

## Argument and Rhetoric. Adverbial Connectors in the History of English

# Topics in English Linguistics

## 64

*Editors*

Bernd Kortmann

Elizabeth Closs Traugott

De Gruyter Mouton

# Argument and Rhetoric. Adverbial Connectors in the History of English

*by*

Ursula Lenker

De Gruyter Mouton

ISBN 978-3-11-020558-9  
e-ISBN 978-3-11-021606-6  
ISSN 1434-3452

*Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data*

Lenker Ursula.

Argument and rhetoric : adverbial connectors in the history of English / by Ursula Lenker.

p. cm. — (Topics in English linguistics ; 64)

Includes bibliographical references and index.

ISBN 978-3-11-020558-9 (alk. paper)

1. English language — Adverbials. 2. English language — Connectives. 3. English language — History. 4. English language — Grammar, Historical. 5. English language — Grammar. I. Title.  
PE1326.L46 2010  
425'.76—dc22

2009051326

*Bibliographic information published by the Deutsche Nationalbibliothek*

The Deutsche Nationalbibliothek lists this publication in the Deutsche Nationalbibliografie; detailed bibliographic data are available in the Internet at <http://dnb.d-nb.de>.

© 2010 Walter de Gruyter GmbH & Co. KG, 10785 Berlin/New York

Cover image: Brian Stablyk/Photographer's Choice RF/Getty Images

Typesetting: OLD-Media OHG, Neckarsteinach

Printing: Hubert & Co. GmbH & Co. KG, Göttingen

∞ Printed on acid-free paper

Printed in Germany

[www.degruyter.com](http://www.degruyter.com)

## Acknowledgements

“Adverbs are an oppressed part of speech, and probably bitter about their ill treatment. If they were ever organized the upper class of nouns and verbs had better look out” (Landau 1984: 78–79). The present book, which was accepted as a *Habilitationsschrift* at the Ludwigs-Maximilians-Universität Munich in the winter term of 2006/2007 (this date basically also marks the end of the full coverage of literature quoted), tries to remedy the ill treatment of at least one class of adverbs: adverbial connectors. I am deeply indebted to the mentors and referees of this thesis, Professor Hans Sauer, Professor Ulrich Detges and Professor Richard Janney, who provided invaluable information, advice and encouragement while I was writing this book. I have to thank Dick Janney in particular for drawing my attention to the relevance of “(your) little pointing words”, a remark which acted as a catalyst for my ideas on the importance of different means of discourse deixis for the subject of adverbial connectors. I am also very grateful to Hans Sauer and my father, Willibald Lenker, without whose unyielding perseverance this monograph might never have been written.

I am very deeply indebted to Helmut Gneuss, who gave me as good a start in academic research as anyone could wish for: from my early student days, he has always supported me in my various strands of academic interest (even in fields he would never have researched himself), unfailingly providing a plethora of references and critical comments. I would also like to thank Alfred Bammesberger, Manfred Markus, Judith Huber and Friedrich Heberlein for their very helpful critical comments on an earlier version of this book, and the series editors, Bernd Kortmann and Elizabeth Traugott, for accepting the book for the *Topics in English Linguistics*. A number of readers and reviewers of earlier versions of selected chapters, in particular Cynthia Allen, Walter Hofstetter, Lucia Kornexl, Andreas Mahler, Anneli Meurman-Solin and Elizabeth Traugott have substantially improved sections in this book with their pertinent remarks. At the very beginning of my research on this topic, conversations with Otto Gsell and Klaus Schubert on trains and in the language centre corridor, which seemed casual at the time, were decisive in encouraging me to focus on the “mixed bag” of the word class “adverb”.

In the final stages of completing and proof-reading the manuscript, Stefanie Beckstein, Veronika Bischofberger, Christina Grießl, Christine Haunz and, at Mouton de Gruyter, Wolfgang Konwitschny and Birgit Sievert gave wonderful support. Steffi Beckstein made these tedious weeks bearable with her infinite patience and, in particular, her upbeat personality.

“Only connect”, from *Howards End*, was the slogan of a telephone company some years ago – and so, above all, I would like to thank all my friends and family who helped me to stay connected to a world outside the realm of adverbial connectors during all these years. In particular, of course, I have to thank Michael Burghart, who provided so much more than the music.

Munich/Eichstätt, December 2009

# Contents

<b>Acknowledgements</b> .....	v
<b>List of abbreviations</b> .....	xv
<b>1. The framework</b> .....	1
1.1. Particles .....	1
1.2. Earlier research .....	2
1.3. Aims of the study .....	4
1.4. Rhetoric and stylistic aspects: a sample study .....	6
1.5. Early Modern and Late Modern English .....	9
1.6. The inventory of adverbial connectors .....	9
1.7. The text corpus .....	10
1.8. Presentation of corpus findings .....	16
1.9. Outline of the present study .....	20
<b>2. Clausal connection</b> .....	22
2.1. Clausal connection .....	22
2.2. Connectors – connects: definitions .....	23
2.3. Connectors: coordinating conjunctions, subordinating conjunctions, adverbial connectors .....	25
2.4. Connectors and information processing .....	28
<b>3. The category “adverb”</b> .....	33
3.1. Adverbs and adverbials .....	33
3.2. Classification of adverbials .....	35
3.2.1. “Circumstance adverbials” or “adjuncts” .....	36
3.2.2. “Stance adverbials” or “disjuncts” (content/attitudinal and style disjuncts) .....	36
3.2.3. Adverbial connectors (“linking adverbials” or “conjuncts”) .....	37
3.3. Semantic categories of adverbial connectors .....	39
3.4. “Pure” and “impure” connectives .....	41
3.5. Adverbial connectors in Present Day English: corpus findings .	42
3.5.1. The corpus of the <i>Longman Grammar</i> .....	42

3.5.2.	Different types of adverbials over the core registers . . .	42
3.5.3.	Syntactic realizations of adverbials . . . . .	43
3.5.4.	Positions of adverbials . . . . .	43
3.5.5.	Linking adverbials: distribution of semantic categories	44
3.5.6.	Summary: Present Day English corpus findings . . . . .	45
3.6.	Adverbial connectors – discourse markers . . . . .	46
<b>4.</b>	<b>Adverbs and conjunctions in earlier metalinguistic thought</b>	<b>49</b>
4.1.	Introductory remarks . . . . .	49
4.2.	The Greek and Latin tradition . . . . .	49
4.3.	Ælfric's Old English <i>Grammar</i> . . . . .	51
4.4.	Grammatical treatises of the Middle English period . . . . .	53
4.5.	The prologue to the revision of the Wycliffite Bible . . . . .	54
4.6.	Early Modern English dictionaries and grammars . . . . .	56
<b>5.</b>	<b>Connectors in Old English</b> . . . . .	<b>58</b>
5.1.	Semantic and syntactic polyfunctionality . . . . .	58
5.2.	Circumstance adverbs with connective force (Group B-a): temporal and spatial adverbs . . . . .	59
5.2.1.	OE <i>eft</i> 'again' . . . . .	60
5.2.2.	OE <i>nu</i> 'now' (Group B-a, Group C) . . . . .	61
5.2.2.1.	Temporal <i>nu</i> . . . . .	61
5.2.2.2.	Text-deictic <i>nu</i> . . . . .	61
5.2.2.3.	Adverbial connector <i>nu</i> – TRANSITION/RESULT	62
5.2.2.4.	Adverb/conjunction <i>nu</i> in correlative constructions . . . . .	62
5.2.2.5.	Conjunction (subordinator) <i>nu</i> . . . . .	63
5.3.	Ambiguous adverbs/conjunctions (Group C) . . . . .	64
5.3.1.	OE <i>þa</i> . . . . .	64
5.3.2.	OE <i>þeah</i> , <i>swaþeah</i> , ( <i>swa</i> ) <i>þeahhwæpere</i> – CONTRAST/CONCESSION . . . . .	66
5.4.	Position of adverbial connectors . . . . .	67
5.4.1.	<i>Nacherstposition</i> – 'post-first-position' . . . . .	67
5.4.2.	Present Day German adverbial connectors in post-first-position . . . . .	68
5.4.3.	Post-first-position of adverbial connectors in Old English	70
5.5.	Pronominal connectors . . . . .	72
5.5.1.	Pronominal connectors in Old English . . . . .	72



5.5.2.	Pronominal connectors in the history of the Romance languages .....	73
5.5.3.	Connectors in Louisiana French and French-based creoles .....	74
<b>6.</b>	<b>Adverbial connectors in the history of English .....</b>	<b>76</b>
6.1.	Introductory remarks .....	76
6.2.	The diachrony of coordinating and subordinating conjunctions: general tendencies .....	76
6.3.	The diachrony of adverbial connectors: general tendencies ....	77
6.4.	New adverbial connectors in the sub-periods of English: methodology .....	78
6.5.	The inventory of Present Day English connectors: donor periods .....	80
6.6.	Middle English: a period of experiment .....	85
<b>7.</b>	<b>Adverbial connectors: morphology .....</b>	<b>88</b>
7.1.	The expansion of the English lexicon .....	88
7.2.	Major morphological changes .....	92
7.3.	Simple adverbs, compounds and derivations .....	94
7.3.1.	Simple adverbs .....	94
7.3.2.	Compounds .....	94
7.3.3.	Derivations: adverbs in <i>-lice</i> , <i>-es</i> and <i>-ways/-wise</i> ....	95
7.4.	Pronominal connectors – lexicalized phrases .....	96
7.5.	Pronominal connectors .....	98
7.5.1.	Pronominal connectors in Old English .....	98
7.5.2.	Pronominal connectors in the history of English .....	100
7.6.	Lexicalized (prepositional) phrases .....	102
7.6.1.	General tendencies .....	102
7.6.2.	Lexicalization .....	103
7.6.3.	Verbal and nominal phrases .....	104
<b>8.</b>	<b>Cognitive source domains .....</b>	<b>106</b>
8.1.	General tendencies .....	106
8.2.	Source domain TIME .....	108
8.3.	Source domain PLACE/SPACE .....	110
8.4.	Source domain TRUTH/FACT .....	114
8.4.1.	General tendencies .....	114

8.4.2.	Conversational implicatures: CONCESSION/CONTRAST ..	114
8.4.3.	TRANSITION .....	116
8.4.4.	OE <i>soplice</i> – ME <i>soothly</i> .....	117
8.4.5.	ME <i>forsooth(e)</i> .....	122
8.4.6.	OE <i>treowlice</i> – ME/EModE/PDE <i>truly</i> .....	124
8.4.7.	PDE <i>indeed</i> and <i>in fact</i> .....	127
8.4.8.	Regularities in change .....	128
8.4.9.	Truth, facts and communicative principles .....	128
<b>9.</b>	<b>Shifting deictics in the history of English causal connection</b>	<b>131</b>
9.1.	Earlier research on causals .....	132
9.2.	Causal connectors .....	133
9.2.1.	The relation CAUSE: CAUSE – RESULT VS. RESULT – CAUSE	133
9.2.2.	Present Day English causal connectors: corpus findings	134
9.2.3.	Causal connectors: word classes and topology .....	134
9.2.4.	Semantic and pragmatic parameters .....	136
9.2.5.	Information processing .....	138
9.3.	OE <i>forþæm</i> , <i>forþon</i> , <i>forþy</i> .....	140
9.3.1.	Forms and functions of <i>forþæm</i> , <i>forþon</i> , <i>forþy</i> .....	140
9.3.2.	Expressions for causal relations in Early and Late West Saxon .....	143
9.4.	Discourse deixis .....	147
9.4.1.	<i>Forþæm</i> : morphological make-up and discourse deixis	147
9.4.2.	Pronominal connectors in Present Day German .....	149
9.4.3.	Deictic elements in English causal connectors .....	151
9.5.	Causal connectors in the history of English .....	152
9.5.1.	Causal connectors in English translations of Boethius' <i>De Consolatione Philosophiae</i> .....	152
9.5.2.	Causal adverbial connectors in the history of English ..	154
9.5.3.	Deixis in new adverbial connectors .....	157
9.5.4.	ME <i>for that</i> .....	158
9.5.5.	"Recursive" <i>for</i> – Latin <i>nam/enim</i> .....	161
9.5.6.	Subordinators: <i>for as much as</i> , <i>since</i> , <i>because</i> .....	164
9.6.	Conclusions .....	166
<b>10.</b>	<b>CONTRAST/CONCESSION .....</b>	<b>168</b>
10.1.	CAUSE – CONDITION – CONTRAST: affinities .....	168
10.2.	CONCESSION – CONTRAST .....	169

10.2.1.	CONCESSION . . . . .	169
10.2.2.	CONTRAST . . . . .	169
10.2.3.	CONCESSION/CONTRAST: information structure . . . . .	171
10.2.4.	Subordinators – adverbial connectors: mood distinctions . . . . .	173
10.3.	Cross-linguistic patterns in the origin of concessive connectors . . . . .	173
10.4.	The diachrony of English contrastive/concessive adverbial connectors . . . . .	175
10.4.1.	General tendencies . . . . .	175
10.4.2.	Antithetic/reformulatory adverbial connectors . . . . .	175
10.4.3.	Contrastive/concessive connectors in English: general tendencies . . . . .	178
10.4.4.	Shifting deictics in English contrastive/concessive connectors . . . . .	178
10.4.5.	Patterns in the origin of English concessive connectors . . . . .	181
10.5.	OE <i>þeah</i> – PDE <i>though</i> . . . . .	184
10.5.1.	Long-term developments: grammaticalization . . . . .	184
10.5.2.	OE <i>þeah</i> . . . . .	186
10.5.3.	Contrastive adverbial connectors from Middle to Present Day English . . . . .	190
10.5.3.1.	<i>Though</i> . . . . .	190
10.5.3.2.	<i>Yet</i> and <i>still</i> . . . . .	191
10.5.3.3.	<i>However</i> . . . . .	194
10.6.	Sentence-final connectors in Present Day English . . . . .	197
10.6.1.	Corpus findings . . . . .	197
10.6.2.	Information structure . . . . .	198
10.6.3.	Sentence-final connectors in Present Day German . . . . .	198
10.6.4.	Sentence-final connectors in the history of English . . . . .	200
10.7.	Present Day English sentence-final <i>though</i> . . . . .	200
10.7.1.	Earlier research . . . . .	200
10.7.2.	PDG <i>obwohl</i> . . . . .	202
10.7.3.	PDE <i>but</i> . . . . .	203
10.7.4.	<i>Although</i> and <i>though</i> in the <i>LLC</i> . . . . .	207
10.7.4.1.	Quantitative findings . . . . .	207
10.7.4.2.	Functions of the subordinator ( <i>al</i> ) <i>though</i> . . . . .	208
10.7.4.3.	Functions of sentence-final <i>though</i> . . . . .	210
<b>11.</b>	<b>ADDITION . . . . .</b>	<b>214</b>
11.1.	General tendencies . . . . .	214
11.2.	The diachrony of reinforcing adverbial connectors . . . . .	214

11.2.1. General tendencies . . . . .	214
11.2.2. <i>Also</i> . . . . .	215
11.2.3. New coinages: <i>item, plus, too</i> . . . . .	219
11.2.4. Iconic principles . . . . .	219
11.3. Equative connectors . . . . .	220
11.4. Summative connectors . . . . .	221
11.5. Appositive connectors . . . . .	222
11.6. Enumerative (listing) connectors . . . . .	222
11.7. Genre-dependency . . . . .	224
<b>12. TRANSITION . . . . .</b>	<b>227</b>
12.1. Preliminary considerations . . . . .	227
12.2. Source domain UNCERTAINTY/DOUBT: <i>peradventure, perchance, perhaps</i> . . . . .	228
12.3. Interrogatives . . . . .	229
12.4. The diachrony of transitional connectors . . . . .	230
12.4.1. Paradigm shift: TRUTH – FACT . . . . .	230
12.4.2. Regularities in semantic change . . . . .	231
<b>13. Perspicuity and the “New Rhetoric” . . . . .</b>	<b>233</b>
13.1. Collocations vs. medial position of adverbial connectors . . . . .	233
13.2. Sentence-initial collocations . . . . .	234
13.3. Medial positions of adverbial connectors . . . . .	235
13.4. Corpus findings . . . . .	237
13.4.1. Present Day English . . . . .	237
13.4.2. Old English to Late Modern English . . . . .	238
13.5. <i>Copia – perspicuitas</i> . . . . .	241
13.5.1. Perspicuity . . . . .	241
13.5.2. Punctuation . . . . .	242
13.5.3. The Scottish Rhetoricians: “The New Rhetoric” . . . . .	243
13.5.4. George Campbell’s <i>The Philosophy of Rhetoric</i> (1776) . . . . .	243
<b>14. Conclusions . . . . .</b>	<b>247</b>
<b>References . . . . .</b>	<b>251</b>
1. Corpora . . . . .	251
2. Sources . . . . .	251

3.	Dictionaries .....	254
4.	Secondary sources .....	255

## Appendix

Appendix A .....	276
A.1. Adverbial connectors: items .....	276
A.2. Alphabetical index of adverbial connectors .....	282

<b>Word index</b> .....	286
-------------------------	-----

<b>Subject and name index</b> .....	291
-------------------------------------	-----

## Appendices on CD-ROM

Appendix B .....	295
B.1. Listing/additive adverbial connectors .....	295
B.2. Summative adverbial connectors .....	307
B.3. Causal/resultive adverbial connectors .....	308
B.4. Contrastive and concessive adverbial connectors .....	317
B.5. Transitional adverbial connectors – interjections .....	329
Appendix C .....	343
C.1. Corpus texts .....	343
C.2. Selected corpus texts .....	353
C.2.1. “Treatises and Homilies” .....	353
C.2.2. Translation of Boethius’ <i>De Consolatione Philosophiae</i> .....	358



## List of abbreviations

A	Adverbial
BT	Bosworth & Toller (1882–1898)
ByrM	Byrhtferth's <i>Enchiridion</i> (ed. Baker & Lapidge 1995)
CE-	Initial Letters of Corpus Texts from Early Modern English
CH	Clark Hall 1984
CL-	Initial Letters of Corpus Texts from Late Modern English
<i>CLMET</i>	<i>A Corpus of Late Modern English Texts</i> (de Smet 2005)
CM-	Initial Letters of Corpus Texts from Middle English
<i>CME</i>	<i>Corpus of Middle English Prose and Verse</i>
CO-	Initial Letters of Corpus Texts from Old English
Conj.	Conjunction
<i>DOE</i>	<i>Dictionary of Old English</i>
<i>DOEC</i>	<i>Dictionary of Old English Corpus</i>
EETS	Early English Text Society
EMEDD	<i>Early Modern English Dictionary Database</i>
EModE	Early Modern English
	EModE1 (1500–1570), EModE2 (1570–1640), EModE3 (1640–1710)
<i>Eustace</i>	<i>Life of St Eustace</i> ; ed. Skeat 1900: 190–219
<i>HC</i>	<i>Helsinki Corpus</i>
Ind.	Indicative
Lat.	Latin
<i>LLC</i>	<i>London Lund Corpus of Spoken English</i>
LModE	Late Modern English
	LModE1 (1710–1780), LModE2 (1780–1850), LModE3 (1850–1920)
LOB	<i>Lancaster-Oslo/Bergen Corpus of British English</i>
M	Merkmal = 'property'
ME	Middle English
	ME1 (1150–1250), ME2 (1250–1350), ME3 (1350–1420), ME4 (1420–1500)
<i>MED</i>	<i>Middle English Dictionary</i>
O	Object
OE	Old English
	OE1 (–850), OE2 (850–950), OE3 (950–1050), OE4 (1050–1150)

<i>OED</i>	<i>Oxford English Dictionary</i>
ON	Old Norse
O. S.	Old Series
PDE	Present Day English
PDG	Present Day German
PP	Prepositional Phrase
Prs.	Person
S	Subject
Sg.	Singular
Subj.	Subjunctive
V	Verb (Predicate)
V2	Verb-second

## **Symbols**

◦	ambiguous adverb/conjunction
[ ]	in Appendix A.1: not attested in the corpus texts



# 1. The framework

## 1.1. Particles

In his *Essay Concerning Human Understanding*, one of the first linguistic accounts explicitly addressing what we now call textual organization or cohesion,<sup>1</sup> John Locke asserts that it is the right use of “Particles” which is crucial for the clearness and beauty of good style:

These Words, whereby it signifies what connection it gives to the several Affirmations and Negations, that it unites in one continued Reasoning or Narration, are generally call'd *Particles*: and 'tis the right use of these, that more particularly consists the clearness and beauty of good Stile. ... And to express well such methodical and rational Thoughts, he must have words to *shew* what *Connexion*, *Restriction*, *Distinction*, *Opposition*, *Emphasis*, etc. he gives to each respective *part of his Discourse* (Locke [1690] 1975: 471; emphasis by Locke).

As is evident from this description, Locke's “Particles” are co-referential with the linguistic elements we now call “clausal connectives”.<sup>2</sup> Locke highlights that he regards these elements not merely as an adornment or frequent supplementary device to uncover textual organization,<sup>3</sup> but as indispensable for the understanding of an utterance:

To mistake in any of these, is to puzzle, instead of informing, his Hearer: and therefore it is, that those words, which are not truly, by themselves, the names of any *Ideas*, are of such constant and indispensable use in Language ... (Locke [1690] 1975: 471).

The novelty and originality of this view that “Particles” play a central role in language is made explicit when Locke proceeds by criticizing previous grammars and grammarians for their ill-treatment or even neglect of these linguistic elements:

- 
- 1 For details on the treatment of connectives in European and English language scholarship, see Lenker (2003) and below, Chapter 4.
  - 2 The term “connective” is used as an umbrella term for all kinds of linguistic items signalling a linkage of sentences or chunks of discourse. The term “connector” more specifically refers to paratactic connectives, in particular adverbial connectors.
  - 3 For the repeatedly expressed view of adverbial connectors and so-called discourse markers as supplementary or even superfluous features of language, and for a discussion of the overlap between coordinators, subordinators, adverbial connectors and “discourse particles” as well as cases of polyfunctionality, see Chapters 2 and 3.

This part of Grammar has been, perhaps, as much neglected, as some others over-diligently cultivated. 'Tis easy for Men to write, one after another, of *Cases* and *Genders*, *Moods* and *Tenses*, *Gerunds* and *Supines*: ... But though *Prepositions* and *Conjunctions*, etc. are names well known in Grammar, and the Particles constrained under them carefully ranked into their distinct subdivisions; yet he who would shew the right use of Particles, and what significancy and force they have, must take a little more pains, enter into his own Thoughts, and observe nicely the several Postures of his Mind in discoursing (Locke [1690] 1975: 471–472).

## 1.2. Earlier research

More than 300 years after Locke's attempt to draw attention to the importance of connectives and to foster their attention with grammarians, we find that this field is still neglected in linguistics.<sup>4</sup> In 2003, the compendium on German connectives, the *Handbuch der deutschen Konnektoren*, has to state in an almost identical way:

Mit der Wahl dieses Gegenstandsbereiches behandelt das Handbuch Einheiten des deutschen Wortschatzes [= Konnektoren "connectives"], die weder in Grammatiken noch Wörterbüchern noch in den texttheoretischen und konversationsanalytischen Arbeiten befriedigend beschrieben sind. Wie nicht anders zu erwarten ist, werden in Grammatiken nur die systematischen Eigenschaften der betreffenden Einheiten beschrieben. Dabei stehen dort jedoch traditionell in der Regel semantische Klassenbildungen im Vordergrund (Pasch et al. 2003: xv).

'The subject area chosen by the handbook are items of the German vocabulary [= connectors, U.L.] which have neither been satisfactorily described in dictionaries, nor in studies on text theory and conversation analysis. As expected, it is only the systemic properties of the respective items which are described in grammars. Traditionally, however, these descriptions generally focus on the distinction of various semantic classes'.

This summary testifies to a lack of synchronic in-depth studies in the field of connectives.<sup>5</sup> It is, however, in particular the history of connectives that has received only very little attention. With regard to the history of the English language and the establishment of modern English prose, there are only two studies which explicitly approach this field diachronically in a wider and systematic perspective:

---

4 For the first fuller treatment of connectives in Campbell ([1776] 1963), see below, Chapter 13.5.4.

5 For English, notable exceptions are the very comprehensive studies by Altenberg, in particular Altenberg (1984, 1986).

In a study situated at the interface between literary studies<sup>6</sup> and linguistics, Sylvia Adamson (1999) relates the emergence of new forms of sentential connection to major changes in literary style and text production in Early Modern England, namely to the evolution of the “plain style” as an indicator of *perspicuitas* – an idea connected with the stylistic ideals of the Royal Society – in contrast to earlier, very different stylistic ideals such as *copia* (for details, see below, Chapter 13.5).

In the field of linguistics proper, Bernd Kortmann’s study of adverbial subordinators (1997), though predominantly concerned with typological and cross-linguistic data (see the material collected in 1997b), also gives a short outline of the history of adverbial subordinators, one of the most important groups of connectives in English. The results of Kortmann’s study of the history of subordinators will here be used as a contrastive plane for the comparison with the findings for adverbial connectors.<sup>7</sup>

In addition to these more general accounts, there is a small number of studies examining individual items, concepts and relations in the field, such as Jucker 1997 (*well*), Enkvist & Wårvik 1987 (OE *þa*; and many further studies on OE *þa* such as, e. g., Kim 1992), Brinton 1996 (on various “pragmatic markers”), Lenker 2000 (OE *soplice*, *witodlice*), Lenker 2003, 2007a (*forsooth*), Markus 2000 (ME *wherefore*, *therefore*, etc.), Österman 1997 (*there*-compounds), Rissanen 1999a (*rather*), Schlegel 2002 (OE *swa*), Stanley 2000 (OE *hwæt*), Traugott 1997 (*after all*), Traugott and Dasher 2002 (*indeed*, *in fact*) and Fischer 2007 (*instead*; *indeed*, *in fact*, *soplice* and *witodlice*).

The semantic relation analysed most thoroughly is that of “concessives” which features prominently in studies of the semantic-pragmatic approach to grammaticalization (see König and Traugott 1982; König 1985a, 1985b, 1988; Barth-Weingarten and Couper-Kuhlen 2002). In addition to the still central study on cohesion in Present Day English by Halliday and Hasan (1976), there are a number of studies on Present Day English discourse markers, which refer to the history of some of the adverbial connectors in question (e. g., Schiffrin 1987; Lenk 1998). With the exception of Halliday and Hasan’s systematic analysis of conjunctive elements in Present Day English (1976: 226–273), these studies concentrate on single connectives or patterns of language change, such as grammaticalization, and do thus not endeavour to provide a comprehensive treatment of connectives.

A more integrated view of clausal connection in the history of English is offered in most of the papers presented at the workshop “Clausal Connection in

---

6 We also find some relevant information on connectives scattered over more general works on the evolution and establishment of English prose (see, for instance, Mueller 1984, McIntosh 1998 and Robinson 1998).

7 The present study is very much indebted to Kortmann’s study and was set off by my review of his book. For the details of the comparison, see in particular Chapter 6.

the History of English” at the 13th *International Conference on English Historical Linguistics* at Vienna in 2003. This workshop was initiated because the convenors Anneli Meurman-Solin and Ursula Lenker regarded it as a drawback that the typologies of clause-combining devices in English as well as other European languages are widely discussed in recent literature (Devriendt, Goossens, and van der Auwera 1996; Kortmann 1997; van der Auwera 1998), but have chiefly been construed by using secondary sources such as dictionaries and grammars (for this “grammar-cum-dictionary-method”, see, e.g., Kortmann 1997: 53). Most of the workshop papers are therefore corpus-based studies of various connectives in the history of English, focusing on subordinators (*while*, *lest*, *since*, *albeit*) or specific semantic domains, such as concessives or conditionals (see Lenker and Meurman-Solin 2007). There is as yet, however, no comprehensive, corpus-based treatment of adverbial connectors in the history of English.

### 1.3. Aims of the study

The present study tries to fill at least a segment of this large gap in historical (English) linguistics by corpus-based analyses of the development of a particular word class in connector function – namely “adverbial connectors”, which are also called “conjuncts” (Quirk et al. 1985) or “linking adverbials” (Biber et al. 1999).<sup>8</sup> The focus of the study therefore rests on the inventory and use of linguistic elements which explicitly mark textual cohesion on a level higher than the phrase.<sup>9</sup> Even more specifically, the focus is on connectives which signal textual organization on a more global level in discourse, i.e. a level higher than the sentence.<sup>10</sup>

In Lehmann’s universal typology of clause linkage (Lehmann 1988), adverbial connectors belong – together with subordinators and coordinators (i.e. coordinating and subordinating conjunctions) – to the little integrated, explicit markers of clausal connection (in contrast to embedded constructions, relative connectives, non-finite verb forms, absolute constructions, etc.).<sup>11</sup> While

---

8 For the terminology employed in various grammars, see below, Chapter 3.

9 Some of these items can also mark relations on the level of the phrase; these are only included, however, if they are polyfunctional and if they can also function on the higher level of textual organization.

10 This position at the interface between the sentence and the text (paragraph) may be one of the reasons why they are a neglected subject in linguistics. Theories of syntax, such as all kinds of generativist approaches and also many functional perspectives, ignore them because they are above the level of the core sentence.

11 Most of these other strategies fulfilling a “connective” function, such as linking by non-finite constructions (present participles, infinitives etc.) extra-textual links and non-linguistic structuring devices, which are not in the focus of this study, do not play

the distinction between coordinators, subordinators and adverbial connectors is rather clear-cut for Modern English,<sup>12</sup> it has to be stressed here right at the beginning of this study that there was no such clear distinction in Old English, which predominantly uses so-called “ambiguous adverbs/conjunctions” (for details, see below, Chapter 5).

This first of all means that the whole system of clausal connection has been re-structured in the history of English. While other, in particular typologically related, languages such as German, show much more stability in the morphological make-up and use of subordinating conjunctions and adverbial connectors, English has only very few remnants of the older Germanic system present in Old English. The Old English inventory mainly consisted of polyfunctional items comprising an explicitly deictic element. In addition to forms comprising *swa* ‘so’ (cf. *swapeah* or *swapeahhwæðere* ‘although; nevertheless’), we very frequently find morphologically complex connectors comprising a pronominal element, such as OE *forþæm*, *forþon* or *forþy* ‘for, because; therefore’ (< *for* [preposition] ‘because of’ + *þæm/þon/þy* [demonstrative; dative *þæm*, instrumental *þon/þy*]).<sup>13</sup>

This scenario suggests that the first essential motivating force for the dramatic changes in the inventory of adverbial connectors starting in the early Middle English period are structural constraints and therefore typological properties of English.<sup>14</sup> The break-down of the case and gender inflections of both of the Old English demonstratives and, in particular, the use of *that* as a demonstrative, complementizer and general subordinating particle (replacing OE *þe*) triggered new structures which signal anaphoric relations on the surface, disambiguating subordinators from adverbial connectors. The complex problems involved in drafting this new inventory marking discourse deixis are reflected

---

an important role in the history of the development, because they are either rather rare (e. g. full prepositional phrases) or emerge very late in the history of English, i. e. in the Early Modern English period when non-finite constructions become increasingly grammaticalized. Only from LModE2 onwards, infinitives (e. g. *to begin with*, *to conclude*, *to proceed*) become more popular. In Present Day English, they do not amount to more than four per cent of linkage constructions (Altenberg 1984: 47). In the present sample from LOB-D and FROWN-D (68,000 words each), the token numbers are: infinitives (3), present participles (9), and past participles (7).

12 A notable exception is the status of PDE *for*; see Chapter 9.

13 The changes in the morphological make-up of these forms and their relevance are discussed in Chapter 7. In Raible (1992: inserted foldout), these pronominal connectors form a typologically separate group: “Junktion durch Wiederaufnahme (eines Teils) des vorhergehenden Satzes (II)”.

14 For similar typological changes involving the loss of deictic elements in French creoles see Raible (1992: 172–177) and below, Chapter 5.5.

in the manifold forms in Early Middle English (ME 1/2). The innovations in these periods, however, still show symptomatic regular, pronominal patterns, comprising the new demonstratives *this* and *that* (cf. additive, reinforcing *over that / over this* or resultive *for that / this*). Early Middle English thus emerges as a period of experiment and transition, and hence as the first decisive period for the re-structuring of the system of adverbial connectors in the history of English. This re-structuring also led to the loss of polyfunctionality in connectives and a distinction between coordinators and subordinators, which will, as one exemplary case, be followed in the development of the system of causal connectives in the history of English in Chapter 9 (i. e. the development of *because*, *since* and *as* in certain positional variants and contexts); the other sections of the book focus primarily on adverbial connectors.

#### 1.4. Rhetoric and stylistic aspects: a sample study

The following introductory example of an (unfortunately rather small) experiment conducted by Mauranen (1993: 159–168) shows that a study of adverbial connectors cannot be confined to morphological, semantic and syntactic analyses. Mauranen presented the following text (Text 1) to a group of English native speakers with professional linguistic training. All of the participants worked as English lecturers at universities or as lectors or revisers for technological research reports and were selected because they were considered to be extremely sensitive to language and textual organization.

The subjects were first invited to read the text and were then, in a second step, placed in groups of two and three and asked to come to a group decision on the following issues: whether the text was correct as it stood, and, secondly and, more specifically, if they felt that connectives should be added in any of the sentences.

Text 1 (Mauranen 1993: 164)

In a recent study on 5- to 6-year-old children, Astington confirmed that they see a strong link between promising something and actually doing it: “To promise” means “you do it”. This link is much stronger for children than for adults, which leads children to assert that an unfulfilled promise was not a promise, but a “lie”. For young children promising is not simply a speech act but something that includes execution of the promised action as well.

It seems likely that children of 5 years or so understand that the use of the word *promise* entails commitment, but this understanding may be based on a simple rule “If you have said ‘I promise’ then you must do what you said you would.” Although the use of the word *promise* may often be a sufficient condition for becoming committed, it is certainly not a necessary condition. It is seldom used in everyday ex-

changes between adults, who tend to say “I will meet you at 6 o’clock”, “I’ll return your book tomorrow”, and so forth. The commitment, although informal, is binding.

What distinguishes a commitment (*I will return your book*) from a statement of intention (*I will stay in tonight*) or a prediction of a future event (*I will get wet*) is the knowledge that someone else is relying on one to carry out the commitment and the knowledge that the other person is aware that one has made a commitment. The interesting question is whether young children can recognize commitment without the help of the word *promise*. Our aim in this study was to investigate whether children of between 5 and 10 years are aware of reliance as the essential and necessary condition for commitment.

After having read and discussed Text 1, the groups unanimously concluded that the text “was good as it stood”. They reported that they felt it was “clear”, “easy to read” and that it “required no additions” (Mauranen 1993: 166). They also agreed that no connectives needed to be added “at all”.

In a second phase, however, the groups were shown the authentic version of the text, which had been altered by Mauranen for the first test phase. For Text 1, Mauranen had deleted connectives which were dispensable, i.e. which are not crucial for the grammatical correctness of the text because they are peripheral to the sentence structure and act on a level higher than the local phrase, marking textual cohesion globally. The authentic text (Text 2) with the restored connectors reads as follows:

Text 2 (Mauranen 1993: 164)

In a recent study on 5- to 6-year-old children, Astington confirmed that they see a strong link between promising something and actually doing it: “To promise” means “you do it”. However, this link is much stronger for children than for adults, which leads children to assert that an unfulfilled promise was not a promise in the first place, but, rather, a “lie”. In other words, for young children promising is not simply a speech act but something that includes execution of the promised action as well.

It seems likely, then, that children of 5 years or so understand that the use of the word *promise* entails commitment, but this understanding may be based on a simple rule, such as “If you have said ‘I promise’ then you must do what you said you would.” Although the use of the word *promise* may often be a sufficient condition for becoming committed, it is certainly not a necessary condition. Indeed, it is seldom used in everyday exchanges between adults, who tend to say “I will meet you at 6 o’clock”, “I’ll return your book tomorrow”, and so forth. The commitment, although informal, is nonetheless binding.

What distinguishes a commitment (*I will return your book*) from a statement of intention (*I will stay in tonight*) or a prediction of a future event (*I will get wet*) is the knowledge that someone else is relying on one to carry out the commitment and, furthermore, the knowledge that the other person is aware that one has made a commitment. The interesting question is, therefore, whether young children can



recognize commitment without the help of the word promise. Our aim in this study was to investigate whether children of between 5 and 10 years are aware of reliance as the essential and necessary condition for commitment.

The linguistic elements which had been removed in Text 1 are underlined here for reasons of transparency. They are spread over the whole text with a ratio of about one deletion per sentence. No deletions were undertaken in the first and the last sentence of the text, as these sentences set the frame for the textual cohesion of the passage and therefore do not show any employment of connectives on the level above the sentence.

After having read the original version with all the connectives restored (Text 2), Mauranen's subjects were asked to comment on the text again and evaluate it. The immediate reaction of the subjects was that they felt a "dramatic difference" between the two versions.<sup>15</sup> More specifically, the emphasis was seen to have changed, and the text was said to be not only "easier to read", but also to be "more logical" and "more convincing". It was also perceived to have "more authority" (Mauranen 1993: 167–168).

The fact that the test groups registered a "dramatic" difference between the two versions of the text – with the connectives having an overall effect of making Text 2 "more authoritative, logical and convincing" – shows that a study of the history of connectives in English must certainly not be confined to their etymology, morphology and semantics, but has to be situated at the interface between syntax, semantics, pragmatics, text linguistics and rhetoric. The central role or even indispensability of these connectives in the construction of a text, as highlighted by Locke, is corroborated by Mauranen's experiment, which also shows that it is necessary to view the employment of these items in the wider perspective of the evolution of an English prose style. Yet, the preference of certain means of textual organization and the employment of linking adverbs as connectives is certainly not the only crucial driving force in the developments of adverbial connectors in the history of English. In Present Day English, for example, an author may choose among the adverbials *therefore*, *thus* and *hence* for marking the semantic relation RESULT, and their use indeed exhibits some variability by author: most academic texts show a clear preference for either *thus* or *therefore*, usually using one item at least twice as often as the other (Biber et al. 1999: 889). This choice, however, is merely a choice in the lexical material employed. In both cases, the authors do not choose to mark the organization of the text by coordinating or subordinating conjunctions (*because*, *since*, *as* or *for*), but by adverbial connectors. Although some changes

---

15 For the importance of stylistic considerations, see also Lehmann (1988: 210–213). For an early discussion, see Campbell (1776: 384–415) and below, Chapter 13.5.4.



and choices in the use of adverbial connectors may indeed be due to stylistic predilections of a period or of individual authors (see below, Chapter 13), the more crucial changes in the history of English connectors thus seem to have been triggered by the typological and structural changes which set English – also in this respect – apart from other Germanic languages.

## 1.5. Early Modern and Late Modern English

After the period of experiment and variation in early Middle English, there are two further periods which are decisive for shaping the system and the use of adverbial connectors in English. In Early Modern English (EModE 1/2), when English develops into an *Ausbausprache* gradually being used as a national language also in the written medium, a number of new connectors are formed. In contrast to those coined in the Early Middle English period, however, these are not replaced again, but for the most part remain in the language until Present Day English (see Chapter 6.5).

The English of the late eighteenth and nineteenth centuries (Late Modern English 2 and 3; 1780–1850 and 1850–1920) then sees crucial changes in (a) the preference of adverbial connectors over coordinating conjunctions and their collocations, and (b) the sentence position of adverbial connectors (see Chapter 13.1–13.3). Instead of sentence-initial position – very often in collocation with a conjunction such as *and* or *but* or a connective such as *for* –, adverbial connectors become increasingly used in medial position. This medial position, however, is virtually only found in the written medium and is attested in less than 2.5 per cent of instances in the spoken medium (see Biber et al. 1999: 891): it thus sets the English of the written medium apart from that of the spoken medium (see Chapter 13.4). In spoken interaction, however, we also find a new position for adverbial connectors: adverbial connectors such as *however* and, in particular, *though* are increasingly placed at the very end of a sentence from the middle of the twentieth century onwards. The motivating forces and consequences of the sentence-final positioning of adverbial connectors will be exemplified by a contrastive analysis of the use of PDE *although*, *though*, and sentence-final *though* and German *obwohl* with main clause word order in Chapter 10.5.

## 1.6. The inventory of adverbial connectors

The present study covers many of the issues suggested by these introductory examples. It gives an – as complete as possible – account of the single-word or lexicalized linguistic items which have been used as adverbial connectors in the

history of English. Furthermore, it describes their employment as well as their meaning and their text structuring and information processing functions in relation to other coordinators, such as coordinating and subordinating conjunctions.

The approach employed is therefore a decidedly diachronic and functional one. The study is mainly focussed on single-word adverbs because corpus findings for Present Day English show that it is single adverbs which are predominantly employed in this function (Biber et al. 1999: 887, and Figure 10.26), although this adverbial linking function may theoretically be realized not only by single adverbs, but also by prepositional phrases, such as *for that reason*, *in other words*, or *on the contrary*. The distinction between prepositional phrases and single adverbs, however, is, even in Present Day English, by no means clear-cut; in Present Day American English, for example, the lexicalization of the phrase *after all* is indicated in its spelling *afterall* as one word (see *OED*, s. v. *after*; 10.):

- (1) Afterall, the movement of people, not vehicles, is what counts. (1976 *Billings* [Montana] *Gazette* 1 July)

Similarly, in Middle English, the phrase *at/on/of last* ‘finally’ is attested as *alast* (see *MED*, s. v. *a-last*). Even longer phrases such as *over and above* ‘furthermore’, a popular reinforcing connector in Early Modern English, could be spelt as a single word *hoverendebuv* (see *OED*, s. v. *over and above*).

Furthermore, since many of today’s single word items are univerted and lexicalized prepositional (e. g. *indeed*) or verbal (e. g. *albeit*, *howbeit*, *notwithstanding*) phrases and since a distinction, especially in periods without a fixed orthography, is not unambiguously possible, lexicalized prepositional phrases were included in the detailed analysis of this book. Only fully transparent, i. e. non-lexicalized phrases, such as *in other words*, *for that cause*, or *the sum is*, have been excluded (for the respective morphological and syntactic criteria, see Chapter 7.4).

## 1.7. The text corpus

The inventories of adverbial connectors of the respective periods were first gathered by a search in the relevant dictionaries (*OED* for the history of English; *CH* and *BT* for Old English, *MED* for Middle English and the *EMEDD* for Early Modern English) as well as in the grammars of the earlier periods of English (Mitchell 1985; Mustanoja 1960; Kerkhof 1982; Franz 1939) and of Present Day English (Quirk et al. 1985; Biber et al. 1999; Huddleston and Pullum 2002; Halliday and Hasan 1976). While it was thus possible to gain a good overview over the system of adverbial connectors in Old, Middle, Early Mod-

ern and Present Day English, the Late Modern English Period, i.e. the English of the eighteenth and the nineteenth century, remained a neglected period.

The *OED*, for example, whose first edition was compiled in the nineteenth century, often does not have special entries for phrases which were at that time not yet lexicalized or had only recently been lexicalized, such as *after all*, *above all*, *in all events*, *at any rate* (see *OED*, s.vv. *after*, *all*, *event*, *rate*). Generally, the varieties of the late eighteenth to the early twentieth century had until recently to be described as “the Cinderellas of English historical linguistic study” (Jones 1989: 279). Although the general interest in the language of an increasingly more distant past and the change of emphasis within historical linguistics to socio-historical and corpus-based approaches has led to a surge of interest in Late Modern English, the more recent publications on the field (Bailey 1996; Romaine 1998; Lass 1999; Görlach 1999; Görlach 2001; Beal 2004) do not treat textual cohesion in any detail. This lack of material on Late Modern English, together with the plan to study not only the inventory, but also the changes in use and position of adverbial connectors in the history of English, created the need for a diachronic corpus-based approach, including texts from Late Modern English, which are not covered by the *Helsinki Corpus of English Texts*.

In order to study not only changes in the inventory, but more generally developments in the use of adverbial connectors (also in contrast to conjunctions) from Old English to Present Day English, the findings of the present study are based on a corpus of texts from all periods of English (see Appendix C.1) and, for the quantitative analyses, on two smaller corpora of selected comparable texts (see Appendix C.2.1. “Treatises and Homilies” and C.2.2. “Translations of Boethius’ *De Consolatione Philosophiae*”).

The complete corpus is modelled on the *Helsinki Corpus*, which comprises texts from the earliest Old English period until 1710 (see Kytö 1996). For the periods no longer covered by the *Helsinki Corpus*, I have compiled a corpus in 70-year sub-periods (equivalent to the periods from ME3 to EModE3 of the *Helsinki Corpus*) until 1920 (LModE1 from 1710 to 1780, LModE2 from 1780 to 1850, LModE3 from 1850 to 1920). For each of these periods, I extracted 5,000-word passages from texts of the *Project Gutenberg* and the *Literature Online (LION)* collections.<sup>16</sup> In order to provide a comparable text basis, the

---

16 Most of the Late Modern English texts I had selected are now publicly available in the *CLMET (Corpus of Late Modern English Texts)*, also modelled on the *Helsinki Corpus* in its 70-year sub-periods (see De Smet 2005). In Appendix C.1, I only list the exact sources of these corpus texts which are not part of the *CLMET* (these texts are marked as *Project Gutenberg* with text number or *LION* in appendix C.1). While the *CLMET* usually gives the full texts, I, as a rule, took the first ca. 5,000

selection of texts was guided by the principles of the *Helsinki Corpus* with respect to the length of the passages and, as far as possible, the text types (for the problems concerning text type comparability, see Kohnen 2004: 81–128 and below). The target number was 100,000 words per period; furthermore, the respective corpus texts should comprise as many complete texts (e. g. homilies) by as many different authors as possible.<sup>17</sup>

For a first survey of the sub-periods and the design of the corpus, see the following table (for details on the texts, see Appendix C.1):

Period	Dates	Number of Texts	Words
OE1	–850	1	1860
OE2	850–950	69	48780
OE3	950–1050	13	76350
OE4	1050–1150	12	34390
ME1	1150–1250	10	73370
ME2	1250–1350	3	1440
ME3	1350–1420	13	100540
ME4	1420–1500	22	136630
EModE1	1500–1570	13	97310
EModE2	1570–1640	16	108770
EModE3	1640–1710	20	136040
LModE1	1710–1780	13	102890
LModE2	1780–1850	18	99840
LModE3	1850–1920	18	102410
PDE	1920–1990	49	103900
TOTAL			1,224,520

This table shows that the texts which have come down to us do not allow a detailed quantitative analysis on a large scale (for the periods from 1150 to 1700, see the detailed account in Kohnen 2004: 81–128). Apart from the general

---

words from these full texts to create a corpus comparable to the texts chosen for the *Helsinki Corpus*. Page numbers are thus only given when the passages are not taken from the beginning of the respective texts.

17 A selection of text as in the BROWN, LOB, F-LOB and FROWN corpora, which choose 2,000 words from the beginnings of texts, would not have been suitable for the present study because certain kinds of adverbial connectors, i. e. listing or, in particular summative ones, only occur at certain passages of the text as a whole (in the middle or the end, respectively).

problems of the lack of documents for the periods OE1, OE4, ME1 and ME2, which are a hazard to all corpus studies,<sup>18</sup> the present study is confronted with a more specific problem concerning conjunctions and adverbial connectors.

First of all, only prose texts could be chosen because poetry employs very different means of text structuring (see, e.g., Brinton 1996: 68–79 on text structuring devices such as *ME gan* + infinitive in Chaucer's *Troilus & Criseyde*). More importantly, Present Day English corpus findings also demonstrate that adverbial connectors are extremely rare in narrative texts belonging to the *Longman Grammar*'s registers FICTION and NEWS (Biber et al. 1999: 882; see also Chapter 3.5). In narrative texts, authors often choose to leave the relationships unmarked, since relations such as CAUSE and RESULT may be inferred from a chronological sequence. Authors of narrative fiction even avoid being too explicit about the relations because they want to keep readers in suspense. Thus the only adverbials which are frequently used in narrative prose are temporal circumstance adverbials (Biber et al. 1999: 822), which – in particular in the categories “History”, “Biography”, “Travelogue” or “Diaries” of the *Helsinki Corpus* – are used as chronological signposts. In the following passage from the *Diaries of Samuel Pepys*, for example, the majority of sentences start with a temporal adverbial:

- (2) 15–16 DECEMBER 1666. Lords day. Lay long, talking with my wife in bed. **Then** up with great content, and to my chamber to set right a picture or two – Lovett having sent me yesterday Santa Clara's head varnished, which is very fine. **And now** my closet is so full stored and so fine, as I would never desire to have it better. Dined without any strangers with me – which I do not like on Sundays. **Then** after dinner by water to Westminster to see Mrs. Martin, whom I found up in her chamber and ready to go abroad. I sat there with her and her husband and others a pretty while; **and then** away to White-hall and there walked up and down to the Queen's side, and there saw my dear Lady Castlemayne, who continues admirable methinks – and I do not hear but that the King is the same to her still as ever. **Anon** to chapel, by the King's closet,

---

18 There are almost no texts surviving from the earliest period of English (OE1) and the late thirteenth century (ME2). The texts collected in OE4 are mainly copies of texts by authors whom we also find in OE3 (Ælfric in COTEMPO, COAELHOM, COAELET3, COAEPREF, COAEPREG for OE3 and COAELET4 for OE4; Wulfstan with COWULF3 for OE3 and COWULF4 and COINSPOL for OE4). The first Middle English period (ME1) has some texts which are copies of Old English manuscripts and should definitely be re-allocated to OE3 or OE4 (in particular CMBODLEY, which is typical of Late Old English).

and heard a very good Anthemne. **Then** with Lord Brouncker to Sir W. Coventry's chamber, and there we sat with him and talked. He is weary of anything to do, he says, in the Navy (CEDIAR3A, p. VII, 409).

There is, to take another example, not a single adverbial connector in the 6070 word passage taken from John Evelyn's *Diary* (CEDIAR3B). With respect to the text type categorization of the *Helsinki Corpus*, we are furthermore confronted with the problem that many texts which are labelled as different categories are in fact predominantly narrative in style. See, for example, the following passage from the *Book of Margery Kempe* (which is categorized as a "Religious Treatise" in the *Helsinki Corpus*), in which every single sentence starts with a temporal adverbial (*þan* 'then', *whan* 'when', *so long* 'for such a long time', *sithyn* 'then'):<sup>19</sup>

- (3) **þan** sche, hauyng trust of hys a-mendyng & compassyon of hys infirmyte, wyth scharp wordys of correpcyon promysyd to fulfillyn hys entent gyf God wolde grawntyn it. **Whan** sche cam to hir meditacyon, not forgetyng þe frute of hir wombe, sche askyd forgeuenes of hys synne & relesyng of þe sekenes þat owr Lord had gouyn hym gyf it wer hys plesawns & profite to hys sowle. **So longe** sche preyid þat he was clene delueryd of þe sekenes and leuyd many gerys aftyr & had a wife & a childe, blissyd mote God ben, for he weddyd hys wife in Puce in Dewchelonde. **Whan** tydyngys cam to hys modyr fro ouyr þe see þat hir sone had weddyd, sche was ryth glad & thankyd God wyth al hir hert, supposyng & trustyng he xulde leuyn clene & chast as þe lawe of matrimony askith. **Sithyn, whan** God wolde, hys wife had a childe, a fayr mayde-child. **þan** he sent tydingys to hys modyr in-to Ingland how gracyowsly God had visityd hym & hys wife ... (CMKEMPE p. I, 223).

Similarly, long narrative passages – in which primarily the coordinator *and* and temporal adverbials are employed – are found in many of the private and official letters across all periods; for example, in the following passage from a letter by Margaret Paston to her husband John:

- (4) **And** Jamys Gloys come with his hatte on his hede between bothe his men, as he was wont of custome to do. **And whanne** Gloys was a-yenst Wy-

---

19 Similarly, in her *Revelations of Divine Love* – also categorized as a "Religious Treatise" – Julian of Norwich virtually only uses the coordinators *and*, *for* and *but* (CMJULNOR). Only the following adverbial connectors are employed (token counts): *therefore* (4), *wherefore* (1), *furthermore* (1), *nevertheless* (1).

mondham he seid þus, ‘Couere thy heed!’ **and** Gloys seid ageyn, ‘So I shall for the.’ **And whanne** Gloys was forther passed by þe space of iij or iiij strede, Wymondham drew owt his dagger and seid, ‘Shalt þow so, knave?’ **And þerwith** Gloys turned hym and drewe owt his dagger ... **And þanne** Haweys ran into Wymondhams place and feched a spere and a swerd, and toke his maister his swerd. **And** with þe noise of þis a-saut and affray my modir and I come owt of þe chirche from þe sakeryng; and I bad Gloys go in to my moderis place ageyn, and so he dede. **And thanne** Wymondham called my moder and me strong hores, and seid þe Pastons and alle her kyn were ... (1448, 19 MAY; CMPRIV, p. 223).

These test analyses for the respective periods show that the paucity of adverbial connectors found for the Present Day English category FICTION is also attested for the earlier periods of English, mainly in texts labelled “History”, “Biography, Lives”, “Fiction”, “Travelogue”, or “Diaries”. Apart from a few sample texts (see above, and Appendix C.1), these were not analysed because they only use very few, if any, tokens of adverbial connectors.

This means that a large number of the texts which have survived from the Old and Middle English period (in particular passages from Bible translations, “Chronicles” and “Saints’ Lives”) had to be excluded. Furthermore, texts which obviously did not fit their respective categories were excluded from the quantitative parts of the present study. Generally, text type consistency and comparability is one of the most problematic issues in diachronic corpus linguistics. In his study of English participle and gerund constructions from 1100 to 1700, which had set out to correlate the respective occurrences with text-type patterns, Kohnen shows – in a detailed analysis of the texts and their contexts – that only a certain number of texts of the *Helsinki Corpus* can be employed for comparable analyses of patterns according to text types (see Kohnen 2004: 81–128; as a result, his corpus consists of “Chronicles”, “Religious Treatises”, “Homilies”, “Laws/Documents”, “Narrative Prose” and “Private Letters”).

The main text type chosen for the present analysis are thus argumentative texts with their focus of attention on what is commonly called “academic” or “scientific language” (Biber et al. 1999), i. e. homilies or religious, philosophical, educational, and literary treatises, some of which also allow more detailed quantitative analyses (for the principles of selection, see the introduction to Appendix C.2). This choice of texts causes another well-known problem for the historical analysis: there are not only few texts of this type extant from earlier periods of English, but most of them are translations from Latin or French. For the earliest periods of English, there are thus solely some “Prefaces” (COPREFCP, COAEPREF, COAEPREG, CMPURVEY, CMCAXPPO) and