



HAL
open science

Conjunctions

Benjamin Fagard Fagard

► **To cite this version:**

Benjamin Fagard Fagard. Conjunctions. Manual of Romance Word Classes, pp.499 - 524, 2024, 9783110745917. 10.1515/9783110746389-020 . halshs-04857553

HAL Id: halshs-04857553

<https://shs.hal.science/halshs-04857553v1>

Submitted on 28 Dec 2024

HAL is a multi-disciplinary open access archive for the deposit and dissemination of scientific research documents, whether they are published or not. The documents may come from teaching and research institutions in France or abroad, or from public or private research centers.

L'archive ouverte pluridisciplinaire **HAL**, est destinée au dépôt et à la diffusion de documents scientifiques de niveau recherche, publiés ou non, émanant des établissements d'enseignement et de recherche français ou étrangers, des laboratoires publics ou privés.

Copyright

Conjunctions

Benjamin Fagard

Fagard, Benjamin. 2024. Conjunctions. In Anna-Maria De Cesare & Giampaolo Salvi (eds), *Manual of Romance Word Classes*. Berlin, Boston: De Gruyter, 499-524.
<https://doi.org/10.1515/9783110746389-020>

Abstract: In this chapter, I describe the renewal of coordinating and subordinating conjunctions from Latin to Modern Romance, a phenomenon which has attracted a good deal of attention, and for a long time. I focus on the importance of diversification, and specifically on the phenomena which have pushed it further (e.g. language contact, borrowing and local innovations) or prevented it (relatinization, parallel innovations, internal borrowing within the language family).

Keywords: grammaticalization, paradigm renewal, language contact, corpus linguistics, subordination, coordination

1 Introduction

One important change in Medieval Romance is the shift towards greater syntactic structuring (e.g. Combettes 2018, 373, on the transition from Latin to French). The renewal of coordinating (as in 1) and subordinating (as in 2) conjunctions from Latin to Modern Romance, which amounts to a global paradigm shift in both cases, has attracted a good deal of attention for over a century, concerning both subordinating (Jeanjaquet 1894; Meillet 1921; Avram 1960; Herman 1963; Dardel 1978) and coordinating conjunctions (Cosieriu 1968; Hansen 2021). In this evolution, there are instances of renewal (e.g. Latin *ut* → French *que* in 2) but also of continuity (Latin *et* > French *et* in 1):

(Old French)

- (1) *Ce estoit Chauve la soriz / **Et** Pelez li raz ses mariz*
'It was Bald the mouse **and** Mangy the rat, her husband' (*Roman de Renart*, 12th century, v. 2109-2110; my translation)
- (2) *Tuit oram **que** per nos degnet preier*
'Let us all pray that she will deign pray for us' (*Cantilène de Sainte Eulalie*, 9th century, v. 26; my translation)

One element of interest in this evolution is the speed of the paradigm renewal, and the way it contributes to the diversification of Romance languages. Specific phenomena may have either pushed it further (e.g. language contact, borrowing and local innovations) or mitigated it (relatinization, parallel innovations, internal borrowing within the language family). Building on earlier work (Fagard 2011; Fagard/Pietrandrea/Glikman 2016) and reference grammars, with

occasional help from modern corpora, I investigate the dynamics of this paradigm shift. We will see that this diversification process is unequal in various respects.

After laying out theoretical and methodological considerations (Section 2), I present an overview of the global evolution of conjunctions from Latin to Modern Romance (Section 3). I then focus on various phenomena which contributed to these paradigm shifts (Section 4), e.g. semantic and/or grammatical reinforcement as well as grammaticalization, at various stages.

2 Theoretical and methodological considerations: Defining and studying conjunctions

2.1 A grammaticalization approach

After over a century of research on grammaticalization, there is a consensus on the main hallmarks of the phenomenon. It is a complex process triggered by semantic loss, associated with morphological and syntactic variation, which go hand in hand with a gain in frequency, and lead to a phonetic reduction. Among these hallmarks, the most reliable from a usage-based perspective are the following: loss in morphological variation, in syntactic freedom, referential loss, gain in frequency, paradigmaticization. Other features of grammaticalization include the fact that it is a unidirectional phenomenon (from lexicon to grammar, with no reverse trend); a piecemeal process, i.e. it can stop at any point on the way; and a cumulative process, i.e. the change from less to more grammatical does not entail the disappearance of earlier stages, or of other grammatical items. As a result, the transformation of a grammatical word class in any given language is by no means a simple replacement of an old paradigm with a new one. Instead, each tier of the paradigm, from the core elements to the margins of the category, may receive new members, which may in turn dislodge older members – or not; or do so only partly.

One apparently *systematic* outcome of grammaticalization processes is the creation of grammatical categories which display a prototypical structure, with a small core of highly grammaticalized elements and a large array of less grammaticalized items (for the prototypical structure of grammar, see also Haiman 1985, 259; Croft 1990, 248; Kortmann 2012, 15). Core elements are the most grammaticalized, most frequent and least numerous; the further from the core an element is, the less frequent it is (in this function) (cf. e.g. Company Company 2002, 203; Lehmann 1995, 95-96). We will see that this prototypical structure emerges for both paradigms of subordinating and coordinating conjunctions, though in slightly different forms.

2.2 Methodology: Languages, periodization, corpora

For this chapter, I used online corpora to compare frequencies and retrieve examples:

1. Late Latin: PaLaFra Corpus (5th-10th c.)
2. French: BFM (Old French); Frantext (Old to Modern French); CFPP2000 (Spoken Present-Day French)
3. Italian: MIDIA (Medieval Italian, see D’Achille/Grossmann 2017)
4. Spanish: Corpus del Español (13th-20th c., Davies 2002)
5. Portuguese: Corpus do Português (13th-20th, Davies/Ferreira 2006)
6. Romanian: 16th-18th (Hill/Mardale 2021)
7. French, Italian, Spanish: Google Books Ngram corpus (Lin et al. 2012)
8. French, Italian, Spanish, Portuguese, Romanian: web corpora accessed through the Sketch Engine query system¹
 - French (frTenTen 10,666,617,369 words)
 - Italian (ItTenTen 2,588,873,046 words)

¹ See Kilgarriff et al. (2014).

- Spanish (esTenTen 2,103,770,763 words)
- Portuguese (ptTenTen 2,757,635,105 words)
- Romanian Web as a Corpus (RoWaC, 44,729,032 words)

In order to assess the global evolution of the paradigms, I focus on Classical Latin (before the 1st century AD) and Modern Romance (19th-21st centuries), but I will occasionally refer to other periods, namely: Late Latin (after the 2nd century AD), Medieval Romance (before the 15th century) and Classical Romance (16th-17th centuries).

2.3 Coordination and subordination

Conjunctions are often compared to adpositions, as they are invariable and belong to a mostly closed class: for both, there is a closed class of highly grammaticalized, highly frequent elements, as well as an open class of constructions which are functionally similar. I will talk here of “main” and “secondary” paradigms of conjunctions.

The opposition between *coordination* and *subordination* is not always clear-cut, but can be seen as opposite poles of a continuum (see e.g. Foley/van Valin 1984; König/van der Auwera 1990; Raible 1992, 14-23; Koch 1995, 15), and there is some overlap between *coordinating conjunctions* and *subordinating conjunctions*. However, it is possible to provide a working definition which successfully distinguishes, by and large, between the two. One important difference between coordinating and subordinating conjunctions is that the former link together constituents which are at the same syntactic level and have similar syntactic functions,² while the latter signal a relation of subordination, i.e. of syntactic hierarchy, dependence, between two clauses (or, in some cases, constituents and even single words), viz. a host clause and a dependent clause (Gougenheim 1969, 327; Moignet 1973, 329). Subordination is thus generally identified by means of features such as dependency and syntactic embedding (Cristofaro 2003, 15).

There is often some variation across grammars of a given language on which elements should be included in these two paradigms; however, this is mostly the case for the secondary paradigms, while there is a consensus on the main elements of the paradigm, e.g. for coordinating conjunctions English *and*, *or*, *but* and their Romance equivalents – compare for instance It. *e* ‘and’ and more adverbial-like elements like *pure* ‘also’. Besides, the main and secondary paradigms are not discrete categories. A few elements can be unequivocally said to pertain to the main paradigm, e.g. for Italian *e* ‘and’, *o* ‘or’, *ma* ‘but’. Similarly, a host of constructions or sequences clearly pertain to the secondary paradigm, e.g. It. *eppure* ‘nevertheless, however’, *oppure* ‘or, otherwise’, *però* ‘however’ (see Section 2.3.1). But there is a range of items for which the decision is more delicate, for instance Fr. *puis* > *pis* ‘and, also’ which, in some varieties, could be said to have replaced partially *et* ‘and’ (Dostie 2004, 118).

2.3.1 Coordinating conjunctions

Works on coordinating conjunctions generally distinguish between two main types of coordination: *copulative* and *disjunctive*. Alongside these two main types, some authors identify further types, which are often said to be less prototypical, such as *adversative* conjunctions. Other items which may be included in these paradigms are *conclusive* conjunctions, which some authors classify as adverbs. These four subtypes of coordinating conjunctions can be illustrated by English *and* (copulative), *or* (disjunctive), *but* (adversative) and *so* (conclusive).

From a typological perspective, works on coordination have shown that it may be found at any and all levels of the grammatical hierarchy (Dik 1968, 201; Serra/Prunyonosa 2002, 2201).

² Additionally, there is a constraint on “something like semantic likeness”, which excludes sentences like **Juan y el cuchillo cortaron el pan* ‘*Juan and the knife cut the bread’ (Etxepare 2012, 507).

While some languages have different conjunctions for different levels, distinguishing namely between NP, VP and clause, with various possible combinations (Haspelmath 2004, 11), this is generally not the case in Romance. An interesting counter-example could come from Romansh, specifically Tuatschin, a Sursilvan Romansh dialect spoken in Tujetsch/Tavetsch. Indeed, in Tuatschin, there is a contrast between the use of conjunctions to coordinate constituents, in which case they appear alone, and their use to coordinate clauses, in which case they are followed by the complementizer *tga*, as illustrated in (3) for *u... né* ‘either... or’:

(Romansh)

- (3) *U tga té fas ùrdan ajn tia tgombra né tga té lavas gjù.*
 ‘Either you tidy up your room or you do the dishes.’ (example and translation: Maurer-Cecchini 2021, 237).

Another point of variation across languages is the position of the conjunction with regard to the items it links together, and its nature (clitic or not): from this perspective, Haspelmath (2004, 4) suggests that the main types are [A] [conjunction B], [A conjunction] [B] and [A] [B conjunction], while the last theoretically possible type, [conjunction A] [B] is not in his sample. In this respect, conjunctions in Romance languages are overwhelmingly of the first type, as illustrated in (6) – note that this is not the case for Latin (see Section 3.1).

It has also been shown that there is a close link, in many languages, between coordinating conjunctions and comitative markers (Stassen 2000), though there is limited evidence of this phenomenon in Romance. Examples seem to indicate that the use of comitative markers such as the Cat. preposition *amb* ‘with’ is possible, as in (4), though the corpus shows that they are not very frequent:

(Catalan)

- (4) *El professor amb els ajudants editen el text*
 ‘the professor and the assistants are editing the text’ (Serra/Prunyonosa 2002, 2194)

On the basis of the existing literature on coordinating conjunctions in general, and more specifically on coordinating conjunctions in Romance, a series of features can be shown to be characteristic of this word class, and specifically of copulative conjunctions. Their most important features are the fact that they are typically recursive, and necessarily adjacent to the second coordinated element (5)–(6) rather than inserted in one of these elements (7)–(8), and that they link items with identical syntactic status and function (5)–(6), for which permutation is possible (9). They are semantically opaque (Dardano/Trifone 1995, 428; Pană Dindelegan et al. 2010, 331; Serra/Prunyonosa 2002, 2205), and cannot be combined (10 vs. 11).³

(Occitan)

- (5) *E los dròlles e las dròllas e los joves e los vièlhs seràn convidats*
 ‘boys and girls and young people and old people, all will be invited’ (lit. ‘and the boys and the girls...’; example from Vernet 2000, 125, my translation)

(Italian)

- (6) *Giovanni ha cotto la cena, e ha poi preparato la tavola*
 (7) **Giovanni ha cotto la cena, ha e poi preparato la tavola*
 ‘Giovanni cooked supper, and then set the table’ (examples from Orlandini/Pocchetti 2014, 268, my translation)

³ One apparent exception is the emergence of a new composed conjunction, *and/or*, see Section 3.2.

(Catalan)

- (8) **Vindrà* *o* *dimarts* *dilluns*
come.IND.FUT.3SG or Tuesday Monday
'he / she will come Monday or Tuesday' (Serra/Prunyonosa 2002, 2206)

(French)

- (9) *J'ai laissé mon chat et mon chien à la maison = J'ai laissé mon chien et mon chat à la maison*
'I left my cat and my dog home'

- (10) *Je veux un chat ou un chien*
'I want a cat or a dog'

- (11) (a) **Je veux un chat et ou un chien*
*I want a cat and or a dog
(b) **Je veux un chat ou et un chien*
*I want a cat or and a dog

Copulative conjunctions are the most frequent subtype. Similar features apply to disjunctive conjunctions; both paradigms include items with a wide range of uses, both semantically and syntactically. From a semantic perspective, copulative and disjunctive conjunctions are often abstract or generic; from a syntactic perspective, they may coordinate various types of constituents. These features, which result from the fact such items have undergone a grammaticalization process (Hopper/Traugott, 2003), go hand in hand with their high frequency.

On the other hand, it is frequently noted in grammars that adversative or conclusive conjunctions do not display similar features. For instance, they are not recursive (12), and in their case permutation is not always possible (13); they also tend to have other uses, e.g. as adverbs or DMs (13b-c):⁴

(Occitan)

- (12) **Puèi los dròlles puèi las dròllas puèi los*
then DET.M.PL boy.PL then DET.F.PL girl.PL then DET.M.PL
joves puèi los vièlhs seràn
young.PL then DET.M.PL old.M.PL be.IND.FUT.3PL
convidats
invited.PST.PTCP.M.PL
(example from Vernet 2000, 125, gloss my own)

(French)

- (13) (a) *La boulangerie était fermée, donc j'ai dû aller à celle où le pain au chocolat coûte 5 centimes de plus* (Twitter example)
'The bakery was closed, so I had to go to the one where the pain au chocolat [*chocolate croissant*] costs 5 cents more'
(b) #*Donc j'ai dû aller à l'autre, la boulangerie était fermée*

⁴ Note that the variants are acceptable, but with a different interpretation and syntactic analysis: in (13b) and (13c), *donc* is no longer a coordinating conjunction. It is closer to a discourse marker, translatable as 'so', 'actually' or 'in the end'. In that case, *donc* does not link the two clauses, but rather links back to a previous utterance.

- # 'So I had to go to the other one, the bakery was closed'
 (c) # *Donc la boulangerie était fermée, j'ai dû aller à l'autre*
 # 'So the bakery was closed, I had to go the other one'

The contrast between copulative and disjunctive coordination, on the one hand, and adversative or conclusive conjunctions, on the other, is also visible in the size of the paradigm. While the former are clearly closed-class paradigms with a limited number of members and a low degree of diachronic renewal, the exact opposite is true for the latter. Finally, copulative and disjunctive conjunctions may both coordinate either constituents or clauses, while adversative and conclusive conjunctions only coordinate clauses.

These subtypes thus include items which typically do not display all defining features of coordinating conjunctions: they are much less grammaticalized, much less frequent, and vary across languages and over time. Indeed, given their lesser degree of grammaticalization, there is some disagreement between linguists as to how they should be described: adverbs with uses as conjunctions, or conjunctions in their own right?

Table 1 below sums up these differences across subtypes of coordinating conjunctions.

	copulative	disjunctive	adversative	conclusive
abstract / generic	+	+ / -	-	-
coordinates subjects	+	+ / -	-	-
coordinates constituents	+	+	-	-
always in first position	+	+	+ / -	+ / -
adverbial or DM uses	+ / -	+ / -	+	+
coordinates clauses	+	+	+	+
recursive	+	+	-	-
permutation	+	+	-	-

Table 1: Features of coordinating conjunctions, for different subtypes (see a.o. Paná Dindelegan et al. 2010, 332)

Copulative and *disjunctive* conjunctions display almost all typical features. Among *adversative* conjunctions, which are generally less grammaticalized, some may still be considered “genuine coordinations”, as is the case for *mas* in Portuguese (Móia 2016, 332). Finally, at the other end of the continuum, so-called *conclusive* conjunctions represent the least degree of coordination and are sometimes described as “connectors” (Móia 2016, 332; see also chapter 32 on connectives), or adverbs with the role of a conjunction (Paná Dindelegan et al. 2010); this might explain why they are not included in Haspelmath (2004), who lists only the first three types.

2.3.2 Subordinating conjunctions

Despite some structural similarities which have to do with the grammaticalization process, paradigms of subordinating conjunctions are quite different from those of coordinating conjunctions: they are much larger, and include many multiword expressions. Grammars distinguish between complementizers, i.e. subordinating conjunctions introducing clauses which behave as nominal constituents (14), and circumstantial conjunctions or “adverbial subordination” markers (Kortmann 2012; respectively *complement* and *adverbial* relation in Cristofaro 2003), i.e. subordinating conjunctions with semantic nuances such as the expression of time (15), cause (16), condition (17) or concession (18):

- (Italian)
 (14) *Dico **che** è arrivata ieri.* (= *Dico questo*).

‘I’m saying [that] she arrived yesterday (= I’m saying this)’.

(Portuguese)

- (15) *Chegou **quando** estava a dormir*
‘She arrived as I was sleeping’

(Spanish)

- (16) *Fracasó **porque** no estaba listo.*
‘He failed because he wasn’t ready’

(Romanian)

- (17) ***Dacă** plouă, atunci plecăm*
‘If it rains, then we’ll leave’ (Pană Dindelegan et al. 2010, 331, my translation)

(Catalan)

- (18) *No sóc cap escopeta, **encara que** tinc dos canons*
‘I’m no rifle, though I have two canons’ (Elementary school riddle).

From the perspective of grammaticalization, there is indeed a clear contrast between complementizers – which are the most grammaticalized subordinating conjunctions, generally semantically empty or highly polysemous, and closed class (at most three elements) – and all other types of subordinating conjunctions. All subordinating conjunctions seem to display a high degree of renewal (as pointed out already in Meillet 1921); however, this rate of renewal seems lower for complementizers, and it has been contended that it is highest for concessive conjunctions (Meillet 1921, 172–173; Herman 1963, 64; Dardel 1983, 246; Soutet 2008, 116–117); Jensen (1992, 487) thus points out that no Latin concessive conjunction survived in French.

2.2.3 Conjunctions, grammaticalization and prototypicality

As I explained above, it is expected that the paradigms of conjunctions be of a prototypical nature, with a few highly grammaticalized elements, and more items as we move towards the edge of the category, with lower degrees of grammaticalization and entrenchment.

I present below a schematic description of these two paradigms, taking Latin as a starting point, in order to highlight the important changes that took place in the transition to Medieval and Modern Romance. We can thus identify a first tier (Tier 1 in Table 2) of conjunctions, which are highly grammaticalized items, very frequent, highly polysemous, and polyfunctional. The second tier includes ‘lexical’ conjunctions, i.e. those with incipient morphosyntactic entrenchment, and a frequency high enough to ensure lexicalization (i.e. they are part of any native speaker’s lexicon), but not high enough to lead to high degrees of polysemy or polyfunctionality. The third tier includes complex conjunctions, with little or no lexicalization, i.e. no morphosyntactic entrenchment and typically low frequency; no or only limited polysemy and polyfunctionality. The fourth and last tier includes syntactically free constructions which are only functionally, viz. distributionally, equivalent to conjunctions.

This approach ties in neatly with the results presented in Kortmann (2012) and with “Zipf’s Law of Abbreviation of Words and the three principles constituting the Law of Diminishing Returns” (Zipf 1949, 120–131, cf. Kortmann 2012, 127), i.e. the frequency of a lexical item correlates inversely with its formal complexity, directly with its semantic versatility, its permutability and its age.

Table 2 below provides a (non-exhaustive) list of subordinating and coordinating conjunctions in Classical Latin, classed by tier; note, however, that this classification is only tentative. Some

items may be at intermediate stages along this cline in Classical Latin. This could be said for instance of complex conjunctions with partial lexicalization, viz. univerbation, such as *quandoquidem* ‘since’. For such items, one valid criterion when deciding to include them in Tier 2 or 3 is their degree of semantic opacity: in the case of *quandoquidem*, for instance, it seems that its degree of opacity qualifies it for Tier 2.

Tier	1	2	3	4
<i>subordinating conjunctions</i>	<i>cum</i> ‘as, when, because’, <i>ut</i> ‘that, so that’, <i>quod</i> ‘that’	<i>quando</i> ‘when, given that’, <i>postquam</i> ‘since’ (mainly temporal or causal), <i>antequam</i> , <i>priusquam</i> ‘until’, <i>quatenus</i> ‘while’, <i>quia</i> ‘because’	<i>eo quod</i> , <i>pro eo quod</i> ‘because’, <i>qua re</i> , <i>quam ob rem</i> ‘for which reason’	[<i>in</i> / <i>ex</i> / ... + DEM (<i>eo</i> / <i>illo</i> / ...) (...) + <i>ut</i> / <i>cum</i> / <i>quod</i>] ‘for which reason’, ‘to the extent that’, etc.
<i>coordinating conjunctions</i>	<i>et</i> , <i>-que</i> ‘and’, <i>-ve</i> ‘or’, <i>sed</i> ‘but’, <i>nec</i> , <i>neque</i> ‘and not, neither’	<i>igitur</i> ‘therefore’, <i>nam</i> ‘for, indeed’, <i>autem</i> ‘however’, <i>tum</i> ‘then’, <i>nunc</i> ‘now’, <i>enim</i> ‘for, indeed’, <i>vero</i> ‘however’, <i>modo</i> ‘only’	<i>non tantum ... sed etiam</i> ‘not only... but also’, <i>vel... vel</i> ‘either... or’, <i>etenim</i> ‘and indeed’	<i>neque vero</i> ‘nor indeed’, <i>nec autem</i> ‘nor’

Table 2: Paradigms of subordinating and coordinating conjunctions in Classical Latin (based on Kroon 1994, 304; Baños 2010; Fagard 2011).

Besides these items, Latin also relied on two syntactic configurations. The first is the simple juxtaposition of clauses, which seems to have been quite frequent. It is illustrated in (19), in which a strong opposition between the two clauses can be reconstructed, even in the absence of a conjunction making this relation explicit. It is also visible in set phrases such as *huc illuc* ‘here and there’, *serius ocius* ‘sooner or later’, *velim nolim* ‘whether I want it or not’:

- (19) *Vincere scis, Hannibal; uti victoria*
 vanquish.INF know.IND.PRS.2SG, Hannibal; use.INF victory.ABL.SG
nescis
 ignore.IND.PRS.2SG
 ‘You know how to win a battle, Hannibal; [but] you don’t know how to use victory’
 (Sausy 2010, 183)

Though juxtaposition is still used in Romance languages, it is generally considered to be a polyvalent form of coordination which poses little or no semantic constraint on the interpretation of the sentence (e.g. Mória 2016, 332).

The other important tool for linking clauses in Latin was the use of connecting relatives, illustrated in (20) (Pompei 2011; see however Bolkestein 1996 for a critical view of this analysis):

- (20) *Quod* *cum* *diceret*
 which.thing as said.SUBJ.IMPF.3SG
 ‘And as he said that’ (Sausy 2010, 74)

This configuration, despite some attempts at revival in Classical Romance languages (e.g. Bossuet for French, see Sausy 2010, 74), has not survived in Modern Romance.

3 Paradigms of conjunctions: From Latin to Romance

3.1 From Latin to Romance

Between Latin and Romance, important changes took place in the paradigms of subordinating conjunctions (cf. Herman 1963; Väänänen 2008, 272): the most grammaticalized conjunctions disappeared (mostly *ut* ‘that, in order to’ and *cum* ‘as, given that, though’, in most varieties also *quia* ‘since’ and *quam* ‘that’), replaced by *quod* ‘that’, later *que* ‘that’. These were then used for the creation of analytic sequences in Late Latin, such as *eo quod* ‘because’, *pro eo quod* ‘because’, later (from the 6th century on) also *post quod* ‘after’, *ante quod* ‘before’, *per quod* ‘because’. These constructions later yielded simple conjunctions in Romance, e.g. Old French *por que*, Middle French *por ce que*, Spanish *porque*, Italian *perché* ‘because’, etc. (Väänänen 2008, 276). Additionally, the most grammaticalized items, with uses as complementizers, are also used in Romance as ‘transitivizers’: complex conjunctions thus follow a general [Adverb + COMP] pattern in which the complementizer can be seen as turning adverbs into conjunctions. As noted above (2.2.2), concessive conjunctions seem to have a high rate of renewal, which might explain why both *quamquam* ‘though’ and *quamvis* ‘though’ also disappeared.

The same goes for many coordinating conjunctions, such as *autem* ‘however’, *nam*, *enim* ‘for’, etc. Existing corpora of Classical and Late Latin seem to show that, in some cases, this evolution started as early as Late Latin. Thus, the relative frequency of *eo quod* ‘because’ jumps up from 26 to 304 occurrences per million, while the frequency of *autem* goes down from 3,800 to 1,900 in the same period (*nam* 3,250 to 750, *enim* 1,900 to 1,100, *igitur* 1,550 to 1,000). Conversely, the frequency of *ut* and *cum* do not display this tendency.

Other features which seem more frequent in Latin are parataxis, i.e. the absence of either type of conjunction, the (relatively) free placement of conjunctions, which do not always head the clause, especially in poetry, and the fact that they are not always repeated even when multiple elements are being linked.

3.2 Modern Romance coordinating conjunctions

On the surface, the paradigm renewal for coordinating conjunctions is only marginal: the most frequent coordinating conjunction in Latin, *et* ‘and’, which seems to be the default copulative conjunction in Classical Latin, remains the typical coordinating conjunction – and the most frequent one – in a vast majority of Modern Romance languages, with a few exceptions such as Rom. *Și* ‘and’ (from Lat. *Sic*) and Fr. *pis* ‘and, also’. The same goes for Latin *aut* ‘or’, which is the default disjunctive conjunction in Classical Latin (with a relative frequency of some 9,000 occurrences per million words in our corpus, i.e. roughly one third in comparison to that of *et*); and for Latin *nec* ‘and (not)’, the default copulative coordination in negative contexts. However, this is only part of the picture, and some items such as Lat. *Sed* ‘but’ have disappeared from Modern Romance.

One important caveat in this respect is that *et* could probably be described as a relatively recent conjunction in Latin, i.e. the result of the grammaticalization of an adverb *et* ‘also’ which coexisted with – and gradually replaced – the original conjunction *-que*, from Indo-European **-k^we* ‘and’ (“main connective particle”, Mallory/Adams 2006, 62). This clitic illustrates a

typologically rare type of conjunction – the least frequent construction type, according to Haspelmath (2004, 4). The loss of *-que*, which seems to start in Late Latin (our corpus data show that it is roughly three times less frequent than *et* at that period, i.e. 10,000 vs 28,000 occurrences per million)⁵ and left no trace in Romance languages (at least in paradigms of coordinating conjunctions), along with the survival of *et*, thus seem to constitute an important typological shift. This impression is reinforced by the similar loss of the clitic *-ve* ‘or’, though this item seems to have been, even more than *et*, the result of a relatively recent grammaticalization: that of the imperative *vel* ‘or’ (lit. want.IMP.2SG). In any case, as with *et*, the non-clitic *aut* survived in the vast majority of Romance languages, with few exceptions.

Thus, the two main coordinating conjunctions in Modern Romance languages are the modern versions of *et* and *aut*, in almost all Romance varieties. These are the sources, respectively, of the main copulative conjunction – Fr. *et*, Occ./Gal./It. *e*, Cat. *i*, Sp. *y*, Romansh *a* – and of the main disjunctive conjunction – Fr./Pt. *ou*, Occ./Gal./Sp./It. *o*, Romansh *u*. There are phonological variants in some cases, e.g. Sp. *e*, It. *ed*. And a few exceptions: French seems to have partly replaced *et* with *pis* ‘then’ (< Fr. *puis* ‘then’, < Lat. *postius* ‘later’: esp. Quebec French, but also e.g. Picard *et pi* ‘and’, Auger/Wycoff 2015), and similarly outcomes of Lt. *postius* may be used as copulative conjunctions elsewhere (e.g. Romansh *pi*, *api* ‘and’); Romanian has renewed the paradigm more radically, replacing the Classical *e* ‘and’ with *și* ‘and’ < Lat. *sic* ‘thus’, and *au* ‘or’ with *sau* ‘or’ (< complementizer *să* ‘that’ + *au*, or *sic* + *aut*, according to Sala 2005, 140) and *ori* ‘or’ (possibly from **volet* < *volere*, see Ciorănescu 2001: 551).

The subtypes for which there has been the most important phenomenon of paradigm renewal are the least prototypical coordinating conjunctions, i.e. *adversative* and *conclusive* ones.

The main *adversative* conjunctions in Latin (*sed*, *at*, *autem*, *tamen*, *vero*, *verum*, *nisi*, with meanings close to ‘but, however’) have disappeared as such (see e.g. Togeby 1980, 151; Sánchez López 2017, 650), and have been replaced mainly with new conjunctions based on Latin *magis* ‘more’ (Fr./Gal. *mais*, Occ. *mai*, Sp./Pt. *mas*, It. *ma*). Other important sources for the renewal of this function include Late Latin *per hoc* ‘for that (reason)’ (Cat. *però*, Sp./Gal. *pero*, It. *però*) and Romance *if* + negation (Fr./Oc. *sinon*, Cat. *sinó*, Pt. *senão*, Sp. *sino*, Gal. *senón*). This renewal has thus led to the further differentiation of Romanian, which (as noted by Sánchez López 2017, 651) has a different set of *adversative* forms: *iar* ‘and, but’ (ex. 21), *dar* ‘but’ (the etymology of *iar* and *dar* is not entirely clear; see the details in Zafiu 2009, 605), *însă* ‘however’ (< Lat. *ipsa*), *ci* ‘but’ (< *ce* < Lat. *quid*):

(Romanian)

- (21) *Vom respectă toate legile, fiindcă suntem un partid de ordine, iar nu un partid de anarhie, un partid de reforme, iar nu de revoluțiuni*
 ‘We will respect all the laws, since we are a party of order, and not a party of anarchy, a party of reform, and not a party of revolution’ (Alexandru Lahovari, *Discursuri parlamentare 1888-1891*, 1915)

The subtype of *adversative* conjunctions, as explained in Section 2.3.1., includes items which are less grammaticalized, less frequent, and typically do not display all defining features of coordinating conjunctions. For instance, the combination of copulative conjunctions is excluded (22). One exception is the use of *and/or* in Modern European languages, e.g. Pt. *e / ou* (23)–(24). This is a rather recent innovation, possibly linked to administrative uses of language, which seems partially lexicalized (cf. the impossibility of using **or / and*), and is

⁵ This decline may have started earlier; however, the frequency counts provided by Francese (2020) show that *et* and *-que* are still quite close in Classical Latin, with *et* in 1st position – thus the most frequent word in Classical Latin, by that count – and *-que* not far behind, in 4th position.

now attested even in Spoken Corpora (e.g. CFPP 2000 for French, Corpus do Português, etc.); the earliest occurrences in our corpora date from the mid-20th century. On the other hand, it is possible to combine adversative or conclusive conjunctions with genuine conjunctions.. Similarly, while genuine conjunctions always appear before the coordinated constituent in Modern Romance, this is not always the case for less prototypical (and less frequent) members of the paradigm (25),⁶ which may sometimes appear in various syntactic positions within their host clause, including after the clause (25b) (in which case they could be analyzed as discourse markers: they are used as an afterthought), or within the clause (26). Conversely, adversative or conclusive conjunctions afford neither reversibility⁷ nor recursivity. The following examples illustrate some of these specificities:

(Portuguese)

- (22) (a) *Não o maior **mas** o melhor*
 ‘Not the largest but the best’ (Corpus do Português)
 (b) **Não o maior **mas e / e mas** o melhor*
 ‘Not the largest but and / and but the best’
- (23) (a) *O maior **e** o melhor mercado do Brasil*
 ‘The largest and best market in Brazil’ (Corpus do Português)
 (b) *#O maior **e ou** o melhor ...*
 ‘The largest and/or the best...’
- (24) *pública e ou privada*
 public.F.SG and or private.F.SG
 ‘public and/or private’ (Corpus do Português)

(Occitan)

- (25) (a) *èri pas arribat, **donec** los ai pas pogut veire*
 ‘I wasn’t there yet, so I missed them (*lit.* I could not see them)’
 (b) *èri pas arribat, los ai pas pogut veire **donec***
 ‘I wasn’t there yet, so I missed them’
 (Vernet 2000, 125, my translation)

(Catalan)

- (26) *Nevava fort; els trens, **però**, circulaven*
 ‘it was snowing hard, but the trains circulated’ (Serra/Prunyonosa 2002, 2188)

The renewal also concerns correlative constructions. This is the case for (positive) copulative correlatives, which shift in many cases from Latin *tantus... quantus* (still visible in It. *tanto... quanto*, Rom. *atât...cât şî*) to structures based on Latin *quo modo* ‘how’: Cat. *tant... com*, Sp. Pt. *tanto... como*, Gal. *tanto...como / a*, It. *tanto... come, tanto... che* (Sánchez López 2017, 651). French diverges from the other varieties, with a new construction based on *bien* ‘well’: *aussi bien... que*.

In the case of disjunctive correlatives, Romance languages innovated with a variety of new constructions, based on the subjunctive of the verb ‘to be’ or on other items: Fr. *ou bien... ou*

⁶ Discourse markers, which are functionally close to adversative and conclusive coordination, also typically appear in sentence-initial position (van Dijk 1979, 449; see also Orlandini/Pocchetti 2014, 269; see also chapter 32 on connectives).

⁷ Note however that “canonical *symmetric coordination* is probably the exception rather than the norm in language use”, as noted by Fabricius-Hansen/Ramm (2008, 10, quoted in Orlandini/Pocchetti 2014, 268).

bien, soit... soit, Occ. *ara... ara, quora... quora, un còp... un còp, siá... siá* (Vernet 2000, 130), Cat. *o bé... o bé*, Gal. *ou... ou, ora... ora, quer... quer, sexa... sexa, cando... cando*, Pt. *seja... seja, ora... ora*, Sp. *sea... sea, ora... ora*, It. *sia... sia, ora... ora*, Rom. *sau... sau, fie... fie, ori... ori*. Other types of correlative constructions are also found, for instance negative copulative conjunctions, generally the reflections of Latin *nec... nec*, e.g. Fr. *ni... ni*, It. *né... né*, etc.; or of Lat. *neque*, in the case of Rom. *nici... nici* (note that, from a functional perspective, negative coordination presents an interesting evolution from Latin to Romance, see Coseriu 1968; Hansen 2021), or more complex structures (e.g. Occ. *entre... e* ‘between... and’).

Paradigm renewal is also linked to the phenomenon of semantic reinforcement: though *et* and *aut* survived in most Modern Romance varieties, there is some evidence of their semantic weakening, with the emergence of constructions in which they are either replaced with totally new linguistic material, e.g. Fr. *ainsi que* ‘as well as’ (lit. thus COMP; note, however, that it is only partially equivalent to a full coordinating conjunction), or reinforced, e.g. Fr. *ou bien* ‘or’ (lit. or well), It. *oppure* ‘or’ (lit. or also), Genovese *oppù* ‘or’ (Toso 1997, 241).

A minor element of renewal lies in the uses of the main complementizer (*que, che*) as a coordinating conjunction. This use is found for instance in Catalan and Galician:

(Galician)

(27) *Perrón era apelido, **que** non apodo*

‘Perrón was his name, not his nickname’ (Cunqueiro, in Freixeiro Mato 2000, 582)

In most Romance languages, there is thus no complete overhaul of the paradigm of coordinating conjunctions, but rather a piecemeal process which mostly concerns the least frequent items or constructions.

3.3 Modern Romance subordinating conjunctions

In the case of subordinating conjunctions, two phenomena are at play in the various stages of evolution from Latin to Romance: the extreme grammaticalization of a small number of items, and the appearance of new constructions.

The most highly grammaticalized subordinating conjunctions in Modern Romance are based on a handful of Latin sources: QUOD, QUO MODO, QUA RE, QUIA, QUANDO, SI, and forms of the relative. For instance, QUO MODO ‘by which means, in which manner’ is the source of Fr. *comme*, Sp. Pt. *como*, It. *come*, Rom. *cum* ‘how’; QUA RE ‘for which reason’ that of Fr./Occ./Cat. *car* ‘so, because’, forms of the relative or a weakened form of Latin QUIA (see Wartburg 1922-2002; Herman 1963, 143; Tekavčić 1972, 630), that of Fr./Sp./Pt./Gal./Oc./Cat. *que*, It. *che*.

Some complex conjunctions already present in Medieval Romance underwent further grammaticalization, e.g. Middle French *par ce que* > Classical French *parce que* > Present Day French *paske* [pask(ə)] or *parce* [pars(ə)]. Others disappeared, leaving little or no trace.

The paradigms of subordinating conjunctions in Modern Romance are structurally quite close to that of Latin, with a reduced number of highly grammaticalized items and a large paradigm of more or less set sequences. One important difference is the emergence of a new complementizer. This phenomenon seems most acute in French, less in other Romance varieties, and least in Romanian and Sardinian, as argued in Fagard/Pietrandrea/Glikman (2016). Thus, French *que*, “void of semantic content and very versatile” (Jensen 1992, 477), has taken on the role of ‘conjunction-builder’ (or *Translativ*, cf. Raible 1992, 165), and is present in 90% of complex conjunctions, vs 80% for Spanish *que*, for instance (Kortmann 2012, 134). The higher degree of grammaticalization of French *que* can also be seen in the fact that French *que* can be used even for conjunctions which ordinarily do not need the presence of a

complementizer, resulting for instance in the non-standard *quand que* ‘when’ (lit. ‘when that’). This phenomenon can also be found in other Romance varieties, e.g. Astigiano *come che* ‘since’, *quand che* ‘when’, *përchè che* ‘because’ (28), (Substandard or Dialectal) It. *quando che* ‘when’, Romansh *parquaj tga* ‘because COMP’:

- (Astigiano)
- (28) *përchè ch’ èt sij nen èvni? Përchè*
 why COMP PRO.2SG be.IND.2SG NEG come.PST.PTCP? because
- ch’ a j’ heu nen podì*
 COMP PRO.1SG ADV.CL AUX.IND.1SG NEG can.PST.PTCP
- ‘why didn’t you come? Because I couldn’t’ (Musso 2004, 116)

Other Romance languages allow the construction of complex conjunctions with other complementizers: QUOMODO, QUARE, QUANDO, e.g. Old Fr. *si tost com* ‘as soon as’, Occ. *tan com* ‘as long as’, Pt. *visto como* ‘seen as, given that’ (30),⁸ Cat. *per ço com* ‘because’, *així com*, *tan aviat com* ‘as soon as’; Old Fr. *por ice car* ‘because’, Medieval Occ. *per so car*, *per tal car* ‘because’ (29) and Cat. *per ço car* ‘because’; Medieval Occ. *tan can* ‘as long as’ (Jensen 1992, 480):

- (Medieval Occitan)
- (29) *per so car gen m’acolhitz, vos serai francs*
 “because you are giving me a fine reception, I shall be forthright with you” (G. de Bornelh 56.46, Jensen 1992, 483, my translation)

- (Portuguese)
- (30) *Não se admite de forma nenhuma a libertação de negros e mulatos visto como eles poderiam aspirar a concorrer no comércio, nas letras e na política.*
 ‘The liberation of black and multi-ethnic persons is not admitted in any form, because (lit. *seen how*) they could aspire to compete in commerce, literature and politics’ (José do Patrocínio, *A Campanha Abolicionista*, 19th c., Corpus do Português)

Finally, another phenomenon distinguishing French *que* from other Romance complementizers is the so-called “double mood selection”, i.e. the possibility of using the indicative or the subjunctive in the subordinate clause. The choice of mood, which is restricted grammatically in Modern French (**je crois qu’il soit* ‘I think that he be’), is possible and semantically relevant in e.g. It. *credo/penso/spero che è/(che) sia* ‘I believe/think/hope that they are/(that) they be’, as well as in other Romance languages (e.g. 31-32):

- (Portuguese)
- (31) *Após a indisponibilidade manifestada por Fernando Gomes, acho que é a melhor solução.*
 ‘With Fernando Gomes saying he is not available, I think this is the best solution’
 (*Público*, 20th c., Corpus do Português)
- (32) *Mas eu, no meu ver, acho que seja pouco.*

⁸ In some contexts, as in (30), the construction can be analyzed either as a conjunction or as a free syntactic sequence, with the literal meaning “seen how”.

‘But me, as I see it, I think it is (lit. *it be*) too little’ (Spoken Portuguese, 20th c., Corpus do Português)

In some cases, these highly grammaticalized conjunctions are used as adverbial conjunctions, e.g. Oc. *car*, Pt. *como*, Sp. *quando* or It. *che* introducing a causal clause:

(Portuguese)

- (33) **Como** *toda a meninada resolveu ir fazer a escolinha, eu fui também, mas nunca tinha pensado no basquete como profissão*
‘Since all the kids decided to go to that school, I also went there, but I’d never thought I would end up as a professional player’ (Corpus do Português, my translation)

Alongside these highly grammaticalized items, paradigms of subordinating conjunctions in Romance include a host of sequences with a complementizer. Indeed, the most frequent pattern found in paradigms of Romance subordinating conjunctions is [LEXICAL COMPONENT + COMP], in which the COMP form is generally *que* < *quod*, in Romanian *că* (< *quod* / *quia*, cf. Herman 1963, 165ss.), in Sardinian *chi* (< *qui*). The lexical component may be, among other things, a noun, a participle, an adjective, or an adverb. Most elements of the paradigm thus follow the pattern [ADV COMP] (34), [PTCP COMP], or [P N COMP], as illustrated by the (non-exhaustive) list in Table 3:

(Spanish)

- (34) *Lo haré, ya que me obligáis.*
‘I will do it, since you force me’ (Fernán Caballero, *La gaviota*, 1836, Corpus del Español)

Other items include variations on these patterns, e.g. [P DET N COMP] (35), [P COMP], as well as more restricted patterns, e.g. [NP COMP] (36), among others (37):

(Portuguese)

- (35) **ao passo que** *o tempo vai aquecendo vou eu também melhorando do achaque do estômago.*
‘as the weather gets warmer, I too find myself recovering from my stomach trouble’ (Padre António Vieira, *Cartas*, 1626-1692; Corpus do Português)

(Italian)

- (36) *Io posso bene ometterla in questo momento, una volta che intendo mostrarvi, tra l’altro, come i rimanenti fatti sociali presuppongono quello economico*
‘I can omit it now, given that (lit. *one time* + COMP) I intend to show you, among other things, how the remaining social factors presuppose the economic one’ (Alfonso Asturaro, *Il materialismo storico e la sociologia generale: prelezione al corso di sociologia generale dell’anno 1902-1903 nell’Università di Genova*, 1903, Corpus MIDIA)

(Genovese)

- (37) *t’accapiscio, scibben che no son convinto*
‘I understand you, though I’m not convinced’ (Toso 1997, 241)

main patterns	adverb + COMP	Pt. <i>já que</i> ‘given that’, Occ. <i>dempuèi que</i> ‘after’, Fr. <i>avant que</i> ‘before’, Rom. <i>înainte să</i> ‘before’ ⁹
	participle + COMP	Pt. <i>visto que</i> ‘given that’, It. <i>dato che</i> ‘given that’, Sp. <i>supuesto que</i> ‘assuming that, given that’, Cat. <i>atès que</i> ‘given that, seen that’, Occ. <i>essent que</i> ‘being that, given that, since’, Rom. <i>dat fiind că</i> ‘given that (lit. <i>given AUX COMP</i>)’
	P + N + COMP	Fr. (non-standard) <i>à cause que</i> ‘because’, Pt. (non-standard) <i>por causa que</i> ‘because’, Occ. <i>pèr causo que, a fauta que</i> , ‘because’, Rom. <i>în loc să</i> ‘instead of’
other patterns	P (DET) N COMP	Pt. <i>ao passo que</i> ‘as’, Fr. (<i>au fur et</i>) <i>à mesure que</i> ‘as’
	P COMP	Pt. <i>desde que</i> ‘since’, Cat. <i>amb que</i> ‘provided’
	NP COMP	Pt. <i>uma vez que</i> ‘since, given that (lit. <i>a time that</i>)’, It. <i>una volta che</i> ‘since, given that (lit. <i>a time that</i>)’, Rom. <i>o dată ce</i> ‘since, given that (lit. <i>a time that</i>)’
	other	Sp. <i>a pesar de que</i> ‘though’ (on <i>pesar</i> ‘sorrow, regret’ from the verb <i>pesar</i> ‘to weigh’, with figurative uses), Cat. <i>tot i que</i> ‘though’ (lit. ‘all and COMP’), Genovese <i>scibben (che)</i> ‘though, however’ (lit. ‘so.well (COMP)’), It. <i>siccome</i> ‘since’ (lit. ‘so.COMP’)

Table 3: Examples of complex subordinating conjunctions in Modern Romance

In some cases, subordinating conjunctions arise without a complementizer, as a result of a grammaticalization process. These are sometimes specific to some varieties, as in Pt. *mal* ‘as soon as’, Occ. *dóumaci* ‘thanks to, because’, *si tot* ‘even though’, It. *qualora* (< (*nella*) *quale ora* ‘at which hour’) ‘in case’.

A number of complex conjunctions have undergone a process of grammaticalization, resulting in various degrees of simplification; others have not. As a result, there are important disparities across paradigms in terms of formal complexity: as indicated in Section 2.2.3, all paradigms are composed of a large set of non-grammaticalized items with low frequency, free sequences and (ever) smaller sets of (ever) more grammaticalized items with (ever) higher frequency.

4 Dynamics of language change – the case of conjunctions

4.1 Innovation and conservation

The similarity across paradigms in terms of their distribution (a few very frequent items, many items with a low(er) frequency) also holds from a diachronic perspective: the general structure of the category is stable from Latin to Modern Romance. We find, in all periods, a limited number of highly grammaticalized items – simple coordinating conjunctions and complementizers, respectively – and a long list of complex markers of coordination or subordination. The renewal process of these paradigms has now extended over a period of 2,000 years (Koch 2002, 51), with progressive differentiation (see Section 4.3), loss of part of the original Latin paradigm, multiple reinforcements and creation of new items as a result of grammaticalization phenomena.

Among the forces driving this renewal, one important phenomenon is *semantic reinforcement* (Fagard 2009): the more grammaticalized items of the paradigm gradually extend to new

⁹ Note that Rom. *să* ‘to’ (highly polysemic) is generally not considered a conjunction in a synchronic perspective.

contexts and lose semantic weight; they come to be used in combination with lexical items which contribute their own meaning to the resulting construction. For subordinating conjunctions, correlative constructions are one of the early forms of these reinforcements, with the emergence of Latin sequences such as *eo quod, per eo quod*, for which Modern Romance offers parallel sequences such as It. *per questo... perché*, Sp. *por eso... porque* ‘for that (reason)... because’, which are quite frequent in Spoken corpora (Fagard 2011).

4.2 Written vs spoken

This brings us to the fact that one of the causes of this evolution from Latin to Modern Romance may have been sociolinguistic rather than purely linguistic; one important element in this evolution is linked to changes in discourse traditions (Koch 1997). As has been pointed out by many authors (e.g. Meillet 1921; Haiman/Thompson 1988, xii; Chafe 1984; Kortmann 2012, 46), *conjunctions* appear to be a fixture of written language, as spoken language tends to yield juxtaposed sentences, which display no formal links, while in high registers and literature one can observe efforts to make explicit the links between sentences. According to Väänänen (2008, 268), this could explain the fact that the paradigm of subordinating conjunctions is much more elaborate in Latin prose than in the common language, as attested e.g. in inscriptions:

- (38) *Bene labes oze [= hodie], a[ssem] des;*
 well bathe.SUB.PRS.2SG today penny.ACC.SG give.SUB.PRS.2SG
cras gratis
 tomorrow free
 ‘today take a bathe and enjoy, pay a penny, tomorrow it’s free’ (CIL 8244 (thermal baths, Mauritania), Väänänen 2008, 269)

Medieval Romance seems to have retained some proximity to such syntactic behaviors, with e.g. some freedom of placement of conjuncted members (39) and omission of the conjunction (40):

- (Medieval Italian)
 (39) *vidi che povero mi pareo lo*
 see.IND.PST.1SG COMP poor.M.SG PRO.1SG.DAT seem.IND.PST.3SG DET.M.SG
servigio e nudo
 service.M.SG and naked.M.SG
 ‘I saw that it seemed to be a *poor* and bare service’ (Dante, *Vita nuova*, cap. 33, par. 1, Salvi 2016, 87, my gloss, translation Franke 2021)

- (Medieval French)
 (40) *quant il ot faite sa proiere et ø il s’an revenoit arriere, si li vient uns moignes molt vialz a l’encontre*
 ‘when he had said his prayer, and [when] he was coming back from there, a very old monk came toward him’ (Chrétien de Troyes, *Le roman de la charrete*, 12th c., v. 1845, example from Jensen 1992, 494, my translation)

Medieval Romance languages may have completive and consecutive clauses with no subordinating conjunction at all (41) or, conversely, with a repeated complementizer (42) (for Italian, see Salvi 2016, 84):

(Medieval French)

(41) *Ço sent Rollant de sun tens*
DEM.M.SG feel.IND.PRS.3SG Roland of POSS.M.3SG time

n' i ad plus
NEG PRO.ADV have.IND.PRS.3SG more

‘Roland feels he has no time left’ (*Chanson de Roland*, 11th c., v. 2366, Moignet 1973, 339, gloss and translation mine)

(42) *Or dist li contes que, quand messires Gauvain se fu partiz de ses compaignons, qu’il chevaucha mainte jornee*

‘Now the tale says that, when lord Gauvain left his companions, [that] he rode for many a day’

(*Queste del Saint Graal*, 13th c., 147,1, example from Moignet 1973, 339, my translation)

4.3 Gradual differentiation

There are different forces at play in the paradigm renewal. On the one hand, Romance languages have kept similar paradigms as a result of panromance conservatisms (e.g. Latin *quando* ‘when’), of the ‘natural’ evolution of this common ancestor, with in some cases similar innovations (e.g. *quo modo* > *quomodo* > Fr. *comme*, It. *come*, Sp./Pt. *como*, Rom. *cum* ‘how’, with comparative, then temporal and causal meanings), but also as a result of later waves of relatinization (see e.g. Dworkin 2010, 175-176), as well as borrowings among Romance languages, with well-known influence of first Occitan, later French, Italian and Spanish on other Romance varieties, at various periods, sometimes also through the prism of Medieval Latin (see e.g. Hope 1971). On the other hand, there has also been wide-spread differentiation as a result of isolated evolution, of isolated conservatism, and of language contact and borrowing from non-Romance languages, e.g. Romansh *ábar* ‘but’ from German *aber* ‘but’ (Maurer-Cecchini 2021, 8, 237) or Classical Romanian *i* ‘and’ from Slavonic *i* ‘and’, in translations from Slavic. The panromance loss of some conjunctions, among which the most grammaticalized items (*ut*, *cum* for subordinating conjunctions; *-que*, *-ve* for coordinating conjunctions), has favored differentiation. Thus, the correlative conjunction *cum... tum* disappeared everywhere (Orlandini/Pocchetti 2014, 272) and led to different replacements (see Section 3.2).

One important example of differentiation is linked to the common loss of Latin *ut* and *cum* (on account of ‘phonetic weakness’ and polysemy, according to Tekavčić 1972, 635; for *cum*, because of the collision with preposition *cum* ‘with’, but also with *quod* and *quomodo*, according to Togeby 1980, 134): whereas they have been replaced with *quod* then *quid* then *que* (from the relative pronoun, Herman 1963, 143) in most Romance varieties, in the “conservative South-East” (Togeby 1980, 134) *quod* remained as *cu* (Southern Italian dialects, Sardinian, alongside *quod* > *ca*) or *că* (Romanian, alongside *sî* > *să*). This subsystem with two conjunctions may be linked to the Greek adstratum (Rm. *că* + IND, *să* + SUB) or substratum (Terra d’Otranto *ca* + IND, *cu* + SUB, Rohlf’s 1949-1954, §788; Togeby 1980, 134). Romanian stands aside for its isolated conservatisms and innovations, such as the loss of Latin *sî* ‘if’ (which became a complementizer in Romanian, *să* ‘that’) and *et* ‘and’, replaced respectively with *dacă* and *și*.

That Romance varieties have different sources – and different degrees of grammaticalization – for their main complementizer has had a widespread impact, given that this complementizer typically appears in all complex subordinating and even some coordinating conjunctions (compare for instance Catalan *tant... com* ‘as well as’ with French *aussi bien... que* ‘as well as’).

5 Conclusion

From Latin to Modern Romance, there have been important changes in the paradigms of coordinating and subordinating conjunctions, with the loss of many items in the original Latin paradigms, and a steady flow of new items and constructions, some of which have contributed to the differentiation of Romance varieties.

The renewal is important in both paradigms, and overall rather uniform across Romance languages, with several pan-Romance features. However, Romanian and French (in some varieties) stand apart, using a new form as their main copulative conjunction, i.e. neither the original enclitic *-que* ‘and’, which left no trace in Romance, nor the more recent *et* ‘also, and’, which has had a continuation in all Romance languages. Other pan-Romance features of conjunctions include losses (e.g. of Latin *ut* ‘that’) and conservatisms (e.g. of Latin *nec* ‘and not’), while separate innovations and grammaticalization phenomena account for the growing differentiation across languages. French and Romanian also stand out – in different ways – in the absence of double mood selection (for French), and the presence of two complementizers (for Romanian).

Among these changes, some stand out for their typological relevance. One is the loss of clitic coordinating conjunctions, which were present in Latin and are typologically rare. Another is the fact that Romance languages not only have large paradigms of coordinating and subordinating conjunctions, but have gradually expanded their original paradigms by adding layers of lexical items on top of the original conjunctions, and now “overwhelmingly use phrasal expressions” (Kortmann 2012, 130). These two features are illustrative of the global trend toward analyticity that characterizes the evolution from Latin to Romance.

6 References

- Auger, Julie/Wycoff, Jake (2015), *How many ands in Picard?*, in: Eivind Torgersen et al. (edd.), *Language Variation – European Perspectives V: Selected papers from the Seventh International Conference on Language Variation in Europe (ICLaVE 7), Trondheim, June 2013*, Amsterdam, Benjamins, 17–30.
- Avram, Mioara (1960), *Evoluția subordonării circumstanțiale cu elemente conjuncționale în limba română*, București, Editura Academiei.
- Baños, José Miguel (2010), *Del latín clásico al latín tardío: eo quod, pro eo quod y la renovación de las conjunciones causales*, in: Maria Angeles Almela Lumbreras et al. (edd.), *Perfiles de Grecia y Roma: actas del XII Congreso Español de Estudios Clásicos*. Valencia, Sociedad Española de Estudios Clásicos, 269–277.
- Bolkestein, Machtelt A. (1996), *Is qui / et is? On the so-called free relative connection in Latin*, in: Hannah Rosén (ed.), *Aspects of Latin*, Innsbruck, Institut für Sprachwissenschaft, 533–566.
- Chafe, Wallace (1984), *How people use adverbial clauses*, *Proceedings of the Annual Meeting of the Berkeley Linguistics Society* 10, 437–449.
- Ciorănescu, Alexandru (2001), *Dicționarul etimologic al limbii române*, București, Saeculum.
- Combettes, Bernard (2018), *La subordination dans la Chronique de Frédégaire: les propositions non régies*, in: Anne Carlier/Céline Guillot-Barbance (edd.), *Latin Tardif, Français Ancien: Continuités et Ruptures*, Berlin, De Gruyter, 373–412.
- Company Company, Concepción (2002), *Grammaticalization and category weakness*, in: Ilse Wischer/Gabriele Diewald (edd.), *New Reflections on Grammaticalization*, Amsterdam, Benjamins, 201–215.

- Coseriu, Eugenio (1968), *Coordinación latina y coordinación románica*, in: *Actas del III Congreso español de estudios clásicos*, Madrid, Sociedad Española de Estudios Clásicos, vol. 3, 35–57.
- Cristofaro, Sonia (2003), *Subordination*, Oxford, Oxford University Press.
- Croft, William (1990), *A conceptual framework for grammatical categories (or: a taxonomy of Propositional Acts)*, *Journal of Semantics* 7, 245–279.
- D’Achille, Paolo/Grossmann, Maria (edd.) (2017), *Per la storia della formazione delle parole in italiano: un nuovo corpus in rete (MIDIA) e nuove prospettive di studio*, Firenze, Cesati.
- Dardano, Maurizio/Trifone, Pietro (1995), *Grammatica italiana, con nozioni di linguistica*, Bologna, Zanichelli.
- Dardel, Robert de (1978), *Les propositions optatives romanes introduites par si et par se*, *Neophilologus* 62, 39–50.
- Dardel, Robert de (1983), *Esquisse structurale des subordonnants conjonctionnels en roman commun*, Genève, Droz.
- Davies, Mark (2002), *Corpus del Español*, online (<https://www.corpusdelespanol.org/hist-gen/>).
- Davies, Mark/Ferreira, Michael (2006), *Corpus do Português*, online (<https://www.corpusdportugues.org/>).
- Dik, Simon C. (1968), *Coordination: Its Implications for the Theory of General Linguistics*, Amsterdam, North-Holland.
- Dostie, Gaétane (2004), *Considérations sur la forme et le sens. Pis en français québécois. Une simple variante de puis ? Un simple remplaçant de et ?*, *French Language Studies* 14, 113–128.
- Dworkin, Steven N. (2010), *Thoughts on the re-latinization of the Spanish lexicon*, *Romance Philology* 64, 173–183.
- Etxepare, Ricardo (2012), *Coordination and subordination*, in: José Ignacio Hualde/Antxon Olarrea/Erin O’Rourke (edd.), *The Handbook of Hispanic Linguistics*, London, Blackwell, 503–531.
- Fabricius-Hansen, Cathrine/Ramm, Wiebke (edd.) (2008), *Subordination versus Coordination in Sentence and Text: A Cross-linguistic Perspective*, Amsterdam, Benjamins.
- Fagard, Benjamin (2009), *Grammaticalisation et renouvellement : conjonctions de cause dans les langues romanes*, *Revue Roumaine de Linguistique* 54, 21–43.
- Fagard, Benjamin (2011), *Conjonctions et grammaticalisation : le cas des langues romanes*, *Mémoires de la Société de Linguistique de Paris* 19, 79–102.
- Fagard, Benjamin/Pietrandrea, Paola/Glikman, Julie (2016), *Syntactic and semantic aspects of Romance complementizers*, in: Kasper Boye/Petar Kehayov (edd.), *Complementizers in European Languages*, Berlin, De Gruyter, 75–130.
- Foley, William A./van Valin, Robert D. Jr. (1984), *Functional Syntax and Universal Grammar*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press.
- Francese, Christopher (2020), *Core Latin and Ancient Greek Vocabularies*, Carlisle, Dickinson College Commentaries.
- Franke, William (2021), *Dante’s Vita Nuova and the New Testament: Hermeneutics and the Poetics of Revelation*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press.
- Freixeiro Mato, Xosé Ramón (2000), *Gramática da lingua galega. II. Morfosintaxe*, Vigo, A Nosa Terra.
- Gougenheim, Georges (1969), *Grammaire de la langue française du seizième siècle*, Paris, Picard.
- Haiman, John (1985), *Natural Syntax. Iconicity and Erosion*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press.
- Haiman, John/Thompson, Sandra A. (edd.) (1988), *Clause Combining in Grammar and Discourse*, Amsterdam, Benjamins.
- Hansen, Maj-Britt Mosegaard (2021), *Cyclic changes to the negative coordinating conjunction from Latin to Modern French*, *Folia Linguistica Historica* 42, 223–254.

- Haspelmath, Martin (2004), *Coordinating constructions: An overview*, in: Martin Haspelmath (ed.), *Coordinating Constructions*, Amsterdam, Benjamins, 3–39.
- Herman, Joseph (1963), *La formation du système roman des conjonctions de subordination*, Berlin, Akademie Verlag.
- Hill, Virginia/Mardale, Alexandru (2021), *The Diachrony of Differential Object Marking in Romanian*, Oxford, Oxford University Press.
- Hope, Thomas E. (1971), *Lexical Borrowing in the Romance Languages*, Oxford, Blackwell.
- Hopper, Paul/Traugott, Elizabeth C. (2003), *Grammaticalization*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press.
- Jeanjaquet, Jules (1894), *Recherches sur l'origine de la conjonction que et des formes romanes équivalentes*, Paris/Neuchâtel, Welter.
- Jensen, Frede (1992), *Old French and Comparative Gallo-Romance Syntax*, Tübingen, Niemeyer.
- Kilgarriff, Adam et al. (2014), *The Sketch Engine: ten years on*, *Lexicography* 1, 7–36.
- Koch, Peter (1995), *Subordination, intégration syntaxique et 'oralité'*, *Études romanes* 34, 13–42.
- Koch, Peter (2002), *Das Französische in typologischer und historisch-vergleichender Sicht*, in: Ingo Kolboom/Thomas Kotschi/Edward Reichel (edd.), *Handbuch Französisch*, Berlin, Schmidt, 36–58.
- König, Ekkehard/van der Auwera, Johan (1990), *Adverbial participles, gerunds and absolute constructions in the languages of Europe*, in: Johannes Bechert/Giuliano Bernini/Claude Buridant (edd.), *Toward a Typology of European Languages*, Berlin, De Gruyter, 337–356.
- Kortmann, Bernd (2012), *Adverbial Subordination*, Berlin, De Gruyter.
- Kroon, Caroline (1994), *Discourse connectives and discourse type: the case of Latin at*, in: József Herman (ed.), *Linguistic Studies on Latin*, Amsterdam, Benjamins, 303–318.
- Lehmann, Christian (1995), *Thoughts on Grammaticalization*, Munich, LINCOM Europa.
- Lin, Yuri et al. (2012), *Syntactic Annotations for the Google Books Ngram Corpus*, in: Min Zhang (ed.), *Proceedings of the ACL 2012 System Demonstrations*, Jeju, Republic of Korea, Association for Computational Linguistics, 169–174, <https://aclanthology.org/P12-3.pdf>.
- Mallory, James P./Adams, Douglas Q. (2006), *The Oxford Introduction to Proto-Indo-European and the Proto-Indo-European World*, Oxford, Oxford University Press.
- Maurer-Cecchini, Philippe (2021), *A Grammar of Tuatschin: A Sursilvan Romansh Dialect*, Berlin, Language Science Press.
- Meillet, Antoine (1921), *Le renouvellement des conjonctions*, in: Id., *Linguistique historique et linguistique générale*, Paris, Champion, 159–175.
- Móia, Telmo (2016), *Semântica e pragmática*, in: Ana Maria Martins/Ernestina Carrilho (edd.), *Manual de linguística portuguesa*, Berlin, De Gruyter, 270–297.
- Moignet, Gérard (1973), *Grammaire de l'ancien français*, Paris, Klincksieck.
- Musso, Giancarlo (2004), *Gramática astésan-a*, Torino, Gioventura Piemontèisa.
- Orlandini, Anna/Pocetti, Paolo (2014), *Polyfunctionality and transcategoriality of coordinating particles in Latin and in other ancient languages*, *Journal of Latin Linguistics* 13, 267–278.
- Pană Dindelegan, Gabriela et al. (2010), *Gramatica de bază a limbii române*, București, Editura Univers Enciclopedic Gold.
- Pompei, Anna (2011), *Relative clauses*, in: Philip Baldi/Pierluigi Cuzzolin (edd.), *New Perspectives on Historical Latin Syntax*, Berlin, De Gruyter, 427–547.
- Raible, Wolfgang (1992), *Junktion. Eine Dimension der Sprache und ihre Realisierungsformen zwischen Aggregation und Integration*, Heidelberg, Winter.
- Rohlf, Gerhard (1949-1954), *Historische Grammatik der Italienischen Sprache und ihrer Mundarten*, Bern, Francke.
- Sala, Marius (2005), *From Latin to Romanian: The Historical Development of Romanian in a Comparative Romance Context*, Oxford, MS, University of Mississippi.

- Salvi, Giampaolo (2016), *Sintassi dell'italiano antico*, in: Sergio Lubello (ed.), *Manuale di linguistica italiana*, Berlin, De Gruyter, 62–89.
- Sánchez López, Cristina (2017), *Coordination and correlatives*, in: Andreas Dufter/Elisabeth Stark (edd.), *Manual of Romance Morphosyntax and Syntax*, Berlin, De Gruyter, 647–690.
- Sausy, Lucien (2010), *Grammaire latine complète*, Paris, Eyrolles.
- Serra, Enric/Prunyonosa, Manuel (2002), *La coordinació*, in: Joan Solà Cortassa et al. (edd.), *Gramàtica del català contemporani*, Barcelona, Empúries, 2181–2245.
- Soutet, Olivier (2008), *Des concessives extensionnelles aux concessives simples*, *Linx* 59, 115–132.
- Stassen, Leon (2000), *AND-languages and WITH-languages*, *Linguistic Typology* 4, 1–54.
- Tekavčić, Pavao (1972), *Grammatica storica dell'italiano*, vol. II: *Morfosintassi*, Bologna, Il Mulino.
- Togoby, Knud (1980), *Romance historical morphology*, in: Rebecca Posner/John N. Green (edd.), *Romance Comparative and Historical Linguistics*, Berlin, De Gruyter, 105–155.
- Toso, Fiorenzo (1997), *Grammatica del genovese*, Genova, Le Mani.
- Väänänen, Veikko (2008), *Introduction au latin vulgaire*, Paris, Klincksieck.
- Van Dijk, Teun A. (1979), *Pragmatic connectives*, *Journal of pragmatics* 3, 447–456.
- Vernet, Florian (2000), *Dictionnaire grammatical de l'occitan moderne selon les parlers languedociens*, Montpellier, Université de Montpellier.
- Wartburg, Walther von (1922-2002), *Französisches etymologisches Wörterbuch*, 25 vols., Bonn/Heidelberg/Leipzig/Berlin/Basel, Klopp/Winter/Teubner/Zbinden.
- Zafiu, Rodica (2009), *L'évolution des connecteurs adversatifs du roumain en perspective romane*, in: Maria Iliescu/Paul Danler/Heidi Siller (edd.), *XXVe CILPR Congrès International de Linguistique et de Philologie Romanes*, Innsbruck, De Gruyter, 603-612.
- Zipf, George K. (1949), *Human Behavior and the Principle of Least Effort: An Introduction to Human Ecology*, Cambridge, MA, Addison-Wesley.

Corpora

- BFM corpus: Base de Français Médiéval, online (<https://txm-bfm.huma-num.fr/txm/>).
- Frantext corpus: online (<https://www.frantext.fr/>).
- CFPP2000 corpus: Corpus de Français Parlé Parisien, online (<http://cfpp2000.univ-paris3.fr/index.html>).
- Corpus del Español: online (<https://www.corpusdelespanol.org/hist-gen/>).
- Corpus do Português: online (<https://www.corpusdoportugues.org/>).
- MIDIA, Morfologia dell'italiano in diacronia, online (www.corpusmidia.unito.it).
- Romanian diachronic corpus: Hill/Mardale (2021) 16th-18th c.
- Late Latin corpus: PaLaFra Corpus (5th-10th c.; <https://palafra.github.io/en/index.html>)
- Google Books: online (<https://books.google.com/>)
- frTenTen corpus, ItTenTen corpus, esTenTen, ptTenTen, RoWaC: Sketch Engine, online (<http://www.sketchengine.co.uk>).