Context and coordination in discourse[1]

Joaquín Garrido
Universidad Complutense de Madrid
jgame@ucm.es

———— ❖ ————

Abstract: Sentences including their deictic information are elementary discourse units linked in constituent structures. They are bound to information from their discourse contexts, and their linking produces rhetorical effects. Discourse is a sequence of linked sentences bound to their discourse contexts. Each sentence or elementary discourse unit is linked to others by means of the information it requires to be interpreted, obtained from its discourse context and its deictic information. Discourse context is the source for the additional information needed for the linking of discourse units and their interpretation in discourse constituent structures, producing the intended intentional rhetorical effects in texts. Subordination in discourse relations between units is analyzed in terms of their topics and frames. Coordination with sentence-initial *and* has subordination-to-the-left properties in the discourse constituent structure. These properties of discourse coordination, including focus and wider scope, are shown to be effective tools to build and organize, by means of discourse coordination, complex discourse units that represent rhetorical moves in texts.

Keywords: *and*, discourse context, coordination, constituent structure, discourse unit, subordination.

Contexto y coordinación de discurso

Resumen: Las oraciones con su información deíctica son unidades de discurso elementales conectadas entre sí en estructuras de constituyentes. Están ligadas a información de sus contextos de discurso y su conexión produce efectos retóricos. El discurso es una secuencia de oraciones conectadas entre sí ligadas a sus contextos discursivos. Cada oración o unidad de discurso elemental se conecta a otras mediante la información que requiere para ser interpretada y conectada, obtenida de su contexto discursivo y su información deíctica. El contexto de

discurso es la fuente de la información adicional necesaria para que la conexión e interpretación de las unidades de discurso tenga lugar en las estructuras constituyentes de discurso, produciendo efectos retóricos intencionales. La subordinación de discurso se analiza en las relaciones de discurso entre unidades y sus tópicos y marcos. La coordinación de discurso con *and* ('y') inicial tiene propiedades de subordinación a la izquierda, incluidos el foco y el alcance, son herramientas eficaces para construir y organizar unidades de discurso complejas que representan movimientos retóricos en los textos.

Palabras clave: *and*, contexto discursivo, coordinación, estructura de constituyentes, subordinación, unidad de discurso.

1. Introduction

Portolés made major contributions to linguistics, including books on the history of linguistics, censorship, and pragmatics (Portolés 2004), continued in his life-long extensive research (Portolés 2023). His seminal book on Spanish discourse markers (Portolés 1998) provides the foundation for this field of research as well as for the present analysis of context and coordination in discourse.

Portolés defines discourse as «the action and result of using the different units of language in a specific act of communication» (Portolés 1998: 27), with «the context necessary to achieve the appropriate inferences» (Portolés 1998: 17; all translations by the author). In his memory, I show here how sentences as discourse units are linked in constituent structures using necessary discourse contexts and how rhetorical effects are produced.

Section 2 presents the theoretical framework, with continuity from sentence structure to discourse structure and then to text structure. Sentences as discourse units are both interpreted and linked by means of their discourse contexts, information required and extracted from other sentences in their discourse. In sections 3 and 4 discourse subordination and coordination are analyzed in terms of their defining properties and their rhetorical effects. The last section includes the conclusions.

2. Discourse context

Discourse goes beyond and above the sentence in a constituent structure organized by relations of hierarchy and dependency

(Garrido 2023; Rodríguez Ramalle 2023a), with discourse coordination and subordination (Asher and Vieu 2005), where sentence grammar is extended to discourse (Garrido 1998), and «the discursive context is crucial» (Rodríguez Ramalle 2023b: 18). An alternative approach has utterances as basic units in macrosyntax (Fuentes Rodríguez and Pérez Béjar 2022, Blanche-Benveniste 1990) or hierarchical-informational structure (Borreguero Zuloaga 2021), with higher-level units such as sequences (Cortés 2011) or moves in functional discourse grammar (Alturo 2013) and pragmatic or contextual enrichment of undeterminned utterances (Portolés 2004, Cortés and Loureda 2021).

In this approach, besides sentence grammar, there is pragmatics outside of grammar, dealing with utterances as sentences paired with contexts in the situation of utterance, in (1).

(1)   […] the context […] is the gross physical, social and interactional aspects of the situation of utterance […] linguistically relevant […]. Pragmatics is the study of the ability of language users to pair sentences with the contexts in which they would be appropriate (Levinson 1983: 10, 24).

Pragmatics is «the study of the interpretation of utterances […] in context» (Sperber and Wilson 1986: 10, 11). Grammar and pragmatics deal with different units, the sentence and the utterance; therefore «an account of discourse is […] a theory of utterance-meaning construction» (L. de Saussure 2007: 139).

This view is not always accepted, for instance Tan and Tao (1999) in (2).

(2)   A common (mis)conception of the relationship between discourse and grammar is that grammar is a set of rules that exist in the language, and discourse, or language use, is nothing more than the deployment of such rules in context. In other words, there is one «grammar» but many contexts in which grammatical rules are applied. (Tan and Tao 1999: 449)

They go on to argue that spoken language «in social interactions has its own patterns and regularities precisely because of the discourse context in which they are operating and the interpersonal communicative functions they serve» (Tan and Tao 1999: 449). Sentences are not produced and then the appropriate contexts are found for them, as in (1). Rather, each sentence is made for its discourse context. Sentences, both spoken and written, have their own «patterns and regularities» in order to build a discourse constituent structure that fits in a text

structure and build it, with rhetorical moves as text units accounting for «the interpersonal communicative functions they serve», in Tan and Tao's terms. In this direction go approaches to a discourse-[sentence-]grammar interface. Discourse units are covert or «hidden» to participants, who are not aware of them, while text units are overt or directly «seen» by participants, who consciously perceive them and can learn to control them.

Discourse is defined as a sequence of linked sentences bound to their discourse contexts and their deictic information in a text. A discourse context is «the surrounding discourse» of the sentence including its deixis, but not the «discourse situation» in which the sentence is said or written, quoting Dorgeloh and Wanner's (2022: 11 and 19) terms. Each sentence or elementary discourse unit is linked, using the information it requires to be interpreted (Garrido 2003), to other units, building complex discourse units, by means of coordinating or subordinating (Asher and Vieu 2005), discourse rhetorical relations (Duque 2022). This required information is obtained from the discourse context of the unit. A sentence, marked as S in (3d), does to not turn into an utterance, but it is organized so that, using information from its discourse context DC, it is linked to other sentences in a discourse D as elementary discourse units EDU in the discourse, engaging in rhetorical relations with them. The wider complex discourse units CDU are organized to build textual rhetorical moves M, in texts T, as in (3).

(3)   a. Sentence with a discourse context DC: linked elementary
         discourse unit EDU.
         b. Discourse: any sequence of discourse units linked by
         rhetorical relations.
         c. Text: linked rhetorical moves M made of complex discourse
         units CDU.
         d. T [M D(CDU [EDU(DC-S)])]

The line (3d) represents in a most simplified a blueprint for text, discourse, and sentence constituent structures, where the sentence has phrasal constituents such as verb phrase VP or noun phrases NP, not shown, among many others.

Discourse rhetorical relations belong to different categories in different inventories. For instance, Carlson and Marcu (2001) propose 78 relations. There are 12 relations organized in three levels for Long and Webber (2022), the higher level being temporal, comparison, contingency and expansion relations. Duque (2016) has 16 relations in three groups, contiguity, similarity and causality, shown in (4).

(4)   a. Contiguity: Elaboration, Circumstance, Background,
         Orientation, Interpretation, Sequence.
         b. Similarity: List, Contrast, Reformulation, Antithesis.
         c. Causality: Cause, Evidence, Condition, Purpose, Means,
         Result.

In an elementary discourse unit, a sentence bound to its discourse context, there is a center where the minimal predication is placed (Garrido 2013; Rodríguez Ramalle 2018). In the left periphery (Sánchez López 2015), there may be expressions linking the unit to previous ones and providing additional information about the information in the center, as well as parenthetical expressions anywhere in the unit, and expressions as afterthoughts in the right periphery (Borreguero Zuloaga 2021; Fuentes Rodríguez 2021).

In 4 in (5a), adapted and translated from (5b) (Portolés 1998: 8), *in short* is placed in a parenthetical position in the center where the predication is asserted, as shown in (11) below.

(5)   3.
         Daily details coexist in these *Diaries* with historical events.
         'Detalles cotidianos conviven en estos *Diarios* con acontecimientos históricos'

         4.
         A treasure, in short, for historians and for all readers.
         'Un tesoro, en fin, para historiadores y para todos los lectores'.

The discourse context for 4 in (5) is provided in 3, *these «Diaries»* with *daily details* and *historical events*. The book with its details and events is evaluated as *a treasure* in a Result discourse relation linking 4 to 3. In this way, (5a) is interpreted by linking 4 to 3 and finding the information required in 4 about what is *a treasure*, the book in 3. The metaphorical interpretation of *treasure* as a book worth reading is forced by the context in a coercion process. At the same time, 4 is linked to 3, and a complex discourse unit is produced and understood. This complex discourse unit, together with other units quoted in (9) below, represents an argumentative move in a journalistic book review: the book *Diaries* is worth reading because it is a *treasure* as a result of its *details* and *events*.

We might summarize the analysis as in (6).

(6)   a. Discourse is a sequence of linked sentences, including their deictic information, bound to their discourse contexts in a text.
        b. Discourse units necessarily require information from their discourse context.
        c. Discourse context provides the information required to link discourse units.

The need to clarify (Cornish 2022, 94) is met: both discourse and text are units of analysis (Garrido 2003), and instead of his «Text + Context → Discourse» (Cornish 2022, 93), we have in (6) each sentence as a unit bound to a *discourse context* and linked to other sentences as *discourse units* in a *text*, which is a higher unit in a *constituent structure*. We then define discourse context according to (6) in (7).

(7)   The *discourse context* bound to a sentence and its deixis provide the information the sentence requires to be understood and related to the discourse in the text.

This principle applies not only to elementary discourse units but to complex ones built into wider discourse segments as sentences with their deixis are added. Units require additional information to be understood or be fully interpreted. We may know what a *book* is and what a *treasure* is, but we are not understanding fully if we do not know why or what for a speaker is calling a *book* a *treasure*. This is not the same as knowing why the speaker likes the book, it is just knowing that he means the book is certainly worth reading in his opinion, a text move based on a causal discourse relation in a book review.

According to (7), both participants obtain the required information from the discourse context. The same applies within the sentence structure in discourse, for instance in noun phrases in (8). In 1 in (8), from Levinson (2006: 47), information required includes the noun the numeral applies to, which is retrieved from the context (Cao 2021).

(8)   a.
        A1.1. I'd like some Marlboros.
        B1.2. Ten or twenty?
        A2.3. Twenty please.
        B2.4. (*passes them*)That'll be forty pence.

        b.
        1. I have two computers (both Windows 10) and both computers are connected to the same network.

2. I want the two of them to have access to each other's files.
3. Is there any way to do this? (www.anyviewer.com
17.03.2023)

Discourse context is also a key element in the deixis of noun phrases, that is, in the «quantitative relationship with the context», total or partial, between the description in a noun phrase and the deictic «context set» (Garrido 1988: 389). In (8b) with *the* in *the two of them*, all the elements in the set are included, as in Spanish *los dos*. In (8a) with *some Marlboros* part of the set is mentioned, as in Spanish *unos Marlboros*. Extending Leonetti's (1996) approach, Cao (2021, 342) explains that «it is the sentence or the statement that determines the formation of the context, and not the other way around […] what is explicitly communicated already includes instructions for modeling the context». As Cornish (2010, 207) points out for anaphors, there is a «discourse-creating procedure» involving through deixis «a salient discourse representation of a situation»; rather than salient, the information is required by the discourse unit involved, as in (7).

The numerals of 2 and 3 in (8a) are, like the article of 2 in (8b), a «syntactic indicator of the need for the noun» information (Garrido 1986, 56), which is found in the discourse context. In (8a) both participants obtain from the discourse context *some Marlboros* in 1 the information 2 and 3 require when they link 2 to 1, and 3 to 2. *Twenty* in 2 and 3 requires the information provided by *Marlboros* in 1, i. e. cigarettes of the brand Marlboro. We don't even need the information that Levinson adds to 4, «passes them», because 4 can only be asked if the product sold is passed to the customer. In (8b), the deixis in *the two of them* in 2 requires the information about *two computers* in 1 when 2 is linked to 1. As stated, discourse context provides the information each discourse unit requires both to be fully understood and to be seamlessly connected to the larger discourse unit where it belongs.

3. Discourse subordination

In the same way that subordination in sentence syntax carries the loss by the subordinate clause of the independent status (Jiménez Juliá 2011), in discourse syntax the subordination of a discourse unit carries the integration of its discourse topic as subtopic of the topic of the larger unit, or global topic, while coordination with another unit keeps the two topics separate (Garrido 2023; Rodríguez Ramalle 2023a). Subordination represents the integration of a cognitive framework (or mental model, Duque 2022) into a higher one, the one in the subtopic and the one in the global topic; whereas coordination represents the aggregation of two different frameworks, in different topics.

In his introductory words about discourse markers, Portolés (1998: 8) argues that «only if we consider that speakers use linguistic units larger than the sentence can we account for [them]». Actually, Portolés is talking the discourse marker *en fin*, ('in short'), in his newspaper data in (9) (translated by the author).

(9)   1. […] la publicación este mes de diciembre de los *Diarios* de Manuel Azaña ha supuesto un acontecimiento de primer orden.
' the publication this December of Manuel Azaña's *Diaries* [*Diaries, 1932-1933: The Stolen Notebooks*] has been an event of the first order'
2. Los *Cuadernos* arrojan luz sobre lo privado y lo público […] de un hombre esencial en la historia reciente de España.
' The *Notebooks* shed light on the private and public aspects of […] an essential man in the recent history of Spain'
3. Detalles cotidianos conviven en las páginas de estos *Diarios* con acontecimientos […] de inmenso valor histórico.
'…] daily details […] coexist on the pages of these Diaries with events […] of immense historical value. […]'
4. Un tesoro, *en fin*, para historiadores y para todos los lecto-res. [*ABC Cultural*, 20, 19.12.98]
'A treasure, *in short*, for historians and for all readers'.

Portolés and his colleagues note that *en fin*, ('in short') in (9), presents its unit as «a conclusion, as well as a closing and final summary (often evaluative)» (Briz, Pons, and Portolés 2008). Portolés argues that the only way to account for the way this marker works is to consider that «speakers use linguistic units larger then they sentence», in this case «a previous sequence made up not by a single sentence but by several» (Portolés 1998: 8), with wide or global scope for the marker. Portolés (1998, 22) explains that markers such as *en fin* do not contribute to the truth conditions of units but to their processing.

In (9b), the discourse marker *in short* in 4 requires the information provided in 1, 2, and 3 that the *treasure* in 4 is made up of *[the life] of an essential man* in 2 and the *details* and *events* in 3, so that they are the reason why *the publication of [the book] is a first-order event* in 1. The argumentative reasoning goes in terms of the steps in (10).

(10)   a. The publication of [the book] is a first-order event,
b. [because] it deals with the life of an essential man,
c. [with] both daily details and historical events of his life,
d. [so that] the book [is] a treasure for readers,

In (10), the specific book in (9b) is referred to as *the book*, and the marker *in short* of (9b) is made more explicit as *so that*. The syntax of 3 and 4 in (9b) represents a predication between 3 and 4 by the syntactical relation of apposition, where a noun in 4 qualifies another one in 3, in a dependence relation of modifier to head, marked by a comma. In (11), as in (10d), with just one unit, the verb in brackets replaces the punctuation mark in (9b), where the «punctuation for emphasis» (Figueras Bates 2014, 138) separates the predication in (9a) into two different units 3 and 4.

(11)   The book is a treasure for readers.

In (9b), *details* and *events* are *a treasure*, and the unit with *treasure* is marked as focus by becoming an independent unit in 4. It could have been also punctuated with an exclamation mark, making redundant the discourse marker *in short*, in (12).

(12)   A treasure for historians and for all readers!

Context according to Sperber and Wilson (1986: 15) is «the set of premises used to interpret an utterance»; as Portolés explains, «inferences, that is, certain mental processes, lead to conclusions […]. In order for these inferential processes to happen, besides what is said, a context is necessary» (Portolés 1998, 15). Context according to Portolés includes beliefs of the participants as well as their perceptions of the immediate situation, and what has been said before.

As summarized in (6), the main source of the information required by a discourse unit is its discourse context, that is, the other units in the discourse linked to the discourse unit in question. The linking or connection takes place by means of this extra required information. The discourse unit 4 in (9) requires the information from its context in the discourse unit 3, 2 and 1, about the daily details and the historical events, of an essential man in the book just published. This information is supported by the syntactic relation described in (11). This general principle of connection or linking, where «the interpretation of every unit has to be integrated in a wider cognitive unit, according to the unit's position in the corresponding wider syntactic structure» (Garrido 2003, 18), is applied to discourse units in (13) in order to account for the role of the discourse context in the linking process in (6).

(13)   *Connection*: The linking of a discourse unit in discourse requires additional information from its discourse context that makes linking the unit possible.

The book publication is an event because the book is a treasure of details and events. In terms of the discourse constituent structure in (9b), unit 4 is the nucleus in a Result evaluative relation to the satellite or subordinated unit 3. We write 3 4′ to represent the structure. This treasure and these details and events are as nucleus in a Result relation with the satellite 2 of the book dealing with an essential man. We write 2 (3 4′)′. And all this is the nucleus of a Result relation with the satellite 1 of the publication being an event. We write 1 [2 (3 4′)′]′.

If there is a doubt whether the publication is an event because the book is a treasure or the book is a treasure because of its publication which is an event, let us consider topics and representation frames. Is (9) about the publication of a book or about a book's value? Unit 1 represents an event knowledge frame, it tells a story about the publication being an event. The other units are about the treasure the book is, including that the book has details and events of value because it deals with an essential man. The topic is maintained in 2, 3, and 4 except that to stress its value tables are turned and instead of the book in 4 the topic is the treasure it is for readers. Discourse subordination represents knowledge frames in subtopics as parts of frames that integrate those parts and are represented by topics of a higher level. The publication being a major event is a property of the book itself. The book is not good because of the publication but the publication is an event because the book is good. The subordination relation has a rhetorical effect in stressing the quality of the book as the cause of the importance of its publication. This is represented by means of the discourse relation of units 1 and 2 in (14) where the book value is said in 2 and placed at the end of the entire sequence 1.2, in an *end effect* where the most important piece of information of a sequence tends to be placed at the end.

(14)   1. The publication is a major event.
         2. The book is a treasure.

We can now summarize this analysis of discourse subordination in (15).

(15)   *Discourse subordination* represents the integration of the knowledge frame related to the local topic of the satellite unit into the frame related to the global topic of the nucleus unit.

A subtopic is a local topic of the smaller integrated unit, while the topic of the nucleus unit is also the topic of the resulting larger unit; therefore, a global topic, in a way similar to the difference in local and global scope of discourse markers mentioned above. In (9), the

publication of the book is the local topic in 1 and the *Diaries* or *Notebooks*, the book, is the global topic of the whole discourse (9).

4. Discourse coordination

In coordination there is an aggregation of two different frames, with two different related topics, as in 1 and 2 in (16) if we do not take into account 3.

(16)   1. Referencing Republican demands to link a debt-limit
         increase to spending cuts, Mr Biden noted that no president
         added more to the national debt than his predecessor, Donald
         Trump.
         2. Republicans responded to that line with hoots of derision.
         3. He then tried to link Republican demands on the debt limit
         to some conservative proposals to cut Social Security and
         Medicare (www.bbc.com 8.02.2023)

In 1 the topic *Mr Biden* is different from the topic in 2, *Republicans*, so that lexical relations between *noted* and *responded* among others present two different actors than interact in the same story. When we add 3, this coordinating relation is modified: discourse construction is dynamic, as in (19) below. In unit 3 the local topic is *he*, that is, *Mr Biden* in 1. Unit 1 continues unit 3, so that unit 2 is just a supplementary piece on information about the topic in 1 and the story of the president speaking about cuts and debt. The story is continued in 3. Polanyi (1988) right-frontier constraint applies to continuation in (18).

(18)   *Continuation*: After two preceding units, a third one continues
         the first if the second is a satellite of the first, or it continues
         the second if it is a nucleus.

In terms of topic, if 3 keeps talking about the president, then 2 is a satellite of 1 and the global topic is *the president*. If 3 would keep talking about *Republicans*, then 2 would be its nucleus and then 1 would be integrated in this story, as in (19).

(19)   1. The president mentioned Mr Trump's debt.
         2. Republicans responded with derision.
         3. They mentioned their proposed debt limit.

The right frontier constraint is represented in (20), with the coordinated units on the same higher level and the subordinated satellite on

a lower level under its nucleus. The discourse constituent structure in (20a) may be represented as (1′ 2)-3, whereas the one in (20b) may be represented as (1 2′)-3.

(20)   a. 1 — 3
            |
            2

         a. 2 — 3
            |
            1

Units are continued on the same level at the right frontier of the unit they link to. The reading process in (16) versus (19) shows the dynamic nature of discourse construction: adding a third unit changes the constituent structure of the first two.

The text paragraphs in (21) provide more data on discourse coordination, specifically with initial *and*. In (21), the first elementary discourse unit 1 in the first paragraph P1 provides the information required by the following unit 2 in the second paragraph P2. In the (21) text segment, paragraphs are sequential text units numbered P1, P2, P3. Linked sentences in the (21) discourse segment are sequential elementary discourse units numbered 1, 2, 3, 4. Paragraphs P1 and P3 are made up of one elementary discourse unit, 1 and 3, respectively; while P3 is made up of two, 2, 3.

(21)   P1.1. The Chinese surveillance balloon was a huge story in
         America over the weekend, but it received barely a mention
         from the president, in the bottom third of his speech.
         P2.2. «As we made clear last week, if China threatens our
         sovereignty, we will act to protect our country», he said.
         P2.3. «And we did».
         P3.4. And that was it for the balloon talk. (www.bbc.com,
         08.02.2023)

The writer means and we readers understand, by inference from putting 1 and 2 together, that the balloon is called a threat by the president, since the *balloon* is *Chinese* in 1 and *China threatens* in 2. The president means it, but he does not say it. Unit 1 provides the discourse context for unit 2. Also, the information in *the president* in 1 is used to figure out who *he* refers to in 2.

The following elementary discourse unit 3, still in the second paragraph P2, requires the information from the previous unit 2, so that

we did is meant and understood as we acted and we is meant and understood as the government led by the president, as in unit 2. Linking 3 to 1 and 2 the president in 2 gives the reason why they acted in 3, because of the balloon. This is the rhetorical effect of linking 3 to 1 and 2: We acted because the balloon was a threat, says or rather means the president, in yet another example of the classic difference between sentence meaning and speaker's meaning, which is rather a difference between saying and meaning.

In 3, the president means they eliminated the threat, shooting down the balloon, but again, he doesn't say it outright: he only says threatens and act to protect our country in 2, but it is enough to understand we did in 3. It is also the information needed to understand did in 3 as the president means it, that we shot the balloon down in order to protect our country sovereignty. It is the logical conclusion of the balloon being a threat we vowed to protect our country from. Notice, by the way, that adding *and* in 3 stresses it as the consequence in fact resulting in 3 when the condition in 2 is met, in a similar way to *We said we would act, and we did*.

The president is arguing rhetorically. But as it turns out, the warning about a threat from someone else in unit 2 is also itself a threat from the president which results in the fact indirectly meant in 3: if you threaten us with a surveillance balloon, we will protect ourselves by shooting down your balloon. What the president is doing is not that the balloon was shot down, which is a known fact, but that in shooting it down he is fulfilling its commitment to protect our country. Notice also that saying our country he involves his audience in the shooting as the beneficiaries of his protecting it. Since a balloon can hardly hurt a country, it is its sovereignty which is at stake: a small device can in fact violate it.

In (21), there is a subordinating rhetorical relation of Background (Duque 2016) between 1 and 2, where the satellite 1 provides information that is the setting for the situation or event described in the nucleus 2. There is a coordinating relation of Narration called Sequence in (4), between 2 and 3 marked among other things by *and* in 3. Since *mention* in 1 describes the quotation in 2 and 3, and *he said* in 2 involves both 2 and 3, then 2-3 is the nucleus and 1 is the satellite. To this complex unit 1(2-3)' unit 4 is coordinated by means of and and the pronoun *it*, having scope over 1, 2, 3, so that the discourse constituent structure in (21) is organized in a way represented in (22).

(22)   [1 (2 - 3)'] - 4

In (23) the discourse constituent structure of (21) in represented, with discourse relations named.

(23)   (2 Narration 3) Narration 4
              Background

In (24), we have an intuitive similar organization of the information in the discourse constituent structure (22), expressed in a single sentence.

(24)   He barely made a mention of the balloon; he said that they
              would act if threatened and that they did act; and that was all
              he said.

In the discourse constituent structure represented in (22) and (23) there are several embedded constituents. The whole segment 1(2-3)' is coordinated with the last unit 4. In the segment or complex unit 1(2-3)', unit 2 is coordinated with unit 3 and unit 1 is subordinated to the complex unit 2-3. Notice that in (1) it is not said but meant and understood that the balloon in 1 was a threat 2. In fact, readers need 3 in order to understand than the condition in 2 was met, since its consequence happened in 3: if there was a threat we would act and we acted, stressed in focus through *did*, *we did*, and through initial *and* in 3. It is possible to say *If there is a threat we will act; we acted*, without focus marking.

What the president is doing in (21) is arguing that his action was justified. The story about what happened, by the way, is known. He doesn't need to say that the balloon was shot down, and he probably doesn't want to mention it explicitly either. In terms of text units, he is carrying out a rhetorical move. Discourse units 2 and 3, without the words *he said*, belong to the actual speech he gave, text T1 in (25)where this short mention of the surveillance balloon is one of the rhetorical moves M1 in the text structure of the text T1. In the text telling the journalist`s story in terms of the verbs was and *received*, *said*, and *was*. As a text, T2 has different moves; here in (21), in his move M2 the journalist is appraising the scant attention given to the balloon incident in the president's speech, against the expectation that a policy decision on a major international event would merit a relatively long and detailed account. The president's speech T1, on the other hand, also has several other sections. In both cases, discourse coordination with *and* subordinates the first unit, making the second one the point the president and the journalist want to make, that, the argumentative move the make.

The first line or line a in (25) shows the discourse constituent structure in (21), now with discourse units marked as D1, D2, etc. The second line (b) shows the text constituent structure of texts T1 and T2,

with their moves M1 and M2. The president in his speech T1 argues for his decision in M1, and the journalist in his news commentary T2 evaluates in M2 the president's speech. T2 is actually a section on the balloon in the news commentary and T1 is a section on the balloon in the president's speech.

(25)   a. [D1 (D2 - D3)'] - D4
         b. T2 (Move 2 [D1 [T1 Move1 (D2 D3)] D4]
         c. T2 (Move 2 [D1 [T1 Move1 (D2 - D3)'] - D4]

In the third line or line (c) in (25), both discourse and text structures are merged in the third representation of constituent structure.

The correlate of subordination in (15) is coordination in (26) defined in terms of relations between topics and their related knowledge frames.

(26) *Discourse coordination* of two nuclei aggregates the two knowledge frames related to its local topics in a composite frame related to the global topic.

Units 2 and 3 in (21) have a composite frame of saying and acting for the global topic *we*. And the complex unit 1, 2, 3 coordinated with 4 has a composite frame of the saying and acting told in the president's speech and its being all he said about it. But actually, in both cases the first frame is included in the second one. Units 2 and 3 are about action in 3, and the previous talking in 2 is about that action. Unit 4 is about the brevity in the balloon mention, announced in 1 and described in 2-3. So, in terms of (15) the second unit's topic integrates in its frame the one in the first. This properties in terms of focus and topic of coordination with initial *and* in the second unit in (21) confirms the subordinating-to-the-left effect or retroactive subordination, a mismatch between coordination and subordination (Garrido 2023).

The Chinese side to the news story in (27) uses *and* for the most important point in their English version, absent any equivalent marker in (28), the Chinese version (transcription and translation by the author).

(27)   P2.1. We have made it clear time and again that the entry of
         the Chinese civilian unmanned airship into US airspace was a
         purely unintended, unexpected and isolated event caused by
         force majeure.
         P4.2. We believe that no irresponsible comments should be
         made when there is no clear evidence.

P4.3. And we are absolutely opposed to made-up stories and smears against China. (fmprc.gov.cn/eng 14.02.2013)

(28)   3a. 我们坚决反对无中生有、抹黑中国的做法。(mfa.gov.cn 14.02.2023)
3b. Wǒmen jiānjué fǎnduì wúzhōngshēngyǒu, mǒhēi zhōng-guó d*e zuòfǎ*.
3c. We firmly oppose [actions of] making up stories, smearing China.

Very often the *and* unit marks a concluding coordination, with an end effect observed in (14) above, as in (21) and (27), where it presents the final and closing element in the text section on the balloon in the BBC news commentary and in the press conference of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs. In the version in Chinese in (28), 1 from its second paragraph P2 of the Ministry's press release, shown only to provide a discourse context for 2 and 3 from its fourth paragraph P4. The denial in 1 is very specific and detailed, and it stands in a Background relation to the segment in P4.

The right periphery of sentence 2 links it to 3: *no clear evidence* in 2 applies to *made up stories* and *smears* in 3. The left periphery links with the preceding the center to the preceding discourse and the right periphery with the following. In units 2 and 3 *we believe*, *and we are absolutely opposed* are placed at the beginning of its sentences, in the left periphery, linking them units to each other but also to unit 1, starting with *we have made it clear*, by the parallelism of their form. It is the same rhetorical device used in (21) by the president, *we said*, *we will act*, *and we did*. Here too, discourse coordination with initial *and* presents as the strongest argument the second one, in this way creating a subordination relation to the first.

5. Conclusions

Discourse context has been shown to be the source for additional information needed for linking and interpreting discourse units producing the intended rhetorical effects as moves in texts. A sentence bound to a discourse context with its deictic information, rather than an utterance in a situation, is an elementary discourse unit, with left and right peripheries and parentheticals providing linking information. The right-frontier constraint applies to continuation in dynamic discourse linking, so that a subordinated unit is not linked to a unit that continues its nucleus unit.

Covert complex units in discourse build overt rhetorical moves in text constituent structures: participants are not aware of discourse

structure and units; but they are aware of text structure and units, and they control them. Coordination with sentence-initial *and* has subordination-to-the-left properties in the discourse constituent structure. Initial *and* has wider scope and focus effects introducing a rhetorical move within the text constituent structure. These properties of discourse coordination, including focus and wider scope, build and organize complex discourse units that represent rhetorical moves in texts.

References

Alturo, Núria (2010), «Coherencia discursiva: dimensiones contextual, conceptual y gramatical», *Círculo de Lingüística Aplicada a la Comunicación*, 41: 3-30.

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

Blanche-Benveniste, Claire (1997), *Approches de la langue parlée en français*, Paris, Ophrys.

Borreguero Zuloaga, Margarita (2021), «Las unidades del discurso y el texto escrito», in Óscar Loureda and Angela Schrott (eds.), *Manual de lingüística del hablar*, Berlin, de Gruyter: 373-391.

Briz, Antonio, Salvador Pons, and José Portolés (eds.) (2008), *Diccionario de partículas discursivas del español*. Available at: www.dpde.es. [Accessed on September 1, 2023].

Cao, Yufei 曹羽菲 (2021), «Anáfora con artículo definido y construcción del contexto: comparación entre español y chino», *Alpha (Osorno)*, 53: 341-347. DOI: 10.32735/s0718-2201202100053959.

Carlson, Lynn and Daniel Marcu (2001), *Discourse tagging reference manual*, ISI Technical Report. ISI-TR-545. Available at: http://www.isi.edu/~marcu/ discourse/. [Accessed on September 1, 2023].

Cornish, Francis (2010), «Anaphora: text-based or discourse-dependent?: functionalist vs. formalist accounts», *Functions of Language*, 17 (2), 207-241. DOI: 10.1075/fol.17.2.03cor.

Cornish, Francis (2022), «Text, discourse, context: a meta-trilogy for discourse analysis», *Journal of Pragmatics*, 199, 91-104, DOI: 10.1016/ j.pragma.2022.07.002.

Cortés, Luis (2011), «El plano secuencial en los debates en torno a la nación, I: el discurso del presidente», *Círculo de Lingüística Aplicada a la Comunicación*, 46, 3-50. DOI: 10.5209/rev_CLAC.2011.v46.1.

Cortés, Luis, and Óscar Loureda (2021), «Las miradas sobre el hablar», in Óscar Loureda and Angela Schrott (eds.), *Manual de lingüística del hablar*, Berlin: de Gruyter: 845-864.

Dorgeloh, Heidrun, and Wanner, Anja A. (2022), *Discourse syntax: English grammar beyond the sentence*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press.

Duque, Eladio (2016), *Las relaciones de discurso*, Madrid, Arco Libros.

Duque, Eladio (2022), «Gramática y estudios del discurso», in Carmen López Ferrero, Isolda E. Carranza, and Teun van Dijk (eds.), *The Routledge handbook of Spanish discourse studies*, London, Routledge: 143-156.

Figueras Bates, Carolina (2014), «Pragmática de la puntuación y nuevas tecnologías», *Normas*, 4: 135-160.

Fuentes Rodríguez, Catalina (2021), «La estructura informativa del hablar», in Óscar Loureda and Angela Schrott (eds.), *Manual de lingüística del hablar*, Berlin, de Gruyter: 419-441.

Fuentes Rodríguez, Catalina, and Víctor Pérez Béjar (2022), «Introducción: macrosintaxis del discurso persuasivo, *Boletín de Filología*, 57 (2): 11-18. DOI: 10.4067/S0718-93032022000200011.

Garrido, Joaquín (1986), «Pronombre y artículo», *Revista de Filología Románica*, 4: 51-71.

Garrido, Joaquín (1988), «Sobre la evolución hasta el artículo actual en español», in *Actas del I Congreso Internacional de Historia de la Lengua Española*, Madrid, Arco Libros: 385-399.

Garrido, Joaquín (1998), «Discourse structure in grammar«, *Estudios Ingleses de la Universidad Complutense*, 6, 49-63.

Garrido, Joaquín (2003), «Relevance versus connection: discourse and text as units of analysis», *Círculo de Lingüística Aplicada a la Comunicación*, 13: 13-20.

Garrido Joaquín (2013). «Thème et dislocation dans la langue parlée», *Círculo de Lingüística Aplicada a la Comunicación*, 42, 3-21.

Garrido, Joaquín (2023), «Constituyentes coordinados en estructuras discursivas jerárquicas», submitted.

Jiménez Juliá, Tomás (2011), «Conjunciones y subordinación en español», *Verba*, 38, 7-50.

Leonetti, Manuel (1996), «El artículo definido y la construcción del contexto, *Signo y seña*, 5: 103-139. DOI: 10.34096/sys.n5.5553.

Levinson, Stephen C. (1983), *Pragmatics*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press.

Levinson, Stephen C. (2006), «On the human "interaction engine"», in Nicholas J. Enfield and Stephen C. Levinson (eds.), *Roots of human sociality*, Oxford, Berg: 39-69.

Long, Wanqiu 龙万秋, and Bonnie Webber (2022), «Facilitating contrastive learning of discourse relational senses by exploiting the hierarchy of sense relations», *EMNLP*, 10704–10716.

Polanyi, Livia (1988), «A formal model of the structure of discourse», *Journal of Pragmatics*, 12 (5–6), 601–638. DOI: 10.1016/0378-2166(88)90050-1.

Portolés, José (1998), *Marcadores del discurso*, Barcelona, Ariel.

Portolés, José (2004), *Pragmática para hispanistas*, Madrid, Síntesis.

Portolés, José (2023), *La pasión por el discurso. marcadores discursivos y pragmática*, Sevilla, Editorial Universidad de Sevilla.

Rodríguez Ramalle, Teresa M. (2018), «La estructura funcional en los límites de la oración», *Círculo de Lingüística Aplicada a la Comunicación*, 75, 107-124. DOI: 10.5209/CLAC.61349.

Rodríguez Ramalle, Teresa M. (2023a), «Conexión, jerarquía y dependencia entre oraciones en el discurso: Estudio a partir del comportamiento de *vamos y vaya*», *Sintagma*, 35: 7-19. DOI: 10.21001/sintagma.2023.35.01.

Rodríguez Ramalle, Teresa M. (2023b), «Evidential adverbs and polarity: a study from Spanish», *Languages*, 8 (4): artículo 243. DOI: 10.3390/languages8040243.

Sánchez López, Cristina (2015), «The left periphery of Spanish comparative correlatives», in Andreas Dufter and Álvaro S. Octavio de Toledo Huerta (eds.), *Left sentence peripheries in Spanish: diachronic, variationist and comparative perspectives*, Amsterdam, Benjamins: 155-184.

Saussure, Louis de (2007), «Procedural pragmatics and the study of discourse», in Louis de Saussure and Peter J. Schulz (eds.), *Pragmatic interfaces*, Amsterdam, Benjamins: 139-159.

Sperber, Dan, and Deirdre Wilson (1986), *Relevance: communication and cognition*, Oxford, Blackwell.

Tan, Pack-Ling 陈佩玲, and Hongyin Tao 陶红印 (1999), «Coordination construction in Mandarin conversation: evidence for syntax-for-interaction», in Chaofen Sun 孙朝奋 (ed.), *Proceedings of the Joint Meeting of ICCL and NACCL 10: Graduate students in linguistics publications*, Los Angeles, University of Southern California: 449-466.