

TOWARDS A TYPOLOGY OF DISCOURSE MARKERS IN CAMBODIAN

Denis Paillard (UMR 7110)¹denis.paillard@linguist.univ-paris-diderot.fr**Abbreviations**

1sg : speaker

2sg: addressee

3sg : third person

deict: deictic

dem: demonstrative

indef: indefinite

neg : negation

part: particle

rest: restrictive

1. Southeast Asian languages use a set of units, defined as “particles” presenting a wide range of uses. Some of these particles play a very important role at the discourse level. If such particles are generally mentioned in the grammars of these languages, it is not always the case for other units or expressions having a discourse function (hence called “discourse markers” as a generic term, henceforth DM). The majority of the DMs take the form of a unit or a combination of units having other uses in the language, a situation not uncommon in a number of other languages, including Indo-European languages.

We give a first illustration of this diversity with a series of DMs formed on ‘*pīt*’ combined with other units :

- (1) *[vie tvəə cie mɔək pɔəŋ poolih thaa cao luəc mootoo*
 3sg make be come complain police say thief steal motobike
vie taam pīt vie leeŋ lbaeŋ cañ haəy luek mootoo kluən vie tee]
 3sg follow + **pīt** 3sg play game loose part sell moto himself 3sg neg
 He lodged a complaint to the police, declaring that his motorbike had been stolen. **taam pīt** he
 lost money at gambling and sold it himself.

taam pīt p reestablishes the facts, belying an untruthful statement.

- (2) *[kñom mien phohtaəŋ cie craən prasən baə look caŋ baan /*

¹ Cette recherche est menée dans le cadre du Labex *Empirical foundations of language* (programme: *Analyse comparée des Marqueurs discursifs*)

1Sg haveevidence be much if Sir want get
taam kaa pīt kii kñom trəv kee baok sotsaat / niv tɲay nuh]
 follow + nom. +**pīt** be 1sg passive 3indef cheat really at day dem
 I can produce many pieces of evidence, if you want to have them. *taam kaa pīt* I have been
 really cheated. On that day,

taam kaa pīt p reestablishes the facts contrary to a previous representation of the situation.

- (3) [puək vie cləh knie **pīt mɛɛn** tae vie niv sralaɲ
 group 3pl quarrel recip. **pīt** + part but 3Pl remain love
 knie dooc pii mun]
 recip like from before

They keep on quarelling **pīt mɛɛn**. But they still love each other as before.

p pīt mɛɛn is undeniable.

- (4) [neak dæl baan khəɲ ruup nieɲ ptoal saasə samrah nieɲ min
 person rel. get see body girl personally admire girl neg
 dac pii moat / nieɲ **pīt cie** sʔaat]
 cut off from mouth girl **pīt** + be pretty

Those who saw the girl with their own eyes kept on praising her beauty. **pīt cie** she is pretty.

pīt cie p presents her beauty as a fact.

- (5) [riəɲ nih min ʔaɲcəɲ tee / **pīt tae** mien kaataavaa klah
 Story dem neg so neg **pīt** + restr. have reclamation some
pontae min mien kaa pah tuɲkic knie tee]
 but neg have hit one another rec neg

«This isn't the true story. **pīt** + **restric** . Complaints have been lodged but there has been no
 hard knocking. »

pīt tae p sifts out what is a fact and what is not.

- (6) [tik cnam nih thum nah / **pīt mɛɛn tae** vie sraak bantəc tae kom
 water year dem. High very **pīt** + part + restric 3sg baisser un peu but neg
 thaa vie min laəɲ tiət prəh kee pyiekaa tuk thaa pliəɲ niv
 say 3sg neg increase still because 3sg forecat say rain still
 min toan chup tleak tee]
 neg still stop fall neg

The water is very high. **pīt mɛɛn tae** it has subsided, but you can't say it will not come up
 again since it has not yet stopped raining.

pīt mɛɛn tae p as a fact is granted, but minimizing its importance : this fact is not the main point.

- (7) [knoɲ camnaom vie teaj pii vie nih təp cie cao **pīt praakat**
 in among 3pl all two 3sg dem be thief **pīt** + certain
 prəh mien phoattaaj trəmrəv ʔaac baɲceak baan]
 becausehave proofs correct can confirm get

Between the two of them, this one is a thief voleur **pīt praakat** for there is strong evidence to
 bear that out.

pīt praakat p is presented as an undisputable fact.

- (8) A woman has been married to Boa by her parents. On the wedding night, the boa who has not eaten anything for a long time starts swallowing the woman. She screams for her parents to help her, but they don't want to hear her and claim to their daughter that the boa, her husband, only wants to stroke her. When the boa has swallowed her up to her knees :

<i>puəh</i>	<i>tlan</i>	<i>cbah</i>	<i>cie</i>	<i>leep</i>	<i>ʔaŋ</i>	<i>p̄it</i>	<i>haəy</i>	<i>kit</i>	<i>niŋ</i>
snake	boa	clear	be	swallow	1SG	p̄it	PART	think	PART
<i>kraok</i>	<i>kaa</i>	<i>kraok</i>	<i>min</i>	<i>ruəc</i>					
get up	PART	get up	NEG	PART					

« But ***p̄it*** ***haəy*** the boa is swallowing me : she wants to get up but she can't»

Against her parents denying it, ***p̄it haəy p*** the fact is undisputable.

2. Problems of categorization

In the studies dealing with DMs, problems of generalization and categorization are discussed at a general level. On the one hand, it appears that each language has a group of words or expressions that can be defined as DMs; on the other hand, approaches and definitions are liable of considerable variation even within one language.

There are two main reasons why the DMs are difficult to categorize. First, there is no well-determined inventory acknowledged for any language (including well-studied languages, such as English, German or French). Second, there is no common consensus on what a DM is supposed to be, and the proposed definitions are more or less idiosyncratic, varying from one author and one language to the other. K. Fischer's volume *Approaches to Discourse Markers* (2006) is a good illustration of the heterogeneity of the DMs as well as that of their definitions and descriptions. There are also many "local" studies limited to the description of one or a few items or to one or to a few of their functions only; the definitions and descriptions usually are of strictly local interest. In short, all the studies of the DMs acknowledge their forming a very particular and heterogeneous set of words which seem to make it hardly possible to draw out any principle of organization.

Another reason preventing (or complicating) any attempt for generalization is the formal heterogeneity of the DMs even within one and the same language. Words and expressions that belong to the DMs often have also another grammatical status and a wide range of functions in the language.

3. The DMs form a set of units fully part of the language

Arguing that the DMs form a set of units which are fully part of the language means that they have, similar to any other unit, a semantic value, a distribution (scope and position relative to that scope). and a prosody

To define the semantics of DMs we will introduce the notion of *enunciative scene* (Fr. *scène énonciative*, cf. Paillard, 2009). We will set out below the main parameters of the enunciative scene that are pertinent for describing the DMs. We will see that the enunciative scene accounts for the conditions of the production of an utterance insofar as they can be drawn out from the very form of the utterance.

1. We will define an utterance **p** as a **subjective and partial way to mean "something" (Z) by words**. This "something" can correspond to a fact, an event or a state of affairs and it becomes manifest through what **p** is actually saying and how it says it. That is what we mean when defining an utterance as a "subjective" way : it means that the utterance is the act of the speaker and that the speaker's representation of **Z** pertains to his perception, knowledge, belief or assumption concerning **Z**. The term "partial" means that **p** fails to say **Z** completely, since other utterances are possible that will complete **p** or compete with **p**.

2. There is a gap between the speaker's communicative intention and his actual utterance, in other words, between what he means and the utterance he uses². The words he uses have a meaning that cannot be completely adequate to make manifest the speaker's communicative intention, so that the utterance is only an interpretation of what the "something" (**Z**) means.

3. Within the framework of the enunciative scene, not only a speaker (S0) but also a hearer (S1) is engaged. In the intersubjective relation, **p** is linked to S0 as well as to S1. This link to S1 is obvious in questions and imperative forms but it is also at work in assertions. In an assertion, the status of **p** varies according to the way of taking S1 into account : in a strict assertion, S1 is considered as a support of a possible questioning of **p**; in other cases, S1 is the source of **p**, which S0 gets reconciled to (in pragmatics terminology it corresponds to the complicity, resignation or capitulation of S0 in front of S1). We will illustrate this second case by the following example:

(9) A. suggest going to the cinema

B. *tiv koo tiv !*

go koo go

Well, OK, let's go ! (even if I don't actually feel at all like going) (Thach 2013)

p (*tiv*) is what S1 aims at, and So who is not at first interested by **p**, finally gets reconciled to S1's proposal.

The intersubjective relation between S0 and S1 can be presented as involving **three positions**: the first position is centered on S0 (it corresponds to of a commitment of S0); the second position is centered on S1 (it corresponds to a non-commitment of S0); the third position can be called a neutral position, standing for a kind of cooperation / interaction between S0 and S1.

We can represent the relations between the three positions as follows :

[So (S'o] S1)

The three main parameters (as mentioned above) are engaged in any utterance. The role of the DMs is to introduce an extra-determination of one of the constituents of the enunciative scene. According to different kinds of determinations, it is possible to distinguish different subsets of DMs and to establish an inventory of the DMs. We will bellow illustrate six subsets of DMs. Each subset corresponds to a type of determination of the enunciative scene: the first two subsets specify the status of **p** in the process of saying **Z**; the third subset describes the relation between **p** and **Z**; the fourth subset takes into account the competition between the utterance **p** and another utterance; in the fifth subset, **p** does not exactly or directly express the communicative intention of the speaker ; and finally, in the sixth subset the DM gives precedence to one of the positions of the intersubjective relations.

4. Six classes of DM

- Each set presents a specific semantic value, corresponding to the particular constituent of the enunciative scene which is put forward.
- The DM gathered in a set have one or several items in commun.
- Describing a DM means taking into account the semantic value or the unit(s) forming the DM.

It must be underlined that the same unit can show several types of uses, such as N, V, particles, etc. The semantic identity of a unit is at work whatever the grammatical categories this unit is liable to belong to. When used as a DM, the semantic value of a unit appears to be more independant of syntactic properties. We argue against such notions as grammaticalization or desemantisation for describing DM's semantics.

² The statement that the utterance does not express completely what the speaker means is central in the theory of relevance (Sperber, Wilson 1986), but it is described from another perspective there.

We now present the six sets of Khmer DMs. It appears that these sets can be found as well in a wide range of languages. Within the academic program "A compared analysis of DMs", these sets are being put forward and studied in French, Russian, Finnish, Vietnamese, Khmer, Japanese and others.

5.1. Point of view DM

The DMs belonging to this subclass specify the utterance (**p**) as a point of view on **Z**. This point of view completes, revises, disqualifies a first point of view introduced in the preceding context:

- (1) *[vie tvəə cie mɔək pdəŋ poolih thaa cao luəc mootoo*
 3sg make be come porter plainte police say thief steal motobike
vie taam pit vie leej lbaej cañ haəy luek mootoo kluən vie tee]
 3sg follow + **pit** 3sg jouer jeux perdre puis sell moto himself 3Sg neg
 He has just lodged a complaint to the police, declaring that his motorbike had been stolen.
taam pit he lost money at gambling and sold it himself.

p reestablishes the facts, belying an untruthful statement.

- (2) *[kñiom mien phohtaəŋ cie craən prasən baə look caŋ baan /*
 1Sg avoir preuves être beaucoup if Sir want get
taam kaa pit *kii kñiom trəv kee baok sotsaat / niv tɣaj nuh]*
 follow + nom. + **pit** be je passif 3indef tromper vraiment at day dem
 I can produce many pieces of evidence, if you want to have them. **taam kaa pit** I have been
 really cheated. On that day,

p reestablishes the facts contrary to a previous representation of the situation

These **point of view** DMs are formed on '*taam*' follow '+ X, *yang*' kind' + X, *cie* ('be') + X.

Other DMs "point of view" :

taam thoamea?daa 'normally', *taam tumnɔəŋ* 'on the face of it, apparently', (ni?yiey) *taam traŋ* 'quite frankly', *yaəŋ naa miŋ* 'in conclusion', *yaəŋ sdaəŋ* 'obviously', *yaəŋ haoc nah* 'at least, *cie ye tha haet* 'possibly, *cie koolkaa* 'in principle', *cie tu tiv* 'in general'.

5.2. Judgment DM: these express a judgment of the speaker regarding an event **p**. It should be noted that the same event can be subject to contradictory judgments, positive or negative: the event as such is neither positive nor negative.

- (10) *[koat mien krəəhtnak tɣun pontae daoy phoap l?aa koat baan*
 3sg have accident serious but **daoy phoap l?aa** 3sg get
ruəc pii seckdəy slap]
escape from death

He had a serious accident, but fortunately/luckily, he escaped death.

The judgment DMs are formed on **daoy** + X or X + *cie* ('be')

Other judgment DMs : *daoy samnaŋ* 'by chance', *daoy saŋkaep* 'in brief', *daoy sar?op* 'roughly speaking', *daoy smah* 'frankly', *daoy pit tiv* 'on reflexion', *daoy haet nih* 'consequently', *muk cie* 'probably', *pit cie* 'really' *praakat cie* 'certainly', *tumnɔəŋ cie* 'visibly', *prahaəl cie* 'may be'.

5.3. Vagueness DM: the state of affairs to be expressed is not soundly established

Two types of DMs must be distinguished :

5.3.1 DMs formed with **dooc** 'like, something like' : in order to express **Z** the speaker uses words not necessarily or directly connected to **Z** (analogical reasoning, approximation) :

- (11) *l̩ sɔɔ dooc cie kang baek*
Hear noise **dooc cie** tire burst

One would say a noise like a tire bursting. [It sounds like a tire bursting]

Another DM : *tumnɔɔŋ dooc* 'It looks as if'.

To be mentioned as well, a series of DMs formed with **dooc** and a deictic: *doocneh*, *doocnih*, *doocnuh* and *doocnəŋ*, the most frequent being *dɔɔcneh* which means that **p** is a way to represent **Z** in contrast / comparison with another way, of various importance, to represent **Z**. This series can be described as coming under both this set and the "subjectivity" DMs' set.

- (12) [*kom tvəə dooc kee ʔaɛŋ tvəə min baan tee tvəə doocnih viŋ*
Neg do as 3pl 2sg do neg get part do **doocnih** again
tiv k̩i riən tae muəy muk baan haəy pruəh ʔaɛŋ kmien peel
go(part) be learn only one get haəy because 2sg neg have time
craən tee
much *tee*

Don't act like the others. You won't be able to, anyway. Act as I tell you (**doocnih**) : just learn one thing, for you don't have much time.

- (13) [*k̩om caŋ tvəə ʔəy srac tae k̩om*
1sg want do indef depend only 1sg

A : I do what I want.

- [*baaŋ ʔaɛŋ tvəə doocnuh məc kaet*
old brother 2sg do **doocnuh** how possible

B : How can you act like that (**doocnuh**) ?

- (14) [*k̩om baan tiŋ kaaboop muəy sʔaat nah poa saa thum lmɔɔm*
1sg get buy bag one nice very colour white big enough

A : I bought a nice bag. It's white and pretty large.

- [*cam cuəy tiŋ ʔaoy k̩om muəy phaəŋ peel ʔaɛŋ tiv psaa lək*
wait help buy give 1sg one also time 2sg go market time
kraoy / baə mien ʔaa doocnəŋ cam yɔɔk
next if have dem **doocnəŋ** wait take

B : When you go to the market next time, buy one for me. Take only one, just like the one you just mentioned (**doocnəŋ**)

5.3.2. DMs formed with an indefinite.

The presence of an indefinite means that using **p** to express **Z** is presented as not granted either from the speaker's point of view or from the co-speaker's. Thach (2013) gives a systematic description of the

indefinites *?ey* et *naa* used as DMs. The following examples ((15) – (18) et (20) – (21)) are taken from this study :

- (15) *nam baay ruac cool keen naa*
eat rice after enter sleep indef
When you've finished your meal, you go to bed, **right?**
- (16) *s?aek knom at tiv tee naa min bac tij*
to-morrow 1Sg neg go part indef neg necessary buy
sambot laan ?aoy knom tee
ticket car give 1Sg part
(Don't forget) tomorrow, I'm not coming, it's no use buying a bus ticket for me
- (17) So advises S1 not to lodge a complaint against a policeman
kom ?ay khaat tae peel ?at prayaoc tee
neg modal indef waste restrict time neg useful part
Don't do it, **it's no use**, you will but waste your time
- (18) *?ay tiv haay*
indef go part
What ! Are you already leaving ?
- (19) A. - *mac cuan sokcat yock bantup nih B. - mien ?ey*
How Npr happy take room deic. have indef
A. – How about it, Chuon ? Shall we take this room ? B. – **Sure, why not** (Huffman)

The DMs formed with an indefinite preceded by the negation mark that in reaction to a first utterance expressing a doubt about the relevance of **p**, the speaker clears up this doubt :

(20) S₁ asks S₀ if he knows about what happened at his friend's place the night before, and S₀ answers

they man daj niv nij pi: daam dal cap
indef neg savoir rester DEICT PRE debut arriver fin
How could it be otherwise ?! I was there from the beginning to the end.

(21a) S1 says So he is sorry for being late. So answers:

min ?ay tee
neg indef part
No problem, don't mention it

5.4. Particles DM. The utterance **p** is, to varying degrees, in competition with another utterance **p'**.

A particle is defined as introducing a sequence **p** (its scope) taking into account another sequence **p'**. This other sequence **p'** stands for the contrasted position '**non p**' or '**other than p**' in competition with **p**; **p** can be present or not in the left context. We put forward a distinction between two types of particles based on the following criteria: in type 1, the very semantics of the particle contains both elements **p** and **p'** while in type 2 the presence of **p'** is compulsory in the left context.

5.4.1. Type 1 particles.

It is the very semantics of the particle that involves the alternative sequence **p'**. **p'** can also be present in the context, but this presence is optional and is linked to some specific cases. These particles are often used in dialogues where the interlocutor is presented as a virtual support of **p'**.

As a general rule, a DM particle 1 is formed with a single unit. We present a non exhaustive series of these particles with a brief characterisation of their semantics :

- **kaa** : **p** is asserted but presented as problematic from a certain point of view (about *kaa* cf. Hayman 2011, Thach 2013).

(9) A. suggests going to the cinema :

B. *tiv kɔɔ tiv !*
go kɔɔ go

Well, OK, let's go ! (even if I don't actually feel like it at all) (Thach 2013)

(22) *ka:p kaa ba:j meema:j kaa sreɣ*
 cooked rice left from *kaa* rice widow *kaa* woman
 the previous meal

Cold rice is still rice : a widow is still a woman! : Khmer popular saying : this is said against the popular opinion claiming the contrary.

(23) *baə koat tvəə baan kɲom kaa tvəə baan*
 if 3SG. do get 1SG. *kaa* do get

Since he is able to do it, there is no reason why I shouldn't be able to do it myself!

The affirmation 'I am able to do it' (**p**) takes into account the fact that I'm not supposed to be able to do it (**p'**).

(24)- *kɲom mɔək niv p^hnɔmpɛ:n kaa daɔysa: koat*
 1SG. come stay Phnom Penh *ka:* because 3SG.
kɲom chup tvəəkka:ka: daɔysa: koat
 1SG. stop work *ka:* because 3SG.

If I came to Phnom Penh, it's because of him, if I stopped working, it's also because of him !
 The co-speaker is presented as unaware of the real reason why he is here.

- **tee**: the selection of **p** (or of **non p**) is presented as resulting from the impossibility to select **non p** (or **p**). [Examples taken from Thach 2013]

(25) *ɲay nəŋ ʔaac mɔək cuəp kɲom ban kɲom niv pteah tee*
 day deict can come meet 1Sg get 1Sg stay house **tee**
 To day, you can come and see me, I'm home (I don't go away)

(26) *rɪəŋ kɲom tee kom mɔək chiɪ cʔaal*
 story 1Sg **tee** neg mod come suffer take care

It's my problem, what's it got to do with you!

- **taə**: apart from marking a question, *taə* is used in exclamatives, meaning that for the speaker, **p** is quite unexpected (« other than one would expect » Hayman, 2013) (*taə* is often associated to *dae* 'also' or to *tee*) (see Hayman, 2011, pp. 237 – 238)

(27) *oo ruup thaat kɲom tee taə*
 oooh ! image take picture 1Sg part taə

Oh! That's really my picture for sure! (Hayman)

(28) *yii krapie nih caŋ sii ʔaŋ taə*
 gee crocodile deict want eat 1Sg taə

Gee, the crocodile really wants to eat me! (Hayman)

- **mɛɛn** : means that **p** is effective : this assertion of **p** takes into account the fact that **p** could be a fancy.

(29) *doocneh look mɔək bəy t^hay haəy mɛɛn tee - nəŋ haəy*

so Sir come three day **haəy məən** part deict part
 So, you've been here for 3 days, haven't you ? - That's it.

- (30) *klie dadaəl ? - mən məən tee. klie bantoəp*
 sentence same neg **məən** part sentence next
 - The same sentence? - No, the next one.

- **haəy** : means that on this matter, there is no point at all contesting or questioning :

- (31) *təe k^hnom thaa t^hv k^h t^hv haəy*
 part I say go be go **haəy**
 When I say I'm going, I'm going (for good)

- (32) *knom yɔk ?anih haəy miin*
 I take that one **haəy** aunt
 I have made up my mind, I take that one, aunty

- **phaang** : p is the complementary to p' (introduced first)

- (33a) *A.- ?əvpuk ?aəj niiv pteah tee B. - ?əvpuk ?at ney phaang*
 father 2Sg stay house part B. - father neg stay **phaang**
puu mien kaa ?əy
 uncle have matter indef

- A. Is your father home ? B. Unfortunately he isn't. What do you want ? (S₁- p' : to be home, S₀-p : not to be home)

- (33b) *baə ?aəj yɔk laan t^hv k^hnom som t^hv ciemuəy phaang*
 If 2Sg take car go 1Sg ask go with **phaang**

If you go there by car, I ask you to take me with you (I did not intend to go there with you, but since you go there by car, I come with you)

- (34) *som kaafee muəy phaang*
 ask coffee one **phaang**

Can you buy me a coffee ?

Here **phaang** means that in principle, S1 is not supposed to buy So a coffee, it normally doesn't fall to him to do so.

- **dae** : concerning p a term Y is presented at the same level as a term X, whereas p is supposed to concern only X :

- (35) *?aəj kət ?qncəŋ l^haa muəy yaan dae*
 2Sg think so good one manner **dae**

Your idea is good (even if there are others)

- **tiət** : extension of the domain of validation of p

- (35) *kluən kra haəy ?əyləv tleak kluən chi# tiət*
 myself poor PART now fall myself sick **tiət**

I am poor, and now I fell ill into the bargain (the illness comes on top of the lack of money)

- **sən** : p is presented as having priority on p' (p' is priori associated to S1)

(36a) *yeng tiv mæl bantup sən baan tee*
 1Pl go see room sən get part

We'll go see the room first, O.K.?

(36b) *məɔk tiv ɲaam bay niv hang nuh məpleet sən*
 come go eat rice at shop deict for a while sən

Let's go get something to eat in that shop for a while, shall we ?

- **mleh** : p doesn't live up to So's expectations:

(37) *laan nih thlay mleh*
 Car deict expensive mleh

This car is really expensive (I didn't expect it to be so expensive)

5.4.2. Particles Type 2 :

These particles combine several units (one of which usually belongs to type 1). In this case, **p'** is present in the left context.

(38) *kñom dak ruup nih traŋ tumpoa nih haəy / khoh ʔəy soom*
 1sg put picture dem. on page dem. part. not trueindef. ask
cuəy kae damrəv phaəŋ / muəy viñ tiət kñom min cbah thaa ruup
 help correct correct part. **muəy viñ tiət** 1sg neg. clear say picture
nih neaknaa neak kuu tee
 dem. who classif. draw neg

I put the picture on this page. If there are mistakes, please correct them. **Besides**, I'm not sure if I know who is the drawer / ...who is the author of this picture.

(39) *[vaentaa ʔaac cuəy ʔaoy pɲeək yəŋ mæl khəñ kan tae cbah /*
 Eye glasses can help give eyes 1pl look see more and more clear
myaəŋ tiət *vie kaa ʔaac cuəy lək samrah baan klah dae]*
myaəŋ tiət 1sg part can help lever beauty-baan- certain also

Eye glasses can help to a better sight. **Moreover** they can make us look somewhat nicer.

(40) A : *[yəŋ prap koat piü riəŋ nih tiv]*
 1pl tell 3sg from story dem go (part)
 B : *[mɛɛn haəy kumnit nih lʔaa myaəŋ dae]*
mɛɛn haəy idea dem good manner also

A : « We'll talk to him about this problem » B : « **Right**. It's a good idea in some way »

(41) *puənyual haəy tvə ʔaoy məə haəy kaa niv tae*
 explain PART do give look **haəy kaa niv tae**
tvə min kaət tiət
 faire NEG naïtre **tiət**

I explained to him, I showed him how to manage and (**in spite of that**) he couldn't even manage to do it. / ...he didn't even succeed in doing it.

(42)S₀ has been invited by his friend to have a drink at his place, but his friend's wife is ill tempered and tension is mounting between his friend and his wife. :

a) *dooc cie mən sruəl tee mæl tiv*
 like be NEG easy part **mæl tiv**

Things are not likely to get better

b) *mæl tiv kuə tae tiv pteah viŋ*
mæl tiv have to rest. go house part

It seems I had better go back home.

(43) Discussing the joyces of pic-nic in the forest

- A. - *baə mən caŋ ʔaŋkuy ptoəl dey ʔaŋkuy ləə tmaa tee*
 If neg want sit down against ground sit down on stone part
- B. *tuəh yaaŋ naa kaa daoy kŋom cool cət ɲam bay niv pteah cieng*
tuəh yaaŋ naa kaa daoy 1sg like eat be in house rather

A.- If you don't want to sit on the ground, you can sit on a stone. B. - **Nevertheless** (however it may be) I prefer to eat at home

5.5. Meaning DM

The speaker considers that the “meaning” of **p** is not clear or may lead to a confusion.

The DMs "meaning" are formed with the verb *thaa* ‘say’

(44) A man informs his friend B that his wife has left him. His friend, instead of comforting him, tells him:

- B. *ʔaŋcaŋ haəy ʔat rɔviirɔvuəl knie*
so PART NEG take care PRO
- A. *cang baan thaa mec ning ʔ aŋ niŋ sam tae kee*
cang baan thaa mec deict. 1sg deict. deserve rest. 3sg
ruət caol kaa ʔəy
run leave part indef

B. - Well, that’s normal (/I’m not surprised), you didn’t take care of her.

A. - What do you mean by that ? Do you mean I deserve to be jilted or what ? (/...I deserve it or what ?)

Other DM meaning : *thaa mec* ‘what does it mean / what do you mean, *ki thaa* ‘that is to say, *mien ney thaa* ‘it means, *dooc thaa* ‘so to speak, *mien (baan) ney thaa mec ?* (it means what?).

5.6. Subjectivity DM

These DMs specify the relation of the speaker (**So**) to the situation or to what has been previously said about the situation or the relation between the speaker and the co-speaker (**S1**).

5.6.1. Interjections : affects / reactions of the speaker facing a situation / the co-speaker

- *ŋoap* « to die », *ŋoap haəy* « to die- part », *ŋoap ʔaŋ haəy* « to die 1sg-part » (‘I’m dead).

(44) Someone is in charge of carrying a heavy parcel. He tries to lift it up, but it's too heavy for him:

ŋoap haəy tŋuən məŋ məŋ neak naa lək ruəc
ŋoap haəy heavy part redup humain indef carry part

ŋoap haəy if it’s so heavy, I can’t carry it?!

(45) A comment about a piece of news on the net about two young girls having assaulted a young man :

ŋoap ʔaŋ haəy cəŋ baan kee hav yendəa
ŋoap ʔaŋ haəy so get PRO call genre

ŋoap ʔaŋ haəy and you speak about equality between men and women !

- *coy* « to make love» : expresses amazement (only between friends or people quarelling) :

(46) S_0 didn't know that his friend was back from abroad, he happens to meet him by chance :

coy mɔɔ pii ʔaŋkal
coy come from when

coy when did you come?

(47) When about to pay for his purchase, S₀ realizes that he has forgotten his wallet, and exclaims:

com forget bag money at house

com I forgot my wallet at home

?ojɲ Something So is powerless to face:

(48) A child has dropped his father's phone into the fish tank. At discovering his phone in the fish tank, the father exclaims (not in anger)

?ojɲ *srac haəy*

?ojɲ ready part

?ojɲ it's ruined !

(49) A child broke a glass, his brother teases him :

?ojɲ **nuh** *mae vay haəy*

?ojɲ **nuh** mother beat part

?ojɲ nuh mum's going to scold you !

5.6.2. Deictic

Given S₀, S₁ et S'₀ positions in the intersubjective relations, we have three series of deictics :

Series in *-h*

nih S0

neh **S0 |S1**

nuh S1

noh **S0 |S1**

Series in *-ŋ*

nəŋ / S'₀ (**S0 – S1**)

nuŋ S'₀ (**S0 – S1**)

Series in ?

niə?

neɛ?

nuə?

naa?

As regards the series en - ŋ (*nəŋ*, *nuŋ*), it corresponds to a shared position coming from the two at first separate S0 and S1 positions : in this shared position, a coexistence of S₀ and S1 is established through the dialogue they are having. The third series is to be found only in Phnom Penh (Thach, work in progress)

(50) - *?aloo neək naa nəŋ ? - san aɛŋ kampuŋ t^hvəə ?ey niŋ ?*

hallo person indef. **nəŋ** San 2sg being do indef. **niŋ**]

- Hallo ? Who's speaking ? – San, what are you doing ?

(51) A child sees a man who is eating something, and instead of asking him straight out to give him a bit, he starts with the question :

ɲam ?əy nəŋ

manger indef **nəŋ**

What is it you're eating ? (the man understands right away that the child wants to eat a bit : he is not actually interested to know what it is)

(52) S₁ looks thoughtful, S₀ asks him to tell him about what he is thinking about :

kət ?əy nəŋ

penser indef **nəŋ**

What is it you are you thinking about?

(53) A group of people are gathering to discuss various things. S₀ who is kept out wants to join them, but he dares not do that right away:

tvəə ?əy nuŋ

faire INDEF nuŋ

What are you doing ?

(54) (...) - *nəŋ haəy* : OK (no problem)

5.6.3. *tiv*, *mɔɔk* AND *coh* as DM subjectivity (D. Paillard *A study of three particles in kmher: tiv, mɔɔk, coh*, in: S. Hancil (ed) *Final particles*, Elsevier, 2014).

Our analysis rests on a common semantic property shared by the three verbs. An entity *a* corresponds to two distinct positions r_i and r_j which are reference points, either temporal, spatial or subjective. Reference points are ordered, meaning that r_j follows r_i and is therefore dependent on r_i . The difference between the uses of these items as verbs and as DM lies in the status of *a*: it is an argument in verbal uses, whereas in discourse uses *a* is interpreted as the sequence *p* under the scope of the DM. When *tiv*, *mɔɔk* and *coh* are used as DM r_i and r_j are associated with the speaker and the addressee.

Given this common property, what distinguishes these three units is the way they involve r_i and r_j , starting with a first difference between *tiv*, *mɔɔk*, on the one hand, and *coh* on the other. In the case of *tiv* and *mɔɔk* one of the positions is salient: r_i in the case of *tiv* and r_j in the case of *mɔɔk*. With *coh* the two positions r_i and r_j are successively salient.

Semantics of *tiv*: *a* is presented as no longer in relation with r_i taken as a salient position (i.e. position of reference). Taking r_j into account means the disconnection between *a* and r_i .

Semantics of *mɔɔk*: for r_j to be salient results from a twofold construction: on the one hand, it comes from r_i ; on the other, it is independent from r_i (which accounts for the deictic value of *mɔɔk*). As for r_i , it is nothing more than a first position, with no consequence.

Semantics of *coh*: the positions r_i and r_j are (successively) salient. The fact that r_i and r_j are ordered, on the one hand, and that r_j comes from r_i , on the other, results in r_i occupying the head position, which boils down to *a* becoming off-centred in relation to r_i .

***tiv* in an intersubjective framework**

tiv as a particle has three realizations : *tiv* as a full form, and also two shortened realizations: *təh* and *tah* that can be met in assertions and imperatives, but not in questions. Contrary to the full realization which simply marks the non-commitment of So regarding the actualization of r_j , the two shortened forms mark that So takes up a position regarding the actualization of r_j , either negative in the case of *təh*, or positive in the case of *tah*. *tiv* is to be met in assertions, imperatives or questions: in these three cases the positions r_i et r_j correspond to two subjective positions, that of So (r_i) and that of S1 (r_j). According to *tiv* basic semantic value, *p* is presented as out of So's concern. In contrast with So's prior commitment as the speaker, So is presented as having nothing to do from now on with *p*. Taking S1 into account as an autonomous subjective reference point is relative to this withdrawal of So. Depending on whether the discourse framework is an assertion, an

imperative, or else a question, So non commitment of So regarding **p** results in various types of meaning.

***tiv* in an imperative**

In an imperative, So introduces **p** and points S1 as the one liable to realize **p**. So introducing **p**, is *a priori* concerned with the realization of **p**. Using *tiv* means that for So the realization of **p** comes only under **S1**'s responsibility.

(51) A mother to his young child:

yup criv haəy deək tiv
night deep part sleep *tiv*

It's late already, go to sleep!

(52) A child asks his father for permission to go out. The father answers:

caŋ tiv tiv tiv cambac suə ʔəy
want go go tiv necessary ask indef

If you want to go out, it's not necessary to ask for my permission'

In (51) and (52) it is possible to remove *tiv*. In this case, the imperative is interpreted as an order, a piece of advice or else an invitation directed by So to S1 to realize **p**. Using *tiv* particle means, once more, that **p** does not concern So. In (13) the non-commitment of So means: 'do what the situation makes it suitable to do'. (14) implies that **S1** has expressed his intention to leave, which means that So is not the one introducing **p** and with *tiv* as a particle it means that he is not concerned by what S1 is about to do.

***tiv* in an assertion**

tiv can be met in an assertion marking the non-comitment of So in the realization of **p**, giving way to various interpretations:

(53) S₁ et S₀ were supposed to meet, but S₁ couldn't come. S₀ says to him:

bae ʔaɛŋ rɔwɔəl yeeŋ cuəp knie ɲay kraoy tiv
if 2sg busy 1pl meet RCP day after *tiv*

If you are busy, we'll meet some other day

In (53) S1 is responsible for cancelling the meeting and So considers that from now on it is not for himself to decide on another meeting: **p** does not concern So any longer, and S1 is the one who must be in charge if he wants a new meeting to take place.

(54) S₁ says to S₀ that S₁ is very angry, S₀ replies:

vie khəŋ kaa khəŋ tiv
3sg angry PART angry *tiv*

He's angry, well, let him be angry!

The answer given by So to S1 means that the latter should not worry about the state of 'he': being angry is nothing but his problem.

In assertions, only the reduced form *təh* is attested:

(55) Following a long period of bargaining, a salesman finally comes to accepting the price offered by the purchaser and tells him:

təh

Well, ok ('I give up')

In (55), the salesman assents to r_j , corresponding to the price offered by the buyer, though reluctantly: for him, the fair price is the first one (r_i).

***tiv* in a question**

Through the question, So marks that he feels concerned by p , *tiv* meaning that he has no idea about the answer to this question: S1 only can give it. The question usually stands for a reaction of So: the event involving S1 is impossible to understand for So; since S1 is involved in the event, he is the only one liable to account for the state of affairs.

(56) *lumhat niŋ Bey tŋay haəy ʔaɛŋ tvee miŋ toan cap*
 exercise deict. Three day 2sg do neg on.time finish
tiet vie piʔbaaʔk pon naa tiv
 more 3sg Difficult equal INDF tiv

You have been working on this exercise for three days, and you haven't finished. Is it really so difficult?

(57) At dinner time, the son refuses to taste what is served and the father asks:

mec miŋ ŋam tiv
 how neg eat tiv

Why don't you eat?

In (56) and (57) it is possible to remove *tiv*. The question merely queries what's going on, i.e. how difficult the exercise is ((56)), or about the reason why the son doesn't want to eat ((57)). When *tiv* is used, the question is different: So asks S1 what is the matter about p presented as puzzling, unexpected, or foolish.

In assertions, imperatives and questions, using *tiv* in final position means that p (r_i), at first introduced by So, is now out of his control or responsibility, therefore coming under that of S1 (r_j).

***mɔɔk* in an intersubjective framework**

***mɔɔk* in an imperative**

mɔɔk can be either in initial or in final position, with different interpretations. Both cases are compatible with the full form *mɔɔk*, or with the reduced form *mah*.

a. *mɔɔk* in the initial position

(58) *mɔɔk coh tiv khaaŋ kraɔm sən*
mɔɔk go.down Go side under PART

Let's go downstairs

- (59) *mɔɔk/mah tiv ɲam baay*
mɔɔk/mah go eat rice

Come to eat

- (60) *mɔɔk/mah daə ta tiv tiet*
mɔɔk/mah walk continue go yet

Come on ! Let's go on walking !'

Using *mɔɔk* in an imperative means that So is not only what introduces **p** in the So – S1 exchange. So is concerned by the validation of **p**. In (58), but also in (59) and (60), using the full realization of *mɔɔk*, S1 is invited / prompted to achieve the process together with So. S1 is free to grant the request or not. So and S1 are on equal terms, and So is dependent on S1 willingness concerning his request. The reduced form *mah* means that the process is already achieved by So: in (59) So is already sitting down to his meal, in (60) So intends to continue his walk. S1 who is already involved in the situation is asked to realize **p**. In (59), S1 takes a long time coming to eat, and in (60), S1 is not sure whether he will continue the walk. And taking into account the actualization of **p**, S1 is presented as having no choice.

b. *mɔɔk* in final position

When *mɔɔk* is in final position, contrary to the case in initial position, So is not involved in the achievement of **p**. *mɔɔk* means that So is concerned by the validation of **p**. With the full form, S1 remains free to achieve the process **p** or not.

(61) A boy asks his mother some money. The mother asks why he wants that money for, but the boy doesn't want to tell her. His mother repeats the question:

- prap sən mɔɔk baan ʔaoy*
 say first *mɔɔk* get give

First, tell me why, and then I will give you the money

- (62) *baŋkɔap mɔɔk*
 order *mɔɔk*

‘Tell me what you want me to do (for you)’

(63) S₀ questions someone about his working conditions, but the latter is reluctant to answer. S₀ insists:

- niʔyiey mɔɔk klaac ʔay*
 speak *mɔɔk* be.afraid INDF

Tell me! Don't be afraid'

With the reduced form *mah*, So denies S1 any possibility not to achieve **p**. In (64) So has temporarily obstructed the achievement of **p**:

(64) S₁ wants to speak with S₀ but up to now S₀ was not available. As soon as he is free to listen to him, S₀ says to him:

- niʔyiey mah*
 speak *mah*

Go on! Tell me!

In the two following examples either *mɔk* or *mah* can be used:

(65) *ʔaoy biyae pii dap mɔk/mah*
 give Beer two bottle *mɔk/mah*

Give me two beers

(66) *kɲom soom barey muəy mɔk/mah*
 1sg ask cigarette one *mɔk/mah*

Give me a cigarette

Both cases are about a request. The identity of S1 is not the same: the examples with *mɔk* involve a friend or some passer-by who is presented as free to satisfy the request or not. The example with *mah* involves a waiter or a salesman: on account of this function, the request is necessarily met.

***coh* in an intersubjective framework**

coh is to be met only in discourse uses, the position r_i and r_j referring respectively to *So* and to *S1*: off-centering means that *So* takes up or joins the position embodied by *S1*. *coh* can be found in final position (coming after *p* working as its scope) but also in initial position, coming before *p*. This variation in the position results in distinct interpretations: *coh* in anteposition appears in questions, *coh* postpositionally attached in assertions and imperatives. Moreover there are strong analogies between *coh* in anteposition and *coh* in the position of V1 in a SVC, on the one hand, between *coh* postposed and *coh* in the position of Vn in a SVC, on the other.

***coh* in anteposition**

We will distinguish two types of uses:

a. *coh* indicates that the verb predicated on a first subject is considered (in an interrogative way) in relation with a second subject:

(67) As an answer to a question about the people attending a meeting:

S1	<i>msel</i>	<i>mien</i>	<i>kɲom</i>	<i>məneak</i>	<i>dae</i>	<i>mɔk</i>	<i>pracum</i>
	yesterday	have	1	one.person	PART	come	meeting
So	<i>coh</i>	<i>neak</i>	<i>p^hseɛŋ</i>	<i>tiet</i>			
	<i>coh</i>	person	different	more			

- Yesterday, you were there, anyway - And what about the other people?

(68) S1 *daraa ʔaɛŋ sok sabaay tee*
 Dara 2sg happy glad part
 So *bat sok sabaay tee coh look vɲ*
 yes happy glad PART *coh* Sir Back

- How are you Dara? – I'm fine, and you?

The property introduced in the first cue is echoed in relation to someone else liable to be subjected to this property. The function of *coh* is to introduce, as a question, the off-centering of the property on a second subject, initiated by a second speaker.

b. *coh* means that a first assertion is not enough to express the state of affairs.

(69) S1 *lək siəvphiv Nih ?aoy kɲom mɔk cam kɲom ?aoy tamlay lʔaa*
 sell book dem. give 1 *mɔk wait* 1sg give price good
 So *coh baə 30000 hien tɨn tee*
coh if 30000 dare buy part

- Sell me this book, I will give you a good price for it - If it were 30000 (riels), would you buy it?

(70) S1 *kɲom lɲoy keepɲ haəy* So *coh min cool keepɲ tiv*
 1sg sleepy sleep part *coh neg enter sleep go*

Well I get sleepy now ! - And why don't you go to sleep?!

(71) S1 *koat thaa koat ?at Luy ɲaam baaj tee*
 3sg tell 3sg NEG money Eat rice part
 So *coh prak khaɛ təp niɲ baək tiv naa ?vɔh tiv*
coh money month past part open go indef finish *tiv*

- He says he has no money to eat. - And what about the paycheck he just got, where has it gone?'

This second type of examples shows again the off-centering relative to a first assertion: through his question, *So* means that the first proposition does not bring all the elements which would make it possible to have a good judgment on the situation in question.

Those two uses of *coh* come to integrating the proposition **p** working in a discursive framework relating to a topic, which is already filled by a first proposition: **p** has no other meaning than taking into account a first proposition – which is confirmed by the fact that **p** is a question. *coh* establishes a twofold framework, thus presenting the question as an echo of what has been said previously, giving no stabilization to the second position, (r_j), contrary to the case when it is postpositionally attached: through his question *So* echoes what S1 has just said.

***coh* in postposition**

coh in final position appears in assertions and imperatives: in both cases the off-centering regarding r_j corresponds to a stabilization of r_j .

***coh* in an assertion**

(72) *vie khəŋ kaa khəŋ coh*
 3 angry part angry *coh*

If he is angry, let him be so (he must have a good reason for that)

(73) S1 *neak ?aɛɲ tvee khoh tiv polih*
 person 2 do wrong go police

So *kɲom khoh haəy ʔaoy kɲom soom toh coh*
 1sg wrong PART give 1sg ask punishment coh

- You are wrong. We are going to the police. – I admit I'm wrong, please forgive me

In (72) So considers that, whatever S1 may think, there is no solution but to accept the bad mood of the person in question. The particle *kaa* is what indicates that this negative assessment of S1 is contextually expressed. The off-centering introduced by *coh* means that concerning the state of 'he' So does not share the negative position of S1 and invites him to accept this situation. In (73), S1 accuses So of having behaved badly: after having first objected to this accusation, So admits he was wrong, then coming down to the position supported from the start by S1.

coh in imperative

We will distinguish three types of uses:

- The ball is in your court

(74) *ʔaŋcəŋ samrac ləə Neak srəy coh*
 so decide on Person woman coh

If that's so, you make the decision (I leave it up to you)

(75) *neak naa khoh neak naa trəv ʔaɛŋ kit məəl coh*
 person INDF wrong person indef be.right 2sg think see coh

Who is wrong, who is right, it's for you to decide (I will respect your judgment)

In (74) – (75), the context is that of a choice which is liable to involve S1 as well as So (*a priori* there is no necessity for So and S1 to make the same choice), and So takes the initiative to ask S1 to be in charge of the decision, giving up making it himself: he accepts the choice made by S1 in advance.

(76) *khao kɲom tɨŋ msɛmɛŋ ʔaɛŋ yɔək slie? coh*
 trousers 1sg buy yesterday 2sg take dress coh

The trousers I bought yesterday, put them on! » (they are for you)

In (76) the meaning is quite similar: So parts with the trousers he bought for the benefit of **S1** (thus reconsidering the reasons why he bought them).

- Permission

(77) S1 *soomtoh kɲom soom tiv mun haəy So ʔaŋcəŋ coh*
 beg.pardon 1sg ask go before part please coh

- Excuse me, I'd like to ask your permission to leave early. – Go ahead! (you can leave!)

In the case of permission, it is not So but S1 who is interested in the validation of **p** (*leave earlier*); but validating **p** or not depends on So: with *coh* So puts **p** back under S1 freedom of action, thus giving up his power of decision.

- Restarting after a suspension:

(78) *baat kɲom niŋ phcɔap turreaʔsap look tiv*
 yes 1sg part connect phone Sir go

look smit soom rancam soom mien praasah coh
 mister smith ask wait ask have speech coh

Yes, just a moment, I'll connect you with Mr. Smith, hold on, please. Go on, speak!

This third case is close to the previous one: the validation of **p** which is aimed at by S1 is under the temporary control of So.

Bibliography

- FISHER, K., (ed.), (2006), *Approaches to discourse particles*, Studies in Pragmatics 1, Elsevier.
- FRASER, B., (1990) "An approach of discourse markers", *Journal of Pragmatics*, 14.3 : 383 -395.
- HAYMAN, J. (2011), *Cambodian Khmer*, London Oriental and African Language Library 16, John Benjamins Publishing Company.
- HEADLEY, R. (1977), *Cambodian English Dictionary*, D.C. The Catholic University of America Press.
- JUCKER, A., SMITH, S. & LÜDGE, T., (2003) "Interactive aspects of vagueness in conversation", *Journal of Pragmatics*, 35: 1737-1769.
- KHIN S. (2002) *La grammaire du khmer moderne*. Paris : Editions You – Feng.
- PAILLARD D. (2009) "Prise en charge, commitment ou scène énonciative." In *Langue française*, 162 : 109 - 128.
- PAILLARD, D. (2014) "A study of three particles in khmer: *təv, mək, coh*", in: S. Hancil (ed) *Final particles*, Elsevier.
- THACH, J. (2013) *L'indéfinition en khmer, du groupe nominal au discours. Etude des particules ʔəy et naa*.