

Soplice, forsoothe, truly – communicative principles and invited inferences in the history of truth-intensifying adverbs in English¹

Ursula Lenker

1. Introduction

The adverbs *soplice* ('truly'; from *sop* 'truth, true', *soplic* 'true') and *witodlice* 'truly, certainly'² are employed in various functions in Old English (OE): on the phrase level, they may be used as manner adverbs, mainly in direct speech with a first-person subject (e.g. in phrases such as *ic secge soplice* 'I tell you truly'), or they are employed as emphasizees. Yet, as I could show in an earlier study, they also have another function – which is not commonly noted in dictionaries – in OE narrative prose: as sentence adverbials and eventually discourse markers, they lose much of their original meaning, extend their scope from the phrase level to at least the sentence level and at the same time develop a metatextual function – they are used as discourse markers demarcating episode boundaries on the global level of discourse and as highlighting devices on the local level of discourse (cf. Lenker 2000).

In the discussion following the presentation of this earlier study at the ICHL at Düsseldorf, the question was raised³ whether this development from manner adjunct to discourse marker was specific to *soplice* and *witodlice* or whether other semantically similar adverbs, i.e. those with a basic meaning 'truly', showed the same functional diversity and development. To test this assertion is one of the aims of the present chapter.

The approach chosen in this chapter is therefore, in contrast to many studies on related subjects, a decidedly onomasiological one, though I will obviously have to limit the detailed analysis to a few exemplary cases: on the basis of a brief summary of my findings for OE *soplice*, which are supplemented by the data for Middle English (ME) *sothly*, the functions of ME *forsoothe* and ME *trewely* are examined. Their history will then be compared to adverbs whose propositional meaning does not express 'veracity' but 'factuality' (Present-day English [PDE] *indeed*, *in fact*, *actually*), thus linking the findings to recent research on PDE *indeed* and *in fact* (Traugott 1999;

Traugott and Dasher 2002: 159–169) and thus to the Adverbial Cline suggested by Elizabeth Traugott (1995 [1997], 1999; Traugott and Dasher 2002) as a regularity in language change:⁴

clause-internal adverbial > sentence adverbial > discourse particle

In a last step, I will show that an onomasiological approach suggests that this Adverbial Cline from referential to metatextual function is inherent in the semantics of the lexemes investigated, if we take a pragmatic perspective and consider communicative principles, in particular Grice's Maxims of Quality ("Do not say what you believe to be false"; "Do not say that for which you lack adequate evidence"; Grice [1989: 25–27]).

2. Epistemic modal adverbials expressing the speaker's commitment to the truth of the proposition: The inventory

These adverbs with the basic meaning 'truly' are, to be linguistically more precise, epistemic modal adverbials expressing the speaker's commitment to the truth of the proposition.⁵ The following summary lists the lexemes which have been used as such epistemic modal adverbials in the history of English. It was compiled by a search of the *OED* online for adverbs which had terms such as 'truly, truthfully, verily' or 'truth, veracity' in their "definitions" section; the items found this way were then – in repeated test runs – entered in the definitions search until no new items turned up.

The inventory of these adverbs in the different periods of English shows them to be a relatively closed set (high-frequency elements are marked in bold):⁶

OE	<i>cuplice, eornostlice, gewislice, soplice, sweotole, sweotolice, witodlice</i>
ME ⁷	<i>certes, certeyn(ly), dowteles, forsoothe, indeed, iwis, perfay, sikerly, soothly, trewely, (verily), witerliche</i>
EModE	<i>actually, assuredly (rare), certainly, doubtless, forsooth, indeed, surely, truly, undoubtedly, verily, veriment</i>
PDE ⁸	<i>actually, certainly, definitely, doubtless, indeed, really, sure (informal AmE), surely, truly, truthfully, undeniably, undoubtedly, unquestionably</i>

The comparison of the inventories first of all illustrates that the number of adverbs, as we might have expected, has increased steadily over the centuries, mainly due to the influx of Latin and French loanwords typical for the vocabulary of PDE. In the ME period, for example, a number of French loans such as *certes*, *certain*, *certainly*, *dowteles* and *verily* enter the language and complement or gradually replace the OE items. A second source of new adverbs is to be found in prepositional phrases which were univerted and lexicalized, such as *indeed* (cf. OE *in + dæd* ‘deed’).

Secondly, it is evident that we are dealing with a rather unstable group. Not a single one of the OE items has survived into Modern or even Early Modern English. This instability gives us quite a number of lexemes on which to test the assertion that the adverbs in question generally follow the suggested cline from manner adverb to discourse marker, and it further may also allow a suggestion what happens to the lexemes after they have finished the cline, a question obviously vital for the hypothesized unidirectionality of these assumed regularities in language change (see Traugott and Dasher [2002: 284], and below, section 7.1).

In the following analysis, I will only investigate adverbs which explicitly exhibit the semantic feature of ‘truth’, i.e. lexemes for which the speaker/writer and listener/hearer does not need any etymological knowledge to link them to another lexical item (noun, adjective, adverb) meaning ‘truth’. All of them – OE *soplice* and ME *soothly*, *forsoothe* and *trewely* – are high-frequency items in their respective periods.

3. OE *soplice* – ME *soothly*

Let me now in a first step sum up my findings for OE *soplice* (cf. Lenker 2000) and supplement them with its functions in ME. I will hereby basically apply the classification of adverbs by Quirk et al. (1985: 478–653) in which “disjuncts” are distinguished from “adjuncts” (manner or time adverbs such as [*to walk*] *slowly*, [*to come*] *regularly*) and “conjuncts” (connecting adverbs such as *therefore*, *however*).⁹ Disjuncts (Quirk et al. 1985: 612–631) – the category most important for the adverbs analysed here – express an evaluation of the speaker, either with respect to the meaning of a sentence (content disjuncts) or with respect to the form of the communication (style disjuncts).¹⁰

3.1. Functions on the phrase level: Manner adjunct – emphasizer

Soplice and *soothly*¹¹ may be employed in several coexisting functions in OE and ME. They can – in very restricted contexts – be used as manner adjuncts, most typically with a first-person subject and a verb of communication (OE *secgan*, ME *seien*, *tellen*)¹² in the present indicative form, such as

- (1) *Nacode he scrydde, and swa ic soðlice secge, ealle nyd-behæfnysse he wæs dælende þam þe þæs behofodon (Eustace 9)*¹³
 ‘The naked he clothed; and, as I truly tell, he distributed to every necessity of them that had need thereof’ (transl. Skeat 1900: 191)
- (2) *And thus I mai you sothli telle, ..., I am in Tristesce al amidde ... (Gower, Confessio Amantis 4.3496–3499)*
 ‘And so I can truly tell you, ..., I am completely in the middle of Despair ...’

Soplice or *soothly* with a verb of communication can either be used in a parenthesis, as in (1), or as a matrix clause, as in (2). These uses provide the ground for all the later uses of *soplice* as a style disjunct and pragmatic marker: the speaker wants to stress the assertion of another clause by explicitly pointing to its truth value.

First, this underlying phrase gives rise to the adverbs’ use as “emphasizers” which may be defined as enhancing “the truth value or force of a sentence” (Quirk et al. 1985: 485).

- (3) *Apolloni, ic oncnawe soðlice þæt þu eart on eallum þingum wel gelæred (Apollonius 16,24)*
 ‘Apollonius, I know truly [indeed] that you are well taught in all things’ (transl. Swanton 1975: 166)
- (4) *... and if that he / ne hadde soothly knowen therbifoore / that parfitly hir children loved she ... (Chaucer, CIT (4) 688–690)*
 ‘... and if he / had not truly [indeed] known before / that she loved her children perfectly ...’

While examples (3) and (4) might be considered ambiguous cases (‘I know in a true (certain) way ...’ or ‘I [intensifier] know ...’), an emphasizer use is clearly suggested by the stative verbs in (5) and (6) and further by the semantic contrast *soothly* vs. *as I gesse* in (6):

- (5) *Ic eom soðlice romanisc. and ic on hæfnyd hider gelæd wæs* (*Eustace* 344)
 ‘I am truly a Roman, and I was brought hither in captivity’ (transl. Skeat 1900: 211)
- (6) *But Venus is it soothly, as I gesse* (*Chaucer, KnT* (1) 1102)
 ‘But it is indeed Venus, as I guess’

3.2. Functions on the sentence level: Sentential adverbials

In narrative contexts (i.e. not in direct speech) and thus in the majority of their occurrences,¹⁴ however, the scope of these adverbs is *not* restricted to the phrase level, but extends to the whole sentence.

- (7) *Wæs he soðlice on rihtwisnysse weorcum ... swiðe gefrætwod* (*Eustace* 4)
 ‘[Marker], he was greatly adorned ... with works of righteousness’
- (8) *Soothly, the goode werkes that he dide biforn that he fil in synne been al mortefied and astoned and dulled by the ofte synnyng* (*Chaucer, ParsT* (10) 232)
 ‘[Marker], the good works he did before falling into sin are all nullified, rendered null and made void by his frequent sinning’

The adverbs are here employed as disjuncts and replace an independent sentence, a matrix clause, with a different proposition and a specifically first-person subject – “soplice ic eow secge þæt ...” (style disjunct) or “soþ is þæt ic secge þæt ...” (content disjunct). This change involves increased scope and syntactic freedom:¹⁵ the adverb is no longer part of the core syntactic structure, becomes syntactically optional and is often found sentence-initially.

As a manner adjunct or emphasizer, *soplice/soothly* is primarily found in direct speech with a first-person (singular) subject because its propositional meaning ‘truly, truthfully’ demands a human agent with high trustworthiness, most likely the speakers themselves. In its sentential use, on the other hand, there is no constraint on either the subject of the sentence, which can be third person or even inanimate, or the verb, which can be in all tenses and moods. The adverbs do, however, retain their epistemic meaning ‘truly’ in that

they introduce the voice of the narrator without directly mentioning her or him and allow the speaker to mark his opinion, her attitude or even his faith or trust in the veracity or importance of the proposition. Thus the adverbs show increased subjectification, if this term is understood with Traugott as a process which focuses on the subject of a discourse and emphasizes subjective valuations.¹⁶

3.3. Discourse functions

3.3.1. *The global level of discourse: Episode boundary marker*

The fundamental difference between the various uses of *soplice/soothly* and its use as a discourse marker lies in the fact that the adverb loses almost all of its propositional meaning ‘truth’ as a discourse marker. *Soplice* and *soothly* can no longer be considered style or content disjuncts because a paraphrase “ic secge *soplice*” or “*sop* is þæt ic secge” is impossible in these contexts.

In (9), you find the instances which originally made me think about this function of *soplice* when working on the rubrics of the OE *West Saxon Gospels* (Lenker 1997). There, the beginnings of the gospel lections read during the service, i.e. the beginnings of the episodes, are marked by sentence-initial *soplice*.

(9) (Luke I.26) ***Soplice*** on þam syxtan monðe wæs asend gabriel se engel fram drihtne on galilea ceastre ...

RUBRIC

(Luke I.39) ***Soplice*** on þam dagum aras maria and ferde on muntland mid ofste. on iudeisce ceastre ...

RUBRIC

(Luke I.56) ***Soplice*** maria wunode mid hyre swylce þry monþas. and gewende þa to hyre huse. ...

RUBRIC

(Luke II.1) ***Soplice*** on þam dagum wæs geworden gebod fram þam casere augusto. þæt eall ymbehwyrft wære to mearcod ...

Luke I.26 ‘[*Truly,] in the sixth month was sent Gabriel the angel by the Lord to a Galilean town ...’

Luke I.39 ‘[*Truly,] in these days Mary got ready and went to the hill-country with haste to a Iudean town ...’

Luke I.56 ‘[*Truly,] Mary lived with her such three months and went then (back) to her house. ...’

Luke II.1 ‘[*Truly,] in these days an order was given by the Emperor Augustus that all the world should be described ...’

Soplice does not show any of its propositional or emphazier meanings in these examples – the notions of ‘in a true way’ (manner adjunct) or enhancing the truth value or force of a sentence as an emphazier (implied ‘I tell you truly’) are no longer important. Instead, the focus is on the organization of discourse in which *soplice* functions as a marker of the global text structure: it signals the beginning of a new episode. It is not employed referentially, but metatextually.

In the same intersubjective function of organizing the discourse, *soplice* is found at the chapter beginnings of the OE translation of *Apollonius*, where it signals the beginnings of chapters 3 and 4:¹⁷

(10) (3,1) *On þisum þingum soðlice þurhwunode se arleasesta cyngc Antiochus ... he asette ða rædels þus cweðende: ... And þa heafða ealle wurdon gesette on ufewardan þam geate.*

‘[Marker] the infamous king Antiochus persisted in this state of affairs ... he set them a riddle, saying: ... And their heads were all set up over the gate’

(11) (4,1) *Mid þi soðlice Antiochus se wælreowa cyningc on þysse wælreownesse þurhwunode, ða wæs Apollonius gehaten sum iung man se wæs swiðe welig ...*

‘While [Marker] the cruel king Antiochus persisted in this cruelty, there was a certain young man called Apollonius who was very wealthy ...’

3.3.2. *The local level of discourse: Highlighting device*

This demarcating function is, however, not only found on the global level of discourse but also on the more local levels, a discourse-marker function especially attested for ME *soothly*. In prose texts, *soothly* or *for soothly* often follow quotations, as may be seen from the two examples taken from Chaucer’s *Parson’s Tale*, an argumentative piece of prose on the seven deadly sins.

- (12) *Homycide is eek by bakbitynge, of whiche bakbiteres seith Salomon that ‘they han two swerdes with whiche they sleen hire neighebores’. **For soothly**, as wikke is to bynyme his good name as his lyf. Homycide is eek in yevyng of wikked conseil by fraude ... For whiche the wise man seith ‘Fedeth hym that almost dyeth for honger’; **for soothly**, but if thow feede hym, thou sleest hym (Chaucer, *ParsT* (10) 565–570)*
 ‘Homicide is also by backbiting, of which backbiters Salomon says that “they have two swords with which they slay their neighbours”. For [Marker], it is as wicked to take away a man’s good name as his life. Homicide is also in giving wicked counsel by fraud, ... This is why the wise man says “Feed him who is almost dead from hunger”; for [Marker], if you do not feed him, you kill him’

(*For*) *soothly* here marks the end of the quotation and is more or less equivalent with today’s “end of quote”. It signals the continuation of the original argument and marks or even highlights the author’s personal opinion in respect to the quotation.

Other frequent collocations with conjunctions, such as *but soothly*, *and soothly* or *now soothly*, also testify to its similarity to conjunctions and its discourse function as a demarcating marker on the local level of discourse.¹⁸

Yet, *soplice/soothly* also reveal this demarcating function when on their own. *Soothly* may, for instance, be used to introduce or to summarize an argument:

- (13) ... *as God seith be the prophete Ezechiel, ‘Ye shal remembre yow of youre weyes, and they shuln displese yow’. **Soothly** synnes ben the weyes that leden folk to helle (Chaucer, *ParsT* (10) 141)*
 ‘... as God says about the prophet Ezechiel, “You shall remember your ways, and you will not like them”. [Marker], sins are the ways that lead people to hell’

In sum, OE *soplice* and ME *soothly* thus follow exactly the path Traugott has suggested as an Adverbial Cline: original manner adverbs come to be used as sentence adverbs and finally as text-structuring and, in particular, highlighting discourse markers. Highlighting an episode or a part of the argument is a decidedly subjective activity of the speaker/writer who achieves this emphasis by *soplice*, an adverb which originally expressed the speaker’s commitment to the truth of the proposition. While OE *soplice* works as an episode

boundary marker on the global level of the text and a highlighting device on the more local level, ME *soothly* retains only this function of a highlighting device on the local level, and serves as a element marking additional authorial information or personal opinion.

4. ME *forsooth(e)*

A similar pragmatic and semantic history can be seen in ME *forsooth(e)*, which enters the semantic field at the beginning of the ME period even though at that time *soothly* is extensively employed, fulfilling all the functions of its OE precursor *soplice*.¹⁹ The new item is – like *soplice/soothly* – overtly related to the concept of truth (OE noun/adjective *sop*), though it is not clear whether it should be analysed as a univerbation of the prepositional phrase *for soþe* (see *OED*, s.v. *forsooth*) ‘in truth, for a truth’ or as a prefixed form of the adjective *sop* modified by the intensifying prefix *for-* ‘very true’ (see Lenker [2003: 276–278]; cf. OE *formicel*, *forwel*).

The form is only attested seven times in OE, but becomes very frequent from the thirteenth century (cf. *MED*, s.v. *forsooth*, and Lenker [2003: 274–278]) mainly as an emphasizer or intensifier. In contrast to the adverbs mentioned above, however, it is also abundantly used in an emphasizer function in both positive and negative answers to questions (see also *MED*, s.v. *forsoth*, sense 2b), e.g.:

- (14) ‘Ye/Yis, **forsothe**’, *quod I* (Chaucer, *Boece* 3, prosa 11.203; prosa 12.57)
- (15) ‘Nay/No **forsothe**’, *quod I* (Chaucer, *Boece* 3, prosa 12.150; 4, prosa 2.100)

In this function, it is also quite frequent in original ME prose, for example as a particle of affirmation in Malory’s *Morte D’Arthur*, e.g.:

- (16) ‘Ye **forsothe**’, *said the queen* ... (Book 13, capitulum vii)

Today’s negative connotations of *forsooth*, which is now only employed “parenthetically with an ironical or derisive statement” (*OED*, s.v. *forsooth*), are certainly a consequence of the overuse of these formulae. In Early Modern English, *forsooth* even came to be considered a superfluous interjection marking the speech of the “lower classes” in London (Lenker 2003: 283–286).

In ME, however, the scope of *forsoothe* could also be wider and extend over the whole sentence. Accordingly, it is – like *soplice/soothly* – found in collocations with conjunctions, such as *and* and *but* and is also employed in the metatextual function sketched for *soplice/soothly*. In (17), for instance, *and forsothe* indicates end of the episode:

- (17) ... *And forsothe this foreseide woman bar smale bokis in hir right hand, and in hir left hand sche bar a ceptre. [end of episode]*
[New paragraph] And whan she saughe thise poetical muses ...
 (Chaucer, *Boece* 1, prosa 1.41)
 ‘... And [Marker] this abovementioned woman bore small books in her right hand, and in her left hand she bore a sceptre.
 [New paragraph] And when she saw the Muses of poetry ...’

The polysemous character and the various functions of ME *forsoothe* on different levels may also be inferred from a contemporary metalinguistic source, the *Catholicon Anglicum*, dated 1483. This English-Latin dictionary provides the following list of Latin translations for ME *forsothe*:

amen, autem, certe, enim, enion, eciam, equidem, nempe, nimirum, profecte, quippe, reuera, siquidem, utique, vero, vere, quidem, quoque, porro, veraciter, quin, quineciam, quinimmo, quinin, veruntamen.

Only a small number of the Latin equivalents (*certe, vero, vere, veraciter, veruntamen*) exhibit – like *forsoothe* – a connection to the concept of truth. Only some of them may be used as emphasizeers, while most of them (*autem, enim, quidem ...*) belong to the group of Latin adverbs for whom Kroon (1995) has established a discourse function.²⁰ This allows us to infer that a contemporary lexicographer indeed regarded *forsoothe* as an adverb with a text-organising function, thus testifying to the suggested Adverbial Cline (see section 1).

5. OE *treowlice* – PDE *truly*

PDE *truly* (OE *treowlice*) also follows the Adverbial Cline sketched for *soplice/soothly* and *forsoothe* from a certain stage, but had to develop an epistemic meaning in a first step and is thus more similar to the items whose development will be summarized below in section 6, namely *indeed, actually* and *in fact*.

5.1. Manner adjunct

In OE, the adverb *treowlice* (cf. *treowe* adj. ‘faithful’) could only be used as a manner adjunct, meaning ‘faithfully, loyally, with steadfast allegiance’ (see *OED*, s.v. *truly*, senses 1–2; *MED*, s.v. *treuli*, senses 1–5).²¹ In ME, we still find a number of examples for this referential use, as in

- (18) *He was also a lerned man, a clerk, / That Cristes gospel **trewely** wolde preche* (Chaucer, *GP* (1) 480–481)

‘He was also a learned man, a clerk / who would loyally preach Christ’s gospel ...’

- (19) *This preyere moste be **trewely** seyde, and in verray feith, and that men preye to God ordinatly and discretly and devoutly* (Chaucer, *ParsT* (10) 1044)

‘This prayer must be spoken reliably, and in true faith, so that men pray to God properly and discretly and devoutly’

In the *General Prologue*, Chaucer describes the manner in which the clerk would preach the gospel as ‘loyally, with steadfast allegiance’, and in (19) the manner in which the prayer is to be said is prescribed by the adverb *trewely*, but also by the propositional phrase *in verray feith* (cf. also the following manner adjuncts *ordinatly*, *discretly* and *devoutly*).

In a more abstract sense, *trewely* can also mean ‘accurately’ (cf. *MED*, s.v. *treuli*, sense 9), as is evident from the rubric of Chaucer’s *Astrolabe* which requires the instruments to be set correctly:

- (20) *To knowe the degrees of longitudes of fixe sterres after that they be determynat in thin Astrelabye, yf so be that thei be **trewely** sette.* (Chaucer, *Astrolabe* 2.18. Rub.)

‘To know the degrees of longitudes of fixed stars after they have been placed in your Astrolabe, if it is the case that they are accurately set’

5.2. Epistemic uses

Only by the thirteenth century does *trewely* become semantically epistemic (cf. *OED*, s.v. *truly*, senses 3 and 5; *MED*, s.v. *treuli*, sense 11). Its epistemic force is evident in (21), since *trewely* does not primarily designate that the

revellers are going to pay ‘faithfully’, but indicates the subjective perspective (they will not pay!) and marks the speech act to be an (unfulfilled) promise.

- (21) *But specially I pray thee, hooste deere, / get us som mete and drynke, and make us cheere, / and we will payen **trewely** atte fulle.* (Chaucer, *RvT*(1) 4131–4133)
 ‘But we ask you in particular, dear host / bring us some food and drink, and make us merry / and we’ll fully pay for it, that’s for sure’

The new truth value force of *trewely* is even more evident in its use as an emphasizer in (22), which does not allow an interpretation of ‘faithfully’ but indicates the narrator’s subjective evaluation of the land where “milk and honey flow”:

- (22) *... and seiden, We camen to the lond, to which thou sentest vs, which lond **treuli** flowith with mylk and hony ...* (*Wycliff Bible*, Numbers XIII.27)
 ‘... and said, We came to the land to which you sent us, a land which indeed flows with milk and honey ...’

The newly acquired epistemic meaning and its functional truth value is most obvious in the translation of the Latin *Amen, (amen) dico vobis* in the New Testament. These formulaic expressions are used when Jesus reinterprets the Old Testament by virtue of his authority as the Son of God and they thereby require an epistemic value. While the OE texts translate these by *sop ic (eow) secge* or *soplice/witodlice ic (eow) secge* (*West-Saxon Gospels*), the Earlier and Later Wycliffite versions use *treuli I seie* (see Matthew XXVI.13.21.34; Mark XIV.9.18.25; Luke XXII.59; John XIII.16.20.21).

At this stage, the functional variability and polysemy of *trewely* is most clearly seen in phrases such as *loven trewely*, in which the adverb may function as a manner adjunct, emphasizer or sentence adverb. In the examples taken from Gower’s *Confessio Amantis*, only the word order and collocation with the conjunction *for* distinguish the uses which in modern editions are then highlighted by punctuation, i.e. the comma in (24).

- (23) *Sithe I have **trewly** loved on* (Gower, *Confessio Amantis*, 3.66)
 ‘Since I have indeed loved one’
- (24) *For **trewli**, fader, I love oon* (Gower, *Confessio Amantis*, 5.2536)
 ‘For indeed, father, I love one’

5.3. Discourse level use

Finally, *trewely* can also be used as a discourse marker on the local level of discourse. It is found in the same collocations as *soothly* – namely with the conjunctions *and*, *for* and *but* *trewely* – and is also similar in its metatextual functions as a highlighting device, as in (25), or a marker of personal opinion, as in (26).

- (25) *And ye shul understonde that looke, by any wey, whan any man shal chastise another, that he be war from chidyng or reprevynge. For trewely, but he be war, he may ful lightly quyken the fir of angre and of wratthe, which that he sholde quenche ...* (Chaucer, *ParsT* (10) 628)
 ‘Understand, in any case, that when a man has to chastise another, he should beware lest he chide or reproach him. For [Marker], unless he be wary, he may very easily kindle the fire of anger and wrath, which he should quench’

In (26), which gives the last lines of the *Clerk's Prologue*, this use as a marker of personal opinion is reinforced by the phrases *as to my juggement* and *me thynketh*.

- (26) *... the which a long thyng were to devyse. / And trewely, as to my juggement / me thynketh it a thyng impertinent / save that he wole conveyen his mateere; / But this his tale, which that ye may heere* (Chaucer, *CIPro* (4) 53–56)
 ‘... it would take a long time to describe this thing to you. / And [Marker; *truly], in my mind / it seems to be an irrelevant thing / save that he wanted to introduce his material; / But here is his tale which you may hear (now)’

The adverb became very popular in the course of the ME period (Swan 1988: 255), as can be seen in the many examples from London English in which we find *truly* used as a highlighting device. In (27), the author highlights the reason why there was no need for a new election by the collocate *and truly* and also by the inverted conditional construction *had not* without a conjunction:

- (27) *... & I wene ther wer a-boute a xxx craftes, & in Chepe they sholden haue sembled to go to a newe eleccion, &, truly, had nought the aldermen come to trete, & maked that John Norhampton bad the poeple gon hoom, they wolde haue go to a Newe eleccion ...* (*The Appeal of Thomas Usk*, p. 28)

‘ ... and I guess that there were about 30 guilds, and in Cheapside they should have assembled to go to a new election, and, [Marker], had not the aldermen come to make terms and caused that John Norhampton bade the people to go home, they would have gone to a new election’

In (28) the author emphasizes his summary of events, i.e. the “full intent”:

(28) ... & that al strange vitailers sholden with their vitailles ... frelich kome to the Cite, to selle their vitailles as wel be retaile as in other wyse, hauyng no reward to the Franchise. **And, truly**, the ful entent was that al the ordinances that wer ordeyned in hys tyme ... (*The Appeal of Thomas Usk*, p. 24)

‘... and that all foreign traders in food-stuffs should come with their victuals freely to the City [London], to sell their victuals by retail-trading as well as in other ways, having no regard of the freedom from tax in London. And, [Marker], the full intention was that all the commissions that were commissioned in his time ...’

OE *treowlice* thus shows an identical line of change as the adverbs discussed above. It develops from manner adjunct to sentence adverbial and discourse marker with highlighting function. As a discourse marker it virtually has the same text-structuring functions as *soplice/soothly* and *forsoothe*. The major difference, however, is that *treowlice* first had to change its propositional meaning. In sum, the changes in the lexical and syntactic properties involved in this shift from manner adverb to discourse marker may be summarized as follows:

Table 1. The shift from manner adverb to discourse marker

manner adjunct	>	sentence adverb (disjunct)	>	discourse marker
medial position		(commonly) initial position		(commonly) initial position
syntactically obligatory (lexical synonym)		syntactically detachable ‘I tell you truly’ ‘truly speaking’ ‘It is true that ...’		syntactically detachable no/vague meaning pragmatic functions: highlighting function; episode boundary marker; marker of personal opinion

It is important to note, however, that these meanings do not replace each other immediately – language change necessarily involves polysemy and loss of original meaning is relatively rare (Traugott and Dasher 2002: 280–281). Thus the old and new meanings may coexist in the same text, a property commonly referred to as “layering”.

6. PDE *indeed*, *in fact* and *actually*

6.1. PDE *indeed*

As has been mentioned above, the adverbs analysed here are semantically and functionally similar to the development of other PDE discourse markers, in particular *indeed*, *in fact* and *actually*. These lexemes share the expression of factuality in their original prepositional meaning and only acquire epistemic meaning (veracity) in the course of their history. The development of *indeed* from a bare prepositional phrase with propositional meaning (‘in the deed/act’) to its discourse-marker use ‘what’s more’ has been repeatedly discussed by Traugott and may be summarized as in the following table (cf. Traugott and Dasher 2002: 165). In stage II, *indeed* develops an epistemic meaning and becomes semantically similar to *soothly*, *forsoothe* and *truly*:

Table 2. The development of *indeed*

Stage I:	PP ‘in action / in practice’	1300–1850	‘in the act’ > ‘ in truth ’
Stage II:	semantically epistemic	1450–	‘ in truth ’ > ‘in addition’
Stage III:	discourse-marker use	1600–	‘what’s more’

6.2. PDE *in fact*

The Adverbial Cline is also identifiable in the history of *in fact*, originally a prepositional phrase with the head *fact* (borrowed from Latin in the sixteenth century), which develops into an epistemic adversative, functionally similar to the conjunction *but*, and eventually into a discourse marker (cf. Traugott 1999; Traugott and Dasher 2002: 165–169).

Table 3. The development of *in fact*

Stage I:	adverbial of “respect in which”	(1670)
Stage II:	epistemic adversative	(1680)
Stage III:	discourse-marker use	(1815)

6.3. PDE *actually*

A similar cline was followed by *actually* which shares the original propositional meaning ‘in actual fact’ or ‘in reality’ with the prepositional phrases *indeed* and *in fact*. The adjective *actual* was borrowed in the fourteenth century from Romance (cf. French *actuel*, late Latin *actual-is* in philosophical and theological writers) with the meaning ‘of or pertaining to action; exhibited in deeds; active’ (cf. Latin *actu-s*; cf. *OED*, s.v. *actual*, sense 1). From the sixteenth century onwards it is used to express factuality “in act or fact; as opposed to *possibly, potentially, theoretically ...*”, thus meaning ‘really, in reality’ (*OED*, s.v. *actually*, sense 3).²²

- (29) a. *This minde ... hath being and continuance **actually** and of it selfe, and euen when it is seperated from the body.* (1587 Golding, *De Mornay* xv. 232)
- b. *Every substance that actually is, by **actually** being that thing, actually is not any other. A piece of brass, for example, **actually** is not an oak.* (1775 J. Harris, *Philos. Arrangem.*, [1841] 365)

Only in the eighteenth century *actually* develops a genuine epistemic meaning “as a matter of fact, in truth, truly; indeed; even. Not said of the objective reality of the thing asserted, but as to the truthfulness of the assertion and its correspondence with the thing” (*OED*, s.v. *actually*, sense 5), as in

- (30) a. *I had some dispositions to be a scholar and had **actually** learned my letters.* (1762 Goldsmith, *Cit. W.* cxix. [1837] 463)
- b. *And this principle will be **actually** found, I believe, to guide the old workmen.* (1849 Ruskin, *Sev. Lamps* iv. §33, 124)

Actually is hence added to vouch for statements which seem surprising, incredible, or exaggerated. In (31), this interpretation is supported by sentence-final *after all*:

(31) *He has **actually** sent the letter after all.*

In PDE, *actually* has reached the right end of the Adverbial Cline and is, at least in spoken communication, commonly used as a discourse particle. In an in-depth study analysing the discourse functions of *actually* in about 700 tokens in spoken British and American conversation, Lenk (1998) shows that *actually* – like *soothly* and *truly* in ME – either marks the statement of a personal opinion, expresses self-correction or contradiction (cf. *in fact*), or indicates the introduction of a new or shifted topic. In dialogue, it functions as a turn initiator (Lenk 1998: 155–188).

Actually is thus a typical example for the Adverbial Cline from manner adverb to discourse particle:

Table 4. The development of *actually*

Stage I:	clause-internal adverbial	‘of or pertaining to action’	(1315–)
Stage II:	expression of factuality	‘really, in reality’	(1590–)
Stage III:	epistemic use	‘truthfulness of the assertion’	(1760–)
Stage IV:	discourse marker, turn initiator		(20th cent.)

6.4. Regularities

Apart from the shifts from one semantic domain to another summarized above, all the lexemes analysed here share the pragmatic-semantic tendencies which Traugott established for the adverbs with a discourse-marker function (Traugott and Dasher 2002: 281):

non-subjective	>	subjective	>	intersubjective
content	>	content-procedural	>	procedural
scope within proposition	>	scope over proposition	>	scope over discourse
truth-conditional	>		>	non-truth-conditional ²³

7. Truth, facts and communicative principles

7.1. Regularities in language change

The aim of the present investigation was to find out whether adverbs with a basic meaning ‘truly’ undergo a recurrent and regular semantic cline from clause-internal adverbial to sentence adverbial and discourse particle (see

above, section 1). After the analysis of several of these items, we may safely assert that this cline seems to be a general and unidirectional one. It is important to note that

no lexeme is required to undergo the type of change schematized [here] ... The hypothesis is that if a lexeme with the appropriate semantics undergoes change, it is probable that the language change will be of the type specified. More importantly, a reverse order of development is hypothesized to be ruled out except under special circumstances such as language engineering.

(Traugott and Dasher 2002: 281)

The data collected here confirm this hypothesis for the adverbs in question: all of them follow the suggested cline once they had started it, and none of the items shows a reverse movement. Most interesting in this respect is the highly frequent *soplice*, which died out after *trewely* had acquired its epistemic and pragmatic functions. Another interesting case is *forsoothe*, which, after having been forced out by *trewely*, has only survived in a highly intersubjective and negatively connotated function, i.e. “parenthetically with an ironical or derisive statement” (*OED*, s.v. *forsooth*; see above, section 4, and Lenker [2003: 283–286]). This also supports Traugott and Dasher’s view that items – after they have reached the right end of the cline – are replaced onomasiologically (2002: 284):

A third issue is what happens to those polysemies that have developed non-truth-conditional, procedural, scope-over-discourse, and intersubjective meanings. Our hypothesis is that Ls [= lexemes] with such meanings are replaced by newly recruited polysemies from other Ls, i.e. do not continue further semasiologically, but are replaced onomasiologically.

7.2. Grice’s Maxims of Quality

As was shown above (sections 5, 6.1–6.3), the replacing items (cf. *indeed*, *in fact* and *actually*) are not linked by their basic meaning ‘truly’ but by their original meaning ‘in fact, deed, action’. It is thus adverbs referring either to veracity or to factuality which seem to provide the “appropriate semantics” (Traugott and Dasher [2002: 281]; see above) of a lexeme to undergo the recurrent changes of the Adverbial Cline.

I would, however, like to go one step further and suggest that the semantics of these adverbs are not only “appropriate” but that the original propositional meaning of these lexemes almost inevitably leads to pragmatic strengthening, to their emphazier and, eventually, discourse-marker use.

I rest this view on one of the seminal concepts in pragmatics, Grice's Co-operative Principle and in particular his Maxims of Quality (Grice 1989: 26–27):²⁴

- 1 Do not say what you believe to be false.
- 2 Do not say that for which you lack adequate evidence.

Obviously, these maxims are directly connected to the adverbs analysed in this chapter: while Quality (1) is related to the adverbs meaning 'truly', Quality (2) clearly encompasses those with an original meaning of 'in fact, in deed, in action'.

If we accept the most basic of Gricean assumptions, namely that all partners in a communicative act want to be cooperative, then the Maxim of Quality implies that we should only talk about the veracity or factuality of a proposition if speakers/writers or listeners/readers doubt it, i.e. in highly emotional or negative contexts. Speakers/writers may thus want to mark their speech acts as performative ones (see the "promise" in (21)) or explicitly express their commitment to the truth of the proposition because they fear the non-acceptance of the interlocutors (see the many instances of *soplice*, *soothly* and *verily* with verbs of communication). Further, the speakers' reference to truth could be co-operative in negative contexts or when they want to mark a hedge, such as in *I'm not sure whether it is true but ...* or *as far as I know*

7.3. Invited inferences

In many of the instances quoted above – apart from some manner adjunct and emphazier uses – none of these contexts are given. Stating the veracity or factuality of a proposition by means of the adverbs in question would thus seem superfluous and therefore un-cooperative. The recurrent use of these adverbs would hence also impair the Maxim of Quantity ("Do not make your contribution more informative than is required") and the Maxim of Relation ("Make your contribution relevant").²⁵ Yet, according to Grice's hypothesis, when a talk does not proceed according to the maxims, hearers/readers assume that, contrary to appearances, the principles are nevertheless being adhered to at some deeper level (cf. Levinson 1983: 102).

In cases of this sort, inferences arise to preserve the assumption of co-operation. Relying on the Maxim of Quality, listeners/readers will principally

assume that speakers are telling the truth. If speakers/writers choose to assert the veracity or factuality explicitly by using a sentential adverbial such as *soplice*, *forsoothe*, *trewely* or *in fact*, the invited inference of the hearer/listener is that the meaning of these items stating the truth or factuality has to be found on another than the propositional or lexical level.

The first level to be expected for these truth-intensifying adverbs is their epistemic use implying increased subjectification, when speakers and hearers agree in their conceptualization of the adverbs as emphasizees: the speaker wants to stress the assertion of another phrase or clause by explicitly pointing to its truth value. In case this level does not provide the expected meaning in accordance with the Co-operative Principle, because the proposition and the grammatical context (inanimate subject, subjunctive mood) will not allow a meaning of ‘truth’ or ‘factuality’, a hearer will fully understand that the speaker’s commitment to truth does not relate to the proposition but again to a different, deeper level, i.e. to the organization of discourse itself. The adverbs are employed and will be understood as discourse markers, because otherwise the interlocutors would flout the Maxim of Quality.²⁶ Once they are predominantly interpreted on this level of textual organization, however, they have lost much of their force as truth-intensifiers on the manner-adverb level and have to be replaced by new lexemes, which may – in due time – follow the same cline.

Notes

1. I would like to thank the organizers and participants of the workshop “Historical Pragmatics” at the 12 ICEHL in Glasgow, the editors of the volume, and in particular Andreas Mahler and Elizabeth Traugott for their most helpful comments on an earlier version of this chapter.
2. *Witod* is the past participle of the verb *witian* ‘to order, to decide’, which is cognate to the verb *witan* ‘to know’.
3. I would like to thank Christian Mair (Freiburg) for raising this stimulating question.
4. This cline has been the subject of various papers by Traugott and is now summarized in Traugott and Dasher (2002: 152–189). In the last decade, this cline was seen as a subtype of grammaticalization in an approach which might be labelled “a semantic-pragmatic approach to grammaticalization” and it was argued that this Adverbial Cline should be added to the inventories of clines in grammaticalization; see, for example, the title of Traugott (1995 [1997]). Grammaticalization processes proper and the above sketched cline indeed

- agree in several important characteristics, in particular semantic bleaching, increased subjectification and pragmatic strengthening. These structural similarities are also stressed in a more recent publication (Traugott and Dasher 2002), but the cline is now no longer regarded as a subtype of grammaticalization, but as a “regularity in semantic change”. In this chapter, I will only refer to the properties inherent in these changes – subjectification, semantic bleaching etc. – but will neither use the term “grammaticalization” nor “regularity in semantic change”, because in my opinion neither of them is fully appropriate (see Lenker 2004).
5. Cf. Swan (1988) who refers to them as “truth-intensifying adverbs”; I will not use this term, however, because it might obstruct an objective approach to the various semantic and especially pragmatic functions of the lexemes in question.
 6. I only list adverbs proper or phrases which have been univerbated to adverbs from former prepositional phrases, such as *forsooth* and *indeed*; this excludes, for example, phrases such as OE *in soþe* ‘in truth’. I also exclude items whose propositional meaning is not (yet) exclusively connected to veracity or factuality, such as *candidly*, *clearly*, *honestly*, *seriously* etc.
 7. I exclude terms like *amen* and *apligh* which are only occasionally – and in very specific contexts – used in the meaning in question.
 8. A group of adverbs listed by Quirk et al. (1985: 620–621) are excluded because they are rare and predominantly used in formal registers: *assuredly* (rare, formal), *avowedly* (formal), *decidedly* (rare, formal), *factually* (rare, formal), *incontestably* (rare, formal), *incontrovertibly* (formal), *indisputably* (formal), *indubitably* (formal), *unarguably* (formal). This does not mean, however, that they might not eventually undergo a semantic path similar to *soplice* etc.
 9. In the *Longman Grammar*, Biber et al. (1999: 762–892) call the different types “circumstance” (adjuncts), “stance” (disjuncts) and “linking” (conjuncts) adverbials.
 10. For speakers’ comments on or evaluations of the sentence (content disjuncts), cf. “She *wisely* didn’t attempt to apologise” (‘It was wise of her that she didn’t attempt to apologise’). Speakers’ comments on the form of the communication can take the form of style disjuncts, such as “*Frankly*, I’m tired” (‘Frankly speaking, I’m tired’; ‘Put frankly, ...’; ‘I’m frank when I say ...’; ‘In all frankness ...’).
 11. For more detailed information, see Lenker (2000); for a survey of the history of the adverbs see *OED*, s.v. *soothly*, *MED*, s.v. *sothli*, and Swan (1988: 91–104, 263–265).
 12. Of the altogether 20 manner adjunct/emphasizer uses of *sothli* in Chaucer, 14 modify *sei(en)* or *tell(en)*. In Gower’s *Confessio Amantis*, four of the five direct-speech instances are with the communicative verbs *say* and *tell*, one with *lieve* ‘to believe’.

13. For the dates of the texts quoted, see the list of sources at the end of the chapter.
14. In Chaucer, 86 of the 114 instances of *soothly* are found in pieces of narrative prose.
15. This is one of the main reasons why it is difficult to regard this development as a case of grammaticalization; see note 3 above.
16. For the terms “subjectification” and “intersubjectification”, see now Traugott and Dasher (2002: 19–24, 89–99). For a completely different conception of subjectification, see Langacker (1999).
17. For the relation of these items to the Latin text, see Lenker (2000: 231) on the *West Saxon Gospels* and (2000: 238–239) on *Apollonius. Soplice* and ME *soothly* translate a number of different Latin adverbs (*autem, ergo, igitur, nam, vero*) which have been shown to be discourse markers organizing the text in Latin by Kroon (1995). It has to be stressed, however, that they are also frequently employed without a Latin discourse marker in the exemplar.
18. Among the prose instances of *soothly*, the numbers are as follows: *for soothly* (31), *but soothly* (16), *and soothly* (7) and *now soothly* (2); *soothly* alone is used 31 times. For the relation between “conjuncts” and “conjunctions” in linguistic theory, see Lenker (2003: 268–272). For the explanatory force of collocates, see Traugott and Dasher (2002: 168).
19. For a survey on the history *forsooth*, see *OED*, s.v. *forsooth*, *MED*, s.v. *forsoth*, and Swan (1988: 259–262). For a fuller account of the etymology, development and semantic and pragmatic characteristics of *forsooth(e)*, see Lenker (2003).
20. While *vero* ‘truly’, for instance, is also a discourse marker in Latin and functions on the interactional level of communicative acts and moves, *autem* is a connective on the level of textual organization (Kroon 1995: 371–375).
21. For a survey on the history of *truly*, see *OED*, s.v. *truly*, *MED*, s.v. *treuli*, and Swan (1988: 254–258).
22. The examples for *actually* are taken from the *OED*, s.v. *actually*.
23. This is most clearly seen with the adverbs analysed here, which start with a proposition referring to the notion of truth which is then completely lost in their discourse-marker uses.
24. For a survey of the principle, the maxims, revisions, applications and problems see Levinson (1983: 100–166; 2000: 12–21) and Mey (2001: 68–88).
25. This Maxim of Relevance (“Be relevant”) has in recent years been considered as the only important one in the cognitively oriented approach by Sperber and Wilson (1996). For a survey and criticism of the concept, see Levinson (2000: 54–64).
26. Levinson (1983: 100–101) deduces the notion of cooperation from “general considerations of rationality” which might consequentially mean that we are dealing with a universal here; cf., for example, Latin *verumtamen* ‘nevertheless’ and especially the use of Latin *vero* as a discourse marker on the intersubjective level (see above, notes 17 and 20).

Sources

- Apollonius* [Old English; mid-eleventh century] = Goolden, Peter (ed.)
 1958 *The Old English Apollonius of Tyre*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- The Appeal of Thomas Usk* [Middle English; 1384]
 1967 The Appeal of Thomas Usk against John Northampton. In *A Book of London English 1384–1425*, R. W. Chambers and Marjorie Daunt (eds.), 22–31. Oxford: Clarendon.
- Catholicon Anglicum* [1483] = Herrtage, Sidney (ed.)
 1881 *Catholicon Anglicum, an English-Latin Wordbook, Dated 1483*. (Early English Text Society o.s. 75.) London: Oxford University Press.
- Chaucer* [Middle English; fourteenth century] = Benson, Larry D. (ed.)
 1987 *The Riverside Chaucer*. 3rd ed. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
ClPro = *The Clerk's Prologue*
CIT = *The Clerk's Tale*
GP = *General Prologue*
KnT = *The Knight's Tale*
ParsT = *The Parson's Tale*
RvT = *The Reeve's Tale*
- Eustace* [*Life of St Eustace*; now considered to be anonymous; first half 11th century] = Skeat, Walter H. (ed.)
 1900 *Ælfric's Lives of Saints*, Vol. 2. (Early English Text Society 114.) Oxford: Oxford University Press, 190–219.
- Gower, *Confessio Amantis* [Middle English; fourteenth century] = Macaulay, G. C. (ed.)
 1900–1901 *The English Works of John Gower*. 2 vols. (Early English Text Society, Extra Series 81–82.) London: Oxford University Press.
- Malory, *Morte D'Arthur* [ca. 1469]
 1990 *The Works of Sir Thomas Malory*. Eugène Vinaver and P. J. C. Field (eds.). 3rd ed., 3 vols. Oxford: Clarendon.
- OED* = *Oxford English Dictionary Online* (see References below).
- West-Saxon Gospels* [Old English; around 1000] = Liuzza, Roy M. (ed.)
 1994 *The Old English Version of the Gospels*, Vol. 1: *Text and Introduction*. (Early English Text Society 304.) Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Wycliff Bible* [Middle English; fourteenth century] = Forshall, Josiah, and Frederic Madden (eds.)
 1982 Reprint. *The Holy Bible. Translated from the Latin Vulgate by John Wycliff and his Followers*. New York: AMS Press. Original edition, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1850.

References

- Biber, Douglas, Stig Johansson, Geoffrey Leech, Susan Conrad, and Edward Finegan
 1999 *Longman Grammar of Spoken and Written English*. London: Longman.
- Blank, Andreas, and Peter Koch (eds.)
 1999 *Historical Semantics and Cognition*. (Cognitive Linguistics Research.) Berlin/New York: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Grice, Paul
 1989 *Studies in the Ways of Words*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Kroon, Caroline
 1995 *Discourse Particles in Latin: A Study of nam, enim, autem, vero and at*. (Amsterdam Studies in Classical Philology 4.) Amsterdam: J. C. Gieben.
- Langacker, Ronald
 1999 Losing control: Grammaticalization, subjectification and transparency. In Blank and Koch (eds.), 147–175.
- Lenk, Uta
 1998 *Marking Discourse Coherence: Functions of Discourse Markers in Spoken English*. (Language in Performance 15.) Tübingen: Narr.
- Lenker, Ursula
 1997 *Die westsächsische Evangelienversion und die Perikopenordnungen im angelsächsischen England*. (Texte und Untersuchungen zur Englischen Philologie 20.) München: Fink.
 2000 *Soplice and witodlice: Discourse markers in Old English*. In *Pathways of Change: Grammaticalization in English*, Anette Rosenbach, Olga Fischer, and Dieter Stein (eds.), 229–249. (Studies in Language Companion Series.) Amsterdam: Benjamins.
 2003 *Forsooth, a source: Metalinguistic thought in Early English*. In *Bookmarks from the Past. Studies in Early English Language and Literature in Honour of Helmut Gneuss*, Lucia Kornexl and Ursula Lenker (eds.), 261–288. (Texte und Untersuchungen zur Englischen Philologie 30.) Frankfurt: Lang.
 2004 Review of Traugott and Dasher (2002). *Word* 55: 262–265.
- Levinson, Stephen
 1983 *Pragmatics*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
 2000 *Presumptive Meanings: The Theory of Generalized Conversational Implicature*. (Language, Speech, and Communication.) Cambridge: MIT Press.

- MED = Kurath, Hans, Sherman M. Kuhn, John Reidy, and Robert E. Lewis (eds.)
1954–2001 *Middle English Dictionary*. Ann Arbor, MI: University of Michigan Press.
- Mey, Jacob
2001 *Pragmatics. An Introduction*. 2nd ed. Oxford: Blackwell.
- OED = *Oxford English Dictionary Online*
Oxford: Oxford University Press. <<http://oed.com/>>
- Quirk, Randolph, Sidney Greenbaum, Geoffrey Leech, and Jan Svartvik (eds.)
1985 *A Comprehensive Grammar of the English Language*. London: Longman.
- Sperber, Dan, and Deidre Wilson
1996 *Relevance: Communication and Cognition*. 2nd ed. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Swan, Toril
1988 *Sentence Adverbials in English: A Synchronic and Diachronic Investigation*. (Tromsø-Studier i Språkvitenskap 10.) Oslo: Novus.
- Swanton, Michael (ed.)
1975 *Anglo-Saxon Prose*. London: Dent.
- Traugott, Elizabeth Closs
1995 [1997] The role of the development of discourse markers in a theory of grammaticalization. [Paper presented at ICHL XII, Manchester, 1995; version of 11/1997.] Online. <<http://www.stanford.edu/~traugott/ect-papersonline.html>>
1999 The rhetoric of counter-expectation in semantic change: A study in subjectification. In Blank and Koch (eds.), 61–89.
- Traugott, Elizabeth, and Richard Dasher
2002 *Regularity in Semantic Change*. (Cambridge Studies in Linguistics.) Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

