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The evolution of Lat. et ‘and’ and sic ‘so, in this way, thus’ in French and Romanian provides interesting evidence for the way in which a conventional implicature can account for both synchronic and diachronic relations between various functions of the same linguistic unit or between different entities. Lat. sic developed into a discourse and pragmatic marker in both French (si) and Romanian (ºi). Lat. et had a different development. In Old Romanian e was mainly a marker of discourse continuity but later on was lost while two other conjunctions ( and iar) served to fulfill the functions of its Latin etymon. In French, et preserved its function as a copulative conjunction but si(c) lost its function of a coherence marker and narrowed its domain specializing as a pragmatic marker of denying a negative expectation.

0. A few terminological preliminaries

According to current approaches, the linguistic entities that signal the speaker's potential communicative intentions and are separate and distinct from the propositional content of the sentence are known under a variety of labels such as: pragmatic connectives (van Dijk 1979), pragmatic markers (Fraser 1996), discourse connectives, particles (Roulet et al. 1991, Moeschler 1996, Hansen 1998, Rossari, 2000), discourse words (Ducrot et al.1980), discourse markers (Schiffrin 1987, Fraser 1990, 1996), phatic connectives (Bazzanella 1990; Lafford 1995), back-channels or regulators (Yngve 1970, Duncan and Fiske 1977, Maingueneau 1996), to mention only a few of them.

The results of these analyses dealing with markers in a variety of languages including English and Romance make possible a reevaluation of these models. In our opinion, such utterances that do not contribute to the propositional content can be roughly reclassified into the following three main categories: (i) pragmatic, (ii) discourse, and (iii) conversation markers.

0.1. Pragmatic markers

If one accepts the definition of pragmatics as the discipline dealing with the relation between speakers and language, the concept of pragmatic marker should have a more limited extension. It would then be properly attributed only to those markers that carry information about the relation between speakers and their messages, signal the speaker's attitude toward the propositional content (e.g. markers of the illocutionary force, modal expressions, hedging devices, etc.).

According to Fraser (1996:168), pragmatic markers are linguistically encoded clues that signal the speaker's potential communicative intentions. They are separate and distinct from the propositional content of the sentence. Fraser distinguishes four types of pragmatic markers:
a) **Basic markers**, which signal more or less specifically the illocutionary force of the basic message: sentence mood and lexical expressions with similar values (see, for example, *je regrette* 'I regret' in (1)):

(1) Fr. *Je regrette* qu’il soit toujours là  
‘I regret that he is still here.’

As Ducrot et al. (1980) pointed out, adversative conjunctions such as the sentence-medial *mais* that coordinates clauses (P *mais* Q), are used by the speaker in order to deny an expected entailment of the structure ‘if P then Q’ (as in (1)). In brief, they are signaling a denial.

(2) *je n’aime pas la plage mais j’adore la mer*  
‘I don’t like the beach but I love the

The denied entailment in (2) could be stated as “if one doesn't like the beach then one can not go to the sea-shore”.

b) **Commentary messages**, which provide a comment on the basic message: e.g. Fr.*à vrai dire*, Engl. *stupidly*, *frankly*, etc:

(3) Engl. *Stupidly*, Sara didn’t fax the correct form in on time.  
    *Frankly*, we should be there by now.  
Fr. *À vrai dire*, on ne devrait pas être là.

c) **Parallel messages**, which are separated from the basic and any commentary messages: e.g. Fr.*Mon Dieu*, Jean (as a vocative), Engl. *In God’s name*, for God’s sake, John, etc.

(4) Fr. *Mon Dieu*, qu’est-ce que tu fais là?  
    Engl. *In God’s name*, what are you doing now?  
Fr. *Jean*, tu fais trop de bruit!  
    Engl. *John*, you are very noisy!

0.2. Discourse markers

The concept of *discourse marker* seems more appropriate for referring to the means of text-coherence; in other words, to the markers that specify how the basic message is related to foregoing discourse: e.g. Fr. *à propos*, *maintenant*, *alors*, *disons*; Engl. *incidentally*, *now*, *finally*, etc.

(5) Engl. *Martha’s party is tomorrow. Incidentally*, when is your party?  
‘Once again, the preacher made a break; his voice rose now more slowly and veiled in gravity’.
Jouve (1992: 361) considers that “maintenant désigne le moment que le récit se donne comme nouveau point de départ, celui qui, par rapport à un continuum, s’est détaché comme un événement. Ce qui explique l’emploi de maintenant avec un verbe au passé simple” ‘maintenant (now) designates the moment that the discourse takes as a new point of departure, the one which, in relation to a continuum, is foregrounded as an event. Which explains the use of maintenant with a verb in the simple past’.

0.3. Conversation markers.

Although they may have similar functions as the pragmatic or discourse markers, conversation markers represent a rather distinct category because they are signals of talk-interaction. As such, they have quite different expressions than the discourse and pragmatic markers (for example, compare the means of topic switch in conversation and narration).

For Deborah Schiffrin (1987) the utterances that signal the participants’ collaborative effort in talk interaction are also discourse markers. These markers belong to the means signaling the relation between the participants in the conversation, in brief they are signals of the participation framework. According to Schiffrin (1987:27), “the participation framework” concerns the following aspects of conversation:

(a) the different ways in which speaker and hearer can relate to one another,
(b) the ways in which speakers and hearers can be related to their utterances; and
(c) they way in which speakers are related to their turns: they may claim them, fight for them, relinquish them.

As will be shown below, the conversation markers have to be further subcategorized on the basis of the following functions:

(a) negotiating the turn:
   (i) to signal that the speaker does not wish to take the turn (“back

According to Yngve (1970: 568), back channels are those utterances that occur when the person who “has the turn receives short messages such as ‘yes’ and ‘uh-huh’ without relinquishing his turn”. Yngve also identifies longer utterances such as requests for clarification as back channels. These utterances are very important in the monitoring of the quality of communication because they tell the speaker that the listener is being attentive (Yngve 1970: 568); see, for example, (7).

(7) Engl. yes … uh-huh
    Fr. Et puis “and then”?
    Rom. ? “and?” …

Duncan and Fiske include in the category of back channels completions by the hearer of a sentence started by the speaker, requests for clarification, brief restatements of the immediately preceding thought completed by the speaker
and non-verbal gestures such as nods and shakes of the head (Duncan and Fiske 1977: 202).

(ii) to signal that the speaker does not intend to relinquish the turn:

(8) Engl. Let me finish
Rom. N‘ am terminat!
Not have.I finished!
‘I haven’t finished’

(b) controlling the addressee’s attention:

(9) Engl. Do you follow? Are you listening?
Fr. Écoute! ‘Listen!’

(c) controlling the addressee’s understanding:

(10) Engl. Do you understand?
Fr. Compris?
Rom. ?
Me:ACC understand.you?
‘Do you understand?’

(d) accepting the speaker’s topic (e.g. left dislocated topics – see (11)) or rejecting it (see (12)):

(11) Fr. Juju escalada le talus et gagna les voies. Les voies, ça avait été son jardin d’enfant et sa promenade de poivrot. Il les aimait encore, les voies (RFC208 in Ball 2000:141)
‘Juju jumped over the slope and reached the roads. The[se] roads, that had been his childhood garden and the path where he walked as a drunkard. He still loved them, these roads.’

(12) Fr. Parlons d’autre chose!
Engl. Let’s talk about something else; let’s change the subject!

(e) their role in confirming the speaker’s hypothesis about the addressee’s background knowledge. Jucker and Smith (1966, 1998) emphasize the importance of shared knowledge in talk-interaction by focusing on the role played by the discourse markers that are used to refer to those assumptions which are entertained by both partners in a conversation and which they assume to be shared (1966:2). In their opinion, tag-questions are a special kind of discourse marker that “help to convey assumptions about the speaker’s beliefs concerning the hearer’s knowledge and beliefs, and they offer the hearer the opportunity to confirm or deny those assumptions” (1966:9).

(13) Engl. She got married last year, didn’t she?
Fr. Elle s’est mariée l’an dernier, ?
Rom. S’a măritat anul trecut, ?
Lafford (1995) talks about the “phatic function” of back channels that play the role of “acknowledgment markers”. Jucker and Smith (1998) subcategorize the markers ensuring the talk interaction into: (a) “reception markers” (which correspond in fact to the back channels, or acknowledgment markers) and (b) “presentation markers”.

(14) Really? is that so? Aiurea! ‘You don’t say!’ (lit. somewhere else).

As Ducrot et al. (1980) emphasize, when in sentence-initial position, 
mais can introduce a counter-argument to the previous enunciator’s assertion:

(15) A: Je n’aime pas la clientèle ici.
    B: Mais la pizza est bonne
    A: ‘I don’t like the customers around here’
    B: ‘But the[ir] pizza is good’.

A implies that he does not like the restaurant in question but B provides an argument aimed at convincing A that the restaurant is not so bad because their pizza is good.

Mais can also introduce an utterance that does not contradict the interlocutor’s verbal statement but is in opposition to a non-verbal element activated by the context

(16) Fr. Mais arrête!
    ‘[But] stop it!’

Utterance (16) can be the verbal reaction of a mother annoyed at her child’s behavior.

As we already emphasized, we shall analyze the evolution of Lat. et ‘and’ and sic ‘so, in this way, thus’ in French and Romanian because it provides interesting evidence for the way in which a conventional implicature can account for both synchronic and diachronic relations between various functions of the same linguistic unit or between different expressions. Consequently, in what follows we shall concentrate only on those functions of Lat. et and sic which account for the Romance developments.
1. Lat. ET versus SIC

1.1.1. The copulative et

As a conjunction, Lat. *et* could connect utterances with either coreferential or non-coreferential subjects. In the first case, *et* can function as a marker of topic-continuity.

(17) *Pueri, plaudite et mihi ob lactum cantharo mulsum date* (Plautus, *Asinaria*, v.906). ‘Slaves, applaud and give me, for this successful deed, a cup of wine with honey’.

In the second case two contextual values may develop:

(i) When the connected terms are logical contraries (expressing opposite referents or events), the copulative conjunction takes a contextual adversative value (see (18)):

(18) Lat. *si tuus servus nullus fuerit et omnes alieni ac mercenarii* (Ciceron, *Caecin*. 58) ‘if there would be no servant of yours but all foreigners and mercenaries’.

In a pragmatic framework, the adversative value is an effet de sens brought in by the conversational implicature that denies and expected entailment of the type “non-*a* and *b*”, asserting “*non-a* and *b*”. This conversational implicature will attract the use of a marker carrying a synonymous conventional implicature denying an expected entailment (see below (48)).

(ii) It could function as a discourse marker connecting utterances that belong to the same narrative unit, with a super-ordinate topic (see (19)).

(19) *Megadorus:*
*Nam meo quidem animo si idem faciant ceteri, Opluentiores pauperiorum filias Vt indotas ducant uxorres domum, Et multo fiat ciuitas concordior, Et inuidia nos minore utamur quam utimur, Et illac malam rem metuant quam metuunt magis, Et nos minore sumpto simus quam sumus.* (Plautus, *Auluaria*, v. 480-486) ‘Megadorus:
Since I think that if everybody else would do as I did,
If the rich people would marry without dowry the poor citizens’ daughters,
Then (lit. And) there would be more agreement in the city,
And we would be less envious,
And they [=our women] would fear more our severity than they do now,
And, as for us, we would have to spend less than we do now.’

In (19) sentence-initial *et* connects sentences belonging to the same narrative unit that provides a sequence of arguments supporting the thought “if everybody else would do as I did, if the rich people would marry without dowry the poor citizens’ daughters “.

The repetition of *et* before two terms expresses the idea that they make a unitary compound, despite a previous negative expectation.⁴

(20) Alcvmena: Equidem ecator uigilo et uigilans id quod factum est fabulor; Nam dudum ante lucem et istunc et te uidi (Plautus, Amphitrvo, 2, 2, 68)
‘Alcumena: I am very much awake and, I swear it, being awake I am telling you what happened. Since, just before the daylight, I saw both (lit. and) this one and you.’

In order to define the difference between the use of a single *et* and the repeated copulative conjunction *et X…et Z* (cf. Engl. ‘both X and Z’) in a formal pragmatic form, compare the following dialogue:

(21) A₁: -- Mary and Ann went to Paris last summer.
B: -- Mary went to Paris but Ann stayed home.
A₂: -- No, you’re wrong! **Both Mary and Ann went to Paris.**

In brief, A₂’s utterance denies B’s belief that only Mary went to Paris:

Utt. B: ∃x (‘Mary’) .V ‘went to Paris’(x). ∃y (‘Ann’) . (~V ‘went to Paris’(y)).
Utt. A₂: ∃x (‘Mary’) .V ‘went to Paris’(x). ∃y (‘Ann’) . ~ (~V ‘went to Paris’(y)).

∃ represents the existential quantifier “there is an x”; V: the predicate; the stop stands for the operation “conjunction”, (‘and’); the negation symbol “~” means

In brief, a repetitive *et a et b*, corresponding to Enlg. *both a and b*, carries a conventional implicature of denial, is a signal denying an expectation of non-addition or non-inclusion within the same superordinate unit.

1.2. SIC as adverb and/or conjunction

It has always been considered that a copulative *sic* ‘thus, so’ could be found already in Latin texts. It is rather interesting that in the same Vulgar Latin text, namely Peregrinatio Aetheriae, *sic* can co-occur with *et* or stand alone for fulfilling the same function. In (22) *sic* follows *et* for the purpose of expressing the equal treatment of both categories (the trainees and the faithful people); or to put it in pragmatic terms, the so called “intensifier” or “reinforcing device” served for the purpose of denying any expectation that both of them received the benediction⁵:
sic must have been co-occurring with et for denying an expectation of non-equality (rather of non-inclusion in the same category). As such sic was in competition with et as a pragmatic marker and, very probably, as a discourse marker of topic continuity (cf. Lat. et… et in (19)), which predicts the functions of its corresponding forms in both Old French and Romanian.

2. ET versus SI in Old French

2.1. Old French ET

In Old French e(t) could have all the functions it fulfills nowadays. Moreover it continued to fulfill several of the functions of its Latin etymon, which later on were lost or became less frequent in contemporary French. For example, it could function as a pragmatic marker by being repeated before each NP or each clause:

(i) Referential inclusion in the same category was mostly expressed by the repetition of et before each term:

(24) Il en apelet e ses dux e ses cuntes (Roland, 15 in Moignet, 1973: 330)

‘He called both his dukes and his counts’.

Utterance (24) denies an expectation that “he called only one category” (for instance, ses ducs “his dukes”) by asserting the fact that he called both his dukes and his counts; otherwise it would have been normal to say:

(24) a Il en apelet ses dux e ses cuntes.

‘He called his dukes and his counts’.

In contemporary French et can also be repeated with a similar value. According to Grevisse (1991:1557),

“Et et ou dans l’usage ordinaire ne se placent que devant le dernier terme de la coordination. […] Ils peuvent cependant se placer, pour l’énergie ou le relief de l’expression, devant chacun des termes, quel que soit leur nombre – ou devant chacun des termes à l’exception du premier, s’il y en a plus de deux.”
‘Usually, *et* and *ou* may occur only before the last term of the coordination. [...] However, for energizing/intensifying or foregrounding the expression, they can occur before each term, no matter how many of them are – or before each term except the first, if there are more than *et* et *ou* sont répétibles”).

In our opinion, what Grevisse defines as “l’énergie ou le relief de l’expression” corresponds to the pragmatically defined function of a *conventional implicature* consisting in the “denial of an expectation”. In this case the “energy of the expression” is the effet de sens of the unexpected addition of an entity (expressed by either a NP or a determiner). In (25) *et* occurs before each term:

(25)  
‘And the old palaces/ And the big porches/ And the white stairs/ […]/ And the bridges, and the streets/ And the gloomy statues/ And the moving bay/ […]/ Everything is silent.’

In (26), *et* does not precede the first term *belle* but only the two other epithets, after full stops:

(26)  
‘The land was beautiful. And rich. And fertile.’

It has to be noted that in Ernout’s French translation (1934: 48) of the Latin example quoted in (20) and reproduced here as (27), the first *et* is omitted. Compare Fr. (28)a and Rom. (28)b:

(27)  
*Alcména:*  
*Equidem ecastor uigilo et uigilans id quod factum est fabulor*  
*Nam dudum ante lucem et istunc et te uidi* (Plautus, *Amphitrio*, 2, 2, 68)  
‘Alcumena: I am very much awake and, I swear it, being awake I am telling you what happened. Since, just before the daylight, I saw both (lit. and) this one and you (together).’

(28) a  
Fr. *Alcmène:*  
*Je suis bien évéillée, sur ma foi; et c’est bien évéillée que je raconte ce qui s’est passé*  
*Car, tout à l’heure, avant le jour, je t’ai vu, et cet autre avec toi.*

In Romanian, both instances of *et* may be translated by the corresponding copulative conjunction  
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(ii) As a discourse marker of topic continuity, *et* could occur in sentence-initial position more often in Old French than nowadays, either preceding *puis* ‘then’ or not for marking discourse continuity (see (29)). In contemporary spoken registers, *puis* ‘after, then’ has become a preferred marker of discourse continuity:

(29) **E Deu l’en rendi gueredon,**
Quant il el ventre del peisson
Le salva e gari de mort
**Et puis le mena a bon port** (Best. 3133, in Schøsler, 2000: 87)
‘And God rewarded him
When he in the belly of the fish
Saved him and protected him from death,
And then brought him to a good harbor.’

It is perhaps interesting to recall that in Ernout’s French translation (1934:175) retort quoted in (19) and repeated here under (30), Lat. *et* is replaced or accompanied by a variety of markers: *d’abord* ‘first of all’, *ensuite* ‘then’ or *et puis* ‘and then’, *et enfin* ‘and finally’.

(30) **Megadorus:** […]
Nam meo quidem animo si idem faciant ceteri,
Opluentiores pauperiorum filias
*Et* indotas *ducant uxor* domum,
**Et multo fiat ciuitas concordior,**
**Et inuidia nos minore utamur quam utimur,**
**Et illac malam rem metuant quam metuunt mafis,**
**Et nos minore sumptu simus quam sumus.** (Plautus, Aulularia, v. 480-486)

(31) **Car m’est avis que si tous les autres faisaient comme moi, si les riches épousaient sans dot les filles des citoyens pauvres,**
*il y aurait bien plus de concorde dans la cité, et puis nous serions moins en butte à l’envie, ensuite nos femmes craindraient nos rigeurs plus qu’elles ne font et enfin nous, nous aurions moins à dépenser qu’à présent.*

In Moignet (1973: 330-331)’s opinion, when Old Fr. *et* occurs in sentence-initial position without any anaphoric function, “Il traduit alors un mouvement affectif, un enchaînement vif” ‘it then translates an affective movement, a lively sequence’. In our opinion, this sentence-initial *et* functions as a well-known colloquial device for connecting turns within a conversational Q(uestion)-A(nswer) pair.

(32) **Dist Oliver:** “Sire cumpainz, ce crei,
De Sarrazins purum bataille aveir."
*Respont Rollant: “E Deus la nus otreit!”* (Roland, )

‘Said Oliver: “Sir comrade, I believe
We may do battle with the Saracens.”
Roland replies: “And God grant it so!”’ (Owen, *Roland*)

In Bedier’s translation (1947) into contemporary French *et* is omitted:

(32) a Olivier dit : “Sire compagnon, il se peut, je crois,
Que nous ayons affaire aux Sarrasins”.
Roland répond : “Ah! que Dieu nous l’octroie!”

(iii) Like its Latin counterpart, *et* could also have a contextual adversative value triggered by a context in which the coordinating sentences express opposite events (cf. Lat. (18)):

(33) Fr. *Mes comme il plus le demandèrent,*  
But as they more him asked
*et meins enapristrent*  (*Artu*, 37.7)  
and less of it learned:they.  
‘But the more they asked him, the less they learned [of it].’

(iv) Contemporary French grammars rarely and only briefly mention the fact that *et* can occur even after a full stop as a signal of text-coherence (Grevisse, 1991: 1566). See, for example, (34).

(34) “C’est une grange…” avait-il répété, dedaignant toute réponse. *Et*  
ils étaient enfin montés dans la voiture (*Malraux, Antimémoires:*  
‘It is a barn…” he had repeated, disdaining any response. And,  
at last, they had got into the car.’

(v) Its discourse function enables *et* to be used even for introducing the main clause after a subordinate clause:

-- hypothetical construction:

(35) *S’en volt ostages, e vos l’en enveiez* (*Roland*, 40)  
‘If he wants hostages, then (lit. and) you sent them to him’

-- main clause after an adverbial clause of location:

(36) *La u Aucassin et Nicolete parloient ensanble, et les escargaites*  
de le ville venoient tote une rue. (*Aucassin*, 14, 23 in Moignet, 1979: 331).  
‘The town guards were coming on the road there where Aucassin  
and Nicolete were talking together.’
In both (35) and (36) *et* signals that the relation between the two sentences is more of a complementary nature than of dependency: ‘if ... then’ in (35),
et, *si* always has an anaphoric function. It signals the temporal succession of events or the logical consequence similar to the use of *alors* in contemporary French (see Moignet, 1973: 287). Here are a few examples from Schøsler (2000):

(i) Sentence-initial *si*: when the coreferential subject of the sentence introduced by *si* is not expressed (zero anaphor). In this case, *si* has no corresponding translation in English:

(37) *Quant il eut che fait, si prist deux grandesmes pierres, si leur fist lier as cous et puis si les fist geter en le mer. Après si se fist coroner tot a force a empereur.* (Clari, XXI, 18-21)

‘When he had done this, he took two very big rocks, had them tied around their necks and then had them thrown into the sea. After that he had himself crowned emperor by force.’ (Schøsler, 2000: 86).

(ii) Its combination with *adont* “then” when the subject follows the verb, shows clearly that *si* was losing its adverbial value:

(38) *Adont si atorna li rois mout rikement se sereur...* (Clari, XX,1)

‘Then the king adorned his sister richly’ (Schøsler, 2000: 80)

(iii) In (39) *si* has carries the implicature of denying an expected entailment, traditionally labeled as an adversative value, which recalls one of the contextual values of Latin *et*:

(39) *Et s’or en deviez crever,*  
*Si dirioie je tote voie [...]* (Perc., 5498-5500)  
‘And if you had to perish now,  
I would say however...’


(iv) As in contemporary French, *si* may have the function of a pragmatic marker contradicting a previous negative statement:

(40) - *Por quoi le demandez vos? fet li roi.*  
- *Por ce, fet messier Gauvains, que ge ne cuit pas que vos le sachiez.*  
- *Si sai bien, fet li rois, mes vos ne le savez pas.* (Artu, 29,30, in Moignet, 1979:288)  
- ‘Why are you asking this? the king asks.'
- Because, sir G. says, I do not want you to know it.
- But I know it very well, the king says, but you do not know this.'

In symbolic terms Gauvains’ statement, which is denied by the king’s answer, can be formulated as follows:

\[ S_G: \exists x ('king') \exists y ('what G. knows') . \neg (V 'knows'_{(x,y)}) \]

By using \( si \), the interlocutor invalidates this statement by asserting:

\[ S_k: \exists x ('I/king') \exists y ('what G. knows') . \neg (\neg V 'knows'_{(x,y)}) \]

This use of \( si \) as a pragmatic marker is preserved in Contemporary French:

\[ (41) "Nous ne nous déroberions pas." \]

Jacques ouvrit la bouche pour crier: “moi, \( si \)”


“...We shall not steal away.”

Jack opened his mouth to shout: “As for me, yes [I would].”

In Grevisse’s words, in such contexts, \( si \) “contredit une formule negative”(1991: 1595). Within a pragmatic framework this function may be defined as a conventional implicature that signals the fact that the previous speaker’s expectation expressed by his/her utterance is invalidated.

In symbolic terms the expectation of (41) can be formulated as follows:

\[ EXP_{41}: \exists x ('we') . \neg (V 'se dérober'_{(x)}) \rightarrow \exists y ('I') . (\neg (V 'se dérober'_{(y)})) \]

By using \( si \), the interlocutor invalidates this expectation by asserting:

\[ \exists y ('I') . (\neg (\neg V 'se dérober'_{(y)})) \]

(v) It is only in its use as an intensifier for justifying a derived consequence that \( si \) recalls its adverbial value of \( ainsi \) and its synonymy with Engl. \( so \):

\[ (42) Je trouve cela \( si \) beau, que je me sens vraiment très émue \]

(Maupassant, Notre Coeur, II, 1, in Grevisse, 1991: 1457)

‘I find this so beautiful, that I am really overwhelmed’.

The spread of \( et \) and the very restricted use of \( si \) (only as an adverbial intensifier and as a pragmatic marker) in French is probably due to two factors:

(a) The competition with synonymous items such as \( alors \) carrying a conventional implicature of “temporal sequencing” or \( ainsi, car, alors \) for expressing the relation of “consequence”.

(b) The homonymy with \( si \) (O.Fr. \( se/si \)), derived from Lat. conditional conjunction \( si \).

Since the evolution of its synonymous replacements as well as the contemporary functions of French SI and ET are well known thanks to a variety of studies (Moignet 1973, Marchello-Nizia 1995, Fleischman 1992, Hansen 1998, Schøsler 2000, to mention only a few), we shall now turn our attention to the evolution of their Romanian counterparts, namely O.Rom. \( e \) (cf. Fr. \( et \)) and (cf. Fr. \( si \)).
3. Old Romanian e versus

Strange as it may sound, Old Romanian had two copulative conjunctions:
(i) the pan-Romance e originating in the Lat. conjunction et "and"; and
(ii) , which originates in Lat. sic.
In the oldest attested forms, the two copulative conjunctions were not interchangeable but had a different distribution. Most of the time, O. Rom. e occurs in sentence-initial position when the conjoined sentences do not have coreferential subjects.

In Codicule Voronean (CV), for example, e occurs in sentence-initial position (after a stop, a semi-colon or a comma 8) in 71% of the cases (see (43)), whereas a sentence-medial e occurs only in 29% of the cases (see (44)).

(43) Era bâseareca turrburatã ⁹i mai mulţi nu-⁹i tiia derep ce au veritu. Din gloatã aleaserã Alexandru ⁹i-¹ scoaserã elu iudeiloru. E

... (CV: 239).
‘In the church, the crowd was in uproar and (= because) most of them did not even know why they had come. From the crowd [they] chose Alexander and took him in front of the Judeans. And Alexander motioned with his hand for the crowd [to be silent] and tried to answer the crowd. They understood that he was a Judean.’

(44) Rom. vinremu întru Co e întru Rodu (CV: 252)
‘we went to Cos and on another day to Rhodes’.

3.1. Old Romanian e

In Old Romanian, inter-sentential E (sentence-initial) is used mainly as a marker of discourse coherence despite a topic switch. In (45) there is an explicit change in subject from the people defending their goddess (Artemis) to the apostle Paul.

(45) Audzirã ⁹i furã împluþ de urrgie. Deaci strigarã grãindu “mare e Archemida efeseiasca” ⁹i împlurã cetatea toatã de smintelã, [...] rrãpirã Gaia ⁹i Aristarrha, machidoneani, soþii lu Pavelu. E Pavel vruindu se întru întru gloatã, nu-l lãsarã elu ucenicii lui (CV: 237-238)
‘They heard and got angry. So they shouted saying: “Great is Artemis the Ephesians” and the uproar spread throughout the whole city, [...] they grabbed Gaius and Aristarchus, [two] Macedonians, Paul’s companions. And Paul wanted to go into the crowd but his disciples did not let him.’

In (46) the subject does not change but e marks the passage from a previous to a new venture: the apostles leave one site and sail for other cities.
Then we kneel at the seashore and pray and embrace one another. Then we board the ship, while they went back to theirs. And we sailed out of Tyre and arrive at Ptolemais. And we greet the believers and stay with them for a day. Monday the 7th week.'
Deaci pristoi întru Efesu  și aceia lăsă acie,  și gloată  și se pîrria cu iudeii, rugîndu-l elu de multă vreame se fie la el (CV: 230)

‘Then he made a halt in Ephesus and left those there, and [he] himself went into the crowd and held discussions with the Judeans, [who] for a long time [had been] asking him to be with them.’

In sermons of the same period, the intra-sentencial e is retained mainly in quotations from the Bible with a weak adversative value, as shown by its frequent use in clause- or sentence-initial position before altul ‘another, other’:

(i) Inter-clausal:

(51)  și petrecură elu întru corabie ca fu a nă duce noao, zmulsemu-nă de la din și în curmeziu îmbîndu vinremu întru Co  și întru r (CV: 252)

‘And they accompanied him to the boat because it was time for us to leave, we left them and went to Cos and in another day to Rhodes and from there to Patara.

(ii) Inter-sentential:

(52) Unii, amu, edului zic-i a fi nechită dulceață. E vrearea sa înpleagă, câ grâia te dereptul , că nechită dulceață, ca pre voia mea să mă veselesc ’(Coresi, Cî:32).

‘Some people now say that the lamb has every happiness. And/whereas others understand his will, because the righteous says, that ’I was never given any joy so I can be happy by my own

The proof that e had already become a mere marker of text coherence (or even only a filler) is provided by contexts where it is followed by the adversative conjunction ‘but’, like in (53):

(53)  și acmu eu legatu-s cu Duhul de viiu întru Ierusalim  și nu  și tu ce mi se va tîmpla într-însu. cum Duhul Sfîntu prin toate cetățile mărturisea te și grâia te că legături și scîrbi menre (CV, 247-248).

‘And now I am bound with the [I am sworn to the] Holy Spirit to come to Jerusalem and I do not know what will happen there. But [lit. and but] as the Holy Spirit warns and says in every town (that) troubles and sufferings await me.’

3.2.  E versus iar( )
The loss of *e* is also due to the concurrent conjunction. Of uncertain origin (maybe related to a Greek form), *iar* also had an interesting evolution. Basically it expressed an additional event, either identical ('again') or not ('also'), with the aim of invalidating an expectation of non-addition (see (54)).

(Zise amu Hristos întru sfânta evanghelie:)

"lumea, ce să spăsesc lumea; nu veniți a chemă dereșii, ce păcătorii la pocăință!

Nu trebuia sănătorii vraci, ce bolnavilor!"

"Pocăiți-vă, că se apropie împărăția cerului!"

(54)

(Coresi, CÎ: 5)

'So Christ said in the Holy Gospel: "I did not come to condemn the world but to redeem the world. I did not come to call the righteous, but sinners to repentance." And: "the healthy do not need a healer, but the sick!"

And again/ also [he says]: "Repent, because the kingdom of God is at hand!"

As shown by (55), only in certain contexts referring to opposite events, *iar* may take the value of a weak adversative conjunction.

(55)

ca învățăvreata so that teach: SUBJ ACC all haughtiness that hate: SUBJ

smârâtia (Coresi, CÎ: 14)

and humility that love: SUBJ

'so that he teaches everybody to hate haughtiness, and to love'

In (56) is preceded by the conjunctions 'once again', which shows that alone could not fully express 'the repetition of the same event':

(56)

David: …(Coresi, CÎ: 4)

And also again speaks David: …

'And David also (again) says:'

In order to reinforce its function of expressing the similarity (if not identity) of additional events, except their time span, *iar* combined with the reflexive (<Lat. *sibi* 'self'): 'again' (see (57)).

(57)

, and talking, also me praise, and not talking, (Coresi, CÎ: 14)

again me praise 'And if I talk, I also praise myself, and if I keep quiet, I praise

3.3. in Old Romanian

3.3.1. as a discourse marker
As already emphasized in 1.2, thanks to its anaphoric value signaling 'identity' **sic** was more appropriate than **et** for expressing a tighter connection between the conjoined terms. Even in Vulgar Latin **et** could combine with **sic** (see Iliescu, 1991), which shows that **et** was on its way to losing its conventional implicature signaling a tight connection between the conjoined entities. This conventional implicature can very well account for the fact that, in Old Romanian, unlike **e**, the conjunction (< **sic**) is the preferred choice when the subjects are coreferential. In CV, in a sample of 2000 words, there are 170 occurrences of **e** and only 15 of **i**. So, out a total of 185 occurrences of copulative conjunctions, represents 0.92% of occurrences versus 0.08% for **e**. In (58), **e** conjoins clauses (intra-sentential use) with the coreferential subject "they", whereas **E** introduces a new sentence with a different subject, Alexandru:

(58) Din gloatã aleaserã Alexandru -1 scoaserã elu iudeiloru.

E  

(58) 'From the crowd [they] chose Alexander and took him in front of the Judeans. And Alexander motioned with his hand for the crowd [to be silent] and tried to answer the crowd. They understood that he was a Judean.'

In sermons of the same period, the sentence-initial **e** is retained mainly in quotations from the Bible, whereas replaces **e** as the preferred marker of topic continuity. For example, in a sample of 10,000 words from Coresi's Carte there are 101 occurrences of sentence-initial **i** (after a stop or after a semi-colon). In (59) **i** occurs after a full stop:

(59) Înv întoarc pre noi cu bun în elep ie cã sp seniei.

i s  ne

(59) ‘He taught us with good wisdom the way of repentance. And, to bring us back from darkness to light, he endured our pains and illnesses; to suffer and to die for our sins, he wished. And [thanks to] his wounds we are all healed.’

As marker of discourse continuity **i** is very frequent in Modern Romanian spoken registers (see Iordan 1975: 219, Manoliu 1998). For example, in (60), sentence-initial **i** occurs repeatedly in the same paragraph, after a full stop, to mark the relation between successive events belonging to the same narrative unit (narrated events in opposition to the previous dialogue):

(60) - Ei, măi tefane ⁹i Smărânducă, mai rămâneb cu sănătate, că eu
- Gata, bunicule, haidem, zisei, necâjindu-mã cu niºte costiþe de porc afumate ºi cu niºte cârnaþi fripþi, ce mi-i pusese mama dinainte.

luându-mi rãmas bun de la pãrinþi, am purces cu bunicul spre Pipirig.

era un pui de ger în dimineaþa aceea, de crãpau lemnele! din sus de vânãtori, cum treceam puntea peste apa Neamþului, bunicul în urmã cu caii de cãpãstru, ºi eu, înainte, mi-au lunecat ciubotele ºi am cãzut în Ozana cât mi-ºi-i bãietul! Noroc de bunicul!

scroambele ieste a voastre îs pocite, zise el scoþându-mã repede, murat pânã la pele ºi îngheþat hãt-bine, cãci iute mi-a scos ciubotele din picioare, cã se f ãcuse bocn ã.

( Creang, PAP: 193-194 ).

- ' "So, dear ªtefan and Smaranda, take care of yourself, since I am leaving. Come, dear grandson, are you ready?"

', grandfather," I said, while I was trying to swallow as quickly as possible a few pork chops and fried sausages, which my mother put in front of me.

And after taking leave of my parents, my grandfather and I started our journey for Pipirig. And that morning it was so cold that the logs would split!

And from "the hunting [place]", as we were leading the horses by the bridle, and I in front, my boots slid and I fell into Ozana, all of me [lit. as long as the boy was]! [But I was] lucky to have my grandfather there!

And these boots of yours are messy," he said while pulling me quickly out of the water, [as I was] soaked to the skin and frozen, since the water was springing up everywhere.

And quickly he pulled off my boots, which were frozen stiff.'
- Atunci, eu m-am vărat iute în horn, şi frate-meu cel mijlociu sub cheresin, iară cel mare, după cum îţi spun, se dă cu nepăsare?
- Atunci, grozăvie mare!

- What has happened here, child?
- What could [have happened]? As soon as you left home, shortly [after that], we heard somebody at the door saying:

  "Three cute kids
Open the door to your mother."
- And?
- And my older brother, stupid and naughty as you know, ran to the door to open it
- And then?
- Then, I went into the stove, and my brother under the tub, and my older brother, as I am telling you, ran to the door and unlocked it.
- And then?
- Then, what a horror!

3.3.2. Rom. as a pragmatic marker

Though much more frequently than French et, Romanian can also function as a pragmatic marker. When strongly stressed, the adverbial (< Lat. sic) occurs very frequently as an expression denying an expected non-inclusion into a superordinate unit in both Old and Contemporary Romanian. For example, in Carte cu Învâþãturã (in a corpus of 10,000 words), there are 93 occurrences of the adverbial . In most cases the intensive includes a new candidate in the set of arguments to which the predicate applies, despite the fact that the preceding co-text does not announce in any way this possibility.

Such an inclusion carries the implicature of denying a negative expectation as shown by the utterance that follows the NP preceded by in (62):

(62) A: - O.K., but he admires you, said Nicholas.'
B: - Da, dar vrea să fie admirat. Ori eu n-am nevoie de asta, cum o să-l admir eu pe el? (M. Preda, MS:202).

O.K., but he wants also to be admired. Or, as for me, I do not want that, how could I admire him?'

In brief the expectation expressed by B may be formulated as follows:

\[ \exists x \text{ (‘he’)} \exists y \text{ (‘the speaker B’)}. (~ \forall \text{ ‘be admired’}_{(x,y)}) \]

In fact this expectation is confirmed by the following utterance eu pe el.

B asserts that, contrary to the expectation B, the one who admires the writer wants also to be admired. In brief, the writer’s assertion is:

Assertion B: \[ \exists x \text{ (‘he’)} \exists y \text{ (‘the speaker B’)}. (\forall \text{ ‘be admired’}_{(x,y)}) \]
Interestingly enough, in Old-Romanian texts, the stressed intonation that differentiates the adverbial intensifier from the conjunction is usually transcribed with an accent over the vowel, i.e.: 

Depending upon the type of syntactic constituent it determines, adverbial has the following contextual meanings attested since the 16\(^{th}\) c.: 

(a) Before NPs means ‘also’: 

has the following contextual
He said: “Once I am there, I should also see Rome.”

By using the stressed, the speaker includes the city of Rome within the group of things he intends to see.

Before verbs it may have two values: (i) ‘even’ (see (64)) or (ii) ‘right away’ (see (65)).

The kings crossed the Danube right away with their troops without the vizier’s knowledge.

This value is already attested in Vulgar Latin, when sic accompanies statim to convey the meaning of unexpected immediacy (see Iliescu, 1991):

(66) Lat. *Vbi cum peruenimum fuerit, statim sic in Anastase ingreditur episcopus* (Egerie, 25.7)

‘As soon as we arrived there, the bishop went right away to

3. 4. Hedging: a change in progress

In contemporary Romanian the adverbial ‘also’ has become a pragmatic marker of ‘hedging’ (see Iordan 1975:155). An interesting example of contexts favoring the semantic change from an intensifier to a hedging device diluting the responsibility of the agentivity may be found in the speech of peasants in Marin Preda’s novel *Marele singuratec*:

(67) -- De ce, Dine? Se putea să fi și murit, chiar dacă era băiat tânar. Parcă numai bătrâni au dreptul ăsta?

      utea sa-și răspund printr-o simplă negație, zise celălalt. Dar eu consider că e mai bine să întrăm undeva, spre o pildă la ‘Carul cu bere’, unde am auzit că e plin de silișteni, noi o bere... (M. Preda, MS:7).

-- Why, Dinu! It could be that he died, even if he was a young boy. [You think] that only old people have this right?
-- To this I could answer you with a mere denial, the other said. But, I think that it would be better if we went [lit. also we] somewhere, for example to [the inn] The Chariot with Beer, where I heard it is full of the inhabitants of Siliștea, and to have [also we] a beer...
and Eng. we serve as hedging devices. By including the referent into a larger class, they dilute the responsibility of the referent. The difference between these two types of inclusion consists in the degree of the speaker's affective perspective (empathy): 'we' for 'you' is a signal of empathy, whereas the intensive is a signal of hedging excluding any empathy.

The attenuating has various contextual values, such as hedging a demand, expressing self-irony or modesty. In this case it cannot be translated by any adverb or conjunction into another Romance language or English. In (71), for example, introduces a nuance of irony by denying the expectation that the children are not usually so quiet:

(71) - *Ei apoi! minte ai, omule?*

-Well then! mind have: you man?

meram eu, de ce -s ei

me wonder I, why are also they so quiet,
(B) SIC. By comparing the evolution of Lat. SIC in French and Romanian, we could advance a hypothesis aimed at explaining the semantic links between
the adverbs and the corresponding discourse and pragmatic markers. The value of “equality” carried by the adverbial *sic* developed into equality by “inclusion into the same superordinate unit”.

(i) In Old French, *si* was a discourse marker of topic continuity. Unlike *et*, *si* carried the conventional implicature of “succession (temporal or logical)”. In modern French, *si* is no longer a discourse marker of continuity but has retained its pragmatic function carrying the implicature of denying a negative expectation expressed in the previous utterance. Its restricted role must have been the result of the spread of its synonymous competitors: *alors* “then”, *puis* “then, after”, *ensuite* “then, after that” for expressing temporal succession or *alors* “then”, or, *and* *car* “since”, for signaling a logical relation of consequence.

(ii) The value of “inclusion into the same superordinate unit” became the invariant semantic feature underlying all the functions of Rom. : (a) the conjunction can express inclusion in the same syntactic or discourse unit. When repeated before each connected term, it carries the conventional implicature denying an unexpected addition or inclusion; (b) the adverbial carries the conventional implicature of an unexpected inclusion into a certain paradigm (the class of arguments for which the same predicate applies, the class of predicates that apply to the same argument, etc). The contexts in which it expresses an inclusion into a general class favored its reinterpretation as a hedging device diluting the Agent’s responsibility

As a marker of cross-sentential continuity may fulfill two conversation functions:
(a) Like O.Fr. *si*, Rom. (occurring in sentence-initial position after a full stop) may connect various sentences within the same turn-unit and, as such, it can signal the speaker’s intention to block any attempt at turn-taking.
(b) Unlike French *et* but like Engl. *and*, it may be a back-channel, a sign of interaction between the speakers: this is the case when *is* uttered by the co-enunciator in order to mark his interest in encouraging the enunciator to continue providing more information about the topic in question.
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**Notes**

1 The “propositional content” corresponds to the logical form (LF) in the initial structure of a sentence.
According to Fraser (1996), “discourse messages”, are “linguistically encoded clues that specify how the basic message is related to foregoing discourse. For an in-depth analysis of several French discourse markers see Rossari 2000.

For the concept of “conversational and conventional implicature” see Levinson (1983, and 2000) and more recently, the survey of various positions concerning Grice’s “Principle of Cooperation” in Jaszczolt (2002: 207-223). Conversational implicatures are intended inferences that may be calculated on the basis of Grice’s Principle of Cooperation. They are cancelable or defeasible, non-detachable, and non-conventional. Conventional implicatures are a kind of non-truth conditional inferences that are not derived from superordinate pragmatic principles like the maxims, but are simply attached by convention to particular lexical items or expressions: e.g., adversative conjunctions such as but (vs. and); same; even (if), however, although, etc.

As Robert Martin (1983) puts it, “expectation is a way of representing a possible world which has the best chances of realization according to the speaker’s universe of beliefs”. For more details on the concept of “expectation” see Manoliu, 1994: 183: “Unlike presupposition or entailment, expectation does not satisfy the criterion of uncontradictability. For example, an utterance such as If I could take a trip to Venus, I would be very happy has the expectation I am not very happy, as shown by the fact that it may be cancelled by an afterthought such as but I am very happy anyway: cf. If I could take a trip to Venus I would be very happy, but I am very happy anyway.” For an updated view on the predicate logic and the propositional semantics see Jaszczolt, 2002, especially Chapter 6.

As Iliescu (1991) and Ferro (1999) pointed out, et sic or even sic alone expressing a relation of succession (temporal) or of addition (usually before the last term of an enumeration) may be found in many other vulgar Latin texts.

For the development of Fr. puis compared with Sp. pues as a discourse marker see Chevalier, J.C. & Molho (1986: pp.23-34.).

Similar uses of si may be found in Northern Italian dialects (see Rohls 1969: 165-166).

As marked in the modern transcription of Cyrillic characters.

Iordan (1939-40/1975: 219) emphasizes that ºi at the beginning of a chain of sentences is “a filler” (Rom. ‘un cuvânt de umplutură’), which serves to build a syntactic unit, in spite of the fact that the conjoined clauses express independent thoughts. The replacement of the full stop by ºi does not affect the falling intonation characterizing the end of a sentence:

See Schiffrin’s characterization of Engl. and (1987: 152))

See Manoliu, 1998. According to Dimitrescu (1973: 44), both functions evolved from the same word, Lat. sic. Such a split is not an isolated phenomenon but can be found also in Old Slavonic, Albanian and French (cf. Larousse du XXe siècle, s.v).

Iordan (1975:155) gives a few interesting examples of the use of the hedging ºi in combination with another hedging device, the adverb acolo ‘there’:

fâ ºi tu, acolo, ce- i putea!  
do also you, there, what would you can  
‘Do what you can!’