ABSTRACT

This paper focuses on the roles played by 'and' in English sentences, based on the notion of linearity which can present different degrees according to the uses or functions of this connector. Based on the theoretical contributions of authors who study the connection and, more specifically, coordination phenomena, we analyze examples from Sinclair's Collins COBUILD English Grammar (1990) concerning the descriptions of the functions of 'and'. The purpose of the sentence analysis is to find out which features guarantee the aspect of linearity of and-constructions.

KEY WORDS: *and*-constructions, multiplicity of meanings, linearity.

AND-CONSTRUCTIONS: DEGREES OF LINEARITY

Aparecida Feola Sella*
Clarice Cristina Corbari**

RESUMO

Este artigo se debruça sobre os papéis assumidos pela conjunção 'and' em sentenças da língua inglesa, com base na noção de linearidade, que pode se apresentar em diferentes graus de acordo com a oscilação de usos ou funções desse conector. Com base em contribuições de autores que estudam a conexão e, mais especificamente, o fenômeno da coordenação, analisamos exemplos da gramática Collins COBUILD English grammar, de Sinclair (1990), com relação às descrições das funções do 'and'. A finalidade da análise das sentenças é a de descobrir quais características garantem o aspecto da linearidade das construções com esse conector.

PALAVRAS-CHAVE: construções com 'and', multiplicidade de significados, linearidade.

*   Professor at Universidade Estadual do Oeste do Paraná (Unioeste), Cascavel (Paraná, Brazil).
    E-mail: afsella1@bol.com.br
** Former student of the Master's Program in Languages, at Unioeste.
    E-mail: ccorbari@bol.com.br

INTRODUCTION

In traditional grammar, the conjunction *and* is usually conceived as an element that has the exclusive function of "joining" the content of two units, that is, it would establish a mere relation of addition between words and clauses. In this view, the units connected by *and* present a similar syntactic-semantic behavior in such a way that they could interchange their position in the sentence without affecting the meaning of the utterance. In other words, the clauses linked by *and* would be symmetric.

In fact, the connector *and* always carries the basic meaning of addition or inclusion, even if it is an addition of opposite arguments or predicates (cf. NEVES, 2000). However, studies by authors like Camacho (1999), Garcia (2003), Mateus et al. (1983), Neves (2000), Koch (2000), and Quirk and Greenbaum (1987) point out the multifunctional character of the conjunction, which can establish different semantic relations between the coordinands, such as cause and consequence, time sequence, conditionality and opposition.

It is necessary to mention that the authors above, except Quirk and Greenbaum, study the phenomenon of connection in Portuguese. In our Master's thesis (CORBARI, 2005), we had found that *and* (English) and *e* (Portuguese), in most cases, behave similarly in the two languages. There are certainly some cases, especially those concerning idiomatic uses, in which they present differences; however, a number of findings can be applied to both Portuguese and English connectors (*e*/*and*), in the sense that we can find sentences in Portuguese that can occur in English, and vice versa. It is possible to confirm this by simply translating English sentences into Portuguese, and noticing that the meaning and syntax remain unaltered (except for some structural or lexical differences that have nothing to do with *and*-coordination).

The studies mentioned suggest that a certain adverbial content would be implicit in the *and*-constructions. In order to explain the meaning that *and* conveys in a given sentence, Quirk and Greenbaum (1987) adopt the procedure of introducing a conjunctive adverb next to the coordinator. For example, the possibility of inserting *then* in the following sentence explains the temporal meaning of *and* in this utterance: *She washed the dishes and (then) dried them*. The apparent "neutrality" of *and* in comparison to other coordinative conjunctions seems to favor the "absorption" of a multiplicity of meanings conveyed by this connector.

As for the notion of symmetry (which allows the inversion of clause order) applied to the coordination structures, it cannot be maintained either. Considering that the functions of *and* are closely related to the meaning of

the clauses linked, it is possible to state that the meaning of the whole utterance is dependent on the fact that the speaker has his reasons to say what he says in a given order (cf. KOCH, 2000). This assumption guides most of our reflections, as can be seen in the following sections.

THE LINEAR FEATURE OF *AND*-CONSTRUCTIONS

The term 'linearity' applied to *and*-constructions is not new. A concept of linearity can be found in Mateus et al. (1983): it refers to the representation of a sequence that is isomorphic to the events of the "real world" – like that which occurs in temporal relations – or isomorphic to the description of states which obey certain logical relations (whole-part, general-particular etc.) in an order considered "normal" or coherent – like that which occurs in the cause-consequence and conditioning-conditioned relations. In this perspective, the *and*-constructions have the property of representing sequences that are, in a certain sense, "expected" by interlocutors, and the semantic link between the connected elements constitutes a factor that may ensure the fulfillment of these "expectations".

For the analysis proposed in this paper, we extended this initial notion by incorporating other elements: the identity of subjects (i.e., when the subjects of both clauses are identical) and the common semantic domain of the verbs and complements or objects (e.g. events carried out in a common environment or referring to the same semantic field). In order to illustrate this notion, we present the sentence * *I visited Maria at the hospital and the government planned to build another hydroelectric power plant*, which seems to present a rupture of linearity due to several factors: (a) the subjects of the two clauses are different; (b) the verbs and complements or objects do not pertain to a common semantic domain; and (c) the connected clauses do not maintain a relation in which the order is relevant (time sequence, cause-consequence etc.). All these factors in combination seem to contribute to characterize the sentence as unacceptable or, at least, not familiar. The sentence is grammatically possible, obeying the syntactic criterion of coordination, but it is not compatible with the property of "linearity" (in the terms proposed in this study) of *and*-constructions.

A restriction of *and*-connection that confirms, in a certain sense, the feature of linearity is the irreversibility of the terms linked: in some cases, the inversion produces unacceptable sentences or, at least, alters their meaning. Example (1) below, taken from Quirk and Greenbaum (1987, p. 257), illustrates the impossibility of reversing the clause order without changing the meaning (compare example (2)).

(1) He heard an explosion and phoned the police.

(2) He phoned the police and heard an explosion.

In other cases in which this "tie" is looser, the inversion can mantain the general signification, but a slight change occurs in terms of meaning effects. We take Ducrot's (1987; 1989) distinction between meaning and signification, which is closely related to the distinction between utterance – a concrete occurrence – and sentence – an abstract entity: signification belongs to the sentence (potential use), and meaning belongs to the utterance, that is, it is built from the context and from the signification of the sentence (real use).

To sum up, the concept of linearity we propose in this study is characterized by the following criteria:

(a) Isomorphism to the events of the "real world" or to the description of states that obey certain logical relations in a "normal" order. In this case, the more isomorphic the sentences, the stronger the linearity.

(b) Identity of subjects. Here, clauses with different subjects seem to weaken the linearity, as there is a certain rupture concerning the description of an action, event or process.

(c) Common semantic domain of verbs and common environment where the action, event or process takes place. In this case, the more the actions, events or processes are related, the stronger the linearity.

Additionally, the arrangement of the criteria above in the sentence produces sentences with different degrees of linearity. For instance, if the sentence describes actions or events that are closely related and sequential in time, and presents the same subject in the clauses linked by *and*, we can say that it is characterized by strong linearity. However, if the sentence describes actions or events that are distant in time and their subjects are different, we can say that the aspect of linearity is weakened. Thus, the proximity of common features for the recovering of referents can entail more or a less explicit linearity. In a nutshell, the more expected the sequence, the stronger the linearity.

There is another feature of *and*-constructions that deserves attention: the nature of the clauses linked by *and*. More explicitly, *and* can establish semantic relations at different levels of analysis, as Halliday (1970), and Halliday & Hasan (1987) propose. These authors postulate three main functional-semantic components of the language system: (i) ideational, which is related to the expression of the cognitive meaning or the propositional content of the sentences; (ii) interpersonal, which is related to the expression of the representation that the speaker elaborates from the interactive situation, reflecting his choice of speech role, his attitudes, judgements, reasons to say

something etc.; and (iii) textual, which is related to the mobilizing of language resources to create text, enabling the speaker to construct connected passages of discourse that are situationally relevant.

In this perspective, the conjunction *and* can establish a connection between two or more facts or events (describing a state of affairs, for example), or establish a link between what is said and the way it is said (reflecting the speaker's judgements, for example), or else, signal textual processing, functioning as a discursive, argumentative, pragmatic, or rhetoric connector or operator. The following example, taken from Quirk & Greenbaum (1987, p. 257), demonstrates how *and* can convey semantic relations at different levels of analysis.

(3) They disliked John – and that's not surprising.

In the example above, *and* links a fact (first clause) and the speaker's comment or evaluation upon this fact (second clause). In other words, it connects a propositional content (ideational level) to the speaker's representation of the interactive situation (interpersonal level). Here, this characteristic "weakens" the linear feature of *and* in the sentence.

Based on what we have discussed so far, we argue that *and*-constructions present different "degrees" of linearity, depending on context. In the following section, we will discuss this notion in more detail.

DIFFERENT DEGREES OF LINEARITY

In this section, we analyze the different degrees of linearity of *and*-constructions. Apart from example (13), taken from Quirk and Greenbaum (1987), all examples in the following subsections are taken from *Collins COBUILD English Grammar* (SINCLAIR, 1990), presented in the section about the functions of *and* (except example (8), presented in the section about causal relations). Previously (CORBARI, 2005), we aimed to show that English grammars for foreign learners do not, in general, go deeper into the functions of *and*, that is, they discuss only superficially the syntax-semantic properties of this connector. In addition, the sentences presented in the grammars are rarely real examples: they are made up only to illustrate the grammar descriptions, which makes it easy to confirm the merely additive meaning of *and*, since the sentences are usually syntactically and semantically very simple. Our choice of Sinclair's grammar was based on its using samples collected from a large database of examples of language in context, presenting richer or more complex sentences in syntactic-semantic terms.

Although coordinate constructions can consist of an indefinite number of units and different types of coordinands (words, phrases, clauses or

sentences), the examples analyzed here are all two-clause sentences. In many cases, we have added a follow-up sentence to provide a minimum of context. In order to verify the meaning of *and*, we inserted an adverbial such as *also, then, moreover* etc., as suggested by Quirk & Greenbaum (1987).

The constructions in which the additive meaning (the basic meaning of *and*) is more "visible", that is, those which accept an inclusive adverbial like *also* present a linearity more related to the identity of subjects and/or to the belonging of verbs (and complements or objects) to the same semantic domain. The following example illustrates this case.

(4) I'm an old man and I'm (also) sick.

In terms of the meaning relation established by *and*, sentence (4) is at first sight a case of "pure" addition, in which the connector would supposedly have a more neutral function. Nevertheless, sequence (4) can reveal the speaker's evaluation or position with respect to a particular state of affairs. In this perspective, it is possible to interpret (4) as a sum of arguments leading to the conclusion[1] developed in the follow-up in (4a) (the adverbial *moreover* reinforces the conclusive meaning).

(4a) I'm an old man and (moreover) I'm sick. So, I deserve to be helped first.

In general, clauses that express a predominantly additive meaning are considered as arguments of equal argumentative force to the final conclusion (cf. GUIMARÃES, 2001). However, it seems that the second clause is stronger than the first in the sense of ensuring the intended conclusion, whether because of its cumulative effect (he is old and, to top it all, he is sick), or because of its "substitutive" meaning (in the case of failure of the first argument, the second may work). Thus, the simple fact of positioning a given clause in the first or second place can reveal a particular speaker's intention. According to Garcia (2003), coordination is a parallel between identical functions and syntactic values, and, for this reason, the structural resources for emphasizing a given idea are usually more limited than in subordination. In many cases, the intended emphasis will depend solely on the clause position in the sentence. In this perspective, the inversion of clauses, despite not changing the meaning of the utterance, can reveal an intention of convincing the interlocutor in the same direction, but by other means or methods. Let us examine example (4b) in more detail.

---

1   According to Ducrot's (1989) notion of argumentative orientation, utterances are produced in order to argue for some particular conclusions with a certain force, depending on the communicative situation.

(4b) I'm a sick man and I'm old.

In sentence (4b) it is possible to notice a strategy of gradual insertion of arguments which can lead to a given conclusion, or even guarantee the intended effect (the strongest argument at the end). We cannot say that the clause inversion does not alter the utterance meaning at all, although the original signification is maintained. The factual, informative content remains the same, but the argumentative "movement" is different.

Nevertheless, this is not the only possible interpretation for (4). The sentence in question can also convey a relation of cause and consequence:

(4c) I'm an old man and (therefore) I'm sick.

The acceptability of (4c) allows us to interpret (4) as conclusive, with the first clause constituting the cause of the state of affairs described in the second clause. What is involved here is the belief that relates old age to sickness, that is, the idea that the elderly are generally sick or are more prone to illnesses. For this reason, a modification like the one in the following sentence results in an odd sequence:

(4d) ? I'm a young man and (therefore) I'm sick.

The sentence above seems to be incoherent, that is, it does not match our perception of the age-sickness relation, contradicting our experience or world knowledge. In this case, the oppositive adverbial *yet* would be more acceptable.

(4e) I'm a young man and (yet) I'm sick

The implicit causal meaning of (4) (cf. example (4c)) provides the utterance with stronger linearity, since there is, in this case, a necessary order of cause or reason and consequence or result. In addition, the adjectives 'old' and 'sick' are closely linked, presenting a certain semantic compatibility. Furthermore, the clauses refer to attributes of a single subject, which reinforces the linear feature of (4).

The following sentence expresses semantic relations closely connected to cultural issues.

(5) Her son lives at home and has a steady job.

Apparently, (5) reflects a mere addition of predicates, in which *and* can be interpreted as *and also*. Other possible interpretations for (5) are linked to the context, which may require an adversative interpretation.

(5a) Her son lives at home and (yet) has a steady job.

The cultural issue monitors the type of "semantic nexus" to be required for *and*: a person with a steady job can afford to have his own home. Sentence (5) reflects the speaker's evaluation concerning the state of affairs described in the utterance. In this interpretation, the sentence presents less explicit linearity, given the implicit oppositive meaning of the elements linked. In addition, we cannot identify in (5) a relation of implicit causality as was observed in (4).

The examples above demonstrate an "oscillation" of the meaning effects provoked by *and*, ranging from constructions that present stronger linearity, as in (4), to constructions that present weaker linearity, as in (5). It should be emphasized that the interpretation exercises carried out above can be characterized as hypothetical reconstructions of the contexts of occurrence, the aim being to infer possible intended meanings in given circumstances. This is possible due to the feature of *and* being relatively neutral and, for this reason, being able to "attract" adverbial meanings.

In the subsections below, we will present different meanings conveyed by *and*, following the notion of linearity from the more to the less explicit.

THE TEMPORAL RELATION

In narrative utterances, especially with verbs in the past tense, *and* generally expresses time sequence, as demonstrated in examples (6) and (7) below, in which the insertion of the adverbial *then* confirms this temporal or sequential meaning of *and*.

(6) He opened the car door and (then) got out.

(7) She was born in Budapest and (then) she was raised in Manhattan.

According to Camacho (1999), the connector per se does not indicate temporal succession, but the order of the two clauses can, by convention, be iconic in relation to the real sequence of events being described. In other words, the clause order is parallel to the order of the real world events, it being unnecessary to add more information concerning the temporal ordering to the events narrated.

Besides the iconic order of events, factors such as identity of subjects and verbs and objects or complements belonging to the same semantic domain also reinforce the linearity. Concerning this latter aspect, we can notice a strong linearity in (6): 'opening the car door' and 'getting out (of the car)' maintain a close semantic relationship, that is, in terms of expectations generated by the first clause, 'opening the car door' almost automatically (or more easily) evokes the subsequent action of 'getting out'.

Although both sentences (6) and (7) express temporality, the time sequence expressed in (6) is not of the same nature as that expressed in (7): the events described in the second example imply a less immediate time sequence – this explains why the insertion of *then* in the utterance is not quite comfortable – while the events in the first example imply an immediate sequence, with a meaning close to cause and effect. In this sense, (6) presents a higher degree of linearity than (7), since the sequence is more predictable – perhaps because the actions take place in the same environment. In (7), there is "looser", less explicit linearity – evidence would be the fact that they are not immediately subsequent events. In (7a), for example, the second clause presents a much closer (and, therefore, more linear) tie with the first than the tie observed in (7).

(7a) She was born in Budapest and (then) was baptized at the local church.

This difference in terms of linearity gives to (6) an exclusively temporal interpretation, while sentence (7) favors other interpretations, which can be confirmed by the possibility of inserting other adverbials besides the temporal *then*.

(7b) She was born in Budapest and (moreover) she was raised in Manhattan.

The insertion of the additive adverbial *moreover* allows a description of (7b) in terms of argumentative orientation of the utterance: *and* seems to sum arguments directed to a certain conclusion, and *moreover* reinforces this additive interpretation. The procedure of developing a follow-up sentence allows us to infer the possible conclusions of the arguments linked in (7).

(7c) She was born in Budapest and was raised in Manhattan. So, she has the best of two worlds.

(7d) She was born in Budapest and was raised in Manhattan. She is not from an insignificant small town.

In (7c), there is the point of view of an "open-minded" utterer, who considers the culture of an old European city (Budapest) and the culture of a modern, North-American urban center (Manhattan) as carrying the same "weight" in terms of the individual's education. In (7d), the point of view is the one of a prejudiced utterer with respect to small towns, regarded as insignificant. In both cases, *and* can be interpreted as *and moreover* or *and furthermore*. Nevertheless, the views about the preference of the Old World over the New World constitute only a possible interpretation. Example (7) may refer, for instance, to the fact that Budapest and New York are far from

each other, that is, contrary to the expectation of living in the same place from birth to adulthood.

It is also possible to insert in (7) an adverbial of adversative meaning, favoring another interpretation (in oral speech, this meaning could be infered mainly by the speaker's intonation).

(7e) She was born in Budapest and (yet) she was raised in Manhattan.

In this sense, the second clause frustrates the expectation created, developed in the follow-up in (7f).

(7f) She was born in Budapest. So, she has a good cultural education.

In this case, European culture is considered positive (the value involved here could be the tradition or the "fine education") in opposition to North American culture, considered negative (in this interpretation, North American culture would be reckoned too "modern"). In this perspective, the second clause in (7e) presents a kind of restriction, considering the point of view of a conservative, European-biased utterer:

(7g) She was born in Budapest and (yet) she was raised in Manhattan. What would you expect from her? She had the chance to become a sophisticated woman, but her "modern" cultural education ruined her.

Considering what has been discussed until now, sentences with a higher degree of linearity seem to be less dependent on communicative context in terms of interpretation of sentence meaning. However, this linearity does not guarantee a single meaning to the utterances, that is, even there may be other interpretations.

In *and*-constructions which convey a semantic relation of time sequence, the last clause depends semantically on the previous one. Although the first clause could be uttered independently from the second, the addition of the second clause brings a new meaning to the whole utterance. Moreover, the second clause is no more autonomous than the first, since its interpretation depends on what has been stated in the previous term: how could we interpret the sequence *got out* without resorting to the first clause? It is necessary to recover the content of the first clause in order to interpret that the subject got out of the car (and not of a bus, a room, a house etc.). In other words, the first clause constitutes a presupposed proposition for the interpretation of the second: denying that the subject of (6) opened the car door implies denying its immediate consequence – getting out of the car. This is reason why, in many situations, the inversion of the clause order is not possible from the semantic point of view, as we can see in (7h).

(7h) * She was raised in Manhattan and was born in Budapest.

In other situations, the inversion modifies the meaning of the utterance.

(6a) He got out and opened the car door

The inversion in (6) results in the description of another scene: the subject in (6a) may have got out of a house or a shop and gone towards the car. This is just an example of how clause reversal modifies the state of affairs described in the sentences, confirming the high degree of linearity of utterances that express chronologically successive events.

THE CAUSAL RELATION

Another type of *and*-construction characterized by explicit linearity is the causal relation, in which the clauses necessarily present the linear order antecedent-consequent. In this case, *and* introduces a consequence or a result of something stated in the first clause. The adverbials *so* or *therefore* can be inserted to explain this causal meaning.

(8) Her boyfriend was shot in the chest and (so) he died.

The lexical-semantic relationship between the verbs is relevant to guarantee causal meaning. For example, the substitution of 'died' by 'survived' does not result in a relation of cause and consequence. The evidence for this is that it is not possible to identify the implicit meaning of *therefore* in the sentence.

(8a) * Her boyfriend was shot in the chest and (therefore) he survived.

It must be highlighted that sentence (8) also expresses a temporal aspect, but this semantic relation is of a different nature from that observed in exclusively temporal constructions. In these, the events are more closely linked in sequential terms, while in causal constructions, the events do not maintain such a close relationship in terms of time sequence: they can be simultaneous events, or immediately successive events, or events that are remote from each other in time. For this reason, in causal constructions that also have a temporal meaning, time is less important than the result of the event or the action in question. Nevertheless, the temporal relation expressed in (8) intensifies the linear feature of the events described.

(8b) Her boyfriend was shot in the chest and (then) he died.

Thus, (8b) presents events successive in time, but the causal meaning prevails, given that the propositional content of the antecedent expresses the reason or the necessary and sufficient condition that enables one to verify the propositional content of the consequent (MATEUS et al. 1983).

In some cases, the causal relation is less explicit and, therefore, the linearity is more tenuous, as in the following example.

(9) He gained a B in English and now plans to study Spanish.

In this sentence, the propositional content of the antecedent expresses neither cause, nor necessary or sufficient conditions, but only a possible condition for the propositional content of the subsequent clause. The reconstruction of the hypothetical context of occurrence of (9) favors causal interpretations, like, for example: (a) the student may have had a disappointment with English, since he used to get an A, and so he plans to change to Spanish; or (b) the student became enthusiastic with the grade, because he used to get a C or D, and this good result made him decide to take another language course. The decision may be related to the "weight" of evaluation in the school context. The person who says (9), says it from the institutional viewpoint of school – a context in which evaluation has a decisive influence on students' lives establishing a close link between learning and success (failure in tests would mean that nothing was learnt at all). Thus, the relation of cause and consequence in (9) is not explicit, it being necessary to resort to the context.

In constructions in which a relation of cause and consequence is patent, the second clause is semantically subordinate to the first, that is, the first clause is regarded as a presupposed proposition for the interpretation of the second: it constitutes the reason or the necessary and sufficient condition for the occurrence of what is being described in the second clause. Order inversion may thus result in illogical or incoherent sentences, as in (8c) and (9a).

(8c) * Her boyfriend died and was shot.

(9a) * He now plans to study Spanish and he gained a B in English.

In this sense, utterances in which a relation of cause or reason and consequence or result is present constitute assymmetric constructions, according to Camacho's categorization (CAMACHO, 1999). The narrative characteristic of the utterances reinforces the fixity of the order, since they refer to states of affairs that require an order coherent with that of the real world.

THE RELATION OF CONDITIONALITY

The semantic relation conditioning-conditioned represents a type of cause-consequence relation included in non-factual modality: the propositional contents cannot be verified in the real world, thus being

classified as hypothetical. In this type of joining together, the first clause is commonly an imperative, and the second contains a verb in the future, a construction typical of utterances that express advice or threat. In the sentences below, *and* has a conclusive meaning, which can be reinforced by the addition of the conclusive adverbial *then*, according to Quirk and Greenbaum (1987).

(10) Go by train and (then) you'll get there quicker.

(11) Do as you are told and (then) you'll be alright.

(12) You put me out here and (then) you'll lose your job tomorrow.

Despite sentences (10), (11) and (12) being similar concerning the causal and conclusive interpretation, they display different nuances of meaning. Sentence (10) expresses both a suggestion and a justification. In (11), there seems to be a promise – in the case of the interlocutor doing what he is supposed to do, he might, for instance, be rewarded or promoted – or even an implicit threat – in the case of disobedience, something bad may happen to him. Finally, sentence (12) can be interpreted as an overtthreat. It should be observed that, in all the sentences, the fact of the first clause being an imperative does not characterize it as an order or a request, but corresponds rather to the conditional construction (subordinate) with *if*: *If you go by train..., If you do as you are told..., If you put me out...*

As every conditional construction implies the notion of cause and consequence, the characteristic of linearity can also be applied to sentences (10), (11) and (12) above, since the conclusive value is also a product of iconic order. However, according to Mateus et al. (1983), this order is not based on real world events, but on logical processes, that is, the clauses are organized logically rather than temporally. The lexical-semantic bind between the clauses is weaker than observed in that time relations; the verbal mood is not identical in the two clauses (imperative + indicative (– Simple Future).

According to Mateus et al. (1983), this type of construction presents a necessary order: the antecedent represents a condition that enables one to verify the propositional content of the consequent. In conditional constructions, both clauses are more closely "bound" than in additive constructions. This evidence allows us to state that sentences (10), (11) and (12) are more readily characterized as subordinate clauses than coordinate clauses.[2]

---

2   Regarding the non-coordinate nature of conditional and-constructions, see Verstraete (2003), who distinguishes between coordinate and subordinate constructions based on the notion of illocutionary force.

According to Longacre (1996), predicates linked by *and* are typically from the same semantic domain, but the requirement of discourse structure may bring together rather unusual items in *ad hoc* domains relative to a given discourse. This is the case of the contrastive relation, in which the second clause "breaks" the normal flow of events, as we can see in the example below, taken from Quirk & Greenbaum (1987).

(13) He tried hard and (yet) he failed.

We can apply Longacre's (1996) notion of frustrated succession here. The 'expectancy chain' represents the events in an order considered normal, as, for example, *search... find, fall down... smash*, or, as in sentence (13) above, *study hard... succeed*. If the second event happens differently from what is expected to follow (e.g. *study hard... fail*), the succession is frustrated.

According to Garcia (2003), the connector, in this case, is contaminated by the semantic poles between which it is situated, conveying a sense of contradiction, opposition or contrast. Garcia (2003) and Quirk and Greenbaum (1987) propose, for this use of the conjunction, replacement by *but*.

(13a) He tried hard but he failed.

Nevertheless, despite this replacement being possible, the argumentative "movement" observed in the utterances which contain *but* seems to be of a different nature from that observed in *and*-constructions. In (13a) by inserting an argument introduced by *but*, the speaker rejects the previous argument. In other words, the argument that the subject tried hard is oriented towards a positive conclusion – he was successful – whilst the argument that the subject failed annuls the previous one and presents a negative conclusion. On the other hand, although sentence (13) contains two clauses with opposed meanings, the speaker seems to include the two arguments as being compatible. That is, 'to try hard' implies two possible results – 'succeeding' and 'failing' – and the speaker merely pointed out one of the possibilities. Thus, the previous argument is not rejected, but maintained.

In this perspective, the oppositive relation with *but* is more properly characterized as disjunctive, while the oppositive relation with *and* (in the sense that they are opposed items, but even so they are both compatible from the speaker's point of view) is characterized as inclusive (and, therefore, conjunctive). This compatibility guarantees a linear character (though less strong) to the contrastive *and*-construction, which cannot be attributed to *but*-constructions.

In some cases, the sentences include an overt adversative adverbial (*yet*), which does not leave any doubt about the oppositive meaning of *and*.

(14) I want to leave, and yet I feel obliged to stay.

In the example above, the speaker's desire and his obligation are linked. As the idea of obligation is located in the second clause (and thus constitutes the "strongest" argument, in our view), the speaker intends to convey an image of a committed person, who puts his "duties" above his own will.

The oppositive relation with *and* constitutes a rupture of linearity in a certain sense, since the elements linked present semantic traits that contrast or oppose each other. However, as mentioned before, our assumption is that the clause introduced by *and* does not exclude the argument presented in the previous clause, but rather maintains it. Thus, in (14), the speaker is still willing to leave although he is obliged to stay. In this sense, the contrastive relation established by *and* gives the utterance a linear feature, but this linearity is much less clear if compared to the additive, temporal, causal and conditional constructions.

THE INTERPHRASTIC RELATION

In the following example, *and* links two speech acts (two imperative clauses), placing emphasis on the second utterance:

(15) Send him ahead to warn Eric. And close that door.

In (15), the connection does not occur at the ideational level (that is, it does not relate to the propositional content of the sentences), but rather at the interpersonal level: it aims at the establishment and the maintenance of social relations. The example shows two imperative phrases directed to a single interlocutor, but the nature or aim of each of these speech acts is distinct. In the first case, it is a request to do a duty or a favor. In the second, the order seems to have a tone of reprimand. The use of *and* at the beginning of the sentence seems to emphasize the speaker's feeling, like, for example, madness or anger. In this sense, the second sentence expresses the locutor's insertion in the utterance more evidently than the first.

In terms of linearity, a rupture occurs in (15) that cannot be attributed solely to the fact of the speech acts being separated in two sentences or constituting orders or requests not performable in sequence. It is also due to the different shades of meaning of the orders or requests. This rupture established by *and* has a particular meaning effect, as mentioned above, demarcating the locutor's position in relation to the state of affairs represented in the utterances.

In its textual function, the adverbial character of *and* is more noticeable, considering that the function of the adverb is to modify the meaning of a sentence. The emphasis that *and* lends to the text is nothing but a modalization on the enunciation. It can reflect the speaker's evaluation or point of view, so that the conjunction *and*, in these circumstances, permits the locutor's exposition.

FINAL CONSIDERATIONS

Our evaluation was founded on the concept of discourse as a complex interactive activity of meaning production, which mobilizes not only knowledge of the "code" or "structure", but also the wide range of knowledge to be reconstructed within the communicative event (cf. KOCK, 2000). Many implicit meanings can only be detected if the conditions in which utterances have been produced are considered. This is why analysis of a sentence isolated from its context of utterance can only be realized if we reconstruct this context through hypothesis. Depending on the situation, the meanings produced vary, and this evidence shows the importance of studying utterances within texts.

In this article, we sought to show that the traditional view of the conjunction *and* as a structural element that establishes a merely additive tie between the elements linked cannot be maintained when the utterances are submitted to a more rigorous examination. The implicit adverbial meaning of *and* makes for a wide range of uses or functions that this element assumes in sentences and texts, establishing temporal, causal, conditional and oppositive meaning relations. The adverbial character of *and* is more noticeable in its textual function considering that the function of the adverb is to modify somehow the meaning of a sentence and, thus, to demarcate the locutor's insertion in the utterance.

The aspects raised here concerning the use of *and* in sentences show that only in a few cases do they have the commutative property traditionally attributed to additive constructions. Even constructions that predominantly present the basic relation of addition are not always symmetric, that is, only a few occurrences do not present a fixed order, so the locutor has reasons to say what he says in a given order: the locutor's option in positioning the arguments can reveal a particular intention, as we have seen in the analysis. In a nutshell, the notions of independence and potential order changing of clauses connected by *and* cannot be maintained considering the perception of several nuances of syntactic-semantic subordination in coordination.

Besides conveying semantic relations of several types, the conjunction *and* links different levels of analysis: it not only joins the propositional or

informative content, but also links distinct speech acts, introducing different discursive-argumentative relations (justification, explanation, specification, confirmation etc.) between them. This characteristic confirms the multifunctional nature of the connector: use in the referential, epistemic and illocutionary domains. For this reason, study of utterances from a strictly logical angle is reductive, in view of the need fot considering not only the relations between the utterances in the analysis, but also the relations established between the utterances and the act of enunciation. In other words, besides joining the content of two propositions logically and semantically, *and* can establish pragmatic, rhetoric or argumentative relations between the clauses, sentences or paragraphs.

As for the notion of linearity, we verified that the degree of linearity of a sentence is closely related to the multiplicity of meanings of *and*. In other words, the linearity can be stronger (more explicit) or weaker (less explicit), according to the different uses or functions of this connector in the sentence. We argued that, in clauses linked by *and*, the aspect of linearity refers to the expectations caused by the first clause in relation to the second: the tighter the semantic proximity or relationship, the stronger the linearity.

Finally, it is important to emphasize that our analysis is still incipient, and certainly imperfect. A criticism that can be made is that the analysis should be based on a corpus, especially because this would provide real paragraph or text level context, which would avoid the simulation of follow-up sentences. But, as we said above, these analyses are the result of a previous study to show that English grammars for foreign learners are very superficial in describing the function of *and*. In this article, our main concern was simply to offer some elements which may help us to understand better the functions of *and*.

REFERENCES

CAMACHO, R. G. Estruturas coordenativas aditivas. In: NEVES, M. H. M. (Org.). *Gramática do português falado*. v. VII. São Paulo: Humanitas/FFLCH/USP; Campinas: Editora da Unicamp, 1999.

CORBARI, C. C. *Um estudo da conjunção "and" em uma gramática da língua inglesa para estudantes estrangeiros*. 2005. Dissertação (Mestrado em Letras) – Programa de Pós-Graduação em Letras, Universidade Estadual do Oeste do Paraná – Unioeste, Cascavel, 2005. 127 f.

DUCROT, O. *O dizer e o dito*. Campinas: Pontes, 1987.

_____. Argumentação e "topoi" argumentativos. In: GUIMARÃES, E. *História e sentido na linguagem*. Campinas: Pontes, 1989.

GARCIA, O. M. *Comunicação em prosa moderna*. 23. ed. Rio de Janeiro: FGV, 2003.

GUIMARÃES, E. *Texto e argumentação*: um estudo de conjunções do português. 2. ed. Campinas: Pontes, 2001.

HALLIDAY, M. A. K. Language structure and language function. In: LYONS, J. (Ed.). *New Horizons in Linguistics*. Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1970.

HALLIDAY, M. A. K.; HASAN, R. *Cohesion in English*. London: Longman, 1987.

KOCH, I. V. *Argumentação e linguagem*. 6. ed. São Paulo: Cortez, 2000.

LONGACRE, R. E. *The grammar of discourse*. 2nd edition. New York/London: Plenum Press, 1996.

MATEUS, M. H. M. et al. *Gramática da língua portuguesa*: elementos para a descrição da estrutura, funcionamento e uso do português actual. Coimbra: Almedina, 1983.

NEVES, M. H. M. *Gramática de usos do português*. São Paulo: Editora da Unesp, 2000.

QUIRK, R.; GREENBAUM, S. *A university grammar of English*. 18th ed. London: Longman, 1987.

SINCLAIR, J. M (Ed.). *Collins COBUILD English Grammar*. London-Glasgow: Collins Publishers-The University of Birmingham, 1990.

VERSTRAETE, J. C. Two types of coordination in clause combining. *Lingua*, v. 115, n. 4, 2003. p. 611-626. Disponível em: <www.sciencedirect.com> Acesso em: 26 maio 2005.