THE EVOLUTION OF PREFERRED ARGUMENT STRUCTURE IN ENGLISH: WITH FOCUS ON REFERENTIAL FORMS AND INFORMATION STATUS

REIJIROU SHIBASAKI

Okinawa International University

This study demonstrates that Preferred Argument Structure holds for the early stages of English. Preferred Argument Structure aims to uncover preferred discourse configurations of arguments over other configurations of grammatically possible alternatives. Grammatical roles A, S, O and Oblique are examined and found to be systematically ordered from the viewpoint of referential forms and information status at each synchronic stage—i.e. $A < S < O < OBL$ —which means that the more to the left a role is situated, the less likely it is to realize a lexical new mention. This implicational hierarchy has gradually been shaped over time. I argue that such form-information combinations have consistently evolved in the shaping of grammatical systems despite the different grammatical details in the earlier stages of English.*

Keywords: *Preferred Argument Structure, form-information combinations, frequency, linguistic and stylistic changes*

1. Preferred Argument Structure: An Introduction

This study demonstrates that grammatical roles, i.e. A, S, O and Oblique, exhibit fairly stable correlations between referential forms and information status at each synchronic stage in the history of English and how the development of linguistic form-meaning correlations can be explained in the framework of Preferred Argument Structure. Preferred

* The earlier version of this article was presented at the Sixteenth International Conference on Historical Linguistics (ICHL16), at the University of Copenhagen, Denmark, Aug. 11–15, 2003. The present version has been developed with invaluable comments from and discussions with Susanna Cumming and Sandra A. Thompson, which are directly contributed into this version. I would also like to thank Maj-Britt Mosegaard Hansen, Corinne Rossari and the audience at the Historical Pragmatics section at ICHL16 for their input into the earlier version. Any remaining fault is all my own.

Argument Structure is identified through an intensive survey of an ergative language, Sacapultec (or Sakapultek) Maya and derived as a fairly established pattern of grammar in use by Du Bois (1981, 1987a, b, 2003a). Crucial for this theory is that certain configurations of arguments are consistently and systematically preferred over other configurations of grammatically possible alternatives. Du Bois (1987a) looks at two features of arguments: lexicality and information status. Because there is no unitary category of subject in Sacapultec Maya, Du Bois refers to Dixon (1979) who adopts more neutral terms A, S and O in his three-way distinction (cf. A, S, and P in Comrie (1978)), where A refers to the more agent-like argument of a transitive verb (or a two-argument verb), S refers to the single argument of an intransitive verb (or a one-argument verb), and O refers to the more patient-like argument of a transitive verb (or a two-argument verb). This distinction makes possible a cross-linguistic comparison of configurations of arguments beyond linguistic systems such as nominative-accusative or ergative-absolutive. The findings from the analysis of Sacapultec Maya by these labels are summarized in Table 1.

	Grammar	Pragmatics
Quantity	One lexical core argument constraint	One new core argument constraint
Role	Non-lexical A constraint	Given A constraint

Table 1. Dimensions and Constraints of Preferred Argument Structure (Du Bois (1987a: 829))

Preferred Argument Structure consists of grammatical and pragmatic dimensions, accompanied by two pairs of soft constraints each. The grammatical dimension has two constraints. One is the ‘one lexical core argument constraint’ which states that only a small number of clauses have more than one core argument as a lexical NP; in other words, any additional core argument tends to appear as a pronoun or a zero form in this language. The other is the ‘non-lexical A constraint’ which means that if there is a lexical NP in a clause, the NP tends to appear in S or O, but not in A. The pragmatic dimension also has a pair of constraints. One is the ‘one new core argument constraint’ which describes a strong tendency: clauses do not contain more than one new argument. The ‘given A constraint’ is the other constraint; it states that new arguments are disposed to appear in S or O, but not in

A.

One unique aspect of Preferred Argument Structure is that its constraints can be violated by dispreferred argument realizations, but Preferred Argument Structure simply predicts that these constructions are rare. In this sense, Preferred Argument Structure is a cognitive-pragmatic reflection of linguistic form-meaning combinations. Importantly, Preferred Argument Structure in a given language can only be explained and explored on the basis of discourse tokens; any discourse frequency approach takes us quite much time to arrive at one conclusion, provisional or decisive. Because it is such a time-consuming troublesome business, the number of research projects on Preferred Argument Structure especially from a diachronic perspective is relatively small (see below).

Yet Preferred Argument Structure has been attested in several languages thus far, providing some cross-linguistic evidence for a discourse universal, as summarized in Du Bois (2003b: 35–40). For example, the most pervasive discourse universal is that A is strongly disfavored for introducing new information with a full lexical noun (Ashby and Bentivoglio (1994), Tao and Thompson (1994), Kärkkäinen (1996), Arnold (1998), Matsumoto (2000), to list a few; for other works see Du Bois et al. (2003)). On the other hand, Preferred Argument Structure has been challenged with some language-specific or genre-specific behaviors of grammatical roles in several languages (e.g. O'Dowd (1990)). For example, while S and O are found to behave in the same way to introduce new information in Sacapultec Maya, some claims against this discourse pattern have been reported from Acehnese (Durie (1988)) and Tamil (Herring (1989)). Moreover, the elastic property of S is also claimed to be sensitive to genre (Kumpf (2003), Shibasaki (2003b)). However, these findings do not reduce the apparent universality of discourse configurations of arguments, but rather they point out that S becomes elastic in encoding surface form and information load.

In comparison to the cross-linguistic elaboration above, the diachronic aspect is less studied. It is true that some works delve into the diachronic aspect of Preferred Argument Structure (Bentivoglio (1994), Josserand (1995), Ashby and Bentivoglio (2003)); however, the gradual development of Preferred Argument Structure has not fully been illustrated in any language. In fact, Ashby and Bentivoglio (2003: 72–73) concede that a simple comparison of two synchronic stages is not sufficient for uncovering and understanding the nature of Preferred Argu-

ment Structure (cf. Shibasaki (2003a)).

Building on speculations from preceding studies, I will examine whether Preferred Argument Structure holds for the early stages of English. Preferred Argument Structure consists of two dimensions: (1) referential forms and information status of grammatical roles and (2) their preferred clausal configurations and chains in discourse. Due to the limitations of space, I will only focus on the former dimension in this study.

2. Data

In this study, I will mainly examine texts of dramas from the fifteenth through nineteenth centuries in order to uncover a genre-specific aspect of Preferred Argument Structure. Drama texts involve interaction by characters that could at least be closer to naturally occurring discourse than texts from other genres, because they exhibit signs of conversational practice at each synchronic stage, and my texts are very popular dramas of their respective periods. Table 2 summarizes the stages and texts used only for this case study.

Stages	Date	Texts
Old English (OE)	450–1150	<i>The Battle of Maldon</i> (c. 991)
Middle English 1 (ME1)	1300–1400	<i>The Canterbury Tales</i> (c. 1388–1400)
Middle English 2 (ME2)	1400–1500	<i>Mankind</i> (c. 1464–71)
Early Modern English (EME)	1500–1770	<i>A Mid-Summer Night’s Dream</i> (c. 1594–96) <i>The Tempest</i> (c. 1612)
Modern English 1 (MDE1)	1770–1800	<i>The Rivals</i> (c. 1775)
Modern English 2 (MDE2)	1800–1900	<i>Lady Windermere’s Fan</i> (c. 1892)

Table 2. Stages and Texts

In addition to drama texts, I will scrutinize two texts from Old and Middle English, respectively. *The Battle of Maldon*, the last text of the series of epics from *Beowulf*, is considered to include possible colloquial expressions especially in its first conversational part (lines 29–41), and in the view of Robinson (1976: 25–28) shows “the first literary use of dialect in English.” Hiltunen (1997) also alludes to the feasibility of historical pragmatics of *The Battle of Maldon*. *The Canterbury Tales* reflect the colloquial language of those times. For example, the second person singular *thow* (= *pou*) is often suffixed and assimilated into the

preceding verbs, especially short and familiar verbs, as in *canstow* ‘you can’ or *se(e)stow* ‘you see’ (cf. Brinton (2001); Shibasaki (2001)). Such a phonological contraction between the subject and the (modal) verb is reported from conversational discourse (e.g. Bybee and Scheibman (1999)); therefore, *The Canterbury Tales* can be regarded as taking on colloquial aspects of those times. I chose *The Pardoner’s Tale* for this study, because it contains a good deal of conversation.¹

It is true that studying different texts might produce different frequencies of given forms; this problem cannot be avoided in any discourse-functional study. But, it can still be fruitful to pursue research across genres or across time. For example, Chafe (1991) explores how grammatical subjects convey new information, comparing conversational language with passages from Hemingway (20C), Hawthorne (19C) and a *Time* magazine report (20C). If we pursue a diachronic view of Preferred Argument Structure, we must include data from different genres, since genres change over time. Moreover, the texts we have access to from previous stages of English are all written texts. However, unlike other studies of Preferred Argument Structure, this study focuses on texts which represent the conversational practices of earlier times. Therefore, this work comes as close as possible to a diachronic study of Preferred Argument Structure in conversational language.

3. Methodology

3.1. Coding Properties

I will set forth four types of coding properties for this study, as summarized in Table 3. First, the first 200 clauses are selected from each

¹ One of my anonymous reviewers pointed out that in OE and ME, the phonological contraction of pronominal subjects and (modal) verbs may have derived from the strict adjacency of pronominal subjects to the preceding verbs (e.g. Koopman (1990: 121–126)); it would be safe to say that such subject cliticization of second person pronominal forms is in essence different from the reflection of conversational practice of those times. I am grateful for this reviewer’s comment. Yet, the following would deserve consideration: “authors in the twelfth, thirteenth and fourteenth centuries generally wrote the English that they spoke—whether in London, Hereford, Peterborough, or York—and the scribes who copied their work either preserved that language or else more or less consistently substituted their own, equally local, forms” (Burrow and Turville-Petre (1996: 5–6)). See Shibasaki (2005: Ch. 7) for related discussions on nonstandard English, French and Japanese.

text to avoid any bias. Note that for argument's sake, *A Mid-Summer Night's Dream* and *The Tempest* are categorized as texts from the seveneenth century in this study.

Types of Code	Instances
Number of clauses	The first 200 clauses from each text
Grammatical roles	A, S, O, and Oblique
Recency of mention	Old, Active, and New
Forms of reference	Pronoun and Lexical Noun

Table 3. Coding Properties

Second, I will use four grammatical roles for this study: A, S, O and Oblique and follow the definitions of A, S and O given in Section 1. Oblique (hereafter, OBL) is the term for nominals that lack a grammatical relation to a given predicate i.e. non-arguments such as objects of prepositions (see Thompson (1997) for the role of OBL in discourse; see note 4).

The third coding property is the recency of mention of any lexical noun and pronoun. While there are several terms and definitions concerning the recency of mention (e.g. Gundel et al. (1993), Chafe (1994); see Arnold (1998: Ch. 2) for details), I shall use the terms 'Old,' 'Active' and 'New' with the following definitions: 'Old': had appeared in text previously, but not in the immediately previous clause; 'Active': appeared in the immediately previous clause; 'New': the first mention in each text, identifiable or not, because it is beyond imagination to know whether a newly introduced NP is actually new to characters in the drama.

The fourth coding property relates to forms of reference. NPs are coded as either pronouns or lexical nouns; and only overt NPs were examined. In his original works, Du Bois (1987a, b) examined both expressed and unexpressed NPs in Sacapultec Maya, because the unexpressed NPs are recoverable by verbal agreement. In OE through ME, very roughly speaking, verbs normally agree with their nominative subjects in number and person; experiencer verbs (e.g. *like*) agree with experiencers which take no case-marking. However, such morphological clues become far from unambiguous even in late OE (e.g. Allen (1995: 29–30, 234–236) for OE and ME; Abbott (1881: 287–290) for EME). Furthermore, it is sometimes hard to know whether there is an unexpressed direct or indirect object, because of lack of agreement

marking on verbs and the difficulty of deciding whether a verb is intransitive or transitive (e.g. Denison (1993: 127–130) for OE and ME; Blake (2002: 219–220) for EME; Kellner (1892: 20–21) for relevant issues). It is then quite difficult to establish a set of premises that are invariantly applicable to all stages. Therefore, I will only investigate overt NPs in this study.²

3.2. Subcategories and Examples

In addition to the above coding properties, I will use several sub-coding properties as follows. The complement of a copula (i.e. predicate nominal) as in (1) is not counted in this study (cf. Ashby and Bentivoglio (1994, 2003)), because it is not an argument.³ Expressions in question are underlined.

(1) Fag. That is *Madam Lucy*, ... (18C *The Rivals* 1.1, 91)

Clear epistemic parentheticals like *I dare say* or *I think* as in (2) are not counted, because they indicate the speaker's attitude toward propositions rather than arguments (e.g. Thompson (2002)).

(2) Myscheff. *I say*, ser, I am cumme hedyr to make yow game. (15C *Mankind*, 69)

Phrasal verbs (e.g. 'look at NP') are regarded as single verbs (cf. 'P' words in O'Dowd (1998)); therefore the pronoun *me* in (3) is regarded as O.

(3) Darlington. You *look on* me as behind the age.
(19C *Lady Windermere's Fan* I, 84–85)

O'Dowd (1998) argues that a 'P' word shows a continuum between preposition and particle. In (3), for example, the phrasal verb *look on* could be replaced by another verb, *regard*, without losing its grammaticality. If I try to be conservative about the existence of the preposition *on* in (3), *me* would be categorized as OBL according to my coding property, but if the expression were like *regard me as behind the age*, would *me* be categorized as O? To make my coding property consistent in this study, I will regard all phrasal verbs as being single verbs (see Thompson and Hopper (2001) for details).

² See Nariyama (2004) for an intensive study of subject ellipsis in Present Day English.

³ In my past work (Shibasaki (2003a)), I counted predicate nominals as S-Comp and included them in S. However, no crucial statistical difference between my past and present works is found in the total ratio of S.

In the same vein, some idiomatic expressions as in (4) and (5) are considered single units, i.e. the underlined phrases are regarded as single predicates.

- (4) Coachman. When the fashion had got foot on the bar ...
(18C *The Rivals* I.i, 78–79)
- (5) Nought. Shall I break my neck to show you sport?
(15C *Mankind*, 78)

(Numeral) classifiers are considered as part of head NPs and not counted in this study. Observe (6), where a classifier ‘a heap of’ comprises part of the NP ‘things.’

- (6) Lady W. ... when he says to her a whole heap of things ...
(19C *Lady Windermere’s Fan*, 42–43)

In addition, NPs of vocative functions, relative pronouns and ambient pronouns as in ‘*It is rainy*’ are all left out. Because of the small number of indirect objects, I did not count them in this study.⁴

By means of these coding properties, I will probe into the two dimensions of Preferred Argument Structure—i.e. grammatical and pragmatic dimensions—in the next two sections. Yet before going any further, I will illustrate the application of the coding properties into the following examples. Note that each grammatical role, A, S, O and OBL is underlined for clarity.⁵

⁴ Ditransitive constructions discussed in detail in Goldberg (1995) are very rare across time in my data. One of the few examples is illustrated in (i).

- (i) Nought. Shall I break my neck to show you sport? (15C *Mankind*, 78)
- (ii) Lydia. I ... showed it to Beverly, ... (18C *The Rivals*, 72–73)

In (i), the recipient *you* is considered to be an indirect object, because the alternative construction shows a clearer syntactic clue, as in (ii). However, the distinction between direct and indirect objects is not uniquely determined from a cross-linguistic perspective (see Dryer (1986) for details and related discussions in Goldberg (1995: 104–106)); therefore, I did not count such indirect objects as in (i) in this study. More importantly, it is reported that ditransitive constructions are also found to be very rare in American conversational discourse (Thompson and Hopper (2001: 51)). This might suggest that some texts in early stages of English involve the conversational practice of those times (e.g. Blake (2002: 216)), which consequently enhances the feasibility of historical pragmatics, with due caution.

⁵ The glossing conventions are as follows. A=subjects of transitive verbs; Acc=accusative; Act=active; Dat=dative; Inf=infinitive; Lex=lexical noun; New=new; Nom=nominative; S=subjects of intransitive verbs; S-Comp=sentence-complement (i.e. predicate nominal); Sg=singular; O=objects of transitive verbs; Obl=oblique; Pl=plural; Pres=present tense; Pron=pronoun; Subj=subjunctive; 1=first person; 2=second person.

- (7) *Me sendon to þe sæmen snelle,*
 me sent to you seafarer.Nom.Sg brave
 O/Act/Pron Obl/Act/Pron A/New/Lex
heton Ø ðe secgan þæt þu most sendon raðe
 commanded you tell.Inf that you must send quickly
 O/Act/Pron A/Act/Pron
beagas wið gebeorge; and eow betere is
 rings.Acc.Pl for protection.Dat.Sg and you.Dat.Pl better is
 O/New/Lex Obl/New/Lex Obl/Act/Pron
þæt ge þisne garræs mid gafole forgyldon
 that you this battle with tribute buy.off.Pres.Subj.2Pl
 A/Act/Pron O/New/Lex OBL/New/Lex
þon[ne] we swa hearde [hi]lde dælon.
 than we so hard battle share.Pres.Subj.1Pl
 A/Act/Pron O/Act/Lex

'Bold seafarers have sent me to you, commanded [Ø (me)] to tell you that you must quickly send rings in return for protection. And it is better for you all that you should buy off this battle with tribute than we should join such a severe battle ...' (10C *The Battle of Maldon*, 29–33)

- (8) Miranda: If by *your art*, my dearest father, *you* have
 Obl/New/Lex A/Act/Pron
 Put *the wild waters* in *this roar*, allay *them*.
 O/New/Lex Obl/New/Lex O/Act/Pron
The sky, it seems, would pour down *stinking pitch*,
 A/New/Lex O/New/Lex
 But that *the sea*, morning to *th' welkin's cheek*,
 A/Old/Lex Obl/New/Lex
 Dashes *the fire* out. O, *I* have suffered
 O/New/Lex S/Act/Pron
 With *those* that *I* saw. *A brave vessel*, ...
 Obl/New/Pron A/Act/Pron S/New/Lex
 Who had no doubt *some noble creature* in *her*,
 O/New/Lex Obl/Act/Pron
 Dash'd all to *pieces*! O, *the cry* did knock
 Obl/New/Lex S/New/Lex
 Against *my very heart*! Poor souls, *they* perish'd.
 Obl/New/Lex S/Act/Pron
 (17C *The Tempest* I ii:, 1–9)

4. Results

The analysis of my texts by these coding properties yields several interesting results on the diachrony of Preferred Argument Structure in English. Most of them give support for or reinforce Du Bois (1987a) from a diachronic perspective, while some appear to unveil certain new dimensions of Preferred Argument Structure. As explained in Section 1, I will focus on referential forms and information status of grammatical roles among others. Table 4 summarizes the number of NPs at each synchronic stage.

Stage	OE (10C)	ME1 (14C)	ME2 (15C)	EME (17C)	MDE1 (18C)	MDE2 (19C)	Total
Number	404	382	365	412	323	372	2258

Table 4. The Number of NPs at Each Synchronic Stage

4.1. Lexical vs. Pronominal Mentions: A Grammatical Dimension

4.1.1. Overview

As explained in Section 1, A strongly disfavored encoding lexical mentions from a cross-linguistic perspective, which almost reaches the status of a discourse universal (Du Bois (2003b)). The results of this analysis further strengthen this generalization.

Stages	Lexical			Pronoun			Total		
	N	A/NP	NP/A	N	A/NP	NP/A	N	A/NP	NP/A
10C	22	5.4%	29.7%	52	12.9%	70.3%	74	18.3%	100%
14C	14	3.7%	15.2%	78	20.4%	84.8%	92	24.1%	100%
15C	13	3.6%	16.5%	66	18.1%	83.5%	79	21.6%	100%
17C	15	3.6%	20.8%	57	13.8%	79.2%	72	17.5%	100%
18C	15	4.2%	20.5%	58	16.2%	79.5%	73	20.3%	100%
19C	8	2.2%	8.2%	90	24.2%	91.8%	98	26.3%	100%
Total	87	3.9%	17.8%	401	17.8%	82.1%	488	21.6%	100%

Table 5. Grammatical Dimension of A

Table 5 summarizes referential forms of A with their proportional frequencies at each stage. A/NP means the distribution of A (lexical and pronominal) in comparison of the total number of NPs at each synchronic stage (see Table 4), while NP/A means the role-internal distrib-

utional pattern of A with respect to the total number of mentions in each form. For example, the distribution of A in comparison of all NPs in OE is: 5.4% in lexical and 12.9% in pronominal forms, while the distributional pattern of A only in that role is: 29.7% in lexical and 70.3% in pronominal forms. The other tables are illustrated in the same way like S/NP, NP/S, etc.

A shows a strong preference of pronominal mentions over lexical mentions at each synchronic stage. In other words, A has disfavored encoding lexical mentions over time. Such disfavours have progressed so far as to reach 2.2% in its overall frequency of lexical mentions. This finding strengthens the Non-lexical A constraint, because such tendencies have been shaped over time. Evidence from other languages, though being synchronic-oriented, coincides more or less with our result (e.g. 2.9% in Sacapultec (Du Bois (1987a)), 7% in Japanese (Matsumoto (1997)), 8% in Hebrew (Smith (1996)), 10% in Papago (Payne (1987)); see Du Bois (2003a: 63) for details). I assume then that the percentage of lexical A in MDE2 (19C) is consistent with those cross-linguistic patterns.⁶

S functions differently from A. Synchronically, Kärkkäinen (1996: 680) states that S tends to avoid lexical mentions in her American English conversational discourse (8.4%) in terms of our S/NP, which exhibits far smaller proportions of lexical mentions than were found in another study on English (35%, in Kumagai (2000); cited in Du Bois (2003b: 37)). Such an ambivalent property of S, which is widely recognized in various languages, is also witnessed in the history of English, as in Table 6.

Stages	Lexical			Pronoun			Total		
	N	S/NP	NP/S	N	S/NP	NP/S	N	S/NP	NP/S
10C	34	8.4%	51.5%	32	7.9%	48.5%	66	16.3%	100%
14C	46	12.0%	48.9%	48	12.6%	51.1%	94	24.6%	100%
15C	34	9.3%	32.7%	70	19.2%	67.3%	104	28.5%	100%
17C	27	6.6%	34.6%	51	12.4%	65.4%	78	18.9%	100%
18C	21	6.5%	23.6%	68	21.1%	76.4%	89	27.6%	100%
19C	16	1.6%	14.3%	96	25.8%	85.7%	112	30.1%	100%
Total	178	7.9%	32.8%	365	16.2%	67.2%	543	24.0%	100%

Table 6. Grammatical Dimension of S

⁶ Ashby and Bentivoglio (2003) found a similar diachronic transition of A in

A closer look at the examples will tell us about the gradual inclination of S towards being pronominal. While there is competition between lexical and pronominal mentions in OE (10C) and ME1 (14C), pronominal mentions began to surpass lexical mentions in number from ME2 to the present. Interestingly, the reverse is true in other languages. Ashby and Bentivoglio (2003: 66–67) report that the percentage of lexical mentions in S has diachronically increased in French and Spanish (28% and 30% in Old French and Old Spanish respectively, and 44% and 36% in Modern French and Modern Spanish respectively). Therefore, S may be considered to have an elastic but elusive property of encoding lexical mentions diachronically and cross-linguistically as well.

Also interesting is the diachronic process of referential forms in O. Synchronically, many studies have reached a consensus on the skewed behavior of O taking lexical forms. Diachronically likewise, Ashby and Bentivoglio (2003) report that O favors taking lexical forms in Old French and Old Spanish (59% and 57%, respectively) and Modern French and Modern Spanish (50% and 58%, respectively). It seems then that O has been stable in encoding lexical mentions across time and space. However, the result of this study casts light on this diachronically unexplored territory. Look at Table 7.

Stages	Lexical			Pronoun			Total		
	N	O/NP	NP/O	N	O/NP	NP/O	N	O/NP	NP/O
10C	118	29.2%	88.0%	16	4.0%	12.0%	134	33.2%	100%
14C	94	24.6%	81.0%	22	5.8%	19.0%	116	30.4%	100%
15C	63	17.3%	64.9%	34	9.3%	35.1%	97	26.6%	100%
17C	92	22.3%	72.4%	35	8.5%	27.6%	127	30.8%	100%
18C	49	13.6%	55.7%	39	10.9%	44.3%	88	24.5%	100%
19C	42	11.3%	47.7%	46	12.4%	52.3%	88	23.7%	100%
Total	458	20.3%	70.5%	192	8.5%	29.5%	650	28.8%	100%

Table 7. Grammatical Dimension of O

French and Spanish, where a relatively high percentage of lexical A in both Old French and Old Spanish (13% and 12%, respectively) has decreased in both Modern French and Modern Spanish (5% and 8%, respectively).

Although lexical mentions had been dominant over pronominal mentions from OE until MDE1, the relative ratio is reversed in MDE2. More importantly, such a diachronic process is gradual but dramatic, as evidenced by their relative frequencies, which is much clearer in O than in A and S.⁷

Stages	Lexical			Pronoun			Total		
	N	Obl/NP	NP/Obl	N	Obl/NP	NP/Obl	N	Obl/NP	NP/Obl
10C	106	26.2%	81.5%	24	5.9%	18.5%	130	32.2%	100%
14C	76	19.9%	95.0%	4	1.0%	5.0%	80	20.9%	100%
15C	76	20.8%	89.4%	9	2.5%	10.6%	85	23.3%	100%
17C	110	26.7%	81.5%	25	6.1%	18.5%	135	32.8%	100%
18C	61	17.0%	83.6%	12	3.3%	16.4%	73	20.3%	100%
19C	42	11.3%	56.8%	32	8.6%	43.2%	74	19.9%	100%
Total	471	20.9%	81.6%	106	4.7%	18.4%	577	25.6%	100%

Table 8. Grammatical Dimension of OBL

OBL exhibits a strong inclination to encode lexical mentions over history, as in Table 8; lexical mentions dominate pronominal mentions at any synchronic stage. But the diachronic process reveals the gradual increment in pronominal mentions in the same way as for O. Synchronically, the relatively high percentage of staging lexical mentions in OBL is reported in various languages (e.g. 59% in American English classroom discourse (Kumpf (2003)), 84.9% in Sacapultec (Du Bois (1987a)), 100% in Roviana (Corston-Oliver (2003))); all figures are calculated in terms of NP/Obl). Diachronically, however, any challenging or pilot result has not been documented from any language; therefore, the finding that OBL has diminished the property of encoding lexical mentions in English deserves further cross-linguistic as well as diachronic investigations.

To conclude this section, I will summarize the diachronic proportional frequencies of lexical and pronominal mentions in all grammatical roles. Chart 1 illustrates the relative frequencies of lexical and pronominal mentions based on role-internal frequency. Grammatical roles have all

⁷ The relative frequency of staging lexical mentions in O in American conversational discourse is 31.6% according to Kärkkäinen (1996: 680). The gradual decreasing process of lexical mentions in O in this study might relate well to her result (e.g. 72.4% in 17C, 55.7% in 18C, 47.7% in 19C, and 31.6% in 20C).

progressed towards becoming pronominal rather than lexical, and the transition of these frequencies may reflect the change of language style. Pronominal mentions have two referential functions i.e. anaphoric and cataphoric but as clarified in section 4.2, information is skewed towards preceding discourse.

4.1.2. Interim Summary of Grammatical Dimensions

Now I will focus on one finding among others: referential forms of core arguments. In OE (10C), the role-internal ratios of lexical mentions in A, S and O are 29.7%, 51.5% and 88.0%, respectively, and the same kind of statistical distribution continued until EME (17C). After MDE1 (18C), however, A and S began to behave similarly with respect to lexical mentions: there are 20.5% in A, 23.6% in S and 55.7% in O in MDE1 (18C), while there are 8.2% in A, 14.3% in S and 47.7% in O in MDE2 (19C). How can we give a plausible account of this phenomenon?

Chart 1. Overall Transition of Lexical vs. Pronominal Mentions in All Grammatical Roles

One of the core arguments in a clause (i.e. O) is portrayed as a lexical mention more than the others (i.e. A or S), and such statistical preference for encoding lexical mentions in O may be attributed to the shaping of accusative systems in English. Mithun and Chafe (1999) propose diverse functional motivations for language-specific grammatical encoding preferences, which they assume go beyond the simple categorization of A, S and O as analytical tools. In the case of English, the accusative system may have influenced the shaping of lexical and pronominal forms in core arguments. Chafe (1994: 85–92) states, in his discussion of conversational language, that 81 percent of the subjects are ‘given’ (i.e. judged to be already known to the listeners) and 98 percent of those given subjects are pronouns. In other words, gram-

matical subjects carry a light information load via pronominal forms ('light subject constraint' in Chafe's term; see Chafe (1991) for various realizations of this constraint in written discourse). This synchronic observation supports our diachronic finding that A and S came to behave in the same way in form and function.

The choice of referential forms is further differentiated between A and S. The total patterning of lexical mentions has been formed as $A < S < O$ by their frequencies, despite the gradual preference for pronominal mentions over time. OBL has a stronger disposition to encode lexical mentions than these core arguments across time. But, as defined as non-arguments above, NPs encoded in OBL are often introduced into discourse once and for all and are rarely if ever restated as co-referential arguments. Therefore, OBL differs from core arguments in degrees of immediate involvement. These observations with statistical evidence support the two grammatical constraints in Table 1: one lexical core argument constraint and non-lexical A constraint.

4.2. New vs. Active vs. Old Mentions: A Pragmatic Dimension

4.2.1. Overview

As in Table 9, A has not been disposed to introduce new referents since OE, which evidences the role constraint on new argument realization i.e. Given A constraint from a diachronic perspective. Ashby and Bentivoglio (2003) also argue that A was already disfavored to introduce new referents in Old French and Old Spanish (26% and 16% respectively, in their role-internal frequency). Thus, the property of staging new referents in A seems to be pervasive across time, at least in English, French and Spanish.

Stages	New			Active			Old			Total		
	N	A/NP	NP/A	N	A/NP	NP/A	N	A/NP	NP/A	N	A/NP	NP/A
10C	16	4.0%	21.6%	48	11.9%	64.9%	10	2.5%	13.5%	74	18.3%	100%
14C	10	2.6%	10.9%	68	17.8%	73.9%	14	3.7%	15.2%	92	24.1%	100%
15C	8	2.2%	10.1%	16	4.4%	20.2%	55	16.4%	69.6%	79	21.6%	100%
17C	14	3.4%	19.4%	42	10.2%	58.3%	16	3.9%	22.2%	72	17.5%	100%
18C	10	2.8%	13.7%	34	9.5%	46.6%	29	8.1%	39.7%	73	20.3%	100%
19C	4	1.1%	4.1%	88	23.7%	89.8%	6	1.6%	6.1%	98	26.3%	100%
Total	62	2.7%	12.7%	296	13.1%	60.7%	130	5.8%	26.6%	488	21.6%	100%

Table 9. Pragmatic Dimension of A

Research on referential distance such as active and old is an unexplored territory from either cross-linguistic or diachronic perspectives (but see Arnold (1988) and Shibasaki (2003b) for pilot results). However, this study can provide us with a relatively solid survey result about this research domain. Namely, the most preferred position for a given NP to refer to is the immediately previous clause (i.e. active), and active and old referents seem to have been stable more or less in their frequencies over time. This finding is consistent with the high percentage of pronominal mentions in A as in the last section.

The ambivalent property of S is also revealed in the pragmatic dimension, as in Table 10.

Stages	New			Active			Old			Total		
	N	S/NP	NP/S	N	S/NP	NP/S	N	S/NP	NP/S	N	S/NP	NP/S
10C	14	3.4%	21.2%	44	10.7%	66.7%	8	2.0%	12.1%	66	16.3%	100%
14C	42	11.0%	44.7%	42	11.0%	44.7%	10	2.6%	10.6%	94	24.6%	100%
15C	30	8.2%	28.8%	30	8.2%	28.8%	44	12.1%	42.3%	104	28.5%	100%
17C	27	6.6%	34.6%	35	8.5%	44.9%	16	3.9%	20.5%	78	18.9%	100%
18C	16	5.0%	20.0%	45	13.9%	50.6%	28	8.7%	31.5%	89	27.6%	100%
19C	24	6.5%	21.4%	86	23.1%	76.8%	2	0.5%	1.8%	112	30.1%	100%
Total	153	6.8%	28.2%	282	12.5%	51.9%	108	4.8%	19.9%	543	24.0%	100%

Table 10. Pragmatic Dimension of S

Except for the low percentage of new referents in OE, new and non-new referents have been competing, especially, new vs. active referents since EME. This finding may coincide with the fact that the relative ratios of lexical and pronominal mentions in S have been competing. However, since S is considered to be sensitive to the changing discourse conditions more readily than other grammatical roles, we cannot be too careful about setting forth any strong argument. In fact, the ambivalent behavior of S introducing new referents is also reported from Old French and Old Spanish (Ashby and Bentivoglio (2003)). Keeping this in mind, let us move on to the finding about the pragmatic dimension of O.

O has gradually lost the property of introducing new referents over history. Interestingly its proportional frequency of introducing new referents in MDE2 looks closer to S, as in Table 11. On the other hand, active referents have increased since ME2 and become dominant over new referents in MDE2. Old referents have remained at the relatively

lower frequency over time.

Stages	New			Active			Old			Total		
	N	O/NP	NP/O	N	O/NP	NP/O	N	O/NP	NP/O	N	O/NP	NP/O
10C	86	21.3%	64.1%	32	7.9%	23.9%	16	4.0%	11.9%	134	33.2%	100%
14C	90	23.6%	77.6%	18	4.7%	15.5%	8	2.1%	6.9%	116	30.3%	100%
15C	50	13.7%	51.5%	5	1.4%	5.2%	42	11.5%	43.3%	97	26.6%	100%
17C	87	21.1%	68.5%	24	5.8%	18.9%	16	3.9%	12.6%	127	30.8%	100%
18C	42	11.7%	47.7%	26	7.2%	29.6%	20	5.6%	22.7%	88	24.5%	100%
19C	32	8.6%	36.4%	46	12.4%	52.3%	10	2.7%	11.4%	88	23.7%	100%
Total	387	17.1%	59.5%	151	6.7%	23.2%	112	5.0%	17.2%	650	28.8%	100%

Table 11. Pragmatic Dimension of O

As shown in Table 12, OBL has favored introducing new referents over history in my study. Thompson (1997: 75) argues that the pragmatic role of OBL is rarely given, identifiable and tracking.

Stages	New			Active			Old			Total		
	N	Obl/NP	NP/Obl	N	Obl/NP	NP/Obl	N	Obl/NP	NP/O	N	Obl/NP	NP/Obl
10C	60	14.9%	46.2%	24	5.9%	18.5%	46	11.4%	35.4%	130	32.2%	100%
14C	68	17.8%	85.0%	4	1.0%	5.0%	8	2.1%	10.0%	80	20.9%	100%
15C	73	20.0%	85.9%	6	1.6%	7.1%	6	1.6%	7.1%	85	23.3%	100%
17C	95	23.1%	70.3%	20	4.9%	14.8%	20	4.9%	14.8%	135	32.8%	100%
18C	54	15.0%	74.0%	10	2.8%	13.7%	9	2.5%	12.3%	73	20.3%	100%
19C	44	11.8%	59.5%	28	7.5%	37.8%	2	0.5%	2.7%	74	19.9%	100%
Total	394	17.4%	68.3%	92	4.1%	15.9%	91	4.0%	15.8%	577	25.6%	100%

Table 12. Pragmatic Dimension of OBL

In her English conversational data, the ratios of given information in core and oblique labels are: 89% in A, 65% in S and O, and 35% in OBL (*ibid.*: 72).⁸ It is worth noting that new information is skewed in OBL in her data. The important thing is, however, that in my data, while OBL had preferred encoding new referents in the tenth through

⁸ Thompson (1997) displays only the unified frequency of given information in S and O (i.e. 65%). My speculation is that there was no crucial difference in the proportional frequency of given information between S and O, as is often reported in other languages.

seventeenth centuries (based on role-internal frequency), it has been disfavoring the introduction of new referents after the seventeenth century. Suppose that this tendency continues, the ratio of active and old referents in OBL would be dominant over that of new referents. This speculation may lead to the findings in Kärkkäinen (1996: 680–690). According to Kärkkäinen, OBL disfavors introducing new referents in (two of her) American conversational texts (the average ratio of lexical mentions is 22.3% in OBL).⁹ My texts do not provide us with such a drastic survey result; however, the findings from Kärkkäinen (1996), Thompson (1997) and this study suggest that in contrast to previous research, there is possibility that even OBL may be influenced by genres and types of discourse (‘information pressure’).

4.2.2. Interim Summary of Pragmatic Dimensions

To summarize the pragmatic dimension of Preferred Argument Structure, I will show a panoramic view of the diachronic transition of referential distance.

Chart 2. Overall Transition of New vs. Non-New Referents in All Grammatical Roles

Chart 2 illustrates the new vs. non-new (i.e. active and old) distinction in all grammatical roles based on role-internal frequency.

It is obvious that there is competition between new vs. non-new

⁹ Worth noting is that the ratio of lexical mentions in OBL (22.3%) is less than that of O (31.6%) in Kärkkäinen (1996: 680). Yet the pragmatic dimension of her data shows a clear continuum of new information skewing: 5.1% in A, 7.9% in S, 47.6% in O, and 61.4% in OBL (ibid.: 684).

(active and old) referents. This competition had continued from OE to EME, and then non-new referents became dominant over new referents after MDE1. Does this imply that information has come to be oriented towards the preceding discourse rather than the following discourse? If it does, then how? Observe another panoramic view of the active vs. old distinction in Chart 3, again based on role-internal frequency. Notice that there happen to be no examples of cataphoric function in my texts.¹⁰

Chart 3. Overall Transition of Active vs. Old Referents in All Grammatical Roles

¹⁰ One of my anonymous reviewers pointed out that the interesting findings are mostly derived from the text analysis in the nineteenth century, suggesting that it is better to attest the validity around that time. I am grateful to his/her comments. The text *Lady Windermere's Fan* is considered to retain some aspects of "comedy of manners" and is often performed in theaters even today (Kawasaki (1992: 128)). Moreover, when I analyzed the other text *Pygmalion* (c. 1913), which is known as the original of *My Fair Lady*, I obtained the following survey results based on role-internal frequency:

- (i) Lexical vs. Pronominal Mentions (cf. Chart 1)
Lexical: 35.6% (110 tokens) vs. Pronominal: 62.3% (91 tokens)
- (ii) New vs. Non-New Reference (cf. Chart 2)
New: 28.1% (82 tokens) vs. Non-New: 71.9% (210 tokens)
- (iii) Active vs. Old Reference (cf. Chart 3)
Active: 56.2% (164 tokens) vs. Old: 15.7% (46 tokens)
- (iv) Lexical New Mention (cf. Chart 4)
A (2.3%) < S (3.7%) < O (42.6%) < OBL (53.3%)

The results (ii) and (iv) fit Charts 2 and 4 exactly. Although the results (i) and (iii) do not perfectly fit Charts 1 and 3, they never disharmonize with these charts. Suffice it to say here that the results from both *Lady Windermere's Fan* and *Pygmalion* are not idiosyncratic around this time.

There appears to have been competition between active and old referents from OE until MDE1. But importantly, active referents have been favored in number, which further elaborates the above implication as follows: information has been oriented towards ‘immediately previous’ clauses, especially after ME2. In other words, chains of information have come to occur ‘clause by clause.’

One may remember Halliday’s (1994) term “interpersonal” that covers a broad spectrum of phenomena e.g. expressions of speech function, exchange structures, and attitudes. Yet the point of relevance here is that Halliday (1994: 179) summarizes these interpersonal functions simply as ‘clause as exchange.’ Supposing that Chart 3 reflects certain cognitive-pragmatic aspects of interpersonal functions of language (here, English), ‘clause’ can be considered to serve as a unit in which information is exchanged between the speaker and the addressee. Taking into account our diachronic survey results, it may be possible to conclude that information is packaged systematically in each grammatical role, and that clause enables us to exchange such packaged information interpersonally. This interpersonal function by clause corresponds to the other dimension of Preferred Argument Structure i.e. preferred clausal configurations and chains in discourse. As I mentioned in Section 1, due to the limitations of space in this article, I will develop this dimension in my future work.

As explained in Section 4.1, patterns of encoding lexical mentions in core arguments have declined; each argument is oriented towards pronominal. While Mithun and Chafe (1999) explicate diverse functional motivations for grammatical encoding preferences in several languages, such motivations may change degrees of preference over time by which core arguments are realized in an event. This case study shows that both core and oblique arguments have favored encoding non-new information, more precisely, active information over time. I thus propose that such changes of informational preference in core arguments represent changes of linguistic styles beyond grammatical differences at early stages.

This whole section leads me to conclude that English has come to favor 1) pronominal mentions in form and 2) “active” information in its clausal chain. These two findings from English cast new light on the grammatical and pragmatic dimensions of Preferred Argument Structure from a diachronic perspective.

5. The Evolution of Preferred Argument Structure in English

In this section, I will briefly present the most consequential findings about Preferred Argument Structure. In Sections 3 and 4, we have examined the grammatical and pragmatic dimensions of Preferred Argument Structure in relation to referential forms and information status, respectively. Here I will combine the two dimensions to show the relative frequencies of 'lexical new' mentions in each grammatical role. Chart 4 presents the implicational hierarchy at each synchronic stage. Note that the more to the left a category is situated, the less likely it is to be a lexical new mention. The percentage is based on role-internal frequency.

A (18.9%)	<	S (21.2%)	<	OBL (44.6%)	<	O (59.7%)	OE (10C)
A (10.9%)	<	S (55.3%)	<	O (75.9%)	<	OBL (85.0%)	ME1 (14C)
A (10.1%)	<	S (25.0%)	<	O (51.5%)	<	OBL (85.9%)	ME2 (15C)
A (11.1%)	<	S (25.0%)	<	O (63.8%)	<	OBL (66.7%)	EME (17C)
A (13.7%)	<	S (28.0%)	<	O (42.0%)	<	OBL (72.6%)	MDE1 (18C)
A (4.1%)	<	S (14.3%)	<	O (34.1%)	<	OBL (54.1%)	MDE2 (19C)

Chart 4. Transition of Implicational Hierarchy: Lexical New Mention

I will emphasize three pilot results. Firstly, the implicational hierarchy has gradually but steadily been established as $A < S < O < OBL$ after ME1. The hierarchical order is never reversed at least after ME1 according to the figures from my texts. Since the vicissitude of the implicational hierarchy has not been reported from any other language, Chart 1 is a pilot result and worth elaboration from a cross-linguistic perspective (cf. Shibasaki (2003a)). Suppose that this hierarchy is evidenced or reinterpreted with substantial results from other languages, Preferred Argument Structure would be better delineated.

Secondly, the frequency-based implicational hierarchy has moved more or less in one direction, i.e. the direction towards grammatically being pronominal and pragmatically being 'active.' To put it another way, it is unidirectional change in the pragmatic dimension of grammatical roles. Each grammatical role may have competed or conspired in the shaping of grammatical systems to realize the most appropriate information in it. According to Du Bois (1985, 1987a), grammatical roles do not constitute any distinct syntactic categories in most languages, but can be best understood as slots available for encoding par-

ticular semantic and pragmatic tasks. In this study, Preferred Argument Structure may serve as an important tool for understanding particular clusters of semantic and pragmatic properties as patterns that have strong correlation with grammatical roles at each synchronic stage. Therefore, by analyzing the transition of Preferred Argument Structure i.e. form-information combinations in this study, we can realize the developmental pathway of Preferred Argument Structure in the history of English. I will further argue that such motivations are related to a change in the degree of (represented) involvement between the speaker and the listener—i.e. the change of linguistic styles—because language users are directly involved in immediate discourse with which appropriate linguistic styles are realized. The findings from Charts 2 through 4—i.e. the gradual and systematic changes of form-information combinations—serve as solid pieces of evidence for this claim of mine. But again, this aspect is yet to be explored in other languages, so it awaits further elaboration from languages across time and space.

Thirdly, I need to touch on the notion of ‘discourse universal’ as pointed out in Section 1. The survey results of this study are consistent with what Du Bois formulates, for example, in Table 1, i.e. grammatical and pragmatic dimensions. On the other hand, this diachronic study tells us that discourse universal is not a static, canonical basis, but means a dynamic, developmental process by which Preferred Argument Structure strengthens the degree of systematic form-information combinations. In other words, discourse universal implies not any function pre-stored in each grammatical role, but function diachronically shaped in it. Moreover, such a linguistic evolution is discourse-based, as presented in this study. I hope that these three pilot results will be taken one step further in future research.

6. Concluding Remarks

I have examined referential forms and information status of grammatical roles in the history of English. Preferred Argument Structure gives an account of fairly established patterns of grammar in use. As initially derived from the analysis of narrative discourse in Sacapultec Maya, relevant studies have embarked on narratives and conversations both of which represent a discourse of an unplanned nature. In this study, I considered Preferred Argument Structure in earlier stages of English. Of course, texts show a more planned style than do conversations.

Nevertheless, the results of this study suggest that Preferred Argument Structure is manifested in earlier stages, and types of discourse do not impose a limit to the feasibility of Preferred Argument Structure. Proposals from this study only serve one interpretation of the diachronic change of language styles, but Preferred Argument Structure gives support for and insight into my interpretation. Language is always in the middle of change; language users are directly involved in such a dynamic and unstable language system. However, Preferred Argument Structure has gradually evolved despite the difference of grammatical details in earlier stages and gives a stable account of linguistic and stylistic changes. It is hoped then that this possibility can be further pursued with findings from other languages.

REFERENCES

- Abbott, Edwin A. (1881) *A Shakespearian Grammar*, Macmillan, London.
- Allen, Cynthia L. (1995) *Case Marking and Reanalysis: Grammatical Relations from Old to Early Modern English*, Oxford University Press, Oxford.
- Arnold, Jennifer E. (1998) *Reference Form and Discourse Patterns*, Doctoral dissertation, Stanford University.
- Ashby, William J. and Paola Bentivoglio (1993) "Preferred Argument Structure in Spoken French and Spanish," *Language Variation and Change* 5, 61-76.
- Ashby, William J. and Paola Bentivoglio (2003) "Preferred Argument Structure across Time and Space: A Comparative Diachronic Analysis of French and Spanish," *Preferred Argument Structure: Grammar as Architecture for Function*, ed. by John W. Du Bois, Lorraine E. Kumpf and William J. Ashby, 61-80, John Benjamins, Amsterdam.
- Bentivoglio, Paola (1994) "Spanish Preferred Argument Structure across Time and Space," *D.E.L.T.A. (Revista de Documentação de Estudos em Lingüística Teórica e Aplicada)* 10, 277-293.
- Blake, Norman F. (2002) *A Grammar of Shakespeare's Language*, Palgrave, New York.
- Brinton, Laurel (2001) "Subject Clitics in English: A Case of Degrammaticalization?" ms., University of British Columbia.
- Burrow, John A. and Thorlac Turville-Petre (1996) *A Book of Middle English*, 2nd ed., Blackwell, Oxford.
- Bybee, Joan L. and Joanne Scheibman (1999) "The Effect of Usage on Degrees of Constituency: The Reduction of *don't* in English," *Linguistics* 37, 575-596.
- Chafe, Wallace L. (1991) "Grammatical Subjects in Speaking and Writing," *Text* 11, 45-72.

- Chafe, Wallace L. (1994) *Discourse, Consciousness, and Time: The Flow and Displacement of Conscious Experience in Speaking and Writing*, University of Chicago Press, Chicago.
- Comrie, Bernard (1978) "Ergativity," *Syntactic Typology: Studies in the Phenomenology of Language*, ed. by Winfred P. Lehmann, 329-374, University of Texas Press, Austin.
- Corston-Oliver, Simon H. (2003) "Core Argument and the Inversion of the Nominal Hierarchy in Roviana," *Preferred Argument Structure: Grammar as Architecture for Function*, ed. by John W. Du Bois, Lorraine E. Kumpf and William J. Ashby, 273-300, John Benjamins, Amsterdam.
- Denison, David (1993) *English Historical Syntax*, Longman, London.
- Dixon, Robert M. W. (1979) "Ergativity," *Language* 55, 59-138.
- Dryer, Matthew (1986) "Primary Objects, Secondary Objects, and Antidative," *Language* 62, 808-845.
- Du Bois, John W. (1981) *The Sacapultec Language*, Doctoral dissertation, University of California, Berkeley.
- Du Bois, John W. (1985) "Competing Motivations," *Iconicity in Syntax*, ed. by John Haiman, 343-365, John Benjamins, Amsterdam.
- Du Bois, John W. (1987a) "The Discourse Basis of Ergativity," *Language* 63, 805-855.
- Du Bois, John W. (1987b) "Absolute Zero: Paradigm Adaptivity in Sacapultec Maya," *Lingua* 71, 203-222.
- Du Bois, John W. (2003a) "Discourse and Grammar," *The New Psychology of Language: Cognitive and Functional Approaches to Language Structure*, vol. 2, ed. by Micheal Tomasello, 47-87, Erlbaum, Mahwah, NJ.
- Du Bois, John W. (2003b) "Argument Structure," *Preferred Argument Structure: Grammar as Architecture for Function*, ed. by John W. Du Bois, Lorraine E. Kumpf and William J. Ashby, 11-60, John Benjamins, Amsterdam.
- Du Bois, John W., Lorraine E. Kumpf and William J. Ashby, eds. (2003) *Preferred Argument Structure: Grammar as Architecture for Function*, John Benjamins, Amsterdam.
- Durie, Mark (1988) "Preferred Argument Structure in an Active Language: Arguments against the Category 'Intransitive Subject'," *Lingua* 74, 1-25.
- Goldberg, Adele E. (1995) *Constructions: A Construction Grammar Approach to Argument Structure*, University of Chicago Press, Chicago.
- Gundel, Jeanette K., Hedberg, Nancy and Ron Zacharaski (1993) "Cognitive Status and the Form of Referring Expressions," *Language* 69, 274-307.
- Halliday, Michael A. K. (1994) *An Introduction to Functional Grammar*, 2nd, ed., Arnold, London.
- Herring, Susan (1989) "Verbless Presentation and the Discourse Basis of Ergativity," *CLS* 25, 123-137.
- Hiltunen, Risto (1997) "Aspects of *The Battle of Maldon*," Lecture given at the *Rikkyo Seminar on English Philology*, the Department of English, Rikkyo (St. Paul) University, Tokyo, Japan, May 20, 1997.

- Josserand, Kathryn (1995) "Participant Tracking in Maya Hieroglyphic Texts: Who Was That Masked Man?," *Journal of Linguistic Anthropology* 5, 65–89.
- Kärkkäinen, Elise (1996) "Preferred Argument Structure and Subject Role in American English Conversational Discourse," *Journal of Pragmatics* 25, 675–701.
- Kawasaki, Toshihiko (1992) *Igirisu Bungakushi Nyuumon* (Introduction to British Literature), Kenkyusha, Tokyo.
- Kellner, Leon (1892/1972) *Historical Outline of English Syntax*, Gordon Press, New York.
- Koopman, Willem (1990) *Word Order in Old English, with Special Reference to the Verb Phrase*, Doctoral dissertation, University of Amsterdam.
- Kumagai, Yoshiharu (2000) "Ergativity in English Spontaneous Discourse," *Mulberry: Bulletin of the Department of English, Faculty of Letters, Aichi Prefectural University* 49, 35–60.
- Kumpf, Lorraine E. (2003) "Genre and Preferred Argument Structure: Sources of Argument Structure in Classroom Discourse," *Preferred Argument Structure: Grammar as Architecture for Function*, ed. by John W. Du Bois, Lorraine E. Kumpf and William J. Ashby, 109–130, John Benjamins, Amsterdam.
- Matsumoto, Kazuko (2000) "Intonation Units, Clause and Preferred Argument Structure in Conversational Japanese," *Language Science* 22, 63–86.
- Mithun, Marianne and Wallace L. Chafe (1999) "What are S, A, and O?," *Studies in Language* 23, 569–596.
- Nariyama, Shigeko (2004) "Subject Ellipsis in English," *Journal of Pragmatics* 36, 237–264.
- O'Dowd, Elizabeth (1990) "Discourse Pressure, Genre and Grammatical Alignment—After Du Bois," *Studies in Language* 14, 365–403.
- O'Dowd, Elizabeth (1998) *Prepositions and Particles in English: A Discourse-Functional Account*, Oxford University Press, Oxford.
- Payne, Doris L. (1987) "Information Structuring in Papago Narrative Discourse," *Language* 63, 783–804.
- Robinson, Fred C. (1976) "Some Aspects of the Maldon Poet's Artistry," *Journal of English and Germanic Philology* 75, 25–40.
- Shibasaki, Reijirou (2001) "Subject Cliticization in Middle English: Grammaticalization vs. Language Planning," ms., University of California, Santa Barbara.
- Shibasaki, Reijirou (2003a) "Diachronic Aspects of Preferred Argument Structure in English and Broader Implications," *BLS* 28, 289–301.
- Shibasaki, Reijirou (2003b) "Jan'rubetsu ni Mita Danwa to Joohookoozoo (Information Structure across Genres)," Invited talk at Workshop, Danwa to Bumpoo (Discourse and Grammar), University of Tsukuba, Japan, Sept. 22, 2003.
- Shibasaki, Reijirou (2005) *Personal Pronouns and Argument Structure in*

- Japanese: Discourse Frequency, Diachrony and Typology*, Doctoral dissertation, University of California, Santa Barbara.
- Smith, Wendy (1996) "Spoken Narrative and Preferred Clause Structure: Evidence from Modern Hebrew," *Studies in Language* 20, 163–189.
- Tao, Hongyin and Sandra A. Thompson (1994) "The Discourse and Grammar Interface: Preferred Clause Structure in Mandarin Conversation," *Journal of the Chinese Language Teachers Association* 29, 1–34.
- Thompson, Sandra A. (1997) "Discourse Motivations for the Core-Oblique Distinction as a Language Universal," *Directions in Functional Linguistics*, ed. by Akio Kamio, 59–82, John Benjamins, Amsterdam.
- Thompson, Sandra A. (2002) "Object Complements and Conversation: Towards a Realistic Account," *Studies in Language* 26, 125–163.
- Thompson, Sandra A. and Paul J. Hopper (2001) "Transitivity, Clause Structure, and Argument Structure: Evidence from Conversation," *Frequency and the Emergence of Linguistic Structure*, ed. by Joan Bybee and Paul J. Hopper, 27–60, John Benjamins, Amsterdam.

Sources

- Benson, Larry D., ed. (1987) *The Riverside Chaucer*, Oxford University Press, Oxford.
- Eccles, Mark, ed. (1969) *The Macro Plays: The Castle of Perseverance, Wisdom, Mankind*, Oxford University Press, London.
- Gibson, Rex, ed. (1993) *A Mid-Summer Night's Dream*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.
- Gibson, Rex, ed. (1993) *The Tempest*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.
- McGuinness, Arthur E., ed. (1968) *The Rivals*, Chandler Pub. Co., San Francisco.
- Raby, Peter, ed. (1995) *The Importance of Being Earnest and Other Plays*, Oxford University Press, Oxford.
- Scragg, Donald G., ed. (1981) *The Battle of Maldon*, Manchester University Press.

Department of British and American Language and Culture
 Okinawa International University
 2-6-1 Ginowan
 Ginowan, Okinawa 901-2701
 email: reijiro@oku.ac.jp