

itself otherwise. We note $\alpha_1 \ll_{\mathcal{D}} \alpha_2$ the fact that $last_{\mathcal{D}}(\alpha_1) <_{\mathcal{D}} first_{\mathcal{D}}(\alpha_2)$ and there is no atomic constituent α' such that $last_{\mathcal{D}}(\alpha_1) <_{\mathcal{D}} \alpha' <_{\mathcal{D}} first_{\mathcal{D}}(\alpha_2)$.

Constraint (16) says that a constituent is *dcr-admissible* whenever every constituent terminated by a discourse CR is the attachment site of a constituent that immediately follows it and the attachment is not a topic shift.

- (16) Let $\alpha = \langle nodes, dr \rangle$ be a non-atomic constituent with respect to discourse \mathcal{D} . We say that α is *dcr-admissible* if and only if, for any $\beta \in nodes$ such that $dcr(last_{\mathcal{D}}(\beta))$,
1. there is some $\gamma \in nodes$ such that, for some R , $R(\beta, \gamma)$ or $R(\gamma, \beta)$ is in dr and $\beta \ll_{\mathcal{D}} \gamma$, and,
 2. there is no $\gamma \in nodes$ such that $Topic-Shift(\beta, \gamma) \in dr$ and $\beta \ll_{\mathcal{D}} \gamma$.

(16) makes room for the two types of configuration illustrated in Figure 13. It is a static constraint, which characterises the attachments that respect certain conditions. A dynamic rule, conform to SDRT's guidelines, is shown in (17). It says that, when attempting to attach β to α in λ , if the penultimate (LAST-1) constituent γ carries a discourse CR, then, normally, (i) $\alpha = \gamma$ (no-back-jump) and (ii) no *Topic-Shift* relation is allowed.

- (17) $?(\alpha, \beta, \lambda)_{LAST-1} = \gamma_{LAST} = \beta \text{ dcr}(\gamma) > \alpha = \gamma \ \& \ \text{Topic-Shift}(\gamma, \beta, \lambda)$

(16) and (17) do not impose any particular discourse relation (they just ban *Topic-Shift*). Additional constraints, such as the description of specific relations, constructional patterns (12) or the speech act range of discourse CRs (14), contribute narrowing the space of possible interpretations.

Interestingly, (16) and (17) are stricter than the *Right Frontier* (RF) constraint, proposed in SDRT. The RF constraint says that a constituent can only be attached to the penultimate constituent or to a constituent that subordinates, directly or indirectly, the penultimate constituent. SDRT exploits Polanyi's (1985) distinction between subordination and coordination relations. Polanyi's intuition was that α subordinates β whenever β does not interrupt the discourse move associated with α . If β creates an interruption, then it is coordinated to α . The status of this distinction was never entirely clear. The interpretation we assume here is that β is subordinated to α whenever it develops or modifies what α says about its specific topic, for instance when it elaborates the contribution of α or introduces some proposition that puts this contribution into a different perspective (by justifying or attacking it, for instance). In contrast, coordination occurs when α 's specific topic is changed. For instance, although two constituents of a continuation elaborate a common topic, the second constituent does not elaborate what the first says about its specific topic. Given the RF constraint, it is in principle possible to jump to a higher, subordinating, constituent. This is precisely forbidden in the case of discourse CRs.

5. Conclusion

In this paper, we have presented and discussed a way of integrating discourse CRs in SDRT. Discourse CRs correspond to inter-sentential major continuations in Delattre's work. We have established that, in isolation, discourse CRs are preferentially interpreted as questions, not as assertions, even when they are acoustically copied from sentence pairs where they obviously convey an assertion. We interpret this somewhat paradoxical result as another manifestation of the generally assumed cue-based nature of discourse construction. However, in the case at hand, the situation is more abstract than in other cases because discourse CRs do not convey semantic or pragmatic 'values', but constrain the kind of attachment that the next constituent must undergo. We have analysed the attachment constraints in Section 4 and shown that they pertain to three different domains: constructions (typically for conditional interpretations, as with pseudo-imperatives), speech act variability (constituents hosting a discourse CR may, for instance, act as questions or commands) and local connexity (no back jump, no topic shift). We have exploited the unique combination of modularity and non-monotonicity found in SDRT to formulate our constraints, pointing on some occasions to possible departures from the received framework. In further work, we plan to explore the cognitive limits of discourse CR illocutionary 'camouflage', that is, the margin of tolerance in the interpretation of discourse CRs as questions, commands, exclamations, etc., depending on different combinations of phonetic properties.

References

- Antoniou, Grigoris. 1997. *Nonmonotonic Reasoning*. Cambridge (MA): MIT Press.
- Asher, Nicholas. 1993. *Reference to Abstract Objects in Discourse*. Dordrecht: Kluwer.
- Asher, Nicholas & Lascarides, Alex. 2003. *Logics of Conversation*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Asher, Nicholas & Morreau, Michael. 1991. "Commonsense entailment: A modal theory of non-monotonic reasoning". In *Proceedings of the 12th IJCAI*, 387–392. San Mateo (CA): Morgan Kaufmann.
- Asher, Nicholas & Morreau, Michael. 1995. "What some generic sentences mean". In *The Generic Book*, Gregory N. Carlson & Francis J. Pelletier (eds), 300–338. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.
- Autesserre, Denis & Di Cristo, Albert. 1972. "Recherches sur l'intonation du français: Traits significatifs et non significatifs". In *Proceedings of the International Congress of the Phonetic Sciences 7, Janua Linguarum 57*, André Rigault & René Charbonneau (eds), 843–859. The Hague: Mouton.

- Baayen, R. Harald. 2008. *Analyzing Linguistic Data: A Practical Introduction to Statistics Using R*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Beckman, Mary E. & Pierrehumbert, Janet. 1986. "Intonational structure in English and Japanese". *Phonology* 3: 255–309.
- Carlson, Katy, Frazier, Lyn & Clifton Jr., Charles. 2009. "How prosody constrains comprehension: A limited effect of prosodic packaging". *Lingua* 119: 1066–1082.
- Chen, Aaju. 2007. "Language-specificity in the perception of continuation intonation". In *Tones and Tunes II*, Tomas Riad & Carlos Gussenhoven (eds), 107–142. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Choi-Jonin, Injoo & Delais-Roussarie, Élisabeth. 2006. "L'association de propositions sans marque segmentale en français parlé: Étude syntactico-sémantique et prosodique". *Faits de Langue* 28: 83–94.
- Clark, Billy. 1993. "Relevance and pseudo-imperatives". *Linguistics and Philosophy* 16: 79–121.
- Corblin, Francis & de Swart, Henriëtte (eds). 2004. *Handbook of French Semantics*. Stanford: CSLI Publications.
- Culicover, Peter & Jackendoff, Ray. 1997. "Semantic subordination despite syntactic coordination". *Linguistic Inquiry* 28: 195–217.
- Dargnat, Mathilde & Jayez, Jacques. 2009. "La cohésion parataxique: Une approche constructionnelle". In *La Parataxe, structures, marquages et explications discursives*, Marie-Josée Béguelin, Gilles Corminboeuf & Mathieu Avanzi (eds), vol. 2, 61–93. Berne: Peter Lang.
- Delattre, Pierre. 1966. "Les dix intonations de base du français". *French Review* 40: 1–14.
- Di Cristo, Albert. 1999. "Le cadre accentuel du français contemporain: Essai de modélisation". *Langues* 2(3):184–205 and 2(4): 258–267.
- D'imperio, Maria Paola, Bertrand, Roxanne, Di Cristo, Albert & Portes, Cristel. 2007. "Investigating phrasing levels in French: Is there a difference between nuclear and prenuclear accents?" In *Selected Papers from the 36th Linguistic Symposium on Romance Languages* [Current Issues in Linguistic Theory 287], José Camacho, Nydia Flores-Ferrán, Liliana Sánchez, Viviane Déprez, & María José Cabrera (eds), 93–106. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Gan, Guojun, Chaoqun, Ma, & Jianhong, Wu. 2007. *Data Clustering: Theory, Algorithms, and Applications* [ASA-SIAM Series on Statistics and Applied Probability]. Philadelphia: SIAM and Alexandria (Virginia): ASA.
- Giron, Stéphanie. 2004. *Inventaire et classement des constructions verbales dans un corpus de français parlé dans l'Allier*, Ph.D. thesis. Université Blaise Pascal (Clermont-Ferrand 2).
- Gunlogson, Christine. 2003. *True to Form: Rising and Falling Declaratives as Questions in English* [Outstanding Dissertations in Linguistics]. New York: Routledge.
- Jayez, Jacques & Dargnat, Mathilde. 2009. "One more step and you'll get pseudo-imperatives right". In *Proceedings of Sinn und Bedeutung 13*, Arndt Riester & Torgrim Solstad (eds), 247–260. Stuttgart: University of Stuttgart.
- Jayez, Jacques & Dargnat, Mathilde. 2011. "Discourse 'major continuatives' in a non-monotonic framework". In *Proceedings of IDP09, Proceedings from IDP 2009, Paris, 9–11 septembre 2009*, Hiyon Yoo & Élisabeth Delais-Roussarie (eds), 223–238. http://makino.linguist.jussieu.fr/idp09/docs/IDP_actes/Articles/jayez.pdf.
- Jasinskaja, Katja. 2006. *Pragmatics and Prosody of Implicit Discourse Relations: The Case of Restatement*. Ph.D. thesis, University of Tübingen.
- Jun, Sun-Ah. 2003. "Prosodic Phrasing and Attachment Preferences". *Journal of Psycholinguistic Research* 32: 219–249.

- Jun, Sun-Ah & Fougeron, Cécile. 1995. "The accentual phrase and the prosodic structure of French". In *Proceedings of the 13th International Congress of Phonetic Sciences* vol. 2, 722–725.
- Jun, Sun-Ah & Fougeron, Cécile. 2000. "A phonological model of French intonation". In *Intonation: Analysis, Modeling and Technology*, Antonis Botinis (ed.), 209–242. Dordrecht: Kluwer.
- Jun, Sun-Ah & Fougeron, Cécile. 2002. "The realizations of the accentual phrase in French intonation". *Probus* 14: 147–172.
- Ladd, Robert D. 1996. *Intonational Phonology*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. 2nd ed. 2008.
- Leone, Nicola, Pfeifer, Gerald, Faber, Wolfgang, Eiter, Thomas, Gottlob, Georg, Perri, Simona & Scarcello, Francesco. 2006. "The DLV system for knowledge representation and reasoning". *ACM Transactions on Computational Logic* 7/3: 499–562.
- Mann, William C. & Thompson, Sandra A. 1988. "Rhetorical Structure Theory: Toward a function theory of text organization". *Text* 8: 243–281.
- Marandin, Jean-Marie. 2006. "Contours as constructions". In *Constructions all over: Case Studies and Theoretical Implications*, Schoenfeld, Doris (ed.), electronic publication at <http://www.constructions-online.de/articles/specvol1/>.
- Morreau, Michael. 1992. *Conditionals in Philosophy and Artificial Intelligence*. Ph.D. thesis, University of Amsterdam, [Arbeitspapiere des Sonderforschungsbereichs 340], University of Stuttgart, University of Tübingen, IBM Deutschland.
- Nilsenová, Marie. 2006. *Rises and Falls: Studies in the Semantics and Pragmatics of Intonation*. Ph.D. thesis, ILLC, University of Amsterdam.
- Nute, Donald. 1980. *Topics in Conditional Logic*. Dordrecht: Reidel.
- Oberlander, Jon. 2004. "On the reduction of discourse topic". *Theoretical Linguistics* 30: 213–225.
- Pierrehumbert, Janet. 1980. *The Phonology and Phonetics of English Intonation*. Ph.D. thesis, MIT.
- Pierrehumbert, Janet & Hirschberg, Julia. 1990. "The meaning of intonational contours in the interpretation of discourse". In *Intentions in Communication*, Philip R. Cohen, Jerry Morgan & Martha E. Pollock (eds), 271–311. Cambridge: MIT Press.
- Pike, Kenneth L. 1945. *The Intonation of American English*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.
- Pinheiro, José C. & Bates, Douglas M. 2000. *Mixed Effect Models in S and S-Plus*. New York: Springer-Verlag.
- Polanyi, Livia. 1985. "A theory of discourse structure and discourse coherence". In *Proceedings of the 21st Meeting of the Chicago Linguistics Society*, 306–322.
- Post, Brechtje. 2000. *Tonal and Phrasal Structures in French Intonation*. Ph.D. thesis, University of Nijmegen.
- Powers, Daniel A. & Xie, Yu. 2008. *Statistical Methods for Categorical Data Analysis*. Bingley: Emerald Group Publishing.
- Quené, Hugo & van den Bergh, Huub. 2008. "Examples of mixed-effects modeling with crossed random effects and with binomial data". *Journal of Memory and Language* 59: 413–425.
- Reese, Brian J. 2007. *Bias in Questions*. Ph.D. thesis, University of Texas at Austin.
- Romeas, Pascal. 1992. *L'organisation prosodique des énoncés en situation de dialogue homme-machine*. Ph.D. thesis, Université de Provence.
- Trager, George L. & Smith, Henry Lee. 1951. *An Outline of English Structure*. Norman (OK): Battenburg Press.
- Vion, Monique & Colas, Annie. 2006. "Pitch cues for the recognition of Yes-No questions in French". *Journal of Psycholinguistic Research* 35: 427–445.

- Von Heusinger, Klaus. 2007. "Discourse structure and intonational phrasing". In *Topic and Focus: Cross-Linguistic Perspectives on Meaning and Intonation*, Chungmin Lee, Matthew Gordon & Daniel Büring (eds), 263–290. Dordrecht: Springer.
- Yee, Thomas W. 2006. *VGAM Family Functions for Categorical Data*. Department of Statistics, University of Auckland. <http://www.stat.auckland.ac.nz/~yee/VGAM/doc/Categorical.pdf>.

