And in English Grammar

Dora Riffer-Maček
Faculty of Philosophy, Zagreb

The conjunction *and* is treated in early and modern grammatical writings from the point of view of its categorization, its function, and evaluation in terms of style. Syntactico-grammatical and logico-semantic criteria are employed by early as well as modern authors. *And* is defined as a function word marking structural relations called coordination, and semantic relations called addition. Rules governing coordination are discussed, as well as the semantic implications of the structure in question. On levels above sentence *and* functions as a text-forming device producing cohesion of the discourse. The paper suggests that the only undisputed function of *and* is that of connector.. The idea of some early grammarians of coordination reduction has been usefully developed in transformational syntax. Further studies in frequency, variety of stylistic applications and change of stylistic range should provide more interesting views of constructions with *and*.

And introducing a sentence is considered by many people to be the mark of a clumsy style, as is its constant repetition, at least in written texts. Nevertheles, *and* is one of the most frequently used words in English (M. West, 1953, notes 106,064 occurrences of *and* per 5 million words). It is the most commonly used function word (Fries, 1940/208) in all varieties of English, and the simplest from of conjunction (Halliday & Hasan, 1976//233). Moreover, as so often happens with simple forms, it has acquired a number of functions which are often ambiguous or difficult to define.

Our aim is first to review the treatment of *and* in early grammars of English and in modern linguistic analysis. The structural, semantic and stylistic facets of *and* will be outlined as they appear in selected literature. A sequel to the paper will deal with usage and changes in usage in English texts from various periods.

1. English grammars from the 16th to the 19th century were influenced by two important models, the Latin school model and the Port—Royal grammar. While some English grammars follow these models closely, others however, modify them to accommodate the structure of English as then perceived. Furthermore, an important number of grammars construct "vernacular" systems (Michael. 1970).

One of the primary concerns of early grammarians was the classification of the parts of speech. Grammars following the Latin model placed *and* in the category of conjunction within a system of eight terms (i. e. noun, pronoun, verb, participle, adverb, conjunction, preposition, interjection). Grammars that aimed at the reformation of this traditional system have only four categories (nouns, adjectives, verbs and particles) so that *an'd* is placed, along with other conjunctions, into the category *particle*, together with adverbs, prepositions and interjections. In these grammars the English term *joining word* is sometimes used instead of the Latin term conjunction (e. g. Brightland and Gildon, 1712, Collyer, 1735). Among the variations of the "vernacullar" system there is one (Harris, 1751) where conjunctions and prepositions from one category called *conjunctive*, and another, aiming to provide a type of universal classification (Lodowyck, 1652), which places pronouns, adverbs, prepositions, conjunctions and interjections among *words of help*.

Delimitation between subclasses in such categories as particle, conjunctive, or words of help was as difficult in older grammars as it is today, but *and* could be unequivocally defined as a "joining word".

1.1. Whether as a separate primary category or within the category of particle, the conjunction is defined as an undeclinable word. Its function is to connect parts of discourse. But whereas there is general agreement among authors on this connective function, they differ in stating what it is exactly that conjuctions connect.

For some early grammarians conjuctions joined only words, for others only sentences. A third opinion held that conjunctions joined words and sentences. It should be noted that the distinction between clauses and sentences was not made in early grammars (Michael, 1975/451, Vorlat, 1970/391).

Since in the grammatical tradition from the Greeks and Romans onwards there were always two theoretical bases, a linguistic-syntactic and a logico-semantic one, their influence can be traced in early English grammatical thought as well. So besieds the above mentioned definitions of the functions of conjunctions there is also the view that conjunctions connect thoughts, reflect the logical connections between ideas. John Harris (1971), for instance, makes a distinction between conjunctions that join sentences *(and* and *but)*, and those that join thoughts *(and* only). In Brightland's translation of the Port-Royal grammar it is said that the conjunction does not mean anything but "the very Operation of the Mind, which joyns, disjoyns..." (quoted in Vorlat, 1970/392).

Those grammarians that define the conjunction as a sentence connector contend, like Maittaire (1712), that even "where the Conjunction joyns only two words expressed, there are really two Clauses or Sentences, whereof if but one is expressed at full, it maketh up, what in the other is wanting, and, to avoid a needless repetition of the same words, understood" (quoted in Vorlat 1975/394). The idea, that words repeated in the conjunction of two sentences are deleted, i. e. "understood", is found in the works of several grammarians, some provide examples similar to the following by Greenwood (quoted in Vorlat, 1970/392):

"*John and Paul preaches, preaches* is understood in the first part of the Sentence." (= John preaches and Paul preaches).

This type of conjunction can have any number of members, a very much reeated example being:

"You, and I, and Peter, rode to London" = "You rode to London; I rode to London; Peter rode to London" (Lowth, 1762, quoted in Michael. 1975/452f).

But there are critics of this analysis as well, who say, like Richard Postlethwaite (1975, quoted in Michael 1975/453), that conjunctions do not always connect sentences: "If A, B and C form a Triangle, A is not a Triangle, B is not a Triangle, C is not a Triangle."

Particles in general, and conjunctions in particular, are understood as "Nerves and Ligaments of all Discourse", joining the "Materials prepared for the Building" together (Greenwood, quoted as above).

1.2. Conjunctions were usually subclassified according to the relations that held among the parts of discourse connected by them. These subclassed could become very elaborate at times, so that it was almost possible to arrive at as many separate subcategories as there were conjunctions. J. Stirling (1735, quoted in Vorlat 1975/393) recognized the danger and suggested that the number of classes should be restricted to *and, or either, neither, nor,* which would make Language vastly more easy; and then the rest would come under the class of Adverb".

Clearly, the mechanisms for distinguishing conjunctions from adverbs (and prepositions, sometimes even pronouns) were not adequate, and semantic subclassitication though logical in general did not offer practicable and unequivocal criteria. In the case of *and* however, there was never any doubt as to its function and it was commonly mentioned as the first member of the, equally undisputed first subclass, i. e. the *copulative* conjunction. It would be fair to say that when the word conjunction is mentioned, the "archconjunction" *and* comes to mind first.

1.3. Since during much of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries grammatical output was not only theoretical or descriptive but prescriptive as well, linguistic usage was often evaluated on its stylistic merits. Thus Duncan (1731, quoted in Vorlat 1975/ 293) on conjunctions: "It is the good or bad Use of Conjunctions that consitutes the essence of a good or bad

Stile. They render the Discourse more smooth and fluent. They are the Helpmates of Reason in arguing, relating and putting the other Parts of Speech in a due Order. Yet in violent Discourse, where Reason gives way to Passion, they are often elegantly omitted."

A more elaborate and careful, obviously formal and written style is here contrasted to less formal, emotional, probably spoken style where simple parataxis is used. Though not mentioned in the quotation, subordinating as well as coordinating conjunctions are meant.

1.4. In summing up the main points about *and* in early English grammars it can be said that:

a) *and* is a conjunction or joining word, a subclass of the category particle,

b) it is typically undeclined, in common with all other particles,

c) its function is that of a connector between parts of discourse and between thoughts,

d) it has no meaning of its own except a relational one expressing the manner in which sentences depend on each other,

e) it is a helping word, providing coherence and smothness to the text, or elegance of style.

f) It is possible to analyze structures with *and* as sentences coupled into one large unit, with identical parts deleted in one sentence, since the conjunction enables them to be "understood" withouth being expressed.

g) There are various subclasses of conjunctions, depending on the view taken by the author, but in all classifications there are at least two subclasses, the copulative *and* and the disjunctive *or*.

2. In expanding, modifying or clarifying already existing ideas, modern English grammatical thought has followed most of the paths laid down by the early grammarians. New solutions are proposed from time to time and new insights gained, though some distinctions remain fuzzy.

2.1 The category *particle* is well established in modern grammars, and it is still comprised of a variety of forms which are not always easily distinguished from each other. Jespersen (1924/89) considers the similarity between the secondary categories to be more important than their differences. He notices that, for instance, some forms may function as members of more than one category. Thus *for* can function both as a preposition and as a conjunction, depending on whether its complement is a noun or a clause respectively. So Jespersen suggests that conjunctions could be considered to be sentence prepositions on account of their initial position. However, he notes that this definition cannot be applied to *and*, though *and* is a word always reckoned among conjunctions, because it does not always precede a sentence, e. g. He *and* i are friends. Jespersen does not consider the possibility of analyzing a conjunction as operating on two sentences where the final output would be a result of ellipsis.

Another reason Jespersen gives for rejecting the classification of *and*, *or* and *but*, as sentence prepositions is their coordinating function. Conjunctions like *for* and the prepositions are all subordinators.

One of the similarities of all particles is their invariability. This feature is one of the reasons why adverbs, conjunctions, prepositions and interjections are placed in the same category. It is interesting that although modern English shows only the rudiments of an inflectional system, grammatical tradition has continued to influence a classification that gives prominence to the distinction between variable and invariable forms.

Another fact noticed by early grammarians, namely that particles lack lexical meaning, is taken up in modern grammatical writings as well. In structuralist approaches it leads to the formulation of the category *function words* (Fries, 1951/106). Conjunctions only have a structural meaning which is to link, connect, conjoin, they "denote merely a relation between the clauses" (Quirk et al. 1972/560).

2.2. The question which was variously answered by earlier grammars, i. e "what is it that conjunctions connect", is in modern works modified into a question about coordinate conjunctions only, since they are the ones that are considered to connect "words, groups of words, clauses and sentences" (Scheurweghs, 1959/312), though more carefully worded definitions speak of "parts", "units", "structures", "constituents", noting that what is linked are "parts of like rank" (Curme 1931/161), "two units with the 'same' structural function" (Fries, 1951/94), "equivalent structures — members of the same form-class, or phrases, clauses, or even sentences" (Strang, 1968/194), "constituents of the same type" (Chomsky, 1965/36).

In logico-semantic terms coordinating conjunctions join "two or more predications" (Leech, 1974/195).

The important and new element, not noticed by early grammarians, is that whatever is linked by *and* (or another coordinator) has to be of "like rank", "same structural function", "same type", "equivalent".

The other element overlooked by these authors was that coordinating and subordinating conjunctions differ in their connecting capacity. This however, was a necessary corollary of the lack of a clear definition of the status of coordinate and subordinate clauses.

2.2.1. It is easy enough to show that the traditional definition of a conjunction as linking words, phrases, clauses, etc. is very loose. The examples that follow can hardly be considered as correct, grammatical, or, for the modern linguist, acceptable sentences:

It is raining and snow.

Shut the door and so did I.

Gleitman (1965) contends that even more precise definitions, like the ones mentioned in the preceding section, fail to cover the entire range of acceptable and unacceptable structures. Taking Chomsky's description of

conjunction as a starting point, Gleitman has shown that there are "constituents of the same type" that cannot be conjoined to from grammatical sentences.

For instance, the two NPs in *Running and to overeat may be unhealthy*, cannot be conjoined due to constraints applying to some nominalizations. On the other hand, *The conjunction of an interrogative and an imperative sentence is excluded* is an acceptable sentence although the constituent prepositional phrase without head noun *(of an interogative)* does not have an equivalent following the coordinator *and*, but only a NP consisting of determiner modifier and noun *(an imperative sentence)*.

There are some exceptions to the above general rule: coordinating conjunctios cannot be conjoined *(He ate and he slept too. + He ate but he slept too. ⟶ *He ate and he slept too.)*, nor can interrogative and imperative sentences *(*What are you doing and shut the door)*. When phrasal constituents are not conjoinable, they do not belong to the same dominating node (which is also the case in the example with the nominalizations *running* and *to overeat*). Sometimes the interpretation is ambiguous, for which reason apparently unconjoinable sentences are acceptable to the speaker.

Gleitman (1965/263) further shows that altlough sentences with different derivational histories are conjoinable e. g., *He was offered a job and he accepted it*, this is not the case with sentences where strings of morphemes repeated in the two conjoined sentences have different phrase structures (e. g., *He turned in his income tax and he turned in his cramped compartment.)*. Such sentences are considered odd or amusing by informants. *He turned in his income tax and his cramped compartment* on the other hand is clearly ungrammatical.

While the odd sentence is acceptable in so far as both conjuncts share the sentence string S, and also the nodes NP-V-P-NP *he turned-in-his income tax/his cramped compartment*, the preposition P of the two conjuncts is dominated by a different node. In the first conjunct the dominator is V *(turn in)* in the second the Adjunct *(in his cramped compartment)*. The ungrammatical sentence is excluded for the same reason while lacking compatibility in the string S.

But here again the line between unacceptable and "odd" sentences may be fuzzy. Sentences where the principle of structural equality is violated may be accepted by some informants as humorous, yet rejected by others. Moreover such "zeugmatic" coordination is often employed for special stylistic purposes, e. g. in Dickens:

Mr. Pickwick took his hat and his leave.

As Lyons (1977/406ff) points out, it is not only a case of structural violation, but there is also a lack of semantic parallelism. Since one of the functions of coordination, i. e. contrast (Gleitman 1965.) is not fulfilled in zeugmatic coordination, it produces odd and ambiguous sentences.

There are however, sentences where neither the structural nor the semantic factor is sufficient to account for the unacceptability or oddity of the sentence. In

John likes brunettes and marshmallows

it is the non-linguistic context that will make informants reject the sentence. Lyons (1977)408) comment on such examples is indicative of the difficulties found in the analysis of such a common structure as coordination: "If therefore the co-ordination of 'brunettes' and 'marshmallows' is rejected for non-linguistic reasons, might this not also be the case, in part at least, for many of the sentences which are held to violate grammatical and semantic constraints?"

2.3. The idea, supported by such grammarians as Maittaire, Lowth and others, that coordination joins sentences was fully developed in transformational syntax, which regards coordination as a series of syntactic processes. After two (or more than two) sentences are conjoined by means of a connecor *(and, or, but)*, identical constituents may be deleted or replaced by pro-forms. Basically, this is the rule occurring in 18th century grammars, expressed in transformational terms:

You went to London. I went to London. Peter went to London ———>
———> You, and I, and Peter went to London.

In a string of conjoined sentences even the connector can be deleted, unless it is the last one in the series, which thean has a retrospective function (Halliday & Hasan, 1976/236): *You, I and Peter went to London.*

This is also the function of the undeleted element, here the verb *went.* By varying the deleted member it is also possible to bring two elements into closer relation (or under one node) and add the third as a tag. Rhematization and focusing can be achieved in this manner as well:

You and I went to London and Peter (did) too.
You went to London, and I and Peter (did) too.

"Splitting" the coordinate as in the above examples requires the introduction of pro-forms for the verb, by which procedure the last coordinate becomes rhematized, and the whole structure marked.

There is a set of rules for substition by pro-forms of single or phrasal constituents repeated in the process of conjunction (coordination). They cover a range of substitutions such as the following examples (genitive, reciprocal objects, complex subjects, adverbial prepositional phrases, etc.):

John plays the violin. John's sister plays the piano. ———> John plays the violin and his sister the piano.

John bowed to Mary. Mary bowed to John. ———> John and Mary bowed to each other.

John and Mary are living in England. John and Mary are spending their vacations in England. ———→ *John and Mary are living in England and they are spending their vacations there.*

2.3.1. In Quirk et al. (1972/552—558) coordinating conjunctions are treated specially with regard to their function as clause linkers. The term "central coordinators" is introduced for *and, or* and *but,* defined by a number of criteria which in turn are to serve as a model against which other conjunctions are measured and placed on a gradient between "pure" coordinators and "pure subordinators".

The criteria are of three kinds: positional, functional and transformational. There are three positional criteria: the central coordinators are restricted to the initial position in a cluse, they cannot be preceded by other conjunctions (the reverse is of course, possible, e. g. *and yet, and because),* and clauses introduced by the central coordinators always follow another clause, i. e. **And his sister plays the piano John plays the violin* is an ungrammatical arrangement.

One criterion is functional: the central coordinators link either two main clauses:

It was snowing and that made the climb difficult
or two subordinate clauses:

It was snowing because the temperature had dropped and (because) the wind had stopped.

This point is taken care of by the more general rule that "constituents of the same type" are joined in coordination.

Finally the definition considers two rules defined in transformational treatments as "coordination reduction", i.e. "ellipsis of the subject is co--referential with that of the preceeding linked clause", and "recursion", i.e. "limitless conjunction" of clause is possible.

As for the positional definitions, they do not seem to express the relevant position of the conjunction. It is not a sentence preposition, as Jespersen also noted, and its position is *between* the clauses it links a natural position for anything that performs a linking function. And again, it is the relationship between the clauses that determines their order, not the conjunction, since it cannot be placed *before* the two conjuncts. Whereas it is probably irrelevant whether we say

John played football and Mary played tennis
or
Mary played tennis and John played football
it would be ungrammatical and meaningless to say:

**That made the climb difficult and it was raining*
because the order of cause—effect relationship would not be expressed as it is in:

38

It was snowing and that made the climb difficult.
Even without the conjunction, violation of this order would not communicate the intended meaning:

That made the climb difficult. It was snowing.

As for the other definitions, transformational rules show much more accurately, though perhaps in a more cumbersome way, and even then not exhaustively, retstrictions on conjoinability and rules for ellipsis and recursion.

2.3.2. 18th century grammatical theory was not much interested in the relation between the coordinate structure and other parts of the sentence, for instance the number agreement between the coordinate subject and the verb. So in the example:

Peter and Paul preaches

there is no reinterpretation of the agreement relation after the conjunction of the subject and ellipsis of one predicate verb. Modern grammars require a rule regulating agreement. For that purpose, a definition of the coordinate is required, as for example in Halliday & Hasan (1976 234), which says that "a pair or a set of items which are joined by coordination functions as a single complex element of structure ... They function in the same way as the equivalent simple elements, that is to say, a nominal group complex ... functions in the structure of the clause in exactly the same way as does a nominal group."

Fries (1940/53) directly expresses the agreement rule: "Joining two or more words the verb has a singular form when the several words of the subject refer to the same thing broadly understood, or when words refer to several things that can be included in one category." His material however, shows some distinction in usage between standard and what he calls "Vulgar" English. In the latter, the singular form (as in Greenwood, see 1.1) is more frequent, even when there is no obvious reason to regard the "several things" as one category.

In standard modern English usage there are ambiguous coordinates which can be variously interpreted by the speaker, e.g.:

The cup and the saucer were put away.
The cup and saucer was put away.

The sentence with the plural verb agrement is a *non appositional coordinate* in the terminology of Quirk et al. (1972., 361f) and derives from two sentences:

The cup was put away. The saucer was put away. ⟶ *The cup and the saucer were put away.*

In transformational terms this is a case of NP + NP coordination *(the cup and the saucer)*, which requires plural verb coordination. In N + N conjunction *(the cup and saucer)* (Gleitman, 1965, 289f) it is optional. It depends

on the interpretation of the coordinate structure as "one category" (cup and saucer), or as "several things" (the cup and the saucer).

In the following example it can be shown that the derivation of the appositional cordinate is a (non-restrictive) relative clause, which in turn derives from a nominal predicate:

His aged servant and the subsequent editor of his collected papers was with him at his death-bed.
His aged servant, who was the subsequent editor ...
His aged servant was the subsequent editor ...
(His aged servant was with him at his death-bed.)

Non-appositional coordination would have applied to the sentence if *subsequent editor* and *aged servant* were not coreferential, i. e. if they referred to two different people:

His aged servant was with him at his death-bed.
The subsequent editor of his collected papers was with him at his death-bed.
His aged servant and the subsequent editor ... were with him at his death-bed.

In the above examples reference was the criterion that decided subject--verb agreement, just as it is in examples such as:

The Bat and Ball sells good beer

which Quirk et al. (1972) term "notional concord". That is to say, the term could apply to all cases of agreement in coordinate structures.

2.4. The logico-semantic approach to coordination is present in modern treatments of the theme just as it was in the gramatical tradition. It was obviously necessary to supplement structural criteria of analysis, but it is still used in definitions, classifications and subclassifications.

Thus Curme (1931/162) gives *copulative* conjunctions precedence in the subclassification of coordinating conjunctions and defines their function as connecting "two members" (i. e, "different independent propositions" that make up a compound sentence) "and their meanings, the second indicating an addition of equal importance, or, on the other hand, an advance in time and space, or an intensification..."

Fries (1940/217) and Quirk et al. (1972/560) discuss the semantic implications of the coordinator *and* in greater detail.

They both mention the additive function (like Curme above), or "pure" addition (Quirk), where *and* can for emphasis be extended by *also, in addition*, etc., e.g.:

Mrs. X keeps the home and in addition raises chickens ... (Fries)

"Advance in time (Curme) is in Quirk et al. described as a relation betveen clauses, when the second coordinated clause is a "chronological se-

quent" to the first. The emphatic coordinator is *and then*. This relation is not separately mentioned by Fries. An example is:

She washed the dishes and (then) she dried them.

For What Fries calls the adversative or contrastive relation, Quirk says, that, the first clause has a concessive force and the second is "felt surprising in view of the first". Emphatic conjunctions are *and yet, and still*:

He tried hard and (yet) he failed.

Quirk also has a contrastive relation, when *and* can alternate with *but*:

Robert is secretive and/but (in contrast) David is candid.

It can be noticed that shades of distinction or emphasis are very subtle here, and either conjunction would be appropirate. The sentences quoted below are ordered in descending emphasis:

He tried hard and yet he failed.
Robert is secretive and in contrast David is candid.
He tried hard but he failed.
Robert is secretive but David is candid.
He tried hard and he failed.
Robert is secretive and David is candid.

Fries draws attention to another phenomenon, namely that it is difficult to find "a reasonable set of criteria by which to separate coordinate from subordinate clauses and thus coordinating function words (conjunctions) from those that are subordinating." (Fries, 1952.). He therefore argues that this distinction has practically no importance in English. Jespersen also notes (1940/Part V, 346ff) that the same type of relation can be expressed in various ways: 1. when two statements are independent, 2. when they are compared with one another, 3. when they are contrasted, 4. when they are dependent on one another. It is a progression leading from coordination to subordination.

A number of functions or clause relations expressed in coordination with *and* as a linking word also show how slight the distinction between coordination and subordination can be. One such relation is consequence or result expressed by the second coordinate, another is condition:

They have become impatient and (and so, therefore) forwarded this account to . . . (consequence)
Put in your request and I'll approve it. (condition)

The second conjunct may be a comment on the first (Quirk), or according to Fries, explanatory, parenthetical:

They disliked John — and that's not surprising.

The point that was made already by Maittaire (see 1.1.) in connection with the subclassification of conjunctions, i.e. that there could be as many

41

subgroups as there are conjunctions, could be applied to modern definitions of functions or relations expressed bu *and*, where every sentence can be defined as expressing a particular relation. Thus Quirk has a relation where the "second clause makes a point similar to the first", which however, could also fall under the section "addition", e.g.:

> *A trade agreement should be no problem and (similarly, also) a cultural exchange could be arranged.*

Fries on the other hand has a "miscellaneous" group of functions under which such complex conjunction as *and for this reason, and by this action,* etc. are subsumed.

One point is not included by Quirk in the list of relations, but is mentioned as a separate function in Fries, as it is in most descriptive grammars. Gleitman considers it an exception to the rules for conjunction, since it is a nonconjunctive use of *and*. The structure is found with imperatives followed by *and* + verb stem:

> *So hurry up and get me out = Hurry up in order to get me out.*

Fries says that in this construction the second verb is subordinate to the first. On the surface it looks like coordination of two imperatives, but in fact it is a transform of a clause of purpose, via infinitive with *in order to.*

2.4.1. In present linguistic theory a distinction is made between the syntactic and the discourse level of sentence analysis. In the first type the sentence is the highest unit of analysis, in the second it is a part of higher units. It has been realized, however, that both structural and logical conjunctive relations are common to both leves. Nevertheless, Halliday and Hasan (1976/233) maintain that in the process of conjunction with *and* the "two elementary logical relations are structural rather than conjunctive; that is to say, they are incorporated into linguistic structure, being realized in the form ot a particular structural relation, that of COORDINATION." *And* is a structural signal. But *and* is also used cohesively, to link sentences of a text to each other. It has, we might say, a more general text-forming function. This function is what Halliday & Hasan term "conjunction". It is a semantic relation and looser than coordination.

This relation, based on the "logical notion of 'and'", is termed ADDITIVE. In distinction to coordination, the cohesive, aditive *and* never joins pairs, always a series of sentences, often producing the retrospective effect which it has as a coordinator. It typically occurs when there is a "total or almost total shift in the participants from one sentence to the next", or when it means "next in a series of things to be said" (Halliday & Hasan, 1976/233).

Quirk et al. (1972/652) also distinguish sentence conjunction from clause conjunction. The three distinctive features according to them are implication in the semantic content, lexical equivalence, and syntactic devices such as connectors. They also provide a list of logical relations expres-

sed in conjunction with *and*. Some of these relations are similar to the relations defined bu the same authors in the chapter on clause coordination. Such relationships are addition, enumeration, result, apposition, reinforcement, though they may not always occur under this name. New categories are:

transition:

> *So this is settled now. And what else did you wanı ıo discuss?*

summation:

> *It was a convention where the expected things were said, the predictable things were done. It was a convention where the middle class and middle aged sat. It was a convention where there were few blacks and fewer beards. And (in sum) that remains the Republican problem. (Quirk et cl., 1972/651)*

inference:

> A. *I'm afraid there isn't much I can help you with.*
> B. *And (in other words) you don't want to be bothered.*

And is not the sole possible connector — other elements are listed, such as adverbs and various phrases.

What is apparent from discussions on sentence and clause conjunction using *and* is that the similarites are greater than the differences, and that if a fruther analysis of the relations was carried out, it might revel some new categories of relationhips to add. Moreover, though authors may seem to differ in the terminology and systematization, they actually agree on the basic functions of *and* and conjunction by means of *and*.

2.5. The stylistic value of constructions with *and* has not passed uncommented by modern authors. Curme observes that copulative coordination is a very old construction "still in coloquial and popular speech often more common than the hypotactic form of statement, which in general is now more common in accurate literary language" (Curme, 1931/172). But even in literary style, he says, when it is to be lively, *and* is widely used as a conjunction.

Fries (1940) notes that in his corpus *and* is the most frequently used function word in all three varieties of English examined, while in "Vulgar English" "it appears about 50 per cent more frequently" (1940/20) than in the "Standard English" materials.

Halliday and Hasan (1976/233) give an explanation whu *and* at the beginning of a sentence is felt as stylistically awkward. This is because mature speakers perceive relations with *and* to be structural rather than cohesive, i.e. text-forming. In texts written by children, sentences with *and* in the initial position are quite common, and so they are in speech.

Sinclair (1972/54), giving an example of *and* in initial position, also says that structure is not very common in writing and suggests that this may be due

either to a prescriptive rule against such usage or to the closeness of *and*-
-linkage, which is not often wanted between one sentence and another.
"Closeness" I take to mean what Halliday understands under "structural
relationship", which refers to structural features such as ellipsis, pronomi-
nalization, agreement etc.

It appears reasonable to consider *and* to be a connector with both struc-
tural-syntactic and cohesive-semantic functions, operating on all levels of
discourse. Moreover it is a very simple and frequently used structural and
cohesive device and accordingly may also be stylistically versatile. Since
style is influenced by fashion, it may well be expected that the value of *and*
in various styles at various times will be differently judged.

2.6. Modern linguistics has accepted the categorization of conjunctions
as particles, whose primary meaning is structural or functional. They are
accepted as structural "helping words".

The major interest of modern linguistics, i.e. to show how exactly struc-
tures are generated and how they function, has in this area of study provi-
ded the most revealing information. It has shown the way language opera-
tes when ideas are communicated in an economical manner.

The inherent shortcoming of a restricted system whose function is to
represent limitless relations is very well reflected in the functions of struc-
tures with *and:* they range from mildly indefinite to blatantly ambiguous
outputs. This is where semantic and pragmatic criteria, not always quite
clear themselves, have to be employed in analysis and explanation.

One of the erroneous assumptions about *and* is that it expresses various
relationships noticeable in structures or texts where it occurs. The only
thing that the conjunction in fact expresses is connection. This function
might be termed additive, or "pure" additive, providing the mathematical
definition of addition is not thought of. In other words, it does not neces-
sarily express a sum of elements, and indeed most frequently it does not.
The logical definition of a conjunction meaning "a compound proposition
in which the component propositions are joined by *and*, which is true
only if the component propositions are true" (Collins, 1979) does not cover
all the uses and implications of *and*. and the structures it links.

What is indisputable however, is the simplicity and therefore great
frequency of usage of *and* as an all-round connector. Whether this is a
result of its applicability in a multiplicity of semantic relations or its versa-
tility as the result of its frequency, is probably difficult to find out. A stu-
dy of the shifts in usage, showing varying exploitation of parts of the range
of *and's* applicability, may provide a view of the directions in which favour-
ite means of cohesion move from one type of communication to another,
resulting in stylistic chage. In other words, how does the most practised
form of expression in an Old English chronicle (i.e., cohesion with *and)* be-
come the hallmark of colloquial narrative? In the sequel to this paper we
shall try to follow some of the changes in usage and style.

REFERENCES

CHOMSKY, Noam, *Syntactic Structure, The* Hague, 1957

COLLINS *Dictionary of the English Language,* London, 1979

CURME, George O., *Syntax,* Boston 1931

FRIES, Charles Carpeter, *American English Grammar,* New York, 1940

FRIES, C. C. *The Structure of English,* London, 1952

GLEITMAN, Lila R., "Coordinating conjunctions in English", Language. Vol. 41, No. 2, 1965.

HALLIDAY, M. A. K. and Ruqaiya HASAN, *Cohesion in English,* London, 1976

HARRIES, Helga, "Coordination Reduction" *Working Papers on Language Universals,* Stanford, 1973

JESPERSEN, Otto, *A Modern English Grammar,* 1909—1949

JESPERSEN, O. *The Philosophy of Grammar,* London, 1924

LEECH, Geoffrey, *Semantics,* Harmondsworth, 1974

LYONS, John, *Semantics,* Cambridge, 1977

MICHAEL, Ian, *English Grammatical Categories,* Cambridge, 1970

QUIRK, Randolph, Sidney GREENBAUM, Geoffrey LEECH, Jan SVARTVIK, *A Grammar of Contemporary English,* London, 1972

SCHEURWEGHS, G., *Present-Day English Syntax,* London, 1959

SINCLAIR, J. McH., *A Course in Spoken English: Grammar,* London, 1972

VORLAT, Emma, *The Development of English Grammatical Theory 1586—1737,* Leuven, 1975

WEST, Michael, *A. General Service List of English Words,* London, 1953

AND U ENGLESKOJ GRAMATICI

Veznik *and* obrađuje se u ranim i modernim gramatičkim djelima sa stanovišta kategorizacije, funkcije i stilističke ocjene tog veznika. I rani i moderni autori upotrebljavaju sintaktičko-gramatičke i logičko-semantičke kriterije. *And* se definira kao funkcionalna riječ koja označava strukturalne odnose koji se zovu koordinacija i semantičke odnose koji se zovu pribrajanje. Razmatraju se pravila koja određuju koordinaciju, kao i semantičke implikacije te strukture. Na iznadrečeničnim razinama *and* djeluje kao sredstvo za oblikovanje teksta, kojim se stvara kohezija diskursa. Ovim se člankom želi iznijeti mišljenje da je jedina neosporna funkcija veznika *and* vezivanje. Misao nekih ranih gramatičara o redukciji u koordinaciji korisno je razvijena u transformacijskoj sintaksi. Dalje proučavanje učestalosti, različitosti stilskih upotreba i promjena stilističkog raspona trebalo bi da otkrije neke zanimljive aspekte konstrukcija s *and*.