

The Importance of Word Order in Sentence Construction and the Impact of Information Status

Abbas Fadhil Jabbar

abbasfadhiljabbar@gmail.com

Department of English language, College of Education, Sawa University, Al Muthanna, Iraq

Abstract

The present study considers the intricate relation between information status and word order in the process of assembling English sentences, thus providing more evidence that optimal communication results from a collaboration between speaker's intention and linguistic organization. Adopting Gricean pragmatics, Relevance Theory and functional-cognitive approaches the theory looks also at how such notions as old vs. new information, topic vs. comment, theme vs. rheme condition sentence patterns in English. This study demonstrates that word order is a basic device for controlling information flow which allows speakers to foreground salient elements of the discourse and background predictable and non-new items. The flexibility of English word order is evident in marked constructions such as passives, clefts, inversion and fronting, which express a relationship between grammatical structure and information structure. Cross-linguistic evidence from Russian and Mandarin, as well as psycholinguistic research, indicates that when word order and information status are aligned comprehension is facilitated and processing resources are reduced whereas misalignments may increase cognitive load. Comparative analyses across source populations have shown information-structural preferences for word order that contribute to diachronic change of syntactic structures, demonstrating the active interplay between discourse conditions and grammaticalization strategies driven by cognitive constraints. This supports a functional-cognitive view in which the lines of syntax, discourse and information control are strongly intertwined. It is not the issue of syntax as such, which determines word order in English, but a linguistic game which provides mutual understanding. This paper highlights the informational state as a key factor in sentence realization and successful conversation by bringing together communicative purpose and structural devices.

Keywords: English syntax, discourse organization, word order, theme-rheme, topic-comment, sentence structure, information status, and functional-cognitive linguistics.

أهمية ترتيب الكلمات في بناء الجمل وتأثير حالة المعلومات

عباس فاضل جبار

abbasfadhiljabbar@gmail.com

قسم اللغة الإنجليزية، كلية التربية، جامعة ساوة، المثنى، العراق



الملخص

تتناول الدراسة الحالية العلاقة المعقدة بين حالة المعلومات وترتيب الكلمات في عملية تشكيل الجمل الإنجليزية، مما يوفر مزيداً من الأدلة على أن التواصل الأمثل ينتج عن تعاون بين نية المتحدث والتنظيم اللغوي. اعتماداً على نظريات براغماتية غرايس، ونظرية الأهمية، والنهج الوظيفي المعرفي، تبحث النظرية أيضاً في كيفية تأثير مفاهيم مثل المعلومات القديمة مقابل الجديدة، والموضوع مقابل التعليق، والموضوع الرئيسي مقابل الجملة الثانوية على أنماط الجمل في الإنجليزية. توضح هذه الدراسة أن ترتيب الكلمات هو وسيلة أساسية للتحكم في تدفق المعلومات، مما يسمح للمتحدثين بإبراز العناصر البارزة في الحديث وإخفاق العناصر المتوقعة وغير الجديدة. تظهر مرونة ترتيب الكلمات في اللغة الإنجليزية في التراكم المميز مثل المبني للمجهول، والتركيبات المقطع، والانعكاس، والإعطاء، والتي تعبر عن علاقة بين الهيكل النحوي وهيكل المعلومات. تشير الأدلة مقارنة بين اللغات مثل الروسية والماندارين، فضلاً عن الأبحاث النفسية اللغوية، إلى أنه عندما يكون ترتيب الكلمات وحالة المعلومات متطابقتين، تسهل الفهم وتقلل من الموارد المعالجة، بينما قد تزيد عدم التطابق من العبء المعرفي. لقد أظهرت التحليلات المقارنة عبر مجموعات المصدر تفضيلات هيكلية معلوماتية لترتيب الكلمات تسهم في التغييرات الزمنية للهيكل النحوي، مما يوضح التفاعل النشط بين ظروف الحوار واستراتيجيات النحوية المدفوعة بالقيود المعرفية. يدعم هذا وجهة نظر وظيفية معرفية حيث تتداخل خطوط النحو والحوار والتحكم في المعلومات بشدة. ليست مسألة النحو في حد ذاتها هي ما يحدد ترتيب الكلمات في الإنجليزية، بل هو لعبة لغوية توفر تفهماً متبادلاً. يبرز هذا البحث الحالة المعلوماتية كعامل رئيسي في تجسيد الجمل والحوار الناجح من خلال الجمع بين الغرض الاتصالي والأدوات الهيكلية.

الكلمات المفتاحية: النحو الإنجليزي، تنظيم الخطاب، ترتيب الكلمات، الموضوع-الجملة، الموضوع-التعليق، هيكل الجملة، حالة المعلومات، واللغويات الوظيفية-المعرفية.

1.Introduction

Information Theory models communication as speech actions through which are generated communicative intentions, a position originally introduced by Grice (1957). To Grice, communication occurs when the speaker communicates an intention behind their speech to the audience and then gets a response. When you communicate, it isn't only about constructing grammatically correct sentences; the person who is listening should understand what it is that you are saying. Bach 2004 supports this by arguing that communication succeeds only when the hearer knows what the speaker had in mind. So in order for the speaker to understand and the listener to understand, they have to be drawing those inferences together. Within the Gricean system, meaning is distinguished between what is said and what is meant. The explicit meaning is in general a matter of truth conditions, the intended meaning goes beyond a literal reading to include implicatures which are generated by the communicative intention. Relevance theorists emphasize how vital is the role of the aim in working out what someone means. Listeners, the theory goes, seek out the most plausible interpretation that aligns with what the speaker had in mind and with their knowledge of the context. Given this, communicative intention plays a vital role in understanding both pragmatic meaning and explicit content. Functionalist and cognitive linguistic perspectives argue that communicative intention itself is not sufficient to fully explain successful communication. They agree that purpose matters but also say that communication is a function of the way

linguistic content is organized and presented. Speakers manipulate word order, sentence structure and how they organize information to help people grasp and manage the flow of information. Sperber and Wilson (1986) claim that Gricean theory does not adequately explicate the ways in which listeners come to differentiate central from peripheral informational contents (see Harris, 2002), integrate new information or how speakers convey the presence of informational content about relevance relation among parts of a sentence. These considerations are particularly relevant in relation to word order. Word order demonstrates how speakers decide to reveal information in strategic ways, revealing how well they know it, how important it is and how (or if) what they are saying relates to what was said before. From the point of view of cognitive and functional theory, information status— especially old vs. new or topic vs. comment differentiation— has a definite effect on word order. When we speak, we usually structure our sentences in a manner that suits the conversation, emphasizing information that is already known and clearing the path for new or important facts. This paper explores the relevance of verb placement in sentence structure, or more concretely, what role information status plays in the positioning of elements. Happily we still have consistent evidence that interaction between grammatical organization and information packaging is necessary for a communication system to function well. So word order is a helpful tool for organizing information and helping people to understand each other, speakers and listeners to meet in the middle.

2. The Role of Information Status in Phrase Structure

When trying to understand what someone is saying, you often need to distinguish between linguistic and communicative meaning. Grice makes a distinction between "what is implicated" (construed) and "what is said" (articulated). Grice uses truth conditions to define "what is said" and communicative intent to define "what is implicated," but Relevance Theorists interpret these differences differently. For example,

Y: "Would you like to play chess?"

X: "My head hurts."

X states that they are unable to play chess (implicature) and that they have a headache (explicature). Implicature refers to inference, while explicature refers to the stated content. Relevance Additionally, theorists distinguish between inference and assertion, focusing on how statements convey meaning without rigorously adhering to truth conditions (Stojanovic Prelevic, 2011). According to Jacobs (1995), language users must understand the meaning of a sentence, the speaker's intended meaning, and the underlying cultural and pragmatic presumptions. Additionally, they must consider how informational roles are encoded by grammatical structures. To effectively share new information, speakers need to think about what their audience already knows. Older



knowledge gives context. Grammatical structures encode three primary informational functions:

1. Information Status: Old versus New
2. Reference/Assertion: Said vs. Mentioned
3. Topic/Comment: What you meant to say vs. what you actually said

These roles frequently intersect. The "topic" is different from "old information" because it stays the same throughout a text. "New information" (or focus) is what the speaker wants to get across. According to Firbas (1976) and Mathesius (1939), sentences can do more than one communicative function because they have a theme (known information) and a rheme (new information). Mathesius characterizes the theme as "that which is known or evident in the context, from which the speaker advances" (Firbas, 1964), while Halliday (1976) further developed this analysis using functional sentence perspective (FSP).

3. Word Order and Information Packaging

Rzayev et al. (2007:173) claim that "word order" is both a stable and a changing part of sentence structure. In English, because there aren't any specific inflections that show grammatical relationships, word order is mostly what shows these relationships. . This is due to the requirement of structural well-formedness on some patterns. But word order is more than just a structural thing; it's also about what sentences are trying to say and the various roles they're meant to play. Both functions and structure are directly involved in word order, because they govern how information will be displayed in various sentence types. Rzayev et al. introduce illustrative word order principles which are necessary for analyzing sentences in a communicative context:

1. Sentences always have a context, and the way their parts are put together is affected by the context.
2. Sentences are naturally communicative, and the way the parts are arranged makes it easier to communicate well. The interrelated functions of word order influence sentence structure in multiple ways, and unique word-order patterns can only be comprehensively understood by examining their grammatical and communicative functions. As a result, each sentence has two main parts: a thematic part that gives familiar or contextually derived information and a rhematic part that adds new information to the conversation. You can show the thematic (TS) and rhematic (RS) segmentation like this:

S (Sentence) = TS (Thematic Section) + RS (Rhematic Section) (Rzayev et al., 2007, pp. 173–174)

In English, as in many other languages, information that is already known usually comes before new information. Topic phrases, which stand for known information, usually come at the beginning of sentences (Jacobs, 1995:153). This first position clearly shows what the topic is. Still, this rule isn't set in



stone. In certain constructions, like wh-clefts, the topic can come at the end of the sentence and be new information, acting as the rhematic part. If there is no topic noun phrase, the subject often takes on the topic role if it stands for information that has already been established. In English, subjects and topics often come together at the start of sentences. Jacobs (1995:154) examines sentences pertaining to Broca's area to demonstrate topic-comment structures. The first definite noun phrases, "The specialized regions of the brain investigated in the greatest detail" and "Broca's area," show what is already known and serve as topics. The second parts of these sentences give new information and act as comments. The third subject, "a stroke destroying Broca's area," on the other hand, is not specific but does give general information and serves as a topic. Jacobs also says that the subject of the last sentence, "a patient of mine who recently suffered such a stroke," is vague and unknown to the listener, giving them completely new information. But, as was said before, topicality and givenness don't always go hand in hand. The noun phrase "a patient of mine" is definite and refers to someone the doctor already knows. It is the topic. The rhematic part, "is still able to read, write, and comprehend, but cannot speak," gives new information. It is not simply word order that gives this emphasis; words such as "still" and the contrastive structure convey a sense of novelty and relevance to the information.

Taken as a whole, these observations make up some of the evidence for the claim that word order and semantic roles align (the default expectation), but there are exceptions, so you have to follow context factors — sociopragmatic and cultural. Having known information at the front of a sentence helps both speakers and writers make sure that new information is understood as it comes. This approach is consistent with the cognitive principle of "progressing from known to unknown" by presenting the established content before adding details.

Passive constructions show even more how word order arranges information. A definite noun phrase in the subject position shows information that has already been given, before the action it takes. For instance, the passive sentence says, "The scholarship was given to the Master's degree student from Iraq." The noun phrase "The Master's degree student from Iraq" is the thematic element (old information), and the action is the new information. When a noun phrase like "a flat in Isparta" is both the subject and something that is already known, it seems to be at the beginning of the sentence to meet discourse requirements. In passive sentences, agents are also placed differently. The active voice follows "agent–action–other constituents," but the passive voice puts the theme first, with the action and agent often at the end of the clause. In English, we often omit the agent in passive constructions for both practical and stylistic reasons. Some critics, such as George Orwell and William Zinsser, insist that the passive voice can be used to deflect responsibility or give readers a false impression. But in other instances, the passive is better for style or getting the meaning across — an

indication of how useful it is for ordering sentences and packaging up information.

4. Passive Voice and the Flow of Information

Passive verbs always show that there is an agent. It is not necessary to mention the agent in a prepositional phrase like "by a master's degree student from Iraq" unless the speaker wants to stress the agent's identity or the clause would not make sense without it. So, passive clauses that don't have a clear agent can mean one less argument than active clauses. This makes it easier to tell the difference between "old" and "new" information, or "thematic" and "rhematic" elements. In English, as in numerous languages, alternative structures may be truth-conditionally equivalent yet pragmatically distinct (Green, 2004:408–409). Horn (1984, 1993) offers a compelling rationale for the inevitability of pragmatic variation.

Green (2004:409–410) observes that various factors affect the selection between truth-conditionally identical structures. For instance, a passive construction may be chosen to emphasize the patient or to postpone the mention of the agent until the conclusion of the sentence, thereby increasing perceptual salience and stress (1a). The passive voice also lets speakers say things when they don't know who did them (1b), when they don't matter (1c), or when they want to leave them out (1d):

- (1) a. Two boys stole money from a bank.
 b. My bike was taken on Monday between 3:00 and 5:30 PM.
 c. Before the missing pages 285 and 286 were found, the book sold almost 20,000 copies.
 d. It has been called simple and not very smart.

Passive constructions usually mean that the event being talked about has an effect on something that is relevant to the situation. In examples (2a–2d), the subject can be a person who is affected (2a, 2b) or another important person, like the speaker or addressee (2c, 2d). The effect that happens can be good or bad, depending on the situation:

- (2) a. He was asked questions for three hours.
 b. A Pulitzer Prize went to his picture.
 c. The fire destroyed the proof.
 d. People have said that it is too simple and not very smart.

Even when the subject clearly refers to an affected entity, as in (3a), the impact may not be explicitly marked as the subject:

- (3) a. A car hit your dog, but he is fine.
 b. A car hit your dog this afternoon, but he is fine.

These examples show how active and passive constructions handle "old/known" vs. "new/unknown" information. They show how arrangements depend on what the reader already knows. Ward and Birner (2004:171) say that in English,



felicitous inversion depends on the discourse status of preposed and postposed constituents. The preposed element usually gives information that is already known, while the postposed element gives information that is new to the discourse (Birner, 1994). For example, the phrase "Free soft drinks, coffee, Sanka, tea, and milk." Red and white wines go well together. Ward & Birner (2004:171) say that the preposed adjective phrase "also complimentary" refers to information that has already been mentioned, while the postposed phrase "red and white wine" brings up new information.

Prince (1981) noted that inferable material often aligns with explicitly referenced discourse-old content, indicating that recently mentioned discourse-old information is more recognizable and prominent. Preposed and postposed constituents are typically limited by semantic and pragmatic factors: a preposed constituent must not be less familiar than a postposed element, as this would result in infelicity. The most recent discourse-old reference usually comes first. For instance, in sequences detailing book and doll lines, "the dolls" were referenced earlier, though not as recently as "the books," aligning their positioning with discourse-driven prominence (Ward & Birner, 2004:171–172). By-phrase passives, similar to other argument-reversing constructions, must adhere to discourse constraints: the preverbal noun phrase should convey discourse-old information, while the post-verbal noun phrase represents the agent (Siewierska, 1984; Birner, 1996). When these roles of information are switched, infelicity happens. For instance:

(6) "Ivan Allen Jr." is not an agent; the grammatical subject must pass on old information about the conversation.

(7) Ivan Allen Jr. will start working on January 1. He takes over as mayor. In (6), the pronoun "he" refers to information that has already been said, while the NP "Ivan Allen Jr." refers to information that is new to the conversation. This is in line with the semantico-pragmatic potential of the passive voice. When you flip this relationship, as in (7), it doesn't work because the subject gives new information and the NP in the "by" phrase gives old information. In inversion and emphasis, the preposed constituent usually signals information that is already known, while the postposed constituent usually signals information that is new (Birner, 1994). The theme/rheme distinction in English is influenced by prominence rather than originality, as illustrated in the sentence "The Sheraton Ocean Park at Eastham, which has a tropical indoor pool with cabanas," where the initial subject conveys thematic (old) information and the post-verbal material conveys rhematic (new) information. Post-verbal arrangement often emphasizes new or evaluative information, as in "Another nice woman is our next guest," where "our next guest" introduces discourse-new material, reinforced by evaluative marking ("nice woman"). When you prepose a constituent, it usually only contains information that is old in the discourse. When you postpose a constituent, it usually contains information that is new in



the discourse. Culicover and Jackendoff (2005:86) say that moving constituents to licensed positions is how linear order is achieved. This makes sure that semantic and pragmatic features are met. This movement puts a "burden" on constituents, but it also lets English speakers control the flow of information in a way that balances old and new content to make communication work.

5. The Significance of Inversion in Sentence Construction

Speakers give subject and object noun phrases intentional or purposive values by switching their roles. This makes sure that these parts convey discourse-motivated information, whether it is new, old, or referenced recently, long ago, or in the middle of a conversation. Language is flexible enough to let you change the order of sentence parts, which makes it easier and more strategic to use the same structures. Consider Turkish and English that, like the other two languages, are also SOV/SVO languages. The principle of homogeneity (logical right-branching) assumes an SVO word order for both. However, the reason why SVO languages should not permit an object to determine a feature is unclear due to the absence of purely SVO or SOV languages. Pollack assumed binary branching (Kayne, 1994) suggesting that an antecedent may bind a variable only to its right in the first minimal clause where both occur. This accounts for cross-linguistic differences in "strength of" inflectional morphology.

Larson (1988) posits that English verb phrase branching occurs "downhill" and to the right, a proposition substantiated by binding facts, binding theory, and the binary branching assumption. C-command is linear when branching is appropriately organized (Culicover & Jackendoff, 2005:82). Changes in SOV/SVO structures show that if a feature like branching, flexibility, expansion, or reduction is lacking, it can't be licensed at a derivational stage that is important for communication. If not, SVO languages would also permit SOV structures.

For consistency, all features must be licensed at some point in a derivation. This suggests that linguistic ordering is connected to cognitive frameworks, both across language groups and within individual languages. Covert movement makes it possible to give out licenses without moving any of the parts. Assuming uniform binary branching and a cross-linguistically consistent semantic interface, linear order is derived through movement, constrained or permitted by formal or semantic factors within a language. Inflectional languages exhibit differing degrees of movement optionality, characterized as either "strong," exemplified by English, or "weak," as seen in Russian. Cinque (1999) posits that hierarchical structure underpins linear order and that cognitive frameworks emerge from this hierarchy. He shows a clear link between linear order and hierarchical structure by assuming that each part of the linear order is a functional head in the syntactic tree. Cinque further asserts that a hierarchy of functional heads regulates universal adverbial word order conventions.

Researchers have looked into the "universal base hypothesis" from time to time since the late 1960s (Fillmore, 1968:1 & Bach, 1968:91).

6. The Role of Item Movement in Information Distribution

Postal (2004: ch.6) asserts that the derivational aspect of the Minimalist Program (MP) requires sentences to be formulated from a fixed lexical foundation, which inherently regulates and influences the extent of word-order inversion. He observes that a constraint-based approach remains unaffected by this principle, as specific contexts allow for "leakage" (Cf. Culicover & Jackendoff, 2005:90). Linguists present diverse viewpoints regarding the formulation, communicative capacity, and positional variability of direct and indirect objects within the syntax-semantics interface. These differences come mostly from how they are used to build sentences and how they add information to the theme or rhematic sections. For instance, the sentence "Somebody gave Bill a sandwich" can be changed to a passive form for ditransitive verbs: "Bill was given a sandwich (by-agent)." This change adds a third grammatical function by rebracketing the original parts and separating the indirect object from the direct object at both the semantic and communicative levels. There is still debate about whether the indirect object is higher or lower in the grammatical hierarchy.

The Keenan-Comrie Accessibility Hierarchy (1977) places the indirect object lower than the direct object because relativizing the indirect object requires relativizing the direct object. However, the direct object is higher than the indirect object in the Pollard & Sag (1987) and LFG frameworks. In opposition, the thematic Hierarchy has the Recipient and Beneficiary over Theme and this instance over a spatial Goal (Jackendoff.,1990). Along the same lines, Kayne (1984) and Larson (1988) argue that the dative is higher than acc in syntax. These perspectives indicate that passive constructions are not directly derived from an active form, but there are different ways to link grammatical roles with syntax and meaning. The active voice is cross-linguistically available with lower structural complexity in the grammatical function layer, and is default but not derivational prior to specific utterances. The second phenomenon, the passive, involves matching grammatical function tiers with syntax and their discourse roles such that at the surface level the subject matches the top-ranked grammar function (an new discourse-level role).

Culicover and Jackendoff (2005:155), divide clause structure into "propositional information structures", a system that categorizes utterances into new, given, or evoked areas of predication. For instance, "The bear chased the lion" is a chase with the bear as agent and the lion as patient. The propositional structure [chase (bear, lion)] might remain constant while information structure gets altered by focus and topicalization, namely "It was the bear that chased the lion" or "The bear was such that it chased the lion."



"Huddleston (1984:448) notes that definite noun phrases usually come before indefinite ones, and known information comes before new information, as in "Jill ran into the street, and a passing car knocked her down." Thematic fronting, or moving parts of a sentence to the beginning, makes them more important than unmarked structures. Some examples are "It was only then that I realized my mistake" and "A convoy of enemy troops appeared over the hill." These constructions change the usual word order to show information that is motivated by discourse, often putting more emphasis on new or important elements.

7. Cross-Linguistic and Historical Evidence on Information Status and Word Order

Studies in various languages and historical periods demonstrate that information structure consistently influences word order beyond English. Research on Old and Middle English indicates that the variation between object-verb (OV) and verb-object (VO) orders is associated with the information status of objects: referential and discourse-given objects are more likely to appear in OV positions, while new information remains adjacent to the verb. It suggests that the old English used word order to indicate information structural roles of constituents in discourse rather than grammatical ones only (Bech.,2012). The proposed phase-based approach suggests that discourse-given objects move on the instruction of information structural properties, and accounts for variation in word order and operation in Old English. Cross-linguistic evidence from language acquisition studies has shown that children learning Russian and English can both use pragmatic strategies to mark IS long before they have fully mastered the syntax. Russian-speaking and English-speaking learners do not use the same structures for marking topic and focus (as seen in drop of topic, among other things), which led to the conclusion that pragmatics/information structure is available as part of grammar early on and does not emerge after syntax. Taken together, these results confirm that the interaction between information structure and word order is not limited to synchronic descriptions of English, but rather reflects more general language- universal patterns. Varbrul-based studies show, that changes in word order in historical perspective or across languages fall out as determined by the communicative need: speakers use structural options to organize information on given and new part of an utterance (Dyakonova, 2005).

8. Psycholinguistic Evidence on Processing and Word Order

Experimental evidence supports the view that the richness of information influences how people process sentences in real time. Research that has investigated the processing of both canonical and non-canonical word orders in native and L2 speakers suggests that the two groups are able to read and understand sentences more efficiently when they comply with the FPCs which are characteristic of naturalistic language structures. In one study of Russian



speakers and Mandarin Chinese speakers learning Russian, for example, participants processed sentences better when the context established a “given → new” order. These were easier to process than non-canonical orders that did not follow this expected pattern, especially for aL2-listeners who are less able to parse out these subtle contextual cues. These results further confirm that information status (given vs. ew) and its relationship to word order are not just theoretical concepts but furthermore they have an empirical effect on comprehension processes and cognitive resources. Sentences with familiar referents before new ones are preferred by readers; deviating from this pattern affects response times and interpretive accuracy. These findings lend credence to the notion that word order decisions have a direct impact on communication effectiveness and people's expectations based on what they hear. (Harchevnik & Slioussar, 2024).

9. Word Order and Information Structure: Functional and Diachronic Perspectives

Functional and diachronic linguistics reveal even more that changes in word order frequently reflect information-structure related pressures. Theories of language change suggest that changes in word order over time (such as the decline of OV variants in early English) are related to people's patterns of expression concerning old and new information. According to this perception, specific word order possibilities were retained or lost because of their real-world utility. For instance: Orders that facilitated access to the topic and focus only became stronger, while orders that made expressing such information more difficult got worse over time. Furthermore, typological evidence from other languages provides reason to believe that variation is often exploited in more free word order languages in order to indicate information structural roles. For example, a language that permits constituents to move about freely in a sentence often allows topicalized or focused elements appear at the beginning of a sentence to indicate the importance of particular discourse while not altering the core meaning. Marked dispositions in English (fronting, inversion, passives) are mainly to organize grammatical form according to informational prominence. These are similar to things that go on in English. In short, both functional and diachronic research support the idea that information structure is what makes word order systems change and stay the same. This backs up the idea that communicative needs, especially the need to organize old and new information, are very important in changing grammar patterns over time and in different languages (Hinterhölzl & Petrova, 2009).

10. Conclusion

This study has shown that information status is very important for both the structure of sentences and the order of words, both in the present and in the past. Gricean pragmatics and Relevance Theory show that communicative intention



and truth-conditional meaning are important for understanding what people say, but they don't explain how speakers organize their discourse. Linguistic structures, especially word order, are important for controlling the flow of information. They allow speakers to contain some things in the foreground and other, new or less predictable things in the background. Analysis of patterns of English sentence structure in conjunction with building evidence across languages (from Russian to Mandarin to Old English), speakers systematically use constructions such as passives, clefts, fronting and inversion to map the grammatical structure onto the informational hierarchy of topic/focus/theme/rheme. Psycholinguistic literature shows that in line with information status word-order patterns help to build an easily comprehensible and processing-effective framework, while unexpected patterns increase cognitive load, particularly for second-language learners. Diachronic and functional evidence in particular highlights the role of word order and information structure as a core conditioning factor in syntactic variation and change. Languages tend to retain structures that facilitate distinguishing new from old information while eliminating those that make things more difficult to follow. This demonstrates that communicative needs, too how information is treated, can alter grammatical schemas diachronically with respect to the relation among syntax-pragmatics- discourse. The results provide support for a functional-cognitive account of language, Language Language Departments, indicating that word order is not just an assembly rule but also a multifaceted and adaptive resource. Good communication results from the interweaving of communicative goals, cognitive constraints, and structural pairings to encode and decode meaning. The present study highlights the requirement to consider both information and grammar in explanation of discourse and syntactic alternatives in a comprehensive model, with data from English, as well as cross-linguistic facts this is based on.

References

- Arnold, J. E., Wasow, T., Losongco, A., & Ginstrom, R. (2000). Heaviness vs. newness: The effects of complexity and information structure on constituent ordering. *Language*, 76(1), 28–55.
- Bach, K. (2004). Pragmatics and the philosophy of language. In L. R. Horn & G. Ward (Eds.), *The handbook of pragmatics* (pp. 463–487). Blackwell.
- Bech, K. (2012). Word order, information structure, and discourse relations in Old and Middle English. In A. Meurman Solin (Ed.), *Information structure and syntactic change in the history of English* (pp. 66–86). Oxford University Press.
- Biber, D., Conrad, S., & Reppen, R. (1998). *Corpus linguistics: Investigating language structure and use*. Cambridge University Press.



- Biber, D., Conrad, S., & Leech, G. (2002). Student grammar of spoken and written English. Longman.
- Birner, B. J. (1994). Information status and word order: An analysis of English inversion. *Language*, 70(2), 233–259.
- Birner, B. J. (1996). The discourse function of inversion in English. Garland.
- Birner, B. J., & Ward, G. (1998). Information status and noncanonical word order in English. John Benjamins.
- Birner, B. J., & Ward, G. (2004). Information structure and syntactic change in English. *Language*, 80(1), 120–153.
- Celce-Murcia, M., & Larsen-Freeman, D. (1983). The grammar book: An ESL/EFL teacher's course. Newbury House.
- Cinque, G. (1999). Adverbs and functional heads: A cross-linguistic perspective. Oxford University Press.
- Culicover, P. W., & Jackendoff, R. (2005). *Simpler syntax*. Oxford University Press.
- Davidson, D. (1980). *Essays on actions and events*. Clarendon Press.
- Dryer, M. S. (1986). Primary objects, secondary objects, and antitativity. *Language*, 62(4), 808–845.
- Dyakonova, M. (2005). Information structure development: Evidence from the acquisition of word order in Russian and English. *Nordlyd*, 32(1).
- Erteschik-Shir, N. (1979). Discourse constraints on dative movement. In T. Givón (Ed.), *Syntax and semantics* (Vol. 12, pp. 441–467). Academic Press.
- Fillmore, C. J. (1968). The case for case. In E. Bach & R. T. Harms (Eds.), *Universals in linguistic theory* (pp. 1–88). Holt, Rinehart and Winston.
- Firbas, J. (1976). Functional sentence perspective and the organization of discourse. Mouton.
- Grice, H. P. (1957). Meaning. *The Philosophical Review*, 66(3), 377–388.
- Halliday, M. A. K. (1994). *An introduction to functional grammar* (2nd ed.). Edward Arnold.
- Hinterhölzl, R., & Petrova, S. (Eds.). (2009). Information structure and language change. De Gruyter.
- Horn, L. R. (1984). Toward a new taxonomy for pragmatic inference. In D. Schiffrin (Ed.), *Meaning, form, and use in context* (pp. 11–42). Georgetown University Press.
- Jacobs, J. (1995). Information structure. In J. Jacobs, A. von Stechow, W. Sternefeld, & T. Vennemann (Eds.), *Syntax: An international handbook of contemporary research* (pp. 146–165). De Gruyter.
- Kayne, R. (1994). *The antisymmetry of syntax*. MIT Press.
- Larson, R. (1988). On the double object construction. *Linguistic Inquiry*, 19(3), 335–391.
- Mathesius, V. (1939). On linguistic characterology with illustrations from Modern English. In *Actes du premier congrès international de linguistes* (pp. 169–175).



- Postal, P. M. (2004). Skeptical linguistic essays. Oxford University Press.
- Prince, E. F. (1981). Toward a taxonomy of given–new information. In P. Cole (Ed.), *Radical pragmatics* (pp. 223–255). Academic Press.
- Slioussar, N., & Harchevnik, M. (2024). Word order and context in sentence processing: Evidence from L1 and L2 Russian. *Frontiers in Psychology*.
<https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2024.1344366>
- Sperber, D., & Wilson, D. (1986). *Relevance: Communication and cognition*. Blackwell.