THE POSITION OF SUBJECT CLAUSES IN THE HISTORY OF ENGLISH

JAVIER RIVAS
UNIVERSIDADE DE SANTIAGO DE COMPOSTELA

INTRODUCTION

The aim of this paper is twofold: it sets out to contribute to the analysis of the position of subject clauses in the history of the English language by studying their distribution in the 18th century, a period to which scholars have not devoted much work. It also intends to present the possible factors which contribute to the placing of subject clauses in pre-verbal position. Subject clauses may occur either post-verbally or pre-verbally in the sentence. The latter position is less frequent and occurs later in time than the former.

The present study is corpus-based, the corpus being John Paine's *The Age of Reason* (1794-1796) where I have analyzed [*-wh*] finite complement clauses in subject function headed by the complementizer *that*. This structure has been chosen for two different reasons: firstly, on account of the text-type. *The Age of Reason* is a highly formal text. This being so, the use of *that* to introduce complement clauses overrides the use of the *zero*-complementizer and the former is even used with complement clauses in object function of high-frequency verbs such as *say* or *tell*. These verbs are usually acknowledged in the literature on the topic as a clear *zero*-favouring environment. Secondly, my main concern is to study subject clauses in pre-verbal position and these cannot occur with a *zero*-complementizer because the clause would not be recognized as a sub-clause. Besides, it is important to note the following points in connection with the corpus results:

- coordinate subject clauses have been counted as one occurrence;

- equative[1] clauses have been left out unless the *that*-clause appears in pre-verbal position.

The Age of Reason has been chosen because it belongs to a period to which little or no attention has been paid in the literature and because it is a very formal text. Pre-verbal subject clauses are usually said to be more common in formal texts. *The Age of Reason* was written during the years that go from 1794 to 1796. The book is a philosophical dissertation on Paine's views of the Bible and Christian religion. He also expresses his ideas about God in this work.

A computerized source has been used. The text is included in the CD-ROM collection *Library of the Future* which contains more than a thousand literary works from all the periods of the history of English. The size of my corpus is around 65,000 words.

As already stated, the second aim of this essay is to present the factors which block or favour the pre-verbal position for subject clauses. In order to do this, the present study has been ordered in the following way: first, there is a synchronic and a diachronic survey. Then, the factors which block or favour pre-verbal position are dealt with and finally these factors have been applied to to the data available in my corpus and to other data provided by various scholars for Middle and early Modern English.

I. COMPLEMENT CLAUSES IN SUBJECT FUNCTION IN THE CORPUS

There are 133 examples of subject *that*-clauses in the whole corpus. They occur with 51 different predicates. With the exception of one example, these subject clauses conform to one of the following patterns:

1. SBCL-V (pre-verbal position): 12 examples, 8 predicates
2. IT-V-SBCL (post-verbal position): 120 examples, 47 predicates

There is one example of a post-verbal subject clause occurring after the predicate STRANGE with the omission of the copula BE and of the anticipatory *it*.

Table 1 shows the number of predicates that take clauses in patterns 1 and 2 according to the matrix type:

Table 1: Predicates	Active Matrix	Passive Matrix	Total
Pre-verbal position	7	1	8
Post-verbal position	35	13	48

Table 2 shows the number of occurrences found in both positions, together with the percentages obtained in each case:

Table 2	Occurrences	Percentage
Pre-verbal position	12	9.02%
Post-verbal position	121	90.98%
Total	133	100%

I.1. *THAT*-CLAUSES IN PRE-VERBAL POSITION (12 EXAMPLES)

a) With an active matrix[2] (7 predicates, 11 examples): **BE** (4 examples, equative constructions), **BE BETTER** (1), **BE CERTAIN** (2), **BE COMMON** (1), **BE DISCERNABLE** (1), **BE EVIDENT** (1), **BE INCONSISTENT** (1).

b) With a passive matrix (1 predicate, 1 example): **BE DEMONSTRATED** (1).

I.2. *THAT*-CLAUSES IN POST-VERBAL POSITION (121)

a) With an active matrix (35 predicates, 94 examples): **APPEAR** (12 clauses), **BE** (4): Two of the examples show subject-auxiliary inversion: *is it more that a man should have swallowed a whale or told a lie?* page 94, **BE ABSURD** (1), **BE AN INCONSISTENCY** (1), **BE BETTER** (2), **BE CERTAIN** (5): there is a marked word order in one of the examples: *and certain it is that, in general, a youth will learn more of a living language in one year, than of a dead language in seven* 58, **BE CONSISTENT** (1), **BE CONVENIENT** (1), **BE CURIOUS** (1), **BE EVIDENCE** (4), **BE EVIDENT** (2), **BE EXTRAORDINARY** (2), **BE IMPOSSIBLE** (6), **BE IMPROBABLE** (2): there is subject-auxiliary inversion in one of the clauses, **BE INCUMBENT** (2), **BE MILLIONS TO ONE** (1), **BE MORE THAN A TOKEN** (1), **BE NATURAL** (1), **BE NECESSARY** (8), **BE OF USE** (1): the following occurrence shows subject-auxiliary inversion: *of what use is it, unless it be to teach man something, that his eye is endowed with the power of beholding to an incomprehensible distance, an immensity of worlds revolving in the ocean of space?* 56, **BE POSSIBLE** (4): there is subject-auxiliary inversion in one example, **BE PROBABLE** (3) one occurrence shows subject-auxiliary inversion: *is it more probable that nature should go*

out of her course, or that a man should tell a lie? 93, **BE PROPER** (3): there is subject-auxiliary inversion in one example, **BE PROVABLE** (1), **BE SAFE** (1): one clause presents subject-auxiliary inversion: *is it not safe that we stop ourselves at the plain, pure, and unmixed belief of one God, which is Deism, than that we commit ourselves on an ocean of improbable, irrational, indecent and contradictory tales?* 222, **BE SATISFACTORY** (1), **(BE) STRANGE** (1): *Strange, indeed, that an army of saints should return to life, and nobody know who they were, nor who it was that saw them, and that not a word more should be said upon the subject, nor these saints have anything to tell us!* 228, **BE STRANGE AND INCONSISTENT** (1): This occurrence has a marked word order: *how strange and inconsistent it is, that the same circumstance that would weaken the belief even of a probable story should be given as a motive for believing this one, that has upon the face of it every token of absolute impossibility and imposture!* 223, **BE TRUE** (2), **BECOME NECESSARY** (1), **COME TO PASS** (6), **CONSIDER** (1), **FOLLOW** (1), **HAPPEN** (9): one of them shows subject auxiliary inversion, **OCCUR** (1).

b) With a passive matrix (13 predicates, 27 examples): **BE ACCOUNTED FOR** (1): there is subject-auxiliary inversion in one of the examples: *how can it be accounted for that not one of these histories should say anything about them?* 156, **BE ADMITTED** (1), **BE BELIEVED** (1): one of the examples presents subject-auxiliary inversion, **BE FOUND** (1), **BE INTENDED** (1), **BE OBSERVED** (1), **BE REPORTED** (1), **BE SAID** (13), **BE SEEN** (1), **BE SHOWN** (1), **BE STATED** (1), **BE SUPPOSED** (3): one of the examples shows subject-auxiliary inversion: *why is it to be supposed that the immensity of space is a naked void, lying in eternal waste?* 75, **BE UNDERSTOOD** (1).

2. COMPLEMENT CLAUSES IN SUBJECT FUNCTION: SYNCHRONIC AND DIACHRONIC SURVEYS

2.1. SUBJECT CLAUSES: A SYNCHRONIC OVERVIEW

In Present-day English, complement clauses in subject function may occur in two different positions within the clause, namely pre-verbally or post-verbally, as for example in (1) and (2) respectively:

(1) *That he was angry was obvious.*

(2) *It was obvious that he was angry.*[3]

In order to account for this variation, two major theories may be found in the literature: *extraposition*, which is the most widely accepted one, and *subject replacement*, later called *intraposition*.

The theory of extraposition presents (1) as the basic structure and (2) as the derived structure. It is claimed that the *that*-clause is shifted to the end of the sequence as in (2) in a process working from left to right and *it* is inserted to occupy the initial position of the clause. Jespersen talks about extraposition in these terms:

> When for some reason or another it is not convenient to put a content-clause in the ordinary place of the subject, object, etc., the clause is placed at the end in extraposition and is represented in the body of the sentence itself by *it*. Thus frequently when the clause is the subject as in "It seems certain *that he is dead*". (Jespersen 1909-1949: III: § 2.1₃)

Within the generativist framework, Rosenbaum (1967: 11-13) talks about an optional extraposition rule to explain how (2) is generated from (1). In this analysis, *it* appears as the sister of the *that*-clause in the deep structure. It is deleted when extraposition does not apply. With some minor changes, Emonds (1976: 116 ff.) supports Rosenbaum's theory of extraposition. Lightfoot (1976: 205) states that, in Present-day English, (1) is the basic structure by means of a process of reanalysis taking place in early Modern English. He accepts the extraposition theory for the early and late Modern English periods.

Non-generativist grammars such as Huddleston's and Quirk *et al.*'s also talk about extraposition for constructions such as (2). Huddleston posits that (1) is "basic since it conforms to the kernel clause structure S[ubject]-P[redicate]-P[redicative]C[omplement]" (1984: 451), and presents (2) as a transformation of (1). Quirk *et al.* define extraposition as the "postponement which involves the replacement of the postponed element by a substitute form" (1985: § 18.33a), and talk about two subjects in (2): the anticipatory subject (*it*) and the postponed subject (the *that*-clause).

In Government and Binding Theory, a specific extraposition rule is not posited any more. Instead, extraposition is part of a more general theory of movement, namely move-α. In (2), the *that*-clause is moved to the end of the sequence and *it* must be included because of the Extended Projection

Principle, which establishes that every clause must have a subject (Haegeman 1994: 59).

Radford presents a minimalist approach, the latest trend in generativist studies. For sequences such as (2) he posits that *it* occupies the spec-TP[4] position, not unlike any other subject. The only difference "would be that the subject of the light [superordinate] verb would be impersonal rather than an AGENT argument like *he* in: *He had remarked to her that Senator Scumme-Bagge was a fraud*" (1997: 380). In Radford's approach, the *that*-clause is part of the VP.

Emonds (1972) first presented the theory of subject replacement or intraposition. According to him, (2) is the basic structure while (1) is derived from (2) through the subject replacement rule: "A straightforward rule to accomplish this derivation [(1) from (2)] would be one which replaces a subject NP dominating *it* (or, perhaps, dominating nothing at the point when the rule applies) with the complement S [...]. I will call this rule "subject replacement"" (Emonds 1972: 34-35). In the deep structure, *it* and the *that*-clause are coreferential and when the subject replacement rule applies, the *it*-deletion rule also takes place. Emonds's subject replacement theory was later termed *intraposition* because it posited a movement in an opposite direction to *extraposition*.

Emonds's theory of intraposition was harshly criticized in the seventies and this is probably one of the reasons why he presents an alternative account in Emonds (1976) in the line of Rosenbaum's (1967) explanation of the topic. However, in the eighties and nineties, the intraposition theory has been supported by some scholars both within the generativist framework (Jackendoff 1981: 201 ff.) and outside generativist studies as well (López Couso 1994a: 231, who bases her arguments on historical evidence).

Apart from the intraposition and the extraposition theories, other explanations have appeared in the literature. Thus, for example, Koster (1978) supports the satellite hypothesis for subject clauses in pre-verbal position. According to this theory, subject clauses are satellites (i.e. topicalized elements) which are bound to a phonologically zero NP subject of the main clause.

2.2. COMPLEMENT CLAUSES IN SUBJECT FUNCTION: A DIACHRONIC SURVEY

A survey will now be made of the position of subject clauses down through the history of English. The following abbreviations will be used for convenience: OE (Old English, from the 7th century to 1100), ME (Middle

English, from 1100 to 1500), eModE (early Modern English, from 1500 to 1700) and lModE (late Modern English, from 1700 up to the present day).

In OE, complement clauses in subject function occur in post-verbal position in all contexts. No examples have been found where clauses of this type occur pre-verbally. It may be said, therefore, that extraposition is the rule in OE. Mitchell states the following: "It is important that the OE noun clause does not occupy first place in OE sentences as it does in ME examples like "that he is rich is true" [...] I have found no examples with a *þæt* clause in this position" (1985: § 1950).

In ME, subject clauses are placed post-verbally as a rule as well. Dekeyser claims that "extraposition of the subject complement clause was an obligatory rule in OE and ME" (1984: 193). However, Warner (1982: 23, 108) gives two examples of pre-verbal clauses although he does not find them in his corpus of *The Wyclifitte Sermons*. He reports as follows: "there are no instances of this construction [*that*-clauses in surface subject position] in the corpus but *þat* clauses are found outside it as subject of BE (with various predicates), BITOKENE, TECHE, TELLE" (1982: 108). In the same line, Méndez Naya (1997: 225) includes one further example of an intraposed clause taken from *Ancrene Wisse*.

In eModE, the commonest position is still post-verbal but there are some instances of subject clauses in pre-verbal position. Dekeyser (1984: 193) presents as perhaps "the earliest occurrence" an example taken from Visser (1963-73: § I, 3) from Thomas More's *Works* (1557) and states that he can find no further examples until the end of the 19th century. A similar state of affairs is given in Traugott's account of ME and eModE. She claims that "the subjectivalization of a *that*-complement as in *That she writes so badly is a pity* seems still not to have been available at this period" (1972: 152).

In Present-day English, although the number of intraposed clauses has increased considerably, there is still a tendency to place clausal subjects after the verb. Huddleston states that so-called extraposed clauses are "much more frequent" (1984: 451). Matthews also claims that "the more usual pattern is with the clause removed outside the subject-predicate relation" (1981: 276).

Corpus-based studies have shown that the post-verbal position has been the more frequent of the two possible orders in all periods. In her Shakespearean corpus, Fanego states that "extraposition is the norm when the clause is a subject" (1990: 9), and only records one example of an intraposed subject clause. Similar results are given by García Lorenzo, who, in his corpus of John Lyly's *Euphues: the Anatomy of Wyt*, does not find

any examples of pre-verbal clauses (García Lorenzo 1993: 137). On the other hand, in her Dryden corpus, López Couso (1994b) finds three examples (2.5%) of intraposed clauses versus 117 subject clauses in post-verbal position (97.5%).

In her study of infinitive complements in Shakespeare's works, Fanego (1992) obtains the following results concerning subject clauses. She records a total of 109 subject clauses in her corpus out of which 28 are preposed and 81 are postposed (Fanego 1992: 73). This gives the following percentages:

preposed subject clauses: 74.3%
postposed subject clauses: 25.7%

As the figures in Table 2 above show, in lModE the occurrence of subject clauses in pre-verbal position has increased considerably and this tendency continues in the twentieth century according to Huddleston (1971), Ellegård (1978), Elsness (1981) and Mair (1990). However, it is important to remark that the text types used in the studies under consideration vary considerably from one corpus to another. This should be taken into account when considering these results.

Huddleston (1971) uses a corpus of written scientific English. He finds 204 examples of finite complement clauses in subject function in the whole corpus. Only 8 clauses are placed pre-verbally (Huddleston 1971: 176). This gives the following percentages:

subject clauses in post-verbal position: 196 (96.07%)
subject clauses in pre-verbal position: 8 (3.93%)

Ellegård works with a sample of the Brown Corpus. The results he presents are classified into four different text-types: fiction, press, literary essays, and science. Both finite and non-finite clauses are included. He obtains the following results (1978: 32):

clauses in subject function: 12.3 %

clauses in subject (lifted)[5] function: 87.7%

Elsness works with the Syntax Data Corpus, consisting of texts included in the Brown University Corpus of American English. He looks for *that-*

clauses[6] in the corpus. The following results may be extracted from his tables (Elsness 1981: 283):

non-extraposed subjects: 32.2 %
extraposed subjects: 67.8%

He also classifies his results according to text-type. He distinguishes four kinds of texts: journalism, popular fiction, literary essays and science.

Finally, there are Mair's results derived from his corpus of infinitival clauses in Present-day English. He distinguishes four types of infinitival

clauses in subject function (Mair 1990: 20): extraposed and subjectless, extraposed with subject, non-extraposed and subjectless, non-extraposed with subject. He gives the following results for the four types he distinguishes (22): extraposed and subjectless: 650 occurrences; extraposed with subject: around 100 occurrences; non-extraposed and subjectless: 52 occurrences; non-extraposed with subject: 5 occurrences. They are classified into two different types for convenience:

extraposed subject clauses: 750 examples (92.93%)
non-extraposed subject clauses: 57 examples (7.07 %)

Table 3 presents the results of the different corpora consulted:

SOURCE	CORPUS	SCOPE	INTRAPOSED	EXTRAPOSED
García Lorenzo (1993)	John Lyly (1578)	Finite [-wh]-complement clauses	0%	100%
Fanego (1990)	Shakespeare	Finite [-wh]-complement clauses	1.38%	98.62%
Fanego (1992)	Shakespeare	infinitive complement clauses	25.7%	74.3%
López Couso (1994b)	Dryden (1631-1700)	finite [-wh]-complement clauses	2.5%	97.5%
	Payne (1794-1796)	that-clauses	9.02%	90.98%
Huddleston (1971)	written scientific English	finite complement clauses	3.93%	96.07%
Ellegård (1978)	Brown Corpus	subject clauses	12.3%	87.7%
Elsness (1981)	Syntax Data Corpus	that and zero- clauses	32.2%	67.8%
Mair (1990)	Survey	infinitive complement clauses	7.07%	92.93%

From the data looked at so far, the following conclusions may be drawn:

1. Post-verbal position has been the more frequent position for complement clauses in subject function throughout the history of the

English language. On this basis, it is convenient for purposes of this paper to consider that final position is the unmarked[7] position for subject clauses in English.

2. Similarly, of the two major theories which have been posited for the position of subject clauses, namely extraposition and intraposition, historical evidence seems to support the intraposition theory.

3. The use of subject clauses in pre-verbal position is neglected till late ME and very uncommon until lModE according to the corpus-based approaches mentioned above.

The possibility of placing subject clauses in post-verbal or pre-verbal positions leads to a consideration of whether the choice of one or other position is arbitrary or determined. Since the post-verbal position is the unmarked position for subject clauses in English, an attempt should be made to explain under what circumstances intraposition takes place. This will be the concern of the following sections.

3. ORIGINS OF INTRAPOSED CLAUSES AND OBLIGATORY INTRAPOSITION

Fanego (1992) posits that intraposed subject clauses derive from left-dislocated clausal structures with a recapitulatory *it*. Structures of this kind "seem to be recorded already in OE, that is, earlier than the pre-verbal type without resumptive pronoun, and continue in use until well into the Early Modern period" (1992: 60). The satellite hypothesis supported by Koster (1978) clearly conforms to this claimed origin for pre-verbal clauses. Nevertheless, once the recapitulatory pronoun no longer occurs, Koster's explanation can only be accepted by positing that there is a phonologically zero NP bound to the subject clause.

Méndez Naya (1997: 225) states that the first occurrences of subject clauses in pre-verbal position appeared in constructions such as (3), where there is a double embedding:

> (3) *That John has blood on his hands proves that Mary is innocent.* (Emonds 1972: 49)

In constructions where double embedding takes place, intraposition seems to be obligatory (Huddleston 1984: 453). The following verbs are said to require obligatory intraposition: PROVE, IMPLY, SHOW, and equative BE. Early

generativist approaches termed this kind of construction *doubly filled nodes* (Emonds 1972: 50).

4. FACTORS BLOCKING INTRAPOSITION

Another factor to be taken into account is that in some contexts, intraposition is not possible. This has led scholars to coin terms such as *obligatory extraposition* (Huddleston 1984: 452) or *empty subject hypothesis* (Emonds 1972: 55 ff.). Four main contexts where intraposition does not seem to be possible in English are usually recognized in the literature:

1. With verbs such as APPEAR, SEEM, HAPPEN, or REMAIN (Huddleston 1984: 452, Noonan 1985: 83 or Quirk *et al.* 1985: § 16.34):

> (4) *It appears from the 38th chapter, that when Jeremiah was in prison, Zedekiah sent for him, and at this interview, which was private, Jeremiah pressed it strongly on Zedekiah to surrender himself to the enemy.* 194[8]
>
> (5) *But it happens, awkwardly enough, that Christ, according to their own account, was but one day and two nights in the grave.* 254

Many of these verbs come from OE verbs occurring in so-called impersonal constructions. Constructions of this kind usually required two participants, one of which occurred in the accusative or dative cases and the other in the genitive. This fact and also the fact that clauses with verbs of this type cannot be intraposed have led some scholars not to consider them subjects but some kind of oblique complement (Emonds 1972: 55 ff. among others).

2. Constructions where subject auxiliary inversion takes place (Huddleston 1984: 452):

> (6) *Neither is it improbable that Jesus Christ had in contemplation the delivery of the Jewish nation from the bondage of the Romans.* 13
>
> (7) *Of what use is it, unless it be to teach man something, that his eye is endowed with the power of beholding to an incomprehensible distance, an immensity of worlds revolving in the ocean of space?* 56

In connection to this, Noonan (1985: 83) claims that complement clauses show restrictions to be placed in medial position cross-linguistically, because otherwise they would be more difficult for the human brain to process.

3. Complement clauses in subject function do not occur pre-verbally when the matrix predicate is passive:

(8) *It may be said that a man may speak of himself in the third person, and therefore it may be supposed that Moses did.* 117

(9) *It may also be observed, that the book shows itself to be the production of a mind cultivated in science, which the Jews, so far from being famous for, were very ignorant of.* 170

Yet, there is one example in my corpus which has a pre-verbal subject clause and a passive matrix:

(10) *That the consciousness of existence is not dependent on the same form or the same matter is demonstrated to our senses in the works of the creation, as far as our senses are capable of receiving that demonstration.* 258

Considering all this, it may be concluded that subject clauses in pre-verbal position mainly occur in unmarked constructions as far as clause type and voice are concerned (declarative, active respectively).

5. FACTORS WHICH FAVOUR INTRAPOSITION IN ACTIVE DECLARATIVE CLAUSES

Factors of different types favouring intraposition have been considered in the literature:

1. Stylistic factors: they include aspects such as the following: text type (scientific, popular fiction, drama, press, etc.), degree of formality of the text and medium (written or spoken language). All three factors are interrelated.

2. Structural factors: questions such as the word order of the sequence or the principle of end-weight are of concern in this section.

3. Thematic factors: they refer to the arrangement of information in the clause. From the point of view of the informational load the elements of a clause contain, two different types of pragmatic functions may be distinguished: *topic* and *comment*. Alternative labels are *given* vs. *new information* or *theme* vs. *rheme*.

5.1. STYLISTIC FACTORS

As stated above, the stylistic factors that are most relevant to this study are: text type, degree of formality and medium. Apparently, the use of intraposed subject clauses is usually associated with formal written text types such as scientific prose, literary essays or press. This factor has been applied to the corpus-based studies of lModE which include figures according to text-type or medium with the following results:

-Text-type: Both Ellegård (1978) and Elsness (1981) use (part of) the Brown Corpus for their quantitative studies. The kinds of text they use are therefore very similar. Table 4 shows their results:

Table 4: Intraposed clauses	Ellegård (1978: 32)	Elsness (1981: 283)
Popular Fiction	18.18%	35.21%
Journalism	12.5%	51.35%
Literary Essays	19.79%	35.25%
Science	2.29%	21.6%

-Medium: Table 5 contains Mair's (1990) results according to whether the discourse is written or spoken:

Table 5: Intraposed clauses	Mair (1990: 40)
Written language	78.84%
Spoken language	21.16%

Mair's results can be compared with Huddleston's (1971) as far as scientific written English is concerned. Huddleston obtains a percentage of 3.93 for intraposed clauses in subject function. His results are thus similar to Ellegård's for scientific texts (2.29%) but quite different from Elsness's results for the same kind of text.

According to the evidence presented, it may be concluded that intraposed subject clauses are more common in written than in spoken language. As far as text type is concerned, scientific texts are the ones which are most reluctant to accept intraposed clauses while these clauses occur with more or less the same frequency in popular fiction and literary essays. Further research is needed to account for the reasons for this fact. Regarding press texts,

results are contradictory, and therefore, it is difficult to arrive at a definitive conclusion.

5.2. STRUCTURAL FACTORS

It has usually been claimed that subject clauses occur at the end of the sequence because they are heavy elements and are therefore conditioned by the so-called principle of end weight, according to which heavy groups tend to be placed at the end of the sequence. Clausal complements are heavy groups and consequently tend to occur in final position (see Dekeyser 1984: 193-194, Traugott 1972: 97, 105 or Fanego 1990: 62-63 for early stages of English). Huddleston also supports this claim for Present-day English:

> The main thematic effect of extraposition is that a "heavy" unit appears at the end of the clause, which makes for easier processing, whether by speaker or hearer– and the longer the embedded clause or non-finite construction, the more likely it is that the extraposed construction will be selected. (Huddleston 1984: 453)

In my corpus, the principle of end-weight does not seem to apply in some cases:

> (11) *That many good men have believed this strange fable, and lived very good lives under that belief (for credulity is not a crime),* is what I have no doubt of. 18
> (12) *That the Jews did translate the literary productions of the Gentile nations into the Hebrew language, and mix them with their own,* is not a matter of doubt. 170

However, in most of the examples of intraposed clauses, *that*-clauses are not as heavy as the groups in (11) and (12):

> (13) *and that he is the author,* is an altogether unfounded opinion, got abroad nobody knows how. 117
> (14) *That it does not prevent our dying* is evident, because we all die. 33
> (15) *That she could fabricate writings* is certain, because she could write. 37

The same can be applied to the examples provided by Méndez Naya (1997: 225) for ME:

> (16) *þet þis scheld naveð   siden, is for bitacnunge þet his*
>   that this   never have parts   symbol
> *deciples, þe   schulden stonden bi him and habben ibeon his siden,*
> disciples who should   stand by   have been   side
> fluhen   alle from him ant leafden him as fremede. (Ancrene
>   *Wisse,* 513)
> ran away   all   and left   stranger.
> "That this shield did not have any parts, is to signify that his disciples, who should have stood by him and have been on his side, all ran away from him and left him as a stranger".
> (17) *And þat Crist touchide þis leprouse techiþ us now þat*
>   that Christ touch   this   leprous   teach
> *þe manhede of Crist was instrument to his godhede. (Wycl. Ser.i.*
>
>   90.3; Warner 1982: 108)[9]
>   manhood   godhead.
> "And that Christ touched this leprous teaches us now that the manhood of Christ was an instrument to his godhead".

or to Fanego (1990)'s and López Couso (1994b)'s examples for eModE:

> (18) *That I am wretched/ Makes thee the happier. (Lear,* 15.63; Fanego 1990: 9)
> (19) *And that some such have been,* is proved too plain. (*Religio Laici,* 274)
> (20) **That ancient Fathers thus expound the page/** Gives truth the reverend majesty of age. (*Religio Laici,* 336-337, López Couso 1994b)

On the other hand, Visser (1963-1973: § I, 2) provides an example from eModE where the intraposed clause is modified by an embedded relative clause:

> (21) *That God gave him here in this world all thynge double that he lost,* little toucheth my mater. (1534 St. Th. More *Wks* 1557 1159 D5)

It may be said then that there is a tendency for heavy elements to go at the end of the clause although this tendency may be overridden by other factors.

5.3. THEMATIC FACTORS

The position of subject clauses may also be influenced by the distribution of information within the clause. It has been posited that subject clauses occur pre-verbally when the pragmatic structure of the clause follows the pattern: GIVEN + NEW information. This view is supported by Fanego for eModE:

> Generally speaking, the choice between the pre- and post-verbal type of subject infinitive is intimately connected with the thematic organization of the sentence, as is also largely the case in PE. Thus, pre-verbal clauses tend to contain given information, and to be linked to the preceding context by anaphoric references of various kinds. (1992: 61)

Huddleston states that the same holds for Present-day English: "The difference between the extraposed and non-extraposed patterns has to do with the thematic organization of the sentence or discourse, and it is not difficult to suggest thematic reasons for the order of elements in non-extraposed examples" (1971: 176).

Bolinger states that "with a *that*-clause, the extraposed element can just as readily be the comment [as be the topic of the sequence]" (1977: 73 ff.). He claims that verbs of information in the passive voice highly favour extraposition:

(22) *It will be announced that the president has been indicted.*

Bolinger does not consider an intraposed version of (23) grammatical. However, if the informational load of the verb is increased, intraposition is possible:

(23) *That the president has been indicted will not be announced.*[10]

Bolinger concludes that rather than the knownness of the clause, what forces extraposition is the "semantic weight" of the predicate. The more semantic weight a predicate has, the less likely it is for extraposition to take place. His conclusion seems to support the idea that intraposed clauses usually convey given information within the clause.

The problem is that not all the scholars agree on what *new information* is and on what *given information* is. The term *given information* may refer to at least three different things according to Prince (1981: 225 ff.):

1. predictability, recoverability. The hearer can predict that a particular linguistic item will occupy a particular position within the clause.
2. saliency. The hearer has some particular item, entity, thing... in his mind when s/he hears the utterance.
3. shared knowledge. The hearer knows or can infer a particular item of information.

In order to avoid problems with terminology, Prince talks about *assumed familiarity* and establishes three different types: *new*, *inferrable* and *evoked*. These three different types form a hierarchy:

$$\text{EVOKED} > \text{UNUSED}^{11} > \text{INFERRABLE} > \text{NEW}$$

Although she does not deal specifically with intraposed clauses, they are treated as inferrable entities in the examples she presents. A discourse entity is inferrable "if the speaker assumes the hearer can infer it, via logical-or, more commonly, plausible reasoning, from discourse entities already evoked or from other Inferrables" (1981: 236).

Containing inferrables are distinguished from *non-containing inferrables*. The former are characterized by the fact that what is inferred is contained within the entity in itself. Intraposed subject clauses are containing inferrables, that is, they are treated as abstract entities which contain within themselves what the hearer needs to infer.

Another linguist who avoids the pair *new* vs. *given information is* Givón (1983). He talks about comment and topic respectively. Givón states that languages very often place their topics in dislocated positions (both left and right) as in the following examples:

(24) *John, he came yesterday.*
(25) *He came yesterday, John.*

These two sequences contain two topicalized units (*John* and *he*). However, these two units are not syntactically and pragmatically similar. These two facts lead Givón to talk about "a non-discrete entity of topicality" (Givón 1983: 7). He considers that entities are not characterized by being topics or comments but by the fact that they can be topics to a certain degree. He states that the basic information-processing unit is the clause. Clauses are

joined into what he calls thematic paragraphs. In every thematic paragraph, there is one topic which is the "continuity marker, the *leitmotif*" (8). This topic is usually grammaticalized as the subject. As a result, prototypical topics are usually highly definite and referential participants, known information for both the speaker and the hearer. But within the same thematic paragraph there may be other topics. The beginning of the thematic paragraph is usually considered a secondary topic which either presents new entities or links up with the previous paragraph.

In order to explain how topics are structured in a language, Givón establishes the following hierarchy:

COMMENT > COMMENT-TOPIC > TOPIC-COMMENT > TOPIC

The most obvious topics are codified by means of zero markers, the least obvious ones by means of the repetition of the topic. There are two intermediate points between the two extremes. They are all governed by the following psychological principle: "Attend first to the most urgent task" (1983: 20).

Mair also considers the dichotomy *given* vs. *new information* an oversimplification of the problem. He states that subject clauses in initial position may contain "anaphoric references and important information not mentioned previously in the discourse" (1990: 35). Therefore, they can be treated as both given entities or new entities as far as their informational load is concerned.

It would seem, then, from the above that to classify an element of a particular sequence as new or given information may imply an oversimplification of the pragmatic functions of the clause. Entities can convey different degrees of topicality. This is clearly the case with long elements such as clausal complements. This being so, a tendency would seem to emerge for intraposed clauses to convey low informational load (i.e. they tend to be topics, given information). Another feature of intraposed clauses is that they contain anaphoric references to the previous sequence/s.

An attempt will now be made to focus on the data available from the corpora. For the ME period, three examples will be considered. Two of them are provided by Warner (1982: 23, 108):

(26) *þat þe þre kingis camen so fer... bitokeneþ Cristis*

lordship. (i. 341.28)

that   three   kings come   far   grant   Christ
"That the three kings came so far ... grants Christ's lordship".

(27=17) *And þat Crist touchide þis leprouse techiþ us now þat þe manhede of Crist was instrument to his godhede. (Wycl. Ser. i. 90.3)*

and another one is our earlier example (16) provided by Méndez Naya (1997: 225), which is repeated here as (28) with a broader context:

(28) **His scheld þe**   *wreah   his goddhead wes his leoue licome*
    shield   which conceal   divinity   dear body
*þet wes ispread o rode –brad as **scheld** buuen in his istrahte*
who   spread rood broad   above   outstrechted
earmes, nearow bineoð asþe an fot (efter monies wene, set upo þe
arms   narrow underneath one foot after many opinions upon
oðer). Ðetþis scheld naveð   siden, is for bitacnunge þet his
other that this   never have parts   symbol
deciples, þe   schulden stonden bi him and habben ibeon his
disciples who should   stand   by   have been
    siden, fluhen   alle from him ant leafden him as fremede. (Ancrene
Wisse, 513)
    side   run away all   and left   stranger.

"His shield, which concealed his divinity was his dear body who was spread on the Rood –broad as a shield above, in his outstretched arms, narrow as one only foot underneath (according to many opinions, set upon the other). That this shield did not have any parts, is to signify that his disciples, who should have stood by him and have been on his side, all ran away from him and left him as a stranger".

The first example provided by Warner is difficult to analyze because the transcription does not include any further context. However, in examples (27) and (28) the intraposed clauses are low informational entities which refer back to the preceding context. In Warner's example, there is an anaphoric pronoun *þis* and in Méndez Naya's there is a repetition of the whole NP containing an anaphoric pronoun (*þis scheld*) which is the topic of the thematic paragraph in Givón's terms.

Fanego (1990: 9) provides only one example of intraposed subject clause which has already been given as (18) but which is repeated here as (29) with more context:

(29) *Here, take this purse, thou whom the heaven's plagues/ Have humbled to all strokes. That I am wretched/ Makes thee the happier. (Lear, 15.63)*

Fanego explains the occurrence of this example in terms of metrical requirements. However, she also mentions the fact that "it is tempting to correlate it with the fact that the content of the complement clause is given, and well known to the audience; by positioning it initially the normal pattern given + new is attained" (1990: 9).

López Couso (1994b) finds three examples of intraposed clauses in her Dryden corpus. They are all three given here with a broad context:

(30) *This day was that designed by Dauphine for the settling of his uncle's state upon him, which to compass, he contrives to **marry** him. That the **marriage** had been plotted by him long beforehand is made evident by what he tells True-Wit in the second act. (Essay of Dramatic Poesy 115/ 20-23)*

Again, the intraposed clause refers to something which has been previously mentioned (*the marriage*) although the clause also gives some new information (the fact that the marriage had previously been plotted). We can say that the clause is a low informational entity which contains a referent already mentioned in the previous clause.

(31) *If written words from time are not secured,*
How can we think have oral sounds endured?
Which thus transmitted, if one mouth has failed,
***Inmortal lies** on ages are entailed;*
*And that **some such** have been, is proved too plain;*
If we consider interest, church, and gain.
(Religio Laici, 270-275)

The intraposed clause has a low informational load. There are two anaphoric items (*some such*) referring back to *inmortal lies*

(32=20) *That ancient Fathers **thus** expound the page*
Gives truth the reverend majesty of age.
(Religio Laici, 336-337)

This clause contains an anaphoric item, *thus*, which shows that the intraposed clause refers back to the previous clause. It is important to

remember that examples (31) and (32) belong to Dryden's poetic modes. Therefore, the selection of the intraposed variant may have been determined by metrical considerations.

In my corpus, out of the twelve examples of intraposed clauses found, six of them occur at the beginning of a paragraph. Their function is to link what has been said in the previous paragraph to the following one. They have therefore low informational load. Very often, some information is repeated and the sequences usually contain anaphoric items:

(33) *Had the inventors of this story told it the contrary way, that is had they represented the Almighty as compelling Satan to exhibit himself on a cross, in the shape of a snake, as a punishment for his new transgression, **the story** would have been less absurd– less contradictory. But instead of this, they make the transgressor triumph, and the Almighty fall.*
*That many good men have believed **this** strange fable, and lived very good lives under that belief (for credulity is not a crime), is what I have no doubt of. 18*
(34) *The sentence of death, which they tell us was thus passed upon Adam must either have meant dying naturally, that is, ceasing to live, or have meant what these Mythologists call damnation; and, consequently, the act of **dying** on the part of Jesus Christ, must, according to their system, apply as a **prevention** to one or other of these two things happening to Adam and to us.*
*That it does not **prevent our dying** is evident, because we all die. 33*
(35) *If, then, the thing produced has in itself a capacity of being immortal, it is more than a token that the power that produced it, which is the self-same thing as **consciousness of existence**, can be immortal also; and that as **independently of the matter** it was first connected with, as the thought is of the printing or writing it first appeared in. The one idea is not more difficult to believe than the other, and we can see that one is true.*
*That **the consciousness of existence is not dependent on the same form or the same matter** is demonstrated to our senses in the works of the creation, as far as our senses are capable of receiving that demonstration. 258*

In the other examples, the same tendencies are observed. The examples are characterized by containing given information, sometimes, exclusively:

(36) *In the first place, there is no affirmative evidence that Moses is the author of those books; and that he is the author, is an altogether unfounded opinion, got abroad nobody knowshow.* 117

(37 and 38) *Why are we to give this Church credit when she tells us that those books are genuine in every part, any more than we give her credit for everything else she has told us, or for the miracles she says she had performed? That she could fabricate writings is certain, because she could write; and the composition of the writings in question is of that kind that anybody might do it; and that she did fabricate them is not more inconsistent with probability than that she could tell us, as she has done, that she could and did work miracles.* 37

or in clauses in which new information is included, we have anaphoric pronouns referring back to some entity which occurs in the previous sequence:

(39) *The story of his being struck to the ground as he was journeying to Damascus has nothing in it miraculous or extraordinary; he escaped with life, and that is more than many others have done, who have been struck with lightning; and that he should lose his sight for three days, and be unable to eat or drink during that time, is nothing more than is common in such conditions.* 255

It may be concluded then that subject clauses in pre-verbal position tend to convey low informational load. This implies that they tend to be topics or given information. As a result, anaphoric items or the repetition of elements are common in clauses of this type. There also seems to be a tendency for intraposed subject clauses to function as cohesive links between paragraphs.

6. CONCLUDING REMARKS

Complement clauses in subject function may occur either pre-verbally or post-verbally in English. The post-verbal position is the most frequent one in 18th century according to the corpus used for the present study. The results show that there are more than ten clauses in post-verbal position for each intraposed subject clause. However, there is a notable increase of intraposed clauses in this period when these results are compared with the figures provided

by other scholars for the eModE period. Further research is needed to find out if this increase may be applied to other text-types from the same period.

Different theories may be found in the literature to explain the variation between the two positions of subject clauses. Three major theories have been considered: extraposition, intraposition and the satellite hypothesis. A diachronic survey of the topic shows that post-verbal clauses have always been the most frequent pattern, and have even been the only one in the earliest stages of the language. The results of the corpus-based studies presented in this paper show that the pre-verbal position starts to be a relatively common alternative only in the late Modern English period. On the basis of this historical evidence, intraposition seems to be the most suitable theory since it posits that the basic structure is the one where the subject clause occurs post-verbally.

The satellite hypothesis would seem to be supported by the account of the origin of intraposed clauses. It is claimed that they derive from left-dislocated structures recapitulated by a dummy *it*. Once the dummy *it* no longer occurs, this theory can only be supported if it is accepted that there is a phonologically zero NP bound to the subject clause.

Intraposed subject clauses tend to appear only in unmarked contexts as far as clause type and voice are concerned. Three major factors have also been considered in the literature to explain why subject clauses may be preferred pre-verbally: stylistic, structural and thematic factors. Drawing on the data presented in this paper, the following conclusions may be set out:

- Intraposed clauses tend to occur in written English. Under the text-type heading, scientific texts seem to be the most reluctant type to use pre-verbal clauses. Intraposed subject clauses appear with similar frequency in both literary essays and popular fiction. As far as press is concerned, a definite conclusion can not be reached since the results are contradictory.

- The principle of end-weight according to which heavy elements go at the end of the sequence does not seem to apply in all cases as regards subject clauses. There is a tendency for long clauses to occur at the end of the sequence but this tendency may be overridden by other factors.

- Subject clauses in pre-verbal position tend to be informationally low. They behave as topics or given information. As a result, they usually contain anaphoric items or elements which have already occurred in the context previously. Intraposed clauses very often occur at the beginning of a paragraph, referring anaphorically to the previous paragraph. Further research on the topic is needed to find out if other factors might favour the pre-verbal position for subject clauses.

JAVIER RIIVAS

NOTES

[1] By *equative constructions*, I refer to structures such as "The main concern of this meeting is that everybody is sure of their task". Huddleston (1984: 457-459) talks about *identifying Be* when he deals with this type of construction.

[2] In the relation of predicates and examples offered here, the following points should be noted: (i) no examples of clauses in pre-verbal position have been included since they will be presented later on in the paper; (ii) unless otherwise indicated, the predicates occur in declarative sequences; (iii) some examples are included when the word-order of the sequence is marked; (iv) the numbers after the examples refer to the page where the example may be found.

[3] Examples taken from Huddleston (1984: 451).

[4] *TP* stands for "tense phrase" in Radford's approach. *Spec* stands for "specifier". The spec-TP position is occupied by what traditional grammars call the *subject* of the sequence.

[5] Ellegård defines *lifting* as the fact that "two constituents share a function within one and the same clause" (1978: 16-17), as is the case with *it is difficult to understand* where both *it* and *to understand* function as the subject of *is difficult*.

[6] He includes clauses introduced by both *that* and *zero* complementizers.

[7] Croft (1990: 92) states that one of the criteria to be taken into account in markedness is frequency. According to him, the unmarked element must occur at least as many times as the marked element.

[8] Unless otherwise indicated, the examples are taken from my corpus.

[9] Examples (16) and (17) involve cases of double embedding and therefore, the subject clause cannot occur in post-verbal position.

[10] Examples (22) and (23) are Bolinger's.

[11] Prince distinguishes groups within the general ones which she denominates *evoked*, *inferred* and *new*. *Unused* is a kind of new entity included in the speech as "assumed to be in the hearer's model" (1981: 236).

WORKS CITED

BOLINGER, D. 1977. *Meaning and Form*. London: Longman.

CROFT, W. 1990. *Typology and Universals*. Cambridge: Cambridge U. P.

DEKEYSER, X. 1984. "Diachronic Dimensions of Subject and Object Complement Clauses". In Blake, N. F. and C. Jones. (eds.). *English Historical Linguistics: Studies in Development* (CECTAL Conference Papers, 3). Sheffield: The Centre for English Cultural Tradition and Language, University of Sheffield: 194-204.

ELLEGÅRD, A. 1978. *The Syntactic Structure of English Texts: A Computer-based Study of Four Kinds of Text in the Brown University Corpus*. Götheburg: Acta Universitatis Gothoburgensis.

ELSNESS, J. 1981. "On the Syntactic and Semantic Functions of *that*-clauses". In Johansson, S. and B. Tysdahl. (eds.). *Papers from the first Nordic Conference for English Studies*. Oslo: University of Oslo: 281-303.

EMONDS, J. 1972. "A Reformulation of Certain Syntactic Transformations". In Peters, S. (ed.). *Goals of Linguistic Theory*. Englewood Cliffs: Prentice Hall: 21-62.

---. 1976. *A Transformational Approach to English Syntax. Root, Structure-Preserving and Local Transformations*. New York: Academic Press.

FANEGO, T. 1990. "Finite Complement Clauses in Shakespeare's English. Part I & II". *Studia Neophilologica* 62: 3-21 and 129-149.

---. 1992. *Infinitive Complements in Shakespeare's English: Synchronic and Diachronic Aspects*. Santiago de Compostela: University, Servicio de Publicacións e Intercambio Científico.

GARCÍA LORENZO, J. C. 1993. "Aspects of the Syntax of Finite Complement Clauses as Subjects in John Lyly's *Euphues: The Anatomy of Wyt*". *Atlantis* XV: 135-152.

GIVÓN, T. 1983. "Topic Continuity in Discourse: An Introduction". In Givón, T. (ed.). *Topic Continuity in Discourse. A Quantitative Cross-language Study*. Amsterdam-Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company: 5-41.

HAEGEMAN, L. (1991) 1994. *Introduction to Government and Binding Theory*. Oxford: Basil Blackwell.

HUDDLESTON, R. 1971. *The Sentence in Written English. A Syntactic Study Based on an Analysis of Scientific Texts*. Cambridge: Cambridge U. P.

---. 1984. *Introduction to the Grammar of English*. Cambridge: Cambridge U. P.

JACKENDOFF, R. 1981. *X-Syntax: A Study of Phrase Structure*. Cambridge Mass: The MIT Press.

JESPERSEN, O. 1909-1949. *A Modern English Grammar on Historical Principles*, I-VII. London: Allen & Unwin.

KOSTER, J. 1978. "Why Subject Sentences Don't Exist". In Keyser, S. J. (ed.). *Recent Transformational Studies in European Languages*. Cambridge Mass: The MIT Press: 53-64.

LIGHTFOOT, D. W. 1976. "Diachronic Syntax: Extraposition and Deep Structure Reanalysis". *Folia Linguistica* IX, (1/ 4): 197-214.

LÓPEZ COUSO, M. J. 1994a. "Extraposition vs Intraposition: the Whys and the Wherefores". In Ruíz, J. M. *et al.* (eds.). *Actas del XVI Congreso de la Asociación Española de Estudios Anglo-Norteamericanos (A.E.D.E.A.N. 1992).* Valladolid: Secretariado de Publicaciones: 227-233.

---. 1994b. *Finite Complementation in the Works of John Dryden: A Corpus-based Study.* [Unpublished Ph. D. dissertation, University of Santiago de Compostela].

MAIR, C. 1990. *Infinitival Complement Clauses in English: A Study of Grammar in Discourse.* Cambridge: Cambridge U. P.

MATTHEWS, P. H. 1981. *Syntax.* Cambridge: Cambridge U. P.

MÉNDEZ NAYA, B. 1997. "Subject Clauses in Old English: Do They Really Exist?" *Miscelánea: A Journal of English and American Studies* 18: 213-230.

MITCHELL, B. 1985. *Old English Syntax.* 2 vols. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

NOONAN, M. 1985. "Complementation". In Shopen, T. (ed.). *Language Typology and Syntactic Description.* Vol. 2. Cambridge: Cambridge U. P.: 42-140.

PAINE, J. 1794-1796. *The Age of Reason.* In *Library of the Future* (CD-ROM). Windows. Ver. 4.2. World Library, Inc. 1991-1994.

PRINCE, E. F. 1981. "Toward a Taxonomy of Given-New Information". In Cole, P. (ed.). 1981. *Radical Pragmatics.* New York: Academic Press: 223-255.

QUIRK, R., S. GREENBAUM, G. LEECH and J. SVARTVIK. 1985. *A Comprehensive Grammar of the English Language.* London & New York: Longman.

RADFORD, A. 1997. *Syntactic Theory and the Structure of English. A Minimalist Approach.* Cambridge: Cambridge U. P.

ROSENBAUM, P. S. 1967. *The Grammar of English Predicate Complement Constructions.* Cambridge Mass: The MIT Press.

TRAUGOTT, E. C. 1972. *The History of English Syntax.* New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston.

VISSER, F. T. 1963-1973. *An Historical Syntax of the English Language.* Vols. I-III. Leiden: Brill.

WARNER, A. 1982. *Complementation in Middle English and the Methodology of Historical Syntax.* London & Canberra: Croom Helm.

THE ROLE OF TEXT STRUCTURE IN ENCODING IDEOLOGY AND INDIVIDUAL PERSPECTIVE

MARÍA JOSÉ LUZÓN MARCO
UNIVERSIDAD DE ZARAGOZA

1. INTRODUCTION

Over the past few decades the relation between discourse and ideology has been the focus of much discourse analysis. Critical discourse analysis (e.g. Fairclough 1989a, 1989b, 1992; Fowler 1991; Fowler *et al.*, 1979; Simpson 1993) has developed as a sub-area of discourse analysis concerned with the exploration of the linguistic encoding of ideology. Within this current of linguistics discourse is a mode of talking associated with a certain institution and thus determined by the nature of such institution (Kress 1985: 28). Or, as Fairclough puts it, discourse is "language as social practice determined by social structures" (1989a: 16). Critical linguists adopt Halliday's (1978) concept of language as consisting of systems of options among which the speaker or writer makes meaningful selections. Given that language is used within society, linguistic features at any level reflect social processes and therefore specific linguistic choices are used to convey cultural and social values and particular ideologies.

Since discourse is language as social practice it reflects the system of knowledge and beliefs of the institution where it has been produced and the social positions and identities of its users. That is, discourse is the clearest expression of ideology (Fairclough 1989a, 1989b; Kress 1985). Discourse contributes to perpetuating class conflict and to legitimising existing power relations. It is a means of realising and supporting power relations and at the same time of challenging or changing them.

Given that discourse reflects ideology it will select the most appropriate linguistic elements to convey that ideology. For instance, racist discourse will select linguistic forms that contribute to expressing concepts such as