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1. Introduction

- Target items ('discourse marker'; 'pragmatic marker'; 'metatextual particle')
  - English: *in fact, after all, so, then, well*
  - Japanese: *sate 'well', sunawati 'namely, in other words'*

- Characteristics
  - signalling speaker's rhetorical stance
  - marking speaker's epistemic stance
  - carrying deictic properties
  - having little conceptual semantics
  - making no significant contribution to truth-conditional meanings

- Source Characteristics
  - terms that served primarily contentful functions (contra procedural)
  - clause-internal predicate adverbs > sentential adverbs > discourse markers

2. Discourse Markers

- Schiffrin (1987)
  - DM: *and, because, but, I mean, now, Oh!, or, so, then, well, y'know...*
  - Different from speech act adverbials (stance adverbs)

  (1) Frankly, I didn't enjoy that movie at all. (SA)
  (2) In fact, I did not enjoy that movie at all. (DM)

- diverse relationships: condition, cause, justification, elaboration, contrast, topic shift, etc.
- clearly subjective & often modal
- some intersubjective: *well, actually, y'know, hwæt, etc.* (hedges, mitigators)

3. The Development of DMs Signaling Local Connectivity

- 3 uses of *in fact*
  (3)a. Clause-Internal
    - Humanity, comfortably engaged elsewhere in the business of living, is absent *in fact*
but everywhere present in feeling. (1997 May, UA Hem. Mag.)

b. Sentential
   Humanity is **in fact** absent.

c. DM
   Humanity is not often present. **In fact**, it is usually absent.

• Correlation between positions of adverbs and different meanings
  (4) a. Clause-internal: right margin of clause
   b. Sentential: adjacent to the tensed verb or left margin
   c. DM: outside the clause

3.1 Indeed
• OE *dede* < IE *dhe-* 'set, put'
• Development
  (5) a. Stage I: indeed₁: adverbial of 'respect in which' (RA)
       ↓ invited inference (observability > truth)
  b. Stage II: indeed₂: epistemic (EA)
       ↓ invited inference (adversativity) (cf. development of emphatic)
  c. Stage III: indeed₃: DM

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Form</th>
<th>Meaning</th>
<th>Label</th>
<th>1300</th>
<th>1450</th>
<th>1600</th>
<th>1850</th>
<th>2000</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>indeed₁</td>
<td>in the act</td>
<td>RA</td>
<td>------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>indeed₂</td>
<td>in truth</td>
<td>EA</td>
<td>------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>indeed₃</td>
<td>what's more</td>
<td>DM</td>
<td>------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.2 In Fact
• fact (< IE *dhe-* 'set, put') borrowed from Latin *fac-* 'do' in 16th c.
• Development
  (7) a. Stage I: in fact₁: adverbial of 'respect in which' (RA)
       ↓ acquisition of 'evidential' meaning (cf. competition w/ indeed, actually)
  b. Stage II: in fact₂: epistemic adversative (EA)
       ↓ acquisition of justification & self-corrective elaboration
  c. Stage III: in fact₃:

3.3 Actually
• actual < French 'active' 'real' 14th c.
• Development
  (8) a. Stage I: actually₁: manner adverb actively, effectively (MA)
       ↓ invited inference of reality (active > real)
b. Stage II: *actually*: epistemic certainty
   ↓ invited inference of epistemic certainty

c. Stage III: *actually*: additive (rather than adversative) and epistemic, confirmation of
   full intention with evidence

3.4 Comparisons

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Adv Type</th>
<th>indeed</th>
<th>actually</th>
<th>in fact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>RA</td>
<td>1300</td>
<td>1425</td>
<td>1670</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EA</td>
<td>1450</td>
<td>1750</td>
<td>1680</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DM</td>
<td>1600</td>
<td>1815</td>
<td>1815</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(10) *indeed vs. in fact*

(a) Original *deed* largely restricted to deeds of valor (contra *fact*)
(b) Original bare *in deed* now restricted to *in deed and word* (contra *fact*)
(c) *Indeed* can signal agreement (despite counterexpectation) to prior
   utterance/implicature. (contra *fact*)
(d) *In fact* cannot be used in the sense of *Yes*. (contra *indeed*)
(e) Being confirmatory, *indeed* invites inference that though info may be new to Add but
   Spk had it in mind before. (contra *in fact* presenting new info)

(11) *actually & in fact*

(a) Neither can be used in the sense of *Yes*.
(b) Both invite inference that the info is new.
(c) Both serve as hedges.

4. Subjectification & Intersubjectification

- subjectivity:
  (12) a. crucial in linguistic communication (cf. syntactic subject, speaking subject)
  b. Spk selects content & expression of the content (syntactic subject, topicalization, tense...)
     cf. "Objective" language: active, declarative assertion w/o speaker's viewpoint
  c. particularly prominent with evidentials
  d. Spk's viewpoints: deixis, modality, marking of discourse strategies...

- intersubjectivity:
  Spk-Add: honorification...
  variation per lgs: *I will take you to school. tu, vous, du, Sie*...

- subjectification of *in deed, in fact, actually*
(13) a. RA meanings > EA meanings
   b. EA meanings > DM meanings

• subjectification of *wake*
  Suzuki (1998):
  *waku* 'divide' >> *wake* 'reason' (18th c.)
  *wake* "it is the reason/case/situation that" >> "Spk invites the hearer to accept a logical relationship" ("you see")

• intersubjectification of *actually & in fact*
  marking connectivity and functioning as DM hedges

4.1 *Well*
• clear case of development of intersubjective meanings
• OE *well* 'in a good manner' (<IE *wel-* 'to will, wish' > 'in accordance with a good or high standard of conduct or morality'; OED)
• OE *wella* [well + la] 'listen up' (similar to *hwæt*)
• ME *well* (clause-initial, direct reported speed, at beginning of TCU). "frame-marker" "text-sequencing device" (Jucker 1997)
• EModE *well* in monolog. hedging device (for its tendence of use in situations of conflict)

4.2 *Let's*
• *let's*: intersubjective from the beginning, increase of intersubjectivity
  (14) a. Let us go (release us)
      b. Let yourself down on the rope.
      c. Let Bill go (release Bill)
  (15) Let's go to the circus tonight.
  (16) a. Lets give you a hand.
      b. Let's you and I take 'em on for a set.
  (17) a. Lets you and him fight.
      b. Lets you go first, then if we have any money left I'll go.
  (18) a. Lets wash your hands.
      b. Lets eat our liver now, Betty.
  (19) a. sgo
      b. sfight

>>> (20) (a) The meaning shift of the full verb *let*. (allow/permit > attitudinal/suggestion...)
   (b) The syntactic constraint loosened. (subject)
   (c) Cliticization of *us* and fusion (*us* > 's > *s* word > affix > phoneme)
   (d) Phonological reduction ([ts] > [s])
   (e) Routinization and specialization of emerging function (adhortative)
5. The Development of DM Signaling Global Connectivity: *Sate*
   
   - MdJ *sate*: global discourse particle typically signalling topic shift (similar to Eng. *so*)
   - In Modern Colloquial JPN: expressive value as a mild hedge (similar to Eng. *well*)
   - MdJ: rarely occurs clause-internally, completely lost its original deictic manner adverbial meaning 'thus, in that way'
   
   **Development**
   
   (21) a. Stage I: *sate*: 'thus'; OJ 'that manner'
   b. Stage II: *sate*: connection between p (as a whole) and q; LOJ no manner meaning; cause-effect relationship
   c. Stage III: *sate*: scene-shifter; global association w/ discourse structure; EMJ opener of a new section of discourse; Fully established by LMJ
   d. Stage IV: *sate*: exclamation (and hedge), LMJ, signaling Spk's emotional state
   e. Stage V: *sate*: epistolary formula, MdJ

   (22)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Form</th>
<th>Meaning</th>
<th>OJ</th>
<th>LOJ</th>
<th>EMJ</th>
<th>LMJ</th>
<th>EMdJ</th>
<th>MdJ</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><em>sate</em>&lt;sub&gt;1&lt;/sub&gt;</td>
<td>&quot;thus&quot;</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>sate</em>&lt;sub&gt;2&lt;/sub&gt;</td>
<td>&quot;then (conn)&quot;</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>sate</em>&lt;sub&gt;3&lt;/sub&gt;</td>
<td>&quot;scene-shifter&quot;</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>sate</em>&lt;sub&gt;4&lt;/sub&gt;</td>
<td>&quot;exclamation&quot;</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>sate</em>&lt;sub&gt;5&lt;/sub&gt;</td>
<td>&quot;epistolary formula&quot;</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

   **Characteristics by Stages**

   (23) a. Stage I: Deictic manner verb: connection with manner characteristics; clause-internal
   b. Stage II: Discourse marker connective: connection with instantiation, time, or logical consequences; clause-initial; local discourse level
   c. Stage III: Pragmatic particle for new topic; no deictic referent requirement; global discourse level
   d. Stage IV: Exclamatory lexeme; Spk's emotional involvement, or hedge for Add; global pragmatic marker
   e. Stage V: Epistolary formula

   (24) Correlated paths

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ADV&lt;sub&gt;manner&lt;/sub&gt;</th>
<th>ADV&lt;sub&gt;adversative&lt;/sub&gt;</th>
<th>ADV&lt;sub&gt;elaboration&lt;/sub&gt;</th>
<th>ADV&lt;sub&gt;hedge&lt;/sub&gt;</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>content</td>
<td>content/procedural</td>
<td>procedural</td>
<td>procedural</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>s-w-proposition</td>
<td>s-o-proposition</td>
<td>s-o-discourse</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nonsubjective</td>
<td>subjective</td>
<td></td>
<td>intersubjective</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
6. Conclusion

- non-epistemic > epistemic adverbs/particles
- development of metatextual meanings making explicit Spk's rhetorical purposes and attitude
- development of polysemies with intersubjective meanings

- Number of English Initial Sentence Adverbials by Class over Time (Swan 1991)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>OE</th>
<th>ME</th>
<th>MdE</th>
<th>PDE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Truth/modal ADV</td>
<td>292</td>
<td>816</td>
<td>987</td>
<td>1336</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluative ADV</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>303</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Epithetical ADV</td>
<td>230</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>164</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speech Act ADV</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>39</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>566</td>
<td>1077</td>
<td>1258</td>
<td>1763</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Different languages may favor different kinds of ADVs at different times, but the direction of change with adverb types is unidirectional.
  - MdE: modal ADVs (*possibly*), evaluatives (*surprisingly*), epitheticals (*wisely*), speech act ADVs (*frankly*)
  - OE: truth intensifiers (*witodlice* 'truly'), epitheticals (*wislice* 'wisely'), evaluatives (*wundorlice* 'surprisingly') only; No speech act ADVs until 17th c.

- Direction of change is entirely regular:
  - verb-modifier > sentence-modifier
  - relatively concrete > relatively abstract, nonreferential
  - contentful > procedural