

AMSTERDAM STUDIES IN THE THEORY AND
HISTORY OF LINGUISTIC SCIENCE

General Editor
E.F.K. KOERNER
(Zentrum für Allgemeine Sprachwissenschaft, Typologie
und Universalienforschung, Berlin)

Series IV – CURRENT ISSUES IN LINGUISTIC THEORY

Advisory Editorial Board

Lyle Campbell (Salt Lake City); Sheila Embleton (Toronto)
Brian D. Joseph (Columbus, Ohio); John E. Joseph (Edinburgh)
Manfred Krifka (Berlin); E. Wyn Roberts (Vancouver, B.C.)
Joseph C. Salmons (Madison, Wis.); Hans-Jürgen Sasse (Köln)

Volume 283

Connectives in the History of English

Edited by Ursula Lenker and Anneli Meurman-Solin

S EH 1040

CONNECTIVES IN
THE HISTORY OF ENGLISH

Edited by

URSULA LENKER
University of Munich

ANNELI MEURMAN-SOLIN
University of Helsinki

JOHN BENJAMINS PUBLISHING COMPANY
AMSTERDAM/PHILADELPHIA

ENGL. SEMINAR U. MÜNCHEN

75 Aug 22 17



The paper used in this publication meets the minimum requirements of American National Standard for Information Sciences — Permanence of Paper for Printed Library Materials, ANSI Z39.48-1984.



Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data

International Conference on English Historical Linguistics (13th : 2004 : Vienna University)
Connectives in the history of English : [selected papers from 13th ICEHL, Vienna, 23-28 August 2004] /
edited by Ursula Lenker and Anneli Meurman-Solin.
p. cm. -- (Amsterdam studies in the theory and history of linguistic science. Series IV, Current issues in
linguistic theory, ISSN 0304-0763 ; v.283)
Includes bibliographical references and index.
1. English language--History--Congresses. 2. English language--Grammar--Congresses. 3. English language--
Connectives--Congresses. 4. English language--Grammar, Historical--Congresses. I. Lenker, Ursula. II. Title.
PE1075.I57 2007
420'.9--dc22 2007011997
ISBN 978 90 272 4798 8 (Hb; alk. paper)

© 2007 – John Benjamins B.V.

No part of this book may be reproduced in any form, by print, photoprint, microfilm, or any other means, with-
out written permission from the publisher.

John Benjamins Publishing Co. • P.O.Box 36224 • 1020 ME Amsterdam • The Netherlands
John Benjamins North America • P.O.Box 27519 • Philadelphia PA 19118-0519 • USA

Table of contents

Foreword	VII
Introduction	1
<i>Ursula Lenker and Anneli Meurman-Solin</i>	
Adverbial connectives within and beyond adverbial subordination:	
The history of <i>lest</i>	11
<i>María José López-Couso</i>	
<i>To</i> as a connective in the history of English	31
<i>Bettelou Los</i>	
From <i>op</i> to <i>till</i> : Early loss of an adverbial subordinator	61
<i>Matti Rissanen</i>	
Rise of the adverbial conjunctions { <i>any, each, every</i> } <i>time</i>	77
<i>Laurel J. Brinton</i>	
The evolution of <i>since</i> in medieval English	97
<i>Rafał Molencki</i>	
Grammaticalization and syntactic polyfunctionality: The case of <i>albeit</i>	115
<i>Elina Sorva</i>	
On the subjectification of adverbial clause connectives: Semantic and pragmatic considerations in the development of <i>while</i> -clauses	145
<i>Ana I. González-Cruz</i>	
A relevance-theoretic view on issues in the history of clausal connectives	167
<i>Carsten Breul</i>	
<i>Forhwi</i> 'because': Shifting deictics in the history of English causal connection	193
<i>Ursula Lenker</i>	
Conditionals in Early Modern English texts	229
<i>Claudia Claridge</i>	

logical synergies permit us to create a happy balance between quantitative and qualitative approaches.

It is our very sad duty to announce that Elina Sorva died prematurely in January 2006, and we publish her paper in memory of a dear friend and highly respected colleague.

Munich and Helsinki, January 2007

Ursula Lenker and Anneli Meurman-Solin

Introduction

Ursula Lenker and Anneli Meurman-Solin

University of Munich / University of Helsinki

1. Connectives and current linguistic research

Clausal connection is one of the key building blocks of language in use, and thus a field where a wide range of syntactic, semantic, pragmatic and cognitive phenomena meet. The availability of large databases as well as considerable advances in corpus-linguistic methods have strengthened the interest in the history of features linking clauses or larger chunks of text. However, in recent typology-oriented research, the inventories of clause-combining devices in English and other European languages have chiefly been construed by using secondary sources such as dictionaries and grammars (see, e.g., Devriendt et al. 1996 and Kortmann 1997). There is thus space for a greater degree of integration between cross-disciplinary corpus-based analysis and the reconstruction of taxonomies and typologies of connectives, the former detecting complex patterns of variation and change which may remain unidentified in insufficiently representative data.

The papers collected in this volume therefore set out to combine a thorough corpus-based analysis of the history of individual connectors, their co-occurrence patterns, and patterns of variation and change from both intra- and inter-systemic perspectives with a variety of methodological tools, ranging from sophisticated methods of grammatical analysis to pragmatics, text linguistics and discourse analysis. Drawing on quantitatively and qualitatively improved data, the studies try to reconstruct the history of connectives in English from various new theoretical perspectives.

The distinctive profile of this volume is based on a number of developments in current linguistic research. Firstly, the studies profit from the fact that solid analyses of texts from the various periods in the history of English are now greatly facilitated by balanced corpora, such as ARCHER, or large single-genre corpora, such as the *Corpus of Early English Correspondence* (for a more detailed account of corpora employed, see Section 7 below). Secondly, they illustrate how recent ad-

vances in the fields of pragmatics and text linguistics have enriched the diachronic study of connective devices in English – see, for example, tracing of the path of new connectors from utterance-token to utterance-type meanings to their conventionalization as coded meanings (cf. the “Invited Inferencing Theory of Semantic Change”, as proposed in Traugott & Dasher 2002). Such studies are, of course, only possible when the quantitative methods of corpus linguistics are combined with a careful micro-level analysis of the texts in question. In other words, even though the quantitative analysis is part and parcel of methods employed, the majority of the contributions also rely on a detailed analysis of individual examples in their contexts.

This combination of corpus findings with a close analysis of co-text and context is particularly fruitful for those studies which apply recent findings of information processing to the history of connectors. For example, beginning with Thompson’s analysis of the different functions of initial versus final purpose clauses (Thompson 1985), there has been an increasing and continuing interest in the discourse factors which determine the position of subordinate clauses in Modern English (see Haiman & Thompson 1988; Ford 1993 and, most recently, Diessel 2005), an approach which is here seen as being essential for an understanding of the history of connectives, and in particular of clause combination not only on the local level, but also on the global level of text (see Claridge on the position of *if*-clauses, González-Cruz on that of *while*-clauses and Lenker on that of causal/resultive clauses).

Thirdly, this view of sentence connection not only on the clause, but also on the sentence and discourse levels, requires the examination of functionally related features as systems. Thus, certain uses of relatives are analysed within the variational pattern of anaphoric reference at the sentence level instead of being interpreted exclusively in terms of the established grammatical categorization of relatives in English (Meurman-Solin). Systems consisting of co-occurrence patterns are the focus of the construct of “connective profile”, created by Kohnen as a new analytical tool for the assessment of varying degrees of orality and literacy in texts and genres.

2. Connectives: Continua in clause linkage

Linguistic literature has often neglected connectives in a wider sense, because many theories of grammar choose the sentence as the highest level of analysis. Thus, the established criteria mainly relate to the composition of compound sentences by coordinators such as *and* or *or*, or, as far as complex sentences are concerned, the differentiation between coordination and subordination, and their respective connectives (see Quirk et al. 1985: Chapters 13.2–19, 14.1–4; Biber et

al. 1999: Chapters 2.4.7–8, 3.3; Huddleston & Pullum 2002: Chapters 11.8.1–2, 15.2.1). However, the concept of ‘connective’ essentially also refers to features which create relations not only between clausal structures but also larger units of text. Connectives which function only or predominantly on a more global level, connecting chunks of discourse, have only rarely been studied in detail; this also applies to zero-realization, a recurrent and important pattern attesting to variation and change in the history of linking systems in English.

A variationist typology of connectives can only be achieved when we accept as the general assumption that there are typologically relevant relations between numerous different types of links at the clausal, sentential, discoursal and textual levels. The studies of the present volume reflect the view that the use of the traditional morpho-syntactic criteria and the subsequent classification of connectives in traditional categories, i.e., word classes such as adverb, subordinating conjunction or coordinating conjunction, are not in all cases adequate for identifying the relevant constructions or patterns. An inherent feature of the present corpus-based approach, then, is that developments over time can be depicted by continua based on inventories which include all variants with connective potential (for such approaches, see the cross-linguistic classifications by Lehmann 1988 and Raible 1992). Consequently, for an inventory to be valid for examining variation, it is necessary to give full membership to highly elaborated as well as compressed and zero realisations of links.

A framework for such an inventory is provided by Lehmann’s generally applicable parameters of clause linkage (1988), which have emerged from his typological investigation of the most important aspects of complex sentence formation in the languages of the world. Lehmann’s broad view of connectives postulates continua of several parameters, ranging from two maximally elaborated paratactic clauses with finite verbs and no syntactic embedding at one end (so-called ‘relations of sociation’), all the way to a single clause containing an embedded predicate in a much-reduced form with no inflectional marking of person, aspect, tense and mood, and no complementizer or other element signalling embedding, at the other end (so-called relations of ‘dependency’). The possibilities thus range from a pole of ‘maximal elaboration’ to a pole of ‘maximal compression (or condensation)’, realized in continua within each of the following six parameters: (i) hierarchical downgrading of the subordinate clause (from weak parataxis to strong embedding), (ii) main clause syntactic level of the subordinate clause (from high sentence to low word), (iii) desententialization of the subordinate clause (from weak clause to strong noun), (iv) grammaticalization of the main verb (from weak lexical verb to strong grammatical affix), (v) the interlacing of two clauses (from weak clauses adjunct to strong clauses overlapping), and (vi) the explicitness of the linking (from maximal syndesis to maximal asyndesis).

For several studies in this volume Lehmann's typology is very useful; it, for example, provides a framework for the development of English *lest* from a subordinator (OE *þy læs þe*) to a complementizer, i.e., from a less to a more embedded connective structure (López-Couso). Following the diachronic path of an even more embedded structure, Los plots the Old English *to*-infinitive on the continua provided by Lehmann's parameters, determines its position towards the low end of the parameters (indicating compression rather than elaboration) and compares this with the positions of the other two structures she considers to be parallels – the subjunctive clause and the *to*-prepositional phrase – thus reconstructing a scenario for category change. Los also poses the question of the extent to which the continuum from highly elaborated to compressed overlaps with grammaticalization continua (at first glance only obvious in Lehmann's parameter (iv) from full verb to affix).

Most of the other papers deal with connectives positioned at the 'elaboration pole' of the continua, namely explicit linkers such as coordinating and subordinating conjunctions or adverbial connectors. They are thus mainly concerned with intra-parameter paths in (vi) 'explicitness of linking', i.e., the path from syndesis to asyndesis, which Lehmann specifies as: '[elaboration] anaphoric subordinate clause – gerundial verb – prepositional phrase – connective adverb – specific conjunction – universal subordinator – non-finite verb form [compression]' (1988:213). In a prototypical study of such a path, Sorva shows how PDE *albeit* developed from an anaphoric subordinate clause (ME *al be it (that)*) into a subordinator in the standard language, but can also be used as an adverbial connector in some varieties of English past and present. This last point is similar to González-Cruz's observation that *while* – when used to mark additive rather than temporal or concessive relations – shows 'coordinator-like behaviour' by becoming less dependent on the main clause. The volume also reflects an interest in covering developments from earliest extant documents up to Present-Day English (see, e.g., recent changes in the use of *albeit* (Sorva) and {*any/each/every*} *time* (Brinton)). Problems related to the reconstruction of the language of the past are highlighted by phenomena such as the loss of the group of lexicalized pronominal connectors (cf. OE *forþæm (þe)*) after the Early Middle English period (Lenker), the replacement of *oþ* by *till* (Rissanen) or by the category change of infinitival *to*, which Los concludes to have taken place in pre-Old English times.

3. Domains: Typological findings

Other studies deal with conjunctions which have basically remained stable, in the sense that they have served as conjunctions in all of the attested periods of English. Most of them developed from earlier adjectives or adverbs and show a high

amount of semantic and syntactic polyfunctionality, which, however, decreases after the Old and, in particular, Middle English period. These studies illustrate another of the more recent typological findings by Kortmann (1997), namely that interclausal relations differ markedly with regard to their 'cognitive basicness or centrality for human reasoning' and also their 'cognitive complexity or specificity'. According to Kortmann (1997:342), highly grammaticalized, preferably monomorphemic or single-word connectors which are frequently used and stable over time indicate 'cognitive basicness' ('lexical primes code cognitive primes'). While most of the basic relations also show a low degree of complexity, cognitive basicness and cognitive complexity must nevertheless be kept separate, since CONCESSION, for instance, exhibits 'a high degree of cognitive complexity, and yet clearly belongs to the core set of cognitively basic relations'. These parameters yield a core of twelve basic relations (CAUSE, CONDITION, CONCESSION [CCC], RESULT, PURPOSE, SIMULTANEITY OVERLAP, SIMULTANEITY DURATION, ANTERIORITY, IMMEDIATE ANTERIORITY, TERMINUS AD QUEM, PLACE AND SIMILARITY) and several layers of relations of an increasingly peripheral nature. Generally, the relations can be parcelled into four networks, i.e., temporal, CCC, modal and locative relations.

Kortmann further shows that network-transcending changes are generally unidirectional, so that we can distinguish between source (locative, modal) and goal (CCC) domains. The CCCC or four-C relations (CONTRAST is now commonly added as a fourth domain; see Couper-Kuhlen and Kortmann 2000) constitute the prototypical goal network, i.e., endpoints of network-transcending semantic changes. Cross-linguistic polysemy patterns (Kortmann 1997: 175–211) also show that affinities are strongest between the temporal and the CCCC-networks, so that original temporal connectors often develop CCCC readings.

These typological findings and frequencies are reflected in the studies in this volume. Two of the studies deal with temporal connectors: Rissanen examines the replacement of the Old English temporal subordinator *oþ* by *till* 'till, until' in the Early Middle English period, a counter-example to the usual stability in the field of temporal connectors; Brinton follows the rise of the adverbial conjunctions {*any, each, every*} *time*. Most of the other papers deal with prototypical goal domains, namely CAUSE (Lenker) and, in particular, CONTRAST/CONCESSION (Breul, González-Cruz, Molencki, Sorva), i.e., with items which have transcended their local (*where, whereas*) or temporal (*while, since*) source domain and have, in several steps, acquired a concessive meaning.

4. Grammaticalization

These processes commonly imply an increase in subjectification and are thus seen as prototypical instances of grammaticalization. This scenario has repeatedly been

mentioned in the literature, but in the studies of this collection it is analysed in great detail with respect to the wider perspective of frequency patterns in balanced corpora on the one hand, and the narrow analysis of decisive bridging contexts on the other (see above for Traugott & Dasher's "Invited Inferencing Theory of Semantic Change" and Heine 2002). The perspective of variationist typology to connectives positions them in a variational space in which polyfunctionality and fuzziness are inherent features. A history of univerbated *albeit* based on the analysis of morpho-syntactic properties, for example, may permit the conclusion that we have here a straightforward case of grammaticalization. Evidence of categorial fuzziness and polyfunctionality, elicited from a wide range of digitized sources, suggests, however, that the history of this connective should rather be described in terms of two parallel processes, i.e., the development of the subordinator and that of the discourse marker (Sorva; see also Lenker on ME and EModE *for*). The corpus-based diachronic approach has also permitted the examination of grammaticalization vs lexicalization patterns (for a comprehensive up-to-date account of the various, often opposing views and conceptions on lexicalization and grammaticalization, see Brinton & Traugott 2005: Chapters 2 and 3). In discussing the contexts of the change in domain of *where* and *whereas* from local to concessive/contrastive, Breul focuses on the appropriateness of neo-Gricean principles as the conceptual basis for such explanations in grammaticalization theory, arguing that relevance theory is to be preferred over neo-Gricean approaches.

5. Co-occurrence patterns

The focus of this collection on semantic and pragmatic aspects and, in particular, its perspective on evidence above the clausal or sentential level is illustrated by Kohnen, whose analyses of co-occurrence patterns of linguistic features (see Biber 1988, 1995), i.e., of a particular set of subordinators and coordinators, can be used as a diagnostic tool for defining what he calls the "connective profile" of a text or genre. Both Kohnen and Claridge integrate corpus linguistics and historical stylistics by discussing corpus data from the perspective of genre and text type. They express an interest in the identification of general stylistic trends, either by positioning their investigation of a particular time period within the wider framework of how written discourse developed in Early Modern English texts (Claridge on conditional clauses in texts dating from the period 1640–1740 and representing the registers of POLITICS and SCIENCE), or by examining developments in two quite different genres over a long time-span (Kohnen). While Claridge discusses the dimensions of interactive vs. non-interactive (cf. Biber's involved vs. informational) and argumentative vs. non-argumentative (cf. Biber's persuasive vs. non-persuasive), Kohnen polarizes SERMONS and STATUTES, hypothesising that

these two genres will reflect different degrees of orality and literacy in their use of specific sets of connectives.

Meurman-Solin relates connectives to other cohesive devices in text structure by examining relative elements as anaphoric reference signals at sentence level. In addition to degree of topicality and referential accessibility, the choice of variant realizations of referential links is shown to be conditioned by the particular text-structuring properties and formulaic language use of epistolary prose. A further dimension is the finding that sequences of particular speech acts can be related to the choice or particular use of a connective (see also González-Cruz).

6. Language contact

Finally, the inspection of data originating from the Middle and Early Modern English periods (when English finally developed into an *Ausbausprache*) raises questions as to the influence of contact-induced change, which strengthens the typological orientation of current research on connectives. Thus, the role of borrowed syntax from Latin in the development of the subordinator and complementizer *lest* is discussed by López-Couso, and the hypothesis that the phrase *all be it* (*that*), later an atomic connective, is modelled on the Old French expression *tout soit il/ce que* (Sorva). Latin influence is a complex issue, and it is proposed here that some new light could be shed by drawing on multi-genre corpora including translations of Latin texts, and by examining variational paradigms of linguistic features which share a particular function in text structure from a comparative perspective.

7. Theoretical and methodological synergies

The rationale behind this compilation of studies can be described with reference to the theoretical and methodological synergies which are relevant and necessary for gaining a deeper understanding of the complex history of clause-combining devices, both from the perspective of a single language system and that of a comparative approach, including language contact phenomena. Such synergies can be identified in the following areas in particular: elaboration of corpus-linguistic tools for historical pragmatics, historical text-linguistics, historical stylistics, and historical typology; application of variationist principles to provide synchronic and diachronic accounts of linguistic features and systems; and integration of information about phonological, structural, syntactic and semantic properties with that acquired in micro-level analyses of discourse functions, especially as regards the framework of grammaticalization and subjectification theory.

The ability to provide new information on clause-combining devices in the history of English is dependent on sufficiently large and representative diachronic corpora. There are still important gaps, in Late Modern English in particular, and differences between compilation principles and practices sometimes make comparisons between data drawn from different sources difficult, even impossible. In the studies in this volume, standard digital sources such as the *Helsinki Corpus of English Texts* (HC), the *Helsinki Corpus of Older Scots* (HCOS), the *Century of Prose Corpus* (COPC), and the *British National Corpus* (BNC) are still used as originally constructed, but the benefits of producing tagged and/or parsed versions of at least parts of these databases, such as the *York-Toronto-Helsinki Parsed Corpus of Old English Prose*, are obvious (see Los in this volume). In addition to a number of new on-line dictionaries, most studies in this volume draw on a wide range of sources, complementing corpus data with data extracted from the *Toronto Dictionary of Old English Corpus* (DOEC), the *Middle English Compendium* (MEC), the *Literature Online* (LION) database and the quotations corpus of the *Oxford English Dictionary* (OED).

In a number of articles, relatively new corpora, which have not been used as yet quite as extensively as the above-mentioned earlier-generation ones, also appear in the lists of sources, most of these being included in the *ICAME Collection of English Language Corpora: the Lampeter Corpus of Early Modern English Tracts* (Claridge), the *Australian Corpus of English* (López-Couso), the *Newdigate Newsletters* (Sorva), and the *Corpus of Early English Correspondence Sampler* (González-Cruz, Sorva); González-Cruz and López-Couso also draw on ARCHER-2. In addition, the use of internet sources is becoming a standard (González-Cruz, Sorva). There is ample evidence in this volume of the potential of the comprehensive corpus-based inventories to provide important new information about previously unidentified variation at all levels of language use. Claridge, for instance, shows how focused corpora such as the *Lampeter Corpus of Early Modern English Tracts* (1640–1740) may permit us to analyse in great detail transition periods reflecting a process 'to an increasingly more modern state of the language'.

Corpora created with particular research questions in mind have also been compiled by extracting relevant texts from existing corpora and adding a considerable number of new texts, thus constructing a larger single-genre diachronic corpus. For example, Kohonen uses a corpus of sermons dating from Late Middle English to the late twentieth century which has been compiled using revised and extended versions of sermons in the *Helsinki Corpus of English Texts*, extracting later sermons from the *British National Corpus* and the *London-Lund Corpus*, and increasing the size of this compilation by digitizing a number of new sermons.

However, the studies with a text-linguistic rather than morpho-syntactic approach in particular also reveal some of the problems of computerized data. Corpus compilers have become increasingly aware of the fact that historical texts have

sometimes been edited by the application of editorial principles which may reduce the validity of the data in research. It seems that this is the case especially when non-literary texts such as legal documents and letters have been edited, presumably on the assumption that the bulk of their readership would be historians. Some differences between original manuscripts and edited texts which have direct implications for the study of connectives are, for instance, that clause structure remains unrecoverable in texts in which modernisation has been resorted to in areas such as punctuation and the use of capitals (Meurman-Solin). With respect to the function of global markers of discourse structure, there are also other non-linguistic features, such as spacing and paragraph structure, which play a role in syntactic and textual analysis and are unfortunately lost in the use of traditional computerized corpora. Since annotation in electronic corpora still largely focuses on morpho-syntax, the studies in this volume mostly retrieve information about semantic, pragmatic and text-linguistic features manually. This permits the authors to identify relevant examples reflecting change in periods of transition, and to keep track of parallel developments and continued variation in processes of change which take place over a long time-span.

The chapters have been ordered to reflect focus areas ranging from more general aspects such as categorial continua (López-Couso, Los) to detailed analyses of particular connectives representing various semantic roles, i.e., connectives signalling temporal (Rissanen, Brinton), concessive/contrastive (Molencki, González-Cruz, Sorva, Breul) and causal (Lenker) relations. The last three chapters examine text-organisational aspects of connectives (Claridge on conditionals, and Meurman-Solin on relatives) and co-occurrence patterns of connectives in sermons and statutes (Kohonen), shedding new light on the evolution of genres and text types.

References

- Biber, Douglas (1988). *Variation Across Speech and Writing*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Biber, Douglas (1995). *Dimensions of Register Variation. A Cross-Linguistic Comparison*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Biber, Douglas, Stig Johansson, Geoffrey Leech, Susan Conrad, and Edward Finegan (1999). *Longman Grammar of Spoken and Written English*. London: Longman.
- Brinton, Laurel J. and Elizabeth Closs Traugott (2005). *Lexicalization and Language Change*. (Research Surveys in Linguistics). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Couper-Kuhlen, Elizabeth, and Bernd Kortmann, eds (2000). *Cause – Condition – Concession – Contrast*. (Topics in English Linguistics, 33). Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Devriendt, Betty, Louis Goossens, and Johan van der Auwera, eds (1996). *Complex Structures. A Functionalist Perspective*. (Functional Grammar Series, 17). Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

- Diessel, Holger (2005). 'Competing Motivations for the Ordering of Main and Adverbial Clause'. *Linguistics* 43: 449–470.
- Ford, Cecilia (1993). *Grammar in Interaction. Adverbial Clauses in American English Conversation*. (Studies in Interactional Sociolinguistics, 9). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Haiman, John and Sandra A. Thompson (1988). *Clause Combining in Grammar and Discourse*. (Typological Studies in Language, 18). Amsterdam: Benjamins.
- Heine, Bernd (2002). 'On the Role of Context in Grammaticalization'. In: *New Reflections on Grammaticalization*, ed. Gabriele Diewald and Ilse Wischer. (Typological Studies in Language, 49). Amsterdam: Benjamins, 83–101.
- Huddleston, Rodney and Geoffrey K. Pullum (2002). *The Cambridge Grammar of the English Language*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Kortmann, Bernd (1997). *Adverbial Subordination: A Typology and History of Adverbial Subordinators Based on European Languages*. (Empirical Approaches to Language Typology, 18). Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Lehmann, Christian (1988). 'Towards a Typology of Clause Linkage'. In: Haiman and Thompson, eds, 181–225.
- Quirk, Randolph, Sidney Greenbaum, Geoffrey Leech, and Jan Svartvik (1985). *A Comprehensive Grammar of the English Language*. London: Longman.
- Raible, Wolfgang (1992). *Junktion. Eine Dimension der Sprache und ihre Realisierungsformen zwischen Aggregation und Integration*. Sitzungsberichte der Heidelberger Akademie der Wissenschaften. Philosophisch-Historische Klasse 1992/2. Heidelberg: Winter.
- Thompson, Sandra A. (1985). 'Grammar and Written Discourse: Initial vs. Final Purpose Clauses in English'. *Text* 5: 55–84.
- Traugott, Elizabeth Closs and Richard Dasher (2002). *Regularity in Semantic Change*. (Cambridge Studies in Linguistics). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

JL⁵

JP

Adverbial connectives within and beyond adverbial subordination

The history of *lest*

María José López-Couso*

University of Santiago de Compostela

1. Introduction

Syntactic and semantic polyfunctionality is often mentioned as a property of a number of adverbial subordinators across languages (cf. Harris 1988:75–76; Kortmann 1997:58–69, 105; Bisang 1998:759, among others). The great versatility of adverbial connectives manifests itself both intracategorially, i.e., within adverbial subordination, and extracategorially, i.e., beyond the domain of adverbial relations. Particularly interesting instances of the latter type of syntactic and semantic polyfunctionality in English are subordinators whose primary function is that of signalling certain types of adverbial relations but which, over the course of time, have developed a secondary use as declarative complementizers under specific conditions. The aim of this study is to trace the history of one of these connectives, namely *lest*, which to date has been almost wholly neglected in scholarly literature. Evidence will primarily be drawn from the *Helsinki Corpus of English Texts* (HC) and ARCHER-2. Supplementary sources, such as the *Oxford English Dictionary* (OED), the *Dictionary of Old English Corpus* (DOEC) and the *Middle*

* I am grateful to the Autonomous Government of Galicia (grant no. PGIDT05PXIC20401PN), and the Spanish Ministry of Education and Science and the European Regional Development Fund (grant no. HUM2004-00940) for generous financial support. I am also indebted to the Department of English of the University of Freiburg for granting me access to ARCHER-2 during my stay there in the summer of 2004. Thanks are also due to my colleagues Teresa Fanego and Belén Méndez-Naya who provided input at various points. Finally, I would like to acknowledge the editors of this volume and an anonymous reviewer for many valuable comments and useful suggestions on a previous version of the study.