Rhetorical relations and verb placement in the early Germanic languages

A cross-linguistic study

Svetlana Petrova and Michael Solf
Humboldt-Universität zu Berlin

The paper investigates pragmatic principles determining clause structure in the early Germanic languages. Previous observations on discourse-related properties of V1 vs. V2 in Old High German are reconsidered on a larger scale and compared with evidence from other early Germanic languages. It is claimed that the position of the inflected verb is a device of marking coordination vs. subordination as the two basic types of discourse relations according to the model of SDRT (Asher & Lascarides 2003).

Keywords: Early Germanic, verb placement, information structure, discourse relations

1. Introduction

Throughout the mass of literature exploring the principles of word order in the early Germanic languages, numerous remarks suggest that the placement of the inflected verb is sensitive to a complex set of factors pertaining to information packaging and discourse organization (Ries 1880; Behaghel 1932; Fourquet 1974; Lenerz 1984). Following this, Hinterhölzl & Petrova (2005) take a first attempt at describing word order variation in early Germanic in a dynamic model of discourse relations as outlined in the Segmented Discourse Relation Theory (SDRT) by Asher & Lascarides (2003). On the basis of data from Old High German (henceforth OHG), it is claimed that the position of the finite verb is a device of differentiating coordination vs. subordination as the two major types of rhetorical relations outlined in the framework of SDRT. This function mainly manifests itself in the opposition of verb-initial (V1) vs. verb-second (V2) as the two most common root patterns in OHG. V2 structures with referential material placed before the verb typically occur in contexts giving supportive, e.g., explanatory or descriptive information and therefore constitute discourse parts that are subordinated in text structure. By contrast, V1 and functionally equivalent patterns in which only a frame-setting element (a particle or an adverbial) precedes the verb are generally found in sentences carrying the main story-line of the narration and are therefore viewed to attribute to the coordinating type of linking.

Following these observations it may be concluded that syntactic patterns other than the widely assumed basic verb-final order started to emerge in early Germanic for reasons of discourse organization and rhetorical explicitness. In earlier studies, it has been already observed that verb fronting in early Germanic is related to phenomena like illocution and sentence mood. Kiparsky (1996) and Van Kemenade (1997) postulate residual V2 in the case of syntactic operators like interrogative phrases, negation elements or sentence adverbials (e.g., *þa/þonne* in Old English) situated in the left periphery of the clause and regularly attracting the verb to the second position in the sentence. Additionally, Eythórsson (1996: 111) assumes a phonologically empty operator yielding verb-initial structures in imperatives, while Lenerz (1984) – building upon Fourquet's (1974) idea that verb fronting highlights the contents of the whole sentence – accounts for special stylistic usages of V1 in declaratives. In an overview on verb placement in Old English, Pintzuk (1996: 380) assigns to all these cases the overall label of some common discourse-related functions. Following this, we aim at discussing further type of data, predominantly declaratives, to provide more empirical support for the claim that verb placement serves special discourse needs in the early Germanic languages. In this respect, we are indebted to previous observations by Hopper (1979) on Old English and Leiss (2000: 84–109) on Old Norse who relate verb placement to grounding in discourse and show how this interacts with the aspectual reading of the verbs involved. Both Hopper (1979) and Leiss (2000) state that V2-clauses provide background information in Old English and Old Norse respectively. Hopper relates foregrounding to peripheral verb placement, which means both Vend and V1. He also observes a strong tendency of perfective verbs to appear in foregrounding (i.e., V1) units. Leiss draws the attention at the complementary distribution of the "historic present" and V1 in different types of sentences serving the aim of foregrounding the message. Her main claim is that V1 is a device of perfectivization in Old Norse. However, this view cannot be applied to all cases of V1 in older Germanic. As will be shown later, there are examples in which verbs in initial position retain their durative semantics, cf. (1a), (17b) and (21a) below. Therefore, we aim at deriving a common functional definition of V1 with both perfective and statal/durative predicates in early Germanic which in our view is achievable if we look at word order from the perspective of text structure and discourse analysis.

The paper is organized as follows: starting from an analysis of the distribution of V1 and V2 in OHG, we compare our findings with the situation in the remaining early Germanic languages attested from nearly the same period of time and then propose a formal model of discourse-semantics which is suitable to account for the distinctions observed.

2. The initial hypothesis: verb placement in the Old High German *Tatian*

In order to investigate the role of information structure in the syntax of OHG, Hinterhölzl et al. (2005) pursue an approach that especially concentrates on the

relationship between the given/new status of discourse referents and their placement with respect to the inflected verb in the sentence. For several methodological reasons outlined in Hinterhölzl et al. (2005: 4–6), the empirical basis of the analysis is restricted to examples from the *Tatian* translation (9th century) in which the vernacular text departs from the word order of the underlying Latin original. The analysis provides significant points in favour of the interdependence between verb placement and information structure in OHG which can be best demonstrated on sentences representing the thetic vs. categorical type of judgements (Sasse 1995). By definition, categorical sentences have a bipartite structure divided into a predication base, or topic of the sentence and a comment on this topic. By contrast, thetic utterances are "monominal predications" (Sasse 1995: 4) in which no particular constituent is taken as the predication base of the utterance; rather, the entire sentence, including all participants, is asserted as a unitary whole. Therefore, thetic utterances are viewed as all-focus sentences in which no topic-comment division applies (see also Drubig 1992).

Typical representatives of the thetic kind of judgements are presentational sentences introducing a new discourse referent to the context (Lambrecht 1994, pp. 127–131, 137–146 and 177–181). In OHG, such sentences basically display two syntactic patterns. In the first one, the finite verb[1] occupies the position at the beginning of the entire sentence yielding V1, see (1a). This use of V1 has been already reflected in previous studies, e.g., Lenerz (1984: 151–153) or Ramers (2005: 81) who claim that V1 in OHG is typical for utterances containing new information only. Apart from V1, a second pattern occurs in which a particle or an adverbial is allowed before the verb, see *tho* 'then', *thar* 'there' in (1b):

(1) a. *uuas thar ouh sum uuitua* (T 201, 2)
was there too [a] certain widow
'There was a widow there, too'
vidua autem quædam <u>erat</u>

   b. *tho* <u>uuas</u> *man In hierusalem* (T 37, 23)
then was [a] man in Jerusalem
'There was a man in Jerusalem'
homo <u>erat</u> *In hierusalem*

In both patterns, the newly added referent is placed after the finite verb, see *sum uuitua* 'a widow' in (1a) and *man* 'a man' in (1b). As for the structure of the left periphery of these sentences, there is evidence to assume that pure V1 is the preferred pattern in these contexts since particles or adverbials added against the original are also found in these sentences.

---

1. The finite verb in both OHG and Latin, as well as in all instances from other early Germanic languages considered later in this paper, is underlined for clarity. A slash stands for end of verse or text line according to the graphical representation of the instances in the manuscripts respectively.

postverbal position thus preserving V1, see *thar* in (1a). From this we may conclude that V1 is strongly associated with the functional type of presentational, or thetic/all-focus sentences in the early period of German.

By contrast, categorical sentences are systematically realized as V2 structures against various word order patterns occurring in the Latin original. See the second conjunct in (2) predicating on the discourse entity *guot hirti* 'a good shepherd' introduced in the previous sentence:

(2)　(*ih bin guot hirti.* '*I am a good shepherd*')　　　　　　　　[T 225, 16])

　　　guot　hirti/　　tuot　sina　sela　furi　siniu　scaph　　(T 225, 16–17)
　　　good　shepherd　does　his　soul　for　his　sheep
　　　'The good shepherd gives his soul for his sheep.'
　　　bonus pastor/ animam suam dat pro ouibus suis

A general property of V2-instances like those in (2) distinguishing them from structures like (1b) consists in the type of phrase that occupies the pre-verbal domain. In V2-structures of the categorical kind, the inflected verb singles out a discourse referent that is meant to provide the starting point, or the aboutness topic of the utterance (Reinhart 1981). This does not hold for structures like (1b) where the sentence-initial elements provide the temporal or local orientation of the situation, thus sharing properties of frame-setting elements.

This analysis strongly suggests that the position of the finite verb in OHG is sensitive to the information structure as reflected by the status of the discourse referents in the sentence. This allows for an initial generalization concerning the placement of the finite verb in early German. In all cases considered above, the verb occupies one and the same position, namely the one at the beginning of the new-information focus domain, by additionally setting apart the aboutness topic from the rest of the utterance. This generalization is represented in (3):

(3)　thetic　　a.　　　　　　$_{FOC}$[Vfin … DRnew …]
　　　　　　　　b.　Frame　　$_{FOC}$[Vfin … DRnew …]
　　　categorical　　$_{TOP}$[DRgiv]　$_{FOC}$[Vfin …]

Given this conclusion, however, we are in need of an explanation for V1 in sentences containing discourse-given material as in (4):

(4)　*bigonda　ther　phariseus　innan　imo/　ahtonti　queden*　(T 126, 4–5)
　　　began　this　Pharisee　inside　him　thinking　[to] speak
　　　'This Pharisee began to speak thinking by himself'
　　　Phariseus autem coepit intra se/ reputans dicere

Here, the definite expression *ther phariseus* 'this pharisee' refers to a discourse-given entity which is a suitable topic candidate. Nevertheless, it occupies a position shown as typical for new referents in all-focus sentences. A further examination of the *Tatian* as well as a look at other OHG texts reveals that V1 with discourse-given material is

a wide-spread phenomenon at this stage of German. Consequently, it is unjustified to restrict V1 to sentences with new information only. Rather, we have to look for the conditions leading to V1 and the subsequent postverbal realization of discourse-given subjects in root declaratives in OHG.

On closer inspection, cases of V1 in OHG show a clear positional and functional distribution. First, it is well-known that they typically occur in text-initial sentences or at the beginning of new episodes (Schrodt 2004: 199). A similar fact is reported for some colloquial registers of modern German as well as for the beginning of some orally transmitted genres like jokes etc. (Lenerz 1984: 153; Önnerfors 1997: 53). For the Bavarian dialect, Simon (1998: 145) describes a similar function of V1 sentences used to open a new dialogue or to continue a dialogue after a break.[2] In *Tatian*, which is a bilingually attested translation of a gospel harmony, episode onsets, for instance the shift to another place of reference in the source text of the New Testament, are signalled by concordance notes in the left-hand margin of the Latin column or between the Latin and the OHG text. Additionally, it is known that Carolingian manuscripts of both Latin and vernacular texts use to mark the beginnings of new text units by means of punctuation and graphical representation in order to distinguish coherent parts in written discourse (Bästlein 1991: 59 and 1991: 214–242). As for the manuscript of the *Tatian*, Simmler (1998: 306–307) remarks that the strategy of dividing episodes and sub-episodes through initial capital letters predominantly applies for the Latin section of the text and only rarely occurs in the OHG part. At the same time, we observe that the graphical distinction of new episodes in the Latin original correlates with the regular pre-posing of the finite verb in the OHG translation, see (5a–b):

(5)　a.　*uuard　　　thô　gitân　In　then　tagon*　　　　　(T 35, 7)
　　　　　[it] became　then　done　in　those　days
　　　　　'It happened in those days'
　　　　　Factum est autem In diebus illis

　　　b.　*Intfiengun　sie　tho　the　　heilantes　lichamon*　　(T 321, 29)
　　　　　took　　they　then　the$_{Gen}$　Saviour$_{Gen}$　body$_{Acc}$
　　　　　'Then they took the body of Jesus'
　　　　　Acceperunt autem corpus ihesu

This suggests that the syntactic means of verb fronting systematically applies for marking episode boundaries in OHG as a functional equivalent of the graphical highlighting of the episode onsets in the Latin original. The strong preference for V1 at the

---

2.　But note that Simon points at further restrictions on V1 in Bavarian. Unlike the situation in the standard language, V1 in Bavarian appears to be most common with modals, less common with auxiliaries and highly restricted with main verbs (Simon 1998: 148). Moreover, V1 is preferred in sentences highlighting the reference to an addressee. As such, they represent no declarative statement but fulfill different illocutionary functions in the domain of request (Simon 1998: 149).

beginnings of new episodes not only accounts for the post-verbal position of full DPs as in (4) but also for the positioning of pronominal subjects inserted against the Latin original, see *sie* 'they' in (5b).

Furthermore, it has been observed that V1 regularly occurs with certain verb lexemes in OHG (for an overview see Schrodt 2004: 199) which according to our data classification constitute some stable classes of predicates. The most common group of predicates favouring V1 – apart from those in presentational sentences – are motion verbs (6a), verbs of saying (6b) as well as punctual, especially inchoative verbs (6c) signalling the initiation of a new state of affairs (very often this is a new physical or cognitive state of the referent):

(6)   a.   *quam thara gotes engil*   (T 35, 32)
     came there God$_{Gen}$ angel
     'There appeared God's angel'
     & ecce angelus domini

   b.   *antlingota thô sîn muoter Inti quad*   (T 30, 24)
     responded then his mother and said
     'Then his mother responded and said'
     & respondens mater eius & dixit

   c.   *uuard tho giheilit ther kneht in thero ziti*   (T 84, 7)
     became then healed the boy in these times
     'Then the boy was healed at this very moment'
     & sanatus est *puer in illa hora*

How can the initial position of the finite verb in these examples containing discourse-given material be re-unified with the fact that the same structure occurs in presentational sentences with brand-new referents as well? One suggestion that might be uttered in this respect is that the predicates favouring V1 are intransitive unaccusatives in which the surface subject is an underlying object actually[3]. However, our data provides examples of V1 with transitive verbs as well, see (7a–b); consider that the insertion of the subject pronoun as well as of the adverbial *tho* in OHG does not affect the initial position of the inflected verb:

(7)   a.   *Quad her tho zi then giladoten/ ratissa*   (T 180, 9)
     said he then to the guests parable$_{Acc}$
     'Then he told a parable to the guests'
     Dicebat autem & ad Inuitatos/ parabolam

   b.   *furstuont siu thó in ira lihhamen/*   (T 95, 14)
     understood she then in her body
     (*thaz siu heil uuas fon theru suhti* 'that she was healed from her suffering'
     [T 95. 15])

---

3.   See Sasse (1995: 6) for a brief discussion on this matter.

'Then she realized with her body'
*& * *sensit* *corpore/ quod sanata ess& a plaga*

We suggest that a plausible explanation of the postverbal position of both given and new subjects in V1 sentences discussed so far can be gained if next to the informational status of referents, discourse relations among sentences are considered as well. From the point of view of discourse organisation, examples (4)–(7) do not act as categorical sentences providing a comment on a given referent but rather as event-reporting sentences answering implicit questions like "What happened then?/How does the story go on?" etc. This makes clear that the discourse referents contained in the instances under scrutiny are not mentioned as the starting point or the aboutness topic of the utterances but as being involved in the new state of affairs reported here. From this perspective, sentences (4)–(7) have to be viewed as all-focus sentences just like the presentational ones given in (1). Since the post-verbal position is associated with new-information focus (see (3) above), fronting of the finite verb is used as a special strategy to highlight the entire proposition and to disable a topic-comment separation, which otherwise would have applied, especially as far as discourse-given material is contained in the sentence.

Another point in favour of this account on V1 comes from the lexical meaning of the predicates involved. Motion verbs, inchoatives predicates as well as verbs of saying affect the main characteristics providing the deictic orientation of the narrative situation according to 'place', 'time' and 'participant/perspective'. In discourse-analytic approaches like Brinton (1996) these characteristics are considered relevant for distinguishing episode boundaries in running discourse. Changes with respect to one of these characteristics mark the beginning of a new episode in the structure of the text. This observation fits to the fact that the shift of place and/or participant is a typical instance in which episode onset is marked by an initial capital letter in Carolingian manuscripts (see Bästlein 1991: 168 and 1991: 192). Following these considerations, we can conclude that predicates like those favouring V1 in OHG operate as inherent indicators of episode boundaries. Presentational sentences appear to be a subset of this group of sentences establishing a new situation via change of personnel.

3.   Comparison to other early Germanic languages

The hypothesis about the role of verb placement as a discourse-structuring device in OHG would gain strong support if it turned to hold in other early Germanic languages as well. In the following analysis, the contexts and factors favouring V1 vs. V2 in OHG shall be reconsidered on the basis of data from other early Germanic languages. For this reason, texts from Old English (henceforth OE), Old Saxon (henceforth OS) and Old Norse (henceforth ON) shall be considered. Remarks on age,

size and genre of the evaluated texts will be given at the beginning of each section, respectively.[4]

3.1 Old English

For OE, we chose the text of the *Beowulf* poem, the oldest epic narrative of all early Germanic literature.[5] The text, comprising some 3.000 alliterative lines, is composed in the 8th century in the Anglian dialect but written down in the later half of the 10th century in Late West Saxon – the standard OE dialect at that time – though a number of original Anglian forms remain (see Lehnert 1960, vol. I, p. 43).

Starting with a review of typical V1-occurrences in *Beowulf*, it is important to note that these are by no way rare or uncommon for this text of the early Germanic period. First of all, *Beowulf* tends to use V1 regularly in text-initial position as well as at the beginning of a new text section. New chapters (called 'fits') are easily detected in *Beowulf* since they are marked by Roman numbers in the manuscript. At the beginning of such chapters, V1 goes with all types of main-verb predicates. So in (8a) the sentence at the beginning of a fit XII describes a statal (durative) condition, whereas in (8b) the predicate at the beginning of fit XIX clearly describes a punctual event:

(8)   a.   *Nolde*   *eorla hleo [...] /*   *cwealm-cuman*
          not wanted   noblemen$_{Gen}$ protector   murderous visitor$_{Akk}$
          cwicne   forlætan
          alive   let go   (Beo 791f.)
          'The protector of the warriors did not wish to let the monster go alive'
     b.   *Sigon   þa| to   slæpe*   (Beo 1252)
          sank$_{Pl}$ then   to   sleep
          'They sank then into sleep'

Next to episode onsets, V1 in *Beowulf* appear to favour the same groups of verbs which were also described for OHG above. Among these, motion verbs constitute the

---

4.   Gothic, which apart from the runic inscriptions provides us with the earliest written records of the Germanic group, leaves only little ground for any reliable conclusions about authentic word order. The basic text of the corpus, the translation of the New Testament from Greek made by Wulfila in the 4th century and attested in fragments of copies from the 5th and 6th century (see Braune & Heidermanns 2004, § E5, p. 6), shows an overwhelming identity with the word order of the parallel Greek text. If this text is indeed the source for the Gothic translation, future work could address especially sentences deviating from the syntactic structure of the original, an approach similar to the one pursued for the *Tatian* above. According to Fourquet (1938: 234–281), such sentences in Gothic really exist. A full sample of these would provide a basis for a subsequent analysis of verb placement in Gothic, too.

5.   On the possibility to acquire suitable material for syntactic analysis from *Bewoulf*, see Pintzuk (1996: 386).

overwhelming part. In such instances, both context-given and context-new referents are involved, see (9a–b). Note that in (9b) Wealhtheow, the wife of the Danish king Hrothgar, is mentioned for the first time in the narrative:

(9)   a.   *Com   þa| to   lande   lid-manna   helm*   (Beo 1623)
          came   then   to   land   sailors$_{Gen}$ protector
          'Then the protector of the sailors approached the shore'
     b.   *eode   wealh-þeow   forð   cwen   hroð-gares*   (Beo 613)
          went   Wealhtheow   forth   wife   Hrothgar$_{Gen}$
          'Then came Wealhtheow, Hrothgar's wife'

V1 is also common with verbs of saying appearing both at the beginning of a fit (10a) as well as within one (10b):

(10)   a.   *Heht   ða   þæt   heaðo-weorc   to   hagan   biodan*   (Beo 2893)
           ordered then   that   battle-toil$_{Acc}$ to   castle$_{Dat}$ announce
           'He ordered to tell the people in the castle about this difficult fight'
      b.   *Spræc/   ða   ides   scyldinga*   (Beo 1168)
           spoke   then   [the]   queen [of the] Danes$_{GenPl}$
           'Then the queen of the Danes spoke'

With verbs of saying, the V2 pattern as in (11) is also very common:

(11)   *Bio-wulf   maðelode   bearn   ecg-ðioes* (Beo 1999)
       Beowulf   spoke   child   Ecgtheow$_{Gen}$
       'Beowulf spoke, the son of Ecgtheow'.

However, a typical property of this type of expression is that a discourse-given referent, mainly a changing interlocutor in a dialogue, is placed before the verb and an apposition follows it. Apparently, the verb lexeme in this type of structure never changes which indicates a kind of idiomatic expression standing beyond the analysis of word order variation in this functional domain.

Furthermore, V1 also correlates with different main verbs sharing the property of perfective, punctual semantics which – used within a fit – denote the beginning of a new state of affairs. This pattern is especially frequent when a new or extraordinary important event is announced, e.g., a turning point in the course of the narration. See (12) which relates that Beowulf suddenly detects the weapon with which he is going to win the battle against Grendel's mother:

(12)   *GE-seah   ða   on|searwum   sige-eadig   bil*   (Beo 1558)
       saw   then   in battle   triumphant$_{Acc}$ blade$_{Acc}$
       'In the middle of the battle he saw a triumphant blade'

Also in striking parallelism to the picture drawn for OHG above, V1 sentences may contain particles or adverbials like OE *þa* 'then' placed after the verb. V1 as an indicator of a change within the narrative setting is thus preserved. Additionally, instances of

sentence-initial *þa* followed immediately by the verb co-occur as functional equivalents to V1-sentences in all contexts described so far,[6] see (13):

(13) a. *Ða   com   of more [...]   gre-/ ndel   gongan*   (Beo 710)
          Then came from moor_Dat [...] Grendel   go_PastPart
          'Then from the moorland [...] Grendel came'

      b. *ða| wæs   swigra   secg   sunu/ eclafes*   (Beo 980)
          then was   more silent man   son   Ecglaf_Gen
          'Then this man, the son of Ecglaf, became more silent'

To sum up, the context features and predicate groups distinguished as triggers of V1 in OHG appears to be a wide-spread pattern in the *Beowulf* as well. In the previous literature, the placement of a finite verb before all arguments has already been associated with the purpose of highlighting "a new or surprising subject" (Stockwell 1984: 576). Due to the property of V1 sentences to carry further the discourse, we may now extend the function of this pattern to that of focussing not only the subject but the entire proposition.

Turning to sentences of the categorical kind and comparing the results from OE with the preferred V2 in OHG, we encounter a basic difference between the two languages. V2 with a left-peripheral topic constituent dominating in this pragmatic domain in OHG is indeed found in part of the evidence from OE. This is the case in (14) which clearly allows for an interpretation as an identificational sentence answering the preceding question 'Who are you?':

(14) *we| synt   gum-cynnes/ geata leode*   (Beo 260)
      we   are   kin_Gen   Geats_Gen people
      'We are by kin of the clan of Geats'

The same kind of topic marking also occurs in parenthetic constructions providing additional information on an entity just mentioned:

(15) *wulfgar   maþelode   þæt   wæs   wendla   leod*   (Beo 348)
      Wulfgar   spoke   this was   WendelsGen   chieftain
      'Wulfgar spoke – this was the Wendles' chieftain'

Due to the pragmatic status of the referents and on the basis of discourse interpretation, it can be concluded that the finite verb in structures of the type in (14) and (15) is set to distinguish the aboutness topic from the new information supplied by the rest of the sentence.

Nevertheless, patterns other than V2 also appear in categorical sentences of OE. Consider the following small discourse: after his return to his home land, Beowulf

---

6. For a detailed investigation on the discourse functions of OE *þa* see Enkvist & Wårwick (1987) who describe parallel functions of sentence-initial *þa* followed by the verb as those claimed here for V1 in OE.

relates his adventures with the Danes and is eager to present the gifts that he has obtained from them as an award for his successful fight against Grendel. So he asks to bring these gifts and as they lay in front of his counterparts, he utters the sentence quoted in (16):

(16) *me| ðis hilde-sceorp/   hroðgâr   sealde*   (Beo 2155)
      me   these ornaments of war Hrothgar   gave
      'These ornaments of war were given to me by Hrothgar'

The context of this text passage bears strong indications for the interpretation of the sentence as a categorical one. It is also clear that the definite expression *ðis hildesceorp* 'these ornaments of war' best qualifies to be the aboutness-topic of the utterance because due to the preceding context it is the expected starting point of the next sentence providing more information on these weapons. However, this constituent is not separated from the rest of the utterance by means of verb placement as demonstrated for the parallel cases in (2) from OHG and (14)–(15) from OE. Rather, the aboutness topic of the utterance shares the same syntactic domain as referents belonging to different information-structural categories, for example the familiarity topic *me* 'me/to me' as well as the focus of the sentence, the donor of the weapons Hrothgar.

The examples discussed in this section provide important points concerning the interaction between verb placement and discourse structure in OE. On the one hand, the cases of V1 confirm the findings for OHG. On the other hand – in contrast to the situation in OHG – V2 turns out not to serve as a topic-marking device in categorical statements.

3.2 Old Saxon

After having pointed at a crucial difference between the syntactic realization of categorical sentences in OHG and OE, we turn to the investigation of evidence from the OS period. The data is based on the most representative text of the OS corpus – the *Heliand* – a 9th/10th-century poetic gospel harmony comprising 5.983 alliterative lines (see Rauch 1992: 1).

It has been pointed out in the previous literature that sentences in which the finite verb precedes all arguments in main clauses are extremely frequent in OS syntax. Rauch (1992) estimates sentences initiated by a particle followed immediately by the finite verb to be the most common pattern in OS and therefore accounts them to be "[t]he unmarked word order of the OS independent declarative sentence" (Rauch 1992: 24), followed in number by pure V1 sentences. As early as in the revealing work of Ries (1880), the kind of logical relations between sentences in context have explicitly been accounted for as factors triggering this kind of fronting of the finite verb in OS.

Looking at the correlation between the finite verb form and the pragmatic features of discourse referents, we encounter a slightly different situation in OS in comparison to OHG. On the one hand, in presentational contexts, the type of clause-initial particles followed by the finite verb seems to be more frequent than pure V1, see (17a)

vs. (17b). Thus, these two patterns in presentational sentences establish a quantitative relation opposite to that in OHG:

(17) a. *Than uuas thar ên gigamalod mann* (Hel 72)
then was there an old-aged man
'Then it was an old-aged man there'

b. *Lag thar ên felis bioƀan* (Hel 4075)
lay there a stone upon
'A stone lay there upon [the entry of the tomb]'

On the other hand, categorical sentences – for example those directly following presentational ones – exhibit the structure established for OHG already, i.e., they use to fill a single position before the finite verb form with the topic of the utterance, most usually in form of an anaphoric pronoun referring backwards to the entity just introduced to context, see (18):

(18) a. *that uuas fruod gomo* (Hel 73)
that was wise man
'that was a wise man'

b. *That uuas sô sâlig man* (Hel 76)
that was so blessed man
'This was such a blessed man'

This situation leads to some conclusions about the interaction between information structure and syntax in OS. First, it points at a higher stage of generalization of the V2-rule in OS as this structure appears in different contextual types of main sentences despite of the type of constituent or the pragmatic status of the referents involved. Second, it shows that new information in all cases follows the finite verb and therefore confirms the view of a right-peripheral focus domain in early Germanic as stated so far. This is also demonstrated by other instances bearing a brand-new referent, for example in the object position of a transitive verb, see (19):

(19) *Thar fundun sea ênna gôdan man* (Hel 463)
there found$_{Pl}$ they a$_{Acc}$ good$_{Acc}$ man$_{Acc}$
'There they found a good man'

However, OS displays some more peculiarities. There are cases showing patterns other then V1 or V2, see (20):

(20) *Ic is engil bium* (Hel 119)
I his angel am
'I am his angel'

The sentence provides more information on a discourse-given referent, thus it classifies as a categorical one, with the pronoun OS *ic* as the aboutness topic of the utterance. Nevertheless, the sentence shows a mixed topic-focus-domain in front of the finite

verb, a peculiarity which reminds us of comparable instances in OE like (16) repeated here for convenience:

(16) *me|ðis hilde-sceorp/ hroðgâr sealde* (Beo 2155)
'These ornaments of war were given to me by Hrothgar'

Like OE, OS does not show a tendency to distinguish the aboutness-topic from the rest of the utterance as was observed for OHG, thus confirming OS to linger on a continuum between the other West Germanic dialects.

On the other hand, although V1 turns out to be less frequent in presentational contexts, it is interesting to look for further utilizations of this pattern aside from these classical cases of all-focus sentences. As a matter of fact, such instances really occur in OS exactly in the conditions under which they systematically appear in OHG and OE discussed above. Also quite similar to the situation in these languages, V2 with a preceding frame adverbial acts as an optional variant in the pragmatic domains of V1-sentences.

First, we shall turn to sentences at the beginning of a new text section. There is no problem to isolate such instances in *Heliand* as the text is divided in chapters termed 'fits' ('per vitteas') in the Latin preface of the poem. V1 occurs with all sorts of predicates describing both states and actions, see (21a) vs. (21b):

(21) a. *Stôd imu thô fora themu uuîhe* (Hel 3758)
stood PronRefl then in front of the temple
Crist uualdandeo
almighty Christ
'The almighty Christ stood in front of the temple'

b. *Uurðun thô thea liudi umbi thea êra Cristes, / umbi*
became$_{Pl}$ then the people about the doctrines Christ$_{Gen}$ about
thiu uuord an geuuinne (Hel 3926f.)
the words in quarrel
'Then these people began quarreling about the message of these words'

Second, V1 regularly occurs in sentences containing the predicate groups distinguished as triggers of verb-initial placement in OHG above. Like in OE, the most common examples are provided by sentences containing motion verbs. In general, these occupy the initial position in the sentence despite of the pragmatic status of the referent involved or the position of the utterance in global text structure. As (22a) vs. (22b–c) show, both new and given referents are found in post-verbal position, and only (22b) is one at the beginning of a new fit, the rest of the examples signal a change of the situation within one and the same episode:

(22) a. *Thô quam thar ôc ên uuîf gangan* (Hel 503)
then came there also a woman go$_{PastPart}$
'Then a woman came there, too'

b. *Giuuitun im thô eft an Galilealand Ioseph endi*
went$_{Pl}$ PronRefl then back to Galilee Joseph and

Maria (Hel 780)
Maria
'Then Joseph and Mary went back to the land of Galilee'

c. *Fôrun thea bodon obar all* (Hel 350)
went_{Pl} the messengers over all
'The messengers went all over the country'

The same may be seen to apply to verbs of saying. V1 occurs both at the beginning of a fit as well as within one, see (23a–b). Sentence-initial particles or adverbials followed by the verb provide a functional equivalent of this pattern, see (23c):

(23) a. *Hiet man that alla thea elilendiun man iro*
ordered PronIndef that all the foreign people their
ôðil sôhtin (Hel 345)
home country serche_{3PlSubjII}
'It was ordered that all these foreign people went to their native country'

b. *Hêt imu helpen thô / uualdandeo Krist* (Hel 4101)
ordered him helpINF then almighty Christ
'The almighty Christ ordered to help him'

c. *Thô sprak thar ên gifrôdot man* (Hel 208)
then spoke there a wise man
'Then a wise man spoke there'

Finally, the same structural variation holds for predicates pointing at the beginning of a new state of affairs, e.g., a physical or cognitive state of affairs of a given referent, see (24a–c):

(24) a. *uuarð ald gumo / sprâca bilôsit* (Hel 172f.)
became old man speech_{Gen} bereft
'The old man became bereft of speech'

b. *Uuarð Mariun thô môd an sorgun* (Hel 803)
became Maria_{Dat} then heart in worries
'Then Mary became anxious'

c. *Thô uuarð hugi Iosepes, / is môd giuuorrid* (Hel 295)
then became mind Joseph_{Gen} his heart worried
'Then, Joseph became worried'

Apart from these instances in which – quite similar to the other investigated old Germanic languages – OS makes use of verb syntax to signal progress in narration, OS itself offers a number of special cases in this direction. One of these involves the use of the V1 in explanatory parts of the narration denoting durative conditions on a discourse-given referent. In the cases analysed so far, we witnessed regular V2 in OHG and parts of the OE examples, but no V1. However, the OS data give reason to believe that V1 in explanatory parts of the narration does not occur randomly but applies exactly in sentences announcing an outstandingly important event or property,

i.e., a state of affairs which is crucial for the further development of the narrative (see Ries 1880: 19 for a similar interpretation of such instances). Applying our previous account on cases like these, we may conclude that fronting of the finite verb to the beginning of the sentences is a syntactic means used to highlight the importance of the entire proposition in relation to the surrounding units of discourse. V1 and V2 form an interesting opposition, as will be shown by the following examples taken from the story about the nativity of John the Baptist (Luke 1):

(25) a. *Than uuas thar ên gigamalod mann, /*
then was there an old-aged man

b. *that uuas fruod gomo [...]*
that was wise man

c. *That uuas sô sâlig man / [...]*
that was so blessed man

d. *was im thoh an sorgun hugi, / that sie*
was him however in worries mind that they
erbiuuard êgan ni môstun
heir own Neg could (Hel 72–86)
'Then there was an old-aged man, this was a wise man [...] This was such a blessed man [...] But they had great sorrow, for they had no child'

The categorical sentences in (25b–c) provide additional information about the discourse referent introduced in (25a), the information-structural domains of *Topic* and *Focus* are clearly distinguished by means of verb placement. In (25d), however, a characterization of the referent is given which is more important than the already provided information about his age and his wisdom. Zachariah's and Elizabeth's lack of a child is crucial for the further development of the story; it is a condition which is going to change and to motivate a chain of subsequent events constituting the further course of the narrative. So in this case, a special utilization of verb position is shown for OS. Whenever an important feature of a referent, or a crucial event of the story is narrated, the language switches to V1 in order to highlight the whole proposition and to set it up against other, not so important parts of the discourse.

As a further peculiarity of OS, V1 appears not only at episode edges but within episodes of temporally successive events called 'period' according to the ancient grammatical tradition (see Kusmenko 1996: 147). Consider the following example:

(26) a. *Thô uuarð thar an thene gastseli / megincraft mikil*
then became there in the guesthall crowd big
manno gesamnod [...]
menGen gathered

b. *Quâmun managa / Iudeon an thene gastseli;*
came many Jews_{Gen} in this guesthall

c. *uuarð im thar gladmôd hugi, / blîði*
became they there gladhearted mind happy

an iro   breostun: [...]
in   their hearts

d. <u>Drôg</u> *man   uuîn an flet / skîri mid scâlun [...]*
carry PronIndef wine in room pure with bowls

e. <u>Uuas</u> *thes   an lustun landes hirdi, /   huat*
was this$_{Gen}$ in joy land$_{Gen}$ shepherd what
he themu uuerode mêst te   uunniun gifremidi. /
he the$_{Dat}$ crowd$_{Dat}$ most for joy   did

f. <u>Hêt</u>   he *thô gangen forð gêla thiornun*   (Hel 2733–2745)
ordered he then go$_{Inf}$ forth gay maiden$_{Acc}$
'There was a mighty crowd of men gathered together in the guest hall [...]
Many people came into that guest hall; there they became glad-hearted [...].
Wine was brought to the room [...]. The herdsman of the land bethought
him with joy [...]. He hight to go forth the gay maiden'

The example gives a chain of chronologically ordered events all exposing no dependency
relation among each other but being equally situated on the layer of main action. Again,
V1 signals that each sentence in a narrative chain like the one in (26) reports a new event
and thus forms a situation on itself in which no topic-comment distinction applies.

3.3 Old Norse

ON, although exhibiting a rich amount of authentic text material, starts its written
records only very late, in the 12th century (Ranke & Hofmann 1988: 13–18), i.e., at a
time at which in other Germanic dialects we already speak of Middle High German or
Middle English respectively. Moreover, most of the prose is attested to us in copies of
a later time – something we should keep in mind comparing the ON evidence against
the West Germanic. Although the runic inscriptions show us a mixed picture of word
order, see (27) as an example of V-last in a main sentence from Proto-Norse, ON has a
very strong tendency towards V2 in all kinds of sentences, see (28).

(27) *ek hlewagastiR holtijaR horna* <u>tawido</u>   (Golden horn of Gallehus)
I   Hlewagast Holt$_{Gen}$ horn$_{Acc}$ made
'I, Hlewagast, from/son of Holt, made the horn'

(28) *gud minn þu* <u>ert</u> *hialpari minn*   (VienPs 17,3)
God my   you are helper my
'My lord, you are my helper'
Deus meus adiutor meus

Whereas a sentence like (27) was possible centuries before the ON literal tradition started,
ON abandoned this pattern in favour of a more rigid syntax, as (28) demonstrates: The
Vienna Psalter shows how even an interlinear version tends to build V2-sentences, here
by inserting the subject pronoun and the finite copula verb. In other words, ON shows
less evidence that the position of the verb differs according to the pragmatic properties of

sentence constituents. New discourse referents for instance are introduced in sentences
showing regularly V2, see (29), which stands as typical for the Edda prose:

(29) *Garðarr hét   maðr*   (Ldn 3)
Garðarr was called man
'Garðarr was the name of a man'

Findings like these do not differ from instances of anaphoric reference:

(30) *Garðarr* <u>siglði</u> *umhverfis landit*   (Ldn 3)
Garðarr sailed around   land-the
'Garðarr sailed around the land'

Unlike in the West Germanic dialects, we may suppose, the V2-order seems to be
much more fixed. As for the functional domains of V1 outlined for OHG, ON uses this
verb pattern too, but shows no regular connection between the content of a verb and
its position. Thus we find examples like (31–33) with a verb of motion, and (34–36)
with a verb of saying:

(31) *oc* <u>fór</u> *hann útan þat sumar*   (Íslb X, 10)
and went he   out that summer
'and he went out that summer'

(32) *þá* <u>fór</u> *hann á braut*   (Íslb VII, 3)
then went he   away
'then he went away'

(33) *En et næsta sumar epter* <u>fóro</u> *þeir austan*   (Íslb VII, 6)
but one next summer after went$_{Pl}$ they east$_{Acc}$
'and the next summer they went eastwards'

Even though there are instances of V1 (31) and equivalent V2-order after a frame
adverbial like in OHG, OE and OS (32), the occurrence of V2 sentences with the
same group of verbs (33) clearly speaks against a functional positioning of the fi-
nite verb according to a West Germanic pattern. The same is true for, e. g., verbs of
saying:

(34) *oc* <u>mælte</u> *því   mange í gegn*   (Íslb X, 9)
and spoke that$_{Dat}$ many against
'and there were many speaking against that'

(35) *En þá* <u>hóf</u> *hann tǫlo sína upp [...] oc sagþe* (Íslb VII, 13)
but then raised he   voice$_{Acc}$ his up   and said
'and then he raised his voice [...] and said'

(36) *En hann* <u>sagþe</u> *cuningom Ólafe*   (Íslb 7)
but he   said   king$_{Dat}$ Olaf$_{Dat}$
'and he said to king Olaf'

Here, V1 (34), sentence-initial frames followed by the verb (35) and V2 with referential constituents in preverbal position (36) may serve the same discourse function. As can be seen from the connective elements, the sentences in (31) and (34) – and this is quite often the case – are noninitial conjuncts. We often find the typical group marker *oc* (see Kotcheva 2000: 154) in particular to connect shorter or longer passages of V1-sentences to chains of conjuncts of the kind already encountered in the OS *Heliand*, see (37).

(37) *Þá var fjǫrðrinn fullr af veiðiskap, ok gáðu þeir*
then was fjord-the full of catch and carePl they
eigi fyrir veiðum at fá heyjanna, ok dó alt kvikfé
not for acres to make hay-the and died all cattle
þeira um vetrinn. (Ldn 5)
their in winter-the
'There was the fjord full of fish, and because of the fishing they didn't care to make hay, and all their cattle died in the winter'

This phenomenon, known as 'Narrative Inversion' (see Sigurðson 1994) often applies within a passage to link closely related and chronologically successive events to consistent units of running discourse called 'period' after the ancient Latin syntactic tradition, see Heusler (1977, § 508, p. 173), Kusmenko (1996) and Donhauser et al. (2006). It is a reminiscence of the common Germanic discourse-sensitive properties of verb placement in ON although ON allows less freedom of word order than the remaining early Germanic languages were shown to do.

4. Theoretical implications

The foregoing analysis revealed that the placement of inflected verb in the early Germanic languages depends on properties of discourse organization and text structure. The aim in this part is to account for a theoretical model reflecting these properties of early Germanic syntax.

There is a great variety of approaches developed to capture matters of discourse organization and text coherence. Two recent and well accepted models, the Rhetorical Structure Theory RST (Mann & Thompson 1988) and the Segmented Discourse Relation Theory SDRT (Asher & Lascarides 2003) share the basic assumption that discourse coherence is achieved only if each utterance makes an illocutionary contribution to another utterance in the context. This is achieved when discourse units establish different kinds of rhetorical relations among each other thus creating a dynamic, hierarchical structure in discourse. According to the models presented above, the rhetorical relations linking together the contents of single discourse units can be basically of the following two kinds:

a. two units can display no dependency relation among each other but share the same level of discourse hierarchy thus creating a multi-nuclear relation in the terms of RST or a relation of coordination in the terms of SDRT

b. two units can build a dependency relation creating a hierarchical structure in discourse, i.e., a nucleus-satellite relation due to RST or a relation of subordination due to SDRT.

In order to show how verb placement participated in achieving discourse hierarchy in texts of the early Germanic tradition, we chose the model of SDRT and provided some additional characteristics. Although the inventory of individual discourse relations is still under discussion, there is overwhelming agreement on the basic features distinguishing coordination vs. subordination as the two basic types of linking. Both are associated with prototypical rhetorical relations displaying some complementary features (Asher & Vieu 2005). Coordination, which is prototypical for units situated on an equal level of discourse hierarchy, is typically represented in the relation of *narration*. *Narration* is established when e.g., two discourse units (α, β) display a temporal relation of succession and β continues the narrative sequence in discourse. By contrast, subordination is typically represented in *elaboration*, i.e., when a unit β provides more detail on another unit α situated on a higher level of discourse hierarchy. In this case, the two events (α, β) temporally overlap. Further, the rhetorical relation of *continuation* applies when two or more subsequent units β and γ are equally situated on a lower level of dependency with respect to a higher unit α so that both β and γ represent elaboration on α.

Looking at the distinctive features of coordination vs. subordination in SDRT, we discover a number of parallels between them and the discourse properties of the word order patterns discussed in the foregoing data analysis. Turning to the distribution of the V2-pattern in OHG first, we recall the fact that it appears in sentences providing explanatory or supportive information like descriptions, characterizations, motivation etc. on a referent or action previously mentioned in the discourse. The events described in such sentences temporally overlap with the state of affairs of the governing situation. Thus, V2 in OHG indicates relations of subordination, i.e., *elaboration* and *continuation* in discourse. By contrast, V1 in OHG never occurs in elaborative passages. In its first canonical domain – that of presentational or text-opening sentences, V1 establishes the basis for subsequent *elaboration*, whereas in its second domain – episode onsets within the text – it signals that a previous sequence of *elaboration* or *continuation* is suspended and discourse returns to the level of main action. The same function is also observed in patterns in which the verb is preceded only by a frame adverbial. Our analysis on the relation between this pattern and pure V1 in OHG gives reason to believe that the former pattern is an innovation in the system of OHG which has major effects on the consolidation of the V2-phenomenon in root clauses of modern German while V1 was marginalized in certain domain of colloquial style.

Comparing this picture with the one in the remaining early Germanic languages, we have to observe that elaborative parts display patterns in which the preverbal domain is not restricted to the aboutness topic of the utterance as was shown for OHG. However, in each of the languages examined, V1 was detected in different functional domains providing progress in narration. Like in OHG, the pattern displaying a

sentence-initial adverbial or particle also occurs in this function as an equivalent of V1. However, V1 sentences may also contain frame adverbials or a particle in post-verbal position. This indicates that V1 is a genuine Germanic pattern and a common formal correlate of coordination in discourse in all early Germanic languages.

In this respect, the results from ON are especially suggestive. Although ON displays a much later stage of language development towards a generalized V2, we nevertheless encounter domains in which V1 serves to carry further the discourse by providing chronologically sequenced units failing to establish a hierarchical order among them. In these cases known as 'Narrative Inversion' V1 still displays typical properties of coordination in discourse by establishing the level of main action in text structure.

5. Conclusions

The present study investigates some discourse-related properties of verb placement in the early Germanic languages. It reconsiders a number of already known ideas about the syntax of some individual Germanic languages by providing a larger empirical basis and a more fine-grained classification of the discourse-related properties of particular word order patterns as well as the conditions for their use. Above all, the pragmatic value of the word order patterns was seen from the comparative perspective in order to show that we have to deal with no isolated phenomena but with properties of a common Germanic heritage.

The most important conclusion from the empirical part of the investigation is that apart from OHG, other early Germanic languages also provide evidence for the claim that verb placement plays a role in text-structuring and discourse organization. In West Germanic languages other than OHG, instances of V1 as a main device of discourse segmentation show up more or less regularly in the functional domains outlined for OHG, though with a slightly different distribution and frequency than in OHG. A crucial domain of difference in the early Germanic situation was discovered in the field of supportive text parts providing more information on a preceding referent or situation. Here, V2 used in OHG but broadly generalized in OS seems to co-occur with verb-final structures in OE. These differences in the early Germanic situation could be made responsible for the development of different word order patterns in the modern systems of these languages.

In order to explain the role of verb placement in early Germanic, we invoke the distinction between coordinating and subordinating discourse relations as developed in Asher & Lascarides (2003) and claim that at a certain stage in the history of the Germanic languages, the position of the verb was a means for distinguishing the type of rhetorical relation the sentence implies with respect to the previous context. We outlined the main characteristics of coordination and subordination in the framework of SDRT and pointed to the parallels which special word order types display with regard to these types of discourse linking. In the overall comparison between the

languages investigated, we discovered that the V1 pattern is a common formal correlate of coordination in discourse while relations of the subordinating kind are realized by different syntactic means in the languages of the early Germanic tradition.

Primary texts

[Beo]   Beowulf. Reproduced in facsimile from the unique manuscript British Museum Ms. Cotton Vitellius A. XV. With a Transliteration and notes by Julius Zupitza. Second edition containing a new reproduction of the manuscript with an introductory note by Norman Davis. Published for the Early Text Society. London: Oxford University Press. 1959.

[Hel]   Heliand und Genesis. Hg. v. Otto Behaghel. 10. überarb. Aufl. v. Burkhard Taeger. Tübingen: Niemeyer. 1996.

[Íslb]   Íslendingabók. Hg. Wolfgang Golther. 1923. Ares Isländerbuch. 2., neu bearb. Aufl. Halle: Niemeyer.

[Ldn]   Landnámabók Íslands. Ug. Finnur Jónsson. København: Thiele. 1925.

[T]   Die lateinisch-althochdeutsche Tatianbilingue Stiftsbibliothek St. Gallen Cod. 56. Hg. von Achim Masser, Göttingen: Vandenhoek & Ruprecht. 1994. (Studien zum Althochdeutschen, Bd. 25).

[VienPs] Vienna Psalter Der Wiener Psalter. Hg. Heiko Uecker. Cod. Vind. 2713. Kopenhagen: Reitzel. 1980.

References

Asher, Nicholas & Lascarides, Alex. 2003. *Logics of Conversation*. Cambridge: CUP.

Asher, Nicholas & Vieu, Laure. 2005. Subordinating and coordinating discourse relations. *Lingua* 115(4): 591–610.

Bästlein, Ulf Christian. 1991. *Gliederungsinitialen in frühmittelalterlichen Epenhandschriften. Studie zur Problematik ihres Auftretens, ihrer Entwicklung und Funktion in lateinischen und volkssprachlichen Texten der Karolinger- und Ottonenzeit* [Europäische Hochschulschriften. Reihe I. Deutsche Sprache und Literatur, 1167]. Frankfurt: Peter Lang.

Behaghel, Otto. 1932. *Deutsche Syntax. Eine geschichtliche Darstellung*. Bd. IV. *Wortstellung. Periodenbau*. Heidelberg: Carl Winter.

Braune, Wilhelm & Heidermanns, Frank. 2004. *Gotische Grammatik. Mit Lesestücken und Wörterverzeichnis.* 20 edn, [Sammlung kurzer Grammatiken germanischer Dialekte. A. Hauptreihe Nr. 1]. Tübingen: Max Niemeyer.

Brinton, Laurel J. 1996. *Pragmatic Markers in English. Grammaticalization and Discourse Function.* Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

Donhauser, Karin, Solf, Michael & Zeige, Lars Erik. 2006. Informationsstruktur und Diskursrelationen im Vergleich Althochdeutsch – Altisländisch. In *Grenzgänger. Festschrift zum 65. Geburtstag von Jurij Kusmenko* [Berliner Beiträge zur Skandinavistik 9], Antje Hornscheidt et al. (eds), 73–90. Berlin: Nordeuropa-Institut.

Drubig, Bernhard. 1992. Zur Frage der grammatischen Repräsentation thetischer und kategorischer Sätze. In *Informationsstruktur und Grammatik* [Linguistische Berichte. Sonderheft 4], Joachim Jacobs (ed.), 142–195. Opladen: Westdeutscher Verlag.

Enkvist, Nils Erik & Wårvik, Brita. 1987. Old English þa, Temporal Chains, and Narrative Structure. In *Papers from the 7th International Conference on Historical Linguistics*, Anna Giacalone-Ramat, Onofrio Carruba and Giuliano Bernini (eds), 221–237. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Eythórsson, Thórhallur. 1996. Functional categories, cliticization, and verb movement in the early Germanic languages. In *Studies in Comparative Germanic Syntax*, Höskuldur Thráinsson, Samuel David Epstein & Steve Peter (eds), 109–139. Dordrecht: Kluwer.

Fourquet, Jean. 1938. *L'ordre des éléments de la phrase en germanique ancien. Étude de syntaxe de position.* Paris: Les Belles Lettres.

Fourquet, Jean. 1974. Genetische Betrachtungen über den deutschen Satzbau. In *Studien zur deutschen Literatur und Sprache des Mittelalters. Festschrift für Hugo Moser zum 65. Geburtstag*, Werner Besch, Günther Jungbluth, Gerhard Meissburger & Eberhard Nellmann (eds), 314–323. Berlin: Erich Schmidt.

Heusler, Andreas. 1977. *Altisländisches Elementarbuch.* 7 edn. Heidelberg: Carl Winter.

Hinterhölzl, Roland & Petrova, Svetlana. 2005. Rhetorical relations and verb placement in the early Germanic languages: Evidence from the Old High German Tatian translation (9th century). In *Salience in Discourse. Multidisciplinary Approaches to Discourse*, Manfred Stede et al. (eds), 71–79. Münster: Stichting / Nodus.

Hinterhölzl, Roland, Petrova, Svetlana & Solf, Michael. 2005. Diskurspragmatische Faktoren für Topikalität und Verbstellung in der ahd. Tatian-Übersetzung (9. Jh.). *Interdisciplinary Studies on Information Structure* 3: 143–182.

Hopper, Paul. 1979. Aspect and foregrounding in discourse. In *Syntax and Semantics*, Talmy Givón (ed.), 213–241. New York NY: Academic Press.

Kemenade, Ans van. 1997. V2 and embedded topicalization in Old and Middle English. In *Parameters of morpho-syntactic change*, Ans van Kemenade & Nigel Vincent (eds), 326–352. Cambridge: CUP.

Kiparsky, Paul. 1996. The shift to head-initial VP in Germanic. In *Studies in Comparative Germanic Syntax*, Höskuldur Thráinsson, Samuel David Epstein & Steve Peter (eds), 140–179. Dordrecht: Kluwer.

Kotcheva, Kristina. 2000. Om konjunktionerna *og* och *en* i isländskan. In *Kors och tvärs i nordistiken. Föredrag från det 4:e studentkollokviet i nordisk språkvetenskap* [Kleine Schriften des Nordeuropa-Instituts 20], Jurij Kusmenko & Sven Lange (eds), 24–35. Berlin: Nordeuropa-Institut der Humboldt-Universität.

Kusmenko, Jurij. 1996. Die Periode – Syntaktische Haupteinheit der altisländischen Prosa. In *Berkovs bók. To Honour of Prof. V. P. Berkov*, Jurij Kusmenko & Lilja Popowa (eds), 145–160. Moscow: Impeto.

Lambrecht, Knud. 1994. *Information Structure and Sentence Form. Topic, Focus and the Mental Representations of Discourse Referents.* Cambridge: CUP.

Lehnert, Martin. 1960. *Poetry and Prose of the Anglo-Saxons*, Vol. I: *Texts.* 2nd, revised edn, Halle (Saale): Max Niemeyer.

Leiss, Elisabeth. 2000. *Artikel und Aspekt. Die grammatischen Muster von Definitheit* [Studia Linguistica Germanica 55]. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter.

Lenerz, Jürgen. 1984. *Syntaktischer Wandel und Grammatiktheorie. Eine Untersuchung an Beispielen aus der Sprachgeschichte des Deutschen* [Linguistische Arbeiten 141]. Tübingen: Max Niemeyer.

Önnerfors, Olaf. 1997. *Verb-erst-Deklarativsätze. Grammatik und Pragmatik.* Stockholm: Almquist & Wiskell International.

Mann, William C. & Thompson, Sandra A. 1988. Rhetorical structure theory: Toward a functional theory of text organization. *Text. An Interdisciplinary Journal for the Study of Discourse* 8: 243–281.

Pintzuk, Susan. 1996. Clitization in Old English. In *Approaching Second. Second Position Clitics and Related Phenomena*, Aaron L. Halpern & Arnold M. Zwicky (eds), 375–409. California CA: CSLI.

Ramers, Karl Heinz. 2005. Verbstellung im Althochdeutschen. *Zeitschrift für germanistische Linguistik* 33: 78–91.

Ranke, Friedrich & Hofmann, Dietrich. 1988. *Altnordisches Elementarbuch.* 5 edn. Berlin: de Gruyter.

Rauch, Irmengard. 1992. *The Old Saxon Language.* New York NY: Peter Lang.

Reinhart, Tanya. 1981. Pragmatics and linguistics: An analysis of sentence topics. *Philosophica* 27: 53–94.

Ries, John. 1880. *Die Stellung von Subject und Prädicatsverbum im Hêliand.* Straßburg: Trübner.

Sasse, Hans-Jürgen. 1995. "Theticity" and VS order: A case study. *Sprachtypologie und Universalienforschung* 48(1–2): 3–31.

Schrodt, Richard. 2004. *Althochdeutsche Grammatik II. Syntax* [Sammlung kurzer Grammatiken germanischer Dialekte. A. Hauptreihe, Nr. 5/2]. Tübingen: Max Niemeyer.

Sigurðson, Halldór Ármann. 1994. *Um frásagnarumröðun og grundvallarorðaröð í forníslensku.* Reykjavík: Málvísindastofnun Háskóla Íslands.

Simmler, Franz. 1998. Makrostrukturen in der lateinisch-althochdeutschen Tatianbilingue. In *Deutsche Grammatik. Thema in Variationen. Festschrift für Hans-Werner Eroms zum 60. Geburtstag*, Karin Donhauser & Ludwig M. Eichinger (eds), 299–335. Heidelberg: Carl Winter.

Simon, Horst J. 1998. "KinnanS Eahna fei heid gfrein." – Über einen Typ von Verb-Erst-Aussagesätzen im Bairischen. In *Deutsche Grammatik. Thema in Variationen. Festschrift für Hans-Werner Eroms zum 60. Geburtstag*, Karin Donhauser & Ludwig M. Eichinger (eds), 137–153. Heidelberg: Carl Winter.

Stockwell, Robert P. 1984. On the history of the verb-second rule in English. In *Historical Syntax*, Jacek Fisiak (ed.), 575–592. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

Studies in Language Companion Series (SLCS)

This series has been established as a companion series to the periodical
Studies in Language.

Volume 98

'Subordination' versus 'Coordination' in Sentence and Text
A cross-linguistic perspective
Edited by Cathrine Fabricius-Hansen and Wiebke Ramm

'Subordination' versus 'Coordination' in Sentence and Text

A cross-linguistic perspective

Edited by

Cathrine Fabricius-Hansen

Wiebke Ramm
University of Oslo

John Benjamins Publishing Company
Amsterdam / Philadelphia

Table of contents

Editors' introduction

Subordination and coordination from different perspectives

Cathrine Fabricius-Hansen & Wiebke Ramm
University of Oslo

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.[1]

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.