

# ***Auch* as a Coordinating Conjunction in Transylvanian Saxon German Analyses from Historical Linguistics and Typological Linguistics\***

Sara Arndt

Kyoto University

sara.arndt0829@gmail.com

**Abstract:** In this article, I aim to identify the mechanisms that potentially cause specific language change with reference to the studies of historical linguistics and typological linguistics. In my research, the coordinating-conjunctive use of the focus/additive particle, *auch*, observed in an endangered minority language in Romania, Transylvanian Saxon is dealt with as research object to demonstrate my hypothesis that certain changes of languages in contact are caused by activation or deactivation of potentials that the form possesses, which could be compared to heredity of species.

**Keywords:** Transylvanian Saxon German; linguistic typology; historical linguistics; coordinating conjunction

## 1. Introduction

This paper aims to identify mechanisms that could catalyze some specific language change by reviewing the analyses from German historical linguistics and linguistic typology regarding the coordinating conjunction and focus/additive particle. I have selected a specific linguistic phenomenon seen in the

---

\* There are a lot of people without whom this big research project would be impossible both in a technical and mental sense. I would like to thank Yasushi Kawasaki who has supported me as my Japanese supervisor since 2014; Ludwig M. Eichinger who kindly decided to take over my dissertation project in spite of my sudden contact last year; Ariana Bancu who is working on the same topic as the only 'study mate' for me in the world, who kindly asked me if we could collaborate for our research project, and Marlyse Baptista who supports Ariana and me in our collaboration project. All the supports that you always give me makes me happy and creative, inspired and motivated as well. And also, I cannot forget one more person I'm very thankful for, but I could never ever say this to: Jörg Riecke who was one of the kindest, smartest and most open-minded people I have ever met, who left us too early last year. I really thank you for accepting me as your student in Heidelberg and supporting even my private life decisions as well. My thanks also go to Grant Beckett who corrected my very first English paper this time though it was really at short notice. I guess it was definitely annoying to correct my Germanized English. I also thank Shimon Nakanishi, Ami Okabe and Kaname Okano for their giving information regarding Old English, Dutch and Slavic languages, and discussion about coordinating conjunctions in those languages. Finally, but not least, I am grateful for my husband who always supports me mentally, not only during writing this article, but also generally.

Transylvanian Saxon German dialect (TrSax<sup>1</sup>), namely the use of *auch* (EN: also) as a coordinating conjunction like *and* in English, as my research object. This variety has existed for over 850 years and developed independently.

Chapter 1 provides some basic information regarding Transylvanian Saxons and TrSax, and then I illustrate the use of *auch* as a coordinating conjunction in TrSax by comparing it with that of *und* and *auch* in Standard German. I shortly reference previous studies of TrSax and set my research questions in chapter 2. Chapter 3 shows the analyses of *und* and *auch* from the historical point of view by referring to previous studies about these two words in the history of Germanic languages. In the typological section in chapter 4, I seek more potentials surrounding the conjunction and focus/additive particle from cross-linguistic point of view. Lastly, I summarize my conclusions and explain future research plans.

### 1.1 Transylvanian Saxon German

Transylvanian Saxon German dialect (DE: Siebenbürgisch-Sächsisch) is spoken by one of the German minorities living in Romania<sup>2</sup> called Transylvanian Saxons (DE: Siebenbürger Sachsen). The ancestors of Transylvanian Saxons were invited by the Hungarian king of those days to today's Sibiu area (DE: Hermannstadt) in 1141-1162 to protect the land (cf. Wagner 1990: 15-16). Though it is impossible to concretely define where they originally came from due to lack of written records, some archaeological evidence and place names reveal that the migrants apparently consisted not only of German speaking people, but also non-German speaking members such as Flemish, Franks and Walloons (cf. Wagner 1990: 24 and Gündisch 2005: 30).

Though Transylvanian Saxons had kept having the privilege of the self-government for a long time (until 1876), their situation became more and more difficult in the 20th century. After World War I, Transylvania was annexed to Romania along with Banat, Bessarabia, Bukovina, Sathmar, etc., where other German minorities had lived. This motivated the Romanian Germans to establish a political association for all of them. The loss of the Third Reich in World War II put Transylvanian Saxons in a tough situation along with the other German minorities in Europe. Romanian Germans were subjected to dispossession

---

<sup>1</sup> In this paper, I will use the abbreviation that Bancu (2019) introduced though our ways to handle this variation are different. While Bancu (2019) consistently holds TrSax for a single language form, I will rather take a traditional position based on the categorization of German dialectology. That means, I will handle this variation as one of the German dialects, which is, however, not inconsistent with the arguments that TrSax consists of some different dialects and even some other languages such as Romanian and Hungarian.

<sup>2</sup> Romania has some other German minorities in the former Austrian-Hungarian territory such as Banat Swabians, Satu Mare Swabians, Transylvanian Landler, Zipser Germans, etc. Other Germans of Romania, such as Bessarabian Germans and Bukovina Germans, were resettled in the area of the Third Reich during the World War II due to the policy of the NSDAP *Heim ins Reich*.

and deportation to the kolkhozes of the former Soviet Union, where a number of the deportees died.<sup>3</sup> In communistic Romania under Ceaușescu, they could continue learning and speaking their own languages in schools or churches and private spheres. Since a lot of Romanian Germans emigrated to Germany after the collapse of Ceaușescu's regime, the population of Germans in Romania drastically decreased. From 1977 to 1992, the population of Transylvanian Saxons fell from 172,000 to 41,000. The 2002 census showed less than 20,000 Transylvanian Saxons were located in Romania (cf. Bottesch 2008: 334).

Though Romanian Germans could have kept their own languages and culture for more than 850 years, today the dialect competence of native speakers is very limited, and many of them don't speak the local variations any more.<sup>4</sup> In Sibiu, there is a German gymnasium where they teach in Standard German, but TrSax is not used there. As with other Romanian Germans, many Transylvanian Saxons tend to become monolingual in Romanian or bilingual in Romanian and Standard German. Those who immigrated to Germany, especially migrants of the first and second generations, try to maintain their dialects by organizing events to present their poems written in dialects and/or by posting their works on Internet forums where TrSax is used as a communication means. The generations born after their parents' immigration to Germany mostly use only Standard German or local German dialects, and their competence of TrSax is rather passive and limited to listening.

## 1.2 Transylvanian Saxon German dialect

Based on the phonological characteristics identified by local Germanists from Transylvania, such as Gustav Kisch and Richard Huss, at the end of the 19th century and the beginning of the 20th century by comparison with those of German dialects, TrSax is German-dialectologically categorized in Moselle Franconian that includes Luxembourgish and Eifel dialects. The reason why they have been called *Saxon* dates back to the very beginning when the settlers were invited by the Hungarian king who called all German-speaking people *saxones*, according to the historical document. The phonological studies conducted at the end of the 19th century aimed to find the origin of Transylvanian Saxons (*Urheimatthese*). The scholars concluded that the ancestors of Transylvanian Saxons would have originated in the area of Luxembourg, which is denied by some historical evidence today. These works contribute to describing the linguistic features of TrSax and understanding this minority variety that is regarded as one of the endangered languages nowadays.

---

<sup>3</sup> Though according to Münz and Ohlinger (1998), Romanian Germans were not so systematically discriminated as the other German minorities in the East Europe that were completely expelled from their home countries or forbidden to use their own languages, the memories of these discriminations strongly remained in their lives, which is well described in some literatures of Herta Müller such as "Mein Vaterland war ein Apfelkern" (2016) and "Atemschaukel" (2009).

<sup>4</sup> Regarding the language competence of each Romanian German group, see Bottesch (2008: 357).

Phonologically, the effect of the High German consonant shift is partially significant. For example, the unvoiced consonant /t/ in the middle of a word is changed to the fricative sound /s/ as is seen in *Wasser* in Standard German while the English equivalence *water* keeps the voiceless alveolar. The word-final consonant /t/ that was completely shifted to /s/ in High German, is maintained in TrSax (e.g. DE: *es* vs. TrSax: *et*).

Strictly speaking, TrSax consists of various local dialects that are especially distinguished in phonology and lexicons. One well-known phonological feature observed solely in the south of Transylvania<sup>5</sup> is the so-called Eifler rule that Luxembourgish represents as well. The Eifler rule signifies that the word-final /n/, which does not belong to the word stem, drops out in a fluent conversation<sup>6</sup> as is presented in (1a) with the equivalent sentence in Standard German in (1b):

- (1) a. Sə        **huə**                sech                iigäästərn                uəgemaldən.<sup>7</sup>  
           They    have.3PL.PRS    REFL.3PL    the day before yesterday    register.PCTP  
       b. Sie        **haben**                sich                vorgestern                angemeldet.  
           They    have.3PL.PRS    REFL.3PL    the day before yesterday    register.PCTP  
           “‘They registered the day before yesterday.’”

(Bottesch: 2008: 391; gloss and translation mine)

As my research object to be analyzed in this paper is the use of *auch* in TrSax which is seen in all TrSax regions, I don't particularly differentiate each of them from one another in my analysis, nor do I intend to show the local distribution. However, I will mention where the data and/or the speakers come from in the following samples if needed.

Apart from numerous lexical variations, quite a lot of linguistic relicts are found in TrSax. The word *ke*, which means *gegen* (EN: 'against, toward') in Standard German today, can be counted as an example. This preposition is used not only as *gegen*, but also as *nach* (EN: to) when expressing direction with concrete cities, countries, etc.

The morphological and syntactic features of TrSax seem quite homogeneous, but distinct, too. Morphologically, two types of past participle of the strong verbs are used in TrSax, according to the audio corpus *Audioatlas Siebenbürgisch-Sächsischer Dialekte* (ASD), e.g. *funden* vs. *gefunden* (EN: 'found') or

<sup>5</sup> The areas where TrSax is spoken are divided into the south and the north. The south part consists of *Königsboden* in which Sibiu is located in the middle, and *Burzenland*, the region of Braşov (DE: Kronstadt) whereas the area of Bistriţa (DE: Bistritz) called *Nösnerland* is regarded as the north part.

<sup>6</sup> When /h/, /d/, /t/ and /z/ comes after the word-final /n/, this deletion does not happen (cf. Bottesch 2008: 353).

<sup>7</sup> The bold marks in this paper are added by author.

*kommen* vs. *gekommen* (EN: ‘come’). The latter forms are regarded as standard today while the former ones are used in some dialects in German speaking areas such as in the Switzerland. One of the syntactic characteristics unique to TrSax is a deviation of sentence bracket (DE: *Satzklammer*), which Bancu (2019) and Sift (2016) analyzed in detail.

The most important and relevant point of my research is that this variety has developed in contact with Romanian and Hungarian parallel to various German dialects and German standard form recently, which is remarkably seen in the lexicon and phraseology as borrowing.<sup>8</sup> Krefeld (2016) describes Romanian elements of TrSax vocabulary and phrases from free talks referring to ASD. His data show not only borrowed words from Romanian such as *Prents* (RO: ‘brânză’, DE: ‘Käse’, EN: ‘cheese’), but also hybrid words of Romanian and TrSax and borrowed structures and concepts from Romanian expressions such as *eine Prüfung geben* (RO: ‘a da un examen’, DE: ‘eine Prüfung schreiben’, EN: ‘to take an exam’). These, however, do not necessarily indicate whether the forms are integrated into TrSax language system fully or whether they are idiolects. Krefeld has still shed light on characteristics of TrSax as a contact-induced language and offered research interests from the point of contact linguistic view.

## 2. *Auch* and *und* in TrSax and Standard German

In this chapter, I briefly illustrate how the use of *auch* and *und* in TrSax and Standard German appears. Each of them exists in both varieties, but they are used in different ways. In Standard German, *und* is the only coordinating conjunction, and *auch* is categorized as an adverb which functions as a focus/additive particle. The function of *auch* in TrSax seems to be extended. In TrSax, *auch* is used as both a conjunction and a focus/additive particle<sup>9</sup>. I describe the patterns of both varieties by referring to the following examples, and then the research questions dealt with in this article are mentioned.

### 2.1 *Auch* and *und* in Standard German

Before going through the TrSax use of both words, I want to look into how both forms are categorized and used in Standard German grammar.

The same as the English *and*, *und* in Standard German has the copulative function while *auch* that corresponds to the English *also* is grammatically sorted as an adverb and is used as a focus/additive

---

<sup>8</sup> Though I’m aware of the importance to discuss every terminology regarding contact linguistics such as borrowing, code-switching, transference and so on, I don’t go through this issue in this paper. For detailed explanations regarding these terms, see Thomason (2001) and Riehl (2014).

<sup>9</sup> Bancu (2019) handles *och* which corresponds to *auch* in this article as an individual coordinator while she notes that this particle functions as an additive particle in TrSax. In my study, both functions of *auch* is treated as a continuum since they are semantically, functionally and etymologically related to each other as it is shown in the following parts.

particle.<sup>10</sup> The examples for comparison follow below:

- (2) a. Er ist ehrlich **und** geschickt.  
 he be.3SG.PRS honest **and** skillful  
 “He is honest and skillful.”  
 (Ihara and Hamakawa 1958: 150; gloss and translation mine)
- b. Er ist ehrlich, (**und**) **auch** geschickt.  
 he be.3SG.PRS honest **and also** skillful  
 “He is honest and also skillful.”  
 (Ihara und Hamakawa 1958: 151; gloss and translation mine)
- c. \*Er ist ehrlich **auch** geschickt.
- (3) Sie können **auch** sehr schnell laufen.  
 they can.3PL.PRS **also** very fast run.INF  
 “They can also run very fast.”
- (4) **Auch** der junge Mann, der zu meiner Linken sitzt,  
**also** the.M.SG.NOM young man the to my.SG.F.DAT left sit.3SG.PRS  
 nimmt sich nur vom Gemüse.  
 Take.3SG.PRS REFL.3SG only of-the.N.SG.DAT vegetable  
 “The young man who sits on my left, too, takes some only from vegetable.”  
 (DWDS, J. Erpenbeck, Wörterbuch, 2004: 30; gloss and translation mine)
- (5) Der Fernseher ist kaputt. **Auch** hat ein Student  
 the.M.SG.NOM TV be.3SG.PRS broken **also** have.3SG.PRS a.M.NOM student  
 mein Auto angefahren. Dies alles hat nicht gerade meine  
 my.SG.N.ACC car collide.PCTP this all have.3SG.PRS not exactly my.SG.F.ACC  
 Laune verbessert.  
 mood improve.PCTP  
 “The TV is broken. Moreover, a student hit my car. All this didn’t really improve my mood.”  
 (Reis and Rosengren 1997: 246; gloss mine)

---

<sup>10</sup> In this paper, I consistently use the term focus/additive particle to refer to *auch* and its correspondence in other languages to avoid confusion. Though there are a lot of terms for words that connect elements with one another such as connectors, conjunctors, connections etc., and I’m aware of the necessity of separate explanation regarding these terms, I don’t go through details this time.

The coordinating conjunction *und* appears in so-called interposition as is seen in (2a), and all coordinands<sup>11</sup> conjoined by *und* have the same status in terms of their information structure, whereas *auch* does not allow the same prototypical position as *und*, which is described in (2c). *Auch* in Standard High German is, however, able to be used with the coordinating conjunction *und* to supplement the main clause with some additional information as is described in (2b) – in a conversation, *und* does not necessarily appear, but *auch* needs to be stressed. That means the words, phrases, or clauses conjoined by *auch* are information-structurally asymmetric: In the case of (2a), it would be possible to keep the original meaning even if the positions of ‘ehrlich’ and ‘geschickt’ were shifted, which I hold for symmetric while the meaning of the sentence where the position of ‘ehrlich’ in (2b) is swapped for that of ‘geschickt’ would differ from the original one because the element ‘geschickt’ of (2b) is added to the expression ‘Er ist ehrlich’ as supplemented information. Since *auch* is grammatically categorized as an adverb, it can come along within a sentence or in the ‘prefield’ (*Vorfeld*) as is seen in (3) - (5). In comparison with the examples *und* appears in, (5) shows that *auch* can be put in front of a verb alone in certain contexts.<sup>12</sup>

## 2.2 *Auch* and *und* in TrSax

The coordinating conjunction *auch* is considered a remarkable and novel feature of TrSax. Interestingly, the conjunction *und* which is categorized as the only coordinating conjunction in Standard German, has not completely been replaced with *auch* in TrSax, but both exist in this variety and function in different ways to conjoin the coordinands. While the TrSax *und* connects clauses including verbs such as VP, sentences, and quite often subordinate clauses, *auch* conjoins ‘smaller’ ones such as words and phrases like NP, AP, AdvP, PP etc. (Shinohara 2016: 67) as shown in following samples (6) - (8):

- (6) Em meß            sich        de            Verhealtnessen    upassen    **und** et mät  
 one must.3SG.PRS REFL.3SG the.N.PL.DAT circumstance.PL adapt.INF **and** it with  
 den            noae Männern    geat    hâlden.  
 the.M.PL.DAT new man.PL    good    hold.INF.

“You must adapt yourself to the circumstances and keep it with the new men well.”

(Schuster 1923: 35; gloss and translation mine)

- (7) Da    tanzte            man Polka **auch**        Walzer.  
 there dance.3SG.PST    one polka    **also**        waltz

<sup>11</sup> Coordinands are the clauses, phrases or words conjoined by a coordinating conjunction. Those that are conjoined by a conjunction are called ‘conjuncts’ more generally.

<sup>12</sup> I would, however, like to underline that this use of *auch* in the beginning of sentence seems to be marked in terms of nuance.

“They danced polka and Waltz there.”

(ASD | Arkeden | 66w | 1439; gloss and translation mine)<sup>13</sup>

- (8) Äm Greangd geni wör hië jo e geat Kerl **und** keangd senjer  
 in ground take.PCTP be.3SG.PST he yes a.M.NOM good guy **and** can.3SG.PST his.F.DAT.  
 Frä nor schwēr äst uëfchlön. **Und** nōdem se **uch** detmōl wedder esi hārz  
 wife only hard something reject.PCTP **and** after she **also** this time again so kind  
 bāt, esi sōht hië...  
 ask.3SG.PST so say.3SG.PST he

“Basically, he was a good guy and could hardly refuse his wife something. And after she so kindly asked him this time again, he said so...”

(Schuster 1923: 25; gloss and translation mine)

Referring to (8), *auch* acts as a focus/additive particle like Standard German as well, but it is allowed to appear in the interposition in TrSax as is shown in (7). Furthermore, the conjunction *auch* occurs in some idiomatic phrases that include *und* in their Standard German equivalents such as *zwischen A und B* (EN: between A and B) and *und so weiter* (EN: and so on). In the case that *auch* is used with *und* like in (2b), *auch* does not appear alone either in spoken or in written data in TrSax and always functions as a focus/additive particle. Another pattern of use for *auch* found only in TrSax is *auch A auch B* that corresponds to *sowohl A als auch B* in Standard German (EN: both A and B), which seems to be translated from the Romanian equivalent expression *și A și B*. Haspelmath (2007: 11) calls this construction ‘bisyndetic coordination’<sup>14</sup>, or Bîlbîie (2008) names it ‘correlative coordination’.

The difference in types of coordinands and the use of *auch* as a coordinating conjunction are unique to TrSax and found in none of the German varieties today including those of the regions where German is spoken as a minority language.

### 2.3 Previous research and analysis of *auch* as a coordinating conjunction in TrSax

This unique feature of TrSax has already been described in Kisch (1900) and McClure (1973) partly, but it was not linguistically analyzed in depth before Shinohara (2016) and Bancu (2019). Kisch (1900: 12) shortly notes that *ant* which corresponds to *und* in the northern dialect only conjoins sentences while *och* which is the northern form of *auch* serves to connect words. McClure (1973) mentions that Vingard’s (DE:

<sup>13</sup> Citation from ASD is always done in accordance with the following rules: ASD – home place of informant – age and sex of informant – data number.

<sup>14</sup> Haspelmath (2007: 2) names all kinds of expression that means ‘both A and B’ in English as ‘emphatic coordination’ which I will also adopt in this paper when speaking of the general construction with this meaning.



Weingartskirchen) dialect, one of the southern dialects he dealt with in his dissertation, has two conjunctions *en(t)* and *uch*, but he does not really point out the difference between them in terms of the types of coordinands though his examples obviously confirm what Kisch (1900) mentioned.

In Shinohara (2016), I analyzed the difference of coordinands of both conjunctions with the data sets from ASD based on Wenker's sentences (DE: *Wenkersätze*)<sup>15</sup> and interviews from around 250 places recorded in the late 60's and the late 70's. In this study, I determined that TrSax speakers in all areas use *auch* as a coordinating conjunction which tends to conjoin words and/or phrases that do not have verbs in them. My hypothesis was that the Romanian equivalent, *și*, which is used as a coordinating conjunction as well as a focus/additive particle should play a role and that the use of *auch* could result from language contact with Romanian. Why the difference of coordinands occurred in this variety is impossible to attest by only doing a corpus study.

Bancu (2019: 4) points out that the two conjunctions in TrSax are category-specific. This means they conjoin specific types of categories or coordinands, which I also agree with. She conducted her research on one specific dialect from Viscri (DE: Weißkirch) located in the southern part of Transylvanian by using sociolinguistic methodology and two organized conversation groups – one of them had speakers from Viscri, and the other consisted of those who emigrated to Germany and live in Nuremberg. Her research shows that today's Viscri Saxon dialect is losing the category-specific functions of *und* and *auch* (in her research *end* and *och*) and allows the conjunctions to overlap in terms of coordinands. She hypothesizes that “more influence from German in TrSax would result in the expansion of *end* to all types of coordinands and the increased use of *end* where both conjunctions are possible, while influence from Romanian would result in the expansion of *och* to all types of coordinands and the increased use of *och* in all contexts where both conjunctions are possible” (Bancu 2019: 101). This research is, however, still limited to synchronic study and the scope does not include why and how category-specific conjunctions in TrSax occurred. Also, her research focuses on one single dialect though we know today that the feature is found in the whole TrSax area.

#### 2.4 Research questions

Diachronic aspects of this feature are missing in the research carried out before, as is mentioned above. It may be better to say that it is unfortunately impossible to identify the origin of this feature due to the lack of materials written in TrSax, which is a common problem with contact-induced languages or endangered

---

<sup>15</sup> *Wenkersätze* handle a classic method of dialectology developed by Georg Wenker in the 19th century. Wenker sent this list of sentences written in standardized German to German-spoken areas so that his informants filled out the questionnaire in their dialects, and he mapped the results. The results of his work are available on [Regionalsprache.de](http://Regionalsprache.de) (REDE) of the Forschungszentrum Deutscher Sprachatlas of Marburg University today. ASD has audio data of this list in TrSax and maps of the features unique to TrSax.

languages. I, however, want to more deeply analyze the use of *auch* as a coordinating conjunction from a broader perspective to figure out what factor influenced the TrSax conjunctions, what kind of ‘potential’ there is for *auch* and *und*, and how these potentials could be related to the use of *auch* as a coordinating conjunction in TrSax. My research questions in detail are:

- (i) What do(es) the coordinating conjunction(s) and focus/additive particle (today’s *und* and *auch* in German) look like in the history of German language? Did the category-specific conjunctions seen in TrSax possibly exist in older German(ic) languages?
- (ii) Does a language-universal potential for the category-specific conjunction of *auch* exist? What strategy do the words *und* and *auch* generally have from typological point of view?
- (iii) What are the potentials of the ways how both conjunctions are used in TrSax?

The term ‘potential’ here can roughly be understood as a gene in biology. In my assumption, a linguistic feature ‘coordinating conjunction’ is for example seen as a trait in genetics, and its function, etymology, concept, image, meaning, syntactic rules, etc. would all be registered as genes. Each of them would stand for DNA in biology which composes a gene.<sup>16</sup> The influence of contact with Romanian and Standard German should also be taken into account because the conjunctive use of *auch* is not found in other German varieties. I built a hypothesis that some certain change of languages in contact is caused by activation or deactivation of the potentials that the form, in this case *auch* and *und*, has, where language contact itself is understood as an ecological factor that externally supports the change.<sup>17</sup> These potentials are sought to demonstrate this hypothesis in this article.

### 3. Historical linguistic point of view regarding *und* and *auch*

In this part, I will concretely go through the analyses from historical linguistics in regard with coordinating conjunction(s) and focus/additive particles to seek the answer to the research questions (i) especially.

Coordinating conjunctions and focus/additive particles in older Germanic varieties such as Old High German differ from those of the following evolutions of German including today’s German. As TrSax is German-dialectologically categorized as Moselle Franconian dialects, and the ancestors of Transylvanian Saxons settled in Transylvania in the 12th century, I analyzed some texts written in Moselle Franconian

---

<sup>16</sup> Some linguists have already used an analogy of genetics for the linguistic systems. Mufwene (2001), for example, presents such intention to explain the development of creole languages.

<sup>17</sup> It is maybe possible to take twins who have grown up in different environment and therefore have different languages, characters, tastes, etc. as a metaphor for this hypothesis. Note that the actual biological studies, however, require much more complex sets. This metaphor is just simplified to give a better understanding for my hypothesis.

dialects in the Middle High German period to figure out whether the German dialects possessed the use of both conjunctions seen in TrSax. If they had the same features, it would handle relict and not be related to language contact though it might be possible to say that the contact language, Romanian, supported reservation of the relict, which is not the case here.

### 3.1 *Auch* and *und* in German(ic) historical linguistics: OHG era (ca. 750 – 1050)<sup>18</sup>

Though New High German has two different words for coordinating conjunctions and focus/additive particles, it was not necessarily the same in the past. In OHG which was used around between 750 and 1050 in the further south of the so-called Benrath line, there were two coordinating conjunctions, *inti*<sup>19</sup> and *joh*<sup>20</sup>. Etymologically, the majority of scholars agree that *inti* comes from the IE adversative adverb *\*hanti* (EN: ‘but, opposite, against it, at the front’) as Selmani (2012: 78) mentioned, which remains in today’s German prefix *ant-* seen in *Antwort* (EN: answer). The second conjunction *joh*, which was completely replaced with *inti* and *unde* in MHG, seems to be composed of pronominal *j-* or particle *ja* and *ouh* which is the OHG form of *auch*. The OHG particle *ouh* derived from *\*auke*, the imperative form of *\*auk-a-* (EN: ‘add’) of Germanic languages whose source can be tied back to the IE *\*aug-* (EN: ‘increase’), and the IE particle *\*au* (EN: ‘on the one/other hand, against it, but’) had adversative and additive meanings (cf. Eroms 2010, Selmani 2012, Desportes 2003).<sup>21</sup>

According to the analysis of Monseer Matthäus conducted by Eroms (2010), *enti*, corresponding to *inti*, usually appears in structures with verbs rather than in nominal ones. The other connector, *joh* (*ioh* in Eroms 2010), by contrast, is found in simple nominal phrases though its use for sentence connection is also partly apparent. Valentin (2003) who analyzed Otfrid figured out that the language of Otfrid belongs to *ioh*-area, while Eroms’ results show that Monseer Matthäus has overtly more uses of *enti* as a connector. Valentin (2003: 185) defines *joh* as the normal copulative connector based on Otfrid which should gather two or more propositions or expressions so that they build a higher argumentative unit together. He argues that *joh* can bind two elements to one single syntactic-semantic unit even on the lower structural level (cf. Valentine 2003: 186) though he does not offer any comments about what the lower structure means here. Regarding *inti*, he points out that it is also a sort of copulative connector, but this does not often come up and it expresses more than pure conjunction because it conjoins segments that don’t necessarily stand

<sup>18</sup> The German historical periods indicated in this paper are based on Riecke (2016: 39).

<sup>19</sup> Some variations for this word such as *endi* and *enti* have been confirmed in written materials (cf. Selmani 2012: 79).

<sup>20</sup> Other variation for this word: *ioh* (cf. Eroms 2010).

<sup>21</sup> Though Bancu (2019: 16) implies that *ouh* in OHG functioned both as a conjunction and an additive particle, it is basically difficult to distinguish conjunctions from conjunctive adverbs since the syntax of OHG was not to be so firm as that of today’s German as Robin (2003: 137) indicates. That’s why Germanists call all these words rather connector than conjunction.

parallel. This is perhaps caused by multiple functions of this word such as an adversative use for example. More interestingly, *inti* is, however, apparently often used for so-called natural conjunction as defined by Haspelmath (2007: 23)<sup>22</sup>, e.g. *thurst inti hungar* (EN: ‘thirst and hunger’) or *dages inti naht* (EN: ‘day and night’). Piper (1884: 225) mentions that *inti* is used to conjoin the conjuncts that are related to each other whereas *ioh* connects random things, which partly bears out Valentine’s study.

The OHG *ouh*, the alternative form of *auh*, is also regarded as a connector, but the potential semantic and/or pragmatic scope of *auch* of the later German varieties can be observed. Valentin (2003: 183) argues that *ouh* highlights something that supplements, goes over what has already been expressed, or transitions of something expected. According to Desportes (2003) who analyzed Isidor, *auh* functions to express temporal sequences, connections, or orders, similar to a coordinating conjunction, but addition and supplementation are included in the semantic scope of *auh* (cf. Desportes 2003: 291). He also points out that with the use of *auh* new information is added to the one that has already been given before (cf. Desportes 2003: 289). It is characteristic that the conjuncts which are conjoined by *auh* should have the same semantic status. His following argument is also reminiscent of *auch* in NHG:

“Mit *auh* wird...das Addierte als ein Bestandteil des propositionalen Inhalts dargestellt, in einer Aufzählung, deren letztes Glied mit *auh* eingeleitet wird und auf diese Weise topikalisiert, fokussiert und hervorgehoben wird, was wiederum argumentativen Zwecken dient.” (Desportes 2003: 292)

(The added thing is described as a component of the propositional content with *auh* in an enumeration whose last item is introduced with *auh* and is topicalized, focused and emphasized in this way, what in turn serves argumentative purpose.)<sup>23</sup>

Eroms (2010) conducted analysis of the adversative connectors such as *inti*, *auh* and *auuar/auur* in OHG. *Auuar/auur* became the only adversative conjunction *aber* in today’s German, though Eroms (2010) concludes that it did not really have adversative meaning in those days because it was possible to express adversative meaning with *inti/enti*. *Ouh*, in comparison to *auur* in Monseer Matthäus, apparently functions more adversatively than *auur*. He mentions that *auh* has the additive meaning like *auch* in today’s German (cf. Eroms 2010: 291-292).

Some combinations of these three words are seen in OHG texts. Eroms (2010: 294) mentions that the combination of *enti ioh* is found and means *und so weiter* (EN: ‘and so on’) and *und fernerhin* (EN: ‘and furthermore’) in Monseer Matthäus. Other interesting and important remarks made by Valentin (2003) and

<sup>22</sup> According to Haspelmath (2007: 23), natural conjunction generally consists of only two conjuncts such as ‘father and mother’. The conjuncts in natural conjunction are so essential that they could even build one unit to refer to its components as is seen in Erzya Mordvin, one of the Finno-Ugrian languages spoken in Russia, e. g. *t’et’ at-avat* (‘fathers and mothers’ = parents). Example cited from Haspelmath (2007: 23). Valentin (2003) calls this kind of conjunction ‘formulaic combination’ (formelhafte Kombination).

<sup>23</sup> English translation by the author.

Eroms (2010) indicate that *ouh* can be used with *joh*, but not with *inti*. Valentin (2003: 187) claims that this fact strengthens his argument that *ioh* should be the true, pure coordinator in OHG. I assume that the combination of *enti ouh* is perhaps impossible due to an overlapping of the adversative meaning of both connectors. *Ouh of ioh ouh* seems to emphasize the argumentative symmetry between two elements though these can just be mentioned one after another because of the linear character of the language (cf. Valentin 2003: 187). The last expression unique to the old German(ic) languages is *joh A joh B* which describes the correlative conjunction *sowohl A als auch B* (EN: ‘both A and B’) in NHG, which reminds us of TrSax correspondent.<sup>24</sup>

What do the other old German(ic) languages look like these three connectors? According to the analysis of Robin (2003), Heliand written in Old Saxon (OS) shows many variations of the connectors mentioned above that apparently have some differences between them in terms of their use: *endi*, which seems to correspond to *inti* in OHG, appears as a conjunction of two or three sentences and other elements including nominal phrases with a limit of four elements (cf. Robin 2003: 138-139). She also mentions that the word is used, at times repeatedly, to continue a story. While OHG *inti/enti*, *endi* can function adversatively according to Robin (2003: 138), Heliand has *tho* and *ac* as adversative particle in it, too. The following conjunctive forms are found in Heliand: *ia, ge/gi, gie/gia, gec, giac*.<sup>25</sup> *Ia*, which is similar to OHG *joh*, conjoins two sentences and clauses, and has a repeated function like *endi* that seems to show an overt overlap. *Ia* apparently has no accent according to Robin (2003: 141). She does not often refer to how conjunctions that do not contain verbs appear in Heliand, in particular regarding *ia*, but the example in her study shows that prepositional phrases are able to be conjoined by *ia*, e.g. *far iro hêrron ia far hebencuning* (EN: ‘for her men and for the king of heaven’).<sup>26</sup> She summarizes that *ge, gi, ia, gie, gia* are used rather for correlative conjunction such as *ia A ia B, gie A gie B, bêdies (...) gie A gie B, bêdiu ia A ia B*, etc. while *endi* follows the principle of general conjunction (cf. Robin 2003: 146). *Giac* consists of *ge* and *ac* to serve as *und* and appears only between two sentences to describe the temporary sequence like *and then* in English, which means the positions of the conjuncts conjoined with *giac* cannot be changed (cf. Robin 2003: 141-143).<sup>27</sup> In addition to these connectors, she refers to *iac* and *ac* as connectors. According to Robin (2003: 142-143), *iac* is made up with *ja* and *ak* and interpreted as *sowie* (EN: ‘as well as’) and *auch*. This connector seems to conjoin both non-verbal and verbal phrases based on Robin’s examples. The particle,

<sup>24</sup> I don’t go through this expression this time, but regarding the typological strategies for this structure, see Haspelmath (2007: 15).

<sup>25</sup> These words seem to have the common etymology. Dunkel (2014: 389) mentions that *ge* and its variations in OS and OE come from nominative plural of second person pronoun, but I don’t intend to deepen the etymological point of *ge* in this paper.

<sup>26</sup> Emphasized by the author. cf. Robin (2003: 140).

<sup>27</sup> *giac* is found twice in Heliand, one of which has a particle *ôc* that apparently means *auch* though Robin (2003) does not explain this word concretely in her paper.

*ac*, which is regarded as the equivalent of *ouh* of OHG, functions like *auch* as the corrective connector<sup>28</sup> *sondern* (EN: ‘but’ of the form ‘not A, but B’) and, *aber*, and the causative coordinator *denn* in NHG. Robin concludes that the meaning of *ac* varies depending on context though it only appears between two sentences.

Another older German language, Gothic, also shows similar copulative conjunctions such as *jah* and, *-hl/-uh* that are connected enclitically (cf. Feist 1922: 145). Selmani (2012: 77) mentions that Gothic does not possess the conjunctive which corresponds to West German *enti/inti*. Thus, all types of conjuncts are conjoined with this word. Braunmüller (1978: 114) says that Gothic *jah* once had a very general meaning which may be paraphrased by the feature ‘and the following (too)’ like OHG *joh*. One more similarity between Gothic *jah* and OHG *joh* is that it is possible to build an emphatic coordination by putting the word bisyndetically, namely *jah A jah B*. Gothic *auk* is listed as causative *since* (Feist 1922: 146, Braunmüller 1978: 116, Selmani 2012: 181), adversative conjunction *but* and additional meaning like *furthermore* (Kroonen 2013: 42) while *ak* or *akei* function adversatively.<sup>29</sup>

North Germanic languages, in contrast to the Germanic languages mentioned above, experienced other language change progress that is recognized in today’s variations though the Old Norse (ON) still shows similar characteristics to those of OHG, OS and Gothic. According to Nielsen (2017: 235), ON has two common connectors. *Ok* which is cognate of the coordinating conjunction *und* and focus/additive particle *auch*, and *en* which functions adversatively like *aber* in NHG. While Selmani (2012: 78) and Lühr (1979: 117) mentions that ON *en(n)* had the other meanings *ok* possessed.<sup>30</sup> There does not seem to be any special differences in terms of the types of coordinands which are conjoined by *ok* or *en*.

Old English (OE) had *and/ond* as a copulative conjunction<sup>31</sup> and *ac* as an adversative conjunction (cf. Zimmermann 2014: 1). Selmani (2012: 181) lists *eac* and *ec* as the additive particle corresponding to *auch* in NHG. According to an online dictionary “Dictionary of Old English”, this language had the bisyndetic correlative construction *and...and...* with a comment: “instead of the more usual *ge...ge...* or *ge...and...*”, which is reminiscent of the OS equivalencies. Referring to this online dictionary, OE *and/ond* seemed not to have the adversative function, but only the additive and copulative conjunctive meaning<sup>32</sup>

<sup>28</sup> Translation from Kotcheva’s term ‘Korrekturkonnektor’ (Kotcheva 2014: 23).

<sup>29</sup> Feist (1922: 146) refers to the meaning of *ak* as *sondern*, which indicates that this word appears after a negation (cf. Dunkel 2014: 88). There is an adversative *ip* in Gothic, which is supposed to come from IE \**éti* and to become *et* in Latin for example (cf. Dunkel 2014: 261-262). The conjunction *ip* conjoins sentences.

<sup>30</sup> ON *en(n)* disappeared in the Modern Mainland Scandinavian.

<sup>31</sup> Mitchell (1985: 694) defines *and* and *ond* as ‘cumulative’ because the term coordination is misleading in case of OE “because such OE conjunctions as *ond* and *ac* are frequently followed by the elements order S...V, which is basically subordinate”. To avoid using too many definitions regarding such type of conjunction, I won’t use this word and go through the details in this paper.

<sup>32</sup> Hall (1916: 51) mentions *and* as adversative *but* without any example though.

while *ac* could function causatively like *for* or *because* in Modern English and almost as a simple connector like *moreover*, *and also* and *and*. *Eac/ēac* or *ec* can obviously be used with *and* or *ond* with all types of elements as conjuncts.

To summarize the *und* and *auch* in old Germanic languages in the OHG period, some overlaps and similarities are partly observable: (i) the ancestors of both *und* and *auch* seems to have had adversative meanings; (ii) the older forms of *auch* in the Germanic languages already had the focus/additive function; (iii) in the West and East German languages such as OHG, OS and Gothic, there was another conjunction which does not exist in today's Germanic languages, namely *joh*, *ia* and *jah* whose etymology consists of a particle *ja* or pronominal *j-* and *ouh*, and they show a sort of semantic overlap with the ancestor of *und*, *enti/inti*; (iv) no difference between the conjunctions is observed in terms of conjuncts; (v) the variations of *joh* were used for a correlative conjunction. Though today's German *und* and *auch* have separate functions, they were etymologically, semantically and functionally similar in the past, which I see as the potentials that conjunctive *auch* in TrSax possesses. The next part addresses the conjunctions in the Middle Ages, especially the Moselle Franconian dialect for which I analyzed how the conjunction and additive particle were used in some written materials.

### 3.2 *Auch* and *und* in German(ic) languages: MHG era (ca. 1050 – 1350)

The overlaps seen in the older Germanic languages seem to be differentiated more in the MHG period. MHG has *unde/und* that functioned as a copulative conjunction<sup>33</sup> and can be used with *aber* together to express opposition. According to Selmani (2012: 89), *unde* tends to conjoin easy expressions from the nominal area in particular while *und* conjuncts verbs, phrases and sentences. This does not mean that both words are completely different, but it addresses alternative forms of one word and they are interchangeable (cf. Selmani 2012: 91). The MHG *unde/und* had already had the prototypical position of today's *und* apparently. The MHG *ouch*, which comes from *ouh* in OHG, functions additively and partly adversatively<sup>34</sup> while *aber* also had more adversative meaning in MHG than OHG *aur*. However, the MHG *aber* is categorized as an adverb as well, which meant *wieder*, *abermals* (EN: 'again') based on Lexer's dictionary, so that the *und aber*-configuration was accepted in this language (cf. Selmani 2012: 95).

In Middle Low German (MLG), *unde/und* seem to be used as coordinating conjunctions based on

<sup>33</sup> According to Lexer's dictionary, *unde/und* was also partly used adversatively like *und doch*, *aber auch*, etc., which seems to me that it did not function as a pure adversative coordination, but rather as addition and/or focus.

<sup>34</sup> Lexer's MHG dictionary refers to *aber auch*, *dagegen*, *andererseits*, and *dennoch* as meaning with the comment: "um einen neuen satz dem vorigen stärker oder schwächer entgegensustellen" (to more strongly or more weakly set a new sentence against the previous one).

some examples provided by Pfeiffer (1864). *Ok* functions as *auch* and also as an adversative particle like *anderseits*, *aber*, *doch* in disjunctive sentences, according to Lübben’s dictionary of MLG. Interestingly, the MLG has a different word for an adversative connector, namely *men* (Kotcheva 2014: 143), which is borrowed into the Mainland Scandinavian languages and replaced *en(n)* used in the previous period. I don’t aim to detail the adversative connector in this paper, but through the history of Germanic languages, coordinating conjunctions and adversative conjunctions obviously had a strong relation.

To move closer to the answer to my research questions, I conducted an analysis based on six texts written in Moselle Franconian dialects from the 12th to the 14th century by using the “Reference Corpus of Middle High German”. TrSax has many similarities with the Moselle Franconian dialects, particularly in the phonological system. It might be helpful to look into these dialects at the time when the ancestors of Transylvanian Saxons emigrated in order to find out whether the use of the two conjunctions is one of the relicts of TrSax has or it has developed among the TrSax speakers uniquely. The use of both *unde/und* and *ouch* in MHG shown in the MHG dictionaries and the preceding studies about MHG seem not to have category-specific functions.

The six texts I analyzed consist of two proses (“Gothaer Fiebersegen” and “Lancelot”) and four verses (“Albanus”, “Herzog Ernst”, “Arnsteiner Marienlied” and “Bruder Hermann: Das Leben der Gräfin Yolanda von Vianden”). All of them have *und/unde/inde/onde/ont/iñ* as connector in them which conjoins all kinds as conjuncts. Four texts have *ouch* with some alternative forms such as *oug*, *och*, *ouh* etc. while “Gothaener Fiebersegen” and “Albanus” don’t contain this word. In the six texts, 408 tokens are confirmed as *und* in total, and 75 tokens as *auch*. To go straight to the point, the conjunctive use of *auch* that is seen in TrSax is not detected by my text analysis. The longest text<sup>35</sup>, “Bruder Hermann: Das Leben der Gräfin Yolanda von Vianden”, interestingly shows that *und* and *auch* are able to be used together to emphasize the addition of information, argument, etc. as is seen in the following examples, which was not allowed in OHG.

(9) Du    fis           ze   junc   **vnd oich**   ze krank.

You be.2SG.PRS too young   **and also** too weak

“You are too young, and also too weak.”

(V4aV\_Yol-3177: ReM; gloss and translation mine)<sup>36</sup>

(10) Sy   twanc           ir                   wort **vnd oich** den           mūt.

She control.3SG.PST her.SG.N.ACC word **and also** the.SG.M.ACC sprits

<sup>35</sup> “Bruder Hermann: Das Leben der Gräfin Yolanda von Vianden“ has 257 tokens as *und* and 59 tokens as *auch* in total.

<sup>36</sup> Cited from the diplomatic text of “Bruder Hermann: Das Leben der Gräfin Yolanda von Vianden”.



“She controlled her word, and also sprits.”

(V4aV\_Yol-3616: ReM; gloss and translation mine)<sup>37</sup>

The combination of *und auch* in this text mostly appears to connect words or phrases that don't contain verbs as conjuncts (35 of 37 sets), whereas two of all instances *und auch* (*vnd oich/oig* in word) are used to combine clauses. This fact could be counted as a potential for explaining why *auch* is allowed to function as a coordinating conjunction in TrSax, though I need conduct more detailed analysis as this feature is only confirmed in a single text written in the Moselle Franconian dialect. For now, I conclude that *auch* as a category-specific conjunction is not seen in the Moselle Franconian dialect in the Middle Ages as the preceding studies show or omit, and thus, this use of *auch* developed after the ancestors of Transylvanian Saxons had immigrated to Transylvania.

#### 4. *Auch* and *und* in typology

In this chapter, I will seek to identify the language functional potential of *auch* from a typological point of view. Many European languages including Romanian have one word as both a coordinating conjunction and a focus/additive particle, which has not been addressed in preceding studies, like how Stassen (2000) groups languages into AND-languages and WITH-languages. I will try to describe how AND-languages and ALSO-languages appear, and how the position of TrSax relates to these languages to figure out the typological potential of conjunctions.

##### 4.1 Coordinating conjunction in typology

The coordinating conjunction itself has already been thematized in typology. Haspelmath (2004) and (2007) explore not only basic terms regarding conjunctions, but also the types and positions of coordinators, including correlative constructions (Haspelmath 2004: 6) and a semantic map for conjunctions and related expressions (Haspelmath 2007: 21). Mithun (1988) deals with grammaticalization<sup>38</sup> of coordination construction by having a look at a couple of languages. She mentions that “the relationships between juxtaposed clauses are usually interpret from context” before the grammaticalization which “results in a systematic specification of the precise nature of link”, and after the construction is grammaticalized, “the link is no longer merely semantic or pragmatic”, but also syntactic (Mithun 1988: 356). Haspelmath (2004: 11-12) also describes this relationship with charts. Stassen (2000) specifically focuses on two different strategies for the conjunction of noun phrases in world languages, namely a coordinate strategy and a

<sup>37</sup> Cited from the diplomatic text of “Bruder Hermann: Das Leben der Gräfin Yolanda von Vianden”.

<sup>38</sup> She uses a term ‘grammaticization’, but I would replace it with another word ‘grammaticalization’ because it is more popular now though both, in my understanding, refer to the same phenomenon.

comitative strategy which he calls AND-language and WITH-language. Haspelmath (2004: 19) indicates that comitative construction is also seen in coordination of non-NP.

Though the AND-language and WITH-language have well been discussed and addressed in the preceding studies, ALSO-languages like TrSax have not been paid much attention because such languages have been regarded as a part of AND-languages, which is clearly described in Haspelmath's semantic map where the focus/additive particle is combined with N-conjunction (cf. Haspelmath 2004: 21). In other words, this could support the idea that the category-specific conjunction *auch* in TrSax has a typological potential. Haspelmath (2004: 24) also shows diachronic links between conjunction and related functions in a chart where the focus/additive particle has a unidirectional arrow directing to N-conjunction. Mithun (1988: 340) also indicates that "nominal conjunctions also develop from ... an adverbial particle meaning 'also, too, as well'".

I, however, want to shed light on the so-called ALSO-language separately to understand the potential of the conjunctive *auch* in TrSax because the functions of *auch* and *und* in German or *also* and *and* in English are different from each other in terms of information structure, as mentioned previously. I also expect that it will be possible to position the Romanian coordinating construction *și* that has not really been studied, even though I'm aware that Romanian coordination itself needs to be thematized separately with respect to TrSax because language contact with Romanian definitely plays a role in TrSax coordinating construction.

#### 4.2 ALSO-language and AND-language

As Stassen (2000) names the languages that have conjunctive strategy AND-languages and those that have comitative strategy WITH-languages, I would call the languages that have the same forms for coordinating conjunctions and focus/additive particles like Romanian 'ALSO-languages'.

Many languages in the world have two different words for coordinating conjunctions and for focus/additive particles, e.g. German: *und* – *auch*, English: *and* – *also*, French: *et* – *aussi*, Hungarian: *és/med*<sup>39</sup> – *is* Japanese: *to* – *mo*, Korean: *kwa/wa* – *do*, while one word can have both meanings in some languages such as Russian *i*, Romanian *și*, Latin *et*, Serbian *i* etc. In North Germanic languages, with the exception of Icelandic, there are two separate words for coordinating conjunctions, e.g. *och* and *og*, and focus / additive particles, e.g. *ocksá* and *ogsá*.

The majority of languages, however, possesses multiple forms for coordinating conjunctions and/or focus/additive particles, e.g. Japanese: *to* – *-te*, Korean: *kwa* / *wa* – *-go*, Latin: *et* – *atque* – *ac* – *-que* for coordination and French: *aussi* – *également*, Italian: *anche* – *pure*, Russian: *i* – *takže* – *tože* for

---

<sup>39</sup> Hungarian normal coordinating conjunction is *és*, but *med* is also used in informal situations.

focus/additive particles. Typologically, it is interesting that Romanian, which is one of the contact languages of TrSax, has only one form for both coordinating conjunction and focus/additive particles as is found in (11) – (13). *Kai* in Greek functions similarly.

(11) Ion și Maria vorbesc franceza.

Ion and Maria speak.3PL.PRS French

“Ion and Maria speak French.”

(Bilbîie 2008: 9; gloss and translation mine)

(12) Ion vorbește și franceza.<sup>40</sup>

Ion speak.3SG.PRS also French

“Ion speaks French (= as well as [other language, e.g. English, German....]).”

(Bilbîie 2008: 9; gloss and translation mine)

(13) Și Ion vorbește franceza.

also Ion speak.3SG.PRS French

“Ion also speaks French (= as well as [someone, e.g. Maria, Oana...]).”

As Haspelmath (2004: 11-12) mentions for coordinating conjunction, the difference among those multiple forms can depend on syntactic or semantic rules. For instance, Japanese *to* conjoin NP while the suffix *-te* is used to coordinate AP and VP as is shown in (14) and (15). In Russian three focus/additive particles can change the scope based on positions and/or forms, which is described in the following examples (16) – (18) with context “Ada reads science fiction” and “Lara reads science fiction” (Benazzo and Paykin 2017: 272)<sup>41</sup>:

(14) Kyō-wa yubinkyoku-to sūpā-ni iku yotei-ga aru.

today post-and supermarket-to go plan exist

“Today I have a plan to go to the post and the supermarket.”

(15) Ichinichijū Tabe-te neru-dake-no seikatsu-wo okuru.

all day long Eat-and sleep-only-of life spend

<sup>40</sup> In a conversation, *și* often appears doubly to add new information like in English ‘and also’, e.g. “Ion vorbește franceza, **și și** engleza (Ion speaks French, and also English), which is not really mentioned in a grammar book as long as I read.

<sup>41</sup> According to them, the use of *takže* which is not stressed seen in (14) “insists on the contrastive rhematic element ‘detective stories’, while the use of *tože*” in (15) “emphasizes the similarity between the two predicates, only indirectly presenting the theme as contrastive”. They also imply that *i* can appear in both (14) and (15) like ‘Ada čitaet *i* detektivy *takže*’ or ‘Ada čitaet *tože i* detektivy’ for context “Ada reads science fiction” to convey the same nuance (Benazzo and Paykin 2017: 272-273).

“(I) spend a life only to eat and sleep for all day long.”

Context: Ada reads science fiction.

(16) Ada čitaet i detektivy.

Ada reads and detective-stories.

“Ada reads detective stories as well.”

(17) Ada takže čitaet detektivy.

Ada also/the-same-way reads detective-stories

“Ada also reads detective stories.”

Context: Lara reads science fiction.

(18) Ada tože čitaet detektivy.

Ada also reads detective-stories

“Ada also reads detective-stories (= as well as Lara)”

(Benazzo and Paykin 2017: 272)

In comparison to the West German languages, the North German languages, such as Danish, Norwegian, and Icelandic, have experienced a different development in terms of coordinating conjunction. Though two separate forms of coordinating conjunctions, e.g. *och* and *og*, and focus/additive particles, e.g. *också*, *også*, appear in Mainland Scandinavian languages like Swedish, Danish, and Norwegian, both words consist of a part of the Germanic focus/additive particle. While *inti* that originally meant adversative in OHG had represented a coordinating-conjunctive function in the West German languages, *ouh* took on the position of coordinating conjunction in the North Germanic languages. The similarity that both Germanic language groups show is that both *inti* and *auh* lost adversative meaning through their histories, which is regarded as universal according to Eroms (2010: 282): In German, for example, *auur* acquired adversative meaning, and *men* which was borrowed from MLG is used as an adversative conjunction in Mainland Scandinavian languages.<sup>42</sup>

TrSax has two coordinating conjunctions, namely *und* and *auch* which function category-specifically, and one focus/additive particle *auch*. The conjunction *auch* in this language can conjoin everything that does not contain verbs. Mithun (1988) refers to Cayuga, a Northern Iroquoian language of Ontario, which has *hni'* that functions as both a nominal conjunction and a focus/additive particle, and acts as an example

<sup>42</sup> In Icelandic, *en* that is etymologically common to OHG *inti* and functioned adversatively in ON, is still used as an adversative conjunction. According to Kotcheva (2014), this word is likely to have an *and*-meaning, but it functions far from coordination. The difference between *og* and *en* in Icelandic is that the first one conjoins conjuncts whose subject references are identical while *en* serves as marker for contrast and limitation (cf. Kotcheva 2014: 75-77), which is similar to Russian *a* that is often translated into *and*.

of ALSO-language. She indicates, however, that this word does not conjoin verbs or clauses<sup>43</sup> (cf. Mithun 1988: 342), which is likely to be similar to TrSax *auch*. Though most European languages are unlikely to have the category-specific strategy, it is not surprising cross-linguistically because “such a particle (= focus/additive particle) would often occur in potentially ambiguous contexts” (cf. Mithun 1988: 341).

To sum up various points mentioned above, I provide the chart found below in which only the word distribution is displayed. The last section describing the Mainland Scandinavian languages has the dotted lines to express that both forms are interrelated and, not completely different, unrelated words.

Language	Coordinating conjunction	Focus / additive particles
a. Russian, Bulgarian, Icelandic etc.	<i>i</i>	<i>tože</i> ...
b. Romanian, Greek	<i>și</i>	
c. TrSax, Cayuga	<i>und</i>	<i>auch</i>
d. German, Japanese etc.	<i>und</i>	<i>auch</i>
e. Norwegian, Danish, Swedish	<i>og, och</i>	<i>også, också</i>

Figure 1. Chart of the distribution of coordinating conjunction and focus / additive particle

Though the coordinating conjunctions and focus/additive particles are related in terms of their concept, as Haspelmath (2004) illustrates with the semantic map, their use is variously distributed among languages, even among the ALSO-languages described from (a) to (c) in the chart above. As the North Germans from the Scandinavian Mainland reveal, coordinating conjunction and focus/additive particles can develop while maintaining their conceptual relations which could be counted as a potential of conjunctive use of the focus/additive particle. Focus/additive particles can develop into coordinating conjunctions because “the focus-particle source of conjunction always has the marker on the second conjunct” as Haspelmath (2007: 10) indicates, but the limitation of the conjuncts which the conjunctive from the focus-particle source can conjoin and extend the use of such conjunction need to be explored further. I would like to do so as one of the next steps for my research by analyzing historical texts written in TrSax, and diachronic materials and studies of other ALSO-languages.

<sup>43</sup> In Cayuga, verbs and clauses are conjoined without any conjunctive (cf. Mithun 1988: 342).

## 5. Conclusion

In this paper, I explored historical circumstances of *und* and *auch* in Germanic languages such as etymology and functions as well as typological facts, especially regarding coordinating conjunction and focus/additive particle to seek the answers for some of my research questions repeated below:

- (i) What do(es) the coordinating conjunction(s) and focus/additive particle (today's *und* and *auch* in German) look like in the history of German language? Did the category-specific conjunctions seen in TrSax possibly exist in older German(ic) languages?
- (ii) Does a language-universal potential for the category-specific conjunction of *auch* exist? What strategy do the words *und* and *auch* generally have from typological point of view?
- (iii) What are the potentials of the ways how both conjunctions are used in TrSax?

Though there is only one word for coordinating conjunction in today's German, namely *und*, the old Germanic languages had two forms for coordinating conjunction, *inti* and *joh*. The latter disappeared through the course of history, but it has an etymological commonality with *auch*. Interestingly, the ancestors of both *und* and *auch* had a rather adversative function in the OHG period, which has been completely changed through the history. While it is not seen any more in the later German languages, the OHG showed a loose tendency for category-specific conjunctions in *joh* and *inti*, which could reveal a potential conjunctive use of *auch*. From the analysis of some texts written in Moselle Franconian dialects in the MHG era, *ouch* functioned as a focus/additive particle like NHG, but the combination of *und ouch* that is not likely to be allowed in the OHG period mostly appears in NP, which could lead to a category-specific conjunction *auch* in TrSax as well.

The second research question addresses a cross-linguistic point of view. I described the typological distribution of coordinating conjunctions and focus/additive particles in the chart above. As the preceding studies such as Haspelmath (2007) and Mithun (1988) reveal, the focus/additive particle is able to develop into a coordinating conjunction. The conjunctive use of this particle seems to be limited to NP conjunction according to both authors. Since the conjunctive *auch* is allowed to conjoin AP and PP as well in TrSax, this conjunction may be located in the transition from the particle to the general conjunction, which I want to deepen in the next step. It is, however, possible that this conjunction has some constraints in coordination of VP and sentences because of another function of coordinating conjunction, namely sequential conjunction as is often translated as 'and then' in English, which was not the scope of this article and needs to be clarified in the next research step by looking into German, TrSax, Romanian and other languages individually and typologically. I assume that focus/additive particle may tend to develop limitedly to the enumerative conjunction because of the asymmetry of the conjuncts, which I will deepen

in the further research. Cross-linguistically, the focus/additive particle has the potential to become a coordinating conjunction though its development flow needs to be attested by conducting analyses with historical materials written in TrSax and looking into the historical references of other ALSO-languages.

### **Abbreviation**

ACC = accusative

AdvP = adverbial phrase

AP = adjective phrase

ASD = Audioatlas Siebenbürgisch-Sächsischer Dialekte

DAT = dative

DE = German

DWDS = DWDS-Kernkorpus

EN = English

F = feminine

IE = Indo-European

INF = Infinitive

M = masculine

MHG = Middle High German

N = neutral

NHG = New High German

NOM = nominative

NP = nominal phrase

OE = Old English

OHG = Old High German

ON = Old Norse

OS = Old Saxon

PCTP = past-participle

PL = plural

PP = prepositional phrase

PRS = present

PST = past

REDE = Regionalsprache.de

REFL = reflexive

RO = Romanian

SG = singular

TrSax = Transylvanian Saxon German

VP = verb phrase

## References

- Bancu, Ariana. 2019. *Dynamics of Language Contact and Language Variation: The Case of Transylvanian Saxon in the Homeland and the Diaspora*. Dissertation. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan.
- Benazzo, Sandra and Katia Paykin. 2017. Additive relations in L2 French: Contrasting acquisitional trend of Italian and Russian speakers. De Cesare, Anna-Maria and Cecilia Andorno. *Focus on Additivity. Adverbial modifiers in Romance, Germanic and Slavic languages*. Amsterdam / Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company. 265-309.
- Bilbîie, Gabriela. 2008. A syntactic account of Romanian correlative coordination from a Romance perspective. Müller, Stefan (ed.). *The 15th International Conference on Head Driven Phrase Structure Grammar. Keihanna, Japan*. Stanford: CSLI Publications.
- Bottesch, Johanna. 2008. Rumänien. Eichinger, M. Ludwig, Albrecht Plewnia and Claudia M. Riehl (Hrsg.). *Handbuch der deutschen Sprachminderheiten in Mittel- und Osteuropa*. Tübingen: Gunter Narr Verlag. 329-392.
- Braunmüller, Kurt. 1978. Remarks on the formation of conjunctions in Germanic languages. Braunmüller, Kurt. *Beiträge zur Skandinavistischen Linguistik*. Oslo: Novus. 247-272.
- Desportes, Yvon. 2003. auh im althochdeutschen Isidor. Desportes, Yvon (Hrsg.). *Konnektoren im älteren Deutsch. Akten des Pariser Kolloquiums. März 2002*. Heidelberg: Universitätsverlag Winter. 271-319.
- Dunkel, George E. 2014. *Lexikon der indogermanischen Partikeln und Pronominalstämme*. Heidelberg: Universitätsverlag Winter.
- Eroms, Hans-Werner. 2010. Additive und adversative Konnektoren im Althochdeutschen. Ziegler, Arne und Christian Braun. *Historische Textgrammatik und Historische Syntax des Deutschen: Traditionen, Innovationen, Perspektiven*. Berlin / New York: De Gruyter. 279-303.
- Feist, Sigmund. 1922. *Einführung in das Gotische. Texte mit Übersetzungen und Erläuterungen*. Leipzig & Berlin: B. G. Teubner.
- Gündisch, Konrad. 2005. *Siebenbürgen und die Siebenbürger Sachsen. 2. Auflage*. München: Langen Müller.
- Haspelmath, Martin. 2004. Coordinating conjunctions: An overview. Haspelmath, Martin (ed.). *Coordinating constructions*. Amsterdam / Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company. 3-39.



- Haspelmath, Martin. 2007. Coordination. Shopen, Timothy. *Language Typology and Syntactic Description: Complex Construction. 2nd Edition. Vol. 2.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. 1-51.
- Ihara, Kenji and Sakae Hamakawa. 1958. *Zenchishi, Setsuzokushi [Preposition, Conjunction]*. Tokyo: Hakusuisha.
- Kisch, Gustav. 1900. *Nösner Wörter und Wendungen: ein Beitrag zum siebenbürgisch-sächsischen Wörterbuch*. Bistritz: Druck von Theodor Botschar.
- Kotcheva, Kristina. 2014. *Adversativkonnectoren in den nordgermanischen Sprachen. Synchronie und Diachronie*. Heidelberg: Universitätsverlag Winter.
- Krefeld, Thomas. 2016. Rumänismen im Material des ASD. Thomas Krefeld, Stephan Lücke and Emma Mages (eds.). *Zwischen traditioneller Dialektologie und digitaler Geolinguistik: Der Audioatlas siebenbürgisch-sächsischer Dialekte (ASD). Korpus im Text, Vol. 2.* Münster: Monsenstein & Vannerdat. 211-227.
- Lühr, Rosemarie. 1979. Das Wort 'und' im Westgermanischen. *Münchener Studien zur Sprachwissenschaft* 38: 117-154.
- McClure, McKenzie Malcolm. 1973. *A grammar of Weingartskirchen dialect of Transylvanian German. (Doctral Dissertation)*. Berkeley: University of California.
- Mitchell, Bruce. 1985. *Old English Syntax. Vol. 1. Concord, the parts of speech and the sentence*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Mithun, Marianne. 1988. The grammaticization of coordination. Haiman, John and Sandra A. Thompson (eds.). *Clause Combining in Grammar and Discourse. Vol. 18.* Amsterdam / Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company. 331-359.
- Münz, Rainer and Rainer Ohlinger. 1998. *Deutsche Minderheiten in Ostmittel- und Osteuropa, Aussiedler in Deutschland. Eine Analyse ethnisch privilegierter Migration*. Berlin: Humboldt-Universität zu Berlin, Institut für Sozialwissenschaften.
- Mufwene, Salikoko S. 2001. *The Ecology of Language Evolution*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Nielsen, Marit A. 2017. A remark on the Old Norse conjunction ok. *Scripta Neophilologica Posnaniensia*. 17: 235-242.
- Pasch, Renate et al. 2003. *Handbuch der deutschen Konnectoren I. Linguistische Grundlagen der Beschreibung und syntaktische Merkmale der deutschen Satzverknüpfen (Konjunktionen, Satzadverbien und Partikeln)*. Berlin / New York: De Gruyter.
- Pfeiffer, Franz. 1864. *Niederdeutsche Erzählungen aus dem 15. Jahrhundert*. Wien: Carl Gerold's Sohn.
- Piper, Paul. 1884. *Otfrids Evangelienbuch. II Theil: Glosar und Abriss der Grammatik*. Freiburg u.a.: Mohr.

- Reis, Marga and Inger Rosengren. 1997. A modular approach to the grammar of additive particles: the case of German *auch*. *Journal of Semantics*, Vol. 14, Issue 3 1 February: 237-309.
- Riecke, Jörg. 2016. *Geschichte der deutschen Sprache. Eine Einführung*. Stuttgart: Reclam.
- Riehl, M. Claudia. 2014. *Sprachkontaktforschung: Eine Einführung. 3. Auflage*. Tübingen: Narr Francke Attempto Verlag.
- Robin, Thérèse. 2003. Die Konnektoren im 'Heliand'. Desportes, Yvon. *Konnektoren im älteren Deutsch. Akten des Pariser Kolloquiums. März 2002*. Heidelberg: Universitätsverlag Winter. 137-159.
- Selmani, Lirim. 2012. *Grammatik von und. Mit einem Blick auf seine albanischen und arabischen Entsprechungen*. Münster / New York / München / Berlin: Waxmann.
- Shinohara, Sara. 2016. Der konjunktionale Gebrauch von *auch* im Siebenbürgisch-Sächsischen. (Hg.). Japanische Gesellschaft für Germanistik. *Beiträge zur Dialektologie*. München: iudicium. 58-75.
- Sift, Johannes. 2016. "Bevor ich meine Erzählung an werde fangen..." Untersuchungen zur morphosyntaktischen Variation von Partikelverben mit *ab-*, *an-*, *auf-* und *aus-* im Siebenbürgisch-Sächsischen. Krefeld, Thomas, Stephan Lücke and Emma Mages. *Zwischen traditioneller Dialektologie und digitaler Geolinguistik: Der Audioatlas siebenbürgisch-sächsischer Dialekte (ASD). Korpus im Text, Vol. 2*. Münster: Monsenstein & Vannerdat. 189-210.
- Stassen, Leon. 2000. AND-languages and WITH-languages. *Linguistic Typology* 4: 1-54.
- Thomason, G. Sarah. 2001. *Language Contact: An Introduction*. Washington D.C.: Georgetown University Press.
- Valentin, Paul. 2003. Konnektoren bei Otfrid. Desportes, Yvon (Hrsg.). *Konnektoren im älteren Deutsch. Akten des Pariser Kolloquiums. März 2002*. Heidelberg: Universitätsverlag Winter. 179-191.
- Wagner, Ernst. 1990. *Geschichte der Siebenbürger Sachsen. Ein Überblick. 6. Auflage*. Thaur bei Innsbruck: Wort und Welt Verlag.
- Zimmermann, Richard. 2014. Distributional differences between Old English main clauses with and without a conjunction. Butt, Miriam and Tracy H. King (eds.). *Proceedings of the LFG14 Conference*. CSLI Publications.

### **Dictionaries and corpora**

- ASD. Audioatlas Siebenbürgisch-Sächsischer Dialekte: <http://www.asd.gwi.uni-muenchen.de/> (last accessed: October 10, 2020)
- Dictionary of Old English: <https://doe.utoronto.ca/pages/index.html#pub/web-dict> (last accessed: October 13, 2020)
- DWDS-Kernkorpus 21: <https://www.dwds.de/d/korpora/korpus21> (last accessed: October 29, 2020)
- REDE. Regionalsprache.de: <https://www.regionalsprache.de/> (last accessed: October 29, 2020)

ReM. Reference Corpus of Middle High German (Referenzkorpus Mittelhochdeutsch):

<https://www.linguistics.ruhr-uni-bochum.de/rem/index.html> (last accessed: October 23, 2020)

Hall, John R.C. 1916. *A Concise Anglo-Saxon Dictionary*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Lexer, Matthias. 1992. *Mittelhochdeutsches Taschenwörterbuch*. 38. Auflage. Mit den Nachträgen von Ulrich Pretzel. Stuttgart: S. Hirzel Verlag.

Lübben, August. 1888. *Mittelniederdeutsches Handwörterbuch*. Darmstadt: WissenschaftlicheBuchgesellschaft.

### **Other literatures**

Müller, Herta. 2016. *Mein Vaterland war ein Apfelkern. Ein Gespräch mit Angelika Klammer*. Frankfurt am Main: FISCHER Taschenbuch.

Müller, Herta. 2009. *Atemschaukel*. München: Carl Hanser Verlag.

Schuster, Dutz G. 1923. *De Tarokpartie uch aonder lastich Geschichten*. Mediasch: Feder & Henzion.

## トランシルヴァニア・ザクセン方言における *auch* の並列接続詞的用法 歴史言語学及び言語類型論からの考察

アーント 沙羅

本稿は、言語接触下にある言語について、ある特定の言語形式が持つポテンシャルがアクティベート化あるいは非アクティベート化されることで主変種とは異なる言語変化が起こるという筆者の仮説に基づき、ドイツ語の一変種として分類され、850年以上にわたりルーマニア語との接触状態にあるトランシルヴァニア・ザクセン方言に見られる *auch* の並列接続詞的用法を例として、様々な観点から言語変化が起こり得るポテンシャルを見つけ出すことを目指している。主要な章となる第3章と第4章では、かつて存在したゲルマン語族の並列接続詞ならびに現代の標準ドイツ語では副詞で焦点化詞に位置づけられる *auch* の意味変化と、両語彙の関連性と使用に関し概観し、さらに言語類型論の観点からみた並列接続詞と *auch* の関連性と通言語的な分布について考察することで、変化の要因となり得るいくつかのポテンシャルと考えられる要素を挙げ、仮説実証への足掛かりとしている。