Syntactic and Semantic Discrepancies among the Verbs for 'kill' in English, Chinese and Thai ∗

Kingkarn Thepkanjana[a] and Satoshi Uehara[b]

[a]Department of Linguistics, Chulalongkorn University
Phyathai Road, Bangkok 10330, Thailand
Kingkarn.T@chula.ac.th

[b]Center for the Advancement of Higher Education,
& Graduate School of International Cultural Studies, Tohoku University,
41 Kawauchi, Aoba-ku, Sendai, 980-8576, Japan
uehara@intcul.tohoku.ac.jp

Abstract. This paper shows that there are some syntactic and semantic discrepancies among three seemingly semantically equivalent verbs denoting one of the most basic actions in any language, i.e. the verbs meaning 'kill' in English, Chinese and Thai. Specifically, it examines the possibility of these verbs to appear in two syntactic patterns in which English is used as the metalanguage: (A) X kill Y dead, and (B) X kill Y but Y not die. The different syntactic properties among these verbs suggest that the verbs for 'kill' in the three languages are not completely semantically equivalent. It is found that the resulting dead event of *kill* in English is lexically entailed but that of *shā* in Chinese is merely implied. Thai is a more complicated case. The verbs for 'kill' in the three languages are thus classified into different categories based on their syntactic and semantic properties.

Keywords: accomplishment verb, activity verb, entailed-result verb, implied-result verb.

1   Introduction

The verb meaning 'kill' denotes one of the most basic and common actions in any language. Semantically, there are two components in an action of killing, namely, an unspecified causing action and a resulting change to the dead state of an affected entity. These facts might lead us to believe that the verbs for 'kill' across languages have complete semantic equivalence. This paper aims to point out that there are some syntactic and semantic discrepancies among the verbs for 'kill' in some languages. The languages that are chosen as a case study to illustrate the discrepancies are English, Chinese and Thai.

The verb glossed as 'kill' in any language is typically encoded as a transitive verb taking an agent and a patient. The verb *kill* in English is generally categorized in two ways, i.e. a lexical causative verb and an accomplishment verb. Thepkanjana (2000) claims that lexical causatives express prototypical causation in Lakoff's sense, in which an agentive participant volitionally and directly transfers physical energy onto the second participant (Lakoff, 1987). The second participant undergoes a change of state as a result of the agent's action. A lexical causative thus consists of two major subevents: the agent's activity and the patient's change of state. Given the four event types postulated by Vendler, namely, activity, accomplishment, achievement, and state, the verb *kill* in English can be categorized as an accomplishment verb (Vendler, 1967). An accomplishment refers to a process going on in time and proceeding to a terminal point. An accomplishment is thus durative and bounded. The change of state of a patient can be regarded as the terminal point of the process initiated by an agent. In this paper, we will argue that the verbs for 'kill' in Chinese and Thai cannot be semantically characterized and categorized in the same way as the English counterpart. In addition, the three verbs with this meaning in the three languages exhibit different syntactic behavioral properties, which will be presented in the next section. It is noted that there are many verbs which express the meaning of causing somebody to die in each language, such as *assassinate, murder, execute, slaughter, massacre, smother, drown,* in English. These verbs are semantically different in the manner, the purpose of causing somebody to die, and the type and number of killed people. This paper chooses as data the most semantically unmarked and the least semantically specific verb of causing somebody to die in English, Chinese and Thai, namely, *kill*, *shā*, *khâa*, respectively.

2   Syntactic Discrepancies among the Verbs for 'kill' in English, Chinese and Thai

This section examines the possibilities of the verbs for 'kill' in the three languages to appear in the following two structural patterns in which English words are used as the metalanguage. Please note that the structural patterns in (A) and (B) do not observe the grammatical rules of English because they represent structural schemas.

(A) X kill Y dead.[†]
(B) X kill Y, but Y not die.

The two structural patterns serve as templates for linguistic realizations of monoclausal and biclausal sentences containing the verbs for 'kill' in the three languages. Pattern (A) is a monoclausal multipredicate construction whereas pattern (B) is a biclausal coordinate one which consists of two monopredicate clauses. The crucial property of pattern (A) is that the verb for 'kill' is accompanied by another predicate denoting the resulting dead subevent which is actually inherent in the verb. That means an occurrence of the resulting dead subevent inherent in the verb for 'kill' is confirmed explicitly as a separate predicate in pattern (A). In pattern (B), which is a biclausal coordinate structure, the last conjunct is a disclaiming clause in that it denies the occurrence of the resulting dead subevent inherent in the verb for 'kill'. Although the verbs *kill*, *shā*, *khâa* in the three languages denote the same action, they have different syntactic

---

† The words *sǐ* in Chinese and *taay* in Thai are ambiguous in that they can be interpreted as a process meaning 'die' and a state meaning 'dead'. For the sake of simplicity, only the adjective 'dead' is given as the gloss. Although we say this here, we use 'die' instead of 'dead' in the other examples as in (5)-(8) and (30)-(31).

behavioral properties with regard to the two structural patterns described above. We will discuss the English verb first.

It is not possible for the English verb *kill* to appear in either patterns in unmarked contexts as exemplified below.

(1) **John killed Mary dead.*[†]
(2) **John killed Mary, but Mary did not die.*

The unacceptability in (1) arises from redundancy whereas that in (2) arises from contradiction. These facts suggest that the occurrence of the resulting dead subevent of killing cannot be confirmed nor denied in the case of *kill* in English. Interestingly, it is found that the verb *kill* in English can take the confirming resultative predicate *dead* only in the case of advertising insect-killing spray or computer bugs-killing software as below (Thepkanjana and Uehara, 2009).

(3) *Raid. Kills Bugs Dead*. (A RAID commercial advertisement)
(4) *ZD Net: kill Y2K Bugs Dead*. (A computer program commercial)

It is noted that the context in which *kill* and *dead* co-occur is an emphatic one in which the speaker or writer wants to emphasize the dead condition of an affected entity, which is the resulting event in the verb *kill*. The emphasis aims at convincing the hearer or reader of the effectiveness of an advertised product. Therefore, the emphatic context pragmatically licenses the appearance of the resultative predicate *dead* after *kill*.

As for Chinese, it is possible for *shā* 'kill' to appear in pattern (A). However, the predicate denoting the resulting subevent *sǐ* 'dead' must occur immediately after *shā* 'kill', both of which form a verb compound. Since this type of verb compound consists of the causative and resultative verb, it is called "resultative verb compound" in linguistic literature on Chinese (Ross, 1990; Thompson, 1973). Since the two verbs form a resultative verb compound, the direct object of the causative verb which simultaneously functions as the subject of the resultative verb cannot intervene between the two verbs as exemplified in (5). It must appear after the resultative verb compound, which can be schematized as [V V NP].

(5) *Zhāngsān   sh ā s ǐ   le   Lǐsì.*
     Zhangsan   kill   die   PERF   Lisi
     'Zhangsan killed Lisi dead.' (literal translation)

It is also possible for *shā* 'kill' to appear in pattern (B), which is the coordinate structure as below.

(6) *lángrén   shì qīng yì sh ā   bù   s ǐ   de .*[*]
     wolfman   SHI   easily   kill   not   die   DE
     w ǒ   sh ā   le   t ā   j ǐ   huí, t ā   dō u   méi sǐ .
     I   kill   PERF   he   many   CL   he   all   not   die
     'The wolfman could not be easily killed. I killed him many times but he never died.'

It is obvious that *shā* 'kill' in Chinese accepts both patterns (A) and (B). In other words, an occurrence of the resulting event inherent in *shā* 'kill' can be confirmed explicitly in the form of the verb *sǐ* 'die' as in (5) and can be denied in the disclaiming clause as in (6).

[†] In this regard, the verb *kill* is an entailed-result verb as opposed to an "implied-result" verb in English such as *wipe, wash* and *sweep,* which can be accompanied by a predicate denoting an expected resulting state, such as *John wiped the table clean* (Thepkanjana and Uehara, 2009).

[*] The *shi....de* construction in Chinese is used to put focus on circumstances of an action which took place in the past, such as place, purpose, manner and time.

Thai is different from Chinese in that the verb *khâa* 'kill' can appear in pattern (A) as exemplified in (7) but is marginal when it appears in pattern (B) as in (8). According to a sample of 100 corpus citations containing the verb *khâa* 'kill' collected from the Thai National Corpus at the Faculty of Arts, Chulalongkorn University, it is found that 26 out of 100 occurrences of *khâa* 'kill' are accompanied by the predicate *taay* 'die' confirming the realization of the resulting event. It is therefore obvious that the occurrence of *khâa* 'kill' accompanied by *taay* 'die' is not uncommon in the Thai corpus. It is found that 2 out of 100 occurrences of *khâa* 'kill' in the collected corpus citations are accompanied by the negated predicate *mây taay* 'not dead', which denies the occurrence of the resulting state, in the same clause. The two instances suggest that there exists the syntactic schema 'X kill Y not dead' as well in Thai although the affirmative counterpart is more common. We will get back to this negative monoclausal syntactic schema later in the paper. On the other hand, some Thais ruled out (8) as ungrammatical whereas some others considered it marginal.

(7) *sǒmchaay   khâa   sǒ msak   taay*
    Somchaay   kill   Somsak   die
    'Somchaay killed Somsak dead.' (literal translation)

(8) ??*sǒmchaay   khâa   sǒ msàk   t ɛɛ   sǒ msàk   mây   taay* †
     Somchaay   kill   Somsak   but   Somsak   not   die
     '*Somchaay killed Somsak but Somsak did not die.' (literal translation)

The fact that sentence (7), which is a monoclausal sentence containing the causative and resultative verbs, is acceptable in Thai suggests that it does not exhibit redundancy. On the other hand, sentence (8) is marginal and even unacceptable for some native speakers because it apparently exhibits contradiction between the first and the second conjunct clauses. Notice that pattern (A) is realized in Chinese as a resultative verb compound in which the causative and the resultative verbs follow one after the other. On the other hand, pattern (A) in Thai is manifested in the form of the serial verb construction in which the direct object of the first verb functions as the subject of the second one.

We can see that the verb *khâa* 'kill' in Thai can appear in pattern (A) but is marginal in pattern (B). This discrepancy means that the occurrence of the resulting subevent in *khâa* 'kill' can be confirmed in the serial verb construction as in (7) without exhibiting redundancy like Chinese, while it may not be always denied in the coordinate, biclausal construction as in (8) like English.

The verbs for 'kill' in the three languages obviously exhibit syntactic discrepancies with regard to patterns (A) and (B). Chinese is the most accepting in that the verb *shā* can appear in both patterns. English is the least accepting in that the verb *kill* cannot occur in either pattern. Thai lies in the middle in that the verb *khâa* can appear in pattern (A) but is marginal in pattern (B). These discrepancies can be summarized in Table 1. It is noted that the summary in Table 1 is not absolute facts but merely represents a tendency of the syntactic behavioral properties of the verbs for 'kill' with respect to patterns (A) and (B) in the three languages.

Table 1: Discrepancies among the verbs for 'kill' in the three languages

Language	Pattern (A)	Pattern (B)
English	nonacceptable	nonacceptable
Chinese	acceptable	acceptable
Thai	acceptable	marginal

---

† The Thai informants who accepted (8) thought it was more natural to insert the verb *phayayaam* 'try' in front of *khâa* in (8), which would result in the meaning 'Somchaay tried to kill Somsak but Somsak did not die.'

3   Previous Accounts

There are many pieces of work which account for co-occurrence possibilities between the verbs for 'kill' and other semantically comparable verbs on the one hand, and the resultative predicates on the other hand in both monoclausal and biclausal constructions in Chinese, Japanese and English (Teng, 1972; Tai and Chou, 1975; Tai, 1984; Ikegami, 1985; Talmy, 2000; Pederson, 2007).

Teng (1972) claims that the verbs for 'kill' in English and Chinese are not completely semantically equivalent. He observes that while the English verb *kill* consists of two subevents, namely, a causing action and a resulting state, the corresponding verb *shā* in Mandarin Chinese has only the causing action although it may imply the resulting state of *sǐ* 'dead'. Tai and Chou (1975) support Teng's claim by saying that "As opposed to the verb compound <u>*shā sǐ,*</u> <u>*shā*</u> can occur in the pattern of <u>X *shā* Y, Y not *sǐ*</u> 'X "kill" Y, Y not die.' This indicates that <u>*shā*</u> does not necessarily imply <u>*sǐ*</u>." (Tai and Chou, 1975). Tai (1984) further studies accomplishment verbs in English and their supposed equivalents in Chinese and points out that the former necessarily imply an attainment of the goal whereas the latter do not contain such an implication as an inherent part of the meaning. To insure the attainment of the goal, Chinese uses resultative verb compounds in which the first element denotes an action and the second one the result. Thus, we can say that the implication in the Chinese verbs in question emerges from the composite meaning of the whole resultative verb compound or from the context. Tai and Chou (1975) make a further claim that so far they have found no Chinese action verbs which entails the attainment of goal.

Ikegami (1985) also does a contrastive investigation of a number of English and corresponding Japanese "goal-directed" action verbs defined as verbs which contain two subevents, i.e. an action and a goal, bearing a relation to each other in such a way that the former is directed to the latter. Some examples of this kind of verb include those meaning 'kill', 'burn', 'boil', 'drop', 'cheat', 'dry', 'float', 'melt', etc. A goal-directed action may or may not achieve its goal. It is found in this work that corresponding verbs in English and Japanese may differ in the emphasis they lay on the action or the achievement phase. English verbs tend to focus on the achievement phase whereas Japanese verbs focus on the activity phase. He finally concludes that English verbs are goal-oriented whereas Japanese ones are process-oriented. Ikegami also discusses the English and Japanese verbs with the meanings 'kill' and 'burn.' He points out that the English verb *kill* and the corresponding Japanese verb *korosu* are in the same semantic category since the achievement of the goal is implied in both verbs in the two languages. On the other hand, the English verb *burn* and the corresponding verb *moyasu* in Japanese are in different semantic categories since the achievement of the goal is implied by the English verb but not by the Japanese one. The English and Japanese sentences cited by Ikegami to support this claim are as follows (Ikegami, 1985).

(9)   **John killed Mary, but Mary didn't die.*

(10) **John-wa   Mary-o   korosita   keredomo,   Mary-wa   sinanakatta.*
       John-Top   Mary-Acc   killed   though   Mary-Top   didn't die
       '*John killed Mary but Mary didn't die.'

(11) **I burned it, but it didn't burn.*

(12) *moyasita   keredo,   moennakatta.*
       burned   though   didn't burn
       '*(Someone) burned (something), but it didn't burn.'

Talmy (2000) accounts for the same phenomenon by postulating the notion of "lexicalized implicature," which refers to the kind of implicature which is defeasible and which is associated with a lexical item. Talmy claims that different verbs in a certain semantic field in a single language, such as *choke, stab, strangle,* and *drown*, may have different degrees of strength of

lexicalized implicature which might correlate in part with different degrees of strength of the agent's intention for a further result. Furthermore, the different degrees of strength of implicature tend to correlate also with the verbs' ability to take a satellite that confirms the fulfillment. The verb *choke* is located at one end of the cline of strength of implicature since it has no implicature that the resulting event of dying will take place, at least for some speakers, whereas the verb *drown* is located at the other end since the occurrence of the resulting event of dying is not merely implied but asserted in the lexical semantics of the verb itself. The verbs *stab* and *strangle* are located between the two extremes with some degree of strength of implicature.

Pederson (2007) explores how different languages encode the realization of an event. The data in this study is drawn from Tamil, German and English. He claims that the core meanings expressed by typical translation equivalent or corresponding verbs in English and Tamil are the same. However, the Tamil verbs are more flexible in that they can be used extensionally in ways prohibited by English. For example, although the verb for 'kill' in Tamil does mean 'kill' in its basic use, it can be used to refer to only the doing part without asserting the final realized state (dead). Pederson (2007) argues that the whole-for-part metonymy is a strategy which allows Tamil speakers to use a transitive verb such as the verb for 'break' to refer only to the first part(s) of the event. However, they cannot use this strategy when they use the converb construction, which entails realization, otherwise it would be contradictory. On the other hand, English has a number of words and constructions which explicitly deny realization, such as *almost, nearly, shoot at the soldier.* The availability of this strategy reduces the motivation to use event verbs in a whole-for-part metonymy.

In accounting for properties of the verbs for 'kill' and other semantically comparable verbs across languages, all of the works reviewed above take the same position with regard to two issues. First, most works listed above claim that lexical semantic properties inherent in those verbs have a bearing on whether they can co-occur with the resultative predicate or not. Such lexical semantic properties of those verbs can vary from language to language and from verb to verb in the same semantic field in a single language. Second, all works reviewed above assume that the agent performs an action expressed by those verbs with a certain goal in mind. The goal is a resulting event which happens to an affected entity after the agent has performed the action. If the resulting state takes place, it means that the agent's goal has been attained.

4   A New Account

In this section, we will propose a new account of the verbs for 'kill' in the three languages.

4.1 The Verbs for 'kill' in English and Chinese

In this section, we will account for the English verb *kill* and the Chinese verb *shā* only because their properties sharply contrast. Since *kill* rejects both patterns (A) and (B) whereas *shā* accepts both, we argue that *kill* and *shā* are in different semantic categories. Our claim corresponds with those postulated in previous studies. *Kill* consists of two subevents, namely, an agent's causing action and the affected entity's resulting state of dying. The crucial property of *kill* is that the dead state is lexically entailed. This accounts for the fact that *kill* cannot be accompanied by *dead* except in an emphatic context. On the other hand, *shā* merely implies that the patient dies as a result of the agent's action. Therefore, it can be confirmed as in (5) and cancelled as in (6).

Thepkanjana and Uehara (2009) postulate two semantic categories of verbs which are subtypes of activities and accomplishment verbs in Vendler's terms, namely, "implied-result" and "entailed-result" verbs. Implied-result verbs refer to a subtype of activity verb which expresses an activity which implies that a patient undergoes a change in state as a result of the agent's action. The result is not guaranteed to take place; it is only implicated. In Figure 1, the implied-result is represented by the unfilled bar.

Figure 1: A schematic representation of an implied-result verb

On the other hand, entailed-result verbs are a subtype of accomplishment verb which entails that a patient undergoes a change in state as a result of the agent's action and that the state emerges after the terminal point has been reached. In addition to *kill* in English, other entailed-result verbs include *cut (paper), break (a twig), destroy (a building), drown (a child),* and *strangle (a man)*. In normal cases, an entailed-result verb cannot be accompanied by a predicate confirming the occurrence of a resulting event as exemplified in **I killed him dead,* which is ill-formed. It is neither possible to deny the occurrence of an entailed resulting event of this type of verb as in **I did not kill him dead.* In Figure 2, the black bar represents the entailed result.

Figure 2: A schematic representation of an entailed-result verb

It is obvious that *kill* in English can be categorized as an entailed-result verb since it rejects both patterns (A) and (B). The rejection arises from the fact that the resulting state of dying is lexically entailed in *kill*. On the other hand, *shā* in Chinese falls in the implied-result verb category because it accepts both patterns (A) and (B). In addition to *shā* 'kill', some other examples of implied-result verbs in Chinese are listed in the left column below. To ensure the attainment of a goal, Chinese resorts to using resultative compounds in which the first element indicates an action and the second one a result.

Implied-result verbs	Resultative verb compounds	
(13) *xué* 'study'	*xué-huì* 'study-able'	= 'learn'
(14) *zhǎo* 'seek'	*zhǎo-dào* 'seek-reach'	= 'find'
(15) *shōu* 'collect'	*shōu-dào* 'collect-reach'	= 'receive'
(16) *kàn* 'look for'	*kàn-jiàn* 'look-perceive'	= 'see'
(17) *tīng* 'listen'	*tīng-jiàn* 'listen-perceive'	= 'hear'

Some examples of implied-result verbs in English are *wash (clothes, glasses), wipe (a table), sweep (floor), iron (a shirt),* and *wax (floor)*. The verbs *wash, wipe,* and *sweep* imply that the patient becomes clean as a result; the verb *iron* implies that the patient becomes smooth as a result; the verb *polish* implies that the patient becomes shiny as a result. Implied-result verbs in English can take resultative predicates in the same clause with different degrees of acceptability as below.

(18) *John waxed the floor glossy*. (marginal)
(19) *John washed the glass clean*. (marked)
(20) *John ironed the shirt smooth*. (less marked than (18) and (19))
(21) *John swept the floor clean*. (very common)
(22) *John wiped the table clean*. (very common)

Moreover, it is possible for the English implied-result verbs in (18)-(22) to be accompanied by a coordinated clause denying the occurrence of the implied resulting event such as below.

(23) *John waxed the floor but it was still dirty.*
(24) *John washed the glass but it was still dirty.*
(25) *John ironed the shirt but it was still wrinkled.*

(26) *John swept the floor but it was still dirty.*
(27) *John wiped the table but it was still dirty.*

4.2 The Verb for 'kill' in Thai

The verb *khâa* in Thai is a more complicated case because it accepts pattern (A) but is marginal in pattern (B). In other words, the occurrence of the resulting event of dying can be both confirmed and denied in a monoclausal structure but cannot be denied in a biclausal, coordinate structure. It obviously has the properties of an implied-result verb when it appears in the monoclausal, mutipredicate, serial verb construction and has the properties of an entailed-result verb when it appears in the biclausal, coordinate construction. Notice that the biclausal, coordinate structure is actually two monopredicate sentences coordinated with each other. The syntactic difference between patterns (A) and (B) in Thai boils down to the difference between a multipredicate clause, which is in this case realized by the serial verb construction, and two monopredicate simplex clauses coordinated with each other. Since the monopredicate simplex clause is typically considered an unmarked clause, the entailed-result verb type should be taken as an unmarked type of *khâa*.

The crucial question is why the verb type of *khâa* changes when this verb appears in the multipredicate serial verb construction. That means there must be something about the serial verb construction which changes the verb type of *khâa* from the entailed-result verb into the implied-result verb. We argue that the serial verb construction serves as a "profile-changing construction" in Croft's sense, which changes the aspectual profile of *khâa* (Croft, in preparation). According to Croft, the profile of the aspectual contour of a situation can be shifted if the verb stem indicating that situation appears in a "profile-changing construction". A good example of a profile-changing construction is the *VERB-ing* aspect construction, which normally serves as the progressive aspect marker in English. This progressive marker normally appears with activity verbs, such as *John is running, John is reading a book*. However, stative verbs can occur in this construction in marked contexts. In that case, this construction serves to change the aspectual profile of the stative verbs from states to activities. Please look at the examples below.

(28) *He is naughty.*
(29) *He is being naughty.*

The verb stem *be naughty* in sentence (28) profiles a state. When this verb stem is put into the *VERB-ing* construction in sentence (29), the original aspectual profile, which is a state, is reconceptualized or construed as an activity which is going on at the moment. In the case of the verb *khâa* in Thai, it is argued that the aspectual contour of the situation expressed by this verb is an accomplishment. It is the serial verb construction which changes the profile of the aspectual contour of the killing situation expressed by *khâa*. The serial verb construction is generally defined as a sequence of verbs which act together as a single predicate and which are put in juxtaposition without any linker. One of the typical uses of serial verb construction is to indicate a sequence of events. We argue that when *khâa*, which expresses an accomplishment, appears in a serial verb construction, the accomplishment originally denoted by this verb is reconceptualized as an activity and the culmination phase is encoded as a separate achievement verb *taay* following *khâa*. In other words, the serial verb construction serves to shift the aspectual profile of the entailed-result verb from an accomplishment to an activity. The entailment which is originally inherent in *khâa* is linguistically encoded as the verb *taay* as below.

(30) *sǒmchaay   khâa   sǒ msàk   taay*
     Somchaay   kill   Somsak   die
     'Somchaay killed Somsak dead.' (literal translation)

The current analysis is substantiated by the existence of the negative counterpart expression of Pattern (A) in Thai, which is exemplified in (31). Notice that (31) is also a monoclausal serial verb construction, where *khâa* 'kill' is accompanied by the negated predicate *mây taay* 'not dead', which denies the occurrence of the resulting state in the same clause.[†]

(31) *sŏmchaay   khâa   sŏ msàk   mây   taay*
    Somchaay   kill   Somsak   not   die
    'Somchaay tried to kill Somsak but he was not dead."

In conclusion, the verb *khâa* in Thai is originally an entailed-result verb when it appears in a monopredicate clause. However, it is the serial verb construction which changes the aspectual profile of this verb from an accomplishment with an entailment to an activity with an implicature. The aspectual profile shift makes (30) and (31) acceptable sentences because it prevents redundancy and contradiction in the two sentences respectively.

5   Conclusion

This study examines the possibility of the verbs for 'kill' in English, Chinese and Thai to appear in two structural patterns. One pattern is a monoclausal, multipredicate construction and the other is a biclausal construction consisting of two monopredicate clauses. It is found that Chinese is the most accepting because the verb *shā* can appear in both patterns; English is the least accepting because the verb *kill* rejects both; Thai lies in the middle because the verb *khâa* accepts pattern (A) but is marginal in pattern (B). It can be concluded that the verb *kill, shā, khâa* in the three languages are not completely semantically equivalent. Based on some different syntactic and semantic properties, *shā* in Chinese is categorized as an implied-result verb whereas *kill* and *khâa* in English and Thai are entailed-result verbs. We argue that the serial verb construction serves as a profile-changing construction which changes the aspectual profile of *khâa* in Thai from an accomplishment verb with an entailed result to an activity verb with an implicature.

References

Croft, W. In preparation. *Verbs: Aspect and Argument Structure* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Ikegami, Y. 1985. 'Activity'-'Accomplishment'-'Achievement'—A Language that can't Say 'I Burned It, but It didn't Burn' and One that can'. In A. Makkai and A. K. Melby, eds., *Linguistics and Philosophy. Essays in Honor of Rulon S. Wells,* pp.265-304. John Benjamins Publishing Company.

Lakoff, G. 1987. *Women, Fire and Dangerous Things.* Chicago: Chicago University Press.

Pederson, E. 2007. Event Realization in Tamil. In M. Bowerman and P. Brown, eds., *Crosslinguistic Perspectives on Argument Structure: Implications for Learnability,* pp. 331-355. Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Ross, C. 1990. Resultative Verb Compounds. *Journal of the Chinese Language Teachers Association,* 25(3), 61-83.

Tai, J. H-Y. 1984. Verbs and Times in Chinese: Vendler's Four Categories. In D. Testen, V. Mishra and J. Drogo, eds., *Papers from the Parasession on Lexical* Semantics, pp.289-296. Chicago Linguistic Society.

Tai, J. H-Y. and J. Y. Chou. 1975. On the Equivalent of 'Kill' in Mandarin Chinese. *Journal of the Chinese Language Teachers Association,* 10(2), 48-52.

Talmy, L. 2000. *Toward a Cognitive Semantics. Volume II. Typology and Process in Concept Structuring.* Cambridge: MIT Press.

[†] It should be noted that the syntactic schema 'V1 not V2' in Thai differs from the superficially similar schema 'V1 *bu* 'not' V2' in Chinese. The latter is a potential construction, whose affirmative counterpart is 'V1 *de* V2', not the resultative compound verb 'V1 V2'.

Teng, S. 1972. *A Semantic Study of the Transitivity Relations*. Ph.D. thesis, University of California, Berkeley.

Thepkanjana, K. 2000. Lexical Causatives in Thai. In A. Foolen and F. Leek, eds., *Constructions in Cognitive Linguistics*, pp.259-281. John Benjamins Publishing Company.

Thepkanjana, K. and S. Uehara. 2009. Resultative Constructions with "Implied-Result" and "Entailed-Result" Verbs in Thai and English: A Contrastive Study. *Linguistics. An Interdisciplinary Journal of the Language Sciences*, 47(3), 589-618.

Thompson, S. A. 1973. Resultative Verb Compounds in Mandarin Chinese: A Case for Lexical Rules. *Language*, 49(2), 361-379.

Vendler, Z. 1967. *Linguistics in Philosophy*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press.