8

Interpersonal uses of the pragmatic particle /kɔ̂ɔ/ in Thai conversation

Kiyoko Takahashi

Abstract

This article presents a data-driven analysis of spoken uses of the Thai pragmatic particle /kɔ̂ɔ/. Drawing on an examination of instances in dialogic discourse, this study identifies several speech-act types related to uses of /kɔ̂ɔ/ and reveals that /kɔ̂ɔ/ interpersonally functions as a reaction marker when the speaker uses it turn-initially and takes into consideration the interlocutor's previous utterance as a communicatively given presupposition. A fine classification of the instances enables us to see the plausibility of /kɔ̂ɔ/ having broadened past its original, text-procedural function to a logical and modal one, and further to an interpersonal one.

1 Introductioni[1]

"Pragmatic particles," broadly defined, encode non-propositional, relational meanings in discourse context, be they discourse-oriented (discursive, text-procedural), speaker-oriented (subjective, cognitive), or interlocutor-oriented (intersubjective, social). They function as a metalinguistic operator for, say, situating a spoken utterance or a written passage in a discourse context, indicating the speaker/author's attitude or commitment with regard to the truth of a proposition, suggesting the speaker/author's communicative intention, mitigating or reinforcing the speaker/author's emotive attitude toward the interlocutor/reader, indexing the degree of formality of the communicative situation, and so forth. The Thai language is known to abound in pragmatic particles (cf. Bhamoraput 1972; Cooke 1989; Peyasantiwong 1981; Sa-anwong 1981; Singhabhandhu 1983, among others). Especially in oral communication, Thai speakers favor the use of a variety of pragmatic particles to make their utterances as expressive and appropriate to the speech situation as possible.

Thai pragmatic particles in general fall into three main types in terms of their syntactic positions:

a.　　　Interjectional type occurring in isolation, for example, /hɤ́y/ in (2)

b.　　　Phrase-final type occurring at the end of a prosodic unit called an "intonational phrase" (Selkirk 1984 cited in Pittayaporn & Chulanon 2012: 16), for example, /ŋay/, /pàʔ/ in (1) and /ʔàʔ/ in (2)[2]

c.　　　Predicate-initial type occurring immediately before a verb- or noun-predicate and after the subject noun phrase, if any, for example, /thɯ̌ŋ/, /kɔ̂ɔ/ in (1)

[2] See Takahashi (2016) for a detailed review of previous studies on Thai pragmatic particles of the phrase-final type.

(1)   . . .   sǒŋsǎy   wâa   thammay man   thʉ̌ŋ   pùat   ŋay

         doubt   COMP   why   PRON   PRTCL   ache   PRTCL

kheen   rúu   pàʔ

Ken(proper.name)   know   PRTCL

chán   kɔ̂ɔ   mây   rúu

PRON   PRTCL   NEG   know

"(I) wonder why it aches. Ken, do (you) know (the reason)? I don't know (the reason)."

(2)   hə̀y   hây   lâw   ciŋ   ʔàʔ

         PRTCL   make   narrate   be.serious   PRTCL

kɔ̂ɔ   tɔɔn rɛ̂ɛk   dooreemii   naaŋ   pay   rooŋ rian . . .

PRTCL   at.the.beginning   Doremi(proper.name)   PRON   go   school

"Hey, (you will) make (me) tell (you the story of the movie), (are you) serious? Then, at the beginning, regarding Doremi (= a character in the movie), she went to school."

Common members of the predicate-initial type include /cuŋ/, /thʉ̌ŋ/, /ləəy/, and /kɔ̂ɔ/. In present-day Thai, the latter two may also appear at the clause-initial position (the beginning of a clause that consists of a predicate with its overt or covert subject noun phrase), for example, /kɔ̂ɔ/ in (2), that is, they are hybrids of the predicate-initial and the clause-initial types.[3] The basic function these predicate-initial particles have in common is a text-procedural one; they organize discourse by instructing the interlocutor/reader to find a certain information structure in discourse and thereby facilitate discourse cohesiveness. Additionally, the predicate-initial particles have a cognitive function. Using them helps the interlocutor/reader construe that there exists an implicit relation between the propositional content of the predicate marked by the particles and the propositional content of the preceding predicate(s). Specifically, they signify the speaker/author's construal of causal relation between the two propositional contents, such that a cause produces an effect or that a reason accounts for a result.

The most frequent predicate-initial particle of Thai is /kɔ̂ɔ/. It is assumed that /kɔ̂ɔ/ originates in a sequential indicator for marking the chronological succession of actions and events in narrative discourse (Burusphat 2008). However, the meaning of /kɔ̂ɔ/ in modern Thai is not merely text-procedural but attitudinal as well. The use of /kɔ̂ɔ/ normally alludes to cognitive attitudes on the part of the speaker/author; it may add modal senses, such as conclusive judgment and concessive evaluation, to propositional contents. What is more, /kɔ̂ɔ/ has extended its functional domains not only into the subjective domain ("subjectification")[4] but further into the intersubjective one ("intersubjectification").[5] Its additional interpersonal functions set it apart from another common predicate-initial

---

[3] Before the eighteenth century, /cuŋ/ also could occur at both syntactic positions, viz. in front of a predicate and/or a clause (Takahashi 2004: 205).

[4] "Subjectification" is "the semasiological process whereby SP/Ws [speakers/writers] come over time to develop meanings for Ls [lexemes] that encode or externalize their perspectives and attitudes as constrained by the communicative world of the speech event, rather than by the so-called 'real-world' characteristics of the event or situation referred to" (Traugott & Dasher 2002: 30).

[5] "Intersubjectification" is the process "where meanings come explicitly to index and acknowledge SP/W's [speaker's/writer's] attitude toward AD/R [addressee/reader] in the here and now of the speech event" (Traugott & Dasher

particle /cɯɯŋ/ whose functions are confined to text-procedural and cognitive ones (Takahashi 2004).

The present chapter focuses on the interactional nature of the Thai pragmatic particle /kɔ̂ɔ/. It aims to present an account of social interactive uses of the particle in conversation. So far, the particle's dynamic communicative functions have not been seriously examined. This study, therefore, attempts to identify typical communicative functions of the particle through a close examination of instances gathered from corpus data of spoken discourse. It also tries to delineate how the particle's different uses – that is, text-procedural uses in the discursive domain, logical and modal uses in the subjective domain, and interpersonal and social uses in the intersubjective domain – are related to one another.

The remainder of this chapter is organized as follows. Section 2 explains main characteristics of the particle /kɔ̂ɔ/. Section 3 analyzes various uses of the particle. The findings of the analysis show that uses of the particle can be categorized into several different speech-act types. Of particular interest is that in a pragmatically ambiguous context, the use of /kɔ̂ɔ/ concerns a hybrid speech act between an assertive and a directive (description of logical outcome and hortative suggestion at the same time). This hybrid sense is not directly connected with /kɔ̂ɔ/'s original, text-procedural, assertive sense (description of phenomenal consequence or temporal sequence), but it would appear to arise from the subjective assertive sense (description of logical outcome) that is derived from the text-procedural assertive sense. That is to say, the subjective assertive sense (description of logical outcome) links the text-procedural assertive sense (description of phenomenal consequence) with the intersubjective directive sense (hortative suggestion). Thus, it is likely that the usage of /kɔ̂ɔ/ first extends from the discourse-oriented domain into the speaker-oriented domain, and further into the interlocutor-oriented domain, as indicated in Table 8.1. Section 4 concludes this study.

Table 8.1 Plausible extension of the usage of /kɔ̂ɔ/

Discourse-oriented domain		Speaker-oriented domain		Interlocutor-oriented domain
Text-procedural assertive sense (e.g., description of phenomenal consequence)	>	Subjective assertive sense (e.g., description of logical outcome)	>	Intersubjective directive sense (e.g., hortative suggestion)

2 Characteristics of the pragmatic particle /kɔ̂ɔ/

Burusphat (2008) posits that /kɔ̂ɔ/ in Thai has its origin in Khmer. She regards /kɔ̂ɔ/ and its corresponding lexical items in other Southeast Asian languages (such as /kɔ/ in Khmer, /thì/ in Vietnamese, /lɛ:/ in Burmese, /pun/ in Malay, etc.) as a pre-verbal temporal auxiliary or sequential indicator, which, she argues, is an areal feature in the Southeast Asian linguistic area. As mentioned earlier, however, /kɔ̂ɔ/ in present-day Thai is not a mere sequential indicator functioning only in the discursive domain; its functions have expanded into the subjective and the intersubjective domains. The plausible links between its original and derived functions will be discussed in detail in the next section.

The basic syntactic and semantic properties of /kɔ̂ɔ/ have not changed since 13–14 CE, the earliest period of the documented history of the Thai language (Sa-anwong 1981). Generally, /kɔ̂ɔ/ places emphasis on the propositional content represented by a verb- or noun-predicate it precedes (Singhabhandhu 1983). In narrative

2002: 31).

discourse, the predicate-initial /kɔ̂ɔ/ is used to highlight backbone information describing informative and central events which advance the storyline (Chodchoey 1986). From the perspective of clause linkage, /kɔ̂ɔ/ can be considered a linker of two clauses: a prior subordinate/supporting clause and a posterior main/focal clause marked by /kɔ̂ɔ/ (Iwasaki & Ingkaphirom 2005: 173–174, 274). As such, it is used for the marking of the main/focal clause, but not of a subordinate/supporting clause.[6] See (3) for an example.[7]

(3)	. . .	phɔɔ		klàp	pay
		as.soon.as		return	go
kɔ̂ɔ	nân	lɛ́ʔ			
PRTCL	that	PRTCL			
kɔ̂ɔ	cháy	chiiwít	naaŋ	pokatìʔ	. . .
PRTCL	spend	life	PRON	normally	

"As soon as (she = a character in the movie) got back, (it was) that; (she) spent her normal life." [predicate-initial, highlighting, narration]

Example (3) comprises the prior adverbial clause (phɔɔ klàp pay "as soon as (she) got back") and the two posterior main clauses serialized. The first main clause contains a noun-predicate (nân lɛ́ʔ "(it was) that"), and the second one contains a verb-predicate (cháy chiiwít naaŋ pokatìʔ "(she) spent her normal life"), which is an enlarged paraphrase of the noun-predicate. Being led by /kɔ̂ɔ/, the two predicates each convey focal (as opposed to supporting) and foreground (as opposed to background) information.

Furthermore, when /kɔ̂ɔ/ occurs clause-initially in narrative discourse, it functions as a conjunction associated with such assertive senses as additive description, adequate interpretation, and others (see Section 3.3.2). In (4A.ii), for example, a clause-initial /kɔ̂ɔ/ is used for the sense of additive description.

(4)	A.i:	. . .	pə̀ət	pratuu	khâw	pay	cəə	maacɔɔrikâa
			open	door	enter	go	meet	Majorica(proper.name)
	maacɔɔrikâa		yaŋ	pen	mɛ̂ɛ mót	yùu	ləəy	
	Majorica		still	COP	witch	CONT	PRTCL	

"(Doremi = a character of the movie) goes in through the door and meets Majorica. Majorica still remains a witch."

	B:	maacɔɔrikâa	ʔɔ̆ɔ	pen	mɛ̂ɛ mót
		Majorica	PRTCL	COP	witch
		tɔɔn lǎŋ		pen	lûuk ʔɔ̀ɔt
		afterwards		become	tadpole

"Majorica, oh, (she) is a witch. Afterwards (she will) become a tadpole."

---

[6] This view, with which I agree, differs from Tsunoda's (2018) claim that /kɔ̂ɔ/ is a subordinator.

[7] All the three clauses in (3) do not have an overt subject noun phrase in front of the predicate or the predicate-initial /kɔ̂ɔ/. The referents of the respective subject noun phrases, however, can be readily retrieved based on the discourse context. It is not uncommon that nominal arguments of verbs are not named in Thai discourse.

A.ii:	yaŋ	pen	mɛ̂ɛ mót	yùu	ləəy
	still	COP	witch	CONT	PRTCL
	kɔ̂ɔ	dooreemii		pay	chíi	nâa . . .
	PRTCL	Doremi(proper.name)		go	point	face

"(She) still remains a witch. Then, Doremi points at (her) face." [clause-initial, additive description, narration]

In conversational discourse, a clause-initial /kɔ̂ɔ/ may appear at the opening of a responsive turn by one of conversational coparticipants. The particle /kɔ̂ɔ/ that occupies the outset position of a responsive turn (for short, "turn-initial /kɔ̂ɔ/") is ordinarily followed by a clause with an overt or covert subject noun phrase. Iwasaki and Ingkaphirom (2005: 175–176) call it a "response marker." According to them, the use of /kɔ̂ɔ/ as the response marker characteristically signals that the response may not completely satisfy the questioner. Further, they claim that /kɔ̂ɔ/ has developed into a hedging device for avoiding a halt of the flow of conversation. Speaker B's utterance with /kɔ̂ɔ/ in (5) illustrates this hedging usage.[8]

(5)	A:	thîi	nay	baa	tham	nâathîi	ʔaray	bâaŋ	háʔ
		at	in	bar	do	duty	what	any	PRTCL

"What are some of (your) duties at the bar?"

	B:	kɔ̂ɔ	pen	wéttrèet
		PRTCL	COP	waitress

"Well, (I) am a waitress." [hedging reply]

To summarize, uses of /kɔ̂ɔ/ can be classified from both a discursive and a syntactic perspective, as shown in Table 8.2.

Table 8.2 Main types of the pragmatic particle /kɔ̂ɔ/

Discursive types	Syntactic types
1. Narrative type or conversational turn-internal type, for example, (1), (2), (3), (4)	1. Predicate-initial type, for example, (1), (3)
	2. Clause-initial type, for example, (2), (4), (5)
2. Conversational turn-initial type, for example, (5)	

The present chapter focuses on the turn-initial type of the clause-initial subtype, for example, (5). To my knowledge, no studies have offered an in-depth analysis of communicative functions of the turn-initial /kɔ̂ɔ/, and only a few studies (Chodchoey 1986; Iwasaki & Ingkaphirom 2005; Noss 1964; Peinukachon 2002) have briefly mentioned such turn-opening usages. Employing a corpus-driven approach, this study explores what illocutionary forces can be set forward by the use of a turn-initial /kɔ̂ɔ/ in talk-in-interaction.

---

[8] Example (5) is from Iwasaki and Ingkaphirom (2005: 176). For convenience's sake, I have changed its phonetic alphabets representing colloquial pronunciation into those denoting orthographic spelling.

3 Corpus-based analyses

The corpus data of this study comes from the recording and transcription of a 32-minute dialogue between a female and a male college student in Bangkok. It is one of the 11 conversations which comprise the TUFS Spoken Thai Corpus (see footnote 1). The two college students engaged in a casual conversation; they largely talked about their favorite things, such as movies and foods. In total, 128 tokens of /kɔ̂ɔ/ were found in the data. Out of 128, 13 tokens (about 10%) are of the turn-initial type, and 115 tokens (about 90%) are of the turn-internal type. Although the number of instances of the turn-initial /kɔ̂ɔ/ was only 13, several different illocutionary-force types pertaining to its use could be identified.

3.1 Attested usage types of turn-initial /kɔ̂ɔ/

The working definition of "turn-initial /kɔ̂ɔ/" in this study is as follows. If a token of /kɔ̂ɔ/ (or idiomatic coalescent unit containing /kɔ̂ɔ/)[9] appears at the start of a turn that immediately follows the previous turn (or if it follows an interjectional particle that immediately follows the previous turn)[10] and the two serial turns represent two distinct speech acts, then the token is categorized as a turn-initial /kɔ̂ɔ/. Put differently, the two speakers involved in the dialogue must carry out different, though closely related, speech acts in the respective turns.

Table 8.3 shows different usage types of the turn-initial /kɔ̂ɔ/ that I found in the corpus data.

Table 8.3 Usage types of the turn-initial /kɔ̂ɔ/

1. Primary event-participant(s)	1.1. Sharing, for example, (6)	
	1.2. Non-sharing, for example, (7)	
2. Illocutionary forces	2.1. Response	2.1.1. Reply, for example, (6), (7)
		2.1.2. Skew reply, for example, (8)
	2.2. Association	2.2.1. Concurring, for example, (9)
		2.2.2. Contesting, for example, (10)

In terms of the "primary event-participant(s)" in propositional contents, the attested turns linked with a turn-initial /kɔ̂ɔ/ can be classified into two types: (a) the type with the sharing of the primary event-participant(s) among the two propositional contents, and (b) the type without the sharing (for short, "sharing" and "non-sharing" types).

In the sharing type, the two propositional contents of the two speakers' turns before and after /kɔ̂ɔ/ share the primary event-participant(s). In (6), for instance, the place called "SCB" is the topic and the primary event-participant in both the two turns' propositional contents. In contrast, the two propositional contents of the non-sharing type do not share the primary event-participant(s), as shown in (7). The primary event-participant of (7A) is the movie that the two speakers are talking about, while that of (7B) is the characters of the movie.

---

[9] For details see footnote 11.
[10] Interjectional particles (e.g., /ʔɔ̌ɔ/ "oh") may occur before the turn-initial /kɔ̂ɔ/, cf. example (15).

(6) A: thîi ʔés sii bii nîi rabəət rɯ̌ɯ plàaw
         at SCB(proper.name) PRTCL explode PRTCL
         rɯ̌ɯ rabəət dâan
         or explode fail.to.explode
         "At the SCB, did an explosion occur? Or, (it) failed to explode?"

     B: kɔ̂ɔ rabəət yùu náʔ hěn phâap ʔàʔ
         PRTCL explode CONT PRTCL see picture PRTCL
         "Well (I will tell you), (at the SCB) an explosion has occurred. (I) saw a picture (of the SCB)."
         [sharing]

(7) A: man pen rɯ̂aŋ kìaw kàp ʔaray
         PRON COP story link with what
         "What kind of story is it (= the movie)?"

     B: kɔ̂ɔ kháw khɛ̀ŋ rót kan
         PRTCL PRON race car RECP
         "Well (I will tell you), they (= the characters in the movie) did a car race." [non-sharing]

With the same primary event-participant(s), the two propositional contents of the two turns before and after /kɔ̂ɔ/ of the sharing type (6) are more directly linked with each other, compared to those of the non-sharing type (7). The point to observe is that the use of a turn-initial /kɔ̂ɔ/ does not depend on whether the primary event-participants in the two propositional contents are the same or not. The use of it signals that more talk is forthcoming, which is suggestive of the turn-taker's collaborative stance in conversational interaction. On this basis, I consider the turn-initial /kɔ̂ɔ/ as an indicator of reactive assertion (response or association) (see following).

In terms of speech acts by interlocutors, the illocutionary-force types of a pair of turns connected by a turn-initial /kɔ̂ɔ/ can be categorized into two combinational types: (a) the type of one's response to the other's question, and (b) the type of one's association with the other's assertion (for short, "response" and "association" types). Each type, in turn, subsumes two contrastive types. The response type encompasses (a) the "reply" type, which directly answers the conversational coparticipant's question, and (b) the "skew reply" type, which does not directly answer the question. The association type comprises (a) the "concurring" type, with a harmonious coordination of the two turns, and (b) the "contesting" type, with a disharmonious apposition of the two.

Examples of the response type include (6) to (8). Speaker B of the reply type (6) and (7) gives a proper answer to Speaker A's question, while Speaker B of the skew reply type (8) evades doing so. In (8), Speaker B does not give an answer to the question about movie stories but just says that she barely has seen Thai movies.

(8) A: lɛ́ɛw mii rɯ̂aŋ nǎy ʔìik ʔàʔ
         then exist story which else PRTCL
         "Then, what else (= an another movie story) do (you) have?"

     B: kɔ̂ɔ nǎŋ thay mây khɔ̌y dây duu náʔ
         PRTCL movie Thai NEG rather REA watch PRTCL

"Well (I will tell you), regarding Thai movies, (I) hardly saw (them)." [skew reply]

(9) and (10) are two contrastive examples of the association type: concurring and contesting types, respectively. The latter turn by Speaker B of the concurring type (9) ("you must try to go to Japan for eating Japanese food there just one time") is a comment in favor of, or a hortative suggestion in support of, Speaker A's desire to eat Japanese food in Japan. By contrast, the latter turn by Speaker B of the contesting type (10) ("I still want to eat Japanese food") offers an opinion opposed to Speaker A's explanation that there are also choices to eat Western food in Japan.

(9) A: . . . kɔ̂ɔ dii ʔàʔ
     PRTCL be.good PRTCL
     "(To eat Japanese food in Japan) is good."

  B: kɔ̂ɔ tôŋ lɔɔŋ pay sák khráŋ nɯŋ duu
     PRTCL must try go just time one look
     "Well (if you think so), (you) must try (to go to Japan for eating Japanese food there) just one time." [concurring]

(10) A: mii hɛɛmbəəkoŋ hɛɛmbəəkəə sataabák yaŋ mii yùu
      exist hamburgers.and.the.like Starbucks also exist CONT
      tɛ̀ɛ yùu thîi tookiaw náʔ
      but be.located at Tokyo PRTCL
      "There are hamburgers and the like. There are also Starbucks coffee shops, but (they) are located in Tokyo."

  B: kɔ̂ɔ yàak thaan yùu
     PRTCL want eat CONT
     "Well (though you suggest so), (I) still want to eat (Japanese food)." [contesting, explanation]

(11) provides an additional example of the contesting type. Speaker B's turn in (11) starts with the compound (idiomatic coalescent unit) /tɛ̀ɛ kɔ̂ɔ/ "even so," which is composed of the concessive linkage morpheme /tɛ̀ɛ/ "but" and /kɔ̂ɔ/.[11] With this explicit concessive marker, the turn is readily interpreted to express an evaluation contrary to the expected evaluation for the movie story being described.

(11) A: com nám taay mây chây . . .
      sink water die NEG
      "(They = the characters in the movie) were drowned, but not . . ."

  B: tɛ̀ɛ kɔ̂ɔ sanùk dii

---

[11] In the corpus data, there are a number of idiomatic coalescent units containing /kɔ̂ɔ/ which have a conjunctive function (e.g., /tɛ̀ɛ kɔ̂ɔ/ "even so," /lɛ́ɛw kɔ̂ɔ/ "in addition," /kɔ̂ɔ bɛ̀ɛp/ "in a manner of speaking," /kɔ̂ɔ ləəy/ "so," /kɔ̂ɔ khɯɯ/ "that is"; see Section 3.3.2). Though they have a more specific meaning than /kɔ̂ɔ/, in this study I consider those as variants of /kɔ̂ɔ/ on the grounds that they entail /kɔ̂ɔ/'s essential, procedural function (i.e., to manage sequences of talk).

but   PRTCL   be.fun   be.good

"But (even so) (it) is fun." [contesting, concessive description]

It is noteworthy that all the attested usage types of the turn-initial /kɔ̂ɔ/ show affinities across a dialogically juxtaposed pairing of utterances before and after /kɔ̂ɔ/. Put another way, the two utterances of either type hold a more or less cohesive relation, irrespective of whether or not the turn-taker straightforwardly replies to the interlocutor's question, whether or not the turn-taker's associative utterance gets into line with the interlocutor's expectations, and whatever emotion the turn-taker bears in mind while taking the turn. By means of /kɔ̂ɔ/, the turn-taker indicates his/her intention of reacting to the interlocutor in a positive and cordial manner and also of cooperating with the interlocutor to sustain the conversation. Moreover, all the usage types make a reactive assertion with a modal flavor, such as emphatic description, conclusive judgment, concessive evaluation, and the like. This implication of subjective meanings is similarly involved in the text-procedural usage of the predicate-initial /kɔ̂ɔ/, as mentioned in Section 1.

Table 8.4 summarizes all attested usage types of the turn-initial /kɔ̂ɔ/ with the number of tokens of each type. To recapitulate, a couple of turns before and after /kɔ̂ɔ/ may or may not share the primary event-participant(s). With the sharing of the primary event-participant(s), the two propositional contents of the prior and posterior turns are more directly linked with each other (sharing type); without it, the two are less directly linked (non-sharing type). The two turns each exhibit a distinct speech act. There are two combinational speech-act types. One is the combination of a question and its response (response type); the other is the combination of an assertion and its association (association type). These principal illocutionary-force types are further categorized into two antithetical types. The response type is either conducive (reply type) or deviatory (skew reply type). The association type is either conjunctive (concurring type) or disjunctive (contesting type).

Table 8.4 Usage frequencies of each type of the turn-initial /kɔ̂ɔ/

Primary event-participant(s) Illocutionary forces		Sharing [2 tokens]	Non-sharing [11 tokens]
Response [7 tokens]	Reply	[2 tokens], for example, (6)	[4 tokens], for example, (7)
	Skew reply		[1 token], for example, (8)
Association [6 tokens]	Concurring		[4 tokens], for example, (9)
	Contesting		[2 tokens], for example, (10)

The number of tokens is put in brackets. Because the overall number of turn-initial instances is only 13, the number of each subtype is very small, ranging from 4 to 1. The most frequent were the type of "non-sharing and reply" [4 tokens] and the type of "non-sharing and concurring" [4 tokens]; the second most were the type of "sharing and reply" [2 tokens] and the type of "non-sharing and contesting" [2 tokens]; the third most was the type of "non-sharing and skew-reply" [1 token]; and there were no instances of the types of "sharing and skew-reply" and "sharing and association (neither concurring nor contesting)" in the corpus. I admit that the amount of data is a limitation of this study. There might be missing types that are actually in use but not attested due to the limitation of the data. Nevertheless, I believe that the differences in the number of the attested subtypes tell us something about Thai

speakers' disposition in the usage of the turn-initial /kɔ̂ɔ/.

The figures in Table 8.4, though small in number, may allow for the following interpretations. First, regarding the types of sharing and non-sharing of the primary event-participant(s), instances of the non-sharing type [11 tokens] outnumber those of the sharing type [2 tokens]. From this, we can see that, often, a turn-taker beginning with /kɔ̂ɔ/ introduces his/her novel perspective involving different primary event-participant(s) into the conversation, that is, the turn-taker does not simply take the same angle as the dialogic partner's previous turn, but he/she tends to say something viewed from a different vantage point.

Second, when comparing the two main illocutionary-force types, the number of instances of the response type [7 tokens] does not very much differ from that of the association type [6 tokens]. This means that /kɔ̂ɔ/ is used for the marking of response (reaction to a question) and of association (reaction to an assertion) rather impartially. In this regard, the nomenclature "response marker" seems inadequate, since it refers to only one side of principal speech acts put forward by the turn-initial /kɔ̂ɔ/. Rather, we may call the turn-initial /kɔ̂ɔ/ more generally a "reaction marker" instead.

Third, as for the response type, instances of the reply type [6 tokens] outnumber those of the skew-reply type [1 token]. The skew-reply type gives an explanation rather than an answer. The explanation is motivated by what is said in the previous turn. Only one token of the skew-reply type is found in the corpus data. It follows that in a responsive turn, /kɔ̂ɔ/ is likely to be associated with a collaborative response (response proper), which allows development of a good rapport with the dialogic partner and helps the dialogue proceed in concord.

Fourth, with respect to the association type, the number of instances of the concurring type [4 tokens] is larger than that of the contesting type [2 tokens]. The concurring type marks a harmonious association, which meets the dialogic partner's suggestions, desires, reasoning, inferences, expectations, purposes, or the like. The contesting type may allow the turn-taker to make a clear, concessive description or rather to explanatorily present an opinion opposed to the partner's. Anyhow, the corpus data show that a turn-initial /kɔ̂ɔ/ used in an associative turn tends to be of the concurring type.

The important point to note is that the turn-initial /kɔ̂ɔ/ may be employed not only as the marker of consonant reaction (reply and concurring types) but also of dissonant reaction (skew-reply and contesting types). Whether the reaction is consonant or dissonant with the previous turn, the turn-taker's act of reaction to the dialogic partner, in itself, reflects his/her wish to continue the dialogue with the partner.

3.2 Frequent usage types

Table 8.4 earlier shows that 13 tokens of the turn-initial /kɔ̂ɔ/ can be classified into the following four speech-act types: (i-a) reply, (i-b) skew reply, (ii-a) concurring, and (ii-b) contesting types. The reply type has six tokens, which is the most among the four, and the concurring type has four tokens, which is the second most. This section discusses exactly what illocutionary forces these two frequent types are compatible with. Section 3.2.1 explicates particular speech acts of the reply type, and Section 3.2.2 those of the concurring type.

3.2.1 Reply types

The reply type constitutes two subcategories: (a) straight reply (i.e., reply proper) and (b) hedging reply. The corpus

data contains four tokens of the former type, for example, (6), (7), and (12), and two tokens of the latter type, for example, (13).

(12)	A:	lɛ́ɛw	mii	ʔaray	ʔìik	ʔàʔ
		then	exist	what	else	PRTCL
		"Then, what else is there?"				
	B:	kɔ̂ɔ	mây	rúu	ʔàʔ	
		PRTCL	NEG	know	PRTCL	
		"Well (though you ask so), (I) don't know." [straight reply]				
(13)	A:	lɛ́ɛw	yùu	yîipùn	dây	ŋay
		then	stay	Japan	POS	PRTCL
		"Then, how can (you) stay in Japan?"				
	B:	kɔ̂ɔ	hěn	wâa	yùu	yâak
		PRTCL	see	COMP	stay	be.difficult
		"Well (as you may think), (I) think that it is difficult (for me) to stay (in Japan)." [hedging reply]				

Straight and hedging replies both willingly provide the conversational coparticipant with relevant information according to the coparticipant's request for a response, despite the fact that sometimes the degree of relevance of the information given by a hedging reply is low. Compare (12) and (13). In the straight-reply usage (12), Speaker B gives quite a straight answer ("I don't know") to Speaker A's question ("What else is there?"). Even though the content of Speaker B's reply is negative, this negative reply is no less relevant to the question than an affirmative one. In the hedging-reply usage (13), on the other hand, the content of Speaker B's reply ("It is difficult for me to stay in Japan") does not have a direct connection with Speaker A's question ("How can you stay in Japan?"), though it is not irrelevant to the question at all.[12]

3.2.2 Concurring types

All four tokens of the concurring usage similarly make a reactive assertion, but they differ in their detailed illocutionary forces. The following two subtypes of the concurring usage are conceivable from the corpus data: (a) the description of phenomenal consequence, for example, (14), and (b) the description of logical outcome, for example, (15) and (16). Let us consider each of examples (14) to (16).

(14)	A:	man	phə̂əm	khûn	rûay rûay
		PRON	increase	INC	continually
		"It (= the reported intensity-value of the earthquake in the Chiangmai district) increased continually."			
	B:	kɔ̂ɔ	ləəy	ŋoŋ	

---

[12] If (13A) is uttered sarcastically as an assertive expression ("It is impossible for you to stay in Japan"), the turn-initial /kɔ̂ɔ/ in (13B) should be regarded as the concurring type (see Section 3.2.2).

	PRTCL	therefore	be.puzzled

"Well (that being the case), therefore (we) were puzzled." [description of phenomenal consequence]

Example (14) exemplifies the first type: the description of phenomenal consequence. Speaker A speaks of a strange thing about the recent large-scale earthquake in the Chiangmai district ("The reported intensity-value of the earthquake increased continually"). Quickly taking a turn, Speaker B describes the situation at that time, that the strange information about the intensity-value made people, including her, feel puzzled. Evidently, the content of Speaker B's turn is in accord with that of Speaker A's turn, and furthermore, the two contents have a cause-and-effect relationship. That is, a series of reports on the varying intensity-value of the earthquake (the cause) led to the resultant confusion among people (the effect).

(15)	A:	dây	rɔ́ɔy hâa sìp		têm			
		obtain	150		score			

"(If they can catch the Golden Snitch, they will) get 150 points."

	B:	ʔɔ̌ɔ	kɔ̂ɔ	khɯɯ	chanáʔ	ŋíi	rǝ̂ǝ
		PRTCL	PRTCL	namely	win	like.this	PRTCL

"Oh, well (that being the case), that is, (they) won like this, yes?" [description of logical outcome]

Example (15) illustrates the second type of the concurring usage: the description of logical outcome. On the basis of Speaker A's explanation about the rules of the game Quidditch, as played by the characters in the Harry Potter movies ("If they can catch the Golden Snitch, they will get 150 points"), Speaker B reflects a logic implied by Speaker A's explanation and eventually understands that the characters won the game because they could catch the Golden Snitch and so got 150 points. The contents of the two conversational coparticipants' utterances of (15), like those of (14), have a causal relation. However, the causal relation involved in (14) and that in (15) differ in the level of abstraction. The causal relation of (14) exists in the physical space, that is, the cause-situation brings about the consequence-situation. It is a phenomenological, truth-conditional relation, whose level of abstraction is relatively low. In contrast, the causal relation of (15) is highly abstract since it involves a logic, viz. the reason accounts for the result. It requires mental calculations, inferences, suppositions, etc. on the part of the speaker. In (15), Speaker B is told of the game's rule that one should get 150 points when catching the Golden Snitch, from which he draws an inference to explain why the persons in question won the game.

(16)	A:	. . .	kɔ̂ɔ	dii	ʔàʔ			
			PRTCL	be.good	PRTCL			

"(To eat Japanese food in Japan) is good."

	B:	kɔ̂ɔ	tôŋ	lɔɔŋ	pay	sák	khráŋ	nɯŋ	duu
		PRTCL	must	try	go	just	time	one	look

"Well (if you think so), (you) must try to go (to Japan for eating Japanese food there) just one

time." [description of logical outcome and hortative suggestion at the same time]

Example (16)=(9), too, is of the second type: the description of logical outcome. However, it can be considered a hybrid between an assertive and a directive speech act, for it makes a resultative description and a hortative suggestion at the same time. Going along with Speaker A's opinion that it is good to eat Japanese food in Japan, Speaker B claims that if she thinks so, she must try doing so. This claim is concurrently an advice for her to try doing so.

The hybrid type comprises a speaker-oriented assertive (description of logical outcome) and an interlocutor-oriented directive (hortative suggestion). On the other hand, the original speech-act type of /kɔ̂ɔ/ as a sequential indicator is of the discourse-oriented assertive type: the description of phenomenal consequence. This speech act inherently has nothing to do with genuinely interlocutor-oriented directives, such as suggestion and advice. It is likely that /kɔ̂ɔ/'s speech-act types have expanded in a step-by-step manner, as in the following. /kɔ̂ɔ/ first gained an additional assertive sense associated with the speaker-oriented, cognitive domain (description of logical outcome), and then it further enlarged the range of speech acts into the interlocutor-oriented, social domain (hortative suggestion) (cf. Table 8.1 in Section 1). To better comprehend this step-by-step expansion process of speech-act types bearing on uses of /kɔ̂ɔ/, it is necessary to distinguish the extended type (description of logical outcome, for example, (15)) from the original type (description of phenomenal consequence, for example, (14)).

Table 8.5 Subtypes of "reaction" speech act pertinent to uses of the turn-initial /kɔ̂ɔ/

i. Response to question	i-a. Reply i-a.1. Straight reply (or reply proper), for example, (6), (7) and (12) i-a.2. Hedging reply, for example, (13) i-b. Skew reply (Explanation), for example, (8)
ii. Association with assertion	ii-a. Concurring ii-a.1. Description of phenomenal consequence, for example, (14) ii-a.2. Description of logical outcome, for example, (15) ii-a.3. Description of logical outcome and Hortative suggestion, for example, (9)=(16) ii-b. Contesting ii-b.1. Contesting explanation, for example, (10) ii-b.2. Concessive description, for example, (11)

To sum up, the results of the corpus-based research reveal that turn-initial uses of the reaction marker /kɔ̂ɔ/ are associated with two main illocutionary-force categories: (i) response to question and (ii) association with assertion. Further, they embrace at least eight subcategories as listed in Table 8.5: (i-a.1) straight reply, (i-a.2) hedging reply, (i-b) skew reply (explanation), (ii-a.1) description of phenomenal consequence, (ii-a.2) description of logical outcome, (ii-a.3) description of logical outcome and hortative suggestion at the same time, (ii-b.1) contesting explanation, and (ii-b.2) concessive description.

3.3 Less-frequent-usage types

As discussed in the preceding subsections, the turn-initial /kɔ̂ɔ/ of the clause-initial subtype mainly functions as a reaction marker. It marks the turn it accompanies as a certain reaction to the immediately preceding turn that expresses a question or assertion. The reaction may or may not match up to the questioner's expectations, and it may or may not support the conversational coparticipant's views.

The turn-internal /kɔ̂ɔ/ of the predicate-initial subtype functions in the text-procedural domain as a highlighting marker, as mentioned in Section 2. It makes the proposition it accompanies stand out, thereby marking the proposition as the foreground consequence-situation in contrast with the background cause-situation described by the immediately preceding propositional unit. In other words, it retrospectively connects the proposition to the preceding propositional unit, creating an implicit causal relation between them.

Apart from these typical uses ("reaction" and "highlighting"), /kɔ̂ɔ/ has other less-frequent uses. In the following, the use for bringing about "collaborative completion" in conversations (the turn-initial type of the predicate-initial subtype) is explained in Section 3.3.1, and "conjunction" uses in narrations (the turn-internal type of the clause-initial subtype) are introduced in Section 3.3.2.

3.3.1 Collaborative completion

The turn-initial /kɔ̂ɔ/ has two subtypes in terms of its syntactic position: (a) predicate-initial type and (b) clause-initial type (Table 8.6). This section explicates the nature of the former predicate-initial type.

Table 8.6 Syntactic subtypes of the turn-initial /kɔ̂ɔ/

1. Predicate-initial type: Collaborate completion, for example, (18)
2. Clause-initial type: Reaction, for example, (6) to (16)

A typical text-procedural use of the predicate-initial /kɔ̂ɔ/ is exemplified in (3) earlier. Similarly, the constructed example (17) in the following is a narration by a single speaker, and its second clause includes a predicate-initial /kɔ̂ɔ/, which highlights the content of the predicate preceded by /kɔ̂ɔ/ (/lîan/ "be oily").

(17)　tɛ̀ɛ　　thâa　　thaan　　thoŋkhátsɯ̀ʔ　　thúk　　wan　　man　　kɔ̂ɔ　　lîan
　　　 but　　 if　　　 eat　　　breaded.pork　　 every　　day　　PRON　　PRTCL　　be.oily
　　　 "But if (we) eat breaded pork everyday, then it is oily." [predicate-initial, narration]

(18)　A:　　tɛ̀ɛ　　thâa　　thaan　　thoŋkhátsɯ̀ʔ　　thúk　　wan　　kɔ̂ɔ
　　　　　　 but　　 if　　 eat　　 breaded.pork　　 every　　day　　PRTCL
　　　　　　 "But if (we) eat breaded pork everyday, then . . ."
　　　 B:　　kɔ̂ɔ　　lîan
　　　　　　 PRTCL　　be.oily
　　　　　　 "Well (if so), (it) is oily." [turn-initial, conversation]

By contrast, example (18) illustrates an interpersonal use of the turn-initial /kɔ̂ɔ/ in a dialogue. Speaker B's turn contains a turn-initial /kɔ̂ɔ/, and so it is easily interpreted as a reactive assertion. Speaker B kindly finishes Speaker A's ongoing turn, assuming that she should wind up her turn as such or that she might want to refrain from saying a negative thing. It looks as if the two speakers jointly produce a single utterance. Speaker B does not intend to interrupt Speaker A's turn. Rather, he contributes to the completion of her turn. The pairing of the two turns linked by /kɔ̂ɔ/ in (18) forms a "compound turn-constructional unit" (Lerner 1991: 441), that is, a single turn-constructional unit that is produced across the talk of two speakers. Wilkinson and Kitzinger (2011: 31–34) call this kind of phenomenon observed in conversational interaction a "collaborative completion."

What is common between the clause-initial use (14) and the predicate-initial use (18) is that Speaker B takes into consideration Speaker A's previous turn. Hence, they are both interpersonal. But the intention of Speaker B is divergent between the two, namely, he will make a description of phenomenal consequence, as in (14), or he will construct a collaborative utterance together with the dialogic partner, as in (18).

3.3.2 Conjunction types

Like the turn-initial /kɔ̂ɔ/, the turn-internal /kɔ̂ɔ/ has two subtypes: (a) predicate-initial type and (b) clause-initial type (Table 8.7). This section accounts for diverse assertive speech acts pertaining to uses of the latter clause-initial subtype.

Table 8.7 Syntactic subtypes of the turn-internal /kɔ̂ɔ/

1. Predicate-initial type: Highlighting, for example, (1), (3), (17)
2. Clause-initial type: Conjunction, including (i) description of phenomenal consequence, for example, (19); (ii) additive description, for example, (2), (4), (20); (iii) description of logical outcome, for example, (21); (iv) adequate interpretation, for example, (22), (23)

The corpus data reveal that among utterances with the clause-initial /kɔ̂ɔ/, those of the turn-internal type (e.g., (2), (4), (19) to (23)) [11 tokens] are as frequent as those of the turn-initial type (e.g., (6) to (16)) [12 tokens]. Whereas turn-initial uses of the clause-initial /kɔ̂ɔ/ are interpersonal, turn-internal uses are text-procedural. To be specific, the latter turn-internal type functions as a conjunction or conjunctive adverb (clause linker) in narrative discourse, as elaborated in what follows.

The clause-linker uses of /kɔ̂ɔ/ are related to such procedural meanings as "the description of phenomenal consequence (or temporal sequence)" (19), "additive description" (20), "the description of logical outcome" (21), and "adequate interpretation" (22) and (23).

(19) mɛ̂ɛ   bɔ̀ɔk   wâa   khít   sáʔ   wâa   yùu   yîipùn   lɛ́ɛw kan lûuk
      mother   tell   COMP   think   PRTCL   COMP   stay   Japan   PRTCL   child
      kɔ̂ɔ   lǝǝy   phim   pay   bɔ̀ɔk   phɯ̂an   wâa . . .
      PRTCL   therefore Pim(proper.name)   go   tell   friend   COMP
      "(My) mother said, 'Think of staying in Japan, my dear daughter.' So, Pim (= I) told (my) friend that […]."

[turn-internal and clause-initial, description of phenomenal consequence]

In (19) (description of phenomenal consequence), the narrator uses /kɔ̂ɔ ləəy/ "so," which consists of /kɔ̂ɔ/ and the linkage morpheme /ləəy/ "therefore," to describe a resultant action originating from the event described previously.

(20) | mây | mii | taŋ | càay | kháw |
      |-----|-----|-----|------|------|
      | NEG | exist | money | pay | PRON |

man tôŋ ʔaw lûuk kɛ̂ɛw wêetmon pay lɛ̂ɛk
PRON must take glass.marble magic go exchange

lɛ́ɛw kɔ̂ɔ phɔɔ câw khɔ̌ɔŋ ráan hěn . . .
then PRTCL as.soon.as owner shop see

"(She = a character in the movie) does not have money to pay them (= the shop owner). She must take the magic marble to make an exchange (with it). In addition, as soon as the shop owner saw (it). …" [turn-internal and clause-initial, additive description]

In (20) (additive description), the narrator describes an additional story by using /lɛ́ɛw kɔ̂ɔ/ "in addition," in which the linkage morpheme /lɛ́ɛw/ "then" is combined with /kɔ̂ɔ/.

(21) mii phûu lên cèt khon sɔ̌ɔŋ fàay fàay láʔ cèt khon
      exist player seven CLF two CLF CLF per seven CLF

khɛ̀ŋ kan tôŋ càp kɔ̂ɔ khɯɯ síkkəə khɔ̌ɔŋ tɛ̀ɛ láʔ
compete RECP must catch PRTCL namely Seeker of each

thiim tôŋ càp koondên sanít hây dây
team must catch Golden.Snitch without.fail

"There are seven players in both the two teams. Each team has seven players. (They) compete with each other. (They) must catch (the Golden Snitch). That is, each team's Seeker must catch the Golden Snitch without fail." [turn-internal and clause-initial, description of logical outcome]

In (21) (description of logical outcome), the narrator uses /kɔ̂ɔ khɯɯ/ "that is," which is composed of /kɔ̂ɔ/ and the linkage morpheme /khɯɯ/ "namely," to summarize what she has said so far, in order for the interlocutor to comprehend it.

(22) thîi tɔɔn rɛ̂ɛk hɛɛrîi man yùu bâan chây máy
      at.first Harry PRON stay house PRTCL

kɔ̂ɔ thúk pii man càʔ tôŋ klàp maa thîi bâan
PRTCL every year PRON IRR must return come at house

"At first, regarding Harry, he stayed at home, right? (It was so because) every year he must come back

home." [turn-internal and clause-initial, adequate interpretation]

(23)	lɛ́ɛw	thîi nîi	kɔ̂ɔ	bɛ̀ɛp	luŋ	man	mây	yàak	hây	klàp	thîi
	then	now	PRTCL	just.like	uncle	PRON	NEG	want	COMP	return	at

rooŋ rian

school

"Then, now, in a manner of speaking, regarding the uncle, he does not want (him = Harry) to go back to the school." [turn-internal and clause-initial, adequate interpretation]

In (22) and (23) (adequate interpretation), the narrator tries to interpret the information she wants to convey to the interlocutor as adequately as possible, in order to make herself fully understood. /kɔ̂ɔ bɛ̀ɛp/ "in a manner of speaking" in (23) comprises /kɔ̂ɔ/ and the linkage morpheme /bɛ̀ɛp/ "just like."

3.4 The system of different uses of /kɔ̂ɔ/

Table 8.8 shows a two-dimensional classification of speech acts pertaining to uses of /kɔ̂ɔ/ attested in the corpus data. All the speech-act types listed come under the major category of "assertion."[13]

Table 8.8 All the attested speech-act types pertaining to uses of /kɔ̂ɔ/

Functional domain / Syntactic position	Text-procedural uses: Narrative type or conversational turn-internal type	Interpersonal uses: Conversational turn-initial type
Predicate-initial type	Highlighting	Collaborative completion
Clause-initial type	Conjunction i. Description of phenomenal consequence ii. Additive description iii. Description of logical outcome iv. Adequate interpretation	Reaction i. Response i-a. Reply i-a.1. Straight reply i-a.2. Hedging reply i-b. Skew reply (explanation) ii. Association ii-a. Concurring ii-a.1. Description of phenomenal consequence ii-a.2. Description of logical outcome ii-a.3. Description of logical outcome and Hortative suggestion ii-b. Contesting ii-b.1. Contesting explanation ii-b.2. Concessive description

---

[13] Admittedly, we have to examine a much larger number of instances of /kɔ̂ɔ/ to see whether there are other speech-act types.

From Table 8.8 we can see that the functional domain of a use of /kɔ̂ɔ/ (text-procedural or interpersonal)[14] is not determined solely by its syntactic position (predicate- or clause-initial). The syntactic position is indeed an indexical factor, but not the absolute factor determining the functional domain that each use of /kɔ̂ɔ/ applies to. The distinction between interpersonal uses, on the one hand, and text-procedural uses, on the other hand, depends exclusively on whether or not they are interlocutor-oriented. With the speaker's intention to react to his/her interlocutor, the use of /kɔ̂ɔ/ will be interpersonal regardless of whether its syntactic position is predicate-initial or clause-initial.

The predicate-initial /kɔ̂ɔ/ mostly occurs turn-internally and functions in the text-procedural domain as a highlighting marker. When appearing turn-initially, it functions in the interpersonal domain and executes the act of collaborative completion. In a similar vein, when the clause-initial /kɔ̂ɔ/ occurs turn-internally, it functions in the text-procedural domain as a kind of conjunction; when it occurs turn-initially, it functions in the interpersonal domain as a reaction marker. The category of reaction speech acts encompasses a number of subcategories.

I would like to clarify the differences between the description of phenomenal consequence and that of logical outcome in the left column of Table 8.8 (the turn-internal type of the clause-initial subtype, for example, (24)=(19) and (26)=(21)) and those in the right column (the turn-initial type of the clause-initial subtype, for example, (25)=(14) and (27)=(15)). The former are discourse-oriented, text-procedural senses (viz. conjunction), while the latter are interlocutor-oriented, interpersonal senses (viz. reaction).

(24) mɛ̂ɛ   bɔɔk   wâa   khít   sáʔ   wâa   yùu   yîipùn   lɛ́ɛw kan lûuk
      mother tell   COMP   think   PRTCL COMP   stay   Japan   PRTCL   child
      kɔ̂ɔ   ləəy   phim   pay   bɔɔk   phŵan wâa . . .
      PRTCL   therefore Pim(proper.name) go   tell   friend COMP
      "(My) mother said, 'Think of staying in Japan, my dear daughter.' So, Pim (= I) told (my) friend that."
      [turn-internal and clause-initial, description of phenomenal consequence, narration]

(25) A: man   phə̂əm   khŵn   rŵay rŵay
            PRON   increase INC   continually
            "It (= the reported intensity-value of the earthquake in the Chiangmai district) increased continually."
      B: kɔ̂ɔ   ləəy   ŋoŋ
            PRTCL   therefore be.puzzled
            "Well (that being the case), therefore (we) were puzzled." [turn-initial and clause-initial, description of phenomenal consequence, reaction]

In both (24) and (25), /kɔ̂ɔ ləəy/ "therefore" is used for the sense of the description of phenomenal consequence. However, the two descriptions differ in the description of the cause event. The narrator of (24) describes

---

[14] One way or the other, all uses of /kɔ̂ɔ/ are cognitive and logical, and therefore, "cognitive-logical uses" are not particularly referred to in Table 8.8.

the cause event by herself, whereas Speaker B of (25) makes use of Speaker A's utterance and takes it as the description of the cause event. Put differently, the consequence-description led by /kɔ̂ɔ ləəy/ in (24) derives from the speaker's own cause-description before /kɔ̂ɔ ləəy/; that in (25) derives from the interlocutor's previous cause-description.

(26)	mii	phûu lên	cèt	khon	sɔ̌ɔŋ	fàay	fàay	láʔ	cèt	khon
	exist	player	seven	CLF	two	CLF	CLF	per	seven	CLF
	khɛ̀ŋ	kan	tôŋ	càp	kɔ̂ɔ	khɯɯ	síkkəə	khɔ̌ɔŋ	tɛ̀ɛ láʔ	
	compete	RECP	must	catch	PRTCL	namely	Seeker	of	each	
	thiim	tôŋ	càp	koondên sanít	hây dây					
	team	must	catch	Golden.Snitch	without.fail					

"There are seven players in both the two teams. Each team has seven players. (They) compete with each other. (They) must catch (the Golden Snitch). That is, each team's Seeker must catch the Golden Snitch without fail." [turn-internal and clause-initial, description of logical outcome, narration]

(27)	A:	dây	rɔ́ɔy hâa sìp	tɛ̂m
		obtain	150	score

"(If they can catch the Golden Snitch, they will) get 150 points."

	B:	ʔɔ̌ɔ	kɔ̂ɔ	khɯɯ	chanáʔ	ŋíi	rəə̀
		PRTCL	PRTCL	namely	win	like.this	PRTCL

"Oh, well (that being the case), that is, (they) won like this, yes?" [turn-initial and clause-initial, description of logical outcome, reaction]

Likewise, /kɔ̂ɔ khɯɯ/ "that is" in (26) and (27) is used for the sense of the description of logical outcome or, more precisely, for the sense of summing up. Nonetheless, the two instances differently introduce the presupposition based on which the logical outcome was brought forth. While the narrator of (26) describes the presupposition by herself, Speaker B of (27) takes Speaker A's previous utterance as the presupposition.

In conversations (25) and (27), the speaker B takes the preceding utterance by the interlocutor as the presupposition for his/her utterance. These conversations are intertwined conversations, so to speak. An intertwined conversation is a dynamic mutual product of the two dialogic partners.

4 Conclusion

The findings of the corpus-based research are summarized as follows. The pragmatic particle /kɔ̂ɔ/ appears mostly predicate-initially (105 tokens, about 82% of all the tokens) and functions as a contextual operator with connotations of emphatic assertion in narrative discourse (highlighting marker). Sometimes it occurs clause-initially (23 tokens, about 18%) and helps express a variety of assertive speech acts. What is important is that in either of the two syntactic positions (predicate- or clause-initial position), it may function interpersonally, provided that the speaker uses it turn-initially to take a turn while making use of the interlocutor's previous utterance as an interactively given presupposition. The attested number of turn-initial uses (13 tokens, about 10%) is much less than that of turn-internal

uses (115 tokens, about 90%), though.

      This chapter concentrated on an examination of social interactive uses of /kɔ̂ɔ/. But /kɔ̂ɔ/ is multifunctional; it has other functions besides social ones. Based on the results of the corpus analysis, I consider the system of the multifunctionality of /kɔ̂ɔ/ as follows. The basic function of /kɔ̂ɔ/ is text-procedural (description of phenomenal consequence). Functioning as a sequential indicator, it organizes the flow of discourse. This basic function has extended into the cognitive-logical domain. Cognitive-logical uses of /kɔ̂ɔ/ signify the speaker's construal of causal relation between two propositional contents concatenated. Since /kɔ̂ɔ/ marks the consequence content, its use connotes the speaker's resultative description or conclusive judgment. On the basis of these implicit cognitive-logical meanings, the functions of /kɔ̂ɔ/ have developed into the communicative-interactional domain. In conversational discourse, the speaker may use it as the marking of reaction or hortative suggestion to the interlocutor, considering the interlocutor's prior utterance as the conversational presupposition for his/her posterior utterance.

      Despite the limited number of instances, this case study demonstrated the validity of a corpus-driven approach for understanding the nature of pragmatic particles.

Abbreviations

CLF	classifier	COMP	complementizer
CONT	continuous	COP	copula
INC	inchoative	IRR	irrealis
NEG	negative	pos	possibility
PRON	pronoun	PRTCL	particle
REA	realization	RECP	reciprocal

References

Bhamoraput, Amara. 1972. Final Particles in Thai. Master's thesis, Brown University.

Burusphat, Somsonge. 2008. An etymological speculation on the sequential indicator /kɔ̂ɔ/ in Thai narrative. In Anthony V. N. Diller, Jerry Edmondson & Yong Xian Luo (eds.), The Tai-Kadai Languages, Chapter 15, 431–444. London: Routledge.

Chodchoey, Supa W. 1986. Strategies in Thai Oral Discourse. Ph.D. thesis, Pennsylvania State University.

Cooke, Joseph R. 1989. Thai sentence particles: Forms, meanings and formal-semantic variations. In Papers in South-East Asian Linguistics, No. 12: Thai Sentence Particles and Other Topics (Pacific Linguistics, A-80), 1–90. Canberra: Department of Linguistics, Research School of Pacific Studies, Australian National University.

Iwasaki, Shoichi & Preeya Ingkaphirom. 2005. A Reference Grammar of Thai. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Lerner, Gene H. 1991. On the syntax of sentences-in-progress. Language in Society 20. 441–458.

Noss, Richard B. 1964. Thai Reference Grammar. Washington, DC: Foreign Service Institute.

Peinukachon, Vichai. 2002. Taigo ni okeru setuzokusi /kɔ̂ɔ/ ni tuite no iti kōsatu [A study of the conjunction /kɔ̂ɔ/ in Thai]. Southeast Asian Studies, Tokyo University of Foreign Studies 7. 112–126.

Peyasantiwong, Ratcharin. 1981. A Study of Final Particles in Conversational Thai. Ph.D. thesis, University of

Takahashi, Kiyoko. 2024. Interpersonal uses of the pragmatic particle /kɔ̂ɔ/ in Thai conversation. In Nomoto, Hiroki and Elin McCready (eds.) *Discourse Particles in Asian Languages Volume II: Southeast Asia*, Chapter 8, 191–213. New York: Routledge.

Michigan.

Pittayaporn, Pittayawat & Pirachula Chulanon. 2012. Syntactically naughty?: Prosody of final particles in Thai. In Tadao Miyamoto, Naoyuki Ono, Kingkarn Thepkanjana & Satoshi Uehara (eds.), Typological Studies on Languages in Thailand and Japan, Chapter 1, 13–28. Tokyo: Hituzi Syobo.

Sa-anwong, Wiyada. 1981. Kaan sadɛɛŋ khwaam mǎay khɔ̌ɔŋ kham kɔ̂ɔ nay phaasǎa thay [The Use of the Expression /kɔ̂ɔ/ in the Thai Language]. M.A. thesis, Silpakorn University.

Selkirk, Elizabeth. 1984. Phonology and Syntax: The Relation between Sound and Structure. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Singhabhandhu, Panomporn. 1983. Wíkhrɔ́ʔ kaan cháy kham kɔ̂ɔ nay phaasǎa thay [An Analysis of the Word /kɔ̂ɔ/ in Thai]. M.A. thesis, Chulalongkorn University.

Takahashi, Kiyoko. 2004. Logical resultative construction in Thai. Journal of Kanda University of International Studies 16. 203–224.

Takahashi, Kiyoko. 2016. Taigo no goyōronteki shōji [Pragmatic particles in Thai]. Journal of Kanda University of International Studies 28. 289–309.

Traugott, Elizabeth C. & Richard B. Dasher. 2002. Regularity in Semantic Change. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Tsunoda, Tasaku. 2018. Five levels in Thai. In Tasaku Tsunoda (ed.), Levels in Clause Linkage: A Crosslinguistic Survey, 615–675. Berlin & Boston: De Gruyter Mouton.

Wilkinson, Sue & Celia Kitzinger. 2011. Conversation analysis. In Ken Hyland & Brian Paltridge (eds.), The Continuum Companion to Discourse Analysis, Chapter 2, 22–37. London & New York: Continuum International.

Corpus data

The TUFS Corpus of Spoken Thai, which belongs to the TUFS Multilingual Oral Discourse Corpus compiled by the Language Institute of the Tokyo University of Foreign Studies (TUFS).