

ANALOGY IN FUNCTIONAL SYNTAX¹

0. INTRODUCTION

Denison (1993: 414) has identified six main areas in which change is found in the history of the English passive: function and meaning of the passive, form and function of the participle, choice of auxiliary verb, paradigm of the auxiliary, range of syntagms available to passivization and expression of the agent. As regards the choice of the auxiliary, it is a well-known fact that there were three possibilities in OE: *wesan* passive, *weorðan* passive and zero auxiliary or inflectional passive, restricted to the verb *hatan* “call, name”:

(1)

- a. Nu is seo boc swiðe nearlice gesett
now is this book very accurately compiled
“Now this book is very accurately compiled”² (ASC 1014)
- b. Him wearð Ææs getiðod
he was that given
“He was given that” (OSW)
- c. on Æam bocum Æe hatton Apocalipsin
on those books that are called Apocalypsis
“in those books which are called Apocalypsis” (V)

¹ The research resulting in this paper has been financially supported by the Vicerrectorado de Investigación de la Universidad de Zaragoza through the project *Estudio Evolutivo de la Crónica Anglosajona*, whose main researcher is Dr. María Pilar Navarro Errasti. A preliminary version of this paper was read at the XVIII AEDEAN Congress, held in the University of Alcalá de Henares in December 1994.

² We have used, whenever they were available, the translations from Old English offered by reputed scholars such as Garmonsway (1967) and Visser (1984).

However, only the suppletive verb *wesan* has survived in modern times: *weorþan*¹ and *hatan* disappeared before modern times, although *hatan*, as a literary archaism, has been attested in English up to the Early Modern English period, as these examples show:

- (2)
- a. What hight she? (V)
 - b. I hyght Iohan of Helenes (V)
 - c. What doth he hight? (V)

In other Germanic languages, this verb is still in full use (Dutch *heten*, German *heißen*, Swedish *heta*, Danish *hede*), as Visser (1984: 2090) has pointed out:

- (3)
- a. German
Ich heiße Geiges
I am called Geiges
“My name is Geiges”
 - b. Swedish (Koefoed 1991: 13)
Hun hedder Lise
she is called Lise
“She is called Lise”

Given these preliminary remarks, the purpose of this paper is to explore how analogy works in a functional grammar in general and, more specifically, in functional syntax, by discussing the analogical change undergone by the former middle voice *hatan*. We have organized this paper as follows: section

¹ For fuller discussion that we can offer here see Denison (1993: 420ff).

1 introduces the treatment of the copula in functional grammar (hereafter FG) both in the synchronic and in the diachronic axis; section 2 presents the data extracted from the OE and ME corpus; section 3 examines the points starred in section 2 and focusses on the analogical change at the semantic, morpho-syntactic and pragmatic levels; finally, section 4 summarizes the results of our research.

1. THE COPULA IN FG

There are two distinctions that have brought about some complication to the transformational grammar (henceforth TG) view of the passive, namely the distinction drawn between lexical and syntactic passives and between *be* deletion and introduction. In order to remedy this undesirable situation, FG has gone a long way in treating the copula (henceforth COP) as a supportive device which is empty from a semantic point of view¹. Dik's (1983: 121ff) first claim is that the new treatment of this phenomenon, including *be* as a copulative, passive and progressive verb, consists of the application of a single rule² of *Be* Support Introduction when COP shows up at surface level;

¹ On this topic, Goossens (1992: 71) is worth seeing since he does not regard *be* as a completely meaningless verb: Rather, *t* contributes a highly abstract meaning which I have labelled adscriptive: it explicitly ascribes some non-verbal predicate to an argument. Whether that means that there should be some representation of this meaning in the underlying structures of FG, or whether specific expression phenomena should be interpreted as meaningful, I do not want to decide in the restricted context of this paper, but at least I want to mention the problem.

² Not all languages, however, allow for a unified treatment of COP. Old English and Spanish, for instance, have two copular verbs with clearly differentiated uses. Spanish *ser* and *estar* qualify as distributionally complementary verbs, *ser* implying permanent property and *estar* non-permanent property. The solution which is proposed by Hengeveld (1986: 393) is to put forward two support rules: *Ser* Support and *Estar* Support. These rules also allow for an elegant treatment of passives, where the same variation *ser/estar* is possible. The existence of the two copulas and the proposal for two support rules is compatible with the explanation provided above because it is predicate operators that ultimately determine -before expression rules such as COP Support apply- which

TG, on the other hand, favours an explanation according to which COP is always present at deep structure and is deleted whenever it does not appear in surface structure. Indeed, Dik (1983, 1989: 166ff) is forced by the constraints imposed upon the power of the theory to consider the presence of COP as a result of introduction rather than a matter of deletion. In the diachronic axis, Dik (1987: 53ff) has regarded the process whereby the copula comes to be used -Copula Auxiliarization, henceforth CA- as a matter of expansion rather than as a matter of desemantization¹. This statement is based on the view that the rule of COP support, which inserts COP when necessary, is part of the expression rules and therefore it adds nothing to the semantic content of the predication. According to this view, the verb *be* has received an extra, equally grammatical function:

The copula comes to be used in constructions which are integrated into the Tense-Mood-Aspect system of the predicate. Once this integration is completed, the copula can be said to have auxiliary status, while retaining its basic character of a semantically empty supportive verb (...) CA is more a matter of gradual expansion into the domain of the verbal paradigm, than a categorial clear-cut acquisition of entirely new functions by the copula. (Dik 1987: 58)

As regards the origin of CA, it is to be found in aspectual forms that may be later reinterpreted in terms of tense or voice. The most important channels

of the two rules is to be used. Moreover, as Hengeveld (1986: 395) has remarked, the difference between languages with or without COP, or with a limited use of COP can easily be accounted for.

¹ This statement must be seen in the light of Givon's explanations for the origins of the passive (1990: 600ff): the stative-adjectival source (English), the reflexive source (Spanish), the topic construction source (Kimbundu), the nominalization source (Panare) and the obviative source (Chamorro). It should also be taken into account that the view of CA has to be coherent with the unified treatment of COP proposed by Dik (1983: 121ff).

along which COP develops into an aspectual auxiliary (Dik 1987: 64ff, following Haine and Rech 1982: 116 and Claudi and Heine 1985: 17ff) are the following: the localist channel (e.g. *John is in the garden*), the property channel (e.g. *Cæsar victus est*) and the serial channel (e.g. *He is going to eat*).

2. THE DATA

The study of the corpus yields the following summary, which shows the different variants and alternatives of *hatan* that coexist in the early stages of the English language¹:

- (i) *OE*
- (4) *hatte*
... and se munuc hatte Abbo (EDM)
“... and this monk was called Abbo”
- (5) *is/wæs haten*
... Íæt is Meresig haten (ASC 894)
... that is called Mersey”
- (6) *is/wæs gehaten*
He wæs gehaten Leotberend (AH)
“He was called Lightbearing”

¹ The corpus comprises 2,100 passive clauses covering the following periods: (i) OE (up to 1100): from *The Anglo-Saxon Chronicle* (Macintosh file by Dr. Santiago González-Corugedo, Universidad de Oviedo, quoted as ASC); from *St. Edmund, King and Martyr* (in Needham 1966: 43ff, quoted as EDM); from Visser (1984: 2091ff, quoted as V). (ii) EME (1100-1300): from Visser (1984: 21091ff, quoted as V); from *The Kentish Sermons* (in Burnley 1992: 107-111, quoted as KS); from *The Peterborough Chronicle* (Macintosh file by Dr. González-Corugedo, quoted as ASC); (iii) LME (1300-1500): from Chaucer's translation of Boetius' *De Consolatione Philosophiæ* (in Navarro et al. 1991: 101-126, quoted as CHB); from *The Wyclifite Sermons* (Macintosh file by Dr. González-Corugedo, quoted as WS); from Visser (1984: 2165ff, quoted as V).

(ii) *EME*

(7) is/was *haten*

His *fæder* wæs *Englisc* *Raulf* *hatte* (ASC 1084)

“His father was called Raulf in English”

(8) is/was *gehaten*

... *Íatt* wass *Beġania* *gehatenn* (V)

“ ... who was called Bethiania”

(iii) *LME*

(9) *hatte*

a. *Dis* *child* *shal* *hoten* *godes* *prophete* (V)

b. *The* *gnatte* *is* *a* *littil* *fflye* *Íat* *hatte* *spitil* (V)

A couple of points of clarification are in order here. To start with, the OE verb *cleopian* (to call on, to summon, to call by a name) coexisted with *hatan* and was retained in use down through the ME period (*OED*):

(10)

a. ... in ane cite *Íat* was *icleped* *Cane* (KS)

b. So that thise ilke *rychesses* ne *oughten* *nat* by *ryghte* to *ben* *cleped* *rychesses* (CHB)

OE *nemnan* has also survived until modern times; here is an EME example:

(11)

... *Íatt* wass *Íurrr* *Drihhtin* *nemned* *Marge* (KS)

“ ... who was called Mary by Our Lord”

Another interesting datum: the first entry of the *OED* for the Scandinavian borrowing *call* with the meaning of *call by the name of* dates back to 1250:

- (12)
- a. *Îat stede beſ cald Íor-for-carbroth*
 - b. *Yow schalt be callud Petre (WS32)*

The picture that emerges from all this is summarized and put into perspective in (13):

(13)	<i>OE</i>	<i>ME</i>	<i>LME</i>
<i>hatten</i>	X	X	(rare)
<i>is/wæs haten</i>	X	X	(rare)
<i>is/was gehaten</i>	X	X	(rare)
<i>is/was nemned</i>	X	X	X
<i>is/was clepud</i>	X	X	X
<i>is/ben callud</i>		X	X

In a few words, the table takes care of the fact that, even though *hatan* was in use up to the EModE period, it must have started to decay in EME times. This hypothesis couples with the data extracted from the corpus, where *hatan* occurrences hardly turn up in LME texts. From OE times onwards *hatan* coexisted with *nemnan* and *cleopian*, whereas *call* and *hatan* became concurrent in the EME period. As a result, evidence suggests that (i) there was a change in the analogical direction whereby *hatan* acquired passive form; and that (ii) later on, the verbal predicate *hatan* -along with *cleopian*- was swept away by *call* and *name*. In the remainder of this paper, we deal with (i), leaving (ii) for future research.

3. DISCUSSION

What we have called rather tentatively *change in the analogical direction* may, in fact, involve a series of changes at different levels: in the first place, *hatan* became accessible to passivization, which means, in practice, that the middle voice died out. In OE times passivization demanded

the presence of two predicate slots filled with arguments -not with satellites¹. More precisely, only first arguments along the Semantic Function Hierarchy (Dik 1989: 226ff), that is, arguments whose semantic function was Agent, Positioner, Force, Processed and Zero, or Goal arguments were candidates for Subject assignment. In the case of *hatan*, a single argument with semantic function Zero, was present in the predicate frame of *hatan*. The change, therefore, must have originated in the lexical fund, where the quantitative valency of the predicate increased². Relevant to this hypothesis is the fact that this verb (*hatan-1*) had, at least, another meaning, which called for a different complementation pattern: *hatan* was a three-place verbal predicate when it meant *to order*, to which we shall refer as *hatan-2*:

(14)

Îa het he me on Íysne síÍ faran

then ordered he me on this journey go

Then he told me to go on this journey (ASD)

The existence of the predicate frame of *hatan-2* leaves room for a movement in the analogical direction of *hatan-1*. This analogical change may be illustrated, at surface level, by the following linguistic expressions:

¹ As stated, in TG terms, in Lightfoot (1979: 239ff) and Denison (1993: 103ff).

² In the FG framework predicate formation rules account for the extension of the number of arguments of the predicate frame and the shift of the semantic functions of the predicate frame. On the far-reaching implications of this treatment Dik comments the following: «Predicate formation rules (...) may have certain structure-changing, that is transformational properties, in that the output predicate-frame of a predicate formation rule may consist of a restructuring of the input predicate-frame(s), involving re-allocation of a semantic function, loss (or addition) of argument positions, and shifts in semantic aspects. It is clear, then that the general ban on structure-changing operations characteristic of FG will have to be relaxed as far as these properties of the predicate formation component are concerned.» (Dik 1980: 51). For the opposite phenomenon see Moreno Cabrera (1990: 39).

(15)

*The monk calls Abbo (by means of valency increase) ›They call the monk Abbo (by means of marked subject assignment) ›The monk is called Abbo

As is displayed in (15), a reinterpretation middle (intransitive) -active (transitive)-passive (transitive) seems plausible. In the lexical fund, then, the predicate frame of *hatan-1* must have undergone the following change¹:

(16)

a. $hatan_V(x_1)_0$

where $x_1=S$

b. $hatan_V(x_1)_{Ag}(x_2)_{Go}$

where $x_1=S$ [unmarked] and $x_2=S$ [marked]

Having these entries in the lexical fund, let us see briefly to what happens in the clause layer component. The predicate frame in (16.a) gives rise to linguistic expressions like (17.a): the verbal predicate *hatan* combines with an argument which bears the semantic function Zero and to which the syntactic function Subject is assigned. The predicate frame in (16.b), on the other hand, combines with two arguments, which are assigned the semantic functions Agent and Goal, Subject being assigned to the Agent argument in the

¹ Dr. Gómez Soliño [University of La Laguna], in personal communication, pointed out that the predicate *hatan* is not a one-slot but a two-slot predicate and that one should resort to the semantic function Reference (Dik 1989) to account in a satisfactory way for the predicate frame of this verb. We have not taken this line for two reasons: in the first place, because the function Reference has not been properly studied in the FG literature; in the second place, and more importantly, because the existence of one or more verbal arguments does not constitute a point central to this discussion; from the perspective of a functional syntax, what constitutes a main point of debate is the functional explanation for the analytical construction advanced in this section.

unmarked voice and to the Goal argument in the marked voice, as is the case with the linguistic expression in (17.b):

(17)

a. His sune -Willelm hæf eallswa Íe fæder- feng to Íam rice.

“His son -William was also called his father- inherited the kingdom”

(ASC 755)

b. Se wæs Cyneheard haten

“He was called Cyneheard” (ASC 755)

Now, let us turn to the expression rules that turn out the passive form of *hatan-1*. Once there was a candidate for marked Subject assignment in the predicate frame of this verb, the expression component must have started triggering the COP Support Rule. As in the rest of the cases, it is not beyond all doubt when *wesan* underwent CA, thus acquiring AUX(iliary) status. Given the evidence yielded by the corpus, our view is that *wesan* had already achieved AUX status when the perfective form *gehaten* entered linguistic expressions like:

(18)

On Íam ylcan timan com eac sum bisceop fram Romebyrig, Birinus gehaten, to Westsexena kyninge, Cynegyls gehaten

“At that time a bishop called Birinus came from Rome to visit the Westsaxon king, called Cynegyls” (ASC 755)

Moreover, the omission of the *wesan* form (**Íe wæs Cynegyls gehaten*), reinforces the view of this verb as an AUX element. The omission (**Íe wæs Leofstan gehaten*) is more glaring in the following example, where *wesan* shows up in the main clause¹:

¹ In using the gapping criterion we derive our inspiration from Ramat and Denison. Denison (1993: 422) provides six kinds of syntactic evidence of grammaticaliza-

(19)

On *Íam lande wæs sum man, Leofstan gehaten* (EDM)

“There was a man in that land, called Leofstan”

In semantic terms, the meaning of the copulative verb *wesan* became increasingly more non-denotational (grammatical) as *wesan* approached the AUX status¹. So far, we have explored the semantic and morphosyntactic aspects of the movement in the analogical direction of *hatan*. However, the picture that we have got is that of the result rather than of the cause of the analogical change². In line with the FG view that morphosyntactic and semantic rules can make reference to pragmatic rules but not viceversa, our point is that the cause of the change must be explained in pragmatic terms³: the cause of the change in the analogical direction must have been the attempt to

tion of the passive auxiliaries: generalization to all lexical verbs, acquisition of agreement, transparency (the retained object is part of the lexical structure of the lexical verb rather than of the auxiliary); postverbal ellipsis, the presence of other auxiliaries before the passive auxiliary and the occurrence of the progressive passive. Ramat (1987: 16) has defined AUX in terms of four criteria: AUX must have the same S as the uninflected dependent verb; AUX and V must have the same predicate frame; no semantic restrictions can be imposed by AUX on V; and the function of AUX is to express tense, mood and aspect relations.

¹ Goossens (1992: 54) has set a predication scale such that the further we move towards the minimally-predicational end of the scale, the lower the degree of denotational meaning becomes, and the higher the degree of grammatical (non-denotational) meaning. The predication scale can be correlated with the grammaticalization scale in FG as follows: «full predicate predicate formation operator» / «predicational semi-predicational minimally predicational».

² In this respect, we follow Lightfoot (1979: 371) as regards analogy, which seems to be a result rather than a cause of change. As for linguistic change, our approach comes in the wake of Bossuyt (1986) and Dik (1986), who have set up the framework of a functional explanation in the diachronic axis. For more detailed information, we refer the reader to these papers.

³ Therefore, we provide an external explanation in the sense of *external control*, in line with Comrie (1983), Hyman (1983) and Kuno (1987).

bridge the gap that the lack of the interverbal position imposes on the informative structure of the clause; indeed, *hatan* clauses like (4) lack a position of special pragmatic value in OE. The constituent bearing Focus (FOC) was likely to be aligned in interverbal position, as the following examples show¹:

(20)

- a. Cu**lbryht** wæs TO **ÆRCEBISC** gehal**god** (ASC 741)
Cuthbrith was to archibishop consacrated
- b. **Íar** wæron eac o**íre** VII bro**íru** BE NAMAN **gecigde** (V)
there were also other seven brothers by name announced

The interverbal constituents in bolds in (20) are assigned FOC, as is the case with the postverbal ones in the present-day English versions:

(21)

- a. “Cuthbrith was consacrated **ARCHBISHOP**”
- b. “There were announced also the other seven brothers **BY THEIR NAMES**”

4. SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

We close our investigation by restating the most important points:

- (i) before its disappearance, *hatan* underwent a change in the analogical direction whereby it acquired passive form and meaning;
- (ii) the semantic and the morphosyntactic levels provide us with the results rather than with the cause of the change: *hatan* became accessible to passivization after a change that took place in the lexical fund, where the quantitative valency of the predicate increased. Such valency increase allowed for a reinterpretation middle (intransitive)-ac-

¹ Dezsó (1978: 3ff) has identified sentence stress in preverbal position in SOV languages and in postverbal position in SVO languages.

- tive (transitive)-passive (transitive). In the expression rule component, the COP Support Rule started applying.
- (iii) *Wesan* in *hatan* passives must have got AUX status before gapping was acceptable.
- (iv) The cause of the change can be explained in pragmatic terms as the desire on behalf of the speaker to provide *hatan* clauses with a position of special pragmatic value, namely interverbal position, in which the constituent bearing FOC frequently turned up and which was lacking in middle voice *hatan* clauses.
- (v) As the results of this paper suggest, analogy in functional syntax must be explained multifunctionally by resorting to multiple perspectives of analysis and by looking in pragmatics for the external explanations that functional syntax demands.

Javier Martín Arista
University of La Rioja (Logroño)

REFERENCES

- BOSSUYT, A. 1986. "Functional Requirements. Causes or Constraints upon Language Change?". *Belgian Journal of Linguistics* 1: 127-147.
- BOSWORTH, J. and T. N. TOLLER. 1983 (1898). *Anglo-Saxon Dictionary*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- BURNLEY, D. 1992. *The History of the English Language*. London: Longman.
- CLAUDI, U. and B. HEINE. 1985. "From metaphor to grammar: some examples from Ewe". *Afrikansiche Arbeitspapiere* 1: 17-54.
- COMRIE, B. 1983. "Form and function in explaining linguistic universals". *Linguistics* 21/1: 87-103.

- CONTE, M. *et al.* eds. 1978. *Wortstellung und Bedeutung*. Tübingen: Niemeyer.
- DENISON, D. 1993. *English Historical Syntax*. London: Longman
- DEZSO, L. 1978. "Towards Typology of Theme and Rheme: SOV Languages" in Conte *et al.* eds.: 3-11.
- DIK, S. C. 1980. *Studies in Functional Grammar*. London and New York: Academic Press.
- DIK, S. C. 1983. "Auxiliary and copula *be* in a Functional Grammar of English" in Heny and Richards eds: 121-143.
- DIK, S. C. 1986. "On the Notion Functional Explanation". *Belgian Journal of Linguistics* 1: 11-52.
- DIK, S. C. 1987. "Copula Auxiliarization: How and Why?" in Harris and Ramat eds.: 54-84.
- DIK, S. C. 1989. *The Theory of Functional Grammar. Part I: The Structure of the Clause*. Dordrecht: Foris Publications.
- GIVON, T. 1990 (1984). *Syntax: A Functional-Typological Introduction* (2 vols.). Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- GOOSSENS, L. 1992. "Graded predicationality, semanticization and *be* in a functional grammar of English". *Belgian Journal of Linguistics* 7: 53-73.
- HANAY, M. and E. Vester eds. 1990. *Working with Functional Grammar: Descriptive and Computational Applications*. Dordrecht: Foris.
- HARRIS, M. and P. Ramat eds. 1987. *Historical Development of Auxiliaries*. Berlin: Mouton.
- HEINE, B. and M. Rech. 1982. *Patterns of grammaticalization in African languages*. AKUP: Arbeiten des Kölner Universalienprojekts 47.
- HENGEVELD, K. 1986. "Copular verbs in a functional grammar of Spanish". *Linguistics* 24: 393-420.

- HYMAN, L.M. 1983. "Form and substance in language universals". *Linguistics* 21/1: 67-85.
- KOEFOED, H. A. 1991 (1958). *Danish*. Sevenoaks, Kent: Hodder and Stoughton.
- KUNO, S. 1980. "Functional Syntax" in Moravsik & Wirth eds.: 117-135.
- LIGHTFOOT, D. W. 1979. *Principles of Diachronic Syntax*. London: Cambridge University Press.
- MORAVSIK, E. & J. R. Wirth eds. 1980. *Syntax and Semantics XIII: Current Approaches to Syntax*. London and New York: Academic Press.
- MORENO CABRERA, J. C. 1990. "Spanish impersonal constructions" in Hannay and Vester eds.: 31-40.
- NAVARRO, M. P. et al. 1991. *Setting up a Presence-and-Permanence Glossary of Native and Non-Native Terms in Medieval English I*. Universidad de Zaragoza: Servicio de Publicaciones.
- NEEDHAM, G. I. 1966. *Ælfric Lifes of Three English Saints*. London: Methuen.
- RAMAT, P. 1987. "Introductory paper" in Harris and Ramat eds.: 3-19.
- VISSER, F. T. 1984 (1973) *An Historical Syntax of the English Language*. Leiden: Brill.

* † *