



## A metafunctional approach to word order in Persian language

Ahmad Farshbafian<sup>a1</sup> , Esmail Safaei Asl<sup>b</sup> 

<sup>a</sup>Tabriz University, Iran

<sup>b</sup>Allamah Tabataba'i University, Iran

### APA Citation:

Farshbafian, A. & Safaei Asl, E. (2021). A metafunctional approach to word order in Persian language. *Journal of Language and Linguistic Studies*, 17(Special Issue 2), 773-793.

Submission Date: 05/09/2020

Acceptance Date: 24/10/2020

---

### Abstract

Within the framework of the systematic functional grammar (SFG), Matthiessen (2004) has provided an analysis of the word/element order according to which word/element order in a clause is decided by experiential, interpersonal and textual metafunctions. In this study which has been conducted aiming at the description and analysis of the word/element order in a simple Persian clause, we have sought to describe and analyze the sequence of the main elements in a Persian active simple declarative clause within Matthiessen (2004)'s metafunctional model. In fact, through evidence from Persian language, i.e. samples derived from Persian texts and also other Persian researchers' works, we have sought to demonstrate how the three experiential, interpersonal and textual metafunctions are involved in determining the order of the main elements in an active simple declarative clause in Persian. The results of this study show that the "basic" order of the main elements in a Persian simple clause and specifically single-Complement clause is in line with both experiential and interpersonal metafunctions and any type of the movement of the aforementioned elements in an active simple declarative clause in Persian language is explained with the help of the mechanisms of textual metafunction.

© 2021 JLLS and the Authors - Published by JLLS.

*Keywords:* systematic functional grammar; Matthiessen; word order; metafunction; Persian language

---

## 1. Introduction

"Word order typology", or precisely speaking, "constituent order typology"<sup>1</sup> as one of the sub-branches of "language typology"<sup>2</sup> deals with the diversity among languages based on the sequence of constituents. Regarding the description of the aforementioned diversity, one can identify three models: a) six-way typology, b) four-way typology, and c) two-way typology.

A) Six-way Typology. This model, which is a lasting tradition in linguistics and is closely related with Greenberg's work (1963)<sup>3</sup> (cf. Dryer, 1989; 1997), classifies the languages based on the typological parameter of "relative sequence of subject, verb and object"<sup>4</sup> in six logically possible linguistic types (Comrie, 1989): 1) subject-object-verb (SOV), 2) subject-verb-object (SVO), 3) verb-subject-object (VSO), 4) verb-object-subject (VOS), 5) object-verb-subject (OVS), 6) object-subject-verb (OSV). Comrie (ibid) has noted that the distribution of these six linguistic types among the world languages is

---

<sup>1</sup> Corresponding Author.

E-mail address: [farshbafian@tabrizu.ac.ir](mailto:farshbafian@tabrizu.ac.ir)

intensively tending towards the first three types, particularly the first two types.<sup>5</sup> As to the order of words in languages, particularly within the framework of six-way typology model, three points are noteworthy. It should be stated that the first two points have been mentioned by Comrie (*ibid*) and the third one is indicated by Givón (2001).

- Contrary to the model of six-way typology on the basis of which every language can be assigned one of the six basic orders, there are many languages where determining the fundamental word order is less clear-cut and even some languages may lack a fundamental word order. The languages that lack a fundamental word order in which the order of the words is free are called “free word order languages”. Nevertheless, Comrie (*ibid*) has noted that even in the free word order languages including Russian, one of the possible word orders can be considered to be more basic than the other orders in respect of frequency.
- In some languages, the fundamental word order is split; in other words, in aforementioned languages, there are two fundamental word orders each one of which is concerned with a different structure. For example, in German the main clauses are of SVO word order but the dependent clauses have the fundamental order of SOV (Comrie, *ibid*).
- As to the “fixedness” and “freedom” in word order in “fixed and free word order languages”, Givon (*ibid*) has claimed that fixed word order is not totally similar in no language in all of its structures. Even in those languages which have the most fixed word orders, there are certain structures where the order of words is changing. According to Givon (*ibid*), pragmatic considerations including “topic” and “focus” are the motive for change in the word order in marked structures. Givon (*ibid*) has noted that we can find a graded measure between the maximum stability and maximum flexibility or freedom in the order of words in a clause.

B) Four-way Typology. Dryer (1997), with the help of eight arguments, has demonstrated the insufficiency of six-way typology and replaced the four-way typology with it. Within the framework of the four-way typology and on the basis of two parameters of two-way typology, i.e. OV (object-verb order) versus VO (verb-object order), on the one hand, and SV (subject-verb order) versus VS (verb-subject order), on the other hand, languages are classified into four language types: 1) VS and VO, 2) SV and VO, 3) SV and OV and 4) VS and OV. It is noteworthy that through a number of arguments, Dryer in his essay (2013), in response to the arguments of Newmeyer (2004; 2005), and in defence of the idea of six-way typology, has endorsed the insufficiency of the idea of six-way typology and on the contrary, the sufficiency of the four-way typology.

C) Two-way Typology. According to this model and on the basis of a two-way typology parameter, i.e. object-verb order (OV) versus verb-object order (VO), languages are classified into the following two ideal language types: 1) OV languages, 2) VO languages. The fundamental thought governing the two-way typology is that at least in ideal state, OV languages are opposite to the VO languages. In other words, all typological features of the word order of OV languages are reversed (*cf.* Dryer, 1996). It is necessary to note that classification of languages into two types of VO and OV languages is based on the existence of correlation between the verb and object order, on the one hand, and particular pair order of grammatical elements, on the other hand. In other words, two-way typology is grounded in several correlated typological parameters and is not merely restricted to the typological parameters of “sequence of main constituents of clause”. As to the existence of correlation between the order of verb and object and order of particular pairs of grammatical elements, Dryer (1992) has noted that although Greenberg (1963) was clearly conscious that many of his statistical universals represented a substructural model of numerous pairs of correlated elements with VO order, Lehmann (1973; 1978) and Vennemann (1973; 1974a; 1976b; 1974) highlighted this substructural model in the domain of typology. Nevertheless, neither Lehmann nor Vennemann provided any systematic evidence that would confirm their

hypothesis regarding the order of those pairs of elements which are correlated with the VO order. It is noteworthy that Dryer (1992), through studying features of word order in 625 languages, has provided results that confirm many claims as to the correlations of the word order.

In the present article, we strive to describe and analyze the order and sequence of the main elements in an active declarative simple clause in Persian language within the framework of Matthiessen (2004)'s metafunctional model via evidence from Persian language, and also the works of other researchers of Persian language. Before starting this description and analysis, we shortly introduce the studies conducted regarding the word order in Persian within the framework of the previous models.

## **2. Typological Studies of Word Order in Persian Language**

In this part, the studies conducted regarding “word order” in Persian language are introduced within the framework of three typological models of word order, i.e. six-way typology, four-way typology and two-way typology.

### *2.1. Six-way Typology*

As to the typological behavior of Persian language within the framework of six-type typology of word order, two different views can be identified:

A) According to the first view, Persian language is an SOV (subject-object-verb) language. In other words, the basic order of words/constituents in a Persian clause is SOV (cf. Bateni, 2001; Mahootian, 1999; Golfam, 2006; Dabir Moghaddam, 2013). The following examples are pieces of evidence that substantiate this claim:

- 1) mæn ān film-rā did-æm.  
I that film-obj. watched-I  
'I watched that film' (Bateni, *ibid*).
- 2) Ali Mæryæm-rā did-Ø.  
Ali Maryam-obj. saw-he  
'Ali saw Maryam' (Golfam, *ibid*).

It is noteworthy that the basic order of the main constituents in Persian clauses having two objects is in the following form:

- 3) subject –(implicit/prepositional group object)-explicit object-verb (Mahootian, *ibid*; Roberts, 2009, as cited in Dabir Moghaddam, 2011).

The following clause is an example that endorses this claim:

- 4) mæn be to xænjær-i mi-dæh-æm.  
I to you dagger-indefinite present-give-I  
'I give you a dagger'.

The significant point regarding the basic order of implicit object and explicit object is that the definite explicit object precedes the implicit object but the indefinite explicit object follows the implicit object (cf. Roberts, *ibid*; Mahootian, *ibid*; Rasekh Mahand, 2004). It is noteworthy that the two aforementioned basic orders for the explicit object in Persian have been argued by Karimi (2003, as cited in Rasekh Mahand & Ghiyasvand, 2015) as “Two Object Position Hypothesis”. The semantic parameter of specificity/definiteness is considered to be involved in the assignment of the two different basic positions.

It is noteworthy that according to Givon (*ibid.*) on the lack of absolute stability in word order, the main constituents in a Persian clause can also be moved. In other words, although the basic order of main constituents in a Persian declarative clause is SOV, these constituents can be moved. Then, one can expect the main constituents in a Persian declarative clause to have a marked order. The examples 5 and 6 are pieces of evidence for this claim:

5) ān film-rā mæn did-æm.  
that film-obj. I watched-I  
'I watched that film' (Batani, *ibid.*).

- 6) A) be Minā mæn gol-ro dād-æm. (Mahootian, *ibid.*) [11]<sup>6</sup>  
to Mina I flower-obj. gave-I  
'I gave the flower to Mina'<sup>7</sup>.  
B) gol-ro mæn be Minā dād-æm. [12]  
flower-obj. I to Mina gave-I  
'I gave the flower to Mina'.  
C) dād-æm mæn be Minā gol-ro. [14]  
gave-I I to Mina flower-obj.  
'I gave the flower to Mina'.  
D) gol-ro dād-æm mæn be Minā. [15]  
flower-obj. gave-I I to Mina  
'I gave the flower to Mina'.

Other studies including Ahmadipur (2012) underline the flexibility of the basic order of the main constituents in a Persian declarative clause.

B) The second view considers the Persian language to have a free word order. In this regard, Samareh (1990, as cited in Dabir Moghaddam, 2013, p. 100) has argued that "Persian is not sensitive to the order of the constituents in the main clause, insofar as one can consider it to be among the languages that have free order. For SVO order or even other orders are acceptable depending on the grammatical situation. Therefore, one should not consider the parameter of main clause to be vital in typology of this language". In line with Samareh's perspective, Rasekh Mahand (2004, p. 56) has noted that "Persian language is one of those languages that are of free word order type, and in Persian language, constituents can be in several positions in a sentence". Majidi (2011) and Kazemi and Afrashi (2013) have also considered the order of words in Persian to be free. Rasekh Mahand (*ibid.*; 2006) has discussed the function of the process of "scrambling"<sup>8</sup> in Persian as an evidence to prove the free order of constituents in a Persian clause and has illustrated his claim with the following sentences.

- 7) A. Arya ketāb-rā be Nazanin dād-Ø.<sup>9</sup> [1]  
Arya book-obj. to Nazanin gave-he.  
'Arya gave the book to Nazanin'.  
B. ketāb-rā Arya be Nazanin dād-Ø.  
Book-obj. Arya to Nazanin gave-he.  
'Arya gave the book to Nazanin'.  
C. be Nazanin Arya ketāb-rā dād-Ø.  
to Nazanin Arya book-obj. gave-he.  
'Arya gave Nazanin the book'.  
D. ketāb-rā be Arya Nazanin dād-Ø.  
book-obj. to Arya Nazanin gave-she.  
'Nazanin gave Arya the book'.  
E. Arya be Nazanin ketāb-rā dād-Ø.  
Arya to Nazanin book-obj. gave-he.  
'Arya gave the book to Nazanin'.  
F. Arya ketāb-rā dād-Ø be Nazanin.

Arya book-obj. gave-he to Nazanin.  
'Arya gave the book to Nazanin'.

As to the second view, Dabir Moghaddam (2013) has first raised a hypothesis as follows:

8) Persian language is basically a language with free word order. [35]

Then, based on the findings attained through a study of the word order in Persian in three ancient, middle and modern periods of Persian language, Dabir Moghaddam has refuted the aforementioned hypothesis and has concluded that in modern period, we are witnessing the further establishment and stability of the sequence of the main constituents in a sentence (or word order).

## *2.2. Four-way Typology*

As far as the authors know, no study has been conducted concerning the typological behavior of Persian language within the framework of the four-way typology. Nevertheless, according to the studies conducted on the word order in Persian language within the framework of six-way typology, one can infer that Persian language belongs to SV and OV type, i.e. verb-final type, among the four presupposed language types (cf. Dryer, 1997).

## *2.3. Two-way Typology*

Dabir Moghaddam (2013) has conducted a typological study of the word order in Persian language within the framework of the two-way typology and specifically Dryer's article (1992). In this study, Dabir Moghaddam has concluded that Persian language tends more towards 'strong verb-medial (verb before the object)' languages and he has hypothesized that Persian language is in the stage of type change. In their study as regards the word order in Persian language within the framework of Dryer's article (ibid) and relying on the measure of grammaticalization, Davari and Giunashvili (2013) have concluded that "... Persian language, instead of being a language with a free word order and influenced by discursal motives, is a language with a fixed and unchangeable word order that is more under the control of grammar than under the applied and discursal motives. This feature shows the relative tendency of Persian language towards a linguistic pattern that enjoys a fixed word order in the group level and a free word order in clause level ..."

The final significant point in recapping the typological behaviors of Persian language in terms of the three models of word order typology is that Persian language is a verb-final language on the basis of both six-way and four-way typology models, while based on the two-way model, it is a strong verb-medial language. This dual behavior of Persian language explains the two uses of the terms "language with VO order" and "language with OV order" (For further information cf. Comrie, 1989).

Now having touched upon the previous studies regarding the word order typology in Persian language, we continue to introduce the metafunctional approach to the constituent order. Then, based on the aforementioned approach, we will try to analyze the order of the main constituents in a Persian active declarative simple clause.

## **3. Metafunctional Approach to Constituent Order in Persian Language**

### *3.1. Theoretical Framework*

As previously mentioned, this essay strives to analyze the order of the main constituents of an active declarative simple clause in Persian language from a metafunctional perspective, specifically from

Matthiessen (2004)' metafunctional point of view. Before presenting the aforementioned analysis, we discuss Matthiessen (ibid)'s metafunctional perspective regarding the word/constituent order.

Within the framework of “systematic functional grammar” and specifically in the discussion concerning “word order”, Matthiessen (ibid) has dealt with the difference between the “free word order” and “fixed word order”. In this regard, he has argued that these terms are so misleading. Thus, it is more useful to leave them aside, because free order is not free and the fixed order is not fixed. The matter is not the “freedom” or “fixedness” in sequence and order of the elements of clause, rather the main issue is that which metafunction has the most dominant role in determining the order of clause elements. Free order typically refers to the order that is decided by the textual metafunction while the fixed order represents an order that determines the interpersonal or experiential metafunction. Matthiessen (ibid) considers the difference that has recently been drawn between the “pragmatic word order” and “grammatical word order” to be useless, because the aforementioned difference does not reveal the metafunctional origin of the effective parameters influencing the sequence of the clause elements. Although the “pragmatic” term is an equivalent of the textual metafunction, it is not clear if the term “grammatical” refers to the interpersonal parameters or to the experiential parameters.

It is necessary to be noted that the difference between the pragmatic (or discourse-determined) and the grammatical (or syntactic) word order is another tradition in word order typology which has been discussed in such works as that of Thompson (1978) (cf. Dryer, 1989).

According to what was said above as regards Matthiessen's approach to “word order”, one can call the aforementioned approach “metafunctional typology of word order” and consider it to be a new approach to the typological studies.

### *3.2. Metafunctional Constituent Order<sup>10</sup> in Persian Language*

As previously mentioned at the beginning of 1-3, the main goal of the present article is to study the order of the main elements of the active declarative simple clause in Persian language within the framework of Matthiessen (ibid)'s model. Strictly speaking, in the present study, we strive to analyze the sequence of the main elements in the simple active declarative clause in Persian language from the perspective of Matthiessen's metafunctional approach. Accordingly, we are no longer concerned with the “fixed” or “free” order of the elements in the Persian clause. It is noteworthy that within the framework of the metafunctional typology of word order, experiential or interpersonal order is replaced with the fixed order and the textual order is replaced with the free constituent order. Precisely speaking, within the aforementioned framework, fixed or unmarked word order in clause level is explained by the assistance of the experiential metafunctional mechanisms or interpersonal metafunctional mechanisms while free sequence or marked order of words is explained by the textual metafunctional mechanisms.

#### *3.2.1. Experiential Order*

##### *3.2.1.1. Introduction*

Within the framework of the systematic functional grammar, every clause has a line of meaning or metafunction: experiential metafunction, interpersonal metafunction and textual metafunction. Each one of the three lines of meaning has exclusive sources or systems of meaning creation. In this subsection, we shortly explain the experiential metafunction.

The fundamental system within the experiential metafunction is the system of TRANSITIVITY.<sup>11</sup> The system of TRANSITIVITY construes a quantum of change in the form of process+participant+circumstantial adjuncts (cf. Matthiessen, ibid). It is noteworthy that the two elements of “process” and “participant” constitute the “experiential centre” of the clause and the circumstantial adjuncts in some way augment the experiential centre of the clause (cf. Halliday &

Matthiessen, 2014). Since the present paper focuses on the order of main elements of the clause, we avoid dealing with the discussion of the circumstantial adjuncts and instead we focus on the two core elements of process and participant.

As to the interaction of the two elements of process and participant in the clause, two models can be recognized: the model of TRANSITIVITY and model of ERGATIVITY. According to the model of TRANSITIVITY, a participant is the controller of the process. Such a clause is called “intransitive”. Representation of the process would be expanded beyond the Controller participant and influence another participant called Impacted. Such a clause is called “transitive”. Accordingly, given the model of TRANSITIVITY, the two types of intransitive clause (Controller+process) and transitive clause (Controller+process+Impacted) are systematically contrasting each other and the difference between the two types of clause is explained by the variable of “extension”. It needs to be mentioned that within the framework of the model of TRANSITIVITY, each process has its own exclusive participants. In other words, the participant “we” in the example (9) which is a relational clause has the function of an Assigner but in the example (10) which is a mental clause, it has a different function, i.e. Inducer. Thus, the participant “each other” in the relational clause (9) has the function of “Token” while in the mental clause (10), it has a different function, i.e. Senser.

- (9) mā hæmdijær-rā kæfče māhi sedā mi-kon-im.  
 we each other-obj. flounder call present-do-we  
 ‘We call each other flounder’ (Behrangī, 1968)

mā we We	hæmdijær-rā each other-obj. each other	kæfče māhi flounder flounder	sedā mi-kon-im call present-do-we call
Assigner	Token	Value	process: relational

- (10) mā hæmdijær-rā xošhāl mi-kon-im.  
 we each other-obj. happy present-make-we  
 ‘We make each other happy’.

mā we We	hæmdijær-rā each other-obj. each other	xošhāl mi-kon-im happy present-make-we make happy
Inducer	Senser	process: mental

Given the ergativity based model of process-participant interaction, process is represented through a participant called Medium. It is noteworthy that “Medium” is the only essential and internal participant which is always involved in the representation of every process. This participant is indeed a “medium” for the realization of the process. In the realization of the process through the participant of Medium, there would be another participant called Agent which is an unessential and external participant. Accordingly, given the model of ergativity, two types of middle clause (Medium+process) and effective clause (Agent+Medium+process) are systematically distinguished from each other and the difference between these two types of clauses is based on the variable of “causation”. Another important point as regards the model of ergativity is that in this model, contrary to the model of transitivity, participants in all types of processes have fixed functions and hence, the functions of participants do not vary from process to process. In the examples (11) and (12), which are respectively a repetition of the examples (9) and (10), we see that the participant “We” in two different clauses (11) and (12) has a similar

function, i.e. Agent. The participant “each other” in two clauses (11) and (12) plays a fixed function, i.e. Medium.

(11) mā hæmdijær-rā kæfče māhi sedā mi-kon-im.

mā we We	hæmdijær-rā each other-obj. each other	kæfče māhi flounder flounder	sedā mi-kon-im call present-do-we call
Agent	Medium	Range	process: relational

(12) mā hæmdijær-rā xošhāl mi-kon-im.

mā we we	hæmdijær-rā each other-obj. each other	xošhāl mi-kon-im happy present-make-we make happy
Agent	Medium	process: mental

The final point as regards the two models of transitivity and ergativity is that these two models complement each other and each clause can be analyzed from two perspectives of transitivity and ergativity (cf. Matthiessen, *ibid*).

### 3.2.1.2. Experiential Order of Main Constituents in a Persian Declarative Clause

First it is worthy to remind the unmarked order of the main constituents in a Persian simple declarative clause, which is indeed based on two studies conducted by Mahootian (2004) and Roberts (2009, as cited in Dabir Moghaddam, 2011). The order in (13) below, which is a repetition of number (3) above, shows the mentioned order.

(13) subject – (implicit object/ preposition group) – explicit object – verb

In the following, with the help of the examples (14) to (16), we will study the basic order of the main constituents of a Persian declarative clause from the perspective of the experiential metafunction and on the basis of the two models of transitivity and ergativity.

(14) mæn be to xænjær-i mi-dæh-æm.  
I to you dagger-indefinite present-give-I  
'I give you a dagger'. (repetition of the example (4))

**Table 1.** experiential representation of the main elements of the clause (14)

participant / model	mæn I I	be to to you to you	xænjær-i dagger- indefinite a dagger	mi-dæh-æm present-give-I give
transitivity	Actor	Recipient	Goal	process: material
ergativity	Agent	Beneficiary	Medium	

(15) mā hæmdijær-rā kæfče māhi sedā mi-kon-im.  
we each other-obj. flounder call present-do-we  
'We call each other flounder' (repetition of example (9))



**Table 2.** experiential representation of the main constituents of clause (15)

participant/ model	mā we we	hæmdijær-rā each other-obj. each other	kæfče māhi flounder flounder	sedā mi-kon-im call present-do-we call
transitivity	Assigner	Token	Value	process: relational
ergativity	Agent	Medium	Extension	

(16) in fekr hær ādæm-e āgel-i-rā divāne mi-konæd-Ø.  
 this thought every person-genitive wise-indefinite-obj. mad present-make-it  
 ‘This thought makes every wise person mad’ (Hedayat, 1963).

**Table 3.** experiential representation of the main elements of the clause (16)

model/ participant	in fekr this thought This thought	hær ādæm-e āgel-i-rā every person-genitive wise- indefinite-obj. every wise person	divāne mi-konæd-Ø. mad present-make-it makes mad
transitivity	Inducer	Senser	process: mental
ergativity	Agent	Medium	

As shown in tables 1 to 3, the Controller/Agent participants precede the Impacted/Medium participants, the order which is in line with the “experiential iconicity”. According to the principle of “experiential iconicity”, participants (and circumstantial Adjuncts) lie in a sequence that is a reflection of the order of control process [Controller before Impacted] or the process of agency [Agent before Medium (cf. Matthiessen, *ibid*). Thus, iconicity order of the main constituents in a Persian active declarative clause is in the form of Controller+Impacted+process (reflection of the process of control) or (Agent)+Medium+process (reflection of the process of agency). As to the participant “Recipient/Beneficiary” in the example (14) and participant “Value/Extension” in the example (15), it needs to be mentioned that within the framework of the experiential metafunction, contrary to Goal which is impacted by the function of the process, Recipient/Beneficiary takes advantage of the process function while Value/Extension is neither affected by the function of the process nor benefits from it; rather it construes the “scope” of the function of process (cf. Halliday & Matthiessen, *ibid*). Thus, both Recipient/Beneficiary and Value/Extension in clauses (14) and (15) are outside of the process of control or agency.

According to what went in the previous paragraph, it can be inferred that the basic order of the main elements in a Persian simple active declarative clause is in line with the experiential order of the constituents.

### 3.2.2. Interpersonal Order

#### 3.2.2.1. Introduction

The fundamental system of interpersonal metafunction is the MOOD system (Halliday & Matthiessen, *ibid*). MOOD system forms part of the interaction in the form of a proposition (for information exchange) or a proposal (for goods and services exchange) in the course of the dialogue between the speaker and the listener (Matthiessen, *ibid*). It is worthy to note that a clause, in the exchange of information, i.e. in the form of proposition, plays the two speech functions of statement and question, but in the exchange of goods and services, i.e. in the form of a proposal, it plays the two speech functions of offer and command (Halliday & Matthiessen, *ibid*).

From the perspective of interpersonal metafunction, a clause is composed of two parts, i.e. Mood<sup>12</sup> and Residue. In other words, the combination of “Mood+Residue” constitutes the “interpersonal structure” of the clause. The Mood structure itself is composed of the two elements of Subject, i.e. what is responsible for the truth and falsity of proposition, and the Finite which includes three elements of Modality, Primary tense and Polarity and as the chief constituent of the clause determines the mood of the clause. Regarding the purpose of the speaker in creating an interaction, which is to express indication or question or order, the mood of a clause is divided into two indicative and imperative classes. The indicative mood itself includes the declarative mood and the interrogative mood. The interrogative mood also includes the polar question (yes/no) and the WH- question. The Residue is the second part of the interpersonal structure of the clause that is composed of three functional elements of Predicator, Complement and Adjunct. It is noteworthy that a clause has only one Predicator, one or two Complements, and a number of Adjuncts. The element of Predicator that appears in the form of a verb group minus temporal and modal operator with the finite function exists in all types of major clauses. The Adjunct element typically appears in the form of an adverbial group or a preposition and cannot play the role of an Agent (cf. Halliday & Matthiessen, *ibid*).

### 3.2.2.2. Interpersonal Order of Main Elements in a Persian Declarative Clause

In this subsection, again with the help of the examples (14) to (16) above, we will study the basic order of the main elements of a Persian active declarative clause from the point of view of interpersonal metafunction.

**Table 4.** interpersonal representation of main elements of the clause (14)

mæn I I	be to to you to you	xænjær-i dagger- indefinite a dagger	mi-dæh-æm present-give-I give	
Agent	Complement <sup>13</sup>	Complement	Predicator-	Finite:present
Residue				
Mood				

**Table 5.** interpersonal representation of main elements of the clause (15)

mā we We	hæmdijær-rā each other-obj. each other	kæfče māhi flounder flounder	sedā mi-kon-im call present-do-we call	
Agent	Complement	Complement	Predicator -	Finite: present
Residue				
Mood				

**Table 6.** interpersonal representation of the main constituents of clause (16)

in fekr this idea this idea	hær ādæm-e āgel-i-rā every person-genitive wise- indefinite-obj. every wise person	divāne mi-konæd-Ø. mad present-make-it makes mad		
Agent	Complement	Predicator -	Finite: present	
Residue				
Mood				

All the three tables 4 to 6 show that in the Mood section, the Agent precedes the Finite and in the section of Residue, the Predicator is located at the end of the clause and the Complements<sup>14</sup> immediately come

before the Predicator. It is noteworthy that the place of both Predicator and process in Persian language is the end of the clause, because the process is always conflated with the Predicator (cf. Matthiessen, *ibid*). It should be noted that in the metafunctional representation of the basic order of the main elements in a Persian active declarative clause, the interpersonal order of the elements is always in line with the experiential order of the elements. Table 7 below shows this compatibility.

**Table 7.** representation of the compatibility of the interpersonal and experiential elements

experiential elements	Controller	Impacted	process
	Medium	∅ Medium	process
interpersonal elements	Agent	Complement	Predicator

Table 7 shows that in intransitive/middle clauses, Subject is in line with Controller and Medium and in transitive/agentive clauses, it is in line with Controller and Agent. On the other hand, Complement is in line with Medium and Impacted and Predicator is permanently in line with the process.

The possibility of representing the basic order of the main elements in a Persian active declarative simple clause through experiential metafunction and specifically through experiential iconicity on the one hand and the compatibility of the interpersonal order of those elements with their experiential order on the other hand is in line with Matthiessen’s previously mentioned viewpoint as to the intervention of the experiential or interpersonal metafunction in the determination of the basic order of the elements. Moreover, according to Matthiessen’s aforementioned view, every movement in the basic order of the elements, i.e. free order of elements, is determined by textual metafunction.

### 3.2.3. Textual Order

#### 3.2.3.1. Introduction

THEME and INFORMATION are the two fundamental systems of textual metafunction. These two systems construe the experiential and interpersonal meanings as a “flow of information” (cf. Matthiessen, *ibid*). According to Matthiessen (*ibid*), a flow of information is quantized into a clause unit or an information unit in the form of a message or quanta of information. The clause unit is quantized into Theme and Rheme and the information unit is quantized into given information and new information. It is noteworthy that although these two quanta are interrelated, the Theme+Rheme quantum is speaker-centered while the old+new quantum is hearer-oriented. Furthermore, it should be noted that in the unmarked combination of the two aforementioned structures, Theme lies within the old information and Rheme lies within the new information (Cf. Halliday & Matthiessen, *ibid*). The following two examples which are respectively the repetition of examples (14) and (16) above and reveal the basic order of the main elements in a Persian simple clause show the aforementioned unmarked combination:

- (17) mæn be to xænjær-i mi-dæh-æm.  
 I to you dagger-indefinite present-give-I  
 ‘I give you a dagger’.

mæn	be to xænjær-i mi-dæh-æm
I	to you dagger-indefinite present-give-I
Theme	Rheme
old information	new information

- (18) in fekr hær ādām-e āgel-i-rādivāne mi-konæd-Ø.  
 this thought every person-genitive wise-indefinite-obj. mad present-make-it  
 ‘This thought makes every wise person mad’

in fekr this thought	hær ādām-e āgel-i-rādivāne mi-konæd-Ø every person-genitive wise-indefinite-obj. mad present-make-it
Theme	Rheme
old information	new information

In both of the above examples, the Theme structure is located within the old information and the Rheme structure lies within the new information. It should be mentioned that in Persian language the pre-verb position is the unmarked position for the information focus<sup>15</sup>. In fact, the position before the final verb (for example, “xænjær-i” (a dagger) in example (17)) includes the main stress of the sentence and as a result, the information focus of the sentence (cf. Rezaei & Tayyeb, 2006). Of course, it should be noted that if the element before the verb is the direct object along with “rā” (e.g. “hær ādām-e āgel-i-rā” (every wise person) (see example (18)), then the “verb” itself (e.g. “divāne mi-konæd-Ø” (makes mad) (see example (18)) will be the “information focus” of the clause (cf. Rasekh Mahand, 2005).

### 3.2.3.2. Movement of the Main Elements in a Persian Declarative Clause

In the previous subsection, it was mentioned that the Theme+Rheme structure is speaker-oriented while the old information + new information structure is hearer-oriented. Nevertheless, it should be noted that it is the “speaker” who assigns both of the aforementioned structures. In fact, in the process of the discourse, the speaker maps these two structures onto each other to relate the discourse to its environment. It needs to be mentioned that the speaker’s choices are based on what has been said and what has been happened in the discourse. The discourse context creates certain conditions that dominate the aforementioned unmarked combination of the two Theme-Rheme structure and information structure. Consequently, elements in the thematic structure and information structure are likely to move and provide different types of rhetorical effects or stylistic effects. In fact, at any point of the discourse process, there builds up a rich verbal and nonverbal environment for whatever is to follow (cf. Halliday & Matthiessen, *ibid*).

In this subsection, with the help of some examples, we strive to explain the movement of the main elements in a Persian simple active declarative clause within the framework of textual metafunction.

- (19) æjær xærj væ dæxl-rā mæn xod-æm be dæst mijereft-æm ...  
 if expenditure and income -object I self-I took into hands-I  
 ‘If I myself took the expenditure and income into hands’ ... (Dadegan<sup>16</sup>, the Principal).

In example (19) above, the “Complement/Goal/Medium”, i.e. expenditure and income, has moved from its basic position inside the Rheme structure to the beginning of the clause and plays as the marked Theme<sup>17</sup> in the clause. The “Subject/ Actor/ Agent”, i.e. “I myself”, has also moved from its own unmarked position, i.e. beginning of the clause, to a marked position within the Rheme. Hence, technically speaking, the textual status<sup>18</sup> of “thematicity” of the experiential/interpersonal elements of “expenditure and income” and “I myself” has undergone through certain changes. Occurring at the beginning of the clause and as a result enjoying the thematic prominence<sup>19</sup>, the element “expenditure and income” paves the ground and serves as a point of departure for the message. Occurring within the Rheme, the element “I myself” has lost part of its own thematic prominence. Nevertheless, this element in this clause has the contrastive prominence and as a result, it serves as the contrastive focus<sup>20</sup>. It needs to be mentioned that anaphoric and deictic elements including “I myself” in clause (19) which have

completely identifiable extensions are considered to be new information through particular features including ‘contrast’ (cf. Steiner & Teich, 2004; Halliday & Matthiessen, *ibid*).

20) in *bāvær-rā pəžuheš-hā-y-e* Charles Darwin *təgviyæt*  
 this belief-object research-plural-mediating morpheme- genitive Charles Darwin strengthened  
*kærd-Ø*.  
 -they

‘This belief was strengthened by Charles Darwin’s researches.’ (Dadegan, *A Study on Iranian Myths*)

In the example (20), just like the example (19), we encounter with a change in the textual status of the thematicity. To put it more clearly, the speaker of the clause (20) has moved the complement “this belief” to the thematic position of the clause, and as a result, he has made it prominent so that he can locate the clause within its context on the one hand, and can help his addressee to process the message on the other hand (cf. Halliday & Matthiessen, *ibid*). It is noteworthy that in line with the claim raised by De Hoop (2003, as cited in Rasekh Mahand & Ghiyasvand, 2015) as to the intervention of anaphoricity in the movement of definite objects, the definite and anaphoric complement, i.e. “this belief”, in clause (20) has moved to the thematic position of the clause and thereby, it has connected clause (20) with its preceding clause and has consistently expanded the discourse.

21) *mæn xænjær-i be u [to] mi-dæh-æm.*<sup>21</sup>  
 I dagger-indefinite to him [you] present-give-I  
 ‘I give him [you] a dagger’ (Roberts, 2009, as cited in Dabir Moghaddam, 2011) [64].

22) *mærdomšenāsi hæyāt-e jædid-i be motāle-?āt-e ædyān-e*  
 anthropology life-genitive new-indefinite to study-plural-genitive religions- genitive  
*bāstān-i væ æsātir bæxšid-Ø*.  
 ancient- possessive and myths gave-it.

‘Anthropology has given a new life to the studies of ancient religions and myths’ (Dadegan, *A Study of Myths in Iran*).

In both of the examples (21) and (22), the two unspecified/indefinite/non-identifiable Mediums/Goals, i.e. “a dagger” and “a new life”, have moved from their unmarked position, i.e. the position before the final verb (cf. next paragraphs), to the position before the Beneficiaries/Recipients, i.e. “him (you)” and “studies of ancient religions and myths”. Following this movement, some changes have occurred in the “information status” of the two elements of “a dagger” and “a new life”. These two elements were the focus of information and as a result had a tonic prominence in their own basic position, i.e. before the verb. Since these two elements were in the position of the focus of information, there was no possibility for them to move (cf. Rasekh Mahand, 2006). Nevertheless, as the clauses (21) and (22) show, the abovementioned two elements have remained outside the information focus. Following Molnar (2001) and Karimi (2001) (as cited in Rasekh Mahand, 2004) and Roberts (*ibid*), the movement of the two elements of “a dagger” and “a new life” in the abovementioned clauses has taken place only on the basis of the textual motive of “contrast” and getting a stronger stress. Accordingly, we can argue that in this movement, the information focus (and tonic prominence) has changed into the contrastive focus (contrastive prominence). It is noteworthy that unlike information focus, contrastive focus is the marked focus of the sentence (cf. Rasekh Mahand, 2006).

Before turning to other examples of the movement of the main elements in a Persian active declarative clause, we strive to explain the basic order of the two complements “Medium” and “Beneficiary” in the material clauses having two complements like the abovementioned clauses (15) and (16).

Given the basic order (3) within the framework of six-way typology that has been repeated as number (23), one can infer the basic order (24) for material clauses having two complements within the framework of metafunctional typology of word order.

23) subject– (implicit/prepositional group object) – explicit object – verb

24) Subject/ Agent/ Actor – Complement/ Beneficiary/ Recipient/ Client – Complement/ Medium/ Goal-material process

As to the order (24) above, three points are worth mentioning:

**A)** As it was mentioned in subsection 2-1-2-3, within the framework of experiential metafunction, Beneficiary lies outside of the control or agency process. Thus, in experiential sequence of the main elements in a simple clause, Beneficiary has no basic position. Then, experiential metafunction ignores the position of Beneficiary in the sequence (24) and according to the principle of experiential iconicity, it only explains the basic sequence of the other three elements (cf. Subsection 2-1-2-3, table 3). However, from the perspective of interpersonal metafunction, the two participants of Medium and Beneficiary have the same function in declarative clauses with two complements. Nevertheless, interpersonal metafunction does not have access to any mechanism for determining the order of Medium and Beneficiary in declarative clauses having two complements. Accordingly, one can argue that neither of the two experiential and interpersonal metafunctions is able to shed light on the basic sequence of Beneficiary and Medium in the material clauses with two complements.

**B)** Given Karimi (2003)’s “two positions hypothesis” and the viewpoints of scholars such as Roberts (2009), Mahootian (1999) and Rasekh Mahand (2004) (cf. subsection 1-2, example 4), the basic order (24) can have another version which has appeared as (25).

25) Subject/ Agent/ Actor – Complement/ Medium/ Goal – Complement/ Beneficiary/ Recipient/ Client – material process

In fact, within the framework of Karimi’s two positions hypothesis and the viewpoints of the abovementioned scholars, both orders of (24) and (25) are basic and making a choice between the two depends on the specificity/ definiteness of Complement/Medium/Goal; in other words, if the Complement/ Medium/ Goal is an unspecific/indefinite entity, it unmarkedly precedes the process (order 24). But if the Complement/Medium/Goal is a specified/definite entity, along with the postposition *-rā* and unmarkedly, it follows Subject/ Agent/ Actor and precedes Beneficiary (order 25). The examples (26) and (27) respectively illustrate the two basic orders of (24) and (25).

26) *pineduz hæm be hæ r næfær-i yek jerde nānvæyek kuze āb dād-Ø.*

shoemaker as well to any person-indefinite one loaf bread and one pitcher water gave-he

‘The shoemaker, as well, gave anyone one loaf of bread and one pitcher of water’ (Hedayat, *ibid*).

27) *Arya ketāb-rā be Nazanin dād-Ø.*

Arya book-obj. to Nazanin gave-he.

‘Arya gave the book to Nazanin’. (7 A)

**C)** Given the two points (A) and (B) above, and also within the framework of textual metafunction, one can form another analysis of the basic sequence of the two participants of Medium and Beneficiary in material clauses with two complements. The semantic parameter of specificity/ definiteness on the basis

of which Karimi (ibid) and the other abovementioned scholars assume both orders of (24) and (25) as basic is one of the three textual statuses discussed in textual metafunction (cf. footnote related to “textual status” in the subsection 2-3-2-3 in the explanations of the example (19) in this article). Given this point, on the one hand, and also assuming the order (24) as the basic order of the main elements in the material clauses with two complements that is endorsed by the six-way typology, on the other hand, one can argue that the order (25) is a textual version of the order (24) and not a basic order.<sup>22</sup> In explaining the textual order (25), one can argue that since the specified/definite/identifiable Medium has already been mentioned in the discourse and hence given for the hearer, the speaker moves it to a position before the Beneficiary and near the Theme and along with the Theme, makes it as an orienter to the message. It is worth noting that this explanation is in line with Dabir Moghaddam (1990; 2005)’s point of view regarding the function of *-rā* as the marker of secondary topic.<sup>23</sup>

Following Dabir Moghaddam (ibid), the order (25) is analyzed as (28).

28) primary topic – secondary topic – comment (= Beneficiary + process).

Within the framework of Dabir Moghaddam (ibid)’s perspective, both primary and secondary topics provide the ground for the comment.

It is noteworthy that what went above regarding the sequence of Medium and Beneficiary in the material clauses with two complements is also true of “verbal” and “mental” declarative clauses having two Complements. Accordingly, and given the above basic order (24), we can assume the following two basic orders (29) and (30) respectively for verbal and mental clauses with two Complements in Persian.

29) Subject/ Agent/ Sayer – Complement/ Beneficiary/Receiver– Complement/ Range/ Verbiage – verbal process

30) Subject/Agent/Incentive– Complement/Medium/Senser– Complement/Range/ Phenomenon<sup>24</sup> – mental process

The following two examples (31) and (32) respectively illustrate the above two basic orders:

31) “mādær, mixāh-æm bā to čænd kælme-i hærf bezæn-æm”.  
 mother, want-I with you some words-indefinite speak-I  
 ‘Mother, I want to speak some words with you’ (Behrangī, ibid).

32) “...be mā čiz-hā-y-i yād dād-i ke ....”  
 ...to us thing-plural- mediating morpheme-indefinite taught-you that ...  
 ‘... you taught us things that ...’ (Behrangī, ibid).

In the verbal clause (31), we see that the Verbiage, i.e. “čænd kælme-i” (some words), has occurred after the Receiver, i.e. “to” (you), and before the process. Now if the Verbiage is a specified/ definite/ identifiable entity (e.g. “problem” in the example (33)), it, accompanied by *-rā*, occurs after the Sayer and before the Receiver.

33) nāzem Gæziyye-rā dær do se kælme bærāye bæčče-hāgoft-Ø.  
 deputy head issue-obj. in two three words to child-plural told-he  
 ‘The deputy head told the issue to the children in two or three words’ (Dadegan, Principal).

In the mental clause (32), the Phenomenon, i.e. “čiz-hā-y-i” (things), appears after the Senser, i.e. “mā” (we), and before the process. But if the Phenomenon is a specified/ definite/ identifiable entity (e.g. “in

hærf-hā-rā” (these words) in the example (34)), it follows Incentive and precedes Senser. The following example (34) illustrates this claim:

- 34) momken æst-Ø fekr kon-i ke yek kes-i in hærf-hā-rā be māhi  
 possible is-it think-you that one person-indefinite this word-plural-obj. to fish  
 kučuluyād dād-e-Ø, æmmā ...  
 little taught-perfective aspect-he, but ...  
 ‘You may think that someone has taught these words to the little fish, but ...’ (Behrangi, *ibid*).

It is noteworthy that both “Verbiage/Range” and “Receiver/Beneficiary” in verbal clauses and “Phenomenon/Range” in mental clauses are located outside the process of control or agency (cf. Halliday & Matthiessen, *ibid*). Thus, experiential metafunction cannot explain the basic sequence of Verbiage and Receiver in verbal clauses and that of Phenomenon and Senser in mental clauses. The interpersonal metafunction does not have any mechanism to explain the abovementioned sequences, as well.

At the end of this subsection, two other examples of the movement of the main elements in a Persian active declarative clause are mentioned.

- 35) væli ye irād-i dāšt-Ø kār-e dærvāzebān.  
 but one flaw-indefinite had-it action-genitive goalkeeper  
 ‘But the goalkeeper’s action had a flaw’ (Rasekh Mahand & Ghiyasvand, 2013) [4A].
- 36) xeyli æz resāne-hā-y-e ghærb-i dār-ænd in  
 many of medium-plural-mediating morpheme-genitive west-possessive have-they this  
 no? negāh-ro  
 type look-obj.  
 ‘Many western media have this type of look’ (Rasekh Mahand & Ghiyasvand, *ibid*) [5 C]

In both clauses (35) and (36), we see the application of post-posing process. Strictly speaking, in both examples, an element has moved from its own basic position to the position after the verb. It is noteworthy that both post-posed elements, i.e. “kār-e dærvāzebān” (the goalkeeper’s action) in clause (35) and “in no? negāh-ro” (this type of look) in clause (36), are specified/definite/identifiable entities in their contexts<sup>25</sup> and also have given (old) information.<sup>26</sup> In fact, in clause (35) through the movement of “kār-e dærvāzebān” (the goalkeeper’s action) to the post-posed position, i.e. the position of given information and of the lowest degree of thematicity prominence, the element “ye irād-i” (a flaw) that is the focus of new information has enjoyed further thematicity prominence, because it is located in the Theme position. Accordingly, one can argue that following the application of the post-posing process in clause (35), the “thematicity status of both “kār-e dærvāzebān” (the goalkeeper’s action) and “ye irād-i” (a flaw) has completely changed. Also, in clause (36), through moving from the position preceding the focus of new information, i.e. the final verb (cf. explanations of the two clauses (17) and (18) in this essay), to the position after the focus of new information, the element “in no? negāh-ro” (this type of look) has got the lowest degree of thematicity prominence; however, the new information focus, i.e. the process “dār-ænd” (have), has enjoyed further thematicity prominence.

#### 4. Conclusion

In the present study, we have first introduced three models of word order typology, i.e. six-way typology, four-way typology and two-way typology. Then the studies conducted in terms of the “word order” in



Persian have been introduced within the framework of the abovementioned three models. In the next section, after the introduction of Matthiessen (2004)'s metafunctional perspective concerning the word/constituent order, the order of the main elements in a Persian active simple declarative clause has been analyzed from the perspective of Matthiessen's metafunctional approach. Here in the following, we briefly review the results of this analysis.

The basic order of the main elements in a Persian simple active declarative clause is compatible with the principle of "experiential iconicity" and as a result, it is in line with the experiential order of those elements. Interpersonal order of the main elements in a simple active declarative clause in Persian language is also compatible with the experiential order of the elements. Accordingly, and in line with Matthiessen (ibid)'s perspective, both experiential and interpersonal metafunctions are involved in determining the basic order of the main elements in a Persian simple active declarative clause. However, we need to take it into account that neither of the two experiential and interpersonal metafunctions has access to a mechanism to explain the basic sequence of the complements in simple declarative clauses having two Complements. Textual metafunction is also concerned with the movement of the experiential or interpersonal elements in an active declarative simple clause. In other words, every type of movement of the main elements in the basic order in a Persian simple active declarative clause can be explained by the help of the mechanisms of the textual metafunction. Technically speaking, when the experiential or interpersonal elements move in a simple active declarative clause, a change occurs in their "Textual Status" and specifically in their degree of prominence. It is noteworthy that the explanation of the basic sequence of the Complements in a simple declarative clause having two Complements is also undertaken by the textual metafunction.

## 5. Ethics Committee Approval

The author(s) confirm(s) that the study does not need ethics committee approval according to the research integrity rules in their country (Date of Confirmation: January 17, 2021).

## References

- Ahmadipour, T. (2012). A typological study of constituents in Persian. *Journal of Roshd in Persian Language Teaching*, 103, 61-63.
- Batani, M.R. (2001). *A description of Persian language structure*. Tehran, Iran: Amir Kabir Publication.
- Behrang, S. (1968). *The little black fish*. Tehran, Iran: Institute for the Intellectual Development of Children and Young Adults.
- Comrie, B. (1989). *Language universals and linguistic typology: syntax and morphology* (2nd ed). Chicago, America: Chicago University Press.
- Dabir-Moghaddam, M. (2005). *Studies in Persian linguistics (selected articles)*. Tehran, Iran: Iran University Press.
- Dabir-Moghaddam, M. (2012). Introducing and criticizing the book "a study of Persian discourse structure". *Dastur (Grammar)*, 7, 223-293.
- Dabir-Moghaddam, M. (2013). *Typology of Iranian languages* (Vol. I). Tehran, Iran: SAMT.
- Davari, S. & Giunashvili, H. (2013). Fixation of word order in Persian: A parameter of

- grammaticalization. In M. Naghzyguy Kohan (Ed.), *Proceedings of the 1<sup>st</sup> conference on Iranian languages and dialects*. Tehran, Iran: Nevis-e Parsi Publication.
- Dryer, M. S. (1989). Discourse-governed word order and word order typology. *Belgian Journal of Linguistics*, 4, 69-90.
- Dryer, M. S. (1992). The Greenbergian word order correlations. *Language*, 68, 81- 138.
- Dryer, M. S. (1996). Word order typology. In J. Jacobs (ed.), *Handbook on syntax* (Vol. 2, pp. 1050 – 1065). Walter de Gruyter Publishing.
- Dryer, M. S. (1997). On the six-way word order typology. *Studies in Language*, 21 (1), 69-103.
- Dryer, M. S. (2007). Word order. In T. Shopen (ed.), *Language typology and syntactic description* (Vol. 1): *Clause Structure* (2<sup>nd</sup> ed., pp. 61-131). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Dryer, M. S. (2013). On the six-way word order typology, again. *Studies in Language*, 37 (2), 267-301.
- Givón, T. (2001). *Syntax: An introduction* (Vol. I). Amsterdam, Netherlands: John Benjamins.
- Golfam, A. (2006). *Principles of grammar*. Tehran, Iran: SAMT.
- Halliday, M.A.K. & Matthiessen. C.M.I.M. (2014). *Halliday's introduction to functional grammar* (fourth edition). London and New York: Routledge.
- Hedayat, S. (2004). *Bufe Kur*. Esfahan, Iran: Sadegh Hedayat.
- Kazemi, F. & Afrashi, A. (2013). The comparative study of markedness in Persian and English based on SFG. *Language Related Research*, 4 (1), 125-149.
- Mahutian, S. (1999). *Persian language grammar from a typological perspective* (M. Samai, Trans.). Tehran, Iran: Markaz.
- Majidi, S. (2011). Information structure in Persian language in the framework of systemic functional grammar and role and reference grammar. *Dastur (Grammar)*, 7 (7), 183-208.
- Matthiessen, C.M.I.M. (2004). Descriptive motifs and generalizations. In A. Caffarel, J.R Martin, & C.M.I.M. Matthiessen, (Eds.), *Language typology: A functional perspective* (pp. 537- 673). Amsterdam, Netherlands: Benjamins.
- Rasekh Mahand, M. (2004). Direct object position in Persian. *Journal of Name-y-e Farhangestan*, 24, 56-66.
- Rasekh Mahand, M. (2005). Different kinds of focus in Persian. *Language and linguistics*, 1 (1), 5-19.
- Rasekh Mahand, M. (2006). The relationship between scrambling and focus in Persian. *Dastur (Grammar)*, 2(2), 20-33.
- Rasekh Mahand, M. & Ghiyasvand, M. (2013). Motivating factors of post-posing in Persian. *Journal of linguistics and Khorasan dialects*, 5 (9), 27-47.
- Rasekh-Mahand, M., & Ghiyasvand, M. (2015). A corpus-based study of functional motivations effects on Persian scrambling. *Dastur (Grammar)*, 10, 163-198.
- Rezai, V. & Tayyeb, S.M.T. (2005). Information structure and word order in Persian. *Dastur*

(Grammar), 2, 3-19.

Steiner, E. & Teich, E. (2004). Metafunctional profile of the grammar of German. In A. Caffarel, J.R. Martin, & C.M.I.M. Matthiessen (Eds.), *Language typology: A functional perspective* (pp. 139-184). Amsterdam, Netherlands: Benjamins.

## Appendix A.

### Notes

1. According to Comrie (1989), “constituent order typology” is more precise than the established term “word order typology”, because on the one hand, when one speaks of the basic order of subject-verb-object, for example, in one language, it does not make any sense to ask whether the constituents at issue are composed of one word or more words. On the other hand, in addition to the sequence of constituents composed of one or more words, sequence of smaller single words like “affix” and “stem” are discussed. It is noteworthy that Dryer (2007)’s definition of “word order” is in line with the perspective offered by Comrie. Dryer (2007, p. 61) defines the word order as follows: “word order generally refers to the order of every series of elements, whether in clause level or within the phrases, e.g. the order of elements inside a noun phrase”.
2. “Language Typology” consists of the systematic study of the diversity among languages (cf. Comrie, 2001, as cited in Dabir Moghaddam, 2013, p. 2).
3. This essay entitled “Some Universals of Grammar with Particular Reference to the Order of Meaningful Elements” was published in 1963 in a book under the title of “Universals of Language” edited by Greenberg. The second edition of this book was published in 1966. This book with the same title and with an introduction written by Bernard Comrie was published in 2002 (Dabir Moghaddam, 2013). According to Comrie (1989), this seminal article by Greenberg has played a major role in the recent development of language typology.
4. As to the importance of the fundamental parameter of “main constituents order”, it is worth mentioning that most of the Greenberg’s universals are concerned with the fundamental order of subject, object and verb (cf. Dryer, 1996).
5. For more information about the distribution of six aforementioned types cf. Dryer.
6. The numbers within the brackets in all examples and also in the hypothesis (8) in this article refer to the number of the examples and hypothesis in the original source. It should be noted that in a number of examples of the present article, no number is seen inside the brackets. This is because the aforementioned examples have not been numbered in the main source.
7. In the introduction of her book, Mahootian (1999) notes that the language studied in that book is of a colloquial style which is used by the educated people in Tehran.
8. According to Rasekh Mahand (2006), this term was first used by Ross (1967) to refer to the feature of languages that have free word order.
9. Rasekh Mahand (2006) has considered the clause (7. A) to be the unmarked structure in Persian.
10. It needs to be reminded that within the framework of the metafunctional typology of word order, “word order” in this context refers to the “constituent order”. Thus, we will use the term “constituent order/sequence” instead of “word order”.
11. It is noteworthy that in the present essay, following Halliday and Matthiessen (ibid), the name of systems has been written with the full capital letters and the name of the functions with the first capital letter.
12. As previously mentioned, in this essay the names of systems (for example, MOOD system) is written in full Capital letters while the name of functions (for example, Mood) has been written with the first capital letters.
13. It is noteworthy that in this example, the Complement “you” has appeared in the form of a prepositional phrase. It should be noted that the experiential participant of Recipient/Beneficiary in Persian language appears with the interpersonal function of a Complement along with the preposition “to”.
14. For further information about the order of the Complements in di-transitive clauses like the examples (14) and (15), cf. final paragraph of the subsection 2-3-2-3.
15. It should be noted that the information focus is the unmarked focus of the clause (cf. Rasekh Mahand, 2006).
16. DADEGAN refers to the Persian language database. To take advantage of this database cf. <http://pldb.iics.ac.ir>.

17. It needs to be mentioned that in Persian declarative clauses, the Theme Subject is unmarked and every experiential element other than the Subject in the beginning of the clause is a marked Theme.

18. Textual status of the experiential or interpersonal elements refer to the value of thematicity, newsworthiness and specificity. These triple values respectively refer to the occurrence of the elements in the Theme/ Rheme position in the clause, old information or new information state of the elements for the hearer and their specificity or unspecificity for the hearer (cf. Matthiessen, *ibid*). As to the textual status of the specificity, it needs to be mentioned that Matthiessen has considered the three concepts of specificity, definiteness and identifiability to be equivalent (cf. Matthiessen, *ibid*).

19. It is noteworthy that the triple textual statuses of the elements which were mentioned above have their specific mode of expression and each one of them is ranging on a cline from the peak to the trough (cf. Matthiessen, *ibid*). For further information of the degrees of prominence of the textual statuses, cf. table 10-19 in Matthiessen, *ibid*.

20. Contrastive focus is the focus which is somehow in contrast with the hearer's old information and corrects his/her old presupposition (cf. Rasekh Mahand, 2006).

21. It should be noted that clause (21) appears as “*mæn xænjær-i be to mi-dæh-æm*” (I give you a dagger) in the original text, i.e. The little black fish.

22. If we consider the movement of the specified/definite/identifiable Medium to the position before the Beneficiary textual, then we have to conceive a degree of markedness for that movement. It should be reminded that in examples (19) and (20), we also see the movement of the specified/definite/identifiable Medium to the Theme position of the clause. It is noteworthy that the movement of the specified/definite/identifiable Medium to the Theme position of the clause is more marked than its movement to the position before the Beneficiary, because, contrary to the first movement, the latter movement takes place within the Rheme.

23. It needs to be mentioned that according to Dabir Moghaddam (*ibid*), secondary topic accompanied by *-rā* would be an unspecified/ indefinite/unidentifiable Medium.

The following example taken from Dabir Moghaddam (*ibid*), illustrates this claim.

A) *mæn ketāb-i xærid-æm.*

I book-indefinite bought-I

‘I bought a book’. [72]

However, it should be noted that in Dabir Moghaddam (*ibid*)’s opinion, the above example is acceptable for the hearer provided that its speaker adds some explanations about the “book”. As an example, Dabir Moghaddam (*ibid*) has added the following clause (B) to clause (A).

B) *væ ān-rābe bærādær-æm ferestād-æm.*

and it-obj. to brother-I sent-I

‘And I sent it to my brother.’

In such conditions, we can argue that, contrary to identifiable Complements in the examples (19), (20) and (27) which are anaphoric, the Complement “a book” in clause (A) above is a cataphoric element and since it has not already been mentioned in the discourse, it is unidentifiable for the hearer. It should be reminded that the movement of an unidentifiable Complement without *-rā* to the position before the Beneficiary in examples such as (21) and (22) has been for other textual motivations.

24. This participant is an element that is sensed, thought, desired and perceived. It is noteworthy that the participant of Phenomenon in Persian can appear both in the form of a nominal group (e.g. “*čizhā-y-i*” (things) in clause (32) and “*in kælemāt*” (these words) in clause (34)) and in the form of a finite clause after the process (e.g. “*bæčče-hā birun bāzi mi-kærd-ænd*” (the children were playing in the outside) in the following clause (A)). It needs to be mentioned that the occurrence of a Phenomenon in the form of a finite clause after the process brings about a complex mental clause. Since this paper concentrates on simple clauses, we avoid dealing with the details of complex mental clauses.

A) *mæn did-æm ke bæčče-hā birun bāzi mi-kærd-ænd.*

I saw-I that child-plural out play continuous asp.-did-they

‘I saw that the children were playing in the outside’ (Dabir Moghaddam, 2005) [(126A)].

25. Rasekh Mahand and Ghiyasvand (2013) have extracted the two clauses (35) and (36) along with other examples from a corpus of interviews and live round tables on TV and sport reports.

26. It should be mentioned that according to Frommer (1981, as cited in Rasekh Mahand & Ghiyasvand, 2013), a post-posed element [in Persian] has given information. According to Rasekh Mahand (2009, as cited in Rasekh Mahand & Ghiyasvand, *ibid*), the significant condition in the post-posing process in Persian is for the post-posed element to be hearer-given.

## Fars dilinde kelime düzenine metafonksiyonel bir yaklaşım

---

### Öz

Sistemik fonksiyonel gramer (SFG) çerçevesinde, Matthiessen (2004) bir yan cümlecik sözcük/eleman sırasının deneyimsel, kişilerarası ve metinsel metafonksiyonlarla karşılaştırıldığı kelime/eleman sırasının analizini sağlamıştır. Basit bir Farsça cümlecik kelime/element sırasının tanımı ve analizini amaçlayan bu çalışmada, Matthiessen (2004) metafonksiyonel modelinde Farsça aktif basit bir bildiren cümlecik içinde ana öğelerin dizilimini tanımlamaya ve analiz etmeye çalıştık. Aslında, Farsça'dan elde edilen kanıtlar, yani Farsça metinlerden ve diğer Farsça araştırmacıların çalışmalarından elde edilen örneklerle, üç deneyimsel, kişilerarası ve metinsel metafonksiyonların Farsça'da aktif basit bir ifade cümlecikde ana unsurların sırasını belirlemede nasıl rol aldığını göstermeye çalıştık. Bu çalışmanın sonuçları, Farsça basit bir yan cümlecik ana unsurların 'temel' sırasının ve özellikle tek Tamamlayıcı tümcenin hem deneyimsel hem de kişilerarası metafonksiyonlarla uyumlu olduğunu ve yukarıda sözü edilen unsurların Farsça'da aktif bir beyan basit cümlecikdeki hareketlerinin her türlüşünün metinsel metafonksiyonun mekanizmaları yardımıyla açıklanmış olduğunu göstermektedir.

*Anahtar sözcükler:* sistemik fonksiyonel gramer; Matthiessen; sözcük sırası; metafonksiyon; Farsça

---

### AUTHOR BIODATA

Ahmad Farshbafian works as an assistant professor of Persian language and literature at Tabriz University, Tabriz, Iran

Esmail Safaei Asl is a PhD alumnus in linguistics from Allamah Tabataba'i University, Tehran, Iran.