

The grammaticalization of coordinating interclausal connectives

Anna Giacalone Ramat and Caterina Mauri*

1. The notion of interclausal connective

As is well known, 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 1988: 210).

- (1) Parengi (Mithun 1988: 334)

no²n kuy alung ir-ru, din-ru²
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). The aim of this paper is to analyze 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, autonomous cognitive profiles and being both coded by utterances characterized by the presence of some illocutionary force (cf. also Haspelmath 2004: 34).

A major distributional criterion for identifying coordinating connectives is provided by Dik (1968: 34-37), 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

* 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 3.3, and Caterina Mauri is responsible for the writing of sections 1, 3.1 and 3.2.

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: 171-172), 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 (1998: 301-305), 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 1998: 305-325) 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 to follow 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: 351-356). 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 (1995). Section 3.3, on the other hand, takes into account the factors, the stages and contexts characterizing the paths at issue, analyzing the occurrences in texts.

3. Diachronic sources and paths of change

3.1 Recurrent diachronic sources of coordinating connectives

Tables 1-3 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.

Conjunctive connectives often develop from spatio-temporal adverbs and prepositions (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’ (2) and paragraph linking strategies or discourse markers of the type ‘moreover, and then’ (3).

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 – 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>tahmu</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: 428-431); Tetun (Austronesian) <i>hodi</i> ‘to bring’ > ‘and then’ (van Klinken 2000: 354-357)
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 1. Diachronic sources for conjunctive connectives.

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 (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’ (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 (6), whose anaphoric use may easily develop into an interclausal connective function.

Table 2 shows a list of frequent diachronic sources for disjunctive connectives. Distal elements meaning ‘that, other’ may acquire a disjunctive meaning (1) by virtue of the inherent duality and exclusivity that characterizes both the notion of alternative and the notion of ‘otherness’.

Source meaning	Examples
1. Distal meaning ‘that, other’	Dan. Nor. Swe. <i>eller</i> ‘or’ < Proto-Germanic * <i>alja-</i> , * <i>aljjs-</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’to</i> ‘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...soit</i> ‘be it’ > ‘either ...or’
4. Dubitative particles ‘perhaps’	Kuuk Thaayorre (Pama-Nyungan) = <i>okun</i> ‘DUB’ > ‘or’ (Gaby 2006: 323-324); Rus., Bulg., S-Cr.: <i>i</i> (‘and’) + <i>li</i> (dubitative particle) > <i>ili</i> ‘or’
5. Negative particles	Nakanai (Oceanic) (<i>ou</i>) <i>ka</i> ‘NEG’ > <i>ka</i> ‘or’ (Johnston 1980: 239);
6. Denied conditional clause ‘if not’, ‘if it is not so’	Cavineña (Tacanan) <i>jadya</i> = <i>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>senno</i> ‘otherwise’ < <i>se</i> ‘if’ + <i>no</i>

Table 2. Diachronic sources for disjunctive connectives.

Paths 2.-6. all instantiate a further inherent semantic property of disjunction, namely 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” (cf. 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 3. While disjunctive connectives link potential (non-cooccurring) 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*)¹ 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 Tab.1 path 1 to Tab. 3 paths 1-3). Spatial sources (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 co-existence over time of two events comes to be perceived as a surprising one, as a consequence of the fact that the antonymic differences existing between the two events are foregrounded at the expense of their temporal relation.

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 and Mauri, 2009); Eng. <i>still</i> ‘constantly’ > ‘nonetheless’
4. Causal (and resultive) meaning	It. <i>però</i> , Fr. <i>pourtant</i> ‘therefore’ > ‘nonetheless’ (cf. Giacalone 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 Bertinetto 1984), Fr. <i>mais</i> ; Old Serbian <i>veće</i> ‘bigger’ > Serbian <i>već</i> (Meillet 1958)
6. Emphatic reinforcing of the 2 nd clause	Eng. <i>in fact</i> , It. <i>bensi</i> ‘but rather’

Table 3. Diachronic sources for adversative connectives.

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 and Mauri (2008), the denial of an expected causal sequence (‘not for that’) may be easily reanalyzed as a construction overtly encoding the (counterexpectative) 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).²

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

² 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.

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 (1995) 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 (1995), 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, 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).³ 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, 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 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 analyze 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

³ 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 2004), 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.

and 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 re-assigning 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, chap. 25]

[...] *chè noi mangiamo sì poveramente in questo luogo, u voi mi vedete,*
 because we eat.1PL so poorly in this place where you me see.2PL
che a grande pena ne possiamo sostenere nostra vita; né non
 that to great difficulty it.GEN can.1PL bear our life nor NEG
'sciamo giammai di qua entro; tuttavia ci dimoriamo sì come noi lo
 go.out.1PL never from here inside **always** there dwell.1PL so as we it.ACC
possiamo fare [...]
 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 (Giacalone Ramat and Mauri 2009).

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 the 25% of the total amount of occurrences; in the development of *tuttavia* ‘always’ > ‘nonetheless’, the peak frequency of critical contexts reaches the 23% of the total amount 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”, 9/8/1774)

Ella forse può essere a giorno del prezzo che ha al presente
 You.POL perhaps may be updated of.DEF price REL has at present
questo libro, e però la prego aver la bontà di

this book and **therefore** you.POL.ACC pray to.have DEF kindness of
avvisarmi
 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]”, 15/9/ 1790)
Non sono solito di scrivervi mai le nuove di Roma; questa volta
 NEG be.1SG used of write:2PL.DAT never DEF news of Rome this time
però ve ne voglio dare una che non è piccola [...]
however 2PL.DAT 3.GEN want.1SG give 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.

References

- Bybee, Joan 2006. From Usage to Grammar: The Mind's Response to Repetition. *Language* 82/4: 711-733.
- Diewald, Gabriele 2002. *A model for relevant types of contexts in grammaticalization*. In I. Wischer and G. Diewald (eds.), *New Reflections on Grammaticalization*, Amsterdam, Benjamins, 2002, pp 103–120.
- Dik, Simon. 1968. *Coordination. Its implications for the theory of general linguistics*. Amsterdam: North-Holland Publishing Company.
- Elliott, Jennifer R. 2000. Realis and irrealis: Forms and concepts of the grammaticalisation of reality. *Linguistic Typology* 4: 55-90.
- Falk Hjalmar and Alf Torp. 1910. *Norwegisches-Dänisches etymologisches Wörterbuch*, Heidelberg.
- Frajzyngier, Zygmunt and Erin Shay. 2002. *A Grammar of Hdi*. Berlin; New York: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Gaby, Rose. (2006). *A Grammar of Kuuk Thaayorre*. PhD Thesis, Univeristy of Melbourne.
- Giacalone Ramat, Anna and Caterina Mauri 2008. From cause to contrast. A study in semantic change. In *Studies on Grammaticalization*, Elisabeth Verhoeven et al. (eds.), pp. 303-321. Berlin, New York: Mouton de Gruyter.

- Giacalone Ramat, Anna and Caterina Mauri. 2009. Dalla continuità temporale al contrasto: la grammaticalizzazione di tuttavia come connettivo coordinativo. In A. Ferrari (ed.), *Sintassi storica e sincronia dell'italiano – subordinazione, coordinazione, giustapposizione* - Proceedings of the X Convegno della Società Internazionale di Linguistica e Filologia Italiana (Basilea, 30 June-3 July 2008). Firenze, Franco Cesati Editore.
- Guillaume, Antoine. 2004. *A Grammar of Cavineña, an Amazonian Language of Northern Bolivia*. PhD Thesis. RCLT, La Trobe University.
- Haspelmath, Martin. 1993. *A Grammar of Lezgian*. Berlin, New York: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Haspelmath, Martin. 2004. Coordinating constructions: an overview. In Martin Haspelmath, (ed.), *Coordinating constructions*, pp. 3–39. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Haspelmath, Martin. 2007. Coordination. In Timothy Shopen, (ed.), *Language typology and linguistic description*, pp. 1-51. Cambridge: CUP, 2nd edition.
- Heine, Bernd. 2002. On the role of context in grammaticalization. In *New Reflections on Grammaticalization*, Wischer, Ilse and Gabriele Diewald (eds.), pp. 83–101. Amsterdam, New York: John Benjamins.
- Hopper, Paul J. and Elizabeth C. Traugott. 2003. *Grammaticalization* (2nd edition). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Johnston, Raymond Leslie. 1980. *Nakanai of New Britain: The grammar of an Oceanic language*. Pacific Linguistics.
- Kluge, Friedrich and Elmar Seebold. 1989. *Etymologisches Wörterbuch der deutschen Sprache*. Berlin, New York: Walter de Gruyter.
- König, Ekkehard. 1988. Concessive connectives and concessive sentences: cross-linguistic regularities and pragmatic principles. In John A. Hawkins (ed.), *Explaining Language Universals*. Oxford: Blackwell, 145-166.
- Kortmann, Bernd. 1997. *Adverbial subordination. A typology and history of adverbial subordinators based on European languages*. Berlin; New York: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Lang, Ewald. 2002. Die Wortart "Konjunktion". In: D. A. Cruse et al. (eds.) *Lexikologie. Lexicology. Ein Internationales Handbuch zur Natur und Struktur von Wörtern und Wortschätzen*. (= HSK 17.2) Art. 80. pp. 634-641. Berlin-New York: de Gruyter.
- Lehmann, Christian. 1995. *Thoughts on grammaticalization*, München, Lincom Europa.
- Lehmann, Christian. 1988. "Towards a typology of clause linkage". In: Haiman, John & Sandra A. Thompson, eds. *Clause combining in discourse and grammar*. Amsterdam: Benjamins, 181-225.
- Luraghi, Silvia. 1990. *Old Hittite sentence structure*, London & New York, Routledge.
- Marconi D, Bertinetto P. M. (1984), *Analisi di ma*, "Lingua e stile", 19, pp. 223-258 e 475-509.
- Matras, Yaron. 1998. Utterance modifiers and universals of grammatical borrowing. *Linguistics*, 36-2: 281–331.
- Mauri, Caterina 2008a. The irreality of alternatives: towards a typology of disjunction. *Studies in Language* 32/1: 22-55.
- Mauri, Caterina 2008b. *Coordination Relations in the Languages of Europe and Beyond*. Berlin, New York: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Mauri, Caterina and Anna Giacalone Ramat. 2009. The grammaticalization of interclausal connectives: the case of adversatives', talk presented at the *19th International Conference on Historical Linguistics*, Nijmegen, 10th-15th August 2009.
- Meillet, Antoine. 1958. Le renouvellement des conjonctions. In *Linguistique historique et linguistique générale*, pp. 159–174. Paris. Original edition in 1915-16: Champion.
- Mithun, Marianne. 1988. The grammaticization of coordination. In John Haiman and Sandra Thompson (Eds.), *Clause combining in grammar and discourse*, pp. 331-60. Amsterdam; Philadelphia: Benjamins.
- Stassen, Leon. 2001. Noun phrase coordination. In Martin Haspelmath et al. (Ed.), *Language Typology and Language Universals. An International Handbook*, pp. 1105-11. Berlin, New York: Mouton de Gruyter.

- Traugott, Elisabeth. 1986. On the origins of 'and' and 'but' connectives in English. *Studies in Language* 10: 137-150.
- Traugott, Elizabeth. 2003. Constructions in grammaticalization. In Brian D. Joseph and Richard D. Janda (eds.), *A Handbook of Historical Linguistics*. Oxford: Blackwell, 624-647.
- Van Klinken, Catharina. 2000. From verb to coordinator in Tetun. *Oceanic Linguistics* 39-2: 350-363.
- Zeevat, H. and Jasinskaja, K. 2007. And as an additive particle. In Aurnague, M., Korta, K., and Larrazabal, J. M. (Eds.), *Language, Representation and Reasoning. Memorial volume to Isabel Gómez Txurruka*, pages 315–340. University of the Basque Country Press.

List of abbreviations

1	1 st person	DEF	definite	POL	polite
2	2 nd person	GEN	genitive	PST	past
3	3 rd person	NEG	negative	REL	relative
ACC	accusative	PL	plural	SG	singular
DAT	dative				

Abstract:

The aim of this paper is to analyze the rise and grammaticalization of interclausal coordinating markers, i.e. conjunctive, disjunctive and adversative connectives. After examining the differences that such connectives show in terms of intra-linguistic variation, renewal and borrowability, we will discuss data according to different levels of depth. First, we will focus on the recurrent diachronic sources of coordinating connectives, basically from an etymological perspective. Second, we will examine the attested paths under the lens of the traditional criteria for grammaticalization. Finally, we will discuss the factors, the stages and contexts characterizing the paths at issue.

Biography of the authors

CATERINA MAURI.

She has a post-doc fellowship at the University of Pavia and she is involved in both historical and typological research projects, concerning the cross-linguistic coding and the grammaticalization of coordinating constructions, directives and reality status. In her PhD (2003-2007, University of Pavia), she carried out a typological research on coordination, which was published in 2008 by Mouton de Gruyter with the title *Coordination Relations in the Languages of Europe and Beyond* and for which she received the ALT Greenberg Award 2009.

ANNA GIACALONE RAMAT.

She is Professor of Linguistics at the University of Pavia. Her areas of research include theoretical issues of grammaticalization, linguistic change in typological perspective, language obsolescence and second language acquisition of tense/aspect relations. She is the author of : *Lingua, dialetto e comportamento linguistico. La situazione di Gressoney, Aosta*. Musumeci, 1979. She also published several articles on diachronic developments of Indo-European languages and on semantic change of interclausal connectives. She is the editor of *Typology and Second Language Acquisition*, De Gruyter, 2003 and (with Paul J. Hopper) of *The limits of grammaticalization*, Benjamins, 1998. She has served as the President of the "International Society for Historical

Linguistics" (1983-1985), as the President of the Società Italiana di Glottologia (1991-1992) and as the President of the Societas Linguistica Europaea (1999-2000).

Keywords (Max 10): conjunction, adversative, disjunction, coordination, interclausal connectives, role of context in grammaticalization, gradualness, role of frequency in grammaticalization, subjectification