay
he IrIr help I Qaoy meet mother
'He will help me meet (my) mother.'

The complement containing qaoy which follows the predicate cuay 'to help' has characteristics of a complement containing the non-predicate qaoy. The matrix object can occur either before or after the form qaoy. As shown in (379) and (380), the matrix object can occur after the form qaoy.

379) sot cuay qaoy ni₉i₉i baan kaa twɔɔ
Sot help Qaoy Nieree get work do
'Sot helped Nieree get a job.'

380) kɔ₉i₉i ni₉i₉i cuay qaoy k₉i₉om cu₉i₉ par mdaay
he IrIr help I Qaoy meet mother
'He will help me meet (my) mother.'

If the form qaoy is missing, as shown in (381) and (382), the predicate cuay 'to help' in these examples cannot have the meaning of 'to assist'. Although examples (381) and (382) are structurally grammatical, they have a pragmatically strange meaning in which both the matrix subject referent and the matrix object referent participate in the action following cuay.

381) ?sot cuay ni₉i₉i baan kaa twɔɔ
Sot help Nieree get work do

382) ?kɔ₉i₉i ni₉i₉i cuay k₉i₉om cu₉i₉ par mdaay
he IrIr help I Qaoy meet mother

In comparison with examples (381) and (382), examples (383) and (384) are grammatical and pragmatically acceptable. The meaning of cuay 'to help' in examples (383) and (384) is different from that in (377) - (380). The predicate cuay in (377) - (380), means 'to assist' while cuay in examples (383) and (384) below can have two interpretations. Firstly, it can mean 'to be a participant in'; the matrix subject as well as the matrix object perform the action following cuay 'to help'. In (383), Sot as well as Nieree signed the loan agreement contract with the bank whereas both the mother and I in (384) cleaned the house together. In the second interpretation, only the matrix subject can be interpreted as the performer of the action following cuay. In other words, the second meaning of cuay in these examples is 'to help by'.

383) sot cuay ni₉i₉i kɔ₉i₉i luy pii thɛawɔŋθi₉i₉i
Sot help Nieree borrow money from bank
'Sot helped Nieree borrow money from the bank.'

OR
'Sot helped Nieree by borrowing the money from the bank.'
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384) ក្រុម គុឯ ម្លារ បារ សម្រាប់ ព្រៃ២០១
I help mother sweep clean house
'I helped my mother clean the house.'
OR
'I helped my mother by cleaning the house.'

Either the object of គុឯ or the proposition following គុឯ can be omitted. In (385) and (386), the object of គុឯ 'to help' is missing. As Khmer is a pro-drop language, it is difficult to argue whether the predicate គុឯ in examples (385) and (386) is an intransitive or a transitive verb.

385) សួត គុឯ ការ លូយ ពូ ឈី ដំណើរកុម្មុយន៍
Sot help borrow money from bank
'Sot helped (someone) borrow the money from the bank.'
OR
'Sot helped (someone) by borrowing the money from the bank.'

386) ក្រុម គុឯ ម្លារ សម្រាប់ ព្រៃ២០១
I help sweep clean house
'I helped (someone) clean the house.'
OR
'I helped (someone) by cleaning the house.'

As illustrated in (387) - (389), when the proposition following the predicate គុឯ is omitted, the sentences are still acceptable.

387) សួត គុឯ និរីឈី
Sot help Nieree
'Sot helped Nieree.'

388) ក្រុម គុឯ ម្លារ
I help mother
'I helped my mother.'

389) យុំ ត្រែ គុឯ ក្កឹត
we must help each other
'We must help each other.'

In addition to this, the adverbial complementiser ដាយ 'by' can be inserted before the proposition. When ដាយ is inserted in examples (385) and (386) above, as shown in (390) and (391), the sentences can have only one interpretation. In (390), the prepositional phrase ចុំឈី និរី  emphasises that only the matrix subject referent signed the loan agreement contract with the bank. In (391), the adverb តែមាន់ កំណេ 'alone' is optionally inserted to emphasise that the matrix subject referent cleaned the house without someone's help.

390) សួត គុឯ ចូលបាយ ដាយ ការ លូយ ពូ ឈី ដំណើរកុម្មុយន៍
Sot help Chinda by borrow money from bank
'Instead she
'Sot helped Chinda by borrowing a sum of money from the bank for her.'
The fact that the proposition following the predicate cuøy 'to help' can be omitted and that it can be optionally introduced by the adverbial complementiser suggests that the proposition is best analysed as an adjunct.

Huffman (1967:167) considers that there are two forms of cuøy 'to help' in Khmer. The first cuøy 'to help' is a modal verb whereas the second cuøy 'to help' is a transitive verb. He claims that there cannot be an object intervening between the modal verb cuøy 'to help' and the following adjunct. According to Huffman's claim, the predicate cuøy 'to help' in (392) and (393) is a modal verb.

392) koun cuøy twɔɔ-kaa mdaay
   child help do-work mother
   'The child helps his mother work.' (Huffman, 1967:167) (transcription revised)

393) kʰom cuøy baoh samqaat ptɛəh mdaay
   I help sweep clean house mother
   'I helped my mother by cleaning the house.'

In contrast, cuøy as in (394) and (395) is a transitive verb.

394) koun cuøy mdaay twɔɔ-kaa
   child help mother do-work
   'The child helps his mother work.'

395) kʰom cuøy mdaay baoh samqaat ptɛəh
   I help mother sweep clean house
   'I helped my mother by cleaning the house.'

Information received from many Khmer speakers, nevertheless, suggests that the meaning of cuøy 'to help' in (392) - (393) is the same as that in (394) - (395). Examples (392) - (393) only differ from examples (394) - (395) in that examples (392) - (393) have a further implication. This is that the work in (392) is the work of the mother and that the house in (393) belongs to my mother, that is, mdaay in (392) and (393) simply functions as the possessor of the adjunct object. In Khmer, a possessor can immediately follow a possessed noun.33 When the matrix object is coreferential with the possessor of the adjunct object, Khmer speakers prefer to omit the matrix object. It is redundant for both the matrix object and the coreferential possessor of the

---

33For more detail, see section 2.3.1.1: Nouns.
adjunct object occur in the same sentence. This is exemplified in (396) and (397).

396) #koun cuay mdaay twaakaa mdaay
child help mother do-work mother
'The child helps his mother work.'

397) #kNom cuay mdaay baah samqaat ptewah mdaay
I help mother sweep clean house mother
'I helped my mother by cleaning the house.'

When the matrix object is not coreferential with the possessor of the adjunct object, the matrix object can only occur in place or be unexpressed by the pro-drop rule. Unlike examples (392) - (393) and (394) - (395), examples (398) and (399) have a different meaning. In (398), Nieree can only function as the matrix object whereas Nieree in (399) only functions as the possessor of the adjunct object.

398) kNom cuay niarii kcey luy
I help Nieree borrow money
'I helped Nieree by borrowing the sum of money for her.'

399) kNom cuay kcey luy niarii
I help borrow money Nieree
'I helped (someone) by borrowing the sum of money from Nieree.'

The fact that the matrix object can be unexpressed when it is coreferential with the possessor of the adjunct object indicates that there is only one form of cuay 'to help'.

To sum up, the predicate cuay in Khmer means 'to help; to assist' when it is followed by a complement containing the non-predicate qaoy. Only the matrix object referent functions as the controller of the complement action. When cuay is followed by an adjunct, it means 'to help by or to be a participant in'. In this interpretation, the matrix subject referent gets involved in the following adjunct action.

6.10 Conclusion

This chapter has discussed the form qaoy and its usage in complements. This form, on its own, has various meanings and functions. For instance, it can be a verb meaning 'to give', 'to have someone do something; to allow'. The meaning of the predicate qaoy is distinguished by the argument subcategorisation. The verb qaoy meaning 'to give' subcategorises for a subject, an object and an object2. Only qaoy meaning 'to have someone do something; to allow' subcategorises for a subject, an object and an object-controlled complement. When qaoy introduces the jussive sentence type, it only subcategorises for a sentential complement. The complements containing qaoy can be preceded by a manipulative predicate, an utterance predicate, a commitment predicate, a desiderative predicate or an aspectual predicate. Although
qaoy looks superficially similar to a complementiser, qaoy does not share the same characteristics of a complementiser that are displayed by thaa, a true complementiser. The form qaoy which occurs in the complement constructions retains a verbal feature – it can be negated.

In this study, two forms of qaoy in complements are proposed – the predicate qaoy and the non-predicate qaoy. The predicate qaoy 'to have someone do something; to allow' in complements shares similar characteristics with predicates introducing subject-controlled complements. Complements containing the predicate qaoy can be preceded by a desiderative predicate, a commitment predicate or an aspectual predicate. The unexpressed subject of qaoy is controlled by the matrix subject whereas the unexpressed subject of the complement following qaoy is controlled by the object of the predicate qaoy.

The form qaoy following a desiderative predicate, in some contexts, can lose its meaning 'to have someone do something; to allow'. The matrix subject referent only expresses a wish for something to happen to someone. In the first type of the non-predicate qaoy, the matrix predicate subcategorises for a subject and a sentential complement. The non-predicate qaoy does not have a PRED feature. The non-predicate qaoy also has the $[\text{\texttt{\textasciitilde{COMP} SUBJ SB}} = -$ feature attached to it. This feature indicates that the antecedent of the unexpressed subject of a complement following qaoy cannot have a SUBJ function within the f-structure. The feature $[\text{\texttt{\textasciitilde{COMP} SUBJ SB}} = -$ of the non-predicate qaoy marks the switch of the subject referent in this complement construction. Complements containing the non-predicate qaoy can also be preceded by a manipulative predicate or an utterance predicate. In this case, the matrix object is the controller of the complement subject following the non-predicate qaoy. The characteristics of complements containing the non-predicate qaoy are similar to those of object-controlled complements except that the form qaoy in this complement construction can be negated. Although the non-predicate qaoy does not subcategorise for an argument, the matrix object can either precede or follow the form qaoy by phrase structure rules.

Although the predicate of the complement containing the non-predicate qaoy can be the full verb qaoy 'to have someone do something; to allow' itself, it is phonologically redundant to have two forms of qaoy in adjacent. Khmer speakers prefer to have only one overt form of qaoy. In this construction, it has been proposed that there are two forms of qaoy in the f-structure. In Khmer, some manipulative predicates such as qaphosañ 'to invite', babuol 'to persuade' can be followed by either an object-controlled complement or a complement containing the non-predicate qaoy. The selection of which type of complement to be used depends on the style of the
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speaker.

When the form qaoy can occur in S-like complements with the thaa complementiser, it can function as a full verb qaoy 'to have someone do something; to allow' or the jussive qaoy. As a full verb, qaoy can subcategorise for a subject as well as be negated and be modified by an auxiliary. If the form qaoy functions as the jussive qaoy, it indicates an indirect imperative.

In colloquial speech, the form soum 'to ask for permission' and som 'to ask for a request' can be phonologically merged. The form som 'to ask' can then be followed by either a subject-controlled complement or an object-controlled complement. To avoid confusion, Khmer speakers prefer to use a complement containing the non-predicate qaoy with som 'to ask for a request'. When only the object referent of the predicate cuay 'to help' performs the action following cuay, the predicate cuay is followed by a complement containing the non-predicate qaoy and it has the assistance meaning. In contrast, cuay means 'to be a participant in; to help by' when it is followed by an adjunct.
Chapter 7

Conclusion

This study has investigated types of verbal complement constructions in Khmer. Since most previous syntactic research which has been done on this language has focused on serial verb constructions and no one has studied Khmer complementation in details, this is the first study of verbal complementation in the language.

This thesis is also the first study which applies the formalisms of Lexical-Functional Grammar (LFG) to Khmer, and is also the first to do so amongst the languages of mainland South-East Asia. LFG provides an explicit and coherent theory of how to associate superficial constituency in a c-structure with meaningful grammatical functions in a corresponding f-structure (Kaplan and Bresnan, 1982:173-174). Using this LFG framework, complement constructions in Khmer have been classified into sentence-like (S-like) complements and controlled complements. The subject of S-like complements can be either overt or unrealised while the subject of controlled complements can never be expressed within the complement constructions. In this study, I have also examined the co-occurrence of complement types and classes of complement-taking predicates. Complement-taking predicates have been classified according to their distribution with complement types and their meaning into utterance predicates, belief predicates, perception predicates, predicates of fearing, factive predicates, aspectual predicates, commitment predicates, desiderative predicates, achievement predicates, manipulative predicates and prohibitive predicates. For details of the distribution of the different complement types and classes of complement-taking predicates, see the appendix.

S-like complements have been further divided into S-like complements with a complementiser and S-like complements without a complementiser. S-like complements with and without a complementiser have some characteristics in common. The time locus of all S-like complements is that of the action of the matrix clause. The possibility of auxiliary insertion and negator insertion in S-like
complements depends on the semantic restrictions of the matrix predicates. There is no control relationship in S-like complements. The interpretation of either an overt or an unexpressed pronoun in S-like complements is free, like that of a pronoun in normal sentences. When reflexive pronouns occur in the complement subject position, however, they may only be interpreted as being coreferential with the matrix subject. If a reflexive pronoun functions as the complement object, either the matrix subject or the complement subject can be the antecedent. However, there is a difference in the first interpretation of the antecedent depending on the form of the reflexive used. The matrix subject is the preferred antecedent of the reflexive form kluon whereas the complement subject is the preferred antecedent of kluongaen.

It has been shown in this study that there are two complementisers in Khmer. Both the thaa and the dael complementisers have developed from the same word class – verb. The thaa complementiser has developed from the verb thaa 'to say' whereas the dael complementiser seems to have developed historically from the verb dael 'to be constant, unchanged'. S-like complements with the thaa complementiser introduce new information while S-like complements introduced by the dael complementiser present factive or old information. S-like complements with the thaa complementiser can be preceded by an utterance predicate, a belief predicate, a perception predicate, a predicate of fearing or a manipulative predicate. S-like complements with the dael complementiser are much more restricted in their choice of complement type, and can only follow a factive predicate. S-like complements with the thaa complementiser can introduce either direct or indirect speech, whereas S-like complements with the dael complementiser always report indirect speech.

Predicates which can be followed by an S-like complement without a complementiser are limited. Only some of the verbs in the belief predicate, perception predicate, predicate of fearing and utterance predicate classes may precede an S-like complement without a complementiser. Although some of these predicates can also subcategorise for either an object noun phrase or an S-like complement without a complementiser, the subject of an S-like complement without a complementiser following these predicates does not receive a semantic role directly from the matrix predicate. The string associated with an S-like complement without a complementiser as a whole functions as an argument of the matrix predicate.

The major syntactic difference between S-like complements with and without a complementiser is that only S-like complements with a complementiser can be preceded by the tee particle. The tee particle in Khmer normally occurs in a negative sentence or a polar question, and its position indicates the scope of negation or question. I have proposed that examining the different possibilities for the insertion of
the tee particle in a sentence provides good evidence for there being a greater degree of clause union between an S-like complement without a complementiser and its matrix predicate than there is between an S-like complement with a complementiser and the complement-taking predicate.

Most predicates which can be followed by an S-like complement without a complementiser also have the possibility of being followed by an S-like complement with a complementiser. If a perception predicate precedes an S-like complement without a complementiser, the complement proposition is directly perceived. In contrast, an S-like complement with a complementiser following a perception predicate is an indirect report about a situation. The semantic distinctions between S-like complements with and without a complementiser, preceded by a belief predicate or a predicate of fearing, are not obvious. There is individual variation amongst speakers as to whether or not they use a complementiser. Further study on semantics of Khmer complement-taking predicates would help to clarify differences between these two types of complements. The utterance predicate thaa 'to say' is the only utterance predicate which can be followed by an S-like complement without a complementiser. Other utterance predicates are followed by an S-like complement with the thaa complementiser. It has been proposed in Chapter 4 that the reason for this difference is that it is phonologically repetitious to have two adjacent forms of thaa in the same sentence. This investigation has helped me to understand the interactions of different complement types and the semantics of complement-taking predicates.

Controlled complements in Khmer can also be divided into two types: subject-controlled complements and object-controlled complements. The control relation of subject-controlled complements specifies the matrix subject to be the controller of the unexpressed complement subject, whereas that of object-controlled complements assigns the matrix object to be the controller of the unexpressed complement subject. The string associated with a matrix object and an object-controlled complement is superficially similar to an S-like complement without a complementiser. There are, however, differences; the matrix object followed by an object-controlled complement directly receives a semantic role from the matrix predicate. In contrast, the string produced by an S-like complement without a complementiser, rather than only its subject, is subcategorised for by the matrix predicate. In addition to this, the strings produced by controlled complements following a complement-taking predicate also appear to be similar to those of serial verb constructions. It has been argued in this study that controlled complements are subcategorised for by the matrix predicate whereas the verbal structures are not subcategorised for by the first verb of serial verb constructions. Furthermore, it has
been shown that the matrix object preceding an object-controlled complement can be passivised whereas the matrix object in serial verb constructions cannot.

Subject-controlled complements can be modified by the irrealis marker, which indicates the potential mood and may be negated. The possibilities of auxiliary modification and negator insertion are also dependent on the semantics of the matrix predicate. Object-controlled complements cannot be independently modified by an auxiliary or negated. The thaa complementiser or the tee particle cannot precede either subject-controlled complements or object-controlled complements. In this study, it has been shown that subject-controlled complements can be preceded by an aspectual predicate, a commitment predicate, a desiderative predicate and an achievement predicate.

Some of the most interesting findings in this study concern the verb qaoy. This verb has presented the most problems for the analysis and it is theoretically very interesting. The verb qaoy has various meanings and functions depending on its subcategorisation. This study has only focused on the form qaoy 'to have someone do something; to allow'. As a main verb 'to have someone do something; to allow', qaoy subcategorises for a subject, an object and an object-controlled complement. In addition to this, the main verb qaoy has a separate grammaticalised use in the jussive sentence type, where it subcategorises for a sentential complement. Unlike the main verb qaoy 'to have someone do something; to allow', the noun phrase following the jussive qaoy cannot undergo passivisation. Although the form qaoy in complements looks superficially like a complementiser, some pieces of evidence indicate that qaoy in this position does not share the characteristics of a complementiser that are displayed by thaa, a true complementiser in Khmer. (The dael complementiser only occurs with factive predicates, and so is not directly comparable with qaoy.) The form qaoy can be negated and be modified by the irrealis marker depending on the classes of the matrix predicates, while the thaa complementiser can neither be modified by the irrealis marker nor be negated, with the same matrix predicates. This suggests that qaoy is a verb.

The investigation in this study has revealed that there are two forms of qaoy in complements: the predicate qaoy and the non-predicate qaoy. When a complement containing the form qaoy is preceded by a commitment predicate, a desiderative predicate or an aspectual predicate, the form qaoy shares some characteristics with the predicates that introduce subject-controlled complements. The unexpressed subject of the predicate qaoy is controlled by the matrix subject and the object of qaoy functions as the controller of the unexpressed subject of the following complement. There is a degree of manipulation involved in this construction. The matrix subject referent
exercises authority to have the object referent of the predicate qaoy perform an action, as in nii̍ t ci̍ ng qaoy sot twa kaa nih 'Nieree wants to have Sot do this work'.

Complements containing the non-predicate qaoy can be preceded by a desiderative predicate, a manipulative predicate or an utterance predicate. I have argued that the form qaoy following a desiderative predicate loses its manipulative meaning in some contexts, e.g., nii̍ t ci̍ ng qaoy sot twa cnaot 'Nieree wants Sot to win the lotteries'. The matrix subject referent only expresses a wish for something to happen to someone; and the matrix subject referent has no power over whether it happens or not. The form qaoy in this construction has been interpreted as the non-predicate qaoy. It does not have a PRED feature, that is, it does not subcategorise for an argument. There is no obvious syntactic distinction between complements containing the predicate qaoy and those containing the non-predicate qaoy when they are preceded by a desiderative predicate. As a result, it is sometimes ambiguous which forms of qaoy is used in sentences.

The non-predicate qaoy has the additional feature $[^{\uparrow} \text{COMP SUBJ SB = -}]$ attached to it. This feature indicates that the antecedent of the unexpressed subject of a complement following the non-predicate qaoy cannot have a SUBJ function within the f-structure. This feature marks the switch of the subject referent in complements following the non-predicate qaoy. When there is a switch of the subject referent, it is obligatory to use the non-predicate qaoy. If the non-predicate qaoy is missing, the sentence is ungrammatical. Foley and Van Valin (1984:339) note that switch-reference systems are "always associated with verb-final languages" whereas Stirling (1993:12) proposes that languages with switch-reference system tend to be associated with complex verb morphology. Although Khmer is an SVO language, and it has no significant inflectional morphology, the occurrence of the non-predicate qaoy is obligatory to mark the switch of the subject referent in a complement construction. In addition to this, switch-reference system tends to be an areal feature rather than a language specific (Stirling, 1993:5). The behaviour of the verb 'to allow; to order' in other South-East Asia languages seems to be similar to that of the non-predicate qaoy marking a switch of the subject referent. A comparative study of the verb 'to allow; to order' of languages in South-East Asia is an interesting issue for further research.

In a controlled complement, the same restrictions apply; if the subject of the complement is not equal to the subject of the matrix clause, the non-predicate qaoy is obligatory with most manipulative predicates and utterance predicates which inherently imply manipulation. There are a few manipulative predicates, such as quong to 'invite', babual 'to persuade', haw 'to call' that can be followed by either an object-controlled complement or a complement containing the non-predicate qaoy. In
other words, the occurrence of the non-predicate \textit{qaoy} in complements following these predicates is optional. The option of which type of complements used with these predicates seems to depend on the individual preferences of different speakers.

Most characteristics of complements containing \textit{qaoy} preceded by a manipulative predicate or an utterance predicate are similar to those of object-controlled complements, except that \textit{qaoy} preceded by a manipulative predicate or an utterance predicate can be negated. It has been shown that the form \textit{qaoy} in this construction also loses its manipulative meaning and its ability to subcategorise for arguments. As a result, \textit{qaoy} in complements following a manipulative predicate or an utterance predicate, as in \textit{niorii prap sot qaoy twaa kaa nih 'Nieree told Sot to do this work'} has also been analysed here as the non-predicate \textit{qaoy}. This analysis allows the matrix predicate to subcategorise for a following VCOMP in a simple way, even though the verb \textit{qaoy} intervenes. Although the non-predicate \textit{qaoy} does not subcategorise for an argument, the matrix object can also be generated after the form \textit{qaoy}, e.g., \textit{niorii prap qaoy sot twaa kaa nih 'Nieree told Sot to do this work'}. It seems to be a surprising fact that there can be two object positions in a sentence. However, the formalisms in LFG offer a natural way to deal with it. These two positions of objects can be predicted in LFG by phrase structure rules. In addition to this, the noun phrase object can occur overtly both before and after the form \textit{qaoy}, as in \textit{niorii prap sot qaoy sot twaa kaa nih}. I have proposed that in some circumstances, it is necessary to merge the PRED value of the same argument. The noun phrase object following the non-predicate \textit{qaoy}, moreover, can be replaced by a pronoun which shares the same grammatical information with the noun phrase object preceding \textit{qaoy}. It has been shown that the pronoun in this position loses its referential property and it is best analysed as a pronoun without the PRED value. Although there can be two object positions in the same sentence, Khmer native speakers prefer to have only one overt object and it is preferred to have the object immediately following the matrix predicate rather than having the matrix object generated after the non-predicate \textit{qaoy}.

The predicate of complements containing the non-predicate \textit{qaoy} can be the predicate \textit{qaoy} itself. The characteristics of the predicate \textit{qaoy} in this construction are the same as those of the predicate \textit{qaoy} in normal clauses. The order of its subject and that of its object are fixed. Nevertheless, it is phonologically redundant to have two forms of \textit{qaoy} adjacent to each other. I have proposed that superficially there can be only one overt form of \textit{qaoy} in the construction, but that there are two forms of \textit{qaoy} in the c-structure and the f-structure. Since Khmer is a pro-drop language, either the matrix object or the object of the predicate \textit{qaoy} can be omitted. As a result, it is also ambiguous whether the matrix predicate is followed by a complement containing the
non-predicate qaoy or a complement which contains the combination of the non-predicate qaoy and the predicate qaoy.

When qaoy occurs in S-like complements with the thaa complementiser, the form qaoy can be either a full verb qaoy 'to have someone do something; to allow' or the jussive qaoy. For example, qaoy in the following sentence is a full verb qaoy 'to have someone do something; to allow', niarii prap thaa kōet qaoy sot twaa kaa nih 'Nieree told (someone) that s/he allowed Sot to do this work'. The full verb qaoy can be preceded by a subject noun phrase and be modified by a negator and/or an auxiliary. The form qaoy in the following example functions as the jussive qaoy, niarii prap thaa qaoy sot twaa kaa nih 'Nieree told (someone) that Sot should do this work'. The jussive qaoy in an S-like complement with the thaa complementiser marks an indirect imperative. Unlike the full verb qaoy, the jussive qaoy cannot subcategorise for a SUBJ and it can only be negated by the prohibitive.

The form qaoy in Khmer has some similar characteristics to the form háy in Thai. Both the form qaoy in Khmer and the form háy in Thai can function as main verbs. They can mean either 'to give' or to have someone do something; to allow'. I have shown that the main verb qaoy 'to have someone do something; to allow' in Khmer has been grammaticalised in the jussive sentence type. However, no previous studies of háy in Thai propose a parallel function of the form háy. The form háy can also occur in an embedded clause similar to the form qaoy in Khmer. In this position, both qaoy in Khmer and háy in Thai can be negated and are treated as verbs. Most previous studies (Sriphen, 1982; Thepkanjana, 1986) consider that an embedded clause containing háy in Thai is a complement and there is only one complement construction. In contrast, Pingkarawat (1989) argues that a construction containing háy in Thai can be either a complement or an adjunct. However, I have shown that Pingkarawat's argument cannot be applied to an embedded clause containing qaoy in Khmer and an embedded clause containing qaoy is best analysed as a complement. Furthermore, I have shown that there can be two types of the form qaoy in complements in Khmer. A detailed comparative study of constructions containing háy in Thai and those containing qaoy in Khmer is another interesting research topic.

This thesis has shown the value of basing a descriptive study in a formal framework. The formalisms chosen have helped me to find a suitable means for analysing the constructions in Khmer and have made me investigate some areas of the language that would not otherwise have occurred to me. This has resulted in a collection of interesting data and theoretical analysis. In addition to this, results of the analysis of qaoy in complements have shown that the formalisms within Lexical-Functional Grammar provide a natural analysis for complements containing qaoy and
are well suited to account for homophonous forms in this language. Although the string associated with a complement containing the predicate *qaoy* and that produced by a complement containing the non-predicate *qaoy* are similar in respect to the phrase-structures, they can be clearly distinguished by their annotations in the c-structures and their functions in the f-structures.

Even though the results in this study have revealed a new approach for analysing homophonous forms in Khmer (which can also be applied to similar constructions in other South-East Asian languages), various issues have been left for further investigation. For example, a study of the distinctions between different reflexive forms in Khmer involving grammaticality judgements of native speakers has been shown to be an interesting issue as a result of the data gathered in this linguistic study. The fact that an argument can occur in two positions and the analysis which suggests that their PRED value should be merged merits further theoretical investigation. Further study on the distinctions of pronouns with and without the PRED value in Khmer is another challenging theoretical topic. In addition to these theoretical issues, other aspects of the Khmer language provide interesting avenues for deeper examination. The study of the semantic implications of complement-taking predicates (as listed in the appendix) is open for further research. A historical study of grammatical words such as the *dael* complementiser and that of grammaticalised forms like *qaoy* would help to shed light on the synchronic behaviour of these forms.
Appendix

The distribution of complement types and classes of complement-taking predicates

Complement-taking predicates in Khmer are classified into classes as follows:

A. Utterance predicates
B. Belief predicates
C. Perception predicates
D. Predicates of fearing
E. Factive predicates
F. Aspectual predicates
G. Commitment predicates
H. Desiderative predicates
I. Achievement predicates
J. Manipulative predicates
K. Prohibitive predicates.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Complement-taking predicates</th>
<th>S-like complement with a complementiser</th>
<th>S-like complement without a complementiser</th>
<th>Controlled complement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>prap 'to tell'¹</td>
<td>thaa +</td>
<td>dael</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>prap 'to tell; to order'²</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>thaa 'to say'</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pool 'to say'</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cumriap 'to inform'</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pdam 'to give a message'</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pdae pdam 'to instruct'</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>baak 'to tell'</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>suə 'to ask'</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>snəə 'to propose'</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>saəpsua 'to investigate'</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table A.1: Utterance predicates

¹ = normal utterance predicate  
² = utterance predicate involving manipulation
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Complement-taking predicates</th>
<th>S-like complement with a complementiser</th>
<th>S-like complement without a complementiser</th>
<th>Controlled complement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>niiiyiyo 'to say'</td>
<td>thaa +</td>
<td>dael -</td>
<td>subject -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>niyiyo laak 'to encourage'</td>
<td>thaa +</td>
<td>dael -</td>
<td>object -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tikcat</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sraek 'to cry out'</td>
<td>thaa +</td>
<td>dael -</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>banloy 'to shout'</td>
<td>thaa +</td>
<td>dael -</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ksap 'to whisper'</td>
<td>thaa +</td>
<td>dael -</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ksap ksiow 'to whisper'</td>
<td>thaa +</td>
<td>dael -</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>damqouñi 'to murmur'</td>
<td>thaa +</td>
<td>dael -</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tlaen 'to explain'</td>
<td>thaa +</td>
<td>dael -</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>prakaah 'to proclaim'</td>
<td>thaa +</td>
<td>dael -</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>psaay 'to diffuse'</td>
<td>thaa +</td>
<td>dael -</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table A.2: Utterance predicates (Cont.)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Complement-taking predicates</th>
<th>S-like complement with a complementiser</th>
<th>S-like complement without a complementiser</th>
<th>Controlled complement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>thaa</td>
<td>dael</td>
<td>subject</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>quət</td>
<td>'to boast'</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>quətqaan</td>
<td>'to show off'</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sasaa</td>
<td>'to praise'</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>qəňwaq</td>
<td>'to beg'¹</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>qəňwaq</td>
<td>'to beg'²</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>quaq</td>
<td>'to answer'</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tuaq</td>
<td>'to answer'</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>saarəphićp</td>
<td>'to confess'</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>koohaq</td>
<td>'to tell a lie'¹</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>koohaq</td>
<td>'to tell a lie'²</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>phuut(phoɔ)</td>
<td>'to tell a lie'¹</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>phuut(phoɔ)</td>
<td>'to tell a lie'²</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table A.3: Utterance predicates (Cont.)
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Complement-taking predicates</th>
<th>S-like complement with a complementiser</th>
<th>S-like complement without a complementiser</th>
<th>Controlled complement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>thaa</td>
<td>dael</td>
<td>subject</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bantaa  'to continue'</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>banthaem 'to add'</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bańcap 'to finish'</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bańćeőq 'to clarify'</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bańćeőqbanthaem 'to confirm'</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ponyūal 'to explain'</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>caacaen 'to explain'</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>quthibaay 'to explain'</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sarup 'to summarise'</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pŏnṇṇiņė 'to describe'</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>riĮpțōp 'to describe'</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table A.4: Utterance predicates (Cont.)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Complement-taking predicates</th>
<th>S-like complement with a complementiser</th>
<th>S-like complement without a complementiser</th>
<th>Controlled complement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>thaa</td>
<td>dael</td>
<td>subject</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>prodau 'to give an advice'</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>prodau 'to give an advice'</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tiən 'to urge, warn'</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tiən 'to urge, warn'</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>səy 'to complain'</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bantoh 'to blame, accuse'</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cii səy 'to blame'</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>səy bantoh 'to scold'</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>prakaek 'to protest'</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cumtəh 'to oppose'</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tehdiəl 'to criticise'</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table A.5: Utterance predicates (Cont.)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Complement-taking predicates</th>
<th>S-like complement with a complementiser</th>
<th>S-like complement without a complementiser</th>
<th>Controlled complement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>thaa</td>
<td>dael</td>
<td>subject</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tmahtehdiøl 'to blame'</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>rikhüøn 'to criticise'</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>titiøn 'to criticise'</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>taawa 'to complain'</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pðøø 'to inform against'</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pðøøpdøø 'to complain'</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tguøntqae 'to complain'</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pðøøtaawa 'to sue'</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>phphiøøsa 'to judge'</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>katkdøy 'to judge'</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table A.6: Utterance predicates (Cont.)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Complement-taking predicates</th>
<th>S-like complement with a complementiser</th>
<th>S-like complement without a complementiser</th>
<th>Controlled complement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>thaa</td>
<td>dael</td>
<td>subject</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ciə</td>
<td>'to believe'</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ciəcəq</td>
<td>'to believe'</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tucət</td>
<td>'to trust'</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>qahqaŋ</td>
<td>'to affirm'</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>thiənə</td>
<td>'to quarantee'</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kit</td>
<td>'to think'</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nik</td>
<td>'to think'</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>piccarənæa</td>
<td>to consider</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>niknə</td>
<td>'to consider'</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>künki</td>
<td>to consider</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cam (baan)</td>
<td>'to remember'</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sanəkhım</td>
<td>'to hope'</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table B.1: Belief predicates
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Complement-taking predicates</th>
<th>S-like complement with a complementiser</th>
<th>S-like complement without a complementiser</th>
<th>Controlled complement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>thaa</td>
<td>dael</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>smaan</td>
<td>'to guess'</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>saŋsay</td>
<td>'to suspect'</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>müₜₜil</td>
<td>'to suspect'</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>çral</td>
<td>'to wonder'</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>rumpin</td>
<td>'to wonder'</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sannòthaan</td>
<td>'to surmise'</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>məmuy</td>
<td>'to imagine'</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sbat</td>
<td>'to swear'</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sbaesbat</td>
<td>'to asseverate'</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sacca</td>
<td>'to swear'</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tiay</td>
<td>'to predict'</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pyiₜkao</td>
<td>'to foretell'</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table B.2: Belief predicates (Cont.)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Complement-taking predicates</th>
<th>S-like complement with a complementiser</th>
<th>S-like complement without a complementiser</th>
<th>Controlled complement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>thaa</td>
<td>dael</td>
<td>subject</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>caot 'to rumour'</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cacaaqaraam 'to rumour'</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bañcañ 'to show'</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>samdañ 'to show'</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table B.3: Belief predicates (Cont.)
### Table C.1: Perception predicates

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Complement-taking predicates</th>
<th>S-like complement with a complementiser</th>
<th>S-like complement without a complementiser</th>
<th>Controlled complement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>thaa</td>
<td>dael</td>
<td>subject</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>llii 'to hear'¹</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>llii 'to hear'²</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>khōōñ 'to see'¹</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>khōōñ 'to see'²</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mōōlkhōōñ 'to understand'</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sāṅkeet 'to notice'</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>yūōl 'to understand'</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>yūōl koh 'to misunderstand'</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>yūōl crālam 'to misunderstand'</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

-¹ = Direct perception  
-² = Indirect report about a situation
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Complement-taking predicates</th>
<th>S-like complement with a complementiser</th>
<th>S-like complement without a complementiser</th>
<th>Controlled complement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>thaa</td>
<td>dael</td>
<td>subject</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dəŋ</td>
<td>'to know'</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dəŋkluan</td>
<td>'to realise'</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>criəp</td>
<td>'to know'</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>criəpcēeq</td>
<td>'to realise'</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table C.2: Perception predicates (Cont.)
### Complement-taking predicates

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Complement-taking predicates</th>
<th>S-like complement with a complementiser</th>
<th>S-like complement without a complementiser</th>
<th>Controlled complement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>thaa</td>
<td>dael</td>
<td>subject</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>klaac 'to be afraid'</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>phiy 'to be afraid'</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pruy klaac 'to be afraid'</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>klaac kraen 'to be afraid'</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kraen 'to be worried'</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table D.1: Predicates of fearing
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Complement-taking predicates</th>
<th>S-like complement with a complementiser</th>
<th>S-like complement without a complementiser</th>
<th>Controlled complement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>thaa</td>
<td>dael</td>
<td>subject</td>
<td>object</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>baarom</td>
<td>'to be sad, worried'</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pruay</td>
<td>'to be worried'</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kwalcet</td>
<td>'to be worried'</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>phiy</td>
<td>'to be afraid'</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>klaac</td>
<td>'to be afraid'</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sdaay</td>
<td>'to regret'</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>qancet</td>
<td>'to be disappointed'</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>khaj</td>
<td>'to be angry'</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sqap</td>
<td>'to hate'</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>chiicet</td>
<td>'to be hurt'</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ranthoetet</td>
<td>'to be frightened'</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>knaqet</td>
<td>'to feel hurt'</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table E.1: Factive predicates
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Complement-taking predicates</th>
<th>S-like complement with a complementiser</th>
<th>S-like complement without a complementiser</th>
<th>Controlled complement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>thaa</td>
<td>dael</td>
<td>subject</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>klaocca</td>
<td>'to have a strong feeling'</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>thuñ</td>
<td>'to be bored'</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>qapsok</td>
<td>'to be bored'</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>thuñtrõon</td>
<td>'to be tired of'</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cinnaay</td>
<td>'to be tired of'</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>touccoc</td>
<td>'to be disappointed'</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kmah</td>
<td>'to be ashamed'</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>qaamah muk</td>
<td>'to be ashamed'</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>qõon</td>
<td>'to be shy'</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>prakan</td>
<td>'to be offended'</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table E.2: Factive predicates (Cont.)
### Table E.3: Factive predicates (Cont.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Complement-taking predicates</th>
<th>S-like complement with a complementiser</th>
<th>S-like complement without a complementiser</th>
<th>Controlled complement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>thaa</td>
<td>dael</td>
<td>subject</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>qaanit</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>qaa</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>treikqaa</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>riikriay</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sapbaayycat</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sapbaay riikriay</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>piñcat</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>trawcat</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>goakun</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kaot</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sosaa</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sñaec</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Complement-taking predicates

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Complement-taking predicates</th>
<th>S-like complement with a complementiser</th>
<th>S-like complement without a complementiser</th>
<th>Controlled complement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>thaa</td>
<td>dael</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cappdaom</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>chup</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lεεŋ</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>catcaŋ</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>rūŋŋcam</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table F.1: Aspectual predicates
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Complement-taking predicates</th>
<th>S-like complement with a complementiser</th>
<th>S-like complement without a complementiser</th>
<th>Controlled complement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>thaa</td>
<td>dael</td>
<td>subject</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>smaqcọt</td>
<td>'to volunteer'</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sọqcọt</td>
<td>'to agree to'</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>samraacọt</td>
<td>'to decide'</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>daccọt</td>
<td>'to decide'</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tancọt</td>
<td>'to determine'</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pdọcọaacọt</td>
<td>'to determine'</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sanya</td>
<td>'to promise'</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sọmọmat</td>
<td>'to agree, promise'</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>yuαlproom</td>
<td>'to agree'</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>proom</td>
<td>'to agree'</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kit</td>
<td>'to intend'</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bomrun</td>
<td>'to plan, intend'</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table G.1: Commitment predicates
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Complement-taking predicates</th>
<th>S-like complement with a complementiser</th>
<th>S-like complement without a complementiser</th>
<th>Controlled complement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>thaa</td>
<td>dael</td>
<td>subject</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>padiseet 'to refuse'</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pincet 'to be willing to'</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sapbaaycet 'to be pleased'</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>riikriay 'to be pleased'</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>stegaqstaay 'to hesitate'</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tiitac 'to hesitate'</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>totegaqtion 'to hesitate'</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>riareet 'to hesitate'</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>qakcet 'to be reluctant'</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table G.2: Commitment predicates (Cont.)
### Table G.3: Commitment predicates (Cont.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Complement-taking predicates</th>
<th>S-like complement with a complementiser</th>
<th>S-like complement without a complementiser</th>
<th>Controlled complement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>thaa</td>
<td>dael</td>
<td>subject</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>prcompriŋ knia 'to agree'</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>coh samran knia 'to agree'</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ruam knia 'to join'</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ruapruam knia 'to unite'</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pruaşday knia 'to join force'</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Complement-taking predicates | S-like complement with a complementiser | S-like complement without a complementiser | Controlled complement
---|---|---|---
| thaa | dael | subject | object |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Complement-taking predicates</th>
<th>'to want'</th>
<th>'to want'</th>
<th>'to wish'</th>
<th>'to wish'</th>
<th>'to wish, to desire'</th>
<th>'to like'</th>
<th>'to endure'</th>
<th>'to endure'</th>
<th>'to venture'</th>
<th>'to attempt'</th>
<th>'to try hard'</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>caŋ</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*caŋ</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>praatθɔnaa</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*praatθɔnaa</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>paŋ</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>coulɔat</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gathɔɔn</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>trɔɔm</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>suu</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>punpaŋ</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kham</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table H.1: Desiderative predicates

*Desiderative predicates followed by a complement containing the non-predicate qaoy marking a switch of the subject referent
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Complement-taking predicates</th>
<th>S-like complement with a complementiser</th>
<th>S-like complement without a complementiser</th>
<th>Controlled complement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>thaa</td>
<td>dael</td>
<td>subject</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>khamprøŋ 'to try'</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>prumprøŋ 'to try'</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pyiaiøm 'to try'</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>knahknaŋ 'to make an effort'</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>soum 'to ask for a request'</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tradeetradø 'to struggle'</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sanwaat 'to try hard'</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hiøn 'to dare'</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(fak)hat 'to practise'</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>wøkwiin 'to practise'</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table H.2: desiderative predicates (Cont.)
### Complement-taking predicates

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Complement-taking predicates</th>
<th>S-like complement with a complementiser</th>
<th>S-like complement without a complementiser</th>
<th>Controlled complement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>thaa</td>
<td>dael</td>
<td>subject</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>plic 'to forget'</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>khaan 'to miss'</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bat 'to lose (a desire)'</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ci:\hwiaŋ 'to avoid'</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kœcwioh 'to avoid'</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lœ 'to test'</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>l\œ\œ 'to test'</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ceh 'to know how'</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table I.1: Achievement predicates
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Complement-taking predicates</th>
<th>S-like complement with a complementiser</th>
<th>S-like complement without a complementiser</th>
<th>Controlled complement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>thaa</td>
<td>dael</td>
<td>subject</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>qañcœñ 'to invite'</td>
<td>−</td>
<td>−</td>
<td>−</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>haw 'to call, order'</td>
<td>−</td>
<td>−</td>
<td>−</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kahhaw 'to call, order'</td>
<td>−</td>
<td>−</td>
<td>−</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>babœl 'to persuade'</td>
<td>−</td>
<td>−</td>
<td>−</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>qaoy 'to have someone do something; to allow'</td>
<td>−</td>
<td>−</td>
<td>−</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>som 'to ask for permission'</td>
<td>−</td>
<td>−</td>
<td>−</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bañciœ 'to order'</td>
<td>−</td>
<td>−</td>
<td>−</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bañciœ 'to order'²</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>−</td>
<td>−</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>neñoñom 'to suggest'¹</td>
<td>−</td>
<td>−</td>
<td>−</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table J.1: Manipulative predicates

−¹ = manipulative predicate  
−² = utterance manipulative predicates
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Complement-taking predicates</th>
<th>S-like complement with a complementiser</th>
<th>S-like complement without a complementiser</th>
<th>Controlled complement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>thaa</td>
<td>dael</td>
<td>subject</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>neenoom</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>camruu</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>camruu</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fiuhfiiig</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fiuhfiiig</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>panuhu</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>panuhu</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>baŋkham</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>qanuñaat</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>qanumat</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tøtuuc</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cuøy</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table J.2: Manipulative predicates (Cont.)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Complement-taking predicates</th>
<th>S-like complement with a complementiser</th>
<th>S-like complement without a complementiser</th>
<th>Controlled complement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>haam</td>
<td>'to prohibit'</td>
<td></td>
<td>subject</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>haampraam</td>
<td>'to prohibit'</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>haamkhọọt</td>
<td>'to prohibit'</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>haampdac</td>
<td>'to prohibit'</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>khọọt</td>
<td>'to prevent'</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>khọọtkhẹẹŋ</td>
<td>'to prevent'</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bangak</td>
<td>'to prevent'</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bańchup</td>
<td>'to halt'</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bangaeabantay</td>
<td>'to dilly-dally'</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table K.1: Prohibitive predicates

×qaoy means that a negator is obligatorily inserted before qaoy.
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