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1. Preliminaries

The present collection of papers addresses semantic, pragmatic or discourse-oriented aspects of coordination and subordination in a broad sense. Five of the papers approach the topics from a cross-linguistic perspective. The collection is the outcome of a workshop (AG8) on ‘Subordination’ versus ‘Koordination’ in Satz und Text aus sprachvergleichender Perspektive / ‘Subordination’ versus ‘Coordination’ in Sentence and Text – from a Cross-linguistic Perspective, which was organised by the editors during the 28th Annual Meeting of the Deutsche Gesellschaft für Sprachwissenschaft in February 2006.

Coordination and subordination are well-established grammatical terms, but like many other linguistic terms with a long history, they are somewhat fuzzy, both being used in a variety of – mutually related – senses depending on the theoretical context. This holds for other, closely related notions such as parataxis and hypotaxis as well. Thus Lehmann (1988) observes in a paper on the typology of clause linkage:
The term subordination is applied, in different schools of linguistics, to different kinds of phenomena. In the broadest use, which may be found in certain trends of European structuralism, the size and nature of the subordinate element is of no concern. Here subordination practically means the same as dependency. In the most narrow use, characteristic of classical philology, only finite clauses can be said to be subordinate. Here subordination practically means the same as hypotaxis; and consequently the two latter terms are mostly used interchangeably. (Lehmann 1988: 221)

In what is probably their most widespread application, ‘subordination’ and ‘coordination’ – along with their adjectival cognates ‘subordinate’, ‘coordinate’, etc. – are syntactic notions denoting relations between parts of a complex syntactic unit. That is, they concern the structure of sentences or clauses and their parts.

Subordination is an asymmetric relation – both in linguistics and in everyday life – and by that token intimately correlated with the notion of hierarchical structure: If A is subordinate to B, then B cannot be subordinate to A; but B may, in its turn, be subordinate to a third entity C, and so on. This means that B has a ‘higher’ position in the domain structured by subordination, i.e. it is nearer to the ‘topmost’ element of that structure, which is conventionally identified with an element that is not subordinate to any other element within the domain. In social hierarchies,
this kind of asymmetry is typically correlated or associated with (social) ‘importance’, ‘prominence’ and the like. Similarly, the subordinate clause in clausal subordination is often said to contain less prominent or salient information, to have less communicative weight (‘kommunikatives Gewicht’ in German) than the ‘superordinate’ clause (typically the so-called main clause) (see e.g. Aarts 2006, Hartmann 1984, Hetland & Molnár 2001, Peyer 1997, Reis 1993). However, while importance and prominence may be quite transparent concepts with respect to social hierarchies, it is far from clear how the functional notions of prominence, salience or communicative weight can be mapped onto specific structural-syntactic categories as defined by the grammars of different languages.

As far as the domain of natural discourse and texts is concerned, it is a common observation in various theoretical approaches that entities of this domain too can be organised hierarchically (‘subordinating’, ‘hypotactically’) or non-hierarchically (‘coordinating’, ‘paratactically’). Relevant examples are Rhetorical Structure Theory (Mann & Thompson 1988) and Segmented Discourse Representation Theory (Asher 1993, Asher & Lascarides 2003). However, relatively few attempts have been made so far to answer the following questions (but see references in Matthiessen & Thompson 1988: 275):

(i) What kind of relationship holds between the discourse-related and the sentence-related (syntactic) notions of subordination and coordination or related distinctions? Is the parallelism as close as the terminology may
suggest? What impact does the choice between syntactic subordination and coordination have on discourse structure?

(ii) By what means are hierarchical (‘subordinating’) and non-hierarchical (‘coordinating’) discourse relations signalled across languages? To what degree, and how, do languages differ in this respect? Do languages exploit syntactic subordination (and coordination) differently as a means of organizing information in discourse – ‘information packaging’ – and if so, why and in what ways?

The phrases in sentence and text and from a cross-linguistic perspective occurring in the title of the present volume relate to these two sets of questions. An additional important issue concerns methodology:

(iii) Since the questions raised above are partly of an empirical nature, extensive studies of natural texts – ‘wildlife’ texts, so to speak – are needed, including studies of parallel corpora (of original texts and their translations) and comparable texts in different languages: Explorative analyses indicate that text- and corpus-oriented cross-linguistic studies can make an important contribution to the issues specified in (i) and (ii) and thus improve our general understanding of how information packaging on sentence and text level are related (see Doherty 1996, 1999, 2005 and 2006, Granger et al. 2003, Hasselgård et al. 2002, Johansson 2007, Johansson & Oksefjell 1998).

These issues were the motivation for our workshop and the articles collected in this volume. We invited contributions based on parallel corpora
and/or language comparison, including, but not limited to, topics such as the following:

- Syntactically adjoined structures from the perspective of information structuring on discourse level
- ‘Subordinating’ versus ‘coordinating’ discourse relations / clause combining, and their realisation
- Connectives and punctuation as a means of structuring discourse and signalling discourse relations

Apart from punctuation, these topics are all addressed more or less directly in the papers below.

The collection is divided into four parts: The two contributions in Part I are concerned with central theoretical questions. Part II contains four corpus-based studies of clause combining and discourse structure, comparing at least two of the languages German, English, French, Dutch, and Norwegian. The five papers in Part III address specific – predominantly semantic – topics relating to German, English or French. Finally, the two papers in Part IV approach the topic of subordination, coordination and rhetorical relations from a diachronic perspective, involving Old Indic and early Germanic languages, respectively.

Sections 2-4 of this introduction address some of the general issues raised above more thoroughly, referring to individual papers where relevant. The final section (5) gives a brief presentation of each contribution,
outlining how it fits into the overall topic of study. First, however, we need to comment on our distinction between ‘sentence’ and ‘text’.

2. ‘Sentence’ versus ‘text’

What ‘is’ a sentence? As is well known, this question cannot be answered in a theory-independent and at the same time precise manner. From a syntactic point of view the sentence is the domain of syntactic theory: a unit that is governed by syntactic principles (constituent structure, dependency, government, binding, movement, etc.). From a discourse perspective a sentence might be a unit representing a single illocutionary act on the part of the speaker/reader and intended to be understood as such by the hearer/reader. Thus, it is a unit the reader/hearer is expected to process ‘in a single step’, assigning to it a communicative purpose and a content to be integrated into her/his representation of the current discourse, i.e. what corresponds to an utterance in spoken language. As mentioned in Section 1, we shall primarily be concerned with written texts. And for the present purpose we shall assume without further discussion that sentence boundaries in the discourse-oriented sense are marked by full stop in written discourse – with question and exclamation marks as non-assertive alternatives. That is, we take the orthographic sentence as defined e.g. by Huddleston & Pullum (2002: 1728) to be the basic processing unit in written
texts, and full stop to be the written default counterpart of declarative
terminal fall in intonation, signalling to the reader/hearer that the end of the
current communicative unit has been reached and that the common ground
can be updated with the content expressed by that unit in the given context
(Büring 2007). Comma may signal the end of a syntactic sentence (clause)
but cannot by itself mark a sentence boundary in the discourse-oriented
sense. For the rest of this introduction we shall use the term ‘sentence’ in
that sense unless otherwise indicated, assuming that discourse-sentences by
default manifest themselves as orthographic sentences in written language.

The terminological decisions made above have some important
implications:

(i) A text consists of a finite number of sentences in succession, with one-
sentence texts as a marked category.

(ii) A sequence of syntactically independent clauses separated by commas is
not a sentence sequence but constitutes a single (complex\(^3\)) sentence if
properly demarcated.\(^4\)

(iii) If clause combining (Haiman & Thompson 1988), or clause linkage
(Lehmann 1988), is to be understood as connecting clauses rather than
sentences (which in our opinion is reasonable) it must be confined to the
sentence level. That is, simple juxtaposition of syntactically independent
clauses separated by comma, without overt coordination, represents a
special case of (paratactic) clause linkage. Corresponding full-stop
sentences, on the other hand, are, strictly speaking, not related by any kind of clause combing; they simply succeed each other.\(^5\)

According to Huddleston & Pullum (2002: 1735f) *colon* and *semicolon*, like comma, “normally mark boundaries within a sentence, and hence can be regarded as secondary boundary marks” located between comma and full stop in a hierarchy of “relative strength”. To our knowledge, however, the discourse functions of semicolon and colon have not yet been thoroughly investigated from the perspective of discourse structure or discourse processing, let alone in a cross-linguistic setting (a detailed account of the use and functions of the colon in German, however, can be found in Karhiaho 2003). So, since the topic of punctuation is not addressed in the present collection of papers, we shall refrain from further speculation on this matter.

### 3. Coordination and subordination as syntactic notions

#### 3.1 Coordination

The literature on the syntax, semantics and pragmatics of coordination – clausal or not – is extensive (see for instance Carston 2003, Carston & Blakemore 2005, Haspelmath 2004, Pasch et al. 2003, Redder forthcoming,
for recent overviews and discussions), so we shall confine ourselves to
issues of immediate interest in the present context.

As a syntactic relation, *coordination* (or conjunction, as it is often
called\(^6\)) is traditionally said to hold if the units in question are syntactically
‘equivalent’, ‘have the same status’, ‘play the same role’ in the given
syntactic context (see e.g. Lang 1984, Lehmann 1988, Zifonun et al. 1997:
2362ff, Huddleston & Pullum 2002: 1281ff, Haspelmath 2004 with further
(2004), for instance, proposes the definition in (a) below, which he later
refines as in (b), leaving out the reference to relative salience (compare
Sections 1 above and 4.2 below), on the one hand, and stressing the
semantic nature of ‘sameness’ of type, on the other (cf. also Reich
forthcoming). This in its turn distinguishes Haspelmath’s second proposal
from Lehmann’s definition in (c).

(a) A construction \([A B]\) is considered coordinate if the two
parts \(A\) and \(B\) have the same status (in some sense that needs to
be specified further), whereas it is not coordinate if it is
asymmetrical and one of the parts is clearly more salient or
important, while the other is in some sense subordinate.
(Haspelmath 2004: 3f.)

(b) The term coordination refers to syntactic constructions in
which two or more units of the same type are combined into a
larger unit and still have the same semantic relation with other
surrounding elements. (Haspelmath 2004: 34)

c) Coordination is a relation of sociation [i.e. non-dependency]
combining two syntagms of the same type and forming a syntagm
which is again of the same type. (Lehmann 1988: 182)

In his pioneering work on the semantics of coordination, Lang (1984)
explicitly distinguishes between genuine “coordinate conjoining” and
“subordinate conjoining”, stressing that the conjuncts have to fulfil both the
grammatical condition of “homogeneousness” and semantic conditions
concerning the relation between conjunct meanings in order for the
construction to qualify as (acceptable) “coordinate conjoining”.

The coordinated entities (the conjuncts, coordinates, coordinands,
conjoins) may be clauses in a broad sense, i.e. finite or non-finite verb
phrases or full clauses, or they may be lower-level categories (phrasal
coordination). In this book, we shall predominantly be concerned with the
former variety, i.e. clausal coordination (including verb phrase
coordination).

Coordination, as traditionally understood, is signalled by a
coordinating connective (‘conjunction’, e.g. and, or, but), which in the
languages studied here introduces non-initial constituents of coordinating
constructions; that is, coordination represents a syndetic variety of
paratactic clause combining (Lehmann 1988). The archetypical coordinating
conjunction is and together with its counterparts in other languages – the
general terms ‘coordination’ and ‘conjunction’ are, in fact, often used in the restricted default sense of and-coordination/-conjunction. And this is how they will be used in this introduction, as in most of the individual contributions, if nothing is said to the contrary (see Section 3.3).

Coordination is a symmetric relation in the formal sense: if A is coordinated to B, then B is also coordinated to A. However, in the literature on coordination the term ‘symmetric’ often seems to be used in a less formal sense, referring to the criterion that the coordinated entities must be of the same type and must have the same relation with surrounding elements. In yet other contexts symmetry is related to the permutativity property of logical conjunction (&) and other operators (intersection and summation) that are taken to represent the meaning of and, depending on the semantic nature of the conjuncts (Partee & Rooth 1983). However, the symmetry condition, in one sense or the other, is not always met by constructions that are yet classified as coordinative according to diagnostic coordination tests, as summarized e.g. by Lang (1984), Haspelmath (2004: 34f) and Reich (forthcoming). In other words, the concept of (syntactic) coordination – like subordination (see 3.2) and many other traditional grammatical notions – has prototype structure: In addition to ‘canonical’ or ‘standard’ coordination, which is symmetric by definition, the literature has registered an impressive variety of asymmetric construction types.

Opinions vary somewhat as to where exactly one should draw the borderline between coordination (parataxis) and subordination (hypotaxis)
in the continuum represented by non-canonical varieties of these categories, i.e. *and*-constructions exhibiting crucial subordinate properties ("subordinate conjoining" (Lang 1984) or "pseudo-coordination" (e.g. Johannessen 1998)), on the one hand, and coordination-like clause combining formally marked as subordinating (see Section 3.2), on the other hand. At the other end of the continuum we find what Zifonun et al. (1997: 2362) call *Quasikoordination*: “adjacent conjuncts” that do not form a single orthographic sentence or a single “intonation unit”, i.e. cases where a clause containing a coordinating connective follows a major boundary mark in written or spoken language (e.g. full stop and falling boundary tone, respectively). So-called (*and*-parenthetical coordination (Blakemore 2005; see also Zifonun et al. 1997: 2363f) represents yet another non-canonical variety of coordination that we cannot take up here.

Asymmetry in coordination has been an object of much theoretical discussion, and, as far as clausal coordination is concerned, certain types of asymmetry, in fact, occur so frequently that what is called canonical coordination may seem an abstract ideal rather than a ‘real’ prototype.

Thus it has been repeatedly observed that clausal coordination in practice often deviates from standard logical conjunction by being sensitive to permutation of the conjuncts, i.e. that the interpretation may change with the order of the conjuncts, even if overt anaphoric dependences between the second and the first conjunct are adjusted; cf. (1)-(2), taken from Levinson (2000: 121) and Blakemore & Carston (2005: 570), respectively.
Here the conjuncts are ‘equal’ at the syntactic level, they are full clauses of the same ‘type’ in (1) and verb phrases in (2); that is, the asymmetry concerns the level of interpretation alone. This phenomenon of conjunction buttressing (Levinson 2000) can be explained as pragmatic enrichment based on the principle of informativeness (I-principle) which allows the hearer/reader to choose the strongest interpretation coherent with what is explicitly said: “[…] conjunction is ripe for I-enrichment: when events are conjoined, they tend to be read as temporally successive and, if at all plausible, as causally connected.” (Levinson 2000: 122)

Asymmetries of this semantic-pragmatic kind have played a prominent role in Relevance Theory as an argument for the central distinction between what is said and what is implicated (see Blakemore & Carston 2005, Carston 2002: 222ff). In his contribution to the present volume, Solfjeld (Chapter 5) exploits certain aspects of the relevance-theoretic approach to clausal coordination to account for a characteristic translation strategy in Norwegian translations from German.

Other asymmetries in clausal coordination overtly concern morpho-syntactic aspects of the initial and non-initial conjuncts: asymmetries with respect to syntactic category (full clause vs. e.g. verb phrase), type of clause...
(e.g. imperative vs. declarative, verb-end vs. verb-second or verb-first in German), choice of verb form, extraction and binding phenomena, gapping, etc. (see e.g. Johannessen 1998, Huddleston & Pullum 2002: 1323ff., Reich to appear). Some examples are seen in (3) - (5):

(3)  
   a. Give me your address, and I'll see what I can do.
   b. Give me your money, or I'll shoot.

(4)  Gestern [hat er wieder verschlafen und ist zwei Stunden zu spät gekommen].

‘Yesterday he overslept again and arrived two hours late.’

(5)  Here is the whisky which I [went to the store and bought].

In (3) an imperative and a declarative clause are coordinated, and in the German example (4) the second conjunct has a subject gap which must be interpreted as co-referential with – or bound by – the overt subject of the first conjunct. The fronted temporal adverbial gestern ‘yesterday’ can, from a semantic perspective, be analysed as ‘common’ to both conjuncts, i.e. as standing outside the coordinate construction. (5) is a ‘classical’ example (from J. R. Ross 1967) of asymmetric extraction leaving an object gap in the second conjunct alone and thus violating the so-called Coordinate Structure Constraint (see e.g. the discussion in Johannessen 1998: 214ff, Kehler 2002, Crysman 2006 and Reich forthcoming, with relevant references).
Asymmetries in clausal coordination are the subject of Franke’s and Reich’s contributions (Chapters 11 and 12).

To conclude our discussion of asymmetries in clausal coordination, the following points should be made:

(i) On the surface, clauses (or sentences) may be represented as rather simple syntactic structures, depending on syntactic theory. However, from a semantic perspective, they must be conceived as multi-level or multi-layered structures: a full sentence contains a series of nested operators or modifiers (‘functional projections’) – polarity, aspect, tense, modality, illocutionary force – above the predicate expressed by the lexical (main) verb and head of the clause. In the case of clausal coordination, then, it has to be decided at which semantic level the second conjunct attaches to the first – and whether it does in fact constitute a full independent clause from a semantic point of view or rather a semantically reduced clausal variant, i.e. a more or less ‘desententialized’ entity in the sense of Lehmann (1988: 200). For this reason the difference between full clausal and verb phrase coordination should probably be taken more seriously than has hitherto been the case.

(ii) It is by now generally acknowledged that semantic interpretation is more flexible and that pragmatics plays a more prominent and pervasive role in interpretation than was envisaged some decades ago (Sperber & Wilson 1986, Levinson 2000, Carston 2002, Kehler 2002, Zeevat forthcoming). Against that background it is conceivable that a semantically adequate
conjunctive interpretation may be extracted from what seems somewhat ‘odd’ on the surface. At some level the conjuncts must be interpreted as semantic objects of the same type if the meaning of the coordinator is as presumed; otherwise the interpretation would break down.\footnote{11}

(iii) Since the first conjunct necessarily precedes and is not structurally subordinated to or embedded in the second conjunct, anaphoric elements occurring in the second conjunct – including zero anaphors – may find their antecedents in the first conjunct. More generally stated: the first conjunct is an accessible context when the second is processed, but not the other way round (“No Backward Anaphoricity”; cf. Lang 1984, Haspelmath 2004 and Reich forthcoming, among others). Consequently, permutativity between conjuncts is to be expected only in the – presumably quite rare cases – where the second conjunct is not linked, explicitly or implicitly, to the first in any other way than by being conjoined with it.

(iv) As argued e.g. by Lang (1977/1984), Carston (2002), Blakemore & Carston (2005) and Jasinskaja (2006), coordination itself can be taken to signal that the conjoined clauses are more tightly linked than a corresponding sentence sequence. The coordinating connective has a “procedural” or “operational” meaning triggering the construction of a what Lang (1984: 71) terms a “common integrator”, i.e. “a conceptual entity which encompasses the conjunct-meanings”, on the basis of the conjunct meanings themselves, the linguistic and situational contexts and extra-linguistic knowledge systems etc. That is, the coordinator following the first
conjunct makes clear that the sentence is not yet finished but that more ‘of
the same kind’ as the structure processed thus far will have to be integrated
in the interpretation (cf. Redder forthcoming with further references).

(i) – (iv) go a long way towards explaining why syntactic-semantic
mismatches may occur in natural language coordination and why they are
interpreted as they are. But (i) – (iv) cannot, of course, account for
language-specific restrictions on syntactic-semantic asymmetry.

For the reasons mentioned above, canonical symmetric coordination is
probably the exception rather than the norm in language use. (6) and (7) are
cases in point.

(6)  Tom did his homework and Anna went to the cinema.

(7)  I had a paper to finish and my parents needed help.

Here the conjuncts can hardly be understood as connected in any other way
than as partial – and jointly exhaustive (Jasinskaja 2006) – answers to a
given ‘Question under Discussion’12 like What did the children/ Tom and
Anna do last night? for (6) and Why didn’t you join us? for (7). That is,
unlike the asymmetric examples discussed above, the coordinate
constructions in (6) and (7) cannot be interpreted as self-contained coherent
texts. The conjuncts are not linked at the level of eventualities (causally or
otherwise); the relation between them is of a purely rhetorical nature.

In symmetric coordination, the order of the conjuncts has no bearing
on truth conditions. However, this is not to say that the order is arbitrary or
irrelevant in general. There may be other reasons for the speaker/writer to
prefer one order over the other, e.g. relative importance or salience from a psychological/emotional – or rhetorical – point of view: Only the second, or last, conjunct or the whole coordinate sentence may function as an attachment point for a subsequent sentence; the first conjunct is blocked (see Section 4.2).

Like sentence interpretation in general, the interpretation of coordinate constructions interacts with information structure at sentence level (focus-background and topic-comment partition, cf. Krifka (2007)). In spoken language prosody and intonation play a prominent role in this respect (see Lang (2004) for coordination). To our knowledge, however, coordination, in written language at least, has not been investigated specifically from that perspective, except for symmetric coordination exhibiting the characteristic pattern of parallel and contrast seen in (6) (see e.g. Abraham 2006, Büring 2007, Lang 2004). The interplay between information structure/prosody and subordination/coordination in a historical language (Old Indic) is central in the contribution by Lühr (Chapter 13).

3.2 Subordination

As pointed out in Section 1, the term subordination – like coordination – may be used in a general sense, as defined e.g. by Lehmann (1988):

(a) A grammatical relation R connecting syntagms X and Y is a relation of dependency iff X occupies a grammatical slot of Y or
In a dependency relation, Y depends on X iff X determines the grammatical category of the complex and thus its external relations. [...] Embedding is the dependency of a subordinate syntagm. (Lehmann 1988: 182)

But often – as will be the case here – ‘subordination’ is applied in the restricted sense of clausal subordination, as the asymmetric counterpart of clausal coordination: A clause $\beta$ is subordinate to another clause $\alpha$ if the former is syntactically dependent on the latter (in a sense to be further specified) but not vice versa. In traditional structural terms dependency can be conceived as structural (and functional) embedding: the subordinate clause $\beta$ is embedded into the superordinate or matrix clause $\alpha$ with a specific syntactic function (complement, adverbial, attribute, etc.) at some level of that clause. Other definitions of clausal subordination rest more directly on the functional properties of the subordinate clause (e.g. Longacre 1985, Matthiessen & Thompson 1988, Cristofaro 2003). Cristofaro (2003) presents a comprehensive typological study of subordination in 80 different languages based on what she terms the Asymmetry Approach. She defines subordination in terms of the cognitive-linguistic notion of ‘profiling’ (Langacker 1991), explicitly equating (non-)profiling with (non-)assertion:

(b) We are now in a position to propose a functionally based definition of subordination, resting on cross-linguistically applicable and consistent criteria. By subordination will be meant a situation whereby a cognitive asymmetry is established
between linked SoAs [States of Affairs], such that the profile of one of the two (henceforth, the main SoA) overrides that of the other (henceforth, the dependent SoA). This is equivalent to saying that the dependent SoA is (pragmatically) non-asserted, while the main one is (pragmatically) asserted. (Cristofaro 2003: 33).

In practice Cristofaro’s investigation seems to support approaches that consider subordination to be a multidimensional phenomenon (Lehmann 1988, Verstraete 2007).

The definition in (c) below represents a third variant, based primarily on the notion of prominence (cf. Section 1):

(c) In a general sense, if an element \( \alpha \) is subordinate to an element \( \beta \), it is less prominent than \( \beta \) and usually \( \alpha \) is dependent on \( \beta \). […] It is a defining characteristic of subordination (also called hypotaxis) that the subordinate element is syntactically at a lower level in the overall structure than the element or string it is subordinate to. (Aarts 2006: 249)

As is well known, subordinate clauses in the canonical sense of complement, (restrictive) adverbial and (restrictive) relative clauses tend to exhibit specific formal characteristics: constraints on verb form or word order (e.g. verb-final in German), the presence of specific subordination markers – complementizers, subordinating connectives (subordinating conjunctions, subordinators, subjunctions), relativizers – etc.\(^{14}\)
She doubted that she would gain access.

If you can’t beat them, join them!

Keiner, der es gesehen hat, wird es je vergessen.

nobody REL.PRON it seen has will it ever forget

‘Nobody who has seen it will ever forget it

Hence the term ‘subordinate’ is sometimes also used with reference to clauses having the relevant formal properties without being syntactically embedded in the strict sense suggested above, i.e. without apparently having the function that is typically associated with those properties. So-called ‘supplementary’ (Huddleston & Pullum 2002: 1356) or ‘sentential’ relative clauses and resultative clauses introduced by so that are cases in point; cf. (11) and (12) from Huddleston & Pullum (2002: 1356, 969).

We called in to see Sue’s parents, which made us rather late.

Most primary teachers are women so that suitable ‘role’ models, to use the trendy phrase, are more abundant for girls than for boys.

Clauses having subordinate form may even be used as independent sentences with a marked (exclamatory) illocutionary function, and conversely: clauses may be structurally subordinated (embedded) without being formally marked as subordinate (e.g. Fabricius-Hansen 1992, Reis 1999). Such mismatches between form and function have given rise to much discussion – and terminological confusion – in particular, it seems, with respect to German (see e.g. Fabricius-Hansen 1992 and forthcoming, Holler
2005, Lefèvre 2000, Pasch et al. 2003, Peyer 1997, Reis 1997, Zifonun et al. 1997: 2233ff). They are, however, clear indications of the multidimensionality of the notion of clausal subordination. This is the issue addressed in the paper by Holler (Chapter 8). In what follows, we shall use the term ‘subordinate clause’ to refer to clauses that are formally characterized as such, irrespective of whether they are properly embedded or not.

From a semantic point of view complement clauses, being arguments of predicates, represent a very different case from adverbial and relative clauses; since none of the papers in this volume is concerned with this category we shall not dwell on it here (see e.g. Noonan 1985 for details). Adverbial and relative subordinate clause types are often subsumed under the notion of (syntactic) *adjuncts*, together with e.g. non-clausal adverbials and attributive adjectival phrases (Austin et al. 2004, Lang et al. 2003). Semantically, such adjuncts are – *grosso modo* – said to modify clauses and noun phrases (including determiner phrases), respectively. As for adverbial clauses,

[t]his modification can occur at various levels (such as verb phrase, tense phrase, mood phrase) and in various dimensions (such as times and worlds). These variations give rise to a categorization of adverbial clauses (temporal, modal, …) and a subcategorization according to a range of relations within these dimensions, depending on the subjunction. (Sæbø forthcoming).
Modification often amounts to restricting the denotation of the modified constituent. Thus the noun phrase *student that passes the exam* denotes a proper subset of the set denoted by the head noun (phase) *student*, i.e. the property of being both a student and passing the exam – but with priority assigned to the head noun property (Bierwisch 2003). Similarly, the temporal clause in (13) restricts the temporal frame denoted by the future tense of the main clause.

(13) *I’ll leave when you arrive.*

This means that adjunction, including clausal adjunction, may involve the same type of semantic operation as coordination, viz. logical conjunction and related operations (see Section 3.1), but ‘asymmetrically’ restricted to the domain of the modified entity, i.e. semantically ‘downgraded’.

In addition to restrictive relative clauses we find *non-restrictive* (parenthetical, supplementary, appositive) relative clauses as exemplified in (11) above and (14):

(14) *Dr. Brown, who lives next door, comes from Australia.* (Quirk et al. 1985: 290)

However, while there seems to be general consensus as to the syntactic-semantic analysis of the canonical restrictive relative clause this, to the best of our knowledge, does not hold for the non-restrictive varieties. It is not quite clear what their syntactic status is, e.g. whether they should be considered adjuncts to the noun (or determiner) phrase or to the matrix
clause itself, nor is it clear how their semantic contribution should be accounted for compositionally.

For adverbial clauses (in a broad ragbag sense) we can similarly distinguish between, on the one hand, canonical varieties that are properly integrated into their matrix clause as modifiers at various levels (temporal, conditional, causal, illocutionary, …; cf. the quotation above), on a par with ordinary non-clausal adverbials, and, on the other hand, ‘non-restrictive’ varieties having a more supplementary relation to the subordinate clause, like (12) above and (15):

(15) White motorists make up 78 per cent of Maryland highway traffic, while black drivers account for about 17 per cent.

Integration as a dimension structuring the subordination-coordination (parataxis) continuum is discussed in detail in the paper by Holler (Chapter 7); see also Lehmann (1988). However, subordinate clauses that are not properly integrated into their matrix clause, e.g. as a temporal or causal modifier, are ‘less subordinate’ (hypotactic) and ‘more coordinate’ (paratactic) than canonical restrictive varieties. This makes this type of clause linkage particularly interesting in the present context: In order to understand the rationale behind such ‘intermediate’ patterns of clause combining we have to transgress the sentence level and investigate their use, i.e. how they function in natural discourse (see Section 4.2) and across languages. This challenge is taken up by Ramm (Chapter 6).
Being non-integrated or somehow detached from the rest of the sentence is a property that certain subordinate clause types share with e.g. (clausal and non-clausal) parenthetical constructions (see Dehé and Kavalova (2007) for a recent collection of articles on parentheticals), appositions and various ‘dislocated’ elements at the (left or right) sentence periphery. The discourse-structural functions of right dislocation are the topic of Averintseva-Klisch’s contribution (Chapter 9).

In restricting our use of the term subordination to clausal subordination we deviate terminologically from Lehmann (1988), who uses hypotaxis and parataxis for the clausal varieties of coordination and subordination in the more general sense. In Matthiessen & Thompson (1988), on the other hand, ‘hypotaxis’ and ‘hypotactic clause (combining)’ refer to a subclass of what is traditionally subsumed under subordination, viz. subordinate clauses that are not embedded (or integrated). Matthiessen & Thompson even suggest that

there is no advantage to postulating a grammatical category of ‘subordinate’ clause; rather the grammar of English at least, and perhaps of other grammars as well, suggests that a distinction between what we have been calling ‘hypotaxis’ and embedding is crucial. (Matthiessen & Thompson 1988: 317)

It is, however, not quite clear how embedding is defined in their (systemic-functional) theoretical framework. In practice, the notion seems to subsume complement clauses and clauses functioning as restricting modifiers in noun
phrases. This leaves us with hypotaxis covering the heterogeneous group of adverbial clauses in the broadest traditional sense, whether semantically restrictive or not, as well as non-restrictive or ‘appositive’ noun-modifying clauses. It is far from evident that hypotaxis, thus understood, is a natural category. So we prefer equating hypotaxis etc. with subordination etc. in the general sense; parataxis, then, could be a cover term for explicitly marked coordination, as it is understood here (Section 3.1), and mere juxtaposition of mutually independent clauses. But on the whole, we refrain from using these terms. It should be noted, however, that terminology varies somewhat in the present volume as a whole. Thus coordination in the paper by Cosme (Chapter 4) is used in the broad sense of Lehmann (1988), covering syndetic paratactic clause combining (with and etc.) as well as asyndetic juxtaposition of independent clauses (separated by comma) or sentences (separated by full stop) whereas e.g. Solfjeld (Chapter 5) understands ‘coordination’ in the narrower sense outlined in Section 3.1.

4. ‘Coordination’ and ‘subordination’ at text level

Following our survey of current conceptions of syntactic coordination and subordination, this section briefly introduces relevant approaches to the description and representation of discourse structure (4.1) and the discourse functions of syntactic subordination and coordination (4.2).
4.1 Relevant discourse-theoretical distinctions

There exists at present a whole series of more or less different conceptions of discourse structure and the relations between discourse units. We shall confine ourselves to models that are applied or discussed in the papers below.

Segmented Discourse Representation Theory (SDRT), as outlined in Asher (1993) and Asher & Lascarides (2003), is an extension of ‘classical’ Discourse Representation Theory (DRT, Kamp & Reyle 1993). While DRT incrementally collapses the content of sentence sequences into one single discourse representation structure (DRS), SDRT aims at modelling discourse coherence and the incremental (dynamic) construction of ‘segmented’ discourse representations (SDRSs) that ‘keep track of’ the units making up the text in question. This is achieved by representing such units – the discourse constituents – as discourse referents of their own, elementary discourse constituents being identified roughly with (DRSs assigned to) clauses. Discourse relations (Asher 1993, 2004), or rhetorical relations (Asher & Lascarides 2003), are defined for pairs of discourse units immediately succeeding each other.

Like many approaches to discourse structure, SDRT acknowledges the fact that discourse units may be organised hierarchically or non-hierarchically by distinguishing between two types of discourse relations,
‘subordinating’ and ‘coordinating’. The function of a discourse unit connected to its preceding discourse unit by a subordinating discourse relation (the prototypical example being Elaboration) is to change the ‘granularity’ of description in the text in the sense of providing more detail to some element present in the preceding discourse unit (Asher & Lascarides 2003: 8, 146; Asher 2004: 172), whereas discourse units connected to the preceding context by a coordinating discourse relation continue the description without changing granularity. Central to the definitions of subordinating vs. coordinating discourse relations is the (formal) notion of a discourse topic (Asher 2004) and of discourse dominance (in subordinating discourse relations the preceding discourse unit dominates the current one).

As noted, SDRS construction is understood as an incremental (dynamic) online process. Consequently, it has to be decided for each ‘new’ or ‘incoming’ discourse segment (≈ clause) how it attaches to the SDRS established thus far, i.e. at which point and by which discourse relation(s). In this process the so-called Right Frontier Constraint (RFC) is of central importance, in particular with respect to the options for the use of anaphoric expressions (Asher 1993: 270-271, Asher & Lascarides 2003: 10-12): Anaphors can only be resolved if their antecedents can be found on the ‘right frontier’ of the incrementally growing discourse structure which covers the proposition introduced by the prior sentence and any propositions that dominate it (i.e. are in a subordinating discourse relation to it). – The
concepts of ‘coordinating’ and ‘subordinating’ discourse relations are applied in the papers by Ramm (Chapter 6), Averintseva-Klisch (Chapter 9), Delort (Chapter 10) and Petrova & Solf (Chapter 14), and discussed by Blühdorn (Chapter 3).

_Rhetorical Structure Theory_ (RST), as originally presented by Mann & Thompson (1988), aims at modelling textual coherence by assigning discourse relations recursively to pairs of neighbouring text spans of increasing length, starting with _elementary discourse units_ of (typically) clause length. The text (passage) is assumed to be coherent if it is possible to assign a discourse relation to all discourse units contained in the text.

In RST, the idea that discourse units may be connected hierarchically as well as non-hierarchically is accounted for by the distinction between _nucleus-satellite_ and _multinuclear_ discourse relations. The former are weighted in the sense that the nucleus is conceived as more central to the writer’s purpose than the satellite (i.e. the relation between the discourse units is asymmetric). In multinuclear relations the discourse units are not weighted against each other, i.e. they are of equal importance to the writer’s purpose (they represent a symmetric relation). The notion of nuclearity in RST is the central topic of Stede’s contribution to the present volume (Chapter 2).

Seemingly, the fundamental distinction between nucleus-satellite and multinuclear discourse relations is similar to the ‘subordinating’/‘coordinating’ dichotomy in SDRT, and some of the
discourse relations do indeed have the same labels in both theories (e.g. Elaboration, Background, Contrast). The underlying criteria for the assignment of a discourse relation, however, are quite different: In SDRT, which aims at an incremental model-theoretic interpretation of discourse, the definitions of SDRT relations are closely related to the construction and maintenance of discourse topics and to the temporal relations between eventualities. In RST, on the other hand, the definitions of discourse relations are based on the writer’s intentions as to which communicative effects s/he wants to reach by uttering a piece of discourse.

Yet another concept of discourse organisation can be found in the Quaestio model, as outlined e.g. in Klein & v. Stutterheim (1991, 1992) and Stutterheim (1997), which was originally developed to account for text production rather than discourse analysis. According to this approach, a text answers a specific text question, quaestio, which may be divided into a sequence of sub-questions. The global structure or development of the text will be constrained in different ways depending on the nature of the quaestio, e.g. whether it is a narrative or a descriptive task. Sentences or clauses that contribute to answering the text quaestio (by answering a sub-quaestio) are said to belong to the main structure of the text. In addition, a text may contain various kinds of side structures consisting of clauses, sentences or larger text spans that do not directly contribute to the quaestio, but fulfil other functions.
Since it is not quite clear how the side structures are linked to the main structure (if at all), a text may not be formally represented as a connected hierarchical structure (e.g. tree structure) in this model, as is the case in SDRT and RST. But, obviously, side structures are ‘secondary’ to the main structure.

The quaestio approach has primarily been applied to narrative texts, i.e. text passages that are constrained by a principle of temporal movement; the paper by Carroll et al. (Chapter 7) provides an example. As observed by Ramm (Chapter 6) the model may not be applied quite as easily to non-narrative texts.

4.2 Syntactic coordination and subordination from a textual perspective

Discourse theories differ also with respect to whether, and to what degree, they assume and model a (more or less) direct correlation between coordination and subordination in syntax and on the level of discourse representation.

As for syntactic coordination, SDRT is relatively explicit in assuming that syntactic and-coordination is a reliable indicator of coordination on discourse level, i.e. a ‘coordinating’ discourse relation like Narration or Result. Asher & Vieu 2005 (following Txurruka 2000), for example, use and-coordination as a test to distinguish between ‘coordinating’ and ‘subordinating’ discourse relations, although they do point to data
suggesting that the inference from and-coordination to discourse coordination may be defeasible in some cases (Asher & Vieu 2005: 598-599; see also Asher 2004: 183-185).

RST is less explicit than SDRT in associating syntactic coordination with a specific type of discourse relation, since the theory generally refrains from directly mapping discourse relations to concrete syntactic realisations in a particular language. However, examples given on the RST website (http://www.sfu.ca/rst/), illustrating the multinuclear relation Conjunction, suggest that also RST assumes that the syntactic symmetry of and-coordination mirrors a multinuclear (symmetric, non-weighted) relation on discourse level.

Whether such a correlation between syntactic and discourse coordination is a feature that holds universally across languages, however, has been questioned in recent contrastive studies (e.g. Ramm & Fabricius-Hansen 2005, Ramm forthcoming). The studies show that coordination is used somewhat differently in Norwegian versus German and English. In particular, syntactic coordination seems to be compatible with some (‘subordinating’) discourse relations in Norwegian that are blocked in German or English.

As concerns possible correlations between syntactic subordination and discourse subordination or asymmetry, RST is slightly more explicit, e.g. in Matthiessen & Thompson (1988: 317), who hold “that hypotactic clause combining is best understood as a grammaticalization of the Nucleus-
Satellite relations which characterize the rhetorical organization of certain types of written discourse”. Of course, due to the recursive nature of constructing discourse representations in RST, the concept of asymmetric nucleus-satellite relations is not restricted to syntactically subordinate structures: a nucleus-satellite relation may also hold between independent sentences or even between paragraphs in a text. But again there seems to be some agreement that syntactic subordination typically implies subordination/asymmetry on discourse level as well. The issue of possible non-correlations between subordination on the syntactic level and on the level of discourse relations is addressed in the papers by Delort (Chapter 10) and Ramm (Chapter 6). Also Stede (Chapter 2) shows that automatically equating syntactic subordinating with discourse asymmetry (in the RST sense) is a simplification that does not do justice to the complexity of natural discourse (cf. Stede 2004).

The Relevance-Theoretic work on and-coordination by Blakemore and Carston (Blakemore 1987, 2002, Blakemore & Carston 2005), pointing to the possibility of asymmetric interpretations, has already been mentioned above (Section 3.1; see also Solfjeld, Chapter 5 in this volume). Blakemore and Carston also show that coordination is possible in certain cases while blocked in others and, in particular, that using coordination instead of a sequence of non-coordinated (‘full stop’) sentences sends two types of signal to the reader: (i) The two conjuncts should be processed as a unit, both conjuncts functioning together as premises in the derivation of a joint
cognitive effect; (ii) specific inferences are licensed regarding the semantic-pragmatic relations holding between them, the first conjunct always functioning as a background to the processing of the second. Thus, in narratives a temporal-causal relation is often inferred (see Section 3.1). A non-narrative use of coordination can be seen in argumentative examples, where the conjuncts make a joint contribution as steps in an argumentation (Blakemore & Carston 2005). Relevance Theory does not distinguish between ‘coordinating’ and ‘subordinating’ discourse relations – and prefers to avoid the notion of discourse relations altogether (Blakemore 2002: Section 5.3) – but most of the narrative, as well as the argumentative examples given in Blakemore & Carston (2005), would probably be classified as ‘coordinating’ relations in the SDRT framework.

Klein and v. Stutterheim’s quaestio approach also dispenses with an explicit theoretical concept of discourse relations. But at least in narration, clause coordination with and etc. is generally taken to continue the current quaestio, i.e. mostly the main story line, corresponding to the ‘coordinating’ discourse relations Narration and Continuation in SDRT. Syntactic subordination, on the other hand, is conceived as a means of ‘downgrading’ information (Stutterheim 1997; see also Carroll et al. in this volume), without necessarily assigning the downgraded information to some side structure.19

Associating syntactic subordination with a downgrading or backgrounding function at text level is common practice in more traditional
linguistic description (see e.g. Aarts 2007, Brandt 1996, Cristofaro 2000, Hartmann 2004, Hetland & Molnár 2001, Peyer 1997). Unfortunately, however, these notions are understood in varying ways, having being explained alternately – and mostly not very explicitly – in terms of e.g. information structure (focus – background), illocutionary function (assertion vs. non-assertion), temporal anchoring (event versus co-temporal state), (lack of) relevance in the given discourse context, attachment options for subsequent discourse units, or in terms of other general terms like salience, prominence or ‘communicative weight’.

There are exceptions such as Tomlin (1985) and Schecker (2002), who define the notions of foreground(ed) and background(ed), or downgraded, information in experimental text reproduction independently of linguistic form. And they both conclude that (certain types of) subordinate clauses do tend to encode information that is backgrounded or downgraded in the defined sense.

On the whole, however, empirical investigations into discourse-functional aspects of subordination and coordination in natural discourse are rare. There is a conspicuous lack of comprehensive studies combining a precise theoretical framework and a sound methodology with extensive empirical data from ‘wildlife’ texts including, but not restricted to, narratives.

Matthiessen and Thompson conclude their article on “The structure of discourse and ‘subordination’” as follows:
If hypotaxis in English is a grammaticalization of rhetorical relations, then it follows that the grammar of clause combining may differ radically from one language to another. Indeed, preliminary discourse-based investigations of such phenomena in unrelated languages strongly suggest that this is the case. If the basic approach to clause combining taken in this paper is correct, then the interesting cross-linguistic issue is how and to what extent the grammar of clause-combining in a given language reflects the rhetorical organization of discourse in that language [...]. (Matthiessen & Thomspn 1988: 317)

Since then some empirically oriented contrastive research has been done, indicating that even quite closely related languages (or language communities) may differ considerably in their use of syntactic coordination and subordination (in a broad sense) as a means of information packaging at text level; see the papers by Cosme, Solfjeld and Carroll et al. (Chapter 4 – 7), with further references. Part of this picture is the difference between a more ‘incremental’ and a more ‘hierarchical’ style of writing, which is mentioned by Cosme (Chapter 4), and taken up more in detail by Ramm (Chapter 6).

Of course, more studies are needed, based on more data, more languages and a more refined assessment of language-specific structural constraints and language-specific means of expressing syntactic subordination and coordination, on the one hand, and (discourse) relations
between independent sentences, on the other. But it is our hope that the papers presented here will help reduce the research gaps outlined above, either directly or by encouraging further research.

5. Outline of contents

The overall structure of the following collection of papers is outlined in Section 1. Below we briefly present the individual contributions (in the order in which they appear below): their research topics, theoretical framework and methods of investigation, their relation to the general topics of the present volume, as outlined above, and their relation to each other.

*Manfred Stede* (‘RST revisited: Disentangling nuclearity’, Chapter 2) discusses the central notion of *nuclearity* in RST (see Section 4.1 above) and other discourse-theoretical approaches, relating it to the broader concept of *salience*. Reviewing three problematic aspects of RST nuclearity – its relationship to syntactic subordination, its direct association with coherence relations, and its purported pervasiveness – he argues that the complexity of textual coherence and discourse organization is not adequately modelled by hierarchical (tree) structures alone, but demands a multi-level representation. The last part of his paper outlines an annotation framework for multi-level discourse representation. Like *Blühdorn* (Chapter 3), Stede directly addresses theoretical issues of primary importance in the present
context. The RST notion of nuclearity also plays a role in the paper by Ramm (Chapter 6).

Hardarik Blühdorn (‘Subordination and coordination in syntax, semantics, and discourse: Evidence from the study of connectives’, Chapter 3) addresses the basic question of whether the syntactic and the discourse notions of subordination and coordination are as closely related as the parallel terminology may suggest (cf. Sections 1 and 4.1 above). Using the syntax and semantics of connectives (in the broad sense of e.g. Pasch et al. 2003) as his point of departure, he argues that the nature of the syntactic and the discourse domains are too different to warrant such parallelism and that syntactic hierarchy should not be considered a general model for the conceptualization of discourse hierarchy, nor vice versa. Blühdorn’s contribution relates to those by Solfjeld (Chapter 5) Ramm (Chapter 6) and Delort (Chapter 10) by pointing to mismatches between syntactic subordination or coordination and ‘subordination’/‘coordination’ at the discourse level. Further, it ties in well with Stede’s paper (Chapter 2) in that both address a primarily theoretical issue.

Christelle Cosme (‘A corpus-based perspective on clause linking patterns in English, French and Dutch’, Chapter 4) compares clause-linking patterns and discourse information packaging in English, French and Dutch. Investigating comparable (authentic) as well as translational parallel corpora she concludes that the three languages employ clausal subordination and paratactic clause combining differently: On the scale between a more
incremental and a more hierarchical information organization Dutch tends towards the former and French towards the latter, with English situated somewhere in the middle. From a theoretical perspective, Cosme’s study supports the conception of (clausal) coordination and subordination as gradient categories (cf. Section 3 above); these aspects of her paper link it to Holler’s study (Chapter 8). Her contribution is related to the three subsequent papers – Solfjeld, Ramm and Carroll et al. – by its contrastive perspective and its focus on the use of subordination and paratactic clause combining. It shares two of its object languages (English and French) with Carroll et al. (Chapter 7) but is more closely connected to Solfjeld (Chapter 5) and Ramm (Chapter 6) as far as its research questions, data and methods are concerned.

Kåre Solfjeld’s study (‘Sentence splitting – and strategies to preserve discourse structure in German-Norwegian translations’, Chapter 5) is related to the papers by Cosme (Chapter 4) and, in particular, Ramm (Chapter 6): it is contrastive (German-Norwegian), based on parallel (translational) corpora, and concerned with the relation between syntactic subordination/coordination and discourse interpretation. The particular question Solfjeld addresses is to what extent and by what means the discourse structure of the (German) source text (ST) is preserved in the (Norwegian) target text (TT) when a phrasal adjunct is rendered as an independent sentence or clause. Following a primarily relevance-theoretic line of argumentation, he concludes that simply preserving the linear order
of the relevant information units often suffices to ensure an adequate interpretation of the TT, but that clause coordination with og ‘and’ may be used as compensation for missing grammatical options to express ‘backgrounding’ by syntactic subordination (adjunction); and connectives may be added in the second TT clause/sentence if the ST discourse relation is not inferable otherwise.

Wiebke Ramm (‘Upgrading of non-restrictive relative clauses in translation – a change in discourse structure?’, Chapter 6) analyses the discourse functions of non-restrictive relative clauses (see Section 3.1 above) and the discourse-functional effect of ‘upgrading’ (German) non-restrictive relative clauses to independent sentences in (Norwegian) translations. She investigates whether the distinction between appositive/discontinuative and continuative relative clauses is relevant for how a non-restrictive relative clause is translated into Norwegian (in cases where translation by a corresponding relative clause is not an option). Ramm concludes that upgrading is more problematic with respect to discontinuative/appositive relative clauses, since this gives them too much weight in the discourse structure compared to the original text. The study also reveals certain shortcomings of approaches based on SDRT and the quaestio model. Furthermore, as in Cosme’s paper, the topic of different discourse organisation strategies across languages is taken up: The upgrading of relative clauses makes the translations less hierarchically organised than the original texts – an observation which calls for reflections
on the cross-linguistic assessment of coherence within and across sentence boundaries.

Mary Caroll, Antje Rossdeutscher, Monique Lambert & Christiane von Stutterheim (‘Subordination in narratives and macrostructural planning: A comparative point of view’, Chapter 7) present a comparative study of ‘macro-structural planning’ in English, French and German retellings of a silent animation. Following the quaestio model (cf. Section 4.1 above) they take macro-structural planning to manifest itself in information selection (Which events to narrate?) and strategies of downgrading selected information (e.g. clausal subordination and passive) in accordance with the primary narrative task of advancing the story line. Part of this picture is the choice of (protagonist versus narrator) perspective, which involves the temporal frame of reference and potential mapping of narrated events onto subordinate rather than main clauses (i.e. downgrading). The first part of the study presents empirical generalizations relating observed significant language-specific differences between the three sets of narratives to well-defined morpho-syntactic parameters like subject vs. topic prominence, aspectual marking and word order flexibility. The second part constitutes a first step towards a formal (decision-hierarchical) model of the language-specific principles guiding macro-structural narrative planning. As a cross-linguistic investigation of information packaging at discourse level this paper is linked, in particular, to Ramm (Chapter 6) and Cosme (Chapter 4).
The paper by Anke Holler (‘German dependent clauses from a constraint-based perspective’, Chapter 8) focuses on the general issue of non-canonical subordination (see Section 3.1 above), proposing a fine-grained systematization and explication within the constraint-based framework of Head-driven Phrase Structure Grammar (HPSG). She argues that dependent clauses must be distinguished regarding their degree of integration into a putative matrix clause and exemplifies this by means of five instances of non-canonical clause types in German: weil-verb second clauses, continuative wh-relative clauses, verb second relative clauses, free dass-clauses, and dependent verb second clauses. The distinctions between these clause types are modelled in the HPSG framework as constraints and sorts partially ordered in multiple-inheritance hierarchies. By not depending on the position of the finite verb, the analysis goes beyond earlier constraint-based approaches implementing a strict dichotomy between main and subordinate clauses and relying on the V2 property alone. It is linked to other papers concerned with detached constructions (cf. Averintseva-Klisch, Chapter 9) and mismatches between formal and functional aspects of subordination, i.e. Delort (Chapter 10) and Solfjeld (Chapter 5).

Maria Averintseva-Klisch (‘To the right of the clause: Right dislocation vs. afterthought’, Chapter 9) investigates the discourse functions of two apparently similar constructions at the right sentential edge in German, right dislocation (RD) and afterthought (AT). She shows that RD is syntactically adjoined to its host sentence and functions as a discourse-
structuring device marking the topic for the following discourse segment, whereas AT is syntactically independent of its host sentence and serves as a local repair strategy in discourse. Furthermore, she shows that these two functions can be identified in French and Russian data as well. Her paper ties in with other papers in this volume investigating possible mismatches between syntactic and discourse structure, e.g. Ramm (Chapter 6) and Delort (Chapter 10), by pointing out that AT exemplifies a subordinating discourse relation (according to the tests developed by Asher & Vieu 2005), but is detached syntactically as an orphan to its host sentence.

Laurence Delort (‘Exploring the role of clause subordination in discourse structure – the case of French avant que’, Chapter 10) investigates discourse relational aspects of a specific subordinating connective, viz. French avant que (‘before’). She argues that avant que, depending on the (sentence-internal and -external) context, may convey at least two different discourse relations between the connected clauses. Adopting relevant SDRT definitions (see Section 4.1), she identifies these two relations with Narration, which is a ‘coordinating’ relation, and Background, which she classifies as a ‘subordinating’ relation in accordance with Vieu & Prévot (2004). The difference manifests itself in different substitution and translation options. Delort’s contribution relates to other SDRT-inspired contributions, viz. Averintseva-Klisch (Chapter 9) and Petrova & Solf (Chapter 14), and to Blühdorn (Chapter 3), Ramm (Chapter 6) and Holler
which are also concerned with the mismatch between syntactic and discourse ‘subordination’.

*Michael Franke* (*‘Pseudo-imperatives and other cases of conditional conjunction and conjunctive disjunction’, Chapter 11*) investigates interpretational asymmetries (‘pragmatic puzzles’) exhibited by so-called pseudo-imperatives (PIs), i.e. *and*-conjunction and *or*-disjunction as exemplified in example (3) in Section 3.1. Analyzing PIs on the background of related non-standard conjunction and disjunction, he proposes a pragmatic explanation of PI interpretation that is based on the different *discourse segmentation behaviour* of the two connectors: Disjunctive PIs are *discourse separating*, associating the two connected clauses with separate communicative events, while conjunctive PIs may be either *discourse integrating* or discourse separating, with different consequences for the interpretation of the construction as a whole. In distinguishing between discourse integrating and discourse separating (instances of) conjunctive or disjunctive coordination, Franke implicitly addresses not only the fundamental issue of discourse segmentation (see Section 2 above) but also the question of where, i.e. at which meaning level, coordinate clause combining may take place (see Section 3.1 above). The topic of his contribution – asymmetry in clausal coordination – links it to the paper by *Reich* (Chapter 12).

*Ingo Reich* (*‘From discourse to “odd coordinations” – on asymmetric coordination and subject gaps in German’, Chapter 12*) addresses syntactic-
semantic asymmetries relating to word order (‘clause type’) and subject gaps in German – so-called Asymmetric Coordination (AC) and SLF-Coordination (SLFC) \(^{21}\) – as illustrated in example (4) in Section 3.1. Combining generative feature-based syntax and formal semantics with discourse-relational considerations, he argues that the conjuncts in both cases are semantically linked by a relation of event subordination, termed *Occasion*. He defines this relation as a semantic explication of the discourse (‘Contiguity’) relation Occasion as understood by Kehler (2002), introducing it syntactically by way of a specific functional projection. Thus, the syntactic-semantic characteristics of the AC and SLFC constructions are explained as a ‘grammaticalization’ of properties that are typically attributed to coordinate structures in discourse. Reich’s contribution is related to other contributions concerned with subordination-coordination mismatches, i.e. Blühdorn (Chapter 3) and Holler (Chapter 8), and to the immediately preceding paper (Franke) on pragmatic asymmetries in coordination.

*Rosemarie Lühr* (‘Old Indic clauses between subordination and coordination’, Chapter 13) addresses the interplay between prosody and subordination/coordination in Old Indic. Her paper aims to explain the distribution of sentences with and without stress on the initial verb and, in particular, the status of sentences that have the prosodic properties of subordinate clauses but are not introduced by a subordination marker. Lühr proposes a solution in terms of information structure, viewing the latter construction type as the Old Indic counterpart of German coordinate
structures showing the rise-fall contour that goes along with contrastive coordination. That is, contrary to what has often been suggested in the literature, she takes stress on the first verb in sentences lacking a subordinator to be a main clause phenomenon signaling that a continuation will follow. Lühr’s contribution is the only one in the collection that explicitly takes up prosodic and information-structural aspects of subordination-coordination mismatches. However, it is linked to the paper by Petrova & Solf (Chapter 14) in applying theories of information structure and discourse relations to historic languages.

Svetlana Petrova & Michael Solf (‘Rhetorical relations and verb placement in the early Germanic languages. A cross-linguistic study’, Chapter 14) investigate discourse-related properties of verb placement (V1 versus V2) in Old High German (OHG) and other early Germanic (declarative) main clauses. Adopting the SDRT distinction between ‘subordinating’ and ‘coordinating’ discourse relations, they argue that V1 is a common correlate of discourse ‘coordination’ in all early Germanic languages while ‘subordinating’ discourse relations are signalled by different syntactic means. These differences may be responsible for the development of different word order patterns in the modern languages. Petrova & Solf’s contribution is closely related to the paper by Lühr (Chapter 13) in being concerned with information or discourse structural aspects of main clause word order in historic Indo-European languages.
Notes

1 The research underlying this introduction has been carried out in connection with the project SPRIK (Språk i kontrast/Languages in Contrast) at the University of Oslo, Faculty of Humanities, funded by the Norwegian Research Council (NFR) under project number 158447/530 (2003-2007). Editing was financed by the SPRIK project and by grants from the Department of Literature, Area Studies and European Languages and the Faculty of Humanities. We thank Maria F. Krave and Signe Oksefjell Ebeling for their meticulous work with the manuscripts. And we thank the editors of the Studies in Language Companion Series for giving us and the other workshop participants this opportunity to publish our research presented at the DGfS 06 conference.

2 We have coined the term ‘wild(life) texts’ inspired by the Norwegian newspaper Aftenposten, which after a very mild winter (2005) introduced the compound vill-snø ‘wild-snow’ referring to natural snow.

3 Sentences having the form of two or more coordinated main clauses are sometimes termed compound rather than complex.

4 As Huddleston & Pullum (2002: 1728) put it: “[…] there will often be no syntactically marked distinction between a sentence with the form of a combination of two successive main clauses and a sequence of sentences each of which has the form of a main clause. In writing, one function of punctuation is precisely to indicate whether successive clauses belong together or are to be treated as separate.”

5 The literature on clause combining (e.g. Lehmann 1988, Matthiessen & Thompson 1988) is not very explicit in this respect.

6 But see e.g. Cormack & Smith (2005: 396), who distinguish notionally between (logical) conjunction and (syntactic) coordination.
7 See Haspelmath (2004) for a typological overview. In multiple coordination, comma is a semantically neutral alternative to and or between all but the last two conjuncts.

8 Coordinate Structure Constraint (CSC), Across the Board Movement (ATB), No Backward Anaphora, the possibility of multiple conjuncts.

9 “Unbalanced” coordination according to Johannessen (1998).

10 It should be noted that when we front the subject instead of the adverbial, we get what appears to be a syntactically canonical VP coordination:

(4)’ Er [hat gestern verschlafen und ist zwei Stunden zu spät gekommen].

he has yesterday overslept and is two hours too late arrived

‘He overslept yesterday and arrived two hours late.’

But even so, i.e. when placed within the first conjunct, the temporal adverbial gestern ‘yesterday’ is interpreted as setting a temporal frame for both conjuncts. Thus asymmetries involving subject gaps – type (4) – might after all be special instances of VP coordination, despite the counter arguments put forward by Reich (forthcoming).

11 “To sum up, extraction out of parts of conjuncts is possible when a link can be established between the conjuncts which can be described in terms of consequence, despiteness, or time (there may be other relationships, too)” (Johannessen 1998: 233). Cf. Kehler (2002, 2004), who argues for a coherence-driven, i.e. pragmatic, approach to asymmetries in coordination. See also e.g. Vuillaume’s (2000) account of asymmetric coordination in German.


13 According to Langacker (1991: 436) “[…] a subordinate clause can also be understood more broadly as one that is not a main clause. Is there, then, something that all such clauses have in common that sets them apart from main clauses? I suggest that there is, and that the distinction rests on profiling. Specifically, the main clause is the head of at a particular level of organization, i.e. the clause that lends it profiling to the composite structure
of a multiclausal expression. A *subordinate clause* is then describable as one whose profile is overridden by that of a main clause.”

14 It should be noted that from a structural point of view the entity consisting of subjunction + clause should not, strictly speaking, be considered a clause but a phrase of a different category, headed by the subjunction, i.e. a ‘subjunction phrase’ or the like (cf. Pasch et al. 2003). Similarly for coordination: the second conjunct including the conjunction itself by all relevant phrase structure criteria constitutes a ‘conjunction phrase’ (ConjP) rather than a clause (see in particular Johannessen 1998). Viewed as devices of so-called clause combining, conjunctions and subjunctions are also not considered parts of the clauses they introduce. In this introduction, however, we adhere to the traditional, albeit vague use of the term ‘subordinate/coordinate clause’.

15 See Zifonun et al. (1997) for a detailed account of such mismatches between function and form.

16 We shall use the notation ‘coordinating’, ‘subordinating’ when referring to discourse relations rather than syntactic relations.

17 The set of discourse relations is not absolutely fixed, but many RST applications operate with a set of approx. 30 relations (see e.g. the relation definitions on the ‘official’ RST website http://www.sfu.ca/rst/01intro/definitions.html.

18 In essence, the notion of quaestio corresponds to the notion of a *Question under Discussion (QuD)*, which was developed in question-answer analysis and which is applied in Jasinskaja’s (2006) approach to discourse relations and the discourse function of *and*-coordination.

19 Side structures may be realized in different ways: as subordinate clauses, as parenthetical insertions or other kinds of ‘orphans’, and as independent sentences or text passages.

20 Asher (1993) and Asher & Lascarides (2003) view Background as a ‘coordinating’ relation; but as argued by Vieu & Prévot (2004) and Behrens
& Fabricius-Hansen (forthcoming), it fails to meet decisive (RFC-based) criteria of discourse ‘coordination’. In Asher (2004: 179-180), Background is characterized as ‘subordinating’.

21 SLF stands for ‘Subject Lacking in F(ronted) structure’ (Reich forthcoming: 2).
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