

Special issue of *East Asian Pragmatics*

Grammaticalisation of Discourse Markers in East Asian Languages Introduction

Seongha Rhee,^a Reijirou Shibasaki,^b and Xinren Chen^c

With the interest in different manifestations of linguistic features on the one hand and the interest in commonalities of discursive needs in interaction on the other, there is a broadening of pragmatics to the study of multiple languages (Aijmer, 2009; Blum-Kulka, House, & Kasper, 1989; Connor, Nagelhout, & Rozycki, 2008; Fillmore, 1984; Kasper & Blum-Kulka, 1993; Kranich, 2016; Verschueren, 2016, among others). Significant advances have been made through the comparisons and contrasts from such contrastive-pragmatic approaches in various fields such as intercultural communication, ethnography of communication, interlanguage pragmatics, rhetoric, cultural textology, translation studies, discourse analysis, language education, etc.

Given the efficacy of contrastive-pragmatic approaches, this special issue addresses the grammaticalisation of certain discourse markers (DMs) in three different East Asian languages, i.e., Chinese, Japanese, and Korean. The grammaticalisation scenarios displayed by these DMs constitute a unique theme in that the ultimate origin of the DMs is a Chinese etymon 實/实/実 (*shi* in Chinese, *jitsu* in Japanese, and *sil* in Korean), denoting ‘real(ity), true, full, rich, fruit’ (*Handian*, entry for 實 *shi*). Scientists from various persuasions, from biology to psychology, have long been intrigued by the question of the determinative impact of genetic

Affiliation

^a Hankuk University of Foreign Studies, Republic of Korea ^b Meiji University, Japan

^c Nanjing University, China

email: srhee@hufs.ac.kr reijiro@meiji.ac.jp cxr3354182@163.com

predisposition and the extent of variations effected by the environment, a query that often led to studies of identical twins reared apart (cf. the nature–nurture controversy; Harris, 2009[1998]; Pinker, 2002; Ridley, 2011[2003]; Watson, 1924; among numerous others). Likewise, linguists have been naturally interested in the life of words of the same origin, i.e., cognates, in different languages, largely in comparative linguistic studies, since they are linguistic analogues of identical twins reared apart (see Aijmer & Simon-Vandenberg, 2003, 2006; Hansen 2018; Hansen & Strudsholm, 2008; Simon-Vandenberg & Willems, 2011, among others).

The etymon under the present discussion are triplets, born in China and reared in China, Korea, and Japan, respectively. They have the same literal meaning and developed their functions in the three different languages rather independently because the interaction among them seems to have been largely restricted to written texts, rather than everyday oral communication (Narrog, Rhee, & Whitman, 2018). Since contact-induced change generally occurs in and through the spoken use of a language (Heine & Kuteva, 2005, p. 250), the present analyses will shed light on the issues of how much of their grammaticalisation feature is attributable to the lexical origin and to what extent their ‘evolutive’ or ‘natural’ developmental patterns (Andersen, 1973; Paul, 1920[1880]; Thomason & Kaufman, 1988) can be similar when they are situated in different linguistic systems.

The words that developed from the etymon 實/実/実 into DMs are 事實上/事實上/事實上 (*shishishang* in Chinese, *jijitsujoo* in Japanese, and *sasilsang* in Korean), 其實/其实 (*sonojitsu* (其の实) in Japanese and *kisil* in Korean), and 實狀 (*silsang* in Korean). The authors in this issue investigate the developmental paths of these three lexemes that led to the contemporary DM functions.

The first three articles, i.e., He, Shibasaki, and Rhee, discuss the grammaticalisation of 事實上/事实上/事实上, which can be roughly translated as ‘in fact’. Xiao He discusses the grammaticalisation of *shishishang* (事实上) in Mandarin Chinese, which first appeared in the Song Dynasty literature. Consisting of *shishi* (事实), a noun phrase denoting ‘the objective fact’, and the locative *shang* (上), *shishishang* has the literal meaning ‘based on the objective fact’. Synchronically, it functions as an adverbial, occurring utterance-medially, but it also functions as a DM at the utterance-initial position. The functional shift occurred in tandem with the positional shift from the utterance-medial position to the utterance-initial position. This is in line with the observed tendencies in earlier studies across languages (Aijmer, 2002, p. 29; Brinton, 1996, pp. 33–35; Hansen, 1997, p. 156; Heine et al., 2021; Schiffrin, 1987, pp. 31–32; Traugott, 1995, pp. 5–6; among many others). Xiao He also shows that *shishishang* carries the textual and interactional functions. Most notably, among a number of interactional functions, *shishishang* has the signal function, i.e., to alert the addressee to realise that there is a lack

of fit between two sides of the dialogue, i.e., there would be slight disagreement or a violation of expectation. Thus, *shishishang* indicates to the addressee that they should be prepared for information that, although relevant, may not be what they are expecting. He's findings of the emergence of textual and interactional functions supports the widely observed semasiological change patterns, best captured by 'subjectification' and 'intersubjectification' (Traugott, 1982, 2003, 2010; Traugott & Dasher, 2002).

Similarly, Reijirou Shibasaki addresses the development of the Japanese equivalent of the Chinese *shishishang* (事實上). He examines the discourse-pragmatic functions of the DM *jijitsujoo* 事実上 (or 事實上) 'as a matter of practice, practically speaking' in comparison with another DM *jijitsu* 事実 (or 事實) 'in fact, the fact is' in the history of Japanese. Discourse-pragmatically, *jijitsu* serves to introduce telling evidence for the preceding statement, while *jijitsujoo* reformulates the preceding statement with what the speaker regards to be relevant, whereas disregarding irrelevant information. Syntactically, they are distributed in a complementary manner. *Jijitsujoo* has a strong tendency to appear in the middle of a sentence from Modern Japanese (ModJ) through Present Day Japanese (PDJ), whereas *jijitsu* tended to appear as a verbal adverb sentence-medially in ModJ, subsequently becoming DM-oriented serving sentence-initially in PDJ. Such pragmatic and functional differentiations are still in the making. Further, Shibasaki discusses the development of *jijitsujoo* with respect to the *functional asymmetry hypothesis* (Beeching & Detges, 2014) and notes that *jijitsujoo* shows subjectivity at sentence-medial position, contrary to their hypothesised correlation of left-periphery (LP) and subjectivity (here LP can be interpreted as sentence-initial position). Findings from Shibasaki's contribution supply corroborating information for those from He's and Rhee's contributions.

Seongha Rhee addresses the word of the same origin *sasilsang* (사실상; 事實上) in Korean. As is the case with *shishishang* in Chinese and *jijitsu(joo)* in Japanese, the Korean DM *sasilsang*, literally 'in fact', developed from the two lexemes *sasil* 'truth, fact' and *sang* 'top' in the form of a compound, first attested in Modern Korean. In historical records, the noun *sasil* was first used to refer to religious truth, particularly the truth in Buddhism, in Early Middle Korean. With the disappearance of the religious meaning, the later meanings of *sasil* denoted the mundane reality, plainly visible and unambiguous. The meaning of *sasil* was further extended to hidden reality, i.e., one not plainly observable and in contrast with the appearance. The hidden reality meaning, according to Rhee, prompted the word's development into a DM as a signal to indicate the surprising nature of the information that is to follow. Interestingly, the hidden reality is often the speaker's interpretive reality rather than objective reality. The strategic use of the DM engendered such discursive functions as marking common-ground sollicita-

tion, pause-filling, hesitance, and politeness, among others. His observation is in consonance with the developmental patterns of *shishishang* in Chinese and *jijitsu(joo)* in Japanese. Further, Rhee's examination of the DM *sasilsang* with respect to the oft-cited peripheral asymmetry leads to the conclusion that the asymmetry cannot be confirmed by the development of the Korean DM *sasilsang*. This also corroborates the findings in He's and Shibasaki's contributions.

In the next two articles, Yuko Higashiizumi and Keiko Takahashi, and Sujin Eom and Seongha Rhee discuss the grammaticalisation of 其實, which can be roughly translated as 'its reality, its fact'. Higashiizumi and Takahashi investigate the development of the hybrid noun phrase *sonojitsu* 其(の)實/其(の)実 'that fact, its fact' to a DM 'in fact, in reality, as a matter of fact' in the history of Japanese. Their historical investigation presents a number of notable findings. First, *sonojitsu* was sporadically used as a noun phrase mainly attached to an accusative marker or a topic marker until the early 18th century. The topic-marked *sonojitsu* could be interpreted in two ways: either as a topic-marked noun in the construction [*sonojitsu*-TOP ... COP] 'the fact/reality is that ...' or as a phrasal DM 'in fact' in sentence/clause-initial position. According to the authors, *sonojitsu*-TOP seems to have played a role as a 'bridging context' (Heine, 2002) or a 'critical context' (Diewald, 2002), in which pragmatic ambiguity in context yields grammaticalisation. Further, the zero-marked *sonojitsu* began to be used as a DM of adversativity from the early 18th century, taking over the meaning and function of *sonojitsu*-TOP as a phrasal DM 'in fact'. In contemporary Japanese, the majority of *sonojitsu* use is as a DM. The authors also note that the DM *sonojitsu* typically occurs at the sentence-medial (clause-initial) position, serving an adversative relationship between two clauses/sentences. This discourse function is realised in the structural template of [PROPOSITION₁ ADVERSATIVE *sonojitsu* PROPOSITION₂], often used redundantly with a preceding expression of adversativity, as in the case of the English *in fact* (Traugott, 1999).

Sujin Eom and Seongha Rhee analyse the development of the DM *kisil* in Korean, the close counterpart of the Japanese *sonojitsu*. Unlike the Japanese counterpart, which was borrowed as a unit 其實/其実 but was read *sonojitsu* in a vernacular reading, Korean *kisil* preserves the pronunciation of the borrowed phrase from Chinese. The DM *kisil(un)* presents an interesting grammaticalisation scenario in a number of ways. The DM *kisil* began its life as a phrasal borrowing from Chinese, a syntactic construction to mean 'that/its fruit' in Middle Korean. It consequently developed into a single lexeme with more abstract meanings, e.g., 'essence, reality, fact, truth', and further it was grammaticalised into a DM signalling a speaker's diverse stances in discourse contexts. A phrasal borrowing from Chinese, its initial uses carried the pedantic flavour because knowledge of written Chinese was an unmistakable emblem of the speaker's membership in the privi-

leged literati class. It is for this reason, however, that it became officially banned in Modern Korean as part of efforts for ‘language purism’. Even though it has been officially declared to be avoidable and thus occurs at a very low frequency in contemporary Korean, the DM *kisil* in its history developed diverse interactional functions. Further, unlike most other DMs, *kisil(un)* does not have much positional freedom but occurs mostly between the subject and the predicate, bridging two pieces of contrasting information.

The semantic and functional development displayed by the Japanese DM *sonojitsu* and the Korean *kisil* has much in common. In particular, the two DMs clearly show a great extent of subjectification and intersubjectification. A major difference between the two is that the Japanese *sonojitsu* is gaining wider circulation whereas the Korean *kisil* has fallen into nearly total disuse.

The last article of the issue, by Hyun Sook Lee, discusses the grammaticalisation of *silsang* (실상, 實狀) in Korean, which can be roughly translated as ‘the reality, the real state, the true circumstance’. The Korean lexeme *silsang* (실상, 實狀) consists of *sil* (실, 實) ‘real’ and *sang* (상, 狀) ‘state’, and displays interesting semantic and functional changes in its history. It is first attested in 17th-century data with the meaning of ‘the reality’, occupying argument positions. The lexeme *silsang* has undergone semantic and structural changes, and it survives as a noun denoting ‘reality’, an adverb ‘in reality’, and as a DM ‘in fact’, with a few notable discursive functions in contemporary Korean. Lee shows that the original meaning of *silsang*, just like the other ‘truth/reality’-related lexemes addressed in this issue, implied some departure from the perceived reality, giving rise to the contrast between the misguided, observed reality and the hidden, true reality. Morpho-syntactically, from the Early Modern Korean, *silsang* began to occur increasingly in non-argument positions, thus fulfilling adverbial functions, which set the form free from syntagmatic constraints. This semantic and syntactic change promoted its development into a DM. As a DM, due to its contrast meaning, it is often used as a marker alerting the addressee to the following information which departs from the normal expectation. As Lee argues, the newly emerging DM functions are results of ‘subjectification’ and ‘intersubjectification’ (Traugott, 2003, 2010, 2014a, etc.; Traugott & Dasher, 2002), like the other DMs under discussion.

The findings in the six articles in this issue bring forward a number of noteworthy points of theoretical significance in terms of semantic, syntactic, and discursive functions. With respect to semantics, the most prominent aspect of the findings is the directionality of change, notably from the objective to subjective and to intersubjective meanings, a streamlined change through subjectification and intersubjectification. For instance, the etymon *shi/jitsu/sil* (實) began its life as a pictogram consisting of ‘under a roof’ (宀), ‘farming field’ (田), and ‘money/shell’ (貝), thus symbolising ‘riches, resources, fullness, fruit’, which then

developed to the dominant ‘reality’ meaning. Even though this semantic change involves abstraction, a natural process in the change from pictogram to ideogram, the objectivity sense at this stage still survives in the ‘reality’ meaning. A more significant change involves subjectification, whereby the objective reality is contrasted with the undisclosed reality, which the speaker intends to disclose. This type of subjectivity involving ‘contrast’ seems to be rooted in the human propensity when two propositions or events are juxtaposed, as is well illustrated in the development of English *while*, which denoted an objective temporal point (as a noun), then was extended to temporal overlap (as a connective of duration) to circumstantial overlap (as a connective of condition), and further to contrast (as a connective of concession) (see Hopper & Traugott, 2003[1993], pp. 90–92; see also Kuteva et al., 2019, pp. 426–427 for crosslinguistic observations). Thus, in all three languages, all the lexemes involving the etymon *shi/jitsu/sil* (實) developed into the contrast meaning invoking unexpected information, counter-expectation, surprise, etc. It is particularly interesting in this context that the innovated meanings in all three languages tend to reject the observable reality and present the allegedly hidden but true reality.

The syntactic change involved in the development of the etymon *shi/jitsu/sil* (實) also merits attention. DMs, by virtue of being extra-clausal elements, tend to favour non-argument positions and be flexible in their placement behaviour (Brinton, 2017, p. 29; Degand & Evers-Vermeul, 2015, p. 77; Heine et al., 2021, pp. 48–52, 64). In the case of *shishishang* (Chinese), *jijitsujo* (Japanese), and *sasilsang* (Korean), the final element *shang/joo/sang* (上/上) plays an important role, since it is less than a full-fledged noun. Its perceived nominality is higher in Korean, but in Chinese it is often labelled as a ‘localiser’ (cf. Chappell & Peyraube, 2008; Peyraube, 1994, 1999, 2003), and in all three languages it developed into a postposition (Rhee, in press). Thus, it can easily turn the compound word into a syntactically non-bound constituent, helping the form gain positional freedom, an essential characteristic of a DM. Further, different strategies surface in this context, largely depending on the typological differences. In other words, agglutinative languages like Japanese and Korean, in which postpositional particles are developed, tend to recruit a non-syntactic role marker, typically the topic marker *-wa* (e.g., *jijitsu-wa*, *jijitsujo-wa*, *sonojitsu-wa*, etc. in Japanese) and *-un* (e.g., *kisil-un*, *silsang-un*, etc. in Korean). The Korean *sasilsang* does not seem to use the topic marker, which may have to do with the defective nominal feature of *sang* (上/上). The degree of syntactic freedom seems variable, as it is noted that the Korean *kisil* and *silsang*, and the Japanese *sonojitsu* seem to be typically locked between two contrasting propositions (e.g., sentence-medial clause-initial positions, also see below).

In terms of the discursive functions, the target functions of the DMs under discussion are not rigidly tied to their lexical meaning. The DMs signal diverse

context-dependent functions, most notably alerting the addressee to be prepared to receive unexpected information. For instance, *shishishang* in Chinese prefaces, among others, information incongruent with expectation; *sasilsang* in Korean signals the surprising nature of the information to follow; *sonojitsu* in Japanese marks adversativity, i.e., the following information does not fit with the preceding information; *kisil* in Korean also introduces a proposition in contrast with the foregoing one; *silsang* in Korean signals that the information to follow is of surprising nature; and *jijitsujuo* in Japanese marks emphasis on the following information which otherwise might not be fully heeded by the addressee. The surprise value carried by these DMs seems to be of variable strengths, with *jijitsujuo* being at the lowest continuum. The mirative nature of the DMs is likely to result from the subjectification of the source meaning in that the ‘reality’-meaning in the source lexemes tends to refer not to the objective reality but to the interpretive reality, i.e., the truth hidden behind what is plainly manifested.

Another important issue crosscutting the DMs in the three languages is the positionality of the DMs. Having the nominal nature in meaning and form, the source lexemes first tend to occur in argument positions, thus, typically in clause-medial positions, and then gradually acquire positional freedom by virtue of being placed in the adverbial position or affixed with non-argument postpositional particles, thus, in initial or final positions. For instance, the Chinese DM *shishishang* occurs utterance-initially; the Japanese DMs *jijitsu* and *jijitsujuo* occur sentence-initially (this preference being stronger with *jijitsu* than *jijitsujuo*); the Korean DM *sasilsang*, when signalling the surprise value of the following information, tends to occur at the initial position (though the position varies depending on the discourse functions); the Japanese DM *sonojitsu* occurs between two contrastive propositions, thus at utterance-medial clause-initial positions; and, likewise, the Korean DMs *kisil* and *silsang* typically occur at utterance-medial clause-initial positions. An important generalisation from the crosslinguistic observations with respect to the functional asymmetry hypothesis (Beeching & Detges, 2014) is that there is no instance that lends support to the hypothesis. More specifically, the hypothesised LP-subjective and RP-intersubjective correlation is not supported. However, this state of affairs is in line with the conclusions in previous studies (e.g., Degand, 2014; Rhee, 2016; Traugott, 2014a; among others).

Our final issue concerns language contact. All DMs addressed in this issue are of Chinese origin, even though some of them are modified in the course of nativisation of the foreign words (notably, *sonojitsu* in Japanese). As indicated, the three countries had limited contact between their spoken languages (Narrog et al., 2018), and the influence was largely restricted to the lexicon and, further, the influence was largely unidirectional, i.e., from Chinese to Korean, and from Chinese to Japanese. The influence in the reverse direction and between Korean and

Japanese was nearly non-existent. Chinese texts in religion, philosophy, science, technology, and literature were imported by Korea and Japan. It is widely known that contact-induced change generally occurs in and through the spoken use of a language (Heine & Kuteva, 2005, p. 250), and thus the situation among Chinese, Korean, and Japanese constitutes a unique case. Despite some claims that 'any linguistic feature' can be borrowed (Campbell, 1993, p. 104; Curnow, 2001, p. 434; Thomason & Kaufman 1988, p. 14; among others), Heine and Kuteva (2008) refute them by showing that there indeed are constraints. An interesting aspect of the grammaticalisation scenarios of the DMs under present discussion is that only the lexemes were borrowed, and then those lexemes were independently selected by the three languages as sources of grammaticalisation for DMs. A more intriguing fact is that their developmental paths are remarkably similar, i.e., highlighting selective aspects of the meaning (e.g., the objective and obvious nature from the reality), subjectifying the meaning (e.g., an interpretive reality from the objective reality), intersubjectifying the function (e.g., interaction-management through prefacing the mirative nature of the upcoming information), among others. Even though the source lexemes are borrowings, the developments into DMs in the three languages can be regarded as instances of 'evolutive' or 'natural' development (Anderson, 1973; Paul, 1920[1880]; Thomason & Kaufman, 1988). Thus, all the scenarios strongly suggest that cognitive operations behind the development are remarkably similar and that the lexical source is largely responsible for the direction and the result of the grammaticalisation procedures, as suggested by the source determination hypothesis (Bybee, Perkins, & Paglucia, 1994; Traugott, 2014b).

References

- Aijmer, K. (2002). *English discourse particles: Evidence from a corpus*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins. <https://doi.org/10.1075/scl.10>
- Aijmer, K. (Ed.) (2009). Contrastive pragmatics. Special issue of *Languages in Contrast*, 9(1). <https://doi.org/10.1075/lic.9.1.01aij>
- Aijmer, K., & Simon-Vandenberg, A.-M. (2003). The discourse particle *well* and its equivalents in Swedish and Dutch. *Linguistics*, 41(6), 1123–1161. <https://doi.org/10.1515/ling.2003.036>
- Aijmer, K., & Simon-Vandenberg, A.-M. (2006). Pragmatic markers in translation: A methodological proposal. In K. Fischer (Ed.), *Approaches to discourse particles* (pp. 101–114). Amsterdam: Elsevier.
- Andersen, H. (1973). Abductive and deductive change. *Language*, 49(4), 765–793. <https://doi.org/10.2307/412063>
- Beeching, K., & Detges, U. (2014). Introduction. In K. Beeching & U. Detges (Eds.), *Discourse functions at the left and right periphery: Crosslinguistic investigations of language use and language change* (pp. 1–23). Leiden: Brill. <https://doi.org/10.1163/9789004274822>

- Blum-Kulka, S., House, J., & Kasper, G. (Eds.). (1989). *Cross-cultural pragmatics: Requests and apologies*. Norwood, NJ: Ablex.
- Brinton, L. J. (1996). *Pragmatic markers in English: Grammaticalization and discourse functions*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter. <https://doi.org/10.1515/9783110907582>
- Brinton, L. J. (2017). *The evolution of pragmatic markers in English: Pathways of change*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1017/9781316416013>
- Bybee, J. L., Perkins, R., & Pagliuca, W. (1994). *The evolution of grammar: Tense, aspect, and modality in the languages of the world*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.
- Campbell, L. (1993). On proposed universals of grammatical borrowing. In H. Aertsen & R. J. Jeffers (Eds.), *Historical Linguistics 1989: Papers from the 9th International Conference on Historical Linguistics, New Brunswick, 14–18 August 1989* (pp. 91–109). Amsterdam: John Benjamins. <https://doi.org/10.1075/cilt.106.08cam>
- Chappell, H. M., & Peyraube, A. (2008). Chinese localizers: Diachrony and some typological considerations. In D. Xu (Ed.), *Space in languages of China: Cross-linguistic, synchronic and diachronic perspectives* (pp. 15–37). Dordrecht: Springer. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-1-4020-8321-1_2
- Connor, U., Nagelhout, E., & Rozycki, W. V. (Eds.). (2008). *Contrastive rhetoric: Reaching to intercultural rhetoric*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins. <https://doi.org/10.1075/pbns.169>
- Curnow, T. J. (2001). What language features can be ‘borrowed’? In A. Y. Aikhenvald & R. M. W. Dixon (Eds.), *Areal diffusion and genetic inheritance: Problems in comparative linguistics* (pp. 412–436). Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Degand, L. (2014). ‘So very fast then’: Discourse markers at left and right periphery in spoken French. In K. Beeching & U. Detges (Eds.), *Discourse functions at the left and right periphery: Crosslinguistic investigations of language use and language change* (pp. 151–178). Leiden: Brill. https://doi.org/10.1163/9789004274822_008
- Degand, L., & Evers-Vermeul, J. (2015). Grammaticalization or pragmaticalization of discourse markers? More than a terminological issue. *Journal of Historical Pragmatics*, 16(1), 59–85. <https://doi.org/10.1075/jhp.16.1.03deg>
- Diewald, G. (2002). A model for relevant types of contexts in grammaticalization. In I. Wischer & G. Diewald (Eds.), *New reflections on grammaticalization* (pp. 103–120). Amsterdam: John Benjamins. <https://doi.org/10.1075/tsl.49.09die>
- Fillmore, C. J. (1984). Remarks on contrastive pragmatics. In J. Fisiak (Ed.), *Contrastive linguistics* (pp. 119–141). Berlin: Mouton. <https://doi.org/10.1515/9783110824025.119>
- Handian*. Online searchable historical dictionary, accessed September–October 2021. <https://www.zdic.net/>
- Hansen, M.-B. M. (1997). *Alors* and *donc* in spoken French: A reanalysis. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 28(2), 153–187. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0378-2166\(96\)00086-0](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0378-2166(96)00086-0)
- Hansen, M.-B. M. (2018). Cyclic phenomena in the evolution of pragmatic markers: Examples from Romance. In S. P. Bordería & Ó. L. Lamas (Eds.), *Beyond grammaticalization and discourse markers: New issues in the study of language change* (pp. 51–77). Leiden: Brill. https://doi.org/10.1163/9789004375420_004
- Hansen, M.-B. M., & Strudsholm, E. (2008). The semantics of particles: Advantages of contrastive and panchronic approach. A study of the polysemy of French *déjà* and

- Italian *già*. *Linguistics*, 46(3), 471–505. <https://doi.org/10.1515/LING.2008.016>
- Harris, J. R. (2009[1998]). *The nurture assumption: Why children turn out the way they do* (revised ed.). New York: Free Press.
- Heine, B. (2002). On the role of context in grammaticalization. In I. Wischer & G. Diewald (Eds.), *New reflections on grammaticalization* (pp. 83–101). Amsterdam: John Benjamins. <https://doi.org/10.1075/tsl.49.08hei>
- Heine, B., Kaltenböck, G., Kuteva, T., & Long, H. (2021). *The rise of discourse markers*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1017/9781108982856>
- Heine, B., & Kuteva, T. (2005). *Language contact and grammatical change*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511614132>
- Heine, B., & Kuteva, T. (2008). Constraints on contact-induced linguistic change. *Journal of Language Contact – THEMA*, 2, 57–90. <https://doi.org/10.1163/000000008792525363>
- Hopper, P. J., & Traugott, E. C. (2003[1993]). *Grammaticalization* (second ed.). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Kasper, G., & Blum-Kulka, S. (Eds.). (1993). *Interlanguage pragmatics*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Kranich, S. (2016). *Contrastive pragmatics and translation: Evaluation, epistemic modality and communicative styles in English and German*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins. <https://doi.org/10.1075/pbns.261>
- Kuteva, T., Heine, B., Hong, B., Long, H., Narrog, H., & Rhee, R. (2019). *World lexicon of grammaticalization* (second ed.) Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1017/9781316479704>
- Narrog, H., Rhee, S., & Whitman, J. (2018). Grammaticalization in Japanese and Korean. In H. Narrog & B. Heine (Eds.), *Grammaticalization from a typological perspective* (pp. 166–188). Oxford: Oxford University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1093/oso/9780198795841.003.0009>
- Paul, H. (1920[1880]). *Prinzipien der Sprachgeschichte* (5th ed.). Halle: Niemeyer.
- Peyraube, A. (1994). On the history of Chinese locative prepositions. *Chinese Language and Linguistics*, 2, 361–387.
- Peyraube, A. (1999). Historical change in Chinese grammar. *Cahiers de Linguistique – Asie Orientale*, 28(2), 177–226. <https://doi.org/10.3406/clao.1999.1555>
- Peyraube, A. (2003). On the history of place words and localizers in Chinese: A cognitive approach. In Y.-H. A. Li & A. Simpson (Eds.), *Functional structure(s), form and interpretation* (pp. 180–198). London: Routledge.
- Pinker, S. (2002). *The blank slate: The modern denial of human nature*. New York: Penguin Books.
- Rhee, S. (2016). LP and RP in the development of discourse markers from ‘what’ in Korean. *Journal of Historical Pragmatics*, 17(2), 255–281. <https://doi.org/10.1075/jhp.17.2.05rhe>
- Rhee, S. (in press). *Linguistic forms at the border of lexis and grammar: Grammaticalization of adpositions across languages*. Seoul: Global Contents.

- Ridley, M. (2011[2003]). *Nature via nurture: Genes, experience, and what makes us human* (second ed.). New York: Harper Perennial.
- Schiffrin, D. (1987). *Discourse markers*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511611841>
- Simon-Vandenbergen, A.-M., & Willems, D. (2011). Crosslinguistic data as evidence in the grammaticalization debate: The case of discourse markers. *Linguistics*, 49(2), 333–364. <https://doi.org/10.1515/ling.2011.010>
- Thomason, S. G., & Kaufman, T. (1988). *Language contact, creolization, and genetic linguistics*. Berkeley: University of California Press. <https://doi.org/10.1525/9780520912793>
- Traugott, E. C. (1982). From propositional to textual and expressive meanings: Some semantic-pragmatic aspects of grammaticalization. In W. P. Lehmann & Y. Malkiel (Eds.), *Perspectives on historical linguistics* (pp. 245–271). Amsterdam: John Benjamins. <https://doi.org/10.1075/cilt.24.09clo>
- Traugott, E. C. (1995). The role of the development of discourse markers in a theory of grammaticalization. Paper presented at the International Conference of Historical Linguistics XII, Manchester 1995.
- Traugott, E. C. (1999). The rhetoric of counter-expectation in semantic change: A study in subjectification. In A. Blank & P. Koch (Eds.), *Historical semantics and cognition* (pp. 177–196). Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter. <https://doi.org/10.1515/9783110804195.177>
- Traugott, E. C. (2003). From subjectification to intersubjectification. In R. Hickey (Ed.), *Motives for language change* (pp. 124–139). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511486937.009>
- Traugott, E. C. (2010). (Inter)subjectivity and (inter)subjectification: A reassessment. In K. Davidse, L. Vandelanotte, & H. Cuyckens (Eds.), *Subjectification, intersubjectification and grammaticalization* (pp. 29–71). Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter. <https://doi.org/10.1515/9783110226102.1.29>
- Traugott, E. C. (2014a). Intersubjectification and clause periphery. In L. Brems, L. Ghesquière, & F. Van de Velde (Eds.), *Intersubjectivity and intersubjectification in grammar and discourse* (pp. 7–27). Amsterdam: John Benjamins. <https://doi.org/10.1075/bct.65.02trau>
- Traugott, E. C. (2014b). On the function of the epistemic adverbs *surely* and *no doubt* at the left and right peripheries of the clause. In K. Beeching & U. Detges (Eds.), *Discourse functions at the left and right periphery: Crosslinguistic investigations of language use and language change* (pp. 72–91). Leiden: Brill. https://doi.org/10.1163/9789004274822_005
- Traugott, E. C., & Dasher, R. B. (2002) *Regularity in semantic change*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511486500>
- Verschueren, J. (2016). Contrastive pragmatics. In J.-O. Östman & J. Verschueren (Eds.), *Handbook of pragmatics* (2016 instalment). Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Watson, J. B. (1924). *Behaviorism*. New York: The People's Institute Publishing.

