

John Benjamins Publishing Company



This is a contribution from *Journal of Historical Pragmatics* 17:2
© 2016. John Benjamins Publishing Company

This electronic file may not be altered in any way.

The author(s) of this article is/are permitted to use this PDF file to generate printed copies to be used by way of offprints, for their personal use only.

Permission is granted by the publishers to post this file on a closed server which is accessible only to members (students and faculty) of the author's/s' institute. It is not permitted to post this PDF on the internet, or to share it on sites such as Mendeley, ResearchGate, Academia.edu.

Please see our rights policy on <https://benjamins.com/content/customers/rights>

For any other use of this material prior written permission should be obtained from the publishers or through the Copyright Clearance Center (for USA: www.copyright.com).

Please contact rights@benjamins.nl or consult our website: www.benjamins.com

Alors/donc/then at the right periphery

Seeking confirmation of an inference

Kate Beeching

University of the West of England, Bristol

This paper compares the functions and development of right peripheral (RP) *alors*, *donc* and *then* in French and English. These items developed historically from temporal expressions, they express consequence and can serve, intersubjectively, as an appeal to the addressee to confirm previous assumptions. An analysis of the frequency and positions of *alors*, *donc*, *so* and *then* in contemporary spoken corpora of standard British English and French shows that, though these terms are similar in consequential function, they have different distributions. From a diachronic perspective, drawing on recent theories which highlight the crucial role of contact with Anglo-French in the history of the English language (e.g., Ingham 2012a,b), this paper adduces evidence from the *Manières de langage* (1396; see Kristol 1995), which suggests that the final positioning of *then* in English may have arisen as a sense/pragmatic extension on analogy with French *donques*.

Keywords: *alors*, *donc*, then, Anglo-French, sense extension by analogy

1. Methodological preliminaries: defining periphery and the exchange structure

Before discussing right-peripheral (RP) *alors/donc/then*, a decision has to be made as to what exactly constitutes the RP. Three models of periphery were proposed in Beeching and Detges (eds, 2014): the preamble-rheme based model adopted for French by Detges and Waltereit, drawing on Morel (2007) and Danon-Boileau et al. (1991); a clause-based dependency structure model developed by Degand, for French; and a layered model proposed by Onodera for Japanese, adapted from Shinzato (2007). The drawback of these paradigms is that they present a somewhat static model, focussed on single utterances and not on the exchange structure as a whole. This paper proposes a model based on the adjacency pair in order to

capture the complexity of the exchange structure and the different types of acts which can occur at LP and RP.

Sacks et al.'s (1974) ground-breaking insight that everyday interaction is built on adjacency pairs, such as question-answer, request-compliance and invitation-refusal/acceptance, throws considerable light on the variation observed at LP and RP. The notions of the first pair part (FPP) and the second pair part (SPP) can help disambiguate whether LP is discourse-initial or not — in other words, whether the item at LP is a reaction to what a previous speaker has said or launches a new topic in (an ongoing) interaction.

This leads to several different types of LP/RP marker, depending on whether the marker at LP is in a FPP or a SPP and whether markers at RP close the conversation or open a new FPP. These are illustrated in Table 1.

Table 1. Items at LP and RP in relation to first- and second-pair parts.

Pair-parts		Action and exchange functions
FPP (discourse-initial)	(1) LP1	attention-getter/link to (implicit) previous discourse
	(2) RP1	modaliser/end-marker
	(3) RP2	response-inviter
SPP (discourse non-initial)	(1) LP2	response-marker/attention-getter/ link to previous discourse
	(2) RP3	modaliser/end-marker (anaphoric reference to FPP may be included)
	(3) RP4	response-inviter (anaphoric reference to FPP may be included) (and new FPP)

This somewhat simplified model suggests that items that occur at LP and RP in a SPP may be different from those which appear in a FPP: items in a SPP react to what has happened in the FPP and can refer back to elements which appear in the FPP and the SPP, in a logical propositional way, as well as in an interactional and actional manner, to do with the exchange and action structures. The type of speech act which can occur will be constrained by the nature and position in the exchange structure — and these constraints are arguably universal cross-linguistically.

Diachronically, it has been suggested (Sweetser 1990) that there are universal cognitive mechanisms underlying semantic change which link pragmatic ambiguity and lexical polysemy. Concrete or propositional lexical items are drawn on metaphorically to serve grammatical, discourse or interpersonal functions. What we wish to test in the current special issue is the universality of such cognitive mechanisms and how these interact with the exchange structure, specifically at the LP and RP of the turn. A comparison of *alors*, *donc*, *so* and *then* in French and

English can shed some light on this question. This paper is structured in the following way. After an introduction to, and exemplification of, synchronic usages of *alors*, *donc*, *so* and *then* in Section 2, relevant previous studies are presented in Section 3. Section 4 surveys the distributional frequencies of *alors*, *donc*, *so* and *then* at LP and RP in contemporary spoken corpora. In Section 5, recent developments in the study of medieval Anglo-French are presented and new data from the *Manières de langage* are evaluated in Section 6. After a discussion in Section 7, some conclusions and suggestions for future avenues of research are proposed in Section 8.

2. Introduction

There is some evidence that RP elements are increasing in frequency (in European languages in any case): an analysis of spoken corpora reveals that occurrences of French post-posed *quoi* tripled in the 40 years to 2002 and that occurrences of *bon* have doubled (Beeching 2007, 2009). On the other hand, utterance-final *like*, associated with Northern dialects in the UK, appears to be in decline, while utterance-medial, approximative, *like* is increasing in frequency (Beeching 2016).

This paper aims to present examples of right-peripheral *alors*, along with *donc* and *then*, across a range of both synchronic and diachronic corpora and to gauge the extent to which these right-peripheral forms are increasing in frequency in real time — or whether they are simply a reflection of the spoken interactional nature of the corpus data. The motivation for selecting these items is that they:

- Developed historically from temporal expressions;
- Express consequence; and,
- Serve, intersubjectively, as an appeal to the addressee to confirm previous assumptions.

The following example from the late twentieth-century *Corpus de Référence du Français Parlé* illustrates the way in which *alors* is used turn-peripherally at LP to link to previous discourse and intersubjectively at RP to request confirmation of an inference which is being drawn by the addressee (in this case, that the candle-making process in question was a form of sculpture):

- (1) L1 *alors* ça il fallait faire on faisait les cierges + euh euh premièrement la le
 cierge + et après il fallait les + l'ama- amalguer le pied pour euh + < oui oui
 L2 *donc* > là c'était de < la sculpture
 L1 et puis > on l'ouvrait
 L2 de la sculpture *alors*

- L1 oui
 L2 hein c'était une sc-
 [L1 so here we had to make we were making candles + euh euh firstly the the
 candle + and afterwards we had to + add on the foot in order to euh + <
 yes yes
 L2 so > in that case it was < sculpture
 L1 and then > we opened it
 L2 sculpture **then**
 L1 yes
 L2 wasn't it ? it was a sc-]

Similar examples of RP *then* in English have been studied by Haselow (2011, 2012a,b) and can be found in the spoken demographic section of the British National Corpus. In the example which follows, *then* is used in a temporal or consequential sense at LP at the beginning of the extract and is used at RP further down. At RP, *then* appears to capture the inference that, as (a consequence of the fact that) Margaret is doing the shopping, Albert will not need to, but also seeks confirmation that the speakers will meet up later.

- (2) (SP:PS01A) **Then** I'll, probably have to end up (unclear) and wash up (unclear).
 (SP:PS01C) Mm.
 (SP:PS01A) Right, I'll get off to shop and get her the stuff what she wants, and make her her dinner. (pause) She wants a tin of soup she says. (pause) Well (pause) (cough) (pause) (humming) (pause) Right. I'll see you later!
 (SP:PS01C) See you Albert.
 (SP:PS01A) Nowt you want is there?
 (SP:PS01C) No.
 (SP:PS01A) While I'm here.
 (SP:PS01C) Margaret's just doing some shopping for (unclear).
 (SP:PS01A) Fair enough. See you later **then**!
 (SP:PS01H) Yeah.
 (SP:PS01C) Yeah.
 (SP:PS01A) Ta-ta!
 (SP:PS01C) Ta-ta!

In both the French and the English passages, the response-marker 'yes' ('oui' and 'yeah') confirms the intersubjective nature of the RP usage of *alors/then*.

In response to the questions raised by the conveners of this special issue, to do with the universality of interactional features in relation to the periphery of the turn, the paper addresses the following two questions:

- a. What sorts of exchange- and action-structure related functions are expressed at RP? And,
- b. What generalizations can be made about how elements at RP arise historically?

With respect to (a) it is well-established that, in the case of *alors/donc/then*, for both French and English, a temporal expression develops a consequential sense and from there a discourse-marking usage, positioned at LP or, indeed, RP. These findings may be contrasted with Degand's (2009) findings for Dutch where the polysemy appears to be captured in different expressions (*dan, dus, toen*, etc.). The fact that *so* in English is restricted to LP¹ serves to illustrate the non-deterministic nature of such changes. With respect to (b), I will review previous studies which have investigated the historical evolution of *alors/donc/then* and problematise the evidence which historical data can afford in relation to colloquial, interactional features. The development of RP *alors/donc/then* seems to conform to the notion of "diachronic parallelism" (Fleischman and Yaguello 2004), whereby forms with similar semantic structures spontaneously develop new meanings in each language (and might thus illustrate universal tendencies which occur cross-linguistically). Extraordinary evidence drawn from the *Manières de langage* (1396; see Kristol 1995), however, suggests that the parallelism between *then* and *donc* may in fact be a case of contact-induced change, involving sense extension by analogy.

3. Previous studies of *alors, donc* and *then* in synchrony and diachrony.

Degand and Fagard (2011) review the literature on *alors* and describe its main functions in present-day French (PDF) as being temporal, causal and discourse-structuring. Historically, *alors* developed from Latin *ILLA HORA* 'at that hour' and, in Old French, it expressed temporal simultaneity and sometimes duration. The movement from temporality to causality is attributed to certain fundamental patterns of inference "when one state of affairs is seen as forming the background for another, the assumption will frequently be made that the former is also the cause of the latter" (Hansen 1997: 181). Metadiscursive *alors* marks shifts to a new topic and links different pieces of discourse, and can also initiate a turn which shifts the conversation to a new topic (as *so* can do in English). Degand and Fagard (2011) are primarily interested in exploring the interaction between syntactic position and function and they note that *alors* in initial position generally expresses a dependency link between Segment 1 (S1) and Segment 2 (S2),

1. *So* does, however, appear at RP in Irish English (Luckman de Lopez 2014).

while medial and final *alors* do not. Medial *alors* is most often temporal while utterance final resultative *alors* is “often found with statements made on the basis of inference from prior discourse by the interlocutor, and which therefore usually function pragmatically as requests for confirmation” (Hansen 1997:182). In Degand and Fagard’s data, *alors* appears in the twelfth century but its frequency is very low until the fifteenth century. In Old French, *alors* has purely temporal usages. At the end of the thirteenth century, examples appear in which it retains a temporal meaning, but in contexts in which it can take on a causal meaning. This ‘in-between’ stage is crucial for its semantic evolution. Signally, causal contexts appear in the thirteenth century but conditional contexts for *alors* do not arise until the fourteenth century. Degand and Fagard explain that, in relation to its syntactic position, *alors* can be said to shift from medial position in Old French to initial position from Middle French onwards and to be situated almost exclusively at the periphery of the sentence in Present-Day French (PDF), where it can have a temporal reading in written French, but not in spoken French. Their data suggest that the movement to clause-initial position was a precondition of the semantic and functional change of *alors*. Degand and Fagard conclude by highlighting the difference between speech and writing in the semantic distribution of *alors*. Given that the data which we have for earlier periods of the language are exclusively written, the question arises as to whether speakers of the language already used *alors* in final position to request confirmation of an inference but we simply do not have sufficiently oral data to test this.

Hansen (1997) treats both *alors* and *donc* mainly from a synchronic point of view, but with some consideration of their diachronic origins and evolution. According to Hansen, Old French *donc* had several uses:

- a. A temporal one (*at that time*);
- b. In hypothetical *if*-constructions, where it would introduce the apodosis;
- c. Introducing results or conclusions; and,
- d. As an emphatic particle with imperatives.

Only the resultative sense of *donc* has been carried over to PDF, the temporal and hypothetical uses having been lost. However, Hansen demonstrates very clearly that *donc* has a function which marks surrounding text as being mutually manifest, a repetition of something which has been said before — while *alors* flags a new inference. *Alors* is a great deal more frequent in Hansen’s PDF data than *donc*, is a great deal more polysemous, and is best analysed as a radial category. Hansen does not propose to trace the evolution of the semantics of *alors*, explaining that “since a great many of the uses of *alors* ...are really only typical of spoken interaction, a diachronic study is hardly feasible” (Hansen 1997:184). She points out that it is reasonable to suggest, however, that “the extensions to conditional and

consecutive environments are prior to the foregrounding and more generally re-perspectivising ones”.

Bolly and Degand (2009) establish the highly multifunctional nature of *donc* in contemporary spoken French. They provide exemplification of usages which are not only consequential but in which *donc* marks recapitulation, reformulation, explicitation and discourse organisation. Finally, Degand (2014) analyses 100 examples of *alors* and *donc*, 50 of each at LP and RP, respectively, in PDF. There appears to be little specialisation of the meanings for LP and RP, though argumentative causal-conclusion functions are more frequent at RP than LP for *alors* and equally balanced at LP and RP for *donc*. *Alors* is more often used at LP for topic introduction and résumé than is *donc*.

Alors and *donc* share a number of semantic features with *then* in English. Haselow (2011, 2012a,b) provides excellent overviews of the functions of *then* in Present-Day English (PDE) and of its historical evolution (Haselow 2012a: 161) from a deictic adverb (time) to a marker of logical conclusion, thence to a linking adverbial (sequencer) and finally to a discourse marker and final connector.

Haselow (2012a: 172–3) argues that “[f]inal *then* originates from the optional conjunct *then* in *if ... then* constructions in which the conditional protasis is not expressed in a subordinated *if*-clause, but implied in a preceding utterance... The phenomenon originated in interactive language use. Brinton (2007: 314) cites Wårvik (1995: 348) who “considers the pragmatic use to be related to the adverbial form, not to the conjunctive form, as the adverb marks foregrounded action and the conjunction backgrounded action... in Middle English, adverbial *þa* is replaced by *þonne*, which originally marked backgrounded action while conjunctive *þa* / *þonne* is replaced by *when ...* the foregrounding functions of ‘then’ are lost in Middle English, and it becomes first a marker of episodic structure and then a mere sequencer”.

Schiffrin (1987: 254–61) points out that the use of *then* to mark inferences that are warranted by another’s prior talk is similar to conditional (and conjunctive) *then* marking the apodosis of condition (*if* X, *then* Y). She argues, however, for the source of both sequential and inferential *then* in the temporal *then*, one through a straightforward extension of the temporal meaning and the other through pragmatic inferencing from temporal succession to causal meaning. As Brinton (2007: 314) remarks “it would seem she sees both pragmatic uses of *then* as deriving from the adverbial function”.

There appears, thus, to be a missing link between adverbial *þonne* and inferential *then*. Inferential final connector *then* (‘in that case’) does not fit either an ‘if ... then’ frame or the causal frame posited by Schiffrin — it expresses ‘consequence’. In the example:

A: I'll see you at the beach.

B: You're coming with us then?

then indicates “I deduce (as a consequence of the fact that you say that you'll see me at the beach) that you are coming with us (after all)”.

This analysis concurs with Degand's (2014) argument, for French, that, by using *donc* or *alors*, the speaker makes explicit how the situation described in Segment 2 (S2) is meaningfully related to the situation described in a previous Segment 1 (S1). She points out that these usages correspond in many respects to Sweetser's (1990) content and epistemic relations, “It follows from this that...” Once an LP deductive use is established, terms like *alors*, *donc* or *then* can be used intersubjectively on the RP as confirmation requests, thus initiating a new question–answer adjacency pair. Table 2 recapitulates Haselow's findings with respect to the distribution of *then* in his historical corpus of English.

Table 2. Distribution of *then* (*þa/þonne/þan/than*) in the corpus according to function (Haselow 2012b: 161); figures in round brackets are percent.

(25,000 words in each corpus)	OE (700 [900]–1100)	Early ME (1100–1300)	Late ME (1300–1500)	EModE (1500–1700)
Deictic adverb	24 (4)	17 (15)	31 (18)	12 (8)
sequencer	363 (59)	38 (34)	21 (13)	35 (23)
Conj <i>when...then</i>	201 (33)	8 (7)	12 (7)	2 (1)
Conj <i>if...then</i>	13 (2)	15 (13)	25 (15)	11 (7)
DM	9 (2)	31 (28)	66 (39)	41 (27)
Final connector	0	3 (3)	13 (8)	51 (34)
all uses	610	112	168	152

What is most surprising in this table is the dramatic dip in frequency of *then* in the Early ME texts. The corpus for each period is made up of texts which amount to approximately 25,000 words, so inequalities in the word count do not explain this discrepancy. One explanation may be that the texts written in OE are very different in genre from those from the early ME period. The OE texts are narratives, with less dialogical language, a high proportion of sequencers and few DMs or final connectors. Haselow (2012b: 155) is very careful to point out that final connectors (like *then*) are “basically a phenomenon of unplanned and unedited spoken language” and it is thus “more promising to look for the origins of final *then* in texts that represent the spoken mode or historical texts which are intended to be closer to the oral mode, e.g., for didactic purposes, than in other text types”. Not only are the texts highly heterogeneous across different periods, but the sample is relatively small, thus making it necessary to take great care not to draw any firm conclusions

about the frequency of *then* across the different periods. The dramatic dip in frequency of *then* may be related, as Kemenade and Los (2007) have suggested, to a reorganization of topic- and focus-marking in Early ME, which affected word order but also usage of *then*-constructions.² Another factor, however, which has not been taken into consideration is the fact that, after 1066, and into the Early ME period, most writing of both an official and literary sort was generally undertaken in French, rather than in English. This may have had an impact on the genres of texts which continued to be written in English and, indeed, on the English in which texts were written.

One thing we can note in the Early ME period, in addition to the dramatic drop in frequency of *then*, is that there is an equally dramatic rise in the proportion of DM usage, followed by a gradual rise in DM and final usages over the late ME and into the EModE period. I am not persuaded by Haselow's "if...then" argument for the development of final *then*, for reasons outlined above. The hypothesis that I wish to explore in what remains of this paper concerns the role of French–English bilingualism in the development and propagation of final *then* in English. This aspect is introduced in Section 5. My working hypothesis is that the word order changes and reorganization of *then* constructions noted by Kemenade and Los were accompanied by sense extensions by analogy with French. Before going on to this, let us turn to a comparison of *alors*, *donc*, *so* and *then* in synchronic corpora of spoken French and English.

4. *Alors*, *donc*, *so* and *then* in PDF and PDE

Alors and *donc* can be translated by English *so* (at LP) or *then* (at LP or at RP). The distributional frequency and position (LP or RP) of *alors*, *donc*, *so* and *then* were charted in the *Corpus de Référence du Français Parlé* (82 speakers; 287,482 words) and the demographic spoken section of the British National Corpus. The CRFP is made up of interviews with people of different ages and in 40 towns across France. The demographic spoken section of the BNC (4,233,962 words, approximately 1,068 speakers) is made up of more everyday conversations, recorded "on the fly" by volunteers. One-hundred occurrences of *alors* and 100 of *donc* were randomly selected, and analysed to gauge the extent to which they are used at RP. A similar procedure was carried out for the BNC. One-hundred occurrences of *so* and 100 occurrences of *then* were randomly selected for detailed investigation to see whether they appeared at RP.

2. I am indebted to Elizabeth Traugott for drawing my attention to this when she reviewed this paper.

Table 3. Tokens and rates of occurrence per 10,000 words, and numbers and percentages of RP usage of *alors*, *donc*, *so* and *then* in the CRFP and the BNC.

	N	r	RP-N (in samples of 100)	Percent of usages at RP
<i>alors</i>	967	34	3	3
<i>donc</i>	2,333	81	4	4
<i>so</i>	24,402	58	5	5
<i>then</i>	17,562	41	36	36

The first thing to note is that *donc* is by far the most frequent marker in the data, occurring at a rate of 81 times per 10,000 words. This is a much higher rate than that found in the VALIBEL Corpus by Degand (2014: 153) with rates of 37.5 per 10,000 words for *alors* and 39.5 per 10,000 words for *donc*. It is also somewhat surprising, given Hansen's (1997) findings that *alors* is a great deal more frequent than *donc* and that it is more polysemous. In a 50,668 word sample from the VALIBEL Corpus, Degand (2014) analysed all of the occurrences of *alors* (190 examples) and of *donc* (200 examples) and found that 12.6 percent of the examples of *alors* were at RP and 19 percent of the examples of *donc* were at RP. The rather lower percentages of RP *alors* and *donc* in the CRFP data may be explained by the fact that the conversations take the form of interviews which give the interviewee the floor in a long monologue, rather than being more dialogic and intimate in genre. The BNC provides more everyday spoken interactions between intimates. In the samples taken, five tokens of *so* occur at RP, but they are either in expressions such as "I (don't) think so" or in utterances which have been left hanging in the air, such as "But it's not a long one so [pause]" or "we'll have left by then so". The discrepancy between the rates of RP occurrences of the markers in French and English in the current data (and between the VALIBEL and the CRFP data) is arguably attributable to genre differences. This highlights the need to find sufficiently interactive spoken data in the investigation of RP elements. What we can say, however, and with reasonable certainty, is that *alors* and *donc* in French are more evenly distributed across LP and RP than are *so* and *then* in English, *so* is exclusively LP in the BNC and *then* can be LP but is used 36 percent of the time at RP. Haselow (2014) addressed the complementary distribution of *so* and *then* in English, which he notes is also evidenced in German *also* and *dann* (Deppermann and Helmer 2013).

5. The impact of Anglo-French³

Since Pope (1934), Anglo-French has traditionally been considered to be a degenerate form of French, often dubbed “Anglo-Norman”. A great deal more interest has been shown in the status of Anglo-French in recent years, notably by Rothwell (e.g., 1991, 1994), Trotter (e.g., 2003, 2007) and Ingham (2012a,b, 2015).

Scholars now agree that, far from being a diglossic situation in which Norman overlords spoke a variety of Norman French while the peasantry spoke English, the linguistic situation in England after the Norman Conquest in 1066 was marked by considerable bilingualism and a long period of contact, not just between Norman overlords but also with continental French, from 1066 up to the fifteenth century. Ingham (2012a) argues that choir schools played a major role in the transmission of Anglo-Norman. It was in these choir schools that young boys from the age of six learnt Latin through the medium of French. The fact that most did not start learning French until they were past a critical period for acquiring phonology explains some shifts in the ways that place-names for example were adapted from French. Ingham (2012a) demonstrates, however, that these native English speakers acquired an excellent mastery of both the morphology and the vocabulary of the language. These schools were difficult to maintain after about 1400 when the Black Death killed so many of the tutor-monks that they were no longer sustainable.

The main period of borrowing into English from French is considered to have been from 1200–1400, and most studies suggest that it was vocabulary which was borrowed. Miller (2012: 172) claims that “one of the most frequent types of word formation among code-switching bilinguals is the calque, or loan translation [...]”. Miller (2012: 174) draws attention to the London Grocers’ Company records, which exemplify the gradual death of Anglo-French in written records. One of the items noted there is as follows:

Item: paie pur takyn downe off tyle off an olde housz (1432)
 [Item: paid for taking down of tile off an old house]

3. An anonymous reviewer rightly points out my apparently inconsistent use of the terms “Anglo-French” and “Anglo-Norman” in what follows. Authors on this topic have generally referred to the type of French spoken in post-conquest England as “Anglo-Norman” and have compiled, or make references to, the “Anglo-Norman dictionary/hub/corpus” and the “Anglo-Norman Yearbook”. I have thus referred to their works using the term “Anglo-Norman”. However, there has been more recent agreement that the division between an early “Norman” period and a later “French” period is “somewhat artificial” (Miller 2012: 150, 152ff, citing also Rothwell 1996, 1998). The invading “Normans” hailed from different regions of France and were linguistically very mixed. There was, moreover, continuous contact between England and more central parts of France, thus justifying, and, in my view, necessitating, the more inclusive epithet, Anglo-French. Hence, I alternate between the two terms in this paper.

Miller (2012: 174) comments that there is:

not much left that one can call French. From the Old English point of view, given the loanwords *pay*, *take*, *tile*, little remains that one can call native Germanic-English either. The languages are inextricably mixed (Rothwell 1994: 66).

It has been argued elsewhere (e.g., Rissanen 2000; Hoffmann 2005)⁴ that calquing from French is responsible for the grammaticalization of certain complex prepositions in English (e.g., *by virtue of*, *in conjunction with*, *according to*, etc.). Specialists in contact-induced change provide further evidence of the ways in which particular items are adopted into the receptor language. Sakel (2007), for example, makes a distinction between matter (MAT) loans, where the item is simply taken wholesale untranslated into the receiving language, and pattern (PAT) loans, where the grammatical pattern is replicated in the receiving language. Sakel shows that MAT loans most often occur where the donating language is dominant, while PAT loans depend on a high degree of bilingualism. In the early stages of contact between French (the dominant language) and English (the receptor language), there is a high level of MAT loans. What we also see in the English which came into contact with French, as Ingham (2012b) demonstrates with respect to *comme/as*, is a type of PAT loan: sense extension by analogy. Bilingual speakers who used both French and English were familiar with both French *comme* and English *as* (which are translation equivalents, in many cases) and began to use a sense of *comme* which was not one of the senses of *as* when they used *as* in English. The existence of this PAT loan suggests that the speakers adopting it were bilinguals. It is entirely possible that the new uses of *then* were adopted as a sense extension by analogy with *donc*. The next section evaluates the evidence for such a hypothesis.

6. *Then* and *donc*

The working hypothesis in this paper is that a contributory factor in the development of DM and final *then* may have been contact with Anglo-French *donc*. However, what evidence can we find for such a hypothesis? *Donc*, derived from Latin DUM either through the elaboration DUMQUE or through DUNC (on analogy with the pair TUM/TUNC) indicated temporal simultaneity “at that time”, could be used in hypothetical *si*-constructions, to introduce results or conclusions, and could be used emphatically with imperatives (like DUM). Only the resultative sense remains in PDF, along with its use with imperatives. Interesting in the latter case are Dostie’s (2009) comments on the form *coudon* (‘hey’, ‘by the way’)

4. I am indebted to Seongha Rhee for drawing my attention to these sources.

in Canadian French. *Coudon* is a coalesced form of *écoute + donc* ('listen then') which is attested in seventeenth century European French, but continued to pragmaticalise only once it crossed the Atlantic. (*Ecoute donc* virtually disappears from European French at the beginning of the twentieth century.)

Searches for final *donc* (*donques/donq*, etc.) in the FRANTEXT Corpus of literary French (tenth- to the twenty-first century) yielded few examples, though dramatic texts proved to be more promising in this respect, as we can see in Example 3, which is from the thirteenth century.

- (3) Car li tresors est revenus,
 Plus grans que il ne fust emblés
 Che m'est avis qu'il est doublés –
 Et li sains Nicolais gist sus !
 LI ROIS
 Senescal, gaves me tu **donques** ?
 LI SENESCAUS
 Rois, si grans tresors ne fu onques :
 Il a passé l'Octevien,
 Tant n'en ot Cesar ni Eracles.
 LI ROIS
 Ostés ! comme est grans chis miracles !

[For the treasure has come back
 Greater than it was before
 I think it has doubled
 And Saint Nicolas is lying on it!
 The King:
 Seneschal, are you deceiving me **then**?
 Seneschal:
 King, such great treasure was there never before
 It goes beyond Octavian
 So much had neither Caesar not Heracles
 The King: how great is this miracle!]

(R101 — BODEL Jehan, *Le jeu de saint Nicolas*, c. 1200, p. 131,
C'ESTLI JUS DE SAINT NICHOLAI, lines 1,392–1,401)

Donques does not have a temporal sense here. It is clearly a request for confirmation and the utterance has an emphatic force which might be glossed as "you've got to be kidding". It is arguable that the right peripheral position of *donques* is forced by the need for a rhyme with *onques* in the following line. However, the question mark after *donques*, the seneschal's reply which reassures the King that the extent

of the treasure is not in doubt, followed by the King's affirmative response, "How great is this miracle!", indicate that *donques* serves as a request for confirmation.

A further source of French data of a less literary sort is to be found in the more recently constituted database of Anglo-Norman (Trotter 2007). The Anglo-Norman dictionary lists 39 spelling variants and seven main senses for *donc* in Anglo-Norman, including 'then, in that case; then, therefore'.

Ingham (2015) surveys the uses of *donques* in the Anglo-Norman Yearbooks and suggests that:

Its basic meaning is ...temporal ('then'), but already in Old French it gained the argumentative meaning 'so'. ... in utterance initial position, it can signal a subjective inference on the part of the speaker or writer, e.g.

(6) Thorpe: Donques vous ne deditez mye qe nous fumes distreint par vostre defaute. YB 1340

[So you don't deny that we were distrained by your fault]

(7) Thorpe. Bien, Sire. Donques vous veiez bien coment il plede en descharge de cesti terre. YB 1340

[Very well, sir. So you can see how he pleads in discharge of this land]

Such cases occurred frequently in the yearbooks; *donques* had no temporal value in these instances, and the temporal meaning 'then', denoting a distal point in time, has been bleached, as it has in the analogous English item.

The spoken discourse of the year books clearly favoured this speaker-orientated use, with its discourse function of signalling a subjective inference, very much as is the case with utterance-initial *donc* in modern French; the subjective judgment of the speaker was engaged by the very nature of the action of pleading.

This spoken (albeit fairly formal and legal) genre provides evidence for the subjective and inferential use of *donc* at LP. Searches for the form *donques* in the Anglo-Norman Corpus adduced 107 further occurrences, 68 of which are in the *Manières de langage* and of those 68, seventeen are final *donques*.

The *Manières de langage* document was discovered by Meyer in the Bodleian library and was published in 1890. It is accompanied by a note stating that it was "Escript a Bury saint Esmon, en la Veille de Pentecost l'an de grace mil trois cenx quatre vinz et sesze" [written at Bury St. Edmund on the Eve of Pentecost year of our grace one thousand three hundred and ninety-six]. Meyer established this to be 29 May 1396. Kristol (1992, 1995) provides further detail.

The *Manières de langage* are imaginary dialogues confected with a pedagogic purpose for an Englishman travelling in France, modelling how to secure food, clothing, help or information, and concerning how to deal with different people he would be likely to meet: innkeepers, servants, fellow travellers, merchants and

others. It was written by an Englishman (purportedly on the basis of his travels in France) and the language use was reckoned by Meyer to be that found in the final stages of Anglo-Norman literature. Importantly, the *Manières* are written in dialogue form and illustrate everyday semi-colloquial language. Examples 4 to 5 show this, at the same time as giving examples of RP *donques*:

(4) **Aultre maniere de langage pour achetre et vendre.**

[Other language forms for buying and selling]⁵

8.1 Au marché.

Ditez, a combien cest cy? Ditez, coment le averey je?

Le veuillez vous avoir?

Voire, sire, ditez a un mot.

Sire, vous me donrez tant pour ce.

Nemy, sire, sauve vostre grace, ce est trop.

Et que me donrez vous **donques**?⁶

Ditez coment le me donrez vous a droit.

Vous le averez a bon marché.

[8.1 At the market

Tell me, how much is it?

Tell me, how much can I have it for?

Do you want it?

Indeed, Sire, just say the word

Sire, you can give me so much for this

No, Sire, by your grace, that's too much

And how much will you give me for it **then**?

Say how much you'll give me for it

You will have it cheap.]

The entry starts off by providing a list of different ways of asking how much a particular product costs. It is thus difficult to say to what extent the line with *donques* is part of a dialogue pursued after “Nemy, sire, sauve votre grace, ce est trop” [No, Sire, by your grace, that's too much]. Assuming that it pursues this line of transactional behaviour (an assumption which appears to be justified by the inclusion of *et* [‘and’] at LP) the line with *donques* can be glossed ‘and (given that you think I am charging too much for that product = *donques*), how much are you prepared to give me for it?’ *Donques* refers back to prior discourse and to shared assumptions

5. Translations into English are, in each case, my own.

6. An anonymous reviewer notes that the use of the question mark was highly variable in medieval writing. The presence of the question mark in these extracts is, however, not crucial to the interpretation of the utterances ending with *donques* as requests for confirmation.

(that if something is too expensive, the buyer will not consider buying it, but may offer a lesser sum). *Donques* itself can be glossed ‘in that case’. *Donques* is right-peripheral and is followed by a question mark, but it is not *donques* itself which triggers the question, which is carried by the question word *que* and also by the verb-pronoun inversion *donrez vous*. *Donques* thus appears at right periphery but it does not qualify as a request for confirmation. In Example 5, however, both occurrences of *donques* mark fully fledged requests for confirmation of an inference drawn from prior discourse.

(5) 11.2 **Politique contemporaine; nouvelles de Paris.**

[Contemporary politics; news from Paris]

Dame, vous soiez bien trouvee.

Vraiment, sire, vous soiez bien rencontré. Et quelles nouvelles, sire?

Vraiment, dame, tresmerveilleuses.

Et quelles, je vous emprie?

Si me ait Dieu, dame, j’ay ouy dire que le roy d’Anglitterre est osté.

Quoy, desjoie?

Par ma alme, voir.

Et les Anglois n’ont ils point de roy **donques**?

Marie, ouy. Et que celuy que fust duc de Lancastre, que est nepveu a celluy que est osté.

Voire?

Voire vraiment.

[Lady, it’s good to see you

Truly, sire, you are well met.

And what news, sire?

Really, lady, very marvellous

And what, I beg you?

By God, lady, I have heard say that the King of England is ousted.

What, deposed?

On my soul, it’s true.

And the English don’t they have a king **then**?

Marry, yes. And it’s he who was the Duke of Lancaster who is the nephew of the one who was ousted.

Really?

Yes really.]

11.2 (continued)

Et le roy d’Anglitterre, ou fust il coroné?

A Westmynstre.

Fustez vous la, **donques**?

Marie, oy. Il y avoit tant de presse que par un pou que ne mouru, quar a paine je eschapey a vie.

[And the king of England, where was he crowned?

At Westminster.

Were you there, **then**?

Marry, yes. There were so many people that I nearly died for I scarcely escaped with my life.]

In the first example, the inference is that, as the King has been deposed, the English currently have no king. *Donques* triggers a response which denies the inference. In the second, the assumption is made that the interlocutor was present at the coronation; the request for confirmation is again marked with *donques*, and the speaker confirms that indeed he or she was.

7. Discussion

The examples from the *Manières de langage* provide strong evidence that *donques* as a final connector linking two utterances and requesting confirmation was well-established by 1396. The Anglo-Norman Yearbooks and *Manières de langage* provide an unequalled source of naturalistic dialogic interactions. They suggest that pragmatic, subjective and intersubjective uses of markers may have existed earlier than we thought (but we do not have evidence for them from more formal written texts). This evidence serves to cast some doubt on our ability to posit with any certainty that elements, such as *alors*, *donc* and *then*, have only very recently appeared at RP.⁷ Degand and Fagard (2011) noted that *alors* moves from a medial position and thence to an initial and finally to a final position (in PDF). It is, however, possible that, once *alors* developed a consequential rather than a temporal meaning, speakers used *alors* strategically at RP in earlier periods in interactional everyday speech. Such interactional everyday speech is simply not relayed in the written texts which have come down to us, and even in a PDF spoken corpus, the CRFP, which contains lively and spontaneous speech, where there are very low percentages of RP *alors* and *donc*.

The development of a final (deductive) sense of *then*, which is used to request confirmation, may be a sense extension in bilingual communication which is similar to that reported by Ingham (2012b) for *as*. *So* and *then* in English behave in similar and complementary ways to German *also* and *dann*, suggesting that

7. Though Kemenade and Los (2007:245) demonstrate the right-ward shift of *pa/ponne/penne* ('in that case'), as English clause-structure and discourse organisation changed during the OE and on into the ME period.

they derive from the Germanic substrate. However, *dann* never appears at RP in German. This fact supports the hypothesis that RP *then* usage may have arisen as a contact-induced change in the mouths of the heavily bilingual speakers of the Middle Ages. It may be, however, that the development of DM and final *then* results from diachronic parallelism, whereby similar pragmatic and strategic uses of items with particular basic meanings occur across different languages. For one thing, the status of the (Anglo-)French in the *Manières* is debatable. The author is purportedly a native English-speaking teacher of French. It is also possible that the use of *donques* to request confirmation is an Anglicism, a calque of the English final connector *then* (examples of which are to be found, albeit in small numbers, from the year 1100). There remains, however, considerable mystery concerning the sudden drop in occurrences of *then* in English reflected in the data from Haselow (2012b) and reproduced in Table 2. Haselow (2012b: 164) found that:

The first occurrence of *then* in the right domain of a clause in the corpus texts is first attested in early and late ME, where it is either a final or pre-final element. Its use is basically restricted to *if...then* constructions [...].

Haselow argues that final uses of *then* include an implicit conditional, and require (2012b: 165) “the inclusion of some part of the pre-text, which needs to be re-interpreted as a conditional protasis”. However, in many examples of final *then* cited by Haselow, it seems to me that the data do not justify the positing of an (implicit) conditional protasis. The assumption taken up by Speaker B is not conditional on, but consequential to, an inference gathered from what has been uttered by Speaker A. It functions at a speech act level, along the lines of “I say X because of [i.e., as a consequence of] the implicature or background assumption contained in prior discourse”. This is evident in the examples given of *donques* (‘therefore’, ‘in that case’) in the *Manières*. It is possible that, as English *then* came into contact with Anglo-French *donc* in the heavily bilingual period prior to 1500, the consequential potential of *then* was developed in a sense extension by analogy with *donc* and was, like *donc*, positioned at RP.

8. Conclusion

This section will attempt to answer the two questions posed at the start of the paper which form the focus of this special issue, with specific reference to the findings about *alors*, *donc* and *then*. The section includes suggestions for future avenues of research.

8.1 What sorts of exchange- and action-structure related functions are expressed at RP?

Van der Wouden and Foolen (2011) find modal, focus, some connective particles, and repairs at RP in Dutch. The existence of RP *alors/donc/then* in French and English suggests that Van der Wouden and Foolen's set is not exhaustive and that the "seek confirmation of an inference" RP function is not language-specific but may be cross-linguistically robust. In addition to the functions above, Van der Wouden and Foolen (2011: 13) mention, in relation to the doubling of Dutch *dan* and Norse *da* ('then'), that they:

involve both a backward looking function and a forward one. On the one hand, the speaker indicates that his utterance was motivated by preceding discourse, on the other hand, he indicates that he would appreciate a ratification or a comment from the hearer.

Alors/donc/then/dan and *da* serve both action- and exchange-structure purposes, as they are speech-act requests which terminate a turn and initiate another. Given similar uses of *alors/donc/then/dan* and *da*, one might posit that dialogical exploitation of terms expressing 'consequence', 'in that case' may be a cognitive universal. The janus-faced nature of such markers can be captured only by including reference to preceding and following utterances, possibly using CA terminology involving FPPs and SPPs, as described in Section 2. Expressions like 'then' act as vital and highly economical pivots in dialogic situations, punctuating a SPP and converting it to the next FPP. Given the close interrelationship between English, German and French, the hypothesis needs to be tested against genetically unrelated languages such as Arabic, Chinese or Japanese. It is only by focussing specifically on terms with onomasiologically related functions cross-linguistically that progress can be made in determining the extent to which there are universals of exchange- and action-structure at RP. What is more, as shown in Section 3, changes do not have to occur and there can be regional variation, as well as variation across languages: *coudon* exists as a pragmaticalised form in Canada, but not in Europe; *so* is used only at LP in British English, but is used at RP in Irish English; *alors* and *donc* are more equally distributed across LP and RP.

8.2 What generalizations can be made about how elements at RP arise historically?

Fundamentally dialogic terms such as RP *alors/donc/then* are not well served by historical data which is typically written and often monologic. Evidence from the *Manières de langage* (1396; see Kristol 1995) suggests that RP *donques* draws on

invited inferences in much the same way as PDE *then* does. We cannot exclude the possibility that speakers have always drawn strategically on the semantic potential of terms for pragmatic, dialogic purposes — in other words, that terms expressing “consequence” can have contextual side-effects — and that using them on RP creates one of those contextual side-effects. Scholars are in considerable agreement, however, and the data shown in this study support the contention, that lexical items with basic temporal meanings precede extensions to conditional and consecutive environments, that temporal meanings are in the middle field while conditional and consecutive usages tend to be left-peripheral (in European languages at least). Right-peripheral, particularly intersubjective, usages tend to be restricted to the highly interactive contexts characteristic of spontaneous speech and are, thus, difficult to access in historical written texts. The collection and transcription of time-dated spoken data, which has been possible since the 1960s, will allow greater progress to be made in the tracking of such RP phenomena.

Corpora

Anglo-Norman Online Hub. <http://www.anglo-norman.net>.

British National Corpus (BNC). 1980s–1994. *100 million words of British English*. <http://bncweb.lancs.ac.uk>.

Corpus de Référence du Français Parlé (CRFP). 2002. From 40 towns in France, 400,000 words, 82 speakers. Available through a concordancer. <http://sites.univ-provence.fr/delic/corpus/index.html>.

Corpus of Middle English Verse and Prose. <http://quod.lib.umich.edu/c/cme/>.

FRANTEXT. French literary corpus. 271,599,218 words, tenth century to twenty-first century. <http://www.frantext.fr/>.

References

- Beeching, Kate. 2007. “Social Identity, Salience and Language Change: The Case of Post-Rhematic *quoi*”. In Wendy Ayres-Bennett and Mari Jones (eds), *The French Language and Questions of Identity*, 140–149. London: Legenda.
- Beeching, Kate. 2009. “Sociolinguistic Factors and the Pragmaticalization of *bon* in Contemporary Spoken French”. In Kate Beeching, Nigel Armstrong and Françoise Gadet (eds), *Sociolinguistic Variation in Contemporary French*, 215–229. Amsterdam: John Benjamins. doi: 10.1075/impact.26.16bee
- Beeching, Kate. 2016. *Pragmatic Markers: Meaning in Social Interaction*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. doi: 10.1017/CBO9781139507110
- Beeching, Kate and Ulrich Detges (eds). 2014. *Discourse Functions at the Left and Right Periphery: Crosslinguistic Investigations of Language Use and Language Change*. Leiden and Boston: Brill.

- Bolly, Catherine and Liesbeth Degand. 2009. "Quelle(s) fonction(s) pour *donc* en français oral ? Du connecteur conséquentiel au marqueur de structuration du discours" [What Function(s) for *donc* in Spoken French? From a Consequential Connector to a Marker of Discourse Structure]. *Linguisticae Investigationes* 32 (1): 1–32. doi: 10.1075/li.32.1.01bol
- Brinton, Laurel. 2007. "Pathways in the Development of Pragmatic Markers in English". In Ans Van Kemenade and Bettelou Los (eds), *The Handbook of the History of English*, 307–334. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Danon-Boileau, Laurent, Annie Meunier, Mary-Annick Morel and Nicolas Tournandre. 1991. "Intégration discursive et intégration syntaxique" [Discourse and Syntactic Integration]. *Langages* 25 (104): 111–128. doi: 10.3406/lgge.1991.1619
- Degand, Liesbeth. 2009. "Describing Polysemous Discourse Markers: What Does Translation Add to the Picture?" In Stef Slembrouck, Miriam Taverniers and Mieke Van Herreweghe (eds), *From Will to Well: Studies in Linguistics Offered to Anne-Marie Simon-Vandenbergen*, 173–183. Gent: Academia Press.
- Degand, Liesbeth. 2014. "So very fast then': Discourse Markers at Left and Right Periphery in Spoken French". In Kate Beeching and Ulrich Detges (eds), *Discourse Functions at the Left and Right Periphery: Crosslinguistic Investigations of Language Use and Language Change*, 151–178. Leiden: Brill.
- Degand, Liesbeth and Benjamin Fagard. 2011. "Alors between Discourse and Grammar: The Role of Syntactic Position". *Functions of Language* 18 (1): 29–56. doi: 10.1075/fol.18.1.02deg
- Deppermann, Arnulf and Henrike Helmer. 2013. "Zur Grammatik des Verstehens im Gespräch: Inferenzen anzeigen und Handlungskonsequenzen ziehen mit *also* und *dann*". *Zeitschrift für Sprachwissenschaft* 32 (1): 1–40. doi: 10.1515/zfs-2013-0001
- Dostie, Gaétane. 2009. "Discourse Markers and Regional Variation in French: A Lexico-Semantic Approach". In Kate Beeching, Nigel Armstrong and Françoise Gadet (eds), *Sociolinguistic Variation in Contemporary French*, 201–14. Amsterdam: John Benjamins. doi: 10.1075/impact.26.15dos
- Fleischman, Suzanne and Marina Yaguello. 2004. "Discourse Markers across Languages? Evidence from English and French". In Carol Lynn Moder and Aida Martinovic-Zik (eds), *Discourse across Languages and Cultures*, 129–147. Amsterdam: John Benjamins. doi: 10.1075/slcs.68.08fle
- Hansen, Maj-Britt Mosegaard. 1997. "Alors and *donc* in Spoken French: A Reanalysis". *Journal of Pragmatics* 28 (2): 153–157. doi: 10.1016/S0378-2166(96)00086-0
- Haselow, Alexander. 2011. "Discourse Marker and Modal Particle: The Functions of Utterance-final *then* in Spoken English". *Journal of Pragmatics* 43 (14): 3603–3623. doi: 10.1016/j.pragma.2011.09.002
- Haselow, Alexander. 2012a. "Subjectivity, Intersubjectivity and the Negotiation of Common Ground in Spoken Discourse: Final Particles in English". *Language and Communication* 32 (2): 182–204. doi: 10.1016/j.langcom.2012.04.008
- Haselow, Alexander. 2012b. "Discourse Organization and the Rise of Final *then* in the History of English". In Irén Hegedús and Alexandra Fodor (eds), *English Historical Linguistics 2010: Selected Papers from the Sixteenth International Conference of English Historical Linguistics (ICEHL 16)*, 153–75. 23–27 August 2010. Pécs. Amsterdam: John Benjamins. doi: 10.1075/cilt.325.07has
- Haselow, Alexander. 2014. "Managing Intersubjective Understanding in Conversational Interaction: Explicated Inferences with *so* and *then*". Presentation at *Discourse Variation and Change Conference*. 7–9 April. Newcastle, UK.

- Hoffmann, Sebastian. 2005. *Grammaticalization and English Complex Prepositions: A Corpus-based Study*. London: Routledge.
- Ingham, Richard. 2012a. *The Transmission of Anglo-Norman: Language History and Language Acquisition*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins. doi: 10.1075/lfab.9
- Ingham, Richard. 2012b. "Sense Extension through English–French Language Contact in Medieval England: The Case of *as*". In Claudia Lange, Beatrix Weber and Göran Wolf (eds), *Communicative Spaces: Variation, Contact, and Change: Festschrift for Ursula Schaefer*. Bern: Peter Lang.
- Ingham, Richard. 2015. "Spoken and Written Register Differentiation in Pragmatic and Semantic Functions in two Anglo-Norman Corpora". In Jost Gehrke and Ralf Gippert (eds), *Corpus Linguistics and Interdisciplinary Perspectives on Language*, 269–280. Tübingen: Gunther Narr.
- Kemenade, Ans van and Bettelou Los. 2007. "Discourse Adverbs and Clausal Syntax in Old and Middle English". In Ans van Kemenade and Bettelou Los (eds), *The Handbook of the History of English*, 224–248. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Kristol, Andres. 1992. "'Que dea! Mettes le chapron, paillard, comme tu parles a prodome!' La représentation de l'oralité dans les Manières de langage du XIVe/XVe siècle" ["Well, now! Cover your head, laddie, when you talk to a gentleman!" The Representation of the Spoken Language in the Manières de Langage of the 14th/15th Century]. *Romanistisches Jahrbuch* 43: 35–64.
- Kristol, Andres. 1995. *Manières de langage (1396, 1399, 1415)*. (Volume 53). London: Anglo-Norman Text Society.
- Luckman de Lopez, Kathryn. 2014. "Pragmatic Markers in Final Position: *so* and *then* in Irish English and British English". Presentation at *Discourse Variation and Change Conference*. 7–9 April. Newcastle, UK.
- Miller, D. Gary. 2012. *External Influences on English*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
doi: 10.1093/acprof:oso/9780199654260.001.0001
- Morel, Mary-Annick. 2007. "Le posthème dans le dialogue oral en français" [The Post-rheme in Spoken Dialogue in French]. *L'information Grammaticale* 113 (1): 40–46.
doi: 10.3406/igram.2007.3885
- Pope, Mildred. 1934. *From Latin to Modern French with especial Consideration of Anglo-Norman: Phonology and Morphology*. Manchester: Manchester University Press.
- Rissanen, Matti. 2000. "Paths of Loan-Word Grammaticalization: The Case of *according to*". In Christiane Dalton-Puffer and Nikoalus Ritt (eds), *Words: Structure, Meaning, Function: A Festschrift for Dieter Kastovsky*, 249–262. Berlin: Mouton.
- Rothwell, William. 1991. "The Missing Link in English Etymology: Anglo-French". *Medium Aevum* 60: 173–196. doi: 10.2307/43632563
- Rothwell, William. 1994. "The Trilingual England of Geoffrey Chaucer". *Studies in the Age of Chaucer* 16: 45–67.
- Sacks, Harvey, Emanuel A. Schegloff and Gail Jefferson. 1974. "A Simplest Systematics for the Organisation of Turn-Taking for Conversation". *Language* 50 (4i): 696–735.
doi: 10.1353/lan.1974.0010
- Sakel, Jeanette. 2007. "Language Contact between Spanish and Mosetén: A Study of Grammatical Integration". *International Journal of Bilingualism* 11 (1): 25–53.
doi: 10.1177/13670069070110010301
- Schiffrin, Deborah. 1987. *Discourse Markers*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
doi: 10.1017/CBO9780511611841

- Shinzato, Rumiko. 2007. "(Inter)subjectification, Japanese Syntax and Syntactic Scope Increase". In Noriko O. Onodera and Ryoko Suzuki (eds), *Historical Changes in Japanese: Subjectivity and Intersubjectivity* (special issue of *Journal of Historical Pragmatics*) 8 (2): 171–206. doi: 10.1075/jhp.8.2.03shi
- Sweetser, Eve. 1990. *From Etymology to Pragmatics: Metaphorical and Cultural Aspects of Semantic Structure*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. doi: 10.1017/CBO9780511620904
- Trotter, David. 2003. "Not as Eccentric as it Looks: Anglo-French and French French". *Forum for Modern Language Studies* 39 (4): 427–38. doi: 10.1093/fmls/39.4.427
- Trotter, David. 2007. "Anglo-Norman Online Hub Text-base". Available online at: www.anglo-norman.net.
- Van der Wouden, Ton and Ad Foolen. 2011. "Dutch Particles in the Right Periphery". Published as: "Pragmatische partikels in de rechterperiferie". *Nederlandse Taalkunde* 16 (3): 307–322. Available online at: http://www.tonvanderwouden.nl/index_files/papers/fipa-2011-05b.pdf. doi: 10.5117/NEDTAA2011.3.PRAG497
- Wårvik, Brita. 1995. "The Ambiguous Adverbial/Conjunctions *þa* and *þonne* in Middle English: A Discourse-Pragmatic Study of *then* and *when* in Early English Saints Lives". In Andreas Jucker (ed.), *Historical Pragmatics: Pragmatic Developments in the History of English*, 345–357. Amsterdam: John Benjamins. doi: 10.1075/pbns.35.20war

Author's address

Faculty of Arts, Creative Industries and Education
University of the West of England, Bristol
Frenchay Campus
Coldharbour Lane
Bristol
BS16 1QY
United Kingdom
Kate.Beeching@uwe.ac.uk

About the author

Kate Beeching is Associate Professor in Applied Linguistics at the University of the West of England, Bristol. Her main research interest is in language variation and change, specifically in relation to pragmatic markers, their historical evolution and sociolinguistic salience in French and English. She is the author of *Gender, Politeness and Pragmatic Particles in French* (Benjamins, 2002) and *Pragmatic Markers in British English: Meaning in Social Interaction* (Cambridge University Press, 2016).