

# INTERSUBJECTIVITY AND INTERSUBJECTIFICATION

*Lieselotte Brems*

## 1. Introduction

Intersubjectivity is often defined with respect to or even as being dependent on the notion of subjectivity, which refers to the linguistic expression of speaker involvement via lexical, grammatical, and/or construal choices. Intersubjectivity, then, in a very general sense, crucially highlights the hearer/addressee (as well as, or rather than, just the speaker). However, whereas the study of subjectivity has recently received a lot of attention (see De Smet & Verstraete 2006), intersubjectivity has received relatively little explicit attention in its own right, in the sense of a critical survey of the available definitions and recognition criteria (but see Davidse et al. 2010; Brems, Ghesquière, & Van de Velde 2014). Intersubjectivity appears in various linguistic fields and (synchronic and diachronic) frameworks, which, however, sometimes use conflicting definitions, which may cover quite different phenomena. In grammaticalization research, for instance, Traugott (2010) has mainly defined intersubjectification as a secondary process, potentially following the much more common process of subjectification, and has restricted it to the—fairly rare—emergence of politeness markers, such as honorifics in Japanese (Traugott & Dasher 2002: 263–276) (see section 4.2). From a cognitive grammar perspective, Verhaegen (2005), on the other hand, has argued that intersubjectivity is omnipresent and involves the coordination of cognitive systems between speakers and hearers, thereby constituting the very basis of discourse, and even a precondition for language use. Since some constructions highlight this type of coordination more than others, they can be said to be more intersubjective than others, e.g., negation patterns or adversative connectors. Confusingly perhaps, Traugott (2010) would qualify the latter constructions as being subjective, rather than intersubjective. Finally, there are also more applied approaches (e.g., Hunston & Thompson 2000; Hyland 2005) which use such notions as appraisal, stance, or metadiscourse, and which seem to partially overlap with both subjective and intersubjective notions. In their approach, hedging and text organization might be considered intersubjective.

This chapter aims to give an overview of, and a possible way out of, the terminological confusion relating to intersubjectivity and intersubjectification. Important questions to be addressed are the following. Are intersubjectivity/intersubjectification independent concepts, or do they depend on subjectivity and subjectification? It is, for instance, generally assumed that diachronically intersubjective meanings develop later than and typically derive from subjective meanings. Can we distinguish subtypes of intersubjectivity, similarly to De Smet and Verstraete's (2006)

classification of types of subjectivity? Is intersubjectivity primarily a semantic notion, or can we find formal correlates? What semantic and/or formal parameters are there for intersubjectivity and intersubjectification? Following Brems, Ghesquière, and Van de Velde (2014), it will be suggested to define intersubjectivity independently (from subjectivity). Different subtypes of intersubjectivity will be discussed, i.e., attitudinal, responsive, and textual intersubjectivity. In addition, the possibility of defining systematic formal correlates of intersubjective meaning as well as the necessity of intersubjectivity developing unidirectionally from subjectivity will be assessed.

## 2. Historical Perspectives

The term intersubjectivity has received many interpretations and definitions in different linguistic frameworks, which have accordingly been used to capture sometimes very divergent phenomena. In the literature, there seem to be three main notions of intersubjectivity, namely Traugott's, who essentially has a diachronic approach linked to grammaticalization, Verhagen's notion, which is grounded in the theory of Cognitive Grammar, and Nuyts's understanding of it in terms of shared meanings.

Traugott's notion of intersubjectivity is perhaps the most widespread one and is typically understood to refer to meanings coding attention to the social self of the hearer (e.g., Traugott & Dasher 2002), the prime example of which is Japanese addressee honorifics, which are suffixes that code the specific social relation between a speaker and a hearer in terms of respect, intimacy, or social distance. For Traugott and Dasher (2002: 22) and Traugott (2014) intersubjectivity is closely connected to and cannot be defined without reference to subjectivity. Both synchronically and diachronically, subjectivity is considered a prerequisite for intersubjectivity. While subjective expressions index speaker attitude or viewpoint, markers of intersubjectivity, in this view, additionally index the speaker's "attention to AD[dressee]/R[earer] as a participant in the speech event, not in the world talked about" (Traugott & Dasher 2002: 22).

Building on the Cognitive Grammar framework developed by Langacker (1991), Verhagen (2005, 2007) has proposed an account of intersubjectivity in terms of cognitive coordination between speaker and hearer. In intersubjective constructions, the hearer is more explicitly foregrounded as the active interpreter of utterances of the speaker. In this view, the hearer is hence not only a passive addressee guided by the speaker to focus on a given conceptual content, but crucially is an active conceptualizer. Importantly, in Verhagen's view, this cognitive coordination task of speaker and hearer is always present in communication, but it is coded more explicitly in some constructions than others, e.g., negation patterns. Verhagen (2005) gives the example of *She is not happy* versus *She is unhappy*, where only the former, i.e., sentential, negation *not happy* takes into account the presence of another perspective than that of the speaker, which is then negated. The morphological negation *unhappy* does not bring in a distinct viewpoint according to Verhagen.

Nuyts (2001a, 2001b, 2014), based on his research into the expression of modal meanings, has developed yet another view on intersubjectivity. For him it refers to meanings "presented as being shared between the assessor and a wider group of people, possibly (but not necessarily) including the hearer" (Nuyts 2014). Hence, whereas *Given the instability in the country it is likely that the army will intervene* is intersubjective, *In such an unstable situation I think the army will intervene* qualifies as subjective.

## 3. Critical Issues and Topics

As the fairly short characterizations in section 2 show, the three main perspectives on intersubjectivity are all quite different and cannot be used interchangeably. Important (interlocking) points of divergence concern the status of intersubjective meanings: are they considered to be coded (i.e.,

semantic or semanticized), or are they pragmatic in nature? Secondly, there is the issue of operationalizing intersubjectivity diachronically in terms of intersubjectification. Thirdly, there is the question of which types of language phenomena can be described and explained in terms of intersubjectivity. This links up with the question of whether it is useful or even possible to distinguish between subtypes of intersubjectivity. Fourthly, there is the important question of whether intersubjectivity (and intersubjectification) can be said to be conceptually independent, especially with regard to subjectivity (and subjectification). Some authors, such as López-Couso (2010), use the term '(inter)subjectivity' with 'inter' in between brackets to cover both notions or even seemingly lumping them together. The use of such a conflated label suggests that the boundaries between non-subjectivity, subjectivity, and intersubjectivity are at the very least vague or fuzzy rather than clear-cut. The possibility of distinguishing between these notions will in turn partly determine the possibility to draw up recognition criteria that are exclusive to intersubjectivity and intersubjectification, and their cross-linguistic validity.

Traugottian intersubjectivity, for instance, refers to the semantics of constructions, i.e., to (coded) meanings. In Japanese, for instance, honorifics form a well-established system within the grammar. Honorifics are obligatory and leaving them out would create a social *faux pas*. In addition, Traugott would say that some expressions can have an intersubjective meaning dependent on the specific context at hand but it is hence pragmatic in nature only. For instance, *a bit (of)* can function as a hedge, downtoning the upcoming noun or adjective so as not to offend the hearer, as in *It was a bit boring*. However, in other contexts it can be used as a booster or simply to indicate a small quantity.

Verhagen's and Nuyts's understandings of intersubjectivity are inherently more pragmatic in nature, in that they do not refer to meanings as such but rather to the rhetorical representation of meaning. For Nuyts (2014), for instance, intersubjectivity is a discursive tool or strategy that allows the speaker to represent meaning as shared as opposed to it being restricted to one speaker. In the context of modals, Nuyts (2014: 58) says that "[a]modal evaluation is 'intersubjective'<sup>IN</sup> if it is presented as shared between the assessor and a wider group of people, possibly (but not necessarily) the hearer". *It is unacceptable they left already* is hence intersubjectively deontic. However, *I really regret that they left already* is a subjective deontic assessment since it is presented as "being strictly the assessor's sole responsibility" (Nuyts 2014: 60; emphasis mine).

In terms of synchronic and/or diachronic implementations, Traugott's framework is the only one that is well-developed both synchronically and diachronically. In addition, it also seems more generally applicable to a wide range of phenomena, even though she (2014) argues that there are two main types of language functions that most likely give rise to intersubjective meanings, namely politeness and particular metadiscursive functions.

The Cognitive Grammar notion of intersubjectivity put forward by Verhagen (2005, 2007) has not been developed diachronically yet. Nuyts, in contrast, has developed a framework that can account for both intersubjectivity and intersubjectification, but it is strongly linked to the domain of modality, and it is difficult to see how it could be extended to other domains of language.

Traugott's framework hence seems the most promising to account for synchronic variation as well as for diachronic processes of change, and might be general enough to account for phenomena from a variety of domains including not only politeness and metadiscursive markers, but also modality, and the verb phrase in general, as well as adjectives, the noun phrase, etc. However, it is important to keep in mind that Traugott's notions of intersubjectivity and intersubjectification depend conceptually on subjectivity and subjectification. Intersubjective meanings are said to develop later than subjective ones and the latter are a prerequisite of the former.

Section 4 will summarize the most relevant current answers to the critical issues and topics presented here.

## 4. Current Contributions and Research

### 4.1 Semantics versus Pragmatics

Authors like Traugott have come to emphasize the importance of distinguishing between pragmatic intersubjectivity and semantic intersubjectivity. Traugott (2010: 32) acknowledges that communicating with another person always involves intersubjectivity in a general sense, and discourse can only be communicatively successful if speakers pay attention to the audience's needs, and to 'mutual management' (Schiffrin 1990; Nuyts 2001a, 2001b; Verhagen 2005). Thompson (2014: 78) similarly states that all discourse is "constructed fundamentally in terms of exchanges between interactants in communicative events in which each interactant shapes their message to accommodate and affect the other". As indicated in section 3, what distinguishes Traugott's notion of intersubjectivity from Nuyts's or Verhagen's approach is that she is interested in coded intersubjective (or rather intersubjectified) meaning. Pragmatic intersubjectivity, then, refers to "the ambient context in which linguistic change takes place and to which linguistic change contributes" (Traugott 2010: 32).

Particularly in cases of currently ongoing change it is very difficult to make the distinction between pragmatic and semantic intersubjectivity. I will not be making any bold claims concerning the pragmatic or semantic nature of the intersubjective meanings discussed in the following sections and will propose to treat it as a pragmatic-semantic phenomenon.

### 4.2 Range of Phenomena and Subtypes of Subjectivity

Traugott (2003: 128) argues that

Intersubjectivity is the explicit expression of the SP/W's attention to the 'self' of addressee/reader in both an epistemic sense (paying attention to their presumed attitudes to the content of what is said) and in a more social sense (paying attention to their 'face' or 'image needs' associated with social stance and identity)

As stated earlier, Traugott (2014) connects two main functions of language with intersubjectivity, i.e., politeness and metadiscursive functions. Politeness involves "the encoding of the Speaker's appreciation and recognition of the Addressee's social status" (Traugott 2003: 128) and qualifies as intersubjective because

intersubjective meanings crucially involve social deixis (attitude toward status that speakers impose on first person–second person deixis). They impact directly on the self-image or 'face' needs of SP/W or AD/R.

*Traugott & Dasher 2002: 23; SP/W refers to speaker/writer and AD/R to addressee/reader*

Textbook examples of intersubjective meaning in the context of politeness are Japanese honorifics, e.g., Modern Japanese *mas-u-* ('let come') which grammaticalized from a main verb into a subjective verbal suffix coding humility, and finally became the intersubjective addressee honorific, which has become obligatory in certain social contexts:

- (1) Go-kyōryoku no hodo o-negaimōshiagemasu  
'We respectfully request the favor of a measure of your cooperation.' (Narrog and Heine 2018)

Less exotic examples are the so-called T/V pronouns (from French *tu* and *vous*), such as *vous* and *Sie* in French and German respectively, which were originally second person plural pronouns but have also developed singular polite reference or are used to signal social distance. Hedging discourse markers such as *sort of*, which downtone the potentially negative impact of certain words, are also commonly accepted as being intersubjective:

- (2) No it's not that bad the game actually it's alright but, it is a bit, **sort of** boring when you play it every day. (Brems 2011: 314)

Likewise, the discourse marker *well*, which can be used as a floorholder or as a dispreferred response signal (Defour 2008):

- (3) "You think all these dudes are throwing their muscles around here just for fun and games?"  
"Well, it's partly that, I guess. But, Teach, a lot of it has to do with money."<sup>1</sup>

Paradoxically, however, even though such expressions explicitly involve a speaker linguistically paying heed to a hearer, Traugott and Dasher (2002) for instance classify T/V pronouns as mostly subjective, rather than intersubjective, and Traugott (2014) would consider *well* as intersubjective, but only pragmatically so, i.e., the intersubjective function would not be coded (see section 4.1).

As to metadiscursive markers, Traugott (2014) singles out "turn-giving or elicitation of response" such as question tags (*isn't it?*) or clause-final *right?* Rather than serving as face-saving devices, these markers aim to solicit some sort of action from the hearer and support discourse continuity.

Ghesquière et al. (2014: 134) have argued that more types of meanings than just politeness and metadiscursive ones can be considered intersubjective. In their view intersubjectivity is inherently hearer-oriented and crucially relies on "the creation of joint attention" (cf. Diessel 2006). Since this attention can pertain to different aspects, they propose a typology of intersubjective meanings and distinguish between attitudinal, responsive, and textual intersubjectivity. They state that the boundaries between these subtypes are by no means discrete and expressions may combine various subtypes of intersubjective meanings.

Attitudinal intersubjectivity expresses a speaker's attention to the social self of the hearer and their face needs. Honorifics and English *sort of* as well as other hedges illustrate this subtype. Responsive intersubjectivity is illustrated by question tags, clause-final *right?* and turn-taking devices, and involves eliciting a verbal response or action from the hearer, while also enhancing discourse continuity. Textual intersubjectivity, then, pertains to elements that are used to guide the hearer's interpretation of a stretch of discourse, for instance by helping to identify or track a particular discourse referent. Demonstratives, such as *this/that* or *these/those* illustrate this in that they explicitly point out discourse referents and "focus the hearer's attention on elements in the ongoing discourse" (Ghesquière et al. 2014: 136). In addition, (in)definite determiners like English *a(n)* and *the*, which lack the pointing meaning of demonstratives, would also qualify as textually intersubjective. They help the addressee to make cognitive access with the intended referent by signaling, among other things, whether the referent is presumed known or not (cf. Ghesquière 2011, 2014).

Importantly, especially when it comes to classifying textual meanings, authors do not always see eye to eye. Traugott (1982) sees conjunctions like concessive *while* as subjective in nature and not intersubjective since they allow a speaker to impose a concessive link on two clause contents. Narrog (2014) argues that textual meaning is neither objective, subjective, nor intersubjective and that its development involves a process that is *sui generis*; it cannot be captured by (inter)subjectification, but has to be recognized as a separate process. Breban (2010: 115) seems to view

all textual meaning as intersubjective. With Ghesquière et al. (2014) I would argue that (at least) some textual meanings can be considered intersubjective, as illustrated above.

In any case, intersubjectivity can be said to include more than just politeness markers, and may be extended to response-eliciting devices, as well as determiners, which allow a speaker to negotiate discourse referent tracking for the hearer. Intersubjectivity then not only includes attitudinal meanings focused on the social self and face of the hearer (Traugott & Dasher 2002), but also responsive and textual intersubjectivity, demonstrating other types of hearer-orientation.

### 4.3 Conceptual (In)dependence, Diachrony, and Directionality

Several authors have looked into the relation between non-subjectivity (or objectivity), subjectivity, and intersubjectivity in terms of their conceptual (in)dependence as well as the relative chronological order of subjectification and intersubjectification. As noted above, authors such as Traugott have stated that intersubjective meanings and especially intersubjectification typically or even always presuppose an earlier stage of subjectivity and subjectification. Intersubjectification is then considered to be conceptually and temporally dependent on subjectification with meanings unidirectionally changing from subjective to intersubjective and not the other way around. Supporting this view, Degand and Fagard (2012: 159) argue that “interactional [intersubjective] elements are necessarily subjective, while the reverse is not true; in other words, intersubjectification presupposes subjectification”. They illustrate their claims by means of a case study of the French conjunction *parce que* (‘because’), which first appears with a subjective meaning (4) (so-called external negation) and later with intersubjective meaning (5) (so-called internal negation):

- (4) mort me fis en mi la voie por ce que trop grantfain avoie (Roman de Renart, early 13th century)  
‘I played dead in the middle of the road, because I was terribly hungry’
- (5) Bon, vous me racontez. Qui conduisait votre taxi?—Que je vous explique. J’ai un ami, Toni, enfin un copain. Parce que, vé, on est pas intimes, vous comprenez (Contemporary French; Sicca & Izzo 1995)  
‘Ok, you tell me. Who was driving your cab?—Let me explain. I have a friend, Toni, well, a buddy. Because, y’see we aren’t intimate, you understand’

In (4) subjective *parce que* causally links two states of affairs, whereas in (5) intersubjective *parce que* introduces grounds for a specific reasoning. Other examples illustrating that subjective uses of constructions precede intersubjective ones often subsume honorifics and hedges in Traugott’s and Narrog’s work and modal auxiliaries in Nuyts’s work.

Traugott’s definition of intersubjectification by definition relies on unidirectionality, whereas the definition of (subtypes of) intersubjectivity in section 4.2 can be seen as an attempt to define it independently from subjectivity, since it does not assume that intersubjective meanings necessarily derive from earlier subjective ones. In this vein, Ghesquière (2011, 2014) has shown that intersubjective uses of a certain construction may precede subjective uses, rather than follow them. Her case study discusses *such*, which can be used as a determiner (6) or an emphazier (7):

- (6) Breast cancer is the most common cause of death from cancer in Australian women. Diagnosing **such** a cancer early, while it’s still small, enables the best possible chance of a cure.
- (7) You’ve been so good to me and I’ve been **such** a horrible, horrible bitch of a friend.

Following Ghesquière et al (2014) determiners are textually intersubjective since they help a hearer identify the intended referent, in (6) by establishing anaphoric reference to *breast cancer*. As an

emphasizer, *such* is subjective in that it allows the speaker to express the extent to which she evaluates herself as horrible. Crucially, the intersubjective determiner use is attested earlier than its subjective emphaser use and so *such* goes against the ‘expected’ directionality. Needless to say, this crucially depends on whether or not one accepts to classify determiner uses as intersubjective and hence on the definition of (inter)subjectification used. In any case, when subjective and intersubjective meanings and the diachronic processes that give rise to them are defined independently, intersubjective meanings may precede subjective ones.

Furthermore, the different subtypes of intersubjective meanings (attitudinal, responsive, and textual) may display different tendencies diachronically with regard to (earlier or later) subjective uses. In addition, there is the question of whether the various subtypes of intersubjective meanings show directional tendencies (between them). Cornillie (2008: 56), for instance, hypothesizes that discourse markers or parentheticals, classified as attitudinally intersubjective by Ghesquière et al. (2014), may derive from previously subjective uses. However, the emergence of evidential and epistemic uses of Spanish semi-auxiliaries *parecer* and *resultar* suggests the opposite chronology, with intersubjective uses preceding subjective ones. As to directionalities between subtypes of intersubjective meanings, Ghesquière et al. (2014: 144) put forward that “textually intersubjective items may develop from responsively intersubjective ones”, but are otherwise cautious about proposing other directional pathways. They conclude that “the chronological link between subjectified and intersubjectified uses is better described as multidirectional”.

Further research will first have to evaluate the validity of the proposed typology of subtypes of intersubjectivity and then check whether systematic directionalities can be found for those various subtypes.

#### 4.4 Recognition Criteria

Intersubjectivity is a pragmatic-semantic notion, but in any functional-cognitive or constructional framework it is important to check for formal correlates and hence find formal recognition criteria to further operationalize the notion. For subjectified elements it has been pointed out that they have lost a number of formal properties, in that they can no longer be brought under the scope of negation, are not focusable, cannot be submodified or graded, and do not allow pronominal substitution (see De Smet & Verstraete 2006). Adamson (2000: 44) has argued that as items shift from objective to subjective meaning they diachronically undergo so-called leftward movement, as with *lovely*; compare its descriptive use in *a lovely lady* and its use as a (subjective) intensifier as in *lovely long legs*. In the latter, *lovely* occurs in a more leftward slot vis-à-vis the head noun.

Again, it may turn out that the different subtypes of intersubjective meanings match up with different formal correlates, or even that no set of formal correlates can be found that unambiguously and exclusively applies to (all subtypes of) intersubjective meaning. Non-focusability and resistance to negation do not seem to work for textually intersubjective items like determiners, though they might apply more easily to attitudinally intersubjective ones such as hedging discourse markers. *Sort of*, for instance, cannot successfully be the focus of an *it*-cleft, as shown by (9), whereas English demonstratives can be questioned, focused on, or negated (*Was it THAT girl or THIS one?*).

- (8) It kept **sort of** pouring out of his pocket, his brother said.  
 (9) \*It was **sort of** that it kept pouring out of his pocket, his brother said.

The formal correlates proposed for (inter)subjectivity (see López-Couso 2010) seem to work for both subjectivity and some types of intersubjectivity and are hence diagnostic of non-objective meaning as such. I will go through the two most important and promising propositions suggested

in the literature, but we have to keep in mind that they will most probably not be exclusive to intersubjective meanings and may be language-specific.

First, there is a positional reflex, in that it has been pointed out that there is a functional division of labour between the right and left periphery in the clause. Degand (2011) associates the right periphery with addressee-accommodation, and hence intersubjectivity. Traugott (2014: 22) provides some further evidence for this claim, but confirms that it is not without exceptions, even though as a generalization “it appears to be robust”. Other examples are English tag questions (10) and the clause-final Korean particle *-tanikka* in (11), which is similar in function to the English parenthetical *you know*:

- (10) It is the twenty fourth of September **isn't it?** (Kimps 2007: 283)  
 (11) pi-ka on-n-**tanikka**  
 ‘It’s raining, you know! (How many times should I tell you?/Don’t you trust me?/...)’  
 (Rhee 2010: 3)

If intersubjectivity is, among other things, “oriented toward turn-giving, or elicitation of response, and towards the Addressee’s stance and participation in the communicative situation” (Traugott 2014), the right periphery seems an appropriate place, because it is where “the speaker hands over his/her conversational turn, and wants to accommodate the addressee so as to ensure the steady flow of discourse” (Ghesquière et al. 2014).

The left periphery (and leftward movement), on the other hand, has been associated with subjectivity and subjectification, as argued by Adamson (2000), but also Beeching et al. (2009). Again, more research is needed to put these associations between (sub)types of meanings and left or right periphery to the test, not just in English, but in a typological perspective. Furthermore, it remains to be seen whether attitudinally, responsively, and textually intersubjective markers display the same preference for the right periphery.

Secondly, there is prosody and more specifically intonation, as potential diagnostics for intersubjectivity and intersubjectification. Kimps (2007) has shown a link between (responsively intersubjective) English question tags and rising intonation and/or high pitch. Of course, one might claim that these prosodic features might also just be characteristic of interrogative mood as such, but interrogative mood is inherently addressee-oriented and hence at least pragmatically intersubjective in nature. Ohala (1983, 1984, 1994) has argued that high pitch and rising intonation are biological markers of submission, which seems an intersubjective notion. Obviously, more work is needed here too.

## 5. Future Directions

As indicated in the previous sections, further research is needed to test the validity of the typology of intersubjective meanings as well as the recognition criteria and directional hypotheses proposed. Section 4.4 has shown that it is difficult to find formal recognition criteria that exclusively characterize intersubjective elements. An additional question is whether they will turn out to be valid in a typologically varied sample of languages. The tendency for intersubjective elements to be associated with the right clausal periphery does seem to be confirmed cross-linguistically, since it is attested not only for Germanic languages like English, Dutch, German, and Norwegian, and Romance languages such as French and Italian, but also for Japanese, Chinese, and Korean (Van der Wouden & Foolen 2011).

### Note

- 1 All examples that do not cite a specific source were extracted from Collins Wordbank Online.



### Further Reading

- Brems, L., Ghesquière L., & Van de Velde, F. (Eds.). (2014). *Benjamins Current Topics: Vol. 72. Intersubjectivity and intersubjectification in grammar and discourse: Theoretical and descriptive advances*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins. (This volume also includes studies of intersubjectivity within applied linguistics, where notions such as evaluation, stance, appraisal, and metadiscourse can be said to partially overlap with the notion of intersubjectivity. Thompson (2014) for instance is a case study in which two sets of UK newspapers are compared in terms of differences in the intersubjective choices they make when interacting with their respective audiences. Ädel (2014) addresses intersubjectivity within English for Academic Purposes and studies the use of the second person pronoun *you* both in spoken and written academic data and can convincingly argue that it fulfills many discourse functions, and that not all of them can be analyzed as truly intersubjective in the sense of working as an engagement marker.)
- De Clerck, B., Decock, S., Vandenberghe, J., & Seghers, M. (2019). Theory versus practice: A closer look at transactional and interpersonal stance in English electronic complaint refusal notifications. *English Text Construction*, 12(1), 103–136. (This article studies transactional and interpersonal stance in English electronic complaint refusal notifications. Based on a corpus study and an experiment, they study the rhetorical moves and linguistic realizations of complaint negotiations within this specific business genre. The linguistic strategies to mitigate the illocutionary force of this potentially face-threatening speech act are described. The authors do not use the term intersubjectivity, but notions like “interactional justice” and the importance of politeness, respect, and transparency can easily be linked to it.
- For studies on intersubjectivity and intersubjectification outside of English see for instance:
- Cornillie, B., & Cabedo, A. (2011). On the prosody of subjective and intersubjective modal adverbs in Spanish. Paper presented at the 12th International Pragmatics Association Conference (IPrA). Manchester, July 3–8, 2011.
- Narrog, H. (2010). (Inter)subjectification in the area of modality and mood—concepts and cross-linguistic realities. In K. Davidse, L. Vandelanotte, & H. Cuyckens (Eds.), *Subjectification, intersubjectification and grammaticalization* (pp. 385–429). Berlin: De Gruyter Mouton.
- Beeching, K., & Detges, U. (Eds.). (2014). *Discourse functions at the right and left periphery: Crosslinguistic investigations of language use and language change*. Boston: Brill. (This volume further explores the hypothesis that the left and right periphery of clauses cater to different types of meanings and are hence not symmetrical. It includes corpus studies on English, French, Italian, Chinese, Korean, and Japanese, which mainly confirm the association between the right periphery and intersubjective elements.)

### Related Topics

cognitive semantics; cognitive grammar; grammaticalization, lexicalization, and constructionalization; cognitive pragmatics; cognitive linguistics and linguistic typology; diachronic construction grammar

### References

- Adamson, S. M. (2000). A lovely little example: Word order options and category shift in the premodifying string. In O. Fischer, A. Rosenbach, & D. Stein (Eds.), *Pathways of change: Grammaticalization in English* (pp. 39–66). Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Ädel, A. (2014). “What I want you to remember is...”: Audience orientation in monologic academic discourse. In L. Brems, L. Ghesquière, & F. van de Velde (Series Eds.), *Benjamins Current Topics: Vol. 72. Intersubjectivity and intersubjectification in grammar and discourse: Theoretical and descriptive advances* (pp. 101–127). Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Beeching, K., Degand, L., Detges, U., Traugott, E. C., & Waltireit, R. (2009). Summary of the workshop on meaning in diachrony at the Conference of Meaning in Interaction (Unpublished manuscript). University of the West of England, Bristol, UK.
- Breban, T. (2010). *English adjectives of comparison: Lexical and grammaticalized uses*. Berlin: De Gruyter Mouton.
- Brems, L. (2011). *Layering of size and type noun constructions in English*. Berlin: De Gruyter Mouton.
- Brems, L., Ghesquière L., & Van de Velde, F. (Series Eds.). (2014). *Benjamins Current Topics: Vol. 72. Intersubjectivity and intersubjectification in grammar and discourse: Theoretical and descriptive advances*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

- Cornillie, B. (2008). On the grammaticalization and (inter)subjectivity of evidential (semi-) auxiliaries in Spanish. In E. Seoane & M. J. López-Couso (Eds.), *Theoretical and empirical issues in grammaticalization* (pp. 55–76). Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Davidse, K., Vandelanotte, L., & Cuyckens, H. (Eds.). (2010). *Subjectification, intersubjectification and grammaticalization*. Berlin: De Gruyter Mouton.
- Defour, T. (2008). The speaker's voice: A diachronic study on the use of well and now as pragmatic markers. *English Text Construction*, 1(1), 62–82.
- Degand, L. (2011). Plaats en functie hangen samen dus. De vraag is hoe? *Nederlandse Taalkunde*, 16(3), 352–353.
- Degand, L., & Fagard, B. (2012). Competing connectives in the causal domain: French car and parce que. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 44(2), 154–168.
- De Smet, H., & Verstraete, J. (2006). Coming to terms with subjectivity. *Cognitive Linguistics*, 17(3), 365–392.
- Diessel, H. (2006). Demonstratives, joint attention, and the emergence of grammar. *Cognitive Linguistics*, 17(4), 463–489.
- Ghesquière, L. (2011). The directionality of (inter)subjectification processes in the English noun phrase: Pathways of change. Unpublished PhD dissertation, University of Leuven, Belgium.
- Ghesquière, L., Brems, L., & Van de Velde, F. (2014). Intersubjectivity and intersubjectification: Typology and operationalization. In L. Brems, L. Ghesquière, & F. van de Velde (Series Eds.), *Benjamins Current Topics: Vol. 72. Intersubjectivity and intersubjectification in grammar and discourse: Theoretical and descriptive advances* (pp. 129–153). Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Hunston, S., & Thompson, G. (Eds.). (2000). *Evaluation in text: Authorial stance and the construction of discourse*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Hyland, K. (2005). *Metadiscourse: Exploring interaction in writing*. London: Continuum.
- Kimps, D. (2007). Declarative constant polarity tag questions: A data-driven analysis of their form, meaning and attitudinal uses. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 39(2), 270–291.
- Langacker, R. W. (1991). *Foundations of cognitive grammar. Vol. 2: Descriptive application*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.
- López-Couso, M. J. (2010). Subjectification and intersubjectification. In A. H. Jucker & I. Taavitsainen (Eds.), *Historical pragmatics* (pp. 127–163). Berlin: De Gruyter Mouton.
- Narrog, H. (2014). Beyond intersubjectification: Textual uses of modality and mood in subordinate clauses as part of speech-act orientation. In L. Brems, L. Ghesquière, & F. van de Velde (Series Eds.), *Benjamins Current Topics: Vol. 72. Intersubjectivity and intersubjectification in grammar and discourse: Theoretical and descriptive advances* (pp. 29–51). Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Narrog, H., & Heine, B. (Eds.). (2018). *Grammaticalization from a typological perspective*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Nuyts, J. (2001a). *Epistemic modality, language, and conceptualization: A cognitive-pragmatic perspective*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Nuyts, J. (2001b). Subjectivity as an evidential dimension in epistemic modal expressions. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 33(3), 383–400.
- Nuyts, J. (2014). Notions of (inter)subjectivity. In L. Brems, L. Ghesquière, & F. van de Velde (Series Eds.), *Benjamins Current Topics: Vol. 72. Intersubjectivity and intersubjectification in grammar and discourse: Theoretical and descriptive advances* (pp. 53–76). Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Ohala, J. J. (1983). Cross-language use of pitch: An ethological view. *Phonetica*, 40(1), 1–18.
- Ohala, J. J. (1984). An ethological perspective on common cross-language utilization of F0 of voice. *Phonetica*, 41(1), 1–16.
- Ohala, J. J. (1994). The frequency code underlies the sound-symbolic use of voice pitch. In L. Hinton, J. Nichols, & J. J. Ohala (Eds.), *Sound symbolism* (pp. 325–347). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Rhee, S. (2010). Context-induced reinterpretation and (inter)subjectification: Cases of grammaticalization of sentence-final particles. Paper presented at International Conference on Grammaticalization and (Inter)subjectification (Gramis). Brussels, November 11–13, 2010.
- Schiffrin, D. (1990). The management of a cooperative self during arguments: The role of opinions and stories. In A. D. Grimshaw (Ed.), *Conflict talk: Sociolinguistic investigations of arguments in conversations*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Sicca, L., & Izzo, F. (1995). *La gestione dei processi di Turnaround. Un caso esemplare: La Pirelli S.P.A.* Naples: Edizioni Scientifiche Italiane.
- Thompson, G. (2014). Intersubjectivity in newspaper editorials: Construing the reader-in-the-text. In L. Brems, L. Ghesquière, & F. van de Velde (Series Eds.), *Benjamins Current Topics: Vol. 72. Intersubjectivity and intersubjectification in grammar and discourse: Theoretical and descriptive advances* (pp. 77–100). Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

- Traugott, E. C. (1982). From propositional to textual and expressive meanings: Some semantic-pragmatic aspects of grammaticalization. In W. P. Lehmann & Y. Malkiel (Eds.), *Perspectives on historical linguistics* (pp. 245–271). Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Traugott, E. C. (2003). From subjectification to intersubjectification. In R. Hickey (Ed.), *Motives for language change* (pp. 124–139). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Traugott, E. C. (2010). (Inter)subjectivity and (inter)subjectification: A reassessment. In K. Davidse, L. Vandelanotte, & H. Cuyckens (Eds.), *Subjectification, intersubjectification and grammaticalization* (pp. 29–71). Berlin: De Gruyter Mouton.
- Traugott, E. C. (2014). Intersubjectification and clause periphery. In L. Brems, L. Ghesquière, & F. van de Velde (Series Eds.), *Benjamins Current Topics: Vol. 72. Intersubjectivity and intersubjectification in grammar and discourse: Theoretical and descriptive advances* (pp. 7–27). Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Traugott, E. C., & Dasher, R. B. (2002). *Regularity in semantic change*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Van der Wouden, T., & Foolen, A. (2011). Pragmatische partikels in de rechterperiferie. *Nederlandse Taalkunde*, 16(3), 307–322.
- Verhagen, A. (2005). *Constructions of intersubjectivity: Discourse, syntax, and cognition*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Verhagen, A. (2007). *Constructions of intersubjectivity: Discourse, syntax, and cognition* (2nd ed.). Oxford: Oxford University Press.