



THE ROLE OF VN IN FUNCTIONAL SYNTAX: SOME OE PATTERNS¹

JAVIER MARTÍN ARISTA
UNIVERSIDAD DE LA RIOJA

0. INTRODUCTION

This paper discusses the role that should be played in a functional syntax by functional patterns that include V in a position N of the linear order of the clause.² We adopt the theoretical framework of Functional Grammar (henceforth FG) as devised by Dik (1978, 1989). More precisely, we make use of the typology of pragmatic functions advanced by Dik et al. (1981: 41ff), de Jong (1981: 89ff) and Dik (1989: 268ff); we also draw on the model of syntactic template and constituent order rule put forward by Connolly (1991). As we shall see, it is possible to take one more step than Connolly, since he does not deal with syntactic discontinuity or duplicated constituents.

In the methodological dimension, we have opted for OE in order to explore these phenomena, since it exhibits a range of constructions in which exbraciated constituents show up wider than that of P-D (Present-Day) English; moreover, we have concentrated on passive constructions because they are *older* than their active counterparts, that is, they allow for intraverbal constituents more frequently than active constructions do. Our qualitative dis-

cussion and conclusions are based on a previous quantitative study of a linguistic corpus,³ much in the way Givón (1984/1990, 1995) does.⁴

This paper is organized as follows: firstly, we discuss the descriptive and explanatory inadequacy of the V2 rule; secondly, we address the question of relative constituent ordering; thirdly, we tackle the problems posed by absolute constituent ordering; finally, we offer some concluding remarks.

1. THE INADEQUACY OF THE V2 RULE

This section deals with the inadequacy of the V2 Rule both from a descriptive and from an explanatory point of view. We resort to the data from several corpora—including ours—to prove the V2 Rule descriptively inadequate; and to a comparison between a pragmatic explanation and a syntactic explanation of an example from our corpus to prove the V2 Rule explanatorily inadequate.

In a formal syntax the VO character of OE clauses follows from the V2 Rule, which moves Vf from its base clause-final position to second position in the clause.⁵ As a result, objects and complements follow the finite verb and precede the non-finite verb. OV variants with pronoun objects are accounted for as variants of the VO order.⁶ Fischer (1992) has stated that the V2 Rule was a productive device throughout the OE period. Koopman (1992) has argued for an OV rather than a VO order. Although Koopman's data are not available, he insists on the high number of exceptions to the V2 Rule, as shown in Table 1⁷:

	Year	Text	V2 %
Brown	1970	PC	16%
Smith	1971	ASC	45%
Stockwell	1977	ASC	69%
Bean	1983	ASC	50%
Martín Arista	1997	ASC <i>et al.</i>	42%

Table 1: Percentage of V2 clauses according to the figures offered by five corpora.

Although there are some divergencies due to the fact that different corpora (based on different texts) are compared, it seems beyond all doubt that

many OE constructions cannot be accounted for by the V2 Rule: even the most *optimistic* figures show up to 31% of exceptions to this rule. Furthermore, the explanatory character of this rule is also questionable. Let us discuss this character in the light of the following example:

- (1) Her wæs Cnut gecoran to kynge
 here was Cnut crowned king

"In this year was Cnut crowned" (ASC 1014)⁸

Given the linguistic expression in (1), the positions of the finite verb (Vf) and the non-finite verb (Vn) are determined by the V2 rule in the following way:

- (2) Vf--->P2
 Vn--->P4 or P5

However, if no further condition is specified apart from the V2 constraint, the following placements, which do keep to this constraint, are also possible. Since they are theoretical reconstructions, they have been marked with an asterisk.

- (3) a. *Cnut wæs her gecoran to kynge
 b. *To kynge wæs Cnut gecoran her
 c. *To kynge wæs her gecoran Cnut
 d. *Cnut wæs her to kynge gecoran
 e. *Her wæs Cnut to kynge gecoran

At least, these five linear orders follow the V2 Rule. As a matter of fact, (3.d) and (3.e) are the linguistic expressions that most strictly follow the V2 Rule: the complements follow Vf and precede Vn. The presence X in clause-initial position (P1) may explain the existence of an inter-verbal S since X takes up P1 and pushes S towards P3. Nevertheless, the constituent order displayed in (3)—to the exclusion of that in (3.e)—should be justified; in other words, the question is: why does X undergo exbraciation to occupy clause-final position? The presence of X in clause-final position is not the result of the application of the V2 rule which, in fact, predicts the occurrence of X in interverbal position.

A similar problem is posed by the following example. The V2 Rule does not predict the exbraciated character of the linguistic expression in (4):

- (4) *ðar wearð ofslægen Harold fagera, and Tostig eorl*
 there were slain Harold Fairhaired, and Tostig earl

"There were slain Harold the Fairhaired and earl Tostig" (ASC 1066)

No formal constraint can be derived from the application of the V2 Rule that accounts for the occurrence of S in clause-final position in the linguistic expression in (4). So far we have pointed to the inadequacy of the V2 Rule when explaining clauses that *do conform* to this rule. Things are even worse when we come to explain clauses that lack V2 order, like the following:

- (5) a. *ða se halga wer wæs getogen*
 then the saint man was brought to an end
 "Then the saint man was slain" (V)
- b. *ða ðæt folc gewearð egesan geacloed*
 then the people were with fear terrified
 "Then the people were terrified with fear" (EDM)

In (5) we have intentionally chosen two clauses introduced by an adverbial to show that not even in these examples is the V2 Rule an explanatory principle of general validity: neither in (5.a) nor in (5.b) does Vf show up in P2, as we might expect, since the V2 Rule predicts the linearization of Vf in P2 and the displacement of S to P3, which is not the case with these linguistic expressions.

In the light of these considerations, it does not seem unreasonable to state that a functional syntax should not make its explanations dependable on the V2 Rule; on the theoretical side, in the remainder of this paper we shall try to improve the model of the functional pattern proposed by Dik (1978, 1989), which, in our opinion, is descriptively adequate but lacks explanatory adequacy.

We have suggested elsewhere (Martín Arista 1994a, 1994b), that the typology of syntactic functions put forward by Dik (1989) should be enlarged in the light of the proposals made in Dezsó (1978), Halliday (1985) and Downing and Locke (1992).⁹ In this view, the linear structure of the clause involves the matching of clausal constituents that bear semantic, syntactic and pragmatic functions with parts of the prosodic contour of the clause. As

is stated in Martín Arista (forthcoming), Old-English constituent order favours syntactic discontinuity, which evidences the relevant character in terms of information transmission of the interverbal position: this is the only functional explanation that can be proposed.¹⁰ This situation changes in more recent stages of the language: as is well known, ME and ModE are alike in showing sentence-stress and focus-bearing constituents in clause-final position. In this sense, OE is a period of great change, since the shift SOV-SVO is also finished up in passives, which, being *older*, we have chosen for this study.

A first study of the OE corpus reveals that P1 and P3 are the communicatively most relevant positions (the percentage of TOP and FOC occurrence in these positions may amount to 95% TOPum/FOCm¹¹ in P1 and TOPm/FOCum in P3). Therefore, we propose the following hypothesis: we shall speak of TOPm whenever this pragmatic function is assigned to a constituent that does not occupy clause-initial position. TOPum, then, is to be identified with clause-initial position. As regards FOC, its unmarked position (FOCum) is the inter-verbal position, clause-initial, second and final positions being marked ones (FOCm). To illustrate this point, we take, in the light of the evidence provided by the corpus, the most usual template of passive clauses in OE to be as follows¹²:

- (6) P1-P2-P3-P4

The placement rules that govern the insertion into this template may be sketched in the following way:

- (7) a. Given TOPum and FOCum: TOPum--->P1/FOCum--->P3
 b. Given TOPum and FOCm: TOPum--->P1/FOCm--->P4/P2
 c. Given TOPm and FOCum: TOPm--->P4/P2/FOCum--->P3
 d. Given TOPm and FOCm: TOPm--->P2/P3/P4/
 FOCm--->P1/P2/P4

At this point of the discussion, it seems advisable to compare this proposal with other hypotheses than can be found in previous research.

On the one hand, this proposal is coherent with the importance of the *pragmatic mode* in OE (Bossuyt 1985: 15ff; Tejada 1988: 83ff) and with the descriptions of OE constituent order made by Dik (1980: 153) and Bossuyt (1985: 27). As is well known, the order of OE constituents was freer than that of Modern English, which resulted in a higher number of *displaced* constituents due to pragmatic reasons. This evidence, then, suggests that, in a

functional syntax, explanations of a pragmatic character should be primary with respect to syntactic explanations of the kind *insert V into P2*. Moreover, one of the basic principles of FG is that pragmatic rules govern semantic rules, which restrict, in turn, the operation of syntactic rules. Furthermore, FG is constrained in the sense that no transformations are allowed and no explanation can be proposed in terms of a surface order determined by order-changing operations on its underlying order, such as the ones proposed by Malsch (1976: 28ff), Lightfoot (1977: 191ff) or Reddick (1982: 37ff), among others.¹³

Dik has stated that OE was a strong V2 language, that is, a language with basic¹⁴ P1VSO/PIXVSO order in which V is always in second position in the dominant unmarked order of actual sentences. P1 stands for a special pragmatic position to which TOP or FOC constituents are displaced. Bossuyt's description, which is complementary to Dik's, hints at the marked character of FOC when displaced to P1, as well as the unmarked character of TOP in initial position.

On the other hand, our explanation seems to contradict Bean (1983: 136) when she remarks that:

It could still be argued that OE was a verb-second language simply on the basis of the percentage of verb-second clauses. One could also still argue for a topic-verb language on the basis that SVX was a primary order with topical subjects, VSX with non-topical subjects and SXV with pronominal objects. However, I would like to argue that OE was neither verb-second nor topic-verb but rather that it was verb-third.

Nevertheless, further detailed discussion will show that there are several points of convergence with Bean: firstly, we do not state that OE was a Topic-Verb language; nor do we remark that OE passive constructions were Topic-first. What we argue for is a non-marked initial position of TOP in OE passive constructions. Secondly, although we do not think that the statement that OE was Verb-third is applicable to passive constructions, we do find several instances of Vf/Vn in P3. Nevertheless, we insist on their marked character. Finally, we do agree—although for different reasons—with Bean as regards the inadequacy of the V2 Rule, to which we have devoted this section.

2. VN IN RELATIVE ORDER

The evidence from the corpus suggests that a high percentage of OE passive clauses qualify as discontinuous (see Table 2). Passive continuity can be realized either as Vf-Vn or as Vn-Vf (this topic is dealt with below). We define *continuity* (or *adjacency*, in the terminology used by Connolly (1991: 7)) as the characteristic that shows the constituents, especially the verbal complex, which are not interrupted by other constituents or by elements belonging to other constituents. These examples of P-D English illustrate this definition:

- (8) a. The village *was completely destroyed* by the army
(McCawley 1987: 194).
b. Tom *serves more expensive liquors* than Dick
does to guests (McCawley 1987: 194).
c. *Everyone came who I invited* (Jacobson 1987: 62).

In examples (8.a), (8.b) and (8.c) the constituents in italics are interrupted by the adverbial, the second part of the discontinuous modifier and the verb respectively. These instances conspire against Dik's (1989: 343) Principle of Domain Integrity, which states that domains prefer not to be interrupted by constituents from other domains. It is necessary, however, to insist on the communicative rather than the structural effects of the phenomena of displacement. In other words, we must find a functional explanation for the fact that (8.a), (8.b) and (8.c) are preferred to their paraphrases in (9.a), (9.b) and (9.c), which do not show syntactic discontinuity:

- (9) a. The village was destroyed by the army completely.
b. Tom serves more expensive liquors to guests than Dick does.
c. Everyone who I invited came.

The functional explanation for these displacement phenomena we provide will be based on the special communicative value of the displaced constituents, which we shall explain in terms of pragmatic function assignment. Let us give an example:

- (10) Her Herebriht aldormon wæs ofslægen from hædnum monnum
here Herebriht earl was slain by heathen people

"In this year ealdorman Hereberth was slain by the heathen" (ASC 838)

- (16) Seo is Legaceaster gehaten
it is Chester called

"It is called Chester" (ASC 893)

From what we have said, it follows that S-COMP in final position is to be analysed as a case of FOCm assignment. This is the case with the example in (16).

As Table 2 displays, more than half of the constituents that enter the verbal complex in discontinuity 1 passives are adverbials. The following example of inter-verbal adverbial is worth commenting on since it shows, in our opinion, TOPm and FOCm:

- (17) ða hergas wæron ða gegaderode begen to Sceobyrygon
then the hosts were then concentrated at Shoebury

Eastseaxum
in Essex

"Then the hosts were concentrated at Shoebury in Essex" (ASC 893)

We favour the TOPm/FOCm explanation to the exclusion of an alternative explanation consisting of the existence of a double Topic construction (TOPum+TOPm, assigned to the adverbial of time) and FOCm assigned to the adverbial of place. Our point is that the explanation we have provided accounts more accurately for the marked character of the linguistic expression in (17) since the constituents that are central to the informative structure of the clause (*hergas* and *begen to Sceobyryg on Eastseaxum*) are assigned the pragmatic functions FOC and TOP.

Up to this point, we have been dealing with passive clauses that show Vf-Vn continuity or degree 1 discontinuity. Now we deal with clauses in which the Vf-Vn continuum is interrupted by more than one constituent. As Table 2 shows, most discontinuous passives qualify as discontinuity 1 constructions, the cases of discontinuity degree 2 and 3 being statistically marked. In (18) an example of discontinuity degree 2 is given. We account for the low frequency of appearance of these constructions in the corpus and, therefore, for their marked character, by resorting to the presence of TOPm and/or FOCm:

- (18) ða wæron hie mid metelieste gewægde
then were they by want of food reduced

"Then they were reduced by want of food" (ASC 893)

In (18) TOPm is assigned to S in P3 and FOCm is borne by the adverbial in P4.

The instances of degree of discontinuity 3 we find in our corpus are usually associated with the presence of a constituent which undergoes duplication, as is the case with:

- (19) Wæs he se mon in weorulhade geseted
was he this man in a lay condition restored

"He was restored to a lay condition" (V)

Clauses like (19), in which a combination of degree of discontinuity 3 and Vf initial is found, show an extremely low frequency of appearance in the corpus and, as a result, a highly marked character. Therefore, we describe this clause as having been assigned TOPm and FOCm to S and Vn respectively.

Relative order:			
<i>syntactic continuity</i>	<i>examples</i>	<i>total</i>	<i>%</i>
Syntactic continuity	432	720	60
Syntactic discontinuity	288	720	40
1st. degree discontinuity	166	288	57.6
Interverbal S	56	166	33.7
Interverbal adverbial	23	166	13.8
Other interverbal cons.	87	166	52.4
2nd. degree discontinuity	77	288	26.7
3rd. degree discontinuity	45	288	15.6

Table 2: Syntactic (dis)continuity in the corpus.

We go on to raise another problem concerning relative position in the clause, namely the relative order of Vf and Vn. As Table 3 shows, OE favours a relative order of Vf and Vn in which Vf precedes. Therefore, according to our data, orderings like (20.a) are preferred to others like (20.b):

- (20) a. Crist is magenum naman genemned
Christ is by many names called

"Christ is called many names"(V)

- b. ... ær sio fierd gesamnod wære
... before his levies divided had been

"... before his levies had been divided" (ASC 893)

The comparison with P-D English is straightforward: the Vn-Vf ordering is restricted to highly emphatic constructions like the following:

- (21) The boss ordered that he should be fired; and *fired* he was

Our point is that the degree of markedness of Vn-Vf constructions is lower in OE than in P-D English. Let us discuss an example in detail. In (22) we offer an instance of continuous passive presenting Vf-Vn order:

- (22) *Ædelwulf aldormon wearð ofslagen*
Ædelwulf earl was slain

"Earl *Ædelwulf* was slain" (ASC 871)

This example of constructions involving P1-P3 templates reinforces our remark that when P3 templates are involved, P3 is also considered the unmarked FOC position, P1 and P2 being the marked ones; otherwise we would be forced either to analyse *wearð* as FOCum (which does not bear up to closer examination because Vf is unlikely to carry relevant information) or to characterise *ofslagen* as FOCm (thus describing as marked a Vf-2/Vn-3 clause, which is not advisable on the grounds of the corpus—see Table 3). Let us give another example, this time one involving a P1-P4 template:

- (23) *Betwux ðam wearð ofslagen Eadwine his eam*
while that was slain Edwin his uncle

"Meanwhile his uncle Edwin was slain" (OSW)

As regards (23), we propose assigning TOPm to *Eadwine his eam* and FOCum to *ofslagen*. This explanation is preferable to another stating that TOPum is assigned to X, which falls short when it comes to accounting for the statistically marked character of S-final constructions.

The passive continuity/Vn-Vf combination also appears in the corpus. As Table 3 shows, there is no clear tendency as regards continuous passives showing Vf-Vn or Vn-Vf; both orderings qualify as having similar figures. Let us give an example of Vn-Vf ordering in a continuous passive construction:

- (24) *Se swiðe gewundad wæs*
he seriously wounded was

"He was severely wounded" (ASC 755)

By assigning FOCm to X we draw attention to the fact that this construction is marked, as the evidence extracted from the corpus suggests (see Table 3). The co-existing variant Vn-Vf of continuous passives does not show up in discontinuous passives, in which only the Vf-Vn relative order is found (see Table 3). Two examples of this phenomenon follow:

- (25) a. *hie wurdon ða gebrohte to ðæm biscope*
they were then taken to that bishop

"They were then taken to that bishop" (ASC 1014)

- b. *ða wurdon hi ofwundrode ðæs wulfes hydrædenne*
then were they amazed of the wolf's guardianship

"They were amazed at the wolf's guardianship" (EDM)

In our view, (25.b) is more marked than (25.a): as regards the latter, we have assigned FOCm to X (*to ðæm biscope*), TOP remaining unmarked, whereas in the case of the former we assign TOPm to S and FOCm to X (*ðæs wulfes hydrædenne*).

Relative order: Vf and Vn	examples	total	%
Vf-Vn	493	720	68.4
Vf-Vn: syntactic cont.	205	493	41.5
Vf-Vn: syntactic discont.	288	493	58.4
Vn-Vf	227	720	31.5
Vn-Vf: syntactic cont.	227	227	100
Vn-Vf: syntactic discont.	0	227	0

Table 3: Relative order of Vf and Vn in the corpus.

3. VN IN ABSOLUTE ORDER

In the previous section we dealt with relative order problems. In the remainder of the paper, we tackle absolute order problems, namely V-initial, V-2 and V-final clauses, as well as S-final clauses. In the first place, we address the question of the order of Vf/Vn-initial clauses.

According to the figures we have offered, only 5% of the clauses in the corpus qualify as V-initial clauses, either Vf-initial or Vn-initial (see Table 5). This percentage reflects, beyond a doubt, the marked status of V-initial clauses. Among these clauses, Vf-initial clauses like (26.a) constitute a vast majority with respect to Vn-initial clauses like (26.b):

- (26) a. Wæs todæled in foreweardum Danieles dagum in tua
was divided on the following day of St Daniel's into two

bicscira West Seaxna lond
bishoprics the West Saxon land

"The West Saxon land was divided into two bishoprics on the following day of Saint Daniel's" (ASC 959)

- b. Iðonked wurde he
thanked be he

"May he be thanked" (V)

Since the clause operator OPT is present in the linguistic expression in (26.b), we have found it convenient to analyse *iðonked* as FOCum and *he* as TOPum so as to draw a distinction between marked clauses with clause operator DECL, which are regarded as marked if TOPm, FOCm or both are present, and those with clause operator OPT. One implication of this solution, however, is that the framework proposed above has to be justified: whenever the clause operator OPT is present, the unmarked FOC position is P1 whereas the unmarked TOP position is P3; the marked positions, on the other hand are as follows: P1 and P2 for TOP and P2 and P3 for FOC.

The question we must address is that of how NEG and IMP clause operators are related to V-initial passive clauses. To start with, we focus on NEG OPT clauses in (27):

- (27) Ne bið us geborgen
not be we saved

"May we be not saved" (V)

This example shows that our hypothesis holds in accounting for NEG OPT clauses. The assignment of pragmatic functions to NEG OPT clauses may be summarized as follows: P3 is the unmarked position of TOP and P1 of FOC. This description calls for two remarks: firstly, no instances of marked pragmatic functions in NEG OPT clauses have entered the corpus; these clauses undergo discontinuity of Vf and Vn but not of NEG and Vf. In stating this, we do not deny the existence of such clauses: our point is that marked and highly marked NEG OPT clauses, in the way in which we have defined them, are very unlikely to occur. And secondly, we have assumed that NEG--->P1, which is statistically feasible.

As regards the clause operator IMP, which is the only one we have not commented on yet: in principle, it should not trigger a constituent order substantially different from the one triggered by OPT. Let us see to what extent this *a priori* statement is correct. Take, for instance, (28):

- (28) Wes ðu gebletsod betuh eall wifa
be you blessed between all women

"May you be blessed among all women" (V)

As (28) evidences, the difference concerning order between OPT and IMP is that TOPum is assigned in P3 in OPT clauses and in P2 in IMP clauses, FOCum being assigned in P1 in both cases and the other possibilities being marked ones. Therefore, the assignment of pragmatic functions in IMP clauses is the same as that of OPT. Now, we will look at NEG IMP clauses. They are identical as regards pragmatic function assignment to clauses that have a clause operator OPT and NEG OPT. There follows an example:

- (29) Ne beo ðu, Maria, geunroted
not be you, Maria, sorrowful

"Don't be sorrowful, Maria" (V)

Absolute order: V1	examples	total	%
V1	37	720	5.1
Vf1	31	37	83.7
Vf1: DECL	25	31	80.6
Vf1: NEG	6	31	19.3
Vf1-Vn2	0	6	0
Vf1-Final Vn	18	37	48.6
Vn1	6	37	16.2
Vn1-Vf2	6	6	100

Table 4: V1 in the corpus.

With reference to Vf and Vn in V2 position, the data offered by the corpus evidence that the V2 construction is relatively frequent (43% of the clauses in the corpus qualify as V2) and that most V2 passives are Vf2 ones (see Table 5). Another fairly frequent pattern is V2-VF (see Table 6). It is worth noticing that all the clauses that accommodate to this pattern are Vf-2/Vn-VF. Of course, P1-P3 templates, in which Vf occupies P2 and Vn lies in P3, are included here. As is the case with other possibilities of ordering, no different order is triggered by the use of *wesan* to the exclusion of *weorðan* or viceversa. This point is illustrated, with reference to Vf2, by (30):

- (30) a. Seo stow is gehaten Heofonfeld on Englisc
 this place is called Heavenfield in English
 "The place is called Heavenfield in English" (OSW)
- b. Him wearð ðæs getiðod
 he was that given
 "Him was that given" (OSW)

It has been shown, then, that no different order of the constituents is triggered by either copular verb. The next question is whether the appearance of Vn in P2 can be attributed to the dependent or independent character of the clause. A V2 independent clause with Vn2 is exemplified by (31):

- (31) ðær geflemed wearð Norðmanna bregu
 there forced to flee was the Northmen leader

"The leader of the Northmen was forced to flee" (ASC 937)

The assignment of TOPm and FOCm and the highly marked character resulting from this assignment are coherent with the low frequency of appearance in the corpus of these constructions (see Table 5). Therefore, no modification of the proposed framework is demanded by these examples. Let us now look at dependent clauses with Vn2. As a general rule, the dependent clauses in our corpus offer a pattern S/TOP-(X)-(Y)-Vn/FOC-(NEG/FOC)-Vf, as the following example illustrates:

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

We may state then that no modification of our hypothesis should be put forward if P1-P4 templates are involved. Indeed, the pattern S/TOPum/FOCm-X/TOPm/FOCm-Vn/TOPmFOCm-Vf/TOPm/FOCm accommodates to the general schema we have proposed for DECL clauses, the most common sequence being TOPum-(TOPm/FOCm)-FOCm-Vf. This pattern, however, is based on the assumption that Vf is not relevant from an informative point of view, as is normally the case, and that we always find DECL and P1-P4, which is not always the case. When NEG or P1-P3 templates occur, the unmarked character of FOC in P2 in P1-P3 dependent clauses is due to their dependency. In other words, the difference between dependent and independent clauses with P1-P3 templates is that while independent DECL clauses show FOCm--->P3, dependent DECL clauses qualify as FOCm--->P2 (TOPum occurs in P1 in both types of clause). It might be argued that this is tantamount to saying that Vf appears in P2 in independent clauses and in P3 in dependent clauses while Vn occurs in P3 in independent clauses and in P2 in dependent clauses. Our pragmatic explanation, however, is more comprehensive than the structural one just mentioned, since a structural explanation is not accurate enough to account for clauses that, in spite of being marked, do occur in OE, as the data yielded by our corpus indicate. In a structural explanation, these instances would be described as exceptions to the rule that states that Vf(INDEP)--->P2 and Vf(DEP)--->P3, etc. The framework that we have proposed seems wider since it can account for all these orderings; and more accurate, since no ordering is done away with for

not accommodating to a given pattern. Our proposal has a drawback, though: we must admit that the unmarked character of FOC in P2 in P3 DECL clauses is to be attributed to their subordinate quality.

As regards P4 NEG dependent clauses, on the other hand, no modification is needed if we accept that FOCum is assigned to NEG. Two remarks should be made as regards this solution: in the first place, by assigning FOCum to NEG we avoid assigning FOCm to Vn, which would entail describing as marked a construction which the evidence from the corpus proves to be unmarked (see Table 6). Furthermore, we follow the general pattern FOCum--->P3 (if the template is P1-P4) and no modification of our hypothesis is called for. In the second place, the occurrence of Vf in P4 and Vn in P2 must be explained in terms of dependent vs. independent clauses; otherwise, the alternative order would be equally acceptable, which is not compatible with the basic principle that different patterns are the result of different communicative values.

<i>Absolute order: V2</i>	<i>examples</i>	<i>total</i>	<i>%</i>
Vf2/Vn2	315	720	43.7
Vf2	291	315	92.4
V2-V Final	149	315	47.3
Vf2-Vn Final	149	149	100
Vn2	24	315	7.6
Vn2: independent clauses	13	24	54.1
Vn2: dependent clauses	11	24	45.9
Vn2-Final Vf	0	149	0

Table 5: V2 in the corpus.

We consider V-Final constructions, with special emphasis on the fact that the occurrence of Vf in P4 must be regarded as a result of clause dependency. As the evidence from the corpus suggests, most OE V-Final passive clauses are Vn-VF ones (see Table 6). Vf-VF constructions are either marked independent clauses or dependent clauses. Let us discuss in the first place Vf-VF independent clauses by giving one example:

- (33) *ða Deniscan scipu aseten wæron*
the Danish ships captured were

"The Danish ships were captured" (ASC 893)

As we have already remarked, whenever P3 templates are involved, it is necessary to consider P3 the unmarked FOC position, P1 and P2 being the marked ones. In (33), a P1-P3 independent DECL clause, Vn has been assigned FOCm, which accounts for the statistically marked character of these constructions (see Table 6); assigning FOCum to Vf would be unacceptable not only from a statistical point of view but also from a semantic/pragmatic one: Vf-VF independent clauses are very scarce and, moreover, Vf is unlikely to stand out pragmatically. This reasoning makes it unnecessary to revise the framework we have proposed above. Now, let us concentrate on Vf-VF dependent clauses. In (34) a P1-P3 dependent clause is shown:

- (34) *...ðe ær wæs forslægen*
...who before had been killed

"... who had been killed before" (ASC 1014)

In this example, the marked character of the construction is not defined by the dependency of the clause but by the assignment of FOCm to the time adverbial, for this is a P1-P4 clause (see Table 6).

Once we have explained the presence of Vf in final position both in dependent and independent clauses, we examine marked and unmarked Vn-VF clauses. The clause in (35) is an instance of Vn-VF unmarked order:

- (35) *ðær wæs micel wæl geslægen*
there were many people slain

"There were many people slain" (ASC 823)

In (36) we find an instance of Vn-VF marked clause:

- (36) *From Offam kyninge Hygebryht wæs gecoren*
by Offa king Hygebryth was appointed

"Hygebryth was appointed by king Offa" (ASC 785)

We have attributed the marked character of this construction, which is statistically justifiable (see Table 6), to the assignment of TOPm to S and FOCm to X. This example puts an end to the discussion of Vf and Vn in clause-final position.

<i>Absolute order: Final V</i>	<i>examples</i>	<i>total</i>	<i>%</i>
Final Vf/Vn	340	720	47.2
Final Vf	71	340	20.8
Final Vf: independent clauses	12	711	6.9
Final Vf: dependent clauses	59	71	83.1
Final Vn	269	340	79.2

Table 6: V-Final in the corpus.

We end section 3 by giving an explanation for the instances of S-final clauses in the corpus. S-final clauses are marked constructions resulting from the assignment of TOPm or FOCm, as is the case with the following example, or both TOPm and FOCm:

- (37) On ðara Deniscena healf wearð ofslægen Eohric hira cyng
on the Danish part was slain Eohric their king

"On the part of the Danish Eohric king was slain" (ASC 871)

4. CONCLUDING REMARKS

In this paper we have argued for a change of perspective in the descriptive and explanatory character of functional patterns in which VN and X show up: the element which constitutes the starting point for formulating expression rules both in synchronic and in diachronic terms is X, not VN. As we have seen, X bears unmarked focus, receives sentence stress and occupies an outstanding syntactic position, in such a way that the syntactic organization of the clause iconically reflects the distribution of the information at the pragmatic level.

NOTES

1. The research resulting in this paper has been funded by the Vicerrectorado de Investigación de la Universidad de La Rioja through the research project entitled *Aspectos metodológicos de la investigación lingüística en un paradigma funcional: diacronía y sincronía* (1996).

2. The following abbreviations appear throughout this paper: OE (Old English), ME (Middle English), ModE (Modern English), P-D English (Present-Day English), S (subject), O (object), V (verb) Vf (finite verb), Vn (non-finite verb), VF (verb in final position), X (a major constituent of the clause other than subject, object and verb), NEG (negation morpheme), TOP (topic), FOC (focus), m (marked), um (unmarked), PX (syntactic position number x), VX (verb in syntactic position number x), DECL (clause operator declarative), INT (clause operator interrogative), NEG (clause operator negative), IMP (clause operator imperative) and OPT (clause operator optative).

3. The corpus comprises 800 passive clauses from the following OE (up to 1100 AD) texts: from *The Anglo-Saxon Chronicle* (Macintosh file by Dr. Santiago González Fernández-Corugedo, Universidad de La Coruña, quoted as ASC); from *St. Edmund, King and Martyr* (in Needham 1966: 43ff, quoted as EDM); from Visser (1984: 2091ff, quoted as V).

4. See also Hopper and Traugott (1993: 32ff) and Harris and Campbell (1995: 61ff).

5. For more technical details, see Lightfoot (1991: 42ff) and Denison (1993: 25ff).

6. Thus Mitchell (1985: §3907).

7. Saitz's (1955) figures in Bean (1983: 115) are also worth taking into account:

	9th century	12th century
SVO	49%	72%
SOV	31%	16%
VSO	12%	6%

The figures correspond to full-nominal subjects and objects. With pronominal subjects, SOV is the order found in 70% of the total and with pronominal objects there are no instances of SVO in the 9th century.

8. The translations from ASC have been taken from Garmonsway (1972).

9. For an alternative proposal, see Hannay (1990) and Mackenzie and Keizer (1991).

10. This implies that in Pre-Old English sentence-stress and focus-bearing constituents must have been in interverbal position and that the shift of sentence stress to clause-final position is previous to the shift of focus-bearing constituents to the end of the clause, although this observation might not be entirely original, for several scholars, whose work we acknowledge in this paper, have drawn comparable conclusions.

11. In line with Dik (1989), Croft (1990) and Givón (1995) we use the term *markedness* in such a way that the correlation between structural (qualitative) and statistical (quantitative) markedness is stressed. For more information we refer the reader to Andrews (1990: 9ff).

12. In describing the template in this way, we admit, unlike Connolly (1991), the *variable* status to the syntactic template.

13. Lightfoot (1977: 192) has pointed out that OE was an SOV language with an V-final underlying order and an NP Postposing rule. Malsch (1976: 28) has stated that OE was a VO language having a verb-initial underlying order and a V Postposing rule. Reddick (1982: 54-55) argues for an underlying VO order on which three leftward movement rules operate.

14. As Brody (1984: 711ff) has remarked, the concept of basic constituent order poses several problems as regards the assumptions that all languages have a single basic word order and that basic word order is a basic phenomenon across all languages. Brody's conclusion is that basic word order sentences have different functions in different languages and that therefore the notion of basic word order is not uniform across all languages.


15. This hierarchy is in line with Bossong (1989: 27ff), who has dealt with the (morphemic) marking of TOP and FOC and has drawn the conclusion that partial marking means that TOP alone is marked whereas total marking covers both TOP and FOC.

WORKS CITED

- ANDREWS, E. 1990. *Markedness Theory*. Durham: Duke UP.
- BEAN, M. 1983. *The Development of Word Order Patterns in Old English*. London: Croom Helm.
- BOLKESTEIN, A. M., C. DE GROOT and J. L. MACKENZIE, eds. 1985. *Predicates and Terms in Functional Grammar*. Dordrecht: Foris.
- BOSSONG, G. 1989. "Morphemic Marking of Topic and Focus." *Belgian Journal of Linguistics* 4: 27-51.
- BOSSUYT, A. 1985. "The Typology of Embedded Predications and the SOV/SVO Shift in Western Germanic." In Bolkestein, de Groot and Mackenzie, eds. 1985: 1-30.
- BRODY, J. 1984. "Some Problems with the Concept of Basic Word Order." *Linguistics* 22: 711-736.
- CONNOLLY, J. H. 1991. *Constituent order in Functional Grammar: Synchronic and diachronic perspectives*. Berlin: Foris.
- CONTE, M., et al. eds. 1978. *Wortstellung und Bedeutung*. Tübingen: Niemeyer.
- CROFT, W. 1990. *Typology and Universals*. Cambridge UP.
- DENISON, D. 1993. *English Historical Syntax*. London: Longman.
- DEZSO, L. 1978. "Towards a Typology of Theme and Rheme: SOV Languages." In Conte et al., eds. 1978: 3-11.
- DIK, S. 1978. *Functional Grammar*. Dordrecht: Foris.
- . 1980. *Studies in Functional Grammar*. New York: Academic Press.

- . 1989. *The Theory of Functional Grammar I: The Structure of the Clause*. Dordrecht: Foris.
- DIK, S., et al. 1981. "On the Typology of Focus Phenomena." In Hoekstra et al. eds. 1981: 41-74.
- DOWNING, A., and P. LOCKE. 1992. *A University Course in English Grammar*. Hemel Hempstead: Prentice Hall International.
- FISCHER, O. 1992. "The development of quasi-auxiliaries in English and changes in word order." International Congress of English Historical Linguistics-7. Unpublished paper.
- GARMONSWAY, G. N., ed. 1972. *The Anglo-Saxon Chronicle*. New York: Dent.
- GIVÓN, T. 1984/1990. *Syntax: A Functional-Typological Introduction*. 2 vols. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- . 1995. *Functionalism and Grammar*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- HALLIDAY, M. 1985. *An Introduction to Functional Grammar*. London: Arnold.
- HANNAY, M. 1990. "Pragmatic function assignment and word order variation in a Functional Grammar of English." *Working Papers in Functional Grammar* 38. Amsterdam: U of Amsterdam.
- HARRIS, A., and L. CAMPBELL. 1995. *Historical Syntax in Cross-Linguistic Perspective*. Cambridge: Cambridge UP.
- HOEKSTRA, T., et al., eds. 1981. *Perspectives on Functional Grammar*. Dordrecht: Foris.
- HOPPER, P., and E. C. TRAUGOTT. 1993. *Grammaticalization*. Cambridge: Cambridge UP.
- HUCK, G. J., and A. E. OJEDA, eds. 1987. *Syntax and Semantics 20: Discontinuous Constituency*. San Diego: Academic Press.
- JACOBSON, P. 1987. "Phrase Structure, Grammatical Relations, and Discontinuous Constituents." In Huck and Ojeda, eds. 1987: 27-69.
- JONG, J. DE. 1981. "On the Treatment of Focus Phenomena in Functional Grammar." In Hoekstra et al., eds. 1981: 89-115.
- KOOPMAN, W. F. 1992. "Main Clauses with OV Order in Old English Prose." International Congress of English Historical Linguistics-7. Unpublished paper.
- LIGHTFOOT, D. 1991. *How to Set Parameters*. Cambridge (MA): MIT Press.
- . 1977. "Syntactic Change and the Autonomy Thesis." *Journal of Linguistics* 13: 191-216.
- MACKENZIE, J., and E. KEIZER. 1991. "On Assigning Pragmatic Functions in English." *Pragmatics* 1: 169-215.
- MALSCH, D. L. 1976. "Clauses and Quasi-clauses: VO Order in Old English." *Glossa* 10: 28-43.
- MARTÍN ARISTA, J. 1994a. "Funciones pragmáticas marcadas y no marcadas." *Miscelánea* 15: 391-404.
- . 1994b. "Aspectos semánticos y pragmáticos de la operación de las reglas de expresión." In Martín Arista, ed. 1994: 193-238.

- . (forthcoming). "The Prefield-Postfield Drift and the Evolution of the English Passive." *Revista Canaria de Estudios Ingleses*.
- , ed. 1994. *Estudios de Gramática Funcional*. Zaragoza: Mira editores.
- MCCAWLEY, J. D. 1987. "Some Additional Evidence for Discontinuity." In Huck and Ojeda, eds. 1987: 185-199.
- MITCHELL, B. 1985. *Old English Syntax*. 2 vols. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- NEEDHAM, G. I. 1966. *Ælfric's Lives of Three English Saints*. London: Methuen.
- REDDICK, R. J. 1982. "On the Underlying Order of Early West Saxon." *Journal of Linguistics* 18: 37-56.
- TEJADA, P. 1988. "Perspectivas para el estudio del orden de palabras en inglés antiguo." *Revista Canaria de Estudios Ingleses* 16: 85-104.
- VISSER, F. 1984. *A Historical Syntax of the English Language*. 1963-1973. 4 vols. Leiden: Brill.

NARRATION-PARODY-INTERTEXTUALITY: REWRITING THE PAST IN CHARLES PALLISER'S *THE QUINCUNX* ¹



MARÍA JESÚS MARTÍNEZ ALFARO
UNIVERSIDAD DE ZARAGOZA

Come with me now, gentle reader, and let us return to the Victorian heyday of the British novel, a time when villains spoke in Cockney accents and escapes were hair's-breath and maidservants were either traitorous or eternally devoted, where heroes were young and plucky and gained something (as opposed, in the contemporary novel, to losing it) in the process of growing up, when plots hinged on stolen wills and a book had only just finished laying the groundwork when it reached page 300. (Walton 1990: H01)

In this way starts a critique of *The Quincunx*, emphasizing what early British and American reviewers of the novel immediately recognized: its striking Victorian quality. Robert Taylor (1990: 38) describes it as "a Victorian three-decker gone back to the future" and a Ballantine executive calls it "a Wilkie Collins or Charles Dickens novel written by Umberto Eco" (Stephenson 1990: E12).

At the end of the twentieth century, in a world experienced as totally contingent and random, and on a level of consciousness that no longer allows us to regard reality as something to be experienced directly and immediately,