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1. Introduction

Our understanding of causal relation, namely one situation is correlated with another situation, is basic in our mental life. [1] Causal relation consists of cause/reason and effect/result. The content relation between the first pair ‘cause-effect’ involves phenomenal motivation, i.e., a cause produces an effect, as illustrated in (1a), while the epistemic relation between the second pair ‘reason-result’ involves logical motivation, i.e., a reason accounts for a result, as in (1b).

(1) a. ‘Because he bumped me, I dropped the glass’ (Givón 1990: 834)
   b. ‘Because it was boring, I left’ (Givón 1990: 835)

Although causes and effects are semantic components for the description of objective events taking place in the physical world, a link between a cause and an effect never exists as part of objective reality, but is established by virtue of human thinking encompassing expectation, inference, reasoning, and so on. Therefore, causal relations, be they phenomenal or logical, exist in relation to our interpretation of reality. I assume that we acquire from everyday experiences the ‘idealized cognitive model’ (ICM) (cf. Lakoff 1987) for causal relation. ICM is the mental structure of our knowledge of world.

The Thai language has a function word signifying a certain causal relation between two propositions, namely cuñ. [2] The usage of cuñ in modern Thai is exemplified in (2) and (3).
(2) a. kháw kíñ khâaw sèt chán cûñ pay
  PRONOUN eat rice finish PRONOUN go
  ‘S/he finished a meal, then I went’

  b. kháw pen prathaan böorisát
  PRONOUN COPULA president company
  khray khray cûñ kreeŋ cay
  anyone be afraid of offending (one)
  ‘S/he is the president of a company, so anyone is afraid of offending
  (her/him)’ (Bandhumedha 2001: yóo-yîŋ 101)

(3) a. kháw kíñ khâaw sèt cûñ pay
  PRONOUN eat rice finish go
  ‘S/he finished a meal, then went’

  b. kháw pen prathaan böorisát
  PRONOUN COPULA president company
  cûñ máy kreeŋ cay khray
  NEG. be afraid of offending (one) anyone
  ‘S/he is the president of a company, and is not afraid of offending
  anyone’

The antecedent and consequent clauses in (2) have a different subject, whereas the
serialized verb phrases in (3) share the same subject. At any rate, these examples are
composed of two propositions, the latter of which expresses some effect/result situation
interpreted by the speaker. Before the Ratanakosin period (from the 18th century through
the present time) the syntactic position of cûñ was relatively free. It could occur before
the subject noun phrase at the beginning of the consequent clause: cûñ + NP + VP.
Moreover, the subject noun phrase could be sandwiched between two cuŋ’s: cuŋ + NP + cuŋ + VP. But in modern Thai only one cuŋ is placed immediately before the verb phrase: NP + cuŋ + VP.

The antecedent clause of cuŋ constructions may begin with a subordinator specifying a type of the correlation of that clause with the following clause. For example, (4a) includes a temporal subordinator mǔa ‘when, once’ and (4b) includes a causal subordinator phr🇸? ‘because.’

(4) a. mǔa khāw kin khāaw sêt chán cuŋ pay
when PRONOUN eat rice finish PRONOUN go
‘When s/he finished a meal, I went’

b. phr🇸? khāw pen prathaan boɔrisât
because PRONOUN COPULA president company
khray khray cuŋ kreeŋ cay
anyone be afraid of offending (one)
‘Because s/he is the president of a company, anyone is afraid of offending (her/him)’

The aim of this paper is to examine the meaning of the Thai connective cuŋ by investigating the history of linguistic constructions including it. I propose that the essential property of cuŋ is to activate the ICM for causal relation, which can be schematically represented as follows: CAUSE $\rightarrow$ EFFECT. The arrow between CAUSE and EFFECT stands for indirect causal link, by means of the speaker’s internalization, between two propositions represented by two clauses or phrases connected by cuŋ. I name constructions including cuŋ ‘logical resultative constructions’ (LRC’s) since they highlight an effect/result situation involving the speaker’s reasoning. The analysis of my
data of LRC’s, which I gathered from literature on inscriptions and documents in the
Sukhothai period (the 13th – 14th centuries) through the Ratanakosin period (from the
18th century to the present time) and from published books and students’ compositions
in modern Thai, shows that the use of \textit{cu}ŋ has changed little since the 13th century. The
meaning of \textit{cu}ŋ is confined to the non-interpersonal domain and resists further
development with respect to ‘subjectification’ (cf. Traugott 1982, 1989, 1999). Instead,
it keeps ‘pragmatic ambiguity’ (cf. Horn 1985).

The following discussion is divided into three sections, as follows. Section 2
explicates the meaning of \textit{cu}ŋ, relying on Halliday’s (1970) idea of ‘language
functions’ of three types, namely ‘ideational,’ ‘interpersonal’ and ‘textual’ functions.
Section 3 examines the conceptual parallelism between LRC’s and the other type of
resultative constructions which I call ‘physical resultative constructions’ (PRC’s) in
contrast to LRC’s, referring to findings in Kessakul & Methapisit (2000). Section 4
summarizes the findings in this study.

2. The meaning of \textit{cu}ŋ

\textit{cu}ŋ, as a discourse connective, has ‘textual’ function, that is, it constrains the
relevance of one clause to the preceding clause. I will first examine \textit{cu}ŋ and LRC’s
from the perspective of clause linkage.

Ohori (1994: 142) proposes the general tendency in the development of clause
linkage, namely from lower to higher integration in terms of dependency on each other
of two elements linked and the level of linkage, as graphically represented below.

\begin{center}
\begin{tabular}{c}
\textbf{low} \hspace{4cm} \textbf{integration} \hspace{4cm} \textbf{high} \\
\end{tabular}
\end{center}

Dependency: \textit{Juxtaposition} (Coordination)

e.g. ‘They ate a lot, and went to sleep’
> Incorporation (Subordination)

e.g. ‘Because they ate a lot, they went to sleep’

low --------------------- integration --------------------- > high

Level: Clause (Predicate + Arguments + Periphery)

e.g. tosyokan de bunken o sirabeta node, kurasu de happyoo ga seekooshita ‘Since (I) had consulted documents in the library, (I) succeeded in presenting in the class’

> Core (Predicate + Arguments)

e.g. ‘gohan o tabe nagara, terebi o mita ‘While taking a meal, (I) watched TV’

> Nucleus (Predicate)

e.g. tome te oita ‘(I) left (it) stopped’

His diachronic study on the Japanese connective -ba (Ohori 1994, 1998) reveals that the degree of integration of two linguistic elements linked by -ba has increased according to the above schema. As for the V-(r)eba desinence (izenkee ‘perfective form’ -ba), he has attested that it originally involved temporal sequence but has undergone the following semantic extensions. [3]

Temporal relation, e.g. (5)

(non-motivated relation of realized situations)

[+realized, -motivated]

> Causal/Logical relation, e.g. (6)

(motivated relation of realized situations)

[+realized, +motivated]
Dispositional (generalized conditional) relation, e.g. (7)
(motivated relation of realized or unrealized situations)
[+/−realized, +motivated]

> Hypothetical conditional relation, e.g. (8)
(motivated relation of unrealized situations)
[−realized, +motivated]

(5) hi-no kure-nure-ba suberi ide.tamahi.nu
day-PRT darken-PERF-BAsnake go.out.POL.PERF
‘As the day darkened, (he) sneaked out’ (*Taketori Monogatari*, 10C)

(6) kore-wo hito-ni katari.tamahe-ba kiku hito mina
this.ACC people-DAT tell.POL-BA hear people all
minokeyodati.keri
become.terrified.EVID
‘(She) told this to her people, and all the people who heard (it) became terrified’ (*Heike Monogatari*, 13C)

(7) kwan’on-wo sinzimause-ba aratani gorisyau ari
Kannon-ACC believe.POL-BA truly divine.patronage be
‘When[ever] (one) believes in Kannon, there truly is divine patronage’ (*Otogi Sausi*, 15C)

(8) sasiagere-ba tori-mo ue-ni agari, sagere-ba
hold.up-BA bird-also above-DAT go.up hold.down-BA
tori-mo mata sagaru
bird-also again go.down
‘When/If (they) hold (it) up, the birds will go up, and when/if (they) hold (it) down, the birds will go down’ (*Amakusa-ban Isopo Monogatari*, 16C)
Formerly V-(r)eba linkage had the positive value of the realization feature and the negative value of the motivation feature: [+realized, -motivated] (genuine temporal relation); but by the present the former feature has become unrestricted and the latter feature has become positive, hence [+/ -realized, +motivated] (causal/logical and conditional relations).

Ohori (1994: 145) states that clauses linked by -ba, because of being juxtaposed in the discourse context, invite pragmatic inferences in accord with the cooperative principle of communication, such that the antecedent event is taken to be the cause for the following event. He regards this inference as the effect of ‘pragmatic strengthening’ (cf. Traugott 1988, 1989). The strengthening of pragmatic inferences to relevance (in other words, the conventionalizing of a salient conversational inference) resulted in higher semantic dependency between two events represented by serial two clauses. This process corresponds to the notion of ‘subjectification’ introduced by Traugott. In her view (Traugott 1999: 179), if the meaning of a lexical item or construction is grounded in the socio-physical world of reference, it is likely that over time speakers will develop polysemies that are grounded in the speaker’s world, whether reasoning, belief, or metatextual attitude to the discourse. Subjectification, thus, involves increase of encoding of speaker informativeness about his/her attitude.

In a similar vein, Traugott & König (1991) argue that the temporal and logical meanings of the English connective ‘since,’ as exemplified in (9a) and (9b) respectively, arise historically through changes in the status of inferences, i.e., from temporal to logical.

a. ‘I have done quite a bit of writing since we last met’

(Traugott & König 1991: 194)
b. ‘Since you are so angry, there is no point in talking with you’

(Traugott & König 1991: 195)

Reviewing the use of the Thai connective cuñ from the 13th century through the present time, however, I do not think that the same story of semantic extension as V-(r)eba and ‘since’ goes for cuñ. cuñ has not undergone semantic extension from the physical domain into the epistemic domain. Rather, ‘pragmatic ambiguity’ should underlie the meaning of cuñ. Like the negative ‘not’ and the additive connective ‘and’ in English, cuñ has pragmatically ambiguous meanings. Actually one may interpret the relationship between the two juxtaposed propositions in (2) and (3) above as either temporal or logical, given appropriate pragmatic context (which subsumes the linguistic discourse and the extralinguistic world knowledge). I assume that the meaning of cuñ inherently is abstract enough to apply to both spatio-temporal and logical structures of language. Naturally, the function of cuñ pertains to both the ‘ideational’ and the ‘textual’ mode of language. The ideational function is to indicate the speaker’s experience of the outside and the inside world, and the textual function is to mark sequential dependence to constrain the relevance of one proposition to the preceding proposition. In my opinion, cuñ is a ‘contextual operator’ (cf. Kay 1989) whose semantic value consists, at least in part, of instructions to find a certain kind of information structure in the context. In particular, cuñ invokes the ICM that imposes the causal framing (CAUSE $\rightarrow$ EFFECT) upon some propositional material and places emphasis on its effect/result involving the speaker’s interpretation.

The linkage level of cuñ, unlike that of –ba, has not changed in the direction of Ohori’s hypothesis, namely from clause (predicate plus arguments and periphery) to core (predicate plus arguments) and further to nucleus (predicate). (10) below shows –ba linkage at the core (phrase) level.
(10) kare-wa asi-mo haya-kere.ba kata-mo tuyoi
he-TOP foot-also be.fast-BA shoulder-also be.strong
‘He runs fast and has a strong throwing arm as well’

The level of –ba linkage has expanded from clause, as in (5) to (8), to core, as in (10). By contrast, the connective cuŋ has been used as a linker at both of the levels since the Sukhothai period (the 13-14th centuries). It links linguistic elements either at the clause level or at the core level very flexibly. Examples include (11) which are fragmentary glosses of an inscription in the 13th century. In (11a) cuŋ links clauses; in (11b) it links verb phrases.

(11) a. King Rāma Gamhèn, the ruler of the kingdom, hears the call; he goes and questions the man, examines the case, and decides it justly for him.
So the people of this Möan of Sukkhodai [cuŋ] praise him.
(Griswold & naNagara 1971c: 198, 208)
b. They were worshiped for a month and six days, [cuŋ] were buried in the middle of Srī Sajjanālai.
(Griswold & naNagara 1971c: 201, 217)

Since the 13th century cuŋ has been able to co-occur with a subordinator not only for ‘realis’ relation (e.g. múa ‘when, once;’ phrō ‘because’) but also for ‘irrealis’ relation, i.e., conditional (e.g. thāa ‘if’ in (12) below). Furthermore, in the Ratanakosin period (the 18th century through the present time) it may co-occur with a subordinator for purpose relation as well (e.g. phūa ‘in order to’ in (13) below).
I summarize types of semantic relation existing between two linguistics elements linked by *cun* below.

Realis types [+realized, +motivated]:

Temporal relation (temporally motivated relation of realized situations)

Causal/Logical relation (logically motivated relation of realized situations)

Irrealis types [-realized, +motivated]:

Conditional relation (logically motivated relation of unrealized situations)

> Purpose relation (volitionally motivated relation of unrealized situations)

Here the semantic features for temporals are the same as those for causals/logicals, i.e.
[+realized, +motivated], which seemingly does not fit Ohori’s account that temporals have the semantic features [+realized, -motivated]. However, he also comments that the semantic features [+realized, -motivated] characterize ‘genuine’ temporals. I regard temporal relation marked by cuŋj as having the motivation feature [+motivated], that is, the relation is interpreted as temporally motivated.

The emergence of LRC’s with a purpose subordinate clause is relatively recent. To my knowledge, they are not included in inscriptions. I consider this change as having happened to the semantics of LRC at the construction level, but not the semantics of cuŋj at the lexical level. cuŋj by itself keeps its highly abstract sense of causality established by the speaker’s reasoning. This general causal sense is compatible with conditional and purpose relations entailing some anticipated effect/result. Those irrealis relations cannot be encoded by the connective cuŋj alone. To express a specific irrealis relation, a subordinator or other lexical element’s help is needed.

Crucially, cuŋj does not bear on the ‘interpersonal’ mode of language. It cannot express the speaker’s attitude toward the proposition, nor effect cooperation between the speaker and the hearer. In this regard, cuŋj differs from English connectives ‘then’ and ‘so.’ According to Halliday & Hasan (1976: 241), English connectives largely have both the ‘experiential’ function (subtype of ideational function) for describing objective events, as in (14), and the ‘interpersonal’ function for enhancing communication process, as in (15).

\begin{enumerate}
\item (14)  
\begin{enumerate}
\item a. Then, as dusk fell, he sat down to rest. (Halliday & Hasan 1976: 239) 
\item b. She was never really happy here. So, she’s leaving. 
\end{enumerate} 
\item (15)  
\begin{enumerate}
\item a. A: Supposing it couldn’t find any? 
\item b. B: Then it would die, of course. (Halliday & Hasan 1976: 258) 
\end{enumerate}
\end{enumerate}
b. A: She’ll be better off in a new place.
B: So, she’s leaving? (Halliday & Hasan 1976: 241)

The Thai connective ขั้น, which is another contextual operator and is given multiple translations such as ‘then,’ ‘that being the case,’ ‘in addition,’ ‘similarly,’ ‘at least,’ etc. depending on the context, seems to have acquired some additional interpersonal function, as in (16).

(16) A: ทั้มมาย ไม่ ไป
   why  NEGATIVE go
   Why won’t (you) go?
B: ขั้น ไม่ ยาก ไป
   NEGATIVE want  go
   (Because I) don’t want to go.

In contrast, คุณ has nothing to do with the interpersonal mode of language. It does not have the social or expressive or conative function at all.

3. Conceptual parallelism between two resultative construction types in Thai

It is known that the Thai language uses resultative constructions to encode quite a wide range of causal relations between an activity and its resultative state. For convenience’ sake, here I call those constructions ‘physical resultative constructions’ (PRC’s) in contrast to LRC’s. Kessakul & Methapisit (2000) analyzed Thai PRC’s from the scalar viewpoint. Taking into account the compatibility with the connective ณ ‘until’ indicating duration needed for the activity to progress before reaching the resultative state (which they named ‘transition marker’), they classified Thai PRC’s into
three patterns:

Pattern 1: *Peripheral PRC*, e.g. (17) \( N1 \ V1 \ N2 \ V2 \) Modifier

Pattern 2: *Typical PRC*, e.g. (18) \( N1 \ V1 \ N2 \ (\text{con}) \ V2 \) (Modifier)

Pattern 3: *Marginal PRC*, e.g. (19) \( N1 \ V1 \ \text{con} \ N2 \ V2 \) (Modifier)

The resultative state represented by the second verb (V2) is rather fixed in Pattern 1, variable in Pattern 2, and unlimited in Pattern 3. On this basis, Kessakul & Methapisit characterized Pattern 1 as ‘peripheral’ PRC, Pattern 2 as ‘typical’ PRC, and Pattern 3 as ‘marginal’ PRC. Below is further explanation for each pattern.

In Pattern 1, the first verb is a causative-activity verb and the second verb is a change-of-state or state verb, as in (17). Normally this pattern includes a modifier for describing the speaker’s evaluation towards the resultant state. The transition marker \text{con} is not compatible with this pattern, since this pattern represents an accomplishment event in which the result state takes place instantly after the cause activity.

(17) \( \text{kháw} \ \text{khôn} \ \text{tôn máy} \ \text{lóm} \ \text{mòt ləy} \)

\text{PRONOUN} \ \text{topple} \ \text{tree} \ \text{topple over} \ \text{completely}

‘S/he toppled a tree (and the tree toppled over) completely’

In Pattern 2, the first verb is a transitive activity verb and the second verb is a change-of-state or state verb, as in (18). A modifier may or may not be included. \text{con} is optionally placed between the second noun and the second verb. (18b) with \text{con} implies that s/he repeatedly beat something until it became broken.
(18) a. kháw tii man tèék
           PRONOUN beat PRONOUN be broken
           S/he beat it broken.

           b. kháw tii man con tèék
               PRONOUN beat PRONOUN be broken
               S/he beat it until (it) was broken.

In Pattern 3, the first verb is an unergative activity verb and the second verb is a state verb, as in (19). A modifier may or may not be included. con is obligatorily used to mark a transition time from the action scene to the result scene. The second noun in (19a) is unspecified because it is identical to a person represented by the first noun. That in (19b) represents a body-part (of the person represented by the first noun), and that in (19c) represents any other participant.

(19) a. kháw dœn con nùay
         PRONOUN walk be tired
         S/he kept walking until feeling tired.

           b. kháw róọŋ háy con taa buam
               PRONOUN cry eye be swollen
               S/he kept crying until her/his eyes became swollen.

           c. kháw dœn con sôn róọŋ tháaw stūk
               PRONOUN walk heels shoes be worn out
               S/he kept walking until the heels of the shoes became worn out.

Varieties of PRC’s in Thai are summarized below.
My claim here is that in modern Thai there is parallelism between PRC and LRC in terms of conceptualization. con in PRC’s and cuŋ in LRC’s both belong to the ideational system of language, though they function in different sub-domains, namely ‘experiential’ and ‘logical’ domains. The experiential domain is concerned with the speaker’s experience of the outside world (physical space), while the logical domain is concerned with that of the inside world (mental space). The use of con involves a durative or repetitional activity that eventually leads to the change of state of a patient, whereas the use of cuŋ involves the speaker’s mental process to determine some causal relation. Thus, con and cuŋ in common signal an indirect causal link between two propositions represented by the construction, highlighting the effect/result part.

4. Conclusion

Thai LRC’s are used to encode not only realis causal relations (temporal and causal/logical relations) but also irrealis causal relations (conditional and purpose relations) between propositions denoted by clauses or phrases in the construction. To explicitly express irrealis causal relations, however, the construction needs an additional lexical item specifying those relations. I claim that the connective cuŋ included in the construction serves as a contextual operator that invokes the ICM imposing causal relation with the highlighted effect/result upon the given propositions. I reject the idea that the meaning of cuŋ has historically extended from the spatio-temporal domain to

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pattern 1</th>
<th>Pattern 2</th>
<th>Pattern 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Type of action verb</td>
<td>causative V</td>
<td>transitve V</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appearance of con</td>
<td>incompatible</td>
<td>optional</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Possible result</td>
<td>rather fixed</td>
<td>variable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Status of PRC</td>
<td>Peripheral</td>
<td>typical</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
the abstract domain. From the corpus date in 13th century through the present time, we can see that the meaning of cuñ constantly has pragmatic ambiguity. LRC’s can be interpreted either phenomenally or logically, unless they include subordinators or other lexical elements that indicate a specific relation between two propositions in question. Which interpretation is more plausible or salient depends on the context.

What is more, I have found that there is conceptual parallelism between the meanings of PRC’s containing con and LRC’s containing cuñ. Both of con and cuñ mark some indirect causal link. The indirect link indicated by con (i.e. duration of activity) exists in the outside world or physical space, while that indicated by cuñ (i.e. inference of the speaker) exists in the inside world or mental space.

NOTES

1. An earlier version of this paper was presented at the 7th International Cognitive Linguistics Conference at UCSB, July 22-27, 2001. I would like to thank Osamu Akagi and the National Language Institute, Tokyo for providing the data for this study. Thanks are also due to Robert De Silva for his stylistic suggestions.

2. cuñ has synonyms such as ciñ. In this paper I will use cuñ as a representative of them.

3. Examples (5) to (8) and (10) are Ohori’s (1998). Abbreviations for function words are:
   ACC(usative); DAT(ive); EVID(ential); PERF(ect); POL(ite); PRT(=particle); TOP(ic); VOL(itional).
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