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**Ursula Lenker (Munich)**

**Forwhi hence: Shifting Deictics in Early English Causal Connection**

In their Call for papers, the conveners of the workshop English in the Middle Ages asked papers to "show that modern approaches can fruitfully be applied to interpret the older stages of English language and literature, and conversely, that the historical dimension is indispensable for modern linguistic, literary and cultural studies." This paper tries to consider both issues and sets out to demonstrate that the characteristics of clausal connection specific to Present Day English are much better understood when we scrutinize the instability of the system of connectives in Earlier English and in particular the considerable variety of forms of adverbial connectors in Middle English. A closer inspection of why some of the forms emerging in early Middle English (such as forwhi) were rejected by earlier authors (such as hence) have survived, suggests that this development was initially ...the collapse of the Old English system of demonstratives. The fully-fledged para-Old English demonstratives allowed explicit deictic causal connectors, so-called "functional connectors", being formed by means of a preposition and a demonstrative (e.g. why, for who, etc.) because these forms lost the parenthood, English had to express deictic relations in connectors in other ways. In t...
SHifting DEICTICS IN EARLY ENGLISH CAUSAL CONNECTION

This persistent focus on syntax or even word order is most evident in the first part of the Handbuch der deutschen Konnektoren (Pasch et al.) which, in particular in its terminology, considers topological criteria only (cf. the terms Postponierer 'postponers' or Verbzwische- satzeinbeter 'V2-embedders'). Yet, another fairly recent publication mainly concerned with German connectors, the volume Subordination in Syntax, Semantik und Textlinguistik (Le-fèvre), demonstrates that an analysis of connectors should choose a wider perspective and in addition also consider not only aspects of semantics (which is commonly done), but in particular those of text linguistics. In the following chapter, I will summarize the main aspects of these issues – concerning mainly functional sentence perspective and information structure – with respect to English causal connectors.

2 Present Day English (PDE) Coordinators: CAUSE – RESULT

Conjunctions and other connective expressions are an explicit means of marking the connection of states of affairs on the surface. With respect to their semantic functions, three broad categories are generally distinguished, namely ADDITION, CONTRAST/CONCESSION and CAUSE. The category of CAUSE can be further split into CAUSAL RELATION on the one hand (PDE since, because) and the relation of RESULT (PDE therefore, so that) on the other.

It is important to note that all connectors form complex propositions (cf. M3 – M5 above). Thus a sequence of two propositions – (1) proposition A: John is ill and proposition B: John won't come tonight – becomes a complex proposition "[if] a sequence of two propositions A and B expresses a new thought on a level other than that of the isolated propositions", cf. Rudolph (176). Hence connectors commonly have a two-fold function: they connect two states of affairs, and at the same time convey the speaker's opinion on the configuration of these states of affairs, as in

(2) John won't come tonight because he is ill.
(3) John is ill so (that) he won't come tonight.

While the complex sentence (2) marks a CAUSAL relation, (3) reverses the sequence of information and relates the same states of affairs by marking the relation as RESULT. The same relation of RESULT can also be expressed by the employment of an adverbial connector, as in

(4) John is ill. Therefore he won't come tonight.

With respect to the states of affairs there is no difference whether the relation of causality is expressed by a CAUSAL relation as in (2) or a relation of RESULT as in (3) and (4). While the
causal constant A→B remains the same in all cases, the differences between the various means of marking causal connection are to be found in the speaker's choice of information structure and therefore in the intended and/or highlighted 'aim of the message'.

In the sentence highlighting the CAUSAL relation (2), the speaker's interest is focussed on the first connect B (John won't come tonight) reflecting the main information. This information is thus presented in the main clause. From B the speaker mentally looks back to A (John is ill), which gives the reason why B has occurred. B, however, continues to be the aim of the message.

As for the relation of RESULT in (3), the speaker's interest is focussed on A (John is ill). Therefore this information is presented in the main clause, here again the first connect. From A the speaker looks forward to the result B (He won't come tonight), but the main aim of the message remains the fact denoted by A. These differences are highly important for the general organization of the text: Since these complex sentences have only one focus, the information given by the speaker in the subordinate clause is commonly not pursued in the following discourse.

This becomes even more evident when we compare these complex sentences with the RESULT construction by means of an adverbial connector in (4): Here we have two main clauses (John is ill. Therefore he won't come tonight) and hence two foci, i.e. two separate information blocks, which might be pursued in the following discourse. To avoid ambiguities, the connection by means of an adverbial connector has to mark the deictic relation most prominently on the surface level. Consequently, it can not only be used to link clauses but also whole chunks of discourse, so that adverbial connectors may also serve to structure textual organization on the surface level.

In Present Day English conjunctions and adverbial connectors as well as the differences between the various modes are mainly marked by lexical means. The same is true for the difference between external "true reason clauses" and internal "explanation clauses" (cf. Quirk et al. 12.10). Thus the conjunction because signals external "true reason clauses", such as He likes them because they are always helpful. Since and as are so-called internal "explanation causal" as can be seen from the fact that they do not allow Why-questions or cleft-sentence constructions.9 Similarly, for also functions internally as explanation rather than assertion of a true causal relation; in Present Day English, it is restricted to post-position. Adverbial connectors in all cases mark RESULT in a separate main clause.

---

9 The criteria for distinguishing these are answers to Why-questions (Why does he like them? Because they are always helpful) and the possibility of cleft-sentence constructions (It's because they are helpful that he likes them). Compare Why are you late? *Since* as I missed the bus or *It's since/as they are always helpful that he likes them.

---

3 Old English forþæm, forþon, forþy

When we compare this Present Day English system of causal connection with the system in Old English, we find that all of these PDE connectors are new coinages or developments in the history of English. Old English has only one central connector marking the semantic relation CAUSE or REASON, namely the forms forþæm, forþon and forþy. The Dictionary of Old English lists these forms in one single entry and counts altogether about 15,500 occurrences in a wide variety of spellings, which do, however, not carry distinguishing force (cf. DOE, s.v. forþæm, forþon, forþy).11

Since these forms are found in slots which in Present Day English are filled by adverbs ('therefore', cf. Appendix, A) or conjunctions ("because", cf. Appendix, B),12 they are traditionally called "ambiguous adverbs/conjunctions" (for causal connectors, cf. Mitchell § 3010).13 This terminology does not convey, however, that these uses have to be kept apart, because they mark either RESULT or RESULT and also because they structure the information presented in a very different way (cf. above examples (2) – (4)).

Forþæm and its variants may be employed in all kinds of sequences for a number of different relations. In contrast to the wide variety of forms of Present Day English, Old English thus virtually only employs one form to mark the various relations of CAUSE (C) and RESULT (R).14

---

10 In addition to these, there are lexicalised forms such as after all, indeed, in fact or of course which may serve the same function but can also be used in a weaker form as discourse particles. For a full discussion of this issue, cf. Lenker (forthc.).

11 For a survey of the different functions fulfilled by forþæm etc. in Byrhtferth's Enchiridion, cf. Appendix D. For the selection of texts and a detailed analysis of their connectors cf. Lenker (forthc.).

12 Old English does also not make use of – as the typologically similar Modern German does – different forms of the connectors or differences in word order (V2 vs. V-final), though there are tendencies to one or the other in certain authors. Cf. Mitchell §§ 3011-51.

13 Other "ambiguous adverbs/conjunctions" are, for instance, OE after (PDE 'afterwards' vs. 'after') or OE baþonne (PDE 'then' vs. 'whence'). Present Day English differentiates these by morphologically distinct forms.

14 The following table is compiled from Mitchell §§ 3010-51, Traugott 252-55, Wiegand and my own material.
Table 3: for ṣem in Old English

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RESULT – CAUSE</th>
<th>CAUSE – RESULT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>R for ṣem (be) C</td>
<td>(C) for ṣem R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R ṣem R be C</td>
<td>for ṣem be C R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(… for R ṣem …) be C</td>
<td>C (… for R ṣem)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R ṣem R for ṣem (be) C</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Yet, in spite of this wide variety of possible functions, there are very few instances of ambiguity, despite the lack of formal help or a consistent punctuation in Old English. In fact, the instances of cases which allow different interpretations can be listed individually (Mitchell §§ 3011-14). This astonishing fact – and also the later development of causal connectors in English – are in the present paper seen to have their roots in the morphological make-up of the Old English connectors and in the deictic reference they inherently contain.

The morphological make-up of all of the forms listed above is unproblematic. They are prepositional phrases consisting of the preposition for governing the distal demonstrative pronoun in the dative (ṣem) or instrumental (ṣ). In all functions, they may, but need not, be followed by the particle be (cf. Mitchell §§ 3011-51):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>preposition</th>
<th>distal demonstrative pronoun</th>
<th>[+ be]</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>for</td>
<td>dative ṣem – instrumental ṣ</td>
<td>[+ be]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>for</td>
<td>ṣem/ṣ</td>
<td>[+ be]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4 Discourse Deixis

Traditional accounts of the history of this construction state that the original prepositional phrase was re-analysed as a conjunction. A prototypical use of one of the common forms of for ṣem in a true reason clause is illustrated in example (5), where the form forpon – traditionally classified as a conjunction – points anaphorically to the preceding clause.

(5) Do þearto fife forpon bunresdaeg hæfða fij regulares.
   'Add five to that, because [CONJ] Thursday has five regulars' (ByrM 1.2.236-37).

This construction is commonly seen as a re-analysis of

(6) *Do þearto fife for pon: bunresdaeg hæfða fij regulares.
   'Add five to that for [reason] [PP AS A]: Thursday has five regulars'.

In construction (6) assumed to be underlying (5), the prepositional phrase for pon functions as an adverbial in the first clause, and cataphorically refers to the following clause. The demonstrative pon (< ṣem) has a dual function: with respect to the first clause, it is the noun phrase in the prepositional phrase functioning as an adverbial. At the same time, it points cataphorically to the second, causal clause identifying the adverbial relation cause which must necessarily follow here.
Virtually all of the causal connectors in Present Day German, but mainly the adverbial connectors, apart from folglich which is purely lexical, contain a deictic element, most often a demonstrative pronoun (cf. underlined items), which allows their analysis as prepositional phrases.

Another group of important deictic connectors – highlighted in the list by capital letters – are those relating to time or space deixis, such as weil (time) and da, denn, daher and darum (space). The point of reference here is the text itself in its temporal and spatial extension. Da 'there' in daher, for instance, relates the following to the preceding element of discourse which is the cause for the result mentioned in the daher-clause (cf. her 'from there'). In contrast to the pronoun connectors, which explicitly require a point of reference in the co-text, this signalling of deictic reference is more subtle and thus asks for a more sophisticated cognitive process by the listener/reader (Consten 26-37).

Present Day German hence shows three different patterns for connectors: in addition to the pronoun connectors, such as deshalb or deswegen, it uses linguistic items which employ time and space deixis (cf. daher, somit); only rarely lexical elements, such as folglich, are found.

5 Connectors in the History of English

An examination of the system of causal connectors in Present Day English shows that there is not a single remnant of the principal pattern of Old English, i.e. pronominal connectors such as for þæm.

Table 6: PDE CAUSE/RESULT Connectors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Conjunctions CAUSE</th>
<th>external true reason clauses:</th>
<th>because</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Conjunction RESULT</td>
<td>internal explanation clauses:</td>
<td>since, as, for</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adverbial Connectors</td>
<td>so that</td>
<td>accordingly, consequently, hence, so, then, therefore, thus</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

With respect to the conjunctions, we find the lexical because and the polyfunctional and the polyfunctional since (time deixis). As (< eall swa 'all so') is no longer transparent as a deictic; the same is true for for, which is no longer related to the prepositional phrase for þæm, but is only semantically transparent through the preposition for 'because of that'.

There are several forms which use time and space deixis. Kortmann (331), for example, lists the subordinator now that, which has existed in causal function since Old English (nū þæt) and which is also attested as an adverbial connector nū (now). Similarly, OE ponne 'then' is employed as a conjunction ('when ... then') and as an adverbial connector marking RESULT in Old English.

6 Development of Adverbial Subordinators

Most of the causal connectors used in Present Day English testify to dramatic changes which have occurred in the English system after the Old English period. This can best be illustrated by the changes affecting adverbial connectors in the early Middle English period. Adverbial connectors are – as has been shown above (cf. (4)) – the kind of connectors which have to signal linkage most explicitly, because of their presentation of the states of affairs in two information blocks.

Table 7: Causal Adverbial Connectors in the history of English

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>OE</th>
<th>ME</th>
<th>EModE</th>
<th>PDE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>forþon, forly, forþæm</td>
<td>forthi, forthen</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*heonu (ono)</td>
<td>now</td>
<td>now</td>
<td>now</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*nu</td>
<td>so</td>
<td>so</td>
<td>so</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*swa</td>
<td>thane</td>
<td>then</td>
<td>then</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*pa</td>
<td>*forhwi</td>
<td>forwhy</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*ponne</td>
<td>*forwhan</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>*whereby</td>
<td>whereby</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>*wherefore</td>
<td>wherefore</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>*wherethrough</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>hereby</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>herefore</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>herethrough</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>thus</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*so-called ambiguous adverb/conjunction (cf. above, p. 67 and footnote 13)

This Table evidences that there are very few adverbial connectors which have survived in a stable function from Old English to Present Day English. The ones which have survived –

17 Lexical elements are marked by bold letters.

18 For the layout of the tables cf. Kortmann on which it is modelled for reasons of comparison. For a detailed description of the sources used and also a comparison of the history of subordinators and adverbial connectors, cf. Lenker (forthc.). Now and after all are not included in Tables 2 and 6 because they are, if at all, only listed as peripheral causal connectors in the grammars of PDE.
now, then, so\(^\text{19}\) – are extremely polyfunctional elements which have always played only a marginal role in the system of causal connection.

The early Middle English period in particular emerges as a "period of experiment": of the many new connectors emerging in this period, only two have survived, namely therefore and thus (a late-comer first attested in this function in 1380).

This range of new forms together with their short lives illustrates the problems English had to face after the collapse of grammatical categories in demonstratives at the end of the Old English period and thus the loss of the predominant and most explicit causal connector in the language, for þæm. Forban (< for þæm) and especially the instrumental forbi (< for þi) lose their transparency when the article the is no longer inflected for case and gender and has finally become indeclinable (around 1200). Consequently, they also lose their deictic value: the original prepositional phrase eventually turns into a conjunction. These originally deictics, however, are soon lost whereby phonologically weakened forms such as forban are given up much earlier than the stronger forbi which survives as a univerbed, lexicalized form until the end of the Middle English period (cf. MED, s.v.).

With respect to the new forms, it is obvious at first glance that there are not very many different patterns among the new coinages. They are – with the exception of thus – rather similar to their Old English models, in that they can be employed as adverbial connectors or conjunctions, i.e. they are so-called "ambiguous adverbs/conjunctions" (symbol ° in the Table above). More importantly, they also try to indicate deixis by inherently pronominal forms. This pattern can be exemplified by the functional extension of forms such as the relative, originally interrogative forhwæ and forhwæn. From the 13th century on, they are not only used as relatives but also employed as adverbial connectors signalling a new information unit, thus carrying the meaning 'therefore' (cf. OED, s.v. forwhyn). This use is only attested as a conversational implicature in Old English (cf. the single entry in the DOE for forhwæn, forhwæn, forhwæ). Forhwæ and forhwæn are, however, the last coinages which follow the Old English pattern of "pronominal connectors".

The other field of experiment are new connectors employing time or space deixis, similar to OE nd and jonna. From early Middle English onwards, deixis of space in particular is becoming more important. The co-text is taken as a point of reference in patterns using the relative where and the distal and proximal forms there and here (cf. therefore, wherefore, whereas though, hereby), which relate the following to the preceding discourse. Though this means of establishing cohesion is not as explicit as the linkage by a demonstrative, it is still comparatively transparent in signalling deixis. These forms become very frequent from the beginning of the 13th century onwards (cf. Österman and Markus), i.e. at exactly the time when the paradigm of the demonstrative was given up yielding the indeclinable article the. Yet, of the connectors formed by this experimental pattern, only therefore has survived. However, in Present Day English therefore does not seem to be transparent in its space deixis for most speakers (cf. OED, s.v. therefore). This is different with younger connectors used since the end of the Middle English period. Adverbial connectors such as hence and

---

\(^\text{19}\) So - in German as well as in English – is notoriously difficult to analyse because of its polyfunctional- ity; cf. Schleburg.

---

20 The meanings and functions of after all are still only listed in the entry for the preposition/adverb after in the OED (s.v. after).
in the fourth year it has twenty-nine, because one day grows over four years ...
(ByrM 2.1.18-20)

- forpon SOAV (= CAUSE) RESULT
  forpon pu us pus dydest, we hit þe forgyllda
  'because you did us so, we convict you for it' (LS 1.1 (AndrewBright) 201)

C. Correlative Construction: RESULT – CAUSE

- forpon SOVA (=RESULT) forþam SVC (= CAUSE)
  Forþam Romani hine gelogodon þissum monde (þet ys on Februario) forþam he
  ys scyrynest ealra monda ...

  'The Romans placed it [therefore] in this month (in February) because
  it is the shortest of all the months' (ByrM 2.1.36-38)
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