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The prevalent hypothesis in research on pragmatic markers suggests that the left periphery of an utterance attracts predominantly subjective meanings, whereas the right periphery is the locus of intersubjective meanings. The goal of this paper is to test this hypothesis for **but** as used in a dataset of spoken Glaswegian English, a variety in which **but** may occur in both left- and right-peripheral positions. Considering that **but** derives its discursive meaning not *per se*, but from its embeddedness in particularized contexts, the methodological framework integrates the notion of (inter)subjectivity with the interactional-sociolinguistic concept of contextualization cue to identify (inter)subjective patterned co-occurrences for **but**. A fine-grained analysis of the patterns **but** forms with subjective and intersubjective cues in its local linguistic context shows that discourse patterns of left-peripheral **but** tend to foreground subjective meanings, while discourse patterns of right-peripheral **but** tend to foreground more intersubjective meanings, supporting the hypothesis of peripheral asymmetry.

1. Introduction

Increased interest in pragmatic markers (PMs)\(^1\) in utterance-final, or right-peripheral, position across different languages (e.g. Barth-Weingarten & Couper-Kuhlen 2002; Haselow 2012 on English final particles; Koivisto 2012 on Finnish final particles; Van der Wouden & Foolen 2011 on Dutch final particles) has motivated research into potential cross-linguistic correlations between syntactic slots and the functionality of PMs (e.g. Degand & Fagard 2011; Detes & Waltereit 2011; Traugott 2012; contributions in Beeching & Detges 2014). The hypothesis most widely tested to trace cross-linguistic regularity in the positional variation

---

1. *Pragmatic marker* will be used as an umbrella term covering linguistic items commonly referred to as discourse markers, pragmatic markers, pragmatic particles or discourse connectives.
of PMs in terms of “peripheral meaning” (Degand 2014: 153) is one that assumes asymmetry between left periphery (LP) and right periphery (RP), viz. that the LP predominantly attracts subjective meanings, such as topic- and turn-structural functions, whereas the RP is the locus of intersubjective meanings in the sense of interpersonal, hearer-related functionalities (Traugott 2012). While some PMs seem to follow this asymmetric pattern, others have turned out to be non-conformant to the hypothesis (Degand 2014; Traugott 2012). The goal of this paper is to contribute to previous research by testing the asymmetry hypothesis for Glaswegian but, a variety-specific PM.

While verb-final languages such as Japanese with their rich array of right-peripheral PMs offer a large testing ground for further case studies, English provides fewer such opportunities. The small set of English PMs that may occur in both left-peripheral and right-peripheral slots includes, for example, I think (Fetzer 2014; Kaltenböck 2009), though (Barth-Weingarten & Couper-Kuhlen 2002; Beeching 2009) and anyway (Haselow 2013), all of which display positional variation across English varieties, especially in spoken discourse. The variation this paper is interested in, viz. the variation between prospective LP and retrospective RP but, however, has only been observed in a relatively small number of varieties of English, among them Australian English, Maltese English, New Zealand English, South African Indian English, Irish English, Scottish English and Tyneside English (see e.g. Aitken 1979: 109; Beeching 2007; Krug 2015; Mulder et al. 2009; Quirk et al. 1985: 644; Trudgill 1986: 140). This study will be concerned with peripheral variation of but as used in Scottish English, more specifically, the urban dialect of Glasgow. Left-peripheral and right-peripheral uses of but in Glaswegian English are exemplified in (1), where two females are chatting about male acquaintances.

(1) 1 Lorna: [pause] Andrew Donald’s nice  
2 Caitlin: d- you think so?  
3 Lorna: trying // tae think //  
4 Caitlin: // his // teeth butRP!  
5 Lorna: aye, butLP ah’ m try~ , ah’ m trying tae focus on every-  
6 body in [place name] you trying tae get everybody in  
7 [place name] in the heid?

2. Considering that meanings and functions of PMs are interdependent, I will use meaning and function as quasi-synonyms in this paper.

3. Unless stated otherwise, all the examples given in this article are taken from the Glasgow Real-time Corpus (Stuart-Smith 2011–2014). All personal names, street names and place names have been substituted by pseudonyms or deleted from the data to secure data protection. All interpretations of but-occurrences in the excerpts and periphrases are based on judgements by two native-speaker raters.
The *but* uttered by Lorna in line 5 of (1) illustrates LP *but*, the left-peripheral variant in the Glaswegian vernacular. Like Standard English *but*, it operates prospectively, in this particular case initiating a topic shift from Andrew Donald’s physical appearance to other potential friends worth discussing by establishing a concessive relationship between the preceding utterance X (“his teeth *but*”) and the following utterance Y (“I’m trying to focus on the other people in [place name]”). The underlying concession follows the pattern [X *but* Y] and may be paraphrased by ‘I’m trying to focus on the other people. I say this although I share your doubts about Andrew Donald’s appearance’.

*But* in line 4, which exemplifies the right-peripheral variant (RP *but*), does not link the utterances preceding and following it. Rather, it operates retrospectively by linking its host utterance (“his teeth”) back to Lorna’s evaluation of Andrew. In this particular example, RP *but* could be substituted by *though* without changing the meaning of the utterance, as it concedes aspects of Lorna’s statement about Andrew, but raises an objection. The concession follows the pattern [X, Y *but*] and may be paraphrased by ‘Although Andrew is mostly nice looking, his teeth are not’.

The aim of the present article is to test whether Glaswegian *but* correlates with subjective meanings in LP and with intersubjective meanings in RP by examining the discursive patterns the PM forms in a dataset of spoken Glaswegian English. Taking into account that linguistic items derive their discursive meanings not *per se*, but from their embeddedness in specific contexts, the methodological framework integrates the notion of (inter)subjectivity4 with the interactional-sociolinguistic concept of contextualization cues (Gumperz 1982, 1992), conceiving of PMs as cues that pattern with other cues in their local linguistic context to foreground certain meanings. It thus considers the (inter)subjective meaning of a PM as depending on the contextual patterns the PM occurs in, which in turn trigger inferencing processes that may lead to a more subjective or more intersubjective reading of the PM.

To identify (inter)subjective configurations of *but*, discourse patterns (Ariel 2008) the PM forms with other subjective or intersubjective cues in its local linguistic context, viz. its host utterance, on the level of personal pronominal reference, modality (Palmer 2001), stance (Biber et al. 1999) and turn-structure have been filtered out and have, in accordance with Traugott’s (2012) model of (inter)subjectivity, been categorized as (i) subjective when relating to the speaker, (ii) intersubjective when relating to the hearer, and (iii) (inter)subjective when relating to both hearer and speaker.

The article is structured as follows. While Section 2 examines the notions of periphery and intersubjectivity and the assumed asymmetry between LP and RP,

---

4. For convenience, *subjectivity and intersubjectivity* will be contracted to *(inter)subjectivity* throughout the paper.
Section 3 elaborates on the context-dependency of PMs, considering in particular their status as contextualization cues that form part of more complex discourse patterns. Section 4 discusses peripheral variation of but in Glaswegian, paying special attention to LP and RP variants and potential peripheral meanings. Following a description of the methodology, Section 5 presents the discourse patterns identified for LP but and RP but and discusses their implications for the research question. Section 6 summarizes and draws conclusions for further research.

2. Peripheries and (inter)subjectivity

Testing asymmetry between LP and subjectivity and RP and intersubjectivity depends on the interpretation of the notions involved, which have been defined differently across various research paradigms.

The concept of periphery is relational in that it relies on a core unit and a reference unit. As the language under investigation is spoken English, the reference unit chosen for this study is the utterance, and the core unit chosen to identify periphery is the dependency structure of the verb, reflected in the traditional unit of clause. Periphery will hence be taken to refer to the slots that are peripheral to the dependency structure and are positioned at the left and right edges of an utterance.\(^5\) In line with Degand’s (2014: 154f) model of utterance structure,\(^6\) the left periphery is defined

linearly as the most leftward positional slot of the utterance, outside the dependency structure of the verb, at the right of the non-finite verb (if present). Medial position then corresponds to the dependency structure of the clause (predicate-argument structure with adjuncts), which itself has an initial and a final position … Elements at LP are very often utterance-initial, but not always. Similarly, elements at RP are not always utterance-final.

---

5. The differentiation between non-peripheral material and peripheral material adopted in this paper is also reflected in the sentence vs. thetical distinction in Thetical Grammar (Kaltenböck et al. 2011), and the differentiation between intra-clausal and extra-clausal material in Functional Grammar (Dik 1997).

6. The model’s application to natural spoken data is not always as clear since utterances do not always allow the identification of a clausal element, and since boundaries of turns and utterances, whose segmentation relies on syntactic, semantic and prosodic information, are not always clear-cut. Nevertheless, the framework provides an essential methodological tool that is indispensable for an analysis of peripheral items in discourse.
Periphery is assumed to correlate with (inter)subjectivity. Both subjectivity and intersubjectivity are terms used in various areas of linguistic research and, as such, denote diverging concepts. The use of the terms in this paper follows Traugott (2003, 2010, 2012), who regards expressions as subjective when they are evaluative, epistemic, information-structuring and/or connective, and are thus oriented toward the speaker and her/his attitudes; they are labelled intersubjective when they index the speaker’s attentiveness to the hearer’s attitudes and beliefs “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)” (Traugott 2003: 128). In her later work, Traugott (2012: 10) also includes turn-structuring functions, such as elicitation of response and turn-yielding, in her definition of intersubjectivity. Subjectivity and intersubjectivity are considered to be derived from unidirectional historical processes following the cline non-/less subjective > subjective > intersubjective – viz. subjectification and intersubjectification (Traugott & Dasher 2002).

Regarding the relationship between (inter)subjectivity and periphery, a recent hypothesis (e.g. Beeching & Detges 2014; Traugott 2012) assumes that subjectivity and intersubjectivity are asymmetrically distributed across left- and right-peripheral positions, with linguistic items at LP being more subjective, and linguistic items at RP being more intersubjective. This ‘asymmetry hypothesis’ is particularly relevant for PMs appearing in both LP and RP position, since it would predict that the same linguistic item would acquire a more subjective interpretation in LP, and a more intersubjective one in RP.

A number of studies have tested the asymmetry hypothesis for individual PMs in different languages. Some of the PMs examined seem to corroborate the hypothesis of asymmetry (e.g. Degand 2014 on French PMs alors and donc; Degand & Fagard 2011 on alors; Detges & Waltereit 2011 on French subject pronoun moi; El Zarka 2013 on independent pronouns in Egyptian Arabic), whereas others seem to contradict it, especially those dealing with Asian languages (e.g. Hansen 2005 on French enfin; Onodera 2007 on Japanese PMs; Pichler 2013a,b on neg-tag

---


8. The view that the discursive meaning of PMs varies according to syntactic position is also supported by the Principle of No-Synonymy as outlined in Construction Grammar, which states that “if two constructions are syntactically distinct and (S)emantically synonymous, then they must be (P)ragmatically distinct” (Goldberg 1995: 67).
innit; Traugott 2012 on surely and no doubt). Traugott (2012: 8) concludes that the “hypothesized correlation between subjectivity and LP and intersubjectivity and RP is robust, but not deterministic” and that it might not hold cross-linguistically. However, although all the studies mentioned above reportedly draw on the Traugottian definition of (inter)subjectivity, a key problem seems to be the differing application of the notions to specific contextual meanings of PMs.

Degand (2014), for example, coded all information-structuring, argumentative and epistemic uses of PMs alors and donc as subjective, and those with metatextual, interpersonal and interactional uses as intersubjective. If metadiscursive uses had been coded as intersubjective, she notes, “the results would fit the working hypothesis [i.e. that LP attracts subjective meanings and RP intersubjective ones] a lot less” (Degand 2014). Moreover, some PMs encode subjectivity and intersubjectivity at the same time, and thus defy a clear-cut categorization. Hansen’s findings for enfin, for example, which she identifies as conveying “intersubjective stance” (Hansen 2005: 62) when it is used to encode dissatisfaction directed at the hearer, are heavily dependent on a coding that considers the subjective stance encoded in dissatisfaction-signaling enfin as secondary. The indeterminateness of the notions of (inter)subjectivity thus complicate their application to data and hence a verification of the hypothesis in individual studies, which also leads to difficulties for cross-linguistic and cross-research comparisons.

One way to bypass these problems, this paper argues, is to recognize the gradient between subjectivity and intersubjectivity by taking into account the ability of PMs to encode subjectivity and intersubjectivity at the same time, and to think of (inter)subjectivity as being encoded not in the PMs alone, but in their local contexts.

9. Japanese peripheries abound in PMs with (inter)subjective functions (e.g. Izutsu & Izutsu 2014; Onodera 2007; Shinzato 2006, 2007). Their order in the peripheral slot appears to be the result of an underlying layered model with the proposition in the core, subjective elements in an intermediate layer, and intersubjective ones in the outer layer – hence following not an asymmetric, but a symmetric structure (Onodera 2004; Shinzato 2006, 2007).

10. Problems also arise with respect to whether or not elements with clearly intersubjective functions should still be considered intersubjective in Traugott’s terms even if they have not undergone the corresponding semantic process of intersubjectification. Depending on the view taken in this respect, Tottie & Hoffmann’s (2006) analysis of tags, the majority of which are identified as being confirmatory and facilitative, and thus of an intersubjective, though not intersubjectified, nature, either corroborates or contradicts the asymmetry hypothesis (see also Traugott 2012: 11f).
3. (Inter)subjective discourse patterns

An explicit accommodation of context in the study of PMs has recently become a major issue in various approaches to PMs. In the field of Construction Grammar, for example, Fischer & Alm (2013: 49) draw attention to the impact of linguistic context on the interpretation of PMs, which, in their view, is “not defined by the lexemes [viz. potential PMs] but is a matter of their use in context … The structural contexts in which the particles under consideration occur have been found to determine, at least partly, the interpretations the particles have in conversation”. Aijmer (2013: 18) additionally stresses the importance of sociocultural contexts in the study of PMs, as these may account for their “‘indexically rich’ sociolinguistic or situational meanings”. Sociocultural context can in turn be conceived as a particularized type of social context, viz. a communicative situation in which co-participants with particular speaker roles negotiate and co-construct meanings in particular physical surroundings and particular institutional or non-institutional domains (Fetzer 2004). Moreover, the processing of PMs is based on inferencing, and is thus also inextricably linked to cognitive context, viz. mental representations, propositions, contextual and factual assumptions, and common ground. Against this background, the relationship between PMs and context may be understood as one of interdependency: a PM requests the hearer to perform inference operations that feed on its local and global contexts, and at the same time, the production of the PM itself contributes to the construal of local or global contexts.

As has been suggested by Aijmer (2013), the relation of interdependency of PM and context is best captured in the interactional-sociolinguistic notion of contextualization cue (Gumperz 1982, 1992). Contextualization cues are implicature-generating devices of verbal and non-verbal nature that function relationally and cannot be assigned context-independent, stable, core lexical meanings. Foregrounding processes, moreover, do not rest on any one single cue. Rather, assessments depend on co-occurrence judgments … that simultaneously evaluate a variety of different cues. When interpreted with reference to lexical and grammatical knowledge, structural position within a clause and sequential location within a stretch of discourse, foregrounding becomes an input to implicatures, yielding situated interpretations. (Gumperz 1992: 232)

According to the interactional-sociolinguistic framework, a PM’s multifunctionality may hence be explained by the different generalized and particularized contextual configurations it occurs in (cf. Aijmer 2013; Fetzer 2014; Fischer & Alm 2013). More generalized functions will be represented by more general configurations of cues, while more particularized functions will be represented by more particularized patterns. Depending on their frequency in discourse, these
patterned co-occurrences (Fetzer 2014) trigger more or less generalized conversational implicatures. They may accordingly be regarded as emergent or salient discourse patterns, which stand out either because they are frequent, or because of other reasons ... The most important feature of salience is that what is salient is highly accessible to us, foremost on our minds, and hence more easily available for use. Salient discourse patterns may lead to various conventionalizations. They may ... create syntactic options not previously available ... and they may conventionalize contextually derived interpretations. (Ariel 2008: 188f)

*Emergent discourse patterns* and *patterned co-occurrences* may be used interchangeably and describe patterns that are not as frequent, but may increase in frequency over time (Fetzer 2014).

Against this background, the attribution of subjective and intersubjective meanings to a PM may be considered as the result of its forming patterns with other contextualization cues indexing (inter)subjectivity, which may contribute to the foregrounding of subjective or intersubjective meanings. The (inter)subjective meaning of a PM is thus conceived as a foregrounded discursive meaning that is *not* generated by the PM alone, but by ‘contextually derived interpretations’ triggered by patterned co-occurrences of the PM with other (inter)subjective cues in its local linguistic context. Applied to *but*, this means that an occurrence of *but* is likely to receive a subjective interpretation when patterning with subjective contextualization cues such as first person pronouns, markers of speaker stance or speaker-related modality in its host utterance, whereas it is likely to receive an intersubjective interpretation when patterning with intersubjective contextualization cues, such as second person pronouns, or hearer-related stance markers. Moreover, frequencies of patterns formed by the LP and the RP variant in the data may give insights on salient and emergent subjective and intersubjective patterns *but* forms in different peripheral positions, which may contribute to the assignment of more stable subjective or intersubjective meanings to the variants, thus allowing a strategic testing of the asymmetry hypothesis as outlined above.

Considering LP *but* and RP *but* as dependent variables forming patterns with (inter)subjective cues thus allows an examination of whether the peripheral variants correlate with either subjectivity or intersubjectivity; the asymmetry hypothesis may be discarded if both peripheral variants exhibit similar salient or emergent patterns, or it may be evidenced if the analysis yields an uneven distribution of (inter)subjective patterns across the variants in the sense that RP favours intersubjectivity and LP favours subjectivity. The primary goal of this study is therefore the filtering out of subjective and intersubjective patterns LP *but* and RP *but* form with (inter)subjective cues in their local context, viz. their host utterance, in order
to detect potential asymmetries in the (inter)subjective salient patterns and patterned co-occurrences of which they form part.

For the identification of (inter)subjective cues in but’s local linguistic context, it is assumed that, being elementary functions in the negotiation-of-meaning processes linearly instantiated in discourse, subjectivity and intersubjectivity may be encoded on various verbal and non-verbal levels including, amongst others, stance, modality, prosody and gesture. As the dataset analyzed does not provide visual data and the quality of audio-data fluctuates, the analysis is confined to explicit verbal cues on the levels of (i) personal pronominal reference, (ii) modality, (iii) stance and (iv) turn-structure to transparently filter out subjective and intersubjective patterns in accordance with Traugott’s (2012) model of (inter)subjectivity.

i. On the level of pronominal reference, subjective, objective and possessive personal pronouns may refer exclusively to the speaker (viz. I, me, my and ‘exclusive’ we, us, our, etc.), exclusively to the hearer (viz. you, your, etc.) or to both speaker and hearer (viz. ‘inclusive’ we, us, our, etc.), and are accordingly categorized as subjective, intersubjective or (inter)subjective.

ii. The categorization of modality follows Palmer’s (2001) model of epistemic (probability/predictability), deontic (permission/obligation) and dynamic (ability/volition) modality and differentiates between speaker-oriented and hearer-oriented modality as conceptualized by Narrog (2012). Epistemic modality is considered speaker-oriented if the judgements made reflect the speaker’s assessment, and hearer-oriented if they reflect the hearer’s assessment (e.g. in questions like Do you think it’ll snow?). Deontic modality is considered speaker-oriented if the authority of the deontic utterance is the speaker (e.g. I don’t allow her to go) or if the speaker is the target of the utterance (e.g. I’m not allowed to go); conversely, it is considered hearer-oriented if the hearer is the authority or target of the deontic utterance. Lastly, dynamic modality is considered speaker-oriented or hearer-oriented when signaling the speaker’s or hearer’s willingness/ability, respectively. Speaker-oriented modality is generally categorized as subjective, hearer-related modality as intersubjective. Cases in which speaker- and hearer-oriented modality overlap (e.g. in you may not go now!) are accordingly categorized as (inter)subjective.


12. Note that this categorization differs crucially from other notions of (inter)subjectivity as employed by researchers such as Nuyts (2001) or Lyons (1977). For an overview of these, see Nuyts (2012).
subjective. To account for modality in the local context of but, the study considers explicit modal cues including (modal) verbs (e.g. may, might, doubt, think), (sentential) adverbs (e.g. actually, maybe, surely) and PMs with modal values (e.g. I think, I dunno).

iii. The analysis treats stance roughly in accordance with Biber et al.’s (1999) affective stance and Martin & White’s (2005) appraisal, understanding it as a category that encodes (inter)subjectivity in cues indexing the speaker’s attitudes/feelings/evaluations (subjective) or the speaker’s attention to the hearer’s attitudes/feelings/evaluations (intersubjective). Stance cues considered in the analysis include evaluative or emotive adjectives (e.g. fantastic, dumb, happy), intensifiers and other adverbs indexing stance (e.g. pure, really, just, then), as well as PMs such as interjections (e.g. oh, fuck), tags (e.g. innit) and agreement markers (aye, uh-huh).

iv. On the level of turn-structure, but is considered, in accordance with Traugott (2012), to occur in a subjective turn-structural context if its position in the turn structure hints at a turn-claiming/turn-holding function, e.g. if it is located in turn-initial position or followed by turn-holding particles such as ehm. Its turn-structural context is categorized as intersubjective if suggesting a turn-yielding function, e.g. if it occurs in turn-final position, an interrogative utterance or an imperative utterance.

Operationalization of the notions of subjectivity and intersubjectivity as cued on these four levels of linguistic context is summarized in Table 1.

4. PM but in Glaswegian English

The testing ground for the asymmetry hypothesis as outlined above will be the variation between LP but and RP but in Glaswegian English. As mentioned in the introduction, variation between prospective LP but and retrospective RP but has not only been observed for Glaswegian English, but in several geographically scattered varieties of English. The occurrence of RP but in these varieties might not due to independent intravarietal processes, but a result of the dispersal of the British variant during British colonialization, with Scottish and Irish English as the sources of RP but as used in non-British varieties (e.g. Fritz 2007: 210; Moore 2008: 91; Trudgill 1986: 140). Right-peripheral uses of items equivalent to English RP but have also been observed for Finnish (see Koivisto 2012 on RP mutta) and Japanese (see Izutsu & Izutsu 2014 on RP demo and sikasi), suggesting cross-linguistic variation.
Carolin Hofmockel

thus confined to spoken, mostly informal, language (e.g. Beeching 2007; Mulder et al. 2009), whereas LP but may be observed in all registers. As a consequence of the far more wide-spread use of LP but in English in general and the focus of earlier research on initial position, studies on LP but vastly outnumber those on RP but.

The dataset used for the empirical research summarized in this paper has been extracted from the Glasgow real-time corpus “Sounds of the City” (Stuart-Smith 2011–2014), which was originally designed to track fine phonetic variation and sound change in the urban dialect of Glasgow and contains recordings and transcripts from a four-decade period (1970s–2000s). With the dataset of the 2000s capturing the most intimate, symmetrical, private and informal conversations between speakers from the area, the analysis was restricted to the recordings and transcripts from the most recent decade, a dataset that includes roughly 150,000 words uttered by 36 speakers from three different age groups.

To give further insights into the use of the two peripheral variants as conceptualized in this paper, a further example displaying both an LP and an RP variant is provided in (2).15

---

15. The discursive meanings of but in the dataset were determined with help from two native raters (one male, one female) who answered the following questions: (1) Is but LP or RP? (2) Can its position be shifted without a change in discursive meaning? (3) Can you paraphrase the utterance containing but? All claims about discursive meanings of but and the periphrases given derive from their answers.
In (2), but in line 1 is a typical representative of LP but, which equals prospective Standard English but in Glaswegian English. In line with the Standard variant, LP but may occur in turn-initial and/or utterance-initial position. Intonationally, it may form an independent IU or may be integrated into the intonation units (IU) of the host utterance it introduces, as is the case in (2), where but forms an IU with “he’s~.”

But in line 5, on the other hand, exemplifies the variant referred to as RP but throughout this article. In previous studies, it was also termed “final but” (Mulder & Thompson 2006, 2008), “final particle but” (Mulder et al. 2009), “clause-final but” (Beeching 2007, 2009) and “backshift but” (Izutsu & Izutsu 2014). Unlike LP but, which may also form an independent IU, this variant is invariably intonationally integrated into its host utterance and is uttered with terminal intonation (cf. Izutsu & Izutsu 2014). Moreover, it may sometimes be followed by tag questions and other address markers, so that it does not necessarily occupy the rightmost position in an IU, as will be shown in later examples, e.g. in (6). Instead of pointing to upcoming discourse, it has a retrospective orientation, i.e. it points backwards in discourse, and is therefore considered “a ‘fully-developed’ final particle” by Mulder & Thompson (2008: 192). In this particular example, RP but serves to establish a retrospective concession between the inferred statements X (“Andy has a remarkable size for his age”), which is partly conceded and contrasted via but by a directly preceding Y (“Andy is turning fifteen next month, and thus maybe older than you think”), and is therefore very similar to concessive final though (Barth-Weingarten & Couper-Kuhlen 2002), which could substitute but in the above example without any change in discursive meaning.

RP but as conceptualized in this paper differs from an utterance-final particle, which, unlike RP but, prospectively projects an implied proposition. Presumably featuring in all English varieties, this particular variant of but has been referred to

---

16. Phonetic make-up may have a much deeper impact on processing. First observations suggest that RP but’s have a longer duration than LP but’s, and the vast majority of but’s are uttered with an open-mid back unrounded vowel and a glottal stop in RP, while they typically exhibit a central vowel in LP, suggesting that vowel length and vowel quality might be discriminatory devices in online production.
in the literature as “final hanging but” (Mulder & Thompson 2008; Mulder et al. 2009) and “truncation but” (Izutsu & Izutsu 2014), but also as “final but” (Haselow 2013; Norrick 2009), with a stress on the fact that typically it ends an IU and is usually followed by a substantial pause, which often, though not necessarily, leads to speaker change. Unlike RP but, however, it is uttered with intermediate pitch (cf. Haselow 2013: 394f), and it differs from both LP and RP but in that the second statement Y, which is typically contrasted via but with statement X, is implicit, and has to be retrieved from the context by the hearer instead (cf. Haselow 2013; Izutsu & Izutsu 2014). Phonologically, this prospective variant can either form an independent IU when it is bracketed by pauses or it can be included in the IU of the utterance it accompanies. A typical example is illustrated in (3), an American English example adopted from Mulder & Thompson (2006: 13). Here, but trails an implicit concession that may be paraphrased as ‘Although I don’t like hot dogs that well, I ate these anyway’ (cf. Mulder & Thompson 2006: 13). “That is, this but tells the hearer that there’s an implication, and invites the listener to infer what it is and to continue the interaction appropriately given that implication” (Mulder et al. 2009: 345f).

(3) Annette: So I had two of them, and I mean the first one kinda tasted pretty // good? And I ate the other one, then half of the other one //
Alice: // [laugh] //
Annette: it was like, whoah.
Alice: // Yeah. //
Annette: // I don’t l // ike hot dogs that well but, [pause] and then we had cake.

In the tagging of Glaswegian but-occurrences as either left-peripheral or right-peripheral for this study, items prosodically qualifying as “final hanging but” were considered as independent units lacking a host utterance, left-peripheral PMs that accompany an elliptical, yet inferable, host utterance, or as ambiguous items (in which case they were excluded from analysis) for the following reasons. Firstly, since speakers sometimes continue or try to continue their turn after the pause that follows a potential final-hanging but, it is often difficult to tell whether the PM is actually supposed to trail a non-verbalized statement, or whether a speaker only uses it as a turn-holding particle which in fact is intended by the speaker to serve

17. The transcription symbols of (3) have been adapted to fit the ones given in the appendix.

18. For an opposing line of argumentation with respect to the ‘final hanging’ variant of French donc, see Degand (2014: 156f), who has categorized such variants as belonging to RP on the basis of their tendency to invite turn-yielding.
as a left-peripheral connective (see also Haselow 2012: 184). Looking at authentic examples, it is usually only the response of the addressee that may suggest that an inference has been triggered by but, for example when the proposition implicitly realized by the speaker is explicated by the addressee herself/himself, or when the addressee signals agreement as in the above example (“yeah”). Secondly, even if it clearly trails a “hanging” implication, but is still clearly prospective in its discursive orientation, so that it can be assumed to be cognitively rather associated with the elliptically realized Y-proposition than with the explicitly realized X-proposition. Against this background, it would be misleading to consider final hanging but as right-peripheral in the framework applied.

From what has been said so far, we can conclude that the discrimination of left-peripheral from right-peripheral uses of but is determined by the complex interplay of prosodic and semantic contexts the PM is embedded in. But may qualify as left-peripheral if it forms the left edge of an IU or an independent IU and is uttered with non-terminal pitch from a prosodic perspective, and if its linguistic context assigns it a prospective discursive orientation. If it is located at or towards the right edge of an IU, and has a retrospective discursive orientation, it may be considered as belonging to RP. Drawing on an excerpt from Example (2), Table 2 applies this conceptualization of LP and RP variants to the framework of utterance structure as outlined in Section 2.

All LP and RP variants of but identified in Glaswegian English qualify as members of the PM category, which is generally viewed as a fuzzy functional category with more or less prototypical members exhibiting certain phonological, semantic, syntactic, sociolinguistic and functional qualities (Brinton 1996: 33–35; Jucker & Ziv 1998). Similar to prototypical PMs, which have been described as multifunctional metatextual elements operating simultaneously on several discursive levels (a.o. Aijmer 2002; Blakemore 1987; Brinton 1996; Hansen 1998; Lenk 1998; Schiffrin 1987), both LP and RP uses of but display a wide range of discursive meanings.

For LP but a broad variety of functions in spoken and written English discourse have been reported, the most important of which will be mentioned here.19 According to the literature, LP but is often used as a marker of contrast or concession, but is also frequently employed as a topic shifter “that does not signal an objection towards the previous speaker’s utterance, but a deviation from the current discourse topic” (Altenberg 1986: 28f; see also Norrick 2001; Schiffrin 1987). Furthermore, it may be employed as a topic-resumer (or pop-marker, Polanyi & Scha 1983: 152) that marks “a return to the original line of thought” (Altenberg

19. More comprehensive functional accounts and examples can be found in Altenberg (1986), Couper-Kuhlen & Thompson (2000), Norrick (2001) and Schiffrin (1987) and references there.
186: 32) and that may contribute to self-repairs (Schiffrin 1987). Additionally, Altenberg (1986: 29) points to an involvement of LP but in face-saving strategies, which hints at an intersubjective meaning of LP but in discourse. On a turn-structural level, LP but often serves as a turn-claiming or turn-holding device. With most relevant work on RP but taking a primarily diachronic perspective, the discursive functions of RP but have not received much attention yet. Studies dealing with the Australian RP variant (Mulder & Thompson 2006, 2008; Mulder et al. 2009; Izutsu & Izutsu 2014), for example, focus almost exclusively on its emergence from its LP counterpart and make only scarce reference to potential functions. Similarly, its functions are only briefly sketched in Beeching’s (2007, 2009) studies of Dumbarton English (South-West Scotland). The following paragraphs will outline the functions as mentioned in the literature.

According to Beeching (2009: 97), RP but “retains its canonical adversative sense in some contexts but not in others”. It often serves as an “adversative refutation marker” (Beeching 2009: 97; see also Beeching 2007; Izutsu & Izutsu 2014; Mulder et al. 2009) to indicate contrast and concession by establishing coherence relations between its host utterance and other units of discourse. Both RP but’s employed in Examples (1) and (2) above are illustrative of this function.

In other cases involving potentially face-threatening propositions, Beeching (2007, 2009) argues, RP but softens the face-threatening act (FTA) committed, but at the same time reinforces the contradictive statement it is attached to. An example comparable to the one given by Beeching can be found in the sequel to Example (1), illustrated in (4).

(4) 1 Lorna: [pause] Andrew Donald’s nice
2 Caitlin: d- you think so?
In line 7, Lorna ‘echoes’ her earlier statement made in line 1. Audio material shows that Lorna’s contribution is uttered in a rather unagitated, calm manner and low pitch; RP but may therefore be interpreted as softening the FTA in this particular example. The utterance seeks Caitlin’s approval and may be paraphrased by ‘I have taken into consideration your evaluation of Andrew, but I don’t agree’. In other examples displaying such echo-clauses, RP but seems to either intensify or down-tone FTAs related to topical development in the discourse, especially when interactants are talking at cross-purposes as in (5). Abigail tries to draw Samantha’s attention back to what she said earlier by attaching but to her utterance, which can thus be considered as a marker of topic shifts in such examples.

(5) Abigail: Oh man, I can’t wait to go on holiday. It’ll be pure brilliant, won’t it? Are we definitely goin’?
Samantha: Mind when Chris~
Abigail: Are we?
Samantha: Mind when Chris [unclear]~
Abigail: That’s pure terrible he changed his number cause we kept phoning them [laugh] [pause] No. testing. Don’t make me laugh.
Samantha: Thingmie
Abigail: No it’ll be dead good this holiday but. This is my plan, right, we get to the holiday just the early hours of the morning, right?

While, according to the native speakers consulted, a weak contrastive meaning of RP but is still traceable on the level of discourse topic in (5), other occurrences of RP but completely lack a contrastive element and have therefore been described as being purely intensifying (Beeching 2009; Izutsu & Izutsu 2014). While RP but can be fronted to the prototypical LP position or substituted by though without creating

20. Judgments of the two native speakers consulted revealed that while an LP but would have openly acknowledged a conflict and invited further negotiations, RP but may be interpreted as either softening or reinforcing the FTA here, depending on the intonation involved. An intonation pattern with higher pitches, indicating emotional involvement and insistence, would have rendered the use of RP but in Lorna’s utterance as emphasizing the contradiction, making her contribution more offensive.
significant semantic changes in many cases, this is usually not possible “without giving rise to pragmatic and sometimes semantic infelicity” (Izutsu & Izutsu 2014: 73) in cases in which RP but is employed as a purely intensifying device. In (6), for example, where RP but emphasizes Jonathan’s evaluative contribution, a move to LP or a substitution of but by though would imply a contrast that is difficult to accommodate within the discourse and would render the utterance rather awkward:

(6) Michael: you watching Jackass the night?
   Jonathan: Is it on Channel four?
   Michael: aye
   Jonathan: Aye, I will. Have you seen the movie of //that yet? //
   Michael: // a-- aye // uh-huh, I’ve, I’ve got it but I’ve no seen it, seen bits of it
   Jonathan: He does some stupid shit butRp man, he makes a wee mad
crocodile bite his nipple and aw that
   Michael: does // he // ?

To sum up, despite their different discursive orientations, we can observe a considerable functional overlap between the LP and RP variants of but.21 Determining the functionality of left-peripheral and right-peripheral instances of but in the data is thus a very complex endeavor that depends on the local contexts the PM occurs in. To fulfil the goal of testing an asymmetric distribution of subjective and intersubjective discursive meanings of but across the peripheries, this study suggests, a more appropriate approach is to accommodate patterns of LP and RP but with other (inter)subjective cues to find out if the peripheral variants correlate with subjectivity and intersubjectivity in their local linguistic context.

5. (Inter)subjective patterns of Glaswegian but

5.1 Procedure

The goal of this study is to track potential differences in the patterns LP but and RP but form with (inter)subjective cues in the local linguistic context of their host utterance. As already indicated in Section 3, the dataset used for analysis belongs to the Glasgow Real-time corpus and comprises about 150,000 words from speakers of three age groups recorded in the 2000s. As the study is interested in positional variation of PM but, RP and LP uses of but that would serve as dependent variables for

---

21. This is also reflected in the judgements of the native speaker raters, which imply that the pragmatic meaning of RP but is sometimes very hard to pin down and a lot more elusive than that of LP but.
later analyses were identified. This involved the tagging of *but*-occurrences in the data as either ‘Non-PM’ (if used as prepositions or nouns, if part of direct speech or if inaudible in the recording; thus excluded from analysis), or as ‘LP’ or ‘RP’ in line with the model of utterance-structure described in Section 2 (see Table 3). Since the tagging process revealed that the data section representing the older age group does not exhibit a clear variation of LP and RP *but*, the variable context was restricted to texts representing the younger and middle age group, yielding an overall number of 586 *but*’s, 65 (11.1%) of which were excluded from analysis, 409 (69.8%) of which are positioned in LP and 112 (19.1%) of which are positioned in RP.

To filter out salient and emergent discourse patterns, (inter)subjective cues in the host utterances of the dependent variables were identified and categorized as subjective or intersubjective in accordance with the framework established in Section 4. These categorizations formed the basis for identifying subjective, intersubjective and (inter)subjective patterns of *but* in LP and RP. Finally, every instance of the dependent variables was assigned a four-digit code reflecting a combination of values assigned to the four levels analyzed. If an instance did not pattern with any (inter)subjective cues on a certain level, it was assigned the value ‘N’ (neutral) for this level; if it patterned with subjective cues at that level, it was assigned the value ‘S’ (subjective), and if it patterned with intersubjective or (inter)subjective cues, it was assigned the value ‘I’ (intersubjective). The four-digit codes then served to identify patterned co-occurrences and more salient discourse patterns for the peripheral variants.

---

22. If *but*-occurrences were interpretable as having prospective or retrospective discursive orientation, and if they, at the same time, did not exhibit a clear terminal intonation identifying them as right-peripheral, they were categorized as ‘ambiguous’ and excluded from further analysis. Whenever host utterances of LP *but* contained a false start or a repetition, they were not split if they still formed a coherent whole. If a false start ended abruptly without forming a coherent whole with what followed, however, false start and following utterance were treated as two separate utterances. To secure reliability, tagging was checked against categorization of *but*’s by the two native raters and updated accordingly, re-tagging items as ‘ambiguous’ which had been identified by at least one rater as ambiguous or upon which analyses differed.

23. This apparent-time distribution suggests that Glaswegian English has seen a steep rise in the use of RP *but* over the past years, strongly implying an increase in usage of the PM in real-time, and seems to challenge the hypothesis that RP *but* has a longer history in the Scottish variety. Differences may also be due, however, to the somewhat higher formality of the texts in the older age group.
5.2 Results

The analysis of (inter)subjective cues in the local contexts of but in the data reveals that both the LP variant and the RP variant may co-occur with subjective and intersubjective contextualization cues. On the level of personal pronominal reference (Table 3), for example, both LP but and RP but have the tendency to co-occur with (inter)subjective pronominal reference (62% and 53%).

While neither of the variants tends to pattern with both subjective and intersubjective pronouns, LP items clearly prefer subjective pronominal reference (henceforth PR) over intersubjective PR (28% vs. 8%), whereas RP but equally attracts subjective and intersubjective PR, suggesting a slightly more intersubjective value of RP but.

Table 3. Co-occurrences of peripheral but with personal pronominal reference*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Personal pronominal reference</th>
<th>LP but</th>
<th>RP but</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Personal pronominal patterns</td>
<td>overall N</td>
<td>154</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td></td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUBJECTIVE</td>
<td>p</td>
<td>0.0007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subjective</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Objective</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Possessive</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INTERSUBJECTIVE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subjective</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Objective</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Possessive</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(INTER)SUBJECTIVE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S + S</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S + O</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O + S</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pos + S</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Abbreviations in this and the following tables are in line with those given in Table 1. P-values have been calculated using a chi-square test that considered LP and RP but as dependent variables, and neutral, subjective, intersubjective and (inter)subjective as independent variables, indicating whether differences in correlations of RP and LP but with the independent variables are significant at $p < 0.05$. 
A similar picture emerges if we consider the co-occurrences of *but* with modal cues (Table 4). While only 18% of all LP *but*’s pattern with modality, more than one third of all RP *but*’s (34%) do. Despite this unequal distribution, both variants prefer subjective patterns with epistemic or dynamic modality over others. A clear difference may be observed for patterns involving both hearer- and speaker-oriented modality, though, in which RP *but* outweighs LP *but* with 8% vs. 2%. The most recurrent pattern of hearer-related and speaker-related modal cues here is one of deontic modality where the hearer is the target of a directive utterance issued by the speaker as the authority, as in (7).

(7) (Abigail just told Samantha about a kiss)
Samantha: How, were you drunk?
Abigail: No.
Samantha: Oh.
Abigail: Don’t tell anybody *but*<sub>RP</sub>. // Rachel and // Amy know, that’s it.
Samantha: // No I won’t. //

With respect to stance cues, LP *but* again slightly lags behind the RP variant in all three domains (overall 49% vs. 67%), the biggest deviation (9% vs. 15%) being detectable for (inter)subjective stance patterns (Table 5). Strikingly, RP *but* co-occurs more frequently than LP *but* with subjective evaluations (16% vs. 9%), a typical example being RP *but* in (4) above.

Table 4. Co-occurrences of peripheral *but* with modality

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Modality</th>
<th>LP <em>but</em></th>
<th>RP <em>but</em></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Overall</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>P</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.0009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subjective</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Epistemic</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deontic</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dynamic</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>N</strong></td>
<td>61</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intersubjective</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Epistemic</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deontic</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>N</strong></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Inter)subjective</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>N</strong></td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
As regards turn-structuring, all turn-peripheral representatives of LP *but* must *per se* be considered subjective in the Traugottian system, just as all turn-peripheral uses of RP *but* have to be considered intersubjective, which is why this categorization may be tautological to a certain extent. Interestingly, however, Table 6 shows

### Table 5. Co-occurrences of peripheral *but* with stance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stance patterns</th>
<th>LP <em>but</em></th>
<th>RP <em>but</em></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>overall N</td>
<td>201</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUBJECTIVE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ev&lt;sub&gt;S&lt;/sub&gt; only</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PM&lt;sub&gt;S&lt;/sub&gt; only</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adv&lt;sub&gt;S&lt;/sub&gt; only</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ev&lt;sub&gt;S&lt;/sub&gt; + PM&lt;sub&gt;S&lt;/sub&gt;</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ev&lt;sub&gt;S&lt;/sub&gt; + Adv&lt;sub&gt;S&lt;/sub&gt;</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INTERSUBJECTIVE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PM&lt;sub&gt;1&lt;/sub&gt; only</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PM</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>adress marker</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tag</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>general extender</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>agreement marker</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>agree</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>disagree</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ev&lt;sub&gt;I&lt;/sub&gt; only</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ev&lt;sub&gt;I&lt;/sub&gt; + PM&lt;sub&gt;1&lt;/sub&gt;</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(INTER)SUBJECTIVE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PM&lt;sub&gt;1&lt;/sub&gt; + PM&lt;sub&gt;S&lt;/sub&gt;</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PM&lt;sub&gt;1&lt;/sub&gt; + Adv&lt;sub&gt;S&lt;/sub&gt;</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PM&lt;sub&gt;1&lt;/sub&gt; + PM&lt;sub&gt;S&lt;/sub&gt;</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PM&lt;sub&gt;1&lt;/sub&gt; + PM&lt;sub&gt;S&lt;/sub&gt; + Adv&lt;sub&gt;S&lt;/sub&gt;</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PM&lt;sub&gt;1&lt;/sub&gt; + PM&lt;sub&gt;S&lt;/sub&gt; + Ev&lt;sub&gt;S&lt;/sub&gt;</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
that RP but is more often turn-peripheral than LP but, viz. it is more frequently followed by speaker change than LP but initiates turn-takes, suggesting that RP but has more influence over the turn-taking system than LP but has.

Going beyond isolated levels, the assignment of four-digit codes made up of the values ‘S’ (subjective), ‘I’ (subjective or (inter)subjective) and ‘N’ (lack of (inter)subjective cues) for each of the four levels analyzed to the but-occurrences as indicated above allowed the identification and quantification of neutral (NNNN), subjective (SNNN, SSNN, SSSN), intersubjective (NNNI, NNII, NIII, IIII) and (inter)subjective (SNNI, SSNI, SNII, SSSI, SSII, SIII) patterned co-occurrences that would reveal more salient discourse patterns of but in LP and RP. Counting all combinations of the codes yielded from this process, the tendencies observed for isolated levels seem to be corroborated.

As is clearly shown in Figure 1, RP but forms considerably more intersubjective and (inter)subjective discourse patterns than LP but, which forms the most salient pattern with subjective cues only (29.5%), revealing a significant difference ($p < 0.00001$) between the two dependent variants. The tendencies of LP but and RP but to pattern with subjective and (inter)subjective cues even appear to be diametrically opposed. While an overall 48% of LP occurrences pattern with subjectivity and 17% with (inter)subjectivity, (inter)subjective patterns make up 37.5% and subjective ones 14.5% of all RP patterns. In fact, RP but clearly leads before LP
but in both intersubjective and (inter)subjective domains, revealing an asymmetry with regard to the meanings attracted by the variants.

Within the most salient pattern of LP but, viz. SNNN (29.5%), the two most frequent patterned co-occurrences were formed by LP but with (a) [neutral PC][no modality][no stance][turn-structural] and (b) [neutral PC][no modality][subjective stance][turn-medial], as in (8). The most frequent patterned co-occurrences adding to the formation of the most salient patterns of RP but, i.e. SNNI and NNII, were (c) [neutral PC][no modality][subjective stance][turn-structural], exemplified in (9) and (d) [neutral PC][no modality][intersubjective stance][turn-structural].

(8) They said I could go to ehm college an that but$_{LP}$ I’m quite happy doing what I’m doing.

(9) Lauren: Ah don’t like Ben at aw. He just looks doon at on everybody, as if // he’s better than // everybody.

Melissa: // He’s pure lovely but$_{RP}$ //
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(10) Jonathan: Was there anything in them [= the houses]?
Michael: Just got hammers and aw that.
Jonathan: quite nice hooses \( \text{but}_{\text{RP}} \) aren’t they no?

5.3 Discussion

In the analysis of salient patterns, turn-structure has played a decisive role for categorizations of LP \textit{but} as subjective and of RP \textit{but} as intersubjective. Considering that the LP variant may not be categorized as intersubjective and the RP variant may not be categorized as subjective within the framework applied, and that turn-structure therefore may not be as reliable a category as modality or stance, a valid objection may be that the inclusion of this category may skew the analysis. Interestingly, however, chi-square tests that considered LP and RP \textit{but} as dependent variables, and neutral, subjective, intersubjective and (inter)subjective as independent variables provide evidence that there is also a statistically significant difference in the distribution of subjective, intersubjective and (inter)subjective values in all other categories considered (cf. Tables 3 to 6). Although p-values vary slightly, asymmetry may be regarded as stable across categories.

Judging from the distribution of (inter)subjective patterns across the two variants, it may hence be assumed that the frequent foregrounding of subjective meanings in patterns of LP \textit{but} contributes to the stabilization of a more subjective reading of the LP variant, and that the frequent foregrounding of intersubjective meanings promotes the stabilization of a more intersubjective reading of RP \textit{but}. The distribution of patterns across the peripheral variants of Glaswegian \textit{but} are hence suggestive of a correlation between subjectivity and LP and between intersubjectivity and RP in Glaswegian English that corroborates the above depicted hypothesis of peripheral asymmetry.

The picture that emerges from the contextual analysis, however, reveals that the stratification of meanings triggered by the peripheral variants and their patterns is by no means a sharp one. Rather, the patterns identified show that in both variants, subjective meanings layer with intersubjective or neutral ones in various ways, resulting in multilayered meanings in single instances of \textit{but}, and in an orchestrated interplay of meanings in the peripheral variants in general. Meanings foregrounded through the patterns in which the variants occur therefore do not follow a clear-cut divide; more precisely, they are scattered along a cline from more subjective to more intersubjective. On this cline, LP \textit{but} as found in the data is oriented more towards the former pole, whereas RP \textit{but} is oriented more towards the latter pole, hinting at a gradient between LP and subjectivity, and RP and intersubjectivity.
The synchronic distribution of but-occurrences and its meanings in the data are suggestive of an underlying process of grammaticalization but is affected by in Glaswegian English (cf. Izutsu & Izutsu 2014 on AusE but). The occurrences of LP, RP and ambiguous uses of the PM indicate that it is going through a process of syntactic expansion from LP to RP. Within the same process, it appears to be developing more intersubjective meanings from formerly “neutral” and subjective ones – a development that would be in line with Traugott’s concept of intersubjectification, a process by which meanings, “once subjectified, may be recruited to encode meanings centred on the addressee” (Traugott 2010: 35).

6. Conclusion

Conceptualizing PMs as contextualization cues whose meanings are dependent on their embedment in specific contextual configurations, this article has provided an analysis of Glaswegian PM but against the background of potential position-function correlations involving clines of (inter)subjectivity. It has argued that specific functionalities of LP and RP but should be ascribed to patterned co-occurrences they form with other contextualization cues in their local context, as these may be suggestive of emergent or salient discourse patterns contributing to a stabilization of implicatures triggered by the PM, and thus of its attributed discursive (inter)subjective meanings.

To test the hypothesis of (inter)subjective asymmetry for the positional variation of but, (inter)subjectivity was seen as encoded in personal pronominal reference, modality, stance and turn-structure. The qualitative analysis has revealed that both variants exhibit a complex interplay of multilayered meanings. Quantification has shown that the distribution of subjective, (inter)subjective and intersubjective patterns differs significantly across the peripheral variants, with LP but forming more salient patterns with subjective cues and RP but attracting more intersubjective meanings. The resulting emergent and salient patterns are likely to contribute to a stabilization of subjective meanings of but in LP, and of intersubjective meanings of but in RP. Moreover, the peripheral distribution of meanings is suggestive of an underlying process of grammaticalization or pragmaticalization involving intersubjectification.

For future case studies, it may be worthwhile to adopt a layered view of (inter)subjective meanings of PMs across peripheries as found for LP and RP but by taking into account their local contexts in general, and their patterned co-occurrences with other (inter)subjective cues in particular. Systematic analyses of PMs within their local linguistic contexts may help to appropriately accommodate the indeter-
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minateness of PMs in discourse, to filter out fine semantic-pragmatic differences between peripheral variants and to enable intra- and cross-linguistic comparisons.
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Appendix. Transcription symbols

// overlap
. terminal intonation
, non-terminal intonation
? question intonation
~ incomplete word or abrupt break
[ ] pause or anonymized content
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