John Benjamins Publishing Company

On the rise of types
of clause-final pragmatic markers in English

Elizabeth Closs Traugott
Stanford University

Much work on pragmatic markers in the history of English has been devoted to expressions used clause-initially at "left periphery". By contrast, this study provides an account in broad outlines of the incremental development of pragmatic markers in clause-final "right periphery" position. Particular attention is paid to the rise of comment clauses, question tags, general extenders, and retrospective contrastive markers. Traditional characterizations of pragmatic markers, such as occurrence primarily at left periphery and with prosodic breaks are critiqued.

Keywords: comment clauses, general extenders, periphery, question tags, retrospective contrastive markers

1. Introduction

Pragmatic markers have been the topic of extensive research ever since Schourup's (1982) pioneering study of discourse particles (e.g., *like*, *well* and *y'know*), and Schiffrin's (1987) and Fraser's (1990) work on discourse markers (e.g., *because*, *or* and *well*). "Discourse markers", narrowly defined, have a connective function and are "sequentially dependent elements which bracket units of talk" (Schiffrin 1987: 31) at both the local and the global levels of discourse structuring. The study of historical pragmatics has its roots in Jucker (ed., 1995) and Brinton (1996). The development of discourse and other pragmatic markers in clause-initial position constitutes a large component of these works and, in the years since then, focus has remained primarily on clause- (or in the case of conversation, utterance-) initial position. This position is often referred to as "left periphery" (LP).[1]

---

1. For a complete list of abbreviations used in this paper, see the "Key to Abbreviations" at the end of the text.

Far less attention has been paid to clause-/utterance-final "right periphery" (RP) phenomena — probably, in part, because of the tradition of work in connective discourse markers but also, in part, because in English pragmatic markers that occur in both positions tend to be far less frequent at RP than at LP. However, in her discussion of the rise of comment clauses such as *I think* and *I guess*, Brinton (2008) points to uses at RP as well as LP, and challenges hypotheses such as Thompson and Mulac's (1991) that they originated in main clauses. Brinton argues that they probably arose not in main clauses (which suggests sentence-initial origin) but, rather, in adjunct clauses like *as I think* (which suggests sentence-final origin). Other clause-final markers that have been studied from a historical perspective include question tags like *isn't it?* (Tottie and Hoffmann 2009), and contrastive adversative uses at RP of concessives like *though* (Lenker 2010) and of temporal *then* (Haselow 2012a).

Since developments at RP have been discussed in separate studies of particular domains, and without particular attention to position, they do not give a picture of the cumulative development of pragmatic marker types at RP. The purpose of this paper is to bring together historical studies of those pragmatic markers that are used primarily at RP. I also include general extenders; these have been studied in considerable detail synchronically (e.g., Dines 1980, Overstreet 1999 and, more recently, Pichler and Levey 2010) but they have not been studied in any detail diachronically. My purpose is to turn the spotlight on RP and draw the broad outlines of the incremental development of different types of pragmatic markers in English at RP (RPPM types for short), building on what is known about pragmatic markers in this position.

Although reference is made to LP and RP, two questions — what precisely they are "left" and "right" of and how we define "periphery" — are vexed (for preliminary attempts to answer them see Beeching and Detges 2014a; Traugott 2015). LP and RP are understood here as preferred positions "outside" the core clause and are markers of topic and focus. They are on a continuum from "inner core clause" position to "outer" position, since many originate in adverbs and other expressions used within the argument structure of the clause. Those pragmatic markers that occur in initial and final positions by hypothesis have different "socio-dialogical" functions, such as linking, turn-taking and turn-yielding (Haselow 2012b); such distinct functions are the topic of Beeching and Detges (2014b) and will not be repeated here.

The organization of this paper is as follows: Section 2 outlines the definition of pragmatic markers adopted; Section 3 briefly describes the data and methodology I have used; Section 4 provides a broad survey of the development of RPPM

types, beginning with Old English (OE);[2] and I introduce two questions that have been of concern in recent historical work with respect to pragmatic markers in Section 5:

i.   Do RRPMs occur distinctly "outside" the host clause or is there a gradient from "clause-internal" to "clause-external" structure?
ii. Are there systemic changes in English that might account for or at least be correlated with the development of RRPM types?

2.   Background

I use the term "pragmatic marker" as an umbrella term for markers that are multifunctional, act as instructions or "linguistic 'road-signs' to intended meaning" and are in this sense "procedural" (Hansen 1998:199). As will be discussed below, contrary to many characterizations (e.g., Brinton 2008, Kaltenböck et al. 2011), some pragmatic markers may be relatively integrated within the prosodic envelope.[3] Non-truth-conditionality is often regarded as a defining characteristic of pragmatic expressions. But some pragmatic markers are mixed in so far as they are procedural and pragmatic while also having effects on truth-conditionality in at least some of their uses. For example, Ifantidou (1994) and others have pointed out that some evidentials like *I hear* and *evidently* may be used truth-conditionally. Likewise Dehé and Wichmann (2010a:18) show that *I think/believe* are "semantically variable in their effect on truth conditionality" depending on whether they are prosodically stressed or not in clause-initial position.

Various types of pragmatic markers have been identified over the years (see, especially, Fraser 1990, 1996, 2006). Fraser has been particularly concerned with distinguishing discourse markers from other pragmatic markers. In other work, Kaltenböck (2005) distinguished seventeen different categories of parentheticals in ICE-GB, depending primarily on their syntactic form and their lack of "syntactic attachment" (which has prosodic correlates); many of these are not pragmatic markers, however.

---

2. Periodization is problematic (see Lass 2000), but the following approximate dates will be used: Old English 700–1100, Middle English 1100–1500, Early Modern English 1500–1700, Late Modern English 1700–1970, and Present-Day English 1970–present.

3. I am not directly concerned with prosody in this paper because we have little or no access to it in historical data, but it should be noted that Detges and Waltereit (2014) point out that "peripheries are not typically separated from the core by a pause, contrary to what was previously assumed" (however, the parenthetical uses of the French strong pronoun *moi* that they discuss has its own intonation contour).

While categorization has been one line of research on pragmatic markers, other lines have focused on the types of communication involved. Schiffrin (1987) identified several "planes of talk": information state, participation, ideational structure, action structure and exchange structure. Moving away from "structure", more interactional approaches to pragmatic markers highlight the negotiation of meaning, such as marking off conversational units (Estélles and Pons Bordería 2011), and especially strategies of argumentation to a conclusion and negotiation of viewpoints (e.g., Detges and Waltereit 2009).

Since this study is intended to sketch the development of pragmatic marker types in only very broad outlines, many of the fine distinctions among pragmatic marker functions that have been developed will be ignored. Instead, the following five types will be distinguished.

a. Epistemic adverbs (e.g., *no doubt* and *surely*). These index the speaker's degree of commitment to the content of the utterance. These are mostly adverbs and NPs in origin.
b. Comment clauses (e.g., *I think*, *y'know* and *see*). Most have epistemic meaning and many have their source in a verb of cognition or perception. These are structurally different from epistemic adverbs in that they involve a pronoun (first- or second-person, depending on the verb) and a verb in the present tense.
c. Retrospective contrastive final connectors (e.g., *then*, *though*, *anyway*, *after all* and *actually*). These connectors can all occur initially and in other positions but in retrospective contrastive use they occur in contexts where prior text is referred to and the status of that text is revised. They are, therefore, metatextual.
d. General extenders (e.g., *and stuff* and *or something*). Most are structurally paratactic (combined by, for example, *and* or *or*) and extend the prior text (rather than the list) and are, therefore, metatextual.
e. Question tags (e.g., *isn't it?*). These may be used as stance markers, challenges to prior text, or as facilitators of interaction.

Although the individual markers in each set are multifunctional, only a prototype tendency for use of the marker type is suggested here. Further details are provided as each new category is introduced in the sections below.

Many of the types, (a) to (d), are primarily speaker-oriented; so are question tags used as attitudinal stance markers, although facilitative uses are inter-personal (hearer-oriented). General extenders are not referential members of lists, but are procedural, and they function like pragmatic markers. Aijmer (2002), for example, includes them in her discussion of "discourse particles". She finds that in Present Day English (PDE) the longer Extenders are often prosodically separate, but short ones (*and things* and *or something*) tend not to be (Aijmer 2002:230–3). Question tags are not genuine questions to which a yes–no answer is expected. As

discussed in Section 4.3, they have been used with pragmatic functions since the sixteenth century (Hoffmann 2006; Tottie and Hoffmann 2009: 154). The main difference between question tags and traditional pragmatic markers is that they do not occur clause-initially and do not derive from lexical items (Hoffmann 2006). Nevertheless, they are considered to be a sub-category of pragmatic markers by Fraser (1996) and Andersen (2001), among others.

Despite the tendency from Schourup (1982) and Schiffrin (1987) onwards to associate pragmatic markers with conversation, many occur in writing (see, for example, Lewis 2006 on *of course*; and Redeker 2006 on a variety of coherence-related discourse markers in English and Dutch). Most historical work is based on written texts. Although used far less frequently than in conversation, pragmatic markers can be found in written texts, especially trials, drama and fiction. Such texts provide important clues to the speech of the time, particularly to interaction involving social relations, acts and turns, as well as structural elements. However, they do not represent speech: they record it, with varying degrees of accuracy (Culpeper and Kytö 2000). Since pragmatic markers in general tend to be associated with relatively informal, colloquial usage, the history of their development is inevitably bound up with the development of different genres over time and with changes in stylistic and social norms (for a study of such factors in EModE with respect to *marry*, *well* and *why*, which occur at LP only, see Lutzky 2012). Blake's (2002) finding, that there are few pragmatic markers in Shakespeare's poetry, including dramas written in iambics, carries over to the use of pragmatic markers in poetry in general. So does his finding that different pragmatic markers are favored in different plays by Shakespeare: use is highly author- and text-dependent (see further Section 4.3).

3.   Data and methodology

The data I investigated in this study include extensive sets of relevant markers identified in earlier work (e.g., for OE epistemic adverbs, Swan 1988, for Middle English (ME) comment clauses, Brinton 2008). In addition, every effort was made to find in earlier periods examples of markers that in the literature have been argued to arise at a later period (e.g., to find examples of the ME comment clause *I wene* in OE when the form was *ic wene*). To do this, I searched the following electronic data: the Old and Middle Dictionaries (DOEC and MED) and OED, and especially HC, CLMETEV, OBP and COHA. Since pragmatic markers have been associated primarily with conversation, I focused especially on texts within the corpora that represent speech and also used the Shakespeare corpus on-line and the York Plays from the end of the fifteenth century. Since the latter is available

in print only, examples were collected manually. Searches of HC and CLMETEV were conducted using egrep. Keyword search tools were used for the other databases.[4]

A preliminary study of the data suggested that the pragmatic markers in question occurred overwhelmingly after clauses rather than after, for example, NPs. In the case of epistemic adverbs, they also occurred in independent responses, where they clearly have a different function that deserves separate study. Therefore the data selected was limited to clause-final markers.

Since all the data are written, I refer to clause-, not utterance-final, position. Markers occurring after words or phrases rather than clauses, usually in responses (e.g., *No ifaith*) were excluded, leaving for further investigation whether they have a function similar to that of responses or of clause-final markers. Primary interjections (e.g., *O* and *La*) were also largely excluded, except for occasional brief mention, because most do not arise from lexical sources (see Taavitsainen 1995); so were exclamations (e.g., *Out!* and *Harrow!*, Taavitsainen 1997) and forms of address (names and proforms, e.g., *man*). These appear to be much freer in position and significantly less polyfunctional than RPPMs of the kind under discussion. Furthermore, their status as pragmatic markers is not fully agreed on.

As is to be expected in any study of change, some examples were ambiguous or undecidable (Diewald 2002) and were coded as such. Given the small number of examples in the data, the study is qualitative not quantitative. However, since change, as opposed to innovation, requires replication (Weinreich et al. 1968; Croft 2000), a change was not considered to have occurred unless at least two examples of a new use of an extant form in two different texts in the data of the period under discussion are attested.

4.   The rise of RPPMs

The development of individual pragmatic markers that may occur at RP, and most especially of the types of function which they can serve, is incremental in the history of English. No function appears to have been lost, though some individual markers (e.g., OE *ʒewis* 'certainly') have been. As Brinton (2001: 151 original emphasis) notes:

> Despite the changes in discourse forms over time or their loss, there would nonetheless seem to be a *continuity* of pragmatic functions over time, with the forms expressing discourse functions […] continually being replaced.

---

4. For complete details concerning the corpora, see the "Sources" section at the end.

For sake of clarification, functions of forms persist "once they come into being". For example, question tags are not found in OE, and only one was found in Hoffmann and Tottie's database before EModE (Hoffmann 2006). However, once question tags begin to appear with any frequency, continuity can be demonstrated, despite changes in preference for particular types of question tag, across time, varieties of English, and authors.

4.1 Old English

The number of types of pragmatic marker available in OE texts is small and se-mantically limited, whether used clause-initially or clause-finally. This may be due, in part, to the kinds of texts that have come down to us: chiefly poems, religious and historical treatises. However, most OE texts had a distinct oral orientation because they were designed to be read aloud (recited in the case of epic poetry and probably some religious texts, such as homilies and sermons).

Brinton (1996) focuses on several episode markers, most of which occur at LP only. Most famous of these is *hwæt* ('what'). Brinton (1996: 189) analyzes it as a strongly evaluative comment on the following discourse and suggests that it func-tions rather like *y'know*, introducing knowledge as if it is shared, as in Example 4. However, Walkden (2013) proposes that *hwæt* functions as a *wh*-exclamative, not as an extra-clausal interjection as is traditionally assumed, or a pragmatic marker such as Brinton (1996) suggests.

Beside episode-marking pragmatic markers, there were several epistemic ad-verbs that appear to have had pragmatic, or partially pragmatic, function clause-initially and sometimes medially; they are used to comment on the truthfulness of the proposition (Swan 1988). Among them are *witodlice*, *soðlice*, *cuðlice* and *gewislice*, all of which can be translated as 'truly'. Of these *witodlice* is by far the most frequent in DOEC. It occurs primarily at LP, but also medially and occasion-ally clause-finally, as in Example 1.

(1) Ða gegrap Zosimus swiðlic ege and fyrhtu **witodlice.**
     then seized Zosimus great   fear and terror truly
     [Then great fear and terror seized Zosimus, truly.]
                              (LS *Mary of Egypt* B3.3.23 [DOEC][5])

Soðlice appears mainly medially but also at LP, and in a few instances at RP as in Example 2.

---

5. Dates of OE texts are often not known, or only the approximate date of a later copy is known. DOEC provides no dates, and HC provides only one-hundred-year approximations.

(2)   and ne gelæd þu   us on costnunge ac alys   us of   **yfele soþlice.**
      and not lead   thou us in temptation but release us from evil   truly
      [and lead us not into temptation, but release us from evil, truly.]
                                                    (Mt (WSCp) B8.4.3.1, [DOEC])

Gewislice, which can be used to translate Latin *scilicet* ('namely') is only rarely an epistemic adverb. However, it is used epistemically (translated from Latin *certe*, 'certainly') at LP in Ælfric's *Colloquy* — a question-and-answer pedagogical work designed to teach Latin to ploughmen, oxherds, cooks and others. *Gewislice* occasionally occurs clause-finally in other texts, as in Example 3.

(3)   On þone sunnandæg ofer þæt þe   he swa eald bið,
      on that Sunday   over that:SBD he so   old becomes,
      se   bið eastordæg **gewislice.**
      that is   Easterday truly
      [The Sunday on which he reaches that age is Easter Sunday, truly.]
                                                    (Comp 1.6 (Henel) [DOEC])

Cuðlice appears primarily in non-initial position meaning 'appropriately', and can only occasionally be interpreted as a pragmatic epistemic adverb, usually at LP.

    In the few examples in which *witodlice*, *soðlice* and *gewislice* might be inferred to be RPPMs, they have semantic scope over the whole prior clause and are grounded in the speaker, not the syntactic subject. They serve to comment on the speaker's commitment to the truth of or belief in the proposition and can be assumed to be pragmatic markers. It is not possible to assess to what extent they are syntactically and prosodically integrated in the core clause. Even though punctuation was largely prosodic in OE (used to mark metrical lines and narrative episodes), it was not used in a sufficiently fine-grained way to mark clause-final contours.

    We may conclude that in OE there was a position "outside" the clause at RP, but that it sanctioned very few construction types. The majority were epistemic adverbs, but their token frequency was very low.

4.2 Middle English

ME was a period of significant change. Structurally, there was the loss of morphological case and the shift to fairly rigid VO word order. Lenker (2010: 9) suggests that the early ME period is one of "experiment and variation" leading from a relatively paratactic, co-ordinating syntax in OE to a ME syntax with a more defined distinction between co-ordinate and subordinate clauses. This was accompanied by large-scale replacement of connectives, some of them derived from English

forms (e.g., *however* and *therefore*), but new in ME, others borrowed from French (e.g., *certes*, 'certainly'), yet others being morphological hybrids combining French bases with English derivational morphology (e.g., *verily* ['truly'], *surely* and *finally*).

Especially in the later period, several new text types appear that include significantly more, and more varied types of, represented speech than do earlier texts, including drama. The *York Plays*, which date from the end of the fifteenth century, give interesting insights into the pragmatic markers available and their use. A significant difference can be observed between the language of God, angels and other moral authorities on the one hand, and of Lucifer (in Latin *angelus deficiencs*, 'angel revolting'), and humbler characters, like Noah and his family, on the other. The moral authorities use pragmatic markers, mostly at LP, whereas the other characters use a wider set of pragmatic markers, sometimes at RP.

4.2.1   *Types of epistemic pragmatic markers at RP in ME*

In addition to epistemic adverbs (e.g., *iwis* ['truly, certainly'] and *certes*) in ME we find epistemic clauses. Many of these clauses include a first-person pronoun and a speech act verb (e.g., *I promise/warrant/prey*, all from French), or they mark metatextual relations (e.g., *as ye shall see*). Some instances are given in Example 4 from the York Plays. Example 4a is the beginning of Lucifer's entering prideful and bombastic speech for which he is thrown into hell. The first line begins with a sequence of pragmatic markers at LP (including *what*) and ends with the epistemic adverb *iwys*. Example 4b is an excerpt from an interchange among Noah's family after he has sent his son (Filius) to call on his wife (Vxor) to hasten to the ark, a call she rejects and then reluctantly obeys.

(4)   a.   Owe, certes,   what I am worthily wroghte with wyrschip, **iwys**!
            Oh,   certainly what I am well   created   with honor   truly
            For in a glorius   gle   my gleteryng it glemes.
            for in a glorious radiance my glittering it glows
                                        (1463–77 *Fall of the Angels,* [YP, p. 51, l. 81])

      b.   *Vxor*:   We bowrdre al wrange, **I wene** …
                      we jest   all idly   I think …
           Filius: My modir   comes to you this daye.
                      my mother comes to you this day
           Noe: Scho is welcome, **I wele warrande**.
                      she   is welcome I well affirm
                                        (1463–77 *The Flood,* [YP, p. 82, l. 66])

Types of clauses like those in Example 4b, but most especially *as I mean*, *as you see* and *look (ye)*, are among those studied by Brinton (2008). The generic term Brinton uses is "comment clause", but many sub-types are identified. Among them

are markers that signal speakers paying attention to the addressee's understanding of the text (*I mean*), hedging and lessening of imposition (*I preye you*) and demanding attention (*see!* and *look!*). The position at RP for attitudinal markers that existed already in OE was clearly expanded in ME to sanction a relatively large number of expressions with clausal syntax.

4.2.2   *General extenders*[6]

ME was also a time when general extenders of the type *and so forth* and *and things* appeared (Carroll 2008). In PDE, general extenders are routines like *and stuff*, *and all that kind of thing* and *or anything*, as in Example 5.

(5)   It's not very like *fashionable and artistic* **or anything**.

<div align="right">(Pichler and Levey 2010: 18)</div>

They may serve as a backward-looking hedge, a topic-closer or a turn-yielder. The prototypical form is connector + indefinite pronoun, as in Example 6, but they may be considerably longer (e.g., *and stuff like that*, where *like* is a "similative" and *that* a deictic). In their study of Extenders in Berwick-on-Tweed conversation, Pichler and Levey (2010: 20) observe that extenders like *and stuff*, *and everything* and *or something* have the following kind of structure.

(6)   connector (modifier) generic noun/pro-form (similative) (deictic)

Pichler and Levey hypothesize that general extenders may have developed in steps such as these:[7]

Stage 0: final, indefinite, member of a set
Stage 1: textual marker of a set, implicating a larger category; backward-looking and topic closing
Stage 2: interpersonal, backward-looking hedge; turn-yielding

Examples from OE in Carroll (2008) suggest that only Stage 0 is attested in the data in that period. They are what she calls "specific extenders" because they denote a set (indefinite, but specific). They usually collocate with a modifier, as in Example 7.

---

6. Other terms are "set marking tag" (Dines 1980), "referent-final tags" (Aijmer 2002) and "extender tags" (Carroll 2008).

7. A further "punctor" stage is postulated that is "devoid of referential or pragmatic meaning", but is not discussed here as it is not attested in my data.

(7)   ða   gesinhiwan   mon sceal   manian **and eac**
      those married-couples one   ought remind and also
      gehwelnce mon   ðæt …
      every   person that …
      [One ought to remind married couples and also every person that …]
                            (850–950 HC CoCura 397, [Carroll 2008: 8])

This passage follows a long list of instructions to exhort and remind persons, many of them sinful, of various duties and behaviors that are important for the Christian life. Here, "and eac gehwelnce mon" is not "semantically empty" but denotes a category equivalent to "ða gesinhiwan", presumably including children and single persons, whether once married or not. All the same, it introduces "an element of vagueness in the proposition" (Aijmer 2002: 13), which is crucial to the development of general extenders.

   By ME some examples appear that suggest that fixed expressions or formulae were developing which imply a larger set, without necessarily denoting a specific (but indefinite) set. Among the clearest examples are *et cetera* and *and so forth*, neither of which allows an elliptical interpretation, as in Example 8.

(8)   Bi resun   of the goldfoyl,   **ant so vorth**, as I seyde er.
      by reason of the gold-foil, and so forth   as I said   earlier.
            (1325 *Recipe Painting(1)* in *Archaeol. J. 1* (Hrl 2253), [MED and 1c. (b)])

As Carroll notes, it is difficult to know to what extent many other potential examples are to be understood as general rather than specific extenders. This is especially true when antecedents are nominals and particularly when the routine is of the type *and other (such)*, where ellipsis of a category term is an available reading as in Example 9.

(9)   or he may passe to Ieen   or Vinice **or some oþer**.
      or he may go   to Genoa or Venice or some other
            (a1425 *Mandeville's Travels* 214, Hamelius, ed. 1919, [Carroll 2008: 13])

Such ambiguity is the likely site for the development from specific to general extenders (Pichler and Levey's Stage 1) since it is a "critical" context (Diewald 2002) for change, and is pragmatically and also syntactically ambiguous in terms of the older and newer meaning

   Although general extenders may have distinctly pragmatic uses, some members are mixed in the sense introduced in Section 2: they are not wholly pragmatic and non-truth-conditional; whether there are further items on a list can be a matter of veridicality. Furthermore, syntactically they are relatively integrated with the core clause sytactically. They suggest a gradient between "inner" and "outer" RPPMs that will be discussed in Section 5.1.

4.3 Early Modern English

In Early Modern English (EModE) both comment clauses and general extenders are found with higher token frequency. A large number of comment clauses of the type discussed by Brinton and illustrated in Example 5b occur in various positions, including LP, medial positions (e.g., after a tensed verb), and, with various frequencies, at RP. For example, the speech act tag *I warrant* is preferred at RP over *I promise* in the works of Shakespeare: in Spevak's (1973) *Shakespeare Concordance* there are only six instances of *I promise thee/you* at RP, but thirty-two of *I warrant (thee/you)* in this position.

A further type of tensed clause that arose in EME occurs mainly at RP, though sometimes medially: the question tag. Hoffmann (2006) cites a solitary example from the very end of the ME period.

(10) Than thay have some maner gettynge
      then they have some kind   getting
      By some occupacione, **have thay**?
      by some occupation,   have they?
      [Then they have some means of supporting themselves through some job, do
      they?]   (1497 Medwall: *Fulgens and Lucrece,* [Hoffmann 2006: Example 12])

This said, a single example does not provide evidence of a change. Such evidence is provided by a steady rise in the use of question tags from the 1550s onwards (Tottie and Hoffmann 2009). Tottie and Hoffmann (2009: 145) find that in their data, which consists of dramas, most sixteenth-century tags are confirmatory (seven examples) or attitudinal (four examples). Confirmatory tags do not answer an information question inviting a yes–no response, but, rather, seek assent. They are usually turn-final. Tottie and Hoffmann consider Example 11 to be an instance of an assent-seeking use of the tag.

(11) *Custance*:   I sent him a full answere by you **dyd I not**?
      Merygreeke: And I reported it.
      Custance: Nay I must speake it againe.
      R. Royster: No no, he tolde it all.
                (1553 Udall: *Ralph Roister Doister,* [Tottie and Hoffmann 2009: 142])

Here Merygreek implies 'Yes', but, apparently because he does not utter it, Custance is unsure that the message has been imparted ("I must speak it again"). In written texts a confirmatory tag that is explicitly answered is potentially ambiguous — absent prosodic information — between a genuine question and a tag. In Example 11, the miscommunication over lack of an explicit response suggests that "did I not?" was actually intended as a yes–no question rather than as a confirmatory tag.

In any event, Example 11 is the kind of example which illustrates the unobtrusive way in which change may occur.

Unlike confirmatory tags, attitudinal tags may appear clause-finally within a complex sentence (Example 12a) or continuous discourse (Example 12b), and no answer is expected or given. They are not, therefore, ambiguous.

> (12) a. *Esau*:   Come out whores and theues, come out, come out I say.
>   *Ragau*: I told you, ***did I not?*** that there would be a fray.
>   *Esau*:   Come out litle whoreson ape, come out of thy denne.
>   (1550 *Iacob and Esau*, [Tottie and Hoffmann 2009: 142])
>   b. *Ford*:   Have I not forbid her my house? She comes of errands, **does she**? We are simple men, we do not know what's brought to pass under the profession of fortune-telling.
>   (1602 Shakespeare, *Merry Wives of Windsor* IV. ii. 173)

Attitudinal tags, as in Example 12, follow a verb of locution or cognition, and introduce a complement. According to Tottie and Hoffmann (2009: 145) additional uses of question tags are also attested in their data: two instances of challenging and one each of softening, hortatory and emphatic hortatory uses in EModE texts.

The token increase of question tags and changes in polarity preference are discussed in Hoffmann (2006). Different authors may use question tags in very different ways. For example, Shakespeare favors positive clauses with negative tags ("They shoot elephants, don't they?"), and positive with positive ("They shoot elephants, do they?"), but rarely uses negative–positive ("They don't shoot elephants, do they?"). By contrast, Jonson favors negative–positive, and rarely uses positive–positive (Tottie and Hoffmann 2009: 151). Examples 13a and 13b, from Shakespeare, show all three types.

> (13) a. *Slender*: How now, Simple! Where have you been? I must wait on myself, **must I**? You have not the Book of Riddles about you, **have you?**
>   *Simple*: Book of Riddles! Why, did you not lend it to Alice Shortcake?
>   (1602 Shakespeare, *Merry Wives of Windsor* I. i. 200)
>   b. *Prince*: I think it is good morrow, **is it not**?
>   *Sheriff*: Indeed, my lord, I think it be two a' clock.
>   (1598 Shakespeare, *I Henry IV* II. iv. 524)

The first question tag in Example 13a is followed by another clause, and clearly no answer is expected. The other uses do, however, elicit responses.

Over time, confirmatory use eliciting a response has decreased in British and especially American English (Tottie and Hoffman 2009: 146). Tottie and Hoffmann show that a far weaker "facilitative use", which is largely absent from EModE drama, has, by contrast, increased rapidly, and accounts for over one-third

of the examples in the British National Corpus (BNC). In this use the speaker makes reference to assumed shared knowledge, engages an interlocutor and typically elicits a minimal response such as *Mm*, as in a teacher's or parent's use of a question tag, illustrated by Example 14. If assent occurs, it affirms knowledge and does not answer or confirm a question, since the addressee knows that the speaker is not seeking information about the proposition.

(14)   Teacher: Right, it's two, **isn't it?**
　　　 Pupil:　Mm.　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　(Tottie and Hoffmann 2009: 141)

Finally, question tags came not to be restricted to RP; they can occur within a phrase, as in Example 15.

(15)   [about the Revenger's Tragedy] it's a mixture **isn't it** of original instruments and kind of what sound to me like modern trumpets
　　　　　　　　　　　(ICE-GB: s1b-012 #140, [Dehé and Braun 2013: 131])

Although it is often said that pragmatic markers are typically separate prosodically, the question tag in Example 15 is not phrased separately.

In EModE dramas, different pragmatic markers have been shown to be associated with different personal characteristics. In a study of Shakespeare's use of pragmatic markers in his prose plays, for example, Blake (2002: 298) suggests that women and less assertive characters tend to use *truly* and *in good sooth*, while assertive men tend to use *I say*. On the other hand, *I protest* and *I tell* tend to be neutral and are not associated with gender. Working with a wide range of EModE texts, Bromhead (2009: 281) finds that "faith" expressions like *by my faith* and *in faith* are associated with "the testimony of specific reliable persons" and, therefore, with the upper classes, while *in truth* and *by my troth* "have meanings which are set in the public sphere and are used by all classes" (see also Section 5.2).

4.4 Late Modern English

Beyond the loss of several individual pragmatic markers like *in troth*, Late Modern English (LModE) is characterized by the development of a new set of markers that occur primarily at RP and occasionally non-finally, but not at LP: retrospective contrastive (and sometimes dismissive) uses of *then*, *though*, *however*, *after all* and *actually*. As in the case of general extenders, they suggest a gradient between "inner" and "outer" RPPMs because, although they may have highly pragmatic uses, some members are mixed: they are not wholly non-truth-conditional and syntactically they are relatively integrated with the core clause. In this section, I focus on the development of retrospective contrastive *then* (see Section 4.4.1). I also outline the further expansion of the general extender set which had already

come into being in ME. Its development in EModE has to my knowledge not yet been investigated (see Section 4.4.2).

4.4.1   *The retrospective contrastive set*

In a study of adverbial connectors marking CAUSE/RESULT, CONCESSION/CON-TRAST relations, Lenker (2010: 198, citing Biber et al. 1999: 889), regards connectors like *because* and *(al)though* at LP to be unmarked. In her view, they are explicit signposts of textual cohesion that "facilitate the rapid processing of a passage". There was also a set of temporal connectors like *now*, *then* and *now then* that have been used at LP in a metatextual additive sense (Lenker 2010: 108) throughout the history of English. At LP they are not only additive, but in many instances, they introduce alternative options (Defour 2008). A subset of these connectors began to be used in LModE at RP, especially *then* and *though*. Lenker (2010: 196) finds evidence in historical texts that this use probably originated in spoken language. At RP the connectors have been reinterpreted as marking contrast (Lenker 2010: 186) and "force a re-processing or even reinterpretation of the preceding assertions" (Lenker 2010: 198). A recently identified and similar development is in the use of clause-final *but* in conversation (Mulder and Thompson 2008; Mulder et al. 2009).

Using the BNC as a database for analysis of *then* at RP in PDE, Haselow (2012b) suggests that the function of final *then* depends, in part, on whether the preceding text is an assertion or a question, but what is common to all the uses is that it is a device for managing common ground. It "typically marks the proposition it accompanies as the sudden failure or violation of a prior assumption by the speaker (also Schiffrin, 1987, p. 258)" (Haselow 2012b: 192). Example 16 demonstrates this.

(16)   A. I haven't the faintest idea what you're talking about
        B. well you have to listen to the tape **then**
                                (ICE-GB s1a-085, [Haselow 2012b: 190])

In Example 16, Speaker B is analyzed as pragmatically reformulating A's "I haven't the faintest idea what you're talking about" as "If, as is the case, you say you don't have the faintest idea what I am talking about" and concluding "then you will have to listen to the tape". In other words, Haselow treats the turn as a conditional pairing in which A's condition is contrasted by B's utterance and refuted.[8] Here, *then* is "part of a paratactic structure in which it retrospectively links the proposition it accompanies to an immediately preceding propositional unit, creating an

---

8. Haselow (2011: 3606) attributes the inspiration for the conditional interpretation to Biber et al. (1999: 888).

implicit conditional relation between them" (Haselow 2012a: 163). The pairing is represented here (Haselow 2012b: 191):

A: — if you ~~I~~ haven't the faintest idea
　　　　　　what ~~you're~~ I am talking about　　→　as is the case
B:　　　　　well you have to listen to the tape then ←

Such retrospective conversion of the preceding proposition into a condition rank-shifts the paratactic second clause of the pair to an implied dependent, hypotactic clause (Haselow 2012a: 166–9).

　　Haselow (2012a) argues that uses of conditional *then* appear near or at RP in later ME and EModE and that final contrastive *then* originates historically in the *then* of *if-then* conditional constructions such as Example 17, in which *then* is spelled as *than*.

(17)　For **if** we be clene in levyng
　　　for if we be clean in living
　　　Oure bodis   are Goddis tempyll **þan**
　　　our   bodies are God's   temple   then
　　　In the whilke he will make his dewllyng.
　　　In the which he will make his dwelling
　　　[For if we are clean in living then our bodies are the temple of God in which
　　　he will make his dwelling.]
　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　(*The Baptism,* [YP p. 182. 36; Haselow 2012a: 164])

He also argues that some examples of the retrospective contrastive use of *then* with implied but not overt *if* are attested in the late ME York Plays and Shakespeare's plays, as in Example 18.

(18)　a.　*Eue*:　　Nay Adam, wite　me nought.
　　　　　　　　No   Adam, blame me not
　　　　Adam:　Do wey, lefe Eue, whame **than**?
　　　　　　　　Enough, dear Eve, whom   then
　　　　　　　　　　　　(1463–77 *Fall of Man,* [YP p. 67. 120; Haselow 2012a: 164])
　　　b.　*Mrs Ford*: […] There is no hiding you in the house.
　　　　　Falstaff: I'll go out **then**.
　　　(1602 Shakespeare, *Merry Wives of Windsor* IV. ii. 63 [Haselow 2012a: 168])

These examples appear to be ambiguous, however, unlike the PDE shown in Example 16. In Example 18, both instances of *then* could be understood as re-sultative "therefore, in that case". There is also the possibility that in Example 18a "blame me not" can be understood as pragmatically reconfigured by Adam as a

conditional "if I don't blame you", and likewise that in Example 18b "There is no hiding you in the house" can be understood as retrospectively converted into "if there is no place for me to hide in the house". Again, this is a critical context, pragmatically ambiguous between resultative and retrospective contrastive and also syntactically ambiguous between an adverb and a pragmatic marker.

Evidence for the development of a retrospective (but not fully contrastive) use of *then* is provided by examples from the end of the seventeenth century where it appears in questions, as in Example 19.

(19) *Lord Foppington*:   Why, that's the Fatigue I speak of, Madam: For 'tis impossible to be quiet, without thinking: Now thinking is to me, the greatest Fatigue in the World.
      Amanda: Does not your Lordship love reading **then**?
      Lord Foppinton: Oh, passionately, Madam — But I never think of what I read.
      (1696 Vanburgh, *The Relapse,* [HC ceplay3a; Lenker 2010: Appendix B])

Haselow (2012b: 191) finds that in contemporary conversation, yes–no questions that end in retrospective *then* with falling intonation anticipate confirmation. While we cannot reconstruct the intended prosody of Example 19, there is clear evidence of an answer and implied confirmation. The paucity of examples with clause-final *then* in the relevant sense suggests that it was rare before later EModE. What is striking in Example 19 is that conditional questions do not usually allow *then*: "If Jyllyan comes, *then will we be able to go out?" This suggests that the use of *then* at RP had become independent of the temporal adverb use by the end of the seventeenth century.

While Lenker (2010) mentions adverbials used at RP with temporal sources (*then*, *after all* and *still*), her focus is on concessives. She finds that the retrospective ground-changing function of these adverbials was not widely used until the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries when a new typology of connectives arose. Indeed, according to Lenker, most adverbials of this type that appear at RP develop quite late. For example, *though* came to be used frequently only in the 1990s (Lenker 2010: 201). There are, however, occasional early examples of *however* at RP, one in *The Relapse* by Vanbrugh (1696) and another in *The Beaux Stratagem* by Farquhar (1707). The latter is reproduced in Example 20.

(20) *Dorinda*:   O, Madam, had I but a Sword to help the brave Man?
      Bountiful: There's three or four hanging up in the Hall: but they won't draw. I'll go fetch one **however**.
      (1707 Farquhar, *The Beaux Stratagem.* [HC ceplay3b; Lenker 2010: 196])

Bountiful's rhetorical strategy here is to state that swords are available and to imply that they are not usable because they cannot be drawn. "I'll go fetch one" contrasts with the possible conclusion "therefore I won't get one", forcing a reinterpretation as "despite the fact that they won't draw may be one will be useful after all".

4.4.2 *General extenders revisited*

As we have seen, a number of non-specific general extenders are attested from ME on. A study of the development of extenders like *and stuff (like that)*, *and everything, or something (like that)* and *or anything* in COHA (1810–2009) suggests persistence over time of the potential for ambiguity of function between extension of a list (specialized extenders) and more metatextual uses such as topic closure (general extenders).

> (21)   and how she winds up with, "Well, perhaps you will do for me — you you may go down in the kitchen and try;" or, "You won't do for me — you are sickly — I don't like your reference," **or something of the kind**. Now, how does that girl consider the lady-as her friend, adviser, and protector?
> (1834 S. G. H., *Atheism in New-England,* [COHA])

Here "or something of the kind" is a final indefinite phrase following a set of possible scenarios in which responses are given to an applicant for a housekeeping job (in other words, it completes a list). However, because it is followed by a topic shift ("Now…") it can also be interpreted as a topic closer. More clearly, pragmatic general extender use can be identified when bare *or something* appears without any following phrase like *of the kind* expressing alternatives, and without prior alternatives in a list, but with clausal antecedents, and relatively unconstrained backward-looking reference as in Example 22.

> (22)   [A sailor asks] "What place is this?" "Mrs. Wiswall's," answered Margaret. "I guess Nimrod cast the name overboard, before he got here, **or something**," replied the sailor.   (1845 Judd, *Margaret,* [COHA])

Usually the expression is modalized and begins with *I think/guess*, as in this example, which contributes to the impression that general extenders have a hedging function. Bare *or anything* has a similar history. Here the typical context is, unsurprisingly given *anything*, a polarity item (e.g., negation, conditional, question or imperative) as in Example 23.

> (23)   Nathan came up to him, and said, — "Father, are you busy now, — thinking, **or anything?**"   (1855 Abbot, *Rollo's Philosophy,* [COHA])

While *stuff* originally referred to equipment, supplies belonging to an army, etc., the OED cites it as being used in the sense "matter of an unspecified kind" (*stuff*

n1, III) from the sixteenth century on and in the routine *and stuff* from the seventeenth, often in a pejorative context, as in Example 24.

(24)   She turned to me and said, 'Lewis, I find you pretend to give the Duke
       notions of the mathematics, **and stuff**.'
                   (?1697 J. Lewis *Mem. Duke of Glocester* (1789) 66, [OED *stuff* n[1], III. d])

Here, as in many examples, it is unclear whether *and stuff* has the NP *mathematics* as its antecedent, or the clause *pretend to X*. Similarly, Example 25a is ambiguous since *and stuff* could have backward-looking scope over the object (*gags*) or over the verb phrase (*do gags*). Finally, in the twentieth century, examples appear where the extender has unambiguous backward-looking scope over an eventuality, as in Example 25b.

25   a.   *Harry* (With spirit and noise, dancing): I dance and do gags **and stuff**.
          Nick: In costume? Or are you wearing your costume?
                                       (1936 Saroyan, *Time of your Life,* [COHA])
     b.   they're all the time hollering about how brave I am **and stuff**. You know
          what makes me brave? It's because I'm so happy I got you.
                                       (1941 Wolff, *Whistle Stop,* [COHA])

These and other uses may, however, be used with an inter-personal function oriented toward politeness (Overstreet 1999), which suggests functional orientation to the addressee and next speaker.

4.5   Summary

To summarize, the types of pragmatic marker appearing at RP over the history of English are used at first as subjective metatextual comments on what precedes. Some may later come to be used intersubjectively as hedges (general extenders) or facilitatives (question tags). The development of types is incremental, as shown in Figure 1.

   Epistemic adverbs and comment clauses may occur in any position available for pragmatic markers. General extenders and question tags may occur clause-internally but not at LP. Retrospective contrastive *then* has a form that serves other functions at LP. Other retrospective contrastive forms serve connectivity (*though* and *however*) and reformulation (*actually*) functions at RP, but not conditional reformulation.

	OE	ME	EModE	LModE
Epistemic adverb	————————————————————			
Comment clause		——————————————————		
General extender			———————————————	
Question tag			———————————————	
Retrospective contrastive				————————

Figure 1. Incremental RPPM type developments

5. Discussion

In this section I turn to interpretations of the changes outlined in Section 4 with respect to the issues of evidence for category gradience and of correlated systemic changes in English.

5.1 The gradient properties of RPPMs

General extenders, tag questions and retrospective pragmatic markers all have primarily metatextual pragmatic functions, but in several ways they do not fit the traditional prototype of pragmatic markers in that they do not have all the characteristics identified by Schiffrin (1987). A slightly elaborated set of these characteristics is as follows (based on Kaltenböck et al. 2011; see also Brinton 2008; Haselow 2012b). They:

a. are positionally mobile
b. cannot be interrogated, negated or focused
c. do not form an immediate constituent of the core clause, but are loosely connected with it syntactically and prosodically
d. have no impact on the truth value of an utterance
e. do not add anything to the propositional content
f. have wide scope (modify the whole utterance, not single segments)

With respect to characteristic (a), general extenders and question tags are only relatively mobile since they cannot occur in clause-initial position. They can, however, occur in medial position. This was illustrated for question tags in Example 15 in Section 4.3, and is repeated here in part as Example 26.

(26) it's a mixture *isn't it* of original instruments
(ICE-GB: s1b-012 #140, [Dehé and Braun 2013: 131])

Medial position is illustrated for general extenders by Example 27.

(27)   We found that eh stuff **and that** was dearer for a while.

<div align="right">(Pichler and Levey 2011: 446)</div>

Characteristics (b) and (c) have been shown to be problematic for pragmatic markers that appear at LP. They are particularly problematic for RPPMs. As far as loose connectivity and non-integration in the clause are concerned, there may be gradience with respect to syntactic and prosodic detachability from a clause. This is hardly surprising historically. There must typically be a "'point of entry' through the syntax" as Haegeman and Hill (2010: 6) say with reference to the hypothesized grammaticalization of the West Flemish particle *zè* ('see') as part of the demonstrative pronoun. Prosodic gradience is discussed from a theoretical point of view, and largely in connection with clause-/utterance-initial position, in Fischer (2006: 8–12) and tested in Dehé and Wichmann (2010a,b).

As mentioned at the beginning of Section 2, the lack of truth value has also been challenged (criterion d). For example, Haselow (2012b: 188–9) points out with respect to the set of retrospective contrastive RPPMs that use in final position may have an impact on the truth value of the clause:

> The final position can be used for the insertion of elements that, for instance, reinforce the truth-value of a proposition (*actually*), ask for the validity of a proposition (*then*), correct a preceding utterance (*though*) or express certainty (final a*nyway*), i.e. for elements which indicate how the proposition is to be taken in relation to a preceding discourse segment.

A closer look at uses at RP versus LP evidenced by earlier comment clause types like *as I think/mean* discussed in Brinton (2008) and many pragmatic uses of espistemic adverbs like *iwis* and *certes* reveals similar gradience in terms of their truth value and hence how much content they add (e). These factors suggest that synchronically at some point in the history of the developments discussed here there may be a gradient between non-pragmatic and pragmatic markers with respect to truth value. This follows from the fact that the pragmatic markers discussed here originate in referential and truth-conditional expressions, and have varying degrees of pragmaticality.

Finally, characteristic (f) is also gradient in that scope is not always decidable, as illustrated by Example 25a. While question tags typically have the whole preceding clause within their scope, they can also have scope over the preceding NP, as in Example 15, where the question tag occurs after the first NP in a binominal construction.

Gradience is the outcome of gradual micro-step by micro-step change (Traugott and Trousdale 2010). Historically, there is textual evidence for gradual development of pragmatic markers that conforms to De Smet's (2012: 608) concept of "sneaky" change that extends "from one environment to another on the

basis of similarity relations between environments". While De Smet's examples are primarily syntactic, they show semantic–pragmatic "sneakiness" as well. The undecidability of some examples, such as Example 18 with *then* in Section 4.4.1, confirms the gradual, micro-step development via pragmatic ambiguity.

5.2 Systemic correlates for changes in pragmatic markers

No set of changes occurs independently of others in a language. A number of structural and social factors may have influenced the development in English of pragmatic markers in general and RPPMs in particular.

Some changes relevant to epistemic adverbs have been associated largely with cultural shifts. For example, Wierzbicka (2006) proposes that there was a significant ideological change in the eighteenth century, and spear-headed by John Locke, from faith to the search for evidence. In particular she hypothesizes that there are linguistic correlates of the "post-Lockean emphasis on the limitations of human knowledge, on the need to distinguish knowledge from judgment, and on differentiating between 'degrees of assent'" (Wierzbicka 2006: 247). The linguistic correlate she "tentatively" (p. 295) proposes is the rise of epistemic adverbs such as *probably*, *possibly*, *clearly* and *certainly*, the semantics of which, in her view, concerns knowledge rather than truth. Testing this hypothesis, Bromhead (2009) investigates a variety of pragmatic markers in EModE including *in truth*, *I think* and *I suppose*, and concludes that in fact a shift from "certainty" to "doubt" was part of the social and intellectual climate in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries — well preceding Locke's *Essay Concerning Human Understanding* of 1690. Blake's (2002) study of pragmatic markers in Shakespeare, mentioned in Section 4.3, shows that at the beginning of the seventeenth century Shakespeare represented distinct variability in use depending on gender, social role, etc. It seems likely that what we witness in texts from the sixteenth to eighteenth centuries is a particular manifestation of discourse practices that can now be traced from OE through LModE to PDE, in which adverbial connectors and markers of metatextual and attitudinal perspectives are replaced and new ones emerge (see Lenker 2010: 81 for an extensive list). Such practices are by hypothesis closely linked to changing attitudes as well as genres, and a fine-grained analysis of possible correlates across the whole history of English is needed.

Other changes have been associated with structural shifts. Lenker (2010: 198) notes that the use at RP of concessive particles (a subset of what are here called retrospective contrastive pragmatic markers) is rare in Indo-European languages. In other Indo-European languages adverbials in final position usually express manner of action (cf. *briefly*) or stance (cf. *wisely*). Lenker links the development in English of retrospective contrastive markers to what she considers to be

a typological syntactic change in the late eighteenth and nineteenth centuries toward a growing preference for adverbial connectives over co-ordinating conjunctions (p. 9). In writing, adverbial connectives are preferred in medial position, but in speech *though* is preferred in final position in the twentieth century. Comparing German, which differentiates subordinate and main clause by word order (OV and V2, respectively), she notes that English lost this word order distinction. "English has established a new slot for the placement of adverbial connectors, the sentence-final position" (Lenker 2010: 213). Another structural shift that has been mentioned is the preference of younger speakers of British English for invariant tags like *yeah*, *eh*, *okay*, *right* and *innit* (Stenström et al. 2002).

The RP position is new for the connectors Lenker discusses, as is the retrospective function, but if "slot" is understood as a position (RP), this position has been available since OE for Adverbs. I have shown that over time the position has been used for more and more functions. Haselow (2012a: 154) further argues that the syntactic change Lenker identifies is inter-woven with ongoing changes in discourse organization occurring in spoken English, which continue "as the gravitation of an increasingly high number of lexemes towards the right periphery of an utterance shows". As Haselow notes, this shift has not been widely recognized and deserves study.

A more particular structural change has been correlated with the development of question tags. Tottie and Hoffmann (2009: 156) hypothesize that this development is dependent on the establishment of the negator *not* in place of the older *ne*:

> It appears unlikely that tag questions would have begun to be used when the sole negator was *ne*, which normally preceded the verb in Old English. As the negator provides the new information and would require end-weight, *ne* could not have fulfilled this function.

In their view, the change in negator is likely to have been more important than the rise of *do*, which doubtless also facilitated the development of question tags. Their evidence is that the first example of a question tag (Example 11) involves *have*, and question tags could easily have developed earlier (Tottie and Hoffmann (2009: 155).

It is widely accepted, starting with Schourup (1982) and Schiffrin (1987), that pragmatic markers are primarily associated with spoken language. I have, therefore, used corpora of text types that for the most part represent speech. However, some, most notably connectives like *then*, *though* and *in fact*, are found ubiquitously, and Lenker (2010) does not restrict her corpora to those that are representative of speech. The development of pragmatic markers in all text types should be investigated to determine which are largely restricted to spoken, interactional language, and which are not. By hypothesis, token frequency is higher in spoken

varieties and, above all, in conversation; but type frequency may be relatively high in certain types of written genres as well. It is also likely that changes in type frequency have occurred over time in connection with the development of new genres and styles.

6.   Conclusion

I have shown in this paper that the rise of pragmatic markers at RP in English has been incremental from OE times on. In two cases, question tags and general extenders, RP is the typical position where they occur, but they can also occur medially. The retrospective contrastive use of *then*, *though*, *however*, *after all* and *actually* appears to be constrained to RP, but these pragmatic markers appear in other uses in other positions. It has been possible here to sketch only the broad outlines of the changes in question. A complete study of pragmatic markers would need to investigate in which positions a particular marker can occur, which are preferred, and what the meaning in each position is, as recommended by Aijmer (1986), and what differences there are among varieties of English. Most importantly, use in "medial" positions needs to be better understood. Distributional preference is partly predictable in terms of function, but for the most part it is marker-specific.

Many other larger questions arise in any study of the development of linguistic categories. In Section 5, I provided some suggestions about possible links between the rise of particular types of pragmatic markers, especially since EModE, cultural shifts and wide systemic changes. Among further issues that have been the subject of inquiry and deserve future work is whether the development of pragmatic markers in any position involves grammaticalization or pragmaticalization (e.g., Brinton 2008, Brems et al. [eds] 2012). Another question is whether pragmatic markers at RP are primarily modalizing, intersubjective and turn-yielding, and most importantly, how periphery should be defined (Beeching and Detges 2014a).

Key to abbreviations

EModE	Early Modern English
LModE	Late Modern English
LP	left periphery
ME	Middle English
OE	Old English
PDE	Present Day English
RP	right periphery
RPPM	pragmatic marker used at right periphery

SBD   subordinator
SBJV   subjunctive

Abbreviations of databases can be found in the list of sources.

Acknowledgements

Sources

BNC British National Corpus Version 3 (BNC XML Edition). 2007. Distributed by Oxford University Computing Services on behalf of the BNC Consortium. http://www.natcorp.ox.ac.uk/

COHA The Corpus of Historical American English 2010–. Compiled by Mark Davies. Brigham Young University. http://corpus.byu.edu/coha/

DOEC Dictionary of Old English Corpus 2011. Original release 1981 compiled by Angus Cameron, Ashley Crandell Amos, Sharon Butler and Antonette diPaolo Healey. Release 2009 compiled by Antonette diPaolo Healey, Joan Holland, Ian McDougall and David McDougall, with Xin Xiang. University of Toronto. http://www.helsinki.fi/varieng/CoRD/corpora/DOEC/index.html

HC Helsinki Corpus of English Texts 1991. Compiled by Matti Rissanen (Project leader), Merja Kytö (Project secretary); Leena Kahlas-Tarkka, Matti Kilpiö (Old English); Saara Nevanlinna, Irma Taavitsainen (Middle English); Terttu Nevalainen, Helena Raumolin-Brunberg (Early Modern English). Department of English, University of Helsinki. http://www.helsinki.fi/varieng/CoRD/corpora/HelsinkiCorpus/index/html

ICE-GB International Corpus of English–Great Britain http://ice-corpora.net/ice/

MED The Middle English Dictionary 1956–2001. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press. http://www.hti.umich.edu/dict/med/

OBP The Old Bailey Proceedings Online, 1674–1913 2012. Tim Hitchcock, Robert Shoemaker, Clive Emsley, Sharon Howard and Jamie McLaughlin, et al, version 7.0. www.oldbaileyonline.org

OED Oxford English Dictionary http://www.oed.com/

Shakespeare 1974. G. Blakemore Evans et al (eds), *The Riverside Shakespeare*. Boston: Houghton Mifflin.

Shakespeare Corpus Compiled by Mike Scott. http://www.lexically.net

YP The York Plays 1982. Richard Beadle (ed.). London: Arnold.References

Aimer, Karin. 1986. "Why is *Actually* so Popular in Spoken English?" In Gunnel Tottie and Ingegerd Bäcklund (eds), *English in Speech and Writing: A Symposium*, 119–27. Stockholm: Almqvist and Wiksell.

Aijmer, Karin. 2002. *English Discourse Particles: Evidence from a Corpus*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins. doi:10.1075/scl.10

Andersen, Gisle. 2001. *Pragmatic Markers and Sociolinguistic Variation: A Relevance-theoretic Approach to the Language of Adolescents*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins. doi:10.1075/pbns.84

Beeching, Kate and Ulrich Detges. 2014a. "Introduction". In Kate Beeching and Ulrich Detges (eds), *Discourse Functions at the Left and Right Periphery: Crosslinguistic Investigations of Language Use and Language Change*, 1–23. Leiden: Brill.

Beeching, Kate and Ulrich Detges (eds). 2014b. *Discourse Functions at the Left and Right Periphery: Crosslinguistic Investigations of Language Use and Language Change*. Leiden: Brill.

Biber, Douglas, Stig Johansson, Geoffrey Leech, Susan Conrad and Edward Finegan. 1999. *Longman Grammar of Spoken and Written English*. Harlow, Essex: Pearson Education.

Blake, Norman F. 2002. *A Grammar of Shakespeare's Language*. New York: Palgrave.

Brems, Lieselotte, Lobke Ghesquière and Freek Van de Velde (eds). 2012. *Intersections of Intersubjectivity*, special issue of *English Text Construction* 5 (1).

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

Brinton, Laurel J. 2001. "Historical Discourse Analysis". In Deborah Schiffrin, Deborah Tannen and Heidi E. Hamilton (eds), *The Handbook of Discourse Analysis*, 138–50. Malden, MA: Blackwell.

Brinton, Laurel J. 2008. *The Comment Clause in English: Syntactic Origins and Pragmatic Development*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. doi:10.1017/CBO9780511551789

Bromhead, Helen. 2009. *The Reign of Truth and Faith: Epistemic Expressions in 16th and 17th Century English*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter. doi:10.1515/9783110216028

Carroll, Ruth. 2008. "Historical English Phraseology and the Extender Tag". *Journal of the Spanish Society for Medieval English Language and Literature (SELIM)* 15 (1): 7–38.

Croft, William. 2000. *Explaining Language Change*. Harlow, Essex: Longman, Pearson Education.

Culpeper, Jonathan and Merja Kytö. 2000. "Data in Historical Pragmatics: Spoken Interaction (Re)cast as Writing". *Journal of Historical Pragmatics* 1 (2): 175–99. doi:10.1075/jhp.1.2.03cul

Defour, Tine. 2008. "The Speaker's Voice: A Diachronic Study on the Use of *well* and *now* as Pragmatic Markers". *English Text Construction* 1 (1): 62–82. doi:10.1075/etc.1.1.06def

Dehé, Nicole and Bettina Braun. 2013. "The Prosody of Question Tags". *English Language and Linguistics* 17 (1): 129–57. doi:10.1017/S1360674312000342

Dehé, Nicole and Anne Wichmann. 2010a. "The Multifunctionality of Epistemic Parentheticals in Discourse: Prosodic Cues to the Semantic–Pragmatic Boundary". *Functions of Language* 17 (1): 1–28. doi:10.1075/fol.17.1.01deh

Dehé, Nicole and Anne Wichmann. 2010b. "Sentence-Initial *I think (that)* and *I believe (that)*: Prosodic Evidence for Use as Main Clause, Comment Clause and Discourse Marker". *Studies in Language* 34 (1): 36–71. doi:10.1075/sl.34.1.02deh

De Smet, Hendrik. 2012. "The Course of Actualization". *Language* 88 (3): 601–33. doi:10.1353/lan.2012.0056

Detges, Ulrich and Richard Waltereit. 2009. "Diachronic Pathways and Pragmatic Strategies: Different Types of Pragmatic Particles from a Diachronic Point of View". In Maj-Britt

Mosegaard Hansen and Jacqueline Visconti (eds), *Current Trends in Diachronic Semantics and Pragmatics*, 43–61. Bingley, UK: Emerald. doi:10.1163/9789004253216_004

Detges, Ulrich and Richard Waltereit. 2014. "*Moi je ne sais pas* vs. *Je ne sais pas moi*. French Disjoint Pronouns in the Left and Right Periphery". In Kate Beeching and Ulrich Detges (eds), *Discourse Functions at the Left and Right Periphery: Crosslinguistic Investigations of Language Use and Language Change*, 24–46. Leiden: Brill.

Diewald, Gabriele. 2002. "A Model for Relevant Types of Contexts in Grammaticalization". In Ilse Wischer and Gabriele Diewald (eds), *New Reflections on Grammaticalization*, 103–20. Amsterdam: John Benjamins. doi:10.1075/tsl.49.09die

Dines, Elizabeth R. 1980. "Variation in Discourse – and Stuff Like That". *Language in Society* 9 (1): 13–31. doi:10.1017/S0047404500007764

Estélles, María Arguedos and Salvador Pons Bordería. 2011. *"Absolute Initial Position"*. MS. University of Valencia.

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

Fraser, Bruce. 1990. "An Approach to Discourse Markers". *Journal of Pragmatics* 14 (3): 383–95. doi:10.1016/0378-2166(90)90096-V

Fraser, Bruce. 1996. "Pragmatic Markers". *Pragmatics* 6 (1): 167–90. doi:10.1075/prag.6.2.03fra

Fraser, Bruce. 2006. "Towards a Theory of Discourse Markers". In Kerstin Fischer (ed.), *Approaches to Discourse Particles*, 189–204. Amsterdam: Elsevier.

Haegeman, Lilian and Virginia Hill. 2010. "The Syntacticization of Discourse". Available online at: http://www.gist.ugent.be/file/164 (accessed 27 March 2013).

Hansen, Maj-Britt Mosegaard. 1998. *The Function of Discourse Particles: A Study with Special Reference to Spoken Standard French*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins. doi:10.1075/pbns.53

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

Haselow, Alexander. 2012a. "Discourse Organization and the Rise of Final *then* in the History of English". In Irén Hegedüs and Alexandra Fodor (eds), *English Historical Linguistics 2010. Selected Papers from the Sixteenth International Conference on English Historical Linguistics (ICEHL 16), Pécs, 23–27 August 2010*, 153–75. Amsterdam: John Benjamins. doi:10.1075/cilt.325.07has

Haselow, Alexander. 2012b. "Subjectivity, Intersubjectivity and the Negotiation of Common Ground in Spoken Discourse: Final Particles in English". *Language and Communication* 32 (3): 182–204. doi:10.1016/j.langcom.2012.04.008

Hoffmann, Sebastian. 2006. "Tag Questions in Early and Late Modern English: Historical Description and Theoretical Implications". *Anglistik* 17 (1): 35–55.

Ifantidou, Elly. 1994. Evidentials and Relevance. PhD thesis. University College London.

Jucker, Andreas H. (ed.). 1995. *Historical Pragmatics: Pragmatic Developments in the History of English*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins. doi:10.1075/pbns.35

Kaltenböck, Gunther. 2005. "Charting the Boundaries of Syntax: A Taxonomy of Spoken Parenthetical Clauses". *View[z]: Vienna Working Papers* 14: 21–53. Available online at: http://anglistik.univie.ac.at/fileadmin/user_upload/dep_anglist/weitere_Uploads/Views/Views0501ALL.pdf (accessed 17 March 2013).

Kaltenböck, Gunther, Bernd Heine and Tania Kuteva. 2011. "On Thetical Grammar". *Studies in Language* 35 (4): 852–97. doi:10.1075/sl.35.4.03kal

Lass, Roger. 2000. "Language Periodization and the Concept 'Middle'". In Irma Taavitsainen, Terttu Nevalainen, Päivi Pahta and Matti Rissanen (eds), *Placing Middle English in Context*, 7–42. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

Lenker, Ursula. 2010. *Argument and Rhetoric: Adverbial Connectors in the History of English*. Berlin: De Gruyter Mouton. doi:10.1515/9783110216066

Lewis, Diana M. 2006. "Discourse Markers in English: A Discourse-Pragmatic View". In Kerstin Fischer (ed.), *Approaches to Discourse Particles*, 61–76. Amsterdam: Elsevier.

Lutzky, Ursula. 2012. *Discourse Markers in Early Modern English*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins. doi:10.1075/pbns.227

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

Mulder, Jean, Sandra A. Thompson and Cara Penry Williams. 2009. "Final *but* in Australian English". In Pam Peters, Peter Collins and Adam Smith (eds), *Comparative Studies in Australian and New Zealand English*, 339–59. Amsterdam: John Benjamins. doi:10.1075/veaw.g39.19mul

Overstreet, Maryann. 1999. *Whales, Candlelight, and Stuff Like That: General Extenders in English Discourse*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Pichler, Heike and Stephen Levey. 2010. "Variability in the Co-occurrence of Discourse Features". *University of Reading Language Studies Working Papers* 2: 17–27.

Pichler, Heike and Stephen Levey. 2011. "In Search of Grammaticalization in Synchronic Dialect Data: General Extenders in Northeast England". *English Language and Linguistics* 15: 441–71. doi:10.1017/S1360674311000128

Redeker, Gisela. 2006. "Discourse Markers as Attentional Cues at Discourse Transitions". In Kerstin Fischer (ed.), *Approaches to Discourse Particles*, 339–58. Amsterdam: Elsevier.

Schiffrin, Deborah. 1987. *Discourse Markers*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. doi:10.1017/CBO9780511611841

Schourup, Lawrence. 1982. "Common Discourse Particles in English Conversation". *Working Papers in Linguistics* 28. Ohio State University.

Spevak, Marvin. 1973. *The Harvard Concordance to Shakespeare*. Cambridge, MA: Belknap Press of Harvard University Press.

Stenström, Anna-Brita, Gisle Andersen and Ingrid Kristine Hasund. 2002. *Trends in Teenage Talk: Corpus Compilation, Analysis, and Findings*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins. doi:10.1075/scl.8

Swan, Toril. 1988. *Sentence Adverbials in English: A Synchronic and Diachronic Investigation*. Oslo: Novus.

Taavitsainen, Irma. 1995. "Interjections in Early Modern English: From Imitation of Spoken to Conventions of Written Language". In Andreas H. Jucker (ed.), *Historical Pragmatics: Pragmatic Developments in the History of English*, 439–65. Amsterdam: John Benjamins. doi:10.1075/pbns.35.23taa

Taavitsainen, Irma. 1997. "Exclamations in Late Middle English". In Jacek Fisiak (ed.), *Studies in Middle English Linguistics*, 373–607. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

Thompson, Sandra A. and Anthony J. Mulac. 1991. "A Quantitative Perspective on the Grammaticalization of Epistemic Parentheticals in English". In Elizabeth Closs Traugott and Bernd Heine (eds), *Approaches to Grammaticalization*, Vol. 2: 313–29. Amsterdam: John Benjamins. doi:10.1075/tsl.19.2.16tho

Tottie, Gunnel and Sebastian Hoffmann. 2009. "Tag Questions in English – The First Century". *Journal of English Linguistics* 37 (2): 130–61. doi:10.1177/0075424209332962

Traugott, Elizabeth Closs. 2012. "Intersubjectification and Clause Periphery". In Lieselotte Brems, Lobke Ghesquière and Freek Van de Velde (eds), *Intersections of Intersubjectivity*, special issue of English Text Construction, 5 (1): 57–28.

Traugott, Elizabeth Closs. 2015. "Investigating 'Periphery' from a Functionalist Perspective". In Alexander Bergs, Abigail C. Cohn and Jeff Good (eds), *Linguistic Vanguard* 1, 119–30. Berlin: De Gruyter.

Traugott, Elizabeth Closs and Graeme Trousdale. 2010. "Gradience, Gradualness and Grammaticalization: How Do They Intersect?" In Elizabeth Closs Traugott and Graeme Trousdale (eds), *Gradience, Gradualness, and Grammaticalization*, 19–44. Amsterdam: John Benjamins. doi:10.1075/tsl.90.04tra

Walkden, George. 2013. "The Status of *hwæt* in Old English". *English Language and Linguistics* 17: 465–88. doi:10.1017/S1360674313000129

Weinreich, Uriel, William Labov and Marvin Herzog. 1968. "Empirical Foundations for a Theory of Language Change". In W.P. Lehmann and Yakov Malkiel (eds), *Directions for Historical Linguistics*, 95–189. Austin: University of Texas Press.

Wierzbicka, Anna. 2006. *English: Meaning and Culture*. New York: Oxford University Press. doi:10.1093/acprof:oso/9780195174748.001.0001

Author's address

Department of Linguistics
Stanford University
Stanford CA 94301–2150
USA

traugott@stanford.edu

About the author

Elizabeth Closs Traugott is Professor of Linguistics and English Emerita at Stanford University, USA. Her primary research interest area is historical linguistics, including historical pragmatics and discourse analysis. Books published in the last ten years are *Lexicalization and Language Change* (co-authored with Laurel J. Brinton, 2005), *Gradience, Gradualness and Grammaticalization* (co-edited with Graeme Trousdale, 2010), *The Oxford Handbook of the History of English* (co-edited with Terttu Nevalainen, 2012), and *Constructionalization and Constructional Changes* (co-authored with Graeme Trousdale, 2013).