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The subject of these investigations is the word kan found in the predicate of Thai sentences following the main verb or as the closure component of a number of adverbial expressions. Just what part kan plays in the predicate will be discussed later. The first task is to ensure that the word is clearly identified and clearly distinguished from any homophones. At the outset it is helpful to point out that what is here called a word is in other authors called a particle. This is an issue of terminology which will also be left until later in the discussion, but what should be mentioned at this point is that it is one and the same kan that we speak of. As for homophones, if we appeal to dictionaries we shall leave no doubt as to what the subject for discussion is and, moreover, we shall also have a starting-point in a common-sense statement about what kind of a word kan is and what meanings it is capable of having. Word-class in dictionary terms gives us a start on syntax; definition in dictionary terms gives us a start on lexis.

Let us appeal first to PRB. There are two numbered main-entries. The second, classed as verb, cannot possibly be the one we have in mind. We therefore specify which is the relevant meaning from a variety of sub-entries under Number 1 with the following classes: pronoun, verb

---

1) 'Modern Standard Thai' is meant to cover both spoken and written styles. Evidence for written usage has been drawn from journals, newspapers and novels. For spoken usage a group of Thai colleagues and friends was relied upon. The criterion for acceptability was that any one native speaker accepted an utterance as good Thai. There may therefore be differences of opinion about the acceptability of certain sequences or sentences, but it is held that these do not materially affect the conclusions reached for which, of course, the author alone accepts responsibility.

2) All works referred to are coded by initials and the bibliographical references are to be found at the end of the article. The transcription is that of Mary Haas as set out in the introduction (pp. x–xvi) to TESD.

3) NSMT. See my footnote 20 below.

4) p. 124, ใ, ใ, ใ are.

5) ใ, ใ (ใ) shave smooth or level; hold, grasp. (Khmer loanword)
and *wisēēd* (adjective/adverb type of stative or descriptive word, in Thai classifiable by structural analysis as a sub-class of the verb). There is no hesitation in choosing the definition of our word *kan* as the one which reads “a verb-modifier indicating that the doers of an action number from two upwards” with examples given: *tī kan* and *phuud kan*6. This definition is marked as belonging to *kan* of the adjective/adverb class. PBFW has virtually the same definition and agrees in word classification. Before proceeding, let us note that the keynote of the meaning is plurality with reference to the Subject—the “doers of an action”, i.e. a plural noun—whereas the word-class links *kan*, in its capacity of a modifying attribute, with the verb or with the sort of words we should expect to be capable of figuring in the predicate of a sentence. Indeed, we have already seen these expectations fulfilled: the word *kan* is found in the predicate and only in the predicate. It remains to be seen whether, because it is found there, it is necessarily modifying the predicate. Dictionary definitions seem to offer a hint that it is a part, albeit a disjunctive part, of the Subject, in which case it might be derived under noun and, thus, not a *wisēēd* word at all.

If another dictionary, TESD7, is consulted, the entry *kan* that we seek is obviously entry number 1 where we find the definitions: “(1) each other, one another, mutually, together. (2) severally (imparting a distributive sense to the verb). Often not rendered explicitly in English.” In both of these definitions plurality is implicit. Though we recognise the additional semantic ingredient of the feelings or transactions appropriate to plurality, we must also bear it in mind that this additional gloss or nuance will not be so strong as always to bring itself to the notice of an English translator. I think it is fair to assume that this means that the English plural forms are often enough to convey the Thai meaning. When we look at the word-class, we find it is an unique one, *Reciprocal Pronoun*. It is beginning to look as if the hint about *kan*’s participation in a Subject, which is ultimately derived under noun, has been taken up. Regrettably, there is no room in Mary Haas’ *Brief Description of Thai*, which prefaces the dictionary, for any explanation of this uniqueness. As a pronoun, though, we might expect it to conform

---

6) * (...)* เหมือนภาษาไทยใช้ร่วมกันเป็นรูปทำนกทั้งสองก็เป็น ใช้ ซื้อหน้า, เพลิน
7) TESD pp. 25 and 26.
to the requirements of such a statement as: "Personal Pronouns may be
substituted for nouns but they are not followed by as many types of
attributes." We might expect this because the distinction between the
terms 'Personal' and 'Reciprocal' does not seem to be of an order such
as to preclude the statement's application to kan. After all, the
reciprocity must be envisaged as being effected between the Persons
(First, Second and Third) in some way or other, - 'between' them, that is
to say, or 'within' them as plurals. And if the dictionary's classifying
of kan as a kind of pronoun offers a likelihood that what applies to
Personal Pronouns will also apply to Reciprocal ones, it is furthermore
ture that kan permits fewer attributes than do nouns. Though kan
commonly occurs in predicate strings in a 'slot' in the word order before,
say, adverbs or quantifying expressions, it can easily be shown that these
are not attributes of kan, despite the word order's immediate prompting,
but attributes of the predicate, or of the Subject or Object nouns,
respectively. The limitations placed upon attribution with Personal
Pronouns, therefore, seem in the case of the Reciprocal Pronoun to have
grown so as to become a total ban. But even accepting kan as an extreme
or odd type of pronoun, we must still raise a further question before
passing on to other aspects of this investigation. It is: for what is kan
substituting? A clearer way of asking this is to say: where kan now is,
was there a noun or a noun phrase standing? Does kan in some way
refer to this noun's nature and existence and does it mark its location in
a sentence's word-order?

This point is taken up by the authors of WPPT who make no bones
about the criterion of substitution in identifying pronominality. Under
"Partitive Pronouns" (wiphaagsubphanaam) comes the explanation:

8) ibid. p. xxi
9) In the ... kan mod, ... kan jaj sequences discussed later in this investigation it
is possible to see an intimate association between kan and certain following
adverbs but this does not amount to attribution in the strict sense of the word.
The placing of kan within a predicate string is dealt with in FOT, pp. 363-364.
TRG p. 160 has a revealing note about predicates containing haj and jaw with
kan but it is not relevant to attribution.
10) WPPT. p. 144: ถ้า จำแนกSuffix "กัน" แล้ว แยกที่คำ:\ (kan)
 แล้ว จับที่คำที่เป็น ชนิดนามของข้อมูลของคำที่เป็น สรรพนามของค่อนโดยค่อน
 ต่าง บอย นน ค่อนของข้อมูล
 ต้องเป็นคำของคำที่ "กัน" วิเคราะห์โดยคำที่เป็น ชนิดนามของข้อมูลของคำที่เป็น ค่อน
 ค่อนของข้อมูล และคำต่อคำของคำที่เป็น ค่อน ค่อนของข้อมูล ค่อน
 ค่อนของข้อมูล
"wiphāag means divide, distribute, and refers to words substituting for a preceding noun so as to divide up this noun into parts. The pronouns of this group are: taal, baa!, and kan, as they occur in the following examples: ... kan is used to substitute for a preceding noun in order to show that this noun is divided into parts doing actions that are in an inter-linked or reciprocal relationship, eg. sunāg kad kan, phii-nāg thalī? kan." A useful reminder follows (kholo saqkeed ryaq wiphaagsabphanaam): "kan may be misunderstood as being a wised word. It should be remembered that the word kan that is a pronoun must show an inter-linked or reciprocal relationship and it must be a word that substitutes for a noun that is the recipient of an action or for a noun that constitutes some part of the sentence."

We therefore have two kinds of kan: the pronoun being implicitly plural in the sense that it takes two to make up reciprocity; and the adverb signifying plurality presumably in some more explicit way. The other side of the coin, as it were, needs looking at: kan as a wised word.

Under pramaanawised, glossed as words "indicating quantity", kan will be found exemplified under 1(b): “In addition to these there are also words indicating quantity but not in a specifically exact way. They are: māag, nāj ... kan etc. eg. ... maa tham-ṇaa kan thā?.” We may legitimately understand ‘quantity’ (camnuan) here to include the idea of plurality by reason of the company kept by kan (māag and nāj, among others) and because of the treatment of ‘number’ (camnuan nāh) in a different sub-section of pramaanawised—2(a)—which, of course, includes singularity (nyṇ) quite specifically. Already, however, there are some doubts about kan’s pluralizing force. The sentence chosen to illustrate ‘adverbial’ kan can be understood two ways. As ‘Come on, let’s work!’
we have understood it to have a First Person plural Subject. As 'Come and work (with us)!', however, we have understood the Subject to be Second Person, in which case it might just as well be singular as plural. And in this sentence, is kan the attribute (for, note the definition, *wiséed* words are *kham prakééh kham ?yyn*) of an understood Subject (i.e. adjectival), or is it an attribute of the verb *tham-nan* (i.e. adverbial)? This is still unclear.

Whatever the procedure followed by the authors of WPPT to classify forms, the findings are quite compatible with those that a modern, structural analysis might also present. It is common enough to meet with a form analysed as two or more homophonous words on the basis of differing word-class or word sub-class. Such words, for instance, as *wii* or *khamooj* may be classed as nouns or verbs according to the dictates of syntax. They make major inter-category changes, but suffering withal hardly any changes in referential meaning.\(^1\) Such words as *thii* and *câag* likewise fall into different classifications, the former ranging between the noun ‘place’, the preposition ‘at’, the relative pronoun ‘where, who, which’ and the ordinal numeral marker; the latter being either a verb, ‘to part’, or the preposition ‘from’. They make minor intra-category transfers in as much as they range from full noun and full verb respectively to more restricted classes.\(^2\) The restricted

---

13) Eg. noun: ไวย์ น้ํา น้ําหมาย
‘Would you please pass the comb.’
verb: ไวย์ น้ํา น้ําหมาย
‘Would you please comb my hair.’

and
verb: ไวย์ น้ํา น้ําหมาย
‘He didn’t steal the car.’
noun: ไวย์ น้ํา น้ําหมาย
‘He isn’t a thief, you know.’

14) Eg. ผู้ที่ ซื้อ ที่ ซื้อ ที่ซื้อใน จังหวัดสงขลา
‘The third person was the one who bought land in Songkhla province.’
being an exemplification of ordinal numeral, relative pronoun, noun and preposition in succession.

and
verb: ผู้ที่ ซื้อ ที่ ซื้อ ที่ซื้อใน จังหวัดสงขลา
‘The lovers did not want ever to part.’

prep.: ผู้ที่ ซื้อ ที่ ซื้อ ที่ซื้อใน จังหวัดสงขลา
‘The lovers did not want to travel away from Thailand.’
classes could be said to make up most, if not all, \textsuperscript{15} of their membership by recruiting words from the noun and verb categories and causing them to specialize. This specialization cannot run counter to referential meaning, but it must obviously devote this meaning to a particular function. Thus it comes about that, by analysis of syntax, special classes are identified with these special functions. Structural analysis is careful to make this class-specialization clear. But it tends to relegate the processes of specialization, and the semantic referential relationships therein relied upon, to a particular type of scholarship more properly viewed as the study of the diachronic development of a language rather than as being a grammatical pursuit.

If \textit{kan} is a case in point, then a severely structural account of WPPT's findings would leave two homophones (\textit{kan} the pronoun and \textit{kan} the adverb) listed alongside the other homophones (\textit{kan} the verb 'to prevent', \textit{kan} the Khmer loan-word 'to hold'; \textit{kan} a male First Person pronoun; and another verb, 'to shave') without further gloss. This is counter-intuitive.

Intuition tells us that there must have been processes that still exert a conditioning influence upon certain uses of homophonous forms. We assume, for example, that non-synonymous homophones like \textit{kan} for 'I' and \textit{kan} for 'to shave' (cf. also \textit{phôm} for 'I' and \textit{phôm} for 'hair' etc.) can never have had any grounds for incompatibility when used together in the same grammatical structure—unless, of course, plausible collocation and stylistic feedback in the avoidance of homophony be counted, and we do not admit them as being grammatical considerations here. We may further check for compatibility of main as against restricted classes and remark that multiple \textit{thii}-forms, main and restricted, seem to occur readily in close sequence in the same sentence, but multiple \textit{caag} forms (or \textit{khàw}—'to enter'/into', or \textit{thỳq}—'to arrive'/up to' etc.) are not likely so to occur, the reason being that the diachronic process has not specialized far enough yet to make possible a complete break into two. The suspicion about \textit{kan}, however, is that there has never been a break at all: it is unreasonable in Thai to want to use multiple \textit{kan} in one and the same predicate, intending one as 'unison' togetherness and the other as

\textsuperscript{15} See my footnote 17 below.
particular' reciprocity. Take the English 'With one accord they all kissed each other the moment the New Year bells rang out.' The point is not that such a sentence is untranslatable (by using such a sequence as ... phaa kan ciub kan ..., for instance, it would be possible) but that it is unreasonable to expect a sequence ... ciub kan kan ... to be even a faint prospect. Even from a synchronic point of view, it would be of interest, to say the least, to grade homophony into the randomly coincidental cases and the derivationally close cases. If we accept this and we do grade kan forms in these terms, then we might wish to subject kan's meanings to closer investigation, or, at least, that part of meaning that is common to both the pronoun and the adverb. More important than this, though, is to examine the two kinds of specialization that invite two distinct classifications for kan to see whether they remind us of other major inter-category changes or other minor intra-category ones.

As a pronoun on the one hand and an adverb on the other, we are tempted to look for a derivation under both noun and verb—one of the major inter-category ambivalences. But kan is not amenable to the immediate and convincing kind of syntactical analysis that makes wi and khamooj such obvious candidates for dual classification. It will not take negation to show it is a verb/adjective/adverb. It will not substitute for a noun Subject in the Subject 'slot' to show it is a pronoun. Minor intra-category dualities present similar difficulties. As a highly specialized member of the set of pronouns (recalling remarks above on the Reciprocal Pronoun) and also of the set of one-word adverbs (it cannot, for instance, double up as an adjective; it cannot be modified or compared), it plays roles that are difficult to match with those of other specializing families. The family of prepositions, for instance, fits into a simple pattern like the following, and its relationships are plotted along the minor dimension (downwards), in contrast to the major dimension, exemplified by the form wi (across the top).

16) The idiomatic sequence kan le? kan comes near to this, of course, but it is not suggested that the first and second occurrences are felt as different meanings of kan (unison and reciprocal) but, rather, as different arrangements of participants in the same transaction with the same relationships. Towards the close of this investigation a theory will be advanced to account for kan le? kan in terms of arrangements of participants in reversible partnerships.
But it is not claimed that kan belongs to a family with this sort of distribution of roles, for its two functions are not to be reconciled in terms of a 'new' word-class analogous to the way the class 'preposition' reconciles and accommodates noun-transfers and verb-transfers. The two roles of kan are to be kept apart: pronoun and adverb. But we have already seen that forms with a clear dichotomy of roles, those along the major dimension, are hard to compare with kan. This difficulty remains

17) The form naj is included in the set as a token. It stands for 'unambivalent membership of a class'—a possibility that analysis must not overlook. In similar vein, khon is included as an unambivalent noun and maa as an unambivalent verb.
even for comparison with tāang and bāang,18 with which kan is often classed, for there are cases where their claim to pronominality can be based on finding them occupying sentence slots in substitution for noun phrases in which they themselves figure, e.g.

raw tāang kāo tham nāa-thīi khōng raw

where tāang substitutes for tāang khōn and alludes to an expected tāang nāa-thīi to balance the usage in the predicate; or

nāg-riān bāng ?āan bāng khian nāngsī19

where each occurrence of bāng replaces bāng khōn. This manner of substitution is not applicable to kan. Pronoun kan does not replace adverbial kan in this way. Nor is there any adjectival kan to enter into consideration. Before accepting a bipartite classification for kan, therefore, it is helpful to check its pronominality and adverbiality a little further.

What strikes us about Russell Campbell's work, subtitled A study in Pronominality, is that he does not consider kan to be a pronoun at all. It is Campbell who classifies kan for the purposes of his study as a Plural/Reciprocal Particle and includes it among "Thai function words" where many other particles will be found, those, for instance, like khrāb, sō̄ with a verb, khwaam- and kan-; kamlāng with a verb, interstitial -kwā-, and finals such as -sa and sī.20 Campbell has evidently followed a categorization procedure reminiscent of traditional Chinese grammatical

18) bāang and bāng are here taken as forms approaching homophony and sharing a common referential meaning. To this extent they constitute a form-family like that of tāang.

19) Examples taken from WPPT, pp. 144 and 145.

20) NSMT, p. 15, footnote 1. Judith Jacob uses the term adverbial particle to classify kālā in Cambodian (IC p. 329). kālā corresponds very closely to the Thai kan. By particle she means: "All words which cannot be catalyzed as V, n, x or c." (Ibid. p. 331) where the symbols are to be read as verb, noun, numeral and numeral co-efficient (classifier) respectively. Within the particles, kālā belongs to the adverbial subset in the independent particles division. The similarity in treatment is easy to see: Campbell's function words have a membership that resembles that of Jacob's particles quite closely.
analysis into 'full' words and 'empty' words with the implication that kan, one of the 'empty' words or 'markers', cannot profitably be ascribed either to nouns, and hence to pronouns, or verbs, and hence to one-word adjectives and adverbs. But is the exclusion of kan from membership of the noun class so emphatic and clear? We shall be helped by a statement of the alternatives so far: is kan modifying by attribution; replacing by substitution; or marking the fact that some grammatical operation has taken place? To enlarge upon this last alternative: if nouns and verbs are seen in algebraical terms as $x$ and $y$ respectively, then 'markers' are not just another term, such as $z$, but the sign of an 'operator' such as a plus or a minus, i.e. not just different but contrasting in essence and function, not akin to any $x$ or $y$ or $z$ or any symbol that is destined to be the raw material on which our operators have to work.

That some process of substitution takes place seems to be demonstrated by transformational grammar. In TSAO we find certain Obligatory Grammatical Transformations among which is rule 04, entitled Reciprocal. This rule demands that a string such as khon tii khon or khruu phuud kàb khruu be 'transformed' or re-written as khon tii kan and khruu phuud kan. The second noun in each case has disappeared: its place has been taken by kan and its role in the sentence's meaning is effectively played by kan. Nevertheless, the status of pronoun is not granted to kan, its occurrence being characterized only by the words "new item" in the terms of rule 04. Nor does kan occur in the Sample Lexicon under any of the PP entries (Personal Pronouns). Indeed, it does not occur there at all for the reason that it is not an item in any terminal string generated by Phrase Structure only. What this means is

---

21) These terms are used loosely. Chinese grammatical analysis cannot be expected to fit Thai in every detail, nor can analysis within Chinese itself be expected to be canonical—sufficient, efficient and final. For a discussion of this latter point and for the term marker, see CLT, p. 116: Markers.

22) TSAO, p. 63:  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Thai Sentence</th>
<th>English Translation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>man beat man</td>
<td>'men beat each other'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>teacher talk with teacher</td>
<td>'teachers talk to one another'</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
that the appearance of kan is not a direct outcome of ever increasing
degrees of complexity in what started as a simple, basic sentence. Its
appearance is due23 rather to the fact that certain of the direct outcomes—
specific applications of general rules—are unacceptable and must undergo
a transforming operation. Which of these operations it will be, will, of
course, vary according to the specific case, but it is worth reminding
ourselves that the operations may include inversion and deletion as well
as the addition of "new items". And, last but not least, it is also worth
observing that such new items need not be words in substitution for other
words but may well be words to stand as evidence that a transformation
has been effected. We are back again with the possibility that kan is an
operator or marker.

A close examination of TSAO's untransformed strings and the
process they undergo will now be made to ascertain whether kan really
does substitute for the second noun in any meaningful way. The stric-
tures placed upon us before being obliged to apply the Reciprocal rule
are that, in khon ti khon, the first khon and the second khon be identical.
It follows that this stricture governs the two khruu nouns in khruu phaud
kab khruu too. But the construction to put upon the word 'identical'
should give us pause. Let us view the problem in English terms, not for
the sake of translating but for the sake of certain notions to do with
plurality, identity and reciprocity. Take the two English renderings:

man beat man --> 'men beat each other'
teacher talk with teacher --> 'teachers talk to each other'

It certainly looks as if there is here some sort of linguistic addition sum:
two singulars are re-written as one plural plus kan. Arithmetically,
then, kan is not a substitute but must be some sort of sign that the sum
has been done. But if the first 'man' is identical with the second, no
sum can be done. Logic demands that the re-written strings should be
something like

--> 'man beats himself'
--> 'teacher talks to himself'

Now, kan is emphatically not a Reflexive. It does not usurp the
function of ton-/- tua-eeq. Nor does TSAO wish to imply that this is

23) ibid. p. 62, paragraph introducing Chapter V.
the case, of course. It is misplaced emphasis on the identity of Noun 1 and Noun 2 that gives rise to the misinterpretation. We might therefore say that in order for them not to be in a reflexive relationship it is necessary, indeed, that they should not be identical.

It may be objected, though, that the choice of 'man' and 'teacher' in the singular is unfair. Had we said

men beat men  →  ... etc.
teachers talk with teachers  →  ... etc.

would not then TSAO's strictures about identity have been seen to be just and necessary? There are two aspects to the meaning of identity. One aspect of identity is total congruence in all respects and relations. Such a rigorous view of identity offers no obstacles to the transformation

men beat men  →  'men beat themselves'

Most languages, including Thai, mark such transformations very specifically. Unmarked transformations, then, would seem to go on the assumption that the Subject will not participate in the Object role. It is not part of kan's function to underline this assumption, though it is interesting to note how kan might be thought to be affected by it—i.e. kan would not be expected to be the same as the Subject. The other aspect of identity is that the set of men in the first occurrence of a plural noun should be the same as the set in the second occurrence, but that there should be no necessity for congruence in the internal arrangements or relations of members, or for congruence of roles of individual members in participating in a transaction. It is clearly this second aspect of identity that allows reciprocity between the 'same' sets in Subject role and Object role.

A sentence like

naaj dam kāb naaj daeng tī kan

gives the impression that two named people in the Subject role are beating two pronominalized people in the Object role. But in actual fact neither Dam nor Daeng is hitting two people. Dam has but one adversary and so has Daeng. This adversary appears to be kan. As a pronoun, then, kan must subsume plurality (both are, undeniably, suffering a beating) and a kind of distributive singularity too (each is being beaten...
by only one assailant). The word kan acts as a set-maker but at the same time as a set-breaker, concerning itself with individual roles in a transaction. And this concern needs must extend to making and breaking sets for noun-Subjects. Since it cannot do this by substitution, might it not be doing it by implicating the whole sentence-nucleus? We shall later try to show that making and breaking sets is important in understanding the usage of adverbial kan too. In any event, it is not exclusive to pronominality.

The claim that kan substitutes for Objects in reciprocal relationship with Subjects provides so far the basis for classifying kan as a pronoun. It is, of course, possible to find the form kan co-occurring with noun-Objects. It is not difficult to find in Thai examples such as

\[
\text{naaj dam kāb naaj deēŋ tīi kloan kan}
\]

‘Dam and Daeng are beating the drums (together)’

where the Object of the verb tīi is kloan and not kan. The objections here, however, are that the meaning of kan is not reciprocal and that there is no substitution for a noun and therefore kan is not pronominal. But, again, why should there not be a meaning possible where pronominal, reciprocal kan may play its part? Take, for instance, interpretations such as

‘Dam and Daeng beat each other’s drums’

or

‘Dam and Daeng drummed to each other’ (messages)

or

‘Dam and Daeng beat (cross-rhythms on) their drums against each other’ etc.

There is a further point to note. It is equally easy to find in Thai sentences like

\[
\text{naaj dam kāb naaj deēŋ tīi hûa kan}
\]

‘Dam and Daeng are punching each other’s heads’

where reciprocity is undeniable. The Object in this case is hûa. So what is kan? Other sentences, with Dam and Daeng as Subject and in which reciprocity is a distinct and unexceptional possibility, may be constituted with predicates like
Pronominality is not excluded by these sentences. It could well be that some possessive relationship might be postulated (as the English possessive ‘each other’s’ suggests) between the various Objects and *kan*. The suspicion arises, however, that *kan’s* availability for use as a pronoun is, to say the least, conditional. One condition is that *khon* may not be used to make any possessive relationship explicit. We may not say ... til hua khon kan or ... runcag baan khon kan or ... rab pag khon kan. Nor, for instance, can the challenge to translate into Thai the following

24) The use of *khon* in possessive relationships being so strongly prepositional, it is right to ask whether *kan* forbids the use of other prepositions that might seem to ‘govern’ it as they govern pronouns. The preposition *naaj*, ‘in’, never occurs in ... *naaj kan*, nor does the prepositional use of *thii*, ‘at’, in ... *thii kan*. Not all prepositional usage is forbidden, however. For instance, the sequence ... *kge kan* is common enough:

```
naj dam kab naj deey siy khon-khovan haj kge kan
```

‘Dam and Daeng bought presents for each other.’

and an undeniably prepositional use of *chag* is possible with *kan* in, for instance,:

```
dyan la-khar chaw dai rab codmaaj chag kan
```

‘They got letters from each other once a month.’

It is worth noting that it is locative topology (‘inside, outside, on, under, above, at’, etc.) that seems inadmissible whereas relative position and motion/action seem appropriate for the ‘two-ness’ expected in *kan*. The prepositions above, however, are definitely non-unison: it is hard to imagine ... *kge kan* and ... *chag kan* being other than reciprocal with the necessary consequence of plurality for the noun-Subject. The contrast with *daaj kan*, *myan kan*, *phrom kan* etc. is interesting, where Subject plurality is by no means obligatory and where a unison interpretation is thus possible. Discussion of these considerations—and the relevance to them of reversibility in relationships—is taken up later in this investigation. The most useful point to add at this juncture is that *kab* is not one of the prepositions that ‘govern’ *kan*: there is no acceptable ... *kab kan* sequence in any predicate. The closeness of the meaning of *kab*-noun and what we are terming the ‘unison’ meaning of *kan*—‘all together, one with another’—is obvious.
English sentences by equating 'each other' with pronominal kan (and, hence, reciprocal kan) ever be met:

‘Dam and Daeng bought each other’s presents yesterday.’
‘... always kept watch over each other’s houses.’
‘... take each other’s children to school.’

Working on the ... ti húa kan analogy and basing ourselves on the sequence Subj.verb, Obj.kan, we get the following sentences

... shy không-khwán kan mây-waan nii
... fàw báan kan sama<l
... sòŋ luông paj roong-rian kan

These sentences, however, demand an interpretation of kan that accords with its meaning when classified as adverb:

‘... bought presents (together) yesterday’
‘... keep watch (together) over their houses’
‘... take their children to school (together)’

The conditioning factor here, which forces reciprocal kan into abeyance, is the choice of verb, or, more correctly, of verb + Object transaction in the predicate. Our findings seem to indicate a threefold division: transactions permitting kan to signify their (reciprocal) fulfilment; transactions permitting kan as an adverb but excluding kan’s use for reciprocation; and transactions where either is permitted but not both together. Such a rapport between the form kan and sets of verbs and their transactions seems odd for a pronoun. It reminds us of the collocations we might expect for adverbs with verbs.25

To sum up so far: we have argued that kan must be a pronoun in some sense because it substitutes for a noun-Object when a reciprocal

25) The particle ca. in Burmese modifies the verb in ways very similar to Thai kan. Anna Allott (IPLS Pt II, p. 301) describes its effect, under the heading Severality— and we recall Haas’ TESD definition, "severally (imparting a distributive sense to the verb)" at this point too—as applying to "several separate actions, events or states," and explains one of the illustrations by saying, "each of several people did the same thing" without there being any "necessity for such a sentence to contain a plural 'subject'." Its use as 'each other' is also noted and said to be called forth "when the verb requires it."
force is called for in the meaning of the sentence; we have argued that its adverbial force seems to consist in endorsing the Subject's plurality. We have also upheld that this latter characteristic, i.e. the invoking of plurality in noun-Subjects, is one of the fundamental meanings in any usage of *kan*, common to both pronoun and adverb alike. This plurality, furthermore, is a plurality of individuals, not a compounded, homogenized unit-mass. This too is a fundamental meaning common to both pronoun and adverb. There is a choice between the particular meanings of *kan*, either the one (reciprocal) or the other (plain pluralizer) but not both together. This choice is not open for all predicates: some resist reciprocity and some plain plurality. Though the obvious correlation is with intransitive and transitive verbs respectively, there are cases within the transitive verbs where the choice seems conditioned one way or the other.

Let us turn to the points in common. Dealing with plurality in the Subject, the problem is to find a way of getting from the predicate to the Subject without relinquishing the possibility that *kan* might stand for a noun in the predicate serving as the Object. (It might be noted here that it is not the problem of identity here—TSAO accounts for that reasonably well—but the problem of how a noun-Object may enforce plurality upon a noun-Subject.) Now, there is a way of classifying *kan* that allows it always to be pronominal in a certain sense. Suppose that *kan* is seen as a particle belonging to the Subject, invoking plurality, but always positioned, as it were, at one remove from the Subject. In other words, suppose *kan*'s nature is derived under noun, much as we should expect to derive a plural particle like, shall we say, the Modern Standard Chinese suffix—*man*\(^{26}\) ultimately under a noun class, but that *kan*'s syntax is discontinuous and that this discontinuity expresses itself in some such symmetry as 'Subject-Noun before the onset of main verb predication; and Subject-Plural after the close of main verb predication'. This would allow us to maintain some sort of claim to the status of pronoun for *kan* ('pro' meaning 'in support of' rather than 'instead of') and to accommodate an Object within the main verb predicate too. It could also plausibly stand as the 'reciprocal' Object itself too. It might be said to demand

\(^{26}\) \(\text{mon}.\) Cantonese has \(\text{te}: i\).
to be taken as a sign of reciprocity by being a sign of set-completion. It marks the set—it puts a ring round the set—of all participants in any transaction. For transitivity this completion must, one way or the other, cater for the fulfilment of Subject-Object demands within whatever set is finally 'ringed'.

Somewhat surprising though this last suggestion may be,—and it is only a *ballon d’essai* and no more—there are one or two things to recommend it. It bridges the Subject-Predicate gap; it maintains 'identity', it does away with a need for separate adverb classification; it allows the nature of the transaction to determine the part that plurality plays in its fulfilment; and it places pluralization well to the fore. Plurality is felt in Thai to be the concern of nouns; it would enhance this feeling if *kan* could be attached to that part of a basic sentence form which, in transformational procedure, starts life pre-eminently as a noun or a noun-phrase. *We mean the Subject.*

Such a heavily Subject-oriented, pronominalized approach to *kan* cannot be maintained, however. Among the various objections it is possible to raise, the most important is that *kan* does not figure as a pluralizer in the predicates of all and every kind of verb. Broadly

---

27) Reference is made here to the habit of labelling the two sides of a pivotal sentence with terms redolent of nouns and verbs in order to make the first move away from bare axiomatic assertion. ITG, p. 14, for instance, says, "Among the non-terminal symbols there is at least one *initial string* of symbols which is taken as given by the theory (in the fashion of a primitive term in a chain of definitions or an axiom in deductive theory)." This "string" is, almost invariably, in practice but one symbol only: S (for 'well-formed sentence'). Likewise, symbols of the next-to-initial string are usually N-something (for nominality) and V-something (for verbality). (TSAO, p. 5, in fact uses S → Nm+VP (F.).) It is not twisting the argument then to go on and say that nominality and verbality, in the sense of functions of the Subject and predicate respectively, are next-to-axiomatic. How *kan* is to be accommodated in transformational grammar, were it agreed to be a discontinuous plural suffix, is a minor problem. Discontinuity—especially across the pivot of the sentence—is hard to cater for at a deep, phrase structure level. Pronominal *kan* would doubtless have to undergo some obligatory transformation in order to move it over from its derivational side across to habitual residence on the predicate side of the pivot.
speaking, it is the adjective sub-class of verb that offers most resistance to any of the uses of **kan** that we have been discussing. Thus, whilst we can say

\[ \text{phūu-jī phūng nān phōb kan} \]

‘Those girls met (each other)’

and

\[ \text{phūu-jī phūng nān wīj kan} \]

‘The girls all ran (together)’

we cannot change from the ‘active’ or operative type of verb to the ‘stative’ type that we here refer to as adjective and say

\[ \text{phūu-jī phūng nān sūaj kan} \]

‘The girls are all beautiful’

Note that we can say ... **sūaj kan jāj**, ... **sūaj kan mōd**, ... **sūaj kan cīg** etc. but we cannot naturally put together **sūaj** and **kan** with the expectation that it would mean that the Subject is plural. Bafflingly enough, however, certain stative verbs do take **kan** quite regularly; **klāj**, ‘to be near’, is one, and **sanīd**, ‘to be close, intimate’, is another. Here the meaning is not only plural as to Subject but also reciprocal as to relationship:

28) There are a number of idiomatic usages that detract from the absolute truth of this generalization, in addition to and apart from the exceptions that are discussed below in the body of the investigation. For instance, **dīi kan** meaning ‘to make up and be friends again’ (the opposite of **krood kan** ‘to fall out with one another’) is an idiom that removes **dīi**, ‘to be good’, from the adjectival stative class and puts it in with the operative verbs. **too kan** is similarly re-classed when **too** means not ‘to be big’ but ‘to grow up’. I suspect that **ruaj kan** is also used in an operative sense—‘to get rich, to have made money and become wealthy’, e.g. Achin Panchaphan’s

\[ "ข้ามข้ามไปถึงกันแน่นอน" \]

‘I could see my pals all getting rich, so I thought I might like that too.’

(อชิน ปัญญะภพ, p. 47—from the story เด็กที่ไม่รู้เรื่อง)

The relative truth of the generalization holds good, however: by far the great majority of ‘adjectives’, used statively and not as verb-process terms like ‘getting...’, becoming..., turning...’ etc., reject **kan** as a pluralizing agent.
roong-reem kāb roong-rian kan;  
'The hotel and the school are near each other.'

klaajand sanid involve a balance or polarity, a 'two-ness' or 'between-ness'.
This quality may be possessed by other word-classes or combinations of word-classes: the stative or descriptive use of the verb 'to be' with a noun, for instance,

naaj dam kāb naaj deen pen phyan kan
'Dam and Daeng are friends (with each other)';
or a word commonly classed among the prepositions, rawaa'ng, 'between, among,'

roong-reem kāb roong-rian jhu rawaa'ng kan
'The hotel and the school are quite close to each other';
and a word kwān commonly serving as a sort of operator for the comparison of adjectives in

naaj dam kāb naaj deen khraj tāa kwān kan
'As between Dam and Daeng, who is the more handsome?'.

A closer look is advisable, so it seems, at the immediate environments in which kan is commonly found. Since we know that, at its widest scope, the predicate of a sentence will include all these possible environments, and since we know that some verbs can determine the choices of interpretation for kan, there may emerge from the enquiry a conviction that kan is essentially adverbial after all.29

29) In English there is a parallel case for the classification of terms with meanings corresponding to kan's. Old-fashioned usage ('one with another, each for the other;' etc.), figuring as an adverbial phrase of manner, finds modern counterparts in 'one another, each other' figuring as pronominal unit-phrases which may be reciprocal 'Objects' or be governed by prepositions ('with one another, for each other,' etc.) or be marked for possessive relationship ('one another's hats, each other's costs,' etc.)

They walked one with another. — They walked with one another.
They whispered each to the other. — They whispered to each other.
They clasped each the other's hand. — They clasped each other's hands.
but
Each loved the other, — They loved each other.
The last example, with the bare sequence 'each . . . the other', clearly reveals implications both of partnership and of singularity in a basic pattern that becomes the national foundation for grammatical forms, whether adverbial or pronominal, in sentences where plurality is the keynote of the first impressions received.
For the sake of being concise, let us agree upon abbreviating the set of words going before \textit{kan} to BK, and, when \textit{kan} is followed by certain words, let us abbreviate this set to KF. We have already met KF examples in such sequences as \ldots \textit{kan mói} and \ldots \textit{kan cíj}. It will be recalled that the degree of affinity between \textit{kan} and KF was such that in strings where \textit{kan} alone was unacceptable, \textit{kan} + KF produced good Thai. A survey of the most common meanings for KF would probably result in a grouping of two: meanings connected with counting or quantity, including the concepts of the partitive and the whole:

\ldots \textit{kan bíañ}, \ldots \textit{kan thán sín}, \ldots \textit{kan thán láaj} etc.;

and meanings which intensify an assertion or commit the speaker to its truth in some way:

\ldots \textit{kan nêe}, \ldots \textit{kan cág lâaj}, \ldots \textit{kan dèd khâad} etc.

Though plurality is still enjoined upon the Subject, some of the force of \textit{kan} seems to have combined with the succeeding adverb, making the resultant expression hang together much more than is the case when \textit{kan} finds itself beside other words, when the juxtaposition can be said to be adventitious. If, for example, we construct a frame with the sentence nucleus \textit{phuu-jíq sàng khon ní súaj} as the common element for each test case and with a blank left after \textit{súaj} and before a selection of predicate remainders, we can apply the test of inserting \textit{kan} into the blank space to see whether a sequence be a true KF one or an adventitious one. The adventitious ones will have to reject \textit{kan} after \textit{súaj}. For example:

\textit{phuu-jíq sàng khon ní súaj} --- jâj

'\textit{The two girls are tremendously pretty}'

\ldots \ldots \textit{súaj} --- tem thií

'\ldots are utterly beautiful'

\ldots \ldots \textit{súaj} --- ciñ

'\ldots are truly beautiful'

\ldots \ldots \textit{súaj} --- tâñ tèn ēng maa

'\ldots have been beautiful ever since they were kids'

\ldots \ldots \textit{súaj} --- phrêñg rüecâng tèn nàa

'\ldots are pretty because they know how to use make-up'

\ldots \ldots \textit{súaj} --- nàj sàaj-táa khüng chaaw fàrâñ

'\ldots are pretty to Westerners' eyes'
The last three of the cases are rejections and therefore adventitious sequences as far as kan is concerned. This enlistment of kan for purposes other than those covered by our account of its normal adverbial usage needs further investigation. However, though the evidence presented about it here is, admittedly, impressionistic, it will have been worth while if only for its provision of a clue to the unusual and idiomatic use of kan in emotively charged questions:

?araj kan, m?araj kan, thii n?j kan etc.

Odd though it sounds to say that a speaker is committed to the truth of a question, it is but a step to say that he is (emotionally) committed to the truth of an answer to it. TRG glosses this aroused attitude with the words “reasonable answer not foreseen” and categorizes this use of kan among “Interrogative postpositions”, a special class of its own not associated by TRG with any other ways of using the form kan.

The other aspect of kan’s immediate environment is the sequence BK + kan. Our concern with this sequence might be said to amount to a turning point in our enquiry, for it is in relationship with BK that kan ceases to invoke plurality in the Subject of a sentence. This is easy to see if we take the pronoun ph?m as conclusive evidence for singularity and then form sentences such as:

ph?m ca-paj d?aj kan, ph?m ca-paj phr?m kan,
ph?m ca-paj m?jan kan, ph?m ca-paj ch?n diaw kan etc.

Singulars and plurals alike being permitted, then, it would appear that ties with the noun-Subject role become ever more tenuous, though we do note, nevertheless, that a sort of implicit plurality is still found somewhere. It may just as well, however, apply to a plurality of verbs,


‘The heroine in that film did, by turns, some singing and some dancing’
or, within the predicate, to a plurality of Objects,

ph?a-kh?n d?ym l?w thaj k?b l?w faraj tid-tid kan

‘The businessman drank Thai whiskey and Scotch whiskey straight after each other’

30) TRG, p. 198.
A plurality of adverbial details, which can be summarized by the expressions

... wecha dìaw kan, ... bëng dìaw kan, ... withi dìaw kan

'at the same time', 'at the same place', 'in the same way'
serving as cover terms for the whole set, also commonly co-occur as BK + kan.

To go over this part of the ground again, let us take plain, non-reciprocal kan on the one hand and the BK sequence dúađ kan on the other, both of them being plausibly glossed in English as 'together', in order to see the singular/plural implications. Hitherto we have been dealing with sentences like

dég-chañj khon nìi kàb dég-jig khon nàn ràŋ phleen kan

'This boy and that girl sang together'
and this can be matched by the predicate

... ràŋ phleen dúađ kan

without significant change of meaning here. We are now in a position to assert, however, that the sentences

dég-chañj khon nìi ràŋ phleen dúađ kan

and

dég-jig khon nàn ràŋ phleen dúađ kan

are both equally probable and equally correct in Thai, whereas two such sentences could not be produced from the string in which kan figures alone. In some way, therefore, the notion of plurality conveyed by dúađ kan is compatible with a manifestly singular noun-Subject. A further point: kan here cannot possibly be identical with the Subject in any way at all. To bring this out in an English rendering, we might resort to

'The boy sang with the others'
or, a slight variation,

'The girl joined with them in the singing'

It will now be suggested that BK + kan usage can be explained in terms of what we might call the 'kàb transform' procedure. We mean by this that in the vast majority of examples coming under the BK + kan
formula, there is a related form (or in transformational terms an ‘earlier’
form in the derivational tree) with the BK-word coming directly before
kāb + a noun:
  
  ... dīaj kāb ... , ... phrām kāb ... , ... chēn diaw kāb ... etc. TRG
makes much of this observation and calls what we may write as

  ... BK + kāb + noun ——— → ... BK + kan

a “covert relationship”.31 Without much fear of traducing TRG, we
can suggest that it is ‘covert’ not because it is hard to notice but because
the word kan is a ‘portmanteau’ morph: it contains within itself both
the morpheme kāb and the morpheme of whatever the noun in the case
might be. Indeed, there is a further stage possible: kan contains the
morpheme of the pronoun of the relevant noun together with kāb. We
might therefore guess that this account of kan provides one of the
weightier considerations for considering kan to be essentially a pronoun
despite the overall adverbiality of the sequence BK + kan as a whole.
TRG is of this persuasion and holds kan to be one of the “General
Pronouns”,32 i.e. those not paired off into conventional partnerships in
living dialogue. We shall check, however, whether kan really is indifferent
(as the term “general” implies) to the contingencies of dialogue. Whilst
doing this, we can arrange for a check also to be made on the plausibility
of the ‘kāb transform’ being an explanation for other usages of kan
where a BK-word is absent from the sentence.

If we do a permutation on all the positions for kāb and for kan in
the context of an explicitly singular noun-Subject and an explicitly
singular ‘partner’ to be governed by kāb, and if we do this without, as it
were, consulting a Thai speaker, we might get some strings like the
following. In brackets we shall tick those that are acceptable and put
a cross by those that are bad Thai. We must recall no more than one
rule: that kan will appear only in the predicate of any string. Let us
have naaj dam as Subject and paj, ‘to go’, as the verb.

31) TRG, p. 164.
We now add some imperatives addressed to naaj dam:

(8) paj kan thǎ?
(9) paj kǎb naaj deen thǎ?
(10) paj kǎb naaj deen kan thǎ?
(11) paj kan kǎb naaj deen thǎ?
(12) paj kan kǎb naaj deen kan thǎ?
(13) ja-paj kan kǎb naaj deen kan nǎ

Number (13) has been put in to show where the negative imperative differs in acceptable forms from the affirmative imperative. This means that for (8), (9), (10) and (11) the form ja-paj could take the place of paj and the tick would still remain in the approval bracket. Another sentence set, that of the second Person singular interrogatives, could be added with very similar results to those of the imperative set above:

paj kan mǎj, ... paj kǎb naaj deen kan mǎj, etc.

but the only important additional comment to make about interrogatives is to note that a sentence superficially resembling Number (1).

naaj dam ca-paj kan mǎj

33) There is a certain simplification in the presentation of kan's capabilities vis-à-vis the Persons here. The formulae at the close of this investigation make it clear that dialogue usage does allow an unrestricted paradigm for all the persons. The contextual demands that are met in order to illustrate second Person usage are, however, so striking and so clear (imperatives and interrogatives) and, moreover, the sentences are so amenable to classification as 'initiating'—hence avoiding the question of 'understood' anaphoric omission or substitution (see footnote 36 below)—that there are good practical reasons for allowing the second Person to make an impact first and foremost. It is nevertheless conceded, for instance, that

naaj dam ca-paj kan mǎj

might well have, in dialogue, not only the meaning

'Dam, are you going with me?'

but also the meaning

'Dam, are you going with him/her/them?'

or, addressing, say, Daeng:

'Is Dam going with you, Daeng?'

'Is Dam going with you, Daeng?'

'Is Dam going with him/her/them, Daeng?'
would be ticked as approved provided that *naaj dam* is seen to be here the second Person (equivalent to, say, *khun* or *thán*) who is being addressed.

From the array of sentences we can derive several truths. One is that the sequence ... *kan kâb* ... acts as if it were a BK-*kâb* form. As such, it seems to indicate an adverbial force for *kan* or, at least, a non-pronominal one. In a predicate such as ... paj *kan kâb naaj deeq*, the word *kan* can hardly be said to be substituting either for *kâb* or for *naaj deeq*. Far more important, though, is the observation that for sentences (1) to (7) inclusive the presence of *kâb* + noun (or *kan kâb* + noun) in the predicate means that the co-occurrence of *kan* there in a predicate-final position is forbidden, whereas for all the rest, save Number (13), the sequence *kâb* + noun + *kan* is acceptable. We can take this to mean that, in (1) to (7), *kan* becomes somehow redundant if *kâb* and a noun figure earlier in the same predicate. This now looks like a confirmation of the 'kâb transform' process. But why only in (1) to (7)? A further point: the same seven sentences with *phôm* as Subject instead of *naaj dam* would yield the same results in terms of a tick or a cross. It looks as if the third Person and the first Person display a common, restricted paradigm of possibilities with *kâb* and *kan* when contrasted with the possibilities for the second Person.34

34) Again it is hoped that a certain simplification will be allowed for—see footnote 33 above—and that the point will be borne in mind as being essentially about permitted singularity of noun-Subject with *kan* in dialogue situations. Take, for instance, the sequence Dam! ... *kâb* Daeng ... *kan* and let us examine it for various possible arrangements of pronoun substitution as between the Persons.

By using three relationship symbols, viz. \[\text{for "is addressed by"; } \overset{\text{\(\rightarrow\)}}{\text{kâb}} \overset{\text{\(\rightarrow\)}}{\text{kan}} \text{ for "is spoken of as being predicated with";} \text{and} \]

\[\text{kan} \text{ for "marks the set of Persons predicated under the term } \text{kan"}, \text{ then some diagrams may be drawn. If Dam is addressed by Daeng} \]

(Dam \[\overset{\text{\(\leftrightarrow\)}}{\text{\(\leftrightarrow\)}} \text{Daeng} \text{ who says, "Dam, go with Daeng (me)!"} \]
Now, the rule we are accustomed to in dealing with the three Persons associating in various sets does not completely reflect the priority of Persons we have just found. We usually say that first Person 'swallows' the second, which, in turn, 'swallows' the third:

\[
\text{Dam} \rightarrow \text{kab} \rightarrow \text{Daeng}
\]

and the only possible set of those going must include someone other than Dam and the only "someone" available is Daeng (\(\text{Dam} \rightarrow \text{kan} \rightarrow \text{Daeng}\)), the diagram comes out thus:

\[
\text{Dam} \quad \text{kan} \quad \text{Daeng} \quad \text{kab} \quad \text{Daeng}
\]

and \text{kan} is redundant with respect to \text{kab Daeng}. But if Dam is addressed by, say, someone called 'A' (\(\text{Dam} \leftrightarrow \text{A}\)), who says, "Dam, go with Daeng!" (\(\text{Dam} \leftrightarrow \text{kab} \leftrightarrow \text{Daeng}\)), and if the \text{kan} set must include someone (anyone) other than Dam, then one possible diagram is

\[
\text{kan} \quad \text{Dam} \leftrightarrow \text{A} \quad \text{kab} \quad \text{Daeng}
\]

and here again \text{kan} is redundant with respect to \text{kab Daeng}. Another diagram is possible, however, viz.:
To list the priorities of our new findings, however, we shall have to say that kan overrides I and he (i.e. they must get themselves replaced by

where kan is not redundant. A variant of, or, rather, the logical upshot of, this diagram is, of course:

where kan is redundant with respect to kāb Daeng but not so with respect to A's participation. It is suggested that number (11) of the sentence series has a high probability for a non-redundant or a partially redundant interpretation of kan, and sentence number (10) a fair probability (an even chance) for such an interpretation. A re-working of these points is found at the close of these investigations expressed in terms of degrees of specialization in kan's usage.
the Subjects *we* or *they* whereas *you* overrides *kan* (i.e. *you* may remain singular and *kan* must convey plurality by some relationship elsewhere).

There is a special situation exerting an influence here: communication between the first and second Persons (dialogue) is 'existentially' different from any communication about the third Person (narrative). In the realm of language this means that: (i) *I* and *you* know they are ultimate prerequisites for communication to take place at all; and (ii) they accept the reciprocal relationship in their terms of identity: *I* knows he will be addressed as *you* and that his *you* will be interpreted as *I* in the mind of the interlocutor. Put very simply, there is a partnership undertaken for the sake of the desired dialogue. The roles in this partnership are not merely presumptive or 'understood' (as, say, examples of anaphora are 'understood') but are the poles of the speakers' world.  

35) When they are not replaced, a certain oddity ensues, though the meaning—plus the partner (s)—still comes through. For example, Achin Panchapban has the passage

"และที่เค้าทายใจเราไม่สั่นณ   ฉันจะไม่เอา   คุณจะอยู่ไว้แต่เรายังไม่รู้"  "เมื่อที่เราต้อง   ถ้าเขามาแต่เราไม่รู้"  "เมื่อที่เขา   ถ้าเขามาแต่เราไม่รู้"

'The two or three men sitting at the table inside still kept staring at me unwaveringly. One of them said'

"I'm just having a bet with them how many days you'll stay on in that house."

(ผู้นี้ภาพ หน้า 62—ในเรื่อง

36) [SRMCT treats this whole topic (pp. 178-180, 247, 248-249, 252 and 267) but since *kan* is classified as adverb occurring as Modifier in the Verb Phrase (pp. 83, 91 and 161), the relevance to problems of substitution and non-plurality is not brought out. However, the example (p. 184) that is of most interest to this investigation,

**pay-tham nam kan may**  
(Shall we go and have a drink of water?)

is among "initiating sentences which are non-cataphoric" (p. 183). These may look to be "non-initiating and anaphoric in form" but they 'cannot be related to any cataphoric sentence.' The appeal to "context of immediate perception" (Chapter XIII, p. 263) resembles my appeal to a recognition of different 'existential' worlds.
those spoken about—the narrative world—, however, is full of fixed names and references. There are constants that are not subject to relative viewpoints. They must remain the same no matter who is speaking to whom.

We shall now consider the implications for kan in the two worlds. Let us suppose that kan means something like “plus the partner”. The partnership depends on what kind of participants (Persons) are involved and what demands the situation (the ‘world’) might be expected to make upon the content of the communication. This may be exemplified in Thai by the expectation that in the world of dialogue, typified by interrogatives and imperatives, there will be frequent recourse to pronouns (to get the Person relationship clear) and frequent elision of nouns and pronouns too. In the latter case there is some probability that it will be you understood for the role of Subject and that, correspondingly, it will be I filling the pronominal role embodied within kan in the predicate.  

TRG notes this: p. 102. Whether there is a connection between this probability and the use of the form kan as a first Person pronoun is worth considering. Cambodian kniːa provides a parallel here: it too has the meaning ‘together/each other’ when used in the predicate, and ‘I’ when used as Subject. And yet, inasmuch as it can be masculine or feminine first Person singular (normally pairing with nəak or nəə as second Person, cf. Thai kan pairing with kee or naaj) and since there is the possibility that it can be third Person singular too, kniːa is brought more into line with, say, Thai khāw, also usable as either first or third Person. Subject pronoun kan in Thai is reserved for masculine first Person singular only, e.g.

“A young man, grinding his teeth with rage, said to a friend of his, “I should like to give a good kick to the fellow who broke my back and break his for him!” (broke my back=‘betrayed me’).

and

“A young man told his friend in most hurt tones, “I persisted in trying to come to see you, managing to swallow all my pride, but then you turn and accuse me of being the sort of person who has never had any pride or self-respect at all!”

(Examples taken from KCP, p. 102.—my translations)
The reason is that it is less likely that questions and orders will be addressed to oneself than to the 'second Person'. This is true even for soliloquy where ego speaks to a second Person self. There are also examples of languages where the grammar has recourse to second Person forms to deal with a notional first Person imperative. The English 'let me... /let us...' is an example of this (i.e. you let me) and, in a different sense, so is the form 'may I.../may we...' for the question form implies an address to you even though the Subject is grammatically first Person.

To ring a few changes in order to illustrate the effects of moving from one world to another and of an appeal to existential partners, let us switch a sentence between narrative and dialogue as follows.

**naaj dam ca-paj kāb naaj deēŋ māj**

Here there is an obvious narrative interpretation. No 'understood' partner is needed.

'Is Dam going with Daeng?'

But it is open to us in Thai to interpret *naaj dam* as second Person address.

'Dam, are you going with Daeng?'

Nevertheless, there is still no role for an 'understood' of existential partner. With *kan* in the predicate, however, such a possibility presents itself.

**naaj dam kāb naaj deēŋ ca-paj kan māj**

Without overstraining the imagination it is possible to interpret *kan* as meaning here 'plus the existential partner'. Thus, in addition to the narrative interpretation

'Are Dam and Daeng going together?'

there is also the interpretation

'Dam and Daeng, are you going with me?'

We duly note that in this dialogue world *kan* with *naaj dam* alone is possible. We also note that, while this removes the type of ambiguity discussed above, there is, nevertheless, a residual ambiguity arising out of the Person 'understood' in *kan*. 
"naaj dam ca-paj kan màj"
"Are you going with us, Dam?"
"Are you going with them, Dam?"

All the ambiguities return, of course, with the pronominalization of "naaj dam:

"khun ca-paj kan màj"
"Are you going together?" (plural 'you')
"Are you going with us?" (singular 'you' possible)
"Are you going with them?" (singular 'you' possible)

It has been our intention thus far to examine and then to challenge what we at first selected (from PRB) as a sensible basis for argument about kan, namely, that it enjoined plurality on the noun-Subject. It is conceded that this definition still remains sensible, for in a great number of cases this is what kan, in effect, does. But we have seen that BK-kan enjoined no plurality, though, notionally, it implied that plurality was somewhere in the offing. Furthermore, by checking over second Person dialogue-usage with kan, it emerged that there were situations where, even in the absence of a BK-word from the predicate, kan did not demand a plural Subject. Here again, though, there was an implication of plurality, borne out by the dialogue situation itself, but not reflected in particular by the noun-Subject. We have, then, been trying not to lose sight of the possibility that noun plurality pure and simple need not be the only justification for kan's presence in a sentence. We now turn to look at plurality itself in Thai and consider how it sorts itself out in the syntax and lexis available.

For any noun in Thai it must be accepted that plurality may be unmarked. The problem comes to a head in translation: khon may be either 'man' or 'men'. No morphology is devoted to the marking of a noun's plurality. However, the expression of plurality is not, of course, impossible—nor is it difficult—in Thai. It presents itself in ways other than those of morphological modifications of noun-words. Syntactical modification is the obvious alternative. But the main point in this syntactical modification is not so much the placing of one word next to another (word order) as the choice of words from certain word classes
that are available for placing. What therefore comes about as a consequence of this pursuit of plurality is that, in Thai, the investigator finds himself well out of the province of morphology and well into the province of lexis. Whatever syntactical relationships are discovered in the course of this pursuit will turn out to be no different from those prevailing in other relationships not specifically to do with plurality.

A review of the various ways in which plurality presents itself in Thai nouns must include at least four main divisions. One of these will be the use of kau, which we leave in abeyance for the time being. For the other three a table can be drawn up, as seen below, the parameters being: across the top—the presence or absence of differentiation in nouns; and down the side—the nature of the syntactical relationship involved.

A review of the various ways in which plurality presents itself in Thai nouns must include at least four main divisions. One of these will be the use of kau, which we leave in abeyance for the time being. For the other three a table can be drawn up, as seen below, the parameters being: across the top—the presence or absence of differentiation in nouns; and down the side—the nature of the syntactical relationship involved. 'Differentiation' means the overt presence of different distinct entities (e.g. phu-chaaj, phu-jig, deg-chaaj, deg-jig etc.) in a kind of list. They may, of course, be linked by co-ordinating conjunctions such as t? or káb. 'Undifferentiation' will be relevant to plurality for identical entities that have to be presented lexically by one and the same term (khon+ khon+khon etc.) without recourse to marking (differentiating) individuals at all. In the former case, of course, we are saying that we recognize different qualities as belonging to different entities to which, if so desired, we could assign names or numbers. This would be, then, differentiated plurality. In the latter case we are saying that, even though we cannot tell (i.e. recognize) one from another, we can still claim to tell (i.e. count) one from two. This, then,—counting in spite of being presented with indistinguishably uniform entities—would be undifferentiated plurality.

The syntactical relationships involved are the basic ones of coordination and sub-ordination or, terms which are here equally applicable, those of exocentric and endocentric relationships respectively. Apposition and predication are exocentric constructions; attribution is an endocentric construction.
Examples of set-words for A above are พยวก, หลว, หวั่นด้า, หานั้น มั้น etc. These merit some observations about plurality in their own right which will be left until later.

Examples of words that make up a counting agency in B above are ส่ง, สัม, ติม etc., of course, and หลาจ, หลาจ, หาญ, ทูง, รู้ etc., all with appropriate classifiers, as well as other phrasal modifiers like หานั้น, หานั้น, หานั้น, รู้, รู้, รู้ etc.

Countable nouns figuring in A and B provide the contents of sets and appear therefore in attributive position as the ‘tail’ in A, whilst in B they provide the ‘head’ for endocentric constructions of noun+number+classifier. In C, of course, they provide the items for appositional lists.

Illustrations of all three, using the countable noun ตื่น and the verb นั่น-หับ as predicate, may be found in the following:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subordination (Endocentric)</th>
<th>Undifferentiated</th>
<th>Differentiated</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A) by grouping:</td>
<td>set-word + contents of set</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B) by enumerating:</td>
<td>countable + counting word agency</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C) by listing:</td>
<td>apposition of different items</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Examples of set-words for A above are ผาง, หลว, หวั่น, หานั้น มั้น etc. These merit some observations about plurality in their own right which will be left until later.

Examples of words that make up a counting agency in B above are ส่ง, สัม, ติม etc., of course, and หลาจ, หลาจ, หาญ, ทูง, รู้ etc., all with appropriate classifiers, as well as other phrasal modifiers like หานั้น, หานั้น, หานั้น, รู้, รู้, รู้ etc.

Countable nouns figuring in A and B provide the contents of sets and appear therefore in attributive position as the ‘tail’ in A, whilst in B they provide the ‘head’ for endocentric constructions of noun+number+classifier. In C, of course, they provide the items for appositional lists.

Illustrations of all three, using the countable noun ตื่น and the verb นั่น-หับ as predicate, may be found in the following:

A) ผาง ตื่น นั่น-หับ ‘The children are sleeping.’
B) ตื่น ส่ง หานั้น นั่น-หับ ‘The two children are sleeping.’
C) ตื่น หานั้น กับ ตื่น หานั้น นั่น-หับ

‘This child and that child are sleeping.’
We may now try to observe what particular effect kan may have as a pluralizer by adding it to A, B and C to see if it becomes merely redundant or if it contributes something to a structure already explicitly plural.

A) phuang dēg noon-lah kan
B) dēg sān̄q khon noon-lah kan
C) dēg khon nii kab dēg khon nān noon-lah kan

By producing a succession of A, B and C-type sentences, adding kan in each case, an impression of kan's particular nuance, if any, will be increasingly reinforced. This nuance, I venture to suggest, will be one of compresence. I mean by this a focussing of attention upon times and places shared in common. Put another way round, kan reduces the number of possibilities for admitting plurality to a sentence. Individual entities in the Subject are not to be set apart from each other by distances or circumstances that stretch and strain our capacity for undivided attention. It also means that individual actions in the predicate are unlikely to be timed so as to suggest sporadic or desultory occurrence.

To turn back to the examples A, B and C before the addition of kan, we can imagine a context in which A could refer to children anywhere at any time. For instance:

phuang dēg noon-lah sabaāj mya mii khwaam ?ōb-?un-rāg-khrāj caāg faaj phās-mēe

'Children sleep well when they get warmth and affection from their parents.'

is bound to include some 'only' children, each asleep alone in his bed, as well as brothers and sisters asleep together. Or we could imagine that B, with its phrase dēg sān̄q khon, might appear in a context referring to one child sleeping in his bed at home in San Francisco and the other at home asleep in Bangkok. Or in the case of C, in such a sentence as
dēg-chaāj kab dēg-jīp noon-lah thāā māj sūn-caj raajkaan thii-wii

'The boy and the girl fall asleep if they lose interest in the TV programme,'

the meaning could plausibly be that the boy, say, might be asleep whilst the girl was awake, according to their tastes in TV programmes. But
these imagined interpretations would become strained or impossible with \textit{kan} present in the predicates.

Thus, for any Thai plural that is explicit,\textsuperscript{38} the actors in a Subject role may constitute a set determined not only by listing, or by grouping, or by enumeration, but also, once \textit{kan} figures in the predicate, by copresence in a mooted place at a mooted time. Awareness of this place and time must reside primarily in the minds of speaker and addressee and it will have been mooted in a context that is linguistic, extra-linguistic or a mixture of both. For instance, whether the children sleep in the same bed, in two beds in the same room, in single beds in separate rooms

\textsuperscript{38) Where it is \textit{kan} itself, and \textit{kan} alone, that makes plurality explicit—say, in the world of narrative with an undifferentiated Subject—then the question arises about its place in the table previously set out. As a part of the predicate, presumably its relationship to the noun-Subject is exocentric and \textit{kan} will therefore go in the empty quarter at bottom left. If, on the other hand, \textit{kan} is treated as an adverb of copresence, its place in the table is hard to agree upon, for while it is, as an adverb, presumably endocentric with regard to the verb in the predicate, its relationship to a noun-Subject—which is what the table is drawn up to reveal—might be collocational rather than colligational. If it is a sort of disjunctive, 'pronominal' part of the noun-Subject, then the question of whether it is a subordinate part or a co-ordinate term must be resolved, the likelihood being that it will turn out to be but a special case of B in the table, and should therefore go in the top left quarter. We have already acknowledged the frequent occurrence of \textit{kan} followed by counting or quantity terms, e.g. \ldots \textit{kan} mod, \ldots \textit{kan} saµ̄ sin, etc. \ldots the whole lot (of them), \ldots in (their) entirety', and typical B sequences can indeed be transferred to predicate-final position:

\textit{deg nım-lāb sāño khon}

and

\textit{deg nım-lāb kan sāño khon}.

'Both the children were asleep.'

The possibility that terms from A—the set-words—might be so transferred, cf. Cambodian \textit{köi} (etymologically comparable with Thai \textit{khanā}, ná, Skt. \textit{gānu}) being used as both set-word (\textit{kñi-a-sing} means 'we', cf. Thai \textit{phāngraw}) and a \textit{kan}-term, must not be overlooked. It is a possibility, however, that is remote both in time (diachronically, it \textit{may} once have been so, but certainly not now) and in plausibility (\textit{kan} and \textit{kāb} and their relationship seem likelier as 'constants' in the Thai past than does the hypothesis that a set-noun \textit{kan} existed, gave rise to a transferred, predicate-final \textit{kan}, and then disappeared.)
but all in the same house etc. cannot be decided by kan. Context and
‘real life’ plausibility must suggest the scope of the compresence and this
suggestion must be approved by all parties to a communication.
However, secondarily, as a kind of endowment, perhaps, some part of
the awareness of compresence may be passed on to the minds of the
actors themselves, provided the Subject role is a human one, presumably.
Consider the impact of sentences like:
Type A)  thúg wan-jíd khana?–kháb-rój paj duu náŋ kan
    ‘Each day-off all the choir goes to the cinema.’
Type B)  thi sanáam-rób hég níi thááan láaj phán khón taaj kan
    ‘It was upon this battlefield that many thousands of soldiers met
their deaths.’
Type C)  chaaw-thaj lá? chaaw-kháw chóób dyym láw kan
    ‘Thais and hilltribesmen alike are fond of taking a drink.’
The participants in the above events are, themselves, to some greater or
lesser extent, presumed to be bearing witness to what is being transacted
by themselves and by others. Thus, in A above there is a nuance of
‘concerted’ cinema going rather than that of one going to one cinema and
one to another; in B the carnage has a dramatic impact, soldiers face to
face with the deaths of comrades and their own imminent deaths too—
rather than a long succession of raids, sniping and fitful engagements; in
C the drinking is convivial and not a plurality of lonely alcoholics.
Sentence C does have one ambiguity, though: who is drinking with
whom—Thais together with hill-tribesmen or Thais together in one group
and hill-tribesmen together in another?

The set-words (phúag, htw etc.) mentioned in the discussion of
plurality in Thai nouns serve to introduce a final point about kan. This
concerns the legitimacy of notional plurality in a discussion of grammar.
One objection familiar to English speakers will be that grammatical
plurality may not correspond to notional plurality. Nouns such as
scissors, trousers, scales etc. illustrate this discrepancy. Relevance to
Thai plurality is, however, not easy to discern since much of the evidence
for grammatical plurality in English is morphological (if we include
concord under this heading too). The evidence provided by words like
scissors that concerns possible co-occurrence with other words, however,
does put things on a more comparable footing. Co-occurrence with the
word pair, for instance, enables us to line up parallel sequences in English
such as
'These scissors match. They are a pair.'
'These gloves match. They are a pair.'

with notional plurality failing to correspond clearly: 'Here is a pair of scissors.' is made equivocal here whereas 'Here is a pair of gloves.' is not. But are the observations we have just made only notional? Can the word pair be, by turns, a grammatical device for obtaining a singular scissors as well as a word with notional force of specific plurality?

The dilemma to do more specifically with kan's pluralizing force in Thai is, perhaps, even closer to another kind of discrepancy found in English, the use of the collective noun. Concord is idiosyncratic. We can say

'The team is playing well this week.'

and

'The team consult with each other before the match.'

Without any morphological concord, the discrepancy in Thai falls elsewhere:

?aathid nii thim lén dìi màag
?aathid nii thim lén kan dìi màag

thim màag-en-prygśā kan kōon thii ca-ʔɔɔg pəj lén

In the first sentence, whether 'team' or 'teams' is meant is a problem that only context can solve. That is not the point at issue. In the second sentence the likelihood is that 'the teams are playing well together' i.e. they are having a good match. In the third sentence, though, can we say that kan resolves any ambiguity? The answer is no. The set-word thim could be pluralized by kan—'the teams consult each other'—but, equally, it need not be. The sentence can stand as a translation of 'The team consult with one another...'. Thus, if we make what appears to be a definitive grammatical statement to the effect that kan, in agreed, normal circumstances, acts as a pluralizer of the noun-Subject, then the sentence

phūag dèg chōg kan jāj

must mean, 'The children's gangs beat each other up', i.e. more than one phūag. If we make a notional statement, more like a lexical definition, to the effect that kan requires 'comprersence' for participants in any transaction or relationship, then the meaning, 'The children are fighting among themselves' is a legitimate possibility i.e. only one phūag. An account that does justice to kan's usage in modern Thai must accommodate both kinds of statement.
To set down some conclusions: kan is a pronoun in effect when we agree to gloss its meaning as ‘plus a partner/partners’; equally, it is not only a pronoun since the word ‘plus’ is embodied in it too. The operator ‘plus’ imposes reversibility: \( x + y = y + x \). Note that this is not total homogeneity \( (x + x) \) nor yet reciprocity but simply reversibility: \( x \) is not doing anything to \( y \) or vice-versa: \( x \) can merely fit in wherever \( y \) does, and vice-versa. One of the reversible relationships is ‘plus’; another is ‘or’; another is ‘next to’; another is ‘meet with’ etc. We shall refer to any member of the set of reversible processes or relationships by the symbol \( R \). In Thai the great majority of \( R \)-terms are marked (or may be marked) by the linking word \( \text{kab} \), itself one of the ‘reversible’ conjunctions, as if to reinforce the \( R \)-ness. One salient point is to be kept in mind. The relationship \( R \) in Thai must hold only between distinctly different terms. As long as \( x \) is singular, we may not have \( x \, R \, x \). Even when \( x \) is plural (or a set), we must resort to \( x' \, R \, x'' \) (\( x \) arranged in two different ways). In perfect homogeneity reversibility is irrelevant. We need to find an area of language, therefore, in which the substitution ‘plus the partner’ is unequivocal about which is \( x \) and which is \( y \), and unequivocal about the uniqueness (singularity) of \( x \) and \( y \). This is found in the world of dialogue and may serve as a basis for further development.

A table of all possible substitutions for the Persons by kan in a predicate follows with indications of whether the partners (Subject ‘Person’ and Predicate ‘Person’) may be singular and/or plural. One asterisk and two asterisks mean availability for narrative usage at, respectively, the first stage and the second stage of specialization. These

\[ \text{sameti na sameti makan kobb \( \text{na} \) makan.} \]
\[ \text{‘(one statement) tallies (with the other)’} \]
\[ \text{na sameti makan kobb \( \text{na} \) makan.} \]
\[ \text{‘(a person of good luck) is not compatible (with one of ill luck)’} \]

The resemblance between dialogue usage of kan, e.g. such possible sentences as

\[ \text{thii khaw \( \text{na} \) nii kobb troq kan} \]
\[ \text{‘What he says tallies (i.e. with what has been said elsewhere by others)’} \]

and

\[ \text{khoo nii maj khaw kan nii.} \]
\[ \text{This fellow won’t get on (with others) for sure.’} \]

and the Burmese examples with ca. (kobb) reinforce a common notion of a partnership of ‘participants’ extending across and even beyond the Subject and predicate, irrespective of grammatical plurality’s being in evidence or not.

\[ \text{39) This crucial point is made by J. Okell (IPLS Pt II, p. 222) with respect to the Burmese verb-particle ca. in Nissaya Burmese (here kobb), where its rendering of a singular Pali verb is cited:} \]
\[ \text{sameti \( \text{na} \) makan kobb \( \text{na} \) makan.} \]
\[ \text{‘(one statement) tallies (with the other)’} \]
\[ \text{na sameti makan kobb \( \text{na} \) makan.} \]
\[ \text{‘(a person of good luck) is not compatible (with one of ill luck)’} \]

The resemblance between dialogue usage of kan, e.g. such possible sentences as

\[ \text{thii khaw \( \text{na} \) nii kobb troq kan} \]
\[ \text{‘What he says tallies (i.e. with what has been said elsewhere by others)’} \]

and

\[ \text{khoo nii maj khaw kan nii.} \]
\[ \text{This fellow won’t get on (with others) for sure.’} \]

and the Burmese examples with ca. (kobb) reinforce a common notion of a partnership of ‘participants’ extending across and even beyond the Subject and predicate, irrespective of grammatical plurality’s being in evidence or not.
two stages will be made clear in a subsequent schematization. For the present it is helpful to note that what may be called homogeneous plurality of Persons is a second stage specialization, and that some explanation is required as to how the $x \ R \ y$ heterogeneity that we have stated to be essential for expectation of meaningful reversibility can have adapted itself in such a way as to appear to contradict the rule that holds good for the general run of other entries in the table, viz. that the Subject and Predicate ‘Persons’ are ‘opposite numbers’, not homogeneous terms.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Addressed</th>
<th>Subject</th>
<th>Predicate + kan</th>
<th>substituting for</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2 s</td>
<td>2 s</td>
<td>... R ... kan</td>
<td>1 (s,p)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3 (s,p)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 p</td>
<td>2 p</td>
<td>... R ... kan</td>
<td>1 (s,p)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2 p only **</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3 (s,p)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 (s,p)</td>
<td>1 s</td>
<td>... R ... kan</td>
<td>2 (s,p)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3 (s,p)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 (s,p)</td>
<td>1 p</td>
<td>... R ... kan</td>
<td>2 (s,p)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1 p only **</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3 (s,p)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 (s,p)</td>
<td>3 s</td>
<td>... R ... kan</td>
<td>1 (s,p)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2 (s,p)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 (s,p)</td>
<td>3 p</td>
<td>... R ... kan</td>
<td>1 (s,p)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3 p only **</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2 (s,p)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Making due allowance for context, a sentence such as

\[ \text{naj wan phra? naa ca-paj thi bood kan majo} \]

with the basic information about composure in the activity of 'going to the bood on the Buddhist sabbath' can be made to fit all the cases tabulated. The word \( \text{nann} \) 'mother's younger brother or sister' can be 1, 2 or 3 in 'Person' usage and may be singular or plural. Among the substitution possibilities for \( \text{kan} \) will be, besides \( \text{kab chan}, \text{kab raw}, \text{kab than} \) and \( \text{kab khaw} \), also a substitution for \( \text{kab nna} \) in what we have called homogeneous plurality.

The majority of the entries in the table conform to a simple formula which might be expressed thus

\[
\begin{array}{ccc}
\text{Subject} & \text{Predicated} & \text{Subject} \\
\text{'Person'} & R \text{ kab} & \text{'Person'} R \text{ kan} \\
(s,p) & (s,p) & (s,p)
\end{array}
\]

The above formula can apply to all types of \( R \) in theory, though in practice there are two kinds: \( R^v \), the verbs which are by themselves reversible in meaning or which are made reversible by usage with \( \text{kab} \); and \( R^r \), a set of adverbs and adverbial phrases devoted to processes of alternation, equation, differentiation, juxtaposition etc. These processes normally require a verb (\( V \)) to constitute a predicate for the sentence in which they operate. Their reference is not restricted to 'Persons' set off against the Subject but extends to any two terms occupying the same IC in the sentence. We may now revise the formula, then, to read either

\[ x R y \text{ where } R \text{ is } R^v \text{, Subj. } R^v \text{ kab Partner } \rightarrow \text{ Subj. } R^v \text{ kan} \]

or

\[ x R y \text{ where } R \text{ is } R^r \text{ and in the environment of } V, \]

\[ x R^r \text{ kab} y \rightarrow \ldots \ldots \ldots V \ldots \ldots R^r \text{ kan} \]

\((x \text{ and } y)\)
An example of the former is

naaj dam ca-phôb (kâb) phôm ——> naaj dam ca-phôb kan

and of the latter

naaj dam maa phra:m kâb naaj deeq ——> naaj dam maa phra:m kan illustrating Dam's *meeting with* (Rv) a partner and Dam's arriving *along with* (Rf) a partner respectively.

There follows a diagram to map out the consequences of Rv and Rf usages and the restrictions upon the 's or p' choice and the 'p only' alternative. It will be seen that the four categories set out in the diagram are numbered. This is a convenience to make reference to the categories in the discussion that follows somewhat easier. The large squares that frame groupings of the categories are intended to show the successive stages of specialization called forth by the differences between the world of dialogue and the world of narrative. Thus, though the category marked @ is intended to have a certain primacy as illustrating the fundamental process at its simplest, the categories numbered ©, © and ® are not intended to show any historical order of derivation. The most that can be said is that category @ requires a step or two more in explanation than do the other two.

To recapitulate: the "fundamental process at its simplest" is that a reversible but not necessarily reciprocal sequence \( x \, R \, y \) may be rewritten as \( x \, R \, kan \) without any restrictions on the singularity or plurality of \( x \), and (save for the provision of a verb to make up a predicate where necessary) without any requirement that \( R \) be either Rv or Rf. With this in mind as the exemplification of category @, the diagram should be intelligible.

40) In some such context as

baa~thii naaj dam ca-phôb kan thaa mii weelaa waa~

where the speaker and addressee know who is meant by *kan* and who it is that has the spare time, eg.

"Perhaps Dam will meet me/us/you if he/I/we/you have any spare time."

or with *naaj dam* as second Person address

"Perhaps you'll meet me/us/them, Dam, if you/I/they have any spare time."
4 and 5 begin processes of specialization. The former dwells on the fact that \( x \text{ R } y \) resembles a sentence with a pattern \( N \text{ V } N \), the first \( N \) of which is always the Subject and the second \( N \) is predicated upon the basis of some kind of understood partnership and may thus undergo substitution by \( \text{kun} \) that renders this second \( N \) implicit
rather than explicit. The latter dwells on unrestricted possibilities of participation for $x$ and $y$ as joint fillers of any IC ‘slot’ in a sentence, not merely the Subject slot. Viewed in this light, therefore, $\textcircled{a}$ might really be called a specialized case of $\textcircled{b}$. We deal with $\textcircled{b}$ first, however, because it shows up another dichotomy. In those sections of the diagram

(with the shape $\textcircled{b}$), in which the word \textipa{kan} is paired

with reference to no other IC of the sentence but the Subject, there is a split revealed by the ability or inability to tolerate singularity of Subject. $R^\text{r}$ may take either singular or plural, whereas $R^\text{v}$ must go one step further in specialization and take only plural.

In category $\textcircled{a}$ (with the shape $\textcircled{a}$), the word \textipa{kan}, used with $R^\text{r}$, is applied to an $R$-process at work between any two items, $x$ and $y$, that are appropriate fillers of any single IC slot but which must be patent and explicit, not latent and implicit. The corollary therefore is that this $R^\text{r}$ process demands plurality unless it is the special case of $\textcircled{b}$. Let us set down in formulaic terms the steps that are concerned in such a process,$^{41}$ choosing the Subject slot so as to bring out the difference between the applications of \textipa{kan} from category $\textcircled{a}$ and from category $\textcircled{b}$:

41) It is assumed that underlying compresence, represented by some such formulated array as

(Subj $\text{V}$) (Subj $\text{V}$) where $V$ is common to both

will always have alternative presentations: either

Subj' $\text{V}$ or Subj' $\text{V} \text{ kab} \text{ Subj}'$

It is further assumed that the grammar of $\text{Subj''}$ cannot be mistaken for other constructions with $\text{Subj''}$ for e.g.,

$\text{naa} \text{aj} \text{ dam} \text{ ch}\text{oob} \text{ kin} \text{ klaaj-hoom} \text{ kab} \text{n} \text{ naaj-khe'ng}$

Dem likes to eat banana with cheese.

that lead to preposterous alternatives such as

$\text{naa} \text{aj} \text{ dam} \text{ kab} \text{n} \text{ naaj-khe'ng} \text{ ch}\text{oob} \text{ kin} \text{ klaaj-hoom}$

"Dam and cheese like to eat banana!"

IC analysis can take care of this. So can transformational grammar (e.g. TSAO: GT 12 and 13, pp. 37-38). Ringing the changes on these alternative presentations, however, is very important for explanations of the specializations of \textipa{kan} set forth below.
1st step: Subj' R f kāb Subj' .... V ....
2nd step: Subj' .... V .... R f kāb Subj''
3rd step: 
   \{ Subj' .... V .... R f kan (exclusively case ₡) \\
   or \\
   Subj' & Subj' .... V .... R f kan (typically case ₡) \}

The second step leads, by substitution of kan for kāb Subj'', to the category ₡ formula in step 3. The category ₡ formula in step 3 requires some explanation, however. The question arises: what is Subj'' doing in the Subject slot, or in the sentence at all, if kan is supposed to be substituting for it? The whole process might be explained by simplifying the account of what is really taking place and by writing out a general formula thus:

\[ x \text{ R } kāb \ y \text{ & y R kāb x} \]
and then by substitution
\[ x \text{ R kan' & y R kan''} \]
and then by re-arrangement as
\[ x \text{ & y R kan' & kan''} \]

The suggestion of an origin for the Thai phrase kan làp kan is obvious. The suggestion also is made, however, that the second kan (i.e. the ...... & kan''), being homophonous in actual utterance, is nearly always dropped, leaving us with the ‘joint’ or double-item formula for sentences using kan under the terms of category ₡. This double-item plurality and the application of it to the Subject slot in particular is important in explaining the ultimate specialization found in category ₡.

Recalling that kan làp kan is normally reduced to one kan only, we may add the remark that reduplication or linked reiteration (xx or x & x) are not normally available as devices to convey notional plurality in Thai. With the exception of certain nouns (deg-deg ‘children’ and lūng-lūng ‘one’s children’, for instance), nouns and pronouns that are not specific as to singularity or plurality must be content with a single unmarked form for singular and plural alike. Category ₡ exploits this state of affairs and not only reduces two hypothetical occurrences of kan to one but also does so for two hypothetically individual Subject items too.
In order to do this, of course, the individuals must be homogeneous. Another way of putting it is to conceive of each noun-word as a named set that thus will obey the elementary rule for the addition of sets:

for any set \( a \), \( a \cdot a = a \).

Returning to our nouns, which we continue to term \( x \), we may set down formulae with each ‘individual’ \( x \) or set-member marked in the same way that we previously marked each occurrence of \( \text{k}an \). Keeping track of \( x \) in this way allows us to account for the two important ways in which category \( \Theta \) presents itself: as unison plural \( \text{k}an \) (e.g. \( \text{d}\text{e}g\text{ w}i\text{n} \text{k}an \), ‘The kids are running along with one another’); and reciprocal plural \( \text{k}an \) (e.g. \( \text{d}\text{e}g\text{ t}i\text{i} \allowbreak \text{k}an \), ‘The kids are fighting each other’). It remains to be said that the \( R \)-process in category \( \Theta \) must find expression in the main verb and, hence, we might expect \( R^V \) to be entered as the main verb in our formulae. Reversibility in this category, however, will be assumed to reside in the word \( \text{k}ab \) rather than, necessarily and inherently, within the meaning of the verb. If, for instance, we stress the meaning of the verb \( \text{t}i\text{i} \) as ‘to hit, to smack or beat’ rather than ‘to fight’, then it is not reversible in implication. Verbs like \( \text{r}i\text{g} \) ‘to love’ and \( \text{k}li\text{ad} \) ‘to hate’ and so forth do not have inherently reversible meanings either. We therefore write \( V \) or \( V \text{ Obj} \) for the relevant predicate nuclei in our formulae.

(a) unison \( \text{k}an \)– \( V \) is intransitive:

\[
x' \ V \text{k}ab \ x'' & \ x' \ V \text{k}ab \ x' \\
\text{re-arranged as} \\
x' & x'' \ V \text{kan}' & \text{kan}' \\
\text{reduced by addition of sets to} \\
x \ V \text{kan}
\]

The re-arrangement we have, of course, met with in category \( \Theta \). The additional factor here is homogeneity: \( x' \) and \( x'' \) are, ultimately in actual utterance, destined to be unitary \( x \).

(b) either unison or reciprocal–\( V \) is overtly transitive:

\[
x' \ V \text{Obj} \text{k}ab \ x'' & x'' \ V \text{Obj} \text{k}ab \ x' \\
\text{reduced by the above procedure to} \\
x \ V \text{Obj} \text{kan}
\]
Context and collocational plausibility must decide whether the Object is itself singular, and therefore in common for the transactions done by both $x'$ and $x''$ (e.g. $\text{moon phracan kan}$, 'gazed at the moon together'), or plural and 'shared' severally (e.g. $\text{jig nōg kan}$, 'shot game together') as it must also decide whether unison or reciprocal interpretations are appropriate. This latter issue is a vital one for presentation (c) of category @:

(c) reciprocal with double homogeneity—where Object is $x$ too!

$$x' V x'' \, \text{kāb} \, x'' \, \& \ldots \ldots \text{etc.}$$
cannot be reduced to $x' V x'' \, \text{kāb} \, x' \, \& \ldots \ldots \text{etc.}$ because the predicate of Subject $x'$, i.e. $V x''$, cannot, as it stands, constitute a predicate permissible by reversibility with $x'$ as Subject too: we cannot allow $x'' V x'$. We must therefore postulate a convention whereby the hypothetical predicate $V x'' \, \text{kāb} \, x'$ may undergo a special, partial substitution and become $V \, \text{kan}''$. This is in order to preserve the reversibility of the transaction at the cost of removing specific mention of any Object. By observing this convention, therefore, the formulae come down once again to

$$x' V kān'' \, \& \, x'' V \, kān'$$
and by reduction as before to

$$x \, V \, kān.$$ 

The upshot of this ordering of priorities—reversibility at the cost of overt mention of Object—is that, as regards notional interpretations of the formula $x \, V \, \text{kan}$ where $V$ is a transitive verb, the supplying of an Object may or may not be homogeneous with the Subject, an ambiguity that can be resolved only by context.42 A demonstration of this at its most paradoxical can be found in such sentences as

42) The sentence

""What are you going on about?" I asked in a rather non-committal voice, "This story about people finding pearls—here?"

(Achin Panupban's story วรรคที่ 3 หน้า 138.)

The observation of underlying ambiguity in $x \, V \, \text{kan}$ is also made, by implication, in KCP on p. 140

"Why are you looking at him? / Why are you all looking at each other?"
sad thi kin kan mai kan kan

in which context is left to explain (granted that absurd self-contradiction is not intended) whether the meaning shall be

‘Animals that eat (food) together do not eat each other.’

or

‘Animals that eat each other do not eat (food) together.’

or even—with a new ‘understood’ Subject—

‘Animals that (we humans) all eat are not the ones that eat each other.’

or

‘Animals that eat each other none (of us humans) will eat.’

It is of interest to conjecture whether kan will always retain the ability to take part in substitution procedures such as have provided the material on which the foregoing diagram and formulae have been based. A sequence such as

\[ x \overset{V}{\rightarrow} \text{kan kab} y \]

already hints that analysis based solely on substitution will not work, since kan cannot be said to substitute for the kab phrase that immediately follows it. At some time in the future Thai usage may demand that kan’s “covert relationship” with kab be held in abeyance, prominence being given by the synchronic analyst of the time to the conception of kan as, say, adverb of compresence. It has been the aim of this investigation to perceive a unifying raison d’être for kan despite the diversity of its uses in a predicate. What is hypothetical is the account of the relationships between these diverse uses. Whilst the hypotheses will doubtless be challenged, it is hoped they will be seen to treat language as something continuing to live, with room to live, with a future. If there is such a thing as wajjaakan thaj taj tua, then this account of kan cannot be a part of it.
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