[Special Lecture]

On the Function of Adverbs of Certainty
Used at the Periphery of the Clause

Elizabeth ClossTraugott
Stanford University

The histories of some modal adverbs in English have been shown to involve subjectification and changes in position with respect to the clause (Traugott and Dasher 2002, Lenker 2010). The question whether there is a predictable relationship between a) position "outside the proposition", i.e. left and right periphery, and b) subjectivity or intersubjectivity, has been of interest for some time (see Onodera 2004, Onodera and Suzuki 2007, Beeching, Degand, Detges, Traugott, and Waltereit 2009). In this paper I suggest that while a correlation between topic functions, subjectivity, and left periphery appears to be quite robust, other proposed correlations, e.g. of subjectivity in general with left periphery and of intersubjectivity in general with right periphery, may be specific to the individual construction and not generalizable. I outline the histories of *no doubt* and *surely*, and show that in its pragmatic linking function *no doubt* has come to be used mainly subjectively at left and right periphery while *surely* in the same function has come to be used mainly intersubjectively in both positions.

Keywords:　Modal adverbs; pragmatic markers; subjectification; intersubjectification; left periphery; right periphery; adverb position

1.　Introduction*

I have long had an interest in epistemic modal adverbs (e.g. *indeed, in fact, actually*), their origins, and the paths of change they have undergone, including their development into primarily pragmatic markers (e.g. Traugott 1989, Traugott and Dasher 2002). They started out as adverbs of circumstance or manner, and were recruited to do modal work, typically clause-medially, and later metatextual work, typically "outside" the proposition or "core clause". Their histories are therefore deeply intertwined with changes in position and with subjectification and intersubjectification (see also Lenker

---

2000, 2010 on similar developments with other adverbs such as Old English *soþlice, witodlice*, both meaning 'truly'). Such changes have raised questions whether there are predictable correlations between changes in function, position in the clause, and subjectification and intersubjectification (e.g. Beeching, Degand, Detges, Traugott, and Waltereit 2009).

In this paper I will use two modal adverbs, *surely* and *no doubt* to explore three questions, all of which concern historical pragmatics:

Q1　What changes in the function of the adverbs *surely* and *no doubt* are attested?

Q2　Are the changes correlated with subjectification and intersubjectification?

Q3　Are there predictable correlations between the resulting functions of the two modal adverbs, (inter)subjectivity, and position at left or right periphery of the clause?

As these questions presuppose a number of theoretical distinctions and perspectives, I start by broadly outlining some functional distinctions among modal adverbs and some scalar distinctions on a scale of certainty (section 2), and then outline my view of subjectivity and subjectification, intersubjectivity and intersubjectification (section 3). In section 4 I introduce two hypotheses about correlations between the functions, (inter)subjectivity and position at left or right periphery of the "core clause" (proposition). Section 5 sketches the histories of *surely* and *no doubt*. I will conclude that in English at least correlations between function, (inter)subjectivity, and position at best capture tendencies. Position does not uniquely predict or determine meaning and function (see also Traugott Forthcoming).

Surely and *no doubt* are among twenty-two adverbs of "modal certainty" in Present Day English listed by Simon-Vandenbergen and Aijmer (2007: 69). Like modals in general, even modal adverbs of certainty call the absolute truth of the proposition into question. In other words they imply "alternatives" (White 2003: 260). Both *surely* and *no doubt* are illustrated in (1). Both could be paraphrased by *I am sure*, but the pragmatic difference between them would be lost. *No doubt* expresses the Speaker's subjective certainty that her inference that he was 'disconcerted and offended' is correct in a way that implies non-negotiation of the point. On the other hand *surely* does not express the speaker's certainty that *it was not my fault* so much as intersubjectively seek confirmation by the Addressee, in this case the imagined reader.

(1)　Whereupon, he wished me a good morning and withdrew, disconcerted and offended, ***no doubt***; but ***surely*** it was not my fault. (1848 Anne Brontë, *The Tenant of Wildfell Hall* CLMETEV II)

If (1) had been written as (1′) without the adverbs:

(1′)　Whereupon, he wished me a good morning and withdrew, disconcerted and offended; but it was not my fault.

he wished me a good morning, he withdrew, he was disconcerted and offended, it was not my fault would be understood as assertions of fact, not an inference on the Speaker's part.[1] If (1) had been written as (1″)

> (1″) Whereupon, he wished me a good morning and withdrew, disconcerted and offended; but ***no doubt*** it was not my fault.

the comments on 'him' would be understood as assertions of fact, and *but no doubt* in the last clause on the Speaker's responsibility would convey self-satisfaction, obstinacy, and rejection of alternatives such as *it was my fault*.

The main corpus to be used in this paper is CLMETEV, *The Corpus of Late Modern English Texts Extended Version*, compiled by Hendrik de Smet, totaling nearly fifteen million words divided into three periods. Data for the first period, 1710−1780 in CLMETEV I, are about three million words long. Data for the second period, 1780−1850 in CLMETEV II, are about five and three quarter million words long. And data for the third period, 1850−1920 in CLMETEV III, are about six and a quarter million words long. CLMETEV will be abbreviated as CL in citations.

2.   Some distinctions relevant for modal adverbs

A set of distinctions that will be used throughout this paper is between three uses of adverbs:
a) Adverbial adjuncts. These have contentful meaning. In English they typically appear toward the end of the clause, after the main verb and before locative, directional, temporal, instrumental and other adverbs, cf:

> (2) Quit Smoking Slowly and ***Surely*** with Electronic Cigarettes
>   (http://realevant.com/quit-smoking-slowly-and-surely-with-electronic-ciga-rettes.htm/; accessed July 25th 2011)

Slowly but surely is a fixed phrase in contemporary English and has greater freedom of position than many other adverb adjuncts,[2] but here *surely* means 'deliberately', not 'certainly'; as will be shown in section 5, this is close to its original meaning 'securely'.
b) Epistemic modal adverbs such as *in fact, truly, surely*. Many of them are derived from contentful adverbs. As epistemic modals they are non-factual (or "irrealis"), and relativize states of affairs to a set of possible worlds. They tend to occur clause medial-

---

[1] *But* does of course imply alternatives, but this is a separate issue.

[2] It may also be used as a view-point expression at the beginning of a clause, but as the paraphrase 'slowly and deliberately' shows, it is contentful, and quite different in meaning from the epistemic linker *surely* as in *Surely that can't be right!*, which does not mean 'deliberately' but rather 'please confirm that …".

ly in English, and to presuppose some proposition to which the current one is contrast-
ed. They are paraphrasable by 'I am certain that', i.e. the speaking subject, not the sub-
ject of the sentence controls the adverb (Benveniste 1971 [1958]), e.g.:

(3) a. Pedestrians Do, In Fact, Have the Right of Way. Proposed legislation
         seeks to remind cars and trucks they don't own the road.
         (http://shelton.patch.com/articles/pedestrians-do-in-fact-have-the-right-of-
         way; accessed July 25th 2011)
     b. You do *surely* have a point!
         (http://www.huffingtonpost.com/social/Madelaine/glenn-beck-fareed-zaka-
         ria_n_826670_78878244.html; accessed July 25th 2011)

Here *do* is affirmative, providing in writing a cue to the contrastive stress that would
normally occur with this use of *in fact* and *surely*. Modal epistemic adverbs are on a
continuum between lexical and grammatical expressions (Simon-Vandenbergen and Ai-
jmer 2007). They are lexical to the extent that they convey the content 'knowledge sta-
tus', but are primarily grammaticalized expressions, being highly schematic and ab-
stract, signaling the Speaker's evaluation of the proposition on a scale of certainty.
c) Pragmatic modal linkers. These are primarily pragmatic, and serve a connective
function linking the current clause with a prior or subsequent one, as does *surely* in (1)
and *in fact* in (4). Here they are paraphrasable as e.g. 'I want you to agree with me'
('surely') or 'better stated' ('in fact') rather than as 'I am certain':

(4) They didn't agree on much. *In fact* they rarely agreed on anything.
     (Nicholas Sparks, http://www.goodreads.com/quotes/show/62495 (accessed
     July 25th 2011))

Unlike the first two uses, this third use has no truth-conditional semantics, is difficult to
translate or paraphrase, and is item-specific. Lenker calls modal adverbs of this type
"epistemic linkers", and argues (2010: 114-130) that expressions denoting truth or fact
may be used as connectives only when signaling concession and contrast (*surely*) or
transition (Old English *soðlice* 'truly', *in fact, indeed*). As the implicature 'I want you
to agree with me' suggests, there are additional connective uses, so I will use the term
'pragmatic modal linker' for modal adverbs with a connective function. Such adverbs
are grammaticalized, procedural items that cue how the Speaker conceptualizes relation-
ships within and between clauses, and how the Addressee is to interpret these relation-
ships[3] (Degand and Simon-Vandenbergen 2011b).

---

[3] The term "procedural" was first used by Blakemore (1987) for pragmatic, non-conceptual meaning
within a Relevance Theoretic framework. More recently, however, a continuum between conceptual
and procedural meaning has been acknowledged (see Nicolle 1998). Only the term, not other aspects
of Relevance Theory are adopted here.

Another set of distinctions concerns correlations with degree of certainty (the "modal scale"). In the epistemic adverb domain the scale ranges from *certainly* to *maybe*. As epistemic modals and pragmatic markers *surely* and *no doubt* are lower on the scale than *certainly*, and *no doubt* is lower than *surely*.[4] Since epistemic modals and linking modals express the Speaker's comment on the possibility of the state of affairs and link what is said to Speaker's degree of conviction (and in some cases to the Addressee's projected degree of conviction) they are "stance markers" (Biber and Finegan 1988). Currently there are two major view of "stance". For Biber and his colleagues it refers to "personal feelings, attitudes, value judgments, or assessments" (Biber, Johansson, Conrad, and Finegan 1999: 966). This interpretation of stance is mainly subjective in that Speaker's attitudes are highlighted. A different view of stance is suggested by Englebretson (2007), who refers to "stance-taking". The *-ing* here is significant, highlighting stance as interactional position-taking actively engaged in by language users as they communicate with each other. This is a mainly intersubjective interpretation, with Speakers paying attention to and negotiating with the Addressee.

Surely and *no doubt* illustrate both types of stance, depending on their function. As epistemic modals, they express Speaker's assessment of or stance toward the veracity of the state of affairs. This is consistent with Biber's sense of "stance". As pragmatic modal linkers they are used to negotiate pragmatic discourse management, including Speaker's stance toward the evolving text and anticipation of how the Addressee may interpret it. This is consistent with Englebretson's view of stance.

3. Subjectification and intersubjectification

As is well known, there are different approaches to subjectification and intersubjectification (see Onodera and Suzuki 2007, López-Couso 2010). For me, the *-ation* signifies change, a process leading from less to more subjective or intersubjective and identifiable in specific semantic-pragmatic changes. Subjectivity and intersubjectivity are, by contrast, synchronic concepts and are of two kinds. On the one hand subjectivity and intersubjectivity are ambient in communication since they are grounded in the Speaker-Addressee dyad; one simply cannot say or write anything that does not involve the Speaker's construal. Normally one cannot say or write anything that is not addressed to someone (this includes self-address, or address to some future unborn persons). There is also coded subjectivity (e.g. use of the modal *will* to express future) and intersubjectivity (e.g. use of subject inversion to express a yes-no question). The Speaker-Addressee dyad is in my view asymmetric: interlocutors do not have exactly the same cognitive representations, and prototypically do not, indeed cannot, understand each other completely. This is an enabling factor in change.

---

[4] *Certainly*, however, appears not to be used frequently as a pragmatic marker.

I define subjectification as the recruitment of meanings to express the Speaker's self and attitudes, including attitudes to text-creation in the sense of discourse-management. Text-creation in this sense has long been part of my thinking on subjectification. However, I have pointed out in various places (most recently Traugott 2010: 31) that my original (1982) use of "textual" was restricted in ways that are no longer tenable in the hypothesis that semantic change progresses along the path "propositional > textual > expressive". In (1982) I focused on coordinators and complementizers as syntactic not pragmatic metatextual markers. The difference between syntactic and metatextual marking (e.g. use of *in fact* for reformulation), came to be of major research interest in the late eighties under the influence of Schiffrin (1987) and therefore "textual" came to be inadequate. As a result of this inadequacy I have tended to include meta-textual, text-creation markers under subjective "attitude". Some readers have concluded from this that I have abandoned "text-creation" as an important factor in change (see e.g. Breban 2006, Visconti Forthcoming), but this is not the case, as evidenced by discussion of *indeed, in fact*, and *actually* as reformulation markers in Traugott and Dasher (2002). The adverbs under discussion here are clearly both attitudinal (being modal) and text-creating in their pragmatic linking uses. By contrast to subjectification, intersubjectification is recruitment of meanings to express Speaker's acknowledgement of the Addressee and desire to maintain social exchange with the Addressee (see Brinton 1996: 270). Subjectification and intersubjectification are gradient and on a continuum. Different languages code them to different degrees.

In my view, then, subjectification and intersubjectification are semantic mechanisms (reanalyses, see Eckardt 2006) by which meanings are recruited by Speakers to encode and regulate attitudes and beliefs (subjectification), and once subjectified, may be recruited to encode meanings centered on the Addressee and Addressee's self-image (intersubjectification) (Traugott 2010: 35). This is a semasiological approach concerned with the development of new form-meaning pairings, i.e. with semanticization of earlier pragmatic meanings, usually implicatures. Some examples of subjectification in English are:

a) In the lexical-social domain: *essential* 'in essence' > 'morally necessary/deontic' (Van linden, Verstraete, and Cuyckens 2008).

b) In the quantifier domain: *a lot of* 'a share/unit of' > 'much', cf. *a lot of courage.*

c) In the intensifier domain: *pretty* ('good-looking; evaluative adj') > 'rather' (degree modifier), cf. *pretty ugly.*

d) In the connective domain *beside(s)* 'at the side of' > 'meta-linguistic marker of added comment'.

Examples in the domain of intersubjectification are largely to be found in the domain of social deixis, e.g.:

e) use of 2nd Pl Pronoun for polite address to a singular 2nd person (in Early Modern English *ye* for *thou*).

f) use of formulae like *please* < *if you please* 'if it pleases you'.

g) use of honorific speech styles (cf. lexical and grammatical markers of this style in Japanese).

As we will see, intersubjectification may also play a role in the recruitment of epistemic modal adverbs for use as turn-elicitors.

The outputs of both subjectification and intersubjectification are on a continuum of less to more (inter)subjective when the changes first occur. Subjectification frequently coocurs with early grammaticalization because the speaker selects the theta role for a particular noun (case), temporal and phasal relationships (tense and aspect), and connectivity (types of coordination, subordination, etc.). However, a correlation with subjectification is neither necessary nor sufficient for grammaticalization, as the example of *essential* in a) above shows (see also Traugott 2010).

De Smet and Verstraete (2006) counter my proposal to combine lexical and grammatical examples of subjectification, and argue that a distinction should be maintained between Speaker-internal content (essentially lexical-social, see a) above) and enactment of Speaker position, which is interpersonal as it cues the Addressee to metatextual relations (grammatical and procedural, see b)−d) above). They are mainly concerned with synchrony. Visconti (Forthcoming), in a paper focusing on diachrony, also objects to my "lumping approach", which has (inter)subjectification ranging over lexical and grammatical material. She cites Smirnova's (2009) question "Why should the semantic content of an attitudinal adjective (like e.g. *silly*) be essentially the same as that of a grammatical construction (like e.g. *be going to*), as far as their subjective meaning component is concerned?"

This question shows the need to clarify two points. One is that subjectification is not production of semantic content, but rather of a new meaning more based in the Speaker's attitude than an older one, a change based in cognitive processes that apply equally to any item on the lexicon-grammar continuum. What a semantic or pragmatic feature [+subjective] conveys is not "content" (on the assumption that "content" is referential), but a highly abstract contextualized orientation toward Speaker's attitudes and assessments. The second point is that while subjectification results in increased subjectivity for the expression in its new use, this new subjectivity is always subject to change, depending on the function of the expression. *Silly*, which meant 'blessed, innocent', was pejorized by Speakers in Middle English; this was subjectification—subjective attitudes came to be associated with the word and to be encoded in it. Over time the word *silly* came to mean 'stupid', and has been institutionalized with this meaning. People may now think silliness can be objectively defined by behavior. In this sense the lexical item *silly* is now only evaluative, not subjective in its lexical semantics (however, the act of evaluating someone or something on the scale of rationality is a subjec-

tive act that is often cloaked in societal norms). By contrast, *be going to* expresses future. Originally a motion with a purpose expression, this string was recruited to mark a highly abstract grammatical notion. This was also subjectification, but since future expresses subjective assessment of the temporal relationship between a proposition and time of utterance, *be going to* has continued to be used subjectively. It is not a contentful meaning, but rather a schematic, grammatical one of the specific deictic type associated with tense in English. It is this deictic temporal context (together with that of the inflected tense marker on *be,* if it occurs) that determines the subjectivity of *be going to.*

Before I move on to discussion of the concept of a correlation between (inter)subjectification and "edge" or "periphery", it may be useful to mention that the view of subjectification used here is considerably different from Langacker's well known more restrictive approach to it. For him (see e.g. Langacker 1990, 2006) "subjectification" is construal (not a fundamentally diachronic notion): "As I define it, subjectification occurs when an objectively construed relationship fades away, leaving behind a subjectively construed relationship that was immanent in it (inherent in its conception)" (Langacker 2009: 850). Pragmatic markers barely play a role in this view of subjectification. Neither does intersubjectification. Since for Langacker (2007) the Speaker-Addressee dyad is essentially symmetric, he would doubtless conceptualize it very differently. Despite the differences, there is no fundamental inconsistency, and indeed there is overlap between our approaches at several points. As De Smet and Verstraete (2006: 369) say, "the difference is not whether something is Speaker-related or not, but how explicitly reference to the Speaker figures in the form of the utterance". For Langacker a key question is whether reference to the Speaker is explicit (e.g. by use of a first person pronoun, cf. *Vanessa is sitting across the table from me*), or implicit (subjective, cf. *Vanessa is sitting across the table*). For me a key question is whether an expression is non-Speaker-related or Speaker-related (subjective).

4.　Two hypotheses about correlations between the functions of adverbs, (inter) subjectivity, and position at left or right periphery of the clause

There are currently two main hypotheses known to me about a possible correlation between the function of an adverb (or other expression), (inter)subjectivity, and position at the periphery of the proposition. They are the subject of much current discussion.[5]

One hypothesis is a relatively weak symmetric one: both LP and RP may be subjective or inter-subjective, depending on the function of the expression in question.

---

[5] For example there were three workshops and several papers on related topics at the Twelfth International Pragmatics Conference in Manchester July 2011. Volumes based on these workshops are anticipated.

This hypothesis is grounded largely in Japanese, Korean, and Chinese data (Onodera and Suzuki 2007; also Huang 2000, Onodera 2004). In these works it is shown that in Japanese LP is favored for, but not limited to: a) topic change, b) linking function, c) reinforcing function, d) summons, e) interjections. Of these a)–c) are primarily subjective, and d), e) primarily intersubjective. By contrast, in Japanese RP is favored for, but not limited to: f) exclamations, g) tags. Of these (f) is primarily subjective, and g) primarily intersubjective. Although the terms "subjective" and "intersubjective" are synchronic, the markers under discussion are shown in the works cited above to have been derived historically by (inter)subjectification.

The other hypothesis is a stronger and fundamentally asymmetric one attempting to make a cross-linguistically testable claim about a particular kind of division of pragmatic labor: "Expressions at left periphery are likely to be subjective, those at right periphery intersubjective" (Beeching, Degand, Detges, Traugott, and Waltereit 2009; see also e.g. Hansen 2008, Degand and Fagard 2011 for French; Traugott 2010 for English). This is because LP represents the beginning of a message before the relevant parts of the message itself exist. LP is the locus for a) Topic markers, and b) connectives that express Speaker's stance, cf. *besides, anyway*, and not only "frame the clause but also mark its connection to the previous discourse" (Downing 2002: 288). On the other hand, RP represents the end of a message when the message itself exists and is manifest to both Speaker and Addressee. More specifically: "[T]he left periphery anchors the emergent phrase in the foregoing discourse. By contrast, the right periphery is a locus for speaker's comments on the completed phrase, suitable for fine-tuning the latter's impact on the audience ..." (Detges and Waltereit 2011)

There has been a tradition in work on European languages to pay attention mainly or only to LP. For example, Traugott and Dasher (2002) discuss *in fact* 'in the doing (circumstance adv)' > 'epistemic modal' > 'reformulation marker', and correlations with position. They distinguish:

(5)   a.   It is true *in fact* (with respect to facts; adverb of circumstance)
       b.   It is *in fact* true (contrastive; epistemic modal)
       c.   *In fact* it is true (reformulation marker; pragmatic linking modal)

but do not discuss uses at RP. From examples such as the development of *indeed, in fact, actually* and others in English Aijmer (2007: 39) generalized: "Grammaticalization implies a movement toward a loosely attached pre-front field constituent", i.e. leftward in the clause or intonation unit. Like Traugott and Dasher's, this is a claim about how individual form-meaning pairings change, more specifically are recruited by Speakers to different functions. The slots and functions have been present throughout the history of English (with some modifications of Medial adverb position related to changes in verb structure in the sixteenth century, see e.g. Kroch 1989). However, even though Aijmer's claim accounts for much English data, as a cross-linguistic generalization it is easily falsified by changes in many Asian languages where grammaticalized elements may be

recruited to RP over time, e.g. *no* in Japanese, *puny a* in Malay, *de* in Mandarin, all meaning 'for sure' (Yap, Matthews, and Horie 2004). As we will see, *no doubt* and *surely* also raise questions about Aijmer's hypothesis.[6]

One question must of course be "left" or "right" of what? The answer to this question depends in part on the construction under investigation. Topic markers tend to occur at or just before the beginning of the proposition, also known as predicate argument structure, or "core clause", a term which I will use here for short. Other elements typically are "outside" this core clause. *Surely, no doubt* and other modal connectives precede the core clause but may follow interjections (*Oh, yes*), addressee names, connectives (e.g. *and, but, for, why*) as in (1), or "topicalized" contrastively-used adverbs like *now* as in (6):

> (6)　Short while ago, we saw him at the top of Fortune's Wheel, his word a law to all Patriots: and now **surely** he is at the bottom of the Wheel.
> (1837 Carlyle, *French Revolution*; CL II)

They may follow the core clause, as in:

> (7)　(discussing a hand-written will) "But I say that note isn't legal. Houses ought to be done by a lawyer, Charles, **surely**."
> (1910 Forster, *Howard's End*; CL III)

When *surely* is clause-final (as opposed to being at RP) it is usually a circumstantial or manner adverb, as in (8) which can be paraphrased as 'star ... by which he may be safe/sure/certain in directing his course'. To use Langacker's terms, in (8) the construer (*he*) is "on-stage" and explicitly mentioned. The epistemic modal would require a paraphrase of the type 'I am sure', as in (6, 7)) where the construer is *I* and "off-stage", inexplicit and implied:

> (8)　a star in sight by which he may direct his course **surely**.
> (1829 Southey, *Sir Thomas More*, CL II)

When *no doubt* is clause-final it is usually the object of *have*. It often introduces a complementation with *that* or *but*, as in (9):

> (9)　there was then a call for hats off, and I have **no doubt** that I was as zealous in this call as any one.
> (1733 Hunt, *Memoirs*; CL II)

---

[6] Since Aijmer (1996) argued that the development of pragmatic markers is not grammaticalization but pragmaticalization she would probably not include them in her hypothesis. However, the proposed distinction between grammaticalization and pragmaticalization has been argued to be unnecessary (e.g. Degand and Simon-Vandenbergen 2011a).

5.   A brief history of *surely* and *no doubt*

Before turning to the history of the two adverbs, I comment briefly on some findings regarding their use in Present Day English. Of the class of "*surely* adverbs", i.e. adverbs of certainty, Biber and Finegan say: "they serve to invite affirmation and to seclude certain assertions from polite dispute … By presenting information as if it were obvious, speakers encourage its acceptance and minimize the need for supporting evidence" (Biber and Finegan 1988: 19). Biber and Finegan do not, however, distinguish uses in different positions (nor do many other researchers, despite citing examples). Use at RP is almost entirely ignored on grounds that it is "afterthought", or "perfunctory" (Simon-Vandenbergen 2007: 14 on *no doubt*).

Downing (2001) investigated use of *surely* in Present Day English in BNC with pronoun subjects. She says it marks two mainly subjective stances: a) it is used as an evidentiality marker indexing the state of the Speaker's knowledge,[7] and b) it is used as a mirative expressing the Speaker's coming into awareness, at moment of speaking of a "state of affairs of which the Speaker was up to then unaware" (p. 277). She also identifies two mainly intersubjective stances that invite response: a) challenging, "fighting word" use (*You CAN grate the cheese* **surely**); this is used mainly with 2nd person, and is disfavored in Medial position, b) seeking agreement, corroboration (**Surely** *he must be worried?*); this is used mainly with 1st plural and 3rd person in her data. This last agreement-seeking function is one that had been identified earlier by Greenbaum (1969), Biber and Finegan (1988), and Swan (1988). These examples show intersubjective *surely* at both LP and RP.

Of *no doubt* Simon-Vandenbergen (2007) says that in ICE-GB and FLOB it may imply a "high degree of predictability", hence ridicule, sarcasm ([re dinner] *At the Chelsea Kitchen again,* **no doubt**) (p. 17). It is often used with *but* (*it was a shocking thing* **no doubt**, *but …*); in this collocation it concedes the truth "in order to posit the counterargument in a context of dialogic argumentation" (p. 16). This concessive use often conveys more certainty than other contexts (p. 30). These are subjective stances with some implied intersubjectivity, but do not seek agreement.

5.1.   Surely

Surely was borrowed from French in Middle English as a lexical expression. Ultimately from Latin *securus* 'safe, secure' it appears c.1300 as a manner adverb meaning 'securely', 'deliberately' and 'truthfully':

---

[7] Usually "evidentiality" is associated not with knowledge but source of knowledge, however (see Aikhenvald 2004).

(10)　Ac arst þow schal tsykery me, and þy　treuþe
　　　　but first you　shall　promise me　and thy truth

　　　　surly　　ply3te þat þou　for me schalt don a þyng.
　　　　truthfully swear that thou for me shalt　do　a thing
　　　　'But first you shall promise me and truthfully swear that you will do some-
　　　　thing for me.'
　　　　(c1380 Firumb.(1) (Ashm 33) 1281 [MED])

Here it is the second person 'thou' who must be certain, not the Speaker who is certain,
so this is clearly a non-epistemic use.

　　There are also occasional uses as epistemic 'certainly', as in (11):

(11)　a.　Hit is *surely* soth, þe　Soverayn of heven…
　　　　　　it　is surely　true, the　sovereign of heaven…

　　　　　　Gart　　hym grattest　to be of governors alle.
　　　　　　created him　greatest to be of governors all
　　　　　　'It is surely true that the king of heaven … created him to be the greatest
　　　　　　of all governors'
　　　　　　(c1400(?c1380) *Cleanness* (Nero A.10) 1643 [MED])
　　　b.　*Sewerly* on like　　wyze　mans flesh 3eues men
　　　　　　certainly in　similar manner man's flesh gives men

　　　　　　a tast　of þe wyne of lechery by vnclene kyssynges.
　　　　　　a taste of the wine of lechery by unclean kissings
　　　　　　'Surely in similar ways people's bodies give them a taste of the wine of
　　　　　　lechery and sinful kissing.'
　　　　　　(c1450(c1415) Roy.Serm. (Roy 18.B.23) 235/20 [MED])

This *surely* is subjective (the Speaker assesses the truth of the proposition) and high on
the certainty scale. Like many other adverbs of certainty, it became weaker c.1700 and
now means 'probably, but without absolute proof' (see e.g. Bromhead 2009 on weaken-
ing of epistemic certainty in many modal expression in the eighteenth century).

　　As (11) shows, use as an epistemic modal in Medial position (11a) and at LP (11b)
is attested in early documents. Material from the MED supports the hypothesis that the
adverb was recruited to Medial and then LP position much like *indeed*, etc., but the
dates are close together and more extensive data is needed to confirm this.

　　The earliest example in my data of an intersubjective use at LP implying that the
Speaker expects agreement or uptake of some kind is (12), from a letter by Sir Thomas
More when he had been imprisoned for treason by his former supporter, Henry VIII.
More is responding to a letter that his daughter Meg sent about her fears for his life:

(12)　The more weke that man is, the more is the strenght of God in his saueguard

declared ... **Surely** Megge a fainter hearte than thy fraile father hath, canst you not haue.

'The weaker that man is, the more is the strength of God declared for his safeguard... Surely, Meg, you cannot have a fainter heart than your frail father'.

(?1537 More [HC cepriv1])

Surely continued to be used as a modal adverb in these positions, but is preferred in Medial position through the eighteenth century, according to the CLMETEV data. No instances at RP are attested in my data before 1710. However, in CLMETEV I (1710–1780) six examples were found at RP.

The functions exemplified in CLMETEV I are similar to those identified by Downing (2001), except that at LP *surely* is more strongly epistemic than in Present Day English. This is especially clear when it is repeated as in (13):

(13)   Yet **surely, surely**, these were famous men!
(1733–4 Pope, *Essay on Man*; [CL I])

(13) is intersubjective. Here and elsewhere *surely, surely* is used in argumentation, addressing an imaginary reader (or the self as interlocutor).

Frequently there is a response to *surely*, especially if it is used as a challenge as in (14):

(14)   "Why, **surely**, man, thou forgettest whom thou talkest to". "O, sir, said he, I beg your pardon!"
(1740 Richardson, *Pamela* [CL I])

At RP too we find epistemic 'I am certain', implying a call for agreement ('and you should be certain too'), hence intersubjectivity:

(15)   Usefulness is agreeable, and engages our approbation. This is a matter of fact, confirmed by daily observation. But, USEFUL? For what? For somebody's interest, **surely**. Whose interest then? Not our own only.
(1751 Hume, *Enquiry Concerning the Principles of Morals*; CL I)

One example is unlike present-day uses. It involves subjective contrast or concession introducing a *but*-clause:

(16)   there needs nothing more to give a strong presumption of falsehood. Yes, reply I, here are metaphysics **surely**; **but** they are all on your side.
(1751 Hume [CL I])

The CLMETEV data over the next two periods show that *surely* ceased to be used as in (16). Also it came to be favored at LP. There is evidence of increased use for managing interpersonal expectations, developing shared common ground (Clark 1996), seeking

uptake and corroboration by the Addressee, as in (17):

(17)　"Magsy! It isn't true, *surely*, what Mr. Wilcox says?"
　　　(1910 Forster)

In sum, *surely* is used mainly subjectively in earlier texts. However, there is an inter-subjective implicature of agreement-seeking especially with 2nd person at LP as well as RP. Clearly intersubjective, challenging meaning arose at LP and RP in the 18thC, whether or not 2nd person is explicitly mentioned in the text.

5.2.　*No doubt*

　　Like *surely*, *no doubt* is derived from French (ultimately from Latin *dubitare* 'to waver'). Borrowed c.1300 it was used to mean 'no fear' and was originally used as an NP in a formula of the type *It is no doubt (that/but), I have/make no doubt* (18).

(18)　Certes ...　　it　　nys ***no doute*** that it nys right worthy　　to ben
　　　'Certainly …　there is　no doubt that it is　very honorable to be
　　　reverenced.[8]
　　　respected'
　　　(?a1425 (c1380) Chaucer *Bo.* (Benson-Robinson) 3.pr.9.42 [MED])

The formulae *There is no doubt, I have no doubt* are still current but *no doubt* used as an adverb meaning 'without doubt/certainly' had been used from about 1400:

(19)　***No doute***　　þei　hadde plente of þis oynement.
　　　'No question, they had　plenty of this ointment'
　　　(c1400 *Bk.Mother* (Bod 416) 140/18 [MED])

Here it is subjective and signals high certainty. Use at LP from the earliest attestations may be due to the origins of the adverb in the formulae, which typically precede the proposition (Simon-Vandenbergen 2007). There has been no "movement toward a loosely attached pre-front field" such as Aijmer (2007) proposed.

　　No doubt is consistently used rather differently from *surely*. Even if used in address to a second person, no uptake is expected (or provided). In (20) John comments on the preceding utterance, and continues with an explanation:

(20)　'My son, sir, is upon his patrole.'
　　　'I thought I saw him looking through the corner window but this moment,' said Mr Chester, who naturally thought that being on patrole, implied walking about somewhere.

---

[8] In Middle English negative concord was the norm, especially after negated negatively oriented lexical items such as *doubt, forget*.

> '*No doubt* you did, sir,' returned John. 'He is upon his patrole of honour, sir, not to leave the premises'.
> (1812 Dickens, *Barnaby Rudge*, CL II)

Indeed, *no doubt* when used as in (20) appears to foreclose interaction. In this sense it could be regarded as marginally intersubjective, but the orientation is toward the Speaker's own line of argument, not toward Addressee, so I consider it to be subjective. (21) is a particularly good example, since the whole discourse is an attempt to silence the Addressee. First, the Speaker suggests the Addressee has nothing to say, then he says he is sure "the matter" is happily settled for 'her'. By contrast *surely* here would imply that the Speaker is open to the Addressee continuing the discussion further.

(21) Why, ... what signifies all you say? The matter's over with her, *no doubt*; and she likes it.
(1740 Richardson, *Pamela* [CL I])

One of the main uses of *no doubt* is to mark stages in a reasoned argument. This is particularly clear when *no doubt* is linked with *but* to imply a concessive argument. In this use *no doubt* means 'I grant that', and *but* means 'however':[9]

(22) a. The son and heir is a promising child nearly the age of my Arthur, and *no doubt* a source of some hope and comfort to his father; *but* the other, a little girl between one and two, ... he probably keeps from conscientious motives alone.
(1848 Anne Brontë, *The Tenant of Wildfell Hall* [CL II])

b. "What you say is very true, *no doubt*"; replied Mr Carson; "*but* how would you bring it to bear upon the masters' conduct—on my particular case?"; added he, gravely.
(1848 Gaskell, *Mary Barton* [CL III])

This kind of concessive use was attested once with *surely* in CLMETEV I (16), but not subsequently, whereas *no doubt* appears with different variants of this use throughout the whole corpus, and with increasing frequency over time. It is one of the uses identified for present day English in Simon-Vandenbergen (2007). While concessive *but* in examples like (22) is by hypothesis connected historically to the use of *but* as a subordinating complementizer in formulae such as *I have no doubt but*, it is used as a coordinator in concessive constructions with *no doubt*.

In sum, *no doubt* is primarily subjective at LP and RP; it signals personal inference and assessment, hence use in concessives. It has none of the rhetorical agreement-seek-

---

[9] Whether there is a period, semi-colon, or commas does not matter. The pragmatics of the discourse is concessive.

ing of *surely*, so (23) would be odd, indeed incoherent. Compare the original in (1) again where *no doubt* and *surely* in that order reflect orientation first inward-to-Speaker and then outward-to-Addressee:

(23) ##Whereupon, he wished me a good morning and withdrew, disconcerted and offended, ***surely***; but ***no doubt*** it was not my fault.

5.3.　*Similarities and differences*

Both *surely* and *no doubt* are in their origins both epistemic adverbs of certainty ultimately borrowed from French expressions in the fourteenth century. Both appear at RP after 1710 in my data, and both have highly pragmatic uses at LP and RP. There are, however, significant differences.

For one, *surely* outnumbers *no doubt* throughout, though the gap between them diminishes (there are 327 instances of *surely* (used at LP, Medial, and RP) in CLMETEV I compared to 759 in CLMETEV III, but 143 of *no doubt* in CLMETEV I compared to 557 in CLMETEV III). *Surely* is favored at LP except in CLMETEV I where it appears slightly more frequently at Medial position. *No doubt* is favored at Medial position throughout CLMETEV. This reflects lower use of *no doubt* for pragmatic functions.

6.　Conclusion

This paper started out with three questions:

Q1　What changes in the function of the adverbs *surely* and *no doubt* are attested? Both adverbs initially were manner adverbs; both were recruited first to use as epistemic adverbs and then to use as pragmatic epistemic linkers. This is similar to changes attested for *indeed, in fact*, and *actually*.

Q2　Are the changes correlated with subjectification and intersubjectification? Epistemic adverb and pragmatic linking uses clearly show subjectification. In the case of *surely*, linking uses also show significant Addressee orientation, hence intersubjectification. To what extent any or all of *indeed, in fact*, and *actually* are used intersubjectively remains to be investigated.

Q3　Most importantly for this paper, are there predictable correlations between the resulting functions of the two adverbs, (inter-)subjectivity, and position at left or right periphery of the clause? Here the answer is No as far as the modals studied are concerned. *Surely* may be used intersubjectively at both LP and RP, while *no doubt* appears not to be used truly intersubjectively in either position. Therefore position alone does not predict a division of labor between subjective and intersubjective meaning. In most cases stance markers are multifunctional. Like Japanese pragmatic markers, *surely* and *no doubt* suggest a relatively weak hypothesis is needed about correlations between prag-

matic markers, (inter)-subjectivity, and position, and that subjective and inter-subjective markers may appear at either edge of a proposition. Which stance is favored in which position is a characteristic of individual modal expressions, not of position.

Nevertheless, it does appear that some correlations between (inter)subjectivity and position are cross-linguistically robust. These have to do with information-structuring, specifically the correlations between subjectivity and topic. Future research is needed to establish what slots are available "outside" the proposition cross-linguistically, and whether there are correlations between (inter)subjectivity and any of the slots. For example, by hypothesis, addressing an Addressee by name, e.g. Alice, in *Well, Alice, you can surely be home on time*, is always an intersubjective use, whether at left or right periphery.

Electronic Sources cited

BNC *The British National Corpus.* 2005. Distributed by Oxford University Computing Services on behalf of the BNC Consortium. http://www.natcorp.ox.ac.uk/.

CL/CLMETEV. *The Corpus of Late Modern English Texts, Extended Version,* 1710−1920, compiled by Hendrik de Smet. https://perswww. kuleuven.be/~u0044428/clmet.htm.

FLOB *Freiburg-LOB Corpus of English.* http://www.helsinki.fi/varieng/CoRD/corpora/FLOB/.

HC. *Helsinki Corpus of English Texts, Diachronic Part.* Compiled by Matti Rissanen, Merja Kytö, Leena Kahlas-Tarkka, Matti Kilpiö, Saara Nevanlinna, Irma Taavitsainen, Terttu Nevalainen, Helena Raumolin-Brunberg. Available from The Oxford Text Archive. ICAME International Computer Archive of Modern and Medieval English. http://icame.uib.no/.

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

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

References

Aikhenvald, Alexandra Y. 2004. *Evidentiality.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Aijmer, Karin. 1996. "*I think* — an English Modal Particle." In Toril Swan and Olaf Jansen Westvik (eds.) *Modality in Germanic Languages: Historical and Comparative Perspectives,* 1−47. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

Aijmer, Karin. 2007. "The Interface between Discourse and Grammar: *The fact is that.*" In Agnès Celle and Ruth Huart (eds.) *Connectives as Discourse Landmarks,* 31−46. Amsterdam: Benjamins.

Beeching, Kate, Liesbeth Degand, Ulrich Detges, Elizabeth Close Traugott, and Richard Waltereit. 2009. Summary of the Workshop on Meaning in Diachrony at the Conference on Meaning in Interaction, University of the West of England, Bristol, April 23−25.

Benveniste, Émile. 1971 [1958]. "Subjectivity in Language." In *Problems in General Linguistics,* 223−230, trans. by Mary Elizabeth Meek. Coral Gables: FL: University of Miami Press.

(First published in 1971 as De la subjectivité dans le langage. In Émile Benveniste, *Problèmes de Linguistique Générale*, 258‒266. Paris: Gallimard.)

Biber, Douglas and Edward Finegan. 1988. "Adverbial Stance Types in English." *Discourse Processes* 11, 1‒34.

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

Blakemore, Diane. 1987. *Semantic Constraints on Relevance.* Oxford: Blackwell.

Breban, Tine. 2006. "Grammaticalization and Subjectification of the English Adjectives of General Comparison." In Angelika Athanasiadou, Costas Canakis, and Bert Cornillie (eds.) *Subjectification: Various Paths to Subjectivity,* 241‒278. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

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

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

Clark, Herbert H. 1996. *Using Language.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Degand, Liesbeth and Benjamin Fagard. 2011. "*Alors* between Discourse and Grammar: The Role of Syntactic Position." *Functions of Language* 18, 29‒56.

Degand, Liesbeth and Anne-Marie Simon-Vandenbergen. (eds.) 2011a. *Grammaticalization, Pragmaticalization and/or (Inter)Subjectification: Methodological Issues for the Study of Discourse Markers.* Thematic issue. *Linguistics* 49:2.

Degand, Liesbeth and Anne-Marie Simon-Vandenbergen. 2011b. "Introduction: Grammaticalization and (Inter)subjectification of Discourse Markers." In Degand and Simon-Vandenbergen (eds.), 287‒294.

De Smet, Hendrik and Jean-Christophe Verstraete. 2006. "Coming to Terms with Subjectivity." *Cognitive Linguistics* 17, 365‒392.

Detges, Ulrich and Richard Waltereit. 2011. *Moi, je ne sais pas* vs. *je ne sais pas, moi.* French tonic pronouns in the left vs. right periphery. Abstract of paper presented at IPra, Manchester, July 2011.

Downing, Angela. 2001. "'Surely you knew!' *Surely* as a Marker of Evidentiality and Stance." *Functions of Language* 8, 253‒285.

Downing, Angela. 2002. "Evaluating Evaluation." *Estudios Ingleses de la Universidad Complutense* 10, 283‒300.

Eckardt, Regine. 2006. *Meaning Change in Grammaticalization: An Enquiry into Semantic Reanalysis.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Engelbretson, Robert. 2007. "Stance-taking in Discourse: An Introduction." In Robert Englebretson (ed.) *Stance-Taking in Discourse: Subjectivity, Evaluation, Interaction,* 1‒12. Amsterdam: Benjamins.

Greenbaum, Sidney. 1969. *Studies in English Adverbial Usage.* London: Arnold.

Hansen, Maj-Britt Mosegaard. 2008. *Particles at the Semantics/Pragmatics Interface: Synchronic and Diachronic Issues: A Study with Special Reference to the French Phasal Adverbs.* Amsterdam: Elsevier.

Huang, Shuanfan. 2000. "The Story of Heads and Tails—On a Sequentially Sensitive Lexicon." *Language and Linguistics* 1:1, 79‒107 (Institute of Linguistics, Academia Sinica).

Kroch, Anthony S. 1989. "Reflexes of Grammar in Patterns of Language Change." *Language Variation and Change* 1, 199‒244.

Langacker, Ronald W. 1990. "Subjectification." *Cognitive Linguistics* 1, 5–38.

Langacker, Ronald W. 2006. "Subjectification, Grammaticalization, and Conceptual Archetypes." In Athanasiadou, Canakis, and Cornillie (eds.), 17–40.

Langacker, Ronald W. 2007. "Constructing the Meaning of Personal Pronouns." In Günter Radden, Klaus-Michael Köpcke, and Thomas Berg (eds.) *Aspects of Meaning Construction*, 171–187. Amsterdam: Benjamins.

Langacker, Ronald W. 2009. "A Constructional Approach to Grammaticization." *Investigations in Cognitive Grammar*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

Lenker, Ursula. 2000. "*Soþlice* and *witodlice*: Discourse Markers in Old English." In Olga Fischer, Anette Rosenbach, and Dieter Stein (eds.) *Pathways of Change: Grammaticalization in English,* 229–249. Amsterdam: Benjamins.

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

López-Couso, María José. 2010. "Subjectification and Intersubjectification." In Andreas H. Jucker and Irma Taavitsainen (eds.) *Historical Pragmatics,* 127–163. Berlin: de Gruyter Mouton.

Nicolle, Steve. 1998. "A Relevance Theory Perspective on Grammaticalisation." *Cognitive Linguistics* 9, 1–35.

Onodera, Noriko O. 2004. *Japanese Discourse Markers: Synchronic and Diachronic Discourse Analysis.* Amsterdam: Benjamins.

Onodera, Noriko O. and Ryoko Suzuki. (eds.) 2007. *Historical Changes in Japanese: Subjectivity and Intersubjectivity.* Thematic Issue of *Journal of Historical Pragmatics* 8:2.

Schiffrin, Deborah. 1987. *Discourse Markers.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Simon-Vandenbergen, Anne-Marie. 2007. "*No doubt* and Related Expressions: A Functional Account." In Mike Hannay and Gerard J. Steen (eds.) *Structural-Functional Studies in English Grammar,* 9–34. Amsterdam: Benjamins.

Simon-Vandenbergen, Anne-Marie and Karin Aijmer. 2007. *The Semantic Field of Modal Certainty: A Corpus-based Study of English Adverbs.* Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

Smirnova, Elena. 2009. "(Sub)classifying Subjectivity." Paper presented at the Nineteenth International Conference on Historical Linguistics, Nijmegen, August 2009.

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

Tottie, Gunnel and Sebastian Hoffmann. 2006. "Tag Questions in British and American English." *Journal of English Linguistics* 34, 283–311.

Traugott, Elizabeth Closs. 1982. "From Propositional to Textual and Expressive Meanings: Some Semantic-pragmatic Aspects of Grammaticalization." In W. P. Lehmann and Yakov Malkiel (eds.) *Perspectives on Historical Linguistics,* 245–271. Amsterdam: Benjamins.

Traugott, Elizabeth Closs. 1989. "On the Rise of Epistemic Meanings in English: An Example of Subjectification in Semantic Change." *Language* 65, 31–55.

Traugott, Elizabeth Closs. 2010. "Revisiting Subjectification and Intersubjectification." In Kristin Davidse, Lieven Vandelanotte, and Hubert Cuyckens (eds.) *Subjectification, Intersubjectification and Grammaticalization,* 29–70. Berlin: de Gruyter Mouton.

Traugott, Elizabeth Closs. Forthcoming. "Intersubjectification and Clause Periphery." In Lieselotte Brems, Lobke Ghesquière, and Freek Van de Velde (eds.) Thematic issue of *English Text Construction* 5 (April/May 2012).

Traugott, Elizabeth Closs and Richard B. Dasher. 2002. *Regularity in Semantic Change.* Cam-

bridge: Cambridge University Press.

Van linden, An, Jean-Christophe Verstraete and Hubert Cuyckens. 2008. "The Semantic Development of *essential* and *crucial*. Paths to Deontic Meaning." *English Studies* 89, 226‒247.

Visconti, Jacqueline. Forthcoming. "Facets of Subjectification." In Muriel Norde, Alexandra Lenz, and Karin Beijering (eds.) *Current Trends in Grammaticalization Research.* Thematic issue of *Language Sciences.*

White, P. R. R. 2003. "Beyond Modality and Hedging: A Dialogic View of the Language of Intersubjective Stance." *Text* 23, 259‒284.

Yap, Foong Ha, Stephen Matthews, and Kaoru Horie. 2004. "From Pronominalizer to Pragmatic Marker: Implications for Unidirectionality from a Cross-linguistic Perspective." In Olga Fischer, Muriel Norde, and Harry Perridon (eds.) *Up and down the Cline—The Nature of Grammaticalization,* 137‒168. Amsterdam: Benjamins.