


<https://doi.org/10.22363/2687-0088-40952>

EDN: LQIHCS

**Review of Bernd Heine, Gunther Kaltenböck, Tania Kuteva
and Haiping Long. 2021. *The Rise of Discourse Markers*. Cambridge:
Cambridge University Press, xi+308 pp. ISBN 978-1-108-83385-1**

Fangqiong ZHAN  

Nanyang Technological University National Institute of Education, Singapore

 fangqiong.zhan@nie.edu.sg

The Rise of Discourse Markers coauthored by Bernd Heine, Gunther Kaltenböck, Tania Kuteva, and Haiping Long, offers a cross-linguistic examination of the development of discourse markers (henceforth, DMs), highlighting their significant role in communication and their connection to broader sociocultural behaviour. By examining languages from diverse typological backgrounds, the book reveals how DMs facilitate smooth interaction and coherence in communication. Through detailed case studies and theoretical insights, the authors also demonstrate that DMs are not merely linguistic tools but also integral components of human interaction that adapt to the evolving needs of speakers across different cultures and languages. This work highlights the universal and variable aspects of DMs, making it an essential resource for linguists and anyone interested in understanding the dynamics of human communication.

The book presents a novel and thoroughly supported alternative to traditional theories concerning the development of DMs, which have primarily focused on grammaticalization and pragmaticalization. Traditional theories often emphasize how linguistic elements evolve into DMs through changes in grammar or pragmatics. However, this book challenges these perspectives by introducing the concept of “cooptation.”

Cooptation is a process where existing linguistic elements are repurposed to serve as DMs, without necessarily undergoing significant grammatical changes. This concept is pivotal to understanding the emergence of DMs and is introduced in the first two chapters: “The Development of Discourse Markers: An

© Fangqiong Zhan, 2024



This work is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License
<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc/4.0/legalcode>

Introduction” and “Concepts of Analysis.” In these chapters, the authors lay the theoretical foundation for cooptation, explaining how certain words and phrases are co-opted into discourse as markers that manage conversational flow and structure. This approach allows for a broader and more flexible understanding of how DMs can arise across different languages and contexts. The authors argue that cooptation provides a more accurate account of the development of DMs, as it accounts for the diverse ways in which these markers can emerge and function. By focusing on cooptation, the book shifts the analytical lens from structural changes in grammar to functional adaptations in discourse, offering a fresh perspective that accommodates the complex interplay between language use, social interaction, and cultural influences. This innovative approach provides valuable insights into the dynamic nature of language and the essential role of DMs in communication.

The subsequent four chapters of the book provide an in-depth exploration of the development of discourse markers (DMs) in four languages: English, French, Japanese, and Korean. This section aims to rigorously test the cooptation hypothesis through detailed analyses of each language’s unique linguistic landscape and historical development. By selecting languages from different language families and cultural contexts, the authors offer a comprehensive view of how DMs can emerge and evolve through cooptation across diverse linguistic environments. Chapter 7, “Discourse Markers in Language Contact,” explores another potential pathway for the evolution of DMs, focusing on how language contact and borrowing can influence the development and spread of DMs, further supporting the cooptation hypothesis by demonstrating how these markers can transcend linguistic boundaries and become integrated into new linguistic contexts. In Chapter 8, “Discussion,” the authors address various issues raised in earlier chapters, delving deeper into the factors driving cooptation. The book concludes by summarizing the key points and findings of the study, reinforcing the validity and applicability of the cooptation hypothesis. The authors synthesize the insights gained from the cross-linguistic analyses and discussions, emphasizing the importance of considering functional and contextual factors in the development of DMs. This comprehensive conclusion ties together the book’s themes, providing a cohesive understanding of the dynamic nature of DMs and their vital role in human communication.

The book can be divided into three main parts:

Part I Theoretical background and claims (Chapters 1–2): This section lays the groundwork for understanding the authors’ approach and introduces the concept of cooptation.

Part II Empirical testing across languages (Chapters 3–6): This part tests the theoretical claims against data from English, French, Japanese, and Korean.

Part III Related issues and broader context (Chapters 7–9): The final section discusses issues related to the earlier chapters, providing a broader context for the findings.

In the following review, I will present the chapters in sequence before offering a general assessment of the book's strengths and contributions.

The book begins with an in-depth introduction to the intricate category of DMs, setting the stage for a thorough exploration of their nature and development. This introduction highlights the significant body of research that has emerged in this dynamic field, reflecting the growing interest in understanding how DMs function within language and communication. The authors define DMs as elements that do not contribute to the semantic content of a sentence or clause; rather, their function is commonly classified as "metatextual." They serve to help speakers organize their thoughts, manage interactions, and signal shifts in topics or perspectives. DMs are fairly independent of the syntactic structure of a sentence and tend to be set off from the rest of the sentence. Their scope is not restricted to any particular part of the proposition; instead, it relates to the proposition as a whole and extends beyond it to the context. While DMs are not confined to positions reserved for adverbials, they can occur in various positions within a sentence, although the left periphery is a preferred position for many of them.

The focus of the book is not simply defining what DMs are, but to explore the processes through which they come into existence. Rather than cataloguing the various forms and functions of DMs, the authors are more interested in understanding the mechanisms that lead to their emergence and development. To illustrate this process, the book shows how certain words evolve from their original non-DM uses to become DMs.

Traditionally, the transition from non-DM uses to DMs has been explained through grammaticalization or, less commonly, pragmaticalization. Landmark studies by Lehmann (1982), Hopper and Traugott (1993), and Brinton (1996) have theorized grammaticalization as a process where lexical items gradually acquire new grammatical functions. However, these features have been less effective in explaining the development of DMs, as the concept of "grammaticalization" is still difficult to explain the main questions: if DMs are of least grammatical effect, can the concept of "grammaticalization" explain items that are not grammatical? How to explain the difference between the formation process of DMs and the standard parameters of grammaticalization (Lehmann 1982). Considering these challenges, pragmaticalization has been proposed as an alternative explanation (Dostie 2009). However, the development of DMs does exhibit some features of grammaticalization, thus, to treat DMs as instances of something other than grammaticalization would be "to obscure its similarities with the more canonical clines" (Traugott 1995: 15).

Compared to other approaches, Diachronic Construction Grammar (DCG) provides a more global perspective of grammatical change (Hilpert 2013, Traugott & Trousdale 2013), a comprehensive understanding of changing grammatical markers in the context of constructional configurations. However, the authors argue that DCG falls short in addressing the central question of the book: How do DMs

evolve from expressions that are deeply embedded in sentence structure to ones that are neither semantically, syntactically, nor prosodically integrated?

Heine et al. (2013) argue that grammaticalization does not adequately explain the development of DMs. Moreover, they propose “cooptation,” a process defined as “a cognitive-communicative operation whereby a text segment such as a clause, a phrase, or a word is transferred from the domain or level of sentence grammar and deployed for use on the level of discourse organization” (p. 26). The root “co-opt” of the term “cooptation” originally defined as a verb by the Cambridge English Dictionary as selecting a new member for a group by the current members. The term “cooptation” is used in the literature that there is a shift from one field or body of operation to another. In this book, the term is metaphorically used to involve a shift from the field of sentence organization to that of discourse processing, thereby being integrated in the structure of discourse organization. Cooptation represents a significant shift in a DM’s development, moving it from the sentence level to the discourse level, with grammaticalization processes continuing before and after this shift. The proposed schema for DM development, as outlined in Heine 2013, is represented as “(Grammaticalization >) cooptation > grammaticalization” (p. 27).

A key conclusion from the discussions in Chapter 1 is that both grammaticalization and cooptation are crucial in the development of DMs. While grammaticalization, a well-established field, provides significant insights into how linguistic elements evolve, cooptation plays an equally vital role in this process. To address these points, Chapter 2 of the book, “Concepts of analysis” delves into the details of these two mechanisms. The chapter explores how grammaticalization and cooptation contribute separately to the evolution of DMs and examines their interactions in shaping the structure of these markers.

In this book, grammaticalization is defined as the development from lexical to grammatical forms and from grammatical to even more grammatical forms (Heine & Kuteva 2002: 2). Cooptation, on the other hand, is described as “a fully productive operation whereby a chunk of sentence grammar, such as a word, a phrase, a reduced clause, a full clause, or some other piece of text, is deployed for use on the metatextual level of discourse processing, thereby turning into a thetical” (p.67). These two mechanisms are held responsible for the rise of DMs.

The following constructed examples are given to illustrate the process of cooptation at work in English (p. 65):

- (1) a. ***You probably know already** that our chairman will resign next month.*
- b. *Our chairman, **you probably know already**, will resign next month.*
- c. *Our chairman, **you know**, will resign next month.*

Operated by cooptation, the text piece printed in bold can be derived from a construction like that in (1a) in a principled way and be inserted in another sentence as in (1b). As example (1c) shows, coopted text chunks tend to have the appearance of “elliptical” clauses or phrases. What matters is that any “missing” information be recoverable by the hearer from the situation of discourse (the “context”).

Cooptation is a cognitive-communicative operation which enables speakers to switch their perspective from the level of reasoning anchored in the meaning of sentences to a meta-level of reasoning immediately anchored in the situation of discourse (cf. Rhee 2013: 67). Once coopted, DMs may undergo typical effects of grammaticalization including context extension (and new discourse functions), desemanticisation, decategorialisation (and univertation), erosion, etc. The subsequent four chapters of the book are dedicated to testing the cooptation theory using authentic linguistic data from four distinct languages. The authors aim to evaluate the theory's validity by examining how coopted DMs in different linguistic and cultural contexts undergo these grammaticalization effects. This comparative analysis seeks to confirm whether the patterns observed align with the predictions made by cooptation theory and to explore the generalizability of its claims across various languages.

Chapters 3 through 6 analyze the evolution of DMs from four different languages: English, French, Japanese, and Korean. Each chapter examines the diachronic development of selected DMs, drawing on data from existing research to illustrate how these markers have evolved over time. The analysis is framed within the theoretical approach involving both grammaticalization and cooptation. This approach views the development of DMs as a shift from sentence-level grammar to discourse-level grammar, where markers transition from their original grammatical functions to serve broader metatextual roles.

Chapter 3, titled “English Discourse Markers,” explores twelve distinct markers through the lens of the cooptation hypothesis. These markers include *after all*, *anyway*, *I mean*, *if you like*, *if you will*, *instead*, *like*, *no doubt*, *right*, *so to say* / *so to speak*, *well*, and *what else*. To illustrate the analysis, let's consider the case of *anyway*.

There are three main usages of *anyway*, namely an additive, a dismissive and a resumptive one. Only the second usage is that of a DM, classified by Fraser (2009) as a topic orientation marker. The DM *anyway* is primarily associated with two main usages: at the left periphery of an utterance and at its right periphery. In the former, it signals an upcoming discourse, indicating a particular conception of what will unfold in the emerging discourse relative to the preceding discourse. In the latter usage, *anyway* functions as a modal and intersubjective marker, connecting two units that have already been produced and expressing a conceptual-conditional relationship.

The DM can be traced back to the Old English noun phrase *ænig weg* “any way, path, route,” changing to Middle English *any wei/way*, which was grammaticalized to an adverbial meaning “in any way or manner, by any means,” already attested in Late Middle English (1350–1500) (Haselow 2015: 172). The text data available suggest that around the mid-nineteenth century, roughly between 1840 and 1865, if not earlier, *anyway* clearly had acquired the main hallmarks of a coopted unit and of a DM. The main evidence showing that *anyway* had turned into

a thetical by the middle of the nineteenth century or earlier is summarized in Haselow (2015: 99).

a Meaning: The meaning of *anyway* is no longer part of the meaning of its host sentence, its validity is not bound to or inferentially linked to the propositional content of its host.

b Function: *Anyway* now seems to function as a metatextual unit, it establishes a sequential relation between discourse units rather than relations within the sentence (Haselow 2015: 180), marking the unit it accompanies as contextually linked to prior discourse.

c Syntax: Changing from sentence-internal to sentence-external expression it now lacks constituent status, it “neither governs any of the constituents of the structural units it refers to, nor is itself governed by any other constituent” (Haselow 2015: 176, 180).

d Prosody: It is likely to be set off prosodically, forming an intonation unit of its own (Haselow 2015: 178).

e Semantic–pragmatic scope: It has wider scope, extending over a sequence of discourse units. At the left periphery, it has scope over larger chunks of discourse while at the right periphery it has scope over two adjacent units of talk (Haselow 2015: 180, 183).

f Placement: It changed from clause-internal adverbial to DM placed at the right or the left periphery of its host.

To conclude, grammaticalization occurred in two distinct phases. First, prior to cooptation, *anyway* gradually transitioned from a noun phrase to a more abstract adverbial, losing its concrete lexical content through desemanticization and its internal word boundary through internal decategorialization. Second, there appears to have been a later phase of grammaticalization following cooptation, during which *anyway* developed a paradigmatic relationship with other DMs—such as *then*, *though*, *but*, and *actually* in the case of right-periphery *anyway* (Thompson & Suzuki 2011, Haselow 2013), and *actually*, *well*, and *so* in the case of left-periphery *anyway* (Haselow 2015: 180–81).

Some scholars including Brinton (2008) propose “indeterminate structures” in Middle English. For example, *I mean* has its full content meaning used in initial position but is followed by a *that*-less complement. In such contexts, it is hypothesized, *I mean* can be interpreted either as a matrix clause introducing a complement clause or as the adverbial ‘namely,’ which is an example of indeterminate structure. In Section 3.3, the authors argue that the instances of intermediate structure and “ambiguity” identified by Brinton (2008) and others are problematic due to the communicative intent of the speaker or writer, the researcher’s specific interpretation, or the absence of sufficient contextual or grammatical information. Thus, generalizations about gradualness and intermediate stages offer valuable tools for reconstructing grammaticalization. However, both must be applied with caution when reconstructing the emergence and evolution of DMs.

Chapter 4, titled “French Discourse Markers,” examines seven markers: *à la rigueur*, *à propos*, *à ce propos*, *alors*, *en fait*, *au fait*, and *enfin*. The analysis of each marker leads the authors to conclude that grammaticalization alone cannot fully explain the transition from sentence grammar to thetical grammar, making it necessary to hypothesize the sudden cooptation of the item in question.

The hedging DM *à la rigueur* is not attested in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, the first instance of it is found in the eighteenth century. Subsequently its use increased dramatically, with the result that in the twenty-first century it is the only one surviving. It appears to have turned into a thetical in the early eighteenth century, if not earlier, and it became a full-fledged DM. There is no grammatical evidence to suggest that the DM properties emerged in a gradual way one after the other in the history of *à la rigueur*.

The case studies of DMs in Japanese, presented in Chapter 5, focus on a selection of seven markers: *dakedo*, *demo*, *douride*, *ga*, *jijitsu*, *sate*, and *wake*. The historical development of the DM *dakedo* can be understood in terms of two stages (Onodera 1995, Aoki 2019). Stage I, spanning from the eighteenth to the early twentieth century, marks the emergence of the clause-final construction [V + *kedo*]. The [V + *kedo*] construction continued to be used when sentence-initial *dakedo* emerged in the early twentieth century at Stage II, which covers the period from the early twentieth century to the present. There is no information to suggest that the change from Stage I to Stage II took place gradually, involving stages as they characterize grammaticalization and, as far as the evidence provided by Onodera suggests, the changes appear to have occurred rather simultaneously. Chapter 5 concludes that, overall, there is converging evidence supporting the cooptation hypothesis proposed in this chapter.

Chapter 6 notes that the Korean language displays an extraordinary richness of discourse marker structures, and Korean DMs also stand out with regard to the wide range of functions they express. Another interesting feature of Korean can be seen in the fact that it has developed a range of DMs from interrogative constructions via rhetorical questions, that is, questions that do not seek information or require an answer (Rhee 2004: 413). Furthermore, prosodic marking appears to strongly correlate with the respective functions expressed by a given DM. The case studies focus on four DMs: *icey*, *makilay*, *maliya*, and *tul*. In contemporary Korean, *makilay*-DMs are very popular among youngsters – to the extent that between 2011 and 2017 there was a children’s TV show in South Korea named the *Makilay Show* (Rhee 2019). The *makilay*-DMs are transparently derived from clause-like constructions – a process whereby constructions like *makwu ilehkey ha-e(yo)* ‘reckless like.this say-SFP(POL)’ turned into *makilay(yo)* ‘DM’ (Rhee 2013). The main grammatical changes leading to the rise of *makilay* DMs suggest that these changes align with the hypothesized effects of cooptation, as well as with observations made in the development of other DMs in Korean and other languages.

Chapters 7 and 8 shift focus from case studies to explore alternative pathways in the development of DMs, adopting a broader typological perspective on the issue.

Chapter 7 explores the development of DMs through borrowing in contexts of language contact, presenting this as a common alternative to cooptation. Given that DMs are deeply entrenched in the socio-cultural environment and discourse organization of a language, it might be surprising that they can be influenced by language contact more significantly than many other types of linguistic expressions.

Borrowing involves taking a DM as a form-meaning unit from one language and inserting it into another. Replication, including loan translation, is a more complex process that involves meaning and/or structure but not form (Heine & Kuteva 2005). While borrowing may involve just one or a few DMs, it can also affect an entire repertoire of such markers. These observations lead to the question: Why are DMs frequently borrowed from one language and incorporated into texts of another language? A comparative survey suggests that the following types of factors are most commonly cited to account for the role of DMs in bilingual situations, either as reasons for or contributors to the borrowing of DMs: formal linguistic factors; text organization; attitudes of the speaker; speaker-hearer interaction.

An interesting and critical point raised in the concluding paragraphs of this chapter is that a DM arising from language contact often remains psychologically linked to its donor language. Its use may evoke cultural and/or emotional features associated with the donor language community (p. 235). This connection is likely what most distinguishes borrowed DMs from native ones in a given context.

Chapter 8 addresses issues that emerged in previous chapters but could not be discussed in detail at the time. The first section of the chapter focuses on the dualistic organization of linguistic discourse. DMs were defined as having a metatextual function and the term “metatextual” implies that, in addition to a “textual” level there is a second level of discourse processing. The dualistic model of language activity builds on earlier research (Heine 2019) and ongoing work, distinguishing between a microstructure and a macrostructure of discourse. The microstructure corresponds to sentence grammar, while the macrostructure aligns with thetical grammar (p. 237). The distinction between microstructure and macrostructure is not only supported by evidence from a wide range of data and different research traditions, it is also supported by neurolinguistic findings (Heine, Kuteva & Kaltenböck 2014, Heine et al. 2015, Haselow 2019, Heine 2019). The second section of the chapter examines the factors that lead people to create new DMs and those that facilitate cooptation. It also addresses the types of text segments selected for cooptation and the inherent limitations of this process. Section 8.3 examines constituent-anchored DMs, which modify a specific constituent rather than the entire utterance. Research suggests that these DMs evolve from utterance-anchored DMs, indicating that they may represent a stage of late grammaticalization occurring after the process of cooptation. The fourth section of the chapter addresses imperative-derived DMs. “Canonical imperatives,” which are positive singular imperatives directed at a singular referent (such as a hearer, reader, or signee), express commands or requests. These forms are typically non-finite and concise (Aikhenvald 2010: 18) and often exhibit thetical properties. The authors

address imperative-derived DMs separately, noting a key distinction in their development compared to many other DMs: Imperatives are inherently thetical (Heine 2016). Consequently, their evolution into DMs bypasses cooptation and is primarily characterized by late grammaticalization, during which they progressively transform into text-structuring devices. The final section of the chapter looks at fillers or hesitation markers, such as *ano* in Japanese. The authors differentiate between primary fillers, which function solely as fillers and are similar to interjections, and secondary fillers, which some languages use in additional roles (typically as demonstratives). For secondary fillers, the authors propose a potential development through cooptation, analogous to the process described for other DMs in the book.

In the concluding chapter, the authors reaffirm that the primary aim of the book was to address the question: Why do DMs possess the grammatical properties they do? According to the perspective adopted in this book, language users are creative agents who frequently employ linguistic resources in innovative ways. They may extend an expression's use to new contexts for specific cognitive and communicative purposes, gradually grammaticalizing it into a form that serves new functions. Alternatively, through cooptation, they might adapt elements of sentence grammar to the metatextual level of discourse, leading to the emergence of new DMs.

The Rise of Discourse Markers offers a significant contribution to metadiscursive studies, presenting a central hypothesis that DMs develop through cooptation. This process involves a shift from sentence grammar (microstructure) to thetical grammar (macrostructure). While grammaticalization plays a role both before and after cooptation, the authors argue that it alone cannot account for the profound transformation required for an expression to become a DM. The book challenges the traditional reliance on grammaticalization theory and introduces a nuanced approach to understanding the emergence of DMs. By focusing on cooptation as a key factor, it provides a compelling and insightful exploration of the evolution and function of DMs. This approach not only offers significant theoretical implications but also encourages further research into the mechanisms shaping metatextual phenomena.

The authors provide a robust critique of existing explanations that rely solely on grammaticalization or pragmaticalization, highlighting the limitations of these theories. They advocate for a more refined understanding of how metatextual items emerge, supported by extensive research and analysis. The book situates its study within the broader historical development of DMs, enriching readers' understanding of language dynamics and the factors influencing DM evolution. Moreover, *The Rise of Discourse Markers* includes a detailed examination of case studies and empirical data, offering concrete examples of how cooptation functions across different languages. The comparative analysis presented adds depth to the discussion and underscores the universal aspects of the proposed model, making it a valuable addition to the field of metadiscursive studies.

Nevertheless, there has been rapid progress recently in the theoretical framework of the development of DMs, including significant advancements in Diachronic Construction Grammar (DCG). While the study acknowledges DCG, it does not fully explore its potential contributions to understanding linguistic change. The diachronic constructional approach to the formation of DMs is inspired by Cognitive Construction Grammar, as conceptualized in Goldberg (2003, 2006) and Croft (2001). Traugott (2020, 2022) takes up the challenge to find ways of infusing more pragmatics into constructionalist thinking, investigates the development of constructions that can be used to do discourse structuring work, and develops a systematic and nuanced approach to the history of discourse structuring markers (DSMs, which include two types – 1DSMs and DMs – both function as connectors) from DCG (Traugott & Trousdale 2013, Barðdal et al. 2015). Given the recent advancements in DCG, incorporating a more thorough analysis of this framework could enhance the study by providing deeper insights into the evolution of constructions and their role in language change. Future research that integrates DCG more extensively could offer valuable perspectives and contribute to a more comprehensive understanding of linguistic evolution.

Overall *The Rise of Discourse Markers* is a groundbreaking work that offers a fresh perspective on the development of DMs through the process of cooptation. It is a significant contribution to the field of metadiscursive studies and is highly recommended for researchers and scholars interested in the intricacies of language evolution and the role of DMs. The book's depth of analysis and theoretical advancements make it an essential read for anyone engaged in the study of discourse.

Acknowledgements

I wish to extend my sincere thanks to the editors of this special issue for granting me the opportunity to contribute this review and for their invaluable guidance throughout the editorial process. I am equally grateful to the two reviewers for their insightful feedback and constructive comments, which have greatly enhanced the quality of this work. However, the views and interpretations presented in this book review remain solely my own. This work is supported by Nanyang Technological University National Institute of Education, Singapore, under its Academic Research Fund (RI 8/24 ZF).

References

- Aoki, Hirofumi. 2019. Setsuzokushi to bunpooka – Chusei kooki ‘shoomono shiryō’ o chuushin ni [Conjunctions and grammaticalization – With special focus on the Late Medieval “Shoomono data”]. Paper presented at the Workshop on Grammaticalization (GJNL-4), Tohoku University.
- Aikhenvald, Alexandra Y. 2010. *Imperatives and Commands (Oxford Studies in Linguistic Theory)*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Barðdal, Jóhanna, Elena Smirnova, Lotte Sommerer & Spike Gildea (eds.). 2015. *Diachronic Construction Grammar*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

- Brinton, Laurel. 1996. *Pragmatic Markers in English: Grammaticalization and Discourse Functions (Topics in English Linguistics, 19)*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Brinton, Laurel J. 2008. *The Comment Clause in English: Syntactic Origins and Pragmatic Development (Studies in English Language)*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Croft, William. 2001. *Radical Construction Grammar: Syntactic Theory in Typological Perspective*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Dostie, Gaetane 2009. Discourse markers and regional variation in French: A lexico-semantic approach. In Kate Beeching, Nigel Armstrong & Francoise Gadet (eds.), *Sociolinguistic variation in contemporary French*, 201–214. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Fraser, Bruce. 2009. Topic orientation markers. *Journal of Pragmatics* 41. 892–898.
- Goldberg, Adele E. 2003. Constructions: A new theoretical approach to language. *Trends in Cognitive Sciences* 7. 219–224.
- Goldberg, Adele E. 2006. *Constructions at Work: The Nature of Generalization in Language*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Haselow, Alexander. 2013. Arguing for a wide conception of grammar: The case of final particles in spoken discourse. *Folia Linguistica* 47 (2). 375–424.
- Haselow, Alexander. 2015. Left vs. right periphery in grammaticalization: The case of *anyway*. In Andrew D. M. Smith, Graeme Trousdale & Richard Wälchli (eds.), *New directions in grammaticalization research*, 157–186. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Haselow, Alexander. 2019. Discourse markers and brain lateralization: Evidence for dual language processing from neurological disorders. Lecture presented at the University of Düsseldorf, December 15.
- Hilpert, Martin 2013. *Constructional Change in English: Developments in Allomorphy, Word-Formation and Syntax*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Heine, Bernd. 2013. On discourse markers: Grammaticalization, pragmaticalization, or something else? *Linguistics* 51 (6). 1205–47.
- Heine, Bernd. 2016. On non-finiteness and canonical imperatives. In Claudine Chamoreau & Zarina Estrada-Fernández (eds.), *Finiteness and nominalization (typological studies in language 113)*, 245–270. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Heine, Bernd. 2019. Some observations on the dualistic nature of discourse processing. *Folia Linguistica* 53 (2). 411–442.
- Heine, Bernd, Gunther Kaltenböck, Tania Kuteva & Haiping Long. 2015. *On Some Correlations between Grammar and Brain Lateralization (Oxford Handbooks Online in Linguistics)*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Heine, Bernd, Tania Kuteva & Gunther Kaltenböck. 2014. Discourse grammar, the dual process model, and brain lateralization: Some correlations. *Language & Cognition* 6 (1). 146–180.
- Heine, Bernd, Gunther Kaltenböck, Tania Kuteva & Haiping Long 2013. An outline of discourse grammar. In Shannon Bischoff & Carmen Jany (eds.), *Functional approaches to language*, 175–233. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Heine, Bernd & Tania Kuteva. 2002. *World Lexicon of Grammaticalization*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Heine, Bernd & Tania Kuteva. 2005. *Language Contact and Grammatical Change (Cambridge Approaches to Language Contact, 3)*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Hopper, Paul J. & Elizabeth C. Traugott. 2003[1993]. *Grammaticalization*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Lehmann, Christian. 2015[1982]. *Thoughts on Grammaticalization*. Berlin: Language Science Press.
- Onodera, Noriko Okada. 1995. Diachronic analysis of Japanese discourse markers. In Andreas H. Jucker (ed.), *Historical pragmatics*, 393–437. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

- Rhee, Seongha. 2004. From discourse to grammar: Grammaticalization and lexicalization of rhetorical questions in Korean. In Gordon Fulton, William J. Sullivan & Arle R. Lommel (eds.), *LACUS: Forum XXX: Language, thought and reality*, 413–423. Houston: Lacus.
- Rhee, Seongha. 2013. “I know I’m shameless to say this”: Grammaticalization of the mitigating discourse marker *makilay* in Korean. *Procedia: Social and Behavioral Sciences* 97. 480–486.
- Rhee, Seongha. 2020. On determinants of discourse marker functions: Grammaticalization and discourse-analytic perspectives. *Linguistic Research* 37 (2). 289–325.
- Thompson, Sandra A. & Ryoko Suzuki. 2011. Grammaticalization of final particles. In Heiko Narrog & Bernd Heine (eds.), *The Oxford handbook of grammaticalization*, 665–677. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Traugott, Elizabeth C. 1995. Subjectification in grammaticalization. In Dieter Stein & Susan Wright (eds.), *Subjectivity and subjectivisation*, 31–55. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Traugott, Elizabeth Closs. 2020. The development of “digressive” discourse-topic shift markers in English. *Journal of Pragmatics* 156. 121–135.
- Traugott, Elizabeth Closs. 2022. *Discourse Structuring Markers in English: A Historical Constructionalist Perspective on Pragmatics*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Traugott, Elizabeth Closs & Graeme Trousdale. 2013. *Constructionalization and Constructional Changes*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Review history:

Received: 07 October 2024

Accepted: 25 October 2024

Bionote:

Fangqiong ZHAN is an Assistant Professor at National Institute of Education, Nanyang Technological University, Singapore. She received her PhD in Chinese Linguistics from Stanford University, USA. Her research interests include Chinese linguistics, discourse grammar, and language acquisition and pedagogy. Her numerous publications occur in high-level peer-reviewed journals including *Journal of Pragmatics*, *Chinese Language and Discourse*, *Lingua*, *Diachronica*, *Journal of Historical Pragmatics*, *Studies in Language*, among others.

e-mail: fangqiong.zhan@nie.edu.sg

<https://orcid.org/0000-0002-5791-8205>

Сведения об авторе:

Фаньцюн ЧЖАНЬ – доцент Национального института образования, Наньянский технологический университет, Сингапур. Получила степень PhD по китайской лингвистике в Стэнфордском университете, США. Ее научные интересы включают китайскую лингвистику, грамматику дискурса, а также педагогику и изучение иностранного языка. Автор многочисленных публикаций рецензируемых журналах, включая *Journal of Pragmatics*, *Chinese Language and Discourse*, *Lingua*, *Diachronica*, *Journal of Historical Pragmatics*, *Studies in Language* и др.

e-mail: fangqiong.zhan@nie.edu.sg

<https://orcid.org/0000-0002-5791-8205>