

DITRANSITIVE COMPLEMENTATION FROM THE FSP POINT OF VIEW

GABRIELA BRŮHOVÁ

1. Introduction

The present paper aims at contributing to the study of ditransitive complementation from the FSP point of view. It focuses on the position of the two objects of ditransitive verbs and on the factors that have an impact on the object ordering. Ditransitive verbs are defined as verbs that require complementation by two right-hand participants, two objects. Of the two basic types of ditransitive complementation, O_i-O_d (e.g. *to give sb. sth.*), and O_d-O_{prep} (e.g. *to remind sb. of sth.*), the first type is dealt with, the point under analysis being the alternation between O_i and O_{prep} (e.g. *to give sb. sth.* vs. *to give sth. to sb.*). Ditransitive verbs of this type thus form two clause patterns: SVO_iO_d and SVO_dO_{prep} , respectively. The two positions of the objects are systematically examined with respect to non-clausal realization (i.e. substantival or pronominal). Realization of objects by clauses and non-finite verb forms is left aside in the present analysis, as their position does not vary.

In the case of non-clausal realization of the two objects, four types need to be distinguished: i. both O_i/O_{prep} and O_d realized by nouns; ii. both O_i/O_{prep} and O_d realized by pronouns; iii. O_i/O_{prep} realized by a noun and O_d by a pronoun; iv. O_i/O_{prep} realized by a pronoun and O_d by a noun. The position of the objects is assumed to be associated with the distribution of communicative dynamism or in other words with the principle of end-focus, i.e. that given information tends to precede new information. The second principle that operates in the ordering of the two objects is the principle of end-weight. Thus, the object that is longer and heavier is more likely to be placed finally. The present study aims to demonstrate whether the position of the two objects is in accordance with these principles and whether there are other potential factors at play in object ordering.

2. Material and method

This study draws upon the study of Brůhová (2010), where five ditransitive verbs (*give, lend, send, offer* and *show*) were analyzed from the syntactic, semantic and FSP aspects. The present analysis is carried out on the basis of 652 examples of ditransitive construc-

tions with both realized objects and primarily pays attention to the FSP aspect.¹ The data used for the analysis had been extracted from the British National Corpus.

The selection of the five analysed verbs was based on the semantic verb classes defined by Gropen et al. (1989: 243ff.). An attempt was made to select those verbs that occur predominantly in the ditransitive pattern (and not in intransitive, monotransitive or complex-transitive patterns). The five verbs *give*, *lend*, *send*, *offer* and *show* have been selected from four different semantic classes:

- verbs that inherently signify acts of giving: *give*, *lend*;
- verbs of sending: *send*;
- verbs of future having: *offer*;
- verbs of type of communicated message: *show*.

The “verbs that inherently signify acts of giving” are to be regarded as the most prototypical class of ditransitive verbs and therefore two verbs from the same semantic class have been included in the analysis. Since all five selected verbs are stylistically neutral and may appear in any register, the aspect of style is left aside in the present study and the texts from which the examples have been excerpted are not further specified.

Of the three (or four, including intonation) factors whose interplay determines the FSP function of a clause element, in the case of ditransitive complementation the most important role is played by the contextual factor. Therefore, particular attention is paid to the context-dependence/independence of the two objects. In the present study a distinction is made between ‘context-dependent’ and ‘context-independent’ expressions, which are to be understood “as retrievable and irretrievable from the immediately relevant context, respectively” (Firbas, 1992: 31). Within Firbas’s conception of context, this is its narrowest sphere, which is embedded in the entire preceding verbal, situational and experiential context, with the latter forming part of the general context of human knowledge and experience (Firbas, 1992: 22–3). In the present analysis, following Firbas (1992: 31), who stresses that it is not the wider, but the immediately relevant context in the narrower sense that has the decisive role in FSP, the two objects are studied as carriers of given or new information “in regard to the immediately relevant communicative step”. As regards the length of the retrievability span within the preceding context, Svoboda’s (1981: 88–9) and Firbas’s (1992: 23; 1995: 18) estimates are adhered to, viz. the context consisting of seven sentences that precede the particular ditransitive construction are taken into account.² At the same time, attention is paid to cases in which irretrievable information

¹ The original analysis (Brůhová, 2010) was carried out on the basis of 1000 examples of ditransitive constructions (i.e. 200 examples of ditransitive complementation of each verb), as also ditransitive constructions with one or both objects omitted had been included in the analysis. With a view to a different aim, viz. investigation of the position of the two objects and their degrees of communicative dynamism, the present study examines only ditransitive constructions with both realized objects (i.e. 652 examples).

² However, it has turned out during the analysis that the retrievability span is occasionally much longer than seven sentences, as the following example demonstrates: *When he went home to Basle he **showed the photographs to his family** and pointed out to them my very good neighbour Canon Ramsay [sic] from Durham, an authentic Anglo-Catholic, with strange views concerning tradition, succession, ontology and so on.* (A68,1663) Although “photographs” have not been mentioned within the seven preceding sentences, the definite article used with “the photographs” is obviously anaphoric. There-

predominates and to the five factors through which a given element becomes disengaged from context dependence: (a) selection, (b) contrast, (c) identification, (d) purposeful repetition and (e) the summarizing effect (Firbas, 1995: 22).

Context-dependent elements appeared to be relatively easy to identify, their context dependence being signalled by various devices (anaphoric pronouns, anaphoric articles, repetition of a lexical expression, use of synonyms, etc.). However, determining a context-independent element turned out to be a more complex task. Therefore, the various cases that were identified as context-independent elements in the present paper are listed below:

(a) a first mention – an element that occurs for the first time, which is usually signalled by an indefinite or zero article:

(1) Nigel decided to take up jogging again in the grounds and got Flora to **lend him a sewing kit** to mend his trousers. (AC3,2588)

(b) an element that has been mentioned before but is accompanied by a further (new) element, the semantic content of which prevails:

(2) Gi71 Care would be needed with the wording used in any such scheme and ACET can **give you more details about this**. (A01,385)

(c) if a focaliser (*exactly, just, only, precisely* etc.³) occurs in the rhematic part of the sentence, it makes the whole phrase context-independent, even though the element is mentioned in the immediately preceding context and therefore seems to convey known information, as in ex. (3) *even*, in ex. (4) *direct*:

(3) To achieve crosswind landing exactly on the spot without using the engine and in a strange machine **offers a strong challenge even to the most experienced pilot**. (A0H,1636)

(4) The doctor's certificate must be taken to the Registrar of Births and Deaths in the registration sub-district where the death occurred, normally within five days. The doctor may provide a leaflet explaining how to register the death and should be able to advise where to do so. Otherwise funeral directors keep detailed lists, or offices are listed in the phone book, or the Citizens Advice Bureau can advise. A check should be made that it is the correct registration office and for opening times. Sometimes a doctor will **send the certificate direct to the Registrar**, but it is always necessary for whoever is arranging the funeral to attend at the Registrar's office, this is usually a close family member but does not have to be. (A0Y,66)

fore it is assumed that "photographs" must have been mentioned in a wider preceding context and thus, that the retrievability span is longer.

³ For a more detailed list of focalisers, see Dušková (1988: 473) and Quirk et al. (1985: 604ff.).

(d) when a known/given element becomes disengaged from context dependence on account of one of the factors listed above: selection, contrast, identification, purposeful repetition and the summarizing effect (cf. Firbas 1995: 22). The following example illustrates that O_{prep} , although mentioned in the immediately preceding context (*you receive the money which you are due*), has been disengaged from context dependence on account of contrast (i.e. *to yourself* is contrasted with a “bank manager”, “solicitor” and “publisher”):

- (5) Securing a Copyright: A music writer can protect a copyright in a number of ways: (i) put the music down in some physical form, like a musical score or as a demo tape. Date it and place it in the safe keeping of a bank manager or a solicitor (although these professionals often don't like doing this, as it is a lot of trouble). (ii) Get the copyright 'signed' to a publisher. It is then the publisher's responsibility to see that *you* receive the money which *you* are due. (iii) put the song down into a physical form, as described above, and **send it to yourself** by REGISTERED POST. (A6A,1886)

Moreover, it is worth mentioning that in a relatively high number of examples the object is composed of intermingled context-dependent and context-independent elements, in Firbas's terminology it is a “heterogeneous” element (cf. Dušková, 1999: 293; Firbas, 1995: 20). Since in the present study the object is classified into one or the other category (i.e. an object conveying context-dependent or an object conveying context-independent information), the context-dependence/independence of such objects was then determined on the basis of the pragmatically more dominant information or in other words which kind of information prevailed “in regard to the immediately relevant communicative step” Firbas (1992: 31). Thus, in ex. (6) the direct object *10,000 copies of the pamphlet* is partly context-dependent (due to the anaphoric definite article in *the pamphlet*) and partly context-independent (first mention of *10,000 copies*). However, the whole noun phrase of the direct object has been determined as context-independent, since the element that conveys the high point of the message is *10,000 copies*:

- (6) Mr Watts **sent 10,000 copies of the pamphlet to MPs, peers, the Press, neighbours of Lord Aldington, the parents of pupils at Winchester and to former pupils**, in an attempt to force Lord Aldington's resignation as Warden. (A2A,598)

The last remark to be made before proceeding to the analysis concerns the possible FSP functions of the two objects. According to Firbas (1995: 42) object complementation is disposed to carry a higher degree of communicative dynamism than the verb, i.e. it is dynamically stronger. In order to be such a competitor of the verb, the object must be context-independent. Thus, if an object conveys context-independent information, it automatically functions in the rheme.⁴ A context-dependent object, on the other hand, always pertains to the thematic section, performing one of the functions within this

⁴ Note, however, that there are exceptions, notably the indefinite pronoun *something* (see section 3.2, ex. (19)).

section, most frequently that of the diatheme. In the case of both context-dependent objects the rheme is to be sought somewhere else – predominantly in the verb. It is to be borne in mind that the present study investigates the mutual position of the two objects with respect to context-dependence (besides semantics and the form of realization), the relevant point being the respective context-dependence/independence of the objects, not the actual function of the context-dependent object within the thematic section. Thus, the actual FSP function is determined only in the case of context-independent objects. Where relevant, particularly in the case of both context-independent objects, it is determined which of the objects functions as the rheme proper (Rh_{proper}); and where both objects are rheme components (Rh_{comp}), which element constitutes the rheme proper. In speech, the expression that functions as the rheme proper carries the intonation centre of a sentence. These instances are noted in the analysis. As regards the context-dependent objects, specification of the FSP function within the thematic section, i.e. whether the object constitutes the theme proper (Th_{proper}) or the diatheme (DTh), is in most cases left aside in the present analysis. Therefore, most cases of context-dependent objects are merely classed as pertaining to the thematic section. Nevertheless, there are instances where the actual FSP function within the thematic section is considered because of possible relevance in the object ordering, viz. in instances where both objects convey context-dependent information; the actual FSP function of these objects (i.e. the theme proper or the diatheme) is then determined.

3. Analysis

The following section is divided into several subsections. First, the overall frequency of syntactic patterns in which the verb occurs is given. Next, a systematic overview is presented of the position of the two objects with respect to their realization form (i.e. substantival or pronominal) and the factors that have an impact on the ordering of the objects. Moreover, the last subsection 3.5 is provided with a summarizing table demonstrating whether the objects are ordered according to their degrees of CD or whether they deviate from this ordering.

Four different configuration types of the realization forms of the two objects are analyzed:

- i. both O_i/O_{prep} and O_d are realized by nouns
- ii. both O_i/O_{prep} and O_d are realized by pronouns
- iii. O_i/O_{prep} is realized by a noun and O_d by a pronoun
- iv. O_i/O_{prep} is realized by a pronoun and O_d by a noun

As regards the factors that have an impact on the ordering of the objects, it is assumed that the position of the objects is most probably associated with the principle of end-focus (FSP), which is usually accompanied by the principle of end-weight. The simultaneous operation of these two principles has been pointed out by several authors (e.g. Quirk et al., 1985: 1361ff.; Biber et al., 1999: 898; Arnold et al., 2000: 34), who note that both factors reinforce one another: “Since the new information often needs to be stated more

fully than the given (that is, with a longer, ‘heavier’ structure), it is not unexpected that an organization principle which may be called END-WEIGHT comes into operation along with the principle of end-focus” (Quirk et al., 1985: 1361–2). Thus, items that are new to the discourse tend to be complex, while items that are given tend to be simple. The present paper attempts to determine whether the position of the two objects is in accordance with these principles.

The frequency of ditransitive patterns of all five verbs is presented in Table 1. It shows the syntactic patterns in which the ditransitive verbs *give*, *lend*, *send*, *offer* and *show* occur. The non-prepositional pattern SVO_iO_d is evidently more frequent (62.3%) than the prepositional pattern SVO_dO_{prep} (37%) and there are only five instances of the prepositional pattern $SVO_{prep}O_d$ (0.7%). Hence, generally, we can say that the SVO_iO_d pattern appears to be more frequent than the SVO_dO_{prep} pattern.

Table 1. The overall frequency of ditransitive patterns

Ditransitive pattern:	<i>GIVE</i>	<i>LEND</i>	<i>SEND</i>	<i>OFFER</i>	<i>SHOW</i>	Total	%
SVO_iO_d	98	71	83	40	114	406	62.3%
SVO_dO_{prep}	30	73	71	41	26	241	37%
$SVO_{prep}O_d$	1	3	1	0	0	5	0.7%
Total	129	147	155	81	140	652	100

However, if we take into account the realization form of the two objects, the prevailing clause pattern may change. For instance, in the cases where both objects are realized by nouns, the more frequent object ordering is the SVO_dO_{prep} pattern (see below section 3.1); when O_d is realized by a noun and O_i/O_{prep} by a pronoun, on the other hand, the most common ordering is undoubtedly SVO_iO_d (see below section 3.4). Therefore, the results in Table 1 should be viewed as mere generalizations and it should be borne in mind that the realization form and context-dependence of the two objects should always be taken account of.

Table 2 illustrates the different types of realization of the two objects and their frequency.

Table 2. The overall realization of the two objects

Realization	<i>GIVE</i>	<i>LEND</i>	<i>SEND</i>	<i>OFFER</i>	<i>SHOW</i>	Total	%
noun (O_i/O_{prep}) + noun (O_d)	66	90	64	50	34	304	46.6%
pronoun (O_i/O_{prep}) + pronoun (O_d)	1	5	6	6	10	28	4.3%
noun (O_i/O_{prep}) + pronoun (O_d)	1	3	12	1	5	22	3.4%
pronoun (O_i/O_{prep}) + noun (O_d)	61	49	73	24	91	298	45.7
Total	129	147	155	81	140	652	100%

3.1 The position of O_i/O_{prep} and O_d realized by nouns

Table 3 illustrates the clause patterns and the context-dependence/independence of instances where both objects⁵ are realized by nouns.

Table 3. The position of O_i/O_{prep} and O_d realized by nouns, the context-dependence/independence of the information conveyed by the objects and their FSP function

Clause Pattern			Context-dependence/independence and FSP function			
Pattern	Verb	Total	1st O: dep (Th)	1st O: dep (Th)	1st O: indep (Rh)	1st O: indep (Rh)
			2nd O: indep (Rh)	2nd O: dep (Th)	2nd O: indep (Rh)	2nd O: dep (Th)
SVO _i O _d	<i>GIVE</i>	38	23	0	15	0
	<i>LEND</i>	21	15	0	6	0
	<i>SEND</i>	11	7	0	4	0
	<i>OFFER</i>	13	5	1	7	0
	<i>SHOW</i>	21	9	0	12	0
	Total	104 (34.3%)	59 (56.8%)	1 (0.9%)	44 (42.3%)	0
SVO _d O _{prep}	<i>GIVE</i>	28	0	0	23	5
	<i>LEND</i>	67	0	0	59	8
	<i>SEND</i>	52	8	0	37	7
	<i>OFFER</i>	37	1	0	31	5
	<i>SHOW</i>	13	4	0	9	0
	Total	197 (64.8%)	13 (6.6%)	0	159 (80.7%)	25 (12.7%)
SVO _{prep} O _d	<i>GIVE</i>	0	0	0	0	0
	<i>LEND</i>	2	1	0	1	0
	<i>SEND</i>	1	0	0	1	0
	<i>OFFER</i>	0	0	0	0	0
	<i>SHOW</i>	0	0	0	0	0
	Total	3 (0.9%)	1 (33.3%)	0	2 (66.7%)	0
Total	304 (100%)	73 (24.1%)	1 (0.3%)	205 (67.4%)	25 (8.2%)	

⁵ As for the abbreviations used in Table 3 (as well as in the following tables in the analysis), “dep” stands for context-dependent, “indep” for context-independent. The abbreviations “1st O: dep; 2nd O: indep”, “1st O: dep; 2nd O: dep” etc. bring the context-dependence/independence of the objects into relation with their position (clause pattern). Thus, e.g. in the column “1st O: dep; 2nd O: indep”, the figure “59” denotes that in 59 instances of the pattern SVO_iO_d the first object (i.e. O_i) conveys context-dependent and the second object (i.e. O_d) context-independent information. The abbreviations in brackets Th and Rh denote whether the object pertains to the thematic or rhematic part of the clause. The actual FSP of context-independent objects is determined in the analysis; where relevant, particularly in the case of both context-independent objects, it is determined which of the objects functions as the rheme proper (Rh_{proper}); and where both objects are rheme components (Rh_{comp}), which other element constitutes the rheme proper. The FSP function of context-dependent objects is left aside in the present thesis, since in view of the main aim of the present paper the actual FSP function of context-dependent objects appears to be irrelevant (see section 3).

As follows from Table 3, when both O_i/O_{prep} and O_d are realized by nouns, the prepositional pattern $SVO_d O_{\text{prep}}$ (197 instances – 64.8%) is by far the most frequent pattern. It is nearly twice as frequent as the non-prepositional pattern $SVO_i O_d$ (104 instances – 34.3%) and there are only three instances of the prepositional pattern $SVO_{\text{prep}} O_d$ (0.9%). One of the reasons for a higher occurrence of the prepositional construction has already been pointed out by Jespersen (1927) and Curme (1935), viz. the growing tendency to the prepositional construction. Curme (1935: 132), notes that since “the older dative has lost the distinctive endings that it had in older English the newer form is often preferred as a clearer dative form”. Besides, it is noted that the dative form with *to* is used “to mark the dative relation clearly in cases where doubt might arise”. This is in accordance with Biber et al. (1999: 928), who also regard the prepositional object as a clearer marker of syntactic relationship.

Let us examine the three different clause patterns in greater detail.

3.1.1 $SVO_i O_d$

As regards the context-dependence/independence of the objects in the $SVO_i O_d$ pattern, we find that:

- (a) In 59 instances the O_i conveys context-dependent and O_d context-independent information, O_i pertaining to the thematic section of the sentence and O_d functioning as the rheme (ex. 7). Thus, the linearity serves as one of the indicators of the more important element in the communication; in other words it indicates which element conveys the high point of the message; and thus which element functions as the rheme:
 - (7) Without chapter 11, if a firm were shut down and its assets sold off, the spoils would go first to senior creditors – banks and others that had **lent the firm money**. (ABG,2494)
- (b) In 44 cases both objects convey context-independent information and O_d conveys the information towards which the communication is perspectived, i.e. O_i is a component of the rheme, and O_d functions as the rheme proper; the ordering of the objects is thus in agreement with the basic distribution of communicative dynamism at the clausal level (ex. 8):
 - (8) The policy unit will also discuss an alternative London School of Economics private sector scheme under which the financial institutions, rather than the Treasury, would **lend students money**, with repayments collected through National Insurance contributions. (A88,530)
- (c) One instance (ex. 9) displays a deviation from the basic distribution of CD, as in this example both objects are context-dependent and the element towards which the communication is perspectived (i.e. the high point of the message) is the subject *not all employers*. The rhematic character of the subject is signalled by the negative par-

ticle *not* that functions as a rhematizer (see Dušková, 1988: 532). Firbas (1992: 102) also points out the rhematizing ability of *not*: “[...] *not* is always perspectived to the element that carries the highest degree of CD and serves as RhPr (focus) of the negative sentence. The particle *not* serves as the negation focus anticipator (NegFocA)”.⁶

- (9) Since 1987 it has been possible to ask your employer to deduct regular sums from your pay through the PAYROLL GIVING SCHEME up to a maximum of £600 per annum (*not all employers offer their employees this facility*).

3.1.2 SVO_dO_{prep}

As regards the context-dependence/independence of the objects in the SVO_dO_{prep} pattern:

- (a) In most instances of the SVO_dO_{prep} both objects convey context-independent information (159 of the total of 197 instances – 80.7%); hence, O_d functions as a component of the rheme and O_{prep} as the rheme proper (ex. 10–12). In these cases the ordering of the objects is also in agreement with the basic distribution of communicative dynamism at the clausal level. The high representation of both context-independent objects in the prepositional pattern demonstrate that where both objects convey context-independent information there seems to be a tendency to use the pattern SVO_dO_{prep} . In other words, it appears that it is more usual to put focus on the recipient (and not the patient), i.e. to place the recipient (O_i/O_{prep}) in the final position. In most cases the principle of end-focus coincides with the principle of end-weight, since the head of the noun phrase functioning as O_{prep} is typically post-modified (e.g. by a prepositional phrase, participle or a clause) (ex. 10). In other examples O_{prep} is of comparable length to O_d (ex. 11). Occasionally, the principle of end-focus seems to override the principle of end-weight, the O_d being heavier than O_{prep} (ex. 12):
- (10) These can **offer real support to new actors seeking their first taste of work** and such co-ops do show enormous interest in the work of drama students in their last term. (A06,1544)
- (11) You will need **to send a photograph to Spotlight**, too. (A06,1504)
- (12) Earlier, Mr Justice Judge had ruled in the Manchester High Court that the terms of a temporary injunction be lifted, allowing him to **show financial details of the club to his advisers**. (A4B,347)
- (b) In 13 instances (6.6%) O_d conveys context-dependent and O_{prep} context-independent information; hence the principle of end-focus is again the major factor in the object ordering. In ex. (13) the context-dependent object is signalled by the anaphoric definite article (*the photocopy*) and repetition (*your record*), respectively:

⁶ Note that our FSP interpretation presupposes the intonation centre on the element *Not all employees*.

- (13) The principle indicated in those cases was a long way from the circumstances of the present case and was far from warranting the conclusion that by making a photocopy of a document which in the hands of the maker of the photocopy was not privileged, and then **sending the photocopy to a solicitor** for the purposes of obtaining advice, privilege was thereby cast on the copy sent to the solicitor. (A1Y,24)
- (c) 25 examples of the SVO_dO_{prep} pattern (12.7%) display the opposite distribution of CD, i.e. O_d conveys context-independent (and thus functions as the rheme) and O_{prep} context-dependent information (exx. 14 and 15). In speech, the expressions that would carry the intonation centre of the sentences are *an air of authority* (in ex. 14) and *credence* (in ex. 15), the rheme being the carrier of the intonation centre in general, irrespective of its position. One possible explanation of this ordering of the objects is that the primary grammatical principle of English word order may and often does operate counter to the principle of end-focus to the extent as to override it. In the case of the verb *lend*, another potential factor influencing the ordering is the inanimate nature of the referent of the prepositional object in all cases, which seems to reinforce the non-prepositional pattern.⁷
- (14) Their publication coincided with the Red Anchor period of the Chelsea porcelain factory in the mid 1750s, when many beautiful floral paintings decorated plates and other pieces. These came to be known as ‘Hans Sloane plants’, although he died before their reproduction. The use of his name and his connection with the area, particularly with the Physic Garden and also his reputation abroad, **lent an air of authority to these pieces of china** – as no doubt Mr Sprimont, the astute manager of the factory appreciated. (ALU,1183)
- (15) This is an idea which has fascinated spinners. Girls have been seen in Italy, spinning with spindles over a balcony, while their sisters sat knitting below, which lends support to such a theory. There is also a picture (Church and School of the Carita) by Canaletto in the National Gallery, London, of a woman on a balcony with a distaff and spun thread in her hand, which **lends further credence to the idea**. (AP8,182)

3.1.3 $SVO_{prep}O_d$

There are only three instances of the $SVO_{prep}O_d$ pattern. As for the context-dependence/independence of the objects, in two cases both objects convey context-independent information (ex. 16). In the third case O_{prep} conveys context-dependent information and O_d context-independent information (ex. 17). Thus, we can say that in all three cases the element towards which the communication is perspective is the O_d .

⁷ Note, however, that inanimate O_i in SVO_iO_d pattern is not entirely impossible (cf. Brůhová, 2010: 84).

- (16) He has **sent to the Prime Minister and the Cabinet and Shadow Cabinet a copy of his book on his experiences.**⁸ (A7W,501)
- (17) Election '92: Vengeful undertaker waiting in the wings Godfrey Barker on the man who may succeed Kinnock if Labour lose By GODFREY BARKER GORDON BROWN, the heir presumptive to Neil Kinnock in the event of disaster next Friday, is heir also to John Knox. A son of the manse, he **lends to Labour the dark Church of Scotland tones** that can make the recession sound as bleak as the wind that whips off the Firth of Forth in midwinter. (AHX,339)

The question arises why a speaker selects this unusual ordering when the same distribution of CD could also be achieved by the SVO_iO_d pattern. In attempting to answer the question let us now replicate how Quirk et al. (1985: 1396) describe the prepositional pattern $SVO_{prep}O_d$ in comparison with the SVO_iO_d . Comparing the pattern $SVO_{prep}O_d$ [3] *She gave to her brother a signet ring* (see *ibid.* section 2.4.1.1) with the non-prepositional pattern SVO_iO_d [1] *She gave her brother a signet ring* and the prepositional pattern SVO_dO_{prep} [2] *She gave a signet ring to her brother*, they point out that: “The O_d in [3] has the same rhematic force as in [1] but the O_i has been replaced by a form that raises its communicative dynamism above that of the O_i in [1] though still below that of the paraphrase in [2]” (*ibid.*). Hence, they suggest that the prepositional object in [3] carries less communicative dynamism than the direct object although its degree is definitely higher than in the first example. As the exact amount of CD in the case of both context-independent objects seems rather impossible to determine, a more plausible explanation is found in Biber et al., who describe the $SVO_{prep}O_d$ as a pattern where the preposition *to* “is felt to be a clearer marker of syntactic relationships than word order” (Biber et al., 1999: 928).

3.2 The position of O_i/O_{prep} and O_d realized by pronouns

Proceeding now to the analysis of the position of both objects realized by pronouns, we find two clause patterns, viz. SVO_iO_d and SVO_dO_{prep} .⁹

Of the 28 instances of both objects realized by pronouns, there are 13 instances of SVO_iO_d and 15 instances of SVO_dO_{prep} pattern (see Table 4). Thus, it can be said that the prepositional pattern SVO_dO_{prep} only slightly prevails over the non-prepositional one. Biber et al. (1999: 929), who provide the most detailed analysis of object ordering in the case of pronominal realization, state that the prepositional pattern is by far the most frequent. Nonetheless, such great prevalence of the prepositional pattern has not been confirmed in the present analysis. This could be explained by two reasons. First, the corpus contains a relatively low number of examples where both objects are realized by pronouns (28 instances). Second, it should be borne in mind that Quirk et al. and Biber et

⁸ Note that O_d in ex. (16) is an example of heterogenous element that is classified as context-independent element in the present analysis (for more detail, see section 3.3).

⁹ According to Quirk et al. (1985: 1396) and Biber et al. (1999: 929), there is a third possible ordering, viz. SVO_dO_i (e.g. *give it me*), which is, however, not attested with any of the five ditransitive verbs in the examined corpus.

al. state the possible object ordering only for both objects realized by personal pronouns; they do not take into account other possible realizations.

However, it can be argued that when discussing the ordering of objects realized by pronouns, it is necessary to take into consideration the concrete realization of the pronoun. In other words, the findings of this study imply that the type of pronoun realizing the objects also has an impact on the object ordering. As regards the nonprepositional pattern, in all 13 examples the O_i is realized by a personal pronoun and the O_d by an indefinite or demonstrative pronoun. Hence, the combination “personal pronoun (O_i) + indefinite/demonstrative pronoun (O_d)” seems to favour the SVO_iO_d pattern. The combination of two personal pronouns, on the other hand, appears to favour the prepositional pattern SVO_dO_{prep} . Of 15 cases of the prepositional pattern we find 13 instances of two personal pronouns and 2 instances of “personal + reflexive pronoun” combination.

Table 4. The position of O_i/O_{prep} and O_d realized by pronouns, the context-dependence/independence of the information conveyed by the objects and their FSP function

Clause Pattern			Context-dependence/independence and FSP function			
Pattern	Verb	Total	1st O: dep (Th)	1st O: dep (Th)	1st O: indep (Rh)	1st O: indep (Rh)
			2nd O: indep (Rh)	2nd O: dep (Th)	2nd O: indep (Rh)	2nd O: dep (Th)
SVO_iO_d	<i>GIVE</i>	0	0	0	0	0
	<i>LEND</i>	4	0	4	0	0
	<i>SEND</i>	2	1	1	0	0
	<i>OFFER</i>	4	2	1	0	1
	<i>SHOW</i>	3	3	0	0	0
	Total	13 (46.4%)	6 (46.2%)	6 (46.2%)	0	1 (7.6%)
SVO_dO_{prep}	<i>GIVE</i>	1	0	1	0	0
	<i>LEND</i>	1	0	1	0	0
	<i>SEND</i>	4	2	2	0	0
	<i>OFFER</i>	2	0	2	0	0
	<i>SHOW</i>	7	1	6	0	0
	Total	15 (53.6%)	3 (20%)	12 (80%)	0	0
Total	28 (100%)	9 (32.1%)	18 (64.3%)	0	1 (3.6%)	

3.2.1 SVO_iO_d

As regards the context-dependence/independence and the FSP function of the two objects, we find that:

- (a) In 6 instances both objects convey context-dependent information, the only rhematic element being the verb (ex. 18):

(18) Then, offering the razor: ‘I’ll **lend you this** if you want.’ (ACV,267)

- (b) In 6 instances, the O_i (realized by a personal pronoun) conveys context-dependent, while the O_d realized by the indefinite pronoun *something* context-independent information. Since a context-independent object typically exceeds the verb in CD (see above), the ordering of the two objects appears to be in accordance with their degrees of CD. However, Firbas (1992: 45) points out several restrictions on this general rule, one of them being O realized by the indefinite pronoun *something*, which is the case of ex. (19). Thus, although *something* is context-independent, it does not develop the communication any further and operates as a mere semantic slot filler.¹⁰ Thus, again, the only rhematic element is the verb.¹¹

(19) ‘How long have you got to wait before they’ll **offer you something?**’ (A0E,1216)

- (c) There is one instance where the context-independent O_i precedes the context-dependent O_d . In ex. (20) the O_i , although realized by the personal pronoun *you*, conveys context-independent information, since it is disengaged from context dependence on account of contrast (i.e. “he” has a cigarette “himself” but does not offer one to the other participant of the communication “you”). Thus, the O_i *you* functions as the rheme proper and in speech it would carry the intonation centre.

(20) He poured the wine and lit a cigarette for himself. I won’t **offer you one**. I’m sure you don’t smoke. (A0R,1232)

3.2.2 SVO_dO_{prep}

As regards the context-dependence/independence of the two objects in the prepositional pattern, the findings are as follows:

- (a) In an overwhelming majority of cases, both objects are context-dependent (12 out of 15 instances), the only new (i.e. rhematic) element being the verb (exx. 21 and 22):

(21) Gareth’s appearance surprised everyone, especially Tremayne: he made a bravado entrance to cover shyness in a dinner jacket no one knew he had, and he looked neat, personable and much older than fifteen. ‘Where did you get that?’ his father asked, marvelling. ‘Picked it off a raspberry bush.’ He smiled widely. ‘Well, actually, Sam said I was the same height as him now and he happened to have two. So he’s **lent it to me**. OK?’ (ADY,853)

(22) At the end of a year our judges will choose the best tip of all, and the winner will receive a holiday for two in Thailand, plus £500 spending money. All thanks to

¹⁰ Firbas (1992: 45) notes that *something* may exceed the verb in CD if it is postmodified, e.g. *She must have said something dreadful*. In ex. (20) *something* might be interpreted as being postmodified by a prepositional phrase *on a tray*; however, we regard *on a tray* as an adverbial of place, i.e. an element independent of *something*.

¹¹ It should be borne in mind that in the case of ex. (19) the FSP function of *something* is not reflected in the Table, i.e. that the context-independent 2nd O does not function as Rh. The heading in the table has been kept for the sake of consistency.

BBC Gardeners' World Magazine and Guinness Original. How to enter: Just jot down your tips and ideas, including drawings if appropriate, and **send them to us**. (A0G,1993)

- (b) In one case, O_d is context-dependent, while O_{prep} context-independent. Nevertheless, being realized by an indefinite pronoun *someone* that does not develop the communication any further (similarly to ex. 19), the only rhematic element is again the verb (ex. 23):

(23) If I had the address on a yellow card I could **show it to someone** and they'd tell me. (A74,2589)

- (c) In two instances of the prepositional pattern (exx. 5 and 24) where both objects are realized by personal pronouns, O_d is classified as conveying context-dependent information, while O_{prep} context-independent information, since the O_{prep} is disengaged from context-dependence on the basis of contrast. In ex. (5) *to yourself* is contrasted with a "bank manager", "solicitor" and "publisher" and thus functions as a component of the rheme; the rheme proper is realized by the adverbial "by registered post". In ex. (24) O_{prep} *to me* is contrasted with "local scrap metal dealers" and functions as the rheme proper. Therefore, in these two examples the ordering of objects corresponds to their respective degrees of CD:

(24) Any readers who want to collect aluminium cans can either **send them to me** or contact local scrap metal dealers and take them there, where they can then donate the cash to a charity of their own choice. (A17,1220)

Now, let us focus on the factors that determine the speaker's choice of the prepositional or nonprepositional pattern. The question is whether in the abovementioned examples a different ordering would be possible. Note that in the nonprepositional pattern the O_d is typically realized by an indefinite pronoun (*one* or *some-*), while in the prepositional pattern the O_d is typically realized by *it* or *them*. Since the pronouns in most cases do not differ in givenness or length, the prepositional pattern cannot be explained in terms of the principle of end-focus and end-weight, and the reason for this particular ordering is to be sought in the lexical factors (or in other words the actual realization and combination of pronouns). In the case of the pronoun *it*, the reasons for this ordering of pronouns seem to be lexical: *it* in direct object position triggers off the prepositional pattern $SVO_d O_{prep}$ and renders the $SVO_i O_d$ pattern inadmissible (e.g. in ex. (23) **show someone it*) (cf. Mukherjee, 2005: 103, 197). Lexical factors might also explain the object ordering in the cases where O_d is realized by the personal pronoun *them*. Biber et al. (1999: 930) point out that some personal pronouns (like *them*) can be interpreted as an indirect or a direct object. Consequently, it is argued that to avoid ambiguity the speaker/writer would generally prefer the unambiguous prepositional construction with *to*. Thus, it can be assumed that in the case of *them* in O_d position the $SVO_i O_d$ pattern would not be acceptable (e.g. in ex. (22) **send us them*). Our findings correspond to Mukherjee (2005: 186), who argues that the alternative construction of a ditransitive verb cannot always be used in all contexts, although the verb is traditionally regarded as a verb allowing two

alternative constructions (i.e. SVO_1O_d and SVO_dO_{prep}): “[...] the structural correspondence between the type-I [i.e. SVO_1O_d] and the type-II pattern [i.e. SVO_dO_{prep}] which is assumed in traditional grammars does not very often translate into the possibility of changing the patterns in a given context.”

To answer the question whether the objects are ordered according to their degrees of CD (according to their FSP function), we may conclude that in 25 out of 28 instances of both objects realized by pronouns, the objects are components of the theme, the verb functioning as the rheme proper. In the remaining 3 instances, one object has been disengaged from context-dependence and thus becomes the high point of the message (i.e. the rheme). In two cases the ordering corresponds to the respective degrees of CD, as the element towards which the communication is perspectived is placed finally (exx. 5, 24) and in one case there is a deviation from this pattern, i.e. the rhematic O_1 precedes the thematic O_d (ex. 20).

3.3 The position of substantival O_i/O_{prep} and pronominal O_d

There are altogether 22 occurrences of O_i/O_{prep} realized by a noun and of O_d realized by a pronoun. The only ordering found in the corpus material of this study is the prepositional pattern SVO_dO_{prep} , which corresponds to the hypothesis of Quirk et al. (1985: 1396), who claim that SVO_dO_{prep} is the only possible ordering with this kind of realization. Hence, these findings have not confirmed the assumption of Siewierska & Hollmann (2007: 86), who note that when O_d is realized by a demonstrative or indefinite pronoun, the SVO_1O_d ordering should also be possible.

Table 5. The position of substantival O_i/O_{prep} and pronominal O_d , the context-dependence/independence of the information conveyed by the objects and their FSP function

Clause Pattern			Context-dependence/independence and FSP function			
Pattern	Verb	Total	1st O: dep (Th)	1st O: dep (Th)	1st O: indep (Rh)	1st O: indep (Rh)
			2nd O: indep (Rh)	2nd O: dep (Th)	2nd O: indep (Rh)	2nd O: dep (Th)
SVO_dO_{prep}	<i>GIVE</i>	1	1	0	0	0
	<i>LEND</i>	3	3	0	0	0
	<i>SEND</i>	12	12	0	0	0
	<i>OFFER</i>	1	1	0	0	0
	<i>SHOW</i>	5	4	1	0	0
	Total	22 (100%)	21 (95.5%)	1 (4.5%)	0	0

As far as the FSP is concerned, with one exception, in all cases the ordering of objects corresponds to the respective degrees of CD, since the O_d , realized by a personal or demonstrative pronoun (thus, having anaphoric reference), conveys context-dependent information and O_{prep} conveys context-independent information. Therefore, the O_{prep} functions as the rheme proper (ex. 25). In one case both O_d and O_{prep} convey context-dependent information, the only rhematic element being the verb (ex. 26) (see Table 5).

The position of the two objects is also in accordance with the principle of end-weight. Thus, with this type of object realization, the SVO_iO_d pattern seems to be unacceptable, otherwise both the principle of end-focus and the principle of end-weight would be violated. Moreover, lexical factors also seem to play a role, since, as mentioned above, certain personal pronouns (*it* or *them*) usually cannot be placed in final position and therefore trigger off the prepositional pattern.

- (25) If you have had your letters to Dr Nguyen Dan Que from Vietnam returned, could you please **send them to Dr Que's brother, Dr Nguyen Quoc-Quan.** (A03,273)
- (26) There were demonstrations at Hammersmith; at Rugby where the most vociferous health worker turned out to be a school caretaker; at Bristol; and at Exeter where the demonstrators appeared to have gathered beforehand in the nearby public house. Throughout the dispute my technique was to go through the front door – I refused to be smuggled in – and then ask for a deputation of the demonstrators to come and talk to me. Usually that defused the demonstration and the visit could go ahead uninterrupted. Sometimes the police, however, had other ideas. At Cambridge, NUPE put a picket around the Union building where I was taking part in a debate and the police wanted to take me in by a side entrance. When I protested, they assured me that there would be no question of hiding me from the crowd. A week or two before they had got into trouble when Norman Tebbit had come to Cambridge and in the words of one of the policemen they had not '**shown him**' to the demonstrators. (ABU,841)

3.4 The position of pronominal O_i/O_{prep} and substantival O_d

Turning attention to the 298 instances of O_i/O_{prep} realized by a pronoun and the O_d by a noun, we find that by far the most frequent ordering is SVO_iO_d , (see Table 6), which accounts for 289 instances (96.9%). The remaining 9 instances are represented by 7 instances of the prepositional SVO_dO_{prep} pattern (2.4%) and 2 instances of the prepositional $SVO_{prep}O_d$ pattern (0.7%).

Table 6. The position of pronominal O_i/O_{prep} and substantival O_d , the context-dependence/independence of the information conveyed by the objects and their FSP function

Clause Pattern			Context-dependence/independence and FSP function			
Pattern	Verb	Total	1st O: dep (Th)	1st O: dep (Th)	1st O: indep (Rh)	1st O: indep (Rh)
			2nd O: indep (Rh)	2nd O: dep (Th)	2nd O: indep (Rh)	2nd O: dep (Th)
SVO_iO_d	<i>GIVE</i>	60	60	0	0	0
	<i>LEND</i>	46	43	3	0	0
	<i>SEND</i>	70	70	0	0	0
	<i>OFFER</i>	23	18	3	2	0
	<i>SHOW</i>	90	86	3	1	0
	Total	289 (96.9%)	277 (95.8%)	9 (3.1%)	3 (1.1%)	0

Clause Pattern			Context-dependence/independence and FSP function			
Pattern	Verb	Total	1st O: dep (Th)	1st O: dep (Th)	1st O: indep (Rh)	1st O: indep (Rh)
			2nd O: indep (Rh)	2nd O: dep (Th)	2nd O: indep (Rh)	2nd O: dep (Th)
SVO _d O _{prep}	<i>GIVE</i>	0	0	0	0	0
	<i>LEND</i>	2	0	0	0	2
	<i>SEND</i>	3	0	0	1	2
	<i>OFFER</i>	1	0	0	0	1
	<i>SHOW</i>	1	0	0	0	1
	Total	7 (2.4%)	0	0	1 (14.3%)	6 (85.7%)
SVO _{prep} O _d	<i>GIVE</i>	1	1	0	0	0
	<i>LEND</i>	1	1	0	0	0
	<i>SEND</i>	0	0	0	0	0
	<i>OFFER</i>	0	0	0	0	0
	<i>SHOW</i>	0	0	0	0	0
	Total	2 (0.7%)	2 (100%)	0	0	0
Total		298 (100%)	279 (93.6%)	9 (3.1%)	4 (1.3%)	6 (2%)

Let us examine the three different clause patterns in greater detail.

3.4.1 SVO_iO_d

As regards the context-dependence/independence of the objects in the SVO_iO_d pattern, we find that:

- (a) In 277 instances the O_i conveys context-dependent and O_d context-independent information. As regards the type of pronoun realizing O_i, in most instances it is a personal pronoun (ex. 27), less frequently a reflexive pronoun (ex. 28) and there is one instance of O_i realized by a reciprocal pronoun (ex. 29). The ordering of objects can be said to be in accordance with both the principle of end-focus (the rhematic object is placed at the end of the sentence) and the principle of end-weight (the substantial O_d is considerably heavier than the pronominal O_i):

(27) They can't **give you a purpose or meaning in life**. (A01,139)

(28) Amadeo Franco Perez allegedly spent six years **sending himself more than £1.25m of pay cheques for non-existent employees and selling fake tax receipts**. (A1V,704)

(29) Parisian cultural life between the wars was close-knit; writers and artists **gave each other mutual support**. (A04,238)

- (b) In 9 instances both O_i and O_d convey context-dependent information, thus pertaining to the thematic section, the only rhematic element being the verb (ex. 30).

- (30) The crunch came when my bank asked for my credit card back and demanded I pay off the overdraft at once. I had to ask Mum to **lend me the money** – it was the most humiliating moment of my life. (A7N,530)
- (c) In 3 instances both objects convey context-independent information. Thus, the ordering is in accordance with the basic distribution of CD at the clausal level and linearity serves here as an indicator of the more important element in the communication. It should be noted that in two cases of the context-independent O_i the O_i is realized by an indefinite pronoun *others* (and not by a personal pronoun, which is the most frequent pronoun found with context-dependent objects) (ex. 31). In the third case (ex. 32) the O_i *them* is disengaged from context-dependence by means of *both*, which signals its rhematic function.
- (31) Now those unused tomes of practical or technical information can be donated to a worthy cause, **offering others the opportunity to gain from our over-filled bookshelves**. (A0X,111)
- (32) Why on earth had she been so precise in depicting her supposed ideal man to Caroline and Roger? She heard that his flat, to which she foresaw she would soon be invited, was a mixture of Victorian (the furniture) and deco (the mirrors, the glass). He hated all soaps, especially Neighbours. He did a great deal of walking. He played tennis. He didn't jog. He rarely ate red meat. This was terrible; he was exactly as she had envisaged. What could she do? Caroline returned, 'Everything all right?' and **offered them both more wine**. (A0R, 2770)

3.4.2 SVO_dO_{prep}

In all 7 instances of the prepositional pattern SVO_dO_{prep} , the ordering of objects operates counter to the principle of end-focus and the principle of end-weight. As regards the context-dependence/independence of the two objects:

- (a) Six instances of the prepositional pattern display deviation from the ordering according to the respective degrees of CD, since the pronominal O_i/O_{prep} conveying context-dependent information follows the substantival O_d conveying context-independent information. Therefore the context-independent O_d functioning as the rheme precedes the thematic O_{prep} . The pronominal O_{prep} is predominantly realized by a personal pronoun (exx. 33, 34) and in one case by a demonstrative pronoun (ex. 35), in all cases having anaphoric reference. When seeking speaker's motivation for the choice of the prepositional pattern, where the ordering of objects is at variance with their degrees of CD (i.e. the rhematic O_d precedes the thematic O_{prep}), it can be presumed that occasionally the English grammatical word order overrides the principle of end-focus and even the principle of end-weight. Considering the existence of the alternative non-prepositional pattern SVO_iO_d (see section 3.4.1) and the prepositional construction with the pronoun preceding the direct object $SVO_{prep}O_d$ (see section 3.4.3), these examples confirm that English word order primarily serves as a grammatical device.

- (33) As printers became more powerful, it became necessary **to send more control information to them**, such as to set margin widths or select fonts. (A19,931)
- (34) Central Council **sends its good wishes to her**. (A65,185)
- (35) The Times hypothesised in the course of the election campaign that it was leaders who lost elections, not challengers who won them. The circumstances which led to the inconclusive ballot result **lend some credence to this**. (APE,210)
- (b) In one occurrence of the prepositional pattern SVO_dO_{prep} , where O_{prep} is realized by the indefinite pronoun *anybody* (ex. 36), both objects convey context-independent information. The indefinite pronoun *anybody*, when unstressed,¹² appears to behave like the pronoun *something* (mentioned above, see section 3.2), i.e. although context-independent, it does not exceed the verb in CD and operates as a mere semantic slot filler. Hence, the only rhematic element is the verb:
- (36) And he did not **send any word to anybody** when he knew you were coming home? (A6N,2177)

3.4.3 $SVO_{prep}O_d$

In the only two cases of the prepositional pattern $SVO_{prep}O_d$, the O_{prep} conveys context-dependent information and O_d context-independent information (ex. 37). Thus we may say that the position of the two objects is in accordance with their respective degrees of CD. Since the same distribution of CD could also be achieved by SVO_iO_d ordering, the preposition *to* probably serves here again as a clearer marker of the syntactic relationship:

- (37) This book shows something of what has emerged out of religious interpretations of death, not as a history of death but as an indication of what lies at the root of the major religious traditions, **leading to each its characteristic style**. (A10,1226)

3.5 The overall correlation between the object ordering and the respective degrees of CD

Table 7 summarizes our findings regarding the correlation between the object ordering and the degrees of CD.

¹² However, if the intonation centre were on the indefinite pronoun *anybody*, then *anybody* would function as the rheme.

Table 7. The overall correlation between the object ordering and the degrees of CD

Realization	Pattern	Agreement Rh = 2nd O	Deviation			Total
			Rh = verb	Rh = 1st O	Rh = subject	
NOUN + NOUN	SVO _i O _d	103	0	0	1	104
	SVO _d O _{prep}	172	0	25	0	197
	SVO _{prep} O _d	3	0	0	0	3
	Total	278	0	25	1	304
			26			
PRON + PRON	SVO _i O _d	0	12	1	0	13
	SVO _d O _{prep}	2	13	0	0	15
	Total	2	25	1	0	28
				26		
NOUN (O _i /O _{prep}) + PRON (O _d)	SVO _d O _{prep}	21	1	0	0	22
	Total	21	1	0	0	22
				1		
PRON (O _i /O _{prep}) + NOUN (O _d)	SVO _i O _d	280	9	0	0	289
	SVO _d O _{prep}	0	1	6	0	7
	SVO _{prep} O _d	2	0	0	0	2
	Total	282	10	6	0	298
			16			
Total		583 (89.4%)	36 (5.5%)	32 (4.9%)	1 (0.2%)	652 (100%)
			69 (10.6%)			

4. Conclusions

In the present study an attempt was made to determine whether the position of the two objects is in accordance with the principle of end-focus and the principle of end-weight or whether there are other potential factors that might play a role in object ordering. To summarize the findings regarding the correlation between the object ordering and the degrees of CD, we can say that of all 652 ditransitive constructions in 583 instances (89.4%) the objects are ordered in accordance with the increase of CD (see Table 7). Thus, in most instances the interaction of the two major word order principles, the grammatical and FSP, appear to be cooperative, i.e. there is agreement between the ordering of the objects and their degrees of CD. Deviation from this pattern of CD was observed in 69 instances (10.6%). In these cases, the element that functions as the rheme is either the verb (36 instances, 5.5%) or the first object (32 instances, 4.9%) or the subject (1 instance, 0.2%). These deviations are due to the operation of the grammatical principle of English word order which overrides the principle of end-focus. Moreover, since in most cases the object in the rhematic position is postmodified by a clause or a heavy phrase, the object

ordering is also in accordance with the principle of end-weight. Thus, it has been confirmed that the principle of end-focus tends to correspond to the principle of end-weight, as the new information often needs to be stated more fully than the given.

In addition, the analysis has shown that in the case of pronominal realization of object(s) also lexical factors appear to play a role, since certain personal pronouns (*it* or *them*) cannot usually be placed in final position and therefore trigger off the prepositional pattern.

REFERENCES

- Allerton, D. J. (1982) *Valency and the English Verb*. New York, Academic Press.
- Arnold, J. E., Wasow, T., Losongco, A., Gingstrom, R. (2000) Heaviness vs. newness: Effects of structural complexity and discourse status on constituent ordering. *Language* 76: 28–55.
- Biber, D., Johansson, S., Leech, G., Conrad, S., Finegan, E. (1999) *Longman Grammar of Spoken and Written English*. London, Longman.
- Brůhová, G. (2010) *Syntactic, semantic and FSP aspects of ditransitive complementation: A study of give, lend, send, offer and show*. PhD. thesis. Praha, Univerzita Karlova v Praze.
- Curme, G. O. (1935) *Parts of Speech and Accidence, A Grammar of the English Language* 3. Boston, Heath.
- Duškova, L. (1999a) Basic distribution of communicative dynamism vs. nonlinear indication of functional sentence perspective. In E. Hajičová, T. Hoskovec, O. Leška, P. Sgall, Z. Skoumalová (eds.), *Travaux du Cercle linguistique de Prague NS. Prague Linguistic Circle Papers* 3: 249–261. Amsterdam/Philadelphia, John Benjamins.
- Duškova, L. (1999b) The role of definiteness in functional sentence perspective. *Studies in the English Language* 2: 289–301. Praha, Karolinum.
- Duškova, L. (2008) Some thoughts on potentiality in syntactic and FSP structure. In V. Smolka (ed.), *The Dynamics of the Language System, South Bohemian Anglo-American Studies* 2: 3–13. České Budějovice, Jihočeská univerzita v Českých Budějovicích.
- Duškova, L. et al. (2006 [1988]) *Mluvnice současné angličtiny na pozadí češtiny* [A grammar of contemporary English against the background of Czech]. Praha, Academia.
- Firbas, J. (1992) *Functional Sentence Perspective in Written and Spoken Communication*. Cambridge, University Press.
- Firbas, J. (1995) Retrieval span in functional sentence perspective. *Brno Studies in English* 21: 17–45. Brno, Masarykova univerzita.
- Gropen, J., Pinker, S., Hollander, M., Goldberg, R., Wilson, R. (1989) The learnability and acquisition of the dative alternation in English. *Language* 65: 203–257.
- Huddleston, R., Pullum, G. K. (2002) *Cambridge Grammar of the English Language*. Cambridge, University Press.
- Jespersen, O. (1909–1949) *A Modern English Grammar on Historical Principles* 3 – *Syntax* 2 (1927). Heidelberg, Carl Winters.
- Levin, B. (1993) *English Verb Classes and Alternations: a preliminary investigation*. Chicago/IL, The University of Chicago Press.
- Levin, B. (2008) *Dative verbs and dative alternations from a cross-linguistic perspective* <http://www.stanford.edu/~bclevin/hu08dat.pdf>.
- Matthews, P. H. (1981) *Syntax*. Cambridge, Cambridge University Press.
- Mukherjee, J. (2006) *English Ditransitive verbs: aspects of theory, description and a usage-based model*. Amsterdam/New York, Rodopi.
- Quirk, R., Greenbaum, S., Leech, G., Svartvik, J. (1972) *A Grammar of Contemporary English*. London, Longman.
- Quirk, R., Greenbaum, S., Leech, G., Svartvik, J. (1985) *A Comprehensive Grammar of the English Language*. London, Longman.

Siewierska, A., Hollmann, W. (2007) Ditransitive clauses in English with special reference to Lancashire dialect. In M. Hannay, G. J. Steen (eds.), *Structural-Functional Studies in English Grammar*: 83–102. Amsterdam, John Benjamins.

Svoboda, A. (1981) *Diatheme*. Brno, Masarykova univerzita.

Wasow, T., Arnold, J. (2003) Post-verbal constituent ordering in English. In G. Rohdenburg, B. Mondorf (eds.), *Determinants of Grammatical Variation in English*: 119–154. Berlin, Mouton de Gruyter.

Sources

British National Corpus (BNC) – accessed from <http://ucnk.ff.cuni.cz/>.

ABBREVIATIONS

BD of CD	basic distribution of communicative dynamism
CD	communicative dynamism
CamGEL	Cambridge Grammar of the English Language
CGEL	A Comprehensive Grammar of the English Language
dep	context-dependent
ex	example
indep	context-independent
O	object
O _d	direct object
O _i	indirect object
O _{prep}	prepositional object
Rh	rheme
Rh _{comp}	component of the rheme
Rh _{proper}	rheme proper
S	subject
Th	theme
Th _{proper}	theme proper

DITRANZITIVNÍ KOMPLEMENTACE Z HLEDISKA AKTUÁLNÍHO ČLENĚNÍ VĚTNÉHO

Resumé

Studie se zabývá analýzou pěti ditranzitivních sloves *give*, *lend*, *send*, *offer* a *show* se zaměřením na pozici předmětů a faktory, které ovlivňují jejich řazení. Práce podává systematický přehled pozice předmětů s ohledem na jejich realizaci, která má čtyři různé formy: i. oba předměty O_i/O_{prep} i O_d jsou realizovány substantivy; ii. oba předměty O_i/O_{prep} i O_d jsou realizovány zájmeny; iii. O_i/O_{prep} je realizován substantivem a O_d zájmenem; iv. O_i/O_{prep} je realizován zájmenem a O_d substantivem. Cílem práce je zjistit, zda jsou předměty řazeny v souladu s principem koncového postavení rématu („principle of end-focus“) a s principem postpozice rozvítejších větných členů („principle of end-weight“), nebo zda v řazení předmětů hrají roli i jiné faktory. Ze tří (popř. čtyř, včetně intonace) faktorů určujících aktuálně-členskou funkci větného členu v případě ditranzitivní komplementace hraje největší roli kontext. Zvláštní pozornost je proto věnována kontextové závislosti/nezávislosti obou předmětů.

Práce přinesla zajímavé zjištění, že při hodnocení řazení předmětů je třeba brát v úvahu jejich realizační formu. Z výsledků vyplývá, že bezpředložkový syntaktický vzorec SVO_dO_d (62.3%) převažuje nad předložkovými vzorci SVO_dO_{prep} (37%) a SVO_{prep}O_d (0.7%). Obecně lze tedy říci, že se vzorec SVO_dO_d vyskytuje častěji než SVO_dO_{prep}. Vlivem konkrétní realizace předmětů však může převažovat jiný větný

typ. Na příklad jsou-li oba předměty realizovány substantivy, převládá vzorec SVO_dO_{prep} ; avšak v případech, kdy je O_d realizován substantivem a O_i/O_{prep} zájmenem, jednoznačně nejčastější vzorec je SVO_iO_d . Dalším pozoruhodným zjištěním je, že v případě zájmenné realizace obou předmětů je nezbytné brát v potaz konkrétní druh zájmena, neboť i to může mít na řazení předmětů vliv.

Pokud jde o aktuálněčlenský aspekt ditranzitivní komplementace, z celkového počtu 652 příkladů odpovídá řazení předmětů v 583 případech (89.4%) zvyšujícímu se stupni výpovědní dynamičnosti, tj. mezi řazením předmětů a jejich stupněm výpovědní dynamičnosti je shoda. Odchylky se vyskytují celkově v 69 případech (10.6%): ve 36 případech (5.5%) je rématem sloveso, ve 32 případech (4.9%) první předmět a v jednom případě je rématem podmět (0.2%). Všechny tyto odchylky vznikají pravděpodobně působením gramatického slovosledu v angličtině. Bylo rovněž potvrzeno, že oba principy (principle of end-focus a principle of end-weight) působí ve větě současně a jeden s druhým souvisí, neboť novou informaci je většinou třeba vyjádřit pomocí více slov.