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Recently considerable interest in investigating how grammaticalization and construction grammar may be integrated (e.g. Bergs and Diewald Forthc, Traugott Forthc, Trousdale Forthc). There has also been interest in “grammaticalization without lexical bleaching” (Lehmann Forthc), and what motivations we might hypothesize for it. For example, Detges (2006) suggests that turn-taking and self-topicalization motivated the development of French subject pronouns. In this paper I investigate another such development without lexical bleaching, the emergence of ALL- and WH-pseudo-clefts in Early Modern English, from the perspective of grammaticalization and construction grammar. Using electronic corpora that include letters, drama, and Old Bailey trials, I argue that textual evidence suggests that dialogic argumentation (Roulet 1994, Schwenter 2000) motivated the development of WH- and ALL- pseudo-clefts, as in *There is no possibilitie of overthrowing the new election … so all I you can doe is to do some good for the tyme to come* (1624 Oliver Naylor, Letter).This may seem surprising given that most discussion of constructed examples of pseudo-clefts focuses on question-answer pairs, and Hopper (2001) suggests that a key role of WH-clefts in present day conversational data is to delay an assertion at a turn. The historical data show the pseudo-clefts were originally precursors of present-day usage in which WH-clefts serve contesting purposes (Kim 1995).
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