

## CHAPTER 54

---

# THE GRAMMATICALIZATION OF COORDINATING INTERCLAUSAL CONNECTIVES

---

ANNA GIACALONE RAMAT  
CATERINA MAURI

### 1. THE NOTION OF INTERCLAUSAL CONNECTIVE

---

Two clauses can be linked in a number of different semantic relations either by being simply juxtaposed or by means of explicit linking devices. This distinction is commonly referred to as the opposition between asyndetic (1) and syndetic (2) constructions, respectively (cf. Lehmann 1988a: 210).

- (1) Parengi (Mithun 1988: 334)  
*no<sup>2</sup>n kuy alung ir-ru, din-ru<sup>2</sup>*

This work is the result of a continuous exchange of ideas between the two authors. However, Anna Giacalone Ramat is responsible for the writing of sections 2.1, 2.2 and Caterina Mauri is responsible for the writing of sections 1.3.1 and 3.2.

he well inside jump-PST die-PST-UNDERGOER  
'He jumped inside the well and died.'

(2) *Mary washed the dishes and Peter dried them.*

As Kortmann (1997: 46) and Mithun (1988: 357) point out, explicit linking devices are especially frequent in written language. In spoken discourse the situational context (intonation, extra-linguistic cues, etc.) helps in defining the nuances that language may miss, but in written texts language is the only tool available to establish and infer interclausal relations (cf. also Meillet 1958 [1921]). The aim of this chapter is to analyse the rise and grammaticalization of a specific subtype of interclausal linking devices, namely coordinating connectives.

Interclausal connectives have been referred to as 'conjunctions' in the European tradition, mainly denoting free and invariable morphemes (cf. Lang 2002: 636). The term 'conjunction', however, is here restricted to the expression of combination ('and') relations and will thus not be adopted in the European traditional sense.

Coordinating interclausal connectives are characterized by their ability to establish alone (i.e. further cooccurring connective elements are optional, not obligatory) a coordination relation between two clauses. Following Mauri (2008b: 41), we will consider as coordination relation between two clauses any relation established between functionally equivalent states of affairs, having the same semantic function and autonomous cognitive profiles and being both coded by utterances characterized by the presence of some illocutionary force (cf. also Haspelmath 2004a: 34).

A major distributional criterion for identifying coordinating connectives is provided by Dik (1968: 34–7), who assumes that 'two members can never be coordinated by more than one coordinator'. Such a method however has some intra-linguistic and cross-linguistic limits, first of all because interclausal coordinating connectives do not show the same properties in all languages, and because markers may show different degrees of grammaticalization (Haspelmath 2007: 48).

Both Haspelmath (2007) and Mauri (2008b) highlight that the category of coordinating connectives does not have sharp boundaries and should be best described in terms of a cline or a continuum. Therefore, the markers included in this analysis as coordinating connectives will be identified on the basis of their function, rather than on the basis of their morphosyntactic and distributional properties.

## 2. THE GRAMMATICALIZATION OF COORDINATING CONNECTIVES: GENERAL PROPERTIES

.....

### 2.1. Intra-linguistic variation, renewal, and borrowability

Two coordinated states of affairs can stand in different conceptual relations. Three main relation types have been recognized in the literature on clause coordination:

conjunction ('and'), disjunction ('or'), and adversativity ('but'). There are crucial differences among the interclausal connectives encoding these three types of coordination, which group conjunctive and disjunctive connectives apart from adversative ones.

First of all, adversative connectives show a higher intra-linguistic variation than conjunctive and disjunctive connectives. In other words, in the same language there are usually a number of adversative connectives, partially overlapping in their functions, whereas such variation is not frequently attested in the expression of combination and alternative relations. Take for instance French, which only shows *et* for conjunction and *ou* (*ou bien*) for disjunction, but a number of different connectives for contrast relations, e.g. *toutefois*, *mais*, *par contre*, *alors que*, *pourtant*.

Secondly, adversative connectives are more easily and quickly renewed than conjunctive and disjunctive ones, which instead seem more stable over time. Romance languages provide clear examples of such a difference in pace: as pointed out by Meillet (1958: 171–2), of the original Latin inventory, Romance languages have preserved *et* for conjunction (> Fr. *et*, It. *e*, Sp. *y*) and *aut* for disjunction (> French *ou*, Italian, Spanish *o*), while none of the Latin adversative connectives (*sed*; *tamen*, *at*, etc.) has survived. Besides, in some cases the development of adversative markers occurred only in very recent times, as is the case of It. *però*, whose adversative value was conventionalized during the 16th century.

Finally, adversative connectives are more easily borrowed than disjunctive and conjunctive ones. An implicational hierarchy (see (3)) has been suggested by Matras (1998b: 301–5), according to which in bilingual contexts languages replacing combination markers also replace alternative (disjunctive) markers, and languages replacing alternative markers also replace contrast (adversative) markers:

- (3) 'but' > 'or' > 'and'

According to Matras, this implication mirrors the different degrees of 'intensity with which the speaker is required to intervene with hearer-sided mental processing activities' (Matras 1998b: 305–25) in establishing the relations of combination, alternative, and contrast. The more the relation implies a contrast, the more the speaker has to maintain assertive authority despite the denial of the addressee's expectations. To do so, bilingual speakers tend to adopt connectives of the pragmatically dominant language.

In our view, the explanation provided by Matras for the hierarchy in (3) points to the deeply intersubjective function of adversative connectives, which may also play a role in motivating the differences described above with respect to the grammaticalization of conjunctive and disjunctive connectives. Adversative connectives are crucial to the expressive potential of speakers, and therefore speakers are constantly in search of new and expressive ways of conveying contrast, determining a high synchronic intra-linguistic variation and a quicker renewal.

Conjunctive and disjunctive connectives, on the other hand, are rather connected to the organization/description of the linked states of affairs and are thus characterized by a lesser degree of intersubjectivity, which in turn determines a less urgent need for expressivity and renewal.

## 2.2. Documentation and diachronic methodology

The differences highlighted in the preceding section lead to some methodological considerations. The direct consequence of the different paces in the renewal of coordinating connectives is that in a well- documented family such as the Indo-European one, the grammaticalization of adversative connectives is more likely to be attested in historical texts, thus allowing for the identification of the successive stages of the diachronic process (see Diewald 2002). By contrast, the diachronic analysis of conjunctive and disjunctive connectives is often limited to the etymological reconstruction of the diachronic sources, without the possibility of following their grammaticalization steps in texts. This, of course, does not hold for languages with a recent system of connectives, where their diachronic origins are still morphologically transparent (see Mithun 1988: 351–6). However, such languages are usually also characterized by a scarce written tradition, which makes it rather difficult to follow the diachronic path back in time. In such cases, the attested synchronic variation is the best tool to identify the critical contexts and functions where the diachronic process began.

The availability of written documentation and the dating of the change thus crucially determine the methodology that may be employed in the diachronic analysis. Sections 3.1, 3.2, and 3.3 will discuss data according to different levels of depth. Section 3.1 focuses on the diachronic sources of coordinating connectives, basically from an etymological perspective. Section 3.2 then examines the attested paths under the lens of the traditional criteria for grammaticalization identified by Lehmann (1995a [1982]). Section 3.3, on the other hand, takes into account the factors, the stages and contexts characterizing the paths at issue, analysing the occurrences in texts.

## 3. DIACHRONIC SOURCES AND PATHS OF CHANGE

.....

### 3.1. Recurrent diachronic sources of coordinating connectives

Tables 54.1–54.3 show a far from exhaustive list of the recurrent diachronic sources attested across languages for conjunctive, adversative, and disjunctive connectives, providing examples and references for each diachronic path.

Table 54.1. Diachronic sources for conjunctive connectives

Source meaning	Examples
1. Spatial and temporal meanings of linear succession 'in front', 'after, before, then'	I.E. <i>*hanti, hant-</i> 'in front' > O.Saxon <i>ant-</i> , Goth. <i>and(a)-</i> 'in front' [cognate to Lat. <i>ante</i> 'in front, before', Gr. <i>anti</i> 'in front, against', Hit. <i>ánti</i> ] > Engl. <i>and</i> , Germ. <i>und</i> (cf. Traugott 1986: 141, Kluge and Seebold 1989: 179, 749)
2. Focal additive particles 'also, too'	I.E. <i>*eti</i> 'also, too' > Lat. <i>et</i> 'also, and', Gr. <i>éti</i> 'furthermore'; Slavic <i>i</i> : 'also' > 'and' (Meillet 1958: 165, cf. also Mithun 1988)
3. Paragraph linking strategies, particles and adverbs 'besides', 'moreover', 'and then'	Mohawk (Northern Iroquoian) <i>tahnu</i> : 'besides' > 'and' (Mithun 1988: 347);
4. Comitative markers	Sarcee (Athapaskan) <i>mih</i> 'with' > 'and' (Mithun 1988: 349; see also Stassen 2001)
5. Verbs meaning 'go', 'bring' in narrative contexts	Hdi (Chadic) <i>là</i> 'to go' > 'and then' (Frajzyngier and Shay 2002: 428–31); Tetun (Austronesian) <i>hodi</i> 'to bring' > 'and then' (van Klinken 2000: 354–7)
6. Pronominal roots	I.E. 'proximal stem' <i>*tó</i> > Hittite <i>ta</i> 'and' (Luraghi 1990: 65–70), OCS <i>ta, to, ti</i> 'and', Ukr. <i>ta</i> 'and'

Table 54.2. Diachronic sources for disjunctive connectives

Source meaning	Examples
1. Distal meaning 'that, other'	Dan. Nor. Swe. <i>eller</i> 'or' < Proto-Germanic <i>*alja-</i> , <i>*aljis-</i> 'other' (Falk and Torp 1910: 187); I.E. <i>*au-</i> 'other, that' > Lat. <i>aut</i> ( <i>*auti</i> ) 'or', <i>autem</i> 'but' > It. Sp. Cat. <i>o</i> , Fr. Port. <i>ou</i> ;
2. Interrogative particle	Instrumental form of Common Slavic <i>*ch</i> 'to what' > Cz. Pol.: <i>czy</i> , Bel. <i>ci</i> 'choice-aimed or';
3. Free choice verbs	Lat. <i>vel</i> 'want' > 'simple or', Fr. <i>soit</i> . . . <i>soit</i> 'be it' > 'either . . . or'
4. Dubitative particles 'perhaps'	Kuuk Thaayorre (Pama-Nyungan) = <i>okun</i> 'DUB' > 'or' (Gaby 2006: 323–4); Rus., Bulg., S-Cr.: <i>i</i> ('and') + <i>li</i> (dubitative particle) > <i>ili</i> 'or'
5. Negative particles	Nakanai (Oceanic) ( <i>ouka</i> 'NEG' > <i>ka</i> 'or' (Johnston 1980: 239)
6. Denied conditional clause 'if not', 'if it is not so'	Cavineña (Tacanan) <i>jadya=ama ju-atsu</i> 'thus=NEG be-ss' (lit. being not thus, if it is not so) > 'or' (Guillaume 2004: 114); Lezgian <i>ta˘xajt'a</i> 'or' < conditional form of the negated aorist participle of <i>xun</i> 'be', meaning 'if it is not' (Haspelmath 1993: 332); Italian <i>sennò</i> 'otherwise' < <i>se</i> 'if' + <i>no</i>

**Table 54.3. Diachronic sources for adversative connectives**

Source meaning	Examples
1. Spatial meaning of <i>distance</i> (separation), <i>closeness</i> (same place) or <i>opposition</i>	OE <i>be utan</i> 'at (the) outside' > Engl. <i>but</i> (cf. Traugott 1986: 143); OE <i>in stede</i> 'in the place' > <i>instead</i> ; <i>whereas</i> < 'in the place where'; Lat. <i>ante</i> > It. <i>anzi</i> ; German <i>sondern</i> 'separate' > 'but rather'
2. Temporal meaning of overlap, simultaneity 'while'	Eng. <i>while</i> ; It. <i>mentre</i> 'while, until' > 'whereas'; Fr. <i>alors que</i> 'when' > 'whereas', <i>ce pendant</i> 'during this' > <i>cependant</i> 'whereas'
3. Temporal meaning of continuity 'always'	It. <i>tuttavia</i> , Fr. <i>toutefois</i> 'always, continuously' > 'nonetheless' (Giacalone Ramat and Mauri 2009b); Eng. <i>still</i> 'constantly' > 'nonetheless'
4. Causal (and resultive) meaning	It. <i>però</i> , Fr. <i>pourtant</i> 'therefore' > 'nonetheless' (cf. Giacalone Ramat and Mauri 2008); Germ. <i>dafür</i> 'for that' > 'on the other hand'
5. Comparative meaning 'more', 'bigger'	Lat. <i>magis</i> > It. <i>ma</i> (Marconi and Bertinotto 1984), Fr. <i>mais</i> ; Old Serbian <i>veće</i> 'bigger' > Serbian <i>već</i> (Meillet 1958)
6. Emphatic reinforcing of the 2 <sup>nd</sup> clause	Eng. <i>in fact</i> , It. <i>bensi</i> 'but rather'

Conjunctive connectives often develop from spatio-temporal adverbs and prepositions (Table 54.1, item 1) typically indicating a linear succession in time 'before, after' or a linear organization in space 'in front, beside'. Such diachronic paths involve a metaphorical process of abstraction from concrete to more abstract, logical notions (Traugott 1986: 137). Further frequent sources for conjunctive connectives are focal additive particles meaning 'also, too' (item 2) and paragraph-linking strategies or discourse markers of the type 'moreover, and then' (item 3).

In both cases, the source denotes an addition to some previously mentioned entity but on different syntactic levels. Focal additive particles usually precede or follow elements at the lower levels, and typically start their grammaticalization path as connectives between NPs (Mithun 1988: 340); paragraph-linking and discourse markers, on the other hand, grammaticalize at the higher levels as connectives between clauses. Comitative markers (item 4), too, grammaticalize as connectives at the NP level (Stassen 2001; Haspelmath 2007), by virtue of sharing with conjunction the joint involvement of two participants, and may eventually extend to the coordination of higher-level entities (e.g. *mih* in Sarcee: Mithun 1988: 349). Verbs with a dislocative meaning, such as 'go' or 'bring' (item 5), may develop into conjunctive connectives in narrative contexts, where they frequently occur between successive events, the second of which requires a dislocation, thus

triggering their reanalysis as clause linkage devices. Finally, as exemplified by Indo-European languages, the diachronic source for conjunctive connectives may consist of pronominal roots (item 6), whose anaphoric use may easily develop into an interclausal connective function.

Table 54.2 shows a list of frequent diachronic sources for disjunctive connectives. Distal elements meaning ‘that, other’ may acquire a disjunctive meaning (item 1) by virtue of the inherent duality and exclusivity that characterizes both the notion of alternative and the notion of ‘otherness’.

Items 2–6. all instantiate a further inherent semantic property of disjunction: the irrealis potential status of the two alternatives, which cannot be presented as facts, but need to be overtly indicated as *possibilities* (see Mauri 2008a). The following diachronic sources mirror the potential nature characterizing the notion of alternative and belong to the so-called ‘irrealis realm’ (see Elliott 2000). Interrogative markers (2) typically develop into disjunctive connectives in contexts where the speaker asks for a choice between two equivalent possibilities, i.e. in questions. Free choice constructions (3), on the other hand, grammaticalize as connectives in declarative sentences, where each alternative is overtly stated as a possible choice for the hearer. Dubitative epistemic markers (4) and conditional constructions (6) encode the speaker’s doubt on the actual occurrence of the two alternatives, which cannot be certain until a choice is made. Finally, negative markers (7) develop into disjunctive connectives in contexts where one of the two alternatives is overtly denied in order for the second one to be proposed.

Diachronic sources for adversative connectives are exemplified in Table 54.3. While disjunctive connectives link potential (non-co-occurring) alternatives, both conjunctive and adversative connectives denote cooccurring events. This may explain why languages with a restricted set of connectives often employ the same strategy both for combination and contrast relations (cf. !Xun, Northern Khoisan, *te*)<sup>1</sup> and why conjunctive and adversative connectives frequently share the same diachronic sources. For instance, spatio-temporal meanings may grammaticalize into both conjunctive and adversative connectives through metaphorical processes of increasing abstraction (compare Table 54.1, path 1 to Table 54.3, paths 1–3). Spatial sources (Table 54.3, item 1) may denote a wide set of relations, ranging from closeness to distance, and the adversative meaning arises when the differences existing between the linked clauses are foregrounded, at the expenses of their respective spatial location. A similar mechanism is at work for diachronic sources denoting temporal values, such as the relation of simultaneity ‘while’ (2) and the meaning of continuity ‘always’ (3). In both cases, the coexistence over time of two events comes to be perceived as surprising, as a consequence of the

<sup>1</sup> We would like to thank the editors of this volume for bringing this case to our attention.

fact that the antonymic differences existing between the two events are foregrounded at the expense of their temporal relation.

Further diachronic sources for adversative connectives are, somehow unexpectedly, causal ones (4), the reanalysis of which typically occurs in negative contexts. As pointed out by Giacalone Ramat and Mauri (2008), the denial of an expected causal sequence ('not for that') may be easily reanalysed as a construction overtly encoding the (counter-expectative) contrast deriving from such denied expectation. The grammaticalization of comparative markers into adversative ones is exemplified in (5). This path is motivated by the inherent asymmetry that characterizes both contrast and comparison, at the logical and at the informational level. Finally, adversative connectives may also derive from strategies expressing an emphatic reinforcement of the second clause, on which a special focus is given as opposed to the preceding one (6).<sup>2</sup>

### 3.2. The grammaticalization of coordinating connectives under the lens of traditional parameters

The grammaticalization of coordinating connectives shows some recurrent properties, which may be described with reference to the parameters identified by Lehmann (1995a) for grammaticalization processes. Phonological reduction and univerbation are often attested in the first stages of the diachronic paths under examination (cf. OE *be utan* > Engl. *but*). However, the opposite can also be observed, since it is not infrequent to notice processes of strengthening due to the cyclical need for expressivity that characterizes the use of connectives (Meillet 1958: 161; cf. also Italian *o pure* 'or also' > *oppure* 'or').

Among the criteria identified by Lehmann (1995a), there are three that prove problematic in the description of the development of interclausal connectives: namely obligatorification, paradigmaticization, and scope reduction. The problems in applying these criteria can be explained by the function and morphosyntactic properties that are typical of interclausal connectives as such.

Being clause linkers, coordinating connectives typically show a wide scope over the two linked clauses; therefore a scope reduction would be inconsistent, if not incompatible, with their syntactic function (cf. Traugott 2003: 643). Secondly,

<sup>2</sup> Adversative connectives share with concessive connectives the ability to encode a contrast between two clauses, and this might lead one to hypothesize that these two types of connectives may derive from similar diachronic sources, although the former encode a coordination relation while the latter a subordination relation. However, the comparison of our data with the diachronic sources of concessive connectives discussed by König (1988) reveals several differences, which cannot be examined here in detail for questions of space. Briefly, the diachronic paths attested for adversative and concessive connectives partially overlap as far as originally temporal values are concerned, but tend to diverge in the remaining cases.

unless the connective itself takes part in an inflectional paradigm (as in e.g. Japanese *-te* 'and', Korean *-ko* 'and', *-kena* 'or', in which the connectives are verbal suffixes), coordinating connectives need not be obligatory in the same way as inflectional morphemes are, as witnessed by the alternation between syndesis and asyndesis even in languages having a well developed system of connectives. Along the same line, connectives need not take part in a paradigm as, say, number or gender inflections do, because, although they constitute a closed set, different connectives may happen to co-occur and are not necessarily mutually exclusive (see section 1).<sup>3</sup> For these reasons, obligatorification, paradigmaticization and scope reduction cannot be taken as indicators of the degree of grammaticalization of interclausal connectives.

Furthermore, the grammaticalization of coordinating connectives is characterized by an increase in abstraction, developing relational, grammatical meanings from adverbs, verbs, nouns, prepositional phrases, and particles with more concrete reference. In the case of adversative connectives, this process of abstraction is typically associated with an increase in subjectivity (see Hopper and Traugott 2003), involving a shift from objective functions to functions based in the speaker's attitude to what is said.

### 3.3. Factors at play and gradualness in morphosyntactic and semantic change

The recurrent paths presented so far share common factors which are significant for the grammaticalization process. Together with widely accepted hypotheses on the subject, we will also discuss some theoretical considerations based on a corpus study on the grammaticalization of adversative connectives in Italian (see Mauri and Giacalone Ramat submitted 2009 on the development of *mentre*, *tuttavia*, and *però*, based on texts from the 13th to the 20th centuries). Although the analysis was restricted to a few Italian connectives, the model elaborated seems suitable and generalizable for understanding the diachronic paths under examination.

As pointed out by Heine (2002) and Diewald (2002), the different contexts in which a form is attested play a crucial role in grammaticalization processes, to the point that it is possible to analyse the successive stages along which the diachronic change occurs based on the analysis of the types of contexts. The grammaticalization of connectives typically starts in contexts that are semantically and

<sup>3</sup> In languages where the interclausal connective belongs to an inflectional system (e.g. languages expressing interclausal coordination by means of converbs, serial verb constructions and switch-reference strategies: see Haspelmath 2004a), the connective can be argued to be both obligatory and part of a paradigm. As far as its scope is concerned, on the other hand, although in such cases the connective is inflectional in nature, its scope remains necessarily interclausal.

syntactically ambiguous between the original meaning and the connective role, i.e. ‘critical’ contexts according to Diewald’s terminology. In such contexts speakers activate pragmatic inferences concerning the presence of an interclausal relation of combination, contrast or alternative, without specifically reassigning a connective function to the form at issue. An instance of critical context is exemplified in (4) from Old Italian, where the complex sentence is ambiguous between two readings: (i) an asyndetic juxtaposition of two conflicting clauses, the second of which starts with the temporal adverb *tuttavia* ‘always’; (ii) and a syndetic adversative construction in which *tuttavia* works as interclausal connective meaning ‘nonetheless’.

- (4) Palamedès pis., c.1300 (part 2, ch. 25; see Mauri and Giacalone Ramat submitted)

[...] *chè noi mangiamo sì poveramente in questo luogo, u*  
 because we eat.1PL so poorly in this place where  
*voi mi vedete, che a grande pena ne possiamo sostenere*  
 you me see.2PL that to great difficulty it.GEN can.1PL bear  
*nostra vita; né non sciamo giammai di qua entro*  
 our life nor NEG go.out.1PL never from here inside  
*tuttavia ci dimoriamo sì come noi lo possiamo fare [...]*  
 always there dwell.1PL so as we it.ACC can.1PL do  
 ‘[...] because we eat so poorly in this place, where you see me, that with a  
 great difficulty we manage to bear our lives; nor we go out of here; always  
 (nonetheless) we dwell in this place as we can do [...]

In (4) *tuttavia* may be reinterpreted as having scope over both the clause in which it occurs and the preceding clause, thus being ambiguous between a narrow scope (clause-internal, ‘always’) and wide scope (clause-external, ‘always, including the case mentioned before’) reading. In a critical context such as (4), speakers activate a conversational inference of coherence with what precedes, so that *tuttavia* is interpreted as referring not only to the clause that follows, but also anaphorically to the specific situation mentioned in the preceding one (Mauri and Giacalone Ramat submitted).

The occurrence of a given form in critical contexts, however, is not a sufficient condition for the change to happen. As pointed out by Bybee (2006), it is also necessary that critical contexts significantly increase in frequency, in order for the critical construction to be processed as a single unit and for the form to be reinterpreted as having an interclausal connective function. Quantitative evidence supporting the identification of a restricted critical period, during which the frequency of critical contexts significantly increases, was found in our data: in the development of *però* ‘therefore’ > ‘nonetheless’, critical contexts increase during the 15th and 16th centuries, reaching 25 per cent of the total number of occurrences; in the development of *tuttavia* ‘always’ > ‘nonetheless’, the peak frequency of

critical contexts reaches the 23 per cent of the total number of occurrences during the 14th century. If critical contexts do not significantly increase, the new meaning may not become conventionalized and the form is likely to keep its original value (as happened in the case of *pertanto* ‘therefore’ in Italian, which was never reanalyzed as adversative despite its early occurrences in critical contexts).

The critical stage can be followed by a phase in which the old meaning and the new connective one co-exist in complementary syntactic distribution. For instance, in the case of *però*, during the 17th and 18th centuries the original resultive meaning ‘therefore’ systematically occurred in initial position and after *e* ‘and’ (5), while the new adversative meaning systematically occurred in postposed position and after a wide scope negation (6).

- (5) Vincenzo Monti, Epistolario (‘A Girolamo Ferri—Longiano’, 9 Aug. 1774; see Mauri and Giacalone Ramat submitted)

*Ella forse può essere a giorno del prezzo che ha*  
 You.POL perhaps may be updated of.DEF price REL has  
*al presente questo libro, e però la prego*  
 at present this book and therefore you.POL.ACC pray  
*aver la bontà di avvisarmi*  
 to.have DEF kindness of let.know:me

‘You (POLITE) may perhaps be well informed on the price that this book has at the moment, and **therefore** I ask you to be so kind as to let me know [...]’

- (6) Vincenzo Monti, Epistolario, (‘All’ab. [Cesare Monti]—[Fusignano]’, 15 Sept. 1790; see Mauri and Giacalone Ramat submitted)

*Non sono solito di scrivervi mai le nuove di*  
 NEG be.1SG used of write:2PL.DAT never DEF news of  
*Roma; questa volta però ve ne voglio dare*  
 Rome this time however 2PL.DAT 3.GEN want.1SG give  
*una che non è piccola [...]*  
 one REL NEG is small

‘I’m not used to writing to you news from Rome; this time **however** I want to tell you one that is not little [...]’

During the stage of syntactic and semantic specialization, the form occurs in what Diewald calls isolating contexts, namely contexts that are incompatible with the original meaning, as in (6), where the resultative interpretation of *però* is excluded. Such contexts reveal that the form—function reanalysis through which the connective function has been conventionalized has taken place. The stage of syntactic specialization may not occur if the diachronic source already shows the morphosyntactic properties of the target function, i.e. if the source is already an interclausal connective and simply undergoes a semantic shift (e.g. *mentre* in Italian, which develops its adversative function from an original simultaneity one).

Finally, the new value may extend to all the morphosyntactic contexts, included those that were associated to the original meaning during the stage of syntactic specialization. Such an extension usually entails the gradual disappearance of the source function, as in the development of *però* and *tuttavia*, although layering situations are also possible. A condition of layering, i.e. coexistence of old and new meanings, is attested in such cases as Italian *mentre*, English *while* and Russian *i* ('too' and 'and', Zeevat and Jasinskaja 2007: 324–325).

The factors at play in the successive stages of the paths just described, namely pragmatic inferences activated by the context, frequency and specific syntactic distributions, are mirrored at the synchronic level in an intra-linguistic gradience, which is itself a crucial prerequisite for the gradualness of change in grammaticalization processes.