Chapter 5

Conclusion

5.1. Findings

An emanation event is imagined when we holistically view physical entities and consider them as being related to each other. In an emanation event, an intangible entity emerges from a source entity and moves in relation to a reference entity. To describe the arbitrarily construed geographic relation among those entities, we use emanation expressions. In this study I have investigated Thai emanation expressions. In Section 1.3, I posited the following two hypotheses of this study: (a) the types of emanation events in Thai are language-specific; (b) the syntactic patterns of emanation event subtypes are different, reflecting different underlying cognitive models. These hypotheses have been verified throughout the course of this study. The main findings of this study are recapitulated below.

First, there are two force-dynamic types of idealized cognitive models (ICM's) for Thai emanation event, neither of which is marked:

(1) thematic ICM involving two role archetypes (mover and absolute)

(2) agentive ICM involving three role archetypes (mover, absolute and agent)

The subject of clauses for thematic emanation events is either a mover or an absolute, while the subject of clauses for agentive emanation events is always an agent. This is because a mover or an absolute is the focal participant in thematic ICM and an agent is the focal participant in agentive ICM.

Second, Thai emanation events can be classified into four specific semantic types according to the nature of the intangible mover:

(1)   perception emanation, including

(1.1)   visual emanation (fictive motion of a line of vision)

(1.2)   auditory emanation (fictive motion of a sound)

(1.3)   olfactory emanation (fictive motion of a smell)

(1.4)   tactile emanation (fictive motion of a current of air)

(2)   radiation emanation (fictive motion of light)

(3)   shadow emanation (fictive motion of a shadow)

(4)   orientation emanation (fictive motion of the focus of an observer or conceptualizer's attention)

In Thai, visual, auditory and radiation emanations are represented by relatively more differing clause patterns, while shadow and orientation emanations are represented by relatively fewer various clause patterns.

Third, Thai emanation events have the following event structure types.

(1)   a simplex type representing a simplex emanation event

(2)   an integrated type representing an integrated emanation event, including:

a.   a simultaneous type representing an emanation event that is described in more than one perspective

b.   a sequential type representing an emanation event in which two sub-events occur in succession

This classification is based on the surface forms of predicates for emanation events. The simplex type is expressed by one verb phrase, whereas the integrated type is expressed by a serial verb construction or one verb phrase combined with one prepositional phrase.

There are the following semantic constraints on realization of these emanation event structures. Verbs in simultaneous emanation expressions must denote processes occurring at the same time. The last verb in sequential thematic emanation expressions must denote an inchoative motion at the terminal phase (e.g. a mover's stopping at an absolute; a mover's striking at an absolute; a mover's covering an absolute). The first verb in sequential agentive emanation expressions must denote an inchoative motion at the initial phase (e.g. an agent's launching a mover, an agent's stretching a mover).

These findings of this study on Thai emanation events give us a certain clue to understand how Thai speakers mentally organize the world.

5.2. Discussion

Adopting Langacker's revised notion of "subjectification" (Langacker 1999: 297-302), I identify the degree of subjectivity involved in each type of Thai emanation. Subjectification is a shift from a relatively objective construal of some entity to a more subjective one. In his latest account of subjectification, a revision of the former account (Langacker 1985, 1990), Langacker acknowledges that an offstage conceptualizer is ALWAYS subjectively construed to the extent that it functions as the subject of conception. However, there are at least three stages of subjectification. In the first stage, a conceptualizer mentally scans from one participant to another in an event s/he conceives, and the most focal participant, which functions as an initial point of access in conceiving the profiled relationship among the participants, is determined by the participants' objective asymmetry with regard to activeness. In the intermediate stage, a conceptualizer does the same or a comparable mental scanning as in the first stage, but the objective situation offers less motivation for this. The most focal participant (source entity) is selected by the conceptualizer more or less arbitrarily. And in the final stage, there is no objective basis for the conceptualizer's mental scanning. The basis for it entirely resides in the conceptualizer's activity, that is, the process of conceptualization itself.

I think that Thai emanation events involve the intermediate stage of subjectification. But the degree of subjectification of orientation emanation is slightly higher than in other types of emanation. In conceptualizing perception emanation or radiation emanation or shadow emanation, Thai speakers imagine an intangible mover analogous to a tangible mover. The imagined mover is autonomous and substantial enough to be described as moving in a manner such as rushing, flowing, falling, and so on. In conceptualizing orientation emanation, on the other hand, Thai speakers do not imagine any mover independent of the conceptualizer. What moves along a path

connecting participants in an orientation emanation event is the focus of the
conceptualizer's attention which is by no means substantial. However, orientation
emanation is not a fully subjective conceptualization since a certain objective motivation
is still involved. That is, there must be such an objective situation that an orientated
entity either actually or fictively turns or points toward a reference entity prior to the focus
of attention's shift from the orientated entity to the reference entity.

Let me conclude this study by comparing Thai emanation events with English
emanation events examined by Talmy (1996). Thai way of conceiving emanation
reflected in Thai emanation expressions differs from the English way of conceiving
emanation reflected in English emanation expressions, although the same human
mental operations (such as schematization, landmark-trajector organization, idealized
models, force-dynamic construals, conceptual blending, and so on) apply to the both.
Differences between them are summarized below.

First, most Thai emanation expressions, unlike English emanation expressions,
include the deictic verb มา **maa** 'come' or ไป **pay** 'go' which signals the observer or
conceptualizer's vantage point independent of event participants. It follows that Thai
emanation events tend to be observed from a particular point of view, or in other words,
they are largely designated in the "relative frame of reference" (Levinson 1996: 142-145).

Second, stative verbs (like 'face, lie') and dynamic prepositions (like 'toward,
away from') may co-occur in English orientation emanation expressions (e.g. The cliff
wall faces toward the valley; The snake is lying toward the light), whereas they do not in
the Thai counterparts. (164) including the stative verb phrase นอนอยู่ **nɔɔn yùu** 'be lying'
and the dynamic preposition ยัง **yaŋ** 'toward' is unacceptable.

(164) *	งู	นอน	อยู่	(ไป)	ยัง	ไฟ
	ŋuu	nɔɔn	yùu	(pay)	yaŋ	fay
	snake	lie down	stay	(go)	toward	light

(intended meaning) The snake is lying (facing) toward the light.

Thai orientation emanations always involve the orientated entity's actual or fictive motion in place (turning, pointing). To put it another way, Thai orientation emanations cannot be fully subjective; they need reference to some motion in the physical world.

Third, perception emanation involving no agent (i.e. thematic perception emanation) is scarcely imagined by English speakers, but it is a common conceptualization for Thai speakers.

One construal factor that distinguishes Thai and English emanations is whether or not the speakers put great emphasis on the "agentivity" of event participants. The semantic distinction between an agent that has body parts and volition/intention to act, on the one hand, and a non-agent including a mere mover, on the other hand, is significant in English, while it is not clear in Thai. For example, Thai verbs of bodily motion in place (such as หัน **hăn** 'turn the face or back' and ชี้ **chíi** 'point the finger or hand') are used for describing not only bodily motions of animate beings, as in (165a), but also spatial relationships of inanimate beings, as in (165b).

(165) a.

เขา	หัน	หน้า	เข้า	หา	กัน
kháw	hăn	nâa	khâw	hăa	kan
PRONOUN	turn	face	enter	seek	RECIPROCAL

Two persons face toward each other.

b.

ป้าย	หัน	หน้า	เข้า	หา	กัน
pâay	hăn	nâa	khâw	hăa	kan
signboard	turn	face	enter	seek	RECIPROCAL

Two signboards face toward each other.

This is not a matter of rhetorical personification because there are no other choices to express the oppositional relationship of two objects with a face-like part than by using the verb phrase หันหน้าเข้าหากัน **hăn nâa khâw hăa kan** '(turn + face + enter + seek + RECIPROCAL) face each other' in Thai. It might appear that agentivity or volition does not inhere in the meaning of bodily motion verbs in Thai. The most significant semantic elements that those verbs entail, I think, are schematic shape and the position of human body parts (such as front surface and pointed end) as well as directionality of

motion (such as horizontal motion and vertical motion) apart from agentivity or volition.

These considerations invite further empirical investigation regarding human cognition. A full understanding of a variety of emanation phenomena awaits further research on the human mental mechanism.

SOURCES OF DATA

กฤษณา อโศกสิน. 2525a. บันไดเมฆ ๑. กรุงเทพฯ: รวมสาส์น.

กฤษณา อโศกสิน. 2525b. บันไดเมฆ ๒. กรุงเทพฯ: รวมสาส์น.

กฤษณา อโศกสิน. 2534. กระเช้าสีดา. กรุงเทพฯ: รวมสาส์น.

ชาติ กอบจิตติ. 2541. เวลา. กรุงเทพฯ: หอน.

ปรียา อิงคาภิรมย์ โฮริเอะ และกนก ศฤงคารินทร์ (ผู้แปล). 2538. โคะโคะโระ [Mind]. กรุงเทพฯ:
        ดอกหญ้า.

พงาพันธ์ (ผู้แปล). 2542. เจ้าชายน้อย [Le Petit Prince]. กรุงเทพฯ: ศรีสารา.

พิสิฐ ภูศรี. 2542. คนโซในปราสาท. กรุงเทพฯ: ดอกหญ้า.

ไพฑูรย์ รัญญา. 2541. ก่อกองทราย. กรุงเทพฯ: นาคร.

ว.วินิจฉัยกุล. 2535a. สองฝั่งคลอง ๑. กรุงเทพฯ: วัตสาตรี.

ว.วินิจฉัยกุล. 2535b. สองฝั่งคลอง ๒. กรุงเทพฯ: วัตสาตรี.

วาศนา ชลศักษ์ เคนแมน (บรรณาธิการ). 2538. ผู้หญิงอาเชีย:
        รวมเรื่องสั้นสะท้อนชีวิตและวัฒนธรรม. กรุงเทพฯ: คบไฟ.

ศิลา โคมฉาย. 2536. ครอบครัวกลางถนน. กรุงเทพฯ: มิ่งมิตร.

สมาคมนักเขียนแห่งประเทศไทย. 2541. เรื่องแสงดาว:
        รวมเรื่องสั้นเด่นของนักเขียนดังระดับคุณภาพ. กรุงเทพฯ: ชวนพิมพ์.