

INTERVIEW WITH ELIZABETH CLOSS TRAUOGOTT AND GRAEME TROUSDALE*ENTREVISTA COM ELIZABETH CLOSS TRAUOGOTT E GRAEME TROUSDALE**Karen Sampaio Braga Alonso¹**Diego Leite de Oliveira²*

Since the last decade, many books and papers have been published in the field of Language Change, under a Functional-Cognitive approach. Among these contributions, the book *Constructionalization and Constructional Change* (TRAUGOTT & TROUSDALE, 2013) became a must read to those who work or intent to work on constructions from a diachronic perspective. The authors, Elizabeth Traugott and Graeme Trousdale, brought out to the audience a thought-provoking book about how new constructions are coined in language throughout the centuries. For that, they establish a difference between constructionalization and constructional changes, considering the former as the creation of a new construction and the latter as changes in the form or in the meaning of an existing construction.

In Brazil, and all over the world, the book gained popularity and figured in the center of a rich debate concerning the conciliation between *construction grammar*, a theoretical model about the speaker's knowledge of language, and *language change*, which goes beyond the individual's lifespan. For those who adopted the concepts of the book and or criticized some of the definitions and understandings presented by the authors, there are still several open questions regarding a diachronic approach to grammar.

In the wake of this debate, we are very happy to have interviewed Elizabeth Traugott (Professor Emerita at Stanford University) and Graeme Trousdale (Professor at The University of Edinburgh) to celebrate ten years of the publication of *Constructionalization and Language Change*. In this interview, you will be able to follow the way the authors see the work of 2013, how they dialogue with the criticisms received and how they understand language change in 2023.

REVISTA LINGUÍSTICA: Ten years ago, you published *Constructionalization and Constructional Changes*. From that time on, this book has been considered one of the main contributions to offer a systemic framework for approaching language change, from a usage-based constructionist perspective. It gained popularity and is still being used and cited by several scholars dedicated to the study of language change all around the world, including Brazil. So, we would like to go back a decade and ask you to talk about the motivations, expectations, and discussion involved in the preparation of that book.

¹ Universidade Federal do Rio de Janeiro (UFRJ), karensampaio@letras.ufrj.br, <http://orcid.org/0000-0002-7853-0015>.

² Universidade Federal do Rio de Janeiro (UFRJ), diegooliveira@letras.ufrj.br, <http://orcid.org/0000-0003-0601-4131>.

ELIZABETH TRAUOGOTT AND GRAEME TROUSDALE: We have provided individual responses to this first question, to begin with, and have then written something on our joint influences and our collaboration prior to and during the writing of Traugott and Trousdale (2013, hereafter T&T, 2013).

ELIZABETH TRAUOGOTT: For me, my interest in Construction Grammar (CxG) was primarily that it provided not only a way to think about form and meaning at the same time, but actually required the dual focus, something which the model of grammaticalization that I was working with before did not (although it allowed analysis in terms of form and function, it did not require it). Furthermore, a constructional approach allows investigation into a larger range of linguistic structures, such as ditransitives like *I gave the boys muffins for breakfast*. Croft's (2001) proposal that a construction is a unit with two sets of components, one form, one meaning, united by a symbolic link between the sets, provided a way of talking about how components of a unit could change independently. That said, my early work was heavily influenced by grammaticalization. For me a key conference was one organized by Alexander Bergs and Gabriele Diewald, papers from which appear in Bergs and Diewald (2008), but it was not until the 2008 New Reflections on Grammaticalization (NRG) conference in Leuven that Graeme talks about below (TRAUGOTT and TROUSDALE, 2010) that I fully understood how different the questions asked in the one model and the other are and could relatively free myself from thinking in terms of grammaticalization. Grammaticalization asks how a grammatical unit (what Joan Bybee and her colleagues called a "gram") comes into being), while a historical constructional approach asks how a construction comes into being!

GRAEME TROUSDALE: For me, the motivation for the book came initially from attending a talk that Elizabeth gave at the University of Edinburgh in 2004, and thinking more about Brinton and Traugott (2005), particularly the ways in which that book articulated similarities and differences between grammaticalization and lexicalization. I was keen to think about a framework that had a uniform treatment of the 'outputs' of both of these processes, and was also working with a PhD student, Takeshi Koike, who was interested in the diachronic dimensions of Langacker's Cognitive Grammar, particularly in relation to the loss of various functions of the genitive in the transition from Old to Middle English. This led me to CxG and the loss of impersonal structures in English, how the CxG framework might be used to explain shifts from lexical to structural case, and how this might link up to grammaticalization. Running through all of this was another strand, which is to do with the link between gradience and gradualness in language change (e.g. the gradual loss of functions of the genitive in English, and how that is reflected as gradience in a synchronic slice of the language in the Middle English period). Elizabeth and I shared ideas on these and related topics at a number of conferences and workshops in the mid 2000s, and we decided to collaborate by running a workshop on gradience and gradualness at the NRG conference in Leuven in 2008, which led to the publication of Traugott and Trousdale (2010). At that same conference, we talked further with Muriel

Norde about degrammaticalization, and it was really from that point that the focus was on trying to see if CxG could provide a principled way of talking about the similarities and differences between grammaticalization, lexicalization and degrammaticalization. We had independently been working on different English data sets (e.g. Elizabeth on quantifiers and clefts, Graeme on possessive marking and composite predicates), so we decided to see what a further collaborative effort might produce.

ELIZABETH TRAUOGOTT AND GRAEME TROUSDALE: In the 2010s we were both also greatly influenced by other work in grammaticalization studies (particularly Nikolas Himmelmann's (2004) work on grammaticalization as context expansion and reduction, Christian Lehmann's (1988) work on clause combining, the various projects happening at KU Leuven, developed by Hubert Cuyckens, Kristin Davidse and their doctoral students at the time, such as Tine Breban, Hendrik De Smet and Peter Petré (see e.g. BREBAN, 2010; DE SMET, 2013 and PETRÉ, 2014), and new work in diachronic studies informed by cognitive linguistics (such as HILPERT, 2008, 2013). While we did not agree with all of the ideas that were proposed, it was a very fertile period for research on usage-based approaches to language change. In discussing the work of these and other scholars, and in thinking about our interpretation of the data from the history of English with which we had been working, we decided to try to answer the following question. We assumed that language is indeed organized as construction grammarians suggest, i.e. as a network of form-function pairings, shared across a group of speakers; how, then, are we to understand the similarities and differences between changes that have been characterized as grammaticalization, lexicalization and degrammaticalization? That is the question at the heart of T&T (2013). That book was never intended as a 'manual' for how to conduct work in diachronic construction grammar (not least because it said little about the quantitative dimension which characterized much new research in that area). Indeed, the question as formulated above is important for how we hoped the book would be read – it takes constructions as given, and then asks how we understand particular processes of language change; a different kind of DCxG book might have started with the processes, and then asked whether this is evidence that supports the claim that what speakers know when they know a language is the constructions of that language. Of course, these two things are related, but we think it is important to stress that we saw the book as primarily a contribution to historical linguistics, and secondarily to theories of representation of linguistic knowledge.

REVISTA LINGÜÍSTICA: In 2013, you described constructionalization as the creation of form_{new}-meaning_{new} (combinations of) signs, forming new type nodes which have new syntax or morphology and new coded meaning, in the linguistic network of a population of speakers. From that time on, several linguists have used this conception and this definition in attesting to or positing the emergence of new constructions. On the other hand, this definition has been discussed, reviewed, and criticized by some researchers who argue that the distinction between constructionalization and constructional changes is not easy to draw, or that this distinction, although theoretically viable, does

not hold empirically (cf. BÖRJARS; VINCENT and WALKDEN, 2015; HILPERT, 2021). How do you see the impact of the T&T 2013 proposal on diachronic studies in construction grammar and how your current studies have benefited from the dialogue with people who are thinking about linguistic change in Construction Grammar, especially regarding the constructionalization approach?

ELIZABETH TRUGOTT AND GRAEME TROUSDALE: Your question asks about the impact of T&T (2013) on DCxG, but as we noted above, we hoped T&T (2013) would make a contribution to recent developments in historical linguistics, especially the relationship between ideas from DCxG and work on grammaticalization and related changes. From that historical linguistic perspective, we tried to understand two specific things:

- (a) how a construction comes into being
- (b) whether the development of constructions with different functions (e.g. grammatical vs. lexical) is similar or different along a set of parameters (namely schematicity, productivity and compositionality)

Clearly other linguistics researchers have different but related questions, and we have profited from the dialogue before during and since writing the book.

Your question has two main parts – first, what we consider the impact of T&T (2013) on the field to be, and second, our reaction to the reception of the book. We think the best way to advance knowledge is to share and discuss ideas with others, some of whom are more aligned to your way of thinking, and some of whom are very much not so aligned. This means that we have welcomed and learned from the various scholars who responded to some of our ideas, especially those who had many critical questions about what was proposed. Probably the most contentious idea in the book is the notion of constructionalization itself. A main aim of the book was to try to come up with a workable characterization of constructionalization. We felt that such a characterization was inevitable for a book that took (as we stated above) the basic principles of Goldberg’s usage-based CxG as a given, e.g. that speakers know constructions. There has certainly been some spirited debate around whether our characterization was workable, and even useful for thinking about the different ways in which constructions can change.

In terms of influencing other research, we feel that it is up to others to say whether they consider T&T (2013) to have had an impact on their thinking. But we hope that we were able to encourage researchers to rethink grammaticalization further in the context of how constructions change, ideally in a range of languages other than English. We also hoped to provide a framework for a textual approach to DCxG (as a complement to the more widespread work on quantitative approaches in DCxG). Finally, we are both interested in how meaning is negotiated through speaker-hearer interaction³, and

³ We use ‘speaker-hearer’ as a cover term for the various kinds of interaction between producers and perceivers of language.

the consequences of this for morphosyntactic change, so we hope that the book was of interest to researchers in a sub-field of historical pragmatics.

We will say more about the second part of your question in our response to question 3, since how we have reacted to the reception of T&T (2013) is manifest in our recent research agendas (both individually and collaboratively). But we would like to underscore here our previous statement about how advancing knowledge is optimized by sharing ideas with as wide a range of other researchers as possible. Since all research builds on previous research, we have been engaged in rethinking constructionalization in particular, and DCxG in general.

REVISTA LINGÜÍSTICA: About ten years after *Constructionalization and Constructional Changes*, the term *constructionalization* has been revisited by you. More recently, you adopted a new version of it, which is *the established of a new conventionalized symbolic link between form and meaning which has been replicated across a network of language users, and which involves an addition to the constructicon*. Considering so, we would like to hear from you about the motivations and methodological implications due to this new version of constructionalization in comparison to the prior one.

ELIZABETH TRAUOGOTT AND GRAEME TROUSDALE: There have been a number of motivations for us to rethink constructionalization, but we would like to discuss two topics that we think are crucial. The first concerns developments in CxG more generally, and particularly psycholinguistic and experimental work in that field. The second is more overtly diachronic in focus, and that concerns developments in understanding what the evidence is for a new construction having come into being, and how existing constructions change.

On the first issue, psycholinguistic, theoretical and other synchronic empirical work within CxG has led to a much more permissive view of what constructions are, compared to their characterization in Goldberg (1995: 4): “C is a CONSTRUCTION iff_{def} C is a form-meaning pair $\langle F_i, S_i \rangle$ such that some aspect of F_i or some aspect of S_i is not strictly predictable from C’s component parts or from other previously established constructions”. It was this definition that influenced our initial thinking while working on T&T (2013). It foregrounded unpredictability and idiosyncrasy of form and/or function. If a construction so defined is taken as the main building block of language, a constructionally-minded historical linguist would need to identify the development of a particular configuration of form and function within a given linguistic system, showing how the system changes to accommodate innovative patterns.

More recent views – both of what the construction is (e.g. GOLDBERG, 2019) and what constructional change therefore is (e.g. HILPERT, 2021) – shift the discussion away from a linguistic system comprised of precisely defined and identifiable constructions, to more emergentist and

statistical models of linguistic knowledge, where knowing a language is essentially a process of tracking variable frequency data in interaction.

This leads to the second issue. Probably the most frequently voiced criticism of T&T (2013) from within the field of DCxG is concerned with our focus on new constructions, or how constructions come into being. Much other work in DCxG is concerned with how an existing construction changes. These are related but distinct phenomena, and connect strongly with the methods used by different researchers. It is one thing to search in a parsed corpus for a given sequence (even if that sequence is partially schematic) and track how it changes. It is quite another to establish how the given sequence came to be in the first place. The *way*-construction is a good example. It is possible to search for sequences of the type [V POSS *way* PP] to establish which Vs appear in the construction and at what period, and to establish changes in the path denoted by the PP. But what, precisely, do you search for to find out how the sequence [V POSS *way* PP] comes to have a non-compositional meaning? How do you establish and delimit what the input constructions are prior to the creation of the *way*-construction, and what discourse contexts might be relevant for the development of a particular meaning? Both seeking to understand how a construction comes into being and seeking to understand how an existing construction is modified have value. Both are revealing about our capacity for language and why language changes. But both have very different methods, and ask questions about different stages of change.

Both of these (sets of) developments have been important influences in our recent work. New research in DCxG has foregrounded the architecture of the constructional network (DIESSEL, 2019; HILPERT, 2021), and the shift in focus from the ‘nodes’ to ‘links between nodes’. Much of this work is still relatively new in DCxG, but we agree that a clearer understanding of the nature of the language network will be fruitful for further research. In our new characterization, we were thinking about three different aspects of the network, as follows.

1. We wanted to draw more attention to the link that exists between form and function. In other words, we were keen to reconceptualize constructionalization as involving a new conventionalized way of connecting linguistic form and meaning (broadly construed). This new configuration is a new resource for language users which they can deploy in communication. The form-function link is important, because it serves to identify how a portion of meaning space is connected to a formal configuration. By focusing on this particular kind of link, we do not mean to ignore other links that are important in constructional change (e.g. the various links that demonstrate collocational tendencies between constructions, or the associative links that exist between related constructions). However, the link we have focused on is rather different from other kinds of links, because it is symbolic. In Ronald Langacker’s work (e.g. LANGACKER, 1987), lexical items and grammatical structures are understood as symbolic assemblies. A critical feature of symbolic links is that they are something which groups of speakers come to agree on (i.e. they are conventionalized as a result of speaker-hearer interaction). This recognizes that

constructions are the product of change, not innovation, as they are conventional and arise as a result of practices of groups of speakers (a topic we return to below in our response to your question about innovation and change).

2. We therefore also wanted to draw attention to the idea that membership of the construct-i-con must change as a result of constructionalization. However the construct-i-con is conceived – whether it includes knowledge of how to combine constructions, for instance – our updated characterization is an attempt to underline the idea that membership of the construct-i-con must change over time. It is not merely a case of existing constructions changing: in such a scenario, membership of the construct-i-con would never change, since all that would happen is that existing constructions would vary in some dimension of their form or function. And it is clear that at least at some level, there must be additions to and loss from the construct-i-con, understood as a shared, communal resource. New lexical constructions (e.g. contemporary English *blog*) appear and old ones (e.g. Old English *eaxlgestealla* lit. shoulder.comrade ‘bosom buddy’) disappear. If such constructions can appear and disappear from the construct-i-con over time, then we have no reason to suspect that other more complex and schematic constructions should behave any differently, given the idea that knowing a language means knowing the constructions of that language. This connects closely to work on change in argument structure constructions (e.g. ZEHENTNER and TRAUGOTT, 2020 on the English ditransitive and related constructions) and raises interesting questions about what it is precisely that speakers know. In the case of Zehentner and Traugott (2020), for example, that research raises questions about whether speaker knowledge includes knowledge of allostructions only, constructemes only, or both.
3. As we have discussed above, much of our work is in the textual analytic subarea of DCxG, and this work in the more textual domain has been important in the reconceptualization. Elizabeth has recently published a book on DCxG and the development of discourse structuring markers (DSMs; see further the response to the final question in this interview), and the conference paper in which the new characterization of constructionalization was introduced was about the DSM *by the way* (TROUSDALE and TRAUGOTT, 2021). Discourse structuring was not something that we covered in detail in T&T (2013). Our shift in thinking about DCxG was in part in recognition of the need for a clearer discussion of textual factors (and the relationship between discourse structuring and morphosyntax).

REVISTA LINGUÍSTICA: Diachronic Construction Grammar became a very fruitful field in the general framework of Construction Grammar, dedicated to language change (T&T, 2013; HILPERT, 2013, 2021; PETRÉ, 2014; BARÐDAL et al 2015; SOMMERER, 2018; SOMMERER & SMIRNOVA, 2020). As a new field, it of course faces some challenges, such as the definition of its exact object, the difference between Diachronic Construction Grammar and Grammaticalization Theory, or the problem of how to suit the changes empirically attested in a feasible network model (cf HILPERT, 2018; SOMMERER & SMIRNOVA, 2020). Considering that, what are, in your opinion, the main open questions of Usage-based Diachronic Construction Grammar?

ELIZABETH TRUGOTT AND GRAEME TROUSDALE: We think there are many questions that are worth exploring within the field of DCxG, but if we had to narrow down the list, we would consider these questions to be potentially very fruitful lines of enquiry.

1. How is our understanding of DCxG enhanced by looking at a wider variety of languages, from a wider range of language families? William Croft's work, both on language change generally (CROFT, 2000), and on Radical Construction Grammar (CROFT, 2001), has always had a typological focus, and understood patterns of language change with that comparative perspective at the fore. Such data, however, often comes from grammars of lesser studied languages, or from comparative reconstruction. This is in contrast with other work in historical linguistics, especially work in what might be called the textual tradition (tracking changes over time in languages with an extensive historical record), which itself is being rethought in the light of data from computerized corpora. Nevertheless, much of what is theorized about language change comes from a very small fraction of the world's languages (and often from an even smaller fraction of the varieties of those languages).
2. We have identified (at least two) different strands of research in DCxG. One is concerned primarily with understanding the development of constructions in particular textual uses, investigating discourse can shape form-function associations. Another sees (diachronic) corpora as reflections of community knowledge, which enable the researcher to provide careful quantitative analysis of, for example, frequency changes and collocations. Do these different perspectives in DCxG complement each other (and are thus mutually reinforcing) or are we in a position where we have two distinct approaches that are addressing different things? What do these two approaches, separately and together, tell us about how knowledge of constructions can change?
3. Relatedly, what is the extent of change in 'knowledge of constructions'? Until recently there has been a focus on change to the 'internal structure' of constructions (the 'nodes' of the constructional network), trying to understand how changes affect generalizations across constructional types (schematization) or how slots in constructions change (e.g. the changes to the V-slot in the *way*-construction). Much less has been said about changes to knowledge about which constructions can combine with one another, and what constraints there are on such combinations. This requires a greater focus on the 'links' of the constructional network. How do such links change, and is change in links of the same type as change in nodes?
4. What is DCxG's take on phonological change? Joan Bybee's work on phonological change (particularly on the role of exemplars in phonological change) has clear connections with principles of constructional change, as Bybee herself has indicated (e.g. BYBEE, 2013). But the treatment of phonological change has largely been studied independently of constructions. In other words, while 'phonological properties' have been considered part of the structural organization of constructions, hardly any attention has been paid in the DCxG literature as to how those properties change, and what their relation is to other kinds of language change. There is considerable work on usage-based approaches to

phonology, especially in the field of Laboratory Phonology, with its focus on synchronic gradience, but the connections between usage-based approaches to grammatical (i.e. morphosyntactic change) and to phonological change have not been widely explored within the framework of DCxG.

REVISTA LINGUÍSTICA: Considering that *innovation* and *change* are key concepts for the study of the dynamics of language change and that sometimes is difficult to establish a threshold between them, could you please enlighten us about the difference between those two concepts and the importance of them to the usage-based approach to language change as well?

We see the distinction between innovation and change as connected to the distinction between individuals and groups of individuals. We see innovation as an alteration to linguistic representation in the mind of an individual, and language change as an alteration to the linguistic behaviour of more than one individual. Importantly, both innovations and changes happen as a result of interaction between individuals, and both innovations and changes can be short-lived or ‘unsuccessful’. Many linguists tend to be interested in relatively ‘successful’ changes, especially those that have shaped standard languages with a rich textual history, because the various stages can be tracked, whether qualitatively or quantitatively, in (edited versions of) manuscripts or computerized corpora. But ‘success’ is just a matter of degree, and of repetition, and successful alterations are of no more theoretical interest than unsuccessful or limited ones (though successful changes (not innovations) will be of interest from a sociolinguistic perspective). A ‘successful’ innovation is one that is relatively more entrenched in the mind of an individual than an ‘unsuccessful’ one is. A ‘successful’ change is one that has come to characterize the behaviour of a wider social group of individuals than an ‘unsuccessful’ one has.

We have given this reasonably sharp distinction between innovation and change because we want to be clear on what we think the relevant scope of enquiry is. We are not suggesting that there is not a connection between innovation and change – as we noted above, interaction is at the heart of both processes, and Schmid (2020) articulates the relationship extremely well in his ‘entrenchment-and-conventionalization’ model. Furthermore, we are probably not aligned with most of the researchers in the emergentist tradition in making the distinction between innovation and change in the way that we do, because changes in representations are difficult to implement in a model where there is no representation to speak of. In the emergentist model, presumably innovation and change both relate to frequency changes, the former measured through experiments in terms of differences in behaviour by individual subjects, the latter measured through corpus searches in terms of differences in profiles across sets of subjects or texts.

In response to your asking about the main ‘open questions’ of DCxG above, we mentioned that we see constructions as the product of change, not innovation, because constructions involve a symbolic link, and symbols are by definition conventional and thus shared. An important, and perhaps overlooked, consequence of this claim is that individual speakers do not ‘know’ constructions. They

do know pairings of form and meaning, and these may be entrenched (accessed as a unit). But these may also be highly idiosyncratic to the idiolect. Certainly these unit-like pairings of form and meaning might well be shared with at least one other speaker (in which case they are constructions), but until they are shared, they cannot be constructions, by definition.

REVISTA LINGUÍSTICA TO GRAEME: In 2022, you gave the online conference ‘Functionalism and Change in the language network’ at the International Seminar of Functional Linguistics. On that occasion, you adopted Word Grammar approach to address language change. That was a very thoughtful talk and, as such, we would like to ask you to talk a little bit more about the claim: *Word Grammar deals better with the language network than Construction Grammar*.

GRAEME TROUSDALE: Thank you for your kind words about my talk. WG is a theory of words, and that theory can accommodate constructions, but it does not take constructions as the basic unit of language, not least because WG is not a phrase-structure grammar. I think WG has a better articulation of the language network than CxG does. It provides a usage-based account of language (speakers build structure from tokens of use, whether that structure involves classification of words, or an understanding of the possible combinatorics of words.) Its view of the language network is dynamic (recognizing that particular words and relations between words may be more entrenched than others, and that language users are capable of storing information about specific tokens.) Crucially, it provides a formal account of language (lacking in most versions of CxG with the exception of Sign-Based Construction Grammar, which is not usage-based), which allows much greater precision in the description of how representations alter, and why some kinds of alterations might be more likely than others. It is clearly the case that speakers do make use of ‘chunking’ in the Bybeeian sense, and it is not yet clear to me quite how WG can handle such chunks (though see HUDSON, 2010 for some discussion). I think this is particularly important when it comes to the study of language change (an area which is currently under-researched in WG), because it is clear that, over time, unanalyzable chunks develop from sequences of independent words (e.g. classic cases of lexicalization such as *holiday* ‘day not spent at work’ < *halig.dæg* ‘holy day’, or *sheriff* ‘law enforcement officer’ < *scir. refa* ‘shire reeve’, as well as other cases of univerbation of forms which have a more grammatical function like *gonna*). My current work is concerned with providing a more detailed treatment of the nature of language change in WG, especially in connection to changes of relations between words of various kinds, adding to the work done on the diachronic implementation of WG by Richard Hudson (HUDSON, 1997) and especially Nikolas Gisborne (e.g. GISBORNE, 2010, 2011, 2017). I hope that this research will contribute to a better understanding of the dynamics of the network in WG, and allow for some comparison with the excellent work on networks in DCxG currently being undertaken by scholars such as Holger Diessel (DIESEL, 2019), Martin Hilpert (HILPERT, 2021) and Tobias Ungerer and Stefan Hartmann (UNGERER and HARTMANN, 2023), among others.

REVISTA LINGUÍSTICA TO ELIZABETH: You have just published the book “Discourse structuring markers in English: A historical constructionalist perspective on pragmatics”. Since you are a renowned linguist in the field of Historical Linguistics and have been publishing in the area throughout your career, could you please tell us what the readers can expect from the book?

ELIZABETH TRAUOGOTT: Yes, I have been publishing about semantic change and particularly the role of pragmatic inferencing in that change for over forty years! In 1982 I published a paper in which *while* is an example. My thought then was that it was grammaticalized during the Middle English period from a subordinator, *the hwile that* ‘during the time that’, and came to be used as a coordinate connective meaning either ‘during’ or ‘although’. The concessive ‘although’ use interested me because it is subjective. The counterexpectational type of connectivity that it marks is not truth-conditional; it has no part in what Sweetser (1990) later called the “socio-physical world”; it is part of the cognitive world (SWEETSER’S “epistemic world”). At the time, objectivity was highly valued and arguing, as Lyons 1982 and Langacker 1990 did too, that subjectification was an important phenomenon was an uphill battle. I was once asked after I gave a presentation on *in fact* why I bothered with expressions that one usually edits out! Editing many of such markers out, can result in dry, sometimes incoherent discourse! It took a while for the importance of pragmatic markers of various sorts to be recognized, thanks especially in the US to work of Laurel Brinton, Bruce Fraser, and Deborah Schiffrin and in Europe by Gaétane Dostie, Maj-Britt Mosegaard Hansen, Ursula Lenker, Jacqueline Visconti, among many, many others.

Since writing the 1982 paper I have been trying to refine my understanding of ways in which semantic change may result from pragmatic inferencing, using a wide number of examples from the history of English. Fast forward to the mid 2010s, a time when I had been shifting from thinking in terms of a grammaticalization framework to a constructional one of the Adele Goldberg type. The constructional framework was particularly useful as the idea that language is made up of form-function pairings addressed one of the issues on my mind. Meaning shifts correlate with shifts in form (syntax and phonology, especially prosody), the pairing is key to understanding the histories of many expressions, and formalisms require the dual approach. I was invited to participate in a conference on digressive markers by Benjamin Fagard at CNRS and Sorbonne 3 in Paris. My paper on *by the way* for that conference (TRAUGOTT, 2020) jump-started the idea behind the book on Discourse Structuring Markers (TRAUGOTT, 2022b). And the way was paved for it by Ten Lectures that I presented via Zoom on the topic at Beihang University in Beijing at the invitation of Fuyin (Thomas) Li (TRAUGOTT, 2022a). Both the book and the Ten Lectures were products of COVID-19!

The title points to my proposal that there is a class of Discourse Structuring Markers (DSMs) in English, and probably most languages, that are used to signal coherence in discourse. I argue that a distinction needs to be made between connectives that are minimally pragmatic (*on the one hand, instead*) and those that are highly pragmatic (*but, after all, by the way*) in their contemporary uses.

I call them all DSMs. The distinction is evidenced by the histories of the highly pragmatic markers which I call Discourse Markers (DMs). All DSMs start out used in contentful lexical phrases, but some come to be used as DMs. For example, *by the way* is used as a circumstance adverbial meaning ‘in passing’, as an introduction to the equivalent of a footnote, or aside in a complex, often philosophical argument. It comes to be used as a DSM and is then generalized to other contexts in the 16thC. In the 17thC it came to be used as a hedge, or interpersonal marker.

There are a number of detailed specific studies in the book, modeled in most cases in terms of William Croft’s (2001) concept of a construction as a unit pairing with two sets of linked components, one form (syntax, morphology, phonology), the other meaning/function (semantics, pragmatics, discourse function); I show that each of these components may change over time.

A broader objective of the book is to seek to find ways to embed more pragmatics in construction grammar, as is called for by Rita Finkbeiner in a 2019 issue of the journal *Constructions and Frames*. There is also discussion of two more particular theoretical issues. One is the relationship between subjectification and intersubjectification, which has been the topic of some debate. I propose that for the set of DSMs, at least, ordering of the two processes is not relevant, because when an expression comes to be used as a DSM it is necessarily both subjectified (it expresses speaker’s stance to the text) and intersubjectified (it calls on the addressee to agree with or at least access SP’s stance). When a DSM arises, weak subjectification and intersubjectification occur simultaneously. One or the other may undergo strengthening at a later time, e.g. when *by the way* came to be used as a hedge, it underwent stronger subjectification.

The other issue addressed is how to think about position since some DSMs occur in pre-clausal, medial and final position, sometimes with different meanings. I suggest position is not a construction, adding another piece of evidence in answer to Thomas Hoffmann’s (2020) question about the robustness of Goldberg’s famous “It’s construction all the way down” (GOLDBERG, 2003, p. 223). Standard formulations of DMs are typically presented as being of the ‘Clause 1, Marker Clause 2’ type (in FRASER’S (1996 and elsewhere) notation, Segment 1, Marker Segment 2). This precludes discussion of clause-final uses, which Schiffrin (1987) pays significant attention to, and even more of medial position, the informational function of which Lenker (2014) analyzes in connection with contrastives like *however*.

The book would not have been possible without the work of many others. Graeme Trousdale inspired much of the foundational constructionalist thinking, colleagues and students have raised questions and challenged some of my hypotheses over the years in person or in print. I feel privileged to have been able to witness the flowering of a very small idea about *while* in the early 1980s into a big research question about the role of pragmatics in constructionalization. I hope the 2022b book will foster further evolution of our understanding of this question.

ELIZABETH TRAUOGOTT AND GRAEME TROUSDALE: In closing, we would like to thank you for giving us this opportunity to talk about T&T (2013) and our thinking since the book was

published. We hope that this collaborative endeavor in DCxG will continue to help to reveal patterns in the ways in which languages change.

References

- BARÐDAL, Jóhanna *et al.* (eds.). *Diachronic Construction Grammar*. Amsterdam: Benjamins, 2015.
- BERGS, Alexander; DIEWALD, Gabriele (eds.). *Constructions and Language Change*. Berlin: de Gruyter Mouton, 2008.
- BÖRJARS, Kersti; VINCENT, Nigel; WALKDEN, George. On constructing a theory of grammatical change. *Transactions of the Philological Society* 113, 2015, pp. 363-82.
- BREBAN, Tine. *English Adjectives of Comparison: Lexical and Grammaticalized Uses*. Berlin: de Gruyter Mouton, 2010.
- BRINTON, Laurel J.; TRAUGOTT, Elizabeth Closs. *Lexicalization and Language Change*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2005.
- BYBEE, Joan L. Usage-based theory and exemplar representations of constructions. In: HOFFMANN, Thomas; TROUSDALE, Graeme (eds.). *The Oxford Handbook of Construction Grammar*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2013, pp. 49-69.
- CROFT, William. *Explaining Language Change*. Harlow, Essex: Longman, Pearson Education, 2000.
- CROFT, William. *Radical Construction Grammar: Syntactic Theory in Typological Perspective*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2001.
- DE SMET, Hendrik. *Spreading Patterns: Diffusional Change in the English System of Complementation*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2013.
- DIESSEL, Holger. *The Grammar Network: How Linguistic Structure is Shaped by Language Use*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2019.
- FINKBEINER, Rita (ed.) On the role of pragmatics in Construction Grammar, special issue of *Constructions and Frames*, v. 11, n. 2, 2019.
- FRASER, Bruce. Pragmatic markers. *Pragmatics* v. 6, pp. 167-90, 1996.
- GISBORNE, Nikolas. *The Event Structure of Perception Verbs*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2010.
- GISBORNE, Nikolas. Constructions, Word Grammar, and grammaticalization. In: HOFFMANN, Thomas; TROUSDALE, Graeme (eds.). Special Issue on Variation, Change, and Construction in English, *Cognitive Linguistics* v. 22, pp. 155-82, 2011.
- GISBORNE, Nikolas. Defaulting to the new Romance synthetic future. In: GISBORNE, Nikolas; HIPPELEY, Andrew (eds.). *Defaults in Morphological Theory*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2017.
- GOLDBERG, Adele E. *Constructions: A Construction Grammar Approach to Argument Structure*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1995.

- GOLDBERG, Adele E. Constructions: A new theoretical approach to language. *Trends in Cognitive Sciences* v. 7, pp. 219-24, 2003.
- GOLDBERG, Adele E. *Explain Me This*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2019
- HILPERT, Martin. *Germanic Future Constructions: A Usage-based Approach to Language Change*. Amsterdam: Benjamins, 2008.
- HILPERT, Martin. *Constructional Change in English: Developments in Allomorphy, Word-Formation and Syntax*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2013.
- HILPERT, Martin. Three open questions in diachronic construction grammar. In: COUSSÉ, Evie; OLOFSSON, Joel; ANDERSSON, Peter (eds.). *Grammaticalization meets Construction Grammar*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 2018, pp. 22-39.
- HILPERT, Martin. *Ten Lectures on Diachronic Construction Grammar*. Leiden: Brill, 2021.
- HIMMELMANN, Nikolaus P. Lexicalization and grammaticization: Opposite or orthogonal? In: BISANG, Walter; HIMMELMANN, Nikolaus P.; WIEMER, Björn (eds.). *What Makes Grammaticalization - A Look from its Fringes and its Components*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter, 2004, pp. 21-42.
- HOFFMANN, Thomas. What would it take for us to abandon Construction Grammar? Falsifiability, confirmation bias and the future of the constructionist enterprise. *Belgian Journal of Linguistics* v. 34, pp. 149-161, 2020.
- HUDSON, Richard. The rise of auxiliary do: verb-non-raising or category strengthening? *Transactions of the Philological Society* 95, pp. 41-72, 1997.
- HUDSON, Richard. *An Introduction to Word Grammar*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2010.
- LANGACKER, Ronald W. *Foundations of Cognitive Grammar, Vol. I: Theoretical Prerequisites*. Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1987.
- LANGACKER, Ronald W. Subjectification. *Cognitive Linguistics* v. 1, pp. 5-38, 1990.
- LEHMANN, Christian. Towards a typology of clause linkage. In: HAIMAN, John; THOMPSON, Sandra A. (eds.). *Clause Combining in Discourse and Grammar*. Amsterdam: Benjamins, 1988, pp. 181-225.
- LENKER, Ursula. Knitting and splitting information: medial placement of linking adverbials in the history of English. In: PFENNINGER, Simone E. et al. (eds.). *Contact, Variation and Change in the History of English*. Amsterdam: Benjamins, 2014, pp. 11-38.
- LYONS, John. Deixis and subjectivity: Loquor, ergo sum? In: JARVELLA, Robert J.; KLEIN, Wolfgang (eds.). *Speech, Place, and Action: Studies in Deixis and Related Topics*, pp. 101-124. New York: Wiley, 1982.
- PETRÉ, Peter. *Constructions and Environments: Copular, Passive, and Related Constructions in Old and Middle English*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2014.
- SCHIFFRIN, Deborah. *Discourse Markers*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1987.
- SCHMID, Hans-Jörg. *Dynamics of a Linguistic System: Usage, Conventionalization, and Entrenchment*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2020.

SOMMERER, Lotte. *Article Emergence in Old English: A Constructionalist Perspective*. Berlin: De Gruyter Mouton, 2018.

SOMMERER, Lotte; SMIRNOVA, Elena (eds.). *Nodes and Networks in Diachronic Construction Grammar*. Amsterdam: Benjamins, 2020.

SWEETSER, Eve E. *From Etymology to Pragmatics: Metaphorical and Cultural Aspects of Semantic Structure*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1990.

TRAUGOTT, Elizabeth Closs. From propositional to textual and expressive meanings: Some semantic-pragmatic aspects of grammaticalization. In: LEHMANN, Winfred P.; MALKIEL, Yakov (eds.). *Perspectives on Historical Linguistics*, Amsterdam: Benjamins, 1982, pp. 245-71.

TRAUGOTT, Elizabeth Closs. The development of “digressive” discourse–topic shift markers in English. In: FAGARD, Benjamin; CHAROLLES, Michel (eds.). *Topic Shifters in a Contrastive Perspective*, Special issue, *Journal of Pragmatics* v. 156, pp. 121-35, 2020.

TRAUGOTT, Elizabeth Closs. *Ten lectures on a Diachronic Constructionalist Approach to Discourse Structuring Markers*. Leiden: Brill, 2022a.

TRAUGOTT, Elizabeth Closs. *Discourse Structuring Markers in English: A Historical Constructionalist Perspective on Pragmatics*. Amsterdam: Benjamins, 2022.

TRAUGOTT, Elizabeth Closs; TROUSDALE, Graeme (eds.). *Gradience, Gradualness, and Grammaticalization*. Amsterdam: Benjamins, 2010.

TRAUGOTT, Elizabeth Closs; TROUSDALE, Graeme. *Constructionalization and Constructional Changes*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2013.

TROUSDALE, Graeme. Functionalism and Change in the language network. Paper presented at the online International Seminar of Functional Linguistics (SILF VI), 24 June 2022.

TROUSDALE, Graeme; TRAUGOTT, Elizabeth Closs. Rethinking constructionalization: The history of by the way. Paper presented at ISLE 6, Jeonsuu, Finland, 2021.

UNGERER, Tobias; HARTMANN, Stefan. *Constructional Approaches, Past, Present, and Future*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2023. <https://doi.org/10.1017/9781009308717>. (Open Access)

ZEHENTNER, Eva; TRAUGOTT, Elizabeth Closs. Constructional networks and the development of benefactive ditransitives in English. In: SOMMERER, Lotte; SMIRNOVA, Elena (eds.). *Nodes and Networks in Diachronic Construction Grammar*. Amsterdam: Benjamins. 2020, pp. 168-211.