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1. Introduction

- Topic: Comparison between diachrony of stance constructions
  - containing a negative quantifier + wonder (‘no’ wonder) + proposition
  - containing a negative quantifier + chance (‘no’ chance) + situation

- Their formal properties: two formal types in PDE
  - Clausal cxns: ‘no’ + N forms part of clause
    - It’s no wonder Norwegians hunt whale. There’s nothing else left to catch. (WB)
    - For another, there was little or no chance that the National government, working with a very large Conservative majority, would be in danger of political defeat even on the matter of “appeasement”. (WBO)
  - Adverbial uses:
    - No wonder model Sophie Dahl has health problems if she has dieted down from size 16 to size 8. (WBO)
    - My coffee is always heavily laced with cream and sugar. Mother takes hers black. .... “No chance I'll get the wrong cup.” (WBO)
1. Introduction

- Their **semantic** properties: express speaker attitude
  - **no wonder**: mirative appraisal (cf. DeLancey 2011; Gentens et al. 2016) → ‘lack of surprise’
    - *It’s no wonder* Norwegians hunt whale. There’s nothing else left to catch. (WB)
  - **No wonder** model Sophie Dahl has health problems if she has dieted down from size 16 to size 8. (WBO)
  - **No chance**: modal meaning, typically epistemic, sometimes dynamic (cf. Van Linden & Brems 2017)
    - For another, there was little or **no chance** that the National government, working with a very large Conservative majority, would be in danger of political defeat even on the matter of “appeasement”. (WBO)
    - My coffee is always heavily laced with cream and sugar. Mother takes hers black. .... **“No chance I'll get the wrong cup.”** (WBO)
1. Introduction

- Their **discursive** properties: express discourse organization → speaker uses both structures to assess proposition (P) + motivates this assessment by explicit justification (J).
  - Clausal cxns:
    - *It’s no wonder* Norwegians hunt whale. *There’s nothing else left to catch.* (WB)
    - *For another, there was little or no chance that the National government, working with a very large Conservative majority, would be in danger of political defeat even on the matter of “appeasement”.* (WBO)
  - Adverbial uses:
    - *No wonder* model Sophie Dahl has health problems if she has dieted down from size 16 to size 8. (WBO)
    - *My coffee is always heavily laced with cream and sugar. Mother takes hers black. .... “No chance I’ll get the wrong cup.”* (WBO)
1. Introduction

Fits in with earlier joint work on ‘no’ + semiotic noun [doubt/question/way/wonder/need/fear/chance] + complement clause/relative clause

(Van linden, Davidse & Brems 2011; Davidse & De Wolf 2012; Davidse et al. 2014; Davidse, De Wolf & Van linden 2015; Saad et al. 2011; Brems 2015; Gentens et al. 2016; Van linden et al. 2016)

→ Role of negative polarity in grammaticalization?
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2. Diachrony of ‘no’ wonder constructions

2.1 Data

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Period</th>
<th>Subperiod</th>
<th>Extracted per subperiod</th>
<th>Relevant tokens per subperiod</th>
<th>Total extracted per period</th>
<th>Total relevant tokens per period</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Old English (750-1150)</td>
<td>Early (YCOE, 750-950)</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>807</td>
<td>113</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Late (YCOE, 950-1150)</td>
<td>696</td>
<td>83</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle English (1150-1500)</td>
<td>Early (PPCME2, 1150-1350)</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>228</td>
<td>102</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Late (PPCME2, 1350-1500)</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>58</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Modern English (1500-1920)</td>
<td>Early (PPCEME, 1500-1710)</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>1002</td>
<td>302</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Late (CLMETEV, 1710-1920)</td>
<td>905</td>
<td>279</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Present-day English (1960-2005)</td>
<td>written (WB, 1960-2005)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>428</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Present-day English (2014)</td>
<td>spoken (Jacobs 2014)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>96</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2. Diachrony of ‘no’ wonder constructions
2.2 Present-day English

• in Present-day English **adverbial** cxns of **no wonder** predominate
• 2 subtypes: distinct structural and semantic-discursive features

1. **disjunct** no wonder: typically precedes P which it qualifies  
   \[[170/235; 72%]\]
   (1) **No wonder** he was a sea captain. He stays calm in a storm. (WBO)

2. **anaphoric** no wonder: inherently follows P  
   \[[65/235; 28%]\]
   (2) And then there’s Jack Howard, recently divorced and **no wonder**. If all the 
   rumours about him are true, he’s been in enough bedrooms to qualify as a 
   top adviser for Laura Ashley furnishings. (WBO)

→ P retrieved anaphorically: adverbial “gives an instruction to include the pre-
supposed proposition in the interpretation” (Halliday & Hasan 1976: 216), e.g.
   (3) Will he be elected? – **Probably**. (‘Probably, **he will be elected.**’)
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2. Diachrony of ‘no’ wonder constructions

2.2 Present-day English

- in Present-day English **adverbial** uses of *no wonder* predominate
- 2 subtypes: distinct structural and semantic-discursive features

1. **disjunct** *no wonder*: typically precedes P which it qualifies
   
   (1) *No wonder* he was a sea captain. He stays calm in a storm. (WBO)

2. **anaphoric** *no wonder*: inherently follows P
   
   (2) And then there’s Jack Howard, recently divorced *and no wonder*. If all the rumours about him are true, he’s been in enough bedrooms to qualify as a top adviser for Laura Ashley furnishings. (WBO)

- **historically**, 2 adverbial subtypes originate in distinct **multi-clausal** cxns in Old English, persisting as infrequent variants in Present-day English
2. Diachrony of ‘no’ wonder constructions
2.2 Present-day English

- ‘no’ wonder cxns – both clausal and adverbial – instantiate 3 basic discourse schemata (DS) (most common, with minor variants)

(i) justification + mirative qualifier + proposition
[If all the rumours about Jack Howard are true, he’s been in enough bedrooms to qualify as a top adviser for Laura Ashley furnishings.]_{JUST} [It’s no wonder]_{MQ} [he recently divorced.]_{PROP}

(ii) mirative qualifier + proposition + justification
[It’s no wonder]_{MQ} [Jack Howard recently divorced]_{PROP}. [If all the rumours about him are true, he’s been in enough bedrooms to qualify as a top adviser for Laura Ashley furnishings.]_{JUST}

If all the rumours about him…_{JUST}  It’s no wonder_{MQ}  Jack Howard recently divorced_{PROP}

It’s no wonder_{MQ}  Jack Howard recently divorced_{PROP}  If all the rumours about him…_{JUST}
2. Diachrony of ‘no’ wonder constructions
2.2 Present-day English

- ‘no’ wonder cxns – both clausal and adverbial – instantiate 3 basic discourse schemata (DS) (most common, with minor variants)

(iii) proposition + (anaphoric) mirative qualifier + justification

[And then there’s Jack Howard, recently divorced]PROP [and no wonder.]MQ [If all the rumours about him are true, he’s been in enough bedrooms to qualify as a top adviser for Laura Ashley furnishings.]JUST

Jack Howard recently divorced PROP

and no wonder MQ

If all the rumours about him… JUST
2. Diachrony of ‘no’ wonder constructions
2.3 Historical development

• Old English: only multi-clausal patterns (no adverbial uses)
• **grammaticalization** of clausal expressions with *be no/what wonder*
• triggered by **negative** polarity item (NPI):
  • denies conceptually negative notion: ‘wonder’ implies ‘unexpected’
  \[ \rightarrow \text{no wonder, ‘not unexpected’, emphatic and grammaticalized} \]

  (3) *Nu cwæð se halga Beda ... þæt hit *nan wundor* nys, þæt se halga cynincg untrumnysse gehæle nu he on heofonum leofað*
  \[ \text{‘Now said Bede the Holy, ... that it is no wonder that the holy king heals weaknesses now that he lives in heaven.’} \ (YCOE 950-1050) \]

• *it is no wonder*: cannot be probed by *how much wonder is it?*
  \[ \rightarrow \text{grammaticalized, discourse secondary modifier of P} \]
  (Boye & Harder 2012)

• cp. lexical use: *How much trouble is it? It is no/much trouble.*
2. Diachrony of ‘no’ wonder constructions
2.3 Historical development

2 multi-clausal subtypes in which adverbials originate:

1. Extraposition: with finite complement clause

• 2 discourse schemata

DS (i): J + Mirative Qualifier (P)

(4) Be ðæm is awritten, Se wisa suigad, oð he ongiet ðæt him bið nyttre to sprecanne. Nis hit *nan wundur*, ðeah he swugie, & bide his timan. (YCOE, 850-950)
‘On this it is written: the wise man is silent until he thinks that it is more useful for him to speak. It is no wonder, that he is silent and waits his time.’
2. Diachrony of ‘no’ wonder constructions
2.3 Historical development

2 multi-clausal subtypes in which adverbials originate:

1. Extraposition: with finite complement clause

• 2 discourse schemata

DS (ii): MQ(P) + J

(5) Nu cwæð se halga Beda þe ðas boc gedihte, þæt hit nan wundor nys, þæt se halga cynincg untrumnyssé gehæle nu he on heofonum leofað
‘Now said Bede the Holy, who wrote the book, that it is no wonder that the holy king heals weaknesses now that he lives in heaven.’
(YCOE 950-1050)

// PDE: It’s no wonder Norwegians hunt whale. There’s nothing else left to catch. (WBO)
2. Diachrony of ‘no’ wonder constructions
2.3 Historical development

2 multi-clausal subtypes in which adverbials originate:

2. Paratactic pattern

DS (iii): P + anaphoric MQ + J

(6) þanon he welt þam gewealdleðerum ealle gesceafatu. Nis nan wundor, forþam ðe he is cyning & dryhten & æwelm & fruma & æ & wisdom rihtwis dema

‘Henceforth he rules all creation with reins. It is no wonder, for he is the king, the lord, the beginning, the creator, the law, wisdom, and the righteous ruler.’ (YCOE 850-950)

• P followed by MQ, which anaphorically refers back to P
• forþam ‘for’: consequential, i.e. anti-concessive, relation between P+J

// PDE: And then there’s Jack Howard, recently divorced and no wonder. If all the rumours about him are true, he’s been in enough bedrooms to qualify as a top adviser for Laura Ashley furnishings. (WBO)
2. Diachrony of ‘no’ wonder constructions
2.3 Historical development

Gentens et al. 2016
2. Diachrony of ‘no’ wonder constructions
2.3 Historical development

- Late Middle English: emergence of adverbials
- which increasingly replace
  - extraposition
  - paratactic structures
- strikingly, two distinct adverbial types
  - disjunct
  - anaphoric adverbial
- inherit structural-syntagmatic and discursive-pragmatic features of two multiple-clause types

Gentens et al. 2016
2. Diachrony of ‘no’ wonder constructions
2.3 Historical development

**J+MQ+Prop**

- **MQ+Prop+J**

![Graphs showing diachrony of 'no' wonder constructions](image-url)

- disjunct adv
- extrapos

---
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2. Diachrony of ‘no’ wonder constructions
2.3 Historical development

But in general: lower token frequencies than other schemata
3. Diachrony of ‘no’ chance constructions
3.1 Data

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subperiod of English</th>
<th>Time span</th>
<th>Corpus</th>
<th>Number of words (millions)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Middle English (ME)</td>
<td>1150–1500</td>
<td>Penn-Helsinki Parsed Corpus of Middle English, Second Edition (PPCME)</td>
<td>1.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Early Modern English (EModE)</td>
<td>1500–1710</td>
<td>Penn-Helsinki Parsed Corpus of Early Modern English (PPCEME)</td>
<td>1.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1570–1710</td>
<td>Corpus of Early Modern English texts (CEMET)</td>
<td>3.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Late Modern English (LModE)</td>
<td>1710–1920</td>
<td>Corpus of Late Modern English texts, Extended Version (CLMETEV)</td>
<td>15.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Present-day English (PDE)</td>
<td>1960–2005</td>
<td>WordBanks Online</td>
<td>550</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3. Diachrony of ‘no’ chance constructions
3.2 Present-day English

**Clausal** cxns with *(‘no’) chance* show more variety than those with *(‘no’) wonder*:

* Types of matrix cxns:
  * *There BE (‘no’) chance*
  * *Have (‘no’) chance*
  * *Chances BE*
  * *(give somebody (‘no’) chance)*
  * *(stand (‘no’) chance)*
  * *(get (‘no’) chance)*

* Formal type of complement:
  * *That*-clause
  * *To*-infinitive
  * *Of V-ing*
  * *Of NP (denoting action/state)*

* Have & *there BE (‘no’) chance*: predominance of **positive polarity**
3. Diachrony of ‘no’ chance constructions
3.2 Present-day English

Clausal cxns with (‘no’) chance show more variety than those with ‘no’ wonder:

[HAVE chance + to-inf]

(1) If he had a dropsy fit sitting there, I wouldn’t have a chance to grab him because he goes that quick down. (WBO) [dynamic/epistemic modality]

[HAVE chance + of V-ing]

(2) Since he was quite unable to run he had no chance of outstripping his pursuer, so he resigned himself to imminent recapture. (WBO) [dynamic/epistemic modality]

[there BE chance + that-clause]

(3) And there’s every chance the NATO summit will unveil a revised military strategy for the Alliance (WBO) [epistemic modality]
3. Diachrony of ‘no’ chance constructions
3.2 Present-day English

**Adverbial cxns with ‘no’ chance**

- Appear in PDE data only; far less frequent than clausal cxns
- Specific query: “no chance” preceded by punctuation mark in WBO

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Complement?</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>to-infinitive</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>9,3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>of V-ing</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>13,0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>of NP (including 'that')</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>19,1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>for/with NP</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>9,8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>that-clause [overt 'that']</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2,0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>that-clause [that-omission]</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2,8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>anaphoric adverbial</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>43,9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>246</td>
<td>100,0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- “no chance” typically followed by complement, and hence elliptical matrix
- Adverbial type: anaphoric adverbial only?
3. Diachrony of ‘no’ chance constructions
3.2 Present-day English

Anaphoric adverbial cnxns with ‘no’ chance

- Anaphoric adverbial: epistemic

(4) After 16 years of top-flight rugby, a World Cup winner's medal, Grand Slam, Six Nations titles and two Lions tours -- on top of all his domestic honours with Leicester -- you might think that Back's appetite for more glory would be blunted. No chance. His four tries this season help make him the top scorer in Premiership history with 74. (WBO)

- Emphatic negative response to a question or another speech act, also observed for ‘no’ way (cf. Huddleston & Pullum 2002: 849; Davidse et al. 2014)

(5) I went to an auction about 20 years ago, when for a few weeks we were thinking about moving. Well, I was, but my wife said ‘no chance’. (WBO)

Disjunct adverbial or that-clause complement of elliptical matrix?

(6) My coffee is always heavily laced with cream and sugar. Mother takes hers black. .... “No chance I'll get the wrong cup.” (WBO)
3. Diachrony of ‘no’ chance constructions
3.3 Historical development

OED online on chance (< Old French; attested from ME onwards)

• “The falling out or happening of events; the way in which things fall out; fortune; case.”

• “An opportunity that comes in any one's way. Often const. of.”

• “A possibility or probability of anything happening: as distinct from a certainty: often in plural, with a number expressed.”

• In “phrases”: “To stand a (fair, good) chance”; “Is there any chance of....?”; “To be in with a chance”

• No relevant cxns in Middle English data
3. Diachrony of ‘no’ chance constructions

3.3 Historical development

Early Modern English: 1500-1710 in PPCEME

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>matrices of clausal complement types</th>
<th>1500-1570</th>
<th>1570-1640</th>
<th>1640-1710</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><em>it BE (possessive det) chance + to-inf</em></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>(possessive det) chance BE + to-inf</em></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>3</strong></td>
<td><strong>3</strong></td>
<td><strong>0</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(7) After that lacke had long led this pleasant life, beeing though hee were but poore in good estimation; it was his Masters *chance* to die, and his Dame to bee a Widow, who was a very comely auncient Woman, and of reasonable Wealth. (PPCEME 1570-1640)

➔ Happenstance meaning: ‘it was his master’s hap, fortune to die’

➔ // complement-taking predicate ‘happen to’: Possessor *HAPPEN TO* + Inf ‘Positive achievement CTP’ in Noonan’s (2007) typology of CTPs

➔ Also first meaning of epistemic adverbs like *maybe, perhaps, perchance* (López-Couso & Méndez-Naya 2017)
3. Diachrony of ‘no’ chance constructions

3.3 Historical development

Early Modern English: 1570-1710 in CEMET

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>matrices of clausal complement types</th>
<th>1570-1640</th>
<th>1640-1710</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>it be (det) chance + to-inf</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(det) chance be + to-inf</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Have (det) chance + of V-ing</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>6 [161]</strong></td>
<td><strong>3 [90]</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Patterns with to-inf: happenstance meaning

(8)  *I was very well pleased with the sight of a fine lady that I have often seen walk in Graye’s Inn Walks, and it was my chance to meet her again at the door going out.*  (CEMET 1640-1710)
3. Diachrony of ‘no’ chance constructions

3.3 Historical development

Early Modern English: 1570-1710 in CEMET

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>matrices of clausal complement types</th>
<th>1570-1640</th>
<th>1640-1710</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><em>it be (det) chance + to-inf</em></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>(det) chance be + to-inf</em></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Have (det) chance + of V-ing</em></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>6 [161]</strong></td>
<td><strong>3 [90]</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Pattern with HAVE (det) CHANCE of V-ing: emergence of modal meaning!

(9) *The right path is that by which he has the best chance of adding to the stock of knowledge in the world something worth labouring for* (CEMET 1570-1640)

→ Best able to add sth? → dynamic modal meaning?
→ Most likely to add sth? → epistemic modal meaning?
3. Diachrony of ‘no’ chance constructions
3.3 Historical development

Late Modern English: 1710-1920 in CLMETEV
Modal meanings; clausal cxns only

HAVE (det) CHANCE + of V-ing

(10) I have but just begun to like London, and to be settled in an agreeable set of people, and now they are going to wander all over the kingdom. Because they have some chance of having a month of good weather they will bury themselves three more in bad. (CLMETEV: 1710-1780) → epistemic

HAVE (det) CHANCE + to-INF

(11) as they all spoke together, no man had chance to be heard (CLMETEV: 1710-1780)

(12) what specialties of treason, stratagem, aimed or aimless endeavour towards mischief, no party living [...] has now any chance to know. Camille's conjecture is the likeliest [...] (CLMETEV : 1780-1850)
4. Theoretical reflections

- hitherto, grammaticalization of ‘comment clauses’ studied within complex sentence: Hopper & Traugott (2003), Boye & Harder (2012)
- **larger rhetorical** (trans-sentential) units: locus for historical shift discourse primariness > discourse secondariness

‘no’ wonder:

- combined force of Thetical Grammar (Kaltenböck et al. 2011) and discourse secondariness (Boye & Harder 2012):
  - Paratactic grammatical patterns:
    - MQ in separate (main) clause - - not included in Boye & Harder 2012
    - but still discursively dependent on the previous clause, i.e. its anchor (Kaltenböck et al. 2011),
    - As proven by tests for discursive secondariness (Boye & Harder 2012), e.g. cannot be probed by *how much wonder is it?* or polar interrogatives such as *Was it a wonder?*, unlike the lexical uses
4. Theoretical reflections

‘no’ wonder:

- **discourse schemata** (speaker-stance + discourse organization) informed large scale ‘replacement’ of clausal by adverbial qualifiers, with the latter ‘inheriting’ discursive, pragmatic and contextual features
  - support for position that specific *interactional, rhetorical* strategies may underlie changes such as grammaticalization (Schwenter & Waltereit 2010, Waltereit 2012)

- Among adverbial qualifiers, intriguing category of *anaphoric adverbial*, which has received little attention in synchronic literature, and even less in historical studies
- Distinction between 2 types of adverbials (disjunct and anaphoric adverbials) not only related to different discourse schemata and different historical source patterns, also associated with different prosodic behaviour (see Gentens et al. 2016)

‘no’ chance:

- Discourse schemata less important in historical development; especially modal-attitudinal meaning (rather than signalling discursive relation)
- First happenstance meaning; modal meanings emerge later
- Category of *anaphoric adverbial* is predominant; disjunct type seems absent
4. Theoretical reflections

‘no’ chance:

• Category of *anaphoric adverbial* is predominant; disjunct type seems absent

• Other content disjuncts:
  
  • *certainly, probably, decidedly, incontestably, undeniably, admittedly, unquestionably*
  
  • *(in)correctly, rightly, (un)justly, foolishly, cleverly, sensibly, unreasonably, (un)wisely*
  
  • never affect polarity of propositional content they scope over (but comment on its degree of truth, or express a value judgement towards it), just like *no doubt, no wonder*

• Meaning is hard to pin down + different types of negation depending on modal-attitudinal meaning:
  
  • Epistemic → internal negation: will NOT; it is highly probable that NOT ...

  
  
  → *certainly* + NOT in propositional content

  
  
  (13) *My coffee is always heavily laced with cream and sugar. Mother takes hers black. …. “No chance I'll get the wrong cup.” (WBO)*

  
  (13’) *My coffee is always heavily laced with cream and sugar. Mother takes hers black. …. “Certainly I won’t get the wrong cup.” (WBO)*
4. Theoretical reflections

‘no’ chance:

• Meaning is hard to pin down + different types of negation depending on modal-attitudinal meaning:
  • Dynamic → external negation: X was NOT able to ... → not attitudinal, hence no possible disjunct meaning

    (14) I have not had a chance to explain or to see the person who is in charge of this case. (WBO)

    (14’) I have not been able to explain or to see the person who is in charge of this case.

• When grammaticalized to negative adverb like no way in (13), no chance should trigger inversion, but this is not observed in the data:

    (13) A spokesman for the Duchess said: “It was all a joke. No way did the Duchess strip.” (WBO)

• The negative adverb meaning of no chance often is ‘never’ (projecting into the future) → adjunct of frequency, rather than disjunct

• Also lexical uses, e.g. with tag that relates to main clause (cf. Boye & Harder 2012):

    (14) All they need do is get the new car some TV exposure and they’ll be away. No chance of giving one to Lovejoy, is there? (WBO)
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