

THE PREFIELD-POSTFIELD DRIFT AND THE EVOLUTION OF THE ENGLISH PASSIVE¹

Javier Martín Arista
Universidad de Zaragoza

INTRODUCTION

Several causes have been advanced as explaining, at least partially, the final stage of the drift prefield-postfield in English. In the first place, the Proto-Indo-European and the Indo-European orders have been discussed by Lehmann (1974:30ff) and Miller (1975:31ff) respectively. In the second place, as regards Germanic and OE, it has been pointed out that the introduction of a strong initial accent in Proto-Germanic must have led to a consequent loss of inflectional suffixes (Lehmann 1978:212). Hawkins (1986:51), following Bean (1983:139ff), has identified case sincretism as the casual factor for SOV-SVO. Such explanation is refuted in Nyman (1986:251ff), where it is held that the Paradigm Economy Principle, which states that the number of paradigms is at the minimum logically compatible with the inflexional resources involved, is not relevant to historical linguistics. Case and agreement, as regards SVO-SOV, is dealt with in Foster and Hofling (1987:475ff). Stockwell (1977:296ff) has put forward the analogy with independent clauses as the cause of the change SOV-SVO in dependent clauses. Stockwell's explanation (1977:296) is based on the conception that the main movement in the process of exbraciation is the one that takes place by means of S=TOP, with the subsequent displacement of the S towards the first position of the clause. Stockwell's explanation (1977:296) follows Steele's (1975:243) conclusion that *it is not at all improbable that topic may solidify in sentence initial position*. Other scholars have also discussed these movements towards central (in the case of V) or peripheral position (in the case of O) in the belief that the displacement of clause constituents must be explained in terms of the suitable contexts for such movements. Hock (1982:91ff), for instance, has demonstrated that in three different linguistic areas of the world a change from SOV to SVO has been initiated by the shifting of clitic AUX to clause-second position. This shift is followed by the tendency for other finite verbs to move to the same position in clause structure. A final step is that

all the members of V shift to second position, thus bringing about SVO order. Dik (1989:353) following Steele (1977), Garber (1980) and Hock also remarks that *the preference of Aux-like elements for second clause position may explain certain historical developments which, in the last instance, may lead to a shift from SOV to SVO order*. Another cause that has been put forward is the influence of the foreign languages (Strang 1970).

Nevertheless, no aspect of the ones revised above can be offered as an overall explanation for the drift prefield-postfield in English, although it seems sensible to acknowledge that all of them must have played a role in the evolution we are concerned with. It is in this spirit that in this paper we concentrate on an aspect of this evolution that has remained largely uninvestigated so far, namely the evolution of the English passive with special emphasis on the (change of the) rules that governed placement in passive clauses. We expect that the discussion of the passive order evolution will illuminate some aspects of the SOV-SVO drift that still remain unclear. Adopting the FG framework, we have organized this paper as follows: section 1 sets up our hypothesis as regards the evolution of passive clause functional patterns; section 2 presents the empirical evidence found in the corpus; section 3 engages in the discussion of the quantitative data extracted from the corpus and a summary of the main contributions and conclusions is offered in section 4.

1. THE EVOLUTION OF THE ENGLISH PASSIVE

Very briefly, the evolution of the passive from PIE to Modern English could be summarised as follows²:

- (1)
 stage 1: Middle voice endings with active meaning (synthetic)
 stage 2: Middle voice endings with passive meaning (synthetic)
 stage 3: Lexical passive (periphrastic)
 stage 4: Syntactic passive (periphrastic), including double passives (*John was given a book by Susan/ A book was given to John by Susan*); indirect passives (*This problem has already been dealt with*) and non-local passives like (*John was expected to come*).

As regards positional syntax, the evolution of the English passive is an instance of convergence, meaning by *convergence* (Connolly 1991:156) the change³ from synchronic heterogeneity into synchronic homogeneity. This is the case with:

- (2)
 continuous/discontinuous passive > continuous passive
 COP-PP/PP-COP order > COP-PP order
 COP---P1/P2/P4 > COP---P2
 PP---P1/P2/P4 > PP---P3
 NEG---P1/P2/P3 > NEG---P3
 MOD/AUX---P1/P2 > MOD/AUX---P2
 Ag/Man/Loc/Temp---P3/P4 > Ag/Man/Loc/Temp---P4⁴.

We also witness an externally motivated change (in Dik's (1986:21) terminology) because, as will be shown in due course, a change has taken place in the functional principles governing the assignment of pragmatic functions that results in the structural changes outlined above. Connolly (1991:148) has accounted for some aspects of this evolution concerning the ME period. He remarks that: (i) the rules governing the placement of elements in P1 (in LME) do not appear to differ from those for EME or ModE; and that (ii) there is a reduction in the number of clause positions in LME compared with EME. We agree with the statement (i), although we have identified P1 as TOPum position, as Connolly does, and FOCm position, unlike Connolly, who does not distinguish between FOCum and FOCm (Martín Arista 1994). As regards (ii), however, it must be pointed out that Connolly's approach lies on the very boundaries of functional syntax since he offers a syntactic treatment of several phenomena that are accounted for in semantic-pragmatic terms in *orthodox* FG⁵. Our point is that the rules governing passive clause constituent ordering have changed gradually as the last relics of prefield functional patterns, involving OV phonology and morpho-syntax, were disappearing. The following traces may be identified as relics of prefield linearization⁶: (i) at the phonological level, main pitch accent (or *nucleus* in the sense given by Cruttenden (1984:48)) in preverbal position; (ii) at the morphological level, PP-COP order; and (iii), at the syntactic level, discontinuous passive, COP---P2/P4, PP---P2/P4 and S/Ag/Man/Loc/Temp---P3. These statements call for further explanation: our starting point is in Dik (1983:353), where it is remarked that AUX has shifted from clause-final position to P2. Dryer (1991:457), in line with this argument, has pointed out that V-final languages tend to be PP-COP, SVO languages COP-PP and V-initial languages COP-PP. This is a logical result of the view of COP as AUX:

- (3)
 Stage 1: S-X-PP-COP
 Stage 2: S-COP-X-PP

Afterwards, the adverbials that had accompanied COP in its shift towards P2, thus taking up P3, were displaced towards P4, in a change that resembles SOV-SVO:

- (4)
 Stage 3 (passive): S-COP-PP-X
 Stage 3 (active): S-AUX-V-O/X

A highly hypothetical Stage 0 S-X-Y-V might be argued for following Lightfoot (1979:239) and the Copula Auxiliariation (Dik 1987:54ff) process. The assumption in putting forward the Stage 0 is that the passive originated in a non-periphrastic middle voice form that took up clause-final position. Given a template P1-P2-P3, the scenario would be as follows:

- (5)
- | | |
|------|---------|
| | NUCLEUS |
| Goal | |
| S | PPCOP |
| TOP | FOC |

In (5) the evolution of P1-P3 template passive clauses is unfolded into four different levels of analysis: phonological (nucleus position), semantic (Ag and Go), syntactic (S and O) and pragmatic (TOP and FOC assignment). Given P1-P4 templates, adverbials like Ag, Man, Temp and Loc must have been aligned before COP, as is shown in (6):

(6)			
Goal		NUCLEUS	
		Agent, Manner,	
		Locative, Time, etc	
S	PP	X	COP
TOP		FOC	

The change COP-X-PP>COP-PP-X, of which we have stressed the importance of the shift of FOCum from P3 to P4 must have taken place through clauses involving S, COP and PP that in OE times already carried FOCum in P3, thus coexisting with the pattern offered in (5):

(6)
S-PP(FOCum)-COP
S-COP-PP(FOCum)

The coexistence of these two patterns seems more plausible than that of linearizations like S-PP(FOCum)-COP or S-COP(FOCum)-PP. Indeed, it does not seem sensible to assign FOC to COP since it was unlikely to be accented given its semantically empty character. If we accepted the coexistence of the functional patterns displayed under (6), to the exclusion of the ones just mentioned, it would be arguable that, when adverbials turned up in P4, they carried the nucleus and bore FOCum, in a linear order that resembles the pattern S-COP-PP(FOCum): S-COP-PP-X(FOCum). This evolution may be said to consist of the three stages drawn under (7):

(7)
1st. stage: P1-P2-FOCum
2nd. stage: P1-P2-FOCum-P4/P1-P2-P3-FOCum
3rd. stage: P1-P2-P3-FOCum

As is seen in (7), two functional variants coexisted (P1-P2-FOCum-P4/P1-P2-P3-FOCum), much in the same way as S-PP(FOCum)-COP and S-COP-PP(FOCum) had been said to coexist before. The LME (and modern) outcome of the evolution is represented by the following diagram:

(8)			
Goal			PITCH ACCENT
			Agent, Manner,
			Locative,Time,etc
S	COP	PP	X
TOP			FOC

2. EMPIRICAL EVIDENCE

So far, we have presented our hypothesis, still in a highly speculative manner. In this section, we confront this hypothesis with the empirical evidence extracted from a corpus of two thousand and four hundred passive clauses including OE, EME and LME instances of passive functional patterns⁷. In the light of these examples, we discuss the different aspects of the evolution of the order of passive clauses in turn: in section 2.1 continuous and discontinuous passives are tackled; in section 2.2 we focus on the relative order of COP and PP; in section 2.3 we draw our attention to V-initial, V-2 and V-final; and in section 2.4 the different positions taken up by NEG, MOD and AUX are dealt with.

2.1. CONTINUOUS/DISCONTINUOUS PASSIVES

By *syntactic continuity/discontinuity* we refer to the fact that COP and PP allow or do not allow constituents to be placed between them. In quantitative terms, the data yielded by our corpus evidence the decrease in the percentage of discontinuous passives throughout the OE and the ME periods:

	% OE	%LME
Discontinuous passive	40	12.9

Table 1: percentage of discontinuous passive functional patterns in OE and LME.

It is our contention that passive discontinuity constitutes an intermediate stage in the evolution of the form of the passive: the passive verb complex allows constituents to occur between COP and PP, which, consequently, still has a tendency to take up final position in the clause. Thus, it is possible to relate the disappearance of passive discontinuity to the emergence of the new active order: by means of a process of leaking (or prefield-postfield movement) all the constituents of passive clauses might have come to occupy post-verbal positions, meaning by post-verbal post-participial instead of post-copulative position. Let us concentrate on the qualitative aspects of this evolution. OE linear structure allowed all the constituents normally involved in passive clauses to occur in interverbal position. Some instances of this occurrence follow:

(9) *Passive discontinuity in OE*

(i) *COP-S-PP*

Her wæs Cnut gecoran to kyng
here was Cnut crowned king

“In this year Cnut was crowned” (ASC 1014)

(ii) *COP-S COMP-PP*

Cuðbryht wæs to ærcebisc gehalod
Cuthbrith was to archbishop appointed

“Cuthbrith was consecrated archbishop” (ASC 741)

(iii) *COP-Ag-PP*

ða ðæt folc gewearð egesan geaclod
then the people were with fear terrified

“Then the people were terrified with fear” (OSW)

- (iv) *COP-Man/Loc/Temp-PP*
 He wæs oft gewundad
 he was very wounded
 “He was severely wounded” (ASC 755)

The same statement may be made with reference to EME:

- (10) *Passive discontinuity in EME*
 (i) *COP-S-PP*
 Hit bieð sume ðe bieð swiðe wise ihealden ðurh ðessere Godes giue (V&V)
 (ii) *COP-S COMP-PP*
 ...ðatt wæs Beðiania gehatenn (V)
 (iii) *COP-Ag-PP*
 A leafdi wes mid hire fan biset al abuten (AW)
 (iv) *COP-Man/Loc/Temp-PP*
 Alle Godes heastes, as Sein Gregorie seið, beoð i luue irotet (AW)

In LME, however, the situation must have changed:

- (11) *Passive discontinuity in LME*
 (i) *COP-S-PP*
 ... in whiche is ðis horn picchid (WS27)
 (ii) *COP-Ag-PP*
 Fulofte aboute the hals Love is of false men embraced
 (iii) *COP-Man/Temp-PP*
 ðis gospel is cownfort to alle ðat ben ðus pursewyde (WS11)

Before going on, it is worth noticing that the instances drawn under (9)-(11) coexisted with variants like the following, in which no discontinuity shows up:

- (12) *Continuous passive*
 (i) *OE*
 ða se halga wer wæs getogen
 then the saint man was brought to an end
 “Then the saint man was slain” (EDM)
 (ii) *EME*
 ðis scheld is igeuen us agein alle temptations (AW)
 (iii) *LME*
 ...with thynges that ben put to hym (CHB)

It is also worth pointing out that the discontinuous instances in (9)-(11) even coexisted with completely modern order throughout the three periods:

- (13) *Completely modern order*
 (i) *OE*
 Wilfrið biscop wæs adriften of his bisc dome from Ecgefer e cyninge
 Wilfrid bishop was driven out of his bishopric by Ecgfrith king
 “Bishop Wilfrid was driven from his bishopric by king Ecgfrith” (ASC 638)

(ii) *EME*

Se eorl wearð gewounded at an gefiht fram ane swein (ASC 1128)
 “The earl was wounded by a wild boar in a hunt”

In general, the order of passive clauses is completely modern by LME times, to which this example belongs:

(iii) *LME*

Thowe hast be sought in many londe with messengerys and with sonde (CHB)

The first statement that can be made as regards (9)-(11) concerning a qualitative change in progress is that no instances of S COMP or Loc in interverbal position have been found in our LME corpus. In general, the evolution that the data offered by the corpus shows is towards a situation in which only adverbials can occur interverbally. The other qualitative change, that is, implying a change in the rule system, that we have identified is that the degree of discontinuity has decreased. This is displayed by the following table:

	% OE	% LME
Degree of discontinuity 1	57.6	94.5
Degree of discontinuity 2	26.7	4.6
Degree of discontinuity 3	5.6	0.7

Table 2: discontinuity degree in OE and LME.

We have considered three different DD’s depending on the number of constituents that appear between COP and PP: degree of discontinuity 1 (1 constituent is allowed between COP and PP), degree of discontinuity 2 (2 constituents are allowed between COP and PP) and degree of discontinuity 3 (3 or more constituents are allowed between COP and PP). Only DD1 –involving Man and Temp– has survived, the tendency being for the percentage of degree of discontinuity 2 and degree of discontinuity 3 to decrease as we approach the ModE period. As is shown in (14), up to three constituents broke into the COP-PP continuum in Early English:

(14) *DD*(i) *OE*

ðar wæron eac oðre VII broðru
 there were all other seven brothers
 be naman gecigde
 by name called

“The other seven brothers were called by their names” (ASC 867)

(ii) *EME*

Hali men ðe wummen beoð of alle fondunges swiðest ofte itemptet (AW)

(iii) *LME*

This blessyd Boke 56, Copyed has this Sauter ben of yuel men of lollardry
 (WS 69)

Indeed, two constituents turn up between COP and PP in the OE (14.i) and the LME (14.iii) examples, whereas the clause in the EME example (14.ii) allows three constituents to occur interverbally.

2.2. THE RELATIVE ORDER OF COP AND PP

Along with the coexistence of continuous and discontinuous passives in OE and ME, we find a variation COP-PP/PP-COP which is worth commenting on. Let us set some examples taken from the OE (15) and ME (16) corpora:

(15) COP-PP relative order

(i) OE

Oswoldes cynerice wearð gerymed ða swyðe
 Oswald's kingdom was extended then greatly
 "Then Oswald's kingdom was extended greatly" (OSW)

(ii) EME

He wes islein on ende (AW)

(iii) LME

Thow languyssest and art deffeted for desir and talent of thi rather fortune
 (CHB)

(16) PP-COP relative order

(i) OE

... ðæt se cyning ofslagen wæs (ASC 755)
 "...that the king was slain"

(ii) EME

Sene it was ðat she was fair wif (AW)

(iii) LME

Ryght swich was sche whan sche flatelyd the and desseyved the with unfeul
 Ikynges of fals welefulnesse (CHB)

In effect, the relative order of COP and PP has not completely rigidified until rather late in the history of English, as is shown below:

	% OE	% LME
Relative order COP-PP	68.4	97.2
COP-PP in continuous passives	41.5	86.9
COP-PP in discontinuous passives	58.4	13
Relative order PP-COP	31.5	2.8
PP-COP in continuous passives	100	92.8
PP-COP in discontinuous passives	0	7.1

Table 3: relative order of COP and PP in OE and LME.

As we have remarked above, this evolution is to be related to the prefield>postfield character of English. Since COP-PP vs. PP-COP orders normally entail V---P1/P2/P3, we go deeper into this topic in the next section.

2.3. V-INITIAL, V-2 AND V-FINAL

After we have tackled a number of problems of relative order (continuity vs. discontinuity and COP-PP vs. PP-COP order) we raise in this section several problems of positional syntax related to the absolute order of the passive: verb (COP/PP) in clause-initial (V-initial), clause-intermediate (V-2) and clause-final position (V-final). Let us consider some examples⁸:

(17) *V2*(i) *OE*

Her Herebriht aldormon wæs ofslægen

here Herebriht earl was slain

from hædnum monnum

by heathen people

“This year earl Hereberth was slain by the heathen” (ASC 838)

(ii) *EME*

Hit is iwriten ðurh ðe prophete (V)

(iii) *LME*

Cresus was lad to the fyer to ben breed (CHB)

The COP-2 order became dominant and later on exclusive in DECL clauses, as is shown in the following table:

	% OE	% LME
V2 (COP/PP2)	43.7	72.0
V2 (COP2)	92.4	98.7
V2 (PP2)	7.6	1.2
PP2 in independent clauses	54.1	44.4
PP2 in dependent clauses	45.9	55.5
V2-V final	47.3	15.4
COP2-PP final	100	100
PP2-COP final	0	0

Table 4: V2 functional patterns in OE and LME passives.

It is important to take into account that Table 4 also includes clause operators different from DECL and dependent clauses. As for these, the drift towards V2 in dependent clauses took place later. Both V(COP)2 and V-final coexist throughout the three periods, though. This point is illustrated by example (18):

(18) *V2 in dependent clauses*(i) *EME*

... in ane cite ðat was icleped Cane (KS)

(ii) *LME*

... ðæt beon ichosen ðurh us and ðurh ðæt loandes folk on ure kuneriche (HP)

In spite of offering COP-PP pattern, (19) still reflects X-AUX-V, a stage earlier than AUX-V-X, the order displayed by (18.i) and (18.ii):

(19) *OE*

... ðe ær wæs forslægen
 ...who before had been killed
 "... who had been killed before" (ASC 1014)

Dependent passive clauses must have adopted the V2 pattern later on, as was the case with their active counterparts. As a result, the clauses in (20), which combine COP---P2 and PP---P4, were not rare until the end of the EME period:

(20) *COP---P2/PP---P4*

- a. ðes king wes himseolf to wundre ituket (AW)
 b. Ich hit am ðat sum chearre wes ðurh wise Salomon ethalden (KS)
 c. ðus we beoð of Brutenne freonden biræued (AW)

As we have already remarked, instances of discontinuity were not restricted to dependent clauses, the reason being that the drift V(COP)F>V2 had not finished yet by the end of the EME period. Let us set two examples:

(21) *V-final in dependent clauses*(i) *OE*

... ær sio fierd gesamnod wære
 ... before his levies divided had been
 "... before his levies had been divided" (ASC 893)

(ii) *EME*

... ðe wes bold gebyld er ðu iboren were (AW)

In LME, on the contrary, the presence of COP in clause-final position is scarce, as is the case with PP---P4. The following table seeks to insist on this fact:

	% OE	% LME
Absolute order: V final	47.2	20
COP final	20.8	0.5
COP final in independent clauses	16.9	33.3
COP final in dependent clauses	83.1	66.6
PP final	79.2	99.5

Table 5: V final functional patterns in OE and LME passives.

It must be noted that the figures yielded by the corpus show PP---P3 as well as PP---P4, which is an order restricted to marked constructions. Unlike OE and ME passive clauses, the PP---P4 order of LME passive clauses cannot be put down to their dependent or independent character:

(22) *VF in LME*(i) *Independent clauses*

Balelles of wyn, by sixe or sevene He shulde soone delyvered be (WS34)

(ii) *Dependent clauses*

...how *ðei weron specially doon* (WS37)

It is PP that is most frequent in P4 in LME, as is illustrated by (22.ii). In LME, PP normally occurs in P3, which brings about the disappearance of passive discontinuity since the interverbal position is taken up by PP in a process parallel to the displacement of X to P4:

(23) *COP---P2/PP---P3 in LME*(i) *Independent clauses*

...and so God *schulde be moste loued* (WS3)

(ii) *Dependent clauses*

... as it is *ofte seyde*...(WS7)

The instances of PP---P2, which correlate with COP---P3, have been identified as heavily marked (Martín Arista 1994):

(24) *Ryght swich was sche whan sche flateryd the and desseyved the with unfulful Iykynges of fals welefulnesse* (CHB)

The nearer modern times we get the more marked constructions like (24) become, as is displayed by Table 6:

	% OE	% LME
V initial	5.1	4.3
COP initial	83.7	44.1
COP initial DECL	80.6	89.4
COP initial Neg	9.3	10.5
PP initial	6.2	55.8
COP initial-PP2	0	21
COP initial-PP final	48.6	0
PP initial-COP2	100	91.6

Table 6: V-initial functional patterns in OE and LME passives.

COP---P1 has also been identified as marked when occurring in clauses other than INT:

(25) *COP initial: marked*(i) *OE*

Wæs toðeald in foreweardum Danieles dagum was divided on the following day of St Daniel in tua bicscira West Seaxna lond into two bishoprics the West Saxon land "The West Saxon land was divided into two bishoprics on the following day of Saint Daniel's" (ASC 959)

(ii) *EME*

Nas nauere quene in ðis lond ido so muche scome (AW)

(iii) *LME*

Git ben ther thynges dwelled to the-ward that no man douteth that they ne be more derworthe to the than thyn so owene lif (CHB)

PP-initial has not been equated with markedness when associated with clause operators different from DEC:

(26) *PP---P1*

(i) *OE*

Iðonked wurðe him

thanked be he

“May he be thanked” (V)

(ii) *EME*

ðonked wurðe drihtene

(iii) *LME*

Blessyd be owre mesure, ðat Crist putteð in charyte (WS2)

From EME times onwards, however, an alternative pattern is found:

(27) Ure Louerd beo iðoncked

The following examples do not conform to the unmarked order, either:

(28)

a. God cwæð: Beon gegaderode ða wæteru

God said be joined the waters

“God said: may the waters join together” (V)

b. Be occupyed ellys as Crist was (WS4)

These examples provide further evidence of linguistic change as the ultimate result of the coexistence of several functional variants out of which only one is chosen once they have become equally functional. In fact, the situation was probably far less complex than the above casuistry might suggest: in the first place, COP left clause-final position to take up P2 in DECL clauses. This process had not finished by OE and EME times, especially in dependent clauses. COP began to occur in clause-initial position, movement which seems to be motivated by the two different forms triggered by clause operators DECL vs. INT. In the second place, PP was displaced towards P3, which was not any longer the unmarked position of FOC. The only exception were NEG clauses, in which NEG was fixed in P3, thus carrying FOCum. In OPT and IMP clauses PP remained in P1 until the end of the LME period, this position being the unmarked one for FOC. Finally, Ag, Man, Loc and Temp left P3 to change places with PP in a movement that bears a resemblance to the exbraciation of O in active clauses. The outcome of this change was the disappearance of discontinuous passives, which in the LME period were almost exclusively restricted to X-discontinuity.

2.4. NEG, MOD AND AUX

After revising the changes in the positions of COP, PP, Ag, Man, Loc and Temp in the linear order of passive clauses, we turn now to discussing very briefly the changes that the positions of NEG, MOD and AUX underwent. Let us start by seeing to MOD. The case with MOD is similar to AUX. Both MOD and AUX were finally attached to clause-second position. The rigidification of this order, however, cannot have taken place until COP was fixed in P2 since the tendency has always been for MOD and AUX to appear before COP in DECL clauses, before NEG in NEG clauses and before S in INT clauses:

(29) *MOD---P1/P2*

(i) *OE*

hwi sceal ic beon bedæled

why should I be deprived

ægðer minra sunena?

both of my sons?

“Why should I be deprived of my two sons?” (V)

(ii) *EME*

... ðe mei beon itemptet (AW)

(iii) *LME*

He wyll nogt ben aknowe ðie truthe (CHB)

Although this tendency was glaring as early as in OE times, it was ultimately dependent on the absolute position of COP and NEG, which was not always P2 and P3 respectively, as we have already remarked. Let us address the position of AUX now. We have just insisted on the similarity between AUX and MOD positions: both AUX and MOD tend to occur in P2 and push other constituents to further positions in clause linear structure:

(30) *AUX*

(i) *EME*

We have be comaunded to unnedeful ... doynge, and also to wythðawe us

(AW)

(ii) *LME*

Thow thiself art he to whom it hath be schewed and proved by ful many demonstracyons (CHB)

The presence of NEG brings about a displacement of COP towards the left, whereas a clause operator INT causes MOD to be pushed towards the right, as is shown in the following examples, where DECL and INT are compared:

(31) *DECL and INT AUX*

(i) *DECL clauses*

Thowe hast be sought in many londe with messengerys and with sonde (CHB)

(ii) *INT clauses*

Maystow evere have any comwolden han be hydd? (CHB)

The following example seeks to illustrate the effects on the linear order of the clause of the presence of MOD plus the presence of AUX:

(32) *AUX and MOD*

...that hath itand the precyous stones that wolden han be hydd? (CHB)

The fact that we find examples like the following one evidences that the absolute position of MOD and AUX was not completely fixed in LME times yet:

(33) Crist *ða* wollde fullhtwedd beon att Sannt Iohanness hande (WS12)

As we have pointed out above, the position of MOD and AUX was dependent on the position of other constituents of passive clauses, especially that of COP. Therefore, when COP is displaced to a marked position in the clause the resulting order is also different from the one expected for MOD or AUX. This is the case with the following instances of inversion, in which S takes up P2 thus pushing COP towards P3, the final order being one in which MOD does not precede COP:

(34)

- a. For *ðanne* schal Cristus baner be reryd (WS12)
 b. Ne shal the corn in his berne ben eten wid no muis (WS13)

The order of (34.b) is triggered by the presence of NEG in P1. NEG has rigidified in P3 regardless of the presence of MOD or AUX. NEG, therefore, has left pre-copulative position to occur in post-copulative position, a movement coherent with the general evolution from prefield to postfield in English.

(35) *NEG in the prefield*(i) *OE*

- a. ... *ðæt* hit bebyrged ne wurde
 ...that he buried not were
 "...that he were not buried" (EDM)

- b. ... *ðæt ðe* god ne mæg beon
 ... that the good not may be
wið ðæt yfel gemenged
 with the evil mixed
 "That good and evil may not be mixed" (AB)

(ii) *EME*

- a. Ne bið us geborgen (V)
 b. Nas nauere quene in *ðis* lond ido so muche scome (AW)

(iii) *LME*

- a. ... *ðat* ne it schal be schewed *ðanne* (WS17)
 b. Ne I wolde nat of hym corrected be (CHB)

Indeed, NEG occurs in the prefield up to the LME period. This is the case with dependent clauses in OE ((35.i.a) and (35.i.b)), OPT and IMP clauses in OE and EME (35.ii.a) and with clauses involving MOD/AUX in OE, EME and LME ((35.iii.a) and (35.iii.b)). In spite of the occurrence of these prefield constructions it is beyond a doubt that the tendency is for LME NEG to take up P3, as is illustrated below:

(36) *NEG in the postfield*

- a. ... *ðat* it may not be proued *ðat* it ys resonable to haue such a pope (WS27)
- b. The covetise of men, that mai nat be stawnched ... (CHB)
- c. *ðer* schal not be a ston laft on a ston *ðat* ne it schal be destroyed (WS20)

3. EXPLANATION: WHAT LIES BEHIND POSITIONAL SYNTAX

Summarizing the previous analysis (and the one carried out in Martín Arista 1994), the role played by focalised⁹ constituents in the evolution of the order of English passive clauses may be said to be the following: OE passive was discontinuous due to the survival of prefield restrictions that constrained Man, Loc, Time, Ag and, less frequently S-COMP and S, to interverbal position. Whenever these constituents were assigned a marked pragmatic function, they were displaced towards clause-initial or clause-final position; in LME passive discontinuity was not a grammatical structure any more, due to the disappearance of the very last relics of OV morphosyntax; it was a pragmatic organization in which constituents bearing marked pragmatic functions were set in interverbal position¹⁰. In line with this analysis, we pursue the matter further in this section, which is divided into two parts: 3.1 is on markedness shift in passive functional patterns and 3.2 deals with iconicity in the evolution of passive constituent order.

3.1. MARKEDNESS SHIFT: FROM MARKED TO UNMARKED

In this part we discuss whether or not an evolution from marked to unmarked¹¹ in passive constructions may be argued for. We use the term *marked* to refer to those constructions that are statistically less frequent because they involve a higher degree of structural complexity and/or they are iconically marked. Before going on, we should like to insist upon the idea that passive voice constructions are marked with respect to their active counterparts, on which there has been general agreement (thus Givón (1990:573)). Nevertheless, it is convenient to specify what *structural complexity* means. Our approach to structural complexity has been to accept the markedness of passives with respect to actives; what follows is that passive clauses having CLAUSE OP NEG, INT, IMP and OPT are not marked with respect to DECL clauses but with respect to their active counterparts.

It is a well known fact that binary structures are easier to code by speakers and to decode by addressees. This is particularly the case with those binary constructions that follow a narrative order. By *narrative order* we mean Participant-Event order; the order Event-Participant is therefore regarded as marked¹²:

(37)

- a. *ðei* schuldon wyll *ðat* it were destroyed (WS13)-*unmarked*
- b. *ðar* wear*ð* ofslægen Harold fagera, and Tostig eorl (ASC 1066)-*marked*
“Harold the fairhaired and earl Tostig were slain there”

Both in (37.a) and (37.b) we find a binary distribution LEFT-RIGHT. Given this distribution we say that (37.a) is unmarked because the Participant appears on the left

and the Event on the right; and that (37.b) is marked because the reverse order is displayed: the Event appears on the left and the Participant on the right. However, not all the clauses we have been dealing with show binary distribution. There are many cases of tertiary distribution. It must be noted that what we have called *binary distribution* correlates with P1-P2-P3 templates (if NEG, MOD or AUX are involved more positions are needed); consequently, tertiary distribution is the correlate of P1-P2-P3-P4 syntactic templates (the same consideration as before applies). This point is illustrated by the examples below:

- (38)
- a. He sceolde bion ofslægen (AB)
“He should be killed”
 - b. ... ðæt hi ne magon weorðan togædere gemended (AB)
“...that they may not be gathered together”
 - c. ... ðæt ðe god ne mæg beon wið ðæt yfel gemenged (AB)
“...that the evil and the good must not be mixed”

Given Event and two Participants in a setting LEFT-CENTER-RIGHT we have identified as unmarked the symmetrical distribution Participant-Event-Participant, Participant-Participant-Event and Event-Participant-Participant being marked:

- (39)
- a. *ðe secownde cause* was to be helud of *Crist* (WS14)-unmarked
 - b. Her *Herebriht aldormon* wæs ofslægen from *hædnum monnum* (ASC 838)-marked

When the Circumstances in which the Event takes place are explicit in the clause, these follow the Event in the unmarked order:

- (40)
- a. *Monye myraclis* weron byfallen *abowte ðe byrðe of ðs Iohn* (WS51)-unmarked
 - b. *Betwux ðam* wearð ofslagen *Eadwine his eam* (OSW)-marked
“Meanwhile, his uncle Edwin was slain”

As is illustrated in (40.b), patterns like Circumstances-Participant-Event (or Participant-Circumstances-Event or Event-Circumstances-Participant, etc) are marked¹³. So far, we have been setting OE examples for markedness and LME examples for unmarkedness. We have done so for the sake of the argument but the situation was not so uniform. Although the evolution from marked to unmarked in the terms that we have proposed here seems to have taken place, we do find marked instances in the LME corpus:

- (41)
- a. Som man is wel and selyly ymaried (CHB)
 - b. They were of no creature perceiued (CHB)
 - c. ðus was Steuene martirud (WS40)

Indeed, (41.a) follows a pattern Participant-Circumstances-Event, (41.b) Participant-Participant-Event and (41.c) Circumstances-Participant-Event. Special mention should be made here of instances like the following, which we have described as unmarked for lack of another linguistic expression onto which the same underlying linguistic expression is unfolded:

(42) Blessyd be pore men in spirygt (WS11)

The same goes for clauses with clause operator INT and IMP; NEG clauses pose no problem since NEG can be included within the verbal complex, thus regarded in this approach as a part of the Event. Moreover, we come across constructions that were statistically marked in our OE corpus but that are unmarked according to the criteria we have just proposed:

(43)

- a. Wilfrið biscop wæs adripen of his bisc dome from Ecgeferðe cyninge (ASC 678)
“Bishop Wilfred was driven out of his Bishopric by king Egheferth”
- b. Seo stow is gehaten Heofonfeld on Englisc (OSW)
“This place is called Heavenfield in English”

Other instances, on the other hand, are marked according to the criteria we have just proposed, although they are statistically unmarked in the OE corpus:

(44)

- a. ðær wearð se cyning Bagsecg ofslægen (ASC 871)
“King Bagsecg was slain there”
- b. Her wæs Cantwarabyrig gewunnan (ASC 959)
“It is called Canterbury”

As a result, two conclusions may be drawn: firstly, the criteria for markedness, which we have taken to be the position of the constituents that are assigned TOP and FOC, must have changed from the OE to the LME period. This conclusion reinforces our remark (Martín Arista 1994) that the FOCum position shifted from P3 in OE to P4 in LME (in P1-P4 syntactic templates). Secondly, this shift is coherent with the evolution of markedness which is generally accepted: marked>unmarked>grammaticalized. FOC in P4, for instance, was marked in OE, unmarked in LME and almost-grammaticalized (in line with Halliday (1985) and Cruttenden (1986)) in Present-Day English; as regards TOP in P1, just to set another example, it was unmarked in OE and LME and grammaticalized, if the condition is met that TOP=S, in Present-Day English (in line with Dik 1989:349).

3.2. ICONICITY: FROM NON-ICONIC TO ICONIC

In order to offer an account of markedness shift not only in quantitative but also in qualitative terms, it seems necessary to resort to the concept *iconicity*, meaning by iconicity, in a broad sense, the extent to which linguistic syntactic codification reflects the organization of the non-linguistic events that are coded. More specifically,

we shall be using the term *iconicity* in the sense of isomorphism between code and coded and *structural isomorphism* with the meaning of iconic motivation code-code. Consequently, we shall describe iconic order in terms of iconic motivation and proximity resulting in iconic peaks¹⁴.

In the previous section we have identified as unmarked the following order:

(45)
PARTICIPANT1-EVENT-(PARTICIPANT2)-(CIRCUMSTANCES)

This order constitutes a peak of iconicity given the multiple choice involved, its indetermination and its localistic representation and is iconically motivated because its codification is maximally isomorphic to experience. It also follows the Proximity Principle (Givón 1985:195) because concepts which are semantically close like PARTICIPANT 1-EVENT, EVENT-PARTICIPANT 2 or EVENT-CIRCUMSTANCE are syntactically adjacent to each other. Other syntactic arrangements such as PARTICIPANT 1-PARTICIPANT 2 or PARTICIPANT 1-CIRCUMSTANCE have not been found to be iconically motivated. The syntactic justification for these iconic and non-iconic arrangements is the fact that while the predicate is able to organize the whole predication, this is not possible for other categories such as nouns or adverbs. Given these premises, we may state that the drift from marked to unmarked that we have identified at the pragmatic level correlates with another drift from non-iconic to iconic at a cognitive level. This would offer a better explanation of several phenomena:

(i) linguistic expressions that, being pragmatically and iconically marked in OE or ME, have become pragmatically and iconically unmarked:

(46)
LME: They were of no creature perceived (CHB)
ModE: They were seen by nobody (They were not seen)

As is shown in (46), the LME example is iconically marked due to the order PARTICIPANT 1-PARTICIPANT 2-EVENT and pragmatically marked as a result of TOPum---P1 and FOCm---P3 assignment. The ModE equivalent, on the contrary, is iconically (PARTICIPANT 1-EVENT-PARTICIPANT 2) and pragmatically (TOP---P1 and FOCum---P4) unmarked.

(ii) Linguistic expressions that, being pragmatically and iconically marked in OE or in ME, have remained pragmatically marked and have become iconically unmarked in modern times:

(47)
OE: Betwux ðam wearð ofslagen Eadwine his eam (OSW)
ModE: His uncle Edwin was slain in the meanwhile.

The OE version is pragmatically marked due to TOPm---P4 and FOCum---P3 assignment and iconically marked as a result of CIRCUMSTANCE-EVENT-PARTICIPANT order. Its contemporary equivalent, on the contrary, is pragmatically marked

by means of TOP---P1 and FOCm---P3 assignment and iconically unmarked due to the order PARTICIPANT-EVENT-CIRCUMSTANCE.

(iii) Linguistic expressions that, being pragmatically and iconically marked in OE or in ME, have become pragmatically unmarked and have remained iconically marked in modern times:

(48)

OE: *ðar wearð ofslægen Harold fagera, and Tostig eorl* (ASC 1066)

ModE: This year Harold the fairhaired and earl Tostig were slain.

Indeed, the OE version of the expression in (48) is pragmatically marked due to TOPum---P1 and FOCm---P4 assignment and iconically marked as a result of CIRCUMSTANCE-EVENT-PARTICIPANT order. It has remained iconically marked (CIRCUMSTANCE-PARTICIPANT-EVENT) and has become pragmatically unmarked given TOP---P1 and FOCum---P4 assignment.

(iv) Linguistic expressions that, being pragmatically and iconically marked in OE or ME have remained pragmatically and iconically marked:

(49)

LME: *ðus was Steuene martirud* (WS40)

ModE: Thus Stephen was martyred.

The LME counterpart of the linguistic expression in (49) is pragmatically marked by means of TOPm---P3 and FOCum---P4 and iconically marked as a result of the order CIRCUMSTANCE-EVENT-PARTICIPANT; in ModE we also find a marked pragmatic function assignment TOP---P2 and FOCum---P4 and a marked iconic ordering CIRCUMSTANCE-PARTICIPANT-EVENT.

(v) Linguistic expressions that were pragmatically marked and iconically unmarked in OE and have remained iconically unmarked but have become pragmatically unmarked:

(50)

OE: *Herebriht aldormon wæs ofslægen from hædnum monnum* (ASC 838)

ModE: Earl Herebrith was slain by the Heathen.

As is displayed above, (50) is pragmatically marked by TOPum---P1 and FOCm---P4 assignment in OE whereas its contemporary equivalent qualifies as iconically (PARTICIPANT-EVENT-PARTICIPANT) and pragmatically (TOPum---P1 and FOCum---P5) unmarked. We do not seek to exhaust this topic by analyzing all the possibilities of correspondence between OE/ME and modern times. Therefore, we shall restrict ourselves to arriving at two conclusions: (i) it seems more sensible to speak of a tendency towards iconicity rather than of a rule moving constituents towards an iconic order given that some evidence may be put forward of evolution in a counter-iconic way. (ii) After combining iconicity and (pragmatic function assignment) markedness it is beyond a doubt that a better explanation can be advanced for

examples like the following if the relationship between cognition and linguistic codification is taken into account:

(51) Blessyd be pore men in spirygt (WS11)

In line with the comments we have made above, (51) is an instance of counter-ionic ordering that correlates with unmarked pragmatic order given the CLAUSE OP OPT.

5. SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

We expect that, for the time being, it will have been demonstrated that the evolution of passive clause functional templates can be regarded as a part of a far larger process involving the drift from prefixed to postfixed constructions. Summarizing, we have argued for an evolution that consists of the following stages:

(52)
 Stage 0: SXV
 Stage 1: S-X-PP-COP
 Stage 2: S-COP-X-PP
 Stage 3: S-COP-PP-X

The change from one stage into another involves a number of qualitative changes that are summarized below:

(53)
 (i) continuous/discontinuous passive > continuous passive
 (ii) COP-PP/PP-COP order > COP-PP order
 (iii) COP---P1/P2/P4 > COP---P2
 (iv) PP---P1/P2/P4 > PP---P3
 (v) NEG---P1/P2/P3 > NEG---P3
 (vi) MOD/AUX---P1/P2 > MOD/AUX---P2
 (vii) Ag/Man/Loc/Temp---P3/P4 > Ag/Man/Loc/Temp--P4

Given these changes, a systematic description of the evolution of the passive order up to 1500 including cognitive, phonological, semantic, syntactic and pragmatic levels may be drawn as follows:

(54)

(i) <i>Stage 2</i>				
PARTICIPANT	EVENT	CIRCUMSTANCES	EVENT	
		PITCH ACCENT		
Goal		Agent, Manner, Locative, Time, etc		
S	COP	X	PP	
TOP		FOC		

(ii) Stage 3		
PARTICIPANT	EVENT	CIRCUMSTANCES PITCH ACCENT
Goal		Agent, Manner, Locative, Time, etc
S	COP-PP	
TOP		FOC

Finally, the change from Stage 2 to Stage 3 must have taken place through OE and EME passive clauses involving P1-P2-P3 templates in which PP is assigned FOCum in P3. Other sources of the evolution, such as NEG clauses (with FOCum on NEG), in which prominent X constituents take up postverbal position; or constituents bearing FOCum in clause-final position will have to be tested against cross-linguistic evidence in future research (Martín Arista, in preparation); typological evidence may also help us elucidate whether or not discontinuous periphrastic passives are not only a feature of SOV morpho-syntax but also a phenomenon that favours the evolution in the postfield direction.

Notes

1. I should like to thank Prof. Carmen Olivares, Prof. Juan de la Cruz, Prof. Santiago Fernández-González Corugedo and Dr. María Pilar Navarro for their patient and devoted comments on an earlier version of the research that is reported here. It goes without saying that the responsibility for any errors or misconceptions remains entirely mine.
2. We draw on Lightfoot (1979:239ff) and Lehmann (1974:383ff). There seems to be another change that the English passive has undergone. According to Aaronson (1977:201ff), the English passive is evolving away from the nominative construction in the direction of the active construction. In this view, OE was a nominative language because OE verbs were classified with respect to transitivity/intransitivity, the agent of a transitive verb and the subject of an intransitive verb received the same treatment and there was no classificatory system of nouns on the grounds of natural class. Nowadays we find, according to Aaronson, absence of the opposition transitive/intransitive in the verb, identical treatment of the agent and the patient of transitive constructions, classification of verbs as active or stative, lack of distinction between direct and indirect objects and a classificatory system of nouns according to natural class.
3. As for linguistic change, we follow the concept of *functional explanation* in the diachronic axis set up in Dik (1986:11ff). We also adhere to Bossuyt's (1986:129) and Romaine (1981:285ff) critiques of the Transparency Principle (see Lightfoot 1979 and 1989; the concept *therapy* is discussed in Pulgram (1988:95ff)). The typological insights have been derived from Croft (1990:204ff) and Kefer (1986:53ff), who have explored the extent to which language universals, linguistic changes and language-specific rules are functionally motivated. We have also followed Bossuyt's (1986) model of change, which stands as a comprehensive theory of linguistic change that is coherent with the philosophical underpinnings of a functional paradigm and goes beyond the restricted framework offered by Lightfoot's Transparency Principle. It should be noted, however, that the weakest points of Bossuyt's model are the lack of inclusion of typological data and the formalization of the processes of change. As we have suggested in Martín Arista (1992, 1993 and 1994), the data obtained in cross-linguistic comparison and diachronic typology ultimately determine the variants that are acceptable for the system, out of all the possible variants which the Principle of Functionality accounts for.

4. The following abbreviations are used in this paper: PIE (Proto-Indo-European), IE (Indo-European), OE (Old English), ME (Middle English), EME (Early-Middle English), LME (Late-Middle English), ModE (Modern English), FG (functional grammar) S (subject), V (verb), O (object), TOP (topic), FOC (focus), m (marked), um (unmarked), PX (clause position number X), DD (discontinuity degree), COP (copulative verb), PP (past participle), NEG (negative particle), AUX (auxiliary), MOD (modal auxiliary), DECL (declarative), INT (interrogative), IMP (imperative), OPT (optative), Ag (agent), Man (manner), Loc (place) and Temp (time).
5. This is the case with the treatment of syntactic templates, which have a fixed number of clause positions. Such fixed number of clause positions might demand a transformation whenever a position is empty: P1-P2-Ø-P4>P1-P2-P3-Ø>P1-P2-P3. Therefore, we have preferred a variable number of template positions.
6. In line with Dezsó (1978:7ff), who has defined the change SOV-SVO as a change from preverbal sentence stressing to post-verbal one: according to this view, the pitch accent is on V in SOV languages. SVO languages may also stress V, but this is a relic of an earlier stage of the SOV type. It follows that the FOCum position is P3 (for empirical evidence, see Martín Arista 1994).
7. The corpus includes examples extracted: (i) OE (up to 1100): from *The Anglo-Saxon Chronicle*, years 409, 495, 501, 675, 678, 731, 741, 755, 785, 823, 838, 871, 892, 893, 894, 895, 896, 924, 937, 959, 963, 1014, 1030, 1066, 1075, 1084, 1086, 1087, 1093, 1103, 1117, 1119, 1124 and 1137 (Macintosh file by Dr. Santiago González-Corugedo, Universidad de La Coruña) (quoted as ASC); from *The Vespasian Psalter Gloss* (1 & 2) (in Burnley 1992:7-11) (quoted as VPG I-II); from *Bede's Account of Poet Caedmon* (in Burnley 1992:27-35) (quoted as BC); from *St. Oswald, King and Martyr* (in Needham 1966:27-41) (quoted as OSW); from *St. Edmund, King and Martyr* (in Needham 1966:43-69) (quoted as EDM); from *The West-Saxon Bible* (WSB1, WSB6, WSB11, WSB12, WSB13) (in Navarro et al. 1991:96-100) (quoted as WSB); from *Ælfric's De Temporibus Anni* (in Burnley 1992:44-47) (quoted as DTA); from *Ælfric's Homilies* (in Burnley 1992:38-41) (quoted as AH); from *Alfred's Preface to Pastoral Care* (in Burnley 1992:20-25) (quoted as PPC); from *King Alfred's Pastoral Care* (in Brown 1970:54-58) (quoted as PC); from King Alfred's translation of Boetius' *De Consolatione Philosophiae* (in Navarro et al. 1991:79-95) (quoted as AB); from Visser (1984:2091ff) (quoted as V); (ii) EME (1100-1300): from Visser (1984:21091ff) (quoted as V); from *Vices and Virtues* (in Burnley 1992:89-96) (quoted as V&V); from *Ancrene Wisse* (Macintosh file by Dr. González-Corugedo) (quoted as AW); from *The Kentish Sermons* (in Burnley 1992:107-111) (quoted as KS); from *A Proclamation of Henry III* (in Burnley 1992:113-117) (quoted as HP); from *King Alisaunder* (in Burnley 1992:125-129) (quoted as KA); (iii) LME (1300-1500) from Chaucer's translation of Boetius' *De Consolatione Philosophiae*, Book II (in Navarro et al. 1991:101-126) (quoted as CHB); From *The Wyclifite Sermons* (1-70) (Macintosh file by Dr. González-Corugedo) (quoted as WS); from Visser (1984:2165-2188) (quoted as V). The 2,400 passive clauses are distributed in this fashion: OE (1000 examples), EME (400 examples) and LME (1000 examples).
8. Along with the different possibilities of ordering on which we comment here, other orderings did occur with different degrees of markedness (Martín Arista 1994).
9. We consider unmarked those focalised constituents that are signalled by intonation contour alone and marked focalised constituents those that are signalled by the intonation contour of the clause plus a special position in the linear order of the clause. Pragmatic function markedness is thus defined in terms of clause position of the constituent to which a given function is assigned. This treatment is eclectic in the sense that it is coherent with the proposals by Halliday (1985), Cruttenden (1986), Dik (1989) and Bossong (1989). We have followed Bossong as regards the existence of a markedness hierarchy but not as regards partial marking as a result of TOPm. Another proposal on which we have drawn is made in Bolkestein (1987). According to Bolkestein (1987:167)

there is no incompatibility for clauses between offering focal information and being expressed hypotactically. We also follow Bolkestein (1985:1ff) as regards the theoretical justification for a clausal treatment of TOP and FOC, although we do not deny the existence of the TOP continuum advanced by Givón (1983) and followed, to some extent, by Dik (1989:263ff). A similar treatment is offered by Mackenzie and Hannay (1982:43ff) and Siewierska (1987:147ff).

10. Passive discontinuity, which is a very restricted device nowadays might have started to lose its informative relevance since the pragmatic status of the constituents in interverbal position decreased as a result of grammaticalization. Nowadays native speakers are increasingly displacing informatively relevant constituents to clause-initial and clause-final position much in the same way as in OE.
11. Although the explanation we put forward here is somehow different, we are not unaware that we have drawn on Dik's general principles of constituent order (1989:337). More precisely, the following principles are relevant to this discussion: The Principle of Iconic Ordering, The Principle of Centripetal Orientation and The Principle of Domain Integrity. Dik's principles come in the wake of Hopper and Hopper and Thomson, who have advanced another explanation for the drift SOV-SVO in English. Since Ag, Go and V are the three compulsory participants in transitive events, transitivity can be prototypically presented as follows: transitive clauses correlate with foregrounding of the information and intransitive clauses correlate with backgrounding of the information (Hopper and Thomson 1980:251ff). Hopper (1979) has related VS and OV order to foregrounding and SV and VO backgrounding in OE and has defined V as peripheral in foregrounded clauses.
12. Gunkel et al. (1988:285ff) consider the following constructions iconically marked: Pred-S (vs. S-Pred), raising (vs. non-raising) and clauses in non-temporal order (vs. clauses in temporal order)
13. As Dik (1989:431) has hinted, this is not the case with expressions in which two different events and their participants are referred to i.e. in utterances involving dependent clauses.
14. As Haiman (1985:73ff) has remarked, isomorphism is based on the hypothesis that one form corresponds to one meaning and iconic motivation is defined as the parallelism between the relations among parts in linguistic structure and relations between parts of what is signified. Haiman's restricted view of isomorphism and motivation has been criticised by Croft (1990:165ff), who has focused on structural isomorphism – as a form of iconic motivation – by stating that linguistic distance between constituents implies conceptual distance between the concepts signified by those constituents; in other words: the structure of the complex utterance reflects the structure of the complex concept. Östman (1989:158), on the other hand, uses the term *iconicity* in the sense of iconic motivation rather than in the sense of isomorphism. A rather different view is held by Seiler (1989:171), who has defined iconicity as the mode of direct representation operating on the basis of relational similarity: peaks of iconicity are marked by the convergence of multiple choice, indetermination and localistic representation. Givón (1985:189ff) has accounted for the motivation for iconic representation by formulating the The Iconicity Metaprinciple and has considered not only isomorphism between code and coded but also between forms, strategies and correlates of the code.

References

- Aronson, H.I. "English as an Active Language." *Lingua* 41 (1977): 201-216.
 Bean, M. *The Development of Word Order Patterns in Old English*. London: Croom Helm, 1983.

- Bolkestein, A.M. "Discourse Functions of Predications: The Background/Foreground Distinction of Tense and Voice in Latin Main and Subordinate Clauses." Eds. Nuyts and Schutter. 163-178.
- Bosson, G. "Morphemic Marking of Topic and Focus." *Belgian Journal of Linguistics* 4 (1989): 27-51.
- Bossuyt, A. "Functional Requirements. Causes or Constraints upon Language Change?" *Belgian Journal of Linguistics* 1 (1986): 127-147.
- Brown, W.H. *A Syntax of King Alfred's Pastoral Care*. The Hague: Mouton, 1970.
- Burnley, D. *The History of the English Language*. London: Longman, 1992.
- Connolly, J.H. *Constituent Order in Functional Grammar: Synchronic and Diachronic Perspectives*. Berlin: Foris, 1991.
- Conte, M. et al. eds. *Wortstellung und Bedeutung*. Tübingen: Niemeyer, 1978.
- Croft, W. *Typology and Universals*. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1990.
- Cruttenden, D. *Intonation*. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1986.
- Dezso, L. "Towards Typology of Theme and Rheme: SOV Languages." Eds. Conte et al. 1978. 3-11.
- Diehl, L. "Space Case: Some Principles and Their Implication Concerning Linear Order in Natural Language." *North Dakota Work Papers* 19 (1975): 93-150.
- Dik, S.C. "On the Notion Functional Explanation." *Belgian Journal of Linguistics* 1 (1986): 11-52.
- "Copula Auxiliarization: How and Why?" Eds. Harris and Ramat. 1987. 54-84.
- *The Theory of Functional Grammar. Part I: The Structure of the Clause*. Dordrecht: Foris, 1989.
- Foster, J.F. and C.A. Hofling. "Word Order, Case, and Agreement." *Linguistics* 25 (1987): 475-499.
- Garber, A. "Word Order Change and the Senufo Languages." *Studies in the Linguistic Sciences* 10 (1980): 45-55.
- Givón, T. "Iconicity, Isomorphism and Non-arbitrary Coding in Syntax." Ed. Haiman. 1985. 188-219.
- *Syntax: A Functional-Typological Introduction* (2 vols.). Amsterdam: Benjamins, 1990 [1984].
- Givón, T., ed. *Discourse and Syntax*. New York: Academic Press, 1979.
- *Topic Continuity in Discourse*. Amsterdam: Benjamins, 1983.
- Gundel, J.K. et al. "On the Functions of Marked and Unmarked Terms." Eds. Hammond et al. 285-301.
- Haiman, J., ed. *Iconicity in Syntax*. Amsterdam: Benjamins, 1985.
- Halliday, M.A.K. *An Introduction to Functional Grammar*. London & New York: Edward Arnold, 1985.
- Hammond, M. et al. eds. *Studies in Syntactic Typology*. Amsterdam and Philadelphia: John Benjamins, 1988.
- Harris, M. and P. Ramat eds. *Historical Development of Auxiliaries*. Berlin: Mouton, 1987.
- Hawkins, J.A. *A Comparative Typology of English and German*. Austin: University of Texas Press, 1986.
- Hock, H.H. "Aux-cliticization as a Motivation of Word Order Change." *Studies in the Linguistic Sciences* 12 (1982): 91-101.
- Hopper, P. "Aspect and Foregrounding in Discourse." Ed. Givón. 1979. 213-141.

- Hopper, P. and S. Thompson. "Transitivity in Grammar and Discourse." *Language* 56 (1980): 251-299.
- Kefer, M. "On Functional Explanations of Language Change, Universals and Rules." *Belgian Journal of Linguistics* 1 (1986): 53-66.
- Lehmann, W.P. *Proto-Indo-European Syntax*. Austin: U of Texas P, 1974.
- "English, a Characteristic SVO Language." Ed. Lehmann. 169-222.
- Lehmann, W.P. Ed. *Syntactic Typology*. Sussex: The Harvester Press, 1978.
- Li, Ch. Ed. *Word Order and Word Order Change*. Austin: U of Texas P, 1975.
- *Mechanisms of Syntactic Change*. Austin: U of Texas P, 1977.
- Lightfoot, D.W. *Principles of Diachronic Syntax*. London: Cambridge UP, 1979.
- "Syntactic Change." Ed. Newmeyer. 303-323.
- Mackenzie, J.L. and M. Hannay. "Prepositional Predicates and Focus Constructions in a Functional Grammar of English." *Lingua* 56 (1982): 43-57.
- Martin Arista, J. "How to Provide Functional Grammar with Typological-Diachronic Adequacy." *Miscelánea* 13 (1992): 85-102.
- "Is There Room for Communicative Efficiency in Functional Grammar?" *Studium* 9 (1993): 177-189.
- *SVO and Passive Order in English: Synchronic, Diachronic and Typological Perspectives*. Zaragoza: Servicio de Publicaciones de la Universidad de Zaragoza, 1994.
- "English Functional Patterns at the Typological Crossroads" (to appear in *Studium* 10). (In preparation)
- Miller, G. "Indo-European: VSO, SOV, SVO or all three?" *Lingua* 37 (1975): 31-52.
- Navarro, M.P. et al. *Setting Up a Presence-and-Permanence Glossary of Native and Non-Native Terms in Medieval English I*. Zaragoza: Servicio de Publicaciones de la Universidad de Zaragoza, 1991.
- Needham, G.I. *Ælfric Lives of Three English Saints*. London: Methuen, 1966.
- Newmeyer, F.J., ed. *Linguistics: The Cambridge Survey*. (4 vols.) Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1989.
- Nuyts, J. and G. de Schutter, eds. *Getting One's Words into Line*. Dordrecht: Foris, 1987.
- Nyman, M. "Is the Paradigm Economy Principle Relevant?" *Journal of Linguistics* 23 (1987): 251-267.
- Östman, J. "Testing Iconicity." *Belgian Journal of Linguistics* 4 (1989): 145-163.
- Pulgram, E. "Diachony and Therapy." Eds. Albrecht et al. 1988: 95-103.
- Romaine, S. "The Transparency Principle. What It Is and Why It Doesn't Work." *Lingua* 55 (1981): 277-300.
- Seiler, H. "Iconicity in Functional Perspective," *Belgian Journal of Linguistics* 4 (1989): 165-172.
- Siewierska, A. "Post-verbal Subject Pronouns in Polish in the Light of Topic Continuity and the Topic/Focus Distinction." Eds. Nuyts and Schutter. 147-162.
- Steele, S. "On Some Factors That Affect and Effect Word Order." Ed. Li. 1975. 197-268.
- "Clisis and Diachrony." Ed. Li. 1977. 539-579.
- Stockwell, R.P. "Motivations for Exbraciation in Old English." Ed. Li 1977. 291-314.
- Strang, B. *A History of English*. London: Methuen, 1970.