

**AND HIM NO MORE THAN A MINISTER'S MAN:
THE ENGLISH SUBORDINATING AND-CONSTRUCTION IN CROSS-
LINGUISTIC PERSPECTIVE**

Martina HÄCKER

Abstract

This article investigates the origins of subordinating *and*. Based on a detailed semantic and syntactic description of the construction, it points out the differences from the co-ordinating use of *and* which justify the additional classification of *and* as a subordinator. Two hypotheses of the origins of the construction are considered: (i) that the construction is a calque on a Celtic construction, and (ii) that the construction is the result of a native English development. On the basis of structural, semantic and geographical evidence the first of these two hypotheses is dismissed and possible explanations for the functional extension of *and* are discussed from a pragmatic and cross-linguistic point of view.

1. Introduction

The construction referred to as subordinating *and*-construction is of linguistic interest for various reasons: (i) it challenges our neat categories of prototypical co-ordinators and subordinators, (ii) it is restricted to the spoken medium or written representations of it, and (iii) it occurs predominantly in regional varieties. For these reasons the construction has been largely ignored in standard grammars, but received considerable attention from linguists with a major interest in 'Celtic Englishes', who argued that the construction is a loan translation from a Gaelic or Irish construction (Barry 1982, Bliss 1984, Filppula 1991, Odlin 1991, Klemola & Filppula 1992, and Harris 1993).¹ An unbiased analysis is therefore a desideratum. Subordinating *and* should neither be considered as abnormal because it predominantly occurs in regional varieties, nor should political considerations lead to an overemphasis of its un-Englishness.

2.1 Semantics of subordinating *and*

Subordinating *and*-clauses may have several different meanings. These are illustrated by the following examples, in which the subordinators in the respective standard English glosses give the closest semantic approximation to the meaning conveyed by *and* in the original:

- (1) But, if you'll believe me, he spoke such high English that I couldna understan' the half he said - *and him no more than a minister's man!* (Slater n.d.: 8)
'But if you'll believe me, he spoke such high English that I couldn't understand a word he said *although he was no more than a minister's man.*'
- (2) ... he wad hae wastit nae time on me, *and him ahint wi the sprayin.* (McLellan 1990: 209)

¹ A notable exception is Ó Siadhail (1984), who argues that the Irish and English constructions developed independently.

‘... he would have wasted no time with me, *since he was behind with the spraying (of fruit trees).*’

- (3) I only thought of him there *and* I cooking my dinner. (Filppula 1991: 618)
'I only thought of him there *while* I was cooking my dinner.' [my gloss, MH]

In all examples the meaning of subordinating *and* is noticeably different from that of the co-ordinator. In (1) it approaches the meaning of *although*, but is more emphatic. It expresses concession + emphasis. In (2) it expresses reason + emphasis, and in (3) simultaneity. In a sentence consisting of three clauses *and* may express both concession and reason. In this case it typically expresses a concession with respect to the immediately superordinate clause and a reason with respect to the main clause:

- (4) I never cud unnerstaun' yer brither Rubbert cud mairry sic an auld bogle, *an* him wi' sic a braw sister. (Bell 1990: 28)
'I could never understand how your brother Robert could marry such an old scarecrow, *although* he has such a pretty sister/because he has such a pretty sister.'

The semantics of subordinate *and*-clauses can be summarised as follows:

- (i) emphasis + concession
- (ii) emphasis + reason
- (iii) emphasis + concession/reason
- (iv) simultaneity

2.2 Structural patterns of subordinate *and*-clauses

The following structural patterns are found in subordinate *and*-clauses:

- (i) *and* + pronoun in the objective case + noun (phrase) or adjective (phrase)
- (ii) *and* + pronoun in the objective case + preposition phrase or adverb
- (iii) *and* + pronoun in the objective case + present participle (+ various constituents)
- (iv) *and* + pronoun in the objective case + past participle
- (v) *and* + pronoun in the subjective case + noun (phrase) or adjective (phrase)
- (vi) *and* + pronoun in the subjective case + preposition phrase or adverb
- (vii) *and* + pronoun in the subjective case + present participle (+ various constituents)
- (viii) *and* + pronoun in the subjective case + past participle

This list gives only the basic structural types. All types may take additional adverbials. The present participle type takes in addition the complementation the respective verb requires, which is indicated in (iii) and (vii) by '+ various constituents'. With the exception of the present participle type, all types consist of *and* + subject + subject predicative in the sense of Greenbaum (1996: 66-68).²

2.3 Subordinating versus co-ordinating *and*

Since *and* is a prototypical co-ordinator, the additional classification as subordinator needs to be justified. What is the difference between subordinating *and* and the use of *and*

² Greenbaum 1996 (66-68) uses the term 'subject predicative' for all obligatory complements of copular verbs, irrespective of their morphological and syntactic structure.

as a clause-co-ordinator? The following sentence is classified as irregular by Quirk et al. (1985: 844):

- (5) How could you be so spiteful *and her your best friend?*

'Irregular' implies that the sentence does not follow the rules of Standard English grammar. The choice of the term 'subordinating *and*' makes a different and more far-reaching claim: sentences like these are not irregular, but they follow different rules from those that apply to compound sentences linked by *and*, since *and* is used as a subordinator. We may therefore expect subordinate *and*-clauses to share features with other subordinate clauses. The following features mark clauses as subordinate: (i) certain initial elements, (ii) a change from normal word order, (iii) the use of a non-finite verb form, (iv) the absence of an overt subject, and (v) verblessness (cf. Quirk *et al.* 1985: 997). These features are illustrated by the following examples:

initial element:

- (6) *As* he was crossing the street, he was knocked down by a car.

change of word order:

- (7) *Had you* been more careful, you could have avoided the accident.

nonfinite verb and absence of an overt subject:

- (8) ___ *Crossing* the street, he was knocked down by a car.

nonfinite verb, absence of an overt subject and initial element:

- (9) *When* ___ *crossing* the street, he was knocked down by a car.

verblessness and initial element:

- (10) *With* the baby ___ ill, I could not take the older children to school.

(5), which will be repeated here for the reader's convenience, corresponds exactly to the last pattern. It has an initial element (*and*), a subject (*her*) and a subject complement (*best friend*):

- (5) How could you be so spiteful *and her* ___ *your best friend?*

A possible counterargument to the classification of the *and*-clause in (5) as subordinate could be provided by the fact that the second clause in compound sentences may also be verbless. If the verbs of both clauses are identical, gapping, i.e. verb ellipsis, is the norm, as illustrated by (11) and its gapped version (11a):

(11) She is a doctor and he is a dentist.

(11a) She is a doctor *and he* ___ a dentist.

A compound sentence whose second conjoint is gapped does not allow a change of clause order, and in this respect (11b) also resembles (5a):

(11b) *He ___ a dentist and she is a doctor.

(5a) *She your best friend and how could you be so spiteful?

Although (11a) and (5) look superficially similar, there are substantial differences between the two examples. In (11a) the subjective (nominative) form of the personal pronoun is used, and a replacement by the objective (accusative) form in the second conjoint would lead to a rather unacceptable mixture of styles:

(11c) ??She is a doctor *and him* a dentist.

If we assumed that the verblessness in (5) were to be interpreted as ellipsis, the retrievable verb form would not be the same as in (11a). While in (11a) the ellipted verb form is a finite verb, a finite verb could not be inserted in (5). Here only a present participle could be inserted, although this is considered as less idiomatic than the verbless construction and is therefore rejected by most speakers.

(5b) ?How could you be so spiteful *and her being your best friend?*

(5c) *How could you be so spiteful *and she is your best friend?*

In addition, there is also a marked difference in the stress patterns of (11a) and (5) (capitalisation is used to indicate stressed words):

(11a) SHE is a DOCTOR and HE a DENTIST.

(5) HOW could you be so SPITEFUL and HER your BEST FRIEND?

The different stress patterns are significant. In co-ordinated clauses parallel constituents are stressed (the subjects and complements in [11a]) while this is not the case in a sequence of superordinate and subordinate clause.

3. Origins of the subordinating *and*-construction

The construction has frequently been attributed to Celtic influence on the English language. Two factors seem to support this argument: (i) the construction is most frequent in Scots and Irish English and (ii) Irish and Scottish Gaelic have a subordinate construction that is introduced by the word *agus*, whose main function is that of a co-ordinator. The use of Gaelic *agus* is illustrated by the following Irish examples, which are given with a word-by-word translation and an English gloss:

- (12) Tháinig Seán *agus é ólta*. (Boyle 1973: 222)
 ‘Came John *and he drunk*.’
 ‘John came in the state of drunkenness.’
- (13) Tháinig Seán *agus bhi sé ólta*. (Boyle 1973: 221)
 ‘Came John *and was he drunk*.’
 ‘John came and he was drunk.’

The Irish subordinating *agus*-construction indeed shows great similarity to the subordinating *and*-construction. It consists of a conjunction that also functions as a co-ordinator, a personal pronoun as subject and a subject complement, which in this example is an adjective. There are, however, also factors that do not support the theory of a Celtic origin: the case of the subject and the geographical distribution of the construction. The subordinate Irish *agus*-construction contains a personal pronoun in the objective case, whereas the co-ordinate construction contains a personal pronoun in the subjective case. In Hiberno-English subordinate *and*-clauses the subject is more frequently in the subjective case than in the objective case (cf. the examples in Filppula 1991 and Henry 1957). The use of the subjective case is specific to Hiberno-English. According to Ó Siadhail (1984: 132), in data from Clare and Carlow-Wicklow only the subjective case is used, while in Roscommon both cases occur (cf. Henry 1957: 205-206). All non-Hiberno-English varieties in which the construction occurs use the objective case.

If the construction was a loan translation from Gaelic, we might expect a major difference in frequency between the Scottish Lowlands and the Scottish Highlands and Western Isles. There is indeed a difference, but it is the exact opposite of what Celtic influence would suggest: the construction is less frequent in Hebridean English than in Scots. On the Scottish mainland it is found predominantly in areas that had no close contact with Gaelic (Häcker 1994: 43). In Sabban’s (1982) study of Hebridean English the construction is not even mentioned,³ nor does it occur in Swift’s (Bliss ed. 1977) parody of Gaelicised English, which is otherwise accurate, though of course ex-aggerated, in the representation of Gaelicised speech. Moreover, the construction is attested in Warwickshire and Lincolnshire, areas that are difficult to regard as having been under Celtic influence. The following examples are found in George Eliot’s writings:

- (14) Comfortable! How canst talk o’ ma’in things comfortable? ... An’ him to be drowned in the brook as we passed o’er the day we war married ... (Eliot: 156, cited from Ó Siadhail 1984: 134).
 ‘... despite the fact that he was drowned in the brook we passed ...’ [Ó Siadhail’s gloss]

- (15) An who is it I should like to know, as you’r bound t’help and comfort i’ the world more nor your own flesh and blood - *an’ me th’ only aunt you’ve got above ground* (Eliot: 721, cited from Ó Siadhail 1984: 133).

³ Sabban’s study is based on data collected in the Kilmuir district of northern Skye and on North Uist in the Outer Hebrides.

‘seeing that/since I am the only aunt ...’ [Ó Siadhail’s gloss]

Lincolnshire tales from the turn of the century provided the following examples:

(16) In course she had been tell’d what men was, and sinfulness is desarving on its punishment: but I thought then and I think now, it fell strange and hard on her, *and her nobbut seventeen*. (Peacock 1897: 48)

‘In (the) course (of time) she had been told what men were like, and sinfulness deserves its punishment: but I thought then and I think now that it was unusually hard on her, because she was only seventeen.’

(17) ... but with that Polly bristled up same as Slut yonder does when you are wanting to take her pubs fra her, *and her not a wedded woman an hour!* (Peacock 1897: 79)

‘... but at that Polly bristled up as Slut over there does when you are trying to take her pubs from her, although she [Polly] had been a married woman for onlyan hour!’

Both the Warwickshire and Lincolnshire examples show the same structural pattern as the Scottish examples: *and* + subject (personal pronoun in the objective case) + subject predicative, as well as in addition a passive infinitive in the position of the subject predicative in one of the Warwickshire examples. Like the Scottish examples they express emphatic concession or reason. The variation in the case of the personal pronoun in the Irish subordinating *and*-clauses, as well as the existence of the construction in Warwickshire and Lincolnshire throw serious doubts on the hypothesis that the construction derives from a Celtic construction and confirm Ó Siadhail’s (1984) claim that the constructions developed independently in Irish and English.

If external influence is excluded, we need to look for earlier evidence of this construction in the English language. As this use of *and* goes against the notion of *and* as the prototypical co-ordinator, it is largely neglected by grammars and the evidence is sparse. *And* is, however, mentioned by Franz in his *Shakespeare Grammatik* (1939: 471-472) as a subordinator introducing clauses of reason in Early Modern English and as a concessive subordinator by both Franz (1939: 458) and Partridge (1969: 151). There are also examples from Middle English and Older Scots that match the pattern (cf. Häcker 1994):

(18) Pitie, it war, thow suld ly in this midding, Be Buryit thus amang this muk on mold, *And thow sa fair, and worth sa mekle gold*. (Henryson, *Fables*, cited from Ohlander 1936: 84)

(19) Lorde, ... i thank the ... that thou to daie hase giuene me grace Almous to take ... Off thaim that was wont to be myne awne menne and seruid me, *And i vnknawen vnto thaim* (North English Legends, cited from Ohlander 1936: 21)

It is striking that the English examples that resemble the present-day subordinating *and*-construction occur predominantly in northern texts, and even in Shakespeare’s works the one character using a subordinating *and*-construction is the Bishop of Carlisle:

- (20) And shall the figure of Gods maiestie, His captaine ... Be judge'd by subiect, and inferior breathe, *And he himselfe not present?* (*King Richard the Second*, Act IV, 1. 129)

These examples differ from the modern examples in the general use of the subjective case for the pronoun functioning as subject. The use of the objective case in these constructions seems to be a fairly recent development. The Scottish poet Robert Burns used the subjective case as late as the end of the eighteenth century:

- (21) How can ye chant, ye little birds,
And I sae weary fu' o' care! (Kinsley ed., 1969)
 'How can you sing, you little bird,
 although I am so weary (and) full of care!'

The case differences and changes are probably part of a general change in the use of personal pronouns in English dialects in the course of the nineteenth century. Jespersen (1965: 48-49) describes the use of the objective case as a recent feature of 'dialectal or vulgar speech' explaining it as due to 'a general dislocation of the feeling for cases.' This increase is not only found in phrases such as 'him an me', but it is also reflected in the change from 'it is I' to 'it is me', which has by now become the norm in Standard English, but is still marked as 'informal' by grammars in the 1970s (e.g Quirk *et al.* 1972: 952, note [c]). The crucial period for these changes seems to be the nineteenth and early twentieth century. This period is also the heyday of the subordinating *and*-construction, which seems to be losing ground outside Scotland and Ireland today.

Even if a Celtic origin of the construction can be ruled out, this does not mean that the existence of a parallel construction in Irish and Scottish Gaelic had no influence at all. This influence seems, however, to be predominantly on the semantic level. The Celtic construction denotes most frequently simultaneity, (cf. Filppula 1991: 626), and simultaneity is also one of the meanings found in Hiberno-English (Henry 1957: 204-207; Filppula 1991; Filppula & Klemola 1992; Häcker 1994). Another frequently overlooked factor is the fact that in those varieties in which the meaning of subordinate *and*-clauses can be purely temporal the subject is not restricted to personal pronouns, but can be a noun phrase, as illustrated by the following examples from a fictional text reflecting the dialect of the Outer Hebrides and Henry's examples from the dialect of North Roscommon:

- (22) What lifeboat could come from Nobost in such a fog? *And the sea as smooth as glass.* (Mackenzie 1980: 144)
 'What lifeboat could come from Nobost in such a fog, *although the sea is as smooth as glass.*'
- (23) I met him *an cattle with him.* (Henry 1957: 206)
 'I met him when he had cattle with him.'

This structurally and semantically extended use of the subordinate *and*-clause is described by Henry (1957: 206) in the following way:

A common co-ordinative usage of *an'* is to attach it in company with a noun (pronoun) and complement to a preceding phrase. The attached phrase expresses a circumstance, usually temporal, of the principal verb in the first phrase.

This raises the question whether the construction described by Henry is a calque on an Irish construction and the existence of a similar construction in mainland Scotland, Lincolnshire, and Warwickshire a mere coincidence. The case variation in the subject pronoun in Henry's data weakens the case for such a position. A more moderate position seems more appropriate to describe the situation: the stronger the position of Gaelic in the respective area, the greater the structural and semantic extension of the English subordinate *and*-construction. For native speakers of Gaelic learning English as a second language, this construction would be what might be termed a 'syntactic-semantic false friend'. Such a position seems also more convincing in the light of recent research into borrowing under language contact situations. A semantic and slight functional extension corresponds to category (2) on Thomason and Kaufman's (1988: 74-75) borrowing scale, which occurs in situations of slight to intense contact. The introduction of a new construction corresponds to category (4), which occurs in situations of strong cultural pressure. For the introduction of a Celtic construction into English at a time when no similar construction existed in English, the dominant culture would therefore have to be Celtic. Socio-historical research suggests, however, that in Celtic-English contact situations the English culture was dominant, whereas the Celtic culture was under pressure (cf. Dorian 1981 and de Fréine 1977)

4. Subordinating *and* in a cross-linguistic perspective

External influence in language change tends to be overevaluated because it provides us with a ready explanation for the change under investigation. For internal changes the question why a certain change has taken place is much more difficult to answer. Nevertheless the question should not be avoided, even if any answer will necessarily remain partly speculative. The question that needs therefore to be addressed is: why do people use the prototypical co-ordinator *and* as a subordinator at all? There is no shortage of subordinators expressing concession in English. We have *although*, *though*, *even though*, and in more formal contexts *whereas* and *while* are used or phrases such as *despite the fact that*. The same is true for subordinators expressing reason: We have *because*, a maid of all work, and the more formal subordinators *since* and *as*, as well as the rarer *seeing that* and *for*, which is increasingly restricted to the written language. *And* does not seem to be encroaching on the territory of any of these. This is not a simple case of one subordinator replacing another. Is there any function a subordinating *and*-clause has that *because*-clauses and *although*-clauses cannot express equally well?

Polysemy patterns are to a certain extent predictable. Thus subordinators whose basic meaning is to express anteriority, such as German *nachdem* or a *terminus a quo* such as English *since* will frequently develop the additional function of denoting reason (Kortmann 1997: 189). Cognitive semantics accounts for such polysemy patterns by claiming the existence of cognitive relatedness between the two meanings. Cognitive relatedness is either intuitively accessible or may be established by cross-linguistic studies. In the first case the semantic link between two or more meanings is comparatively obvious, whereas in the second case it is not. Here the claim for the existence of such a link is based on the fact that it is extremely unlikely that genetically and areally unrelated languages would develop the

same polyfunctionality patterns by mere coincidence. The work of Haiman on conditionals (in particular Haiman 1974, 1978 and 1986) has shown that in such cases the missing link can be established by analysis (cf. also Traugott's and Sweetser's application of this concept to grammaticalisation, in particular Traugott 1982 and 1988 and Sweetser 1988 and 1990).

If the subordinating function of *and* does not owe its existence to coincidence, there must be some aspect of the meaning of *and* that lends itself to a semantic extension towards emphatic concession or emphatic reason. If we assume that the original meaning and the derived meanings are cognitively related, a comparison with other languages could be useful for our understanding of the functional extension of *and* from a co-ordinator to a subordinator.

The emphatic character that is a distinctive feature of subordinating *and* is also found in a prototypical co-ordinator in Danish. Danish *og* may express emphatic contrast to expectation, but it does not introduce a subordinate clause:

- (24) *Og jeg som stolede på ham!*⁴ (Allan, Holmes & Lundskær-Nielsen 1995: 455)
 'And that although I trusted him!' [literally: 'And I who trusted him']

According to Grevisse (1975: 1077), emphatic *et* is also attested in French. Similarly in post-classical Latin *et* could imply emphatic contrast. A famous example first appeared in the seventeenth century under a skull in a picture of a pastoral scene by the painter Giovanni Francesco Barbieri. The same phrase appears in Poussin's painting 'Les bergers d'Arcadie', where it seems to represent the presence of death even in an idyllic pastoral environment.

- (25) *Et in Arcadia ego!*
 'Even I [Death] am in Arcadia/But I am in Arcadia, too'

A Latin use of *et* that semantically resembles subordinating *and* even more closely occurs in a high medieval chronicle from Andes in Artois (Heller 1879: 705), where the author complains about the bodily defects of people who had been accepted as monks:

- (26) *Quidam enim claudi, quidam contracti, quidam monoculi, quidam strabones, quidam ceci, quidam vero manci inter eos apparebant, et hii fere omnes genere nobiles existebant.*
 'For some were obviously lame, some crooked, some one-eyed, some had squints, some were blind, some were crippled, and [= although] almost all of them of noble descent.' [My translation, MH]

The concessive use of *et* goes as far back as classical Latin. It is used by Vergil in Laocoön's famous warning against the Trojan horse:

⁴ *Og* is a cognate of German *auch* 'also'. It is interesting in this context that Latin *et* had the double function of adverb and conjunction with exactly the same meanings: 'and' and 'also' (cf. also Braumüller 1978 for the relationship between *og* and *auch*).

- (27) *Quidquid id est, timeo Danaos et dona ferentes.* (Götte 1997: *Vergil, Aeneid*, II, 49)

‘Whatever it may be, I fear the Greeks even when (they are) bringing gifts.’

This suggests that the first step towards a subordinating use of the prototypical coordinator is an emphatic use implying contrast to expectation. This emphatic use may then develop into emphatic concession or emphatic reason. The Latin examples suggest that emphatic contrast is the more frequent of the two. Besides emphasis, the concessive and causal uses of subordinating *and* share another feature: in all examples the content of the *and*-clause is presupposed as known.

Presupposition in causal clauses can also be expressed by *since* or *as*, and the absence of a similar semantic restriction in the existing concessive subordinators does not provide a convincing argument for the need for subordinating *and*. Approaching the question from a different angle, we might argue that the most striking feature of subordinating *and* is that it can express two opposite meanings: reason and concession. The fact that there is a general tendency for the subordinator systems of languages to develop from one with few subordinators which have multiple meanings to one with many subordinators which have few meanings (cf. Kortmann 1997: 347), suggests that subordinating *and* may be a rare exception in a modern subordinator system. It is, however, not unique in this respect. German uses *wo ... doch* as a subordinator introducing emphatic clauses of reason or concession. Engel (1988: 269) states in his *Deutsche Grammatik*:

Vorwiegend in der gesprochenen Sprache werden Kausalsätze auch mit dem subjunktiven Element *wo* eingeleitet. Dieses *wo* verlangt gewöhnlich zusätzlich die Abtönungspartikel *doch*, die Zustimmung heischende Bedeutung hat.

[Predominantly in the spoken language causal clauses are introduced by the subordinating element *wo*. This use of *wo* typically requires the modifying particle *doch*, whose function (literally ‘meaning’) is a request for confirmation.] [My translation, MH].

He adds that this clause type normally follows its matrix clause. Behagel (1928: 351) mentions the concessive use of *wo (doch)* in Southern German dialects. The double function of *wo ... doch* is illustrated by Engel’s original example, which expresses a presupposed emphatic reason, and a modified version of it, in which the statement is turned into a question and the children’s behaviour changed into its opposite. The modified version expresses emphatic concession:

- (28) *Die Kinder dürfen heute noch aufbleiben, wo sie doch den ganzen Tag so brav waren.* (Engel 1988: 269)

‘The children may stay up late today, *since they have been so good all day.*’

- (28a) *Warum dürfen die Kinder noch aufbleiben, wo sie doch den ganzen Tag unfolgsam waren?*

‘Why are the children allowed to stay up, *although they have been naughty all day?*’

Both sentences have in common the fact that the content of the subordinate clause is presupposed, i.e. known or assumed to be known by the addressee, and that the clause is emphatic. This means that the range of meanings of German *wo* (... *doch*) is identical to that of subordinating *and*. What else do German *wo* (... *doch*) and English *and* have in common? German *wo* is a non-specific subordinator. Its basic meaning is *where*, but in non-standard dialects it is also used as a general relative pronoun that has no number, person or case distinctions. This suggests that there is a pragmatic need for a subordinator that primarily expresses emphasis and whose basic lexical meaning is rather unspecific to allow a context-dependent causal or concessive interpretation or a combination of both. It seems that languages differ with respect to the source category of these subordinators. They may be general relativisers, as is the case in German, which uses the non-standard relative pronoun *wo*, or co-ordinators, as is the case in Scots and English. The alleged advantage of non-polysemous subordinators is irrelevant in the contexts in which subordinating *and* and *wo* (... *doch*) are used. As the content of the respective clauses is presupposed, there is no ambiguity. The fact that the content is presupposed also explains why the subject of subordinating *and* is typically a personal pronoun. If the subject is already known, be it from textual or situational context, it would be unnatural to use anything else but a personal pronoun.

Apart from its innate versatility, there is another feature that makes *and* a most suitable candidate for emphatic contexts: it is a short monosyllabic word. Subordinating *and*-clauses are characterised by brevity. Thus *and* matches the requirements of the construction also best in terms of speech rhythm.

Speech rhythm and intonation patterns are relevant factors for structural choices in the spoken language. The case of subordinating *and* shows that pragmatic principles play not only an important role in the development of subordinators, but also for their use in natural language. Moreover, subordinating *and* illustrates the limitations of syntactic analyses based on prototypes alone. Ultimately it is the context in which a word occurs that allows us to analyse its grammatical function.

References

- Allan, R., Holmes, P. & Lundskaer-Nielsen, T. (1995). *Danish: A Comprehensive Grammar*. London/New York: Routledge.
- Axmaker, S., Jaisser, A. & Singmaster, H. (eds.)(1988). *Proceedings of the Fourteenth Annual Meeting of the Berkeley Linguistics Society*, Berkeley: Berkeley Linguistics Society.
- Bailey, R.W. & Görlach, M. (eds.)(1982). *English as a World Language*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.
- Barry, M.V. (1982). English in Ireland. In Bailey & Görlach (eds.) pp. 84-133.
- Behagel, O. (1928). *Deutsche Syntax: eine Geschichtliche Darstellung*. Vol. III: *Die Satzgebilde*. Heidelberg: Winter.
- Bell, J.J. (1977). *Wee MacGreogor*. London: Grafton Books.
- Bliss, A. (1977). *A Dialogue in Hibernian Stile Between A and B, and Irish Eloquence by Jonathan Swift*. Dublin: The Cadenus Press.
- Bliss, A. (1984). English in the south of Ireland. In Trudgill (ed.) pp. 135-151.

- Boyle, D. (1973). *Ach* and *agus* as coordinate and subordinate conjunctions in Gaelic. In Corum, Smith-Stark & Weiser (eds.) pp. 220-228.
- Braunmüller, K. (1978). Remarks on the formation of conjunctions in Germanic languages. *Nordic Journal of Linguistics* **1**. 99-120.
- Corum, C., Smith-Stark, T.C. & Weiser, A. (eds.)(1973). *You Take the High Node And I'll Take the Low Node: Papers From the Comparative Syntax Festival. The Differences Between Main and Subordinate Clauses*. Chicago: Chicago Linguistic Society.
- de Fréine, S. (1977). The dominance of the English language in the nineteenth century. In Ó Muirthe (ed.) pp. 71-87.
- Dorian, N.C. (1981). *Language Death: The Life Cycle of a Scottish Dialect*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.
- Filppula, M. (1991). Subordinating *and* in Hiberno-English syntax: Irish or English origin? In Ureland & Broderick (eds.) pp. 617-631.
- Franz, W. (1939). *Die Sprache Shakespeares in Vers und Prosa unter Berücksichtigung des Amerikanischen Entwicklungsgeschichtlich Dargestellt* (4th revised and extended edition of *Shakespeare-Grammatik*). Heidelberg: Winter.
- Götte, J. (ed.)(1997). *Vergil, Aeneis*. Düsseldorf/Zürich: Artemis & Winkler.
- Greenbaum, S. (1996). *The Oxford English Grammar*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Grevisse, M. (1975). *Le Bon Usage: Grammaire française avec des Remarques sur la Langue Française d'aujourd'hui* (10th edition). Gembloux: Duculot.
- Häcker, M. (1994). Subordinate *and*-clauses in Scots and Hiberno-English: origins and development. *Scottish Language* **13**. 34-50.
- Haiman, J. (1974). Concessives, conditionals, and verbs of volition. *Foundations of Language* **11**. 341-359.
- Haiman, J. (1978). Conditionals are topics. *Language* **54**. 565-589.
- Haiman, J. (1986). Constraints on the form and meaning of the protasis. In Traugott, ter Meulen, Reilly & Ferguson (eds.) pp. 215-227.
- Harris, J. (1993). The grammar of Irish English. In Milroy & Milroy (eds) pp. 139- 186.
- Heller, J. (1879). Willelmi chronica Andrensis. *Monumenta Germaniae Historica* **24**. 684-773.
- Henry, P.L. (1957). *An Anglo-Irish Dialect of North Roscommon: Phonology, Accidence, Syntax*. Dublin: Department of English, University College Dublin.
- Jespersen, O. (1965). *A Modern English Grammar on Historical Principles*. Vol. V: *Syntax*. London: Allen & Unwin.
- Kinsley, J. (ed.)(1969). *Burns. Poems and Songs*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Klemola, J. & Filppula, M. (1992). Subordinating uses of *and* in the history of English. In Rissanen, Ihalainen, Nevalainen & Taavitsainen (eds.) pp. 310- 318.
- Kortmann, B. (1997). *Adverbial Subordination: A Typology and History of Adverbial Subordinators Based on European Languages* (Empirical Approaches to Language Typology **18**). Berlin/New York: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Lehmann, W.P. & Malkiel Y. (eds.)(1982). *Perspectives on Historical Linguistics* (Current Issues in Linguistic Theory **24**). Amsterdam: Benjamins.
- Mackenzie, C. (1980). *Whisky Galore*. Harmondsworth: Penguin.
- McLellan, R. (1990). *Linmill Stories*. Edinburgh: Canongate.

- Milroy, J. & Milroy, L. (eds.)(1993). *Real English: The Grammar of English Dialects in the British Isles*. London/New York: Longman.
- Odlin, T. (1991). Syntactic variation in Hiberno-English. In Ureland & Broderick (eds.) pp. 597-615.
- Ohlander, U. (1936). *Studies on Coordinate Expressions in Middle English*. Lund: Gleerup.
- Ó Muirthe, D. (ed.)(1977). *The English Language in Ireland*. Dublin: Mercier.
- Ó Siadhail, M. (1984). *Agus (is)/and: A shared syntactic feature*. *Celtica* **16**. 125- 137.
- Partridge, A. C. (1969). *Tudor to Augustan English: A Study in Syntax and Style from Caxton to Johnson* (The Language Library). London: Deutsch.
- Quirk, R., Greenbaum, S., Leech, G. & Svartvik J. (1972). *A Grammar of Contemporary English*, London: Longman.
- Quirk, R., Greenbaum, S., Leech, G. & Svartvik J. (1985). *A Comprehensive Grammar of the English Language*. London/New York: Longman.
- Rissanen, M., Ihalainen, O., Nevalainen, T. & Taavitsainen, I. (eds.)(1992). *History of Englishes: New Methods and Interpretations in Historical Linguistics. Papers Given at the 6th International Conference on English Historical Linguistics May 1990*. Berlin/New York: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Sabban, A. (1982). *Gälisch-Englischer Sprachkontakt*. Heidelberg: Winter.
- Slater, C. P. (n.d.). *Marget Pow in Foreign Parts*. London/New York/Toronto: Hodder & Stoughton.
- Sweetser, E. (1988). Grammaticalization and semantic bleaching. In Axmaker, Jaisser & Singmaster (eds.) pp. 389-405.
- Sweetser, E. (1990). *From Etymology to Pragmatics: Metaphorical and Cultural Aspects of Semantic Structure* (Cambridge Studies in Linguistics **54**). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Thomason, S.G. & Kaufman, T. (1988). *Language Contact, Creolization, and Genetic Linguistics*. Berkeley/Los Angeles/London: University of California Press.
- Traugott, E.C. (1982). From propositional to textual and expressive meanings: Some semantic-pragmatic aspects of grammaticalization. In Lehmann & Malkiel (eds.) pp. 245-271.
- Traugott, E.C. (1988). Pragmatic strengthening and grammaticalization. In Axmaker, Jaisser & Singmaster (eds.) pp. 406-416.
- Traugott, E., ter Meulen, A., Reilly, J.S. & Ferguson, C.A. (eds.)(1986). *On Conditionals*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Trudgill, P. (ed.)(1984). *Language in the British Isles*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Ureland, P.S. & Broderick, G. (eds.)(1991). *Language Contact in the British Isles*, Tübingen: Niemeyer.

Martina Häcker
 Institute of Language and Communication
 Odense University
 Campusvej 55
 DK-5230 Odense M

English subordinating and

Denmark

haecker@language.ou.dk