Grammaticalization or pragmaticalization of discourse markers?

More than a terminological issue

Liesbeth Degand and Jacqueline Evers-Vermeul
Université catholique de Louvain, Belgium / Utrecht University, The Netherlands

Discourse markers are a crucial component of natural language, which is why a description and account of their diachronic evolution must be part of our linguistic models. However, researchers have different views on whether this evolution should be accounted for in terms of grammaticalization and/or pragmaticalization. In this paper, we provide a structured overview of the accounts given for the diachronic evolution of DMs. It is shown that the different positions encountered in the literature can be brought back to diverging views on the conceptualization of grammar, the categorization of discourse markers, and the weight that is put on specific processes involved in the diachronic change. We provide case studies for each of the positions that we present and discuss.

Keywords: discourse markers, grammaticalization, pragmaticalization

1. Introduction

Discourse markers (DMs) are "ideal for observing variation and change: they originate in different grammatical categories, they often compete with many other forms, and they are sensitive to trends regarding language use" (Vincent 2005: 191). However, whether the diachronic evolution of DMs should be accounted for in terms of grammaticalization and/or pragmaticalization is a question that has given rise to a number of diverging views. According to Beijering (2012: 57), "[t]he status of pragmaticalization is controversial because it is not a generally accepted type of language change. Most linguists are reluctant to assign a special status to the rise of discourse markers, while at the same time admitting that the development of discourse markers is by no means a prototypical case of grammaticalization."

A significant number of authors have indeed raised the distinction between the two processes as an explicit topic of discussion (Dostie 2004; Günthner and Mutz 2004; Brinton 2006; Diewald 2006, 2011a, 2011b; Ocampo 2006; Claridge and Arnovick 2010; Degand and Simon-Vandenbergen 2011; Beijering 2012; Boye and Harder 2012; Heine 2013). Probably still more authors discuss the topic indirectly through case studies in different languages, including Aijmer 1997 (*I think*); Barth-Weingarten and Couper-Kuhlen 2002 (*though*); Pinto de Lima 2002 (*pois*); Hansen 2005 (*enfin*); Mulder and Thompson 2008 (*but*); Rossari and Cojacariu 2008 (*la preuve*, *la raison*); Arroyo 2011 (*muy bien*); Evers-Vermeul et al. 2011 (*want*, *omdat*, *car*, *parce que*); Degand and Fagard 2012 (*car*, *parce que*). It is hard to draw a clear line in the arguments put forward by opponents and proponents of one or the other position, not the least because the basic linguistic categories and concepts involved in the discussion are not univocally defined.

It is well known that researchers in the field have not reached a clear consensus on the boundaries of the linguistic category of DMs, nor on how to define them as (functional) linguistic expressions (for an explicit discussion of possible reasons for these disagreements, see Fischer [ed.] 2006; Ocampo 2006; Dér 2010; Aijmer and Simon-Vandenbergen 2011; Lewis 2011; Degand et al. 2013). For the purposes of this paper, we are adopting a very broad definition: "The main function of DMs is to relate an utterance to the situation of discourse, more specifically to speaker–hearer interaction, speaker attitudes, and/or the organization of texts" (Heine 2013: 1211). In principle this definition could cover "any element of language that plays a role in the organization of discourse" (Vincent 2005: 189).

Key to the debate about whether DMs result from grammaticalization or some other process is to come to grips with the grammatical status of DMs. Following the fairly standard definition, grammaticalization is "the change whereby lexical items and constructions come in certain linguistic contexts to serve grammatical functions, and once grammaticalized, continue to develop new grammatical functions" (Hopper and Traugott 2003: 18). If DMs are considered to serve "new grammatical functions", the diachronic process by which they develop must be grammaticalization, and there is no need for a distinct process of pragmaticalization. On the other hand, if we agree on the definition that pragmaticalization is "the process by which a syntagma or word form, in a given context, changes its propositional meaning in favor of an essentially metacommunicative, discourse interactional meaning" (Frank-Job 2006: 397), then DMs should be viewed as the outcome of such a process. Some authors have indeed defined pragmaticalization very simply as equivalent to the development of discourse markers (Norde 2009: 22–4). In this context it seems that deciding on the grammatical nature of DMs should give us the ultimate answer on the linguistic process that is responsible for their rise in language. On the one hand, Fraser (1999: 943) states that

"[s]yntactically, it seems clear that DMs do not constitute a separate syntactic category", and he suggests that "DMs [can] be considered as a pragmatic class, so defined because they contribute to the interpretation of an utterance rather than to its propositional content" (Fraser 1999: 946). On the other hand, Diewald (2006, 2011b) defends the idea that pragmatic functions are genuinely grammatical functions which are indispensable for the organization of spoken dialogic discourse.

On the basis of these contradictory claims, we believe that the main question of this paper — "Should the diachronic evolution of discourse markers be accounted for in terms of grammaticalization and/or pragmaticalization?" — actually covers two sub-questions:

i.   Are discourse markers grammatical expressions?
ii. Are the processes of linguistic change involved (prototypical of) those of grammaticalization?

If the answer to both questions is "yes", the process involved is grammaticalization; if it is "no", the process involved is pragmaticalization or still something else; if it is "yes and no", both processes could be involved. Answering these questions requires that we reflect on how and where to draw the line between grammar and pragmatics; but also on how crucial the different criteria proposed in the literature for prototypical cases of grammaticalization are. Eventually, we should consider whether some DMs could be instances of grammaticalization while others would not.

The aim of this paper is to provide a structured overview of the literature of the accounts given for the diachronic evolution of DMs. Our working hypothesis is that the different positions encountered in the literature can be brought back to diverging views regarding the conceptualization of grammar. Put simply, if grammar is restricted to semantics, phonology, morphology and syntax, DMs will not be viewed as the result of a grammaticalization process; if, in contrast, grammar is viewed as including discourse-pragmatic phenomena, then DMs will most probably find a satisfying account in terms of grammaticalization. For each position, we will try to distill the proponents' view of grammar on the basis of the parameters, criteria or definitions given. Furthermore, we will review other factors, if present, that might play a role in this debate. This confrontation should help us answer the question as to whether grammaticalization and pragmaticalization are variants of the same process or different processes that are empirically and theoretically motivated.

2.   Grammaticalization, pragmaticalization or something else

According to Ocampo (2006: 316–7), there are four basic positions in the litera-
ture with regard to the treatment of discourse phenomena in language change. He
summarizes these views as follows:

> Some authors include movement towards discourse within the process of gram-
> maticalization without any change in this notion (Onodera 1995, Brinton 1996,
> Pinto de Lima 2002). Another position is to expand the notions of grammar
> and grammaticalization so that they encompass movement towards discourse
> (Traugott 1995[b], Lenker 2000). The third position is to postulate two subtypes:
> *grammaticalization I*, movement towards the morpheme, and *grammaticalization
> II*, movement towards discourse (Wischer 2000). A fourth position, which may be
> considered a variant of the previous one, is to postulate the notion of *pragmati-
> calization* (Aijmer 1997, Erman and Kotsinas 1993, Günthner and Mutz 2004).

We used Ocampo's classification as a starting point for our description of the
different positions held in the literature with respect to the question at hand.
However, we wish to organize the discussion by distinguishing five lines of clear-
cut reasoning concerning the semantic and grammatical process(es) that may ac-
count for the emergence and diachronic evolution of DMs (of which the first three
are comparable to the positions mentioned by Heine (2013: 1219)):

1. It is grammaticalization, and the concept of pragmaticalization is superfluous
    (cf. Ocampo's first and second position);
2. It is a special type of grammaticalization, namely pragmaticalization cf.
    Ocampo's third position);
3. It is pragmaticalization, a linguistic process distinct from grammaticalization
    (cf. Ocampo's fourth position);
4. It is sometimes grammaticalization, and sometimes pragmaticalization;
5. It is not grammaticalization, but it is not pragmaticalization either.

In our list, we have collapsed Ocampo's first two positions, because including the
movement towards discourse within the process of grammaticalization does in-
volve a change in this notion, whether the authors discuss this change explicitly
or not. Furthermore, we added two criteria in order to be able to provide a more
detailed picture. The following sections develop the arguments for each of these
views.

2.1 DMs grammaticalize, and pragmaticalization is a superfluous concept

Proponents of the view that the emergence and evolution of DMs is a case of grammaticalization plead for the expansion of the notions of grammar and grammaticalization so that the latter encompasses movement towards discourse (Traugott 1995b; Brinton 1996; Lenker 2000). In other words, they adopt an "extended view" of grammar in order to include discourse phenomena (Heine et al. 1991; Hopper and Traugott 2003 [1993]; Himmelmann 2004). Similarly, the concept of grammaticalization is extended to comprise the linguistic development of expressions functioning at the discourse level.

According to Traugott (1995b), a separate concept of pragmaticalization lacks justification since clear grammatical forms, such as tense, can also have pragmatic functions. Thus, to treat DMs as instances of something other than grammaticalization would be "to obscure its similarities with the more canonical clines" (Traugott 1995b: 15). She claims that the development of DMs is indistinguishable in many formal and semantic aspects from grammaticalization "proper", so that the distinction becomes minimal. Pinto de Lima (2002: 373) holds exactly the same view:[1]

> We may say that it [= the rise of the Portuguese phatic marker *pois*] is a case of grammaticalization (Traugott 1995[b]: 2); although our conception of grammaticalization itself ought to be somehow revised; to encompass a new view of grammar, i.e. a view according to which grammar "structures communicative (including cognitive) aspects of language. It encompasses not only phonology; morphosyntax and semantics but also inferences that arise out of linguistic form […]"   (Traugott 1995[b]: 7).

Brinton (2010) shares the view that there is no need for the concept of pragmaticalization to account for the linguistic change of linguistic expressions at the discoursal level, in her terms "pragmatic markers". She admits that some of the "typical grammaticalization criteria" such as "morphological bonding ("coalescence" see Lehmann [1995: 148]) or phonological reduction ("attrition"; see Lehmann [1995: 126])" do not readily apply. Nevertheless, pragmatic markers "do undergo many of the morphosyntactic and semantic changes thought criterial to grammaticalization" (Brinton 2010: 61–2). Brinton lists the following ten parameters, which she believes justify a description in terms of grammaticalization (Brinton 2010: 62; see also Brinton 2001): decategorialization, change from major (open) to minor (closed) word class, freezing of form, desemanticization or semantic "attrition", shift from referential (propositional) to non-referential (pragmatic or

---

1. Note that this quotation shows that Pinto de Lima (2002) should be listed as a proponent of Ocampo's second position, instead of his first position — contrary to what Ocampo does.

procedural) meaning, conventionalization of invited inferences, subjectification, divergence, layering and persistence.

This view that a process distinct from grammaticalization is unnecessary to account for the diachronic evolution of DMs is advocated in several empirical studies in a variety of languages. A strong advocate is Diewald (2006, 2011b) who considers DMs to be grammatical items, and consequently regards their diachronic evolution as an instance of grammaticalization. She defends the idea that pragmatic functions are genuinely grammatical functions which are indispensable for the organization and structuring of spoken dialogic discourse. DMs are indexical elements operating in spoken dialogic communication: turn-taking signals, topic changers, etc.

Rosenkvist and Skärlund (2013) take a similar view. Studying the evolution of the Swedish lexical item *typ* ('type') from noun, to preposition, to adverb, to DM, they defend the idea that this evolution is a straightforward case of grammaticalization. This position "emanates from a conviction that both semantic, syntactic and pragmatic aspects have to be taken into account when studying grammaticalization — only a combined perspective can give us a deeper understanding of the grammaticalization process" (Rosenkvist and Skärlund 2013: 331).

Méndez-Naya (2006) aims to study whether the different uses of present-day English *right* (as adjunct, modifier and DM) are related in terms of grammaticalization. She concludes that this is indeed the case, showing that "[r]ight started as a typical adverb showing adjunct function but it soon specialized *in a more grammatical function*, that of modifier" (Méndez-Naya 2006: 164, emphasis added). This modifier use (intensifier, negative and focusing modifier) expanded significantly in the Middle English period both in frequency and in functional range, and it then (nearly) disappeared in this use in Early Modern English. The latter period "witnesses the emergence of a new, *more grammatical function* of *right*, that of discourse marker" (Méndez-Naya 2006: 165, emphasis added), of which the adjective *right* is argued to be the most likely source. Clearly, Méndez-Naya regards DMs as grammatical items, which emerge from a grammaticalization process, even if a number of "concomitants of grammaticalization, particularly condensation and fixation, are not met" (Méndez-Naya 2006: 160).

Other researchers do not even address the issue. They seem to take for granted that the diachronic development of the DMs they study is a case of grammaticalization (e.g., Fitzmaurice 2004, on the development of English speaker stance; Andersen 2007, on the rise of French discourse markers, such as *je crois*; Chang 2008, on contrastive markers in Taiwanese Southern Min; Ahn 2010, on the English causal adposition, *thanks to*, and its Korean counterpart, *tekpwuney*; Hyun-Oak Kim 2011, on the Korean discourse marker, *ketun*; Koops and Lohmann 2013 on the sequencing of DMs in English).

Finally, it is worth mentioning Boye and Harder's (2012) usage-based theory of grammatical status and grammaticalization. The authors do not specifically address the diachronic evolution of discourse markers, but they propose a conceptualization of grammaticalization that is meant to accommodate both "uncontroversial cases" and types that "some scholars are reluctant to include […] under grammaticalization proper" (Boye and Harder 2012: 22). In their view, grammar "is constituted by expressions that by linguistic convention are ancillary and as such discursively secondary in relation to other expressions — and […] grammaticalization consists in the diachronic change that leads to such expressions" (Boye and Harder 2012: 7).

2.2 DMs show a special type of grammaticalization: They pragmaticalize

In line with the previous view is the position that the evolution of DMs differs from prototypical grammaticalization, but that it does not require a separate process to be accounted for satisfactorily. In other words, pragmaticalization should be viewed as an extension of grammaticalization, not as a distinct process. Still, the concept of pragmaticalization is maintained in this second position — as a subtype of grammaticalization — whereas in the first position it is regarded as superfluous. Brinton (2010: 64) formulates it as follows:

> Pragmaticalization, it seems to me, is just a subspecies of grammaticalization, not a distinct process. […] although pragmatic parentheticals such as *I mean* are extrasyntactic, falling outside the core syntactic structure of the sentence, they are not agrammatical, and their adverbial-like function would place them squarely within the grammar.

It can be argued that Barth-Weingarten and Couper-Kuhlen (2002) share this view, although they discuss pragmaticalization and grammaticalization in terms of family resemblance (p. 358), and not in terms of subtypes:

> The development of discourse markers could then be considered as related to more prototypical cases of grammaticalization in terms of family resemblance (cf. Taylor 1989: 108–121). This would explain why in some cases only a rather limited number of Lehmann's grammaticalization criteria are met. And it would release us from the necessity of making a binary decision as to whether a particular case is to be included in the category of grammaticalization or not. This would allow us to focus on the similarities with prototypical grammaticalization rather than on the differences (cf. Traugott 1995a: 20) and we could incorporate interesting borderline cases, such as the discourse marker *though*, into the discussion.
>
> (Barth-Weingarten and Couper-Kuhlen 2002: 357)

What both these citations refer to, albeit indirectly for Brinton, is the idea of "prototypical grammaticalization" following from the notion of "prototypical grammar" or "core grammar" as composed of syntax, morphology, phonology and semantics, but excluding pragmatic, discoursal factors. However, proponents of this view do not exclude the development of expressions that function at the discourse level from the boundaries of grammar/grammaticalization altogether. Rather, they account for them in terms of "borderline cases" — still grammatical but not "core grammatical".[2] Grammaticalization is then seen as having prototypical (core) and non-prototypical (peripheral) instantiations, discourse markers being at the non-prototypical side of the cline.[3]

In our view, this approach is highly similar to that of Wischer (2000), who postulates two subtypes of grammaticalization. Subtype I concerns the movement towards the morpheme, in her words the "transformation of free syntactic units to highly constrained grammatical morphemes" (Wischer 2000: 356), while Subtype II is about movement towards discourse, which "operates on the textual or discourse level and concerns the development of textual or discourse markers" (Wischer 2000: 356). These two subtypes are brought together under the general, unified process of grammaticalization, which "is not merely a syntactic change, but a global one, including — apart from syntax — morphology, phonology, semantics and discourse as well" (Wischer 2000: 357). Note however that Brinton (2010) and Barth-Weingarten and Couper-Kuhlen (2002) are more explicit on the idea that the movement towards discourse is an extension of the core grammaticalization process. This idea seems to be missing in Wischer's account.

Several other authors pursue the idea that the diachronic evolution of DMs is a "special" case of grammaticalization. Among them is Prévost (2011), who studies the rise of the discourse marker French *à propos* ('by the way'). Although she is not convinced of the utility of increasing labels, and therefore favors the term grammaticalization even in the case of DMs, she can still be considered a proponent of position 2. As she puts it: "I adopt a broad conception of grammar, inclusive of the domain of pragmatics, and thus consider pragmaticalization as a

---

2. Note that Boye and Harder (2012) also distinguish sub-types of grammaticalization, one of which they label as "standard or prototype grammaticalization", and a second type "consists in a CONVENTIONALIZATION OF A DISCURSIVELY SECONDARY MEANING as a property of a new linguistic expression" (Boye and Harder 2012: 22, original emphasis). However, because Boye and Harder do not label this second type as an instance of pragmaticalization, we have chosen not to put their view in this second position towards grammaticalization.

3. Note that proponents of the first view might also mention core domains and peripheral domains of grammar (see Heine et al. 1991; Hopper and Traugott 2003 [1993]; Himmelmann 2004). The crucial difference is that these proponents do not label these domains as sub-types of grammaticalization.

mere subclass of grammaticalization which shows the crucial features of it, though pertaining to the pragmatic area" (Prévost 2011: 408). Similarly, Callies (2012: 5) argues that *wh*-clefts in spoken English represent a case of pragmaticalization, which he defines as "the grammaticalization of discourse function", and hence as a subtype of grammaticalization: the initial *wh*-clause develops into a topic marker or discourse-marker-like phrase. Rehbock (2001), studying the recent emergence in spoken German of non-referential uses of the time adverbial *jetzt* ('now'), calls upon the notion of pragmaticalization as a "sister category" (p. 263, our translation) of grammaticalization.

2.3 DMs pragmaticalize, a process different from grammaticalization

As Sections 2.1 and 2.2 have illustrated, opponents of a distinct concept of pragmaticalization often focus on the processes involved in the diachronic development of DMs. Proponents of pragmaticalization as a separate process, however, more often focus on the linguistic outcome of the evolution. Traditionally, the concept of pragmaticalization is linked to work by Erman and Kotsinas (1993). In their view, grammaticalization and pragmaticalization are two distinct processes:

> one of them resulting in the creation of grammatical markers, functioning mainly sentence internally, the other resulting in discourse markers mainly serving as text structuring devices at different levels of discourse. We reserve the term grammaticalization for the first of these two paths, while we propose the term pragmaticalization for the second one.   (Erman and Kotsinas 1993: 79)

That is to say, it is the nature of the linguistic element under investigation which is decisive for the process involved. Simplifying their arguments to some extent, one could say that since DMs are pragmatic in nature (just like other pragmatic expressions, such as modal particles, politeness expressions and meta-discursive markers), they result from a pragmaticalization process, whereas grammatical expressions (such as determiners, prepositions and auxiliaries) are the outcome of a grammaticalization process (but see Section 2.4).

Similarly, Günthner and Mutz (2004) argue that the development of DMs does not fit into a narrow view of grammaticalization and that their main feature is the development of pragmatic functions — a process which they claim, is best referred to as pragmaticalization.

Setting pragmaticalization apart from grammaticalization implies that researchers are capable of drawing the boundary between pragmatics and grammar, but this is not a trivial task (for a thorough discussion of the division of labor between grammar and pragmatics, see Ariel 2008, 2010). In this context, Aijmer (1997: 2) proposes a "truth-conditional criterion" to distinguish between

grammatical and pragmatic elements, stating that "elements which cannot be analyzed in terms of truth are pragmatic or pragmaticalized". According to her, "[d]iscourse markers […] are typically 'pragmaticalized' since they involve the speaker's attitude to the hearer" (Aijmer 1997: 2).

Frank-Job (2006: 361) — who argues her position on the basis of both the resulting linguistic items and the processes involved — is also a proponent of pragmaticalization. Studying Italian discourse markers such as *va bene* ('alright'), *adesso* ('now'), *guarda* ('look'), she claims that pragmaticalization distinguishes itself from grammaticalization because of "the linguistic status of the domain in which the new (pragmatic) meaning functions" (Frank-Job 2006: 373, fn. 6), which in the case of DMs is the discourse domain. Seeing both grammaticalization and pragmaticalization as a response to problems of communication, she states that:

> [r]ecurrent communicative problems both on the level of message structuring (grammar) and on the level of discourse structuring (discourse pragmatics) tend to be resolved by speech communities in a durable way, i.e., in routinized techniques which can be used in a merely automatic manner. […] In the case of pragmaticalization, the routinization and functional specialization affects the discourse organizing function of words: instead of contributing to the propositional content of the interaction, the pragmaticalized linguistic item operates on the level of discourse organization. (Frank-Job 2006: 361)

Frank-Job also lists a number of phonetic, morphologic, syntactic and textual features which, when taken together, indicate that the pragmaticalization process of a DM has taken place. These are (i) high frequency, (ii) phonetic reduction, (iii) syntactic isolation, (iv) co-occurrence in contiguity, and (v) propositional/syntactic optionality. Frank-Job does not explicitly refer to the processes that result in these features, but indirectly we get insight into the sub-processes that are involved in the pragmaticalization process.

Finally, Claridge and Arnovick (2010) also explicitly address the question of whether the development of DMs should be accounted for in terms of pragmaticalization or grammaticalization, concluding that the former is a better "label" (see Claridge 2013: 179 for the same conclusion). They present their own case studies (the hedge *as it were*, the conversational formulas *goodbye* and *bless you!*), and summarize other researchers' work on pragmatic expressions (the DM *well*, the politeness marker *pray* (*you*)/*prithee*, and the swearing/interjection *Jesus!*/*gee*), in order to derive common characteristics of the pragmaticalization process and its outcomes. The six case studies appear to share a number of semantic processes: (i) the evolution from referential to discourse-orientated and/or interpersonal meaning including semantic bleaching through pragmatic strengthening, (ii) persistence of the original lexico-grammatical meaning, (iii) subjectification, and to a certain

extent (iv) intersubjectification. Syntactically, there may be (i) scope extension, (ii) decategorialization, and (iii) syntactic optionality. It is noteworthy that some of these, if not all, have been typically ascribed to grammaticalization by a number of authors (in particular, Traugott 1995b and Brinton 2010). Claridge and Arnovick do indeed concede that some of the processes they describe as being involved in pragmaticalization also occur in grammaticalization, but they claim that this is not completely true for all processes and that "some of the processes seem to be actually better suited to pragmaticalization than to grammaticalization" (Claridge and Arnovick 2010: 185). Apparently, the outcome of the diachronic process is the most decisive factor, since the authors point out that all six forms "function on the level of discourse (i.e., they arise in discourse and their functioning remains wedded to the realm). Their origin and consequent use is governed by conversational goals and principles" (Claridge and Arnovick 2010: 182). Interestingly, the authors develop the idea that once pragmaticalized, some linguistic expressions may develop new/further pragmatic functions, as has been noted for grammaticalization as well (e.g., the notion of secondary grammaticalization introduced by Givón 1991). Claridge and Arnovick propose the label "discursisation" for the development of such further pragmatic uses of an already pragmatic item.

Thus, on the one hand, there are a number of processes that are deemed to be very important in grammaticalization (as put forward by, for instance, Lehmann 1985 and Heine 2003) that would not apply to pragmatic items (e.g., obligatorification, paradigmaticalization, scope condensation and syntactic fixedness). On the other hand, there are those processes that seem crucial to pragmaticalization and that, although they may be present in grammaticalization, are not essential to it, like subjectification and pragmatic strengthening. This leads Claridge and Arnovick (2010: 186) to conclude that "grammaticalisation shares characteristics with pragmaticalisation and not vice versa".[4] Nevertheless, the most crucial argument in the authors' plea for pragmaticalization is the nature of the outputs of the changes, which according to them cannot be called grammatical because pragmatic elements fall outside a "narrower" and "more traditional" notion of grammar, which in their view is needed for heuristic purposes of clarity of linguistic description.

Hansen (2008), in her study of French phasal adverbs, shares this idea of common characteristics between grammaticalization and pragmaticalization.

---

4. We share the view of one of the anonymous reviewers that this claim is not flawless. Logically, if grammaticalization shares features with pragmaticalization, then pragmaticalization shares features with grammaticalization; that is, there must be an overlapping set of characteristics. The major point Claridge and Arnovick try to make, is that the features of pragmaticalization cannot be restricted to the features typical of grammaticalization.

She insists that pragmaticalization "is not a subtype of grammaticalization, but rather the result of only partially identical kinds of changes" (Hansen 2008: 58). Thus, "the evolution of pragmatic markers represent[s] an instance of pragmaticalization, not of grammaticalization, in as much as it is characterized by features such as scope increase, syntagmatic and paradigmatic variability, and pragmatic strengthening, although it may also — like grammaticalization — be accompanied by phonological attrition, morphological coalescence, and decategorialization of the source item" (Hansen 2008: 64). In terms of output, Hansen (2008: 82) describes pragmaticalization as "the process whereby context-level markers evolve out of erstwhile content-level items".

Finally, studying the rise of German *so* as a focus marker, Wiese (2011: 1018–19), concedes that the "domain of language change processes that result in words with a *pragmatic* rather than a grammatical function […] is closely related to that of grammaticalization […], but differs from it in its functional outcome". And this is why she prefers the concept of pragmaticalization (for a similar line of reasoning, see Dostie 2004: 26–8). This position also follows from her "more narrow view of grammar" that "does not include processes involved in the organization of discourse, conceptualization, and general information management" (Wiese 2011: 1017).

2.4 DMs sometimes grammaticalize; they sometimes pragmaticalize

Erman and Kotsinas's (1993) view is more nuanced than that presented in Section 2.3. They actually argue that some DMs undergo grammaticalization while others do not. Thus, there are two possible sources for DMs, and consequently two pathways for the rise of DMs:

i.   from lexical item directly to DM, with only pragmaticalization;
ii.   from lexical item to grammatical marker to DM where pragmaticalization follows grammaticalization.

Again we see the idea that grammaticalization and pragmaticalization are two distinct processes. Their baseline is that the function of DMs is seen as a pragmatic one, which is outside the grammar, calling for specific (sub)processes of linguistic change. Grammaticalization is only posited for the evolution of DMs if the DM originates from a previous grammatical item in the traditional sense.

Onodera (2000), who studies two groups of Japanese discourse markers, also adheres to this view: *na* elements undergo pragmaticalization without involving grammaticalization, but the *demo* type connectives undergo both grammaticalization and pragmaticalization.

A case study taking this position can be found in Marchello-Nizia (2009), who studies the development of the French concessive connectors *cependant* ('yet'), *toutefois* ('however') and *pourtant* ('though'). She shows that these linguistic forms first change their syntactic category through a process of grammaticalization (from verbal and nominal expressions to adverbials), in absence of any concessive meaning; then, through a process of pragmaticalization, these adverbials acquire a concessive meaning. *Cependant*, for instance, originates in a verbal expression with temporal (durative) meaning with adjectival use, belonging to the judicial, technical vocabulary. Over time, it evolved through multiple cases of grammaticalization into a temporal preposition and a temporal adverbial, marking simultaneity between two processes. The meaning change from simultaneity to concession is favored by contexts in which the meaning of simultaneity may also mark a contrast, or when the marker co-occurs with an established concessive adverbial, before it can be used independently as a concessive connective and discourse marker. Although Marchello-Nizia (2009) is not explicit about which factors distinguish the processes of grammaticalization and pragmaticalization, she seems to imply that whenever meaning change involves inferencing and pragmatic strengthening, pragmaticalization is involved.

The proponents of position 4 are few. They heavily rely on particular case studies to determine the nature of the diachronic process (albeit not only the resulting items, but also the linguistic items from which they originate), and less so on the precise mechanisms involved.

2.5 DMs do not grammaticalize, nor do they pragmaticalize

Waltereit (2006) focuses on the mechanisms involved in the evolution of DMs, and rejects the rise of DMs as an instance of grammaticalization because the diachronic evolution of DMs does not conform to Lehmann's (1995) grammaticalization parameters. According to him, the change is simply a case of "discursive reanalysis" (i.e., the description of the speaker's strategies when he or she is using a lexical or grammatical item at the discursive level). However, this discursive reanalysis cannot be seen as a synonym for pragmaticalization, because Waltereit does not recognize it as an independent process, but, rather, as a sub-process of language change. In Waltereit's approach, Lehmann's criteria are taken as decisive of what is grammaticalization, and what is not. Some authors have labeled this view of grammaticalization the "narrow" or "restricted" view of grammaticalization (see Degand and Simon-Vandenbergen 2011: 290).

Also holding a "narrow" view of grammaticalization, Hopper (2000: 21) argues that "[Lehmann's] principles are useful, indeed indispensable […] They are, however, characteristic of grammaticization which has already attained a fairly

advanced stage and is unambiguously recognizable as such". This quotation foregrounds the idea that inventories of the parameters of grammaticalization are highly dependent on the type of marker one is dealing with and on the stage of grammaticalization this marker is supposedly in. In our view, preserving grammaticalization for the study of prototypical cases risks overlooking the similarities between prototypical and non-prototypical developments, while strengthening the divergences, with a loss of generalization as a consequence. This appears clearly from a number of alternative proposals to account for the emergence and evolution of DMs, calling neither for grammaticalization, nor for pragmaticalization.

For example, in his study of the DM *claro* in spoken Spanish, Ocampo (2006: 317) shows that:

> although *claro* shares characteristics with grammar and grammaticalization, there are also important differences, which make it difficult and even contradictory to assimilate this process to grammaticalization. This is evident if we consider that grammaticalization is a movement towards syntax and morphology, and that *claro* moves precisely to the opposite end: outside of syntax and towards discourse. […] discoursivization is the diachronic process that ends in discourse and the one that *claro* follows from adjective to discourse particle.

Ocampo claims that the evolution of DMs should be recognized as a linguistic process *per se*, separate from grammaticalization. His argumentation might be interpreted as a plea in favor of a separate process of pragmaticalization, but this is not the case: he prefers to label this linguistic process "discoursivization". Note that this discoursivization is different from what Claridge and Arnovick call "discursisation", since the latter seems to be restricted to the recruitment of "discursive markers from illocutionary material" (Claridge and Arnovick 2010: 183).

Another alternative is the recent proposal by Heine (2013). On the basis of work on thetical grammar, Heine and his colleagues (Kaltenböck et al. 2011; Heine et al. 2013) argue that neither grammaticalization nor pragmaticalization are entirely satisfactory to understand the nature of discourse markers. Instead, they claim that the rise of discourse markers involves an operation called "cooptation", whereby information units such as clauses, phrases or words are transferred from the domain of sentence grammar to that of discourse organization. According to them, the main difference between grammaticalization and cooptation is one of pace and gradualness: "Grammaticalization is a gradual process that may take centuries to be accomplished. Cooptation, by contrast, is spontaneous rather than gradual, it can take place any time and in any situation" (Heine 2013: 1222).

We cannot agree with this "spontaneous character" to account for the evolution of discourse markers, because many different studies in different languages have exposed the gradual rise of linguistic expressions as discourse markers (e.g.,

Brinton 1996; Traugott 1999; Schwenter and Traugott 2000; Waltereit 2002; Evers-Vermeul 2005; Lewis 2007, 2011; Degand and Fagard 2011, 2012, to name but a few). For example, a phenomenon that is frequently mentioned in these studies, and that is typical of gradual change, is that of layering (Hopper 1991): the co-existence of older and newer forms for shorter or longer periods.

2.6 Preliminary conclusion

The overview leaves us with the unsatisfactory feeling that there is no decisive way to determine the process(es) involved when it comes to the rise and diachronic evolution of DMs. However, two factors seem to prevail: either it is the authors' conceptualization of grammar which plays a decisive role (more specifically whether DMs belong to the grammar or not), or it is the nature of the diachronic processes involved in the diachronic change.

Let us, for the sake of argument, simplify the choice to the binary one between grammaticalization and pragmaticalization. In that context, if one focuses on the sole outcome of the diachronic development, and DMs are conceptualized as belonging to the grammar, their emergence will be a case of grammaticalization; if DMs are not part of the grammar, it is another process of language change (e.g., pragmaticalization) for that matter. Note that this simplified choice neglects, for the time being, that grammatical items could arise through processes other than grammaticalization (for a discussion, see, for example, Campbell 2001: Section 5).

If, on the other hand, the focus is on the process(es) involved, this requires one to identify the processes that are typical of grammaticalization and/or pragmaticalization. In other words, if grammaticalization and pragmaticalization are seen as distinct concepts, grammaticalization typically involves processes x, y and z, whereas pragmaticalization involves processes a, b and c.

Alternatively, prototypical grammaticalization may be extended to less prototypical developments, in which not all processes x, y, z apply. In this case, grammaticalization and pragmaticalization are too close to be recognized as separate concepts. However, according to Norde and Beijering (2012) this comes with a certain risk; namely, "stretching the notion of 'grammar', and hence of 'grammaticalization' to the point that the development of discourse markers become 'standard cases of grammaticalization'" (Diewald 2011b: 384) obscures substantial differences between different cases of grammaticalization in this sense, making it a heterogeneous category with little descriptive power".

3.   Discussion and Conclusion

Since discourse markers are a crucial component of natural language, their diachronic evolution must form a part of our linguistic models. Whether this evolution is best described in terms of grammaticalization, pragmaticalization or something else depends on (i) the researcher's conceptualization of grammar, and (ii) the set of (sub)processes that are said to be criterial for grammaticalization. The first factor is particularly relevant if researchers focus on the outcome of the diachronic development (a DM), whereas the second factor is essential if researchers focus on the mechanisms involved in the diachronic development. We recommend, therefore, that future studies of grammaticalization and/or pragmaticalization be explicit about their conceptualization of grammar, and of the (sub)processes involved in grammaticalization.

In this section, we will put forward our own view and argue on the basis of our own work why we believe that the evolution of DMs is better accounted for in terms of grammaticalization, in line with the authors cited in Section 2.1 (especially Brinton, Diewald, Méndez-Naya, Rosenkvist and Skärlund, and Traugott). We will also illustrate why we believe the other approaches are less adequate.

First, we maintain the view that pragmatic functions are genuinely grammatical functions which are indispensable for the organization of spoken dialogic discourse, as well as for the coherence of written texts. This position does justice to the fact that no clear line can be drawn between pragmatics and grammar, since traditional "grammatical" categories (e.g., tense, aspect and mood expressions) may be found to have pragmatic functions (Traugott 1995b), and discourse-related categories (e.g., topic and focus) may display a grammatical dimension (Brinton and Traugott 2005: 139; Prévost 2011: 408). Our functional view of grammar is in accordance with usage-based approaches which also tend to reject the assumption of a clear line between lexicon and grammar (see Langacker's 2008 Cognitive Grammar, and Goldberg's 1995 and Croft's 2001 approaches to Construction Grammar).

We, thus, explicitly disagree with Wiese (2011: 1017) that a narrow view of grammar is necessary in order "to separate the grammatical system proper from more general domains involved in communication" and that only the grammatical system proper "is specific to language and covers, in addition to possibly universal features of grammar, restrictions and rules, or constructions that are specific to a particular language or language family" (Wiese 2011: 1017). If we understand this quote correctly, Wiese seems to suggest that grammar is mainly language specific, although grammatical universals are not excluded entirely, and that discourse phenomena are not constrained by language-specific restrictions and rules because they are supposed to be governed by general cognitive domains involved

in communication. However, there is ample empirical evidence for cross-linguistic variation and hence for language-specific restrictions in the phenomena that Wiese considers to fall outside the grammar: organization of discourse, conceptualization and general information management, to name the ones she cites (see, for example, Givón 1983; Hasselgård et al. 2002; Aijmer and Simon-Vandenbergen [eds] 2006). In other words, pragmatic phenomena are no less constrained by language-specific rules than proper (narrow) grammatical phenomena such as syntactic word order, agreement in number, gender and case, tense, etc. Thus, there is no inherent reason to draw a boundary between the two types of phenomena. It follows that we see DMs as a part of the grammar. This implies that our view is also in opposition to Heine's distinction between a traditional "sentence grammar" and a "thetical grammar" for linguistic expressions that handle the immediate communicative and cognitive needs arising from the discourse situation (Heine 2013; Heine et al. 2013).

We also see the development of DMs as falling within the scope of grammaticalization. All authors discussed (see especially Sections 2.1 to 2.3) seem to agree that grammaticalization and pragmaticalization share several types of changes, such as layering, persistence, decategorialization and semantic bleaching (through pragmatic strengthening). The advantage of NOT distinguishing between grammaticalization and pragmaticalization is that there is no need to draw artificial boundaries between different stages of the evolution of DMs.

To illustrate this point, let us look at the rise of the French DM *alors* ('at that time, then, so, now') in detail. Degand and Fagard (2011) have shown how *alors* evolved from a sentence adverbial with temporal meaning, to a connective marking temporal, causal or conditional relations, and eventually to a discourse-structuring marker with conversation management uses. The three uses are illustrated in Examples 1 to 3.

(1) *Temporal sentence adverbial*:
Mais le soir tomba sans que la pluie eût cessé. *Alors*, la Comtesse commit une imprudence … (Degand and Fagard 2011:31)
[But the night fell and the rain still hadn't stopped. *Alors*, the countess got careless …]

(2) *Causal connective*:
ah il adore ça / *alors* ben tu penses bien avec moi euh il était aux aux anges hein (Degand and Fagard 2011:34)
[oh he loves it / *alors* well you'll guess that with me he was in seventh heaven]

(3)   *Structuring discourse marker*:
mais *alors* ce qui était marrant c'est que euh / tout à coup il s'arrêtait / et *alors* euh / assez vite *alors* xx se disait maintenant vous vous dirigez vers telle porte // mais *alors* (Degand and Fagard 2011 : 35)
[but *alors* the funny thing was that er / suddenly he stopped / and *alors* er / quite quickly *alors* xx was saying now you go towards the door // but *alors*]

Relevant for our discussion here is the observation that the semantic evolution of *alors* went hand in hand with grammatical and functional changes leading to new discourse functions. The original meaning of *alors* is a temporal one. It appeared in twelfth-century Old French as a prefixed variant of *lors* ('then') — that is to say, as a temporal adverbial that is restricted to a clause-internal position (integrated adjunct). At the end of the thirteenth century, it appeared in contexts where it retained its temporal meaning but could take causal meanings, and occasionally also conditional meanings (from the fourteenth century on). The frequency of these non-temporal uses rose steadily to 35% at the beginning of the seventeenth century, while 65% were still clearly temporal. In this period of time, nothing changed from a morphological point of view (there was no categorical change), but from a syntactic point of view the clause-initial position became the privileged position for *alors* from the Middle French period on (i.e., from the fifteenth to the sixteenth century). It is in this new syntactic position that new meanings emerged: first temporal, causal and conditional meanings with a connecting function (from the seventeenth century on), then new meta-discursive meanings (mainly topic shifters and transition markers) from the twentieth century on. These new meanings extended their scope over the whole clause. *Alors*, as a temporal, causal or conditional connective, played a role at the local discourse level by making explicit a temporal/causal/conditional coherence relation between two adjacent clauses. In syntactic terms, this use is best described as a conjunct, outside the core syntactic clause — with a clear preference for clause-initial position, but occasionally also occurring in clause-final position. Meta-discursive *alors* is similar from a syntactic point of view (it resembles a non-integrated conjunct), but at the discourse level it is not restricted to connecting adjacent clauses. Rather, it relates the upcoming sentence to the more global discoursal context, working as a discourse structuring device — introducing new topics, resuming a topic (i.e., functions it shares with other DMs such as French *bon* ['good'] or *à propos* ['concerning/speaking of'] and English *well* or *by the way*). From our point of view, the transition from adjunct to conjunct, and from conjunct to DM does not call for separate diachronic processes. Rather, a new syntactic position (clause-initial) gave rise to new meanings, requiring syntactic scope extension over the host clause in the case of the clausal conjunct, and over potentially more than the host clause in the case of the DM.

The transition from the "core grammar" to the "discourse grammar" follows from a series of meaning extensions through pragmatic inferencing (from temporal sequence to causal sequence to meta-discursive sequence) that — given our broad view of grammar — can be well accounted for within grammaticalization.

An additional argument for labeling the rise of DMs as an instance of grammaticalization lies in the cross-linguistic study of particular linguistic expressions (see the approaches in Ahn 2010; Fagard 2010; Simon-Vandenbergen and Willems 2011). Grammatical systems may vary considerably, and certainly so in the area of clause linking and discourse marking. In a "narrow view of grammaticalization", it is, in principle, possible that the diachronic evolution of a grammatical item would, due to different grammatical systems, count as grammaticalization in one language and as pragmaticalization in another language (e.g., affixes to express the same discourse phenomenon in Japanese and Korean, accompanied by a morpho-syntactic response in the one language, and a "syntax-free" response in the other). This may even be the case for typologically close languages such as French and Dutch. Evers-Vermeul et al. (2011) sum up previous research, reporting that the emergence of the French connective *car* ('because, for') "shows a series of features associated with grammaticalization: phonological reduction and internal bonding (from Latin *qua re* 'for which/what reason' to Middle French *quar*/*quer*, to [Present Day French] *car*). In addition, *car* changes from a complex subordinating conjunction to a simple coordinating conjunction, resulting in the loss of *car*'s ability to occur in preposed connective clauses" (Evers-Vermeul et al. 2011:457). These early syntactic changes are accompanied by semantic changes the authors qualify as subjectification. "Where *qua re* functions at the relatively objective referential level, *car* functions at the more subjective textual level, indicating a causal coherence relation put forward by the speaker." Interestingly, the Dutch counterpart of *car*, *want*, undergoes the same syntactic changes from both subordinating and co-ordinating adverbial to exclusive use as a co-ordinator with loss of its use in preposed connective clauses. Evers-Vermeul et al. (2011:459) stress that "this syntactic change in the use of *want* does not involve subjectification: the loss of the subordinating use is not accompanied by a loss of or decrease in content use". In terms of the diachronic processes involved, the narrow view of grammaticalization would probably call for a pragmaticalization phase following up on the grammaticalization of the French connective, and would leave this pragmaticalization phase out for the Dutch connective. In present day language use, however, both French *car* and Dutch *want* are being described as highly subjective connectives (see Degand 2001; Degand and Pander Maat 2003; Pit 2006; Spooren et al. 2010; Degand and Fagard 2012; Zufferey 2012), fulfilling very similar semantic and pragmatic functions. Descriptively, it does not seem adequate to call for different diachronic processes, when the outcome is highly similar.

Finally, a broad view of grammar allows for a straightforward account of those cases where DMs are not the endpoint of the grammaticalization process, but serve, in turn, as input to new grammatical items. For example, Haselow (2011: 3618) suggests that for utterance-final *then* in spoken English "we need to distinguish two grammaticalization processes […] one for the development from an optional conjunct to a DM, and one from a DM to a modal particle." These three uses of *then* (conjunct, DM, modal particle) are illustrated in Examples 4 to 6 (slightly adapted examples taken from Haselow 2011: 3607, 3613).

(4)   If you like him, (**then**) call him.

(5)   A: I like him.
        B: Call him, **then**.

(6)   I'll have a look and see what they've got.
        So what did you do **then**?

Does this approach leave us with grammaticalization as an "empty cover term" (see the objections raised by Joseph 2001, 2004; Norde and Beijering 2012), where just any kind of variation or meaning change should be considered to be an instance of grammaticalization? — A kind of synonym for "language change"? No. In our approach, grammaticalization involves processes with a clear direction: we see grammaticalization as the evolution of linguistic expressions from a more referential, lexically meaningful state to a more functional, elusive state, in which these expressions start to mark the clause, sentence or wider context in which they occur. If proper attention is paid to the specific mechanisms involved, this broad view of grammar and grammaticalization allows us to generalize over a variety of linguistic phenomena, instead of having to introduce a new term ending in *–ization* for changes at each different level of the grammar.

Our plea, then, is that both the process and the product of grammaticalization should receive attention. This broad approach to grammaticalization needs to be supplemented with detailed analyses of the actual mechanisms involved in the grammaticalization process, instead of "not giving due consideration to the full range of information about the steps in a particular development and attempting to work out the history of various phenomena from synchrony alone" (Joseph 2004: 47). This raises the question of how crucial or essential the different criteria proposed in the literature for prototypical cases of grammaticalization are. Can we, on the basis of instances of grammaticalization "proper", dismiss some criteria as non-critical? For instance, Tabor and Traugott (1998) argue that restricted scope and fixedness of position are not crucial criteria. Perhaps a prototype approach is needed.

More interesting is the question of whether characteristic features can be observed in all instances of grammaticalization processes, which can therefore be considered constitutive of grammaticalization. Or can we uncover clusters of mechanisms that typically occur in combination during the evolution of DMs? To answer these questions, researchers need to start analyzing the rise of different kinds of DMs simultaneously, or conduct meta-analyses on existing studies of single instances or small numbers of DMs: for each of these DMs, the mechanisms involved should be charted, and a cluster analysis should be run (see the proposal in Norde and Beijering 2012). To develop grammaticalization along these lines, we need a test bed with empirical evidence from a variety of languages and linguistic constructions; this, we believe, would prove to be a fruitful exercise.

Acknowledgements

References

Ahn, Mikyung. 2010. "From 'Favor' to 'Cause': The English Causal Adposition *thanks to* and its Korean Counterpart *tekpwuney*". *Language Sciences* 32 (5): 579–87.
     DOI: 10.1016/j.langsci.2010.03.002
Aijmer, Karin. 1997. "*I think*: An English Modal Particle". In Toril Swan and Olaf Jansen Westvik (eds), *Modality in Germanic Languages. Historical and Comparative Perspective*, 1–47. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter. DOI: 10.1515/9783110889932.1
Aijmer, Karin and Anne-Marie Simon-Vandenbergen. 2011. "Pragmatic Markers". In Jan Zienkowski, Jan-Ola Östman and Jef Verschueren (eds), *Discursive Pragmatics*, 223–47. Amsterdam: John Benjamins. DOI: 10.1075/hoph.8.13aij
Aijmer, Karin and Anne-Marie Simon-Vandenbergen (eds). 2006. *Pragmatic Markers in Contrast*. Amsterdam: Elsevier.
Andersen, Hanne Leth. 2007. "Marqueurs discursifs propositionnels". *Langue Francaise* 154: 13–28. DOI: 10.3917/lf.154.0013
Ariel, Mira. 2008. *Pragmatics and Grammar*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
     DOI: 10.1017/CBO9780511791314
Ariel, Mira. 2010. *Defining Pragmatics*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
     DOI: 10.1017/CBO9780511777912
Arroyo, José Luis Blas. 2011. "From Politeness to Discourse Marking: The Process of Pragmaticalization of *muy bien* in Vernacular Spanish". *Journal of Pragmatics* 43 (3): 855–74. DOI: 10.1016/j.pragma.2010.10.002

Barth-Weingarten, Dagmar and Elizabeth Couper-Kuhlen. 2002. "On the Final *though*: A Case of Grammaticalization?" In Ilse Wischer and Gabriele Diewald (eds), *New Reflections on Grammaticalization*, 345–61. Amsterdam: John Benjamins. DOI: 10.1075/tsl.49.22bar

Beijering, Karin. 2012. *Expressions of Epistemic Modality in Mainland Scandinavian; A Study into the Lexicalization-Grammaticalization-Pragmaticalization Interface*. (Groningen Dissertations in Linguistics 106). Zutphen: Wöhrmann Print Service. Available online at: http://irs.ub.rug.nl/ppn/345722167 (accessed 10 September 2013).

Boye, Kasper and Peter Harder. 2012. "A Usage-based Theory of Grammatical Status and Grammaticalization". *Language* 88 (1): 1–44. DOI: 10.1353/lan.2012.0020

Brinton, Laurel J. 1996. *Pragmatic Markers in English: Grammaticalization and Discourse Function*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter. DOI: 10.1515/9783110907582

Brinton, Laurel J. 2001. "From Matrix Clause to Pragmatic Marker: The History of *look*-Forms". *Journal of Historical Pragmatics* 2 (2): 177–99. DOI: 10.1075/jhp.2.2.02bri

Brinton, Laurel J. 2006. "Pathways in the Development of Pragmatic Markers in English". In Ans van Kemenade and Bettelou Los (eds), *The Handbook of the History of English*, 307–34. London: Blackwell.

Brinton, Laurel J. 2010. "The Development of *I mean*: Implications for the Study of Historical Pragmatics". In Susan M. Fitzmaurice and Irma Taavitsainen (eds), *Methods in Historical Pragmatics*, 37–80. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

Brinton, Laurel J. and Elizabeth Closs Traugott. 2005. *Lexicalization and Language Change*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. DOI: 10.1017/CBO9780511615962

Callies, Marcus. 2012. "The Grammaticalization and Pragmaticalization of Cleft Constructions in Present-Day English". In Sebastian Hoffmann, Paul Rayson and Geoffrey Leech (eds), *English Corpus Linguistics: Looking Back, Moving Forward*, 5–21. Amsterdam: Rodopi.

Campbell, Lyle. 2001. "What's Wrong with Grammaticalization?" *Language Sciences* 23 (2–3): 113–61. DOI: 10.1016/S0388-0001(00)00019-X

Chang, Miao-Hsia. 2008. "Discourse and Grammaticalization of Contrastive Markers in Taiwanese Southern Min: A Corpus-Based Study". *Journal of Pragmatics* 40 (12): 2114–49. DOI: 10.1016/j.pragma.2008.04.009

Claridge, Claudia. 2013. "The Evolution of Three Pragmatic Markers: *As it were*, *so to speak* and *if you like*". *Journal of Historical Pragmatics* 14 (2): 161–84. DOI: 10.1075/jhp.14.2.01cla

Claridge, Claudia and Leslie Arnovick. 2010. "Pragmaticalisation and Discursisation". In Andreas H. Jucker and Irma Taavitsainen (eds), *Historical Pragmatics (Handbook of Pragmatics, Vol. 8)*, 165–92. Berlin: De Gruyter Mouton.

Croft, William A. 2001. *Radical Construction Grammar: Syntactic Theory in Typological Perspective*. Oxford: Oxford University Press. DOI: 10.1093/acprof:oso/9780198299554.001.0001

Degand, Liesbeth. 2001. *Form and Function of Causation: A Theoretical and Empirical Investigation of Causal Constructions in Dutch*. Leuven: Peeters.

Degand, Liesbeth and Benjamin Fagard. 2011. "*Alors* between Discourse and Grammar. The Role of Syntactic Position". *Functions of Language* 18 (1): 29–56. DOI: 10.1075/fol.18.1.02deg

Degand, Liesbeth and Benjamin Fagard. 2012. "Competing Connectives in the Causal Domain: French *car* and *parce que*". *Journal of Pragmatics* 44 (1): 154–68. DOI: 10.1016/j.pragma.2011.12.009

Degand, Liesbeth, Bert Cornillie and Paola Pietrandrea. 2013. "Discourse Markers and Modal Particles: Two Sides of the Same Coin?" In Liesbeth Degand, Bert Cornillie and Paola

Pietrandrea (eds), *Discourse Markers and Modal Particles. Categorization and Description*, 1–18. Amsterdam: John Benjamins. DOI: 10.1075/pbns.234.01deg

Degand, Liesbeth and Henk Pander Maat. 2003. "A Contrastive Study of Dutch and French Causal Connectives on the Speaker Involvement Scale". In Arie Verhagen and Jeroen van de Weijer (eds), *Usage-based Approaches to Dutch*, 175–99. Utrecht: LOT.

Degand, Liesbeth and Anne-Marie Simon-Vandenbergen. 2011. "Introduction: Grammaticalization and (Inter)subjectification of Discourse Markers". *Linguistics* 49 (2): 287–94. DOI: 10.1515/ling.2011.008

Dér, Csilla Ilona. 2010. "On the Status of Discourse Markers". *Acta Linguistica Hungarica* 57 (1): 3–28. DOI: 10.1556/ALing.57.2010.1.1

Diewald, Gabriele. 2006. "Discourse Particles and Modal Particles as Grammatical Elements". In Kerstin Fischer (ed.), *Approaches to Discourse Particles*, 403–25. Amsterdam: Elsevier.

Diewald, Gabriele. 2011a. "Grammaticalization and Pragmaticalization". In Heiko Narrog and Bernd Heine (eds), *The Oxford Handbook of Grammaticalization*, 450–61. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Diewald, Gabriele. 2011b. "Pragmaticalization (Defined) as Grammaticalization of Discourse Functions". *Linguistics* 49 (2): 365–90. DOI: 10.1515/ling.2011.011

Dostie, Gaétane. 2004. *Pragmaticalization et Marqueurs Discursifs. Analyse Sémantique et Traitement Lexicographique*. Brussels: De Boeck.

Erman, Britt and Ulla-Britt Kotsinas. 1993. "Pragmaticalization: The Case of *ba*' and *you know*". *Studier i Modern Språkvetenskap* 10: 76–93.

Evers-Vermeul, Jacqueline. 2005. *The Development of Dutch Connectives. Change and Acquisition as Windows on Form-Function Relations*. PhD Thesis. Utrecht University. Utrecht: LOT. Available online at: http://www.lotpublications.nl/index3.html (accessed 10 September 2013).

Evers, Jacqueline, Liesbeth Degand, Benjamin Fagard and Liesbeth Mortier. 2011. "Historical and Comparative Perspectives on Subjectification: A Corpus-based Analysis of Dutch and French Causal Connectives". *Linguistics* 49 (2): 445–78.

Fagard, Benjamin. 2010. "É vida, olha...: Imperatives as Discourse Markers and Grammaticalization Paths in Romance: A Diachronic Corpus Study". *Languages in Contrast* 10 (2): 245–67. DOI: 10.1075/lic.10.2.07fag

Fischer, Kerstin (ed.). 2006. *Approaches to Discourse Particles*. Amsterdam: Elsevier.

Fitzmaurice, Susan. 2004. "Subjectivity, Intersubjectivity and the Historical Construction of Interlocutor Stance: From Stance Markers to Discourse Markers". *Discourse Studies* 6 (4): 427–48. DOI: 10.1177/1461445604046585

Frank-Job, Barbara. 2006. "A Dynamic–Interactional Approach to Discourse Markers". In Kerstin Fischer (ed.), *Approaches to Discourse Particles*, 395–413. Amsterdam: Elsevier.

Fraser, Bruce. 1999. "What are Discourse Markers?" *Journal of Pragmatics* 31 (7): 931–52. DOI: 10.1016/S0378-2166(98)00101-5

Givón, Talmy. 1983. *Topic Continuity in Discourse: A Quantitative Cross-language Study*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins. DOI: 10.1075/tsl.3

Givón, Talmy. 1991. "The Evolution of Dependent Clause Morpho-Syntax in Biblical Hebrew". In Elizabeth Closs Traugott and Bernd Heine (eds), *Approaches to Grammaticalization, Volume II: Types of Grammatical Markers*, 257–310. Amsterdam: John Benjamins. DOI: 10.1075/tsl.19.2.14giv

Goldberg, Adele. 1995. *Constructions: A Construction Grammar Approach to Argument Structure*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Günthner, Susanne and Katrin Mutz. 2004. "Grammaticalization vs. Pragmaticalization? The Development of Pragmatic Markers in German and Italian". In Walter Bisang, Nikolaus Himmelmann and Björn Wiemer (eds), *What Makes Grammaticalization? A Look from Its Fringes and Its Components*, 77–107. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
DOI: 10.1515/9783110197440

Hansen, Maj-Britt Mosegaard. 2005. "From Prepositional Phrase to Hesitation Marker: The Semantic and Pragmatic Evolution of French *enfin*". *Journal of Historical Pragmatics* 6 (2): 37–68. DOI: 10.1075/jhp.6.1.03mos

Hansen, Maj-Britt Mosegaard. 2008. *Particles at the Semantics/Pragmatics Interface: Synchronic and Diachronic Issues; A Study with Special Reference to the French Phasal Adverbs.* Amsterdam: Elsevier.

Haselow, Alexander. 2011. "Discourse Marker and Modal Particle: The Functions of Utterance-Final *then* in Spoken English". *Journal of Pragmatics* 43 (14): 3603–23.
DOI: 10.1016/j.pragma.2011.09.002

Hasselgård, Hilde, Stig Johansson, Bergljot Behrens and Cathrine Fabricius-Hansen (eds). 2002. *Information Structure in a Cross-Linguistic Perspective.* Amsterdam: Rodopi.

Heine, Bernd. 2003. "Grammaticalization". In Brian D. Joseph and Richard D. Janda (eds), *Handbook of Historical Linguistics*, 575–601. Oxford: Blackwell.

Heine, Bernd. 2013. "On Discourse Markers: Grammaticalization, Pragmaticalization, or Something Else?" *Linguistics* 51 (6): 1205–47. DOI: 10.1515/ling-2013-0048

Heine, Bernd, Ulrike Claudi and Friederike Hünnemeyer. 1991. *Grammaticalization*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.

Heine, Bernd, Gunther Kaltenböck, Tania Kuteva and Haiping Long. 2013. "An Outline of Discourse Grammar". In Shannon Bischoff and Carmen Jany (eds), *Functional Approaches to Language*, 155–96. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

Himmelmann, Nikolaus P. 2004. "Lexicalization and Grammaticization: Opposite or Orthogonal?" In Walter Bisang, Nikolaus Himmelmann and Björn Wiemer (eds), *What Makes Grammaticalization? A Look from Its Fringes and Its Components*, 21–42. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter. DOI: 10.1515/9783110197440

Hopper, Paul J. 1991. "On Some Principles of Grammaticization". In Elizabeth Closs Traugott and Bernd Heine (eds), *Approaches to Grammaticalization, Volume I, Focus on Theoretical and Methodological Issues*, 17–35. Amsterdam: John Benjamins. DOI: 10.1075/tsl.19.1.04hop

Hopper, Paul J. (ed.). 2000. *Studies in Descriptive and Historical Linguistics*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins. DOI: 10.1017/s0022226700278493

Hopper, Paul J. and Elizabeth Closs Traugott. 2003 [1993]. *Grammaticalization*. 2nd edn. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Hyun-Oak Kim, Alan. 2011. "Rhetorical Questions as Catalyst in Grammaticalization: Deriving Korean Discourse Marker *ketun* from Conditional Connective". *Journal of Pragmatics* 43 (4): 1023–41. DOI: 10.1016/j.pragma.2010.10.001

Joseph, Brian D. 2001. "Is There such a Thing as *Grammaticalization*?" *Language Sciences* 23: 163–86. DOI: 10.1016/S0388-0001(00)00020-6

Joseph, Brian D. 2004. "Rescuing Traditional (Historical) Linguistics from Grammaticalization Theory". In Olga Fischer, Muriel Norde and Harry Perridon (eds), *Up and Down the Cline: The Nature of Grammaticalization*, 45–71. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
DOI: 10.1075/tsl.59.04jos

Kaltenböck, Gunther, Bernd Heine and Tania Kuteva. 2011. "On Thetical Grammar". *Studies in Language* 35 (4): 848–93. DOI: 10.1075/sl.35.4.03kal

Koops, Christian and Arne Lohmann. 2013. "Discourse Marker Sequencing and Grammaticalization". In Maria-Jose López-Couso et al. (eds), *English Corpus Linguistics on the Move: Applications and Implications* (Book of Abstracts ICAME 34), 126–8. Available online at: http://www.usc.es/export/sites/default/en/congresos/-icame34/descargas/book_of_abstracts.pdf (accessed 10 September 2013).

Langacker, Ronald W. 2008. *Cognitive Grammar: A Basic Introduction*. New York: Oxford University Press. DOI: 10.1093/acprof:oso/9780195331967.001.0001

Lehmann, Christian. 1985. "Grammaticalization: Synchronic Variation and Diachronic Change". *Lingua e stile* 20: 303–18.

Lehmann, Christian. 1995 [1982]. *Thoughts on Grammaticalization: A Programmatic Sketch*. 2nd edn. (First published as Arbeiten des Kölner Universalien-Projekt 48. Köln: Institut für Sprachwissenschaft der Universität.) Munich: Lincom Europa.

Lenker, Ursala. 2000. "*Soplice* and *witodlice*: Discourse Markers in Old English". In Olga Fischer, Anette Rosenbach and Dieter Stein (eds), *Pathways of Change: Grammaticalization in English*, 229–49. Amsterdam: John Benjamins. DOI: 10.1075/slcs.53.12len

Lewis, Diana M. 2007. "From Temporal to Contrastive and Causal: The Emergence of Connective *after all*". In Agnès Celle and Ruth Huart (eds), *Connectives as Discourse Landmarks*, 89–99. Amsterdam: John Benjamins. DOI: 10.1075/pbns.161.09lew

Lewis, Diana M. 2011. "A Discourse-Constructional Approach to the Emergence of Discourse Markers in English". *Linguistics* 49 (2): 415–43. DOI: 10.1515/ling.2011.013

Marchello-Nizia, Christiane. 2009. "Grammaticalisation et pragmaticalisation des connecteurs de concession en français: cependant, toutefois, pourtant". *Revue Roumaine de Linguistique* 54 (1–2): 7–20.

Méndez-Naya, Belén. 2006. "Adjunct, Modifier, Discourse Marker: On the Various Functions of *right* in the History of English". *Folia Linguistica Historica* 27 (1–2): 141–69. DOI: 10.1515/flih.2006.27.1-2.141

Mulder, Jean and Sandra A. Thompson. 2008. "The Grammaticization of *but* as a Final Particle in English Conversation". In Ritva Laury (ed.), *Crosslinguistic Studies of Clause Combining: The Multifunctionality of Conjunctions*, 179–204. Amsterdam: John Benjamins. DOI: 10.1075/tsl.80.09mul

Norde, Muriel. 2009. *Degrammaticalization*. Oxford: Oxford University Press. DOI: 10.1093/acprof:oso/9780199207923.001.0001

Norde, Muriel, and Karin Beijering. 2012. "Facing Interfaces: A Clustering Approach". Paper presented at *Refining Grammaticalization*, Free University of Berlin, 24 February 2012.

Ocampo, Francisco. 2006. "Movement Towards Discourse is Not Grammaticalization: The Evolution of *claro* from Adjective to Discourse Particle in Spoken Spanish". In Nuria Sagarra and Almeida Jacqueline Toribio (eds), *Selected Proceedings of the 9th Hispanic Linguistics Symposium*, 308–19. Somerville, MA: Cascadilla Proceedings Project.

Onodera, Noriko Okada. 1995. "Diachronic Analysis of Japanese Discourse Markers". In Andreas H. Jucker (ed.), *Historical Pragmatics*, 393–437. Amsterdam: John Benjamins. DOI: 10.1075/pbns.35.22ono

Onodera, Noriko Okada. 2000. "Development of *demo* Type Connectives and *na* Elements: Two Extremes of Japanese Discourse Markers". *Journal of Historical Pragmatics* 1 (1): 27–55. DOI: 10.1075/jhp.1.1.05ono

Pinto de Lima, José. 2002. "Grammaticalization, Subjectification and the Origin of Phatic Markers". In Ilse Wischer and Gabriele Diewald (eds), *New Reflections on Grammaticalization*, 363–78. Amsterdam: John Benjamins. DOI: 10.1075/tsl.49.23pin

Pit, Mirna. 2006. "Determining Subjectivity in Text: The Case of Backward Causal Connectives in Dutch". *Discourse Processes* 41: 151–74. DOI: 10.1207/s15326950dp4102_3

Prévost, Sophie. 2011. "*A propos* from Verbal Complement to Discourse Marker: A Case of Grammaticalization?" *Linguistics* 49 (2): 391–413. DOI: 10.1515/ling.2011.012

Rehbock, Helmut. 2009. "*… ohne jetzt nun gleich aggressiv zu werden*: Ein Zeitadverb als Diskursmarker". *Zeitschrift für Germanistische Linguistik* 37 (2): 236–65.

Rosenkvist, Henrik and Sanna Skärlund. 2013. "Grammaticalization in the Present – The Changes of Modern Swedish *typ*". In Anna Giacolone Ramat, Caterina Mauri and Piera Molinelli (eds), *Synchrony and Diachrony: A Dynamic Interface*, 313–38. Amsterdam: John Benjamins. DOI: 10.1075/slcs.133.13ros

Rossari, Corinne and Corina Cojocariu. 2008. "Constructions of the Type *la cause*/*la raison*/*la preuve* Utterance: Grammaticalization, Pragmaticalization, or Something Else?" *Journal of Pragmatics* 40 (8): 1435–54. DOI: 10.1016/j.pragma.2008.03.012

Schwenter, Scott A. and Elizabeth Closs Traugott. 2000. "Invoking Scalarity: The Development of *in fact*". *Journal of Historical Pragmatics* 1: 7–25. DOI: 10.1075/jhp.1.1.04sch

Simon-Vandenbergen, Anne-Marie and Dominique Willems. 2011 "Crosslinguistic Data as Evidence in the Grammaticalization Debate: The Case of Discourse Markers". *Linguistics* 49 (2): 333–64. DOI: 10.1515/ling.2011.010

Spooren, Wilbert, Ted Sanders, Mike Huiskes and Liesbeth Degand. 2010. "Subjectivity and Causality: A Corpus Study of Spoken Language". In Sally Rice and John Newman (eds), *Empirical and Experimental Methods in Cognitive/Functional Research*, 241–55. Stanford: CSLI Publications.

Taylor, John R. 1989. *Linguistic Categorization: Prototypes in Linguistic Theory*. Oxford: Clarendon.

Tabor, Whitney and Elizabeth Closs Traugott. 1998. "Structural Scope Expansion and Grammaticalization". In Anna Giacalone Ramat and Paul J. Hopper (eds), *The Limits of Grammaticalization*, 229–72. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
DOI: 10.1075/tsl.37.11tab

Traugott, Elizabeth Closs. 1995a. "Subjectification in Grammaticalization". In Dieter Stein and Susan Wright (eds), *Subjectivity and Subjectivisation: Linguistic Perspectives*, 31–54. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. DOI: 10.1017/CBO9780511554469.003

Traugott, Elizabeth Closs. 1995b. "The Role of the Development of Discourse Markers in a Theory of Grammaticalization". Paper presented at the ICHL XII, Manchester. Version of 11/97. Available online at: http://www.stanford.edu/~traugott/ect-papersonline.html (accessed 10 September 2013).

Traugott, Elizabeth Closs. 1999. "The Rhetoric of Counter-Expectation in Semantic Change: A Study in Subjectification". In Andreas Blank and Peter Koch (eds), *Historical Semantics and Cognition*, 177–96. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

Vincent, Diane. 2005. "The Journey of Non-Standard Discourse Markers in Quebec French: Networks Based on Exemplification". *Journal of Historical Pragmatics* 6 (2): 188–210.
DOI: 10.1075/jhp.6.2.03vin

Waltereit, Richard. 2002. "Imperatives, Interruption in Conversation, and the Rise of Discourse Markers: A Study of Italian *guarda*". *Linguistics* 40 (5): 987–1010.
DOI: 10.1515/ling.2002.041

Waltereit, Richard. 2006. "The Rise of Discourse Markers in Italian: A Specific Type of Language Change". In Kerstin Fischer (ed.), *Approaches to Discourse Particles*, 61–67. Amsterdam: Elsevier.

Wiese, Heike. 2011. "*So* as an Emerging Focus Marker in German". *Linguistics* 49 (5): 991–1039. DOI: 10.1515/ling.2011.028

Wischer, Ilse. 2000. "Grammaticalization Versus Lexicalization: "*Methinks*" There is Some Confusion". In Olga Fischer, Anette Rosenbach and Dieter Stein (eds), *Pathways of Change: Grammaticalization in English*, 355–70. Amsterdam: John Benjamins. DOI: 10.1075/slcs.53.17wis

Wischer, Ilse and Gabriele Diewald (eds). 2002. *New Reflections on Grammaticalization*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins. DOI: 10.1075/tsl.49

Zufferey, Sandrine. 2012. "*Car, parce que, puisque* Revisited: Three Empirical Studies on French Causal Connectives". *Journal of Pragmatics* 44 (2): 138–53. DOI: 10.1016/j.pragma.2011.09.018

Authors' addresses

Liesbeth Degand
Université catholique de Louvain
Institute for Language and Communication
Place B. Pascal 1
L3.03.33
B-1348 Louvain-la-Neuve
Belgium

liesbeth.degand@uclouvain.be

Jacqueline Evers-Vermeul
Utrecht Institute of Linguistics OTS
Utrecht University
Trans 10
NL-3512 JK Utrecht
The Netherlands

J.Evers@uu.nl

About the authors

Liesbeth Degand is professor in Dutch and general Linguistics at the University of Louvain (Louvain-la-Neuve, Belgium). Her main research interests go to the (corpus-based) study of discourse structure, especially spoken discourse segmentation, and discourse markers in Dutch and French, both in speech and in writing (including discourse-level annotation of multilingual corpora), with a special focus on the interaction between meaning and syntactic position (left and right periphery).

Jacqueline Evers-Vermeul, assistant professor of Dutch Studies at Utrecht University, studies the representation, production and comprehension of text-structural aspects of discourse, especially discourse coherence and connective use. She uses a variety of methods to study adult connective use (synchronic and diachronic corpus-based analyses), students' understanding of school texts and examination questions (on- and off-line reading experiments among children and teenagers), and children's connective acquisition (visual-world experiments among 2- and 3-year-olds, growth-curve analyses of dense longitudinal corpora).